

Hakikat Kitabevi Publications No: 15

DOCUMENTS of the RIGHT WORD

Tenth Edition



Hakikat Kitâbevi

Darıüşşefeka Cad. 53/A P.K.: 35

34083 Fatih-ISTANBUL/TURKEY

Tel: 90.212.523 4556-532 5843 Fax: 90.212.523 3693

<http://www.hakikatkitabevi.com>

e-mail: bilgi@hakikatkitabevi.com

SEPTEMBER-2014

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Part One – The book Documents of the Right Word , is the English version of the book Hujaj-i-qat'iyya, by Abdullah Suwaydî.....	3
Part Two – The book Radd-i-rewâfid , by Imâm-i-Rabbânî, mujaddid-i-elf-i-thânî Ahmad Fârûqî	57
Part Three – Tezkiya-i-Ahl-i-Bayt , rebuts the calumnies which an enemy of Islam has heaped on Islam in a book titled Husniyya.....	101
Part Four – The book Let us Be in Unity and Love One Another	164
Part Five – The book O My Brother; if You Wish To Die in Îmân, You Should Love the Ahl-i-Bayt and the As-hâb	211
Also, Letter 24, Volume 3, by Imâm-i-Rabbânî.....	329
Part Six – What Is Prophethood? Muhammad 'alaihîs-salâm' is the Last Prophet	337
Part Seven – A Biography of Imâm-i-Rabbânî.....	373
Translation of thirty-two letters from Muhammed Ma'thûm Fârûqî's Mektûbât.....	395
Part Eight – English Version of Eyyuhelved	441
Part Nine – Answers to A Religiously Ignorant Person.....	458
Part Ten – Communism; and Communists' Hostility Against Religion.....	475

Publisher's Note:

Those who wish to print this book in its original form or to translate in into another language are permitted to do so. We pray that Allâhu ta'âlâ will bless them for this beneficial deed of theirs, and we thank them very much. However, permission is granted with the condition that the paper used in printing will be of a good quality and that the design of the text and setting will be properly and neatly done without mistakes. We would appreciate a copy of the printed book when completed.

TYPESET AND PRINTED IN TURKEY BY:

İhlâs Gazetecilik A.Ş.
Merkez Mah. 29 Ekim Cad. İhlâs Plaza No: 11 A/41
34197 Yenibosna-İSTANBUL Tel: 90.212.454 3000

PART ONE
DOCUMENTS OF THE RIGHT WORD
PREFACE

(TO THE TURKISH VERSION)

Allâhu ta'âlâ, having mercy on the whole of mankind, creates useful things and sends them these things in the world. And in the Hereafter He will choose some of those Believers who are to go to Hell, forgive them, and make them attain to Paradise. He, alone, creates all living beings, keeps all beings in existence, and protects them all against fear and horror. Trusting ourselves to the honourable Name of such a Being, Allah, we begin writing this book.

If any person thanked and praised any other person in any manner, for anything, at any place, at any time, all this thanks and praisal would have been done to Allâhu ta'âlâ by rights. For He, alone, is the creator, the educator, the discipliner of all beings, and the actuator and sender of all types of goodness whatsoever. He, alone, is the owner of power and energy.

May all types of benedictions be pronounced over MUHAMMAD 'alaihi-salâm', who is His Prophet and most beloved born slave, the most virtuous and most valuable of the entire creation, and over all of his Âl (household) and As-hâb (Companions), who were his helpers and beloved ones 'alahimus-salawâtu wa-t-taslîmât.'!

Serving humanity has always been considered as the most noble obligation, and most people claim to be exclusively doing this service. There are very many people who cover the struggles they have been carrying on for their own sensuous desires, pleasures and financial advantages under the mask of this service. Serving humanity means causing human beings to attain comfort and peace in this world and in the Hereafter. And the only way to success in doing this is the guide to happiness, i.e. Islam, which has been conferred by Allâhu ta'âlâ, most compassionate and most kind, the Creator and educator of human beings. Then, serving humanity is possible by serving Islam; serving Islam

means serving humanity. Enemies of humanity have striven to annihilate Islam. Their most effective aggression has been deceiving Muslims, thus destroying them from within. They have provoked segregation among them, made them hostile against one another, and led them into the talons of irreligious people.

Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ made statements warning Muslims against these catastrophes awaiting them. He said, for one, **“My Umma will be divided into seventy-three groups. Of these groups, only those who follow me and my As-hâb shall escape Hell.”** Fortunately, most of the seventy-two groups who are to go to Hell are extinct today. Hundreds of millions of Muslims on the earth now are only in the three remaining groups, i.e. Sunnîs, Shi’îs, and Wahnâbîs. If these three groups of Muslims today do not take measures of conciliation and cooperation with one another, if they prefer to abuse one another, the enemies of Islam will gain grounds to defile Islam, to divide Muslims into yet other groups, and to mislead young people out of Islam by using all sorts of lies and slanders. As history shows, nations negligent in their faith have incurred Allah’s scourge and fallen into cruel paws. We see today that most of them are still being trodden under the enemy boots called Communists and are being brutally employed for obtaining their food, like beasts, by an immoral, irreligious and cruel minority. Rescuing humanity from this desperate situation depends merely on serving Islam and rescuing Islam. Today, any person living in Europe or America, where human rights are observed, will attain peace and comfort to the extent that he or she follows Islam’s principles, whether consciously or by chance. In order to convince our readers of this fact and to motivate them towards seeing their own peril, we have considered it appropriate to warn them against Communism by appending to our book a brief sampler of the lacerating afflictions suffered by nations who fell into Communists’ traps.

This book explains how the Hurûfîs, who infiltrated the Shi’î communities, attacked the Sunnîs, how the Iranian King **Nâdir Shâh** organized a debate between the Sunnî and the Shi’î scholars, which ended in the bilateral recognition that the Shi’î (Shiah) way had been mixed with Hurûfî elements and that on the other hand the Sunnîs were in the right way, and how it was decided, and the decision was sanctioned by Nâdir Shâh that Iran would be Sunnî as before.

Upon reading this book of ours, our Iranian brothers will agree with the decision taken by the Shiite scholars, become

Sunnî Muslims, and attain happiness. Gratitude be to Allâhu ta'âlâ, next to none of the recent Iranian learners has abandoned the Sunnî way. We observe with gratitude, for instance, that the Persian book **Kimyâ-i-Sa'âdat**, written by Imâm-i-Ghazâlî, a Sunnî scholar, was reprinted in a most splendid form in Tehran in 1964, and the younger generation in Iran are being informed about the statements made by hundreds of Sunnî scholars, thus being impressed by their superior merits.

The very day Shiites free themselves from the Hurûfîs deceit, realize the way shown by their own scholars, and cooperate with the Sunnîs in spreading Islam over the world, the Wahhabîs will join them, Muslims will be in unity, they will certainly resume their past grandeur and superiority, they will once again shed a light on humanity and guide others to civilization, and thus the whole world will attain happiness. Then all people will know that serving Islam means serving humanity.

Mîlâdî
2001

Hijrî Shamsî
1380

Hijrî Qamarî
1422

A Warning: Missionaries are striving to advertise Christianity, Jews are working to spread out the concocted words of Jewish rabbis, Hakîkat Kitâbevi (Bookstore), in Istanbul, is struggling to publicize Islam, and freemasons are trying to annihilate religions. A person with wisdom, knowledge and conscience will understand and admit the right one among these and will help to spread out that for salvation of all humanity. There is no better way and more valuable thing to serve humanity than doing so.

DOCUMENTS OF THE RIGHT WORD

[The book **HUJAJ-I-QAT'IYYA** was written in the Arabic language by Abulberekât Abdullah Suwaydî of Baghdâd. It was printed in Egypt in 1323 [A.D. 1905], and reproduced by offset process in Istanbul. Its Turkish translation, by Allâma Yûsuf Suwaydî, was printed in the Kurdistan printhouse in Egypt in 1326 [A.D. 1908]. Suwaydî Abdullah Efendi was born in Baghdâd in 1104. After performing his duty of hajj in 1137, he was given an ijâzat (certificate, diploma) from Abdulghanî Nablusî [1050-1143] (A.D. 1730) Damascus], and another ijâzat by Alî Efendi of Istanbul [1099-1149]. He taught for years in Baghdâd. He wrote many valuable books. His thirtieth grandfather is Abû Ja'fer Abdullah Mensûr, one of the Abbâsî Khalîfas. Nâdir Shâh [1099-1160 (A.D. 1746)], an Iranian ruler, convoked the scholars of Iran and Bukhara and commanded them to discuss and come to a bilateral conclusion on which one of the Sunnî and Shi'î groups was right, and they appointed him as president of the debate. The book **HUJAJ-I-QAT'IYYA**, which gives an account of the talks made in this assembly, is very valuable. After a long discussion with the Shiite scholars in this assembly, he (Abdullah Suwaydî) proved that the Sunnîs were right. The Shâh liked this and congratulated him. He passed away on the eleventh day, Saturday, of (the Arabic month) Shawwâl in 1174 [A.D. 1760]. He was buried near the tomb of Hadrat Ma'rûf-i-Kerhî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh', who had passed away in 200 [A.D. 815].

