

# The Final Word about the Faithfulness of Abu Talib

The faithfulness of Abu Talib was so clear and certain that it did not need any evidence to be proved except that if you wanted to certify for the blind that the sun was shining in the sky and sending its rays and that the day was bright!

All Abu Talib's sayings, his continuous jihad he had done for the sake of Islam and all the witnesses of the Prophet (S), his pure progeny and the companions confirmed his faith, his belief in monotheism and in the mission of the Prophet (S).

Since all the evidences had confirmed Abu Talib's faith in Islam, all the Shia agreed upon that with no any bit of doubt or suspect. Whoever said other than that is not a Shia especially when the infallible imams had confirmed that with their irrefutable witnesses.

So Shiism and believing that Abu Talib was unbeliever would never meet together; for whoever said that Abu Talib was unbeliever would deny the sayings of the infallible imams of the Shia when confirming the faithfulness of Abu Talib.

Would he, who objected his imams, be a Shia?

Therefore, the faithfulness of Abu Talib was one of the necessities of Shiism. All the Shia said that and many of the Zaydis.<sup>1</sup> Some of the great personalities of the Mu'tazilites said that too.<sup>2</sup> Among them was Sheikh Abul Qassim al-Balkhi and Abu Ja'far al-Iskafi.<sup>3</sup>

Many of the saints and ulema said that it was proved for them that Abu Talib was a Muslim<sup>4</sup> and that he would be safe from punishment; among them were al-Qurtubi, as-Sabki, ash-Sha'arani, and many others. They said: "This is what we believe in before Allah."<sup>5</sup>

Imam Ahmed bin al-Husayn al-Moossily al-Hanafi, who was known as ibn Wahshi, said: "Hating Abu Talib is unbelief."<sup>6</sup> So was said by al-Ajhoori, who was one of the Malikite imams, in his fatwas.<sup>7</sup>

At-Talmassani said when mentioning Abu Talib: "He should not be mentioned except with protecting the

Prophet (S) because he protected and supported the Prophet (S) in saying and doing. Criticizing Abu Talib would harm the Prophet (S) and he, who harmed the Prophet (S), would be unbeliever and the unbeliever should be killed.”[8](#)

Abu Tahir said: “He, who hates Abu Talib, is unbeliever.”[9](#)

Dahlan said: “Believing in the sayings of these imams that Abu Talib was a faithful is safer for one before his God especially that the evidences proves that as it has been mentioned by al-Barazanji.”[10](#)

As-Sayooti had written a book about this subject with this title: (Bughyat at-Talib li Eeman Abu Talib) the aim of the seeker for the faithfulness of Abu Talib).[11](#) The title of the book was enough to show the thought of the author about the subject.

Zayni Dahlan had written a book named (Assna al-Matalib), which we referred to in a previous chapter, about the same subject.

We don't want to quote all the names of the authors and their books written about the subject because they are so much many.

As for that, who thought that Abu Talib was unbeliever, he deviated from the right way. He fabricated those accusations and lies and received his immediate fees in this life but he would receive his other fees in Hell and then he would know that the lowest bottom of Hell would be for whom!

And then came those, who saw the fabrication but didn't try to draw its cover for they knew well what they would uncover.

We were so astonished to see those people denying the faithfulness of Abu Talib in spite of that there were much many clear evidences confirming it whereas at the same time we found such a tradition:

Ash-Shareed said: “One day I rode behind the Prophet (S)”. He asked me: “Do you have something of the poetry of Umayya bin Abus Salt?”

I said: Yes.

He said: Come on!

I recited him a verse.

He said: Come on!

I recited another verse.

He said: come on!

I kept on reciting until I recited one hundred verses.

He said: “He was about to become a Muslim!” or he said: “He was about to be a Muslim with his poetry.”[12](#)

Zayd bin Amr set out looking for the religion of Abraham (as). He took his way towards Sham and then from Sham to Mecca but he died on his way to Mecca. It was related about Aa'isha her saying: "The Prophet (S) said: I entered into Paradise and found that there were two large trees for Zayd bin Amr." [13](#)

It was mentioned that Sa'eed bin Zayd bin Amr bin Nufayl and his cousin Omar bin al-Khattab said to the Prophet (S): "Do you beg forgiveness for Zayd bin Amr?" The Prophet (S) said: "Yes! He would be resurrected as a nation by himself." [14](#)

It was mentioned too that the Prophet (S) had said: "May Allah have mercy upon Qass bin Sa'ida. He would be resurrected in the Day of Resurrection as one nation or as a nation by himself." [15](#)

So what was this contradiction?

Why was the Prophet (S) so generous to the non-relatives, who had never done him any favor, and was so miser towards his uncle, who had done him great favors since his childhood until he became a prophet? Hadn't his Lord revealed to him:

***Is the reward of goodness aught but goodness? (The Holy Quran, Shakir 55:60)***

Then why would the Prophet (S) reward his uncle with else than goodness?

After all we found that accusing Abu Talib of being unbeliever would harm the Prophet (S) and this would be a great sin that could never be forgiven.

