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Foreword

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful

All praise is due to Allah. We praise Him, seek His help, forgiveness and protection from the evil of our souls and bad actions. Whoever Allah guides is truly guided, and whoever He misguides, will not find anyone to guide him. I bear witness that there is no deity besides Allah, alone. He has no partners. I testify that Muḥammad is His servant and Messenger.

Indeed it is among the great principles of Islam to collectively hold onto the rope of Allah and to abstain from disunity. Allah Taʿālā says:

وَاعْتَصِمُوْا بِحَبْلِ اللّٰهِ جَمِیْعًا وَّلَ تَفَرَّقُوْا

And hold firmly to the Rope of Allah all together and do not become divided.¹

Allah says again:

إِنَّ الَّذِیْنَ فَرَّقُوْا دِیْنَهُمْ وَکَانُوْا شِیَعًا لَّسْتَ مِنْهُمْ فِیْ شَیْءٍ

Indeed, those who have divided their religion and become sects — you, [O Muḥammad], are not [associated] with them in anything.²

The Muslims followed the path of guidance and true religion, corresponding to the authentic narrations and the obvious demands of logic, which was the path upon which Allah sent His Messenger. This continued until the assassination of ʿUthmān, whereupon the great strife occurred and the Muslims fought against one another at Ṣiffīn. This is where the foreseen deviation took place.

1 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 103
2 Sūrah al-Anʿām: 159
Nabī described it in the following words:

تمرق مارقة على حين فرقة من المسلمين يقتلهم أولى الطائفتين بالحق

The Māriqah will deviate at a time when the Muslims will be divided. The group closest to the truth will fight them.

Their deviation occurred when the two arbitrators concluded their matters and people separated without agreeing. Thereafter, the innovation of the Khawārij was followed by the innovations of Shīʿism, and then different sects continued to emerge, just as Nabī informed us. Shīʿism first appeared in Kūfah.

1 This is one of the names of the Khawārij. They are the ones who revolted against ʿAlī after he agreed to arbitration. Thus, he fought them on the Day of Nahrawān. Nabī commanded that they should be killed in many authentic aḥādīth. Al-Bukhārī and Muslim contain tens of aḥādīth regarding them. Al-Bukhārī reports three, whilst Muslim reports the rest. (Sharḥ al-Tahāwiyyah pg. 530) Ibn al-Qayyim quotes all of them together in Tahdhīb al-Sunan (7/148-153). Read more about their beliefs and sect in Al-Faraq bāyn al-Firaq (pg. 72) and Al-Mīlal wa l-Nihal (1/146) and Al-Fīṣal (5/51-56).

2 Refer to Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim (with the commentary of al-Nawawī) Kitāb al-Zakāh, Bāb Dhikr al-Khawārij wa Ṣifātihim 7/68.

3 Refer to Minhāj al-Sunnah of Ibn Taymiyyah 1/218-219.

4 The ḥadīth about the ummah splitting into seventy-three sects is as stated by Ibn Taymiyyah, “a mash-hūr (one level below mutawātir) and authentic ḥadīth, which appears in the Sunan and Masānīd (different types of ḥadīth books).” (al-Fatāwā 3/345, gathered by Ḥākim ibn Qāsim). “There are so many narrations of the ḥadīth regarding the splitting of the ummah into seventy-three sects that no doubt can remain regarding the meaning thereof.” (al-Īlm al-Shāmikh pg. 414).

It should be noted that this ḥadīth has been narrated without mentioning that any of them will be doomed. This version has been reported by most of the ḥadīth scholars including the authors of the Sunan (besides al-Nasāʾī). Other versions mention that one will attain salvation and the rest will be doomed. This is not reported by any of the authors of the Sunan besides Abū Dāwūd in Kitāb al-Sunnah (4573). It is also reported in Al-Dāramī (2/241), Ahmad (4/102), Ḥākim (1/128) and al-Ājurrī reports it in al-Sharīʿah (pg. 18).

Just as the Ahl al-Sunnah have reported this ḥadīth, the Shīʿah have also done so. The wording reported by them is, “my ummah will split into seventy two groups, from which seventy one groups will be doomed and one will attain salvation. They asked, ‘who will that group be o Rasūlullāh?’ He replied, ‘the majority, the majority, the majority!’” Another narration states, “My ummah will split up into seventy three sects after me. One sect from them will attain salvation and seventy two will be in hell.” Refer to al-Khiṣāl of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (2/584-585). continued...
Shīʿī narrations have stated that none of the cities of the Muslims accepted their ideology except Kūfah, thereafter, it spread to the other cities. *Irjā* \(^2\), *Qadr* \(^1\) and *Iʿtizāl* \(^4\) also first appeared in Kūfah. Incorrect sacrifices started off in Baṣrah, but their strength was realised in Khurāsān.

All of these innovations took place in areas that were far from the ‘City of Nubuwwah’. \(^5\) This is because innovations do not flourish and spread except when ignorance prevails, and the people of knowledge and īmān are scarce. It is for this reason that one of the predecessors said:

> It is from the good-fortune of a new Muslim and a non-Arab that Allah guides him to a scholar from the Ahl al-Sunnah.\(^6\)

These people would be affected very quickly by mischief and deviation on account of their poor ability of recognising misguidance and finding its flaws.

Thus, the best method to fight deviation and undo sectarianism is to spread the Sunnah between the masses, and explain to them the deviation of those who do not abide to it. This is why the Imāms of the Ahl al-Sunnah exerted themselves in

---

\(^1\) *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/259.
\(^2\) The belief that sins make no difference as long as a person has īmān.
\(^3\) Rejection of the concept of pre-destination.
\(^4\) In principle, to give preference to one’s logic over the texts of Islam.
\(^5\) Ibn Taymiyyah: *Majmūʿ Fatāwā* 20/301.
\(^6\) Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī: *Sharḥ Uṣūl Iʿtiqād Ahl al-Sunnah li Lālikāʾī* 1/60. This statement applies to the early days of Islam. In this belated era, Arabs and non-Arabs are equally in need of scholars from the Ahl al-Sunnah, as innovations have become widespread among all nations.
this matter, explained the condition of the deviates and refuted their assumptions. Imām Aḥmad refuted the views of the irreligious ones and the Jahmiyyah. Imām Al-Bukhārī did the same to the Jahmiyyah.1 Imām Ibn Qutaybah refuted the views of the Jahmiyyah and the Mushabbiyah2 and al-Dārimī rejected the views of Bishr al-Murīsī and others.

It is indisputable that explaining the condition of those sects which have left the fold of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and have strayed away from the aḥādīth; is absolutely important. This removes confusion from the people and it clarifies the truth. It is a means of spreading the dīn of Allah and it serves as a proof against the deviant sects. Thus, destruction and salvation will take place after the establishment of proof. The truth will not seem obscure to anyone. The deviants misguide their followers purely on the basis of doubts and flimsy statements. This is why their followers are either irreligious or ignorant. Therefore, it is necessary to educate the ignorant and to expose the irreligious so that they are known and avoided.

Exposing the leaders of the innovators — who oppose the Qurʾān and Sunnah — is incumbent, according to the consensus of the Muslims. This is to the extent that when Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal was asked, “what is more pleasing to you: for a man to engage in optional ṣalāh, fasting and iʿtikāf, or for him to expose the innovators?”, he replied, “if he engages in optional ṣalāh, fasts and does iʿtikāf, then the benefit thereof will be confined to him. However, if he exposes the innovators, all the Muslims will benefit. Thus, it is better for him to expose the innovators.”

He explained that the benefit of this reaches the general Muslims, the same as fighting in the path of Allah. Cleansing the path of Allah, His dīn, His sharīʿah and repelling the rebellion and hatred of these people is indispensable. This is established from the unanimity of the Muslims regarding it. If Allah did not elect people to repel the evils of these people, then the dīn would have been totally corrupted. The harms of this would be worse than the harm of those enemies

1 The followers of Jahm ibn Safwān who held many deviant beliefs.
2 Anthropomorphists.
who conquer our lands. This is because when they conquer, their primary aim is not to corrupt the hearts and the dīn therein. As for these people, their primary effort is the corruption of the hearts.\footnote{Ibn Taymiyyah: Majmūʿat al-Rasā’il wa l-Masā’il 5/110.}

The enemies who have been waiting for the opportunity to attack Islam have found in these sects — which have opposed the majority — a great niche which they may utilise to stir up conflict among the Muslims. It is not far-fetched that today the enemy is trying to maximise from this problem in their effort to counter the signs of the Islamic awakening which is expanding in all areas of society, and to stall the progress thereof, as it is on the verge of destroying their roots. They have adopted from the reports of their advisors (who pay special attention to the history and beliefs of these sects) — a methodology which they wish to implement in their relations with Muslims and their countries. This reveals to us the reason why they nurture some of these groups and pave the path for them to acquire positions of leadership and authority.

There is no doubt that explaining the reality of these groups will narrow the chances of the enemy as far as maintaining and widening the areas of differences is concerned. This is because turning a blind eye to the leaders of these irreligious innovators and allowing them to continue their efforts in misguiding people, gaining more followers, deceiving the masses and claiming that their buffoonery is part of Islam; will only turn people away from the dīn of Allah and His sharīʿah. One of the reasons behind the increase of atheists is that many of them mistook the actions of these people to be Islam, and when they realised its stark contradiction to basic logic; they became completely antagonistic towards religion itself.

In this era, most of the groups who oppose the majority have become weak, lost their ambition and supporters and even withdrew. Thus, they pose no real threat to the Ahl al-Sunnah. The Shīʿah, however, are increasing daily in their attacks upon the Ahl al-Sunnah in the form of physical injury, criticism of their dīn and a concerted effort to spread their ideologies among them.
It is perhaps the sect of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah Shīʿah (Twelvers) who are making the most effort to misguide the masses, if they are not the only sect doing so. Their perpetual insolence and plots against the Ahl al-Sunnah is unmatched by any other sect. My experience with the problem of Shīʿism started when I was tasked with compiling a thesis for my masters on the subject, “the idea of bridging the gap between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah”. After completing my studies on the subject of ‘bridging the gap’, I wished to acquire a doctorate in the field of researching some of the classical books. Thus I submitted an application to research the first volume of the book, *al-Jawāb al-Ṣaḥīḥ li man Baddala Dīn al-Masīḥ* (The correct answer to those who have changed the religion of the Messiah) of Ibn Taymiyyah. However, professors from that faculty as well as others advised me to continue my studies regarding Shīʿism, as there was a greater need to do an academic study of it as an independent subject.

After further consultation and seeking guidance from Allah، I resolved to do an in-depth study of the fundamental doctrines of the Shīʿah. I made this decision despite knowing very well that the effort required for this subject surpasses the required effort of the former subject to a great extent. This is because I am now burdened with the study of an entire religion, not just the book of one person. I have singled out and selected the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah instead of all the other sects of the Shīʿah due to the following reasons:

1. They are the sect with the largest resources as far as books, institutions and legacy is concerned. This is to the extent that they name their beliefs, “the religion of the Imāmiyyah” and not just a “the madh-hab (codification of law) of the Imāmiyyah”. This is also because their religion is completely different to the religion of the rest of the ummah. It is sufficient for you to know that one of their ḥadīth sources from the Imāms comprises of one hundred and ten volumes, i.e. *Biḥār al-Anwār* of al-Majlisī (d. 1111 A.H)

---

1 *Al-Ītiqād* by Ibn Bābawayh is referred to as *Dīn al-Imāmiyyah*. Refer to *al-Fahrīst* of al-Ṭūsī pg. 189, Āghā Buzrug: *Al-Dhāriʿah* 2/226.
2. This sect leaves no stone unturned in its effort to spread its religion. They have propagators (who have no other duty in life besides this propagation) set up in almost every place. Their main aim is to propagate their beliefs among the Ahl al-Sunnah. I do not think that any other sect is equally passionate and serious about spreading their ideas. Today, they are exerting their energies in order to spread their religion in the Islamic world and strengthening their revolution. They are adopting many different avenues by which they wish to establish their leading country.

Due to the efforts of the Shīʿī pundits, many Muslim youth have left their religion and embraced Shīʿism. Whoever reads the book *The Epitome of Glory Regarding the History of Baṣrah and Najd* will be shocked, as he will learn that entire tribes were converted to Shīʿism. The embassies in the Shīʿī country of Iran have been turned into centres of propagation of their religion, especially among students and those making an effort for Islam in the Muslim world. They are more concerned about converting Muslims instead of non-Muslims.¹

There is no doubt that the responsibility of clarifying the reality for the Muslims is a great one, especially for those who have fallen prey to Shīʿism on account of their love for the Ahl al-Bayt and thought that this was the right path, the path of truth.

3. It is the largest Shīʿī sect in the world in this era. Most of the Shīʿī sects which were found throughout history have been incorporated into this sect. It presents, in its sources, a summary of the ideologies and views of the different Shīʿī groups which sprang up along the centuries. Thus, it has been said that when the word Shīʿah is used, it refers to them alone.

4. This group champions the call towards bridging the gap between the Shīʿah and the Ahl al-Sunnah. They set up centres, send propagators and

¹ The reason will be discussed later on in the book; one can also refer to *Fatāwā Ibn Taymiyyah* 28/478.
hold conferences through which they wish to spread the idea of ‘Islamic unity’.\(^1\)

5. This group sings a song about how close their religion is to the Ahl al-Sunnah and that they are falsely accused and oppressed. They go out of their way to defend their religion and publish many books and pamphlets calling towards it. They even study the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah with the sole intent of finding faults therein and refuting them. None of the above can be found to this extent in any other deviant sect.

6. Its excessive attacks upon the Ahl al-Sunnah, especially the Şaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and its criticism of the fundamental books of the Muslims. This is done on the tens of books which they publish annually. Similarly, they carry out harsh fanatical attacks against anyone who does a critical analysis of their books or their sect, using the excuse that these books widen the gap of disunity and impedes upon the efforts of Islamic unity. Due to this, many writers have held back their pens from writing against them.

7. The great difference of opinion between contemporary writers regarding them caught my attention. One group holds the opinion that they are kuffār and they have overstepped the boundaries of Islam, as stated in the books of Ustādh Muḥīb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, Iḥsān Ilāhī Žahīr, Ibrāhīm Jabhān\(^2\) and others. A second group assumes that the Shī‘ah are a moderate group, which did not get involved in extremism like the sects of the Bāṭiniyyah. This view can be found in the books of al-Nashshār, Sulaymān Dunyā, Muṣṭafā al-Shak‘ah\(^3\) and others. The third group is completely confused,

---

1 Refer to Fikrat al-Taqrīb Bayn Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Shī‘ah pg. 511.
2 Refer to Al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah by al-Khaṭīb, Al-Shī‘ah wa l-Sunnah by Žahīr and Tabdīd al-Ẓalām by Jabhān.
to the extent that they have queried from the Shi‘ī pundits regarding that which Iḥsān Ilāhī Ẓahīr and Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb have written regarding them.

The truth is often obscured as a result of these differences, or at least, it becomes obscured to many. Therefore, I have given due importance in this book to the noise made, especially by the contemporary Shi‘ah, in defence of their religion and in criticism of those who wrote about their religion from the Ahl al-Sunnah. Our predecessors have written regarding the Shi‘ah, who they have referred to as the Rawāfiḍ. These writings have had their effects. They include; the books Abū Nu‘aym, Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Maqdisī, Firoz’ābādī and all the other books which discusses sects and beliefs. However, these writings were penned before the spread and distribution of Shi‘ī books. Thus, only a few of them contain refutations of the writings of the Shi‘ah, and none of them discusses the sect in a comprehensive manner, covering all of their beliefs and ideologies.

Furthermore, the truth regarding the Shi‘ah — on account of their expertise in dissimulation — is often misunderstood. This is why we find, in a book such as The Commentary of Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, the opinion that they do not declare the Ṣaḥābah disbelievers and that their only mistake is that they do not grant superiority to Abū Bakr. We also find Ibn Taymiyyah, despite his careful study of Shi‘ism and his criticism thereof, mentioning, “reliable people have told me that some of them believe that pilgrimage to the Mash-hads (shrines) is greater in virtue than Ḥajj to the Ka‘bah,” whereas today, this is a well-known belief established by tens of narrations and many chapters in their essential books.

Similarly, the most important book of the Shi‘ah is Uṣūl al-Kāfī. Yet you will not find any mention of it by al-Ash‘arī, Ibn Ḥazm or Ibn Taymiyyah. This book is the main source of narrations from the Imāms and it is the foundation according to modern day Shi‘ah. This could be attributed to another factor, that this religion regularly

---

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/124.
undergoes a metamorphosis. It does not remain the same for two generations. Al-Mamaqānī, one of their greatest leaders in the present era states:

ان ما يعتبر غلوا عند الشيعة الماضين أصبح اليوم من ضرورات المذهب

That which was considered extremism by the previous Shīʿah is now considered fundamentals of the religion.¹

This constantly changing religion needs to be unmasked and portrayed for what it is in this era.

Another reason why this book is important is that most of the other books, which were written by the former scholars, are mere answers to Shīʿī allegations against the Ahl al-Sunnah on the basis of that which appears in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. These scholars then went on to point out the fact that those narrations were either fabricated, unauthentic or misconstrued by the Shīʿah. However, the Shīʿah do not have the slightest confidence in any of the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They simply raise these objections to achieve two goals:

Firstly, to occupy the Ahl al-Sunnah with these objections, so that they do not find the time to review their (Shīʿī) books, statements and narrators.

Secondly, to comfort the confused and doubtful among them by claiming that their (bizarre) views are agreed upon by the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Unfortunately (for them), the books of the Shīʿah are available today, like never before. Therefore, these books should be the basis of all studies and critiques, as every sect can only be held accountable for that in which they believe and affirm. As for the contemporary books of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding the Shīʿah, they are very few if compared to the amount that the Shīʿah have written regarding the Ahl al-Sunnah. They are definitely insufficient as far as dealing with the Shīʿah is concerned. Their religion stands upon hundreds of books which serve it, call

¹ Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl 3/23
towards it and presents its beliefs and ideologies. Studying these and analysing them would require great effort and lots of work.

I have noticed that these studies (done by the Ahl al-Sunnah) neglect some pertinent aspects of the study of Shīʿism, such as studying their beliefs regarding the basics of dīn, which I have tried to cover in the second chapter of this book. Similarly, they overlook the importance of knowing the views of contemporary Shīʿah, their motives, relationship with older sects and their classical books. I have discussed this in the fourth chapter of this book.

The subject is really vast and it has many aspects to it. It can only be solved by doing a new study which continues until nothing of the Shīʿah remains unknown. This is why I have chosen to tackle the subject academically, in a way that brings to light many new and important discoveries. Perhaps the following two stand out the most;

1. A study of the Shīʿah perspective on the basics of dīn. It is a discussion wherein most of the views are unknown. This is because they conceal it, and none of the Ahl al-Sunnah have delved into it. An entire chapter (chapter two) was dedicated to this in my book.

2. This book unveils certain beliefs which were not studied by anyone previously — to the best of my knowledge. These beliefs include; the Qurʾān is not a proof unless corroborated by the statement of the Imām, most of it was revealed regarding them and their enemies, the belief regarding the appearance of the al-Mahdī, ʿṬīnah and the claim that divine books were revealed upon the Imāms.\(^1\)

---

1 Al-Shaykh al-Tonsawī indicates in his book, ʿAqāʾid al-Shīʿah, to this belief in a very ambiguous manner. Thereafter, he quotes a narration from al-Kāfī which also does not explain the reality of this belief.

2 Researchers generally confuse this with the concept of Tahrīf (adulteration of the Qurʾān), which is also a view of many, if not all of the Ithnāʾ Ashariyyah.
I have also written regarding when the idea of Taḥrīf (adulteration of the Qur’ān) was first introduced into their religion, as well as the first book that was written to prove this lie. I have exposed this book and traced the date and time when it was written. Another fact that I have exposed is that Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah and his book Minhāj al-Sunnah played a great role in them changing their approach to ḥadīth and thereafter classifying them as ṣahīh (authentic), daʿīf (unauthentic) and muwaththaq (approved).

The matter of the existence of the al-Mahdī, upon whom the present day Shīʿah base their religion, has also been researched. Important testimonials from the very family of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, the Ahl al-Bayt and Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī himself were presented. These were taken directly from Shīʿī books. There are many other aspects of this nature, which the reader will come across in this book.

My methodology in this book is that I explain each matter to the extent that if the reader wishes to add on anything, then he will know where to find the appropriate material. This is because I have tried to suffice — as far as the discussed topics are concerned — upon indicating towards them or reproducing new texts, as I have done regarding their belief that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar were kāfir and in those texts which expose the extremism of the Shīʿah regarding it, which were quoted by al-Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allāh, Iḥsān Ilāhī Ẓahīr and others. I have tried to quote texts from the Shīʿah which refer to them in a subtle manner and thereafter I have quoted their explanations from the books of the Shīʿah.

As for the methodology which governed my approach towards tackling this subject and creating the opportunity for more to be added on, I have adopted it because the chapters of this discussion speak for themselves, and they are the most revealing as far as the subject is concerned. I deem it appropriate to indicate to a few aspects of this methodology. Firstly, I started of my journey by going directly to Shīʿī sources instead of referring to secondary sources. This guarantees that the discussion will not be based upon misunderstandings.

Secondly, I tried my utmost to stay within an objective framework, as required by a subject that is as closely related to beliefs as the one that I have researched.
True objectivity demands that one should be absolutely honest when quoting from their books, quote from the most reliable sources according to them, be just when making a decision and try ones best to find the narrations which are authenticated and often quoted in their own sources — as far as this is possible.

Along the course of my research, I have criticised those aspects, the falsehood of which deserved to be exposed and criticised. This does not go against objectivity. Rather, it is the duty of every Muslim to do so. It is unconditionally imperative to denounce in a befitting manner, expose the heinousness of the crime and the evilness of beliefs such as the belief that the Qur’ān has been tempered with, ‘Alī is the First, the Last, the Apparent and the Hidden and similar blasphemous beliefs. Choosing not to do so will be a great treachery and a disservice to the Muslim reader.

Thus, I have quoted their beliefs as per my methodology, but wherever I found that the subject required a lengthier critical study, I added on an extra discussion. However, I did not stick to this throughout the book, as certain subjects were such that the fallacious nature thereof was self-evident. It is for this reason that Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah stated that a proper presentation regarding any deviant is sufficient to prove their deviance. If the presentation is up to standard, there is no need for any other proof. The only reason why doubts have cropped up is because people do not understand the reality and intended meanings of their ambiguous statements which often have multiple meanings.¹

Thus, at times, I sufficed upon a good presentation of the reality of the statements and simply indicating to the falsity thereof, especially in the subsidiary matters. This is unlike my approach towards the greater issues such as the issues of Naṣṣ, the Ṣaḥābah, etc., where I have added a critique to each one of them in the light of the Qur’ān, Sunnah sayings of their Imāms, obvious matters and matters which are agreed upon.

¹ Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 2/138 (compiled by al-Shaykh Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Qāsim).
In engaging them I will employ the method of internal textual criticism, by comparing their various narrations and thereafter pointing out the contradictions and differences between them as much as possible. The other angle from which I dealt with their arguments was that I criticised them in the light of their very own logic, principles and narrations. This in no way means that I agree with them upon those principles to any extent. It was only for arguments sake that I used those narrations, as they go a long way in exposing the reality of the Shi‘ī religion. It exposes the degree of their non-compliance to their own principles and how they pick and choose (without any valid reason) between their narrations.

The ‘reliable’ books of the Shi‘ah were the primary sources for the quotations regarding their beliefs. However, I did not overlook the other sources in most cases. The reason being that it will be beneficial for the reader to have both in front of him so that he can compare the two, realise the degree to which the older scholars were conversant with Shi‘ism and he can also see the enormous changes that kept on taking place in their religion along the centuries.

Other services that I have rendered in this book are; I have traced all the aḥādīth and statements of the predecessors in this discussion back to their sources, presented a brief overview regarding the groups and sects mentioned, explained the technical terminology, wrote basic biographies regarding those who introduced some of the Shi‘ī beliefs and I explained whatever else I thought needs explanation. I chose not to introduce the reader to every single influential personality who appears herein, as this will preoccupy the reader from the actual subject, and this can easily be found in the books of history and biographies. Rather, I presented a summary regarding all the sects and groups who have been mentioned as this is more relevant to the subject matter.

My study demanded that I overcome a few difficulties:

1. The narrations of the Shi‘ah do not have an index, nor is it systematic like that of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Due to this, I had to read through a lot of the narrations, to the extent that I read all the volumes of Al-Biḥār. I would
read every narration in certain chapters. I also read *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* and I paged through *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah*. In each chapter, the narrations that I needed were in the hundreds, which made my task difficult as I could not write anything until I read all those narrations. Further, I had to continuously refer to the commentaries of al-Kāfī such as *Sharḥ al-Jāmi‘* of al-Māzindarānī to understand the interpretation of their scholars.

2. In search of Shī‘ī books, I travelled to Egypt, Iraq, Bahrain, Kuwait and Pakistan. As a result, I found many important sources, which were beneficial and thus added to the chapters and sections of this book.

3. The lengthy period of time that was covered in this discussion, i.e. from the inception of Shī‘ism until today. I had in front of me tens of Shī‘ī books from many different eras. Hence I spent a great amount of time looking them up and figuring out the development of Shī‘ī doctrine along the centuries.

The Sources of My Book

I have relied in my study, upon the books which they consider reliable from the books of Tafsīr, Ḥadīth, *Rijāl* (biographies), ‘Aqā‘id, *Firaq* (sects) and *Uṣūl* (principles).

From the books of Tafsīr, I referred to:

1. *Tafsīr* (‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm) *al-Qummī*, which is referred to as the mother of all Tafsīrs by them.¹ The narrations thereof have been authenticated by the one who they label al-Imām al-Akbar in this era, i.e. Abū al-Qāsim al-Khū‘ī. He says:

> ولذا نحكم بوثاقة جمیع مشایخ على بن ابراهیم القمی الذى روى عنهم فى تفسیره مع انتهاء السند الى واحد المعصومین

---

¹ Preface of *Tafsīr al-Qummī* pg. 10.
This is why we pass the judgement regarding all the teachers of ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, from whom he narrates that they are reliable as long as the isnād reaches one of the infallibles.¹

Al-Qummī is considered an authority in the field of ḥadīth by them. They believe that he was consistent and reliable² and he was a contemporary of Imām al-ʿAskarī. He died in the year 307 A.H.³

2. *Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī*, which was described by a contemporary scholar of theirs (Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ṭabaṭabāʿī) as:

The best classical book regarding the subject and the most reliable of all of that which we have inherited from our former scholars on the subject of Tafsīr by means of the narrations. The scholars of the field have accepted it for the past thousand years without mentioning any criticism or turning away from anything therein.⁴

3. *Tafsīr Furāt* of Furāt ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Furāt al-Kūfī — who was one of their scholars in the latter part of the third century and the beginning of the fourth century.⁵ Their scholar, al-Majlisī has authenticated it saying:

The narrations of *Tafsīr Furāt* conform to that which has reached us from the reliable aḥādīth.⁶

---

² Rijāl al-Najāshī pg. 197.
³ *Al-Dharīʿah* 4/302, Preface of *Tafsīr al-Qummī* pg. 8.
⁵ Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī: *Nawābigh al-Ruwāt* pg. 216.
⁶ Biḥār al-Anwār 1/37. Refer to the preface of *Tafsīr al-Furāt* by Muḥammad ʿAlī al-Awrdabādī, in which it is stated that this book is among their reliable sources, according to both, the former and latter day scholars.
The above mentioned are the most important classical tafsīrs that exist among them today.¹ I have referred to them with regards to their belief concerning the Qur‘ān among others. I did not only suffice with accurately quoting from them but also added the writings of their latter day reliable scholars such as:

1. *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* by their scholar, Muḥammad Muḥṣin, commonly known as al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī. He is also described as “the erudite scholar, the researcher, the one who delves into fine matters, the highly appreciated and the glorious one.”²

2. *Al-Burhān fī Tafsīr al-Qur‘ān* by Hāshim ibn Sulaymān al-Baḥrānī (d. 1107 or 1109 A.H.). He is described by them as “the erudite scholar, the reliable and consistent one, the knowledgeable Muḥaddith and the fully conversant critic.”³

3. *Mir’āt al-Anwār wa Mishkāt al-Asrār* or *Muqaddimat al-Burhān* by their scholar Abū al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-ʿĀmilī al-Fatūnī, the student of al-Majlisī — the author of *Al-Biḥār* (d. 1140 A.H). The author of *Lu’lu’at al-Baḥrayn* says that he was a researcher and he was one who would delve into fine matters.⁴ The author of *Rowdāt al-Jannāt* says:

من أعظم فقهائنا المتاخرین

He was from the greatest jurists of the latter day scholars.⁵

---

¹ As opposed to *Tafsīr al-Tibyān* of al-Ṭūsī and *Majmaʿ al-Bayān* of al-Ṭabarṣī, regarding which some of their scholars have said that they were written in accordance to the practice of dissimulation, as will be explained.

² Al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt* 2/42.


⁴ Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī: *Lu’lu’at al-Baḥrān* pg. 107.

⁵ Al-Khuwānsārī: *Rawdāt al-Jannāt* pg. 658 second print, al-Zarandī: *Tarjumat al-Mu’allif* (printed along with *Mir’āt al-Anwār*).
Their scholar, al-Nūrī refers to him as al-Ḥujjah (the proof), and he says regarding his book:

The like of it has not been authored.¹

The author of Al-Dharī’ah² states the same.

There were other books of Tafsīr of theirs that I have referred to and I mentioned them after mentioning the ones that I have referred to and I confirmed them from Shiī books. All the former scholars have held the view that the Qur’ān had been adulterated. There can be no doubt that a person who holds a belief like this cannot ever be from the Muslims, yet you will see the quotations wherein they have praised these scholars of theirs.

From their books of Ḥadīth (which are their narrations from the Imāms), I have referred to their seminal works. They are:

1. The four classical books; al-Kāfī, Al-Tahdhīb, Al-Istibṣār and Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh. Their contemporary scholar, Muḥammad Ṣādiq al-Ṣadr says:

ان الشیعه...مجمعة على اعتبار الكتب الربعة و قائلة بصحة کل ما فیها من روایات

The Shī‘ah... are unanimous upon accepting the four books and believing that all the narrations therein are authentic.³

2. The four later books; Al-Wāfī, Bihār al-Anwār, al-Wasā’il and Mustadrak al-Wasā’il. Thus, there seminal books are eight in total. A contemporary Shī‘ī scholar, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥā’irī states:

و اما صحاح الامامیة فهى ثمانیة اربعة منها للمحمدین الثلاثة الوائل و ثلاثة بعدها للمحمدین الثلاثة الاواخر و ثامنها للمحمد حسین المرحوم النورى

¹ Mustadrak al-Wasā’il 3/385.
² Aghā Buzurg: Al-Dharī’ah 20/264.
³ Al-Shī‘ah pg. 127.
As for the authentic books of the Shi‘ah, they are eight. Four of them were written by the first three Muḥammads, four were written by the last three Muḥammads and the last one was written by Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Marḥūm al-Nūrī — the contemporary.¹

I have discussed these sources under the chapter “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah”. The two books which I referred to most from these eight were Uṣūl al-Kāfī and Biḥār al-Anwār. The reason behind that was that particular attention was paid towards beliefs in these books. Also, the Shī‘ah attach a greater importance to these two books. Al-Ṣadr comments regarding al-Kāfī:

It (al-Kāfī) is regarded by the Shī‘ah as the most authentic of the four books.² It contains a total of 16199 narrations. If the author of al-Kāfī did not take the responsibility of gathering the narrations from the Imāms in his book, only a minute amount would have remained.

He adds, 'It has been reported that al-Kāfī was presented to the Mahdī who remarked:

کاف لشیعتنا

It is Kāfī (sufficient) for our sect.³

These are the statement of al-Ṣadr, which he attributes to all the Shī‘ah in general. This is why Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb says, “the Shī‘ah grant the same position to al-Kāfī that the Muslims grant to Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī.”⁴ However, this statement of al-Khaṭīb is a bit inaccurate, as their reliance

---

¹ Minhāj ’Amāli lī l-Taqrīb (An essay by the Rāfiḍī Muḥammad al-Ḥā’irī which is part of the book al-Waḥdat al-Islāmiyyah pg. 233).
² Al-Shī‘ah pg. 133.
⁴ Al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah pg. 25.
upon *al-Kāfī* is far greater than this extreme. This is apparent from their statement that *al-Kāfī* was written when they had direct contact with their *al-Mahdī* and it was presented to one of those who they consider infallible. This is equivalent to the Ahl al-Sunnah saying that Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī was presented to Rasūlullāh ﷺ... The Imām, according to them, holds the same position as a Nabī. They say:

The sources of al-Kulaynī’s knowledge were definitely reliable. This is because the doors of knowledge and ascertaining the credibility of those books<sup>1</sup> were open for him through the means of the ambassadors of al-Qāʾim<sup>2</sup>, as they were in the same city as him, i.e. Baghdad.<sup>3</sup>

With regards to *Al-Biḥār*, they have glorified it, as will appear in this book. They have even said:

المراجع الوحيد لتحقيق معارف المذهب

It is the only source for researching the deep aspects of the madh-hab.<sup>4</sup>

3. I have even referred to the books of those scholars who they consider reliable. They regard these books to be just as reliable as the four books. Some of them are:

I. The book of *Sulaym ibn Qays*. This is the first Shīʿī book that surfaced,

---

1 Which were gathered, in *al-Kāfī*.
2 Their awaited Mahdī. His ambassadors were his four doors, as will be explained under the chapter of ghaybah (occultation).
4 Al-Bahbūdī: *Muqaddimat Al-Biḥār* pg. 19.
as stated by Ibn al-Nadīm.\textsuperscript{1} It is from their reliable and fundamental books.\textsuperscript{2} We had an encounter with this book and its author in the discussion regarding the belief that the Qur’ān was adulterated.\textsuperscript{3}

II. The books of their scholar, Abū Ja’far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381 A.H.), such as \textit{al-Towḥīd}, \textit{Thawāb al-A’māl}, \textit{‘Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā}, \textit{Ma’ānī al-Akhbār}, \textit{al-Amālī} and others. All of his books are “no less famous than the four books upon which the foundation lays in these times.”\textsuperscript{4} There are only five books that are excluded from this, i.e. I did not refer to them.\textsuperscript{5}

III. The books of Shaykh al-Ṭā’ifah, Abū Ja’far Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 A.H.). They are just as famous and reliable as the books of Ibn Bābawayh, with the exception of one.\textsuperscript{6}

I have also referred to other books of their scholars including all of those which were authenticated by al-Majlisī in the first volume of his \textit{Biḥār}.\textsuperscript{7} I have indicated towards some of their authentications of these books during the course of the discussion. The authentications of the books from which I only quote once are mentioned along with the quotations therefrom.

From their reliable books of ‘Aqā’id, I have referred to the following:

1. \textit{I’tiqādāt Ibn Bābawayh}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Refer to al-Fahrist pg. 219, \textit{Al-Dharī‘ah} 2/152, Rawdāt al-Jannāt 4/67 claims that “it was the first book to be authored and compiled in Islam.”
\item \textsuperscript{2} \textit{Biḥār al-Anwār} 1/32.
\item \textsuperscript{3} Refer to pg. 221.
\item \textsuperscript{4} \textit{Biḥār al-Anwār} 1/26.
\item \textsuperscript{5} They are \textit{al-Hidāyah}, \textit{Ṣifāt al-Shī‘ah}, \textit{Faḍā‘īl al-Shī‘ah}, \textit{Muṣādafat al-Ikhwān}, \textit{Faḍā‘īl al-Ash-hur} and \textit{Biḥār al-Anwār} 1/26.
\item \textsuperscript{6} \textit{al-Amālī} (refer to \textit{Biḥār al-Anwār} 1/27).
\item \textsuperscript{7} Pg. 29
\end{itemize}
2. *Awā’il al-Maqālāt* of al-Mufīd and *Taṣḥīḥ Al-Iʿtiqād* by him as well.

3. *Nahj al-Mustarshidīn* by Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī

4. *Al-Iʿtiqādāt* by al-Majlisī (author of *Al-Biḥār*)

5. ‘*Aqāʿid al-Imāmiyyah* by al-Muẓaffar (a contemporary)

6. ‘*Aqāʿid al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah* by al-Zanjānī (a contemporary) as well as others.

As for those beliefs which are confined to them, I have referred to, in addition to the above mentioned, that which were written specifically regarding these beliefs. As an example, on the topic of Ghaybah, I referred to *Kitāb al-Ghaybah* by their scholar Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Nuʿmānī—who is one of their scholars from the third century. Al-Majlisī, before quoting al-Mufīd’s praise for this book, comments:

وكتاب النعمانى من اجل الكتب

The book of al-Nuʿmānī is one of the most outstanding books.

Added to that, I referred to the *Kitāb al-Ghaybah* of al-Ṭūsī and *Ikmāl al-Dīn* by Ibn Bābawayh among others. Regarding their belief of Rajʿah, I referred to that which was written by their scholar, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī. His book is named *al-Īqāẓ min al-Hajʿah bi l-Burhān ʿalā al-Rajʿah*. Similar is the case of the other beliefs.

I have also referred to that which some of their scholars have written regarding groups and sects, namely *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* by their scholar Saʿd ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Asḥarī al-Qummī (d. 301 A.H.) and *Firaq al-Shīʿah* by their scholar Ḥasan ibn Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī— one of their third century scholars.

و هما كتابان وصلا الينا من بين كتب فرق الشيعة الضائعة

---

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/31.
They are the two books which have reached us from the books of the Shīʿah that were lost.¹

As from the books on Rijāl, I referred to their reliable sources on the subject, especially their four books. They have said:

Maʿrifat al-Nāqilīn ʿAn al-Aʿimmat al-Ṣādiqīn by Abū ʿAmr Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Kashshī (one of their scholars from the fourth century) which is also known as Rijāl al-Kashshī.

Kitāb al-Rijāl by Abū al-ʿAbbās Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī al-Najāshī (d. 460) which commonly known as Rijāl al-Najāshī.


Kitāb al-Fahrist by Shaykh al-Ṭūsī.²

The following four books are the most important books which were authored regarding this subject from the books of the former scholars. They are the decisive sources of this subject.

1. Maʿrifat al-Nāqilīn ʿAn al-Aʿimmat al-Ṣādiqīn by Abū ʿAmr Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Kashshī (one of their scholars from the fourth century) which is also known as Rijāl al-Kashshī.
4. Kitāb al-Fahrist by Shaykh al-Ṭūsī.²

¹ Muḥammad Jawwād Mashkūr, preface of the book al-Maqālāt wa l-Fīraq by al-Qummī pg. 11.
The book which I quoted most extensively from was *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, as they regard it to be the most important, oldest and most reliable book on the subject of Rijāl. This is because it is a book of al-Kashshī, who is, according to them “reliable, well-versed with narrations and narrators and he has perfect beliefs.”¹ The next book which I quoted from abundantly was the systemised and summarised book of Shaykh al-Ṭā’īfah al-Ṭūsī. One of their scholars, al-Mustafawī states:

اقدم هذه الكتب: هو رجال الكشى الذى لخصه شیخ الطائفة...فکفى لهذا الكتاب المنیف شرفًا و اعتبارًا

The oldest of these books is *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, which was summarised by Shaykh al-Ṭā‘īfah... this is sufficient an honour and a seal of reliability for this outstanding book.²

In a nutshell, I quoted no other sources besides their most reliable books in my depiction of the religion. Added to that, I only mentioned those beliefs of theirs regarding which they are excessive narrations and their priests have admitted to believing in them. At times, there are plenty of narrations, thus I merely indicate towards that by mentioning the amount thereof and the names of the chapters of those subjects which I discuss. The narrations quoted are accompanied by that which I could find from their authentications and judgements regarding them, on the basis of their authentication system.

Great pains were undertaken to maintain the above mentioned procedures. Hence it cannot be said that we have used some of their rare and weak narrations which are not a true representation of the religion. In most cases, I have made it a point to reproduce their quotations verbatim, as per demands of objectivity and precision in quoting and attribution of quotations. This is also required by the academic methodology, especially as far as the speech of the opposition is concerned.

¹ *Fahrist al-Ṭūsī* pg. 171-172.
Outline of the Discussion

This discussion comprises of an introduction which is followed by five sections.

The introduction includes an explanation of Shīʿism, its inception, historical stems, sects, the different titles of the Shīʿah and the sects thereof.

Section One: This deals with their beliefs regarding the sources of Islam. It is made up of three chapters:

- **Chapter One** — Their beliefs regarding the Qur’ān.
- **Chapter Two** — Their beliefs regarding the Sunnah.
- **Chapter Three** — Their beliefs regarding Ijmāʿ.

Section Two: Four chapters were dedicated to their beliefs regarding the fundamentals of Islam.

- **Chapter One** — Their beliefs regarding their deity.
- **Chapter Two** — Their beliefs regarding their master.
- **Chapter Three** — Their beliefs regarding the names and attributes of Allah.
- **Chapter Four** — Their beliefs regarding Īmān and its components.

Section Three: In this section, their fundamental beliefs and principles which are confined to them have been discussed. The following beliefs of theirs have been covered:

1. **Imāmah** — Their views regarding the Ṣaḥābah, Ahl al-Bayt, Muslim rulers, judges, scholars, Islamic cities and their branches, sects and the ummah have also been touched upon in this chapter.
2. **ʿIṣmah** (infallibility)
3. **Taqiyyah** (dissimulation)
Section Four: Present day Shīʿahs and their association with their predecessors. This section has four chapters:

Chapter One — Their relationship with their classical sources.
Chapter Two — Their relationship with their older sects.
Chapter Three — The relationship between former and latter day Shīʿah as far as beliefs are concerned.
Chapter Four — The state of the Ayatollahs.

Section Five: The judgement regarding them and their effects upon the Islamic world. This section has two chapters:

Chapter One — The judgement regarding them.
Chapter Two — Their effects upon the Islamic world.

Conclusion: A presentation of the most important conclusions that were reached along the course of the discussion.

At the end of this preface, I supplicate to Allah the most high, the one who has complete control to forgive my scholar and teacher Dr Muḥammad Rāshid Sālim and shower him with mercy and happiness. May He engulf him in His infinite clemency and forgiveness and may He grant him residence in His vast gardens of heaven, as he oversaw this book from its very beginning until it was completed. He then granted me permission to print it, but left the world before it saw the light of day, may Allah’s unlimited mercy be upon him. I benefitted greatly from
his directives and knowledge, as he was generous towards me with his virtue and character.

His life was spent in the paths of knowledge and jihād and he was even imprisoned on two occasions. He left behind highly beneficial efforts. It was his heart’s desire to establish, along with his students of the faculty, what he would call “The Ahl al-Sunnah” library, which would publish the classical books of ‘Aqīdah of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and it would refute the beliefs of those who have opposed the majority. I ask Allah to reward him for his intentions and actions a beautiful reward, and may He allow his students to bring to reality his dreams, so that they can continue on the path, following his footsteps.

I also wish to thank and acknowledge the favours of my teacher Dr Sālim ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Dakhīl, who agreed to oversee the completion of the book, reviewed its different stages, checked on its final steps and expressed satisfaction regarding its set-up. His suggestions and instructions were indeed helpful.

I ask Allah to grant the best of rewards to all those who helped me in any way in compiling this book. May Allah send mercy and salutations upon our Nabī Muḥammad and all of his companions and family.

And all praise belongs to Allah.
Expounding upon:

1. A linguistic study of the word ‘Shī‘ah’.
2. The word ‘Shī‘ah’ in the Qur‘ān and its meanings.
3. The word ‘Shī‘ah’ in the Sunnah and its meanings.
5. The word ‘Shī‘ah’ in the light of history.
7. The definition of ‘Shī‘ah’ in the books of the Ismā‘īlis.
8. The definition of ‘Shī‘ah’ from other sources.
9. The preferred definition of the word ‘Shī‘ah’.
10. Inception of the Shī‘ah.

Definition of the Word ‘Shī‘ah’

The Linguistic Definition:

Ibn Durayd (d. 321 A.H.) says:

A certain person is from the Shī‘ah of another person, i.e. he subscribes to his views. You have done tashyī‘ (a tense of the word Shī‘ah) of a person regarding a matter, when you have helped him to do it, and you have done mushāya‘ah (another tense) of a man regarding a matter when you have joined him in doing it.¹

¹ Ibn Durayd: Jamharāt al-Lughah 3/63
Al-Azharī (d. 370 A.H.) says:

Shīʿah are the helpers of a man and his followers. Any group of people who unite regarding a certain matter are called Shīʿah. Groups of Shīʿah are called Shiyaʿ and Ashyāʿ. As for the Shīʿah, they are a people who display love for the family of Nabī Muḥammad ﷺ and support them.

You have done tashyīʿ of the fire when you place in it that which causes it to flare up. It is said, “I have done tashyīʿ of a certain person,” i.e. I went out with him to bid him farewell. It is also said, “we did tashyīʿ of the month of Ramaḍān with six (fasts) of Shawāl,” i.e. we followed it up with six fasts. The Arabs say, “I will come to you tomorrow or it’s Shayʿ (the day after tomorrow).” Shiyaʿ are sects who follow one-another but all of them are not the same.¹

Al-Jowharī (d. 400 A.H.) says:

A man has become a Shīʿah, i.e. he claimed that which the Shīʿah claim. All people who agree upon a matter and some of them follow the views of the others are shiyaʿ. Dhū al-Rimmah said, “the riders made up a story regarding their Ashyāʿ” (i.e. regarding their companions).”

Ibn Manẓūr (d. 711 A.H.) says:

Shīʿah are the followers and supporters of a person. The plural form of the word is Shiyaʿ and the grand plural is Ashyāʿ. The original meaning of the word Shīʿah is: a group of people. It is used for a single person, two people, as well as a group of people — male or female. All of the above is expressed with one word and it has the same meaning in each case. This word is now mostly used for those who support ‘Alī and his household, to

¹ Al-Azharī: Tahdhīb al-Lughah 3/61
² Dīwān Dhī l-Rimmah pg. 4
³ Al-Ṣiḥāḥ 3/1240, researched by Aḥmad ‘Abd al-Ghafūr ‘Aṭār
the extent that it has become synonymous with them. Hence, when it is said, “he is from the Shī‘ah,” it is immediately realised that he subscribes to their views. Similarly, when it is said, “this is according to the Shī‘ah madh-hab,” it is understood that this is their view. The origin of that is from mushāya‘ah which means following and complying.

The Shī‘ah are a group of people who follow the views of others. It is said, “Tashāya‘a, the people have become Shī‘ah,” when they split into groups. It is also said, “the man has become a Shī‘ī,” when he makes the same claims as the Shī‘ah. Shāya‘a, Shiyā and Shayya‘a mean that he followed him. When it is said that he did Shiyyā‘ of the next person upon that, it means that he strengthened him.¹

Al-Zabīdī (d. 1205) says:

Whoever helps a person and becomes part of his group is his Shī‘ah. The origin of Shī‘ah is from Mushāya‘ah which means to follow. It is said that the middle letter of Shī‘ah is a “و,” and from the word Shawwa‘a (he gathered) his people. This word is now mostly used to refer to those who support ‘Alī and his household... they are a nation whose numbers cannot be guessed and they are innovators. The extremists among them are the Imāmiyyah Muntaẓiriyyah. They curse Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. The extremists among them even go as far as declaring them disbelievers. Some of them are heretics.²

Thus, the words: Shī‘ah, Tashayyu‘ and Mushāya‘ah, as far as the literal meaning is concerned, centre around meanings such as following, helping, agreeing with, uniting upon a matter or gathering upon it. Thereafter, as stated by the authors of al-Lisān, Al-Qāmūs and Tāj al-ʿArūs, they were mostly used to refer to those who supported ‘Alī and his household. This usage needs to be reviewed. This is

¹ Lisān al-ʿArab
because, if a person reflects upon the literal meaning of the word Shīʿah, which implies following and helping, and thereafter he casts a glance at majority of the sects upon whom this word is used, it will become clear to him that this usage is linguistically incorrect.

None of these groups follow the Ahl al-Bayt. The reality is that they oppose their ways and they have chosen a path that has nothing to do with the Ahl al-Bayt. Perhaps, this is what was perceived by Sharīk ibn ʿAbd Allāh when he was asked, “who was more virtuous, Abū Bakr or ʿAlī?” He replied, “Abū Bakr.” The questioner surprisingly retorted, “is this what you say, whereas you are a Shīʿī?” He replied, “yes, whoever says otherwise is not a Shīʿī. By the oath of Allah, ʿAlī ascended these steps and then announced, ‘listen well! Indeed the best of this ummah after its Nabī is Abū Bakr and thereafter ʿUmar!’ Thus, how can we reject his statement and belie him? By the oath of Allah, he was not a liar!”

Imām Sharīk understood that all those who do not follow ʿAlī do not deserve to be called Shīʿah, as the original meaning and reality of the word Shīʿah is to follow. This is why many scholars preferred calling them “Rāfiḍah”. The real followers of the Ahl al-Bayt as well as those who were referred to as Shīʿah were also forced to discard this name as it had become synonymous with the innovators who opposed the Ahl al-Bayt. This is pointed out by the author of Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, who says:

---

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/7-8, researched by Dr Muḥammad Rashād Sālim. Refer to ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-Hamdānī: Tathbīt Dalāʾīl al-Nabuwwah 1/63.

Ibn Taymiyyah says: “It has been narrated in eighty different ways from ʿAlī that he announced on the mimbar of Kūfah, ‘the best of this ummah after its Nabī is Abū Bakr and then ʿUmar.’ Al-Bukhārī and others have narrated it.” Refer to Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/137. The same has been recorded in the books of the Shīʿah. Refer to Talkhīṣ al-Shāfī (2/428, as quoted by Iḥsān Ilāhī Zahīr in al-Shīʿah wa Ahl al-Bayt pg. 52).

2 As an example refer to al-Milṭī: Al-Tanbih wa l-Radd pg. 18, al-Baghdādī: Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq pg.21 al-Isfarāyīnī: al-Tabṣīr fil-Dīn pg. 16, Al-Sakā: al-Burhān pg. 36, al-Farmānī: Risālat fi Bayān Madhāhib Baʿḍ al-Firaq al-Ḍallah paper number two (from the manuscript), Abū al-Ḥasan al-ʿIrāqī: Dhikr al-Firaq al-Ḍowāl paper number 12 (from the manuscript).
The former Shīʿah discarded the name Shīʿah when it became the title of the Rawāfiḍ and Ismaʿīlī. They began calling themselves the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamāʿah.¹

The Word ‘Shīʿah’ in the Qur’ān and its Meaning

The root letters of “شِیَعَ” appear twelve times in the Qur’ān.² Imām Ibn al-Jowzī³ summarised their meanings in the following words:

The Exegetes have mentioned that the word “شِیَعَ” appears with four different meanings in the Qur’ān. One meaning is sects. This is as in the verses

اِنَّ الَّذِیْنَ فَرَّقُوْا دِیْنَهُمْ وَکَانُوْا شِیَعًا

Indeed, those who have divided their religion and become sects.⁴

وَلَقَدْ اَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ قَبْلِكَ فِیْ شِیَعِ الَْوَّلِیْنَ

And We had certainly sent [messengers] before you, [O Muḥammad], among the sects of the former peoples.⁵

جَعَلَ اَهْلَهَا شِیَعًا

Made its people into factions,⁶

¹ Ṭuhfah Iḥnā ʿAshariyyah pg. 25-26 (of the manuscript)
² Refer to Al-Muʿjam al-Mufahras li-Alfāẓ al-Qur’ān pg. 18
⁴ Sūrah al-Anʿām: 159
⁵ Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 10
[Or] of those who have divided their religion and become sects,¹

The second meaning which is implied by its usage is family and lineage. This meaning is implied in the following verse:

... one from his faction and one from among his enemy.²

The third meaning for which this word is used in the Qur’ān is “the people of a religion”. This meaning is implied in the following verses:

Then We will surely extract from every sect those of them who were worst against the Most Merciful in insolence.³

And We have already destroyed your kinds, so is there any who will remember?⁴

As was done with their kind before.⁵

---

¹ Sūrah al-Rūm: 32
³ Sūrah Maryam: 69
⁴ Sūrah al-Qamar: 51
⁵ Sūrah al-Saba: 54
And indeed, among his kind was Ibrahīm.\(^1\)

Forthrightly, this word is used to express the meaning “different desires”. This is the case in the verse:

\[\text{یَلْبِسَكُمْ شِیَعًا}\]

or to confuse you (so you become) sects...\(^2\)

Ibn al-Qayyim\(^4\) highlights, in an important passage that he wrote, that the word Shīʿah and Ashyāʿ are mostly used negatively. Even in the Qur’ān, it is used mostly in a negative sense. This is evident from the verses:

\[\text{ثُمَّ لَنَنْزِعَنَّ مِنْ کُلِّ شِیْعَةٍ اَیُّهُمْ اَشَدُّ عَلٰی الرَّحْمٰنِ عِتِیًّا}\]

Then We will surely extract from every sect those of them who were worst against the Most Merciful in insolence.\(^5\)

---

1 Sūrah al-Ṣāffāt: 83
2 Sūrah al-Anʿām: 65
3 Ibn al-Jowzī: *Nuzhat al-Aʿyun al-Nawāẓir* pg. 376-377. Al-Dāmaghānī added a fifth meaning, i.e. to spread something. He backed this by citing the verse, “indeed, those who like that immorality should be spread [or publicised] among those who have believed...” (Sūrah al-Nūr: 19) Similarly, Ibn al-Jowzī explained one meaning of the word to be family and lineage, which he stated is implied in the following verse:

\[\text{هَٰذَا مِنْ عَدُوِّهُ وَ هٰذَا مِنْ شِیْعَتِهُ}\]

...one from his faction and one from among his enemy.

However, al-Dāmaghānī added another meaning to the word, i.e. army, and he cited this same verse as proof. The remainder of the meanings have been agreed upon by both scholars. Refer to al-Dāmaghānī: *Qāmūs al-Qur’ān* pg. 271, researched by Ṭābī al-ʿAzīz al-Ahl

5 Sūrah Maryam: 69
Indeed, those who have divided their religion and become sects.¹

And prevention will be placed between them and what they desire, as was done with their kind before.²

He then explains the reason:

That is because, and Allah knows best, the word Shīʿah implies being spread out and separated, which is the opposite of co-operation and unity. This is also the reason why this word is only used for deviant sects, viz. they differ and separate from the truth.³

These are the uses of the word Shīʿah in the Qur’ān along with their meanings. They do not imply, in any way, the famous understanding of the word Shīʿah. This is quite obvious to the one who reads these verses. Despite this, we were amazed to find that some Shīʿah attempt to hijack the word on some occasions to refer to their deviant group, thus interpreting the Book of Allah against its meaning. They force upon the Qur’ān meanings that are not accommodated by the Qur’ān, in an effort to distort the Qur’ān. This is the result of their disbelief in the Qur’ān.

The following is reported in their hadīth books, under the explanation of the verse:

---

1 Sūrah al-Anʿām: 159
2 Sūrah al-Sabaʾ: 54
3 Badāʿīʿ al-Fawāʿid 1/155. This refers to most cases, not all. This is important to note as it positively mentioned in the verse, “And indeed, among his kind was Abraham.”
And indeed, among his kind was Abraham.¹

Indeed Ibrāhīm was from the Shīʿah of ʿAlī.²

This explanation contradicts the context of this verse of the Qurʾān and the fundamentals of Islam. It is a concoction of the extremist Rawāfiḍ, who grant superiority to their Imāms over the ambiyā’.³ This ludicrous explanation, or rather distortion, demotes the greatest of ambiyā’ after Nabī ʿalayhis salām into a follower of ‘Alī ʿaṣma sayyidina. Islamically, the invalidity of this claim is obvious. However, it is also proven baseless by common sense as well as history. It was concocted by one who failed miserably at his job (of concoction).

The Ahl al-Sunnah have explained this verse to mean that Ibrāhīm was from the group of Nūḥ ʿalayhis salām and upon the same path as him⁴, as narrated from the pious predecessors. This explanation conforms to the context of the verse⁵, as the verses prior to this verse were all in reference to Nūḥ ʿalayhis salām. A noteworthy fact is that one Shīʿī opted for the explanation of the Ahl al-Sunnah, discarding the drivel puked out by his people.⁶

---

¹ Sūrah al-Ṣāffāt: 83
⁵ There exists a defective opinion, which is attributed to al-Farrā, which states that Ibrāhīm was from the group of Muḥammad. Al-Showkānī comments, “the extent to which this opposes the context and the degree of its inaccuracy is self-evident.” (Fatḥ al-Qadīr 4/401). Al-Alūsī says, “al-Farrā was of the opinion that ‘his group’ in the verse referred to our Nabī, Muḥammad ʿṣma sayyidina. However, the accurate meaning is that which we have pointed out (viz. it refers to Nūḥ ʿalayhis salām). This view has been narrated from Ibn ʿAbbās, Mujāhid, Qatādah and Suddī. It is against the norm to say that a person from the former times belongs to the group of someone from the later eras. (Rūḥ al-Maʿānī 23/99-100)
⁶ Al-Ṭabarsī: Majmaʿ al-Bayān 5/67
The Word Shīʿah in the Sunnah and the Meanings Implied

The word Shīʿah appears in the Sunnah. The meaning which is implied therein is followers. This is with reference to the ḥadīth reported by Imām Aḥmad regarding the man¹ who said to Nabī ﷺ, “I believe that you were unjust!” Nabī ﷺ said regarding him,

سيكون له شيعة يعمقون في الدين حتى يخرجوا منه...

He will have followers who will delve so deep into matters of dīn that they will (get irritated thereby and) leave the dīn...²

The same meaning is implied in the ḥadīth reported by Abū Dāwūd regarding those who do not believe in the concept of pre-destination...

وهم شيعة الدجال

They will be the followers of Dajjāl.³

Thus, the word Shīʿah in these texts means companions, followers and helpers. Further, I could not find any ḥadīth wherein the word Shīʿah was used to refer to the infamous sect, despite searching through the books of ḥadīth. The only instances where the word was used to imply them or the followers of ʿAlī I were in those cases where the ḥadīth was either unauthentic or fabricated. Here are a few examples:

---
¹ He was Dhū al-Khuwayṣarah al-Tamīmī... the fountainhead of the Khawārij (Refer to Musnad Aḥmad 12/4).
² Musnad Aḥmad 12/3-5. ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Imām Aḥmad says, “there are many authentic narrations, the content of which corroborates the message of this ḥadīth.” Aḥmad Shākir said, “the isnād is authentic.” (ibid) Ibn Abī ʿĀṣim also narrated it in his book al-Sunnah (2/454).
³ Sunan Abī Dāwūd 5/67. Al-Mundhirī said, “ʿUmar, the mowlā of Ghufra appears in the isnād. His narrations cannot be used as proof. There also appears an unknown person from the Anṣār therein.” Mukhtaṣar Abī Dāwūd 7/61. Imām Aḥmad also narrates this ḥadīth (5/407).
I sought forgiveness for ‘Alī and his Shīʿah.¹

My example is that of a tree. I am the roots, ‘Alī is the branch... and the Shīʿah are the leaves.²

Nabī ﷺ said to ‘Alī ﷺ, “you and your Shīʿah are n Jannah.”³

Some narrations suggest that there will appear a group who will claim to be the supporters of ‘Alī and they will be called ‘Rāfiḍah.⁴ Imam Ibn Abî Ḥâşim reports four narrations concerning the Rāfiḍah.⁵ These narrations have been declared unauthentic on account of their isnāds. Al-Ṭabarānī reports (with a reliable isnād — as stated by al-Haythamī) that Nabī ﷺ said:

"Ya ‘Alī, there will be a group in this ummah who will claim love for the Ahl

1 Al-‘Uqaylī said, “this narration is baseless.” Al-Kinānī mentions it among the fabricated narrations (Tanzih al-Sharīʿah 1/414)
4 The meaning of Rāfiḍah will be explained at a later stage.
5 Such as the ḥadīth, “celebrate o ‘Alī, for you and your Shīʿah will be in Jannah. Listen well, among those who will claim to love you will be a group who will distance themselves from Islam. They will be called Rāfiḍah. If you meet them, then fight against them as they are polytheists.” I asked, “O Rasūlullāh, What will be their sign?” He replied, “they will neither attend Jumuʿah ṣalāh nor any of the congregational ṣalāh and they will condemn the pious predecessors.” (Al-Sunnah lī Ibn Abî Ḥâşim 2/475). This ḥadīth has also been mentioned by Al-Showkānī in al-Aḥādīth al-Mowdūʿah pg. 380-381.
al-Bayt. They will have a nickname, they will be called al-Rāfiḍah. Fight against them, as they are polytheists.¹

Ibn Taymiyyah pointed out the falsity of all the narrations attributed to Nabī in which the word “Rāfiḍah” was used, on the basis of the fact that this word was only coined in the second century.² My personal opinion is that this is not sufficient reason to declare the aḥādīth to be fabrications. This is because, if the isnāds are proven to be reliable, then it will be among those narrations which inform us of future occurrences. It will be understood that Allah informed his Nabī that in future, the Rawāfiḍ will appear, just as He informed him regarding the appearance Khawārij.³ — even though their inception occurred within his very lifetime.⁴


The word Shīʿah appears repeatedly in the narrations and aḥādīth, which they attribute to Rasūlullāh, ‘Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and the rest of the twelve Imāms. In these aḥādīth, it is as if the word was understood to be a term used to refer to their sect, beliefs and their Imāms. It is on account of this that they deluded themselves into believing that Rasūlullāh was the one who planted the seed of Shīʿism and watered it until it grew and ripened.⁶

¹ Majmaʿ Al-Zawā'id 1/22. Refer to the ḥadīth in Al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr of al-Ṭabarānī (12/242 number 12998). The isnād contains al-Ḥajjāj ibn Tamīm who is unreliable. Refer to Taqrīb Al-Tahdhīb 1/152
² Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/8
³ Al-Bukhārī and Muslim report ten aḥādīth regarding them. Al-Bukhārī reports three and the rest are reported by Muslim. Ibn al-Qayyim quotes all of them in Tahdhīb al-Sunan 7/147-153.
⁴ This is established from a few narrations. One such narration is the story of the man who said to Rasūlullāh — whilst he was distributing the spoils of war, “be just, O Muḥammad!” Refer to the complete ḥadīth in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (which is printed along with Fatḥ al-Bārī) 12/290 and Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim (with the commentary of al-Nawawī) 7/165.
⁵ Sunnah, according to them, refers to all that which was said by Rasūlullāh and the twelve Imāms, as will be explained.
⁶ Uṣūl al-Kāfī, under the section, “the appointment of the Imāms is done by Allah, His messenger and the Imāms (as they believe),” the author mentions thirteen chapters which contain a total of one hundred and ten aḥādīth (Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/286-327).
In fact, they have exceeded the limit to the extent that they have even fabricated narrations to prove that that the word Shīʿah (as a term used to refer to their sect) was well-known even before the era of our Nabī, Muḥammad ﷺ. Their aḥādīth contain narrations, under the explanation of the verse, “and indeed, among his kind was Ibrāhīm,”1 which explain that Ibrāhīm ﷺ was from the Shīʿah of ‘Alī I.2 Amazingly, this is not where their claims end. Rather, they go on to claim that Allah took a covenant and a pledge from the ambiyā’ that they should attest to the Wilāyah of ‘Alī I, and that the Wilāyah of ‘Alī was revealed in all the scriptures of the ambiyā’ .4 There are other claims of this nature as well, which will be explained upon under the section, “Development of Shīʿism”.

The Word Shīʿah in the Light of Islamic History

Records of the initial periods of Islamic history refer to the word Shīʿah in no other sense besides its literal meaning, i.e. helping and following. We find this word being used in the document of the arbitration between ‘Alī and Muʿāwiyah L. It is used therein for the supporters of both these luminaries and it is not confined to the supporters of ‘Alī I. Below is an excerpt from this document:

هذا ما تقاضى عليه علي بن ابى طالب و معاویة بن ابى سفیان و شیعتهما...(و منها):  وان علیا و شیعته رضوا  بعبد الله بن قیس و رضى معاویة و شیعته بعمرو بن العاص...(و منها) فاذا توفى احد الحكمین فلشیعته ان یختاروا مكانه (و منها) وان مات احد المیرین قبل انقضاء الجل المحدود فى هذه القضية فلشیعته ان یختاروا مكانه رجلا یرضون عدله

This is the settlement upon which ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Muʿāwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān and their followers (Shīʿah) have agreed upon... (amongst which is that) ‘Alī and his followers (Shīʿah) have chosen ‘Abd Allāh ibn Qays, whilst Muʿāwiyah and his supporters (Shīʿah) have chosen ‘Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ... If any of these intermediaries happen to pass away, then the respective group of

---

1 Sūrah al-Ṣāffāt: 83
2 The references regarding this have already been cited.
3 Al-Baḥrānī: Tafsīr al-Burhān 1/26
4 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/437
supporters (Shī'ah) and helpers will have the right to replace him with a person of their choice... If one of the leaders passes away before the fixed time in this matter, then his supporters (Shī'ah) will have the right to replace him with one whose justice pleases them.¹

Ḥakīm ibn Aflāḥ said:

لا نهى عنها (يَعْنِى عائشة رضي الله عنها) ان تقول في هذين الشيعتين شيئًا

It is because I prohibited her (ʿĀʾishah) from saying anything regarding these two groups (Shī'ah).²

Ibn Taymiyyah quoted this text and used it as proof from the historical perspective that the word Shī'ah was not confined in that era to 'Alī. Another historical report which proves the argument is the incident when Muʿāwiyah sent Busr ibn Arṭāt towards Yemen saying:

امض حتى تأتى صنعاء فان لنا بها شيعة

Carry on until you reach Ṣanʿā, as we have supporters (Shī'ah) there.³

Thus, it has been proven that until that era, the word Shī'ah was not confined to 'Alī. It seems as if the claimants of Shī'ism did not physically gather and adopt this name formally, to distinguish themselves from the rest until the martyrdom of Ḥusayn. Al-Musūdī says:

و في سنة خمس و ستين تحركت الشيعة في الكوفة و تكونت حركة التوابين ثم حركة المحتار (الكيسانية)

Thus, it has been proven that until that era, the word Shī'ah was not confined to ‘Alī. It seems as if the claimants of Shī'ism did not physically gather and adopt this name formally, to distinguish themselves from the rest until the martyrdom of Ḥusayn. Al-Musūdī says:

2 This is part of a lengthy ḥadīth which appears in Sahīh Muslim under the chapter regarding all the matters concerning ṣalāh of the night and the one who sleeps through it or is ill (2/168, 170).
3 Tārikh al-Ya‘qūbī 2/197
In the year 65 (A.H) the Shīʿah began mobilising in Kūfah and the movement of the Towwābūn (repentant ones) took shape. The same was the case with the movement of al-Mukḥtār (al-Kaysāniyyah). The Shīʿah also started formalising themselves, laying the foundations and principles of their madhhab... and they began distinguishing themselves from others by this name.

From the above, it has become clear that that the word “Shīʿah” was used to refer to any group of people who rallied behind their leader. Some groups (Shīʿah) wish to ignore these historic facts and claim that “they were the first to be called Shīʿah in this ummah.” They ignore the fact that Muʿāwiyah I used the word Shīʿah to refer to his followers. Historic records prove that the word Shīʿah was not specific to the followers of ʿAlī I until the martyrdom of ʿAlī I — as stated by some, or the martyrdom of Ḥusayn I — as stated by others.

The Technical Meaning of the Word Shīʿah

a. As Defined by the Books of the IthnāʿAshariyyah

The First Definition

Al-Qummī (d. 301 A.H) defines the word Shīʿah in the following words:

هم شيعة على بن ابى طالب

They are the Shīʿah of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib.
The Shīʿah are the group of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, who are Muslims. The Shīʿah of ʿAlī were known for confining themselves to him and claiming his Imāmah during the lifetime of Nabī and even after his demise.¹

Al-Nawbakhtī² agrees with this definition to the extent that he repeats it using the exact same words.³

**An Analysis of the First Definition**

This is the definition of the word Shīʿah in the most important and the earliest book of the Shīʿah regarding sects. This definition does not indicate towards any core beliefs and principles of the Shīʿah, such as the belief that ʿAlī and his sons were divinely appointed. (The only mention of their beliefs is the words “the Imāmah of ʿAlī”. However, there is no mention of divine appointment or any of his successors.)

A definition which omits the principles laid down by latter day Shīʿah is among the correct definitions of the Shīʿah of ʿAlī or the real Shīʿah. It expels all the claims of the Shīʿah from the boundaries of Shīʿism. These claims are such that the Ahl al-Bayt were completely unaware of them and they had no relation to that which they said. However, the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah do not accept this as the correct definition of Shīʿism, even though al-Qummī and al-Nawbakhtī were of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah.

---

1 *Al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* pg. 15

2 Ḥasan ibn Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī (Abū Muḥammad, the theologian and philosopher). Al-Ṭūsī said, “he was an Imām who had correct beliefs. He authored many books including *Kitāb al-Ārā wa l-Diyānāt*.” He died after the year 300 A.H refer to al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fahrist* (pg. 75), Al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmīʿ al-Ruwāt* (1/228), Ibn al-Nadīm: *Al-Fahrist* (pg. 177), Al-Qummī: *Al-Kunnā wa l-Alqāb* (1/148), Muʿjam al-Mu’allifīn (3/298), al-Dhahabī: *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* (15/327)

3 *Firaq al-Shīʿah* pg. 2, 17
This definition claims that the Shī‘ah of ʿAlī were present during the era of Nabī H. This is a claim that cannot be substantiated by means of any kind of proof, be it the Qur’ān, Sunnah or even authentic history. Rather, the opposite can be found in the Qur’ān, as Allah says:

اِنَّ الدِّینَ عِنْدَ اللّٰهِ الِْسْلاَمُ

Indeed, the religion in the sight of Allah is Islam.¹

Thus, we do not see any mention of Shī‘ism or any other religion/sect. The Ṣaḥābah were all one group, sect and the Shī‘ah during the era of Nabī H. Their support and allegiance was Rasūlullāh H alone.

The Second Definition

The grand Shī‘ī scholar of his era, al-Mufīd, states that the word Shī‘ah refers to:

اتباع امیر المؤمنین صلوات الله علیه على سبیل الولء والعتقاد لمامته بعد الرسول صلوات الله علیه و اله بلا فصل و نفى المامة عمن تقدم فى مقام الخلافة و جعله فى الاعتقاد متبوعا لهم غیر تابع لحد منهم على وجه الاقتداء

The followers of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn (may the salutations of Allah be upon him), who take him to be their guardian and they believe in his Imāmah after Rasūlullāh H without anyone else in between. Also, it demands that Imāmah should be negated from all those before him who were khulafā before him and to believe that they followed him whereas he did not take anyone as his leader.²

Thereafter, he mentions that this definition includes the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah and Jārūdī Shī‘ah. As for the rest of the groups of the Zaydiyyah, they are not part of the Shī‘ah, and the term Shī‘ah does not include them.³

---

¹ Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 19
² Awāʿil al-Maqālāt pg 39
³ Awāʿil al-Maqālāt pg 39
An Analysis of the Second Definition

We do not see in this definition offered by al-Mufīd, any mention of believing that the son of ʿAlī is to be taken as an Imām. This is despite the fact that the one who disbelieves in this is not considered a Shīʿī according to them. The definition also omits many fundamental aspects of Shīʿism, upon which the cult is based. These concepts include divine appointment, infallibility etc., which are fundamental principles of the Imāmiyyah.

It should also be noticed that he explicitly excluded the moderate sect of the Zaydiyyah from his definition of Shīʿah, and he explains that it only includes the extremist Jārūdīs. Furthermore, he has opened the door to include all the extremist Shīʿah under the definition of Shīʿism. As for his claim, “to believe that they followed him whereas he did not take anyone as his leader,” this is an indication towards one of the basic and primary beliefs of the Shīʿah, i.e. Taqiyyah (dissimulation). According to them, ʿAlī was outwardly a follower of the Khulafā’, but secretly, he was their leader. Thus, his obedience to them — according to al-Mufīd and his Shīʿah — was not carried out with sincerity. Instead, it was taqiyyah. He did not believe that they were his leaders, he simply towed the line to please them.

1 A sect from the Zaydiyyah, who are affiliated with Abū al-Jārūd Ziyād ibn al-Mundhir al-Hamdānī al-Kūfī, who was blind. Abū Ḥātim said regarding him. He was a Rāfīḍī who would fabricate aḥādīth in criticism of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh. Among the statements of the Jārūdiyyah is, “Rasūlullāh personally appointed ʿAlī by indicating towards him and describing him. He did not take his name and specify him. The ummah, by placing the matter in the hands of others have gone astray and committed kufr.” For more details regarding Abū al-Jārūd and the Jārūdiyyah, refer to Rijāl al-Kashshī (pg. 151, 229, 230), it contains six narrations, among which there are narrations which imply that he was a liar and a disbeliever. Despite this, their scholar, al-Mufīd includes him among the Shīʿah. This is because, according to his definition, Shīʿism is the name of this type of extremism. Also refer to Al-Ṭūsī: Al-Fahrist (pg. 192), Al-Ardabīlī: Jāmīʿ al-Ruwāt (1/339), Al-Qummī: al-Kunnā wa l-Alqāb (1/30), Ibn Ḥajar: Tahdhib Al-Tahdhib (3/386), al-Qummī: Al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq (pg. 18), al-Nawbakhtī: Firaq al-Shīʿah (pg. 21), Mishwān: Al-Hūr al-ʿAyn (pg. 165), Al-Maqrīzī: Al-Khuṭaṭ (2/352), Al-Shahrastānī: Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal (1/159), Al-Maqrīzī: Al-Khuṭaṭ (2/352), Al-Shahrastānī: Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal (1/159), Al-Miṣṣūfī: Al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd (pg. 23), Ahmad ibn al-Murtaḍā: Al-Munyah wa l-Amal (pg. 20, 90), Al-Baghdādī: Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq (pg. 30), Al-Rāzī: Muḥṣṣal Afkār al-Mutaqaddimīn wa l-Muta’ahhkhirīn (pg. 247), Al-Ashʿarī: Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn (1/140).
His statement, “... they believe in the Imāmah of ʿAlī after Rasūlullāh without anyone else in between,” is based upon the Shīʿī propaganda that the khilāfah of the first three Khulāfā’ was invalid. Al-Mufīd explains this statement in detail in another of his writings.¹ He says:

و كانت امامة أمير المؤمنين بعد النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ثلاثون سنة منها اربع و عرون سنة و ستة أشهر ممنوعا من التصرف في احكامها مستعملة للتقیة و المداراة و منها خمس سنين و ستة أشهر ممتتحنا بجهاد المنافقين من الناکثین و القاسیتین و المارقین و مضطهدًا بفتن الضالین كما كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثلاث عشر سنة من نبوته ممنوعا من احكامها خائفا و محبوسا و هاربا و مطرودا لا يستطيع من جهاد الكافرین ولا يستطيع دفعا عن المؤمنین ثم هاجر و اقام بعد الهجرة عشر سنین ممتحنا بالمنافقین التي ان قبضه الله جل اسمه إليه و اسكنه جنات النعیم

The Imāmah of Amīr al-Mu’minīn after the demise of Rasūlullāh lasted for a period of thirty years. Twenty four years and six months of this period were spent in Taqiyyah and towing the line, as he was stopped from getting involved in its affairs. The next five years and six months were spent in doing jihād against the hypocrites from the Nākithīn, Qāsiṭīn and Māriqīn² as well as dealing with the trials created by the deviates. This was the same as the condition of Rasūlullāh, who was not allowed to implement his laws for thirteen years of his nubuwwah. He was in the state of fear, restricted, a fugitive and he was chased away in these years. He could not fight against the disbelievers or protect the Muslims. Thereafter, he migrated and he spent the remaining ten years fighting against the polytheists and he was tested with the hypocrites until Allah, whose name is glorified, repossessed his soul and granted him residence in the bountiful gardens.³

¹ Kitāb Al-Irshād, one of the most reliable books according to the Twelvers. The forward of Al-Irshād (pg. 70) states: “The scholars of the Imāmiyyah, former as well as latter day scholars, relied upon it. They have considered it among the most important books on the subject and they have paid great attention to it.” To learn more about their reliance upon this book, refer to Bihār al-Anwār (1/27).

² The book Maʿānī al-Akhbār by their scholar Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī explains: “Nākithīn refers to those who pledged allegiance to him in Madīnah and thereafter broke their pledge in Baṣrah. Qāsiṭīn refers to Muʿāwiyyah and his companions from Shām, and Māriqīn refers to the people of Nahrawān.” (Maʿānī al-Akhbār pg. 204)

³ Al-Irshād pg. 12
Thus, according to al-Mufīd, the term Shīʿah only refers to those who believe that the khilāfah of ʿAlī IBN ʿĀLĪ started with the demise of Rasūlullāh ینبوعسلا and ended with his death. The khilāfah of the first three khulafāʿ, according to him, was invalid. Hence, according to him, the word Shīʿah could only be used to refer to three people after the demise of Rasūlullāh ینبوعسلا. The rest of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ینبوعسلا, according to the Shīʿah, were disbelievers just like the polytheists who lived in the era of Nabī ینبوعسلا. The governance was one of kufr. Thus, they believe that ʿAlī lived amongst them practising dissimulation and behaving like a hypocrite. Is it possible for anyone to insult ʿAlī IBN ʿĀLĪ, the Ṣaḥābah and Islam in a manner worse than this?

The Third Definition of the Word Shīʿah

Since al-Mufīd did not mention, in his definition of the word Shīʿah, the aspect of divine appointment and the bequest, we find that their scholar al-Ṭūsī bailed them out and covered up in this aspect by basing Shīʿism upon the belief that ʿAlī IBN ʿĀLĪ became the Imām of the Muslims upon the bequest of Rasūlullāh ینبوعسلا and the will of Allah. Hence, al-Ṭūsī at this point establishes that believing that ʿAlī IBN ʿĀLĪ was appointed by Nabī ینبوعسلا and Allah as the khilīfah is a fundamental belief of Shīʿism. It is for this reason that he excludes the Zaydiyyah.

1 Their scholar ʿAbd Allāh Shibr affirms this meaning in his definition of Shīʿism. He says: “Know well that the word Shīʿah is used to refer to those who believe that the khilāfah of ʿAlī IBN ʿĀLĪ began immediately after the death of Rasūlullāh ینبوعسلا without anyone else in-between.”(Ḥaq al-Yaqīn 1/195)

2 The proofs regarding this will appear under the discussion regarding the law of the one who rejects the Imāmah of the twelve Imāms.

3 Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī al-Ṭūsī. He is regarded by them to be Shaykh al-Imāmiyyah and Raʾīs al-Tāʿīfah (leader of the group). He is the author of two of their four canonical works (which hold a similar position in their circles like that of the six books of ḥadīth according to the Ahl al-Sunnah). These books are Tahdhib al-Aḥkām and Al-Istibṣār. He was born in the year 385 A.H and died in the year 460 A.H. Refer to his autobiography in al-Fahrist pg. 88-190, Al-Baḥrānī: Luʿluʿat al-Baḥrayn pg. 293-304, Al-Qummī :Al-Kunnā wa l-Alqāb 2/357, and Lisān al-Mīzān of Ibn Ḥajar 5/135

4 Talkhīs al-Shāfī 2/56
Sulaymāniyyah, from the sects of Shī'ah as they believe that the Imām is not divinely appointed.

Their beliefs regarding Imāmah are as follows: “Imāmah is a position that is decided through mutual consultation. It can be enacted by the decision of two Muslims, if they are among the most virtuous ones. It is also valid in the case when the person appointed to the post is not the most virtuous person of his era.” The Khilāfah of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar is accepted by them. Hence, they were not only excluded from the Shī'ī cult, but instead they were even labelled as “Nawāṣib”. As if that was not enough, it was stated in Rijāl al-Kashshī that the Zaydiyyah are worse than the Nawāṣib. This judgement was passed by the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah regarding all the sects of the Zaydiyyah who agree with this view of the Sulaymāniyyah such as the Ṣāliḥiyyah and the Batriyyah.

---

1 A sect of the Zaydiyyah who are affiliated with Sulaymān ibn Jarīr al-Zaydī. They are named Sulaymāniyyah by many of those who have authored regarding the subject of sects. Refer to Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/143, Iʿtiqād Firaq al-Muslimīn pg. 78, Al-Mīlal wa l-Niḥal 1/159, Al-Tabṣīr fi l-Dīn pg. 17.

Some of the authors on the subject of sects have named them the Jarīriyyah. (Al-Ḥūr al-ʿAyn pg. 156, Al-Maqrīzī: Al-Khuṭaṭ 2/352) the author of Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq clearly mentions that they are referred to as the Sulaymāniyyah or Jarīriyyah (Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq pg. 32). The author of Al-Munyah wa l-Amal at times refers to them as Sulaymāniyyah (pg. 90) and at times he refers to them as Jarīriyyah (pg. 90).

2 Al-ʿAshʿarī: Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/143

3 Refer to al-Ṭūsī: Al-Tahdhīb 1/364, Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: Al-Wasāʾil 4/288. Nawāṣib are those who consider hatred for ʿAlī to be part of their religion. Ibn Manẓūr: Ḥiṣn al-ʿArab 1/762. However, the Rāfīḍah have a different definition of the word, as you have seen. They go to the extent of classifying all those who do not hate Abū Bakr and ʿUmar as Nawāṣib. (Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 5/ 112). In fact, even the one who says that Abū Bakr was more virtuous than ʿAlī is considered by them to be from the Nawāṣib. Refer to Ibn Idrīs: Al-Sarāʾīr pg. 471, Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 6/341-342.

4 Refer to Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 459

5 Ṣāliḥiyyah are the followers of Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Ḥayy. Batriyyah are the followers of Kathīr al-Nawā al-Abtar. Both sects have the same view as the Sulaymāniyyah regarding Imāmiyyah. Al-Shahrastānī considers both of them to be one sect, as their views are the same. Al-ʿAshʿarī only mentioned the Batriyyah. He says that they do not believe in reincarnation and they believe that the Imāmah of ʿAlī started only after allegiance was pledged to him. (Al-ʿAshʿarī: Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/144, Al-Shahrastānī: Al-Mīlal wa l-Niḥal 1/ 161)
Some of their contemporary scholars hold the same view as al-Ṭūsī. They only consider those who believe that ʿAlī’s appointment to the post of Imāmah was divine to be Shīʿah. They assert that the word Shīʿah “is the official title of those who believe that ʿAlī was appointed as the khalīfah by Nabī.”

It is important to take note that the idea of divine appointment was something that both former and latter day Shīʿī scholars paid special attention to. Thus, we find that their scholar, al-Kulaynī penned down thirteen chapters (in which he quoted one hundred and nine narrations) in his book al-Kāfī regarding this matter. In this day and age, one of the Rāfiḍī scholars authored a book of sixteen volumes regarding one of the narrations that is used by them to prove that the appointment of ʿAlī was divine. This ḥadīth is the ḥadīth of al-Ghadīr, so he named his book al-Ghadīr.

We are not surprised by the fact they the Shīʿah have taken the belief in the divine appointment of ʿAlī to be a fundamental and core belief of Shīʿism. However, what does surprise us is the extent and degree to which they go in proving all those beliefs which are taken to be far-fetched by majority of the Muslims. You will find that they consider all these types of beliefs to be the foundations and core beliefs of Shīʿism, yet when their scholars define Shīʿism, they do not even hint towards these beliefs — despite the fact that they believe Shīʿism cannot be adopted without subscribing to those beliefs, and there is no Shīʿism without them.

Among these beliefs is the belief of Rajʿah (reincarnation). They have it recorded in there narrations that, “the one who does not belief in our Rajʿah is not among

---

1 Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: Al-Shīʿah fī l-Mīzān pg. 15
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/286-328
3 Details regarding this as well as an analysis will appear under the section wherein the proofs of the Shīʿah regarding Imāmah are mentioned.
4 Kitāb al-Ghadīr by their scholar ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn al-Amīnī al-Najafī. It is filled with lies, calamities and blatant kufr. Refer to Masʿalat al-Taqrīb Bayn al-Sunnah wa l-Shīʿah by the same author, page 66.
us.”¹ Despite this, one will never find this in their definition of Shi‘ism. The same is the condition of the belief in infallibility, belief in the Imāmah of the progeny of ʿAlī, etc. This extremism is also found in certain matters of jurisprudence and subsidiary matters such as mut‘ah (temporary marriage). They say, “the one who does not believe in the permissibility of our mut‘ah is not from us.”² Therefore, it can be concluded that they have no clarity and consistency in their religion.

Other Definitions of the Word Shi‘ah

There are other definitions of the word Shi‘ah in the books of former as well as latter day Shi‘ī scholars, which do not differ with that which has been mentioned thus far.³ Along with this, there are other definitions which were formed in a very different way. They do not mention any of their beliefs therein. As an example, their scholar, Al-Najāshī⁴ states:

الشيعة الذين إذا اختلف الناس عن رسول الله اخذوا بقول على واذا اختلف الناس عن على اخذوا بقول جعفر بن محمد

The Shi‘ah are those who accept the statement of ʿAlī when the people differed regarding Rasūlullāh, and they accept the statement of Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad when people differed regarding ʿAlī.⁵

---

2 Ibid
3 Among these definitions are definitions which base Shi‘ism upon following ʿAlī and granting him precedence over others in Imāmah. Refer to *Sharḥ al-Lum‘ah* 2/228. Other definitions add on that it is necessary to believe that he was appointed as Imām by Rasūlullāh and Allah in clear terms as the Imāmiyyah believe, and in unclear terms as the Jārūdiyyah believe. *Mowsūʿat al-Atbāt al-Muqaddasah* pg. 91, *‘An Hawiyyat al-Tashayyu‘* pg. 12.
5 Rijāl al-Najāshī pg. 9
What happens when there are differences in the statements attributed to Ja’far ibn Muḥammad? At this point, who do they follow? We do not find the answer to that in the definition. Except if the definition implies that matters are concluded by the statements of Ja’far ibn Muḥammad and there are no differences among those who narrate from him. However, this implication cannot be established, as reality as well as the narrations from Ja’far — even in the books of the Shi‘ah — belie it. The other possibility is that this statement was made within the lifetime of Ja’far ibn Muḥammad, due to which his decision was final, and al-Najāshī merely narrated it. Whatever the case may be, it neither indicates towards the Imāms before Ja’far, nor to those after him.

Furthermore, this definition contradicts the temperament of Islam. He says that when there are differences in the narrations from Rasūlullāh, then instead of adopting the correct and accepted principles and procedures in order to establish that which is accurate, we should blindly accept the view of ʿAlī. The same is said as far as taking the statement of Ja’far when there are differences concerning the sayings of ʿAlī. Furthermore, we would like to ask, how is it that there will be no differences regarding the sayings of Ja’far, whereas there are differences regarding the sayings of Rasūlullāh and ʿAlī? Was he greater than them?

The books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah contain a few more definitions of the word Shi‘ism. These definitions imply that Tashayyu’ and Shi‘ism are synonymous to piety, uprightness and steadfastness. Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣādiq says:


Our Shī’ah are only those who fear Allah and obey Him. They would be recognised by their humility, submissiveness and trustworthiness.¹

¹ Safinat Al-Bihār 1/733
The Shīʿah of ʿAlī are only those whose bellies and private parts are guarded, they exert themselves, work to please their creator alone, anticipate His reward and fear His punishment. When you see these people, then know that they are the real Shīʿah of Jaʿfar.¹

Abū Jaʿfar al-Bāqir said:

لا تذهب بكم المذاهب فوالله ما شیعتنا الا من اطاع الله عز و خل

The different sects should not sweep you away. By the oath of Allah, our Shīʿah are only those who obey Allah the exalted and glorified.²

b. The Definition of the Word Shīʿah from the Books of the Ismāʿīlī

Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (who was among the most prominent propagators of Ismāʿīlīsm³) says in his book al-Zīnah:

الشیعة لقب لقوم قد الفوا امیر المؤمنین على بن ابى طالب صلوات الله عليه في حیاة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و سلم و عرفوا به مثل سلمان الفارسى و ابى ذر الغفارى والمقداد بن اسود و عمار بن ياسر و كان يقال لهم شیعة على و اصحاب على...ثم لزم هذا اللقب كل من قال بتفضیله بعده الى یومنا و تشبعت

¹ Op. cit. 1/732
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/73, Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allāh quotes at the end of al-Washīʿah (pg 230) similar texts from the books of the Shīʿah. Thereafter he explains, “these Shīʿah were the Shīʿah of ʿAlī. They were known for their scrupulousness, exertion, staying away from minor sins and hatred. They were loved by the former part of the ummah. The religion of these Shīʿah was taqwā (piety) and not Taqiyyah. The religion of these Shīʿah was loyalty to Allah, the truth, His Nabī, his Ahl al-Bayt, his Şahābah and the remainder of the believers. As for these ones, whose religion centres around Taqiyyah, hypocrisy, hatred for the Şahābah as well as some of the Ahl al-Bayt, and extremism with regards to the others; they are not part of the Shīʿah, as testified to by those who the Shīʿah take as their imāms as well as their books. This is why Imām Zayd named them Rāfiḍah instead of Shīʿah.”
³ Abū Ḥātim Aḥmad ibn Ḥamdān ibn Aḥmad al-Rāzī. Among his books are Aʿlām al-Nubuwwah, Al-Zīnah, etc. He died in the year 322 A.H. Refer to Ibn Ḥajar: Lisān al-Mīzān 1/164, Aʿlām al-Ismāʿīliyyah pg. 97 for more details regarding him.
Shīʿah is the title of the group who befriended ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib during the lifetime of Rasūlullāh and they were known for this. They were Salmān al-Fārsī, Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī, Miqdād ibn al-Aswād and ʿAmmār ibn Yāsir. They were referred to as the Shīʿah of ʿAlī and the companions of ʿAlī... Later, this title became attached to all those who believed in his superiority after him,1 up until this day. Many sub groups emerged from this group, all of whom adopted different titles such as Rāfīḍah, Zaydiyyah, Kasāniyyah, etc. All of these groups are included in this one title, viz. Shīʿah, even though there sects and beliefs are different.2

It should be noted that in this definition, the author claims that the word Shīʿah was used to refer to a specific group of people in the very lifetime of Rasūlullāh. This cannot be established historically. The only claimants of this are the Shīʿah, whose object is to somehow prove their madh-hab and its validity. We have peeked into the matter under the discussion of the development of Shīʿism. Another noteworthy claim is that he believes that the basis of the relationship between those Ṣaḥābah and ʿAlī was friendship. He did not claim — as others have done — that it was on account of his divine appointment (to the post of Imāmah) from Allah and his Rasūl, as is believed by the Shīʿah.

---

1 i.e. superiority of ʿAlī over all the Ṣaḥābah after Rasūlullāh. It is also possible that this means he is the greatest person after Rasūlullāh, which would mean that he is greater than the ambiyā. In this way the extremist Rawāfiḍ as well as others would be included as well. However, the meaning that seems most likely is that it refers to all those who consider ʿAlī to be the greatest of all people from the moment Rasūlullāh passed away until this day. This seems to be the most accurate interpretation.

2 Al-Zīnah pg. 259 (Inside the book Al-Ghulūw wa l-Firaq al-Ghāliyah).
c. The Definition of the Word Shīʿah from Other Sources

The Definition of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī

Perhaps the first person to define Shīʿism from the authors of books on sects (besides the Shīʿī authors) was Imām al-Ashʿarī. He states:

انما قِيل لهم الشیعه لنهم شایعوا عليا رضوان الله عليه و يقدمنه علي سائر اصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

They were only referred to as Shīʿah because they supported ʿAlī and granted him precedence over all the other Șaḥābah of Rasūlullāh.¹

An Analysis of the Definition

This definition fits perfectly upon the Mufaḍḍilah sect of the Shīʿah (those who grant ʿAlī precedence over Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and the rest of the Șaḥābah of Rasūlullāh). However, the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah do not accept that merely believing that he was superior to everyone else is enough to be called a Shīʿī. It is incumbent, according to them, to believe that he was divinely appointed as the khalīfah... it began as soon as Rasūlullāh passed away... it is for this very reason that al-Ṭūsī and al-Mufīd excluded some of the Zaydiyyah from the boundaries of Shīʿism (as was explained). It could be correct to say that the definition of al-Ashʿarī includes all or most of the sects of the Shīʿah, without confining it to those who believe in divine appointment as assumed by the Rawāfiḍ.

¹ Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Ismāʿīl ibn Abī Shibr. He was from the progeny of the great Șaḥābī of Rasūlullāh, Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī. He was born in the year 260/270 A.H and he passed away in the year 324 A.H in Baghdad. He was unparalleled in the science of polemics and beliefs, to the extent that the Ahl al-Sunnah have accepted him as an imām in this field. “Abū al-Ḥasan was extremely intelligent, he was an ocean of knowledge and he accomplished many great tasks. He authored many books which reflect the vastness of his knowledge.” For more details refer to al-Dhahabī: Siyar Aʾlām al-Nubalāʾ 15/85-90.

² Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/65
The Definition of Ibn Ḥazm

Among the most precise definitions of the word Shī‘ah (according to some) is the definition of Ibn Ḥazm.¹ He states:

و من وافق الشيعة في أن عليا رضي الله عنه افضل الناس بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و احقهم بال الإمامة و ولده من بعده فهو شيعى و ان خالفهم فيما عدا ذلك مما اختلف فيه المسلمون فان خالفهم فيما ذكرنا فليس شيعيا

Whoever agrees with the Shī‘ah in accepting that ʿAlī was the most virtuous person after Rasūlullāh and he was most deserving of the position of Imāmah and the same applies to his progeny after him, then he is a Shī‘ī, even if he disagrees with them in other matters regarding which the Muslims have had difference of opinion. If he opposes them regarding that which we have mentioned, then he will not be a Shī‘ī.²

This definition was accepted by one of the Rawāfiḍ as the preferred definition, discard that which his cohorts have stated. He considered it the most precise definition of the word Shī‘ah. He explains the reason behind this choice of his saying, “from the reasons which impelled us to grant preference to the definition of Ibn Ḥazm is that accepting the superiority of Imām ʿAlī over the rest of the people after Rasūlullāh, accepting that he was the Imām and Khalīfah after Rasūlullāh and believing that the same applies to his progeny is the foundation and core of Shī‘ism.”³

However, if anyone reads the statements of the Shī‘ah as far as their beliefs are concerned, such as Imāmah, ʿismah (infallibility), Taqiyyah, etc., he will find that they exaggerate the importance of each of their beliefs, to the extent that they declare adherence to these beliefs a pre-requisite for being included among the

¹ Abū Muḥammad ʿAlī ibn Saʿīd ibn Ḥazm al-Ẓāhirī. He was born in the year 383/4 A.H in Cordoba and he passed away in the year 456 A.H in Andalus (Spain).
² Al-Fiṣal 2/107
³ ʿAbd Allāh Fayyāḍ: Tārīkh al-Imāmīyyah pg. 33
Shīʿah. This has already been explained above. Perhaps al-Shahrastānī realised this when he defined for us the word Shīʿah. His definition is the most comprehensive and inclusive definition with regards to the principles of the Shīʿah.

The Definition of al-Shahrastānī

Al-Shahrastānī says:

الشیعة هم الذين شایعوا علیا رضی الله عنه على الخصوص و قالوا بامامته و خلافته نصا و وصیة اما جلیا و اما خفیا و اعتقدوا ان الامامة لا تتخرج من اولاده و ان خرجت فيظام يكون من غيره أو بتقیة من عنده وقالوا ليست الامامة قضیة مصلحیة تناظ باختیار العامة و بتنصب الامام نصبهم بل هي قضیة اصولیة و هي رکن الدين لا يجوز للرسول اغفاله و اهماله ولا تقویضه الى العامة و ارساله

ويجمعهم القول بوجود التبعیض والتصیص و ثبوت عصمة الامینين و الامام و جویا عن الكبیرین والصغیرین و القول بالتولی و التبری قولا و فعلًا و عقیدة الا في حال التقیة و يخالفهم بعض الزیدیة في ذلك.

The Shīʿah are those who support ʿAlī exclusively. They believe that he was divinely appointed through the bequest of Nabī (either directly or indirectly) as the Imām and Khalīfah. They also believe that Imāmah is confined to his progeny. If anyone else holds the position, he does so through oppression or on account of the Imām adopting Taqiyyah. They claim that Imāmah is not just a governmental position which can be attained by selection or appointment by the public. Instead, Imāmah is a pivotal matter and it is the basis of religion. The messenger is not allowed to be negligent regarding it, overlook it, hand it over to the masses or leave it suspended.

The common factor between them is the belief in the theory that divine appointment took place, the ambiyā’ and the Imāms were divinely

1 Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Karīm ibn Aḥmad Abū al-Fatḥ, commonly referred to as al-Shahrastānī. Imām al-Subkī says: “He was an outstanding Imām in the fields of Islamic philosophy and logic. He had expertise in jurisprudence, principles and Islamic philosophy. Among his writings are Al-Milal wa l-Nihal, Nihāyat al-Iqdām, etc.” He was born in the year 467 or 479 A.H. and he passed away in the year 548 A.H. Refer to Tabaqāt al-Shāfiʿīyyah 6/128-130, Mir’āt al-Jinān 3/284-290
protected from all major and minor sins and the belief that it is incumbent to practice Tawallī (support for ʿAlī and those who they assume are his supporters) and Tabarrī (disassociate from all those who they falsely accuse of being the haters of ʿAlī) in word, practice and in dealings, except under the pretence of Taqiyyah. Some of the Zaydiyyah disagree with them.¹

This definition has made it clear that all the sects of the Shīʾah, besides some of the Zaydiyyah, believe in the incumbency of believing in Imāmah, ʿismah, Taqiyyah. The Imāmiyyah, as will be seen, believe in a few more concepts such as Ghaybah, Rajʿah, Badā, etc. Similarly, it is important to note that Imām Zayd and his followers do not believe in the infallibility of the Imāms. In addition, they do not prevent the ummah from appointing an Imām for themselves. This is why Imām Zayd considers it permissible for a less virtuous person to be the Imām in the presence of those who surpass him in virtue. They do not believe in Taqiyyah. It seems as if al-Shahrastānī was indicating towards this when he said, “some of the Zaydiyyah disagree with them.” However, there are some of the Zaydiyyah who believe that Fāṭimah, ʿAlī and Ḥusayn² were infallible. Others believe that three Imāms (ʿAlī, and his two sons ³) were divinely appointed. These beliefs are against the beliefs of the majority.⁴

d. The Most Appropriate Definition

I believe that Shīʾism cannot be defined without paying due attention to the stages of their metamorphosis, especially their ever-changing stances on the subject of beliefs. Shīʾ beliefs are constantly changed and modified. This is why the Shīʾah of the first century have almost nothing in common with those who succeeded them. In the first century, Shīʾah were those who believed that

¹ Al-Milal wa l-Nihal 6/146
³ Yaḥyā ibn Ḥamzah: Al-Risālah al-Wāziʿah pg. 28
⁴ Al-Samarqandī: Al-Muʿtaqadāt (scroll 35 of the manuscript).
ʿAlī ᴰḡ℃ deserved precedence over ʿUthmān ᴰḡ℃. Thus there were Shīṭīs and ʿUthmānīs. A Shīṭī was one who granted precedence to ʿAlī over ʿUthmān and an ʿUthmānī was one who granted precedence to ʿUthmān over ʿAlī ᴰḡ℃. Based on the above, the definition of the Shīṭah in the first century would be, “those who grant precedence to ʿAlī over ʿUthmān ᴰḡ℃.” They have no other beliefs that contradict those of the majority.²

This is why Ibn Taymiyyah stated that the former Shīṭah, who lived during the khilāfah of ʿAlī ᴰḡ℃, would grant precedence to Abū Bakr and ʿUmar ᴰḡ℃.³ Sharīḳ ibn ʿAbd Allāh — who was considered a Shīṭī — refused to refer to those who grant precedence to ʿAlī over Abū Bakr and ʿUmar ᴰḡ℃ as Shīṭah. He knew that this belief was in stark contradiction to that which was unambiguously and undeniably established from ʿAlī ᴰḡ℃, since Tashayyuʿ means “obedience and support”, not opposition and disregard (for the opinions of the one who is to be followed).⁴

Ibn Baṭṭah reports from his teacher, who was well-known as Abū al-ʿAbbās ibn Masrūq:

Reported to us by Muḥammad ibn Ḥumayd — Jarīr — Sufyān — from ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ziyād ibn Jadīr who said, “Abū Isḥāq al-Subayʿī came to Kūfah, so Shimr ibn ʿAṭiyyah said to us, ‘go to him!’ Thereupon we went to sit with him and they began speaking. Abū Isḥāq said:

1 Refer to Nishwān Al-Ḥamīrī: Al-Ḥūr al-ʿAyn pg. 179, Ibn al-Murtaḍā: Al-Munyah wa l-Amal pg. 81
2 Even though they are referred to as Shīṭah, they are in fact part of the Ahl al-Sunnah. This is because the matter regarding ʿAlī and ʿUthmān ᴰḡ℃ is a really insignificant matter. There is no way that one holding the opposite view could be taken as a deviate, as it is only a matter of khilāfah... Some of the Ahl al-Sunnah have differed with the majority regarding the matter of ʿUthmān and ʿAlī ᴰḡ℃, after agreeing that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar ᴰḡ℃ were undoubtedly given precedence over everyone else. Thus, some have said that ʿUthmān was more virtuous whilst others said that ʿAlī ᴰḡ℃ was more virtuous. A third group also existed, who did not comment on the matter. However, the Ahl al-Sunnah eventually accepted the first view. Refer to Majmūʿah Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 3/153, Ibn Ḥajar: Fatḥ al-Bārī 7/34
3 Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/60
4 His exact words were quoted previously.
When I left Kūfah, not a single soul doubted the virtue of Abū Bakr
and ʿUmar and that they should be granted precedence. This
time when I came they saying this and that and I do not know, by
the oath of Allah, what they are saying!

Muḥībb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb explains:

This is clear historical evidence which highlights the transformation of
Shī‘ism. Abū Ishāq al-Subay‘ī was the leading and most prominent scholar
of Kūfah. He was born during the khilāfah of ʿUthmān (three years
before he was martyred) and he lived until the year 127 A.H. He was still a
child during the Khilāfah of ʿAlī. He spoke about himself saying, “my
father lifted me up so I could see ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib delivering a sermon. The
hair of his head and beard was white.”

If we can establish the dates of his departure from Kūfah and the day
he returned, we will be able to determine when were the Shī‘ah ʿAlawī
(followers of ʿAlī), who followed their Imām in granting precedence to
Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, and when did they start opposing ʿAlī and
belying that which he believed, to the extent that he openly announced on
the pulpit of Kūfah that his two brothers (Abū Bakr and ʿUmar) were
the companions, viziers, and Khulafā’ of Rasūlullāh, the best of the
ummah in its purest and untainted eras.

Layth ibn Abī Salīm said:

1 Al-Muntaqā qg. 360
2 Refer to Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb for his biography 8/63, Al-Khulāṣah pg. 291
3 Ḥāshiyat al-Muntaqā pg. 360-361
I met the very first group of Shī‘ah. They would not grant superiority to anyone over Abū Bakr and ʿUmar.¹

The author of *Mukhtāṣar al-Tuḥfah* states that the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and those who followed them diligently, who lived in the era of ʿAlī, all understood his rights and merits and treated him accordingly. Furthermore, they did not attempt to discredit any of his brothers from the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh. Thus, declaring them kāfir and using foul language regarding them was extremely far-fetched.²

Whoever understands the constant modifications that came about in Shī‘ī beliefs will not be surprised at all to see that many great muḥaddithīn (ḥadīth scholars) and scholars were referred to as Shī‘ah. At times it is used for some who were the torchbearers of the Ahl al-Sunnah. This is simply because the term Shī‘ah in its meaning and implications — in the first era — was totally different to that which it later became. Hence, whilst discussing those who were accused of being affected by the innovation of Shī‘ism from the Muḥaddithīn, Imām al-Dhahabī states:

This innovation is of two types. 1) The minor innovation, such as being extreme as far as support for ʿAlī is concerned, or supporting him without any extremism. This is common among the Tābi‘īn and those after them. Along with this, they were religious, pious and truthful. If the aḥādīth of these people is to be rejected, then a great amount of aḥādīth of Nabī will be lost. 2) The major innovation, such as total Rafḍ, extremism in it, disparaging Abū Bakr and ʿUmar and calling towards it. This type of Shī‘ah (their narration) cannot be used as evidence and there is no hesitation regarding that. Not a single truthful or trustworthy person could be presented from this category until now. On the contrary, lies are their hallmark, and Taqiyyah and hypocrisy is their dress-code. Upon what stretch of logic can the narrations of one whose condition is such be accepted? Nay, their narration can never be accepted.

1 Al-Muntaqā pg. 360-361
2 *Mukhtāṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah* pg. 3
The first generation of Muslims considered a person to be an extremist Shīʿī if he spoke negatively regarding ʿUthmān, Zubayr, Ṭalḥah, Muʿāwiyyah and others who had disagreed and clashed with ʿAlī. On the other hand, the extremist in our times and our environments is the one who considers these luminaries to be out of the fold of Islam and he dissociates himself from Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. This individual (who subscribes to the mentioned beliefs) is the deviant liar.\footnote{Al-Dhahabī: Mīzān al-Iʿtidāl 1/5-6, Ibn Ḥajar: Lisān al-Mīzān 1/9-10}

By now, it should be clear that Shīʿism had different levels, modifications, and phases just as it has many sects and groups. However, the sect which we have singled out as a subject of research, analysis and investigation is the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, and the phase that we wish to study is the one which derives its beliefs and religion from the four seminal books (according to them) viz. Al-Kāfī, Al-Tahdhīb, Al-Istibṣār and Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh (these books hold the same status in their eyes that the six books of ḥadīth hold in the eyes of the Ahl al-Sunnah), the four later books which are Al-Wāfī, Al-Biḥār, al-Wasāʾīl and Mustadrak al-Wasāʾīl and the other books (which are many in number) that the Shīʿī scholars believe to be of the same level as the above-mentioned books.

Before concluding our discussion on the definition of the word Shīʿah, we would like to highlight that majority of the books regarding sects define Shīʿah (the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah) as the followers of ʿAlī... This could lead to a very erroneous understanding, which contradicts a belief which the ummah unanimously accepts, i.e. ʿAlī had the same beliefs as the Shīʿah. The fact of the matter is that he was totally innocent from all that the Shīʿah concocted regarding him and his progeny.

Hence, it is necessary to add on to this definition that which will save a person from misunderstanding it, so it will be said, “they are those who claim to be the followers of ʿAlī whereas, instead of following him, they have opposed him. Amīr al-Muʿminīn has nothing at all to do with their beliefs.” Otherwise, it can be said that they claim to be the followers of ʿAlī or they are the Rāfiḍah, as was
explained. Some of the scholars have done so by saying, “(they are) the Rāfiḍah, who are believed to be part of the followers of ‘Alī.”\footnote{Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/106} In essence, they are not on the path of the Shī‘ah of ‘Alī, who followed him, they merely claim so, and they are in reality the Rāfiḍah.

The Inception of the Shī‘ah and its Historical Roots

The Shī‘ah, with their current principles and beliefs, did not come about all of a sudden. Rather, Shī‘ism went through many different stages and it was developed over a very long period of time. It also split up into many different sects. Therefore, it goes without saying that studying the historical and ideological perspectives of Shī‘ism as far as the different stages that it underwent are concerned, would require a separate discussion and research. This is why the subject of this discussion is the inception of Shī‘ism and its historical roots. This absolves us of delving into their different stages and sects. We will start off by mentioning the views of the Shī‘ah from their sources which they consider reliable. This will be followed by the views of others. The reason behind this is that our research will not be truly academic and objective unless we mention the views of the people being discussed before presenting any other persons views regarding them.

Views of the Shī‘ah Regarding Their Inception

They could not even agree upon this. However, we will discuss three views, all of which are explained in their reliable books. After presenting each view, we will do an analysis thereof.

The First View

Shī‘ism is a very old religion. Its inception took place before Nabī was even made a Messenger. Every single Nabī was asked to accept the Wilāyah of ‘Alī... Many tales have been fabricated by the Shī‘ah in order to prove this view. Among them is that which is reported in al-Kāfī from Abū al-Ḥasan:

\footnote{Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/106}
The Wilāyah of ‘Alī is written in all the books of the ambiyā’. Allah did not send any Rasūl except that he believed in the nubuwwah of Nabī and the Wilāyah of ‘Alī.

It is reported from Abū Ja’far al-Bāqir that he said regarding the verse:

وَلَقَدْ عَهِدْنَآ إِلَّى أَدَمَ مِنْ قَبْلُ فَنَسِیَ وَلَمْ نَجِدْ لَهَ عَزْمًا

And We had already taken a promise from Ādam before, but he forgot; and We found not in him determination.

We had taken a promise from him regarding Muḥammad and the Imāms that succeed him but he left it and he was not determined. The Ulul ʿAzm (the Messengers who held the loftiest ranks) were only given their title on account of the promise that was taken from them regarding Muḥammad, his Awṣiyā after him, the Mahdī and his account. All of them were determined to uphold it and they admitted it.

1 Al-Kulaynī: Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/437
2 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 115
3 This explanation is an exaggerated stretch of the meaning of the verse. In fact, it is blasphemy! The pious predecessors and the later scholars have both explained the verse in the following manner, “we emphasised to Ādam saying to him, ‘indeed this (satan) is your enemy as well as your wife’s enemy. Ensure that he does not manage to get the two of you expelled from Jannah.’ However, he forgot that which he was told (by leaving it out). If he had determination, he would not have obeyed Iblīs who was jealous of him.” Qatādah says, “we did not find in him determination,’ i.e. perseverance.” (Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 16/220-222)
It is also reported in *Al-Biḥār* from Rasūlullāh — as they falsely claim:

O ῦ’Alī, Allah did not send any Nabī except that he made him admit your Wilāyah, whether he wished to or not.¹

Another narration from Abū Jaʿfar al-Bāqir states:

Allah took a promise from the ambiyā’ regarding the Wilāyah of ῦ’Alī.²

Reported from Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣādiq:

Our Wilāyah is the Wilāyah of Allah. He did not send any Nabī except that he believed in it.³

In an attempt to prove this blasphemous belief, their scholar Al-Baḥrānī placed in his book a chapter which he named, “the ambiyā’ were sent upon the belief in the Wilāyah of ῦ’Alī”. They have said:

---

¹ *Al-Biḥār* 11/60, Al-Baḥrānī: *Al-Maʿālim al-Zulfā* pg. 303. This narration can also be found in *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* of al-Ṣaffār and *al-Ikhtiṣāṣ* of al-Mufīd.


