

Ruḥamā' Baynahum

VOLUME 4
ANSWERING THE ALLEGATIONS OF
NEPOTISM AGAINST UTHMĀN

By:

Shaykh Muḥammad Nāfi

WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM

Transliteration key

أ- 'ā	د - ḍ
آ - ā	ط - ṭ
ب - b	ظ - ṣ
ت - t	ع - 'a
ث - th	غ - gh
ج - j	ف - f
ح - ḥ	ق - q
خ - kh	ك - k
د - d	ل - l
ذ - dh	م - m
ر - r	ن - n
ز - z	و - w, ū
س - s	ه - h
ش - sh	ي - y, ī
ص - ṣ	

Contents

Foreword	11
Preface	14
Propositions	16
Introductory Points	17
Preliminary Discussions	25
Discussion One - The Offices and Officers in the `Uthmānī Era And Their Correlation	27
Offices of the State	27
1. Judicial	27
2. <i>Bayt al-Māl</i> (Public Treasury)	28
3. Tax Collection	29
4. Army Officers	29
5. Police Department	30
6. Scribe	30
7. Deputy for Ḥajj (35 A.H.)	30
Some Significant Locations and their Governors	32
1. Makkah Mukarramah	32
2. Madīnah al-Munawwarah	33
3. Al-Ṭā'if	33
4. Al-Ṣan'ā' (Yemen)	33
5. Al-Jund (Yemen)	34
6. Azerbaijan	34
7. Ḥalawān	34
8. Hamdhān	34
9. Aṣbahān	35
10. Jurjān	35
11. Māsbadhān	35
12. Qarqaysā'	35
13. Māh	35
14. Al-Rayy	36

15. Qawmas	36
16. Al-Mawṣil	36
17. Ṣan‘ā’ (Yemen)	36
Some Areas in the Sight of the Critics	36
1. Kūfah	37
2. Baṣrah	39
3. Shām	41
The Prophetic Era:	41
The Ṣiddīqī Era:	42
The Fārūqī Era:	42
The ‘Uthmānī Era:	43
Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah’s Declaration	44
4. Egypt	45
The Scribe Office	47
A Narration of Imām al-Bukhārī with regards to Dismissal and Appointment	50
Conclusion of Discussion One	52
Discussion Two	55
Introductory Points	56
Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah	57
Lineage and Islam	57
Natural Potential	58
Appointment as Governor and Officer	59
Achievements	60
Allegations against Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah and its response	62
1. The Qur’ān labelled him a Fāsiq	62
2. ‘Umar warned ‘Uthmān not to appoint Walīd	65
The narration of ‘Umar in <i>al-Istī‘āb</i>	68
Scrutiny of the narration	70
Examination of Muḥammad ibn Ishāq	70
Ibn Ishāq’s Tadrīs	70
A Rule concerning a Mudallis	71
Ibn Ishāq’s Tafarrud and Shudhūdh	71

3. Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah was an alcoholic	75
Statements of Other Scholars	78
Saīd ibn al-‘Āṣ	80
Name & Lineage and Being a Ṣaḥābī	80
Scholarly Potential	81
Kind Behaviour	81
Achievements	81
The Relationship between Saīd and the Family of Abu Ṭālib	82
Final Request	84
‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir	85
Name and Lineage	85
Days of Infancy and Attainment of Blessings	85
Generosity, Heroism, and Compassion	86
Accomplishments in Warfare	86
Humanitarian Work	89
Services to the Residents of Madīnah	89
Ibn ‘Āmir in the Sight of Ibn Taymiyyah	90
Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah	91
Name, Lineage, and Acceptance of Islam	92
Family Links between the Family of Amīr Mu‘āwiyah and the Banū Hāshim	93
First Connection	93
Second Connection	93
Third Connection	94
Fourth Connection	94
Fifth Connection	95
Sixth Connection	95
Prophetic Supplications in favour of Amīr Mu‘āwiyah	96
Being a Guide and Rightly Guided	97
Acquisition of the Knowledge of the Book and Arithmetic and Protection	
from Punishment	98
Knowledge and Tolerance	98
Intellectual Prowess and Aptitude	100
1. Being the Scribe of the Nabī ﷺ	100

2. Ibn ‘Abbās al-Hāshimī’s Academic Reliance on Amīr Mu‘āwiyah and his Acknowledgement of his Talent	101
3. Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah al-Ḥāshimī’s relating Ḥadīth and Shar‘ī rulings from Amīr Mu‘āwiyah	103
4. Amīr Mu‘āwiyah was from the proficient in Fatwā	103
5. Ṣaḥābah narrate aḥādīth from him	104
Religious Services and Islamic Conquests	105
The Participation of Other Seniors	107
Marking the Borders of the Ḥaram	109
Outstanding character, excellent behaviour, Allah consciousness, and fear for the Hereafter	110
‘Allāmah Ibn Taymiyyah’s View on the Biography and Behaviour of Amīr Mu‘āwiyah	112
A Department to Check on the Masses’ Needs	112
Sa’d’s Testimony of Justice and Equality	113
Al-A‘mash’s Testimony	114
Words of Guidance in right of Amīr Mu‘āwiyah and the Issue of Speaking the Truth in his Presence	115
The Islamic Treasury in the Era of Amīr Mu‘āwiyah	117
Exemplary Personality and Excellent Social Dealings	120
Amīr Mu‘āwiyah and his Partisans in the Sight of ‘Alī and his Family	121
Amīr Mu‘āwiyah and his Supporters were all Believers and their Deceased were washed, shrouded, buried, and prayed over	123
The Ruling of the Martyrs of Ṣiffīn in the light of ‘Alī’s Declaration: They are all Inhabitants of Jannah	124
The Rank of the Participants of Jamal and Ṣiffīn in light of ‘Alī’s Declaration	125
Elucidation on the meaning of <i>Baghy</i> on the Tongue of ‘Alī	127
Summary	129
Clarification: Error in the Text of <i>Sharḥ al-Mawāqif</i>	130
Both Sects were unanimous and common in Religious Matters	133
Verbally Abusing Amīr Mu‘āwiyah and his Supporters is Forbidden in conformity with ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā’s Command	134
Corroboration from Shī‘ī Books	135
Ḥasan’s and Ḥusayn’s Compromise with and Bay‘ah to Amīr Mu‘āwiyah	

and Termination of Conflicts	137
From the Books of the Ahl al-Sunnah	138
Corroboration and Authentication of this event from Shīʿī Books	139
Ḥusayn's Statement	141
More Exquisite	142
The Practical Assistance of the Banū Hāshim during Amīr Mu'āwiyah's khilāfah	144
A Hāshimī Judge ('Abd Allāh) in Madīnah Ṭayyibah	144
Hāshimī Warriors during the Wars: Qutham ibn 'Abbās and Ḥusayn	144
Stipends and Gifts for Ḥasan and Ḥusayn and other Hāshimī Seniors from the Treasury of Amīr Mu'āwiyah	147
Stipends for Ḥusayn	148
Other Hāshimites receiving Stipend of 1 million along with Ḥasan and Ḥusayn	149
This Topic in the Shī'ah's Sight	150
The Stipends of Ḥusayn, Ibn 'Abbās, and 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far	150
The Stipends of Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far	150
The Stipend of 'Aqīl, Murtaḍā's brother	151
Stipulation of Stipend for Ḥusayn's son 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn	152
A Village as a Gift to Ḥasan	152
The Objection of Insulting and Cursing	154
Objectionable Historical reports which are the Source and Basis of the Criticisms	155
Analysis of the Above Reports	158
Request	164
'Abd Allāh ibn Sa'd ibn Abī Sarḥ	165
Lineage and Fosterage	165
Apostasy after Islam followed by Islam, Bay'ah and Steadfastness	166
Governor and Official	167
Accomplishments in Islamic Conquests	167
'Abd Allāh's Demise upon Goodness	168
Removal of few misconceptions	169
Analysis of the chain	176
Analysis of the Content of the Report	178

Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam	180
Brief Biography	181
‘Uthmān’s Son-In-Law	182
Relationships between the Children of ‘Alī and Marwān’s family	182
Academic Talent and Reliability	186
Muwaṭṭa’ Imām Mālik	187
Muwaṭṭa’ Imām Muḥammad	188
Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq	188
Musnad Imām Aḥmad	189
Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī	190
Marwān’s Religious and Academic Position and Count among the Fuqahā’	192
Consulting the Ṣaḥābah in Religious Matters	194
Marwān’s Cautiousness	195
Warfare Assistance and Administrative Skill	196
Ṣaḥābah stood as Marwān’s Representative	196
Enthusiasm to Obtain Reward	197
Search for Prophetic Stations and Relics	197
The Intercession of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn on behalf of Marwān	198
Ḥasan and Ḥusayn performing Ṣalāh behind Marwān	199
Umayy Khulafā’ in the sight of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn	201
‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn in the eyes of Marwān	202
Zayn al-‘Ābidīn in the eyes of ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān	202
Removing Doubts	203
First Misconception: The Issue of Exile	204
Second Misconception	209
Marwān’s Post	209
Marwān’s Trustworthiness	211
The Days before ‘Uthmān’s Martyrdom and Marwān’s Behaviour	212
A Forged Letter	214
Examination of the Historical Reports casting Marwān in bad light	214
Third misconception: The Banū Umayyah and Ḥakam’s children, Marwān and others, being Despised and Accursed	219
Removing the Doubt	220
A. Despised	220

Family Links	221
Governmental appointments	223
‘Alī’s Statements in favour of the Banū Umayyah	224
Summary	225
B. Accursed	225
C. The Reports of Disgrace in the Sight of the Scholars	231
Evaluating these narrations logically	232
Conclusion to the Discussion on Marwān	235
Discussion Three	237
First Angle	237
Second Angle	238
Offices for Relatives in the Prophetic Era	239
The Offices of the Banū Hāshim during the Prophet’s ﷺ Era	245
Familial Appointments During the Fārūqī Era	246
Familial Appointments During the Murtaḍwī Era	247
Corroboration (from Shīṭī books)	251
An objection and its Answer	252
Discussion Four - Financial Gifts for Relatives	255
Reports of Gifting Wealth to the Relatives of ‘Uthmān	258
Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam and the Family of al-Ḥakam	258
Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ	261
Examination of the Chain of Narrators	262
Al-Wāqidī	263
Abū Mikhnaf Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā	263
Other reports on the Monetary Gifts of the Fifth of Africa and others	264
Answer	265
Rational Discussion	273
Conclusion of Discussion Four	275
Discussion Five - The Final Stages of the ‘Uthmānī Era and related discussions	277
Relation of Stages	278
Clarification from Imām al-Bukhārī	278
Ibn al-‘Arabī al-Mālikī’s Statement	278
Shaykh Jīlānī’s Statement	279

The incident of Despatching Delegations and their report back	280
Rule of Thumb: Majority gets the ruling of all	281
Sālim ibn ‘Abd Allāh’s statement with regards the Procedure of the ‘Uthmānī Era	283
Statement of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr	284
The beginning of Change	285
Jealousy and Enmity was the Root	285
The Statement of ‘Alī	286
The Statement of Qāḍī Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī	287
Who were the Conspirators?	287
The Beginning of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ and His Methodology	288
Ibn Khaldūn’s Explanation	289
Ibn Saba’s position among the Shī‘ah	290
Summary	292
The Day of ‘Uthmān’s Martyrdom and the Names of the killers	295
‘Uthmān’s Janāzah and hasty washing, shrouding and burial	296
Ṣaḥābah’s Remorse over ‘Uthmān’s Martyrdom	298
In all these trials and afflictions, ‘Uthmān was on the truth and he passed away on the same	299
Glad Tidings	300
Closing with correctness	303
Bibliography	305

Foreword

الحمد لله رب العالمين و الصلوة و السلام على سيدنا محمد و على آله و صحبه أجمعين

Jāmi‘ah Muḥammadī Sharīf, in the Jhang district, is a famous religious institute and has world-recognised fame by the grace of Allah ﷻ. Remaining engaged in establishing an environment of unity and harmony between Muslims is its unique speciality.

There is continuous conflict between the Shī‘ah and Sunnī of the country. The main reason behind this being that the masses of both sects have not studied the lives of the Rightly Guided Khulafā’ in depth. Otherwise, they would not have openly overlooked the accuracy of the glorious Qur’ān, where Allah ﷻ declares them as *Ruḥamā’ Baynahum*, merciful and compassionate to one another.

Therefore, it was necessary for a bondsman of Allah ﷻ—one blessed with the wealth of knowledge and understanding—to write on this subject. All praise belongs to Allah ﷻ who granted the ability to Mawlānā Muḥammad Nāfi‘, a significant central pillar of the production department of Jāmi‘ah Muḥammadī Sharīf, to write a comprehensive well-researched book by the name *Ruḥamā’ Baynahum* wherein he provided references to famous books of both sects in a fair and amicable manner. The book consists of three sections, Ṣiddīqī section, Fārūqī section, and ‘Uthmānī section. All three sections, after being published, have been widely accepted in the country [and internationally] by the grace of Allah ﷻ. It was established therein that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه enjoyed a amicable and brotherly relationship with the three Khulafā’. In the third section, the issue of the accusations against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه of nepotism needed clarification. However, for fear that the ‘Uthmānī section’s will become extensively lengthy, it was decided that the issue of nepotism be discussed in a separate book which was titled *Mas’alah Aqribā’ Nawāzī* (Addressing the issue of nepotism). Accordingly, this book is now being presented. Hopefully, the readers will find it easier to benefit from and will not be confounded with the issues.

This book has five chapters, each chapter was titled with a discussion, and each discussion deals with a different topic.

- » **First Discussion:** An analysis of the officials and posts in the ‘Uthmānī era as well as their comparison. 20 non-Umayyad individuals were governors in 17 places and only a small handful of Umayyads were governors in 4 places.
- » **Second Discussion:** The expertise and worthiness of the governors of the ‘Uthmānī era. The objectors have criticised them due to them being related to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه; e.g. Sayyidunā Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah, Sayyidunā Sa‘d ibn al-‘Āṣ, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir, Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Sarḥ, and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam. The author establishes the fact that these individuals were austere-natured governors, learned, doers of good, lovers of justice, and administrators of note of the ummah, together with them possessing intelligence and proficiency.
- » **Third Discussion:** This aspect was tackled that not only in the ‘Uthmānī era were relatives given positions of authority. Rather, during the Prophetic era, as well as the Fārūqī and Murtaḍwī eras, their relatives were appointed to noble positions. This has been proven through recorded events.
- » **Fourth Discussion:** While discussing the issue of stipends, it was clarified through reliable isnāds that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه would give stipends to his relatives from his personal wealth, and not from the *Bayt al-Māl* (public treasury).
- » **Fifth Discussion:** A detailed response to the objection that towards the ending of his rule, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه acted contrary to Shar‘ī injunctions and tramped the legal punishments determined by Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى. The clarifications of Imām al-Bukhārī, ‘Allāmah ibn al-‘Arabī, Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir Jīlānī, and others were presented in this regard.

Moreover, the original causes which led to the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه were revealed, i.e. the enemies of Islam harboured hatred for Islam and the Muslims and vented their hatred by assassinating Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. The alleged deficiencies and imperfections of the ‘Uthmānī reign did not lead to his martyrdom.

The approach of presenting proofs and evidences and style of *Mas’alah Aqribā’ Nawāzī* is so clear that the supporter will receive further satisfaction by reading it, and the critic will be forced to ponder over why he had the audacity to discard the brilliant actions of the *Possessor of the Two Lights* [Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه]. And divine ability rests in the hands of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

Publishers

Preface

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم الحمد لله رب العالمين و الصلوة و السلام على سيد الأولين و الآخرين إمام
الرسول و خاتم النبيين و على بناته الأربعة الطاهرات و أزواجه المطهرات و على آله الطيبين و أصحابه
المزكين المنتخبين الذين اجتهدوا في دين الله حق اجتهاده و نصره في هجرته و هاجروا لنصرته و
جاهدوا في سبيل الله حق جهاده و على جميع عباد الله الصالحين و سائر أتباعه بإحسان إلى يوم الدين

In the name of Allah, the Exceedingly Compassionate, Excessively Merciful. All praise belongs to Allah, Lord of the universes. Salutations and peace upon the leader of the former and latter generation, the leader of the Messengers and the Seal of Prophets, upon his four pure daughters and purified wives, upon his sanctified family and purified chosen Companions who strove to establish the dīn of Allah as they ought to, assisted him in his emigration, emigrated to support him, and fought in the path of Allah par excellence, and upon all the righteous servants of Allah and all those who follow him with goodness till the Day of Judgement.

After the khuṭbah, the worthless Muḥammad Nāfi'—may Allah forgive him—presents to the readers:

Amīr al-Mu'minīn Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه is one of the Rightly Guided Khulafā' and, according to the majority of the Muslim ummah, enjoys the third rank just after Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنهما. He is the possessor of numerous virtues in Islam. He was perfect to the degree of excellence in qualities like trustworthiness, religiousness, truthfulness, generosity, modesty, maintaining family ties, etc. These praiseworthy characteristics of his are accepted by all.

Despite this, some people are opposed to Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه. It seems like this opposition is the product of enmity alone. No sensible reason is found for this opposition. This illustrious individual has been disparaged for a number of reasons. The list the opposition prepare against Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه opens with the accusation of nepotism. This is an old accusation which has been answered by the scholars of every era and generation.

In this belated era, this allegation has been embellished and remodelled and presented before the masses, whereas it was a dead and forgotten discussion. The ummah was not in need of reviving it, nor was it the demand of the era.

Allah knows what the motives were behind taking the pains to revive this worthless argument. Through it, the masses and elite were troubled and saddened and the opposition to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه became elated and felt safe. Nothing else was achieved besides further disunity and division. To make efforts to further disunite the ummah, especially in an era which demands the harmony of the ummah, is not an act of well-wishing for the religion.

This issue will be tackled by penning down actual anecdotes and realities—and not by using the debate methodology—to support the status of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and to remove evil perceptions about the Rightly Guided Khalīfah. This is the objective.

After studying this presentation, the subject will be clarified and the accusation will be dismissed, by the will of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

The readers are requested to adhere to two aspects. Firstly, to study this entire discussion. Secondly, to shelve prejudice and observe justice. In this manner, this matter will be understood properly. And my capabilities rest with Allah.

Propositions

- Prior to getting into the core discussions of this book, a few points will be mentioned. To explain the issue of nepotism, we will include five discussions, Allah willing. This topic will be explained in a positive light in these discussions, coupled with an effort being made to illustrate the proximity shared by the seniors of the Banū Hāshim and Banū Umayyah of that era.
- In contrast to the usual style of writing, the pattern chosen for this book was that by and large a subject or viewpoint is briefly presented to the readers prior to quoting the text of the reference. Thereafter, the original text is quoted verbatim so that the scholarly fraternity may peruse the text and attain satisfaction. This style is completely discarded in custom and the modern writers will not approve of it at all. Therefore, this was declared as an apology, so it may not be taken offensively.
- At times, in support of an assertion, a number of references are presented. The idea behind it is to corroborate and substantiate the assertion.

Secondly, a library of books is not available to every person. The benefit of quoting from various books is that if a person has one of the books at his disposal, he may refer to it and derive satisfaction therefrom.

Now, some introductory points will be mentioned after which the original content will be presented over five discussions, with the help of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

Introductory Points

1. Worthy to note is that in no Sharī *naṣṣ* (verse or ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth) does the regulation appear that the Muslim ruler or governor is not allowed to appoint any of his family members during his reign to a position of authority nor is it mentioned that he does not have the choice to award a close relative an office.

It is apparent that no such Sharī law is available which Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه allegedly acted contrary to and intentionally violated.

The critics of the ‘Uthmānī era accept that Sayyidunā Dhū al-Nūrayn رضي الله عنه did not break any Sharī regulation in this regard. At the same time, they do not desist from accusing him of nepotism. They keep it fresh with new titles and repeat it over and over so that an aversion is maintained and evil thoughts endure for Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. Every person shall obtain what he intended.

2. Secondly, instating and dismissing governors and officials (known as *‘ummāl* or *wulāt* in Arabic) is a discretionary issue, subject to the opinion of the Islamic Khalīfah. The general populace do not understand the pros and cons of this matter. At the same time, the Amīr al-Mu‘minīn understands the requirements of these situations best. When he appoints governors, according to his foresight, he appoints them to serve public interests. This has been stated by senior scholars in their works:

Al-Qāḍī Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī al-Andalusī writes at one place in *al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim*:

الولاية اجتهاد

To appoint someone as governor or officer is an ijtihādī matter.¹

1 *Al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim*, pg. 87.

He writes at another place:

الولايات و العزلات لها معان و حقائق لا يعلمها كثير من الناس

Appointment and dismissal of governors/officers have many objectives and realities which majority of people are ignorant of. (Meaning that only the responsible can understand those demands.)¹

Shāh Waliyyullāh Muḥaddith Dahlawī states in *Qurrat al-‘Aynayn fī Tafḍīl al-Shaykhayn*:

میگویم کہ نصب و عزل مفوض ست برائے خلیفہ اگر اجتہاد خلیفہ مؤدی شود یا نہ کہ از فلاں شخص کار امت سر انجام می یابد لازم میشود بروئے نصب او

We say that appointment and dismissal is subject to the view of the Khilāfah of the Muslims. If the Khalīfah determines that a certain individual is capable of fulfilling the work of the ummah, it is binding that he be appointed to that position.²

Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضی اللہ عنہ appointed and dismissed governors according to his discretion in the best possible way. He considered the well-being of the ummah and religion when doing so and never allowed any deficiency in his ijtihādī endeavours.

Despite this, if the governors of this era (who are neither angels nor infallible from mistakes) fell short in fulfilling the demands of their post or committed errors or were responsible for any evil action, then to put the blame of all of this on the management and conduct of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضی اللہ عنہ is downright unjust. Whatever wrongs were perpetrated were not done by the suggestion or command of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضی اللہ عنہ.

1 *Al-‘Awāsim min al-Qawāsim*, pg. 24, under nuktah, Lahore print.

2 *Qurrat al-‘Aynayn fī Tafḍīl al-Shaykhayn*, pg. 272, discussion on the criticism against the two sons-in-law, Mujtabaī print, Delhi.

This is exactly what Shāh Waliyyullāh points out in the following text of his book *Qurrat al-'Aynayn fī Tafḍīl al-Shaykhayn* as an answer:

میگوئیم ہر چہ ایشاں بوقوع آمد نہ بامرذی النورین بود و نہ بوفق صلاح دیدوے و در خلافت علم غیب خود شرط نیست آنچه شرط خلافت ست اجتهاد ست و ذی النورین در اجتهاد تقصیر نہ کرد

We say that all the actions of his governors and administrators were neither by the instruction of Dhū al-Nūrayn nor according to his liking. Knowledge of the unseen is not a condition in the matter of Khilāfah. What is a condition in Khilāfah is ijtihād. And in this field Dhū al-Nūrayn did not allow any shortcoming.¹

3. To answer this objection, Shāh Waliyyullāh رَحْمَةُ اللهِ فِيهِ in his book *Izālat al-Khafā' 'an Khilāfat al-Khulafā'*, added weighty points to this discussion on Amīr al-Mu'minīn Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ which if studied will totally eliminate the above objection of the critics. We present the original text of the book verbatim for the impartial readers, after which the meaning will be presented for the benefit of all.

ازاں جملہ انکے اصحاب انحضرت صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم را از حکومت بلاد معزول ساخت و حدات بنی امیہ را کہ در اسلام مسابقت نداشتند حاکم گردانید مثل عزل ابی موسی بعبد اللہ بن ابی عامر از بصرہ و عزل عمرو بن العاص از مصر بہ ابن ابی سرح

و جواب این اشکال اینست کہ عزل و نصب را خداے عز و جل بر راے خلیفہ باز گذاشته است می باید کہ خلیفہ تحری کند در صلاح مسلمین و نصرت اسلام و بر حسب ہماں تحری بعمل آرد اگر اصابت کرد فلہ اجرہ مرتین و اگر در تحری خطا واقع شد فلہ اجرہ مرۃ این معنی ازاں حضرت صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم بعد تواتر رسید و در بعض احیان مولی را معزول ساختند و دیگر را بجائے او نصب فرمودند برائے مصلحتے چنانکہ در غزوہ فتح رأیت انصار از سعد بن عبادہ گرفتند بہ سب کلمہ کہ از زبان او جستہ بود و بہ پسر او قیس بن سعد دادند

و گایے مفضول را منصوب می ساختند بنا بر مصلحتے چنانکہ اسامہ را امیر لشکر فرمود و کبار مہاجرین را تابع وے گردانیدند در اخر حال

1 *Qurrat al-'Aynayn fī Tafḍīl al-Shaykhayn*, pg. 272, discussion on the criticism against the two sons-in-laws, Mujtabaṭ print, Delhi.

و همچنین شیخین نیز در ایام خلافت خود بعمل درآوردند و بعد حضرت عثمان حضرت مرتضی و دیگر خلفاء همیشه بهمین دستور کرده آمدند پس بر حضرت ذی النورین رضی الله عنه ازین وجه باز خواست نیست اگر بحکم تحری خود شخصی از حدت را والی کرده باشد و شخصی از قدمات اصحاب را معزول ساخت خصوصاً در قصص که نقل کرده اند چون تامل نموده می آید اصابت را نے ذی النورین اوضح من الشمس فی رابعة النهار بظهور می رسد

زیر اینکه هر عزلی و هر نصیبی یا متضمن اخماد فتنه اختلاف جند و رعیت بوده است یا مثمر فتح اقلیبه از اقالیم دار الکفر لیکن بهوائے نفسانی ابصار مبتدعین را اعمی ساخته

و عین الرضا من کل عیب کلبه

و لکن عین السخط تبدی المساویا

Among the many objections raised against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضی الله عنه is that he dismissed the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلی الله علیه و آله و سلم from governorship over major cities and appointed inexperienced youth of the Banū Umayyah as governors (who were not forerunners in Islam). For example, he dismissed Abu Mūsā al-Ash‘arī and instated ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir over Baṣrah, and he dismissed ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ and instated ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa‘d ibn Abī Sarḥ over Egypt.

The answer to this is that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَ تَعَالَى handed over the affair of dismissal and appointment to the discretion of the Khilāfah of Islam. The Amīr al-Mu‘minīn should ponder deeply and contemplate over what is best for the Muslims and Islam and act according to his discretion. If his decision is correct, he will receive double reward and if he erred, he will obtain a single reward.

This matter is established from Rasūlullāh صلی الله علیه و آله و سلم to the degree of tawātur in meaning.

Keeping the need and benefit of the area in mind, sometimes he dismissed a governor and appointed another, just like at the Conquest of Makkah, the banner of the Anṣār was taken away from Sa‘d ibn ‘Ubādah (after he made a statement) and given to his son, Qays ibn Sa‘d.

And sometimes owing to a temporary demand, he appointed a lower ranking person as leader just as Usāmah ibn Zayd رضي الله عنه was appointed army general while senior Muhājirīn were put under his command.

Abū Bakr and ‘Umar acted in the same way during their days of Khilāfah and ‘Alī and other Khulafā’ sustained this practice after ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. Therefore, Sayyidunā Dhū al-Nūrayn cannot be taken to task for this.

After applying his discretion, if he appointed a youngster as governor and dismissed some elderly Ṣaḥābah, especially the examples cited above; then when contemplating deeply, the correctness and accurateness of ‘Uthmān’s decision will become clearer than the sun for the simple reason that his dismissal and appointment was either due to putting an end to the fitnah of *ikhtilāf* (disunity) between an army or populace, or to award the fruits of Islamic dominance over disbelieving countries. However, (in this matter) the eyes of the *Ahl al-Bid‘ah* (innovators) are clouded due to carnal desires.

The eyes of happiness are incapable of detecting faults

But the eyes of anger manifest the errors.¹

4. Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Dahlawī made the very same comments in answer to this objection in *Tuḥfat Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*:

جواب از بی طعن آنکه امام رامی باید که بر کرا لائق کارے داند این کار را با وسپارد و علم غیب اصلا نزد اہل سنت بلکه جمیع طوائف مسلمین غیر از شیعه شرط امامت نیست و عثمان با بر کہ حسن ظن داشت و کار امدنی دانست و امین و عادل شناخت و مطیع و منقاد خود گمان برد ریاست و امارت باو داد

The answer to this objection is that it is binding upon the Imām and Khalīfah to hand over the affair to the person he deems fit for the job. Knowledge of the unseen is not a condition for Khilāfah and Imāmah according to the

1 *Izālat al-Khafā’ ‘an Khilāfah al-Khulafā’*, second objective, pg. 247, under the feats of Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, old print, Bareli.

Ahl al-Sunnah. In fact, it is not a condition according to all the Muslims besides the Shī'ah. In respect of whichever person 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه had good thoughts, and understood him to be an efficient worker, trustworthy, fair, and obedient; he gave him the post of leadership and governorship.¹

The gist of the above is that the senior scholars of the ummah have clarified that:

- The matter of dismissal and appointment is ijtihādī. It is the prerogative of the Khilāfah of the Muslims. The Khalīfah may apply his discretion according to the need of the time.
 - If the appointment of governors is correct, the Khalīfah will receive double reward. If any error was committed, he will receive a single reward and his mistake will be forgiven.
 - If hypothetically the governors appointed by the discretion of the Khalīfah did not fulfil the task, the Khalīfah is not accountable.
5. Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه appointed and dismissed governors of the state during his Khilāfah according to his discretion and changed governors at the time of need.

This is a necessary component of Khilāfah and there is no escape from it. A few instances of Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه dismissing few eminent Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and appointing others in their position will be presented to the readers.

a) It appears in *al-Iṣābah*:

و استعمله (أبا موسى) عمر على أمة البصرة بعد أن عزل المغيرة

1 *Tuḥfat Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* Persian, pg. 305, accusations against 'Uthmān, under the answer to the first objection, new print, Lahore.

‘Umar appointed Abū Mūsā [al-Ash‘arī] governor over Baṣrah after dismissing Mughīrah [ibn Shu‘bah].¹

- b) Once, Sayyidunā ‘Umar al-Fārūq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ gave the order to dismiss the famous warrior Sayyidunā Khālīd ibn al-Walīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ due to a gift he made. He wrote to Sayyidunā Abū ‘Ubaydah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

اعزله على كل حال و اضمم إليك عمله

Dismiss him from his post and administer his work yourself.²

- c) The noted warrior, the great conqueror for the religion, Sayyidunā Sa‘d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was dismissed by Sayyidunā ‘Umar:

و فيها (٢١ سنة هـ) شكوا أهل الكوفة سعد بن مالك (أبي وقاص) إلى عمر فعزله و ولي عمار بن ياسر بالصلوة

In the year 21 A.H., the residents of Kūfah complained about Sa‘d ibn Mālik (Abī Waqqāṣ) to ‘Umar so he dismissed him and appointed ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir to lead the ṣalāh.³

- d) The above took place in 21 A.H. In 22 A.H., ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ dismissed Sayyidunā ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ from Kūfah.

و فيها (سنة ٢٢ هـ) عزل عمر عمارا عن الكوفة

In that year, ‘Umar removed ‘Ammār from Kūfah.⁴

1 *Al-Iṣābah with al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 2 pg. 352, biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Qays (Abū Musa); *al-Istī‘āb with Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 363, biography of Abū Mūsā (‘Abd Allāh ibn Qays); *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 4 pg. 207, under the year 17 A.H., old Egypt print.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 4 pg. 205, the year 17 A.H., old Egypt print; *Kitāb al-Kharāj*, pg. 148, section on churches, synagogues, and crosses, second edition, Egypt.

3 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt* (d. 240 A.H.), vol. 1 pg. 122, first edition, Iraq; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’*, vol. 1 pg. 79, biography of Sa‘d ibn Mālik.

4 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 125, Iraq print.

These are incidents of the Fārūqī era presented as examples. It is realised from here, that all of these changes happen due to the need of the time and the advantage of the area. No objection is levelled against Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه for these changes. So justice demands that no objection be raised against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه in the matter of appointment and dismissal.

However, one aspect remains. Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه made the changes but did not appoint people from his tribe in those positions whereas Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه instated men from his tribe. This will be addressed shortly.

Preliminary Discussions

The matter of appointment and dismissal has been presented with clarity to the readers. This much is enough to understand the theme of the matter. Nonetheless, we present few other discussions at this juncture. If the readers do away with prejudice and partiality, and ponder over them with fairness, solace will be brought to the heart, Allah willing, and they will prove extremely beneficial to realise the innocence of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.

The critics state:

قسم الولايات بين أقاربه

‘Uthmān divided the departments of state among his relatives.¹

In short, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه gave his brethren high posts they were unfit for and made wrong allocations due to which an environment of tribalism and discrimination spread. At the end, this was the cause of fitnah and turmoil and led to the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.

In relation to this accusation, five discussions will be presented to the readers.

Firstly, the number of offices given to the relatives of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه which are the basis of criticism should be ascertained. Moreover, how many posts were given to others besides them. Similarly, how many relatives of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه were appointed as governors and how many besides them were appointed as governors in various areas.

Secondly, it should be clarified as to what kind of people were the ones who were given these offices and posts. What type of behaviour did they have? Was the

1 *Minhāj al-Karāmah* of Ibn al-Muḥahhar al-Ḥillī al-Shīṭī, pg. 66, Lahore print, under the accusations against ‘Uthmān, the rebuttal of which was penned by Ibn Taymiyyah al-Ḥarrānī and titled *Minhāj al-Sunnah*.

religion adversely affected due to them? Was Islam destroyed? Or were they, to the contrary, good people? They had immaculate behaviour. They were bearers of many virtues. The religion of Islam benefitted tremendously through their beings. The religion developed, the flag of Islam flew aloft, and the voice of Islam reached the pinnacle of the world.

Thirdly, worthy to note is whether consideration of granting offices to family members and relatives was only found in the ‘Uthmānī era or whether it was present in the former and later eras as well. It is befitting to evaluate the ‘Uthmānī era with other eras in this regard so that a judgement may be reached as regards to the ‘Uthmānī era being worthy of criticism or not.

Fourthly, if Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه favoured his relatives with an abundance of wealth, then it needs to be ascertained whether this action of his was sanctioned in the Sharī‘ah or not and what sort of favouritism this was. This will be discussed rationally and textually, and will prove beneficial in removing all misconceptions.

Fifthly, the final discussion will be whether favouritism of relatives (whether by appointment to office or giving wealth) during the ‘Uthmānī era led to tribalism and discrimination between tribes and finally tribulations in the final days, or were there other causes that led to the troubles and problems? Allah willing, this will be investigated thoroughly in the final discussion in the light of the actual happenings of the time.

Now, a detailed discussion on all these five themes will ensue.

Discussion One

The Offices and Officers in the ‘Uthmānī Era And Their Correlation

During the Khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, the Islamic state spanned over a massive piece of land: The entire country of Egypt, Shām, a great portion of Africa—to the west until Morocco and Spain, the entire Hījāz region including Makkah, Madīnah, and Yemen, in the northern direction, the entire Persian Empire including Khorasan, etc, to the East, till the borders of Makrān. This vast and gigantic Islamic state was under the management of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.

It is apparent that to administer such an enormous state, a few posts and a handful of governors managing these posts were not sufficient. In fact, a special group was needed just to administer the top posts.

Keeping this state of affairs in mind, to gather detailed information on this aspect par excellence is extremely arduous and the pages of history do not support this endeavour. Nevertheless, according to the rule: *what cannot be attained in full, should not be discarded in totality*, we will try our level best to elucidate on the issue of posts and governors which was easily accessible. The correlation between the two will be properly understood through it.

Offices of the State

1. Judicial

Many senior individuals assumed the judicial post at different stages during the ‘Uthmānī Khilāfah. Among them were:

- Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه

و كان على قضاء عثمان يومئذ زيد بن ثابت

Zayd ibn Thābit was at the head of the judicial system of ‘Uthmān.¹

- Mughīrah ibn Nawfal ibn al-Ḥārith ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib al-Hāshimī.

وكان المغيرة بن نوفل قاضيا في خلافة عثمان

Mughīrah ibn Nawfal was a judge during the Khilāfah of ‘Uthmān.²

2. *Bayt al-Māl* (Public Treasury)

The historians have listed a number of people who were appointed over the Muslim Treasury during the ‘Uthmānī era. Some of them will be listed hereunder.

- ‘Abd Allāh ibn Arqam

وكان على بيت المال عبد الله بن أرقم ثم استعفى فعفاه

‘Abd Allāh ibn Arqam was in charge of the Bayt al-Māl. Thereafter, he handed in his resignation and was relieved of the duty.³

‘Abd Allāh ibn Arqam’s appointment over the Muslim Treasury during the ‘Uthmānī era has been corroborated by Hafiz Ibn Ḥajar in *al-Iṣābah*.⁴

- The appointment of Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Thābit al-Anṣārī رضي الله عنه at times to this post has been mentioned in the books on *Asmā’ al-Rijāl* (biographies).

وكان (زيد) على بيت المال لعثمان

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 149, the governors of ‘Uthmān, year 35 A.H.; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 227, discussion on ‘Alī’s bay’ah to the khalīfah.

2 *Al-Istī‘āb* with *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 366, biography of Mughīrah; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 4 pg. 408, biography of Mughīrah; *al-Iṣābah* with *al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 3 pg. 433, biography of Mughīrah ibn Nawfal.

3 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 157, first section, the governors of ‘Uthmān; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 115, biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Arqam.

4 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 265, biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Arqam.

Zayd was in charge of the Bayt al-Māl for ‘Uthmān.¹

- Ibn Jarīr, Ibn Athīr, Ibn Kathīr, and other historians have recorded that Sayyidunā ‘Uqbah ibn ‘Amr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was in charge of the Muslim Treasury in the ‘Uthmānī Khilāfah.

و على بيت المال عقبه بن عمرو

‘Uqbah ibn ‘Amr was in charge of the Bayt al-Māl.²

3. Tax Collection

Some people were assigned the duty of collecting taxes (kharāj, ‘ushr, etc.) during the Khilāfah of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. This is akin to the internal revenue service present in most countries today.

و على خراج السواد جابر بن فلان المزني ... و سماك الأنصاري

Jābir ibn Fulān al-Muzanī and Sammāk al-Anṣārī were tasked with collecting the kharāj of the Sawād (Iraq and surroundings).³

4. Army Officers

The Islamic army was a distinct department. People were appointed to different levels of leadership and management. A number of generals and officers were assigned to various places. Sayyidunā Qa‘qā‘ ibn ‘Amr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was an army officer in the Kūfah region.

1 *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 2 pg. 223, biography of Zayd ibn Thābit al-Anṣārī, Tehran print.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 149, the governors of ‘Uthmān; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the governors of ‘Uthmān; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 227, discussion on ‘Alī’s bay‘ah to the khilāfah.

3 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 148, the governors of ‘Uthmān, year 35 A.H.; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of ‘Uthmān’s officers, *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 227, mention of ‘Alī’s bay‘ah of khilāfah; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān*, pg. 149, chapter eight, Beirut print, Lebanon.

و على حربها القعقاع بن عمرو

Qa'qā' ibn 'Amr was in charge of the military department of Kūfah.¹

5. Police Department

It is imperative to maintain public social affairs. The police department was established during the 'Uthmānī Khilāfah to handle these affairs. The head officer was 'Abd Allāh ibn Qunfudh, from the Banū Taym tribe, of Quraysh descent.

و كان على شرطه عبد الله بن قنفذ من بني تيم قريش

'Abd Allāh ibn Qunfudh from the Banū Taym of Quraysh was head of the police department.²

6. Scribe

A scribe was appointed to take care of all correspondence of the Muslim Khalīfah. Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam handled this service during the 'Uthmānī era.

و كاتبه مروان بن الحكم

His scribe was Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.³

7. Deputy for Ḥajj (35 A.H.)

When the last Ḥajj season of the 'Uthmānī era set in, the rebels besieged Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه in his home. Hence, he was incapable of proceeding for Ḥajj.

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 148, the governors of 'Uthmān, year 35 A.H.; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of 'Uthmān's officers, *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 227, mention of 'Alī's bay'ah of khilāfah; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān fī Maqatal al-Shahīd 'Uthmān*, pg. 149, chapter eight.

2 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 157, 'Uthmānī officers, Iraq print.

3 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 157, 'Uthmānī officers, Iraq print.

On this occasion, he summoned the cousin of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās al-Muṭṭalibī al-Hāshimī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا, and sent him to Makkah after appointing him leader of the Ḥajj.

عن عكرمة عن ابن عباس أن عثمان بن عفان استعمله على الحج في السنة التي قتل فيها سنة خمس و ثلاثين فخرج فحج بالناس بأمر عثمان

‘Ikrimah reports from Ibn ‘Abbās:

‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān appointed him over the Ḥajj in the year in which he was killed, the year 35 A.H. In compliance to his command, he left and led the people in Ḥajj.¹

Note: We have reported this incident previously in the third section (‘Uthmānī) of *Ruḥamā’ Baynahum*, in the beginning of chapter five where we referenced it to many books. It was only repeated here to list the offices.

This responsibility was given to a Hāshimī personality by Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, not an Umayyad. You can gauge the level of alleged tribalism from this fact, the extent of its factuality, and the amount of propaganda involved.

Note:

These are various posts and offices which we listed for the benefit of the readers from the pages of history.

Only one personality, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam is the cousin (paternal uncle’s son) of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as well as his son-in-law. The rest of the individuals who assumed the offices listed above were not even from the Banū Umayyah. Some were from the Banū Hāshim while others were from other tribes.

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 3 pg. 44, first section, mention of ‘Uthmān’s bay’ah, Leiden print; *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 54, 35 A.H., Iraq print.

At this juncture, we will leave it up to the readers to count the relatives and non-relatives and see the correlation between the two. Remove tribalism from your equity loving heart and do the equation. The balance of equity is in your hands.

Regarding the scribe office and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, we will mention a few points in the near future, Allah willing, so that this aspect is clarified accurately.

Some Significant Locations and their Governors

Under the previous heading, a few departments and offices were listed. It is appropriate to now enumerate the governors of few significant locations. The governors of these areas assumed the responsibility of the present day deputy commissioner or provincial minister. He was in charge of all the administrative affairs and management of that area.

These details will reveal the reality of the Umayyad and non-Umayyad governors and it will uncover the exact amount of individuals of the Banū Umayyah Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه appointed as governors and how many from other tribes were appointed.

1. Makkah Mukarramah

During the Khilāfah of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, the following personalities assumed the governor post at different times¹:

1. Sayyidunā Khālid ibn al-‘Āṣ ibn Hishām al-Makhzūmī رضي الله عنه (Ṣaḥābī).²
2. Sayyidunā ‘Alī ibn ‘Adī ibn Rabī‘ah رضي الله عنه (Ṣaḥābī).³

1 Note: We apologise to the readers that to quote the texts of all references and then to translate them will unnecessarily lengthen the discussion. Keeping this in mind, at some places only the gist has been mentioned after which the references provided.

2 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 156, the governors of ‘Uthmān; *Tajrīd Asmā’ al-Ṣaḥābah*, vol. 1 pg. 162, biography of Khālid ibn al-‘Āṣ, Dā’irat al-Ma‘ārif, Hyderabad Dakkan print.

3 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 156, the governors of ‘Uthmān; *Tajrīd Asmā’ al-Ṣaḥābah*, vol. 1 pg. 424, Dā’irat al-Ma‘ārif, Hyderabad Dakkan print.

3. ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr al-Ḥaḍramī.¹
4. ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith ibn Nawfal al-Muṭṭalibī al-Hāshimī, Abū Muḥammad (Title: Babbah).²

2. Madīnah al-Munawwarah

5. When Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه would travel for Ḥajj during his Khilāfah, he would appoint Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Thābit al-Anṣārī رضي الله عنه as his deputy over Madīnah Munawwarah.³

3. Al-Ṭā’if

6. Qāsim ibn Rab’ah al-Thaqafī was the governor over Ṭā’if throughout the reign of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.⁴

4. Al-Ṣan‘ā’ (Yemen)

7. Sayyidunā Ya‘lā ibn Munyah al-Tamīmī رضي الله عنه (Ṣaḥābī), also known as Ya‘lā ibn Umayyah.⁵

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 148, ‘Uthmānī governors, year 35 A.H.; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, governors of ‘Uthmān; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān fī Maqṭal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān*, pg. 150, chapter 8, Beirut print; *Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī* (Shīṭī author), vol. 2 pg. 176, the days of ‘Uthmān, Beirut print, Lebanon.

2 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 5 pg. 15, biography of ‘Abd Allāh, Leiden print; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 5 pg. 181, biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith.

3 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 156, the names of the governors of ‘Uthmān, Najaf Ashraf print, Iraq; *Usd al-Ghābah fī Ma’rifat al-Ṣaḥābah*, vol. 2 pg. 222, biography of Zayd ibn Thābit.

4 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 148, the governors of ‘Uthmān; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān*, pg. 150, chapter 8, Beirut print. Lebanon; *Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī* (Shīṭī) vol. 2 pg. 176, the days of ‘Uthmān.

5 *Al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 3 pg. 625, biography of Ya‘lā ibn Umayyah al-Tamīmī; *al-Iṣābah* with *al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 3 pg. 630, Ya‘lā; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 148, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of his governors; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān fī Maqṭal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān*, pg. 150, Beirut print; *Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī* (Shīṭī), vol. 2 pg. 176, the days of ‘Uthmān.

5. Al-Jund (Yemen)

8. Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Rabī‘ah al-Makhzūmī رضي الله عنه (Ṣaḥābī).¹

6. Azerbaijan

9. Sayyidunā Ash‘ath ibn Qays al-Kindī رضي الله عنه (Ṣaḥābī).²

7. Ḥalawān

10. ‘Utaybah ibn al-Nahhās.³

8. Hamdhān

11. Nusayr.⁴

Hafiz Ibn Kathīr has written in al-Bidāyah while discussing Sayyidunā Jarīr ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Bajāli رضي الله عنه:

قد كان (جرير) عاملا لعثمان على همذان

Jarīr was governor for ‘Uthmān over Hamdhān [for a certain period].⁵

1 *Usd al-Ghābah fī Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥābah*, vol. 3 pg. 155, biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Rabī‘ah, Tehran print; *al-Ṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 297, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Rabī‘ah; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 148, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of his governors; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān fī Maqatal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān*, pg. 150, chapter 8, Beirut print.

2 *Usd al-Ghābah fī Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥābah*, vol. 1 pg. 98, biography of Ash‘ath; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 148, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of his governors; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 227, ‘Alī’s bay‘ah to the khilāfah; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān*, pg. 149, chapter 8.

3 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 149, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 227, ‘Alī’s bay‘ah to the khilāfah; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān fī Maqatal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān*, pg. 149, chapter 8, Beirut print, Lebanon.

4 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 149, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān fī Maqatal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān*, pg. 149, chapter 8.

5 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 56, the year 51 A.H.

The famous shīī historian al-Ya‘qūbī has corroborated this in his *Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī*.¹

9. Aṣbahān

12. Sayyidunā Sā‘ib ibn al-Aqra‘ رضي الله عنه (Ṣaḥābī).²

10. Jurjān

13. Dhū al-Jawshan al-Ḍabābī.³

11. Māsbadhān

14. Ḥubaysh.⁴

12. Qarqaysā’

15. Sayyidunā Jarīr ibn ‘Abd Allāh رضي الله عنه (Ṣaḥābī), for a period.⁵

13. Māh

16. Mālik ibn Ḥabīb.⁶

1 *Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī*, vol. 2 pg. 176, the days of ‘Uthmān (the governors of ‘Uthmān).

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 149, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān fī Maqatal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān*, pg. 150, chapter 8, Beirut print.

3 *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān fī Maqatal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān*, pg. 150, chapter 8, Beirut print, Lebanon.

4 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 149, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān*, pg. 150, chapter 8.

5 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 148, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 227, ‘Alī’s bay‘ah to the khilāfah; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān*, pg. 149, chapter 8.

6 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 149, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān*, pg. 149, chapter 8.

14. Al-Rayy

17. Saʿīd ibn Qays.¹

15. Qawmas

18. Jabalah ibn Ḥayāt al-Kinānī.²

16. Al-Mawṣil

19. Ḥakīm ibn Salāmah.³

17. Ṣanʿāʾ (Yemen)

20. Sayyidunā Thumāmah ibn ʿAdī رضي الله عنه (Ṣaḥābī).

كان (ثمامة) أميراً لعثمان على صنعاء

Thumāmah was ʿUthmān’s governor over Ṣanʿāʾ.⁴

Some Areas in the Sight of the Critics

From among the popular areas, the list of the governors of only 4 cities remain, viz. Kūfah, Baṣrah, Shām, and Egypt; they will be mentioned coupled with the scribe post. These areas are specifically the target of criticism by the critics. We have attached some notes to these areas. Contemplate deeply with fairness over them and assess the policy adopted by Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه and find out the following:

1 *Tārīkh al-Tabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 149, the names of ʿUthmān’s governors; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 95, the names of ʿUthmān’s governors; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān*, pg. 149, chapter 8.

2 *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān*, pg. 150, chapter 8, Beirut print.

3 *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān*, pg. 149, chapter 8.

4 *Al-Istīʾāb* with *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 1 pg. 205, biography of Thumāmah ibn ʿAdī; *Usd al-Ghābah fī Maʿrifat al-Ṣaḥābah*, vol. 1 pg. 248, 249, biography of Thumāmah ibn ʿAdī, Tehran print.

Was all of this due to tribalism and self-worship or due to the benefit for Muslims and the demand of the time and situation? Since all Muslims have conviction and reliance on the trustworthiness, sincerity, and honesty of Amīr al-Mu'minīn Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, his methodology and policy cannot be assessed with the eyes of doubt and mistrust. Have a look at aspects related to these areas.

1. Kūfah

The readers should be apprised of the fact that in the former and latter part of the 'Uthmānī Khilāfah, non-Umayyad persons were governors over Kūfah. In the intervening period, two relatives of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, viz. Sayyidunā Walīd ibn 'Uqbah and Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ رضي الله عنه were given this post.

A clarification will be written regarding the appointment and dismissal of governors over Kūfah which will prove beneficial in understanding the real state of affairs.

Sayyidunā Mughīrah ibn Shu'bah رضي الله عنه (Ṣaḥābī) acted as governor over Kūfah during the final days of the Fārūqī Khilāfah. He remained governor during the 'Uthmānī Khilāfah for approximately a year. Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه relieved him and instated Sayyidunā Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ رضي الله عنه in his place, with the clarification that his dismissal was not due to any breach of trust or evil on his part.¹

Then in 26 A.H, he relieved Sayyidunā Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ رضي الله عنه and appointed Sayyidunā Walīd ibn 'Uqbah رضي الله عنه as governor.² Thereafter in 29 A.H, Sayyidunā Walīd ibn 'Uqbah رضي الله عنه was removed and Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ was appointed the governor.³ After some time, the residents of Kūfah complained about Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ رضي الله عنه (as was the nature of the Iraqīs) and demanded his dismissal.

1 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn*, vol. 8 pg. 998, 999, the martyrdom of 'Umar, the council, and 'Uthmān's bay'ah, Beirut print, Lebanon.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 151, the year 26 A.H., first edition, Egypt.

3 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 138, year 29 A.H., *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 11 pg. 143, 144, biography of Walīd ibn 'Uqbah.

Considering their complaint, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه dismissed Sa‘īd in the year 34 A.H and appointed Sayyidunā Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī رضي الله عنه the governor over Kūfah. He remained governor until the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.¹

Shī‘ī historians have testified to the fact that Sayyidunā Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī رضي الله عنه was the governor over Kūfah during the last days of ‘Uthmān’s رضي الله عنه Khilāfah.

و على الكوفة أبا موسى الأشعري

Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī served as governor over Kūfah.²

In light of the above, it is distinctly clear that during the Khilāfah of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه governorship over Kūfah was not restricted to members of the Banū Umayyahonly, rather, non-Umayyads were appointed as governors in the early and final years of the Khilāfah as well. In the intervening period, only two Umayyads were given this post, one after the other.

In this period, when the time demanded a change, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه dismissed the acting governor. He did not allow any stringency to arise at this occasion. The reasons the people listed for the dismissal [of the governor], Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه did not observe any sternness in considering them.

The opposition of Sayyidunā Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah رضي الله عنه accused him of consuming liquor and they presented evidence in the court of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه to this effect. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه implemented the *ḥadd* (prescribed punishment) on Sayyidunā Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah رضي الله عنه and dismissed him. (The detailed texts of this incident will be reproduced in the second chapter, Allah willing, where the background to this incident will be examined.)

1 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 145, year 34 A.H., *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 157, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *al-Iṣābah* with *al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 2 pg. 352, biography of Abū Mūsā (‘Abd Allāh ibn Qays); *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘īd*, vol. 5 pg. 22, biography of Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ, first edition, Leiden.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī* (Shī‘ī), vol. 2 pg. 176, discussion on the governors of ‘Uthmān, Beirut print, Lebanon.

In a similar way, the conspirators against Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-‘Āṣ (رضي الله عنه) conspired against him (as was the general habit of the people of Iraq, that evil and anarchy ran in their blood). To nip the evil in the bud, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) relieved Sa'īd.

All these incidents testify to the just nature and impartiality Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) possessed and the safe methodology he observed, and indicate to the fact that he desired good for the populace, to the best of his ability, and considered the public’s interest.

Those who criticise Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) have attributed all these things to the self-worship and prejudice of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) out of their own taste for criticism and have used it as a means to concoct a history of tribal worship.

2. Baṣrah

In the ‘Uthmānī Khilāfah, the first governor over Baṣrah was Sayyidunā Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī (رضي الله عنه) (whose name is ‘Abd Allāh ibn Qays). Thereafter in the year 29 A.H., approximately after 5 years of service, he was relieved (due to the need of the time). Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) then instated Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir (رضي الله عنه) in his place.

و ولي ابن عامر البصرة سنة تسع و عشرين

He appointed Ibn ‘Āmir over Baṣrah in the year 29 A.H.¹

و استعمله عثمان رضي الله عنه على البصرة سنة تسع و عشرين بعد أبي موسى

‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) appointed him over Baṣrah in 29 A.H. after Abū Mūsā.²

Only Allah knows with which colours the critics painted this dismissal or change whereas no type of detachment or dejection was formed between these great

1 *Tārīkh Khaliḥah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 158, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors.

2 *Usd al-Ghābah fī Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥābah*, vol. 3 pg. 191, biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir ibn Kurayz.

personalities on this occasion. The following is presented as a form of testimony to this fact. Read them carefully:

- When Sayyidunā Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī رضي الله عنه was dismissed and Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir رضي الله عنه reached Baṣrah after being instated as governor, the former addressed the people and spoke positively of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir رضي الله عنه, which is worth listening to and a great lesson for the critics and conspirators:

Sayyidunā Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī رضي الله عنه said:

قد أتاكم فتى من قريش كريم الأمهات و العمات و الخالات يقوم بالمال فيكم هكذا و هكذا

An honourable youngster from Quraysh has come to you whose mothers, paternal aunts, and maternal aunts are noble and generous. He will distribute wealth among you liberally.¹

- In a like manner, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir رضي الله عنه spoke to Sayyidunā Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī رضي الله عنه keeping his honour and respect in mind, which indicates to his sincerity and clarity of social matters coupled with being strong evidence of the nonexistence of malice between them.

فأتاه ابن عامر فقال يا أبا موسى ما أحد من بني أخيك أعرف بفضلك مني أنت أمير البلد أن أقمت و الموصول إن رحلت قال جزاك الله يا ابن أخي خيرا ثم ارتحل إلى الكوفة

Ibn ‘Āmir approached him and said, “O Abū Mūsā, there is none from your brother’s children more acquainted with your excellence than myself. You are the leader of the city if you choose to stay, and good relations will be maintained with you if you choose to leave.”

Abū Mūsā responded, “May Allah reward you abundantly, O nephew,” and then departed to Kūfah.²

1 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 147, 148, the biography of ‘Āmir ibn Kurayz; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’*, vol. 3 pg. 13, the biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir, *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 136, year 29 A.H.

2 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 5 pg. 32, biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir ibn Kurayz, first edition, Leiden.

- A significant point worthy of consideration is that this change from Baṣrah came with his consent and happiness. There was no coercion, force, or any type of displeasure in the matter, otherwise, Sayyidunā Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would not have accepted the post of governor in Kūfah a second time.

These evidences have clarified that the change of this post took place in a dignified manner. There was no presence of any detachment or inconvenience.

May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى guide those who are hell-bent on concocting a history filled with discrimination and tribal-rule—those who concocted the facts of the original story and distorted the entire face of history. This is their expertise in this science. Whereas, the reality was that there was no sort of tribalism in the sight of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

3. Shām

The Prophetic Era:

As regards to Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, this much clarification is necessary that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ being the scribe of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is an accepted fact. Besides this, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ sometimes appointed him to honourable posts and offices in his noble life. When Wā’il ibn Ḥujr embraced Islam, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ intended to give him a piece of land. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ despatched Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ with the instructions to go with him, apportion a land for him and hand it over to him. The original text will be quoted for the benefit of the scholars. Sayyidunā Wā’il رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ himself says:

فبعث رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم معاوية بن أبي سفيان قال وأمره أن يعطيني أرضا فيدفعها إلي

Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ sent Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān with me and instructed him to cut a piece of land and hand it over to me.¹

1 *Al-Tārikh al-Kabīr*, vol. 4 pg. 175, 176, section 2, biography of Wā’il ibn Ḥujr.

This subject matter is documented in *Usd al-Ghābah* and *al-Iṣābah* as well:

وَأَقْطَعَهُ أَرْضًا وَأَرْسَلَ مَعَهُ مَعَاوِيَةَ بْنَ أَبِي سُفْيَانَ وَقَالَ أَعْطَاهَا إِيَّاهُ

He allocated a land for him (Wā'il) and sent Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān with him commanding the latter to hand it over to the former.¹

The Ṣiddīqī Era:

During the reign of Sayyidunā Ṣiddīq Akbar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidunā Amīr Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was given an honourable office.

Sayyidunā Amīr Mu'āwiyah's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ elder brother Sayyidunā Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was engaged in jihād to conquer land in Shām. A need arose to send reinforcements to assist them so Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ mobilised an army and despatched them to Shām as reinforcements, appointing Sayyidunā Amīr Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as the army general. This is contained in the following text:

وَاجْتَمَعَ إِلَى أَبِي بَكْرٍ أَنَسُ فَأَمَرَ عَلَيْهِم مَعَاوِيَةَ وَأَمْرَهُ بِاللِّحَاقِ بِيَزِيدٍ فَخَرَجَ مَعَاوِيَةَ حَتَّى لَحِقَ بِيَزِيدٍ

A multitude of people gathered by Abū Bakr who appointed Mu'āwiyah their leader with the orders to join with Yazīd. In compliance, Mu'āwiyah left and joined Yazīd.²

The Fārūqī Era:

During the Fārūqī era, Sayyidunā Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ passed away in Shām. (This occurred in 17/18 A.H. during the plague of 'Amwās.) Sayyidunā 'Umar al-Fārūq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ thus instated Sayyidunā Amīr Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as the governor of that area in his place.

1 *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 5 pg. 81, biography of Wā'il ibn Ḥujr, Tehran print; *al-Iṣābah* with *al-Istī'āb*, vol. 3 pg. 592, biography of Wā'il ibn Ḥujr.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 4 pg. 30, the year 13 A.H.; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 4, the year 13 A.H.

Thereafter, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه in his Khilāfah maintained Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah’s رضي الله عنه post as governor over the Shām region. Hereunder is the text in support of this. Have a look at it:

ثم جمع عمر الشام كلها لمعاوية وأقره عثمان

Then ‘Umar gathered the entire Shām under Mu‘āwiyah and ‘Uthmān upheld this.¹

The ‘Uthmānī Era:

The above explains that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه did not appoint Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه the new governor over Shām but rather sustained the governor appointed by the previous Khalīfah.

Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه fulfilled his duty par excellence owing to his intrinsic proficiencies. He mastered the science of administration and government. He never left any stone unturned in giving solutions to the problems faced by the masses. Moreover, there was no worthy complaint lodged against him from the side of the populace.

In view of this state of affairs, had other conquered areas been assigned to him, there would be absolutely no question of fitnah and chaos rearing its ugly head. But when there is hatred for an individual, then objections can be raised at every step he takes.