Allah the Almighty said:

***...and (as for) those who molest the Messenger of Allah, they shall have a painful punishment. (The Holy Quran, Shakir 9:61)***

***...and it does not behoove you that you should give trouble to the Messenger of Allah. (The Holy Quran, Shakir 33:53)***

***Surely (as for) those who speak evil things of Allah and His Messenger, Allah has cursed them in this world and the hereafter, and He has prepared for them a chastisement bringing disgrace. (The Holy Quran, Shakir 33:57)***

Hence we found that at-Talmassani had said that the one, who accused Abu Talib of being unbeliever, should be killed because it would harm the Prophet (S) and whoever harmed the Prophet (S) should be killed.

The Muslims agreed upon killing the one, who harmed the Prophet (S), according to the Quranic verses, which confirmed that whoever harmed the Prophet (S) would be in Hell for ever.

No harm was be caused to the Prophet (S) more than defaming his uncle and supporter and accusing

him of being unbeliever whereas he was a sincere believer and a nonesuch supporter.

They mentioned that one day Subay'ia bint Abu Lahab had come to the Prophet (S) complaining that people often said to her: "You are the daughter of the firewood of Hell (for she was the daughter of Abu Lahab)."

The Prophet (S) stood up angrily and said: "Why do some people harm me with my relatives? He, who harms me, will harm Allah."<sup>16</sup>

What kind of kinship with Abu Lahab, who had cut every relation and perished every connection by harming the Prophet (S) so severely, it was!

They also mentioned that the Prophet (S) had said: "Don't curse the dead lest you harm the live."<sup>17</sup>

They determined that: "Harming the Prophet (S) is unbelief. Whoever does that shall be killed if he doesn't repent."<sup>18</sup>

The Malikites thought that whoever harmed the Prophet (S) should be killed even if he repented.<sup>19</sup>

If it was so according to their thought, then wouldn't defaming Abu Talib and accusing him wrongly harm the Prophet (S)?

It would be enough sin to make its committer deserve to be killed as punishment in this world and to be in Hell for ever as punishment in the afterlife.

Therefore as-Sayooti said that their purpose behind defaming Abu Talib was to defame Ali himself but their arrow missed and hit the Prophet's parents; Abdullah and Aamina, and grandfather Abdul Muttalib.

Any how the Prophet (S) and Ali (as) were as one soul and Abu Talib was to the Prophet (S) as was Abdullah to him and Fatima (Ali's mother) was to the Prophet (S) as Aamina was.

As-Sayooti said: "I didn't pretend that the matter of the parents was agreed upon by the consensus but there was disagreement<sup>20</sup> about it like the other matters, which were disagreed upon, but I chose the sayings of those, who thought that the Prophet's parents were pure, and this was the most suitable.

Be cautious of mentioning them (the Prophet's parents) with anything bad because this may harm the Prophet (S)<sup>21</sup> because the traditional custom determined that defaming one's parents would harm the son undoubtedly."<sup>22</sup>

If it would defame the Prophet (S) when one of his forefathers was a polytheist, then definitely it would defame him to be brought up in a house of a polytheist,<sup>23</sup> who looked after him, assisted him, defended him and defended his religion and defended the followers of his religion. Then the Prophet (S) with all his glory and success would be indebted to that polytheist man! What a great value and a high position that polytheist would have!

Hadn't the Prophet (S) said: "O Allah! Don't make a dissolute or an unbeliever have a chance of getting my kindness!"

If the polytheist father would defame the faithful son, so the polytheism of Abu Talib would defame his son Ali! Definitely Abu Talib was accused of being polytheist just to defame Ali in order to perish his virtues and high qualities, which no one at all had save Ali. No one of the companions' fathers was faithful nor was they themselves free from polytheism at some time of their lives whereas Ali was pure, since his birth in the Kaaba, whether in his lineage or his beliefs.

Hence, we found how they fabricated different traditions pretending that some of the companions' fathers were Muslims.

They fabricated such traditions besides the tradition talking about the polytheism of Abu Talib just to lighten the scales of Ali (as) and to make the scales of others outweigh!

Even if those traditions were true, the two scales of the balance would never be equal in any case that their fathers were polytheists and then became Muslims –if sincerely– while Abu Talib was monotheist where polytheism could never find any outlet to his heart at all.

The same was fabricated against the antecedence of Ali's faithfulness in the Prophet's mission. They fabricated as possible as they could until they reached a point that they couldn't deny the truth but they tried to clothe it. Ignorantly they tried by saying: "The first of boys, who believed in Muhammad, was Ali, the first of men was Abu Bakr and the first of women was Khadeeja."

If it was said that somebody became a Muslim, that was because that somebody was unbeliever and then became a Muslim but this was not true concerning Ali, who had never been unbeliever for a moment of his life nor had he bowed before an idol! He always raised his head upwards looking at the greatness of the great Creator. He had been faithful since the first day. He had never been unbeliever and then turned to be faithful. He had never prostrated himself before anything save Allah.