³ *Al-Maʿālim al-Zulfā* pg. 303
It has been established that all the ambiyā’ and messengers of Allah as well as all the believers were lovers of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. It has also been established that those who opposed them hated him and all those who loved him... Only those who loved him will enter Jannah, whether they were from the first generation or the last generation. Thus, he is the one who will divide the occupants of Jannah and Jahannam.\(^1\)

Narrations of the same meaning have appeared in many of their reliable books such as al-Kāfī\(^2\), Al-Wāfī\(^3\), Al-Bīhār\(^4\), Mustadrak al-Wasā’il\(^5\), al-Khiṣāl\(^6\), ‘Ilal al-Sharā‘i’\(^7\), Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah\(^8\), Tafsīr Furāt\(^9\), al-Šāfī\(^10\), al-Burhān\(^11\), etc. They have so many narrations that corroborate this that al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī states in Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah (one of their eight canonical works) that the narrations which state that Allah took a promise from the ambiyā’ when he created the creation are more than a thousand.\(^12\)

The Shī‘ī exaggeration does not end with what you have just read. Instead, they go on to claim:

الله عز اسمه عرض ولیتنا على السماوات و الرض و الجبال و المصار

Allah, whose name is exalted, presented our Wilāyah upon the skies, earth, mountains and cities.\(^13\)

\(^{1}\)Al-Kāshānī/Tafsīr al-Šāfī 1/16

\(^{2}\)Al-Kulaynī/Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/8

\(^{3}\)Al-Kāshānī/Al-Wāfī 2/155, 3/10

\(^{4}\)Al-Majlisī/Al-Bīhār 35:151, Al-Qummī/Safīnat Al-Bīhār 1/729

\(^{5}\)Al-Nūrī/Mustadrak al-Wasā’il 2/195

\(^{6}\)Al-Ṣadūq/Al-Khiṣāl 1/ 270

\(^{7}\)Al-Ṣadūq/‘Ilal al-Sharā‘i’ pg. 122, 135, 136, 143, 144, 174

\(^{8}\)Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī/Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah pg. 158

\(^{9}\)Tafsīr Furāt pg. 11, 13

\(^{10}\)Tafsīr al-Šāfī 2/80

\(^{11}\)Al-Baḥrānī 1/86

\(^{12}\)Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah pg. 159

\(^{13}\)Al-Nūrī/Mustadrak al-Wasā’il 2/195
This is why their scholar Hādī al-Ṭahrānī (who is presently one of their Āyāt and authorities) said:

Some narrations indicate that every nabī was instructed to invite towards the Wilāyah of ʿAlī. In fact, Wilāyah was presented to everything. Thereafter, whatever accepted it prospered and whatever rejected it got corrupted.¹

**An Analysis of this View**

There are some views and beliefs, the falsity of which can be highlighted by simply presenting them. This view, undoubtedly belongs to that category. The falsity of it is quite obvious. The Book of Allah, which is amidst us, does not lend support, in any possible way to this absurd claim. The call of the Messengers was towards Towḥīd — and not Wilāyah — as they falsely claim. Allah, the most exalted says:

وَ مَا آَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ قَبْلِكَ مِنْ رَّسُوْلٍ اِلَّ نُوْحِیْٓ اِلَیْهِ اَنَّه لَ اِلٰهَ اِلَّ اَنَا فَاعْبُدُوْنِ

And We sent not before you any messenger except that We revealed to him that, “There is no deity except Me, so worship Me.”²

وَلَقَدْ بَعَثْنَا فِیْ کُلِّ اُمَّةٍ رَّسُوْلً اَنِ اعْبُدُوا اللّٰهَ وَ اجْتَنِبُوا الْتَّاغُوْتَ

And We certainly sent into every nation a messenger, [saying], Worship Allah and avoid the Ṭāghūt [idols and false gods].³

Every nabī and messenger of Allah called his nation towards worshipping Allah alone, without adding any partners. Nūḥ, Hūd, Šāliḥ and Shuʿāyb all said to their nations:

---
¹ Hādī al-Ṭahrānī/Wadāyi’ al-Nubiwwah pg. 115
² Sūrah al-Ambiyā': 25
³ Sūrah al-Naḥl: 36
O my people, worship Allah; you have no deity other than Him.¹

Rasūlullāh said:

I have been commanded to wage war against people until they testify that there is no deity besides Allah and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah.²

Ibn ʿAbbās narrates from Rasūlullāh, who said on the occasion of sending Muʿādh to Yemen:

You will be going to a nation from the People of the Book (Jews and Christians). The first thing that you should call them towards is the worship of Allah, the most honoured and glorious.³

Thus, the authentic Sunnah (aḥādīth) only state that which disproves this opinion. Similarly, “the luminaries among the pious predecessors were all unanimous regarding the fact that the first command towards which a person will be invited is the declaration of the Shahādatayn.”⁴ With this being the case, we are forced to

¹ Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 59, 65, 73, 85
² Reported by al-Bukhārī in Kitāb al-Īmān, the chapter (regarding the verse), “but if they should repent, establish ṣalāh, and give zakāh, let them [go] on their way.” (Sūrah al-Towbah: 5) (1/11), and Muslim in Kitāb al-Īmān, the chapter of being commanded to wage war against people until they say, “there is no deity besides Allah.” It has been reported by others as well.
³ Reported by al-Bukhārī and Muslim with similar wordings. The quoted version is reported by Muslim. Refer to Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Zakāh the chapter of the obligation of Zakāh (2/108) and Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, Kitāb al-Īmān, the chapter of inviting towards the Shahādatayn (1/50-51)
⁴ Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah pg. 75
ask: What is the basis and origin of that which they claim regarding the Wilāyah of ʿAlī I?

If the Wilāyah of ʿAlī I appeared in the scriptures of all the ambiyā‘, then why are the Rawāfiḍ the only people in the world who proclaim it? Why is it unknown to the religious people? Why was this Wilāyah not mentioned in the Qur‘ān, which abrogates all the other Books and Scriptures, and the one which is protected by Allah the Most Exalted and Glorified? The reality is that it nothing but a baseless claim which will only be proclaimed by one who lacks in dīn, intellect and modesty; which would have prevented him from doing so.

Ibn Taymiyyah explains:

People have removed from the scriptures of the ambiyā‘ those texts in which Nabī H was mentioned. None of them had any mention of ʿAlī ... None of the Jews and Christians who have accepted Islam stated that ʿAlī was mentioned in their books, so how can it be said, “every nabī was sent after admitting to the Wilāyah of ʿAlī”, whereas they did not mention that to their nations and it was not narrated by anyone?1

How did these tale-producers have the audacity to belittle the ambiyā‘? How could they claim that Ādam S and they rest of the ambiyā‘ (with the exception of the Ulul ‘Azm) discarded the command of Allah regarding Wilāyah? This is indeed a great accusation! Wilāyah has no basis, and the accusations against the ambiyā‘ are even worse! The greatest paradox is that the same people who have no limits to their extremism regarding the infallibility of the Imāms, unhesitatingly and impudently make these kind of claims regarding the best of Allah’s creation, i.e. the ambiyā‘.

Is this not clear proof that the brains and souls of the people behind these tales are bereft of any knowledge and īmān? Is it not clear proof that they are filled with hatred for the pious and chosen servants and they have made it their objective to

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/46
work together against them? Can there be any doubt that they have used Shi‘ism as a tool to penetrate into the matters of people and destroy their dīn? This is definitely the reality! Only an irreligious person can concoct these types of tales. This belief of theirs implies that the followers of the Imams are of a loftier status than the ambiyā’ (excluding the Ulul ‘Azm) as they followed the command whilst the ambiyā’ left it out! Indeed, this is pure deviation!

The promise that Allah took from the ambiyā’ was that if He sends Muḥammad as a Messenger whilst they are alive, they will believe in his nubuwwah and assist him. This was stated by Ibn ʿAbbās and others. Allah says:

وَ اِذْ اَخَذَ اللّٰهُ مِیْثَاقَ النَّبِیّنَ لَمَآ اٰتَیْتُكُمْ مِّنْ کِتٰبٍ وَّحِكْمَةٍ ثُمَّ جَآءَکُمْ رَسُوْلٌ مُّصَدِّقٌ لِّمَا مَعَكُمْ مِّنَ الشّٰهِدِیْنَ

And [recall, O People of the Scripture], when Allah took the covenant of the ambiyā’, [saying], “whatever I give you of the Scripture and wisdom and then there comes to you a Messenger confirming what is with you, you [must] believe in him and support him.” [Allah] said, “have you acknowledged and taken upon that My commitment?” They said, “we have acknowledged it.” He said, “then bear witness, and I am with you among the witnesses.”

Thus, it is as if these people have taken that which was the accolade of Nabī and attached it to ‘Alī, as per their habit. They were not asked to believe in the details of that with which Muḥammad was sent, so how is it possible that they were asked to support one Ṣahābī out of all the believers? Further, the Muslims are unanimous regarding the fact that if a person believes in Nabī and obeys him without being informed that Allah created Abū

1 Refer to Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 6/557 (The researched edition).
2 Sūrah al-A’rāf: 81
Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, and ‘Alī, he will not be taken to task for it, and it will not affect his entry into Jannah. When this is the case regarding the ummah of Muḥammad, then how can it be said that it was compulsory upon all the ambiyā’ to believe in one specific Ṣaḥābī?¹

If we may ask, what happened to the intellect of those who believe in this type of bunkum? How is it possible that promises were taken from all the ambiyā’ prior to us, as well as their nations that they will accept the Imāmah of ‘Alī? This is, as explained by Ibn Taymiyyah:

The speech of mentally deranged people. The ambiyā’ all passed away before Allah created ‘Alī, so how could he be their amīr? The most that can be claimed (as far as logic is concerned) is that he was the amīr of the people of his time. Claiming that he was the amīr and Imām of those who were created before him (his existence) as well as those who will be created after him (his death) can only be done by one who has absolutely no understanding of that which he is blurring out, and he is not shy to blur nonsense...

This is from the same category as the claim of Ibn al-ʿArabī al-Ṭāʿī and his likes from the irreligious among the Sūfis who claim that the ambiyā’ acquire the benefit of knowledge from the lantern of the seal of awliyā’ (pious people), and those who only appeared six hundred years after Muḥammad. Thus, the claim of these people is from the same category as the claim of those people regarding the pious. Both of them based their claims upon lies, extremism, shirk, false claims and opposition of the Qur’ān, Sunnah and the beliefs of the pious predecessors, regarding which they were unanimous.²

What exactly is the object and motive behind this type of claims, the falsity of which is apparent to all and sundry? Is it to deter people from the dīn of Allah?

¹ Refer to Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/46
² Ibid 4/78
Since the falsity of these claims are obvious, if they are spread and attributed to Islam, and the people of other religions happen to see them; they will doubt Islam itself (due to such beliefs, which defy logic as well as the revealed scriptures being attributed to Islam).

How do the intellectuals and people of knowledge react to this weird explanation regarding the corruption or prosperity of objects, plants, water, etc., that it is based on their position regarding the Wilāyah of ‘Alī? What will the world say regarding this? Is this the religion that they wish to present to people? Or is it simply that they wish to taint the image of Islam and prevent people from drawing close to it?

It is not surprising to see the Shī‘ah proclaiming this view, as they are the champions of bizarre exaggerations which belie undeniable realities and indisputable narrations, and they believe in that which is refuted by the intellect and divine texts. This is their view regarding the one who they claim to be their Imām. However, they have equally weird beliefs regarding those who they falsely believe to be his enemies. This is their belief regarding the first two rightly guided and celebrated khulafā’:

It appears in a narration that al-Qā‘im (their awaited saviour), when he emerges, will revive them and take them to task for every single sin and vice that took place in the world, even the murder of Hābīl by Qābīl, the casting of Yūsuf in the well by his brothers, the casting of Ibrāhīm (as in the fire and everything else). Similarly, it reported from al-Ṣādiq that not a stone moved, nor did a cup of blood be spilt, except that they will be responsible for it, i.e. the first and second Khalīfah.\

---

1 Al-Baḥrānī: Durrah Najafīyyah pg. 37. Refer also to Rijāl al-Kashshi pg. 205-206, Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah 1/82.
The Second View (of the Shīʿah)

Some of the former as well as the latter day Shīʿah believe that Rasūlullāh  is the one who planted the seeds of Shīʿism, and that Shīʿism became apparent in his era. There were some Ṣaḥābah who became part of the Shīʿah of ‘Alī  and supported him from that era. Al-Qummī says:

فاؤل الفرق الشیعة وهي فرقة على بن ابی طالب المسمون شیعة على في زمان النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم و بعده معروفون بالانقطاع لهم الیه و القول بإمامته منهم المقداد بن الانسود الکندی و سلمان الفارسی و ابو ذر جندب بن جنادة الغفاري و عمار بن ياسر المذحجي...وهم اول من سموا باسم التشیع من هذه الامة

The first sect to appear was the Shīʿah, who are the sect of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. They were referred to as Shīʿat ‘Alī in the time of Nabī  as well after him. They are well known for confining themselves to him and believing in his Imāmah. Among them were Miqdād ibn Aswad al-Kindī, Salmān al-Fārsī Abū Dhar Jundub ibn Junādah al-Ghifārī and ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir al-Madhḥajī... They were the first people to be referred to Shīʿah in this ummah.¹

This view is confirmed by al-Nawbakhtī² and al-Rāzī.³ Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā (d. 1373 A.H) says:

ان اول من وضع بذر التشیع على قلوب الإسلام هو النفس صاحب التشیع-يعني ان بذرة التشیع وضعت مع بذرة الإسلام جنبًا إلى جنب و سواء و لم يزل غارسها يتعاهدها بالسقیة و الری حتى نمت و ازدهرت في حياته ثم امرت بعد وفاته

The first person to plant the seed of Shīʿism on the lands of Islam was the one upon whom the sharīʿah was revealed. This means that the seed of

---

¹ Al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq pg. 15
² Firaq al-Shīʿah pg. 17, al-Shībī erred in quoting the view of al-Nawbakhtī by saying that he believed that Shīʿism started after the demise of Rasūlullāh  . Refer to al-Ṣilah Bayn al-Taṣarruf wa l-Tashayyu’ pg. 22
³ Refer to al-Rāzī (who was among the scholars of the Ismāʿīliyyah) Al-Zīnah pg. 205 (of the manuscript).
Shīʿism was planted side by side and concurrently with the seed of Islam.¹
The one who planted it then took care of it by watering it and irrigating
it until it grew and blossomed in his lifetime and bore its fruits after his
demise.²

A group of present day Shīʿah subscribe to this view.³

An Analysis of this View

Firstly: the first person to proclaim this view was al-Qummī in his book al-
Maqālāt wa l-Firaq and al-Nawbakhtī in his book Firaq al-Shīʿah. Perhaps the most
influential reason behind the invention of this view is that some Muslim scholars
traced back the origin and growth of Shīʿism to foreigners. They had done so on
account of the clear indications which prove this, as will be explained. Therefore,
in an attempt to counter this, the Shīʿah tried to establish that their religion was
divinely instated. In this way, they wish to refute the claims of their opposition
that they have foreign roots. This is the reason behind this claim of theirs.

Every means and avenue was adopted by them to substantiate and support this
view, including the fabrication of many aḥādīth against Rasūlullāh ﷺ.
They then went on to claim that these are narrations that are reported by the Ahl
al-Sunnah, whereas they are such narrations “which are unknown to the greatest

¹ Take note of how he admits that the seed of Shīʿism is different to the seed of Islam.
² Aṣl al-Shīʿah pg. 43
³ Refer to Muḥsin al-ʿĀmilī: Aʾyān al-Shīʿah 1/13, 16, Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: Al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah
27, al-Shīrāzī: Hākadhā al-Shīʿah pg. 4, Muḥammad al-Ḥasanī: Fī Zīlāl al-Tashayyuʿ pg. 50-51, al-Zayn:
Al-Shīʿah fī l-Tārīkh pg. 29, 30, al-Muẓaffar: Tārīkh al-Shīʿah pg. 18, Al-Ṣadr: Baḥth Ḥawl al-Wilāyah pg. 63,
Ahmad Tuffāḥah: Uṣūl l-Dīn pg. 18, 19
⁴ The books on the subject of fabricated aḥādīth of the Ahl al-Sunnah have many narrations regarding
this subject, which were narrated by the Rawāfiḍ. As examples, refer to Al-Mowḍūʿāt of Ibn al-Jowzī
1/338s, al-Showkānī: Al-Fawāʾid al-Majmūʿah pg. 342, al-Kattānī: Tanzīh al-Sharīʿah 1/351. They have
many different ways and methods by which they try to establish proof against the Ahl al-Sunnah. I
have written regarding this in my book Fikrat al-Taqrīb pg. 51.
scholars of the Sunnah as well as the conveyors of the sharī‘ah. Most of them are either fabricated, reported by unreliable people or they have no relation to that which they wish to prove therefrom.”

Secondly: This view cannot be established from the Qur’ān and the Sunnah. It has no reliable historical chain of narration. Rather, it is a view that is alien to Islam and it contradicts established historic fact. Islam is a means of uniting this ummah upon the truth, not a means of dividing them into sects and parties. In the era of Nabī ﷺ, there was no mention of Shī‘ah or Sunnī. Allah ﷻ says:


Indeed, the religion in the sight of Allah is Islam.

There is no mention of Shī‘ism or anything else. They have admitted in their statement, “this means that the seed of Shī‘ism was planted side by side and concurrently with the seed of Islam...” that Shī‘ism is different to Islam. Allah ﷻ says:


And whoever desires other than Islam as religion — never will it be accepted from him...

Among the undeniable historical facts which exposes the preposterousness of this view and its stark contradiction to the reality is that there were no Shī‘ah in the era of Abū Bakr, ’Umar and ’Uthmān. Some of the scholars of the

1 Ibn Khaldūn: Al-Maqqaddimah 2/527, researched by ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Wāḥid Wāfī
2 Sūrah Āl-ʿImrān: 19
3 Sūrah Āl-ʿImrān: 85
4 Ibn Taymiyyah says, “during the khilāfah of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, there were no such people who were referred to as Shī‘ah, and the word Shī‘ah was not attached to any person’s name.” Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/64, researched by Dr Muḥammad Rashād Sālim.
Shīʿah were forced to accept this reality, even though it is their temperament to deny established realities. Their Ayatollah and mujtahid of his time, Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā says:

و لم يكن للشیعة والتشیع يومئذ (فى عهد ابى بكر و عمر رضي الله عنهما) مجال للظهور لن السلام

...و لم يكن للشیعة والتشیع يومئذ (فى عهد ابى بكر و عمر رضي الله عنهما) مجال للظهور لن الإسلام

There was no scope in that era (the eras of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar) for the Shīʿah to make an appearance, as Islam was upon its correct methodology and path.¹

A similar acknowledgement was made by another scholar of theirs, Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-ʿĀmilī who said:

ان لفظ الشیعة قد اهمل بعد ان تمت الخلافة لبی بكر و صار المسلمون فرقة واحدة الى اواخر ایام

الخليفة الثالث

The word Shīʿah was left out after khilāfah was established for Abū Bakr and the Muslims became one group. This continued until the last days of the third khalīfah.²

We say: It was left out because it simply did not exist. How is it possible that it was left out and it did not make an appearance whereas you believe that the government was kāfir, as is stated so often in your books that it cannot be doubted that these are your beliefs (the quotations and necessary explanation will soon appear). How is it possible that the Muslims were split into different sects in the era of Rasūlullāh, but they united during the eras of the three khulafā’?

Thirdly: They claim that the Shīʿah were made up of ʿAmmār, Abū Dhar and Miqdād. Did any of these luminaries accept any of the beliefs and doctrines of the Shīʿah such as Naṣṣ, declaring Abū Bakr, ʿUmar as well as majority of the

¹ Aṣl al-Shīʿah pg. 48
² Al-Shīʿah fī l-Tārīkh pg. 39-40
Ṣaḥābah to be kāfīr, etc.? Did they display any detachment, or dislike for them? Did they use foul language regarding them? Definitely not! None of the above can be established. The narrations and claims which appear in the books of the Shīʿah (who have filled volumes of books with these narrations) are nothing but a figment of their imagination. They were concocted by the imaginations of the jealous ones and the enemies.¹

Ibn al-Murtaḍā (who is a Zaydī Shīʿī) says:

فان زعموا ان عمارا و ابا ذر الغفارلى و المقداد بن السود و سلمان الفارسى كانوا سلفهم لقولهم بامامة
على اكذبهم كون هؤلاء لم يظهروا البراءة من الشیخین و لا السب لهم الا ترى ان عمارا كان عاملا لعمر
بن الخطاب في الكوفة و سلمان الفارسي في المدائن

If they claim that ʿAmmār, Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī, Miqdād ibn Aswad and Salmān al-Fārsī were their predecessors as they believed in the Imāmah of ʿAlī, they are proven to be liars by the fact that neither did any display any kind of disassociation from Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, nor did they revile them. Do you not see that ʿAmmār was ʿUmar’s governor in Kūfah and Salmān was his governor in Madā’in?²

These historical facts blow away all that claims that the Shīʿah have built up along the centuries.

Fourthly: Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allah believes that this view is a grave error committed by the Shīʿah, which has reached the pinnacle of insolence. It is a severe accusation

¹ One such view is their fabrication that Zubayr, Miqdād and Salmān shaved their heads with the intention of fighting Abū Bakr. (Rijāl al-Kashshī number 210 pg. 133). Their narrations regarding this will fill up volumes of books. It should be noted that in this narration they mentioned Zubayr, whereas he later fought against ʿAlī, and they forgot to mention Abū Dhar, ʿAmmār and the Ahl al-Bayt.


³ Ṭabaqāt Ibn Saʿd 4/87

⁴ Al-Munyah wa l-Amal pg. 124, 125
against Nabī ﷺ and it is an intolerable manipulation of words. He is especially surprised at their claim, “the first person to plant the seed of Shi‘ism is the one upon whom the sharī‘ah was revealed.” He remarks, “which seeds did Nabī ﷺ plant, that it grew into ears of reviling and declaring as disbelievers the Ṣaḥābah, and the best individuals of this ummah? It grew into ears of believing that the Qur‘ān was adulterated by the hypocrites among the Ṣaḥābah, the unanimity of the ummah is deviation, and righteousness is when they are divided and the true beliefs hid inside the tidal wave of the deviation of the Shi‘ah.”

The Third View

It is claimed that Shi‘ism started on the Day of Jamal. Ibn al-Nadīm² says:

ان علیا قصد طلحة و الزبیر لیقاتلهما حتى یفیئا الى امر الله جل اسمه فسمى من اتبعه على ذلك الشیعة
فكان يقول شیعتى و سماهم علیه السلام الصفیاء الولیاء شرطة الخمیس الصحاب

‘Alī set out to fight Ṭalḥah and Zubayr so that they could once again submit to the law of Allah ﷺ. Thus, whoever followed him in this was called Shi‘ah. He would say, “my Shi‘ah,” and he named them, “the chosen ones, the guardians, the vanguards and the companions.”³

This is a view (as far as I know) that is only held by Ibn al-Nadīm. It seems as if he is indicating towards the appearance of the Shi‘ah in the meaning of helpers and followers, and the historical date from which the word Shi‘ah was used for the helpers of ‘Alī ﷺ, and that he was the one who named them Shi‘ah. Thus, this view has no indication to the inception of Shi‘ism as a separate sect with its own mind-set and principles. Here, the literal meaning of Shi‘ah (which means helpers) is meant. This is why he used other titles with a similar meaning such as companions and guardians. It has already been explained that the expressions “my Shi‘ah,” “Shi‘ah”, just as they were used by ‘Alī ﷺ, were also used by Mu‘āwiyah.

1 Al-Washī‘ah
2 Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Ya‘qūb al-Nadīm. He was a Mu‘tazilī Shi‘ī. Among his works are al-Fahrist. He died in the year 438 A.H. (Lisān al-Mīzān 5/72)
3 Ibn al-Nadīm: al-Fahrist pg. 175
Dr Muṣṭafā Kāmil al-Shībī (a contemporary Shīʿī from Egypt) states that this view of Ibn al-Nadīm is strange, due to him mentioning that Shīʿism was a title that ʿAlī himself granted to his companions...⁠¹ However, I do not see anything strange about ʿAlī calling his helpers “my Shīʿah.” Dr Nashshār is of the view that there is some extremism² in the statement of Ibn al-Nadīm, but he does not explain the reason behind this view.

The Views of Non-Shīʿah Regarding the Inception of Shīʿism

The First View

Shīʿism started after the demise of Rasūlullāh, as a result of some believing that ʿAlī was most deserving of being the khalīfah. This view was stated by group of classical as well as contemporary scholars including ʿAllāmah Ibn Khaldūn, Ahmad Amīn and some orientalists. This view stems from that which is narrated by some that there were people at that time who felt that the relatives of Nabī were most deserving of being the khulāfā’ after him. In Khaldūn says:

The inception of this state (of the Shīʿah) was when Nabī passed away and the Ahl al-Bayt opined that they are most deserving of the post, and that the khilāfah was reserved for their men, excluding everyone else.³

Arab Amīn says:

The first seed of Shīʿism was the group that believed that after the demise of Nabī the Ahl al-Bayt were most deserving of succeeding him.⁴

---

¹ Al-Ṣilah Bayn al-Taṣawwuf wa l-Tashayyu’ pg. 18
² Nash’at al-Fikr al-Falsafi 2/32
³ Al-ʿIbar 3/170-171
⁴ Fajr al-Islām pg. 266, Refer to Duḥā al-Islam 3/209. Dr ʿAlī al-Kharbūṭalī says, “we are of the view that Shīʿism started after the khilāfah was concluded in respect of Abu Bakr instead of ʿAlī. ” Al-Islām wa l-Khilāfah pg. 26. Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh ʿInān held the same view. Refer to Tārīkh al-Jamʿiyyāt al-Sirriyyah pg. 13
This view of Aḥmad Amīn (among others) is identical to that of the orientalists.¹

**An Analysis of this View**

This view has been adopted based upon the view that the relatives have the greatest right to khilāfah. There is no doubt that if there was such a view, then there was also a view that Saʿd ibn ʿUbādah should be appointed as the khalīfah and the Anṣār were most deserving of the post. This does not tell us of the inception and birth of any separate group or sect. Differences of opinion were an obvious and natural occurrence. They are the result of the system of consultation in Islam.

Hence, they differed in that meeting, however, “they did not separate until they agreed upon a decision. This cannot be considered a fight.”² All of them unanimously agreed to obey Abū Bakr. Alī heard the entire affair and he pledged allegiance to Abū Bakr in front of a crowd of witnesses. He even volunteered to join in the campaign against Banū Ḥanīfah.³ Their condition was one of mutual love and unity. They would put their lives and the best of their wealth in obedience to their khalīfah (Imām), just as they would do during the era of their Nabī.⁴

If the view of the Ahl al-Bayt being most deserving of the post was in reality the inception of Shīʿism, then undoubtedly they would have made some appearance in the era of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. However, it was a view (if it is established) like all the other views that were expressed at the meeting at al-Saqīfah. If it was expressed, it was discarded after the bayʿah took place; unity was reached and all agreed upon one decision.

The stance of Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī demands that these views and opinions ceased to exist and came to an end among the Ṣaḥābah. It has been narrated from

---

¹ Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-Islāmiyyah 14/58
² Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/36
³ Al-Juwaynī: Al-Irshād pg. 428
⁴ Al-Nāshī al-Akbar: Masāʾil al-Imāmah pg. 15
him with tawātur\(^1\) in many different ways that he proclaimed from the pulpit of Kūfah, “the best of this ummah after its Nabī is Abū Bakr and then ‘Umar’.”\(^2\) Thus, how is it possible that any of the other Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh \(^{3}\) would believe regarding him that which he himself did not believe?

There is no mention of the Shīʿah in the eras of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān \(^{4}\). Thus, how can it be claimed that their inception took place after the demise of Rasūlullāh \(^{5}\).\(^3\) As mentioned, this reality has been accepted by some of the scholars of the Shīʿah.

1 A narration reported by such a large number of people that it is inconceivable that they could have all agreed upon a lie.

2 Ibn Taymiyyah says, “it is reported from ‘Alī from approximately eighty sources or more that he said this on the pulpit of kūfah. A narration of Bukhārī which is reported by the men of al-Hamdān specifically, wherein ‘Alī \(^{6}\) says ‘if I was a doorkeeper of Jannah, I would say to Hamdān, ‘Enter in peace.’”. From the narration of Sufyān al-Thowrī who reports from — Mundhir al-Thowrī from — Hamdān—Al-Bukhārī from — Muḥammad ibn Kathīr from —Sufyān-jāmi’ ibn Abī Rāshid from — Abū Ya’lā-Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah: “I asked my father, ‘who is the best of people after Rasūlullāh \(^{7}\)’? He replied, ‘Abu Bakr.’ I asked, “who is next?” He replied, ‘then ‘Umar.’ I feared that he would say ‘Uthmān so I asked, ‘and then you?’ He replied, ‘I am one among the Muslims’. (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī with Fatḥ al-Bārī Kitāb Faḍā’il al-Ṣaḥābah Bāb Faḍl Abī Bakr 7/20) This was said to his son, in whose presence there is no way that he could have been doing Taqiyyah.” Al-Fatāwā 4/407–408, Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/137–138

3 That which has been narrated by some (that a group appeared after the demise of Nabī \(^8\) who believed that ‘Alī \(^{9}\) was deserving of Imāmah) has no authentic historical evidence. It seems as if it is based upon the narration of al-Ya’qūbī in his book on history, wherein he says, “a group, including Salmān, Abū Dhar, ‘Ammār and Miqdād delayed their pledge of allegiance to Abū Bakr and inclined towards ‘Alī.” (Tārīkh al-Ya’qūbī 2/124) However, the narrations of al-Ya’qūbī, and similarly al-Masʿūdī should be carefully studied or avoided. This is because they were inclined towards Shīʿism. Thus, when a narration reflects their inclination towards Shīʿism, then it becomes even more deserving of being discarded. Qāḍī Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī comments regarding those narrations which are reported by them alone, “do not take the speech of any historian except al-Ṭabarī. Besides him, the rest are cancerous and deadly.” He further states regarding the historian al-Masʿūdī, “he was an innovator who was deceived.” (Al-‘Awāṣim Min al-Qawāṣim pg. 248–249) Another reason why al-Ṭabarī can be relied upon is that he narrates with chains of narration, which makes it possible to ascertain the authenticity of his narrations.
The Second View

Shīʿism started when 'Uthmān遐遐 was murdered. Ibn Ḥazm states:

Thereafter, 'Uthmān遐遐 assumed governance, and he remained for twelve years. His death was the cause of disputes, whereupon the Rawāfiḍ١ were given birth to. The one who started the plantation of the seed of Shīʿism was 'Abd Allah ibn Saba', (the Jew.²) who started his movement at the end of the era of 'Uthmān遐遐.

---

1 Al-Fiṣal 2/8. This view of Ibn Ḥazm was held by other scholars as well, such as Shaykh 'Uthmān ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥanafī, the author of Al-Firaq al-Muftariqah Bayn Ahl al-Zaygh wa l-Zandaqah. Refer to Al-Firaq al-Muftariqah pg. 6. Similarly, the orientalist Wellhausen also held this view. Refer to Al-Khawārij wa l-Shīʿah pg. 112

2 'Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ was the founder of the Saba‘iyyah. He would claim that ‘Alī was a deity, he believed in Rajʿah and he would revile the Ṣaḥābah. He was originally from Yemen. He was a Jew who portrayed himself to be a Muslim. In order to spread his mischief, he travelled to Ḥijāz, followed by Baṣrah and thereafter Kūfah. He entered Damascus during the reign of 'Uthmān遐遐, but he was expelled by its people, due to which he turned towards Egypt, where he openly proclaimed his corrupt innovations. Ibn al-Ḥajar states: “‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ was among the extremist disbelievers (who adopted blasphemy as their trademark). He was astray and he would lead others astray. I think ‘Alī burnt him in the fire.” There are many narrations regarding his mischief, personal ideas and efforts in causing strife along with his cohorts in the books of sects, biographies, history etc., of both, the Ahl al-Sunnah as well as the Shīʿah. Refer to al-Mīṭṭi: Al-Tanbīḥ wa l-Radd pg. 18, al-Ash’arī: Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/86, al-Baghdādī: Al-Faqṣ bayn al-Firaq pg. 233, al-Shahristānī: Al-Milal wa l-Nīḥāl 1/174, al-Isfarāyīnī: al-Tabṣīr fī l-Dīn pg. 71-72, Al-Rāzī: ’Iʿtiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn pg. 86, Ibn al-Murtadā: Al-Munyat wa l-Amal pg. 29, Ibn Ḥajar: Līsān al-Mīzān 3/289, Ibn ‘Asākir: Tārīkh Dimashq 7/431, al-Samʿānī: Firaq al-Shīʿah pg. 22. Al-Kashshī reports a few narrations regarding Ibn Saba’, refer to Rijāl al-Kashshī, narrations 170, 171, 172, 173 and 174 (from page 106-108), Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd: Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah 2/308
Many classical and modern-day researchers have insisted that he was the foundation and the first brick in the building of Shīʿism. His existence has been narrated with tawātur in both, Shīʿī as well as Sunnī sources. However, a group of Shīʿah have sprung up in this era who attempts to deny his existence by simply striking their pens and blackening pages. They have no real grounds or solid proof to prove their claim. Some of them even claim that ‘Abd Allah ibn Saba’ was in fact ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir. These claims are an attempt or a strategy by which they wish to exonerate the Jews from the crime of conspiring against the Muslims. At the same time, it serves as a scheme by which they wish to attribute divinity to Rafḍ and silence the opposition, who have stated that Shīʿism has roots that are foreign to Islam.

The classical Shīʿī and Sunnī scholars did not have any difference of opinion concerning the existence and presence of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ during a certain

1 Ibn Taymiyyah, for example, is of the view that Ibn Saba’ was the first person to claim that ‘Alī was infallible and his appointment to Imāmah was divine. He wished to pollute Islam, just as Paulus polluted Christianity (Majmūʿ Fatāwā 4/518 (compiled by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Qāsim)). Ibn al-Murtaḍā corroborates this view in his book al-Munyat wa l-Amal (pg. 125). From the modern-day scholars, Abū Zahrah (among others) states that Ibn Saba’ was the greatest devil who was at the forefront of the groups who were filled with hostility towards Islam and conspired against its adherents. He concocted the belief of the re-incarnation of ‘Alī and that he was the appointed successor of Muḥammad, and he called towards this.

Abū Zahrah also states that Ibn Saba’ and his group were the greatest mischief-makers, in whose shadows the Shīʿī religion was formed. Refer to Tārīkh al-Madhāhib al-Islāmiyyah 1/31-33). Another scholar is Saʿīd al-Afghānī, who is of the view that Ibn Sabā’ was one of the pioneers of a (Talmudic) secret society, whose ultimate dream was to crush the Islamic empire, and they were working towards empowering the Roman empire. Refer to ʿĀʾishah wa l-Siyāsah pg. 60 and al-Qaṣīmī fi l-Ṣirāʿ pg. 60. The scholar ʿAlī al-Baṣrī is of the view that al-Wardī was in fact parroting his teacher Hidāyat Alūḥakīm al-Hillī, who is a lecturer in the University of London, and he published these views of his in his book Takhs Imām (the first Imām). Al-Wardī published the translation thereof in his book Wuʿʿāẓ al-Salāṭīn. Refer to Majallat al-Thaqāfah al-Islāmiyyah-Baghdād-edition 11 year 1, the article of ʿAlī al-Baṣrī titled, “Ali al-Wardī-Another Attention Seeker”.

2 Murtaḍā al-ʿAskarī in his book ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’... pg. 35 onwards.

3 ‘Alī al-Wardī in his book Wuʿʿāẓ al-Salāṭīn pg. 274. He was parroted by another Shīʿī, i.e. Muṣṭafā al-Shībī in his book al-Ṣilah bayn al-Ṭaṣawwuf wa l-Tashayyu’ pg. 40-41. The scholar ‘Alī al-Baṣrī is of the view that al-Wardī was in fact parroting his teacher Hidāyat Alūḥakīm al-Hillī, who is a lecturer in the University of London, and he published these views of his in his book ʿĀʾishah wa l-Siyāsah pg. 60 and al-Qaṣīmī fi l-Ṣirāʿ pg. 60. The scholar ʿAlī al-Baṣrī is of the view that al-Wardī was in fact parroting his teacher Hidāyat Alūḥakīm al-Hillī, who is a lecturer in the University of London, and he published these views of his in his book Takhs Imām (the first Imām). Al-Wardī published the translation thereof in his book Wuʿʿāẓ al-Salāṭīn. Refer to Majallat al-Thaqāfah al-Islāmiyyah-Baghdād-edition 11 year 1, the article of ʿAlī al-Baṣrī titled, “Ali al-Wardī-Another Attention Seeker”.
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period in history. Thus, how can something be denied after it has been established by both groups? The claim that he was ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir is rejected by the intellect, narrations and history. It is impossible that ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir subscribed to the beliefs that were proclaimed by Ibn Saba’. This claim is another offence carried out against the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh and an insult to their integrity.

There is no need for me to delve into this matter as objective and comprehensive studies have already been penned down regarding the subject. Thus, it is unnecessary for us to continue discussing it. At this juncture, it will be sufficient for us to reproduce that which appears in the reliable books of the Shī‘ah regarding Ibn Saba’. This will add weight to the argument in a few different senses. Firstly, it is in accordance to the standards of the discussion, i.e. basing our discussions upon their sources. Secondly, the claim that he did not exist came from the Shī‘ī camp. Thus, their claims will be uprooted if they are proven wrong from their reliable books. Thirdly, by presenting the views regarding Ibn Saba’ from Shī‘ī sources, a sketch of the roots and origin of Shī‘ism will be painted in their own words.

So what do the Shī‘ī books say regarding Ibn Saba’? The scholar of the Shī‘ah, Sa’d ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Qummī (d. 229-301), “the scholar, jurist and pride of the sect” (as described by al-Najāshī) admits that he existed and mentions the names of some of his accomplices. He names their sect “the Saba’iyyah”. He also considers them

---

1 Among the most important and outstanding books on the subject is the book ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ wa Atharuhū fī Iḥdāth al-Fitnah by Dr Sulaymān al-‘Awdah. It is a comprehensive study wherein he scrutinises the speech of those who wish to create doubts, and deny the existence of Ibn Saba’ or claim that he was ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir. On the basis of proof and evidence, he established the preposterousness of these views.

Another scholar who disproves these views is Dr ‘Ammār al-Ṭālibī, who done so in his book Ārā’ al-Khawārij (pg. 75-81). Dr ‘Izzat ʿAṭiyyah also scrutinises and disproves these views in his book al-Bid‘ah (pg. 64). Dr Sa’dī al-Hāshimī did a valuable discourse on the subject, in which he proved the existence of Ibn Saba’ from the sources of both groups. (Refer to Ibn Saba’ Ḥaqīqah lā Khiyāl pg. 201-223 Muḥāḍarāt al-Jāmi‘ah al-Islāmiyyah, year 1399 A.H.-1998 C.E)

2 Rijāl al-Najāshī pg. 126
to be the first extremist Islamic sect. He believes that Ibn Saba’ was:

The first person to disparage Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān and the Šaḥābah. He dissociated himself from them and claimed that ʿAlī commanded him to do so.

Al-Qummī mentions that ʿAlī was informed of this, whereupon he ordered that he should be killed. However, he later decided against this and sufficed upon expelling him to al-Madā’in.¹ He also quotes from a group of scholars (as he describes them):

'Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ was a Jew who embraced Islam and accepted the Wilāyah of ʿAlī. Whilst he was a Jew, he would believe that Yūshaʿ ibn Nūn was the Waṣī of Mūsā, so after embracing Islam, he believed in the same concept with regards to ʿAlī. He was the first person to proclaim that the Imāmah of ʿAlī was compulsory and he dissociated himself from his enemies... and declared them disbelievers. On account of this, those who oppose the Shīʿah say that the Rafḍ is based upon Judaism.²

Thereafter, al-Qummī quotes the words of Ibn Saba’ when the news of the demise of ʿAlī reached him, wherein he claimed that he did not pass away but rather will return back to the world and in this manner did he adopt extremism.³

---

¹ Al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq pg. 20
² Al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq pg. 20
³ Al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq pg. 21
You have just read the statement of al-Qummī regarding Ibn Saba’, and al-Qummī is described by the Shīʿah as, “reliable and an expert on the science of narrations.” His knowledge, according to them, is extremely lofty, as a result of it being collected at a very early stage. Also, Sa’d al-Qummī, as narrated by their scholar who was given the title al-Ṣadūq (the honest one), that is Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, met their infallible Imām Ḥasan al-’Askarī (as they believe) and heard from him.²

Their scholar, al-Nawbakhtī agrees with all that which has been mentioned by al-Qummī regarding Ibn Saba’, even as far as the wording is concerned.³ He is considered by them to be reliable.⁴ Al-Kashshī⁵ reports six narrations regarding Ibn Saba’⁶ in his famous book Rijāl al-Kashshī. This book is the oldest and most reliable book of the Shīʿah on the science of narrators. Those narrations imply that Ibn Saba’ claimed nubuwwah and that Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn is Allah — Allah is exalted and pure of these allegations! It also mentions that ‘Alī commanded him to repent, but he refused to do so, whereupon he had him burnt alive. Al-Kashshī mentions that he would concoct lies in the name of ‘Alī and he quotes the curses of the Imāms regarding ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ as well. ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn said:

May curse of Allah be upon the one who fabricates in our names. When I think of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ every hair on my body stands on end. He

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: al-Fahrist pg. 105, al-Ardabīlī: Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt 1/352
2 Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī: Ikmāl al-Dīn pg. 425-435
3 Firaq al-Shīʿah by al-Nawbakhtī pg. 22-23
5 He is regarded by them as “reliable and well-versed with narrations and narrators”. (al-Ṭūsī: al-Fahrist pg. 171)
6 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 106-108, 305
propagated a most heinous belief, what is wrong with him, may Allah curse him. ʿAlī was, by the oath of Allah, a pious slave of Allah and the brother of Rasūlullāh. He only achieved honour from Allah on account of his obedience to Allah.\(^1\)

After mentioning these narrations, al-Kashshī says:

\[\text{ذکر اهل العلم ان عبد الله بن سبا کان یهودیا فاسلم و والی علیا و كان يقول وهو على يهوديته في يوشع بن نون وصى موسى بهذه المقالة فقال في اسلامه بعد وفاة رسول الله صلى الله علیه و سلم فى على بمثل ذلك و كان اول من شهد بالقول بفرض امامة على و اظهر البراءة من اعداءه و كاشف مخالفیه و اکفرهم فمن هاهنا قال من خالف الشیعة ان اصل الرفض مأخوذ من اليهودیة}

ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saba’ was a Jew who embraced Islam and accepted the Wilāyah of ʿAlī. Whilst he was a Jew, he would believe that Yūshaʿ ibn Nūn was the Waṣī of Mūsā, so after embracing Islam, he believed in the same concept with regards to ʿAlī. He was the first person to proclaim that the Imāmah of ʿAlī was compulsory and he dissociated himself from his enemies, exposed them and declared them disbelievers. On account of this, those who oppose the Shīʿah say that the Rafḍ is based upon Judaism.\(^2\)

This is the statement of al-Kashshī, which corresponds to the statement of al-Qummī and al-Nawbakhtī, all of whom authenticate their statements by attributing them to the people of knowledge.

In addition, all of these narrations appear in Rijāl al-Kashshī, which they accept as one of the four references which can be relied upon regarding the science of narrators. This book was systemised by Shaykh al-Ṭā’ifah al-Ṭūsī, due to which its reliability and the value of research therein was multiplied manifold in their sight. This is because it was a combined effort of al-Kashshī, who is regarded by them as reliable and well-versed in sciences of narrations and narrators, as well

---

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 108
2 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 108-109
as al-Ṭūsī, who is the author of two of their four canonical books as well as two of their reliable books (according to them) on the science of narrators.¹

Many of their other books on the science of narrators have mentioned Ibn Saba’². An example of this is the book which is considered as the most important and all-encompassing book on narrators in this day and age, i.e. *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*³ by their scholar ‘Abd Allāh al-Mamaqānī⁴ (d. 1351). It is for this reason that another approach can be noticed among some of the contemporary Shi‘ī scholars, i.e. they abstain from denying that he existed. As an example, Muḥammad al-Zayn says:

و على كل حال فإن الرجل اى ابن سبا كان في عالم الوجود و اظهر الغلو و ان شك بعضهم في وجوده وجعله شخصا خياليا...اما نحن بحسب الاستقراء الاخير فلا نشك بوجوده و غلوه

Nevertheless, the man (Ibn Saba’) existed and he was an open extremist, even though some of them have doubted his existence and felt that he was an imaginary individual. As far as we are concerned, in accordance to the latest research, we have no doubt regarding his existence and extremism.⁵

---

¹ That which we have quoted from al-Kashshī was from the systemisation and selection of al-Ṭūsī, as the original (as they claim) no longer exists. Refer to *Muqaddimat Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 17, 18, Yūsuf al-Bahrānī: *Lu’lu’at al-Baḥrayn* pg. 403


³ *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 2/183

⁴ Al-Aʿlamī: *Muqtabas al-Athar* 21/230

⁵ *Al-Shīʿah fī l-Tārīkh* pg. 213
This approach rescues them, because if they deny his existence, they will be discrediting and belying their scholars (even though they have not clearly stated so) who have mentioned Ibn Saba’, and their books on narrators wherein he is repeatedly mentioned. It will also be an unintentional acknowledgement from them that their books on narrators cannot be relied upon and they hold no weight, even if all of them state the same view.

Thus, it is admitted in the books of the Shī‘ah that Ibn Saba’ was the first person to claim that ‘Alī was divinely appointed, he will be reincarnated and he was also the first person to revile the first three khulafā’ and the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh. These are ideas and beliefs which later became the foundation of Shī‘ism, as they, as well as other beliefs were given the form of narrations and aḥādīth and they were falsely, deceptively and shamelessly attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt. This duped many of the ignorant masses, non-Arabs and others into accepting them.

The Third View

Shī‘ism started in the year 37 A.H. Among the most famous people to hold this view is the author of Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah who says:

The name Shī‘ah became known in the year 37 A.H.¹

This view is also held by Montgomery Watt who says:

The Shī‘ī movement started on one of the days of the year 658 CE (37 A.H).²

It seems as if this view links Shī‘ism to the incident of Şīfīn — which occurred in the year 37 A.H between ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyyah — and that all the incidents that followed and all the effects that came about resulted from this incident. However, this view is not related to the inception of Shī‘ism as far as its principles

¹ Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah pg. 5
² Montgomery Watt, Islam and the Integration of Society pg. 104
are concerned, as none of the books of history state that the proclamation of the views of divine appointment of ʿAlī ʿa.s as the khalīfah, his Rajʿah or any of the other famous beliefs of the Shīʿah were among the happenings of this year.

It is impossible that the supporters of ʿAlī ʿa.s were upon the religion of the Shīʿah, or that they adopted any of their principles. This is despite the fact that among the ranks of the supporters of ʿAlī as well as Muʿāwiyah ʿa.s were some enemies of Islam who acted as if they were Muslims in order to plot against Islam from the inside. The Sabaʿiyyah were definitely highly influential in stirring up strife. This cannot be denied. However, it should be noted that prior to the arbitration as well as in the write up thereof, the word Shīʿah was used for both parties without singling out any of them, as was explained.

The Fourth View

Shīʿism started after the martyrdom of Ḥusayn ʿa.s. R Strothmann\(^1\) says:

\[\text{The blood of Ḥusayn was the first seed of Shīʿism in the form of beliefs.}^2\]

The Preferred View

We have presented most of the views regarding the inception of Shīʿism, along with an analysis of each view. However, my view is that Shīʿism as a separate ideology and set of beliefs did not come into being all of a sudden. It went through different stages along and transformed over a period of time. Nonetheless, the first signs thereof and the core fundamentals were first proclaimed by the Sabaʿiyyah, as admitted in the books of the Shīʿah, which state that he was the first person to claim that the Imāmah of ʿAlī was compulsory and that he was the Waṣī of Muḥammad ʿa.s (as explained). This is the basis of Shīʿism according to the scholars, whose statements have already been quoted under the definitions of Shīʿism.

---

1 Rudolf Strothmann was among the orientalists who studied religions and sects. He has penned down discussions regarding them. Among his works are Cult of Zaidi, as well as four Ismaʿilī books. Refer to Najīb al-ʿAqīqī: al-Mustashriqūn 2/788.

2 Dāʾirat al-ʿArif al-ʿIslāmiyyah 14/59
Shīʿī books also admit that Ibn Saba’ was the first person to openly disparage Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān — who were the in-laws of Rasūlullāh, his relatives, his successors and the closest of people to him. He was also guilty of reviling the other Ṣaḥābah. The beliefs of the Shīʿah in respect of the Ṣaḥābah are identical to the above-mentioned, and they are recorded in their most reliable books. Furthermore, Ibn Saba’ believed in the Raj’āh of ‘Alī, a belief which is also among the fundamental beliefs of the Shīʿah, as will be explained. Another belief of Ibn Saba’ to which they also subscribe is that ‘Alī and his Ahl al-Bayt were granted a special knowledge which was confined to them, as indicated to by Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah (d. 95/100 A.H.) in Risālat al-Irjā.

These beliefs have become the fundamental beliefs of the Shīʿah. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī contains narrations which indicates that these beliefs came about at a very early stage, and that ‘Alī enquired regarding them. He was asked, “do you people (Ahl al-Bayt) have any knowledge that is not mentioned in the Qur’ān or is not known to anyone else?” He answered by strongly denying this. These are the


2 Ibn Ḥajar says: “Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Abū Muḥammad al-Madanī. His father was well known by the name Ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah. He has a booklet concerning Irjā which was narrated along with its isnād by Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-ʿAdnī in his book Kitāb al-Īmān.” Refer to Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb 2/32

3 Risālat al-Irjā (inside Kitāb al-Īmān of Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-ʿAdnī pg. 249-250)

4 Al-Imām Al-Bukhārī reports this ḥadith under the following chapters: writing down knowledge 1/204 (al-Bukhārī maʿā al-Fatḥ), the sacredness of al-Madīnah 4/81, the freeing of captives 6/167, the protection and care offered by Muslims 6/273, the sin of the one who promises and then breaks his promise 6/279, 280, the sin of the slave who dissociates himself from those who freed him 12/41-42, blood money 12/246, a Muslim is not killed in lieu of a Kāfir 12/260, the prohibition of delving deep into matters, fighting and being extreme 13/275-276, Muslim reports it under the chapters: the virtue of al-Madīnah and its sacredness 9/143-144, the book on animal slaughter 13/141 (Muslim maʿā Sharḥ al-Nawawī), al-Nasāʾī reports it in al-Mujtabā 8/19, Sunan al-Tirmidhī 4/668, Musnad Aḥmad 1/100.
most important beliefs of the Shī‘ah,¹ which were traced immediately after the martyrdom of ʿUthmān ʿa., in the era of ʿAlī ʿa. However, they were not accepted in the form of a set of beliefs by any specific and known sect. In fact, he Saba’īyyah did not raise their heads, except that ʿAlī ʿa. fought against them.²

Unfortunately, the events that took place after this (the Battle of Ṣiffīn, the incident of the arbitration that followed it, the assassination of ʿAlī ʿa. and the killing of Ḥusayn ʿa.) created a perfect environment for these ideas to be propagated and kept up by a specific group and sect. All of these incidents stirred up the emotions of people and prompted them to support the Ahl al-Bayt. Therefore, the idea of supporting ʿAlī ʿa. and his household began penetrating the hearts of people, but it was then hijacked and misused by all those who wanted to destroy Islam, whether they were irreligious, hypocrites or satanic. In this manner, the infiltration of foreign ideas and beliefs into the Muslims took place, all under the guise of support for ʿAlī ʿa., as it was the easiest path. Thereafter, with the passing of time, this innovation began spreading and its danger thereof was intensified, as Ibn Saba’ now had many successors.

During the era of ʿAlī ʿa., the title ‘Shī‘ah’ meant nothing else but support and help. It was not related in any way to the present-day beliefs of the Shī‘ah. Further,

---

¹ It is important to take note of that the strong link between the inception of Shī‘ism and Ibn Saba’ are confined to the extremist Shī‘ah (who are the majority in this era), as for “the moderate Shī‘ism which merely grants precedence to ʿAlī ʿa. and this type of beliefs, this was not started by the irreligious ones, as opposed to the sect that claims he was divinely appointed and he was infallible. This sect was started off by a hypocrite who was irreligious.” Ibn Taymiyyah: Majmū‘ah al-Fatāwā 20/466. The person referred to is Ibn Saba’ and his cronies from the Jews, hypocrites, jealous people and mentally instable persons.

² He ordered that those who believe that he is a deity should be burnt. Refer to Ibn Taymiyyah: Minhāj al-Sunnah (researched by Dr Muḥammad Rashād Sālim, Faṭḥ al-Bārī 2/270, al-Mīlī: al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd pg. 18, al-Isfarāyīnī: al-Tabṣīr fi l-Dīn pg. 70. As for the Saba’īyyah who would revile Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, he summoned Ibn al-Sowdā’ (who was believed to be the perpetrator of these crimes). It is said that he intended to kill him but he escaped and fled. Regarding the Mufaḍḍilah, i.e. those who grant ʿAlī superiority over Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, he said, “If anyone is brought to me who says that I am superior to Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, I will mete out to him the punishment of false accusations.” Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/219-220
this word or title was confined to the supporters of ʿAlī. This is proven from the record of the arbitration, in which the word Shīʿah was used for both, the supports of ʿAlī (ra as well as the supports of Muʿāwiyah. The details of this have already passed.

Thus, the tragedies that that were faced by the Ahl al-Bayt (the martyrdom of ʿAlī, the martyrdom of Ḥusayn, etc.) were among the influential causes for people to unhesitatingly support the Ahl al-Bayt. However, this matter was hijacked by the enemies, who were impatiently awaiting the occurrence of calamities among the Muslims. Thus, they found this to be an opportune moment and a perfect reason to infiltrate the ranks of the Muslims.

Among their ‘achievements’ thereafter was that they split the ranks of the ummah and they managed to achieve, through plotting and planning, that which they failed to achieve by means of weapons and arms. Shīʿism was the realisation of the dream of all those who longed for the downfall of Islam and conspired against it. This is why it also attracted many conspirators of other religions. Once they managed to form a sect, they began laying down the ‘inspired and revealed’ principles of their religion, and they attributed it to Islam. This will be discussed next under the topic, “the origins of Shīʿism”.

The Origins of Shīʿism

The scholars and researchers have differed regarding the origins of Shīʿī beliefs. Some have stated that it has Jewish origins, others have stated that it has Persian origins, a third group says that it was the home of old Asian beliefs such as Buddhism.¹ There are other views as well.

¹ They are the followers of Buddha. They are scattered across Asia and the beliefs of the different groups differ Buddha. Japanese Buddhists believe that he is a god who is embodied in the universe. The Buddhists of India (from where it started) do not have a deity. The Buddhists of China are inclined towards the belief that there is one deity who manifests himself in the form of different people and Buddha was one of them. For more details, refer to Muḥammad Sayyid Kīlānī: Dhayl al-Milal wa l-Niḥal pg. 13, 26, 31, Muḥammad Abū Zahrah: al-Diyānāt al-Qadīmah pg. 53, Sulaymān Maẓhar: Qiṣṣat al-Diyānāt pg. 73
The View that it has Jewish Roots

There are some researchers who believe that Shīʿism has a Jewish flavour to it. This conclusion is reached due to two different reasons:

Firstly, Ibn Saba’ was the first person to believe in the divine appointment of ʿAlī and Rajʿah, and Ibn Saba’ was a Jew. These ideas went on to become the core principles of Shīʿism. It is for this reason that al-Qummī, al-Nawbakhtī and al-Kashshī (who were among the classical Shīʿī scholars) have indicated towards this, after gathering and reviewing the ideas of Ibn Saba’ which ware later ‘elevated’ to degree that they became the founding principles of Shīʿism. They state:

فمن هنا قال من خالف الشيعة ان اصل الرفض مأخوذ من اليهودية

This is why those who oppose the Shīʿah say that the origin of Rafḍ is Judaism.¹

Secondly, there is a degree of resemblance between the foundations of Judaism and Shīʿism. Perhaps the first and most encompassing statement that was pronounced regarding this² is that which is reported from al-Shaʿbī. Ibn Ḥazm indicates to a portion thereof. He says:

These Shīʿah are treading the path of the Jews who believe that Ilyās and Fanḥās ibn al-ʿĀzār ibn Hārūn are alive up until today.⁴

---

¹ Refer to al-Qummī: al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq pg. 20, al-Nawbakhtī: Firaq al-Shīʿah pg. 22, Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 108
² ‘Āmir ibn Sharāḥīl ibn ʿAbd Dhī Kibār al-Shaʿbī. A narrator from the Tābiʿīn. He had a phenomenal memory (d. 102 A.H.) Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb 5/5
³ Reported by al-Khallāl in Kitāb al-Sunnah. The researcher of the book says that the isnād is unreliable as it contains ’Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Mālik ibn Mīghwāl whose narrations were not accepted. However, whatever has been mentioned therein is found among the Rāfiḍah. Al-Sunnah lī l-Khallāl 2/563-565, Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/6-10, al-Lālikā’ī: Sharḥ Uṣūl ʾIʿtiqād Ahl al-Sunnah, Kāshif al-Ghummah fī ʾIʿtiqād Ahl al-Sunnah pg. 611, Ibn al-Jowzī: al-Mowḍūʿāt 1/337, Ibn Bakr: al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān pg. 233-234 (of the manuscript).
⁴ Al-Fiṣal 5/37
Ibn Taymiyyah says that the Shīʿah in their extremism, ignorance and following of desires resemble the Jews in certain aspects and the Christians in other aspects.\(^1\) People have always described them in this manner. Thereafter he quotes the statement of al-Shaʿbī regarding their resemblance to the Jews and Christians. Many researchers have held this view.\(^2\)

**The View that Shīʿism is of Persian Origin**

Some researchers are of the opinion that Shīʿism has Persian links. This is due to the following factors:

**Firstly,** as stated by Ibn Ḥazm and al-Maqrīzī, the Persians had a vast kingdom, they had dominance over all other nations and they were overawed by themselves to the extent that they would call themselves the free ones (as opposed to slaves) and the masters and the rest of the nations were considered by them, to be their slaves. Thus, when their kingdom came to an end at the hands of the Arabs (who they viewed as the people of the least potential) they were dumbstruck and mind boggled. No calamity could not have been worse than this.

Hence, they planned a number of physical attacks against the Muslims. However, on each of these occasions, Allah granted dominance to the truth. Thereupon, they realised that waging a subtle ideological war against the Muslims would be

---

1. Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/6
2. Among them is Ahmad Amīn who says, “Judaism became apparent in Shīʿism, as they believed in Rajʿah and they claimed that the Shīʿah are forbidden upon Hell except for a few moments just as the Jews said, “Hell will not touch us, except for a few days”. Christianity became apparent due to the speech of some of them who said, “the relationship between Allah and the Imam is the same as the relationship between Him and the Messiah.” Refer to Fajr al-Islām (pg. 276). Goldziher is of the view that the concept of Rajʿah crept into the Shīʿah due to Jewish and Christian influences. Refer to al-ʿAqīdah wa l-Sharīʿah (pg. 215). Similarly, Friedlaender states that the core ideologies and doctrines of Shīʿism were donated to it by Judaism. Refer to al-ʿAqīdah wa l-Sharīʿah pg. 100. Wellhausen says that their origins go back to Judaism, and he points out some of the beliefs which are common between the Jews and the Shīʿah. Aḥzāb al-Muʿāridah pg. 170
more productive. The result of this was that some of them hypocritically came across as Muslims and won the confidence of some of the supporters of ʿAlī ʿAyyūb by ostentatiously expressing their love for the Ahl al-Bayt and condemning the oppression that ʿAlī ʿAyyūb underwent (according to them). Thereafter, they steered them onto paths which distanced them from the path of guidance.¹

Secondly, the Arabs believed in freedom (in choosing their rulers) whereas the Persians believed that kingdom was inherited and restricted to the family in authority. The idea of choosing the khilāfah was unheard of by them. Thus, since Nabī Ṭabīq passed away and he did not leave behind any sons, the most deserving person of leadership would be his cousin, ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib ʿAyyūb. Consequently, whoever else assumed the post of khilāfah — such as Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān — all snatched the post from the one who was most deserving of it.

Added to that, the culture of the Persians was to consider the ruler to be — to some degree — divine. As a result, they viewed ʿAlī ʿAyyūb and his progeny in the same light. They would say, “obedience to the Imām is compulsory. Obeying him is in fact obedience to Allah.”² Many Persians had accepted Islam, but they did not rid themselves of all their previous beliefs, which they inherited generation after generation. Thus, with the passing of time, they merely gave their old ideologies an Islamic flavour. Hence the view of the Shīʿah regarding ʿAlī and his progeny is the exact same view that was held by their forefathers regarding the rulers.

Shaykh Abū Zahrah says:

We believe that the Shīʿah were affected by Persian ideologies regarding kingdom and inheritance, as the resemblance between their religion

---

and the system of Persian kingdom or rule is quite evident. This view is supported by the fact that most Persians are Shi‘ah and the first Shi‘ah were from Persia.

Thirdly, after the Muslims conquered the Persian lands, Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī married the daughter of Yazdegerd — one of the kings of Persia — after she was brought into the lands of Muslims along with all the other captives. ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn was born out of this wedlock. Thus the Persians now had seen in their offspring, who were born out of Ḥusayn’s wedlock, heirs to their previous kingdom. They believed that the blood that flowed in the veins of ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn and his progeny was Iranian (Persian) blood (due the daughter of Yazdegerd who was his mother) and he was from the progeny of the Sassanid and thus divine kings (according to their belief). Added to that, the name Fāṭimah (as stated by some) is a revered name among the Persians, as there was a Fāṭimah, according to Persian history, whose achievements were praiseworthy.

Fourthly, there are some narrations in the books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah which have a Persian flavour to them. According to them, Salmān — who was exonerated by Allah from their blasphemous beliefs — had a few specialities and qualities which raised him above the sphere of being a normal human. Their narrations state:

1 Muhammad Abū Zahrah: Tārīkh al-Madhāhib al-Islāmiyyah 1/38
2 For more information regarding the fact that the mother of ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn was the daughter of Yazdegerd, refer to Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī 2/247, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī 1/53. To understand the effects thereof, refer to Samīrah al-Laythī: al-Zandaqah wa l-Shu‘ūbiyyah pg. 56, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī: Wa Já’a Dowr al-Majūs pg. 77, al-Nashshār: Nash‘at al-Fikr al-Falsafī 2/111, ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥiṣān: al-Mahdī wa l-Mahdawiyyah pg. 82, Donaldson DM: /This Shi‘ite Religion pg. 101
3 She helped out greatly — as they believe — in exposing the fire-worshipper Samardays, who took over the throne of the Kayānīn. Thus Fāṭimah was brave and consequently sanctified. If it was not for, the matters of this Smardays, the fire-worshipper would have remained unknown. If it was not for her, her father Otans and his companions would not be able to conspire against him. Refer to ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥiṣān/al-Mahdī wa l-Mahdawiyyah pg. 84, on the authority of Herodotus (2/462), al-Maqdisī: al-Bad‘ wa l-Tārīkh 4/134, 6/95
Salmān is the door of Allah upon the Earth. Whoever recognises him is a believer and whoever does not recognise him is a kāfir.¹

This description of Salmān یُمَحْرَمُ is repeatedly found in their narrations regarding their twelve Imams. Similarly, their narrations state:

بهذة الله اله ما ماذا ينكر في ذهن يقول كيت كيت

Allah sends an angel to him who whispers into his ears saying such and such...²

Ḥasan ibn Manṣūr reports:

I asked al-Ṣādiq, “was Salmān divinely inspired?” and he replied, “yes.” I asked, “who conveys to him the inspiration?” He replied, “an honourable angel.” Thereafter, I asked, “if Salmān is of this status, then what is the status of his companion?” He replied, “mind your own business.”³

This narration establishes that Salmān received revelation. It also implies that his companion, ʿAlī یُمَحْرَمُ was level above that as well! Their narrations establish that Salmān یُمَحْرَمُ was blessed with the knowledge of the ambiyā’ and Imams. It states:

سلمان ادرك علم الول والخر

Salmān had the knowledge of the first and the last.

The narration then goes on to explain this:

معنى علم النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم و علم على و أمر النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم و أمر علي

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 15
2 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 16
3 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 19
i.e. the knowledge of Nabī H and ʿAlī and the matters of Nabī H and ʿAlī.¹

It is also stated in their narrations that Salmān is one of those Shīʿah (as the falsely claim) by means of whom:

ترزقن و بهم تنصرون و بهم تمطرون

You are given sustenance, helped and because of whom you are granted rain.²

Some of the Shīʿah were not satisfied with this degree of extremism. Hence they took it even further by claiming that Salmān was a deity. This sect was found in the era of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī (d. 330 A.H). He indicates towards them in his book, Maqālāt, by saying:

Some people have said, in this era, that Salmān al-Fārsī was a deity.³

The narrations of this type which appear in the books of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah could be from the effects of this group. This is because the books of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah are an all-inclusive collection of the absurdities of all the different sects of the Shīʿah. However, the fact that these narrations have been preserved warns us that this group could resurface at some point in the future.

In this day and age, we have witnessed, among the inner circles of the Shīʿah an attitude of honouring a Persian personality, who participated in conspiring against the Khilāfah Rāshidah (the rightly guided khulafā‘, viz. Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān and ʿAlī M), i.e. Abū Luʿluʿah, the Persian fire-worshipper who assassinated ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb I. He is granted the honourable title of Bābā Shujāʿ al-Dīn⁴, by them. The date of the murder of ʿUmar I, at the hands

---

¹ Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 16
² Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 6-7
³ Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/80
⁴ ʿAbbās al-Qummī: al-Kunnā wa l-Alqāb 2/55
of this fire-worshipper is celebrated as one of their ‘Īds. Their scholar, al-Jazā’irī quoted many narrations regarding this. Furthermore, they honour the Day of Nayrūz, just as the fire-worshippers do, whereas their narrations clearly state that the Day of Nayrūz is the ‘Īd of the Persians.

**The View that Shī‘ism is the Home of Old Asian Beliefs**

Some believe that Shī‘ism is the home and habitat of old Asian beliefs such as Buddhism and others. Āḥmad Amīn says:

> Under the banner of Shī‘ism, views such as *Tanāsukh al-Arwāḥ* (transmigration of souls), believing in *Tajsīm* (Anthropomorphism), *Ḥulūl* (that the Almighty may embody another person) and other similar beliefs which were common among the Brahmins, philosophers and Zoroastrians before it entered the Islamic world.

---

1. *Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah* 1/108
5. The transference of the soul, after death, from one body to another, whether it is the body of a human or an animal. This view was held by some Hindus and Pythagoras of Greece and thereafter found its way into the Muslim world. Refer to *al-Mu’jam al-Falsafī* pg. 55, *al-Ta’rīfāt* by al-Jurjānī pg. 93
6. They are those who affiliate themselves with a man from them named Braham. *al-Mīlal wa l-Nīḥal* 2/251, or Birhām, who was one of the kings of Persia. *Al-Munyat wa l-Amal* pg. 72, They believe in Allah but disbelieve in the ambiyā’. They have different sects among them. Refer to the above-mentioned references.
7. Besides worshipping fire, they also believe that everything is based upon two principles; light and darkness. Light, according to them, always existed, whilst darkness came about later. The laws of the Zoroastrians also revolve around two principles; i.e. explaining the reason why light mixes with darkness and explaining the reason why it is free from darkness. Mixing of the two is considered the beginning and freedom of light is the end-point. *Al-Mīlal wa l-Nīḥal* 1/232, al-Rāzī: *I’tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa l-Mushrikīn* pg. 134 Akhbār Uman al-Majūs:al-Kasandar Sībīl
8. *Fajr al-Islam* pg. 277
One of the orientalists pointed out that many un-Islamic beliefs were embraced by the Shīʿah. He states:

“Those beliefs were adopted from Zoroastrianism, Maniasm, Buddhism and other religions which were popular in Asia even before the appearance of Islam.”

The author of *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* says:

“The religion of the Shīʿah has exact resemblances with Judaism, Christianity, polytheism and Zoroastrianism. Thereafter he mentions the reasons behind their resemblance with each group.”

A very accurate statement was made by the person who said that after studying the different sects of the Shīʿah, he found that Shīʿism contained all those beliefs against which Islam waged war.

**The Preferred View Regarding the Origin of Shīʿism**

I am of the view that simply claiming that ʿAlī was divinely appointed as the khalīfah is not necessarily something that has foreign roots. Love for the Ahl al-Bayt is natural (for Muslims). This love itself, does not demand that any difference is made between the different members of the Ahl al-Bayt, extremism is adopted as far as their love is concerned, or any of the Ṣaḥābah should be bad-mouthed — as is the practice of those who claim Shīʿism.

---

1 Maniasm: The followers of Mānī ibn Fātik who was a Zoroastrian by origin, and thereafter formed a religion between fire-worship and Christianity. The Zoroastrians opposed him and tried to kill him, until eventually he was killed by Bahrām ibn Hurmuz ibn Sābūr, after the era of ʿĪsā. His religion remained among his followers. They also believe in the two principles; light and darkness. They believe that the universe was formed from these two, and that light is greater than darkness. It is the praiseworthy deity. Refer to *al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* 1/244 onwards, *al-Munyat wa l-Amal* pg. 60, *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* pg. 18, *al-Rāzī: Iʿtiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa l-Mushrikīn* pg. 128
2 Vloten: *al-Siyādat al-ʿArabiyyah* pg. 83-84
3 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* pg. 298
4 Barakāt ʿAbd al-Fattāh: *al-Wahdāniyyah* pg. 125
Love for the Ahl al-Bayt increased and intensified after the calamities and trials that they were put through, starting from the assassination of ʿAlī, thereafter his son Ḥusayn and so on. These incidents ripped open the emotions of the Muslims. The ideologies of Ibn Saba’ did not find fertile grounds to flourish and spread except after the occurrence of these tragedies.

However, Shīʿism in the form of set beliefs such as the divine appointment of ʿAlī, Rajʿah, Badā, Ghaybah, ʿIṣmah, etc., there is no doubt that these beliefs were brought into the ummah and they unlawfully entered the ranks of the Muslims. Their roots can be traced back to many different nations, as whoever had any malice and hatred for Islam and the Muslims jumped onto the bandwagon of Shīʿism.

Shīʿism was also a safe haven for all those who wished to remain upon their beliefs (whether they were Jews, Christians, Zoroastrian or followers of any other set of beliefs) and still be referred to as Muslims. The outcome of all of this was Shīʿism became a conglomeration of foreign doctrines which forced their way into it. This will be explained under the in-depth study of their principles. Ibn Taymiyyah accurately stated that those who claim to be adherents of Shīʿism composed their religion from the beliefs of the Persians, Romans, Greeks, Christians, Jews and others. They added all of these to Shīʿism. Thereafter, he says that this is the realisation of the information passed on to us by Nabī, that this ummah will follow in the footsteps of the people before them, and he quotes the relative aḥādīth. He says that this the exact condition of the Shīʿah.

The Sects of the Shīʿah

The books regarding sects are filled with the names of the different sects and groups of the Shīʿah. What draws our attention is the amount of sects that they

1 This is unlike the first case, where a mere claim is made and it is not linked in any way to a person’s beliefs and it has no effect upon his status as a Muslim.

2 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/147, read the aḥādīth regarding this in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-ʿiṣām bī l-Sunnah, Bāb Qowl al-Nabī Latattabiʿanna Sunan Man Kān Qablakum number 2669, al-Musnad 2/450, 511, 527
have amongst them. Perhaps no other religion in the world has that amount of sects. It is their outstanding trait, or rather calamity. After the death of each of their Imāms, a new set of sects emerged, and each sect had a unique methodology by which they would appoint the next Imām. Similarly, each sect would invent a unique set of beliefs and thereafter claim that they alone were on the correct path.

This difference of opinion was something that the Shīʿah themselves complained and grumbled about. One of the Shīʿah asked his Imām, as quoted by Rijāl al-Kashshī:

“May Allah allow me to be sacrificed for you! What is all this differences in your Shīʿah?” He asked, “what differences?” The questioner replied, “I sit in their study circles in Kūfah, which makes me doubt regarding the differences in their aḥādīth.” Abū ʿAbd Allāh (al-Ṣādiq) replied, “yes, it is as you have stated. The act of lying against us has been imbued into people. I say a ḥadīth to one of them, but he does not leave my presence until he interprets it against its interpretation. That is because they do not seek by means of our ḥadīth and love for us the reward of Allah. Their only goal is worldly wealth and each one dreams of being made a leader.”

This narration spells out to us that love for leadership and the wealth of this temporary world was the motive behind many Shīʿah embracing Shīʿism, as well as the fact that lying and fabricating against the Ahl al-Bayt was their passion. This was the reason behind their differences and splintering. Al-Mašʿūdī (al-

---

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 135-136, Bihār al-Anwār 2/246
Shīʿī) mentions that that there is a total of seventy-three sects among the Shīʿah, and each group declares the next group disbelievers. It is for this reason that the Rāfīḍī Mīr Bāqir al-Dāmād assumed that the ḥadīth which states that the ummah will split up into seventy three different sects refers to the sects of the Shīʿah, and the one that will be granted salvation is the Imāmiyyah.

1 Muruḥ al-Dhahāb 3/221, also refer to al-Rāzī: Iʿtiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn pg. 85
2 Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad al-Istarbādī, famously known as Dāmād. He was among the scholars of the Shīʿah during the reign of the Ṣafawīs (d. 1040). His biography can be found in al-Kunnā wa l-Aqlāb 2/206, al-Muḥībī: Khulāṣat al-Athār pg. 301, al-Ḥakīmī: Tārīkh al-Ulamā pg. 83
3 The ḥadīth about the ummah splitting into seventy-three sects is as stated by Ibn Taymiyyah: “A Mashhūr (one level below mutawātir) and authentic ḥadīth which appears in the Sunan and Masānīd.” (al-Fatāwā 3/345, gathered by 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Ṭāwīfī). “There are so many narrations of the ḥadīth regarding the splitting of the ummah into seventy-three sects that no doubt can remain regarding the meaning thereof.” (al-ʿĪm al-Shāmīkīh pg. 414).

It should be noted that this ḥadīth has been narrated without mentioning that any of them will be doomed. This version has been reported by most of the ḥadīth scholars including the authors of Sunan books (besides al-Nasāʾī). Other versions mention that one will attain salvation and the rest will be doomed. This is not reported by any of the authors of Sunan books besides Abū Dāwūd in Kitāb al-Sunnah (number 4573). It is also reported in Al-Dāramī 2/241, Ahmad 4/102, Ḥākim 1/128 and al-Ājurrī reports it in al-Sharīʿah pg. 18.

There is also a narration which states that all the sects will attain salvation besides one, i.e. the irreligious sect. The ʿulamā have classified this narration as a fabrication. Refer to Kashf al-Khafā 1/369, Al-Asrār al-Marfūʿah pg. 161.

Just as the Ahl al-Sunnah have reported this ḥadīth, the Shīʿah have also done so. The wording reported by them is: “My ummah will split into seventy two groups, from which seventy one groups will be doomed and one will attain salvation.” They asked, “who will that group be, O Rasūlullāh?” He replied, “the majority, the majority, the majority!” Another narration states: “My ummah will split up into seventy three sects after me. One sect from them will attain salvation and seventy two will be in hell.” Refer to Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī: al-Khiṣāl 2/584-585.

There is no clear mention in these narrations that all these sects will be from the Shīʿah. Added to that, it is unambiguously stated that the sect that will attain salvation is the majority (not the Shīʿah)!

As for the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Muʿtazilah and others, they are regarded by him to be part of those who need an invitation towards Islam. He believes that they did not yet accept the call towards Islam, and have not entered into it. This view was expressed by earlier Shīʿah as well. Al-Shahrastānī\(^1\) and al-Rāzī\(^2\) have indicated towards this. Dāʿirat al-Maʿārif states:

> It has become apparent from the subsidiary laws of the Shīʿah that there are more sects than the seventy three famous ones.\(^3\) Al-Maqrīzī mentions that they have reached three hundred.\(^4\)

The basis of their differences, in most cases, is account of their differences regarding the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt. They have many different opinions regarding the appointment of Imāms, their numbers and whether Imāmah should end with one of the Imams or it should be passed on to the next person and whether he should be made an Imam. This is besides their differences in subsidiary laws and fights regarding the interpretations of aḥādīth.

Al-ʿAllāmah Ibn Khaldūn, after stating their differences regarding the appointment of Imāms:

> This type of difference of opinion proves that there was no divine appointment.\(^5\)

This means that their claim that Rasūlullāh  عليه السلام himself appointed ʿAlī ﷺ and the other Imāms is definitely baseless. This conclusion is based upon the fact that if the appointment was divine, there would be no differences and disagreements, especially to the extent that was found amongst them. Since there is a high degree of differences, we are forced to believe that there was no divine appointment. Allah ﷻ says:

---

1. Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal 1/165
2. Al-Rāzī: Iʿtiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn pg. 85
3. Dāʿirat al-Maʿārif al-Islāmiyyah 14/67
4. Al-Khuṭaṭ 2/351
5. Ibn Khaldūn: Lubāb al-Muḥaṣṣal pg. 130
If it had been from [any] other than Allah, they would have found within it much contradiction.¹

It is imperative to remember that Imāmah is the building block and foundation of Shī‘ism. Thus, differences of opinion regarding it cannot be tolerated, as is tolerated in subsidiary matters. The leading scholar of the Zaydiyyah in his era, Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā al-Murtaḍā (d. 840 A.H), considered the differences that arose at the death of each Imām and the appointment of the next Imām as the strongest and clearest proof which exposes the falsity of the claim that the Imams were divinely appointed.²

When we look at the books regarding sects, or other books which have mentioned the different sects of the Shī‘ah, we find that they had such differences in their principles that on account of it they split up into many types of different sects. Al-Jāḥiẓ believes that there are only two types of Shī‘ah; Zaydiyyah and Rāfiḍah. He says:

اعلم رحمك الله ان الشیعة رجلان زیدى و رافضى و بقیتهم بدد ل نظام لهم

Know well, may Allah have mercy upon you, that the Shī‘ah are only two types; the Zaydīs and the Rāfiḍīs. The rest of them are unsettled, they have no order.⁴

This classification is accepted by the leading scholar of the Shī‘ah, al-Mufīd who

---

1 Sūrah al-Nisā: 82
2 He was among the greatest scholars of the Zaydiyyah, to the extent that his books on jurisprudence were highly appreciated by the Zaydiyyah of Yemen and those who affiliate themselves with the Ahl al-Bayt. Refer to al-Showkānī: al-Badr al-Ṭāli‘ 1/122
3 Al-Munyat wa l-Amal pg. 21
4 Thalāth Rasā’il lī l-Jāḥiẓ (published by al-Sindūbī) pg. 241, or Rasā’il al-Jāḥiẓ, Risalāt Istiḥqāq al-Imāmah pg. 207 (researched by ʿAbd al-Salām Hārūn)
Imām al-Ashʿarī believes that there were primarily three sects; the Ghāliyah, the Rāfiḍah (Imāmiyyah) and the Zaydiyyah. According to his count, the total amount of sects of the Shīʿah were forty-five. Fifteen sects belonged to the Ghāliyah, twenty-four to the Rāfiḍah and six to the Zaydiyyah. The Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah are considered by him as one of the sects of the Rāfiḍah (Imāmiyyah), and he names them al-Qaṭīʿīyyah. He states that they are the majority of the Shīʿah.

Many of the authors of books regarding sects have followed in the footsteps of al-Ashʿarī as far as regarding them to be, in essence, three sects. Al-Rāzī, al-Isfarāyīnī, Ibn al-Murtaḍā and Ibn Taymiyyah are examples of the many scholars who did so.

Al-Rāzī names them saying, the Zaydiyyah, the Imāmiyyah and the Kaysāniyyah. Ibn al-Murtaḍā says, “the Shīʿah are three sects; the Zaydiyyah, Imāmiyyah and Bāṭiniyyah.” Ibn Taymiyyah categorised them placing each one on a different level, the worst of them being the Ghāliyah (who believe that ʿAlī was to some degree a deity or at least that he was a Nabī), followed by the Rāfiḍah, and the best of them being the Mufaḍḍilah among the Zaydiyyah and others (who grant precedence to ʿAlī over Abū Bakr and ʿUmar but believe that their khilāfah was valid and they were just. They do not dissociate themselves from them.

---

1 Al-Irshād pg. 195
2 Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/66, 88, 140
3 Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/90
4 Refer to the statement of Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn ibn Yūsuf al-Askūbī wherein he says, “as for the Shīʿah, they are twenty two sects, three of whom are the roots of the rest, i.e. the Ghulāt, the Zaydiyyah and the Imāmiyyah.” al-Raddʿ al-Shīʿah, page 9 of the manuscript.
5 Ḥaṣan al-Iṣṭiqāʾ Fī al-ʿAqīdah al-ʿAqīdah, pg. 77
6 Al-Munyat wa l-Amal pg. 20, al-Maqdisī: al-Badʿ wa l-Tārīkh 5/125
7 Ibn Taymiyyah: al-Tisʿīniyyah pg. 40 inside Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā vol. 5 printed in Kurdistan 1329 A.H.
ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī believes that there are four primary sects among the Shīʿah; the Zaydiyyah, Imāmiyyah, Kaysāniyyah and the Ghulāt. He gives all of them the title of Rāfiḍah.⁰ According to his count, there are twenty sects in total,¹ excluding the extremists.² He includes the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah among the sects of the Imāmiyyah and he refers to them as the Qaṭīʿiyah as well,³ even though he previously listed Qaṭīʿiyah and the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah as two different sects of the Imāmiyyah,⁴ not as one sect.⁵

As for al-Shahrastānī, he is of the view that the Shīʿah were divided into many different sects. He says, “they have many differences and views regarding their counts of the Imams. At each count and hesitation (to appoint the next Imām) a new book, a new sect and a further decline takes place.”⁶ However, he states that in principle, they are five sects; the Kaysāniyyah, Zaydiyyah, Imāmiyyah, Ghulāt and Ismāʿīliyyah.⁷

The author of al-Ḥūr al-ʿAyn sums up the many different sects into six main sects.⁸ Ibn Qutaybah counts them as eight.⁹ Abū al-Ḥasan al-Milṭī believes that the Shīʿah have twelve (primary) sects. He refers to all of them as Rāfiḍah.¹⁰ He is supported, as far as this view is concerned, by al-Saksakī in his book al-Burhān fī

---

1 Al-Faqr bayn al-Firq pag. 21
2 The extremists are twenty sects according to him. Al-Faqr bayn al-Firq pag. 232
3 Al-Faqr bayn al-Firq pag. 23
4 Ibid pg. 64
5 Ibid pg. 53
6 It is for this reason that Muḥy al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd points out that the manner in which al-Baghdādī’s list in Al-Faqr bayn al-Firq, the Twelvers are a separate group from the Qaṭīʿiyah (footnotes of Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/90). He did not realise that al-Baghdādī clearly stated that the Qaṭīʿiyah and the Twelvers are one sect. Al-Faqr bayn al-Firq pag. 64
7 Al-Mīlal wa l-Nihal 1/147
8 Ibid 1/147
9 Al-Ḥūr al-ʿAyn pag. 154
10 Ibn Qutaybah: al-Maʿārif pg. 622-623
11 Al-Tanbīḥ wa l-Radd pag. 18
However, it is surprising to note that al-Milṭī refers to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah as the Ismā‘īliyyah. Ibn al-Jowzī is of the view that the Shī‘ah are twelve sects, and Imam al-Qurṭubī concurs with him regarding that.

It is important to note that the Zaydiyyah — besides the Jārūdiyyah — should be excluded from the rest of the Shī‘ah, if they are all being referred to as the Rāfiḍah. This is because the Jārūdiyyah have adopted the stance of the Rawāfiḍ. This is the same reason why the renowned scholar of the Shī‘ah, al-Mufīd, considers them alone — in exclusion to the rest of the Zaydiyyah — to be Shī‘ah. The rest of the sects are not regarded as Shī‘ah, as the Jārūdiyyah alone share the same principles as that of Rafḍ.

The books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah on the subject of sects have adopted a different methodology in mentioning the sects. They list the sects of the Shī‘ah in order of the Imāms, as they realised that the Shī‘ah split up into many different sects at the death of each Imām. The count of the sects of Shī‘ah in the book al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq of al-Qummī and Firaq al-Shī‘ah of al-Nawbakhtī exceeds sixty. The Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah have been counted by both of them among the fourteen or fifteen groups into which the Shī‘ah split after the death of Ĥasan al-‘Askarī (d. 260 A.H).

As for the books on narrations, al-Kulaynī quotes a narration in al-Kāfī in which it is stated that there are thirteen sects of the Shī‘ah and all of them, with the

---

1 Al-Burhān pg. 36  
2 Al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd pg. 32-33  
3 Talbīs Iblīs pg. 32 (researched by Khayr al-Dīn ‘Alī)  
4 Bayān al-Firaq, page 1 of the manuscript  
5 Refer to al-Mufīd: Awā’il al-Maqālāt pg. 39. Read up on the Jārūdiyyah on page 58 of this booklet. Footnote 1.  
6 Refer to al-Nawbakhtī: Firaq al-Shī‘ah pg. 96 where he mentions that the companions of Ĥasan al-‘Askarī who split up into fourteen sects after his death. Al-Qummī states that they split up into fifteen groups. Refer to al-Qummī: al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq pg. 102.
exception of one, will be in hell.\(^1\) With all the above being mentioned, studying the inception of Shī‘ism and the constant metamorphosis that it underwent requires a separate research and discussion, which would be a study of their History. So, we will not digress by stating all of their details.

Nonetheless, as will be noticed when the ideas and doctrines will be presented, the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah have upheld most of the ideas and doctrines that the other sects have concocted. They are the river into which all the streams and lakes flow. A study of this matter (which would require studying the narrations of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah and comparing them with the views of the other sects) would also demand a separate discussion. I have indicated to some of these reasons in this chapter of my thesis that I wrote for my masters.\(^2\)

Thus, these sects have not ceased to exist, as is commonly believed. Most of them have survived. They remain in our midst, courtesy of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah school of thought. Present-day Shī‘ah can be categorised into three groups:\(^3\)

1. The Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah
2. The Ismā‘īliyyah\(^4\)

---

1. *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* (which is printed at the bottom of *Mir‘āt al-ʿUqūl*) 4/344. Al-Majlisi, according to their so-called classification methodology, classified this narration to be Hasan (reliable). *Mir‘āt al-ʿUqūl* 4/344

2. *Fikrat al-Taqrīb Bayn Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Shī‘ah* pg. 346


4. They believe that the Imam after Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq is Ismā‘īl ibn Jaʿfar and thereafter Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Jaʿfar. The Imāmah of the rest of the progeny of Jaʿfar is rejected by them. Other groups sprouted out from the Ismā‘īliyyah such as the Qarāmiṭah, Hashshāshis, Fātimids and the Druze. The Ismā‘īliyyah have many different sects and names which differ from place to place. They have, as al-Shahrastānī states, “a new claim in every era and a new doctrine in every language.” As for their religion, al-Ghazālī (among others) states, “it is a religion which is outwardly Rafḍ and in reality nothing but plain kufr.” Ibn al-Jowzī states, “the crux of their beliefs is the denial of a creator, belittling nubuwwah and denying the hereafter. However, they do not disclose this at the first encounter. They have different levels in their invitation (to their beliefs). continued.....
and the Zaydiyyah

The reality of the religion is not told to anyone, unless he reaches the highest level. Many of the scholars have learnt the reality of their matters and thereafter exposed them. Al-Baghdādī came across their book, *al-Siyāsat wa l-Balāgh al-Akyad wa l-Nāmūs al-Akbar*. He realised therefrom that they are atheists and irreligious people who hide behind the veil of Shīʿism. Al-Ḥamādī al-Yamānī got to live amongst them, through which he realised their condition. He explained this in his book *Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyyah*. Ibn al-Nadīm found their *al-Balāghāt al-Sabʿah* (the seven messages), and he read the seventh message. To his surprise, he found it to be a legalisation of illegal and forbidden acts, as well as a mockery of the sharāʿiʿ (plural of sharīʿah) and the ones upon whom they were revealed as well as others. They are still active today. They keep their books a secret amongst themselves. One of them stated, ‘we have books which are not available to anyone for reading except us and none will learn their realities besides us.’” Muṣtafā Ghālib”*al-Ḥarakāt al-Bāṭiniyyah fī l-Islam* pg. 67, Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī al-Ismāʿīlī: *al-Zīnah* pg. 287 (inside the book *al-Ghuluw wa l-Firaq al-Ghāliyah*), al-Ghazālī: *Faḍāʾiḥ al-Bāṭiniyyah* pg. 37 onwards, *al-Milal wa l-Nīḥal 1/167*, 19, al-Baghdādī: *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 294, 621, Ibn al-Nadīm: *al-Fahrist* pg. 267-268, al-Miḥīn: *al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd* pg. 218, al-Maṣḥūrī: *al-Badʾ wa l-Tārīkh 5/124*, al-Isfarāyīnī: *al-Tabṣīr fī l-Dīn* pg. 99, *al-Ismāʿīliyyah: Ihṣān Ilāhī Zahīr*.

The Zaydiyyah are the supporters of Zayd ibn Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, *al-Milal wa l-Niḥal 1/154, Muqaddimat al-Baḥr al-Zakhkhār* pg. 40. They have been named Zaydiyyah due to their affiliation with him. Yaḥyā ibn Ḥamzah: *al-Risālat al-Wāziʿah* pg. 87-88. The Zaydiyyah and the Muʿtazilah share the same beliefs. *al-Milal wa l-Nīḥal 1/162*, al-Muqbilī: *al-ʿIlm al-Shāmikh* pg. 319, al-Rāzī: *al-Muḥaṣṣal* pg. 247. There are different sects among the Zaydiyyah as well. Some have no affiliation with Zayd except his name. They are in reality Rawāfiḍ. They claim that the ummah deviated and committed kufr by directing the khilāfah towards someone other than ʿAlī (Ibn Ḥazm says that the actual belief that has been established from Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ is that Imāmah is restricted to the Quraysh). They associate themselves with all the Ṣaḥābah, but they believe in the superiority of ʿAlī over the rest. Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Fiṣal 2/266*. For more information regarding the fair stance of the real Zaydiyyah as far as the subject of Ṣaḥābah is concerned, refer to Ibn al-Wazīr: *al-Rowd al-Bāsim* pg. 49-50, al-Muqbilī: *al-ʿIlm al-Shāmikh* pg. 326. Also refer to my discussion regarding the Zaydiyyah in *Fikrat al-Taqrīb* pg. 146.
The IthnāʿAshariyyah are the largest of all the groups in today’s time, just as they would represent the majority of the Shiʿah at different points in history.

Some of the scholars who wrote regarding sects have referred to them as the “majority of the Shiʿah”. Among them is al-Ashʿarī, al-Masʿūdī, ʿAbd al-Jabbār al-Hamdānī, Ibn Ḥazm and Nishwān al-Ḥimyarī. However, they were not always the majority. As an example, Ibn Khaldūn relates that the Shiʿah of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah were the largest (group from the) Shiʿah of the Ahl al-Bayt (i.e. in their era). Thereafter, the followers began abandoning it until it disappeared. Similarly, al-Balkhī says, as quoted by the author of al-Ḥūrr al-ʿAyn, that the Faṭḥiyyah were the largest group of the Jaʿfariyyah and they had the largest gatherings (i.e. in his era).

---

1 Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/90
2 Murūj al-Dhahab 4/199
3 Al-Mughnī vol. 2 category two pg. 176
4 Al-Fiṣal 5/38, 4/158
5 Al-Ḥūr al-ʿAyn pg. 166
6 Tārikh Ibn Khaldūn 3/172
7 They are the followers of ʿʿAbd Allāh ibn Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq, the eldest of al-Ṣādiq’s children. They were named al-Faṭḥiyyah because ʿAbd Allāh had a large head (afṭāḥ al-raʾ in Arabic). They are also named al-ʿAmmāriyyah, as one of their leaders was known as ʿAmmār. Al-Nawbakhtī says that most of the scholars and jurists of the Shiʿah had inclined towards this group. However, ʿAbd Allāh lived for a mere seventy days after the demise of his father, due to which they retracted their view that he was an Imam. Refer to Masāʾīl al-Imāmah pg. 46, Firaq a-Shīʿah by al-Nawbakhtī pg. 77-78, Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/102, Al-Ḥūr al-ʿAyn pg. 163-164.

The author of al-Zīnah (Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī al-ISMāʿīlī (d. 322 A.H)) says: “This sect has ceased to exist, as none hold this view anymore. ʿAbd Allāh passed away seventy days after the demise of his father and he did not leave behind any male children.” Al-Zīnah pg. 287. Perhaps this is the reason why they have ceased to exist. The narrations of the followers of this group have been preserved in the reliable books of the Twelvers as will appear under the chapter of the Sunnah.

8 Al-Ḥūr al-ʿAyn pg. 164
The Titles of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah Shīʿah’s

Some of the titles by which the Ithnā ʿAshariyyahs are referred to by authors of books on sects are:

Al-Shīʿah:

The title Shīʿah is used to refer to all the sects thereof. However, in this era, this title refers only to the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah when used in its general sense, according to them and others including Strothmann,1 al-Ṭabarsī,2 Amīr ‘Alī,3 Kāshīf al-Ghiṭā,4 Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-ʿĀmilī5 and ʿIrōn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd6. I am also of the opinion that it refers only to them. However, I say so, not only on account of them being the largest sect from the Shīʿah, but on account of another reason as well, which holds more weight (although I have not seen anyone who studied and explained it whereas a discussion concerning it requires an independent study which should include a comparison along with an analysis), i.e. the books of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah on ḥadīth and narrations have covered the views of most, if not all, of the sects that emerged along the course of history (as explained previously). Thus, this sect has become the guardian of the other sects.

1 Ḍāʾīrat al-Maʿārif al-Islāmīyyah 14/68
2 Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil 3/311
3 Amīr ‘Alī says: “The (word) Ithnā ʿAshariyyah has become a synonym of the (word) Shīʿah.” Rūḥ al-Islām 2/92
4 He says: “Today, when it is used in its general sense, it refers specifically to the Imāmiyyah.” The word Imāmiyyah here is used to refer to the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, as will be seen from that which appears after this sentence. Aṣl al-Shīʿah wa ʿUṣūlūhā pg. 92
5 Al-ʿĀmilī says: “Since the Zaydiyyah and Imāmiyyah are only known by these affiliations, and the Faṭḥiyyah and Wāqifiyyah do not exist in this era, the name Shīʿah is now confined to the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah.” Al-Shīʿah fī l-Tārīkh pg. 43.
6 ʿIrōn says: “When the word Shīʿah is used without being specified or singling out (any sect), then only the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah are being referred to.” Majallat Kulliyyat al-Dirāsāt al-Islāmīyyah, edition 1 pg. 35-1387 A.H.
For more examples of scholars who held this view, refer to al-Sāmurāʾī: al-Ghulū wa l-Firaq al-Ghāliyāh pg. 82, Aḥmad Zākī Tufāḥāh: Uṣūl al-Dīn wa Furūʿīh ʿInd al-Shīʿah pg. 21 and Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣahīr: al-Shīʿah wa l-Tashayyuʿ pg. 9
Al-Imāmiyyah

According to many of the authors of books regarding sects, this title is used for many different sects of the Shīʿah. However, according to latter day authors as well as others, it is confined to the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah. Perhaps the first person to hold this view was the leading scholar of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah in his era, al-Mufīd, in his book Awā’il al-Maqālāt. Al-Samʿānī indicated that this was the common practise of his time. He says:

Nowadays the title al-Imāmiyyah is used for this sect (referring to the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah).

Ibn Khaldūn stated:

As for the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, their latter day scholars have referred to them specifically, using the title al-Imāmiyyah.

The author of Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah has indicated that the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah are the first sect that comes to mind when using the title Imāmiyyah. Shaykh Zāhid al-Kowtharī says, “it is common knowledge that the Imāmiyyah are the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah.” Kāshīf al-Ghiṭā is among the contemporary Shīʿī scholars who uses the title Imāmiyyah with reference to the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah. Some Shīʿī scholars who belong to the other sects are of the opinion that the Imāmiyyah consist of different sects, including the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah; the Kaysāniyyah, the Zaydiyyah and the Ismāʿīliyyah. After understanding that the title Imāmiyyah is one of the many titles of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, we will now move on to that which has been said regarding its definition:

1 Awā’il al-Maqālāt pg. 44
2 Al-Ansāb 1/344, Ibn al-Athīr: al-Lubāb 1/84, al-Sūyūṭī: Lubb al-Albāb fi Taḥrīr al-Ansāb/the alphabet Ḥamzah, the word Imāmiyyah.
3 Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn 1/201
4 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah pg. 20
5 Al-Kowtharī: in his footnotes on the book al-Tanbīḥ wa l-Radd of al-Milṭī, pg. 18
6 Aṣl al-Shīʿah wa Uṣūluhā pg. 92
7 Muḥsin al-Amīn: Aʿyān al-Shīʿah 1/21
The scholar of the Shīʿah in his era, al-Mufīd says:

The Imāmiyyah are those who believe in the compulsion of Imāmah, infallibility and the incumbency of divine appointment. They were only given this title on account of them holding onto all of the above principles. Whoever upholds all of them will be an Imāmī, even though he adds on to them in the madh-hab. This is irrespective of whether he adds on truth or falsehood. In addition, those to whom this title is applicable and they are truly deserving thereof due to adhering to it, have differed regarding the (appointment of the different) Imāms, secondary matters which are based upon these principles as well as other matters. The first sect to separate from the rest of the Imāmiyyah was the Kaysāniyyah.¹

Here, we see al-Mufīd granting the title of Imāmiyyah to all those who uphold the three principles; Imāmah, infallibility and divine appointment. However, in another book of his, he places such pre-requisites to qualify for this title, that it is as if he wishes to confine it to the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah. He says:

Al-Imāmiyyah is the title given to all those who accepts the incumbency of Imāmah, its existence in every era, believes that it takes place by explicit divine appointment (revelation), confines it to the progeny of Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī. (Thereafter he lists all the Imāms until al-Riḍā, 'Alī ibn Mūsā).²

1 Al-ʿUyūn wa l-Maḥāsin 2/91
2 Awā’il al-Maqālāt pg. 44
This definition states that a person has to believe that the divine appointment was explicit, whereas he previously omitted this condition, as to include the belief that it was explicit as well as the belief that it was inexplicit. Similarly, here, he added on the condition that the Imāms should be from the progeny of Husayn and he listed all of them until al-Riḍā ʿAlī ibn Mūsā, which he did not do in his first definition — the result of which was that it included the Kaysāniyyah. It seems as if he realised the contradiction between his two views. Thus he says:

لا إنه إن كان (أي لقب الامامية) في الأصل علمًا على من دان من الأصول بما ذكرناه دون التخصيص لمن قال في الأعيان بما وصفناه فانه قد انتقل عن اصله لاستحقاق فرق من معتقديه القاذا بحاديث لهم باقابيل احدهما فغلبت عليهم في الاستعمال دون الوصف بالأمامية وصار هذا الاسم في عرف المتكلمين و غيرهم من الفقهاء وال العامة علمًا على من ذكرناه

This is because, even though it (the title Imāmiyyah) was originally coined to point out all those who accept the principles that we have mentioned, without confining it to those who believe regarding the Imāms that which we have explained, it is now used against its original meaning since some sects deserved other titles on account of their beliefs, aḥādīth and views which they invented. Thus, it became the norm to refer to them using these titles, instead of ‘Imāmiyyah’. Consequently, this title was used to identify those who subscribe to all the beliefs that we had mentioned.¹

If we look beyond that which al-Mufīd had stated and page through the other books regarding sects, to get an idea of the definition of ‘Imāmiyyah’ according to non-Shī‘ahs, we will see that most of the authors regarding the subject of sects have not confined the title of Imāmiyyah to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. Imāmiyyah, according to them was much more general and inclusive. Al-Shahrastānī says:

The Imāmiyyah are those who believe in the Imāmah of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, and that he was appointed through explicit (revealed) texts. It was a specific and definite appointment of him, not a description which was suggestive of him. He was appointed in person.²

¹ Ibid pg. 44
² Al-Milal wa l-Nīḥal 1/162
Al-Ashʿarī’s view is no different:

They are referred to as al-Imāmiyyah as they believe that ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib was divinely appointed.¹

Among the authors on the subject, is an author who opined that they were named al-Imāmiyyah on account of their belief that the world will never be void of an Imām, either he will come out in public and be known, or he will be hidden and described to people.² However, Ibn al-Murtaḍā says:

و الامامية سميت بذلك لجعلها امور الدين كلها للامام و انه كالنبي و لا يخلو وقت من امام يحتاج اليه في امر الدين و الدنيا

The Imāmiyyah have been given their name on account of them placing all the matters of dīn in the hands of the Imām, as if he is a Nabī. No era can be devoid of an Imām, he is needed for religious as well as worldly matters.³

In a nutshell, some believed that the title was given to them on account of their belief in divine appointment, some believed that it was a result of their belief that the earth will never be devoid of an Imām and others believed that it was also on account of their belief that all the matters of religion are in the hands of the Imām. All of these views are inter-connected and boil down to the same thing.

The title, Imāmiyyah, came to the fore after the title, Shīʿah. Apparently, it became popular after the Shīʿah started paying more attention and granting importance to the doctrine of Imāmah and the Imām, and after some sects sprung up who singled out certain individuals of the Ahl al-Bayt as Imāms. The entire discussion will appear under the subject of Imāmah. Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd states that the views of the Imāmiyyah (not even their title) only became famous in the later eras. He says:

---
¹ Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/86
² ʿUthmān ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿIrāqī: Dhikr al-Firaq al-Ḍawāl (manuscript). Al-Qurṭubī has the same view in his book Bayān al-Firaq (manuscript). Refer to Sharḥ al-Ithnayn wa l-Sabʿīn (manuscript).
³ Al-Munyat wa l-Amal pg. 21
The views of the Imāmiyyah and those who adopt their path, i.e. criticising the Imāmah of the salaf was not as famous in that era (the era of the Omayyads) as it is now.

**Al-Ithnā al-ʿAshariyyah**

This term is not found in the classical books regarding sects. Al-Qummī (d. 299/301 A.H) did not mention it in his book *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq*, al-Nawbakhtī (d. 310 A.H.) did not mention it in his book *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* and al-Ashʿarī (d. 330 A.H) did not mention it in his book *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*. Perhaps, the first person to mention it (from the Shī‘ah) was al-Masʿūdī (349 A.H). As for non-Shī‘ahs, ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī (d. 429 A.H) was most likely the first to mention it as he says, “they were named the ‘Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah’ due to their claim that the awaited Imām belonged to the twelfth generation from the progeny of ‘Alī.”

Muḥammad Jawād Mughnyyah, a contemporary Rāfiḍī says:

Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah is an adjective used to describe the Shī‘ah Imāmiyyah who believe that there are twelve Imāms and they specify them by their names.

This name or title undoubtedly only made its appearance after the demise of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī (d. 260 A.H.), “prior to his demise none held the view that their

---

1 Literally pious predecessors. In this context, those who preceded, viz. ‘Alī, Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān.
2 *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* 4/522
3 *Al-Tanbih wa l-Ishrāf* pg. 198
4 *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 64
5 *Al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah wa Aḥl al-Bayt* pg. 15
twelfth Imām will be the awaited one. Added to that, there is no proof, from the era of ‘Alī as well as the entire reign of the Banū Umayyah, that anyone claimed that there will be twelve Imams.” However, the author of Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah is of the view that the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah appeared in the year 255 A.H.\(^1\)

It seems as if he stipulated this date based on his own calculations. This is because that was the year in which the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah claimed that their Twelfth Imām\(^3\) had been given birth to (regarding whom they believe that he is alive until today and they are awaiting his appearance). If the matter should be left to calculations, then it would be more appropriate to stipulate the year 260 A.H., as the claim of the existence of the twelfth and awaited Imām only came to the fore after the demise of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī (who passed away in the year 260 A.H).

As for the twelve Imāms who the Jaʿfariyyah take as their Imāms, they are ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and the progeny of Ḥusayn.

To follow is a list of the names, titles, agnomens, birthdates and dates of death of each Imām.

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/209
2 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah pg. 21
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name of the Imām</th>
<th>His Agnomen</th>
<th>His Title</th>
<th>His Dates of Birth and Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib</td>
<td>Abū al-Ḥasan</td>
<td>Al-Murtaḍā</td>
<td>23 (Before Hijrah)-40 A.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī</td>
<td>Abū Muḥammad</td>
<td>Al-Zakī</td>
<td>2 A.H.-50 A.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī</td>
<td>Abū ʿAbd Allāh</td>
<td>Al-Shahīd</td>
<td>3 A.H.-61 A.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn</td>
<td>Abū Muḥammad</td>
<td>Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn</td>
<td>38 A.H.-95 A.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī</td>
<td>Abū Jaʿfar</td>
<td>Al-Bāqir</td>
<td>57 A.H.-114 A.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad</td>
<td>Abū ʿAbd Allāh</td>
<td>Al-Ṣādiq</td>
<td>83 A.H.-148 A.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar</td>
<td>Abū Ibrāhīm</td>
<td>Al-Kāẓim</td>
<td>128 A.H.-183 A.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ʿAlī ibn Mūsā</td>
<td>Abū al-Ḥasan</td>
<td>Al-Riḍā</td>
<td>148 A.H.-203 A.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī</td>
<td>Abū Jaʿfar</td>
<td>Al-Jawwād</td>
<td>195 A.H.-220 A.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad</td>
<td>Abū al-Ḥasan</td>
<td>Al-Ḥādī</td>
<td>212 A.H.-254 A.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī</td>
<td>Abū Muḥammad</td>
<td>Al-ʿAskarī</td>
<td>232 A.H.-260 A.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan</td>
<td>Abū al-Qāsim</td>
<td>Al-Mahdī</td>
<td>They claim that he was born in the year 255/256 A.H and he is alive until today.¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Al-Qaṭ‘iyyah

It is one of the titles of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah according to some of the authors on the subject of sects such as al-Ash‘arī, al-Shahrastānī, al-Isfārāyīnī and others.4 They were named al-Qaṭ‘iyyah as they were certain that Mūsā ibn Ja‘far (al-Ṣādiq)5 had passed away. This is the view of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. Al-Mas‘ūdī says:

و في سنة ستيين وماتين قبض أبو محمد الحسن بن علي...وهو أبو المهدي المنتظر الإمام الثاني عشر

In the year 260, Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī passed away… He is the father of the awaited Mahdī, the twelfth Imām, according to the Qaṭ‘iyyah Imāmiyyah.6

Some of them consider the word Qaṭ‘iyyah to be a name of one of the sects of the Imāmiyyah, and not one of the titles of the Imāmiyyah.7

1 Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 90-91
2 al-Milal wa l-Niḥal 1/169
3 Al-Tabṣīr fī l-Dīn pg. 33
4 Al-Ḥūr al-ʿAyn pg. 166
6 Murūj al-Dhahab 4/199
7 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuhfāt al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah pg. 19-20. There is no doubt that the Qaṭ‘iyyah were the predecessors of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. They were given this name after they expressed certainty regarding the death of Mūsā. This led to their separation from the Ṣīḥah. However, when we look at the fact that the Ṣīḥah split up at the death of each Imām, we realise that this separation was the lot of the Qaṭ‘iyyah… Further sects were formed from them, who did not believe in twelve Imāms. Thus, they were no longer part of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. Therefore, the term Qaṭ‘iyyah is not restricted to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah.
Aṣḥāb al-Intiẓār

Al-Rāzī grants this title to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah since they believe that the Imām after Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī is his son Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī who is in occultation and will soon emerge. He says, “this is the madh-hab of the Imāmiyyah of our times.” There are other sects as well, not only the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah, who are anticipating the emergence of the Imām. However, they have differences among themselves as to who exactly is the Imām.

Al-Rāfiḍah

Some scholars (such as al-Ashʿarī in al-Maqālāt and Ibn Ḥazm in al-Fiṣal) have used the word Rāfiḍah to refer to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. The books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah admit in very clear words, that this is one of their titles. Their scholar, al-Majlisī (in his book Al-Biḥār — which is one of their eight canonical works on ḥadīth), quotes four of their narrations in which they are extolled for being named Rāfiḍah. It is as if they tried to lull their masses by beautifying this name. However, even these narrations reveal that people began referring to them in this way to insult them and not to praise them.

---

1 Iʿtiqādāṭ Firaq al-Muslimīn wa l-Mushrikīn pg. 84-85
2 Refer to Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/88
3 Al-Fiṣal 4/157-158
4 Al-Majlisī mentions them under the chapter titled, “the virtue of the Rāfiḍah and the praiseworthiness of being named so”. An example of the narrations in this chapter is:

Reported from Abū Baṣīr, I said to Abū Jaʿfar (al-Bāqir), “May I be sacrificed for you, we have been given a name by which the authorities have taken as a license to spill our blood, take our wealth and punish us!” He asked, “what is that name?” I replied, “al-Rāfiḍah.” Thereupon Abū Jaʿfar said, “there were seventy men from the army of Mūsā who were the most hard-working and had the greatest love for Hārūn. Thereupon, the nation of Mūsā named them al-Rāfiḍah. Allah then revealed to Mūsā, ‘place this as their name in the Torah as I have granted it to them.’ Allah has granted that name to you (as well).” Al-Biḥār 68/96-97, Tafsīr Furāṭ pg. 139, al-Barqī: al-Maḥāsin pg. 157, al-Aʿlamī: Dāʿirat al-Maʿārif 18/200
These Shīʿī sources do not cite the reasons behind them becoming the targets of this derogatory term and insult. Nevertheless, other sources have explained that this is on account of their stances regarding the khilāfah of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. Abū al-Ḥasan al-Asḥārī states:

They were only given the name Rāfiḍah on account of them denouncing the khilāfah of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. Ibn Taymiyyah quoted this statement of al-Asḥārī and thereafter commented, “the correct view is that they were named al-Rāfiḍah after they abandoned Zayd ibn ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, when he left Kūfah during the reign of Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik.” However, this view of Ibn Taymiyyah boils down to that which al-Asḥārī stated. This is because they only denounced Zayd when he openly declared his view regarding Abū Bakr and ‘Umar and their khilāfah.