When Shâh Huseyn Safawî, the ninth and last king of the Safawid dynasty in Iran, was killed by the Afghans in 1142 [A.D. 1729], a state of chaos began in Persia. The Shâh's son, Tahmâsib II, was an incompetent and pleasure-seeking person. Therefore his vizier named Nâdir took over. He expelled the Afghans out of Iran and recaptured the capital, Isfehân. He besieged Baghdâd, which was then governed by Ahmad Pasha. Eight months later an army commanded by Uthmân Pasha, whose nickname was Lame, arrived from Istanbul and repelled the Iranian army.

Nâdir Shâh became the Shâh of Iran in 1148. He captured Delhi. He shed very much blood. Then he captured Afghanistan and Bukhâra. He was given the nickname (Shâhinshâh). He sent ambassadors to the Ottoman State and proposed to arrange a scientific discussion to decide which one of the Sunnî and Imâmiyya groups was the right one. Organizing a great army, he moved towards Baghdâd and Musul. Unable to capture them, he

retreated to Nejef.

In order to eliminate the disagreeing principles of belief between the Sunnîs and the Shi'îs and to unite the two groups in one by adhering to the right one, scholars from both groups came together upon the order of NÂDIR SHÂH. Abdullah Efendi made such detailed, scientific, mental and documental speeches in front of the whole assembly that the Shiites were short of answering him. [The questions asked and the answers given by both sides were compiled in a book and published with the title (HUJAJ-I-QAT'IYYA)].

Ahmad Pasha, Governor of Baghdâd, sent for me. When I went there Ahmad Agha, one of the officials of Ahmad Pasha, met me and said that the Pasha wanted to send me to Nâdir Shâh. I asked him why. He said, "The Shâh asked for a Sunnî scholar. You are to conduct a debate with the Shiite scholars to find out whether the Shiite tenets are right. If so, Shiism will be proclaimed as the fifth (true) madh-hab."

"O Ahmad Agha," I said. "Don't you know that the Persians are obstinate, headstrong people? Do you think they will admit my words? Especially their Shâh is cruel and proud. How can I state the documents showing that their way is wrong? How can one ever talk with them? They already deny the hadîth-i-sherîfs I am to put forward as documents. They reject the religious books. They interpret the âyat-i-kerîmas in such a manner as will suit their purposes. How can I prove to them the fact that it is permissible to make masah^[1] on mests^[2] when making ablution? This facility has been made permissible by the sunnat-i-seniyya. The hadîth-i-sherîf stating this permission has been narrated by more than seventy Sahabîs. One of them is Hadrat Alî 'ker-rem-Allâhu wejheh'. If I tell them these facts, they will say that more than a hundred Sahabîs have reported that this facility is not permissible. If I tell them that the statements they look on as hadîth-i-sherîfs are mawdû', that is, they have been fabricated afterwards, they will tell me the same thing. They will say, 'Whatever you say, we will say it back to you.' For this reason, I beg Hadrat Pasha to excuse me from this duty."

He said, "This is impossible. The Pasha has chosen you for this duty. You have to obey him. Don't you ever object to his command."

[1] To wet the hands and rub them gently on mests.

[2] Light, soleless leather boots worn with overshoes.

The following morning I had a long conversation with Ahmad Pasha. He said, "Go and get to it. May Janâb-i-Haqq give effectiveness to your tongue and argumentation! If they show obstinacy and vanity during the debate, talk briefly. Yet do not let them go without an answer! If they admit the facts and talk reasonably, do not hesitate to state all the facts that you know! Never be the losing party! Nâdir Shâh must be in Nejeff now. Be there by Wednesday." I and a few other people set out. Throughout the journey I thought about the answers I was going to give and the evidences I was going to furnish. People I met on my way said that the Shâh had convened almost seventy Shiite muftis.

