

Part 6: "Their Love And Respect Deter Them"

It is highly unlikely that the coup leaders would assault the house of Fatima (sa), being deterred by her status from doing any such thing.

He tries to provide evidence for such a status with many matters which, in turn, are mere unsubstantiated claims or unfit to prove his point.

But he does not find it "unlikely" that they would threaten to burn the house in order to psychologically coerce them to yield to their demands, emphasizing that they only wanted to arrest the Commander of the Faithful, peace with him. As for al-Zahra' (sa) or others, they had no business with them...!

In this Part, we are going to discuss these issues which he considers to be sufficient to justify the doubt which he entertains and which does not reach the degree of open rejection, although he tries to amass proofs and evidences to sufficiently deny all of that, not to merely cast some doubt. Here we are going to provide his proofs and evidences and explain how they are unfit for such a role.

[This Part's Research](#)

Before entering into the details, we would like to point out to the discussion in this Part to be centering around these points:

1. A dispute with one person does not prohibit him from respecting that person's wife for one reason or another.
2. Ali (as) taking Fatima (sa) to the houses of the Ansar to solicit their support demonstrates the loftiness of her status and of the respect which she enjoyed in the Islamic society.
3. Those brought by "Umar to the house of al-Zahra' (sa) objected when he threatened to burn the house and everyone inside it, so they said to him, "But Fatima (sa) is inside!" He said to them, "So what?!" This has many implications:

One: al-Zahra' (sa) enjoyed a status which could not be ignored.

Two: The hearts of those brought by "Umar were filled with love for al-Zahra' (sa); so, how can we imagine that they would assault her?

Three: Even if they did not love al-Zahra' (sa) nor respect her, they went there only to subdue the opposition and to arrest Ali (sa) and had no business with al-Zahra' (sa) even if she was present there and then, and this is what "Umar meant when he said, "So what?!"

Four: There is more than one narrative discussing people's respect for al-Zahra' (sa); so, how could anyone dare to assault her?

Five: Their going there, i.e. Abu Bakr and "Umar going to the house of al-Zahra' (sa) and requesting her to forgive them, shows the greatness of the status which she enjoyed in the Islamic society especially among senior *sahabis*.

Six: al-Zahra' (sa) was pleased with both senior *sahabis* when they visited her seeking to appease her.

Seven: The reception awarded by al-Zahra' (sa) to both senior *sahabis* proves the invalidity of the tradition of hers which says, "It is best for a woman that she neither sees men, nor men should see her."

Their Dispute With Ali (as) and Respect for al-Zahra' (sa)

Someone says that the dispute of the assailants with Ali (as) did not prohibit them from loving and respecting al-Zahra' (sa) for there may be one candidate competing with another to be elected and wishing to drop him from the elections, but having a dispute with him does not stop him from respecting the wife of his competitor for one reason or another.

The answer is that we notice many matters regarding this statement:

FIRST: The case of Ali (as) with those who assailed him and his house, usurped his right and disobeyed Allah and His Messenger S, has no similarity with the competition between two candidates. Rather, it is similar to a military coup d'etat carried out by a sweeping and devastating force, though it was not that obvious yet deeper in its implications and indications.

SECOND: Respect for the competitor's wife is not known by conjecture or assumption. Rather, it is known by practice, stand, and movement on the real grounds. We have seen these folks being very cruel and crude against the wife of the person described by this same individual as a "competitor"! It is the practice that lacks any mercy or compassion in their hearts. So let the reader read the description of what went on in various texts and legacies which we do not exaggerate if we say that they are consecutively reported as the kind reader will see for himself.

THIRD: Even if we submit that the assailants respected her, or even loved her (sa), respect and love did

not stop them when she stood in their faces and threatened them with her aspirations and was the reason for the failure of their serious plan. All that did not stop them from turning against her and treat her with utmost cruelty.

Even if the doers were their brothers and offspring, they would still confront them with the same violence, for love for authority and the seriousness of what they wanted to carry out would put them in a fateful dilemma which would act as a catalyst for deciding the matter by force. The matter for them was much more serious; it was stronger than and ignoring such a respect.

Status of al-Zahra' (sa) with the Ansar and with Her Assailants

Someone claims that those who assaulted the house of al-Zahra' (sa) loved and respected her, and that those brought by "Umar had hearts full of love for her; so, how could they have assaulted her?!

Then he seeks evidence from the following:

According to *Bihar al-Anwar* and many other references, Ali (as) used to take al-Zahra' (sa) around the houses of the Muhajirun and the Ansar so that she might defend his right. She, then, wanted to take advantage of her status and of the respect awarded to her to win their support; so, how could anyone dare to assault her?!

Obviously, such talk is derived from al-Fadl ibn Rozbahan who used to rebut 'allama al-Hilli by saying, "The chiefs of the Ansar and senior *sahabis* were Muslims who were led by their love for the Messenger of Allah S; so, could it be possible that they remained silent and did not speak to Abu Bakr in this regard? Surely burning the house of the family of the Prophet S is not permissible or commendable."¹

The answer is as follows:

FIRST: There were three parties in Medina:

1. A party which nothing could deter, be it religion or ethics or civil feelings, from harming Ahl al-Bayt (as), even burning their houses or killing them and those who seek refuge with them with the fire.
2. Another party which sympathized a little with the oppressed group which faced all these great calamities, but it preferred to remain safe and was not ready to sacrifice anything for the oppressed, not even for righteousness or for the religion to which they were invited.

All these elements combined, the love, respect, religion, oppression, humanity, could not move it to take a decisive stand against the assailing party aiming at forcing Ali (as) to swear the oath of allegiance to him. Both Ali and al-Zahra' (as) tried to stir this particular party to action, but they could not; thus was the will of the Messenger of Allah S lost.

3. A third party which stood beside al-Zahra' (sa) ready to sacrifice everything precious for the sake of

effecting justice and equity and putting an end to injustice when daring and courage were viable. The members of this party was very small; they included Abu Tharr, Salman, al-Miqdad, 'Ammar...

Thus, it becomes obvious that there was no indication that the assailants were members of the party that loved al-Zahra' (sa) rather than the third or the second party. We find their actions, assaults and practices, as clear indications that they belonged to the party which did not respect her but did hate her, and they did not hesitate to burn her house with everyone who sought shelter in it.

They actually caused all of that to happen when they hit her and caused her to miscarry, so she died a martyr in its aftermath, although they were trying not to openly express such a hatred. Such was their policy. Thus did they placate people so that the public might not lean more to the family of Ali (as) and so that they would be convinced that he and his Ahl al-Bayt (as) were, indeed, oppressed, and that their way was more right.

To sum up, there is no meaning for pointing to the status enjoyed by al-Zahra' (sa) and to the respect which she enjoyed by the members of the second party which liked its skins to remain safe and did not want to enter the arena of struggle. There is no meaning for pointing out to the status of and to the "respect" whereby she was held by the assailing party which did not hesitate to attack al-Zahra' (sa) and confront her with evil and harm.

SECOND: Had the assailants really loved and respected al-Zahra' (sa), there would have been no need for Ali (as) to take her around the homes of the Muhajirun and the Ansar to win their support and to convince them to defend his right, peace with him. Rather, it would have been sufficient for her to face the assailants in person and to use her influence with them and her position in their hearts so that they might retreat, or to disappoint those who enticed them to do what they wanted them to do without achieving their objective or earn anything that went against the wish of al-Zahra' (sa) or which would have enraged her.

Asides from that, had they all loved al-Zahra' (sa), would she still have needed to seek the support of the Ansar to attack those who loved her and to try to kill them?! Was al-Zahra' (sa) the type of person who would cause animosity among those who loved her, letting them fight among themselves while she stood to watch both parties happy and pleased?!

THIRD: If those folks loved al-Zahra' (sa), why did she die turning away from them and from those who brought them to her house?! Then she stated in her will that neither of the two senior *sahabis* (Abu Bakr and 'Umar), nor any of those who oppressed her, should be present at her funeral. Then she was buried, for this reason, in the darkness of the night. It is for this reason that her grave is not known to people at all, to all of them, the only daughter of the Messenger of Allah S that she was and the Head of the Women of Mankind from the early generations to the last ones.

How could she meet their love with such cold-heartedness while Allah, Praised and Glorified is He, commands them to love her and to make her pleased, while she turns away from them or feel angry with

them?!

Who Said to "Umar, "But Fatima (sa) is Inside..."?!

Someone says that those who objected to "Umar, when he threatened to set the house of al-Zahra' (sa) to fire, were the same individuals whom he had brought with him to assault her house, so they said to him, "But Fatima (sa) is inside!" And he said to them, "So what?!"

Their objection is evidence that they loved al-Zahra' (sa), venerated and respected her, because it means that "The daughter of the Messenger of Allah S was inside the house; so, how could we enter her house by force, scare and terrorize her?"

It has already been stated that the individual says that the assailants brought by "Umar had hearts that were full of love for al-Zahra' (sa), so how can we imagine that they would attack her?!

Before answering this question, let us keep in mind two issues mentioned by someone:

The first is that those who objected to "Umar are the same individuals whom he had brought to attack the house where revelation had descended.

The second is that their objection reflects the status al-Zahra' (sa) enjoyed in their hearts.

We would like to answer both points by saying:

FIRST: Who said that those who objected to "Umar's order were the same assailants? And what is the evidence for that, if any? Fatima's house was located inside the Prophet's Mosque itself, and people used to frequent the Mosque and be present thereat most of the time. When they assaulted the house of al-Zahra' (sa), "... people assembled to watch, and the streets of Medina were full of men"². So, why could those who objected to the assailants not be among those assembling men who gathered to watch what was going on or some of the good believers who were present at the Mosque of the Prophet S? That would make more sense, for it appears that the assailants did not consider any value for the house, or for those inside it, or even to the Mosque or to the grave of the Messenger of Allah S which was also inside the house of al-Zahra' (sa).