1 There is a claim that the first person to name them Rāfiḍah was al-Mughīrah ibn Saʿīd, the leader of the al-Mughīriyyah sect. He was killed by Khālid al-Qisrī in the year 119 A.H. This was due to him inclining towards the Imāmah of al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah (Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ḥasan) after the demise of Muḥammad al-Bāqir, and he proclaimed this view. Thereupon the Shīʿah of Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad denounced him. Consequently, he named them al-Rāfiḍah. Refer to al-Qummī: al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq pg. 76-77, al-Nawbakhtī: Firaq al-Shīʿah pg. 62-63, al-Qāḍī ʿAbd al-Jabbār: al-Mughnī vol. 20 category 2 pg. 179. This view seems to be a product of the works of the Rawāfiḍ. Al-Ṭabarī pointed this out saying, “These days they claim that they were named al-Rāfiḍah by al-Mughīrah, when they separated from him.” Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī (7/181). ʿAbd Allāh al-Fayyād considers the ḥadīth that is attributed to al-Mughīrah, wherein he names the Shīʿah “al-Rāfiḍah”, to be so unreliable that it does not even deserve to be scrutinised. One way in which this is proven is that, if he was the one who named them so, it would not have been a derogatory term and the authorities would not have taken it as a license to spill their blood, take their wealth and punish them, as they claim in their narrations. Tārīkh al-Imāmiyyah pg. 75
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4 This should not create the impression that any of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt had a different view regarding Abū Bakr and ‘Umar, as they too revered these illustrious personalities. However, what gives greater merit to the denunciation of the Shīʿah by Zayd was that he openly declared this reverence when they rallied around him and dissociated himself from those who reviled them, whereas the praise of the other Imāms for the illustrious Ṣaḥābah did not occur on the same scale as Zayd.

Thus, the view that they abandoned Zayd or his madh-hab, according to me, is the same (as the view that they were named such on account of denouncing Abū Bakr and ʿUmar). Nonetheless, Ibn Taymiyyah took into consideration the historical perspective when he commented on the view of al-Ashʿarī. Proof of this is that some of the sects of the Shīʿah, such as the Sabaʾiyyah and others had already denounced the khilāfah of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, even before their disagreement with Zayd, but they were not called Rāfiḍah. This title was only given to them after they publicly distanced themselves from Zayd, (due to his praise for Abū Bakr and ʿUmar) who consequently named them al-Rāfiḍah.

Added to the above, there are other views regarding the reason why they were called al-Rāfiḍah. Also, some authors on the subject of sects refer to all the groups of the Shīʿah using the word ‘Rāfiḍah’.

**Al-Jaʿfariyyah**

They Ithnā ʿAshariyyah are also referred to as the Jaʿfariyyah, due to their claim that their sixth Imam is Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. It is a reference to all of them by naming just one Imām. Al-Kashshī reports that the (supposed) supporters of Jaʿfar in Kūfah were named al-Jaʿfariyyah. This reached him whereupon he was angered and he said:

ان اصحاب جعفر منكم خیل انما اصحاب جعفر من اشتد ورعه و عمل لخالق و رجا ثوابه فهؤلء اصحابى

Indeed there are almost no companions of Jaʿfar amongst you. The companions of Jaʿfar are only those whose scrupulousness is of a high

---

1. It is said that they were named al-Rāfiḍah because they did not help al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah. Ibn al-Murtaḍā: *al-Munyat wa l-Amal* pg. 21, footnote 1 page 111. It is also said that it was on account of them not having love for the Ṣaḥābah, ‘Ali al-Qārī: *Shamm al-ʿAwārid fi Dhamm al-Rawāfīd* pg. 254 (of the manuscript). Another reason that has been stated is that it is on account of them leaving the religion of Islam, al-Iskūbī: *al-Radd ʿAlā al-Shīʿah* pg. 23 (manuscript). Refer to Muḥy al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd: footnotes of *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/89.

level, he acts only to please his Creator and he hopes for reward from Him.
These are my companions.¹

This indicates — if there is any truth to the narration — that the name al-Ja’fariyyah was common in the time of Ja’far, and he was not pleased with most of those who claimed affiliation with him. Similarly, it also points out that this name was shared between the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah and the Ismā‘īlī, as the split between them only took place after the demise of Ja’far. The term al-Ja’fariyyah was also used in reference to a sect of the Shī‘ah who are now non-existent. They held the view that the Imām after Hasan al-A’askari was his brother Ja’far.² There are also other names and titles that were given to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah in different countries.³

**Al-Khāṣṣah (the special ones)**

This is a title used by the scholars of the Shī‘ah to refer to their sect, and they refer to the Ahl al-Sunnah as the ‘Āmmah (the common folk). The following appears in Dā’irat al-Ma‘ārif al-Shī‘īyyah:

الخاصة في اصطلاح بعض اهل الدرایة: الأئمة الثاني عشرة والعامة اهل السنة و الجماعة

The term al-Khāṣṣāh, according to some of the scholars refers to the Ithnā

---

1. Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 255
2. Al-Rāzī: I’tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn pg. 84, Mukhtaṣar al-Tuhfah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah pg. 21
3. Such as ‘al-Mutāwilah’. This was used in the latter days to refer to the Shī‘ah of Mount Āmil, Ba’albakk and Mount Libnān. It is the plural form of the word Mutawālī, which is one form of the verb tawālā (from al-walā and al-muwālāt) which means love. This was on account of their claim that they loved the Ahl al-Bayt. It is also said that they were given this name because they would say, at the time of war, “Mit waliyyan li‘Alī” (die whilst supporting ‘Alī). Thus they were each name mutawālī. Refer to Ḥāḍīr al-ʿĀlam al-Islāmī 1/193-194, A’yān al-Shī‘ah 1/22. Another title is ‘Qizilbash’ — a Turkish word which means, the one with a red head — nowadays this name is popular in Iran. Similarly, all the Shī‘ah of India, Rome and Syria are referred to by this name. Refer to A’yān al-Shī‘ah 1/23-24. It will appear under the discussion of the sects of the Shī‘ah that the Qizilbash are one of the sects of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah.
ʿAshariyyah, and the term al-ʿĀmmah refers to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamāʿah. These two terms are used quite extensively in their aḥādīth narrations. They say, “this is reported by the ʿĀmmah and this is reported by the Khāṣṣah.”

The Sects of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah

The Ithnā ʿAshariyyah are an offshoot of the Imāmiyyah (in its broader meaning), and one of its contingents. They are one of the fifteen groups that the Shīʿah spilt up into after the demise of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī (260 A.H). Added to that, many other sects were also formed within the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah. Maḥmūd al-Mallāh, who carefully studied and follows the developments of this sect, says, “in this time of ours, we find the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah divided into (the following sects):

1. Uṣūliyyah
2. Akhbāriyyah
3. Shaykhīyyah

1 Dāʿirat al-Maʿārif 17/122
2 As an example, refer to Ghāyat al-Marām of Hāshim al-Baḥrānī. Among their narrations is;ما خالف العامة ففیه الرشاد
That in which is in opposition of the ʿĀmmah is guidance.
Refer to Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/68, Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 18/76.
3 Refer to al-Qummī: Firaq al-Shīʿah pg. 102.
4 Al-Shaykhīyyah: they are also referred to as al-Aḥmadiyyah. They are the followers of Shaykh Aḥmad al-Iḥsāʿī (who was born in the year 166 A.H. and died in the year 241 A.H.) He was among the scholars of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah. Al-Ālūsī says regarding al-Iḥsāʿī and his followers, “their speech indicates that they believe regarding ʿAlī that which the philosophers believe regarding the first intellect (universal reason, i.e. all creation emanated from it). The beliefs of ḥulūl, (incarnation: when the divine embodies the flesh of a human) taking the Imāms as deities and denying a physical resurrection have also been attributed to them. Among the foundations of their beliefs is the belief in the existence of a perfect man (who was given the form of Iḥsāʿī).” The Ithnā ʿAshariyyah Shīʿah have differed greatly regarding him. continued...
4. Kashfiyyah

Some, such as al-Khowansārī (in Rawḍāt al-Jannāt 1/94) have praised him while others, such as Muḥammad Mahdī al-Qazwīnī (in his book Zuhūr al-Ḥaqīqah ‘alā Firqat al-Shaykhiyyah) have condemned him. A third group, including ’Alī al-Bilādī (in Anwār al-Badarayn pg. 408) preferred not to comment regarding him, whilst a fourth group decided to take the ‘middle path’ regarding him. Muḥammad Ḥusayn says:

اختلف الناس فیه بين من یقول برکنیته و بين من یقول بكفره و التوسط خير المور والحق انھ من اکابر علماء الامامیة

People have differed regarding him. Among them are those who believe that he is the foundation of faith, and another group who believes that he was a disbeliever. However, the best of paths is moderation, and the truth is that he was from the senior scholars of the Imāmiyyah.

Thereafter he showers some praise upon him, and he goes on to say:

نعم له کلمات في مؤلفاته بجملة - كذا - مشابهة لا يجوز من أجلها التهجم والجراة على تكفيره

Yes, he has some statements in his writings which are highly questionable. This does not make it permissible to attack him and be bold in declaring him a disbeliever. (Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā (the footnotes of Rawḍāt al-Jannāt pg. 408-409).

This difference of opinion informs us that the blasphemous bunkum and deviation proclaimed by this man were taken lightly by many of the Shīʿah. For more information on the religion of the Shaykhiyyah, refer to al-Ālūsī: Nahj al-Salāmah pg. 18-19 (of the manuscript), Mukhtāṣar al-Tuḥfah pg. 22, al-Aʿlamī al-Ḥā’irī: Muqtabas al-Athar 20/126, Muḥammad Ḥasan Āl al-Talaqānī: al-Shaykiyyah Nash’atuhā wa Taṭawwuruhā, Majallat al-ʿIrfān vol.22, pg. 199, Aʿyān al-Shīʿah 8/390, Muḥsin ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd: Ḥaqīqat al-Bābiyyah wa l-Bahā'iyyah pg. 34, Goldziher: al-ʿAqīdat wa l-Sharīʿah pg. 270, Mubārak Ismāʿīl: al-Tayyārāt al-Fikriyyah pg. 110

1 They are the followers of Kāẓim ibn Qāsim al-Rishtī (d. 1259 A.H.). He was the student of al-Iḥsāʿī (the founder of the Shaykhiyyah), and he succeeded him in his post after his death. He upheld the teaching of his teacher adding onto it a greater degree of extremism and fanaticism. They were named al-Kashfiyyah on account of the claim of their leader, that he received kashf and ilhām (divine inspiration). Al-Ālūsī says regarding them, “al-Kashfiyyah is a title which was given to them by one of the viziers of the viziers (ʿAlī Riḍā Pashā) may Allah elevate his ranks. They are the students of al-Sayyid Kāẓim al-Ḥusaynī al-Rishtī who is a student of al-Iḥsāʿī, and he graduated under him. However, he opposed him in certain matters. His speech was more severe and distasteful than that of his teachers, to the extent that the Ithnāʾ ʿAshariyyah consider him to be from the extremists. He, on the other hand, exonerates himself from the apparent meanings of his statements. I have met him many times, but I did not see in him that which the Ithnāʾ ʿAshariyyah scholars say, who declare him a disbeliever.
Yes, the reality is that his views regarding the Imāms, the beginning of creation and the hereafter are different to theirs... I do not think that his differences with his teacher would be sufficient grounds to regard him and his followers a separate sect from the Shaykhiyayah.” Nahj al-Salāmah pg. 19. Other scholars have regarded his group to be a separate sect, on account of him explicitly saying this in his book Dalil al-Hayran pg. 136:

This is a view which has not been expressed by anyone before me. (Refer to Āl Ṭa‘ah: Madinat al-Husayn pg. 34)

It is for this reason that Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshī al-Ghiṭā says regarding him, “he is the one who strayed from the correct path and deviated greatly. He is the one who brought upon the Shi‘ah Imāmiyyah the greatest trial and test. The calamity of al-Bābiyyah was given birth to by him and his followers, not his teacher al-Iḥsā‘ī.” Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshī al-Ghiṭā: footnotes of Anwār al-Badrayn pg. 408-409. Further details regarding them can be found in Muṣṭafā ‘Imrān: Tahāfut al-Bābiyyah pg. 37-39, Āl Ṭu‘mah: Madinat al-Husayn (this book contains a lengthy discussion regarding the Kashfiyyah from the books of their leader and his students pg. 24 onwards), ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥusaynī: al-Bābiyyūn wa l-Bahā‘īyyūn pg. 10.

1 The followers of Mirzā Muḥammad Karīm ibn Ibrāhīm Khān al-Kirmānī. He is one of the students of al-Rishtī and he upheld his madh-hab. They were given their name as they believed in the fourth rukn (principle) and the perfect Shi‘ī. They understood this to be from the foundational principles of the dīn and they believed that it took the form of their leader. Refer to Āl Ṭu‘mah: Madinat al-Ḥusayn pg. 56. Some scholars are of the view that Rukniyyah and Kashfiyyah are titles of the Shaykhiyyah and all of them are one and the same sect. Refer to Majallat al-‘Irfān vol. 33 pg. 199, Muḥammad Āl al-Ṭaliqānī: al-Shaykhiyyah pg. 274.

2 They are the followers of Muḥammad al-Fajrī al-Kirmānī Karīmkhān, who was upon the madh-hab of the Shaykhiyyah. This is why al-Ḥā’irī said regarding him, “the leader of the Shaykhiyyah.” Muqtabas al-Athar 24/274-275.

3 They are Shi‘ah who follow the Safavid Sūfī order. The word Qizilbāsh means red head. They were given this name because they would cover their heads with a red uniform, i.e. a specific red hat which was their outstanding symbol. One of them describes it; “Ḥaydar ibn Junayd al-Ṣafawī ordered his followers don a distinctive twelve-gored crimson headwear indicating their adherence to the Twelve Imams.” Muḥsin al-Amīn claimed that Qizilbash was a title of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah in some countries (as stated earlier). He probably said this merely to hide the extent of division among the Shi‘ah as well as their abundance of sects, as he usually does. Refer to Muṣṭafā al-Shībī: al-Fikr al-Shī‘ī pg. 405-406, A’yān al-Shī‘ah 1/23,24.
All of these sects belong to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. Their principles are spread out in the books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. Despite this, they declare one another disbelievers. Some researchers have added a few more names to this list, i.e. al-Qartiyyah, al-Bābiyyah and al-Kowhariyyah. Others have also added the Nūrbakhshiyyah. Al-Ālūsī says, “it is not unlikely that more sects of the

1 Al-Ārā’ al-Ṣarīḥah pg. 81
2 The followers of a woman named Hind. Her agnomen was Umm Salamah, and her title wa Qurrat al-ʿAyn. This title was given to her by Kāẓim al-Rishtī in his correspondences with her as she was one of his followers. After his death, she followed al-Bāb, and thereafter opposed him in a few matters including the establishment of responsibility. It is said that she believed that all private parts were permissible and there was no responsibility. Al-Ālūsī (Abū al-Thanā) says: “I did not perceive any of that from her, even though she was imprisoned in my house for two months. According to my research, the Bābiyyah and Qartiyyah are the same sect. They hold the same beliefs as the Kashfiyyah regarding the Imāms, and they believe that the responsibility of performing five ṣalāh has been terminated. They also believe that revelation has not come to an end.” Nahj al-Salāmah pg. 21. Refer to Āl Ṭuʿmah: Madīnat al-Ḥusayn pg. 56, 239. Most of the books that have been authored regarding the Bābiyyah speak about this woman and her followers. Refer to the references that will be presented in the next footnote.
3 The followers of al-Bāb Mīrzā ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Shīrāzī (1235-1265). He was from the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah Imāmiyyah. He claimed to be the Bāb (door) of the Imām that they are waiting for. He alone speaks on behalf of him. Thereafter, he claimed that he is the (awaited) Imām. As if that was not enough, he further went on to claim that Allah — whose being is far too lofty to be affected by these types of nonsensical claims — embodied Himself into him. His kufr and deviation was of many different types. Refer to Muḥsin ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd: Haqīqat al-Bābiyyah wa l-Bahā’iyyah, Muṣṭafā ʿImrān: Tahāfuṭt al-Bābiyyah wa l-Bahā’iyyah, Maḥmūd al-Mallāḥ: al-Bābiyyah wa l-Bahā’iyyah, Iḥsān Ilāhī Ţahīr: al-Bābiyyah.
4 They are the followers of al-Ākhund Mullā Ḥasan Kowhhar, whose sect is promoted in Karbalā until today. (Āl-Ṭuʿmah: Madīnat al-Ḥusayn pg. 55). The Kashfiyyah had a great effect in bringing them to the fore. Op. cit. pg. 239. They take the Imāms to be deities and thereafter say that it (this view) emancipates a sinner from the punishment of his sins. Ibid pg. 53-54
5 This is a reference to Muḥammad Nūrbakhsh al-Qohistānī whose agnomen was Abū al-Qāsim. He was born in the year 795 A.H. and he died in the year 869 A.H. The Ithnā ʿAshariyyah claim that this sect is one of their sects. They are found in the valleys of Himalaya and Kohistan in Baltistān, which lies next to Tibet (China). He claimed that he is the Mahdī. His agnomen was on the pattern of his (al-Mahdī’s) name. He disbeliefed in the Mahdi of the Shi‘ah and dissociated himself from them.
Imāmiyyah are still to emerge.” We ask Allah for protection.¹

Along the course of my search for the texts of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, which they attribute to the Imāms and relate them in their reliable works, I found that it contains the seeds of many different sects and deviant desires. Every worshipper of his desires, extremist and innovator will find in there his objective and goals. It became voluminous due to the permissibility (or rather commendableness) of Taqiyyah (dissimulation), excessive fabrications against the Imams and the admittance of the irreligious and conspirators (against Islam, not Shīʿism) among its ranks. The Shīʿī scholars were also unable to discern the original beliefs from that which was added on along the centuries, as they had no proper scale by which they could measure the correctness of any of the narration. These, among others, are the reasons why they include the seeds of almost every poisonous belief in their hideous narrations.

If we decide to present a comprehensive discussion regarding each sect independently, our discussion will lengthen to a great extent whereas it is not part of our actual subject. Our aim is to do a study regarding their roots, not the development of their sects, the details of the founders thereof, their views and ideas. We may suffice upon discussing the split of the Shīʿah into Uṣūliyyah

continued from page 143

Due to this, some of them are of the opinion that he was not from the sects of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah. Rather, they believe that he was from those Śūfiyyah who believed in Waḥdat al-Wujūd. Iḥsān Ilāhī Zahīr: al-Shīʿah wa l-Tashayyuʿ pg. 316. However this does not prove that they were not part of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah. His ideas were mostly from their school of thought, but he claimed to be the Mahdī and tried to fit the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah upon himself. He accepted the Twelve Imāms and that is why on the day in which he accepted the pledge of allegiance as the Mahdī, he sufficed upon accepting all twelve Imāms (using the number of the Imāms as a source of blessing). Al-Shībī: al-Fikr al-Shīʿī pg. 332 Similarly, he visited the ‘sanctified Shīʿī shrines’ when he visited ‘Irāq. Al-Shībī: al-Fikr al-Shīʿī pg. 333 As for his Sufī leanings, the Shīʿah have often used Sufism as a springboard, tool and guise to trap the ignorant and unwary. For further reading regarding this sect, refer to al-Shīʿah wa l-Tashayyuʿ pg. 314, Muṣṭafā al-Shībī: al-Fikr al-Shīʿī pg. 328.

¹ Abū al-Thanā al-Ālūsī: Nahj al-Salāmah pg. 22
and Akhbāriyyah, as the Uṣūliyyah is the basis and foundation of the religion of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, who make up the majority, and they are rivalled by the Akhbāriyyah — who are less than them in number.

The rest of the sects do not have the numbers and size that is possessed by the Uṣūliyyah. This is why we have sufficed upon brief definitions of each sect in the footnotes. As for the differences between the Uṣūliyyah and Akhbāriyyah, this affects the foundations of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah sect. It is a difference of opinion that divides the champions and compilers of the legacy of their madh-hab. Whilst al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī (author of Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah), al-Kāshānī (author of Al-Wāfī), al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (author Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil) and most importantly, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (who was considered the leader of the Akhbārīs) are all Akhbārīs and authors of the most authentic books of narrations according to them, they are opposed by al-Ṭūsī (author of Al-Istibṣār and Al-Tahdhīb) and al-Murtaḍā (to whom Nahj al-Balāghah is attributed — if not his brother) among other Uṣūlīs.

Thus, the differences between the Uṣūlīs and the Akhbārīs is a difference of opinion that exists between the flag-bearers and pillars of the madh-hab. Hence we cannot take a step further without defining these two sects:

The Akhbārīs: They do not allow ijtihād (deduction of laws from the sources of Islam), and they act upon their apparent meaning of narration. They believe that all the narrations which appear in the four books of the Shīʿah are authentic and they were undoubtedly articulated by the Imams. They suffice upon the Qur’ān and their narrations. This is why they are called Akhbārīs, which is a reference to akhbār (narrations). They do not accept ijmāʿ (consensus) or the intellect as

---

1 Refer to al-Uṣūliyyūn wa al-Akhbāriyyūn Firqat Wāḥidah pg. 4 You will also notice that some Akhbārī scholars rose to fame amongst them such as Muhammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā, the author of Aṣl al-Shīʿah wa Uṣūluhā. Some of the influential scholars of the Uṣūlīs, who make up the majority, are Muḥsin al-Ḥakīm, Sharīʿat Madārī, al-Khūʿī, al-Khomeini, etc.

2 They are, al-Ḵāfī, Al-Wāfī, Al-Istibṣār and Man Lā Yaḥḍurūh al-Faqīḥ. Details regarding them will appear under the section, “Sunnah, according to the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah”.

---
proofs.\(^1\) They see no need to learn the principles of jurisprudence (\textit{Uṣūl al-Fiqh}), rather they see it as incorrect.

The \textbf{Uṣūlīs/Mujtahids}: They believe in ijtihād. According to them, laws are established from the Qur’ān, Sunnah, ijmāʿ and the intellect. They do not accept that all the narrations in the four books are authentic. They are the majority.\(^2\)

However, their scholar, al-Anṣārī reveals, as he quotes from their researcher Ghulām Riḍā al-Qummī, that the Akhbārīs rely solely upon the Shīʿī narrations, and accept them (even though they may contain flaws) without differentiating between the authentic and unacceptable narrations. He says:

\textit{و نعجبني في بيان وجه تسمية هذه الفرقة الأخبريين المرموقة بالخبرية وهو أحد الأئمين:}

\textit{الأول: كونهم عاملين بتمام الامام من الأخبار من الصحيح والحسن والمؤوث و الضعف من غير أن يفرقوا بينها في مقام العمل في قبال المجتهدين}

\textit{الثاني: أنهم لما انكروا الدلائل الثلاث بما فيها القرآن الكريم وخصوا الدليل بالواحد منها اعنى الأخبار فلذلك سموا بالاسم المذكور}

I wish to explain the reason behind the name of the sect Akhbāriyyah. They are referred to as Akhbāriyyah due to one of two reasons:

1. They practise upon all types of narrations — ṣaḥīḥ, ḥasan and ḍaʿīf\(^3\) — without distinguishing between them before practising upon them, as opposed to the Mujtahids.

2. Since they rejected the other three sources of proofs, including the Qur’ān, and confined it to only one (the narrations) they were given the above-mentioned name.\(^4\)

---

1 Refer to \textit{al-ʿAql ʿInd al-Shīʿah al-Imāmiyyah} by Rushdī ʿIlyān.
3 The explanation of these terms will appear under the chapter, “their view regarding the Sunnah”.
4 \textit{Al-Qalāʾid ʿalā l-Farāʾid}, marginal notes of \textit{Rasāʾil al-Shaykh al-Anṣārī} (Mabḥath Ḥujjīyat al-Qaṭ’). Refer to \textit{al-Taqlīd fi l-Sharīʿat al-Islāmiyyah} pg. 93
A fact that deserves attention is that they bowed down to the fairy-tales in which it is mentioned that the Qurʾān is incomplete. Hence they discarded its proofs and preferred over it their fairy-tales. Due to this, they expelled themselves from the boundaries of Islam. However, despite this blatant kufr which they openly declared, many Shīṭ scholars have this to say regarding the differences between the Akhbārīs and Uṣūlīs:

یقتصر على بعض الوجوه البسيطة ككل خلاف يحدث بين أبناء الطائفة الواحدة تبعا لاختلاف الرأي والنظر

It is confined to a few simple matters, just like any other difference of opinion which occurs between the adherents of a sect on account of the differences that exist between outlooks and intellects.¹

The author of al-Uṣūliyyūn wa l-Akhbāriyyūn Firqat Wāḥidah says:

انى بحسب تتبعى وفحصى كتب الصولیین والخباریین لم اجد فرقا بين هتین الطائفتين الا في بعض الأمور التي لا توجب تشنيعا ولا قدحا

According to the extensive research and studying that I have done of the books of the Uṣūlīs and Akhbārīs, I did not find a difference between these two sects except in some matters, which do not necessitate that either of them should be reproached or considered incorrect.²

Hence, are they two agents of the same mission?

One of the present day Shīṭah wished to trivialise the gravity of their view regarding practising upon the Qurʾān and rejecting the Qurʾān. He says:

كيف ينكرون الاخباريون وهم من المسلمين دليلة الكتاب

How is it possible that the Akhbārīs do not take the Qurʾān as a source of proof whereas they are from the Muslims?³

1 Al-Taqlid pg. 92, al-Bahrānī: al-Ḥadāʾiq 1/169-170
2 Farj al-ʿImrān: al-Uṣūliyyūn wa al-Akhbāriyyūn Firqat Wāḥidah pg. 2-3
3 ʿIzz al-Dīn: al-Taqlid pg. 93
Thereafter, he tries to find for them a crevice through which they can escape by quoting their scholar al-Astarabādī:

إن القرآن ورد على وجه التعمیة بالنسبة الى اذهان الرعیة

Indeed the (text of the) Qur’ān is quite general for the minds of the people.¹

Therefore, it is not permissible to act upon it, except according to the guidelines of their narrations.² Thus, in essence, both explanations lead to the same conclusion. This is because their narrations are an attempt at misinterpreting the meaning of the Qur’ān and turning it away from its actual implications, as will be explained. This applies to a greater extent to this sect, since they do not even believe in differentiating between the unreliable and so called authentic narrations.

Concerning the initial split of the Shī‘ah into Akhbārīs and Uṣūlīs, al-Baḥrānī says regarding their scholar Muḥammad Amīn al-Astarabādī (d. 1033 A.H.):

هو اول من فتح باب الطعن على المجتهدین و تقسیم الفرقة...الى اخباری و مجتهد

He is the first one who opened the door of criticising the Mujtahids and dividing the sect... into Akhbārīs and Mujtahids.³

Others claim that it was done previously, and al-Astarabādī simply revived the concept.⁴ Notwithstanding all of the above, there has been rebuttals, arguments, reproaching and declaration of kufr between these two sects — to the extent that each group believed it to be impermissible to perform ṣalāh behind the opposition.⁵

Among the scholars of the Akhbāriyyah were those who did not touch the writings of the Uṣūliyyah, fearing its impurity. They would only touch it using their clothes.⁶

---

¹ Al-Fawā'id al-Madaniyyah pg. 47-48, al-Taqlīd pg. 94, al-Ḥadā'iq 1/169
² ibid
³ Lu’lu’at al-Baḥrayn pg. 117
⁴ Al-Uṣūliyyūn wa l-Akhbāriyyūn Firqat Wāḥidah pg. 4
⁵ Refer to Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: Maʿa ʿUlamā’ al-Najaf pg. 74
⁶ Muḥammad Ál al-Ṭaliqānī: al-Shaykhiyyah pg. 9
Al-Astarabādī (who was an Akhbārī) declared some of the Uṣūlīs to be kāfir and he also insinuated that they are destroying the dīn (as he opines). Similarly, al-Kāshānī (who was also an Akhbārī and he authored one of the eight fundamental books, i.e. Al-Wāfi) attributed kufr to a number of their scholars. He was taken to task by one of them as he had views which were similar to the (deviant) ṣūfīs and the philosophers, which necessitated kufr, for example, his belief in the idea of Waḥdat al-Wujūd. In this way, they keep declaring one another kāfir, an age-old tradition that their predecessors initiated. This can also be seen in many of their narrations, as will appear. Nevertheless, both of these sects belong to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah.

As for the essential differences between these two groups, their scholar, Kāshif al-Ghiṭā wrote a book titled, al-Ḥaqq al-Mubīn fī Taṣwīb al-Mujtahidīn wa Takhti’at al-Akhbāriyyīn, in which he counted these differences to be eighty in number.

Al-Baḥrānī tries to do away with these differences, so he brings them down to as little as eight or even less, as he believes that they open the door for criticising the scholars of both sects and make the Shīʿah vulnerable to condemnation. However, he was beaten by his successor, Muḥsin al-Amīn, who tried getting away with the claim that they are no more than five in number. Then, a third stance

---

1 Lu’lu’at al-Baḥrayn: al-Baḥrānī pg. 118
2 Ibid pg. 121
3 This was Al-Baḥrānī. Refer to Lu’lu’at al-Baḥrayn pg. 121
4 A ṣūfī term, the apparent meaning of which is open blasphemy. It means that Allah is in everything. In other words, there is only one existing being, Allah. However, some scholars have stated that the correct interpretation thereof is that (the greatness of) Allah can be witnessed in everything. His is the only true and independent existence.
5 Under the discussion of occultation in this book.
6 This book was printed in Tehran in the year 1316 A.H. Refer to Al-Dharīʿah 7/37-38
7 ‘Izz al-Dīn Bahr al-‘Ulūm: al-Taqlīd pg. 95
8 In the book al-Ḥadā’iq, “I did not find him establishing more than four differences.” Refer to al-Ḥadā’iq 1/167.
9 Al-Ḥadā’iq 1/167
10 A’yān al-Shīʿah 17/453-458
also existed, which was a stance in between the two, thus bringing the number to a total of forty-three,\(^1\) forty\(^2\) and twenty-nine.\(^3\)

The minimising of the differences is achieved by claiming that some of the matters are inter-linked, claiming that a difference of opinion exists within the sect itself so the contrary view cannot represent the sect or the difference does not really exist. An example of the last case is the issue of ijmāʿ, which is established as a source of proof by the Uṣūlīs and rejected by the Akhbārīs. However, their scholar, al-Baḥrānī believes that this difference does not exist, as he states that even though the Uṣūlīs have listed it as one of the sources of proof in their books regarding the principles of jurisprudence, they have discarded it on a practical level in their books wherein proofs are mentioned. They have argued regarding its establishment, occurrence and whether the results thereof ever existed. Thus, the effects of it have been totally annihilated.\(^4\)

The object of our discussion is not to get into all the matters in which they oppose one another,\(^5\) rather we only wish to point out the division of the Shīʿah themselves into two sects who oppose one another and disagree regarding the sources of proofs, to say the least — even though some have tried to sweep it

---

1 This is the view of their scholar ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Baḥrānī as stated in his book Munyat al-Mumārisīn, refer to al-Ḥadā’iq 1/167
2 This is the view of their scholar ʿAbd Allāh al-Samāhījī. Refer to Rawḍāt al-Jannāt 1/36
3 This is the view of their scholar al-Khowansārī refer to Rawḍāt al-Jannāt 1/36.
4 Al-Ḥadā’iq 1/168
5 For details regarding these differences refer to Muqtabas al-Aθar of al-Ḥā’irī 3/296, al-Khowansārī: Rawḍāt al-Jannāt 1/36, al-Baḥrānī: al-Ḥadā’iq 1/167, al-Kashkāl 2/386-389, Muḥammad Ṣādiq Bahr al-ʿUlūm: Dalīl al-Qaḍā al-Sharʿī Uṣūluhū wa Furūʿuhū 3/22-26, Muḥsin al-Amīn: Aʾyān al-Shīʿah 17/453-458, ʿIzz al-Dīn Bahr al-ʿUlūm: al-Taqlīd pg. 95, al-Gharīfī: al-Ijtihād wa l-Fatwā pg. 99. Some have said that the most important differences that exist between them are four in number: 1) The types of aḥādīth (ṣaḥīḥ, ḥasan, muwaththaq, ḍaʿīf) which is established by the by the Uṣūlīs and rejected by the Akhbārīs. 2) Taqlīd, the Uṣūlīs do not accept that a dead person can be followed, whereas the Akhbārīs accept it. 3 & 4) Ijmāʿ and the intellect. The Uṣūlīs accept that they can be used after the Qurʿān and the Sunnah, but the Akhbārīs do not accept that. Refer to al-Gharīfī: al-Ijtihād wa l-Fatwā pg. 99
under the carpet. At this point, I wish to highlight that these differences which occurred between the two sects of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah have shed light upon many realities of their religion, as the veil of Taqiyyah was ripped to pieces by the assaults that took place during the attacks on each other. Had it not been for these differences, these realities would not have come to the fore.

A careful and thoughtful study of the differences between the two sects will definitely reveal many of the secrets of the religion.¹

¹ Personally, I benefitted from the arguments between them under the chapter, “their view regarding the Sunnah” and the chapter of Ijmāʿ.
Section One

Their Beliefs Regarding the Sources of Islam

This section contains three chapters:

1. Chapter One – Their Beliefs Regarding the Book of Allah
2. Chapter Two – Their Beliefs Regarding the Sunnah
3. Chapter Three – Their Beliefs Regarding Ijmāʿ

Chapter One

Their Beliefs Regarding the Glorious Qur’ān

In this chapter, if Allah wills, we will first include the statements of the Shī‘ah which expose their beliefs regarding the Book of Allah. We will first present their view regarding the Qur’ān as a source of proof and their opposition of the consensus of the ummah in this matter. They believe that the Qur’ān cannot be a proof, unless it is accompanied by one who keeps it in place (one of the twelve Imāms). They also believe that the knowledge of the Qur’ān is preserved only with the Imām. They were handpicked for its knowledge, and none besides them had access to it. Furthermore, they opine that he has the right to restrict the general command and add conditions to that which is stated without any conditions therein, etc.

Secondly, we will present their beliefs regarding the meaning of the Qur’ān. This will include their view that the Qur’ān has an inner meaning, which is only known by the Imāms as well as their view that most of the Qur’ān was revealed regarding them and their enemies. Thirdly, we will include their views regarding the text of the Qur’ān, and we will study whether or not the Shī‘ah believe that the Qur’ān is incomplete and was interpolated.
Added to the above, the Shi'ah believe that the Qur'an is a creation — an idea which they inherited from the Mu'tazilah. This matter will also be discussed under the chapter regarding their beliefs concerning the names of Allah and His attributes. Another claim of theirs, which repeatedly appears in their books although no one has analysed it or pointed it out, is that divine books are revealed to the Imāms. This matter was unclear to many, to the extent that I seen some researchers mistaking this to be the same as another view that is attributed to the Shi'ah, viz. the Qur'an was interpolated. Among them was Goldhizer, Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb and Iḥsān Ilāhī Ẓahīr.

The Shi'ah also uphold the belief that their Imāms possess all the books that were revealed upon the ambiyā'. We will look into this matter as well as the one prior to it under the discussion ‘belief upon the Book’ – which is one of the pillars of faith. The reason why I mentioned them here is so that a complete picture of their beliefs regarding the Book of Allah could be drawn (as this is easier when everything is mentioned in one place). However, these three matters have been discussed in the mentioned places, as they are more appropriate for the discussion.

All the above has been covered in this book, as I noticed (according to my own research) that those who countered Shi'ism did not give due attention to them. Our contemporary scholars have excessively discussed one subject, i.e. the view of interpolation of the Qur'ān, which is attributed to the Shi'ah. We will see that the discussions around this subject were not free from mistakes and generalisation of the view that is actually upheld by the extremist Shi'ah. We seek the help of Allah alone.
Discussion One

Their Belief Regarding the Qur’ān as a Source of Proof

This discussion will be divided into three sub-sections; Firstly, their claim that the Qur’ān cannot be used as a proof, unless it is accompanied with the opinion of the Imām. Secondly, the belief that the knowledge of the Qur’ān and its understanding is confined to the Imāms. Thirdly, the view that the Imām has the right to restrict the general commands of the Qur’ān and add conditions to those which were revealed without any conditions attached to them, etc.

a. The Qur’ān Cannot be a Proof Unless it is accompanied With the Opinion of the Imām

Along the course of my study of Shī‘ī literature, I found that this matter was emphasised in a number of their relied upon works. I had never previously imagined that any sect which associates itself with Islam would dare say, “the Qur’ān cannot be used as a source of proof,” whereas Allah says regarding those who asked for a sign to prove the truthfulness of the Messenger:

أَوَ لَمْ يَكْفِهِمْ إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ يُتْلَى عَلَيْهِمْ

And is it not sufficient for them that We revealed to you the Book (i.e., the Qur’ān) which is recited to them?

Thus, the glorious Qur’ān is the sign, proof and evidence. However, the scholar of the Shī‘ah, who they have dubbed Thiqat al-Islām (the reliable one of Islam), al-Kulaynī, reports in his book Uṣūl al-Kāfī (which the Shī‘ah revere as much as the Ahl al-Sunnah revere Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī):

1 Sūrah al-ʿAnkabūt: 51
2 Refer to the chapter, “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah,” in this book.
The Qurʾān cannot be a proof except with the Imām one who keeps it in place...ʿAlī was the one who kept the Qurʾān in place. Obedience to him was compulsory upon the people, and he was the proof against the people, after Rasūlullāh.¹

This doctrine can be found in many of their seminal books such as Rijāl al-Kashshi, ʿIlal al-Sharāʾiʿ, al-Maḥāsin, Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah, etc. What exactly do they mean by this statement? Does it mean that the text of the Qurʾān cannot be used as proof unless it is sanctioned or explained by the Imām? This would mean that the actual proof is not the word of al-Raḥmān, but rather the word the Imām! Or, do they mean that the Qurʾān will not be practised upon except if it is enforced by the sultan, and he is the one who keeps it in place by implementing it? This possibility is ruled out due another narration which complements the above narration. This narration states:

I pondered over the Qurʾān. I found that the Murjī’ah, Qadariyyah and renegades who do not have faith; all use it to argue and defeat men with their arguments. Thereupon I realised that the Qurʾān cannot serve as proof unless it is accompanied by the Imām.⁶

This implies that the statements of the Imām are clearer than the speech of al-Raḥmān. It is also clear from the above that the actual proof is the statements of

---

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/188
2 Al-Ṣadūq: ʿIlal al-Sahrāʾiʿ pg. 192
3 Rijāl al-Kashshi pg. 420
4 Al-Barqī: al-Maḥāsin pg. 268
5 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 18/141
6 Ibid
the Imam as he alone has the ability of explaining it. Hence, they have referred to the Qur’ān as *al-Qur’ān al-Ṣāmit* (the silent Qur’ān) and the Imām as *al-Qur’ān al-Nāṭiq* (the talking Qur’ān). They even have a ‘narration’ from ‘Alī wherein it is alleged that he said:

هو كتاب الله الصامت و أنا كتاب الله الناطق

This is the silent Book of Allah, and I am the Book of Allah who speaks.¹

Another narration goes:

ذلك القران فاستنطقوه فلن ينطق لكم أخبركم عنه

This is the Qur’ān. Ask it to speak, and it will never speak to you people. I will inform you about it.²

Their narrations also state:

و على تفسير كتاب الله

‘Alī is the explanation of the Book of Allah.³

On other occasions, they claim that the Imāms are in fact the Qur’ān.⁴ Yet another

---

1 Al-Hurr al-ʿĀmilī: *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah* pg. 235
2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/61
3 *Al-Bihār* 37/209, al-Ṭabarsī: *al-Iḥtijāj* pg. 31-33, al-Barūjardī: *Tafsīr al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* 20/30
4 This is why we find them misinterpreting the verse:

وَاتَّبَعُوا النُّورَ الَّذِی اُنْزِلَ مَعَهُ…

…and followed the light which was sent down with him – (Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 157).

They say, “‘light’ refers to ‘Alī and the Imāms (Thus, according to this, the Imāms were sent down from the heavens).’ *Al-Kāfī* 1/194. They also misinterpret the following verse:

و*… إنَّمَا يُفْهَمُ عَلَىٰ هُمْ إِبَابًا تَلْبَسْهَا قَالَ الَّذِیْنَ لَۡیَرْجُوْنَ لِقَاۡیَ بِقُرْاٰنٍ غَیۡرِهِ ۚ إِذَا تُتْلَی عَلَیْهِمْ اٰیَاتُنَا بَیِّنٰتٰی…

And when Our verses are recited to them as clear evidences, those who do not expect the meeting with Us say, “Bring us a Qur’ān other than this or change it.” Say, [O Muhammad], “It is not for me to change it on my own accord. I only follow what is revealed to me. (Sūrah Yūnus: 15)
claim of theirs is that the Qur’ān was not explained to anyone besides ‘Alī.

If any of the above makes any sense, what definitely does not make sense is how could ‘Alī be the one who keeps the Qur’ān in its place if he himself was the Qur’ān? If he was the Qur’ān or the one who keeps it in place, then why was it explained to him? Similarly, how could it have been explained to him when he was the explanation? Undoubtedly, these views are a collection of contradictions, which were concocted by a disbeliever whose only intention was the corruption of the religion of the Muslims. Who else would have said this regarding the Book which was revealed by Allah as a means of guidance for the entire humanity? Allah says:

اِنَّ هٰذَا الْقُرْأٰنَ یَهْدِیْ لِلَّتِیْ هِیَ اَقْوَمُ وَیُبَشِّرُ الْمُؤْمِنِیْنَ الَّذِیْنَ یَعْمَلُوْنَ الصّٰلِحٰتِ اَنَّ لَهُمْ اَجْرًا کَبِیْرًا

Indeed, this Qur’ān guides to that which is most suitable and gives good tidings to the believers who do righteous deeds that they will have a great reward.

continued from page 157

They say, “Bring us a Qur’ān other than this or change it (i.e. Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn).” Refer to Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī 2/120, Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/419, Tafsīr al-Burhān 2/180, Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaqalayn 2/296, Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/310, and Biḥār al-Anwār 80 /36.

A similar misinterpretation is seen in their explanation of the verse:

ٓ اِنْ کَانُوْا صٰدِقِینَْ﴾  فَلْیَاْتُوْا بِحَدِیْثٍ مِّثْلِه

Or do they say, “he has made it up”? Rather, they do not believe. Then let them produce a statement like it, if they should be truthful. (Sūrah al-Ṭūr: 33-34)

Tafsīr al-Qummī states:

“He has made it up”? i.e. Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn. “Rather, they do not believe” (that he did not make it up and he did not place it on account of his own view.) Then let them produce a statement like it (a man like him from Allah), if they should be truthful.

Refer to Tafsīr al-Qummī 2/333, al-Baḥrānī: al-Burhān fī Tafsīr al-Qur’ān 4/242, Biḥār al-Anwār 36/85, etc.

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/250
2 Sūrah al-Isrā: 9
The rightly guided Khalīfah, ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib ﷺ said:

The Book of Allah contains historical anecdotes of the people before you and the law that you should apply among yourselves. It is the judge. It is not a means of amusement. Whoever discards it out of arrogance, Allah will destroy him and whoever looks to anything besides it for guidance, Allah will lead him astray. It is the Rope of Allah which will not ever snap, the reminder which is filled with wisdom and the straight path. Desires are not corrupted by it and tongues are not confused by its recital. It does not cease to amaze (the reader) and the scholars are never satiated by it (it always leaves them with a desire for more). Whoever speaks it or recites it says the absolute truth, whoever practices upon it, will be rewarded, whoever passes a judgement according to it, his judgement will be filled with justice and whoever calls towards it will be guided to the straight path.1

---

1 Ibn Kathīr states while commenting upon this narration: “Those who attribute this statement to Nabī ﷺ are mistaken. The most that can be said regarding it is that it is the statement of Amīr al-Muʿminīn ʿAlī ﷺ.” Refer to Ibn Kathīr: Faḍāʾil al-Qur’ān pg. 15. Al-Tirmidhī reports a version wherein it is attributed to Nabī ﷺ under the section of the reward received for the Qurʿān, the chapter of the virtues of the Qurʿān, number 2906 4/172. Al-Dāramī reports it in his Sunan, the book regarding the virtues of the Qurʿān, the chapter of the merit of the Qurʿān pg. 831 and Imām Ahmad reports it in his Musnad 2/703, number 704 (researched by Aḥmad Shākir). The isnād of this ḥadīth has been criticised. Al-Tirmidhī says, “we do not know this ḥadīth except from these narrators. The isnād is unknown, and Ḥārith (one of the narrators) has been criticised.” Refer to al-Tirmidhī 4/172. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ʿArabī al-Mālikī says: “The aḥādīth of Ḥārith cannot be relied upon.” Refer to ʿĀridat al-Aḥwadhī 11/30. Aḥmad Shākir says: “The isnād is quite unauthentic on account of Ḥārith.” Refer to al-Musnad 2/704. Another researcher corroborates the above and adds that perhaps the statement was uttered by ʿAlī ﷺ, and thereafter attributed to Nabī by Ḥārith (who was even regarded by some of the scholars to be a liar). Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah (Takhrīj al-Albānī) pg. 68. Nonetheless, this statement is reported from ʿAlī ﷺ in the books of the Shīʿah. Refer to Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/3, al-Burhān 1/7, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/15, Bihār al-Anwār 7/19.
Ibn ʿAbbās says, “whoever recites the Qur’ān and practices upon it it is guaranteed safety from misguidance in this world and protection from being ill-fated in the hereafter by Allah.” Thereafter he recited this verse:

فَمَنِ اتَّبَعَ هُدَایَ فَلاَ یَضِلُّ وَلَا یَشْقَی

Then whoever follows My guidance will neither go astray [in the world] nor suffer [in the hereafter].\(^1\)

This matter (i.e. the Qur’ān is the actual proof and guide) is so widely accepted that it does not serve any purpose for us to mention all the proofs thereof. We have chosen to suffice upon the Qur’ān itself and that which is reported by the Ahl al-Sunnah from a personality of the Ahl al-Bayt. However, before concluding this discussion, we deem it appropriate to point out those statements in their own books which contradict their claims, as evidence against them regarding their excessive contradictions. We will also shed light upon the objective behind the concoction of such a theory. One of their reliable sources reports the following statement:

ذَکَرُ الرضی-رضى الله عنه- يوما القرآن فعظم الحجة فيه...فقال هو حبل الله المتین و عروته الوثقی...
جَعِل دلیل البرهان و حجة على كل انسان لا يأتبه الباطل من بين يديه ولا من خلفه تنزل من حکیم

الحمد

Al-Riḍā mentioned the Qur’ān one day and he presented a great deal of proof regarding it... thereafter he said, “it is the Rope of Allah which will not snap and the His reliable handhold. It was made the guide of the proof\(^2\) and evidence against every human. No falsehood will infiltrate it neither from its front nor from the back. It is a revelation from the one who is Wise and Praiseworthy.”\(^3\)

---

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 123, refer to *Tafsīr Ibn Jarīr* (al-Ṭabarī) 16/225
2 This appears in the source from which this is quoted. However, this seems to be an error. The actual sentence should have been, “It is the guide of the bewildered,” as proof does not need a guide.
3 Al-Majlisī: *Al-Biḥār* 92/14, Ibn Bābawayh: *ʿUyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā* 2/130
Another text of theirs reads:

فَاذَا التبست علیكم الفتن كقطع الليل المظلم فعليكم بالقرآن فانه شافع مشفع من جعله امامه قاده الى الجنة ومن جعله خلفه ساقه الى النار وهو الدلیل یدل على خیر السبیل

When trials cause confusion among you, like portions of a dark night, then hold onto the Qurʾān as it is an intercessor whose intercession is upheld. Whoever keeps it in front of him, will be drawn by it to Jannah, and whoever keeps it behind him, it shoves him into hell. It is a guide which guides to the best path.¹

*Nahj al-Balāghah*, which the Shīʿah attribute to ʿAlī ² and believe regarding it that “no falsehood will infiltrate it neither from its front nor from the back”³ reports the following statement:

فالقرآن امر زاجر و صامت ناطق حجة الله على خلقه

Thus, the Qurʾān commands and reproaches. It is silent and it speaks. It is the proof of Allah against His creation.⁴

These texts are corroborated by any others, which exposes to us the degree of contradiction and confusion that exists in the sources of these people. As you have seen, their narrations always contradict one another. The greatest problem

---

1 *Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī* 1/2, Al-Bihār 92/17
2 The experts have always expressed great suspicion and doubt regarding the attribution of this book to ʿAlī ⁵. Al-Dhahabī says: “Whoever reads *Nahj al-Balāghah* will be convinced that it was falsely attributed to ʿAlī ⁶.” Thereafter, he explains the reasons and signs thereof. Refer to * Mizān al-ʿīdāl* 3/124, under the biography of Sharīf Murtaḍā. More details will appear regarding it under the chapter of the Sunnah, as well as those books wherein it has been analysed and criticised, Allah willing.
3 Al-Hādī Kāshif al-Ghiṭā (a contemporary Shīʿī scholar) states that denying its attribution to ʿAlī ⁷, according to them, is in the category of denying that which is obvious. He says: “The condition of all that is narrated in it is the exact same as that which is narrated from Nabī ⁸.” Refer to *Madārik Nahj al-Balāghah* pg. 190
4 *Nahj al-Balāghah* pg. 265, researched by Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ, Al-Bihār 92/20
that after finding themselves in this state of confusion, they decided to steer themselves out of it by holding onto all that which is against the view of the majority, i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah. Further details regarding this will appear under the section of their beliefs regarding ijmā'.

They prefer the views which oppose the views of the majority, even though they have texts which oppose these views. Furthermore, if any of their scholars were to wake up to the call of the truth and openly declare that he opposes them, they simply use their trump card of Taqiyyah, as will be discussed under the discussion related to Taqiyyah. Whoever ponders regarding this view of the Shīʿah concerning the Qur’ān — which is established beyond any doubt in their books — will realise that it is a product of one of their malicious enemies, who intended to keep them away from the Book of Allah and His guidance.

This theory makes the Qur’ān dependent upon the presence of one who keeps it in place. According to the Shīʿah, the only people who can keep it in place are the twelve Imāms. This is based on their belief that the Qur’ān was only explained to one person, viz. ʿAlī. Thereafter, this knowledge was passed on to the twelve Imāms. Each Imām taught it only to the next Imām until this chain ended with the twelfth Imām.¹

The twelfth Imām, however, is hidden and could not be traced for more than a thousand years. Neither can any of the sects of the Shīʿah find him, nor anyone else. Despite this, the Qur’ān cannot be used as a source of proof without the Imām (who is either hidden, as they claim, or does not exist). In other words, the Qur’ān can no longer be used as proof as the one who is to keep it in place is either hidden or does not exist. The Qur’ān can no longer be referred to or used as proof as the actual proof is the statement of the Imām who is not present (which ultimately means that the Qur’ān no longer serves it purpose as a source of proof). This is why the Akhbārī sect:

¹ We will discuss this in detail under the chapter of the Sunnah, Allah willing.
... rejected the other three sources of proofs,\(^1\) including the Qur’ān, and confined it to only one (i.e. the narrations, which is why) they were given the above-mentioned name.\(^2\)

This is all that is needed to go astray and lead others away from the path of Allah. This was not where the conspiring against the Book of Allah and the Shīʿah ended, rather, it was one link of the chain, and one tactic from the grand ploy which aimed at distancing the Shīʿah in the furthest possible manner from the majority of the Muslims. It was the first and opening step towards interpreting the Book of Allah against its meaning, as they claimed that these (their concocted interpretations) were from the one who keeps it in place, the Imām from the Ahl al-Bayt. There is no proof besides his statements. He speaks on behalf of the Qur’ān and he alone can explain it. Without him, the Qur’ān cannot serve as proof!

b. Their Belief that the Knowledge of the Qur’ān and its Understanding is Confined to the Imāms

It is a known fact in Islam that the knowledge and understanding of the Qur’ān cannot be a secret confined to a certain bloodline. ʿAlī\(^3\) was definitely not singled out as a recipient of this divine blessing, which would mean deprivation of the rest of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh\(^4\) Ḥ. Rather, they were (collectively) the first students thereof, who had the grand opportunity of learning the Qur’ān from the Messenger who was sent to the entire humanity, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh\(^5\). They then had the privilege of imparting it to the rest of the generations to come. It is only the Shīʿah who deny this fact and fundamental belief of Islam and prefer to believe that Allah had confined all the knowledge contained in the Qur’ān to their twelve A’immah, and they alone know its interpretation. Whoever seeks the knowledge of the Qur’ān from anyone besides them is indeed misguided.

---

1 Ijmāʿ, the intellect and the glorious Qur’ān.
2 Refer to al-Taqlīd fī l-Sharīʿah al-Islāmiyyah pg. 93.
Some sources of the Ahl al-Sunnah state that this belief was originated or at least the roots thereof were planted by Ibn Saba’, as he is the one who claimed:

ان القرآن جزء من تسعة اجزاء و علمه عند علي

The (present) Qur’ān is one of nine portions, and the knowledge of it by ʿAlī.¹

This view is repeated in the books of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah in many different narrations:

A lengthy narration from Abū ‘Abd Allāh appears in Uṣūl al-Kāfī, wherein he says:

ان الناس يكفيهم القرآن لو وجدوا له مفسرا و ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فسره لرجل واحد و فسر للامة شان ذلك الرجل وهو علي بن ابى طالب

The Qur’ān is sufficient for people, if they find one who is able to interpret it for them. Rasūlullāh interpreted it for one man and he explained the details of that man to the ummah. He is ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib.²

Many of their reliable books report the following from Rasūlullāh:

ان الله انزل على القرآن وهو الذى من خالفه ضل و من يبتغى علمه عند غير علي هلك

Allah revealed upon me the Qur’ān. It is such a book that whoever opposes it will go astray and whoever seeks the explanation of it from anyone besides ‘Alī will be destroyed.³

---

1 Al-Jowzajānī: Aḥwāl al-Rijāl pg. 38
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/25, Wasāʾīl al-Shīʿah 18/131
It is also claimed in their books that Abū Jaʿfar (al-Bāqir) asked Qatādah, “O Qatādah, are you the jurist of the people of Baṣrah?” Qatādah replied, “that is what they say.” Thereupon Abū Jaʿfar said:

ویمنك تفسر القران فقال له قتادة: "ولن أرى القران من خوطب به

“It has reached me that you explain the Qurʾān.” Qatādah replied in the affirmative whereupon Abū Jaʿfar said:

Woe unto you o Qatādah! Only that person has knowledge of the Qurʾān who was addressed by it.¹

*Tafsīr al-Furāt* states:

The only responsibility of the masses is to recite the Qurʾān as it was revealed. When they require its explanation, then guidance is in (following) us and (coming) to us.²

This chapter is laden with narrations, so much so that if I were to present all that is in front of me right now, it will fill an entire volume. *Al-Kāfī* contains a few chapters, each of which contain a number of their narrations on the subject. They include the following chapters:

1. The Imāms are the guardians of the decision of Allah and the treasurers of his knowledge.³
2. The ‘Ahl al-Dhikr’, who the creation have been commanded to ask all their questions are only the Imāms.⁴

---

¹ *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/192
² *Tafsīr Furāt* pg. 91, *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 18/149
⁴ *Ibid* 1/210
3. Whenever people are referred to as knowledgeable, it refers to the Imāms.¹
4. The ones who are well-grounded in knowledge are the Imāms.²
5. The Imāms have been granted knowledge and it has been established in their bosoms.³

As for the author of Al-Biḥār, as per his habit, has a large collection on this topic. Among his chapter titles are:

1. They are the custodians of the knowledge of the Qur’ān (This chapter contains 54 narrations).⁴
2. They are the treasurers of the knowledge of Allah.⁵
3. The knowledge of the skies and earth is not hidden from them.⁶
4. Nothing is hidden from them.⁷

Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah of al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has a chapter entitled “the impermissibility of extracting laws from the apparent meaning of the Qur’ān by analogy, except after learning their interpretations from the speech of the A’immah”. This chapter contains eighty of their narrations.⁸ Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah fī Uṣūl al-A’immah has a chapter titled “none knows the interpretation of the Qur’ān besides the Imāms.”⁹ The author of Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī dedicated one of the introductory chapters of his book to this matter, i.e. “the second introduction — a synopsis of that which has come to us regarding the all the knowledge of the Qur’ān being confined to the Ahl al-

¹ Ibid 1/212
² Ibid 1/213
³ Ibid 1/213
⁴ Al-Biḥār 23/188-205
⁵ Ibid 26/105
⁶ Ibid 26/109
⁷ Ibid 26/137
⁸ Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 18/129-152
⁹ Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah pg. 173
The author of *Muqaddimat al-Burhān* writes, “the fifth chapter: explaining that which indicates that the knowledge of the interpretation of the Qur’ān, or rather, the entire Qur’ān is known only to the Ahl al-Bayt”. He mentions a few of their narrations regarding this matter after which he says:

I say, “the narrations in this chapter are too many. They cannot be counted.”

If we list all the Shīʿī books in which this has been discussed, the discussion will become lengthy, as this is one of their foundational principles. One of their Ayatollahs say:

Know well that the knowledge of the Qur’ān is securely kept by the Ahl al-Bayt. This is from the fundamentals of the madh-hab.

It is quite amazing that based upon the claim that the Imāms alone have the knowledge of the Qur’ān, they claim that they have knowledge regarding everything. Abū ‘Abd Allāh (asl-Ṣādiq) says (as they falsely assert):

Indeed I know what is in the heavens, what is in the earths, what is in Jannah, what is in Jahannam, what happened in the past and what will

---

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 1/19
2 *Muqaddimat al-Burhān* pg. 15
3 Ibid pg. 16
4 Ḥusayn al-Barūjardī – one of their contemporary scholars
5 *Tafsīr al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* 3/4
happen in the future. He paused for a while and noticed that his speech weighed heavily upon those who heard it. Thus he said, “I learnt all of it from the Book of Allah. Allah says in it ‘the explanation of everything.’”

Look at this text which is attributed to Ja’far — and we stand witness to his innocence, as his piety and leadership does not allow this. The one who concocted it claims that he knew everything, but he was ignorant of even that which he was quoting as the Qur’an does not contain any verse such as “تبيان كل شيء”, the correct wording of the verse is “تبيان لكل شيء”. Allah disgraced him by exposing his ignorance regarding this verse. This mistake also serves as a clear proof that these texts are from the fabrications of an irreligious individual who infiltrated the ranks of the Muslims in a move to plot against Islam and Muslims.

Analysis and Criticism of this View

Analysis of the Texts

The reader should be aware that it is beyond us to quote all their texts on this matter, gather them here and analyse them, due to their abundance. Doing so would require a great amount of pages. It is more appropriate for us to cite a few examples therefrom, as all echo the same meaning, i.e. the knowledge of the Qur’an was confined to twelve Imāms, it is kept as a treasure by them and they, by means of it, have knowledge regarding everything. We will now pause and analyse and examine each text that we have quoted. Thereafter, we will return to the actual belief and analyse it.

The First Text: Wherein it is Claimed that Rasūlullāh Explained the Qur’an Only to ‘Alī

Allah says:

وَ آنَّا لَكُمْ الْيَتْكُدُّونَ لِيُبْيِنُونَ لِلنَّاسِ مَا نُزِّلَ إِلَيْهِمْ وَلَعَلَّهُمْ يَتَفَكَّرُونَ

1 Al-Bihār 26/111
2 Sūrah al-Nāḥl: 89
And We revealed to you the message [i.e., the Qur’ān] that you may make clear to the people what was sent down to them and that they might give thought.¹

The books of the Shī‘ah, as we have previously mentioned, state that it is not the duty of the Rasūl to explain the Qur’ān to the people. Rather, his duty is to explain “the position of that man — ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib”. As for explaining the Qur’ān to the people, this was the duty and deputation of ‘Alī, not Muḥammad. The speech of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah at this juncture is akin to the speech of one of the extremist sects, the Gharābiyyah — who would say that Muḥammad resembled ‘Alī to a greater degree than that of the resemblance between two crows. Allah had sent Jibrīl with revelation to ‘Alī, but he was mistaken and thus passed on the revelation to Muḥammad.²

Is there any real difference between this view and the view of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah? The Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah have also passed on the task of conveying the message of Allah to ‘Alī (instead of Muḥammad). The only difference is that they did not accuse Jibrīl of making a mistake. According to this, the only duty which was assigned to Nabī was, the introducing of ‘Alī and explaining his position. I leave it upon the reader to ponder over the rest of the similarities, as they are self-evident.

The Second Text: Whoever Seeks the Knowledge of the Qur’ān from Anyone Besides ‘Alī will be Destroyed

We believe that whoever seeks the knowledge of the Qur’ān from the Qur’ān, the Sunnah and the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh, among whom is ‘Alī, will definitely be guided. The claim that whoever seeks it from any source besides ‘Alī is totally unknown and foreign to Islām. In fact, its falsity is obvious, Nabī.

¹ Sūrah al-Naḥl: 44
did not ever confine the knowledge of Islam and the sharīʿah to any specific Ṣaḥābī, thereby depriving the rest of his companions thereof. The above-quoted verse, “and We revealed to you the message [i.e., the Qurʾān] that you may make clear to the people what was sent down to them,” very clearly points out that the explanation was presented to the people and not to a specific individual or group of people, even though they were from the household of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

Added to the above, Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī Ḥ. denied the claim that Rasūlullāh ﷺ taught him anything that was not taught to others. Also, Nabī ﷺ addressed his Ṣaḥābah (and included the rest of the generations after them in this address), saying to them that they should convey his message and he exhorted them fervently to do so. Zayd ibn Thābit as well as others narrates:

نضر الله امرءا سمع منا حدیثا فحفظه حتى یبلغه غیره قاص رب حامل فقه لیس بفقیه و رب حامل فقه الى من هو افقه منه

May Allah safeguard (the faculties and abilities of) the person who hears a ḥadīth from us, memorises it and passes it on to others. Many a carrier of knowledge does not have a comprehensive understanding thereof, and many a carrier of knowledge conveys it to those who surpass him in understanding it...

This ḥadīth is also found in the reliable books of the Ithnāʿ Ashariyyah. Thus there remains no reason for it not to serve as proof against them.

---


2 Refer to Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/403, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: Wasāʾīl al-Shīʿah 18/63
The Third Text

None were addressed by the Qur’ān besides the twelve Imāms. Thus, none knows the Qur’ān besides them.

اِنَّمَا يَعْرَفُ الْقُرْآنُ مِنْ خَوْطِبِهِ

Woe unto you o Qatādah! Only that person has knowledge of the Qur’ān who was addressed by it.¹

It is for this very reason that the noble Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the generation after them and the scholars of Islām along the centuries have been described as “those who are doomed and have brought doom (upon others)” on account of them shouldering the task and responsibility of explaining the Qur’ān in accordance to its principles. Another reason could be that they believed that the Qur’ān contains that which none will be excused for being ignorant thereof, that which the Arabs have always known, as it was part of their speech, that which is only known to the scholars and that which is not known to anyone except Allah.²

The Shī’ah claim that none have the knowledge of the Qur’ān besides the Imāms, and they possess all the knowledge of the Qur’ān. This is claim that needs to be backed by proof. However, it is belied by both logic as well as narration. Most of all, their books of Tafsīr are the greatest of testimonies against them, as will be seen!

The Fourth Text

The duty of the entire humanity, besides the Imāms, is only to recite the Qur’ān. Nobody is allowed to undertake the responsibility of explaining it besides the

¹ Al-Kāfī Kitāb al-Rowḍāh 12/415, number 485 (which is printed along with Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ of al-Māzindarānī), Wasā’il al-Shi‘ah 18/136, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/21-22, al-Burhān fī Tafsīr al-Qur’ān 1/18, Biḥār al-Anwār 24/237, 238
² A statement to this meaning has been narrated from Ibn ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه. Refer to Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 1/76 (researched by Aḥmad Shākir and Maḥmūd Shākir) and Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 1/5.
Imāms. Nabī ﷺ himself was not allowed to do so, as his responsibility was only to “explain the details of that man”. Thus, the prohibition applied to a greater extent to the Ṣaḥābah, pious predecessors and leading scholars of the ummah. If anyone requires the explanation of any verse of the Qur’ān, his only option is to place his query before those who possess the knowledge of the Qur’ān, i.e. their Imāms.

Now, if that is the case, then let us ask, what can we find in the books of Tafsīr or other books of the Shīʿah such as Tafsīr al-Qummī, al-ʿAyyāshī, al-Burhān, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī, al-Kāfī and Al-Biḥār under the explanations of the verses of the Qur’ān which are attributed to the Imāms? One who looks, will find that the interpretations offered there are supposedly ‘hidden’ meanings. They are not, in any way, linked to the text of the Qur’ān, the contexts wherein they appear, their meanings or implications. This will be demonstrated in the examples that will appear.

As stated, the greatest testimony that stands against this view of the Shīʿah is their own books of Tafsīr. Further, the texts quoted from their books on the subject deter people from pondering over and reflecting upon the Qur’ān and understanding its meanings. This is clearly a form of preventing people from the dīn of Allah and His sharīʿah. Perhaps, the secret behind the concoction of this fallacy is to prevent the Shīʿah from studying the Book of Allah, reflecting upon it and understanding it, as that would embarrass the founders of the religion by exposing their colossal amount of lies, misguided schemes and flawed methodology of interpreting the Qur’ān (by claiming that their interpretations are a reflection of the internal or secret meanings).

**An Analysis of this View**

This view is based on the belief that the Rasūl ﷺ passed on all the knowledge of the Qur’ān to ʿAlī ilden. This view raised its head in the very lifetime of Amīr al-Muʿminīn, as the Sabaʿiyyah openly claimed that ʿAlī ilden is the sole possessor of some knowledge. Consequently, he made an open declaration to the contrary saying:
By the oath of the one who caused the seed to split and created every being, we do not possess except that which is in the Qur’ān besides understanding which a man is blessed with regarding the Book of Allah.

A fact that simply cannot be overlooked is that Rasūlullāh ﷺ explained the meanings of the verses of the Qur’ān to his Ṣaḥābah, just as he taught them the wording thereof. The following verse refers to both, the words as well as the meanings:

وَ آنْزَلْنَآ إِلَیْكَ الذِّکْرَ لِتُبَیِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ مَا نُزِّلَ اِلَیْهِمْ وَلَعَلَّهُمْ يَتَفَکَّرُوْنَ

And We revealed to you the message [i.e., the Qur’ān] that you may explain clearly to the people what was sent down to them and that they might give thought.¹

Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī² said:

Those who taught us the Qur’ān (ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān, ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd and others) narrated to us that when they would learn from Nabī ﷺ, they would not learn more than ten verses until they had fully grasped the knowledge of what they had learnt and brought it into practise. Thus they would say:

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 44
2 The Qārī of Kūfah, the luminary, Imām ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ḥabīb ibn Rabī′ah al-Kūfī. He was from the generation of the children of the Ṣaḥābah. He was born during the lifetime of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and he learnt the Qur’ān from ʿUthmān, ʿAlī, Zayd, Ubay and Ibn Masʿūd 未能找到。Refer to al-Dhahabī: Siyar Aʾlām al-Nubalāʾ 4/267, al-Sūyūṭī: Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāẓ pg. 19. He should not be confused with the sufī and scholar who goes by the same name (Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī), who is the author of Ḥaqāʾiq al-Tafsīr and he passed away in the year 412 A.H. He was guilty of attributing explanations to Abū Jaʿfar (al-Bāqir) which are in fact the views of the Bāṭiniyyah, and Abū Jaʿfar had nothing to do with them. Refer to Ibn Taymiyyah: Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/146, al-Fatāwā 13/242-243, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī: Tārīkh Baghdād 2/248-249 and al-Dhahabī: Mīzān al-Iʿtidāl 3/523.
We learnt the Qurʾān, understood the knowledge (contained therein) and practised upon it all together.¹

Thus, it comes as no surprise that they would take a while to learn each surah. They were practically implementing the following advices of Allah:

وَ لِیَتَذَکَّرَ  اُولُوا الَْلْبَابِ
کِتٰبٌ  اَنْزَلْنٰهُ  اِلَیْکَ مُبٰرَكٌ  لِّیَدَّبَّرُوْآ اٰیٰتِه

(This is) a blessed Book which We have revealed to you, [O Muḥammad], that they might reflect upon its verses and that those of understanding would be reminded.²

اَفَلاَ یَتَدَبَّرُوْنَ الْقُرْاٰنَ

Then do they not reflect upon the Qurʾān.³

اَفَلَمْ یَدَّبَّرُوا الْقَوْلَ

Then have they not reflected over the word [i.e., the Qurʾān].⁴

---

¹ Refer to Ibn Taymiyyah: Majmūʿ Fatāwā 13/331. Al-Ṭabarī also narrates this in his Tafsīr (1/80). The researcher stated in the footnote of this narration: “This is an unbroken and reliable isnād.” Refer to Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī which was researched by Maḥmūd Shākir and Aḥmad Shākir. Al-Ṭabarī also records it from Ḥusayn ibn Wāqid-A’mash-Shaqiq from — Ibn Masʿūd: “When one of us would learn ten verses, he would not proceed further until he understood its meanings and practised upon it.” (1/80) The researcher comments, “this is an authentic isnād.” Although it is narrated from Ibn Maṣʻūd, it holds the same weight as that which is narrated from Rasūlullāh, as he learnt the Qurʾān from Nabī. Thus, he narrates to us the methodology of the illuminated era of nubuwah. Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 1/80. Shu‘ayb al-Arnaʿūṭ commented on this ḥadīth saying: “The narrators are reliable.” Refer to his footnotes of Siyār Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ 4/270

² Surah Ṣād: 29

³ Sūrah al-Nisā: 82, Sūrah Muḥammad: 24

⁴ Sūrah al-Muʿminūn: 68
A fact that needs no mention but will be mentioned due to it being ignored is that it is impossible to ponder upon the Qur’ān without understanding its meanings. Another verse which exposes the lies behind their view is:

```
اِنَّآ اَنْزَلْنٰهُ قُرْءٰنًا عَرَبِیًّا لَّعَلَّكُمْ تَعْقِلُوْنَ
```

Indeed, We have sent it down as an Arabic Qur’ān that you might understand.¹

Added to these proofs, it is also well known to all that the purpose of speech is that the meaning thereof should be understood. Simply grasping the words is definitely not the goal. Due to all of these proofs, this doctrine of the Shī‘ah became indigestible to many of them as well. Consequently, they wriggled their way out of it saying that the knowledge of the outward meanings are not confined to the twelve Imāms, but they are known to all. The knowledge which is confined to the Imāms is the inner or secret meanings.

This caused a huge disagreement between the Uṣūlīs and Akhbārīs as far as considering the apparent meanings of the verses to be proof. The first group believes, based upon the verses which call upon everyone to ponder over the Qur’ān and understand it, that they do serve as proof, whilst the second group insists that the knowledge of the Qur’ān, be it the apparent meanings or the secret ones, is confined to the twelve Imāms.²

The claim that the Qur’ān was not explained to anyone besides ʿAlī renders the following verse meaningless or at least distorts its meaning:

```
وَ اَنْزَلْنَآ اِلَیْكَ الذِّکْرَ لِتُبَیِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ مَا نُزِّلَ اِلَیْهِمْ وَلَعَلَّهُمْ يَتَفَكَّرُوْنَ
```

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 2

And We revealed to you the message [i.e., the Qurʾān] that you may explain clearly to the people what was sent down to them and that they might give thought.¹

The instruction is quite clear — a clear explanation to the people, not only ʿAlī. Now, the champions of this doctrine will have only one of two options; either they will accuse Rasūlullāh of not conveying that which was revealed to them, or they will disbelieve in the Qurʾān. Both options are in stark contradiction to the basics of Islam as well as the demands of intelligence. Added to that, this doctrine is disproved by the number of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh being known for their expertise in explaining the Qurʾān such as; the four khulafā’, Ibn Masʿūd, Ibn ʿAbbās, Zayd ibn Thābit, etc. In fact, “Alī would praise the commentaries of Ibn ‘Abbās.”²

Ibn Taymiyyah says:

The amount of narrations that Allah willed, in which the commentaries of Ibn ‘Abbās is reported are all authentic and established. However, none of them contain the name of ‘Alī, whereas Ibn ‘Abbās narrates from other Ṣaḥābah including ʿUmar, Abū Hurayrah, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ’Awf, Zayd ibn Thābit and Usāmah ibn Zayd among others from the Muhājirīn and Anṣār. His narrations from ‘Alī are extremely few in number, and they do not appear in the books whose authors sufficed upon authentic aḥādīth. In these books, his narrations from ʿUmar, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ’Awf, Abū Hurayrah and others are narrated. The Muslims do not possess any authentic (complete) Tafsīr which can be attributed to ‘Alī. The books of ḥadīth and Tafsīr are filled with narrations from the Ṣaḥābah and Tābiʿīn, with a very minimal amount being from ‘Alī. Also, most of that which is attributed to Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq is nothing but fabrications.³

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 44
3 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/155
The other claim (that the Imāms have knowledge of the entire Qur’ān) is also clear exaggeration. The matter is as stated by Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī:

There are some portions of the Qur’ān that cannot be understood without an explanation from Rasūlullāh. They are clarifications of that which is equivocal in the revealed form, and the masses are in need of its explanation as it includes the laws of dīn, such as commandments, prohibitions, clarification of that which is permissible and impermissible, mention of the punishments and the laws of inheritance. None could have known the meanings without the explanation of Rasūlullāh, who would not have known them without revelation from Allah. There are other portions as well, the interpretations of which are not known to anyone besides Allah, the Almighty. This applies to all those matters, the knowledge of which Allah preferred to keep to Himself such as the time of the final hour, the blowing of the trumpet, etc. A third portion also exists, which is understood by all those who understand Arabic, the language in which the Qur’ān was revealed.¹

Another established fact which is challenged by their claim that ‘Alī was the only one who transferred the knowledge of the Qur’ān, is the fact that the laws of the Qur’ān were passed down to each generation, starting from the Ṣaḥābah, with tawātur; as their claim suggests that this transmission was done by only one person, i.e. ‘Alī.

The crux of the issue is that this doctrine was a ploy, the goal of which was to prevent (the Shī‘ah) from the Book of Allah, to turn them away from pondering over its contents, learning from its guidance, reflecting upon its lessons and contemplating upon its meanings and objectives. Hence in the religion of the Shī‘ah, there is no way that the meanings of the Qur’ān can be understood, except through the twelve Imāms. The rest of humanity should remain deprived of benefitting therefrom. Undoubtedly, this is a ploy, the object of which cannot remain hidden. This is because the Book of Allah was revealed in clear Arabic and

---

¹ Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 1/73-74, 87-88
the entire humanity was addressed therein. Allah says:

اِنَّآ اَنْزَلْنٰهُ قُرْءٰنًا عَرَبِیًّا لَّعَلَّكُمْ تَعْقِلُوْنَ

Indeed, We have sent it down as an Arabic Qur’ān that you might understand.¹

هُذَا بَیَانٌ لِّلنَّاسِ وَهُدًی وَمَوْعِظَةٌ لِّلْمُتَّقِیْنَ

This [Qur’ān] is a clear statement to [all] the people and a guidance and instruction for those conscious of Allāh.²

Allah commanded his bondsmen to ponder over the Qur’ān and take lessons from its examples. It is impossible that a person can be commanded to ponder over what he is told if he does not know what is being said to him or he does not understand its meaning. How can he be told, “take a lesson from that which you do not understand”?³

It is also an attempt to render meaningless the great knowledge regarding the Tafsīr of the Qur’ān which was conveyed to us by the Ṣaḥābah and pious predecessors. All of these treasures are worthless and useless according to the Shī‘ah, as they are not reported from the twelve Imāms. This has also been explicitly mentioned by one of the contemporary scholars:

ان جمیع التفاسیر الواردة عن غیر اهل البیت ل قیمة لها ول یعتد بها

All the commentaries which are not narrated from the Ahl al-Bayt have no value and they cannot be relied upon.⁴

According to them, only their books of Tafsīr hold any value. This forces us to ask, “what do their books contain?” A study of their reliable books such as Tafsīr

---

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 2
2 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 138
3 Refer to Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 1/82
4 Muhammad Riḍā al-Najafī: al-Shī‘ah wa l-Raj‘ah pg. 19
al-Qummī, al-ʿAyyāshī, al-Ṣāfī and al-Burhān, as well as their ḥadīth books the likes of al-Kāfī and Al-Biḥār reveals such interpretations of the Book of Allah which are attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt which reflect (in most cases) gross ignorance regarding the Book of Allah, interpretations which are open fallacies and twists of the meaning which cannot be hidden. The attribution of these interpretations to the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt is defied by the simplest of logic.

This is because these explanations have no connection to the wording, its meanings and implications or even the context of the verses of the Qur’ān, as will be established from a few examples of their commentaries. The implication of this attribution, after taking cognizance of their belief, is that these fallacies and statements (which reflect gross ignorance regarding the Book of Allah) are the pinnacle of the knowledge of the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt. The insults, disparagement and accusation of ignorance contained in this belief against the Ahl al-Bayt exceed all limits, especially from a people who are claimants of their love and tashayyuʿ (support).

The matter does not end here. In fact, the greatest potential damage that is contained in this belief is their view that these are the meanings of the Qur’ān and the knowledge thereof. There is no other meaning to the Qur’ān which surpasses them, as they emerged from the original and sole source, which alone was authenticated and approved to convey it. This is a defamation of the Qur’ān and it belittles the position accorded to it. It is no exaggeration to say that this is open war against the Qur’ān and a wicked smear campaign to deter people from drawing close to it.

c. Their Belief that the Imām has the Right to Abrogate Verses, Restrict the General Commands of the Qur’ān and Add Conditions to those which were Revealed Without any Conditions Attached to them, etc.

This belief is founded upon the following Shīʿah beliefs; the Imām is the one who keeps the Qur’ān in place, he is the speaking Qur’ān, the Imāms are the treasurers
of the knowledge of Allah and His confidants\(^1\) concerning His revelation\(^2\) and that the sharī'ah was not complete at the time of the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, but he passed on the remainder to 'Alī ﷺ, who extracted from it that which applied to his era, and then passed on the rest to the next Imām who did the same, until this reached the absent Imām.\(^3\)

Based on the above, abrogation of verses, restricting general commands and adding conditions to verses which were revealed without any conditions attached to them, did not end with the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, as prophetic statements and divine additions to the law continued after his death, until the beginning of the fourth century when the major occultation\(^4\) took place after which they could no longer communicate with their Imām and receive from him divine revelation — as they believe:

\[
\text{ان حدیث كل واحد من الائمة الطاهرين قول الله عز و جل ولا اختلاف في اقوالهم كما لا اختلاف في قوله تعالى}
\]

The speech of each one of the pure Imāms is in fact the speech of Allah the most honoured and majestic. There is no inconsistency in their speech, just as there is no inconsistency in the speech of Allah.\(^5\)

They go to the extent of saying that one who hears a ḥadīth from Abū 'Abd Allah (Ja'far al-Ṣādiq) has the right to narrate this very ḥadīth from his father (Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq), any of his fore-fathers or even directly attribute it to Allah.\(^6\) Thus, the Imām has all the required rights to abrogate verses, restrict the general commands of the Qur'ān and add conditions to those which were revealed without any conditions attached to them, as it is one verse of the Qur'ān

\(^1\) Refer to the marginal notes of Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/192.
\(^2\) Refer to Uṣūl al-Kāfī, Bāb Ann al-A'immah Wulāt Amr Allah wa Khazanat 'Ilmih 1/192
\(^3\) Faṣl al-Sunnah
\(^4\) Refer to the discussion on Ghaybah in this book.
\(^5\) Al-Māzindarānī: Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ (ʿAlī al-Kāfī) 2/272
\(^6\) ibid
being used to explain another verse, based upon their concocted belief that the speech of the Imām is the Speech of Allah.

One of the contemporary Ayatollahs explains this belief of theirs:

The wisdom of gradual (revelation) demanded that some commands should be explained and others should be hidden. However, he passed them on to his Awṣiyā’, and each Waṣī passed it on to the next one, so that he could explain it at the appropriate time, according to the demands of wisdom as far as the general command is concerned, whether it should be specified, left as is, have a condition to it or an ambiguous command that is explained, etc. At times Nabī would mention a general command and later on he would add clauses. At times he would not even mention these clauses, but rather he would disclose it to the Waṣī to mention it in his time.¹

The matters of abrogation, specification and adding clauses is only part of the greater job of the Imāms, which is al-Tafwīḍ fī l-Dīn — deputation in matters of dīn. The author of al-Kāfī affirms this under a chapter dedicated to it under the title, “the chapter of tafwīḍ to Rasūlullāh and the Imāms in the matters of dīn”.² Thus, matters of this dīn have been handed over to the Imāms, just as they were handed over to Rasūlullāh. They have the right to pass laws. The books of the Shī‘ah state regarding the Imāms:

---

¹ Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā: Aṣl al-Shī‘ah pg. 77
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/265
Allah, the honoured and magnificent handed over the matters of dīn to Nabī ﷺ. He said, “and whatever the Messenger has given you, take; and what he has forbidden you, refrain from,”1 whatever was handed over to Rasūlullāh ﷺ, has been handed over to us.2

Abū ʿAbd Allah (al-Ṣādiq), according to their books, said:

لا والله ما فوض الله الى احد من خلقه الا الى رسول الله صلى الله علیه و اله و الى الئامة قال عز و جل:

اِنَّآ اَنْزَلْنَآ اِلَیْكَ الْكِتٰبَ بِالْحَقِّ لِتَحْكُمَ بَیْنَ النَّاسِ بِمَا اَرٰیكَ اللّٰهُ وهى جاریة فى الوصیاء

By the oath of Allah, Allah did not hand over (the matters of dīn) except to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Imāms. He, the honoured and magnificent says, “indeed, We have revealed to you, [O Muḥammad], the Book in truth so you may judge between the people by that which Allah has shown you,”3 this applies to the Imāms (as well).4

The Imāms are the custodians of the knowledge of the angels, the ambiyā’ and the messengers. They have all the books that were divinely revealed, as established by their reliable books in the form of many narrations, as will appear.5 These important matters of forming the laws are all part of the blessings of this knowledge which is kept as a treasure by the Imāms.

As for the practical application of this belief, it manifests itself in the destructive amount of narrations regarding doctrine and other matters wherein they have isolated themselves from the rest of the Muslim ummah and opposed them. As an example, the words of kufr, kuffār, shirk and mushrikīn which appear in the Book of Allah ֶֶֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿّ

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 7
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/266
3 Sūrah al-Nisā: 105
4 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/268
5 Faṣl al-Sunnah, the discussion of īmān upon the Book of Allah.
6 The proofs of this will appear under the discussion, “examples of Shi‘ī interpretations of the verses of the Qur‘ān”.
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Thus, they have specified a general rule of the Book of Allah, without any text which allows them to do so. Instead, they have altered the text under the pretext of specifying its purport. They have equated or rather, granted more importance to the matter of Imāmah than kufr and shirk, despite not having any sound textual or logical proof. By doing so, they have belittled the consensus of the Muslims as well as the texts of dīn which were transmitted with tawātur. Added to that, they have even displayed ignorance regarding the language in which the glorious Qur‘ān was revealed:

اِنَّآ اَنْزَلْنٰهُ قُرْءٰنًا عَرَبِیًّا لَّعَلَّكُمْ تَعْقِلُوْنَ

Indeed, We have sent it down as an Arabic Qur‘ān that you might understand.¹

We will soon present many examples of this type of tampering with the meaning of the Qur‘ān.

An Analysis of this Belief

Allah  terminated risālah (sending of messengers) through the medium of Rasūlullāh Ḥ, and culminated the dīn by sending him. Waḥī (revelation) was thus ended with his death. These are facts regarding the dīn which are known to all and sundry. However, the above belief of the Shī‘ah cannot be validated except if all of these facts are rejected. Undoubtedly, this is an outright contradiction of the reality of the testimony that Muḥammad is the Rasūl of Allah Ḥ, which is a pre-condition for anyone to be entered into the fold of Islam.

Perhaps the one who ponders regarding this belief and calculates its dimensions will reach the conclusion that the ultimate goal behind it is to change the dīn of Islam and alter the laws revealed upon Muḥammad Ḥ. The Speech of Allah has become the target of changes and alterations by the means of abrogation, specifications, conditions, explanations or general statements which the scholars of the Shī‘ah claim are narrated from their Imāms.

¹ Sūrah Yūsuf: 2
The idea of changing and altering Islam will become even clearer if one takes note of the excessive lies spoken by these people, to the extent that they even consider deceit to be a noble act of their religion, as will be proven.1 “Whoever studies the books regarding criticism and commendation (of personalities) will find that those who were found by their authors to be liars are far greater in number among the Shī‘ah, as compared to any other sect.”2

A large number of leading Muslim scholars have testified that there is no group which spoke more lies and presented more false testimonies than them. They fabricate narrations and thereafter take the same to be part of their religion. They were always labelled, rightfully, as liars. The people of knowledge prohibited students from listening to aḥādīth from these Rawāfiḍ.3 In fact, the very books of these people contain narrations from the Ahl al-Bayt, wherein they voice their displeasure regarding the lies and accusations that are levelled against them by this sect.4

This belief rests, primarily, upon the claim that Islam is an incomplete religion and it is in need of the twelve Imāms in order to bring it to its completion. The Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Rasūl were not sufficient to bring the dīn to its completion, as the remainder was kept by the Imāms. Also, the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ (who was sent for the guidance of humanity at large), instead of conveying that which was revealed to him by his Rabb, hid away some of it and secretly passed it on to ʿAlī.

All of the above is open disbelief in Allah and His Rasūl, and it goes against the basic principles of Islam, in the light of the following verses:

---

1 Refer to “the matter of Taqiyyah”
2 Refer to al-Muntaqā pg. 22
3 Refer to Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/16, 17, al-Sūyūṭī: Tadrīb al-Rāwī 1/327
4 Al-Bihār 25/263, al-Māmaqānī: Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl 1/174, Rijāl al-Kashshī numbers; 174, 216, 541, 542, 544, 549, 588, 659, 741, 909, 1007, 1048. Some of these will appear under the discussion, “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah”.
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This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favour upon you and have approved for you Islam as religion.¹

And We have sent down to you the Book as clarification for all things and as guidance and mercy and good tidings for the Muslims.²

And [mention, O Muḥammad], when Allah took a covenant from those who were given the Scripture, [saying], “You must make it clear [i.e., explain it] to the people and not conceal it.”³

Indeed, those who conceal what We sent down of clear proofs and guidance after We made it clear for the people in the Scripture — those are cursed by Allah and cursed by those who curse. Except for those who repent and correct themselves and make evident. Those — I will accept their repentance, and I am the Accepting of repentance, the Merciful.⁴

Imām al-Ashʿarī has attributed this belief to the fifteenth category of the extremist Shīʿah, according to his categorisation. “They are the ones who believe that the

---

¹ Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 3
² Sūrah al-Naḥl: 89
³ Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 187
⁴ Sūrah al-Baqarah: 159
Imāms annul the laws of Islam, angels descend upon them, signs and miracles are manifested upon their hands and they receive revelation.”¹ These beliefs have now become part of the fundamental beliefs of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah², as they have sucked out their doctrines and beliefs from the residue left on the thumbs of each group of extremists. Abū Jaʿfar al-Naḥḥās (d. 338 A.H) indicated towards this belief without attributing it to any specific group. He says:

Others believe, “the door of abrogating (verses) and the abrogated ones are in the hands of the Imām, he has the right to abrogate anything he wishes.”³

He then declares those to be a great form of kufr, after which he explained its falsity saying:

Abrogation was not even the right of Rasūlullāh Ḥ, except if he received revelation from Allah E. This would either happen in the form of a Qurʾānic verses, just like it (the abrogated one) or through revelation which was not Qurʾān.⁴ Since these two ended with the demise of Rasūlullāh Ḥ, the matter of abrogation also came to an end.⁵

---

¹ Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/88

² To learn more regarding the acceptance of the belief that the Imāms receive revelation and the angels descend upon them by the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, refer to the section of the Sunnah in this book. As for their acceptance of the belief that miracles are displayed at the hands of the Imāms, refer to the discussion, “īmān upon the messengers,” of this book.

³ Al-Nāsikh wa l-Mansūkh pg. 8

⁴ i.e. the Sunnah of Muḥammad Ḥ, as Allah E says:

Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed. (Sūrah al-Najm: 3-4)

⁵ Al-Nāsikh wa l-Mansūkh pg. 8-9
Discussion Two

Their Beliefs Regarding the Interpretation of the Qur’ān

This discussion involves two issues:

a. Their belief that the Qur’ān has inner meanings which contradict the apparent one or the wording.

b. Their belief that most of the Qur’ān was revealed regarding them and their enemies.

a) The Qur’ān Has Inner Meanings which Contradict the Apparent Meaning

This belief was taken to far and dangerous heights by the Shīʿah, the result of which is that on account of it, the Book of Allah — according to them — is something totally different to that which the Muslims have in their possession. Their scholars went a long way in implementing this invented principle, and the Shīʿah have concocted hundreds of narrations in which the Qur’ān is interpreted against its meaning. Sadly, they have once again attributed their lies to the twelve Imāms. These inner meanings are not based upon any principle or reliable law.

The reader will find that their interpretations of the verses of the Qur’ān are useless attempts aimed at changing this dīn, destroying its distinguishing characteristics and razing to the ground its foundations. This is how it unfolds; the commentaries of the Imāms are the essence of dīn. Subsequently, they interpreted the verses regarding kufr and shirk (disbelief and polytheism) to be related to the Wilāyah of ʿAlī and his Imāmah and the verses regarding ḥalāl and ḥarām to be narrative regarding them and their enemies. In this manner, the one reading these commentaries finds a religion that is completely inconsistent with Islam. This religion is actually based upon two principles, viz. believing in the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms and cursing and reviling their ‘enemies’.
Uṣūl al-Kāfī of al-Kulaynī states:

Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr reports, “I asked the pious slave regarding the statement of Allah, the Most Honoured and Magnificent, ‘say, my Lord has only forbidden immoralities — what is apparent of them and what is concealed...’ and he replied, ‘the Qur’ān has an outward meaning and an inner meaning. All that which Allah had made impermissible in the Qur’ān is the outward meaning, and the inner meaning of that is the oppressive rulers, and all that which is declared permissible in the Qur’ān, is the outward meaning, the inner meaning of which is the just rulers.’”

This narration, which appears in one of their four most authentic books affirms the principle that the Qur’ān has inner meanings which have absolutely no link or relation to the outward meanings. This narration goes on to demonstrate to us their application of this principle. Thus, the wholesome and pure items which were declared permissible are a reference to specific men, i.e. the twelve Imāms, and the despised and evil acts or items, which have been declared impermissible are a reference to their enemies, i.e. the rest of the Muslim rulers.

A question that we beg to ask is, ‘how is it that this interpretation is not backed by the laws that govern usage of words, the intellect or religion?’ The only possible answer to this is that it is an attempt at changing the religion of Islam, starting at its very roots and eventually calling towards freedom and lawlessness. This narration, however, does have some benefit. It contains the secret behind their claim that the Qur’ān has an outward as well as a hidden meaning.

A dilemma that gave them sleepless nights and shook the foundations of their beliefs is that there is no mention anywhere, in any way of their twelve Imāms

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 33
or their enemies. They have unambiguously admitted that the Qur’ān has no mention of their Imāms. Thus, they assert:

 لو قرئ القرآن کما انزل لالافينا مسمين

If the Qur’ān was recited the way it was revealed, we would have found specific peoples’ names.¹

Since the foundation of their religion (Imāmah) and the Imāms have not been mentioned anywhere in the Book of Allah, they invented this belief to pacify their followers and spread their religion among the gullible and ignorant ones. Then, in order to give their idea some ‘credibility’, they – as usual — forged chains of narrations by means of which they attribute this concoction to a member or two of the Ahl al-Bayt.

Their books are replete with this belief (that the inner meaning of the Qur’ān opposes the outer meaning), to the extent that it has become one of their fundamental beliefs. This is because their religion cannot even hope to survive in the absence of this belief, or that which is equivalent to it. Hence, we find that the author of Al-Biḥār has a chapter titled, “the Qur’ān has an outer and inner (meaning),”² under which he quoted 84 narrations — a fraction of what is quoted in his book on the subject. His introduction to this chapter, after which he quotes the narrations is:

قد مضى كثير من تلك الأخبار في أبواب كتاب الإمامة ونورد هنا مختصرًا من بعضها

A great amount of these narrations have been quoted under the chapters of Kitāb al-Imāmah (the book on Imāmah). Here, we will list a synopsis of some of them.³

---

1 Refer to Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/13, al-Mujallā: Al-Biḥār 19/30, Hāshim l-Baḥrānī: al-Burhān pg. 22
2 Al-Biḥār 92/78-106
3 ibid
Tafsīr al-Burhān has a chapter similar to that of Al-Biḥār, namely, “the Qur’ān has an outer and inner meaning.”¹ The introduction of Tafsīr al-Burhān contains many statements which confirm this belief. It has five chapters wherein the narrations of their Imāms regarding this have been mentioned. These are only a selection from the greater amount which exists in their reliable books.² Similarly, many of their other books on tafsīr confirm this belief in their introductions. In fact it is as if this is one of the pivotal principles (of tafsīr) according to them. Among the books wherein this principle is mentioned are Tafsīr al-Qummī³, al-ʿAyyāshī⁴, al-Ṣāfī,⁵ etc.

Hereunder, we reproduce two of their narrations:

ان للقران ظهرا و بطنا و ببطنه بطن الى سبعة ابطن

The Qur’ān has an outer and an inner. Its inner has another inner which extends up to seven inners.⁶

Jābir al-Juʿfī reports:

سالت ابا جعفر عن شئ من تفسیر القران فاجابنى ثم سالت ثانية فاجابنى بجواب اخر فقلت جعلت فداك كنت اجبت فى هذه المسئلة بجواب غیر هذا قبل الیوم فقال لى یا جابر ان للقران بطنا و للبطن بطنا و ظهرا و للظهر ظهرا يا جابر و ليس شئ ابعد من عقول الرجال من تفسیر القران ان الاية لتكون اولها فى شئ و اخرها فى شئ وهو كلام متصل يتصرف على وجه

I asked Abū Jaʿfar (al-Bāqir) regarding the interpretation of a portion of the Qur’ān, to which he replied. Thereafter, I asked him a second time. His reply differed from the first one, so I objected saying, “may I be sacrificed for you. Your answer today is different from your previous one.” Thereupon,

1 Al-Burhān 1/19
2 Mirʾāt al-Anwār pg. 4-19
3 Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/14,16
4 Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/11
5 Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/29
6 Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/31
he said to me, “O Jābir, indeed the Qur'ān has an outer and an inner. The
inner has an outer and an inner and the outer has an outer. O Jābir, there
is nothing further from the intellect of man than the commentary of the
Qur'ān. The beginning of a verse is regarding one thing and the end is
regarding something else, but it is speech which is connected and it can be
dealt with in many different ways.”

The texts of the Shīʿah affirm that every verse has an outer and an inner meaning.
In fact, they go further than that also, saying that every verse has seven inner
meanings. Thereafter, their counting skills were corrupted, which allowed them
to claim that it actually has seventy inner meanings. They have many narrations
which confirm this. One of their scholars says:

لا لكل اية من كلام الله ظهر و بطن... بل لكل واحدة منها كما يظهر من الخبر المستفيضة سبعة بطون و
سبعون بطننا

Every verse from the speech of Allah has an inner and an outer... in fact,
as is apparent from many narrations, it has seven inners and seventy
stomachs.

We have no idea regarding the reality of these inners. That which they wish to
establish does not exceed two ideas, viz. the Imāmah of their twelve Imāms and
disparagement regarding their opposition as well as declaring them disbelievers.
When this is the case, then what was the need to invent so many ‘inners’? One
who studies their narrations (which promote this hidden secret creed and have
taken up volumes of books) will find that they do not go beyond these two
subjects. They claim:

و قد دلت احاديث متكررة كادت ان تكون متواترة على ان تكون تواترة على ان بطنها و تاويتها بل كثير من تنزيلها و تفسيرها
في فضل شان السادة الاطهار... بل الحق المتبین ان أكثر ايات الفضل و الاعنا و المدح و الاكرام بل كلها

1 Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/11, al-Barqī: al-Maḥāsin pg. 300, al-Burhān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān 1/20-21, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī
1/29, Biḥār al-Anwār 92/95, Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 18/142
2 Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf: Mirʾāt al-Anwār pg. 3
So many aḥādīth have been reported, that it is almost mutawātir that the inner of it and its interpretations, in fact the exact revelation was concerning the great position of the pure leaders... the clear truth is that most verses, or rather — all of the verses regarding virtues, rewards, praise and honour were revealed regarding them and their supporters. On the other hand, most, if not all the passages containing any reprimand, denunciation, warning or humiliation are with regards to their enemies and those who opposed them. Allah, the most honoured and magnificent made most of the inner (meaning) of the Qur‘ān a call towards Imāmah and Wilāyah, just as He made most of its outer a call towards towḥīd, nubuwwah and risālah.¹

More details regarding this will appear under the topic, “most of the Qur‘ān was revealed regarding them and their enemies”.

An Analysis of This View

There is no doubt that the glorious Qur‘ān is a shoreless sea. The treasures of the Qur‘ān, no doubt will never be depleted, and it will not cease to amaze and render one and all hopeless as far as matching it is concerned. Needless to say, there are many secrets and indications kept therein. However, all of these are governed by the meanings of the words, and they do not go against the framework of the apparent meanings.

This is where the claim of these deviants parts ways with the Qur‘ān. Their interpretations, as will appear, have absolutely no link with the Qur‘ān. It cannot be linked to the meanings of the words, their connotations or even their contexts. As a matter of fact, their interpretations are totally against the text of the Qur‘ān.

¹ Ibid
The main objective behind it is to establish a source that supports their opposition of the Muslims, and ultimately it is used to deter people from the Book of Allah and His dīn. In a nutshell, this ‘inner’ meaning is the solvent they wish to use to dissolve the dīn of Islam.¹

Most humans, despite their languages consider the apparent meanings of statements to be the actual and intended meanings of the speaker. It is only the Shīṭah who take riddles and puzzles to be the actual form of speech. If this form of speech had to be adopted, it would be impossible to get messages across, in a manner that they could be correctly understood. It would also be impossible to have conviction regarding any belief, as riddles and puzzles and secret meanings cannot be governed by laws and structures.

Giving due thought to this doctrine will reveal to a person the danger of this ‘inner’ interpretations and approach to the Qur’ān. It takes away the meanings of words, and does not allow anyone to benefit from the speech of Allah and His Rasūl, as that which is apparent is not the intended meaning and there is no proper way in which the inner meanings can be governed. Each person will present a different meaning, as people’s minds work differently. In this way, the Shīṭah wish to destroy the entire sharīʿah, i.e. by doing away with the apparent meanings and re-interpreting them in any way that they wish to.

If these interpretations were really the meanings of the Qur’ān, it would not have been a speech that is unmatched in its eloquence. It would have simply been a riddle. However, the Arabs admitted that it was unmatched in its eloquence and they understood it by means of its outward and apparent meanings. Ibn Taymiyyah states²:

> Whoever claims secret (inner) knowledge, or knowledge regarding a secret, whereas that contradicts the apparent meanings of texts, then he has erred.

---

1 Refer to Ibn Ḥajar: *Fatḥ al-Bārī*: 1/216
2 *Majmūʿ Fatāwā Ibn Taymiyyah*: 13/236-237
He is either an irreligious person or an ignorant deviate. As for the secret or inner meaning which opposes the known and apparent meanings, they can be seen in the claims of the Bāṭiniyyah Qarāmitāh, who belong to the Ismāʿīliyyah, the Nuṣayriyyah and their likes. These Bāṭiniyyah interpret the following verse to be a reference to ‘Alī:

وَكُلَّ شَيْءٍ اَحْصَیْنٰهُ فِیْٓ اِمَامٍ مُّبِیْنٍ

... and all things We have enumerated in a clear register.¹

They interpret this verse to be a reference to Ṭalḥah and Zubayr:

فَقَاتِلُوْٓا اَئِمَّةَ الْكُفْرِ

... then fight the leaders of disbelief.²

This verse is, according to them, a reference to the Banu Umayyah:

وَالشَّجَرَةَ الْمَلْعُوْنَةَ فِی الْقُرْاٰنِ

the accursed tree [mentioned] in the Qur’ān.³

These interpretations which are quoted by Ibn Taymiyyah and attributed to the Bāṭiniyyah can be found verbatim among the IthnāʿAshariyyah. The interpretation of the first verse, “...and all things We have enumerated in a clear register,”⁴ can be found in five or more narrations of theirs.⁵ They have recorded these in their most reliable works⁶, whereas there is no indication in the verse

1 Sūrah Yā Sīn: 12
2 Sūrah al-Towbah: 12
3 Sūrah al-Isrā: 60
4 Sūrah Yā Sīn: 12
towards this interpretation.\textsuperscript{1} Similarly, the interpretation regarding the second verse (... then fight the leaders of disbelief) is also found in many of their reliable books\textsuperscript{2}, with more than eight narrations to support it.\textsuperscript{3} The interpretation of the third verse (the accursed tree [mentioned] in the Qur’ān) mentioned by Ibn Taymiyyah, according to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah, is supported by a minimum of twelve narrations.\textsuperscript{4} He then quoted a bunch of these interpretations from their reliable sources.\textsuperscript{5}

We found many more interpretations of this type, some of which were more severe than this. However, at this point, our object is to highlight the fact, which was mentioned by the scholars of Islam, that the interpretations of the Bāṭiniyyah have now been inherited by the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. They have even become part of their methodology. The scholars of Islam have always objected to this type of interpretations, as “whoever interprets the Qur’ān against its known interpretation, which has been passed down from the Ṣaḥābah and Tābi‘īn has lied against Allah and disbelieved in the verse of Allah. He has distorted words from their proper places. This is the door to disbelief in the name of Islam. The falsehood thereof is well-known and obvious in Islam.”\textsuperscript{6}

The false ‘inner’ interpretations which were found by the scholars of Islam are only a fraction of that which the present day publishing houses of Tehran and Najaf are bringing to the fore. However, there is almost nothing different or new in these interpretations which were carried out by deceivers and liars (who have

\textsuperscript{1} The pious predecessors have explained the meaning of this verse saying, ‘clear register’ here refers to Umm al-Kitāb. The entire universes’ happenings are recorded in a protected book called \textit{al-lowḥ al-Maḥfūẓ}. Refer to \textit{Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr} 3/591
\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Al-Burhān} 2/106-107, \textit{Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī} 2/324, \textit{Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī} 2/77-78, \textit{Tafsīr al-Qummī} 1/283
\textsuperscript{3} Refer to the above quoted references.
\textsuperscript{4} Refer to \textit{al-Burhān} 2/424-425
\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Al-Fatāwā} 13/143
not yet put a stop to their evil). They have interpreted many verses of the Qur’ān in this manner of inner and secret meanings, claiming that the glorious Qur’ān was revealed regarding them and their enemies. This will become abundantly clear under the discussion of the next issue.

b) Their Belief that Most of the Qur’ān was Revealed Regarding them and Their Enemies

The Shīʿah claim, “most of the Qur’ān was revealed regarding them (the twelve Imāms), their supporters and their enemies.”\(^1\) If anyone were to search through the Book of Allah and use all the different dictionaries of Arabic, he will not even find in the Qur’ān one of the names of these Imāms. Despite that, their scholar, al-Baḥrānī claims that ʿAlī alone was mentioned 1154 times in the Qur’ān. Regarding this, he authored a book titled, \textit{al-Lawāmiʿ al-Nūrāniyyah fī Asmā ʿAlī wa Ahl Baytihī al-Qur’āniyyah}\(^2\). In this book, all the laws of Arabic are laid to waste. It defies all principles of reasoning and logic. Nevertheless, he has in fact disgraced his own people publicly, as all of their forgeries and meddling with the Qur’ān have been collected here from their reliable books. Perhaps if he did not do so it would not have been realised by the majority.

Some of their narrations, such as this one, expose them:

\begin{quote}
 ان القرآن نزل اربع ارباع: ربع حلال و ربع حرام و ربع سنن و احكام و ربع خبر ما كان قبلكم و نبا ما يكون بعدكم و فصل ما بينكم
\end{quote}

The Qur’ān was revealed in four quarters; a quarter is regarding the permissible, another quarter is regarding the impermissible, the third quarter is regarding mannerisms and laws and the fourth quarter is regarding the history of the people before you, news of that which will happen after you and judgement between you.\(^3\)

---

1 \textit{Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī} 1/24. The author of \textit{al-Ṣāfī} made this statement under the title of his second introduction.

2 This book has been printed by al-Maṭbaʿah al-ʿIlmiyyah – Qum 1394 A.H.

3 \textit{Uṣūl al-Kāfī} 2/627
Does this narration not reveal to us that there is no mention (at least in an explicit manner) of the Imāms in the Qur’ān?

However, another narration of theirs divides the Qur’ān differently. As if they realised the slip-up in the previous narration, they tried to cover up by dedicating a portion (one third) to the Imāms and their enemies. However, they sufficed upon one third (unlike their other claim that most of the Qur’ān is regarding this). The narration states:

نزل القران اثلاثا: ثلث فینا و في عدونا و ثلث سنن و امثال و ثلث فرائض و احكام

The Qur’ān was revealed in thirds; on third regarding us and our enemies, one third regarding mannerisms and parables and one third duties and commands.¹

A third narration appears which increases the portion of the Imāms and their enemies from one third to half. The narration states:

نزل القران على اربعة ارباع: ربع فینا و ربع في عدونا و ربع سنن و امثال و ربع فرائض و احكام

The Qur’ān was revealed in quarters: quarter regarding us, quarter regarding our enemies, quarter regarding mannerisms and parables and quarter regarding duties and laws.²

It should be noted that until here, the Imāms have no extra merit over their enemies as far as the portion that was dedicated to them. This gave birth to a fourth narration, (thanks to some Shī‘ī who realised this) which is identical to the above narration except that it contains the following addition:

و لنا كرائم القرآن

The best portion of the Qur’ān is regarding us.³

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/627, al-Burhān 1/21, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/24, al-Lawāmiʿ al-Nūrāniyyah pg. 6
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/627, al-Burhān 1/21
³ Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/9, Tafsīr Furāt 1,2 Biḥār al-Anwār 24/305, al-Karājkī: Kanz al-Fawāʿid pg. 2, al-Burhān 1/21, al-Lawāmiʿ al-Nūrāniyyah pg. 7
The author of *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* indicates towards this saying:

و زاد العیاشى و لنا کرائم القران

Al-ʿAyyāshī added, “the best portion of the Qurʾān is regarding us.”

In this way, they ended up claiming that most of the Qurʾān was revealed regarding them and their enemies.

Their scholar, al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (the author of *Al-Wāfī* — which is one of their canonical sources in ḥadīth) says:

وردت اخبار جمة عن اهل البيت في تاویل كثير من آيات القرآن بهم و باولایاتهم و باعدائهم حتى ان
 Jameaʿaʿ من أصحابنا صنفوا كتبًا في تاویل القرآن علي هذا النحو جمعوا فيها ما ورد عنهم في تاویل القرآن
 آية ایة اما بهم او بعشیعهم او بعدوهم على ترتیب القرآن و قد رایت منها كتابًا کاد يقرب من عشرین الف
 بیت و قد روی في الكافی و في تفسیر العیاشی و على بن ابراهیم القمی و التفسیر المسموع من أبي محمد
 الزکی اخبارا كثيرا من هذا القبیل

Many narrations have been reported from the Ahl al-Bayt in which the verses of the Qurʾān are interpreted to be reference to them, their followers and their enemies. This is to the extent that some of our scholars have authored books in which the Qurʾān is interpreted in this manner. They gathered all that which was narrated from them regarding the interpretation of the Qurʾān, verse by verse. Each referring either to them, their supporters or their enemies, according to the order of the Qurʾān. I saw one book which would fill almost twenty rooms. Many such narrations have been reported in *al-Kāfī, Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī,* ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī and the Tafsīr which was heard from Abū Muḥammad al-Zakī.

This is a testimony or confession from one of their luminaries which confirms the degree to which this belief is common and widespread amongst them. It is

---

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 1/24
2 Al-Kāshānī: *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 1/24-25
now an accepted principle in their reliable books of tafsîr, as well as their most authentic books of ḥadîth. In this manner, they have turned the Book of Allah away from its meanings and done away with its revealed form. They have turned it into a book which is quite different to that which is in the possession of the rest of the Muslims.

This is the primary principle according to them. One of their scholars asserts:

ان الصل فى تنزیل ایات القران...انما هو الرشاد الى ولیة النبى و الئمة صلوات الله علیهم بحیث لا خیر خبر به الا وهو فيهم و في اتباعهم و عارفیهم ولا سوء ذكر فيه الا وهو صادق على اعدائهم و في مخالفیهم

The foundational principle regarding the revelation of the verses of the Qur’ān... it is only guidance regarding the Wilāyah of Nabī and the Imāms. There is no goodness that was conveyed except that it is applicable to them, their supporters and those who know them and there is no mention of evil except that it is applicable to their enemies and opponents.¹

Thus, it is not surprising to see their scholars competing with one another in changing the verses of the glorious Qur’ān and twisting it to suit this principle.

Their scholar, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has a chapter in his book Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah fī Uṣūl al-A’immah regarding this, which is “all the verses in the Qur’ān regarding the permissible and impermissible are as intended by their apparent meaning and their inner meaning is regarding the Imāms of justice and oppression.”² Thus, he considers all the verses of permissibility to be a reference to the Imāms and all the verses regarding impermissibility of acts or objects to be a reference to the leaders of the Muslims (besides Imām ‘Alī and the rest of the twelve Imāms). This, undoubtedly opens the door to lawlessness, which is upheld by sects of the Bāṭiniyyah. However, he considers this to be a principle of the Imāms.