I thought to myself. It would be wrong to refrain from stating the facts in front of them. And yet there was fear that they might make changes in my statements before reporting them to the Shâh. The best thing to do would be to request that the Shâh attend the debate. We were two hours from Nejeff, when somebody came and said, "Why are you lingering here? The Shâh is waiting for you." I asked if it was the Shâh's habit to send men to meet his guests on their way. He said, "No. You are the first person the Shâh has ever sent a message to and said to hurry up." Upon these words I said to myself, "The Shâh's purpose is to force me to admit the Imâmiyya (Shiite) tenets. He is going to press upon me, maybe he will compel me. Yet I am not going to let them corner me; I am not afraid of them. I shall not hesitate to state the truth even if I know they will kill me. Muslims have been in a difficult situation twice so far. The first one was when Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' passed away. Then Abû Bekr-i-Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu anh' came to their rescue and relieved them. Second; Hârûn-ur-reshîd's son, Me'mun, the Khalîfa, [his mother was a jâriya. He was born in 180 and passed away in 218. His grave is in Tarsus], liked the Shiite group. He said that Qur'ân al-kerîm was a creature. Ahmad bin Hanbel [164-241, Baghdâd] 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' saved Muslims from this fitna (instigation, mischief). And now it is seen that a third fitna is cropping up. If I make a mistake or falter, it may hold on till the end of the world. That is, Islam's improvement or impairment depends on some means. Now I am going to be the means for the elimination of this fitna." I decided to exert myself and be perseverant. I ventured even my life.

Two flags appeared in the distance. When we came nearer, I saw the royal tents. The Shâh's tent was set up on seven big posts.

There were thousands of sentinels. Someone met us. He asked about Ahmad Pasha and the begs (officials under the Pasha's command), mentioning their names one by one. I was surprised at his way of asking as if he had known them. "I served as the Iranian Ambassador to the Ottoman State. I served Ahmad Pasha, too. My name is Abd-ul-kerîm Beg," he explained. Then nine other people came. Abd-ul-kerîm Beg stood up respectfully when they came. I knew they were people of high positions. We greeted each other. They said, "We invite you to take presence with the Shâh," and raised the curtain in front of the big tent. Walking through a passageway, we entered the Shâh's room. When Nâdir Shâh saw me, he said, "Abdullah Beg, merhabâ (hello)! Come nearer." We took ten steps, and he said again, "Come nearer!" I walked on, so that there was only one or two metres between him and me when I stopped. He was seated. You could tell he was tall. There were exuberantly ornamented ribbons on his head, around his neck and arm. He was proud, contented. He looked tired and aged. His beard was dyed black, and he had lost his front teeth. His eyes were beautiful with his eye-brows like open bows. He was an imposing, yet at the same time affable, person. When I saw him the fear I had had in my heart diminished. He said, in Turkish again, "How has Ahmad Pasha been?" "He is well, in good health," was my answer.

[At that time Sultan Mahmud Khan I, the twenty-fourth Pâdishâh (Emperor), was on the Ottoman throne. Yet Ahmad Khân III, the previous Sultan, was still alive. He was born in 1083 and passed away in 1149 [A.D. 1736]. He is in the mausoleum of (Turhan Sultan), his paternal grandmother, which is at Bahçekapı, between Yeni Câmî' (New Mosque) and Mısır Çarşısı (Market). He ascended to the throne in 1115. He was dethroned upon the Janissary insurrection. His brother's son, Sultan Mahmud I, took his place. The defeat of Petro (Peter) the Crazy and the lynching of Ibrahim Pasha of Nevşehir in 1143 took place during his reign.

It is stated as follows in the first volume of the book *Sijill-i Uthmânî*: Ahmad Pasha is Eyyûbî Hasan Pasha's son. He became the governor of Konya in 1129, the governor of Basra in 1130, the governor of Baghdâd upon his father's death in 1136, and then he was sent to Iran as the Serasker (Commander-in-chief). In 1149 he became the governor of Baghdâd again. He passed away in the (Arabic) month of Zilqa'da in 1160. His two-time governorship of Baghdâd lasted for twenty-two years.]

He said, "Do you know why I wanted you here?"

I said, "No, I don't."

He explained, "As you know, my country is of two divisions. One of them is Turkistan and Afghanistan. People in these provinces assert that Iranians are disbelievers. It is not something good for people under my command to call one another disbelievers. I appoint you my deputy. You shall confer with them and determine the right party. You shall do away with this segregation. Let me know whatever you see and hear at the place of meeting! Report to Ahmad Khan, too."