SECOND: If we suppose that some men among the assailants said it, it is evident that they did not respect al-Zahra' (sa), nor did they venerate her. Such a protest could have been prompted by their fear of the consequences of committing something as serious as that... If people accepted their conduct to attack Ali (as), since he was the sensitive nucleus of the opposition to their schemes and to their ambitions to take over the government, and if they excused them because Ali (as) had killed their fathers and sons and brothers while defending the Cause of Allah, al-Zahra' (sa) did not do any such deeds. So, attacking her house with the intention to burn it, the only daughter of the Messenger of Allah S that she was, the one who was well known as such throughout the entire Islamic world, could not have been

justified at all by the public, and it could have turned things against them if it appeared that al-Zahra' (sa) had been killed as a result.

THIRD: The assailants attacked al-Zahra' (sa) by beating her and through other means, causing her to miscarry. Nobody among the assailants, nor among others who did what they did, objected to it. Had they been afraid of 'Umar, were they afraid of Qunfath, or of al-Mughirah ibn Shu'bah, or of their likes?!

FOURTH: If the assailants respected al-Zahra' (sa) to such an extent, then the reason for her confronting them and for Ali (as) and Banu Hashim to have a sit-in at the house becomes quite clear because her confrontation in such a situation was to prevent the assailants from reaching Ali (as) and arresting him, as the individual seeking evidence for his statements says and according to his own criteria! Thus, the reason why she, rather than Ali (as) or anyone else who was present there and then, went in person to open the door. And we wish that it was sufficient to deter them from forcing the door open, although it does have an impact on safeguarding the truth from being lost and showing the real face of the leaders of the coup.

FIFTH: The history and policies of those brought by 'Umar to attack the house of al-Zahra' (sa) point out to the fact that they did not love her (sa) at all, and we have found no proof to the contrary. History has informed us of the names of a number of the assailants such as:

Abu Bakr, 'Umar, Qunfath, Abu 'Ubaydah ibn al-Jarrah, Salim slave of Abu Huthayfah, al-Mughirah ibn Shu'bah, Khalid ibn al-Walid, 'Othman (ibn 'Affan), Assad ibn Hadar, Mu'ath ibn Jabal, 'Abd al-Rahman ibn 'Awf, 'Abd ar-Rahman ibn Abu Bakr, Muhammed ibn Maslamah (who broke al-Zubayr's sword), Zaid ibn Aslam, 'Ayyash ibn Raba'ah and others³ who will be mentioned in the texts' section.

How Much Respect Did the Sahaba Have For al-Zahra' (sa)?

Someone says that al-Zahra' (sa) enjoyed a distinctive status among all the Muslims; so, attacking her in such a horrible way could stir the public opinion against the assailants. A proof for this great status is that people treated her with utmost respect and regards, and this raises many question marks about the accuracy of what is claimed about her being allegedly assaulted.

The answer is as follows:

FIRST: Her father, the Messenger of Allah S, enjoyed a greater status in the hearts of the Muslims than anyone else, yet this did not stop someone ('Umar ibn al-Khattab) from confronting the Messenger of Allah S with his famous statement, "The Prophet is hallucinating"⁴ or something like that. The person who articulated this statement was the head of those who assaulted the house of al-Zahra' (sa).

We neither heard nor read anywhere that a single person from among those who were present, when the said statement was articulated, protested or expressed his displeasure and annoyance at such a rude statement. And a group from among the *sahaba* disobeyed the Prophet's order to enlist in

Usamah's army. They did not provide any equipment for that army although he (as) had condemned all those who lagged behind Usamah's army as is well known.[5](#)

They also scared the she-camel on which the Messenger of Allah S was riding in the night of 'Aqaba and made a false charge against his wife ('A'isha), in addition to many other matters which they demonstrated towards the Prophet S and his Purified 'Itra.

Add to the above their killing of al-Husayn (as) and taking his family members captive. This, too, was a major crime which they committed and which is no less heinous than their forceful entry into the house of al-Zahra' (sa) and their beating her. Those who killed al-Husayn were the offspring of those who assaulted the house of al-Zahra' (sa)...

They also conspired to kill Ali (as) as he was standing for the prayers at the Mosque of the Messenger of Allah S at the hands of Khalid ibn al-Walid had not Abu Bakr said, "Khalid should not do what I ordered him to do" shortly before making his *tasleem*.[6](#) Abu Hanifa issued a verdict permitting speaking prior to the *tasleem* based on this incident as is said.[7](#) Sufyan al-Thawri, too, issued a verdict, based on this incident, saying that the prayers of anyone who makes himself unclean prior to pronouncing the *tashahhud* are valid.[8](#)

SECOND: There is respect which manifests itself during ordinary circumstances, when there is nothing to fear or to wish for, but when the case is not so, people, as Imam al-Husayn (as) said, "are the slaves of this world, and they give religion lip service; so, once they are tested, few, indeed, prove to be the true followers of the religion."[9](#)

Respect during the time of ease does not necessarily mean support during the time of trials and tribulations when their interests are threatened, and this fact is known to everyone.

THIRD: What proves the error of what they mentioned, that is, that all those folks loved al-Zahra' (sa) and respected her, and the fact that a group of people dared to go to an unbelievable extent against her, is what Shaikh al-Tusi narrates from Abul-'Abbas ibn 'Uqdah from Muhammed ibn al-Mufaddal from al-Hassan ibn Ali al-Washsha' from 'Abd al-Karam ibn 'Amr al-Khath'ami from 'Abdullah ibn Abu Ya'far and Mu'alla ibn Khunays from Abul Samit from Abu 'Abdullah (Imam al-Sadiq عليه السلام) who says that there are seven of the greatest of sins..., etc., adding, "As for charging innocent women, *they* even charged Fatima (sa) from the top of their pulpits..., etc."[10](#)

"Ali (as) is a Dissenter Who had to be Subdued"

Someone offers a view saying that:

1. Those who assembled at the house of al-Zahra' (sa), namely Ali (as) and Banu Hashim, represented the opposition to the new government. The nature of the matter required that when the opposition was assembled to rebel against the caliphate, the rulers had to confront them and subdue them. Their going

there, then, was to arrest Ali (as) in order to put an end to the opposition.

2. The purpose of the assailants was to arrest Ali (as); as for Fatima (sa), they had no business with her because there was a public opinion present then. "Umar's statement "So what?!" which he gave in answer to those who said to him, "But Fatima (sa) is inside!" comes natural. It means: "We have no business with Fatima (sa); we only want to put an end to the opposition by arresting Ali (as). So, if al-Zahra' (sa) is present, we do not intend to have anything to do with her; our objective is only to arrest Ali (as)."

The answer is:

FIRST: We are very surprised to see how Ali (as) is described as a rebel and so are those with him from Banu Hashim as well as others. They are all described as the "opposition"! Since when did the usurpers settle in and establish their authority so that the others could be described as an "opposition"?! The assault on the house of al-Zahra' (sa) took place immediately after Abu Bakr had already returned from Saqifat Banu Sa'ida and went to the Mosque. It is there that Abu Bakr sat on the pulpit on which the Prophet S used to sit, and it was then that the assault started. Even after they had held the reins of authority in their hands, is it right or wrong to label the person who has the legitimate right with him, the one against whom the assailants initiated their attack in order to usurp his right and position wherein Allah Almighty placed him and to subdue him with force, coercion, trickery and other illegitimate means, as an "opposition" or a rebel who had to be subdued? Should all of this be done in order to render legitimacy to the oppressive usurper?

SECOND: Had all this been "right," is it right for "Umar to say, "You shall get out or I burn the house and everyone inside it!" They said to him, "But Fatima (sa) is inside!" He said, "So what?!" Does this statement mean, "We have no business with Fatima (sa); we only want to arrest Ali (as)"? Does this mean that they would save Fatima (sa) from being burnt and direct the fire towards Ali (as) rather than anyone else?! Is it thus that the assailants could express their respect for Fatima (sa) in lieu of all the statements which her father, the Messenger of Allah S, made about her?!

THIRD: Does the existence of a public opinion mean that it would stop them from burning Fatima (sa)?! If this public opinion permitted the burning of Ali (as), why did it not likewise permit the burning of Fatima (sa) and both al-Hassan and al-Husayn, peace with them both, with him, since they are his supporters?! Since the statements made by the Prophet S in honour of al-Zahra' (sa) served as a deterrent, why were they not deterred by his statements in honour of Ali (as)?! What kind of "public opinion" is this that allows arresting and assaulting Ali (as)?!

Had there really been a public opinion, why did it not deter someone from saying that the Messenger of Allah S was "hallucinating"?! And why was the speaker not punished or at least reprimanded?! We have not found a shred of evidence testifying that they even frowned at him, which is the least they should have done under the circumstance, except if this same individual wanted to deny that the same man

(‘Umar) did not commit such a rude insult against the Greatest Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him and his progeny! And why did this “public opinion” not prohibit the hitting of Fatima (sa) and her miscarriage in its aftermath?! Why did that “public opinion” not prohibit the killing of Imam al–Husayn (as) and those with him from among the stars on earth of Banu Hashim and of the elite from among the believers and sincere ones?! Why did it not prohibit the taking of the daughters of the Messenger of Allah S captive to be paraded in one country after another as men looked on? And why, and why?...

FOURTH: It is quite obvious that “So what?!” serves to join a preceding sentence to one that follows it, so it means: “So what if Fatima (sa) is inside the house?! I shall burn the house and everyone inside it...!” It does not at all mean, “We have no business with Fatima (sa). We have only come to arrest Ali (as),” as the speaker claims. His claim is not supported by any of the rules of Arabic grammar, and it is not acceptable in the sciences of fluency or in any other.

