

# On The Khilafah Of 'Ali Over Abu Bakr



**Toyib Olawuyi**

[Al-Islam.org](http://Al-Islam.org)

**Sub Title:**

A Dictionary of Sahih Sunni Ahadith

**Author(s):**

Toyib Olawuyi [3]

This text provides evidence for the Caliphate of Imam Ali (AS) over Abu Bakr using different Traditions such as Hadith Al-Wilayah, Hadith Al-Tawliyah, and Hadith Al-Wirathah.

**Category:**

Sunni & Shi'a [4]

Early Islamic History [5]

Imam Ali [6]

Hadith Collections [7]

**Topic Tags:**

Hadith Al-Wilayah [8]

Hadith Al-Tawliyah [9]

Hadith Al-Wirathah [10]

**Miscellaneous information:**

Copyright © 2014 Toyib Olawuyi All rights reserved. ISBN-10: 1492858846 ISBN-13: 978-1492858843

**Featured Category:**

Resources for Further Research [11]

Shi'a beliefs explained [12]

**Person Tags:**

Imam Ali [13]

Abu Bakr [14]

This research is dedicated to Amir al-Muminin 'Ali b. Abi Talib, *salawatullah wa salamuhu 'alaihi*, who is my *mawla* and the *mawla* of all believers.

Special thanks to Tural Islam, Aneela Sultan, Ali Baker, Syeda Umme Rabab Bukhari, Ahmad Olawuyi, and the following brothers and sisters, for their encouragement: Shaykh Muhammad Nura Dass, Steve

Davies, Jaffer Abbas, Jibreel Ibn Mikael, Jafar Mer, Muhammad Ali Khalil, Hassan Bokhari, Syed Jarry Haider, Omidiji Nurudeen, Kassim Agbonika Salihu, Aquib Mehdi Rizvi, Syed Ali Raza, Sajjad Abu Ja'far Baktash, Akram Abbas, Ali Hussnain, Nader Carun, Henna Rai, Rizziandrie Zairul, Kashif Bukhari, Syed Mansab Ali Jafri, Nasir Hasan, and Hussain Ali Nasser. May Allah bless them all and all our loving brothers and sisters from the Shi'ah Imamiyyah and the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah.

## بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ

Two questions stand at the centre of the Sunni-Shi'i disagreement:

- (i) Did the Messenger of Allah, *sallallahu 'alaihi wa alihi*, ever appoint any *khalifah* to stand in his command position and substitute for him in his command roles after his death?
- (ii) If he did, *who* exactly did he designate?

Our brothers from the Ahl al-Sunnah resolutely submit that the Prophet *never* appointed a *khalifah*. Rather, he – according to them – died without any designated heir to his command, and gave no indication whatsoever as to the method of appointing future commanders of the *Ummah*. Therefore, *any* Sunni Muslim can become the Sunni caliph by inheritance, or through a popular vote, an electoral college, a coup, or an armed rebellion. By contrast, the Shi'ah Imamiyyah argue that the Messenger of Allah actually appointed twelve *khalifahs* from his bloodline – by Divine Order – to assume his command roles after him. In line with the Shi'i doctrine, the first of these *khalifahs* was Amir al-Muminin 'Ali b. Abi Talib, *'alaihi al-salam*, followed by Imam al-Hasan, *'alaihi al-salam*, then Imam al-Husayn, *'alaihi al-salam*, and then nine others from the progeny of al-Husayn, *'alahim al-salam*. The twelfth of them, according to Shi'is, is Imam al-Mahdi, *'alaihi al-salam*.

Another crucial difference between the Sunni and Shi'i positions is outlined below:

1. According to Sunni Islam, it is primarily political and military power which determines legitimacy. Therefore, whoever is to *seize* full political and military control of most of the Sunni communities is their legitimate *khalifah*. Whoever is not able to achieve that is not the *khalifah*.
2. On the other hand, Shi'is maintain that it is only divine appointment that determines legitimacy. Even if the divine appointee is denied political or military power, he still remains the legitimate *khalifah*. Whoever exercises political or military control over him is nothing but a rebel, and so is whosoever fails to recognize his authority. All the messengers of Allah, *'alahim al-salam*, were commanders of their respective *Ummahs* till their deaths<sup>1</sup>. Yet, most of them were denied both political and military authority. That, of course, never stripped them of their legitimate command over even the rebel leaders.

However, there are authentic *ahadith* in the Sunni sources which firmly establish that the Prophet – by the Command of Allah – *did* appoint twelve *khalifahs* from his bloodline, with the first of them really being ‘Ali! This then is exactly where the supreme problem lies for the Sunni claims, and – of course – the entirety of Sunni Islam as a whole.

The *khalifah* is the one who takes the place of another one, who is physically absent for one reason or another. Imam Ibn al-‘Athir (d. 606 H), an ace Sunni lexicographer, explains:

### ال خليفة من يقوم مقام الذاهب ويسد مسده

The *khalifah* is whoever stands in the position of the one who is physically absent and substitutes for him.<sup>2</sup>

So, the *khalifah* is basically the “substitute” of the one who is physically absent. The cause of the absence does not matter – whether distance, death or others. What is important is that someone who occupies/occupied a certain position is physically absent, and another – the *khalifah* – “substitutes” for him *in it*. This often happens in football matches. A player is substituted by another who then plays his *exact* role on the pitch. The substitute is the *khalifah* of the substituted footballer. With regards to our *Ummah*, the Messenger of Allah is our *amir* (commander)<sup>3</sup>. His command endures over, and binds, all Muslims – civilian and military – till the End Time. In particular, he had, and still has, full command of all Muslim armed forces. No Muslim can ever validly claim that the Prophet’s command has ceased over *any* of the believers. None has ever, and none will ever, do such. The Messenger of Allah is, and will forever remain, the *amir* of the believers (*amir al-muminin*).

However, it was impossible for the Prophet to personally exercise all his command roles over the *Ummah*, even during his lifetime. Therefore, whenever he was unable to do so by himself, he used to deputize people to fill the roles for him. Whoever he appointed was therefore known as his *amir* (i.e. the *amir* appointed by him)<sup>4</sup>. Imam Ahmad (d. 241 H) records one of his explicit instructions concerning such deputies:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا روح ثنا بن جريج أنا زياد عن بن شهاب ان أبا سلمة بن عبد الرحمن أخبره انه سمع أبا هريرة يقول قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم من أطاعني فقد أطاع الله ومن عصاني فقد عصى الله ومن أطاع أميري فقد أطاعني ومن عصى أميري فقد عصاني

<sup>2</sup>‘Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Ruh – Ibn Jurayj – Ziyad – Ibn Shihab – Abu

Salamah b. 'Abd al-Rahman – Abu Hurayrah:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “Whosoever obeys me has obeyed Allah and whosoever disobeys me has disobeyed Allah. Also, **whosoever obeys my *amir* has obeyed me, and whosoever disobeys my *amir* has disobeyed me.**”<sup>5</sup>

Shaykh al-Arnaut says:

### إسناده صحيح على شرط الشيخين

Its chain is *sahih* upon the standard of the two Shaykhs.<sup>6</sup>

These *amirs* were generally appointed either as army commanders or civilian governors. In the latter case, they were also referred to as *khalifahs*<sup>7</sup>. They stood in the position of the Messenger of Allah – often in a limited capacity – and substituted for him within his *Ummah*. The question then is about the command roles of the Prophet *after his death*. Did he appoint *amirs* to fill them for him or not? He knew for certain that he was going to die one day, and would no longer be able to personally perform his command roles at all anymore within his *Ummah*. So, what did he do about these roles? Did he follow his Sunnah of appointing *amirs* to perform them for him whenever he was unable to do by himself? Or, did he abandon his own Sunnah?! Our brothers from the Ahl al-Sunnah say: *Yes, he abandoned his own Sunnah!*

He knew that he still had those roles in his *Ummah* which would endure after his demise, and that he would soon be unable to carry them out personally. Yet, he deputized no one to perform them for him in his absence (due to death). Meanwhile, the Shi'ah contradict the Ahl al-Sunnah on this matter. They argue that it was absolutely impossible for the Messenger to have departed without taking steps to ensure the continued fulfillment of his command roles over his *Ummah* after him. They submit instead that he actually appointed twelve *amirs* to fill his full command roles for him among his followers till the Hour.

The Shi'i claim apparently has support in authentic Sunni reports. For instance, this is an authentic *hadith* documented in the *Musnad* of Imam Ahmad:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني سريج بن يونس عن عمر بن عبيد عن سماك بن حرب  
عن جابر بن سمرة قال سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يقول يكون  
من بعدي اثنا عشر أميراً فتكلم فخفي علي فسألت الذي يليني أو إلى جنبي فقال  
كلهم من قريش

‘Abd Allah – Shurayh b. Yunus – ‘Umar b. ‘Ubayd – Simak b. Harb – Jabir b. Samurah:

I heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, saying, “**THERE WILL BE AFTER ME TWELVE AMIRS**”. Then he said something which I did not hear clearly. So I asked the one next to me, and he said, “**All of them will be from Quraysh.**”<sup>8</sup>

Shaykh al-Arnaut comments:

حديث صحيح وهذا إسناده حسن من أجل سماك

It is a *sahih hadith*, and this chain is *hasan* due to Simak.<sup>9</sup>

Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 H) says about the same *hadith*:

هذا حديث حسن صحيح

This *hadith* is *hasan sahih*<sup>10</sup>

And ‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) agrees:

صحيح

*Sahih*<sup>11</sup>

Imam Ahmad further records:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا مؤمل بن إسماعيل ثنا حماد بن سلمة حدثنا داود بن هند عن الشعبي عن جابر بن سمرة قال سمعت النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم يقول يكون لهذه الأمة اثنا عشر خليفة

‘Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Mumal b. Isma’il – Hamad b. Salamah – Dawud b. Hind – al-Shu’bi – Jabir b. Samurah:

I heard the Prophet, peace be upon him, saying: “**There will be FOR this Ummah TWELVE**

**KHALIFAHS.”<sup>12</sup>**

Shaykh al-Arnaut says:

## حديث صحيح

It is a *sahih hadith*.<sup>13</sup>

Note that the *hadith* says “for this *Ummah*” and not “in this *Ummah*”. So, it explicitly and very emphatically *limits* the number to twelve till the extinction of the *Ummah* at the Last Hour. The phrase “in this *Ummah*” – although having the same effect too – would have been weaker.

Ahmad again documents:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا هاشم ثنا زهير ثنا زياد بن خيثمة عن الأسود بن سعيد الهمداني عن جابر بن سمرة قال سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم أو قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يكون بعدي اثنا عشر خليفة كلهم من قريش

‘Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Hashim – Zuhayr – Ziyad b. Khaythamah – al-Aswad b. Sa’id al-Hamdani – Jabir b. Samurah:

I heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, saying, or the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “**THERE WILL BE AFTER ME TWELVE KHALIFAHS, all of them from Quraysh.**”<sup>14</sup>

Al-Arnaut comments:

## حديث صحيح

It is a *sahih hadith*<sup>15</sup>

In some other *ahadith*, their direct appointment by the Prophet is stated, as well as their primary identities. Imam Ibn Abi ‘Asim (d. 287 H) records:

ثنا أبو بكر، ثنا عمرو بن سعد أبو داود الحفري، عن شريك، عن الركين عن القاسم بن حسان، عن زيد بن ثابت قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: إني تارك فيكم الخليفين من بعدي، كتاب الله وعترتي أهل بيتي وإنهما لن يتفرقا حتى يردا علي الحوض.

Abu Bakr – ‘Amr b. Sa’d Abu Dawud al-Hafri – Sharik – al-Rakin – al-Qasim b. Hisan – Zayd b. Thabit:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, “**I AM LEAVING BEHIND AMONG YOU the two khalfahs after me: the Book of Allah and my bloodline, my Ahl al-Bayt.** Both shall never separate from each other until they meet me at the Lake-Font.”<sup>16</sup>

‘Allamah al-Albani declares:

### حديث صحيح

It is a *sahih hadith*.<sup>17</sup>

Imam Ahmad too documents:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا الأسود بن عامر ثنا شريك عن الركين عن القاسم بن حسان عن زيد بن ثابت قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إني تارك فيكم خليفين كتاب الله حبل ممدود ما بين السماء والأرض أو ما بين السماء إلى الأرض وعترتي أهل بيتي وإنهما لن يتفرقا حتى يردا علي الحوض

‘Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – al-Aswad b. ‘Amir – Sharik – al-Rakin – al-Qasim b. Hisan – Zayd b. Thabit:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, “**I AM LEAVING BEHIND AMONG YOU two khalfahs: the Book of Allah** – a rope stretching between the heaven and the earth or from the heaven to the earth – **and my bloodline, my Ahl al-Bayt.** Both shall never separate from each other until they meet me at the Lake-Font.”<sup>18</sup>

Shaykh al-Arnaut comments:

حديث صحيح بشواهدة دون قوله : " وإنهما لن يتفرقا حتى يردا علي الحوض "  
وهذا إسناد ضعيف لسوء حفظ شريك

**The *hadith* is *sahih* through its *shawahid* (witnesses)**, except his statement “Both shall never separate from each other until they meet me at the Lake-Font.”<sup>19</sup>

Ahmad further records:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا أبو أحمد الزبيري ثنا شريك عن الركين عن  
القاسم بن حسان عن زيد بن ثابت قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم  
إني تارك فيكم خليفتين كتاب الله وأهل بيتي وإنهما لن يتفرقا حتى يردا علي  
الحوض جميعا

‘Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Abu Ahmad al-Zubayri – Sharik – al-Rakin –  
al-Qasim b. Hisan – Zayd b. Thabit:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “**I AM LEAVING BEHIND AMONG YOU two *khalifahs*: the Book of Allah and my Ahl al-Bayt.** Both shall never separate from each other until they meet me together at the Lake-Font.”<sup>20</sup>

Al-Arnaut again says:

حديث صحيح بشواهدة دون قوله : " وإنهما لن يتفرقا حتى يردا علي الحوض "  
جميعا "

**The *hadith* is *sahih* through its *shawahid***, except his statement, “Both shall never separate from each other until they meet me together at the Lake-Font.”<sup>21</sup>

Imam al-Haythami (d. 807 H) too copies this report from *Musnad Ahmad*:

عن زيد بن ثابت قال : قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم: إني تارك فيكم  
خليفتين : كتاب الله عز و جل حبل ممدود ما بين السماء والأرض – أو ما  
بين السماء إلى الأرض – وعترتي أهل بيتي وإنهما لن يتفرقا حتى يردا علي

## الحوض

Narrated Zayd b. Thabit:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, “**I AM LEAVING BEHIND AMONG YOU two *khalifahs*: the Book of Allah** – a rope stretching between the heaven and the earth or from the heaven to the earth – **and my bloodline, my Ahl al-Bayt**. Both shall never separate from each other until they meet me at the Lake-Font.”<sup>22</sup>

And he passes this verdict:

رواه أحمد وإسناده جيد

Ahmad has narrated it **and its chain is good (*jayyid*)**.

It was the Prophet himself who was personally leaving behind the Qur’an and his bloodline as *khalifahs* among his *Ummah*. In fact, in one of the reports, he called them “*the two khalifahs after me*”, thereby fixing and restricting the *khilafah* to them. In any case, both the Qur’an and his bloodline are his *khalifahs*, appointed by him, according to the authentic *ahadith* above. Something to note at this point is that the word *khalifah* is both singular and plural, as submitted by Imam al-Raghib al-Isfahani (d. 501 H):

والخليفة يقال للواحد والجمع ، وهاهنا [هو] جمع ، فإن الخليفة لم يرد به آدم عليه السلام فقط ، بل أريد هو وصالحو أولاده ، فهم خلفاؤه

**The word *khalifah* is used to refer to a single person or to a group**. Here (under Qur’an 2:30), it is plural. This is because the word *Khalifah* (there) does not refer to Adam, peace be upon him, alone. Rather, it refers to him and the righteous ones among his offspring. So, they are His (i.e. Allah’s) *Khalifahs*.<sup>23</sup>

Therefore, it was linguistically permissible for the Prophet to refer to his bloodline as his *khalifah*, to indicate that each of them was his *khalifah* individually. Secondly, like in the case of Adam, the word *khalifah* in the *ahadith* is not a reference to all the members of the bloodline indiscriminately. Rather, as stated in the other *ahadith*, the *khalifahs* among them are only twelve of their righteous ones. Each of these *khalifahs* stands in the Messenger’s position as the *amir* of the *Ummah* and substitutes for the latter in his command roles. So, each of them is also our *amir*, the *amir* of our Prophet over us.

The big questions then rise here:

1. How many are the *khalifahs* of Sunni Muslims?
2. What percentage of them were from the Prophet's bloodline, his Ahl al-Bayt?
3. What percentage of them remained eternally inseparable from the Qur'an, as stipulated by the *ahadith*?
4. And what percentage of them acted *for* the Messenger of Allah?

Without a doubt, the Sunni *khalifahs* were in their dozens. Meanwhile, the *khalifahs* for this *Ummah*, according to its Prophet, are only twelve. So, it is either none of them was a *khalifah* for the *Ummah*, or only twelve of them were. Perhaps, the worst part of it all is that none of the dozens of Sunni *khalifahs* – apart from Amir al-Muminin and Imam al-Hasan – was from the Prophet's bloodline. In particular, Abu Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthman, Mu'awiyah and Yazid – the primary Sunni *khalifahs* – were all from *outside* the bloodline of the Messenger. This fact singlehandedly kicks them out of the scope of the legitimate *khilafah*!

Apparently, Sunni Islam itself survives upon the legitimacy of the *khilafah* of Abu Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthman, Mu'awiyah and Yazid at the least. Should their *khilafah* – or that of any of them – collapse, the Sunni religion as a whole dies with it. So, the Sunni *'ulama* make all the desperate efforts they can and go to all desperate lengths to deny the legitimate *khilafah* of the Ahl al-Bayt and uphold the patently illegitimate *khilafah* of the others. It is a survival tactic for them. They have no other choice if they still want to maintain their flocks and the attendant benefits. However, it is indeed a very dangerous game actually, in the light of this noble verse:

ولا تلبسوا الحق بالباطل وتكتموا الحق وأنتم تعلمون

And mix not the Truth with falsehood, nor conceal the Truth while you know.<sup>24</sup>

Then, Allah adds:

إن الذين يكتُمون ما أنزلنا من البينات والهدى من بعد ما بيناه للناس في الكتاب أولئك يلعنهم الله ويلعنهم اللاعنون

**Those who conceal the clear proofs, evidences and the guidance**, which We have sent down, after We have made it clear for the people in the Book, **they are the ones being cursed by Allah** and being

cursed by the cursers.<sup>25</sup>

In particular, these desperate Sunni *‘ulama* focus upon the *khilafah* of Amir al-Muminin ‘Ali b. Abi Talib. He was the immediate, undisputed leader of the Prophet’s bloodline after the latter. Meanwhile, the true *khilafah* had been fixed permanently within this same bloodline. Therefore, naturally, ‘Ali was the first legitimate *khalifah* of Islam. So, even if there were no other authentic *ahadith* about his *khilafah*, it is nonetheless perfectly proven through this route.

Yet, in addition to this general evidence, there are also loads of specific undeniable Sunni proofs for the *khilafah* of Amir al-Muminin over Abu Bakr and the entire *Ummah* after the Messenger of Allah. But, as a way of protecting the patently illegitimate *khilafah* of Abu Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthman, some scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah further wage an *extreme* war against the authentic evidences in favour of ‘Ali in their own books. They instinctively deny, without tabling any academic excuse, any *sahih* Sunni *hadith* about Amir al-Muminin which threatens Abu Bakr and ‘Umar in any way – whether in merits, virtues or *khilafah*.

None among them has ever been as violent in this regard as Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah. He has done this recklessly and relentlessly throughout his books, especially *Minhaj al-Sunnah*. Therefore, in this book, this author has concentrated mainly upon Ibn Taymiyyah’s claims and arguments against the doubtless Sunni proofs which firmly, explicitly and specifically establish the *khilafah* of Amir al-Muminin *immediately* after the Messenger of the Lord of the worlds.

In this book, we have adopted the same investigative research methodology as we did in our first book: *‘Ali: the Best of the Sahabah*. Through these efforts and the complete transparency of our techniques, we hope to give every truth-seeker the full opportunity to reach the truth in a safe, honest, and intellectually charged environment, devoid of sectarian propaganda or bias. We implore Allah to forgive us all our mistakes, and to accept this as a worthy act of *‘ibadah*. And may Allah send His *salawat* and *barakat* upon our master, Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah, and upon his purified bloodline.

1. See Qur’an 4:64

2. Ibn al-Athir, Abu Sa’adat al-Mubarak b. Muhammad al-Jazari, al-Nihayah fi Gharib al-Hadith wa al-Athar (Qum: Muasassat Isma’iliyyan) [annotator: Mahmud Muhammad al-Tanahi and Tahir Ahmad al-Zawi], vol. 2, p. 69

3. There are several verses of the Qur’an which order all believers till the Day of al-Qiyamah to “obey” the Messenger – 4:64, 3:32, , 3:132, 4:13, 4:59, 4:69, 4:80, 5:92, 8:1, 8:20, 8:46, 9:71, 24:47, 24:51, 24:52, 24:54, 24:56, 33:33, 33:66, 33:71, 47:33, 48:17, 49:14, 58:13, and 64:12.

4. This shows that it is permissible, and in fact the Sunnah, to refer to deputies and substitutes in command roles as amirs.

5. Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu’ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 2, p. 511, # 10645

6. Ibid

7. We have discussed instances of this usage in the main body of this book, especially in the chapters on Hadith al-Khilafah and Hadith al-Manzilah.

8. Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu’ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 5, p. 99, # 20978

9. Ibid

10. Abu 'Isa Muhammad b. 'Isa al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi, al-Jami' al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 4, p. 501, # 2223
11. Ibid
12. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 5, p. 106, # 21051
13. Ibid
14. Ibid, vol. 5, p. 92, # 20890
15. Ibid
16. Abu Bakr b. Abi 'Asim, Ahmad b. 'Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1400 H) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 2, pp. 350-351, # 754
17. Ibid, vol. 2, p. 351, # 754
18. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 5, p. 181, # 21618
19. Ibid
20. Ibid, vol. 5, p. 189, # 21697
21. Ibid
22. Nur al-Din 'Ali b. Abi Bakr al-Haythami, Majma' al-Zawaid (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1412 H), vol. 9, p. 256, # 14957
23. Abu al-Qasim al-Husayn b. Muhammad b. al-Mufadhhal al-Raghib al-Isfahani, Tafsir al-Raghib al-Isfahani wa Muqadimmatuh (Kulliyat al-Adab, Jami'ah Tanta; 1st edition, 1412 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad 'Abd al-'Aziz Basyuni], vol. 1, p. 139
24. Qur'an 2:42
25. Qur'an 2: 159

Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) says:

والجواب أن هذا ليس مسنداً بل هو مرسل لو ثبت عن عمرو بن ميمون وفيه ألفاظ هي كذب على رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم كقوله أما ترضى أن تكون مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى غير أنك لست بنبي لا ينبغي أن أذهب إلا وأنت خليفة فإن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم ذهب غير مرة وخليفته على المدينة غير علي

The reply is that this (*hadith*) is not fully-connected in its chain (*musnad*). Rather, it is *mursal* (narrated by a Tabi'i directly from the Prophet), (even) if it is authentically transmitted from 'Amr b. Maymun. It (also) contains **statements that are lies upon the Messenger of Allah** such as his statement: "Are you not pleased that you are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, with the exception that you are not a prophet? **It is not right that I depart except with you as my *khalifah*.**" Verily, the Prophet, peace be upon him, departed many times and his *khalifah* over Madinah was other than 'Ali (on each occasion). 1

First, our dear Shaykh grades the *hadith* of 'Amr b. Maymun to be *mursal*. This means that there is no Sahabi in the chain. The last narrator transmitting directly from the Messenger of Allah, *sallallahu 'alaihi*

*wa alihi*, is only a *Tabi'i*. Second, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah claims that it contains clear lies upon the Messenger of Allah, especially the statement that 'Ali, '*alaihi al-salam*, was his *khalifah*. He also interprets "depart" in the *hadith* to mean "depart from Madinah", rather than "depart from this world". It would be appropriate to examine its full chain, context and texts in order to determine the validity of the Shaykh's claims.

*Hadith al-Khilafah* has come in three *sighahs* (versions). The first *sighah* is documented by Imam Ibn Abi 'Asim (d. 287 H). He records:

ثنا محمد بن المثنى، حدثنا يحيى بن حماد، عن أبي عوانة، عن يحيى بن سليم  
أبي بلج عن عمرو بن ميمون، عن ابن عباس قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله  
عليه وسلم لعلي: أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنك لست نبيا وأنت  
خليفتي في كل مؤمن من بعدي.

Muhammad b. al-Muthanna – Yahya b. Hammad – Abu 'Awanah – Yahya b. Sulaym **Abu Balj** – 'Amr b. Maymun – **Ibn 'Abbas**: The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to 'Ali: "You are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, with the exception that you are not a prophet. **And you are my *khalifah* over every believer after me.**"<sup>2</sup>

Dr. al-Jawabirah says:

أسناده حسن. رجاله رجال الشيخين غير أبي بلج واسمه يحيى بن سليم بن بلج،  
قال الحافظ: صدوق ربما أخطأ. وله شواهد

**Its chain is *hasan*.** Its narrators are narrators of the two Shaykhs, except Abu Balj, and his name is Yahya b. Sulaym b. Balj. Al-Hafiz said: "*Saduq* (very truthful), *maybe* he made mistakes." **There are witnesses for it (i.e. the *hadith*).**"<sup>3</sup>

'Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H), in his annotated version of Ibn Abi Asim's *Kitab al-Sunnah* surprisingly added some new words in brackets:

ثنا محمد بن المثنى، حدثنا يحيى بن حماد، عن أبي عوانة، عن يحيى بن سليم  
أبي بلج عن عمرو بن ميمون، عن ابن عباس قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله  
عليه وسلم لعلي: أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنك لست نبيا] إنه لا

ينبغي أن أذهب إلا [وأنت خليفتي في كل مؤمن من بعدي].

Muhammad b. al-Muthanna – Yahya b. Hammad – Abu ‘Awanah – Yahya b. Sulaym **Abu Balj** – ‘Amr b. Maymun – **Ibn ‘Abbas**: The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to ‘Ali: “You are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, with the exception that you are not a prophet. [**Verily, it is not right that I depart except] with you as my *khalifah* over every believer after me.**”<sup>4</sup>

Nonetheless, ‘Allamah al-Albani also comments:

إسناده حسن. ورجاله ثقات رجال الشيخين غير أبي بلج واسمه يحيى بن سليم بن بلج قال الحافظ: " صدوق ربما أخطأ "

**Its chain is *hasan*.** Its narrators are trustworthy, and are narrators of the two Shaykhs (i.e. al-Bukhari and Muslim) except Abu Balj. His name is Yahya b. Sulaym b. Balj. Al-Hafiz said: “*Saduq* (very truthful), *maybe* he made mistakes.”<sup>5</sup>

This *hadith*, in the Sunni book, is narrated by Ibn ‘Abbas, *radhiyallahu ‘anhu*, a Sahabi. Therefore, it is not *mursal*, as claimed by Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah. Rather, its chain is *musnad* (well-connected) and *hasan* (good). Moreover, since the *hadith* has been authentically transmitted, the Shaykh’s grading of it as “a lie” also has absolutely no basis at all.

The second *sighah* is recorded by Imam Ahmad b. Hanbal (d. 241 H), in his *Musnad*:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا يحيى بن حماد ثنا أبو عوانة ثنا أبو بلج ثنا عمرو بن ميمون .... قال بن عباس .... وخرج بالناس في غزوة تبوك قال فقال له علي أخرج معك قال فقال له نبي الله لا فبكي علي فقال له أما ترضى أن تكون منى بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنك لست بنبي انه لا ينبغي أن أذهب الا وأنت خليفتي

‘Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Yahya b. Hammad – Abu ‘Awanah – **Abu Balj** – ‘Amr b. Maymun .... Ibn ‘Abbas said:

.... He (the Messenger of Allah) went out for the battle of Tabuk. So, ‘Ali said to him, “Let me go out with you.” Therefore, the Prophet of Allah, peace be upon him, said, “Do not weep, ‘Ali. Are you not pleased that you are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, with the exception that you are not a prophet? **Verily,**

it is not right that I depart except with you as my *khalifah*.”<sup>6</sup>

Al-Arnaut strangely says:

إسناده ضعيف بهذه السياقة . أبو بلج أعدل ما قيل فيه أنه يقبل حديثه فيما  
لاينفرد به.

Its chain is *dha'if* with this context. **Abu Balj**, the fairest that has been said about him is that his *hadith* is accepted only when he is corroborated.<sup>7</sup>

However, he contradicts himself elsewhere:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا عفان ثنا أبو عوانة ثنا أبو بلج عن محمد بن  
حاطب.... إسناده حسن من أجل أبي بلج

‘Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – ‘Affan – Abu ‘Awanah – **Abu Balj** – Muhammad b. Hatib ....

**Its chain is *hasan* due to Abu Balj.**<sup>8</sup>

Al-Arnaut also states:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا حسن حدثنا زهير حدثنا أبو بلج ان عمرو بن  
ميمون حدثه قال قال أبو هريرة.... هذا إسناده حسن

‘Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Hasan – Zuhayr – **Abu Balj** – ‘Amr b. Maymun – Abu Hurayrah .... **This chain is *hasan*.**<sup>9</sup>

Apparently, *Hadith al-Khilafah* is *hasan* by the standards of Shaykh al-Arnaut too! Commenting about the same *hadith* in *Musnad Ahmad*, ‘Allamah Ahmad Shakir (d. 1377 H) declares:

إسناده صحيح، أبو بلج، بفتح الباء وسكون اللام و آخره جيم: اسمه يحيى بن  
سليم ويقال يحيى بن أبي الأسود الفزاري، وهو ثقة، وثقه ابن معين وابن سعد  
والنسائي والدارقطني وغيرهم. وفي التهذيب أن البخاري قال: فيه نظر! وما  
أدري أين قال هذا؟، فإنه ترجمه في الكبير 4/2/279 - 280 ولم يذكر فيه جرحاً،

ولم يترجمه في الصغير، ولا ذكره هو والنسائي في الضعفاء، وقد روى عنه  
شعبة، وهو لا يروي إلا عن ثقه.

**Its chain is *sahih*.** Abu Balj: his name is Yahya b. Sulaym. He is also called Yahya b. Abi al-Aswad al-Fazari, and he is ***thiqah*** (trustworthy). **Ibn Ma'in, Ibn Sa'd, al-Nasai, al-Daraqutni and others declared him *thiqah*.** It is said in *al-Tahdhib* that al-Bukhari said: "There is a problem in him"! I do not know: **where has he said that?** This is because in his (al-Bukhari's) biography of him in *al-Kabir* 4/2/279-280, he does not mention any criticism against him, and he (al-Bukhari) does not write his biography in *al-Saghir*, and neither he nor al-Nasai has mentioned him in (his respective) *al-Dhu'afa*. Moreover, Shu'bah has narrated from him, and he does not narrate except from *thiqah* narrators.<sup>10</sup>

Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) records the *hadith* too:

أخبرنا أبو بكر أحمد بن جعفر بن حمدان القطيعي ببغداد من أصل كتابه ثنا  
عبد الله بن أحمد بن حنبل حدثني أبي ثنا يحيى بن حماد ثنا أبو عوانة ثنا أبو  
بلج ثنا عمرو بن ميمون .... قال ابن عباس :.... وقعوا في رجل له بضع عشرة  
فضائل ليست لأحد غيره.... وخرج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في غزوة  
تبوك وخرج بالناس معه قال فقال له علي : أخرج معك قال : فقال النبي صلى  
الله عليه وسلم لا فبكي علي فقال له : أما ترضى أن تكون مني بمنزلة هارون  
من موسى إلا أنه ليس بعدي نبي إنه لا ينبغي أن أذهب إلا وأنت خليفتي

Abu Bakr Ahmad b. Ja'far b. Hamadan al-Qati'i – 'Abd Allah b. Ahmad b. Hanbal – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Yahya b. Hammad – Abu 'Awanah – **Abu Balj** – 'Amr b. Maymun .... Ibn 'Abbas said:

.... **They are attacking a man who has ten EXCLUSIVE merits**.... The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, went out for the battle of Tabuk, and the people went out with him. So, 'Ali said to him, "Let me go out with you." Therefore, the Prophet, peace be upon him, said, "Do not weep, 'Ali. Are you not pleased that you are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, with the exception that there is no prophet after me? **Verily, it is not right that I depart except with you as my *khalifah*.**"<sup>11</sup>

Al-Hakim says:

هذا حديث صحيح الإسناد

This *hadith* has a *sahih* chain. 12

Al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) backs him:

## صحيح

*Sahih*. 13

Meanwhile, Imam al-Nasai (d. 303 H) has documented the third *sighah*, through the same *hasan* chain of transmission as the first:

وخرج بالناس في غزوة تبوك فقال علي أخرج معك فقال لا فبكي فقال أما  
ترضى أن تكون مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنك لست بنبي ثم قال أنت  
خليفتي يعني في كل مؤمن من بعدي

... He (the Messenger of Allah) went out with the people for the battle of Tabuk. So, ‘Ali said to him, “Let me go out with you.” Therefore, he (the Prophet) said, “Do not weep, ‘Ali. Are you not pleased that you are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, with the exception that you are not a prophet? **You are my *khalifah*, that is, over every believer after me.**”<sup>14</sup>

This third *sighah* reveals that the second *sighah* actually misses some words. When the Messenger of Allah declared Amir al-Muminin as his *khalifah*, he explicitly explained what he meant, so that the *khilafah* is not confused with ‘Ali’s governorate over Madinah. In the end, all three *sighahs* actually say the same thing: ‘Ali was the *khalifah* of the Messenger of Allah over *every* believer *after* him.

These various reports record varying degrees of details of the text of *Hadith al-Khilafah*. However, by combining the *sighahs*, a clear picture emerges:

1. The Messenger of Allah made Amir al-Muminin his *khalifah* over Madinah during the battle of Tabuk.
2. The Prophet himself led the army to Tabuk.
3. ‘Ali was very distressed with the appointment and preferred to participate in the battle as a soldier. This displeasure made him weep.
4. His request to the Prophet to let him participate as a soldier in the battle was turned down.
5. To make him happy and pleased, the Prophet stated that he was exactly the Harun of this *Ummah*,

except that while Harun was a prophet, he was not.

6. The Messenger of Allah also informed him that he would become his *khalifah* over his *entire Ummah* after him.<sup>15</sup>

7. The Prophet further added that it was not right for himself to depart except with 'Ali being his *khalifah* over the *entire Ummah* after him.

8. Lastly, 'Ali's *khilafah* in the *hadith* is part of his ten **exclusive** merits, according to Ibn 'Abbas.

Interestingly, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah seeks to capitalize on the fact that the *hadith* was delivered during 'Ali's *khilafah* over Madinah. He therefore restricts the *khilafah* in the *hadith* to mere governorate over a town or city within the *Ummah*. On that basis, he kicks it out:

فإن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ذهب غير مرة وخليفته على المدينة غير علي

Verily, the Prophet, peace be upon him, departed many times and his *khalifah* over Madinah was other than 'Ali (on each occasion).<sup>16</sup>

His submission however fails for two reasons. First, the Messenger wanted to tell 'Ali something to make him happy, considering the latter's deep distress over his appointment as governor of Madinah. How then would he have still mentioned that *same* governorate to cheer him up? Does that make any sense? Besides, the Prophet specifically indicated that the *khilafah* he was speaking about would be over the *entire Ummah* after him. This certainly is different from the governorate of Madinah, which was over a tiny portion of the *Ummah* while the Messenger of Allah was still alive! How on earth did our dear Shaykh miss this simple, clear difference?

As if the weird actions of Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah on *Hadith al-Khilafah* are not enough, 'Allamah al-Albani sinks even deeper:

أما ما يذكره الشيعة في هذا الحديث وغيره أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال في علي رضي الله عنه: "إنه خليفتي من بعدي". فلا يصح بوجه من الوجوه، بل هو من أباطيلهم الكثيرة التي دل الواقع التاريخي على كذبها لأنه لو فرض أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قاله، لوقع كما قال لأنه (وحي يوحى) والله سبحانه لا يخلف وعده

As for what the Shi'ah mention about this *hadith* and others that the Prophet, peace be upon him, said

about ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, that “**he is my *khalifah* after me**”, it is NOT authentic for many reasons. **Rather, it is one of their (i.e. Shi’is) several fabrications**, which are exposed as lies by history. If truly the Prophet, peace be upon him, had said it, it would have occurred as predicted, because it is *wahy* revealed, and Allah never betrays His Promise.<sup>17</sup>

Has the ‘Allamah really forgotten that he has personally authenticated the chain of that *hadith*? Or, did he choose to become economical with truthfulness and sincerity after realizing that *Hadith al-Khilafah* simply cannot be twisted to kill its true meaning? It is rather unfortunate that ‘Allamah al-Albani plays this lowly “Ibn Taymiyyah” card despite his high calibre.

The only excuse he has actually tabled for attacking the *hadith* (despite his claim of the existence of many) is that it contradicts historical reality. Rather than ‘Ali, Abu Bakr became the *khalifah*. Therefore, ‘Ali could not have been the designated successor?! This reasoning further exposes another aspect of ‘Allamah al-Albani: his shocking ignorance of the meaning of the word *khalifah*! Does he even read the Qur’an at all?

Musa and Harun, *‘alaihima al-salam*, were both messengers chosen by Allah:

فَأْتِيَاهُ فَقَوْلَا إِنَّا رَسُولَا رَبِّكَ

So go you both to him and say: “Verily, we both are **messengers** of your Lord”<sup>18</sup>

By the Order of Allah, every messenger was a ruler of his people:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَسُولٍ إِلَّا لِيُطَاعَ بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ

We sent no **messenger**, but to be obeyed by Allah’s Leave.<sup>19</sup>

So, what happens when the people refuse to obey a messenger? Does he lose his status? By the reasoning system of ‘Allamah al-Albani, if Allah had truly appointed someone a messenger, then the people would certainly have obeyed him. If they did not obey him, then it must have been that he was not a genuine messenger!

Harun, apart from being a messenger, was also Musa’s *khalifah* over the latter’s entire *Ummah*:

وَقَالَ مُوسَى لِأَخِيهِ هَارُونَ اخْلُفْنِي فِي قَوْمِي

Musa said to his brother, Harun: “Be my *khalifah* over my people.”<sup>20</sup>

But, what happened once Musa went away temporarily from his *Ummah*, with his brother as his *khalifah* over them? A rebel leader rose against Harun, and stole power. The people of Musa thereby disobeyed Harun and followed the rebel leader, named al-Samiri. Allah informed Musa of the situation while he was still absent from them:

قال فإنا قد فتنا قومك من بعدك وأضلهم السامري

He (Allah) said: “Verily! We have tried your people in your absence, and al-Samiri has led them astray.”<sup>21</sup>

The Qur’an continues:

ولما رجع موسى إلى قومه غضبان أسفا قال بئسما خلفتموني من بعدي  
أعجلتم أمر ربكم وألقى الألواح وأخذ برأس أخيه يجره إليه قال ابن أم إن القوم  
استضعفوني وكادوا يقتلونني

When Musa returned to his people, angry and grieved, he said, “What an evil thing is that which you have done during my absence! Did you hasten and go ahead as regards the matter of your Lord?” He threw down the Tablets and seized his brother by his head and dragged him towards him. Harun said, “O son of my mother! Indeed the people judged me weak, and were about to murder me.”<sup>22</sup>

In line with the logic of ‘Allamah al-Albani, since Allah announced Harun as a messenger, and Musa too called him his *khalifah*, then the Israelites *must* have obeyed him. Otherwise, the Promise of Allah would have failed! Moreover, because they disobeyed Harun and obeyed al-Samiri – in the thinking line of ‘Allamah al-Albani – the former was therefore no longer a messenger or a *khalifah*! Rather, al-Samiri became the true messenger and *khalifah* by staging a successful rebellion! How can a Muslim scholar reason like that?

1. Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 5, p. 34

2. Abu Bakr b. Abi ‘Asim, Ahmad b. ‘Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (Dar al-Sami’i li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’) [annotator: Dr. Basim b. Faysal al-Jawabirah], vol. 1, pp. 799–800, # 1222

3. Ibid

4. Abu Bakr b. Abi ‘Asim, Ahmad b. ‘Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1400 H) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 2, p. 565, # 1188

5. Ibid

6. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muassasat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 1, p. 330, # 3062
7. Ibid
8. Ibid, vol. 4, p. 259, # 18305
9. Ibid, vol. 2, p. 355, # 8645
10. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Dar al-Hadith; 1st edition, 1416 H) [annotator: Ahmad Muhammad Shakir], vol. 1, p. 331, # 3062
11. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 3, p. 143, # 4652
12. Ibid
13. Ibid
14. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Ahmad b. Shu'ayb al-Nasai, Sunan al-Kubra (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Dr. 'Abd al-Ghaffar Sulayman al-Bandari and Sayyid Kasrawi Hasan], vol. 5, p. 112, # 8409
15. 'Ali obviously was very passionate about serving Islam. This was why he preferred to be a soldier, rather than a governor. As a soldier, he believed that his contributions would be far greater. The Prophet then informed him that he was holding, and would also be holding, ranks and positions that would afford him unprecedented opportunities to serve Islam. This was to make him happy, and it did.
16. Abu al-'Abbas Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 5, p. 34
17. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqhiyah wa Fawaidihah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 4, p. 344, # 1750
18. Qur'an 20:47
19. Qur'an 4:64
20. Qur'an 7:142
21. Qur'an 20:85
22. Qur'an 7:150

Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) states about *Hadith al-Wilayah*:

و كذلك قوله هو ولي كل مؤمن بعدي كذب على رسول الله صلى الله عليه و  
سلم

And similarly his statement “he is the *wali* of every believer after me”, **it is a lie upon the Messenger of Allah.**<sup>1</sup>

The implication of Shaykh's words is that the *hadith* is *mawdu'*. It does not have a single *sahih*, *hasan* or even *dha'if* chain. Rather, each of its chains contains at least one known or suspected liar or *hadith* fabricator. But, is this submission of Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah true? Is the *hadith* really *mawdu'*?

*Hadith al-Wilayah* is a report from the Messenger of Allah, *sallallahu 'alaihi wa alihi*, concerning Amir al-Muminin 'Ali, *'alaihi al-salam*, in which he declares the latter to be the *wali* of every believer *after him*.

What does *wali* mean in the *hadith*? What did the Prophet intend by saying “after me”? These are questions that need answers – but only if the *hadith* is first confirmed to be authentic. Since Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah has graded it to be *mawdu’*, it is therefore necessary to confirm or refute this first before embarking upon any exegetical exercise about its *matn* (content).

Imam Abu Dawud al-Tayalisi (d. 204 H) records:

حدثنا أبو داود قال حدثنا جعفر بن سليمان الضبعي حدثنا يزيد الرشك عن مطرف بن عبد الله بن الشخير عن عمران بن حصين: أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بعث عليا في جيش فرأوا منه شيئا فأنكروه فاتفق نفر أربعة وتعاهدوا أن يخبروا النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم بما صنع علي قال عمران وكنا إذا قدمنا من سفر لم نأت أهلنا حتى نأتي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم وننظر إليه فجاء النفر الأربعة فقام أحدهم فقال يا رسول الله ألم تر أن عليا صنع كذا وكذا فأعرض عنه ثم قام الثاني فقال مثل ذلك فأعرض عنه ثم قام الثالث فقال مثل ذلك فأعرض عنه ثم قام الرابع فقال مثل ذلك فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ما لهم ولعلي إن عليا مني وأنا منه وهو ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

Abu Dawud – Ja’far b. Sulayman al-Dhab’i – Yazid al-Rishk – Mutarrif b. ‘Abd Allah b. al-Shikhir – ‘Imran b. Hasin who said:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, appointed ‘Ali as part of an army expedition. They (his co-soldiers) saw something in him that they hated, and a small band of four people (among them) therefore agreed and vowed to inform the Prophet, peace be upon him, about what ‘Ali did. It was our custom back then that whenever we returned from any journey, we would not go to our families until after visiting the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, and looking at him.

So, the small band of four people came (to the Prophet immediately they returned), and one of them stood up and said, “O Messenger of Allah! Have you not seen that ‘Ali did so and so?” So, he (the Prophet) turned away from him. Then, the second stood up and said the same thing. So, he (the Prophet) turned away from him (too). Then the third stood up and said the same thing. So, he (the Prophet) turned away from him (as well). Then the fourth stood up and said the same thing. Therefore, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “What is it with them and ‘Ali? **Verily, ‘Ali is from me and I am from him, and he is the *wali* of every believer after me.**”<sup>2</sup>

‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) says about this *riwayah*:

أخرجه....الطيالسي في " مسنده " (829) .... من طريق جعفر بن سليمان الضبيعي عن يزيد الرشك عن مطرف عن عمران بن حصين رضي الله عنه....وقال الترمذي: "حديث حسن غريب، لا نعرفه إلا من حديث جعفر بن سليمان". قلت: وهو ثقة من رجال مسلم وكذلك سائر رجاله ولذلك قال الحاكم: " صحيح على شرط مسلم"، وأقره الذهبي.

Al-Tayalisi recorded it in his *Musnad* (829).... from the route of Ja'far b. Sulayman al-Dhab'i, from Yazid al-Rishk, from Mutarrif, from 'Imran b. Hasin, may Allah be pleased with him .... And al-Tirmidhi said: "A *hadith* that is *hasan gharib* (i.e. with a *hasan* [good] chain), we do not know it except through the *hadith* of Ja'far b. Sulayman". I (al-Albani) say: **and he (Ja'far b. Sulayman) is *thiqah* (trustworthy), from the narrators of (*Sahih*) Muslim, and so are the rest of its (i.e. the *hadith's*) narrators.** This is why al-Hakim said, "*Sahih* upon the standard of (Imam) Muslim. And al-Dhahabi concurred with him.<sup>3</sup>

All the narrators are *thiqah* (trustworthy), and are relied upon in *Sahih Muslim*. Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 H) declares the chain to be *hasan*, while both al-Hakim (d. 403 H) and al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) grade it as *sahih*. 'Allamah al-Albani approvingly cites their consensus opinion, which shows that he too holds the same view about the chain.

Al-Tayalisi further records another chain for the *hadith*:

حدثنا يونس قال حدثنا أبو داود قال حدثنا أبو عوانة عن أبي بلج عن عمرو بن ميمون عن بن عباس أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قال لعلي: أنت ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

Yunus – Abu Dawud – Abu 'Awanah – Abu Balj – 'Amr b. Maymun – Ibn 'Abbas:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to 'Ali: "**You are the *wali* of every believer after me.**"<sup>4</sup>

'Allamah al-Albani says about it:

. وأما قوله: "وهو ولي كل مؤمن بعدي" فقد جاء من حديث ابن عباس، فقال الطيالسي (2752): حدثنا أبو عوانة عن أبي بلج عن عمرو بن ميمون عنه " أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال لعلي: " أنت ولي كل مؤمن بعدي".

وأخرجه أحمد (1 / 330 – 331) ومن طريقه الحاكم (3 / 132 – 133) وقال:  
" صحيح الإسناد " ، ووافقه الذهبي، وهو كما قالاً.

As for his statement “and he is the *wali* of every believer after me”, it has been narrated in the *hadith* of Ibn ‘Abbas, for al-Tayalisi (2752) said: Abu ‘Awanah – Abu Balj – ‘Amr b. Maymun, from him (i.e. Ibn ‘Abbas), “that the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to ‘Ali: ‘You are the *wali* of every believer after me.” Ahmad (1/330–331) recorded it, and from his route al-Hakim (3/132–133), **and he (al-Hakim) said, “a *sahih* chain” and al-Dhahabi concurred with him, and it is indeed as both have stated.**<sup>5</sup>

So, Imam al-Hakim<sup>6</sup>, Imam al-Dhahabi<sup>7</sup> and al-Albani again grade this second chain of the *hadith* to be *sahih*. Imam al-Busiri also states:

وعن ابن عباس ، رضی الله عنهما ، أن رسول الله صَلَّى الله عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قال  
لعلي : أنت ولي كل مؤمن بعدي. رواه أبو داود الطيالسي بسند صحيح.

Narrated Ibn ‘Abbas, may Allah be pleased with them both: The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to ‘Ali: “You are the *wali* of every believer after me.”

Abu Dawud al-Tayalisi has recorded it **with a *sahih* chain.**<sup>8</sup>

Closely following al-Tayalisi is Imam Ibn Abi Shaybah (235 H)<sup>9</sup>. Imam al-Shami (d. 942 H) says:

وروى ابن أبي شيبة وهو صحيح عن عمران – رضي الله تعالى عنه – قال: قال  
رسول الله – صلى الله عليه وسلم – : " علي مني وأنا منه، وعلي ولي كل  
مؤمن من بعدي."