Upon his permission I left his presence. I'timâd-ud-dawla, i.e. the Grand Vizier, ordered me to be his guest and to meet the head Molla, that is, Chief of Religious Affairs, after early afternoon prayer. I was very happy when I left the place. At lunch time they took me to the Grand Vizier. The Vizier acknowledged my salutation, seated as he was. He did not stand up or show any respect. When I sat down, he stood up and said, "Welcome." According to their custom, the host would stand up after the guest sat down. Because I did not know about this, I felt annoyed first. In fact, I was going to ask the Shâh to punish the Grand Vizier for irreverence to a religious scholar, as the first step in eliminating the acts of disbelief, which was the Shâh's command. However, when I learned about this custom of theirs, I knew that he had been respectful. After lunch we mounted animals and set out to see the head Molla. On the way I met an Afghan. He saluted me. When I asked him who he was, he said, "I am Molla Hamza, the Afghan Mufti." "Do you know Arabic?" I asked. He answered positively. I said, "The Shâh has commanded me to correct the heretical principles of belief and wrong deeds held and practised by the Persians. But what should I do if they obstinately stick to their disbelief or conceal some of their tenets? I do not know much about these people. Tell me whatever you know, so that I shall act accordingly."

He said, "Do not trust the Shâh! He sends you to the head Molla so that you will speak with him alone. Be extremely circumspect during the conversation."

I said, "I fear a probable treachery."

"No," he said. "Don't be afraid as to that! The Shâh posted men he could trust at every step to report the talks to him. It is impossible to misinform the Shâh."

I approached the head Molla's tent. He walked out to meet me.

He was short. He showed me a seat which was by him and somewhat above him. In the midst of the conversation he said, "Today I saw Hâdî Khodja, the Afghan Mufti. He is an ocean of knowledge." Hâdî Khodja was the Qadi (Judge) of Bukhara. He was very profoundly learned. He was called Bahr-ul-'ilm (Ocean of Knowledge). He had been here for days previous to my arrival, with six other scholars from Bukhara.

He (the Molla) said, "How could he ever think the name (Bahr-ul-'ilm) becoming himself? He is quite devoid of knowledge. If I gave him two evidences proving the fact that Imâm-i-Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was the first Khalîfa by rights, he would not be able to find an answer. Not only him; even if all the Sunnite scholars came together, they would not be able to answer."

"What are those unanswerable evidences of yours?" I said.

1- He said, "First, I should like to ask you a question: Hadrat Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated as follows about Alî ibn Ebî Tâlib 'radiy-Allâhu anh': **'Whatever Hârûn (Aaron) was in relation to Mûsâ (Moses), you are the same with relation to me. The only difference is that no Prophet shall come after me.'** You, too, know this hadîth."

"Yes. In fact, it is widely known," I said.

He said, "This hadîth-i-sherîf shows that Imâm-i-Alî should be the Khalîfa after hadrat Prophet."

"How is that," I asked.

He said, "It is pointed out that the position of Imâm-i-Alî in relation to the Prophet is identical with that of Hârûn to Mûsâ. The only exception is stated to be **"Yet no Prophet shall come after me."** For this reason, hadrat Alî should be the first Khalîfa. Had Hârûn's lifetime not ended, he would have succeeded Mûsâ."

"You assert clearly that these statements have a general reference according to the knowledge of logic. How do you reach the conclusion that they have a general meaning?"

"In exceptions, annexation implies a general meaning."

"Hârûn 'alaihis-salâm', like Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', was a Prophet. On the other hand, as you, too, know, hadrat Alî was not a Prophet; neither before, nor afterwards. Furthermore, Hârûn 'alaihis-salâm' was Mûsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' real brother. On the other hand, hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' is not Rasûl-i-ekrem's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' real brother. Exception in something general refers to supposition in the knowledge of logic. Therefore,

the meaning of the statement must be sought as to a position, a station. Accordingly, the letter (t) at the end of the (Arabic) word ‘menzila’ (position) indicates a singular meaning. The izâfet (annexation) ‘like the position of Hârûn’ is an izâfet-i-ahdiyya, as is the case with most types of annexation. In other words, it does not indicate a general meaning. And the word ‘Only’ means ‘Yet’. Then, the statement bears a suppositious meaning, not a definite one. In statements such as this, something which is uncertain can be understood with the help of some other information. That is, as the relation between the words ‘menzila’ and ‘Hârûn’ indicates that he was the Khalîfa only for the Sons of Israel, so it indicates that hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was left in Medîna-i-munawwara as the Khalîfa during the Holy War of Tabuk.