---

¹ Abu al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf: Mir’āt al-Anwār (the introduction to al-Burhān) pg. 4. Also refer to al-Lawāmi‘ al-Nūrāniyyah pg. 548
² Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah fī Uṣūl al-A’immah pg. 256
Al-Kāfī — the most authentic book according to them — contains many narrations regarding this. It will suffice you to read, “the chapter in which there are fine points and anecdotes of the revelation, regarding Wilāyah”. The reader will be shocked to find ninety-one narrations which he gathered in this chapter, by means of which he changed the true meaning of the Qur’ān.¹ This is only one of a few chapters in which this was done.² Each chapter contains tens of narrations which convert the Qur’ān into a Shīʿah. It is left with no content besides information about the twelve Imāms, their followers and their enemies.

The book Al-Biḥār, which is considered one of their reliable ḥadīth sources, contains many narrations which are of the level of rules and principles of tafsīr according to them. Many narrations have been quoted here, all of which have this approach towards the Book of Allah. One only has to read the titles of a few of these chapters to realise the degree to which they are inconsistent with the Arabic language, the intellect and the basic principles of Islam. They will leave the reader convinced that this is indeed among the most severe forms of disbelief in the Book of Allah and corruption of its meanings. We will present one of these types of titles below. Al-Majlisī says:

باب تاویل المؤمنین و الیمان و المسلمین و السلام بهم و بولیتهم علیهم السلام و الكفار و المشرکین
و الكفر و الشرک و الجبت و الطاغوت و اللات و العزی و الصنام باعدائهم و مخالفیهم

Chapter: Interpreting the words Mu’mīnīn, īmān, Muslims and Islam to mean them and their Wilāyah, and the words kuffār, mushrīkīn, kufr, shirk, jibt (false objects of worship), ṭāghūt (devil), al-Lāt (name of an idol), al-ʿUzzā (name of an idol) and idols to be a reference to their enemies and opposition.³

One hundred narrations have been quoted in this chapter.

---

1 Ḫūṣühl al-Kāfī 1/412
2 E.g. “The Imams ظمیم are the signs which Allah mentioned in His book,” “the signs which are mentioned by Allah in his book are the Imams,” “the Ahl al-Dhikr (those who Allah instructed the masses to refer their questions to), are the Imams,” etc. Ḫūṣühl al-Kāfī 1/206, 207, 210.
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 23/354-390
Chapter: They are the righteous ones, the pious, the fore-runners and the ones who have been drawn close, and their Shi‘ah are the people of the right and their opponents are the transgressors, the evil ones and the people of the left.¹

Twenty five narrations have been quoted in this chapter.

Chapter: They and their Wilāyah are referred to as justice, righteousness, virtue, fairness and the scale, and their enemies are referred to as kufr, transgression, sin, immorality, evil and oppression.²

This chapter contains fourteen of their narrations.

There are many other chapters like this, as will be presented. They will reveal an attempt that was directed towards changing the dīn of Islam, as all the realities of Islam were modified and confined to the pledge of allegiance to one man. The meanings of shirk as far as worshipping Allah, kufr, ṭāghūt, idols, etc., have been changed to weird meanings which expose the agenda of the one who were behind all of these concoctions.

This is because, they have considered all the Muslim leaders — with the exception of the twelve Imāms — from Abū Bakr up until the last ruler before the Day of Judgement to be the enemies of the Imāms. Furthermore, all those who pledge allegiance to these leaders, starting from the Ṣaḥābah, are of their enemies, upon whom the words kufr and shirk can be used. This will appear under the discussion of Imāmah.

---

¹ Ibid 24/1-9

² Biḥār al-Anwār 24/187-191
What happens to all the tenets and principles of Islam? What happens to its laws? Are all of them now confined to Imāmah? Shirk, kufr and idols are no longer abhorred, as there is no shirk or kufr except believing in another Imām or rejecting the Imāmah of one of the twelve, as established by these narrations. Is this not the greatest form of irreligiousness and disbelief? Can any bigoted enemy plan a greater attack than this? The ideas propagated are no doubt that of an ignorant person, as is apparent from the extent of its incongruity. However, a Muslims amazement has no limits regarding this; how does a nation (of millions) remain mentally enslaved and imprisoned to such preposterous and outrages beliefs?

We continue with our presentation of the chapter heading from Al-Biḥār. The author says:

باب انهم الصلاة و الزکاة و الحج والصیام و اعدائهم الفواحش والمعاصى

Chapter: They are ṣalāh, zakāh, ḥajj, fasting and all other acts of obedience, and their enemies are immorality and sins.¹

This chapter contains seventeen narrations.

This belief is identical to the belief of the Bāṭiniyyah, who “interpret the commands of sharīʿah and the prohibitions thereof against that which is common knowledge to the Muslims. They are known to one and all to be lies, false attributions to the ambiyāʿ and adulteration of the speech of Allah, as well as disbelief in His verses.”² The author of Al-Biḥār continues to present to us the true colours of the religion of the Ithnāʿ Ashariyyah, by means of the chapters. This is because he wrote his book during the rule of the Safavids, when taqiyyah was — to some degree — discarded. He writes:

---

1 Ibid 24/286-304
2 Majmūʿ Fatāwā Ibn Taymiyyah 3/29
Chapter: They are the signs of Allah, His proofs and His book.

This chapter contains twenty narrations.¹

Chapter: They are the seven oft-repeated verses.

This chapter contains ten narrations.²

Chapter: They are the ones who stand in rows, the ones who glorify, the people of the known station, the carriers of the throne of al-Raḥmān and the noble and righteous scribes.

This chapter contains eleven narrations.³

Chapter: They are the words of Allah.

This chapter contains twenty five narrations.⁴

Chapter: They are the sanctified (objects) of Allah.

This chapter contains six narrations.⁵

---

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 23/206-211
² Ibid 24/114-118
³ Ibid 24/87-91
⁴ Ibid 24/173-184
⁵ Ibid 24/185-186
Chapter: They are al-Dhikr (the reminder) and the people of al-Dhikr.

This chapter contains sixty five narrations.¹

Chapter: They are the lights of Allah.

This chapter contains forty-two narrations.²

Chapter: They are the best nation and the best leaders, selected for mankind.

This chapter contains twenty four narrations.³

Chapter: They are the oppressed ones.

This chapter contains twenty seven narrations.⁴

Chapter: They are the ones who were taken to be weak.

This chapter contains thirteen narrations.⁵

¹ Ibid 23/172-188
² Ibid 23/304-188
³ Ibid 24/153-158
⁴ Ibid 24/221-231
⁵ Ibid 24/167-173
Chapter: They are the people of Aʿrāf (partitions) who have been mentioned in the Qurān.

This chapter contains twenty narrations.¹

Chapter: Interpreting parents, the child, relatives and close family to be a reference to them.

This chapter contains twenty three narrations.²

So, the Imāms, as you have seen in these chapter headings, are at times angels, at times heavenly books and at times divine illumination. Despite that, they are also oppressed and taken to be weak. These are claims that need no analysis. Their absurdity and contradiction to the usage of words as well as the intelligence is self-evident. There is no need to even discuss them in the light of the principles and laws of Islam. In fact, they contradict one another. As if all of this was not enough, he continues, now interpreting inanimate bodies to be the Imāms. He says:

Chapter: They are the sweet water, the destroyed well, the magnificent palace. The interpretation of clouds, rain, shade, fruits and all other objects which give off benefit is their knowledge and their blessings.

This chapter contains twenty one narrations, which were selected (as usual) from a few of their reliable books.³

---

¹ Ibid 24/247-256
² Ibid 23/257-272
³ Bihār al-Anwār 24/100-110
He then exceeds all limits. He does not even spare the qualities of Allah. He writes:

باب أنهم جنب الله و روحه و يد الله و أمثالها

Chapter: They are the side of Allah, His soul, His hand and all similar (descriptions).

This chapter contains thirty six narrations.¹

He then makes them the Ka’bah and the Qiblah. He has a chapter heading which reads:

باب أنهم رضى الله عنهم حزب الله و بقیته و کعبته و قبلته و ان الثارة من العلم علم الوصیاء

Chapter: They are the group of Allah, His vicegerents, His Ka’bah² and His Qiblah. The ‘trace of knowledge’ is the knowledge of the Awṣiyā.

He presents seven narrations in this chapter.³

His extremism continues and becomes apparent in a few more chapter headings. These are actually the most profound refutations and condemnations of the Shi‘ī sect. He is in fact demolishing their foundations on the one hand, and demonstrating the grandeur of Islam on the other hand, as the reality of something becomes clear when its opposite is seen. If bitterness did not exist, none would appreciate a sweet taste. These interpretations can only be compared to the efforts of Musaylamah — the imposter. They themselves announce that

---

¹ Ibid 24/191-203
² The Bohras (Ismā‘īlis of India and Yemen who go for Ḥajj due to them believing that the Ka’bah is a symbol of Imām ‘Alī — Islām bilā Madh-hab pg 240) could have adopted this form of disbelief on account of these types of narrations, as the Rawāfiḍ are the door and pathway to the extremisms of the Bāṭiniyyah.
³ Al-Biḥār 24/211-213
they are not from Allah ﷺ. One who has the slightest knowledge of the Arabic language will be able to confirm this, over and above scrutinising them in the light of the laws and principles of Islam. This is because Allah ﷺ revealed the Qur’ān in clear Arabic.

The book Al-Biḥār (which is highly reliable according to the Shīʿah) wishes to turn the Imāms into everything that is mentioned in the Qur’ān. Thus, he continues listing these chapters, hoping to establish whatever his whims and fanaticism leads him to. He ends up disgorging all that was kept in his heart, without caring in the least about the embarrassment of being exposed, and without hesitating to display his insolence. He says:

باب انهم البحر و اللؤلؤ و المرجان

Chapter: They are the sea, pearls and corals.

This chapter contains seven narrations.¹

So, are they inanimate objects, or is this some secret code of theirs? They are not inanimate, as he titles another chapter:

باب انهم الناس

Chapter: They are humanity.

This chapter contains merely three narrations.²

In this chapter, he establishes that, besides the Imāms, no one else belongs to the human race. Thereafter, he continues to propagate his weird and absurd religion, which the scholars of the past did not consider to be the religion of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, but rather the religion of the Bāṭiniyyah.³ He adds a chapter:

---

¹ Al-Biḥār 24/97-99
² Ibid 24/94-96
³ Some of their scholars have stated that their religion is changed and modified in every era, as will be discussed under the chapter, “present day Shīʿah and their relationship with their predecessors”.
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A unique chapter in interpreting the bee to be a reference to them.

This chapter contains seven narrations.¹

Another chapter heading reads:

Chapter: Interpreting days and months to be the Imāms.

This chapter contains four narrations.²

If we go on to quote all the aḥādīth of those chapters, and thereafter scrutinise and analyse them, we will need a few volumes. Also, we have opted to quote the chapter headings instead of the narrations, so it cannot be said that we are taking them to task on the basis of rare narrations. Similarly, we will quote, as examples, some narrations from these chapters which will be — in most cases — narrations which are mentioned in many of their reliable books. The above-quoted chapter headings are a few from the many that are mentioned in their books. They also appear in their outstanding encyclopaedia on ḥadīth, Al-Biḥār — which was described by their contemporary scholars as:

The most comprehensive book on the sciences of ḥadīth.³

A more comprehensive book was neither compiled before it, nor after it.⁴

It has become a reference book for all those who seek any chapter from the chapters of knowledge of the household of Muḥammad Ṣallallāhu 'alaihi wasallam.⁵

---

¹ Al-Biḥār 24/110-113
² Ibid 24/238-243
³ Muḥsin al-Amīn: Aʾyān al-Shīʿah 1/293
⁴ Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭehrānī: Al-Dharīʿah 3/26
⁵ Ibid 3/26-27
It is the only source as far as researching the intricacies of the madh-hab is concerned.¹

As for the author of the book, he is, according to them:

Shaykh al-Islām wa l-Muslimīn.²

The leader of the jurists and muḥaddithīn. The sign of Allah in the universe. The source of delight for the muḥaddithīn of every era, and the source of refuge for the mujtahids of every era.³

They have bestowed upon him other titles as well.

These narrations are actually sourced from some of their reliable books, as he states:

All praise is due to Allah, besides the four books⁴, we have as many as two hundred books. I have gathered this in Biḥār al-Anwār.⁵

The author of Al-Dharīʿah says:

Most of the sources of Al-Biḥār are authentic books and reliable sources.⁶

---

1 Al-Bahbūdī: Muqaddimah Al-Biḥār pg. 19
2 Al-Ardabīlī: Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt 2/78
3 Muqaddimah Al-Biḥār pg. 29
4 Al-Kāfī, Al-Tahdhīb, Al-Istibsār and Man Lā Yaḥḍurū al-Faqīh. Details regarding these books will appear under the discussion, “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah”.
5 Iʿtiqādāt al-Majlisī pg. 24 (quoted from the book al-Fikr al-Shībī by Muṣṭafā al-Shībī pg. 61)
6 Al-Dharīʿah 3/26-27
As I have explained previously, whoever has any knowledge regarding the Arabic language, he will immediately realise that these chapters and their narrations are a great form of disbelief in the Book of Allah. It is undoubtedly adulteration of the Speech of Allah. They can only be accepted by one who is clueless regarding both, Arabic as well as Islam. It is also clear proof that the one who wishes to temper with the Book of Allah is severely disgraced. These absurdities are not confined to their ḥadīth books. Rather, if a person reads the highly celebrated Tafsīr of theirs, which is referred to as “The mother of all Tafsīrs” (Tafsīr al-Qummī) by them, he will find a fair share of Bāṭinī interpretations.

Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī, one of their classical and reliable commentaries, is no different. The same can be said regarding Tafsīr al-Burhān, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī and others, which supposedly rely upon that which is reported from Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq or one of the other Imāms for their interpretations. If we wish to study and analyse each book of tafsīr independently, the subject will be lengthened extensively and it will be a prolonged digression. It will suffice us to mention a few of their narrations of these chapters.

The Origin of These Interpretations, Their Roots and a Few Examples

Their Origin

The claim of the Shīʿah that the Qurʾān cannot be used as proof unless it is accompanied by one who keeps it in place has already been discussed. He has to be one of the twelve, and he has all the knowledge of the Qurʾān, an accolade that is shared with him by none. Furthermore, he was granted the duty of the law-maker, by specifying texts which were general, adding conditions to some of them from his own side, choosing a meaning for those which had more than one implication and abrogating those which he wished to abrogate. This is because all the matters of religion were handed over to him.

1 Aṣl Uṣūl al-Tafsīr, refer to the introduction of Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/16
Thereafter, they proved the necessity of having the one who keeps it in place by stating, “the Qur’ān has inner meanings which contradict the apparent ones.” Then, this treasure of knowledge, which was guarded by the twelve Imāms was finally revealed to be a reference to them (the Imāms) and their enemies (the Ṣaḥābah and those who followed diligently in their footsteps). Most of the discussions in the Qur’ān (according to them) do not go beyond this topic. Finally, these ideas needed to become a reality. Thus, the scholars of the Shī‘ah rose to the occasion by fabricating hundreds of narrations to twist the meanings of the Qur’ān, so that they could claim that it is a reference to the Imāms, their opponents or any other doctrine which is upheld by them alone, and it is in stark contradiction to the beliefs of the majority.

It is the opinion of one of the orientalists\textsuperscript{1} that the first book which set this trend in tafsīr for the Shī‘ah, is a book that was written in the second century after the hijrah by Jābir al-Ju‘fī.\textsuperscript{2}

Some of the scholars of the Shī‘ah have indicated towards this Tafsīr\textsuperscript{3}, and it was — as indicated by some of their narrations — something that was spread and passed on secretly. Al-Kashshī reports from Mufaḍdal ibn ʿUmar al-Ju‘fī:

\textsuperscript{1} Goldziher: Muhammedanische Studien pg. 303-404
\textsuperscript{2} Jābir ibn Yazīd ibn al-Ḥārith al-Jū‘fī al-Kūfī. (d. 127 A.H.) Ibn Ḥibbān says, “he was a Saba‘ī, from the companions of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saba‘. He would say that ʿAlī will return to this world.” Al-ʿUqaylī reports with his isnād from Zā‘idah who says, “Jābir al-Ju‘fī is a Rāfiḍī who reviles the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.” Al-Nasā‘ī and others have stated that he is unreliable. Yaḥyā said, “his narrations should not be written and he has no dignity.” Ibn Ḥajar says, “he is an unreliable Rāfiḍī,” refer to Mizān al-ʿītīdāl 1/379-380, Taqrīb Al-Tahdhib 1/123, al-Ḍuʿafā l-ʿUqaylī 1/191-196.

The views regarding him in the books of the Shī‘ah are contradictory. Some suggest that he is the one who possessed all the knowledge of the Ahl al-Bayt. They generously grant him super-human attributes such as knowledge of the unseen, etc. On the other hand, there are views wherein he is criticised. However, they interpret the views wherein he is criticised as Taqiyyah, and they regard him to be reliable, as is their habit regarding those who share their views, even if he was the greatest liar. Refer to Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 20/51, Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 191, Jāmi‘ al-Ruwāt 1/144. Read up the details under the chapter, “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah”.

\textsuperscript{3} Al-Ṭūsī/Al-Fahrist pg. 70, Āghā Buzurg/Al-Dharī‘ah 4/268, al-ʿĀmilī/A’yān al-Shī‘ah 1/196
I asked Abū Jaʿfar regarding the Tafsīr of Jābir. He replied, “do not inform the lowly ones of it, as they might spread it.”

One can find many narrations spread in the books of the Shīʿah, which have been narrated from this Jābir and attributed to Imām Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad or his father. It is obvious that the Shīʿah cannot find any footing or proof from the Book of Allah, except by means of these ludicrous Bāṭinī interpretations. This is why this methodology was given birth to at a very early stage.

In fact, we could say that the roots of this belief started growing on the veranda of Sabaʿism, as Ibn Sabaʿ is the one who tried finding proof regarding his belief of reincarnation from the Qurʾān by means of an ‘inner’ interpretation. He proclaimed, “those who surprise us are the ones who believe that ʿĪsā will return, yet they do not believe that Muḥammad will return. Allah says:

اِنَّ الَّذِیْ فَرَضَ عَلَیْكَ الْقُرْاٰنَ لَرَآدُّكَ اِلٰی مَعَادٍ

Indeed, [O Muḥammad], He who imposed upon you the Qurʾān will take you back to a place of return.

Some of the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah have related to us examples of Shīʿī interpretations of the Book of Allah. However, that which has been revealed to

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 192
2 Al-Muẓaffar (one of the contemporary Shīʿī scholars) says, ‘He reported seventy thousand aḥādīth from al-Bāqir alone. It is said that he had all the knowledge of the Imāms.’ Muḥammad al-Muẓaffar/ al-Imām al-Ṣādiq pg. 143. However, Rijāl al-Kashshī (pg. 191), under the biography of Jābir al-Juʿfī states: ‘Zurārah says, “I asked Abū ’Abd Allah regarding the aḥādīth of Jābir. He replied, ‘I have not seen him with my father except once, and he did not ever visit me.’” These are testimonies from them that prove the lies of Jābir al-Juʿfī as far as his narrations from al-Ṣādiq and his father are concerned. Further details regarding this will appear under the chapter of the Sunnah.
3 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 85. This text is found in Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī 4/34, Tārīkh Ibn al-Athīr 3/77.
us in this era, was unimaginable. It seems as if those interpretations which were attributed to the extremist Shīʿah by the scholars of Islam have been inherited by the Ithnāʿ Ashariyyah. Imām al-Ashʿarī, al-Baghdādī, al-Shahrastānī and others report from Mughīrah ibn Saʿīd (who the Ahl al-Sunnah as well as the Shīʿah accept as an extremist and whose sect is called al-Mughīriyyah) that he interpreted the word shayṭān in the following verse to be ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb:

Like the example of Satan when he says to man, “disbelieve.”

This interpretation has been narrated verbatim by the Ithnāʿ Ashariyyah, and they have preserved it in their reliable sources. Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī, al-Ṣāfī, al-Qummī, al-Burhān and Biḥār al-Anwār report from Abu Jaʿfar (al-Bāqir) regarding the verse of Allah:

1 Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/73
2 Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq pg. 240
3 Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal 1/177
4 Al-Mughīriyyah – the followers of al-Mughīrah ibn Saʿīd. The authors on the subject of sects have counted them among the extremists Shīʿahs. Al-Mughīrah was of the view that ʿAlī was god. He claimed nubuwwah, anthropomorphism and other deviant beliefs. The books of the Twelvers have narrated that the Imāms have disparaged him and cursed him. Khālid ibn ʿAbd Allah al-Qisrī had the opportunity of killing him in the year 119 A.H.
Also refer to these books of the Shīʿah; al-Qummī: al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq pg. 55, Rijāl al-Kashshī narrations 336, 399, 400, 909, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 511, 542, 543, 544, 549
5 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 16
6 Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 2/223
7 Al-Kāshānī: Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 3/84
8 Tafsīr al-Qummī (Refer to Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 3/84. I did not find it in my copy of Tafsīr al-Qummī)
9 Al-Bahrānī: al-Burhān 2/309
10 Biḥār al-Anwār 3/378
And Satan will say when the matter has been concluded...¹

He is the second one. There is no place in the Qur‘ān wherein it is said, “Shayṭān said,” except that it refers to the second one.

The books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah have surpassed Mughīrah by setting this blasphemous interpretation as a standard rule. Al-Kāfī reports from Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq):

Fulān (an unnamed person) was a shayṭān.² Al-Majlisī says in his commentary of al-Kāfī, “the one who is referred to as fulān is ’Umar.”³

These narrations, which the books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah attribute to Abū Ja’far al-Bāqir are in fact from the fabrications of Mughīrah ibn Sa‘īd and his likes. Al-Dhahabī reports from Kathīr al-Nawā⁴ that Abū Ja’far (al-Bāqir) said:

Allah and Rasūl have nothing to do with Mughīrah ibn Sa‘īd and Bayān ibn Sam‘ān. They have concocted lies using our (the Ahl al-Bayt) names.⁵

---

¹ Sūrah Ibrāhīm: 22
² Al-Kulaynī: al-Kāfī (which is printed along with Mir’āt al-ʿUqūl 4/416)
³ Mir’āt al-ʿUqūl 4/416
⁴ Kathīr al-Nawā: He was a Shī‘ī. It is said that he repented from being a Shī‘ī. Al-Dhahabī says, “they considered him to be unreliable. Ibn Ḥibbān was lenient regarding him.” Al-Kāshīf 3/3
⁵ Mīzān al-ʿītīdāl 4/161
Al-Kashshī reports in his *Rijāl* from Abū 'Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq):

\[
	ext{لعن الله المغیرة بن سعید كان يكذب علينا}
\]

May Allah curse Mughīrah ibn Saʿīd, he would forge lies against us.¹

Thereafter, al-Kashshī quotes a few narrations similar to this. These narrations indicate that Mughīrah would acquire his deviant ideas from a Jewish source. *Rijāl* al-Kashshī states that Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) said one day to his companions:

\[
	ext{لعن الله المغیرة بن سعید و لعن يهودیة كان يختلف الیها يتعلم منها السحر و الشعذبة (کذا) والمخارق}
\]

May Allah curse Mughīrah ibn Saʿīd and may he curse the Jewish woman. He would visit her to learn from her witchcraft, magic and sorcery.²

It is noteworthy that al-Ashʿarī, al-Baghdādī, Ibn Ḥazm and Nishwān al-Ḥimyarī all agreed that Jābir al-Juʿfī was the first person to lay the foundations of this Bāṭinī method of tafsīr adopted by the Shīʿah. He was the successor of Mughīrah ibn Saʿīd³ who said that the meaning of the word shayṭān in the Qurʾān is Amīr al-Muʾminīn Sayyidunā ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb. They are components of the same poison which were led to the destruction of Shīʿism.

### A Few Examples of Shīʿī Interpretations of the Verses of the Qurʾān

The leading Shīʿī scholar of his time, who is referred to when the word ‘Allāmah is used without any name after it, Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, says whilst trying to prove that ʿAlī was the one who deserved to be the khalīfah:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{البرهان الثلاثون قوله تعالى مَرَجَ الْبَحْرَیْنِ يَلْتَقِیٰنِ} & \quad 19\text{. قال يَبْغِیٰنِ ۖ بَیْنَهُمَا بَرْزَخٌ لَّ} \\
\text{﴾ النبی صلى الله علیه و سلم يَخْرُجُ مِنْهُمَا اللُّؤْلُؤُ وَ} & \quad 21\text{. على و فاطمة بَیْنَهُمَا بَرْزَخٌ لَّ يَبْغِیٰنِ ۖ بَیْنَهُمَا بَرْزَخٌ لَّ} \\
\text{﴾ الحسن و الحسین} & \quad 22\text{.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

---

¹ *Rijāl* al-Kashshī number 336
² Ibid number 403
The thirtieth proof: The statement of Allah, “He released the two seas, meeting [side by side]. Between them is a barrier [so] neither of them transgresses,” they are ʿAlī and Fāṭimah. “Between them is a barrier [so] neither of them transgresses,” this refers to Nabī. “From both of them emerge pearl and coral,” this refers to Ḥasan and Ḥusayn.

When Ibn Muṭahhar tried using this as proof, Ibn Taymiyyah stated:

Indeed this, and all those arguments similar to it can only emerge from one who does not understand that which he articulates. It is closer to being a mockery, than being a commentary of the Qur’ān. It is from the interpretations of the irreligious and the Qarāmiṭah Bāṭiniyyah. In fact it is worse than many of their interpretations. This kind of commentary is the pathway towards disbelieving in the Qur’ān and finding fault with it. This is undoubtedly the greatest form of insults to the Qur’ān.¹

I wonder what his reaction would be if he had to see all that which is preserved in al-Kāfī, Al-Biḥār, Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī, al-Qummī, al-Burhān, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī and others. I have in front of me a huge collection of this type of drivel. Quoting them would require volumes.² They are truly a scary amount of narrations. The Shīʿah have been deprived of the illumination and guidance of the Qur’ān.

Towḥīd, which was at the core of the call of the ambiyā’ and the crux of their mission is interpreted by them to be the Wilāyah of the Imām. They narrate from Abū Jaʿfar (al-Bāqir):

ما بعث الله نبیا قط الا بولايتنا و البراءة من عدونا و ذلك قول الله فى كتابه وَلَقَدْ بَعَثْنَا فِیْ كُلِّ اُمَّةٍ رَّسُوْلً

آن اعْبُدُوا اللّٰهَ وَ اجْتَنِبُوا الطَّاغُوْتَ

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/66
² I prepared a table of these interpretations wherein I presented their subjects in alphabetical order. Under each subject, I listed the amount of places that this is repeated in the Book of Allah along with the interpretations of the Shīʿah in these places. This table ended up being really large. However my superior was of the opinion — and I agreed with him — that there is no need for it, as that which has been mentioned thus far is sufficient (on account of methodological reasons).
Allah did not send any Nabī except with (the message of) our Wilāyah and denouncing our enemies. This is established from the statement of Allah, “and We certainly sent into every nation a Rasūl, [saying], ‘worship Allah and avoid Ṭāghūt.’”\(^1\),\(^2\)

They have many narrations under this chapter, as will appear.

The word \textit{Ilāh} (deity) is the Imām. Have a look at the interpretation of this verse:

\begin{center}
\begin{verse}
لاَ تَتَّخِذُواْ اِلْهَيْنَ اثْنَیْنِ إِنَّمَا هُوَ اِلَّهُ وَاحِدٌ
\end{verse}
\end{center}

Do not take for yourselves two deities. He is but one deity.\(^3\)

Abū ʿAbd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) says, as they allege:

\begin{center}
یعنى بذلك و لا تتخذوا امامين انما هو امام واحد
\end{center}

What is meant is do not take two Imāms, there is only one Imām.\(^4\)

“Rabb” also refers to the Imāms according to them. They could have got away with this one, as the word Rabb is used for other meanings as well, such as \textit{rabb al-bayt} (the owner of the house) and \textit{rabb al-māl} (the owner of the money). However, they chose to interpret it in this way in such verses which are definitely referring to Allah alone. They interpret the verse wherein Allah speaks about the mushrikīn:

\begin{center}
وَ دَوَّرْنَاهُمْ مِنْ دُونِ اللّهِ مَا لَ يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَ لَ يَضُرُّهُمْ وَ كَانَ الْكَافِرُ عَلَى رَبِّهِ عَلَى رَكِبَةٍ خُفِيفَةٍ
\end{center}

But they worship rather than Allah that which does not benefit them or harm them, and the disbeliever is ever, against his Rabb, an assistant [to Satan].\(^5\)

\(^1\) Sūrah al-Naḥl: 36
\(^3\) Sūrah al-Naḥl: 51
\(^5\) Sūrah al-Furqān: 55
Al-Qummī says in his *Tafsīr*:

الكافر: الثانى كان على امیر المؤمنین علیه السلام ظهیرا

The second kāfir (referring to ʿUmar ibn al-Ḵālid) was an assistant against Amīr al-Muʿminīn.¹

Thus, he took Amīr al-Muʿminīn ʿAlī to be the Rabb. Al-Kāshānī reports in *al-Baṣāʿir*² that al-Bāqir ʿAbd Allāh was asked regarding its meaning, to which he replied:

ان تفسیرها فى بطن القرآن على هو ربه فى الولیة والرب هو الخالق الذى لا يوصف

The interpretation according to the inner meaning of the Qur'ān is that ʿAlī is his Rabb in Wilāyah and the Rabb is the creator who is beyond description.³

This is a definite lie, as the verse is regarding Allah. The author of *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* tries to do away with this matter, so he explained this verse in the following manner:

یعنى ان الرب على الطلاق الغیر المقید بالولیة هو الخالق جل شانه

Wherever the word Rabb is used without the word Wilāyah added to it, it refers to the Creator...⁴

However, the wording of the verse does not support his claim, as the word Rabb therein did not have the word Wilāyah after it. Thus it could only refer to Allah. Furthermore, there is no indication due to which the word should be

---

¹ *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/115
² *Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt* by their scholar al-Ṣaffār.
³ Take note of their disbelief in the attributes of Allah in this quotation, as will be expounded upon. Refer to it in *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 4/20, *al-Burhān* 3/172, *Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaqalayn* 4/25, *Mirʿāt al-Anwār* pg. 59
⁴ *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 4/20, *Mirʿāt al-Anwār* pg. 59
interpreted against its meaning. It is for this reason that some of the predecessors said regarding its interpretation, “the kāfir was a helper of shayṭān against his Rabb, and he helped him to disobey Him.”

Regarding the verse of Allah:

وَ اَشْرَقَتِ الَْرْضُ بِنُوْرِ رَبِّهَا

And the earth will shine with the light of its Rabb.

The mufassirīn have stated:

The earth will be lit on the Day of Qiyāmah when Allah’s manifestation takes place for the creation when he will judge.

However, the leading mufassir, according to the Shīʿah (Ibrāhīm al-Qummī) reports with his chain from Mufaḍḍal ibn ʿUmar that he heard Abū ʿAbd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) saying regarding the verse:

وَ اَشْرَقَتِ الَْرْضُ بِنُوْرِ رَبِّهَا

And the earth will shine with the light of its Rabb.

رب الارض يعني امام الارض فقلت فاذا خرج يكون ماذا قال اذا يستغنى الناس عن ضوء الشمس و نور القمر و يجتزون كذا بنور الامام

The Rabb of the earth refers to the Imam of the earth. I asked, “so when he emerges, what will happen?” He replied, “then, people will no longer need the light of the sun and moon. They will take guidance from the light of the Imām.”

1 Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 19/26-27, Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 3/338
2 Sūrah al-Zumar: 69
3 Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 4/70
4 Sūrah al-Zumar: 69
5 Tafsīr al-Qummī 2/253, al-Burhān 4/87, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 4/331
They interpret the verses regarding the attributes of Allah to be a reference to the Imāms. As an example, they say:

ان الأخبار المستفيضة تدل على تأويل وجه الله بالائمة عليهم السلام

A large amount of narrations indicate that the interpretation of the face of Allah is the Imāms.¹

Obviously, these can only be Shī‘ī narrations. Al-Majlisī mentioned many of these narrations under a chapter which he titled:

باب أنهم جنب الله و روحه و يد الله و أمثالها

Chapter: They are the side of Allah, His soul, His hand and all similar (descriptions).

This chapter contains thirty-six narrations.²

Does this mean that they interpret these verses to mean the Imām:

کُلُّ شَیْءٍ هَالِكٌ اِلَّ وَجْهَه

Everything will be destroyed except His Face.³

وَ يَبْقَى وَجْهُ رَبِّكَ ذُوالْجَلَّالَ وَ الْكَرَامَ

And there will remain the Face of your Rabb, Owner of Majesty and Honour.⁴

---

¹ Mir‘āt al-Anwār pg. 324
² Biḥār al-Anwār 24/191
³ Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 88
⁴ Sūrah al-Raḥmān: 27
Will the Imāms remain forever? In fact will they be the only ones to remain? I did not think that their matter would be this severe, until my eyes fell upon their narrations in their books. Al-Ṣādiq says, as they claim, regarding the first verse:

نحن وجه الله

We are the face of Allah.¹

Regarding the second verse he says:

نحن وجه الله الذى یؤتى منه

We are the face of Allah from which He will be brought.²

However, the Imāms, just like all humans, were overtaken by death. Allah says:

کُلُّ مَنْ عَلَیْهَا فَانٍ

Everyone upon it [i.e., the earth] will perish.³

The author of al-Kāfī tried granting the Imāms of the Shīʿah a distinguishing feature as far as death was concerned. Thus he said:

ان الئمة یعلمون یموتون و ل یموتون ال باختیار منهم

The Imāms know when they will die and they do not die except by choice.⁴

---

¹ Refer to Tafsīr al-Qummī 2/147, al-Karājkī: Kanz al-Fawā'id pg. 219, Ibn Shahrāshūb: Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib 3/63, Bihār al-Anwār 24/193, Tafsīr Shibr pg. 378
³ Sūrah a-Raḥmān: 26
⁴ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/258
Nonetheless, there is no doubt that death did overcome them. Also, if their death occurred in accordance to their decision and choice, then taqiyyah would not exist. Another blasphemous claim is that the Imāms are referred to when Allah speaks of the Asmā’ al-Ḥusnā (best of names) in this verse:

وَلِلّٰهِ الَْسْمَآءُ الْحُسْنٰی فَادْعُوْهُ بِهَا

And to Allah belong the best names, so invoke Him by them.¹

As usual, they forged a narration from Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) that he said:

نحن والله السماء الحسنى الذى لا يقبل من أحد إلا بمعرفتنا قال فَادْعُوْهُ بِهَا

By the oath of Allah, we are the best of names. (Prayers) are not accepted from anyone unless he knows us. He said, “so invoke Him by them.”²

More details will appear when the attributes of Allah will be discussed, if Allah wills. Nevertheless, these interpretations which turn the “Ilāh”, “Rabb”, “Allah” and His attributes into Imāms are the effects of the Saba’iyyah, who believe that ‘Alī was a deity. This poisonous effect has remained among the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah, and has become part of their religion. Thus, till today some scholars of this sect continue to proclaim this view.³

Rijāl al-Kashshī contains narrations which highlight the displeasure of Imām Ja’far regarding these bāṭinī interpretations. One such narration states that it was said in the presence of Ja’far that some Shī’ah (as reported by al-Kashshī) opined that the Imām was referred to in the verse:

وَ هُوَ الَّذِی فِی السَّمَآءِ اِلٰهٌ وَّ فِی الَْرْضِ اِلٰهٌ

And it is He [i.e., Allah] who is [the only] deity in the heaven, and on the earth [the only] deity.⁴

---

¹ Sūrah al-A’rāf: 180
³ Refer to the section, “present day Shī’ah and their relationship with their predecessors,” of this book.
⁴ Sūrah al-Zukhruf: 84
Abū ʿAbd Allah responded, “By the oath of Allah, no roof will house me or him (the one who accepted this interpretation). They are worse than the Jews, Christians, Zoroastrians and polytheists. By the oath of Allah, the grandeur of Allah has not decreased in the least by their mockery. By the oath of Allah, if I have to accept that which the people of Kūfah say, the earth will devour me. I am only a slave of my master. I have no control over any goodness or evil.1

The Imām (who is referred to as Rabb and Ilāh by them) is also referred to as Rasūl. The author of Mirʿāt al-Anwār says:

The interpretation of Rasūl to mean Imām has been narrated, as well as Rusul (its plural) to mean Imāms, in some verses where the word can be applied to a meaning other than its own.2

This means that wherever the word Rasūl appears, it can be interpreted as Imām. The following text supports our understanding:

The primary reason behind sending the Rusul was Wilāyah. Therefore, it is correct to interpret Rusūl to be something to which it is related to.3

This, far from being a reason or proof behind their interpretation, is actually a mockery of Islam. Allah himself says that the primary reason behind sending them was towḥīd:

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 300
2 Mirʿāt al-Anwār pg. 163
3 Mirʿāt al-Anwār pg. 163
And We certainly sent into every nation a Rasūl, [saying], “worship Allah and avoid Ṭāghūt.”

And We sent not before you any Rasūl except that We revealed to him that, “there is no deity except Me, so worship Me.”

Among the examples of their interpretation of the word Rasūl to mean Imām is that which they report from al-Ṣādiq under the commentary of the verse:

And for every nation is a messenger.

He said, “this means that in each era there will be an Imām who will call them towards the truth.”

The Imāms are also referred to as angels in the Qur’ān. Their narrations state, as they claim, that the meaning of angels in the Qur’ān is the Imāms, according to the inner interpretation. This is irrespective of whether the word ‘angels’ is used or they are referred to without mention of the word ‘angels’ such as the phrase, “those who carry the ‘Arsh,” and its likes. As explained previously, the Imāms are

---

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 36
2 Sūrah al-Ambiyā: 25
3 Sūrah Yūnus: 47
5 Mir’āt al-Anwār pg. 303
also the Qur’ān and they are “the Book”. *Tafsīr al-Qummī* reports from al-Ṣādiq regarding the verse:

\[
ذَلِكَ الْكِتَابُ لَ رَيْبَ فِيهِ
\]

This is the Book about which there is no doubt.\(^1\)

قال الكتاب على

He said, “‘the Book,’ is ‘Alī and there is no doubt regarding that.”\(^2\)

The Imām is the “the word” in the following verse:

\[
وَلَوْ لَ کَلِمَةُ الْفَصْلِ لَقُضِیَ بَیْنَهُمْ
\]

But if not for the decisive word,\(^3\)

قالوا الكلمة الإمام

“The word,” is the Imam.\(^4\)

Regarding the verse:

\[
لَ تَبْدِیْلَ لِکَلِمَتِ اللَّهِ
\]

No change is there in the words [i.e., decrees] of Allāh.\(^5\)

قالوا: لا تغيير للإمامة

They say, “no change is allowed in Imāmah.”\(^6\)

---

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 1-2
3 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 21
5 Sūrah Yūnus: 64
Their Imām, Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad says regarding the verse:

سَبْعَةُ اَبْحُرٍ مَّا نَفِدَتْ کَلِمٰتُ اللّٰهِ

... seven [more] seas, the words of Allah would not be exhausted.¹

نحن الكلمات التي لا تدرك فضائنا ولا تحصى

We are the words of Allah. Our virtues can neither be realised nor can they be counted.²

Their narrations regarding this are many in number. Al-Majlisī quoted twenty five of them in his Biḥār.³ Interpreting ‘word’ to mean Imām reflects the degree to which they borrowed beliefs from Christianity, as the Messiah was referred to as “the word of Allah”. However, the glaring difference between the Messiah and the Imām (‘Alī) is that the creation of the former was similar to the creation of Ādam. (He created him from sand and then said to him, “Be (in existence)!” and so he was. Thus, he was created by the word of Allah.) The latter was created in a manner that was no different to the creation of the rest of humanity.⁴

The straight path is another reference to the Imām (Amīr al-Mu’minīn) according to them. Thus they believe that he is referred to in this verse:

ۙ اِهْدِ نَا الصِّرَاطَ الْمُسْتَقِیْمَ

Guide us to the straight path.⁶

---

1 Sūrah Luqmān: 27
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 24/173-175
4 Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/18
6 Sūrah al-Fātiḥah: 6
He is also referred to as the Sun. They report from al-Ṣādiq the interpretation of the verse:

وَ الشَّمْسِ وَ ضُحَّاهَا

By the sun and its brightness.¹

قال الشمس امیر المؤمنین و ضحاها قیام القائم

He said, “the Sun is Amīr al-Mu’minīn and its brightness is the appearance of al-Qā’im (their awaited Imām).”²

The Masjid, Masājid (plural of Masjid), Ka’bah and Qiblah are all used to refer to the Imām. They report from al-Ṣādiq regarding the verse:

وَ اَقِیْمُوْا وُجُوْهَكُمْ عِنْدَ کُلِّ مَسْجِدٍ

... and that you direct yourselves [to the Qiblah] at every place [or time] of prostration,³

قال يعني الأئمة

He said, “this refers to the Imāms.”⁴

Another supposed narration from him states regarding the verse:

بَنِی‌ اٰدَمَ خُذُوْا زِیْنَتَكُمْ عِنْدَ کُلِّ مَسْجِدٍ

O children of Adam, take your adornment [i.e., wear your clothing] at every masjid,⁵

---

1 Sūrah al-Shams: 1
2 Al-Burhān 4/476, Mir’āt al-Anwār pg. 200, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/85, Bīhār al-Anwār 23/211 (One will also find the interpretation of the day to be Imāms here).
3 Sūrah al-A’rāf: 29
4 Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshi 2/12, al-Burhān 2/8, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 2/188 Mir’āt al-Anwār pg. 175, Nūr al-Thaqalayn 2/17
5 Sūrah al-A’rāf: 31
He said, “this refers to the Imāms.”

And regarding the verse:

وَّاَنَّ الْمَسْجِدَ لِلّٰهِ فَلاَ تَدْعُوا مَعَ اللّٰهِ اَحَدًا

And [He revealed] that the masjids are for Allāh, so do not invoke with Allah anyone.

He said, “the Imām (must be) from the family of Muḥammad, so do not take an Imām from any other people.”

They also claim that al-Ṣādiq said:

نحن البلد الحرام و نحن کعبة الله و نحن قبلاة الله

We are the sanctified land, the Kaʿbah of Allah and the Qiblah of Allah.

Sujūd (prostration) is interpreted to be acceptance of the Wilāyah of the Imāms. This interpretation is applied to the verse:

وَقَدْ كَانُوْا يُدْعَوْنَ إِلَى السُّجُوْدِ وَهُمْ سَلِيمُوْنَ... and they used to be invited to prostration while they were sound.
i.e. they used to be invited to the Wilāyah of ʿAlī in the worldly life.¹

It is perhaps narrations such as these that are the cause behind the Shīʿah worshipping their Imāms and their tombs as well as the cause behind them frequenting the mashāhid (mausoleums of the Imāms) whilst abandoning the Masājid. They were made to believe that the mashāhid were in fact the Masājid and the Imām was the Ka’bah and Qiblah of Allah. This is why they have written books such as Manāsik al-Mashāhid (the rites of the tombs) and Manāsik al-Ziyārāt or al-Mazār.² Special attention was accorded to explaining their virtues and the etiquettes of visiting them to the extent that these matters made up large portions of their books³, as will be explained.⁴

The meaning of the word towbah (repenting from sins and turning towards the obedience of Allah) was known to one and all. However, the Shīʿah were not satisfied. Thus, they decided to interpret it to mean denouncing the Khilāfah of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and the Banū Umayyah and emphasising the Imāmah of ʿAlī. Thus, three narrations are reported regarding the interpretation of the following verse:

فَاغْفِرْ لِلَّذِیْنَ تَابُوْا وَ اتَّبَعُوْا سَبِیْلَكَ

... so forgive those who have repented and followed Your way.⁵

² This is a reference to books such as Manāsik al-Ziyārāt by al-Mufīd, Kitāb al-Mazār by Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Faḍl, al-Mazār by Muḥammad al-Mash-hadī, al-Mazār by Muḥammad ibn Humām, al-Mazār by Muhammad ibn Ahmad. Al-ʿĀmilī mentioned them in Wasā’il al-Shīʿah and he even quoted from them. Refer to Wasā’il al-Shīʿah 20/48-49. Also refer to Ibn Taymiyyah: Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/175, al-Fatāwā 17/498
³ This can be seen in books such as Uṣūl al-Kāfī, Al-Wāfi, Al-Biḥār, Wasā’il al-Shīʿah, etc. Further details regarding these texts as well as the texts themselves will be presented shortly.
⁴ Refer to the chapter regarding their beliefs as far as towḥīd is concerned.
⁵ Sūrah al-Ghāfir: 7
The first narration states:

فَاغْفِرْ لِلَّذِینَ تَابُوا من ولیة فلان و فلان و بنى امیة

So forgive those who have repented from the Wilāyah of so and so and Banū Umayyah.

(‘So and so’ is with reference to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar).

The second narration states:

فَاغْفِرْ لِلَّذِینَ تَابُوا من ولیة الطواغیت الثلاثة

So forgive those who have repented from the Wilāyah of the three devils.

(Here, they are referring to Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān).

The third narration states:

فَاغْفِرْ لِلَّذِینَ تَابُوا من ولیة هؤلاء و بنی امیة و آتیعوا سبلک هو امیر المؤمنین

So forgive those who have repented from the Wilāyah of these and the Banū Umayyah, “and followed Your way,” i.e. Amīr al-Mu’minīn.¹

All of these three narrations are attributed falsely — as usual — to Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad al-Bāqir, whose piety and knowledge belies that they ever be attributed to him. These narrations establish for us a new meaning to the word towbah. At its core, it is nothing more than loving one man and hating another. There is no other dimension to it. Thus, towbah can only be done regarding Wilāyah of the Imām. All else does not demand any repentance or remorse. This is why they did not mention anything besides Wilāyah of the Imām.

It is as if the Shī‘ah, by means of these interpretations, have exonerated the one who believes in the wilāyah of ʿAlī from all sins, even though his crimes are as many

¹ Al-Burhān 4/92-93, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 4/335, Tafsīr al-Qummī 2/255
as the dust particles on the earth. Conversely, acceptance of the khilāfah of the most virtuous ones of all the creation (besides the ambiyā’) — Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān — is believed by them to be disbelief, along with which no amount of virtue holds any weight. Is this Islam? Was this (the Wilāyah of ʿAlī) the only reason why the Rasūl and his Ṣaḥābah struggled and exerted themselves?

Furthermore, what effects do these narrations have on those who believe that they are the words of Muḥammad al-Bāqir? Will the gravity of sins not leave their hearts? Will it not spur them on to commit every crime and prevent them from good deeds and nobility? These are definitely possible outcomes. Rather, they are realities which have already seen the light of day. I came across an important testimony on the subject in al-Kāfī, wherein one of the Shīʿah complains to his Imām regarding the poor character of his Shīʿī brethren. He even expresses surprise at the vast difference in character that he noticed between the Shīʿah and the Ahl al-Sunnah.¹ Al-Showkānī relates to us some important observations

---

¹ The exact wording is as follows:

'Abd Allah ibn Yaʿfūr says, “I said to Abū ʿAbd Allah:

"لَذَٰلِكَ أَخَافُ أَنَّ النَّاسَ يَفْتَرِسُوا مِنْ أُقْوَامٍ لَا يَتَوَلِّونَكُمَّ وَلَا يَتَوَلِّونَ فَلَا نَّاسَ لَهُمْ آمَانَةً وَصِدَاقٌ وَوَفَاءٌ وَأُقْوَامٍ يَتَوَلِّونَكُمَّ لَيْسَ لَهُمْ ثُلُثَ آمَانَةٍ وَصِدَاقٌ وَوَفَاءٌ""

My interaction with people leaves me dumbfounded, as I notice that many people who do not accept your Wilāyah and the Wilāyah of your family, instead they accept the Wilāyah of so and so (i.e. Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, which is an obvious reference to the Ahl al-Sunnah) are trustworthy, faithful and truthful. On the other hand, those who accept your Wilāyah (the Shīʿah) do not have in them the same level of trustworthiness, faithfulness and honesty?

Thereupon, Abū ʿAbd Allah sat up straight and turned to me as if he had been angered. He then said,

لا دين لمن دان الله بولیة امام جائر لیس من الله ولا ءبب على من دان بولیة امام عادل من الله

There is no dīn for the one who worships Allah and accepts the Wilāyah of an oppressive Imām who is not from Allah, and there is no criticism against the one who accepts the just Imām appointed by Allah.
regarding this, which he penned down during his interactions with the Shīʿah.\(^1\)

This will be discussed under the chapter, “their effect upon the Islamic world”.

The fundamental and core commandments of Islam, such as ṣalāh, zakāh, ḥajj and ṣiyām (fasting), which appear in the Qur’ān are all references to the Imāms. They report from Abū 'Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq):

نحن الصلاة في كتاب الله عز و جل ونحن الزكاة ونحن الصيام ونحن الحج

We are al-ṣalāh, al-zakāh, al-ṣiyām and al-ḥajj in the Book of Allah.\(^2\)

In fact, the entire dīn — according to them — is the Wilāyah of ʿAlī I. Thus, they report from Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq regarding the interpretation of the verse:

إن الله اصطفى لكم الدين

Indeed Allāh has chosen for you this religion.\(^3\)

---

1 He says, “I, as well as others, have seen along the course of our experiences that no Rāfiḍī holds back from any of the prohibitions of the dīn, whatever they may be.” (Ṭalab al-ʿIlm pg. 73) The remainder of his experiences will appear under the chapter, “their effect upon the Islamic world”.

2 Biḥār al-Anwār 24/303

3 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 132
He said, “(this is) the Wilāyah of ‘Alī.”

So do not die except while you are Muslims.¹

In the sense that you have accepted the Wilāyah of ‘Alī.²

*Tafsīr al-Qummī* states regarding the verse of Allah:

*انْ اَقِیْمُوا الدِّیْنَ*

establish the religion.³

*قَبُرَ عَلَی الْمُشْرِکِیْنَ مَا تَدْعُوْهُمْ اِلَیْهِ*

Difficult for those who associate others with Allah is that to which you invite them.⁴

This is regarding the Wilāyah of ‘Alī

---

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 132
3 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 13
4 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 13
Allah chooses for Himself whom He wills.¹

This is an indication towards 'Alī ʿa.s.

If the matter is as stated by them, why was the dīn not named “Dīn al-Muntaẓar” (the awaited one) or “Dīn al-Wilāyah” or “al-Wilāyah”? The truth of the matter is that this religion is a religion other than Islam. The central doctrine of it is the obedience of a mortal. Apparently, the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah have inherited their religion from the Kaysāniyyah², as they believe — as stated by al-Shahrastānī:

They are grouped together on the basis of one belief; din is the obedience of a mortal. This led them to interpreting the fundamental laws of the sharīʿah such as ṣalāh, ṣiyām, zakāh, ḥajj and other laws to mean men… whoever believes that din is the obedience of a man and he has no man (as he is hidden in his chamber), then he has no dīn.³

---

¹ Sūrah al-Shūrā: 13
² They are an extremist Shiʿī sect who believe in the Imāmah of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah. They were named al-Kaysāniyyah as a means of identifying them with Mukhtār ibn Abī ᵁUbayd al-Thaqafi, as he was called Kaysān. They are also referred to as al-Mukhtāriyyah by some authors on the subject of sects. Al-Mukhtār claimed that he received revelation and he believed in Badā as well as other deviant beliefs. It is also said that they are called al-Kaysāniyyah with reference to a man called Kaysān, who was the freed slave of part of the Bujaylah tribe of Kūfah. He is also believed to be the freed slave of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. The Kaysāniyyah divided into many sects, a total of twenty one according to al-Ashʿarī. They could be divided into two primary sects according to al-Baghdādī; one sect who believes that Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah did not pass away and he is the awaited Mahdī, and another sect who believes that Imāmah shifted after his demise to others. Thereafter, they differ regarding the one to whom it shifted. Refer to al-Ashʿarī: Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/91, al-Baghdādī: Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq pg. 23, 38, 53, Ibn Ḥazm: al-Fiṣal 5/35-36, 40-41, 43, al-Rāzī: Iʿtiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa l-Mushrīkīn pg. 93-95, Nishwān al-Ḥimyarī: al-Ḥūr al-ʿAyn pg. 157, Ibn al-Murtaḍā: al-Munyat wa l-Amal pg. 82-83, al-Nāshī al-Akbar: Masāʾil al-Imāmah pg. 25,26, al-Qummī: al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq pg. 21-22, al-Nawbakhtī: Firaq al-Shīʿah pg. 23-24,27, Widād al-Qāḍī: al-Kaysāniyyah fi l-Tārīkh wa l-Adab
³ Al-Milal wa l-Nīḥal 1/147
Thus, dīn was now confined to the Wilāyah of one man, ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib. Subsequently, the meanings of all of that which indicates towards dīn—like the obedience of Allah and His Rasūl, following the path of goodness and abstaining from evil, etc.—were shifted away from their religious implications according to their narrations.

The word ummah, the meaning of which is well known and it appears forty-nine times in the Book of Allah, is interpreted by the Shīʿah to mean Imāms or the Shīʿah. It is stated in Mirʾāt al-Anwār:

ان الذي يستفاد من روایاتنا على اختلاف الفاظها تاویل المة فیما یناسب بالئمة علیهم السلام و باهل الحق والشیعة المحقة و ان قالوا

The crux of our narrations (even though their wordings are different) is that the word ummah will be interpreted to mean the Imāms wherever possible, and the Ahl al-Ḥaq (people of the truth) and the sect (Shīʿah) who are upon the truth, even though they may be few in number.¹

Thereafter, the author quotes some of their narrations to prove this interpretation from many of their reliable books. If the word ummah is accepted to mean Imāms, it would mean that the Qurʾān was revealed specifically for them, and the ummah have neither been addressed in the Qurʾān, nor is it their responsibility to practice upon it.

Inanimate objects are also used to refer to the Imāms. The meaning of the word “well” is not unknown. However, the Shīʿah have a different opinion. They interpret it, as far as the Qurʾān is concerned, to mean:

تعلى رضي الله عنه و بولايته و بالأئمة الصامت - يعنون القرآن و بالمام الغائب و بفاطمة و ولدتها المعطلين من الملك

ʿAlī, his Wilāyah, the silent Imām (the Qurʾān), the absent Imām and the progeny of Fāṭimah who were deprived of kingdom.²

¹ Mirʾāt al-Anwār pg. 81
This interpretation is applied to the verse:

فَكَاَیِّنْ مِّنْ قَرْیَةٍ اَهْلَكْنٰهَا وَهِیَ ظَالِمَةٌ فَهِیَ خَاوِیَةٌ عَلٰی عُرُوْشِهَا وَ بِئْرٍ مُّعَطَّلَةٍ وَّ قَصْرٍ مَّشِیْدٍ

And how many a city did We destroy while it was committing wrong – so it is [now] fallen into ruin – and [how many] an abandoned well and [how many] a lofty palace.¹

Five narrations appear in al-Burhān confirming this interpretation.²

The word sea appears more than thirty three times in the Book of Allah, in contexts which make it obvious that the literal meaning is intended. Despite this, the Shīʿah prefer to interpret it to mean the Imām, Imāms and their enemies. The author of Mirʾāt al-Anwār quotes many of the narrations of his brethren regarding this interpretation. Thereafter he says:

و ل یخفى ان المستفاد من ذلك جواز تاویل البحر والبحار العذبة..المشتملة على المدح و النفع بالامام
و الائمة بل بفاطمة..و تاویل البحر و البحار المالحة باعدائهم

It is obvious that, from that, the permissibility of interpreting sea and sweet seas (rivers)... which contain praise and benefit to mean the Imām, Imāms and even Fāṭimah is established. Salty sea and seas can be interpreted to mean their enemies.³

Tafsīr al-Qummī and others report from Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) regarding the verse:

مَرَجَ الْبَحْرَیْنِ یَلْتَقِیٰنِ

He released the two seas, meeting [side by side].⁴

¹ Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 45
² al-Burhān 3/96-97
³ Mirʾāt al-Anwār pg. 94
⁴ Sūrah al-Raḥmān: 19
He released the two seas, meeting [side by side] — ʿAlī and Fāṭimah; they are two deep seas, but neither of them oppresses the other.

From both of them emerge pearl and coral.

Ḥasan and Ḥusayn.¹

Interpreting abstract meanings and “the greatest example” to mean Imāmah and the Imāms. “Good” is taken to mean Wilāyah. Al-Kāẓim says — as claimed by them — regarding the verse:

and do good²

He said, “(it is) al-Wilāyah.”³

Regarding the verse:

So race to [all that is] good.⁴

---

¹ Tafsīr al-Qummī 2/344, Tafsīr Furāt pg. 177, Ibn Bābawayh: al-Khiṣāl pg. 65, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 5/109, al-Burhān (twelve narrations are quoted regarding this interpretation) 4/265, Biḥār al-Anwār (an entire chapter was dedicated to this titled, “they are the sea, pearls and corals” 24/97. Refer to the comments of Ibn Taymiyyah regarding these interpretations quoted previously.

² Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 77

³ Mīrāt al-Anwār pg. 139

⁴ Sūrah al-Baqarah: 148
Abū Ja’far (al-Bāqir) said:

الخيرات الولیة

[all that is] good refers to Wilāyah.¹

Verses regarding the universe are also a reference to the Imāms. They are referred to as landmarks in the verse:

وَ عَلَّمَهُ وَ بِالنَّجْمِ هُمْ يَهْتَدُونَ

And landmarks. And by the stars they are [also] guided.²

Abū ʿAbd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) said – as reported by them:

النجم رسول الله و العلامات هم الئمة علیهم السلام

“The stars,” refers to the Rasūl, and “landmarks,” refers to the A’immah.³

Al-Kulaynī has a chapter regarding this titled, “the Imāms are the landmarks mentioned by Allah in His Book.”⁴ Al-Majlisī followed in his footsteps and named a chapter, “they are the stars and the landmarks.”⁵ The context in which the verse appears as well as that which is reported from the pious predecessors demands that this interpretation of the verse should be rejected.⁶

---

¹ Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/200, al-Burhān 1/163
² Sūrah al-Naḥl: 16
⁴ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/206
⁵ Biḥār al-Anwār 24/67-82
⁶ Refer to Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 14/92, Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/612
The conditions and stages of the Day of Judgement are interpreted by them to mean the reincarnation of the Imāms or Wilāyah. Thus, al-Ṣāʿah (the hour), al-Qiyāmah, al-Nushūr (the resurrection) and other names related to the Day of Judgement are interpreted by them, in most cases, to mean the reincarnation of the Imāms. The author of Mirʾāt al-Anwār mentions it as a rule:

کل ما عبر به بیوم القیامة فى ظاهر التنزیل فتاویله بالرجعة

Wherever the Day of Qiyāmah appears in the apparent wording of the Qurʾān, it refers to reincarnation.¹

Al-Majlisī says regarding the word sāʿah (hour) which appears in the Qurʾān:

ان الساعة ظهرها القیامة و بطنها الرجعة

The outward meaning of al-sāʿah is Qiyāmah and the inner meaning is reincarnation.²

The interpretation of the word al-sāʿah to mean Wilāyah has also been reported by them. They report from al-Riḍā regarding the verse:

بَلْ کَذَّبُوْا بِالسَّاعَةِ

But they have denied the Hour.³

قال یعنى کذبوا بولایة علی

This means that they denied the Wilāyah of ʿAlī.⁴

---

¹ Mirʾāt al-Anwār pg. 303
² Biḥār al-Anwār 24/334
³ Sūrah al-Furqān: 11
⁴ Al-Nuʾmānī: al-Ghaybah pg. 54, al-Burhān 3/157, Mirʾāt al-Anwār pg. 182
The worldly life refers to the reincarnation, according to them. The author of *Mir’āt al-Anwār* says:

That which indicates that “the world” should be interpreted to mean reincarnation and the Wilāyah of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar has been reported.¹

Imām Jaʿfar said regarding the verse:

Indeed, We will support Our Messengers and those who believe during the life of this world.²

This refers to reincarnation.³

Regarding the verse:

But you prefer the worldly life.⁴

He said, “it is their (Abū Bakr and ʿUmar) Wilāyah.”⁵

---

¹ *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 150
² Sūrah al-Ghāfir: 51
⁴ Sūrah al-Aʿlā: 16
At this point, we wish to remind you that ‘inner interpretations’ are not governed by any laws. You have just seen that “the hereafter” was interpreted to mean reincarnation, just as the worldly life was interpreted to mean the same. This is despite the vast difference between the two. Similarly, the worldly life is interpreted on one occasion to mean reincarnation and on another occasion to mean Wilāyah whereas there is absolutely no link between the two. They are senseless and random statements which have no basis, even as far as logic is concerned.

Their interpretation of verses to mean Imām and Imāms are so many that they are difficult to count. It is as if the Qur’ān was not revealed except regarding them. They have exceeded all the limits set by the intellect in trying to establish this claim. They have imitated, in their interpretations, the jokes of mentally-challenged persons, to the extent that they claim that the bee mentioned in the following verse is a reference to the Imāms:

وَ أُوْحِيَ رَبُّكَ إِلَى النَّهْل

And your Rabb inspired to the bee.¹

Al-Qummī reports with his isnād from Abū ʿAbd Allah (al-Ṣādiq):

نحن التى اوحى الله الیها اَنِ اتَّخِذِیْ مِنَ الْجِبَالِ بُیُوْتًا امرنا ان نتخذ من العرب شیعة وَّمِنَ الشَّجَرِ یقول من العجم وَمِمَّا یَعْرِشُوْنَ یقول من الموالی

We are the ones to whom Allah revealed, “take for yourself among the mountains, houses,” he commanded us to take Shīʿah from the Arabs, “and among the trees,” the non-Arabs, “and [in] that which they construct.” the freed slaves.²

Al-Majlisī gathered their narrations regarding this subject in a chapter named, “a rare chapter regarding interpreting the bee to mean them (Imāms).”³ Similarly,

---

¹ Sūrah al-Naḥl: 68
² Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/387
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 24/110-113
he mentions many narrations in which it is stated that the Imāms are sweet water, a lofty palace, clouds, rain, fruit and all other outwardly beneficial objects.¹

Under the chapter in which he titled, “interpreting days and months to mean A’immah,”² the following appears:

نحن الآيام فالسبت اسم رسول الله و الحسین و الحسن و الحسن بن علي و علي بن محمد و علي بن موسى و علي بن محمد علي و الحسن بن علي و الخديجة بنت حرب

We are the days of the week. Saturday is the name of Rasūlullāh, Sunday is a reference to Amīr al-Mu’minīn, Monday is Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, Tuesday is ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn, Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī, and Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad, Wednesday is Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar, ʿAlī ibn Mūsā, Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī and me, Thursday is my son Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī and Friday is my grandson.³

A point of humour at this juncture is that some days are singled out in Shīṭī narrations to be loathsome.⁴ Would this also be directed at the Imām to whom it refers to? The answer cannot be in the negative as “the Imāms are the days!” Jābir al-Juʿfī reports, “I asked Abū Jaʿfar (al-Bāqir) regarding the verse of Allah:

إنَّ عِدَّةَ الشُّهُورِ عِنْدَ اللهِ اثْنَا عَشَرَ شَهْرًا فِیْ کِتٰبِ الله قال فتنفس سیدى الصعداء ثم قال یا جابر اما السنة فهى جدى رسول الله صلى الله علیه و سلم و شهورها اثنا عشر شهرا فهو امیر المؤمنین الى و الى ابنى جعفر و ابنى موسى و ابنى علي و ابنى محمد و ابنى حسن و ابنى محمد الهادي المهيد اثنا عشر اماما...والاربعية الحرم الذين هم الدين القيم اربعة منهم يخرجون باسم واحد على امیر المؤمنین و التي الله عه و ابن الحسين و علي بن موسى و علي بن محمد فالاقرار بهؤلاء هو الدين القيم فلا تظلموا بهم أنت الس كم أي قولوا بهم تهتدوا

“Indeed, the number of months with Allah is twelve [lunar] months in the register of Allah.”⁵ My master took a deep sigh and then said, “O Jābir, the

---

1 Ibid 24/100-110
2 Ibid 24/238-243
4 Refer to Safinat Al-Biḥār 1/137
5 Sūrah al-Towbah: 36
year is my grandfather, the Rasūl ’étīda, its months are Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn until me¹ and my son Ja’far, his son Mūsā, his son ‘Alī, his son Muḥammad, his son ‘Alī, his son Ḥasan, his son Muḥammad al-Hādī al-Mahdī — twelve Imams. The four sacred ones who are the correct religion are four from them who have the same name; ‘Alī Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn, my father ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn, ‘Alī ibn Mūsā and ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad. Accepting them is the correct religion. ‘So do not wrong yourselves during them,’ means that if you believe in them, you will be guided.”²

The mosquito (a small and well-known insect) which was mentioned in Sūrah al-Baqarah³ is ‘Alī ʿaṣṣ according to them.⁴ The word fly is also interpreted in Shīʿī books to mean ‘Alī ʿaṣṣ. One of them tried to water down this interpretation by claiming that this refers to the honey-bee (which is called the honey-fly in Arabic). However, he did not realise that this interpretation was applied to the verse:

انَّ الَّذِیْنَ تَدْعُوْنَ مِنْ دُوْنِ اللّٰهِ لَنْ یَّخْلُقُوْا ذُبَابًا وَّ لَوِاجْتَمَعُوْا لَه

Indeed, those you invoke besides Allah will never create [as much as] a fly, even if they gathered together for it [i.e., that purpose].⁵

The question that troubles us is, what is the secret behind using the names of the most despicable insects to refer to Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ‘Alī ʿaṣṣ, especially since this is done by a sect who claims to be his ardent lovers? The truth is, the hatred has slipped of their tongues, and that which is concealed in their hearts is even worse. Their practical track-record as far as the Ahl al-Bayt is concerned is of a much more severe and abysmal nature.

¹ i.e. Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and the Imāms after him until it reaches me. Al-Majlisī: Biḥār al-Anwār 24/240
³ Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 73
⁴ Tafsīr al-Qummi: 1/35, al-Burhān 1/70
⁵ Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 73
The graves of the Imāms received a fair share of their interpretations. The blessed piece of land in the following verse is Karbalā’.¹

فَلَمَّآ اَتَهَا نُوْدِیَ مِنْ شَاطِیَِٔ الْوَادِ الَْیْمَنِ فِیْ الْبُقْعَةِ الْمُبٰرَکَةِ مِّنَ الشَّجَرَةِ

But when he came to it, he was called from the right side of the valley in a blessed spot — from the tree.²

It is well-known that this land was none other than Mount Sinai, as proven from the verse immediately before this verse:

مِنْ جَانِبِ الطُّوْرِ

from the direction of the mount.³

Just as the Imāms of the Shīʿah have been referred to in these verses as claimed by their narrations, similarly, the followers have also been singled out in verses of the Book of Allah, to the extent that the Shīʿah are “the things” in the verse:

وَ رَحْمَتِیْ وَسِعَتْ کُلَّ شَیْءٍ

My mercy encompasses all things.⁴

Thus, they wish to confine the all-encompassing mercy of Allah to the Shīʿah, and place limits upon that which Allah had granted in abundance to His servants. Similarly, they wish to interpret the words shirk, kufr, riddah (turning renegade) and ḍalāl (misguidance) against the meanings that is known to the Muslims. All of these words are interpreted to mean the failure to pledge allegiance to the twelve

---

¹ Ibn Qūluwayh: Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 48-49, al-Burhān 3/336, Mir‘āt al-Anwār pg. 192
² Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 30
³ Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 29
⁴ Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 156
Imāms (even though the only one amongst them who held the post of khilāfah was Amīr al-Mu’minin ‘Alī).

There are tens of narrations of this nature. We have previously pointed out that their scholar, al-Majlisī dedicated a few chapters in his Bihār, the titles of which are all in conformity to this ‘inner’ interpretation. Some of these chapters comprise of a hundred narrations. Here, we are only presenting examples of these aḥādīth. Among them is the following interpretation which appears in Shīʿī books:

لِئِنْ اَشْرَکْتَ لَیَحْبَطَنَّ عَمَلُكَ وَ لَتَكُوْنَنَّ مِنَ الْخٰسِرِیْنَ

If you should associate [anything] with Allah, your work would surely become worthless.¹

لن ان اشركت في امامة على ولية غيره

If you accept anyone else’s Wilāyah with the Imāmah of ‘Alī.²

The author of Mir‘āt al-Anwār says:

فعَلِى هذَا جَمِيعُ الْمُخَالِفِينَ مَشْرِكِينَ

Based upon this, all those who oppose (the Shīʿah) are mushrikīn.³

He adds:

ان الْاخِبَارَ مَتَضَافِرَةَ فِي تَأویلِ الْشَّرِكِ بِاللَّهِ وَ الْشَّرِكِ بِعَبَادَتِهِ بِالشَّرِكِ فِي الْوَلَّیَةِ وَ الْإِمَامَةِ

There are a great number of (Shīʿī) narrations in which it is mentioned that shirk with regards to Allah and the worshipping of Allah should be interpreted to mean shirk in Wilāyah and Imāmah.⁴

---

¹ Sūrah al-Zumar: 65
² Tafsīr al-Qummī 2/251, Tafsīr Furāt pg. 132, al-Burhān 4/83, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 4/328
³ Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf: Mir‘āt al-Anwar pg. 202
⁴ ibid
This is precisely the reason due to which they declared the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh to be renegades, as they pledged allegiance to Abū Bakr instead of ʿAlī. Kufr is also interpreted in this way by them. Al-Kāfī reports from Abū ʿAbd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) regarding the statement of Allah the most honoured and glorified:

\[
\text{إنَّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوْا ثُمَّ كَفَرُوْا ثُمَّ آمَنُوْا ثُمَّ كَفَرُوْا ثُمَّ ازْدَادُوْا کُفْرًا لَّنْ تُقْبَلَ تَوْبَتُهُمْ}
\]

Indeed, those who have believed then disbelieved, then believed then disbelieved, and then increased in disbelief — never will their [claimed] repentance be accepted.¹

This verse was revealed regarding fulān (an Arabic word used to refer to an unnamed person), fulān and fulān.³ They believed in Nabī in the beginning and then disbelieved when Wilāyah was presented to them... Thereafter they believed in the bayʿah (pledge of allegiance) of Amīr al-Muʿminīn and thereafter disbelieved when Rasūlullāh passed on, as they did not uphold the bayʿah. Then, they increased in kufr by taking as their supporters those who pledged allegiance to him. Consequently, no bit of īmān remained in them.⁴

---

¹ More details regarding this will appear under the chapter of Imāmah.
² Take note that two verses from two different Sūrahs have been joint and presented as if they are one verse. This clearly indicates that the one who fabricated these tales in the name of the Ahl al-Bayt was an ignorant and irreligious character. The last portion of the verse, “never will their [claimed] repentance be accepted,” is from Sūrah Āl ʿImrān (90), whereas the first portion, “indeed, those who have believed then disbelieved, then believed then disbelieved, and then increased in disbelief,” is from Sūrah al-Nisā (137).
³ This refers to Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān, as explained by one of their scholars. This will appear in more detail under the chapter of Imāmah.
Thus, as you have just seen, they have confined this judgement to the best of the creation after the ambiyā’. What then is their belief regarding the rest of the ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ? One of their scholars indicated towards the reason behind specifying them as the ones regarding whom the verse was revealed. He says:

ورد فى بعض الروایات تاویل الكفر برؤساء المخالفلین ل سیما الثلاثة (یعنون الخلافاء الراشديين) مبالغة بزيادة كفرهم و ججدهم

It appears in some narrations that the interpretation of kufr is a reference to the leaders of the opposition, especially the three (i.e. the rightly guided khulafā’). This is to emphasise the point due to their extreme kufr and denial.¹

The word riddah  means turning renegade as far as the bay’ah of the twelve Imāms. It appears in Uṣūl al-Kāfī as well as others from Abū ʿAbd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) regarding the verse of Allah:

بتَبِينَ لَهُمُ الْهُدَی

Indeed, those who reverted back [to disbelief] after guidance had become clear to them.²

قال فلان و فلان و فلان ارتدوا من الیمان فى ترك ولیة امیر المؤمنین

Fulān, fulān and fulān turned renegade from īmān as they abandoned the Wilāyah of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn.³

Ḍalāl (deviation), according to them means failing to recognise the Imām. It is said regarding the verse of Allah:

---

¹ Mir’āt al-Anwār pg. 187
² Sūrah Muḥammad: 25
Have you not seen those who were given a portion of the Scripture, purchasing misguidance [in exchange for it]?\(^1\)

\[\text{قال يعني ضلوا في امير المؤمنين.}^2\]

They say regarding the verse:

\[\text{لِّیْنَ} \not\text{ غير المغضوب عليهم ولا الضالين}^3\]

“Those who are astray,” are those who do not recognise the Imām.\(^4\)

The interpretation of kufr, shirk, riddah and ḍalāl to mean abandoning the pledge of allegiance to the twelve Imāms — besides it not being backed by divine texts, intellect, language or sharīʿah — leads a Muslim to granting superiority to kufr and kuffār over all Muslims (besides the Shīʿah — who claim to be Muslim — as the core of Kufr is the rejection of Imāmah). Perhaps this was the actual goal of the one who fabricated this narration. The result of this was seen along the course of Sunnī-Shīʿī history.

Another glaring distortion that comes to the fore due to these interpretations is that the crimes of shirk and irreligiousness are taken to be extremely light offences, if they are even taken to be offences at all. If this is not the demolition

---

1 Sūrah al-Nisā: 44
2 Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/139
3 Sūrah al-Fāṭihah: 7
4 Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/29
of the foundations of Islam and a calculated war against the nubuwwah of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allah — who was sent to combat and annihilate shirk, kufr and ḍalāl thereby establishing the laws of towḥīd and the sharīʿah of Islam — then what else is it?

Major sins and all other prohibitions, according to them, is nothing more than a reference to the enemies of the Imāms. They claim that Abū ’Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) said:

و عدونا فى كتاب الله عز وجل: الفحشاء و المنكر و البغى و الخمر و المیسر و النصاب و الزلم و
الأصنام و الأوثان و الجبیت و الطاغوت و المیتة و الدم و لحم الخنزير

Our enemies are in the Book of Allah, the most honoured and glorified, immorality, evilness, oppression, wine, gambling, sacrificing on stone alters, taking omens from arrows, idols, false deities, the devil, carrion, blood and the flesh of pigs.¹

We have already indicated that the interpretation of the prohibitions to mean the enemies of the Imāms appears in many chapters of Al-Biḥār, many of which comprise of tens of narrations. Some of their reliable books have revealed the name of the one who fabricated all this bunkum. They explain that the interpretation of prohibitions to mean the enemies of the Imām, and interpreting the commandments to mean the Imāms was started by Abū al-Khaṭṭāb, the one from whom the Imāms dissociated themselves and cursed them. Rijāl al-Kashshī has it:

كتب ابو عبد الله الى ابى الخطاب بلغنى انك تزعم ان الزنا رجل و ان الخمر رجل و ان الصیام رجل و ان الفواحش رجل و لیس هو کما تقول

Abū ’Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) wrote to Abū al-Khaṭṭāb, “it has reached me that you claim that zinā is a man, wine is a man, ṣalāh is a man, ṣiyām is a man, immorality is a man. The matter is not as you say.”²
The books regarding sects mention that some extremist Shīʿah would believe that the prohibitions are all names of people who Allah commanded us to have enmity for, and the commandments are names of people who we have been commanded to befriend.\(^1\) Al-Shahrastānī says:

> The object behind interpreting the commandments and prohibitions to mean certain men is that whoever has the fortune of knowing this man will be relieved of all responsibilities and none of the above will be directed to him.\(^2\)

The Ithnā ʿAshariyyah inherited all of this drivel and they have revived it. Al-Qummī (the author of the *Tafsīr*), al-Kulaynī, al-ʿAyyāshī, al-Kāshānī, al-Majlisī and other scholars of the Safawid dynasty had an enormous share in reviving this as well as all the other tales of the extremist Shīʿī sects. They included them in the beliefs of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah as if they were authentic narrations from the Imāms.

Nevertheless, their interpretations in this chapter are enough to fill up volumes. Each doctrine regarding which they have differed and opposed the rest of the ummah — reincarnation, occultation, dissimulation, etc. — have interpretations and fabrications which cannot be counted. We will delve into this under the discussions regarding them, Allah wiling. Whatever has been mentioned thus far is only a portion of that which we have collected. However, we did not mention them fearing that the discussion will lengthen greatly. The quotations mentioned are but a drop from the ocean. Presenting all of them and then analysing them would require volumes of books. Most of these narrations reveal to us one of their beliefs regarding their deity, nubuwwah, the names and attributes of Allah, the foundations of Islam, etc.

Finally, before concluding the discussion on this subject, I would like to pen down the following observations:

\(^1\) *Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* 1/179

\(^2\) ibid
We have thus far mentioned the belief of the Shī‘ah that most of the Qur‘ān was revealed regarding them and their enemies. Thereafter, examples of their distortion of the meanings of the Qur‘ān were presented. All of these examples emphasise the belief of the Shī‘ah that most of the Qur‘ān is regarding the twelve Imāms and their ‘enemies’. The scholars of the Shī‘ah have gathered thousands of texts, as indicated previously, to establish this. However, after all of this, we find that these claims are contradicted by their own texts.

This text, from Abū ‘Abd Allah Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq states:

لا قرئ القرآن كما أنزل للفيننا فيها مسمين

If the Qur‘ān was recited as it was revealed, you would have found us named (in it).¹

This is a clear testimony from them that there is no mention of their Imāms in the Qur‘ān, and their names are have not appeared therein. It is as if they themselves demolished their own house. Perhaps the secret behind this is that the one who fabricated this narration did so to strengthen the view that the Qur‘ān was tempered with, without realising that narrations which contradict this one had already been fabricated. These kinds of contradictions and inconsistencies are a manifestation of the punishment of Allah upon those who attempt to distort His dīn. This can be deduced from His statement:

ولَوْ كَانَ مِنْ عِنْدِ غَيْرِ اللّٰهِ لَوْ جَدُوْا فِيهِ اخْتِلاَفًا كَثِیْرًا

If it had been from [any] other than Allah, they would have found within it much contradiction.²

---

¹ Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/13, Bihār al-Anwār 92/55, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/41, al-Lawāmi‘ al-Nūrāniyyah pg. 547
² Sūrah al-Nisā: 82
Thus, these contradictions are the greatest proofs that they are not from Allah. Another text of theirs, which was quoted earlier, explains that the Qur’ān is divided into four subjects, none of which included the Imāms. Rijāl al-Kashshī contains yet another text which razed to the ground all that they had built up regarding their ‘inner’ interpretations. Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) was informed of the ‘inner’ interpretations of the sacrilegious ones, whereupon he refuted it. The exact text is:

قیل له روى عنكم ان الخمر و المیسر و النصاب و الزلم رجال؟ فقال ما کان الله عز و جل لیخاطب خلقه بما لا يعلمون

He was told, “it is narrated from you people that wine, gambling, sacrificing on stone alters are all references to men.” He responded, “Allah will not address His creation in a manner which they do not know.”

This means that Allah will not address his servants in manner which is impossible for them to understand and comprehend, as this defeats the purpose of revealing the Qur’ān as a guidance for mankind and a call to the worship of Allah. It is unthinkable regarding Allah that He commands His servants to ponder and reflect upon the Qur’ān if it is incomprehensible and reflecting upon it will not lead one to its intended meaning. Allah is beyond riddles and puzzles. Anyway, this statement of Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq), which is preserved in one their most authentic books on narrators totally annuls all their fantasies and blasphemous interpretations regarding the Book of Allah.

This was an analyses of the matter from their very own sources, which we can refer to as an internal analyses. Nonetheless, anyone who reflects upon the Qur’ān in light of the Arabic language, in which the Qur’ān was revealed, will not find any of their claims to be close to the truth. Allah says:

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 291
The narrations quoted by them have been adequately debunked, as merely reproducing them explains their lack of substance. Will anyone believe that ʿAlī has 1154 names in the Qur’ān? Who is able to digest that “the fly” and “the mosquito” are references to ʿAlī? Is there any believer who will accept that the verses relating to the Day of Qiyāmah in the Qur’ān are all, in fact regarding the doctrine of reincarnation? Is it worth debating the one who believes that the verses regarding īmān and muʾminīn are in fact regarding the twelve Imāms and the verses of kufr and kāfirīn are regarding the noble Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh? 

At this juncture, I would like to voice my opinion regarding these people stooping to such lowly extremes. I believe that this is from the miracles of this fortified dīn. None has ever claimed nubuwah or intended to add to this dīn that which is not from it, except that Allah disgraced him publicly. By the oath of Allah, these views cannot ever be in harmony with the intellect, divine texts, the rules of language or dīn. This is the biggest exposure and the greatest form of disgrace that has been inflicted upon this nation. In this way, Allah exposed their lies and accusations.

Indeed the printing presses of Najaf, Tehran, Qum and Bombay have brought out to us the Shīʿī heritage, which reveals the entire religion, the most accurate name of which could either be the dīn of Wilāyah or the dīn of Imāmah. (It has nothing to do with Islam). These books were not available to the Muslims of the past to the degree that they are available today. It is the dīn which was invented by al-Majlisī, al-Kulaynī and the other masterminds of the Shīʿah. By means of these books, many realities which were previously hidden away have come to the fore. Another

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 2
advantage that is realised by means of these books is that the grandeur of Islam is highlighted and one also realises the divine protection to keep it in its pristine purity until the end. Many a times the reality of something is only understood when the opposite is witnessed or experienced. If it was not for bitterness, none would appreciate sweetness.

Perhaps the revival of the Shīṭī legacy and heritage signals the end of their lifespan, as they have always survived by hiding their beliefs and practising Taqīyyah. However, today their reliable books have exposed them in a befitting manner, allowing one and all to see what their beliefs are and thereafter expose their deviance.

2. These ‘inner’ interpretations with which the books of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah are replete, are unknown to many who write regarding this sect. Suffice to say, you will find some who write regarding them who believe that they (the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah) have nothing to do with Bāṭinīsm (secretive and inner meanings which contradict the apparent meanings) and this trait is confined to the Ismāʿīliyyah. One of them states:

   The Ismāʿīliyyah have attributed certain qualities to the Imāms which were unknown to even the other Shīṭī sects. Outwardly, they accept that the Imāms were humans like the rest of mankind, who would eat, sleep and pass away. However, in their inner interpretations, they claim that the Imām is the “face of Allah”, “hand of Allah” and the “side of Allah”.

   It should be noted that these (the above-mentioned) interpretations are exactly that which the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah believe in. many narrations of theirs confirm this extremism. Al-Majlisī even dedicated a chapter of his Biḥār to this (which he named, “they are the side of Allah, His face, His hand, etc.”), as explained. The reason behind this is, the widespread

---

1 Muṣṭafā al-Shakʿah: Islām bi lā Madhā-hib pg. 247-248
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 24/191-203
ignorance among a group of authors regarding the types of books written by the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah. Their books are of two types; those books which are used to gain followers and support and their authentic and reliable books.

The methodology adopted in the first type is that of deception and Taqiyyah. The second type includes books such as their eight canonical books, their four books on narrators and all those books which are of the same standard as these (according to them), from the books of their scholars. Thus, whoever relies upon the first type alone, will remain ignorant concerning many of their matters. These books, at times, have subtle indications towards their beliefs. However these indications can only be understood by their scholars, or one who has a thorough understanding of their reliable books.

3. One should understand that these interpretations are not considered by them to be debatable opinions regarding the Qurʾān which may or may not be accepted. Rather, they are taken to be divine texts which hold the same position as the revealed texts and the sayings of Nabī ﷺ. Many of their texts sound severe warnings about rejecting these interpretations, which are not supported by the intellect, nature, logic or the language. It is compulsory to simply accept and not have any reservations, as stated in the Arabic proverb, switch off the light in your brain, and believe! They have tried to get their followers accustomed to accepting these types of texts by saying:

ان حديثنا تشمئز منه القلوب فمن عرف فزیدوهم و من انكر فذروهم

Indeed the hearts have an aversion from our aḥādīth. Therefore, whoever understands them, increase them and whoever finds fault with them, then leave them.¹

¹ Ibid 2
Sufyān al-Simṭ reports that he said to Abū ʿAbd Allah (al-Ṣādiq):

May I be sacrificed for you. A man who is infamous for being a liar comes to us from you and he relates a ḥadīth which we find repugnant.

Abū ʿAbd Allah replied:

Does he tell you that I said that the night is the day and the day is the night? If this is what he told you then do not reject it as you are only belying me (by rejecting it). ¹

There are many narrations such as these ones. A point that is worthy of note is that in the last narration they have admitted that the Shīʿah find these narrations to be repugnant, however, they are forced to blindly accept them. In fact the judgement regarding the one who has any reservations regarding any of these narrations is:

He says, how did this come (in the narrations), how did it happen, how is it, then by the oath of Allah this is shirk with Allah, the Great. ²

The author of Al-Biḥār paid special attention to this matter. He quoted 116 of their aḥādīth under a chapter which he titled, “their aḥādīth are extremely difficult, their speech can be interpreted in many different ways, the virtue of pondering upon their narrations submitting to them and the prohibition of rejecting them.” ³ The first person to strengthen the

---

² Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 194
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 2/182
foundations of this belief was probably the author of *al-Kāfī*, who dedicated a special chapter to it named, “what has been reported that their aḥādīth are extremely difficult.” Under this chapter, he mentions five narrations.¹

This methodology was probably the strongest reason behind these tales being so widespread without being countered by any intelligence which would raise the voice of the truth and expose and disgrace (the champions of) falsehood. It is a type of slavery wherein the followers are expected to accept the saying of the Imām despite their outright opposition of all logic. It is similar to the stance of the extremist and bogus ṣūfīs who blindly follow all that comes from the Shaykh without being allowed to give it second thought. This is the very same trick that Firʿown used against his people. Allah indicates towards it saying:

\[
فَاسْتَخَفَّ قَوْمَهُ فَاَطَاعُوْهُ
\]

So he bluffe[d] his people, and they obeyed him.²³

4. Tafsīr is of many types according to them, and all are valid. Abū ʿAbd Allah says – as they allege –:

\[
ان قوما امنوا بالظاهر و کفروا بالباطن فلم ینفعهم شیئ و جاء قوم من بعدهم فامنوابالباطن و کفروا بالظاهر فلم يتفعهم ذلك شيئا و لا ايمان بظاهر الا بباطن و لا باطن الا بظاهر
\]

Some people believed in the outer (meaning) and rejected the inner so that did not benefit them in any way. Another group of people came after them who believed in the inner and rejected the outer. That did not benefit them in any way. There is no īmān upon the outer except if it is coupled with īmān upon the inner and vice-versa.

---

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/401-402  
2 Sūrah al-Zukhruf: 54  
3 Refer to *al-Madkhal ilā al-Thaqāfat al-Islāmiyyah* pg. 113-115
This is the reason why some Shīʿī books of tafsīr do not mention both interpretations. At times they only mention that which is accommodated by the usage of the language or that which is transmitted from the pious predecessors. However, this does not mean that they do not accept the ‘inner’ interpretation, as they believe that each verse has an inner as well as an outer (meaning) and both are meant (by Allah). Therefore, some of them suffice upon the outer whilst others suffice upon the inner and a third group mentions both.

The exact same methodology is visible in their narrations as we learn from this from the following narration quoted by the author of *al-Kāfī* regarding the interpretation of the verse:

\[
\text{ثُمَّ لْیَقْضُوْا تَفَثَهُمْ وَلْیُوْفُوْا نُذُوْرَهُمْ}
\]

Then let them end their untidiness and fulfil their vows.¹

ʿAbd Allah ibn Sinān reports from Dharīḥ al-Muḥāribī who said, “I said to Abū ʿAbd Allah, ‘Allah has commanded me in His book regarding a certain matter and I wish to comply.’ He asked, ‘what is that?’ I replied, ‘the statement (command) of Allah, then let them end their untidiness and fulfil their vows.’² He explained:

\[
	ext{لْیَقْضُوْا تَفَثَهُمْ لقاء المام وَلْیُوْفُوْا نُذُوْرَهُمْ تلك المناسك}
\]

“Let them end their untidiness”, i.e. meeting the Imām, “and fulfil their vows,” i.e. those rites.

ʿAbd Allah ibn Sinān says, “I went to Abū ʿAbd Allah and asked, ‘may I be sacrificed for you, (what is the explanation of the) command of Allah

¹ Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 29

² Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 29
“Then let them end their untidiness and fulfil their vows,” means that the moustache should be removed, the nails should be clipped and all which resembles that (should be done).

I said, “may I be sacrificed for you, Dharīḥ al-Muḥāribī related to me from you that you said to him, ‘let them end their untidiness’, i.e. meeting the Imām, ‘and fulfil their vows’ i.e. those rites.” He replied, “Dharīḥ has spoken the truth and I have (also) spoken the truth. Indeed the Qur’ān has an outer (meaning) and an inner. Who is capable of tolerating that which Dharīḥ tolerates?”

In this text, which is related by the author of al-Kāfī, the author of Man lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh as well as others, it is clearly stated that the Qur’ān has an outer meaning which is to be told to the general public and an inner meaning that should only be mentioned to specific people, according to their ability to tolerate it. This text also informs us that these people are very few in number, and at times they do not even exist. It states, “who is capable of tolerating that which Dharīḥ tolerates?”

A third point that can be raised from this text is that the Imāms were, in a sense, stingy as far as this knowledge was concerned and they would only

---

reveal it to people who were on the level of Dharīḥ. Why then did the books of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah oppose this methodology of the Imāms? Why did they publish this ‘knowledge’ which was held back from the public in their books for one and all to have access to them?

One may also ask, “why do we not attribute the interpretations which conform to the apparent meanings, the context, the Arabic language, that which is related from the pious predecessors and that upon which the ummah has agreed to the Imāms? Why do we not believe that nothing other than that was uttered by the likes of Muḥāmmad al-Bāqir, Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq and the rest of them among whom were outstanding scholars of Islam and the Arabic language? Why do we not believe that the inner interpretations, which cannot be supported by any reliable evidence (the divine texts, the intellect and the usage of the Arabic language) is from the concoctions of the anti-religious atheists who wished to cause damage to the Book of Allah, His dīn and the Ahl al-Bayt, especially since these interpretations are as ludicrous as they are and they are only transmitted by a handful of people as indicated at the end of the above text?”

It is impossible that the interpretation of the Qurʾān could have been some secretive knowledge which was only accessible to a select few. This is because Allah revealed the Qurʾān for guidance of the entire humanity and not a specific group of people. Added to that, the era of these great Imāms was one wherein glory belonged to Islam and it was dominant. Thus, how is it that in an era like that, this ‘knowledge’ was kept a secret and in an era like ours it has become accessible to all? This is far-fetched, as the well-known fearlessness and bravery of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt rule out the possibility that that they cowardly hid away the commands of Allah and His sharīʿah and they shied away from openly proclaiming it!

5. These interpretations are nothing but an attempt to inject deviation in the Book of Allah and His verses. Allah ﷻ says:
Indeed, those who inject deviation into Our verses are not concealed from Us.¹

Ibn ‘Abbās explained:

هو ان يوضع الكلام فى غير موضعه و ذلك بالنحرف فى تاویله

This is done by taking statements against their contexts², which is a result of misinterpreting them.³

It is mentioned in al-īkīl:

In this is a refutation of those who interpret the Qur’ān in a way that is not accommodated by the meaning of the words, as the Bāṭiniyyah, Ittiḥādiyyah and heretics do.⁴

These people who try to corrupt the Qur’ān and distort its meanings, although they try to hide their kufr and hide behind false ideologies, they cannot remain hidden from Allah. He says, “(They) are not concealed from Us.”⁵,⁶

6. The scholars of the Shī‘ah have attributed these interpretations, or rather distortions, to the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt so that they may be accepted by the masses. Since these interpretations make no sense, they wriggle their way out of this dilemma by asserting that the Qur’ān’s methodology

---

¹ Sūrah al-Fuṣṣilat: 40
² Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 24/123, Fath al-Qadīr 4/520
³ Refer to al-Qāsimī: Maḥāsin al-Ta’wil 14/211, al-Ālūsī: Rūḥ al-Maʿānī 24/126
⁴ Al-Sūyūṭī: al-Iklīl pg. 354 (printed with as a footnote to Jāmiʿ al-Bayān)
⁵ Sūrah al-Fuṣṣilat: 40
⁶ Anwār Shāh al-Kashmīrī: Ikfār al-Mulḥidīn pg. 2
is not harmonious with the intellect. This too is attributed to an Imām, Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. Jābir al-Juʿfī reports that Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq said to him:

O Jābir, Indeed the Qur’ān has an outer and an inner. There is nothing which is further away from the intellect of men than it. The first portion of a verse is revealed regarding one thing and the last portion is regarding another, but it is correlated speech which may be interpreted in many different ways.

There is no doubt that this is the condition of their interpretations (and not the Book of Allah), as they have no link at all with the text of the Qur’ān or its authentic and correct interpretations.

7. Most of their books on Tafsīr have adopted this Bāṭinī methodology of explanation, which they learnt from Abū al-Khaṭṭāb, Mughīrah ibn Saʿīd and Jābir al-Juʿfī among other heretics. It seems as if they began trying to detach themselves from this methodology of Tafsīr to some extent in the fifth century. This was when the ‘scholar of the sect’ Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ţūsī (d. 460 A.H.) authored for them a Tafsīr in which he shed some light upon the correct interpretations by quoting Sunnī sources. No doubt, he also quoted their sources, however, he tried to water down or get away from the blatant extremism contained in Tafsīr al-Qummī, al-ʿAyyāshī, Uṣūl al-Kāfī, etc.

Although he defends the principles of his sect and approves of their unfounded methods, he does not stoop to the same levels as al-Qummī and those who followed suit. Among those who treaded the path of al-Ţūsī was Faḍl ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭabarsī in his book Majmaʿ al-Bayān. Ibn Taymiyyah points this out saying:
Al-Ṭūsī and those like him take from the Ahl al-Sunnah as far as their Tafsīr is concerned. In fact all the beneficial information in their Tafsīr books is actually taken from the the Ahl al-Sunnah.\(^1\)

However, the leading scholar of the Shīʿah in his era, their muḥaddith, expert on the science of narrators, compiler of the latest and final collection of (their) aḥādīth — and the tutor of many of their senior scholars including Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā, Aghā Buzrug al-Tehrānī as well as others — Ḥusayn al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī divulged a secret that was always well hidden by them. He ripped apart the screen which kept us in the dark regarding an important reality, i.e. the book of al-Ṭūsī (al-Tibyān) was only written on account of Taqiyyah with the purpose of drawing the opposition closer. Here are his exact words:

\[
ث٢٨ لِیخفى على المتأمل في کتاب التبیان أن طریقته فیه على نهایة المداراة والمماشاة مع المخالفین،
\]

It will not remain hidden from the one who ponders over the book al-Tibyān that his (the author's) methodology therein is the epitome of compromising and toeing the line of the opposition, as you see him sufficing, as far as the commentary of verses are concerned, upon quoting the speech of Ḥasan, Qatādah, al-Ḍaḥḥāk, al-Suddī, Ibn Jurayj, al-Jubāʾī, al-Zujāj Ibn Zayd and their likes. He did not quote from any of the tafsīr scholars of the Imāmiyyah. He did not even mention narrations from any of the Aʿimmah, except a few on some occasions, which perhaps the opposition agreed with

---

\(^1\) Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/246
him regarding quoting them. In fact, he counted the first ones (the above mentioned mufassirīn) in the first category of Mufassirs, whose methods are praised and their madh-habs commended. This is quite strange, if it was not done simply to toe the line (of the opposition)... Among that which supports the view that this book was written in Taqiyyah is the statement of the glorious master, 'Alī ibn Ṭāwūs in Saʿd al-Saʿūd. His exact words are:

We will mention that which my grandfather, Abū Jaʿfar Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, relates in the book al-Tibyān. Complying with the demands of Taqiyyah, he sufficed upon it; granting superiority to the Makkī over the Madanī and differences regarding its times...¹

Thereafter, al-Nūrī comments on the quoted statement of Ibn Ṭāwūs saying:

هو - يعني ابن طاوس - أعرف بما قال من وجوه لا يخفى على من اطلع على مقامه فتأمل

He (Ibn Ṭāwūs) knows best (the meaning) of his statement from angles which will not be vague for the one who realises his position. Thus ponder over it.²

The above text makes it quite clear that al-Tibyān of al-Ṭūsī was written with the purpose of Taqiyyah, as is the view of the leading scholar of present day Shīʿah. However, it is also possible that al-Ṭūsī wrote it to please the intellectuals who would not be impressed by the base and gross misinterpretations of the meanings of Qurʾān by his people, who had the nerve to call it Tafsīr. He could have also been influenced to adopt some moderation and fairness as a result of his intermingling with some of the Sunnī scholars of Baghdād.

¹ Al-Nūrī did not quote the full text.
² Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 35 (page 17 of the manuscript copy)
This means that the Shi‘ah of today, who could be represented by al-Nūrī (whose book —*Mustadrak al-Wasā’il* — they have accepted as their reliable source of ḥadīth\(^1\) which proves his lofty standing in their eyes) are extremist fanatics of the highest level. This is why they view the *Tafsīr* of al-Ṭūsī and the books of those authors who treaded his path as works which were written only on account of the opposition. Thus, Taqiyyah was the soul of all of these writings, with the ultimate goal being merely to blend Shī‘ī beliefs with the beliefs of non- Shī‘ah.

The reader must have noticed, from the comments of the leading scholar of the Shī‘ah regarding the book *al-Tibyān* that Taqiyyah was largely responsible for the consecration of extremism in this sect and burying every intelligent voice and unbiased view. These would simply be interpreted to be Taqiyyah, as they assumed them to be harmonious with the views of the Ahl al-Sunnah. The consequence of this was that this sect remained trapped in this locked cycle. Taqiyyah served as a fort behind which they would take shelter on every occasion that the breezes of rectification and the winds of change would blow in their direction, as will appear under the discussion of Taqiyyah.

We would also like to bring to the attention of the reader that whatever we stated regarding the book of al-Ṭūsī is also applicable to the book *Majma‘ al-Bayān* of al-Ṭabarsī, as he adopted the methodology of al-Ṭūsī. He admits this in the introduction of his *Tafsīr* saying:

... إلا ما جمعه الشيخ الأجل السعيد أبو جعفر محمد بن الحسن الطوسي قدس الله روحه من كتاب التبيان، فإن الكتاب الذي يقتبس منه ضياء الحق ويلوح عليه رواه الصدق... وهو القدوة أستضيء بأنواره وأطلآ مواقع آثاره

... except that which was gathered by the great and fortunate scholar Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī — may Allah sanctify his soul — in

---

1 Refer to the chapter “al-Sunnah” in this book.
the book *al-Tibyān*, as this is the book from which the light of the truth is obtained and the splendour of honesty is seen... He is the exemplary (personality) from whose illumination I seek light and in whose footsteps I walk.¹

¹ *Majma’ al-Bayān* 1/20
Discussion Three

Do the Shī‘ah Believe that the Qur’ān was Interpolated?

A Preamble to the Subject:

This discussion begins with a question due to three reasons;

Firstly, many of the senior scholars of the Shī‘ah, the likes of al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, Ibn Bābawayh a-Qummī, etc., distance themselves from this view.

Secondly, all Muslims are unanimous upon the belief (fact) that the Book of Allah is protected by Allah, who says:

َلاَ یَتَآیِهِ الْبَاطِلُ مِنْ بَيْنِ يَدَیْهِ وَ لَآَ مِنْ خَلْقِهِ

Falsehood cannot approach it from before it or from behind it.¹

Thus, whoever entertains doubts regarding the protection of the Qur’ān from alterations and truncations is immediately cast out of the fold of Islam. This spells out to us the condition of one who firmly believes that alterations and truncations took place. Due to the severity of the consequences, it was binding upon us to take extra caution in this study of ours as far as attributing this type of disbelief to any sect. Therefore, the attributions which will follow were done after a meticulous research in which great caution was applied.

Thirdly, there is a group of intellectuals who attribute this kufr to the all the Shī‘ah, without differentiating between them. This is undoubtedly incorrect, as there are many sects among the Shī‘ah, and the sect passed through many phases. One cannot say, for example, that the early Shī‘ah

1 Sūrah al-Fuṣṣilat: 42
held this belief.\(^1\) Neither can it be said that the Zaydiyyah subscribe to this lie. Therefore, it is incorrect and unacceptable to generalise and attribute this belief to all the Shi‘āh.

Nonetheless, a Muslim researcher is left aghast after setting his sight upon these malevolent and repugnant words which emerge from midgets who try to stretch their evil hands in an attempt to carry out an assault against the Book of Allah. It is only on the basis of necessity that a subject such as this is discussed. However, the reader should understand that a discussion regarding this subject cannot be written in defence of the Qur‘ān, as the Qur‘ān has no need to be defended. It is beyond the phantasms of those who have succumbed to wishful thinking and its grandeur is unaffected by the accusations of bigots and claimants who are driven by ulterior motives. Can the palm of a human ever conceal the Sun or the Moon?

A bigot who is taught that he had been wronged will not hesitate to present false claims. Hence, it does not befit us to scrutinise and refute every single claim that is made against us or our beliefs. The poet says:

> If I place a stone in the mouth of every dog that barks, each gram would be worth a gold coin.

Similarly, false beliefs and claims should be ignored and they should not be granted any attention, leaving them to fade away and disappear. However, once they become common, gain fame or they are adopted by any sect — especially when they are preserved in books — then it becomes necessary to expose the deviation of the one who uttered it as well as the falsity therein.

---

1. Iḥsān Ilāhī Ẓahīr bought into the theory of the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb, who claimed that none of the former Shi‘āh rejected this belief except these four (i.e. Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, al-Murtaḍā, al-Tabarsī and al-Ṭūsī). Iḥsān says, “in a nutshell; the former as well as the latter Shi‘āh, almost all of them, agreed upon the belief that the Qur‘ān was changed and altered.” Al-Shī‘ah wa l-Sunnah pg. 122, printed by Dār al-Anṣār. The reality is that this doctrine was introduced at a much later stage than the actual formation of the Shi‘āh. The former Shi‘āh were not upon this deviation and there are still some sects of the Shi‘āh who do not accept this falsehood.
I deem it necessary to clarify, at this juncture, that the motive behind the study of this matter is not to refute and counter the belief of the opposition. Rather, it is only to establish whether or not the Shīʿah subscribe to this belief. If it is established to be their belief, they will be utterly disgraced and their foundations will be smashed to smithereens. Who will then accept anything that they say? Will any word that emerges from their mouths hold any weight? Is it possible that a Muslim takes the word or accepts the judgement of the one who attacks the Book of Allah?  

Therefore, we are penning down this research so that the truth behind the attribution of this belief to the Shīʿah may come to the fore. This is because the one who wishes to lay any type of attack upon the Book of Allah and attempts to challenge its divinity is far out of the fold of Islam, even if insists that he should be called a Muslim. It is necessary to expose him so that the ummah can be aware of his enmity for Islam. He is attacking its extraordinary basis and its immovable foundation.

Merely attributing this view to the one who subscribes to it is sufficient, absolves us of the responsibility of refuting it, as stated by Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī. This is because it is even logically impossible, on account of the amount and reliability of the measures that were kept in place to protect it, that the Qur’ān surrendered to any alterations or truncations. This was a fulfilment of the promise of Allah:

\[
\text{اِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّکْرَ وَ اِنَّا لَه لَحٰفِظُوْنَ}
\]

Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e. the Quran], and indeed, We will be its guardian.

---

1 This is why we see that Ibn Ḥazm, when challenged by the Christians — who used that which is attributed to the Rāfiḍah as evidence to prove that the Qur’ān was interpolated — replied by saying that these people are not Muslims. They are a group who sprung up against Islam and the Muslims. The first sign of them was seen twenty five years after the demise of Rasūlullāh ٓ. Refer to al-Fiṣal (2/80)
2 ʿIjāz al-Qur’ān pg. 24, researched by Aḥmad Ṣaqr
3 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9
Another aspect regarding this claim, which could also be found in Shi‘ī circles (the extent to which they accept it or deny it will be studied as well) is that it was given birth to whilst the causes of its extinction and the proofs of its falsity and fallaciousness were already kept in it. Whoever concocted this view really did a putrid job. Therefore, it exposes and contradicts itself. The claim is that the Qur‘ān is incomplete and that the complete Qur‘ān, which is protected from any distortions was in the possession of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib [309] who then passed it on to the next Imām until it reached their hidden and awaited Mahdī.

Thus, this claim is intertwined with the personality of ‘Alī [309]. However, he is the one who decided that the Qur‘ān should be the basis of judgements during his khilāfah, he recited it and he complied, believing that that is the only way to please Allah. If he had any other Qur‘ān in his possession, he would have definitely shown it to the public. How could it be permissible for him to comply to a distorted book as far as seeking the pleasure of Allah was concerned?

If any of their claims had any truth to them, he would have definitely brought out the complete Qur‘ān which he had gathered, compared it to the distorted one and solved the matter, especially during the days of his khilāfah. Any other possibility simply cannot be true, as the one who allows the masses to fall prey to the deception of another is just as guilty as the one who deceived them. Added to that, the issue on the basis of which he fought a war against Mu‘āwiyah [357] was a really minor issue compared to this one (even though it was sufficient a reason for the war to take place). Hence, it defies all logic to claim that Amīr al-Mu‘minīn done nothing (publicly) to solve this issue.

The champions of this lie have no answer to this crucial question, which destroys their foundations, besides a statement of their scholar Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī [361]:

1 He holds an extremely lofty position according to them. They have showered him with a many honorary titles such as al-Sayyid (the master), al-Sanad (the pillar of support), al-Rukn al-Mu‘tamad (the reliable pillar of support), al-Muḥaddith al-Nabīh, al-Muḥaqqiq, al-Nihīrīr and al-Muḍāqqiq al-ʿAzīz al-Naẓīr. They believe that he was among the most senior scholars of the latter day Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, a great and invaluable Muḥaddith, an outstanding researcher, etc. He died in the year 1112 A.H. Refer to Amal al-Āmāl 2/336, al-Kunnā wa l-Alqāb 3/298, Safinat Al-Biḥār 2/601, Muqaddimah Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah.
When Amīr al-Muʿminīn sat upon the seat of khilāfah, he could not present this Qur’ān and hide that one as it meant open disparagement of those who preceded him.¹

This is their answer and excuse! Can there be a greater attack and insult against the personality of Amīr al-Muʿminīn — from those who claim to be his ardent supporters? They accuse him of preferring diplomacy in the matter of those who preceded him over the guidance of the ummah! This is the only reason why he did not show the public the Qur’ān that he had in his possession. Glory be to Allah, indeed this is a horrendous accusation!

Amongst the many sad but laughable aspects of this doctrine is that the second personality with whom it is intertwined is their hidden Imām, whose birth and existence can never be established (as will be proven later). Both, the hidden Imām as well as the hidden copy of the Qur’ān are nothing but figments of their imagination. Furthermore, the words that they have managed to put together, which they present as verses that have been discarded from the copies of the Qur’ān further expose the lack of substance of this claim.

The closest match to these sentences are the claims of the great liar and imposter, Musaylamah. You will not be able to make sense of these statements in light of the Arabic language, and the eloquence thereof refutes all possibilities of it being accurate. Later, they decided to cover their tracks by claiming that these sentences cannot be relied upon, they should not be considered as part of the Qur’ān and it is impermissible to recite them as they are transmitted by very few people at some point. Also, the Imāms recited this Qur’ān (the original Qur’ān, which they disbelieve in) and used it, so it is not permissible to leave out that which they have agreed upon on the basis of this type of narrations.

¹ Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah 2/326
Thereafter, a group from them who blessed with some intelligence dissociated themselves from this kufr, as they saw the stark contradictions in it as well the clear falsity thereof. Subsequently, they publicised its falsity and ridiculed those who subscribed to it. In this way, Allah lifted this burden off the shoulders of the Muslims. This war between the two groups (the Shi`ah who subscribe to this belief and those who do not) appears in the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. Further details will be mentioned later, if Allah wills.

To sum up the above, this belief is self-contradictory and its falsity has been exposed through the statements of those who believe in it as well. This is a great sign for the Muslims, and a clear proof as far as the grandeur of the Qur’ān is concerned. It is a manifestation of one of the secrets of its miraculous nature, which cannot be completely comprehended by the intellect. This belief and the matters around it are a demonstration of the fulfilment of the promise of Allah by Him, to guard His Book.

Next, we will study the stance of the Shi`ah on this matter, when it started, how it spread and remained, who is the one who had the greatest share in concocting it and is it the belief of all the Shi`ah, or are there some amongst them who reject it and dissociate themselves from it? We will start off by quoting that which is mentioned in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, after which these quotations will be judged or proven by that which is mentioned in the books of the Ithnā `Ashariyyah.

### The Birth of this Doctrine – as Stated in the Books of the Ahl al-Sunnah

Imām Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim al-Anbārī\(^1\) says:

> The honourable and intelligent ones have always honoured the nobility of the Qur’ān and admitted its lofty status... it is only in this era of ours

---

1 Muhammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn Muhammad, Abu Bakr al-Anbārī. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī says, “he was a truthful, virtuous, pious and from the Ahl al-Sunnah. He authored many books on the sciences of the Qur’ān, Waqf, Ibtidā and he wrote books in refutation of those who opposed the common copy of the Qur’ān. He was among the most learned of people regarding the linguistic aspects and tafsīr of the Qur’ān.” Refer to *Tārīkh Baghdād* 3/181-186.
that one who had deviated from the religion and attacked the ummah by means of that with which he wishes to annul the sharīʿah has risen his head... he claims that the copy which was gathered by ʿUthmān and authenticated by all the Ṣaḥābah is not the complete Qurʾān. Rather, five hundred letters have been deleted from it.

Thereafter Ibn al-Anbārī mentions:

This irreligious one began reciting verses of the Qurʾān against the way in which they were (revealed). He would recite:

ولقد نصركم الله ببدر بسيف علي وأنتم أذلة

Indeed Allah helped you at Badr by means of the sword of ʿAlī, when you were disgraced.¹

This was stated by Ibn al-Anbārī who was born in the year 271 A.H. and he passed away in the year 328 A.H. This indicates that the belief was given birth to at the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth century. The above text also indicated that this belief was concocted by the Shīʿah, hence the words “the sword of ʿAlī”. A third point indicated in this text is that the Muslim ummah had not heard of beliefs of this kind prior to the appearance of this irreligious individual. It seems as if Ibn al-Anbārī is referring to a specific person, but for some reason, he does not name him. However, his sectarian inclinations could be gauged from the words of his concoctions.