Ibn Abi Shaybah narrated, **and it is *sahih***, from ‘Imran, may Allah be pleased with him, saying: The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “Ali is from me and I am from him, and ‘Ali is the *wali* of every believer after me.”<sup>10</sup>

Imam Ahmad b. Hanbal (d. 241 H) too has documented the *hadith*:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا عبد الرزاق وعفان المعنى وهذا حديث عبد

الرزاق قالاً ثنا جعفر بن سليمان قال حدثني يزيد الرشك عن مطرف بن عبد الله عن عمران بن حصين قال: بعث رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم سرية وأمر عليهم علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله تعالى عنه فأحدث شيئاً في سفره فتعاهد قال عفان فتعاقد أربعة من أصحاب محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم أن يذكروا أمره لرسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قال عمران وكنا إذا قدمنا من سفر بدأنا برسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فسلمنا عليه قال فدخلوا عليه فقام رجل منهم فقال يا رسول الله ان علياً فعل كذا وكذا فأعرض عنه ثم قام الثاني فقال يا رسول الله ان علياً فعل كذا وكذا فأعرض عنه ثم قام الثالث فقال يا رسول الله ان علياً فعل كذا وكذا فأعرض عنه ثم قام الرابع فقال يا رسول الله ان علياً فعل كذا وكذا قال فأقبل رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم على الرابع وقد تغير وجهه فقال دعوا علياً دعوا علياً ان علياً مني وأنا منه وهو ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

‘Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – ‘Abd al-Razzaq and ‘Affan al-Ma’ni – Ja’far b. Sulayman – Yazid al-Rishk – Mutarrif b. ‘Abd Allah – ‘Imran b. Hasin:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, deployed a small army and made ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him, their commander. He did something during his journey and they made a covenant. Four of the Sahabah of Muhammad, peace be upon him, made a covenant to report him to the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him. We, when we returned from any journey, used to start (our return) with the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, to greet him.

So, they went to him, and one of them stood up and said, “O Messenger of Allah, ‘Ali did such-and-such.” So, he (the Prophet) turned away from him. Then the second stood and said, “O Messenger of Allah, ‘Ali did such-and-such.” So, he (the Prophet) turned away from him (too). Then the third rose and said, “O Messenger of Allah, ‘Ali did such-and-such.” So, he (the Prophet) turned away from him.

Then the fourth stood and said, “O Messenger of Allah, ‘Ali did such-and-such”. So, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, faced him, and his face had changed, and said, “**Leave ‘Ali alone! Leave ‘Ali alone! Verily, ‘Ali is from me and I am from him, and he is the wali of every believer after me.**”<sup>11</sup>

Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 H) has a similar *riwayah*:

حدثنا قتيبة حدثنا جعفر بن سليمان الضبعي عن يزيد الرشك عن مطرف بن عبد الله عن عمران بن حصين قال: بعث رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم

جيشا واستعمل عليهم علي بن أبي طالب فمضى في السرية فأصاب جارية  
فأنكروا عليه وتعاهد أربعة من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فقالوا  
إذا لقينا رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم أخبرناه بما صنع علي وكان  
المسلمون إذا رجعوا من السفر بدعوا برسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فسلموا  
عليه ثم أنصرفوا إلى رحالهم فلما قدمت السرية سلموا على النبي صلى الله  
عليه و سلم فقام أحد الأربعة فقال يا رسول الله ألم تر إلى علي بن أبي طالب  
صنع كذا وكذا فأعرض عنه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ثم قام الثاني  
فقال مثل مقالته فأعرض عنه ثم قام الثالث فقال مثل مقالته فأعرض عنه ثم  
قام الرابع فقال مثل ما قالوا فأقبل رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم والغضب  
يعرف في وجهه فقال ما تريدون من علي ؟ ما تريدون من علي إن عليا مني  
وأنا منه وهو ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

Qutaybah – Ja'far b. Sulayman al-Dhab'i – Yazid al-Rishk – Mutarrif b. 'Abd Allah – 'Imran b. Hasin:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, deployed an army unit under the command of 'Ali b. Abi Talib. So, he departed with the army unit and gained a female slave (from the war booty). But, they opposed him over it and four of the Sahabah of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, vowed and said, "When we meet the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, we will inform him of what 'Ali has done". When Muslims returned from the journey, they used to start (their arrival) with the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, and would greet him. Then they would go to their various destinations. S

o, when the military unit arrived, they greeted the Prophet, peace be upon him, and one of the four people rose and said, "O Messenger of Allah! Have you not seen that 'Ali b. Abi Talib did so-and-so?" So, he (the Prophet), peace be upon him, turned away from him. Then the second stood up and said the same thing, and he (the Prophet) turned away from him (too). Then the third stood up and said the same thing. So, he (the Prophet) turned away from him (as well). Then the fourth stood up and said what they (i.e. the other three) said. So, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, turned to him, and anger was visible on his face, and he said, "What do you want from 'Ali? What do you want from 'Ali? **Verily, 'Ali is from me and I am from 'Ali, and he is the wali of every believer after me.**"<sup>12</sup>

Al-Tirmidhi says about it:

هذا حديث حسن غريب

This *hadith* is *hasan gharib* (i.e. has a *hasan* chain).<sup>13</sup>

Meanwhile, ‘Allamah al–Albani has a simple verdict on the *hadith*:

## صحيح

*Sahih*<sup>14</sup>

Ibn Hajar al–‘Asqalani (d. 852 H) also states:

أخرج الترمذي بإسناد قوي عن عمران بن حصين في قصة قال فيها قال رسول  
الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ما تريدون من علي إن عليا مني وأنا من علي وهو  
ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

Al–Tirmidhi records in a narrative **with a strong (*qawi*) chain** from ‘Imran b. Hasin: “The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: ‘What do you want from ‘Ali? Verily, ‘Ali is from me and I am from ‘Ali, and he is the *wali* of every believer after me.”<sup>15</sup>

Also commenting on the same *hadith*, Shaykh Nazir Hamadan says:

إسناده قوي، وأخرجه الترمذي (٣٧١٢) (في المناقب: باب مناقب علي بن أبي  
طالب رضي الله عنه، وحسنه، وهو في "المسند ٤٣٨، ٤٣٧ / ٤

**Its chain is strong**, and al–Tirmidhi (3712) recorded it under *al–Manaqib*: Chapter on the Merits of ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him, **and he declared it *hasan***. And it is recorded in *al–Musnad* 4/437, 438.<sup>16</sup>

The *hadith* is recorded by Imam Ibn Abi ‘Asim (d. 287 H) as well:

ثنا عباس بن الوليد النرسي وأبو كامل قالوا ثنا جعفر بن سليمان، عن يزيد  
الرشك، عن مطرف، عن عمران بن حصين قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه  
وسلم: علي مني، وأنا منه، وهو ولي كل مؤمن من بعدي.

‘Abbas b. al-Walid al-Narsi and Abu Kamil – Ja’far b. Sulayman – Yazid b. al-Rishk – Mutarrif – ‘Imran b. Hasin, who said:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “Ali is from me, and I am from him, and he is the *wali* of every believer after me.”<sup>17</sup>

‘Allamah al-Albani comments about it:

إِسْنَادُهُ صَحِيحٌ. رِجَالُهُ ثِقَاتٌ عَلَى شَرَطِ مُسْلِمٍ.

**Its chain is *sahih***, its narrators are *thiqah* (trustworthy), upon the standard of (Imam) Muslim (in his *Sahih*).<sup>18</sup>

Dr. al-Jawabirah also says:

إِسْنَادُهُ صَحِيحٌ. رِجَالُهُ رِجَالُ مُسْلِمٍ.

**Its chain is *sahih***. Its narrators are narrators of (*Sahih*) Muslim.<sup>19</sup>

Abu Ya’la al-Mawsili (d. 307 H) has equally narrated this version of al-Tirmidhi in his *Musnad*<sup>20</sup>. Shaykh Dr. Husayn Asad Salim grades the *hadith* with these words:

رِجَالُهُ رِجَالُ الصَّحِيحِ

Its narrators are narrators of the *Sahih*.<sup>21</sup>

Imam Ibn Hibban (d. 354 H) has documented the same version in his *Sahih*<sup>22</sup>. Shaykh al-Arnaut, the annotator, says about the *riwayah*:

إِسْنَادُهُ قَوِيٌّ

Its chain is strong.<sup>23</sup>

Imam Ibn Jarir al-Tabari (d. 310 H) narrated this *hadith* as well. ‘Allamah al-Hindi (d. 975 H) quotes al-Tabari’s version and authentication in his *Kanz*:

عن عمران بن حصين قال : بعث رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم سرية واستعمل عليهم عليا فغنموا فصنع علي شيئاً أنكره – وفي لفظ : فأخذ علي من الغنيمة جارية – فتعاقد أربعة من الجيش إذا قدموا على رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم أن يعلموه وكانوا إذا قدموا من سفر بدأوا برسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فسلموا عليه ونظروا إليه ثم ينصرفون إلى رحالهم فلما قدمت السرية سلموا على رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فقام أحد الأربعة فقال : يا رسول الله ألم تر أن علياً قد أخذ من الغنيمة جارية ؟ فأعرض عنه ثم قام الثاني فقال مثل ذلك فأعرض عنه ثم قام الثالث فقال مثل ذلك فأعرض عنه ثم قام الرابع فأقبل إليه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يعرف الغضب في وجهه فقال : ما تريدون من علي ؟ علي مني وأنا من علي وعلي ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

( ش ) وابن جرير وصححه

Narrated 'Imran b. Hasin:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, deployed an army unit and appointed 'Ali as their commander. Then, they captured war booties, and 'Ali did something that they hated – and in another version: 'Ali took a slave-girl from the war booty. So, four of the soldiers vowed that when they would meet the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, they would inform him. It was their custom then that whenever they returned from any journey, they would first visit the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, and would greet him and would look at him.

Then they would go to their various destinations. When the army unit arrived, they greeted the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, and one of the four (soldiers) stood up and said, “O Messenger of Allah! Have you not seen that 'Ali took a slave-girl from the war booty?” So, he (the Prophet) turned away from him. Then the second stood up and said the same thing, and he (the Prophet) turned away from him. Then the third stood up and said the same thing. So, he (the Prophet) turned away from him. Then the fourth stood up. So, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, faced him and anger was visible on his face, (the Prophet) and said, “What do you want from 'Ali? **'Ali is from me and I am from 'Ali, and 'Ali is the wali of every believer after me.**”

(Comment) Ibn Jarir (recorded it) **and he declared it *sahih*.**<sup>24</sup>

Al-Hindi himself concurs with al-Tabari:

## علي مني وأنا من علي وعلي ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

(ش عن عمران بن حصين صحيح)

‘Ali is from me and I am from ‘Ali, and ‘Ali is the *wali* of every believer after me.

(Comment: narrated by ‘Imran b. Hasin. **It is *sahih***).25

A further report of the *hadith* is documented by Imam Ahmad b. Hanbal in his *Musnad*:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا بن نمير حدثني أجلاح الكندي عن عبد الله بن بريدة عن أبيه بريدة قال: بعث رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بعثين إلى اليمن على أحدهما علي بن أبي طالب وعلى الآخر خالد بن الوليد فقال إذا التقيتم فعلي على الناس وان افترقتما فكل واحد منكما على جنده قال فلقينا بني زيد من أهل اليمن فاقتلنا فظهر المسلمون على المشركين فقتلنا مقاتلة وسبينا الذرية فاصطفى علي امرأة من السبي لنفسه قال بريدة فكتب معي خالد بن الوليد إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يخبره بذلك فلما أتيت النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم دفعت الكتاب فقرأ عليه فرأيت الغضب في وجه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فقلت يا رسول الله هذا مكان العائذ بعثتني مع رجل وأمرتني أن أطيعه ففعلت ما أرسلت به فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم لا تقع في علي فإنه مني وأنا منه وهو وليكم بعدي وأنه مني وأنا منه وهو وليكم بعدي

‘Abd Allah (b. Ahmad b. Hanbal) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Ibn Numayr – Ajlah al-Kindi – ‘Abd Allah b. Buraydah – his father, Buraydah:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, deployed two army units to Yemen. ‘Ali b. Abi Talib was the commander of one of them while Khalid b. al-Walid was that of the other. So, he said, “When you combine your forces, then ‘Ali shall be the overall commander. But when you disperse, then each of you shall be the commander of his own troops.”

We then battled Banu Zayd from the people of Yemen, and we fought, and the Muslims triumphed over

the idolaters. We killed the combatants and captured the offspring. ‘Ali chose one of the captives, a slave-girl, for himself. So, Khalid and I wrote jointly to the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, to inform him of it. When I (later) came to the Prophet, peace be upon him, and I handed over the letter, and it was read to him, I saw anger on the face of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him.

Then, I said, “O Messenger of Allah! This is the place for the refuge-seeker. You sent me with a man (i.e. ‘Ali) and ordered me to obey him, and I did what you sent me with.” Then, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, “Do not attack ‘Ali, **for he is from me and I am from him, and he is your wali after me; and he is from me and I am from him, and he is your wali after me.**”<sup>26</sup>

‘Allamah al-Albani says:

" لا تقع في علي، فإنه مني وأنا منه وهو وليكم بعدي وإنه مني وأنا منه وهو  
وليكم بعدي ."

أخرجه أحمد (5 / 356) . قلت: وإسناده حسن

“Do not attack ‘Ali, for he is from me and I am from him, and he is your *wali* after me, and he is from me and I am from him, and he is your *wali* after me.”

Ahmad (5/356) recorded it. I say: **and its chain is *hasan*.**<sup>27</sup>

Simply put, there are several *distinct* reliable chains for the *hadith* from three different Sahabah. As such, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah’s grading of the *hadith* as *mawdu’* is completely baseless and a clear distortion of reality. This is why ‘Allamah al-Albani is so surprised at his action. In his closing remarks about *Hadith al-Wilayah*, the ‘Allamah wonders:

فمن العجيب حقا أن يتجرأ شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية على إنكار هذا الحديث  
وتكذيبه في " منهاج السنة " (4 / 104)

Of the truly unbelievable is Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah’s denial of this *hadith*, and his calling it a lie in *Minhaj al-Sunnah* (4/104).<sup>28</sup>

1. Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, *Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* (Muasassat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 7, p. 391

2. Abu Dawud Sulayman b. Dawud b. al-Jarud al-Farisi al-Basri al-Tayalisi, Musnad (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah), p. 111, # 829
3. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqihah wa Fawaidihah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 5, p. 261, # 2223
4. Abu Dawud Sulayman b. Dawud b. al-Jarud al-Farisi al-Basri al-Tayalisi, Musnad (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah), p. 360, # 2752
5. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqihah wa Fawaidihah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 5, p. 263, # 2223
6. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 3, p. 143, # 4652
7. Ibid
8. Ahmad b. Abi Bakr b. Isma'il al-Busiri, Itihaf al-Khiyarah al-Maharah bi Zawaid al-Masanid al-'Ashara (Riyadh: Dar al-Watan; 1st edition, 1420 H), vol. 7, p. 184, # 6630
9. 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. Abi Shaybah Ibrahim b. 'Uthman b. Abi Bakr b. Abi Shaybah al-Kufi al-'Ubsi, Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah fi al-Ahadith wa al-Athar (Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1409 H) [annotator: Prof. Sa'id al-Laham], vol. 7, p. 504, # 58
10. Muhammad b. Yusuf al-Salihi al-Shami, Subul al-Huda al-Rashad fi Sirah Khayr al-'Ibad (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1414 H) [annotators: 'Adil Ahmad 'Abd al-Mawjud and 'Ali Muhammad Ma'ud], vol. 11, p. 296
11. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 4, p. 437, # 19942
12. Abu 'Isa Muhammad b. 'Isa al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi, al-Jami' al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 5, p. 632, # 3712
13. Ibid
14. Ibid
15. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, al-Isabah fi Tamyiz al-Sahabah (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1415 H) [annotators: Shaykh 'Adil Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Mawjud and Shaykh 'Ali Muhammad Ma'udh], vol. 4, p. 468
16. Shams al-Din Muhammad b. Ahmad b. 'Uthman al-Dhahabi, Siyar A'lam al-Nubala (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risalah; 1413 H) [annotators of the eighth volume: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut and Nazir Hamadan], vol. 8, p. 199, # 36
17. Abu Bakr b. Abi 'Asim, Ahmad b. 'Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1400 H) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 2, p. 564, # 1187
18. Ibid
19. Abu Bakr b. Abi 'Asim, Ahmad b. 'Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (Dar al-Sami'i li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi') [annotator: Dr. Basim b. Faysal al-Jawabirah], vol. 1, p. 799, # 1221
20. Abu Ya'la Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Muthanna al-Mawsili al-Tamimi, Musnad (Damascus: Dar al-Mamun li al-Turath; 1st edition, 1404 H) [annotator: Dr. Husayn Salim Asad], vol. 1, p. 293, # 355
21. Ibid
22. Abu Hatim Muhammad b. Hibban b. Ahmad b. Hibban b. Mu'adh b. Ma'bad al-Tamimi al-Darimi al-Busti, Sahih Ibn Hibban bi Tartib Ibn Balban (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risalah; 2nd edition, 1414 H) [annotators: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani and Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 15, pp. 373-374, # 6929
23. Ibid, vo. 15, p. 374, # 6929
24. 'Ali b. Husam al-Din al-Muttaqi al-Hindi, Kanz al-'Ummal fi Sunan al-Aqwal wa Af'al (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risalah; 1989 H), vol. 13, p. 122, # 36444
25. Ibid, vol. 11, p. 907, # 32941
26. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 5, p. 356, # 23062
27. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Silsilah al-

Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqihah wa Fawaidihah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 5, p. 262, # 2223  
28. Ibid, vol. 5, p. 264, # 2223

Shaykh al-Arnaut is a hard-line follower of his "Shaykh al-Islam" Ibn Taymiyyah. Seeing the latter's helplessness on *Hadith al-Wilayah*, he decides to come to his rescue. Although he falls short of calling the *hadith* "a lie" like Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H), Shaykh al-Arnaut nonetheless makes frantic but fragile efforts to cast a shadow of doubt over its head.

Imam Ibn Hibban (d. 354 H), in his *Sahih*, records the *hadith*:

إن عليا مني وأنا منه وهو ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

Verily, 'Ali is from me and I am from 'Ali, and he is the *wali* of every believer after me. 1

The *riwayah* is through this chain:

أخبرنا أبو يعلى حدثنا الحسن بن عمر بن شقيق حدثنا جعفر بن سليمان عن  
يزيد الرشك عن مطرف بن عبد الله بن الشخير عن عمران بن حصين

Abu Ya'la – al-Hasan b. 'Umar b. Shaqiq – **Ja'far b. Sulayman** – **Yazid al-Rishk** – **Mutarraf b. 'Abd Allah b. Shikhir** – 'Imran b. Hasin.2

Shaykh al-Arnaut says about the *hadith*:

إسناده قوي

Its chain is strong.3

This indicates the reliability of all the narrators. 'Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) confirms this when he says about the very same report, with the same chain:

صحيح

The *hadith* is also recorded in *Musnad Ahmad* with this chain:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا عبد الرزاق وعفان المعنى وهذا حديث عبد  
الرزاق قال ثنا جعفر بن سليمان قال حدثني يزيد الرشك عن مطرف بن عبد  
الله عن عمران بن حصين قال ... رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ... دعوا  
عليا دعوا عليا ان عليا مني وأنا منه وهو ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

‘Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – ‘Abd al-Razzaq and ‘Affan al-Ma’ni, and this is the *hadith* of ‘Abd al-Razzaq – Ja’far b. Sulayman – Yazid al-Rishk – Mutarrif b. ‘Abd Allah – ‘Imran b. Hasin:

.... The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “... Leave ‘Ali alone! Leave ‘Ali alone! Verily, ‘Ali is from me and I am from ‘Ali and he is the *wali* of every believer after me.”<sup>5</sup>

Al-Arnaut already testifies to the reliability of Ja’far, Yazid and Mutarrif above. So, we are left with only ‘Abd Allah, son of Imam Ahmad b. Hanbal; and both of them are highly authoritative *hadith* scientists and compilers in the eyes of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Like his father, Ahmad b. Hanbal, ‘Abd Allah needs no introduction and his trustworthiness is absolutely beyond question. ‘Abd al-Razzaq too is like that. His *Musannaf* is a prominent *hadith* source among Sunni ‘*ulama*, and he is a major narrator in *Sahih al-Bukhari*. So, ordinarily, Shaykh al-Arnaut should have absolutely no problem with the *sanad*. However, he does:

### إسناده ضعيف

Its chain is *dha’if* (weak).<sup>6</sup>

He gives no excuse at all, apparently because there is none! Or, is it that he has problem with ‘Abd Allah, his father Ahmad b. Hanbal (d. 241 H) or ‘Abd al-Razzaq (d. 211 H)? Elsewhere in the same *Musnad*, this is how al-Arnaut comments about another chain of theirs:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا عبد الرزاق قال ثنا سفيان عن الأعمش عن أبي  
وائل عن أم سلمة....

## إسناده صحيح على شرط الشيخين

'Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – 'Abd al-Razzaq – Sufyan – al-A'mash – Abu Wail – Umm Salamah....

**Its chain is *sahih*** upon the standard of the two Shaykhs (i.e. al-Bukhari and Muslim).<sup>7</sup>

So, even Shaykh al-Arnaut is well-aware that the chain of *Hadith al-Wilayah* in *Musnad Ahmad* is reliable. Yet, he does what he does!

Or, wait a minute! Is there not a break in the chain between 'Abd al-Razzaq and Ja'far? It is one thing for all the narrators of a chain to be trustworthy and truthful. It is another for it to be well-connected, such that each narrator transmits from the one he really met. If there is a break in the chain, then it is indeed weak. Shaykh al-Arnaut has authenticated the transmission from 'Abd Allah – Ahmad b. Hanbal – 'Abd al-Razzaq. He has equally authenticated the transmission from Ja'far – Yazid – Mutarrif. As such, there is only the question of the link between 'Abd al-Razzaq and Ja'far.

In the *riwayah* of *Hadith al-Wilayah* in *Musnad Ahmad* above, two people have narrated from Ja'far: 'Abd al-Razzaq and 'Affan al-Ma'ni. If only one of them is reliable and is fully connected to Ja'far, then the entire *sanad* is impeccable. But, look at this chain and al-Arnaut's comment on it:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا عفان ثنا جعفر بن سليمان ثنا ثابت عن أنس بن مالك ....

## إسناده صحيح على شرط مسلم رجاله ثقات

'Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – 'Affan – Ja'far b. Sulayman – Thabit – Anas b. Malik ....

**Its chain is *sahih*** upon the standard of (Imam) Muslim, **its narrators are trustworthy**.<sup>8</sup>

Similarly, Shaykh al-Arnaut says about another chain:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا عبد الرزاق ثنا جعفر بن سليمان قال حدثني ثابت البناني عن أنس بن مالك .....

## إسناده صحيح على شرط مسلم , رجاله ثقات

'Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – 'Abd al-Razzaq – Ja'far b. Sulayman – Thabit al-Banani – Anas b. Malik ....

**Its chain is *sahih*** upon the standard of (Imam) Muslim, **its narrators are trustworthy**.<sup>9</sup>

Obviously, two trustworthy narrators have narrated *Hadith al-Wilayah* from Ja'far b. Sulayman. Moreover, all its narrators are trustworthy, and the *sanad* is fully-connected. Therefore, it is a doubly *sahih* chain without any doubt, even by the standards of Shaykh al-Arnaut! Yet, he knowingly grades the *sanad* as *dha'if* without any justification! However, Allah has made him admit the truth about the noble *hadith* in his *tahqiq* of *Sahih Ibn Hibban*. So, his own words will continue to refute him till the Hour!

The second version of *Hadith al-Wilayah*, narrated by Buraydah, is equally documented in *Musnad Ahmad*:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا بن نمير حدثني أجح الكندي عن عبد الله بن بريدة عن أبيه بريدة قال .... فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم لا تقع في علي فإنه منى وأنا منه وهو وليكم بعدي وأنه منى وأنا منه وهو وليكم بعدي

'Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Ibn Numayr – **Ajlah al-Kindi** – 'Abd Allah b. Buraydah – his father Buraydah, who said: .... The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “Do not attack 'Ali, for he is from me and I am from him, and he is your *wali* after me; and he is from me and I am from him, and he is your *wali* after me.”<sup>10</sup>

Shaykh al-Arnaut comments:

إسناده ضعيف بهذه السياقة من أجل أجح الكندي

Its chain is *dha'if* (weak) with this context due to **Ajlah al-Kindi**.<sup>11</sup>

Really?! But, this is what this same al-Arnaut says about the same Ajlah in the same book:

الأجح – وهو ابن عبد الله الكندي – فقد روى له البخاري في "الأدب" وأصحاب السنن وهو صدوق

**Al-Ajlah** – and he is Ibn ‘Abd Allah **al-Kindi** – al-Bukhari has narrated from him in *al-Adab*, and the authors of the *Sunan* too (i.e. al-Tirmidhi, Abu Dawud, Ibn Majah and al-Nasai). **And he is *saduq* (very truthful)**.<sup>12</sup>

How then can anyone grade his *hadith* as *dha’if*? Interestingly, elsewhere, al-Arnaut’s verdict changes:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا مصعب بن سلام سمعته من أبي مرتين ثنا الأجلح  
عن الزيال بن حرملة عن جابر بن عبد الله....

صحيح لغيره وهذا إسناد حسن

‘Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Mus’ab b. Salam – my father – **al-Ajlah** – al-Zayal b. Harmalah – Jabir b. ‘Abd Allah....

*Sahih li ghayrihi, and this chain is hasan*.<sup>13</sup>

Therefore, the version of *Hadith al-Wilayah* narrated by Ajlah is actually *hasan* by the standards of Shaykh al-Arnaut.

1. Abu Hatim Muhammad b. Hibban b. Ahmad b. Hibban b. Mu’adh b. Ma’bad al-Tamimi al-Darimi al-Busti, *Sahih Ibn Hibban bi Tartib Ibn Balban* (Beirut: Muassasat al-Risalah; 2nd edition, 1414 H) [annotators: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani and Shu’ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 15, pp. 373–374, # 6929
2. *Ibid*, vol. 15, p. 373, # 6929
3. *Ibid*, vo. 15, p. 374, # 6929
4. Abu ‘Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, *Ta’liqat al-Hisan ‘ala Sahih Ibn Hibban* (Jeddah: Dar Ba Wazir li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’; 1st edition, 1424 H), vol. 10, p. 67, # 6890
5. Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, *Musnad* (Cairo: Muassasat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu’ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 4, p. 437, # 19942
6. *Ibid*
7. *Ibid*, vol. 6, p. 322, # 26782
8. *Ibid*, vol. 3, p. 267, # 13847
9. *Ibid*, vol. 3, p. 164, # 12698
10. *Ibid*, vol. 5, p. 356, # 23062
11. *Ibid*
12. *Ibid*, vol. 3, p. 305, # 14313
13. *Ibid*, vol. 3, p. 310, # 14372

The word *wali* has a range of different meanings. Hans Wehr lists its various definitions:

Helper, supporter, benefactor, sponsor; friend, close associate; relative; patron, protector; legal guardian, curator, tutor; a man close to God, holy man, saint (in the popular religion of Islam); **master**, proprietor, possessor, owner.<sup>1</sup>

Usually, its exact definition in any given situation is dictated by its context. ‘Allamah al–Albani (d. 1420 H) records that the Prophet, *sallallahu ‘alaihi wa alihi*, said:

ما تريدون من علي؟ ما تريدون من علي؟ ما تريدون من علي؟ إن عليا مني وأنا منه وهو ولي كل مؤمن بعدي. (صحيح)

“What do you want from ‘Ali? What do you want from ‘Ali? Verily, ‘Ali is from me and I am from him, and he is the *wali* of every believer after me.” (*Sahih*)<sup>2</sup>

But, despite weirdly denouncing the authenticity of this *hadith*, which is graded *sahih* above by ‘Allamah al–Albani, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) also attacks the word *wali* in it:

و كذلك قوله هو ولي كل مؤمن بعدي كذب على رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بل هو في حياته و بعد مماته ولي كل مؤمن و كل مؤمن وليه في المحيا و الممات فالولاية التي هي ضد العداوة لا تختص بزمان وأما الولاية التي هي الإمارة فيقال فيها والي كل مؤمن بعدي

And similarly his statement “he is the *wali* of every believer after me”, it is a lie upon the Messenger of Allah. Rather he (the Prophet), during his life and after his death, was the *wali* of every believer, and every believer is his *wali* in life and death. The *walayah* which means the opposite of enmity (i.e. friendship) is not restricted by time. As for the *wilayah* that means authority, then it is said concerning it: *wali* of every believer after me.<sup>3</sup>

In other words, *wali* (ولي) only means “friend”. It cannot refer to anyone with authority. Rather, the only related word that means “master” is *wali* (والي). So, if the Messenger of Allah had intended ‘Ali, *‘alaihi al–salam*, to be the ruler of the Muslims after him (as the Shi’ah assert), he would have used the second word, and not the first.

Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah also proposes another word:

فقول القائل علي ولي كل مؤمن بعدي كلام يمتنع نسبته إلى النبي صلى الله

عليه و سلم فإنه إن أراد الموالاة لم يحتج أن يقول بعدي و إن أراد الإمارة كان  
ينبغي أن يقول وال على كل مؤمن

Therefore, the statement of the speaker “Ali is the *wali* of every believer after me”, it is a statement that cannot be attributed to the Prophet, peace be upon him. This is because if he had intended friendship, he did not need to say “after me”, and if he intended authority, he was supposed to say: *walin* over every believer.<sup>4</sup>

According to Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah, the use of *wali* (ولي) to mean “master” is a serious linguistic blunder. Rather, the correct word is *wali* (والي). Alternatively, the word *walin* (وال) should be used, but immediately coupled with “over”.

Interestingly, Shaykh al-Albani agrees with him:

فالحديث ليس فيه دليل البتة على أن عليا رضي الله عنه هو الأحق بالخلافة من  
الشيخين كما تزعم الشيعة لأن الموالاة غير الولاية التي هي بمعنى الإمارة، فإنما  
يقال فيها: والي كل مؤمن. هذا كله من بيان شيخ الإسلام وهو قوي متين كما  
ترى

There is no proof at all in the *hadith* that ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, was more deserving of the *khilafah* (succession to the Prophet) than the two Shaykhs (i.e. Abu Bakr and ‘Umar) as the Shi’ah claim. This is because friendship is different from the *wilayah* which means authority. In the latter, one only says: *wali* of every believer. All of this is from the explanations of Shaykh al-Islam (Ibn Taymiyyah), and it is extremely strong as you can see.<sup>5</sup>

But, how can it be strong at all when it is only a fallacious submission? As indicated by Hans Wehr – a neutral party – *wali* (ولي) also means “master”! Moreover, ‘Allamah al-Albani has misrepresented the Shi’ah position. Rather, they assert that Imam ‘Ali was *the* only legitimate ruler of the Muslim world immediately after the death of the Messenger of Allah, on the strength of this *hadith*! This is different from saying that he was *more* deserving of the succession than others. In the view of the Shi’ah, others do not deserve it at all; and it was not open for competition. So, the question of comparison does not even arise!

Contrary to the absurd claims of both Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah and ‘Allamah al-Albani, the word *wali* (ولي) is actually the most common – of the three words – in references to authority and power. In fact, it has been used in that sense in several places in the Qur’an! The Shi’i *mufassir*, Shaykh al-Tabarsi (d. 548 H), for instance, says:

(والذين كفروا أولياؤهم الطاغوت (أي: متولي أمورهم وأنصارهم

(And those who disbelieve, their *awliya* [plural of *wali*] are the evil ones) [2:257], meaning: **their rulers and helpers**.6

Al-Kashani (d. 1091 H) supports him:

(الله ولي الذين آمنوا (متولي أمورهم

(Allah is the *Wali* of those who believe) [2:257] **their Ruler**.7

‘Allamah al-Majlisi (d. 1111 H) also says:

والولي المتولي للأمر والناصر والمحب

The *wali* is the **ruler**, and the **helper**, and the **lover**.8

The Sunni position is the same as well. Imam Ibn Jawzi (d. 597 H) submits:

قوله تعالى: الله ولي الذين آمنوا (أي: متولي أمورهم، يهديهم، وينصرهم، ويعينهم.

Allah the Most High’s Statement: (Allah is the *Wali* of those who believe) [2:257] meaning: **their Ruler**, Who guides them, and helps them, and supports them.9

Imam al-Baydhawi (d. 685 H) supports him:

(الله ولي الذين آمنوا (محبهم أو متولي أمورهم

(Allah is the *Wali* of those who believe) [2:257] their Lover or **their Ruler**.10

Al-Tha’labi (d. 427 H) says something similar too:

(الله ولي الذين آمنوا (أي ناصرهم ومعينهم وقيل محبهم وقيل متولي أمرهم

(Allah is the *Wali* of those who believe) [257], meaning their Helper and Supporter. It is said: their Lover. And it is said: **their Ruler**. 11

The same submission was made by al-Khazan (d. 725 H):

(والله ولي الذين آمنوا (أي ناصرهم ومعينهم وقيل محبهم ومتولي أمورهم

(Allah is the *Wali* of those who believe), meaning: their Helper and Supporter. It is said: their Lover and **Ruler**. 12

Al-Mahalli (d. 864 H) and al-Suyuti (d. 911 H) in their *Tafsir al-Jalalayn*, mince no words about this:

{أنت ولينا} متولي أمورنا

(You are our *Wali*) **our Ruler**. 13

They also say:

{إن وليي الله} متولي أموري

{My *Wali* is Allah) [7:196] **my Ruler**. 14

And:

{فهو وليهم} متولي أمورهم

{he is their *wali*} [16:63] **their ruler**. 15

Imam al-Nasafi (d. 710 H) confirms them as well:

{الله ولي الذين آمنوا} [البقرة : 257] .... أي ناصرهم ومتولي أمورهم

{Allah is the *Wali* of those who believe} [Baqarah:257] .... meaning, their Helper and **Ruler**. 16

Shaykh Ibn ‘Ashur, in turn, corroborates al–Nasafi:

(فهو وليهم اليوم.... والمعنى : فالشيطان وليّ المشركين اليوم ، أي متوليّ أمرهم

(he is their *wali* today) [16:63].... the meaning is: “Shaytan is the *wali* of the pagans today”, meaning **their ruler**. 17

‘Allamah Rashid Ridha (d. 1354 H), a Salafi scholar, says too:

(وهو وليهم بما كانوا يعملون) .... و{وليهم } متولي أمورهم

(And He will be their *Wali* because of what they used to do) [6:127].... And {their *Wali*} is **their Ruler**. 18

He also says:

(والله وليهما (أي متولي أمورهما

(And Allah is their *Wali*) [3:122] meaning, **their Ruler**. 19

As such, due to dishonesty or ignorance, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (supported by ‘Allamah al–Albani) effectively attributes linguistic incompetence to Allah, His Messenger and the mostly Sunni Muslim scholars! We have reasons to believe that Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah deliberately misrepresents the truth about the word *wali*, but does not intend the blasphemous implications. He only seeks to undermine the Shi’i claims by all means, including by crook. We say this because Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah himself has said these words in the same *Minhaj al–Sunnah*:

وكل هؤلاء العلماء الذين ذكرناهم يعلمون أن عدل عمر كان أتم من عدل من ولي بعده وعلمه كان أتم من علم من ولي بعده

All of these *'ulama* that we have mentioned knew that the fairness of 'Umar is more perfect than the fairness of anyone **who became the wali after him**, and his knowledge was more perfect than the knowledge of anyone **who became the wali after him**.<sup>20</sup>

He also writes:

و وجدنا عليا إذ ولي قد استعمل أقاربه

And we found that **when 'Ali became the wali**, he appointed his relatives as governors.<sup>21</sup>

Is there *any* possibility that Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah is only discussing about friendship above?

An even more surprising stunt pulled by Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah is in these words:

الفرق بين الولاية بالفتح و الولاية بالكسر معروف فالولاية ضد العداوة و هي المذكوره في هذه النصوص ليست هي الولاية بالكسر التي هي الإمارة و هؤلاء الجهال يجعلون الولي هو الأمير و لم يفرقوا بين الولاية و الولاية و الأمير يسمى الوالي لا يسمى الولي و لكن قد يقال هو ولي الأمر كما يقال وليت أمركم و يقال أولو الأمر و أما إطلاق القول بالمولى وإرادته الوالي فهذا لا يعرف بل يقال في الولي المولى و لا يقال الوالي

The difference between *walayah* and *wilayah* is well-known. The *walayah* which is the opposite of enmity is what is mentioned in these texts, not *wilayah* which is authority. But these ignorant people make *wali* the ruler, and do not differentiate between *walayah* and *wilayah*. The ruler is called the *wali* and not the *wali*. However, the ruler is also called *wali al-amr* as it is said, "I am the *wali* of your *amr* (affairs)". The rulers are further called *ulu al-amr*. As for the use of the word *mawla*, with the meaning of *wali*, this is not known (to be applied in relation to rulers). Rather, the *wali* is called *mawla*, and he is not called *wali*.<sup>22</sup>

In simpler terms:

1. The words *walayah* and *wilayah* are different.
2. *Walayah* applies only to friendship, and is related with *wali* (ولي).
3. *Wilayah* means authority, and is related with *wali* (والي).

4. Every *hadith* about ‘Ali only uses *wali* (ولي), and not *wali* (والي).
5. Therefore, ‘Ali has only friendship (*walayah*) through those *ahadith*, and not *wilayah*.
6. Both *mawla* (مولى) and *wali* (ولي) are synonymous, and are related to *walayah* only.
7. A ruler is never called a *mawla* (مولى) or a *wali* (ولي).
8. Rather, a ruler is only called *wali* (والي), or *wali al-amr* (ولي الأمر).
9. The *wali al-amr* (ولي الأمر) is the one who is the *wali* (ولي) of the *amr* (affairs) of the people.
10. For *wali* (ولي) to mean ruler, it **must** be conjoined with *amr*.

None of these submissions is true! Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah himself has used the word *wali* (ولي) above, without conjoining it with *amr*, to mean ruler! Elsewhere, he has also employed the same word, in the same form, along with *amr*:

وكان أبو بكر معلما للصبيان في الجاهلية وفي الإسلام كان خياطا ولما ولي  
أمر المسلمين منعه الناس عن الخياطة فقال إني محتاج إلى القوت فجعلوا له  
كل يوم ثلاثة دراهم من بيت المال

Abu Bakr was a teacher of children during the *Jahiliyyah*. But, during the Islamic era, he was a tailor. When he became the *wali* of the *amr* of the Muslims, the people forbade him from tailoring. So he said, “I need food”. Therefore, they gave to him three dirhams from the Public Treasury every day.<sup>23</sup>

Nobody is a better refuter of Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah than himself! He says somewhere:

و وجدنا عليا إذ ولي قد استعمل أقاربه

And we found that when ‘Ali became the *wali*, he appointed his relatives as governors.<sup>24</sup>

Elsewhere, he states:

ولما ولي أمر المسلمين منعه الناس عن الخياطة

When he (Abu Bakr) became the *wali* of the *amr* of the Muslims, the people forbade him from tailoring.<sup>25</sup>

It is very apparent from these words that Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah, in truth, accepts that *wali* (ولي), *wali* (والي) and *wali al-amr* (ولي الأمر) mean the same thing! But, he wants to defeat the Shi'ah, whatever it takes! What it has taken, of course, is this disturbing linguistic acrobatics! He is distorting the meaning of *wali* (ولي) simply because it is the term used by the Prophet to describe Amir al-Muminin 'Ali. Otherwise, if the Messenger of Allah had said that Imam 'Ali would be the *wali* (والي) or *wali al-amr* (ولي الأمر) of every believer after him, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah would certainly have turned his own arguments inside out! In any case, the top lexicographers of both the Shi'ah and the Ahl al-Sunnah also agree that *wali* (ولي) and (ولي الأمر) are synonyms.

For instance, al-Jawhari (d. 393 H), who came more than 300 years before Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H), states:

وكل من ولي أمر واحد فهو وليه.

Every person who is the *wali* of the *amr* of anyone, he is thereby the latter's *wali*.<sup>26</sup>

He is corroborated by Ibn Faris (d. 395 H), another highly recognized Sunni lexicographer:

وكل من ولي أمر آخر فهو وليه

Every person who is the *wali* of the *amr* of anyone, he is thereby the latter's *wali*.<sup>27</sup>

The most well-known and highest-regarded classical Sunni lexicographer, Ibn Manzur (d. 711 H), also submits:

كل من ولي أمر واحد فهو وليه

Every person who is the *wali* of the *amr* of anyone, he is thereby the latter's *wali*.<sup>28</sup>

Finally, the highly authoritative Shi'ah lexicographer, al-Turayhi (d. 1085 H) caps it all:

والولي: الوالي، وكل من ولي أمر أحد فهو وليه.

The *wali* is the *wali*, and every person who is the *wali* of the *amr* of anyone, he is thereby the latter's

The *wali* of the *amr* (or simply *wali al-amr*) of anyone is his ruler. This is why Abu Bakr is referred to as the *wali al-amr* of the Muslims after the death of the Prophet. He was in charge, and had full control. In the same manner, the king of Saudi Arabia is the *wali al-amr* of Saudis while the British Prime Minister is the *wali al-amr* of Britons. The standard linguistic principle, of course, is that a synonym for *wali al-amr* is *wali*.

With that, Abu Bakr became the *wali* of the Muslims after the Prophet – according to Sunni Islam. The Saudi king is the *wali* of Saudis, and the British Prime Minister is the *wali* of Britons. This is a solid, undeniable reality that Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah struggles so desperately to deny, conceal and distort. This, apparently, is because it poses a direct fatal threat to the survival of Sunni Islam as a whole!

At this point, the fallacy of Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah's weird claim that *wali* relates to *walayah* (friendship) only, and not to *wilayah* (authority) is very obvious. *Wali* can denote either *walayah* or *wilayah*, depending on its meaning within the specific context of each case. If, as the Shi'ah claim, it really means "ruler" in the case of *Hadith al-Wilayah*, then it is indeed *wilayah*!

A rarer meaning of *wali* is heir. We will be discussing this definition in detail at its place.

1. Hans Wehr, A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic, ed. J. Milton Cowan (Ithaca, New York: Spoken Languages Services; 3rd edition, 1976 CE), p. 1100
2. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Sahih al-Jami' al-Saghir wa Ziyadatuhu (Al-Maktab al-Islami), vol. 2, p. 980, # 1803
3. Abu al-'Abbas Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 7, p. 391
4. Ibid
5. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqihah wa Fawaidihah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 5, p. 264, # 2223
6. Abu 'Ali al-Fadhl b. al-Hasan al-Tabarsi, Majma' al-Bayan fi Tafsir al-Qur'an (Beirut: Muassasat al-A'lami li al-Matbu'at; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 2, p. 165
7. Mullah Muhsin al-Faydh al-Kashani, Tafsir al-Safi (Tehran: Maktabah al-Sadr; 2nd edition, 1416 H) [annotator: Shaykh Husayn A'lami], vol. 1, p. 284
8. Muhammad Baqir al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar al-Jami'ah li Durar Akhbar al-Aimah al-Athar (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi; 3rd edition, 1403 H), vol. 83, p. 184
9. Abu al-Faraj Jamal al-Din 'Abd al-Rahman b. 'Ali b. Muhammad al-Jawzi al-Qurshi al-Baghdadi, Zad al-Masir fi 'Ilm al-Tafsir (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman 'Abd Allah], vol. 1, p. 268
10. 'Abd Allah b. 'Umar al-Baydhawi, Tafsir (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr), vol. 1, p. 558
11. Abu Ishaq Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Tha'labi al-Naysaburi, al-Kashf wa al-Bayan (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi; 1st edition, 1422 H) [annotator: Abu Muhammad b. 'Ashur], vol. 1, P. 237
12. 'Ala al-Din 'Ali b. Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Khazan al-Baghdadi, Lubab al-Tawil fi Ma'ani al-Tanzil (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1399 H), vol. 1, p. 272
13. Jalal al-Din Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Mahalli and Jalal al-Din 'Abd al-Rahman b. Abu Bakr al-Suyuti, Tafsir al-Jalalayn (Cairo: Dar al-Hadith; 1st edition), p. 216
14. Ibid, p. 225

15. Ibid, p. 354
16. Abu Barakat ‘Abd Allah b. Ahmad b. Mahmud al-Nasafi, Tafsir al-Nasafi (Beirut: Dar al-Nafais; 2005 CE) [annotator: Marwan Muhammad al-Shi’ar], vol. 1, p. 199
17. Muhammad Tahir b. ‘Ashur, al-Tahrir wa al-Tanwir (Tunis: Dar al-Sahnun li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’; 1997 CE), vol. 14, p. 194
18. Muhammad Rashid b. ‘Ali Ridha, Tafsir Qur’an al-Hakim (Egypt: al-Hay-ah al-Masriyyah al-‘amma li al-Kitab; 1990 CE), vol. 8, p. 54
19. Ibid, Vol. 4, p. 90
20. Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 6, p. 54
21. Ibid, vol. 7, p. 485
22. Ibid, vol. 7, pp. 28–29
23. Ibid, vol. 8, pp. 540–541
24. Ibid, vol. 7, p. 485
25. Ibid, vol. 8, pp. 540–541
26. Isma’il b. Hammad al-Jawhari, al-Sihah: Taj al-Lughah wa Sihah al-‘Arabiyyah (Beirut: Dar al-‘Ilm li al-Malayin; 4th edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Ahmad ‘Abd al-Ghafur ‘Atar], vol. 6, p. 2529
27. Abu al-Husayn Ahmad b. Faris b. Zakariyyah, Mu’jam Maqayis al-Lughah (Qum: Maktab al-‘A’lam al-Islami; 1404 H) [annotator: ‘Abd Salam Muhammad Harun], vol. 6, p. 141
28. Abu al-Fadhl Jamal al-Din Muhammad b. Mukram b. Manzur al-Afriqi al-Misri, Lisan al-‘Arab (Qum: Nashr Adab al-Hawzah; 1405 H), vol. 15, p. 410
29. Fakhr al-Din al-Turayhi, Majma’ al-Bahrayn (2nd edition, 1408 H) [annotator: Sayyid Ahmad al-Husayni], vol. 4, p. 554

The phrase “after me” in Arabic is either *ba’di* (بعدي) or *min ba’di* (من بعدي). Both mean the same thing and are considered as one and the same. *Hadith al-Wilayah* has been transmitted with both terms. Imam al-Salihi al-Shami (d. 942 H) for instance says:

وروى ابن أبي شيبة وهو صحيح عن عمران – رضي الله تعالى عنه – قال: قال رسول الله – صلى الله عليه وسلم –: " علي مني وأنا منه، وعلي ولي كل مؤمن من بعدي."

Ibn Abi Shaybah narrated, **and it is *sahih***, from ‘Imran, may Allah be pleased with him, saying: The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “Ali is from me and I am from him, and ‘Ali is the *wali* of every believer after me (*min ba’di*).”<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile, al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) also states:

أخرج الترمذي بإسناد قوي عن عمران بن حصين في قصة قال فيها قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ما تريدون من علي إن عليا مني وأنا من علي وهو

## ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

Al-Tirmidhi records in a narrative **with a strong (qawi) chain** from ‘Imran b. Hasin: “The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: ‘What do you want from ‘Ali? Verily, ‘Ali is from me and I am from ‘Ali, and he is the *wali* of every believer after me (*ba’di*).”<sup>2</sup>

The Shi’i lexicographer, al-Turayhi (d. 1085 H), explains what *ba’da* (“after”) means in medieval Arabic:

بعد: خلاف قبل. قال تعالى: ولله الامر من قبل ومن بعد (أي قبل الفتح وبعده، وقد يكون بمعنى مع مثل قوله تعالى): عتل بعد ذلك زنيم (أي مع ذلك

**Ba’da: This is the opposite of “before”.** Allah says: (To Allah belongs the Command before and after) [30:4], meaning before the Conquest of Makkah and after it. Also, it also has the meaning of “with”, like in His Words, (Cruel, after that base-born) [68: 13], meaning “with that”.<sup>3</sup>

Classical Sunni lexicographers, Ibn Manzur (d. 711 H) and Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Qadir (d. 721 H), also state:

## وبعد ضد قبل

*Ba’da* is the opposite of “before”.<sup>4</sup>

The definitions are general. As such, *ba’di* refers to any “after”, especially “after in time”, “after in status” or “after in sequence”. A rarer meaning of *ba’di* is “in my absence” or “during my absence”, as in these verses:

قال فإنا قد فتننا قومك من بعدك وأضلهم السامري

He (Allah) said: “Verily! We have tried your people **in your absence**, and al-Samiri has led them astray.”<sup>5</sup>

And:

ولما رجع موسى إلى قومه غضبان أسفا قال بئسما خلفتموني من بعدي

When Musa returned to his people, angry and grieved, he said, “What an evil thing is that which you have done **during my absence!**”

So, what does “after me” mean in *Hadith al-Wilayah*? Was ‘Ali, ‘*alaihi al-salam*, thereby the *wali* of the *Ummah* in the event of Muhammad’s death, *sallallahu ‘alaihi wa aalihi*? Or, was he their *wali* next in rank to the Messenger with the latter alive? Or was he the *wali* only in the temporary absence of the Prophet? In the event of any of these cases, what exactly would *wali* and “after me” mean?

In order to determine these, one must first analyze the text and grammar of the *hadith* itself. There is a clear difference between these two statements:

علي ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

‘Ali is **THE** *wali* (wali) of every believer after me.

And:

علي ولي لكل مؤمن من بعدي

‘Ali is a *wali* (waliyyun) of every believer after me.

The actual word in *Hadith al-Wilayah* is *al-wali* (الولي) – THE *wali*. However, since it is immediately followed by *kulli* (كل), its first two letters are hidden for a smoother pronunciation. Yet, the word remains pronounced as *wali* – indicating that it is a definite noun. Its indefinite form is *waliyyun*. This indefinite form can only be followed by *likulli* (لكل) in order to retain its indefinite status.