As for his phrase “and everyone inside it,” it clearly refers to human beings; it emphasizes his intention to burn the house and all people inside it, namely Fatima (sa), her sons al–Hassan and al–Husayn (as), as well as Ali (as). Had we accepted the interpreter’s viewpoint that they had no business with Fatima (sa), then they had no business with those inside her house, namely Banu Hashim, al–Zubayr and al–’Abbas who, the speaker says, were also present there and then. Was the phrase “and everyone inside it” linguistically applicable to only Ali (as) and not to al–Hassan and al–Husayn, peace with them, nor to Fidda, al–Zubayr, Banu Hashim, Fatima (sa), al–’Abbas..., etc. ?

Add to the above this: If he had no concern about Fatima (sa), why did he not ask her to leave the house for which he had brought firewood to burn it and to burn everyone inside it?! Instead, he answered with “So what?!” when told that Fatima (sa) was inside.

Asking For Fatima’s Forgiveness Denotes the Status of al–Zahra’ (sa)

Someone wonders: “Did not the request of both senior *sahabis*, ‘Umar and Abu Bakr, of al–Zahra’s forgiveness indicate that she (sa) enjoyed a lofty status among major *sahabis*?” Here is our answer:

FIRST: Their request for forgiveness by itself proves that they had harmed her and enraged her to the extent that they sought her forgiveness even if through pretense.

SECOND: There is no doubt that al–Zahra’ (sa) maintained her value in the Islamic society, and this is what forced those who harmed and assaulted her to try to absorb the public anger against them and to remove the negative impression caused by what they had committed against her (sa).

THIRD: When they sought to appease her, they did not offer anything that would prove that they were serious about such an appeasement. All indications point out to their action as a media ploy and nothing else. They did not return Fadak to her, nor did they take any practical steps to remove the effects of their

cruel assault on her, nor did they retreat from their firm determination to usurp the caliphate from Ali (as). Also, they did not publicly admit any wrongdoings, which they also committed, before the *sahaba* in public.

FOURTH: Her maintaining her value did not stop them from assaulting her with beating and with other means. Moreover, her father enjoyed a greater value in the hearts of the people, and he was more holy, yet his greatness, holiness and value did not stop them, when their ambitions and interests prompted them, from directing the most cruel of crude speech to him when one of them prohibited him from writing a book appointing Ali (as) as his successor when he was on his bed feeling sick. This is what is known as “Thursday’s Calamity.” Their man [“Umar] said, “The Prophet is hallucinating,” or “overcome by pain.”¹¹

They had also confronted this great Prophet S with screaming loud noises during the pilgrimage season¹² when he said to them, “The Imams after me..., etc,” till nobody could hear what the Messenger of Allah S was saying after that, i.e. “all of them from Quraish,”¹³ when they had the feeling that he was going to emphasize the Imamate and caliphate of Ali (as) after him.

Also, the value, the greatness and the holiness of this Prophet S did not prohibit them from insisting on disobeying his sure order to enlist in Usamah’s army although he said to him, “The curse of Allah be on anyone who lags behind Usamah’s army.”¹⁴ Nor did it stop them from trying to assassinate him by scaring his she-camel at the ‘Aqaba.¹⁵

FIFTH: What sort of status did she have in their hearts while “Umar was saying to Abu Bakr, who was crying on being rebuked by al-Zahra’ (sa) when they both visited her to appease her, “Are you upset on account of a woman being angry with you?”!

SIXTH: Historical events cannot be evaluated based on one factor in formulating an event, such as the human factor, or the ethical, or the religious, or the interest, or the economic, or the rational..., etc., although each one of them has a degree of affecting the formulation of this event and determining its motives as well as outcomes.

Had such a statement been valid, it would have been mandatory to belie that Yazid killed al-Husayn (as), for example, or Pharaoh claiming to be a god, because all of this is not in harmony with the religion, nor with the ethics, nor is it accepted by reason or conscience.

The fact is that the factor in formulating an event may be all those afore-mentioned matters combined, and it may be the madness of desires, too. Rather, an event may result from stupidity, or from an emotional outburst, or from psychological diseases or complexes, or from right or wrong ambitions. And it may be some of those factors in addition to one more in addition to this or to that. So, deeming al-Zahra’ (sa) as great and respecting her probably would not prohibit them from confiscating Fadak, for example, if their policies, interests, the passion to rule, or love for money, necessitated it.

We all know that one's love for his son and his compassion towards him does not stop the father from killing the son if the latter becomes his rival for authority. We have heard many rulers say, "Authority is sterile; it has no mercy."¹⁶ One may beat his son very hard for a personal reason or for standing between him and his ambitions and desires. It is said that a woman during the Abbaside period killed her son for the sake of power. Al-Ma'mun killed his brother (al-Amin) for the same reason as we have already stated.

Thus, it becomes clear that there are factors and influences some of which may be stronger than others, and some may cancel the effect of others.

Was al-Zahra' (sa) Pleased With Both Senior Sahabis?!

The same individual adds saying that the issue came to a conclusion during her lifetime, for she, peace and blessings of Allah be on her, became pleased with Abu Bakr and 'Umar when they both sought to appease her. We say the following:

FIRST: True, to please al-Zahra' (sa) is the hope of the line which attacked her (sa) out of concern for not seeming to be among those who harmed the Messenger of Allah S and who incurred his anger, so they would be held in public as those who harmed and angered Allah, Praise to Him. Some of them made attempts to commit forgery in the narration which mentioned that same issue for the benefit of those whom they loved; so, they said that she was pleased with them¹⁷; this is what al-Sha'bi says, and his is a disputed *hadith* because he was not old enough to be present at the time when the incident took place.

Another party took to silence, stating neither pleasure nor displeasure.¹⁸ What is more strange than all of that is the claim of some people that those who performed her funeral prayers were Abu Bakr¹⁹ and Ali (as)!

But the scholars who agree with the same sectarian line of these folks are the same who have accurately narrated this incident for us, paying no heed to what these folks have added to it. Rather, they said that when both men went to appease her, she did not grant them permission to enter her house till they pleaded to Ali (as), who also approached her on their behalf, and even then she refused to let them in but said to him, "The house is yours," that is, "You are free to let in anyone you like according to the dictates of circumstances which are beyond your control." As for her, she maintained her view and stand, and there was nothing else that would mandate anything on her. Ali (as) then permitted them to go inside because he was the owner of the house; al-Zahra' (sa) did not permit them in.

Once they were both in, she refused to speak to them. She spoke to Ali (as) and required both men to admit what they had heard the Messenger of Allah S say, that is, "Fatima's pleasure is from my own pleasure, and her anger is from mine. Whoever loves Fatima (sa), my daughter, loves me, and whoever pleases Fatima (sa), pleases me, and whoever incurs Fatima's anger incurs mine." She said to them

(after they had admitted the above), “Then I plead to Allah and to His angels to testify that you incurred my anger and never pleased me, and when I meet the Prophet, I shall complain to him against you.”²⁰

When Abu Bakr wept because of that, “Umar rebuked him saying, “Are you upset on account of a woman being angry with you?!”²¹ As regarding the text according to Sulaym ibn Qays, here it is:

Ali (as) was performing the five daily prayers at the (Prophet)’s Mosque. After each prayer, Abu Bakr and “Umar asked him, “How is the daughter of the Messenger of Allah S doing?” till they felt tired of saying it.

They asked about her once more saying (to Ali ؑ), “Between us and her is what you already know; so, could you please seek permission for us to apologize to her for the sin which we have committed in her regard?” He said, “I shall grant you that.” They stood up and sat at the door. Ali (as) went inside to see Fatima (sa). He said to her, “O free lady! So-and-so are at the door and they wish to greet you, so what do you say?” She (sa) said, “The house is yours, and the free lady is your wife; so, do whatever you please.” He said, “Tie your headpiece.” She did, turning her face to the wall. They entered, greeted her then said, “Be pleased with us, may Allah be pleased with you.” She said, “What prompted you to do what you did?” They said, “We have admitted our wrongdoing and hoped that you would forgive us and get out of your displeasure with us.” She said, “If you were truthful, then provide me with the answers to my questions, for I shall not ask you a question except that I know that you are familiar with its answer.

If you tell the truth, I shall come to know that you are truthful as to why you have both come here.” They said, “Ask whatever you please.” She said, “I ask you in the Name of Allah, did you ever hear the Messenger of Allah S saying, ‘Fatima is part of me; whoever harms her harms me’?” They said, “Yes.” She, thereupon, raised her hand to the heavens and said, “O Lord! They have both harmed me, so I am complaining to You and to Your Messenger about them. No, by Allah, I shall never be pleased with you till I meet my father, the Messenger of Allah, and tell him about what you did to me, and he will judge you both.” It was then that Abu Bakr was extremely upset and started wailing and weeping. “Umar said to him, “Are you, Caliph, upset on account of a woman being angry with you?!”²²

We do not know why the man chose the version narrated by non-Shi’as without taking the trouble to compare it with the other version. Nay! He even makes no reference whatsoever to the other version although his version is forged by those who wish to justify what those who assaulted and harmed al-Zahra’ (sa) had committed despite the clear evidence leading to such a forgery. Yes, he has accepted it, leaving the accurate and the authentic version aside.

SECOND: Pardon²³ comes from one who sincerely regrets and repents what he has committed, and repentance means taking what is right to its rightful owner, correcting the damage and repairing the harm done. Otherwise, no repentance can be accepted from a usurper who holds on to everything then says, “Forgive me and be pleased with me, and I shall not return anything belonging to you back to you.” Forgiving someone like that is more painful to one’s heart because it is uglier than the sin which he

committed. So, why and on what basis should she forgive both men while they did not retreat even one step from what they had committed against her?! They did not return Fadak to her, nor did they return anything of her inheritance from the Messenger of Allah S or from anything else except when one thinks that she was wrong in presenting her claim.