Al-Milṭī (d. 377 A.H.) indicates that this concoction was the work of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam.² He claimed that the Qurʾān which is in the hands of the Muslims was

---

¹ Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī 1/82
² He was of Kūfī origin. He stayed in Baghdad and he grew up in the care of some heretics. Initially, he subscribed to the beliefs of the Jahmiyyah, after which he adopted the belief of Tajsīm (anthropomorphism)... many deviant beliefs have been reported from him. The Shīʿah Hishāmiyyah attribute books regarding sects to him. He died in the year 179 A.H as stated in Rijāl al-Kashshī.
created during the days of ʿUthmān. As for the true Qurʾān, it was raised to the heavens on account of the Ṣaḥābah ʿalā of Rasūlullāh ʿṣṣ turning renegade (as he believes). Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam died in the year 190 A.H., which means that this concocted belief began before the date indicated by Ibn al-Anbārī.

If we ponder over the fact that this lie has a strong connection with the doctrine of Imāmah and the Imāms, which is a belief of the Shīʿah, as well as the fact the scholars of the Shīʿah had to hunt for proofs of this doctrine in the Qurʾān (which contains none) and they could not find anything to prove their claims, they were compelled to accept this concoction as well as others. If we ponder over all of this, then the view of al-Milṭī, that Hishām is the one who concocted this view, makes perfect sense, especially since he was also among the first ones to speak regarding Imāmah. Ibn al-Nadīm stated that Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam was among those who broke the silence on the matter of Imāmah and among his books was Kitāb al-Imāmah.

Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī says:

وکان ممن فتق الكلام في الإمامة وهذب المذهب بالنظر

He was among those who broke the silence regarding Imāmah, and he systemised the madh-hab on the basis of logic.

Another reason, on the basis of which, we are allowed to believe that Hishām was the one who concocted this view is the following text which appears in Rijāl al-Kashshī, the prime book of the Shīʿah on the subject of biographies:

continued from page 273


1 Al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd pg. 25
2 Al-Fahrist pg. 175
3 Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 178
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Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam was from the students of Abū Shākir, and Abū Shākir was a zindīq.¹ ²

Qāḍī ʿAbd al-Jabbār, the Muʿtazilī, states:

Hishām... he was not from the Ahl al-Qiblah. He was infamous for his hatred for the ambiyā’. He was a companion of Abū Jaʿfar al-Dayṣānī.³ (The leader of the Daysāniyyah).⁴

He was associated with him and he was his companion, however he claimed that he belonged to the Shīʿah and he is a supporter of the Banu Hāshim. Consequently, some of the companions of al-Mahdī al-ʿAbbāsī set him free and did not imprison him along with the Abū Shākir.⁵ He was a man who was nurtured by the zindīqs, thus it came as no surprise that he followed in their footsteps. He was advised — as recorded in Rijāl al-Kashshī — to adopt silence when al-Mahdī al-ʿAbbāsī started a campaign to crackdown upon all the Zindiqs.⁶ Hishām says:

فكففت عن الكلام حتى مات المهدي

Thus, I did not speak at all until al-Mahdī passed away.⁷

---

¹ A person who claims to be Muslim, but holds such beliefs which cast him out of the fold of Islam.
² Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 278
³ Refer to Ibn al-Nadīm: al-Fahrist pg. 338
⁴ A group of idolaters who believe in the two principles; light and darkness, and that the world emerged from them. It is regarded as the foundation of Mānūyah. The two sects only differ regarding the manner in which light mixes with darkness. Al-Milal wa al-Niḥal 1/250, Ibn al-Nadīm: al-Fahrist pg. 338, 339
⁵ Tathbīt Dalāʿil al-Nubuwwah pg. 225
⁶ Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 265-256
⁷ Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 266
All of these signs indicate that Hishām and his group were the culprits. The least that this text proves is that this belief was introduced in the era of Hishām. Another text which indicates that this belief existed at that time is that which Ibn Ḥazm reports from al-Jāḥiẓ:

Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm al-Niẓām and Bishr ibn Khālid informed me that they said to Muḥammad ibn Jaʿfar1 the Rāfiḍī who was famously known as Shayṭān al-Ṭāq (the devil of the arch), “woe unto you! Do you not feel ashamed before Allah. You stated in your book regarding Imāmah that Allah did not ever say in the Qur’ān “one of two, when they were in the cave and he [i.e., Muḥammad] said to his companion, ‘Do not grieve; indeed Allah is with us.’”2 They related, “by the oath of Allah, Shayṭān al-Ṭāq let out such a prolonged laugh, as if we were the ones who sinned.”3

This narration is reported by Ibn Ḥazm who quotes al-Jāḥiẓ. Ibn Ḥazm states regarding al-Jāḥiẓ, after considering him to be a deviate:

We have not seen him lying intentionally in his books or establishing them, although he does quote many lies of other people.4

Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was the title of Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Nuʿmān Abū Jaʿfar al-Aḥwal. He died in the year 160 A.H.5 It is well known that Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was a contemporary of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam. Ibn Ḥajar says:

---

1 This name appears in the researched copy of al-Fiṣal. However, the more correct name would be Abu Jaʿfar, as his father was ‘Alī. This is stated in the books regarding biographies.
2 Sūrah al-Towbah: 40
3 Al-Fiṣal 5/39
4 Al-Fiṣal 5/39
5 The following statement, among other deviate beliefs, is attributed to him, “Allah does not know of an occurrence until it takes place.” The sects Shayṭāniyyah and Nuʿmāniyyah, from the extremist Shīʿah are attributed to him. Refer to Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 185, Rijāl al-Najāshī pg. 249, Lisān al-Mīzān 5/300-301, Firaq al-Shīʿah of al-Nawbakhtī pg. 78, Saḥīfah al-Bīhār 1/323, Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/111, al-Mīlal wa al-Nihāl 1/186, Al-Intīsār by Ibn al-Khayyāṭ pg. 14-48
It is said that when Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, the leader of the Rāfiḍah, was informed that they gave him the title Shayṭān al-Ṭāq, he named him (from his side) Muʿmin al-Ṭāq.

Thus, he could have been one of Hishāms accomplices as far as this concoction is concerned, just as he had his share in writing on the subject of Imāmah — the main cause and basis of this concoction, as indicated by the texts of thereof.

The Spread of this Belief Amongst Them – as Explained in the Books of the Ahl al-Sunnah

Thereafter, this belief spread amongst the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah, who are referred to by al-Ashʿarī and others as al-Rāfiḍah until it became — as mentioned by al-Ashʿarī (d. 330 A.H) — the view of a group of these Rawāfiḍ. They claimed that (words) of the Qurʿān were deleted. As far as additions are concerned, they accepted that it was impossible to have happened. Similarly, they believed that it was impossible for anything in it to have been changed. However much of it was deleted, but the Imām has complete knowledge regarding it.¹

Another group, who al-Ashʿarī describes as people who married Imāmah and Iʿtizāl chose to refute this belief. They stated, “nothing was deleted from the Qurʿān and nothing was added to it. It is exactly as Allah revealed it to His Nabī , it was not changed or altered. It has always been in its original form.”²

There is a third group, which apparently, has been omitted.³

---

¹ *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/119-120
² *Ibid* 1/119-120
³ This is the impression we get from the printed version of *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, which was researched by Muḥammad Muḥy al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd (vol. 1 pg. 120). The other print of the book, which was researched by Helmut Rueter, states that the researcher found a footnote in some of the manuscripts which reads, “one group was omitted from the sequence and the count. They are those who accept that additions could have been made but not deletions.” Refer to the footnote of *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* (pg. 47), researched by Helmut Reuter. This is at times the action of the one who copied the book, as he did not find any of the Shīʿah subscribing to this belief. Al-Ṭūsī has mentioned in *al-Tībān* and al-Ṭabarsī in *Majmaʿ al-Bayān* (1/30) that it is agreed upon, in their circles, that additions are impossible.
Al-Baghdādī (d. 429 A.H.) indicates that the Rāfiḍah are the ones who claim that the Şaḥābah distorted some portions of the Qur’ān and changed others. He cited this as one of the reasons for it being incumbent to declare them disbelievers (kāfir) and state that they have left the fold of Islam. It seems as if this drivel took root amongst majority of members of this sect to the extent that Ibn Ḥazm (d. 465 A.H.) ascribes this belief to all the groups of the Imāmiyyah, excluding only three of their influential scholars, who were saved from falling into this profanity.

Similarly, Qāḍī Abu Ya’lā (d. 458 A.H.) attributes this belief to the Rāfiḍah, which is one of the names of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, as explained. However, we find that Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 A.H) attributed this belief to the Bāṭiniyyah. He states:

Similarly (the judgement of Kufr will be passed against) those who believe that the verses of the Qur’ān were deleted, hidden, has a secret interpretation, etc. These people are named al-Qarāmiṭah and al-Bāṭiniyyah.

It is unclear whether Ibn Taymiyyah considered the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah to be from the Bāṭiniyyah or it slipped him that they hold this view, which is why he did not mention them. It is also possible that he was concentrating specifically upon the last cause, i.e. secret interpretations which is firmly upheld by the al-Qarāmiṭah al-Bāṭiniyyah. Whatever the case may be, I did not come across in the writings

1 Refer to Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq
2 Refer to al-Fiṣal 5/40
3 Al-Mu’tamad fi Uṣūl al-Dīn pg. 258. Qāḍī Abū Ya’lā explains the ignorance required to end up making a claim the like of this one, wherein the Rawāfiḍ have denied the obvious and that which is reported by almost everyone. This is because the Qur’ān was compiled (in the form of a book, as previously it was memorised and written, but not in one place in the form of a book) in the presence of the Şaḥābah among whom was ʿAlī. All of them agreed upon it, without any objections raised. It is impossible, even according to the norms of society, that if they did delete or change anything, there would be no objections, at least. Most definitely ʿAlī and others would have said something. However, the reality is that he recited it and applied it! (al-Mu’tamad pg. 258)
4 Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl pg. 586
of Ibn Taymiyyah, as far as what I have read in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (which was a rebuttal of their scholar Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī) and his other published works that he attributes this belief to the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah.

Mīrzā Makhdūm al-Shīrāzī (of the tenth century) reveals to us (as he lived amongst the Shīʿah and he read many of their books — as stated by him¹):

They mention in their books of ḥadīth and their textbooks on doctrine that ʿUthmān deleted verses of the Qurʾān, according to them.

Thereafter he cites a few examples. Among them is the following claim regarding Sūrah al-Inshirāḥ:

After the verse:

و رَفَعْنَا لَكَ ذِکْرَك

And raised high for you your repute.²

Allah said:

و علیا صهرك

And ʿAlī is your son in law.³

---

¹ He mentions that he was forced to live amongst them due to which he had no choice but to mingle with them and read their books... This is how he came to find out their false beliefs and concoctions. Refer to *al-Nawāqiḍ* (scroll 110, 151 and 165 of the manuscript). He goes on to say, “none discovered the details of their books, beliefs and the explanations of their habits and actions in the way that I have. Thus, they cannot say, ‘he lied against us.’ As they claim regarding that which is attributed to the Rāfiḍah in the books of doctrine authored by our predecessors.” (scroll 87)

² Sūrah al-Inshirāḥ: 4

³ *Al-Nawāqiḍ* scroll 103. Shaykh Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb states: “They do not feel shy to make this claim despite knowing that this surah was revealed in Makkah, and the only son in law of Nabī at that time was al-ʿĀṣ ibn al-Rabī al-Umawī!” *al-Khuṭūṭ al-Arīḍah* pg. 15
Muṭahhar ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn ʿAlī ibn Ismāʿīl, in his book *Takfīr al-Shīʿah* (which was authored in the year 990 A.H.), mentions that the Shīʿah of his era burnt copies of the Qurʿān, showed gross disrespect to it and they produced a new version thereof.¹ A personality from the thirteenth century indicates towards the statements of the Shīʿah regarding the interpolation of the Qurʿān, after which he states that the word was going around in his era that the Shīʿah produced two Sūrahs, claiming that these were hidden by ʿUthmān; each of these Sūrahs were equivalent to a juz of the Qurʿān. They were added to the end of the Qurʿān and their names were Sūrah al-Nūrayn and Sūrah al-Walā.²

This matter is further clarified by the author of *al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah*, Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Dehlawī (d. 1239 A.H.) who states that the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah believe that the Ṣaḥābah changed the Book of Allah and deleted from it that which was related to the virtues of ʿAlī and their other Imāms as well as that which was related to their enemies. He then quotes a few examples to prove this from their books. He explains that by doing so, they have opposed the divine texts, logic, that which is obvious to the one who has any knowledge regarding Islam as well as the undisputed and authentic accounts of history. He also states that the Ahl al-Bayt were free of this heresy and that some of the scholars of the Shīʿah, the likes of Ibn Bābawayh began rejecting it.³

Abū al-Thanā al-Ālusī (d. 1270 A.H.) touches upon the subject in his *Tafsīr*. He quotes a few examples from their books, followed by an explanation of their falsity on the basis of the impeccable systems that were put in place to guarantee its protection. They were such that a muʾmin is left convinced that no portion

---

1 *Takfīr al-Shīʿah*, scroll 58 (of the manuscript). He mentioned this under the chapter, “the chapter regarding Tahmasp the illegitimate, his irreligiousness and an explanation of his disbelief and blasphemy.” Tahmasp was the son of Shāh Ismāʿīl ibn Ḥaydar al-Ṣafawī. He was born in the year 919 A.H. and he was one of the kings of the Ṣafawid dynasty. He occupied the throne after the death of his father, in the year 930 A.H., and he belonged to the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah. Refer to *Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif* (al-Shīʿah) vol. 6 pg. 321.

2 Refer to *Risālat al-Radd ʿalā al-Rāfidah* pg. 14

3 Refer to *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah* pg. 82, 30, 50, 52.
of this Qur’ān could have been left unprotected and deleted. If anyone doubts this, he will go on to doubt many other aspects of the dīn which are established beyond doubt.

He further states that when some of their scholars realised the drastic consequences of such a view, they jumped out of the cauldron by stating that it is only a few of their scholars. As proof, he cited the statements of the leading scholar of the Shī‘ah al-Ṭabarsī, which appears in Majma’ al-Bayān that the Shī‘ah reject this view and it is only the view of a group from amongst them. The contradictory view is the accurate one. Thereafter al-Ālūsī comments, “this is a statement which he was forced to make on account of the obviousness — even to children — of the falsity of the view held by his companions. Praise be to Allah upon the triumph of the truth, and Allah removed the burden of countering them from the Muslims.”¹

Perhaps al-Ālūsī (Abū al-Thanā) was the first person to write on the subject so extensively (compared to others) in Arabic, as he added to his study of this fabrication direct quotations from their own sources. He quoted their narrations verbatim from Uṣūl al-Kāfī and other books. He also mentioned the other view held by some of the Shī‘ah who rejected this lie, used their statements as proof and analysed it as well. His grandson, the leading scholar of Iraq, Abū al-Ma‘ālī al-Ālūsī (d. 1342) followed in his footsteps by explaining that the Shī‘ah fell prey to this kufr, in his booklets which he compiled or summarised regarding the Shī‘ah.

Muḥammad Rashīd Ridā (d. 1352 A.H.) was the next person to discuss this matter. He disgraces the Shī‘ah time and again in his magazine, al-Manār², and thereafter in his booklet al-Sunnah wa al-Shī‘ah. He did this after being provoked, or rather, forced by the fanaticism and enmity of some of the scholars of the Shī‘ah — as said by him. He mentions that the Rāfiqah Shī‘ah claim that whatever is between the

¹ Rūḥ al-Ma‘ānī 1/33
² Refer to vol. 29 pg. 436
two covers is not the speech of Allah. Instead, the Ṣaḥābah, according to them, deleted some verses as well as the Sūrah of Wilāyah.¹

Thereafter came Mūsā Jār Allah (d. 1369 A.H.) who lived among the Shīʿah for a while, explored their cities, attended their lessons in the Masjids classrooms and houses and read many of their important books.² He was of the view that the belief of the Qurʾān being distorted by deleting a few words and verses which were revealed as well as by changing the sequence of the words and verses is something that is agreed upon in the books of the Shīʿah.³

These words and verses, as they claim, were regarding ‘Alī and his progeny Ⲥⲧⲧ. They were deleted by the Ṣaḥābah Ⲥⲧⲧ of Rasūllullāh Ⲥⲧⲧ. He goes on to quote Shīʿī scholars who claim that the narrations concerning this lie are of the highest degree of authenticity, according to them. Rejecting these narrations would necessitate the rejection of all their narrations regarding Imāmah, Rajʿah, etc. All of them will then be declared false.⁴

He noticed, during his stay among the Shīʿah at that time, the ill-effects of this belief upon the Shīʿī population, as none of the students or scholars had memorised the Qurʾān. They could not even articulate the words correctly, or even to some extent. They had abandoned the Qurʾān completely.⁵ He then asks, “is this because

²⁸²

---

¹ Al-Sunnah wa l-Shīʿah pg. 43
² Al-Washīʿah pg. 25-26
³ Al-Washīʿah pg. 104
⁴ Al-Washīʿah pg. 138
⁵ He sought some information regarding this glaring calamity from some of the scholars of the Shīʿah in the form of a small paper upon which he wrote (questions) regarding this matter as well as others, but he found no one to answer him. Refer to Al-Washīʿah pg. 27-28. Thereafter, he wrote a booklet in which he mentioned many of the false Shīʿī beliefs and he presented it to leader of the mujtahids of the Kāẓimiyah of Baghdād. Copies of this were made and distributed by al-Rābiṭat al-ʿIlmiyyah to the lecturers of Najaf. He mentions that after waiting for more than a year, he received no reply from the mujtahids of the Shīʿah. It was only the grand mujtahid of the Shah of Baghdād who responded with a ninety page dictionary of vulgarity, directed towards the first century and its people. His language therein was amazingly worse than that which was already contained in the books of the Shīʿah. Al-Washīʿah pg. 98, 117-118.
they are waiting for that which they have been promised in their fairy tales, that the complete Qur’ān will appear with their awaited and promised Mahdī?”

Later, Muḥīb al-Dīn al-Khāṭīb (d. 1389 A.H.), on account of the Shīʿah establishing Dār al-Taqrīb Bayn al-Madhāhib al-Īslāmiyyah in the land of Kinānah, as a ploy to spread their belief of Raḍī among its inhabitants, began writing about them in his magazine al-Fath and in his booklet al-Khūṭūṭ al-ʿAridah. He discusses this lie and he cites as proof that which appears in the book Faṣl al-Khiṭāb fī Ithbāt Tahrīf Kitāb Rabb al-Arbāb (the decisive speech in proving that alterations took place in the book of the Rabb of all masters).

The author of this book was Mīrzā Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad Taqī al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, one of the senior scholars of Najaf, who was honoured by the Shīʿah to such an extent that upon his expiry (in the year 1320 A.H.), they buried him in the most blessed land according to them. He says that this book includes hundreds of narrations from their scholars which are contained in their reliable books, which establish that they were convinced that alterations took place and they believed in the idea without any reservations.

He also cites as proof the narrations which appear in the book al-Kāfī of al-Kulaynī, which holds the same position among them as Sahīḥ al-Bukhārī holds among the Ahl al-Sunnah. A picture of ‘Sūrah al-Wilāyah’ is presented by him, which he says is a photo of one of the copies of the Qur’ān in Iran. Thereafter he says, “there are two Qur’āns; one is common and known and the other is hidden and it is a special one. Sūrah al-Wilāyah is from the second one. He then quotes as proof a text which appears in their verdicts regarding recitation from the ‘Uthmānī Muṣḥaf (copies which comply with the script of the Qur’ān which were revealed to Rasūlullāh and written out in the era of ‘Uthmān). He then says that the elite members of the Shīʿah teach one another that which opposes it (the ‘Uthmānī Muṣḥaf), claiming that this (which they teach) is preserved by the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt.  

1 Refer to pg. 30-31, 112.
2 Al-Khūṭūṭ al-ʿAridah pg. 10-19
Similarly, Shaykh Maḥmūd al-Māl Allāh (d. 1389 A.H.) disgraced the Shīʿah in Iraq as far as this matter was concerned, in an effort to counter their scholar al-Khāliṣī, who attempted to spread Rafḍ under the banner of Islamic unity. Following in the footsteps of all of these scholars, Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṭahī wrote on this subject in his book *al-Shīʿah wa l-Sunnah*. He held the view that all the Shīʿah were entrapped in this kufr. He quotes extensively from their books, which contain the narrations of this fabrication. He believed that whoever rejected this view from them, done so due to Taqiyyah, not because they really believed so. He then says that he explained this matter in an unambiguous manner and he backed his views with proofs in a way that was never done before.

Iḥsān then wished to delve further into the issue, so he wrote the book *al-Shīʿah wa l-Qurʾān*. Herein, he arrives at the exact same conclusion as he arrived at in his previous book. Most of this book is simply a word for word quotation, without any comments or footnotes, of the book which is second to none among the books of the Shīʿah as far as covering this fabrication is concerned, i.e. *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb fī Ithbāt Taḥrīf Kitāb Rabb al-Arbāb*.

Strangely, Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṭahī arrives at the exact same conclusion as the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, even though the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, as will appear, only wrote his book to pacify a group of his brethren who rejected this kufr and refused to swallow it, citing as proof that which some of their earlier scholars stated in rejecting this lie. Thus, the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* wished to disprove their arguments by means of this book. Therefore, he claimed that the denial of the former scholars was nothing but Taqiyyah, or their lack of sufficient sources, as will appear.

Iḥsān adopted the exact same view as the author³ and Niʿmat Allah al-Jazāʿirī, that those who rejected this view done so only on the basis of Taqiyyah. The

---

1 Refer to his book *al-Waḥdat al-Islāmiyyah bayn al-Akdh wa l-Radd*
2 *Al-Sunnah wa l-Shīʿah* pg. 14
3 In the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* it becomes clear that there are two groups among the Shiʿah. One group believes in the lie, claiming that all those who denied it done so on account of taqiyyah. They claim that there is consensus among the Shīʿah regarding this kufr. The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, who — as stated — wrote this book specifically to refute the opposite view, supports this view (that it has been interpolated).
discussion and study of this subject will appear. Muḥammad Māl Allāh also wrote a book titled *al-Shīʿah wa Tahrīf al-Qurʾān*, in which he arrived at the conclusion that the scholars of the Shīʿah agreed upon the acceptance of this lie, citing as proof the statements of twelve of their scholars who accepted it. He did not indicate that there is a difference of opinion regarding this among them, even though a group of their scholars had rejected it.

Added to that, he cited as proof, two hundred of their narrations as examples of Shīʿī alterations to the Qurʾān. Similarly, he prepared a table regarding this, which he included in his commentary on the book *al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah*. This appears at the end of the book. These were extracted from some of the books of tafsīr and ḥadīth of the Shīʿah. However, some of these examples are not clear in this regard (i.e. being alterations) and they could very easily be placed in the category of interpretations. Another huge error committed by him, which was committed by Iḥsān before him, was that he mentioned some narrations of the Shīʿah in which variations of the recital of verses (which were reported by the pious predecessors as well) were reported and he ignorantly dismissed them as alterations.

The root cause of this problem was that they relied, without any reservation or thought, upon the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. There are other books as well, the authors of which fell prey to the same folly.¹ One of the most active personalities regarding

---

¹ Such as the book *Wa Jāʾa Dawr al-Majūs* (page 114) states that their rejection of alterations is Taqiyyah as they believe that the first three khulafāʾ, as well as the majority of the Ṣaḥābah were treacherous hypocrites, and the Qurʾān reached us by means of them. Another reason he cites to believe so is that they ask Allah to send mercy upon their scholars who openly state the opposite view. (page 117)
the problem of Shīʿism, Dr ʿAlī Aḥmad al-Sālūs, disagrees with Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb and others who attribute this view to all the Shīʿah. He is of the view that it is confined to the Akhbārīs. As for the Uṣūlīs, they reject this view. However, he is not totally convinced of the accuracy of this categorisation, as he asked one of the Marjaʾs (title of the high ranking Shīʿī scholars) of the Akhbārīs regarding this. The reply received by him was that alterations took place in the meanings only, not in the words. Dr Sālūs says, “he gave me a booklet which he wrote as a commentary upon a view which attacked the Shīʿah. The following also appears in this book:

٠ مذهبنا - ومذهب كل مسلم - بأن القرآن الكريم المتداول بين أيدينا ليس فيه أي تحريف بزيادة أو نقصان،
٠ وما ذكر في بعض الأحاديث بأن فيه تحريفاً ونقصاناً فهو خالف لعقیدتنا في القرآن الكريم الذي هو الذكر الحكيم، والذي لا يأتيه الباطل من بين يديه ولا من خلفه

Our view, and the view of every Muslim is that the Noble Qur’ān, which is common amongst us was not altered in any way, neither by additions nor by deletions. That which is mentioned in some aḥādīth books, that there were alterations made to it and deletions took place, is in contrast to our beliefs regarding the Noble Qur’ān, which is the Wise Reminder. Falsehood cannot approach it from before it or from behind it.

Dr Sālūs continues, “perhaps those who accept this lie are a group from the Akhbārīs, not all of them. The other possibility is that the statement mentioned in that booklet was stated on the basis of Taqiyyah.” He then attempts to prove this by another statement which appeared in the very same book, which will be reproduced hereunder:

٠ لم يقل الشيعة وأئمتهم بما حب من كرامة الخلفاء المرضيين.. وقد أجري الفتح والخير للمسلمین على يد أولئك الصالحين - عليهم سلام الله ورحمة ورضوانه أجمعين

The Shīʿah and their Imāms have never uttered any derogatory statements regarding the Khulafāʾ with whom everyone was happy... Indeed conquests and goodness became the lot of the Muslims at the hands of those pious ones. May the salutations of Allah, His mercy and His pleasure be upon all of them.
Dr Sālūs then goes on to say that it is clear and obvious that this is not the belief of the Shīʿah. Nonetheless, the scholars of Pakistan and India have also exerted themselves in exposing this great lie from the books of the Shīʿah, and bringing this to the attention of the Muslims. However their works are not in Arabic. This brings us to the end of the brief report on the work that took place against the lie under discussion. We cannot afford to carry out a detailed evaluation of these works, as this will be a digression from our actual topic.

I will endeavour to pen down a discussion regarding this subject from a different perspective, i.e. by studying and discussing its foundations and roots, its historical record and the opening of the road for this evil concoction to make its entrance, be heard and analysed. I have not come across anyone, thus far who has done this. I will also add a few matters, related to this topic, which have not yet been discussed.

Before lifting my pen regarding this subject, I wish to point out that some Shīʿī scholars whine and bellow, claiming that they have been oppressed concerning this subject, and that they are totally innocent. So what is the reality of the matter? We have seen a person who affiliates himself with the Ahl al-Sunnah, whose fervour drove him to gather all that is mentioned in the books of Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṭahīr and Muḥīb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, along with their references and present it to one of the scholars of the Shīʿah— seeking a response from him regarding it.

The Shīʿīs answer included the following text:

سلامة القرآن الكريم من التحریف موضع اتفاق وإجماع علماء الشیعة الإمامیة، ومن شذ منهم في هذه المسألة فلا يعبأ برأیه كما من شذ عن هذا الإجماع من علماء السنة

1 Refer to *Fiqh al-Shīʿah* pg. 148
2 As an example, refer to the book written by Shaykh ʿAbd al-Shakūr Fārūqī al-Lakhnawī which is titled, *Afsānah Tahrīf al-Qurʾān*. Afsānah means: a narrative or report.
3 Sālim al-Bahansawī in his book *Al-Sunnat al-Muftarā ʿalayhā*.
4 Muḥammad Mahdī al-Āṣīfī, as stated by the author, who describes him as ‘The truthful Imām and brother’. Al-Āṣīfī is a resident of Kuwait.
The (belief that) the Qur’ān is free from any alterations is a matter in which the scholars of the Imāmī Shīʿah are unanimous and they have reached a consensus. Attention should not be paid to the one whose personal opinion opposes this consensus, just as (is done) with the one who opposes this consensus from the scholars of the (Ahl) al-Sunnah.

This scholar then goes on to quote some of their senior scholars who rejected this view, along with an explanation that their aḥādīth have different ratings and not all are authentic. Thus saying, he dismissed the narrations quoted in the booklet as unreliable. He says:

We have realised that the unanimity of the sect and their agreement regarding the rejection of the doctrine that alterations took place in the Book of Allah. These narrations, irrespective of their abundance, are rejected by us. Also, do not ask, “why are these narrations preserved in our compilations?” as these are compilations which are subject to criticism and deliberation. They are not authentic enough to be accepted and practiced upon.

Due to the excessive rejection of this doctrine by the Shīʿah and their scholars — whether on the basis of Taqiyyah or due to this really being their belief — Dr Rushdī ʿAlyān says, “it is my view that as long as the reliable Shīṭ scholars believe that no changes, alterations, deletions and additions took place in the Book of Allah, these narrations, even if they are numerous, are rejected by us. Do not ask why these narrations are preserved in our compilations?”

---

1 Take note of the shameless accusation against the Ahl al-Sunnah. It cannot be proven that even one of their scholars held this blasphemous view. Here, we only wish to point out this accusation. We will discuss it at length, as well as the other mistakes and contradictions of this scholar under the discussion, “present-day Shīʿah and their relationship with their predecessors,” if Allah wills.

Allah, we should be satisfied with that. There is no need to repeat some rare views and quote baseless and fabricated narrations regarding it.”¹

Shaykh Raḥmat Allah al-Hindī states in his book *Iẓhār al-Ḥaq*, after quoting the speech of some of their scholars who have rejected the doctrine, “hence, it has become clear that the accurate view according to the scholars of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah Imāmi sect is that the Qur’ān which Allah revealed upon His Nabī is the same as that which is between the two covers, and in the possession of the masses. There is nothing more to it than that...”²

Thus far we have observed the following; that which appears in the book of the one who claims to be a Sunnī, the former scholars — such as al-Ashʿarī — were of the view that the Shīʿah split into two groups (the first group accepted this kufr and the second group rejected it). Thereafter, this lie was attributed to all the Rāfiḍah by al-Baghdādī and Abū Yaʿlā, Some of the latter day scholars — such as Abū al-Thanā al-Ālūsī, Dr Sālūs and others believed that the Shīʿah were divided into two groups as far as this belief was concerned.

Dr Sālūs differentiates between them by taking their names, saying that the Uṣūlīs rejected the narrations which promote this belief, which is the demand of their methodology in ḥadīth criticism. On the other hand, the Akhbārīs accept it as they accept all narrations which are attributed to their Imāms. Then, we seen an indication towards this difference of opinion in the speech of Shaykh Raḥmat Allah.

Next, we learnt that the view of Dr Rushdī ‘Alyān was that, besides the correct view, no other view should be attributed to the Shīʿah, as anything else is a rare or a fabricated narration. We also saw the other category of contemporaries, the likes of Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb and Iḥsān Ilāhī Ẓahīr among others, who believed that all the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah subscribe to this view. If any of them deny this, their denial is only on the basis of Taqiyyah, and it is not the truth.

¹ *Al-ʿAql ʿind al-Shīʿah al-Imāmiyyah* pg. 49
² *Iẓhār al-Ḥaq* pg. 77
After all of this, we decided to summon the reliable Shīʿī sources and make them speak for themselves. They should inform us of the reality of the matter. Is it so that lies and allegations have been circulating about them by some oppressors? Have some scholars attributed to hem that which they do not contain? Are the statements which are recorded in the books of sects far-fetched allegations and misinterpreted implications? Are they not established, or do they have a different interpretation? It has often been said, “the quotations (reproduced by) the opposition are unreliable.” Objectivity and justice are compulsory. Allah says:

وَ اِذَا حَكَمْتُمْ بَیْنَ النَّاسِ اَنْ تَحْكُمُوْا بِالْعَدْلِ

...and when you judge between people to judge with justice.  

وَلَ یَجْرِمَنَّكُمْ شَنَآٰنُ قَوْمٍ عَلٰٓٓی اَلَّ تَعْدِلُوْا

...and do not let the hatred of a people prevent you from being just. Be just; that is nearer to righteousness.

What Do the Shīʿī Sources Have to Say on this Subject?

Before holding the hand of the reader and bidding him farewell as he embarka on a journey, starting from the number zero of the first book written and compiled by the Shīʿah, we wish to highlight two contradictory voices. They exist and they are quite loud in almost every book of the Shīʿah in which this matter is discussed. Lending an ear to them will allow us to understand and fathom the reality of the matter in their circles. There will remain no vagueness in understanding it, even though the journey is one which includes lengthy pauses at the stations of the different Shīʿī books. The leading scholar of the Shīʿah of his time, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381 A.H.) — the author of Man lā Yaḥḍurū al-Faqīh, one of their four canonical books on ḥadīth states - :

1 Al-Qāsimī: Tārīkh al-Jahmiyyah wa l-Muʿtazilah pg. 22
2 Sūrah al-Nisā: 58
3 Sūrah al-Māʾīdah: 8
Our belief is that the Qur’ān which Allah revealed upon His Nabī, Muḥammad, is that which is between the two covers and in the hands of the masses. There is nothing more to it (than that)... Whoever attributes to us (anything which indicates) that we believe in anything other than that is a liar.¹

This is the view of the one who was given the title al-Ṣadūq by them. Among his brethren from the Shīʿah are some who stand with him regarding this view.

Al-Mufīd (d. 413 A.H.) says:

There are innumerable narrations from the Imāms of guidance from the family of Muḥammad regarding the differences of the Qur’ān and that which some of its critics have done, i.e. adding to it and deleting from it.²

He continues:

They have agreed (the Ṣaḥābah) that the Imāms of misguidance opposed (the truth) in a large portion of the compilation of the Qur’ān and

---

¹ Al-‘I’tiqādāt pg. 101-102
² Awā’il al-Maqālāt pg. 54
³ Here, he is referring to the senior Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh — with whom Allah is pleased and they are pleased with Him. These Ṣaḥābah were led by the four khulafā’, the fourth one being ‘Alī.
they turned away from the demands of that which was revealed as well as
the Sunnah of Nabī ﷺ.¹

Al-Mufīd — who they refer to as Rukn al-Islām (the pillar of Islam), Āyat Allāh al-
Malik al-ʿAllām (the great sign of Allah, the Master, the Knowledgeable) — is also
supported by some of their scholars.

These are two contradictory statements which were uttered by two of their
great scholars who lived in the same era and place and who subscribed to the
same belief system. In fact, al-Mufīd who is mentioned here was a student of
Ībn Bābawayh al-Qummī. Now, whose statement do we take? Which of the two
statements is a reflection of the view of the Shīʿah? We find that two students of
al-Mufīd, who are regarded to be among the greatest scholars of the Shīʿah, viz.
al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-Murtaḍā, hold the same view as Ibn Bābawayh, and that the
research scholars of the Shīʿah reject this blasphemous lie.

Each of these two views are supported by a group of Shīʿah. At times, each group
will claim that this is the only view held by the Shīʿah, and the attribution of a
different view to them, is a lie and an accusation. Deciphering these heaps of
contradictory statements, and getting to the truth is no easy task. Reflecting over
the fact that Taqiyyah is a fundamental principle of these people, to the extent
that “the one who does not do Taqiyyah has no ḍīn,” we realise that the reality
is hidden behind huge clouds of lies and deceptions, heaps of contradictory and
conflicting statements and deep valleys of Taqiyyah and concealment.

This is why, as will be seen under the discussion of Taqiyyah, the actual position of
the Shīʿī stance is at times unclear to the Shīʿī scholars as well. They cannot figure
out which of the two statements were said as a result of Taqiyyah. Among other
causes, this is why the madh-hab of the Imāms was destroyed as a result of this
dilemma. Hence we will study this matter from its inception. We will attempt to
distinguish the genuine statements from those which were said only on account

¹ Awā’il al-Maqālāt pg. 13
of Taqiyyah. This will be done by analysing the statements and comparing them to that which was written by the same author elsewhere in his books. I beseech Allah to protect us from accusing others of that which that they are not guilty and may He save us from major errors in our comments and verdicts.

This pivotal discussion — which will result in expelling the Shī‘ah from the ranks of the Muslims, should they be found guilty of holding the above belief as they are then guilty of opposing them in a matter in which all of them agree — will be presented in the following manner; firstly, I will trace the books which were responsible for spreading this kufr among the Shī‘ah, analysing each of them.

I will pause for a moment in this study to ascertain the following; which was the first book in which this lie was recorded, who was the first person to whom this statement could be traced and the reaction of the Shī‘ī scholars to these. This is an important aspect as far as studying the roots of this doctrine is concerned, and exposing the Saba‘ī hands which were accomplices in this crime.

Next, we will discuss the manner in which this lie found its way into all the books of the Shī‘ah. Thereafter, we will take a look at the subjects of these books and the texts therein which are related to the discussion of alterations in the Qur’ān, as well as the weight that these hold according to them. We will also shed some light on that which they refer to as Muṣḥaf ʿAlī (a secret version of the Qur’ān which they keep among themselves).

Lastly, we will examine the rejection of this kufr by some Shī‘ī scholars. Were they done merely out of Taqiyyah or was there any reality to them? All of our information will be taken directly from Shī‘ī sources, except for the comments which will be added when analysing a few aspects. If you find this discussion a bit lengthy, then understand that there was no other option as this is an absolutely grave matter. Added to that, there are huge differences amongst people as to whether the Shī‘ah should be regarded as kāfir or not on account of it, as you have already seen.
The Inception of this Lie — Taken Directly from the Books of the Shi‘ah

The first book in which this lie was recorded was *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays*\(^1\), which was reported from him by Abān ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh.\(^2\) No other person reported this besides Abān.\(^3\) This was “the first book of the Shi‘ah that came to the fore,” as stated by Ibn al-Naḍīm\(^4\) and others. The Shi‘ah have praised him abundantly, venerated him and lauded his book\(^5\) even though I could not find any details of

---

1 The books of the Shi‘ah state, “Sulaym ibn Qays al-Hilālī whose agnomen was Abū Ṣādiq. He was one of the companions of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn. He fled from Ḥajjāj who sought him and wanted to kill him. He sought protection from Abān ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh, who readily granted it to him. When he was about to die, Sulaym gave him a book, i.e. *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays*. He died in the year 90 A.H.”


2 Abān ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh Fayrūz Abū Ismāʿīl. Imām Aḥmad says, “his aḥādīth are discarded. People have discarded his ḥadīth a long time ago. His aḥādīth cannot be written. They are unacceptable.” Ibn Māʿīn said, “his aḥādīth are nothing!” Ibn al-Maḍīnī said, “he was weak.” Shu‘bah said, “Ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh; he would lie (when narrating) aḥādīth.” He died in the year 138 A.H. Refer to *Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb* 1/97-101, al-’Uqaylī: *al-Ḍuʿafā* 1/38-41, Ibn Abī Ḥātim: *al-Jarḥ wa l-Taʿdīl* 2/295-296. This is only some of the comments of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah. As for the Shi‘ī scholars, Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī said, “Abān ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh is extremely weak. Our scholars have attributed the concoction of *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* to him.” Al-Ardabīlī passed similar comments. Refer to Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 206, Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt 1/9


4 Al-Fahrist pg. 219, Al-Dharīʿah 2/152

5 They report from Abū ‘Abd Allah that he said regarding it, “if any of our lovers or Shi‘ah does not have in his possession the book of *Sulaym ibn Qays* al-Hilālī, then he has nothing of our matters by him and he knows nothing about our causes. It is the basic source of the Shi‘ah and one of the secrets of the progeny of Muḥammad ﷺ.” Foreward of *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* pg. 4, Aghā Buzrug al-Ṭahrānī: *Al-Dharīʿah* 2/152, the footnotes of *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 2/42. Al-Nuʿmānī said, “there is no difference of opinion between any of the Shi‘ah who possessed knowledge and reported it from the Imāms that *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays al-Hilālī* is a primary book and one of the most important basic books of which the scholars and narrators of ḥadīth of the Ahl al-Bayt, as well as the first ones. This is because whatever is contained in this foundational book is either from Rasūlullāh ﷺ, Amīr al-Mu‘minīn, al-Miqdād, Salmān al-Fārṣī, Abū Dhar and those who followed their footsteps from those who saw Nabī ﷺ and Amīr al-Mu‘minīn. He heard from both of them.
the author in all the books I referred to.\footnote{I referred to many sources of the Ahl al-Sunnah in an effort to find some details regarding him. However, nothing could be found. As an example, I could not find his name in the list of famous personalities who appear in Tārikh al-Ṭabarī which was prepared by Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm. Similarly, his name does not appear in Tārikh Ibn al-Athīr, as suggested by the lists prepared by Iḥsān ʿAbbās or Sayf al-Dīn al-Kātīb. Shadharāt al-Dhahab of Ibn al-ʿImād al-Ḥanbali, al-Bidāyah wa l-Nihāyah of Ibn Kathīr, Ṭabaqāt Ibn Saʿd, among other books, also do not have any mention of his name. We could not find his name in the books on narrators which include Lisān al-Mīzān, al-Tārikh al-Kabīr, al-Tārikh al-Ṣaghīr (both of which were authored by Imām Al-Bukhārī), Tahdhīb al-Kamāl of al-Mizzī, etc. This makes no sense at all as he was, “the first author of Islam,” and he was also, “being chased by Ḥajjāj, who wanted to kill him.” An individual who stood out to this extent in these two fields simply cannot be neglected or forgotten. Thus, his non-appearance is a clear proof that the Shīʿī statements are empty claims. He is nothing more than an imaginary personality.}

If there was any truth to the claims of the Shīʿah regarding him, there would have definitely been some mention of him in one of these books. However, the only books in which his name is mentioned is the books of the Shīʿah. In fact, one of the classical Shīʿī scholars stated:

إن سلیماً ل یعرف ولا ذکر في خير

Sulaym is unknown and there is no mention of him in any narration.\footnote{Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 83}

However, this is not acceptable according to the latter day Shīʿah. Even though this book carries many of the most dangerous beliefs introduced by the Sabaʾiyyah,

\textit{continued from page 294}
such as taking ‘Alī ʿAbdullāh as a deity and describing him using words which are only used to describe the Rabb of the universe\textsuperscript{1}, the Shīʿah did not hesitate and they were not deterred by this from praising him excessively and blindly accepting all that he claims to narrate from the Ahl al-Bayt. The statements uttered by some of their ‘greatest’ scholars in his favour leaves us bewildered. They go on to claim that he was a brick in the foundation of the family of Muḥammad and a secret from their secrets.

All of this is despite the fact that the chain as well as the texts of his narrations announces their falseness. They are from the narrations of Abān, whose narrations are discarded or valueless according to the Ahl al-Sunnah, and he is considered a weak narrator according to the Shīʿī books on narrators. Sulaym, who is the supposed author of the book cannot be traced. Perhaps his existence was restricted to the imaginations of the Shīʿah.

The style of the book itself is quite contradictory and confusing. However, this is the explanation that they offer regarding it:

\begin{quote}
ما يتراءى من الاضطراب في الطريق غير قادح وهو واقع في أكثر طرق كتب أصحابنا
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1} Some of the narrations of the book plead to ‘Alī ʿAbdullāh by calling him the following names; “Yā Awwal (the one who’s existence preceded everything else), Yā Ākhir (the one who’s existence succeeded everything else), Yā Zāhir (the one who is above everything) Yā Bāṭīn (the one who is beneath everything), O the one who has complete knowledge regarding everything!”. It is even claimed herein that this description was said by the Sun, when it called out to ‘Alī ʿAbdullāh and it was heard by Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār, who passed out upon hearing it and recovered after a while. Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays \textsuperscript{1} (printed by al-Aʿlamī) and pg. 31-32 (of the Najaf print). These qualities (i.e. attributing them to ‘Alī ʿAbdullāh) are from the evil effects of the Sabaʾiyyah who take ‘Alī ʿAbdullāh as a deity. Unfortunately, the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah have inherited it from them. After preserving this drivel in their books, they shamelessly attributed it to the Ahl al-Bayt. Thus, they have wrapped up the Ahl al-Bayt, who they claim to support, in this dirt! These attributes are undoubtedly confined to Allah. He says:

\begin{quote}
هو الأول والآخر والظاهر والباطن وهو بكل شيء عليم
\end{quote}

\textit{He is the First and the Last, the Ascendant and the Intimate, and He is, of all things, Knowing. (Sūrah al-Ḥadīd: 3)}
The confusion that can be noticed in the methodology is not (a reason) to discredit it. This is the condition of most of the books of our scholars.1

Many of the texts in this book are clearly from the books of the sacrilegious Bāṭiniyyah. Despite this, the authors of the four reliable books (according to them) as well as others among their scholars2 have quoted from it, without any reservations. This book contains many of the beliefs of the extremist Shīʿah. Surprisingly, this book has already been exposed by some Shīʿī scholars!

The question is; what drove them — against their practice — to speak the truth? What about this book did they find so intolerable that they felt compelled to expose its reality? Was it the fact that ‘Alī is portrayed as a deity? Was it on account of the attempted insults against the Qur’ān or any other Islamic beliefs? Definitely not! The only danger that they found in this book was that it stated the number of Imams to be thirteen. This is calamity like no other, as it demolishes the very foundation of the religion of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah, especially since this is stated in a book which is considered to be the basic books of Shīʿism and it was “the first book authored in Islam”.

Hence, they did us a huge favour and saved us the time required to analyse this book. A group of them declared:

ان الكتاب موضوع لا مرية فيه

This book is definitely a fabrication. There is no room for doubt regarding that.3

1 Al-Khowansārī: Rawḍāt al-Jannāt 4/68
2 Al-Kulaynī relies upon it and he dedicated a few chapters to it, as examples; Chapter: That which has been narrated regarding the twelve. Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/525, Chapter: The pillars of Kufr Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/391, etc. Similar to him was Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, who was given the title by them of al-Ṣadūq, in his book Man lā Yahḍurhū al-Faqīh. Rawḍāt al-Jannāt 4/68, Al-Dharīʿah 2/154. al-Iḥtijāj of al-Ṭabarsī, al-Ikhtiṣāṣ of al-Mufīd, Tafsīr al-Furāt, etc., are other examples wherein this could be seen. Refer to the forward of the Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays pg. 6.
3 Refer to Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 83, Ibn Dāwūd: al-Rijāl pg. 413, 414
They have explained the flaws in this book and pointed out the signs which indicate that it was concocted. One such indication, as they have pointed out, is that it is inconsistent with history. Example:

إن محمد بن أبي بكر وعظ أباه عند الموت لأنه غصب الإمامة من علي “ان محمد بن أبي بكر ولد في سنة حجة الوداع فكيف يعظ أباه وعمره ثلاث سنوات

Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr admonished his father at the time of his demise, as he had snatched the mantle of Imāmah from ‘Alī.

(The author states this) whereas Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr was only born during the year of Ḥajjat al-Wadā’. Thus, how is it possible that he admonished his father whilst he was only three years old?¹

Similarly, he stated that there are thirteen Imāms. Therefore, they admitted that Sulaym is unknown, there is no mention of his name in the narrations and the chains of the book are all different and beyond comprehension.² Abān ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh is the agreed upon suspect behind this fabrication.³ One of their contemporary scholars managed to guess the era in which it was concocted. He says:

إنه موضوع في آخر الدولة الأموية لغرض صحيح

It was fabricated towards the end of the Umayyad dynasty for a valid reason.⁴

However, he presented no proof for this claim of his. A group from amongst them — apparently — were not ready to part ways with this book, as it is one of their

1 Al-Khowansārī: Rawḍāt al-Jannāt 4/67, Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 83
3 Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 206, Ibn Dāwūd: al-Rijāl pg. 413-414
4 Abū al-Ḥasan al-Shaʿrānī in his footnotes on al-Kāfī which is printed with the commentary of al-Māzindarānī 2/373-374.
foundational books and the primary source for their scholars. Thus they said:

والوجه عندي الحكم بتعدیل المشار إلیه والتوقف في الفاسد من کتابه

My opinion is that the (correct) approach is to venerate the one who is being pointed to and not accept the corrupt (views mentioned) in his book.¹

This is despite the fact that this ‘corrupt view’ destroys the foundations of Shīʿism, as it states that there are thirteen Imāms. However, this view did not receive a warm welcome in Shīʿī circles. Thus, some decided to take action against it in a way that uproots the problem which puts their foundations at stake. Hence, they decided to straighten out the book so that it may be consistent with Shīʿī logic. Al-Khowansārī indicates to some ‘alterations’ made to the book. He says:

إن ما وصل إلینا من نسخ الكتاب هو أن عبد الله بن عمر وعظ أباه عند الموت

The copies of the book which reached us (state) that ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Umar admonished his father at the time of death.²

Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī says:

والذي وصل إلینا من نسخه لیس فیه شيء فاسد، ول شيء مما استدل به على الوضع

There is nothing corrupt in the copies which have reached us and there is nothing in there which indicates that (it is a) fabrication.³

I searched for the errors of the book, as mentioned by the first group, in two different prints thereof⁴, but I could not find them. This informs us that they

---

¹ Rijāl al-Ḥilī pg. 83, Wasā’il al-Shīʿah 20/210
² Rawdāt al-Jannāt 4/69
³ Wasā’il al-Shīʿah 20/210
⁴ Printed in Najaf by al-Maṭbaʿah al-Ḥaydariyyah and by al-Aʿlāmī in Beirut.
change their books, add on to them and delete passages from them. Nevertheless, this book is regarded as a reliable source by latter day Shī‘ah, as established by al-Majlisī in *Al-Biḥār*¹, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī in *al-Wasā’il*² as well as others.

I believe that this deliberation regarding the book *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* is necessary in order to expose the role of the Saba‘iyyah, who are the criminals behind this lie. We have already observed that this lie started from the book *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays*, regarding which it is said that Abān fabricated it, and one of them even specified the date of its occurrence, i.e. the end of the Umayyad dynasty. We have also mentioned that al-Milṭī suspects Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam.

The crux of the matter is that this lie was only brought into existence in the second century. I have searched through the views attributed to Ibn Saba and the Sab‘iyyah. I did not find this view being reported from Ibn Saba. It seems as if this idea did not even cross his mind as its falsity was all too apparent to the generation of his era, who had witnessed the revelation. It would have been suicidal to his mission if even hinted in that direction, thus he did not dare to spread this lie.

However, being the scum that he was, instead of claiming that the Ṣaḥābah altered the Qur‘ān, he expressed his idea in the following words:

بأن هذا القرآن جزء من تسعة أجزاء وعلمه عند علي

This Qur‘ān is one of nine portions and the knowledge thereof is possessed by ‘Alī.³

His statement is vague. The exact meaning that was intended cannot be determined. However, the treatise of Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah (d. 95 A.H.) clarifies its meaning:

---

¹ *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/32  
² *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 20/210  
³ Al-Jowzajānī: *Aḥwāl al-Rijāl* pg. 38
Among his opponents were these Saba’iyyah, who we have met. They say, “we have found revelation that was lost to the people and knowledge that was secret.” They assert that the Nabī of Allah hid away nine tenths of the Qur’ān. If Nabī wished to hide way any of that which Allah revealed, he would have hid away the matter of the wife of Zayd, “and [remember, O Muḥammad], when you said to the one on whom Allah bestowed favour and you bestowed favour, “keep your wife and fear Allah,” while you concealed within yourself that which Allah is to disclose. And you feared the people, while Allah has more right that you fear Him.”

This informs us that the Saba’iyyah did not hold this view. Rather, it was only introduced later. As for the one who was guilty of playing the greatest role in spreading this among the Shī‘ah, it will not be easy to give a definite answer or name specific persons. It will serve no point to study all the chains of the narrations (of the Shī‘ah) regarding the subject of interpolation in the Qur’ān as there are narrations which do not even have chains, such as the narrations of al-‘Iḥtijāj by al-Ṭabarsī. Added to that, there are many indications that chains were only introduced by them after the passing of a few eras, as will appear. Another reason why this will be a frivolous exercise is that one of their tactics is to attach authentic chains to fabrications. Therefore, studying the chains, in this case, will not lead us to a decisive conclusion.

The Spread of this Lie in the Book of the Shī‘ah

We have seen, if we take their word that this lie started with the book of Sulaym ibn Qays. Initially, there were only two narrations regarding it, and it was not

1 Sūrah a-Aḥzāb: 37
2 Kitāb al-Īmān of Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmar al-Makkī al-ʿAdnī pg. 249-250 (of the manuscript).
as clear as that which we learnt from those after him. You will understand this from the narrations which we will present after presenting all the narrations regarding the subject of interpolation. It seems as if the matter was still in its early stages when he penned it down in his book and the lies in support of it were minimal. It was also a matter that was rejected by some of the Shi'a. Thus, it was on the verge of dying out. Unfortunately, the third century was ill-fated with the appearance of a man who held onto this fabrication, added on to it and strengthened its pillars which were about to collapse.

Their scholar, 'Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, who was the mentor of the author of al-Kāfī — al-Kulaynī — filled his Tafsīr with this lies, which he also mentioned in the preface of his book. This is why their scholar, al-Kāshānī said:

في تفسيره مملوء منه وله غلو فيه

His Tafsīr is filled with it (examples of interpolation) and he adopted extremism in that matter.

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī says:

وقد صرح بهذا المعتقد في أول تفسيره وملأ كتابه من أخباره مع التزامه في أوله ألا يذكر فيه إلا مشايخه وثقافته

He (al-Qummī) clearly stated this belief in the beginning of his Tafsīr and he filled it with these narrations. He also took it upon himself in the beginning of his book to mention (narrate from) only his teachers and those who he relies upon.

---

1 There are many examples of this in his book. The following are only a few; Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/48, 100, 110, 118, 122, 123, 142, 159, 2/21, 111, 125 etc. Some of them will be quoted later.
2 Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/10
3 Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/52
4 Al-Ṭabarsī: Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 13 of the manuscript and pg. 26 of the printed version.
Despite this book (*Tafsīr al-Qummī*) being filled with this blasphemy, one of the leading Shīṭ scholars — al-Khū’ī — declares all of al-Qummīs narrations reliable, as mentioned previously.\(^1\) After al-Qummī, his student al-Kulaynī (d. 328 or 329 A.H) — who is given the title Thiqat al-Islam by the Shīṭah and he is the author of one of their four seminal and most reliable works — quoted many of these narrations\(^2\) in his book *al-Kāfī*, even after he took it upon himself to only quote authentic narrations.\(^3\)

It is for this reason that those who wrote regarding him from the Shīṭah have stated:

انه كان يعتقد التحريف والنقصان في القرآن، لأنه روى روایات في هذا المعنى في كتابه الكافي ولم يتعرض لقدح فيها مع أنه ذكر في أول كتابه أنه يثق بما رواه

He believed that alterations and deletions took place in the Qur’ān. This (is established from the fact that) he quoted narrations of this meaning in his book *al-Kāfī* without criticising them. This is despite the fact that he mentioned in the start of his book he relies upon all that he narrates.\(^4\)

According to the scholars of the Rāfiḍah, *al-Kāfī* is of the highest standards of authenticity, as al-Kulaynī was a contemporary of the four messengers who are believed (by them) to have had contact with their hidden and awaited Mahdī. It was extremely easy for him to verify the authenticity of his compilations as he lived with them in the same city, i.e. Baghdad.\(^5\) It should also be noted that

---

1 Refer to the introduction of this book or *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 1/63 of al-Khū’ī for his exact statement.
2 Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* (vol.1 Bāb fīh Nukat wa Nutaf min al-Tanzīl fī l-Wilāyah pg. 413). The numbers of these narrations are as follows; 8, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 45, 47, 58, 59, 60, 64. Refer to vol. 2 of *al-Kāfī*, Bāb al-nawādir pg. 627 onwards, numbers 2, 3, 4, 23, 28. These narrations unambiguously state this. It is quite a stretch to claim that they are narrations of variations in recitation.
3 Refer to the introduction of *al-Kāfī* pg. 9, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī*, the sixth introduction, pg. 52 (printed by al-Ālamī in Beirut) and pg. 14 (of the Tehrani print by al-Maktabah al-Islāmiyyah)
4 Al-Kāshānī: *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī*, the sixth introduction pg. 52 of the Aʿlamī print and pg. 14 of the Tehran print.
5 Refer to Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥā’irī: *Minhāj ʿAmalī lī al-Taqrīb* which is printed along with the book *al-Wahdat al-Islāmiyyah* pg. 233. Their older scholars held the same view. Refer to Ibn Ṭawūs: *Kashf al-Mahajjah* pg. 159. Also refer to the introduction of this book.
Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī declared all the narrations regarding the subject of alterations in the Qurʾān as fabrications even though they appear in *al-Kāfī* — which they have described in this manner and they have declared reliable.

I referred to *Mirʾāt al-ʿUqūl* of al-Majlisī, where I found that he declared some of the narrations of *al-Kāfī* as weak. However, he declared the narrations which stated that alterations took place to be authentic.¹ The same was seen in the book *al-Shāfī* (the commentary of *al-Kāfī*).² Recently, a book by the name of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī* was printed. After referring to it, I found that the author removed all the narrations which interfere with the Book of Allah. In fact, he discarded entire chapters regarding it, along with their narrations³, just as he deleted many chapters which contained many beliefs which make the Shīʿah targets of criticism.⁴ We cannot be sure as to whether this was done out of honesty or was it just Taqiyyah, especially

---

¹ Example, he authenticated the narration:

> أن القرآن الذي جاء به جبریل - علیه السلام - إلى Muḥammad H صلى الله علیه وسلم وآله وسلم سبعة عشر ألف آیة

> The Qurʾān which was brought by Jibrīl to Muḥammad was seventeen thousand verses.

The verses of the Qurʾān do not exceed six thousand. Refer to *Mirʾāt al-ʿUqūl* 2/536

² Refer to *al-Shāfī Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 7/227 to see his authentication of the narration quoted in the previous footnote.

³ Printed in the year 1401 A.H. by one of their contemporary scholars, Muḥammad al-Bāqir al-Bahūdī. It comprises of three volumes.

⁴ Such as the chapter; the Qurʾān was not gathered in totality by anyone except the Imāms. It is from the explicit chapter headings regarding this lie. Refer to *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 26-27. He deleted other chapters as well, just as he deleted the narrations of Bāb fihī Nukat wa nutaf min al-tanzīl fī al-Wilāyah. Initially it contained 92 narrations, but they were brought down to two by him. They now contain no criticism of the text of the Qurʾān, but they still misinterpret the meanings thereof according to the methodology of the Bāṭiniyyah. This chapter contained the majority of the narrations of *al-Kāfī* on the subject of alterations. This is why the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* believed that it was confined to it. Refer to page 36 of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*.

⁵ Like the chapters “when the Imāms feel like practising then they practice, the Imāms know their time of death and they do not die except by choice, the Imāms have knowledge of the past and the future and nothing remains hidden from them,” etc. Compare Kitāb al-Ḥujjah of *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* to Kitāb al-Ḥujjah of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī* to get clear understanding of the matter.
since many of the aḥādīth discarded by him were authenticated by al-Majlisī in Mirʿāt al-ʿUqūl and the author of al-Shāfī.

Further, this lie found its place in many pages across Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī which was authored by Al-ʿAyyāshī — who is of the same rank as al-Kulaynī. This is also one of their reliable books, as mentioned previously (even though its narrations have no chains to them). The author of Al-Biḥār claims that the chains were left out by one of the scribes. Furāṭ ibn ʿIbrāhīm al-Kūfī, who lived in the third century, authored his own Tafsīr, which was named Tafsīr Furāṭ. He was also quite comfortable with lending space to the narrations which promote this lie in his book. This book is also a reliable book according to them. His contemporary, Muḥammad ibn ʿIbrāhīm al-Nuʿmānī, narrated many of these narrations in his book al-Ghaybah, which one of their best and most reliable books. Another bigot who belonged to this clique which was found at that time was Abū al-Qāsim al-Kūfī. Some of the books of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah have declared him an extremist.

---

1 Regarding this, refer to the following pages (including others): 1/13, 168, 169, 206, etc.
2 Refer to the introduction of this book.
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 1/28
4 Printed by al-Maṭbaʿah al-Ḥaydariyyah of Najaf. The front page states, ‘The valuable Tafsīr which the souls of the scholars were longing to see. Despite its small size, it contains that which the larger commentaries do not contain. It is totally in accordance to the aḥādīth and narrations of Nabī and the Imams.
5 Refer to Tafsīr Furāṭ pg. 18, 85, etc.
6 Refer to the introduction of this book.
7 They assert that he was a contemporary of the four messengers of their awaited and hidden Mahdī. He was from the students of their scholar al-Kulaynī, the author of al-Kāfī. Perhaps he learnt this kufr from him. They even say that he is the one who wrote al-Kāfī and assisted al-Kulaynī in authoring it. Refer to Rijāl al-Najāshī pg. 297, Amal al-Āmāl pg. 232, Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 162
8 Refer to page 218 of al-Ghaybah
9 Refer to Biḥār al-Anwār 1/30
10 Al-Najāshī says, “ʿAlī ibn Aḥmad Abū al-Qāsim al-Kūfī was a man from the people of Kūfah. He would claim that he is from the family of Abū Ṭālib and he adopted extremism towards the end and his religion was corrupted. He authored many books, most of them are (filled with) corrupted (content); Kitāb al-Ambiyāʾ, Kitāb al-Awṣiyāʾ, Kitāb al-Bidaʾ al-Muḥdathah, Kitāb al-Tabdīl wa al-Taḥrīf. Al-Najāshī also mentions that the extremists claim that he reached extremely high stages. He died in the year 233 A.H. Rijāl al-Najāshī pg. 203, Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 233. The contemporary Rāfiḍī who wrote the forward to the book al-Istīghāthah (who did not clearly state his name) tried to dispel from him the stigma of being an extremist. Refer to the forward.
He exposed himself in the book *al-Istighātha*, stating that he adhered to this misguided methodology.¹ Al-Najāshī attributed to him a book named *al-Tabdīl wa al-Taḥrīf.*² However, this book along with its likes is no longer available, as pointed out by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb.*³ Herein, he reports directly from al-Qummī⁴ some narrations which state that alterations took place. It is perhaps from him that he learnt this kufr.

Succeeding the above mentioned bigots, we see their scholar al-Mufīd (d. 413 A.H.) writing in his book *Awā’il al-Maqālāt* that his sect have reached a consensus regarding this lie⁵, and he quotes some of his narrations in some of his books such as *Al-Irshād⁶* — which is considered one of their reliable books⁷ The stench of all the above-listed book as well as others leaves a Muslim doubtless that they are from the plotting of malicious enemy of the Book of Allah, His religion and the follower thereof.

This sect was forced to resort to this — as will appear under the analyses of the texts of this lie and its narrations — on account of the fact that the Book of Allah was empty and pure of the bizarre promoted by them, as well as all their other views which cannot be traced back to the Qur’ān. It was far beyond their capacity to take any steps by which they could have altered any of the verses of the Qur’ān, as they had done to the pure Sunnah by adding some narrations which were exposed by the experts of the science.

Since they were unable to add on to the Book of Allah, as it was beyond their reach, they decided to claim that the Book of Allah was altered and portions of it

---

1 *Al-Istighāthah* or *al-Bida’ al-Muḥdathah* pg. 25  
2 *Rijāl al-Najāshī* pg. 203  
3 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 30-31  
4 *Al-Istighāthah* pg. 29  
5 *Awā’il al-Maqālāt* pg. 51  
6 *Al-Irshād* pg. 365  
7 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/27
were deleted. Shouting out a claim is no difficult task, especially for the one who is an oppressive bigot. This plot, apparently, was resorted to as a tactic to soothe their followers, who might have protested upon being unable to find any mention of their Imāms or beliefs in the Book of Allah, the lofty positions of which they kept hearing from their leaders.¹

Thus, they found this lie to be an emergency exit, due to which their scholars of the third and fourth centuries raised through the ranks by discussing this. However, poor planning on their part, as it seems, as far as this problem was concerned landed them into the deepest trouble. It utterly disgraced them in front of everyone and it snipped the veil that kept their faces covered, revealing their hypocrisy and enmity. It expelled them from the domain of Islam, attachment to the Qur’ān and love for the Ahl al-Bayt!

This is why their leading scholar of the fourth century, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī — the author of Man Lā Yāḥḍurhū al-Faqīh (one of their four canonical books of ḥadīth) and the one who they refer to as Ra‘īs al-Muḥaddithīn (the leader of the ḥadīth scholars) (d. 381 A.H.) — announced that the Shī‘ah are innocent of this belief.² Similarly, al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (d. 436 A.H) would reject this belief and he would even declare those who subscribe to this belief as kāfir, as mentioned by Ibn Ḥazm.³ His rejection was even noted by al-Ṭūsī⁴ and al-Ṭabarsī.⁵

Al-Ṭūsī, who authored two of their four reliable ḥadīth books and two of their reliable books on narrators,⁶ also expressed his reservations regarding this belief and its relationship with the Shī‘ah. The same was done by al-Ṭabarsī⁷, the author

¹ The explanation of this will appear under the discussion of Imāmah and their other beliefs.
² Refer to his book Al-ʿĪtiqādat pg. 101-102. The exact words will appear later.
³ Al-Fiṣal 5/22
⁴ Al-Tibyān 1/3
⁵ Majmaʿ al-Bayān 1/31
⁶ Al-Tibyān 1/3
⁷ Majmaʿ al-Bayān 1/31
of Majma‘ al-Bayān. We will quote — if Allah wills — their exact words regarding this, along with a comparative study of their statements in their other books. The statements of the Shī‘ah regarding their rejection will also be quoted.

Despite this rejection and denunciation of these beliefs by these leading ‘scholars’ the matter was not brought to an end. In the sixth century, al-Ṭabarsī, the author of al-Iḥtijāj made it his responsibility to revive this kufr. Hence, he filled his book with it.¹ However, none of his narrations were accompanied by chains. He claims — in the introduction of his book — that he did not mention most of the chains as they are famous or agreed upon by his sect. He says:

ولا نأتي في أكثر ما نوردنه من الأخبار بإسناد، إما لوجود الإجماع عليه، أو موافقته لما دلت العقول إليه، أو لاشتهاره في السير والكتب بين المخالف والمؤالف

We will not mention the chains of most of the narrations which we will quote, either due to there being consensus regarding them, their compliance to logic or on account of them being well known in the books of siyar (the books on campaigns) by both, the opposition as well as those who agree.²

This Ṭabarsī, who openly declared his kufr, was among the contemporaries of Abū al-Faḍl al-Ṭabarsī, the author of Majma‘ al-Bayān, who denied this belief and declared the Shī‘ah innocent regarding it.³ It seems as if there was a story behind the rejection of these four individuals, or the matter became a secret. Thus, we

1 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb script 32 of the manuscript.
2 al-Iḥtijāj pg. 14
3 Some writers mistook one for the other. Subsequently, they ascribed the book al-Iḥtijāj to the author of Majma‘ al-Bayān. The author of al-Iḥtijāj openly pronounces this kufr whereas the author of Majma‘ al-Bayān declares his innocence therefrom. Among those who committed this mistake was Nabīlah ʿUbayd in her book Nashʿat al-Shī‘ah (pg. 39-40), even though she was a Shī‘ī. Similarly some authors could not differentiate between the Ṭabarsī who authored Majma‘ al-Bayān and the Ṭabarsī who authored Faṣl al-Khiṭāb. They mistook both to be the same person, whereas there was a gap of six generations between them. ‘Abd al-Muta‘āl al-Jabrī is among those who committed this error in his book Hiwār Ma‘ā al-Shī‘ah pg. 187
did not see a considerable effort being made to raise it or spread it — openly and on a large scale — except during the Safavid dynasty, wherein it was witnessed that the efforts behind the revival of this belief, concoctions to support it, etc., were even more than that which took place in the third century.

This ‘duty’ was taken up by a group of Shīʿī scholars appointed by the Safavids. Thus, they made such an effort to revive this kufr that this lie, which started off as merely two narrations in the book *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* multiplied until they are now — as admitted by Niʿmat Allah al-Jazāʾirī — more than two thousand narrations. This was a result of the effort of the scholars of the Safavid dynasty (in which Taqiyyah was abandoned to some extent), who left no stone unturned in spreading this kufr in their books. These include al-Majlisi in his *Biḥār*, al-Kāshānī in *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī*, al-Baḥrānī in *al-Burḥān*, Niʿmat Allah al-Jazāʾirī in *Al-Anwār al-Nūʾ māniyyah* and other books, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf in *Mirʾāt al-Anwār*, al-Māzindarānī (the commentator on *al-Kāfī*) as well as others.

Towards the end of the thirteenth century the Shīʾah were completely undressed and disgraced (regarding this subject) by their scholar Ḥusayn al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, who was greatly honoured by them. He compiled a book regarding this kufr in

---

3. *Al-Burḥān* (in many places). As examples; vol. 1 pg. 15 Bāb an al-Qurʾān lam yajmaʿhū kamā unzil illā al-Aʿimmah, pg. 34, 70, 102, 140, 170, 277, 294-295, 308, etc.
4. *Al-Anwār al-Nūʾ māniyyah* 2/357-358
6. He explained *al-Kāfī* and he agreed with the drivel puked out by the author, to the extent that he said, “deletions from the Qurʾān and alterations to it is established by our narrators with tawātur (as far as the meaning is concerned).” Refer to *Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ al-Kāfī* 11/76. It is worth noting at this juncture that this ‘tawātur’ is what the other scholars of the Shīʾah consider as an obvious lie.
7. He is well-respected by the Shīʾah, to the extent that they have taken one of his books, *Mustadrak al-Wasāʿil*, as one of their reliable sources on ḥadīth, as will be explained under the discussion of their beliefs regarding the Sunnah. Upon the expiry of this Ṭabarsī, they buried him in the most blessed land, according to them, “between the family and the book”, i.e. in the third chamber to the right of the ‘blessed courtyard’ from the door of the Qiblah in Najaf. Refer to Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭehrānī: *Aʿlām al-Shīʾah*, category two of volume one pg. 553.
which he gathered all their concoctions on this subject in one book, which he named *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb fi Ithbāt Tahrīf Kitāb Rabb al-Arbāb*¹ (the definitive conclusion in proving the distortion of the Book of the absolute Lord of lords).

This book will always be a source of disgrace to the Shī’ah, as the author gathered all the narrations (which were spread out) regarding it, the statements of their scholars who authenticated these narrations as well as the statements of their research scholars who accepted this kufr. He penned down this book in an effort to counter a group of the Shī’ah who could not digest this kufr and refused to accept this lie. This is clearly understood in his rebuttal of them at the end his book.²

This book brought out that which was hidden and made clear that which was vague. He revealed the malicious plots and enmity for the Qur’ān and its followers by the Shī’ah, which were kept hidden in the ‘secret passages’ of their books. In the introduction to his book, this sacrilegious individual reveals the motive behind his attack on the Book of Allah:

فيقول العبد المذنب المسيء حسین بن محمد تفی الديرسي جعله الله من الواقفین ببابه المتمسكین

بكتابه (!): هذا کتاب لطیف وسفر شریف عملته في إثبات تحریف القرآن وفسانیه أهل الجور والعدوان،

وسميته فصل الخطاب في تحریف کتاب رب الأرباب... وأودعت فيه من بداع الحکمت ما تقر به كل عین,

وأرجو من ينتظر رحمته المسيتون أن يفعلي به في يوم لا يفع مال ولا بيتون

The sinful evil doing slave Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad Taqī al-Dīn al-Ṭabarsī (may Allah make him among those who stand at his door and hold onto his book (sic!)), “this is a small book and a noble scroll which I have written to prove that alterations took place in the Qur’ān and the embarrassing (crimes) of the oppressors and enemies. I have named it *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb fi Ithbāt Tahrīf Kitāb Rabb al-Arbāb*... I have placed in it amazing points of

---

¹ He committed the crime of authoring this book in the year 1292 A.H., and it was printed in Iran in the year 1298 A.H. I have in my possession both; a copy of the manuscript as well as the printed copy. Further details will appear regarding it in the fourth chapter, if Allah wills.

² *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 360
wisdom which will please every eye. I hope from the one whose mercy is anticipated by the sinners that he grants me the benefits of it on the day that neither wealth nor (ones) offspring will be of any benefit.¹

Look at how the Zoroastrians, hide their evil agenda behind ostentation and lies to fool the simple minded and ignorant folk. One of them, whilst trying to hide the filthy agenda (of the author) says:

قد يقال: إن نظره في تأليف ذلك الكتاب إلى جمع تلك الأخبار والشواذ والنوادر ولم يكن غرضه اعتقاد التحريف

It is said: his idea behind writing that book was to gather all those narrations and strange and rare (statements). His motive was not to (establish) the belief that alterations took place.²

However, this claim is belied by the very title of the book. It was a waste of ink and paper, and it was undoubtedly Taqiyyah.³ Some of the contemporary Shīʿī scholars have denounced this belief, even though their cover was blown away by the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb. Among them are al-Balāghī, who done so in Ālā al-Raḥmān⁴, Muḥsin al-Amīn in al-Shīʿah Bayn al-Ḥaqāʾiq wa l-Awhām⁵, ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn in Ajwibat Masāʿil Jār Allah⁶, al-Khuʿī in his Tafsīr al-Bayān⁷, Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah in al-Shīʿah fī al-Mīzān⁸, and as other books of his, Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshīf al-Ghiṭā in Al-Shīʿah wa Uṣūluhā⁹ as well as

---

¹ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 2
² Muḥammad al-Ṭabaṭabāʾī: footnotes of Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah 2/364
³ An analysis of his book, debunking of his arguments and exposure of his lies will appear under the chapter regarding present day Shīʿah.
⁴ Ālā al-Raḥmān: 1/17-32
⁵ Al-Shīʿah Bayn al-Ḥaqāʾiq wa l-Awhām pg. 160
⁶ Ajwibat Masāʿil Jār Allah pg. 27-37
⁷ Al-Bayān pg. 226
⁸ Al-Shīʿah fī al-Mīzān: pg. 58
⁹ Aṣl al-Shīʿah wa Uṣūluhā pg. 88
others. We will pause along the course of our journey to analyse their statements, under the chapter regarding present day Shīʿah and their relationship with their predecessors.

Now, which course should we take? Do we go with that which Imām al-Ashʿarī stated in *al-Maqālāt* (that the Shīʿah have more than one view on this subject and they did not agree upon this deviation)? Should we accept that there are two groups among the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah; one has adopted extremism and the other accepts the truth, as stated by some who claim to be from the Ahl al-Sunnah (as quoted above) as well as some writers of the Shīʿah? Or, should we accept the view that the Shīʿah (who accepted the truth only done so due to) Taqiyyah, as stated by some of the Ahl al-Sunnah as well as those who accept the belief that interpolation took place from among the Shīʿah, such as Niʿmat Allah al-Jazāʾirī? All of this will be looked at and explained in the next discussion.

The Contents of the Narrations on Alterations in the Book of the Shīʿah

After presenting the names of the books in which this deception appears, we now move on to some of the contents of the narrations, the birth of this lie, the manner in which it spread and what was the final result. We will start with the first book of the Shīʿah which contained this lie, i.e. Kitāb *Sulaym ibn Qays*. We find this mentioned in the beginning of this book. It appears as part of two lengthy narrations which are related to the subject of Imāmah of ʿAlī. The first narration is reported by Abān ibn ʿAyyāsh (regarding whom it is agreed that he is unreliable — as explained) from *Sulaym ibn Qays*. Part of it states:

\[
\text{أن علیاً لزم بیته حتى جمعه وکان في الصحف والرقاع}
\]

‘Alī remained in his house until he gathered it all, as it was in booklets and patches (of leather).3

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 1/52-53, *Qawāmiʿ al-Fuḍūl* pg. 298
2 *Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah* 2/358-359. His exact words will appear shortly, if Allah wills.
3 *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* pg. 81
He explained his delay in pledging allegiance to Abū Bakr to be a result of his engrossment with compiling the Qur’ān. He said, when Abū Bakr sent for him to come forward and pledge his allegiance:

إني آلیت على نفسي بيمینا ألا أرتدي رداء إلا للصلاة حتى أولف القرآن وأجمعه

I have promised myself not to wear an upper garment, except for ṣalāh, until I compile and gather the Qur’ān.¹

Claims similar to this one have appeared in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. However, they could not be established with sound chains of narration. This is why Ibn Ḥajar said:

The chain of the narration from 'Alī that he said, “I have promised myself not to wear my upper garment, except for ṣalāh, until I compile the Qur’ān,” after which he compiled it is unreliable due to one of the narrators being left out. If we accept that it is authentic, then it means that he gathered it in his chest (memorised it). That which appears in some narrations — that he gathered it between the two covers — is a mistake of the narrator.²

¹ Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays pg. 81. Take note that in this narration 'Alī did not offer any other explanation regarding the delay of his pledge to Abū Bakr, except his pre-occupation with the compilation of the Qur’ān. It is as if the one who fabricated this tale momentarily forgot their very basis, i.e. Imāmah and that 'Alī did not pledge his allegiance due to him believing that he was the appointed Waṣī (as they claim). This is an oft-repeated mistake that occurs in many of the matter which they wish to establish. They keep establishing one belief using a concoction in which they unintentionally destroy another of their beliefs. This is not surprising, as it is the outcome and outstanding trait of lies; they keep contradicting one another irreconcilably. Allah says:

وَلَوْ كَانَ مِنْ عِنْدِ غَيرِْ اللهِ لَوَجَدُوْا فِیْهِ اخْتِلاَفًا کَثِيرًْا

(Sūrah al-Nisā: 82)

This verse proves that if anything is falsely claimed to be from Allah, it will most definitely contain irreconcilable contradictions.

² Fath al-Bārī 9/12-13. Refer to Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif of Abū Dāwūd as well, pg. 16
The more authentic version, which is the one which is relied upon is the narration of Abū Dāwūd regarding copies (of the Qur’ān). He reports with an acceptable chain from ʿAbd Khayr, ‘I heard ʿAlī saying:

أعظم الناس في المصاحف أجراً أبو بكر - رحمة الله على أبي بكر - وهو أول من جمع كتاب الله

From all the people, Abū Bakr received the greatest reward as far as the copies of the Qur’ān are concerned. May the mercy of Allah be upon Abū Bakr, he was the first person to gather the Qur’ān.¹

Nevertheless, the narration of Sulaym states that ʿAlī’s compilation was not confined to the Qur’ān. Rather, it included “its revelation, interpretation, the abrogating and the abrogated of it.”² Besides the fact that this narration is not established at all, it even contradicts the guidelines set by Rasūlullāh regarding the writing of the Qur’ān, as he said:

لا تكتبوا عنى شيئاً غير القرآن

Do not write anything from me (that which I say) besides the Qur’ān.³

Nabī ordered that the Qur’ān should be written, but prohibited that anything else should be written alongside it, so that the one is not confused with the other. Anyway, the most that this claim establishes is that ʿAlī had a copy of the Qur’ān, just as other Ṣaḥābah, the likes of Ibn Masʿūd ⁴ had copies thereof. This does not suggest any negativity regarding the Book of Allah.

---

¹ Fatḥ al-Bārī 9/12
² Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays pg. 81
³ Reported by Muslim in Kitāb al-Zuhd, number 72, pg. 2298-2299, Al-Dārimī (his introduction) number 42, pg. 119, Ahmad in his Musnad 3/12, 21, 39. The scholars explain that the prohibition of writing the ḥadīth alongside the Qur’ān was so that one is not mixed with the other. Al-Nawawī: Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim 18/130, al-Ubbī: ʿIkām ʿIkām al-Muʿlim 7/305
⁴ Ibn Abī Dāwūd: Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif pg. 60
However, the narration does not end there. Rather, it goes on to claim that he brought it to the Ṣaḥābah and called upon them to accept it, upon which ʿUmar, according to their claims, said:

ما أغنانا بما معنا من القرآن عما تدعونا إليه

The Qur‘ān that we have with us suffices us of that to which you call us.¹

As long as the Qur‘ān of ʿAlī did not just comprise of the Qur‘ān itself but contained in it tafsīr and abrogated verses, it was necessary to refer to the actual Qur‘ān itself. Nevertheless, this clique of bigots went on to build upon this lie, and their hate-filled imaginations destroyed their intellect.

Thus, we find that al-Ṭabarsī (from the sixth century), in al-Iḥtijāj, paints a different picture (as is the nature of lies; they keep changing, with additions and deletions continuously modifying them) of what transpired. He presents this (fabricated) incident as if it was a fight between ʿAlī and the Ṣaḥābah of the Rasūl — may Allah be pleased with all of them, just as they are totally innocent of these accusations.

Another addition is that whilst the narration of Sulaym claims that they rejected his copy on the first occasion, when he presented it to them, the narration of al-Ṭabarsī indicates that they took it:

فلمما فتحه أبو بكر خرج في أول صفحه فضائح القوم

When Abū Bakr opened it, all the embarrassing (crimes) of the nation appeared in its first pages.²

Thus, he informs us of one of the subjects which appeared in the copy of ʿAlī. However, the narration of Sulaym does not contain any explicit criticism

¹ Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays pg. 82
² al-Iḥtijāj pg. 156
of the Qurʿān. The jealousy and hatred in the hearts of these bigots were not calmed down by the lies and accusations cast by them against the first battalion of Islam (who conquered their lands and spread Islam amongst their people). The appetite of these people cannot be satiated except by feeding it vulgarity regarding the Ṣaḥābah.

The verses of the Qurʿān in which their virtues and merits are extolled strike them on the heads like iron rods and burn their filthy hearts. Thus, it is only a natural reaction on their part to concoct such lies. The narration of al-Iḥtījāj has yet another addition to the incident ‘reported’ in Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays:

Thereafter, they had Zayd ibn Thābit, who was an expert reciter of the Qurʿān, brought (to them). ʿUmar said to him, ʿAlī brought a Qurʿān in which the embarrassing crimes of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār have been mentioned. We thought of compiling the Qurʿān (note that the narration of Sulaym suggests that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar already had a complete copy of the Qurʿān) and deleting the crimes and transgressions of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār. Zayd ibn Thābit complied to his wishes and then said, “if I complete the Qurʿān according to your demands and then ʿAlī brings the Qurʿān which he compiled, will not all of your efforts go to waste?” ʿUmar asked, “so what is the way out?” Zayd replied, “you people know better.” Thereupon ʿUmar said, “there is no other way out besides killing him and getting rid of him. So, plan out his murder.”

Elsewhere, he presents an account of the alleged plans regarding the murder and he explains that the task was assigned to Khālid. Thereafter Abū Bakr

---

1 al-Iḥtījāj pg. 156 (al-Aʿlamī print)
regretted and became perturbed regarding this plan, fearing its negative consequences, to the extent that he said whilst in ṣalāh:

لا تقتله يا خالد

Do not kill him, O Khālid!

The tale then continues...¹ Later, he adds on even more to it. He asserts that ‘Umar tried to trick ‘Alī and fool him into bringing out his Qur’ān so that they could start practicing upon it. This was an attempt by ‘Umar to distort the copy of ‘Alī, who did not accept the request. ‘Umar then asked him, “when will it appear?” he replied, “it will appear with the Qā’im (imām) from my progeny. He will bring it forth and make the people practice upon it. Thus the Sunnah will come about with him — the salutations of Allah be upon him!”²

The question that remains unanswered by the narration of al-Ṭabarsī and all the other Shī‘ī books is that since their plot to kill ‘Alī was foiled and their attempt to distort his Qur’ān was a failure, why did ‘Alī not bring out the Qur’ān that he had with him? If (they claim that) he feared them as they were in power, then what stopped him from doing so when he became the khalīfah? Why did he allow himself to be the cause of the ummah remaining astray and lost? How is it that he covered up the treachery of the deceivers and the ones who distorted the Qur’ān? He who helps a deceiver with his treachery is equally treacherous.

The clique could find no answer besides that which their scholar, Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’rī assumed, i.e. he preferred displaying good character towards those who preceded him instead of the guiding the ummah.³ Thus, his (al-Jazā’irī) enmity towards both have been revealed; the Book of Allah as well as ‘Alī, as there is hardly an insult that could be worse than this (as explained previously).

¹ *al-Iḥtijāj* pg. 89-90 (al-A’lamī print)
² *al-Iḥtijāj* 1/225-228 printed in Najaf or pg. 155-156 of the A’lamī print.
³ We have already quoted this text before.
In addition, I would like to ask: if this was the good character shown by their Imām, then why do they oppose him instead of following in his footsteps? Why do they repeat the filthy language and vulgarity that has blackened an enormous amount of pages in their books? Thus, the reason explained above is either a lie, or they are horrible ‘followers’ of the Imām who oppose his actions. I wonder which of the two options they will find more dumbfounding.

We return to Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays. It contains another narration, similar to the first one. However, this one has an addition; a question from Ṭalḥah to ʿAlī. He enquired from him as to why he did not bring out the Qurʾān that was in his possession. ʿAlī ignored the question and continued speaking about him having a greater right to the khilāfah. Ṭalḥah then repeated the question saying:

ما أراك يا أبا الحسن أجيبني عما سألتك عنه عن القرآن ألا تظهر للفناس،

O Abū al-Ḥasan, I see you have not answered my question that I asked you regarding the Qurʾān; why are you not bringing it out to the people?

ʿAlī replied:

يا طلحة، عمداً كففت عن جوابك، قال: فأخبرني عما في كتب عمر وعثمان - كذا - أقرآن كله أم ففيه ما ليس بقرآن، فقال طلحة: حسبي، أما إذ هو قرآن فحسبي

O Ṭalḥah I intentionally refrained from answering you. Tell me of that which is in the book of ʿUmar and ʿUthmān, is all of it Qurʾān or does it have in it that which is not Qurʾān.

Ṭalḥah replied:

بل قرآن كله

All of it is Qurʾān.
ʿAlī said:

قال: إن أخذتم بما فيه نجوتم من النار ودخلتم الجنة، فإن فيه حجتنا وبيان حقنا وفرض طاعتنا,

If you hold onto whatever is in it, you will be saved from the fire and you will enter Jannah, for indeed it has in it our proofs, an explanation of our rights and the compulsion of obeying us.

Ṭalḥah responded:

حسبي، أما إذ هو قرآن فحسبي

That suffices me. Since it is the Qur’ān, it is sufficient for me.¹

This narration of Sulaym does not criticise the Qur’ān in an open manner. In fact, it even emphasises that all that is in it is the Qur’ān. It claims that the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt and the compulsion of obeying them is found in it, whereas many of their narrations contradict this. These narrations claim:

لولا أنه زيد في كتاب الله ونقص منه لما خفي حقنا على ذي حجى

If it was not for the additions and deletions that took place in the Qur’ān, our rights would not have been obscured to those who have intelligence.²

لو قرئ القرآن كما أنزل لألغينا فيه مسمين

If the Qur’ān was recited the way it was revealed, we would find in it named (individuals).³

As is apparent, this was another twist to the tale. However, this one reveals one of the reasons as to why the tale was concocted, i.e. the twelve Imāms (whose acceptance was compulsory for the acceptance of Islam, and rejection of any one

---

¹ Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays pg. 124
² Al-Burhān (forward pg. 37), Bihār al-Anwār 19/30, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/41
³ Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/13, Bihār al-Anwār 92/55, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/41, al-Lawāmiʿ al-Nūrāniyyah pg. 547
of them was kufr) were not mentioned anywhere in the Book of Allah. This reality threatened to destroy their unions and structures. Hence, in a state of panic, they began hunting for a way to repel this threat. Among a few others, the attack upon the Book of Allah was the most dangerous plot!

Other developments that took place regarding this lie were; adding a practical aspect to it as well as the increase in its narrations. These were done courtesy of ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī (the author of the Ṭafsīr) and his student al-Kulaynī (the author of al-Kāfī). These two individuals were responsible for strengthening the foundation of this unfounded belief, and they had a great share in spreading and discussing it.

Their planning and ideas brought the practical aspect of this belief to its culmination. Thus, a few rules to apply this blasphemy to the Qurʾān were formulated. Among them were; adding the words “ق عل” (regarding ʿAlī) in any verse wherein the words “انزل الله عليك وانزلنا عليك” (Allah revealed to you, or We revealed to you) appears, adding the words “ال محمد حقهم” (the family of Muḥammad as far as their rights are concerned) after the word “ظلموا” (they oppressed) in all verses, adding “لى في وليا” (in the matter of the wilāyah of ʿAlī) after the word “اشتركوا” (they subscribed to polytheism) and they changed the word “امة” (nation) to “ائمة” (Imāms) wherever it appeared in the Qurʾān.

In this manner, they attempted to pollute the entire Qurʾān. Among the proofs for this is a narration of theirs reported by al-Kulaynī from al-Qummī, who reports with his chain from Jābir al-Juʿfī who claims that he heard Abū Jaʿfar (al-Bāqir) saying:

ٓاَنْفُسَهُمْ اَنْ یَّكُفُرُوْا بِمَآ اَنْزَلَ اللّٰهُ (فى على) بَغْیًا

Jibrīl brought the revelation of this verse to Muḥammad: “How wretched is that for which they sold themselves – that they would disbelieve in what Allah has revealed through [their] outrage (against ʿAlī).”

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 90
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/417
Similarly, they say:

نَزَّلَ جَبِرِيلُ هَذِهِ الْآيَةَ عَلَى مُحَمَّدَ هَكَذَا: وَإِنْ كُنْتُمْ فِي رَيْبٍ مِّمَّا نَزَّلْنَا عَلَى عِبَادِنَا (فِي عَلِيٍّ) فَأَتُوا بِسُورَةٍ مِّنْ مِّثْلِهَا

Jibrīl brought the revelation of this verse to Muḥammad in this manner: “And if you are in doubt about what We have sent down upon Our Servant (regarding ʿAlī), then produce a sūrah the like thereof.”

Another narration from Abū Ḥaḍīr al-Ṣādiq has it:

یَاّ الَّذِیْنَ اُوْتُوا الْکِتَّابَ اٰمِنُوْا بِمَا نَزَّلْنَا مُصَدِّقًا لِّمَا مَعَكُمْ (فِي عَلِیٍّ) نُوْرًا مُّبِیْنًا

Jibrīl brought the revelation of this verse to Muḥammad in this manner: “O you who were given the Scripture, believe in what We have sent down, confirming that which is with you (regarding ʿAlī) a clear light.”

Take note of how they have joined portions of two separate verses to form one. Al-Qummī says:

وَأَمَامَ مَا هُوَ مُحْرَفٌ فِمْهُ قَولُهُ: لَعَنَ اللَّهُ یَشْهَدُ بِمَا انْزَلَ اِلَیْكُ (فِی عَلیٍّ) اَنْزَلَهُ بِعِلْمِهِ وَلَمْ تَفْعَلْ فَمَا بَلَّغْتَ

O mankind, there has come to you a conclusive proof from your Rabb, and We have sent down to you a clear light. (Sūrah al-Nisā’: 174)
As for that which had been changed, among them are his statements: “But Allah bears witness to that which He has revealed to you (regarding ʿAlī). He has sent it down with His knowledge, and the angels bear witness [as well].” “O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you (regarding ʿAlī) from your Rabb, and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His message,” “Indeed, those who disbelieve and commit wrong [or injustice] (regarding ʿAlī) — never will Allah forgive them, nor will He guide them to a path.” “And those who have wronged are going to know in the overwhelming pangs of death.”

Al-Qummī says:

There are many others like this. We will mention them in their appropriate places.

1 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 166
2 Sūrah al-Mā‘idah: 67
3 Sūrah al-Nisā’, the added words (regarding ʿAlī) were taken from Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/159.
4 Note how far these people are from the Book of Allah, both physically as well spiritually. They even commit errors in their quotations from the Qur’ān (intentionally or unintentionally) and thereafter they falsely attribute this to the Ahl al-Bayt. Observe how they have foolishly and ignorantly joined a portion of the verse, “and those who have wronged are going to know to what [kind of] return they will be returned” (Sūrah al-Shuʿarā: 227), to the verse, “and if you could but see when the wrongdoers are in the overwhelming pangs of death.” (Sūrah al-An‘ām 93). Thus they invented a new verse; “And those who have wronged are going to know in the overwhelming pangs of death.” There is no doubt that seeing the wrongdoers suffering the “overwhelming pangs of death” and the pain at that moment serves a much greater lesson, and it is a far more profound warning compared to the statement of the Shīʿah, “they are going to know in the overwhelming pangs of death,” as someone could say that they are overcome by pain and as a result they have no understanding or idea of anything. We will not deliberate further, as this type of drivel deserves none of our attention.

5 Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/10-11
As promised, he filled his book with this type of kufr in the exact same manner as indicated above. In another narration, which he quotes regarding the verse of Allah, he adds on (as usual) the words ‘the family of Muḥammad’:

فَأَنْزَلْنَا عَلَی الَّذِیْنَ ظَلَمُوْا ال محمد

So We sent down upon those who wronged (the family of Muḥammad).²

Al-Qummī also reports from Abū ʿAbd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) that the following verse was recited in his presence:

کُنْتُمْ خَیْرَ اُمَّةٍ اُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَاْمُرُوْنَ بِالْمَعْرُوْفِ وَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ

You are the best nation produced [as an example] for mankind. You enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong.³

Thereupon Abū ʿAbd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) said:

خیر أمة يقتلون أمیر المؤمنین والحسن والحسین - علیهم السلام -؟ فقال القارئ: جعلت فداك کیف نزلت؟ قال: نزلت (کنتم خیر أئمة أخرجت للناس)، ألا ترى مدح الله لهم تأمرُونَ بالمعروف وتنهون عن المُنكر

The best nation kills Amīr al-Muʾminīn, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn? The reciter asked, “may I be sacrificed for you, how was it revealed?” He replied, “it was revealed, ‘you are the best Imāms, produced for mankind.’ Do you not see the praise of Allah regarding them? ‘You enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong.’”⁴

This means that there is no goodness in the entire ummah, as well as in the Shīʿah. Goodness is confined to the twelve Aʾimmah only. Similarly, we have pointed out

---

1 As examples, refer to vol. 1 pg. 48, 100, 110, 122, 142, 159, 118, 123, 125, etc.
2 Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/48
3 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 110
4 Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/110
that their narrations regarding the interpretation of the Qurʼān establish that the revealed word was “ʼamā” (nation), but its interpretation is “ʼĀ‘īmāh” (A‘immah). On the other hand, the narrations which ‘prove that alterations took place’ claim that the revealed word was actually “Imāms”. Is this not a contradiction?

Regarding the verse:

\begin{align*}
\text{فَسَتَعْلَمُوْنَ مَنْ هُوَ فِیْ ضَلٰلٍ مُّبِیْنٍ}
\end{align*}

And you will [come to] know who it is that is in clear error.

They add:

\begin{align*}
\text{فَسَتَعْلَمُوْنَ یا معشر المكذبین حیث أنبأتكم رسالة ربي في ولیة علي - علیه السلام - والأئمة من بعده، مَنْ هُوَ فِیْ ضَلٰلٍ مُّبِیْنٍ}
\end{align*}

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 13
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/418
And you will [come to] know, O the ones who belied when I conveyed to you the message of my Rabb regarding the Wilāyah of ʿAlī ʿa.s. and the Imāms succeeding him, who it is that is in clear error.

Thereafter, they emphasize their heretical belief that interpolations took place by saying:

هكذا نزلت

This is how it was revealed.1

In the verse:

فَلَنُذِیْقَنَّ الَّذِیْنَ کَفَرُوْا عَذَابًا شَدِیْدًا وَّ لَنَجْزِیَنَّهُمْ اَسْوَا الَّذِیْ کَانُوْا یَعْمَلُوْنَ

But We will surely cause those who disbelieve to taste a severe punishment, and We will surely recompense them for the worst of what they had been doing.2

They add:

فَلَنُذِیْقَنَّ الَّذِیْنَ کَفَرُوْا بترکهم ولیة أمیر المؤمنین علیه السلام عَذَابًا شَدِیْدًا في الدنیا وَّ لَنَجْزِیَنَّهُمْ اَسْوَا الَّذِیْ کَانُوْا یَعْمَلُوْنَ

But We will surely cause those who disbelieve (by rejecting the Wilāyah of Amīr al-Muʾminin ʿa.s.) to taste a severe punishment (in the world), and We will surely recompense them for the worst of what they had been doing3

There are many other narrations like this. If one compares the narration of Tafsīr al-Qummī and al-Kāfī to that which their latter day scholars, such as al-Majlisī,

---

1 Ibid 1/421
2 Sūrah al-Fuṣṣilat: 27
3 Al-Kāfī 1/421
al-Jazā’irī and al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī have mentioned, he will find a considerable increase in the narrations. This indicates that the mission of strengthening this fallacy continued in each era. The reader who understands Arabic will be convinced that these ‘additions’ do not fit — at all — in the verses. They have been added there without the least connection to the verse. It is as if the verse itself rejects it, as its incoherence with the Arabic language and its non-Arab concocter (whose choice of words and ability to convey meanings are quite poor), are both quite visible from it.

The words presented by these liars, as examples of verses which have been deleted, have undoubtedly removed the veil and exposed their kufr, just as it brought to shame their lies and revealed their concoctions. They are attempts at making the Qur’ān subservient to them, which are similar in nature to the lies of Musaylamah — the imposter. This is clear from the little that we have already quoted above, and it will become even clearer if one refers to the thousand plus narrations quoted by the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb.¹

The coherence of the Qur’ān and its miraculous eloquence, which left the masters of eloquence and Arabic dumbfounded and impotent as far as producing a chapter or verse of its like, is enough to expose these lies and concoctions. In fact, most of these concoctions do not even meet the standards of the average person’s eloquence. Thus, they serve as a sign of the grandeur of the Qur’ān and its unmatchable nature, as if it was not for bitterness, sweetness would not be appreciated. They themselves testify that the men behind them were liars, sufficing one and all the effort of looking at the proofs which establish that the Qur’ān was protected and kept pure of any interferences.

These idiotic attempts at adding the speech of humans to the speech of Allah have been the work of some members of this sect for many consecutive centuries. They tried to concoct as much of it that they could. There are other examples of this attempt, added to that which has passed. Some of them have been mentioned

¹ Refer to Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 253.
by al-Majlisī under a chapter which he named, “alterations in the verse which are against that which Allah revealed, which were narrated by our teachers.”  

Similarly, their books of tafsīr are filled with these adulterations, as indicated previously. All of these narrations have been gathered by the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb.

The Rāfiḍah have counted these lies as a portion of that which was deleted from the Book of Allah. Al-Kulaynī reports in al-Kāfī:

أن القرآن الذي جاء به جبريل إلى محمد (ص) وآله وسلم سبعة عشر ألف آية

The Qur’ān that was brought by Jibrīl to Muḥammad contained seventeen thousand verses.

The actual amount of verses, as is well known, is slightly more than six thousand. This means that according to them, close to two thirds of the Qur’ān have been deleted. Can there be a greater lie? This narration appears in al-Kāfī — the most authentic of their books! However, some Shīʿah will escape by claiming, “all that is in al-Kāfī is not authentic.” If we take this claim seriously, instead of brushing it off as Taqiyyyah, we will need to do some research as far as applying it to our case is concerned.

We will overlook that which they refer to as chains, the so called “principles and laws of authentication” that they claim to uphold, their contradictions and confusion regarding the subject and the fact that the classification “weak” only applies to the chain, as stated by them:

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 92/60.
2 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 253
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī Kitāb Faḍā’il al-Qur’ān Bāb al-Nawādir 2/134
4 As examples, refer to Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: al-ʿAmal bī l-Ḥadīth ʿInd al-Imāmiyyah which appears in the book Da wat al-Taqrīb pg. 383, Muḥsin al-Amīn: al-Shīʿah Bayn al-Ḥaqā’iq wa l-Awhām pg. 419-420
5 This will be thoroughly explained under the chapter, “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah”.
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The chains of most of the aḥādīth regarding principles in al-Kāfī are not authentic. However, these are accepted on account of their texts, and their compliance to the correct beliefs. The chain of such (narrations) should not be paid attention to.¹

If we overlook all of the above, and rather seek an answer directly from one of their scholars, so that we could find a more accurate ruling than our own research (which would have taken place by referring to their books on ‘narrators’) we find their scholar al-Majlīsī saying regarding the above narration:

فَالَخَبُرُ صَحِيحٌ

The narration is authentic.²

The testimony of al-Majlīsī holds an unparalleled position, according to them, as he is:

الشَّارِحُ المَتَبَعُ لْإلْكَافِيِّ الَّذِيَ بَيْنَ صَحِيحِهِ مِنْ ضَعْفِهِ

The commentator who studied al-Kāfī thoroughly and differentiated between its authentic and unauthentic.³

A contemporary scholar of the Imāmiyyah, ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Muẓaffar seconds this judgement:

إِنَّهُ موْتَقِحٌ كَالصَّحِيحٍ

It is reliable, like an authentic (narration).⁴

---

1 Al-Ṣhaˈrānī: Muqaddimat Sharḥ Jāmī`
2 Mirˈāt al-ˈUqūl 2/536
3 Refer to Mirˈāt al-ˈUqūl, Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: al-ˈAmal bī l-Ḥadīth wa Shurūṭuh ʿInd al-Imāmiyyah which appears in the book Daˈwat al-Taqrīb pg. 383
4 Al-Shāfī Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 7/227
It is only fair that we mention that the author of *Ṣahīḥ al-Kāfī*, who is also one of their contemporary scholars, omitted this narration from his book.¹ Does this mean that he regarded it as unauthentic? This is the impression that is created by his methodology, which he explained in the forward of his book. At times, he adopts this stance, and even more pleasing stances, which — unfortunately — cannot be blindly accepted to be his actual stance. This is due to the fact that they uphold the belief of Taqiyyah to an extent explained by one of their contemporary scholars:

لاقل مجتهد إمامي أن يرفض أي حدیث لا يرضيه في الكافی وغيره ویأخذ به حدیث موجود في البخاری ومسلم، ولا يحق لأحد أن يحتج عليه من وجهة دینیة أو مذهبیة

Every Imāmī Mujtahid is allowed to reject any ḥadīth of *al-Kāfī* and other books, if it does not suit him. He should rather take the aḥādīth of *Bukhārī* and *Muslim*. None should have the opportunity of pointing a finger at him from the perspectives of religion and (his) sect.²

Thus, Taqiyyah gives him the liberty to lie in this manner. The reality, of course, is not the same as the impression he creates. This is why their celebrated scholar, al-Majlisī named a chapter, “chapter twenty eight: That which the majority report from the narrations of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, that which is authentic according to them (the Shī‘ah) and the prohibition of referring to the narrations of the opposition except when using proof against them from their own books.”³

Thus far, we discussed the authenticity of the narration. As far as the meaning is concerned, al-Māzindarānī, the commentator of *al-Kāfī* says:

القرآن ستة آلاف وخمسمئة والزائد على ذلك مما سقط بالتحريف

---

¹ Refer to al-Bahbūdī: *Ṣahīḥ al-Kāfī*, Kitāb Faḍl al-Qur’ān Bāb al-Nawādir 1/156-157
² Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: *al-ʿAmal bī l-Ḥadīth wa Shurūṭuh ‘Ind al-Imāmiyyah* which appears in the book *Daʿwat al-Taqrīb* pg. 384
³ *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/214
Indeed, the Qurʾān (contains) six thousand five hundred (verses).\(^1\) The remainder were deleted through alterations.\(^2\)

Al-Majlisī says:

إن هذا الخبر وكثير من الأخبار الصحيحة صريحة في نقص القرآن وتغييره

This narration, as well as many authentic narrations explicitly (state) that deletions and alterations took place in the Qurʾān.\(^3\)

These are explanatory statements of scholars from the Safavid dynasty regarding this narration. They are the ones who went all out in trying to be as extreme as possible, and perhaps they have reached the pinnacle thereof. You might be in for a surprise if you compare the explanations of these concoctions (which are kufr through and through — which were spread by scholars of the twelfth century, during the Safavid reign) to the explanations presented by Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī of the fourth century in his book *Al-Iʿtiqādāt*, a book that has been declared by the contemporary Shīʿī scholars to be:

من الكتب المعتبرة الموثقة

Among the reliable and trusted books.\(^4\)

He says:

 إنه قد نزل من الوحي الذي ليس بقرآن ما لو جمع إلى القرآن لكان مبلغه مقدار سبعة عشرة ألف آية، وذلك مثل قول جبرائيل.. عش ما شئت فإنك ميت، وأحب ما شئت فإنك مفارقه، وأعمل ما شئت فإنك ملاقنه...

---

1 I could not find this number in any of the places (in which I looked) where the number of the verses of the Qurʾān is mentioned. Refer to *Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī* 1/64-65, *Al-Itqān* 1/89, al-Feyrozābādī: *Baṣāʾir Dhawī al-Tamyīz* 1/559-560.
2 *Sharḥ Jāmiʿ (ī al-Kāfī)* 11/76
3 *Mirʾāt al-ʿUqūl* 2/536
4 *Al-Dhariʿah* 13/101
The revelation which is not part of the Qur’ān is such that if it were added to the Qur’ān, it would reach a total of seventeen thousand verses. An example of them is the statement of Jibrīl, “live as long as you like, you will definitely die; love whoever you wish to love, you will most definitely leave him; do as you please, you will definitely face it.”

He then goes on to list a few more examples. Take a look at and examine the vast difference between the statement of al-Kulaynī and the statement of Ibn Bābawayh. The one says that talks about “revelation that is not part of the Qur’ān” whilst the other says, “the Qur’ān which was brought by Jibrīl.” In other words, Ibn Bābawayh says that the deficiency is not related to the Qur’ān, whereas al-Kulaynī explicitly declares that the Qur’ān is deficient.

Whilst the explanation of al-Majlisī and al-Māzindarānī (concerning the narration) were in complete harmony with the apparent meaning of the blasphemous narration, Ibn Bābawayh interpreted the extra amount to be part of the *al-Aḥādīth al-Qudsiyyah* (those aḥādīth wherein Nabī  narrates directly from Allah  ). This explanation is also accommodated by the wording of the narration. However, the noteworthy point at this juncture is that none of the two were prepared to belie and reject the narration!

Is there an angle to the narration of al-Kulaynī which would make it, to some degree, acceptable (as opposed to the views and lies of al-Majlisī, al-Māzindarāzī and their likes)? It was possible (if these people were well-wishers of their religion and their followers) for them to regard the additional verses to be among those whose recitation was abrogated, if they did not have the courage to reject it. This is because these narrations can only be dealt with in one of two ways; either they should be interpreted in some way or the other, or they should be rejected. I have seen the author of *Al-Wāfī* mentioning this interpretation, after listing a few possible interpretations which affirm the blasphemous belief of alterations. He says:

---

1. *Al-Iʿtiqādāt* pg. 102
Or the extra amount — which is not in the Qur’ān — is from the portion which is abrogated as far as the recitation is concerned.¹

However, the contemporary Shi‘ī scholar, al-Khū‘ī (who is their greatest Marja‘), whilst acting as if he is defending the Qur’ān, says that there is no difference between saying that there were alterations and saying that abrogation as far as recitation took place.² It is as if he wished to shut the door of interpretation and reject this established principle so that he may institute, in a very shrewd manner, a belief that he almost managed to keep hidden. The difference between alterations and abrogation is quite clear. Alterations are the acts of humans and Allah has condemned it, whilst Allah Himself abrogated verses. Allah says:

```
مَا نَنْسَخْ مِنْ آيَةٍ اَوْ نُنْسِهَا نَاْتِ بِخَيْرٍ مِّنْهَآ اَوْ مِثْلِهَا
```

We do not abrogate a verse or cause it to be forgotten except that We bring forth [one] better than it or similar to it.⁴

This does not, in any way, imply that the Book of Allah was interfered with. If the narration of al-Kulaynī suggests that almost two thirds of the Qur’ān was disposed of, it leaves us with a little more than one third. Take into account the other narration reported by him:

```
نزل القرآن أثلاثاً، ثلث فینا وفي عدونا، وثلث سنن وأمثال، وثلث فرائض وأحكام
```

The Qur’ān was revealed in thirds; one third regarding us and our enemies, one third regarding mannerisms and parables and one third regarding obligations and laws.⁵

---

1 Al-Kāshānī: Al-Wāfī vol. 2 1/274
3 Al-Khū‘ī: al-Bayān pg. 210
4 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 106
5 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/627
So which third, according to them, has remained? Is it the one regarding mannerisms and parables or the one regarding obligations and laws? It cannot be the third relating to the Imāms and their enemies as this sacrilegious sect firmly believes that it had been deleted:

 لو قرئ القرآن كما أنزل لألفينا مسمين

If the Qur’ān was read the way it was revealed, we would have found named (individuals).

This (the claim that the Imāms’ names have been removed) is the actual motive, core and essence of all their attacks against the Book of Allah. This means that the ummah were totally lost all along the centuries. Since the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, they only had one third of their book. The Imāms (according to them) on the other hand, were the saviours of the ummah, as they had by them the entire Qur’ān. However, they chose not to pass it on to the ummah and left them in their pitiable condition, where they could not differentiate between their friends and enemies.

They have been promised that it will resurface with the awaited Imām. Unfortunately, more than a thousand years have passed yet neither is the awaited one making his appearance, nor is any copy of the ‘original’ Qur’ān available. If the ummah can be guided despite its absence, then what is the point of it being brought back by the awaited one? If it is the foundation of guidance for the ummah, then why are the Imāms being barriers between it and the ummah?

Are they happy to leave the ummah in a state of destruction, misguidance and confusion (as asserted by the Shī’ah)? Did Allah reveal His book so that it could remain imprisoned in the chamber of the ‘ Awaited One’ and the ummah could have no real access to it? Is this really the case, even after Allah did not hand over the matter of preserving the Qur’ān to any angel or His Nabī, but rather took it upon Himself to preserve and protect it?
Their narrations state (as quoted previously) that Ālī was unable to bring out the original copy due to fear of it being interfered with. This, in essence, means that the ummah which was earmarked as the best ummah and selected for the guidance of the rest of humanity is itself lost, ill-fated and misguided. The only individuals from this entire ummah who are excluded from this pitiable state are the companions of the awaited one. The rest will remain isolated from the source of their guidance, prosperity and good-fortune.