The singular definite personal noun, followed by *kulli* (كل), is sometimes adopted to name a rank, status or quality that is *absolutely exclusive* to someone. The Qur’an too has used it in this sense, with regards to Allah. For instance, it says:

قل أغير الله أبغي ربا وهو رب كل شيء

Say: “Shall I seek a lord (*rabbān*) other than Allah, while He is **THE** Lord (*Rabb*) of every thing?”<sup>6</sup>

The last part of this verse adopts the exact same grammatical format as *Hadith al-Wilayah*. It apparently seeks to declare that *absolutely* no other lord of everything exists besides Allah – *not at a higher, equal or even lower level* – and has used that format to strongly and completely convey its message. For all intents and purposes, only Allah exists as the *sole* Lord of everything. There is no superior, concurrent or inferior lord – for any purpose – besides Him.

Another similar verse is this:

قل من رب السماوات والأرض قل الله .... قل الله خالق كل شيء

Say: “Who is **THE** Lord of the heavens and the earth?” Say: “Allah”.... Say: “Allah is **THE** Creator of every thing.”<sup>7</sup>

He is the *only* Lord of everything, and the *only* Creator of everything. It is obvious that the Qur’an absolutely restricts the *rububiyyah* (lordship) and *khalq* (creation) of everything exclusively to Him through the adoption of this grammatical style. Meanwhile, the fact that the *wilayah* in the *hadith* is absolutely exclusive to ‘Ali after the Messenger is clearly confirmed by Ibn ‘Abbas, *radhiyallahu ‘anhu*, a very prominent Sahabi. Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) records:

أخبرنا أبو بكر أحمد بن جعفر بن حمدان القطيعي ببغداد من أصل كتابه ثنا عبد الله بن أحمد بن حنبل حدثني أبي ثنا يحيى بن حماد ثنا أبو عوانة ثنا أبو بلج ثنا عمرو بن ميمون قال إني لجالس عند ابن عباس إذ أتاه تسعة رهط فقالوا : يا ابن عباس : إما أن تقوم معنا وإما أن تخلو بنا من بين هؤلاء قال : فقال ابن عباس بل أنا أقوم معكم قال وهو يومئذ صحيح قبل أن يعمى قال : فابتدؤوا فتحدثوا فلا ندري ما قالوا قال فجاء ينفض ثوبه ويقول أف وتف وقعوا في رجل له بضع عشرة فضائل ليست لأحد غيره وقعوا في رجل .... قال له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أنت ولي كل مؤمن بعدي ومؤمنة

Abu Bakr Ahmad b. Ja’far b. Hamdan al-Qati’i – ‘Abd Allah b. Ahmad b. Hanbal – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) Yahya b. Hamad – Abu Awanah – Abu Balj – ‘Amr b. Maymun:

I was sitting in the company of Ibn ‘Abbas when nine men came to him and said, “O Ibn ‘Abbas! Either you debate with us, or tell these folks that you prefer a private debate.” So, Ibn ‘Abbas said, “I would rather participate with you.” In those days, he had not lost his eye-sight yet. So they started talking, but I was not sure exactly what they were talking about. Then he came, squeezing his robe, and saying:

“Nonsense! **They are attacking a man who has ten EXCLUSIVE merits....** They are attacking a man ... to whom the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “**You are THE wali of every male and female believer after me.**”<sup>8</sup>

Al-Hakim says:

## هذا حديث صحيح الإسناد

This *hadith* has a *sahih* chain.<sup>9</sup>

Al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) corroborates him:

## صحيح

*Sahih*.<sup>10</sup>

‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) confirms them both:

. وأما قوله: "وهو ولي كل مؤمن بعدي" فقد جاء من حديث ابن عباس، فقال الطيالسي (2752) : حدثنا أبو عوانة عن أبي بلج عن عمرو بن ميمون عنه " أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال لعلي: " أنت ولي كل مؤمن بعدي ". وأخرجه أحمد (1 / 330 - 331) ومن طريقه الحاكم (3 / 132 - 133) وقال: " صحيح الإسناد "، ووافقه الذهبي، وهو كما قالوا.

As for his statement “and he (*huwa*) is the *wali* of every believer after me”, it has been narrated in the *hadith* of Ibn ‘Abbas, for al-Tayalisi (2752) said: Abu ‘Awanah – Abu Balj – ‘Amr b. Maymun, from him (i.e. Ibn ‘Abbas), “that the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to ‘Ali: ‘You are **THE wali** of every believer after me.” Ahmad (1/330–331) recorded it, and from his route al-Hakim (3/132–133), **and he (al-Hakim) said, “a *sahih* chain” and al-Dhahabi concurred with him, and it is indeed as both have stated.**<sup>11</sup>

The full *hadith* elaborates on all ten exclusive merits. However, we have highlighted the most relevant of them to our current discourse, which is *Hadith al-Wilayah*.

As such, grammatically and based upon the explicit testimony of Ibn ‘Abbas, the *wilayah* of Amir al-

Muminin in the *hadith* is a “merit” that is *absolutely exclusive* to him *alone*. To him alone, to the exclusion of all other creatures, belonged the *wilayah* of the *Ummah* immediately after the Prophet.

A rather relevant fact is that the Messenger of Allah too was the only *wali* of the believers throughout his lifetime. This is explicitly stated in another *hadith* copied by al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir (d. 774 H):

أنا ولي كل مؤمن

I am **THE** *wali* of every believer. 12

Ibn Kathir has this comment about it:

قال شيخنا أبو عبد الله الذهبي حديث صحيح

Our Shaykh, Abu ‘Abd Allah al-Dhahabi, said: (It is) a *sahih hadith*. 13

Imam Ahmad b. Hanbal (d. 241 H) also records that the Prophet said:

أنا ولي المؤمنين

I am **THE** *wali* of the believers. 14

Al-Arnaut says:

إسناده صحيح على شرط مسلم

Its chain is *sahih* upon the standard of (Imam) Muslim. 15

He was the only one. There was absolutely no other among humans – none above him, none with him, and none below him. After him, the exact same status passed onto ‘Ali from him:

علي ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

‘Ali is **THE wali** of every believer after me.

So, what was that totally exclusive type of *walayah* or *wilayah* that the Messenger of Allah held during his lifetime? Was it friendship with the Muslims? Was it help of the Muslims? Was it support of the Muslims? Or, was it rule over the Muslims?

As for *walayah* (friendship, help and support), this was NOT exclusive to the Prophet during his lifetime, nor was it ever exclusive to him and/or ‘Ali or any other Muslim! Allah says:

والمؤمنون والمؤمنات بعضهم أولياء بعض

The believers, men and women, are *awliya* (plural of *wali*) of one another. 16

Al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir explains the verse:

{بعضهم أولياء بعض} أي : يتناصرون ويتعاضدون ، كما جاء في الصحيح:  
"المؤمن للمؤمن كالبنان يشد بعضه بعضا" وشبك بين أصابعه وفي الصحيح  
أيضا : "مثل المؤمنين في توادهم وتراحمهم ، كمثل الجسد الواحد ، إذا اشتكى  
منه عضو تداعى له سائر الجسد بالحمى والسهر"

{are *awliya* of one another}, meaning **they help one another and they support one another**, as it is recorded in the *Sahih*: "Each believer to another believer are like the fingertip, **each strengthening the other**" and he interlocked his fingers. Also, in the *Sahih*, it is recorded: "The example of the believers in **their love of one another, and their mercy to one another**, is like a single body. If a body part complains, the remaining parts of the body come to its rescue with strength and care." 17

With this reality, we are left with only one explanation: the Messenger of Allah was the sole ruler of the *Ummah* – which fits perfectly with history! In *Hadith al-Wilayah*, he apparently indicates the transition of this same exclusive *wilayah* after him, and its direction.

Our understanding is further helped by the context of the *hadith* itself. ‘Ali made an **administrative** decision, in his capacity as the overall commander of the army units. Some of the soldiers under him objected, and thereby reported him to the Messenger. The issue for determination was NOT whether or not he was their friend, helper or supporter. Rather, ‘Ali’s authority was being questioned by his subordinates.

It was in this light that the Messenger of Allah angrily rejected their objections, ordered them to desist

from *any* future recurrence, and informed them that ‘Ali was their *wali* after him. In other words, “he is your next ruler after me: you should learn to be fully loyal to him and his decisions now; if you kept up this attitude to him, you would be rebels to him later”! With the above facts in mind, there is no doubt that “after me” in the *hadith* could only have meant “after my death”.

Interestingly, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) reaches this same conclusion as well:

و كذلك قوله هو ولي كل مؤمن بعدي كذب على رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بل هو في حياته و بعد مماته ولي كل مؤمن و كل مؤمن وليه في المحيا و الممات فالولاية التي هي ضد العداوة لا تختص بزمان

And similarly his statement “he is the *wali* of every believer after me”, it is a lie upon the Messenger of Allah. Rather he (the Prophet), during his life **and after his death**, was the *wali* of every believer, and every believer is his *wali* in life **and death**. The *walayah* that means the opposite of enmity (i.e. friendship) is not restricted by time. 18

Our dear Shaykh obviously understands from the *hadith* that “after me” indicates the end of the Prophet’s *wilayah*, followed immediately by the commencement of that of ‘Ali. He also knows that this termination of the Prophet’s *wilayah*, according to “after me” in the *hadith*, could only have occurred with his death. But, since Ibn Taymiyyah has self-deluded himself into believing that *wali* can never mean “ruler”, he becomes totally confused, or at least pretends to be so. Despite the clear illogicality and grammatical invalidity of such a stance, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah maintains that “the *wali*” in the *hadith* only means “a friend”! Yet, on the strength of the illogicality and fallacy of interpreting *wali* in the *hadith* to mean “friend”, our dear Shaykh throws it away!

Surprisingly, ‘Allamah al-Albani thinks that his Shaykh actually has a point:

فمن العجيب حقا أن يتجراً شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية على إنكار هذا الحديث وتكذيبه في " منهاج السنة " ( 4 / 104 ) كما فعل بالحديث المتقدم هناك، مع تقريره رحمه الله أحسن تقرير أن الموالاتة هنا ضد المعاداة وهو حكم ثابت لكل مؤمن، وعلي رضي الله عنه من كبارهم، يتولاهم ويتولونه.

Of the truly unbelievable is Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah’s denial of this *hadith*, and his calling it a lie in *Minhaj al-Sunnah* (4/104), as he did with the previous *hadith* here, despite his *excellent* confirmation, may Allah be merciful to him, that **the friendship here is the opposite of enmity. And this is a ruling**

**that is firmly established for every believer**, and ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, is one of their elders. **He loves them and they love him.** 19

In simple words, there is nothing special or exclusive to anyone in the *hadith*. It only reminds that ‘Ali is a friend of every believer, in the exact same way that each believer is a friend of every other believer! So, one is tempted to ask: why then has the *hadith* stated “the *wali*”, rather than “a *wali*”, and especially within an exclusion grammar? Secondly, why has ‘Allamah al–Albani pretended not to see that “after me” exists in the *hadith*?! It is not reflected at all in his “explanation”? After all, the Messenger of Allah did not say it for fun! In a rather intriguing stunt, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah himself reveals why ‘Allamah al–Albani and others like him do not like to see the “after me”:

فقول القائل علي ولي كل مؤمن بعدي كلام يمتنع نسبته إلى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فإنه إن أراد الموالاتة لم يحتج أن يقول بعدي

Therefore, the statement of the speaker “‘Ali is the *wali* of every believer after me”, it is a statement that cannot be attributed to the Prophet, peace be upon him. This is because **if he had intended friendship, he did not need to say “after me”**.20

We too add that he would have said “a *wali*”, and NOT “the *wali*”, if he had meant to say “friend”, “helper” or “supporter”. The full *hadith* – if ‘Allamah al–Albani were right – would have been: “‘Ali is a *wali* of every believer”! He apparently prefers to ignore crucial parts of the *hadith* in order to keep his fallacious explanation of it floating.

But, Imam Ibn Hibban (d. 354 H) thinks he has a final solution to this stubborn Sunni dilemma:

ما تريدون من علي ثلاثا إن عليا مني وأنا منه وهو ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

ذكر البيان بأن علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه كان ناصر كل من ناصره رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

“What do you want from ‘Ali! What do you want from ‘Ali? What do you want from ‘Ali. Verily, ‘Ali is from me and I am from ‘Ali, and he is THE *wali* of every believer after me.”

He mentioned the explanation that ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him, **was THE helper** of everyone whose helper *was* the Messenger of Allah, pace be upon him.21

Yet, this, disappointingly, solves nothing. Was Amir al-Muminin not *an* helper of the believers during the Prophet's lifetime? Besides, was the Messenger of Allah *the* only helper of the Muslims during his prophetic mission, such that 'Ali became *the* only helper after him?

Seeing the utter helplessness of the situation, a prominent Sunni scholar, al-Salihi al-Shami (d. 942 H), chooses to submit to the apparent truth, while addressing *Hadith al-Wilayah*:

(وهو وليكم بعدي: (أي يلي أمركم.

(He is your *wali* after me): meaning, **he will rule over your affairs.**<sup>22</sup>

Of even greater interest is that Ibn Abi 'Asim (d. 287 H), a major classical Sunni *muhadith*, places this *hadith* under the chapter heading: **the *Khilafah* of 'Ali:**

ثنا عباس بن الوليد النرسي وأبو كامل قالوا ثنا جعفر بن سليمان، عن يزيد  
الرشك، عن مطرف، عن عمران بن حصين قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه  
وسلم: علي مني، وأنا منه، وهو ولي كل مؤمن من بعدي.

'Abbas b. al-Walid al-Narsi and Abu Kamil – Ja'far b. Sulayman – Yazid al-Rishk – Mutarrif – 'Imran b. Hasin: The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: "Ali is from me and I am from him, and he is **THE** *wali* of every believer after me."<sup>23</sup>

Dr. Al-Jawabirah says:

إسناده صحيح. رجاله رجال مسلم.

**Its chain is *sahih*.** Its narrators are narrators of (*Sahih*) Muslim.<sup>24</sup>

1. Muhammad b. Yusuf al-Salihi al-Shami, *Subul al-Huda al-Rashad fi Sirah Khayr al-'Ibad* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1414 H) [annotators: 'Adil Ahmad 'Abd al-Mawjud and 'Ali Muhammad Ma'ud], vol. 11, p. 296
2. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, *al-Isabah fi Tamyiz al-Sahabah* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1415 H) [annotators: Shaykh 'Adil Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Mawjud and Shaykh 'Ali Muhammad Ma'udh], vol. 4, p. 468
3. Fakhr al-Din al-Turayhi, *Majma' al-Bahrayn* (2nd edition, 1408 H) [annotator: Sayyid Ahmad al-Husayni], vol. 1, p. 217
4. Abu al-Fadhl Jamal al-Din Muhammad b. Mukram b. Manzur al-Afriqi al-Misri, *Lisan al-'Arab* (Qum: Nashr Adab al-Hawzah; 1405 H), vol. 3, p. 92; Muhammad b. Abi Bakr 'Abd al-Qadir al-Razi, *Mukhtar al-Sihah* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Ahmad Shams al-Din], p. 37
5. Qur'an 20:85

6. Qur'an 6:164
7. Qur'an 13:16
8. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 3, p. 143, # 4652
9. Ibid
10. Ibid
11. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqihah wa Fawaidihah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 5, p. 263, # 2223
12. Abu al-Fida Isma'il b. Kathir al-Dimashqi, al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah (Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi; 1st edition, 1408 H) [annotator: 'Ali Shiri], vol. 5, p. 228-229
13. Ibid
14. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muassasat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 3, p. 371, # 15026
15. Ibid
16. Qur'an 9:71
17. Abu al-Fida Isma'il b. 'Umar b. Kathir al-Qurshi al-Dimashqi, Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azim (Dar al-Taybah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 2nd edition, 1420 H) [annotator: Sami b. Muhammad Salamah], vol. 4, p. 174
18. Abu al-'Abbas Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 7, p. 391
19. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqihah wa Fawaidihah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 5, p. 264, # 2223
20. Abu al-'Abbas Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 7, p. 391
21. Abu Hatim Muhammad b. Hibban b. Ahmad b. Hibban b. Mu'adh b. Ma'bad al-Tamimi al-Darimi al-Busti, Sahih Ibn Hibban bi Tartib Ibn Balban (Beirut: Muassasat al-Risalah; 2nd edition, 1414 H) [annotators: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani and Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 15, pp. 373-374, # 6929
22. Muhammad b. Yusuf al-Salihi al-Shami, Subul al-Huda al-Rashad fi Sirah Khayr al-'Ibad (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1414 H) [annotators: 'Adil Ahmad 'Abd al-Mawjud and 'Ali Muhammad Ma'ud], vol. 6, p. 237
23. Abu Bakr b. Abi 'Asim, Ahmad b. 'Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (Dar al-Sami'i li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi') [annotator: Dr. Basim b. Faysal al-Jawabirah], vol. 1, p. 799, # 1221
24. Ibid

Facing severe hopelessness about *Hadith al-Wilayah*, a high-standing Sunni 'alim decides to play the last remaining card: "Shi'is doctored it"! Imam al-Mubarakfuri (d. 1282 H) says:

رواه أحمد في مسنده) وهو ولي كل مؤمن من بعدي (كذا في بعض النسخ  
 بزيادة من وقع في بعضها بعدي بحذف من وكذا وقع في رواية أحمد في  
 مسنده وقد استدلل به الشيعة على أن علياً رضي الله عنه كان خليفة بعد رسول  
 الله من غير فصل واستدلّاهم به عن هذا باطل فإن مداره عن صحة زيادة لفظ  
 بعدي وكونها صحيحة محفوظة قابلة للاحتجاج والأمر ليس كذلك .... زيادة

لفظ بعدي في هذا الحديث ليست بمحفوظة بل هي مردودة فاستدلال الشيعة بها على أن علياً رضي الله عنه كان خليفة بعد رسول الله من غير فصل باطل جداً

Ahmad recorded it in his *Musnad*: “And he is THE *wali* of every believer after me (*min ba’di*)”. This is how it is recorded in some manuscripts, with the addition of “min”. In other manuscripts, there is “ba’di” without “min”, and this is how it is in the report of Ahmad in his *Musnad*. The Shi’ah have proved with it (i.e. the phrase “after me”) that ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, was the immediate *khalifah* of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him.

**Their reliance of upon as proof is fallacious because it depends entirely upon the authenticity of the additional phrase “after me”. If it were authentic, then it would be acceptable as proof.**

But, the matter is not like that... **The additional phrase “after me” in this *hadith* is not authentic.** Rather, it is rejected. Therefore, the reliance upon it as proof, by the Shi’ah, that ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, was the immediate *khalifah* of the Messenger of Allah is terribly fallacious.<sup>1</sup>

In simple words, the original *hadith* was this:

علي ولي كل مؤمن

‘Ali is **THE** *wali* of every believer.

However, some unreliable people maliciously added “after me” to it to make it:

علي ولي كل مؤمن بعدي

‘Ali is **THE** *wali* of every believer after me.

In his haste, al-Mubarakfuri obviously fails to notice that the “dangerous elements” in the *hadith* are two, not one: the word “the” before *wali* and the phrase “after me”. The only way he can have his way is if the original *hadith* had been this:

علي ولي لكل مؤمن

‘Ali is a *wali* of every believer.

In that case, Amir al-Muminin, *'alaihi al-salam*, would have been only one of the friends and helpers of the believers. But, the definite article (i.e. the word “the”) before *wali* in the actual *hadith* restricts *wilayah* to him, to the exclusion of all others – based on the testimony of Ibn ‘Abbas, *radhiyallahu ‘anhu*. As such, the alternative version being proposed by al-Mubarakfuri is blasphemous in its purport as it suggests that the *wali* was only ‘Ali, and not the Messenger, *sallallahu ‘alaihi wa alihi*, even though the latter was still alive! Whatever meaning is given to *wali* in such a situation, the meaning still constitutes disbelief in Islam. No doubt, al-Mubarakfuri has no viable way out of the quagmire.

So, who possibly forged “after me” in the *hadith*? Al-Mubarakfuri now reads his charge sheet:

قد تفرد بها جعفر بن سليمان وهو شيعي بل هو غال في التشيع.... وظاهر أن قوله بعدي في هذا الحديث مما يقوى به معتقدا الشيعة وقد تقرر في مقره أن المبتدع إذا روى شيئا يقوى به بدعته فهو مردود.... فإن قلت لم يتفرد بزيادة قوله بعدي جعفر بن سليمان بل تابعه عليها أجلاح الكندي.... قلت أجلاح الكندي هذا أيضا شيعي.... والظاهر أن زيادة بعدي في هذا الحديث من وهم هذين الشيعيين

Ja’far b. Sulayman was the only one to narrate it (i.e. the phrase “after me” in the *hadith*) **and he was a Shi’i**. Rather, he was an extremist in Shi’ism.... **An apparent fact is that his statement “after me” in this *hadith* is PART OF what is used to strengthen the beliefs of the Shi’ah**. It has been repeatedly stated at its place that whenever a heretic narrates anything through which he strengthens his heresy, then such is rejected.... If you say that Ja’far b. Sulayman is not the only one who narrated the phrase “after me” (in the *hadith*), and that, rather, Ajlah al-Kindi also narrated it... I say: **Ajlah al-Kindi too was a Shi’i**.... The apparent fact is that the additional phrase “after me” in this *hadith* is from the hallucinations of these two Shi’is.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Mubarakfuri admits that “after me” is only “part of” the pro-Shi’i elements in the *hadith*. He fails to elaborate however, and prefers not to touch on the other part at all! It is our submission that this second undisclosed “dangerous” part of *Hadith al-Wilayah* is none other than its definite article.

In any case, al-Mubarakfuri is correct about the Shi’ism of both Ja’far b. Sulayman and Ajlah al-Kindi. Both were companions of the sixth Shi’i Imam, Ja’far al-Sadiq, *'alaihi al-salam*. The Shi’i *hadith* scientist, al-Jawahiri, says about Ja’far:

جعفر بن سليمان الضبعي: البصري – من أصحاب الصادق (ع) ثقة.

Ja'far b. Sulayman al-Dhab'i: al-Basri, **one of the companions of al-Sadiq**, peace be upon him. He was *thiqah* (trustworthy).<sup>3</sup>

He equally states about Ajlah:

الأجلح بن عبد الله: بن معاوية أبو حجية الكندي أسمه يحيى من أصحاب  
الصادق(ع) (روى في كامل الزيارات والكافي وقال المفيد في كتاب الكافية في  
سند فيه الأجلح انه صحيح الاسناد

Al-Ajlah b. 'Abd Allah: b. Mu'awiyah Abu Hujjiyah al-Kindi. His name was Yahya. **He was one of the companions of al-Sadiq**, peace be upon him. He narrated in *Kamil al-Ziyarat* and *al-Kafi*, and al-Mufid says in *Kitab al-Kafiyah* concerning a chain which includes al-Ajlah, that it is a *sahih* chain.<sup>4</sup>

Both Ja'far and Ajlah are considered trustworthy by the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah and the Shi'ah Imamiyyah. So, on what basis does al-Mubarakfuri seek to establish his accusation against them? Does he have any *positive* proof that they doctored the *hadith*? This is all he has given as his basis:

وقد تقرر في مقره أن المبتدع إذا روى شيئاً يقوى به بدعته فهو مردود

It has been repeatedly stated at its place that whenever a heretic narrates anything through which he strengthens his heresy, then such is rejected.

So, both Ja'far and Ajlah are suspects only because the *hadith* supports Shi'ism and they are Shi'is! Therefore, they *must have* doctored it to make it the pro-Shi'i evidence that it is, even though they were trustworthy people! Al-Mubarakfuri has no concrete evidence against his two victims. All he has is mere conjecture. Meanwhile, a contemporary Salafi *hadith* scientist, al-Turayfi, further reveals that al-Mubarakfuri has actually misrepresented the true Sunni position:

والأصل في رواية المبتدع إذا كان ضابطاً ثقة القبول، سواء روى فيما يوافق  
بدعته أم لا، ما لم يكن قد كفر بدعته، فحينئذ يرد لكفره، وعلى هذا الأئمة  
الحفاظ، فهم يخرجون للمبتدع إذا كان ثقة ثبناً، ويصححون خبره، فقد أخرج  
الإمام أحمد في "مسنده" ومسلم في "صحيحه" والنسائي في "الكبرى"  
و"المجتبى" والترمذي وابن ماجه وابن حبان في "صحيحه" وابن منده في كتاب  
"الإيمان" والبيهقي في "الاعتقاد" وغيرهم من حديث عدي بن ثابت عن زر قال:

قال علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه: والذي فلق الحبة وبرأ النسمة إنه لعهد النبي الأمي إليّ أن لا يحبني إلا مؤمن ولا يبغضني إلا منافق. وعدي بن ثابت ثقة وصفه بالتشيع الأئمة كابن معين والإمام أحمد وأبي حاتم ويعقوب بن سفيان، بل قال المسعودي: (ما رأيت أقول بقول الشيعة من عدي بن ثابت) انتهى. ومع هذا أخرج له الأئمة. بل قال بتوثيقه من وصفه بالتشيع وأخرج له فيما يوافق بدعته كالإمام أحمد بن حنبل والنسائي.

The default position concerning the report of a heretic, if he was accurate and trustworthy, is to accept it, **regardless of whether he narrated concerning what agrees with his *bid'ah* (heresy) or not**, as long as he had not apostatized through his heresy. In such a case, it will be rejected due to his *kufr* (disbelief). This was the practice of the Imams who were *hadith* scientists, for they used to narrate from the heretic if he was trustworthy and accurate, and used to declare his report to be *sahih*. For verily, Imam Ahmad has recorded in his *Musnad*, and Muslim in his *Sahih*, and al-Nasai in *al-Kubra* and *al-Mujtaba*, and al-Tirmidhi and Ibn Majah, and Ibn Hibban in his *Sahih*, and Ibn Mandah in *Kitab al-Iman*, and al-Bayhaqi in *al-I'tiqad* and others the *hadith* of 'Adi b. Thabit from Zirr, who said: 'Ali b. Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him, said: "I swear by the One Who split up the seed and created something living, the *Ummi* Prophet verily informed me that none loves me except a believer and that none hates me except a hypocrite."

Meanwhile, 'Adi b. Thabit was trustworthy, and the Imams like Ibn Ma'in, Imam Ahmad, Abu Hatim and Ya'qub b. Sufyan identified him as a Shi'i. Rather, al-Mas'udi said, "I do not see anyone who professes Shi'ism more than 'Adi b. Thabit." Despite this, the Imams narrated from him. **Rather, those who identified him as a Shi'i, like Imam Ahmad b. Hanbal and al-Nasai, also declared him trustworthy, and narrated from him in what agrees with his *bid'ah*.**<sup>5</sup>

Another Salafi *hadith* scientist, al-Mua'lami (d. 1386 H) corroborates him:

وقد وثق أئمة الحديث جماعة من المبتدعة واحتجوا بأحاديثهم وأخرجوها في الصحاح، ومن تتبع رواياتهم وجد فيها كثيراً مما يوافق ظاهرة بدعهم، وأهل العلم يتأولون تلك الأحاديث غير طاعنين فيها ببدعة راويها ولا في راويها بروايتها لها

The Imams in the *hadith* sciences have declared as trustworthy a lot of the heretics, and have taken their (i.e. the heretics') *ahadith* as *hujjah*, and have recorded them (i.e. those reports) in their *Sahih* books. **And whoever researches their (the heretics') narrations finds that a lot of them apparently agree**

**with their heresies.** The scholars give alternative interpretations for those *ahadith* without attacking them (i.e. the *ahadith*) on account of the heresy of their narrators, nor do they attack the narrators for narrating them.<sup>6</sup>

‘Allamah al–Albani (d. 1420 H), in particular, feels uncomfortable about al–Mubarakfuri’s “solution” to the crisis, and therefore refutes him about the same *Hadith al–Wilayah*:

فإن قال قائل: راوي هذا الشاهد شيعي، وكذلك في سند المشهود له شيعي آخر، وهو جعفر بن سليمان، أفلا يعتبر ذلك طعنا في الحديث وعلة فيه؟!

فأقول: كلا لأن العبرة في رواية الحديث إنما هو الصدق والحفظ، وأما المذهب فهو بينه وبين ربه، فهو حسيبه

If someone says: “The narrator of this corroborative *hadith* (i.e. that of Ajlah) was a Shi’i, and also in the chain of the main *hadith*, there is another Shi’i, and he is Ja’far b. Sulayman. Does this not justify attack on the *hadith* and constitute a fault in it?”

So, I answer: “**Not at all, because the requirements in the transmission of *hadith* are ONLY truthfulness and sound memory.** As for the *madhhab* (of the narrator), that is between him and his Lord, and He is sufficient for him.<sup>7</sup>

But, the ‘Allamah is not done yet. He drops the final bombshell:

على أن الحديث قد جاء مفرقا من طرق أخرى ليس فيها شيعي.

Plus, the *hadith* (i.e. *Hadith al–Wilayah*) has been narrated, in parts, **through many others chains, which do not contain a single Shi’i in them.**<sup>8</sup>

The above submissions basically flatten al–Mubarakfuri’s foul attempts on the *hadith* and his unfair allegation against Ja’far and Ajlah!

1. Abu al–‘Ala Muhammad b. ‘Abd al–Rahman b. ‘Abd al–Rahim al–Mubarakfuri, *Tuhfat al–Ahwazi bi Sharh Jami’ al–Tirmidhi* (Beirut: Dar al–Kutub al–‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1410 H), vol. 10, pp. 146–147
2. Abu al–‘Ala Muhammad b. ‘Abd al–Rahman b. ‘Abd al–Rahim al–Mubarakfuri, *Tuhfat al–Ahwazi bi Sharh Jami’ al–Tirmidhi* (Beirut: Dar al–Kutub al–‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1410 H), vol. 10, pp. 146–147
3. Muhammad al–Jawahiri, *al–Mufid min Mu’jam al–Rijal al–Hadith* (Qum: Manshurat Maktabah al–Mahalati; 2nd edition,

1424 H), p. 107, # 2171

4. Ibid, p. 19, # 378

5. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz b. Marzuq al-Turayfi, al-Tahjil fi Takhrij ma lam Yukhraj min al-Ahadith wa al-Athar fi Irwa al-Ghalil (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Rushd li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’; 1st edition, 1422 H), p. 546

6. ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Yahya b. ‘Ali b. Muhammad al-Mu’alami al-‘Atmi al-Yamani, al-Tankil bi ma fi Ta-anib al-Kawthari min al-Abatil (al-Maktab al-Islami; 2nd edition, 1406 H) [annotators: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani, Zuhayr al-Shawish and ‘Abd al-Razzaq Hamzah], vol. 1, p. 237

7. Abu ‘Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqihah wa Fawaidihah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma’arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 5, p. 262, # 2223

8. Ibid, vol. 5, p. 263, # 2223

Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) says:

قوله أنت وليي في كل مؤمن بعدي فإن هذا موضوع باتفاق أهل المعرفة  
بالحديث

His statement, “You are my *wali* over every believer after me”. **Verily, this is a fabrication (*mawdu*), by the consensus of the *hadith* scholars.**<sup>1</sup>

This is a very big claim. It means that every single *hadith* scholar, from the start of Prophet Muhammad’s mission, *sallallahu ‘alaihi wa alihi*, till the days of Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah – without any exception – explicitly declared this *Hadith al-Tawliyah* to be *mawdu*. At a specific level, our dear Shaykh claims that Malik b. Anas (d. 179 H), Ibn al-Mubarak (d. 181 H), al-Shafi’i (d. 204 H), al-Tayalisi (d. 204 H), ‘Abd al-Razzaq al-San’ani (d. 211 H), al-Humaydi (d. 219 H), Ibn Ja’d (d. 230 H), Ibn Sa’d (d. 230 H), Ibn Abi Shaybah (d. 235 H), Ibn Rahwayh (d. 238 H), Ahmad b. Hanbal (d. 241 H), al-Darimi (d. 255 H), al-Bukhari (d. 256 H), Muslim (d. 261 H), Ibn Majah (d. 273 H), Abu Dawud (d. 275 H), Ibn Qutaybah (d. 276 H), al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 H), Ibn Abi ‘Asim (d. 287 H), al-Nasai (d. 303 H), Ibn Khuzaymah (d. 311 H), al-‘Aqili (d. 322 H), Ibn Abi Hatim (d. 327 H), Ibn Hibban (d. 354 H), al-Tabarani (d. 360 H), al-Darqutni (d. 385 H), Ibn Shahin (d. 385 H), al-Hakim (d. 403 H), al-Bayhaqi (d. 458 H), al-Baghdadi (d. 463 H), Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (d. 463 H), al-Khawarazmi (d. 568 H), Ibn Asakir (571 H), al-Nawawi (d. 676 H), among others – each of them has an *express* statement about the *hadith* in which he grades it as *mawdu*. However, the reverse is actually the truth! No scholar before Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) ever classed the *hadith* to be *mawdu* or even *dha’if*. By contrast, Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) actually calls its chain *sahih*! What drove Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah into such reckless fallacy must have been something very huge!

Imam Ahmad has documented *Hadith al-Tawliyah* in his *Musnad*:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا يحيى بن حماد ثنا أبو عوانة ثنا أبو بلج ثنا عمرو بن ميمون .... قال بن عباس .... وخرج بالناس في غزوة تبوك قال فقال له علي أخرج معك قال فقال له نبي الله لا فبكي علي فقال له أما ترضى أن تكون منى بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنك لست بنبي انه لا ينبغي أن أذهب الا وأنت خليفتي قال وقال له رسول الله أنت وليي في كل مؤمن بعدي

‘Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Yahya b. Hammad – Abu ‘Awanah – Abu Balj – ‘Amr b. Maymun .... Ibn ‘Abbas said:

.... He (the Messenger of Allah) went out for the battle of Tabuk. So, ‘Ali said to him, “Let me go out with you.” Therefore, the Prophet of Allah, peace be upon him, said, “Do not weep, ‘Ali. Are you not pleased that you are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, with the exception that you are not a prophet? Verily, it is not right that I depart except with you as my *khalifah*. **You are my wali over every believer after me.**”<sup>3</sup>

‘Allamah Ahmad Muhammad Shakir (d. 1377 H) declares:

### إسناده صحيح

Its chain is *sahih*.<sup>4</sup>

‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1412 H) also states:

وأخرجه أحمد 1/330: ثنا يحيى بن حماد به مطولا وفيه: قال: وخرج صلى الله عليه وسلم بالناس في غزوة تبوك قال: فقال علي أخرج معك قال: فقال له نبي الله: "لا". فبكى علي قال له: "أما ترضى أن تكون منى بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنك لست بنبي انه لا ينبغي أن أذهب الا وأنت خليفتي". قال: وقال له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: "أنت وليي في كل مؤمن بعدي". الحديث وأخرجه الحاكم بطوله 3/132-134 من طريق أحمد ثم قال: صحيح الإسناد ووافقه الذهبي.

Ahmad (1/330) recorded it from Yahya b. Hamad in detail, and part of it is:

He (the Messenger of Allah) went out with the people for the battle of Tabuk. So, ‘Ali said to him, “Let me go out with you.” Therefore, the Prophet of Allah, peace be upon him, said, “Do not weep, ‘Ali. Are you not pleased that you are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, with the exception that you are not a prophet? Verily, it is not right that I depart except with you as my *khalifah*. **You are my wali over every believer after me.**” ... the *hadith*.

Al-Hakim recorded it in full (3/132–134) through the route of Ahmad, and said, “**Its chain is *sahih*” and al-Dhahabi concurred with him.**<sup>5</sup>

The ‘Allamah himself adds concerning its chain:

إِسْنَادُهُ حَسَنٌ.

Its chain is *hasan*.<sup>6</sup>

Commenting on this same chain of *Hadith al-Tawliyah*, Dr. Al-Jawabirah says:

إِسْنَادُهُ حَسَنٌ.

Its chain is *hasan*.<sup>7</sup>

Imam al-Busiri too grades the chain as follows:

سَنَدٌ صَحِيحٌ

A *sahih* chain.<sup>8</sup>

So, one wonders: why is Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah so panicky about this *hadith*? There must be a reason he is so desperate about it, to the extent of attributing patent fallacies to all the Sunni *muhadithun* – perhaps dozens or hundreds of them – before his time in order to bring it down. What is the scary secret?

It is apparent that *wali* in *Hadith al-Tawliyah* cannot possibly mean “friend”, “helper” or “supporter” in any logical sense. ‘Ali, *‘alaihi al-salam*, was the friend, helper and supporter of the believers during the lifetime of the Prophet and after his death, *in his presence* and in his absence. Besides, changing *wali* in the *hadith* to “friend”, or “helper” or supporter” would only produce incoherent and insensible

statements:

أنت وليي في كل مؤمن بعدي

“You are my friend over every believer after me.”

“You are my lover over every believer after me.”

“You are my supporter over every believer after me.”

“You are my friend over every believer after me.”

The Messenger of Allah was absolutely above making such kinds of statements. Moreover, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah himself cautions:

إن أراد الموالاة لم يحتج أن يقول بعدي

If he had intended friendship, he did not need to say “after me”.<sup>9</sup>

But, can we interpret “my *wali*” in the *hadith* to mean “my ruler”? This depends on the exact intended meaning. For instance, Allah says about His Prophet:

قل يا أيها الناس إني رسول الله إليكم جميعا

Say: “O mankind! Verily, I am the **Messenger of Allah** to you all.”<sup>10</sup>

He was the Messenger *appointed by* Allah. The Qur’an also states about him:

أم تريدون أن تسألوا رسولكم كما سئل موسى من قبل

Or, do you want to ask **your Messenger** as Musa was asked before?<sup>11</sup>

Does this mean that the people appointed the Messenger? Of course, they never did! Rather, he was appointed *by Allah* – hence, the Messenger of Allah – and *sent to* the people – and thereby their Messenger. This is a similar verse:

## أَمْ لَمْ يَعْرِفُوا رَسُولَهُمْ فَهُمْ لَهُ مُنْكَرُونَ

Or is it that they did not recognize **their Messenger** so they deny him?<sup>12</sup>

In the light of the above, the following conclusions can be drawn about the word “messenger”:

1. “The Messenger of Allah” means the messenger appointed by Allah.
2. “Your Messenger” means the Messenger sent to you.
3. “Their Messenger” means the Messenger sent to them.

In the same manner:

1. The *wali* of the Prophet over his *Ummah* is the *wali* appointed by him over them.
2. The *wali* of the *Ummah* is the *wali* appointed over them or by them.

As such, the *hadith* “You are my *wali* over every believer after me” may mean “You are the *wali* I have appointed over every believer after me”. This is perfectly in line with *Hadith al-Wilayah* too.

Another probable meaning of “my *wali*” in the *hadith* is “my heir”. One of the rarer meanings of *wali* is “heir”. Prophet Zakariyah, ‘*alaihi al-salam*, prayed to Allah, while he was still barren, with these words:

فَهَبْ لِي مِنْ لَدُنْكَ وَلِيًّا يَرِثُنِي وَيَرِثْ مِنْ آلِ يَعْقُوبَ وَاجْعَلْهُ رَبِّ رَضِيًّا يَا زَكَرِيَّا  
إِنَّا نَبْشُرُكَ بِغُلَامٍ اسْمُهُ يَحْيَى

“So give me from Yourself a **wali, who shall inherit me** and inherit the family of Ya’qub. And make him, my Lord, one with whom You are well-pleased”. (Allah said): “O Zakariyah! Verily, We give you the glad tidings of a son, his name will be **Yahya**.”<sup>13</sup>

Zakariyah was a prophet. His *wali*, who was his son Yahya, ‘*alaihi al-salam*, inherited his prophethood and knowledge, and thereby became the next master of his father’s *Ummah* after his death. Professor Ibn Yasin also states in his *tafsir*:

أَخْرَجَ عَبْدُ الرَّزَّاقِ بِسَنَدِهِ الصَّحِيحِ عَنْ قَتَادَةَ عَنِ الْحَسَنِ فِي قَوْلِهِ (يَرِثُنِي وَيَرِثُ  
مِنْ آلِ يَعْقُوبَ)، قَالَ: نَبُوته وعلمه.

‘Abd al-Razzaq records **with his *sahih* chain** from Qatadah, that al-Hasan said concerning the verse {who shall inherit me and inherit the family of Ya’qub}: [who shall inherit] **his prophethood and knowledge**.<sup>14</sup>

*Hadith al-Tawliyah* therefore makes ‘Ali the *wali* – the heir – of the Messenger of Allah. Meanwhile, this inheritance was declared to be “over every believer” after the Prophet. Apparently, it concerned only matters and affairs between the Messenger and his *Ummah*. These, without doubt, included his powers, rights responsibilities, obligations, and duties *over* them. All of these were inherited by Amir al-Muminin after him.

A *shahid* that has been documented by Ibn Abi ‘Asim (d. 287 H) gives this same impression as well:

ثنا الحسين بن علي وأحمد بن عثمان قالوا: ثنا محمد بن خالد بن عثمة، حدثنا موسى بن يعقوب، حدثني المهاجر بن مسمار، عن عائشة بنت سعد، عن أبيها قال: سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول يوم الجحفة وأخذ بيد علي، فخطب فحمد الله وأثنى عليه ثم قال: أيها الناس إني وليكم. قالوا: صدقت يا رسول الله، وأخذ بيد علي رضي الله عنه فرفعها فقال: هذا وليي، والمؤدي عني.

Husayn b. ‘Ali and Ahmad b. ‘Uthman – Muhammad b. Khalid b. ‘Athmah – Musa b. Ya’qub – al-Muhajir b. Mismar – ‘Aishah bint Sa’d – her father:

I heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, saying on the Day of al-Juhfah while holding the hand of ‘Ali, and he delivered a sermon, and thanked Allah and praised Him, and then said: “**O mankind! I am your *wali***”. They replied, “You have said the truth, O Messenger of Allah.” Then he held the hand of ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, and raised it up, and said, “**This is my *wali*, and the one to discharge on my behalf.**”<sup>15</sup>

‘Allamah al-Albani says:

صحيح، فإن له شواهد

It is ***sahih*** because it has *shawahid*.<sup>16</sup>

‘Ali was the *wali* appointed by the Messenger of Allah over his *Ummah*, and the one to discharge on his behalf among them after him. It is further noteworthy that the responsibility of discharge granted to Amir

al-Muminin was unqualified. Therefore, *anything* that was the responsibility of the Prophet among his *Ummah*, no one else has the right to do it *for him* except ‘Ali. As such, after the death of the Messenger of Allah, all his obligations, responsibilities and liabilities – with regards to the *Ummah* – naturally passed onto ‘Ali by inheritance.

‘Allamah al-Albani has equally copied a further *shahid*:

## علي يقضي ديني

‘Ali will repay my debts. 17

And he gives this verdict about it:

## حسن

*Hasan*. 18

In other words, ‘Ali – being the heir – inherited the liabilities of the Messenger of Allah, including his debts to members of his *Ummah*. So, the liabilities became his personal responsibilities after the death of his Prophet.

But, some unthinkable things happened in Islamic history. Although the Prophet had declared ‘Ali to be his *wali* over his whole *Ummah* after him, the one to discharge on his behalf and the one to repay his debts, some other people precluded Amir al-Muminin and arrogated these ranks to themselves! With support from their kinsmen and associates, they even proceeded to militarily install themselves in ‘Ali places. For instance, Imam al-Bukhari (d. 256 H) records that ‘Umar b. al-Khattab said:

توفى الله نبيه صلى الله عليه و سلم فقال أبو بكر أنا ولي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم.... توفى الله أبا بكر فقلت أنا ولي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم وأبي بكر

Allah caused His Prophet, peace be upon him, to die. **So, Abu Bakr said, “I am the *wali* of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him”.... Allah (also) caused Abu Bakr to die. **So, I (too) said, “I am the *wali* of the Messenger of Allah and Abu Bakr.”** 19**

Elsewhere, al-Bukhari also records:

حدثنا إبراهيم بن موسى أخبرنا هشام عن ابن جريج قال أخبرني عمرو بن دينار عن محمد بن علي عن جابر بن عبد الله رضي الله عنهم قال: لما مات النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم جاء أبا بكر مال من قبل العلاء بن الحضرمي فقال أبو بكر من كان له على النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم دين أو كانت له قبله عدة فليأتنا . قال جابر وعدني رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم أن يعطيني هكذا وهكذا وهكذا فبسط يديه ثلاث مرات قال جابر فعد في يدي خمسمائة ثم خمسمائة ثم خمسمائة

**Narrated Jabir b. ‘Abd Allah:**

**When the Prophet, peace be upon him, died, Abu Bakr received some property from al-‘Ala b. al-Hadhrami. So, Abu Bakr said, “Whoever has a debt claim against the Prophet, peace be upon him, or was promised something by him, should come to us.” I said, “The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, promised me that he would give me this much, and this much, and this much”. And I spread my hands three times. So, he (Abu Bakr) counted for me and handed me five-hundred, then five hundred and then five-hundred.<sup>20</sup>**

What?! Abu Bakr was the *wali* of the Prophet over every believer after him? Abu Bakr was the one to repay the Messenger’s debts? What in the world was happening exactly! Wonders really never end! Besides, why was Abu Bakr repaying the Prophet’s *personal* debts and promises with *state* funds? Would the Messenger have misappropriated the Muslim treasury in such a manner?

Imam ‘Ali was apparently terribly disappointed by this turn of events. Therefore, despite his extraordinary patience, his shock made him to voice out angrily. Imam Muslim (d. 261 H) quotes ‘Umar as having said the following words to both ‘Ali and ‘Abbas:

فلما توفي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قال أبو بكر أنا ولي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم .... فرأيتماه كاذبا آثما غادرا خائنا والله يعلم إنه لصادق بار راشد تابع للحق ثم توفي أبو بكر وأنا ولي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم وولي أبا بكر فرأيتماني كاذبا آثما غادرا خائنا

When the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, died, **Abu Bakr said: “I am the *wali* of the**

**Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him.”.... So both of you (‘Ali and ‘Abbas) thought him (i.e. Abu Bakr) to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest.** And Allah knows that he was really truthful, pious, rightly-guided and a follower of the truth. **Abu Bakr died and I became the wali of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, and the wali of Abu Bakr. So both of you thought me to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest.**<sup>21</sup>

Due to Abu Bakr’s surprising claim that he was the *wali* of the Messenger of Allah – among others – ‘Ali declared him “a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest”. When ‘Umar made the same claim later, ‘Ali repeated those same words for him too. This is what Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah fears; the truth of ‘Ali’s accusations against them both. If his words about them were correct, then Sunni Islam crashes headlong! It cannot stand without the alleged saintly status of Abu Bakr and ‘Umar. Moreover, the fallacy of some “ahadith” circulated to highlight their “merits” becomes exposed as well. The cost is simply too much. So, our dear Shaykh seeks to save his Sunni sect by desperately and recklessly denying *Hadith al-Tawliyah*. The truth, however, never dies.

1. Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 5, pp. 35–36
2. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, al-Mustadrak ‘ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa ‘Abd al-Qadir ‘Ata], vol. 3, p. 143, # 4652
3. Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Dar al-Hadith; 1st edition, 1416 H) [annotator: Ahmad Muhammad Shakir], vol. 1, p. 330, # 3062
4. Ibid, vol. 1, p. 331, # 3062
5. Abu Bakr b. Abi ‘Asim, Ahmad b. ‘Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1400 H) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 2, p. 566, # 1189
6. Ibid, vol. 2, p. 565, # 1188
7. Abu Bakr b. Abi ‘Asim, Ahmad b. ‘Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (Dar al-Sami’i li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’) [annotator: Dr. Basim b. Faysal al-Jawabirah], vol. 1, pp. 799–800, # 1222
8. Ahmad b. Abi Bakr b. Isma’il al-Busiri, Itihaf al-Khiyarah al-Maharah bi Zawaid al-Masanid al-‘Ashara (Riyadh: Dar al-Watan; 1st edition, 1420 H), vol. 7, p. 184, # 6630
9. Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 7, p. 391
10. Qur’an 7:158
11. Qur’an 2:108
12. Qur’an 23:69
13. Qur’an 19:5–7
14. Prof. Dr. Hikmat b. Bashir b. Yasin, Mawsu’at al-Sahih al-Masbur min al-Tafsir bi al-Mathur (Madinah: Dar al-Mathar li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’ wa al-Taba’at; 1st edition, 1420 H), vol. 3, p. 332
15. Abu Bakr b. Abi ‘Asim, Ahmad b. ‘Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1410 H) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 2, p. 565, # 1189
16. Ibid, vol. 2, p. 566, # 1189
17. Abu ‘Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Sahih al-Jami’ al-Saghir wa Ziyadatuhu (Al-Maktab al-Islami), vol. 2, p. 754, # 4092
18. Ibid
19. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Isma’il b. Ibrahim b. Mughirah al-Bukhari al-Ju’fi, al-Jami’ al-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Beirut: Dar Ibn Kathir; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafa Dib al-Bagha], vol. 5, p. 2048, # 5043
20. Ibid, vol. 2, p. 953, # 2537

Allah informs us about two of His prophets in His Book:

## وورث سليمان داود

And Sulayman inherited Dawud. 1

In other words, it was Sulayman, *'alaihi al-salam*, who inherited Dawud, *'alaihi al-salam*. Explaining this verse, Imam al-Tabari (d. 310 H) states:

يقول تعالى ذكره: وورث سليمان أباه داود العلم الذي كان آتاه الله في حياته،  
والملك الذي كان خصه به على سائر قومه

He, the Most High, says: Sulayman inherited **the knowledge** which Allah gave his father during his lifetime and **the kingdom** which He specially bestowed upon him above all of his people.2

Al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir (d. 774 H) also says:

قال الله تعالى: {وورث سليمان داود وقال يا أيها الناس علمنا منطق الطير  
وأوتينا من كل شيء إن هذا لهو الفضل المبين} {النمل: ١٦} (أي ورثه في النبوة  
والملك، وليس المراد ورثه في المال، لأنه قد كان له بنون غيره، فما كان  
ليخص بالمال دونهم

Allah the Most High said: {And Sulayman inherited Dawud, and he (Sulayman) said, “O people, we have been taught the language of birds, and on us have been bestowed all things. This, verily, is an evident grace} [27:16], **that is, inheritance of prophethood and kingdom**. What was intended was not inheritance of material possessions. This is because he (Dawud) had several children apart from him (Sulayman) and he (Sulayman) could not have been exclusively given the material possessions at their expense.3

Imam Ibn al-Jawzi (d. 597 H) has these words too:

قوله تعالى: {وورث سليمان داود} أي: ورث نبوته وعلمه ومملكه، وكان لداود تسعة عشر ذكراً، فخص سليمان بذلك، ولو كانت وراثته مال لكان جميع أولاده فيها سواء.