They also did not admit their crime against Allah's right and against the nation when they usurped the caliphate from its rightful owner, nor did either of them show any readiness to accept retribution for the crime of assaulting her by beating her till she miscarried.

Those who did so were the cornerstones of the government and the aides of the ruler who thus went seeking to apologize as his swords were unsheathed against the necks of anyone who opposed him or who complained against him. There was no repentance whatsoever. Rather, there was an attempt at polishing their image, strengthening their position and gaining more power to keep what they had confiscated.

Had the matter been contrariwise, and had they been serious about seeking to be forgiven, what stopped Abu Bakr from punishing Qunfath or al-Mughirah ibn Shu'bah or 'Umar ibn al-Khattab or others who violated the privacy of her home, peace and blessings of Allah be on her?! If he could not do any of that, the least he could have done was to reprimand them or to frown in their faces or do something like that. Rather, he added to it providing a cover for them and awarding them more care and attention.

I do not know, did he give government jobs and money to so-and-so as a reward for the assault which they had committed?!

As for Qunfath, they exempted him from paying any taxes on the wealth which he amassed while working for them, as the Commander of the Faithful (as) narrated, as his reward!

I do not know if al-Zahra' (sa) wanted to take back from them what they had confiscated from her, would they beat her anew, or would they publicly sentence her to death?!

THIRD: Had she (sa) been pleased with them, why did she, then, state in her will to be buried at night and that neither of them should be present at her funeral?! Ali (as) carried out her will precisely, hiding her grave site, so they both, and their supporters, were furious about it and tried to exhume a number of graves which Ali (as) had dug up just to divert others from the real one. Ali (as) confronted them with a strong and decisive stand, so they both retreated.[24](#)

If the government was strong and in full control, it was able to circulate the rumor that she (sa) had been pleased after being displeased, and nobody would have the courage to belie the government's claims. This rumor would have been accepted by many people. But when she stated in her will to be buried during the night and neither of those men should attend her funeral, nor any of those who oppressed her, she foiled their chance to thus falsify the truth. She did so when she provided the decisive evidence

and the shining proof in the form of a historical testimony to her anger with them embodied also in the fact that nobody knew her grave (sa) across the ages, the Head of the Women of Mankind that she was, the only daughter of the Seal of all Prophets and Messengers of Allah S.

FOURTH: It is quite reasonable and acceptable that they both wanted from trying to appease al-Zahra' (sa) to make the point that it was merely a personal matter which ended just as it began, and that now she was pleased with them and there was no problem with her, as someone's statement suggests.

There was an insult against Fatima (sa), and there was an assault committed against her holy person with beating or through other means. An attempt like that may be interpreted as merely a rash action, or an overwhelming anger which took the doers out of their normal moderation.

Was the reason for such an anger al-Zahra' (sa) herself? Did she do anything or say anything to cause it? Was it the tone of her voice? Or were there any other reasons? They would surely close their eyes rather than determine who was/were responsible for it.

The assailants themselves reverted to themselves and repented, and al-Zahra' (sa) supposedly was obligated to forgive and to overlook, for this is exactly what Islamic ethics mandate and is emphasized by the verses of the Qur'an, especially since she was the most worthy of all people to uphold such ethics, the pious, purified and infallible woman that she was.

This means that she thus rendered legitimacy to the aggression, to the confiscation of the caliphate, and to the usurpation of the inheritance which she had received from the Messenger of Allah S. So, nothing remained except that they simply were too rash to beat her during the confrontation, and they were to be excused for it because it came when emotions reached their ebb and because of the state of suspension and upheaval! And she herself may have been the reason for it anyway because she (sa) was wrong when she stood in their face, and so was Ali (as) who did not rush to recognize the new victorious ruler, nor was he in the vanguard of those who rushed to swear the oath of allegiance and to support! Thus will they regain the public's respect, which is the most precious of their aspirations.

But when al-Zahra' (sa) refuses even their entry into her house, rejecting their "repentance," insisting on complaining against them to the Messenger of Allah S, then she states in her will to be buried at night, that both men should not attend her funeral, then she asks that her grave be unknown to the public..., she surely spoils their plan.

Despite all the alteration and forgery, history records how she died while being still angry with those who assaulted her, so Ali (as) buried her at night. He did not even declare the *athan*, another fact which is documented by respected and reliable references available with a large mass of the Muslims.[25](#)

Imam al-Rida (as) was asked once about both of these senior *sahabis*. He said, "She was for us a kind mother who left this world angry with both of them, and we shall never be pleased till she is pleased."[26](#) Almost the same wording has been transmitted through 'Abdullah son of al-Hassan.[27](#)

Thus, it becomes obvious that al-Zahra' (sa) is an infallible and purified woman; Allah is Pleased for her pleasure and is Wrathful when she is angered. She, through her insightful stand, informed everyone in the past or in the future, whoever enters the gateway of history, that the issue was not a personal one, that it was the issue of the creed, of Islam, of transgressing against Allah and His Messenger, peace and blessings of Allah be on him and his progeny, against righteousness, and against humanity.

It was an assault against Islam which she personified. Aggression against her aimed at prohibiting her from defending the Imamate whereby the faith stands and which is a decisive Divine edict; it is the nation's right, the right of man, every man, every human being.

She recorded her stand after she extracted their confession which clearly indicted them. Such an indictment demonstrated the fact that the aggression affected the Messenger of Allah S and, hence, it was an aggression against Allah, Glory to Him, and it was *not* her privilege to forgive one who transgressed the bounds of Allah, Glory to Him, and those of His Glorious Messenger, peace and blessings of Allah be on him and his progeny. She informed both men of this fact when she said to them, "I shall complain against you to the Messenger of Allah S."

In order to stop anyone from telling the public that al-Zahra' (sa) reverted to herself after that or sent them a message with so-and-so that she was pleased with both of them, she stated in her will to be buried at night.

Some may also claim that it is a Sunnah to bury the dead at night²⁸, as it actually happened, and it is legislated as such, she surmised that doing so was not sufficient to prove the continuation of her anger with them even after her demise, so she stated in her will that both men should not attend her funeral, nor should they perform the funeral prayers for her. Ali (as) prohibited them from doing any of these things in compliance with her will.²⁹

Some references mention that "She took from the Commander of the Faithful, Ali (as), a covenant for which Allah and His Messenger S are the Witnesses, that nobody would attend her funeral except Umm Salimah, Umm Ayman, Fidda, al-Hassan and al-Husayn (as), Salman, 'Ammar, al-Miqdad, Abu Tharr and Huthayfah."³⁰ Ali (as) performed her funeral prayers³¹, reciting the *takbar* five times³².

There is no truth in their claim that Abu Bakr attended her funeral and performed the funeral prayers³³, for he never reached her grave, nor did he do anything like that for the Messenger of Allah S himself although he remained unburied for three days³⁴. The inauguration was completed after his burial.³⁵

Let the fact that her grave site is not known to anyone till our time and the inability of anyone at all to identify it precisely be a glorious proof for such an exclusion which indicts them. All reliable and authentic historical evidences underscore the lies of those who make contrary claims from among those who forge history and who surely are the enemies of the truth.

Thus it becomes quite clear that she (sa) made her death and funeral as means of *jihad* in the Cause of

Allah, for the sake of the religion, and for the sake of explaining the facts to posterity.

The results of this *jihad* appeared from the very first moments. It is narrated that when the report became public that al-Zahra' (sa) had passed away, "... there was a great deal of commotion among the people who kept blaming each other and kept saying, 'Your Prophet left behind him only one single daughter, and when she dies and is buried, nobody was present during her last moments, nor when she was buried, nor when her funeral prayers were performed, nor do you even know where she is buried so you can visit her grave...!'"[36](#)

Al-Fattani has said, "If we contemplate on what we have stated, let alone what we have not, as well as the following evidences, you will come to know that the origin of the pain from which Fatima, peace and blessings of Allah be on her, was inflicted by both men ('Umar and Abu Bakr) and by their followers in general, so much so that she died very angry with them in a way which nobody can deny. Rather, it is a definite conclusion reached by anyone who examines the truth minutely, one who keeps aside denials and the norms of fanaticism as is the case with all consecutively reported traditions."[37](#)

Unsuccessful Devious Attempts

What is really strange is that we find someone trying to dissociate himself from the fact that al-Zahra' (sa) boycotted those who oppressed her till she died by saying the following:

"The meaning of Fatima (sa) boycotting Abu Bakr and refusing to talk to him till her death is that she did not discuss this issue (the wealth) with him, that is, she did not ask him for anything, nor did she find herself obligated to meet him, nor did anyone transmit anything about their meeting together, so one would say that she neither greeted him nor spoke to him because she was busy with her sickness and with other things."[38](#)

Then they decide that al-Zahra' (sa) was too pious to behave like that and more God-fearing.[39](#) We answer them as follows:

The same folks who say so have also said that she (sa) met both senior *sahabis* when they went to meet her and to appease her during her sickness. She spoke to them and was pleased by them, as they allege.[40](#)

Al-Shashi has rebutted this claim by saying that her anger connotes that she (sa) abstained from saying anything to them which is clearly boycotting them.[41](#)

Is the Grave of al-Zahra' (sa) Known to Anyone?

It is noteworthy that the Imams, peace with them, never acquainted their Shi'as with the site of her grave (sa), as was the case with that of the Commander of the Faithful whose grave site was identified by Imam al-Sadiq (as), as is well known, and so is the case with all other Imams who identified their grave

sites to their Shi'as with the exception of al-Zahra' (sa). The Shi'as, who apply the Islamic tenets and Sunnah as taught by Ahl al-Bayt (as), too, those who attended the funeral and the burial, such as 'Ammar, Abu Dharr, Salman, al-'Abbas, 'Aqil and others never acquainted anyone at all with her grave site in compliance with her own will and in loving her. Ibn Abu Qara'ah, who died in 367 A.H./977 A.D., says the following verses of poetry:

ولأي حال لحدت * بالليل فاطمة الشريفة؟

ولما حمت شيخكم * عن وطئ حجرتها المنيفة؟

أوه لبنت محمد * ماتت بغصتها أسيفة

For what was Fatima, the Honorable One, buried at night?