Therefore discussing the subject of antecedence in being faithful wouldn't be fit about Ali (as).

Then if the unbelief of Abu Talib would defame his son Ali, it would, at the same time, defame the Prophet (S) as long as Muhammad and Ali were as one soul. They participated in having the same qualities of the house of deep-rooted faithfulness.

Muhammad and Ali had to be in one degree of virtues and qualities except for the prophecy, which distinguished Muhammad from Ali, in order to be united as one self.

Therefore Abu Talib must be like Abdullah and Fatima must be like Aamina either in faithfulness or unfaithfulness so that the parents were to be united as the sons were united; so Muhammad and Ali were but one!

If the Prophet (S) would be harmed when it was said to Sabee'a, whose father and mother were cursed by the holy Quran, that she was the daughter of the firewood of Hell, then how would he be when his uncle was accused of what he was free from?

Wouldn't that harm him so much because it was unjust accusation and violation of the truth against his nearest relative; Abu Talib, who was the kindest one to him and who supported him until the last moment of his life? Wasn't that required the Prophet (S) to be loyal towards the favors of his kind uncle and to suffer when something harmed his uncle; the faithful, the supporter and the nearest relative to him?

It also did harm the equivalent of his soul; Ali, whom whatever harmed, would harm the Prophet (S) and whatever harmed the Prophet (S) would harm Allah as the true prophetic tradition said.

And if the intercession benefited all those great numbers of people, most of whom deserved to be in Hell, wouldn't it benefit his uncle even if he was not faithful as they pretended?

And as long as the Prophet (S) was the kindest one to his relatives as Onayss had sworn of that and so had every one, who knew the merciful Muhammad, then would his intercession benefit all those great numbers of sinful people but it would fail to include his loving uncle, who was to him like his father and who was the father of Ali; his own self, his beloved brother, his son-in-law and his guardian?

But Abu Talib, as we said and so did every fair one, saw the rightness and followed it and so he would enter into Paradise deservedly as a reward for his deeds with no need for intercession, which would benefit those whose doings didn't save them from the torment of Hell.

He, who did his duties rightfully, would deserve to be in Paradise according to the justice of Allah the Beneficent with no need for any intercession.

If Abu Talib would not enter into Paradise, then for whom would it be?

In fact for whom would it be if Abu Talib wasn't the first to be in it rewardingly?

If Abu Talib entered into Hell, as they raved, then who would be safe from it- even the prophets? Then Hell would not be feared, the values would be perished punishment would be random, justice would be lost and judgment would be unfair! Allah forbid!

O Allah! Forgive us and do not destroy us for what the fools have done!

***And those who speak evil things of the believing men and the believing women without their having earned (it), they are guilty indeed of a false accusation and a manifest sin. (The Holy Quran, Shakir 33:58)***

[1.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 3 p.310, Sheikhul Abtah p. 55, A'yan ash- Shia, vol. 39 p.135.

[2.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 3 p.310, Sheikhul Abtah p. 55, A'yan ash- Shia, vol. 39 p.135

- [3.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 3 p.310, A'yan ash-Shia, vol. 39 p.135.
- [4.](#) As-Seera an-Nabawiyya, vol. 1 p.87, al-Ghadeer, vol. 7 p.382, A'yan ash-Shia, vol. 39 p.135.
- [5.](#) Al-Ghadeer, vol. 7 p.383.
- [6.](#) Ibid
- [7.](#) Al-Ghadeer, vol. 7 p.382.
- [8.](#) Ibid
- [9.](#) Ibid
- [10.](#) Ibid
- [11.](#) Ibid
- [12.](#) Muslim's Sahih vol.1 p.48-49.
- [13.](#) As-Seera an-Nabawiyya, vol. 1 p.96.
- [14.](#) Ala Hamish as-Seera vol.1 p. 136, As-Seera an-Nabawiyya, vol. 1 p.73, 76, 95.
- [15.](#) Biharul Anwar, vol. 6 p.57, As-Seera an-Nabawiyya, vol. 1 p.73, 76, Murooj ath-Thahab vol.1 p.69-70.
- [16.](#) As-Seera an-Nabawiyya, vol. 1 p.77.
- [17.](#) Ibid
- [18.](#) Ibid
- [19.](#) Ibid
- [20.](#) We don't think that there was any kind of disagreement upon this matter. It had been proved by the Quran and the sayings of many scholars that the Prophet's parents and grandparents were faithful until they reached the first faithful Adam (S).
- [21.](#) There was no any doubt that this would harm the Prophet (S) not because of the justification of as-Sayooti but because it would wrong those faithful ones, who were the source of faithfulness and monotheism.
- [22.](#) As-Seera an-Nabawiyya, vol. 1 p.76.
- [23.](#) No doubt that a child will be affected by the manners of the house, in which he is brought up, and that he/she is ready to imitate the one, who brings him/her up, and definitely that one will be considered as his/her example.

---

**Source URL:**

<https://www.al-islam.org/abu-talib-faithful-quraysh-abdullah-al-khunayzi/final-word-about-faithfulness-abu-talib#comment-0>