If fanaticism is discarded and justice is implemented, then one declaration of Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه himself will prove sufficient and satisfying, which we will present before the audience.

1 *Sīyar A’lām al-Nubalā’*, vol. 3 pg. 88, biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 412, biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 157, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors; *Tahdhīb al-Asmā’ wa l-Lughāt*, vol. 2 pg. 103, biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.

Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah’s Declaration

In an address to a group of people from Kūfah, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه declared:

إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كان معصوما فولاني فأدخلني في أمره ثم استخلف أبو بكر رضي الله تعالى عنه فولاني ثم استخلف عمر فولاني ثم استخلف عثمان فولاني فلم أَل لأحد منهم ولم يولني إلا وهو راض عني

Certainly, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم was infallible and he appointed me and included me in his affair. Then Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was appointed Khalīfah and he appointed me, followed by ‘Umar who appointed me, followed by ‘Uthmān who appointed me. I was not a governor for any of them, nor did any of them appoint me to a post, except that he was pleased with me (with no complaints).¹

The summary of the above is that:

- Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه acted in accordance to the prophetic Sunnah as regards to Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.
- In a similar way, the behaviour towards Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه during the Ṣiddīqī and Fārūqī reigns was maintained by Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. He did not start a new practice.
- No demand was made from his populace to have him changed.

Keeping these points in mind, to accuse Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه of tribalism and nepotism and spread this propaganda for him allowing Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه to continue acting as governor over Shām is extreme injustice and in direct conflict to reality.

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 87, the year 33 A.H., mention of the travel of those residents of Kūfah who travelled to it.

4. Egypt

In the 'Uthmānī Khilāfah, Sayyidunā 'Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ رضي الله عنه served as governor over Egypt. Due to the need of the time, in the fourth year of his reign, i.e. 27 A.H, he was relieved and 'Abd Allāh ibn Sa'd ibn Abī Sarḥ رضي الله عنه was given the post. He is the foster brother of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, both of them fostered by the mother of 'Abd Allāh.¹

'Abd Allāh ibn Sa'd is not from the Banū Umayyah, but rather from the Banū 'Āmir. He being the foster brother of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه has been declared his crime.

The change of this office was not because of any tribalism or nepotism. These aspects never featured in the mind of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه. Instead, the demands and advantages of the time required these changes.

We present the following incident to the readers as evidence to this. Pondering over it will reveal the true nature of this matter.

Firstly, Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāṭ writes in his history book:

و فيها سنة ٢٧ ه عزل عثمان بن عفان عمرو بن العاص عن مصر و ولاها عبد الله بن سعد بن أبي سرح
فغزا ابن أبي سرح أفريقية و معه العبادلة عبد الله بن عمر عبد الله بن عمرو عبد الله بن الزبير إلخ

In this year, the 27th year after hijrah, 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān removed 'Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ from the office of Egypt and handed it over to 'Abd Allāh ibn Sa'd ibn Abī Sarḥ. [In this very year] Ibn Abī Sarḥ waged war in Africa with the 'Abd Allāhs, viz. 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Amr, and 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr.²

1 *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 173, biography of 'Abd Allāh ibn Sa'd ibn Abī Sarḥ.

2 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāṭ*, vol. 1 pg. 134, year 27 A.H.; *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāṭ*, vol. 1 pg. 157, the names of 'Uthmān's governors; *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, pg. 234, under the heading: conquest of Africa; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn*, vol. 2 pg. 1003, the governorship of 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Sarḥ over Egypt and the conquest of Africa, Beirut print.

Secondly, another event took place in the year 30 A.H. which should be studied. In the 'Uthmānī Khilāfah, a massive army was mobilised to conquer Khorasan, Ṭabaristān, and neighbouring areas. The leader of the army was Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ al-Umayyad رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Seniors of the ummah and the honourable Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ participated in this significant expedition. Among those who participated was Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. He joined this noble expedition voluntarily.

For the satisfaction of the scholar fraternity, the text of al-Ṭabarī will be quoted verbatim followed by references to other historical works.

عن حنش بن مالك قال غزا سعيد بن العاص من الكوفة سنة ٣٠ هـ يريد خراسان و معه حذيفة بن اليمان و ناس من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و معه الحسن و الحسين و عبد الله بن عباس و عبد الله بن عمر و عبد الله بن عمرو بن العاص و عبد الله بن الزبير إلخ

Ḥanash ibn Mālik reports:

Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ set out from Kūfah in the year 30 A.H. to wage war in Khorasan. With him were Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān and other Companions of Rasūlullāh رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ, and 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr accompanied him.¹

Had the dismissal of Sayyidunā 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ been due to nepotism and been objectionable, then it devolved upon the senior Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ of the time to physically protest against it. If the Khalīfah of Islam does not desist from acting on the dictates of his discrimination, then they should abandon participating in significant expeditions of his. Here the attitude is the complete opposite. Sayyidunā 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ own son, Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, participates in the noteworthy conquest of Africa with other seniors in

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 57, mention of the report from him regarding the jihād of Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ in Ṭabaristān; *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 54, discussion on the war against Ṭabaristān; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 154, the year 30 A.H.; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn*, vol. 2 pg. 1018, the war of Ṭabaristān, Beirut print.

that very year (27 A.H.) and obtains booty just like everyone else. No senior ever raised this objection.

Then, in the year 30 A.H., this son again plays a role in the war in Ṭabaristān and other areas along with other senior personalities, and they participate to their fullest in these important conquests.

What we learn from the above incidents is that Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ’s father, Sayyidunā ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضي الله عنه, was not relieved of his post due to tribalism or family-worship. However, this issue presented itself due to the benefit of the time and some religious need. The attitude of the senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم clarifies this matter, leaving no speck of dust.

There is no cure for the crooked discussions of those hell-bent on criticism. May the Benevolent Master grant divine ability to all Muslims to entertain good thoughts about all the illustrious Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and may He guide the critics.

The Scribe Office

It is documented in history books that Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam was the scribe of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.¹

Keeping in mind the various offices of that era, the scribe was nothing more than a writer and clerk. The critics enlarged this small office by presenting personal details of it and blew it totally out of proportion. They equated it to the office of the secretary general of the entire ‘Uthmānī dominion with supremacy over the length and breadth of his kingdom.

This is nothing but a small phenomenon of the ‘blessed’ pen of the critics and this is the product of their expertise in speech. Otherwise, what relation does an ordinary scribe have with occupying the post of the secretary general of an entire state?

1 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 157, the ‘Uthmānī governors, Iraq print.

جو چاہے آپ کا حسن کرشمہ ساز کرے

If he wills, he will make you fortunate.

- a. In this regard, the readers should be wary of the fact that Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam was not always the scribe during the ‘Uthmānī era. In fact, he was appointed governor over Bahrain for a certain period of time. Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt has documented this in the following words:

و من ولاته عليها مروان بن الحكم

Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam was among his governors over Bahrain.¹

- b. The second point is that Marwān sometimes participated in Islamic wars. Accordingly, al-Balādhurī has recorded in the events of the battle of Africa that while ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ prepared for the battle of Africa, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه mobilised a huge army as reinforcements from Madīnah and sent them. Among them were Ma’bad ibn al-‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib al-Hāshimī, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, and many others. He writes:

و أمده بجيش عظيم فيه معبد بن العباس بن عبد المطلب و مروان بن الحكم بن أبي العاص إلخ

He reinforced him with a massive army among whom were Ma’bad ibn al-‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam ibn Abī al-‘Āṣ.²

In a similar manner, Ibn ‘Adhārī al-Marākishī has recorded in the beginning of his book *al-Bayān al-Mughrib fī Akhbār al-Maghrib*:

خرج جيش المسلمين إلى فتح أفريقية و في الجيش مروان بن الحكم

1 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 159, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors.

2 *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, pg. 234, the conquest of Africa, Egypt print.

The Muslim army left to conquer Africa. In their ranks was Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.¹

It is learnt from these historical reports that Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam did not serve as a scribe throughout the ‘Uthmānī era, forget him being the secretary general over the entire ‘Uthmānī state.

Hereafter, this query is worth considering that the person appointed as the scribe of the Khilāfah of the Muslims, does he become the secretary general of the Islamic state by default? This is not a fundamental of politics. To solve this problem, keep the following incidents in front of you and ponder over them:

For example, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه served as a scribe during the era of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه:

و كان عثمان بن عفان كاتباً لأبي بكر الصديق

‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān was a scribe for Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq.²

Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه as well as Mu‘ayyiqb were scribes in the era of Sayyidunā ‘Umar al-Fārūq رضي الله عنه:

و كاتب عمر زيد بن ثابت و قد كتب له معيقيب الخ

‘Umar’s scribe was Zayd ibn Thābit. Mu‘ayyiqb also served as his scribe.³

What we are trying to point out is that the scribes of these Khulafā’ were not considered the secretary generals of the state, so why is an effort being made to depict Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān’s رضي الله عنه scribe as the secretary general of the entire state?

1 *Kitāb al-Bayān al-Mughrib fī Akhbār al-Maghrib*, pg. 3, the conquest of Africa, Beirut print.

2 *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar*, pg. 377, names of noble scribes, Dakkan print.

3 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 130, the names of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb’s offices, his scribes, confidant, and treasurer, Iraq print.

Note:

While discussing the office of *al-kātib* (the scribe), it is necessary to learn about a historical definition. Well after the era of the honourable Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, in the days of the ‘Abbāsī Khulafā’ and others, there was an office by the Khalīfah known as *al-kātib*. An individual proficient in knowledge and language and acquainted with current news and situations was chosen for this task.

This individual would take care of all intellectual, linguistic, and presentational needs of the Khalīfah. All the written and verbal requirements of the state was managed by this person. However, the person given this position had no say in the affairs or views of state.

This special office of *al-kātib* was never ever found during the days of the ‘Uthmānī Khilāfah. The scribe that would do work for the Khalīfah during the eras of the Rightly Guided Khulafā’, we have explained his position in the Ṣiddīqī and Fārūqī sections previously. He was nothing more than this. This was the very position held by Marwān in the court of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.

The critics have used the identical word *al-kātib* in their attempt to hoodwink the public and depict an ordinary scribe of the ‘Uthmānī era as the secretary general over the entire state, together with placing all the choices of the ‘Uthmānī Khilāfah in his hands, which is completely incorrect and deceitful.

Hopefully, the lovers of justice will solve the issue of this office themselves after studying these points.

Some aspects regarding Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam will be added in the second discussion, with Allah’s help.

A Narration of Imām al-Bukhārī with regards to Dismissal and Appointment

We now come to the final section of the first discussion. This discussion has prolonged beyond our expectation. Nonetheless, the inclusion of the upcoming

narration in the discussion of appointment and dismissal has been regarded valuable:

Imām al-Bukhārī has reported the following narration via his sanad in *al-Tārīkh al-Ṣaghīr*:

حدثنا جبير حدثني جهيم الفهري قال أنا شاهد الأمر كله قال عثمان ليقيم أهل كل مصر كرهوا صاحبهم حتى اعزله عنهم وأستعمل الذي يحبون فقال أهل البصرة رضينا بعبد الله بن عامر فأقره وقال أهل الكوفة اعزل عنا سعيد بن العاص واستعمل أبا موسى ففعل وقال أهل الشام قد رضينا بمعاوية فأقره وقال أهل مصر اعزل ابن أبي سرح واستعمل علينا عمرو بن العاص ففعل

Jubayr narrated to us—Juhaym al-Fihri narrated to me saying: I witnessed the entire scenario.

‘Uthmān announced, “Let residents of every city stand up who dislike their governor so that I may dismiss him and appoint one they approve of.”

The residents of Baṣrah said, “We are pleased with ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir.” So he was sustained.

The inhabitants of Kūfah said, “Dismiss Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ and appoint Abū Mūsā,” and he fulfilled their request.

The people of Shām said, “We are happy with Mu‘āwiyah,” so he kept him.

The residents of Egypt said, “Dismiss Ibn Abī Sarḥ and appoint ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ over us,” and he acceded to their request.¹

This narration clearly shows that the methodology adopted by Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه was totally flawless. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه fully considered the feelings and benefits of the masses with complete honesty. He did not entertain favouritism or nepotism of any kind.

1 *Al-Tārīkh al-Ṣaghīr*, pg. 44, 45, Ilāhabād print, India.

This narration has dispelled many misconceptions and misunderstandings and terminated mainstream stories of this kind.

If the critics do away with prejudice and observe fairness and Allah consciousness, the issue will be solved, leaving no ambiguity at all.

Note:

The above narration of Imām al-Bukhārī clarifies that the tales of the injustices of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam and the stories of his authority over the state—which are broadcasted publicly—are predominantly baseless and useless. Had there been any basis for them, then just as the Muslims of that era requested appointment and dismissal from Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, they would have definitely demanded from him the removal and dismissal of Marwān. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه presented the solution of these type of matters, and yet those present remained silent about Marwān. The truth is that:

السكوت في معرض الحاجة إلى البيان بيان

Silence in a matter which demands communication is in itself communication.¹

Conclusion of Discussion One

From the beginning to the end of this discussion, the ‘Uthmānī posts and offices and their governors and officials have been presented in detail. To tally the number of Umayyad and non-Umayyad as well as relatives and non-relatives is now an easy task for the readers. Have a deep look at the entire state of the ‘Uthmānī era and determine the proportionality and balance for yourself; how many from the Banū Umayyah were appointed to posts and how many from other tribes were appointed.

1 *Uṣūl al-Bazdawī*, pg. 160, chapter on taken an oath from the narrator, Nūr Muḥammad print, Karachi.

Did Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه observe favouritism during his Khilāfah? Did he give his tribe members complete authority over the entire state?

We have, after a little effort, presented historical reports and facts with references in front of you. Now to reach a conclusion should not be difficult for the readers.

State Officials 11 (1 Umayyad)

Governors 30 (5 Umayyads)¹

To sum it up, in such a massive and vast state, only four to five relatives were appointed as governors, some of whom were later changed according to the demand of the time; can this be called giving complete authority of the state to one family? Observe justice!

Now the second discussion will be commenced where the competence, potential, and behaviour of these individuals will be presented, coupled with their religious services, Allah willing.

1 A maximum of only 4 were appointed at a single time—over Shām, Egypt, Kūfah, and Baṣrah—and only 3 were left as governors when ‘Uthmān was murdered.

Discussion Two

We now respond to the widely circulated allegation against Uthman رضي الله عنه:

فإنه ولى أمور المسلمين من لا يصلح للولاية حتى ظهر من بعضهم الفسوق و من بعضهم الخيانة إلخ

For indeed he (‘Uthmān) handed over the affairs of the Muslims to those who were not worthy of authority to the extent that transgression became manifest from some and breach of trust from others.¹

These are the very same personalities from the relatives of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه who have been listed in discussion one, i.e. Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah, Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir ibn Kurayz, Amīr Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa‘d ibn Abī Sarḥ, and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.

These personalities were accused of been given the responsibility of governorship by Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه whereas they did not possess the skills for authority, and were transgressors and fraudsters instead. They brought deficiency in the leadership of Muslims, dīn underwent retrogression due to them, and Islam was destroyed. Because they assumed high posts, tribalism and the prejudice of the era of ignorance reared its ugly head once again and finally resulted in the murder of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.

To answer this objection, a few points need to be taken note of, thereafter the status of each of these individuals should be studied separately. Thus the type of people they were, their behaviour, whether Islam profited from their services, of whether they were worthy of appointment, and if tribalism returned due to them; can all be accurately ascertained, and we can determine once and for all whether there is truth to the tale or is it nothing more than sensationalised propaganda.

1 *Minhāj al-Kirāmah fī Ma‘rifat al-Imāmah*, discussion on the allegations against ‘Uthmān, 66, printed in the end of volume 4 of *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, Lahore print.

Introductory Points

1. To be infallible from sin and error is the quality of the Ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ only. The individuals under discussion were not free from sin, nor were they protected from sins like angels. They were humans, and for a human to err is only natural.
2. The critics have made much hue and cry over the alleged misdeeds of these individuals. This was all they could find to talk about from the biographies of these individuals.

In the forthcoming pages, we will present the other side of the picture. In this manner, both good and bad characteristics of an individual will become visible to the readers.

Supposedly they had defects, then consider their advantages at the same time.

عيب وی جمله بگفتی بنروش نیز بگو

You have enumerated all my flaws. List my excellences as well.

3. Also worth considering is that Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had reliance upon them and assigned duties to them. Had they not been worthy of those posts and had they possessed no potential, Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would have never handed over to them significant work of the ummah.

Presentations on aspects related to these six personalities will now unfold in sequence, which will bring discussion two to a close.

Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah

And the allegations against him

Lineage and Islam

His lineage from his father’s side goes as follows: Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah ibn Abī Mu‘ayṭ ibn Abī ‘Amr ibn Umayyah ibn ‘Abd Shams ibn ‘Abd Manāf. His agnomen is Abū Wahb.¹

His mother’s lineage is as follows:

أمه أروى بنت كرز بن ربيعة وهو أخو عثمان بن عفان لأمه

His mother is Arwā bint Kurayz ibn Rabī‘ah. He is ‘Uthmān’s uterine brother.²

و أم بني عقبه هؤلاء أروى بنت كرز بن ربيعة و أمها البيضاء أم حكيم بنت عبد المطلب توأمة أبي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و أخوهم لأمهم عثمان بن عفان

The mother of these children of ‘Uqbah is Arwā bint Kurayz ibn Rabī‘ah. Her mother is al-Bayḍā’ Umm Ḥakīm bint ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, the twin of Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ father. Their uterine brother is ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān.³

The summary of the above is that from the side of his forefathers, Sayyidunā Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah’s ﷺ ancestry joins with the lineage of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā ﷺ at his sixth forefather, ‘Abd Manāf. Their sixth grandfather is the same individual.

By this elucidation, the blood relation between Sayyidunā Walīd and Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ﷺ has been learnt. At the same time, his family link to Rasūlullāh

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 6 pg. 15, biography of Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah.

2 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 6 pg. 15, biography of Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah.

3 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 146, the offspring of ‘Uqbah ibn Abī Mu‘ayṭ.

صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ has also manifested, i.e. Walīd’s mother is the maternal granddaughter (daughter’s daughter) of the Banū Hāshim. The maternal grandparents of Walīd’s mother are from the Banū Hāshim, and Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah is the son of ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ cousin (paternal aunt’s daughter).

Sayyidunā Walīd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ embraced the faith on the occasion of the Conquest of Makkah. (This is the well-known report.) He is thus among the honourable Companions of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

الوليد بن عقبة بن أبي معيط من مسلمة الفتح

Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah ibn Abī Mu‘ayṭ is from the Muslims of the Conquest (of Makkah).¹

وأسلم الوليد وأخوه عمارة يوم الفتح

Walīd and his brother ‘Umārah accepted Islam on the Day of the Conquest (of Makkah).²

Natural Potential

Sayyidunā Walīd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ brought īmān on the occasion of the Conquest of Makkah. Owing to his natural potential, he possessed many outstanding qualities. He was one of the renowned men of Quraysh, counted among their nobles, brave and chivalrous. He was a big-hearted and generous man as well as a poet of his time.

The above is contained in the following texts:

وكان الوليد من رجال قريش وشعرائهم وكان له سخاء

Walīd was among the notables of Quraysh and their poets, and he was magnanimous.³

1 *Tajrīd Asmā’ al-Ṣaḥābah*, vol. 2 pg. 139, first edition, Dakkan.

2 *Al-Iṣābah* with *al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 3 pg. 601, biography of Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah.

3 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 138, the offspring of ‘Uqbah ibn Abī Mu‘ayṭ.

وكان الوليد شجاعا شاعرا جوادا إلخ

Walīd was brave, a poet, and generous.¹

أسلم يوم الفتح و كان من رجال قريش ظرفا و حلما و شجاعة و أدبا و كان شاعرا شريفا إلخ

He embraced Islam on the Day of the Conquest. He was among the renowned men of Quraysh in his large-heartedness, tolerance, valour, and decorum. He was a poet and dignified.²

Appointment as Governor and Officer

The scholars of narrators and biographies have written:

كتب أبو بكر إلى عمرو بن العاص و إلى وليد بن عقبة و كان على النصف من صدقات قضاة و قد كان أبو بكر شيعة مبعثهما على الصدقة و أوصى كل واحد منهما بوصية اتق الله في السر و العلانية

Abū Bakr wrote to ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ and Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah. The latter was responsible for collecting half the zakāh of the Quḏā‘ah. Abū Bakr had escorted them out of Madīnah when despatching them to collect the zakāh. He favoured them both with the advice: Fear Allah in private and public.³

و ولاه عمر على صدقات بني تغلب و ولاه عثمان على الكوفة ثم عزله ... و في تسع و عشرين عزل عثمان عن الكوفة الوليد بن عقبة إلخ

‘Umar appointed him to collect the zakāh of the Banū Taghlib. ‘Uthmān instated him over Kūfah and later relieved him of his duty.

In the year 29 A.H., ‘Uthmān relieved Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah from Kūfah.⁴

1 *Al-Iṣābah* with *al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 3 pg. 601, biography of Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah.

2 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 11 pg. 142, 143, biography of Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah.

3 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 4 pg. 29, the year 13 A.H.

4 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 11 pg. 143, 144, biography of Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah.

Achievements

A few things will be highlighted here.

1. Sayyidunā Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had work potential and management expertise. Owing to this, the Rightly Guided Khulafā’ appointed him to undertake religious tasks. He was thus an officer over the Banū Taghlib tribe and appointed the governor over ‘Arab al-Jazīrah on behalf of Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

و كان (الوليد بن عقبة) على عرب الجزيرة عاملا لعمر بن الخطاب فقدم الوليد في السنة الثانية من إمارة عثمان ... فقدم الكوفة و كان أحب الناس في الناس و أرفقهم بهم فكان بذلك خمس سنين و ليس على داره باب

Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah was governor over ‘Arab al-Jazīrah for ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb. Walīd then came (from there) in the second year of ‘Uthmān’s reign. He arrived in Kūfah and was the most beloved of people among the people and the most compassionate towards them. He remained in this post for five years. He had no doorkeeper at his house (i.e. the applier for aid had permission to present his needs at any time.)¹

واستعمل الوليد بن عقبة و كان عاملا لعمر على عرب الجزيرة فلما قدمها أقبل عليه أهلها فأقام بها خمس سنين و ليس على داره باب و كان فيه رفق برعيته

He (‘Uthmān) appointed Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah (over Kūfah) who was formerly governor for ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb over ‘Arab al-Jazīrah. When he arrived, the inhabitants came forward (to welcome him). He stayed there for five years. He had no doorkeeper at his house and he was very compassionate to his subordinates.²

2. As regards his accomplishments on the battlefield, the historians write:

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 48, year 26 A.H., the reason ‘Uthmān dismissed Sa’d from Kūfah and appointed Walīd instead.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 151, the year 26 A.H., first edition, Egypt.

إن الوليد بن عقبة سار بجيش الكوفة نحو أذربيجان و أرمينية حين نقضوا العهد فوطي بلادهم و أغار بأراضي تلك الناحية فغنم و سبى و أخذ أموالا جزيلة فلما أيقنوا بالهلكة صالحهم أهلها على ما كانوا صالحوا عليه حذيفة بن اليمان ثمان مائة ألف درهم في كل سنة فقبض منهم جزية سنة ثم رجع سالما غانما إلى الكوفة إلخ

Certainly, Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah set out with the army of Kūfah towards Azerbaijan and Armenia when their inhabitants broke the pact. He trampled upon their earth and attacked the lands in that direction. He acquired booty and captives, and obtained a handsome amount of wealth. When the enemy were convinced of their annihilation, they reached a settlement with him, the same settlement they had reached with Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān, 800 000 dirhams annually. He took from them the Jizyah of a year and then returned safely with booty to Kūfah.¹

3.

جاشت الروم حتى خاف أهل الشام و بعثوا إلى عثمان يستمدونه فكتب إلى الوليد بن عقبة أن إذا جاءك كتابي هذا فابعث رجلا أميناً كريماً شجاعاً في ثمانية آلاف ... إلى إخوانكم بالشام فقام الوليد بن عقبة في الناس خطيباً حين وصل إليه كتاب عثمان فأخبرهم بما أمره به أمير المؤمنين و ندب الناس و حثهم على الجهاد و معاونة معاوية و أهل الشام و أمر سلمان بن ربيعة على الناس الذين يخرجون إلى الشام ... فلما اجتمع الجيشان شنوا الغارات على بلاد الروم فغنموا و سلبوا شيئاً كثيراً و فتحوا حصوناً كثيرة و لله الحمد

The Romans mobilised an army which left the inhabitants of Shām shaken. They thus sent a message to ‘Uthmān requesting reinforcements. ‘Uthmān in turn wrote to Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah stating, “When this letter of mine reaches you, then despatch a trustworthy, big-hearted, and brave man over 80 000 troops to your brothers in Shām.” Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah stood up to address the people when ‘Uthmān’s letter reached him. He informed them of the command of Amīr al-Mu’minīn and encouraged and incited them to wage Jihād and assist Mu’āwiyah and the people of Shām. He appointed Salmān ibn Rab’ah as general over the army who left to Shām.

1 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 149, 150, the year 24 A.H., mention of the khilāfah of Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān, first edition, Egypt.

When both Muslim armies converged, they attacked the Roman lands ferociously, obtaining an abundance of spoils of war, and conquering numerous forts. And all praise belongs solely to Allah ﷻ.¹

Allegations against Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah and its response

Previously, some aspects about the status of Sayyidunā Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah ﷺ were mentioned. Now, some objections coupled with their responses will be presented.

1. The Qur’ān labelled him a Fāsiq

They object that Rasūlullāh ﷺ despatched Sayyidunā Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah ﷺ to the Banū al-Muṣṭaliq tribe to collect their zakāh. When Sayyidunā Walīd ﷺ came close to the tribe, some people advanced to welcome him. As he saw them, he retreated and returned with the report to the presence of Rasūlullāh ﷺ that they have apostatised, planned to kill him, and refused to give zakāh.

Learning of this, Rasūlullāh ﷺ became extremely upset and intended to send an army to attack them. At that time, this verse was revealed concerning Sayyidunā Walīd ﷺ:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِن جَاءَكُمْ فَاسِقٌ بِنَبَأٍ فَتَبَيَّنُوا أَن تُصِيبُوا قَوْمًا بِجَهَالَةٍ فَتُصْحَبُوا عَلٰى مَا فَعَلْتُمْ
نَادِمِينَ

O you who have believed, if there comes to you a disobedient one with information, investigate, lest you harm a people out of ignorance and become, over what you have done, regretful.²

The gist of the above is that Sayyidunā Walīd ﷺ spoke a lie, due to which the Qur’ān labelled him a fāsiq (transgressor). Due to Sayyidunā Walīd’s ﷺ report,

1 Al-Bidāyah, vol. 7 pg. 150, mention of the khilāfah of Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Uthmān.

2 Sūrah al-Hujurāt: 6.

a major calamity would have befallen the Muslims. By an unplanned pairing of events, however, they were spared.

Response

The mufasssīrīn have recorded various reports in the commentary of this verse. Majority of the narrations are attributed to Mujāhid, Qatādah, Ibn Abī Laylah, etc. However, they are not *marfū‘* (the words of Rasūlullāh ﷺ). And these personalities did not live in that era but came later on.

The few *marfū‘* reports on the strength of Sayyidah Umm Salamah, Sayyidunā Ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, etc., are not authentic and not devoid of criticism to the standards of the isnāds of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Rather, they have been criticised and disapproved of.

Even if we accept the incident as true in relation to Sayyidunā Walīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, it does not mean this verse labelled him as a *fāsiq*, the research scholars have stated:

- a. ‘Allāmah Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī writes in the commentary of this verse in his *al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr*:

بل نقول هو نزل عاما لبيان الثبوت و ترك الاعتماد على قول الفاسق و يدل على ضعف قول من يقول إنها نزلت لكذا إن الله تعالى لم يقل إني أنزلتها لكذا و النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم لم ينقل عنه أنه بين أن الآية وردت لبيان ذلك فحسب غاية ما في الباب أنها نزلت في ذلك الوقت و هو مثل التاريخ لنزول الآية و نحن نصدق ذلك و يتأكد ما ذكرنا أن إطلاق لفظ الفاسق على الوليد شيء بعيد لأنه توهم و ظن فأخطأ و المخطئ لا يسمى فاسقا إلخ

Instead we say that it was revealed generally to command investigation and to prohibit reliance on the report of a transgressor. What indicates the weakness of the one who says that it was revealed for this particular instance (i.e. Walīd) is that Allah ﷻ did not say, “I revealed it for this instance,” and it is not transmitted from the Nabī ﷺ that he explained that the verse was revealed to explain this instance only. The most that can be said is that it was revealed on that occasion. It is like a historical report

for the revelation of the verse. And we believe this. What supports what we have mentioned is that applying the word *fāsiq* (transgressor) to Walīd is something far-fetched since he assumed and presumed but erred and one who errs is not labelled a transgressor.¹

b. This issue has been tackled in a similar manner in *Tafsīr Khāzin*. The author writes:

قبل هو عام نزلت لبيان التثبت و ترك الإعتقاد على قول الفاسق وهو أولى من حكم الآية على رجل بعينه لأن الفسوق خروج عن الحق و لا يظن بالوليد ذلك إلا أنه ظن و توهم فأخطأ

It is said that the verse was revealed in general to command investigation and prohibit relying on the statement of a transgressor. This is better than applying the verse to a particular individual since transgression is exiting from the truth and this cannot be perceived in the case of Walīd. Yes, he assumed and presumed but erred.²

c. *Tafsīr Ṣāwī ‘alā l-Jalālayn* pg. 109 – 110 under the verse has the same explanation. The scholars are informed of this.

In the light of the above, it is clear that:

This rule of thumb is considered in such instances:

العبرة لعموم الألفاظ لا لخصوص الموارد

Consideration is given to the generality of the words, not the speciality of events.

It is further noted that even during the Prophetic era, the Ṣiddīqī era and the Fārūqī era as well, Sayyidunā Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah رضي الله عنه was not referred to by the

1 *Al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr*, vol. 7 pg. 589, under the verse, mas’alah 1.

2 *Tafsīr Khāzin with Baghawī*, vol. 6 pg. 222, under the verse, second edition, Egypt.

term transgressor, nor disparaged with this term. To the contrary, Sayyidunā Ṣiddīq and Sayyidunā Fārūq رضي الله عنه had full trust and confidence in him during their respective reigns. As a result, they included him in the management of state and awarded him posts and offices. Hypothetically speaking, had Sayyidunā Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah رضي الله عنه been a transgressor and been deserving of disparagement, then why did Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما treat him with respect and dignity? Were they unaware of the history of Sayyidunā Walīd رضي الله عنه and the verse revealed in his regard?

2. ‘Umar warned ‘Uthmān not to appoint Walīd

The critics of the ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه mention that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه while parting some advice to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه told him not to give authority to the family of Abū Mu‘ayṭ (the grandfather of Sayyidunā Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah رضي الله عنه) over the people. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه did not honour this advice and gave the family of Abū Mu‘ayṭ authority over people. The fear that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه sensed became a reality.

Response

The narrations from which this objection was deduced do not have authentic chains like that of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Many of their narrators have been criticised for a variety of reasons.

If for argument’s sake we accept the soundness of these reports, then just as the above advice given to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه is recorded, the report includes the advice of Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. After swearing upon oath, he told ‘Alī not to grant authority to the Banū Hāshim over people.

Study the entire text. It is recorded in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* and *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d* that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه stated:

أُنشِدُكَ اللهُ يَا عَلِيَّ إِنَّ وَلِيَّتَ مِنْ أُمُورِ النَّاسِ شَيْئًا أَنْ تَحْمِلَ بَنِي هَاشِمٍ عَلَى رِقَابِ النَّاسِ أَنْشِدُكَ اللهُ يَا
عُثْمَانَ إِنَّ وَلِيَّتَ مِنْ أُمُورِ النَّاسِ شَيْئًا أَنْ تَحْمِلَ بَنِي أَبِي مَعِيظٍ عَلَى رِقَابِ النَّاسِ الْخ

I implore you in the name of Allah, O 'Alī! If you are given any responsibility over the affairs of people not to give Banū Hāshim authority over the people. I implore you in the name of Allah O 'Uthmān! If you are given any responsibility over the affairs of people not to give the sons of Abū Mu'ayṭ authority over people.¹

If due to this narration criticism is to be made then the accusation may be equally levelled against both luminaries, since Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه did not practice on the advice of Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه for he gave key posts and significant offices to his relatives (the Banū Hāshim) during his khilāfah (the details of which will appear shortly in the third discussion, Allah willing.)

Our stance is that it is inappropriate to criticise and disparage both these luminaries. Both of them kept in mind their respective situations and made the correct choices. However, the critics by means of the above narration and *due to their marvellous intelligence* disparaged Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه and spared Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه. This is just as the famous proverb goes:

نوله بر عضو ضعيف مي رنزد

The weak limb is the target of attack.

In their sight, Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه was weak so they attacked him while Sayyidunā 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه was strong so they protected him. (This is an example of prejudice. Let the readers make mental notes of this at every step.)

It should be noted by all readers that Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه appointed only one individual from the family of Abū Mu'ayṭ (viz. Walīd ibn 'Uqbah ibn Abī Mu'ayṭ) for a few years as governor over Kūfah (as explained in detail in discussion one). No one besides him was appointed governor. The rest of the relatives that were

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 13, the year 23 A.H., mention of the report about his killing, old edition, Egypt print; *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd*, vol. 3 pg. 249, biography of 'Umar, Leiden print.

given posts were not from the family of Abū Mu‘ayy. The reality of this objection is what has been presented here. May Allah ﷻ guide the critics.

All the honourable Companions of Rasūlullāh ﷺ are deserving of honour and worthy of confidence. To divide them by disparaging the Banū Umayyah Ṣaḥābah and declaring the Banū Hāshim Ṣaḥābah innocent is a despicable division indeed. This is in total contrast to the demands of dīn and the requirements of Islam and in total violation of the divine command:

أَنْ أَفِيئُوا الدِّينَ وَلَا تَتَفَرَّقُوا فِيهِ

*Establish the dīn and do not create divisions therein.*¹

Translators note:

It should be noted that the above would be a response if the narration were to be assumed authentic. The reality, however, is that this narration as it appears in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* is wholly unreliable. It contains the following defect:

- Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Abī Thābit (Imrān) ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf appears in the chain, who is majhūl.²
- His father, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, has been severely criticised and suspected of forgery.
- ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd al-Dāramī quoted Yaḥyā ibn Ma‘īn saying, “He is not reliable, he was a poet.”
- ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn ibn Ḥibbān said, “I found in written in my fathers books, with his handwriting, “Abū Zakariyyā said, ‘Ibn Abī Thābit al-A‘raj al-Madīnī: I saw him here in Baghdad, he would curse people, criticising their ancestry; his Ḥadīth are nothing.”

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 13.

2 *Anwār al-Kāshifāh*, pg. 109-111.

- Aḥmad ibn Ḥasan ibn al-Faḍl al-Sakūnī said, “I heard Muḥammad ibn Yahyā al-Nīsābūrī saying, ‘A *Badanah* (camel paid as a penalty) is due on me if I ever narrate from ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn ‘Imrān.’ I saw him declaring him extremely weak.”
- Al-Bukhārī said, “*Munkar al-Ḥadīth* (a weak narrator who narrates reports in contradiction of reliable narrators), his narrations should not be recorded.”
- Al-Nasā’ī said, “*Matrūk al-Ḥadīth* (suspected of Ḥadīth forgery).” In another place he said, “His ḥadīth should not be recorded.”¹

The narration of ‘Umār in *al-Istī‘āb*

In order to blemish the system of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, the critics related the following narration from *al-Istī‘āb*, wherein Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه speaks about his potential successors. It is mentioned therein:

Ibn ‘Abbās relates: Once I was walking with Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه when he took a deep sigh. It appeared as if his rib broke. I submitted, “Has something substantial happened?”

He replied, “Yes. What style should I adopt regarding my successor concerning the ummah? This is perturbing me.”

Ibn ‘Abbās submitted, “You can select a reliable personality.”

‘Umar said, “What is your opinion; does ‘Alī hold more right from the people?”

I replied, “Definitely. He is early in Islam, a scholar, and a relative.”

Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه said, “Okay, however, he has plenty of humour.”

I said, “‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān is suitable.”

1 *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl*, under the biography of Abd al-Azīz ibn ‘Imrān ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn ‘Umar.

He said, “If I appoint him a successor, he will appoint the sons of Abū Mu‘ayṭ (from the Banū Umayyah) over the necks of people. They will disobey Allah which will lead to an uprising against ‘Uthmān and finally his assassination.”

I then presented the name of Ṭalḥah ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh upon which he remarked, “He possesses greatness and pride. Such a khalīfah is not correct.”

I suggested Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām to which he said, “He will begin beating the people over the ṣā‘ and mudd (i.e. he will display harshness) which is not needed.”

I told him to appoint Sa‘d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ so he responded, “He only possesses war expertise (he is a knight of war).”

I then mentioned the name of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf upon which he commented, “He is a good man. However, he is weak in this matter. A strong man is needed.”¹

The object behind using this narration is to criticise the methodology of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and to establish the incorrectness of his policy. Sayyidunā Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah رضي الله عنه (who is from the sons of Abū Mu‘ayṭ) will be denigrated by the way.

To make the readers understand, we will present some commentaries concerning the above narration. Peruse over it once, Allah willing, the wrong perception they wish to create regarding the conduct and policy of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه will be dispelled.

Two examinations will take place concerning the above narration, *riwāyatan* (the isnād) and *dirāyatan* (the content). First, its isnād will be discussed briefly. Thereafter, the content of the narration will be analysed.

1 *Al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 2 pg. 467, biography of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Hyderabad Dakkan print.

Scrutiny of the narration

One issue is that the above narration (reported from Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه) is non-existent in the Egypt print of *al-Istī‘āb* (with which *al-Iṣābah* of Ibn Ḥajar is published). The possible areas of this print were inspected (especially the biography of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه) but I could not locate this narration. I then referred to the Hyderabad Dakkan print of *al-Istī‘āb* and found it in the biography of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه with its lengthy isnād.

In short, this narration is not found in some of the prints of *al-Istī‘āb* and found in others. This creates a doubt; probably the author of the book removed this narration from the original script when proofreading it while some transmitters kept it in their copies. Whatever the case may be, due to the lack of conformity of the prints, it has become doubtful and suspicious. It does not remain convincing.

Secondly, the isnād of this narration is abnormally long. There is neither time nor any need to discuss all the narrators. Learning of the status of only one narrator, Muḥammad ibn Iṣḥāq, is sufficient. Due to his presence, the unreliability and inauthenticity of the narration will be manifested.

Examination of Muḥammad ibn Iṣḥāq

The scholars of rijāl have recorded both *tawthīq* and *taḍīf*, detailed praise and criticism of Ibn Iṣḥāq. At this stage, to consider the following aspects is of utmost importance to facilitate the reaching of an educated conclusion.

Ibn Iṣḥāq’s Tadrīs

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī discusses the *tadrīs* (omission of narrators) of Ibn Iṣḥāq in the following words in *Kitāb al-Mudallisīn*:

محمد بن إسحاق بن يسار المطلبي المدني صاحب المغازي صدوق مشهور بالتدليس عن الضعفاء و
المجهولين و عن شر منهم وصفه بذلك أحمد و الدارقطني و غيرهما

Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Yasār al-Muṭṭalibī al-Madanī, author of battles. He is truthful but infamous for *tadlīs* from weak narrators, unknown narrators, and those worse than them. Aḥmad, al-Dāraquṭnī, and others have introduced him as such.¹

A Rule concerning a Mudallis

The scholars have determined a rule for this case. A person who practices *tadlīs* and uses the word ‘*an* (from) when narrating, his narration no longer remains worthy of proof. This rule is reported from Imām al-Nawawī in the footnotes of *Naṣb al-Rāyah*:

قال النووي في شرح المهذب ج ٥ ص ١٣٣ إسناده ضعيف فيه محمد بن إسحاق صاحب المغازي وهو مدلس وإذا قال المدلس عن لا يحتج به انتهى كلامه

Al-Nawawī stated in *Sharḥ al-Muhadhab*, vol. 5 pg. 133: “Its isnād is *ḍaʿīf*. Muḥammad ibn Ishāq, author of *al-Maghāzī* is present therein and he is a *mudallis*. When a *mudallis* uses the word ‘from’, his narration cannot be used as proof.”²

The narration of *al-Istīʿāb* under discussion has Muḥammad ibn Ishāq as one narrator. He uses the words ‘*an* (from) to narrate from his teacher al-Zuhrī. According to his habit, Ibn Ishāq has committed *tadlīs* by deleting Allah knows what type of a narrator and broadcasting the narration.

Ibn Ishāq’s Tafarrud and Shudhūd

a. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī has written in volume 9 of *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*:

قال أيوب بن إسحاق بن سامري سألت أحمد فقلت له يا أبا عبد الله إذا انفرد ابن إسحاق بحديث تقبله قال لا

1 *Kitāb al-Mudallisīn*, pg. 19, under the fourth level, Egypt print, old edition.

2 Footnotes of *Naṣb al-Rāyah*, vol. 2 pg. 251, chapter on *janāʿiz*, Majlis al-ʿIlmī print, Dabhel, India.

Ayyūb ibn Ishāq ibn Sāmūrī says, “I asked Aḥmad saying: ‘O Abū ‘Abd Allāh! When Ibn Ishāq is the sole narrator of a ḥadīth, will it be accepted.’ He replied in the negative.”¹

- b. ‘Allāmah al-Dhahabī has discussed Ibn Ishāq in great detail in *Mīzān al-I’tidāl*. He writes at the end:

ما انفرد به ففيه نكارة

When he is the only narrator, then the narration is critiqued.²

- c. In a similar way, ‘Allāmah Badr al-Dīn al-‘Aynī has quoted in *Sharḥ al-Bukhārī*:

فقال البيهقي الحفاظ يتوقون ما ينفرد به ابن إسحاق

Al-Bayhaqī affirms, “The ḥuffāz (of ḥadīth) refrain from accepting the narrations wherein Ibn Ishāq is the sole narrator.”³

- d. Many odd narrations of Ibn Ishāq are documented in books for example:

- I. The narration of 10 sucklings is reported from Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها. It appears therein:

و لقد كان في صحيفة تحت سريري فلما مات رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و تشاغلنا بموته دخل داجن فأكلها

It was documented in a scripture placed under my bed. When Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم passed away and we got occupied in his death, a sheep entered and ate the scripture.⁴

The narrator of this is Muḥammad ibn Ishāq.

1 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 9 pg. 43, discussion on Muḥammad ibn Ishāq, Hyderabad Dakkan print.

2 *Mīzān al-I’tidāl*, vol. 3 pg. 24, under Muḥammad ibn Ishāq, old Egypt print.

3 *‘Umdat al-Qārī Sharḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 6 pg. 178, chapter on Jumu’ah in the villages and cities.

4 *Sunan Ibn Mājah*, pg. 141, chapter on suckling a mature person, Niẓāmī print, Delhi.

- II. Those who practice mourning over the deceased present the upcoming narration to establish the permissibility of slapping one's face. It appears therein that Sayyidah 'Ā'ishah Ṣiddīqah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا says:

إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قبض وهو في حجري ثم وضعت رأسه على وسادة و
 قمت ألتدم مع النساء وأضرب وجهي

Certainly, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ passed away while in my lap. I then placed his head on a pillow and stood up to mourn with the women and slap my face.¹

This narration is also the product of Ibn Ishāq and it is shādh (contrary to authentic reports).

- III. Similar is the narration under discussion from *al-Istī'āb* which the critics quote. It is just one of the reports in which Muḥammad ibn Ishāq is the sole narrator and he contradicts authentic reports (termed *shādh*). We have quoted the ruling of his odd narrations from a few scholars in the previous lines, i.e. they are not worthy of acceptance and are unreliable. Therefore, this narration is unacceptable and discarded.

The first analysis was briefly about the isnād. The second analysis as regards the content will follow.

The books of both Shī'ah and Sunnī and unanimous on the fact that Sayyidunā 'Umar al-Fārūq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ during his final illness trusted in these six individuals (viz. Sayyidunā 'Alī al-Murtaḍā, Sayyidunā 'Uthmān, Sayyidunā Ṭalḥah, Sayyidunā Zubayr ibn al-'Awwām, Sayyidunā Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, and Sayyidunā 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Awf) and handed the issue of khilāfah over to them.²

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 3 pg. 197, year 11 A.H., recall of the happenings on that occasion.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 524, chapter on the merits of 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān, the incident of bay'ah and unanimity upon 'Uthmān, Nūr Muḥammadī print, Delhi; *al-Amālī*, vol. 2 pg. 167 – 169, majlis of Friday, 26 Muḥarram 457 A.H., Najaf Ashraf print, Iraq.

Ponder carefully, respected readers! The *al-Istī'āb* narration tells us that Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه highlighted the respective natural defects and innate weaknesses of these six individuals (who were his potential successors) without determining any one of them worthy of the khilāfah. whereas on the other hand, the incident of his final illness (which is documented in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and other ḥadīth and historical compilations with unanimity) reveals that Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه relied on these six personalities and placed the burden of the Islamic khilāfah on their shoulders. In other words, he gave the reigns of the entire Muslim ummah to them, so whoever they choose among themselves as khalīfah will become the ruler of the entire Muslim populace.

On one hand, highlighting their qualities of unworthiness and on the other hand placing full reliance on the very same individuals is against the insight and mental vision of Sayyidunā 'Umar al-Fārūq رضي الله عنه.

The paradox is only intensified when the very being (Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه) regarding whom the most apprehensions were expressed (according to the report under scrutiny) as a form of prophecy is instated as khilāfah by the selected committee, with them being totally oblivious of the impending dangers. Or did they (Allah forbid) commit a grave mistake—to Allah do we belong and to Him is our return.

The summary of the above is that by acceptance of the *al-Istī'āb* report, a number of inconsistencies arise:

- I. There is total polarity between the words and actions of Sayyidunā 'Umar al-Fārūq رضي الله عنه. To choose and include in the committee the same individual (Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه) regarding whom he expressed the most concern is unacceptable by a sound mind.
- II. The consultation of these six members (which consist of the six top ranking individuals of Islam) came to the incorrect decision.
- III. The third flaw is that while undermining the status of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه and the others, the dignity of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه was also blemished

by referring to him as one who jests a lot, which undermines his awe and is unbecoming for his greatness.

Whichever the case may be, instead of being faced with these discrepancies, it is easier to reach the decision that it be determined that all the dangers and apprehensions originating from this narration are all hypothetical and none of them are accurate. This narration is utterly baseless, which forms the foundation of criticism.

In other words, it is building a faulty structure on a flawed foundation, which the critics publicised to spread the evil and humiliation of the ‘Uthmānī era, with the intention *to accrue the rewards of both worlds*.

3. Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah was an alcoholic

The third indictment is that Sayyidunā Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah رضي الله عنه was an alcoholic. Witnesses testified to him consuming alcohol which was established. This resulted in Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه ordering that he be lashed and consequently dismissing him (as mentioned previously in the ‘Uthmānī section of Ruḥamā Baynahum, fourth chapter.)

Response

This much is correct that people gave witness against Sayyidunā Walīd رضي الله عنه of drinking and he was subsequently lashed. Only this much is reported in the narrations and the muḥaddithīn are generally quiet as regards the background of this incident. The muḥaddithīn have not said anything about the background of this incident. They did not pay attention to the authenticity or inaccuracy of the incident. They simply reported the witnessing of consuming alcohol and the subsequent lashing.

What kind of people were the witnesses? Who were they? Was this testimony the product of any scam? Was it concocted? Generally, the early muḥaddithīn appear

silent in this regard. On the other hand, some early historians like al-Ṭabarī and others have investigated this matter and then the later muḥaddithīn began critically analysing it, as we will present in the forthcoming lines with references. It is apparent from this that the conspirators concocted a story against Sayyidunā Walīd رضي الله عنه. Their plan was to cast Sayyidunā Walīd رضي الله عنه in a bad light and get him removed from his post, that is all!

The issue of Sayyidunā Walīd رضي الله عنه consuming liquor is incorrect. The historians have written the background of this incident and removed the veil from the original story. After learning of this, this issue will be resolved and the accusation will be eliminated.

It appears in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*:

اجتمع نفر من أهل الكوفة فعملوا في عزل الوليد فانتدب أبو زينب بن عوف (الأزدي) وأبو مورع بن فلان الأسدي للشهادة عليه فغشوا الوليد و أكبوا عليه فيبناهم معه يوما في البيت ... فنام الوليد و تفرق القوم عنه و ثبت أبو زينب و أبو مورع فتناول أحدهما خاتمه ثم خرجا ... و قد أرادا داهية فطلبهما فلم يقدر عليهما و كان وجههما إلى المدينة فقدموا على عثمان و معهما نفر ممن يعرف عثمان ممن قد عزل الوليد عن الأعمال فقالوا له فقال من يشهد فقالوا أبو زينب و أبو مورع ... فقال كيف رأيتما قالنا كنا من غاشيته فدخلنا عليه و هو يقي الخمر فقال ما يقي الخمر إلا شاربها فبعث إليه فلما دخل على عثمان ... فحلف له الوليد و أخبره خبرهم فقال نقيم الحدود و بيء شاهد الزور بالنار فاصبر يا أخي إلخ

A group of the residents of Kūfah gathered and plotted to dismiss Walīd. Abū Zaynab ibn 'Awf al-Azdī and Abū Muwarra' ibn Fulān al-Asadī volunteered to testify against him. They attended his gathering and sat in close proximity to him. While they were with him in the house one day, Walīd slept away and the people dispersed. However, Abū Zaynab and Abū Muwarra' remained behind and one of them stole Walīd's ring and then they disappeared. They intended something catastrophic.

Walīd searched for them but could not locate them. Meanwhile, they had journeyed to Madīnah. They approached 'Uthmān and with them were a group who knew 'Uthmān, who Walīd had dismissed from their posts. They told 'Uthmān the story.

‘Uthmān asked, “Who will testify?”

They replied, “Abū Zaynab and Abū Muwarra’.”

He asked them what they saw. They replied, “We were among those who remained in his close company. We entered his presence while he was vomiting liquor.”

‘Uthmān remarked, “Only the one who consumed liquor vomits the same.” And thus summoned Walīd.

Walīd entered his presence and swore on oath (that he did not consume liquor) and informed him of their plan. ‘Uthmān commented, “We mete out legal punishments and the one who gives false testimony will land up in Hell. So bear patiently, my brother.”¹

This report of al-Ṭabarī reveals that:

- The evil-natured conspirators of Kūfah administered a well-planned scheme to dismiss Walīd رضي الله عنه.
- They gave false testimony as part of their sinister plan which resulted in him being flogged whereas in reality, Walīd رضي الله عنه was innocent of the crime.
- Outwardly, this testimony was complete according to the shar‘ī injunction. Therefore, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه did not reject it but rather acted in accordance to it.
- There is evidence that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه recognised the deceptiveness of this incident. That is why he commented, “Those who gives false testimony will land up in Hell.”

This is the story of the conspiracy and malice of the people of Kūfah. They blemished the image of a noble decent valuable human being.

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 61, 62, the year 30 A.H.

Statements of Other Scholars

In the approaching lines, we will quote the declarations of few other scholars who have labelled this incident as a prejudiced scheme of some people of Kūfah and have termed the testimony as false.

It is reported in *al-Iṣābah*:

و يقال أن بعض أهل الكوفة تعصبوا عليه فشهدوا عليه بغير الحق

It is said that some residents of Kūfah acted with prejudice against him (Walīd) and falsely testified against him.¹

قيل في الوليد بخصوصه أن بعض أهل الكوفة تعصبوا عليه فشهدوا عليه بغير الحق

It is said regarding Walīd in particular that some residents of Kūfah acted impartially against him (Walīd) and gave false witness against him.²

It has now become as evident as daylight that all of this was nothing but an evil scheme against Sayyidunā Walīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ which the residents of Kūfah plotted to remove him.

The critics are reviving these old tales in an attempt to spread hatred for Sayyidunā Walīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ whereas senior scholars have written with regards to these aspects of Sayyidunā Walīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

و الصواب السكوت

The best is to remain silent.³

1 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 601, biography of Walīd ibn 'Uqbah.

2 *Fatḥ al-Mughīth lī al-Sakhāwī Sharḥ al-Fiyah al-Ḥadīth*, vol. 3 pg. 104, under recognition of the Ṣaḥābah, Madīnah Ṭayyibah print.

3 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 11 pg. 144, under the discussion on Walīd, first edition, Dakkan.

May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى guide the critics and grant us the divine ability to practice on the divine injunction:

وَالَّذِينَ جَاءُوا مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ يَقُولُونَ رَبَّنَا اغْفِرْ لَنَا وَلِإِخْوَانِنَا الَّذِينَ سَبَقُونَا بِالْإِيمَانِ وَلَا تَجْعَلْ فِي قُلُوبِنَا غِلًّا لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا رَبَّنَا إِنَّكَ رَءُوفٌ رَحِيمٌ

And [there is a share for] those who came after them, saying, “Our Lord, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith and put not in our hearts [any] resentment toward those who have believed. Our Lord, indeed You are Kind and Merciful.”¹

1 Sūrah al-Ḥaṣhr: 10.

Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ

And the allegations against him

Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ رضي الله عنه is from the Banū Umayyah. He was instated as governor by Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه over Kūfah after Sayyidunā Walīd ibn 'Uqbah رضي الله عنه. The critics raise the following objection against him:

فظهر منه ما أدى إلى أن أخرجته أهل الكوفة منها

Such offenses were committed by him which led the people of Kūfah to dismiss him from there.¹

Let us present to the respected readers a brief biography of Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ رضي الله عنه in light of which his personality, conduct, behaviour, habits, and Islamic services may become manifest and may be weighed against the objections against him.

Name & Lineage and Being a Ṣaḥābī

The scholars have written that Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ ibn Umayyah al-Qurashī al-Umawī رضي الله عنه had the great fortune of sitting in the blessed company of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. Some have stated that at the demise of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ رضي الله عنه was 9 years of age. (He is thus counted among the young Ṣaḥābah.)

قال ابن أبي حاتم عن أبيه له صحبة قلت كان لو يوم مات النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم تسع سنين

Ibn Abī Ḥātim reports from his father, “He has companionship.”

I say: He was nine years of age the day the Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم passed on.²

1 *Minhāj al-Karāmah*, pg. 66, 'Uthmānī criticisms, Lahore print, with Minhāj al-Sunnah.

2 *Al-Isābah*, vol. 2 pg. 45, biography of Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 4 pg. 49, biography of Sa'īd.

Scholarly Potential

He was a very eloquent and articulate man of the Arabic language. His accent matched the accent of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

إن عربية القرآن أقيمت على لسان سعيد بن العاص لأنه كان أشبههم لهجة برسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم

The Arabic of the Qur'ān flowed on the tongue of Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ since he was the closest of them in accent to Rasūlullāh ﷺ.¹

Kind Behaviour

The scholars record under the biography of Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

روي عن صالح بن كيسان قال كان سعيد بن العاص حليما وقورا

It is reported from Ṣāliḥ ibn Kaysān who says: Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ was a tolerant and dignified gentleman.²

و كان من سادات المسلمين و الأجواد المشهورين و قد كان حسن السيرة جيد السريرة و كان كريما جوادا ممدوحا

He was from the elite Muslims and the famous magnanimous individuals. He had superb conduct and a magnificent heart. He was kind, generous, and praiseworthy.³

Achievements

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr writes:

1 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 45, biography of Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 4 pg. 49, biography of Sa'īd, *al-Istī'āb*, vol. 2 pg. 9, biography of Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ.

2 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 46, biography of Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ.

3 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 87, biography of Sa'īd; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 84, the year 51 A.H., first edition.

و كان سعيد هذا من عمال عمر رضي الله عنه على السواد

This Sa'īd was one of 'Umar's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ governors over Iraq.¹

و لى الكوفة و غنوا طبرستان و فتحها و غزا جرجان و كان في عسكره حذيفة و غيره من كبار الصحابة

He was appointed over Kūfah (during the 'Uthmānī era). He obtained booty from and conquered Ṭabaristān and then Jurjān. In his army were Ḥudhayfah and other senior Ṣaḥābah.²

و نقض العهد أهل آذربيجان فغزاهم ففتحها

The residents of Azerbaijan violated the covenant. So he fought them and conquered the city.³

The Relationship between Sa'īd and the Family of Abu Ṭālib

It was mentioned previously that during the 'Uthmānī era, when Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ reached Madīnah, he sent gifts and garments to the senior Muhājirīn and Anṣār. He also sent gifts to Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ who accepted them.

و قدم سعيد بن العاص المدينة وافدا على عثمان فبعث إلى وجوه المهاجرين و الأنصار بصلات و كسى و بعث إلى علي ابن أبي طالب أيضا فقبل ما بعث إليه

Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ came to Madīnah to meet 'Uthmān. He sent gifts and garments to the elite Muhājirīn and Anṣār. He also sent to 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib who accepted the gifts sent to him.⁴

Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ proposed for Umm Kulthūm bint 'Alī's hand in marriage. The rest of the narration follows:

1 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 84, biography of Sa'īd, year 58 A.H.

2 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 45, biography of Sa'īd.

3 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 84, year 58 A.H.

4 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd*, vol. 5 pg. 21, biography of Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ, Leiden print.

خطب سعيد بن العاص أم كلثوم بنت علي بعد عمر و بعث لها بمائة ألف فدخل عليها أخوها الحسين و قال لا تزوجيه فقال الحسن أنا أزوجه و اعتدوا لذلك فحضروا فقال سعيد و أين أبو عبد الله فقال الحسن سأكفيك قال فلعل أبا عبد الله كره هذا قال نعم قال لا أدخل في شيء يكرهه و رجع و لم يأخذ من المال شيئا

Sa'īd ibn al-Āṣ proposed to Umm Kulthūm bint 'Alī after 'Umar's demise. He sent to her 100 000 dirhams. Her brother Ḥusayn entered her presence and said, "Do not marry him."

Hasan said, "I will marry her to him," and they prepared for them. Both parties gathered. Sa'īd asked in surprise, "Where is Abū 'Abd Allāh (Ḥusayn)?"

Ḥasan replied, "Do not worry, I will suffice for you."

"It seems as if Abū 'Abd Allāh dislikes this," Sa'īd suggested.

"Yes," replied Ḥasan.

Upon this Sa'īd said, "I will not enter into something he dislikes." Consequently, he returned and did not take any of the wealth back.¹

أن سعيدا خطب أم كلثوم بنت علي من فاطمة التي كانت تحت عمر بن الخطاب فأجابت إلى ذلك إنما كره ذلك الحسين و أجاز الحسن

Sa'īd proposed for Umm Kulthūm bint 'Alī, daughter of Fatimah, who was previously married to 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb. She replied optimistically saying, "Only Ḥusayn disapproves whereas Ḥasan approves."²

The following points are deduced from the above two texts:

- Although Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه did not approve of this marriage, Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها were pleased with

1 Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā', vol. 3 pg. 295, biography of Sa'īd.

2 Al-Bidāyah, vol. 8 pg. 89, biography of Sa'īd, the year 58 A.H.

the proposal and prepared for marriage. However, the marriage could not be contracted due to the former's disapproval.

- Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ's ﷺ gift of 100 000 dirhams and not taking it back is a clear indication of his generosity and magnanimity.
- Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm's ﷺ acceptance of Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ's ﷺ 100 000 dirhams is a manifest evidence of their amiable relationship.

Final Request

The above establishes that Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ ﷺ was very big-hearted, courageous, and a gentlemen with remarkable character. He has many achievements to his name in the field of Islamic conquests. Moreover, he had excellent relations with the Banū Hāshim.

The accusations levelled by the opposition against a man with such outstanding qualities are totally baseless and useless. Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ﷺ dismissed him due to some temporary demands, the reasons behind this were something else. He only did this to terminate the propaganda of the evil Kūfī conspirators.

‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir

And the allegations against him

Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī al-Shīrī writes in *Minhāj al-Karāmah* concerning him:

وولى عبد الله بن عامر العراق ففعل من المنكر ما فعل

He (‘Uthmān) appointed Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (who is his maternal uncle’s son) over Iraq who perpetrated the evils he perpetrated.¹

We will now present brief aspects of the biography of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ which will reveal his personality, character, practice, and the outstanding accomplishments of his life and expose the reality of the objections of the critics.