And she didn't allow your Shaikhs⁴² to set foot in her chamber.

Alas! Muhammed's daughter died choked with sorrow and grief.⁴³

Sayyid Muhsin al-Amin, may Allah have mercy on him, has said these poetry lines:

For what was she in the depth of the dark buried?

For what was she in secrecy placed in her grave?

Buried and none attended her funeral,

Nor do they know where her grave is...⁴⁴

From the above you can come to know the fallacy of someone's claim alleging that the grave of al-Zahra' (sa) is now well known, and we wish he would lead us to it and explain for us the decisive proofs which refute any excuse and dispel any doubt, and we will surely appreciate his effort!

Yet we are sure that he just cannot do so.

Courage of al-Jahiz الجاحظ

How great the distance is between this man who specifically chooses a tradition wherein clues of alteration and forgery are quite obvious, claiming that al-Zahra' (sa) was pleased with those who went to visit her to appease her, despite all the factual and historical and tradition evidences belying such a claim, and the other man who is very well known as having deviated from the line of Ali (as) and of being

especially interested in denying the merits of Ali (as) while supporting his foes, i.e. the famous writer, 'Amr ibn Bahr al-Jahiz! The latter says the following in his well known dissertation titled "Al-'Abbasiyya" as transmitted from him by Shaikh al-Tusi, may Allah have mercy on him:

When he (Abu Bakr) deprived her of her inheritance and was unfair to her and even assaulted her and committed a great sin against her, making her taste oppression and losing all hope of justice, and when she realized how weak she was, and how few her supporters were, she said to him, "By Allah! I shall invoke Allah's retribution against you."

He said, "By Allah! I shall supplicate to Him for you."

She said, "By Allah! I shall never speak to you."

He said, "By Allah! I shall never renounce you."

So, if they do not deny that Abu Bakr was truly rejected by her, then the rejection of Fatima (sa) of him is by itself a proof testifying to her claim. The least they could have done in such a situation was to acquaint her with that of which she had no knowledge (if anything), or reminding her of that which she had forgotten (if anything), or correcting her mistake (if any), and exonerating her above anything lowly or that she would say anything wrong, or oppress a just person, or boycott someone who sought to remain attached to her.

So, if you find them blaming neither of the opponents, then the matters are equal and the causes are straightforward, and reverting to the roots of how Allah has decided regarding faring with one's inheritance is better for us and for yourselves and more obligatory on us and on you... If they say, "How can anyone even think that Abu Bakr would be unfair to her or assault her while whenever Fatima (sa) became more harsh with him, he became more lenient and kind, and how so when she said to him, "By Allah! I shall never speak to you," he said, "By Allah! I shall never renounce you," then when she said, "By Allah! I shall invoke Allah's retribution against you," he said, "By Allah! I shall supplicate to Him for you"?[45](#)

Then he tolerates all this harsh talk from her at the government's headquarters and in the company of the Quraishites and the *sahaba* when the caliphate was in need of pride and prominence and the respect and eminence it required? Yet all of that did not prohibit him from talking to her as someone who was apologetic, seeking nearness to her, safeguarding her honorable status, trying his best to get close to her heart... saying, "Nobody in poverty is dearer to me than you, nor anyone closer to my heart in ease, but I heard the Messenger of Allah (S) say, 'We, prophets, do not leave inheritance; whatever we leave behind is charity.'"

It was said to them that this is not evidence for innocence from injustice, nor is it a way out of oppression. An oppressor may oppress, and a cunning man may scheme, if he has a goal in mind and is used to being disagreed with, he is used to speak in pretense the speech of the oppressed one and fake

the humility of one seeking equity and pretend to be kind and to seek justice.[46](#)

An Embarrassing Conclusion

Thus it becomes clear that al-Zahra' (sa) never recognized the authority nor the Imamate of Abu Bakr since she passed away angry with him and with his friend, dissociating herself from both of them, prohibiting them from attending her funeral or even knowing where her grave was.

It is not possible at all to say that such an Infallible lady, who is purified by token of the Verse of Purification (Qur'an, 33:33), the one for whose anger Allah becomes angry, died the death of the days of ignorance according to the sacred *hadith* saying, "Whoever dies without knowing who the Imam of his time is, or who has not sworn the oath of allegiance to such an Imam, dies the death of the days of ignorance."[47](#)

The *'allama* researcher, al-Khawajoo'i al-Mazandarani, has said, "Be informed that those who follow their creed from among the Muslims, regardless of their sects, have all endorsed the authenticity of the statement made by the Prophet S wherein he said, 'Anyone who dies without knowing who the Imam of his time is dies the death of the days of ignorance.'"

There is no premise for the claim which some people make that this tradition is above the level of criticism, and that what she was expected to do was either acting contrarily to what the Prophet S had brought, or that she had an Imam other than Abu Bakr; so, who could that Imam be? Can anybody imagine him being anyone other than Ali (as)? And can anyone imagine that al-Zahra' (sa), who passed away without swearing the oath of allegiance to Abu Bakr, died the death of the days of ignorance?!

Al-Zahra' (sa) Meeting Men; the Veil Issue

By the way, we would like to state that someone has derived evidence for the fallacy of the tradition saying, "It is better for the woman not to see men nor men seeing her"[48](#) from al-Zahra' (sa) who made this statement, meeting men and talking to them during the crisis while confronting those who assaulted her home and confiscated Fadak.

After all, she did meet Abu Bakr and 'Umar when they both went to appease her, and she talked to them in an ordinary manner. And she (sa) used to go out with the ladies who went out to support the Prophet S as he led the military campaigns to take care of war chores. The Prophet S received women. Had it been better for the woman not to see men, the Prophet S would have set up a barrier between him and each and every woman who went to meet him, then he would have told her to speak from behind the barrier. Our answer to all of this is as follows:

FIRST: This tradition, though weak in *isnad*, cannot be proven as a lie through mentioning what has already been stated because her meeting (sa) with men during the time of the crisis wherein she

confronted Abu Bakr and "Umar does not mean that she let others see her face, and her discourse with them may have taken place from behind a barrier or in a way where they do not see her face.

It is not meant by her not seeing men and them not seeing her that she was not visible to them or that each party does not see the shape and size of the other. Some prefer to understand this tradition as being in favor of the free mixing between men and women. Also, the fact that she accompanied the Prophet S on his campaigns does not mean that men could see her face or attractions. There is no proof that she (sa) used to undertake any military affairs whatsoever. Her accompanying the Prophet S like that does not connote what is alleged.

So is the case with regard to the Prophet S receiving women. It does not mandate that he should set up a barrier between him and every woman who came to have audience with him, nor did he set up a barrier for her to talk to him from behind it. Sufficed her to take safeguards from whatever means of veiling she had at her disposal, and she would talk to him while observing the *hijab*. Speaking with someone does not obligate any adorning or embellishment or sweet talking.

SECOND: When she (sa) delivered a speech before a crowd of the Muhajirun and the Ansar and others, she was wrapped in her outer mantle as the texts indicate.[49](#)

THIRD: The subject of her preference not to be seen by men nor to see men is not confirmed only by the said tradition. There are many other traditions and texts such as the following:

1. One is narrated by Muhammed ibn Ya'qub from some of our men from Ahmed ibn Abu 'Abdullah saying, "Ibn Umm Maktam sought permission to meet the Prophet S who had in his company 'A'isha and Hafsa to whom he said, 'Get up and enter your chambers.' They both said to him, 'He is blind!' He said, 'If he cannot see you, you surely can see him.'" [50](#)

2. Umm Salamah is quoted as having said, "I was in the company of the Messenger of Allah S who had with him Maymana. Ibn Umm Maktam came in after the Prophet S had ordered the veil to be set up, so they both were veiled from him. They said, 'O Messenger of Allah! Is he not a blind man who cannot see us?' He said, 'He is. Are you?! Can't you see him?'" [51](#)

What is odd is someone using this narrative of Ibn Umm Maktam entering the residence of the Prophet S while he is in the chambers of his wives which means his privacy, as he describes it. Then he builds on it the revelation of Surat 'Abas in his regard, and we have pointed out to the error of such a statement if one studies the correct biography of the Prophet (S) so let whoever wishes to refer to it to do so if he wishes.

If Ibn Umm Maktam, by thus entering once or twice to visit the Messenger of Allah S, has produced for us this condition, we ought to verify the deeper situation between the Prophet S and most, if not all, those whom he met during his lifetime.

3. What is quoted from Imam Ja'far al-Sadiq (as): 'Abdullah has told us that Muhammed has said that Musa has said that his father quotes his grandfather, Ja'far ibn Muhammed, quoting his father, peace with them, saying that a blind man once sought permission to enter her house, so she struck a veil between herself and him. The Prophet S asked her, "Why did you wear a veil while he cannot see you?!" She said, "O Messenger of Allah! If he cannot see me, I can see him, and he still breathes!" The Prophet S said, "I testify that you are part of me."

In *Da'a'im al-Islam*, Abu Ja'far (as) is quoted as saying the same. In al-Rawandi's *Nawadir*, the same is quoted by (Imam) Musa ibn Ja'far (as).[52](#)

4. Through the previously quoted *isnad*, Ja'far ibn Muhammed quotes his father, peace with both of them, saying that Ali (as) entered the chamber of Fatima (sa) daughter of the Messenger of Allah S, and he was extremely upset. She asked him why, so he said to her that the Prophet S asked people about woman when she is closest to her Lord, and they did not know how to answer him.