All of this, despite the Imāms being granted sources and means to pass on their message that was not even granted to the ambiyā’. According to them, Ālī possessed supernatural abilities, by means of which he could have circulated the complete Qur‘ān. Al-Majlisī says under the chapter, “a comprehensive collection of his miracles”:

إن علياً مر برجل يخطب: هو هو، فقال: یا شاب، لو قرأت القرآن لكان خیراً لك. فقال: إني ل أحسنه ولوددت أن أحسن منه شيئاً. فقال: ادن مني، فدنا منه فتكلم بشيء خفي، فصور الله القرآن كله في قلبه فحفظه كله

ʿAlī passed by a man who was blurring out, “he, he.” Thus, he advised him, “young man, if you recite the Qur‘ān, it will be better for you.” He replied, “I cannot (recite) properly, but I wish that I could read any portion of it properly.” Thereupon he (ʿAlī) said, “come close to me.” He drew close to him whereupon he said something mysterious. Consequently, Allah created an imprint of the entire Qur‘ān in his heart and he memorised it in its entirety.¹

Hence, Ālī had the ability to convey the entire Qur‘ān in this ‘magical’ way to whomsoever he wished. Furthermore, he was able to adequately counter any opposition that could have come his way, as one of the chapter-headings of al-Kāfī states:

---
¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 42/17
He knows what happened and what is to happen. Nothing is hidden from him.\(^1\)

Similarly, it was impossible for him to be killed without his choice and happiness. The Imāms, as proclaimed by the chapter-headings of \textit{al-Kāfī}:  

\textbf{یعلم ما کان وما یكون ول یخفي علیه الشيء}

They know when they will die, and they do not die except by their own choice.\(^2\)

If this was the degree of strength and control possessed by them, why did they then choose not to convey the Qur‘ān? According to a narration of theirs, Amīr al-Mu’minīn said:

\textbf{لو ثني لي الوسادة وعرف لي حقي لأخرجت لهم مصحفًا كتبته وأملاه علي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم}

If a cushion was laid out for me and my rights were recognised, I would have taken out for them a copy which was dictated to me by Rasūlullāh, and I wrote it out.\(^3\)

Firstly, we pause at his statement:

\textbf{لو ثني لي الوسادة}

If a cushion was laid out for me.

---

\(^1\) \textit{Uṣūl al-Kāfī} 1/260  
\(^2\) \textit{Uṣūl al-Kāfī} 1/258  
\(^3\) \textit{Biḥār al-Anwār} 92/52
This statement, according to al-Majlisī, is a reference to being granted the presidential seat.\footnote{Ibid 92/52} How is it that after he was made the khalīfah, he failed to bring out this copy, even after he promised to do so? Did he break his promise, as asserted by the liar behind this fabrication?

The next portion of his statement is:

وعرف لي حقي

... and my rights were recognised.

How was it possible to recognise his rights when the source which explained this did not reach the masses?

The last portion of his statement, “… which was dictated to me by Rasūlullāh ﷺ,” contradicts the other tales fabricated by them in which it is stated, “compilation of the Qur’ān was only completed after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.” The reality is that all the texts regarding this lie are the greatest insults against the Ahl al-Bayt. None can match them in their accusations against the Ahl al-Bayt. Thus, the statement of one of their Imāms (as admitted in their books) is indeed undisputable. He said:

لقد أمسینا وما أحد أعدى لنا ممن يتحل مودتنا

With the passage of time, we (found) that our greatest enemies are the ones who claim to be our lovers.\footnote{Rījāl al-Kashī pg. 307}

The most amazing narration regarding this fabrication is the one which is referred to as “the satisfactory answer” of Amīr al-Mu’minīn in the book al-Iḥtijāj (one of their reliable works) by their scholar, al-Ṭabarsī - who belonged to the sixth century. Supposedly, this was part of an answer to a question posed by ‘one of the irreligious ones’. He said:

---

1 Ibid 92/52
2 Rījāl al-Kashī pg. 307
إن الكناية عن أسماء الجرائر العظيمة من المنافقين في القرآن ليست من فعله تعالى، وأنها من فعل المغبرين والمبدلين وليس يسوغ مع عموم النية التصريح بأسماء المبدلين، ولا الزراعة في آياته على ما أثبت من تلقائهم في الكتاب بما في ذلك من تقوية حجج أهل التخيل والفكر، والملل المنحرف عن قبلتنا، وأبطل هذا العلم الظاهر الذي قد استكان له الموافقون والمخالفون بوقوع الإصلاح على الأئتمار لهم، والرضوا بهم. فإن الصبر على ولاة الأمر مفروض لقول الله عز وجل: {اصبر كما صبر أولوا الْعَزْمِ مِنَ الرُّسُلِ} (ال ankāf, آية: 25). فحسبك من الجواب عن هذا الموضوع ما سمعت، فإن شريعة النتيجة تحظر التصريح بأكثر منه.


وأما ظهورك على تناكر قوله: {وَ اِنْ خِفْتُمْ اَلَّ تُقْسِطُوْا فِی الْیَتٰمٰی فَانْكِحُوْا مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِّنَ النِّسَآء} (النساء, آية: 3), وليس يشبه القسط في البتائية تناك نسائنا، ولا كل النساء أيهام، فهو مما قد ثبت ذكره من إسقاط المنافقين من القرآن، ويبين كذا في الاحتجاج. القول في البتائية وبينها نكاح النساء من الخطاب والقصص أكثر من ثلث القرآن، وهذا وما أشبهه مما ظهرت حوادث المنافقين فيه لأهل النظر والتأمل، ووجد المعطلون وأهل المثل المختلفة للإسلام مساعاً إلى القذف في القرآن، ولو شرحت لك كل مما أسقط وحَرَفْ وبدل مما يجري هذا المجرى لطال، وظهر مما تحظر النية إظهاره من مناقب الأوليين ومثال الأعداء.

The indirect reference to the names of the criminals responsible for the aghast crimes — from the hypocrites — is not the act of Allah, the Exalted. It is the act of those who distorted and altered (the Qur’ān). It is inappropriate that along with the generality of Taqiyyah, the names of the distorters should be stated. Similarly, it is inappropriate to add on to the verses which they have established in the Book after their consultation. This is because doing so will strengthen the proofs of those who wish to annihilate (Islam), the disbelievers and the people who do not adhere to our Qiblah. It will also lead to the elimination of this outward knowledge, which has been accepted by those who agree as well as the opposition, as some kind of agreement has been reached as far as obeying them and being happy with them. Also, exercising patience with the rulers is obligatory, as Allah instructs His Nabī: ﷺ:
So be patient, [O Muḥammad], as were those of determination among the messengers.¹

This much is enough to answer your question, as the religion of Taqiyyah prohibits that more than this should be stated.

As for His statement:

Everything will be destroyed except His Wajh (literally; face).²

The actual revelation was, “everything will be destroyed except His religion,” as it is impossible that the rest of Him is destroyed and His face remains. He is beyond and greater than that. Only that will be destroyed which is not part of Him. Do you not see that He says:

Everyone upon it [i.e., the earth] will perish. And there will remain the Wajh of your Rabb, Owner of Majesty and Honour.³

Thus, he differentiated between His creation and His face. As for you expressing your suspicions regarding the verse:

And if you fear that you will not deal justly with the orphan girls, then marry those that please you of [other] women...⁴

(You object) that justice with the orphan is not tantamount to marrying women, and not all women are orphans. This is from that which I have already mentioned, i.e. the portions which were deleted from the Qurʾān by the hypocrites. More than one third of the Qurʾān was dedicated to speech and narratives regarding orphans and marrying women.⁵ This, and

---

¹ Sūrah al-Aḥqāf: 35
² Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 88
³ Sūrah al-Raḥmān: 26
⁴ Sūrah al-Nisā: 3
⁵ As stated in al-Iḥtijāj
others similar to it are among the things which expose — for those who contemplate and ponder — the role of the hypocrites regarding it.

Also those who wish to annihilate (Islam) and those who follow religions other than Islam have found a pathway for criticism of the Qur’ān. If I were to explain to you all that had been deleted, altered and changed in this manner, it will become too lengthy. Also, it will bring to the fore that which Taqiyyah prohibits from being publicised, from the merits of the pious ones and the crimes of the enemies.¹

Despite the length of the above quotation, it is only a portion of the supposed lengthy conversation that the author of al-Iḥtijāj claims took place between Amīr al-Mu’minīn ʿAlī I and one of the irreligious ones, in which ʿAlī I debated him and attempted to guide him to the truth. Can there be anyone who is more irreligious than the one who utters such absurdities regarding the Book of Allah and the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh H? We cannot fathom any enemy plotting in a manner worse than this! Mūsā Jār Allah says:

Do the worst enemies find a pathway which is more destructive to the Qur’ān and the religion (if it had any weight to it) than this statement which the scholars of the Shīʿah have attributed to Amīr al-Mu’minīn ʿAlī I?²

Take note of the pitch-black hatred contained in this narration against the best generation known to humanity, the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh H. This is to the extent that it refers to them as “the criminals responsible for the aghast crimes, from the hypocrites”. All of this was on account of the jealousy which devoured the hearts of these bigots and the hatred that left no space for anything else in their souls against this unique generation who were personifications of the Qur’ān. These chauvinists could not find anything in the Qur’ān to pacify their emotions, thus they claimed, “the Qur’ān was filled with the names of the hypocrites (i.e.

---

¹ al-Iḥtijāj: pg. 249-254
² Al-Washīʿah pg. 123
the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) — according to them). However they were deleted by the distorters.” Their narrations of this nature are many in number.

Thereafter, the above-quoted narration goes on to state that it is inappropriate to state the names of the distorters due to the belief of Taqiyyah. Paradoxically (but not surprisingly) the same book contains another narration in which it is stated that the ones who altered the Qur’ān (according to their belief) were Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and Zayd ibn Thābit.

1 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī adds on to the list:

والذین باشروا هذا الأمر الجسیم هم أصحاب الصحیفة أبو بكر وعمر وعثمان أبو عبیدة وسعد بن أبي
وقاص وعبد الرحمن بن عوف، واستعانوا بزید بن ثابت

The ones who carried out this grave crime were the people of the scroll; Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, Abū ʿUbaydah, Saʿd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAwf. They sought assistance from Zayd ibn Thābit.

These were the individuals who were at the forefront of Islamic conquests and they were the vanguard of the first Muslim contingent, who engineered an unparalleled civilization. Consequently, they became a sore-sight for the eyes of these bigots and a bone in their throats. This was precisely the reason behind the specific attack, lies and accusations against this generation by these disgruntled vagabonds.

The concocted narration asserts that it is impermissible, as per the demands of Taqiyyah, to add on to the verses of the noble Qur’ān. Does this mean that it was only on account of their fear that they held back their forged copy of the Qur’ān? Does it imply that, had they nothing to fear, they would have produced a false copy of the Qur’ān? Is it possible that as long as there is some reason to fear, they will keep this copy a secret among themselves, and as soon as they are relieved of this fear, they will publicise this copy?

1 Refer to al-Ṣḥāfat al-Ḥaḍāʾihī pg. 156
2 Faṣḥ al-Khiṭāb pg. 73
The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* presents from the books of his scholars a thousand of what he refers to as ‘proofs’ in which it is alleged that verses of the Qur’ān were deleted. He also proves that most of the books of the Shīʿah confirm this. In doing so, he has undoubtedly exposed the greatest and most shameless crime of the Shīʿah. The question remains; have they done away with Taqiyyah even though their texts state that Taqiyyah will remain with them until the emergence of their Mahdī, or has he disobeyed the instruction of his Imām, and opposed the methodology of his people? Indeed, these are conjectures which annul one another. Soon, we will present some research regarding the question of whether or not the Shīʿah have their own copy of the Qur’ān.

The narration of *al-Iḥtijāj* goes on to claim that ʿAlī, during the course of his debate with the irreligious individual says that, on account of the demands of Taqiyyah, he is not allowed to state more than he already stated, as this would strengthen the proofs of those who wish to annihilate Islam. This means that Taqiyyah is discarded when speaking to an irreligious one and open kufr is uttered. As for conversations with the believers, in that case it remains obligatory.

Does this sect wish to count Amīr al-Muʾminīn among the group of this irreligious one who practices Taqiyyah before the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh, but states his beliefs regarding the Book of Allah in a clear manner when speaking to the irreligious and ungodly ones? After this clear kufr, he says that adding on to this would strengthen the proofs of those who wish to annihilate. If this is a reference to the noble Ṣaḥābah and their followers, then it undoubtedly reveals the bigotry of this sect. On the other hand, if this is a reference to anyone other than them, then how would adding on to what was already mentioned lead to disbelief regarding the Book of Allah?

These vagabonds claim that ʿAlī explained to the irreligious one that he was not allowed to openly claim this and explain it, as it was “obligatory to exercise patience regarding the rulers.” Shīʿī doctrine centres on the belief of negating

---

1 Refer to the chapter regarding Taqiyyah in this book.
the rule of anyone besides their twelve Imāms. However, this text establishes that there were rulers besides them, whose obedience was compulsory! This demolishes the very foundation of their religion, and highlights to us that lies and concoctions will always be self-contradictory.

Among the greatest accusations against Amīr al-Mu’minīn ʿAlī I is that he disobeyed Allah, preferring to obey others, considering this to be his responsibility! It is a well-known principle in Islam that there shall be no obedience to any of the creation, if it necessitates disobedience of Allah.

But if they endeavour to make you associate with Me that of which you have no knowledge, do not obey them.¹

They claim that ʿAlī I obeyed them and towed their line regarding the interpolations that took place in the Qur'ān on account of the law of the religion of Taqiyyah. This is severe defamation of the character of ʿAlī I as well as a claim that he was a disbeliever. Thus, they have attacked him, even before they could attack any of the other companions of Muḥammad H. From this we learn that these people are the enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt and their grudges against them are stronger than their grudges and enmity against the rest of the Muslims.

Look at how he tries to prove that it is incumbent to obey the ruler with regards to kufr from the verse of Allah:

So be patient, [O Muḥammad], as were those of determination among the messengers.²

---

¹ Sūrah Luqmān: 15
² Sūrah al-Aḥqāf: 35
This is a clear sign that the one behind this fabrication was a complete ignoramus. This is because the purport of this verse is the exact opposite of that which he calls towards. Attributing this ‘interpretation’ to ‘Alî ʿAbbîs is an insult to him and a claim that he was an ignoramus. We also understand that this individual was either a non-Arab, who had no understanding of the Arabic language, or he was an irreligious person who played ignorant. This is established from his statement:

Everything will be destroyed except His Wajh (literally; face).\(^1\)

The actual revelation was, “everything will be destroyed except His religion”, as it is impossible that the rest of Him is destroyed and His face remains.\(^2\)

The author of al-Iḥtijāj the goes on to claim that ‘Alî ʿAbbîs said to this irreligious one that more than a third of the Qur’an was deleted from Sūrah al-Nisā’, and if he was to go into the details of that which was deleted and distorted in this manner, the conversation would become lengthy and that would come to the fore, which the religion of Taqiyyah prohibited from exposing.

Undoubtedly, this is among the greatest accusations against Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ‘Alî ʿAbbîs, as he did not reveal to the Muslims, during his rule, this ‘deleted’ portion of the Qur’an. He did not instruct anyone to add it back to the Qur’an, follow its guidelines or practice upon its commands. Thus, these people, who howl slogans of support and love for the Ahl al-Bayt have been exposed, by means of these fabrications, to be their worst enemies. They even surpass, in their enmity for them, the Nawāṣib as they attribute to Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ‘Alî ʿAbbîs the crime of being pleased with kufr and accepting it.

Whenever, they are unable to prove a matter, they resort to their beloved practice of Taqiyyah. Here also, we see that since he is unable to explain “that which was deleted and distorted,” he hid away behind the veil of Taqiyyah. Taqiyyah has

\[^1\] Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 88
\[^2\] Al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah pg. 6
by now, been exposed to be a childish trick and an emergency exit from any confrontation. There were others, who were foolish enough to have an attempt at presenting an ‘example’ or two of verses which were deleted. However, they were badly exposed and their ploy was total failure. This was on account of the fact that these ‘examples’, when compared to the verses of the Qur’ān, were closer to the jokes and nonsensical speech of children than anything else. How could it be possible for them to come close to matching the glorious Qur’ān?

As long as the constitution of the religion of these people refers to those who uttered these profane statements regarding the Book of Allah as irreligious, as stated in the above quoted narration, should we believe the report that the orientalist Brian has in his possession an Iranian copy of the Qur’ān, which has additions to that which was revealed by Allah? Apparently, it contains a surah by the name of “al-Wilāyah”.¹ This would mean that this sect has ‘secret copies’ which they keep among themselves.

**Do the Shīʿah Circulate Among Themselves Secret Copies?**

Do the Shīʿah have a book which includes all of these fabrications and has the Shīʿī version of tales instead of that which was revealed by Allah (which is referred to as the Qur’ān by them)? What do their tales state? What does their condition state regarding this exception? How true is the statement of Shaykh Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, “the Shīʿah have their own copies (of the Qur’ān) which are different to the normal copy”?²

Muḥibb al-Dīn once published a copy of a ‘concocted Sūrah’, which was named Sūrah al-Wilāyah.³ He explained that this was a photocopy from a handwritten

---

¹ *Al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah* pg. 11
² Refer to the footnotes of *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfat al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah* pg. 12
³ He published this in *al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah* pg. 12, *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfat* pg. 31, *Majallat al-Fatḥ*, edition 842, pg. 9. This was also published, prior to his publications, by the al-Ustādh Aḥmad al-Kisrawī who was originally a Shīʿī in his book *al-Shīʿah wa l-Tashayyu‘*. 
Iranian Qur’ān, which was in the possession by Mr Brian, the orientalist.¹ This was also stated by the scholar of the Shīʿah, the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb. Prior to him, the one who passed the verdict of kufr upon the Shīʿah said, “they made up their own copy.” So now begs the question: do the Shīʿah have a secret copy which they keep among themselves, as stated by these writers?

After going through all their texts and the statements of their scholars, I say; they have narrations in which it is said that they should continue practising upon the Qur’ān until their copy appears with their awaited Imām. Al-Kulaynī says in al-Kāfī:

... many of our scholars from — Sahl ibn Ziyād from — Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān from — one of his companions from — Abū al-Ḥasan I, he says: “I said, ‘may I be sacrificed for you, we hear verses in the Qur’ān which are not in our (copies) the way we hear it, and we are not good at reciting it in the way that reached us from you people. So, will we be sinful?’” He replied, “no, recite it the way you learnt it, as the one who will teach you will soon come to you.”²

We can deduct from this text that they recite their fabrications to one another from his statement, “which are not in our (copies) the way we hear it,” and “in the way that reached us from you people”.³ They complained that they were not good at reciting that which they heard or that which reached them, whereupon

---

¹ Muḥibb al-Dīn says that this copy was discovered to be in the possession of Brian and photocopied by one who he refers to as ‘the reliable and trustworthy one’, Muḥammad ʿAlī Saʿūdī, who was – as stated by Shaykh Muḥibb al-Dīn – one of the high-ranking ministers of justice in Egypt. Refer to the footnotes of Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah, pg. 32, al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah pg. 11.

² Uṣūl al-Kāfī

³ There are many narrations in which it is claimed that their Imāms recite something other than the Qur’ān. Tafsīr Furāṭ says: continued on page 346
their Imām promised them that the one who will teach them will shortly appear. This promise, as they falsely claim, was fulfilled during the era of their Imām — Abū al-Ḥasan.

The words, ‘will come to you shortly,’ indicate that a teacher was to go to those who could not recite properly. However, this teacher did not come. That generation, as well as many other generations passed, yet no teacher appeared. Thereafter, the scholars of the Shīʿah decided to re-interpret this to be a reference to their awaited Mahdī. The Shīʿah have been instructed to recite the Qurʾān and to wait for that which will be brought by their awaited one. They have been prohibited from reading their tales, due to them not being good at reciting it, as indicated by the above quoted text. Thus, they do not have a secret copy which they circulate among themselves. This is what we learn from this narration of al-Kāfī.

Al-Mufīd says:

إن الخبر قد صح من أئمتنا - عیلهم السلام - أنهم أمروا بقراءة ما بین الدفتین، وأن نتعداه، بلا زيادة فيه ولا نقصان منته، حتى یقوم القائم -علیه السلام - فیقرأ الناس القرآن على ما أنزله الله تعالى وجمعه أمیر المؤمنین - عليه السلام

It has been authentically reported from our Imāms that they have been commanded to recite that which is between the two covers, and we should

continued from page 345

عن حمران قال: سمعت أبي جعفر يقرأ هذه الآية: "إن الله اصطفى آدم ونوحًا وآدم عيسى عليه السلام وآدم محمد على العالمين" قلت: ليس يقرأ

کذا، قال: أدخل حرف مكان حرف

습니까ً، قال: "I heard Abū Jaʿfar reciting this verse, 'Indeed, Allah chose Ādam and Nūḥ, the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of Muḥammad over the worlds.'" I said, “it is not recited like that.” He replied, “replace a letter with another.” (Tafsīr Furāt pg. 18, Bihār al-Anwār 92/56)

There are many other similar texts which indicate that they attribute recitation to the Imāms, which have nothing to do with that which Allah had revealed and that which the Muslims recite. Will anyone still regard these people as the supporters of the Ahl al-Bayt?

1 Refer to al-Māzindarānī: Sharḥ Jāmīʿ (of al-Kāfī) 11/47. There are many other texts of the Rāfiḍah which clearly state that this is the Qāʾīm or the Mahdī, as will be mentioned shortly.
not go beyond that, neither adding on, nor removing anything, until the Qā’im appears. Thereupon people will recite the Qur’ān in the manner that Allah revealed it and Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn compiled it.¹

Ni’mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī says:

قد روي في الأخبار أنهم عليهم السلام أمرو شیعتهم بقراءة هذا الموجود من القرآن في الصلاة وغيرها والعمل بأحكامه حتى يظهر مولانا صاحب الزمان فيرتفع هذا القرآن من أيدي الناس إلى السماء، ويخرج القرآن الذي أمره الله أمير المؤمنين فيقرأ ويعمل بأحكامه

It has been reported in the narrations that he commanded his Shī‘ah to recite this portion, which is found in the Qur’ān in ṣalāh and outside ṣalāh and to practise upon its commands until our master, Ṣāḥib al-Zamān, appears. Thereupon, this Qur’ān will disappear from the hands of the people to the skies and the Qur’ān that was compiled by Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn will appear. It will then be recited, and its commands will be acted upon.²

If this was the case, why is it that a few extra verses are narrated from each of the Imāms? Also, how can it be acceptable to practise upon an altered version? It seems as if these texts, which call towards practising upon the Qur’ān are, in a subtle way, contradicted by other texts which suggest that the Qur’ān should not be learnt, as it was — according to their belief — altered. Whoever learns the altered version will have difficulty in learning the one which will be brought by their awaited one. Al-Mufīd reports with his isnād from Jābir al-Ju’fī, who reports from Abū Ja’far (al-Bāqir):

إذا قام قائم آل محمد صلى الله عليه وآله ضرب فساطط، ويعمل الناس القرآن على ما أنزل الله عز وجل، فأصعب ما يكون على من حفظه اليوم، لأنه يخالف فيه التأليف

When the Qā’im from the progeny of Muḥammad will appear, he will put up tents and he will teach people the Qur’ān in the manner that

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 92/74
2 Al-Anwār al-Nu’māniyyah 2/363-364
it was revealed by Allah, the Most Honoured, the Most Glorified. The one who will find it most difficult is the one who memorised it today, as it is opposes its sequence.¹

This is the narration of al-Mufīd, who is revered by them to the extent that they believe that he reached a level that is beyond the reach of humans, as their awaited Imām “addressed him by the titles, ‘the righteous brother’ and ‘the guided master.’”² This narration appears in their book, Al-Irshād, which is among the most valued of their reliable books. Al-Majlisī says regarding it:

كتاب الإرشاد أشهر من مؤلفه

The book Al-Irshād is more famous than its author.³

Similarly, al-Nuʿmānī reports in al-Ghaybah, a narration which echoes the meaning of the above-quoted narration. He reports, with his (forged) chain of transmission to Amīr al-Muʿminīn ʿAlī⁴ that he said:

کأني بالعجم فساطیطهم في مسجد الكوفة یعلمون الناس القرآن کما أنزل، قلت: یا أمیر أو لیس هو کما أنزل؟ فقال: ل، محي منه سبعون من قریش بأسمائهم وأسماء آبائهم، وما ترك أبو لهب إلا إزراء على رسول الله - صلى الله علیه وآله - لأنه عمه

It is as if I am with the non-Arabs, their tents are put up in the Masjid of Kūfah, and they are teaching the people Qur’ān in the manner that it was revealed. I asked, “O Amīr al-Muʿminīn, is it not (found) in the way it was revealed?” He replied, “No! The names of seventy people from Quraysh, along with the names of their fathers have been deleted. Abū Lahab was only left so that Rasūlullāh could be disgraced, as he is his paternal uncle.”⁴

---

¹ Al-Mufīd: Al-Irshād pg. 413
² The preface of the book in which all the addresses of the awaited Mahdī to al-Mufīd, which appear in al-Iḥtijāj, have been recorded, pg. 277.
³ Al-Majlisī: Biḥār al-Anwār 1/27
⁴ Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah pg. 171-172, Faṣl al-Khiṭāb, scroll seven, Biḥār al-Anwār 92/60
Al-Nu‘mānī quotes two narrations which convey the same meaning. It seems as if the one who fabricated this narration was an irreligious non-Arab, as he confines the promised teaching to them. The deep hatred that he carries in his heart for the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh, who conquered the lands of his people and spread Islam between them is also quite apparent in his narration. Thus, he pacifies himself, upon not finding their names alongside the name of Abū Lahab, by saying that the Qurʾān was altered.

This narration, which discourages the learning of the Qurʾān, had a strong effect upon Shīʿī communities. This was witnessed by Mūsā Jār Allah, who spent some time in their communities and could not find any of their students or teachers who memorised the Qurʾān. In fact, he did find someone who could recite even a portion of it correctly, leaving no question of whether any of them had any idea of the different manners of recital. His opinion was that this was a result of the Shīʿah anticipating the copy of ‘Alī, which disappeared along with the Qāʾīm from the ‘progeny of Muḥammad’.  

1 Refer to al-Ghaybah pg. 194, Biḥār al-Anwār 25/364
2 Al-Washīʿah pg. 116. There are other narrations in their books which encourage the learning of the Qurʾān and memorising it. They also mention some rewards for the one who does so. One example is the narration of Abū Jaʿfar (al-Bāqir), who said to one of his companions, Saʿd al-Khaffāf:

O Saʿd, learn the Qurʾān...(Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/596)

The author of al-Kāfī then adds the chapter, “the chapter regarding the one who memorises the Qurʾān and then forgets it.” Under this chapter, he quotes six narrations in which the reward that is lost out by the one who forgets a portion of the Qurʾān is mentioned. (Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/607-609). He adds another chapter titled, “the chapter regarding its recital”. Under this chapter, he reports from Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq):

القرآن عهد الله إلى خلقه فقد ينبغي للمرء المسلم أن ينظر في عهده وأن يقرأ منه في كل يوم خمسين آية

The Qurʾān is the bequest of Allah (directed) towards His creation. Therefore, it is necessary for a Muslim to look at His bequest and recite fifty verses thereof daily. (Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/609)

Similarly, he has another chapter heading, “the houses in which Qurʾān is recited”. In it is a narration; Layth ibn Abī Sulaym reports from Rasūlullāh: continued on page 350
Have the Shīʿah gathered all of their lies in one place to facilitate easy learning of the promised copy, when it does appear? Al-Majlisī quotes al-Mufīd:

"... نهونا عليهم السلام عن قراءة ما وردت به الأخبار من أحرف يزيد على الثابت في المصحف، لأنه لم يأتي على التواتر وإنما جاء بالحاد، وقد يلغط الواحد فيما ينقله، ولأنه من قرأ الإنسان بما يخالف ما بين الدفتين غرر بنفسه مع أهل الخلاف، وأغرى به الحارمين، وعرض نفسه للهلاك، فمنعونا عليهم السلام من قراءة القرآن بخلاف ما يثبت بين الدفتين لما ذكرناه.

They have prohibited us from reciting the additional portions which appear in the narrations, which do not appear in the (original) copy, as it is not reported with tawātūr. It can only be established through aḥād, and a single person can err in that which he transmits. Added to that, whenever a person recites anything other than what is between the two covers, he puts his life at risk, at the hands of the opposition and he provokes the oppressors. He puts his life in danger, so they have prohibited us from reciting the Qur'ān against that which is established between the two covers, for the reasons that we have mentioned.\(^1\)

---

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/74-75

---

*continued from page 349*

نوروا بيوتكم بتلاوة القرآن ولا تتخذوها قبوراً

**Illuminate your houses with the recitation of the Qur'ān, and do not make them graves.** (*Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/610)

Another chapter heading reads, “the reward of reciting the Qur’ān”. Herein, seven narrations discuss the great rewards of the one who recites and learns the Qur’ān. (*Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/611-613). One chapter heading is, “reciting the Qur’ān from a copy”. This chapter contains five narrations which state the reward of reciting the Qur’ān whilst looking into a copy of it. (*Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/613-614).

There are other chapters which contain the same message. These contradict the other narrations. In fact, it is proof — from their own books — that their ‘narrations’ from the Ahl al-Bayt are forgeries and concoctions. Otherwise, how was it possible that he instructed the recitation of the Qur’ān, mentioned that great rewards are received by the one who recites it, encouraged all Muslims to recite it daily and illuminate their houses by means of it; if he believed that it was distorted? Does this not point out the great contradiction that exists in their religion?

---

\(^1\) *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/74-75
This means that the concocted verses which contradict the revelation of Allah, which are spread out in their books have not been compiled in a copy that could be circulated due to two reasons; firstly, their fear of the Muslims, and secondly, it is only established through āḥād narrations, and a single person could commit an error in that which he narrates. It should be noted that the hesitance as far as accepting the aḥād narrations is confined to the Uṣūlīs. As for the Akhbārī Shī‘ah, they believe that anything which is narrated by their scholars from the Imāms, in the many books that they have authored, is authentic, mutawātīr and established from its author. Their aḥādīth are thus, established from the infallibles.¹

Hence, they accept every narration regarding this concoction, which appears in the books of their scholars. This is why the scholar of the Shī‘ah, who they describe as “Imām al-Fuqahā al-İzām Ra‘īs al-Islām” (the forerunner of the great jurists, the leader of Islam), Ja‘far Kāshif al-Ghiṭā says:

 Strange laws and incorrect utterances have emerged from them (the Akhbārīs). Among them is their view that the Qur’ān was shortened, which they base upon such narrations which are obviously meant to either be interpreted or rejected.²

Thus, the Akhbārīs believe in the authenticity of all of these tales which appear in the books of their scholars. (Yes, you may express surprise at their acceptance of every letter that appears in these books which are attributed to their scholars — despite the great degree of incongruity in the chains and texts of the narrations — and their simultaneous attacks upon the Book of Allah) They believe obvious lies and reject established realities. Can there be a punishment greater than this kind of deformation? Their temperaments, intellects and standards have all been overturned.

¹ Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 20/61
Nonetheless, the reason cited, that it cannot be spread due to it being transmitted through āḥād narrations, is a matter that is not agreed upon by the Shīʿah. The reason that is agreed upon is that of fear. This means that the circulation of a secret version by the Akhbārīs is highly possible. Perhaps this is the explanation to that which was published by Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb and Aḥmad al-Kisrawī (who was originally a Shīʿī) regarding Sūrah al-Wilāyah, which was photocopied from the Iranian copy.¹

However this was a mere compilation of all those fabrications, which — according to them — are examples of that which appears in the copy of ʿAlī. As for the copy itself, it remains hidden and anticipated, just like their awaited Mahdī, who has not yet appeared. The Qurʿān will be practised upon until he makes his appearance. The compilation of these fabrications was merely to lull the sceptics and confused ones among them.

A point that I have noted from the speech of their scholars is that they have no difference of opinion regarding the existence of the copy of Amīr al-Muʿminīn ʿAlī. This is to the extent that even those who outwardly reject the view that alterations took place, from the classical as well as contemporary scholars such as Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (in Al-Iʿtiqādāt — as will appear) and al-Khūʿī (in al-Bayān) believe that the copy of ʿAlī does exist.²

The only question is; does it contain additional verses or rather, the additions are regarding the interpretations and sequence? This question will be answered shortly.

---

¹ These fabrications have been gathered by the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb and arranged according to the Sūrah of the Qurʿān. However, they are not in the form of a complete copy. A copy from Pakistan came into my possession, which was printed by the Shīʿah there. The publishers filled up this copy with their fabrications. However, they did not interfere with the original text. Rather, it was published like Tafsīr Jalālayn, i.e. the text of the Qurʿān was placed in the centre and the rest was placed around it.

² Al-Bayān pg. 223
The “Copy of ʿAlī”

We have already stated that the copy of ʿAlī ʿa.s. was mentioned in the first book written by the Shīʿah, just as it was mentioned in some narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah — which have been categorised as unauthentic, as explained by the expert on the subject, Ibn Ḥajar. However, the picture painted by the books of the Shīʿah is a different one, as explained. They have discussed this copy greatly and — according to their beliefs — it contains additions to the Book of Allah.

An all-out effort was made by the ‘reliable one’ of their religion, al-Kulaynī to spread this lie, in his book al-Kāfī. He dedicated a special chapter to it named, “the Qur’ān was not compiled in its complete form by anyone except the Imāms.” Thereafter, he quoted six of their narrations to prove this. Among them was that which he narrated from Jābir al-Juʿfī, who claimed to have heard Abū Jaʿfar (al-Bāqir) saying:

ما ادعى أحد من الناس أنه جمع القرآن كله كما أنزل إلا كاذاب، وما جمعه وحفظه كما نزله الله تعالى إلا علي بن أبي طالب والأئمة من بعده

No person has claimed to have gathered the entire Qur’ān in the form that it was revealed, except that he was a great liar. None gathered it and memorised it in the manner that it was revealed by Allah except ʿAlī ʿa.s. and the Imāms who appeared after him.¹

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/228. Take note that this narration was reported by Jābir al-Juʿfī, who is considered a liar by the Ahl al-Sunnah. Added to that, the books of the Shīʿah state that he did not have a good relationship with Abū Jaʿfar. (Refer to Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 191). Thus, this narration is one of his many lies. Al-Kulaynī, who wished to spread this lie did not find anything questionable with it. If the Qur’ān was not gathered by anyone besides ʿAlī ʿa.s., then where is that which he gathered? If he had gathered it, then what was the need for the “Imāms who appeared after him” to gather it? Unless they believe that the Imāms had a share in gathering it, although they did not even exist when it was being gathered. How is it possible that the majority have not seen this book, and no Muslim knew about it? How can this accusation be accepted, which was transmitted by a handful of liars, especially when the consensus of the Ṣaḥābah ʿa.s. — including ʿAlī ʿa.s. — upon practicing on this glorious Qur’ān and submitting to it, is being rejected? Furthermore, all the leading scholars of the ummah (which obviously included scores of scholars from the Ahl al-Bayt) upheld this consensus. These are undoubtedly baseless statements which cannot be accepted by a brain that is free from wayward desires and sinister motives. These can never enter a heart that is imbued with īmān.
In *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, the best book of tafsīr according to them, it is reported from Abū Jaʿfar (al-Bāqir)⁴:

ما أحد من هذه الأمة جمع القرآن إلا وصي محمد صلى الله عليه وآله

No person of this ummah gathered the Qur’ān except the Waṣī of Muḥammad⁵.

The narration of al-Kulaynī creates the impression that each Imām gathered the Qur’ān. Thus, it seems as if there are a few copies, not just one. However, the narration of al-Kulaynī contradicts this by explicitly stating that ʿAlī alone gathered it. Their narrations and chapter headings also state that whoever claims that the Qur’ān was gathered by anyone besides the Imāms is a great liar. This is despite the fact that they assert that it was compiled in the era of Nabī. This, they ‘prove’ from a narration which appears in *Al-Biḥār*⁶. Was it Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and the rest of the Imāms who took up the responsibility of compiling it in his era?

Some narrations have it that some of the Shīʿah discovered this copy. One narration states:

.. عن ابن الحمید قال: دخلت على أبي عبد الله - رضي الله عنه- فأخرج إليّ مصحفًا، قال: فتصفحته
فوقع بصري على موضع منه فإذا فيه مكتوب: "هذا جهنم التي كنتم بها تكذبان، فلا تموتان فيها ولا تحياان

Reported from Ibn Ḥumayd; he says, “I entered the presence of Abū ʿAbd Allah (al-Ṣādiq), who took out and presented to me a copy. I went through it whereupon my eyes fell upon a portion of it. I found that it stated, ‘this is the Hell-fire that the two of you would believe. So enter into it; you will not die there or live.’”

---

¹ *Tafsīr al-Qummī* pg. 744 (printed in Iran), *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/48
² Al-Marʿashī: *al-Maʿārif al-Jaliyyah* pg. 7
Al-Majlisī says:

یعنی الأولین

This is a reference to the first two.¹

They are referring to the two beloveds of the Rasūl ﷺ, his two fathers-in-law, successors, viziers and the best of the creation after the Rasūl, the ambiyā’; i.e. Abū Bakr and Ῥmar ʿUmar ³. This narration allows the chosen companions of the Imāms to take a look at the contents of their version or copy of the “Qur’ān”. However, another narration of al-Kāfī contradicts this. Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Naṣr says:

لم يكن الذین کفروا؛ فوجدت فیها

Abū al-Ḥasan gave a copy to me and said, “do not look into it.” I opened it and read in it, ʿlam Yakun… (Those who disbelieved were not...),” I found in it the names of seventy men of Quraysh, along with the names of their fathers. Thereupon he sent (someone to me saying), “send the copy.”²

In this narration, the Imām entrusted one of his confidants with the copy and prohibited him from taking a look at what is inside it. However, he opposes his Imām and he abuses the trust that was placed on him. He does not only read the contents but also spreads it. Thus, the copy which is referred to in this narration is a secret copy which is to be kept hidden from the general public as well as the chosen ones. None should read it except the Imām.

The narrator indicates that among the contents of this copy is the declaration that the Ṣaḥābah were disbelievers. Thus, this is not the Book of Allah, which was revealed for the benefit of humanity — in which the merits of the

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 92/48
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/631
Ṣaḥābah are extolled. Rather, it is a copy that is circulated by the hands of the Bāṭiniyyah in a very secretive manner. In it, there are forgeries against the Ahl al-Bayt; another act aimed at disgracing them.

This fabrication appears once again, with wording that is different to the previous narration. *Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt* reports from al-Bazanṭī that al-Riḍā handed to him that alleged copy. Al-Bazanṭī said:

One day, I was alone, so I opened the copy to read from it. When I spread it out, I looked in it at Lam Yakun. I found that it had much more than what was in our copy. I tried to read it but I could not understand anything. Thus, I took some ink and a paper and I was about to write it down, so that I could ask regarding, when all of a sudden a traveller came to me (before I could even write anything) carrying a handkerchief, a thread and a seal. He said, “my master commands you to place the copy in the handkerchief, seal it and send it to him with the seal.” I complied.²

This al-Bazanṭī says in this narration, “I did not understand anything from it”, yet in the previous narration, he is reported to have said that he found in it the

---

1 Al-Bazanṭī is the narrator of the previous fabrication. This individual, who reports these lies and makes claims against the Book of Allah, the Ṣaḥābah and the close relatives of Rasūlullāh is considered by them to be reliable (although he abused the trust that his Imām placed in him and he disobeyed him). *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* of al-Khūʿī states:

> وقال: أبو علي المعروف بالبزنطي، كوفي ثقة لقي الرضا، وكان عظيم المنزلة عنده، روى عنه كتاباً، ومات سنة 221 ه.

It is said, Abū ‘Alī. He was commonly known as al-Bazanṭī. He is a Kūfī and he is reliable. He met al-Riḍā and he held a great position in his sight. He narrated a book from him. He passed away in the year 221 A.H. (*Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 2/231)

2 *Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt* pg. 246, from *Bihār al-Anwār* 92/51
names of seventy people from Quraysh along with the names of their fathers. Another narration of his, which appears in Rijāl al-Kashshī paints yet another picture of what had transpired. It says:

Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Naṣr says; when Abū al-Ḥasan was brought, he was taken to al-Qadisiyyah, and he did not enter al-Kūfah. ʿAlī Barrānī took him to Baṣrah, so he sent a copy to me whilst I was in al-Qādisiyyah. I opened it and the sūrah Lam Yakun appeared before me. It was larger and lengthier than that which the people recite. I memorised portions of it. Then, a traveller came, who had with him a handkerchief, clay and a seal. He said, “bring!” thereupon, I handed it to him. He placed it in the handkerchief, placed clay upon it and sealed it. Thereafter, whatever I had memorised escaped me. I tried to recall a single word, but I was unable to do so.

These are three narrations, all from this al-Bazaṇṭī. In the narration of Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt, he claims that he did not understand any of that which he read, and he tried to write that which he read, but before he could do that, he was approached by the messenger of the Imām. In the narration of al-Kashshī, he claims that he memorised a portion of it, but this was forgotten as soon as the copy went out of his possession. In the narration of al-Kāfī, we learn that he understood that which he read, and he managed to recall that which he memorised. It was with regards to the enemies of the ummah from Quraysh. Contradictory tales, as is the case with all fabrications.

If it was difficult to write down anything from it, or to memorise a portion of it, then how were the alleged verses written and memorised (and later transmitted)?

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 588-589
Indeed, these are tales which belie one-another. The narrations of the Shīʿah claim that this copy is in the possession of their awaited Imām. Their scholar, Niʿmat Allāh al-Jazāʾirī says:

إنه قد استفاض في الأخبار أن القرآن كما أنزل لم يؤلفه إلا أمير المؤمنين - إلى أن قال: -وهو الآن موجود عند مولانا المهدي رضي الله عنه مع الكتب السماوية ومواريث الأنباء

It appears in many narrations that the Qurʾān, in the manner in which it was revealed, was not gathered by anyone besides Amīr al-Muʾminīn… Right now, it is in the possession of our leader, al-Mahdī, along with the heavenly books and the inheritance of the ambiyā’.

Added to that, some copies which were in the possession of the Shīʿah, were believed by them to have been written by ʿAlī I. Ibn al-Nadīm (a Shīʿī) says that he saw a Qurʾān which had the handwriting of ʿAlī I. One of the families who claim to be from the offspring of Ḥasan have been passing it down the generations. Ibn ʿAnbah — who claims to be of ʿAlawī descent — indicates towards two copies that were written by Amīr al-Muʿminīn ʿAlī. One of them comprises of three volumes and the other is just one volume. He saw them himself, but they were burnt when the Mash-had caught on fire.

Abū ʿAbd Allah al-Zanjānī, one of the leading contemporary Shīʿī scholars, says:

ورأيت في شهر ذي الحجة سنة 1353 هـ في دار الكتب العلوية في النجف مصنفاً بالخط الكوفي كتب

على آخره: كتبه علي بن أبي طالب في سنة أربعين من الهجرة

I saw in the month of Dhū al-Hijjah, in the year 1353 A.H, in Dār al-Kutub al-ʿAlawiyyah in Najaf, a copy that was written in the Kūfic script. At the end of it, the following was written, “this was written by ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib in the year 40 A.H.”

1 Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah 2/360-362
2 Al-Fahrist pg. 28
3 Ṭālib fī Ansāb Āl Abī Ṭālib pg. 130-131
4 Al-Zanjānī: Ṭārīkh al-Qurʾān pg. 67-68
This is why Mīrzā Makhdūm al-Shīrāzī (who lived among the Shīʿah and read many of their books, as stated previously) said:

Among the ironies is that despite this (their claim of alterations) they believe that many of the copies of the Qurʾān were by ʿAlī and the Imāms from his progeny. However, they did not contain anything more than that which is found in the rest of the copies, (the contents of) which are mutawātir, and are too many to be counted.¹

These supposed viewings of the copy of ʿAlī clearly contradict their claim that the copy of ʿAlī is in the possession of their awaited Mahdī. There can be no doubt that Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī would recite and govern by nothing besides the copy upon which the Ṣaḥābah had consensus. Ibn Abī Dāwūd reports with an authentic chain from Suwayd ibn Ghafalāh who narrates that ʿAlī said:

لا تقولوا في عثمان إلا خيرًا، فوالله ما فعل في المساحف إلا عن ملأ منا

Speak nothing but good regarding ʿUthmān, for — by the oath of Allah — he did not do anything as far as the copy is concerned, except that it was in conjunction with a group from us.²

This has been reported in the books of the Shīʿah, as will appear shortly. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī has it that when Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿUthmān completed the compilation of the Qurʾān, he sent one copy to each land, and he ordered that all other written forms of the Qurʾān, be it on a loose page or in a complete book, should be burnt.³ It is possible that on account of this, the copy of ʿAlī — which they claim existed — was also burnt.

It should also be noted that among the famous Qurrāʾ (experts of the Qurʾān, from the aspect of recitation) there are some whose chain include members of the Ahl

---

¹ Al-Nawāqiḍ scroll 104 of the manuscript
² Fatḥ al-Bārī 13/18
³ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (with Fatḥ al-Bārī 13/11)
al-Bayt. It is on this basis that Dr ʿAbd al-Ṣabūr Shāhīn proves that the Ahl al-Bayt had nothing to do with this fabrication and that the claims the Shīʿah regarding them were nothing but false allegations. Among the seven famous Qurrā’ is Ḥamzah al-Zayyāt whose chain is:

Ḥamza al-Zayyāt from — Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq from — Muḥammad al-Bāqir from — Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn from — his father (Ḥusayn ʿI) from — his father (ʿAlī ʿI).

Thus, these pious personalities, who belonged to the Ahl al-Bayt, did not differ with the consensus of the Muslims and the copy of ʿUthmān ʿI. One of the signs that indicate their approval of it is that they taught the contents thereof to the masses without adding or removing a single letter, or claiming anything that could raise doubts regarding the Book of Allah.2

Dr Muḥammad Baltājī says:

We can add to that the fact that the recital of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib ʿI of the Qur’ān has been narrated from Zayd ibn ʿAlī (the brother of Imām Bāqir and the paternal uncle of Imām al-Ṣādiq). This is admitted by the Imamī Ithnā ʿAshariyyah as well.3

I would like to add on to this an admission and acknowledgement of another Shīʿī scholar, al-Majlisī. He says:

والقراء السبعة إلى قراءته ( يعني قراءة علي) يرجعون، فأما حمزة والكسائي فيعللون علي قراءة علي .. وأما نافع وابن كثير وأبو عمر فمعظم قراءاتهم يرجع إلى ابن عباس، وابن عباس قرأ علي أبي بنب كعب وعلي؛
والذي قرأ هؤلاء القراء بخلاف قراءة أبي فهو إذا ما أخذون عن علي - عليه السلام -.

1 ʿAbd al-Ṣabūr Shāhīn: Tārīkh al-Qur’ān pg. 170
2 Ibid pg. 165
3 Manāhij al-Tashrīʿ al-Islāmī 1/189, the reference cited from the sources of the Shīʿah is Taʿṣīs al-Shīʿah lī ʿUlām al-Islām pg. 285, 343, al-Fahrist of al-Ṭūsī pg. 115
The seven Qurrā’ all refer to his qirā’ah (recital). As for Ḥamzah and al-Kisā’ī, their (Qirā’ah) goes up to ‘Alī. As for Nāfiʿ, Ibn Kathīr and Abū ‘Amr, most of their qirā’ah is from Ibn ‘Abbās and Ibn ‘Abbās learnt from Ubay ibn Ka‘b as well as ‘Alī. The qirā’āt (plural of qirā’ah) of these (three) opposes the qirā’ah of Ubay. Thus, it is taken from ‘Alī.

As for ‘Āṣim, he learnt from Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī who said, “I recited the entire Qur’ān to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.” Thus they say, “the most distinct qirā’ah is the qirā’ah of ‘Āṣim, as he done that which was the original (law), i.e. he does izhār (to recite each letter separately upholding all its dimensions) of that which others do idghām (to combine two letters either entirely, or as far as their qualities of articulation are concerned) of, and he recites the Ḥamzah distinctly in cases where others pronounce it lightly...” Further, the Kufic count of the Qur’ān is attributed to ‘Alī. None of the other Šaḥābah have any count attributed to them. Rather, each city recorded that from one of the Tābi‘īn.¹

In fact, they even claim, as stated by their scholar, ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭāwūsī al-‘Alawi al-Fāṭimī in his book Sa’d al-Sa’ūd:

ثم عاد عثمان فجمع المصحف برأي مولنا علي بن أبي طالب - رضي الله عنه -

Thereafter ‘Uthmān returned and compiled the Qur’ān according to the view of our master, ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.²

They also claim that ‘Alī said:

---

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 92/53-54, Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib 2/42-43
² From Tārīkh al-Qur’ān of l-Zanjānī, who is among the contemporary Shī‘ah pg. 67
O people! Fear Allah, fear Allah! Be careful not fall into extremism regarding the matter of ʿUthmān, and (stay away from) your derogatory title, “the one who burnt the Qur’ān”. By the oath of Allah, he did not burn the Qur’ān except in conjunction with a group from the Šâhâbah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.\(^1\)

There is even more to it than this. They say:

\[\text{إنه ورد عن أهل البيت علیهم السلام أن عثمان بن عفان لما رأى اختلاف الصحابة في قراءة القرآن طلب من علي علیه السلام مصحف فاطمة الذي كانت هي - سلام الله علیها - دونته بإشارة أبيها، وطابقه مع المصاحف الأخرى التي كانت بيد الصحابة، فما طابق منها مصحف فاطمة نشره وما لم يطابقه أحرقه. فعلى هذا يكون المصحف الذي بأيدينا مصحف فاطمة ل مصحف عثمان، وعثمان كان ناشره ل مدونه ومرتبه.}\]

It has been reported from the Ahl al-Bayt \(^{1}\) that when ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān saw the differences in the recitation of the Qur’ān of the Šâhâbah, he asked ʿAlī \(^{2}\) for the copy of Fāṭimah ـ, which she compiled upon the indication of her father. He compared it to the other copies which were in the possession of the Šâhâbah. He published whatever conformed to the copy of Fāṭimah, and burnt whatever did not conform to it. Hence, the copy that in our hands is the copy of Fāṭimah, not the copy of ʿUthmān. He was just the one who disseminated it. He did not gather it or compile it.\(^2\)

Does not all of this destroy their claims and all that they have built upon them? It is another proof of the contradictions in their narrations. This kind of contradictions is a definite sign of the falsity of the religion. It appears, from the last quotation, that there is an effort on their part to retract from their view, which made them targets of contempt, brought upon them shame and criticism and destroyed their religion, without having any effect upon the Qur’ān.

\(^1\) Tārīkh al-Qur’ān of l-Zanjānī pg. 68
\(^2\) Al-Marʿashī: al-Maʿārif al-Jaliyyah pg. 27
However, retracting from this view brings upon them another dilemma and contradiction; this Qur’ān was transmitted to us by Abū Bakr and ʿUthmān and their brethren. These are the very individuals who have received the greatest amount of vilification, revilement and verdicts of kufr against them from the Shīʿah. How is it then possible that one heart and one mind can accept the authenticity of the Qur’ān and simultaneously believe that its compilers were traitors?

Perhaps they concocted the last quotation (in which it is stated that ʿUthmān compared the Qur’ān to the supposed copy of Fāṭimah) to get them out of this predicament. However, this places them in a third dilemma and contradiction, i.e. it contradicts their narrations which claim that the copy of Fāṭimah is something other than the present Qur’ān.¹ That which is established from ʿUthmān is that he sent a message to Ḥafṣah saying, “send to us the pages, we wish to copy them into books.”² However, these people made this out to be something that took place between ʿUthmān and Fāṭimah, as is their habit in attributing the merits of the ambiyā’ and Ṣaḥābah to the twelve Imāms, by distorting aḥādīth and modifying them in their books, so that they fit upon the Imāms. With regards to the verses of the Qur’ān; they seek ‘secretive’ interpretations or they claim that alterations took place, as you have already seen.

The Amount of Narrations Pertaining to this Fabrication in the Books of the Shīʿah, and the Weight that it Holds According to Them

We have seen that most of the books of the Shīʿah have sunk into this brackish quagmire, and they fell into this dangerous abyss. What we now need to determine is the extent and degree of this fall. Do those murky narrations, which found their way into their books and ḥadīth sources dress the one who inclines towards them with the garment of shame and disgrace? Do they snatch from him the last bit of his relationship that he had with Islam?

¹ Refer to the discussion regarding Fāṭimah under the topic, “having Īmān upon the Book”.
² Refer to Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (with Fath al-Bārī 13/11)
Are these narrations nothing more than ‘strange narrations’ which were somehow shoved into their books, without being endorsed by their intellectuals, or accepted by their research scholars? Were they injected into the books on account of the many “fabricators against the Imāms”, as stated in the books of the Shīʿah, who infiltrated their ranks? Is it because Tashayyuʿ was always a fertile ground for all those who wished to harm Islam and its adherents in any way, as proven from events and occurrences?

We have seen that this tale began with two narrations in the book of Sulaym ibn Qays, according to the printed copy that is before us. However, it was not long before it became a huge lie and its narrations increased. ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, the leading scholar of the Shīʿah, made it his duty to amplify this lie and thus he will bear all the repercussions of this kufr.

He reported many narrations regarding this, after stating in his introduction that they are of a large number. He started off an attempt to form a methodology by which this fabrication could be practically implemented, as was explained. It should also be noted that most of the narrations of al-Kulaynī, the author of al-Kāfī are from this al-Qummī, who grabbed onto anything and everything from every lying scoundrel, and added it to his Tafsīr — which is held in high esteem by all Shīʿah.1 Al-Dhahabī and Ibn Ḥajar have said regarding this Tafsīr of his, “he has a Tafsīr, which contains calamities.”2

The extremist circles of the third century exerted themselves in trying to fabricate as many narrations regarding this as possible. This was to the extent that their scholar — al-Mufīd, who they refer to as Rukn al-Islām wa Āyat Allah al-Malik al-ʿAllām (d. 413 A.H) —testifies that there are a great number of these narrations, according to the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah. He says:

إن الأخبار قد جاءت مستفیضة عن أئمة الهدى من آل محمد صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم باختلاف القرآن وما أحدثه بعض الظالمين فيه من الحذف والنقصان

1 Refer to the preface of this book.
2 Refer to Mīzān al-Iʿtidāl 3/111, Lisān al-Mīzān 4/191
There is a great number of narrations from the Imāms of guidance from the progeny of Muḥammad regarding the alterations of the Qur’ān, and that which some of the oppressors done to it as far as adding and removing is concerned.¹

This abundance is the result of the lies and fabrications against the Ahl al-Bayt, which reached a high level at the hands of a bunch of their scholars, in the third century. If the Ahl al-Bayt had anything, they would have recited it, leaving out everything else and they would have brought it out to the public. They would not be allowed to hide it. However, the Ahl al-Bayt, according to the confession of the Shīʿah, did not recite anything besides the Book of Allah. Thus their innocence from this lie has become clear. A religion which contains a great number of falsehood is itself nothing but falsehood!

Nevertheless, al-Mufīd says that this kufr is wide-spread between his people, even though his teacher, Ibn Bābawayh says (as quoted previously):

إن من نسب إلى الشیعة مثل هذا القول فهو کاذب

Whoever attributes to the Shīʿah a statement like this is a liar.

The “descendant of the Ahl al-Bayt”, al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, who was a contemporary of al-Mufīd and a student of his, says, “their narrations on this subject cannot be paid attention to, as they are unreliable. That which is known and its authenticity is undoubted cannot be rejected by means of their likes.”² Do each of these scholars invent their own school of thought and group, with the common factor between them being that they are Shīʿah? Or do they switch colours like chameleons, as a result of Taqiyyah? A third possibility is that they wish to maintain, according to the time and place, two contradictory views so that none may understand the exact position of their religion.

---

¹ Awā’il al-Maqālāt pg. 98
² Majma’ al-Bayān 10/31
This is why we find that in the sixth century, al-Ṭabarsī (the author of the famous *Tafsīr*) rejected this view, as will appear, whereas his contemporary, the other al-Ṭabarsī (author of *al-Iḥtijāj*) openly declared this kufr, and he quoted tens of narrations regarding it, understanding his view to be that upon which consensus took place, or at least it is well known among the adherents of his religion, as explained. A fourth possibility is that these narrations were only fabricated in the latter days, but they were attributed to the classical scholars to win the support of the gullible followers.

The question of all of this being Taqiyyah will be dealt with soon, if Allah wills. Anyway, the production or fabrication of these narrations during the Safavid reign increased manifold. It even surpassed that which was done by al-Qummī, al-Kulaynī, al-Mufīd, Furāt al-Kūfī and the other Shīʿī scholars of the third and fourth century, to the extent that their scholar, al-Majlisī (author of *Bihār al-Anwār*) testified that their narrations regarding this are now equivalent to the narrations of Imāmah. He says:

According to me, the narrations regarding this are mutawātir as far as the meaning is concerned. Rejecting every single one of them would destroy any reliance upon the narrations. In fact, I think that the narrations regarding this are not less than the narrations regarding Imāmah.¹

This is a testament from al-Majlisī who expired in the year 1111 A.H, stating that the narrations regarding this are of a great number, whereas only two of these narrations could be found in the book of *Sulaym ibn Qays* and according to Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381 A.H), they were almost non-existent. He stated:

---

¹ *Mir’āt al-ʿUqūl* 2/536
Undoubtedly, the one who attributes the likes of this to the Shīʿah is a liar. The scholar of the Shīʿah, al-Ṭūsī, rejected that this could be attributed to the Shīʿah.¹

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī really exerted himself to find a way around the statement of al-Ṭūsī. He said:

والطوسي في إنكاره (یعني لتحرير القرآن) معذور لقلة تتبعه الناشئ من قلة تلك الكتب عنده

Al-Ṭūsī, in his rejection (of the belief of alteration taking place) is excused, as he did not research this adequately. This was due to him not having many of those books in his possession.²

This excuse cannot be accepted from the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb, who insists on bringing all the Shīʿah onto his view (that the Qurʾān was altered). This is because al-Ṭūsī was the scholar of the Shīʿah in his era, and he was the author of two of their four canonical books on ḥadīth, and two of their relied upon books on narrators. How then can it be imagined that he could be excused for not having done enough research or not having enough books, as claimed by al-Ṭabarsī?

We, on the other hand would like to establish from this statement of al-Ṭūsī an important testimony and a historic record which establishes that this lie was not widespread and it did not reach the level that it presently stands on except under the supervision of the Safavid dynasty. It is not far-fetched at all that they added on and attributed these fabrications to their classical scholars, in an effort to promote it. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that there is no shortage of evidence to prove that lies are the norm among the Shīʿah. This is well established by the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and it is corroborated by the books of the Shīʿah as well, as will appear shortly.³

---

1 Tafsīr al-Tibyān 1/3
2 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb scroll 175 (of the manuscript)
3 Refer to the chapter, “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah”. 
There is an abundance of testimonies from the scholars of the Safavid dynasty stating that there are many narrations like this. Just as al-Majlisī testified, similarly, their other scholar, Niʿmat Allāh al-Jazāʾirī (who was a contemporary of al-Majlisī and a student of his, and reliable and trustworthy scholar according to them) also testified regarding the same.¹ He says:

إن الأخبار الدالة على ذلك تزيد على ألفي حدیث

The narrations which point that out are more than two thousand aḥādīth.²

He goes on to say, whilst placing the Qurʾān on one pan of the scale, that to proclaim that the Qurʾān was unadulterated would strip the narrations of all credibility. Thus, he says whilst rebutting the classical scholars who proclaimed that the seven qirāʾāt are mutawātir:

إن تسلم تواترها عن الوحي الإلهي، وكون الكل قد نزل به الروح الأمين يفضي إلى طرح الأخبار المستفیضة، بل المتواترة الدالة بصريحها على وقوع التحریف في القرآن

To accept that it is mutawātir, from the revelation of Allah, and that al-Rūḥ al-Amīn (Jibrīl) brought it, leads to discarding the mustafid (reported by multiple reliable narrators) narrations. In fact it leads to the rejection of the mutawātir which point out very clearly that alterations took place in the Qurʾān.³

In other words, it is more important to uphold the veracity and integrity of his narrations than the Qurʾān! This is exactly what their scholar al-Majlisī stated when he said, “rejecting every single one of them would destroy any reliance upon the narrations,” as quoted above. This is the tough decision that these fraudsters have to make; do they lose their narrations, upon which their religion

¹ This was pointed out to by him in Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah 4/232
² Refer to Faṣl al-Khiṭāb scroll 125 (of the manuscript) and pg. 251 of the printed edition.
³ Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah 2/356-357
stands and by means of which their sustenance is attained (in the name of khums) and their sacredness is upheld (as they claim to be deputies of the Imām). Do they lose all these benefits that are accrued by means of it or should they say that the Qur’ān was altered, the result of which will be that the Muslims will declare them disbelievers, their religion will hardly attract anyone thereafter, their followers will dwindle and the avenues of income will diminish. Indeed it is a tough decision for these (scholars)! Should they appear before the public holding two contradictory views, should they hide and do taqiyyah or should they act according to the demand of the moment?

What has been noticed is that the scholars of the Safavid dynasty were bolder in stating their kufr as a result of some power upon which they could rely. Consequently, the act of Taqiyyah was, to an extent, neglected by them. This is why there are many statements made by them stating that this kufr is established by them with tawātur. Their scholar, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf (who is a student of al-Majlisi) claimed:

يمكن الحكم بكونه من ضروريات مذهب التشیع

It is possible to say that it is from the fundamentals of the Shīʿī religion.

Their reliable scholar, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Māzindarānī (d. 1081 A.H.) says:

لا إسقاط بعض القرآن وتحريفه ثبت من طرقنا بالتواتر معنى كما يظهر لمن تأمل كتب الأحاديث (يعني كتب أحاديثهم) من أولها إلى آخرها

The deletion of a portion of the Qur’ān and its alteration is established from our narrations with tawātur as far as the meaning is concerned, as is apparent for the one who ponders over the books of aḥādīth (i.e. Shīʿī books of ḥadīth) from the start to the end.

1 Miḥrāt al-Anwār pg. 49
2 Al-Māzindarānī: Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ (of al-Kāfi) 11/76
Their scholar, Muḥsin al-Kāshānī says:

المستفاد.. من الروایات من طریق أهل البيت - علیهم السلام - أن القرآن الذي بین أظهرنا لیس بتمامه،
کما أنزل على محمد صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم، بل منه ما هو خلاف ما أنزل الله، ومنه ما هو مغیر محرف،
وأنه قد حذف عنه أشياء کثیرة منها اسم علي - علیه السلام - في کثیر من المواضع، ومنها غير ذلك، وأنه
ليس أيضاً على الترتیب المرضي عند الله وعند رسوله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم

What is understood from the narrations of the Ahl al-Bayt is that the Qur’ān which is before us is not complete, in the form that it was revealed upon Muḥammad. Rather, some of it is against that which Allah revealed and some of it is changed and altered. Many things have been deleted therefrom, including the name of ʿAlī from many places, among other things. It is also not according to the sequence that Allah and His Rasūl were pleased with.¹

These are some of the statements of the scholars of the Safavid era regarding the amount of narrations on the subject. These statements are destructive testimonies, which establish that these lies and fabrications are upheld by them and they appear in many places in their books. This, most certainly, proves the falsity of all their narrations. As long as lies and fabrications are reported, according to them, with tawātur, there can be no reliance upon any of their narrations. Whoever inclines towards these beliefs has nothing to do with the religion of Islam.

The religion of these people is the religion of Imāms, or rather, the religion of al-Majlisī, al-Qummī, al-Kulaynī, al-ʿAyyāshī, etc. They are just like all the other irreligious sects who existed along the course of Islamic history. The veil which they used to hide their reality and enmity towards Islam has been ripped to pieces by this claim, and their hundreds of narrations, which they falsely attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt, have been exposed to be lies and deception by means of this open kufr.

Due to the continuous efforts to produce fabrications along the centuries, especially in the era of the Safavids, we see the leading scholar of the Shīʿah,

¹ Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/49
their ḥadīth expert, the expert on the science of (their) narrators, the author of their final ḥadīth compilation (*Mustadrak al-Wasā’il*) and the teacher of many of their reliable scholars (including Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā and Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭehrānī) — Ḥusayn al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī saying that it is inappropriate to study the chains of this fabrication, as it is reported with tawāṭur by their narrators. His exact words are:

إن ملاحظة السند في تلك الأخبار الكثيرة توجب سد باب التواتر المعنوي فيها بل هو أشبه بالوسواس الذي ينبغي الاستعازة منه

Studying the chains of those narrations, which are abundant in number necessitates that tawāṭur as far as the meaning is concerned should be shunned. In fact, it is quite similar to waswās (whisperings of the devil), from which protection should be sought.¹

Al-Khū‘ī, the Marja‘ of the Shī‘ah in Iraq, as well as others today, says:

إن كثرة الروايات (روايتهم في تحرير القرآن) من طريق أهل البيت تورث القطع بصدد بعضها عن المعصومين، ولا أقل من الاستمتنان بذلك، وفيها ما روته طريق معتبر

The abundance of narrations (of their regarding this) from the narrators of the Ahl al-Bayt demands certainty that at least some were stated by the infallibles. The bare minimum is that there is satisfaction (that these fabrications are established) due to that. Many of them are reported through authentic chains.²

After all these confessions from the luminaries of the Shī‘ah, will anyone doubt that these people have fallen into this murky quagmire and dark abyss? How much of pain do they not bring to the heart of a Muslim? Will he not take pity upon a people who rely, in their religious matters, upon books which are laden with this filth and upon ‘scholars’ (who sold their souls to the devil and placed their forelocks in his hand) who openly state this kufr? However, one question

¹ *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* scroll 124 (of the manuscript)
² Al-Khū‘ī: *al-Bayān* pg. 226
remains; is this the belief of all the Shī‘ah? Do all of them subscribe to this kufr? This will be discussed in the next few paragraphs.

Do All Shī‘ah Believe in the Authenticity of these Narrations and Regard them to be Mutawātir?

After our presentation of some of the contents of these narrations which further clarified the reality, our attempt to ascertain the amount of their narrations and the weight of their chains, seeing that most of the Shī‘ī books have fallen into this dark abyss and after seeing that the engineers of Shī‘ism worked hard in trying to fabricate and increase these narrations along the course of the centuries, to the extent that their reliable scholars claimed them to be mutawātir and mustafīḍ and that their chains should not be studied, the question that remains is: do all the scholars of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah agree with them regarding this?

Al-Mufīd (d. 413 A.H.) states in his book *Awā’il al-Maqālāt*, which is among their reliable books (as stated by their present-day scholars):

وافقوا - أي الإمامیة - على أن أئمة الضلال خالفوا في كثير من تأليف القرآن وعدلوا فيه عن موجب التنزيل وسنة النبي صلى الله علیه وسلم، وأجمعت المعتزلة، والخوارج، والزیدیة، والمرجئة، وأصحاب الحديث على خلاف الإمامیة

They (the Imāmiyyah) were unanimous that the Imāms of misguidance opposed greatly, the sequence of the Qur’ān and they turned away in it from the demands of the revelation and the Sunnah of Nabī ﷺ. The Mu‘tazilah, Khawārij, Zaydiyyah, Murji‘ah and people of ḥadīth have all agreed to oppose the Imāmiyyah.

This is an important testimony and an explicit admission by al-Mufīd of the Shī‘ah that the rest of the sects of Islam did not fall into the kufr that he and his sect fell into. It is a testimony that silences those Rawāfiḍ who try — in a cowardly manner — to silence the Ahl al-Sunnah on the topic of this fabrication, by falsely

---

1 Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: *al-Shī‘ah fī l-Mīzān* pg. 14
2 *Awā’il al-Maqālāt* pg. 13
attempting to attribute this lie to them, an attempt that is clearly a hopeless plot. The Ahl al-Sunnah are not in need of this testimony to prove their innocence. However, we have mentioned it here as it is the word of the opposition, whose word holds more weight, when he speaks the truth, than the word of a friend. It also serves the purpose of silencing the lying disbelievers.

He also admits that his sect is unanimous upon this open kufr. He did not mention any difference of opinion among their scholars regarding this, even though his teacher, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (who is referred to as al-Ṣadūq by them (d. 381 A.H.)) rejected this in his book Al-ʾtiqādāṭ. He was also displeased with the attribution of the belief that alterations took place to his sect, as explained. The same was said by al-Sharīf al-Murtadā (d. 436 A.H.), al-Ṭūsī (450 A.H.) (both of whom were students of al-Mufīd) and al-Ṭabarsī (d. 548 A.H. or 561 A.H.).

Why did al-Mufīd not indicate towards the view of his teacher, al-Qummī? Did he ignore it on account of him being satisfied that it was done out of Taqiyyah? Added to that, this very Mufīd, in this very book of his, mentioned that a group from the Imāmiyyah have rejected this view. Similar to the claim of al-Mufīd is the claim of al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, who claimed that the Shīʿah unanimously believed in this kufr, until the appearance of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, who then opposed them. He says:

إن ابن بابویه القمي أول من أحدث هذا القول في الشیعة في عقائده

Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī was the first one to introduce this view to the Shīʿah, in his (book on) beliefs.

---

1 Al-ʾtiqādāṭ pg. 101-102
2 Refer to al-Tibyān 1/3, Majmaʿ al-Bayān 1/31
3 Al-Tibyān 1/3
4 He mentions that a group from the Imāmiyyah state, “there was no deletion of any word, verse or surah.” Refer to Awāʾil al-Maqlāt pg. 55. Their inconsistency regarding the matter of ijmāʿ will be seen under the discussion, “their beliefs regarding ijmāʿ (consensus)”. They have a consensus which is contradicted by another consensus. At times one of them will claim that consensus took place, yet he will state that there was a difference of opinion.
5 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb, scroll 111 (of the manuscript)
Perhaps the reader realised the effort made by this al-Ṭabarsī to establish that the Shīʿah, from their inception, held his view, and that opposition of his view was something that happened later. The reality that no Muslim will argue regarding, and no person who studied the development of Shīʿī doctrine will doubt, is that the initial Shīʿah had nothing to do with this kufr. Shīʿism, in its initial stage, was concerning nothing more than Imāmah and who was most deserving of it.

Thereafter, one innovation led to another, in quick succession. Thus by the third century, we see their scholars competing with one another in upholding this kufr. This brought upon them humiliation, disgust and contempt from the Muslims. Hence, Ibn Bābawayh attempted to take them back to their original beliefs, as it seems. However, the doctrine of Taqiyyah destroyed the fruits of Ibn Bābawayhs efforts. He was nonetheless followed by three of their scholars, as explained earlier. Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī mentions that from the fourth century right up until the sixth century, a fifth person could not be added to this list. He says:

لم يعرف الخلاف صريحاً إلا من هؤلاء الأربعة

No explicit difference of opinion was known, except from these four.¹

Thus, after this idea found its way into the Shīʿī religion, none of their scholars were found to openly condemn it besides these four.² We have indicated previously

1 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb 15 (of the manuscript) and pg. 24 of the printed version.
2 Shaykh Iḥsān Ilāhī Ẓahīr, after quoting this statement, challenged the Shīʿah to bring forth a fifth person. Refer to al-Shīʿah wa l-Sunnah pg. 124. However, regarding this matter, it is necessary to keep in mind the following:

• Firstly, al-Mufīd mentioned that a group of the Imāmiyyah have opposed this view. Refer to Awā'il al-Maqālāt pg. 55. Here, is he referring to the difference of these three (as al-Ṭabarsī only appeared in the sixth century) or were there more individuals (especially since he describes them as a ‘group’, which is indicative of them being many in number), to whom he is referring to? The author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb himself was unsure regarding this. He said:

ولم يعرف من القدماء مؤافق لم إل ما حكاه المفید من جماعة من أهل الإمامة، والظاهر أنه أراد منها الصدوق وأتباعه

None of the classical (Shīʿah) are known to have agreed with them, except that which is reported by al-Mufīd from group of the people of Imāmah. Apparently, it seems as if he was referring to al-Ṣadūq and his followers. (Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 33).
that Ibn Ḥazm mentions that all of the Imāmiyyah were upon this falsehood besides three of them, among who was al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā. Their scholars have stated that the Imāmiyyah were not unanimous regarding this kufr. The author of Qawāmiʿ al-Fuṣūl says:

إن المحكي عن ظاهر الكليني وشيخه عليّ بن إبراهيم القمي والشيخ أحمد بن أبي طالب الطبري صاحب الاحتجاج ووقع التحرر والزيادة والنقصان فيه، بل وحكي ذلك عن أكثر الأخياريين، وعن السيد الصدوقي والمحقق إكرار ذلك، بل وحكي عن جمهور المجتهدين، وظهور الصدوق في اعتقادات أن المراد بما ورد في الأخبار علی أن في القرآن الذي جمعه أمیر المؤمنین - رضي الله عنه - كان زيادة لم يكن في غيرها أنها كانت من باب الأحاديث القدسية للقرآن

That which is reported from the apparent (text) of al-Kulaynī, his teacher, ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī and Shaykh Aḥmad ibn Abī Ṭālib al-Ṭabarṣī (the author of al-Iḥtijāj) is that alterations, additions and deletions took place in it. In fact, that has been reported from most of the Akhbarīs. It is reported from al-Sayyid al-Ṣaduq.¹ and al-Muḥaqqiq² that they have rejected it, just as this is reported from most of the Mujtahids. The apparent meaning of al-Ṣadūq’s statement in his Iʿtiqādāţ is that the purport of all the narrations which indicate that the Qur‘ān which was gathered by Amīr al-Muʿminīn I had additional (information), that was not in the rest was the al-Aḥādīth al-Qudsiyyah, not the Qur‘ān.³

---

1 A title of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, the author of Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh.
2 The title al-Muḥāqqiq (the researcher) is used to refer to Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī and Jaʻfar ibn Ḥasan ibn Yaḥyā (d. 676 A.H.) Refer to Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭehrānī: al-Anwār al-Sāṭi‘ah pg. 164. Here, it is being used to refer to al-Ṭūsī.
3 Qawāmiʿ al-Fuṣūl pg. 298
Al-Ṭabarsī has also indicated towards the above in Faṣl al-Khiṭāb, and he mentioned the names of many of those who believed that alterations took place. Among his statements are:

اعلم أن لهم في ذلك أقوالً مشورها اثنان: الأول وقع التغيير والنقصان فيه

Know that they have many views regarding that, but two of them are popular; the first is that alterations and deletions took place...

Thereafter, he goes on to mention the names of their scholars who were of this view, quoting some of them on the matter. It should be noted that he tries to exaggerate, by adding most of the scholars of this sect to this list. He even goes as far as listing books which neither existed, nor is there any trace of them. Among them are the books he refers to as “al-Taḥrīf” (alterations) and “al-Tabdīl” (the change), the authors of which, he implies, held the same view as him.¹

His opposition may ask, “why rule out the possibility that these books were written to criticise the Shīʿī misinterpretations of the Qur’ān, or their claim that the words were altered? The name could imply that as well.” Thereafter, he mentions the second view:

الثاني: عدم وقوع التغيير والنقصان فيه وأن جميع ما نزل على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم هو الموجود بأيدي الناس فيما بين الدفترين، وإليه ذهب الصدوق في عقائده والسيد المرتضى، وشيخ الطائفة في التبيان، ولم يعرف من القديماء موافق لهم إلا ما حكاه المفید عن جماعة من أهل الإمامة، والظاهر أنه أراد منها الصدوق وأتباعه

The second view is that alterations and deletions did not take place, and whatever Allah revealed to Rasūlullāh is found among the people, between the two covers. This is the view stated by al-Ṣadūq in his (book on) beliefs, al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā and Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifah in al-Tibyān. None of the classical (Shīʿah) are known to have agreed with them, except that which is reported by al-Mufīd from group of the people of Imāmah. Apparently, it seems as if he was referring to al-Ṣadūq and his followers.²

¹ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb 30-31
² Ibid pg. 33
His statement, “none of the classical (Shīah) are known to have agreed with them,” is with reference to his Imāmiyyah and Rāfiḍah scholars. It cannot refer to the initial Shīah, as they did not stoop to this level. Thereafter, this al-Nūrī says:

ثم شاع هذا المذهب (يعني إنكار التحریف) بین الأصولیین من أصحابنا واشتهر بینهم حتى قال المحقق الكاظمي في شرح الوفاة: إنه حكي عليه الإجماع.

Then this view spread (rejection of the view that alterations took place) among our companions from the Uṣūlīs and it became famous amongst them to the extent that al-Muḥaqqiq al-Kāẓimī stated in Sharḥ al-Wāfiyah, “Ijmāʿ has been reported regarding this.”¹

He then tries to reject this ijmāʿ, so that he could claim that most of the Shīah held the same view as him. Now, do we believe that the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah are not unanimous upon this kufr, but rather they have two views regarding the matter, as indicated to by al-Ashʿarī in his Maqālāt? Or, do we say that there is only one view and whoever rejected it, did so whilst practising Taqiyyah? This will be discussed next.

Do those who Reject this Kufr (from the Shīah) do so on Account of Taqiyyah?

Although we explained that the Imāmiyyah were not unanimous upon this kufr, and that senior research scholars among them, such as al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, al-Ṭūsī, al-Ṭabarsī and others who follow them from the latter day scholars have rejected it, a cry was made by the scholars of the Safavid dynasty that any rejection of this view that took place, was done out of Taqiyyah. Their scholar, Niʿmat Allāh al-Jazā’irī (who belonged to the Akhbāriyyah),² regarding whom al-Khowansārī said:

¹ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 38
2 This is why al-Khowansārī said, “despite him being from the Akhbāriyyah, he had a strong relationship with the masters of ijtihād.” Rawḍāt al-Jannāt 8/150
He was from the greatest of our latter day scholars and from the most outstanding of our accomplished well-read ones.¹

He (al-Jazā’irī) says:

والظاهر أن هذا القول إنما صدر منهم لأجل مصالح كثيرة، منها سد باب الطعن عليهم بأنه إذا جاز هذا في القرآن فكيف جاز العمل بقواعده وأحكامه مع جواز لحوق التحریف لها

It seems as if this was only said by them on account of the many benefits thereof. Among the benefits was that they closed the door to the objection that if this was possible regarding the Qur’ān, then how can it be correct to practise upon its laws and regulations, as it is possible that they were changed?²

Thereafter, he presents proof for his statement saying:

كيف وهؤلاء الأعلام رووا في مؤلفاتهم أخباراً تشتمل على وقوع تلك الأمور في القرآن، وأن الیة هكذا أنزلت ثم غيرت إلى هذا

How is it possible (to reject the view) when these luminaries reported in their books such narrations which include (accounts) of those matters taking place in the Qur’ān, and that a verse was revealed in this manner but then it was changed to that.³

The author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb holds the same view. He quotes the above-quoted speech of al-Jazā’irī in support of his view, just as he quotes the view of their scholar, Ibn Ṭāwūs, who says that the book al-Tibyān was written with extreme caution and it is the pinnacle of compromising for the sake of the opposition.⁴ We have quoted his statement previously. Is the reality as stated by these people?

1 Rawḍāt al-Jannāt 8/150
2 Al-Jazā’irī: Al-Anwār al-Nu’māniyyah 2/358
3 Ibid 2/358-359
4 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 38 (of the manuscript)
I say, there is no doubt that al-Jazā’īrī, the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb and others are among those who openly state this kufr. Whoever does so, is quite clearly out of the fold of Islam. If we were instructed to ascertain the truth of the statements of sinners, then what can be said about the statements of these people? They are desperate to have every Shīʿī proclaiming this kufr. Thus, it is not at all surprising that they interpret the statements of their opposition as Taqiyyah. I believe that those who accept the word of this al-Jazā’īrī and those who followed his footsteps, without any hesitation, and have pasted this kufr upon every member of this sect without ascertaining and studying the reality, have erred.

If we do not accept the speech of these liars, this does not mean that we will gullibly accept and take at face value (without questioning) the statements of the opposition. This is especially since we know that Taqiyyah is one of their principles, it makes up nine tenths of their religion and (according to them) there is no religion for the one who does not practise Taqiyyah, as will be proven.

Hence, it is absolutely necessary to do a careful, objective and composed study of this matter. Thus, I say, just as al-Muḥfīd reports that his sect were unanimous regarding this kufr (as explained), many of their senior latter day scholars reported that the Uṣūlī Shīʿah unanimously rejected this kufr. The author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb admitted that the view of rejecting that any alterations took place had spread and become famous among his companions. He says:

شاع هذا المذهب بين الأصوليين من أصحابنا واشتهر بينهم حتى قال المحقق الكاظمي في شرح

This view spread (rejection of the view that alterations took place) among our companions from the Uṣūlīs and it became famous amongst them to the extent that al-Muḥaqiq al-Kāẓimī stated in Sharḥ al-Wāfiyah, “ijmāʿ has been reported regarding this.”

1 Ibid pg. 38 (of the manuscript)
2 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 38
The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* was angered by this. This is because, like I explained, he wishes to portray his view as the most famous one and the view of the majority. He says:

His claim (of ijmāʿ) is extremely bold! How can ijmāʿ be claimed regarding something that was opposed by the majority of the former (scholars), most of the ḥadīth scholars and the luminaries of the historians? This cannot even be classified as famous! Rather, we have seen that most of the books of uṣūl (principles) do not mention anything on the subject. The one who studies will perhaps see the truth of our speech. Nonetheless, that which should be followed is proof, even if it is only followed by a few, as al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā, in some of his matters, stated, “a viewpoint should not be feared on account of the fact that only a few uphold it and are aware of it. Rather, only that should be feared, which is not backed by any proof and is not based on any evidence.” Al-Mufīd stated in one place of *al-Maqālāt*, “it does bother me who opposes this view. Complete serenity is found where there is proof, and there can be no fear of the truth.”

In the above, we see the snippets of an argument that raged between the two groups, with each claiming that his view is the correct and popular one. Then we see this man, cladding himself in the attire of an advisor (just as the devil does at times) and advising his people to the fire of Hell, which is indeed an abhorred abode! He also claims that his view is the one which is supported by proofs from their books. Claiming that the opposite view was famous or that there was unanimity regarding it, is according to him, great boldness.

---

1 Ibid pg. 38-39
Thus, there is no doubt that a group from among the Shīʿah, who had many followers, did not subscribe to this kufr. It was in response to them, as it seems, that the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb compiled his book, i.e. to refute the view upheld by them. He wished to lift from them the blindness that he believes enveloped them. This is why he says that proof should be followed, even if no one else followed it.

Perhaps, he felt lonely due to his view. Kufr has always been a lonely and frightening cave. He probably feared that his followers and supporters were about to diminish, due to which he began advising them not to feel lonely or be fearful on account of them being few. This, according to him was a sign of the truth regarding this matter. It is amazing that he supports his stance using the words of al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, who distanced himself from this kufr and declared those who subscribed to it kāfir. He uses the word of this very individual to invite his people towards heresy.

Along the course of my study of the book Faṣl al-Khiṭāb, it became clear to me that a sect from the Shīʿah were not ready to accept this nonsense. The author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb attacked them on various occasions. He comments on the speech of one of them saying:

لیس لداء قلة التتبع دواء إل تعب المراجعة

There is no cure to the illness of insufficient research except tiring oneself in referring (to sources).¹

He was similarly irritated with by the matter of al-Ṣadūq, the author of Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh — one of their canonical works — due to him rejecting this lie. He says that the matter of al-Ṣadūq is confusing. He accuses him of distorting some narrations to support his view in rejecting this nonsense. He also states that he changed some of the narrations in a manner that creates suspicions regarding him.² The exact texts regarding this will appear shortly. It should be

¹ Faṣl la-Khiṭāb page 84 of the manuscript and 169 of the printed version.
² Ibid page 120 of the manuscript and 240 of the printed book.
kept in mind that his book, *Man Lā Yahḍurhū al-Faqīh* is one of their most relied upon compilations.

At times, he presents excuses on behalf of his brethren who rejected this view, which he insists is proven and mutawātir (through their false narrations). He says:

إن أخبار التحریف متفرقة فلهذا لم يعرفوها

The narrations of *tahrīf* (interpolation) are spread out. Thus, they were not aware of them.¹

One may say, “they were unaware of them, as they did not exist. They were only invented later and they multiplied and increased. People like yourself then began accepting them, either on account of being fooled or because you wished to fool others. This is the only possibility, as it cannot be accepted that the likes of Ibn Bābawayh and others, who were the pioneers of your religion and the compliers of your most relied upon books were ignorant of this.” He presents a similar excuse on behalf of al-Ṭūsī (as will appear). Niʿmat Allāh al-Jazāʾirī, who claimed that they rejected the view on account of Taqiyyah, was not convinced regarding this. Hence, we see him, in *al-Ṣaḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah* expressing his surprise at their actions. He tries to refute their proofs saying:

وأخبارنا متواترة بوقوع التحریف والسقط منه بحیث ل یسعنا إنكاره، والعجب العجیب من الصدوق وأمين الإسلام الطربرسي، والمرتضى في بعض کتبه کیف أنكروه وزعموا أن ما أنزله الله تعالى هو هذا المكتوب مع أن فيه رد متواتر الأخبار

Our narrations regarding the occurrence of alterations and deletions are mutawātīr. Thus, we cannot deny it. It is quite strange that al-Ṣadūq, Amīn al-Islām al-Ṭabarṣī and al-Murtaḍā (in some of his books) rejected this and claimed that whatever Allah revealed is this written (book), even though that would demand rejection of the mutawātīr narrations (i.e. their tales).

---

¹ Ibid page 176 of the manuscript.
Thereafter, he wishes to answer the objection raised by the intelligent ones from his sect, i.e. saying that the Qur’ān was altered demands that it should not be practised upon as it is unreliable, and this is against the view of the Shīʿah and the Imāms. His reply is:

The argument presented by them is that it (the belief that alterations took place) removes reliance upon the verses containing commandments. Thus it will no longer be permissible to use them as proofs, as they were possibly changed. The answer to that is, they (the Imāms) instructed us in these times to recite and practise upon this Qur’ān and that which its verses imply, as this is the era of compromise. When their state will be established the Qur’ān, as it was revealed, will appear. (This is the Qur’ān) which Amīr al-Mu'minīn compiled after the demise of Rasūlullāh H, wrapped it in his cloth and presented it to Abū Bakr and 'Umar (who were sitting amongst a group in the masjid), whereupon they said, “we have no need for you or your Qur’ān. That which is with us, of the Qur’ān, is sufficient for us.” He replied, “you will not see it after this day, until our qā'im appears.” This is when that Qur’ān will become common among the people. Besides that, all the changes that took place in the verses of laws have been pointed out by the Imāms. Thus, we assume that whatever they did not point out, has not been changed.¹

After this, is it correct for anyone to claim with certainty that the rejection of these people was done purely on account of Taqiyyah? Undoubtedly, the

¹ *Sharḥ al-Ṣaḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah* pg. 43
difference of opinion that exists between them and the others from their sect is of a very severe kind. It is quite clear from that which the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* as well as others have written that there is definitely a great dispute.

However, we still need to study the proof presented by Niʿmat Allāh al-Jazāʾirī in support of his claim that it was done out of Taqiyyah. His proof is:

رووا في مؤلفاتهم أخباراً تشتمل على وقوع تلك الأمور في القرآن، وأن الیة هكذا أنزلت ثم غيرت إلى هذا

How is it possible (to reject the view) when these luminaries reported in their books such narrations which include (accounts) of those matters taking place in the Qurʾān, and that a verse was revealed in this manner but then it was changed to that.\(^1\)

Is this the truth regarding those who rejected the view?

We will begin with Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, known as al-Ṣadūq (d. 381 A.H), regarding him to be the first one who criticised the extremists, and claimed that their view does not represent the Shīʿī creed. This, he stated in his book *Al-Iʿtiqādāt*.

**Ibn Bābawayh and His Rejection of that which is Attributed to His Sect**

He says:

اعتقادنا أن القرآن الذي أنزل الله تعالى على نبیه محمد وهو ما بين الدفتین وهو ما في أیدي الناس، ولیس باكثر من ذلك، ومبلغ سوره عند الناس مائة وأربعة عشر وعندنا أن الضحى وألم نشرح سورة واحدة، ومن نسب إلینا أنا نقول أنه أکثر من ذلك فهو کاذب

Our belief is that the Qurʾān that Allah revealed upon his Nabī, Muḥammad, is that which is between the two covers, and it is in the possession of the people. It is nothing more than that. The amount

\(^1\) Al-Jazāʾirī: *Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah* 2/358-359
of sūrahs that it contains, according to the people, is one hundred and fourteen. According to us, al-Ḍuḥā and Alam Nashraḥ (the names of two sūrahs) are one surah. Whoever attributes to us that we say there is more to it, then he is a liar.

Thereafter, he proves his point by quoting the narrations regarding the rewards of reciting a sūrah from the Qurʾān and the rewards of completing the Qurʾān. He explains that this refutes the false claims. He states further:

بل نقول: إنه قد نزل من الوحي الذي ليس بقرآن ما لو جمع إلى القرآن كان مبلغه مقدراً سبع عشرة ألف آية

Rather, we say, “revelation that was not part of the Qurʾān was revealed, and (its amount was so much that) if it had to be added to the Qurʾān, its total would be seventeen thousand verses.”

As proof for this, he cited some of the al-Aḥādīth al-Qudsiyyah (according to them). Thereafter, he says:

ومثل هذا كثير كله وحی ليس بقرآن، ولو كان قرآناً لكان مقررًا به وموصولاً إليه غير مفصول عنه كما قال أمير المؤمنين لما جمعه، فلما جاء به فقال لهم: هذا كتاب الله ريكم كما أنزل عليه نبيكم لم يزيد فيه حرف ولم ينقص منه حرف، فقالوا: لا حاجة لنا فيه، عندنا مثل الذي عندك. فانصرف وهو يقول: فبادوا وراء ظهرهم واشتروا به ثمنًا قليلاً فبئس ما يشترون

There are many others like this. All of it is revelation, but it is not the Qurʾān. If it was part of the Qurʾān, it would have been joined to it and it would not have been separated from it, as Amīr al-Muʿminīn said when he compiled it. After he complied it and presented it to them saying, “this is the Book of Allah, your Rabb. Neither has an alphabet been added to it, nor erased from it.” They replied, “we have no need for it. We have the same as that which you have.” Thereupon, he turned around saying, “they hurled it behind their backs, and bought in exchange of it a petty sum. How evil is that which they bought!”

1 Al-ʾIʿtiqādāt pg. 101-103
This is what was stated by Ibn Bābawayh. I have quoted it in its entirety, as the source from which it was quoted is scarce. Also, most of those who quote from him, Shi‘ah or non-Shi‘ah, only quote the beginning of his speech, which does not give a clear picture of the man’s beliefs. Reflect upon the following regarding his statement:

Firstly, he believed that this was the view of all the Imāmiyyah Shi‘ah. This is why the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb commented, after quoting this text:

وظاهر قوله: اعتقادنا، وقوله: نسب إلینا، اعتقاد الإمامیة

The apparent meaning of his words, “our belief” and “attributed to us” is the belief of the Imāmiyyah.¹

Thereafter, he takes him to task for this saying:

وقد ذکر في هذا الكتاب ما لم یقل به غیره أو قال به قلیل

He mentioned in this book, that which was not the view of others or it was the view of a handful.²

I have already stated that the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb was quite zealous in bringing all the Shi‘ah into his camp.

Secondly, he declares al-Kulaynī, the author of al-Kāfī, his teacher, al-Qummī (the author of the Tafsīr), al-Nu‘mānī (the author of al-Ghaybah) and others who openly state this belief and count it among Shi‘ī beliefs to be liars in his statement, “whoever attributes to us that we say there is more to it, then he is a liar.” In fact, it is as if he does not even count them among the Shi‘ah.

Thirdly, we do not find any indication from him towards a second view regarding the matter amongst them, contrary to that which is stated by al-Ash‘arī and

¹ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 33
² Ibid pg. 33
others. It is as if he believes that those who hold any other view are not part of the Shī‘ah, unless there is some Taqiyyah that is taking place.

**Fourthly,** his statement, “if it had to be added to the Qur’ān, its total would be seventeen thousand verses” seems to be an explanation of the narration of al-Kulaynī in which it is mentioned, “the Qur’ān which was brought to Muḥammad by Jibrīl was seventeen thousand verses, and the Qur’ān, as it is famously known, is a little more than six thousand verses.” However, al-Kulaynī explicitly mentions, as you have seen, that they are from the Qur’ān, whilst Ibn Bābawayh clearly states that they are not from the Qur’ān, and he interpreted them to be from the al-Aḥādīth al-Qudsiyyah.

**Fifthly,** he was not completely emancipated, as you have seen, from the effects of the tale-like narrations regarding this topic, which remained in his brains. Thus, you see him almost contradicting that which he established by mentioning the last narration regarding ‘Alī’s presentation of the Qur’ān to the Ṣaḥābah, and their rejection thereof. His acceptance of this fairy tale does create room for suspicions that his rejection was done on the basis of Taqiyyah (as stated by some Shī‘ī scholars as well as scholars from the Ahl al-Sunnah).

Nonetheless, he did not dare to say anything explicit regarding the Book of Allah. He intended to clear the reputation of his people from the shame that was attached to them. He also did not have the courage to counter his people by rejecting their narrations completely. We cannot say whether he could not cleanse himself completely from their poison, or whether he rejected their view on the basis of Taqiyyah, leaving signs of this in his speech. Allah alone knows the secrets of men.

Among the Shī‘ah, there are those who assert that his rejection was purely on the basis of Taqiyyah, such as Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī. However, no reliable proof is presented to support this assertion. They suffice upon the fact that he reported in his book narrations which say that a verse was revealed in a certain manner and then it was changed to something else. After going through some of the
books of Ibn Bābawayh, who is referred to as al-Ṣadūq by them, to find narrations regarding this fabrication, we find that from the narrations regarding this, he reports the incident of the irreligious one who posed questions to ‘Alī (as they allege), which we quoted earlier on.

This is the very same narration which is reported by their scholar, al-Ṭabarsī (of the sixth century) in his book al-Iḥtijāj. In his version of the narration, there are nine places which indicate towards this kufr, as pointed out by al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī. We find that this tale, when reported by their Ṣadūq in his al-Towḥīd, becomes free of all those statements which indicate towards the kufr of Taḥrīf. The question arises; was this tale built upon in the two centuries after Ibn Bābawayh, so that it could include this kufr, or did Ibn Bābawayh himself delete this portion? Whatever the case may be, it is clear that he was free from the filth of the narration which was carried in the narration of al-Ṭabarsī.

The author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb could not decide as to what was the reason behind this taking place. He says:

وساق (یعنی صدوقهم) الخبر مع نقصان کثیر عما في الحتجاج، منه ما یتعلق بنقصان القرآن وتغییره، إما
لعدم الحاجة إليه كما يفعل ذلك كثيراً، أو لعدم موافقته لمذهبه

He (al-Ṣadūq) reports the narration, leaving out a lot of that which is in al-Iḥtijāj. From it, is that which relates to the shortening and changing of the Qur’ān. This was either because there was no need for it, (as he does this quite often) or because it did not correspond to his beliefs.

Why did he not consider the possibility that the narration of al-Towḥīd was the original narration, and the lies related to Taḥrīf were added later by the author of al-Iḥtijāj and others? This is a very likely possibility, especially since al-Ṣadūq

---

1 Refer to al-Iḥtijāj pg. 240
2 Al-Nūrī: Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 240
3 Refer to al-Towḥīd pg. 255
4 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 240
did not indicate that he deleted anything from the narration. The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* was really angered by al-Ṣadūq — as it seems — on account of this. He says, quoting from another scholar of theirs:

"In a nutshell, the matter of al-Ṣadūq is highly inconsistent. Neither can knowledge, nor any idea be attained from his verdict, which can be attained from the verdicts of the latter day luminaries. The same is the condition of his authentications and preferences."¹

Thereafter, he says:

"The author of *Al-Biḥār* mentioned a narration from him, which appeared in *Kitāb al-Towḥīd*... this narration is taken from *al-Kāfī*, and it has such strange changes to it that they raise suspicions regarding al-Ṣadūq."²

All of this criticism simply because al-Ṣadūq did not report the kufr that was reported by the author of *al-Kāfī*. The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* quoted these ‘criticisms’ due to the fact that Ibn Bābawayh did not adopt the same view as him. However, all the books of al-Ṣadūq were not free of this profanity. In his book, *Thawāb al-Aʾmāl*, he quotes regarding the reward of reciting Sūrah al-Aḥzāb:

---

1 *Ibid*

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 240 Al-Majlisī says this regarding al-Ṣadūq despite the fact that they consider all of his books, besides four of them, to be “just as famous as the four books which have been the foundation along the course of the centuries” *Al-Biḥār* 1/26. He reports from him, in his *Al-Biḥār* on seventeen occasions (including *Al-Biḥār* 1/73). Added to that, his book, *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* is one of their four seminal books. What is the secret behind this contradiction?
Whoever recites Sūrah al-Aḥzāb abundantly, he will be in the companionship of the Rasūl and his wives on the Day of Qiyāmah... Sūrah al-Aḥzāb disgraced Arab women from the Quraysh and it was longer than Sūrah al-Baqarrah, but they shortened it and changed it.

In the book *al-Khiṣāl*, he quotes the following:

On the Day of Qiyāmah, three things will come and complain to Allah; the muṣḥaf (copy of the Qurʾān, the Masjid and the household (of Rasūl H). The muṣḥaf will say, “O my Rabb, they burnt me and tore me.”

The word “حرفوني” (they changed me) appears in *Biḥār al-Anwār* and in the book of one of those who quoted this narration. Undoubtedly, it is a stronger indication of this kufr. However, it is contrary to that which is in the original book. A similar narration appears in *Kitāb al-Amālī* of his. Al-Ṣadūq reports a narration with his isnād from Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq — from his father — from his fore-fathers — from Rasūlullāh H:

Remember your standing before Allah... He will most definitely ask you about that which you done to al-Thaqalayn, after me; the Book of Allah and

---

1 *Thawāb al-Aʾmāl* pg. 139, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/50
2 *Al-Khiṣāl* 1/174-175
3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/49
4 Iḥsān Ilāhī Ẓahīr: *al-Shīʿah wa l-Qurʾān* pg. 68
my household. Thus, be careful that you should not end up saying, “as for the Book, we changed and altered it.”

This narration does not indicate towards any person’s actions, it is only a warning. However, if it is joined to that which precedes it, that they did do it (as these people claim), then it will be kufr. There are other similar narrations which were reported by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* from secondary sources. I will not quote them, as I did not come across them in the books of al-Ṣadūq. Also, there were some narrations regarding authentic recitals that were quoted by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* from the books of al-Ṣadūq — the words of this man cannot be taken without double checking, it is not surprising that he did something like this — which are not in the original books. However, some writers from the Ahl al-Sunnah were fooled by this act of his and they followed suit, without thinking twice.

---

1. *Amāmī al-Ṣadūq* pg. 231
2. One example is that which he quotes from Bashārat al-Muṣṭafā of al-Ṣadūq, which is taken from *Tafsīr al-Burhān* by their ḥadīth scholar, al-Tūbalī. *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 157-158
3. Such as the three narrations quoted by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* (pg. 259) from *Maʿānī al-Akhbār* (refer to *Maʿānī al-Akhbār* pg. 331) that the copies of ʿĀ’ishah and Ḥafṣah stated:

```
حافظوا على الصلوات والصلاة والوسطى وصلاة الع
```
Maintain with care the [obligatory] prayers and [in particular] the middle prayer and the prayer of ʿAsr.

This is a valid manner of recital. Refer, regarding its appearance in the copy of ʿĀ’ishah to *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 5/173, number 5393, 5394, 5397, 5466, 5467 (with the research of Aḥmad and Maḥmūd Shākir). Refer also to *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 1/304. Shaykh Aḥmad Shākir says, “the narration was reported by al-Ḥāfīz in *al-Fath* 8/146 and al-Sūyūṭī 1/304. They did not attribute it to anyone besides al-Ṭabarī. Ibn Ḥazm mentioned it in *al-Muḥallā* 4/354 and ʿAbd al-Razzāq reported it in *al-Muṣannaf* 1/128.” *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* vol. 5 pg. 176 (footnote). Regarding the existence of this qirāʿah in the copy of Ḥafṣah, refer to *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 5/209, 210, number 5406, 5462, 5463. *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 1/304.

*Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* contains that which indicates that the recital of this was abrogated. Refer to *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 1/438 Kitāb al-Masājid wa Mawāḍiʿ al-Ṣalāh, Bāb al-Dalīl liman Qāl al-Ṣalāt al-Wusṭā hiya al-Ṣalāt al-Wusṭā hiya al-Asr.

4. Refer to Iḥsān Ilāhī Ẓahīr: *al-Shīʿah wa l-Qurʿān* pg. 96, Muḥammad Māl Allāh: *al-Shīʿah wa Tahrīf al-Qurʿān* pg. 122
This brings us to the conclusion that some of the books of al-Ṣadūq contain narrations regarding this fabrication. Despite that, we cannot be certain that he upheld this belief, and his rejection was merely Taqiyyah, as stated by some of them. This is because his books were not safe from additions and forgeries. We are not speaking on the basis of our imagination. Rather, additions and forgeries are considered trivial by these people, as is apparent from the book Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays. As stated previously, many of their scholars have admitted that it contained fabrications and it was changed. Similarly, more than half of the book Man lā Yahḍurhū al-Faqīh of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī is made up of their additions, as will appear under the chapter, “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah”.

Al-Ṭūsī and His Rejection of Taḥrīf

As for their scholar, al-Ṭūsī (d. 450 A.H.), he says:

As for the discussion concerning whether addition or deletions took place in it, this is inappropriate. It is agreed upon that there are no additions to it. As for deletions, the known view of the Muslims is that it did not happen, and this is closest to the correct view of our school. Many narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah as well as the Shīʿah indicate that a number of verses were deleted or transferred from place to place. However these narrations are āḥād and thus they are not definite. It is more appropriate to turn away
from it (the narrations), and to abstain from being occupied with it, as it is possible to interpret it.

If they are authentic, they do not criticise that which is between the two covers, as the authenticity thereof is well-known. None of the Imāms objected to it or rejected it. Our narrations encourage recitation of it and holding on to that which is in it. We are also instructed to compare the narrations to it when they contradict in secondary issues and thereafter to practise upon that which conforms to it and discard that which does not conform to it.

A narration is reported from Nabī ﷺ, which no one rejects. He said, “I am leaving amongst you al-Thaqalayn; the Book of Allah, and my household. They will not separate until they meet me at the pond.” This establishes that it will be found in every era, as it is not possible that he commands his ummah to hold onto that which they cannot hold on to. The Ahl al-Bayt and those whose obedience is compulsory are likewise found in every era. Since the authenticity of that which is found amongst us is agreed upon by all, it is necessary for us to concern ourselves with its tafsīr, and explaining its meanings, leaving out all else.¹

This is the speech of their scholar al-Ṭūsī, who authored two of their seminal works in ḥadīth and two of their relied upon books on narrators. Did he say this out of Taqiyyah?

I say, among the signs of Taqiyyah is that there will be contradictions and differences. However, contradictions have become a norm in their narrations. In fact, it is even found in what they refer to as consensus. Thus, it is no surprise that the speech of their scholars have a fair share of it too. It has become exceptionally difficult to realise the actual stance of their school. Even their scholars are baffled, as they find no proof by which they can differentiate between that which was said out of Taqiyyah and that which was actually meant. Their only way out is to rely on a principle laid by an ultra-profane individual amongst them:

¹ Al-Tibyān 1/3
If two contradictory aḥādīth are presented to you, take that which opposes the people (Ahl al-Sunnah).\(^1\)

This principle leads them, in most cases, to leaving the dīn completely.\(^2\) It is natural for any religion which is not from Allah to have many contradictions. “If it had been from [any] other than Allah, they would have found within it much contradiction.”\(^3\) Thus, if he is quoting narrations from their books, it is inevitable that there would be contradictions. Therefore, we cannot take him to task completely, since he rejected the view. Added to that, his view is judged by that which he said, not by that he narrated.

It has been noted that al-Ṭūsī, in his re-arrangement of Rijāl al-Kashshī quotes some narrations regarding this tale. Among them are:

\[
\text{لا تأخذن معالم دینك من غیر شیعتنا، فإنك إن تعدیتهم أخذت دینك عن الخائنین الذین خانوا الله ورسوله، وخانوا أماناتهم، إنهم اؤتمنوا علی كتاب الله جل وعلا فحرّفوا وبدّلوه}
\]

Do not take the guidelines of your religion from anyone other than our sect. if you go beyond them, you will be taking your religion from traitors, who were treacherous toward Allah, His Rasūl and their trusts. They were trusted with the Book of Allah جل وعلا but they changed it and altered it...\(^4\)

He also reports some narrations regarding this tale, in his Tafsīr al-Tibyān, portraying them to be different qirā’āt.\(^5\) However, he believes that all of these

---

1 Al-Biḥār 2/233
2 A discussion will appear regarding this under the discussion of consensus, if Allah wills.
3 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 82
4 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 4
5 An example of this is his explanation of the verse:

Indeed, Allah chose Ādam and Nūḥ and the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of ʿImrān over the worlds... (Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 33). continued on page 395
narrations are Āḥād, which cannot be relied upon, and they cannot cancel out all their narrations which instruct that the Qur’ān should be practised upon and referred to at the time of disputes, as stated by him whilst explaining his rejection of the view.

As for the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb, his explanations of this rejection (which caused him pain, as it is against his view) have differed. At times, he says that this is only the view of al-Ṭūsī and a small group of Shī‘ah. His exact words are:

إنه ليس فيه حكاية إجماع عليه، بل قوله: نصره المرتضى صريح في عدمه، بل في قلة الذاهبين إليه

There is no claim of ijmāʿ regarding it. Instead, his statement, “al-Murtaḍā supported it,” explicitly defies it, or rather, highlights that only a few people held the view.¹

Later, he retracts saying that this was only said by him on account of Taqiyyah, as his rejection is recorded in Tafsīr al-Tibyān. He says:

continuing from page 394
He says:

وفي قراءة أهل البيت: {وال محمد على العالمين}

The qirā’ah of the Ahl al-Bayt is, “and the family of Muḥammad over the worlds.”

This is a very mild way of stating that Taḥrīf took place, or it is an attempt at changing their narrations which clearly state this is not one of the qirā’āt. These narrations claim that it was in fact changed by the Ṣaḥābah. The exact texts of these narrations will appear shortly when we scrutinise the stance of al-Ṭabarsī. The motive behind the attempt at changing these narrations was either to cover up the shame that this brings upon them, or to pull his people out from the gutters into which they fell on account of those tales. However, at times, the narrations of al-Ṭūsī are the original narrations and the additions which explicitly state Taḥrīf were added by the scholars of the Safavid dynasty. An objection could be raised that these narrations are also found in the books of his contemporaries or scholars who appeared before him such as Tafsīr al-Qummī, al-ʿAyyāshī and al-Furāt. The answer to this is that the Shī‘ah do not hesitate to change the books of their older scholars, as is established from the book Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays.

1 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 38
It is quite clear to the one who ponders that the style of *al-Tibyān* was one of extreme compromise and adopting the views of the opposition.¹

He backs this argument by the fact that the author quoted many of the *tafsīrs* of the Ahl al-Sunnah.² However, he cannot say this with certainty. He says:

It (al-Ṭūsī’s quoting from the Ahl al-Sunnah) is quite strange, if it was not done with the intention of compromising. It is possible that this view (rejecting Taḥrīf) of his (al-Ṭūsī) in it (*Tafsīr al-Bayān*) was also due to this (i.e. Taqiyyah and compromise).

Thereafter, a third idea comes to his mind. He says that the speech of al-Ṭūsī contains such contradictions which indicate towards them being Taqiyyah. He says:

His narrations which indicate that changes took place are many. They contradict his statement, “they are āḥād.”. Unless it is interpreted in the manner that we explained (i.e. Taqiyyah).³

Lastly, he forgets all of the above and chooses to excuse al-Ṭūsī. He says:

He is excused in his rejection thereof, as he did not do sufficient research, due to him not possessing many of those books.⁴

---

¹ Ibid pg. 38
² The complete text regarding this was quoted previously.
³ *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 38
⁴ Ibid pg. 351
This is one angle of the bafflement of al-Ṭabarsī regarding the matter of al-Ṭūsī and others who rejected this fabrication. If this is the condition of their scholars, that they cannot agree as to what is the stance of their Imāms and classical scholars on account of Taqiyyah, then we are more deserving of being excused for not being able to arrive at a definite conclusion regarding the stance of their scholars.

Al-Ṭūsī, as seen from his rejection, added vinegar to the honey, and he contradicted himself whilst stating the stance of his school, as is apparent.¹

**Al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā and His Rejection Taḥrīf**

He says:

إن العلم بصحة نقل القرآن كالعلم بالبلدان والحوادث الكبار والوقائع العظام والكتب المشهورة وأشعار العرب المسطورة، فإن العناية اشتدت والدواعي توفرت على نقله وحراسته، وبلغت إلى حد لم يبلغه فيما لعلها “ما ذكرناه” [ذكرنا، لأن القرآن معجزة النبوة، وماأخذ العلماء شرعيًا والأخلاق الدينية، وعلومه]

¹ Amongst this is his claim that the Ahl al-Sunnah also reported this kufr. This is a blatant lie. Their scholar, al-Mufīd testified that none besides the Shīʿah have narrated this calamity. Refer to Awā’il al-Maqālāt pg. 13. The Ahl al-Sunnah are unanimous, in fact, all Muslims are unanimous that the Book of Allah remained protected from any changes, additions and deletions. Allah Himself protected it. Allah says:

اِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّکْرَ وَ اِنَّا لَه لحَٰفِظُوْنَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur’ān], and indeed, We will be its guardian. (Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9)

Knowledge regarding the authenticity of the Qur’ān is like knowledge of the cities, major events, significant occurrences, the famous books and the recorded poems of the Arabs. Great effort was made and there was every reason for its protection and propagation. It reached a standard that none of the other things we had mentioned reached. This is because the Qur’ān was the miraculous challenge supporting nubuwwah, the source of Islamic knowledge and religious verdicts. The scholars of the Muslims reached the pinnacle in their efforts to protect and safeguard it, to the extent that they learnt every variation of it, whether it pertained to the diacritics, the recitals, letters or verses. How is it then possible that it could have been changed or shortened, when such a genuine effort was made and it was learnt this well?

Thereafter, he mentions that if anyone intended to add on or delete from the famous books such as the book of Sībwayh or al-Muzanī it would have been known and reported, as the people of the science are acquainted with the fine details just as they are acquainted with the major aspects. If anyone wished to add on a chapter of nahw (grammar) to the book of Sībwayh or al-Muzanī, which was not part of the original book, it would have immediately been known that this is not part of the original book.