“Being left there as the Khalîfa shows that he is more virtuous. He must be the first Khalîfa,” he said.

I said, “Then, Abdullah ibni umm-i-Mektûm ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ must be a Khalîfa, too. For Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ left him, as well as others, as the Khalîfa, that is, as his representative, in Medîna-i-munawwara. Now, for what reason do you choose hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ as the first Khalîfa instead of conferring the honour on one of the others; for instance, on this one (named above)? Moreover, if being left as a representative were a cause of superiority, Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ would not have expressed his anxiety by complaining, ‘Are you going to leave me here with women, children and the incapable?’ And our Master Fakhr-i-âlem ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ would not have consoled him by stating, **‘Don’t you like to have a position with me like that of Hârûn with Mûsâ?’**”

“According to the Sunnite (branch of) knowledge (called) Usûl, the important thing is not the dissimilarity between the causes but the generality of the statement,” he said.

I said, “I am not treating the dissimilarity between the causes as a documentary evidence. Yet I am stating that the indefinite element in this hadîth-i-sherîf is a token suggesting its specificity.” He was silent.

I went on, “Furthermore, this hadîth-i-sherîf cannot be put forward as a document. For it has not been reported unanimously. Some of the scholars have stated it was sahîh, some of them have said it was hasan, and others have declared it was a dha’if^[1] hadîth.

[1] Kinds of hadîth-i-sherîfs are explained in full detail in the sixth chapter of **Endless Bliss**.

Ibn-ul-Djawzî, for instance, says that it is mawdû'. [Abulferedj Jemâl-ud-dîn Hâfiz Abd-ur-Rahmân bin Ali-yyul-Djawzî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' is a great 'âlim (savant, profoundly learned scholar) of hadîth. He was born in Baghdâd in 508 and passed away there in 597 [A.D. 1201]. He wrote more than a hundred books. His tafsîr (explanation of Qur'ân al-kerîm), titled **Mughnî**, is well-known]. How could this (hadîth) prove that Imâm-i-Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was the first Khalîfa, despite the fact that a document should be widely known nass (an âyat-i-kerîma or hadîth-i-sherîf which has been stated clearly)?"

He said, "Yes, that is right. This (hadîth) is not our only evidence. The hadîth, 'Salute Alî as the Emîr (Ruler) of Believers,' is an evidence. It is an irrefutable fact that this hadîth-i-sherîf signifies Alî's right to be the first Khalîfa, if not his prophethood."

I said, "This hadîth-i-sherîf is mawdû' to our knowledge. The books of the 'Ulamâ (savants) of Ahl-as-sunna 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' do not contain a sahîh hadîth of this sort." He mused (for a while). Then he said suddenly:

"I am going to state another evidence, which is impossible to interpret otherwise. The âyat, **'Come on! Let us call your children and our children!'**, is my evidence," he said.

I questioned, "How can this âyat-i-kerîma, which is the sixty-first âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra, be an evidence?"

He said, "When the Christians coming from Nejran to Medina disbelieved, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' said to them, **'I challenge you; let us imprecate Allah's condemnation on the party which is lying.'** And then he came forward, taking Alî, Fâtima (his daughter), Hasan and Huseyn (his two grandsons) with him. Certainly, a person who joined (the Prophet) in this invocation is more virtuous than one who did not."

I said, "What you have just told is an episode. It does not signify superiority. For there is an episode that is ascribed to each of the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' and which distinguishes him from the others. History readers are quite familiar with this fact. Furthermore, Qur'ân-i-azîm-ush-shân was revealed in the Arabic language. For instance, supposing two tribes were about to fight each other and the chief of one of them said, 'I shall take the brave ones of my tribe with me. And you must select the brave ones in your tribe;' this statement would not prove that neither tribe contained any brave men other than those

who came forward. Being with one's immediate relations during an invocation is (an indication of) a broken heart and it is intended for the acceptance of the invocation."

"This shows abundance of love," he said.

I said, "This is a kind of love innate in one's nature. It is like one's loving oneself, one's children. It is out of place to look for superiority in this."

"One more thing: The Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' put hadrat Alî in the same place with himself," he asserted.