She said to him, "Go back and tell him that she is closest to her Lord when she stays at home." He set out and told the Prophet S the same. The Prophet S asked him, "What?! Is this your own answer, O Ali?!" Ali (as) informed him that Fatima (sa) had informed him of it. He said, "Now you have said the truth, for Fatima (sa) is part of me." These incidents are both narrated by Sayyid Fadlallah al-Rawandi in his *Nawadir* through an *isnad* ending with him.[53](#)

[1.](#) Refer to Abtal Nahjul-Balagha (including in Dala'il al-Sidq), Vol. 3, Part 1, p. 47.

[2.](#) Ibn Abul-Hadid, Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 6, p. 50.

[3.](#) Kanz al-Ummal, Vol. 5, p. 597. Al-Hakim, Al-Mustadrak, Vol. 3, p. 66 who said that this is authentic according to the endorsement of both Shaikhs (al-Bukhari and Muslim), and it is endorsed by al-Dhahbi. Hayat al-Sahaba, Vol. 2, p. 18. Ibn Hamzah, Al-Shafi, Vol. 4, pp. 171, 173. Al-Ikhtisas, p. 186. Al-Ayyashi, Tafsir, Vol. 2, pp. 66, 67. Al-Riyad al-Nadira, Vol. 2, p. 241. Many texts will be cited in a forthcoming section which expose the identity of the participants in the assault, and it is there that you will, Insha-Allah, find their sources in detail.

[4.](#) References for this incident will be cited in a section about those who sought to appease al-Zahra' (sa) which indicated the status she used to enjoy.

[5.](#) Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 27, p. 324. Al-Istighatha, p. 21. Ibn Abul Hadid, Sharh Nahjul-Balagha, Vol. 6, pp. 11, 52, 50, and in other places as well. Al-Bahrani, Manar al-Huda, p. 433. Muftah al-Bab al-Hadi `Ashar, p. 197, edited by Dr. Mahdi Muhaqqiq. Haqq al-Yaqin, pp. 178, 182. Ithbat al-Hudat, Vol. 2, pp. 343-46, quoting Minhaj al-Karama and Nahj al-Haqq. Al-Shahristani, Al-Milal wal Nihal, Vol. 1, p. 23. Sharh al-Mawqif, Vol. 8, p. 376. Al-Kaf'ami, Majma' al-Ghara'ib, p. 288.

[6.](#) Al-Qahba'i, Mujma' al-Rijal, Vol. 2, p. 264 in a footnote. Ibn Hamzah, Al-Shafi, Vol. 4, pp. 173, 202. It is said that al-Jahiz الجاحظ narrated it in Al-Zaydiyya al-Kubra from a group of traditionists including al-Zuhri. Ibn Shathan, Al-'Izah, pp. 155-158. Jala' al-Uyun, Vol. 1, p. 201. Refer to Vol. 2 of the book by Sulaym ibn Qays which will soon be quoted as to Vol.2, p. 360 of Ithbat al-Hudat. Mir'at al-Uqul, Vol. 5, pp. 339-40. Al-Rasa'il al-tiqadiyya, p. 455. Ibn Abul-Hadid, Sharh Nahjul-Balagha, Vol. 17, p. 222. Al-Mustarshid, p. 451 (Iranian edition). Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 29, pp. 126, 133. Al-Tibrisi, Al-Ihtijaj, Vol. 1, p. 234. `Ilal al-Shara'i', Vol. 1, p. 182. Al-Kashshi, Rijal al-Hadith, p. 695 in the biography of Sufyan al-Thawri.

[7.](#) Ibn Abul-Hadid, Sharh Nahjul-Balagha, Vol. 1, p. 222.

[8.](#) Al-Mustarshid fi Imamat `Ali (A) p. 90. Al-'adah, p. 190.

[9.](#) Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 44, pp. 195-383, Vol. 75 p. 117.

[10.](#) Tahthib al-Ahkam, Vol. 4, p. 149. Ma`adin al-Hikma, Vol. 2, pp. 122, 123 quoting him and also quoting Man la Yahduru al-Faqih, Vol. 2, p. 366 (Najaf edition).

[11.](#) Al-Idah, p. 359. Tathkirat al-Khawass, p. 62. Sirr al-`Alamin, p. 21. Al-Bukhari, Sihah, Vol. 3, p. 60 and Vol. 4, pp. 5, 173 and Vol. 1, pp. 21, 22 and Vol. 2, p. 115. Al-Sam`ani, Al-Musannaf, Vol. 6, p. 57 and Vol. 10, p. 361 and Vol. 5, p. 438. Al-Mufid, Al-Irshad, p. 107 (Najaf edition). Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 22, p. 498. Al-Nu`mani, Al-Ghayba, pp. 81, 82. `Umdat al-Qari, Vol. 14, p. 298 and Vol. 2, pp. 170, 171 and Vol. 25, p. 76. Fath al-Bari, Vol. 8, pp. 100-102, 186-87. Al-Bidaya wal Nihaya, Vol. 5, pp. 227, 251. Al-Bid' wal-Tarikh, Vol. 5, p. 59. Al-Shahristani, Al-Milal wal Nihal, Vol. 1, p. 22. Ibn Sa`d, Al-Tabaqat al-Kubra, Vol. 2, p. 244. Al-Tabari, Tarikh al-Umam wal Muluk, Vol. 3, pp. 192-93. Al-Kamil fil Tarikh, Vol. 2, p. 320. Ansab al-Ashraf, Vol. 1, p. 562. Ibn Abul-Hadid, Sharh Nahjul-Balagha, Vol. 6, p. 51 and Vol. 2, p. 55. Tarikh al-Khamis, Vol. 2, pp. 164, 182. Muslim, Sihah, Vol. 1, p. 75. Ahmed, Musnad, Vol. 1, pp. 355, 324, 222, 325, 332, 336, 362, 346. Ibn Hisham, Al-Sira al-Halabiyya, Vol. 3, p. 344. Nahj al-Haqq, p. 273. Al-`Ibar wa Dawan al-Mubtada' wal Khabar, Vol. 2, Part 2, p. 62. Ithbat al-Hudat, Vol. 2, pp. 344, 348, 399 and Vol. 1, p. 657. Al-Tirmithi, Al-Jami` al-Sihah, Vol. 3, p. 55. Nihaya al-Arab, Vol. 18, p. 375. Ibn Shahnah, Rawdat al-Munazir, Vol. 7, p. 808 (as referred to in a footnote in Al-Kamil fil Tarikh). Also refer to Haqq al-Yaqin, Vol. 1, pp. 181-82. Dala'il al-Sidq, Vol. 3, part 1, pp. 63, 70. Al-Sirat al-Mustaqim, Vol. 3, pp. 3, 7. Sharif ad-Dan Sadr ad-Dan al-Musawi, Al-Muraja'at, p. 353; Sharif ad-Dan al-Musawi, Al-Nass wal Ijtihad, pp. 149, 163. Al-Mukhtasar fi Akhbar al-Bashar, Vol. 1, p. 151. Al-Kaf`ami, Majma` al-Ghara'ib, p. 289. Minhaj al-Sunnah, Vol. 3, p. 135. Manaqib al Abu Talib, Vol. 1, p. 292. Tarikh al-Islam, Vol. 2, pp. 383-84. Kashf al-Mahajja, p. 64 (Haidari Press edition, 1370 A.H.). Al-Tara'if, pp. 432, 433. Refer to Al-Taratab al-Idariyya, Vol. 2, p. 241. Al-Muttaqi al-Hindi, Kanz al-`Ummal (Indian edition, 1381 A.H.), Vol. 7, p. 170. Al-Bayhaqi, Dala'il al-Nubuwwa, Vol. 7, pp. 181, 184. Abu Ya'li, Musnad, Vol. 5, p. 393 and Vol. 3, pp. 393-94 and Vol. 4, p. 299. Mujma` al-Zawa'id, Vol. 4, p. 214.

[12.](#) Refer to Ibn `Awanah, Musnad, Vol. 4, pp. 394, 400. Ahmed, Musnad, Vol. 5, pp. 99, 93, 90, 96, 98, 101. Abu Dawud, Sunan, Vol. 4, p. 106. Al-Nu`mani, Al-Ghayba, pp. 121-24. Irshad al-Sari, Vol. 10, p. 273. Muslim, Sihah, Vol. 6, p. 4 (Mashkal edition). Shaikh al-Tasi, Al-Ghayba, pp. 88-89. Fath al-Bari, Vol. 13, pp. 181-184. I`lam al-Wara, p. 38. Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 36, pp. 235, 239, 240 and Vol. 63, p. 236. Muntakhab al-Athar, p. 20. Ikmal ad-Din, Vol. 1, pp. 272-73. Tarikh al-Khulafa', pp. 10-11. Ibn Hajar al-`Asqalani, Al-Sawa'iq al-Muhriqa, p. 18. Al-Qanduzi, Yanabi` al-Mawadda, pp. 444-45. Al-Khisal (in a chapter about the Twelve Imams); refer also to Vol. 2, pp. 470, 472, 474 of it. Refer also to `Uyun Akhbar al-Rida and Mawaddat al-Qurba and to Vol. 13, p. 1 of Ihqaq al-Haqq (the Appendices). Ibn al-Batriq, Al-`Umda, p. 421. Refer to Al-Nihaya fil Lugha, Vol. 3, p. 54. Ibn Manzur, Lisan al-`Arab, Vol. 12, p. 343 and to Al-Qarab fi Mahabbat al-`Arab, p. 129.