Name and Lineage

His name is ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir ibn Kurayz. His mother’s name is Dajājah bint Asmā’ ibn Ṣalt.

Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān’s cousin, the son of his maternal uncle (‘Āmir). In turn, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is the son of Arwā bint Kurayz, the sister of ‘Āmir. The mother of ‘Āmir and Arwā is Umm Ḥakīm bint ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib ibn Hāshim, from the Banū Hāshim.²

Days of Infancy and Attainment of Blessings

أتى به النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو صغير فقال هذا يشبهنا وجعل يتفل عليه ويعوده وجعل عبد الله يتلع ريق رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إنه المسقى فكان لا يعالج أرضا إلا ظهر له الماء... فكان كما قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

1 *Minhāj al-Karāmah*, pg. 67, under ‘Uthmānī criticism

2 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 147 – 149, the children of ‘Āmir ibn Kurayz; *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 5 pg. 31, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn Kurayz; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 191, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Āmir.

During his infancy, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir was brought to Rasūlullāh ﷺ (in the 7th year after hijrah at the occasion of ‘Umrat al-Qaḍā’.) Rasūlullāh ﷺ remarked, “He resembles us.” He then placed his blessed saliva in the infant’s mouth and begged Allah for the infant’s protection. ‘Abd Allāh swallowed the saliva of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ further commented that he will be a finder of water. Thereafter, ‘Abd Allāh would not dig upon any land except that water would be exposed for him. Thus, he was as Rasūlullāh ﷺ prophesised.¹

The reports of *al-Ṭabaqāt* has the following:

قال هذا ابننا و هو أشبهكم بنا و هو مسقى فلم يزل عبد الله شريفا إلخ

Rasūlullāh ﷺ stated, “This is our son and he resembles us the most from all of you. He will be a finder of water. Thus, ‘Abd Allāh remained noble...²

Generosity, Heroism, and Compassion

وكان ابن عامر رجلا سخيا شجاعا و صولا لقومه و لقرابته محببا فيهم رحيفا

Ibn ‘Āmir was a munificent, heroic, maintainer of relations with his people and relatives, beloved to them, and compassionate gentleman.³

Accomplishments in Warfare

وولاه بلاد فارس و كان عمره خمس و عشرين سنة فافتتح خراسان كلها و أطراف فارس و سجستان و كرمان و زابليستان إلخ

1 *Al-Istī‘āb* with *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 351, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Āmir; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 191, biography of ‘Abd Allah; *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 160, biography of ‘Abd Allah.

2 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 5 pg. 31, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Āmir ibn Kurayz, first edition, Leiden.

3 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 5 pg. 32, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Āmir; *al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 2 pg. 352, biography of ‘Abd Allah; *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 149.

He (‘Uthmān) appointed him governor over the land of Persia (Baṣrah) when he was at the age of 25. He conquered

1. the entire Khorasan,
2. the outlying areas of the Persian dominion,
3. Sijistān,
4. Kirmān, and
5. Zābilistān.¹

هو افتتح خراسان و قتل كسرى في ولايته

He opened Khorasan and Kisrā was killed during his reign.²

According to the version of *Kitāb al-Buldān* of al-Ya‘qūbī al-Shī‘ī, the following regions were also conquered under the leadership of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir ibn Kurayz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

6. Qaymas
7. Nasā
8. Abarshahr
9. Jām
10. Ṭūs
11. Isfarā‘īn
12. Sarkhas
13. Marw

1 *Uṣd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 191, biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir; *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 5 pg. 33, biography of Ibn ‘Āmir.

2 *Al-Istī‘āb* with *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 352, biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir.

14. Būshanj
15. Zarnaj
16. Marward¹

Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ has listed more of the conquered lands under the governance of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir رضي الله عنه:

17. Al-Kāriyān
18. Al-Fayshajān (Dārbajard)
19. Zāliq
20. Nāshib
21. Bāsharwardh
22. Hirāt
23. Bayhaq
24. Tanḥāristān
25. Al-Jūzjān
26. Al-Fāriyāb
27. Al-Ṭāliqān
28. Balkh
29. Khawārizm
30. Bādhghīs
31. Aṣbahān
32. Ḥalawān²

1 *Kitāb al-Buldān*, pg. 40 – 45, Maṭba‘at al-Ḥaydariyyah print, Najaf, Iraq, third edition, 1377 A.H. 1957 version.

2 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ*, vol. 1 pg. 140 – 141, year 30 A.H., first edition, Iraq; *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ*, vol. 1 pg. 158, under ‘Uthmānī judges.

Humanitarian Work

Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ constructed ponds, planted gardens, dug rivers, and did other humanitarian works for the benefit of the Muslims, especially arranging ponds for water in ‘Arafāh:

وهو أول من اتخذ الحياض بعرفة وأجرى إليها العين وسقى الناس الماء فذاك جار إلى اليوم

He is the first to construct ponds in ‘Arafah. He sourced water from a spring to these ponds and gave water to the people. This is continuous up to this day.¹

وهو الذي عمل السقاية بعرفة... وله النجاج (موضع) الذي يقال له نجاج ابن عامر وله الجحفة وله بستان ابن عامر بنخلة على ليلة من مكة وله آثار في الأرض كثيرة

He is responsible for arranging drinking water in ‘Arafah. He has a land known as Nibāj ibn ‘Āmir, Juḥfah, and the orchard of Ibn ‘Āmir at Nakhlah, one night journey from Makkah. His charitable memorials in the land are plenty.²

Services to the Residents of Madīnah

وقدم على عثمان بالمدينة فقال له عثمان صل قرابتك وقومك ففرق في قریش والأنصار شيئا عظيما من الأموال والكسوات فأثنوا عليه

He came to ‘Uthmān in Madīnah (with plenty of wealth). ‘Uthmān instructed him, “Maintain ties with your relatives and people.” Accordingly, he distributed loads of money and clothes among the Quraysh and Anṣār who in turn praised him (in appreciation).³

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 5 pg. 34, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Āmir; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 191, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Āmir ibn Kurayz; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 88, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Āmir.

2 *Nasab Quraysh*, vol. 5 pg. 148, Egypt print.

3 *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 191, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Āmir; *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 61, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Āmir.

Ibn ‘Āmir in the Sight of Ibn Taymiyyah

In his book *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, Ibn Taymiyyah extolled the excellent qualities of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir رضي الله عنه and declared his acceptance to the people. He states:

إن له من الحسنات و المحبة في قلوب الناس ما لا ينكر

He has numerous virtuous deeds to his name and love in the hearts of people which cannot be denied.¹

In the light of the above, it is evidently clear that Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir رضي الله عنه was a remarkable personality and a work efficient man who completed many services to Islam and the Muslims. In front of all these outstanding excellences, all the objections of the opposition seem baseless and unfounded. These accusations have been levelled solely on the basis of tribalism so that hatred and malice is maintained in the hearts of people for him. No other reason is discernable besides this *noble one*. May Allah repay them according to their aspirations.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 189 – 190.

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah

And the allegations against him

The critics have a distinctive hatred for Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. They utter very nasty remarks about the era of his governorship and khilāfah. According to the opposition, this was a dark era in which each and every custom of Islam was wiped out. Islamic rites were done away with and the ways of compulsion and despotism were widely spread. Dīnī methodology and rituals were replaced with the policy of dictatorship.

Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī al-Shīrī in his book *Minhāj al-Karāmah fī Ithbāt al-Imāmah* writes a very brief sentence against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه in which he gathers all the accusations against him. He says:

و ولي معاوية الشام فأحدث من الفتن ما أحدث

Mu‘āwiyah assumed governorship over Shām and stirred numerous fitnahs.¹

Previously, in discussion one (under the Shām heading), the religious services of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه during the Prophetic era, Ṣiddīqī era, and Fārūqī era were listed briefly. Now, we will present to the esteemed readers narrations concerning Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and his competence and potential coupled with his religious achievements from Islamic history which will answer the objections levelled against him and dismiss the misconceptions and misunderstandings of that era.

The sequence adopted is that firstly the rank and performance of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه will be presented followed by incidents highlighting his excellent relationship and conduct with the Banū Hāshim family. At the end of

1 *Minhāj al-Karāmah fī Ithbāt al-Imāmah*, pg. 67, accusations against ‘Uthmān, Lahore print, at the end of *Minhāj al-Sunnah* of Ibn Taymiyyah.

all of this, the objections of verbal abuse etc. were addressed. Do not think that these discussions are only related to the ‘Uthmānī era. Rather, these aspects are mentioned concerning his personality and being.

Name, Lineage, and Acceptance of Islam

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ lineage is as follows: Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān ibn Ḥarb ibn Umayyah ibn ‘Abd Shams ibn ‘Abd Manāf.¹

His mother’s lineage is as follows: Hind bint ‘Utbah ibn Rabī‘ah ibn ‘Abd Shams ibn ‘Abd Manāf.²

It is learnt from this lineage that Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ fifth forefather are the same individual, ‘Abd Manāf.

It was approximately the 18th year of his life when he met Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ at the occasion of ‘Umrat al-Qaḍā’ and embraced Islam. He kept his Islam secret from his parents until the Conquest of Makkah. His parents (Abū Sufyān and Hind ibn ‘Utbah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا) entered the faith at the occasion of the Conquest of Makkah.

وكان معاوية يقول أنه أسلم عام القضية و أنه لقي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و سلم مسلما و كتتم إسلامه من أبيه و أمه إلخ

Mu‘āwiyah would say that he embraced Islam the year of the repeat ‘Umrah and that he met Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ as a Muslim but concealed his Islam from his father and mother.³

1 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 124, the offspring of Abū Sufyān.

2 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 125, the offspring of Abū Sufyān; *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 4 pg. 409, biography of Hind ibn ‘Utbah.

3 *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 4 pg. 385, biography of Mu‘āwiyah; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 117, biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Tārīkh Baghdād*, vol. 1 pg. 207, biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 124, the offspring of Abū Sufyān ibn Ḥarb; *Kitāb Duwal al-Islām*, vol. 1 pg. 28, the year 60 A.H., Hyderabad Dakkan print; *Tahdhīb al-Asmā’ wa l-Lughāt*, vol. 2 pg. 102, biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 2 pg. 318, biography of Mu‘āwiyah.

The esteemed readers should be aware that the general historians and authors of biographies mention concerning Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷺ Islam that he entered the fold at the occasion of the Conquest of Makkah (8 A.H.). However, the opinion we quoted is the declaration of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ himself. The early historians like the author of *Nasab Quraysh* and *Tārīkh Baghdād* etc. have reported it via a chain. In conclusion, preference will be given to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷺ own declaration over the views of others.

Family Links between the Family of Amīr Mu‘āwiyah and the Banū Hāshim

To form perpetual links of one family to another, marital links are fundamental. Due to these links, a tribe gains proximity to another, the perpetual connection between the two tribes are strengthened and fortified, and emotions like compassion, love, empathy, and well-wishing are found between them.

We will now list before the respected readers some family connections between the family of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ and the Banū Hāshim so that the proximity shared between these two clans becomes evident to all.

First Connection

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷺ sister, Sayyidah Umm Ḥabībah bint Abī Sufyān ﷺ, was in the wedlock of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. She thus has the privilege of being the Umm al-Mu‘minīn (Mother of the Believers) and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ has the honour of being the brother-in-law of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Sayyidah Umm Ḥabībah’s ﷺ name was Ramlah.¹

Second Connection

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ was the co-brother-in-law of Rasūlullāh ﷺ (i.e. they were married to two sisters.) Umm al-Mu‘minīn Sayyidah Umm Salamah’s ﷺ sister Qarībat al-Ṣuḡhrā was in the wedlock of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ.

¹ *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 123 – 124, the offspring of Abū Sufyān ibn Ḥarb; *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 8 pg. 68 – 69, biography of Umm Ḥabībah (Ramlah bint Abī Sufyān), Leiden print, Europe.

و سالفه من قبل أم سلمة معاوية بن أبي سفيان بن حرب بن أمية كانت عنده قريبة الصغرى بنت أمية بن مغيرة أخت أم سلمة لأبيها لم تلد له

His brother in law before Umm Salamah was Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān ibn Ḥarb ibn Umayyah. In his wedlock was Qarībat al-Ṣughrā bint Umayyah ibn Mughīrah, the consanguine sister of Umm Salamah. They had no children together.¹

Third Connection

هند بنت أبي سفيان بن حرب بن أمية الأموية أخت معاوية كانت زوج الحارث بن نوفل بن الحارث بن عبد المطلب بن هاشم فولدت له ابنه محمدا

Hind bint Abī Sufyān ibn Ḥarb ibn Umayyah al-Umawiyah, the sister of Mu'āwiyah, was the wife of Ḥārith ibn Nawfal ibn al-Ḥārith ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib ibn Hāshim. She gave birth to his son Muḥammad.²

Ḥārith ibn Nawfal is from the offspring of Sayyidunā 'Alī's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ cousins.

Fourth Connection

ولد الحسين بن علي بن أبي طالب عليا أكبر قتل بالطف مع أبيه و أمه ليلى بنت أبي مرة بن عروة بن مسعود الثقفي ... و أمها ميمونة بنت أبي سفيان بن حرب بن أمية

Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib had a son 'Alī Akbar who was killed at Ṭaff (Karbālā') alongside his father. His mother is Laylā bint Abī Murrāh ibn 'Urwah ibn Mas'ūd al-Thaqafī. Her (Laylā's) mother was Maymūnah bint Abī Sufyān ibn Ḥarb ibn Umayyah.³

Maymūnah bint Abī Sufyān is the sister of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. This makes Maymūnah bint Abī Sufyān the mother in law of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the

1 *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar*, pg. 102, Hyderabad Dakkan print.

2 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 58, 59, biography of 'Abd Allah ibn al-Ḥārith ibn Nawfal; *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 4 pg. 409, biography of Hind bint Abī Sufyān ibn Ḥarb; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 5 pg. 181, biography of 'Abd Allah ibn al-Ḥārith; *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd*, vol. 5 pg. 15, biography of 'Abd Allah, Leiden print.

3 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 57, the children of Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib; *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 255, the year 61 A.H., the murder of Ḥusayn and his companions.

maternal grandmother of ‘Alī Akbar. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه is the maternal uncle of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn’s wife, and the granduncle of ‘Alī Akbar.

Shī‘ī scholars have mentioned this connection in the following references:

- *Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn*, vol. 1 pg. 54, chapter on information of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī, his killing and those killed with him, Beirut print.
- *Muntahā al-Āmāl*, vol. 1 pg. 464, discussion on the wives of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī.

Fifth Connection

و تزوجت لبابة بنت عبيد الله بن عباس بن عبد المطلب العباس بن علي بن أبي طالب ثم خلف عليها
الوليد بن عتبة بن أبي سفيان

Lubābah bint ‘Ubayd Allah ibn ‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib married ‘Abbās ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. After his demise, Walīd ibn ‘Utbah ibn Abī Sufyān married her.¹

Lubābah is the granddaughter of Sayyidunā ‘Abbās, the paternal uncle of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Walīd ibn ‘Utbah is the nephew of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Sixth Connection

و تزوجت رملة بنت محمد بن جعفر بن أبي طالب سليمان بن هشام بن عبد الملك ثم أبا القاسم بن وليد
بن عتبة بن أبي سفيان

Ramlah bint Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Abī Ṭālib married Sulaymān ibn Hīshām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik and thereafter Abū al-Qāsim ibn Walīd ibn ‘Utbah ibn Abī Sufyān.²

1 *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar*, pg. 441; *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 133, the children of ‘Utbah ibn Abī Sufyān; footnotes of *‘Umdat al-Ṭālib fī Ansāb Āl Abī Ṭālib* of Ibn ‘Inabah (Shī‘ī author), the children of Ja‘far ibn Abī Ṭālib, Najaf print, Iraq.

2 *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar*, pg. 449.

Ramlah is the granddaughter of Sayyidunā Ja‘far al-Ṭayyār رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Abū al-Qāsim is the son of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ nephew.

After becoming acquainted with the above connections, it is evident that:

- The family of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and the Banū Hāshim were very close. Therefore, to verbally abuse them in any situation is unbecoming. If one of the two families is abused, it is synonymous to abusing the other family. Using vulgarity towards any relative will definitely have a negative impact on the other close relative.
- The second misconception which is being dispelled is that there existed absolutely no tribalism or family prejudice between these two families. Islam brought an end to all prejudices and bigotry. The view of the return of tribalism in the era of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is in total conflict to reality and is specially forged and concocted with much difficulty. These types of family connections and other family links are exceptional evidences in this issue. To ignore these factual proofs and wave the flag of tribalism is a termination of justice and fairness. May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى favour the Muslims with good beliefs about their seniors, which will prove advantageous in the Hereafter and may He protect us from opposition, hatred, and aversion; which will turn out to be detrimental on the Day of Judgement.

Prophetic Supplications in favour of Amīr Mu‘āwiyah

The services rendered for the religion of Islam, the endeavours made for the revival of Islam, and the achievements accomplished in the preservation of Islam by Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ are the blessings of the various supplications made at several occasions by the blessed tongue of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in his favour. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى answered those entreaties of the prophetic tongue and manifested them. Through their blessings, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was given the capability to serve dīn.

Some of those supplications will be quoted which have been recorded by the senior scholars with isnād or referenced to reliable scholars.

Being a Guide and Rightly Guided

عبد الرحمن بن عميرة المزني يقول سمعت النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم يقول في معاوية بن أبي سفيان اللهم اجعله هاديا مهديا و اهده و اهد به

‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Umayrah al-Muzanī reports that he heard the Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ praying in favour of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, “O Allah, make him a guide and rightly guided. Guide him aright and guide by his means.”¹

Imām al-Bukhārī documents yet another narration, backed by an isnād, in favour of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*.

عن أبي إدريس الخولاني عن عمير بن سعد قال لا تذكروا معاوية إلا بخير فإني سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يقول اللهم اهده

Abū Idrīs al-Khawlanī—from ‘Umayr ibn Sa’d who said: Do not speak except positively of Mu‘āwiyah for indeed I heard Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ saying, “O Allah, guide him.”²

Benefit: When Sayyidunā ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ relieved Sayyidunā ‘Umayr ibn Sa’d رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (Ṣaḥābī) from the governorship of Ḥimṣ and instated Sayyidunā

1 *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, vol. 4 pg. 327, section one, discussion on Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, Hyderabad Dakkan print; *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, vol. 3 pg. 240, section one, chapter on ‘Abd al-Raḥmān; *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 7 pg. 136, section two, under ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Umayrah al-Muzanī; *Jāmi’ al-Tirmidhī*, book on virtues, pg. 547, chapter on the merits of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, *Aṣaḥ al-Maṭābī* old print, Lucknow; *Tārīkh Baghdād*, vol. 1 pg. 208, biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 4 pg. 386, biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, Tehran print; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 121, with reference to al-Ṭabarānī, Imām Aḥmad and others, under the biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *al-Faṭḥ al-Rabbānī li Tartīb Musnad al-Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal al-Shaybānī*, vol. 22 pg. 356, chapter on the reports concerning Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.

2 *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, vol. 4 pg. 328, section one, the biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, Hyderabad Dakkan print.

Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as governor, people began to remonstrate this change. It was on this occasion that Sayyidunā 'Umayr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ mentioned the above narration in favour of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

Acquisition of the Knowledge of the Book and Arithmetic and Protection from Punishment

عن عبد الرحمن بن أبي عميرة عن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم قال اللهم علم معاوية الحساب و قه العذاب

'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī 'Umayrah reports:

The Nabī ﷺ prayed, "O Allah, teach Mu'āwiyah arithmetic and protect him from punishment."¹

يقول (عرباض بن سارية) سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يقول اللهم علم معاوية الكتاب و الحساب و قه العذاب

'Irbād ibn Sāriyah relates that he heard Rasūlullāh ﷺ supplicating: O Allah, teach Mu'āwiyah the Book and mathematics and save him from chastisement.²

Knowledge and Tolerance

Imām al-Bukhārī documents in the fourth volume of his *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*:

صدقة بن خالد حدثني وحشي بن حرب بن وحشي عن أبيه عن جده قال كان معاوية ردف النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم فقال يا معاوية ما يليني منك قال بطني قال اللهم أملهأ علما و حلما

1 *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, vol. 4 pg. 327, section one, the biography of Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Majma' al-Zawā'id*, vol. 9 pg. 356, chapter on the reports concerning Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.

2 *Al-Ist'āb* with *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 381, biography of Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Mawārid al-Zam'an*, pg. 566, chapter on Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 120, with reference to Aḥmad and Ibn Jarīr, biography of Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *al-Faṭḥ al-Rabbānī*, vol. 22 pg. 356, chapter on the reports concerning Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.

Ṣadaqah ibn Khālid says—Waḥshī ibn Ḥarb ibn Waḥshī reports—from his father—from his grandfather who relates:

Mu‘āwiyah was sitting behind the Nabī ﷺ on a conveyance when the latter asked, “O Mu‘āwiyah, which part of your body is adjacent to mines”

“My stomach,” he replied.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ supplicated, “O Allah, fill him with knowledge and tolerance.”¹

Note: These supplications had definite effects on Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ just as the prophetic supplications in favour of Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā ﷺ had lasting effects upon him and they were accepted and answered by the Almighty. Rasūlullāh ﷺ despatched Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ to Yemen so the latter submitted, “O Messenger of Allah, I am young and inexperienced in judicial matters.” Rasūlullāh ﷺ placed his blessed hand on Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s ﷺ chest and supplicated:

اللهم ثبت لسانه واهد قلبه

O Allah, make his tongue firm and guide his heart.²

Most definitely, Allah ﷻ favoured Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ with a high level of knowledge and understanding, coupled with courage and tolerance. Allah ﷻ made him the means of multitudes entering the fold of Islam. Many cities were conquered and included in the dominion of Islam through his efforts. The word of Islam reigned supreme and arrangements were established for the perpetual preservation of dīn. He established the Islamic administration in those

1 *Al-Tārikh al-Kabīr*, vol. 4 pg. 180, section 2, chapter on Waḥshī (al-Ḥabashī) the freed slave of Jubayr ibn Muṭ‘im.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 5 pg. 107, Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ despatch of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and Khālid ibn al-Walīd to Yemen prior to the Farewell Pilgrimage, with reference to Imām Aḥmad.

cities. All of this were the effects of the supplications and companionship of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

If the era of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is regarded as the destruction of the Islamic government and termination of the Islamic management, then what impacts did these supplications of Rasūlullāh ﷺ have? Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ prayers for guidance and direction and his supplications for knowledge and tolerance were, Allah forbid, ineffectual and inefficient (to Allah do we belong and to Him is our return). The supplications in favour of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ are beneficial, effectual, and efficient whereas the very same supplications from the blessed tongue in relation to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ are unfruitful; this is paradoxical. Muslims need to ponder deeply and contemplate over this issue. May Allah ﷻ grant us the correct beliefs regarding all the esteemed Ṣaḥābah of our noble Nabī ﷺ, free from tribalism and excesses.

Intellectual Prowess and Aptitude

Few themes will be discussed under this heading which will openly show Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷺ intellectual prowess and talent.

1. Being the Scribe of the Nabī ﷺ

Among the aspects extensively accepted regarding Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is that he has the great fortune of being the scribe in the service of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. He is enumerated among the scribes of the Nabī ﷺ. This is a clear evidence to his talent, truthfulness, and dependability.

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷺ name appears in the list of the scribes of the blessed sīrah of the Nabī ﷺ.¹

1 *Al-Istī‘āb* with *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 375, biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Zād al-Ma‘ād*, vol. 1 pg. 30, section on his ﷺ scribes; *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 312, Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Majma’ al-Zawā’id*, vol. 9 pg. 357, chapter on Mu‘āwiyah; *Jawāmi’ al-Sīrah*, pg. 27, under the heading, his ﷺ scribes.

2. Ibn ‘Abbās al-Hāshimī’s Academic Reliance on Amīr Mu‘āwiyah and his Acknowledgement of his Talent

Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه reports a number of aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم from Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and relied upon him in numerous Shar‘ī rulings. He placed him on the level of a faqīh in religious aspects. Have a look at few of these topics hereunder.

- The issue of Witr was discussed in the presence of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه (who is the cousin of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه) in which the name of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was taken.

فقال ابن عباس ... ليس أحد منا أعلم من معاوية

Ibn ‘Abbās commented, “None of us is more knowledgeable than Mu‘āwiyah.”¹

- The narration of al-Bukhārī mentions that when the discussion on witr took place, Sayyidunā Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه stated:

دعه فإنه قد صحب رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ... قال أصاب أنه فقيه

Leave him, for he is a companion of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم.

He said: He acted correctly, for he is indeed a faqīh (one grounded in understanding of fiqh).²

-

عن مجاهد و عطاء عن ابن عباس أن معاوية أخبره أنه رأى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قصر من شعره بمشقص فقلنا لابن عباس ما بلغنا هذا إلا عن معاوية فقال ما كان معاوية على رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم متهما

1 *Al-Sunan al-Kubrā* of al-Bayhaqī, vol. 3 pg. 26, chapter on witr, Hyderabad Dakkan print.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 531, chapter on Mu‘āwiyah, Nūr Muḥammadī print, Delhi; *al-Isābah* with *al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 3 pg. 413, biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 4 pg. 386, biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.

Mujāhid and ‘Aṭā’ (two renowned students of Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنهما) narrate from Ibn ‘Abbās that Mu‘āwiyah informed him that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم cut his hair with a scissor. We told Ibn ‘Abbās, “This narration has not reached us except from Mu‘āwiyah.”

Ibn ‘Abbās responded, “Mu‘āwiyah is not one to fabricate in the name of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم.”¹

عن ابن عباس قال ما رأيت أحد أخلق للملك من معاوية

It is reported that Ibn ‘Abbās stated: “I have not seen anyone more proficient in governorship than Mu‘āwiyah.”²

Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنهما would travel to Shām to meet Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and he would stay at his place.

أن كريبا مولى ابن عباس أخبره أنه رأى ابن عباس يصلي في المقصورة مع معاوية

Kurayb, the freed slave of Ibn ‘Abbās, informed him that he saw Ibn ‘Abbās performing ṣalāh in the *maqṣūrah* with Mu‘āwiyah.³

Maqṣūrah was a secure chamber built specially for the khulafā’ in the first row.

Moreover, Sayyidunā Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنهما would receive gifts and stipends from Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه which will appear shortly under the heading on gifts and stipends, Allah willing.

1 *Musnad Aḥmad*, vol. 4 pg. 95, musnadāt of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.

2 *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, vol. 4 pg. 327, biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 6 pg. 188, the year 60 A.H., end of discussion on Mu‘āwiyah; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 135, Amīr Mu‘āwiyah, referenced to Muḥaddith ‘Abd al-Razzāq; *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 413, biography of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.

3 *Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq*, vol. 2 pg. 414, chapter on ṣalāh in the *maqṣūrah*, Majlis ‘Ilmī print, Karachi-Dabhel.

3. Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyah al-Ḥāshimī's relating Ḥadīth and Shar'ī rulings from Amīr Mu'āwiyah

Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyah is the son of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه.

عن محمد بن علي الحنفية عن معاوية بن أبي سفيان قال سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يقول
العمرى جائزة لأهلها

Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Ḥanafīyah reports from Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān who says that he heard Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم stating:

'Umrā (lending something to someone for life) is permissible for those in favour of whom it was given.¹

If a person lends another person an item for lifetime, it will become his permanently.

4. Amīr Mu'āwiyah was from the proficient in Fatwā

Ibn al-Qayyim has in the beginning section of his work *A'lām al-Mūqī'in* explained that those esteemed Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم who were proficient in fatwā (to whom people resorted for acquisition of rulings) were of three ranks.

One group issued plenty of fatwā the likes of Sayyidunā 'Umar, Sayyidunā 'Alī, Sayyidah 'Ā'ishah رضي الله عنها, etc.

The second group were moderate in issuing fatwā like Sayyidunā Ṣiddīq Akbar, Sayyidah Umm Salamah, Sayyidah 'Uthmān Dhū al-Nūrayn رضي الله عنهم, etc.

و يضاف إليهم طلحة و الزبير و عبد الرحمن بن عوف ... و معاوية بن أبي سفيان

Ṭalḥah, Zubayr, 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Awf, and Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān are included with them.

1 *Musnad Ahmad*, vol. 4 pg. 97, the ḥadīth of Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, first edition, Egypt.

The third group are those who issue very little fatwā like Sayyidunā Abū al-Dardā', Sayyidunā Abū Salamah, Sayyidunā Sa'īd ibn Zayd رضي الله عنه, etc.¹

This means that concerning the academic prowess of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, just as he is counted among the Fuqahā' of this ummah, he had a unique rank among the proficient in fatwā in the era of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنه. He being from the thinkers and legislators is an accepted historical fact.

5. Ṣaḥābah narrate aḥādīth from him

A significant point to realise the religious reliability and academic integrity of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه is that many illustrious Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنه narrated aḥādīth from him. A few of them are listed hereunder. Furthermore, Imām al-Nawawī has affirmed that 163 aḥādīth have been reported on the strength of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, documented in ḥadīth compilations.

1. Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās al-Hāshimī رضي الله عنه
2. Sayyidunā Jarīr ibn 'Abd Allāh رضي الله عنه
3. Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah ibn Khudayj رضي الله عنه
4. Sayyidunā Sā'ib ibn Yazīd رضي الله عنه
5. Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr رضي الله عنه
6. Sayyidunā Nu'mān ibn Bashīr رضي الله عنه
7. Sayyidunā Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه
8. Sayyidunā Abū al-Dardā' رضي الله عنه
9. Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar رضي الله عنه²

1 A'lām al-Mūqī'n, vol. 1 pg. 5, beginning sections, *Ashraf al-Maṭābī'* print, Delhi; *Tadrīb al-Rāwī Sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawawī*, pg. 404, discussion on the one to issue the most fatwā from them is Ibn 'Abbās; *Jawāmi' al-Sīrah*, pg. 320, third article, the Ṣaḥābah proficient in fatwā.

2 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 412, biography of Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 4 pg. 387, biography of Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Tahdhīb al-Asmā' wa l-Lughāt*, vol. 2 pg. 102 – 103, Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Jawāmi' al-Sīrah*, pg. 277, second article, companions of water and thing.

Religious Services and Islamic Conquests

Previously in the first discussion under the heading of Shām, some of the services of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه in the Prophetic and Şiddīqī era were mentioned briefly. Keeping them in mind, a few other battles and conquests will be listed here.

In relation to battles, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s رضي الله عنه substantial services are plenty. First in the reigns of the Rightly Guided Khulafā’ and then during his own khilāfah, numerous conquests were accomplished through him. A separate book is needed to include all their details. Nonetheless, we will relate a few incidents concisely so that this heading is not void of content.

1. ‘Allāmah al-Balādhurī writes regarding the Conquest of Urdun (Jordan) that the commander in chief was Sayyidunā Abū ‘Ubaydah ibn al-Jarrāḥ رضي الله عنه and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s رضي الله عنه elder brother, Sayyidunā Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه, served as a general. In compliance to the instructions of Sayyidunā Abū ‘Ubaydah رضي الله عنه, the army marched on to the coastal region of Jordan. The leader of the contingent was Sayyidunā Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was appointed over the vanguard of this contingent. After much struggle, the coastal regions of Jordan were conquered at the hands of Sayyidunā Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān, Sayyidunā ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. Sayyidunā Abū ‘Ubaydah رضي الله عنه sent the good news of this conquest to Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه in the capital.

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s رضي الله عنه achievements and accomplishments were outstanding:

و كان لمعاوية في ذلك بلاء حسن و أثر جميل

Mu‘āwiyah displayed a good performance and had superb influence.¹

1 *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, pg. 123, the issue of Jordan, Egypt print.

2. أن قيسارية فتحت قسرا في سنة ١٩ هـ فلما بلغ عمر فتحها نادى أن قيسارية فتحت قسرا و كبر و كبر المسلمون و كانت حوصرت سبع سنين و فتحها معاوية

Qaysāriyyah was conquered in the 19th year after hijrah. When ‘Umar heard of its conquest, he announced that Qaysāriyyah was conquered. He shouted the takbīr and the Muslims shouted the takbīr. It was sieged for 7 years after which Mu‘āwiyah conquered it.¹

3. و كتب عمر بن الخطاب إلى معاوية يأمره يتتبع ما بقي من فلسطين ففتح عسقلان

‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb wrote to Mu‘āwiyah commanding him to advance to (conquer) the remaining areas of Palestine. In compliance, he conquered ‘Asqalān.²

4. قال عمير فحدثنا أم حرام أنها سمعت النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم يقول أول جيش من أمتي يغزون البحر قد أوجبوا قالت أم حرام قلت يا رسول الله أنا فيهم قال أنت فيهم ... فركبت البحر في زمان معاوية بن أبي سفيان فصرعت عن دابتها حين خرجت من البحر فهلكت

‘Umayr says that Umm Ḥarām narrated to us that she heard the Nabī ﷺ saying, “The first army of my ummah that wages war on sea have definitely earned themselves Jannah.”

Umm Ḥarām continues: I asked, “O messenger of Allah, am I part of them?”

Rasūlullāh ﷺ responded, “You are part of them.”

She travelled by sea during the time of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān. She was thrown off her animal after she dismounted the ship and passed away.³

1 *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, pg. 147, 149, the issue of Palestine, Egypt print.

2 *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, pg. 149, the issue of Palestine, Egypt print.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 410, book on jihād, chapter on what was said regarding fighting the Romans, Nūr Muḥammadī print, Delhi; *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 391, book on jihād, chapter on supplicating for jihād and martyrdom; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, vol. 2 pg. 141 – 142, book on leadership, chapter on the virtue of war at sea, Nūr Muḥammadī print, Delhi.

It should be noted that this incident took place during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه in the year 28 A.H., under the leadership of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

و فيها سنة ٢٨ هـ غزا معاوية بن أبي سفيان في البحر ... و معه عبادة بن الصامت و معه امرأته أم حرام بنت ملحان الأنصارية فأتى قبرس فتوفيت أم حرام فقبرها هناك

In that year 28 A.H., Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān went on a naval expedition. With him was ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit accompanied by his wife Umm Ḥarām bint Milhān al-Anṣāriyyah. He came to Qabras (Cyprus). Umm Ḥarām passed away (on the island) and her grave is there.¹

The army of his ummah whom Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم gave the glad tidings of Jannah to; their leader was Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. Therefore, he is deserving of this momentous glad tidings and he is most definitely from the inhabitants of Jannah by the assertion of the tongue of Nubuwwah.

The Participation of Other Seniors

It is noteworthy at this juncture to mention that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه requested permission from Sayyidunā ‘Umar al-Fārūq رضي الله عنه time and again to launch naval expeditions, but was not given permission.

When the era of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه began, he gave permission to launch naval expeditions under special conditions with the national benefit in mind. The advancement on Cyprus was the first naval expedition.

Under the command of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم served in this battle, for example Sayyidunā Abū Ayyūb al-Ansarī, Sayyidunā Abū al-Dardā’, Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī, Sayyidunā ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit, Sayyidunā Fuḍālāh ibn ‘Ubayd al-Ansarī, Sayyidunā ‘Umayr ibn Sa’d ibn ‘Ubayd

1 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 135, the year 28 A.H.; *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 124, the offspring of Abū Sufyān ibn Ḥarab; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 6 pg. 229, biography of Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah; *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, pg. 160, the affair of Cyprus.

al-Ansarī, Sayyidunā Wāthilah ibn al-Asqa' al-Kinānī, Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn Bishr al-Māzinī, Sayyidunā Shaddād ibn Aws ibn Thābit (the paternal cousin of Sayyidunā Ḥassān ibn Thābit and Sayyidunā Miqdād), Sayyidunā Ka'b al-Ḥibr, and Sayyidunā Jubayr ibn Nufayr al-Ḥaḍramī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ acted as the army general of this expedition as he participated himself together with his wife. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى granted them a marvellous victory and the Muslims acquired magnificent booty.

The Muslims armies continued waging jihād in this area until the people of Cyprus threw in the towel and requested reconciliation. In the era of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, they made a permanent agreement with him with few conditions.¹

لما قتل عثمان لم يكن للناس غازية تغزوا حتى كان عامة الجماعة فأغزا معاوية أرض الروم ست عشرة غزوة تذهب سرية في الصيف ويشتر بأرض الروم ثم تغفل و تعقبها أخرى

After the assassination of 'Uthmān, the people did not wage jihād until the year of unity. In that year, Mu'āwiyah began sending army after army to the land of the Romans. 16 campaigns were launched. A detachment would advance in the summer and stay till the winter in the Roman land. Thereafter, they would return and another detachment would advance.²

The year of unity is the year when reconciliation was reached by Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Thereafter, numerous battles were fought. Conquests were made on land and at sea, and at their hands, the banners of Islam were raised at the furthest parts of the world and their endeavours paved the way for the dominance of the religion of Islam. 'Allāmah al-Dhahabī has spoken of this in the book *Duwal al-Islām*. Have a look at it hereunder.

Expertise in management and administration came naturally to Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Under his governance was a large and vast Islamic kingdom. 'Allāmah al-Dhahabī writes:

1 *Futūh al-Buldān*, pg. 160 – 161, the issue of Cyprus.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 133, biography of Mu'āwiyah.

صار ملك الدنيا تحت حكمه من حدود بخارا إلى القيروان من المغرب و من أقصى اليمن إلى حدود قسطنطينية وإقليم الحجاز و اليمن و الشام و مصر و المغرب و العراق و الجزيرة و آرمينية و الروم و فارس و الخراسان و الجبال و ما وراء النهر

The kingdom of the world ended up under his authority from the borders of Bukhārā to al-Qayrawān in the West, and from the limits of Yemen to the borders of Constantinople, including the Hījāz region, Yemen, Shām, Egypt, Morocco, Iraq, Jazīrah, Armenia, the Roman Empire, Persia, Khorasan, the mountainous regions, and the land beyond the [Oxus] river (Transoxiana).¹

Marking the Borders of the Ḥaram

During the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, some of the markings and signs of the Ḥaram of Makkah began to fade away.

أسلم كرز يوم فتح مكة و كان قد عمر عمرا طويلا و كان بعض أعلام الحرم قد عمي على الناس فكتب مروان بن الحكم إلى معاوية بذلك فكتب إليه إن كان كرز بن علقمة حيا فمره فليوقفكم عليه ففعل فهو الذي وضع معالم الحرم في زمن معاوية و هو على ذلك إلى الساعة

Kurz accepted Islam on the Day of the Conquest of Makkah. He was given a prolonged life. Some of the signs of the Ḥaram were unknown to the people so Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam wrote to Mu‘āwiyah concerning this. Mu‘āwiyah replied, “If Kurz ibn ‘Alqamah is alive, then command him and he will inform you of the signs.”

This was done. Thus, he is the one who placed the markings of the Ḥaram during the reign of Mu‘āwiyah and these are the very same signs up to this day.²

1 *Kitāb Duwal al-Islam*, vol. 1 pg. 28, the year 60 A.H., Dā’irat al-Ma’ārif print, Dakkan.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 13 pg. 35 – 36, list of those who died or were killed in 80 A.H.; *al-Isābah* with *al-Istī‘āb*, pg. 275, biography of Kurz ibn ‘Alqamah ibn Hilāl; *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 5 pg. 338, biography of Kurz ibn ‘Alqamah ibn Hilāl, Leiden print.

Outstanding character, excellent behaviour, Allah consciousness, and fear for the Hereafter

- Well-wishing for the masses

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was a man of high morals and his conduct towards his populace is worthy of appreciation. In light of the declaration of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ for the fulfilment of the populace’s needs, he appointed a man to whom the masses may present their needs to. As soon as ‘Umar ibn Murrah narrated the ḥadīth of this subject to him, he practiced immediately.

عن عمر بن مرة أنه قال لمعاوية سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول من ولاه الله شيئا من أمر المسلمين فاحتجب دون حاجتهم و خلتهم و فقرهم احتجب الله دون حاجته و خلته و فقره فجعل معاوية رجلا على حوائج الناس رواه أبو داؤد و الترمذي

‘Umar ibn Murrah reports that he said to Mu‘āwiyah:

I heard Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ warning, “Whoever Allah gives authority to over the affairs of the Muslims and he secludes himself from their needs and leaves them to suffer in poverty, Allah will not fulfil his needs and will leave him to suffer in his poverty.”

Hearing this, Mu‘āwiyah appointed a person to see to the needs of people.

Abū Dāwūd and al-Tirmidhī documented it.¹

فلما دخل أبو مریم (الأزدي الصحابي) عليه (معاوية بن أبي سفيان) قال معاوية ههنا ههنا يا أبا مریم فقال أبو مریم إني لم أجتك طالب حاجة و لكني سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول من أغلق بابة دون ذوى الفقر و الحاجة أغلق الله عن فقره و حاجته باب السماء قال فأكب معاوية يبكي ثم قال رد حديثك يا أبا مریم فرده فقال معاوية ادعوا لي سعدا كان حاجبه فدعي فقال يا أبا مریم حدثه أنت كما سمعت فحدثه أبو مریم فقال معاوية لسعد اللهم إني أخلع هذا من عنقي و أجعله في عنقك من جاء يستأذن له يقضي الله له على لساني ما قضى

1 *Mishkāt*, pg. 324, second section, chapter on the lenience binding upon the authorities; *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, vol. 2 pg. 53, book on kharāj.

When Abū Maryam (al-Azdī al-Ṣaḥābī) entered his (Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān) presence, Mu‘āwiyah said, “Come here O Abū Maryam.”

Abū Maryam explained, “I have not come to you seeking the fulfilment of a need. However, I heard Rasūlullāh ﷺ saying, ‘Whoever closes his door on the poor and needy, Allah closes the door of the heaven on his poverty and need.’”

Hearing this, Mu‘āwiyah bent over and cried. He then said, “Repeat your ḥadīth, O Abū Maryam.” He thus repeated it. Mu‘āwiyah then told the people to summon Sa‘d, his doorkeeper. He was called.

Mu‘āwiyah said, “O Abū Maryam, you relate to him as you heard.” Abū Maryam narrated to him.

Mu‘āwiyah then said to Sa‘d, “O Allah (bear witness)! [Addressing Sa‘d] I have removed this from my neck and placed it on yours. Whoever comes seeking permission to enter, let him in. Allah will decide on my tongue for him what He desires.”¹

- Like the above incidents, the incident highlighting Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷺ fear for Allah and concern for the Hereafter is documented in *Jāmi‘ al-Tirmidhī*, vol. 2 pg. 61, Muḥtabā’ī print, Delhi, the chapters of asceticism, chapter on the reports on show and ostentation, on the strength of Shufayyā Aṣḥabī.
- The incident of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷺ humbleness and humility and attentiveness in following the Sunnah took place with Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr ﷺ and Ibn Ṣafwān. It appears in *Jāmi‘ al-Tirmidhī*, vol. 2 pg. 100, Muḥtabā’ī print, Delhi, the chapters on etiquette, chapter on the report on the unacceptability of a man standing for another.

1 *Kitāb al-Kunā*, vol. 1 pg. 54, Abū Maryam al-Azdī.

- Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷺ worry over deficiency and alteration of the declaration of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and warning the people of Madīnah of this appears in *Jāmi‘ al-Tirmidhī*, vol. 2 pg. 102, Delhi print, the chapters on etiquette, the chapter on the report of the reprehensibility of concocting an incident.

These were indications to incidents of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ for the sake of brevity. The scholars and researchers may refer to the books for satisfaction. These are narrations of aḥādīth. They are not any type of historical reports.

‘Allāmah Ibn Taymiyyah’s View on the Biography and Behaviour of Amīr Mu‘āwiyah

‘Allāmah Ibn Taymiyyah writes:

و كانت سيرة معاوية مع رعيته من خيار سير الولاة و كانت رعيته يحبونه و قد ثبت في الصحيحين عن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم أنه قال خيار أئمتكم الذين تحبونهم و يحبونكم و تصلون عليهم و يصلون عليكم

Mu‘āwiyah’s behaviour with his subordinates is one of the most exemplary behaviours of governors. His populace loved him. It is established in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* from the Nabī ﷺ that he stated, “The best of our leaders are those whom you love and they love you, you pray for them and they pray for you.”¹

A Department to Check on the Masses’ Needs

Ibn Taymiyyah documents in *Minhāj al-Sunnah*:

قال البغوي حدثنا سويد بن سعيد حدثنا همام بن إسماعيل عن أبي قيس قال كان معاوية قد جعل في كل قبيل رجلا و كان رجل منا يكنى أبا يحيى يصبح كل يوم فيدور على المجالس هل ولد فيكم الليلة ولد هل حدث الليلة حادث هل نزل اليوم بكم نازل قال فيقولون نعم نزل رجل من أهل اليمن بعياله يسمونه و عياله فإذا فرغ من القبيل كله أتى الديوان فأوقع أسماءهم في الديوان

¹ *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 189, answers to ‘Uthmānī allegations.

Al-Baghawī says—Suwayd ibn Saʿīd narrated to us—Humām ibn Ismāʿīl narrated to us—from Abū Qays who reports:

Muʿāwiyah had appointed a man in every village. The man among us had the agnomen Abū Yaḥyā. Every morning, he would attend all the gathering and enquire, “Was a child born to any of you last night? Has any calamity struck last night? Has anyone settled in your town last night?”

They would reply, “Yes, one of the residents of Yemen settled here with his family,” and would mention his name and the names of his family members. When he completed his rounds of the whole village, he would go to the register and enter their names into the register.¹

The register had the names of all inhabitants. Arrangements for the fulfilment of their needs was made by the state.

The idea here is that there was a special department to check on the situation of the populace and find out their needs. In this manner, the needs of the masses could be fulfilled in every possible way.

The above incidents highlight Sayyidunā Muʿāwiyah’s ﷺ lifestyle and superb social conduct. In the face of these declarations of the senior scholars of the ummah, to spread the propaganda that his habits and style was like the habits and style of Qayṣar and Kisrā and his practical life was spent in this fashion, is total injustice and in polarity with reality. This is only propaganda to spread hatred for him among people. This picture is painted with reliance on unworthy and unreliable historical reports.

Saʿd’s Testimony of Justice and Equality

Sayyidunā Muʿāwiyah ﷺ was a fair-natured and impartial person. He fulfilled the rights of people in the best possible way.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 185; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 134, biography of Muʿāwiyah.

قال الليث بن سعد حدثنا بكير عن بشر بن سعيد أن سعد بن أبي وقاص قال ما رأيت أحدا بعد عثمان أفضى بحق من صاحب هذا الباب يعني معاوية

Layth ibn Sa'd says—Bukayr narrated to us—from Bishr ibn Sa'īd that—Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ confirmed: “I have not seen anyone after ‘Uthmān more fulfilling of rights than the owner of this door;” referring to Mu‘āwiyah.¹

Sayyidunā Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ رضي الله عنه is among the elite Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم who avoided the Battles of Jamal and Ṣiffīn and did not support any of the two parties. He remained neutral in these disagreements.²

Such a lofty and neutral personality speaks glowingly of the just behaviour of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and declares that he has a high rank in dealing with equality and fulfilling rights after Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.

This testimony is extremely weighty. The reports depicting the behaviour of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه in a negative way have no weight at all.

Al-A‘mash’s Testimony

Likewise, the upcoming testimony of al-A‘mash (Sulaymān ibn Mahrān: a reliable Ṭābiṭ and a muḥaddith of note) is very weighty.

The intellectuals should be aware that the era of al-A‘mash and his contemporaries was very close to the era of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. The testimony of people of that close era have precedence in every way over and are more trustworthy than the historical reports of later generations. The historical reports portraying Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه as an oppressor and tyrannical ruler will be disregarded and will be labelled fallacious and inaccurate.

حدثنا محمد بن جواس حدثنا أبو هريرة المكنب قال كنا عند الأعمش فذكروا عمر بن عبد العزيز و عدله فقال الأعمش فكيف لو أدركتم معاوية قالوا في حلمه قال لا والله بل في عدله

1 *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 2 pg. 321, mention of Mu‘āwiyah; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 133, biography of Mu‘āwiyah, first edition, Egypt.

2 *Duwal al-Islām*, vol. 1 pg. 15, the khilāfah of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.

Muḥammad ibn Jawās narrated to us—Abū Hurayrah al-Mukattib narrated to us saying:

We were in the company of al-A‘mash when they began speaking highly of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz and his justice. Hearing this, al-A‘mash remarked, “What would your praise be had you met Mu‘āwiyah!”

They asked, “In his tolerance?”

“No, by Allah, in his justice,” he replied.¹

Al-A‘mash intended to highlight that the justice and equality of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was far superior to that of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Words of Guidance in right of Amīr Mu‘āwiyah and the Issue of Speaking the Truth in his Presence

Some luminaries would counsel and admonish Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who would appreciate it and accept it happily.

1.

أخبرني العتبي قال دخل أبو أمامة الباهلي على معاوية فقال يا أمير المؤمنين أنت رأس عيوننا فإن صفوت
لم يضرنا كدر العيون وإن كدرت لم ينفعننا صفونا و اعلم أنه لا يقوم فسطاط إلا بعمد

Al-‘Utbā informed me saying:

Abū Umāmah al-Bāhilī entered the presence of Mu‘āwiyah and said, “O Amīr al-Mu‘minīn, you are the source of our springs. If you are pure, the dirt of the springs will not negatively affect us, but if you are dirty, our cleanliness will not benefit us. Realise that a tent only stands with the support of a pillar.²

1 *Mīnhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 185; *al-Muntaqā*, pg. 388, Egypt print.

2 *Kitāb al-Mujtabā* of Imām of literature and language Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Durayd al-Azdī al-Baṣrī d. 321 A.H. in Baghdād, pg. 39, discussion on Mu‘āwiyah, Dā‘irat al-Ma‘ārif print, Dakkan.

2. People would openly speak the truth in the face of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and he would pay attention to it with delight. Speaking the truth was not absent in his era. Another quotation from this book of Ibn Durayd is presented for the perusal of the readers:

أخبرنا محمد قال أخبرنا معاذ عن دماذ قال أخبرني أبو عبيدة قال إن كان الرجل ليقول لمعاوية والله لتستقيم يا معاوية أو لنقومنك فيقول بماذا فيقول بالخشب فيقول إذا نستقيم

Muḥammad informed us saying—Mu‘ādh informed us—from Dimādh who said—Abū ‘Ubaydah informed me saying:

A person would address Mu‘āwiyah saying, “By Allah, you will most certainly straighten up, O Mu‘āwiyah, or we will straighten you up!”

“With what,” he would ask.

“With the rod,” came the reply.

Hearing this, Mu‘āwiyah would comment, “Then we will become upright.”¹

There is a famous incident in the reign of Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ similar to this one. Someone said to him, “If you do not straighten up, we will straighten you with swords.” In a similarly manner, people would speak the truth openly to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and observe their right of speaking the truth. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not prevent them from this. This teaches us that:

The claim of the critics of this era that locks were on the mouths of the people is incorrect. The reports in substantiation of their claim are worthless and unreliable. To gather such valueless material from history on every upright individual is not difficult at all. May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَرَعَالَهُ the Benevolent allow us to practice on:

1 *Kitāb al-Mujtabā*, pg. 41, Hyderabad Dakkan print, discussion on Mu‘āwiyah; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’*, vol. 3 pg. 102, biography of Mu‘āwiyah; *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 3 pg. 322, under Mu‘āwiyah.

Take what is clear and positive and avoid what is imprecise and negative.

The Islamic Treasury in the Era of Amīr Mu‘āwiyah

During the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, what was the mindset regarding the Bayt al-Māl and how were the recipients of this wealth determined? What importance did the Bayt al-Māl hold in the sight of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه? This aspect needs much elucidation. However, considering brevity, a few quotations will be documented regarding it after which the points deduced from them will be listed.

1. In one Jumu‘ah lecture, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه said, “The wealth of the treasury is ours and the wealth of fay’ is ours. We can prevent it from anyone we like.” No one answered him after he made this statement. He made the same statement in the second Jumu‘ah but no one countered him. But when he made the same statement on the third Jumu‘ah, someone countered. The narration continues:

فقام إليه رجل فقال كلا إنما المال مالنا والفيء فينا فمن حال بيننا وبينه حاكمناه إلى الله تعالى بأسيا فنا
فمضى في خطبته ثم لما وصل منزله أرسل للرجل فقالوا هلك ثم دخلوا فوجدوه جالسا معه على سريره
فقال لهم إن هذا أحيانى أحياء الله سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول سيكون من بعدي أمراء
يقولون فلا يرد عليهم يتقحمون في النار... وإني تكلمت أول جمعة فلم يرد علي أحد فخشيت أن أكون
منهم ثم في الجمعة الثانية فلم يرد علي أحد فقلت إني منهم ثم تكلمت في الجمعة الثالثة فقام هذا الرجل
فرد علي فأحيانى أحياء الله تعالى

A man stood up to him and said, “Never! The wealth is ours and the fay’ belongs to us. Whoever acts as a barrier between us and it, we will bring him to trial in the court of Allah سبحانه وتعالى with our swords.” Mu‘āwiyah continued his khuṭbah. After reaching his residence, he summoned the man. People remarked, “He is destroyed (he will be punished),” But when they entered his presence, they found him sitting with Mu‘āwiyah on the latter’s seat of honour.

Mu'āwiyah said to them, “Certainly, this man has given me life, may Allah ﷻ grant him life. I heard Rasūlullāh ﷺ saying, ‘Soon there will be leaders after me, who will not be corrected when they speak. They will plunge into Hell.’ I made a statement the first Jumu‘ah and no one countered me, so I feared that I am among them. Then in the second Jumu‘ah, no one corrected me so I said that I am from them. Thereafter when I made the statement in the third Jumu‘ah, this man stood up and countered me. He gave me life (i.e. I was saved from the aforementioned warning), may Allah ﷻ grant him life.”¹

Ibn Ḥajar al-Makkī comments after this incident that this is a grand virtue in which Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ appears solitary, for this reason that this type of incident is not reported from anyone else.

Realise with conviction that Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was eager to practice upon the statements of Rasūlullāh ﷺ to the best of his ability.

He always had apprehensions of his position that no transgressing of the limits or slight oppression should not be committed by him. Allah ﷻ protected him in this regard. May Allah ﷻ be pleased with him.

2. It is documented in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* with a chain:

عن عطية بن قيس قال سمعت معاوية بن أبي سفيان يخطبنا إن في بيت مالكم فضلا بعد عطياتكم وإني قاسمه بينكم فإن كان يأتينا فضل عاما قابلا قسمناه عليكم وإلا فلا عتبة علي فإنه ليس بمالي وإنما هو مال الله الذي أفاءكم عليكم

‘Aṭiyyah ibn Qays relates that he heard Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān addressing them in a khuṭbah:

Indeed, in your treasury there is extra funds after your stipends which I will distribute among you. If next year, surplus funds come our way, we will

1 *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 2 pg. 322, under Mu'āwiyah; *Taḥīr al-Jinān wa l-Lisān* with *al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah*, pg. 27, Egypt print, second edition.

divide it among you, otherwise there is no blame upon me. Certainly, it is not my wealth. Rather, it is Allah's wealth which He has returned to you.¹

3. Ibn Kathīr relates on the strength of Ibn Sa'd via a chain:

عن محمد بن الحكم أن معاوية لما احتضر أوصى بنصف ماله أن يرد إلى بيت المال

Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥakam narrates that when Mu'āwiyah was close to passing away, he bequeathed that half his wealth be placed in the Bayt al-Māl.²

The above statements of senior scholars have established that:

- The issue of speaking the truth in religious matters in the era of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه was not discarded. People would openly speak the truth to him and he would accept it.
- Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه did not act contrary to Islamic dictates in respect of the Muslim Public Treasury. Instead, he regarded that wealth as the wealth of Allah سبحانه وتعالى and the Muslims and he would distribute it and utilise it according to Islamic laws.
- He bequeathed half of his wealth and assets to be placed in the Bayt al-Māl during his final days so that any deficiency in regard to the treasury would be redressed. This is a sign of complete caution.

This clarifies that all the objections levelled by people against Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه with regards to the Public Treasury are incorrect.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 185, the seventh reason, discussion on the virtues of Mu'āwiyah; *al-Muntaqā*, pg. 388, under praise of the A'immah for Mu'āwiyah, his judgements, and biography; *Sīyar A'lām al-Nubalā'*, vol. 3 pg. 100, biography of Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 141, under Amīr Mu'āwiyah.

The critics collected useless material from history and opened a case regarding the public treasury. May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى allow them to do good and guide them, and protect them from tribalism and family prejudice. May he safeguard them from harbouring evil thoughts about the esteemed Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and grant them the ability to entertain good thoughts of them which we have been taught and instructed by the religion of Islam.

Exemplary Personality and Excellent Social Dealings

Ibn Kathīr speaks about the situation during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in the following text:

و أجمعت الرعايا على بيعته في سنة إحدى وأربعين كما قدمنا فلم يزل مستقلا بالأمر في هذه المدة إلى هذه السنة سنة ٦٠ هـ التي كانت فيها وفاته و الجهاد في بلاد العدو قائم و كلمة الله عالية و الغنائم ترد إليه من أطراف الأرض و المسلمون معه في راحة و عدل و صفح و عفو

The entire populace were unanimous in pledging allegiance to him in the year 41 A.H. as we have explained earlier. He remained the sole khalīfah during this time until the year 60 A.H. which witnessed his demise. Jihād in the land of the enemy continued, the word of Allah reigned supreme, and booty poured in from the corners of the earth. The Muslims lived in comfort, justice, forgiveness, and pardon.¹

In the year 41 A.H. Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا reached a compromise as regards the khilāfah.

He writes after a few pages in favour of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

إنه كان جيد السيرة حسن التجاوز جميل العفو كثير الستر رحمة الله عليه

He had excellent character, overlooked graciously, pardoned beautifully, and concealed much (errors). May Allah’s mercy be upon him.²

1 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 119, the year 60 A.H., mention of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 126, mention of Mu‘āwiyah.

‘Allāmah al-Dhahabī writes:

و فضائل معاوية في حسن السيرة و العدل و الإحسان كثيرة

The excellences of Mu‘āwiyah in graceful conduct, equality, and kindness are plenty.¹

In light of the above, it is evident that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷺ khilāfah was based on equality and truthfulness and a replica of fairness and impartiality. Islamic rules were prevalent, owing to which the masses were at ease. The courts established by Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ adhered fully to Islamic regulations and issues were absolved according to Islamic set of laws. The propaganda of bringing an end to Islamic policies in the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ levelled by the critics is prepared from worthless historical reports and are in contrary to reality and oppose the emphatic declaration of the distinguished scholars of the ummah. This is due to the fact that eminent scholars like Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah and others have clarified this matter par excellence that Shar‘ī procedures and Islamic systems were not abolished during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ; rather justice prevailed and the populace were treated with kindness and benevolence.

Now, those topics will be tackled which highlight the proximity and relationship enjoyed by Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s family and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷺ family.

Amīr Mu‘āwiyah and his Partisans in the Sight of ‘Alī and his Family

It was mentioned earlier that due to the machination of the evil and mischievous elements of that era, the capital of Islam was attacked and the third khalīfah was assassinated under a conspiracy. Thereafter, the Muslims split into two groups. At the same time, the evil elements split and remained among both groups to fan the created disagreement. They spread misunderstandings regarding each other. They broadcasted a variety of suspicions in the matters disputed over and

1 *Al-Muntaqā*, pg. 388, Egypt print.

created grimness in the matter which finally led to wars and life-threatening events like Jamal and Şiffin.

Here, the idea is not to list the causes and reasons for these events and discuss the details of the battles and their outcomes. Our objective here is to ascertain what views these personalities held regarding each other despite the serious disputes that arose between them. What ruling did they apply to each other? How did they view each other? Were their hearts filled with hatred and animosity for one another? Did they view each other as perpetual enemies? Notwithstanding the passing of centuries since those unfortunate events, some people till this very day continue to pass nasty remarks and use expletives against Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. In fact, they accuse him of being a disbeliever, hypocrite, and transgressor and they deem harbouring suspicion about him and spreading evil about him their religious duty.

Whereas the personalities between whom there existed temporary dispute, discontinued the dispute and reached a compromise¹, and all disagreements were totally discarded after the year of unity.