I said, "You are not aware of the knowledge of Usûl; perhaps you do not even know Arabic! The word 'enfus', which you presume to be an evidence, is jem'i qillat (plural of paucity). It has been attached to (the word) 'Nâ', which is an element of plural. When one plural is placed against another plural, it causes the division of (the number) one by a thousand. For instance, to say that 'the cavalry company have mounted' means to say that all the horsemen in the company have mounted their horses. Jem' means more than one. The twenty-sixth âyat of Nûr sûra, which purports, **'These are not as they have said'**, points to hadrat Âisha 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ' and Safwân 'radiy-Allâhu anh.' Likewise, the expression 'their hearts', in the fourth âyat of Tahrîm sûra, is plural, yet according to the knowledge of logic it means 'two hearts' because it is attached to a pronoun signifying 'two'. By the same token, the expression 'our children', said about Hasan and Huseyn 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ', and the plural reference 'women', made to hadrat Fâtima 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ' alone, are hyperboles. If this âyat-i-kerîma indicated that hadrat Alî should be the first Khalîfa, then Hasan, Huseyn and Fâtima should have been Khalîfas respectively. However, hadrat Fâtima could never be a Khalîfa."

He said, "I have another proof. The fifty-eighth âyat of Mâida sûra purports, **'Verily, thine protectors, thine owners are Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger and Believers.'** As it is unanimously stated by scholars of Tafsîr (Islamic branch of knowledge involving explanation of Qur'ân al-kerîm), hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh', as he was performing namâz, gave his ring as alms to a poor person, whereon this âyat-i-kerîma was revealed. The phrase 'inna-mâ' in the âyat-i-kerîma means 'he, alone'. That is, it refers only to him. And the word 'Walî' (in the âyat-i-kerîma) means 'the one who is best disposed to governing'. What is your opinion of the Sahâba-i-kirâm?"

“Our knowledge about them is such that they are true in person and in words,” was my answer.

2- He said, “Many an âyat in Qur’ân al-kerîm reproaches them. There are a number of âyats declaring that they are hypocrites, that they harassed and annoyed Rasûlullah. Examples of this fact are the fifty-ninth âyat of Tawba sûra and the eighth âyat of Mujâdala sûra and the first âyat of Munâfiqûn sûra and the sixteenth and twentieth and twenty-ninth and thirtieth âyats of Muhammad sûra. Moreover, as is pointed out in the hundred and second âyat of Tawba sûra and in the eleventh and twelfth and fifteenth âyats of Fat-h sûra and in the fourth âyat of Hujurât sûra, so clandestine were the hypocrites in Medina that our master Fakhr-i-’âlam himself, let alone other people, was unaware of them. It is stated in the Enfâl sûra, **‘Verily it is them who opposed Rasûlullah, who evaded the renowned Holy War of Bedr and returned before seeing the enemy, and who refrained from the honour of that day for which Believers gave up their lives.’** It is for this reason that Allâhu ta’âlâ ‘jalla jalâluh’, who is aware of secrets, reveals the hypocrites’ evil intentions in the sixth âyat of Enfâl sûra. It is these hypocrites, again, who escaped from the Holy War of Huneyn and who relied on their being superior in number and thus caused the revelation of the tenth and hundred and sixteenth âyats of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra. In the catastrophe of Uhud they ran away into the mountains, leaving hadrat Fakhr-i-kâinat in the hands of the enemy. They caused the wounding of his blessed face and martyrdom of two of his teeth and his falling down from the mare. In fact, when they were asked to help they pretended not to hear and were therefore reproached by Allâhu ta’âlâ in the hundred and fifty-third âyat-i-kerîma of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra. On account of the infamous behaviour they showed in Tabuk, they were reprimanded and threatened through the thirty-ninth âyat-i-kerîma of Tawba sûra.

(He went on), “As all these facts show, the Prophet’s As-hâb disobeyed him, opposed him. The âyat-i-kerîma about their desertion purports that all of them ran away, not only a few of them. For the forty-third âyat of Tawba sûra declares plainly that they incurred torment and censure. And they caused the revelation of the forty-fourth âyat-i-kerîma of Tawba sûra, which scolds the Fakhr-i-’âlam ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ because he allowed them to rejoin the Believers. Moreover, during the Holy War of Ahzâb, or Hendek (Trench), which took place during the eleventh month of the fifth year of the Hijra (Hegira), they were

reprimanded and censured through the thirteenth and fifteenth âyats of Ahzâb sûra and through many other âyats. How could such people ever be said to be true people? How could their actions and words ever be of documentary value in religious matters? It is neither reasonable nor scientific to believe or trust them.”