It is an undisputed fact that the effort behind the protection and learning of the Qur’ān was far greater than the effort made in preserving the book of Sībwayh and the poetry of the poets. Those who dispute this, from the Imāmiyyah and the Ḥashawīyyah, do not deserve any attention. There is some difference of opinion, which is attributed to the people of ḥadīth.
They narrate some unauthentic narrations, which they regard as authentic. The likes of those cannot be used to reject that, the authenticity of which is known without any doubt.¹

Perhaps his last sentence is a reference to the view of the Akhbārī Shīʿah, who accept this deviation.²

These are the words of their scholar, al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (who Ibn Ḥazm excluded from those who believe in the kufr regarding the subject, as explained). The author of Majmaʿ al-Bayān, after quoting this stated:

إن المرتضى قد استوفى في الكلام في نصرة هذا المذهب الحق في جواب المسائل الطرابلسیات

Al-Murtaḍā done justice in supporting this correct view in Jawāb al-Masāʾīl al-Ṭarābulusiyyāt.³

We could not find this book, and the latter day Shīʿah do not quote from it (al-Kāshānī in Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī, al-Bahrānī in al-Burhān, al-Majlisī in Al-Biḥār, etc.). I could not find anything from it (in all that I searched in) besides this text, which was transmitted by al-Ṭabarsī in Majmaʿ al-Bayān. However, it has been said that this rejection was done out of Taqiyyah, this is because, as stated by the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb:

قد عدّ هو في الشافی من مطاعن عثمان ومن عظیم ما أقدم عليه جمع الناس على قراءة زید وإحراقه وإبطائه ما شك أنه من القرآن

He counted, in al-Shāfi, among the faults and serious crimes of ūthmān that he united the people upon the recitation of Zayd and he burnt and

¹ Refer to Majmaʿ al-Bayān 1/31
² Al-Ālūsī was under the impression that he was referring to the Ahl al-Sunnah. Therefore, he commented saying, “it is either a lie or a terrible misunderstanding, as they are unanimous that no shortening took place in that which is reported to be Qurān, with tawātur, as is found between the two covers today.” Rūḥ al-Maʿānī: 1/24-25
³ Refer to Majmaʿ al-Bayān 1/31
destroyed that regarding which he had doubts as to whether it is part of
the Qur‘ān.¹

This undoubtedly negates his rejection of Taḥrīf as well as the historic and
intellectual proofs that he presented to disprove it. Either this text was added to
his book, like in the other cases. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that
if this was his belief, he would have spoken about it on many occasions, but the
author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb could only reproduce one statement.

The other possibility is that his rejection was on account of Taqiyyah. This
possibility is much weaker than the previous one, based on what we have just
mentioned. This text, added to the fact that it is an insult directed against the
Book of Allah, it also suggests that the entire ummah, including ‘Alī, were all
upon deviation. This is from a people who claimed to support and love him!

How can a Muslim imagine that this took place in that unique Qur‘ānic generation,
who spent everything and migrated, leaving behind their wives and children; to
spread Islam. They left their hometowns purely for the sake of Allah. For whose
benefit, and in whose cause would they then sacrifice all of their great sacrifices,
struggles and privileges of being the leaders in dīn? Why would they sell their
dīn and dunyā (worldly life), and co-operate with one who wished to distort their
dīn and their book? Indeed, this is a great accusation! Rather, this act of ‘Uthmān
I was among his greatest achievements, and it took place with the consensus
of the ummah, as stated by Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī:

لا تقولوا في عثمان إلا خيرًا فوالله ما فعل في المصاحف إلا عن ملاً منها
You should only praise ‘Uthmān, for by the oath of Allah, he only acted
regarding the copies in conjunction with a group from us.²

May Allah reward him greatly on behalf of the ummah.

---

¹ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 33
² Reported by Ibn Abī Dāwūd with an authentic chain, as stated by Ibn Ḥajar in Fatḥ al-Bārī 13/18.
Al-Ṭabarsī and his Rejection of Taḥrīf

He says:

ومن ذلك الكلام في زيادة القرآن ونقصانه، فإنه لا يلبي بالتفسير، فأما الزيادة فيه فمجمع على بطلانها، وأما النقصان منه فقد روى جماعة من أصحابنا وقوم من حشویة العامة أن في القرآن تغيیراً ونقصاناً، والصحيح من مذهب أصحابنا خلافه، وهو الذي نصره المرتضى قدس الله وروحه، واستوفى الكلام فیه غاية الاستفیاء في جواب المسائل الطرابلسیات“ثم ساق بعض كلامه في ذلك

From that is the speech regarding additions and deletions in the Qur’ān. They do not deserve any explanation. As for additions, it is agreed upon that they do not exist. Regarding deletions, a group of our scholars, as well as the Ḥashawiyah from the majority have reported that changes and shortening took place in the Qur’ān. The correct view of our school is the opposite of that. This is what was supported by al-Murtaḍā (may Allah sanctify his soul). He explained this matter fully in Jawāb al-Masā’il al-Ṭarābulusiyyāt. (Thereafter, he quotes a portion of his discussion, which had been quoted above).

Here, he indicates that a group from his scholars reported narrations regarding changes and shortening which took place in the Qur’ān, and that the view of the research scholars is contrary to this. He tries, as usual, to include the Ahl al-Sunnah among the supporters of this kufr by saying, “the Ḥashawiyah from the majority”. This is done in an attempt to defend his sect, save their face and carry out a subtle attack upon the Ahl al-Sunnah. The reply is as stated by al-Ālūsī, “it is either a lie or a terrible misunderstanding, as they are unanimous that no shortening took place in that which is reported to be Qur’ān, with tawātur, as is found between the two covers today.”

Yes, in the era of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq، that which was not mutawātir, that which was abrogated as far as the recital was concerned (but it was still recited by those who were unaware of its abrogation), and that which was not part of al-ʿUrdat al-Akhīrah (the final recital of Rasūlullāh to Jibrīl) was excluded. He left no stone unturned in ascertaining the veracity of all that was
compiled. However the light of this only spread to the horizons during the era of ʿUthmān ʿ Abbott.  

Al-Ālusī scrutinised the statement of al-Ṭabarsī and explained his mistakes. Al-Ālusī goes on to say that his explanation as to why he regards this fabrication as false is such that it exposes the lack of substance of the view of the opposition, even to children. All praise is due to Allah. The truth was revealed without the Muslims even having to make any effort. I realised, whilst studying Majmaʿ al-Bayān, that al-Ṭabarsī tried very hard to cover up this mess of theirs.

Regarding some of the narrations of his companions which are related to this tale — which state that the original verse was such and it was then changed to something else — he tries to change the purport of the narration to fool the Ahl al-Sunnah, or he tries to change it so that this shameful act of theirs becomes ambiguous. He claims that some of these ‘verses’ were actually different qirā’āt.

We will present a few examples of their tales regarding Ṭahrīf, followed by the changes thereof by al-Ṭabarsī. Tafsīr al-Qummī states regarding the verse:

اَنَّ اللَّهَ اصْطَفِى إِدَمَ وَنُوْحًا وَّ اَلَّ اِبْرَاهِیْمَ وَ اَلْ عِمْرَانَ عَلَی الْعَالَمِیْنَ

Indeed, Allah chose Ādam and Nūḥ and the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of ʿImrān over the worlds...  

فأَسْقَطُوا آل مُحْمَّد مِنَ الْكِتَابِ”

The scholar (Imām) said, “It was revealed, ‘and the family of ʿImrān and the family of Muḥammad upon the worlds.’. They deleted, “the family of Muḥammad,” from the Book.”

---

1 Rūḥ al-Maʿānī 1/25  
2 Ibid al-Maʿānī 1/24  
3 Sūrah Āl `Imrān: 33  
4 Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/100
Tafsīr al-Furāt reports from Ḥumrān, who said that he heard Abū Jaʿfar (al-Bāqir) reciting:

إن الله اصطفى آدم ونوحًا وآل إبراهيم وآل محمد على العالمين: قلت: لیس یقرأ هكذا، قال أدخل حرف مكان حرف

Indeed, Allah chose Ādam and Nūḥ and the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of Muḥammad over the worlds.

I said, “This is not how it is recited.” He replied, “one letter (word) was replaced with another.”

Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī reports from Hishām ibn Sālim:

سألت أبا عبد الله عن قوله تعالى إِنَّ اللّٰهَ اصْطَفَى آدَمَ وَنُوحًا وَآلَ إِبْرَاهِیمَ وَآلَ عِمْرَانَ عَلَى الْعَالَمِینَ:

I asked Abū ʿAbd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) regarding the verse of Allah،

“indeed, Allah chose Ādam and Nūḥ and the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of ʿImrān over the worlds.” He replied, “it was, ‘the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of Muḥammad over the worlds,’ but they replaced one name with another.”

The purpose behind this fabrication was to establish their belief regarding twelve Imāms from the Book of Allah. However, they did not realise that the connotations of the expression “family of Muḥammad” are quite general. On the contrary, the twelve Imāms according to them are ʿAlī, his two sons and some of the progeny of only one son مفارقات. The rest of them, as will appear, have been reviled and declared kāfir. Thus, the objective behind their lies and interpretations have not been attained.

1 Tafsīr Furāt pg. 18, Biḥār al-Anwār 92/56
2 Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/168, al-Burhān 1/278, Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 244
These fabrications, which contain accusations against the Book of Allah and the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh (including the Ahl al-Bayt) — which are oft quoted in their tafsīrs — are re-interpreted by the author of Majmaʿ al-Bayān in these words:

وفي قراءة أهل البيت: وآل محمد على العالمين

According to the qirā’ah of the Ahl al-Bayt (it is), “and the family of Muḥammad over the worlds.”

Similarly, he re-interpreted many of their lies as qirā’āt. On some occasions, he creates the impression that those fabrications were explanations of the meanings of verses. Their fabrication says concerning the verse of Allah:

ٍّاَیَُّا النَّبِیُّ جَاهِدِ الْکُفَّارَ وَالمُْنٰفِقِينَْ وَاغْلُظْ عَلَیْهِمْ

O Prophet, fight against the disbelievers and the hypocrites and be harsh upon them. (Sūrah al-Towbah: 73)

Tafsīr al-Qummī says, “the actual revelation was, ‘fight against the disbelievers using the hypocrites,’ as Nabī did not fight the hypocrites using a sword.” Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/301. This is a fabrication that was concocted to support the view of the Rāfiḍah, who accuse the Ṣaḥābah of hypocrisy. He claims that Allah instructed Nabī to rely upon the hypocrites in his jihād. He portrayed Jihād as an act that is shouldered by the hypocrites. Thus, it is ignorance that brings to shame Islam, the history of the Muslims as well as the commentary of the Qur’ān. It is outright profanity. Yet we see al-Ṭabarsī expressing this lie in the words, “a narration of the qirā’ah of the Ahl al-Bayt is, ‘fight against the kuffār using the hypocrites.’”. He tried to explain his interpretation saying, “he would only be polite towards the hypocrites because they would not openly display kufr. The fact that Allah knew of their kufr did not make it permissible to kill them, as they outwardly displayed īmān.” (Majmaʿ al-Bayān 3/100) This explanation is inconsistent with the meaning of the verse. Allah commanded His Nabī to fight against the kuffār and the hypocrites, so how was it possible that he was polite towards the hypocrites in the sense that he relied upon them to fight the kuffār? Furthermore, Jihād in Islam was never shouldered by the hypocrites. Allah says:

لَوْ خَرَجُوْا فِیْكُمْ مَّا زَادُوْکُمْ إِلَّ خَبَال

Had they gone forth with you, they would not have increased you except in confusion. (Sūrah al-Towbah: 47) continued on page 405
ذلِكَ بِاَنَّهُمْ کَرِهُوا مَآ اَنْزَلَ اللّٰهُ فَاَحْبَطَ اَعْمَالَهُم

That is because they disliked what Allah revealed, so He rendered worthless their deeds.¹

عَنْ أَبِي جَعْفَرِ نَزَّلَ جِبَرِیِّلَ عَلَیْ رَسُولِ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَیْهِ وَآَلِهَةَ هَكِذا:

أَنْزَلَ اللّٰهُ (فِي عَلیٰ) فَاَحْبَطَ أَعْمَالَهُم

Abū Jaʿfar (al-Bāqir) says that Jibrīl revealed this verse upon Rasūlullāh Ḥ in this manner, “that is because they disliked what Allah revealed regarding ‘Alī, so He rendered worthless their deeds.”

Pay attention to their addition, “regarding ‘Alī’.”² You will see that this changes, in the works of al-Ṭabarsī to an explanation of the verse. He says:

کَرِهُوا مَا أَنزَلَ اللّٰهُ فِي حَقِّ عَلیٰ رَضَيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ

They disliked that which Allah revealed regarding the rights of ʿAlī.³

This is only some of that which appears in Majmaʿ al-Bayān, which was authored on account of the objectives like that of al-Tibyān of al-Ṭūsī. The leading scholar

continued from page 404

The pious predecessors have explained the meaning of this verse; fight against the kuffār using the sword and kill them. Similarly, fight against the hypocrites using your tongue and abandon all diplomacy. This was stated by Ibn ʿAbbās. Ibn Mašūd explained, “(fight them by) hand, tongue or the heart, according to your capability. Do not meet them except with a frown.” Ḥasan and Qatādah said, “carry out the punishment upon them.” All of these explanations have one thing in common; they carry the meaning of the verse — fighting the hypocrites. This is why ʿAṭā said, “this verse abrogated all types of forgiveness and overlooking.” Refer to Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 12/174-183, and Tafsīr al-Baghawi 2/311. The great difference between the wording of the verse, which commands that the hypocrites should be fought, and the fabricated qirāʿah, which suggests that they should be relied upon, has become quite clear.

¹ Sūrah Muḥammad: 9

² Refer to Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 330

³ Majmaʿ al-Bayān 6/32
of the Shīʿah of the latter days, al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, declared that al-Tibyān was written on the basis of Taqiyyah and compromising to please the opposition. If this is true, it applies to both books, as the methodology of the two are identical.

Some, who are affiliated with the Ahl al-Sunnah, have been duped by this methodology. Thus, they aligned themselves with Dār al-Taqrīb (which was operational until recently, when its true agenda became apparent) in Cairo. Hence, under the pretext of bridging the gap (between the Muslims and the contemporary mainstream Shīʿah), they published this book. It was researched and authenticated by six scholars who were affiliated with the Ahl al-Sunnah.

This happens when a person is unaware of their statements. He will not be able to realise their trickery and deception. It seems as if this very Tafsīr was the reason why some of the Shīʿah considered al-Ṭabarsī’s rejection of the belief in Taḥrīf to be Taqiyyah.

These are the four scholars whose views have been reported. Perhaps there were others who held the same view but their statements did not reach us. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that al-Mufīd, in Awā’il al-Maqālāt, stated that an entire group from the Imāmiyyah rejected Taḥrīf. We will not assume, as was assumed by the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb (who tried his best to silence the voice of the opposition, and claim that most of the Shīʿah held his view), that a fifth individual could not be found in the early days who held the same view as these four.

Lastly, it is my view that the rejection of these senior Shīṭī figures of the fabrication regarding the Book of Allah should not be brushed of as Taqiyyah (as stated by some of the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah), as we have no definite way to prove that. You have read the arguments presented by both parties, which was quoted from Faṣl al-Khiṭāb. Added to that, it became clear that the Shīʿah are incessant liars, who do not hesitate to add on to the books of their scholars. Thus, the one who distances himself from this kufr, after believing in Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ,

---

1 Refer to Majma‘ al-Bayān 10/575, printed by Dār al-Taqrīb
we will accept this from him and hand his matter over to Allah, who is aware of
the reality.

However, the matter does not end there. Rejection of this view demands that a
few more steps should be taken. To start off with, they should take a second look
into all those matters in which they have differed with the Muslims. Their scholar,
al-Majlisī (in rebuttal of those who reject Taḥrīf) admitted that they will have to
tread this path, as rejection of the narrations regarding Taḥrīf — which, by virtue
to their forged and fabricated narrations, have reached the level of tawātur —
would necessitate rejection of all their narrations. This is the reality! The fact
that their books are replete with these narrations (to the extent that they can say
that it is mutawātir), is the greatest proof that their books are compilations and
collections of lies and fabrications.

The Crux of the Discussion

Firstly, it is possible that this fabrication found its way into Shīʿism in the
second century, courtesy of some extremists. Some of their names have already
been mentioned. They were prompted by the fact that the Book of Allah was
completely pure of their innovations regarding Imāmah, the Ṣaḥābah as well as
other matters.

Secondly, most of the books which they consider reliable have this fabrication
recorded in them. Most of these narrations are explicit, thus they cannot be re-
interpreted to be explanations of the verses or different qirāʿāt. They clearly state
that a certain verse was originally such and such, but the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh
changed it. The following are examples of the explicit words used:

هذه الآية مما غيروا وحروفوا

This verse is among that which they (the Ṣaḥābah) changed and
altered.¹

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 92/55
Allah revealed seven, taking their names, but the Quraysh deleted six and left the name of Abū Lahab.¹

The names of men were in it, but they were thrown out.²

By the oath of Allah, this is how Jibrīl revealed it upon Muḥammad, but it is among that which was changed from the Book of Allah.³

Nay, by the oath of Allah, it was part of it. The first person who changed that was Ibn Arwā.⁴

There are many other examples like these. Thus, if any Shīṭ claims that the narrations in their books are narrations pertaining to qirāʿāt or they are among those verses, the recitation of which has been abrogated, then he is attempting to hide this kufr, and he wishes to equate the truth with falsehood.

Thirdly, many of their scholars have stated that these narrations are found in abundance in their reliable books. This, undoubtedly, is a shame upon their books, and not the Book of Allah. In an attempt to rid themselves of this shame, and emerge from this abyss, some of the intelligent ones among them tried to hide or do away with this view. However, these narrations increased with the passing of

---

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 290, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/54
2 *Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī* 1/12, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/55
3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/56
4 *Tafsīr Furāṭ* 177, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 91/56
each era, despite the rejection of those who rejected it. Some heretics, who joined the ranks of the Shīʿah made it their responsibility to spread this rubbish. There is no doubt that the one who subscribes to this kufr has nothing to do with Islam. He has no link with the Book of Allah, the religion that Allah revealed, Rasūlullāh or the Ahl al-Bayt. His religion is something other than Islam.

However, despite this, we see that those who narrate the tales which claim that the Qur′ān was changed (such as al-Majlisī in Biḥār al-Anwār, al-Ṭabarsī in Faṣl al-Khiṭāb) do not hesitate to use the Book of Allah as proof. They even begin each chapter of their books with a verse from the Book of Allah. Al-Majlisī does this in his Biḥār, al-Ṭabarsī does it in Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil and other authors also do the same. In fact, al-Ṭabarsī, who wrote that which he wrote in Faṣl al-Khiṭāb, has a chapter in his book Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil named, “Chapter: It is commendable to perform wuḍū before touching the writing of the Qur′ān, and it is impermissible for a person who does not have wuḍū or is impure to write the Qur′ān.”

Al-Majlisī, the scholar of the Shīʿah, who claimed that there are many narrations regarding the fabrication and they are no less in number than the narrations regarding Imāmah says:

آن الذي بين الدفتين كلام الله تعالى على الحقيقة من غیر زيادة ولا نقصان

Whatever is between the two covers is the actual speech of Allah without any addition or deletion.

Thereafter, he realised that this contradicts their narrations regarding Taḥrīf. Thus he said:

فإن قال قائل: كيف يصح القول بأن الذي بين الدفتين هو كلام الله تعالى على الحقيقة من غیر زيادة ولا نقصان، وأنتم تروون عن الأئمة عليهم السلام أنهم قرؤوا: “كم خير أمة أخرجت للناس” أو “كذلك

1 Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil 1/43
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 92/75
If anyone objects saying, “how is it possible to say that whatever is between the two covers is the actual speech of Allah, without any addition or deletion, when you narrate that the Imāms recited, ‘you are the best of Imāms, who have been selected for humanity,’ ‘we made you moderate A'immah,’ and ‘They ask you for the spoils’? These are all against the copy that the people have.” It will be said to him, “the narrations which have been reported regarding that are all āhād. It cannot be said with certainty that they are from Allah. Thus, we have hesitated regarding them, and we have not turned away from that which is in the available copies, in compliance to that which we have been instructed to do… We do not negate that a verse could have two revealed qirā’āt, one which is in conformity to that which appears in the (peoples) copy and one which is like that which appears in the narrations. Our opposition also admit that the Qur’ān was revealed with many different variations.”¹ (Thereafter, he points out a few of those variations)

If this was the real stance of those who spread those beliefs of kufr, then why did they spread and quote those fabrications? The answer is quite clear from all of that which has already passed, i.e. they wished to pacify their people and supporters that their beliefs are correct, and that the Šaḥābah removed the verses which testify to the truth of their cult. This is also why we see them claiming that other books, besides the Qur’ān, were revealed. Then they resorted to an ‘inner’ interpretation. These were all different schemes which they used to establish their corrupt beliefs.

Even though these efforts were primarily to get themselves out of the trouble that they were in, the consequences and effects thereof, upon some sects of the Shī'ah

¹ Bihār al-Anwār 92/75
were exceptionally destructive. In fact, the effects upon the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah themselves were no less. The Akhbārīs amongst them grant precedence to their narrations over the Book of Allah, as explained. Another serious consequence that came about was that they were believed to have their own version of the Qurʾān.

Fourthly, just as they have narrations in which it is claimed that Taḥrīf took place, they also have narrations which reject this great lie, such as the statement of their Imām:

واجتمعت الأمة قاطبة لاختلاف بينهم في ذلك أن القرآن حق لا ريب فيه عند جميع فرقها، فهم في حالة الاحتجاج عليه مصيبون، وعلى تصديق ما أنزل الله مهتدون، لقول النبي صلى الله علیه وسلم: “لا تجتمع أئمة على ضلالة

The entire ummah are unanimous, with no difference of opinion between them, that the Qurʾān is the truth and there is no doubt regarding it. This is accepted by all of its sects. Thus, when they use it as proof, they are correct and when they believe in that which Allah revealed, they are rightly guided, as Nabī ʿalīṣ ʿalā ʿlā ʿlā said, “my ummah will never be unanimous upon misguidance.”

Similarly the narrations regarding the virtues of reciting Qurʾān, the merits of the one who carries the Qurʾān in his bosom, the necessity of comparing their narrations to the Qurʾān, holding onto it until Qiyāmah, etc., all negate their claim that the Qurʾān had been changed or that the true copy is in the possession of their awaited saviour.

1 Like the Drūz, who made up their own copy named, Muṣḥaf al-Munfarid Bithātih. Refer to Muṣṭafā al-Shakʿah: Islām bi lā Madh-hab (introduction to the fifth print), al-Khaṭīb: ʿAqīdat al-Drūz pg. 138-184
2 Refer to al-Shaʿrānī: Taʿālīq ʿIlmiyyah (ʿalā Sharḥ al-Kāfī lī al-Māzindarānī) 2/414. Refer to the exact text under the discussion, “their beliefs regarding ijmāʿ”.
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī, Kitāb Faḍl al-Qurʾān 2/611
4 Ibid 3/603
5 Ibid 1/59
Fifthly, it became clear to us that this fabrication refutes itself, and that among its components was that which destroys it. It merely has to be presented for the falsity of it to be seen. It also serves as evidence against the Rawāfiḍ, proving them to be great liars. ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, who is a deity according to most of them, a Nabī according to some of them and an infallible Imām according to all of them, who was eventually made the khalīfah and was granted rule, due to which he had all authority for the period of five years and nine months could not do anything about the ‘false’ Qur’ān. It was being recited in the Masjids in every place, he himself would recite it whilst leading the ṣalāh and there were copies everywhere. If he felt that there was any change to it, as claimed by the Rāfiḍah, then why did he sanction all of this? His son, Ḥasan succeeded him, but simply followed in the footsteps of his father and allowed everything to continue.

So where did these liars appear from, and how could they even claim that a single alphabet was changed, added or deleted? He (Amīr al-Muʿminīn) would have fought a much more fierce battle against those who changed the Qur’ān, as compared to the battle against the people of Shām, who opposed him in a matter which was extremely trivial compared to the Qur’ān. Thus, the lies of the Rāfiḍah have been exposed in a way that can never be denied. All praise belongs to Allah.

1 Ibn Ḥazm: al-Fīṣal 2/216-217
Chapter Two

Their Beliefs Regarding the Sunnah (Aḥādīth)

Imām ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī considered the Shīʿah to be among those who reject aḥādīth, based on the fact that they refuse to accept that which is narrated by the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh.¹ We also find Imām al-Suyūṭī stating in his book al-Iḥtijāj bī al-Sunnah (using aḥādīth as proof) that in his era, a strange call was being made. It was a call towards abandoning the Sunnah, and sufficing upon the Qur’ān. He states that the originator of this call was a man from the Rāfiḍah, and this book was written by him to refute this view. Thus, the Shīʿah are the enemies of the Sunnah. The Ahl al-Sunnah on the other hand follow the Sunnah of Muḥammad, hence the name Ahl al-Sunnah.²

This is what some of the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah have to say. However, the Shīʿah report from their Imāms:

آن كل شيء مردود إلى الكتاب والسنة وکل حدیث ل یوافق کتاب الله فهو زخرف

Every matter should be referred to the Qur’ān and Sunnah, and every ḥadīth that does not conform to the Book of Allah is deception.³

There are other narrations of theirs which carry the same message.⁴ This implies that the Shīʿah do not reject the Sunnah of Rasūlullāh. In fact they accept it and place it alongside the Book of Allah as a scale (to weigh matters and decide whether they are correct or incorrect) and an arbitrator. However, the one who studies the texts of the Shīʿah and their narrations, will arrive at the conclusion

1 Refer to Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq pg. 322, 327, 346
2 Al-Muntaqā pg. 189, Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/175
3 Al-Bahbūdī: Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī 1/11
4 Uṣūl al-Kāfī (with its commentary, Bāb al-Akhḍh bī al-Sunnah wa Shawāhid al-Kitāb 2/417), Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī 1/11
that the Shīʿah outwardly accept the Sunnah, but reject it secretly, as most of their views and narrations promote that which contradicts the Sunnah, as known to the Muslims, whether it be in the understanding, application, isnāds, texts, etc. This will be understood from the forthcoming discussion.

**The Speech of the Imām is Like the Speech of Allah and His Rasūl**

According to them, the Sunnah is:

كل ما يصدر عن المعصوم من قولٍ أو فعلٍ أو تقریر

All that is done by *al-Maʿṣūm* (infallible one), i.e. his actions, statements, and that which he approves of.¹

Whoever does not know the nature of their madh-hab, will not understand the degree to which they have opposed the Sunnah by means of this statement. This is because *al-Maʿṣūm* is in fact Rasūlullāh. However, the Shīʿah have granted this quality to many others, besides Rasūlullāh. They regard the speech of these individuals to be of the same level as the speech of Allah and His Rasūl. These individuals are the Twelve Imāms. According to them, there is no difference between these twelve persons and the one who does not speak from [his own] inclination, his speech is not but a revelation revealed (i.e. Rasūlullāh).

ليسوا من قبل الرواة عن النبي والمحدثین عنه، ليكون قولهم حجة من جهة أنهم ثقات في الروایة؛ بل لأنهم هم المنصوبون من الله تعالى على لسان النبي لتبلیغ الأحكام الواقعیة، فلا يحكمون إلا عن الاحکام الواقعیة عند الله تعالى كما هي

They are not narrators who report and transmit from Rasūlullāh, due to which their statements would be proofs from the angle that they are reliable narrators from him. Rather, it is (their statements are proof) because they are appointed by Allah, through the medium of

---

¹ Muhammad Taqī al-Ḥakīm: *al-Uṣūl al-ʿĀmmah lī al-Fiqh al-Muqārin* pg. 122
the speech of his Nabī, to convey the laws of realities. They do not pass judgements except from the laws of reality, as they are by Allah.¹

There is no difference between the speech of these twelve individuals which was uttered by them during their childhood and the speech that was uttered by them after reaching the age of maturity, according to the Shīʿah. This is because they believe that they would not err, neither intentionally or on account of human nature. Thus, one of their contemporary scholars says:

إن الاعتقاد بعصمة الأئمة جعل الأحاديث التي تصدر عنهم صحيحة دون أن يشترطوا إيصال سندها إلى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم كما هو الحال عند أهل السنة

The belief that the Imāms are infallible demands that the aḥādīth from them are authentic, without the requisite that its isnād should reach Rasūlullāh صل الله عليه وسلم, as is the condition of the Ahl al-Sunnah.²

This is due to their belief that Imāmah is a continuation of Nubuwwah³ according to them, and the Imāms are like Rusul. Ibn Bābāwayh says:

قولهم قول الله وأمرهم أمر الله وطاعتهم طاعة الله ومعصیتهم معصیة الله وإنهم لم ينطقوا إلا عن الله تعالى وعن وحيه

Their speech is the speech of Allah, their commands are the commands of Allah, and their disobedience is the disobedience of Allah. They did not speak except on behalf of Allah and from His revelation.⁴

Al-Kāfī has an alleged narration from Abū ‘Abd Allāh (which, in the Shīʿī madh-hab, is a definite proof):

---

2 ‘Abd Allah Fayyāḍ: Tārīkh al-Imāmiyyah pg. 140
3 Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar: ‘Aqāʾid al-Imāmiyyah 166
4 Ibn Bābāwayh: Al-ʾtiqādāt pg. 106
My narrations are the narrations of my father, the narrations of my father are the narrations of my grandfather, my grandfather’s narrations are the narrations of Ḥusayn, the narrations of Ḥusayn are the narrations of Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn, the narrations of Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn are the narrations of Rasūlullāh  and the narrations of Rasūlullāh  are the statements of Allah Ṣallallāhu ‘Alayhi wa-Salīm. ¹

The commentator of al-Kāfī mentions that this statement means:

أن حدیث کل واحد من الأئمة الظاهرین قول الله عز وجل، ول اختلاف في أقوالهم کما لا اختلاف في قوله تعالى

The narrations of each one of the apparent Imāms are the speech of Allah Ṣallallāhu ‘Alayhi wa-Salīm, and there is no incoherence in their speech, just as there is no incoherence in the speech of Allah Ṣallallāhu ‘Alayhi wa-Salīm. ²

He takes it a step further:

یجوز من سمع حدیثاً عن أبي عبد الله - رضي الله عنه - أن یرویه عن أبیه أو عن أحد من أجداده، بل

It is permissible for the one who hears a narration from Abū ’Abd Allāh  to narrate it from his father or any of his fore-fathers. In fact, it is permissible for him to say, “Allah Ṣallallāhu ‘Alayhi wa-Salīm said.”³

This is clear permission to attribute the speech of mortals to Allah Ṣallallāhu ‘Alayhi wa-Salīm. Thereafter, he mentions that some of their narrations state the permissibility of

---

¹ ‌Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/53, Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 18/58
² Al-Māzindaranī: Sharḥ al-Jāmi‘ 2/272
³ Al-Māzindaranī: Sharḥ al-Jāmi‘ 2/272
this, and even state that it is better to do so.\footnote{Al-Māzīndarānī: \textit{Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ} 2/272} \textit{Al-Kāfī} also has a narration from Abū Baṣīr who asked Abū ʿAbd Allāh:

> الحديث أسمعه منك أرويه عن أبيك أو أسمعه عن أبيك أرويه عنك؟ قال: سواء، إل أنك ترويه عن أبي أحيب إليّ. وقال أبو عبد الله - رضي الله عنه - لجميل: ما سمعت مني فأرووه عن أبي

If I hear a narration from you, can I narrate it from your father and vice-versa? He replied, “(It is) the same, except that I prefer that you narrate it from my father.” Abū ʿAbd Allāh said to Jamīl, “Narrate whatever you hear from me, from my father.”\footnote{Uṣūl al-Kāfī (with \textit{Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ}) 2/259}

These narrations clearly allow open lies and forgeries, as it gives them the license to narrate (for example) from Amīr al-Muʾminīn\footnote{Muḥammad Taqī al-Ḥakīm: \textit{Sunnat Ahl al-Bayt} pg. 9} that which he did not say. Rather it was (allegedly) said by one of his grandsons who was not known to be a man of knowledge. It is even permissible, according to these narrations, to attribute to ʿAlī\footnote{Al-Māzīndarānī: \textit{Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ} 2/272} that which they claim are the statements of their awaited Mahdī. It is recommended (as established from the last narration) to attribute their statements to the person furthest up in the chain. The author of \textit{al-Kāfī} understood from this that it is best to attribute everything to Allah. This, undoubtedly, is the height of boldness against Allah ﷺ.

Thus, the Sunnah—according to them—is not just the Sunnah of Nabī\footnote{Muḥammad Taqī al-Ḥakīm: \textit{Sunnat Ahl al-Bayt} pg. 9}, but the Sunnah of all the Imāms as well. The statements of these Imāms hold the same weight as the speech of Allah and His Rasūl.\footnote{Al-Māzīndarānī: \textit{Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ} 2/272} Hence, they admit that this was added on to the pure Sunnah by the Shīʿah. They say:

> والحق الشيعة الإمامية كلما يصدر عن أئمتهم الأثنى عشر من قول أو فعل أو تقرير بالسنة الشریفة

The Shīʿah Imāmiyyah have added all that was done by the Twelve Imāms, i.e. their actions, statements and that which they approved of to the noble Sunnah.
These statements are made by them on the basis of two dangerous elementary principles of theirs. These were indicated to by one of their contemporary scholars, who stated that the speech of the Imām, according to them, holds the same position as the speech of Nabī, in the sense that it serves as proof, compliance to it is compulsory, and they do not pass judgements except in real matters as they are by Allah. This, he explains, is acquired by them in two different ways:

من طريق الإلهام كالنبي من طريق الوحي، أو من طريق التلقي عن المعصوم قبله كما قال مولانا أمير المؤمنين - عليه السلام -: "علمني رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ألف باب من العلم يفتح لي من كل باب ألف باب”

(Either) through inspiration (just as the Nabī would receive it through revelation) or from the previous infallible, as said by our master, Amīr al-Mu'minin, “Rasūlullāh taught me one thousand chapters, and each chapter opens up a thousand chapters to me.”

Thus, the knowledge of the Imāms is of two types: new knowledge, which is granted to them through inspiration and other forms, and knowledge which is kept as a trust by them, which they inherited from Rasūlullāh . Both of these are considered to be the Sunnah. We will now explain these two dangerous principles of the Shī'ah:

The First Principle; The Knowledge of the Imāms is Attained Through Inspiration and Revelation

The knowledge of the Imāms, according to them, is attained through inspiration. The reality of this is as stated by the author of al-Kāfī in his narrations from the Imāms:

النكت في القلوب وفي لفظ آخذه: فقدف في القلوب

1 Muhammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar: Uṣūl al-Fiqh 3/51
Dots on the heart.\(^1\) Or, according to another description of his, “It is placed in the heart.”

He unambiguously states that this is divine inspiration. He says:

وأما النكت في القلوب فإلهام

As for the dots in the heart, they are divine inspiration.\(^2\)

In other words, knowledge is placed in the heart of the Imām due to which he is inspired with the correct view, and it is impossible for him to err as he is infallible. This inspiration is not the only source of their knowledge, as this contemporary Shīʿī, whose words we have quoted, tried to explain. The author of al-Kāfī clearly stated that there are other avenues through which they acquire knowledge. He mentions some narrations wherein it is stated that among the sources of knowledge of the Imāms is ‘an impression in the ear’ from an angel. He explains:

وأما النكت في القلوب فإلهام، وأما النقر في الأسماع فأمر الملك

As for the dots in the heart, they are inspiration, but the impressions in the ear are the commands of the angel.\(^3\)

Al-Māzindarānī says:

إذن هناك وسيلة أخرى غير الإلهام، وهو نقر في الأسماع بتحديت الملك

Thus, there is another method, besides inspiration. It is the impression in the ears, spoken by the angel.\(^4\)

---

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/264
2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/264
3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/264
4 Al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ* 3/29
The Imām hears a voice, but he does not see the angel, as explained in four narrations of *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*, under the chapter, “The difference between a Rasūl, a Nabī and an inspired one”. All of these narrations state:

الأمام هو الذي يسمع الكلام ولا يرى الشخص

The Imām is the one who hears the speech, but does not see the individual.¹

The author of *Al-Biḥār* narrates fifteen narrations, all of which echo this meaning, under the chapter, “They are inspired and made to understand”.² A question arises: How does he know that it is the speech of the angel, if he does not see him? Their Imām says:

إنه يعطى السكونة والوقار حتى يعلم أنه كلام الملك

It gives tranquillity and composure, through which it is identified to be the speech of the angel.³

However, after a few chapters, the author of *al-Kāfī* belies that which he established, by quoting four narrations which affirm that the Imām does in fact see the angel. These narrations appear under the chapter, “The angels enter the houses of the Imāms, walk on their carpets, and give them reports.”⁴ These four narrations are then increased by the author of *Biḥār al-Anwār* to sixteen. Under a chapter named, “The angels come to them, walk on their carpets, and they see the angels”, he quotes these narrations, which emphasise, in clearer words that the Imāms see the angels.⁵

---

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/176-177. The author of *al-Shāfī* (the commentary of *al-Kāfī*) classified this narration as authentic. Refer to al-Shāfī 3/29

2 Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/73


5 Refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/355
Another narration speaks about the types of revelations received by the Imām. In it, it is stated that Jaʿfar said:

إن منا لمن ينكت في أذنه، وإن منا لمن يؤتي في منامه، وإن منا لمن يسمع صوت السلسلة تقع على الطشت (کذا)، وإن منا لمن يتأتي صورة أعظم من جبریل ومیکانیل

From us, impressions are left in the ears of some, some see (revelation in their) dreams, some hear the sound of bells hitting against basins, and some are approached by figures greater than that of Jibrīl and Mīkā’īl.

Al-Biḥār has other narrations to corroborate this one. It is as if they (the last group) have surpassed the Nabī, to whom Jibrīl would come to. This form, which is greater than Jibrīl and Mīkā’īl is al-Rūḥ, as explained in other narrations. The author of al-Kāfī dedicated a chapter to this Rūḥ, titled, “al-Rūḥ, by which Allah directs the A’immah”. This chapter consists of six narrations. Hereunder is one of those narrations:

Abū Baṣīr says, “I asked Abū ’Abd Allāh regarding the verse, ‘And thus We have revealed to you an inspiration of Our command. You did not know what is the Book or [what is] faith.’”

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 36/358, Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt pg. 63
2 Refer to Biḥār al-Anwār 26/35 narrations 110, 111, 112, 113
3 Ma’anī al-Akhbār of Ibn Bābāwayh reports one definition of al-Rūḥ from the Imām. It is:
عمود من نور بیننا وبين الله عز وجل
A pillar of nūr (illumination) between us and Allah

4 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/273-274
5 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 52
He replied, “A creation from the creation of Allah, E, who is greater than Jibrīl and Mīkā’īl. He would accompany Rasūlullāh H, inform him and guide him. Thereafter, he remained with the Imāms.”  

It is well-known that Rūḥ in this verse refers to the Qur’ān, hence the usage of the word, “We have revealed,” along with it. Allah referred to it as Rūḥ (which literally means a soul) due to the fact that a purposeful life can only be lived by taking guidance from it. It seems as if these claims of divine revelation upon their Imām escaped al-Mufīd (d. 413 A.H.), or, they were concocted later on. He states:  

من يزعم أن أحداً بعد نبينا يوحى إلیه فقد أخطأ وکفر

Whoever claims that anyone received revelation after our Nabī then indeed he has erred and he has committed kufr.  

The only other possibility is that he stated this on the basis of Taqiyyah. Thus far, we have learnt that the Imām receives divine inspiration, he hears the voice of an angel who visits his home and walks on his carpet, he sees the angel in his dreams, and an individual who is greater than Jibrīl and Mīkā’īl approaches him. However, this is not all. The Imām has other avenues as well, just as he possesses five souls. They are; the sanctified soul, the soul of īmān, the soul of life, the soul of strength, and the soul of desires.  

The author of al-Kāfī mentions this under a chapter which he titled, “The chapter in which the souls of the Imāms are mentioned”. In this chapter, he quotes six narrations. Later, when the author of Al-Biḥār appeared on the scene, the number of these narrations were increased to seventy four. Their narrations emphasise

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/273  
2 Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah pg. 4  
3 Awā’il al-Maqālāt pg. 39  
4 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/271  
5 Biḥār al-Anwār 25/47-99
the existence of Rūḥ al-Quds (the sanctified soul), which, according to them, is passed on to the Imāms after the demise of the ambiyā’. Uṣūl al-Kāfī states:

إذا قضى النبي صلى الله عليه وآله - انقل روح القدس إلى الإمام

When Nabī passed away, Rūḥ al-Quds moved on to the Imām.¹

Rūḥ al-Quds was the medium through which they learnt of everything, starting from below the ʿArsh, to below the ground.² He does not sleep, become negligent, engage in frivolities, or entertain false hopes, lies or mockery.³ By means of Rūḥ al-Quds, the Imām is able to see the following:

ما غاب عنه في أقطار الأرض وما في عنان السماء وبالجملة ما دون العرش إلى ما تحت الثرى

That which is hidden from him in the corners of the earth, that which is in the highest heavens, and everything from beneath the ʿArsh to below the ground.⁴

If you are amazed at what has been mentioned thus far, embrace yourself for what is next. The Imāms visit the ʿArsh of Allah, perform ʿawāf around it, and then take whatever knowledge they wish to take, every Friday. Abū ʿAbd Allāh says:

إذا كان ليلة الجمعة وافى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله- الأئمة علیهم السلام - ووافینا معهم، فلا ترد أرواحنا إلى أجسادنا إلا بعلم مستفاد، ولولا ذلك لأنفينا

On Thursday nights, Rasūlullāh arrives at the ʿArsh and the Imāms arrive with him. We also arrive (there) with them. Our souls are not returned to our bodies, except with knowledge that is attained. Had it not been for that, we would have been exhausted.⁵

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/272
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/272
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/272
4 Al-Ghifārī: Taʿālīq ʿalā Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/272
5 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/254, Biḥār al-Anwār 26/88-89, Başāʾir al-Darajāt pg. 36
Other narrations, which support this one, are reported by al-Kulaynī under a chapter that he dedicated to this subject, titled, “The Imāms are increased on Thursday nights.” This chapter contains three narrations.1 The author of Biḥār mentioned thirty seven of these narrations under the chapter, “They are increased and their souls ascend to the heavens.”2 Al-Biḥār contains nineteen narrations in which it is mentioned that Allah ʿAlī, and that Jibrīl dictates to him.3 Similarly, seventeen narrations discuss the gifts and presents of Allah to ‘Alī.4 Al-Majlisī also mentions:

أن الله يرفع للإمام عموداً ينظر به إلى أعمال العباد

Allah lifts a pillar for the Imām by means of which he looks at the actions of the people.

To prove this, he quotes sixteen narrations.5 This is what they refer to as ‘new’ knowledge.6 The approval of the Imāms is a requisite for this knowledge to be given to them. This is established in the narrations of al-Kāfī, under the chapter titled, “The Imāms are taught when they wish to learn.” Three narrations are reported in this chapter, which state:

أن الإمام إذا شاء أن يعلم أعلم

When the Imām wishes to learn, he is taught.8

In other words:

إذ أراد الإمام أن يعلم شيئاً أعلمته الله ذلك

---

1 Refer to Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/253
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 26/86-97
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 39/151-157
4 Biḥār al-Anwār 39/118-129
5 Biḥār al-Anwār 26/132-136
6 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/264
7 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/258
8 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/258
When the Imām wishes to know something, Allah teaches that to him.¹

Alas! The revelation received by the Imām is not dependant on the decision of Allah alone, as is the case in the revelation received by the ambiyā’. Rather, it depends on the happiness and decision of the Imām! This knowledge of the Imāms, which they receive whenever they desire it, and it holds the same position as the speech of Allah and His Rasūl (according to the Shī’ah) is only a portion of their knowledge. They also have that which is referred to as al-‘Ilm al-Ghābir or al-‘Ilm al-Mazbūr (the preserved or ancient knowledge) in their narrations.² This is a reference to the books, scriptures, and knowledge that is placed in the care of the Imāms. It is the second basis on which they claim that the speech of the Imām is equal to the speech of Allah and His Rasūl. We will now discuss this.

The Second Principle; The Treasures of Knowledge and the Trusts of knowledge are by the Imāms

Al-Kāfī reports from Mūsā ibn Ja’far that he said (as they claim):

مبلغ علمنا على ثلاثة وجوه: ماض وغابر وحادث، فأما الماضي فمفسّر، وأما الغابر فمزبور، وأما الحادث
فقدف في القلوب ونقر في الأسماع وهو أفضل علمنا ول نبي بعد نبینا

Our knowledge consists of three parts: the past, the ancient, and the new. As for the past, it is explained. The ancient is that which is preserved and the new is that which is placed in the hearts or inscribed in the ears. This is the best of our knowledge, and there is no Nabī after our Nabī.³

---

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/258
² Refer to Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/264
³ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/264

Another narration reports from their Imām:

أما الغابر فالعلم بما يكون، وأما المزبور فالعلم بما كان

As for the Ghābir, it is knowledge of that which will happen, and as for al-Mazbūr, it is knowledge of that which already happened. Refer to Biḥār al-Anwār 26/18, al-Muḥīd: Al-Irshād pg. 257, al-Ṭabarsī: al-Iḥtijāj pg. 203.

This explanation points out the subject matter of each type. One type is related to the happenings of the past, whilst the other is related to that which is to happen.
Al-Bihār contains three narrations of this meaning.\(^1\) The new knowledge is that which has already been explained. It is, as explained in the narration, their best knowledge. This is due to their belief, as explained by one of their scholars:

\[\text{حصل لهم من الله بلا واسطة}\]

Received by them from Allah, without any intermediary.\(^2\)

This means that they receive this knowledge directly from Allah, without the intermediary of an angel. This is similar to the claims of the deviant Ṣūfīs.

As for the knowledge of the past, which is explained and the ancient which is preserved, this is explained by the commentator of al-Kāfī:

\[\text{يعني: الماضي الذي تعلق علمنا به وهو كل ما كان مفسراً لنا بالتفسير النبوي، والغابر المزبور الذي تعلق علمنا به هو كل ما يكون مزبوراً مكتوباً عندنا بخط علي – رضي الله عنه – وإملاء الرسول وإملاء الملائكة مثل الجامعة وغيرها}\]

This means the past, to which our knowledge is connected, is all that which was explained by Nabī H. The ancient and preserved is all that which was preserved by us from the writings of ʿAlī I and that which was dictated by the Rasūl and angels such as al-Jāmiʿah and others.

Thus, we learn that the knowledge that is kept by the Imāms is of two types; books which they inherited from Nabī H or that which they received directly from him (face to face). The crux of this belief, which forms the core of their religion, is that Rasūllullah H conveyed a portion of the Sharīʿah and kept back a portion. He passed the hidden portion on to ʿAlī, alone. ʿAlī, then conveyed a portion of it within his lifetime and passed on the remainder to Ḥasan at the time of his death. Similarly, each Imām conveyed a portion of it, according to the need, and passed on the rest to the one that was to come after him. The last portion now remains with the awaited one.

\(^1\) Biḥār al-Anwār 26/59, Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt pg. 92
\(^2\) Al-Māzindarānī: Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ 6/44
We have already seen what their scholar and Āyat Allah Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn Āl Kāshīf al-Ghiṭā (d. 1376 A.H.) had to say regarding the division of laws in Islam into two categories. One category was that which Nabī openly preached to the Ṣaḥābah, and the other was that which he handed over to his awṣiyā’. Each Waṣī then brings out to the people that which they are in need of in his time. Thereafter, he passes it on to the one after him. He went on to say that at times Nabī would mention a law without mentioning the specific case to which it applies, leaving this to the Imām of the time.¹

Their contemporary scholar, Baḥr al-ʿUlūm says:

Since the glorious book only covers the general laws, without going into the details, they were in need of the Sunnah of the Nabī… the Sharīʿah was not completed with the Sunnah, as there are many new happenings that did not take place in the era of Nabī. He needed to place (the knowledge regarding this) in the care of his awṣiyā’, so that they could convey it on his behalf, at the appropriate time.²

¹ Aṣl al-Shīʿah pg. 77.
² Baḥr al-ʿUlūm: Maṣābīḥ al-Uṣūl pg. 4. There are many statements of their scholars which corroborate this. As an example, their greatest Āyat, Shīhāb al-Dīn l-Najafī says:

Look at how they insult Rasūlullāh, by claiming that he preferred wars over conveying the laws of Allah. Allah says:

O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord. Sūrah al-Māʾidah: 67
These are a few general outlines of this dangerous belief upheld by the Shī‘ah. As for the proofs thereof, the discussion will lengthen unduly if all of them are reproduced. You can well imagine what will happen if they have to be scrutinised and analysed thereafter. Thus, we will quote some with brevity. The author of al-Kāfī has one chapter titled, “The Imāms are the guardians of the matters of Allah and they are the treasurers of His knowledge.”¹ This chapter contains six narrations. A second chapter-heading reads, “The Imāms inherited the knowledge of Nabī ﷺ, all the ambiyā’ before him and awṣiyā’ before them.”² This chapter contains seven narrations. A third chapter heading reads, “The Imāms know all the knowledge that came to the angels, ambiyā’, and messengers.”³ This chapter contains four narrations.

This preserved knowledge, as explained, is of two types (the explained and the preserved). As for the explained, among that which they have to say regarding it is that which is stated by the author of Uṣūl al-Kāfī, “Chapter: Allah did not teach His Nabī anything, except that he commanded him to teach it to Amīr al-Mu‘minīn, and he was his partner in knowledge”. In this chapter, he narrates there narrations.⁴ Similar to this, is that which appears in Al-Biḥār, under the

continued from page 427

So did the Rasūl of guidance turn away from the command of his Rabb? Can these people (who make such derogatory statements regarding Rasūlullāh ﷺ be among the followers of Nabī ﷺ, let alone his Ahl al-Bayt? Does their acceptance of this belief not demand that Allah be belied, as He said”

اَلْیَوْمَ اَکْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِیْنَكُمْ وَاَتَْمْتُ عَلَیْكُمْ نِعْمَتِیْ وَرَضِیْتُ لَكُمُ الِْسْلاَمَ دِیْنًا

This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favour upon you and have approved for you Islam as religion. Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 3

Allah perfected for us the dīn. Thus, any statement which contradicts this is kufr and deviation. Yes, the religion which is incomplete, imperfect and will remain so till the end of times, is the religion of the Shī‘ah. Their scholars keep adding and removing from it, and it has no shortage of contradictions. Why not, when it is a man-made-religion?

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/192-193
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/223-226
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/225-256
4 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/263
title, “He was a partner of Nabī in knowledge, not nubuwwah, he was
granted knowledge, every time Nabī was granted knowledge, and he was
more knowledgeable than all the ambiyā”. This chapter contains twelve of their
narrations.¹

Al-Majlisī also presents eighty two narrations regarding the knowledge of ʿAlī. He tries to establish that Nabī taught him a thousand chapters of
knowledge. He dedicates a special chapter to this subject.² One of his narrations
have it that Nabī secretly taught ʿAlī a thousand narrations, which
he did not teach the ummah. ʿAlī thereafter, made this known to the people
saying:

أيها الناس، إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أسرّ إليّ ألف حدیث، في كل حدیث ألف باب، لكل باب ألف مفتاح

O people! Rasūlullāh secretly taught me a thousand narrations. Each
narration has a thousand chapters and each chapter has a thousand keys.³

On another occasion, he claims that Abū ʿAbd Allāh said:

أوصى رسول الله - صلى الله وآله - إلى علي - عليه السلام - بألّف باب كل باب يفتح ألف باب

Rasūlullāh passed on to ʿAlī a thousand chapters. Each chapter
opens a thousand chapters.⁴

Thereafter, he claims that ʿAlī said:

إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله علمني ألف باب من الحلال والحرام، ومنما كان وموما يكون إلى يوم القيامة، كل باب منها يفتح ألف باب فذلك ألف ألف باب، حتى علمت المنايا والبلايا، وفصل الخطاب

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 40/208-212
² Biḥār al-Anwār 40/127-200
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 40/127, Ibn Bābāwayh: al-Khiṣāl 2/174
⁴ Biḥār al-Anwār 40/129, Ibn Bābāwayh: al-Khiṣāl 2/175-176
Rasūlullāh Ḥ taught me a thousand chapters regarding the lawful and unlawful and that which happened and which is going to happen until Qiyāmah. Each chapter of it opens a thousand chapters. Thus it is a million chapters. In this way, I have learnt the destinies, tragedies, and the decisive speech.¹

Another narration states that Rasūlullāh Ḥ venerated ʿAlī I at the time of his death with his shirt and he narrated a thousand narrations to him, each of which opens a thousand chapters.² All of this, is not considered great knowledge by the Imāms. It is not as great as that which they have. Abū Baṣīr says:

I entered upon Abū ʿAbd Allāh and said to him, “The Shīʿah are saying that Rasūlullāh Ḥ taught ʿAlī a chapter from which a thousand chapters open up.”

Abū ʿAbd Allāh replied, “O Abū Muḥammad, by the oath of Allah, Rasūlullāh Ḥ taught ʿAlī a thousand chapters, from which each chapter opens up a thousand chapters.”

I commented, “By the oath of Allah, this is knowledge!”

He replied, “It is indeed knowledge, but it is not that great.”³

Nabī Ḥ continued teaching ʿAlī I this secret knowledge (as claimed by the narrations of the Shīʿah) as long as he lived. None besides him would get to

---

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 40/130, al-Khiṣāl 2/175, Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt pg. 87
² Biḥār al-Anwār 40/215, Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt pg. 89-90
³ This is part of a lengthy narration which speaks about the imaginary types of knowledge possessed by the Imāms. Read up on it in Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/238, Biḥār al-Anwār 40/130, al-Khiṣāl 2/176-177
know of it. The lies of the Shīʿah regarding this are unbelievable. They go on to claim that ‘Alī continued to receive knowledge from the mouth of Rasūlullāh, even after his death. Al-Majlisī dedicated a chapter to this titled, “That which Rasūlullāh taught him at the time of his demise and after that.”

The first narration of this chapter states that ‘Alī said:

واوصاني النبي صلى الله علیه وآله فقال: إذا أنا متّ فغسلني بست قرب من بئر غرس فإذا فرغت من غسلي فأدرجني في أکفاني، ثم ضع فاك على فمي، قال: ففعلت وأنبأني بما هو کائن إلى یوم القیامة

Nabī made his bequest to me saying, “When I pass away, bath me using six bags of water from the well of Ghars. When you are done bathing me, place me in my coffin. Thereafter, place your mouth on my mouth.”

He says, “I did this, whereupon he informed me of that which will happen until Qiyāmah.”

The second narration states that Rasūlullāh said, as they falsely claim:

يا علي، إذا أنا متّ فاغسلني وكفني ثم أقعدني وسائلني واكتب

O ʿAlī, when I pass away, bath me and place me in my coffin. Thereafter, make me sit, ask me and write.

The rest of the narration continues to convey this laughable message. They go to the extent of saying that whenever ‘Alī was told of anything, he would say:

هذا مما أخبرني به النبي صلى الله علیه وآله بعد موته

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 40/213-218
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 40/213, Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt pg. 80
4 Biḥār al-Anwār 40/213, Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt pg. 80
This is from that which Nabī ﷺ informed me of after his demise.¹

This is how they destroy their own home, and expose their lies, by their exaggerations which have no limits. The above is only a fraction of their narrations regarding the knowledge that Nabī ﷺ passed on to ‘Alī ﷺ alone, which was thereafter passed on to the Imāms who succeeded him. The imaginations of the Shī‘ah did not stop here. They went on to imagine that the Imāms possessed that which they referred to as the ancient knowledge or the books that they inherited from Nabī ﷺ.

The author of al-Kāfī mentioned a few of them under the chapter titled, “Mention of the Ṣaḥīfah, al-Jifr, al-Jāmi‘ah, and Muṣḥaf Fāṭimah ﷺ.”² Another chapter is titled, “The greatest names of Allah that was granted to the Imāms.”³ A third chapter is titled, “The signs of the ambiyā‘ that is possessed by the Imāms.”⁴ As for al-Majlisī, he mentioned many narrations regarding this. He gathered most of that which is found in their ‘reliable’ books in his Bihār, under a number of chapters. It is difficult to cover all of them. A few of them are:

- The types of their knowledge and the books that they have (this chapter contains 149 narrations, which were he selected, as per his habit, from their most relied upon books.⁵)
- They have books in which the names of those kings who ruled the earth is mentioned.⁶
- They have the books of the ambiyā‘ and they recite them in their different languages.⁷

---

1 Bihār al-Anwār 40/215, al-Kharā’ij wa l-Jarā‘īh pg. 132
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/238-242
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/330
4 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/231-232
5 Bihār al-Anwār 26/18-66
6 Bihār al-Anwār 26/155-156. This chapter contains 7 narrations.
7 Bihār al-Anwār 26/180-189. This chapter contains 27 narrations.
• They have all the knowledge of the angels and ambiyā’ and they have been
given all that Allah granted to the ambiyā’.

• Each Imām has all the knowledge of the Imām before him, and the earth
will not remain void of a knowledgeable person.¹

• They have a book in which the names of the people of Jannah, their Shī‘ah,
and their enemies are listed.²

The narrations of these chapters discuss the booklets and other things that the
Imāms inherited. They also discuss the imaginary sources which the Rāfiḍah
claim are in the possession of their Twelve Imāms, in which all that which the
people require is mentioned (as they claim). If we have to present all that which is
covered in these chapters, analyse their contents, highlight their contradictions,
and the nonsense contained therein, we will need a separate chapter. Nonetheless,
we will suffice upon indications and examples.

Many narrations of these chapters contained narrations regarding a booklet
named, ‘al-Jāmi‘ah’ – which they describe as:

سيعون ذراعاً بخط علي عليه السلام، وإملاء رسول الله صلى الله علیهما وعلى أولادهما – كذا – فيها
من كل حلال وحرام

Seventy cubits, in the handwriting of ʿAlī S, which was dictated by
Rasūlullāh H. In it is everything permissible and impermissible.³

Every single matter has been covered in this, including the penalty for a scratch.⁴
Repeated mention is made of the knowledge contained therein, with a few
variations in many narrations.⁵ It is indeed surprising that their Imāms promise

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/159-179. This chapter contains 63 narrations.
² Biḥār al-Anwār 26/117-132. This chapter contains 40 narrations.
³ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/239, Biḥār al-Anwār 26/22
⁴ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/239, Biḥār al-Anwār 26/22
⁵ Refer to Biḥār al-Anwār 26/22. Refer to the following narrations; 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 23 25, 61, 65,
78, 80, 90 etc.
their followers that they will judge on the basis of what is in these booklets, if they ever get the ability to pass judgments. They say:

 لو ولینا الناس لحكمنا بما أنزل الله لم نعد ما في هذه الصحیفة

If we were given authority over the people, we would pass judgments on the basis of that which Allah revealed, we would not go beyond that which is in this booklet.¹

As for the Qurʾān, it is not mentioned. This booklet, as they explain, is their constitution. They say:

فنحن نتبع ما فيها ولا نعدوها

We follow whatever is in it, and we do not go beyond it.²

Abū Baṣīr (one of their narrators) claims that he saw this booklet in the possession of Abū Jaʿfar.³ Similarly, Zurārah claims that he heard a text from the texts in which it is stated:

إن ما يحدث به المرسلون كصوت السلسلة أو كمناجاة الرجل صاحبه

That by means of which the Messengers are communicated with, such as the sound of chains or the whispering of a person to his companion.⁴

Their narrations also have excerpts from that which they refer to as the book ʿAlī. They describe it as follows:

مثل فخذي الرجل مطوّى

Like the folded thighs of a man.⁵

---

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/22-23, Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt pg. 39
² Biḥār al-Anwār 26/22-23, Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt pg. 39
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/23, Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt pg. 39
⁴ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/24, Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt pg. 45
⁵ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/51, Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt pg. 45
And:

خط علي بيده وإملاء رسول الله

The writing of the hand of ʿAlī and the dictation of Rasūlullāh.¹

However, they have narrated to us nothing from these narrations, except their unjust law:

إن النساء لیس لهن من عقار الرجل إذا هو توفي عنها شيء، هذا والله خط علي بیده وإملاء رسول الله

Women are not entitled to anything from the land of a man if he passes away, leaving her behind. By the oath of Allah, this was with the handwriting of ʿAlī and the dictation of Rasūlullāh.²

They hold firmly to this narration, which appears in their imaginary book, ignoring the verses of the Qurʾān, which do not differentiate between land and other possessions. If they insist on accepting this as a law, do they not realise that it contradicts their claims that Fāṭimah was entitled to a share from Fadak?³ Nonetheless, it seems as if this book cannot be publicised except in an environment of irreligiousness. This is because, as soon as Mughīrah⁴ (who is classified in the books of the Rāfiḍah as well as an extremist) was killed, they paid more attention to hiding the book. Their Jaʿfar said (when a text was quoted to him regarding the Wilāyah of ʿAlī):

هذا مكتوب عندي في کتاب عليّ ولكن دفعته أمس حین کان هذا الخوف وهو حین صلب المغیرة

This is written (and) in my possession in the book of ʿAlī. However, I gave

---

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/51, Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt pg. 45
² Biḥār al-Anwār 26/51, Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt pg. 45
³ They try to get out of this mess by claiming that Rasūlullāh specified it for her during his blessed lifetime. Refer to Muqtabas al-Athar 23/179
⁴ Mughīrah ibn Saʿīd al-Bajalī al-Kūfī, a heretic. His details passed on page 135 of this book.
it away yesterday on account of this fear, which was when Mughīrah was hanged.¹

Their narrations also have mention of a booklet (which contained nineteen booklets) which was presented or hidden away² by Rasūlullāh by giving it to the Imāms.³ They mention nothing more than this. The narrations state:

في ذؤابة سيف علي صحبة صغيرة، وأن علياً عليه السلام دعا إلى الحسن فدفعها إليه ودفع إليه سكينة وقال له: افتحها، فلم يستطع أن يفتحها، ثم قال له: اقرأ، قرأ الحسن - عليه السلام - الألف والباء والسين واللام وحرفًا بعد حرف، ثم طواعها فدفعها إلى الحسن عليه السلام، ثم قال له: افتحها، ففتحها له ثم قال له: اقرأ يا بني، قرأها كما قرأ الحسن عليه السلام، ثم طواعها فدفعها إلى ابن الحنفية، ثم قدر على أن يفتحها ففتحها له فقال له: اقرأ، فلم يستخرج منها شيءًا، فأخذها وطعها ثم علقها بذؤابة السيف.

In the sheath of the sword of ʿAlī was a small booklet. He called Ḥasan, gave him a knife and said to him, “Open it.” He could not open it, so ʿAlī opened it for him and then said to him, “Read!” Ḥasan read, “Alif baa seen laam,” and alphabet after alphabet. Thereafter, he folded it and gave it to Ḥusayn, who could not open it. He opened it and said to him, Read, O my beloved son!” he read just as Ḥasan read. Thereafter, he folded it and gave it to Muhammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah. He could not open it, so ʿAlī opened it for him and said to him, “Read!” He could not make any sense of it. Thereupon, he took it, folded it and hanged it to the sheath of the sword.⁴

Abū ʿAbd Allāh was asked regarding the contents of this booklet. He answered:

هي الأحرف التي يفتح كل حرف ألف باب

It is those alphabets, each of which opens up a thousand chapters.⁵

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/52-53, Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt pg. 45. For more information regarding the supposed book of ʿAlī, refer to Al-Biḥār 26/24, number 54, 55, and 59.
² Some copies state ‘hidden’ and others state ‘presented’.
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/24, Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt pg. 39
⁴ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/56, Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt pg. 89, al-Mufīd: al-Ikhtiṣāṣ pg. 284
⁵ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/56, Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt pg. 89, al-Ikhtiṣāṣ pg. 284
Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿAbd al-ʿĀl said:

فما خرج منها إلا حرفان الساعة

Until now, only two alphabets have emerged from it.¹

The exact meanings of these alphabets, which open up a thousand locked chapters, have not been explained in the above text. Nevertheless, the question that we would like an answer to is, why did the Imāms not use them? They, as claimed by the Shīʿah, had to undergo unending difficulties and lived in fear, practicing Taqiyyah all the time, to the extent that the last of them, till now, is hidden away in his cave. He could not step out of it due to fear of the enemies all along the centuries.

Ibn Taymiyyah indicated towards a claim similar to this one, when he touched upon the idea of ‘calculating the total by means of the alphabets’. He states this is from that which was inherited from the Jews, and a certain sect attempted to calculate the amount of time left for the existence of this ummah by means of it.² Claims such as the previous one are similar to this one, and perhaps it also has a Jewish origin. It is nothing more than craziness and idiocy. It is a plot to unsettle the ummah and distract it from its important tasks. As for the commoners among the Shīʿah, it dupes them and sinks them in riddles and puzzles which serve as a smokescreen to block off from the correct path. Engagement in its darkness does not allow them to find the straight path. Their claims of this nature are never ending.

They claim that ʿAlī ʿAlī ṣaʿīd said:

إن عندي صحفاً كثيرة.. وإن فيها صحيفه يقال لها العبیطة، وما ورد عن العرب أشد علیهم منها، وإن فيها لستين قبيلة من العرب بهرة ما لها في دين الله من نصيب

¹ ibid

² Fatāwā 4/82 (gathered by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Qāsim).
I have many booklets by me. Among them is a booklet called al-ʿAbīṭah. It is the most severe narration against them. Sixty tribes of the Arabs have been exposed to be worthless. They do not have any portion in the dīn of Allah.¹

The reader might be able to pick up the agenda of the fabricator of this text and its likes. They are the products of hatred and racism towards the Arabs, not only on the basis of their nationality, but on account of the religion upheld and propagated by them as well. Since a vehicle was needed to spread this hatred, Shīʿism was seen as the perfect target, and thus hijacked by these enemies of the Ummah and its dīn. Consequently, some sects of the Shīʿah bought into the deception of these people and filled their books with these fairy-tales. Perhaps they done so knowingly. However, those who undergo the greatest losses are the followers, as they believe these tales on the basis of their ascription to the Ahl al-Bayt. Little do they know what is going on behind the scenes.

One of the books that they claim is in the possession of their Imāms is the book Dīwān al-Shīʿah (or al-Nāmūs or al-Simṭ—the narrations differ as far as the name of the book is concerned). In this book, the names of every member of the Shīʿah, along with his or her father’s name is recorded. The followers of the Imāms (as stated in their books) would go to the Imāms to find out if their names were in this book, as the appearance of a person’s name in this book guarantees salvation.²

As an example, they have a narration that records the visit of Abū ʿAbd Allāh by a woman named Ḥubābah al-Walibīyyah.

إن لي ابن أخ وهو يعرف فضلكم وإنني أحب أن تعلمني أمن شیعتكم؟ قال: وما اسمه؟ قالت: فلان ابن فلان، قال: یا فلانه، هاتي الناموس، فجاءت بصحیفة تحملها کبیرة فنشرها ثم نظر فیها فقال: نعم هو ذا اسمه واسم أبيه هنا

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/37, Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt pg. 41
² Refer to their narrations regarding this in Biḥār al-Anwār 26/117-132
She said to him, “I have a nephew (brother’s son) who accepts that you people are virtuous. I would like to know if he belongs to your Shī’ah.”

He replied, “What is his name?”

She replied “Fulān, the son of fulān”

She reports, “He then said, ‘O fulānah, bring the Nāmūs.’”

Thus she brought a huge page, which he opened up and looked at.

Thereafter, he said, “Yes, his name as well as his father’s name is here.”

According to them, whoever’s name is not recorded in this book is not from the Muslims, as their Imām said:

إن شيعتنا مكتوبون بأسمائهم وأسماء آبائهم.. ليس على ملة الإسلام غيرنا وغيرهم

Our follower’s names are written along with the names of their fathers. Besides us and them, there are no followers of Islam.

At times, they go on to claim that this was inherited from Rasūlullāh. They believe that on the occasion of his ascension to the heavens, he was given two pages; one had the names of the aṣḥāb al-yamīn (people of the right) and the other had the names of the aṣḥāb al-shimāl (people of the left). These two pages had the names of the people of Jannah and the names of those who were destined for Jahannam as well. Thereafter, Rasūlullah—as they claim—gave it over to ‘Alī. At present, it is in the hands of their awaited one.

1 The word fulān in Arabic is used to refer to an unnamed person.
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 26/121, Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt pg. 46
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 26/123, Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt pg. 47
4 Refer to Biḥār a-Anwār 26/124-125, Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt pg. 52. When we take into consideration their claims that the senior scholars among them communicate with him, we do not find it surprising that some of the Ayatollahs are believed to issue certificates of forgiveness and reports of failure (to the ‘unlucky ones’). They use these to fool their simple minded followers, and shove them into the thick of battle using these fake certificates.
The Imāms also have a book named, Ṭaḥffiz al-Ḥusayn, which contains all the needs of humans,1 or all the needs of the children of Ādam since the inception of the world until its destruction.2 Similarly, the Imāms have al-Jifr al-Abyaḍ3 (literally, the white fortune-teller). It contains, as they claim:

The Psalms of Dāwūd, the Torah of Mūsā, the Bible of Īsā, the pages of Ibrāhīm, the prohibited and allowed, the copy of Fāṭimah, and that which people are in need of. This is to the extent that it contains a strike of a whip, half a strike, one third of a strike as well as well as the compensation for a scratch.4

1 Ṭaḥffiz al-Anwār 26/54, Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt pg. 54
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/304
3 The narrations define this:

وعاء من أدم فيه علم النبیين والوصیین، وعلم العلماء الذين مضوا من بني إسرائيل

A vessel made of leather, which contains the knowledge of the ambiyā’, awṣiyā’, and the scholars of the Banū Isrā’īl. (Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/239)

It is also described as:

جلد ثور ملئ عل

The skin of a bull, filled with knowledge. (Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/241)

How can the Muslims be in need of a constitutional book other than the Qur’ān, when Allah perfected the dīn for us, terminated the revelation of divine books with the Qur’ān and abrogated all other religions by means of it? Allah says:

وَمَن يَبْتَغِ غَيرَْ الإِسْلاَمِ دِینًا فَلَن یُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ

And whoever desires other than Islam as religion – never will it be accepted from him. (Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 85)

Some of their narrations report different colours. Each colour is related to a topic relevant to it, and a smell that conforms to its shape. Thus, there is a red one, which contains the ‘red death’, and with which the awaited one will make his appearance. The Rāfiḍah have been threatened the former as well as the latter generations of the Muslims by means of the red one, as it has the made up story of the promised revenge that will take place. Refer to Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/240, Faṣl al-Mahdiyyah wa al-Ghaybah.

4 Ṭaḥffiz al-Anwār 26/37, Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt pg. 41
Analyses of this belief

We suffice upon the above quoted passages from the imaginary sources claimed by the Rāfiḍāh. A mere presentation of these are more than enough to prove their baseless nature. If any of them were in the least bit true, history would have been very different. The Imāms would not have failed to—as said by the Rāfiḍah—acquire the seats of authority, trials and difficulties would not have been their lot, every single one of them would not have passed away on account of poisoning or being murdered (as stated by the Rāfiḍah), and their hidden one would not have remained stuck in his cave, fearing that he will be killed if he emerges. These fairy-tales, which the Rāfiḍah have preserved in their reliable books, contain many dangerous ideas. A few of these will be highlighted in the chapters that follow.

The first idea that is imperative to highlight is the idea that divine revelation has not yet come to an end. This is undoubtedly a false belief, which is refuted by both, divine texts as well as logical proofs. Hence, the Muslims are unanimous that divine revelation was terminated upon the demise of Rasūlullāh and that revelation can only be received by a Nabī. Allah himself says:

مَا كَانَ مُحَمَّدٌ أَبَا أَحَدِ مِّن رِّجَالِكُمْ وَلَكِن رَّسُولَ اللَّهِ وَخَاتَمَ النَّبِیِّینَ

Muḥammad is not the father of [any] one of your men, but [he is] the Messenger of Allah and Seal [i.e., last] of the prophets.¹

Nahj al-Balāghah reports a statement of ʿAlī regarding Rasūlullāh:

أَرْسَلَهُ عَلَى حَيْن فَرَأَهُ مَرَضَتْ مَرَضَةً مِّنَ الرُّسُلِ فَقَفَّى بِهِ الرُّسُلُ وَخَتَمَهُ الْرَّحْمَةَ

He (Allah) sent him after a period wherein there was no Nabī... he made him the last Rasūl and he terminated revelation with him.²

---

¹ Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 40
² Nahj al-Balāghah pg,. 191
This statement indicates that the previous claims were the products of the latter day scholars of the Shīʿah, who concocted them. As we have already seen, a classical scholar of theirs, al-Mufīd (d. 413 A.H.) declares the one who claims revelation in respect of anyone besides the ambiyā’ to be a Kāfir. The second idea that we wish to highlight is claim that dīn is incomplete. This is in stark contradiction to the verse of Allah:

الْیَوْمَ أَکْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِینَكُمْ... 

This day I have perfected for you your religion...\(^1\)

This claim insinuates that the Rasūl of Guidance did not convey all that was revealed to him, which implies that he did not fulfil the command of Allah who said:

یَا أَیُّهَا الرَّسُولُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنزِلَ إِلَیْكَ مِن رَّبِّكَ وَإِن لَّمْ تَفْعَلْ فَمَا بَلَّغْتَ رِسَالَتَهُ

O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord, and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His message.\(^2\)

This is an insult to the honour of Rasūlullāh. The result of this is that a sect of the Shīʿah have lost respect for Rasūlullāh, and insult him.\(^3\) There is no doubt that Nabī conveyed the message in the best possible manner, explained the dīn in detail, established the proofs required by all, and even announced this to the Muslims without concealing portion of the Sharīʿah from anyone. Allah says:

لَتُبَیِّنُنَّهُ لِلنَّاسِ وَلَ تَكْتُمُوْنَهُ

You must make it clear [i.e., explain it] to the people and not conceal it.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 3  
\(^2\) Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 67  
\(^3\) They are the al-ʿAlbā’īyyah. They will be discussed later.  
\(^4\) Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 187
This verse emphatically states that it is a message for the entire humanity and not just for a faction from the Ahl al-Bayt. Allah also says:

بَعْدِ مَا بَیَّنَّاهُ لِلنَّاسِ فِي الْکِتَابِ أُولٰـئِیکَ یَلعَنُهُمُ ۢ إِنَّ الَّذِیْنَ یَکْتُمُوْنَ مَا أَنزَلْنَا مِنَ الْبَیِّنَاتِ وَالْهُدٰی مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا بِیْنَاهُ لِلْذِیْنِ فِی الْکِتَابِ أُولِیْتَکُ صَبِیْعَهُمْ ۢ اللهُ وَبْیَعُنِّهِمْ الْلَاعِنُوْنَ إِلَّ الَّذِیْنَ تَابُوْا وَأَصْلَحُوْا وَبْیَعُوْا

Indeed, those who conceal what We sent down of clear proofs and guidance after We made it clear for the people in the Scripture — those are cursed by Allah and cursed by those who curse. Except for those who repent and correct themselves and make evident [what they concealed].

In another verse Allah says:

وَمَا أَنزَلْنَا عَلَیْكَ الْکِتَابَ إِلَّ لِتُبَیِّنَ لَهُمُ الَّذِي اخْتَلَفُوْا فِیْهِ

And We have not revealed to you the Book, [O Muḥammad], except for you to make clear to them that wherein they have differed.

The crux of the message of these verses is that the dīn is complete. It will accept no additions deletions or modifications, neither from a supposed Imām, nor from an imaginary individual who lives in occultation. Muḥammad did not leave this world until he conveyed the entire dīn and explained all that needed to be explained, as Allah had commanded him, to all the Muslims. Thus, there is no secret portion of dīn that was confined to anyone. Rasūlullāh said:

ترکتم على مثل البیضاء لیلها کنهارها ل یزیغ عنها بعدي إل هالك

I left you on a clear path, the night of it is the same as the day. None will

---

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 159-160
2 Surah al-Naḥl: 64
3 Ibn Ḥazm: al-Muhallā 1/26
4 Ibn Ḥazm: al-Muhallā 1/15
digress from it after me (my demise) except the one who is destroyed.¹

Abū al-Dardā said:

صدق الله ورسوله فقد تركنا علی مثل البيضاء

Allah and His Rasūl have spoken the truth. Indeed we have been left on a clear path.²

Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī said:

قد تركنا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم وما يحرك طائر جناحه في السماء إل ذکر لنا منه علماً

Muḥammad left us in a state that even if a bird flaps its wings in the skies, some knowledge regarding that has been mentioned to us.³

ʿUmar said

قام فینا رسول الله مقاماً فأخبرنا عن بدء الخلق حتى دخل أهل الجنة منازلهم وأهل النار منازلهم حفظ ذلك من حفظه ونسيه من نسيه

Rasūlullāh stood up amongst us and informed us regarding (everything, from) the beginning of creation until the people of Jannah enter the dwellings and the people of hell take their positions. Some remember it while others have forgotten it.⁴

---

1 This is a portion of a ḥadīth reported by Ibn Mājah in his Sunan (al-Muqaddimah, Bāb Ittibāʿ al-Khulafāʿ a;-Rāhidin 1/16), Aḥmad in his Musnad 4/126, al-Ḥākim in his al-Mustadrak 1/96, Ibn Abī ʿAṣim in Kitāb al-Sunnah. Further, many authentic narrations have been reported conveying the same meaning as this ḥadīth.

2 Ibn Abī ʿAṣim in Kitāb al-Sunnah 1/26

3 Musnad Aḥmad 5/153

Allah says, “Do they not see the birds above them with wings outspread and [sometimes] folded in? None holds them [aloft] except the Most Merciful. Indeed He is, of all things, Seeing,” Sūrah al-Mulk: 19.

4 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 4/73 (Kitāb Badʿ al-Khalq)
Imām al-Shāfiʿī says:

No situation comes upon the one who follows the dīn of Allah, except that the Book of Allah contains guidelines regarding it.¹

Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq (as stated in the books of the Shīʿah) said:

إن الله تعالى أنزل في القرآن تبیان کل شيء حتى والله ما ترك الله شیئاً یحتاج إلیه العباد حتى لا يستطع
عبد یقول: لو کان هذا أنزل في القرآن؟ إل قد أنزل الله فیه

Allah revealed in the Qur’ān the explanation of everything. By the oath of Allah, he did not omit anything that is needed by the servants, so that no servant may say, “If only this was revealed in the Qur’ān,” except that Allah it revealed therein.²

Now who is lying, as there is a clear contradiction between this statement and the narrations quoted previously? It is obviously that it is the Shīʿah. The Rāfiḍah are totally misguided in their opposition of this foundational belief, which is ‘the absolute fundamental principle of knowledge and īmān, to the extent that the one who holds most firmly to it will be closest to the truth in knowledge and practise.³

Where are these pages and booklets of theirs? What stops their awaited one, in this day and age, from bringing it out to the masses? Do people need it for their dīn? If yes, then why was the ummah kept away from their source of guidance for more than one thousand one hundred years (since the imaginary Imām disappeared)? All of these generations committed no crime, due to which they have been deprived of these ‘blessings’ and treasures!

Conversely, if they do not need it for their dīn, then why were all the above claims made? Also, why then do the Shīʿah turn away from the actual sources of

¹ Al-Risālah pg. 20
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/59
³ Maʿārij al-Wuṣūl pg. 2, Muwāfaqat Ṣaḥīḥ al-Manqūl 1/13
guidance, i.e. the Qur’ān and Sunnah? The truth, which simply cannot be doubted is that Allah perfected for us our dīn, as He said, “This day I have perfected for you your religion...”1 if any claims are made contrary to this, it will obviously be lies and baseless propaganda.

The purpose behind concocting all of these narrations was to establish the beliefs of this sect regarding the Imāms, and therefore they did not keep any limits in doing so. The result is that they have exposed themselves. If anything goes beyond its boundaries, it becomes volatile and the result ends up being the opposite of that which was intended. If ʿAlī did have any such knowledge, he would have narrated to the people during his Khilāfah, and the Ahl al-Sunnah would have also reported it. It would not have been confined to a handful of the Rāfiḍah.

These claims were first made during the days of his Khilāfah, primarily by members of the Saba’īyyah, as is reported in Risālat al-Irjā of Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥanafiyyah, as already stated. Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ʿAlī rejected these claims most vehemently, and he informed the Muslim public regarding this. He rejected the notion that Rasūlullāh secretly passed on to them something and made them alone, excluding the rest of the Muslims, the custodians thereof.

ʿAlī added extra weight to his declaration by stating it after taking an oath on Allah. It is as if he knew and feared that some people will appear later and try to play it down by claiming that it was done out of Taqiyyah. Thus, by taking an oath, he made his statement indisputable, so that whoever wishes to be destroyed (by rejecting it) will be destroyed after sufficient proof was made available to him and similarly, the one who wishes to be saved will have total satisfaction that he is upon the correct path. This was from the foresight of the first battalion of Islam, who accrued this by accompanying Muḥammad, learning from him and doing Jihād at his side. The hadīth regarding this rejection is recorded in the Ṣiḥāḥ, Sunan and Masānīd.2

1 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 3
2 The details have passed in page 103 - 104 of this book.
The books of the Shīʿah have also preserved this ḥadīth. *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* reports:

أثناء عليه السلام سئل هل عندكم من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم شيء من الوحي سوى القرآن؟
قال: لا، والذي فلق الحبة وبرأ النسمة إلا أن يعطى العبد فهماً في كتابه

‘Alī was asked, “Do you people have anything from Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم that was waḥī besides the Qur’ān?”

He replied, “By the one who split the seed and purified the air, No! Except that understanding that a slave is given of His book.”

These claims were then increased and amplified during the eras of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq and his father. Each Shīʿī sect took their share of these claims. However, the Twelvers gathered that which was taken by all the different sects and then added on to it as the years passed. Ibn Taymiyyah indicated towards these stances of the Shīʿah and their attribution of these imaginary items, such as the Jifr, to some of the Ahl al-Bayt. However, he did not confine this to the Twelvers. Rather, he attributed the belief that ‘Alī was granted secret knowledge (which opposes the apparent meanings of texts) to the Qarāmiṭah Bāṭiniyyah. Similarly, he attributed the view that ‘Alī knows the details of the future to the extremist Shīʿah.

Shaykh Abū Zahrah is of the view that the Khaṭṭābiyyah were the first to claim the existence of the Jifr. He deduced this from the statement of al-Maqrīzī. Added to that, the Shīʿī books have statements which support this. They state that Abū al-Khaṭṭāb is the one who attributed knowledge of the unseen to Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, who belied and denounced him. He then enumerated a few examples wherein knowledge regarding certain things had escaped him in his life, even though it

---

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 1/19
2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/179
3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/179
4 *Al-Imām al-Ṣādiq* pg. 126
was not beyond his reach to learn about them. His position was the same as the rest of humanity, as far as this was concerned. We will reproduce his exact words later.

These claims are further refuted by the lives of the Imāms. They acquired knowledge, like everyone else, from humans. Whoever reads up their biographies will see this very clearly, without any difficulty.¹ The most reliable of the Shiī books on the subject of narrators, Rijāl al-Kashshī, confirms that Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn narrated from Jābir ibn ʿAbd Allāh ʿ. However, they present an ultra-flimsy excuse for this saying, “He narrated from him so that people could believe him.”² This excuse ridicules all the other claims regarding the Imāms, who are believed to possess knowledge and supernatural abilities which grant them control over the hearts and minds of people. Added to that, why would the people not believe them when they are from the progeny of the Rasūl ʾ?⁴

If Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn possessed some of the knowledge that they claim, he would have planned the matters of his Khilāfah differently. He definitely did not have the kind of knowledge that they attribute to him, as he regretted some of that which he did.³ The Shīʿah state that Ḥusayn’s ʿ going to Kūfah, the treachery of its people towards him, and his assassination was on account of everybody—besides three—turning renegade.⁴ If he really had knowledge of the future, he would not have went at all, or he would have gone to other people.

---

¹ As examples;
ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn studied under Jābir, Anas, the Ummahāt al-Muʾminīn: ʿĀ’ishah, Umm Salamah, and Ṣafiyyah, as well as Ibn ʿAbbās, Miswar ibn Makhramah, Abū Rāfiʿ (the freed slave of Rasūlullāh ʾ), Marwān ibn Ḥakam, Saʿīd ibn al-Musayyab, and others from the ʿulamā’ of Madīnah. Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/153, 4/144.
Ḥasan ʿ studied under his father as well as others, including some of the Tābiʿīn. This was the result of his great understanding and piety. Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/144. The same was the condition of all the ʿulamā’ of the Ahl al-Bayt.
² Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 28
³ Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/180
⁴ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/280, Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 123
The books of the Shīʿah have it recorded that Jaʿfar distanced himself from these extremists and their fanaticism. He rejected the knowledge of the unseen which Abū al-Khaṭṭāb attributed to him, after taking numerous oaths. He then further established this by presenting examples from his life which proved this. He said:

لقد قاسمت مع عبد الله بن الحسن حائطاً بيني وبينه فأنى الطديل والشرب وأصابني الجبل

I divided a garden between myself and ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan. He received the flat portion with water, whilst I received the mountain (uneven land).¹

He also said:

يا عجباً لأقوام يزعمون أنا نعلم الغيب، ما يعلم الغيب إلا الله، لقد هممت بضرب جارتي فلما فهربت متي فما عملت في أي بيوت الدار هي

How strange it is that some people claim that we know the unseen. None knows the unseen except Allah. I intended to hit a certain slave girl of mine, but she ran away from me and I did not even know in which room of the house she was.²

Their lives were the greatest proof that this belief is nothing but pure drivel, as they were no different from the rest of humanity. They would forget and commit errors. The engineers of Shīʿism invented two mechanisms by means of which they get themselves out of this, viz. Taqiyyah and Badā. If the Imāms answer to a question was incorrect, they used Taqiyyah and if he supposedly informed regarding an event, which turned out against that which he said, they claimed that Badā took place by Allah.³

At times it is said that these fairy-tales are mere narrations which have no practical consequences as the Imāms no longer exist. They are merely preserved in the

¹ Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 188-189 (Iranian print), Biḥār al-Anwār 25/322
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/257
³ Refer to the chapters regarding Taqiyyah and Badā.
books of the Shī‘ah to highlight their deviant ideas. However, I am of the opinion that these blatant lies do have dangerous consequences upon the attitude and mentality of the gullible followers. It leads those who allow their minds to give it some thought towards the worst types of disbelief. Similarly, this extremism, at times, adopts a practical form which can be noted from the extremism that takes place at the graves of the Imāms.

A third problem that is created by this idea is that they believe (as will appear in detail under the discussion of Imāmah) that their Ayatollahs and scholars are deputies of the absent ones and they are his representatives among the people. They are believed to be in contact with this “Hidden One”, who makes himself apparent to some of them, as they claim. Thus, they are claims which have real and practical consequences, which are central to the Shī‘ī doctrine. This will be discussed in detail in the next discussion, the narratives of al-Riqā‘ (the notes).
The Narratives of al-Riqāʿ

Hasan al-ʿAskarī—who the Shīʿah take as their eleventh Imām—passed away in the year 260 A.H, leaving behind no offspring. This fact is admitted in the books of the Shīʿah, and the most reliable historians have also recorded it. The roots of Shīʿism were shaken by this reality just as it signalled their end, as the foundation of their religion is the Imām, whose words—according to them—holds the same weight as the speech of Allah and His Rasūl.

Since the Imām passed away without any offspring, he left them without anyone to hold on to. Hence, in the year 260 A.H, divine speech was halted. This also resulted in the termination of the cash-flow, which was collected from the followers in the name of the Imām. Consequently, the Shīʿah were divided, their affairs were uncertain, they were condemned and the matter became really difficult for them, as will appear.

However, this sect—who have made it their responsibility to divide the ummah—began stitching up their patches and worked their way around the situation so that they could keep alive the beliefs of Shīʿism and thereby continue harming the ummah. It was also the tool used by them to devour the wealth of the gullible and simple minded followers in the easiest possible manner, and to gain status and popularity amongst them.

Thus, they made the most preposterous claim, i.e. Ḥasan had a child who hid away, and therefore none got to know him. The reason why he went into hiding was that he feared that he would be killed, even though his father and grandfather and their ancestors were not killed by the state. It is unknown how this fear gripped

1 ولم يعرف له خلف ولم يعرف له ولد ظاهر
“He was not known to have any offspring and no son of his was seen.”

Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq pg. 102

2 Refer to al-Muntaqā pg. 31

3 The details will appear under the chapter of Ghaybah.
him, especially since he was only child and the adults in his family were left to live. Why would anyone leave the adults and kill a new-born child?

This lie, despite its obvious fallaciousness, delighted the scholars of the Shi‘ah. Subsequently, they began spreading it among their followers. The result was that this belief penetrated the sectarian Shi‘ī circles in the most complete manner. Thereafter, the scholars began differing regarding being his deputies, with each of them producing a signed letter from this child wherein the other scholars were cursed and it was stated that the possessor of the letter was the actual representative.

Many claimants then began arriving at the scene, each wanting to be the representative of the Imām, which would entitle him to dupe the masses into handing over their hard-earned cash to him. The Twelvers, however, accepted four of these claimants as the deputies of the awaited one. They would collect money on behalf of this child, forward questions and requests of the people to him and bring back to them, in a very secretive manner, answers and correspondences which they claimed were in the hand-writing of this child. They also set a date for his public appearance, so that they would not be doubted and belied. However, when that generation passed, they presented the excuse, “Badā took place by Allah and now there is no date set for his appearance.”

These unknown letters, which were the products of the hands of this conniving clique—which are attributed to the imaginary child—are regarded by the Shi‘ah as the most reliable narrations and the texts which hold the most weight. They refer to them as al-Tawqī‘āt, which is the name given to the so called letters of the Imāms regarding the matters of the Shi‘ah. It seems as if sectarianism and fanaticism for one’s group deprives the brain of doing its functions. The thinking capacity of a person is stunned and paralyzed by means of it. How else would it be possible for this sect to grant a child like this the authority to dictate the Sharī‘ah? How else would they equate him to the ambiyā’? If he really did exist,

---

1 Further details will appear under the chapter of Ghaybah.
at that stage he was to be taken care of by his guardian. Amazingly, Sharīʿah was narrated from this child from the moment that he was born!

Have a look at a narration of the one who they refer to as al-Ṣadūq, Ibn Bābāwayh al-Qummī, from a female named Naṣīm (who they claim is the servant of the toddler). She said:

قال لي صاحب الزمان وقد دخلت عليه بعد مولده بليلة فعطست عنده فقال لي: رحمك الله، قالت نسیم: ففرحت بذلك، فقال لي - عليه السلام -: أل أبشرك في العطاس؟ قلت: بلى یا مولي، قال: هو آمن من الموت ثلاثة أيام

The master of the era said to me (since I walked into his presence a night after his birth and sneezed), “May Allah have mercy upon you.”

I was elated by this, so he said to me, “Should I not give you glad-tidings regarding the sneeze?”

I replied, ‘Please do, o my master!’

He responded, “It is a protection from death for a period of three days.”

This text is reported by one of their greatest scholars, who considers this to be from the Sunnah of the infallibles and he equates it to the statements of Allah and His Rasūl. These lies were spread by a group of these fraudsters, who claimed to be in communication with the awaited one. This sect accepted four of them, as explained. The period in which these deputies claimed correspondence with the Imām is referred to as al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā (the minor occultation), which continued for approximately seventy years. Each of the Islamic countries had a few representatives of these deputies, who would ensure that the money of their followers reached them and in return, they would produce these forged letters.

The scholars of the Shīʿah have paid great attention to these letters, and they have preserved them in their most important books, believing that they are from

---

1 Ikmāl al-Dīn pg. 406, 407 and 416
waḥī, which cannot be affected by falsehood in any way. To name a few, al-Kulaynī
does so in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*, Ibn Bābāwayh in *Ikmāl al-Dīn*, al-Ṭūsī in *al-Ghaybah*,
al-Ṭabarsī in *al-Ḥāṣidah*, and al-Majlisī in *Al-Biḥār*. Their scholar, ʿAbd Allāh ibn Jāʿfar
al-Ḥimyarī gathered the narrations from the awaited one in a book which he
named *Qurb al-Isnād*, and the author of *Al-Dharīʿah* listed two books of theirs on
this subject named *al-Tawqīʿāt al-Khārijah min al-Nāḥiyah al-Muqaddasah*.

These notes or letters contain the views of the Imām regarding many matters
relating to dīn and life. They portray him as one who had access to the knowledge
of the unseen, one who fulfilled the wishes of the Shīʿah, cured their ill ones,
solved their problems, answered their questions and blessed the wealth that they
sent for him with acceptance. At times, these are all presented in the form of a
narrative.

If a reader ponders over the verdicts ascribed to him as far as the matters of
dīn are concerned, he will see gross ignorance regarding the basic matters of
the Sharīʿah, which indicates that either the one who fabricated these letters
was a very ignorant bigot who could not even fabricate properly, or Allah wished to expose and disgrace them in a way that all and sundry may understand.

Thus, their attempts and likes were akin to the attempts of Musaylamah’s, the
imposter, attempts at producing the like of the Qur’ān.

Have a look at the contents of one of these letters. You may witness the falsity
for yourself:

---

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/517
2 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* pg. 450
3 *Al-Ghaybah* pg. 172
4 *al-Ḥāṣidah* 2/277
5 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/150-246
6 This book was printed by al-Maṭbaʿh al-Islāmiyyah in Tehran.
7 Aghā Buzurg Tahrānī: *Al-Dharīʿah Ilā Taṣānīf al-Shīʿah* 4/500-501
He wrote a letter to him in the year 308, asking him regarding a few matters... He asked if the testament of the bald one, the leper, and the semi-paralyzed could be accepted.

He replied, “If it is affected them (after birth) then their testimony will be accepted, but if they were born like that, then it will not be accepted.”

How can baldness and its likes have any effect on the acceptance or rejection of testimonies? Can there be any rationale to the difference that was stated between the one who was born with the illness and the one who was affected by it at a later stage? Does a verdict such as this one deserve any attention? How can something so ludicrous be attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt or to Islam? Another letter states that he was asked, ‘Is it permissible for a person to count his tasbīḥ (glorification of Allah) using beads that are made from the sand of a grave and is there any virtue attached to this?’ He replied:

He should use it to count. There is nothing more virtuous than it for counting the tasbīḥ. Among its virtues is that if a man forgets his count and then rotates the beads, he will receive the reward of tasbīḥ.²

This ideology belongs to the religion of the idolaters, not the religion of the monotheists. They receive rewards for playing with beads. Which Sharīʿah says this, and which scholar will issue such a verdict? There are many other examples

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 53/164
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 53/165
of this kind of foolish and baseless verdicts.¹

This ‘Sunnah’, which is uttered by this awaited one, contains narratives of the unseen, and supernatural abilities by means of which many hopes turn into realities. A certain Shī‘ī, who was afflicted by a chronic illness, such that the doctors gave up hope of him recovering, turns to this “Imām” through the medium of his representatives and writes a letter in which he asks to be cured. A signed letter is returned to him, which includes a prayer for him to be cured. He did not even have to wait for a week to pass before he was cured.²

---

¹ On another occasion he was asked if a person is allowed to prostrate upon a grave. He replied:

والذي عليه العمل أن يضع خده الأيمن على القبر، وأما الصلاة فإنها خلفه ويجعل القبر أمامه

The practise is to place the right cheek upon the grave. As for ṣalāh, it should be performed behind it, and the grave should be in front of it. Bihār al-Anwār 53/165.

How can a person make the grave his Qiblah? Why would anyone soil his cheeks with the sand of the grave? Muslims are commanded to face the House of Allah, and to prostrate to Allah alone. Curses have been narrated regarding those who take the graves as places of prostration. The following question is among that, regarding which they claim was posed to the awaited one, followed by a signed answer from him:

قد اختلف أصحابنا في مهر المرأة فقال بعضهم: إذا دخل بها سقط المهر، ول شيء لا، وقال بعضهم: هو لزم في الدنیا والخرة، فکیف ذلك؟ وما الذي يجب فیه؟ فأجاب عليه السلام: إن کان علیه بالمهر کتاب فیه دین، فهو لزم له في الدنیا والخرة، وإن کان علیه کتاب فیه ذکر الصدقات سقط إذا دخل بها، وإن لم یكن عليه كتاب فیا دخل بها سقط فی الصداق

Our scholars have differed regarding the dowry of a woman. Some of them said, ‘When he has intercourse with her, the dowry falls away and she will not deserve anything.’ Others say, ‘It is binding in this world as well as the hereafter.’ How is this possible? What is necessary?

He replied, “If it recorded on as a debt as far as the dowry is concerned, it will be compulsory upon him in this world as well as the hereafter, if it is written on a document with charities, it will fall away once he has intercourse with her, and if it is not recorded anywhere, the remainder of the dowry will fall away when he has intercourse with her.” Bihār al-Anwār 53/169

Can an answer like this come out of the mouth of a scholar? Even an ignorant person who has some bit of sense will not utter such nonsense. This ideology, undoubtedly, has nothing to do with Islam. How can a person lose his or her wealth simply because there is no document wherein their right to it was recorded? The dowry, as stated above, falls away if it is not recorded! This is the constitution of thugs and anarchists, not the Sharī‘ah of Islam. If anyone wishes to see more of these examples, he may refer to Bihār al-Anwār pg. 53, Ikmāl al-Dīn of Ibn Bābāwayh and al-Ghaybah of al-Ţūsī.

² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/519
Another man has a wife who is barren. His longing and desire to have children reached its peak, thus he writes to the sacred chamber.¹ The response is a signed letter stating that his wife will give birth before the passing of four months and the child will be a boy.² They even learn their dates of death from this toddler. One Shī‘ī wrote to him requesting a burial garment. The reply in the letter was:

إنك تحتاج إليه في سنة ثمانين، فمات في سنة ثمانين وبعث إليه بالكفن قبل موتة بأيام

“You will need it in the year 80.” Thus, he died in the year 80 and a burial garment was sent to him a few days prior to his death.³

Some of these letters indicate that upholding the practices of Islam cannot be done without the permission of this hidden individual. It is as if the ‘Sunnah’ contained in these letters hold more weight than the texts of Islam according to the Shī‘ah. This can be understood from the following texts:

ولد لي مولود فكتبت أستأذن في تطهيره يوم السابع. فلم يكتب شيئاً فمات المولود يوم الثامن.

A child was born to me, so I wrote seeking permission to cleanse him on the seventh day. Nothing was written (in reply), so the child died on the eighth day.⁴

This person waited for the permission of the Imām to circumcise his son. Another narration indicates that marriage takes place, in most cases, after the Imām instructs that it should take place. One of them says:

زوجت بأمره سراً فلا وطئت علقت وجاءت بابنة فاغتممت وضاق صدري فكتبت أشكو ذلك (يعني في رسالة إلى هذا الطفل المنتظر) فورد: ستكشفوا، فعاشت أربع سنين ثم ماتت فورد: الله ذو أناة وأنتم تستعجلون

¹ A reference to their Mahdī.
² Ikmāl al-Dīn pg. 460
³ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/524, Ikmāl al-Dīn pg. 465, 467
⁴ Ibn Bābāwayh: Ikmāl al-Dīn pg. 465
I married a concubine on his instruction. After I had intercourse with her, and she gave birth to a girl, I was greatly saddened and anguished. I wrote (to this awaited Mahdī), complaining (about my situation).

The reply was, “You will be sufficed regarding her.”

She lived on for four years and then died.

Thereupon, it was stated, “Allah is patient but you people hurry.”

Ḥajj depends on the permission of this “child”. One Shīʿī reports:

I prepared for Ḥajj and I bid farewell to the people. I was about to leave when it (the letter) came, “We dislike that, but the matter is for you to decide.”

1 Ibid.

Take note that this infallible Mahdī did not have anything to say regarding the agony and grief of the one who complained, even though this was in reality, from the customs of the people of Jāhiliyyah. Allah says regarding them:

وَإِذَا بُشرَ أَحَدُهُمْ بِالأُنثَى ظَلَّ وَجْهُهُ مُسْوَدًّا وَهُوَ كَظِیمٌ

And when one of them is informed of [the birth of] a female, his face becomes dark, and he suppresses grief. (Sūrah al-Naḥl: 58)

He was greatly worried regarding her sustenance, even though Allah is the one who is responsible for sustenance. He said:

وَلَ تَقْتُلُواْ أَوْلَادَكُمْ خَشْيَةَ إِمْلاقٍ نَّحْنُ نَرْزُقُهُمْ وَإِیَّاکُم

And do not kill your children for fear of poverty. We provide for them and for you. (Sūrah al-Isrā: 31)

The awaited one, on the other hand, considered death to be the way out.
Thereupon, I was disheartened and saddened so I wrote, “I am listening and obeying, so I will stay behind. However, I am grieved due to being left behind from Ḥajj.”

The reply was, “Do not grieve, as you will perform Ḥajj next year if Allah wills.”

When I wrote the next year, seeking permission, it was granted.¹

Is the command of their Imām above the command of Allah and His Sharīʿah that they have to be given permission by him before they can carry out one of the fundamentals of Islam? These letters, despite their ridiculous contents, hold a very special position in the eyes of the Shīʿī scholars. Hence, they grant precedence to them over that which is narrated in their books with that which they refer to as authentic isnāds when there is a contradiction. Ibn Bābāwayh, after speaking about the letters from the sacred chamber in his book Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīḥ, under the chapter “Two men who have been bequeathed” says:

هذا التوقیع عندي بخط أبي محمد الحسن بن علي، ثم ذكر أن في الكافي للكلیني روایة بخلاف ذلك التوقیع عن الصادق، ثم قال: “لست أفتي بهذا الحديث بل أفتي بما عندي بخط الحسن بن علي..”

This letter is by me in the writing of Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī. Thereafter, he mentioned in al-Kāfi of al-Kulaynī there is a narration from al-Ṣādiq that contradicts that letter. He then says, “I will not pass a verdict according to this ḥadīth. Rather, I will pass a verdict based on what is by me in the writing of Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī.”

Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī commented on this saying:

الخط المعصوم أقوى من النقل بوسائط

The hand-writing of the infallible one holds more weight than narrations in many different ways.

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/522
How are they so sure that this was the hand-writing of the Hasan or the awaited one (who was not even born), even though hand-writings are similar? What makes them believe that these were from him, when there are so many lies attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt? In order to accept this, they rely upon one who is not infallible (i.e. the deputy of the Imām), whereas infallibility is from their primary principles. Added to that, the post of being the deputy is highly questionable, as many of their leading figures attempted to secure this post for himself, as it is the easiest way to collect wealth.

It seems as if the one who opened this door for the Shīʿah was an expert thief who mastered the art of lying and donned the garment of hypocrisy in order to plot against the Muslims, lead people astray and earn a great deal of wealth. However, the reports of this single person, who was not even considered infallible (but rather, unreliable), became the most authentic texts according to their scholars. Consequently, they grant precedence to these letters over that which appears in their most authentic books. Furthermore, whoever claims to have had contact with this Imām, or to have written to him, secures himself the trust of his sect (even though this is the greatest proof, in the light of history and logic that they are liars), as is apparent from their books on narrators.

These letters also contain disparagement and commendation of people or narrators, which are then considered to be the basis of their approval or disapproval of any individual. Thus, they serve as a pivotal source of their dīn. Al-Ālūsī says:

They formed their religion on the basis of notes, which are such that no man of intellect will doubt that they are forgeries against Allah. None will accept them except those whose sight and foresight have been taken away by Allah.

1 Refer to Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 100 (the biography of ʿAlī ibn al-Jahm), Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 20/332 (the biography of Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allah ibn Jaʿfar a-Ḥimyari) and 20/262 (the biography of ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn ibn Bābāwayh).
2 Refer to Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 90
3 Kashf Ghayāhib al-Jahālāt pg. 12 of the manuscript.
Al-Ālūsī then goes on to speak about a man from the Rāfiḍah who claims to have met this imaginary figure whilst he was in hiding. His name is ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn ibn Mūsā Ibn Bābāwayh al-Qummī. He also claims to have received letters from the awaited one. Al-Ālūsī expresses his surprise that a person like this was given the title, al-Ṣadūq (the truthful one) by the Rāfiḍah. He says:

لا يخفى عليك أن هذا من قبل تسمية الشيء باسم ضده، وهو وإن كان يظهر الإسلام فهو كافر في نفس الأمر

It will be obvious to you that this is a case of naming something using its antonym. Even though he portrayed himself as a Muslim, he was in reality a kāfir.

Next, he explains that the falsity of al-Ṣadūq’s claim cannot be hidden from any intelligent person, as al-Ṣadūq claims that he would write his question on a piece of paper, leave it in a hole in a tree at night, and the Imām would then write the answer.1 He then explains that the Rāfiḍah did not stop at the point of believing this drivel, rather, they went on to establish that these are their most reliable sources and their strongest proofs. He, just like any other objective intellectual, admits that he cannot understand their claim to be followers of the Ahl al-Bayt, whereas they base the laws of their religion upon all of these forgeries. The lawful and unlawful is established in their religion on the basis of fairy-tales. He says:

إنهم في الحقيقة أتباع الشیاطین وأهل البیت بریئون منهم

They are, in reality, the followers of the devils, and the Ahl al-Bayt have nothing to do with them.2

The truth is that these kind of letters hold no weight, whether in courts, on the basis of logic or the intellect of any human. They are notes that are attributed to a child whose existence itself cannot be proven, even according to some sects of

1 Refer to Wasā’il al-Shī’ah 20/262
2 Kashf Ghayāhib al-Jahālāt pg. 12 of the manuscript.
the Shīʿah. Hence, some of them rejected his existence. According to researchers, he definitely did not exist. Over and above this, his ‘letters’ cannot be confirmed and they are transmitted through unknown sources. Can any law be based on something like this, leave alone basing an entire constitution upon it? This is an stain on the Rawāfiḍ, which will remain with them until the end of times. As long as it remains, it will serve as proof of the falsity of their religion. Allah has disgraced those who wish to attribute to His dīn that which has no place in it.

These letters continued throughout the minor occultation—as they refer to it—which lasted for seventy years. Four individuals, who are referred to as al-Sufarāʾ and al-Nuwwāb (representatives or deputies) claimed, one after the other to be the Imām’s deputies. The fourth one, al-Samarrī, announced the end of the era of deputies and communication with the Imām. They say:

A letter came out (i.e. a letter came from the awaited one) to Abū al-Ḥasan al-Samarrī: O ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Samarī, listen—may Allah grant your brothers a great reward as far as you are concerned—as you are going to die within the next six days. Therefore, gather your matters and do not appoint anyone to take up your post after your death, as the Ghaybah has taken place in its complete form. There will be no appearance, until Allah grants permission. Some from my Shīʿah will appear and claim to have seen me. Lo! Whoever claims to have seen me before the appearance of the Sufyānī and the Scream (the Day of Qiyāmah) is indeed a lying imposter.¹

This means that the divine texts—according to them—came to an end in the year 329 A.H. with the commencement of al-Ghaybah al-Kubrā (Major occultation). However, the Shīʿī scholars were unhappy with the announcement that contact

¹ Ibn Bābāwayh: Ikmāl al-Dīn 2/193, al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah pg. 257
has been totally lost with the awaited one. Thus, we find many claims by them of contact with the Imām, meeting him and learning from him (although their Imām said that whoever claims so is a “lying imposter”). Hence, according to them, the divine texts did not come to an end. In fact, the Shīḥah announced this as soon as al-Samarrī died. We find their scholar Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī (who was given the title ‘Allāmah—the one who has extensive knowledge) claiming that he met the Mahdī, who authored a book for him in one night.¹

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, their celebrated scholar, explains the following text of al-Kāfī:

لابد لصاحب هذا الأمر من غیبة، ولابد له في غیبته من عزلة، وما بثلاثین من وحشة

It is necessary for the man of this matter to be in occultation and his occultation demands seclusion.

He says:

فی کل عصر یوجد تلاثان مؤمناً ولیاً یتشرفون بلقائه

In every era, there are thirty pious believers who have the good-fortune of meeting him.²

They claim further:

إن بعض المجتهدین يتمكن من لقاء الغائب ویأخذ منه بعض الأحكام الشریعیة، وقد ل یستطیع أن یعلن
عن هذا اللقاء لأمر الإمام له بالكتمان فهو حينئذ یدعي حصول الإجماع على هذا الحكم، وإن لم یوجد
إجماع في الحقيقة

Some of the Mujtahids get the ability to meet the absent one and take from him some of the laws of Sharīʿah. At times, they cannot announce this meeting, due to the instruction of the Imām to keep it hidden, as he will

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 51/361
² Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsi: Jannat al-Maʿwū 53/320 (printed with Biḥār al-Anwār)
then claim that consensus took place upon this law, whereas in reality, no consensus took place.¹

This is one explanation to the claims of their scholars regarding consensus, in those cases where certain opinions were held only by them, yet they claimed that consensus was found. We will also discuss, under the chapter of ijmāʿ, their view that if a group of people stated something and among them was ‘an unknown scholar whose lineage was not known’, then ijmāʿ takes place, irrespective of who opposes the view, based on the possibility that this unknown person could have been the Imām.

Their scholars firmly believe regarding this awaited one—who did not exist:

كان يجتمع بجملة من أهل العلم والتقوى الذين كانوا يستحقون المقابلة كالعلامة السيد مهدي بحر العلوم النجفي فيما اشتهر عنه، والشيخ ميثم البحراني فيما ينقل عنه

He would get together with some of the people of knowledge and piety, who deserved to be met, such as al-ʿAllāmah al-Sayyi Mahdi Baḥr al-ʿUlūm al-Najafī (according to that which is famous regarding him) and al-Shaykh Maytham al-Baḥrānī (as is narrated regarding him).²

Books have been written by some of their scholars in which the narratives and happenings of the meetings with the awaited one by some people have been recorded. Al-Majlisī (d. 1111 A.H.) done so in Al-Biḥār and he was followed al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (d. 1320 A.H.) who authored a book regarding it, which he named Jannat al-Maʿwā fīman Fāza bi Liqā’ al-Ḥujjah wa Muʿjizātuh fi al-Ghaybah al-Kubrā. In this book, he records fifty-nine stories regarding those who claimed to have met the awaited one, after the era of al-Majlisī.³

In this manner, every accursed devil, from the human and jinn race was given an avenue through which he could plot against these people. He merely had to act

1 Jannat al-Maʿwā 53/320-321
2 Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ: Haṣāʾīl al-Fikr pg. 123
3 Refer to Aghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī: Al-Dharīʿah 5/159
as if he was the awaited one and then he could shove into their religion anything that he wished to, no matter how far it took them away from the truth. As long as this avenue remains, and they regard this to be from the Sunnah, this deviation will not be curbed.