Allah the Most High says {And Sulayman inherited Dawud}, that is: **he inherited his prophethood, knowledge and kingdom**. Dawud had nineteen sons. But, Sulayman was exclusively given that. If it had been inheritance of material possessions, all his children would have been equally entitled.<sup>4</sup>

There are a number of points from this verse:

1. Prophethood is an inheritable office.
2. Divine knowledge is inheritable.
3. Kingdom – which is also called *khilafah* – is inheritable.

Moreover, where someone, out of many possible heirs, is singled out as the only heir in any circumstance, then such inheritance could not have been about material possessions. Rather, it must have been with regards to knowledge, offices and ranks. Prophet Sulayman was *the* inheritor of his father, Prophet Dawud. As such, he became the prophet, the supreme scholar and the ruler after him. But, what about our dearest Prophet Muhammad, *sallallahu 'alaihi wa alihi*? Was he inherited by anyone? Did he name any inheritor?

Imam al-Nasai (d. 303 H) records a really interesting *hadith* in this regard:

أخبرنا الفضل بن سهل قال حدثني عفان بن مسلم قال حدثنا أبو عوانة عن عثمان بن المغيرة عن أبي صادق عن ربيعة بن ناقد أن رجلاً قال لعلي يا أمير المؤمنين لم ورثت بن عمك دون عمك قال: جمع رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم أو قال دعا رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بني عبد المطلب فصنع لهم مداً من طعام قال فأكلوا حتى شبعوا وبقي الطعام كما هو كأنه لم يمس ثم دعا بغمر فشربوا حتى رووا وبقي الشراب كأنه لم يمس أو لم يشرب فقال يا بني عبد المطلب إني بعثت إليكم بخاصة وإلى الناس بعامة وقد رأيتم من هذه الآية ما قد رأيتم فأيعني على أن يكون أخي وصاحبي ووارثي فلم يقم إليه أحد فقامت إليه وكنيت أصغر القوم فقال اجلس ثم قال ثلاث مرات كل ذلك أقوم إليه فيقول اجلس حتى كان في الثالثة ضرب بيده على يدي ثم قال أنت أخي

## وصاحبي ووارثي ووزيرى فبذلك ورثت بن عمى دون عمى

Al-Fadhli b. Sahl – ‘Affan b. Muslim – Abu ‘Awanah – ‘Uthman b. al-Mughirah – Abu Sadiq – Rabi’ah b. Najid:

A man said to ‘Ali, “**O Amir al-Muminin! Why is it you that have INHERITED your cousin (i.e. the Prophet) and not your uncle?**”

He replied, “The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, gathered/summoned the Banu ‘Abd al-Mutalib. He cooked some food for them, and they ate until they were satisfied while food was still remaining, as though they never touched it. Then he called for water, and they drank until their thirst was quenched, and the containers of the water remained as though they were never touched or drunk.

After that, he said, “O Banu ‘Abd al-Mutalib! I have been sent to you specially, and to mankind generally. You have seen in this verse what you have seen. Therefore, which one of you will give me a *bay’ah* (oath of allegiance) to become my brother, my companion **and my inheritor?**” None stood up. So, I (‘Ali) stood up, and I was the youngest of the people. So, he (the Prophet) said, “Sit down”. On the third time, he hit his hand on my hand (for the *bay’ah*) and then said: “**You are my brother, and my companion, and MY INHERITOR, and my *wazir*.**” So, through this, **I have inherited my cousin**, at the expense of my uncle.<sup>6</sup>

The above *hadith* has a *sahih* chain. All its narrators – without *any* exception – are *thiqah* (trustworthy), and it is well-connected. Strangely, this is what ‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) says about it:

قلت: وهذا إسناد ضعيف، رجاله كلهم ثقات؛ غير ربيعة بن ناجد، قال الذهبي في ((الميزان)): ((لا يكاد يعرف، وعنه أبو صادق بخبر منكر فيه: علي أخي ووارثي)) يشير إلى هذا الحديث. وصرح في ((الكاشف)) بأنه لم يرو عنه غير أبي صادق هذا. وقال في ((الضعفاء والمتروكين)): ((فيه جهالة)).

I say: This chain is *dha’if*, **all its narrators are *thiqah* (trustworthy), except Rabi’ah b. Najid.** Al-Dhahabi said in *al-Mizan*:

“**He is scarcely known**, and Abu Sadiq narrated from him a *munkar* (repugnant) report, which contains: ‘Ali is my brother and inheritor.”

He was referring to this *hadith*. **He explicitly declared in *al-Kashif* that none else narrated from him other than this Abu Sadiq.** And he (al-Dhahabi) said in *al-Dhu’afa wa al-Matrukin*: “There is *jihalah* in him (he is not known)”.<sup>7</sup>

So, the only narrator that the ‘Allamah has problem with is Rabi’ah b. Najid, and his only evidence against him is Imam al-Dhahabi’s (d. 748 H) overall verdict that he is “scarcely known”. The ‘Allamah places everything on the fact that only Abu Sadiq has narrated from him. It is also noteworthy that al-Dhahabi has called the above *hadith* “repugnant” without giving any proof or explanation.

But, does the fact that a narrator is “scarcely known” – where only a single person has transmitted from him – really affect his *ahadith*? Perhaps, the best way to answer that is to examine how the ‘*ulama* of the Ahl al-Sunnah have treated other similar cases.

A very clear example is Hasin b. Muhammad al-Ansari. Al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) says about him:

حصين بن محمد الأنصاري السالمي المدني يحتج به في الصحيحين لا يكاد  
يعرف قلت ذكره ابن حبان في الثقات

Hasin b. Muhammad al-Ansari al-Salimi al-Madani: **He is relied upon as a *hujjah* in both *Sahihs*** (i.e. *Sahih al-Bukhari* and *Sahih Muslim*). **He is scarcely known.** I say: Ibn Hibban has included him in *al-Thiqat*.<sup>8</sup>

He also adds:

حصين بن محمد الأنصاري السالمي المدني صدوق الحديث من الثانية لم يرو  
عنه غير الزهري.

Hasin b. Muhammad al-Ansari al-Salimi al-Madani: *Saduq al-hadith* (very truthful in *ahadith*), from the second (*tabaqat*). **None narrated from him except al-Zuhri**.<sup>9</sup>

He is exactly like Rabi’ah b. Najid! Yet, he is relied upon as a *hujjah* in both *Sahih al-Bukhari* and *Sahih Muslim*, and is accepted as *saduq* (very truthful)!

Another case is that of Zayd b. Rabah. He too is like Rabi’ah; only one person as transmitted from him. Imam al-Dhahabi confirms:

زيد بن رباح مديني. سمع أبا عبد الله الأغر. ما وجدت أحداً روى عنه سوى  
مالك

Zayd b. Rabah, a resident of Madinah: He heard from Abu ‘Abd Allah al–Aghrah. **I could not find anyone who has transmitted from him except Malik.** 10

Nonetheless, he is graded *thiqah* (trustworthy) by al–Hafiz:

## زيد بن رباح المدني ثقة

Zayd b. Rabah al–Madani: *Thiqah* (trustworthy). 11

In very simple words, whether or not only a single individual has transmitted from a narrator does not affect his standing as long as there is proof that he is trustworthy or very truthful. If there is no evidence for or against his reliability, then such a fact becomes relevant and makes him *majhul* (unknown). In the case of Rabi’ah, it is well–known that only his brother, Abu Sadiq, transmitted from him. Moreover, there is no evidence at all against his reliability. But, is there evidence to prove his trustworthiness or truthfulness?

Rabi’ah’s surname is spelt in two ways in the books of *ahadith* and *rijal*: Najid (ناجد) and Najidh (ناجد). Meanwhile, the ‘*ulama* have used the two words to refer to the same individual. As such, Imam al–‘Ijli (d. 261 H) says about Rabi’ah:

## ربيعة بن ناجذ كوفي تابعي ثقة

Rabi’ah b. Najidh: He was a Kufan, a Tabi’i, ***thiqah* (trustworthy)** 12

Imam Ibn Hibban (d. 354 H) has also included him in his book of *thiqah* (trustworthy) narrators:

## ربيعة بن ناجذ الأسدي الأزدي الكوفي يروى عن علي روى عنه أبو صادق

Rabi’ah b. Najidh al–Asadi al–Azdi al–Kufi: He narrated from ‘Ali, and Abu Sadiq narrated from him. 13

Al–Hafiz confirms both of these in his *al–Tahdhib*:

ربيعة بن ناجذ الأزدي ويقال أيضا الأسدي الكوفي. روى عن علي وابن مسعود وعبادة بن الصامت رضي الله عنهم. وعنه أبو صادق الأزدي يقال إنه أخوه

## ذكره ابن حبان في الثقات .... وقال العجلي كوفي تابعي ثقة

Rabi'ah b. **Najid** al-Azdi, also called al-Asadi al-Kufi. He narrated from 'Ali, Ibn Mas'ud and 'Ubadah b. al-Samit, may Allah be pleased with them. Abu Sadiq al-Azdi narrated from him, and he is said to have been his brother. **Ibn Hibban mentioned him in *al-Thiqat* ... and al-'Ijli said: A Kufan, Tabi'i, *thiqah* (trustworthy).**<sup>14</sup>

Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) also considers the chain of Rabi'ah to be *sahih*, thereby accepting him as *thiqah*:

حدثني أبو قتيبة سالم بن الفضل الآدمي بمكة ثنا محمد بن عثمان بن أبي شيبة  
ثنا عمي أبو بكر ثنا علي بن ثابت الدهان ثنا الحكم بن عبد الملك عن الحارث  
بن حصيرة عن أبي صادق عن ربيعة بن ناقد عن علي رضي الله عنه....  
صحيح الإسناد

Abu Qutaybah Salim b. al-Fadhl al-Adami – Muhammad b. 'Uthman b. Abi Shaybah – Abu Bakr – 'Ali b. Thabit al-Dihan – al-Hakam b. 'Abd al-Malik – al-Harith b. Hasirah – Abu Sadiq – **Rabi'ah b. Najid** – 'Ali, may Allah be pleased with him.... **The chain is *sahih*.**<sup>15</sup>

In his *al-Taqrīb*, al-Hafiz personally grades him *thiqah* (trustworthy) too:

ربيعة بن ناقد الأزدي الكوفي يقال هو أخو أبي صادق الراوي عنه ثقة

Rabi'ah b. Najid al-Azdi al-Kufi: It is said that he was the brother of the narrator, Abu Sadiq. **He was *thiqah* (trustworthy).**<sup>16</sup>

Intriguingly, 'Allamah al-Albani himself concurs to a good extent:

عن عبد الله بن سالم المفلوج حدثنا عبدة بن الأسود عن القاسم بن الوليد عن  
أبي صادق عن ربيعة بن ناقد عن عبادة بن الصامت مرفوعا....

قلت: وهذا إسناد جيد، رجاله ثقات غير ربيعة هذا فقد وثقه الحافظ فقط تبعاً

## لابن حبان.

‘Abd Allah b. Salim al-Mafluj – ‘Ubaydah b. al-Aswad – al-Qasim b. al-Walid – Abu Sadiq – **Rabi’ah b. Najidh** – ‘Ubadah b. al-Samit, in a *marfu’* manner....

I say: **This chain is good**. Its narrators are trustworthy, except this Rabi’ah, for only al-Hafiz (Ibn Hajar) has declared him *thiqah*, copying Ibn Hibban. 17

The ‘Allamah has reservations about the fact that –according to him – only al-Hafiz al-‘Asqalani, imitating Ibn Hibban, has declared Rabi’ah to be *thiqah* (trustworthy). Nonetheless, that does not stop him from authenticating the chain. Needless to say, however, the ‘Allamah’s position contains an error: al-‘Ijli, Ibn Hibban and al-Hakim actually declared him *thiqah* before al-Hafiz. If the latter copied anyone, it was at least both al-‘Ijli and Ibn Hibban.

The bottom-line is that this *hadith* has a *sahih* chain:

## أنت أخي وصاحبي ووارثي ووزير

You are my brother, and my companion, and MY INHERITOR, and my *wazir*.

The objections of Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah and ‘Allamah al-Albani to it are without basis.

We know from this authentic *hadith* that Amir al-Muminin ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, *‘alaihi al-salam*, was the chosen inheritor of the Prophet’s knowledge, power and divine *khilafah* after him. In fact, if prophethood had not ended with Muhammad, ‘Ali would have inherited it too.

1. Qur’an 27: 16
2. Abu Ja’far Muhammad b. Jarir b. Yazid b. Kathir b. Ghalib al-Amuli al-Tabari, Jami al-Bayan fi Tawil al-Qur’an (Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: Sidqi Jamil al-‘Attar], vol. 19, p. 172
3. Abu al-Fida Isma’il b. Kathir al-Dimashqi, al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah (Dar Ihya al-Turath al-‘Arabi; 1st edition, 1408 H) [annotator: ‘Ali Shiri], vol. 2, p. 22
4. Abu al-Faraj Jamal al-Din ‘Abd al-Rahman b. ‘Ali b. Muhammad al-Jawzi al-Qurshi al-Baghdadi, Zad al-Masir fi ‘Ilm al-Tafsir (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahman ‘Abd Allah], vol. 6, p. 60
5. See Qur’an 38:26
6. Abu ‘Abd al-Rahman Ahmad b. Shu’ayb al-Nasai, Sunan al-Kubra (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Dr. ‘Abd al-Ghaffar Sulayman al-Bandari and Sayyid Kasrawi Hasan], vol. 5, p. 125, # 8451
7. Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Dha’ifah wa al-Mawdu’ah wa Athariyah al-Sayyiah fi al-Ummah (Riyadh: Dar al-Ma’arif; 1st edition, 1412 H), vol. 12, p. 646, # 5793
8. Shihab al-Din Abu al-Fadhl Ahmad b. ‘Ali b. Hajar al-‘Asqalani, Lisan al-Mizan (Beirut: Manshurat Muassasat al-‘Ilami li al-Matbu’at; 2nd edition, 1390 H), vol. 7, p. 199, # 2686
9. Ahmad b. ‘Ali b. Hajar al-‘Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-‘Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa ‘Abd al-Qadir ‘Ata], vol. 1, p. 223, # 1391

10. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad b. 'Uthman al-Dhahabi, Mizan al-l'tidal fi Naqd al-Rijal (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah; 1st edition, 1382 H) [annotator: 'Ali Muhammad al-Bajawi], vol. 2, p. 103, # 3004
11. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 1, p. 328, # 2142
12. Abu al-Hasan Ahmad b. 'Abd Allah b. Salih al-'Ijli al-Kufi, Ma'rifat al-Thiqat (Madinah: Maktabah al-Dar; 1st edition, 1405 H), vol. 1, p. 359, # 471
13. Abu Hatim Muhammad b. Hibban b. Ahmad al-Tamimi al-Busti, Kitab al-Thiqat (Hyderabad: Majlis Dairat al-Ma'arif al-'Uthmaniyyah; 1st edition, 1398 H), vol. 4, p. 229
14. Shihab al-Din Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1404 H), vol. 3, p. 228, # 498
15. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 3, p. 132, # 4622
16. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 1, p. 298, # 1923
17. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqihah wa Fawaidihah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 4, p. 582, # 1942

Imam al-Haythami (d. 807 H) records:

وعن ابن عباس أن عليا كان يقول في حياة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم :  
 إن الله عز وجل يقول : { أفإن مات أو قتل انقلبتم على أعقابكم } والله لا نقلب  
 على أعقابنا بعد إذ هدانا الله تعالى والله لئن مات أو قتل لأقاتلن على ما قاتل  
 عليه حتى أموت والله إني لأخوه ووليه وابن عمه ووارثه فمن أحق به مني

Narrated Ibn 'Abbas:

'Ali used to say *during the lifetime of the Messenger of Allah*, peace be upon him: "Verily, Allah the Almighty said {If he dies or is killed, will you then turn back on your heels} [3:144]. By Allah, we will never turn back on our heels after Allah the Most High has guided us. I swear by Allah, if he dies or he is killed, I will fight upon what he fights upon until I die. **I SWEAR BY ALLAH, verily I am his brother, AND HIS WALI, and his cousin, AND HIS INHERITOR. So, who is it that is more entitled to him than me?**"<sup>1</sup>

Al-Haythami comments:

رواه الطبراني ورجاله رجال الصحيح

Al-Tabarani records it, and its narrators are narrators of the *Sahih*.<sup>2</sup>

‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) senses the fatal danger the above *sahih hadith* poses to the Sunni creed as a whole. So, he decides to “take care of” it. After including it in his *Silsilah Dha’ifah* (his collection of unreliable *ahadith*), he grades it as:

## منكر

*Munkar* (repugnant)<sup>3</sup>

What is his reason? He explains:

قلت: وسكت عليه الحاكم والذهبي؛ ولعل ذلك لظهور علتة، وهي تنحصر في سماك، أو في الراوي عنه: أسباط.

أما الأول؛ فلأنه وإن كان ثقة؛ فقد تكلموا في روايته عن عكرمة خاصة، فقال الحافظ في "التقريب": "صدوق، وروايته عن عكرمة خاصة مضطربة، وقد تغير بآخره...".

وأما الآخر؛ فقال الحافظ: "صدوق، كثير الخطأ...".

I say: al-Hakim and al-Dhahabi kept silent about it. Maybe this is due to the obviousness of its defect, **and it is limited to Simak, or from the narrator from him, Asbat.**

As for the first (Simak), it is because even though he is *thiqah* (trustworthy), his report from ‘Ikrimah has been specifically criticized. So, al-Hafiz says in *al-Taqrīb*: “*Saduq* (very truthful), his report from ‘Ikrimah alone is confused. He changed during the last part of his life...”.

As for the other (Asbat), al-Hafiz says: “*Saduq* (very truthful), makes a lot of mistakes<sup>4</sup>...”.<sup>5</sup>

Since no-one in the chain is *munkar al-hadith*, the ‘Allamah’s grading of the *hadith* as “munkar” is a clear error. This is especially the case, since he has himself limited the “fault” of the *riwayah* to its chain.

Besides, both al-Hakim (d. 403 H) and al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) have no problem with that chain. For instance, al-Hakim records a similar chain:

أخبرنا أبو محمد بن إسحاق الصفار العدل ثنا أحمد بن نصر أنبأ عمرو بن  
طلحة القناد ثنا أسباط بن نصر عن سماك بن حرب عن مكرمة عن ابن عباس  
رضي الله عنهما....

Abu Muhammad b. Ishaq al-Saffar al-'Adl – Ahmad b. Nasr – 'Amr b. Talhah al-Qanad – **Asbat b. Nasr – Simak b. Harb – 'Ikrimah** – Ibn 'Abbas, may Allah be pleased with them both....6

Al-Hakim says:

هذا حديث صحيح الإسناد

This *hadith* has a *sahih* chain7

Al-Dhahabi agrees:

صحيح

*Sahih*8

In fact, 'Allamah al-Albani himself has no problem with the same chain! He writes:

قلت: حديث ابن عباس هذا أخرجه البخاري في (الأدب المفرد) وأبو داود  
والحاكم من طريق عمرو بن طلحة قال: ثنا أسباط عن سماك بن حرب عن  
عكرمة عن ابن عباس به.... وهذا سند جيد وقال الحاكم: (صحيح الإسناد)  
ووافقه الذهبي

I say: This *hadith* of Ibn 'Abbas is recorded by al-Bukhari (in *al-Adab al-Mufrad*), and Abu Dawud and al-Hakim through the route of 'Amr b. Talhah – **Asbat – Simak b. Harb – 'Ikrimah** – Ibn 'Abbas with it.... **This chain is good**. Al-Hakim says (The chain is *sahih*) and al-Dhahabi agrees with him.9

In another book, he also says:

قلت: هذا الحديث أخرجه البخاري في " الأدب المفرد " (ص 178) ، وأبو داود (2/349) من طريق عمرو بن طلحة قال: ثنا أسباط عن سماك بن حرب عن عكرمة عن ابن عباس .... وهذا سند جيد. ثم رأيت الحاكم قد أخرجه في " المستدرک " (4/284 – 285) من هذا الوجه، وقال: " صحيح الإسناد ". ووافقه الذهبي.

I say: This *hadith* has been narrated by al-Bukhari in *al-Adab al-Mufrad* (p. 178) and Abu Dawud (2/349) from the route of ‘Amr b. Talhah – **Asbat** – **Simak b. Harb** – **‘Ikrimah** – Ibn ‘Abbas.... **This chain is good**. Then I saw that al-Hakim has recorded it in *al-Mustadrak* (4/284–285) with this chain, and said, “It has a *sahih* chain”. Al-Dhahabi concurred with him. 10

So, the chain is good. But, when it comes to the *fadhail* of Amir al-Muminin, *‘alaihi al-salam*, it becomes *munkar* and all sorts of unfounded allegations and excuses are raised! What disturbing double standards! Besides, since ‘Allamah al-Albani is aware that both al-Hakim and al-Dhahabi authenticated the chain of Asbat – Simak – Ikrimah, why has he then pretended as though both doubted it? Wonders, indeed, never end!

In any case, Imam Muslim (d. 261 H) has relied upon this chain as a *hujjah* in the *usul* of his *Sahih*:

حدثنا عمرو بن حماد بن حماد بن طلحة القناد حدثنا أسباط ( وهو ابن نصر الهمداني )  
عن سماك عن جابر بن سمرة

‘Amr b. Hamad b. Talhah al-Qanad – **Asbat** (and he is Ibn Nasr al-Hamdani) – **Simak** – Jabir b. Samurah<sup>11</sup>

As for Simak having *actually* narrated authentically from ‘Ikrimah, Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 H) has confirmed this repeatedly in his *Sunan*. For example, this is a chain in the book:

حدثنا هناد و أبوعمار قالا حدثنا وكيع عن إسرائيل عن سماك عن عكرمة عن  
ابن عباس

Hanad and Abu ‘Ammar – Waki’ – Israil – **Simak** – ‘**Ikrimah** – Ibn ‘Abbas<sup>12</sup>

He comments:

هذا حديث حسن صحيح

This hadith is *hasan sahih*<sup>13</sup>

Interestingly, ‘Allamah al–Albani agrees:

صحيح

*Sahih*<sup>14</sup>

The ‘Allamah further caps everything here:

" ليقرأ القرآن ناس من أمتي يمرقون من الإسلام كما يمرق السهم من الرمية  
".

أخرجه ابن ماجة (1 / 73) وأحمد (1 / 256) وابنه أيضا وأبو يعلى (2 / 623)  
عن أبي الأحوص عن سماك عن عكرمة عن ابن عباس مرفوعا. قلت: وهذا  
إسناد جيد وهو على شرط مسلم.

“Some people from my *Ummah* will recite the Qur’an. But they will apostatize from Islam as the arrow pierces the game.”

Ibn Majah (1/73) records it, and Ahmad (1/256), and his son too, and Abu Ya’la (2/623) from Abu al–Ahwas – **Simak** – ‘**Ikrimah** – Ibn ‘Abbas, in a *marfu’* manner. I say: **This chain is good, and it is upon the standard of (Imam) Muslim.**<sup>15</sup>

Elsewhere, he again reiterates:

وشاهد آخر من حديث ابن عباس. أخرجه الطحاوي (2 / 277 – 278) وأحمد (1 / 269، 328) من طريق سماك عن عكرمة عنه. وإسناده صحيح على شرط مسلم.

Another witness is in the *hadith* of Ibn ‘Abbas. It is narrated by al-Tahawi (2/277-278), and Ahmad (1/269, 328) from the route of **Simak – ‘Ikrimah** from him (Ibn ‘Abbas). **And its chain is *sahih* upon the standard of Muslim.** 16

But, who on earth says that meeting the standard of *Sahih Muslim* is not good enough?!

A further corroboration of *Hadith al-Wirathah* is provided by Imam al-Hakim:

أخبرنا أبو النضر محمد بن يوسف الفقيه ثنا عثمان بن سعيد الدارمي ثنا النفيلي ثنا زهير ثنا أبو إسحاق قال عثمان : وحدثنا علي بن حكيم الأودي وعمرو بن عون الواسطي قالوا ثنا شريك بن عبد الله عن أبي إسحاق قال سألت قثم بن العباس كيف ورث علي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم دونكم قال : لأنه كان أولنا به لحوقا وأشدنا به لزوقا

Abu al-Nadhar Muhammad b. Yusuf al-Faqih – ‘Uthman b. Sa’id al-Darimi – al-Nufayli – Zuhayr – Abu Ishaq – ‘Uthman – ‘Ali b. Hakim al-Awdi and ‘Amr b. ‘Awn al-Wasiti – Sharik b. ‘Abd Allah – Abu Ishaq:

I asked Qatham b. al-‘Abbas, “How come **‘Ali INHERITED the Messenger of Allah**, peace be upon him, and not yourselves?” He replied, “Because he was the first of us to meet him (in Islam) and the he was the strictest of us to adhere to him. 17

Al-Hakim says:

هذا حديث صحيح الإسناد

This *hadith* has a *sahih* chain. 18

Al-Dhahabi concurs:

صحيح

1. Nur al-Din 'Ali b. Abi Bakr al-Haythami, *Majma' al-Zawaid* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1412 H), vol. 9, p. 183, # 14765
2. Ibid
3. Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, *Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Dha'ifah wa al-Mawdu'ah wa Athariyah al-Sayyiah fi al-Ummah* (Riyadh: Dar al-Ma'arif; 1st edition, 1412 H), vol. 10, p. 653, # 4948
4. The jarh against both Simak and Asbat are clear and substantiated. For instance, Asbat used to make a lot of mistakes. These facts should ordinarily have made each of them dha'if in his reports. However, the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah – including Imam Muslim – have made them exceptional cases, and have accepted their ahadith as sahih.
5. Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, *Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Dha'ifah wa al-Mawdu'ah wa Athariyah al-Sayyiah fi al-Ummah* (Riyadh: Dar al-Ma'arif; 1st edition, 1412 H), vol. 10, p. 653, # 4948
6. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, *al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihayn* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 4, p. 317, # 7766
7. Ibid
8. Ibid
9. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, *Al-Thamar al-Mustatab fi Fiqh al-Sunnah wa al-Kitab* (Gharas li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1422 H), p. 441
10. Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani, *Asl Sifat al-Salat al-Nabi* (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1427 H), vol. 2, p. 790–791
11. Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj al-Qushayri al-Naysaburi, *Sahih Muslim* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Fuad 'Abd al-Baqi], vol. 4, p. 1814, # 2329
12. Abu 'Isa Muhammad b. 'Isa al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi, *al-Jami' al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 5, p. 208, # 2964
13. Ibid
14. Ibid
15. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, *Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqhiyah wa Fawaidihah* (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 5, p. 235, # 2201
16. Ibid, vol. 2, p. 413, # 782
17. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, *al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihayn* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 3, p. 136, # 4633
18. Ibid
19. Ibid

Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) states:

قوله لا يؤدي عني إلا علي من الكذب

His statement “None can discharge on my behalf except ‘Ali” is a lie.<sup>1</sup>

This *hadith* is recorded by Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 H) in his *Sunan*:

حدثنا إسماعيل بن موسى حدثنا شريك عن أبي إسحاق عن حبشي بن جنادة  
قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم علي مني وأنا من علي ولا يؤدي عني  
إلا أنا أو علي

Isma'il b. Musa – Sharik – Abu Ishaq – Habashi b. Junadah:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “Ali is from me and I am from ‘Ali, **and none can discharge on my behalf except myself or ‘Ali.**”<sup>2</sup>

Al-Tirmidhi comments:

هذا حديث حسن غريب

This *hadith* is *hasan gharib* (i.e. has a *hasan* chain)<sup>3</sup>

Al-Albani (d. 1420 H) also says:

حسن

*Hasan.*<sup>4</sup>

The Messenger of Allah, *sallallahu ‘alaihi wa alihi*, further put this declaration into practice during his lifetime. Imam Ibn Abi Shaybah (d. 235 H) records:

حدثنا عفان قال ثنا حماد بن سلمة عن سماك عن أنس أن النبي صلى الله عليه  
وسلم بعث ببراءة مع أبي بكر إلى مكة، فدعاه فبعث عليا فقال: " لا يبلغها إلا  
رجل من أهل بيتي "

‘Affan – Hamad b. Salamah – Simak – Anas:

The Prophet, peace be upon him, sent Abu Bakr with *Barat* to Makkah. But, he recalled him and sent ‘Ali (instead), and said, “**None can convey it except a man from my Ahl al-Bayt.**”<sup>5</sup>

This chain is apparently *sahih*. ‘Al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) says about ‘Affan, the first narrator:

## عفان بن مسلم بن عبد الله الباهلي أبو عثمان الصفار البصري ثقة ثبت

'Affan b. Muslim b. 'Abd Allah al-Bahili, Abu 'Uthman al-Saffar: **thiqah (trustworthy), thabt (accurate)**.6

'Allamah al-Albani also says:

عن عفان بن مسلم، قال: كنت عند سلام....

قلت: وهذا إسناد صحيح عن سلام، فعفان ثقة من رجال الشيخين

Narrated 'Affan b. Muslim: I was with Salam....

I say: This chain is *sahih* up to Salam, **and 'Affan is thiqah**, from the narrators of the two Shaykhs.7

What of the *shaykh* of 'Affan b. Muslim, that is, Hamad b. Salamah? Al-Hafiz again states:

حماد بن سلمة بن دينار البصري أبو سلمة ثقة عابد أثبت الناس في ثابت وتغير حفظه بأخرة

Hamad b. Salamah b. Dinar al-Basri, Abu Salamah: **Thiqah (trustworthy)**, 'abid (a great worshipper of Allah), the most reliable person with regards to Thabit. His memory weakened at the end (of his life).8

'Allamah al-Albani agrees on his trustworthiness, but with a mistaken reservation:

حدثنا أسود حدثنا حماد بن سلمة عن قتادة عن عكرمة عن ابن عباس ورجاله كلهم ثقات رجال مسلم، لكن حماد بن سلمة مع جلالة قدره في حديثه عن غير ثابت شيء، ولذلك لم يخرج له مسلم إلا ما كان من روايته عن ثابت، ولذلك قال الحافظ في "التقريب": "ثقة عابد، أثبت الناس في ثابت، وتغير حفظه بآخره.

Aswad – Hamad b. Salamah – Qatadah – 'Ikrimah – Ibn 'Abbas:

Its narrators are all **thiqah (trustworthy)**, narrators of (*Sahih*) Muslim. However, despite that high status of Hamad, in his *ahadith* from other than Thabit, there is a problem. **This is why (Imam) Muslim never records his ahadith except those from Thabit.** This is (also) why al-Hafiz says in *al-Taqrīb*: "*Thiqah*

(trustworthy), ‘*abid* (a great worshipper of Allah), the most reliable person with regards to Thabit. His memory weakened at the end (of his life)”.<sup>9</sup>

The above submission is inaccurate, actually. Imam Muslim (d. 261 H) has, for instance, recorded this chain:

حدثنا هدا ب بن خالد الأزدي حدثنا حماد بن سلمة عن سماك بن حرب قال  
سمعت جابر بن سمرة

Hadab b. Khalid al-Azdi – **Hamad b. Salamah** – **Simak b. Harb** – Jabir b. Samurah<sup>10</sup>

As we shall soon prove, ‘Allamah al-Albani himself also accepts that Hamad authentically transmitted from Simak.

Concerning the last narrator, Simak, Imam al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) says:

سماك بن حرب أبو المغيرة الهذلي الكوفي. صدوق .... قلت: قد احتج مسلم  
به [في روايته، عن جابر بن سمرة، والنعمان بن بشير، وجماعة.

Simak b. Harb, Abu al-Mughirah al-Hazali al-Kufi: **Saduq (very truthful)**.... **I say: Muslim had relied [upon him] as a *hujjah* in his reports**, from Jabir b. Samurah, al-Nu'man b. Bashir, and a group of others.<sup>11</sup>

So, the chain is *sahih* upon the standard of *Sahih Muslim*.

Imam Ahmad (d. 241 H) further records

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا عبد الصمد وعفان قال ثنا حماد المعني عن  
سماك عن أنس بن مالك: أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بعث ببراءة مع  
أبي بكر الصديق رضي الله عنه فلما بلغ ذا الحليفة قال عفان لا يبلغها إلا أنا أو  
رجل من أهل بيتي فبعث بها مع علي

‘Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) ‘Abd al-Samad and ‘**Affan – Hamad al-Ma’ni – Simak** –  
Anas b. Malik:

Verily, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, sent Abu Bakr al-Siddiq, may Allah be pleased with him, with *Barat* (to Makkah). But, when he reached Dhu al-Halifah, he (the Prophet) – as narrated by ‘Affan – said: “**None can convey it except myself or a man from my Ahl al-Bayt.**” So, he sent ‘Ali with it (instead).<sup>12</sup>

Note that Hamad b. Salamah is occasionally referred to as al-Ma’ni, as documented by Ibn Asakir (d. 571 H):

.... أبو شبل وحسن يعني ابن موسى قالوا نا حماد بن سلمة المعني عن ثابت

....

.... Abu Shibl and Hasan, that is Ibn Musa – Hamad b. Salamah **al-Ma’ni** – Thabit....<sup>13</sup>

Therefore, there should no confusion due to this new phrase “al-Ma’ni”.

Shockingly, Shaykh al-Arnaut says about the above chain of *Musnad Ahmad*:

إسناده ضعيف لنكارة متنه

Its chain is *da’if* due to the repugnancy of its *matn* (content)<sup>14</sup>

This is a rather disturbing manner of weakening *asanid*! So, if someone does not like the content of a *hadith*, he is free to declare its patently reliable *sanad* as *dha’if* only on that basis?!

Meanwhile, al-Arnaut has authenticated a very similar chain in the same book:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا عبد الصمد وعفان قالوا ثنا حماد ثنا ثابت عن  
أنس .... إسناده صحيح على شرط مسلم

‘Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – ‘Abd al-Samad and ‘Affan – Hamad – Thabit – Anas.... **Its chain is *sahih* upon the standard of Muslim.**<sup>15</sup>

The only difference is: instead of Simak, there is Thabit. But, what does al-Arnaut say about Simak?

Here are his words:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا معاوية بن عمرو ثنا زائدة قال ثنا سماك بن حرب  
عن عبد الرحمن بن القاسم عن أبيه عن عائشة....إسناده صحيح على شرط  
مسلم

‘Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Mu’awiyah b. ‘Amr – Zaidah – **Simak b. Harb** – ‘Abd al-  
Rahman b. al-Qasim – his father – ‘Aishah.... **Its chain is *sahih* upon the standard of (*Sahih*)  
Muslim. 16**

In other words, Shaykh al-Arnaut is fully well aware that the chain of *Hadith al-Ada* – which he  
baselessly discredits – is truly *sahih* upon the standard of *Sahih Muslim*!

Imam al-Tirmidhi too records about the Prophet’s practicalization of the *hadith*:

حدثنا محمد بن بشار حدثنا عفان بن مسلم و عبد الصمد بن عبد الوارث قالا  
حدثنا حماد بن سلمة عن سماك بن حرب عن أنس بن مالك قال: بعث النبي  
صلى الله عليه و سلم ببراءة مع أبي بكر ثم دعاه فقال لا ينبغي لأحد أن يبلغ هذا  
إلا رجل من أهلي فدعا عليا فأعطاه إياه

Muhammad b. Bashir – ‘Affan b. Muslim and ‘Abd al-Samad b. ‘Abd al-Warith – Hamad b. Salamah –  
Simak b. Harb – Anas b. Malik:

The Prophet, peace be upon him, sent Abu Bakr with *Barat* to Makkah. But, he recalled him and said, “**It is NOT right for ANYONE to convey this except a man from my family.**” So, he summoned ‘Ali and gave it to him. 17

Al-Tirmidhi says:

هذا حديث حسن غريب

This *hadith* is *hasan gharib* (i.e. has a *hasan* chain) 18

‘Allamah al-Albani concurs:

حسن الإسناد

Its chain is *hasan*19

Imam Abu Ya'la al-Mawsili (d. 307 H) also documents:

حدثنا زهير حدثنا عفان حدثنا حماد بن سلمة حدثنا سماك عن أنس: أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بعث بـ(براءة) مع أبي بكر إلى أهل مكة ثم دعاه فبعث عليا فقال : لا يبلغها إلا رجل من أهل بيتي

Zuhayr – ‘Affan – Hamad b. Salamah – Simak – Anas:

Verily, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, sent Abu Bakr with (*Barat*) to the people of Makkah. Then he recalled him, and sent ‘Ali (instead), and said, “**None can convey it except a man from my Ahl al-Bayt.**”<sup>20</sup>

Shaykh Dr. Asad says:

### إسناده حسن

Its chain is *hasan*.21

Shaykh Muhammad Ghazali al-Saqa (d. 1416 H) has his own submission too:

بعث رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أبا بكر أميرا على الحج، ليقوم بالمسلمين المناسك، فخرج من المدينة يسوق البدن أمامه موليا وجهه شطر المسجد الحرام، ونزل الوحي بسورة براءة بعد انصراف أبي بكر ووفد الحجيج، فأشير على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن يبعث بالآيات إليه ليقرأها على أهل الموسم كافة. ورأى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن يرسل بها علي بن أبي طالب قائلا: «لا يؤدّي عني إلا رجل من أهل بيتي»

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, appointed Abu Bakr the *amir* over the *Hajj*, in order to lead the Muslims in the performance of the *Hajj* rites. So, he left Madinah, driving camels ahead of him, turning his face towards the Masjid al-Haram (in Makkah). Then, *wahy* (divine revelation) descended with *Surah Barat* after Abu Bakr had left and had reached al-Hajj.

So, it was suggested to the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, to send a messenger with the verses to him (i.e. Abu Bakr) so that he could recite it to all the pilgrims. But the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, had the opinion that he should send ‘Ali b. Abi Talib with it (to the Hajj, instead), saying: “None can discharge on my behalf except a man from my Ahl al-Bayt.”<sup>22</sup>

‘Allamah al-Albani says about the report:

حديث حسن، رواه ابن هشام: 2/328، عن ابن إسحاق عن أبي جعفر محمد بن علي مرسلا، لكن له شواهد يتقوى بها، ذكرها ابن كثير في تاريخه: 5/37-38.  
.38

**It is a *hasan hadith*.** Ibn Hisham (2/328) recorded it, from Ibn Ishaq, from Abu Ja’far Muhammad b. ‘Ali in a *mursal* manner. However, it has corroborating reports that strengthen it. Ibn Kathir (also) mentioned it in his *Tarikh* (5/37–38).<sup>23</sup>

Finally, Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) records Ibn ‘Abbas’ testimony, *radhiyallahu ‘anhu*, that *Hadith al-Ada* is an exclusive merit of ‘Ali:

أخبرنا أبو بكر أحمد بن جعفر بن حمدان القطيعي ببغداد من أصل كتابه ثنا عبد الله بن أحمد بن حنبل حدثني أبي ثنا يحيى بن حماد ثنا أبو عوانة ثنا أبو بلج ثنا عمرو بن ميمون قال إني لجالس عند ابن عباس إذ أتاه تسعة رهط فقالوا : يا ابن عباس : إما أن تقوم معنا وإما أن تخلو بنا من بين هؤلاء قال : فقال ابن عباس بل أنا أقوم معكم قال وهو يومئذ صحيح قبل أن يعمي قال : فابتدؤوا فتحدثوا فلا ندري ما قالوا قال فجاء ينفض ثوبه ويقول أف وتف وقعوا في رجل له بضع عشرة فضائل ليست لأحد غيره .... بعث رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فلانا بسورة التوبة فبعث عليا خلفه فأخذها منه وقال لا يذهب بها إلا رجل هو مني وأنا منه

Abu Bakr Ahmad b. Ja’far b. Hamdan al-Qati’i – ‘Abd Allah b. Ahmad b. Hanbal – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) Yahya b. Hamad – Abu Awanah – Abu Balj – ‘Amr b. Maymun:

I was sitting in the company of Ibn ‘Abbas when nine men came to him and said, “O Ibn ‘Abbas! Either you debate with us, or tell these folks that you prefer a private debate.” So, Ibn ‘Abbas said, “I would rather participate with you.” In those days, he had not lost his eye-sight yet. So they started talking, but I

was not sure exactly what they were talking about.

Then he came, squeezing his robe, and saying: “Nonsense! **They are attacking a man who has ten EXCLUSIVE merits....** The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, sent so-and-so with Surat al-Tawbah. But, he sent ‘Ali to go after him and take it from him, and said, “**None goes with it except a man who is from me and I am from him.**”<sup>24</sup>

Al-Hakim says:

هذا حديث صحيح الإسناد

This *hadith* has a *sahih* chain.<sup>25</sup>

Al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) corroborates him:

صحيح

*Sahih*.<sup>26</sup>

‘Allamah Ahmad Shakir also declares about the *sanad*:

إسناده صحيح

Its chain is *sahih*.<sup>27</sup>

‘Allamah al-Albani too says concerning its chain:

إسناده حسن.

Its chain is *hasan*.<sup>28</sup>

Dr. Al-Jawabirah says the same thing:

أسناده حسن.

Its chain is *hasan*.29

Imam al-Busiri is not left out either, concerning the chain:

## سند صحيح

A *sahih* chain.30

1. Abu al-'Abbas Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 5, p. 63
2. Abu 'Isa Muhammad b. 'Isa al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi, al-Jami' al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 5, p. 636, # 3719
3. Ibid
4. Ibid
5. 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. Abi Shaybah Ibrahim b. 'Uthman b. Abi Bakr b. Abi Shaybah al-Kufi al-'Ubsi, Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah fi al-Ahadith wa al-Athar (Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1409 H) [annotator: Prof. Sa'id al-Laham], vol. 7, p. 506, # 72
6. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 1, p. 679, # 4641
7. Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani, Mukhtasar al-'Uluw al-'Aliyy al-'Azim (al-Maktab al-Islami; 2nd edition, 1412 H), pp. 148-149
8. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 1, p. 238, # 1504
9. Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani, Mukhtasar al-'Uluw al-'Aliyy al-'Azim (al-Maktab al-Islami; 2nd edition, 1412 H), p. 118
10. Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj al-Qushayri al-Naysaburi, Sahih Muslim (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Fuad 'Abd al-Baqi], vol. 3, p. 1452, #1821
11. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad b. 'Uthman al-Dhahabi, Mizan al-I'tidal fi Naqd al-Rijal (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah li al-Taba'ah wa al-Nashr; 1st edition, 1382 H) [annotator: 'Ali Muhammad al-Bajawi], vol. 2, pp. 232-233, # 3548
12. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muassasat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 3, p. 212, # 13237
13. Abu al-Qasim 'Ali b. al-Hasan b. Habat Allah b. 'Abd Allah, Ibn Asakir al-Shafi'i, Tarikh Madinah Dimashq (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: 'Ali Shiri], vol. 24, p. 235
14. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muassasat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 3, p. 212, # 13237
15. Ibid, vol. 3, p. 152, # 12560
16. Ibid, vol. 6, p. 115, # 24883
17. Abu 'Isa Muhammad b. 'Isa al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi, al-Jami' al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 5, p. 275, # 3090
18. Ibid
19. Ibid
20. Abu Ya'la Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Muthanna al-Mawsili al-Tamimi, Musnad (Damascus: Dar al-Mamun li al-Turath; 1st edition, 1404 H) [annotator: Dr. Husayn Salim Asad], vol. 5, p. 412, # 3095
21. Ibid
22. Muhammad Ghazali al-Saqa, Fiqh al-Sirah (Damascus: Dar al-Qalam; 1st edition, 1427 H) [annotator: Muhammad

Nasir al-Din al-Albani], p. 417

23. Ibid

24. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, al-Mustadrak ‘ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa ‘Abd al-Qadir ‘Ata], vol. 3, p. 143, # 4652

25. Ibid

26. Ibid

27. Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Dar al-Hadith; 1st edition, 1416 H) [annotator: Ahmad Muhammad Shakir], vol. 1, p. 331, # 3062

28. Abu Bakr b. Abi ‘Asim, Ahmad b. ‘Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1410 H) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 2, p. 565, # 1188

29. Abu Bakr b. Abi ‘Asim, Ahmad b. ‘Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (Dar al-Sami‘i li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi‘) [annotator: Dr. Basim b. Faysal al-Jawabirah], vol. 1, pp. 799-800, # 1222

30. Ahmad b. Abi Bakr b. Isma‘il al-Busiri, Itihaf al-Khiyarah al-Maharah bi Zawaid al-Masanid al-‘Ashara (Riyadh: Dar al-Watan; 1st edition, 1420 H), vol. 7, p. 184, # 6630

Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) classifies *Hadith al-Ada* as “a lie”. Of course, it is actually *hasan*, as explicitly declared by both Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 H) and ‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H). Moreover, concerning reports of how the Prophet, *sallallahu ‘alaihi wa alihi*, implemented *Hadith al-Ada* in the case of Abu Bakr, the Shaykh further states:

وقال الخطابي في كتاب شعار الدين وقوله لا يؤدي عني إلا رجل من أهل بيتي  
هو شيء جاء به أهل الكوفة عن زيد بن يثيع وهو متهم في الرواية منسوب إلى  
الرفض

Al-Khattabi said in *Kitab Shi‘ar al-Din*: “And his statement ‘None can discharge on my behalf except except a man from my Ahl al-Bayt’, **it is something brought by the people of Kufa from Zayd b. Yathi’, and he is accused in narrations.** He is attributed to *al-rafdh* (hardline anti-Abu Bakr Shi‘ism).”<sup>1</sup>

Ibn Taymiyyah has approvingly quoted, and has relied upon and adopted, al-Khattabi’s opinion. Therefore, he is bound by its consequences.

Our Shaykh suggests that the reports of the Messenger’s implementation of *Hadith al-Ada* – in which the above-quoted phrase is mentioned – are narrated only by Kufans from a single man: Zayd b. Yathi’. This Zayd is accused in narrations – according to Ibn Taymiyyah – and has been attributed to *al-rafdh*. If what Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah says were true, then the *hadith* would be *mawdu’* (fabricated). However, is it so?

In the last chapter, we have presented different reliable chains of the reports (of the implementation), and none of them includes Zayd b. Yathi’. That alone exposes our dear Shaykh’s submission as a

blatant distortion of reality. Zayd b. Yathi' is not the only source of the reports!

But then, has Zayd b. Yathi' really being accused in narrations? We will mention first the scholars of *rijal* who had commented about Zayd *before* Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H). Imam Muhammad b. Sa'd (d. 230 H) submits:

زيد بن يثيع: روى عن علي وحذيفة بن اليمان وكان قليل الحديث

Zayd b. Yathi': He narrated from 'Ali and Hudhayfah b. al-Yaman, and he narrated few *ahadith*.<sup>2</sup>

Imam al-'Ijli (d. 261 H) also states:

زيد بن يثيع كوفي ثقة تابعي

Zayd b. Yathi': A Kufan, *thiqah* (trustworthy), a Tabi'i.<sup>3</sup>

Ibn Abi Hatim (d. 327 H) makes a mistake in the surname:

زيد بن نفيح الهمداني الكوفي روى عن علي وأبي ذر وحذيفة روى عنه أبو إسحاق الهمداني سمعت أبي يقول ذلك.

Zayd b. Nafi' al-Hamadani al-Kufi: He narrated from 'Ali, Abu Dharr and Hudhayfah, and Abu Ishaq al-Hamadani narrated from him. I heard this from my father.<sup>4</sup>

Imam Ibn Hibban (d. 354 H) has also included him in his book of *thiqah* (trustworthy) narrators:

زيد بن يثيع الهمداني كوفي يروى عن علي روى عنه أبو إسحاق السبيعي

Zayd b. Yathi' al-Hamadani: A Kufan, he narrated from 'Ali, and Abu Ishaq al-Sabi'i narrated from him.<sup>5</sup>

In addition to al-'Ijli and Ibn Hibban, Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) too considers Zayd b. Yathi' to be *thiqah* (trustworthy). He mentions this chain in his book:

حدثنا أبو العباس محمد بن يعقوب ثنا الحسن بن علي بن عفان وأخبرني محمد بن عبد الله الجوهرى ثنا محمد بن إسحاق بن خزيمة ثنا الحسن بن علي بن عفان العامري ثنا فضيل بن مرزوق الرواسي ثنا أبو إسحاق عن زيد بن يثيع عن علي رضي الله عنه

Abu al-‘Abbas Muhammad b. Ya‘qub – al-Hasan b. ‘Ali b. ‘Affan – Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Jawhari – Muhammad b. Ishaq b. Khuzaymah – al-Hasan b. ‘Ali b. ‘Affan al-‘Amiri – Fudhayl b. Marzuq al-Ruwasi – Abu Ishaq – **Zayd b. Yathi** – ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him.6

Commenting on the *sanad*, al-Hakim says:

### هذا حديث صحيح الإسناد

This *hadith* has a *sahih* chain.7

It is noteworthy that NONE of the classical Sunni *muhadithun* ever accused Zayd b. Yathi’ of anything – whether lying, fabrication or *al-rafdh*. Rather, three of them called him *thiqah* (trustworthy). This reveals yet another disturbing foul play by our dear Shaykh, Ibn Taymiyyah.