[13.](#) Regarding the narrator hearing the phrase "all of them from Quraish," or "from Banu Hashim," refer to the following references: Muslim, Sihah, Vol. 6, p. 3 through various venues (Mashkal edition). Ahmed, Musnad, Vol. 5, pp. 90, 92-101, 106-18. Abu `Awanah, Musnad, Vol. 4, p. 394. Hilyat al-Awliya', Vol. 4, p. 333. I`lam al-Wara, p. 382. Ibn al-Batriq, Al-`Umda, pp. 416-22. Ikmal ad-Din, Vol. 1, pp. 272-73. Al-Khisal, Vol. 2, pp. 275, 469. Fath al-Bari, Vol. 13, pp. 181-85. Al-Nu`mani, Al-Ghayba, pp. 119-25. Al-Bukhari, Sihah, Vol. 4, p. 159. Al-Qanduzi, Yanabi` al-Mawadda, pp. 444-46. Tarikh Baghdad, Vol. 2, p. 126 and Vol. 14, p. 353. Al-Mustadrak `alal Sihahain, Vol. 3, p. 618 and its Talkhis by al-Dhahbi (referred to in its footnote) on the same page. Muntakhab al-Athar, pp. 10-23 which cites numerous references. Al-Tirmithi, Al-Jami` al-Sihah, Vol. 4, p. 501. Abu Dawud, Sunan, Vol. 4, p. 116. Kifayat al-Athar, from p. 49 till the end of the book. Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 36, p. 231 till the end of the chapter. Ihqaq al-Haqq (Appendices), Vol. 13, pp. 1-50, citing numerous references.

[14.](#) The references for this statement have already been cited.

[15.](#) Refer to Al-Mustarshid fi Imamate Ali ﷺ p. 146 and p. 147 of Al-Farq Baynal Firaq.

[16.](#) Refer to the following references: Sharh Mamiyyat Abu Firas, pp. 73-74. Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 48, p. 131. `Uyun Akhbar al-Rida, Vol. 1, p. 91. Al-Qanduzi, Yanabi` al-Mawadda, p. 383. Maqatil al-Talibiyyin, p. 453. Al-Khawarizmi, Manaqib Ali ﷺ ibn Abu Talib, p. 208. Ibn Sa`d, Al-Tabaqat al-Kubra, Vol. 5, p. 227 (Sadir's edition). Al-Bidaya wal Nihaya, Vol. 8, p. 316. Tatimmat al-Muntaha, p. 185. Qamus al-Rijal, Vol. 10, p. 370.

[17.](#) Refer to al-Bayhaqi, Dala'il al-Nubuwwa, Vol. 7, p. 281. Al-Riyad al-Nadira, Vol. 1, p. 176. Siyar A`lam al-Nubala', Vol. 2, p. 121. Tarikh al-Khamis, Vol. 2, p. 174 quoting Al-Wafa' and al-Sammani in Al-Muwafaqa and Vol. 6, p. 174 of Al-

Sunan al-Kubra. Al-Sira al-Halabiyya, Vol. 3, p. 361. Ibn Sa'd, Tabaqat, Vol. 8, p. 72. Al-Bidaya wal Nihaya, Vol. 5, p. 289. Hayat al-Sahaba, Vol. 2, p. 473. Ibn Abul-Hadid, Sharh Nahjul-Balagha, Vol. 6, pp. 19, 49 and Vol. 2, p. 57. Fath al-Bari, Vol. 6, p. 139. Nuzhat al-Majalis, Vol. 2, p. 183.

[18.](#) Refer to al-Muttaqi al-Hindi, Kanz al-Ummal, Vol. 12, p. 515 and Vol. 13, p. 687.

[19.](#) Kanz al-Ummal, Vol. 5, p. 605 quoting al-Bayhaqi, adding, "This tradition is taken for granted and its isnad is good." Ibn Sa'd, Tabaqat, Vol. 8, p. 29.

[20.](#) Al-Imama wal Siyasa, Vol. 1, pp. 14-15. Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 36, p. 308 and Vol. 78, p. 254 and Vol. 43, pp. 170-71. Dala'il al-Imama, p. 45. `Awalim al-Ulum, Vol. 11, pp. 411, 445, 498, 499. Kifayat al-Athar, pp. 64-65. Al-Burhan, Vol. 3, p. 65. `Ilal al-Shara'i, Vol. 1, pp. 186-189. Al-Shafi, Vol. 4, p. 213. Tawfiq Abu `Alam, Ahl al-Bayt, pp. 168-69, 174. Mir'at al-Uqul, Vol. 5, pp. 322-23. Diya' al-Alamin (manuscript), Vol. 2, pp. 85-87. Al-Manawi, Al-Jami' al-Saghir, Vol. 2, p. 122. Al-Rasa'il al-Itiqadiyya, p. 448.

[21.](#) Refer to `Awalim al-Ulum, Vol. 11, p. 500. `Ilal al-Shara'i, Vol. 1, p. 187. Diya' al-Alamin, Vol. 2, p. 87.

[22.](#) The book of Sulaym ibn Qays (edited by al-Ansari), Vol. 2, p. 869. Jala' al-Uyun, Vol. 1, pp. 212-13 with additional details. Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 43, pp. 197-203 and Vol. 28, p. 357. `Ilal al-Shara'i, Vol. 1, pp. 186-87.

[23.](#) Reference to the same is made in Diya' al-Alamin (manuscript), Vol. 2, p. 108.

[24.](#) Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 30, pp. 286, 348-49 and Vol. 29, p. 193. The author also transmitted her will in a footnote on p. 171, Vol. 43, of his book from the following references: Hilyat al-Awliya', Vol. 2, p. 43. Al-Hakim, Mustadrak, Vol. 3, p. 162. Usd al-Ghaba, Vol. 5, p. 524. Al-Isaba, Vol. 4, pp. 379-80. Al-Imama wal Siyasa, Vol. 1, p. 14. A'lam al-Nisa', Vol. 3, p. 1214. Refer also to Ibn Abul Hadid, Sharh Nahjul-Balagha, Vol. 6, p. 50, where the author says, "I have confirmed that she did die angry with both of them, etc." `Abd al-Razzaq, Musanaff, Vol. 3, p. 521. Al-Isti'ab, Vol. 2, p. 751. Al-Khawarizmi, Maqatal al-Husayn, Vol. 1, p. 83. Dala'il al-Imama, p. 44.

[25.](#) Al-Bidaya wal Nihaya, Vol. 5, pp. 250, 285-287, quoting al-Bukhari, Ahmed and `Abd al-Razzaq. Refer to al-Bukhari's "Kitab al-Maghazi" where Khaybar's campaign is discussed and how the Messenger of Allah (S) said, "We do not leave our inheritance as charity." Ibn Abul-Hadid, Sharh Nahjul-Balagha, Vol. 6, pp. 49-50 and Vol. 16, pp. 218, 232. Muslim, Sihah, "Kitab al-Jihad wal Siyar." Ibn Hamzah, Al-Shafi, Vol. 4, pp. 211, 205. Al-Thiqat, Vol. 2, pp. 164-65. Al-Tabari, Tarikh Muluk, Vol. 3, p. 208 (Dar al-Ma'arif edition). Tawfiq Abu `Alam, Ahl al-Bayt, p. 172. Mushkil al-Athar, Vol. 1, p. 48. Ibn al-Batraq, Al-Umdah, pp. 39-91. Al-Sunan al-Kubra, Vol. 6, pp. 300-01. Al-Tanbih wal Ishraf, p. 250. Al-Dhabbi, Tarikh al-Islam, p. 591 (published by Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi, the Prophet's Biography Dept.), and in its footnote there is a reference to many sources. Ibn Sa'd, Tabaqat, Vol. 8, pp. 28-29. Rawdat al-Muttaqin, Vol. 5, p. 349. Al-Tara'if, pp. 257-58, 262, 269. Tahrir al-Afkar, p. 228. Alqab al-Rasul wa `Itratih, p. 44. Refer also to p. 370 of Kifayat al-Talib. Al-Hakim, Mustadrak, Vol. 3, p. 162. Ithbat al-Hudat, Vol. 2, p. 366. Ahmed, Musnad, Vol. 1, pp. 6-9. Al-Riyad al-Mustataba, p. 291. Tarikh al-Khamis, Vol. 1, p. 174. Mir'at al-Uqul, Vol. 5, pp. 322-23. Al-Sam`ani, Musannaf, Vol. 5, p. 472 and Vol. 4, p. 141 and Vol. 3, p. 521. Taysar al-Wusal, Vol. 1, p. 209. Refer also to Diya' al-Alamin (manuscript), Vol. 2, pp. 65-66, 91.

[26.](#) Alqab al-Rasul wa `Itratih, p. 44. Al-Tara'if, p. 252.

[27.](#) Ibn Abul-Hadid, Sharh Nahjul-Balagha, Vol. 16, p. 232 and Vol. 6, p. 49.

[28.](#) Judge `Abd al-Jabbar, Al-Mughni, Vol. 20, p. 335.

[29.](#) Refer to pp. 10-11 of Al-Istighatha. `Awalim al-Ulum, Vol. 11, pp. 467, 505-06, 523, 508, 493, 411, 501-02, 504, 404, 534, 122, 515, 512. Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 78, pp. 250, 253-256, 310, 387 and Vol. 43, pp. 201, 207, 218, 181, 191, 214, 199, 182-83 and Vol. 28, p. 353 and Vol. 29, p. 192 (footnote), 193 and Vol. 30, pp. 348-49, 286. Ibn Shahr Ashub, Al-Manaqib.

[30.](#) Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 78, p. 310.

[31.](#) Al-Hakim, Mustadrak, Vol. 3, p. 162. Al-Nawawi, Tahthib al-Asma', Vol. 2, p. 353. Sifat al-Safwa, Vol. 2, p. 14. Ibn Shabbah, Tarikh al-Medina, Vol. 1, p. 197. Ibn Haban, Tarikh al-Sahaba, p. 208. Ibn al-Batriq, Al-Umdah, pp. 390-91. In a footnote of the latter, it is indicated that the text is quoted from p. 154, Vol. 5 of Muslim's Sihah and from al-Bukhari's Sihah, in a chapter about the Khaybar campaign and from al-Omari al-Musilli's book Al-Rawda al-Fayha', p. 252. Al-Irbali, Kashf al-Ghumma, Vol. 2, p. 128. Diya' al-Alamin (manuscript), Vol. 2, p. 3. Jami' al-Usul, pp. 9-10.