To elucidate on the above heading, some aspects will be related at this juncture which will clarify the views held by Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and his progeny about Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and his partisans. To reach this objective, the

1 A compromise was reached by Sayyidunā 'Alī al-Murtaḍā and Sayyidunā Amīr Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in the year 40 A.H. A small quotation is reproduced hereunder for the satisfaction of the scholarly fraternity:

و في هذه السنة (سنة ٤٠ هـ) جرت بين علي و معاوية المهادنة بعد مكاتبات يطول ذكرها على وضع الحرب بينهما و أن يكون ملك العراق لعلي و معاوية الشام و لا يدخل أحدهما على صاحبه في عمله بجيش و لا غارة و لا غزوة ... و أمسك كل واحد منها عن قتال الآخر و بعث الجيوش إلى بلاده و استقر الأمر على ذلك

In this year (40 A.H.), an agreement was reached between 'Alī and Mu'āwiyah after much correspondences, mention of which will be a lengthy matter, to terminate war between them and that the country of Iraq will be for 'Alī and the Shām region for Mu'āwiyah. Moreover, none of the two will interfere in the affairs of the other, neither with an army, nor attack, nor battle. Each of them refrained from fighting the other. He sent the armies to his land and the decision was endorsed. (*Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 6 pg. 81, the year 40 A.H.; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 322, with reference to Ibn Jarīr, the year 40 A.H.)

statements and incidents of Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and his family will be presented in sequence. Ponder over them deeply.

Amīr Mu‘āwiyah and his Supporters were all Believers and their Deceased were washed, shrouded, buried, and prayed over

1. عن سعد بن إبراهيم قال خرج علي بن أبي طالب ذات يوم و معه عدي بن حاتم الطائي فإذا رجل من طيء قتل قد قتله أصحاب علي فقال عدي يا ويح هذا كان أمس مسلما و اليوم كافرا فقال علي مهلا كان أمس مؤمنا و هو اليوم مؤمن

Sa‘d ibn Ibrāhīm reports:

‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib left one day accompanied by ‘Adī ibn Ḥātim al-Ṭā‘ī. They came across a slain man from Ṭay’ who had been killed by ‘Alī’s supporters. ‘Adī commented, “How unfortunate! He was a Muslim yesterday and today he is a disbeliever.”

‘Alī countered, “Wait (do not pass judgement so quickly)! Yesterday he was a believer and today he is also a believer.”¹ (I.e. he has not lost his īmān on account of opposing us. Instead, he is still a believer.)

2. محمد بن راشد عن مكحول أن أصحاب علي سألوه عن من قتلوا من أصحاب معاوية قال هم المؤمنون و في رواية عن من قتل بصفين ما هم قال هم المؤمنون

Muḥammad ibn Rāshid reports—from Makḥūl who relates:

The supporters of ‘Alī asked him concerning those partisans of Mu‘āwiyah who have been killed. He replied, “They are believers.”

Another narration says: They asked him concerning those killed at Ṣiffīn, what are they? He replied, “They are believers.”²

1 *Tārīkh Ibn ‘Asākīr Kāmil*, vol. 1 pg. 330, Damascus print; *Talkhīṣ Ibn ‘Asākīr* of Ibn Badrān ‘Abd al-Qādir ibn Aḥmad, commonly known as Ibn Badrān al-Dimashqī, vol. 1 pg. 73, chapter on the reported statements of the impartial regarding those people of Shām who were killed at Ṣiffīn.

2 *Tārīkh Ibn ‘Asākīr Kāmil*, vol. 1 pg. 330, Damascus print; *Talkhīṣ Ibn ‘Asākīr*, vol. 1 pg. 73, same chapter as above, first edition; *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 61; *al-Muntaqā*, pg. 335, Egypt print.

3. قال عقبة بن علقمة اليشكري شهدت مع علي يوم صفين فأتني بخمسة عشر أسيرا من أصحاب معاوية فكان من مات منهم غسله و كفنه و صلى عليه

‘Uqbah ibn ‘Alqamah al-Yashkurī reports:

I was present by the side of ‘Alī on the Day of Şifḫin. 15 captives from the supporters of Mu‘āwiyah were brought to him. Whoever of them passed away, ‘Alī would wash him, enshroud him, and pray Şalāt al-Janāzah over him.¹

The declarations of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه make it distinctively clear that those who fought against Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, for whatever reason, are believers. Their washing, shrouding, burial, and Şalāt al-Janāzah were all correct and carried out by Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Not regarding them as believers is disobedience to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and contrary to his way.

The Ruling of the Martyrs of Şifḫin in the light of ‘Alī’s Declaration: They are all Inhabitants of Jannah

The Battle of Şifḫin between the armies of Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه occurred in Şafar 37 A.H. The anarchists were thus successful in their despicable purpose (disunity and discord).

Both luminaries, on the basis of their ijtiḫād, fought but did not transgress Shar‘ī limits in fighting. For example, they never wanted to kill those who avoided fighting, they did not kill the captives, they did not lift the ḫijāb of any woman, they did not loot the wealth of any person, they gave peace to those who placed down their weapons, they did not remove the weapons and clothes from the killed, they did not enslave any Muslim male or female, they did not consider each other’s wealth as booty, etc.

1 *Talkḫiṣ Ibn ‘Asākīr*, vol. 1 pg. 74, chapter on the reported statements of the impartial regarding those people of Shām who were killed at Şifḫin, first edition.

Study the following references for these rulings:

- *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*, vol. 4 pg. 1018, chapter on Jamal, (Qilmī) Pīr Jhandā Sindh
- *Fath al-Qadīr Sharḥ al-Hidāyah*, vol. 4 pg. 412, chapter on rebels, Egypt print.
- *Naṣb al-Rāyah*, vol. 3 pg. 463, chapter on rebels.
- *Al-Akḥbār al-Ṭiwāl*, pg. 151, the incident of Jamal, Egypt print.

From this we learn the nature of this skirmish.

Now, let us learn about the judgement from Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه with regards the final outcome of the slain:

سئل علي عن قتال يوم الصفين فقال قتلانا و قتلهم في الجنة و سيصير الأمر إلي و إلى معاوية

‘Alī was questioned regarding the killing of the Day of Ṣiffīn. He said, “Our slain and their slain will be in Jannah. The matter will return to me and Mu‘āwiyah.”¹

The Rank of the Participants of Jamal and Ṣiffīn in light of ‘Alī’s Declaration

Under this heading, we like to mention that those whom Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه fought against (e.g. those who participated in the Battle of Jamal and Ṣiffīn), what viewpoint did Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه express with regards to them and what position did he hold them in. Listen to it from the mouth of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه:

1 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*, vol. 4 pg. 1036, chapter on the reports on Ṣiffīn, (Qilmī) Pīr Jhandā Sindh; *Majma’ al-Zawā’id*, vol. 9 pg. 357, with reference to al-Ṭabarānī, chapter on the reports concerning Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān; *Kanz al-Ummāl*, vol. 6 pg. 87, the incident of al-Ṣiffīn, first edition; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’*, vol. 3 pg. 95, biography of Mu‘āwiyah.

سئل علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه وهو القدوة عن قتال أهل البغي من أهل الجمل والصفين أمشركون هم قال لا من الشرك فروا فقليل أمنافقون قال لا لأن المنافقون لا يذكرون الله إلا قليلا قيل له فما حالهم قال إخواننا بغوا علينا

‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام was asked, and he is the exemplar, regarding fighting the rebels from the participants of Jamal and Ṣiffīn:

“Are they mushrikīn?”

“No,” he replied, “They ran away from shirk.”

He was asked, “Are they hypocrites?”

He said, “No, since the hypocrites do not remember Allah except a little.”

He was asked, “What is their situation?”

He replied, “They are our brothers who have opposed us.”¹

Note: For the information of the scholars. This statement of Sayyidunā ‘Alī عليه السلام has been documented by numerous scholars in their respective books. Keeping conciseness in mind, it is recorded in Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt in the books on tafsīr, regarding Jamal and Ṣiffīn in ḥadīth compilations, it is quoted in the discussion on rebels by the Fuqahā’, and in related discussions in books of history. To the extent that senior Shī’ah have reported it from Ja’far al-Ṣādiq via their isnād.

جعفر عن أبيه أن عليا عليه السلام لم يكن ينسب أحدا من أهل حربه إلى الشرك و لا إلى النفاق و لكن يقول هم إخواننا بغوا علينا

Ja’far reports—from his father that ‘Alī عليه السلام would not attribute anyone who fought him to shirk nor to hypocrisy. Rather he would suggest, “They are our brothers who opposed us.”²

1 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*, vol. 4 pg. 1013, chapter on Jamal, Qilmī from the library Pīr Jhandā Sindh; *al-Sunan al-Kubrā* of al-Bayhaqī, vol. 8 pg. 173, book on fighting the rebels, Dakkan print; *al-Jāmi’ li Aḥkām al-Qur’ān (Tafsīr al-Qurṭubi)*, vol. 16 pg. 324, under the verse: create unity between your brothers, Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt, 26 Juz.

2 ‘Abd Allah ibn Ja’far al-Ḥimyarī al-Shī’ī from the scholars of the third generation: *Qurb al-Isnād*, pg. 45, old print, Iran.

Elucidation on the meaning of *Baghy* on the Tongue of ‘Alī

This viewpoint which Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه expressed regarding the participants of Jamal and Şiffīn: “They are our brothers who have opposed us;” people have spoken much on its explanation. However, if its commentary is brought to light from other statements of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, it would be appropriate and there would be no need to delve into lengthy arguments. On the occasion of Jamal and Şiffīn, some supporters of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه went to extremes and began labelling his opposition as disbelievers. Hearing this, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه clarified the matter.

Ibn ‘Asākir documents the report via his chain with the following words:

نا أبو زرعة عن جعفر بن محمد عن أبيه قال سمع علي يوم الجمل أو صفين رجلا يغلو في القول يقول الكفر قال لا تقولوا فإنهم زعموا أنا بغينا عليهم و زعمنا أنهم بغوا علينا

Abū Zur‘ah narrated to us—from Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad—from his father who said:

‘Alī heard on the Day of Jamal or Şiffīn a man exceeding the proper bounds by attributing *kufr* (to the opposition). ‘Alī said, “Do not say such for indeed they believe that we have opposed them and we believe they have opposed us. (This led to war.)”¹

Ibn Taymiyyah al-Ḥarrānī has quoted this narration from *Musnad Işhāq ibn Rāhawyah* via an isnād in the following words:

سفيان عن جعفر بن محمد عن أبيه قال سمع علي يوم الجمل و يوم الصفين رجلا يغلو في القول فقال لا تقولوا إلا خيرا إنما هم قوم زعموا أنا بغينا عليهم و زعمنا أنهم بغوا علينا فقاتلناهم

Sufyān—from Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad—from his father who said:

1 *Tārīkh Ibn ‘Asākir Kāmil*, vol. 1 pg. 329, Damascus print, 1371 A.H. 1951 edition; *Tahdhīb Ibn ‘Asākir*, vol. 1 pg. 73, chapter on the reported statements of the impartial regarding those people of Shām who were killed at Şiffīn.

‘Alī, on the Day of Jamal and the Day of Şiffin, heard a person exceeding the bounds in speech upon which he commanded, “Do not utter except goodness. They are only a nation who believe that we have opposed them and we believe they have opposed us, so we fought them.”¹

We will now corroborate and confirm this meaning from the reports of senior shī’ah from books considered reliable by them, so that both Sunnī and Shī’ah have the opportunity to reflect and ponder over this matter.

جعفر عن أبيه أن عليا عليه السلام كان يقول لأهل حربه إنا لم نقاتلهم على التكفير لهم و لم نقاتلهم على التكفير لنا و لكننا رأينا أننا على حق و رأوا أنهم على حق

Ja’far reports—from his father that ‘Alī عليه السلام would say about his opposition in war:

We do not fight them labelling them disbelievers and we do not fight them for them labelling us disbelievers. Rather, we believe with conviction that we are upon the truth and they are certain that they are upon the truth.²

The summary is that in light of the statements of Sayyidunā ‘Alī عليه السلام, the issue has been clarified that “our brothers” means “our brothers in faith” and the linguistic meaning of *baghy* is meant i.e. transgressing the limits, to demand, etc. The *iṣṭilāḥī baghāwah* (rebellion) is not meant. The aforementioned narrations serve as evidences.

The *iṣṭilāḥī* (technical) meaning of *baghāwah* is for someone to oppose a true khilāfah on the basis of his own view or interpretation. Sayyidunā ‘Alī عليه السلام was not a rebel to any khalīfah, yet he says that they believe that we have committed *baghāwah* against them. From this we learn that the *iṣṭilāḥī* or shar’ī meaning of *baghāwah* is not meant. Rather, the linguistic meaning is referred to.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 61, under the heading: the predecessors have stated that Allah commanded to beg Allah to forgive the ummah of Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم and the Rāfiḍah swore them; *al-Muntaqā*, pg. 335, Egypt print, 1374 A.H. edition.

2 *Qurb al-Isnād*, pg. 45, with other articles, Iran print, old edition.

Summary

Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not regard Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as a mushrik (polytheist), nor labelled him a hypocrite, disbeliever or a transgressor. Rather:

- Each sect was convinced that the other was their religions brethren, but believed that they committed injustice against them. (Nothing more.)
- Each party regarded themselves to be upon truth and the other upon falsehood and error. Fighting broke out upon this viewpoint. This is labelled an ijtihādī error.
- Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (despite the volatile situation) openly announced and commanded that nothing should be uttered besides good about their opposition.

لا تقولوا إلا خيرا

Do not speak anything except good (about them).

This has been mentioned above.

This issue has been correctly encapsulated in a poem by the famous deceased poet Ḥālī in his book *Musaddis Ḥālī*. Two of his couplets will be quoted before the respected readers:

تو بالکل مدار اس کا اخلاص پر تھا
خلاف ایشی سے خوش ایندہ تر تھا

اگر اختلاف ان میں باہم دگر تھا
جہگرتے تھے لیکن نہ جہگروں میں شر تھا

If disputes were mutually rife among them,

then its basis was only upon sincerity.

They disputed each other; however, there existed no evil in their disputes.

Their dispute was far better than peace.¹

1 *Musaddis Ḥālī*, pg. 25.

Clarification: Error in the Text of *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*

Now that the discussion on transgression and aggression has come up, it is better to clarify few misconceptions. The texts of some authors at this juncture are ambiguous and may be misunderstood. For example: in *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, in the discussions on Imāmah, seventh objective, the commentator writes while quoting the statements of scholars regarding Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s ﷺ adversaries:

و منهم من ذهب إلى التفسیق كالشیعة و كثير من أصحابنا

Some of them have resorted to labelling them transgressors like the Shī‘ah and many of our people.¹

To answer this, the article of Imām Rabbānī will be presented which will clarify the actual discussion and you may study other scholars’ statements as well.

1. Imām Rabbānī writes in his articles:

وإنچه شارح مواقف گفته که بسیاری از اصحاب ما برآن اند که این مناظعت از روی اجتهاد نبوده مراد از اصحاب کدام گروه را داشته باشد ابل سنت بر خلاف این حاکم اند چنانکه گذشت و کتب القوم مشحونتهء بالخطاء الاجتهادی کہا صرح به الامام الغزالی و القاضی ابو بکر و غیرهما پس تفسیق و تضلیل در حق محاربان حضرت امیر جائز نباشد الخ

This statement made by the commentator of *Mawāqif* that many of our people are of the view that the disagreement between Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ was not on the basis of ijtihād. Which group is meant by this? As mentioned previously, the Ahl al-Sunnah have passed judgement contrary to this and the books of the entire sect are replete with labelling this issue an ijtihādī error. Imām Ghazālī, Qāḍī Abū Bakr, Ibn ‘Arabī, and other scholars have emphatically declared that applying the ruling of transgression and deviation on those who fought against Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ is impermissible.²

1 *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, vol. 8 pg. 374, under seventh objective, Egypt print.

2 *Maktūbāt Imām Rabbānī*, vol. 1 pg. 272 – 273, first register, fourth section, maktūb 251, old edition, Nawl Kashawr Lucknow print, new print Lahore, pg. 67 – 68, fourth, fifth, sixth section, Nūr company, Lahore.

2. If any scholar wishes to study more details on this discussion, then he should read *Kitāb al-Tamhīd* by Abū Shakūr Sālimī, pg. 168, under the seventh view (Lahore print). Abū Shakūr Sālimī has negated transgression from these people with proofs.
3. ‘Allāmah Taftāzānī in *Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid* (seventh discussion) has unequivocally stated regarding the participants of Şiffīn:

وليسوا كفارا ولا فسقة ولا ظلمة لما لهم من التأويل وإن كان باطلا فغاية الأمر أنهم أخطأوا في الاجتهاد
وذلك لا يوجب التمسيق فضلا عن التكفير ولهذا منع علي أصحابه من لعن أهل الشام وقال إخواننا
بغوا علينا إلخ

They were not disbelievers, nor transgressors, nor oppressors for they had an interpretation, although it was inaccurate. The most that may be said is that they erred in *ijtihād*. This does not necessitate *fisq* (transgression) leave alone disbelief. Due to this, ‘Alī prohibited his supporters from cursing the people of Shām and said, “They are our brothers who committed aggression against us.”¹

4. Similarly, Mullā ‘Alī Qārī has written under the heading: discussion on ‘Alī’s *khilāfah* in *Sharḥ Fiqh al-Akbar*:

ثم كان معاوية مخطئا إلى أنه فعل ما فعل عن تأويل فلم يصر به فاسقا

Thereafter, Mu‘āwiyah erred and did what he did through interpretation. Hence, he did not become a transgressor.²

In short, eminent scholars like Mujaddid Alf Thānī, Abū Shakūr Sālimī, Taftāzānī, Mullā ‘Alī Qārī, and others have negated the application of transgression and oppression to the participants of Şiffīn. Therefore, the above statement of the

1 *Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid*, vol. 2 pg. 223, seventh discussion, the adherents of the truth are unanimous, Istanbul print.

2 *Sharḥ Fiqh al-Akbar*, pg. 82, Mujtabā’ī print, Delhi.

commentator of *Mawāqif* is against research and is labelled an error. May Allah ﷻ forgive him.

Some Fuqahā' have used the words *jawr* (oppression) and *jā'ir* (oppressor) for Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. The following text is found in the book of etiquette of a judge, of the third volume of *al-Hidāyah*:

ثم يجوز التقليد من السلطان الجائر كما يجوز من العادل لأن الصحابة رضي الله عنهم تقلدوا من معاوية
و الحق كان بيد علي في نوبته

Then it is permissible to follow an oppressive ruler just as it is permissible to follow a just ruler because the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم followed Mu'āwiyah while the truth was in 'Alī's hand during his time.

While commenting on the above, the following appears in *Fatḥ al-Qadīr*:

هذا تصريح بجور معاوية

This is definite on Mu'āwiyah's oppression.

To clarify this issue, one point is that the wording of *al-Hidāyah*, during his time is sufficient to answer the objection of the opposition, because according to us, during the lifetime of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه, 'Alī's khilāfah was correct and Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah's رضي الله عنه khilāfah was not correct, but rather an ijtihādī error. Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه is a mujtahid in this matter.

المجتهد قد يخطئ و يصيب

A mujtahid errs and is right.

The second point is that immediately after the above words in the commentary *Fatḥ al-Qadīr*, a text appears which dismisses this objection. It is written there:

و المراد في خروجه لا في قضيته ثم إنما يتم إذا ثبت أنه ولي القضاء قبل تسليم الحسن له و أما بعد
تسليمه فلا

The purport is his rebellion not his decision. Then, this will only be complete when it is established that he assumed the post of judge before Ḥasan handed to him (the khilāfah). With regards after handing it over to him, then no.¹

Furthermore, this issue has been resolved by Imām Rabbānī Mujaddid Alf Thānī in the upcoming letter of his. It is sufficient and satisfactory, with the condition of justice. It is quoted hereunder verbatim. Have a look:

إنّجہ عبارات بعضے از فقہا لفظ جور در حق معاویہ واقع شدہ است و گفته کان معاویہ اماما جائرا مراد از جور عدم حقیقت خلافت او در زمان خلافت حضرت امیر خواد بود نہ جوریکہ مالش فسق و ضلالت ست تا باقوال اہل سنت موافق باشد مع ذلک ارباب استقامت از اتیان الفاظ موبومہ خلاف مقصود اجتناب می نمایند و زیادہ بر خطا تجویز نمی کند کیف یکون جائرا و قد صح انہ کان اماما عادلا فی حقوق اللہ و فی حقوق المسلمین کما فی الصواعق

In the texts of some Fuqahā' the word oppression or oppressive ruler have been used for Amīr Mu'āwiyah رضی اللہ عنہ. The meaning of it is that during the khilāfah of 'Alī رضی اللہ عنہ, Amīr Mu'āwiyah's khilāfah was incorrect and improper. The meaning of jawr here is not that the outcome of which is transgression and deviation. Then only will this ruling be in harmony with the views of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Moreover, ambiguous titles of this nature which are contrary to the intended meaning are avoided in usage by the men of *istiqāmah* (maturity of knowledge). More than an ijtihādī error, they do not mention anything. How can Amīr Mu'āwiyah be an oppressor whereas he was a rightful ruler and fair in regards the rights of Allah and the rights of the Muslims as documented in *al-Shawā'iq*.²

Both Sects were unanimous and common in Religious Matters

Both personalities (Sayyidunā 'Alī and Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضی اللہ عنہما) were one in terms of religion and faith. In this aspect, they had no difference. This is an

1 *Faṭḥ al-Qadīr Sharḥ Hidāyah*, vol. 5 pg. 461, with 'Ināyah, book on the etiquette of a judge, Egypt print.

2 *Maktūbāt Imām Rabbānī*, vol. 1 pg. 273, old edition, Nawl Kashawr, Lucknow, maktūb 251, to Moulānā Muḥammad Ashraf, first register, fourth section, Nūr company, Lahore, pg. 68 – 69.

accepted fact according to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah. At the same time, in books regarded reliable by the Shī'ah, this matter is documented in the same manner:

و من كتاب له عليه السلام كتبه إلى أهل الأمصار يقتص فيه ما جرى بينه وبين أهل صفين و كان بدأ أمرنا أنا الثقينا و القوم من أهل الشام و الظاهر أن ربنا واحد و نبينا واحد و دعوتنا في الإسلام واحدة لا نستزيدهم في الإيمان بالله و التصديق برسوله صلى الله عليه و سلم و لا يستزيدوننا و الأمر واحد إلا ما اختلفنا فيه من دم عثمان و نحن منه برآء

Portion of his (‘Alī رضي الله عنه) letter which he wrote to the city dwellers, relating what transpired between him and the participants of Şiffin.

The commencement of our affair is that we and the people from Shām met in battle—whereas it is evident that our Rabb is one, our Messenger is one, and our call in Islam is one. We do not claim that we possess more īmān in Allah and belief in His Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم than them and they do not make this claim over us. Our religious affair is the same. Yes, we have differed with regards the blood of ‘Uthmān while we are innocent of the same.¹

Verbally Abusing Amīr Mu‘āwiyah and his Supporters is Forbidden in conformity with ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā’s Command

Both these sects adhered to the same religion and were one with regards to Islam. There is no difference between them is this regard. They had ijtihādī disagreement in few matters i.e. regarding the killing of ‘Uthmān and the murderers of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. Following this, whenever the issue of cursing and swearing his opponents came to his notice, Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه vehemently prohibited his supporters from this despicable act and forbade them over and over again. Study the evidence of this hereunder.

عن عبد الله بن صفوان قال قال رجل يوم صفين اللهم العن أهل الشام قال فقال علي لا تسب أهل الشام
جما غفيرا فإن بها الأبدال فإن بها الأبدال فإن بها الأبدال

1 *Nahj al-Balāghah*, vol. 2 pg. 114, his letter to the city dwellers, Egypt print, with footnotes of ‘abdash; *al-Durrah al-Najfiyyah Sharh Nahj al-Balāghah*, pg. 344, old Iran print, under the above text.

‘Abd Allāh ibn Ṣafwān relates that a man said on the Day of Ṣiffīn, “O Allah, curse the people of Shām.”

Hearing this, ‘Alī cautioned, “Do not curse the people of Shām altogether, for indeed the abdāl reside there, the abdāl reside there, the Abdāl reside there.”¹

عن شريح بن عبيد قال ذكر أهل الشام عند علي و قيل العنهم يا أمير المؤمنين قال إني سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم الأبدال يكونون بالشام و هم أربعون رجلا كلما مات رجل أبدل الله مكانه رجلا إلخ

Shurayḥ ibn ‘Ubayd reports:

The people of Shām were mentioned before ‘Alī and he was told, “Curse them, O Amīr al-Mu’minīn.”

He responded saying, “(No.) I heard Rasūlullāh ﷺ: ‘The abdāl are in Shām and they are forty men. Whenever a man among them passes on, Allah replaces him with another.’”²

These statements of Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ were presented from our books. Now, the declarations of Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ documented in books of the Shī‘ah will be quoted.

Corroboration from Shī‘ī Books

Recognise this theme in the following text of *Nahj al-Balāghah*:

و من كلام له عليه السلام و قد سمع قوما من أصحابه يسبون أهل الشام أيام حربهم بصفين إني أكره لكم أن تكونوا سبائين و لكنكم لو وصفتهم أعمالهم و ذكرتم حالهم كان أصوب في القول و أبلغ في العذر و

1 *Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq*, vol. 11 pg. 249, chapter on Shām; *Tārīkh Ibn ‘Asākir Kāmil*, vol. 1 pg. 323, Damascus print, chapter on the prohibition of cursing the people of Shām; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 20, chapter on mention of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān and his dominion.

2 *Mishkāt*, pg. 582 – 583, with reference to Aḥmad, chapter on mention of the people of Yemen and Shām; *Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id wa Manba‘ al-Fawā‘id*, vol. 10 pg. 62, chapter on the reports on the abdāl and that they are in Shām.

قلتم مكان سبكم إياهم اللهم احقن دماءنا ودمائهم وأصلح ذات بيننا وبينهم واهدهم من ضلالتهم حتى يعرف الحق من جهله و يرعوى عن الغي و العدو ان من ليجج به

From his رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ speeches, after he heard some of his supporters verbally abusing the people of Shām during the days of fighting at Šiffīn:

I dislike for you to be cursers. However, had you described their actions and mentioned their situation, it would have been more accurate in speech and deeper in excuse. You should have said instead of cursing them, “O Allah, protect our blood and their blood, unite us, and guide them from their nonconformity so that the ignorant recognise the truth and those bent on transgression and aggression should desist from the same.”¹

The renowned Shīrī historian, Aḥmad ibn Dāwūd Abū Ḥanīfah al-Dīnawarī (d. 282 A.H.) has reproduced this very declaration of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in *al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl* with more detail. The text is quoted verbatim:

و بلغ عليا أن حجر بن عدي و عمرو بن الحمق يظهران شتم معاوية و لعن أهل الشام فأرسل إليهما أن
كفا عما يبلغني عنكما فأتياه فقالا يا أمير المؤمنين ألسنا على الحق و هو على الباطل قال بلى و رب الكعبة
المسدنة قالوا فلم تمنعنا من شتمهم و لعنهم قال كرهت لكم أن تكونوا شتامين لعانين و لكن قولوا اللهم
احقن دماننا و دمائهم و أصلح ذات بيننا و بينهم و اهدهم من ضلالتهم حتى يعرف الحق من جهله و
يرعوى عن الغي من ليجج به

The news reached ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that Ḥujr ibn ‘Adī and ‘Amr ibn al-Ḥumq were openly swearing Mu‘āwiyah and cursing the people of Shām. He sent word to them, “Stop the action that has reached me about you.”

They approached him and submitted, “O Amīr al-Mu‘minīn, are we not upon truth and they upon falsehood?”

He said, “Most definitely, by the Rabb of the Ka‘bah.”

They asked, “Then why do you prevent us from swearing and cursing them?”

1 *Nahj al-Balāghah*, vol. 1 pg. 420, from his speech prohibiting cursing the people of Shām, Egypt print.

He replied, “I dislike that you become swearers and cursers. Rather say, ‘O Allah, spare our blood and their blood, unite us, and guide them from their nonconformity so that the ignorant recognise the truth and those bent on aggression should desist from the same.’”¹

Thirdly, Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭūsī al-Shīrī has quoted the bequests of Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه to his friends in *al-Amālī*. Among these advices is the following. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه commands:

و أوصيكم بالصلوة ... و الزكوة ... و الجهاد ... و أوصيكم بأصحاب نبيكم لا تسبواهم إلخ

I bequeath you to perform ṣalāh ... zakāh ... jihād ... and I bequeath you concerning the Companions of your Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم; do not revile them.²

Those who revile and insult Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه should pay close attention to these statements of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and reflect over their own behaviour. They should analyse their conduct, whether it is correct. In the enmity of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, have they not rebelled against Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه command? Have they not become disobedient to his instruction by way of their actions?

Ḥasan’s and Ḥusayn’s Compromise with and Bay‘ah to Amīr Mu‘āwiyah and Termination of Conflicts

Although, the outcome of the conspiracies of the conspirators of that era, e.g. ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ and others, led to events like Jamal and Ṣiffīn taking place between the Muslims, nonetheless after the demise of Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه, Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه reconciled with Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and pledged allegiance to him. This reconciliation was the manifestation of the glad tidings and prophecy of the Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم:

1 *Al-Akḥbār al-Ṭiwāl*, pg. 165, the Battle of Ṣiffīn, Cairo print, Egypt.

2 *Al-Amālī*.

أبني هذا سيد سيصلح الله به بين الفئتين العظيمتين من المسلمين

This son of mine is a leader. Soon will Allah unite two huge fractions of Muslims because of him.¹

Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ agreed with his brother Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in handing over the khilāfah to Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Keeping the benefit of the Muslim ummah at heart, temporary skirmishes were terminated and the road of unity and harmony was levelled.

This event is an accepted occurrence of Islamic history. The scholars of both the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shī'ah agree to its accurateness. This is not a disputed issue. Yet, for the satisfaction and solace of the esteemed readers, some concise texts will be quoted from famous books of both sects.

From the Books of the Ahl al-Sunnah

1. The renowned historian Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt, in the first volume of his history work, has written under the events of the year 41 A.H. (which is called the year of unity):

و فيها (سنة الجماعة) اجتمع الحسن بن علي بن أبي طالب و معاوية فاجتمعا بمسكن من أرض السواد و من ناحية الأنبار فاصطلحا و سلم الحسن بن علي إلى معاوية و ذلك في شهر ربيع الآخر أو في جمادى الأولى سنة إحدى و أربعين

In this year (the year of unity), Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and Mu'āwiyah met at a residence in the land of Iraq, on the border of Anbār and reached a compromise. Ḥasan ibn 'Alī handed over to Mu'āwiyah (the khilāfah). This occurred in the month of Rabī' al-Awwal or Jumādā al-Ūlā the year 41.²

2. Al-Ḥākim Nīshāpūrī has written in *al-Mustadrak*:

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 530, chapter on the merits of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn.

2 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 187, the year 41 A.H., the year of unity.

فصالح الحسن معاوية و سلم الأمر له و بايعه بالخلافة على شروط و وثائق إلخ

Ḥasan reconciled with Mu‘āwiyah, handed over the khilāfah to him, and pledged allegiance to him upon conditions and policies.¹

3. Abū Nu‘aym al-Aṣḥānī and al-Bayhaqī have written: “At Nakhlah, this agreement was reached between the two gentlemen. Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه said on that occasion:

تركته لمعاوية إرادة إصلاح المسلمين و حقن دمائهم

(Although khilāfah is my right) I have left it for Mu‘āwiyah anticipating unity of Muslims and the sparing of their blood.²

The momentous event of this reconciliation and bay‘ah has been documented by countless scholars, for example:

1. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr: *al-Istī‘āb* with *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 378, under the biography of Mu‘āwiyah.
2. Ibn al-Athīr: *Uṣd al-Ghābah*, vol. 4 pg. 386 – 387, mention of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.
3. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar: *al-Iṣābah* with *al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 3 pg. 413, biography of Mu‘āwiyah.
4. Ibn Badrān: *Talkhīṣ Ibn ‘Asākir*, vol. 4 pg. 220

Corroboration and Authentication of this event from Shī‘ī Books

Shī‘ī scholars and historians have written extensively on Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s رضي الله عنه agreement with Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه and the subsequent bay‘ah. In

1 *Al-Mustadrak*, vol. 3 pg. 174, the reconciliation between Ḥasan and Mu‘āwiyah.

2 *Al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, vol. 8 pg. 173, book on fighting the rebels; *Ḥilyat al-Awliyā’*, vol. 2 pg. 37, biography of Sayyidunā Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.

submission to their despicable habit, they make numerous additions; that it was out of coercion and Taqiyyah.

We will now quote their texts verbatim for the benefit of the scholars. Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه wrote a letter from his residence in Shām to Sayyidunā Ḥasan, Sayyidunā Ḥusayn, and Qays ibn Sa'd ibn 'Ubādah al-Ansarī رضي الله عنه calling them over. These gentlemen reached Shām, obtained permission to enter, and entered. The lecturer had kept the people prepared (in a gathering).

فقال يا حسن قم فبايع فقام فبايع ثم قال للحسين عليه السلام قم فبايع فقام فبايع ثم قال يا قيس قم فبايع
فالتفت الى الحسين عليه السلام ينظر ما يأمره فقال يا قيس إنه إمامي

He (Mu'āwiyah) said, “O Ḥasan! Stand up and pledge allegiance.” He stood up and pledged his allegiance.

He then said to Ḥusayn, “Stand up and pledge allegiance.” He stood up and pledged allegiance.

He then said, “O Qays, stand up and pledge allegiance.” He looked towards Ḥusayn to see what he commands him. Ḥusayn said, “O Qays, he is my leader.”¹

In *Furū' al-Kāfi kitāb al-Rawḍah*, this event is explained in the following words:

عن أبي جعفر قال والله للذي صنعه الحسن بن علي عليه السلام كان خيرا لهذه الأمة مما طلعت عليه
الشمس

Abū Ja'far declared, “By Allah, definitely what Ḥasan ibn 'Alī رضي الله عنه did was superior for the ummah to everything the sun rises over.”²

1 Abū 'Amr al-Kashshī: *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, pg. 72, under the biography of Qays ibn Sa'd ibn 'Ubādah, Mumbai print, India, pg. 102, new edition, Tehran print; *Biḥār al-Anwār*, vol. 10 pg. 122 – 124, chapter on the manner of Ḥasan ibn 'Alī's reconciliation, old Iran print.

2 *Furū' al-Kāfi*, vol. 3 pg. 153, *Kitāb al-Rawḍah*, Lucknow print; *Furū' al-Kāfi*, vol. 2 pg. 252, new Tehran print, with Persian translation.

Mullā Bāqir writes the translation of the above mentioned report as:

یعنی کلینی بسند معتبر از حضرت امام باقر روایت کرده است که صلحی که حضرت امام حسن با معاویة کرد برای این امت بهتر بود از دنیا و ما فیها

Kulaynī reports with an authentic chain from Imām Bāqir, “By Allah, Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī’s رضی اللہ عنہ reconciliation with Mu‘āwiyah was superior for the ummah to the world and its contents.”¹

Note: This matter has been documented in the following Shī‘ah books regarded reliable by the Shī‘ah with their respective texts. The scholars may refer to them:

1. *Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn*, pg. 28, mention of the report of his bay‘ah after the demise of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn and handing over the affair to Mu‘āwiyah, old print; Beirut print, vol. 1 pg. 46 – 48, under the reconciliation.
2. *Ihtijāj al-Ṭabarsī*, pg. 148, 156, 157, his proof upon the one who condemned him for agreeing with Mu‘āwiyah, old print.
3. *Al-Amālī*, vol. 2 pg. 173, 180, 189, majlis 11, Ṣafar 457 A.H., Najaf Ashraf.
4. *Biḥār al-Anwār*, vol. 10 pg. 110, 111, 112, the reason of Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī’s reconciliation, old first print.

Ḥusayn’s Statement

One of the ancient Tafḍīlī historians of the Shī‘ah, Aḥmad ibn Abū Dāwūd al-Dīnawārī al-Shī‘ī (d. 282 A.H.) in his famous work *al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl* has explained Sayyidunā Ḥusayn’s رضی اللہ عنہ bay‘ah to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضی اللہ عنہ in a beautiful manner. We will reproduce it for the benefit of the readers, apart from Sayyidunā Ḥasan’s رضی اللہ عنہ bay‘ah so that both brothers’ views in this matter is clearly understood.

1 *Jalā’ al-‘Uyūn*, pg. 292, while speaking about the reconciliation of the second Imām with Mu‘āwiyah.

Al-Dīnawārī has written that a man by the name Ḥujr ibn ‘Adī was among the ardent supports of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. After the reconciliation between Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, he was hell-bent upon fighting the latter but to his disappointment, Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was not prepared for war. He then intended to incite Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to wage war and fight.

فقال الحسين إنا قد بايعنا و عاهدنا و لا سبيل إلى نقض بيعتنا

Ḥusayn replied, “We have pledged allegiance and entered into a pact. There is no way to break our allegiance.”¹

More Exquisite

Another incident documented by the Shīṭī historians regarding Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ after the compromise was reached sheds further light on the stance of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ concerning Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. The Shīṭī al-Dīnawārī says that during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, his governor over Madīnah informed him that Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ plans to overthrow his khilāfah. Upon this, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ wrote a letter to Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ that the conspirators are hell-bent on inciting and provoking you, so kindly refrain from it. Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ put his apprehensions to rest:

فكتب إليه الحسين رضي الله عنه ما أريد حربك و لا الخلاف عليك قالوا و لم ير الحسن و لا الحسين طول حياة معاوية منه سوء في انفسهما و لا مكروها و لا قطع عنهما شيئا مما كان شرط لهما و لا تغير لهما عن بر

Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ wrote to him, “I do not intend fighting you or rebelling against you.”

They add: Neither Ḥasan nor Ḥusayn had any bad experience with Mu‘āwiyah until the end of his life, nor did they have distasteful situations

1 Al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl, pg. 220, discussion on allegiance of khilāfah to Mu‘āwiyah and Ziyād ibn Abīh, Cairo print, Egypt, 1960 print.

with him, nor did he break any condition he made with them, nor did he change his generosity towards them.¹

The above reports make it certain that:

- After Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه pledged allegiance to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, the thought of breaking the pledge never crossed his mind, nor did he take any step in this direction.
- During the entire khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما did not see anything evil or reprehensible in him.
- The conditions Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه promised Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما were fulfilled. He did not violate them.
- Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه maintained his kind and caring behaviour towards Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما and did not change in the least.

In short, this accusation against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه that he usurped the rights of Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما, violated the conditions of reconciliation, and maintained bad relations with the Banū Hāshim and the family of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم due to which these personalities harboured enmity and animosity for Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه is totally incorrect. The above quotations are taken from the Shī‘ī historian al-Dīnawarī. He adheres to Shī‘ism and is earlier than al-Ṭabarī, al-Jazarī, and others. He has solved these issues excellently with the above documentations of his. Hopefully, those with fair temperaments will bless them with acceptance and consider the view of the latter historians worthless and insignificant.

1 Al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl, pg. 225, discussion between Mu‘āwiyah and ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, Cairo print, Egypt.

The Practical Assistance of the Banū Hāshim during Amīr Mu‘āwiyah’s khilāfah

Hāshimī personalities would practically assist Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه during his khilāfah. Incidents of this nature was documented in *Ruḥamā’ Baynahum*, third section (‘Uthmānī).

Few incidents of the practical assistance in administrative matters from the Banū Hāshim during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه will now be penned. Men of understanding and people with impartial temperaments may draw beautiful conclusions from these events.

A Hāshimī Judge (‘Abd Allāh) in Madīnah Ṭayyibah

It appears in *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*:

عن أبي الغيث قال سمعت أبا هرير لما ولي مروان بن الحكم المدينة لمعاوية بن أبي سفيان سنة اثنتين وأربعين في الأمانة الأولى استتضى عبد الله بن الحارث بن نوفل بن الحارث بن عبد المطلب بالمدينة فسمعت أبا هريرة يقول هذا أول قاض رأيت في الإسلام

Abū al-Ghayth recalls that he heard Abū Hurayrah saying:

When Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam assumed the post of governor over Madīnah on behalf of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, the year 42 for the first time, he appointed ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith ibn Nawfal ibn al-Ḥārith ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib (al-Hāshimī) as judge in Madīnah.”

I heard Abū Hurayrah explaining, “This was the first judge I saw in Islam.”¹

Hāshimī Warriors during the Wars: Qutham ibn ‘Abbās and Ḥusayn

1. Sayyidunā Qutham ibn ‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib al-Hāshimī is counted among the young Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. He is the foster brother of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 5 pg. 13, under ‘Abd Allah ibn Nawfal; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 6 pg. 98, the year 42 A.H.; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 269, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn Nawfal ibn al-Ḥārith ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, Tehran print.

قال ابن سعد غزا قثم بن عباس خراسان و عليها سعيد بن عثمان بن عفان ... قال الزبير (بن بكار) سار قثم أيام معاوية مع سعيد بن عثمان إلى سمرقند فاستشهد بها

Ibn Sa'd says: Qutham ibn 'Abbās waged war in Khorasan and the army general was Sa'īd ibn 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān.

Zubayr ibn Bakkār says: Qutham travelled during the days of Mu'āwiyah with Sa'īd ibn 'Uthmān (who was the army general) to Samarqand (to wage jihād) and was martyred in that land.¹

Shī'ī clerics have written that Qutham ibn 'Abbās ibn al-Hāshimī al-Muṭṭalibī served as governor over Makkah Mukarramah on behalf of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه. Then Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه was martyred. After some time, during the reign of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, he participated in the Battle of Samarqand:

واستشهد بسمرقند في زمن معاوية

He was martyred in Samarqand during the reign of Mu'āwiyah.²

2. The historians have categorically stated that during the reign of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī رضي الله عنه would visit him and accepted gifts from him (as will appear shortly in the quotations). Moreover, he happily participated in the expeditions of that time. Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه did not display any detachment or aloofness. This was his practical assistance of the khilāfah of the time and heartfelt support in administrative matters. There was no coercion or force of any time upon him. have a look at the exact texts of the historians:

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd*, vol. 7 pg. 101, biography of Qutham ibn 'Abbās ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, Leiden print; *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 27, mention of the offspring of 'Abbās ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 4 pg. 197, biography of Qutham ibn 'Abbās; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'*, vol. 3 pg. 292, biography of Qutham ibn 'Abbās.

2 Ibn Maytham al-Bahrānī al-Shī'ī: *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah*, vol. 5 pg. 72, the text of his letter رضي الله عنه to Qutham ibn 'Abbās who was his governor over Makkah, new Tehran print.

و وفد على معاوية و توجه غازيا إلى القسطنطينية في الجيش الذي كان أميره يزيد بن معاوية

He visited Mu‘āwiyah and went out as a warrior towards Constantinople in the army led by Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah.¹

It appears in volume eight of Ibn Kathīr’s *al-Bidāyah*:

ولما توفي الحسن كان الحسين ينفذ إلى معاوية في كل عام فيعطيه و يكرمه و قد كان في الجيش الذين غزوا القسطنطينية مع ابن معاوية يزيد في سنة إحدى و خمسين

After the demise of Ḥasan, Ḥusayn would pay annual visits to Mu‘āwiyah who would favour him with gifts and entertain him. Furthermore, he participated in the army who attacked Constantinople with Mu‘āwiyah’s son, Yazīd, in the year 51 A.H.²

Summary of the above Headings

1. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his supporters were believers in light of Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ statement.
2. The martyrs of the Battle of Şiffīn are all inhabitants of Jannah.
3. The participants of Jamal and Şiffīn were religious brethren, but opposed each other.
4. The commentary of baghāwah was presented, making it clear that they were neither transgressors nor tyrants.
5. Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ vehemently prohibited insulting and cursing his opponents and instructed that prayers be made in their favour.

1 *Tahdhīb Tārīkh Ibn ‘Asākīr*, 4 pg. 311, biography of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 150 – 151, mention of Ḥusayn’s journey to Iraq and the manner of his martyrdom.

6. Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه enjoyed a friendly and cordial relationship with Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. He practically assisted him. There was no hostility. No lineage excellence or tribal prejudice existed between them, that Hāshimites should be prevented from honourable positions while Umawīs should be awarded the same. This was non-existent. Aspects of this kind did not exist in the era of the noble Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. These are later concoctions.
7. Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah's رضي الله عنه khilāfah ran under Islamic system. Islamic regulations were not dismissed. The practical support and participation in administration by senior Hāshimites and other esteemed Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم acts as exclusive proof and evidence for this.
8. The tales of the oppression and tyranny perpetrated by Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه are all baseless. Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah's رضي الله عنه behaviour was totally appropriate. He served the populace and religion and brought much benefit to Islam and its adherents. Hāshimites and other Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم joined him and maintained their physical support of the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Stipends and Gifts for Ḥasan and Ḥusayn and other Hāshimī Seniors from the Treasury of Amīr Mu'āwiyah

After the year of unity, Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه stipulated allowances for Sayyidunā Ḥasan, Sayyidunā Ḥusayn, and other Hāshimī persons. They were favoured with gifts and presents on various occasions. From the year 41 A.H. until 60 A.H. up until the demise of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, this practice was maintained diligently. No shortcoming existed during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. Plenty of details on this issue have been penned by Sunnī and Shī'ī historians and biography writers. Presentation of all incidents will be a lengthy issue while our object is conciseness. Hence, a few quotes will be inserted as evidence for this topic.

Ibn ‘Asākir records in his famous work on history, *Tārīkh Dimashq* (in the biography of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ):

فأعطاه أربع مائة ألف درهم و روى المبرد أن الحسن كان ينفد كل سنة على معاوية فيصه بمائة ألف درهم

Mu‘āwiyah gifted 400 000 dirhams to Ḥasan.

Al-Mubarrad narrates that every year, Ḥasan would visit Mu‘āwiyah, who used to favour him with 100 000 dirhams.¹

This is recorded in the following texts:

كان له (حسن بن علي) على معاوية في عام جائزة و كان ينفد إليه فر بما أجازة بأربعمائة ألف درهم و راتبه في سنة مائة ألف

He (Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī) had an annual stipend from Mu‘āwiyah and he would visit him annually. At times, the latter would favour the former with 400 000 dirhams and follow it up with 100 000 the same year.²

Stipends for Ḥusayn

Common incidents of this nature exist for both brothers (Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا) while at some places, they are reported specifically about Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

Shaykh ‘Alī Hajwīrī Lāhōrī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (better known as Dātā Ganjbakhsh) writes a story in chapter 8 of *Kashf al-Mahjūb*:

Once a beggar approached Sayyidunā Ḥusayn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ saying: “O grandson of Rasūlullāh عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ! I am a poor person with a family to look after. Kindly give me some food for today.”

1 *Tahdhīb Tārīkh Dimashq*, vol. 4 pg. 200, biography of Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī, first old print.

2 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 1 pg. 329, biography of Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 37, biography of Ḥasan; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 41 – 42, biography of Ḥasan; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 137, biography of Amīr Mu‘āwiyah.

حسین وے را گفت بنشین که مارا رزقی در راه است تا بیازند بے برنیامد که پنج صره از دینار بیادردند از معاویه اندر
بر صره هزار دینار بود و گفتند که معاویه از تو عذر می خواهد الخ

Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضی اللہ عنہ told him: “Wait a while. My allowance will reach me soon. When I receive it I will hand it over to you.”

After a little while, a messenger from Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضی اللہ عنہ arrived with five bags (each containing 1000 gold coins). The messenger told Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضی اللہ عنہ that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضی اللہ عنہ apologizes that he had sent such a small amount, but that he should kindly accept it.

Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضی اللہ عنہ accepted it, handed it over to the beggar, and asked his apologies for giving him such a meagre amount.¹

Ibn Kathīr speaks about stipends in the following passage, which the intellectuals should study:

فلما استقرت الخلافة لمعاوية كان الحسين يتردد إليه مع أخيه الحسن فيكرههما معاوية إكراما زائدا و
يقول لهما مرحبا و أهلا و سهلا و يعطيهما عطاء جزيلا و قد أطلق لهما في يوم واحد مائتي ألف (يعني
في بعض الأيام)

After the khilāfah settled in favour of Mu‘āwiyah, Ḥusayn would visit him with his brother Ḥasan. Mu‘āwiyah would honour them extensively and welcome them saying, “Welcome, feel at home and at ease!” He would give them expensive gifts. On one occasion he gave them 200 000 dirhams.²

Other Hāshimites receiving Stipend of 1 million along with Ḥasan and Ḥusayn

إن معاوية كان يجيز في كل عام الحسن و الحسين و عبد الله بن عباس و عبد الله بن جعفر بن أبي طالب
كل واحد منهم بألف ألف درهم

1 Shaykh ‘Alī ibn ‘Uthmān al-Ghazawī al-Hajwīrī then Lāhorī (d. 456 A.H.): *Kashf al-Mahjūb*, pg. 92-93, chapter 8, mention of their A‘immah from the Ahl al-Bayt, Samarqand print.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 150 – 151, the incident of Ḥusayn and the reason from him departing from Makkah to Iraq, Egypt print, first edition.

Mu'āwiyah would award Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās, and 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far ibn Abī Ṭālib, each with 1 000 000 dirhams annually.¹

This Topic in the Shī'ah's Sight

The Stipends of Ḥusayn, Ibn 'Abbās, and 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far

Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd al-Shīrī has reported the 1 million report in his commentary. He writes:

فإنه كان يجيز الحسن و الحسين ابني علي في كل عام لكل واحد منهما بألف درهم و كذلك كان يجيز عبد الله بن العباس و عبد الله بن جعفر

He would favour Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, the sons of 'Alī, each with 1 million dirhams annually. Similarly, he would grant 'Abd Allāh ibn al-'Abbās and 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far (the same amount).²

The Stipends of Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far

Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has narrated from Sayyidunā Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

از حضرت صادق علیه السلام روایت کرده است که روزی حضرت امام حسن حضرت امام حسین و عبد الله بن جعفر فرمود که جائزه بای معاویه در روز اول ماه بشما خواهد رسید چون روز اول ماه باشد چنانچه حضرت فرموده بود اموال معاویه رسید جناب امام حسن قرض بسیاری داشت از آنچه او فرستاده بود برای اینحضرت قرضهای خود را ادا کرد و باقی را در میان اهل بیت و شیعیان خود قسمت کرد جناب امام حسین قرض خود را ادا کرد آنچه مانده بود بسه قسمت کرد یک حصه را بابل بیت و شیعیان خود داد و دو حصه را برای عیال خود فرستاد و عبد الله بن جعفر قرض خود را ادا کرد الخ

One day, Imām Ḥasan told his brother Imām Ḥusayn and his paternal cousin 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far that on the first date of the upcoming month, gifts and presents from the side of Amīr Mu'āwiyah will reach you. When

1 Abū Manṣūr 'Abd al-Malik ibn Muḥammad al-Tha'ālabī (d. 429 A.H.) *Laṭā'if al-Ma'ārif*, pg. 21 – 22, Egypt print.

2 *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah Ḥadīdī*, vol. 15 pg. 25, old print, Beirut print, vol. 3 pg. 705 – 706, discussion on the comparison between the generosity of the kings of the Banū Umayyah and the kings of the Banū Hāshim.

the first date of the month came, an abundance of wealth reached from Amīr Mu'āwiyah and all three luminaries were given.

Imām Ḥasan had plenty of debt on his shoulders. He first settled his debt from that wealth and then divided the rest among his family and relatives and close friends.

Imām Ḥusayn first settled his debt after which he divided the rest of the wealth into three parts. One third was given to his relatives and special supporters and two thirds were given to his family.

‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far al-Ṭayyār also fulfilled his debt.¹

Note: Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه gifted Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far al-Ṭayyār رضي الله عنه with 100 000 dirhams. This has been documented by Ibn ‘Inabah al-Shīrī in *‘Umdat al-Ṭālib fī Ansāb Āl Abī Ṭālib*, pg. 38, under the offspring of Ja‘far Ṭayyār. Moreover, this is also mentioned in *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh (Ṭarāz al-Madhhab Muḏaffarī* volume) pg. 395, the biography of Zaynab al-Kubrā. The incident is correct. ‘Abd Allāh did in fact obtain this gift and Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه sent it. However, the portrayal of the incident creates dislike and hatred for Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and has been concocted to reach this goal, as is the famous statement of someone:

و لیکن قلم در کف دشمن است

However, the pen is in the enemy's hand.

The same applies here.

The Stipend of ‘Aqīl, Murtaḏā’s brother

Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḏā’s رضي الله عنه brother ‘Aqīl ibn Abī Ṭālib once visited Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. They had a good chat whereafter the latter ordered that 100 000 dirhams be given to the former. The one entrusted this duty said to him:

1 *Jalā’ al-Uyūn*, pg. 270, chapter on the nuṣūṣ of imāmah and the miracles of Imām Ḥasan, Tehran print, 1334 A.H. print.

He (Mu'āwiyah) has ordered us to give you 100 000. He thus gave him the amount.¹

Stipulation of Stipend for Ḥusayn's son 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn

The following incident about Sayyidunā Ḥusayn's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ son, 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn i.e. Zayn al-Ābidīn, has been recorded in *Furū' al-Kāfi*:

استعمل معاوية مروان بن الحكم على المدينة و أمره أن يفرض لشباب قريش ففرض لهم فقال علي بن الحسين عليهما السلام فأتيته فقال ما اسمك فقلت علي بن الحسين ففرض لي فرجعت إلى أبي عليه السلام فأخبرته

Mu'āwiyah appointed Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam as governor over Madīnah and instructed him to stipulate stipends for the youngsters of Quraysh. Accordingly, he stipulated for them.

'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ says: I came to him. He asked me, "What is your name?"

"'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn," I replied.

He thus stipulated for me a stipend after which I returned to my father رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and informed him of it.²

A Village as a Gift to Ḥasan

The famous history book of the Shī'ah *Nāsikh al-Tawārikh*; its ninth volume (called *Ṭarāz al-Madhhab Muḥaffarī*) has an incident that Amīr Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ during his khilāfah instructed the governor of Madīnah (Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam) to propose for the daughter of 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far al-Ṭayyār for his son Yazīd ibn Mu'āwiyah,

1 *Al-Amālī*, vol. 2 pg. 334, Najaf Ashraf Iraq print,

2 *Furū' al-Kāfi*, vol. 2 pg. 262, book on 'aqīqah, chapter on names and agnomens, Nawl Kashawr Lucknow print, old edition; *Nāsikh al-Tawārikh*, vol. 11 pg. 40, book 2, Marwān's dialogue with that person.

informing him that he will give a substantial amount of wealth as well as dowry, etc.

Marwān called ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far and encouraged him. ‘Abd Allāh handed over the affair to Sayyidunā Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. After calling up a meeting, Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه said to Marwān:

ما چنان بصواب شمر ديم که زينب را به پسر عمش قاسم بن محمد بن جعفر کا بين بندم و اورا باقاسم تزويج کردم و کا بين اورا بقریهء که در مدینه دارم و معاويه در ازائے ده هزار دينار بمن داده است مقرر داشتم و زينب را اس مبلغ کفايت می کند

We have given her to our nephew (Qāsim ibn Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far) and we gave Zaynab the dowry of a village in the vicinity of Madīnah which Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه favoured us with in lieu of 10 000 gold coins (Ṭalā‘ī). This amount of dowry will be sufficient for Zaynab.¹

This incident clearly mentions that Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه received from Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه along with other stipends, an exclusive village in the vicinity of Madīnah Ṭayyibah which he utilised on this occasion as dowry for the marriage.

Points of the Above Headings:

1. It is manifest that the allegation against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه of ill-treating the Banū Hāshim and the family of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم is totally contrary to factual events.
2. In the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, the tales of oppression and aggression against the family of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and the progeny of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, are fabricated by the foes and have no truth to them whatsoever.

1 Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh, vol. 9 pg. 380, (Ṭarāz al-Madhhab Muḥaffarī), while speaking of ‘Abd Allah ibn Ja‘far’s excuse to Mu‘āwiyah and his story with Mu‘āwiyah and Yazīd, old Iran print, 1315 A.H. print.

3. If any incident took place in that era, for the kingdom's administration and regulation, then it only occurred because of the demand of that situation and due to necessity. However, the historians blew it out of proportion and described it as a tale of cruelty and tyranny. Thereafter, the pen of the antagonists beautified it further, made a mountain of a molehill, and broadcasted it among the masses.
4. May Allah ﷻ bless the Muslims with guidance and impartiality and grant them the correct understanding that the esteemed Companions of the Nabī ﷺ were bearers of the Qur'ān and practiced upon it diligently. Each and every verse of the Qur'ān was the objective of their existence and emulation of the prophetic Sunnah was the mission of their lives. Therefore, subject to Islamic fundamentals, they maintained the administration and management of the entire state and they became recognised as the guides and well-wishers of the Muslim ummah.

The Objection of Insulting and Cursing

The critics have with a concerted effort spread the propaganda among the masses that during his khilāfah, with the command of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, the lecturers would passionately insult and curse Sayyidunā 'Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه and his progeny on the pulpits, while the supporters of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه listened on. Marwān would perpetrate this vile deed on the pulpit of al-Masjid al-Nabawī. To swear and ridicule the Nabī's صلى الله عليه وسلم close friends and family is an extremely wicked act indeed. This remained the practice throughout the era of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

The following are some presentations to answer this objection.

Removal

It is apparent that the target of this objection is Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. However, at the same time, the governors and lecturers during the era of

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه have also been made the target, whether they are Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم or not. Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam has been singled out for ridicule in this matter.

Arguments will now be presented to remove this misconception.

Firstly, Attention initially needs to be given to analysing and scrutinising the reports from which the condemnations and criticisms of insulting and cursing have been deduced. If they meet the standards of authenticity and are not flawed, then defiantly using them as proof is correct and the criticisms deduced from them are accurate. However, if to the contrary, they do not meet the standards of authenticity and are proven false and worthless then the criticisms realised from them will also be worthless and false. After presenting this principle as an introduction, the reports will be reproduced after which their analysis will be penned, with extra points.

Objectionable Historical reports which are the Source and Basis of the Criticisms

- One reports is quoted from *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*:

عن لوط بن يحيى قال كان الولاة من بني أمية قبل عمر بن عبد العزيز يشتمون عليا فلما ولي عمر أمسك عن ذلك

Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā says:

The governors of the Banū Umayyah prior to ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz would insult ‘Alī. When ‘Umar assumed the post of khilāfah, he prohibited this.¹

This report is the personal statement of Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā (Abū Mikhnaf). What type of person this man was will appear shortly.

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 5 pg. 291, biography of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz.

- The report of al-Ṭabarī is also cited. Mention is made therein that when Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه in Jumādā al-Thānīyah 51 A.H. appointed Sayyidunā Mughīrah ibn Shu‘bah رضي الله عنه the governor over Kūfah, the former gave some advices and instructions to the latter. Therein it is mentioned:

ولست تاركا إيصاءك بخصلة لا تتحم عن شتم علي و ذمه و الترحم على عثمان و الاستغفار له و العيب على أصحاب علي و الإقضاء لهم و ترك الاستماع منهم ... غير أنه لا يدع ذم علي و الوقوع فيه

I will not disremember advising you with a characteristic you will not omit; insulting and degrading ‘Alī and seeking mercy and forgiveness for ‘Uthmān, criticising ‘Alī’s partisans, driving them away, and not listening to them.

The narrators adds: (Mughīrah had good qualities) except that he would not desist from degrading and disparaging ‘Alī.¹

The narrator of this report is Hishām ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī and Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā Abū Mikhnaf. Their status will be appear shortly.

- Thereafter, comes the report of *al-Kāmil* of Ibn Athīr al-Jazarī. This report is also presented as proof in the discussion on insulting and cursing. When Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه despatched Sayyidunā Mughīrah ibn Shu‘bah رضي الله عنه to assume the governorship post over Kūfah, he commanded him:

ولست تاركا إيصاءك بخصلة لا تترك شتم علي و ذمه و الترحم على عثمان و الاستغفار له و العيب لأصحاب علي و الإقضاء لهم

I will not neglect instructing you with a point you will not omit; insulting and degrading ‘Alī and seeking mercy and forgiveness for ‘Uthmān, criticising ‘Alī’s partisans and driving them away.²

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 6 pg. 141 – 142, the beginning of year 51 A.H., mention of the cause of Ḥujr ibn ‘Adī’s killing.

2 *Al-Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 234, the beginning of year 51 A.H.