What about the *rijal* scholars after Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H)? Al-Hakim further records this chain in his *al-Mustadrak*:

أخبرنا أبو عبد الله الصفار ثنا محمد بن إبراهيم الأصفهاني ثنا الحسين بن حفص عن سفيان عن أبي إسحاق عن زيد بن يثيع عن حذيفة رضي الله عنه

Abu ‘Abd Allah al-Saffar – Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Isfahani – al-Husayn b. Hafs – Sufyan – Abu Ishaq – **Zayd b. Yathi** – Hudhayfah, may Allah be pleased with him.8

Al-Hakim says:

### هذا حديث صحيح على شرط الشيخين

This *hadith* is *sahih* upon the standard of the two Shaykhs.9

Imam al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) confirms:

## على شرط البخاري ومسلم

(*Sahih*) upon the standard of al-Bukhari and Muslim.<sup>10</sup>

We do not know on what ground both al-Hakim and al-Dhahabi have placed Zayd on the standard of the two Shaykhs, since neither of them has relied upon him in his *Sahih*. However, their main message – that he is *thiqah* (trustworthy) is unmistakable from their respective verdicts. Elsewhere, the same al-Dhahabi also says:

## زيد بن يثيع عن أبي بكر وأبي ذر وعنه أبو إسحاق فقط وثق

Zayd b. Yathi': **He narrated from Abu Bakr** and Abu Dharr, and only Abu Ishaq narrated from him. **He has been graded *thiqah* (trustworthy)**.<sup>11</sup>

Al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) also states:

## زيد بن يثيع ... الهمداني الكوفي ثقة مخضرم

Zayd b. Yathi'.... al-Hamadani al-Kufi: ***Thiqah* (trustworthy)**. He witnessed both the *Jahiliyyah* and the Islamic era.<sup>12</sup>

In simple summary, these are the conclusions so far from our investigations in this chapter:

1. Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah's suggestion that reports of the Prophet's implementation of *Hadith al-Ada* has been narrated by only Zayd b. Yathi' is nothing but a complete fallacy.
2. His claims that Zayd b. Yathi' was accused in narrations and that he was attributed to *al-rafdh* are both patent untruths, with *absolutely* no basis. Rather, Zayd b. Yathi' in reality narrated *ahadith* from Abu Bakr, and is *thiqah* (trustworthy) according to several top-ranking Sunni *muhadithun*!

The most interesting part, however, is that Zayd b. Yathi' actually also narrated about the Messenger's implementation of *Hadith al-Ada* from two grand Sahabis – Abu Bakr and 'Ali – with reliable chains! It is noteworthy that even without any report from Zayd b. Yathi', the incident is reliably transmitted nonetheless, through other routes. Therefore, its authenticity is not dependent in any way upon Zayd b.

Yathi' or his reports. But, the *ahadith* of Zayd b. Yathi' provide *additional* grounds of authenticity for that crucial episode in Islamic history.

Zayd b. Yathi's *hadith* from Abu Bakr is documented by Imam Ahmad b. Hanbal (d. 241 H):

حدثنا عبد الله قال حدثني أبي قال ثنا وكيع قال قال إسرائيل قال أبو إسحاق  
عن زيد بن يثيع عن أبي بكر: أن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم بعثه ببراءة لأهل  
مكة .... فسار بها ثلاثا ثم قال لعلي رضي الله تعالى عنه ألحقه فرد علي أبا بكر  
وبلغها أنت قال ففعل قال فلما قدم على النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم أبو بكر  
بكى قال يا رسول الله حدث في شيء قال ما حدث فيك إلا خير ولكن أمرت أن  
لا يبلغه إلا أنا أو رجل مني

'Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Waki' – Israil – Abu Ishaq – Zayd b. Yathi' – Abu Bakr:

The Prophet, peace be upon him, sent me with *Barat* to the people of Makkah.... I journeyed with it for three days. Then, he (the Prophet) said to 'Ali, may Allah the Almighty be pleased with him, "Meet him, and ask Abu Bakr to return to me, and convey it yourself". So, he did so. When I got to the Prophet, peace be upon him, I wept and said, "O Messenger of Allah, has something happened about me"? He replied, "Nothing happened about you except a good thing. However, **I HAVE BEEN COMMANDED that none can convey it (i.e. *Barat*) except myself or a man from me.**"<sup>13</sup>

Shaykh al-Arnaut comments:

إسناده ضعيف رجاله ثقات رجال الشيخين غير زيد بن يثيع

Its chain is *dha'if*. Its narrators are *thiqah* (trustworthy), narrators of the two Shaykhs, except Zayd b. Yathi'.<sup>14</sup>

Of course, Zayd b. Yathi' is *thiqah* (trustworthy) too, as we have proved. Al-Arnaut's submission is surprising – considering his calibre – since it has absolutely no basis! It is obvious that he only seeks – in line with his custom – to salvage the face of his beloved spiritual father, Ibn Taymiyyah, by boosting the latter's ranks in his distortions. That, however, does both of them no good.

The above *sahih* report of Zayd b. Yathi' confirms that the order to replace Abu Bakr came directly from Allah. Moreover, it was a command that *must* be obeyed by the Messenger and his entire *Ummah*, and not merely a piece of advice or a recommendation.

The same report is also recorded by Imam Abu Ya'la al-Mawsili (d. 307 H) his *Musnad*:

حدثنا إسحاق بن إسماعيل حدثنا وكيع حدثنا إسرائيل عن أبي إسحاق عن زيد بن يثيع عن أبي بكر الصديق أن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم بعثه ببراءة إلى أهل مكة....فسار بها ثلاثا ثم قال لعلي الحقه فرد علي أبا بكر وبلغها قال ففعل قال : فلما قدم على النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم أبو بكر بكى وقال : يا رسول الله أحدث في شيء ؟ قال ثم قال : ما حدث فيك إلا خير إلا أنني أمرت بذلك : أن لا يبلغ إلا أنا أو رجل مني

Ishaq b. Isma'il – Waki' – Israil – Abu Ishaq – **Zayd b. Yathi'** – Abu Bakr al-Siddiq:

The Prophet, peace be upon him, sent me with *Barat* to the people of Makkah.... I journeyed with it for three days. Then, he (the Prophet) said to 'Ali, "Meet him, and ask Abu Bakr to return to me, and convey it". So, he did. When I got to the Prophet, peace be upon him, I wept and said, "O Messenger of Allah, has something happened about me"? He replied, "Nothing happened about you except a good thing. However, **I HAVE BEEN COMMANDED with it, that none can convey it (i.e. *Barat*) except myself or a man from me.**"<sup>15</sup>

Shaykh Dr. Husayn Asad Salim, the annotator, says:

## رجاله ثقات

Its narrators are *thiqah* (trustworthy).<sup>16</sup>

Zayd b. Yathi's report from Amir al-Muminin, '*alaihi al-salam*', is documented by Imam al-Nasai (d. 303 H). He records:

أخبرنا العباس بن محمد قال حدثنا أبو نوح واسمه عبد الرحمن بن غزوان قراد عن يونس بن أبي إسحاق عن أبي إسحاق عن زيد بن يثيع عن علي: أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بعث ببراءة إلى أهل مكة مع أبي بكر ثم اتبعه بعلي فقال له خذ الكتاب فامض به إلى أهل مكة قال فلحقته فأخذت الكتاب منه فانصرف أبو بكر وهو كئيب فقال يا رسول الله أنزل في شيء قال لا إني أمرت أن أبلغه أنا أو رجل من أهل بيتي

Al-‘Abbas b. Muhammad – Abu Nuh, his name is ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Ghazwan Qurad – Yunus b. Abi Ishaq – Abu Ishaq – Zayd b. Yathi’ – ‘Ali:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, sent *Barat* to the people of Makkah with Abu Bakr. Then he sent me after him, and said to me, “Take the document and go with it to the people of Makkah.” I met him and took the document from him. So, Abu Bakr headed back, weeping. Then he said, “O Messenger of Allah, has something (bad) been revealed (from heaven) about me?” He replied, “No. **(But) I have been COMMANDED to either convey it myself or a man from my Ahl al-Bayt should convey it.**”<sup>17</sup>

Al-Hafiz says about the first narrator:

عباس بن محمد بن حاتم الدوري أبو الفضل البغدادي خوارزمي الأصل ثقة  
حافظ

‘Abbas b. Muhammad b. Hatim al-Dawri Abu al-Fadhl al-Baghdadi, originally from Khawarazm: **Thiqah (trustworthy), hafiz (the hadith scientist)**.<sup>18</sup>

The second narrator is like that too, according to al-Hafiz:

عبد الرحمن بن غزوان .... أبو نوح المعروف بقراد .... ثقة

‘Abd al-Rahman b. Ghazwan .... Abu Nuh, better known as Qurad ....: **Thiqah (trustworthy)**.<sup>19</sup>

What of the third narrator? Al-Hafiz states:

يونس بن أبي إسحاق السبيعي أبو إسرائيل الكوفي صدوق يهم قليلا

Yunus b. Abi Ishaq al-Sabi’i, Abu Israil al-Kufi: **Saduq (very truthful), hallucinates a little**.<sup>20</sup>

The status of Abu Ishaq and Zayd b. Yathi’ is already known. Both are *thiqah* (trustworthy). Abu Ishaq in particular is a narrator of both *Sahih al-Bukhari* and *Sahih Muslim*, as further confirmed by Shaykh al-Arnaut. As such, the above *hadith* is *hasan* due to Yunus b. Abu Ishaq.

With the undeniable authenticity of Zayd b. Yathi’s reports, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah loses completely, and is shamed on all fronts concerning *Hadith al-Ada*.

1. Abu al-'Abbas Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 5, p. 63
2. Muhammad b. Sa'd, al-Tabaqat al-Kubra (Beirut: Dar al-Sadir), vol. 6, p. 222
3. Abu al-Hasan Ahmad b. 'Abd Allah b. Salih al-'Ijli al-Kufi, Ma'rifat al-Thiqat (Madinah: Maktabah al-Dar; 1st edition, 1405 H), vol. 1, p. 380, # 535
4. Abu Muhammad 'Abd al-Rahman b. Abi Hatim Muhamamd b. Idris b. al-Munzir al-Tamimi al-Hanzali al-Razi, al-Jarh wa al-Ta'dil (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi; 1st edition, 1371 H), vol. 3, p. 573, # 2598
5. Abu Hatim Muhammad b. Hibban b. Ahmad al-Tamimi al-Busti, Kitab al-Thiqat (Hyderabad: Majlis Dairat al-Ma'arif al-'Uthmaniyyah; 1st edition, 1398 H), vol. 4, p. 251
6. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 3, p. 73, # 4434
7. Ibid
8. Ibid, vol. 4, p. 521, # 8462
9. Ibid
10. Ibid
11. Shams al-Din Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad b. al-Dhahabi al-Dimashqi, al-Kashif fi Ma'rifat Man Lahu Riwayat fi al-Kutub al-Sittah (Jeddah: Dar al-Qiblah li al-Thaqafat al-Islamiyyah; 1st edition, 1413 H), vol. 1, p. 419, # 1759
12. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 1, p. 332, # 2166
13. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muassasat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 1, p. 3, # 4
14. Ibid
15. Abu Ya'la Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Muthanna al-Mawsili al-Tamimi, Musnad (Damascus: Dar al-Mamun li al-Turath; 1st edition, 1404 H) [annotator: Dr. Husayn Salim Asad], vol. 1, p. 100, # 104
16. Ibid
17. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Ahmad b. Shu'ayb al-Nasai, Sunan al-Kubra (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Dr. 'Abd al-Ghaffar Sulayman al-Bandari and Sayyid Kasrawi Hasan], vol. 5, p. 128, # 8461
18. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 1, p. 475, # 3200
19. Ibid, vol. 1, p. 586, # 3991
20. Ibid, vol. 2, p. 348, # 7928

*Hadith al-Ada* – in its theoretical and practical forms – has been authentically transmitted from the following Sahabah – in line with our preceding research:

1. Habashi b. Junadah
2. Anas b. Malik
3. Ibn 'Abbas, *radhiyallahu 'anhu*
4. Abu Bakr
5. Imam 'Ali, *'alaihi al-salam*

Meanwhile, it has equally been narrated by a sixth Sahabi, as documented by Imam Ibn Asakir (d. 571

H):

أخبرنا أبو الفضيل الفضيلي أنا أبو القاسم الخليلي أنا أبو القاسم الخزاعي أنا  
الهيثم بن كليب الشاشي نا أحمد بن شداد الترمذي نا علي بن فادم نا إسرائيل  
عن عبد الله بن شريك عن الحارث بن مالك قال أتيت مكة فلقيت سعد بن أبي  
وقاص فقلت هل سمعت لعلي منقية قال قد شهدت له أربعاً لأن تكون لي  
واحدة منهن أحب إلي من الدنيا أعمر فيها مثل عمر نوح عليه السلام إن رسول  
الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بعث أبا بكر ببراءة إلى مشركي قريش فسار بها يوماً  
وليلة ثم قال لعلي اتبع أبا بكر فخذها فبلغها ورد علي أبا بكر فرجع أبو بكر فقال  
يا رسول الله أنزل بي شئ قال لا إلا خير إلا أنه ليس يبلغ عني إلا أنا أو رجل  
مني أو قال من أهل بيتي

Abu al-Fudhayl al-Fudhayli – Abu al-Qasim al-Khalili – Abu al-Qasim al-Khuza'i – al-Haytham b.  
Kulayb al-Shashi – Ahmad b. Shaddad al-Tirmidhi – 'Ali b. Fadim – Israil – 'Abd Allah b. Sharik – al-  
Harith b. Malik:

I met **Sa'd b. Abi Waqqas** in Makkah and said, "Did you hear any merit of 'Ali?" He replied, "I have witnessed four merits of his. If I had just one of them, it would more beloved to me than the world in which I would last like the lifetime of Nuh, peace be upon him (i.e. 950 years). Verily, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, sent Abu Bakr with *Barat* to the polytheists of Quraysh (in Makkah). So, he journeyed with it for one day and one night. Then, he (the Prophet) said to 'Ali, "Pursue Abu Bakr and take it and convey it, and tell Abu Bakr to return." So, Abu Bakr returned and said, "O Messenger of Allah, has something (bad) been revealed about me (from heaven)?" He (the Prophet) replied, "No, except what is good. **But, none can convey on my behalf except myself or a man from me**" or he said, "**from my Ahl al-Bayt**".<sup>1</sup>

This gives us six Sahabah in total (and five for the practicalized version of *Hadith al-Ada*), and almost all the chains are either *sahih* or *hasan*. Although there are slight discrepancies among them, all the reports agree on the main facts: that the Messenger of Allah, *sallallahu 'alaihi wa alihi*, first sent Abu Bakr, then sent Amir al-Muminin, *'alaihi al-salam*, in his stead, and then announced and applied *Hadith al-Ada*. These *ahadith* are the most authentic reports on that incident, due to their *sihat* (reliable chains) and mutual corroboration.

The *hadith* proves a fundamental point: there are certain roles and functions in this *Ummah* that *only* the Prophet of Allah can discharge. This is by Allah's Decree. Moreover, there are others that can be discharged either by him or any other Muslim. When *Surah al-Tawbah* was first revealed, it was of the

“general” class. However, Allah abrogated that status and placed it on the exclusive list of His Messenger. As a result, it technically became illegal for any creature to convey it to the people except the Prophet.

However, Allah also makes a very special exception to this rule. In any case that His Messenger is unable to discharge his *exclusive* function for any reason, then the job falls on a male member of his Ahl al-Bayt. But, it is not just any male relative of his. The man must be *from him* (i.e. the Prophet), and he too must be from the man. Other than such a man, no one else has any right or legitimate authority to act on behalf of the Messenger in any matter on his divinely-designed exclusive list. He also specifically named ‘Ali. Therefore, as long as ‘Ali was alive, no one else could fulfil that role.

It is further noteworthy that the Prophet mentioned “discharge” without qualifying it. If he had said “discharge my duties”, then his liabilities would have been excluded and vice versa. By leaving it unrestricted, the Messenger of Allah – in his great wisdom – includes anything and everything that he could discharge exclusively. As such, all his exclusive duties, responsibilities, liabilities and so on are fully covered by *Hadith al-Ada*.

Duties, responsibilities and liabilities that have been limited exclusively to the Messenger of Allah – in the Qur’an and Sunnah – are several. However, we will focus on one of them here.

Is judicial sovereignty over the believers an exclusive title of the Prophet? Or, is it a shared authority? The Qur’an provides an explicit answer:

فلا وربك لا يؤمنون حتى يحكموك فيما شجر بينهم ثم لا يجدوا في أنفسهم  
حرجا مما قضيت ويسلموا تسليما

But no, by your Lord, they can have no faith, **until they make YOU (Muhammad) the judge in WHATSOEVER dispute there is between them**, and find in themselves no resistance against WHATSOEVER judgement you give, and submit with absolute submission.<sup>2</sup>

This verse is about all believers till the Day of Resurrection. None can be a true believer unless he makes the Messenger of Allah his judge in absolutely all matters of dispute – no matter the nature – between him and *any* other Muslim. Al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir (d. 774 H) further explains:

يقسم تعالى بنفسه الكريمة المقدسة : أنه لا يؤمن أحد حتى يُحْكَم الرسول صلى  
الله عليه وسلم في جميع الأمور ، فما حكم به فهو الحق الذي يجب الانقياد له  
باطنا وظاهرا

Allah swears by His Holy Self: that none can be a believer until he makes the Messenger, peace be upon him, the judge IN ALL MATTERS, and whatever he (the Prophet) judges is the truth that must be submitted to, inwardly and outwardly.<sup>3</sup>

A key fact in the above verse is that this authority is *absolutely* limited to the Prophet. None whatsoever shares it with him. It also remains with him, and exclusive to him, till the Hour. Moreover, the authority binds every single Muslim, whatsoever his rank, status or office. It is a condition of faith. Without it, there is no *iman*. So, if one must be a believer (and he must), then he must also adopt the Prophet as his judge in every instance of dispute between him and another Muslim.

Many contemporary Muslims would think that making the Messenger of Allah our judge only means adopting his Sunnah to resolve our disputes. Their reasoning would be that his Sunnah has taken his place since he is no longer physically present among us. However, such a thought is nothing but a misconception of the noble verse. The Sunnah mostly concerns jurisprudential and judicial matters. Meanwhile, the Prophet's judicial sovereignty extends into even completely secular, personal matters. Moreover, each case must be decided on the basis of its special circumstances. Therefore, there are instances where the judge must exercise personal discretion and flexibility in *Shari'i* issues, and equally in matters of no religious significance – something that is sometimes impossible with the rigid, non-secular Sunnah. A quick look at the circumstance of descent of the noble verse reveals the correctness of our submissions. Imam al-Bukhari (d. 256 H) records:

حدثنا محمد أخبرنا مخذ قال أخبرني ابن جريج قال حدثني

ابن شهاب عن عروة بن الزبير أنه حدثه :

أن رجلا من الأنصار خاصم الزبير في شراج من الحرة يسقي بها النخل فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم اسق يا زبير – فأمره بالمعروف – ثم أرسل إلى جارك. فقال الأنصاري أن كان ابن عمك ؟ فتلون وجه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم قال اسق ثم احبس حتى يرجع الماء إلى الجدر. واستوعى له حقه فقال الزبير والله إن هذه الآية أنزلت في ذلك {فلا وربك لا يؤمنون حتى يحكموك فيما شجر بينهم.}

Narrated 'Urwah b. al-Zubayr:

An Ansari man quarrelled with al-Zubayr **about a canal in the Harrah which was used for irrigating date-palms**. So, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, ordering him to be considerate, said, “O Zubayr! Irrigate (your land) first and then leave the water for your neighbour.” As a result, the Ansari said, “**Is it because he is your aunt’s son?**” On that the colour of the face of the Messenger of Allah changed and he said, “(O Zubayr!) Irrigate (your land) and withhold the water till it reaches the walls that are between the pits around the trees.” So, the Messenger of Allah gave him his full right. **Al-Zubayr said, “By Allah, the following verse was revealed in that connection:** ‘But no, by your Lord, they can have no faith until they make you the judge in whatsoever dispute there is between them.’”<sup>4</sup>

Look at what this man from the Ansar uttered to the Prophet and compare it with Sunni claims about the Sahabah!

Anyway, the following points are obvious from the narration:

1. The dispute was between two Muslims, rather two Sahabis – one a Muhajir and the other an Ansari.
2. The dispute was about the use of water flowing through a canal – a secular matter.
3. The canal passed through al-Zubayr’s land, and he used to withhold its flow into the Ansari’s land. Al-Zubayr would irrigate his own land with all its water – a personal matter.
4. The Messenger gave two different judgements on the case, both of them involving the use of personal discretion and flexibility. He first ordered al-Zubayr to allow the water flow to get to the Ansari’s land too. But, due to the insolence of the latter, he changed the verdict right then and there.

Obviously, in order to exercise the judicial sovereignty of the Prophet of Allah, his Sunnah alone is not enough. He *must* be personally present to determine each case according to its merit, and to exercise personal discretion and flexibility wherever necessary.

Another point to further highlight is that even some punishments within the *Shari’ah* are also deferred to the personal discretion of the judge. For instance, Imam al-Tirmidhi records:

حدثنا قتيبة حدثنا الليث عن يزيد بن أبي حبيب عن بكير بن عبد الله بن الأشج  
عن سليمان بن يسار عن عبد الرحمن بن جابر بن عبد الله عن أبي بردة بن  
دينار قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم لا يجلد فوق عشر جلدات الا  
في حد من حدود الله

Qutaybah – al-Layth – Yazid b. Abi Habib – Bukayr b. ‘Abd Allah b. al-Ashja’ – Sulayman b. Yasar – ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Jabir b. ‘Abd Allah – Abu Bardah b. Dinar:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “None is to be given more than ten strokes of the cane (in punishment) except in the case of punishments immutably fixed by Allah.”<sup>5</sup>

Al-Tirmidhi comments:

هذا حديث حسن غريب لا نعرفه إلا من حديث بكير بن الأشج وقد اختلف أهل العلم في التعزير وأحسن شيء روي في التعزير هذا الحديث

This *hadith* is *hasan gharib* (i.e. has a *hasan* chain). We do not know it except through the *hadith* of Bukayr b. al-Ashja'. **The scholars have differed about *al-ta'zir* (i.e. the use of personal discretion in awarding penalties). The best thing narrated about *ta'zir* is this *hadith*.**<sup>6</sup>

‘Allamah al-Albani, on his part, only says:

صحيح

*Sahih*<sup>7</sup>

The *hadith* establishes two crucial points:

1. There are some crimes whose penalties Allah has immutably fixed. In such cases, the judge *must* abide by the fixed penalties set by Allah.
2. There are also crimes whose penalties Allah has NOT fixed. In such cases, the judge has the discretion to award up to ten strokes of the cane against the convict.

As such, in many secular and *Shari'i* issues, the Messenger has an obligation to apply personal discretion – considering the unique circumstances of each case – in making his judgements. Doesn't this require his physical presence to fulfill, rather than merely records of his Sunnah?

This takes us back to the time of Abu Bakr! Who was the sovereign judge of the believers immediately after the demise of the Prophet? After all, the latter was no longer available to exercise his authority. Therefore, someone *must* take over his responsibility *in his name*. So, to whom *must* all Muslims all over the world refer all their disputes for judgment *in lieu* of the Messenger of Allah? The *hadith* is clear: it was Amir al-Muminin 'Ali b. Abi Talib! The Prophet never left his *Ummah* in disarray. If 'Ali was alive, then no one else could be sovereign judge:

## علي مني وأنا من علي ولا يؤدي عني إلا أنا أو علي

Ali is from me and I am from 'Ali, **and none can discharge on my behalf except myself or 'Ali.**

If he was dead, then another male from the Ahl al-Bayt must fill the post:

## لا يؤدي عني إلا رجل من أهل بيتي

None can discharge on my behalf **except a man from my Ahl al-Bayt.**

But, what happened? Even though he was fully aware of these *ahadith* (as they involved his case), Abu Bakr seized the reins of the Prophet's role as the sovereign judge of the *Ummah*! Then, matters of dispute – including those involving 'Ali – *must* be referred to him for judgment! Things turned really upside down!

There are only two explanations here:

1. Abu Bakr assumed that the Messenger's juridical sovereignty over his *Ummah* had ceased. So, Abu Bakr was only discharging the role *in Abu Bakr's name* and on Abu Bakr's *independent* authority.
2. Abu Bakr believed that the Prophet's jurisdiction remained, and that he (Abu Bakr) was only exercising the latter's authority *on his behalf* over his *Ummah*.

Neither of the options offers any good news to Abu Bakr and his followers.

The most interesting side to all of this is that whosoever holds the Prophet's judicial sovereignty *on his behalf* is necessarily the true *khalifah*. Only a *khalifah* can legitimately exercise such a level of authority, apart from a prophet:

## يا داوود إنا جعلناك خليفة في الأرض فاحكم بين الناس بالحق

O Dawud! We have appointed you **a *khalifah*** over the earth. **Therefore, judge between mankind** with the truth.<sup>8</sup>

1. Abu al-Qasim 'Ali b. al-Hasan b. Habat Allah b. 'Abd Allah, Ibn Asakir al-Shafi'i, *Tarikh Madinah Dimashq* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: 'Ali Shiri], vol. 42, p. 117

2. Qur'an 4:65

3. Abu al-Fida Isma'il b. 'Umar b. Kathir al-Qurshi al-Dimashqi, *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azim* (Dar al-Taybah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 2nd edition, 1420 H) [annotator: Sami b. Muhammad Salamah], vol. 2, p. 349

4. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Isma'il b. Ibrahim b. Mughirah al-Bukhari al-Ju'fi, al-Jami' al-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Beirut: Dar Ibn Kathir; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafa Dib al-Bagha], vol. 2, p. 832, # 2233
5. Abu 'Isa Muhammad b. 'Isa al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi, al-Jami' al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 4, p. 63, # 1463
6. Ibid
7. Ibid
8. Qur'an 38:26. Prophet Dawud was both a prophet and a khalifah. In the above verse, Allah is only making reference to his khilafah, and not to his nubuwwah.

Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) states:

والمقصود هنا أن ما يعتذر به عن علي فيما أنكر عليه يعتذر بأقوى منه عن عثمان فإن عليا قاتل على الولاية وقتل بسبب ذلك خلق كثير عظيم ولم يحصل في ولايته لا قتال للكفار ولا فتح لبلادهم ولا كان المسلمون في زيادة خير

The intention here is that whatever is used to excuse 'Ali from the criticisms against him, such also exonerate 'Uthman at an even greater level. **This is because 'Ali fought for power, and murdered an extremely large number of people to achieve that.** And he did not achieve during his government – he did not fight the pagans, nor did he conquer their (pagans') land. **Moreover, the Muslims did not experience any increase in goodness.** <sup>1</sup>

He adds:

ونحن لا ننكر أن عثمان رضي الله عنه كان يحب بني أمية وكان يواليهم ويعطيهم أموالا كثيرة وما فعله من مسائل الاجتهاد التي تكلم فيها العلماء الذين ليس لهم غرض كما أننا لا ننكر أن عليا ولى أقاربه وقاتل وقتل خلقا كثيرا من المسلمين الذين يقيمون الصلاة ويؤتون الزكاة ويصومون

We do not deny that 'Uthman, may Allah be pleased with him, used to love Banu Umayyah, and used to befriend them and gave them lots of money. What he did was from matters of *ijtihad* (personal opinions) which the unbiased scholars criticize, just as **we do not deny that 'Ali put his relatives in power, and fought, and murdered a lot of Muslims who used to perform *Salat*, and used to give *Zakat*, and used to fast.** <sup>2</sup>

These are terribly disturbing accusations. Considering that our Sunni brothers always claim all the

Sahabah were saints, one wonders where in their theology the above allegations fit in. If 'Ali, *'alaihi al-salam*, was indeed a power-hungry mass murderer – as the Shaykh has alleged – then how exactly was he a saint at all in their *madhhab*?

But, our Shaykh has not finished yet. In his view, the defensive battles of Amir al-Muminin against the insurgents – led by Mu'awiyah and 'Aishah – who rose in bloody armed rebellion against him, had nothing to do with Islam:

فإن جاز أن يطعن في الصديق والفروق أنهما قاتلا لأخذ المال فالتعفن في غيرهما أوجه فإذا وجب الذب عن عثمان وعلي فهو عن أبي بكر وعمر أوجب وعلي يقاتل ليطاع ويتصرف في النفوس والأموال فكيف يجعل هذا قتالا على الدين

If it is permissible to criticize (Abu Bakr) al-Siddiq and ('Umar) al-Faruq on the basis that they both fought in order to collect wealth, then criticism of others apart from them both is even more correct. If it is necessary to defend 'Uthman and 'Ali, then defence of Abu Bakr and 'Umar is even more necessary. **'Ali used to fight to make people obey him and to have control over souls and wealth. How can this be categorized as fighting for the religion?**<sup>3</sup>

In fact, our Shaykh thinks that the evidence suggesting that 'Ali had become a pagan through his fighting and killings are strong and supported by *sahih ahadith*:

ثم يقال لهؤلاء الرافضة لو قالت لكم النواصب علي قد استحل دماء المسلمين وقاتلهم بغير أمر الله ورسوله على رياسته وقد قال النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم سباب المسلم فسوق وقتاله كفر وقال ولا ترجعوا بعدي كفارا يضرب بعضهم رقاب بعض فيكون علي كافرا لذلك لم تكن حجتكم أقوى من حجتهم لأن الأحاديث التي احتجوا بها صحيحة وأيضا فيقولون قتل النفوس فساد فمن قتل النفوس على طاعته كان مريدا للعلو في الأرض والفساد وهذا حال فرعون والله تعالى يقول تلك الدار الآخرة نجعلها للذين لا يريدون علوا في الأرض ولا فسادا والعاقبة للمتقين فمن أراد العلو في الأرض والفساد لم يكن من أهل السعادة في الآخرة وليس هذا كقتال الصديق للمرتدين ولمانعي الزكاة فإن الصديق إنما قاتلهم على طاعة الله ورسوله لا على كعته فإن الزكاة فرض عليهم فقاتلهم علا الإقرار بها وعلى أدائها بخلاف من قاتل ليطاع هو

Then it is said to the Rafidhah (i.e. Shi'is). If the Nawasib (i.e. haters of 'Ali) said to you (i.e. Shi'is): 'Ali made it permissible to shed the blood of Muslims and fought them, without the order of Allah and His Messenger, to enforce his rule, and the Prophet, peace be upon him, had said, "Cursing a Muslim is an evil deed, **and fighting him is disbelief**" and he (the Prophet) also said, "Do not become pagans after me by killing one another", **and thereby 'Ali became a pagan, your (i.e. Shi'i) argument is NOT stronger than their (i.e. Nasibi) argument because the *ahadith* which they use as proof are *sahih*.**

Moreover, they say that murder is mischief, and that whoever murders in order to enforce obedience to himself, he is someone who wants to be exalted in the earth. This mischief was the condition of Fir'awn, and Allah the Most High says, "That home of the Hereafter, We shall assign to those who do not seek to be exalted in the earth, nor commit mischief, and the good end is for the pious." (28:83) Therefore, anyone who seeks to be exalted in the earth, and to do mischief, is not from the successful ones in the Hereafter.

This was not like the fight of Abu Bakr against the apostates and those who refused to pay *Zakat*. This was because al-Siddiq only fought them to enforce the obedience of Allah and His Messenger, and not to enforce his own obedience. *Zakat* was compulsory upon them, and fighting them was to the reason for its recognition (by the rebels) and payment, as opposed to the one who fought to enforce his own obedience.<sup>4</sup>

This is a simple summary of the claims of Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah against Amir al-Muminin 'Ali:

1. His wars were not for Islam. He was only fighting for power and control of people's wealth.
2. He murdered a very large number of righteous Muslims in pursuit of his power struggle.
3. Any Muslim who fights another Muslim is a pagan. Therefore, those who claim that 'Ali had become a pagan through his wars have a strong point, backed by *sahih ahadith*.

So, why does our Shaykh still consider 'Ali to have been a "righteous" Muslim? He makes a further claim:

وعلي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه ندم على أمور فعلها من القتال وغيره

'Ali b. Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him, regretted things he did, such as fighting and others.<sup>5</sup>

Without that, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah would have declared him a pagan war criminal like the Nawasib did. But, what is the truth of all these allegations, accusations and claims? Is any of them based upon reliable sources? Did 'Ali truly fight only for power? Did he really murder Muslims? Did he ever regret his defensive wars against the insurgents?

1. Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 6, p. 191
2. Ibid, vol. 6, p. 356
3. Ibid, vol. 8, pp. 329-330
4. Ibid, vol. 4, pp. 499-500
5. Ibid, vol. 6, p. 209

The Messenger, *sallallahu ‘alaihi wa alihi*, had predicted the occurrence of ‘Ali’s wars before his departure. He also gave clear hints about the true nature and purpose of those wars. Let us have a look at his words. Imam Abu Ya’la (d. 307 H) records:

حدثنا عثمان حدثنا جرير عن الأعمش عن إسماعيل بن رجاء عن أبيه عن أبي سعيد الخدري قال : سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يقول : إن منكم من يقاتل على تأويل القرآن كما قاتلت على تنزيله فقال أبو بكر : أنا هو يا رسول الله ؟ قال : لا قال عمر : أنا هو يا رسول الله ؟ قال : لا ولكنه خاصف النعل وكان أعطى عليا نعله يخصفها

‘Uthman – Jarir – al-A’mash – Isma’il b. Raja – his father – Abu Sa’id al-Khudri:

I heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, “Verily, among you is **he who will fight for the implementation of the Qur’an** as I fought for its revelation.” **So, Abu Bakr said, “Am I the one, O Messenger of Allah?” He said, “No”.** ‘Umar said, “Am I the one, O Messenger of Allah?” He said, “**No**. Rather, he is the one repairing the shoe”. And he had given his shoe to ‘Ali which he was repairing.<sup>1</sup>

Shaykh Dr. Asad says:

إسناده صحيح

Its chain is *sahih*<sup>2</sup>

Imam al-Haythami (d. 807 H) also comments about the *hadith*:

رواه أبو يعلى ورجاله رجال الصحيح

Abu Ya'la recorded it, and its narrators are narrators of the *Sahih3*

So, Imam 'Ali's wars were for the Qur'an. Yet, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah claims that he was not fighting for Islam! Apparently, the Shaykh is *very* unfair in his damning accusation against 'Ali, *'alaihi al-salam*, that the latter only fought for power. Amir al-Muminin was fighting *for* the Book of Allah while his opponents were fighting *against* it. Interestingly, the Prophet specifically made it clear that neither Abu Bakr, nor 'Umar or 'Uthman, ever fought for the Qur'an. This is an extremely crucial point concerning the legitimacy of their *khilafah*, and their wars! It is not possible for a true *khalifah* to fight wars that are not *for* the Qur'an. As such, one may safely conclude that Allah and His Messenger never accepted the legitimacy of the *khilafah* and wars of the trio.

Imam Ahmad (d. 241 H) also records:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا حسين بن محمد ثنا فطر عن إسماعيل بن رجاء الزبيدي عن أبيه قال سمعت أبا سعيد الخدري يقول كنا جلوسا ننتظر رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فخرج علينا من بعض بيوت نساءه قال فقمنا معه فانقطعت نعله فتخلف عليها علي يخصفها فمضى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ومضينا معه ثم قام ينتظره وقمنا معه فقال ان منكم من يقاتل على تأويل هذا القرآن كما قاتلت على تنزيله فاستشرفنا وفينا أبو بكر وعمر فقال لا ولكنه خاصف النعل قال فجئنا نبشره قال وكأنه قد سمعه

'Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Husayn b. Muhammad – Fatr – Isma'il b. Raja al-Zubaydi – his father – Abu Sa'id al-Khudri:

We were sitting, expecting the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him. Then he came to us from one of the rooms of his wives. So, we stood with him, and his shoe broke. Therefore, he asked 'Ali to stay behind to repair it. The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, departed and we departed with him. Then, he stood waiting for him (i.e. 'Ali), and we stood with him.

So, he said, "Verily, among you is **he who will fight for the implementation of this Qur'an** as I fought for its revelation. So, we became curious. **Among us were Abu Bakr and 'Umar. But, he (the Prophet) said, "No (to Abu Bakr and 'Umar).** Rather, he is the one repairing the shoe." We went (to him) to give him the glad news. But, it was as though he had heard it (before).<sup>4</sup>

Shaykh al-Arnaut says:

## حديث صحيح , وهذا إسناده حسن

It is a *sahih hadith*, and this chain is *hasan*.5

‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) comments about the exact same *hadith*:

فالحديث صحيح لا ريب فيه.

The *hadith* is *sahih*. There is NO doubt about it.6

Imam Ahmad further records:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا وكيع حدثنا فطر عن إسماعيل بن رجاء عن أبيه  
عن أبي سعيد قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ان منكم من يقاتل على  
تأويله كما قاتلت على تنزيله قال فقام أبو بكر وعمر فقال لا ولكن خاصف  
النعل وعلي يخصف نعله

‘Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Waki’ – Fatr – Isma’il b. Raja – his father – Abu Sa’id:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, “Verily, among you is **he who will fight for its implementation** as I fought for its revelation.” **So, Abu Bakr and ‘Umar stood up, and he said, “No.** Rather, he is the one repairing the shoes”. And ‘Ali was repairing his shoes.7

Shaykh al-Arnaut comments:

صحيح وهذا إسناده حسن

It is *sahih*, and this chain is *hasan*.8

Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) caps it:

أخبرنا أبو جعفر محمد بن علي الشيباني بالكوفة من أصل كتابه ثنا أحمد بن

حازم بن أبي غرزة ثنا أبو غسان ثنا عبد السلام بن حرب ثنا الأعمش عن إسماعيل بن رجاء عن أبيه عن أبي سعيد رضي الله عنه قال ابن أبي غرزة : وحدثنا عبيد الله بن موسى ثنا فطر بن خليفة عن إسماعيل بن رجاء عن أبيه عن أبي سعيد رضي الله عنه قال كنا مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فانقطعت نعله فتخلف علي يخصفها فمشى قليلا ثم قال : إن منكم من يقاتل على تأويل القرن كما قاتلت على تنزيله فاستشرف لها القوم وفيهم أبو بكر وعمر رضي الله عنهما قال أبو بكر : أنا هو قال : لا قال عمر : أنا هو قال : لا ولكن خاصف النعل عليا فاتيناه فبشرناه فلم يرفع به رأسه كأنه قد كان سمعه من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

Abu Ja'far Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Shaybani – Ahmad b. Hazim b. Abi Gharzah – Abu Ghassan – 'Abd al-Salam b. Harb – al-A'mash – Isma'il b. Raja – his father – Abu Sa'id, may Allah be pleased with him, AND Ibn Abi Gharzah – 'Abd Allah b. Musa – Fatr b. Khalifah – Isma'il b. Raja – his father – Abu Sa'id, may Allah be pleased with him:

We were sitting with the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, when his shoe broke. So, he left 'Ali behind to repair it, and walked a little. Then he said, "Verily, among you is **he who will fight for the implementation of the Qur'an** as I fought for his revelation." The people became curious about it and among them were Abu Bakr and 'Umar, may Allah be pleased with them both. **Abu Bakr said, "Am I the one?" He said, "No". 'Umar said, "Am I the one?" He said, "No.** Rather, he is the one repairing the shoe, 'Ali." So, we went to him, and we gave him the good news. But he did not raise his head due to it, as if he had already heard it from the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him.<sup>9</sup>

Al-Hakim comments:

هذا حديث صحيح على شرط الشيخين

This *hadith* is *sahih* upon the standard of the two Shaykhs.<sup>10</sup>

Imam al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) agrees:

على شرط البخاري ومسلم

(*Sahih*) upon the standard of al-Bukhari and Muslim<sup>11</sup>

1. Abu Ya'la Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Muthanna al-Mawsili al-Tamimi, Musnad (Damascus: Dar al-Mamun li al-Turath; 1st edition, 1404 H) [annotator: Dr. Husayn Salim Asad], vol. 2, p. 341, # 1086
2. Ibid
3. Nur al-Din 'Ali b. Abi Bakr al-Haythami, Majma' al-Zawaid (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1412 H), vol. 5, p. 338, # 8950
4. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 3, p. 82, # 11790
5. Ibid
6. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqihah wa Fawaidihah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 5, p. 640, # 2487
7. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 3, p. 33, # 11307
8. Ibid
9. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 3, p. 132, # 4621
10. Ibid
11. Ibid

The fiercest enemy of Amir al-Muminin, '*alaihi al-salam*', and the most successful armed rebel against his government, was Mu'awiyah. He was the only one of the rebel leaders with firm control over vast territories, namely modern Syria, Palestine, Israel, Jordan and Lebanon. He was 'Uthman's governor over these countries. However, when 'Ali became accepted as the *khalifah*, Mu'awiyah refused to accept the former's authority.

He therefore took the territories under his governorate and their territorial armies with him in a bloody insurgency against the central government. The others – mainly Umm al-Muminin 'Aishah's army and the Khawarij – had no such advantage. Unlike them, Mu'awiyah had large well-equipped, handsomely-paid, highly experienced and very loyal armed forces. In the end, Imam 'Ali was assassinated in cold blood by a Khariji. Mu'awiyah's rebellion succeeded, and he became the new *khalifah*. He eventually founded the Umayyad dynasty.

The Messenger of Allah, *sallallahu 'alaihi wa alihi*, had predicted Mu'awiyah's insurrection, and had described him and his armies in some very strong terms. Imam al-Bukhari (d. 256 H) records:

حدثنا مسدد قال حدثنا عبد العزيز بن مختار قال حدثنا خالد الحذاء عن عكرمة قال لي ابن عباس ولابنه علي انطلقا إلى أبي سعيد فاسمعا من حديثه فانطلقنا فإذا هو في حائط يصلحه فأخذ رداءه فاحتبى ثم أنشأ يحدثنا حتى أتى ذكر بناء المسجد فقال كنا نحمل لبنة لبنة وعمار لبنتين لبنتين فرآه النبي صلى الله عليه

و سلم فينفض التراب عنه ويقول (ويح عمار تقتله الفئة الباغية يدعوهم إلى الجنة ويدعونه إلى النار) . قال يقول عمار أعوذ بالله من الفتن

Musaddad – ‘Abd al-‘Aziz b. Mukhtar – Khalid al-Khudha – ‘Ikrimah:

Ibn ‘Abbas said to me and to his son ‘Ali, "Go to Abu Sa‘id and listen to what he narrates." So we went and found him in a garden looking after it. He picked up his garment, wore it and sat down and started narrating to us until he mentioned the construction of the mosque. Therefore, he said, "We were carrying one adobe at a time while ‘Ammar was carrying two. The Prophet, peace be upon him, saw him and started removing the dust from his body and said, 'May Allah be merciful to ‘Ammar. **He will be murdered by a *baghi* group. He will be inviting them (i.e. the *baghi* group) to Paradise and they (i.e. the *baghi* group) will be inviting him to Hell-fire.**' ‘Ammar said, 'I seek refuge with Allah from affliction.'"<sup>1</sup>

This *hadith* is *mutawatir*, as Imam Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (d. 463 H) states:

وتواترت الآثار عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أنه قال تقتل عمار الفئة الباغية وهذا من إخباره بالغيب وأعلام نبوته صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو من أصح الأحاديث

**The reports are *mutawatir* from the Prophet**, peace be upon him, stating that he said, "‘Ammar will be murdered by a *baghi* group". This was one of his prophecies, and one of the proofs of his prophethood, peace be upon him, and it is one of the most authentic *ahadith*.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) also submits:

وتواترت الأحاديث عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أن عمارا تقتله الفئة الباغية وأجمعوا على أنه قتل مع علي بصفين

**The *ahadith* are *mutawatir* from the Prophet**, peace be upon him, that ‘Ammar would be murdered by the *baghi* group, and they (i.e. the scholars) had a consensus that he (‘Ammar) was murdered on the side of ‘Ali at Siffin.<sup>3</sup>

The battle of Siffin was between Amir al-Muminin ‘Ali and the Syrian rebels commanded by Mu‘awiyah. ‘Ammar, *radhiyallahu ‘anhu*, was in the army of ‘Ali, and was murdered by the troops of Mu‘awiyah. As

such, Mu'awiyah and his armies were the *baghi* group. Al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir (d. 774 H) explains further:

وهذا مقتل عمار بن ياسر رضي الله عنه مع أمير المؤمنين علي بن أبي طالب  
قتله أهل الشام وبان وظهر بذلك سر ما أخبره به الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم  
من أنه تقتله الفئة الباغية وبان بذلك أن عليا محق وأن معاوية باغ

This was the murder of 'Ammar b. Yasir, may Allah be pleased with him, on the side of Amir al-Muminin 'Ali b. Abi Talib. He was murdered by the Syrians. From this, the secret of what the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, had predicted that he ('Ammar) would be murdered by a *baghi* group became clear. **It became clear from this that 'Ali was upon the Truth and that Mu'awiyah was a *baghi* person.**<sup>4</sup>

Al-Hafiz agrees, but with some caution:

وزهب جمهور أهل السنة إلى تصويب من قاتل مع علي لامثال قوله تعالى وان  
طائفتان من المؤمنين اقتتلوا الآية ففيها الامر بقتال الفئة الباغية وقد ثبت ان  
من قاتل عليا كانوا بغاة وهؤلاء مع هذا التصويب متفقون على أنه لا يذم واحد  
من هؤلاء بل يقولون اجتهدوا فأخطأوا

The majority of the Ahl al-Sunnah are of the opinion that those who fought on the side of 'Ali were correct, based on His statement, "If two groups from the believers fight each other" and in it is an order to fight the *baghi* group. **It is firmly established that those who fought against 'Ali were *baghi* people.** Yet, these people (i.e. Sunnis), despite their commendation (of the troops of 'Ali) have a consensus that none of these people (i.e. the *baghi* people) should be criticized. **Rather, they (i.e. Sunnis) say: they did *ijtihad* and made mistakes.**<sup>5</sup>

In simpler words, the murderers of 'Ammar were free from blame, according to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah! Imam al-Nawawi (d. 676 H) reiterates this:

قال العلماء هذا الحديث حجة ظاهرة في أن عليا رضي الله عنه كان محقا  
مصيبا والطائفة الأخرى بغاة لكنهم مجتهدون فلا إثم عليهم لذلك

The scholars said: This *hadith* is explicit proof that 'Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, was upon the Truth and was correct, **and that the other side were *baghi* people.** However, they (i.e. the *baghi*

people) did *ijtihad*. **Therefore, there was no sin upon them due to that.**<sup>6</sup>

Whatever the case, there is Sunni agreement that Mu'awiyah and his troops were the *baghi* group in the *mutawatir hadith*. Meanwhile, there are a number of crucial points about Mu'awiyah and his armies in the *hadith* that need to be looked into in order to deal with their acquittal by the Ahl al-Sunnah. First, we must understand that being a *baghi* person or group is *haram*, as Allah has declared:

إن الله يأمر بالعدل والإحسان وإيتاء ذي القربى وينهى عن الفحشاء والمنكر  
والبغي يعظكم لعظمكم لتذكرون

Verily, Allah commands you to do justice and kindness, and to give to kith and kin, and **forbids** corrupt behaviours, evil deeds **and al-baghi (i.e. being a baghi person or group)**. He admonishes you, that you may take heed.<sup>7</sup>

Therefore, Mu'awiyah and his armies were an *illegitimate* group. Allah Himself BANNED them. In line with this, it is obligatory for Muslims as a whole to rise in arms against every *baghi* group within the *Ummah*:

وإن طائفتان من المؤمنين اقاتلوا فأصلحوا بينهما فإن بغت إحداهما على  
الأخرى فقاتلوا التي تبغي حتى تفيء إلى أمر الله

If two groups among the believers fight each other, then make peace between them both. **But if one of them is the baghi against the other, then fight you against the baghi one** till it complies with the Command of Allah.<sup>8</sup>

This is the case where the *baghi* group were “believers”. What then about a case where they were haters of ‘Ali, and therefore “hypocrites” according to the Messenger? Apparently, the group of Mu'awiyah were in a far worse situation. In any case, by describing them as a *baghi* group, the Prophet was indicating that they were a *banned* group, and that fighting them was compulsory upon all living Muslims at the time of the Battle of Siffin.

Moreover, there is a clear indication in the above verse that the non-*baghi* group is upon the Command of Allah, and has not strayed from it in the least. This is another point in the *hadith*: ‘Ali and his army were upon the Command of Allah in the war. This fact is strengthened even further by the Prophet’s description of ‘Ammar as calling the *baghi* group to Paradise.