I took my turn: “All the âyat-i-kerîmas that you put forward as documents in order to vilify the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘alaihîmur-ridwân’ were intended for munâfiqs (hypocrites). No one doubts as to this fact. In fact, Shiïtes also unanimously acknowledge this fact. It would be quite incompatible with justice and reason to attempt to heap the reproaches stated in these âyat-i-kerîmas which are known to have been revealed to reprimand the hypocrites on the As-hâb-i-kirâm, who have been praised and lauded through âyats, and thus to try to defame these great people. Formerly there were many hypocrites. Later on they began to decrease in number. Towards the end of the blessed lifetime of our master Fakhr-i-âlam ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ the hypocrites were separated from the true Believers. With the hundred and seventy-ninth âyat-i-kerîma of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra, Allâhu ta’âlâ severed the good from the vicious. Our master, hadrat Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ stated, **‘As the fire in the smith’s forge severs the iron from its dirt, so Medina severs the good people from the bad ones.’** [That is, as the forges used by blacksmiths and blast-furnaces separate the scum called dross from the iron, so Medina city separates good people from bad ones.] How could it ever be justifiable to impute (the contents of) the âyat-i-kerîmas describing the hypocrites to the As-hâb-i-kirâm? The hundred and tenth âyat of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra purports, **‘You have been the most beneficent, the best of ummats.’** How could those people, who are praised and lauded through this âyat, be equated with the hypocrites?

(I went on), “Allâhu ta’âlâ praises the As-hâb-i-kirâm through many âyat-i-kerîmas. It is written in all the books of Tafsîr that the fifty-ninth âyat of Tawba sûra descended about Ibni zil Huwaysira bin Zuheyr, who was the chief of the (Khawârij) tribe. It is not worthy of a man of knowledge to impute (the evils purported in) this âyat-i-kerîma to the Sahâba-i-kirâm ‘ridwânullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’in’. It will be appropriate at this point to paraphrase the passages explaining this event in the book Bukhârî-yi-sherîf. Abû Sa’îd-i-Hudrî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ narrates: I was with our master Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam.’ I was enjoying the

pleasure of seeing his blessed luminous face. He was meting out the booties taken from the disbelievers in the Holy War of Huneyn. Huwaysira from the Benî Temîm clan came in, and said, ‘O Rasûlallah! Observe justice!’ Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ stated, **‘Shame on you! If I do not administer justice, who does? If I did not dispense justice, you would suffer much harm!’** At that moment ‘Umar-ul-Fârûq ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ stood up and said, ‘Please give me permission to kill that nescient.’ He (Rasûlullah) stated, **‘Leave him! For this man has friends. They perform namâz like you. They fast, read Qur’ân al-kerîm with you. Yet the word of Allâhu ta’âlâ does not go down their throats. They leave the religion (Islam) like an arrow leaving the bow. When he looks at his arrow and at the target and at the bottle, he cannot see any of them. Yet the arrow has reached the bottle, pierced it, and shed the blood. Among them will be a person, whose colour is black. One of his arms is like the udder of an animal. It drips ceaselessly.’** As Abû Sa’îd-i-Hudrî narrates, hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ made war against the Khawârij during his caliphate. We saw a man of this sort among the captives. He was exactly as our master Rasûlullah described him. It has been reported that the reason for the revelation of this âyat-i-kerîma was due to the following statement made by a hypocrite named Abulhawât: ‘O my friends! Why don’t you look at your owner! He wants to make a show of justice by giving what belongs to you to shepherds.’

(I went on), “Also, the eighth âyat of Mujâdala sûra was revealed for the Jews and hypocrites. For they were organizing meetings hidden from the Muslims among themselves, and trying to deceive the As-hâb-i-kirâm with eye and eye-brow gestures. The Believers, on the other hand, would feel pity for them, thinking that they were apprehending a certain calamity that was going to befall them and talking secretly among themselves lest others should know about it. Yet the prolongation of these talks revealed their real purposes. The As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘alaihimur-ridwân’ complained to our master Fakhr-i-’âlam ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ and petitioned that these malevolent secret meetings should be put an end to. Therefore he (Rasûlullah) commanded that such meetings should be discontinued. Yet the hypocrites disobeyed him and carried on their sedition. Upon this the eighth âyat of Mujâdala sûra was revealed, which purported, **‘Have you not seen those who were prohibited from holding secret meetings? They have met again despite the prohibition. They have been**

Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