The readers should be cognisant of the fact that this report of al-Jazarī is the very same report of al-Ṭabarī quoted above. They are not separate reports. Al-Jazarī cites from al-Ṭabarī. Due to this, his wording resemble the latter's wording, with slight variation and it is documented in the beginning of the year 51 A.H.

Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī being the source of *al-Kāmil* of Ibn Athīr al-Jazarī is an accepted fact. 'Allāmah al-Jazarī has spelt this out in the introduction of his book, "I have relied upon al-Ṭabarī and obtained historical material from him."

- They cite a report from *al-Bidāyah*:

و لما كان (مروان) متوليا على المدينة لمعاوية كان يسب عليا كل جمعة على المنبر و قال له الحسن بن علي لقد لعن الله أباك الحكم و أنت في صلبه على لسان نبيه فقال (النبي) لعن الله الحكم و ما ولد والله أعلم

When Marwān was governor over Madīnah for Mu'āwiyah, he would curse 'Alī every Friday on the pulpit. Ḥasan ibn 'Alī said to him, "Certainly, Allah has cursed your father al-Ḥakam, while you were in his loins, upon the tongue of His Nabī. Thus the Nabī ﷺ said, 'May Allah curse al-Ḥakam and his progeny.'" And Allah knows best.¹

- Another report from *al-Bidāyah wa l-Nihāyah* is located with much difficulty and brought into the arena of criticism. Listen to it:

There was a person by the name Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Thaqafī. He served as governor over Yemen in the era of Walīd ibn 'Abd al-Malik i.e. 90 A.H. It is written about him:

كان يلعن عليا على المنابر

He would curse 'Alī from the pulpit.²

1 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 259, biography of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, first edition, Egypt.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 9 pg. 80, the year 90 A.H.

Aspects relating to these two reports of *al-Bidāyah*, and the above reports of Ibn Sa'd, al-Ṭabarī, and al-Jazarī will be presented in sequence. Reflect deeply over them and mix a little justice as well, if available.

Analysis of the Above Reports

1. The first report quoted from *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd*, volume 5, is the personal view of Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā (Abū Mikhnaf). It is not the statement of any Ṣaḥābī or Tābi'ī. Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā is a person of later generations, not of that era. This person is extremely critiqued by the masters of this science. He is unreliable, weak, and discarded. He is an antagonistic Shī'ī.

أبو مخنف لوط ابن يحيى هالك لا يوثق به ضعيف ليس بشيء شيعي محترق صاحب أخبارهم

Abū Mikhnaf Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā is destroyed. He is unreliable, weak, worthless, an antagonistic Shī'ī, the reporter of their tales.¹

2. The second narration is of al-Ṭabarī whose narrators are Hishām ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī and Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā Abū Mikhnaf. We have learned about Lūṭ. Now hear the decision of the masters of this science regarding Hishām.

Hishām ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī

تركوه و هو أخباري متروك رافضي ليس بثقة لا يوثق به

They have discarded him. He is an Akhbārī. Matrūk (suspected of ḥadīth forgery). A rāfiḍī. He is unreliable. He should not be trusted.²

1 *Al-Mughnī*, vol. 2 pg. 807, under Abū Mikhnaf; *Mizān al-I'tidāl*, vol. 2 pg. 360, under Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā, old Egypt print; *Lisān al-Mizān*, vol. 4 pg. 492, under Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā, Dakkan print.

2 *Al-Mughnī*, vol. 2 pg. 711, under Hishām ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī; *Mizān al-I'tidāl*, vol. 3 pg. 256, under Hishām; *Lisān al-Mizān*, vol. 6 pg. 196 – 197, under Hishām.

3. The third narration is Ibn Athīr al-Jazarī's *al-Kāmil* report which he took from al-Ṭabarī and included it in the beginning of 51 A.H. just like al-Ṭabarī. The status of the narrators of al-Ṭabarī have been determined above. Therefore, the unreliability of this report is just as the report of al-Ṭabarī. There is no need for separate criticism.
4. The fourth report of volume 8 of *al-Bidāyah* (in the biography of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam), is only found in one copy of *al-Bidāyah* while it is absent from the Egypt print. Moreover, its source and reference has not been mentioned in *al-Bidāyah* nor was any takhrīj of it mentioned so that the authenticity or inauthenticity may be determined from the source. This is contrary to the general methodology of Ibn Kathīr.

The inclusion of the report in one copy and its absence from another, makes it doubtful according to the author. Furthermore, al-Ṭabarī did not record this narration at this juncture. The author of *al-Bidāyah* i.e. Ibn Kathīr passed away in 774 A.H. how can an eighth century historian's narration be accepted which has no basis or source, which casts the action of the respected Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم in a bad light.

Secondly, Ibn Ḥajar Makkī, in *Taḥḥīr al-Jinān*, has thoroughly criticised the report of cursing taking place on the pulpit of Madīnah. He writes:

و جوابه أنه لم يصح عنه شيء من ذلك كما ستعلمه مما سأذكره إن كل ما فيه نحو ذلك في سنده علة

The answer to it is that nothing of this sort is authentic as you will soon learn from what I will shortly pen. Indeed, every report in this regard has a flaw in the chain.¹

Moreover, it is worthy to mention here that two aspects were encompassed in the report. One was Marwān publicly insulting Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه on

1 Aḥmad ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī al-Makkī: *Taḥḥīr al-Jinān wa l-Lisān*, pg. 26, section 2 (printed at the end of *al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah*), note 4 from Shaykh al-Islam wa l-Ḥuffāz, Egypt print, new edition.

the pulpit. Secondly, Imām Ḥasan رضي الله عنه cursing Marwān and his father, through the prophetic tongue. Both these aspects are erroneous.

Discussions on clearing the misconception around Marwān will appear shortly where an analysis of the ḥadīth of curse upon Marwān will be brought.

5. The reports of *al-Bidāyah*'s volume 9 brought to display Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه in a bad light, no source has been mentioned for the report nor any takhrīj. We submit that if hypothetically the report is accepted as correct, then it is an incident of the ear of Walīd ibn 'Abd al-Malik, 90 A.H. whereas Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه passed away in 60 A.H. An incident after a lengthy period of 30 years has no connection in reality with his era. To indict Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه on the basis of this report is total injustice.

The summary is that the above reports of Ibn Sa'd, al-Ṭabarī, al-Jazarī, etc., are criticised according to the rules of the science of ḥadīth scrutiny and are baseless. They cannot be used as proof. Therefore, criticism cannot be established on their basis. More points on their baselessness will appear in the upcoming lines.

Secondly, before presenting this point, the esteemed readers should remember well that according to us, neither are the reports which speak of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه or Marwān insulting and disparaging Sayyidunā 'Alī or Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما correct; nor are those reports correct which mention the curses and insults of the latter for Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah or his other supporters among the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. We do not accept the mutual insulting and cursing of the senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم from these reports. This is totally false.

After clarifying our stance and viewpoint, we submit that if hypothetically, the past reports are accepted according to the critics, then as an equivalent for that, some reports portraying the opposite image are documented in books which may be presented as a silence this issue once and for all. Those reports affirm that

Sayyidunā ‘Alī عليه السلام and his supporters would always insult and curse Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān عليه السلام, and their partisans. They began this practice and the other party acted in answer to it. The following sources should be studied:

- *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 6, mention of the gathering of both arbitrators at Dawmat al-Jandal, the year 36 A.H., old Egypt print.
- *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 6, the reason for Ḥujr ibn ‘Adī’s assassination, the year 51 A.H., old Egypt print.
- *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, vol. 2, section 1, chapter on Ḥanzalah, Hyderabad Dakkan print.
- *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar*, discussion on those who participated in Ṣiffīn with Mu‘āwiyah, Hyderabad Dakkan print.

There are many reports of this nature. However, if evaluation of this issue is the object, then this amount is sufficient. This was simply mentioned to indict the other party. Otherwise, with regards the disputes among the Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام, our stance is the same as the majority of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah and the pious predecessors i.e. all the Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام are deserving of the highest respect and honour from us. We do not regard as correct, speaking negatively of any of them, and we declare the entire pile of such reports inauthentic and false. They are historical rubbish, unreliable.

Thirdly, the issue of insulting and cursing has come to the table of discussion. While discussing it, as a rule of thumb, something will be highlighted briefly, which will prove beneficial to the readers. The senior scholars are already aware of this, and are not in need of it.

The status and honour of the noble Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام, their sincerity, integrity, noble practices, and immaculate character is established from the Book of Allah and the authentic Sunnah. On the basis of this, if any reports are found of insulting and cursing, etc., they will be weak, criticised, baseless, and unworthy of perusal.

If they have authentic chains, then the meaning of insulting and cursing will be subject to interpretation. The report will be interpreted since the words *sabb* and *shatam* are not only used for insulting and swearing, but at many junctures they refer to harshness in speech, bluntness, pointing out the faults of the addressee, and highlighting the defects and shortcomings of one another. Have a look at few examples of this:

1. Rasūlullāh ﷺ prevented two persons from touching the spring water before his arrival. They erred and touched the water. At this, Rasūlullāh ﷺ said:

هل مسستما من مائها شيئا فقالا نعم فسيهما رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و قال لهما ما شاء الله أن يقول

“Did you touch any of the water?” They replied in the affirmative.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ spoke harshly to them and said to them what Allah desired he say.¹

2. Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was in a world of bewilderment on the Day of Khandaq and began using harsh words for the kuffār.

إن عمر بن الخطاب قال يوم الخندق و جعل يسب كفار قريش قال يا رسول الله ما كدت أصلي العصر إلخ

On the Day of Khandaq, ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb began using harsh words for the kuffār. He said, “O Messenger of Allah, I was not able to perform ‘Asr.”²

1 *Al-Muwaṭṭa’*, chapter on joining two ṣalāhs at home and while on journey; *Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq*, vol. 2 pg. 546, Beirut print.

2 *Jāmi’ al-Tirmidhī*, vol. 1 pg. 53, chapter on the report of a person who missed a ṣalāh, with which should he begin, old print.

3. In *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, there is a report of a dispute between Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنهما and the words *istatabb* and *istatabbā* are used which mean that they spoke harshly to each other.¹

In some narrations, aspects on *ṭa’n* (criticism) and *qadh* (disparagement) are reported. If a suitable interpretation or meaning can be found, it will be. However, if a correct interpretation cannot be made, then the report will not be accepted and the respect and honour for the noble Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم will be upheld in every situation.

This topic with its details could be studied in the following books:

- *Al-Shifā’ bi Ta’rif Ḥuqūq al-Muṣṭafā* صلى الله عليه وسلم, vol. 2 pg. 49 – 50, Egypt print, section on part of his honour and kindness to him صلى الله عليه وسلم, is honouring his Companions.
- *Nasīm al-Riyāḍ Sharḥ al-Shifā’*, vol. 3 pg. 466 – 467, section on part of his honour and kindness to him صلى الله عليه وسلم, is honouring his Companions, old Egypt print.

The essence of the above is that we have presented a few points about this criticism levelled against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. Keeping them in mind, you decide for yourself with impartiality whether this objection is correct or not. Is it correct to rely on baseless narrations and broadcast misconceptions among the masses?

If one party criticised or objected to another party at few occasions (which is possible at times) then to label it as continuous insulting and cursing is pure prejudice. To display the image of expletives being uttered constantly from the

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 2 pg. 575, book on battles, chapter on the ḥadīth of Banū Naḍīr and Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم advancement upon them, Nūr Muḥammadī print, Delhi; *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 2 pg. 1085, book on adherence, chapter on the reprehensibility of becoming absorbed, disputing, and extremism in dīn, Nūr Muḥammadī print, Delhi.

pulpits is not only discrimination, but rather indicates animosity and antagonism. May Allah ﷺ protect us all from harbouring antagonism and rancour for all the noble Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم.

Request

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was a close relative of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. During the ‘Uthmānī era, he was tasked with the responsibilities of a huge city. Then he assumed the post of khilāfah, he served the dīn and made marvellous religious achievements. He kept strong relations with the Banū Hāshim. During his reign, the Muslims and Islam advanced considerably. To display the correct image of this, a vast register is needed. Nonetheless, we highlighted few superb aspects of that era through which the personality and conduct of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه can be understood properly.

The image which the critics have displayed of that era, that it brought about the destruction of the Islamic system and was the source of fitan and calamities; the reality of this has opened before you. The balance of justice is now in your hands. You evaluate and reach a conclusion by yourself.

‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ

And the allegations against him

The critics have levelled a number of accusations against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه on account of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ رضي الله عنه. For example, he removed an experienced and mature Ṣaḥābī (Sayyidunā ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضي الله عنه) from Egypt without any reason and appointed his foster brother (‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d), a youngster, as governor.

Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī al-Shīrī writes:

ولى عبد الله بن سعد بن أبي سرح مصر حتى تظلم منه أهلها إلخ

He appointed ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ over Egypt and due to him their residents were put under oppression.¹

A few aspects of the life of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d رضي الله عنه will be briefly presented to the esteemed readers which will highlight his worthiness and value and his Islamic services. At the end, few misconceptions will be addressed, Allah willing. By virtue of the above, the misconceptions will be removed.

Lineage and Fosterage

His name is ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ ibn al-Ḥārith. He is from the ‘Āmirī tribe. He is not an individual from the Banū Umayyah clan.

He is the foster brother of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه drank ‘Abd Allāh’s mother’s milk.

This is mentioned in *Ṭabaqāt ibn Sa’d* and *Usd al-Ghābah*:

1 *Minhāj al-Karāmah*, vol. 4 pg. 66, discussion on criticism against ‘Uthmān, Lahore print, at the end of *Minhāj al-Sunnah*.

عبد الله بن سعد بن أبي سرح بن الحارث ... بن عامر إلخ هو أخو عثمان من الرضاعة أرضعت أمه
عثمان إلخ

‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ ibn al-Ḥārith ... ibn ‘Āmir. He is the foster brother of ‘Uthmān. His mother suckled ‘Uthmān.¹

Apostasy after Islam followed by Islam, Bay‘ah and Steadfastness

و استأمن له عثمان يوم فتح مكة من رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فأمنه و قد كان أمر بقتله إلخ

On the Day of the Conquest of Makkah, ‘Uthmān sought security for him from Rasūlullāh ﷺ who awarded it to him. He had, aforesaid, ordered his assassination.²

و كان قد أسلم قديما ... ثم افتتن و خرج من المدينة إلى مكة مرتدا فأهدر رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم دمه يوم الفتح فجاء عثمان بن عفان إلى النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم فاستأمن له فأمنه ... و قال يا رسول الله تبايعه فبايعه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يومئذ على الإسلام و قال الإسلام يجب ما كان قبله

He had accepted Islam early on. Thereafter, he fell into fitnah and left Madīnah to Makkah as an apostate. Rasūlullāh ﷺ thus declared his blood permissible on the Day of the Conquest. So ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān came to the Nabī ﷺ and sought protection for him, and the request was granted. He said, “O Messenger of Allah, take bay‘ah from him.” thus Rasūlullāh ﷺ accepted his pledge of allegiance on that day upon Islam and declared, “Islam destroys everything before it.”³

و أسلم عبد الله بن سعد بن أبي سرح أيام الفتح فحسن إسلامه فلم يظهر منه شيء ينكر عليه بعد ذلك هو أحد النجباء العقلاء الكرماء من قريش

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 7 pg. 190 – 191, section 2, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ, Leiden print; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 173 biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sa’d, Tehran print.

2 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 433, the progeny of Abū Sarḥ.

3 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 7 pg. 190 – 191, section 2, ‘Abd Allah ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ.

‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ embraced Islam during the days of the Conquest. His Islam was firm. Thus, no issue thereafter was exhibited by him for which he was criticised. He is one of elite, intellectuals, and kind-hearted individuals of the Quraysh.¹

ثم إنه حسن إسلامه و لم يؤثر عنه بعدها إلا الخير

Thereafter, his Islam was sincere. Nothing was displayed by him after that besides goodness.²

Governor and Official

Allah blessed Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ رضي الله عنه with excellent talent. He was a ready pillar in administration affairs. That is why Sayyidunā ‘Umar al-Fārūq رضي الله عنه appointed him governor over the district Ṣa‘īd during his khilāfah. Thereafter, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه appointed him governor over Egypt. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar and Ibn al-Barqūnī have spoken of the above in the following words:

ثنا أبو صالح من الليث قال كان ابن أبي سرح على الصعيد في زمن عمر ثم ضم إليه عثمان مصر كلها إلخ

Abū ṣāliḥ narrated to us—from al-Laythī who said:

Ibn Abī Sarḥ was governor over Ṣa‘īd during the reign of ‘Umar. Thereafter, ‘Uthmān put the entire Egypt under his authority.³

Accomplishments in Islamic Conquests

When Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه appointed Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh رضي الله عنه as governor over Egypt due to the present circumstances, he fought many battles for the

1 *Al-Istī‘āb* with *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 368, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sa’d; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 173, biography of ‘Abd Allah.

2 *Al-Muntaqā*, pg. 403, Egypt print; *Jawāmi‘ al-Sīrah*, pg. 232, the conquest of Makkah.

3 *Al-Iṣābah* with *al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 2 pg. 309, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sa’d.

expansion of Islam. The Conquest of Africa is the most memorable achievement of his which took place in 27 A.H. With this, the Battle of Asāwid (In the Nubian land in 31 A.H.) and the Battle of al-Ṣawārī (in the Roman Sea) was won by him. All these vast lands were conquered under his supervision. These are his high religious services which the seniors of the ummah view with much appreciation.

ثم ولاة عثمان بعد ذلك مصر ... وفتح على يديه أفريقية سنة سبع و عشرين إلخ

Then ‘Uthmān made him governor over Egypt. Africa was conquered at his hands in the year 27 A.H.¹

وله مواقف محمودة في الفتوح ... وكان محمودا في ولايته و غزا ثلاث غزوات أفريقية و ذات الصواري و الأسود إلخ

He has many praiseworthy accomplishments on the battlefield to his name. He was praiseworthy during his term of governorship. He fought three battles, Africa, Dhāt al-Ṣawārī, and al-Asāwid.²

‘Abd Allāh’s Demise upon Goodness

After fulfilling religious tasks for a lengthy period, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa‘d رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ adopted solitude and detachment after the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and the arising fitnah thereupon and avoided the disputes therefrom. Some have mentioned that he settled in ‘Asqalān while others mention Ramlah.

قيل بل أقام بالرملة حتى مات فارا من الفتنة و دعا ربه فقال اللهم اجعل خاتمة عملي صلوة الصبح فتوضأ ثم صلى الصبح ... ثم سلم عن يمينه و ذهب يسلم عن يساره فقبض الله روحه

It is said that he stayed in Ramlah until he passed on, escaping the fitnah. He implored his Rabb saying, “O Allah, make the last action of mines the

1 *Al-Istī‘āb* with *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 368, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sa‘d; *Uṣd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 173, biography of ‘Abd Allah.

2 *Al-Iṣābah* with *al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 2 pg. 309, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sa‘d.

Fajr prayer.” He thus performed wuḍū’ and then performed Ṣalāt al-Fajr. He made salām to his right and as he went to make salām to his left, Allah took away his soul.¹

Glory be to Allah. May Allah be pleased with him.

Removal of few misconceptions

The critics have listed a number of criticisms against Amīr al-Mu’minīn Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, among which many pertain to Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ رضي الله عنه. Since Ibn Abī Sarḥ رضي الله عنه is the foster brother of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه (although he is not from the Banū Umayyah tribe), and Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه appointed him governor over Egypt, these objections are jointly targeted at Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān and Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ رضي الله عنه. Answering them is our concern.

1. The first accusation they level is that Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh رضي الله عنه accepted Islam and then apostatised after some time, due to which Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم ordered his assassination and execution. To shed some light on this issue (as we mentioned above), his acceptance of Islam and subsequent apostasy happened prior to the Conquest of Makkah. On the occasion of the Conquest of Makkah, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه brought him in the noble presence of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, after which he reverted to Islam and pledged allegiance. At this, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم announced, as appeared above:

إن الإسلام يجب ما كان قبله

Indeed, Islam wipes out every sin and shortcoming before it.

1 *Al-Istī‘āb* with *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 366, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sa’d; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 174, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ; *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 309, biography of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ; *Sīrat al-Ḥalabīyyah*, vol. 3 pg. 264, chapter on the list of his صلى الله عليه وسلم famous scribes.

This prophetic affirmation has cleared the air. All sins, whether big or small, are pardoned and his Islam is accepted.

Another famous Ṣaḥābī is Sayyidunā ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. His incident is recorded in the books of ḥadīth. It is reported therein that he came into the presence of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to give bay‘ah. After extending his hand, he withdrew it and said, “O Messenger of Allah, on condition that my previous mistakes are forgiven.” On this occasion, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ announced:

يا عمرو أما علمت أن الإسلام يهدم ما كان قبله

O ‘Amr, do you not know that Islam wipes out everything before it.¹

In a similar way, many persons apostatised in that era and subsequently reverted to Islam and became upright. This is the same case with Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa‘d رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Now, to recall the previous sins, continue taking him to task, and label him a *murtad* (apostate) and *Ṭarīd al-Rasūl* (Rasūl’s outcast) is against the Islamic style. In the glorious Qur’ān, the divine declaration has been sounded as a warning:

وَلَا تَتَابَرُؤْا بِالْأَلْقَابِ بِئْسَ الْأِسْمُ الْفُسُوقُ بَعْدَ الْإِيمَانِ وَمَنْ لَمْ يَتُبْ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الظَّالِمُونَ

*Do not call each other by [offensive] nicknames. Wretched is the name of disobedience after [one’s] faith. And whoever does not repent - then it is those who are the wrongdoers.*²

2. They also object that Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa‘d ibn Abī Sarḥ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and other people of his kind were the *Ṭulaqā’*, i.e. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ forgave

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, vol. 1 pg. 76, book on faith, chapter on Islam erasing everything before it, Nūr Muḥammadī print.

2 *Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt*: 11.

them on the occasion of the Conquest of Makkah. These *Ṭulaqā'* were given the reigns of the ummah by Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. It is due to this that people looked at them with scorn.

Sufficient with regards to this issue is that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ stood at the door of the Ka'bah on the occasion of the Makkan conquest and announced inter alia:

O gathering of Quraysh! Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has removed the pride and arrogance over your forefathers of ignorance. All people are from Ādam and he was from dust.”

He then recited the following verse:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنَّا خَلَقْنَاكُمْ مِنْ ذَكَرٍ وَأُنْثَىٰ وَجَعَلْنَاكُمْ شُعُوبًا وَقَبَائِلَ لِتَعَارَفُوا إِنَّ أَكْرَمَكُمْ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ أَتْقَاكُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلِيمٌ خَبِيرٌ

*O mankind, indeed We have created you from male and female and made you peoples and tribes that you may know one another. Indeed, the most noble of you in the sight of Allah is the most righteous of you. Indeed, Allah is Knowing and Acquainted.*¹

After which he proclaimed:

O gathering of Quraysh, what is your view? How will I treat you?

The people replied, “You will treat us cordially. You are noble and kind and the son of a noble and kind man.”

Hearing this, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said, “Go, you are free, i.e. you all have been awarded pardon.”²

1 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 13.

2 *Sīrat Ibn Hishām*, vol. 2 pg. 412, Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ṭawāf of the House and his speech therein, Egypt print.

During this address, all the tribes of Quraysh were present. Rasūlullāh ﷺ addressed the entire audience. The individuals of a particular tribe were not the only addressees, nor were these words directed at a handful of selected persons. Various tribes of the Quraysh were present before his noble personality. The Banū Taym, Banū ‘Adī, Banū Makhzūm, Banū Khuzaymah, Banū Asad, Banū Nawfal, Banū Zuhrah, Banū Hāshim, Banū ‘Abd Shams (Banū Umayyah), etc., all those present were addressed with the words:

اذهبوا فانتم الطلقاء

Go for you are free.

This ruling was not specific to any clan. The words O gathering of Quraysh is an open contextual evidence for generality.

Now to label a few individuals of the Banū Umayyah (Sayyidunā Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Sarḥ ﷺ) as Ṭulaqā’ and to create dislike for them in the masses is no noble deed. First of all, this was not a derogative word which Rasūlullāh ﷺ uttered. It only implied forgiveness. Moreover, due to this word, there existed no mutual disgust or aversion in the time of the esteemed Ṣaḥābah ﷺ, nor would they use it to insult one another, nor were the noble Ṣaḥābah ﷺ perturbed by any of them assuming a position of authority. In fact, the reality is the opposite. Sayyidunā ‘Umar al-Fārūq ﷺ gave amazing offices to these Ṭulaqā’ during his khilāfah, as we mentioned previously. Specifically Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ ﷺ was appointed governor over the Ṣa’īd district by Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ. Or in other words, he handed the reigns of the ummah to the Ṭulaqā’. (The reference to this has been provided in the previous pages.)

It is ironic that these Ṭulaqā’ are awarded positions of authority in the eras of Sayyidunā Ṣiddīq Akbar and Sayyidunā Fārūq A’ẓam ﷺ, and

everything runs smoothly. The public is neither disturbed, nor is Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه criticised. On the other hand, when they assume posts in the ‘Uthmānī era, these very *Ṭulaqā’* are despised and disparaged, the entire populace is disgusted with them, and the propaganda of giving the reigns of the ummah to *Ṭulaqā’* activates. Oh how paradoxical!

3. Another objection raised is that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه dismissed Sayyidunā ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضي الله عنه, an experienced Ṣaḥābī, from Egypt and gave this honourable position to his foster brother. This was a prejudiced deed done for family distinctions. To top it all, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Sarḥ رضي الله عنه wrought havoc.

To remove this doubt, a few points are penned hereunder to ponder over. No other answer will be needed.

Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ رضي الله عنه was not from the tribe of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه (the Banū Umayyah). Rather, he was from the Banū ‘Āmir. Nonetheless, the critics have regarded his foster brotherhood his crime.

The year in which Sayyidunā ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضي الله عنه was relieved from Egypt and Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ رضي الله عنه was instated, this very same year (27 A.H.) saw the Battle of Africa. Under the leadership of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d رضي الله عنه was this momentous operation handled. Among the warriors was the biological son of Sayyidunā ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضي الله عنه, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضي الله عنه. Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh is a Ṣaḥābī himself and participated enthusiastically in the Battle of Africa along with other Ṣaḥābah, the likes of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar, ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr, Ma’bad ibn al-‘Abbās, ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās, Ibn Ja’far, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and others رضي الله عنهم. The Muslims were victorious and obtained booty. All this was accomplished under the leadership of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d رضي الله عنه who was the army general.

Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāṭ has written in volume one of his history compilation:

و فيها (سنة ٢٧ هـ) عزل عثمان بن عفان عمرو بن العاص عن مصر و ولاها عبد الله بن سعد بن أبي سرح
فغزا ابن أبي سرح أفريقية و معه العبادلة عبد الله بن عمر و عبد الله بن عمرو (بن العاص) و عبد الله بن
الزبير

In this year (27 A.H.) ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān relieved ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ from Egypt and instated ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ. Ibn Abī Sarḥ waged war on Africa alongside the ‘Ubādalah, viz. ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr (ibn al-‘Āṣ) and ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr.¹

The following historians have also recorded this fact that in the Battle of Africa, Sayyidunā ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ’s son, ‘Abd Allāh رضي الله عنه, joined while the army general was Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ رضي الله عنه.

- Al-Balādhurī: *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, pg. 234, the Conquest of Africa.
- Ibn Khaldūn: *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn*, vol. 2 pg. 1003, governorship of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Sarḥ over Egypt and the Conquest of Africa, new Beirut print.

The idea of relating this is that had Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه removed Sayyidunā ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضي الله عنه in an impermissible way, and had this dismissal been the product of prejudice, then on that occasion why did the senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم raise no objection? Sayyidunā ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ’s own son Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh رضي الله عنه did not object nor deemed the dismissal erroneous. To the contrary, after a short while (when the Battle of Africa presented itself) he participated under the leadership of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d رضي الله عنه, displaying his total support. As if his action has removed the doubt that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه removed Sayyidunā ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضي الله عنه for no reason and out of discrimination. Furthermore, Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz speaks of this by mentioning:

1 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ*, vol. 1 pg. 134, the year 27 A.H., Iraq print.

در لشکر او بسیاری از صحابه و اولاد صحابه بودند بر همه از سیرت او خوش ماندند و بیچ وجه بر اوضاع او انکار نه کردند از جمله اینها عقبه بن عامر جهنی و عبد الرحمن بن ابی بکر و عبد الله بن عمرو بن العاص

In the army of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d رضی اللہ عنہ in the Conquest of Africa, many illustrious Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم and children of Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم were present. Everyone was pleased with Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d’s رضی اللہ عنہ behaviour and mannerism. They did not in any way criticise the behaviour of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh رضی اللہ عنہ. Among those who participated were Sayyidunā ‘Uqbah ibn ‘Āmir al-Juhanī, Sayyidunā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr, and Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضی اللہ عنہ.¹

Worthy of note is that Sayyidunā ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضی اللہ عنہ was a staunch supporter and backer of the Banū Umayyah. History bears testimony to this fact. If for argument’s sake we accept that Sayyidah ‘Uthmān رضی اللہ عنہ dismissed him out of prejudice and took this post away from him in an impermissible manner, then Sayyidunā ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضی اللہ عنہ would have been saddened and grieved at heart. Due to this, not only would he be opposed to the Banū Umayyah, he would have supported their opposition. However, the reality is the opposite. This teaches us that his dismissal from Egypt was not out of discrimination, nor was he grieved by it. Instead, the change of post was due to present circumstances.

Note:

In those days, the objection of the entire *khums* (fifth of the booty) of Africa been given to Sayyidunā Ibn Abī Sarḥ رضی اللہ عنہ is quite well-known. The answer to it will, Allah willing, be presented in the discussion on favouritism of relatives with regards to wealth. This discussion is regarding favouritism of relatives with regards to posts and offices. In the fourth discussion, the aspect of wealth will be tackled and this issue will be resolved there, with Allah’s سُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى help.

1 *Tuḥfat Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*, pg. 315, criticisms against ‘Uthmān, the end of fourth criticism, new Lahore print.

Benefit:

At this juncture, the report of *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 71, under the year 31 A.H. is presented by the critics which disparages and derides Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه in a nasty manner and mentions that his execution is permissible. Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa‘d رضي الله عنه is taken to task on few accounts. All these faults have been listed from the side of Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr and Muḥammad ibn Abī Ḥudhayfah.

This narration is very lengthy. Quoting the text of the report and then translating it will be a lengthy issue. The above signs of the narration are sufficient to locate the narration.

Briefly, both the chain and text will be analysed which will prove sufficient for the just-natured people and the unreliability of this report will be realised.

Analysis of the chain

Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī narrates from Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar (al-Wāqidī) who in turn narrates from Ma‘mar ibn Rāshid who reports on the strength of Zuhri.

- Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī has gathered all types of historical reports; authentic and inauthentic, weak and strong, fabricated and baseless; the entire lot. Generally, he mentions a chain. However, at times he does not and mentions some things from his own side. This is evident and nothing obscure to the scholars. He mentioned the above chain for this report.
- Al-Ṭabarī took this information from Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar al-Wāqidī. Al-Wāqidī is a famous liar, *matruk* (accused of ḥadīth forgery), and a fabricator of aḥādīth.¹

1 *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb wa Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 9 pg. 364, 366, 367, under Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar al-Wāqidī.

Until his report is not strengthened from another avenue, it is unacceptable. His mutafarrid reports are discarded. Whatever appears in this report is not backed by a ṣaḥīḥ narration.

- Al-Wāqidī reports from Ma'mar ibn Rāshid. Ma'mar is a reliable person and the scholars have praised him duly and declared him reliable. Notwithstanding this, it is proven that one of Ma'mar's nephews was a Rāfiḍī. He got hold of Ma'mar's compilation of aḥādīth and altered them. Have a look at the following texts as evidence. The words of Ibn Ḥajar are:

قال أبو حامد ابن الشرقي هو حديث باطل و السبب فيه أن معمرا كان له ابن أخ رافضي و كان معمرا يمكنه من كتبه فأدخل عليه هذا الحديث

Abū Ḥāmid ibn al-Sharqī says: It is a false ḥadīth. The reason for this is that Ma'mar had a nephew who was a Rāfiḍī. Ma'mar would grant him access to his books. He included this ḥadīth in the books and attributed it to Ma'mar.¹

It is compulsory to clarify here so that no deviate from the truth writes a rule that all the reports of Ma'mar are doubtful. No, this is incorrect. Instead, the incident has been written by the scholars under those reports of Ma'mar which contradict accepted fundamentals. They are *munkar* or *shādh* reports. They appear contradictory to accepted fundamentals of the Sharī'ah and no proper interpretation can be given to them. Regarding such reports of Ma'mar, the research scholars have certainly clarified that doubts and alterations are found in them. And the report of al-Ṭabarī under our discussion is also of this type. Hence, it is also not worthy of acceptance.²

1 *Mizān al-Itidāl*, vol. 1 pg. 38, Aḥmad ibn al-Azhar ibn Manī al-Naysāpūrī; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 1 pg. 12, Aḥmad ibn al-Azhar ibn Manī; *Dhayl al-La'ālī al-Maṣnū'ah*, pg. 61, book on virtues, 'Alawī Lakhnawī publishers, old edition, under the merits of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 11 – 12.

- Ma'mar has related the entire incident from al-Zuhrī. And the entire thing is his personal statement. It is not the statement of a renowned individual of that era. Al-Zuhrī is reliable, however, noteworthy is that Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī was not present at the time. In fact, the scholars have written that he was born in 58 A.H. and this incident (the Battle of Africa) took place in 27 A.H. (as in the report of Ibn Khayyāṭ.) al-Ṭabarī on the other hand mentions it under the year 31 A.H, but the research of Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ seems correct. So, al-Zuhrī is born approximately 31 years after. Then, his age of maturity is taken at least 15 years. This adds to 46 years. Where did this report remain for such a lengthy period? Who reported it? Who related it to Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī? All of this is worthy of consideration. To the contrary, the reports which have authentic and uninterrupted isnāds, which do not contain these criticisms against Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه will be accepted and this report will be discarded.

Analysis of the Content of the Report

Worthy of noting is that if the content of this report is hypothetically deemed correct (that Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه has these defects due to which his execution is correct) then in this significant Battle of Africa, why did a large group of senior Ṣaḥābah from Madīnah Munawwarah and youngsters of the Banū Hāshim and Quraysh the likes of Sayyidunā Ibn 'Umar, Ibn 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ, Ibn 'Abbās, 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr, 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr ibn al-'Awwām, Miswar ibn Makhramah, Basr ibn Arṭāt, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn (according to Ibn Khaldūn), etc. participate? These luminaries were ought to raise these objections against Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه and Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn Sa'd رضي الله عنه before. Why did they not? Why did they join the military expedition of Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn Sa'd ibn Abī Sarḥ رضي الله عنه with silence?

Secondly, worthy consideration is that Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr and Muḥammad ibn Abī Ḥudhayfah are of a low rank. Senior nobles and Quraysh leaders do not consider these criticisms and do not spread these defects while low ranking

persons broadcast the same? As if only they observed these faults while the seniors were totally blind to them.

According to al-Balādhurī, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's son, Sayyidunā 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr رضي الله عنه, was part of the Battle of Africa under the leadership of Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn Sa'd رضي الله عنه while his brother, Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr, on this occasion vehemently insults and criticises Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn Sa'd and Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه. This is practical and verbal polarity between the true brothers. In this case, the practical support of Sayyidunā 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr رضي الله عنه will be given preference and Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr's disagreement will be put behind, since the former's rank is far superior to the latter's in every aspect.

Another point worth pondering over, in the light of this report, Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr and Muḥammad ibn Abī Ḥudhayfah raised these objections on the occasion of the battle. Why did they not raise the issue in Madīnah? If these issues were correct, it was binding upon them to present them to the people in the capital of Islam, Madīnah. After crossing Egypt and at the battlefield was not the occasion. The gist of this is that this report makes no logical sense just as it is unacceptable from the perspective of its chain.

Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam

And the allegations against him

One of the relatives whom Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه gave state responsibilities to was Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.

He is disparaged for a number of reasons just as the other relatives of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. His excellences were declared non-existent and his flaws were publicised whereas if a person has flaws, then he definitely has some good qualities too. In this regard, a brief biography of Marwān will be penned.

1. The image of Marwān’s life presented by the critics is filled with tribal prejudice and historical misguidance. Looking at these historical information, some scholars and authors have criticised Marwān.

In the upcoming lines, we will present few incidents and aspects of the life of Marwān which will reveal his potential and worthiness as well as his conduct and behaviour. The answers to tribalism will appear as well. Lineage preferences will appear weightless. And the good side of the relationship shared by the Banū Hāshim and Banū Umayyah will come to the fore.

2. We do not claim the infallibility of Marwān, nor are we persistent that he committed no mistakes. Possibly, he erred at various occasions. May Allah forgive him. Nonetheless, listing his good qualities is a practical and historical necessity. Owing to this, we will portray the other side of Marwān’s image to the readers so that the fair-natured will automatically realise the reality and his opposition who have spoken condescendingly of his behaviour will be able to draw a comparison.
3. Previously, in the first discussion, some aspects were briefly mentioned regarding Marwān’s office which should be kept in mind in his biography. Moreover, be informed that the following aspects of Marwān are not

exclusive to the ‘Uthmānī era but overflow to the subsequent eras. The discussion will be regarding Marwān’s personality.

4. At the end of this discussion, it will be appropriate to remove some misconceptions. Allah willing, they will be tackled according to the occasion.

Brief Biography

Marwān’s father’s name is al-Ḥakam ibn al-‘Āṣ ibn Umayyah. At the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, Marwān was five years or eight years old, according to various reports of scholars.

قالوا قبض رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و مروان بن الحكم ابن ثمان سنين فلم يزل مع أبيه حتى مات
أبوه الحكم بن أبي العاص في خلافة عثمان بن عفان إلخ

Rasūlullāh ﷺ passed on and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam was eight years old. He remained with his father until his father Ḥakam ibn Abī al-‘Āṣ passed away in the khilāfah of ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān.¹

مات الحكم سنة اثنين و ثلاثين في خلافة عثمان

Al-Ḥakam passed away the year 32 in ‘Uthmān’s khilāfah.²

مات في شهر رمضان سنة خمس و ستين بدمشق

He passed away in the month of Ramaḍān, 35 A.H. in Damascus.³

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘ād*, vol. 5 pg. 24, biography of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, Leiden print; *al-Iṣābah* with *al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 3 pg. 256, second section, biography of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.

2 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 1 pg. 345, biography of Ḥakam ibn Abī al-‘Āṣ.

3 *Al-Jam‘ bayn Rijāl al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, pg. 501 – 502, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, Hyderabad Dakkan print; *al-Iṣābah* with *al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 3 pg. 456, second section, biography of Marwān. Egypt print; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 260, end of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam’s biography.

‘Uthmān’s Son-In-Law

According to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam possessed noble character and excellent behaviour. Owing to this, he gave his daughter Umm Abān al-Kubrā in marriage to this cousin of his.

وتزوجت أم أبان الكبرى مروان بن الحكم بن أبي العاص فولدت له و توفيت عنده زوجه إياها عثمان

Umm Abān al-Kubrā married Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam ibn Abī al-‘Āṣ. She gave birth to his children and passed away while married to him. ‘Uthmān got them married.¹

Now some family links between Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ family and Marwān’s family will be mentioned. Study them carefully.

Relationships between the Children of ‘Alī and Marwān’s family

1. وكانت رملة بنت علي عند أبي الهياج واسمه عبد الله بن أبي سفيان بن الحارث بن عبد المطلب ولدت له وقد انقرض ولد أبي سفيان بن الحارث ثم خلف عليها معاوية بن مروان بن الحكم بن أبي العاص

Ramlah bint ‘Alī was in the wedlock of Abū al-Hayyāj, whose name was ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Sufyān ibn al-Ḥārith ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib. She gave birth to his children. However, the progeny of Abū Sufyān ibn al-Ḥārith ceased. Mu‘āwiyah ibn Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam ibn Abī al-‘Āṣ then married her.²

ومعاوية ... شقيق عبد الملك ... وتزوج رملة بنت علي بن أبي طالب بعد أبي الهياج عبد الله بن أبي سفيان بن الحارث بن عبد المطلب

Mu‘āwiyah, the twin of ‘Abd al-Malik: Ramlah bint ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib married him after Abū al-Hayyāj, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Sufyān ibn al-Ḥārith ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib.³

1 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 112, the offspring of ‘Uthmān.

2 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 45, the offspring of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.

3 *Jamharat Ansāb al-‘Arab*, pg. 87, the offspring of al-Ḥakam ibn Abī al-‘Āṣ and the children of his son Marwān.

2. وكانت زينب بنت الحسن بن الحسن بن علي عند الوليد بن عبد الملك بن مروان وهو خليفة

Zaynab bint al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī was married to Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān when he was khalīfah.¹

Zaynab’s mother is Fatimah bint Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.

Ibn Ḥazm has spoken of this marriage while discussing the details of the offspring of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam in *Jamharat al-Ansāb*:

و ولد معاوية بن مروان بن عبد الملك الوليد بن معاوية أمة زينب بنت الحسن بن الحسن بن علي بن أبي طالب

The son of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Marwān ibn ‘Abd al-Malik was Walīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah. His mother was Zaynab bint al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.²

Note: The readers should be cognisant of the fact that Ramlah bint ‘Alī was first in the wedlock of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Marwān and Zaynab bint al-Ḥasan al-Muthannā came after into his wedlock. (They were married to him at different times.) Zaynab bint al-Ḥasan al-Muthannā had two successive husbands, one Mu‘āwiyah ibn Marwān and after him, Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān. However, we could not find clarification as to which was her first and second husband. A woman being married to uncle then nephew [or vice versa] is no defect.

3. The third bond of marriage between these two families has been documented as such:

ونفيسة بنت زيد تزوجها وليد بن عبد الملك بن مروان فتوفيت عنده وأمه لبابة بنت عبد الله بن عباس بن عبد المطلب بن هاشم

1 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 52, the children of Ḥasan Muthannā.

2 *Jamharat Ansāb al-‘Arab*, pg. 108, offspring of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.

Nafīṣah bint Zayd: Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān married her. She passed away while in his wedlock. Her mother was Lubābah bint ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib ibn Hāshim.¹

وكان لزيد ابنة اسمها نفيسة خرجت إلى الوليد بن عبد الملك بن مروان فولدت منه

Zayd had a daughter, Nafīṣah. She went to Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān and had children with him.

وقد قيل إنما خرجت إلى عبد الملك بن مروان أنها ماتت حاملا منه و الأصح الأول و كان زيد يفد على الوليد بن عبد الملك و يقعد على سريريه يكرمه لمكان ابنته

It is said that she went to ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān and passed away while pregnant with this child. The first view is correct, however. Zayd would visit Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, sit on his chair, and honour him to Walīd’s relation with his daughter.²

Caution: Some scholars have said that Nafīṣah was married to ‘Abd al-Malik. This is incorrect. Rather, her marriage to Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān is correct. The word *kharajat* (went) was used by the Shī‘ī clerics. Our scholars have not used this term.

4. فولد إسماعيل بن عبد الملك بن الحارث مسلمة و إسحق و مروان و حسينا و محمدا أمهم أم كلثوم بنت الحسين بن الحسن بن علي بن أبي طالب

The children of Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn al-Ḥārith are: Muslimah, Isḥāq, Marwān, Ḥusayn, and Muḥammad. Their mother is Umm Kulthūm bint al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.³

Ismā‘īl is Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam’s biological brother, al-Ḥārith ibn al-Ḥakam’s grandson. He married Umm Kulthūm. Some have her name as Khadījah:

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 5 pg. 234, biography of Zayd ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.

2 *‘Umdat al-Ṭālib fī Ansāb Āl Abī Ṭālib*, pg. 70, first object, the progeny of Zayd ibn al-Ḥasan.

3 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 171, Ḥārith ibn al-Ḥakam; *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 51, Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.

و ولد إسماعيل بن عبد الملك بن الحارث بن الحكم المذكور محمد الأكبر و الحسين و إسحاق و مسلمة
أمهم خديجة بنت الحسين بن حسن بن علي بن أبي طالب

The offspring of Ismā'īl ibn 'Abd al-Malik ibn al-Ḥārith ibn al-Ḥakam are: Muḥammad al-Akbar, Ḥusayn, Ishāq, and Muslimah. Their mother is Khadījah bint al-Ḥusayn ibn Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.¹

5. و ولد إسماعيل بن عبد الملك بن الحارث بن الحكم محمد الأصغر و الوليد و يزيد أمهم حامدة بنت
الحسن بن الحسن بن علي بن أبي طالب خلف عليها بعد بنت عمها المذكورة

The offspring of Ismā'īl ibn 'Abd al-Malik ibn al-Ḥārith ibn al-Ḥakam are: Muḥammad al-Aṣghar, Walīd, and Yazīd. Their mother is Ḥāmidah bint al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. He married her after her above-mentioned cousin (paternal aunt's daughter).²

Under the above heading, a couple of marriage bonds between the two families were listed. These family links are a beautiful means of bringing these two tribes closer, and are recorded for eternity on the pages of history. They are marvellous pieces of evidence, denial of which is impossible.

Now if at times, there were temporary disputes and disagreements between these two families, its occurrence will be regarded as a temporary issue, just like temporary issues come and go and are resolved in their limits. The reality is that these types of disputes are generally temporary and the bond of family is perpetual and everlasting from generation to generation.

Furthermore, the historical reports of tales of dispute between these two families have less truth and more exaggerations. To regard these historical tales based on reality is in no way correct.

All these girls from the progeny of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه were given gladly to the family of Marwān. These bonds were contracted with mutual consent. These are historical facts. They prove that the family of Sayyidunā 'Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه did

1 *Jamharat Ansāb al-'Arab*, pg. 109, offspring of Muḥammad ibn Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.

2 *Jamharat Ansāb al-'Arab*, pg. 109, the children of Muḥammad ibn Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.

not regard the family of Marwān as bad, but rather as good. On the basis of this, these links were created.

Moreover, it is evident that the tales of the evil of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam are not correct, the way presented by those who came after. This is due to the fact that the Hāshimites who contracted these bonds with Marwān's family were closer to that era so they ought to be aware of the Marwānī shenanigans and Marwānī behaviour.

Despite this, if the Hāshimites formed these perpetual bonds with this tribe, then they have by family tradition and practical assistance established that Marwān and his family are not deserving of hatred and insult, as broadcasted by the narrators among the people.

Academic Talent and Reliability

Concerning Marwān's academic position and potential, much material is available in our religious books. A few of these aspects will be presented to the noble readers.

Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam's academic reliability is accepted to the extent that he reports aḥādīth and masā'il from Sayyidunā 'Umar, Sayyidunā 'Uthmān, Sayyidunā 'Alī, Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Thābit, Sayyidunā 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Aswad, and other senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. Some Ṣaḥābah and senior Tābi'īn narrate from him, like Sahl ibn Sa'd (Ṣaḥābī), 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn (Tābi'ī), 'Urwah ibn al-Zubayr (Tābi'ī), Sa'īd ibn al-Musayyab (Tābi'ī), Mujāhid, etc.

روى مروان عن عمر و عثمان و علي رضي الله عنهم و روى عنه سهل بن سعد و علي بن الحسين و عروة بن الزبير و أبو بكر بن عبد الرحمن

Marwān narrates from 'Umar, 'Uthmān and 'Alī رضي الله عنهم and Sahl ibn Sa'd, 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, 'Urwah ibn al-Zubayr, and Abū Bakr ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān narrate from him.¹

1 *Kitāb al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*, vol. 4 pg. 271, section 1, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, Dakkan print; *al-Jam' bayn Rijāl al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, pg. 501 – 502, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam ibn Abī al-'Āṣ, Dakkan print.

The esteemed scholars have written that Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam's position in ḥadīth is reliable. He is not accused in the science of ḥadīth. Senior muḥaddithīn and leading Fuqahā' of the ummah have relied upon him and have documented his reports through their respective chains. A few of Marwān's reports will be quoted as samples.

قال عروة بن الزبير كان مروان لا يتهم في الحديث

'Urwah ibn al-Zubayr says, "Marwān was not suspected in ḥadīth."

وقد روى عنه سهل بن سعد الساعدي الصحابي اعتمادا على صدقه

Sahl ibn Sa'd al-Sā'idī the Ṣaḥābī narrated from him, relying on his truthfulness.

وقد اعتمد مالك على حديثه ورأيه و الباقرن سوى مسلم

Mālik relied upon his ḥadīth and view as well as the others besides Muslim.¹

Muwaṭṭa' Imām Mālik

Imām Mālik رحمه الله in his *magnum opus Muwaṭṭa'* has reported Sharῑ masā'il at a number of places via his chain from Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, with full reliance on him. A few places will be listed as samples.

1. *Muwaṭṭa' Mālik*, pg. 14, Mujtabā'ī Delhi print, wuḍū' after touching the private area.
2. *Muwaṭṭa' Mālik*, pg. 87, Mujtabā'ī Delhi print, book on fasting, chapter regarding the reports on the fast of a person who woke up in major impurity.

1 *Hady al-Sārī Muqaddamah Faṭḥ al-Bārī*, vol. 2 pg. 164, the letter mīm, Egypt print.

3. *Muwaṭṭa' Mālik*, pg. 304, Muḥtabā'ī Delhi print, chapter on the reports on the right upon the pulpit.
4. *Muwaṭṭa' Mālik*, pg. 342, Muḥtabā'ī Delhi print, qīṣāṣ in killing.
5. *Muwaṭṭa' Mālik*, pg. 356, Delhi print, book on stealing, chapter on items where cutting will not take place.

Muwaṭṭa' Imām Muḥammad

Likewise, Imām Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Shaybānī رحمته الله has documented many laws from Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam in his book, *Muwaṭṭa'*, with full trust in them. The respective chapters have been flagged below. Quoting the entire text was a lengthy issue, hence this style was adopted. The scholars may refer to the book for satisfaction.

1. *Muwaṭṭa' Muḥammad*, pg. 178, Muṣṭafā'ī Lucknow print, chapter on a man upon who dawn enters in Ramaḍān while he is in major impurity.
2. *Muwaṭṭa' Muḥammad*, pg. 290, chapter on the blood money for teeth.
3. *Muwaṭṭa' Muḥammad*, pg. 299, book on legal punishments, chapter on the person who steals a fruit or something else which is not guarded.
4. *Muwaṭṭa' Muḥammad*, pg. 303, book on legal punishments, chapter on the defalcator.
5. *Muwaṭṭa' Muḥammad*, pg. 347, book on business transactions, chapter on gifts and charity, Muṣṭafā'ī Lucknow print.

Muṣannaf 'Abd al-Razzāq

The renowned muḥaddith, 'Abd al-Razzāq, has reported a statement of Sayyidunā 'Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه on the strength of Marwān, via his chain in *al-Muṣannaf*, pertaining to *īlā'*¹:

1 *īlā'*: the husband swearing on oath that he will not have conjugal relations with his wife.

عن عبد الرزاق عن الثوري عن ليث عن مجاهد عن مروان عن علي قال إذا مضت الأربعة فإنه يحبس حتى يغيء أو يطلق قال مروان ولو وليت هذا لقضيت فيه بقضا علي

‘Abd al-Razzāq—from al-Thawrī—from Layth—from Mujāhid—from Marwān—from ‘Alī who said:

When four (months) pass, he [the husband who made the oath] will be detained until he breaks his oath or gives ṭalāq.

Marwān comments, “Had this case been brought to me, I would have passed ‘Alī’s judgement.”¹

In *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*, this statement of Marwān is documented as follows:

قال مروان ولو وليت لفعلت مثل ما يفعل

Marwān comments, “Had this case been brought to me, I would have done just as ‘Alī had done.”²

Musnad Imām Aḥmad

Imām Aḥmad in volume 4 of his *Musnad Aḥmad* has commenced a new heading under which he included the reports of Sayyidunā Miswar ibn Makhramah al-Zuhrī رضي الله عنه and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam. Sayyidunā Miswar ibn Makhramah رضي الله عنه is among the junior Ṣaḥābah. From page 323 to page 331 of volume 4, many reports of these two persons are documented therein. The titled has the following words:

حديث المسور بن مخزومة الزهري و مروان بن الحكم رضي الله عنهما

The ḥadīth of Miswar ibn Makhramah al-Zuhrī and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam رضي الله عنه.

1 *Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq*, vol. 6 pg. 457, chapter on the termination of four, (discussion on ṭalā’), Majlis ‘Ilmī Beirut print, first edition.

2 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*, vol. 5 pg. 131, a person who makes ṭalā’ should hold on, discussions on ṭalā’, Hyderabad Dakkan print.

In volume 5 of *Musnad Aḥmad*, the report of Marwān is documented under the traditions of Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Thābit رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

عروة بن الزبير أن مروان أخبره قال قال لي زيد بن ثابت مالك تقرأ في المغرب بقصار المنفصل

‘Urwah ibn al-Zubayr narrates that Marwān informed him saying:

Zayd ibn Thābit said to me, “Why do you read *qīṣār al-mufaṣṣal*¹ in Maghrib?”²

Similarly, at various places of this *Musnad* are the reports of Marwān available. This marking simply served as a sample.

Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī

Imām al-Bukhārī has documented the reports of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. He mentions the narration of both Sayyidunā Miswar ibn Makhramah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam at one place in the book on *wakālah* (representation):

عن ابن شهاب قال و زعم عروة أن مروان بن الحكم و المسور بن المخزومة أخبرا أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قام حين جاءه وفد هوازن مسلمين إلخ

Ibn Shihāb states: ‘Urwah is confident that Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam and Miswar ibn al-Makhramah informed that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ stood when the delegation of Hawāzin came to him as believers.³

Similarly, Sayyidunā Sahl ibn Sa’d al-Sā’idī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (Ṣaḥābī) and other Tābi’īn have obtained narrations from Marwān which are documented in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar confirms this in the introduction of *Fath al-Bārī* saying:

1 Short sūrahs beginning from Sūrah al-Bayyinah to Sūrah al-Nās.

2 *Musnad Aḥmad* with *Muntakhab Kanz al-Ummāl*, vol. 5 pg. 189, Zayd ibn Thābit, Egypt print, old edition.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 309, book on representation, chapter on when he gifts the representative something, Nūr Muḥammadī print, Delhi.

Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam al-Umawī has two traditions.¹

Ibn Ḥajar writes in the introduction of *Fath al-Bārī*:

فإنما حمل عنه سهل بن سعد و عروة بن الزبير و علي بن الحسين و أبو بكر بن عبد الرحمن بن الحارث
و هؤلاء أخرج البخاري أحاديثهم عنه في صحيحه إلخ

Sahl ibn Sa'd, 'Urwah ibn al-Zubayr, 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, and Abū Bakr ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ḥārith narrated from him and al-Bukhārī has documented their aḥādīth from him in his *al-Ṣaḥīḥ*.²

At this juncture, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has clarified that besides some Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, senior Tābi'īn like 'Urwah ibn al-Zubayr, Zayn al-Ābidīn ('Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn), and others trusted Marwān in religion and knowledge and thus reported from him aḥādīth and Shar'ī masā'il. Imām al-Bukhārī has included these in his *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*.

Note: The scholars should be notified that Imām al-Bukhārī, in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, vol. 4, section one, page. 368, has mentioned some brief points on Marwān without any criticism. Similarly, Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī in *Kitāb al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*, vol. 4, section 1, pg. 271, has given a brief biography of Marwān with noting that a certain Ṣaḥābī and certain Tābi'ī obtained reports from him. He did not mention any word of criticism for him. He only highlighted his reliability.

The scholars are aware that these two books hold the position of primary references for biographies and narrators. They are silent when it comes to criticising Marwān. They have not spoken negatively of him, as have those who came after them after being affected by historical reports.

1 *Hady al-Sārī Muqaddamah Fath al-Bārī*, vol. 2 pg. 192, mention of a few reports of every Ṣaḥābī in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, mawṣūl or mu'allaq.

2 *Hady al-Sārī*, vol. 2 pg. 164, under the letter mīm, Egypt print.

Marwān's Religious and Academic Position and Count among the Fuqahā'

‘Allāmah Ibn Kathīr in *al-Bidāyah* has listed the lofty capabilities and good qualities of Marwān in his biography. He quotes Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ statement in favour of Marwān from which the religious talent of this man can be realised.

1. فقال أما القاري لكتاب الله الفقيه في دين الله الشديد في حدود الله مروان بن الحكم

Mu‘āwiyah stated, “Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam is a proficient reciter of the Book of Allah, a jurist in the religion of Allah, and stern in implementing the punishments determined by Allah.”¹

2. He then speaks of Marwān’s judicial post.

عن الإمام أحمد قال يقال كان عند مروان قضاء كان يتبع قضايا عمر بن الخطاب

Imām Aḥmad said: It is said that Marwān held the judicial post (at times during Mu‘āwiyah’s reign). He would pass judgement in the light of the rulings of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb.²

3. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī has spoken of the academic prowess of Marwān in *al-Iṣābah* in the following words:

وكان يعد في الفقهاء

He was reckoned among the jurists.³

4. ‘Allāmah Ibn Taymiyyah speaks of his academic and jurisprudic rank in the following words:

1 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 257, biography of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 258, biography of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.

3 *Al-Iṣābah* with *al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 3 pg. 455, section two, biography of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.

أخرج أهل الصحاح عدة أحاديث عن مروان وله قول مع أهل الفتيا

The authors of the *Ṣiḥāḥ* have documented a few aḥādīth from Marwān and his statement is significant among the jurists.¹

5. These are few quotations on the academic reliability of Marwān. At the end, we reproduce the statement of Qāḍī Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī (d. 543 A.H.) in his favour so that the readers might realise his academic rank. He says:

مروان رجل عدل من كبار الأمة عند الصحابة و التابعين و فقهاء المسلمين

Marwān is a just and reliable individual from the seniors of the ummah according to the Ṣaḥābah, Tābī‘īn, and Fuqahā’ of the Muslims.

أما الصحابة فإن سهل بن سعد الساعدي روى عنه

As regards the Ṣaḥābah, Sahl ibn Sa‘d al-Sā‘idī has reported from him.

و أما التابعون فأصحابه في السن و إن جازهم باسم الصحبة في أحد القولين

As regards the Tābī‘īn, he is their contemporary in age, although he has overtaken them by the honour of Companionship according to one view.

و أما فقهاء الأمصار فكلهم على تعظيمه و اعتبار خلافته و التلفت إلى فتواه و الاتقياد إلى روايته

All the Fuqahā’ of the cities honour him, deem his khilāfah correct, consider his rulings, and accept his reports.

و أما السفهاء من المؤرخين و الأدباء يقولون على أقدارهم

The foolish historians and linguists speak according to their worth.²

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 189.

2 *Al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim*, pg. 89 – 90, discussion on ‘Uthmānī criticisms, 12.

The gist of the above is that Marwān's academic prowess and talent is accepted by the senior individuals of the ummah. Senior muḥaddithīn and Fuqahā' have reported religious matters from him and relied on him. We have presented these statements as samples. Now if some historians on the basis of inauthentic historical reports criticise Marwān, they are not worthy of consideration. It is evident that historical drivel has no weight in comparison to the emphatic statements of the senior muḥaddithīn and fuqahā'.

Consulting the Ṣaḥābah in Religious Matters

The scholars who penned the biography of Marwān have mentioned that during his governorship over Madīnah Ṭayyibah, whenever the need arose to consult regarding a religious matter, Marwān would gather the present Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and consult with them and act in accordance to the decision reached in the consultation.

Ibn Sa'd writes:

وكان مروان في ولايته على المدينة يجمع أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يستشيرهم ويعمل بما يجمعون له عليه

During his governorship over Madīnah, Marwān would gather the Companions of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and consult them and act in accordance to their unanimous decision.¹

An example of this is recorded by Ibn Kathīr:

قالوا ولما كان نائبا بالمدينة كان إذا وقعت معضلة جمع من عنده من الصحابة فاستشارهم فيها قالوا وهو الذي جمع الصبيان فأخذ بأعدلها فنسب إليه الصاع فقليل صاع مروان

They say that when he was representative over Madīnah, whenever any difficult matter arose, he would gather the Ṣaḥābah present by him and consult them in the matter.

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd*, vol. 5 pg. 30, end of the biography of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, Leiden print.