A rather disturbing quality of Mu'awiyah and his armies is that they were callers to Hellfire, according to

the *mutawatir hadith*. Apparently, this nullifies *any* acquittal or defence of them. In the Sight of Allah, that *baghi* group were not a collection of mistaken fellows. Rather, they were full-scale callers to Hellfire, *undoubtedly* working for Shaytan. We will say more on this below. Meanwhile, even *if* they had truly been people who made mistakes (as the Ahl al-Sunnah claim), would that have exonerated them from the crimes they committed? The Qur'an says "no":

إن فرعون وهامان وجنودهما كانوا خاطئين

Verily, Fir'aun and Haman and their soldiers were people **who made mistakes**.<sup>9</sup>

Yet, they will fully answer for their crimes on the Day of Resurrection. Moreover, we read this in the Book of Allah:

قالوا يا أبانا استغفر لنا ذنوبنا إنا كنا خاطئين

They said: "O our father! Ask forgiveness for our sins. Indeed, we have been people **who made mistakes**." <sup>10</sup>

This is a similar verse:

إنا آمنا بربنا ليغفر لنا خطايانا

We have believed in our Lord, that He may forgive us **our mistakes**. <sup>11</sup>

As such, the defence of mistake can never work as a shield from culpability for crimes. But then, even if we accepted it as a valid excuse (in opposition to the Qur'an), Mu'awiyah and his *baghi* armies still had a lot to answer for. They murdered 'Ammar and several other righteous soldiers of Amir al-Muminin. Let us say, for the sake of argument, that the *baghi* group had *mistakenly* killed those pious people. Still, the Book of Allah has clear provisions concerning such a case:

وما كان لمؤمن أن يقتل مؤمناً إلا خطأ ومن قتل مؤمناً خطأ فتحرير رقبة مؤمنة ودية مسلمة إلى أهله إلا أن يصدقوا ... فمن لم يجد فصيام شهرين متتابعين توبة من الله وكان الله عليماً حكيماً ومن يقتل مؤمناً متعمداً فجزاؤه

## جهنم خالداً فيها وغضب الله عليه ولعنه وأعد له عذاباً عظيماً

It is NOT for a believer to kill a believer except by mistake. **And whoever kills a believer by mistake, he must set free a believing slave** and a compensation be given to the deceased's family, unless they remit it ... **And whoever finds this beyond his means, he must fast for two consecutive months IN ORDER TO SEEK REPENTANCE FROM ALLAH.** And Allah is All-Knowing, All-Wise. And whoever kills a believer intentionally, his recompense is Hellfire to abide therein forever, and the Wrath and the Curse of Allah are upon him, and a great punishment is prepared for him.<sup>12</sup>

So, even if you killed a believer *by mistake*, you must still seek “repentance from Allah”. To do that, you must set free a slave for each life mistakenly taken, and pay compensation to the families of the deceased. If you were unable to manumit a slave (as in modern times), or you lacked the financial capability to pay the compensation, then you must fast consecutively for two months. Unless you did these, there would be no forgiveness for you for the *accidental* killing(s), and you would be in serious trouble in the Hereafter. Mu'awiyah and his *baghi* colleagues never did any of these things! Therefore, they never sought or earned Allah's forgiveness.

The most important issue for consideration here is that only *intentional* murder has been associated with Hellfire. Interestingly, Mu'awiyah and his troops were also branded callers to it. In other words, they were themselves inmates – in fact, officials – of Hellfire. They were only drawing more people to join them in it. Imagine if the Sunni claim that the *baghi* group had no blame had been true, would such have been the case? Would Allah and His Messenger have described them as callers to Hellfire if they had solely been killing believers *by mistake*?

Finally, the fact that they were callers to Hellfire also casts a huge shadow over their Islamic credentials. Whenever anyone is described as “calling to Hellfire”, it means that he is a *kafir*. 'Allamah al-'Uthaymin (d. 1421 H) states:

(وجعلناهم أئمة يدعون إلى النار (يعني بذلك قادة الكفار

(And We made them leaders inviting to the Fire), He is referring to **the leaders of the *kuffar***.<sup>13</sup>

In other words, those who invite to Hellfire are the *kuffar*, and their leaders are the leaders of the *kuffar*.

Imam al-Alusi (d. 1270 H) also says:

{يدعون إلى النار...} والمراد جعلهم ضالين مضلين

{Inviting to the Fire} ... what is intended is: **He made them misled misleaders.** 14

Therefore, those who invite to the Fire are those that have been misled by Shaytan, and who also function as his soldiers, workers and callers.

In any case, Allah Himself has given a clear Verdict about people like them:

ولا تنكحوا المشركين حتى يؤمنوا ولعبد مؤمن خير من مشرك ولو أعجبكم  
أولئك يدعون إلى النار والله يدعو إلى الجنة والمغفرة بإذنه

And do not marry to **idolaters** till they believe, and verily a believing slave is better than an idolater, even though he pleases you. **Those invite to Hellfire, and Allah invites to Paradise** and Forgiveness by His Leave. 15

In other words, the army of Amir al-Muminin were soldiers of Allah while the *baghi* group – led by Mu'awiyah – were *kuffar*, misled misleaders and idolaters.

1. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Isma'il b. Ibrahim b. Mughirah al-Bukhari al-Ju'fi, al-Jami' al-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Beirut: Dar Ibn Kathir; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafa Dib al-Bagha], vol. 1, p. 172, # 436
2. Abu 'Umar Yusuf b. 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Barr b. 'Asim al-Nimri al-Qurtubi, al-Isti'ab fi Ma'rifat al-Ashab (Beirut: Dar al-Jil; 1st edition, 1412 H) [annotator: 'Ali Muhammad al-Bajawi], vol. 3, p. 1140
3. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, al-Isabah fi Tamyiz al-Sahabah (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1415 H) [annotators: Shaykh 'Adil Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Mawjud and Shaykh 'Ali Muhammad Ma'udh], vol. 4, p. 474, # 5720
4. Abu al-Fida Isma'il b. Kathir al-Dimashqi, al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah (Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi; 1st edition, 1408 H) [annotator: 'Ali Shiri], vol. 7, p. 296
5. Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, Fath al-Bari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah li al-Taba'ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 13, p. 58
6. Muhyi al-Din Abu Zakariyyah Yahya b. Sharaf al-Nawawi, Sahih Muslim bi Sharh al-Nawawi (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-'Arabi; 1407 H), vol. 18, p. 40
7. Qur'an 16:90
8. Qur'an 49:9
9. Qur'an 28:8
10. Qur'an 12:97
11. Qur'an 20:73
12. Qur'an 4:92-93
13. Muhammad b. Salih al-'Uthaymin, Fatawa Nur 'ala al-Darb (Muasassat Shaykh Muhammad bin Salih b. 'Uthaymin al-Khayriyyah; 1427 H), vol. 31, p. 111
14. Abu al-Fadhl Mahmud al-Alusi, Ruh al-Ma'ani fi Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azim wa Sab' al-Mathani (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi), vol. 20, p. 83
15. Qur'an 2:221

Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) states:

ففي هذا الخبر إخبار عمر بين المهاجرين والأنصار أن أبا بكر سيد المسلمين وخيرهم وأحبهم إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ذلك علة مبايعته فقال بل نبايعك أنت فأنت سيدنا وخيرنا وأحبنا إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ليبين بذلك أن الأمور به تولية الأفضل وأنت أفضلنا فنبايعك

In this report is the declaration of ‘Umar among the Muhajirun and the Ansar that **Abu Bakr was the sayyid of the Muslims** and the best of them, and the most beloved of them to the Messenger of Allah. This is the reason for following him. **So, he (‘Umar) said, “Rather, we will follow you because you are our sayyid,** and the best of us, and the most beloved of us to the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him”. He wanted to make clear through it that: **What is ordained is to give authority to the best,** and you are the best of us. So, we will follow you.<sup>1</sup>

‘Umar apparently referred to Abu Bakr as “our *sayyid*”<sup>2</sup>. Our Shaykh interprets that “our” as referring to all Muslims of that time, who were only the Sahabah. In other words, ‘Umar was speaking on behalf of his colleagues as a whole. Therefore, on the basis of ‘Umar’s testimony, Abu Bakr was the *sayyid* of the Sahabah. So, what does this mean?

First and foremost, it is important to note that the word *sayyid* has different meanings and can be used in various contexts. Dr. Baalbaki, a contemporary lexicographer, defines *sayyid* in this manner:

master, lord, chief, head, leader; Mr.; gentleman; a descendant of Prophet Mohammad; sovereign; independent.<sup>3</sup>

As such, in a cultural context, the word *sayyid* means “descendant of the Prophet”. In a political context, it refers to the ruler. In a tribal context, the title belongs to their chief. In the family setting, the husband – being its head – is the *sayyid*. The examples go on and on. What matters to our research, however, is solely the *spiritual* context. Therefore, all references to “sayyid” or “siyadah” henceforth in this and other chapters on *Hadith al-Siyadah* relate to spirituality only. Abu Bakr was not the political leader of Muslims, nor was he their tribal or other chief, when ‘Umar addressed him as “our *sayyid*”. This reveals that he too was referring to Abu Bakr’s alleged spiritual *siyadah* over the *Ummah*.

In order to determine what the term *sayyid* indicates in the spiritual context, we must examine the following *hadith*, documented by Imam Muslim (d. 261 H):

حدثني الحكم بن موسى أبو صالح حدثنا هقل (يعني ابن زياد) عن الأوزاعي  
حدثني أبو عمار حدثني عبدالله بن فروخ حدثني أبو هريرة قال قال رسول الله  
أنا سيد ولد آدم يوم القيامة

Al-Hakam b. Musa Abu Salih – Hiql b. Ziyad – al-Awza'i – Abu 'Ammar – 'Abd Allah b. Farukh – Abu Hurayrah:

The Messenger of Allah said: "I am the *sayyid* of the descendants of Adam on the Day of Resurrection."<sup>4</sup>

Imam Ahmad (d. 241 H) also records:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا يحيى بن سعيد قال ثنا أبو حيان قال ثنا أبو زرعة بن عمرو بن جرير عن أبي هريرة قال ... رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ... أنا سيد الناس يوم القيامة

'Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Yahya b. Sa'id – Abu Hayyan – Abu Zur'ah b. 'Amr b. Jarir – Abu Hurayrah:

... The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: "... I am the *sayyid* of mankind on the Day of Resurrection."<sup>5</sup>

Shaykh al-Arnaut comments:

### إسناده صحيح على شرط الشيخين

Its chain is *sahih* upon the standard of the two Shaykhs.<sup>6</sup>

Obviously, the *siyadah* of the Prophet, *sallallahu 'alaihi wa alihi*, in these *hadiths* falls within the spiritual context, especially since they are connected with the Hereafter. This is how the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah understand the reports too. Imam al-Nawawi (d. 676 H), for instance, states:

### تفضيل نبينا صلى الله عليه وسلم على جميع الخلائق

قوله صلى الله عليه وسلم أنا سيد ولد آدم يوم القيامة ... وهذا الحديث دليل لتفضيله صلى الله عليه وسلم على الخلق كلهم لأن مذهب أهل السنة أن الآدميين أفضل من الملائكة وهو صلى الله عليه وسلم أفضل الآدميين وغيرهم

وأما الحديث الآخر لا تفضلوا بين الأنبياء فجوابه من خمسة أوجه الأول: أنه صلى الله عليه وسلم قاله قبل أن يعلم أنه سيد ولد آدم فلما علم أخبر به

Superiority of our Prophet, peace be upon him, over the entire creation

His statement, peace be upon him, "I am the *sayyid* of the descendants of Adam on the Day of Resurrection".... **This *hadith* is proof of his superiority, peace be upon him, over all the creation.** This is because the doctrine of the Ahl al-Sunnah is that human beings are superior to angels, and he, peace be upon him, is the most superior of the human beings and others. As for the other *hadith* "do not give superiority to any among the prophets", the answer is from five aspects. The first is: he, peace be upon him, said it before he knew that he was the *sayyid* of the descendants of Adam. When he knew, he informed of it.<sup>7</sup>

Imam al-Mubarakfuri (d. 1282 H) has a similar view:

قوله أنا سيد ولد آدم يوم القيامة ولا فخر أي ولا أقوله تفاخرا بل اعتداد بفضله

His statement, "I am the *sayyid* of the descendants of Adam on the Day of Resurrection, and I am not boastful", meaning: I am not saying it for pride. **Rather, it was in consideration of his superiority.**<sup>8</sup>

Therefore, in the spiritual context, *siyadah* means superiority in the Sight of Allah. Whoever is the *sayyid* of the Muslims is their best. Moreover, anyone who is a *sayyid* in the Hereafter is equally a *sayyid* in this world in the same capacity.

Our brothers from the Ahl al-Sunnah often quote a relevant Sunni-only report to prove the superiority of both Abu Bakr and 'Umar over the *Ummah*. 'Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) states:

قال عبد الله بن أحمد في "زوائد المسند" (1 / 80) : حدثني وهب بن بقية الواسطي حدثنا عمر (في الأصل: عمرو) بن يونس اليمامي عن عبد الله بن عمر اليمامي عن الحسن بن زيد بن حسن حدثني أبي عن أبيه عن علي رضي الله عنه قال: "كنت عند النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، فأقبل أبو بكر وعمر رضي الله عنهما، فقال: "يا علي هذان سيدا كهول أهل الجنة وشبابها بعد النبيين والمرسلين".

‘Abd Allah b. Ahmad said in *Zawaid al-Musnad* (1/80):

Wahb b. Baqiyyah al-Wasiti – ‘Umar (in the original: ‘Amr) b. Yunus al-Yamami – ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Umar al-Yamami – al-Hasan b. Zayd b. Hasan – my father – his father ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him:

I was with the Prophet, peace be upon him, when Abu Bakr and ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with them both, approached. So, he said, “O ‘Ali! **These two are the two *sayyids* of THE ELDERLY ONES of the people of Paradise (*Ahl al-Jannah*) and of its youth**, after the prophets and messengers.”<sup>9</sup>

Our ‘Allamah comments:

قلت: وهذا سند حسن

I say: This chain is *hasan*.<sup>10</sup>

The problem of the above *hadith* is primarily in its *matn* (content). It disturbingly assumes that there will be elderly people in Paradise, alongside its youth! This embarrassing mistake raises several red flags concerning its true origin. The correct opinion of the Messenger of Allah, which is universally confirmed, is that there will be only youth in *Jannah*. Imam Ahmad b. Hanbal records, for instance:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا سليمان بن داود ثنا عمران عن قتادة عن شهر بن حوشب عن عبد الرحمن بن غنم عن معاذ بن جبل انه سأل النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أو سمع النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول يدخل أهل الجنة الجنة جرذا مردا مكحلين بنى ثلاثين أو ثلاث وثلاثين

‘Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) Sulayman b. Dawud – ‘Imran – Qatadah – Shahr b. Hawshab – ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Ghanam – Mu’adh b. Jabal:

The Prophet, peace be upon him, said, “The people of Paradise will enter Paradise hairless, beardless with their eyes anointed with kohl, **aged thirty or thirty-three years.**”<sup>11</sup>

Shaykh al-Arnaut declares:

حسن لغيره

*Hasan li ghayrihi*<sup>12</sup>

In his *Sahih al-Jami' al-Saghir*, the 'Allamah copies a similar *hadith*:

يدخل أهل الجنة الجنة جرداً مرداً كأنهم مكحلون أبناء ثلاث وثلاثين

The people of Paradise will enter Paradise hairless, beardless, with their eyes anointed with kohl, **aged thirty-three years**.<sup>13</sup>

And the 'Allamah says:

صحيح

*Sahih*<sup>14</sup>

Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 H) also documents a *shahid*:

حدثنا محمد بن بشار و أبو هشام الرفاعي قالوا حدثنا معاذ بن هشام عن أبيه  
عن عامر الأحول عن شهر بن حوشب عن أبي هريرة قال قال رسول الله صلى  
الله عليه و سلم أهل الجنة جرد مرد كحل لا يفنى شبابهم ولا تبلى ثيابهم

Muhammad b. Bashir and Abu Hisham al-Rufa'i – Mu'adh b. Hisham – his father – 'Amir al-Ahwal –  
Shahr b. Hawshab – Abu Hurayrah:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, "The people of Paradise will be hairless and beardless, with their eyes anointed with kohl. **Their YOUTH will never end**, and their clothes will never become worn."<sup>15</sup>

Al-Tirmidhi says:

هذا حديث حسن غريب

This *hadith* is *hasan gharib*.<sup>16</sup>

‘Allamah al-Albani supports him:

## حسن

Hasan17

Since there will be no elderly folks in Paradise, how then will Abu Bakr and ‘Umar be their *sayyids* in there? Al-Mubarakfuri – apparently troubled by these facts – attempts to explain away the fatal problem:

لم يكن في الجنة كهل ... وقيل سيّدا من مات كهلا من المسلمين فدخل الجنة  
لأنه ليس فيها كهل

**There will be NO elderly person in Paradise ...** And it is said they (i.e. Abu Bakr and ‘Umar) both will be *sayyids* of **those who died as elderly people** among the Muslims and thereby entered Paradise, because there will be no elderly person in it. 18

So, “elderly ones of the people of Paradise” only refers to those who died elderly in this world and were later admitted to *Jannah* in the Hereafter. Their official title, according to the Ahl al-Sunnah, is “elderly ones of the people of Paradise”. What about those who died young in this world and then made it to Paradise? In line with the Sunni logic, they are “the youth of the people of Paradise”. Things however get out of hand when questions are asked about the fortunate people of *Jannah* who died as infants, babies or children in this world? The *hadith* mentions only two categories for the people of Paradise:

" يا علي هذان سيّدا كهول أهل الجنة وشبابها بعد النبيين والمرسلين "

“O ‘Ali! These two are the two *sayyids* of the elderly ones of the people of Paradise (*Ahl al-Jannah*) and of its youth, after the prophets and messengers.”

The youth, of course, are people above the ages of adolescence. It would be ridiculous to put babies of two months or fetuses, for instance, in the category of youth! So, there are only two possibilities here:

1. People who died in pregnancy, infancy or childhood will all automatically go to Hellfire. No category is listed for them, thereby suggesting that they have no place in Paradise. Otherwise, the *hadith* should have mentioned “the, fetuses, infants and children of the people of Paradise” as well.

2. People who died in infancy or childhood will all be superior to Abu Bakr and ‘Umar, in Paradise! After

all, the duo are described as being *sayyids* of only the elderly as well as the youth of the people of Paradise. The infants and children are conspicuously excluded.

Apparently, neither of the above is acceptable to our brothers from the Ahl al-Sunnah. As such, the absurdity of al-Mubarakfuri's linguistic gymnastics, even by Sunni standards, is unmistakable. Clearly, the Sunni *hadith* is not about the age of death here in the world *at all*. It rather informs the Ahl al-Sunnah that the people of Paradise will be in two categories only: the elderly as well as the youth. Of course, such a scandalous error could never have emerged from the noble Messenger of Allah.

Things get even a lot messier when one considers the case of Bilal b. Rabah, the well-known *muezzin* of the Prophet. Imam Ibn Sa'd (d. 230 H) records about him:

قال أخبرنا محمد بن عمر قال أخبرنا موسى بن محمد بن إبراهيم بن الحارث التيمي عن أبيه قال توفي بلال بدمشق سنة عشرين ودفن عند الباب الصغير في مقبرة دمشق وهو بن بضع وستين سنة قال أخبرنا محمد بن عمر سمعت شعيب بن طلحة من ولد أبي بكر الصديق يقول كان بلال ترب أبي بكر قال محمد بن عمر فإن كان هذا هكذا وقد توفي أبو بكر سنة ثلاث عشرة وهو بن ثلاث وستين سنة فبين هذا وبين ما روي لنا في بلال سبع سنين وشعيب بن طلحة أعلم بميلاد بلال حين يقول هو ترب أبي بكر فالله أعلم

Muhammad b. 'Umar – Musa b. Muhammad b. Ibrahim b. al-Harith al-Tamimi – his father: “Bilal died in Damascus in the year 20 AH, and was buried at the *al-Bab al-Saghir* in the cemetery of Damascus, **and he was more than sixty years old.**”

Muhammad b. 'Umar – Shu'ayb b. Talhah, from the descendants of Abu Bakr al-Siddiq, used to say: “**Bilal was an age mate of Abu Bakr.**” Muhammad b. 'Umar said, “If this was the case, and Abu Bakr had died in 13 AH at the age of sixty three, then the difference between this and what is narrated to us concerning Bilal (i.e. his date of death) is seven years. Shu'ayb b. Talhah was the most knowledgeable of the date of birth of Bilal when he used to say that he (Bilal) was an age mate of Abu Bakr. And Allah knows best.”<sup>19</sup>

He was over 60 years old when he passed away. That puts him far into the elderly category. Yet, he was the *sayyid* of 'Umar in the same way that Abu Bakr was, as the son of al-Khattab himself testified! Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) records:

حدثنا أبو عبد الله الصفار أحمد بن عبد الله ثنا أحمد بن مهران الأصبهاني ثنا

خالد بن مخلد وحدثنا أبو العباس محمد بن يعقوب ثنا بحر بن نصر ثنا عبد  
الله بن وهب قالاً : ثنا عبد العزيز بن أبي سلمة الماجشون عن محمد بن  
المنكدر عن جابر قال قال عمر : رضي الله عنه أبو بكر سيدنا وأعتق سيدنا  
يعني بلالا

Abu ‘Abd Allah al–Saffar Ahmad b. ‘Abd Allah – Ahmad b. Mahran al–Isbahani – Khalid b. Mukhlid AND  
Abu al–‘Abbas Muhammad b. Ya’qub – Bahr b. Nasr – ‘Abd Allah b. Wahb – ‘Abd al–‘Aziz b. Abi  
Salamah al–Majishun – Muhammad b. al–Munkadar – Jabir:

‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with him, said, “Abu Bakr is our *sayyid*, **and he emancipated OUR  
SAYYID, THAT IS BILAL.**”<sup>20</sup>

Al–Hakim comments:

### صحيح ولم يخرجاه

It is *sahih*, and they both (i.e. al–Bukhari and Muslim) have not recorded it.<sup>21</sup>

Imam al–Dhahabi (d. 748 H) also states:

### صحيح

*Sahih*<sup>22</sup>

Contrary to the mistake of al–Hakim, Imam al–Bukhari (d. 256 H) has actually recorded it:

حدثنا أبو نعيم حدثنا عبد العزيز بن أبي سلمة عن محمد بن المنكدر أخبرنا  
جابر بن عبد الله رضي الله عنهما قال : كان عمر يقول أبو بكر سيدنا وأعتق  
سيدنا . يعني بلالا

Abu Na’im – ‘Abd al–‘Aziz b. Abi Salamah – Muhammad b. al–Munkadar – Jabir b. ‘Abd Allah, may Allah  
be pleased with them both:

‘Umar used to say, “Abu Bakr is our *sayyid*, and he emancipated our *sayyid*, that is Bilal”.<sup>23</sup>

*Siyadah* – in the spiritual sense – in this world only reflects that of the Hereafter. For instance, our Prophet will be the *sayyid* of all humanity in the Hereafter. This, as we have shown, is why he is our *sayyid* here as well. As such, since Bilal was the *sayyid* of ‘Umar, he will *surely* also be the latter’s *sayyid* in the Hereafter. *Siyadah* in the Hereafter reflects in this world, and *siyadah* in this world is evidence of that of the Hereafter.

1. Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muasassat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 8, p. 565
2. See also Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Isma’il b. Ibrahim b. Mughirah al-Bukhari al-Ju’fi, al-Jami’ al-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Beirut: Dar Ibn Kathir; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafa Dib al-Bagha], vol. 3, p. 1341, # 3467
3. Dr. Rohi Baalbaki, al-Mawrid: A Modern Arabic-English Dictionary (Beirut: Dar al-‘Ilm li al-Malayin; 7th edition, 1995 CE), p. 653
4. Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj al-Qushayri al-Naysaburi, Sahih Muslim (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-‘Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Fuad ‘Abd al-Baqi], vol. 4, p. 1782, # 2278 (3)
5. Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu’ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 2, p. 435, # 9621
6. Ibid
7. Muhyi al-Din Abu Zakariyyah Yahya b. Sharaf al-Nawawi, Sahih Muslim bi Sharh al-Nawawi (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-‘Arabi; 1407 H), vol. 15, pp. 37–38
8. Abu al-‘Ala Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahman b. ‘Abd al-Rahim al-Mubarakfuri, Tuhfat al-Ahwazi bi Sharh Jami’ al-Tirmidhi (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1410 H), vol. 10, p. 59
9. Abu ‘Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqihah wa Fawaidihah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma’arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 2, p. 468, # 824
10. Ibid
11. Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu’ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 5, p. 243, # 22159
12. Ibid
13. Abu ‘Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Sahih al-Jami’ al-Saghir wa Ziyadatuhu (Al-Maktab al-Islami), vol. 2, p. 1341, # 3158 (8072)
14. Ibid
15. Abu ‘Isa Muhammad b. ‘Isa al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi, al-Jami’ al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-‘Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 4, p. 679, # 2539
16. Ibid
17. Ibid
18. Abu al-‘Ala Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahman b. ‘Abd al-Rahim al-Mubarakfuri, Tuhfat al-Ahwazi bi Sharh Jami’ al-Tirmidhi (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1410 H), vol. 10, p. 103
19. Muhammad b. Sa’d, al-Tabaqat al-Kubra (Beirut: Dar al-Sadir), vol. 3, p. 238
20. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, al-Mustadrak ‘ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa ‘Abd al-Qadir ‘Ata], vol. 3, p. 320, # 5239
21. Ibid
22. Ibid
23. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Isma’il b. Ibrahim b. Mughirah al-Bukhari al-Ju’fi, al-Jami’ al-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Beirut: Dar Ibn Kathir; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafa Dib al-Bagha], vol. 3, p. 1371, # 3544

‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) records this *hadith* in his *al-Dha’ifah*:

يا علي! أنت سيد في الدنيا، سيد في الآخرة، حبيبك حبيبي، وحبيبي حبيب الله،  
وعدوك عدوي، وعدوي عدو الله، والويل لمن أبغضك بعدي

**O ‘Ali! You are a *sayyid* in this world and a *sayyid* in the Hereafter.** Your lover is my lover, and my lover is the lover of Allah. Your enemy is my enemy, and my enemy is the enemy of Allah. Woe unto anyone who hates you after my death. 1

In his *takhrij* of the report, our ‘Allamah states:

أخرجه ابن عدي (2 /308) ، والحاكم (3 /127-128) ، والخطيب (4 /42-41) ، وابن عساكر (12 /134-2 /135-1) من طرق عن أبي الأزهر أحمد بن الأزهر: أخبرنا عبد الرزاق: أنبأ معمر عن الزهري عن عبيد الله بن عبد الله عن ابن عباس رضي الله عنهما قال: نظر النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - إلى علي فقال ... فذكره.

وقال الحاكم: "صحيح على شرط الشيخين، وأبو الأزهر - بإجماعهم - ثقة، وإذا انفرد الثقة بحديث؛ فهو على أصلهم صحيح!!"

وتعقبه الذهبي بقوله: "قلت: هذا وإن كان رواه ثقات؛ فهو منكر، ليس ببعيد من الوضع؛ وإلا لأي شيء حدث به عبد الرزاق سراً، ولم يجسر أن يتفوه به لأحمد وابن معين والخلق الذين رحلوا إليه، وأبو الأزهر ثقة".

Ibn ‘Adi (2/308), al-Hakim (3/127-128), al-Khatib (4/41-42) and Ibn Asakir (12/134/135-2/1) through many routes from Abu al-Azhar Ahmad b. al-Azhar - ‘Abd al-Razzaq - Ma’mar - al-Zuhri - ‘Ubayd Allah b. ‘Abd Allah - Ibn ‘Abbas, may Allah be pleased with them both:

The Prophet, peace be upon him, looked at ‘Ali and said, "...” Then he mentioned it (i.e. the *hadith* as quoted above).

Al-Hakim says: “It is **sahih** upon the standard of the two Shaykhs, and Abu al-Azhar – based upon their (i.e. the scholars’) consensus – is *thiqah* (trustworthy). When a trustworthy narrator narrates a *hadith* without corroboration, it is (nonetheless) *sahih* based upon their (i.e. the scholars’) principle”!!

Al-Dhahabi responded to him by saying: “I say: **Although its narrators are trustworthy**, this (*hadith*) is *munkar* (repugnant). (In fact), it is not far from being a fabrication. Otherwise, why did ‘Abd al-Razzaq narrate it secretly, and did not have the courage to transmit it to Ahmad, Ibn Ma’in and the other people who travelled to him. And Abu al-Azhar was trustworthy.”<sup>2</sup>

Both Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) and Imam al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) agree that all its narrators are trustworthy. However, while the former grades the *hadith* as *sahih*, al-Dhahabi nonetheless rejects it, questioning why Imam ‘Abd al-Razzaq (d. 211 H) had narrated it only secretly. As such, his sole reason for throwing out the noble *hadith* is nothing but the secrecy of its transmission. Of course, that is not a valid ground in the Sunni *hadith* sciences.

What is ‘Allamah al-Albani’s own verdict on the *hadith*? This is it, in one simple word:

## موضوع

*Mawdu’* (fabricated)<sup>3</sup>

But, on what basis is this? Our ‘Allamah has no objection to al-Dhahabi’s claim that all its narrators are trustworthy. So, what is the problem? He outlines his reasons:

قلت: فانحصرت العلة في عبد الرزاق نفسه، أو في معمر، وكلاهما ثقة محتج  
بهما في "الصحيحين"

I (al-Albani) say: **So, the fault (in the *hadith*) is LIMITED to ‘Abd al-Razzaq himself, or to Ma’mar, and both of them are relied upon as *hujjah* in the two *Sahihs*.**<sup>4</sup>

In other words, all the narrators are *truly* trustworthy, as declared by Imam al-Dhahabi. Moreover, the alleged defect in the *hadith* is traceable *only* to its narrators, specifically to either ‘Abd al-Razzaq or Ma’mar. Yet, both are “trustworthy” narrators of *Sahih al-Bukhari* and *Sahih Muslim*! There is absolutely no other issue with the *sanad* or *matn* (content) of the *riwayah*. Here, the plot thickens significantly.

So, what exactly is al-Albani’s point against Ma’mar? Let us hear him out:

أما بالنسبة لمعمر؛ فقد بين وجه العلة فيه: أبو حامد الشرقي؛ فقد روى الخطيب بسند صحيح عنه: أنه سئل عن حديث أبي الأزهر هذا؛ فقال: "هذا حديث باطل، والسبب فيه: أن معمرًا كان له ابن أخ رافضي، وكان معمر يمكنه من كتبه، فأدخل عليه هذا الحديث، وكان معمر رجلاً مهيباً لا يقدر عليه أحد في السؤال والمراجعة، فسمعه عبد الرزاق في كتاب ابن أخي معمر!".

قلت: فهذا – إن صح – علة واضحة في أحاديث معمر في فضائل أهل البيت، ولكنني في شك من صحة ذلك؛ لأنني لم أر من ذكره في ترجمة معمر؛ كالذهبي والعسقلاني وغيرهما. والله أعلم.

With regards to Ma'mar, Abu Hamid al-Sharqi has explained the reason for the fault with him. Al-Khatib has narrated with a *sahih* chain from him that he was asked about this *hadith* of Abu al-Azhar. So, he said, "This *hadith* is nonsense, and the reason is this: Ma'mar had a nephew who was a Rafidhi, and Ma'mar gave him control of his books. So, he (the Rafidhi nephew) included this *hadith*, attributing it to him (i.e. Ma'mar). Meanwhile, Ma'mar was an awe-inspiring man. None could criticize him. So, 'Abd al-Razzaq heard from the book of Ma'mar's nephew!"

I (al-Albani) say: This – if authentic – is a clear defect in the *ahadith* of Ma'mar concerning the merits of the Ahl al-Bayt. However, **I am in doubt concerning the authenticity of that**, because I saw no one – like al-Dhahabi, al-'Asqalani or others – who mentioned it in the biography of Ma'mar. And Allah knows best.<sup>5</sup>

Everything here revolves around whether al-Sharqi was telling the truth or not. 'Allamah al-Albani himself doubts the reliability of al-Sharqi's story. Yet, this same 'Allamah has rejected *Hadith al-Siyadah* on the strength of this suspicious tale! 'Allamah al-Maghribi – a well-known contemporary Sunni *muhadith* – was understandably very angry while responding to this blameworthy action of 'Allamah al-Albani on the *hadith*:

قلت: هذا كلام باطل جدا، وبيان ذلك: أن ابن أخي معمر، شخص وهمي لا وجود له، ولا يعرف أخ لمعمر. وكيف يوجد ابن بدون أب غير عيسى عليه السلام؟

I say: This is complete nonsense! The reason for this is: **That nephew of Ma'mar was only an**

**imaginary figure. He never existed!** Ma'mar was not known to have any brother. How could a son exist without a father, apart from 'Isa, peace be upon him?<sup>6</sup>

Why has 'Allamah al-Albani stooped so low as to rely upon such kind of evidence in undermining an authentically transmitted *hadith*? Well, he also mentions 'Abd al-Razzaq as a possible defect. Therefore, what has he got against him? Our 'Allamah launches his further attack:

وأما بالنسبة لعبد الرزاق؛ فأعلاله أقرب؛ لأنه وإن كان ثقة؛ فقد تكلموا في تحديته من حفظه دون كتابه؛ فقال البخاري: "ما حدث به من كتابه فهو أصح". وقال الدارقطني: "ثقة، لكنه يخطيء على معمر في أحاديث". وقال ابن حبان: "كان ممن يخطيء إذا حدث من حفظه؛ على تشيع فيه". وقال ابن عدي في آخر ترجمته: "ولم يروا بحديثه بأساً؛ إلا أنهم نسبوه إلى التشيع، وقد روى أحاديث في الفضائل مما لا يوافقه عليه أحد من الثقات، فهذا أعظم ما رموه به، وأما في باب الصدق؛ فإني أرجو أنه لا بأس به؛ إلا أنه قد سبق منه أحاديث في فضائل أهل البيت ومثالب آخرين؛ مناكير".

As for 'Abd al-Razzaq, his own fault is more likely. This is because even though he was trustworthy, he has been criticized in his *ahadith* from his memory, other than from his book. Al-Bukhari said, **"Whatever he narrated from his book is MORE *sahih*."** Al-Daraqutni said, "*Thiqah* (trustworthy), but he made mistakes in *ahadith* from Ma'mar." Ibn Hibban said, "He used to make mistakes when he narrated from his memory, plus (there was) Shi'ism in him." Ibn 'Adi said at the end of his biography of him, **"I do not see any problem with his *hadith*, except that they have linked him with Shi'ism.** He narrated *ahadith* about the merits (of the Ahl al-Bayt) which were not narrated by any other trustworthy narrator. This is the worst of the accusations against him. As for the issue of truthfulness, I hope there is no problem with him, except that he had narrated *munkar* (repugnant) *ahadith* on the merits of the Ahl al-Bayt and in criticism of others."<sup>7</sup>

There are two allegations above:

1. 'Abd al-Razzaq used to make mistakes when he narrated from memory.
2. Specifically, he also used to make mistakes in *ahadith* from Ma'mar.

It is noteworthy that *ahadith* of 'Abd al-Razzaq from his memory are *sahih*, according to Imam al-Bukhari (d. 256 H). However, his reports from his books are "more *sahih*". If his *ahadith* from memory had been *dha'if*, al-Bukhari would never have added "more" to his declaration. The worst that one could deduce from this is that 'Abd al-Razzaq made slight mistakes, which were neither serious nor many, and

which did not change the original meanings of his narrations.

Al-Bukhari, of course, has not accused him of making “serious” or “a lot of” mistakes – terms which are normally employed to indicate worrisome memory degeneration. Imam Ibn ‘Adi (d. 365 H) even disputes al-Bukhari’s claim entirely. In the former’s view, ‘Abd al-Razzaq *never* made any mistakes, in any of his *ahadith*, whether from memory or otherwise. However, some of his *ahadith* – in terms of their messages – did not sit well with mainstream Sunni beliefs. As such, Sunni *‘ulama* graded them as *manakir* (repugnant narrations).

As for the submission that he made mistakes in his reports from Ma’mar, the *muhadithun* of the Ahl al-Sunnah do not give any independent weight to it. As such, even if the opinion of Imam Ibn ‘Adi were disregarded, other conditions must still be fulfilled before that point could become valid. For instance, Imam Muslim (d. 261 H) has relied upon reports of ‘Abd al-Razzaq from Ma’mar from al-Zuhri in his *Sahih*<sup>8</sup>. Imam Ahmad (d. 241 H) has equally narrated through a similar chain:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا عبد الرزاق ثنا معمر عن الزهري عن عروة بن  
الزبير عن المسور بن مخرمة

‘Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – ‘**Abd al-Razzaq – Ma’mar – al-Zuhri – ‘Urwah**  
b. al-Zubayr – al-Musawwar b. Mukhramah<sup>9</sup>

Shaykh al-Arnaut has a clear verdict on the chain:

إسناده صحيح على شرط الشيخين

Its chain is *sahih* upon the standard of the two Shaykhs.<sup>10</sup>

Even more interesting is that ‘Allamah al-Albani himself has the same opinion. This is what he writes in his *Sahih Abi Dawud*:

إسناده: حدثنا الحسن بن علي: ثنا عبد الرزاق: ثنا معمر عن الزهري عن ابن  
المسيب وأبي سلمة عن عبد الله بن عمرو بن العاص.

قلت: وهذا إسناده صحيح على شرط الشيخين

Its chain: al-Hasan b. 'Ali – **'Abd al-Razzaq – Ma'mar – al-Zuhri** – Ibn al-Musayyab and Abu Salamah – 'Abd Allah b. 'Amr b. al-'As:

I (al-Albani) say: **This chain is *sahih*** upon the standard of the two Shaykhs.11

Meanwhile, there is an extremely crucial point which *must* be taken into notice concerning 'Abd al-Razzaq's alleged mistakes in *ahadith* generally. Imam al-Dhahabi records:

أبو زرعة الدمشقي، أخبرنا أحمد، قال: أتينا عبد الرزاق قبل المئتين، وهو صحيح البصر، ومن سمع منه بعدما ذهب بصره، فهو ضعيف السماع

Abu Zur'ah al-Dimashqi – Ahmad: “We went to 'Abd al-Razzaq before the year 200 H, and his eye-sight was still good. **Whoever heard from him after he lost his eye-sight, then what he heard is *dha'if*.**”<sup>12</sup>

Al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) also states:

عبد الرزاق بن همام بن نافع الحميري مولاهم أبو بكر الصنعاني ثقة حافظ مصنف شهير عمي في آخر عمره فتغير وكان يتشيع

'Abd al-Razzaq b. Hammam b. Nafi' al-Humayri, their freed slave, Abu Bakr al-San'ani: ***Thiqah* (trustworthy), *hafiz* (a *hadith* scientist), a well-known author. He became blind at the end of his lifetime, and thereby his memory deteriorated.** He was a Shi'i.<sup>13</sup>

In simple terms, 'Abd al-Razzaq had a sound memory *before* his blindness. This puts everything into its proper context. All the alleged mistakes of 'Abd al-Razzaq – whether from Ma'mar or others – occurred only during the last part of his lifetime, *after* he had gone blind. Therefore, whatever *ahadith* he transmitted *before* that period is *sahih*, with no defects at all.

There seems to be irreconcilable contradictions among the Sunni *muhadithun* on the gravity of 'Abd al-Razzaq's alleged mistakes *after* his blindness and subsequent memory issues. Imam Ibn 'Adi does not agree anyway that his memory problem affected his narrations at all. By contrast, al-Bukhari alleges that it affected his *ahadith*, even though his resultant mistakes were only very slight and inconsequential. Imam Ahmad, at the other end, argues that 'Abd al-Razzaq's mistakes *after* his blindness were actually serious. Yet, even if we took Ahmad's view as the most correct, *Hadith al-Siyadah* still scales through!

The question to ask is: did Abu al-Azhar hear *Hadith al-Siyadah* from him before his blindness or not?

Imam al-Dhahabi copies this game-changing report, which is specifically about the *hadith*:

قال مكّي بن عبدان: حدثنا أبو الأزهر، قال: خرج عبد الرزاق إلى قريته، فبكرت إليه يوماً، حتى خشيت على نفسي من البكور، فوصلت إليه قبل أن يخرج لصلاة الصبح، فلما خرج، رأيته، فأعجبه، فلما فرغ من الصلاة، دعاني، وقرأ علي هذا الحديث، وخصني به دون أصحابي.

Makki b. ‘Abdan said: Abu al-Azhar narrated to us:

‘Abd al-Razzaq went to his town. So, I went early to him one day, until I feared for myself due to the earliness. I therefore reached him before he went out for *Salat al-Subh*. When he came out, **he SAW me**, and he was surprised. After finishing the *Salat*, he called him, **and READ this *hadith* to me**, and transmitted it to me only without my companions. 14

Concerning Makki – the sub-narrator, al-Dhahabi states:

مكي بن عبدان ابن محمد بن بكر بن مسلم، المحدث الثقة، المتقن، أبو حاتم التميمي النيسابوري.

Makki b. ‘Abdan b. Muhammad b. Bakr b. Muslim: the *muhadith* (*hadith* scientist), **the *thiqah*** (**trustworthy**) *hadith* scientist, the extremely precise narrator, Abu Hatim al-Tamimi al-Naysaburi. 15

This basically seals everything! First, Abu al-Azhar got the *hadith* from ‘Abd al-Razzaq *before* the latter’s blindness, when his memory was still sharp and sound. Therefore, he was blessed with it at a time when ‘Abd al-Razzaq was not making mistakes in his reports, either from Ma’mar or anyone else.

Second, ‘Abd al-Razzaq did NOT narrate to Abu al-Azhar from memory. He actually “read” the *hadith* to the latter, obviously from a script! It might be argued that he must have “read” it from memory, since no book or any other written source was mentioned. Even then, this was *before* ‘Abd al-Razzaq’s blindness and memory problems. As such, all criticisms of the *hadith* – on account of his memory – fall and fail completely.

1. Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, *Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Dha’ifah wa al-Mawdu’ah wa Athariyah al-Sayyiah fi al-Ummah* (Riyadh: Dar al-Ma’arif; 1st edition, 1412 H), vol. 10, p. 522, # 4894

2. Ibid

3. Ibid

4. Ibid, vol. 10, p. 523, # 4894

5. Ibid, vol. 10, p. 524, # 4894
6. Abu al-Fadhl 'Abd Allah b. al-Siddiq al-Maghribi, al-Qawl al-Muqni' fi Radd 'ala al-Albani al-Mubtadi', p. 8
7. Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Dha'ifah wa al-Mawdu'ah wa Athariyah al-Sayyiah fi al-Ummah (Riyadh: Dar al-Ma'arif; 1st edition, 1412 H), vol. 10, p. 524, # 4894
8. See, for instance, Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj al-Qushayri al-Naysaburi, Sahih Muslim (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Fuad 'Abd al-Baqi], vol. 3, p. 1648, # 2078 (31)
9. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 4, p. 327, # 18936
10. Ibid
11. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Sahih Abi Dawud (Kuwait: Muasassat al-Gharas li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1423 H), vol. 7, p. 188, # 2098
12. Shams al-Din Muhammad b. Ahmad b. 'Uthman al-Dhahabi, Siyar A'lam al-Nubala (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risalah; 9th edition, 1413 H) [annotators of the ninth volume: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut and Kamil al-Khurat], vol. 9, p. 565, # 220
13. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 1, p. 599, # 4078
14. Shams al-Din Muhammad b. Ahmad b. 'Uthman al-Dhahabi, Siyar A'lam al-Nubala (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risalah; 9th edition, 1413 H) [annotators of the ninth volume: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut and Kamil al-Khurat], vol. 9, p. 576, # 220
15. Shams al-Din Muhammad b. Ahmad b. 'Uthman al-Dhahabi, Siyar A'lam al-Nubala (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risalah; 9th edition, 1413 H) [annotators of the fifteenth volume: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut and Ibraaheem al-Zaybaq], vol. 15, p. 70, # 38

The Messenger of Allah, *sallallahu 'alaihi wa alihi*, identified Amir al-Muminin, *'alaihi al-salam*, as a *sayyid* in both this world and the next. This, without doubt, falls within the spiritual context. Of particular interest therefore is that the Prophet had described him as a *sayyid* in absolute terms. As such, he is superior – in the Sight of Allah – to all mankind, except whoever has been excluded through other irrefutable proofs. The Messenger stated the same thing about al-Hasan, *'alaihi al-salam*, the first son of 'Ali. Imam Ahmad (d. 241 H) records:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا سفيان عن أبي موسى ويقال له إسرائيل قال  
سمعت الحسن قال سمعت أبا بكره وقال سفيان مرة عن أبي بكره رأيت رسول  
الله صلى الله عليه وسلم على المنبر وحسن عليه السلام معه وهو يقبل على  
الناس مرة وعليه مرة ويقول أن ابني هذا سيد

'Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Sufyan – Abu Musa, also called Israil – al-Hasan – Abu Bakrah; and Sufyan also narrated directly from Abu Bakrah at another time:

I saw the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, upon the pulpit, and Hasan, *'alaihi salam*, was with him. He was turning to the people at one time and turning to him (i.e. al-Hasan) at another, and he was saying: **“Verily, this son of mine is a *sayyid*.”**<sup>1</sup>

Shaykh al-Arnaut comments:

## إسناده صحيح على شرط البخاري

Its chain is *sahih* upon the standard of al-Bukhari.<sup>2</sup>

Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 H) also states about the same *hadith*:

هذا حديث حسن صحيح

This *hadith* is *hasan sahih*.<sup>3</sup>

And ‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) agrees:

صحيح

*Sahih*<sup>4</sup>

In another report, our Prophet explains what this means. ‘Allamah al-Albani copies this *hadith*:

ابناتي هذان: الحسن والحسين: سيّدا شباب أهل الجنة وأبوهما خير منهما

These two sons of mine, al-Hasan and al-Husayn, are the two *sayyids* of the youth of the people of Paradise, **and their father is better than them both**.<sup>5</sup>

The ‘Allamah comments:

صحيح

*Sahih*<sup>6</sup>

Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) also documents a similar report:

حدثنا أبو سعيد عمرو بن محمد بن منصور العدل ثنا السري بن خزيمة ثنا

عثمان بن سعيد المري ثنا علي بن صالح عن عاصم عن زر عن عبد الله رضي  
الله عنه قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الحسن والحسين سيّدا شباب  
أهل الجنة وأبوهما خير منهما

Abu Sa'id 'Amr b. Muhammad b. Mansur al-'Adl – al-Sirri b. Khuzaymah – 'Uthman b. Sa'id al-Mirri –  
'Ali b. Salih – 'Asim – Zirr – 'Abd Allah, may Allah be pleased with him:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: "Al-Hasan and al-Husayn are the two *sayyids* of the youth of the people of Paradise, **and their father is better than them both.**"<sup>7</sup>

Al-Hakim states:

هذا حديث صحيح بهذه الزيادة

This *hadith* is *sahih* with this *ziyadah*.<sup>8</sup>

And Imam al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) concurs:

صحيح

*Sahih*<sup>9</sup>

In other words, both al-Hasan and al-Husayn, *'alaihima al-salam*, are superior in the Sight of Allah to *anyone* who will be a youth in Paradise. Of course, everyone in Paradise will be young. Imam al-Darimi (d. 255 H) records:

أخبرنا محمد بن يزيد الرفاعي ثنا معاذ يعني بن هشام عن أبيه عن عامر الأحول  
عن شهر بن حوشب عن أبي هريرة عن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم قال أهل  
الجنة شباب جرد مرد كحل لا تبلى ثيابهم ولا يفنى شبابهم

Muhammad b. Yazid al-Rufa'i – Mu'adh b. Hisham – his father – 'Amir al-Ahwal – Shahr b. Hawshab –  
Abu Hurayrah:

The Prophet, peace be upon him, said: "The people of Paradise will be hairless, beardless youth,

with their eyes anointed with kohl. Their cloths will never become worn **and their youth will never end.**"<sup>10</sup>

Shaykh Dr. Asad comments:

## إسناده حسن

Its chain is *hasan*.<sup>11</sup>

So, Imam al-Hasan and Imam al-Husayn are the best of all the people of Paradise, from Adam till the last human being to die. The only exceptions are the Prophet himself – being the *sayyid* of mankind – and Amir al-Muminin, who has been explicitly excluded. The direct implication of this is that Imam ‘Ali is the *sayyid* of all inhabitants of Paradise with the sole exception of the Messenger of Allah. Expectedly, the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama’ah are troubled by the possibility of ‘Ali, al-Hasan or al-Husayn being superior to either Abu Bakr or ‘Umar. Its implication is severe on the legitimacy of the Sunni *khilafah* system. Imam al-Mubarakfuri (d. 1282 H) therefore posits the various Sunni diversions of the *hadith*:

قوله الحسن والحسين سيذا شباب أهل الجنة ... قال المظهر يعني هما أفضل من مات شابا في سبيل الله من أصحاب الجنة ولم يرد به سن الشباب لأنهما ماتا وقد كهلا ... أو أنهما سيذا أهل الجنة سوى الأنبياء والخلفاء الراشدين وذلك لأن أهل الجنة كلهم في سن واحد وهو الشباب وليس فيهم شيخ ولا كهل قال الطيبي ويمكن أن يراد هما الان سيذا شباب من هم من أهل الجنة من شبان هذا الزمان

His statement “al-Hasan and al-Husayn are the two *sayyids* of the youth of the people of Paradise” ... Al-Muzaffar said: “It means that both of them are the best and most superior of whoever died young on the Path of Allah among the inhabitants of Paradise. He (the Prophet) did not intend by it the age of youth, because both of them died at elderly ages ... Or both of them are *sayyids* of the people of Paradise except the prophets and the *khulafa al-rashidin*. And this is because the people of Paradise will all be of the same age, and that is youth, and there will not be any old or elderly person among them.”

Al-Tayyibi said, “It is possible the intended meaning is that both of them (i.e. al-Hasan and al-Husayn) were at that moment *sayyids* of those youth who were from the people of Paradise from that era.”<sup>12</sup>

All these acrobatics are obviously aimed at propping up Abu Bakr and ‘Umar. Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah

explains why:

فقال بل نبايعك أنت فأنت سيدنا وخيرنا وأحبنا إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ليبين بذلك أن المأمور به تولية الأفضل وأنت أفضلنا فنبايعك

So, he ('Umar) said, “**Rather, we will follow you because you are our *sayyid*...** He wanted to make clear through it that: **What is ORDAINED is to give authority to the best**, and you are the best of us. So, we will follow you.13

In simpler words, if it were confirmed that both al-Hasan and al-Husayn were superior to Abu Bakr, then the latter's *khilafah* would be illegitimate! It was, and is always, *obligatory* in the religion of Muhammad to give authority and leadership to the best *only*. The direct implication of this is that *khilafah* was the exclusive right of Amir al-Muminin, after the Messenger of Allah. After all, he was, and still is, the *sayyid* of all Muslims after their Prophet.