[32.](#) Refer to Ibn al-Sabbagh al-Maliki, Al-Fusal al-Muhimma, p. 131. Jawahir al-Akhbar wal Athar al-Mustakhraja min

Lujjat al-Bahr al-Zakhkhar, Vol. 3, p. 118. Kashf al-Ghumma, Vol. 2, p. 128.

[33.](#) Refer to Al-Riyad al-Nadira, Vol. 1, p. 176. The author comments saying, "This has been transmitted by al-Basri and is included by Ibn al-Samman in Al-Muwafaqa. Thakha'ir al-Uqba. P. 54. Al-Isaba, Vol. 4, p. 479. Tahthib al-Kamal, Vol. 35, p. 252. Tarikh al-Hijra al-Nabawiyya, p. 58. Al-Khawarizmi, Maqtal al-Husayn, Vol. 1, p. 86. Tarikh al-Khamis, Vol. 1, p. 278. Al-Sira al-Halabiyya, Vol. 3, p. 361. Judge `Abd al-Jabbar, Al-Mughni, Vol. 20, p. 335.

[34.](#) Abu al-Salah, Taqrib al-Ma`arif, p. 251. Ibn Shahr Ashub, Al-Manaqib, Vol. 1, p. 297.

[35.](#) Dala'il al-Imama, p. 46. Diya' al-'Alamin (manuscript), Vol. 2, pp. 94-94, quoting Al-Manaqib.

[36.](#) Dala'il al-Imama, p. 46. Diya' al-'Alamin (manuscript), Vol. 2, pp. 93-94, quoting Al-Manaqib.

[37.](#) Diya' al-'Alamin (manuscript), Vol. 2, p. 95. Al-Hidaya al-Kubra, p. 179.

[38.](#) Sharh Bahjat al-Mahafil, Vol. 1, p. 131, quoting al-Dhahbi. Fath al-Bari, Vol. 6, p. 139. Al-Sira al-Halabiyya, Vol. 3, p. 361.

[39.](#) Fath al-Bari, Vol. 6, p. 139.

[40.](#) Al-Dhahbi, Tarikh al-Islam (the part discussing the righteous caliphs), p. 47. Fath al-Bari, Vol. 6, p. 139.

[41.](#) Fath al-Bari, Vol. 6, p. 139.

[42.](#) Abu Bakr and `Umar are always referred to in history and theology books as "the two Shaikhs," senior sahabis. The word "shaikh" has many meanings. One of them is "scholar" or "mentor" as exists in many places throughout this book. The "two shaikhs," scholars, are also al-Bukhari and Muslim. Generally speaking, "shaikh" is used to identify a man who has passed his mid-aged. It also conveys the meaning of a tribal chief or chieftain. ___ Tr.

[43.](#) "Abul-Hassan" Ali ibn `Isa ibn Abul-Fath al-Arbili, Kashf al-Ghumma fi Ma`rifat al-A`imma, Vol. 2, p. 131.

[44.](#) Al-Majalis al-Saniyya, Vol. 5, p. 120.

[45.](#) Ibn Abul-Hadid, Sharh Nahjul-Balagha, Vol. 16, p. 214. Al-Shafi, Talkhis, Vol. 3, p. 152 and other references.

[46.](#) Al-Shafi, Talkhis, Vol. 3, pp. 152-53. A commentator said the following commenting on p. 151 of Al-`Abbasiyya by al-Jahiz: "The book titled Al-`Abbasiyya was published among letters compiled and verified and explained by Hassan al-Sandubi which he called "Letters of Al-Jahiz" and the number of this Letter is 12. It was published at the Rahmaniyya Press in Egypt in 1352 A.H. Sayyid al-Qazwini quoted these same paragraphs on p. 420 of his book Fatima al-Zahra' minal Mahd ilal-Lahd from pp. 300-03 of these said Letters.

[47.](#) Refer to the wordings of this tradition on p. 390, Vol. 1, of Al-Ghadir where al-Taftazani is quoted on p. 275, Vol. 2, of his book titled Sharh al-Maqasid. Al-Karakchi, Kanz al-Fawa'id, p. 151. Ibn Shahr Ashub, Al-Manaqib, Vol. 3, p. 304. Mujma` al-Zawa'id, Vol. 5, pp. 219-18, 224-25. Ahmed, Musnad, Vol. 4, p. 96 and Vol. 3, p. 446. Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 23, pp. 80, 88, 89, 92. Some of his footnotes cite p. 269 of Al-Ikhtisas, pp. 230-31 of Ikmal ad-Din and p. 15 of Muntakhab al-Athar from Al-Jam` Baynal Sihahain. Ibn Abul-Hadid, Sharh Nahjul-Balagha, Vol. 13, p. 242 from al-Iskafi in Naqd al-`Uthmaniyya and pp. 82-83 of Manar al-Huda by Shaikh Ali al-Bahrani. Al-Muhalla, Vol. 1, p. 46. Al-Bukhari, Sihah ("Kitab al-Fitan," in a chapter titled "You shall see after me things which you shall abhor.") Muslim, Sihah ("Kitab al-Imara," in a chapter about the obligation to be with the majority), Vol. 4, p. 517 (Dar al-Sha`ab edition).

[48.](#) This tradition is narrated from the Prophet ﷺ, from Imam al-Sadiq (A) and from Ali (A); so, refer to Wasa'il al-Shi'a, Vol. 20, pp. 67, 232. Mustadrak al-Wasa'il, Vol. 14, pp. 183, 289. Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 43, pp. 48, 54, 84 and Vol. 100, p. 239 and Vol. 101, p. 36. Ihqaq al-Haqq, Vol. 9, pp. 202-03 from al-Bazzar and Vol. 10, pp. 224, 226 from many references. Mujma` al-Zawa'id, Vol. 4, p. 255. Kashf al-Astar, from p. 235, Vol. 3, of al-Bazzar's Musnad. Fada'il al-Khamsa minal Sihah al-Sitta, Vol. 3, pp. 153-54 quoting p. 315, Vol. 8, of Kanz al-Ummal. Al-Dhahbi, Al-Kaba'ir, p. 176. Da'a'im al-Islam, Vol. 2, pp. 124, 215. Is'af al-Raghibin (as referred to in a footnote in Nur al-Absar), pp. 171-72, 191. Kashf al-Ghumma, Vol. 2, p. 92. Makarim al-Akhlaq, p. 233. Manaqib al Abu Talib, Vol. 3, p. 119. `Awalim al-`Ulum, Vol. 11, p. 197. Al-Khawarizmi, Maqtal al-Husayn, Vol. 1, p. 62. Hilyat al-Awliya', Vol. 2, p. 41. Ibn al-Maghazli, Manaqib al-Imam Ali (A) p. 381. There are other references mentioned in the footnotes of Kitab al-`Awalim. Manaqib Amir al-Mu'minin Ali ؑ by Judge Muhammed ibn Sulayman al-Kafi, Vol. 2, pp. 210-11. Diya' al-'Alamin (manuscript), Vol. 2, p. 14 quoting Al-Manaqib and Al-Durra al-Yatima fi Ba'd Fada'il al-Sayyida al-`Adima, p. 31. Da'a'im al-Islam, Vol. 2, pp. 214-15.

[49.](#) Al-Tibrisi, Al-Ihtijaj, Vol. 1, p. 254. Ibn Abul-Hadid, Sharh Nahjul-Balagha, Vol. 16, pp. 211, 250. Balaghat al-Nisa', p. 24. A'lam al-Nisa', Vol. 4, p. 116. Kashf al-Ghumma, Vol. 2, p. 106. Ihqaq al-Haqq, Vol. 10, p. 299. Al-Murtada, Al-Shafi, Vol. 4, pp. 69, 71. Diya' al-'Alamin (manuscript), Vol. 2, p. 69. Al-`Awalim, Vol. 11, p. 468. Sharh al-Akhbar, Vol. 3, p. 43.

Al-Khawarizmi, Maqatal al-Husayn ﷺ Vol. 1, p. 77. Ibn Maytham, Sharh Nahjul-Balagha, Vol. 5, p. 105.

[50.](#) Al-Wasa'il, Vol. 20, p. 232. Al-Kafi, Vol. 5, p. 534.

[51.](#) Al-Wasa'il, Vol. 20, p. 232. Its footnotes quote p. 233 of Makarim al-Akhlaq, Ahmed's Musnad, al-Tirmithi's Al-Jami' al-Sihah, Vol. 5, p. 102. Abu Dawud, Sunan, Vol. 4, p. 63 and al-Dhahbi's Al-Kaba'ir, p. 177.

[52.](#) Mustadrak al-Wasa'il, Vol. 14, p. 289, footnote on p. 95 of Al-Ja'fariyyat is quoted and so are the following: p. 214, Vol. 2, of Da'a'im al-Islam, p. 23, Vol. 11, of `Awalim al-`Ulum, and its footnote p. 13 of al-Rawandi's Nawadir is quoted. Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 43, p. 91. It is also narrated by al-Maghazli, pp. 380-81.

[53.](#) Mustadrak al-Wasa'il, Vol. 14, p. 182. Its footnote cites p. 95 of Al-Ja'fariyyat and p. 14 of al-Rawandi's Nawadir. Al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 43, p. 92 and Vol. 100, p. 250. `Awalim al-`Ulum, Vol. 11, p. 123.

Source URL:

<https://www.al-islam.org/tragedy-al-zahra-doubts-and-responses-jafar-murtadha-al-amili/part-6-their-love-and-respect-deter#comment-0>