They say that he was the one to gather all the ṣāʿs (type of measurement) and determine the average one. Thus the ṣāʿ was attributed to him and called the ṣāʿ of Marwān.¹

Marwān's Cautiousness

The genealogists have written an amazing incident of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam with regards to his cautiousness.

ʿAnbasah ibn Saʿīd relates: Once, I invited Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam for meals when he was governor. I decorated my house lavishly. I draped exquisite curtains, spread expensive carpets, exhibited fine clothing, and prepared sumptuous meals with much exertion. Marwān accompanied by his two sons ʿAbd al-Malik and ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz attended the function. When the food was presented, Marwān picked up a morsel of food and before inserting it in his mouth, he asked:

فقال يا عنبسة هل عليك من دين قلت نعم إن علي لدينا قال و كم قلت سبعون ألف درهم فقبض يده و رفعها من طعامي و قال لابنيه ارفعا يديكما حرم علينا طعامك ما كنت تقدر أن تجعل بعض هذه الفضول التي أرى في دينك فهو كان أولى به ثم قام و لم يأكل من طعامي شيئاً

“O ʿAnbasah, do you have any debts?”

I replied in the affirmative.

He asked the amount to which I replied, “70 000 dirhams.”

He withdrew his hand from the food and told his sons to do the same saying, “Your food is forbidden for us as long as you have the ability to settle your debt with all these surplus commodities that I see. You debt is more deserving to be settled.”

He then stood up (to leave) and did not eat even a morsel of my food.²

1 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 258, biography of Marwān.

2 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 180 – 181, the offspring of Saʿīd ibn al-ʿĀṣ.

Warfare Assistance and Administrative Skill

Previously in the first discussion, we related the incident which al-Balādhurī documented in *Futūḥ al-Buldān*:

During the Battle of Africa, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه mobilised a huge army from Madīnah and sent them as reinforcements for Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ رضي الله عنه in 27 or 28 A.H. Among the warriors were many Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and other seniors. He writes:

وأمدّه بجيش عظيم فيه معبد بن العباس بن عبد المطلب و مروان بن الحكم و الحارث بن الحكم أخوه
و عبد الله بن الزبير إلخ

He reinforced him with a massive army among whom were Ma’bad ibn al-‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, his brother Ḥārith ibn al-Ḥakam, and ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr.¹

Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam possessed administrative skill. Owing to this, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه made him governor over Bahrain. Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ speaks about this in the following words. We did mention this in discussion one.

و من ولاته عليها مروان بن الحكم

Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam was among his governors over Bahrain.²

Ṣaḥābah stood as Marwān’s Representative

إن أبا هريرة كان حين يستخلفه مروان على المدينة إذا قام للصلوة المكتوبة كبر

When Marwān would appoint Abū Hurayrah over Madīnah, when he would stand for the farḍ ṣalāh, he would recited takbīr.³

1 *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, pg. 234, the conquest of Africa.

2 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ*, vol. 1 pg. 159, the names of ‘Uthmān’s governors, Bahrain.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, vol. 1 pg. 169, chapter on establishment of takbīr in every movement in ṣalāh, Nūr Muḥammadī Delhi print.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr has recorded the same incident in the following words:

و المعروف أن مروان هو الذي كان يسنيب أبا هريرة في إمرة المدينة و لكن كان يكون عن إذن معاوية
في ذلك و الله أعلم

What is known is that Marwān is the one who would appoint Abū Hurayrah as his deputy over the governorship of Madīnah. However, this would happen with Mu‘āwiyah’s consent. And Allah knows best.¹

Enthusiasm to Obtain Reward

قال الليث عن يزيد بن حبيب عن سالم أبي النضر أنه قال شهد مروان جنازة فلما صلى عليها انصرف
فقال أبو هريرة أصاب قيراطا و حرم قيراطا فأخبر بذلك مروان فأقبل يجري حتى بدت ركبته فقعد حتى
أذن له

Layth reports—from Yazīd ibn Ḥabīb—from Sālim Abū al-Naḍr who said:

Marwān attended a Janāzah. After completing the ṣalāh over the deceased, he left. Abū Hurayrah commented, “He attained one *qīrāṭ* (a measurement of that time) and was deprived of one *qīrāṭ*.”

When Marwān was informed of this, he came hurriedly until his knees became exposed. He sat down until general permission was given to leave.²

Search for Prophetic Stations and Relics

There were many places in Madīnah Ṭayyibah where Rasūlullāh ﷺ displayed a miracle or an incident of the exhibition of blessings took place, or something significant happened. Marwān made a concerted effort with sincerity to learn about these blessed spots.

1 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 113, biography of Abū Hurayrah, 56 A.H.; *al-Muntakhab Dhayl al-Mudhīl*, pg. 81, under mention of who said this, printed at the end of *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 258, biography of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.

عن عبد الله بن كعب بن مالك أن مروان أرسل إلى أبي قتادة و هو على المدينة ان اغد معي حتى تريني
مواقف النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم

‘Abd Allāh ibn Ka‘b ibn Mālik relates that Marwān, while he was governor of Madīnah, sent word to Abū Qatādah, “Come with me tomorrow and show me the noteworthy spots of the Nabī ﷺ.”¹

The Intercession of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn on behalf of Marwān

The Ahl al-Sunnah and Shī‘ah both have related an incident of the Battle of Jamal. Sa‘īd ibn Manṣūr (Sunnī muḥaddith) has documented it in the second volume of his *Sunan*. After the Battle of Jamal, Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ announced:

من أغلق عليه باب داره فهو آمن و من طرح السلاح آمن قال مروان و قد كنت دخلت دار فلان ثم أرسلت
إلى حسن و حسين ابني علي و عبد الله بن عباس و عبيد الله بن عباس و عبد الله بن جعفر كلموه قال
هو آمن

Whoever locks the door of his house is safe. Whoever puts down his weapons is safe.

Marwān continues, “I had entered the house of a certain person. I then sent word to Ḥasan, Ḥusayn (the sons of ‘Alī), ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās, ‘Ubayd Allah ibn ‘Abbās, and ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far. They spoke to ‘Alī who said, “He is safe.”²

The Shī‘ī book, *Nahj al-Balāghah*, has the same topic:

من كلام له عليه السلام قال لمروان بن الحكم بالبصرة قالوا أخذ مروان بن الحكم أسيرا يوم الجمل
فاستشفع بالحسن و الحسين عليهم السلام إلى أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام فكلما فيه فخلى سبيله

1 *Al-Tārīkh al-ṣaghīr*, pg. 54, under mention of who was present from the fifties to sixties, Ilāhabād India print.

2 *Sunan Sa‘īd ibn Manṣūr*, pg. 366, chapter on martyrdom, Ḥadīth: 2947, Majlis ‘Ilmī print, Karachi, Dabhel.

From his ﷺ speech which he said to Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam in Baṣrah.

They relate: Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam was taken captive on the Day of Jamal. He thus interceded on the strength of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn ﷺ to Amīr al-Mu'minīn ﷺ. They interceded on his behalf and Amīr al-Mu'minīn released him.¹

The Shī'ī historian Mas'ūdī speaks about the intercession of Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn and Sayyidunā 'Alī's ﷺ subsequent awarding of amnesty to Marwān in the following words. He also includes the amnesty of Sayyidunā Walīd ibn 'Uqbah ﷺ:

و تكلم الحسن و الحسين في مروان فأمنه و آمن الوليد بن عقبة

Ḥasan and Ḥusayn spoke on behalf of Marwān, and he gave him amnesty as well as Walīd ibn 'Uqbah.²

Ḥasan and Ḥusayn performing Ṣalāh behind Marwān

During the governorship of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ would always perform ṣalāh behind him.

عن جعفر عن ابيه قال كان الحسن بن علي و الحسين يصليان خلف مروان قال فقليل له أما كان أبوك يصلي إذا رجع إلى البيت قال فيقول لا والله ما كانوا يزيدون على صلاة الأئمة

Ja'far narrates from his father, (Muḥammad al-Bāqir):

Ḥasan ibn 'Alī and Ḥusayn would perform ṣalāh behind Marwān.

Somebody asked him, “Would your father repeat those ṣalāh performed behind Marwān upon returning home?”

1 *Nahj al-Balāghah*, pg. 123, in his *khutbah* ﷺ in which he taught the people salutations upon the Nabi ﷺ, Egypt print.

2 *Murūj al-Dhahab*, pg. 378, the Battle of Jamal, dialogue between Ibn 'Abbās and 'Āishah, fourth edition, Egypt print.

He replied, “No, by Allah. They would not add onto the ṣalāh of the imāms.”¹

Imām al-Bukhārī has mentioned in *al-Tārīkh al-Ṣaghīr* that Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn (رضي الله عنهما) always performed ṣalāh behind Marwān:

حدثني شرحبيل أبو سعد قال رأيت الحسن والحسين يصليان خلف مروان

Shuraḥbīl Abū Sa‘d narrated to me saying, “I saw Ḥasan and Ḥusayn praying behind Marwān.”²

The statement of Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir is recorded in *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*:

إنا نصلّي خلفهم من غير تقيّة وأشهد على علي بن الحسين أنه كان يصلّي خلفهم في غير تقيّة

We perform ṣalāh behind them without observing Taqīyyah. I testify that ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn would perform ṣalāh behind them without observing Taqīyyah.³

The Shī‘ī clerics have also mentioned the reports of Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq and Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir:

عن موسى بن جعفر عن أبيه قال كان الحسن والحسين يصليان خلف مروان بن الحكم فقالوا لأحدهما ما كان أبوك يصلّي إذا رجع إلى البيت فقال لا والله ما كان يزيد على صلاة

Mūsā ibn Ja‘far narrates from his father:

Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī and Ḥusayn would perform ṣalāh behind Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.

1 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*, vol. 2 pg. 378, mention of ṣalāh behind the governors, Hyderabad Dakkan print; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 258, biography of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.

2 *Al-Tārīkh al-Ṣaghīr*, pg. 57, Anwār Muḥammadī print, Ilāhābād, India.

3 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 5 pg. 158, biography of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn.

They asked him, “Would your father repeat that ṣalāh upon returning home?”

He replied, “No, by Allah. He would not perform more than one ṣalāh.”¹

In the light of the reports of both sects (which are reported from senior members of the Banū Hāshim) it has been made clear that Marwān’s governorship and khilāfah was correct. His leading of the ṣalāh was correct. The senior Hāshimites always performed their five times daily ṣalāh behind him, without observing Taqīyyah, and without repeating it on returning home. In religious matters, lineage distinctions and tribalism was never considered. These incidents prove Marwān’s talent and reject the false propaganda.

Umwāī Khulafā’ in the sight of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn

Ibn Abī Shaybah, in volume two of his *al-Muṣannaf* under the chapter of ṣalāh behind the governors through his chain, has quoted one statement of Zayn al-‘Ābidīn, which holds much significance in resolving these issues. Let the readers study it attentively and keep in mind that this was the era of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam in which Zayn al-‘Ābidīn made this declaration.

عن إبراهيم بن حفصة قال قلت لعلي بن الحسين أن أبا حمزة الشمالي و كان فيه غلو يقول لا نصلي خلف الأئمة و لا نناكح إلا من يرى مثل رأينا فقال علي بن الحسين بل نصلي خلفهم و نناكحهم بالسنة

Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥafṣah relates that he said to ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, “Abū Ḥamzah al-Thumālī—who was an extremist—says: We do not perform ṣalāh behind the leaders and we do not marry except those who hold the same view as ours.”

‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn said, “Instead, we perform ṣalāh behind them and marry into their tribe according to the Sunnah.”²

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār*, vol. 10 pg. 139 – 141, chapter on the condition of the people of his era and what happened between them and Mu‘āwiyah, old Iran print.

2 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*, vol. 2 pg. 378 – 379, ṣalāh behind the leaders, Hyderabad Dakkan print.

‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn in the eyes of Marwān

Sayyidunā Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ relates that once Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam gave a large amount of 100 000 dirhams as a loan to Zayn al-‘Ābidīn (‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn) for marriage so that he might purchase a slave girl and have children with her. Zayn al-‘Ābidīn purchased the slave girl and had plenty children with her. The narration continues:

فلما حضرته الوفاة أوصى إلى ابنه عبد الملك أن لا يسترجع من علي بن الحسين شيئا إلخ

When he was about to pass away, he commanded his son ‘Abd al-Malik not to take anything back from ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn.¹

ثم لما مرض مروان أوصى أن لا يؤخذ من علي بن الحسين شيء مما كان أقرضه فجميع الحسينيين من نسله

Then when Marwān fell ill, he bequeathed that nothing should be taken back from ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn from the amount he gave him as a loan. Thus, the entire progeny of Ḥusayn are from his lineage.²

Zayn al-‘Ābidīn wished to return the amount but Marwān’s son did not accept it and the money stayed by him.

In this incident is a beautiful example of Marwān’s kind treatment of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ children.

Zayn al-‘Ābidīn in the eyes of ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān

The offspring of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, ‘Abd al-Malik etc., enjoyed a friendly relationship with the offspring of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. This is easily available in the books of history.

1 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 258, biography of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 9 pg. 104, 105, biography of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn.

عن شعيب بن أبي حمزة قال كان الزهري إذا ذكر علي بن الحسين قال كان أقصد أهل بيته وأحسنهم طاعة وأحبهم إلى مروان بن الحكم وعبد الملك بن مروان

Shu‘ayb ibn Abī Hamzah reports:

When al-Zuhrī would speak of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, he would say, “He was the most balanced of the people of his household, the most obedient, and the most beloved to Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam and ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān.¹

عن سعيد بن خالد عن المعبري قال بعث المختار إلى علي بن الحسين بمائة ألف فكره أن يقبلها وخاف أن يردّها فأخذها فاحتبسها عنده فلما قتل المختار كتب علي بن الحسين إلى عبد الملك بن مروان أن المختار بعث إلي بمائة ألف درهم فكرهت أن أردّها وكرهت أن أخذها فهي عندي فابعث من يقبضها فكتب إليه عبد الملك يا ابن عم خذها فقد طيبتها لك فقبلها

Sa‘īd ibn Khālid narrates from—al-Mu‘abbarī who says:

Mukhtār sent 100 000 dirhams to ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn who disliked accepting it but at the same time feared returning it, so he took it and kept it by him. After Mukhtār was killed, ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn wrote to ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān, “Mukhtār had sent to me 100 000 dirhams and I disliked returning them as well as accepting them. They are with me till now so send someone to collect them.”

‘Abd al-Malik wrote back to him, “O nephew, take it as I have gifted it to you.” Accordingly, he accepted it.²

Removing Doubts

The matters pertaining to Marwān which we have presented under several headings hold a unique stance to answer the criticisms and through them the rank, character, and practice of Marwān becomes manifest. Nevertheless, to

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 5 pg. 156, section 1, biography of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn; *al-Tārīkh al-Ṣaghīr*, pg. 104, India print.

2 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 5 pg. 158, section 1, biography of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, Leiden print; *al-Muntakhab min Dhayl al-Mudhīl*, pg. 89, those who died in 83 A.H., Egypt print, printed at the end of *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*.

remove specific misconceptions, a few aspects will be mentioned before the readers so that the core of this matter is exposed and the negative notions about Marwān are done away with.

First Misconception: The Issue of Exile

The critics say that Marwān's father Ḥakam ibn Abī al-ʿĀṣ was exiled by Rasūlullāh ﷺ from Madīnah Munawwarah due to some mistakes of his and his son Marwān was with him. Father and son remained in exile during the Ṣiddīqī and Fārūqī eras. When his cousin Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ became khilāfah, he appointed Marwān as his scribe and special consultant.¹

Sayyidunā ʿUthmān, Ḥakam ibn Abī al-ʿĀṣ, and his son Marwān are all targets of this criticism.

The idea put forward is that Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ acted contrary to the statement of the Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Ḥakam ibn Abī al-ʿĀṣ had wicked behaviour due to which the Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had him removed from his city. By remaining in exile with his father, Marwān is also the target of rejection, reproach, and rage.

Response

A. On the onset, let it be realised that this story of exile is not found in authentic aḥādīth. The reports which speak of this story do not reach the standard of authenticity with regards to their chain. Unreliable narrators like al-Wāqidī and severely criticised reporters like Hishām Kalbī are found in the chain. Many authors have documented the tale of expulsion without including the chain, from which the authenticity or inauthenticity of the narration cannot be analysed.

Renowned scholars like ʿAllāmah Ibn Taymiyyah and Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī have severely critiqued the expulsion tale and declared it inauthentic.

1 *Minhāj al-Karāmah*, pg. 67, ʿUthmānī criticisms.

و قصة نفي الحكم ليست في الصحاح و لالها إسناد يعرف به أمرها

The tale of Ḥakam's expulsion is not found in the authentic compilations, nor does it have a chain from which it may be checked.¹

Corroboration of the inauthenticity of Ḥakam's expulsion can be found in one report of *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd*. Ibn Sa'd writes in the biography of Ḥakam ibn Abī al-ʿĀṣ:

أسلم يوم فتح مكة و لم يزل بها حتى كانت خلافة عثمان بن عفان رضي الله عنه فأذن له فدخل المدينة فمات بها في خلافة عثمان بن عفان رضي الله عنه

He embraced Islam on the Day of the Conquest of Makkah and remained there until the khilāfah of ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān رضي الله عنه who gave him permission to enter Madīnah. He passed away there during the khilāfah of ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān رضي الله عنه.²

It is learnt from this report that after embracing Islam, Ḥakam ibn Abī al-ʿĀṣ lived in Makkah Mukarramah and relocated to Madīnah during the era of Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه. (The expulsion tale did not occur in this time.) And Allah knows the truth!

B. Secondly, from another angle, if for arguments sake, it is accepted that the expulsion did take place and Ḥakam was exiled by the prophetic command and Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه called him back; Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī and other scholars have clearly mentioned that this return was upon the permission of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. Accordingly, Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه addressed the critics who besieged him saying:

قالوا إني رددت الحكم و قد سيره رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و الحكم مكي سيره رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ... من مكة إلى الطائف ثم رده رسول لله صلى الله عليه و سلم فرسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم سيره و رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم رده كذلك قالوا اللهم نعم

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 196, discussion on the exile of Ḥakam ibn Abī al-ʿĀṣ; *al-Muntaqā*, pg. 395, section 3, discussion on the expulsion of Ḥakam ibn Abī al-ʿĀṣ.

2 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd*, vol. 5 pg. 331, biography of Ḥakam ibn Abī al-ʿĀṣ, first print, Leiden.

They object that I returned Ḥakam whereas Rasūlullāh ﷺ expelled him. Ḥakam is a resident of Makkah whom Rasūlullāh ﷺ had expelled from Makkah to Ṭā'if and subsequently returned him to it. So Rasūlullāh ﷺ was the one who expelled him and Rasūlullāh ﷺ was the one to return him in the same way.

They answered, “O Allah, yes.”¹

At another juncture, al-Ṭabarī writes that during the siege, Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه addressed some residents of Madīnah saying:

فقال إن الحكم كان مكيا فسيره رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم منها إلى الطائف ثم رده إلى بلده فرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم سيره بذنبه ورسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم رده بعفوه

He said: “Ḥakam was a Makkī. Rasūlullāh ﷺ expelled him from there to Ṭā'if and then returned him to his city. So Rasūlullāh ﷺ expelled due to his sin and Rasūlullāh ﷺ returned him with his pardon.”²

C. The punishment of exile in relation to Ḥakam was not perpetual. It was restricted to a certain time due to the fact that in the Sharī'ah, due to sins of this nature, the punishment of exile for lifetime is waived and after repentance that person does not remain the target of perpetual punishment.

This issue has been discussed by renowned scholars (like Ibn Ḥazm, Ibn Taymiyyah, etc.) in their respective works under this discussion. The texts are reproduced verbatim for the benefit of the scholars. Ibn Ḥazm writes:

ونفي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم للحكم لم يكن حدا واجبا ولا شريعة على التأبید وإنما كان عقوبة على ذنب استحق به النفي والتوبة مبسوطة فإذا تاب سقطت عنه تلك العقوبة بلا خلاف من أحد من أهل الإسلام وصارت الأرض كلها مباحة

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 102 – 103, the conditions surrounding the arrival of the Egyptian and Iraqī delegations into Madīnah, 35 A.H.; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 171, the beginning of 35 A.H.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 135, list of some of 'Uthmān's travels; *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa al-Bayān fī Maqāt al-Shahīd 'Uthmān*, pg. 83 – 84, Beirut print.

Rasūlullāh's ﷺ expulsion of Ḥakam was not a *wājib ḥadd* (punishment) nor a Sharī one for perpetuity. It was only a punishment for a sin that deserved exile. And repentance is open. So when he repents, this punishment is waived from him without dispute from any of the adherents of Islam and the entire earth has become permissible.¹

Ibn Taymiyyah writes:

وإذا كان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قد عزر رجلا بالنفي لم يلزم أن يبقى منفيا طول الزمان فإن هذا لا يعرف في شيء من الذنوب و لم تأت الشريعة بذنوب يبقى صاحبه منفيا دائما بل غاية النفي المقدر سنة وهو في نفي الزاني و المخنث حتى يتوب من التخنث فإن كان تعزير الحاكم للذنوب حتى يتوب منه فإذا تاب سقطت العقوبة عنه

When the Nabī ﷺ had punished a person with exile, it does not necessitate that he remains exiled forever. This is not recognised in any sin and the Sharīah has not stipulated for a sin that the perpetrator remains exiled forever. In fact, the limit of a prescribed exile is a year and that is in relation to the exile of a fornicator and an effeminate until he repents from effeminacy. If the punishment of the leader is for a sin until he repents from the same, then the punishments will fall away when he repents.²

D. At the time of the expulsion, Marwān was still young and immature. He was not the criminal. To put the crime of the father on the young son's shoulders and label him a criminal is in no way correct.

فلم يكن لمروان ذنب يطرد عليه على عهد النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم

Marwān had no sin for which he may be banished during the lifetime of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.³

1 Ibn Ḥazm Abī Muḥammad 'Alī ibn Ḥazm (d. 456 A.H.): *Kitāb al-Faṣl fī al-Mīlā wa al-Ahwā' wa al-Niḥāl* with *Kitāb al-Mīlā wa al-Niḥāl* of Shahrīstānī, vol. 4 pg. 154, discussion on the war of 'Alī and those among the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ who fought against him, first edition.

2 *Minḥāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 196, discussion on the exile of Ḥakam ibn Abī al-'Āṣ and its answer.

3 *Minḥāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 196; *al-Muntaqā*, pg. 395, section 3, research on the exile of Ḥakam and his release.

Some people have decorated this incident of father and son and concocted many issues only to taint the image of the criticised father's *accursed* son, i.e. Marwān. May Allah ﷻ protect us from having evil thoughts and bad opinions about the Muslims of former times. The divine command is:

إِنَّ بَعْضَ الظَّنِّ إِثْمٌ وَلَا تَجَسَّسُوا

*Indeed, some assumption is sin. And do not spy.*¹

In Islam, the Shar'ī rule stands that when any believer repents from any sin, the sin is pardoned and the integrity of that person is not lost. The scholars have stated:

وليس الذنوب مسقطه للعدالة إذا وقعت منها التوبة

Sins do not sacrifice integrity when repentance is done from them.²

In light of the above, both father and son are not worthy of been taken to task. Their īmān and Islam are correct and their integrity is sustained.

The summary of the above is that the banishment incident is not among the accepted narrations by the muḥaddithīn. Various types of reports include this subject which do not reach the standard of authenticity.

If hypothetically this incident is correct, then they were punished according to the command of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Sayyidunā 'Uthmān's ﷺ practice was not in conflict with Rasūlullāh's ﷺ command, but rather in conformity to it. This is the status of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ﷺ. The scholars say:

وما كان عثمان ليصل مهجور رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لو كان أباه ولا يتقص حكمة

1 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 12.

2 *Al-'Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim*, pg. 94.

‘Uthmān was not to maintain ties with one Rasūlullāh ﷺ severed ties from, even if he be his father and he would not violate his command.¹

Ḥakam’s mistake was not perpetual, but rather temporary and deserving of pardon. He was forgiven and the matter was overlooked.

Despite his young age, to declare Marwān the criminal and declare him deserving of hatred and criticism is the highest level of injustice which is unbecoming.

Second Misconception

The opposition to Marwān mention this aspect with much vociferousness and intensity that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ﷺ made him the administrator of the matters of his khilāfah and gave him the reigns to the affairs of his state. They state:

وولى مروان أمره وألقى إليه مقاليد أموره ودفع إليه خاتمه فحدث من ذلك قتل عثمان و حدث من الفتنة بين الأمة ما حدث

He handed over his affairs to Marwān and gave him the reigns of his matters coupled with giving him his ring. This resulted in the murder of ‘Uthmān and countless fitnahs cropped up in the ummah.²

Response

Marwān’s Post

Earlier on, we mentioned in discussion one that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ﷺ appointed Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam as his scribe. He did not make him dominate over his entire state or appoint him his representative. Moreover, Marwān did not occupy this office forever. Rather, he remained the governor of Bahrain for some period and participated in important battles at some stage, e.g. he went

1 *Al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim*, pg. 77, answers to the criticisms against ‘Uthmān.

2 *Minhāj al-Karāmah*, vol. 4 pg. 67, at the end of *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, Lahore print.

along with other seniors to fight in the Battle of Africa. References to this were given in discussion one.

This clearly proves that Marwān did not occupy the post of scribe the entire duration, nor did the *despised Marwān* due to the influence of his *disparaged father* Ḥakam negatively affect the affairs of state, as hallucinated by them.

Marwān being a scribe was not disliked by the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنه. The issue of it being disliked by senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنه has been concocted by the way. This is due to the fact that had Marwān's scribal office for Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه being incorrect, then when Sayyidah 'Uthmān رضي الله عنها made a public announcement for complaints to remove or change the officials, then no one (neither a Ṣaḥābī or non-Ṣaḥābī) brought up the issue of Marwān's post being changed nor did anyone raise any complaints concerning it. (The reference has passed in discussion one.) The people who came later on selected these objections and broadcasted them whereas the noble Ṣaḥābah in the 'Uthmān era never objected.

Another point worth considering is that Marwān remained scribe in the last three years of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān's رضي الله عنه life whereas his father Ḥakam passed on few years earlier in 32 A.H. After his demise, to regard his son as despised and disliked by the noble Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنه is a concocted tale sourced from a pile of baseless historical reports. The objection was not raised (on the basis of a ṣaḥīḥ report.)

Another reality is that Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه did not dismiss a senior Ṣaḥābī and appoint Marwān in his position. Rather, he was given the post from the onset. Have a look at *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*¹.

The khilāfah of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه spread over a vast and wide dominion which comprised of countless provinces and districts. The administration and management of them all was in the hands of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه. The

1 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 156 – 157, the names of 'Uthmān's governors, Najaf Ashraf print, Iraq.

appointment and dismissal of governors was also according to his discretion. Marwān had no control whatsoever. He acted at the rank of an ordinary scribe or writer. Looking at the governors and officials of those far outlying places, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه being the dominant governor is relative and sensible.

Previously, a description of the vast kingdom of the ‘Uthmānī state was included in discussion one. A brief image of the ‘Uthmānī state will be presented here as well as a reminder given by Ibn Qutaybah al-Dīnawarī in *al-Ma‘ārif* and Imām al-Nawawī in *Tahdhīb al-Asmā’*. These are further conquests and dominations over and above the Ṣiddīqī and Fārūqī eras; for example: Rayy, Iskandariyyah, Sābūr, Africa (with its countries), Cyprus Island, the coastal regions of the Roman Sea, Iṣṭakhr al-Ākhirah, Fāris al-Ūlā, Jūr, Fāris al-Ākhirah, Ṭabaristān, Dārzbaḥard, Kirmān, Sajistān, al-Asāwirah (coastal), coast of Jordan, Marw (with its districts), etc.¹

To regard Marwān’s dominance and management over all these countries and districts instead of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān’s رضي الله عنه is wishful thinking and in polarity with reality. It is total injustice to the history of that era which no fair-natured human is prepared to accept.

Marwān’s Trustworthiness

Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam was the paternal cousin of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. In his personal capacity, he was a dignified and trustworthy individual. He remained engaged in serving the religion of Islam. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه got him married to his daughter Umm Abān al-Kubrā. In the biography of Marwān, the reference to this was mentioned.²

With reliance on the religiousness and trustworthiness of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, we can declare with conviction that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه did not give

1 *Al-Ma‘ārif*, pg. 83 – 84, information on ‘Uthmān; *Tahdhīb al-Asmā’*, vol. 1 pg. 323, ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān.

2 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 112, ‘Uthmān’s children.

his daughter's hand in marriage to some irreligious open transgressor. Rather, he was righteous and deserving for this honour and status. Furthermore, the verses and aḥādīth which mention that the hand of assistance should not be stretched towards a sinner, oppressor, or evil person and friendly relationship should not be maintained with him were in front of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه.

In short, Sayyidunā 'Uthmān's رضي الله عنه forming of this link with him is sufficient proof for Marwān's religious potential which cannot be refuted due to historical fallacies.

The Days before 'Uthmān's Martyrdom and Marwān's Behaviour

Before the martyrdom of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, some things occurred which led to the martyrdom. Regarding the causes and reasons of the martyrdom, a brief discussion, according to the need, will take place at the end of these themes, Allah willing. Here, aspects pertaining to Marwān will be penned.

When the rebels and transgressors besieged Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم tried their best to resolve the issues between Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه and the rebels and Marwān continued to remain at the side of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم to guard against the evil of the rebels.

عن محمد بن سيرين قال انطلق الحسن و الحسين و ابن عمر و ابن الزبير و مروان كلهم شاك في السلاح حتى دخلوا الدار فقال عثمان أعزم عليكم لما رجعتم فوضعتم أسلحتكم و لزمتم بيوتكم فخرج ابن عمر و الحسن و الحسين فقال ابن زبير و مروان و نحن نعزم على أنفسنا أن لا نبرح

Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn reports:

Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar, 'Abd Allāh ibn Zubayr, and Marwān came to the house of 'Uthmān, armed with their weapons to defend him. 'Uthmān told them, "I entreat you on oath to return, lay down your weapons, and remain in your homes."

At this, Ibn `Umar, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn left. However, Ibn al-Zubayr and Marwān stated, “We have taken an oath upon ourselves that we will not leave.”¹

This was the offer from these men in the beginning stages.

The unethical rebels had an ulterior motive in their hearts, to fulfil which they devised many schemes and plots. The final plot they devised to start anarchy is that after getting their demands fulfilled by Sayyidunā `Uthmān رضي الله عنه, they returned and after going a certain amount of the way, all the rebels of Baṣrah, Kūfah, and Egypt at once returned to Madīnah and besieged Sayyidunā `Uthmān رضي الله عنه a second time. They expressed their reason for their return to the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم saying that they found a letter from Sayyidunā `Uthmān رضي الله عنه which a camel rider was taking to the governor of Egypt. In it was written that when the Egyptian delegation return, certain members should be punished. The stamp of Sayyidunā `Uthmān رضي الله عنه was on the letter and the man with the letter was riding `Uthmān’s camel. They explained that Sayyidunā `Uthmān رضي الله عنه broke the covenant with them and deceived them, due to which they are going to murder him.

Ibn Khaldūn gives a detailed report of this incident:

فانصرفوا قليلا ثم رجعوا وقد لبسوا بكتاب مدلس يزعمون أنهم لقوه في يد حامله إلى عامل مصر بأن يقتلهم و حلف عثمان على ذلك فقالوا مكانا من مروان فإنه كاتبك فحلف مروان فقال ليس في الحكم أكثر من هذا فحاصروه بداره ثم بيتوه على حين غفلة من الناس و قتلوه و انفتح باب الفتنة

The rebels left for a while and then returned, with a devious letter which they claimed they had found in the hand of its carrier to the governor of Egypt stating that he should kill them all. `Uthmān swore upon oath that he had no knowledge of the letter.

They said, “Allow us to punish Marwān, for he is your scribe.” Marwān swore that he did not write it.

1 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 151, 152, fitnah in the era of `Uthmān, Najaf Ashraf Iraq print, first edition.

‘Uthmān then said, “Nothing more than this is part of the ruling.” Thus, they besieged him in his house and then attacked him when people were in negligence and murdered him in cold blood. This resulted in the opening of the door of fitnah.¹

A Forged Letter

At the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, among the forged letters in the name of the Ṣaḥābah these wicked conspirators broadcasted for their propaganda, one letter was this one which was being sent with a camel rider to the Egypt governor. This was fabricated in the name of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and Marwān was included due to him being the scribe.

This was a logical excuse devised to kill Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. The academic historians have emphatically stated that these letters were concocted. Ibn Kathīr writes:

هذا كذب على الصحابة إنما كتبت مزورة عليهم كما كتبوا من جهة علي وطلحة و الزبير إلى الخوارج كتب مزورة عليهم أنكروها ... و هكذا زور هذا الكتاب على عثمان أيضا فإنه لم يأمر به و لم يعلم به أيضا

This is a fabrication in the name of the Ṣaḥābah. It was forged in their name just as many letters were forged in the name of ‘Alī, Ṭalḥah, and Zubayr to the Khawārij which they denied. Similarly, this letter was forged in ‘Uthmān’s name. He did not order it, nor had any knowledge of it.²

Examination of the Historical Reports casting Marwān in bad light

The critics have prepared a startling image of Marwān’s behaviour at this juncture. It is presented below. Study it and keep it in mind then wait a little for the answer.

1 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Khaldūn al-Maghribī: *Muqaddamah Ibn Khaldūn*, section 30 regarding him assuming the post, pg. 215 – 216, Egypt print, 381 – 382, Beirut print.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 175, discussion on the coming of ruins to ‘Uthmān.

- The eruption of fitnah and evil at the ending of the ‘Uthmānī era was due to Marwān assuming the secretary post.
- Marwān endeavoured tirelessly to corrupt the relationship between the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.
- On this occasion, Marwān lectured the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم sounding many warnings, which was disliked and difficult to listen to, by them from the tongue of one of the Ṭulaqā’.
- The responsibility of creating problems for Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه at this time was solely upon Marwān’s shoulders and this was the cause for the great fitnah.

In short, the heated dialogue between Sayyidunā Muḥammad ibn Maslamah al-Anṣārī رضي الله عنه and Marwān, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه severely criticising Marwān and labelling him responsible for all the affairs, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān’s رضي الله عنه wife Nā’ilah labelling Marwān wicked and a conniver, etc. all of these fall on Marwān’s head.

In answer to this, the basis of the historical reports this *blessed* material was founded upon should be examined narrationally and logically. If it comes out accurate, then all these accusations are correct. However, if to the contrary the very basis is faulty, then the entire building of accusations is useless. Now study carefully.

Firstly, where the issue of appointing Marwān as scribe and earning proximity is mentioned, it is reported with the words they say. Through an authentic chain, this has not reached the era of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. Hence, it being reported back to the actual happening with a strong chain is now doubtful. Allah knows what type of people they were who objected to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه for appointing Marwān.¹

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 5 pg. 234 – 25, biography of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, first edition, Leiden.

Then Marwān spoiling the relationship between the Ṣaḥābah and Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and delivering a lecture, filled with threats, to the Ṣaḥābah, Marwān being responsible for creating problems, Muḥammad ibn Maslamah al-Anṣārī’s, Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā’s رضي الله عنه, and ‘Uthmān’s wife Nā’ilah’s severe criticism and disparagement, etc.; the reporter of all these reports is al-Wāqīdī. Open *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* and have a look. These reports are available at various places. Have a look at the following places:

Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī, vol. 5 pg. 109, 111, 112, 118, 119, under the heading: mention of the travel of those Egyptians who travelled from Dhū Khashab, under the events of 35 A.H., old Egypt print.

The scholars must have realised, but for the benefit of the laymen, it should be noted that the reporter of these tales is an unreliable and weak narrator and such narrations of his have been discarded by the scholars. His narrations are a combination of both truthful and false narrations. To accept them is synonymous to putting an end to distinguishing from truth and falsehood. Especially those aspects which depict the excellent era of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم in a bad light and taint the image of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه will never be accepted. These reports are fabricated. Falsehood has been mixed with the truth.

A few texts highlighting the rank of al-Wāqīdī will be presented for the satisfaction of the intellectual. A little indicates to plenty.

Some research scholars have critiqued al-Wāqīdī in the following manner. ‘Allāmah al-Dhahabī writes in *Mīzān al-’itidāl*:

قال أحمد بن حنبل هو كذاب يقلب الأحاديث... قال البخاري وأبو حاتم متروك... واستقر الإجماع على وهن الواقدي

Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal said, “He is a *kadhāb* (liar). He changes aḥādīth.”

Al-Bukhārī and Abū Ḥātim labelled him *matrūk* (accused of ḥadīth forgery).

The unanimous decision has been reached that al-Wāqidī is weak.”¹

Al-Dhahabī writes in *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāz*:

لم أسق ترجمته هنا لاتفاقهم على ترك حديثه إلخ

I have not mentioned his biography here due to their agreement on discarding his reports.

Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar writes in *al-Tahdhīb*:

قال البخاري الواقدي مدني سكن بغداد متروك الحديث ... قال أحمد بن حنبل الواقدي كذاب ... قال الشافعي كتب الواقدي كلها كذب إلخ

Al-Bukhārī says, “Al-Wāqidī is a Madanī who settled in Baghdād. He is *matrūk al-ḥadīth* (accused of ḥadīth forgery).”

Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal said, “Al-Wāqidī is a *kadhāb* (liar).”

Al-Shāfi‘ī states, “All the books of al-Wāqidī are false.”²

Since he is unreliable and *matrūk*, his reports are discarded and unacceptable. Without the corroboration and substantiation of the narrations of other muḥaddithīn and historians, al-Wāqidī’s reports will not be considered.

Second, if hypothetically the above image of Marwān’s behaviour is correct and he is the foundation for all the chaos and problems, then why did the Hāshimites (Sayyidunā ‘Alī, Sayyidunā Ḥasan, Sayyidunā Ḥusayn, Sayyidunā Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه, etc.) and other esteemed Ṣaḥābah (example Sayyidunā Ibn ‘Umar, Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Thābit, Sayyidunā Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه, etc.) not avoid protecting, supporting, and assisting Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه in every possible way. Why did they wear

1 *Mizān al-I’tidāl*, vol. 3 pg. 110, Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn Wāqid al-Aslamī, old Egypt print.

2 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 9 pg. 364 – 366, Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar al-Wāqidī.

weapons and continue protecting him? Why did they deliver water to him when his water was stopped? Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ told them on oath to put down their weapons but they continued their endeavours to safeguard him to the last breath. Why did they support him and assist him in this manner?¹

These men should have told Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ openly that all the chaos and anarchy is due to Marwān in whose hands he gave the reigns of the entire kingdom and appointed as a special secretary. The responsibility of all the fitnah is upon his shoulders. “Therefore, let Marwān be and your affair be. We cannot assist in this wrongdoing.” The Divine command is:

وَتَعَاوَنُوا عَلَى الْبِرِّ وَالتَّقْوَىٰ وَلَا تَعَاوَنُوا عَلَى الْإِثْمِ وَالْعُدْوَانِ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ شَدِيدُ الْعِقَابِ

*And cooperate in righteousness and piety, but do not cooperate in sin and aggression. And fear Allah; indeed, Allah is severe in penalty.*²

Another point worthy of consideration is that the letter in relation to the Egypt delegation which was stumbled upon, which included the killing of Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr and others, which the camel rider was taking along with him, if Marwān was the one to write it and send it, then it is only sensible to kill such a wicked human first. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is killed and Marwān is spared? What is this all about?

Thirdly, the Battle of Jamal came out after the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. At that time, Marwān was taken captive by the supporters of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He was among the opposition of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا interceded for his pardon to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who forgave him. This intercession is documented in the following sources and has been quoted aforetime in matters pertaining to Marwān from both Sunnī and Shī‘ī books,

1 Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt, vol. 1 pg. 150 – 151, the fitnah in the era of ‘Uthmān.

2 Sūrah al-Mā‘idah: 2.

- *Sunan Sa'īd ibn Manṣūr*, pg. 366, chapter on martyrdom, Ḥadīth: 2947, Majlis 'Ilmī print, Karachi, Dabhel.
- *Nahj al-Balāghah*, pg. 123, in his khuṭbah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in which he taught the people salutations upon the Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Egypt print.

As per the declaration of the critics, if Marwān was the source of all evil, and the 'Uthmānī fitnah was all because of him, then why did Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا intercede for such a man? Why did Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ accept the intercession? It was binding upon him to finish him off. Why was intercession and pardon allowed for Marwān?

Contemplating and pondering deeply over all these aspects reveals that the original cause for this catastrophe was not the doings of Marwān, but other causes. With regards to this, Allah willing, at the end of these discussions, a special section will be dedicated to it and it will be discussed in brief.

Since the critics have the objective of registering all the troubles, shortcomings, and inadequacies of the 'Uthmānī era, they gather such material from weak historical reports to reach their assumed objective.

This behaviour of the critics, whether it harms Marwān or not, but it definitely blemishes the image of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān (the Rightly Guided khalīfah) and bad thoughts about him are certainly spread. How sorrowful! To Allah do we belong and to Him is our return!

Third misconception: The Banū Umayyah and Ḥakam's children, Marwān and others, being Despised and Accursed

The critics present a few such narrations which depict the Banū Umayyah and the children of Ḥakam, viz. Marwān, and others, as disliked, despised, and accursed. After reproducing some reports of this nature, a short discussion will take place so that the reality is learnt in the correct manner and the baselessness of the objection be established.

Removing the Doubt

The examination will take place from two angles, the narration and logic.

- First the reports will be examined by the standards of ḥadīth. What is the status of the reports according to ḥadīth terminology? Are they acceptable or rejected? What ruling did the scholars pass over such reports?
- Secondly, it needs to be ascertained logically whether these reports are acceptable or not. Are these incidents not inconsistent and incongruous? By pondering over these aspects, the issue will be manifested by itself. After discussing it narrationally and rationally, nothing will remain hidden (Allah willing) in the uselessness of these reports and them being in stark conflict with reality.

A. Despised

Those who harbour hatred for the Banū Umayyah Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ present the following narration:

عن أبي برزة الأسلمي قال كان أبغض الأحياء إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بنو أمية و بنو حنيفة و ثقيف

Abū Barzah al-Aslamī reports: The most despised tribes to Rasūlullāh ﷺ were the Banū Umayyah, Banū Ḥanīfah, and the Thaḳīf.¹

In some reports, it appears that Rasūlullāh ﷺ disliked these tribes, viz. the Banū Umayyah, Banū Ḥanīfah, and the Thaḳīf.

Firstly, it is befitting to clarify that Ḥākim reported the narration of Sayyidunā Abū Barzah al-Aslamī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ via one chain from Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal and his son ‘Abd Allāh. We checked *Musnad Aḥmad*, volume four and perused all the

1 *Al-Mustadrak*, vol. 4 pg. 480 – 481, book on fitan and wars, list of the most despised tribes to Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

narrations of Sayyidunā Abū Barzah al-Aslamī رضي الله عنه only to find that although this report is available, however, the words Banū Umayyah are not found. Only the Banū Ḥanīfah and Thaqīf are listed. Have a look at *Musnad Aḥmad*, vol. 4 pg. 420, the musnadāt of Abū Barzah al-Aslamī, first Musnad of the Baṣriyyīn, Egypt print, first edition.

This elucidates that the original report does not have the words Banū Umayyah. It was added later on by some reporters which is termed *idrāj al-rāwī* (addition of a narrator) which is one *spectacle* of the narrators. Many narrators add and delete from narrations.

Secondly, worthy of consideration is that if this report is authentic and the Banū Umayyah were despised and disliked by Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, then how are his following actions correct and how were the following dealings with the Banū Umayyah made. According to the prophetic statement, this tribe is deserving of disparagement and aversion, while the prophetic behaviour displayed kindness and benevolence. Paradoxical, is it not?

Moreover, why did the Banū Hāshim develop links and other relationship with the despised and disliked Banū Umayyah tribe? Why did Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq and Sayyidunā ‘Umar al-Fārūq رضي الله عنهما maintain good relations with the Banū Umayyah? Why were they awarded high posts in the Islamic state? A few points will be listed hereunder as a reminder. Have a look at them and ponder deeply and reflect over this matter. The references have passed before, they may be checked for satisfaction.

Family Links

1. Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم daughter Ruqayyah was married to ‘Uthmān al-Umawī.
2. Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم daughter Umm Kulthūm was married to ‘Uthmān al-Umawī.

3. Umm Ḥabībah bin Abī Sufyān (al-Umawiyah) was in the wedlock of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.
4. Umm Kulthūm, the daughter of ‘Alī’s nephew ‘Abd Allāh, son of his biological brother Ja‘far al-Ṭayyār, was married to Abān ibn ‘Uthmān (al-Umawī).
5. Ḥusayn’s daughter, Sukaynah bint Ḥusayn, was married to ‘Uthmān’s grandson Zayd ibn ‘Amr ibn ‘Uthmān (al-Umawī).
6. Ḥusayn’s daughter, Fatimah bint Ḥusayn, was married to ‘Uthmān’s grandson, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān (al-Umawī).
7. Ḥasan’s granddaughter, Umm al-Qāsim bint Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan, was married to ‘Uthmān’s grandson, Marwān ibn Abān ibn ‘Uthmān (al-Umawī).

(References to all the above marriages with detail, besides Umm Ḥabībah, appears in *Ruḥamā’ Baynahum*, ‘Uthmānī section, discussion one.)

8. Mu‘āwiyah’s sister, Hind bint Abī Sufyān (al-Umawiyah), was married to ‘Alī’s cousin, Ḥārith bint Nawfal ibn al-Ḥārith ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib ibn Hāshim.
9. ‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib’s granddaughter, Lubābah bint ‘Ubayd Allah ibn ‘Abbās was married to Mu‘āwiyah’s nephew, Walīd ibn ‘Utbah ibn Abī Sufyān (al-Umawī).
10. Ja‘far al-Ṭayyār’s granddaughter, Ramlah bint Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far was married to Sulaymān ibn Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik (Umawī). Thereafter, Mu‘āwiyah’s nephew Abū al-Qāsim ibn al-Walīd ibn ‘Utbah ibn Abī Sufyān (al-Umawī) married her.

(References to these marriages were given a little while back in discussion two under the heading of links with the family of Amīr Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ)

The tribe that is despised and disliked by Rasūlullāh ﷺ, how can fostering links and relationships with them of this type ever be correct? Think and deal fairly.

Governmental appointments

1. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ served as a scribe of revelation in the presence of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. This is a widely accepted fact.
2. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was also a scribe of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. (This is also an accepted fact.)
3. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was given a number of responsibilities and official tasks in the era of Nubuwwah.
4. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was made an official over many tasks in the era of Nubuwwah and instated as governor a number of times in the Ṣiddīqī and Fārūqī eras. (Discussion one, under the heading Shām, contains the references.)
5. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ appointed Sayyidunā Abū Sufyān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (Amīr Mu‘āwiyah’s’ father) as governor over Najrān.¹
6. Sayyidunā Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān Umawī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (Amīr Mu‘āwiyah’s’ brother) was appointed as army general by Sayyidunā Ṣiddīq Akbar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ over the detachments sent to conquer Shām. Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ kept him in this position.²
7. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ appointed ‘Itāb ibn Usayd al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as governor over Makkah.
8. Sayyidunā Khālīd ibn Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was appointed to collect the zakāh of the Banū Mudhajjaj and instated as governor of Ṣan‘ā’ and Yemen in the Prophetic era.³
9. Sayyidunā Abān ibn Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was first instated as governor over Sarāyā in the era of Nubuwwah and then over Bahrain after Sayyidunā ‘Alā’ ibn al-Ḥaḍramī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.⁴

1 *Mīnhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 175 – 176; *al-Muntaqā*, pg. 382 – 383.

2 *Ibid.*

3 *Ibid.*

4 *Ibid.*

10. ‘Amr¹ ibn Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was appointed governor over Taymā, Khaybar, and Qurā ‘Uraynah.²

The tribe deserving of hatred, aversion, and detestation according to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, why were they awarded these posts of honour? Why was trust placed in them in the era of Nubuwwah, the Ṣiddīqī era and Fārūqī era, and why were they given these responsibilities?

‘Alī’s Statements in favour of the Banū Umayyah

Many statements of Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ on the virtues and merits of the Banū Umayyah tribe are recorded in many places which highlight his stance and views on the tribe.

عن ابن سيرين قال قال رجل لعلي أخبرني عن قريش قال أرزنا أحلاما أخوتنا بني أمية

Ibn Sīrīn narrates: A person requested ‘Alī to inform him about the Quraysh. (While highlighting the characteristics of all the tribes,) he said: “Our brothers the Banū Umayyah have the weightiest of minds (deepest understanding and foresight).”³

فقال (علي) أوزنا أحلاما إخواننا بنو أمية

‘Alī said, “The ones with the highest level of tolerance are our brothers the Banū Umayyah.”⁴

1 The original book has ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd. However, ‘Amr ibn Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ is correct. The reason is that the common books on genealogy and narrators (at my disposal) has the name ‘Amr among the offspring of Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ. however, ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd is not found. It is learnt from here that the copier made a typo, and wrote ‘Uthmān instead of ‘Amr. Anyways, this is my research. Perhaps Allah will bring about after this a [different] matter.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 175 – 176, answers to the accusations against ‘Uthmān, Lahore print; *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 61 – 62, the names of his صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ governors.

3 *Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq*, vol. 5 pg. 451, bay‘ah to Abū Bakr.

4 *Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq*, vol. 11 pg. 56, chapter on the virtues of Quraysh.

فقال (علي) أما إخواننا بنو أمية فقادة أذبة ذادة

‘Alī said, “With regards our brother the Banū Umayyah, they are leaders (of armies), preparers of food, and protectors of honour.”¹

Summary

In short, in light of the statements and behaviour of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the practice of Sayyidunā Ṣiddīq Akbar and Sayyidunā Fārūq A‘ẓam رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا it is evident that the Banū Umayyah Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ being despised and disliked is contrary to reality. This is in total polarity with the declarations of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ himself. Rather, they are accepted and beloved. The reports which contain the aversion and hatred for the Banū Umayyah are incorrect and inauthentic and are additions from the narrators.

B. Accursed

First of all, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ relates that they were sitting in the company of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and my father went home to change his clothes so that he may attend the gathering. Meanwhile, Rasūlullāh ﷺ stated, “An accursed man will enter your presence.” ‘Abd Allāh continues, I continued looking inside and outside

حتى دخل فلان يعني الحكم

until so and so i.e. Ḥakam entered.²

Worthy of noting is that this report is among the solitary reports. If accepted as correct, then Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not curse by determining a certain individual by name. Rather, he informed of the entering of an accursed person. A certain person entered. One of the narrators determines him as Ḥakam.

1 *Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq*, vol. 11 pg. 57, chapter on the virtues of Quraysh; *Kitāb al-Fā’iq*, vol. 2 pg. 264, nūn with jīm, Dakkan print.

2 *Musnad Ahmad*, the narrations of ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ.

This means that the original narration does not have the name Ḥakam emphatically. However, Ḥakam was taken as the referred to at a later stage. In this way, this report is not clear in its indication to the subject, but is actually the assumption of the narrator.

Secondly, it is reported on the authority of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr رضي الله عنه that while reclining on the Ka’bah, he reported the following statement of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم:

لعن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فلانا و ما ولد من صلبه

Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم cursed so and so and the offspring from his loins.¹

This narration is among the solitary reports. if accepted as accurate, it has cursed a certain individual and his children, without determining who he is. His name does not appear in the original narration, nor was it determined by any narrator.

Thirdly, it is reported on the strength of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr رضي الله عنه:

إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لعن الحكم و ولده

Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم cursed Ḥakam and his issue.²

The scholars have scrutinised the chain of this report and have criticised it. Therefore, this report is not correct and is not worthy of being presented as proof. For example, one of these narrators is Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥajjāj ibn Rushdīn al-Miṣrī. Al-Dhahabī has written in *Talkhīṣ al-Mustadrak* that Ibn ‘Adī declared him weak. Al-Dhahabī writes in volume one of *Mīzān al-I’tidāl* that Ibn

1 *Musnad Aḥmad*, under the musnadāt of ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Zubayr.

2 *Al-Mustadrak*, book on fitan and wars, list of the most despised tribes to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, Dakkan print, first edition.

‘Adī says that the people have labelled Ibn Rushdīn a liar and that he has many munkar reports and many false reports and fabrications are reported from him.¹

Similarly, the same criticism is found in *Lisān al-Mizān*. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar adds that Aḥmad ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Rushdīnī is declared a liar.²

Criticism is found for him in *Kitāb al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* of al-Rāzī (volume one, section one). More narrators in this chain are criticised, however, he has been sufficed upon. In short, this narration is not authentic with regards to its chain. Therefore, it cannot be used as proof.

Fourthly, al-Ḥākim’s *al-Mustadrak* contains a narration which mentions an incident that when Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه told Marwān to pledge allegiance to his son Yazīd, Marwān presented this to the people. Upon this, a heated argument broke out between Sayyidunā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr رضي الله عنه and Marwān. Sayyidunā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān رضي الله عنه explained that this is the system of Heraclius and Caesar. Marwān retorted that the following verse of the glorious Qur’ān was revealed concerning him:

وَالَّذِي قَالَ لَوَالِدَيْهِ أَفٍّ لَّكُمَا

*But one who says to his parents, “Uff to you.”*³

When news of this reached Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها, she said:

كذب والله ما هو به ولكن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لعن أبا مروان ومروان في صلبه

He has spoken a lie, by Allah. It is not in relation to him. On the other hand, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم cursed the father of Marwān while Marwān was in his loins.⁴

1 *Mizān al-I’tidāl*, vol. 1, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Rushdīnī.

2 *Lisān al-Mizān*, vol. 1 pg. 257 – 258, Aḥmad.

3 Sūrah al-Aḥqāf: 17.

4 *Al-Mustadrak*, vol. 4, book on fitan and wars, list of the most despised tribes to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم.

Firstly, *inqiṭā'* (interruption of chain) is found in this report. 'Allāmah al-Dhahabī has written in the footnotes of this report in his *Talkhīṣ*:

قلت فيه انقطاع محمد لم يسمع من عائشة

My comment: There is *inqiṭā'* in it. Muḥammad did not hear from 'Ā'ishah.¹

A narrator is missing in-between which reported it to Muḥammad. (Allah alone knows what type of person he was.)

The second point is that the above narration (the dialogue between 'Abd al-Raḥmān and Marwān) has been documented by senior scholars in the following books, without any mention of Marwān or his father Ḥakam being accursed on the tongue of nubuwwah. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* contains the dialogue of 'Abd al-Raḥmān and Marwān without any mention of Ḥakam and Marwān being cursed.

- *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 2, Sūrah al-Aḥqāf, chapter on His statement: But one who says to his parents Uff to you.
- *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 1 pg. 345, under Ḥakam.
- *Uṣd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 306, biography of 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr.
- *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 400, biography of 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr.
- *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 89, biography of 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr.

The dialogue is recorded in the events of 58 A.H. However, in all these five books, the addition of Marwān and Ḥakam being cursed by the tongue of Nubuwwah is not found. Wherever the addition of cursing on the tongue of Sayyidah 'Ā'ishah رضي الله عنها is found, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr sheds light upon it saying that the reports are inauthentic.

و يروى أنها بعثت إلى مروان تعتبه و تؤنبه و تخبره بخبر فيه ذم له و لأبيه لا يصح عنه

1 *Talkhīṣ al-Mustadrak*, vol. 4 pg. 481.

It is reported that she sent word to Marwān, denigrating him, cursing him, and informing him of a narration which contains disparagement of him and his father. This is not authentic from him صلى الله عليه وسلم.¹

The above mentioned points establish that the authentic reports on this incident do not contain cursing and wherever cursing does appear, they are inauthentic. Therefore, this report cannot establish the claim and the evidence is not complete.

Fifth, a report on the authority of Sayyidunā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf رضي الله عنه goes as follows. In the era of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, whenever a child was born, it was brought to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم for prayers and blessings and Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم would supplicate for the child. When Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam was born, he was brought in the presence of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم who stated:

هو الوزغ ابن الوزغ الملعون ابن الملعون

He is a lizard, son of a lizard; accursed, son of the accursed.²

The scholars have mentioned the following about this report, rendering it totally baseless and worthless. ‘Allāmah al-Dhahabī writes under this report in *Talkhīṣ al-Mustadrak*:

قلت لا والله و ميناء كذبه أبو حاتم

My comment: No, by Allah. The narrator Mīnā’ has been declared a liar by Abū Ḥātim.³

Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī writes concerning Mīnā’ (the freed slave of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf رضي الله عنه) in *Kitāb al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* that he is munkar al-ḥadīth.

1 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 89, biography of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr, year 58 A.H.

2 *Al-Mustadrak*, book on fitan and wars, when the Banū Umayyah will reach 40.

3 *Talkhīṣ al-Mustadrak*, vol. 4 pg. 479; *al-Mughnī fī al-Ḍu‘afā’*, vol. 2 pg. 691, Mīnā’ ibn Abī Mīnā’.

روى أحاديث في أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم مناكير لا يعبا بحدِيثه كان يكذب

He narrates munkar aḥādīth about the Companions of the Nabī ﷺ.
His narrations are not considered. He would lie.¹

Ibn Ḥibbān writes concerning Mīnā' in his book *al-Majrūḥīn*:

وجب التنكب عن حديثه

Abstention from his reports is necessary.²

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar states in *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*:

قال الجوزجاني أنكر الأئمة حديثه لسوء مذهبه قال ابن عدي ... إنه يغلو في التشيع ... قال يعقوب بن سفيان ... أن لا يكتب حديثه

Al-Jūzajānī says, “The A’immah have rejected his ḥadīth due to his evil creed.”

Ibn ‘Adī says, “He was extreme in tashayyu’.”

Ya’qūb ibn Sufyān says, “His ḥadīth should not be written.”³

The above declarations of the senior scholars have established that this report of Mīnā' is baseless and it is necessary to abstain from it.

Caution: These types of reports regarding cursing Marwān and his father Ḥakam have been broadcasted by the narrators in many forms. To count them all and analyse each one of them is a lengthy issue. We have presented few samples of this type to the readers and analysed them. Some reports do not establish the claim and other reports are baseless due to the unreliability of the narrators.

1 *Kitāb al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl*, vol. 4 pg. 395, section one, Mīnā', Hyderabad Dakkan print.

2 *Kitāb al-Majrūḥīn*, vol. 2 pg. 325, Mīnā' the freed slave of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, Hyderabad Dakkan print.

3 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 1 pg. 397, Mīnā' ibn Abī Mīnā'.

C. The Reports of Disgrace in the Sight of the Scholars

Concerning the Umawī Ṣaḥābah and other Ṣaḥābah of their type, disgrace and criticism is found in some reports about them. The senior scholars have written something amazing regarding these type of reports. We will reproduce it below as a sample so that the report against the Umawī Ṣaḥābah can be assessed all at once and this misconception on the reports on hatred, cursing, etc. may be examined altogether.

‘Allāmah ibn Qayyim in his work *al-Manār al-Munīf fi al-Ṣaḥīḥ wa al-Ḍa‘īf* has written something special in the 37th section concerning narrations like the above. A few sentences will be reproduced hereunder for the benefit of the readers:

و من ذلك الأحاديث في ذم معاوية و كل حديث في ذمه فهو كذب و كل حديث في ذم عمرو بن العاص فهو كذب و كل حديث في ذم بني أمية فهو كذب و كذلك أحاديث ذم الوليد و ذم مروان بن الحكم

In the genre are the aḥādīth in disparagement of Mu‘āwiyah. Every ḥadīth in his disparagement is a lie. Every ḥadīth deriding ‘Amr bin al-‘Āṣ is a lie. Every ḥadīth ridiculing the Banū Umayyah is a lie. Similarly, the aḥādīth on criticising Walīd and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.¹

Mullā ‘Alī Qārī has expressed similar verdicts about reports of disparagement, insulting, and cursing. He says:

و من ذلك الأحاديث في ذم معاوية و ذم عمرو بن العاص و ذم بني أمية... و ذم مروان بن الحكم إلخ

From this type [fabrications], are the reports ridiculing Mu‘āwiyah, ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, the Banū Umayyah, and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam.²

1 *Al-Manār al-Munīf fi al-Ṣaḥīḥ wa al-Ḍa‘īf*, pg. 117, 37th section, Aleppo print.