Meanwhile, do the Sunni acrobatics really help their cause? There is a Sunni-only version of the *riwayah*, which puts a complete end to the debate. 'Allamah al-Albani copies this *hadith*:

الحسن والحسين سيذا شباب أهل الجنة إلا ابني الخالة عيسى بن مريم ويحيى بن زكريا وفاطمة سيذا نساء أهل الجنة إلا ما كان من مريم بنت عمران

Al-Hasan and al-Husayn are the two *sayyids* of the people of Paradise, **except the two maternal cousins: 'Isa b. Maryam and Yahya b. Zakariyah**. And Fatimah is the *sayyidah* of the women of the people of Paradise except Maryam bint 'Imran.14

The 'Allamah says:

صحيح

*Sahih*15

So, after the Messenger of Allah and Amir al-Muminin, the only other creatures who will not be under the superiority of al-Hasan and al-Husayn in Paradise are Prophet 'Isa, '*alaihi al-salam*, and Prophet Yahya, '*alaihi al-salam*. Now, how exactly can our Sunni brothers explain away this one to save their first two *khalifahs*?

1. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muassasat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 5, p. 37, # 20408
2. Ibid
3. Abu 'Isa Muhammad b. 'Isa al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi, al-Jami' al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 5, p. 658, # 3773
4. Ibid
5. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Sahih al-Jami' al-Saghir wa Ziyadatuhu (Al-Maktab al-Islami), vol. 1, p. 70, # 47
6. Ibid
7. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 3, p. 182, # 4779
8. Ibid
9. Ibid
10. Abu Muhammad 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Rahman al-Darimi, Sunan (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-'Arabi; 1st edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Husayn Salim Asad], vol. 2, p. 431, # 2826
11. Ibid
12. Abu al-'Ala Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman b. 'Abd al-Rahim al-Mubarakfuri, Tuhfat al-Ahwazi bi Sharh Jami' al-Tirmidhi (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1410 H), vol. 10, p. 186
13. Abu al-'Abbas Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 8, p. 565
14. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Sahih al-Jami' al-Saghir wa Ziyadatuhu (Al-Maktab al-Islami), vol. 1, p. 607, # 3181
15. Ibid

Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) states:

وكذلك قوله وسد الأبواب كلها إلا باب علي فإن هذا مما وضعته الشيعة على طريق المقابلة فإن الذي في الصحيح عن أبي سعيد عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أنه قال في مرضه الذي مات فيه إن أمن الناس علي في ماله وصحبته أبو بكر ولو كنت متخذا خليلا غير ربي لاتخذت أبا بكر خليلا ولكن أخوة الإسلام ومودته لا يبقين في المسجد خوذة إلا سدت إلا خوذة أبي بكر

And likewise, **his statement “and close all doors except the door of ‘Ali”, verily, this is part of what was fabricated by the Shi’ah** in order to oppose. This is because that which is recorded in the *Sahih* from Abu Sa’id from the Prophet, peace be upon him, is that he said during his fatal illness: **“The one among mankind who has conferred upon me the most FAVOURS with his money and his company is Abu Bakr.** If I were to choose a friend (*khalil*) other than my Lord, I would have chosen Abu Bakr as a friend (*khalil*). However, the Islamic brotherhood and his kindness (are enough). **Close all the wickets in the mosque except the wicket of Abu Bakr.”** 1

There are a number of quick points from the above:

1. There are two irreconcilably contradictory reports – one of them in favour of ‘Ali, ‘*alaihi al-salam*, and the other in favour of Abu Bakr.
2. Both *hadiths* have the same contents.
3. Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah thinks that the Shi’ah fabricated the report in favour of ‘Ali in order to oppose that in favour of Abu Bakr.

The *hadith* in favour of Abu Bakr, which our dear Shaykh has quoted, however has some fatal problems. For instance, Imam Muslim (d. 261 H) records that the Prophet, *sallallahu ‘alaihi wa alihi*, had said:

لا تبقيين في المسجد خوذة إلا خوذة أبي بكر

No WICKET shall remain in the mosque except the WICKET of Abu Bakr.2

This calls for the *destruction or removal* – and not closure – of all wickets in the mosque. Meanwhile, it directly contradicts another “sahih” version quoted by our Shaykh:

لا يبقين في المسجد خوذة إلا سدت إلا خوذة أبي بكر

Close all the WICKETS in the mosque except the WICKET of Abu Bakr.

Imam Ahmad (d. 241 H) also documents that the Messenger of Allah had said:

ان أمن الناس على في صحبته وماله أبو بكر ولو كنت متخذا من الناس خليلا  
غير ربي لاتخذت أبا بكر ولكن إخوة الإسلام أو مودته لا يبقى باب في المسجد  
الا سد الا باب أبي بكر

The one among mankind who has conferred upon me the most FAVOURS with his company and his money is Abu Bakr. If I were to choose from mankind a friend (*khalil*) other than my Lord, I would have chosen Abu Bakr as a friend (*khalil*). However, the Islamic brotherhood or his kindness is enough. Close all the DOORS in the mosque except the DOOR of Abu Bakr.3

Shaykh al-Arnaut comments:

## صحيح وهذا إسناده حسن

It is *sahih*, and this chain is *hasan*.4

Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 H) seals it:

حدثنا محمد بن حميد حدثنا إبراهيم بن المختار عن إسحق بن راشد عن  
الزهري عن عروة عن عائشة أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أمر بسد الأبواب  
إلا باب أبي بكر

Muhammad b. Hamid – Ibrahim b. al-Mukhtar – Ishaq b. Rashid – al-Zuhri – ‘Urwah – ‘Aishah:

The Prophet, peace be upon him, ordered the closure of the doors except the DOOR of Abu Bakr.5

‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) says:

## صحيح

*Sahih*6

Of course, a “wicket” is an entirely *different* thing from a “door”! So, what exactly did the Prophet mention? Was it a wicket or a door? Moreover, what instruction did he give exactly? Destruction or removal of wickets? Closure of wickets? Or, closure of doors? These are *fundamental* inconsistencies in these reports of the same *hadith*, and this only suggests that they were mere “rushed” polemical arts.

Worse still, the *hadith* assumes that people used to do “favours” to the Messenger of Allah with their company and their wealth. But, what is a favour? It is an act of kindness that is performed *beyond* what is due or normal, to which the beneficiary is NOT entitled at all *by right*. If the beneficiary is entitled to it by right, then it is no longer a “favour”. So, if we accepted the *hadith* cited by our Shaykh, we must conclude that the Prophet had *no* right to the company of his Sahabah! Rather, they only kept him company out of their magnanimity to him. As such, it was something he should be thanking them all for, especially Abu Bakr who supposedly did the most “favours” in this regard! The Qur’an, however, has directly refuted all that:

يمنون عليك أن أسلموا قل لا تمنوا علي إسلامكم بل الله يمن عليكم أن هداكم

## للإيمان إن كنتم صادقين

They regard as a favour upon you (O Muhammad) that they have embraced Islam. Say: “**Count NOT your Islam as a favour upon me. Rather, Allah has conferred a favour upon you**, that He has guided you to the Faith, if you are truthful”.<sup>7</sup>

So, the Islam of Abu Bakr – the *obligations* of which [if genuine] would certainly have included his spendings in the Way of Allah and his companionship – was *never* a favour upon the Messenger of Allah! By contrast, it was the Prophet who had done favour to him by giving him guidance and his own blessed company. This is further indicated in this verse:

لقد من الله على المؤمنين إذ بعث فيهم رسولا من أنفسهم يتلو عليهم آياته  
ويزكيهم ويعلمهم الكتاب والحكمة وإن كانوا من قبل لفي ضلال مبين

**Indeed, Allah has conferred a favour upon the believers when He sent among them a Messenger from among themselves**, reciting unto them His Verses, and purifying them, and teaching them the Book and wisdom, while before that they had been in manifest misguidance.<sup>8</sup>

Therefore, there is no doubt about it. The Prophet of Allah was the one doing the favour, on behalf of Him, to Abu Bakr and the other Sahabah. It was *never* the other way round. No Muslim ever did a single favour to the Messenger. The Qur’an is very explicit about this.

Honestly, it is also a grave insult to the office of *nubuwwah* to suggest that Abu Bakr was doing a “favour” to the Prophet by keeping him company! There is even an element of blasphemy in it. If Abu Bakr was the one conferring a “favour” upon the Prophet – and not the other way round – through his company, does this not suppose that the former was the *superior* party? The “favour” of companionship is conferred only by masters. Subordinates *serve* their superiors through their companionship, while friends exercise it as a *duty* of their bond, and never as a “favour”.

The third fatal problem with the report of Abu Sa’id – which is far more serious – is that it presupposes that the Prophet did not have any *khalil* (friend) among his followers – not even a single one! That indeed is extremely weird! A *khalil* is a friend or companion *whom you love and who loves you!* So, the Messenger of Allah did not have a single friend or companion among the Muslims whom he loved, and who loved him?! Is that not a *very* reckless submission?

The truth however is that all pious people are *akhillah* (plural of *khalil*) of one another. Each loves all the others, and is loved by them. Allah says:

## الأخلاء يومئذ بعضهم لبعض عدو إلا المتقين

Friends (*akhilla*, plural of *khalil*) on that Day will be foes one to another, **except the pious**.<sup>9</sup>

Al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir (d. 774 H) comments:

وقوله: {الأخلاء يومئذ بعضهم لبعض عدو إلا المتقين} أي: كل صداقة وصحابة لغير الله فإنها تنقلب يوم القيامة عداوة إلا ما كان لله، عز وجل، فإنه دائم بدوامه.

His Statement {Friends on that Day will be foes one to another, except the pious}, means: **every friendship or companionship** that is not for the sake of Allah will turn on the Day of Resurrection into enmity, except what was for the sake of Allah the Almighty the Most Glorious, which will survive forever. <sup>10</sup>

Imam al-Baghwi (d. 516 H) also submits:

{الأخلاء} على المعصية في الدنيا، {يومئذ} يوم القيامة، {بعضهم لبعض عدو إلا المتقين} إلا المتحابين في الله عز وجل على طاعة الله عز وجل.

{Friends} upon sin in this world, {on that Day} the Day of Resurrection, {will be foes one to another, except the pious} except **those who love one another** for the sake of Allah the Almighty the Most Glorious, upon obedience to Allah the Almighty, the Most Glorious. <sup>11</sup>

Imam Abu Sa'ud (d. 951 H) further states under the verse:

{الأخلاء} المتحابون

{Friends [*akhilla*]} [means] **people who love one another**. <sup>12</sup>

So, we ask: did the Prophet not have any friend or companion who loved him and whom he loved? If he did, then such a friend or companion was his *khalil*! If there none, there could be only one possible explanation: none of the Sahabah was pious! 'Allamah al-Albani has copied a *hadith* proving such a conclusion:

إن أوثق عرى الإسلام: أن تحب في الله و تبغض في الله

Verily, **the strongest handhold of Islam is that you love for the sake of Allah** and hate for the sake of Allah. 13

The 'Allamah states:

حسن

Hasan14

Since the Messenger loved and hated only for the sake of Allah, then he certainly loved all the pious ones among his Sahabah, at the least due to this verse:

إن الله يحب المتقين

Surely, Allah loves the pious. 15

Of course, it is completely unthinkable that any Muslim could be pious without loving the Messenger of Allah! As such, we affirm that the Prophet did have *akhilla* – friends and companions who loved him for the sake of Allah and whom He too loved for His sake. There, in fact, were many of them! The most noticeable of them, of course, in the *ahadith* of the Messenger is none other than Amir al-Muminin. Imam Muslim records:

حدثنا قتيبة بن سعيد ومحمد بن عباد (وتقاربا في اللفظ) قالا حدثنا حاتم (وهو ابن إسماعيل) عن بكير بن مسمار عن عامر بن سعد بن أبي وقاص عن أبيه قال أمر معاوية بن أبي سفيان سعدا فقال ما منعك أن تسب أبا التراب؟ فقال أما ذكرت ثلاثا قالهن له رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فلن أسبه... سمعته يقول يوم خيبر لأعطين الراية رجلا يحب الله ورسوله ويحبه الله ورسوله قال فتناولنا لها فقال ادعوا لي عليا فأتى به أرمد فبصق في عينه ودفع الراية إليه ففتح الله عليه

Qutaybah b. Sa'id and Muhammad b. 'Abbad – Hatim b. Isma'il – Bukayr b. Musmar – 'Amir b. Sa'id b. Abi Waqqas – his father (Sa'd b. Abi Waqqas):

Mu'awiyah commanded Sa'd, and therefore said, "What prevented you from cursing Abu al-Turab (i.e. 'Ali)?" So, he (Sa'd) replied, "As long as I remember three things which the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said about him, I will never curse him ... I heard him saying on the Day of Khaybar, **"I will give the flag to a man who loves Allah and His Messenger, and Allah and His Messenger too love him."** So, we longed for it (i.e. the flag). **Then he said, "Call 'Ali for me"**, and he was brought to him. He was sore-eyed. He applied saliva to his eye and gave the flag to him, and Allah granted him victory."<sup>16</sup>

This leaves absolutely no questions. Amir al-Muminin was a confirmed *khalil* of both Allah and His Messenger. Interestingly, the report quoted by Ibn Taymiyyah claims that Abu Bakr was NEVER a *khalil* of the Prophet! Rather, there was only a *wish* that he was! So, that *hadith* – apart from its serious defects – actually undermines, rather than promote, the cause of Abu Bakr! It, among others, shows that there was no reciprocated love between him and the Messenger of Allah. This, in turn, casts grave doubts upon a number of claims made about Abu Bakr, especially those concerning his piety.

Perhaps, the greatest threat *against* the *hadith* about Abu Bakr is the version about 'Ali itself! Al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) writes about it at length:

منها حديث سعد بن أبي وقاص قال أمرنا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسد  
الأبواب الشارعة في المسجد وترك باب علي أخرجه أحمد والنسائي وإسناده  
قوي

وفي رواية للطبراني في الأوسط رجالها ثقات من الزيادة فقالوا يا رسول الله  
سدت أبوابنا فقال ما أنا سدتها ولكن الله سدها

وعن زيد بن أرقم قال كان لنفر من الصحابة أبواب شارعة في المسجد فقال  
رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم سدوا هذه الأبواب إلا باب علي فتكلم ناس في  
ذلك فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم اني والله ما سدت شيئا ولا فتحته  
ولكن أمرت بشئ فاتبعته أخرجه أحمد والنسائي والحاكم ورجالها ثقات

وعن ابن عباس قال أمر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بأبواب المسجد فسدت الا باب علي وفي رواية وأمر بسد الأبواب غير باب علي فكان يدخل المسجد وهو جنب ليس له طريق غيره أخرجهما أحمد والنسائي ورجالهما ثقات

وعن جابر بن سمرة قال أمرنا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسد الأبواب كلها غير باب علي فربما مر فيه وهو جنب أخرجه الطبراني

وعن ابن عمر قال كنا نقول في زمن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم خير الناس ثم أبو بكر ثم عمر ولقد أعطى علي بن أبي طالب ثلاث خصال لان يكون لي واحدة منهن أحب إلي من حمر النعم زوجه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ابنته وولدت له وسد الأبواب الا بابه في المسجد وأعطاه الراية يوم خيبر أخرجه أحمد وإسناده حسن

وأخرج النسائي من طريق العلاء بن عرار بمهمات قال فقلت لابن عمر أخبرني عن علي وعثمان فذكر الحديث وفيه وأما علي فلا تسأل عنه أحدا وانظر إلى منزلته من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قد سد أبوابنا في المسجد وأقر بابه ورجاله رجال الصحيح الا العلاء وقد وثقه يحيى بن معين وغيره

وهذه الأحاديث يقوي بعضها بعضا وكل طريق منها صالح للاحتجاج فضلا عن مجموعها

Among them is the *hadith* of **Sa'd b. Abi Waqqas**: "The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, ORDERED us to close all the doors opening into the mosque, and he left (open) the door of 'Ali." Ahmad and al-Nasai recorded it **and its chain is qawi (strong)**.

And in the report of al-Tabarani in *al-Awsat*, **whose narrators are trustworthy**, there is the addition:

“So they said, ‘O Messenger of Allah! You have closed our doors.’ He replied, ‘I have not closed it. Rather, Allah has closed it.’”

**Zayd b. Arqam** also narrated: “Some of the Sahabah had doors opening into the mosque. So, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, ‘Close all these doors except the door of ‘Ali.’ Then, some people criticized that (order). As a result, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, ‘I swear by Allah, I have not closed anything or open it. Rather, I was ordered (by Allah) to do something, and I followed it (i.e. the order).’” Ahmad, al-Nasai and al-Hakim recorded it **and its narrators are trustworthy**.

**Ibn ‘Abbas** further narrated: “The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, commanded that the doors of the mosque be closed except the door of ‘Ali.” In another report (he said): “He ordered the closure of the doors other than the door of ‘Ali. So, he used to enter the mosque after having a seminal discharge before performing his purification bath. He had no other path except it (i.e. the mosque)”. **Ahmad and Nasai recorded it and their narrators are trustworthy**.

**Jabir b. Samurah** also narrated: “The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him ordered us to close all the doors except the door of ‘Ali. So, perhaps, he would pass through it (i.e. the mosque) after having a seminal discharge before performing his purification bath.” Al-Tabarani recorded it.

**Ibn ‘Umar** narrated: “We used to say during the lifetime of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, that the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, is the best of mankind, then Abu Bakr, then ‘Umar. ‘Ali b. Abi Talib has been given three qualities, if I had just one of them, it would be more beloved to me than a red camel. The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, married his daughter to him, and she gave birth to his children. **He (the Prophet) also closed the doors in the mosque except his door**. And he gave him the flag on the Day of Khaybar.” Ahmad recorded it **and its chain is *hasan***.

And al-Nasai recorded through the route of al-‘Ala b. ‘Arar: “I said to Ibn ‘Umar: ‘Tell me about ‘Ali and ‘Uthman.’” Then he (al-Nasai) mentioned the *hadith* (as above), and added (that Ibn ‘Umar said), “As for ‘Ali, do not ask anyone about him. **Just look at his status from the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him**. He had closed our doors in the mosques and left his door open.” **Its narrators are narrators of the *Sahih* except al-‘Ala, and Yahya b. Ma’in and others have declared him *thiqah* (trustworthy)**.

These *ahadith* strengthen one another, **and each of the chains is qualified to be used as a *hujjah***, much less their combination. 17

Imam al-Tirmidhi further records:

حدثنا محمد بن حميد الرازي حدثنا إبراهيم بن المختار عن شعبة عن أبي بلج

عن عمرو بن ميمون عن ابن عباس أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم أمر  
بسد الأبواب إلا باب علي

Muhammad b. Hamid al-Razi – Ibrahim b. al-Mukhtar – Shu’bah – Abu Balj – ‘Amr b. Maymun – **Ibn ‘Abbas:**

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, ORDERED that all doors be closed **except the door of ‘Ali.** 18

And ‘Allamah al-Albani comments:

صحيح

*Sahih* 19

Imam al-Haythami (d. 807 H) also documents:

وعن عبد الله بن الرقيم الكناني قال : خرجنا إلى المدينة زمن الجمل فلقينا  
سعد بن مالك بها فقال: أمر رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بسد الأبواب  
الشارعة في المسجد وترك باب علي

Narrated ‘Abd Allah b. al-Raqim al-Kanani:

We went to Madinah during the time of (the Battle of) al-Jamal (between ‘Ali and ‘Aishah) and we met **Sa’d b. Malik** there (i.e. in Madinah), and he said, “The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, ORDERED that all the doors opening into the mosque must be closed, **and he left (open) the door of ‘Ali.**”<sup>20</sup>

Then, he says:

رواه أحمد ... وإسناد أحمد حسن

Ahmad narrated it ... **and the chain of Ahmad is *hasan*.**<sup>21</sup>

Meanwhile, ‘Allamah al-Albani has some additional comments:

قلت: ولعله يشير إلى حديث أبي بلج: حدثنا عمرو بن ميمون عن ابن عباس مرفوعا مختصرا بلفظ: "سدوا أبواب المسجد غير باب علي". قال: "فيدخل المسجد جنبا وهو طريقه، ليس له طريق غيره".

أخرجه أحمد (1/330 – 331 و 331) عن أبي عوانة، والترمذي (2/301)، والنسائي في "الخصائص" (63/42) عن شعبة عنه نحوه؛ دون دخول المسجد وقال: "حديث غريب".

قلت: وإسناده جيد، رجاله ثقات رجال الشيخين؛ غير أبي بلج – وهو الفزاري الكوفي – وهو صدوق ربما أخطأ كما في "التقريب".

وهذا القدر من الحديث صحيح له شواهد كثيرة يقطع الواقف عليها بصحته

I say: Perhaps he is referring to the *hadith* of Abu Balj – ‘Amr b. Maymun – Ibn ‘Abbas from the Prophet in a summarized manner with this wording, “**Close the doors of the mosque except the door of ‘Ali.**” He said, “So he (‘Ali) used to enter the mosque after having a seminal discharge before performing the purification bath. It (i.e. the mosque) was his pathway, and he had no other pathway except it.”

Ahmad (1/330–331 and 331) recorded it from Abu ‘Awanah, and al-Tirmidhi (2/301), and al-Nasai in *al-Khasais* (42/63) from Shu’bah from him, **without (mentioning) the entrance into the mosque** and he (al-Tirmidhi) said, “a *gharib* (strange) *hadith*.”

I say: **Its chain is jayyid (good)**. Its narrators are trustworthy, narrators of the two Shaykhs, apart from Abu Balj – and he is al-Fazari al-Kufi – and he is *saduq* (very truthful), maybe he made mistakes, as stated in *al-Taqrib*.

**This part of the *hadith* is sahih.** It has a lot of *shawahid* (witnesses), **which absolutely necessitate accepting it as sahih.**<sup>22</sup>

These reports basically cancel out those about Abu Bakr, and leave no room for reconciliation or harmonization. If we assumed – for the sake of argument – that both events *might* have occurred, then one of them must at least have preceded the other. So, which was it? The highly interesting part is that whichever of them is placed earlier cancels out the possibility of the other. Apparently baffled by the huge clash between the two *hadiths* – one in favour of Abu Bakr and the other in favour of ‘Ali – al-Hafiz makes a desperate attempt to find a middle ground:

الجمع بينهما بما دل عليه حديث أبي سعيد الخدري يعني الذي أخرجه الترمذي  
ان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال لا يحل لاحد ان يطرق هذا المسجد جنبا  
غيري وغيرك والمعنى ان باب علي كان إلى جهة المسجد ولم يكن لبيته باب  
غيره فلذلك لم يؤمر بسده ويؤيد ذلك ما أخرجه إسماعيل القاضي في احكام  
القران من طريق المطلب بن عبد الله بن حنطب ان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم  
لم يأذن لاحد ان يمر في المسجد وهو جنب الا لعلي بن أبي طالب لان بيته كان  
في المسجد

ومحصل الجمع ان الامر بسد الأبواب وقع مرتين ففي الأولى استثنى علي لما  
ذكره وفي الأخرى استثنى أبو بكر ولكن لا يتم ذلك الا بان يحمل ما في قصة  
علي على الباب الحقيقي وما في قصة أبي بكر على الباب المجازي والمراد به  
الخوخة كما صرح به في بعض طرقه وكأنهم لما أمروا بسد الأبواب سدوها  
وأحدثوا خوفا يستقربون الدخول إلى المسجد منها فأمروا بعد ذلك بسدها  
فهذه طريقة لا بأس بها في الجمع بين الحديثين

Harmonization between the two (*hadiths*) is through what is proved by the *hadith* of Abu Sa’id al-Khudri, that is the one recorded by al-Tirmidhi, that the Prophet, peace be upon him, said (to ‘Ali), “It is not permissible for anyone to pass through this mosque after having a seminal discharge before performing his purification bath except me and you (i.e. ‘Ali).” **The meaning is that the door of ‘Ali opens into the mosque and his house had no other door. This was why he was not commanded to close it.**

This is confirmed by what Isma’il al-Qadhi recorded in *Ahkam al-Qur’an* from the route of al-Mutalib b. ‘Abd Allah b. Hantab that the Prophet, peace be upon him, did not permit anyone to pass through the mosque after having a seminal discharge, before performing his purification bath, except ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, because his house was in the mosque.”

The outcome of the harmonization is that the command to close the doors occurred twice. **In the first instance, only 'Ali was exempted due to the reason mentioned. In the other instance, only Abu Bakr was exempted.** However, that will not be fully correct except by interpreting what is (mentioned) in the story of 'Ali (i.e. the door) literally, and what is (mentioned) in the story of Abu Bakr (i.e. the door) metaphorically. What is meant by it (i.e. the door in Abu Bakr's story) is his wicket, as explicitly stated through some of its chains. It is as though he (the Prophet) ordered that the doors be closed. They (the Sahabah) closed them but made wickets instead through which they entered into the mosque. Then he (the Prophet) ordered that they too be closed. There is no problem with this method of harmonizing the two *hadiths*.<sup>23</sup>

Through this submission, al-Hafiz seeks to kill three birds with a single stone:

1. Remove the inconsistencies in the *hadith* about Abu Bakr by re-interpreting "wicket" to mean "door".
2. Explain away the reason for allowing 'Ali to leave his door open.
3. Placing the story of 'Ali ahead in time before that of Abu Bakr.

However, this in fact only creates even more severe problems! Our Hafiz submits that the house of 'Ali had no other door except that in the *masjid*. Therefore, if his only door had been closed, he would have had no way of accessing his house any longer, and his family would have been caged inside it.

As such, he was excused and exempted the first time. But then, why would the Messenger of Allah have nonetheless gone ahead later to issue a new order against 'Ali to seal his sole door? After all, no evidence is led to show that Amir al-Muminin had later built a second exit from his house! Did the Prophet really intend to siege Imam 'Ali and his family in, or banish them from, their house, as al-Hafiz suggests?!

Besides, the Sunni narrative of the two incidents do not place their Sahabah in a good light. Al-Hafiz states:

والمراد به الخوخة كما صرح به في بعض طرقه وكأنهم لما أمروا بسد الأبواب  
سدوها وأحدثوا خوفا يستقربون الدخول إلى المسجد منها فأمروا بعد ذلك  
بسدها فهذه طريقة لا بأس بها في الجمع بين الحديثين

What is meant by it (i.e. the door in Abu Bakr's story) is his wicket, as explicitly stated through some of its chains. It is as though he (the Prophet) ordered that the doors be closed. They (the Sahabah) closed them but made wickets instead through which they entered into the mosque. Then he (the Prophet) ordered that they too be closed. There is no problem with this method of harmonizing the two *hadiths*.

Simply put, the Messenger *ordered* his companions to “close” their doors which had opened into his mosque. The order to *close* meant that the doors were NOT to be removed or replaced. Rather, they were to be left *intact*, but under lock.

However, what did the Sahabah do instead? They *disobeyed* the order by *removing* the doors and *replacing* them with wickets! One of these rebellious companions was Abu Bakr. What Sunni Islam wants us to believe, however, is that the Prophet later legitimized their disobedience and recognized their wickets! Worse still, he even proceeded to refer to those illegal wickets as “doors”!

Meanwhile, we consider it utterly unthinkable that the Messenger of Allah would have referred to “wickets” as “doors” in *any* circumstance! It is like designating a kitchen knife as a sword! The Prophet was the master of language, knowledge and wisdom on the earth. It would be highly blasphemous to suggest that he did not know the difference between wickets and doors, or that he equated the two!

Moreover, disobedience to Allah and His Messenger is never okayed or rewarded in Islam. It is instead condemned and sanctioned appropriately. Abu Bakr’s wicket – in line with the theory of al-Hafiz – was installed, in clear *disobedience* to Allah and His Messenger. The order to him was to *keep* his door intact, but closed. However, he *replaced* it instead with his wicket. As such, it was nothing but an *illegal* entity. Obviously, the Prophet of Allah would never have applauded such rebellion or its symbols!

1. Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 5, p. 35
2. Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj al-Qushayri al-Naysaburi, Sahih Muslim (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-‘Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Fuad ‘Abd al-Baqi], vol. 4, p. 1854, # 2382 (2)
3. Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muassasat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu’ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 3, p. 18, # 11150
4. Ibid
5. Abu ‘Isa Muhammad b. ‘Isa al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi, al-Jami’ al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-‘Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 5, p. 616, # 3678
6. Ibid
7. Qur’an 49:17
8. Qur’an 3:164
9. Qur’an 43:67. This verse, among others, brings down a notion which is very widespread among common Sunnis that the word khalil refers to the person most beloved to another. If such were the case, then the Prophet would have been the sole khalil of every pious Muslim. However, each pious Muslim is a khalil of the other, in this world and in the Hereafter, and this is very explicit from the verse.
10. Abu al-Fida Isma’il b. ‘Umar b. Kathir al-Qurshi al-Dimashqi, Tafsir al-Qur’an al-‘Azim (Dar al-Taybah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’; 2nd edition, 1420 H) [annotator: Sami b. Muhammad Salamah], vol. 7, p. 237
11. Abu Muhammad al-Husayn b. Mas’ud al-Baghwi, Mu’alim al-Tanzil (Dar Tayyibah; 4th edition, 1417 H), vol. 7, p. 221
12. Abu Sa’ud Muhammad b. Muhammad al-‘Imadi, Irshad al-‘Aql al-Salim ila Mizaya al-Qur’an al-Karim (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-‘Arabi), vol. 8, p. 54
13. Abu ‘Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Sahih al-Jami’ al-Saghir wa Ziyadatuhu (Al-Maktab al-Islami), vol. 1, p. 342, # 883 (2009)
14. Ibid
15. Qur’an 9:4

16. Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj al-Qushayri al-Naysaburi, Sahih Muslim (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Fuad 'Abd al-Baqi], vol. 4, p. 1870, # 2404 (32)
17. Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, Fath al-Bari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah li al-Taba'ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 7, pp. 12-13
18. Abu 'Isa Muhammad b. 'Isa al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi, al-Jami' al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 5, p. 641, # 3732
19. Ibid
20. Nur al-Din 'Ali b. Abi Bakr al-Haythami, Majma' al-Zawaid (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1412 H), vol. 9, p. 149, # 14672
21. Ibid
22. Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Dha'ifah wa al-Mawdu'ah wa Athariyah al-Sayyiah fi al-Ummah (Riyadh: Dar al-Ma'arif; 1st edition, 1412 H), vol. 6, pp. 481-482, # 2929
23. Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, Fath al-Bari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah li al-Taba'ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 7, p. 13

Why exactly did the Messenger of Allah, *sallallahu 'alaihi wa alihi*, order that all doors be closed except the door of Amir al-Muminin, *'alaihi al-salam*? This is a question that has engaged the *'ulama* of the Ahl al-Sunnah for centuries, with each side among them offering its difference perspective on the incident. Perhaps, the most widespread opinion among the Sunni scholars is that 'Ali was only "spared" out of mercy. His house had only one door, which was that which opened into the mosque. If it were closed, then he and his family would be sealed *inside* their house or permanently blocked from entering it. Al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) is quite explicit on this:

والمعنى ان باب علي كان إلى جهة المسجد ولم يكن لبيته باب غيره فلذلك لم  
يؤمر بسده

The meaning is that the door of 'Ali opens into the mosque and his house had no other door. This was why he was not commanded to close it.<sup>1</sup>

One of the most crucial evidences often quoted for this position is this *hadith* documented by Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H):

أخبرنا أبو بكر أحمد بن جعفر بن حمدان القطيعي ببغداد من أصل كتابه ثنا  
عبد الله بن أحمد بن حنبل حدثني أبي ثنا يحيى بن حماد ثنا أبو عوانة ثنا أبو  
بلج ثنا عمرو بن ميمون قال إني لجالس عند ابن عباس إذ أتاه تسعة رهط فقالوا  
: يا ابن عباس : إما أن تقوم معنا وإما أن تخلو بنا من بين هؤلاء قال : فقال ابن  
عباس بل أنا أقوم معكم قال وهو يومئذ صحيح قبل أن يعمى قال : فابتدؤوا

فتحدثوا فلا ندري ما قالوا قال فجاء ينفذ ثوبه ويقول أف وتف وقعوا في رجل  
له بضع عشرة فضائل ليست لأحد غيره.... قال ابن عباس وسد رسول الله  
صلى الله عليه وسلم أبواب المسجد غير باب علي فكان يدخل المسجد جنبا  
وهو طريقه ليس له طريق غيره

Abu Bakr Ahmad b. Ja'far b. Hamdan al-Qati'i – 'Abd Allah b. Ahmad b. Hanbal – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) Yahya b. Hamad – Abu Awanah – Abu Balj – 'Amr b. Maymun:

I was sitting in the company of Ibn 'Abbas when nine men came to him and said, "O Ibn 'Abbas! Either you debate with us, or tell these folks that you prefer a private debate." So, Ibn 'Abbas said, "I would rather participate with you." In those days, he had not lost his eye-sight yet. So they started talking, but I was not sure exactly what they were talking about.

Then he came, squeezing his robe, and saying: "Nonsense! **They are attacking a man who has ten EXCLUSIVE MERITS....** Ibn 'Abbas said: "The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, closed the doors of the mosque except the door of 'Ali. So he ('Ali) used to enter the mosque after having a seminal discharge before performing the purification bath. **It (i.e. the mosque) was his pathway, and he had no other pathway except it.**"<sup>2</sup>

Al-Hakim states:

هذا حديث صحيح الإسناد

This *hadith* has a *sahih* chain<sup>3</sup>

Imam al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) agrees:

صحيح

*Sahih*<sup>4</sup>

If we accepted al-Hafiz's understanding of the *hadith*, then there would be no value in it for 'Ali. After all, if another Sahabi had fallen into a similar "predicament", he would have been treated similarly "out of mercy". Therefore, it would be an "ordinary" incident with no special significance to it. However, that theory lacks strength in many respects. First, Ibn 'Abbas, *radhiyallahu 'anhu*, considered the *hadith* to be a "merit" of 'Ali, in fact his "*exclusive* merit"! This reveals very clearly that our Hafiz understood the

reports very wrongly.

Even though ‘Ali had only one door, that was NOT the reason he was allowed to open it. He certainly could have been ordered to relocate the door to the opposite side of his house; and he would have achieved that within hours.

So, there was clearly a choice in the matter. But, the Prophet deemed it unnecessary. In fact, it is obvious from Ibn ‘Abbas’ words that even if there had been many doors to the house of ‘Ali, he still would have been exempted from the closure order. After all, the Messenger purposely left open his door to highlight his “exclusive merit” over the rest of the Sahabah.

Interestingly, Ibn ‘Umar also understood the incident as indicating a unique rank. Al-Hafiz states:

وأخرج النسائي من طريق العلاء بن عرار بمهمات قال فقلت لابن عمر أخبرني  
عن علي وعثمان فذكر الحديث وفيه وأما علي فلا تسأل عنه أحدا وانظر إلى  
منزلته من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قد سد أبوابنا في المسجد وأقر بابه  
ورجاله رجال الصحيح إلا العلاء وقد وثقه يحيى بن معين وغيره

وهذه الأحاديث يقوي بعضها بعضا وكل طريق منها صالح للاحتجاج فضلا  
عن مجموعها

And al-Nasai recorded through the route of al-‘Ala b. ‘Arar: “I said to Ibn ‘Umar: ‘Tell me about ‘Ali and ‘Uthman.’” Then he (al-Nasai) mentioned the *hadith* (as above), and added (that Ibn ‘Umar said), “As for ‘Ali, do not ask anyone about him. **Just look at his status from the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him. He had closed our doors in the mosques and left his door open.**” Its narrators are narrators of the *Sahih* except al-‘Ala, and Yahya b. Ma’in and others have declared him *thiqah* (trustworthy).

These *ahadith* strengthen one another, **and each of the chains is qualified to be used as a *hujjah***, much less their combination.<sup>5</sup>

What exactly was this status? Imam Ahmad (d. 241 H) records a *hadith* that gives the answer:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا عبد الله بن نمير قال ثنا موسى الجهني قال  
حدثتني فاطمة بنت علي قالت حدثتني أسماء بنت عميس قالت سمعت رسول

الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يقول: يا علي أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى الا  
انه ليس بعدي نبي

‘Abd Allah – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – ‘Abd Allah b. Numayr – Musa al-Juhani – Fatimah bint ‘Ali –  
Asma bint ‘Umays:

I heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, saying: “O ‘Ali! You are to me of the status of  
**Harun to Musa** except that there is no prophet after me.”<sup>6</sup>

Shaykh al-Arnaut comments:

### إسناده صحيح

Its chain is *sahih*<sup>7</sup>

So, Imam ‘Ali was exempted from the closure order to highlight his status as the Harun of our *Ummah* –  
the spiritual, political and military lieutenant of our Prophet. Quite strangely though, Ibn ‘Umar and some  
other Sahabah did not think that this status of ‘Ali placed him above Abu Bakr and ‘Umar! How they  
managed to arrive at such a weird conclusion is a mystery of mysteries.

In a related *riwayah*, Ibn ‘Umar even revealed a fact that changes the game even more drastically. Imam  
al-Nasai (d. 303 H) records:

أخبرنا أحمد بن سليمان قال حدثنا عبيد الله قال حدثنا إسرائيل عن أبي  
إسحاق عن العلاء بن عرار قال سألت بن عمر وهو في مسجد رسول الله صلى  
الله عليه و سلم عن علي وعثمان فقال أما علي فلا تسألني عنه وانظر إلى منزله  
من رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ليس في المسجد بيت غير بيته وأما  
عثمان فإنه أذنب ذنبا عظيما يوم التقى الجمعان فعفى الله عنه وغفر له وأذنب  
فيكم ذنبا دون فقتلتموه

Ahmad b. Sulayman – ‘Abd Allah – Israil – Abu Ishaq – al-‘Ala b. ‘Arar:

I asked Ibn ‘Umar while he was in the mosque of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him,  
concerning ‘Ali and ‘Uthman. So, he replied, “As for ‘Ali, then do not ask me concerning him. Just look at  
his apartment from (the apartment of) the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him. **There is NO house**

**in the mosque apart from his house.** As for ‘Uthman, he committed a terrible sin on the day when the two armies met (i.e. at Uhud when he fled). But Allah pardoned and forgave him. Then, he committed another sin among you, and you killed him.”<sup>8</sup>

Both Dr. Bandari and Sayyid Hasan jointly state:

## صحيح رجاله ثقات

It is *sahih*. Its narrators are trustworthy.<sup>9</sup>

Imam al-Bukhari (d. 256 H) also documents:

حدثنا محمد بن رافع حدثنا حسين عن زائدة عن أبي حصين عن سعد بن عبيدة قال : جاء رجل إلى ابن عمر فسأله عن عثمان فذكر عن محاسن عمله قال لعل ذاك يسؤوك ؟ قال نعم قال فأرغم الله بأنفك ثم سأله عن علي فذكر محاسن عمله قال هو ذاك بيته أوسط بيوت النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم قال لعل ذاك يسؤوك ؟ قال أجل قال فأرغم الله بأنفك انطلق فاجهد علي جهدك

Muhammad b. Rafi’ – Husayn – Zaidah – Abu Husayn – Sad b. ‘Ubaydah:

A man came to Ibn ‘Umar and asked about ‘Uthman. So, he (i.e. Ibn ‘Umar) mentioned his good deeds and said to the questioner. “Perhaps these facts annoy you?” He (the questioner) answered, “Yes.” Ibn ‘Umar said, “May Allah stick your nose in the dust!” Then he (the man) asked him (i.e. Ibn ‘Umar) about ‘Ali. So, he (i.e. Ibn ‘Umar) mentioned his good deeds and said, “He (‘Ali) is this. **His house is in the midst of the houses of the Prophet, peace be upon him.** Perhaps these facts have hurt you?” He (i.e. the questioner) said, “Of course.” He (i.e. Ibn ‘Umar) said, “May Allah stick your nose in the dust! Go away and do whatever you can against me.”<sup>10</sup>

This incident clearly took place after the death of ‘Uthman. A number of fundamental facts are discernible from the reports:

1. The purpose of the closure order was to “detach” all houses from the mosque of the Prophet, except his own houses and that of Amir al-Muminin.
2. Once it was impossible to move directly from the *mihrab* (prayer chambers) into the house, it was deemed “detached”.

3. Therefore, once the order was given to close all doors except that of ‘Ali only, the houses of the other Sahabah – including that of Abu Bakr – permanently ceased to have any entry or exit point into the mosque. Through this, they were literally detached from the *mihrab* of the *masjid*.

4. This was the case till after the death of ‘Uthman.

5. As such, Abu Bakr had NO house “attached” to the mosque at the time when the Messenger was allegedly ordering that all “wickets” be closed! How did Abu Bakr possess a wicket when he no longer had any house in the mosque?!

6. Ibn ‘Umar thought that the order to spare only the house of ‘Ali in the mosque is indicative of the latter’s special rank in the Sight of Allah and His Messenger.

7. The Prophet allowed the house of ‘Ali to be in the midst of his own houses facing *into* the mosque. He never granted the same honour to any other creature!

This is our query to our brothers from the Ahl al-Sunnah: how did Abu Bakr manage to have a wicket, or a door, during the Prophet’s fatal illness when he no longer had *any* house facing into the *masjid*? He used to have. But, once the order for closure was issued earlier, he and all other Muslims – with the sole exception of the Messenger of Allah and Imam ‘Ali – “detached” their houses from the mosque by permanently sealing their doors opening into it. This remained the case till, at least, after the death of ‘Uthman. So, how could Abu Bakr have had any wicket or door in that circumstance? Where did his apparently *imaginary* “wicket” and “door” come from?

Ironically, our Sunni brothers have hinged some of their *real* beliefs on this fiction of Abu Bakr’s “wicket” and “door”! Interestingly, however, their statements concerning those two also reveal a lot about the full meaning of *Hadith Sadd al-Abwab*. For instance, al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir (d. 774 H) states:

وفي قوله عليه السلام سدوا عني كل خوذة - يعني الأبواب الصغار - إلى المسجد غير خوذة أبي بكر إشارة إلى الخلافة أي ليخرج منها إلى الصلاة بالمسلمين.

And in his statement, peace be upon him, “Close all wickets opening into the mosque except the wicket of Abu Bakr”, is **an indication towards the *khalifah***, that is, so that he could pass through it (into the mosque) to lead the Muslims in *Salat*.<sup>11</sup>

Therefore, by opening the *imaginary* wicket of Abu Bakr, the Prophet was announcing him as his *khalifah*. The Imam of Muslims, who would be leading them in *Salat* in the mosque of the Messenger, must have his residence forming part of it, like the Prophet too. This establishes beyond doubt that when

the Messenger of Allah left open the *real* door of Amir al-Muminin and closed all others, he was indicating to all the Sahabah that the latter was be his *real* legitimate *khalifah*.

Imam al-Mubarakfuri (d. 1282 H) also says:

وفي حديث أبي سعيد عند البخاري في المناقب لا يبقين في المسجد باب إلا  
سد إلا باب أبي بكر وفي الهجرة لا تبقين في المسجد خوذة إلا خوذة أبي بكر  
وكذا عند الترمذي كما تقدم قال الخطابي وابن بطال وغيرهما في هذا الحديث  
اختصاص ظاهر لأبي بكر رضي الله عنه وفيه إشارة قوية إلى استحقاقه  
للخلافة

In the *hadith* of Abu Sa'id, recorded by al-Bukhari in the Chapter of *al-Manaqib*, it is read, "Close all doors in the mosque except the door of Abu Bakr." In the Chapter of *al-Hijrah*, it is read, "No wicket shall remain in the mosque except the wicket of Abu Bakr". This is how it is recorded by al-Tirmidhi too, as previously stated. Al-Khattabi and Ibn Battal and others said that in this *hadith* is **a clear, exclusive merit** for Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, **and in it is a strong indication of his entitlement to the *khilafah***.<sup>12</sup>

So, by leaving open the *real* door of Amir al-Muminin, the Messenger of Allah was confirming for him a clear, *exclusive* merit and affirming his right to the *khilafah* before anyone else. Imam al-'Ayni (d. 855) adds his few cents too:

قوله خوذة بفتح المعجمتين بينهما واو ساكنة هو الباب الصغير وكان بعض  
الصحابة فتحوا أبوابا في ديارهم إلى المسجد فأمر الشارع بسدها كلها إلا  
خوذة أبي بكر ليتميز بذلك فضله وفيه إيماء إلى الخلافة

His statement "wicket" refers to the small door. Some of the Sahabah used to open the doors of their houses into the mosque. So, the Law-Giver (i.e. Allah) ordered that the closure of all of them except the wicket of Abu Bakr, **to establish his superiority through that, and in it is a gesture towards the *khilafah***.<sup>13</sup>

In other words, 'Ali was the best of the Sahabah, on account of *Hadith Sadd al-Abwab*, and was the first legitimate *khalifah* among them! Al-Hafiz makes an even more groundbreaking submission which reaches far to the very heart of Sunni Islam:

وقد ادعى بعضهم ان الباب كناية عن الخلافة والامر بالسد كناية عن طلبها كأنه قال لا يطلبن أحد الخلافة الا أبا بكر فإنه لا حرج عليه في طلبها والى هذا جنح ابن حبان فقال بعد أن اخرج هذا الحديث في هذا الحديث دليل على أنه الخليفة بعد النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لأنه حسم بقوله سدوا عني كل خوذة في المسجد أطماع الناس كلهم عن أن يكونوا خلفاء بعده

**Some of them (i.e. the Sunni scholars) have claimed that the “door” (in the *ahadith*) is equivalent to the *khilafah*.** So, the order of closure is equivalent to an order against seeking it (i.e. the *khilafah*). It was as though he said, “None should seek the *khilafah* except Abu Bakr, because there is no blame on him in seeking it.” Ibn Hibban subscribed to this view, and so said after recording this *hadith*: “**In this *hadith* is a proof that he (Abu Bakr) was the *khalifah* after the Prophet**, peace be upon him, because **he (the Messenger) terminated** – through his statement ‘Close all wickets in the mosque’ – **the desire of all (other) human beings to become *khalifahs* after him.**”<sup>14</sup>

We agree wholly that the “door” symbolized the *khilafah*. As such, when Allah closed the doors of Abu Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthman and others, He literally banned them forever from ever becoming legitimate *khalifahs* of His Prophet. By leaving open only the door of ‘Ali, Allah and His Messenger explicitly restricted the true *khilafah* to him and his descendants – to his household.

The severe dilemma of the Sunni position is that even *IF* it is agreed, for the sake of argument, that Abu Bakr’s “wicket” and “door” had been real, then the *hadith* would only have proved his *khilafah* and delegitimized those of ‘Umar, ‘Uthman, Amir al-Muminin, Mu’awiyah and others! The *khilafah* would have been the right and preserve of Abu Bakr and his descendants, to the exclusion of all others!

1. Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalani, Fath al-Bari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari (Beirut: Dar al-Ma’rifah li al-Taba’ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 7, p. 13
2. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, al-Mustadrak ‘ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa ‘Abd al-Qadir ‘Ata], vol. 3, p. 143, # 4652
3. Ibid
4. Ibid
5. Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalani, Fath al-Bari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari (Beirut: Dar al-Ma’rifah li al-Taba’ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 7, p. 13
6. Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muassasat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu’ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 6, p. 438, # 27507
7. Ibid
8. Abu ‘Abd al-Rahman Ahmad b. Shu’ayb al-Nasai, Sunan al-Kubra (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Dr. ‘Abd al-Ghaffar Sulayman al-Bandari and Sayyid Kasrawi Hasan], vol. 5, p. 138, # 8491
9. Ibid
10. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Isma’il b. Ibrahim b. Mughirah al-Bukhari al-Ju’fi, al-Jami’ al-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Beirut: Dar Ibn Kathir; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafa Dib al-Bagha], vol. 3, p. 1358, # 3501
11. Abu al-Fida Isma’il b. Kathir al-Dimashqi, al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah (Dar Ihya al-Turath al-‘Arabi; 1st edition, 1408 H)

[annotator: 'Ali Shiri], vol. 5, p. 251

12. Abu al-'Ala Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman b. 'Abd al-Rahim al-Mubarakfuri, *Tuhfat al-Ahwazi bi Sharh Jami' al-Tirmidhi* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1410 H), vol. 10, p. 112

13. Badr al-Din al-'Ayni, *'Umdah al-Qari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari*, vol. 17, p. 39, # 386

14. Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, *Fath al-Bari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari* (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah li al-Taba'ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 7, p. 12

Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) states:

قال الرافضي الثالث قوله أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنه لا نبي بعدي....

والجواب أن هذا الحديث ثبت في الصحيحين بلا ريب وغيرهما

The Rafidhi said: The third (point) is his statement (to 'Ali), “**You are to me of the status of Harun to Musa**, except that there is no prophet after me.”....

The reply is: **This *hadith* is authentic** in the two *Sahihs* **without any doubt**, and in other books too.<sup>1</sup>

This is one of the *very* few, miraculous instances when our Shaykh submits to the truth about the authenticity of a pro-'Ali *hadith*! As he has conceded, the *hadith* is certainly *sahih*. Imam Muslim (d. 261 H) too recorded it in his *Sahih* in confirmation of this:

حدثنا يحيى بن يحيى التميمي وأبو جعفر محمد بن الصباح وعبيدالله القواريري وسريج بن يونس كلهم عن يوسف بن الماجشون (واللفظ لابن الصباح) حدثنا يوسف أبو سلمة الماجشون حدثنا محمد بن المنكدر عن سعيد بن المسيب عن عامر بن سعد ابن أبي وقاص عن أبيه قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم لعلي أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنه لا نبي بعدي

Yahya b. Yahya al-Tamimi, Abu Ja'far Muhammad b. al-Sabah, 'Ubayd Allah al-Qawariri and Surayj b. Yunus – Yunus b. al-Majishun – Yusuf Abu Salamah al-Majishun – Muhammad b. al-Munkadar – Sa'id b. al-Musayyab – Amir b. Sa'd b. Abi Waqqas – his father (Sa'd b. Abi Waqqas):

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to ‘Ali: “**You are to me of the status of Harun to Musa**, except that there is no prophet after me.”<sup>2</sup>

Imam Ahmad (d. 241 H) as well documents:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا يحيى بن سعيد عن موسى الجهني قال دخلت على فاطمة بنت علي فقال لها رفيقي أبو سهل كم لك قالت ستة وثمانون سنة قال ما سمعت من أبيك شيئا قالت حدثتني أسماء بنت عميس أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال لعلي أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنه ليس بعدي نبي

‘Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Yahya b. Sa’id – Musa al-Juhani – Fatimah bint ‘Ali – Asma bint ‘Umays:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to ‘Ali: “**You are to me of the status of Harun to Musa**, except that there is no prophet after me.”<sup>3</sup>

Shaykh al-Arnaut comments:

### إسناده صحيح

Its chain is *sahih*<sup>4</sup>

We need not extend our research on the authenticity of the *hadith*, since there is no denial of it. So, we will simply cap the above with these words of Imam al-Kattani (d. 1345 H) about the *hadith*:

وقد تتبع ابن عساكر طرقه في جزء فبلغ عدد الصحابة فيه نيفا وعشرين وفي شرح الرسالة للشيخ جسوس رحمه الله ما نصه وحديث أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى متواتر جاء عن نيف وعشرين صحابيا

Ibn Asakir investigated its chains in a volume, and the number of the Sahabah who narrated it (in his research) reached more than twenty. In *Sharh al-Risalah* of Shaykh Jasus, may Allah be merciful to him, he states: “**And the *hadith* ‘You are to me of the status of Harun to Musa’ is *mutawatir***. It has been narrated by more than twenty Sahabah.”<sup>5</sup>

So, does Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah accept that Amir al-Muminin, *'alaihi al-salam*, was to Prophet Muhammad, *sallallahu 'alaihi wa alihi*, of the *status* of Prophet Harun, *'alaihi al-salam*, to Prophet Musa, *'alaihi al-salam*? Of course, he does! However, he has limited the circumstance and the scope to just a one-off event:

كان النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم قال له ذلك في غزوة تبوك وكان صلى الله عليه و سلم كلما سافر في غزوة أو عمرة أو حج يستخلف على المدينة بعض الصحابة....

وبالجملة فمن المعلوم انه كان لا يخرج من المدينة حتى يستخلف وقد ذكر المسلمون من كان يستخلفه فقد سافر من المدينة في عمرتين عمرة الحديبية وعمرة القضاء وفي حجة الوداع وفي مغازيه اكثر من عشرين غزاة وفيها كلها استخلف وكان يكون بالمدينة رجال كثيرون يستخلف عليهم من يستخلفه فلما كان في غزوة تبوك لم يأذن لاحد في التخلف عنها وهي آخر مغازيه صلى الله عليه و سلم ولم يجتمع معه أحد كما اجتمع معه فيها فلم يتخلف عنه إلا النساء و الصبيان أو من هو معذور لعجزه عن الخروج أو من هو منافق و تخلف الثلاثة الذين تيب عليهم و لم يكن في المدينة رجال من المؤمنين يستخلف عليهم كما كان يستخلف عليهم في كل مرة بل كان هذا الاستخلاف اضعف من الاستخلافات المعتادة منه لأنه لم يبق في المدينة رجال من المؤمنين أقوياء يستخلف عليهم أحدا كما كان يبقى في جميع مغازيه

**The Prophet, peace be upon him, said it (i.e. the *hadith*) to him (i.e. 'Ali) during the Battle of Tabuk.** Meanwhile, whenever he (the Prophet) made a journey for battle, or for *'Umrah* or *Hajj*, he used to make one of the Sahabah his *khalifah* over Madinah....

In summary, **it is well-known that he (the Prophet) never left Madinah without appointing a *khalifah* over it.** Muslims have mentioned those whom he appointed as *khalifahs*. He made journeys out of Madinah during two *'Umrahs* – *'Umrah al-Hudaybiyyah* and *'Umrah al-Qadha* – and during the Farewell *Hajj*, as well as in more than twenty battles.

On all of them (i.e. these occasions), he appointed *khalifahs* and there used to be several men in Madinah (on all these occasions) over whom the *khalifah* was given authority. However, during the battle

of Tabuk, he (the Prophet) did not permit anyone to stay behind from it (i.e. the battle). It was his last battle, peace be upon him, and he never conscripted (for any battle) as he conscripted for it (i.e. Tabuk). **Therefore, none was left (in Madinah) except women, children, those who were exempted due to inability, hypocrites, and three men who (later) repented.**

There were no believing men in Madinah over whom to appoint a *khalifah* (during Tabuk), unlike the case on all other occasions. **Rather, this appointment (of ‘Ali) as *khalifah* was inferior to the other, several *khilafah* appointments,** because there were no strong believing men in Madinah (during Tabuk) over whom he (the Prophet) could have placed (‘Ali as) a *khalifah*, unlike the case in all his (the Prophet’s) other battles.<sup>6</sup>

Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah obviously interprets the *hadith* as referring solely to Amir al-Muminin’s *khilafah* over Madinah during the battle of Tabuk. So, he was like Harun to Musa only for the duration of the battle. Once the battle ended, and the Messenger took over control of Madinah once again, ‘Ali ceased to be his Harun.

In the simplest terms, in the view of our Shaykh, the status of Imam ‘Ali as the Harun of Prophet Muhammad was temporary and shortlived and never extended beyond the Battle of Tabuk. Moreover, it was limited *exclusively* to ‘Ali’s governorate of Madinah while the battle lasted. It is very apparent that our Shaykh considers *Hadith al-Manzilah* to be specifically linked with the words of Musa in this verse:

وقال موسى لأخيه هارون اخلفني في قومي

Musa said to his brother, Harun: **“Be my *khalifah* over my people.”**<sup>7</sup>

Explaining the connection, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah says:

وقيل أن بعض المنافقين طعن فيه و قال أنما خلفه لانه يبغضه فبين له النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم اني إنما استخلفتك لأمانتك عندي و أن الاستخلاف ليس بنقص و لا غرض فإن موسى استخلف هارون على قومه فكيف يكون نقصا و موسى ليفعله بهارون فطيب بذلك قلب علي

It is said that some hypocrites condemned him (i.e. ‘Ali), and said that he (the Prophet) only made him (i.e. ‘Ali) a *khalifah* because he (the Prophet) hated him (i.e. ‘Ali). So, the Prophet, peace be upon him, explained to him, saying: “I have only made you a *khalifah* due to my trust in you, and that *khilafah* is neither a belittling step nor a demotion, **for Musa appointed Harun as his *khalifah* over his people.**

How then could that have been a belittling step, while Musa did it with Harun?" Through that the mind of 'Ali became clear.<sup>8</sup>

This logic of Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah suggests that all the governors of Madinah during the Prophet's numerous absences were like Harun too. Therefore, it was not a merit *at all* for 'Ali, much less an exclusive one! In fact, the *khilafah* of Amir al-Muminin was the most "inferior" of all, as submitted by our Shaykh! After all, his governorate was only over women, children, mutineers and hypocrites. By contrast, all the other governors had ruled over believers among the men and the women. It is at this point that things get really messy.

*Khilafah* can be temporary, permanent, restricted or total, depending on the circumstances. There is no doubt that the *khilafah* of Amir al-Muminin *during Tabuk* was both *temporary* and *restricted*. He was the governor of Madinah only, and not of the entire Islamic state. What Imam 'Ali controlled during that time was merely a small percentage of the *Ummah* of Muhammad. By contrast, the *khilafah* of Prophet Harun was *total*. He was the *khalifah* of Prophet Musa over the *entirety* of "his people". Therefore, there was simply no connection or comparison between the two *khilafahs*. Meanwhile, the Messenger of Allah specifically mentioned that 'Ali was *exactly* like Harun!

In fact, the Prophet further specifically explained the *khilafah* component of the Harun-'Ali comparison in a way that knocks out Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah! Ibn Abi 'Asim (d. 287 H) records:

ثنا محمد بن المثنى، حدثنا يحيى بن حماد، عن أبي عوانة، عن يحيى بن سليم  
أبي بلج عن عمرو بن ميمون، عن ابن عباس قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله  
عليه وسلم لعلي: أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنك لست نبيا وأنت  
خليفة في كل مؤمن من بعدي.

Muhammad b. al-Muthanna – Yahya b. Hammad – Abu 'Awanah – Yahya b. Sulaym **Abu Balj** – 'Amr b. Maymun – **Ibn 'Abbas**: The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to 'Ali: "You are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, with the exception that you are not a prophet. **And you are my *khalifah* over EVERY BELIEVER after me.**"<sup>9</sup>

Dr. Al-Jawabirah says:

أسناده حسن.

Its chain is *hasan*.<sup>10</sup>

‘Allamah al-Albani agrees:

## إِسْنَادُهُ حَسَنٌ.

Its chain is *hasan*.<sup>11</sup>

Of course, the *khilafah* of Harun too was over the *entirety* of Musa’s *Ummah*, and the same thing was intended for ‘Ali in this *hadith*! The Messenger of Allah was announcing him as the *khalifah* over all believers – in exactly the *same* way that Harun was – in any case of *total* absence of Muhammad from his *Ummah* – as Musa did.

Meanwhile, although Prophet Musa was able to keep away from his entire *Ummah* during his lifetime, the Messenger of Allah was unable to do that except through death. This apparently explains why he mentioned “after me” with the *khilafah*. It is also solely in this context that the phrase “except that there will be no prophet after me” makes any sense. If the Prophet had intended *Hadith al-Manzilah* to be limited to the duration of Tabuk only, on what logical basis would he have added those two expressions?

What is more? The Messenger of Allah never restricted the comparison between Harun and ‘Ali to mere *khilafah*, to begin with! ‘Allamah al-Albani, for instance, states:

أَخْرَجَهُ أَحْمَدُ فِي " الْمُسْنَدِ " (1/170) : حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو سَعِيدٍ مَوْلَى بَنِي هَاشِمٍ حَدَّثَنَا سُلَيْمَانَ بْنَ بِلَالٍ حَدَّثَنَا الْجَعْفَرُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ عَنْ عَائِشَةَ بِنْتِ سَعْدٍ عَنْ أَبِيهَا: " أَنْ عَلِيًّا رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ خَرَجَ مَعَ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ حَتَّى جَاءَ ثَنِيَّةَ الْوُدَاعِ , وَعَلَى رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ يَبْكِي , يَقُولُ : تَخَلَّفَنِي مَعَ الْخَوَالِفِ؟ فَقَالَ : أَمَا تَرْضَى أَنْ تَكُونَ مِنْ بِنْتِ هَارُونَ مِنْ مُوسَى إِلَّا النَّبُوءَةَ؟ "

قلت: وهذا إسناد صحيح على شرط البخارى

Ahmad recorded it in *al-Musnad* (1/170): Abu Sa’id, freed slave of Banu Hashim – Sulayman b. Bilal – al-Ja’id b. ‘Abd al-Rahman – ‘Aishah bint Sa’d – her father:

Verily, ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, WENT OUT WITH THE PROPHET, peace be upon him, UNTIL HE (THE PROPHET) REACHED THANIYYAH AL-WADA’, and ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, was weeping, saying: “You are leaving me behind with the women and children?” So, he (the

Prophet) replied, “**Are you not pleased that you are to me of the status of Harun to Musa EXCEPT PROPHETHOOD?**”

I say: This chain is *sahih* upon the standard of al-Bukhari.12

Shaykh al-Arnaut agrees with him about the same *hadith*:

## إسناده صحيح على شرط البخاري

Its chain is *sahih* upon the standard of al-Bukhari.13

In other words, all the components of Harun’s status to Musa were present in ‘Ali too. The *only* exception was that Harun was a co-prophet with Musa while ‘Ali was not a prophet at all. Needless to say, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah’s restriction of the comparison to *khilafah* contradicts this authentic Sunnah! Amir al-Muminin was to the Prophet *everything* that Harun was to Musa with the sole exception of co-prophethood.

What further kills our Shaykh’s attempted diversion is the fact that the Messenger of Allah repeated that *hadith* to Imam ‘Ali *outside* the context or period of Tabuk! In the last *hadith* above, we read that ‘Ali *went out* of Madinah with the Prophet during Tabuk, till the Muslim army reached Thaniyyah al-Wada’. It was there that the Messenger mentioned the *hadith* to him. There were no women around. The women and children were all in Madinah, while only men were in the army at Thaniyyah al-Wada’. In the light of this, let us examine this *hadith* documented by Imam Ahmad:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا عبد الله بن نمير قال ثنا موسى الجهني قال  
حدثتني فاطمة بنت علي قالت حدثتني أسماء بنت عميس قالت سمعت رسول  
الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول يا علي أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنه  
ليس بعدي نبي

‘Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – ‘Abd Allah b. Numayr – Musa al-Juhani –  
Fatimah bint ‘Ali – Asma bint ‘Umayy:

**I HEARD the Messenger of Allah**, peace be upon him, saying, “O ‘Ali! You are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, except that there is no prophet after me.”14

Al-Arnaut comments:

## إسناده صحيح

Its chain is *sahih* 15

Apparently, Asma (a wife of Abu Bakr) did not “hear” this *hadith* at Thaniyyah al-Wada’. She certainly must have heard it *inside* Madinah, either before or after Tabuk. This fact alone completely defeats all of Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah’s efforts at reinterpreting *Hadith al-Manzilah* out of its intended purpose.

Meanwhile, things get really much worse for him with Ibn ‘Abbas’ claim, *radhiyallahu ‘anhu*, that the “merit” in the *hadith* belonged *exclusively* to ‘Ali! Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) records:

أخبرنا أبو بكر أحمد بن جعفر بن حمدان القطيعي ببغداد من أصل كتابه ثنا عبد الله بن أحمد بن حنبل حدثني أبي ثنا يحيى بن حماد ثنا أبو عوانة ثنا أبو بلج ثنا عمرو بن ميمون .... قال ابن عباس :.... وقعوا في رجل له بضع عشرة فضائل ليست لأحد غيره.... وخرج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في غزوة تبوك وخرج بالناس معه قال فقال له علي : أخرج معك قال : فقال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لا فبكي علي فقال له : أما ترضى أن تكون مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنه ليس بعدي نبي إنه لا ينبغي أن أذهب إلا وأنت خليفتي

Abu Bakr Ahmad b. Ja’far b. Hamadan al-Qati’i – ‘Abd Allah b. Ahmad b. Hanbal – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Yahya b. Hammad – Abu ‘Awanah – Abu Balj – ‘Amr b. Maymun .... Ibn ‘Abbas said:

.... **They are attacking a man who has ten EXCLUSIVE merits....** The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, went out for the battle of Tabuk, and the people went out with him. So, ‘Ali said to him, “Let me go out with you.” Therefore, the Prophet, peace be upon him, said, “Do not weep, ‘Ali. **Are you not pleased that you are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, with the exception that there is no prophet after me?** Verily, it is not right that I depart except with you as my *khalifah*.”<sup>16</sup>

Al-Hakim says:

## هذا حديث صحيح الإسناد

This *hadith* has a *sahih* chain. 17

Al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) backs him:

*Sahih*. 18

Was ‘Ali then the only governor ever appointed over Madinah during the Prophet’s lifetime?! Obviously, the *hadith* is very, very far from what Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah claims!

1. Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, *Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* (Muasassat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 7, pp. 325–326
2. Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj al-Qushayri al-Naysaburi, *Sahih Muslim* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-‘Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Fuad ‘Abd al-Baqi], vol. 4, p. 1870, # 2404 (30)
3. Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, *Musnad* (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu’ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 6, p. 369, # 27126
4. Ibid
5. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ja’far al-Idrisi al-Kattani, *Nazam al-Mutanathir min al-Hadith al-Mutawatir* (Egypt: Dar al-Kutub al-Salafiyah; 2nd edition), p. 195, # 233
6. Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, *Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* (Muasassat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 7, pp. 326–328
7. Qur’an 7:142
8. Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, *Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* (Muasassat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 7, pp. 328–329
9. Abu Bakr b. Abi ‘Asim, Ahmad b. ‘Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, *Kitab al-Sunnah* (Dar al-Sami’i li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’) [annotator: Dr. Basim b. Faysal al-Jawabirah], vol. 1, pp. 799–800, # 1222
10. Ibid
11. Abu Bakr b. Abi ‘Asim, Ahmad b. ‘Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, *Kitab al-Sunnah* (al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1400 H) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 2, p. 565, # 1188
12. Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani, *Irwa al-Ghalil fi Takhrij Ahadith Manar al-Sabil* (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islami; 2nd edition, 1405 H), vol. 5, p. 11, # 1188
13. Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, *Musnad* (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu’ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 1, p. 170, # 1463
14. Ibid, vol. 6, p. 438, # 27507
15. Ibid
16. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, *al-Mustadrak ‘ala al-Sahihayn* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa ‘Abd al-Qadir ‘Ata], vol. 3, p. 143, # 4652
17. Ibid
18. Ibid

Although Allah has informed us of several ranks which Prophet Harun, *‘alaihi al-salam*, held in relation to Prophet Musa, *‘alaihi al-salam*, we will be focusing exclusively on one of them only in this research: the *wizarah*. Musa had supplicated to Allah in this manner, as narrated by the Qur’an:

قال رب اشرح لي صدري ويسر لي أمري واحلل عقدة من لساني يفقهوا قولي

## واجعل لي وزيراً من أهلي هارون أخي

He (Musa) said, “O my Lord! Open for me my chest, and make my assignment easy for me. And make loose the knot from my tongue, that they understand my speech. **And appoint for me a *wazir* from my family, Harun my brother.** 1

Expectedly, his *du'a* was granted:

## ولقد آتينا موسى الكتاب وجعلنا معه أخاه هارون وزيراً

And indeed We gave Musa the Book, **and We appointed his brother Harun as a *wazir*.**2

Therefore, Harun was undoubtedly the *wazir* of Musa, *by divine appointment*. This obviously confirms a principle: the appointment of the *wazir* of each prophet was only in the Hand of Allah. If it had been otherwise, Musa would have simply handpicked his brother for the post without making any *du'a*. This fact, in turn, reveals that being the *wazir* of a prophet was an extremely high rank in the Sight of Allah, so high that He personally chose to make the appointments.

So, who was a *wazir*? What were his functions? The Book of Allah has given us an example: Haman, the *wazir* of Fir'aun. The Qur'an states:

## إن فرعون وهامان وجنودهما كانوا خاطئين

Verily, Fir'aun and **Haman** and their soldiers were people who made mistakes.3

Imam al-Tabari (d. 310 H) starts the identifications:

## وقال فرعون ... لوزيره وزير السوء هامان

Fir'aun said ... to **his *wazir***, the evil *wazir*, **Haman**.4

Al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir (d. 774 H) follows his footsteps here:

## { وهامان } وهو: وزيره في مملكته

{and Haman}, he was his *wazir* in his kingdom.5

Shaykh al-Zuhayli also explains the names:

فرعون ملك مصر وهامان وزير فرعون

Fir'aun was the king of Egypt **and Haman was the *wazir* of Fir'aun.**6

Shaykh al-Maraghi also states:

وهامان وزير فرعون

Haman was the *wazir* of Fir'aun.7

Shaykh 'Ali Shiri, the annotator of *Tarikh Dimashq*, has the same submission:

هامان وزير فرعون

Haman was the *wazir* of Fir'aun.8

Imam al-Tha'alabi (d. 875 H) says as well:

وهامان: هو وزير فرعون وأكبر رجاله

Haman: **he was the *wazir* of Fir'aun** and the most senior of his men.9

And Imam al-Alusi (d. 1270 H) solidly stands with him:

{إلى فرعون وهامان} وزير فرعون

{To Fir'aun and Haman} the *wazir* of Fir'aun.10

The Salafi Imam, Shaykh Ibn Baz (d. 1420 H), corroborates everyone else:

قال بعض أهل العلم في شرح هذا الحديث : إنما يحشر مضيع الصلاة مع فرعون وهامان وقارون وأبي بن خلف؛ لأنه إن ضيعها من أجل الرئاسة والملك والإمارة شابه فرعون الذي طغى وبغى بأسباب وظيفته فيحشر معه إلى النار يوم القيامة، وإن ضيعها بأسباب الوظيفة والوزارة شابه هامان وزير فرعون الذي طغى وبغى بسبب الرئاسة فيحشر معه إلى النار يوم القيامة

Some of the people of knowledge said in the commentary of this *hadith*: The one who abandons *Salat* will be gathered with Fir'aun, Haman, Qarun and Ubayy b. Khalaf (on the Day of *al-Qiyamah*), because if he abandons it due to leadership, kingdom and governance, he will be similar to Fir'aun who oppressed and rebelled on account of his office. So, he (the abandoner of *Salat*) will be gathered with him into the Fire on the Day of *al-Qiyamah*. But, if he abandons it (i.e. *Salat*) due to position and *al-wizarah*, he will be similar to **Haman, the wazir of Fir'aun, who oppressed and rebelled because of leadership**. Therefore, he (the abandoner of *Salat*) will be gathered with him into the Fire on the Day of *al-Qiyamah*.<sup>11</sup>

Then, another top Salafi scholar, Shaykh al-'Uthaymin (d. 1421 H), seals the list:

ففرعون غره الملك والسلطان فاستكبر هو وجنوده في الأرض بغير الحق  
وهامان غرته الوزارة لأنه وزير فرعون

As for Fir'aun, he was deceived by kingdom and power. So, he became arrogant – he and his soldiers – without right. **As for Haman, he was deceived by *al-wizarah*, because he was the wazir of Fir'aun.**<sup>12</sup>

In all, we know that Fir'aun was the king of Egypt, and that its armed forces owed their allegiance to him. We also know that Haman was the *wazir* of this Fir'aun. Interestingly, both Fir'aun and Haman were contemporaries of Musa, and his *wazir*, Harun. The four of them had initially lived together in the same city: Musa and his *wazir*, and Fir'aun and his *wazir*. The rank and power of the *wazir* are indicated in this verse:

إن فرعون وهامان وجنودهما كانوا خاطئين

Verily, Fir'aun and Haman and **their soldiers** were people who made mistakes.<sup>13</sup>

First, Allah mentions Haman immediately after Fir'aun – a fact that is indicative of the status of the *wazir*. The *wazir* is next in rank only to the sovereign ruler. Second, the armed forces of Egypt are identified as the soldiers of *both* the king and his *wazir*! In other words, Fir'aun was the commander-in-chief of the armed forces of Egypt, and his *wazir* – Haman – was their deputy commander-in-chief. Needless to say, Musa was the sovereign leader of the Israelites and his *wazir*, Harun, was the next in rank to him. No Muslim has ever disputed this, and none ever will till the Hour. The true followers of Musa also accepted this fact:

قالوا آمنا برب العالمين رب موسى وهارون

They said: “We believe in the Lord of the worlds, **the Lord of Musa and Harun.**”<sup>14</sup>

Those were their two leaders and masters. Interestingly, they also said:

فألقي السحرة سجدا قالوا آمنا برب هارون وموسى

So the magicians prostrated. They said: “**We believe in the Lord of Harun and Musa.**”<sup>15</sup>

The Qur'an too leaves no one in doubt:

ولقد مننا على موسى وهارون ونجيناهما وقومهما من الكرب العظيم  
ونصرناهم فكانوا هم الغالبين وآتيناهما الكتاب المستبين وهديناهما الصراط  
المستقيم

And, indeed, **We favoured Musa and Harun. And We saved them both and their people from the Terrible Distress.** And We gave them both the Clear Book; and guided them both to the Right Path.<sup>16</sup>

The followers of Musa were apparently also those of his *wazir*.

All these take us back to *Hadith al-Manzilah*:

قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم لعلي أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى  
إلا أنه لا نبي بعدي

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to ‘Ali: “**You are to me of the status of Harun to Musa**, except that there is no prophet after me.”

Without doubt, this *hadith* establishes – among others – that Imam ‘Ali, *‘alaihi al-salam*, was the *wazir* of Prophet Muhammad, *sallallahu ‘alaihi wa alihi*. There was no other *wazir* for Musa except Harun. Therefore, there was no other *wazir* for Muhammad except ‘Ali. This fact too is confirmed in *Hadith al-Wirathah*, which – as we have proved in this book – has a *sahih* chain:

## أنت أخي وصاحبي ووارثي ووزير

You are my brother, and my companion, and my inheritor, **AND MY WAZIR**. 17

In simpler words, Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah was the *amir* of the *Ummah* – their commander-in-chief, and ‘Ali b. Abi Talib – his inheritor – was the *deputy* commander-in-chief. ‘Ali, during the Messenger of Allah’s lifetime, was the deputy *amir* of the believers. The direct implication of this is – the moment the Prophet passed away, Imam ‘Ali *automatically* became promoted to the rank of the supreme *amir* of the *Ummah*. After all, our brothers from the Ahl al-Sunnah claim that the Messenger died *without* designating any heir, inheritor or successor. In cases like that, it is the deputy commander-in-chief (i.e. the *wazir*) who *automatically* succeeds the dead commander-in-chief (i.e. the *amir*)!

Apart from being the deputy leader of the nation, and the deputy commander-in-chief of the armed forces, the *wazir* also functions as the chief adviser *and* helper of the ruler. Imam Ibn Hibban (d. 354 H) records:

أخبرنا الحسين بن عبد الله القطان قال حدثنا موسى بن مروان الرقي قال  
حدثنا الوليد بن زهير بن محمد عن عبد الرحمن بن القاسم عن أبيه عن عائشة  
قالت قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إذا أراد الله بالأمير خيراً جعل له  
وزير صدق إن نسي ذكره وإن ذكر أعانه وإذا أراد الله به غير ذلك جعل له  
وزير سوء إن نسي لم يذكره وإن ذكر لم يعنه

Al-Husayn b. ‘Abd Allah al-Qattan – Musa b. Marwan al-Raqiyy – al-Walid – Zuhayr b. Muhammad – ‘Abd al-Rahman b. al-Qasim – his father – ‘Aishah:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “**If Allah intends good for the *amir*, He appoints for him a sincere *wazir*. If he (the *amir*) forgets, he (the *wazir*) will remind him; and if he (the *amir*) remembers, he (the *wazir*) will help him.** However, if Allah intends other than that for him (i.e. the

*amir*), He appoints for him an evil *wazir*. If he (the *amir*) forgets, he (the *wazir*) will not remind him; and if he (the *amir*) remembers, he (the *wazir*) will not help him.”<sup>18</sup>

‘Allamah al–Albani (d. 1420 H) comments:

## صحيح

*Sahih*<sup>19</sup>

Shaykh al–‘Arnaut agrees with him:

## حديث صحيح

*A sahih hadith*<sup>20</sup>

The *hadith* obviously establishes that the success or failure of a ruler depends very heavily upon his *wazir*. If his *wazir* his righteous, the leader is very likely to succeed. However, if the *wazir* is evil, the *amir* has very low chances of success. For instance, Fir’aun was an evil ruler. Yet, if his *wazir* – Haman – had been a good human being, Fir’aun’s atrocities would have been far less serious or widespread. Prophet Harun was also the *wazir* of his brother, Prophet Musa. This is interesting indeed. Musa was already an infallible leader. Yet, he prayed to his Lord for a *wazir*, and another infallible prophet was bestowed that rank.

Muhammad, on the other hand, is Allah’s most beloved and best creature. Moreover, the task given to him by his Lord was countless times heavier, more difficult, more complex and more important than those awarded to all the other prophets and messengers combined. Since the *wazir* of a prophet can be appointed only by Allah, it is indeed an unimaginably huge honour that He chose ‘Ali for Muhammad.

Amir al–Muminin was the most qualified of all of Allah’s creatures to be the *wazir* – the spiritual, political and military deputy, and the chief adviser and helper – of the master of all creation. That truly is an *extremely* lofty merit. Without a doubt, the superiority of ‘Ali b. Abi Talib over everyone in this *Ummah* – apart from our Prophet – is established absolutely and perfectly through his status as the *wazir* of the best Messenger of Allah.

On that note, we would like to conclude our book with these words of Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H):

ففي هذا الخبر إخبار عمر بين المهاجرين والأنصار أن أبا بكر سيد المسلمين

وخيرهم وأحبهم إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ذلك علة مبايعته فقال بل  
نبايعك أنت فأنت سيدنا وخيرنا وأحبنا إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم  
ليبين بذلك أن المأمور به تولية الأفضل وأنت أفضلنا فنبايعك

In this report is the declaration of ‘Umar among the Muhajirun and the Ansar that Abu Bakr was the *sayyid* of the Muslims and the best of them, and the most beloved of them to the Messenger of Allah. This is the reason for following him.

So, he (‘Umar) said, “Rather, we will follow you because you are our *sayyid*, and the best of us, and the most beloved of us to the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him”. He wanted to make clear through it that: **WHAT IS ORDAINED IS TO GIVE AUTHORITY TO THE BEST**, and you are the best of us. So, we will follow you.<sup>21</sup>

1. Qur’an 20:24–36
2. Qur’an 25:35
3. Qur’an 28:8
4. Abu Ja’far Muhammad b. Jarir b. Yazid b. Kathir b. Ghalib al–Amuli al–Tabari, Jami al–Bayan fi Tawil al–Qur’an (Dar al–Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: Sidqi Jamil al–‘Attar], vol. 24, p. 82
5. Abu al–Fida Isma’il b. ‘Umar b. Kathir al–Qurshi al–Dimashqi, Tafsir al–Qur’an al–‘Azim (Dar al–Taybah li al–Nashr wa al–Tawzi’; 2nd edition, 1420 H) [annotator: Sami b. Muhammad Salamah], vol. 7, p. 139
6. Wahbah b. Mustafa al–Zuhayli, al–Tafsir al–Munir fi al–‘Aqidah wa al–Shari’ah wa al–Manhaj (Beirut, Damascus: Dar al–Fikr al–Mu’asir; 1418 H), vol. 24, p. 103
7. Ahmad Mustafa al–Maraghi, Tafsir al–Maraghi (Egypt), vol. 20, p. 31 and vol. 24, p. 70
8. Abu al–Qasim ‘Ali b. al–Hasan b. Habat Allah b. ‘Abd Allah, Ibn Asakir al–Shafi’i, Tarikh Madinah Dimashq (Beirut: Dar al–Fikr; 1st edition, 1418 H) [annotator: ‘Ali Shiri], vol. 61, p. 59, footnote # 7
9. ‘Abd al–Rahman b. Muhammad b. Makhluq, Abu Zayd al–Tha’alabi al–Maliki, al–Jawahir al–Husan fi Tafsir al–Qur’an (Beirut: Dar Ihya al–Turath al–‘Arabi; 1st edition, 1418 H) [annotators: Shaykh ‘Ali Muhammad Ma’ud, Shaykh ‘Adil Ahmad ‘Abd al–Mawjud and Prof. Dr. ‘Abd al–Fattah Abu Sunnah], vol. 4, p. 264
10. Abu al–Fadhl Mahmud al–Alusi, Ruh al–Ma’ani fi Tafsir al–Qur’an al–‘Azim wa Sab’ al–Mathani (Beirut: Dar Ihya al–Turath al–‘Arabi), vol. 24, p. 61
11. ‘Abd al–‘Aziz b. ‘Abd Allah b. Baz, Majmu’ Fatawa, vol. 10, p. 249. See also vol. 10, p. 278
12. Muhammad b. Salih al–‘Uthaymin, Fatawa Nur ‘ala al–Darb (Muassasat Shaykh Muhammad bin Salih b. ‘Uthaymin al–Khayriyyah; 1427 H), vol. 31, p. 111
13. Qur’an 28:8
14. Qur’an 7:121–122
15. Qur’an 20:70
16. Qur’an 37:114–118
17. Abu ‘Abd al–Rahman Ahmad b. Shu’ayb al–Nasai, Sunan al–Kubra (Beirut: Dar al–Kutub al–‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Dr. ‘Abd al–Ghaffar Sulayman al–Bandari and Sayyid Kasrawi Hasan], vol. 5, p. 125, # 8451
18. Abu Hatim Muhammad b. Hibban b. Ahmad b. Hibban b. Mu’adh b. Ma’bad al–Tamimi al–Darimi al–Busti, Sahih Ibn Hibban bi Tartib Ibn Balban (Beirut: Muassasat al–Risalah; 2nd edition, 1414 H) [annotators: Muhammad Nasir al–Din al–Albani and Shu’ayb al–Arnaut], vol. 10, p. 345, # 4494
19. Ibid
20. Ibid

21. Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 8, p. 565

1. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz b. ‘Abd Allah b. Baz, *Majmu’ Fatawa*
2. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz b. Marzuq al-Turayfi, *al-Tahjil fi Takhrij ma lam Yukhraj min al-Ahadith wa al-Athar fi Irwa al-Ghalil* (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Rushd li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’; 1st edition, 1422 H)
3. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Umar al-Baydhawi, *Tafsir* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr)
4. ‘Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. Abi Shaybah Ibrahim b. ‘Uthman b. Abi Bakr b. Abi Shaybah al-Kufi al-‘Ubsi, *Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah fi al-Ahadith wa al-Athar* (Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1409 H) [annotator: Prof. Sa’id al-Laham]
5. ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Muhammad b. Makhluq, Abu Zayd al-Tha’alabi al-Maliki, *al-Jawahir al-Husan fi Tafsir al-Qur’an* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-‘Arabi; 1st edition, 1418 H) [annotators: Shaykh ‘Ali Muhammad Ma’ud, Shaykh ‘Adil Ahmad ‘Abd al-Mawjud and Prof. Dr. ‘Abd al-Fattah Abu Sunnah]
6. ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Yahya b. ‘Ali b. Muhammad al-Mu’alami al-‘Atmi al-Yamani, *al-Tankil bi ma fi Ta-anib al-Kawthari min al-Abatil* (al-Maktab al-Islami; 2nd edition, 1406 H) [annotators: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani, Zuhayr al-Shawish and ‘Abd al-Razzaq Hamzah]
7. ‘Ala al-Din ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Khazan al-Baghdadi, *Lubab al-Tawil fi Ma’ani al-Tanzil* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1399 H)
8. ‘Ali b. Husam al-Din al-Muttaqi al-Hindi, *Kanz al-‘Ummal fi Sunan al-Aqwal wa Af’al* (Beirut: Muassasat al-Risalah; 1989 H)
9. Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, *Musnad* (Cairo: Dar al-Hadith; 1st edition, 1416 H) [annotator: Ahmad Muhammad Shakir]
10. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, *al-Mustadrak ‘ala al-Sahihayn* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa ‘Abd al-Qadir ‘Ata]
11. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad b. ‘Uthman al-Dhahabi, *Mizan al-I’tidal fi Naqd al-Rijal* (Beirut: Dar al-Ma’rifah; 1st edition, 1382 H) [annotator: ‘Ali Muhammad al-Bajawi]
12. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Isma’il b. Ibrahim b. Mughirah al-Bukhari al-Ju’fi, *al-Jami’ al-Sahih al-Mukhtasar* (Beirut: Dar Ibn Kathir; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafa Dib al-Bagha]
13. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ja’far al-Idrisi al-Kattani, *Nazam al-Mutanathir min al-Hadith al-Mutawatir* (Egypt: Dar al-Kutub al-Salafiyyah; 2nd edition)

14. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Ahmad b. Shu'ayb al-Nasai, *Sunan al-Kubra* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Dr. 'Abd al-Ghaffar Sulayman al-Bandari and Sayyid Kasrawi Hasan]
15. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, *Al-Thamar al-Mustatab fi Fiqh al-Sunnah wa al-Kitab* (Gharas li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1422 H)
16. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, *Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqhiyah wa Fawaidihah* (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1415 H)
17. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, *Ta'liqat al-Hisan 'ala Sahih Ibn Hibban* (Jeddah: Dar Ba Wazir li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1424 H)
18. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, *Sahih al-Jami' al-Saghir wa Ziyadatuhu* (Al-Maktab al-Islami)
19. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, *Sahih Abi Dawud* (Kuwait: Muassasat al-Gharas li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1423 H)
20. Abu 'Ali al-Fadhl b. al-Hasan al-Tabarsi, *Majma' al-Bayan fi Tafsir al-Qur'an* (Beirut: Muassasat al-A'lami li al-Matbu'at; 1st edition, 1415 H)
21. Abu 'Isa Muhammad b. 'Isa al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi, *al-Jami' al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani] Abu 'Umar Yusuf b. 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Barr b. 'Asim al-Nimri al-Qurtubi, *al-Isti'ab fi Ma'rifat al-Ashab* (Beirut: Dar al-Jil; 1st edition, 1412 H) [annotator: 'Ali Muhammad al-Bajawi]
22. Abu al-'Abbas Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, *Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim]
23. Abu al-'Ala Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman b. 'Abd al-Rahim al-Mubarakfuri, *Tuhfat al-Ahwazi bi Sharh Jami' al-Tirmidhi* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1410 H)
24. Abu al-Fadhl 'Abd Allah b. al-Siddiq al-Maghribi, *al-Qawl al-Muqni' fi Radd 'ala al-Albani al-Mubtadi'*
25. Abu al-Fadhl Jamal al-Din Muhammad b. Mukram b. Manzur al-Afriqi al-Misri, *Lisan al-'Arab* (Qum: Nashr Adab al-Hawzah; 1405 H)
26. Abu al-Fadhl Mahmud al-Alusi, *Ruh al-Ma'ani fi Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azim wa Sab' al-Mathani* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi)

27. Abu al-Faraj Jamal al-Din 'Abd al-Rahman b. 'Ali b. Muhammad al-Jawzi al-Qurshi al-Baghdadi, *Zad al-Masir fi 'Ilm al-Tafsir* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman 'Abd Allah]
28. Abu al-Fida Isma'il b. 'Umar b. Kathir al-Qurshi al-Dimashqi, *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azim* (Dar al-Taybah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 2nd edition, 1420 H) [annotator: Sami b. Muhammad Salamah]
29. Abu al-Fida Isma'il b. Kathir al-Dimashqi, *al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah* (Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi; 1st edition, 1408 H) [annotator: 'Ali Shiri]
30. Abu al-Hasan Ahmad b. 'Abd Allah b. Salih al-'Ijli al-Kufi, *Ma'rifat al-Thiqat* (Madinah: Maktabah al-Dar; 1st edition, 1405 H)
31. Abu al-Husayn Ahmad b. Faris b. Zakariyyah, *Mu'jam Maqayis al-Lughah* (Qum: Maktab al-'Ilam al-Islami; 1404 H) [annotator: 'Abd Salam Muhammad Harun]
32. Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj al-Qushayri al-Naysaburi, *Sahih Muslim* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Fuad 'Abd al-Baqi]
33. Abu al-Qasim 'Ali b. al-Hasan b. Habat Allah b. 'Abd Allah, Ibn Asakir al-Shafi'i, *Tarikh Madinah Dimashq* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: 'Ali Shiri]
34. Abu al-Qasim al-Husayn b. Muhammad b. al-Mufadhhal al-Raghib al-Isfahani, *Tafsir al-Raghib al-Isfahani wa Muqadimmatuh* (Kulliyat al-Adab, Jami'ah Tanta; 1st edition, 1412 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad 'Abd al-'Aziz Basyuni]
35. Abu Bakr b. Abi 'Asim, Ahmad b. 'Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, *Kitab al-Sunnah* (al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1400 H) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani]
36. Abu Bakr b. Abi 'Asim, Ahmad b. 'Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, *Kitab al-Sunnah* (Dar al-Sami'i li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi') [annotator: Dr. Basim b. Faysal al-Jawabirah]
37. Abu Barakat 'Abd Allah b. Ahmad b. Mahmud al-Nasafi, *Tafsir al-Nasafi* (Beirut: Dar al-Nafais; 2005 CE) [annotator: Marwan Muhammad al-Shi'ar]
38. Abu Dawud Sulayman b. Dawud b. al-Jarud al-Farisi al-Basri al-Tayalisi, *Musnad* (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah)
39. Abu Hatim Muhammad b. Hibban b. Ahmad al-Tamimi al-Busti, *Kitab al-Thiqat* (Hyderabad: Majlis Dairat al-Ma'arif al-'Uthmaniyyah; 1st edition, 1398 H)
40. Abu Hatim Muhammad b. Hibban b. Ahmad b. Hibban b. Mu'adh b. Ma'bad al-Tamimi al-Darimi al-Busti, *Sahih Ibn Hibban bi Tartib Ibn Balban* (Beirut: Muassasat al-Risalah; 2nd edition, 1414 H) [annotators: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani and Shu'ayb al-Arnaut]

41. Abu Ishaq Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Tha'labi al-Naysaburi, *al-Kashf wa al-Bayan* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi; 1st edition, 1422 H) [annotator: Abu Muhammad b. 'Ashur]
42. Abu Ja'far Muhammad b. Jarir b. Yazid b. Kathir b. Ghalib al-Amuli al-Tabari, *Jami al-Bayan fi Tawil al-Qur'an* (Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: Sidqi Jamil al-'Attar]
43. Abu Muhammad 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Rahman al-Darimi, *Sunan* (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-'Arabi; 1st edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Husayn Salim Asad]
44. Abu Muhammad 'Abd al-Rahman b. Abi Hatim Muhamamd b. Idris b. al-Munzir al-Tamimi al-Hanzali al-Razi, *al-Jarh wa al-Ta'dil* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi; 1st edition, 1371 H)
45. Abu Muhammad al-Husayn b. Mas'ud al-Baghwi, *Mu'alim al-Tanzil* (Dar Tayyibah; 4th edition, 1417 H)
46. Abu Sa'ud Muhammad b. Muhammad al-'Imadi, *Irshad al-'Aql al-Salim ila Mizaya al-Qur'an al-Karim* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi)
47. Abu Ya'la Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Muthanna al-Mawsili al-Tamimi, *Musnad* (Damascus: Dar al-Mamun li al-Turath; 1st edition, 1404 H) [annotator: Dr. Husayn Salim Asad]
48. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, *al-Isabah fi Tamyiz al-Sahabah* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1415 H) [annotators: Shaykh 'Adil Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Mawjud and Shaykh 'Ali Muhammad Ma'udh]
49. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, *Taqrib al-Tahdhib* (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata]
50. Ahmad b. Abi Bakr b. Isma'il al-Busiri, *Itihaf al-Khiyarah al-Maharah bi Zawaid al-Masanid al-Ashara* (Riyadh: Dar al-Watan; 1st edition, 1420 H)
51. Ahmad Mustafa al-Maraghi, *Tafsir al-Maraghi* (Egypt)
52. Badr al-Din al-'Ayni, *'Umdah al-Qari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari*
53. Dr. Rohi Baalbaki, *al-Mawrid: A Modern Arabic-English Dictionary* (Beirut: Dar al-'Ilm li al-Malayin; 7th edition, 1995 CE)
54. Fakhr al-Din al-Turayhi, *Majma' al-Bahrayn* (2nd edition, 1408 H) [annotator: Sayyid Ahmad al-Husayni]
55. Hans Wehr, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, ed. J. Milton Cowan (Ithaca, New York: Spoken Languages Services; 3rd edition, 1976 CE)

56. Ibn al-Athir, Abu Sa'adat al-Mubarak b. Muhammad al-Jazari, *al-Nihayah fi Gharib al-Hadith wa al-Athar* (Qum: Muasassat Isma'iliyyan) [annotator: Mahmud Muhammad al-Tanahi and Tahir Ahmad al-Zawi]
57. Isma'il b. Hammad al-Jawhari, *al-Sihah: Taj al-Lughah wa Sihah al-'Arabiyyah* (Beirut: Dar al-'Ilm li al-Malayin; 4th edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Ahmad 'Abd al-Ghafur 'Atar]
58. Jalal al-Din Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Mahalli and Jalal al-Din 'Abd al-Rahman b. Abu Bakr al-Suyuti, *Tafsir al-Jalalayn* (Cairo: Dar al-Hadith; 1st edition)
59. Muhammad al-Jawahiri, *al-Mufid min Mu'jam al-Rijal al-Hadith* (Qum: Mansurat Maktabah al-Mahalati; 2nd edition, 1424 H)
60. Muhammad b. Abi Bakr 'Abd al-Qadir al-Razi, *Mukhtar al-Sihah* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Ahmad Shams al-Din]
61. Muhammad b. Sa'd, *al-Tabaqat al-Kubra* (Beirut: Dar al-Sadir)
62. Muhammad b. Salih al-'Uthaymin, *Fatawa Nur 'ala al-Darb* (Muasassat Shaykh Muhammad bin Salih b. 'Uthaymin al-Khayriyyah; 1427 H)
63. Muhammad b. Yusuf al-Salihi al-Shami, *Subul al-Huda al-Rashad fi Sirah Khayr al-'Ibad* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1414 H) [annotators: 'Adil Ahmad 'Abd al-Mawjud and 'Ali Muhammad Ma'ud]
64. Muhammad Baqir al-Majlisi, *Bihar al-Anwar al-Jami'ah li Durar Akhbar al-Aimah al-Athar* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi; 3rd edition, 1403 H)
65. Muhammad Ghazali al-Saqa, *Fiqh al-Sirah* (Damascus: Dar al-Qalam; 1st edition, 1427 H) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani]
66. Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani, *Asl Sifat al-Salat al-Nabi* (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1427 H)
67. Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani, *Irwa al-Ghalil fi Takhrij Ahadith Manar al-Sabil* (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islami; 2nd edition, 1405 H)
68. Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani, *Mukhtasar al-'Uluw al-'Aliyy al-'Azim* (al-Maktab al-Islami; 2nd edition, 1412 H)
69. Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, *Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Dha'ifah wa al-Mawdu'ah wa Athariyah al-Sayyiah fi al-Ummah* (Riyadh: Dar al-Ma'arif; 1st edition, 1412 H)
70. Muhammad Rashid b. 'Ali Ridha, *Tafsir Qur'an al-Hakim* (Egypt: al-Hay-ah al-Masriyyah al-'Amma

li al-Kitab; 1990 CE)

71. Muhammad Tahir b. 'Ashur, *al-Tahrir wa al-Tanwir* (Tunis: Dar al-Sahnun li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1997 CE)

72. Muhyi al-Din Abu Zakariyyah Yahya b. Sharaf al-Nawawi, *Sahih Muslim bi Sharh al-Nawawi* (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-'Arabi; 1407 H)

73. Mullah Muhsin al-Faydh al-Kashani, *Tafsir al-Safi* (Tehran: Maktabah al-Sadr; 2nd edition, 1416 H) [annotator: Shaykh Husayn A'lami]

74. Nur al-Din 'Ali b. Abi Bakr al-Haythami, *Majma' al-Zawaid* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1412 H)

75. Prof. Dr. Hikmat b. Bashir b. Yasin, *Mawsu'at al-Sahih al-Masbur min al-Tafsir bi al-Mathur* (Madinah: Dar al-Mathar li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi' wa al-Taba'at; 1st edition, 1420 H)

76. Shams al-Din Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad b. al-Dhahabi al-Dimashqi, *al-Kashif fi Ma'rifat Man Lahu Riwayat fi al-Kutub al-Sittah* (Jeddah: Dar al-Qiblah li al-Thaqafat al-Islamiyyah; 1st edition, 1413 H)

77. Shams al-Din Muhammad b. Ahmad b. 'Uthman al-Dhahabi, *Siyar A'lam al-Nubala* (Beirut: Muassasat al-Risalah; 1413 H) [annotators of the eighth volume: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut and Nazir Hamadan]

78. Shihab al-Din Abu al-Fadhl Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, *Lisan al-Mizan* (Beirut: Manshurat Muassasat al-A'lami li al-Matbu'at; 2nd edition, 1390 H)

79. Shihab al-Din Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, *Tahdhib al-Tahdhib* (Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1404 H)

80. Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, *Fath al-Bari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari* (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah li al-Taba'ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition)

81. Wahbah b. Mustafa al-Zuhayli, *al-Tafsir al-Munir fi al-'Aqidah wa al-Shari'ah wa al-Manhaj* (Beirut, Damascus: Dar al-Fikr al-Mu'asir; 1418 H)

---

**Source URL:** <https://www.al-islam.org/khilafah-ali-over-abu-bakr-toyib-olawuyi>

### Links

[1] <https://www.al-islam.org/user/login?destination=node/30943%23comment-form>

[2] <https://www.al-islam.org/user/register?destination=node/30943%23comment-form>

[3] <https://www.al-islam.org/person/toyib-olawuyi>

- [4] <https://www.al-islam.org/library/sunni-shia>
- [5] <https://www.al-islam.org/library/early-islamic-history>
- [6] <https://www.al-islam.org/library/imam-ali>
- [7] <https://www.al-islam.org/library/hadith-collections>
- [8] <https://www.al-islam.org/tags/hadith-al-wilayah>
- [9] <https://www.al-islam.org/tags/hadith-al-tawliyah>
- [10] <https://www.al-islam.org/tags/hadith-al-wirathah>
- [11] <https://www.al-islam.org/feature/resources-further-research>
- [12] <https://www.al-islam.org/feature/shia-beliefs-explained>
- [13] <https://www.al-islam.org/person/imam-ali>
- [14] <https://www.al-islam.org/person/abu-bakr>