2 *Al-Mawḍū‘āt*, pg. 106, section on what the ignorant who attribute themselves to the Sunnah have fabricated, Mujtabā‘ī print, Delhi; *al-Asrār al-Marfū‘ah fi Akhbār al-Mawḍū‘ah*, *al-Mawḍū‘āt al-Kabīr*, pg. 477, Beirut print, Lebanon; Moulānā ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Parhārdī: *Kawthar al-Nabī*, section 2, discussion on fabricated aḥādīth.

The renowned masters of this science have cautioned the Muslim ummah that the reports ridiculing, insulting, and cursing noteworthy individuals of the Banū Umayyah have been concocted by the narrators and spread among the masses. By coming across piles of narrations of this type, they should not be misled and fall prey to harbouring evil thoughts about these personalities. The scholars have fulfilled their duty of establishing the truth in a splendid way. If any person does not accept the truth despite this and chooses a path wayward from the truth, then this is obstinacy which has a nasty ending. Allah’s declaration is:

أَفَمَنْ يَهْدِي إِلَى الْحَقِّ أَحَقُّ أَنْ يُتَّبَعَ

*So is He who guides to the truth more worthy to be followed?*¹

Evaluating these narrations logically

Ponder deeply over the following. If the reports of cursing for Ḥakam and his offspring Marwān etc., are correct and they are accursed on the tongue of Nubuwwah, then how can the following be correct:

1. How did Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه take Marwān as his son-in-law?
2. Why did Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه appoint Marwān as his scribe?
3. How did Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه appoint Marwān governor over Bahrain?
4. Why did Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه allow Ḥakam and his children to stay in Madīnah? Was he unaware of these disparaging reports? Or was he unaffected by them? What is the truth? Keep the level of trustworthiness, sincerity, and sacrifice of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه in mind and reach a logical conclusion.
5. If this family, on the tongue of Nubuwwah, is worthy of despise, belittlement, and the targets of curse, then why did Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه

1 Sūrah Yūnus: 35.

speaking glowingly of the Banū Umayyah (of which Ḥakam and his children are a big branch) and why did he list their beautiful traits?

6. In the Battle of Jamal, why did Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما intercede before Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه to release the captive Marwān? Why did Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه accede to the request?
7. How did Sayyidunā Sahl ibn Sa’d رضي الله عنه (Ṣaḥābī), ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Hāshimī (Zayn al-‘Ābidīn) (Tābī‘ī), ‘Urwah ibn Zubayr (Tābī‘ī), Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyab (Tābī‘ī), and other elders of the ummah have trust in Marwān’s honesty and obtain aḥādīth from him?
8. Imām Mālik relied on Marwān and quoted a number of Shar‘ī verdicts from Marwān in his al-Muwaṭṭa’.
9. Imām Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Shaybānī reported many Shar‘ī rulings from Marwān in his al-Muwaṭṭa’.
10. How did the renowned Ṣaḥābī Sayyidunā Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه tolerate standing representative of Marwān over Madīnah Munawwarah?
11. How is the statement of Zayn al-‘Ābidīn in favour of the Umawī Khulafā’ correct, which he uttered in answer to someone, “Instead, we perform ṣalāh behind them and marry into their tribe according to the Sunnah.”
12. How can the statement of ‘Allāmah al-Zuhrī about Sayyidunā Zayn al-‘Ābidīn be correct who said: He was the most obedient and the most beloved to Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam and ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān.
13. If for argument’s sake the Banū Umayyah are disgraced and despised by the prophetic statement, and Ḥakam and his children (Marwān, etc.) are specifically accursed, then why did the progeny of Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه contract marital links with such a mischievous family? The irony is that the progeny of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه gave their daughters to Marwān’s progeny, and not vice versa. For example:

- Ramlah bint ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib was married to Mu‘āwiyah ibn Marwān.
- Zaynab bint Ḥasan al-Muthannā was married to Marwān’s grandson, Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān.
- Sayyidunā Ḥasan’s ﷺ granddaughter Nafisah bint Zayd ibn al-Ḥasan was married to Marwān’s grandson, Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān.
- Sayyidunā Ḥasan’s ﷺ granddaughter Khadījah bint al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥasan was married to Marwān’s brother Ḥārith ibn al-Ḥakam’s grandson, Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn al-Ḥārith. Khadijah was also known as Umm Kulthūm.
- Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn al-Ḥārith thereafter married Khadījah’s cousin Ḥāmidah bint al-Ḥasan al-Muthannā ibn al-Ḥasan.

References to these points have been given earlier on in matters pertaining to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ and Marwān and may be referred to.

Worthy of noting is that did the progeny of Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ forget all these statements of Rasūlullāh ﷺ (including hatred, loathing, cursing, etc.) and aligned themselves to the family of Marwān by contracting lifelong bonds with them? Or was it that these reports were never present before them in their era? But rather, the narrators of later times concocted these to reach their evil agendas and propagated them.

Among the readers are intellectuals, academics, thinkers, and scholars of high note. We have presented many angles to the issue at hand. The impartial may ponder and hopefully reach sensible conclusions themselves. Our only request is to reflect after removing the yolk of prejudice and tribalism from the neck.

Conclusion to the Discussion on Marwān

First, a brief biography of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam was penned. Thereafter, answers to a few famous objections against Marwān were presented. We were unable to present all the academic material on these two topics as it deserves. Nonetheless, practicing on the principle: what cannot be attained in full, should not be abandoned completely, what was present was presented.

In the beginning of this discussion it was mentioned and now it is repeated at the end, that excesses in any matter is unnecessary. On the basis of this, Marwān being free from error and innocent from mistakes is not at all the claim. Very likely, he committed errors at many instances. However, to terminate Marwān's good qualities and religious and social services and to spread tales on his flaws is no good work nor any great service to Islam and the religion.

It is appropriate to practice on the stance of the pious predecessors:

خذ ما صفا و دع ما كدر

Take what is clear and positive and avoid what is imprecise and negative.

Telling the truth as is and not supporting falsehood is the safest option and the best possible way to avoid prejudice. If acceptance is viable.

Discussion Three

The issue in this section will be tackled from two angles. First, the Sharī perspective of nepotism will be discovered; in which instances is it praiseworthy and correct in the Sharī'ah and in which cases is it despised and disliked.

The second angle is to analyse this issue in the light of historical details. The eras leading up to the 'Uthmānī era, viz. the era of Nubuwwah, the Fārūqī era and the era succeeding it (the Murtaḍwī era) should be pondered over. What approach was adopted in awarding posts to relatives in those days? Was tribalism the focus in dividing offices? Were relatives banned from state posts? This issue will be clarified through these channels.

First Angle

In the Sharī'ah, the command has been sounded to observe kindness towards relatives. Allah's *سُبْحَانَ رَبِّيَ* command is:

وَأَعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ وَلَا تُشْرِكُوا بِهِ شَيْئًا وَبِالْوَالِدَيْنِ إِحْسَانًا وَبِذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسْكِينِ

*Worship Allah and associate nothing with Him, and to parents do good, and to relatives, orphans, and the needy.*¹

إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَأْمُرُ بِالْعَدْلِ وَالْإِحْسَانِ وَإِيتَاءِ ذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَيَنْهَىٰ عَنِ الْفَحْشَاءِ وَالْمُنْكَرِ وَالْبَغْيِ يَعِظُكُمْ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَذَكَّرُونَ

*Indeed, Allah orders justice and good conduct and giving to relatives and forbids immorality and bad conduct and oppression. He admonishes you that perhaps you will be reminded.*²

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 36.

2 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 90.

It appears in the noble ḥadīth:

عن ابن عمر أن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم قال أبر البر أن يصل الرجل ود أبيه (بعد أن يولى)

Ibn ‘Umar reports that the Nabī ﷺ stated:

The best form of righteousness is for a man to maintain cordial relations with his father’s friends (after his father’s demise).¹

The command to display kindness to family and the emphasis of dealing amicably with relatives is replete in Sharī texts.

Therefore, if perchance Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ considered his relatives in the matter of official posts, then this is in line with the Sharī obligation. It is not in polarity to the same.

The despised and impermissible situation of favouritism is when others rights are snatched away and given to one’s relatives. Similarly, the rights of others are trampled upon, and without their permission, one’s relative is determined rightful of the same. This action is looked down upon with scorn in the Sharīah. If this practice is not adopted, then there is no ill in instating a relative to an office on condition that he is worthy of the same.

Second Angle

Some important posts and offices of the Prophetic era will first be listed before the readers, which Rasūlullāh ﷺ awarded to his relatives (the Banū Umayyah and Banū Hāshim). Thereafter, offices of the Fārūqī era followed by the Murtaḍwī era will be listed which they allocated for their relatives, so that people of discernment and understanding will be able to solve the issue in the light of

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, vol. 2 pg. 314, chapter on the virtue of maintaining ties with the friends of the father and mother and their like, Nūr Muḥammadī print, Delhi; *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, vol. 2 pg. 353, chapter on kindness to parents, Mujtabā’ī print, Delhi.

actual incidents and in order that the ‘Uthmānī era may be compared with other eras.

Offices for Relatives in the Prophetic Era

Firstly, Rasūlullāh ﷺ instated his son-in-law Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to few significant posts and offices during his era, for example:

1. He awarded him the office of writing revelation. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was included among the scribes of revelation.¹
2. Rasūlullāh ﷺ appointed Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as his ambassador to the Quraysh of Makkah on the occasion of the treaty of Ḥudaybiyyah. This ambassadorship of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is recorded in *al-Ṣiḥāḥ al-Sittah* and the common Sīrah books under the happenings of the Battle or Treaty of Ḥudaybiyyah.²
3. Rasūlullāh ﷺ appointed Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as his deputy over Madīnah on one occasion (perhaps more as well) and Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as his deputy on few occasions.

استخلف رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم على المدينة في غزوته إلى ذات الرقاع عثمان بن عفان و
استخلفه أيضا على المدينة في غزوته إلى غطفان الخ

Rasūlullāh ﷺ appointed ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān as his deputy over Madīnah in his Dhāt al-Riqā‘ expedition and he also appointed him over Madīnah in his campaign towards Ghaṭafān.³

1 *Zād al-Ma‘ād*, vol. 1 pg. 30, section on his ﷺ scribes; *al-Sīrah al-Nabawiyah*, vol. 4 pg. 669, the scribes of revelation and other things in his presence; *al-Sīrah al-Ḥalabiyyah*, vol. 3 pg. 364, mention of his ﷺ famous scribes; *Jawāmi‘ al-Sīrah*, pg. 26, his ﷺ scribes.

2 *Mishkāt*, chapter on the merits of ‘Uthmān, section two and three, pg. 561, 562, Nūr Muḥammadi print, Delhi.

3 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 3 pg. 39, section one, mention of ‘Uthmān’s Islam, first print, Leiden; *Minḥāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 16.

If per chance someone has misgivings regarding the above mentioned points on Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, then he should rather observe the following posts awarded to close people of the Banū Umayyah and ponder over the issue.

Secondly, Sayyidunā Abū Sufyān رضي الله عنه—the father of Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه—is a renowned Ṣaḥābī of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. He embraced Islam on the occasion of the Conquest of Makkah. He is among the leaders of the Banū Umayyah. His closest connection to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم is that he is the father of Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم wife, Umm al-Mu‘minīn Sayyidah Umm Ḥabībah Ramlah bint Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنها; making him Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم father-in-law. This is among the widely accepted facts of Islamic history.

He was a friend of Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم uncle, Sayyidunā ‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib رضي الله عنه, from the era of ignorance. He accepted Islam on the Day of the Conquest of Makkah upon the encouragement of Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه and remained his close associate after Islam as well.

Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم awarded few posts and offices to Sayyidunā Abū Sufyān رضي الله عنه and gave him few important responsibilities. Only a few of these will be listed below, which are in conformity to the subject under discussion. For example:

1. Appointment as governor over Najrān

واستعمله رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم على نجران

Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم appointed him governor over Najrān.¹

2. Mission to break idols

When the Banū Thaḳīf accepted Islam, they had a high standing idol which they did not want to break down.

1 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 122, the offspring of Ḥarb ibn Umayyah; *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar*, pg. 126, the governors of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم; *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 62, prophetic governors.

فأبى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلا أن يبعث أبا سفيان بن حرب و المغيرة بن شعبة فيهدماها

Rasūlullāh ﷺ refused and sent Abū Sufyān ibn Ḥarb and Mughīrah ibn Shu‘bah who broke it down into pieces.¹

3. Settlement of Debt

فأمر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أبا سفيان أن يقضي دين عروة والأسود من مال الطاغية فلما جمع المغيرة مالها قال لأبي سفيان إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قد أمرك أن تقضي عن عروة والأسود دينهما فتقضى عنهما

Rasūlullāh ﷺ instructed Abū Sufyān to settle the debt of ‘Urwah and Aswad from the wealth of al-Ṭāghiyah. After Mughīrah gathered its wealth, he said to Abū Sufyān, “Rasūlullāh ﷺ has instructed you to settle the debts of ‘Urwah and Aswad.” Accordingly, he settled their debts.²

4. Distribution of Wealth

‘Amr ibn Faghwā’ reports:

دعاني رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وقد أراد أن يبعثني بمال إلى أبي سفيان يقسمه في قريش بمكة بعد الفتح ... فمضينا حتى قدمنا مكة فدفعت المال إلى أبي سفيان إلخ

Rasūlullāh ﷺ summoned me, and he had intended to send me with wealth to Abū Sufyān which he would distribute among the Quraysh of Makkah after the Conquest. We travelled until we arrived in Makkah. I then gave the wealth to Abū Sufyān (and he distributed it).³

Note: A number of virtues and merits are found regarding Sayyidunā Abū Sufyān رضى الله عنه in the books of ḥadīth and Islamic history. Moreover, his military

1 *Sīrat Ibn Hishām*, vol. 2 pg. 540 – 541, the situation of the Thaḳīf delegation; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 5 pg. 30 – 33, the arrival of the Thaḳīf delegation by Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

2 *Sīrat Ibn Hishām*, vol. 2 pg. 542, the issue of the Thaḳīf delegation and their Islam.

3 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 4 pg. 32 – 33, section 2, ‘Amr ibn Faghwā’, Leiden print; *al-Bayhaqī: al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, vol. 10 pg. 129, book on the etiquette of a judge, chapter on caution when reading a letter.

achievements and religious services are acknowledged. (We have only listed four of these here.) By steering away from prejudice and considering all his religious services and efforts, it becomes clear that all the reports presented against him (whether in al-Ṭabarī or al-Jazarī) are incorrect and contrary to reality. Moreover, in light of ḥadīth grading, those reports are generally flawed, munkar (contradictory reports by weak narrators) or shādh (anomalous), due to them being in conflict with accepted narrations.

Those who quote narrations which depict the actions of Sayyidunā Abū Sufyān رضي الله عنه in an evil light and undermine his religious status, they have neither considered the high rank of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم nor observed reverence for the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. In fact, they did not take the pains of examining those reports on the standards of ḥadīth criticism for their flaws to become apparent. Moreover, they did not examine the subject matter of those reports so as to discover the manner it contradicts what actually transpired. These are the results of tribalism, family feuds, and lineage specialisms; otherwise, there was nothing stopping them from examining these reports.

(May Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى grant them the best of guidance and protect them from prejudice.)

Thirdly, the son of Sayyidunā Abū Sufyān is Sayyidunā Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه—the elder brother of Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and a close relative of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. He is Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم brother-in-law, brother of his wife Umm al-Mu‘minīn Sayyidah Umm Ḥabībah bint Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنها. He was a man of many excellent abilities. He accepted Islam on the occasion of the Conquest of Makkah. He participated in the Battle of Ḥunayn alongside Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم favoured him with an abundance of wealth from the booty of the Battle. The scholars of Islamic history have referred to him with the name Yazīd al-Khayr (Yazīd of goodness).¹

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 7 pg. 127, section 2, biography of Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān al-Umawī; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 95, biography of Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān, under 18 A.H. first edition.

Due to his worthiness and potential, Rasūlullāh ﷺ awarded Sayyidunā Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ with a number of honours and instated him to a number of posts.

1. Scribe of revelation

The scholars, while listing the scribes of revelation, have written:

و معاوية بن أبي سفيان و أخوه أي يزيد إلخ

Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān and his brother, i.e. Yazīd.¹

2. Collection of Zakāh

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar writes:

يزيد بن أبي سفيان صخر بن حرب بن أمية بن عبد شمس القرشي الأموي أمير الشام وأخو الخليفة معاوية من فضلاء الصحابة من مسلمة الفتح و استعمله النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم على صدقات بني فراس و كانوا أخواله إلخ

Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān Ṣakhr ibn Ḥarb ibn Umayyah ibn 'Abd Shams al-Qurashī al-Umawī, the Amīr of Shām and the brother of Khilāfah Mu'āwiyah. He was from the eminent Ṣaḥābah, from those who accepted Islam at the Conquest (of Makkah). The Nabī ﷺ appointed him to collect the zakāh of the Banū Farās who were his maternal uncles.²

3. Governor of Taymā

Abū Ja'far al-Baghdādī has written in *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar*:

1 *Jawāmi' al-Sīrah*, pg. 26, his ﷺ scribes; *al-Sīrat al-Ḥalabiyyah*, vol. 3 pg. 364, chapter on the list of his ﷺ famous scribes.

2 *Al-Iṣābah* with *al-Istī'āb*, vol. 3 pg. 619, Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 5 pg. 112, Yazīd.

(*Rasūlullāh* ﷺ) appointed Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān as governor over Taymā.¹

Fourthly, Sayyidunā Abū Sufyān's son, Sayyidah Amīr Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنها is a renowned and well-known Ṣaḥābī as well as a close relative of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, i.e. the brother of Rasūlullāh's صلى الله عليه وسلم blessed consort Umm al-Mu'minīn Sayyidah Umm Ḥabībah bint Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنها. Another aspect is that Sayyidunā Amīr Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم are co-brothers-in-law, i.e. Umm al-Mu'minīn Sayyidah Umm Salamah's sister Qarībat al-Ṣuḡhrā was married to Sayyidunā Amīr Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه as mentioned in detail in the second discussion under family links.²

1. Scribe

The Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم appointed Sayyidunā Amīr Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه to the office of scribe. He was reckoned among the scribes of revelation as mentioned by the historians. 'Allāmah Ibn Ḥazm, 'Alī ibn Burhān al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī and others have further clarified that Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Thābit al-Anṣārī رضي الله عنه and Sayyidunā Amīr Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه (after the Conquest of Makkah) remained at the service of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم for writing revelation and other material.

وكان زيد بن ثابت من أئمة الناس لذلك ثم تلاه معاوية بعد الفتح فكانا ملازمين للكتابة بين يديه صلى الله عليه وسلم في الوحي وغير ذلك لا عمل لهما غير ذلك

Zayd ibn Thābit remained the most attached from all people to this office, followed by Mu'āwiyah after the Conquest. They were fixed for writing revelation and other material in his صلى الله عليه وسلم presence, they had no work besides this.³

1 *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar*, pg. 126, the governors of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم.

2 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 123 – 124, the offspring of Abū Sufyān ibn Ḥarb; *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar*, pg. 102, Hyderabad Dakkan print.

3 *Jawāmi' al-Sīrah*, pg. 27, his صلى الله عليه وسلم scribes; *al-Sīrat al-Ḥalabiyyah*, vol. 3 pg. 364, chapter on the list of his صلى الله عليه وسلم famous scribes.

2. Apportioning Land

Rasūlullāh ﷺ sent Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to apportion pieces of lands for certain individuals. Wā'il ibn Ḥujr was allocated a piece of land through Sayyidunā Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. This incident has been mentioned in the first discussion, under the heading: Shām.¹

We have mentioned a few posts and offices occupied by close relatives of Rasūlullāh ﷺ from the Banū Umayyah during the Prophetic era. We will now list those offices which Rasūlullāh ﷺ awarded to his family, the Banū Hāshim.

The Offices of the Banū Hāshim during the Prophet's ﷺ Era

1. Rasūlullāh ﷺ appointed his cousin, Sayyidunā Ja'far al-Ṭayyār رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, as the army general of the Battle of Mu'tah in the year 8 A.H. Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Ḥārithah and Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn Rawāḥah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ were also appointed as generals of this army.
2. Rasūlullāh ﷺ appointed Sayyidunā 'Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as army general during the Campaign of Khaybar towards the ending of year 7 A.H., prior to Khaybar being conquered.
3. Rasūlullāh ﷺ dispatched Sayyidunā 'Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ towards Yemen in the 10th year after hijrah to assume the post of governor.
4. On the occasion of the Tabūk Campaign in 9 A.H, Rasūlullāh ﷺ appointed Sayyidunā 'Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as his deputy over Madīnah for a limited period of time to take care of social affairs, while Rasūlullāh ﷺ went on this expedition.

1 *Al-Tārikh al-Kabīr*, vol. 4 pg. 175 – 176, section two, biography of Wā'il ibn Ḥujr; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 5 pg. 81; Wā'il ibn Ḥujr; *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 592, Wā'il ibn Ḥujr.

Since these facts are widely accepted and common in Islamic history, there was no need to reference them.

It is learnt from the above that Rasūlullāh ﷺ appointed his relatives from among the Banū Umayyah and Banū Hāshim to posts and offices at different times. This practice clarifies the issue at hand. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ by appointing some relatives to high posts did not start a new practice. Rather his practice is in conformity to the practice of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Furthermore, it is evident that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not commit any error in this regard, nor was his action, religiously, morally, or politically incorrect.

Rather than labelling the Righteous Successor of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, a wrongdoer and perpetrating evil in this matter, it would be easier to label those who accuse him as wrongdoers and evildoers.

Familial Appointments During the Fārūqī Era

1. Governor of Bahrain

إن عمر بن الخطاب استعمل قدامة بن مظعون على البحرين و هو خال حفصة و عبد الله بن عمر

‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb appointed Qudāmah ibn Maẓ‘ūn as governor of Bahrain. He is the maternal uncle of Ḥaḥṣah and ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar (i.e. brother-in-law of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ).¹

2. Governor of Maysān

و أنه من مهاجرة الحبشة و ولي عمر النعمان هذا ميسان

Nu‘mān ibn ‘Adī: He is from the emigrants to Abyssinia. ‘Umar appointed him over Maysān.²

1 *Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq*, vol. 9 pg. 240 – 241, chapter on those companions of the Nabī ﷺ who were given ḥadd; *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, pg. 128, list of the governors of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb.

2 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 533, letter nūn (Nu‘mān ibn ‘Adī).

Nu'mān ibn 'Adī was from the Banū 'Adī tribe. Later on, he was dismissed from this post.

Familial Appointments During the Murtaḍwī Era

Sayyidunā 'Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ awarded high posts to six or more relatives of his, making them governors over various areas.

1. 'Ubayd Allāh ibn al-'Abbās ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib ibn Hāshim

و استعمله علي بن أبي طالب على اليمن و أمره فحج بالناس سنة ٣٦ و سنة ٣٧ ه و مات عبید الله
بالمدينة

'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib appointed him governor over Yemen. He commanded him to lead the people in Ḥajj in 36 and 37 A.H. 'Ubayd Allāh passed away in Madīnah.¹

'Ubayd Allāh is the cousin of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

2. Qutham ibn al-'Abbās ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib

و ولی قثم بن العباس فلم يزل عليها (مكة) واليا حتى قتل علي

'Alī appointed Qutham ibn al-'Abbās over Makkah. He remained governor there until 'Alī was killed.²

و كان على مكة و الطائف قثم بن العباس

Qutham ibn al-'Abbās was governor over Makkah and Ṭā'if.³

1 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 184 – 185, list of the governors of 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb; *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 27, the offspring of 'Abbās ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib; *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 430, biography of 'Ubayd Allah ibn 'Abbās.

2 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 185, list of the governors of 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb.

3 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 6 pg. 53, end of year 37 A.H.

و حج بالناس في هذا السنة (سنة ٣٨ هـ) قثم بن العباس من قبل علي عليه السلام ... و كان قثم يومئذ
عامل على مكة إلخ

Qutham ibn al-‘Abbās led the people in Ḥajj in this year (38 A.H.) from the side of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. At the time, Qutham was governor of Makkah.¹

Qutham is the cousin of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.

The scholars have written that Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه appointed his cousin Ma‘bad ibn al-‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib as governor over Makkah as well.

و ذكر الدارقطني في كتاب الإخوة أن عليا و لاه مكة

Al-Dāraquṭnī mentioned in *Kitāb al-Ikhwah* that ‘Alī appointed him governor of Makkah.²

This makes it clear that they were successive governors over Makkah from the side of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Both Qutham ibn al-‘Abbās and Ma‘bad ibn al-‘Abbās are Hāshimites and his cousins.

3. Tamām ibn al-‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib

Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه had first appointed Sahl ibn Ḥunayf as governor over Madīnah during his khilāfah.

ثم عزله (سهل بن حنيف) و ولي تمام بن العباس

He then dismissed him and appointed Tamām ibn al-‘Abbās.³

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 6 pg. 77, end of year 38 A.H.

2 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 457, Ma‘bad ibn al-‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, biography: 8330.

3 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 185, list of the governors of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 6 pg. 53, the end of 37 A.H.

Tamām ibn al-‘Abbās is Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ cousin. Some refer to him as Thumāmah ibn al-‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib.

4. ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib

و ولي عبد الله بن العباس فشحض ابن عباس و استخلفه زيادا

He appointed ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās as governor (over Baṣrah). Whenever Ibn ‘Abbās would venture out, he would appoint Ziyād as his deputy.¹

و كان على البصرة عبد الله بن العباس إلخ

‘Abd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās was governor over Baṣrah.²

5. Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr

فولى محمد بن أبي بكر فقتل بها

He appointed Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr governor over Egypt and he was killed there.³

Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr is the stepson of Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. (He is the son of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ born to to Sayyidah Asmā’ bint ‘Umayy رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا who ‘Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ later married, raising Muḥammad as his own.)

Confirmation

‘Allāmah Ibn Taymiyyah has mentioned the above 5 relatives at once place in volume 3 of *Minhāj al-Sunnah*. He states:

1 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 186, list of the governors of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 6 pg. 53, end of 37 A.H.

3 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 186, list of the governors of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 6 pg. 53, end of 37 A.H.

و معلوم أن عليا ولي أقاربه من قبل أبيه و أمه كعبد الله و عبيد الله ابني عباس فولى عبيد الله بن عباس على اليمن و ولي على مكة و الطائف قثم بن العباس و أما المدينة فقبل أنه ولي عليها سهل بن حنيف و قيل ثمامة بن العباس و أما البصرة فولى عليها عبد الله بن العباس و ولي على مصر ربيبة محمد بن أبي بكر الذي رباه في حجره

It is common knowledge that ‘Alī appointed his relatives both paternal and maternal like ‘Abd Allāh and ‘Ubayd Allāh, the sons of ‘Abbās. He appointed ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās over Yemen and Qutham ibn al-‘Abbās over Makkah and Ṭā’if. As regards to Madīnah, it is said that he appointed Sahl ibn Ḥanayf and other say Thumāmah ibn al-‘Abbās. He appointed ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās over Baṣrah. And he appointed his stepson, Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr, who he raised, over Egypt.¹

Besides these five personalities, Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ appointed his nephew, Ja’dah ibn Hubayrah ibn Abī Wahb al-Qurashī al-Makhzūmī, over Khorasan:

6. Ja’dah ibn Hubayrah al-Makhzūmī

بعث علي بعد ما رجع من صفين جعدة بن هبيرة المخزومي و أم جعدة أم هاني بنت أبي طالب إلى خراسان فانتهى إلى أبرشهر

After returning from Ṣiffīn, ‘Alī sent Ja’dah ibn Hubayrah al-Makhzūmī towards Khorasan. And he reached up to Abarshahr. The mother of Ja’dah is Umm Hānī bint Abī Ṭālib.²

و ولي خراسان لعلي

He assumed the post of governor over Khorasan for ‘Alī.³

1 *Mīnhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 173, answers to the allegations against ‘Uthmān.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 6 pg. 53, end of 37 A.H.

3 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 1 pg. 238, letter jīm, Biography: 1161, Ja’dah ibn Hubayrah; *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 1 pg. 258, section two, Biography: 1265.

Corroboration (from Shīī books)

A brief list of the governors and office bearers during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (who were his close relatives) has been presented to the readers, which include the names of 7 individuals, viz. 1. ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās, 2. Qutham ibn al-‘Abbās, 3. Ma‘bad ibn al-‘Abbās, 4. Tamām ibn al-‘Abbās, 5. ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās, 6. Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr, and 7. Ja‘dah ibn Hubayrah. A few references from Shīī historians will now be presented for corroboration.

The early Shīī historian al-Ya‘qūbī writes:

و عزل علي عمال عثمان عن البلدان خلا أبي موسى الأشعري كلمه فيه الاشتهر فأقره و ولي قثم بن العباس
مكة و عبيد الله بن العباس اليمن

‘Alī dismissed all the governors of ‘Uthmān from the cities with the exception Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī. Ashtar spoke to him in this regard so he maintained him. He appointed Qutham ibn al-‘Abbās over Makkah and ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās over Yemen.¹

و كتب أبو الأسود الدثلي و كان خليفة عبد الله بن العباس بالبصرة إلى علي

Abū al-Aswad al-Du‘alī—the deputy of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās over Baṣrah—wrote to ‘Alī.

The above makes it crystal clear that during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, his close relatives were appointed over major cities and assumed high positions. If this is called nepotism, which the critics of the ‘Uthmānī era accuse Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ of, then this is found clearly in the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and is an accepted fact.

In our view, the alleged criticism is actually no condemnation of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Rather, the need of the time and the situation demanded it so

1 *Tārīkh Ya‘qūbī*, vol. 2 pg. 179, under the khilāfah of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī, new edition, Beirut.

Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه adopted it. Similarly, we do not accuse Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه of nepotism for appointing his relatives during his khilāfah. We attribute it to the demands of the time.

In this manner, the honour of both these luminaries is considered and the correct interpretation for historical events is established.

However, if the object is simply to blow the issue out of proportion and to condemn, then first have a look at the Prophetic era, then the Fārūqī era, and then the Murtaḍwī era. Thereafter, look at the ‘Uthmānī era. In all these eras, relatives were given positions of honour. Then why is Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه the only target of criticism?

An objection and its Answer

Another lame objection raised by the critics of the ‘Uthmānī era is that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was coerced to appoint his relatives as governors. Some capable Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم went into solitude, some passed on, some were not assisting, and others joined the opposing party. Due to these challenging situations, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه appointed his cousins as governors of major cities.

Sufficient to remove this objection is to affirm that this lame excuse is in contrary to reality, since a large number of Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم were present in the capital city of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and were not opposed to him. If work was taken from them, they would have been found to be capable of lending support in political affairs. In the presence of such a large number of capable Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, the idea of him being forced to turn to relatives is a hallucination and delusion.

A brief list of the names of the honourable Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم who were residing in the capital of the khalīfah is presented to the readers:

1. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr رضي الله عنه
2. Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه

3. Zayd ibn Arqam رضي الله عنه
4. Ḥakīm ibn Ḥizām رضي الله عنه
5. Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه
6. Saʿd ibn Zayd رضي الله عنه
7. Maʿqal ibn Yasār رضي الله عنه
8. ʿImrān ibn al-Ḥuṣayn رضي الله عنه
9. Jubayr ibn Muṭʿim رضي الله عنه
10. Abū Maḥdhūrah رضي الله عنه (Muʿadhin of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم)
11. ʿAmr ibn Ḥazm al-Anṣārī رضي الله عنه
12. Laṭīb ibn ʿAbd al-ʿUzzā رضي الله عنه
13. ʿUthmān ibn Abī al-ʿĀṣ al-Thaqafī رضي الله عنه
14. Qays ibn Saʿd ibn ʿUbādah al-Anṣārī رضي الله عنه
15. Kurz ibn ʿAlqamah رضي الله عنه¹

The object is to prove that a large number of such Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم were definitely present who were eligible for government posts. There was no need to turn to relatives.

The reality is that just as Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, owing to the demand of the time, included his relatives in affairs of state, Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه did the very same. Both these eras are not worthy of blame and censure. To spare the era of Sayyidunā ʿAlī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه from criticism and censure the era of Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه is nothing but prejudice and bias, which makes tribalism evident and establishes the foundation of hatred and dissension between the nation. There is a strong need to save the ummah from this. This brings the third discussion to a close.

¹ *Usd al-Ghābah, al-Iṣābah, al-Istīʿāb.*

Discussion Four

Financial Gifts for Relatives

In the previous discussions, the relatives of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه being appointed to offices was explained. In the fourth discussion, the object is to focus on the monetary gifts to his relatives.

The critics of the ‘Uthmānī era have levelled a number of accusations in this regard. They write that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه gave his relatives wealth from the Muslim treasury in non-permissible ways, he distributed the wealth unequally, and gave stipends to his relatives without right, which caused hatred in the hearts of the people for him.

Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī al-Shīrī writes:

و كان يؤثر أهله بالأموال الكثيرة من بيت مال المسلمين إلخ

He would favour his family with abundant wealth from the Bayt al-Māl of the Muslims.¹

The critics have propagated this allegation regarding Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه in a very sly manner, saying that it was the demand of maintaining family ties, which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى commands. They say: Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه would state that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما discarded their monetary right from the Bayt al-Māl whereas he took it and distributed it among his close relatives. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه would say that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما prevented themselves and their relatives from this wealth, while he on the other hand interpreted it as maintaining family ties. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه would say that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما

1 *Minhāj al-Karāmah fī Ma’rifat al-Imāmah*, pg. 67, the allegations against ‘Uthmān, printed at the end of *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 4, new edition, Lahore.

obtained rewards by preventing wealth from their relatives while he on the other hands obtains rewards by giving this wealth to his relatives.

These objections have been deduced from these types of narrations:

1. محمد بن عمر الواقدي محمد بن عبد الله عن الزهري قال لما ولي عثمان ... و أعطى أقرباه المال و تأول في ذلك الصلة التي أمر الله بها و اتخذ الأموال استسلف من بيت المال و قال إن أبا بكر و عمر من بيت المال تركا من ذلك ما هو لهما و إني أخذته فقسمته في أقربائي فأنكر الناس عليه ذلك

Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar al-Wāqidi—from Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh from al-Zuhrī who relates:

When ‘Uthmān assumed the khilāfah... he gave wealth to his relatives and interpreted it by attributing it to maintaining family ties which Allah ﷺ commanded. He took the wealth and borrowed from the Bayt al-Māl. He said, “Indeed Abū Bakr and ‘Umar left their right of the Bayt al-Māl while I took it and distributed it among my relatives.” People objected to him for this practice.¹

2. A statement of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is reported which has the same meaning and subject matter as the above. It is reported from Miswar ibn Makhramah and the narrator is **al-Wāqidi**.²

و قال أبو مخنف و الواقدي في روايتهما أنكر الناس على عثمان ... فقال إن له قرابة و رحما قالوا أفما كان لأبي بكر و عمر قرابة و ذو رحم فقال إن أبا بكر و عمر كانا يحتسبان في منع قرابتهما و أنا احتسب في إعطاء قرابتي

Abū Mikhnaf and **al-Wāqidi** say in their narration:

People objected to ‘Uthmān. He said, “He has relatives and family.”

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 3 pg. 44, mention of the bay‘ah to ‘Uthmān, Leiden print; *Ansāb al-Ashraf*, vol. 5 pg. 25, mention of what they objected to from the practice of ‘Uthmān.

2 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 3 pg. 44, mention of the bay‘ah to ‘Uthmān, Leiden print; *Ansāb al-Ashraf*, vol. 5 pg. 25, mention of what they objected to from the practice of ‘Uthmān.

They said, “Did Abū Bakr and ‘Umar not have relatives and family?”

He replied, “Indeed, Abū Bakr and ‘Umar would anticipate reward in preventing (wealth) from their relatives while I anticipate reward in giving my relatives (wealth).”¹

In light of narrations like the above, the critics have levelled the above accusations against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. These reports are just samples, which we have reported with its chain of narration. The scholars by looking at them, would have understood properly their level of reliability. We clarify for the benefit of the general readers that these types of narrations, which are the foundation of the allegation, are the work of oppressive narrators like **al-Wāqidī** and **Abū Mikhnaf**, who are infamous liars and deceivers in the science of ḥadīth. Spreading these types of reports against the noble Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم exposes their innate nature. They are *matrūk* (suspected of ḥadīth forgery) according to the scholars.² The accusations against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه are therefore based on fabricated reports, and are thus baseless.

Note: The above reports are presented by the critics as a rule of thumb for this accusation. We have briefly examined them and we will soon scrutinise them rationally.

The narrations which speak of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه gifting wealth to his family members together with their names will now be presented in sequence. Thereafter, their chains of narrators and their texts will be examined so that the reality of this accusation is clarified before the readers, who will soon realise that it is a corrupt accusation based on a corrupt report and that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه did not commit any wrong and did not act contrary to the Sharīah. The objectionable reports will be presented followed by their examination, Allah willing.

1 *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 5 pg. 28, mention of what they objected to from the practice of ‘Uthmān.

2 *Mīzān al-‘Itidāl; Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*.

Reports of Gifting Wealth to the Relatives of ‘Uthmān

The critics present a list of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān’s ﷺ relatives (who were given gifts). We will now list a few of their names and the wealth given to them with some detail, which will reveal the reality of the allegation.

Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam and the Family of al-Ḥakam

1. Al-Balādhurī has mentioned the following incident from Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in his famous book, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*:

عن الواقدي عن أسامة بن زيد بن أسلم عن نافع مولى الزبير عن عبد الله بن الزبير ... فأعطى عثمان مروان بن الحكم خمس الغنائم إلخ

Al-Wāqidi—from Usāmah ibn Zayd ibn Aslam—from Nāfi‘, the freed slave of Zubayr—from ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr:

(Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ despatched us under the leadership of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ to conquer Africa. ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d obtained a handsome booty.)

‘Uthmān gave a fifth of the booty to Marwān.¹

2. Al-Balādhurī has reported the second narration via Umm Bakr bint al-Miswar ibn Makhrumah:

عن الواقدي عن عبد الله بن جعفر عن أم بكر بنت المسور عن المسور ... فأعطاك ابن عفان خمس أفرقية إلخ

Al-Wāqidi—from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far—from Umm Bakr bint al-Miswar—from Miswar:

Ibn ‘Affān gave a fifth of Africa to you.²

1 *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 5 pg. 27, mention of what they objected to from the practice of ‘Uthmān.

2 *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 5 pg. 28, mention of what they objected to from the practice of ‘Uthmān.

3. The third narration of al-Balādhurī reads:

عن لوط بن يحيى أبي مخنف عمن ... حدثه قال كان عبد الله بن سعد بن أبي سرح أخا عثمان من الرضاعة و عامله على المغرب فغزا أفريقية سنة سبع و عشرين فافتتحها و كان معه مروان بن الحكم فابتاع خمس الغنيمة بمائة ألف أو مائتي ألف دينار فكلم عثمان فوهبها له فأنكر الناس ذلك على عثمان

Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā Abū Mikhnaf—from the one who reported to him who said:

‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ was ‘Uthmān’s foster brother. He appointed him governor over Morocco. ‘Abd Allāh attacked Africa in the 27th year and conquered it. Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam was with him. He sold a fifth of the booty for 100 000 or 200 000 gold coins. He then spoke to ‘Uthmān who gifted him this amount. People objected to ‘Uthmān for this.¹

4. The narration of *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*:

قال الواقدي ... و كان الذي صالحهم عليه عبد الله بن سعد ثلثمائة قنطار ذهب فأمر بها عثمان لآل الحكم قلت أو لمروان قال لا أدري

Al-Wāqidī says:

‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d was responsible for reaching a compromise with them over 300 000 gold coins. ‘Uthmān instructed that it be handed over to the family of Ḥakam.

I asked, “Or Marwān particularly?”

“I do not know,” he replied.²

Ibn Kathīr has reported the same incident from **al-Wāqidī** with slight changes in the wording in *al-Bidāyah*:

1 Ibid.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 50, the year 37 A.H., mention of the report of its conquer, the reason of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sa’d’s rulership over Egypt and ‘Uthmān dismissing ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ

قال الواقدي و صالحه بطريقها على ألفي ألف دينار و عشرين ألف دينار فأطلقها كلها عثمان في يوم واحد
لآل الحكم و يقال لآل مروان

Al-Wāqidi says: He came to a compromise with them over 220 000 gold coins. ‘Uthmān gave it all in one day to the family of Ḥakam, or it is said: the family of Marwān.¹

Both these narrations clearly state that all the wealth acquired from the people of Africa (although there is disagreement in the actual amount) was given by Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه to the family of Ḥakam or the family of Marwān. Both of the books attribute the report to **al-Wāqidi**. Keep a mental note of this as more details will soon appear.

5. The critics quote a narration from *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d* as well which speaks of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه giving wealth to Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam. It is mentioned therein:

أخبرنا محمد بن عمر (الواقدي) حدثني محمد بن عبد الله عن الزهري قال ... و استعمل أقرباءه و أهل بيته ... و كتب لمروان بخمس مصر و أعطى أقرباءه المال إلخ

Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar al-Wāqidi informed us—Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh narrated to me—from al-Zuhrī:

He appointed his relatives and family members as office bearers. He decreed the fifth of Egypt for Marwān and he gave wealth to his relatives.²

This is also the narration of **al-Wāqidi**.

This very narration of *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d* appears in al-Balādhurī’s *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* with the wording:

1 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 152, then the year 27 A.H. entered, the Battle of Africa.

2 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 3 pg. 44, mention of the bay’ah of ‘Uthmān, Leiden print.

He stipulated the fifth of Africa for Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam and gave wealth to his relatives.¹

This narration of al-Balādhurī is also from **al-Wāqidī**. Basically, both the narrations of *Ṭabaqāt ibn Sa‘d* and *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* are from al-Wāqidī. At one place he mentions the fifth of Egypt while in the other book the fifth of Africa is recorded. (This is clear contradiction.) This is since the Conquest of Egypt took place many years prior to that; in the year 20 or 21 A.H. in the Fārūqī era. To take out a fifth from the wealth of Egypt now in the ‘Uthmānī era is not possible at all.

6. Al-Balādhurī mentions yet another narration:

عن الواقدي عن عبد الله بن جعفر عن أم بكر عن أبيها قالت قدمت إبل الصدقة على عثمان فوهبها للحارث بن الحكم بن أبي العاص

Al-Wāqidī—from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far—from Umm Bakr—from her father. She explains:

The zakāh camels arrived by ‘Uthmān who gifted them to Ḥārith ibn al-Ḥakam ibn Abī al-‘Āṣ.²

Ḥārith ibn al-Ḥakam is Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān’s رضي الله عنه cousin.

Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ

و قال أبو مخنف و الواقدي في روايتهما أنكر الناس على عثمان أعطى سعيد بن العاص مائة ألف درهم فكلمه علي و الزبير و طلحة إلخ

1 *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 5 pg. 25, mention of what they objected to from the practice of ‘Uthmān.

2 *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 5 pg. 28, mention of what they objected to from the practice of ‘Uthmān.

Abū Mikhnaf and **al-Wāqidī** have said in their reports:

People objected to ‘Uthmān for giving Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ 100 000 dirhams. ‘Alī, Zubayr, and Ṭalḥah spoke to him in this regard.¹

This is yet another spectacle of **al-Wāqidī** and **Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā Abū Mikhnaf**.

Narrations of this type may be located in other historical compilations, but we have sufficed on seven as samples, coupled with clear mention of their narrators. Hereafter, they will be briefly scrutinised which will reveal the baselessness of this objection.

Examination of the Chain of Narrators

We have presented a few reports before the readers from which the objection of favouritism of relatives with wealth is levelled against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.

The first three reports are listed as the basis. Their chains are examined. All three of them are reported from **al-Wāqidī** and **Abū Mikhnaf Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā**. Both these narrators are severely criticised. Citations will be quoted shortly. Thereafter, those reports were listed which clearly mention the names of the relatives who received wealth from Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. There are 7 reports all in all. Some are narrated by al-Wāqidī alone while others are narrated by him and Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā Abū Mikhnaf and one narration is only from the latter.

The masters of ḥadīth have presented a detailed criticism of these two narrators. Previously, their examination and scrutiny has been mentioned while mentioning aspects pertaining to ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa‘d ibn Abī Sarḥ and the answer to the second misconception on Marwān.

Nonetheless, we present the criticism of both these narrators before the readers so that the baselessness of these reports may be evident.

1 *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 5 pg. 28, mention of what they objected to from the practice of ‘Uthmān.

Al-Wāqidī

His name is Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar ibn Wāqid al-Aslamī al-Wāqidī.

- Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal said, “He is a *kadhāb* (liar). He changes aḥādīth.”
- Ibn Maʿīn said, “His aḥādīth should not be recorded.”
- Al-Bukhārī labelled him *matrūk* (suspected of ḥadīth forgery).
- Abū Ḥātim and al-Nasaʿī said, “He fabricates ḥadīth.”¹
- Al-Dhahabī said in al-Mughnī, “There is unanimity on discarding him.”
- Al-Nasaʿī said, “He would concoct aḥādīth.”²
- Ibn Ḥibbān says, “He would narrate twisted narrations from reliable narrators and concoctions on the strength of trustworthy men.”
- Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal رحمته الله would declare him a liar.
- Al-Madīnī says, “Al-Wāqidī fabricates ḥadīth.”³
- Ibn Ḥajar declares in *al-Lisān*, “He is *matrūk*, despite his vast knowledge.”⁴

In short, those reports which al-Wāqidī is the only reporter of are not fit for proof.

Abū Mikhnaf Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā

His name is Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā and his agnomen is Abū Mikhnaf. He is an *Akhbārī* (story-teller). The scholars write:

- Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā Abū Mikhnaf is an *akhbārī* who is unreliable.

1 *Mizān al-Iʿtidāl*, vol. 3 pg. 110, Muhammad ibn ʿUmar al-Wāqidī; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 9 pg. 364 – 366, Muhammad ibn ʿUmar al-Wāqidī.

2 *Al-Mughnī*, vol. 2 pg. 619, Muhammad ibn ʿUmar al-Wāqidī.

3 *Kitāb al-Majrūḥīn*, vol. 2 pg. 284, Muhammad ibn ʿUmar ibn Wāqid.

4 *Lisān al-Mizān*, vol. 6 pg. 852, al-Wāqidī Muhammad ibn ʿUmar.

- Abū Ḥātim and others have regarded him as *matrūk* (suspected of ḥadīth forgery).
- Al-Dāraquṭnī says, “Weak.”
- Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn states, “He is not reliable.”
- He said once, “He is worthless.”
- Ibn ʿAdī says, “An antagonistic Shīʿī. The reporter of their tales.”
- Abū Mikhnaḥ Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā is destroyed.
- He is unreliable.
- Weak.
- Worthless.
- An antagonistic Shīʿī.
- The reporter of their tales.¹

In short, narrators of this kind who have been so clearly criticised, relying on their reports is totally wrong. Their reports can never be regarded to be correct.

Other reports on the Monetary Gifts of the Fifth of Africa and others

It appears in history books that Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه gave the fifth of Africa to his foster brother, ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saʿd ibn Abī Sarḥ (which was the right of the Bayt al-Māl). It also appears in historical reports that ʿAbd Allāh ibn Khālid ibn Usayd and Marwān were given plenty wealth at once from the Bayt al-Māl. The critics accuse Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه of distributing the wealth of the Bayt al-Māl unfairly and giving his relatives large sums of money in an impermissible manner.

¹ *Mizān al-ʿitidāl*, vol. 2 pg. 360, under Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā; *Lisān al-Mizān*, vol. 4 pg. 492, under Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā.

Answer

- a. Firstly, these are historical reports, which may be authentic or inauthentic. Reports which are probable can never be given the status of *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth*.
- b. Secondly, the scholars have examined such type of reports and declared them inauthentic and questionable. Therefore, relying on their authenticity is incorrect.

For example, Qāḍī Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī states:

و أما إعطاءه خمس أفريقية لواحد فلم يصح

With regards him gifting the fifth of Africa to one individual, this is incorrect.¹

Shāh Waliyyullāh writes in *Izālat al-Khafā’*:

إما قصص ركيكه كه ابل تاريخ بغير تحقيق ذكر مي كند از اسراف در بيت الهال و حى ساختن شجر و غير اين چوں بعض محض منقریات است و بعض ازان قبيل كه در سرد قصه افترا داخل شده اوقات خود را بتسويد اوراق بيان قصبا مشغول نهي سازيم

The historians have, without research, recorded narratives of incorrect expenditure of the funds of the Bayt al-Māl. Some of these are fabrications and lies while others have been mixed with untruths. Therefore, we will not waste our time citing those reports.²

Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz has written in *Tuḥfat Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*:

و قصه بخشیدن خمس افريقه كه بهروان ست نیز غلط محض ست

1 *Al-‘Awāsim min al-Qawāsim*, pg. 100 – 101, answers to objection 13.

2 *Izālat al-Khafā’*, maqṣad 2, pg. 248, answers to ‘Uthmānī allegations, first edition, Bareli.

The story of the fifth of Africa been given to Marwān is totally erroneous.¹

- c. Even if the reports of the fifth of Africa are considered correct, its solution is found in the report of al-Ṭabarī. It states that after the objection, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه instructed ‘Abd Allāh to return the wealth to the Bayt al-Māl. Some details of this will be presented below which will clear up the issue.

Al-Ṭabarī mentions regarding the Conquest of Africa:

The wealth Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى favoured the Muslims with in the Conquest of Africa was distributed by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d among the warriors and soldiers. He took a fifth of the wealth and divided this fifth into five portions according to the rule. He took one of these portions and sent four portions with Ibn Wasīmah al-Naḍrī to Madīnah al-Munawwarah for Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.

At the same time, a delegation reached Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and complained that ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d رضي الله عنه took a fifth of the fifth. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه explained, “I have gifted him this amount above his allotted share. With regards to it, I promised him that he will be given a fifth of the fifth upon the conquest of Africa.”

وقد أمرت له بذلك وذاك إليكم الآن فإن رضيتم فقد جاز وإن سخطتم فهو رد قالوا فإننا نسخطه قال فهو رد وكتب إلى عبد الله برد ذلك واستصاحهم قالوا فاعزله عنا فإننا لا نريد أن يتأمر عليها وقد وقع ما وقع فكتب إليه أن استخلف على أفريقية رجلا ممن ترضى ويرضون واقسم الخمس الذي كنت نفلتكم في سبيل الله فإنهم قد سخطوا النفل ففعل ورجع عبد الله بن سعد إلى مصر وقد فتح أفريقية إلخ

“I had instructed him such. I now hand over the affair to you; if you are pleased then it is passed and if you are displeased, then it is cancelled.”

They said, “We are displeased.”

1 *Tuhfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*, pg. 311, third allegation against ‘Uthmān, new edition, Lahore.

“Then it is cancelled,” he confirmed.

He wrote to ‘Abd Allāh to return this amount and make peace with them.

They said, “Dismiss him for we do not wish him to lead us when this has occurred.”

‘Uthmān thus wrote to him, “Appoint over Africa a man whom you are pleased with and they are pleased with and distribute the fifth which I had originally given you as extra in the path of Allah for they are displeased with the extra.”

‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d acted accordingly and returned to Egypt after he conquered Africa.¹

- d. What appears in some reports of al-Ṭabarī of huge amounts of wealth been given to ‘Abd Allāh ibn Khālid ibn Usayd and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, the answer to this is found in the following narration of al-Ṭabarī.

The report says that once some Ṣaḥābah (Sayyidunā ‘Alī, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah, Sayyidunā Zubayr, and others) were in the company of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Besides other matters, there was a dialogue on Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ giving wealth to his relatives. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ submitted, “The wealth that I have given to my relatives, according to my understanding, this action is correct.”

و رأيت ذلك لي فإن رأيتم ذلك خطأ فردوه فأمرني لأمركم تبع قالوا أصعبت و أحسنت قالوا أعطيت عبد الله بن خالد بن أسيد و مروان و كانوا يزعمون أنه أعطى مروان خمسة عشر ألفا و ابن أسيد خمسين ألفا فردوا منهما ذلك فرضوا و قبلوا و خرجوا راضين

“I feel this is my right. If you regard it as a mistake, then return the wealth. I will follow your orders.”

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 49, the year 27 A.H., mention of the report of its conquer, the reason of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sa’d’s rulership over Egypt and ‘Uthmān dismissing ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ.

They said, “You have acted correctly and have done well.”

They said, “You gave ‘Abd Allāh ibn Khālīd ibn Usayd and Marwān.” They felt that he gave Marwān 15 000 and Ibn Usayd 50 000. They thus took this wealth back. They were pleased, and accepted, and left happily.¹

The above two narrations of al-Ṭabarī clarify that had Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه given an abundance of wealth to ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Khālīd, and Marwān, then after the objection, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه took the wealth back and the objectors were pleased with his action. Thus, this objection no more remains.

Note: The above reports of al-Ṭabarī have clarified the objection; hence, those historians who quote from al-Ṭabarī, for example Ibn Athīr in *al-Kāmil*, Ibn Kathīr in *al-Bidāyah*, and Ibn Khaldūn in his *Tārīkh*, etc., their objections at this instance have also been answered and there remains no need to present a separate answer for them. The reason is simple; these historians have reported from al-Ṭabarī and mentioned the same objections concerning the fifth of Africa.

- e. If it is hypothetically accepted that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه gave his relatives or others gifts from the Bayt al-Māl, then what is the level of the permissibility of this action? Is the khilāfah sanctioned to give wealth to someone using his own discretion? Is the ijtihād of the khalīfah correct or not?

We list a few points below to clarify this. By studying them carefully, these questions will be answered.

أنه قد ذهب مالك و جماعة إلى أن الإمام يرى رأيه في الخمس و ينفذ فيه ما أراه إليه اجتهاده و إن إعطاه
لواحد جائز

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 101, the year 35 A.H.

Mālik and a group of jurists have viewed that the Imām may apply his discretion in the fifth and decree what his ijtihād determines. Moreover, his gifting one person is permissible.¹

Burhān al-Dīn al-Ṭarābilisī al-Ḥanafī has written in *al-Is‘āf fī Aḥkām al-Awqāf*:

عن عبد العزيز بن محمد عن أبيه عن علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه أن عمر بن الخطاب قطع لعلي يبيع ثم اشترى علي إلى قطيعته التي قطع له عمر أشياء فحفر فيها عينا فبيناهم يعملون إذ تنجر عليهم مثل العنق الجزور من الماء فأتى عليا فبشره هذا لك ... و بلغ حدادها في زمن علي ألف وست

From ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Muḥammad—from his father—from ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه:

‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb allocated Yanbu‘ for ‘Alī. Subsequent to this, ‘Alī bought the pieces of land adjacent to the one ‘Umar had allotted for him. A spring was dug therein. While they were working, suddenly water resembling a gigantic camel sprung out. He came to ‘Alī and gave him glad tidings of this. Its produce had reached 100 wasaq during the lifetime of ‘Alī.²

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه accepted this gift wholeheartedly and no Ṣaḥābī رضي الله عنه objected to the same. Previously, this incident was mentioned in the Fārūqī section of *Ruḥamā’ Baynahum*.

- i. Similarly, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه during his khilāfah gifted 20 000 dirhams at once to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه via his governor ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir after his return from Khorasan. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه accepted it and no Ṣaḥābī رضي الله عنه objected to it.

1 *Al-‘Awāsim min al-Qawāsim*, pg. 100 – 101, answers to objection 13.

2 *Al-Is‘āf fī Aḥkām al-Awqāf*, pg. 7 – 8; year of author 905 A.H.; *Wafā’ al-Wafā’*, vol. 4 pg. 1334, section 8, under the word Yanbu‘, Beirut print.

فقال (عثمان) لابن عامر قبح الله رأيك أترسل إلى علي بثلاثة آلاف درهم قال كرهت أن أغرق
و لم أدر ما رأيك قال فأغرق قال فبعث إليه بعشرين ألف درهم و ما يتبعها قال فراح علي إلى
المسجد فانتهى إلى حلقتة و هم يتذاكرون صلوات ابن عامر هذا الحي من قريش فقال علي هو
سيد فتیان قريش غير مدافع

‘Uthmān told Ibn ‘Āmir, “Your view was dishonourable! You sent only 3000 dirhams to ‘Alī?”

He submitted, “I disliked favouring one above another and I was unaware of your opinion.”

‘Uthmān commanded, “Give more to him.”

Accordingly, he sent 20 000 dirhams to ‘Alī coupled with other presents.

Thereafter ‘Alī came to the Masjid and approached a circle who were speaking about the gifts of Ibn ‘Āmir to the Quraysh tribe. ‘Alī announced, “He is the leader of the youth of the Quraysh. His declaration is undisputable.”¹

This incident was cited in *Ruḥamā Baynahum*, section 3 (‘Uthmānī), under the heading: the monetary rights of the family members of the Nabī ﷺ.

These two incidents clarify the issue that the khalīfah of the time with his discretion may favour some individuals of the ummah with wealth and this action of his is correct in the Sharīah. Otherwise, Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s ﷺ acquisition of wealth in the above incidents will be incorrect and wrong, just as the gifts of both the khalīfahs, whereas no one opts for this view.

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 5 pg. 33, ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Āmir, Leiden print.

- ii. Let it be made clear that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ giving wealth from the Bayt al-Māl was not exclusive for his relatives or the Hāshimites. Rather, all the adherents of Islam at the time received wealth from the Bayt al-Māl. Shāh Waliyyullāh رَحِمَهُ اللهُ reports the following in his book *Qurrat al-‘Aynayn*. Ibn Kathīr has also recorded the report as well as Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz in *Tuḥfat Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*:

عن الحسن البصري قال سمعت عثمان يخطب يقول يا أيها الناس ما تنقمون علي و ما من يوم إلا و أنتم تقسمون فيه خيرا قال الحسن و شهدت مناديه ينادي يا أيها الناس اغدوا على عطياتكم فيغدون فيأخذونها و افره يا أيها الناس اغدوا على أرزاقكم فيغدون و يأخذونها و افره حتى والله لقد سمعته أذناي يقول على كسوتكم فيأخذون الحلل و اغدوا على السمن و العسل الخ

Ḥasan al-Baṣrī says: I heard ‘Uthmān addressing the people saying, “O people, what do you hold against me? There is not a day except that you are dividing goodness therein.”

Ḥasan says, “I witnessed his announcer announcing, ‘O people, come get your stipends,’ and they would come and take fully. ‘O people, come take your sustenance,’ and they would come and take properly. To the extent that, by Allah, my own two ears heard him saying, ‘come take your clothes,’ and they would take sets of clothes. ‘And come take butter and honey.’”¹

- f. Even if the above is overlooked, then too worthy of note is that during the last days of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ khilāfah, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ gave a lengthy address to the critics who objected to his giving of wealth (which is recorded by al-Ṭabarī).

He says therein:

1 *Qurrat al-‘Aynayn fī Tafḍīl al-Shaykhayn*, pg. 271 – 272, answer to the objections against the sons-in-law; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 213, section on a brief biography of his; *Tuḥfat Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*, pg. 310 – 311, discussion on the allegations against ‘Uthmān, criticism 3, new edition, Lahore.

وقالوا أي أحب أهل بيتي وأعطيتهم فأما حيي فإنه لم يمل معهم على جور بل أحمل الحقوق عليهم وأما إعطاؤهم فإني أعطيتهم من مالي ولا أستحل أموال المسلمين لنفسي ولا لأحد من الناس إلخ

They say that I love my family members and give them. With regards to my love for them, it did not divert me to oppression. Rather, I fulfil their rights. And as regards my giving them wealth, I give them from my personal wealth. I do not regard the wealth of the Muslims as permissible for myself nor for anyone else.¹

- i. Ibn Kathīr has also quoted the following statement of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه in *al-Bidāyah*:

ثم اعتذر عثمان عما كان يعطي أقرباءه بأنه من فضل ماله

‘Uthmān then presented his excuse of his giving his relatives by asserting that it is from his surplus wealth.²

- ii. The historians (like al-Ṭabarī) have recorded this aspect in the biography of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه that he did not take any remuneration or salary from the Bayt al-Māl of the Muslims. Instead he asserts:

والله ما أكله من مال المسلمين و لكنني أكله من مالي أنت تعلم أي كنت أكثر قريش مالا و أجدهم في التجارة إلخ

By Allah, I do not eat from the wealth of the Muslims. Rather, I eat from my own wealth. You know that I was one of the most affluent men of Quraysh and the most successful in business.³

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 103, the year 35 A.H. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān’s speech in answer to the critics; *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 2 pg. 126, the year 35 A.H.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 169, the year 34 A.H.

3 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 136, the year 35 A.H., some aspects of the biography of ‘Uthmān.

Rational Discussion

Now, a few logical points will be noted which will unearth the basis of this issue and expose the feebleness of the objection.

- a. The first aspect is, was Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه unaware of the Sharī angle of this issue (distribution of the wealth of the Muslims)? Was he ignorant of the rulings of the Qur’ān and Sunnah in this regard? Was Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه oblivious of the difference of whether the demands of family ties ought to be met with wealth from the Bayt al-Māl or one’s personal wealth? Did his knowledge not encompass the choices of distribution of wealth and the Sharī limits of the same? Or despite his knowledge, did he act contrary?

A sincere Muslim ought to ponder over these aspects. Those who wish to soar above prejudice and reflect may do so and establish their honest opinion about the Rightly Guided Khalīfah.

- b. Secondly, relying on Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān’s رضي الله عنه trustworthiness, integrity, and truthfulness, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم declared his hand the hand of ‘Uthmān and established the greatness of the hand of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. Furthermore, Allah سبحانه وتعالى revealed the stamp of His happiness upon those who attended this pledge. The demand of the greatness of the hand of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه is that it will not distribute wealth contrary to the will of Allah سبحانه وتعالى and the rulings of the Sharīah.

The senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم of the ummah (Sayyidunā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf, Sayyidunā ‘Alī, Sayyidunā Zubayr, Sayyidunā Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ رضي الله عنه) placed their hands upon this hand and pledged their allegiance to him as khilāfah and accepted it with unanimity, with reliance on his integrity. Therefore, to attribute incorrect distribution of wealth to him is in itself erroneous. This hand would only distribute wealth with honesty.

In short, his selection in both these cases is a clear evidence of his firmness in dīn and full assurance of his honesty and trustworthiness. He is therefore correct and reliable in every religious action of his and he passed away upon this. Thus, the critics' claim that he was mistaken in the issue of distribution of wealth is a direct attack on his honesty and integrity which is totally wrong.

- c. Thirdly, the objection of the incorrect distribution of the fifth of Africa was raised in the year 27 or 28 A.H. (when Africa was conquered). Thereafter, in the year 30 A.H., the conquests of Khorasan, Ṭabaristān, and Jurjān took place. Senior Ṣaḥābah and senior Hāshimites participated in these conquests, Sayyidunā Ḥasan, Sayyidunā Ḥusayn, Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās, Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar, Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ, Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr and others.

Had the distribution of the booty of the conquest of Africa been incorrect, then why did these luminaries not raise this objection to his distribution? And why did they participate silently in the conquests thereafter? If in the previous conquests, the laws of Sharī'ah were violated when wealth was distributed, then it was binding upon them to first rectify it and then participate in the subsequent conquests. However, this did not happen.

Their actions have made it clear that no objection was raised in the distribution of the wealth of Africa, nor did any error take place. This is only the propaganda of some critics of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه which the historians have spread.

References to participation in battles appeared in *Ruḥamā' Baynahum*, section 3, chapter 4 under the heading: the khilāfah of 'Uthmān and Hāshimites' participation in Jihād. Have a look at the following references for details:

- *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 57, the year 30 A.H.
- *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 154, the year 30 A.H.

Conclusion of Discussion Four

The discussion on financial gifts has been addressed briefly. By observing with an eye of justice the following image appears:

1. The reports from which the case of financial preferences were made, are generally the products of story tellers, deceits, and fabricators, from whom the historians have quoted. To rely on them and blemish the integrity of a Rightly Guided Khalīfah is in no way correct.
2. The incidents of gifting wealth which are correct, were not out of the limits of the Sharīah and were done with the discretion of the khalīfah. The clarifications of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه support this, and have been quoted.
3. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān’s رضي الله عنه academic level is extremely lofty. He is reckoned among the *Fuqahā’* (jurists) of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. He was a strong pillar of the consultations of the Ṣiddīqī and Fārūqī era. He was stationed on the pedestal of the *Ahl al-Ḥall wa al-‘Aqd* (decision makers) in religious matters. Therefore, it can never be imagined regarding Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه that he was ignorant or unaware of the rulings of distribution of wealth. To envisage that he was aware of the rulings but did not practice upon them is even more ludicrous. Only his rivals can imagine such a ridiculous thing, no one else.
4. In the matter of the distribution of the fifth of Africa, after looking at the conquests after that, this issue is resolved. The esteemed Ṣaḥābah (including the Hāshimites) participating in the campaigns after Africa clarifies that no error was committed in the distribution of the fifth of Africa. Otherwise, how were they pleased with this open transgression and how did they assist upon sin and aggression?

The summary of the above is that the objections levelled against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه of wrong distribution of wealth are all baseless. The wealth he

gave to his relatives was permissible and correct according to the Sharī'ah. The propaganda of him transgressing the limits of the Sharī'ah is not real. Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه did not commit any mistake in this regard for him to be accused and criticised.

Discussion Five

The Final Stages of the ‘Uthmānī Era and related discussions

The critics of the ‘Uthmānī era have raised a number of issues concerning its final stages which are contrary to reality and oppose to the actual occurrences of the time.

For example:

- a. Some people assume that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه gave high positions to his relatives who then perpetrated many offenses and oppressions. Moreover, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه unlawfully gave his relatives huge amounts of wealth from the Bayt al-Māl on a number of occasions. This caused hatred among the tribes and gave rise to tribalism. The almost extinguished flames of tribalism were ignited again. He brought an end to the administration and system of the Khilāfah Rāshidah which inevitably led to his assassination.
- b. Some say that besides nepotism and family favouritism, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه innovated many innovations in the Sharī‘ah.

و خالفه المسلمون كلهم حتى قتل و عابوا أفعاله الخ

All the Muslims opposed him until he was killed and they blamed his actions.¹

To realise the reality of this issue, a few points will be explained to the readers under the heading *relation of stages* which will reveal the reality of the final stages of the ‘Uthmānī era after a fair perusal, and expose the inaccuracy of the image portrayed by the critics as well as its falsity.

1 *Minhāj al-Karāmah fī Ma‘rifat al-Imāmah*, vol. 4 pg. 68, the last discussion on the ‘Uthmānī allegations, printed at the end of *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, Lahore print.

Relation of Stages

1. People's portrayal of the 'Uthmānī era that during the end of the 'Uthmānī era many evils and ills spread due to Sayyidunā 'Uthmān's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ governors and office bearers; the laws of the Sharī'ah were violated due to which the people began criticising him; and emotions of hatred began spreading among the people for him; all of this is contrary to reality. A number of senior scholars of the ummah have presented clarifications and rejected the existence of such evils and affirmed that no such action was practiced in that era which could be criticised in the Sharī'ah or make him a transgressor or lead to his assassination.

Clarification from Imām al-Bukhārī

Let us first have a look at Imām al-Bukhārī's clarification. He relates via his sanad from Ḥasan:

حدثنا سليمان بن حرب ثنا أبو هلال قال سمعت الحسن يقول عمل أمير المؤمنين عثمان بن عفان نبتى عشرة سنة لا ينكرون من إمارته شيئاً حتى جاء فسقة فداهن الله في أمره أهل المدينة

Sulaymān ibn Ḥarb narrated to us—Abū Hilāl narrated to us saying: I heard Ḥasan saying:

Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān ruled for 12 years. People never criticised any aspect of his leadership. Then finally the transgressors came along and, by Allah, the people of Madīnah displayed softness in his matter. (i.e. they did not display sternness, hence the transgressors were successful in their sinister mission.)¹

Ibn al-'Arabī al-Mālīkī's Statement

'Allāmah Ibn al-'Arabī al-Mālīkī while discussing this issue states:

1 *Al-Tārīkh al-ṣaghīr*, pg. 32, list of those who passed away during 'Uthmān's khilāfah, Allahabad print (India).

فلم يأت عثمان منكرا لا في أول الأمر ولا في آخره ولا جاء الصحابة بمنكر وكل ما سمعت من خير باطل إياك والالتفات إليه

‘Uthmān never committed any wrong, neither in the beginning stages of his khilāfah nor at the final stages, nor did the Ṣaḥābah commit any wrong. All the false reports you hear of, beware of giving them attention!¹

Shaykh Jīlānī’s Statement

Speaking on the lofty position of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Shaykh Jīlānī writes a beautiful clarification of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his prosperous era in *Ghunyat al-Ṭālibīn*. He says:

و بايع علي ثم بايع الناس أجمع فصار عثمان بن عفان خليفة بين الناس باتفاق الكل فكان إماما حقا إلى أن مات لم يوجد فيه أمر يوجب الطعن فيه ولا فسقه ولا قتله خلاف ما قالت الروافض تبا لهم

‘Alī pledged allegiance and then all the people pledged allegiance (to ‘Uthmān). ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān, thus, became the khalīfah among the people with the unanimity of all. He was a true leader until he passed on. No aspect was found in him which he could be blamed for, or could lead to his transgression, or his assassination, contrary to what the Rawāfiḍ say. May they be destroyed!²

2. The second aspect mentioned is that during the days of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ khilāfah, there were proper systems implemented to fulfil the masses needs, and there were proper systems installed to remove the complaints of people. Governors were instructed to enjoin good and forbid evil. In this way, the correct image of the establishment of dīn was prevalent and state affairs were running smoothly. No signs of the masses being disturbed were existent. Have a look at the forthcoming statements

1 *Al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim*, pg. 60, Suhayl Academy print, Lahore.

2 Shaykh Jīlānī (d. 561 A.H.): *Ghunyat al-Ṭālibīn Mutarjam*, pg. 137, section on the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah, old print, Lahore.

of the historians for proof for this. Firstly a report of a delegation of that time will be presented, followed by the declarations of reliable senior personalities of that era, the likes of Sālim ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar and ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr as corroboration. Hopefully, satisfaction will be obtained by them.

The incident of Despatching Delegations and their report back

Historians like al-Ṭabarī and Ibn Khaldūn have recorded this incident:

أن تبعث رجالا ممن تثق إلى الأمصار حتى يرجعوا إليك بأخبارهم فدعا محمد بن مسلمة فأرسله إلى الكوفة وأرسل أسامة بن زيد إلى البصرة وأرسل عبد الله بن عمر إلى الشام وفرق رجالا سواهم فرجعوا جميعا قبل عمار فقالوا أيها الناس ما أنكرنا شيئا ولا أنكره أعلام المسلمين ولا عوامهم وقالوا جميعا الأمر أمر المسلمين إلا أن أمرائهم يقسطون بينهم ويقومون عليهم واستبطأ الناس عمارا حتى ظنوا أنه قد اغتيل فلم يفتجأهم إلا كتاب من عبد الله بن سعد بن أبي سرح يخبرهم أن عمار قد استماله قوم بمصر وقد انقطعوا إليه منهم عبد الله بن السوداء و خالد بن ملجم و سودان بن حمران و كنانة بن بشر

(During his khilāfah, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه received complaints of his governors. He was thus advised:)

“You send men whom you deem trustable to the main cities and they will bring you information of the people there.”

He thus summoned Muḥammad ibn Maslamah and sent him to Kūfah. He sent Usāmah ibn Zayd to Baṣrah and ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar to Shām. He sent other men besides them as well in different directions. (‘Ammār ibn Yāsir was sent to Egypt.) They all returned before ‘Ammār and said, “O people, we have not found anything improper nor have the notables of the Muslims or their common folk found anything displeasing. The affairs of the Muslims are running smoothly. Their governors deal justly with them and fulfil their duties towards them.”

People sensed ‘Ammār’s delay in returning and thought that he had been assassinated. Suddenly, the letter of ‘Abd Allāh bin Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ arrives informing them that ‘Ammār has been misled by a group (the opposition)

in Egypt and they have gathered around him. Among them are ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Sawdā’, Khālīd ibn Muljīm, Sūdān ibn Ḥumrān, and Kinānah ibn Bishr.¹

The above incident is recorded by Ibn Khaldūn. To reproduce the text coupled with the translation will delay things. Therefore, the reference will be provided which may be referred to for corroboration.²

The above makes it crystal clear that in the days of the ‘Uthmānī khilāfah, there were no evil practices and the masses and elite seen no evil. The entire management and government was run under the Dīn and Sharī‘ah, i.e. Islamic governance was in vogue and justice was maintained between people. Moreover, the governors of those days were not unjust, but righteous individuals who had good dealings with the populace.

Rule of Thumb: Majority gets the ruling of all

It is noteworthy that to investigate complaints of administration in the state, many delegations (comprising of senior Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ) were despatched. Besides the report of one, ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir, the reports of all others stated that the administrative affairs of the state were running smoothly and in favour of the populace. No oppression was been committed upon the people. Rather, justice was being upheld. Thus, the rule of thumb is: majority gets the ruling of all.

The correct image is the one presented by majority of the informers. Sayyidunā ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ being influenced by the opposition of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ could have many reasons. Therefore, the intelligence gathered by majority will be regarded as correct and authentic while the opinion of one will be given the status of an odd view.

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 99, the year 35 A.H., mention of the travel of those residents of Egypt who moved to Dhū Khashab.

2 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn*, vol. 2 pg. 1027.

Translators Note:

The isnād of this report, which was narrated by al-Ṭabarī, includes **Shu‘ayb ibn Ibrāhīm al-Tamīmī al-Kufī**, the narrator of the books of Sayf, about whom there is some ambiguity.

Al-Rāwī said concerning him, “He is not known, although he has some aḥādīth and reports in which there is some weirdness and they contain a lot of bias against the salaf.” [*Istishhād ‘Uthmān wa Waq’ah al-Jamal*, p. 30]

It was also narrated by ‘Umar ibn Shabbah in *Tārīkh al-Madīnah*, where its isnād includes the Shaykh of ‘Umar, **‘Alī ibn ‘Āṣim**:

- » Ibn al-Madīnī said, ‘Alī ibn ‘Āṣim made a lot of mistakes, and when corrected, he would not retract. He was known for narrating ḥadīth and he narrated rejected aḥādīth.
- » Yaḥya ibn Ma‘īn said, “He is worthless.” And on one occasion he said, “He is a liar and worthless.”
- » Al-Nasā‘ī said, “His ḥadīth is to be ignored.”
- » Al-Bukhārī said, “He is not sound according to them, and they criticised him.”
- » Ibn Ḥajar said concerning him, “He is Ṣadūq but he makes mistakes and insists on them, and he was accused of being a Shī‘ah.” [*Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’*, 9/253-255; *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb*, p. 403]

A report with an isnād like this cannot be easily accepted, especially when it is known that ‘Ammār I was a pious man whose piety would prevent him from indulging in such things. Khālīd al-Ghayth says:

This report contradicts what has been proven of the dignity of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, in addition to the fact that it was not narrated via any sound isnād.” [*Istishhād ‘Uthmān wa Waq’ah al-Jamal*, p. 30]

Sālim ibn ‘Abd Allāh’s statement with regards the Procedure of the ‘Uthmānī Era

Sālim, the son of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, speaks about the procedure of the ‘Uthmānī era in the following snippet:

عن سالم بن عبد الله قال لما ولي عثمان حج سنوانه كلها إلا آخر حجة ... و أمن الناس و كتب في الأمصار أن يوافيه العمال في كل موسم و من يشكوهم و كتب إلى الناس إلى الأمصار أن اتمروا بالمعروف و تناهوا عن المنكر و لا يذل المؤمن نفسه فإني مع الضعيف على القوي ما دام مظلوما إن شاء الله فكان الناس بذلك فجرى ذلك إلى ان اتخذه أقوام و وسيلة إلى تفريق الأمة

Sālim ibn ‘Abd Allāh reports:

When ‘Uthmān assumed leadership, he performed Ḥajj all the years except the final year. People were at peace. He wrote to the cities that all governors should come to him in every Ḥajj season together with those who have any complaints against them. He wrote to the people of the cities to enjoy what is good, forbid what is evil, and that no believer should think himself as insignificant for, “Verily, I am with the weak against the strong, as long as the former is oppressed, by the will of Allah.” People lived like this and this practice continued until some groups used it as a means to divide and disunite the ummah.¹ [They levelled unfounded accusations and created the scope for division.]

The condensed version appears in *al-Bidāyah* as:

يلزم عماله بحضور الموسم كل عام و يكتب إلى الرعايا من كانت له عند أحد منهم مظلمة فليواف إلى الموسم فإني آخذ له حقه من عامله الخ

He would make it incumbent upon his governors and officers to attend the Ḥajj every year. He would write to the populace, “Whoever has any grievance with his governor should come to the Ḥajj for I will get his right from his governor.”²

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 134, the year 35 A.H., mention of some of the events of the life of ‘Uthmān

رضي الله عنه.

2 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 218, section on some of his great merits and major good deeds.

Statement of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr

Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr رضي الله عنه is one of the reliable and trusted men of that era. His glowing image of the ‘Uthmānī era has been transmitted by the authors. Have a look:

فسألوه عن عثمان فأجابهم فيه بما يسوؤهم و ذكر لهم ما كان متصفا به من الإيمان و التصديق و العدل و الإحسان و السيرة الحسنة و الرجوع إلى الحق إذا تبين له فعند ذلك نفروا عنه و فارقوه

The Khārijites questioned him about ‘Uthmān. He answered them with something they did not like and listed his salient qualities such as īmān, belief, justice, iḥsān, an excellent biography, and accepting the truth when it became apparent to him. At this, they despised him and dissociated themselves from him.¹

This happened during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr رضي الله عنه. The Khārijites had the same ideologies and allegations against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه which those with Saba’ī influences cooked up. Just like the Saba’īs, the Khārijites were opposed to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. Their aim was that if Sayyidunā Ibn Zubayr رضي الله عنه sided with them, they would side with him, otherwise they would abandon him.

The historian Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī has written a detailed account of this incident in volume 7 under the events of 64 A.H. We have sufficed on *al-Bidāyah*’s report to keep things brief.

In short, the statements of both Sālim ibn ‘Abd Allāh and Ibn al-Zubayr رضي الله عنه testify to the accuracy of the reports brought back by the delegations of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم during the ‘Uthmānī era, attesting to the correctness of the religious and political affairs of that era. Justice prevailed and no ill feelings existed due to tribalism.

1 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 239, the leadership of ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Zubayr رضي الله عنه.

3. The above has affirmed that the religious and political affairs during the ‘Uthmānī era were correct and majority of the time, no discrepancies were found. The changes during the final days of this era were of a particular type and their causes were peculiar.

The beginning of Change

From the era of Nubuwwah up to this stage, numerous tribes had entered the fold of Islam and Islam reigned supreme in every era. Allah’s word was dominant over all countries and cities. All nations had accepted Islam. There remained no courage to stop the advance of Islam. All religions were forced to accept the decree of the Islamic Sharīah.

At this stage, those nations which had a distinctive hatred and enmity for Islam, had no power to stop the advancement of Islam openly. Therefore, they opted for another route to cause harm to the Muslims. Their plan was to infiltrate the ranks of the Muslims and sow the seeds of discord among them. Openly, they would claim to be well-wishers and adherents of Islam. They voiced their love and obedience to the religion of Islam but harboured enmity for the Muslims and Islam and hypocrisy in their hearts. This was a surreptitious scheme to create disunity in Islam which started undercover.

Jealousy and Enmity was the Root

The people opposed Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه during the final days of his khilāfah on the basis of jealousy and enmity. We will firstly present the statements of Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه and other scholars exposing this jealousy after which we will expose those who harboured enmity and began the chaos, which led to the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.

The Statement of ‘Alī

Imām Aḥmad reports in *Kitāb al-Sunnah*:

عن مضارب بن حزن قال قيل لعلي بن أبي طالب ما حملهم على قتل عثمان قال الحسد

Muḍārib ibn Ḥuzn reports:

‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib was asked, “What led them to kill ‘Uthmān.”

“Jealousy,” he replied.¹

Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī quotes an address of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ under the events of the 36 A.H. in which he sheds some light on the jealousy and enmity of some people. It appears therein:

فحمد الله عز وجل وأثنى عليه وصلى على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وذكر الجاهلية وشقاها والإسلام والسعادة وإنعام الله على الأمة بالجماعة بالخليفة بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم الذي يليه ثم الذي يليه ثم حدث هذا الحدث الذي جره على هذه الأمة أقوام طلبوا هذه الدنيا حسدوا من أفاء الله عليه على الفضيلة وأرادوا رد الأشياء على أدبارها والله بالغ أمره ومصيب ما أراد إلخ

He praised Allah—the Mighty and Majestic—and glorified Him and sent salutations upon the Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. He spoke about the period of ignorance and its wretchedness and then about Islam and the fortune and favour of Allah upon the ummah by uniting them under a khalīfah after Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and then the era after him as well as the subsequent era (the ‘Uthmānī era). Thereafter, this new happening took place which was brought upon this ummah by nations who sought this worldly life and harboured jealousy for those whom Allah conferred virtue upon. They intended to capsize things. And Allah will manifest His plan and fulfil what He desires.²

1 *Kitāb al-Sunnah*, pg. 197, Makkah Mukarramah print, 1349 A.H. edition.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 194, the year 36 A.H., Amīr al-Mu‘minīn’s stop at Dhā Qār.

The Statement of Qāḍī Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī

Ibn al-‘Arabī explains the position of the conspirators against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه in his famous book *al-‘Awāṣim*:

و تألب عليه قوم الأحقاد اعتقدوها ممن طلب أمرا فلم يصل إليه و حسد حسادة أظهر دأها و حمله على ذلك قلة دين و ضعف يقين و إيثار العاجلة على الآجلة

A nation of jealous men plotted against him making this their philosophy. They desired something but could not obtain it. Hence, they harboured jealousy and expressed their envy. Their irreligiousness, weak conviction, and preference of the worldly life over the everlasting incited them.¹

Who were the Conspirators?

The above has clarified that there existed a handful of nations who harboured enmity and jealousy for Islam and the Muslims, and who devised the whole plan and schemed to attack the central point of Islam, i.e. the khalīfah of the Muslims Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. The readers will now be made aware of who the conspirators were, who devised the scheme and set it in motion.

Does history indicate to them or are any clues found in the books of history towards them? Sunnī and Shīī historians have clarified this issue extensively in their books. With a little effort, such material will be obtained.

We will present few quotations for the ease of the readers which will make the issue evident after a little contemplation.

Just to give you a brief image, dissension in Islam was started by ‘Abd Allāh bin Saba’, the hypocrite. He wore the garb of Islam and propagated his

1 *Al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim*, pg. 111, Lahore print, answers to allegations against ‘Uthmān.

warped ideologies at various places to various nations. He made people his supporters. Those who were influenced by his hypocritical schemes and warped ideologies were incited to attack the khalīfah of the Muslims and invade Madīnah al-Munawwarah. They attacked the central point of Islam and carried out their evil plots. This opened the door to dissension and disunity among Muslims forever.

The Beginning of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ and His Methodology

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar presents this in the following manner:

و ذكر سيف بن عمر أن سبب تألب الأحزاب على عثمان أن رجلا يقال له عبد الله بن سبأ كان يهوديا فأظهر الإسلام و صار إلى مصر فأوحى علي طائفة من الناس كلاما اخترعه من عند نفسه مضمونه أنه يقول للرجل أليس قد ثبت أن عيسى بن مريم سيعود إلى هذه الدنيا فيقول الرجل نعم فيقول له فرسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم أفضل منه فما تنكر أن يعود إلى هذه الدنيا و هو أشرف من عيسى بن مريم عليه السلام ثم يقول و قد كان أوصى إلى علي بن أبي طالب فمحمد خاتم الأنبياء و علي خاتم الأوصياء ثم يقول فهو أحق بالإمرة من عثمان و عثمان معتد في ولايته ما ليس له فأنكروا عليه و أظهروا الأمر بالمعروف و النهي عن المنكر فافتتن به بشر كثير من أهل مصر و كتبوا إلى جماعات من عوام أهل الكوفة و البصرة فتمالوا على ذلك و تكاتبوا فيه و تواعدوا أن يجتمعوا في الإنكار على عثمان و أرسلوا إليه من يناظره و يذكر له ما ينقمون عليه من توليته أقباءه و ذوي رحمه و عزله كبار الصحابة فدخل هذا في قلوب كثير من الناس فجمع عثمان بن عفان نوابه من الأمصار فاستشارهم فأشاروا عليه بما تقدم ذكرنا له فإله أعلم

Sayf ibn ‘Umar mentions:

The reason for the factions ganging up against ‘Uthmān was that a man by the name ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’, who was formerly a Jew, outwardly announced his Islam. He travelled to Egypt and mentioned to a group of people a proposition which he fabricated. The gist of it was that he would ask a person, “Is it not confirmed that ‘Īsā ibn Maryam will soon return to the world.” The man would reply in the affirmative. Upon this he would say, “Then Rasūlullāh ﷺ is superior to him. So why do you reject him returning to this world whereas he is more noble than ‘Īsā ibn Maryam

عليه السلام.

He would then say, “Rasūlullāh ﷺ had made a bequest to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, i.e. he appointed him his successor. Thus Muḥammad is the seal of the Prophets and ‘Alī is the seal of the Awṣiyā’.” He would then say, “‘Alī is thus more deserving of leadership than ‘Uthmān. Moreover, ‘Uthmān has committed many transgressions during his khilāfah which he was not entitled to.”

His group raised objections against ‘Uthmān on many issues and displayed it as enjoining good and forbidding evil. Thus, many residents of Egypt were affected by this false propaganda. They wrote to groups from the laymen of Kūfah and Baṣrah and leaned them in this direction. They wrote many letters and made promises that they will unite to object to ‘Uthmān. They also sent men who would debate him and list all the objections that have against him, of nepotism and dismissing senior Ṣaḥābah. This entered the hearts of many people. ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān gathered his governors of the cities and consulted them. They gave him the advice which appeared previously. And Allah knows best.¹

Ibn Khaldūn’s Explanation

‘Allāmah Ibn Khaldūn introduces ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ and speaks about his shenanigans:

منهم عبد الله بن سبأ و يعرف بابن السوداء كان يهوديا و هاجر أيام عثمان فلم يحسن إسلامه و أخرج من البصرة فلحق بالكوفة ثم الشام و أخرجه فلحق بمصر و كان يكثر الطعن على عثمان و يدعو في السر لأهل البيت و يقول إن محمدا يرجع كما يرجع عيسى و عنه أخذ ذلك أهل الرجعة و إن عليا وصي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم حيث لم يجز و صيته و إن عثمان أخذ الأمر بغير حق و يحرض الناس على القيام في ذلك و الطعن على الأمراء فاستمال الناس بذلك في الأمصار و كتب به بعضهم بعضا و كان معه خالد بن ملجم و سودان بن حمران و كنانة بن بشر فثبطوا عمارا عن المسير إلى المدينة

Among them (the evil elements) was ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’, commonly known as Ibn al-Sawdā’. He was a Jew who emigrated during the days of

¹ *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 167 – 168, the year 34 A.H.

‘Uthmān. He never entered the fold of Islam properly. (He was a hypocrite.) He was banished from Baṣrah so he went to Kūfah and then to Shām. They banished him until finally he landed in Egypt. He would continuously level accusations again ‘Uthmān and campaign secretly for the Ahl al-Bayt. He would claim that Muḥammad will return just as ‘Īsā will. The people of raǧ’ah took this ideology from him. He claimed that ‘Alī is the waṣī of Rasūlullāh ﷺ whereas this bequest was not fulfilled and that ‘Uthmān assumed leadership unjustly. He would incite the people to stand up and criticise the leaders. He attracted the people with this in the cities and some of them wrote to others. Khālīd ibn Muljīm, Sūdān ibn Ḥumrān, and Kinānah ibn Bishr were in cahoots with him. They prevented ‘Ammār from returning to Madīnah.¹

Note: We have briefly mentioned ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’s enmity for Islam and his desire to create disunity among the Muslims. Those who wish to read up more on him should study the following books:

- *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 90, the year 33 A.H.
- *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5 pg. 98 – 99, the year 35 A.H.
- *Mīzān al-‘itidāl*, vol. 2 pg. 40, the letter ‘ayn, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’
- *Lisān al-Mīzān*, vol. 3 pg. 289, the letter ‘ayn, biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’
- *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa al-Bayān fī Maqṭal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān*, pg. 88, mention of Ibn al-Sawdā’s sending his callers to the cities.

Ibn Saba’s position among the Shī’ah

Senior Shī’ī historians and geologists have clearly mentioned that ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ came from a Jewish ancestry.

¹ *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn*, vol. 2 pg. 1027, the beginning of revolt against ‘Uthmān.

‘Allāmah al-Nawbaktī of the third century writes:

و حكى جماعة من أهل العلم من أصحاب علي عليه السلام أن عبد الله بن سبأ كان يهودياً فأسلم و والى علياً عليه السلام و كان يقول و هو على يهوديته في يوشع بن نون بعد موسى عليه السلام بهذه المقالة فقال في إسلامه بعد وفاة النبي صلى الله عليه و آله في علي عليه السلام بمثل ذلك و هو أول من أشهر القول بفرض إمامة علي عليه السلام و أظهر البراءة من أعدائه و كاشف مخالفيه فمن هناك قال من خالف الشيعة إن أصل الرفض مأخوذ من اليهودية إلخ

A group of scholars of the disciples of ‘Alī عليه السلام narrate that ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ was a Jew who embraced Islam and befriended ‘Alī عليه السلام. He would claim, while upon Judaism, regarding Yūsha’ ibn Nūn being the waṣī of Mūsā عليه السلام. He made the same claim while in Islam after the demise of the Nabī صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم regarding ‘Alī عليه السلام. He is the first to openly claim the necessity of ‘Alī’s عليه السلام Imāmah. He voiced his dissociation from his enemies and unveiled his opponents. From this, those who oppose the Shī’ah say that the basis of rafḍ is taken from Judaism.¹

‘Allāmah Abū ‘Amr al-Kashshī of the fourth century writes:

ذكر بعض اهل العلم أن عبد الله بن سبأ كان يهودياً فأسلم و والى علياً عليه السلام و كان يقول و هو على يهوديته في يوشع بن نون و صي موسى بالغللو فقال في إسلامه بعد وفاة رسول الله صلى الله عليه و آله في علي عليه السلام مثل ذلك و كان أول من أشهر بالقول بفرض إمامة علي و أظهر البراءة من أعدائه و كاشف مخالفيه و أكثرهم فمن ههنا قال من خالف الشيعة أصل التشيع و الرفض مأخوذ من اليهودية

A group of scholars say that ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ was a Jew who embraced Islam and befriended ‘Alī عليه السلام. He would claim, while upon Judaism, regarding Yūsha’ ibn Nūn of him being the waṣī of Mūsā عليه السلام, observing extremeness in this regard. He made the same claim while in Islam after the demise of the Nabī صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم regarding ‘Alī عليه السلام. He is the first to openly claim the necessity of ‘Alī’s عليه السلام Imāmah. He voiced his dissociation from his enemies and unveiled his opponents and excommunicated them. From this, those who oppose the Shī’ah say that the basis of rafḍ and Shī’ism is taken from Judaism.²

1 *Firaq al-Shī’ah*, pg. 44, the Saba’iyyah sect, Najaf Ashraf print.

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, pg. 71, biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’, Mumbai print; *Tanqīh al-Maqāl*, vol. 2 pg. 184, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’, Najaf Ashraf print; *Tuhfat al-Aḥbāb*, pg. 184, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’, Tehran print.

Summary

During the final days of the ‘Uthmānī khilāfah, this deceitful movement of Ibn Saba’ was set in motion to create dissension among Muslims. Ibn Saba’ had set up mischievous people of his ilk in different areas who objected to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and listed the aggressions of his governors. These roguish people, after thorough planning, came from Kūfah, Baṣrah and Egypt to attack Madīnah and laid siege to the house of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ writes:

قال أبو الحسن قدم أهل مصر عليهم عبد الرحمن بن عديس البلوي و أهل البصرة عليهم حكيم بن جبلة العبدي و أهل الكوفة فيهم الأشتر مالك بن الحارث النخعي و المدينة في أمر عثمان فكان مقدم المصريين ليلة الأربعاء هلال ذي قعدة إلخ

Abū al-Ḥasan says:

Came the people of Egypt led by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Adīs al-Balawī, the people of Baṣrah led by Ḥakīm ibn Jabalah al-‘Abdī, and the people of Kūfah with al-Ashtar Mālik ibn al-Ḥārith al-Nakhaī in their midst to Madīnah with regards to ‘Uthmān’s issue. The Egyptians arrived on Tuesday night, the first of Dhū al-Qa’dah.¹

For a few days, they besieged the house of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. During this time, they made various demands and put pressure on him to accept them. But since their plan was something else, i.e. to destroy the centre of Islam, they were not pleased even though their demands were met. At the end, they advanced to fulfil their sinister plan and martyred the centre of Islam, the khalīfah of the Muslims. Those protecting Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ only came to find out after they had completed their evil intention.

4. The Actions of the People of Madīnah and the Ṣaḥābah to protect ‘Uthmān

1 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ*, vol. 1 pg. 145, the year 35 A.H., the fitnah during the time of ‘Uthmān.

When these evil elements proceeded from their headquarters and converged upon Madīnah to set in motion their evil plan, they made it appear that they were simply passing through Madīnah on their way for Ḥajj. They converged upon Madīnah from Kūfah, Baṣrah and Egypt in large numbers. As they reached the outskirts of Madīnah, they claimed that they wish to address few complaints against the khalīfah of the Muslims and his governors. The readers should keep in mind that many Muslims from Madīnah and out of Madīnah had travelled to various cities and were involved in important tasks while some of the residents of Madīnah had set out for Ḥajj. The remaining Ṣaḥābah and residents of Madīnah, in the beginning stages, were involved in addressing the complaints between Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and the rebels. According to the historians, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه accepted their permissible terms, and removed their objections. Nonetheless, they did not stop in their evil endeavours. Their grip tightened by the day and the siege of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه intensified.

When these disturbing conditions became apparent to the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, they presented themselves to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه on multiple occasions seeking permission to raise their hands and unsheathe their weapons to address the evil of the conspirators. Briefly, few snippets will be reproduced below.

Muṣ‘ab al-Zubayrī writes in *Nasab Quraysh*:

فقام الناس إلى عثمان فقالوا قد أمكنتنا البصائر فإذن لنا في الجهاد قال أبو حبيبة قال عثمان عزمت على من كانت لي عليه طاعة أن لا يقاتل

The people came to ‘Uthmān and said, “We have observed the issue (of the difference between the groups). Now allow us to wage war (against the rebels).”

Abū Ḥabībah relates that ‘Uthmān answered, “I take a determination upon those upon whom my obedience is binding that they should not fight.”¹

1 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 103, the children of Abū al-‘Āṣ; *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 2 pg. 133, the year 35 A.H.

Hāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr says that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ prevented the rebels forcefully, which created bitterness and harshness in the matter.

و عزم عثمان على الناس أن يكفوا أيديهم و يغمدوا أسلحتهم ففعلوا فتمكن أولئك مما أرادوا و مع هذا ما ظن أحد من الناس أنه يقتل بالكلية

‘Uthmān swore on oath for the people to withhold their hands and sheathe their weapons and they complied. Thus, the rebels had power to carry out what they planned. At the same time, none of the people thought that he will be killed outright.¹

The law of Islam is that obedience to the khilāfah of the Muslims is mandatory. Owing to this principle, the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ did not take any steps to drive out the rebels, without the khalīfah’s permission. A few incidents where permission was sought from the khalīfah will be quoted now.

Individuals who sought permission to defend

- a. إن زيد بن ثابت قال لعثمان هؤلاء الأنصار بالباب يقولون إن شئت كنا أنصار الله مرتين فقال لا حاجة لي في ذلك كفوا

Zayd ibn Thābit said to ‘Uthmān, “Here are the Anṣār at the door saying, ‘If you wish, we will be the helpers of Allah twice.’”

‘Uthmān replied, “I do not have any need for this. Withhold!”²

- b. إن ابن عمر كان يومئذ متقلدا سيفه حتى عزم عليه عثمان أن يخرج مخافة أن يقتل

On that day, Ibn ‘Umar was carrying his sword until ‘Uthmān had to swear upon oath for him to leave, lest he be killed.³

1 *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 197, section if anyone asks how could ‘Uthmān be killed.

2 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 151, the year 35 A.H., the fitnah in the time of ‘Uthmān; *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 3 pg. 48, mention of what was said to ‘Uthmān about removing the garment.

3 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 151, the year 35 A.H., the fitnah at the time of ‘Uthmān.

c. عن قتادة أن ابا هريرة كان متقلدا سيفه حتى نهاه عثمان

Qatādah relates that Abū Hurayrah had his sword ready, until ‘Uthmān prevented him.¹

d. عن محمد بن سيرين قال قال سليط بن سليط نهانا عثمان عن قتالهم ولو أذن لنا لضربناهم حتى نخرجهم من أقطارها

Muḥammad bin Sīrīn says: Sulayṭ ibn Sulayṭ stated, “‘Uthmān prevented us from fighting them. Had he permitted us, we would have fought them and driven them away from the outskirts (of Madīnah).”²

The Day of ‘Uthmān’s Martyrdom and the Names of the killers

Historians write that the conspirators and oppressors martyred Amīr al-Mu’minīn Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in his home after ‘Aṣr on Friday, the 18th of Dhū al-Ḥijjah 35 A.H. This house of his was situated in Madīnah Munawwarah, in close proximity of Masjid al-Nabawī.

Among the killers were Sūdān ibn Ḥumrān who is also known as Aswad ibn Ḥumrān. Rūmān al-Yamānī is another culprit from the tribe of Banū Asad ibn Khuzaymah. Other persons like Kinānah ibn Bishr are reckoned among the murderers of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Study the following books for further details.

- *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 153, the year 35 A.H.
- *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 185, the manner he was martyred.
- *Al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 190, section the length of the siege of ‘Uthmān in his house.

1 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 151, the year 35 A.H., the fitnah at the time of ‘Uthmān; *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 3 pg. 48 – 49, mention of what was said to ‘Uthmān about removing the garment; *Kitāb al-Sunan* of Sa’īd ibn Manṣūr, vol. 3 pg. 362, section 2, Majlis ‘Ilmī print, Karachi, Dabhel.

2 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt*, vol. 1 pg. 150, the year 35 A.H., the fitnah at the time of ‘Uthmān.

‘Uthmān’s Janāzah and hasty washing, shrouding and burial

Details on the janāzah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه were written in *Ruḥamā Baynahum*, section 3 ‘Uthmānī, chapter 5, under the heading of the janāzah and burial of ‘Uthmān. Nonetheless, it is repeated here, together with mention of his quick burial. This will remove the misinformation that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه was left unattended for 3 days, without a wash or shroud.

- a. Imām Aḥmad reports in *Musnad Aḥmad* through a reliable chain:

عن قتادة قال صلى الزبير على عثمان رضي الله عنه ودفنه الخ

Qatādah says: Zubayr performed the Ṣalāt al-Janāzah over ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and buried him.¹

- b. Old historians like Muṣ‘ab al-Zubayrī and others write:

و كان يومئذ صائما و دفن ليلة السبت بين المغرب و العشاء

He was fasting on that day and was buried on Friday night, between Maghrib and ‘Ishā’.²

- c. Niyāz ibn Mukarram al-Aslamī who was present at the martyrdom relates the details of the incident to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. He says:

حملناه رحمه الله ليلة السبت بين المغرب و العشاء الخ

We carried him (for burial), may Allah’s mercy be upon him, on Friday night, between Maghrib and ‘Ishā’.³

1 *Musnad Aḥmad*, vol. 1 pg. 74, the musnadāt and akhbār of ‘Uthmān, first edition, Egypt.

2 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 101, the offspring of Abū al-‘Āṣ ibn Umayyah.

3 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 3 pg. 54, section 1, mention of who buried ‘Uthmān, when he was buried and who carried him, first print, Leiden.

Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Muḥaddith al-Dahlawī says:

نیز از روایات مشهوره متعدده ثابت شد که تاسه روز افتاده ماندن لاش عثمان محض افترا و دروغ ست و در جمیع تواریخ تکذیب این موجود است زیرا که باجماع مؤرخین شهادة عثمان بعد از جمعه بیشتردلیهم ذی الحجة واقع شده است و دفن او در بقیع شب شبیه وقوع یافت بلا شبه

It is established through many well-known narrations that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān’s body remaining unattended for 3 days is a fabrication and lie. It is belied by all history books. The historians are unanimous that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān was martyred on Friday, the 18th of Dhū al-Ḥijjah 35 A.H. after Jumu‘ah, and was buried that very night near Jannat al-Baqī. There is not the slightest of doubt in this matter.¹

5. What type of Group were the Murderers of ‘Uthmān

Senior scholars of the ummah have clarified:

إن اختيار المسلمين لم يدخل واحد منهم في دم عثمان لا قتل ولا أمر بقتله وإنما قتله طائفة من المفسدين في الأرض من أوباش القبائل وأهل الفتن

Not a single person from the cream of the Muslims were involved in the murder of ‘Uthmān. They neither murdered him nor ordered his killing. A group of those who spread anarchy on earth killed him, who were from the scum of the earth and the people of fitnah.²

و لم يدخل خيار المسلمين في ذلك إنما قتله طائفة من المفسدين في الأرض من أوباش القبائل ورؤء الشر

The best of Muslims were not involved in this. A group of radicals killed him, from the dregs of the tribes and heads of evil.³

1 *Tuḥfat Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*, pg. 329, new print Lahore, at the end of criticism 10, allegations against ‘Uthmān.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 2 pg. 186.

3 *Al-Muntaqā*, pg. 225.

فمن الذي اجتمع على قتل عثمان؟ هل هم إلا طائفة من أولي الشر و الظلم و لا دخل في قتله أحد من السابقين

Who gathered to kill ‘Uthmān? Were they not except a group of evil oppressors? None of the early adherents of the faith participated in his killing.¹

هاجت رؤس الفتنة و الشر و أحاطوا به و حاصروه ليخلع نفسه من الخلافة و قاتلوه قاتلهم الله

The leaders of fitnah and evil sprung up and encircled him and besieged him, so that he may surrender the khilāfah, and then they killed him, may Allah destroy them all.²

The scholars of ‘aqīdah have stated:

إن قتلة عثمان لم يكونوا بغاة بل هم ظلمة و عتاة لعدم الاعتداد بشبهتهم و لأنهم أصروا على الباطل بعد كشف الشبهة و إيضاح الحق لهم

The murderers of ‘Uthmān were not just rebels. Rather they were tyrants and violent impudents, since their doubts held no steam and they were hell-bent on falsehood even after their misconceptions were removed and the truth became manifest to them.³

Ṣaḥābah’s Remorse over ‘Uthmān’s Martyrdom

The conspirators and rebels were successful in their mischievous mission (i.e. ‘Uthmān’s murder). This was no ordinary event. They attacked the centre of Islam and destroyed the central power. Seeing this upsetting event, the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ were distraught. The decree of Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِعَاثِكَ came to pass, which no man holds the power to thwart.

1 *Al-Muntaqā*, pg. 543.

2 *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāz*, pg. 8 – 9, Hyderabad Dakkan print, first edition, Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān.

3 *Al-Musāmrah fī Sharḥ al-Musā‘arah*, vol. 2 pg. 159 – 160, 8th principle, Egypt print.

و قال عبد الله بن سلام لقد فتح الناس على أنفسهم بقتل عثمان باب فتنة لا ينغلق عنهم إلى قيام الساعة

‘Abd Allāh ibn Salām said, “People have opened a door of fitnah upon themselves with the killing of ‘Uthmān which will never be closed until the Day of Qiyāmah.”¹

قال أبو حميد الساعدي لما قتل عثمان و كان ممن شهد بدرا اللهم إن لك علي ألا أفعل كذا و لا أفعل كذا
و لا أضحك حتى ألقاك

Sayyidunā Abū Ḥumayd al-Sā‘idī رضي الله عنه—who attended Badr—vowed, after ‘Uthmān was killed, “O Allah, I make mandatory upon myself for Your pleasure that I will not do this and that, and I will not laugh until I meet you.”²

و ذكر عن أنس بن مالك قال قال عبد الله بن عمر ما شبعنا من طعام منذ قتل عثمان

It is reported from Anas ibn Mālik who relates that ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar stated, “I have not eaten to my fill since ‘Uthmān was killed.”³

The pain of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān’s رضي الله عنه martyrdom was very hard upon the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, and cannot be explained in words. We have quoted a few words of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم as samples. Otherwise, there is a lengthy story of grief of this unjust murder, related from many Ṣaḥābah. The sorrow displayed by the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم upon it is still little. It cannot be healed in any way.

In all these trials and afflictions, ‘Uthmān was on the truth and he passed away on the same

What has been mentioned above makes it clear that the objections levelled by the rebels against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه during his last days were all based

1 *Al-Istī‘āb* with *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3 pg. 84, biography of ‘Uthmān.

2 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, pg. 56, mention of what the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم said.

3 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 102, the offspring of Abū al-‘Āṣ ibn Umayyah.

on deceptive motives. No new practice against the Sharī'ah was invented during the 'Uthmānī era, nor were the limits set by Allah violated. No ideologies of nationalism were raised among the tribes which could be the cause for him giving relatives posts and abundance of wealth.

If some people levelled these accusations, were they better well-wishers of Islam than the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ? Were they better at establishing the dīnī system? It is apparent that majority of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ were opposed to these anarchists and did not rub shoulders with them. This is sufficient proof for the falsehood of the anarchists.

The people who raised objections against Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ were men who did not desire the Islamic system from their hearts and harboured enmity for Islam. They were jealous and had enmity for the progress and advancement of Islam. But they could not express their emotions in another way. They, thus, chose this path, in the guise of well-wishing for Islam and set their sinister plan into motion. In this way, they managed to create the fitnah of dissension and disunity among the Muslims.

All what was mentioned is fully supported by the sayings and actions of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. Some of their words and actions have been quoted in the above pages. Now, corroboration from the blessed tongue of the leader of the worlds Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ will be presented. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ sounded many glad tidings in favour of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ which apply aptly to those final days and indicate to the truthfulness and sincerity of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Some of these will be quoted hereunder.

Glad Tidings

- a. و ذكر موسى بن عقبة عن أبي حبيبة قال أتيت عثمان برسالة الزبير و هو محصور فلما أديتها و عنده أبو هريرة قام أبو هريرة فقال أشهد لسمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يقول تكون بعدي فتن و أحداث قال قلنا فأين المنجا منها يا رسول الله قال إلى الأمين و حزبه و أشار إلى عثمان

Mūsā ibn ‘Uqbah reports from Abū Ḥabībah who says:

I came to ‘Uthmān with Zubayr’s letter while he was besieged. After reading out the contents, Abū Hurayrah (who was present) stood up and announced, “I testify that I had definitely heard Rasūlullāh ﷺ saying, ‘There will be fitnahs after me and new happenings.’ We asked, ‘What is the way to salvation, O Messenger of Allah?’ He said, ‘To the trustworthy and his group,’ and he pointed to ‘Uthmān.”¹

b. Once, Rasūlullāh ﷺ went out somewhere.

استفتح رجل فقال لي افتح له و بشره بالجنة على بلوى تصيبه فإذا عثمان فأخبرته بما قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فحمد الله ثم قال الله المستعان

A man sought permission to enter. Rasūlullāh ﷺ told me (Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī), “Open for him and give him glad tidings of Jannah after a calamity will befall him.”

It turned out to be ‘Uthmān. I informed him of what Rasūlullāh ﷺ had said. He simply praised Allah and then uttered, “Help is sought only from Allah.”²

3. عن عائشة أن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم قال يا عثمان إنه لعل الله يقمصك قميصا فإن أرادوك على خلعه فلا تخلعه لهم رواه الترمذي و ابن ماجه

‘Ā’ishah reports that the Nabī ﷺ said, “O ‘Uthmān, certainly Allah will give you a garment. If they want you to take it off, do not take it off for them.” Al-Tirmidhī and Ibn Mājah narrated it.³

1 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 103, the offspring of Abū al-‘Āṣ ibn Umayyah; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 209, with reference to Musnad Aḥmad, narrations on the virtues of ‘Uthmān.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 522, the virtues of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb; *Mishkāṭ*, pg. 563, chapter on the virtues of these three, section one with reference to al-Bukhārī and Muslim; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, vol. 2 pg. 277 – 278, chapter of the virtues of ‘Uthmān, Nūr Muḥammadī print, Delhi; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 201, aḥādīth on the virtues of ‘Uthmān, with reference to al-Bukhārī and Aḥmad.

3 *Mishkāṭ*, pg. 562, chapter on the virtues of ‘Uthmān, section 2; *al-Bidāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 205, aḥādīth on the virtues of ‘Uthmān, with reference to Aḥmad.

It is evident from the above aḥādīth:

- Trials and fitnahs will occur in the time of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. He will have to face trials, and there is no escape from them.
- Truth will be on whose side? Which group will be correct? According to the words of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was determined as the barometer for truth and his supporters were endorsed.
- Those who opposed and criticised Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ were upon falsehood and their stance was incorrect. The tales they fabricated out of hatred were false and based upon jealousy and enmity.
- Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ passed the trying times and is from the inhabitants of Jannah. He was gifted Jannah for persevering in the face of hardships. He will remain forever and ever in this favour of Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى.
- Those who criticised a trustworthy and honest individual like Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and attributed dishonesty and breach of trust to him and created a thousand hurdles for him will definitely face the evil consequences of their actions and the outcome of their sinister plans.

Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى favoured Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ with the robe of khilāfah. He sacrificed his life, but did not take off the robe of khilāfah as per the instruction of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Together with this, he did not allow for a single drop of blood of a Muslim to be spilled. Had he ordered the Muslims to sacrifice themselves in order to save his life, millions of Muslims would have done so willingly. But rather than giving the order for them to sacrifice their lives, he presented his own life and spared the blood of the nation. This level of passion of preference does not cross the mind of anyone.

May Allah have mercy upon him and be pleased with him and all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ.

Closing with correctness

After having a brief look at the contents of the book, it becomes apparent that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not veer away from the truth in favouring his relatives, nor did he transgress the limits. His actions during his khilāfah did not move away from the needle of justice. The religious services of his family for Islam were fruitful and beneficial (as proven from the pages of history).

In the face of all these realities and truths, there is no worth to the propaganda against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that due to his false policy towards his relatives, tribalism was created which led to all the chaos and fitnah. We have presented historical evidence to prove the fallacy of this belief. People with sound temperament and searchers for the truth will find them satisfactory.

May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى guide all the Muslims and favour them with unity and harmony. May He grant us the ability to have sound beliefs about all the noble Ṣaḥābah and family of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and to emulate them. May He grant us death with īmān and bless us with their company in the Ākhirah.

و آخر دعوانا أن الحمد لله رب العالمين و الصلوة و السلام على سيدخ-لقه خاتم النبيين و على آله و أصحابه و صلحاء أمته و سائر أتباعه بإحسان إلى يوم الدين أجمعين برحمتك يا أرحم الراحمين

The humble, hopeful for prayer: Muḥammad Nāfi‘, may Allah forgive him
Jāmi‘ah Muḥammadī, Jhang (Pakistan)

Sha‘bān al-Mu‘azzam 1400 A.H./July 1980

Bibliography

#	Name of Book	Name of Author	Year of Demise (A.H.)
	<i>Qur'ān Majīd</i>		
1	<i>Muwatta'a'</i>	Imām Mālik	179
2	<i>Kitāb al-Kharāj</i>	Imām Abū Yūsuf	182
3	<i>Al-Muṣannaf</i> (11 volumes)	Ḥāfiẓ al-Kabīr Abū Bakr 'Abd al-Razzāq ibn Humām ibn Nāfi' al-Ḥumaydī al-Ṣan'ānī	211
4	<i>Sīrat Ibn Hishām</i>	Ibn Hishām	211
5	<i>Kitāb all-Sunan</i>	Sa'īd ibn Manṣūr	227
6	<i>Al-Ṭabaqāt</i> (8 volumes)	Muḥammad Ibn Sa'd	230/235
7	<i>Al-Muṣannaf</i>	Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn İbrāhīm ibn 'Uthmān ibn Abī Shaybah al-Kūfī	235
8	<i>Nasab Quraysh</i>	Muṣ'ab al-Zubayrī	236
9	<i>Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt</i>	Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt	240
10	<i>Al-Musnad with selections from Kanz al-'Ummāl</i>	Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal al-Shaybānī	241
11	<i>Kitāb al-Sunnah</i>	Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal al-Shaybānī	241
12	<i>Kitāb al-Muḥabbar</i>	Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb al-Baghdādī	245
13	<i>Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī</i> (2 volumes)	Imām Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī	256
14	<i>Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr</i> (8 volumes)	Imām Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī	256
15	<i>Al-Tārīkh al-Ṣaḡhīr</i>	Imām Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī	256
16	<i>Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim</i>	Imām Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī	260/261

17	<i>Sunan Ibn Mājah</i>	Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Yazīd Mājah	273/275
18	<i>Jāmi’ al-Tirmidhī</i>	Abū ‘Isā Muḥammad ibn ‘Isā al-Tirmidhī	275/279
19	<i>Sunan Abī Dāwūd</i>	Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān ibn Ash‘ath al-Sijistānī	275
20	<i>Ansāb al-Ashrāf</i>	Al-Balādhurī	277/279
21	<i>Futūḥ al-Buldān</i>	Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā al-Balādhurī	277/279
22	<i>Tafsīr</i>	İbn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī	310
23	<i>Kitāb al-Kunā wa al-Asmā’</i> (2 volumes)	Shaykh Abū Bishr Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥammād al-Dūlābī	310
24	<i>Tārīkh al-Umam wa l-Mulūk</i>	Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī	310
25	<i>Al-Muntakhab Dhayl al-Mudhīl</i>	Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī	310
26	<i>Kitāb al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl</i>	İbn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī	320
27	<i>Kitāb al-Mujtabā</i>	Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Durayd al-Azdī	321
28	<i>Kitāb al-Majrūḥīn</i>	İbn Ḥibbān Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad ibn Ḥibbān al-Bastī	354
29	<i>Al-Mustadrak</i>	Al-Ḥākim Nīshāpūrī	405
30	<i>Laṭā’if al-Ma’ārif</i>	Abū Manşūr al-Tha’ālabī	429
31	<i>Jamharat al-Ansāb</i>	İbn Ḥazam	456
32	<i>Kashf al-Maḥjūb</i>	Shaykh ‘Alī al-Ḥajwīrī Lahorī	456
33	<i>Jawāmi’ al-Sīrah</i>	İbn Ḥazam	456
34	<i>Al-Sunan al-Kubrā</i>	Al-Bayhaqī	458
35	<i>Al-Istī‘āb with al-Iṣābah</i> (4 volumes)	İbn ‘Abd al-Barr al-Undulusī	463
36	<i>Tārīkh Baghdād</i>	Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī	463
37	<i>Kitāb al-Tamhīd</i>	Abū Shakūr Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Sa‘īd ibn Shu‘ayb al-Kabshī al-Sālimī al-Ḥanafī	465

38	<i>Tafsīr al-Baghawī</i>	Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn ibn Mas‘ūd al-Farā’ al-Baghawī	516
39	<i>Al-‘Awāšim min al-Qawāšim</i>	Qāḍī Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī al-Undulusī	543
40	<i>Ghunyat al-Ṭālibīn</i>	Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī	560
41	<i>Talkhīṣ Ibn ‘Asākir</i>	Ibn ‘Asākir	571
42	<i>Tārīkh Ibn ‘Asākir</i>	Abū al-Qāsim ‘Alī ibn Ḥasan ibn Hibat Allah known as Ibn ‘Asākir	571
43	<i>Tafsīr Kabīr</i>	Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar Fakhr al-Dīn ibn Ḍiyā’ al-Dīn al-Rāzī	606
44	<i>Usd al-Ghābah</i>	Ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī	630
45	<i>Tajrīd Asmā’ al-Ṣaḥābah</i>	Al-Jazarī	630
46	<i>Tafsīr Qurṭubī</i>	Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Anṣārī al-Qurṭubī al-Mālikī	671
47	<i>Tahdhīb al-Asmā’ wa al-Lughāt</i>	Imām Abū Zakariyyā Muḥyī al-Dīn ibn Sharaf al-Nawawī	676
48	<i>Sharḥ al-Muhadhab</i>	Imām Abū Zakariyyā Muḥyī al-Dīn ibn Sharaf al-Nawawī	676
49	<i>Al-Shafā bi Ta’rīf Ḥuqūq al-Muṣṭafā</i>	Qāḍī Abū al-Faḍl ‘Iyāḍ ibn Mūsā al-Ḥuṣaybī al-Undulusī	6 century
50	<i>Tafsīr Khāzin</i>	‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Baghdādī known as Khāzin	725
51	<i>Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ</i>		Authored in 737
52	<i>Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa al-Bayān</i>	Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā ibn Abī Bakr al-Undulusī	741
53	<i>Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāz</i>	Al-Dhahabī	748
54	<i>Al-Mughnī</i>	Al-Dhahabī	748
55	<i>Al-Muntaqā</i>	Al-Dhahabī	748

56	<i>Kitāb Duwal al-Islām</i>	Al-Dhahabī	748
57	<i>Mīzān al-I'tidāl</i>	Al-Dhahabī	748
58	<i>Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'</i>	Al-Dhahabī	748
59	<i>Minhāj al-Sunnah</i>	Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥalīm al-Ḥarrānī al-Dimashqī al-Ḥambalī	748
60	<i>Madārij al-Sālikīn</i>	İbn Qayyim Shams al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr al-Ḥambalī al-Dimashqī al-Jawziyyah	751/756
61	<i>A'lām al-Mūqī'in</i>	İbn Qayyim	756
62	<i>Zād al-Ma'ād</i>	İbn Qayyim	756
63	<i>Naşb al-Rāyah</i>	Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh ibn Yūsuf al-Ḥanafī al-Zayla'ī	762
64	<i>Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr</i>	'Imād al-Dīn al-Dimashqī	774/775
65	<i>Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah</i>	İbn Kathīr 'Imād al-Dīn Abū al-Fidā' al-Dimashqī	774/775
66	<i>Al-Sīrah al-Nabawīyyah</i>	İbn Kathīr	774/775
67	<i>Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn</i>	İbn Khaldūn	779
68	<i>Sharḥ Maqāşid</i>	Sa'd al-Dīn Mas'ūd ibn 'Umar ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Taftāzānī	791
69	<i>Majma' al-Zawā'id (10 volumes)</i>	Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī	807
70	<i>Mawārid al-Ẓam'ān</i>	Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī	807
71	<i>Sharḥ Mawāqif</i>	Sayyid Sharīf 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Jurjānī	816
72	<i>Al-Işābah fī Tamyīz al-Şaḥābah (4 volumes) with al-Istī'āb</i>	Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar	852

73	<i>Kitāb al-Mudallisīn</i>	Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar	852
74	<i>Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb (12 volumes)</i>	Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar	852
75	<i>Lisān al-Mīzān (6 volumes)</i>	Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar	852
76	<i>‘Umdat al-Qārī Sharḥ al-Bukhārī</i>	Al-‘Aynī	855
77	<i>Fath al-Qadīr Sharḥ al-Hidāyah</i>	Shaykh Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wāḥid known as Ibn Humām	861
78	<i>Insān al-‘Uyūn fī Sīrat al-Amīn al-Ma’mūn commonly known as al-Sīrah al-Ḥalabiyyah</i>	‘Alī ibn Burhān al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī al-Shāfi‘ī	900
79	<i>Fath al-Mughīth</i>	Al-Sakhāwī	902
80	<i>Al-Musāmarah fī Sharḥ al-Musā’arah</i>	Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad knows as Ibn Sharīf al-Maqdisī	905
81	<i>Wafā’ al-Wafā’</i>	Al-Samhūdī	911
82	<i>Dhayl al-La’ālī al-Maṣnū‘ah</i>	Al-Suyūṭī	911
83	<i>Taṭhīr al-Jinān wa al-Lisān</i>	Ibn Ḥajar al-Makkī	973/975
84	<i>Kanz al-‘Ummāl (8 volumes)</i>	‘Alī Muttaqī al-Hindī	975
85	<i>Nasīm al-Riyāḍ fī Sharḥ Shifā al-Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ</i>	Aḥmad ibn Shihāb al-Dīn al-Khafājī al-Miṣrī	1058