Any irreligious old man, who dons the attire of the dervishes, clads himself in black, portrays himself as a person of knowledge and claims to be from the progeny of ʿAlī— the likes of whom are many—is granted great honour by merely claiming that he met the (non-existent) Imām. He then has the license to change their religion in any way that is demanded by his profanity, especially since these people believe that the Imām adopts different forms and changes his dress-style and appearance.¹

Thus, one of these two explanations apply to all of these meetings; either the one who claims to have met the hidden one is a liar who was either craving for popularity or he wished to misguide people. It is also possible that both of these were his motive. The second explanation is that he was an honest and genuine person, however the person who met him in the guise of the Imām was a devilish imposter.² Ibn Taymiyyah explains:

وَكَذَا مِنْتَظَرُ الرَّافِضُةُ قَدْ يَرَاهُ أحَدُهُمْ وَيَكُونُ الْمَرْتُبَيْنَ جَنِباً

Similar is the case of the Awaited One of the Rāfiḍah. One of them may (believe that he) saw him whereas he actually saw a jinn.³

This is the exact manner in which the Christians were led astray, as explained by Ibn Taymiyyah, as they believed that after the Messiah was (as they claim)

1 Refer to Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Kubrā of al-Ṣadr pg. 40
2 For further information regarding the plots of the devil against man, and his adoption of the form of some of their scholars, in order to misguide them further, refer to al-Furqān bayn Awliyā al-Raḥmān wa Awliyā al-Shayṭān.
3 Majmūʿ Fatāwā 13/95
crucified, he appeared before the Ḥawārīn (his companions and helpers), spoke to them, and advised them. This has been mentioned in their Gospels. However, the one who actually appeared before them was a devil who said, “I am the Messiah,” whereas he was not the Messiah.¹

Ibn Taymiyyah goes on to explain, “After al-Ḥallāj was killed, a figure would appear before his followers and say to them, “I am al-Ḥallāj.” They would see with their own eyes his figure. Similarly, there was a person in Egypt who was referred to as al-Dasūqī. After he died, his followers would receive books and leaflets from him. Ibn Taymiyyah says that he saw one of these books that were attributed to al-Dasūqī which were shown to him by one of the sincere followers of al-Dasūqī. He says:

I saw it, in the hand-writing of a jinn, and I have seen the hand-writing of the jinn a few times.

Thereafter, Ibn Taymiyyah listed a few more examples of this nature. He then says:

Similarly, those who believe that ʿAlī or Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah will remain forever, were visited by jinn who adopted their forms. This is something possible and has taken place often. The more ignorant a nation is, the more it occurs amongst them.²

The Narrations of the Ṣaḥābah

After seeing that the Twelvers confined themselves to very limited sources, i.e. that which is narrated from some members of the Ahl al-Bayt (who were not

¹ It was possible for the Ḥawārīn to be confused by this, just as many scholars of the Muslims were confused due to similar occurrences. However, that which al-Maṣḥūḥ instructed them to propagate, before being raised was the truth to which they were meant to confine themselves. He was not raised until he conveyed the message of his Rabb, thus there was no need for him to re-appear.

² Majmūʿ Fatāwā 13/94-95
necessarily people of knowledge as will be explained, and they even added the so called letters of a person whose existence cannot be agreed upon), taking these as an equivalent to the words of Rasūlullāh صل الله عليه وسلم, they took one more step in the direction of misguidance by depriving themselves of a great source of knowledge and īmān; i.e. the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صل الله عليه وسلم, who were blessed with the great fortune of accompanying Nabī ﷺ, witnessing revelation, and understanding the interpretations. Above all, they were praised by Allah Himself.

Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshīf al-Ghiṭā (one of their contemporary scholars), whilst explaining the viewpoint of his people regarding the subject says:

إن الشیعة لا يعتبرون من السنة (أعني الأحادیث النبویة) إلا ما صح لهم من طرق أهل الیبت.. أما ما یرویه مثل أبي هریرة، وسمرة بن جندب، وعمرو بن العاص ونظائرهم فلیس لهم عند الإمامیة مقدار بعوضة

The Shīʿah pay no attention to the Sunnah (the aḥādīth of Nabī ﷺ), except to those which they consider authentic from the reporters of the Ahl al-Bayt. As for that which is reported by the likes of Abū Hurayrah, Samurah ibn Jundub, 'Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ etc., they do not even hold the weight of a mosquito’s wing according to the Imāmiyyah.¹

Here, he establishes that the stance of the Shīʿah is to accept all narrations which are reported authentically from the Ahl al-Bayt,² leaving out all other narrations,

---

¹ Aṣl al-Shīʿah wa Uṣūluhā pg. 79
2 His statement, “except to those which they consider authentic from the reporters of the Ahl al-Bayt,” is a deceptive and inaccurate statement. This is because, those who not know the nature of Shīʿism will be misled into thinking that the speech of Rasūlullāh صل الله عليه وسلم, which was reported by the Ahl al-Bayt, is their source of knowledge. The reality, however, is that they consider each of the Twelve ʿImāms to be like a Rasūl, i.e. he says nothing from his own desires. His speech holds the same weight as the Speech of Allah and His Rasūl. This is why the speech of Rasūlullāh صل الله عليه وسلم rarely appears in their books. They are satisfied with that which is supposedly reported from the Imāms. Likewise, his claim regarding the ‘Ahl al-Bayt’ is also misleading, as this only refers to a handful of them. According to them, the others do not qualify as narrators. Every member of the Ahl al-Bayt is not an Imām.
especially the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh  ﷺ. Since they only refer to twelve individuals as the Ahl al-Bayt, and only one of them met Rasūlullāh  ﷺ as an adult, i.e. ‘Alī  ﷺ, how could it be possible that he alone passed on the entire Sunnah of Rasūlullāh  ﷺ to the forthcoming generations?

This cannot be possible, as he was not with Rasūlullāh  ﷺ at all times. At times, Rasūlullāh  ﷺ would go out on a journey and leave him behind, as in the case of the battle of Tabūk. On other occasions, Rasūlullāh  ﷺ would remain in al-Madīnah al-Munawwarah and send him out, as in the case when Nabī  ﷺ sent him to Yemen. Another example of this is when Nabī  ﷺ sent him along with Abū Bakr to deliver the message to the people of Makkah al-Mukarramah. Added to the above, he could not have been aware of what was happening in the homes of Rasūlullāh  ﷺ. Thus we find that this was the privilege of the Mothers of the Believers, the noble wives of Rasūlullāh  ﷺ. Perhaps this was among the reasons and the wisdom behind him having a number of wives.

Hence, ‘Alī  ﷺ simply could not collect the entire Sunnah. How is it then, that they do not accept anything unless it is reported by him? This concept, of only accepting from the Ahl al-Bayt, also destroys the outstanding attribute of Tawātur as far as the transmission of the Sharīʿah of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah of Nabī  ﷺ is concerned. This is why the Muslims have agreed that the knowledge should not be transmitted by only one person, but rather, a group of people (who could be considered enough to reach the amount of Tawātur) should transmit it,

1 Thus, a narration from the progeny of Fāṭimāh  ﷺ, from the children of Ḥasan  ﷺ would not be accepted by them, as none of his offspring or descendants were Imāms. The most that they could qualify for, is to be narrators who will be graded by the Shīʿah, either as acceptable narrators or rejected narrators. It is for this reason that the Twelvers regarded as kāfir any member of the Ahl al-Bayt who stood up for the post of Khilāfah besides the Twelve Imāms. Refer to Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/372. A prime example could be al-Ṭūsī’s rejection of the narrations of Zayd ibn ʿAlī  in Al-Istibṣār (1/66). Thus, the statement of Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā is undoubtedly misleading. The reason behind his deception is that this book was spread in the Islamic countries to call towards Shīʿism.
so that the one who was not present may have certainty regarding it.\(^1\) Most of the Islamic states received their knowledge from sources besides ‘Alī.\(^2\)

Most of those who conveyed the message of Rasūlullāh were not from the Ahl al-Bayt. It is thus unfathomable that ‘Alī was the only person to do so. Rasūlullāh sent As‘ad ibn Zurārah to his people (the people of al-Madīnah) to invite them towards Islam, teach the Anṣār the Qur’ān and convey to them the understanding of dīn. Rasūlullāh sent Alā ibn al-Ḥaḍramī to Bahrain, Mu‘ādh and Abū Mūsā to Yemen, and ‘Itāb ibn Usayd to Makkah al-Mukarramah; all with the same purpose. In light of this, what weight does the statement of the one who says that only a man from the Ahl al-Bayt conveyed his message?\(^3\)

---

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/138, Ibn Taymiyyah goes on to say, “The narration of one person is not sufficient for knowledge of the Qur’ān and the mutawātir Sunnah. If they say, ‘It is attained due to the transmission of the one who is infallible,’ it will be said to them, ‘It is necessary to first prove that he is infallible, which cannot be proven from his own statements as it is not yet established that he is infallible. It cannot be established by Ijmāʿ as well since no Ijmāʿ took place regarding it. According to the Imāmiyyah, Ijmāʿ is only a proof on the basis of the belief that the Imām is among them. Thus, the matter once again depends upon proving that he is infallible, which cannot be backed by anything besides his own supposed statements. If he was infallible, as they claim, there would have been other proofs to it as well.’” *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/139

2 Ibn Taymiyyah says, “The cities of Islam received knowledge regarding Nabī from people other than ‘Alī. As for the people of al-Madīnah and Makkah, the matter is clear. Similar is the case of the people of Shām and Baṣrah. These people hardly narrate from ‘Alī. Most of his knowledge was preserved in Kūfah. However, its inhabitants had learnt the Qur’ān and Sunnah even before the Khilāfah of ‘Uthmān, leave alone the Khilāfah of ‘Alī. The jurists of al-Madīnah had mastered the dīn during the reign of ‘Umar. As for Yemen, Mu‘ādh stayed among them and taught them for a lengthier period than ‘Alī. Hence the people of Yemen narrate more narrations from Mu‘ādh as compared to ‘Alī. Shurayḥ and the other senior Tābi‘īn became accomplished jurists under the tutelage of Mu‘ādh ibn Jabal. When ‘Alī arrived at Kūfah, Shurayḥ was already a judge. He and Ubaydah al-Salmānī had become jurists under the guidance of others. In a nutshell, the knowledge of Islam had spread before ‘Alī arrived at Kūfah.” *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/15

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/15
Some of the scholars have said that the total number of aḥādīth that are reported with complete chains from ʿAlī I are five hundred and eighty six, from which a mere fifty are authentic.¹ Is the Sunnah of Rasūlullāh H confined to this? The Shīʿah admit the knowledge of ḥalāl and ḥarām and the rites of Ḥajj did not reach them except through Abū Jaʿfar. This means that nothing reached them on this subject from ʿAlī I and hence their predecessors would adhere to that which was reported to them by the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh H.

The books of the Shīʿah state:

کانت الشیعة قبل أن يكون أبو جعفر وهم لا يعرفون مناسك حجهم وحلالهم وحرامهم، حتى كان أبو جعفر ففتح لهم ويتن لهم مناسك حجهم وحلالهم وحرامهم، حتى صار الناس يحتاجون إليهم من بعد ما كانوا يحتاجون إلى الناس

Prior to Abū Jaʿfar, the Shīʿah were unaware of the rites of their Ḥajj as well as their ḥalāl and ḥarām. When Abu Jaʿfar appeared, he explained to them the rites of their Ḥajj and their ḥalāl and ḥarām so much so that people became in need of them after they were in need of the people.²

It is indeed amazing that the Shīʿah declare as mushrik the one who lends an ear to anyone besides the Imām. Uṣūl al-Kāfī states:

من ادعى سماعاً من غير الباب الذي فتحه الله فهو مشرك

Whoever claims to have heard anything from anywhere, besides the door that was opened by Allah is a mushrik.³

There you have it! They have just declared that their predecessors were mushrik, as they took their knowledge of Ḥajj and ḥalāl and ḥarām from the masses. They also say:

---

¹ Ibn Ḥazm: al-Faṣl 4/213, Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/139
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/20, Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/252-253, al-Burhān 1/386, Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 425
³ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/377
 Anything that does not emanate from the Imāms is false.¹

This is a brazen attack against the Sharīʿah of the master of all the messengers, which was transmitted by the first generation to the rest of the ummah. This knowledge is referred to as the sublime Sunnah and it is upheld by the Muslims. The Rāfiḍah, after concocting their principle, that knowledge can only be taken from 'Alī ۴, and thereafter realising that the narrations from him are very minimal (to the extent that they even admitted not having anything on the subjects of Ḥajj and ḥalāl and ḥarām from him), perhaps resorted to their usual practise of fabricating narrations, in order to fill this void. It is for this reason that al-Sha'bī said:

Fabrications have not been forged against any person of this Ummah as much as they have been forged against 'Alī ۴.²

Due to the widespread forgeries against 'Alī ۴ by the Rāfiḍah³ — to the extent that not a single person from them could be relied upon for narrations — the authors of the authentic books were forced to turn away from them. Therefore, it can be seen that al-Bukhārī and Muslim do not narrate anything from him unless it is reported by his household, such as his children Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah, his scribe — ‘Ubayd Allah ibn Abī Rāfī‘, the companions of Ibn Mas‘ūd and others such as ‘Ubaydah al-Salmānī, al-Ḥārith al-Taymī, Qays ibn ‘Ubād and others. These few individuals could be trusted as they were honest in that which they narrated from ‘Alī ۴.

---

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfi 1/399
² Al-Dhahabī: Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā 4/307
³ Ibn al-Jawzī said, “The Rāfiḍah are of three types; one group who heard a ḥadīth and then fabricated other aḥādīth adding on and deleting, a second group who heard nothing, but you see them attributing their lies to Ja’far al-Ṣādiq saying, “Ja’far said” and “So and so said”, and a third group who are the ignorant commoners, they utter anything that comes to their mind, whether it makes sense or not.” Ibn al-Jawzī: al-Mawdū‘ āt 1/338, Ibn Taymiyyah: Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/119
⁴ Majmū‘ Fatāwā 13/32
The books of the Shīʿah have admitted that there are many fabrications against the Ahl al-Bayt. Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq is reported to have said, as stated in the books of the Shīʿah:

إن الناس أولعوا بالكذب علینا

People are fascinated with fabricating against us.¹

The dilemma faced by Jaʿfar was:

اکتنفه - کما تقول کتب الشیعه - قوم جهال یدخلون علیه ویخرجون من عنده ویقولون: حدثنا جعفر بن محمد، ویحدثون بأحادیث کلها منكرات کذب موضوعة على جعفر لیستأکلوا الناس بذلك ویأخذوا منهم الدراهم

A bunch of ignorant people surrounded him, they would enter his presence and leave from his gatherings saying, “Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad narrated to us...”, and thereafter they would narrate such things that were lies and drivel, which were fabricated in the name of Jaʿfar so that they could collect food and dirhams from the people by means of it.²

Some of the scholars have said:

The amount of forgeries that were attributed to Jaʿfar, despite his innocence outnumber the forgeries against others.³

From the above, we can gauge the depth of the problems of the Shīʿah, who accept the narrations of all these liars and fraudsters but reject the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah. In fact, they shamelessly declare the bunch of liars who thronged around Jaʿfar to be reliable narrators. They say:

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 2/246
2 Refer to Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 208-209, Biḥār al-Anwār 25/302-303 (this is only a portion of the text, which will appear in its entirety later).
3 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/143
Four thousand narrators have reported from Ja’far. Some of the scholars of the Imāmiyyah are inclined towards the opinion of considering all of them, without any exception, to be reliable.⁴

This is despite him personally complaining about them. He was also reported to have said that from all of those who claim Shī'ism, he could not even get seventeen genuine supporters. This is emphatically stated in a narration of al-Kāfī.² The question that still remains is, why do the Twelvers disregard the aḥādīth of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ?

The actual cause can be traced back to the initial innovation, which was started off by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’, i.e. ‘Alī was appointed as the successor by Rasūlullāh ﷺ, but the Ṣaḥābah Ṣaḥīḥ did not allow the bequest of Nabī ﷺ to take place and they denied him the post of Khilāfah. This, according to the Shī'ah, meant that the Ṣaḥābah Ṣaḥīḥ all left the fold of Islam. They do not exclude anybody from them, except a few who could be counted on the fingers of one hand, as will appear. This sect did not give any consideration to the praises of Allah and His Rasūl regarding them, their companionship of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, their Jihād and sacrifices in the path of Allah, the fact that they were the first of the ummah to respond to the call of Nabī ﷺ and the fact that they put forward their lives and most valuable possessions and left behind their homelands and families to the spread Islam.

Among the most ironic beliefs held by the Shī'ah is that they consider anyone who claims to have seen the non-existent Imām as a reliable and truthful person. Al-Mamaqānī (who is one of their contemporary scholars) says:

---

² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/242-243
If a man had the fortune of seeing the Ḥujjah (Imām) — may Allah hasten his release and may he allow us to be sacrificed in lieu of any difficulty (that he is to face) — after his occultation, we prove by means of that that he has obviously reached the highest level of integrity.¹

However, the same honour is not afforded to those who were blessed with the companionship of Rasūlullāh. They do not consider the honour accrued by the Ṣaḥābah, by means of seeing Nabī to be a reason on the basis of which they could be considered as men of integrity. Does Rasūlullāh not hold a loftier rank than an awaited individual whose existence was debated by the Shīʿah of his era? What would his position be today, after the passing of so many centuries? Is this not an outright contradiction?

Observe and be amazed at how a person is declared reliable due to claiming that he met one who does not exist, which in reality is a clear proof that he is a liar. On the other hand, the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh are maligned. The only ‘sin’ of all the Ṣaḥābah was that they did not accept the “immediate appointment” of ʿAlī to the post of Khilāfah. This, according to them, is among the worst possible crimes, as the one who rejects the Imāmah of any of the Twelve Imāms — even the absent one who does not exist — is like Iblīs, as stated by al-Ṣadūq Ibn Bābāwayh al-Qummī.²

Believing in their Imāms is the yardstick by means of which they judge whether a person should be accepted or rejected. This, according to them is the foundation of īmān, as will be explained. This is clear deviation. If this belief of theirs was half as important as they assert, it would have definitely been mentioned by Allah in the Qurʿān, Rasūlullāh would have explained it to all those who enquired

---

¹ Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl 1/211
² Ikmāl al-Dīn pg. 13
regarding the reality of īmān and the Muslims would have had no difference of opinion regarding it.

Can any intelligent person fathom that from the era of the Ṣaḥābah and Tābiʿīn, up until today, the ummah did not know the most basic and fundamental aspect of their dīn or they unanimously rejected it? It is impossible that Allah and His Rasūl would leave the best ummah, who were selected for the guidance of humanity without completing for them their dīn and without explaining to them a fundamental from the fundamentals of Islam. Foolishness like this can never cross the mind of a Believer.

My observation: Despite the falsity of this doctrine of theirs, by means of which they judge people and reject the narrations of those who reject any of the Imāms, they only apply it to the Ṣaḥābah. Thus, they reject the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah, but they do not reject the narrations of some of their Shīʿī predecessors who rejected one or more of the Imāms. Their scholar, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī insists that the Imāmiyyah accept and practise upon the narrations of the Faṭḥiyyah, such as ‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr, as well as the narrations of the Wāqifah, such as Samāʿah ibn Mahrān. You will see, in their books on narrators, that many of them were Faṭḥīs, Wāqīfīs or Nāwūsīs.3

1 Refer to page 124 of this book.
2 They stop at Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar. They do not believe in the Imāmah of anyone after him. This is because they believed that Mūsā was alive and he did not pass away. They await his return, just as the Twelvers await the appearance of their imaginary hidden one. Refer to al-Qummī: Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq pg. 93, al-Nāshī al-Akbar: Masāʾil al-Imāmah pg. 47. The author of al-Zīnah says, “Some hold this opinion up until this day.” Al-Zīnah pg. 290. However, they then ceased to exist.

The term Wāqīfīyyah is used at times to refer to those groups who believed that Imāmah ended with others as well, such as those who believe that it was terminated after ‘Alī, al-Ṣādiq, or Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī. 3 The followers of a man named Nāwūs, Ibn al-Nāwūs or ‘Ajlān ibn al-Nāwūs. It is also said that this was actually an attribution to the village of Nāwūs. This sect believed that Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammd did not pass away, he is alive and he will not pass away until he emerges and rules. He is the Mahdī. The author of al-Zīnah says, “This sect no longer exists. None can be found today who uphold this view.” However, their narrations have remained in the books of the Twelvers.

Each one of these three groups reject at least one of the Imāms of the Twelvers. Despite this, all of them are considered to be from them and reliable. As an example, Rijāl al-Kashshī states regarding Muḥammad ibn al-Walīd al-Khazzār, Muʿāwiyah ibn Ḥakīm, Muṣaddaq ibn Ṣadaqah, Muḥammad ibn Sālim ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd:

في محمد بن الوليد الخزار، ومعاوية بن حكيم، ومصدق بن صدقة، ومحمد بن سالم بن عبد الحميد
قال أبو عمرو (الكشي): وهؤلاء كلهم فضيلة وهم من أجلة العلماء والفقهاء والعدلول، وبعضهم أدرك الرضا – رضي الله عنه – وكلهم كوفيون

All of these are Faṭḥiyyah and they are from the greatest scholars, jurists and people of integrity. Some of them met al-Riḍā, and all of them were Kūfīs.¹

〒 1 Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Fuḍāl,² ‘Alī ibn Ḥadīd ibn Ḥakīm,³ and ‘Amr ibn Saṭd al-Madāyini⁴ were all from the Faṭḥiyyah. Similarly, Abū Khālid al-Sijistānī,⁵ ‘Alī ibn Jaʿfar al-Marwazi,⁶ ‘Uthmān ibn Ḥsāb,⁷ and Ḥamzah ibn Bazīgh⁸ were all from the Wāqifah. Notwithstanding this, they were classified as reliable and the Twelvers practised upon their narrations, ignoring the statements of their Imām:

الزيدية والواقفة والنصاب بمنزلة واحدة

The Zaydiyyah, Wāqifah, and Nawāṣib are all on the same level.⁹

---

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 563
2 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 565
3 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 570
4 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 612
5 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 612
6 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 616
7 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 597
8 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 615
9 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 456
The Wāqif is turned away from the truth and he stands upon an evil. If he dies in this state, hell will be his abode and it is the most undesired destination.¹

He also said:

The Wāqifah live in a state of confusion and they die as heretics.²

Yet another statement of his reads:

They are disbelievers, polytheists and heretics.³

Despite all of this, their narrations are accepted, or rather, the scholars of the Twelvers accept the narrations of these people, since some of the bizarre views of their religion are based on these narrations. At the same time, they reject the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah ⁵ 표. Is this not a clear contradiction? The Ṣaḥābah ⁵ 표 only “rejected the text regarding one Imām,” but their narrations are rejected, whereas these narrators from the Waqifah and Faṭḥiyyah reject a few Imāms, as well as the texts that were stated by the Imāms prior to the rejected ones. Are all not guilty of the same ‘crime’ (rejection of any of the Imāms) on the basis of which the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah ⁵ 표 were rejected?

¹ Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 456
² Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 456
³ Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 456
After realising this, it will become abundantly clear to us that they have major contradictions in their religion, they do not have a fixed set of rules and their scholars were blinded by sectarianism. They then led astray their followers and deprived them of the fountains of knowledge and īmān. Before we conclude this discussion, it should be noted that it is impossible to compare those luminaries who were praised by Allah and His Rasūl to a bunch of scums, liars, and fraudsters. Had it not been for the need of highlighting the baseless nature of their attitude towards the narrations of the illustrious Ṣaḥābah Ṣ, we would not have mentioned them together.

The books of the Shīʿah state:

عن ابن حازم قال: قلت لأبي عبد الله.. فأخبرني عن أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم صدقوا
على محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم أم كذبوا؟ قال: بل صدقوا

I (Ibn Ḥāzim ) said to Abū 'Abd Allāh, “Tell me about the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh Ṣ, were they truthful or did they forge lies against him?”

He replied, “No, they were truthful.”¹

No doubt, the Ṣaḥābah Ṣ have no need for this type of praise, after they were praised by Allah and His Rasūl. However, we quoted it to bring to the attention of the reader that they opposed everything, even that which is reported from the Imāms in their very own books, which conforms to the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Rasūl Ṣ. Instead they chose to follow the narrations of a bunch of people who fabricated lies against the Imāms, such people whose lies have been exposed in the books of the Shīʿah as well, as will be proven.²

---

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/65, Bihār al-Anwār 2/228
² Under the discussion of the condition of their narrators, who narrate from the Imāms.
The Beginning of the Compilation of Aḥādīth by the Shī‘ah

Ibn al-Nadīm says:

إن أول كتاب ظهر للشيعة كتاب سليم بن قيس الهلالي، رواه عن أبان بن أبي عیاش لم يروه غيره

The first book of the Shī‘ah that became apparent was the book of Sulaym ibn Qays al-Hilālī.¹ He narrated it from Abān ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh, no other person narrated it.²

We touched upon this book during our discussion on the tale of ‘fabrication’ according to the Shī‘ah. One of the latter day Shī‘ī personalities has the following admission to make:

بأن هذا الكتاب موضوع في آخر الدولة الأموية

This book was compiled towards the end of the Umayyad dynasty.

In other words, there is no truth to its attribution to Sulaym. We have already explained that this Sulaym is not mentioned anywhere in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, even though the Shī‘ah hold him in very high regard. Some believe that he did not exist. If he did exist, he would have been mentioned somewhere. Apparently, the largest compilation of theirs, in the early days, is that which was compiled by Abū Ja‘far al-Qummī (Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn Farrūkh al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī, d. 290 A.H.). He named his compilation Başā‘ir al-Darajāt fī ‘Ulūm Āl Muḥammad wa mā Khaṣṣahum Allah bihī. This book was printed in the year 1285 A.H.³ Al-Ṣaffār was considered by Brokleman as the founder of Imāmī jurisprudence in the non-Arab countries.⁴

---

1 Al-Fahrist pg. 219
3 Refer to Al-Dharīʿah 3/124
4 Tārīkh al-Adab al-ʿArabī 3/337
Dr Muḥammad al-Baltājī is of the view that he was the first person who compiled the jurisprudence and narrations of the Imāmiyyah Twelvers. However, the statement of Ibn al-Nadīm proves that he was not the first person to do so. Al-Majlisī quoted most of this book in the different chapters of his encyclopaedia Al-Bihār. Nonetheless, this book is filled with extremism. In it, one will find criticism of the Qur’ān, fanaticism regarding the A’immah, and verdicts of kufr regarding the Ṣaḥābah; all of which confirm that majority of these narrations have been fabricated in the names of the Imāms.

Al-Kulaynī (d. 328 or 329 A.H.) authored his book, al-Kāfī, in the beginning of the fourth century, after which many other books were authored.

The Primary Books of the Twelvers

The primary books, which are considered the sources of narrations by the Twelvers are eight in number. They are referred to as ‘al-Jawāmiʿ al-Thamāniyah’. The Shīʿah believe that these are the most important sources of the narrations of the Imāms. Their contemporary scholar, Muḥammad Šāliḥ al-Ḥā’irī says:

وأما صحاح الإمامیة فهي ثمانیة، أربعة منها للمحمدین الثلاثة الأوائل، وثلاثة بعدها للمحمدین النوری – الأواخر، وثامنها لحسین – المعاصر – التوري

The authentic books of the Shīʿah are eight. Four of them were compiled by the first three Muḥammads, three of them were compiled by the last three Muḥammads and the eighth one was compiled by Ḥusayn al-Nūrī, a contemporary.

1 Manāhij al-Tashrīʿ al-Islāmī 1/201
2 Miftāḥ al-Kutub al-Arbaʿah 1/5
3 Aʿyān al-Shīʿah 1/288, Miftāḥ al-Kutub al-Arbaʿah 1/5
4 Al-Ḥā’irī: Minhāj ‘Amlī lī al-Taqrīb (An article that was published in the magazine, Risālat al-Islām (in Cairo). It was also published with a few other selected articles in a magazine called al-Waḥdat al-Islāmiyyah pg. 233)
1. The first and most authentic of these, according to them is, *al-Kāfī*,¹ by Muḥammad ibn Yaʿqūb al-Kulaynī.

2. *Man lā Yahḍurhū al-Faqīh*² by the one who is referred to as al-Ṣadūq, Muḥammad Ibn Bābāwayh al-Qummī (d. 381 A.H.) is their second book,

3. *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*³ and *Al-Istibṣār*⁴ by Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī – who they refer gave the title Shaykh al-Ṭāʾifah - (d. 360 A.H.) are the third and fourth of their books.

---

¹ For more details regarding *al-Kāfī*, refer to *Al-Dharīʿah* 17/145, al-Nūrī: Mustadrak al-Wasāʾīl 3/432, Muqaddimah al-Kāfī, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: Wasāʾīl al-Shīʾah 20/71. These references point out that *al-Kāfī* is the most authentic of the four authentic books according to them, and it was compiled during *al-Ghaybah* al-Ṣughrā, due to which all of the texts therein were verified. It is the only book, from their four authentic books, wherein the Book of Allah is criticised. The total number of narrations of *al-Kāfī*, as stated by al-ʿĀmilī is 16099. *Aʿyān al-Shīʾah* 1/280.

This book has been printed a few times, and a number of their scholars wrote commentaries on it. One of the commentaries which I have seen is *Mīrāt al-ʿUqūl*, by al-Majlisī. He attempted to grade their narrations from the perspective of authenticity. Sadly, he authenticated such narrations which are, according to all Muslims, clear-cut kufr, such as the narrations regarding Tahrīf in the Qurʾān. I also saw the commentary of al-Māzindarānī titled *Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ* as well as *al-Shāfīʿ Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfī*.

² For more details on this subject refer to al-Khūwānsārī: *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 6/230-237, Aʿyān al-Shīʾah 1/280, Muqaddimat *Man lā Yahḍurhū al-Faqīh*. The book contains 176 chapters, the first one being the chapter of Ṭahārah (purity) and the last one being al-Nawādir (rare subjects). There is a total of 9044 narrations. In the introduction of his book, he mentions that he omitted the isnāds so that the narrations do not become excessive, and he took his narrations from their famous books, thus it should be relied upon. He also mentions that he did not narrate except that which he considered authentic.

³ Refer to al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarṣī: Mustadrak al-Wasāʾīl 4/719, Al-Dharīʿah 4/504 and Muqaddimah Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām. This book was authored to reconcile the contradictions and differences that are found in their narrations. It has a total of 393 chapters. The total number of narrations will be discussed later.

⁴ This book is made up of three volumes. Two of them pertain to ʿIbādāt (worship) whilst the third volume covers the rest of the chapters of Fiqh. It also has 393 chapters, and the total number of narrations, according to the author, is 5511. He says, “I have restricted them so that additions and deletions may not take place.” In Al-Dharīʿah, it is stated that the total number of narrations of this book is 6531. However this contradicts the statement of the author.

Refer to Al-Dharīʿah 2/14, Aʿyān al-Shīʾah 1/280 and Ḥasan al-Kharsāns forward to Al-Istibṣār.
Their scholar, al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (d. 1091 A.H) says:

إن مدار الأحكام الشرعية اليوم على هذه الأصول الأربعة، وهي المشهود عليها بالصحة من مؤلفيها

Today, the laws of the Sharīʿah are based on these four primary books. Their authenticity has been testified to by their authors.¹

Aghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī, one of their contemporary Mujtahids says:

الكتب الأربعة والمجامع الحدیثیة التي علیها استنباط الأحكام الشرعیة حتى الیوم

The laws of Sharīʿah are deduced from the four books and the ḥadīth compilations, until today.²

These are their four classical sources. Thereafter, Shīʿī scholars of the eleventh century and those who followed wrote a number of books. Four of these books are accepted by the contemporary Shīʿah and they have been named “the four compilations of the latter times”. They are:

1. *Al-Wāfi¹*, by Muḥammad ibn Murtaḍā (also known as Mullā Muḥsin al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī, d. 1091 A.H.),

2. *Biḥār al-Anwār al-Jāmiʿah lī Durar Akhbār al-Aʿimmah al-Aṭhār⁴* by Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī (d. 1110 or 1111 A.H.),

---

¹ *Al-Wāfi* 1/11
² *Al-Dharīʿah* 2/14
³ This book is made up of three large volumes and it was printed in Iran. It has 273 chapters. Muḥammad Baḥr al-ʿulūm, one of their contemporary scholars, says that it has five thousand narrations. *Lu’luʿat al-Baḥrain*, footnote on page 122. However, Muḥsin al-Amīn states that the total number of narrations is 44244. *Aʿyān al-Shīʿah* 1/280
⁴ They have stated that this is the most comprehensive book on narrations. The author gathered them from their reliable books. Refer to *Al-Dharīʿah* 3/27, *Aʿyān al-Shīʿah* 1/293
A Few Observations Regarding the Eight Books

There are many books of theirs, which they consider to be of the same level as the four books, as far as relying upon them and using them as proofs is concerned. This is stated by al-Majlisī in the forward of his Biḥār and al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī in al-

---

1 This, according to them, is the most comprehensive book on the narrations pertaining to laws. The author gathered the narrations of their Imāms from their four books, which have been their primary sources along the centuries. He also added on narrations, which he took from the reliable books (which in this case are 70) of their scholars, as stated by the author of Al-Dharīʿah. Al-Shīrāzī, on the other hand, mentioned in the forward of al-Wasāʾil that they are more than 180 in number. The two numbers are nowhere close to one-another. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī listed the books from which the author quoted. According to my count, they were 80 books. He then indicated that many other books were also referred to, but they were quoted from through the medium of other books.

It was printed in three volumes on a number of occasions, but the final print, which was printed with authentications and footnotes by a team of their scholars comprised of twenty volumes.


2 Aghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī says, “The book al-Mustadrak is like any of the other compilations of narrations of the latter times, in the sense that it is necessary upon the well-versed mujtahids to refer to it when deducing laws. Most of our contemporary scholars have adhered to this.” Al-Dharīʿah 2/110-111. Thereafter, he proved this, using some of the statements of the contemporary scholars in which they state that al-Mustadrak is among their primary sources. Al-Dharīʿah 2/110-111.

However, it seems as if all of their scholars do not agree with him. We find that the author of Aḥsan al-Wadīʿah criticises this book in the strongest of words. He says, ‘Books which are unreliable and unacceptable are quoted from... and books, the copies of which could not be established as authentic, as there were great differences between the different copies.’ Thereafter, he says that its narrations are confined to that which is in Al-Biḥār. “They have been spread out in the relevant chapters of al-Wasāʾil, as compared by me, word for word.” Muhammad Mahdī al-Kāẓimī: Aḥsan al-Wadīʿah pg. 74

3 Refer to vol. 1 pg. 26, al-Majlisī says that the books of al-Ṣadūq, with the exception of five of them, are just as famous as the four books. (ibid). He says, “The book, Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt is from the reliable sources, from which al-Kulaynī and others have quoted. (vol.1 pg. 27)” He has similar comments regarding many of their books.
Wasā’il. This can also be found in the forwards of those books. It seems as if the four books were only singled out on account of them being large collections, or as an attempt to imitate the Ahl al-Sunnah.

The second possibility is strengthened by the fact that they have regarded Al-Wāfī as a separate book among their eight fundamental books, whereas it is a mere compilation of all the narrations of the four initial books, i.e. al-Kāfī, Al-Tahdhīb, Al-Istibṣār and Man lā Yahḍurhū al-Faqīh. How can a book like this be considered a separate book, when it is a compilation of the other books? Similarly, they counted Al-Istibṣār of al-Ṭūsī as a separate source, whereas it is nothing more than a summary of the Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām of al-Ṭūsī, as stated by al-Ṭūsī in the forward of Al-Istibṣār. This is also quite clear to the one who compares the two books. These acts clearly point towards the possibility that they were creating a name for their religion.

Added to that, the original version of Biḥār al-Anwār was divided by the author into twenty-five volumes. However, after seeing that the twenty-fifth volume became too large, he divided it into two, bringing the total number of volumes to twenty-six. However, the contemporary Shīʿah have added on a few books which were not part of the authors book such as Jannat al-Ma’wā of al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, Hidāyat al-Akhbār by al-Mustarḥamī and a few more volumes containing permissions (to transmit knowledge or narrations), so that the total number of volumes could be one hundred and ten! It does not end there, the first volume is numbered ‘zero’. If this is not an attempt to show off their ‘heritage’ then what else can it be? In fact, they are obsessed with the idea of showing off the ‘accolades’ of their religion.

---

1 Refer to Wasā’il al-Shīʿah vol. 20
2 Al-Istibṣār 1/2-3
3 Refer to Al-Dharīʿah 3/27
4 This is why you will find that a large group from them will get together to write on any random subject, and the ḥawzahs (their study circles) will be dedicated to it. Thereafter, once the book is complete, it will be attributed to one of them or one of their scholars, as if he was the only one who carried out this task, which could not have been done except by a group of people. This can be realised from books such as Kitāb al-Ghadīr. They are also infatuated with claiming to be the first to do everything.
As for the subject-matters of these books; Al-Tahdhib, Al-Istibṣār, Man lā Yaḥdurhū al-Faqīh, Wasā’il al-Shī`ah and Mustadrak are all regarding *Fiqh* (jurisprudence). As for al-Kāfī, the first two volumes are regarding matters of belief, whilst the rest of the volumes are regarding Fiqh, thus they are referred to as *Furūʿ al-Kāfī*. Many of their verdicts are very similar to those of the Ahl al-Sunnah, which strengthens the view of those scholars who believe that they merely copied them from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah.¹

They also have a few of their own rulings, which are nothing less than bizarre, and a few more which are totally unimaginable. These deserve to be written in a separate book. Their scholar, al-Murtaḍā gathered a few of them in a book which he named *Al-Intiṣār*.² Ibn ʿAqīl al-Hanbalī quoted some of these rulings, after which he expressed great surprise. Ibn al-Jawzī recorded them in *al-Muntaẓam*³ from that which was in the handwriting of Ibn ʿAqīl. He indicated towards this in *al-Mawḍūʿāt* saying:

ولقد وضعت الرافضة كتاباً في الفقه وسموه مذهب الإمامية، وذكرنا فيه ما يخرق إجماع المسلمين بلا دليل أصلاً

*continued from page 484*

This is why you will always find them claiming to be the first people to discover and master Islamic sciences, even though the Rawāfiḍ are usually clueless until they learn from the Ahl al-Sunnah. They have a few dictionaries, which expose their ignorance.

Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī, in his book *Aʿyān al-Shī`ah*, counts many of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah among the Shī`ah, simply because it had been mentioned in their biographies that they were inclined towards Shī`ism (which in these cases implied a stronger affinity with ʿAlī and the Ahl al-Bayt), despite the fact that this, in no way, entered them into the religion of the Rawāfiḍ. The reality is that true and genuine love for the Ahl al-Bayt is found to a much greater extent among the Ahl al-Sunnah as compared to the Rāfiḍāh.

¹ *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 3/246

² I have seen the latest print, by Dār al-Aḍwā of Beirut (1405). It was printed prior to that in *al-Jawāmiʿ al-Fiqhiyyah* in Tehran in the year 1267 A.H, and separately in the year 1315 A.H. Another name of this book is *Masā’il al-Infīrādāt fi al-Fiqh*. Refer to *Lu‘luʿat al-Bahrain* pg. 320

³ *Al-Muntaẓam* 8/120
The Rāfiḍah have written a book on jurisprudence which they named *Madh-hab al-Imāmiyyah*. In it, they have mentioned that which is against the consensus of all Muslims, without any proof.¹

As for the remainder of these compilations, viz. *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* and *Biḥār al-Anwār* – they are concerning a few matters such as Tawḥīd, al-ʿAdl (justice), Imāmah and so on. Majority of these books are made up of their beliefs and views regarding Imāmah, the Twelve Imāms, the idea that they were divinely appointed, their qualities, their conditions, visiting their graves and their enemies, the foremost of them being the Šaḥābah of Rasūlullāh Ṣallallāhu ʿAlayhi wa Sallam. One will also notice that most matters revolve around Imāmah and the Imāms.

The one who reads these books will also notice the vast and apparent differences between the narrations which are taken from the Ahl al-Sunnah, referred to as ‘ḥadīth’ by them and the narrations of the Shīʿah which they refer to as ‘riwāyāt’. If a ḥadīth is reported in the ḥadīth compilations of the Ahl al-Sunnah, it will be attributed to Nabī ʿAlî ʿAskarī, and it will really be his ḥadīth. As for the books of the Shīʿah, they narrate from any of the Twelve Imāms and they believe, as stated previously – that there is no difference between the ‘statements’ of the Imāms and the aḥādīth of Nabī ʿAlî ʿAskarī.

The reader will also notice that very few of their narrations are attributed to Nabī ʿAlî ʿAskarī. Most of the narrations of al-Kāfī are reported from Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, and a few of them are reported from his father, Muḥammad al-Bāqir. An even lesser amount is recorded from Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī ʿAskarī and those that go all the way up until Nabī ʿAlî ʿAskarī are just an odd few. Another noteworthy fact is that the four latter compilations were compiled in the eleventh century and later. The last of them was compiled in the year 1320 A.H. by al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, a contemporary of Muḥammad ʿAbduh. In it, he gathered twenty-three thousand narrations from the Imāms², which were unknown prior to his compilation.

---

¹ *Al-Mawḍūʿāt* 1/338
² *Al-Dharīʿah* 7/21
Thus, these narrations appeared hundreds of years after the Imāms. If the Shīʿah preserved those narrations by means of an isnād (i.e. passing it on generation after generation) and by narrating them, then how can an intelligent person rely upon a narration that was not written down for a period of eleven or thirteen centuries? If they were written and recorded in books, then how is it that these books were not discovered except in the later eras?

Why is it that these narrations were not recorded by their predecessors? Why are they not found in their books? Why did al-Kulaynī not record them, whereas he had access to the four deputies of the Mahdī (who named the book al-Kāfī, after

---

1 Some of authors of these compilations have explicitly mentioned that they came across books that were not previously part of their authentic books. Al-Majlisī says,

اجتمع عندنا بحمد الله سوى الكتب الأربعة نحو مائتي كتاب، ولقد جمعتها في بحار الأنوار

By the grace of Allah, besides the four books, we have in our possession approximately two hundred books. I have gathered them in Biḥār al-Anwār. (Al-Iʿtiqādāt of al-Majlisī pg. 24, Muṣṭafā al-Shībī: al-Fikr al-Shīʿī pg. 61)

Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī mentioned that he had more than eighty books, besides the four fundamental books, and he gathered them in Wasāʿil al-Shīʿah (Refer to the introduction of al-Wasāʿil and Al-Dharīʿah 4/352-353).

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, despite being a scholar of this era, also found a few books which were not found until now. Aghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī says:

والدافع لتأليفه عثور المؤلف على بعض الكتب المهمة التي لم تسجل في جوامع الشیعة من قبل

The cause behind its compilation was that the author found some important books, which were not previously recorded in the compilations of the Shīʿah. (Al-Dharīʿah 21/7)

The most amazing aspect to this is that they have considered these narrations, which have been recently discovered, as well as the narrations of Mustadrak al-Wasāʿil as indispensable. Their scholar, al-Khurāsānī says, as quoted by the author of Al-Dharīʿah:

أن الحجة للمجتهد في عصرنا هذا لا تتم قبل الرجوع إلى المستدرك، والاطلاع على ما فيه ما الأحاديث

In this era of ours, the proofs of a Mujtahid cannot be complete without referring to al-Mustadrak and knowing the narrations in it. Al-Dharīʿah 2/111.

Does this mean that the views of the scholars who stated their views before al-Mustadrak was compiled holds no weight according to them? Read on, and you will be amazed at how many books and narrations were discovered.
commenting, “It is sufficient for our Shī‘ah”)? How did al-Ṭūsī not mention them in his book *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*, regarding which he stated that in it is all that which relates to Fiqh from the narrations of their scholars, books, and sources. He clearly stated that he did not leave out except a very small and insignificant amount. It seems as if these books were compiled recently, in the era of the Ṣafawīds, and then attributed to scholars of earlier eras.

Even their four primary and initial books were not free from alterations and additions. This can be understood from the fact that it is mentioned by Aghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī in *Al-Dharī‘ah*, Muḥsin al-ʿĀmilī in *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, and other contemporary Shī‘ī scholars that *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* of al-Ṭūsī contains a total of 13950 aḥādīth, whereas al-Ṭūsī himself stated in his book *ʿIdat al-Uṣūl* that the narrations of *Al-Tahdhīb* are more than five thousand, which means that, at most, they were slightly less than six thousand in number. Thus, there are strong indications that additions were made to the book along the course of the centuries, due to which the book is more than twice its original size!

You will also find that a difference of opinion exists among them as to whether *al-Rawḍāh* (one of the books inside *al-Kāfī* – which contains a number of chapters) is from the original compilation of al-Kulaynī or it was added on later to his book *al-Kāfī*. This leaves us with the impression that it is a very normal phenomena for them to make changes and add on to books. Rather, the matter seems to be more dangerous than that. Their ‘reliable scholar’, Ḥusayn ibn Ḥaydar al-Karkī al-ʿĀmilī (d. 1076 A.H.) says:

إن كتاب الكافي خمسون كتاباً بالأسانيد التي فیه لكل حدیث متصل بالأئمة

1 *Al-Istibṣār* 1/2
2 *Al-Dharī‘ah* 4/504
3 *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah* 1/288
4 *Al-Imām al-Ṣādiq* pg. 485
5 *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 6/188-189
Al-Ṭūsī (d. 360 A.H.), on the other hand, says:

 libros veinte le voló entre el siglo V y XI? Cada libro consta de muchos capítulos y cada capítulo de muchas narraciones. Quizás esto es natural, ya que aquel que finge mentiras contra Rasūlullāh, los Ṣaḥābah y el Ahl al-Bayt no hesitará en forjarse narraciones contra sus supuestos sabios. No falta de pruebas al respecto.

As for the texts which appear in these books, you will see clear and irreconcilable contradictions between them. Their scholar, Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī laments:

He goes on to say that these differences are more than the combined differences of all the other madh-habs. This is one of the greatest reasons on account of which

1 Rawḍāt al-Jannāt 6/114
2 Al-Fahrist pg. 161
their madh-hab is criticised. Some of the Shī'ah even abandon their religion, when they discover these contradictions.\textsuperscript{1} Al-Ṭūsī unsuccessfully attempted to reconcile these differences and explain them. Instead of solving the problem, he compounded it, as he simply commented on some of the contradictions that they were based on Taqiyyah. This, he stated without any proof, besides the fact that those narrations corresponded to the narrations or views of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

The truth is that by doing do, he only broadened and solidified the gap between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah and he shut the doors of guidance upon his sect. His efforts were only related to the chapters of Fiqh. He did not attempt to reconcile the narrations of the other chapters. Our claim that his attempt was a failure is backed by the great amount of differences that are still found amongst the Shī'ah. One of their scholars, al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (the author of \textit{Al-Wāfī}, one of the eight books) says regarding the differences of his sect:

\begin{quote}
تراهم يختلفون في المسألة الواحدة على عشرين قولٍ أو ثلاثين قولٍ أو أزيد؛ بل لو شئت أقول: لم تبق
مسألة فرعية لم يختلفوا فيها أو في بعض متعلقاتها
\end{quote}

You will see them having twenty, thirty, or more opinions. In fact, if I wish to, I can say, there is no single subsidiary matter regarding which they have not had a difference of opinion, at least regarding something related to it.\textsuperscript{2}

It should be noted that their differences are not differences based on understandings and interpretations. Rather, they are differences that are a direct result of contradictory narrations and texts. When this is the case (excessive contradictions between the texts), can there be any doubt that this is false religion and that the narrations are concoctions? Allah exposes the people of falsehood. He explains:

\begin{quote}
وَلَوْ كَانَ مِنْ عِندِ غَيْرِ اللَّهِ لَوَجَدُواْ فِيهِ اخْتِلاَفًا كَثِيرًا
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{Tahdhib al-Aḥkām} 1/2-3

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Al-Wāfī} pg. 9 of the forward
If it had been from [any] other than Allah, they would have found within it much contradiction.¹

Some of their narrations blame these contradictions upon the excessive lies and fabrications that are attributed to the Imāms. On one occasion, Fayḍ ibn Mukhtār complained to Abū Ṭabd Allāh regarding the numerous contradictions in their narrations (as reported in their narrations) saying:

ما هذا الخلاف الذي بين شيعتكم.. إني لأجلس في حلقاتكم بالكوفة فأنا أشك في اختلافهم في حديثهم.

What are these differences between your Shīʿah? I sit in their gatherings in Kūfah, and I begin to doubt due to their differences in the narrations.

Abū Ṭabd Allāh replied:

هو ما ذكرت يا فیض إن الناس أولعوا بالكذب علینا.. وإنني أحدث أحدهم بالحديث فلا يخرج من عندي حتى يتأوله على غيره تأويله، وذلك أنهم لا يطلبون بحديختنا ويبحثنا ما عند الله وإنما يطلبون الدنيا وكل يحب أن يدعى رأساً

It is as you mentioned o Fayḍ. People revel in attributing lies to us. I transmit a narration to one of them, but he does not leave my presence until he interprets it against its meaning. This is because they do not seek, by means of our narrations and loving us, that which is by Allah, they only seek the world, and each one of them wishes to call (himself) the leader.²

The Imāms have repeatedly complained of the lies that are attributed to them.³ Connivers, conspirators, and materialistic individuals thronged around them,

---

¹ Sūrah al-Nisā: 82
² The references of this quotation passed on page 115.
³ The books of the Shīʿah report from Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq that he said:

إن لكل رجل منا، رجل يكذب عليه، وقال: إن المغيرة بن سعید دس في کتب أصحاب أبي أحاديث لم يحدث بها، فاتقوا الله ول تقبلوا علينا ما خالف قول ربي وسنته نبينا

For each one of us, there was a person who would attribute lies to him.

He also said:

Mughīrah ibn Saʿīd added into my father’s books that which he did not say. Therefore, fear Allah and do not accept from us anything that opposes the word of our Rabb and the Sunnah of our Nabī.
especially Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. They would intercept the delegations that arrived from around the world to meet the Imāms, and using the names of the Imāms, they would devour their wealth. Thereafter, they would present to them fake certificates of their acceptance and they would narrate from the Imāms that which was not said by them.¹ If the Imāms ever belied them, they brushed it off saying that they were practising Taqiyyah.²

continued from page 491

Mughīrah admits his crime (as reported by the books of the Shīʿah):

I have shoved (added) into your narrations many narrations. They are approximately one hundred thousand in number.

They report from al-Ṣādiq:

We are a truthful household. However, we are not free of liars who forge lies in our names, thus tarnishing our honesty due to his lies.

Anas reports:

I arrived at Iraq. If found a few companions of Abū Jaʿfar and Abū ʿAbd Allah, who were surrounded by crowds. I listened to them and took their narrations. Thereafter, I presented them to Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā. He rejected any of the narrations and then said, “Abū al-Khaṭṭāb attributed forgeries to Abū ʿAbd Allah. May Allah curse Abū al-Khaṭṭāb. Similarly, the companions of Abū al-Khaṭṭāb have been adding these narrations, to this day, to the books of the companions of Abū ʿAbd Allah. Therefore, do not accept anything from us that contradicts the Qurʾān.”

Refer to these texts in Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl 1/174-175. If we add to these texts the testimonies of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah, that the Rawāfiḍ were great liars and fraudsters, it becomes abundantly clear that lies were common and widespread amongst them, further, when you learn of their ignorance regarding the sciences of isnād and al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl (disparagement and commendation), you will realise the dangerous path treaded by these people, by relying on these compilations.

1 Al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, page 92 of the manuscript.

2 Refer to Mizān al-Iʿtidāl 2/69-70, the biography of Zurārah. Under the discussion regarding their narrators, you will see that the scholars of the Shīʿah interpret disparagement of the narrators by the Imāms and their rejection of narrations as Taqiyyah in most cases.
Sharīk ibn ʿAbd Allāh - the judge (d. 177/8 A.H.), describes the people who would surround Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq and attribute narrations to him, as stated in the books of the Shīʿah. Hereunder is the narration:

I said to Sharīk, “Some people are of the view that Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad is a weak narrator.”

He responded, “I will tell you the story. Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad was a pious and scrupulous Muslim. However a bunch of ignorant people thronged around him. They would enter and leave his presence and say, ‘Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad narrated to us,’ and thereafter, they would narrate strange things which were pure lies and fabrications in the name of Jaʿfar, so that they could gain some food and dirhams from the people. Their narrations would include all kinds of weird information. The public heard about this. Some of them were destroyed and some of them rejected it.”

It seems as if these objections were only raised by the former Shīʿah. As for the latter day Shīʿah – especially from the Ṣafawid Dynasty onwards – they have accepted these fabrications in the name of Jaʿfar as a portion of their fundamental beliefs, without any reservations. These narrations have such content that a person can easily point out that they are fabricated, as they contradict the basics and principles of Islam, that which is known by Tawātur, that which is unanimously upheld by all Muslims as well and they are totally illogical.

I have found in their narrations, the instruction to ignore this principle, i.e. questioning the narration due to its outrageous contents. Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt reports from Sufyān al-Simṭ:

---
1 Rijāl al-Kashī pg. 208-209, Biḥār al-Anwār 20/202-203
I said to Abū ʿAbd Allāh, “May I be sacrificed for you, a man comes to us from you, who is known to be a liar, and narrates to us something that we find outrageous.”

Abū ʿAbd Allāh asked, “Does he tell you that I said regarding a night that it is a day or regarding a day that it is a night?”

I replied, “No.”

He said, “If he says this to you, then do not belie him, as you are only belying me.”

Another narration states:

إن حدیثنا تشمئز منه القلوب فمن عرف فزیدوهم، ومن أنكر فذروهم

Our narrations cause the hearts to shudder. Thus, increase the one who understands and leave the one who rejects.

Their scholar, al-Majlisī quotes 116 narrations of this meaning under the chapter, “Their narrations are extremely difficult, their speech could be interpreted in many ways, the virtue of pondering over their narrations M submitting to them and the prohibition of rejecting them.” When this is compared to the views and narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah, it becomes even clearer that these people are on the path of deviation. The Arabic idiom says, “Matters become clear by their opposites.”

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 2/211-212
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 2/192
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 2/182-212
4 Look at a few examples of the views of the Ahl-Sunnah. Al-Rabīʿ ibn al-Khathyam (d. 61/62 A.H.) – to whom Ibn Masʿūd said, “If Rasūlullāh saw you, he would have loved you.” Taqrīb Al-Tahdhīb 1/244. He said, “Some narrations are bright, like the brightness of the day, which can be sensed, and some have a darkness like the darkness of the night. We reject (those).” Reported by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī in al-Kifāyah pg. 605. continued...
Most of the time, they only question the text of a narration if it corresponds to the view of the Ahl al-Sunnah, who they refer to as the common masses. In such cases, they reject the narrations, as guidance (according to their narrations) is in opposing the common masses. In this way, they deviate further away from the truth. It should also be noted, that by doing this, they are even opposing that which appears in their books and was said by some of their Imāms, i.e. “Do not accept from us that which contradicts the Book of our Rabb.” However, their scholars have discarded this principle. Thus, that which the Imāms stipulated as the yardstick of truth became a target of malicious attacks and many fairy tales.

---

continued from page 494

Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn ʿUrwah (who authored al-Kawākib al-Darārī in 120 volumes, refer to al-Sakhāwī: al-Dawʿ al-Lāmiʾ (d. 837 A.H.)) says, “If the heart is conscious (of Allah) and it is clean and pure, it is able to differentiate between right and wrong, truth and falsehood, and guidance and deviation, especially if is accompanied by light and understanding from the illumination of Nabī ʿlā. When this is the case, hidden matters and distortions become clear to it. It is able to distinguish between the authentic and unauthentic. If a reliable or authentic isnād is painted onto a fabricated narration, or an authentic ḥadīth is reported with a weak isnād, he will be able to discern all of this. The words of Rasūlullāh ʿlā do not remain unclear to the intelligent one who has understood them.” Al-Qāsimī quoted this from the manuscript of al-Kawākib al-Darārī of Ibn ʿUrwah on page 165 of Qawāʿid al-Taḥdīth.

The scholars of ḥadīth paid attention to the texts of aḥādīth just as they paid attention to the isnāds. They have noted down signs by which a ḥadīth could be considered fabricated without even looking at the isnād. Most of the books on the science of ḥadīth have discussed this. Ibn Daqīq al-Īd says, “The scholars of ḥadīth often classify a ḥadīth as fabricated on the basis of aspects that relate to the narration and the words of the ḥadīth.” Al-Iqtirāḥ pg. 231. Ibn al-Ṣalāh mentions that sometimes a ḥadīth is recognised as a fabrication due to its text. Many times, lengthy aḥādīth are narrated – as explained by him – but the wordings and meaning thereof indicate that they are fabrications, as they are of a very poor standard. ‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ pg. 89.

Ibn al-Qayyim ʿlā wrote a separate book on this topic, in reply to the following question which was posed to him, “Is it possible to recognise a fabrication by means of any principle, without looking at the isnād?” In response, he listed 44 principles, with 273 aḥādīth as examples, and he explained the reason behind each one of them being fabricated from the aspect of the isnād as well. The name of his book is al-Manār al-Munīf.

1 Refer to the discussion of Ijmāʿ in this book.
2 Refer to Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/69-71. There are many narrations of this meaning quoted there.
As for the authenticity of these narrations and the narrations which make up their compilations, their isnāds, the narrators who they have accepted as reliable narrators from their Imāms, the classifications of narrations according to them and the reasons on the basis of which texts are questioned by them; these are all aspects that require an independent book. They are absolutely important, as they will go a long way in exposing the reality of these compilations to the unwary and simple-minded. By means of such a discussion, falsehood will be stripped of its veils and the crimes of the Saba’iyyah, who were behind the creation and development of this deviance, and thereafter attributed them to scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt, will come to the fore. It is a multifaceted discussion which cannot be adequately discussed here. Nonetheless, we will indicate to a few aspects briefly.

**The Authenticity of the Narrations of these Compilations**

Many of the leading scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah have stated that no sect has lied as much as the Rāfiḍah and they are most vehement in rejecting the truth.1 When Ibn al-Muṭahhar said, “They have their narrations which were reported by their reliable narrators,” Ibn Taymiyyah responded:

> How did you people arrive at the conclusion that those who reported these narrations in the past were reliable narrators? You people have not met them and you do not have any knowledge regarding them, as you have no books in which their details are recorded, by means of which you could have differentiated between the reliable narrators and the others. You also do not have isnāds by means of which you could have learnt who the narrators are.2

Did the scholars of Islam know about these compilations? The reality is that the Muslim ummah had no famous compilations and sources of aḥādīth besides the sources of the Muslims, which were in the forms of Ṣiḥāḥ (authentic compilations),

---

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/110
Sunan (compiled on the format of Fiqhī chapters) and Masānīd (compiled according to teachers or narrators). According to my research, the scholars of Islam, who dealt with the matter of the Rawāfiḍ, such as al-Ashʿarī, Ibn Taymiyyah, and Ibn Ḥazm did not mention any of these books. There is even no mention of their most incriminating book, Uṣūl al-Kāfī, even though the author died in the year 329 A.H. Was this because these compilations were passed around between them in a secretive manner, or, did the scholars of Islam consider them too insignificant to pay attention to? A third possibility is that these books were all authored during the reign of the Šafawid Dynasty and thereafter attributed to their former scholars.

Uṣūl al-Kāfī contains a text which indicates that the books of narrations of the Shīʿah were circulated amongst themselves in a secretive manner. This is why the isnāds are not complete, as that was the demand of Taqiyyah (according to them). The exact text of al-Kāfī is:

إن مشایخنا رووا عن أبي جعفر وأبي عبد الله - علیهما السلام - وکانت التقیة شدیدة فكتموا کتبهم ولم ترو عنهم، فلما ماتوا صارت الكتب إلینا. (قال أحد أئمتهم): حدثوا بها فإنها حق

Our scholars have narrated from Abū Jaʿfar and Abū ʿAbd Allāh. Taqiyyah was at a very high level, so they hid their books and they were not narrated from. When they passed away, their books came into our possession. (One of their Imāms says) Narrate it, as it is the truth.\(^1\)

Other narrations state that these texts should be hidden and they should not be spread among those who do not deserve it.\(^2\) During the era of al-Suyūṭī, one of

\(^1\) Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/53

\(^2\) As stated in the narration which they refer to as the scroll of Fātimah, at the end of which the Imām says:

لو لم تسمع في دهرك إلا هذا الحديث لكفناك قُصّة إلآ عن أهله

If you do not ever hear except this narration, it will be sufficient for you, so protect it, except from its people.
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the Rawāfīd began calling towards practising upon the Qur’ān alone, and leaving out the Sunnah. In refutation of this call, al-Suyūṭi wrote his book, *al-Iḥtijāj bi al-Sunnah*. The question that this raises is, why did this Rāfiḍī not call towards their compilations? These kind of acts lead us to think that they were hiding their books. Nonetheless, why were their books not as widespread and common as they have become in the recent years?

Perhaps the first time that one of their four fundamental books were pointed towards was when the book *al-Nawāqiḍ fī al-Radd ʿalā al-Rawāfiḍ* was written, in which it was stated that among the nonsensical ideas held by the Rawāfiḍ was that they rejected the authentic books of ḥadīth which the entire ummah accepted. In contrast to that, they accept four such books in which many lies have been recorded alongside a few narrations and sayings of the Imāms.¹ The author of *al-Nawāqiḍ* (Makhdūm al-Shīrāzī) belonged to the tenth century. However, just that he mentioned these books does not necessarily mean that they were out in the public, as he lived amongst the Rāfiḍah. Thus, he was forced to seek his knowledge from them. This is how he learnt of their matters which were hidden from others, as stated by him.

As for the authenticity of these books according to them, there are two views regarding this. One group believes that every narration in these books is authentic and every letter was said by the Imāms. The other group that there are authentic as well as unauthentic narrations therein. Their scholar, al-Mamaqānī states:

```
إن كون مجموع ما بين دفتي كل واحد من الكتب الأربعة من حيث المجموع متواتراً مما لا يعترى شك ولا شبهة، بل هي عند التأمل فوق حد التواتر، ولكن هل هي متواترة بالنسبة إلى خصوص كل حديث وعبارة أخرى هل كل حديث وكلمة بجميع حركاتها وسكناتها الإعرابية والبنائية، وهذا الترتيب لكلمات والحروف على القطع أم لا؟ فالمعروف بين أصحابنا المجتهدين الثاني كما هو قضية عدها أخبر أخبارهم صحة سندها أو ما يقوم مقام الصحة، وجل الإخبار على الأول كما يقتضيه قولهم بوجب العمل بالعلم، وأنها قطعية الصدور
```

¹ *Al-Nawāqiḍ* pg. 109, 110
The fact that whatever is between the covers of the four books, when looking at them as a whole, is mutawātir, is something that cannot be doubted. In fact, after pondering over it, they are above the level of Tawātur. However, is each one of the narrations mutawātir? In other words, is each narration, alphabet and diacritic (whether due that being its original diacritic or the diacritic that is a result of something else) in the order that these words and alphabets are, are they definite or not? The popular view amongst our Mujtahid scholars is the second one, as they classify narrations as āḥād and they pay attention to the authenticity of isnād or whatever is equivalent to that. Most of the Akhbārīs, however, hold the second opinion, as is the demand of their view that it is incumbent to practise upon knowledge and that all of them were definitely stated by (the Imāms).

The four fundamental books hold a greater status than the Qur’ān in the sight of the Akhbārīs. Thus, they accept the narrations therein in which the authority of the Qur’ān is brought to question. They have made these books the basis of judging the Qur’ān. This is open deviation and pure kufr. As for the Uṣūlīs, or the Mujtahids – as they call themselves – they believe that there are āḥād narrations in these books, and they take a glance at the isnād when they wish to classify a narration. Jaʿfar al-Najafī – the leading scholar of the Imāmī Shīʿah of his time, writes in his book *Kashf al-Ghiṭā* regarding the authors of the four books:

والمحمدون الثلاثة كيف يعول في تحصیل العلم علیهم، وبعضهم يكذب روایة بعض.. ورواياتهم بعضها يضاد بعضًا.. ثم إن كتبهم قد اشتملت على آخبار يقطع بكذبها كأخبار التجسم والتشبيه وقدم العالم، وثبت المكان، والزمان

How can one rely on the three Muḥammads when seeking knowledge? They belie the narrations of one-another. Even their narrations contradict one-another. Added to that, their books contain such narrations which are definite fabrications, such as the ones relating to anthropomorphism, *tashbīḥ* (likening Allah to His creation), the universe always being in existence and establishing (or confining Allah to a) time and place.

---

1 *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 1/183 (printed in 1349 A.H.)
2 *Al-Shīʿah fī al-Mīzān* pg. 272 (in the footnotes)
3 *Kashf al-Ghiṭā* pg. 40
However, the authors of these four books have unequivocally stated in the introductions of their books that they have only quoted that which is authentic. Thus, the author of *Kashf al-Ghiṭā* explains:

> فلابد من تخصيص ما ذكر في المقدمات أو تأويله على ضرب من المجازات أو الحمل على العدول عما فات، حيث ذكروا في تضاعيف كتبهم خلاف ما ذكروه في أوائلها

It is necessary specify that which was mentioned in the introductions or to interpret it to be a type of figurative speech or to believe that those which did not make the grade were ignored, as they quoted in their books that which contradicts their introductory statements.\(^1\)

Thereafter, another objection is dealt with, which is far more difficult to answer compared to the previous ones, i.e. since these books were compiled from sources which were presented to the Imāms, why did they not object to the fabrications that were found in them? In fact, *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* was written during *al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā*, due to which it was possible for the Imām to comment on the narrations therein, especially since the book was reportedly presented to him upon which he said that it is sufficient for the Shīʿah. As for the author of *Man lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh*, he saw more than twenty years of *al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā*.\(^2\)

The author of *Kashf al-Ghiṭā* could find no answer to this besides Taqiyyah, an answer that is used by them when all else fails. He says:

> وأنه لا يجب على الأئمة المبادرة إليهم بالإنكار ولا تمييز الخطأ من الصواب لمنع التقية المتفرعة على يوم السقیفة

It is not compulsory upon the Imāms to hasten in reproaching them or to differentiate between the authentic and unauthentic, due to the prohibition of Taqiyyah which is based on the Day of Saqīfah.\(^3\)

---

1 ibid
2 Al-Ṣadr: *al-Shīʿah* pg. 125
3 *Kashf al-Ghiṭā* pg. 40
A person may ask: Since the Uṣūlīs have adopted the methodology of authentication on the basis of isnāds, do the Shīʿah not have any expertise on the science of narrators and al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl? The answer to this question is that after reading through their books on the subject, it becomes clear that they did not have a single book regarding this, until the fourth century, in which al-Kashshī penned down a very brief book on the subject, which was of very little benefit. To make matters worse, he quoted in them contradictory reports on jarḥ and taʿdīl.¹ Their available books on narrators are none the better. They only contain biographies of certain narrators,² and there are many mistakes and ambiguities in the names of the narrators, their fathers, agnomens, and titles.³

They had no books on the sciences and principles of ḥadīth until Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿĀmilī⁴ (d. 965 A.H.), who is referred to as al-Shahīd al-Thānī (the second martyr) appeared.⁵ This is a fact that is admitted in the books of the Shīʿah. Their scholar, al-Ḥāʾirī says:

ومن المعلومات التي لا يشك فيها أحد أنه لم يصنف في درایة الحدیث من علمائنا قبل الشهید الثاني وإنما هو من علوم العامة

Among the well known facts which is not doubted by anyone is that nothing was written regarding the principles of ḥadīth by our scholars before al-Shahīd al-Thānī. It is from the sciences of the masses (i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah).⁶

---

¹ As examples, refer to the biographies of Zurārah ibn Aʿyun, Abū Başīr, Jābir al-Juʿfī etc.
² Al-Shīrāzī: al-Nawāqiḍ pg. 113
³ Al-Mamaqānī: Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl 1/177
⁴ Al-Nawāqiḍ pg. 111-112
⁵ Al-Qummī: al-Kunā wa al-Alqāb 2/344
⁶ Maqtabas al-Athar 3/73. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī writes whilst penning down the biography of this scholar:

هو أول من صنف من الإمامیة في درایة الحدیث؛ لكنه نقل الاصطلاحات من كتب العامة، كذكره ونجله وغيره

He was the first from the Imāmiyyah to write on the principles of ḥadīth. However, he copied the terminology thereof from the books of the masses, as mentioned by his son and others.
Another point that will be discussed later is that they had never classified narrations (as authentic and unauthentic) until the seventh century. The author of *al-Tuhfah* was of the opinion that they were motivated to write these books due to the amount of contradictions and incongruities that they had seen in their narrations. They then took help, in forming these principles, from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah.¹

However, they also have some of their own principles which, as in all cases where they have chosen a view contrary to that of the Muslims, are misguidance through and through. One example of this is that they classify as reliable anyone who claims to have seen the awaited Mahdī in hiding, who did not ever exist.² They use this as evidence to prove that the narrator was extremely reliable, whereas the companionship of Nabī ⁵ does not add to a person’s credentials in any way. In other words, they use lies and misguidance to establish that which they consider true and they consider the proofs of integrity to be signs of lies. There can be no end to the amazement of the one who sees this kind of ridiculousness.

Further, they consider as reliable people like al-Kulaynī – who narrated the fairy tales of Taḥrīf and added volumes to his book, *al-Kāfī*, by means of them. This is why al-Kāshānī (in his *Tafsīr, al-Ṣāfi*³), al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (in *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*⁴) and Maḥmūd al-Najafī al-Ṭahrānī (in *Qawāmiʿ al-Fuḍūl*⁵) have stated that he was of the opinion that the Qur‘ān was adulterated. Abū Zahrah says, “This is from his beliefs. Thus he does not belong to (the religion of) those who face the Qiblah.”⁶

---

1 *Al-Tuhfah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah* pg. 105 (of the manuscript)
2 As stated by some sects of the Shīʿah and proven by the reliable historians and genealogists, as will appear under the discussion of *al-Ghaybah*.
4 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 30
5 *Qawāmiʿ al-Fuḍūl* pg. 298
6 *Al-Imām al-Ṣādiq* pg. 440
Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, despite the above mentioned fact regarding al-Majlisī, states that he is among the most reliable and accurate ḥadīth scholars.\footnote{Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 137} Reflect! They wholeheartedly accept the narrations of kuffār, but reject the narrations of Muslims. According to them, whoever does not belong to the Imāmiyyah, his narrations can never be authentic – as will be discussed under the topic, ‘their definition of authentic’. The narrations of an Imāmī, even if he is disparaged by the Imām, are accepted. Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī states:

الطعن في دین الرجل لا يوجب الطعن في حديثه

Disparagement of a man on the basis of religion does not discredit his narrations.\footnote{Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 137}

If these are some of their standards, what will the condition of their narrators be?

The Narrators who Appear in their Isnāds

The authors of these books did not meet any of the Imāms. Thus, their supposed narrations were reported to them by others. This raises a question; what was the condition of the men who transmitted these narrations (most of which are nothing but misguidance) to them from Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq and others? Some of the greatest scholars of ḥadīth of the Ahl al-Sunnah have testified that the Rawāfiḍ are from the worst liars, as far as narrations are concerned. Consequently, they stayed away from them. However, these testimonies hold no weight in the eyes of the Shīʿah. They do not accept the narrations of the masses, thus it is not surprising that the criticism offered by the Ahl al-Sunnah means nothing to them.

The author of al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah researched the narrators of the four books using Shīʿī sources.\footnote{Refer to al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah pg. 97 and 107 and Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah pg. 69} The same was done by al-Ṣawāqiʿ al-Muḥriqah.\footnote{Al-Ṣawāqiʿ al-Muḥriqah lī Ikhwān al-Shayāṭīn wa al-Zandaqah by Naṣīr al-Dīn Muḥāmmad, famously known as Khawājah Naṣr Allah al-Hindī al-Makkī. Al-Shaykh Maḥmūd al-Ālusī summarised the book and named his summary Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqiʿ. Refer to Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqiʿ pg. 112.} Al-Ālūsī

1 Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 137
2 Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 137
3 Refer to al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah pg. 97 and 107 and Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah pg. 69
also presented a brief summary regarding them in *Kashf Ghayāhib al-Jahālāt*.\(^1\) Another book on the topic, which was published recently, is *Rijāl al-Shī‘ah*.\(^2\) The author studied many of their narrators in the light of their books. Occasionally, he added the comments of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding them as well. These are efforts that deserve to be complimented.

These studies revealed that most of the narrators in their books are either kuffār who do not believe in Allah, the Ambiyā’, resurrection or the Ākhirah, people who were previously Christians and they make this known to everyone, along with adopting the dress of the Christians, who did not even claim to have spent time in the company of the Imāms and people who were openly declared as liars by Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq (as admitted in the books of the Shī‘ah) who said regarding them:

\[
	ext{یروون عنا الأکاذیب ویفترون علینا أهل البیت}
\]

They narrate from us lies and they fabricate using our names, the Ahl al-Bayt.\(^3\)

They have a range of different types of fabricators and misguided individuals in their books. The studies of the above mentioned authors have listed the names of the narrators who held heretical beliefs.\(^4\) One of the outstanding scholars of their sect (who authored two\(^5\) of their four foundational books and two or three of their reliable books on narrators\(^6\)), al-Ṭūsī, by the will of Allah, made an admission whilst he was compiling a summary on their narrators. He said:

---

1. *Kashf Ghayāhib al-Jahālāt* pg. 10
2. By ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Zar‘ī, published by Dār al-Arqām in Kuwait in the year 1403 A.H.
3. Refer to *al-Tuḥāfah* pg. 97
4. Maybe one of the faculties of Sunnah in the Islamic universities should do a thorough and comprehensive study of all the narrators of the Twelvers so that the exact reality may be known.
5. *Al-Tahdhib* and *Al-Istibšār*
6. *Al-Fahrist*, *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* and *Rijāl al-Kashshī* (which was systemised by al-Tūsī). The actual book, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* cannot be traced by the Shī‘ah. Thus they only use al-Tūsī’s version along with *Kitāb al-Rijāl* by al-Najāshī.
Many of the authors from our scholars held deviant beliefs.¹

Despite this, he says:

Their books are reliable.²

In essence, the only factor that holds weight is whether or not the person was a Shī‘ah. If he belonged to them, nothing else mattered. The only sect whose narrations are rejected is the Zaydiyyah, just as they rejected the narrations of Zayd ibn ‘Ali, a member of the Ahl al-Bayt. Al-Ṭūsī rejected their narrations in Al-Istibṣār, even though they are a sect of the Shī‘ah. This teaches us that what they actually look for in accepting a narrator is that he should be either an Imāmī Shī‘ah or an extremist.

Hence, the narrations of the Jārūdiyyah, an extremist faction of the Zaydiyyah are accepted by them, since the Jārūdiyyah declare majority of the companions of Rasūlullāh  kāfir and they reject most of their narrations. Thus, they uphold most of the views of the Imāmīyyah.³ The rest of their beliefs, irrespective of the degree of deviation therein, are absolutely irrelevant. Some of their scholars, such as al-Ghaḍā’irī and Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī have clearly stated that if a narrator is criticised on the basis of his dīn, it will not affect the authenticity of his narrations.⁴

There are some narrators who were classified as extremists by the scholars of the former times. Hence, their narrations were rejected. However, this criticism did

---

¹ Al-Fahrist pg. 24-25
² Al-Fahrist pg. 24-25
³ As stated by their scholar, al-Mufīd in Awā’il al-Maqālāt. His speech was quoted on page 41.
⁴ Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 137
not impress the latter day Shīʿah, who presented a strange proof in favour of those narrators, i.e. the religion keeps undergoing modifications. Thus, the extremism that was disliked by the former scholars is now part of the fundamentals of the religion. This means that the standards by means of which they judge the beliefs of a narrator will keep changing as the religion progresses and changes. Al-Mamaqānī – the most senior scholar on the subject in this era - says:

إن القدماء - يعني من الشيعة - كانوا يعدون ما نعد اليوم من ضروريات مذهب الشيعة غلواً وارتفاعاً، وكانوا يرمون بذلك أوثق الرجال كما لا يخفى على من أحاط خبرًا بكلماتهم.

The former (Shīʿah) would consider to be extremism that which we now consider as the fundamentals of the religion. On the basis of these, they would criticise the most reliable narrators. This is not hidden to the one who is well-versed with their speech.¹

There is yet another problem faced by the Shīʿah as far as this matter is concerned. There are authentic and reliable narrations reported in their books, in which a great number of the liars and fabricators, upon whose narrations the Shīʿī religion stands, have been singled out, criticised, and cursed. However, the scholars of the Shīʿah did not accept any negativity regarding them. If they were to accept this criticism, they would have become part of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and their deviant beliefs would have been abandoned. The excuse of Taqiyyah was once again the only answer they could offer to get away from this criticism. The reality is that by doing this, they are rejecting the statement of the Imām in a very subtle way and since the Shīʿah believe that rejection of a statement of the Imām is kufr, they have left the religion completely.

Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar — a contemporary scholar — admits that most of their narrators have been disparaged by the Imāms, and this has been narrated in the books of the Shīʿah. He says, whilst commenting on the criticism that was narrated regarding Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī:

Criticisms have been narrated regarding him, just as they were narrated regarding others, from the most illustrious helpers of the Ahl al-Bayt. The answers to these are common and understood.¹

Thereafter, he says:

How can criticism of these great ones be authentic? Did the religion of truth and the matter of the Ahl al-Bayt not gain strength and publicity purely in the basis of their cutting edge evidences?²

Look at what fanaticism does to a person! They go to the extent of defending those who have been condemned by the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt, and they reject the narrations which are narrated from the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt in which these narrators are condemned and warned about, despite the fact that these narrations are recorded in their own books. By using Taqiyyah as an excuse, they are belying the Ahl al-Bayt and believing these liars. They reject the statements of the Ahl al-Bayt, which correspond to the views of the rest of the ummah, preferring the views of their enemies and their statements. Then, they simply hoodwink their public using the excuse of Taqiyyah.

There are a group of narrators in their books who stand out on account of the excessiveness of their narrations. They are highly praised by the Imāms even though they have been cursed, declared kāfir or liars by the tongues of the Imāms, as admitted in the books of the Shīʿah. I am of the opinion that gathering the criticisms regarding the narrators in the books of the Twelvers, from the books of

¹ Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Muẓaffar: al-Imām al-Ṣādiq pg. 178
² Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Muẓaffar: al-Imām al-Ṣādiq pg. 178
the Shī'ah, along with that which is found in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah will play a great role in exposing the lies that have been attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt. Many of those impure narrations, which have taken the Shī'ah far away from the Ahl al-Sunnah will be flushed away by the result of this exercise.

The commoners and ignorant ones among the Shī'ah (who know nothing about their religion besides the claim by means of which their scholars keep deceiving them, i.e. Shī'ism is from the teachings of the Ahl al-Bayt) will be afforded the opportunity of seeing things the way they are. They have no clue that their narrations are taken from a bunch of liars from whom the Imāms distanced themselves and belied. Most of the general public of the Shī'ah have no idea of the details of their religion and in which direction they are being taken.

Jābir al-Ju'fī

At the forefront of these narrators is Jābir al-Ju'fī. Al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī says:

روى سبعين ألف حدیث عن الباقر - علیه السلام - وروى مائة وأربعین ألف حدیث، والظاهر أنه ما روي
بطريق المشافهة عن الأئمة علیهم السلام أکثر مما روي جابر

He narrated seventy thousand narrations from al-Bāqir, and he narrated one hundred and forty thousand narrations. Apparently, there are no narrations directly from the Imāms more than his.¹

Thus, he takes first position as far as quantity is concerned. When we put into perspective the fact that the total number of narrations of these four books is less than 44244, we realise the true worth of his narrations. They make up most of the narrations in the books of the Shī'ah. Hence, it can be said that they are from the fundamentals of the religion. However, Rijāl al-Kashshī — the first of the books of the Shī'ah on the subject of narrators — reports from Zurārah ibn A'yan:

¹ Wasā'il al-Shī'ah 20/151
I asked Abū `Abd Allāh regarding the narrations of Jābir. He replied, “I have never seen him by my father, except once and he did not ever come to me.”

Al-Imām al-Ṣādiq, here, belies the claims of Jābir of narrating from him and his father. Thus, how does he report so many narrations from a person who he did not meet or only met once, especially since he explicitly claims to have heard these narrations directly from them? Al-Khu‘ī could find no escape route from this narration, hence he resorted to the usual:

لا بد من حمله إلى نحو من التورية

It is necessary to interpret it to be a kind of dissimulation.

He considers al-Ju‘fī to be from the reliable narrators. He says:

الذي ينبغي أن يقال: إن الرجل لا بد من عده من الثقات الأجلاء

It is appropriate to say, “The man was definitely from the great and reliable ones.”

To prove this, he quoted the statements of some of his scholars who considered him reliable, such as Ibn Qūlawiyyah, ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm, and al-Mufīd. Thereafter, he says:

ويبقى الصادق في صحیحة زیاد إنه كان يصدق علينا

Al-Ṣādiq says in the authentic (narration) of Ziyād, “He would report from us truthfully.”

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 191
2 Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth 5/25
3 Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth 4/25
4 ibid
Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt indicates that this narration, which al-Khuʿī classifies as authentic, was narrated through unknown people.¹ I cannot understand why they chose to interpret the first narration and accept this one without any proof. Added to that, al-Khuʿī believes that al-Mufīd was among those who regarded him to be reliable. However, al-Mufīd composed many poems from which it can be understood that al-Juʿfī was unreliable, as he would get confused.² Al-Najāshī says regarding him:

وكان في نفسه مخلطاً

He was confused.³

Hāshim Maʿrūf says:

إن جابر الجعفي من المتهمين عند أكثر المؤلفين في الرجال

Jābir al-Juʿfī was, according to most authors of the subject of narrators, among the accused.⁴

He says on another occasion, whilst passing a judgement regarding one of their narrations:

في سند هذه الرواية صباح المزني، وجابر الجعفي وهما ضعيفان، وقد ورد في جابر قدح ومدح والأكثر

على أنه كان مخلطاً

The isnād of this narration contains Ṣabāḥ al-Muzanī and Jābir al-Juʿfī. Both of them are unreliable. Regarding Jābir, both criticism as well as commendation have been reported. However, most (scholars) are of the opinion that he was confused.⁵

---

¹ Al-Ardabīlī: Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt 1/144
² Al-Najāshī: al-Rijāl pg. 100
³ Al-Najāshī: al-Rijāl pg. 100
⁴ Al-Mauḍūʿāt fī al-Athār wa al-Akhbār pg. 334
⁵ Al-Mawḍūʿāt fī al-Athār wa al-Akhbār pg. 184
Al-Najāshī (d. 450 A.H.), who is one of their most well versed scholars on the subject of narrators, and the author of one of their four important books on the subject mentions:

قلّ ما یورد عنه شيء في الحلال والحرام

Very rarely is something narrated from him regarding ḥalāl and ḥarām.¹

However, al-Khu’ī says:

فإن الروایات عنه في الكتب الأربعة کثیرة في الحلال والحرام

Many of the narrations from him in the four books are related to ḥalāl and ḥarām.²

This brings to our attention another fact, i.e. the man, who was a liar, also had many people lying about him. Al-Najāshī clearly states this in his book on narrators. He says:

روى عنه جماعة غمز منهم وعنهم عمرو بن شمر، ومفضل بن صالح

A group have narrated from him, who have been criticised and considered unreliable. Among them is ʿAmr ibn Shimr and Mufaḍḍāl ibn Ṣāliḥ.³

Hāshim Maʿrūf mentions under the biography of ʿAmr ibn Shimr:

ضعفه المؤلفون في الرجال ونسبوا إليه أنه دس أحاديث في كتاب جابر الجعفي

The authors of books on narrators have considered him unreliable and they have accused him of adding narrations to the books of Jābir al-Juʿfī.⁴

---

1 Al-Najāshī: al-Rijāl pg. 100
2 Al-Khu’ī: Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth 4/26
3 Al-Najāshī: al-Rijāl pg. 100
4 Dirāsāt fī al-Ḥadīth pg. 195
He would fabricate narrations in the books of Jābir al-Ju’fī and thereafter he would attribute them to him.¹

This is another angle from which one can understand the extent to which lies are spread out in their books in the name of Jābir. Some of their narrations also have it that he was among the mentally challenged, but they claim that he adopted this kind behaviour in order to avoid being punished by the Khalīfah.² Other narrations portray him to be an expert magician, although they do not state this clearly.³

His narrations contain most of the elements of kufr that is found in the Shī‘ī madh-hab. He is the one from who it is reported in al-Kāfī that none gathered the Qur’ān besides the Imāms and so on. He was also the first to record ‘inner’ or ‘hidden’ interpretations of the Qur’ān in a book. Some of their narrations state that it is compulsory to keep those interpretations away from others. He also had a share in the other matters by means of which Kufr and deviation were sealed into the Shī‘ah religion. There is no doubt that the greatest proof of him being a liar is his narrations. The scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah have testified that he was one of the greatest liars and forgers.

Imām Abū Ḥanīfah said:

ما رأيت أحداً أكذب من جابر الجعفي

I have not seen a greater liar than Jābir al-Ju’fī.

Ibn Ḥibbān said:

1 Hāshim Ma’rūf: al-Mawdū‘āt wa al-Āthār pg. 234
2 Refer to Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 194-195
3 Refer to the extra-ordinary feats that are reported by them regarding him in Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 197
He was a Saba‘ī, from the companions of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’. He would say, "ʿAlī will return to this world."

Jarīr ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd said:

لا أستحل أن أحدث عن جابر الجعفي هو كاذب يؤمن بالرجعة

I consider it impermissible for me to narrate from Jābir al-Ju‘fī. He is a great liar, who believes in reincarnation.

Zā’idah said:

رفاضي يشتم أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله علیه وسلم

He was a Rāfiḍī who would revile the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh.

Zurārah ibn Aʿyan

One of the accomplices of Jābir was a narrator by the name of Zurārah ibn Aʿyan (d. 150 A.H). Their scholars, such as al-Ṭūsī, al-Najāshī, Ibn al-Muṭahhar and others have considered him reliable and among the six companions of Abū Ja’far and Abū ‘Abd Allāh, whose speech the group has agreed to believe. Many of his narrations appear in the books of the Shī‘ah. There were many others who also joined these two forgers in their mission. Hence, al-Ṭūsī says;

---

1 Refer to al-ʿUqaylī: al-Ḍuʿafā al-Kabīr 1/196, Ibn Ḥibbān: al-Majrūḥīn 1/208, Mīzān al-Iʿtidāl 1/379
2 Al-Fahrist pg. 104, Rijāl al-Ṭūsī pg. 201 and 350
3 Rijāl al-Najāshī pg. 132 and 133
4 Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 76
5 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 20/196, al-Ardabīlī: Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt 1/324
6 Here they are using ijmā as a proof, whereas their belief is that it cannot be a proof.
7 Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth 7/219
8 Al-Fahrist pg. 104
They have many narrations, principles, and books.¹

Al-Khu‘ī mentioned the total amount of Zurārah’s narrations in the four books, saying:

The isnāds of many narrations mention the name of Zurārah. The total amount of these narrations is 2490. He reported a total of 1236 narrations from Abū Ja‘far. He also reported “from Abū Ja‘far and Abū ‘Abd Allāh”. He reports 82 narrations from them in this manner. His narrations from Abū ‘Abd Allāh, who is also referred to as al-Ṣādiq, reach a total of 449. He narrates from “one of them” a total of 56 narrations.²

These are their claims. However Sufyān al-Thawrī says regarding Zurārah:

He did not see Abū Ja‘far.³

Sufyān ibn ‘Uaynah said, when he was told that Zurārah ibn A‘yan narrates a book from Abū Ja‘far:

¹ Al-Fahrist pg. 104
² Al-Khu‘ī: Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth.
³ Refer to Lisān al-Mīzān 2/474
What (book) is that? He did not see Abū Jaʿfar. However, he would search for his narrations.¹

*Mīzān al-Iʿtidāl* has it that Zurārah attributed to Abū Jaʿfar the knowledge of the inhabitants of Jannah and Jahannam. He said to Ibn al-Sammāk, ‘When you meet him, ask him whether I am from the people of Jannah or Jahannam.’ When this reached Jaʿfar, he said, “Inform him that he is from the people of hell, as whoever attributes the knowledge of this to me, will be from its dwellers.”² However, one of their contemporary scholars says:

لم نجد أثراً مما نسبوه إلى كل من زرارة بن أعين، ومحمد بن مسلم، ومؤمن الطاق وأمثالهم، مع أنا قد استفرغنا الوسع والطاقة بالبحث عن ذلك وما هو إلا البغي والعدوان

We have not found any trace of that which they have attributed to Zurārah ibn Aʿyan, Muḥammad ibn Muslim, Muʿmin al-Ṭāq, and their likes, even though we exerted ourselves in trying to find something. It is nothing other than injustice and enmity.³

He wishes to establish that there is no basis for the criticism that is reported regarding Zurārah, and it is based purely on the hatred of the opposition. He asserts that he searched for this in all of their sources and he went the extra mile in doing so, yet he found no trace of it. Can this be true? To answer this question, we will have to visit some of their most reliable sources on the subject of narrators. Thereafter, we will realise the truth or falsity of his statement. There is no other way out, as the belief of Taqiyyah upheld by the Shīʿah simply does not allow one to believe anything that emanates from them.

The first source that deserves to be consulted regarding this matter is the reliable books of narrators of the Shīʿah. *Al-Fahrist* of al-Ṭūsī informs us that he belonged to a Christian family. His grand-father, Sansan was a monk in the Roman lands,

---

¹ *Lisān al-Mīzān* 2/474
² *Mīzān al-Iʿtidāl* 2/69-770
³ Al-Mūsawī: *al-Murājāʿāt* pg. 313
and his father was a Roman slave of a man from the Banū Shibyān. It seems as if the effects of Zurārah on the Shīʿī religion was greater than that of Ibn Saba. In fact, Abū ʿAbd Allāh said:

None have introduced into Islam the innovations which Zurārah introduced. May the curse of Allah be upon him.

He also says:

Zurārah is worse than the Jews, the Christians, and those who say that Allah is but one of a trinity.

Al-Kashshī reports that Abū ʿAbd Allāh cursed him three times, and said:

Undoubtedly, Allah turned around the heart of Zurārah.

He reported a few more narrations in which he was criticised. It is due to this, as stated by al-Kashshī, that Zurārah would say:

As for Jaʿfar, I have some disinclination for him in my heart.

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: al-Fahrist pg. 220, ibn al-Nadīm: al-Fahrist pg. 220. However, al-Fahrist of Ibn al-Nadīm states that his grandfather’s name was Sanbas.
2 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 149
3 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 160
4 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 149
5 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 160
The one who narrates this from Zurārah explains:

Since Abū ‘Abd Allāh revealed his faults.¹

The brazenness of Zurārah in respect of Abū ‘Abd Allāh reached the point, as stated in Rijāl al-Kashshī, where he would belie his statements and talk ill of him.²

He would fabricate statements and insist that they were the statements of Abū ‘Abd Allāh. Rijāl al-Kashshī states:

Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayr says, ‘I entered the presence of Abū ‘Abd Allāh سلَّم, who said, “How did you leave Zurārah?”

I replied, “I left him in the condition that he would not perform ‘Aṣr until the sun had set.”

Thereupon, he said, “You are my messenger to him. Tell him that he should perform it at the times of my companions, for I have been burnt.”

I conveyed this to him.

He responded, “By the oath of Allah, I know that you are not lying about him. However, he commended to me to do something, so I do not wish to leave it.”³

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 144-145
2 Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 157
He claims that Ja’far al-Ṣādiq commanded him to perform ‘Aṣr only after the sun sets, whereas he was completely innocent of this. This is the description of Zurārah in the books of the Shī’ah. Despite this, the senior scholar of the Shī’ah in this era says that after exerting himself, he could find no criticism of Zurārah. Was this hidden from him or does Taqiyyah give him the license to say anything without being reproached?

How is it that the scholars of the Shī’ah consider Zurārah to be reliable after all of this criticism, curses and the verdict of kufr that was passed regarding him by the one who they believe is infallible, especially since both, al-Kashshī as well as Shaykh al-Ṭā’ifah al-Ṭūsī have reported it? The answer to this question is offered by al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī. He says:

 Narrations have been reported in criticism of him. It is appropriate to take this to be Taqiyyah. Rather, it is the only answer. The same can be said about that which was reported regarding his likes from the luminaries of the Imāmiyyah.

To prove this, they quote a narration of theirs from Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Zurārah and his two sons Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, who narrate from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Zurārah:

Abū ‘Abd Allāh (Ja’far al-Ṣādiq) said to me, “Covey greetings to your father and say to him, ‘I only criticise you to protect you. The people and the

1 This is so because Rijāl al-Kashshī was authored by al-Kashshī and it was systemized by al-Ṭūsī. The copy which is common is the edition of al-Ṭūsī, as the original book is lost.

2 Wasā’il al-Shī’ah 20/196
enemy hasten to harm all those who we draw close and praise and love. They criticise them due to our love for him and closeness to him. They wish to harm him and kill him.”¹

They use this as proof, without paying any attention to the fact that the sons narration was criticised, as he was defending his father. Further, if this criticism really was done on the basis of Taqiyyah, why did they go to the extent of cursing them and calling them kuffār? Another fact to consider is that Jaʿfar was quite honoured in his society, so how is it possible that his associates and those who he loved would be harmed? If Jaʿfar really was protecting Zurārah, why did Zurārah falsely claim that Jaʿfar commanded him to perform ʿAṣr after sunset and why did he belie him and speak ill of him? Was this also Taqiyyah? One scholar of the Shīʿah attempted to get away from these narrations, in which Zurārah is criticised, by taking half of them to be Taqiyyah² and criticising the isnāds of the rest.

After looking through his criticisms of some of the narrators, I have seen that they are not in conformity with that which appears in their books regarding narrators. As an example, he rejected one of the narrations in which Zurārah was criticised on the basis that Jibrīl ibn Aḥmad, as he claimed, was unknown.³ The reality is that he is not unknown to the Shīʿah. Al-Ardabīlī says:

کان مقیماً بكش کثیر الروایة عن العلماء بالعراق وقم وخراسان

He was resident of Kash. He narrated many narrations from the scholars of Iraq, Qum, and Khurasān.⁴

Added to the above, he scrutinises the narrations in which Zurārah is criticised but overlooks those in which he is praised. This is open partiality. Their scholars apply this rule to all those who are criticised by their Imāms and they accept

---

2 *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 7/245
3 *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 7/241
4 *Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt* 1/146
their narrations. Other examples of these narrators are Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Marwazī,1 Ismāʿīl ibn Jābir al-Juʿfī, Burayd ibn Muʿāwiyyah al-ʿIjlī, ʿHaṭīz ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Sijistānī, etc.

There is no doubt that there can be absolutely no certainty of Taqiyyah in these conditions. At least, the Shīʿah should have deliberated and kept silent regarding these narrators. The Shīʿah do not accept the criticism of the Ahl al-Sunnah, as they are regarded by them to be ‘the opposition’. However, here they are even rejecting that which is reported from their Imāms, claiming that these were said to please the Ahl al-Sunnah and keep their peace with them. Thus, the truth has been covered up and the Shīʿī religion now stands upon the whims of their scholars and the lies of their narrators.

Types of Narrations – According to the Shīʿah

Although the compilations of the Shīʿah on the subject of narrators were extremely belated, and they did not serve their purpose, the one who reads the books of latter day Shīʿah (such as Mirāṭ al-ʿUqūl by al-Majlisī) or the books of

---

1 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī says, al-Kashshī and others have narrated criticism as well as commendation regarding him. The basis of the criticism is perhaps that which will appear under the discussion of Zurārah (i.e. Taqiyyah). Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 20/127, Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 559-562, Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt 1/48-49.
2 Al-Hurr al-ʿĀmilī says, “There is some criticism regarding him which has a weak isnād and it is not very clear. The interpretation of it will appear under Zurārah.” Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 20/139, Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 199
3 Al-Hurr al-ʿĀmilī said, “A luminary from the luminaries of our scholars. He was reliable and he was a jurist. Al-Kashshī counted him among the people of ijmāʿ (i.e. those whose narrations the Shīʿah have all agreed to accept). There is some criticism regarding him, the explanation of which will appear under Zurārah. Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 20/145-146, Rijāl al-Najāšī pg. 87, Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 26-27, Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt 1/117-119, Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 148 (which quotes Abū ʿAbd Allah to have said, “May Allah curse Burayd.”)
4 Al-ʿĀmilī says, “He is a reliable Kūfī. There is praise regarding him. There is also criticism, which is interpreted to be Taqiyyah for the same reason that appears under Zurārah.” Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 20/162, Rijāl al-Najāšī pg. 111, Rijāl al-Ṭūsī pg. 181, Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 63, Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt 1/182-187
present day Shī'ah (such as al-Shāfī fī Sharḥ Uṣul al-Kāfī) will see that at times they classify certain narrations as authentic and others as unreliable. However, they do not take it upon themselves to do so in many of their books. We have already explained that this (authentication) is the view of one of their sects, i.e. the Uṣūlīs.

The Shī'ah, all along, were ignorant on this subject. Hence, the Ahl al-Sunnah would take them to task on the basis of their ignorance. The question now arises, when did the Shī'ah begin classifying narrations, and what was the cause behind this? I have learnt, after studying their works on the science of al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl that they classify narrations as,

- ʿṣaḥīḥ (authentic),
- ḥasan (good),
- muwaththaq (passible),
- and ʿḍaʿīf (weak).

1 ʿṢaḥīḥ: That narration, the isnād of which is continuous until it reaches the infallible one, by the transmission of an Imāmī, who is a person of integrity, from one who is like him in all the generations.

Ḥasan: The isnād is continuous, just like the above, except that the narrator should be praised, even though his integrity is not mentioned. This should be found in all the generations or in some of them, with the rest being like that of ʿṣaḥīḥ.

Muwaththaq: An isnād which has in it a narrator who was been declared reliable by the scholars, but he held incorrect beliefs.

Ḍaʿīf: None of the conditions of the above three are found. It includes a criticised or an unknown narrator or even someone of a lower standard.

Mursal: That which is narrated from the infallible one by one who did not meet him.


It should be noted that the ‘infallible one’, as explained previously, is not only Rasūlullāh according to them. The Imāms are also infallible, a trait that is confined to the ambiyā’ alone. Further, for the narration to be classified as authentic or acceptable, it is a condition, according to them, that the narrator should be an Imāmī. The narrations of non-Imāmīs are not accepted, as stated by their scholar, Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, who says:
These terms were introduced into their books at a very late stage. Perhaps this matter needs a little more deliberation, as far as it being a new subject for them (as I understand) is concerned. I have not seen anyone before me discussing this.

According to my observation, the Shīʿah began dividing and classifying narrations as authentic, weak, etc., in the seventh century, even though the study of narrators had existed amongst them since the fourth century. This came about at around the same time that Ibn Taymiyyah exposed their ignorance and cluelessness concerning the subject of narrators, just as he exposed them for using narrations from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah which, in many cases, were classified by the scholars as unauthentic or fabricated. Another complaint that he had against them was that they would keep quoting from unreliable books.

Thus, did the Shīʿah come to realise their weaknesses in these aspects and consequently attempt to improve themselves, or did they realise that by using the methodology of the Ahl al-Sunnah in these matters, they could find a way out of all the kufr and idiocy that is found in their books? This means that as soon as

---

1

لا تقبل رواية الكافر وإن علم من دينه التحرز عن الكذب

The narrations of an infidel cannot be accepted, even if is known that abstention from lies is part of his religion.”

Similarly:

المخالف ل يقبل روايته أيضاً لاندراجه تحت اسم الفاسق

The narrations of the one who opposes cannot be accepted, as he is among the transgressors. (Ibn al-Muṭahhar: Tahdīb al-Wuṣūl pg, 77-78)

It should also be noted that they consider as disbelievers all those who not belong to the Shīʿah. Al-Mamaqānī says:

والأخبار في فسقهم بل كفرون لا تقصى كثرة

The narrations which highlight their transgression, or rather, their disbelief, are too many to count. (Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl 3/207)

For further details, refer to the discussion regarding Imāmah in this book. Nonetheless, they are selective as far as applying this principle is concerned. The author of al-Tuhfāh, as well as others, including their brothers from the Akhbārīs, have exposed their inconsistencies in this matter.
anyone questions one of their narrations, they can immediately respond that it is a fabrication, as Taqiyyah allows and encourages them to lie as much as they can!

Undoubtedly, the timing between the exposure by Ibn Taymiyyah and their adoption of these classifications reveal to us that they were definitely affected by his writings. Hereunder is their admission:

أن هذا الاصطلاح مستحدث في زمن العلامة

This terminology (ṣaḥīḥ, ḍaʿīf, etc.) were invented in the era of al-ʿAllāmah (al-Ḥillī).¹

When the title ʿAllāmah appears without any person’s name after it, it is a reference to Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, in refutation of whom Ibn Taymiyyah authored his book. This deduction is strengthened further by the following statement of the author of Al-Wāfī regarding Ibn al-Muṭahhar:

أول من اصطلح على ذلك وسلك هذا المسلك

(He was) the first to coin these terms and adopt this methodology.²

With this being the case, is it not quite apparent that Ibn Taymiyyah and his book, Minhāj al-Sunnah, were largely responsible for the adoption of this system by the Shīʿah? Does this not reveal to us that Ibn Muṭahhar introduced this methodology to his people on account of the criticism that was levelled against them by Ibn Taymiyyah? In the following statement, Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī admits that the Shīʿah only introduced these terms into their religion and began taking an interest in isnāds due to the criticism levelled against them by the Ahl al-Sunnah. He says:

والفائدة في ذكره... دفع تعییر الشیعه بأن أحادیثهم غیر معنعنة، بل منقولة من أصول قدمائهم

¹ Wasā’il al-Shīʿah 2/102, Al-Kāshānī: Al-Wāfī (the second introduction).
² Al-Wāfī 1/11
The benefit of mentioning it (the isnād) is that it dispels the criticism against the Shi‘ah, that their narrations have no reporters to them, but rather, they are copied from the books of their predecessors.¹

This text indicates that their narrations did not have isnāds to them and thus they were criticised by others. Therefore, they began mentioning isnāds along with their narrations. This means that the isnāds which appear with their narrations were, in fact, concocted later on and added to the statements in the books of their predecessors merely to avoid the criticism of the Ahl al-Sunnah (that the narrations are not reported with an unbroken isnād). Hence, it is not far-fetched that the one who undertook the task of concocting these isnāds added to them names of people who did not even exist.

I have already expounded upon the fact that they attribute books and narrations – under the discussion regarding the book of Sulaym ibn Qays (which was their first book) – to people who did not exist. One of their scholars, whilst admitting that the book of Sulaym ibn Qays was a fabrication stated:

والحق أن هذا الكتاب موضوع لغرض صحيح نظیر کتاب الحسنیة، وطرائف بن طاوس، والرحلة المدرسیة

The truth is that this book was fabricated for a valid reason, just like Kitāb al-Ḥasaniyyah, Ṭarā’if ibn Ṭāwūs, and al-Riḥlah al-Madrasiyyah.²

We have already explained that Sulaym ibn Qays was a name behind which there was no person. Further, I have seen the author of al-Ḥūr al-Ţīn quoting a very important testimony of one of their scholars concerning this. He says:

قال السيد أبو طالب إن كثيراً من أسانيد المثنى عشرية مبنیة على أسام ل مسمى لها من الرجال، قال: وقد عرفت من روائهم المكثرین من كان يستحل وضع الأسانید للأخبار المنقطعة إذا وقعت إليه، وحكى عن بعضهم: أنه كان يجمع روایات بزرجمهر، وينسبها للأئمة بأسانید يضعها، فقيل له في ذلك، فقال: الحق

الحكمة بأهلها

¹ Wasā’il al-Shi‘ah 20/100

² Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sha‘rānī: Ta‘līqāt ʿIlmiyyah (ʿalā Sharḥ al-Kāfī lī al-Māzindarānī) 2/373-374
Al-Sayyid Abū Ṭālib' says, “Many of the isnāds of the Twelvers are based upon names behind which there are no individuals. Added to that, I have realised that some of those who narrated excessively (from their narrators) regarded it permissible to concoct isnāds for the narrations which had no isnāds, if they came his way. It is also reported from one of them that he would collect narrations in Zajamhar and thereafter attribute them to the Imāms by means of isnāds which he would fabricate. He was approached regarding this, to which he responded, “I attribute wisdom to its people.”

According to them one of their narrators is Ḥaydar ibn Muḥammad ibn Nuʿaym al-Samarqandī. They state regarding him:

रوى جميع مصنفات الشيعة وأصولهم.. وروى ألف كتاب من كتب الشيعة

He reported all the writings of the Shīʿah as well as their foundational books, and he reported a thousand of the books of the Shīʿah.

If this had any truth to it, his name would have appeared in all the books on narrators and this ‘fact’ would have been recorded in the books of history as well. However, I neither found any mention, nor any indication towards it in these books. The theory that their isnāds have no reality to them is supported by yet another text, which appears in the most authentic of their books. They state:

إن مشايخنا رواوا عن أبي جعفر وأبي عبد الله - عليهما السلام -، وكانت التقية شديدة فكتموا كتبهم ولم ترو عنهم، فلما ماتوا صارت الكتب إلينا. ولما سألوا إمامهم عن ذلك قال: “حدثوا بها فإنها حق

Our scholars have reported from Abū Jaʿfar and Abū ʿAbd Allah. However Taqiyyah was at a very high level at that time. Therefore, they hid their books away and abstained from reporting from them. When they died, the

1 Abū Ṭālib Yahyā ibn Ḥusayn ibn Hārūn al-Ḥasanī stated this in his book al-Daʿāmah. He died in the year 424 A.H. Refer to Muʿjam al-Muʿallifīn 13/192-193
2 Al-Ḥūr al-ʿĪn pg. 153
3 Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 20/185
books came into our possession. They asked their Imām regarding this, to which he replied, “Narrate it, for it is the truth.”

This is an important confession that their narrations do not have proper isnāds. What assurance do they have that these books, which reached them after era of fear and taqiyyah (as indicated to in the above confession) were not fabricated by some heretic whose goal was to distance them from the domain of al-Jamāʿah (the majority) by attributing these fabrications to the noble Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt? This is a very realistic possibility, which is strengthened when we consider the abundance of their narrations, especially those narrations which attempt at criticising that which is honoured most by the Muslims, i.e. the Book of Allah . This is something that is not found in any other sect, whether they are innovators or disbelievers. It is only the Shīʿah who have the audacity to state this.

Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī, at another juncture, emphasises that the ‘new terminology’ (ṣaḥīḥ, ḍaʿīf, etc.), which was introduced by Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī was an attempt to follow the Ahl al-Sunnah. He says:

The new terminology is on par with the beliefs and terminologies of the masses. In fact, it is taken from their books, as is apparent (for the one who looks) through them.2

This text leaves us with certainty regarding two things, i.e. the Shīʿah were quite late in their adoption of this methodology, and the greater concern amongst them was to save their religion from the criticism of the opposition, instead of actually identifying the status of the narrations. Thus, the science of al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl (commendation and disparagement of narrators), in their books, is

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/53
2 Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 20/100
filled with contradictions and inconsistencies. Al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (one of their scholars) says:

في الجرح والتعدل وشروطهما اختلافات وتناقضات واشتباهات لا تكاد ترفع بما تطمئن إليه النفوس
كما لا يخفى إلى الخبير بها

Al-Jarḥ wa al-Taḍīl and its conditions have many contradictions, differences, and ambiguities; which cannot be cleared in a convincing manner. This is obvious to the one who is well-versed with the subject.¹

These decisive confessions by al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī and al-Kāshānī would have never surfaced, had it not been for the differences between the Uṣūlis and the Akhbarīs, in which (as we have seen) Taqiyyah is greatly side-lined, especially since the Shīʿah have (as stated in al-Kāfī) two qualities, viz, love for frivolities and brazenness.² Thus, these confessions explain that the isnād is among the specialities of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and the Shīʿah imitated them and adopted it as a measure to protect their religion from criticism. Furthermore, the fact that Ibn al-Muṭahhar, who was severely criticised by Ibn Taymiyyah, introduced these terms into the Shīʿī religion highlights the extent to which they were affected by it.

However, these terms have been reduced by them to another type Taqiyyah, which they use to hide their extremism. Whenever they are questioned regarding any extremism that appears in their works, they try to brush it off by claiming that their authentic narrations state otherwise. This can be seen in the books of many of their contemporary scholars. If these scholars were to apply the principles of authentication objectively, most of their narrations would go to waste. This was admitted by their scholar, Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī, who says:

والواجب إما الأخذ بهذه الأخبار، كما هو عليه متقدم علمائنا الأبرار، أو تحصيل دين غير هذا الدين، وشريعة أخرى غير هذه الشريعة، لنقصانها وعدم تمامها، لعدم الدليل على جملة من أحكامها، ولا أراهم ينتظرون شيئاً من الأمرين، مع أنه لا تائث لهما في البيين، وهذا بمحمد الله ظاهر لكل ناظر، غير معنف ولا مكابر

¹ Al-Wafī 1/11-12
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/221-22
It is compulsory to either accept all these narrations, as was done by the predecessors from our righteous scholars, or to end up with a religion and a constitution besides this one, which is incomplete, as there are no proofs for a large number of its laws. I do not see them accepting either of these two options, even though a third option does not exist. Praise is due to Allah, this is evident to anyone who looks into it, as long as he is not stubborn and proud.¹

This is an important text, which reveals the reality of their narrations in the light of their version of the science of al-Jarh wa al-Ta’dil. If they were to apply it objectively, most of their narrations would be declared unreliable or fabricated. If they wish to accept their narrations, they have no other option but to blind themselves from the reality and accept it without any questions, as was done by their predecessors (who accepted all the lies and tales in their books). On the other hand, if they are not prepared to totally discard their intellect, they should search for a religion other than Shī’ism, as it is incomplete and cannot fulfil the requisites of a religion.

If we add to these confessions the other confession which appears in their books, i.e. that they were ignorant regarding the rites of Ḥajj as well as ḥarām and ḥalāl until the appearance of Abū Jā’far ² (added to the fact that in his era as well as the era of his son, there were many who would fabricate narrations in the names of the Imāms) it becomes glaringly evident to us that most of their narrations were concoctions and lies. If the principles of al-Jarh wa al-Ta’dil are applied, they will return to the state in which they found themselves before the era of Abū Ja’far. They will not be able to learn the dīn except by means of the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Unfortunately, they chose not to apply their principles. Thus, we see them authenticating the book Nahj al-Blāghah, to the extent that one of their contemporary scholars said:

---

¹ Lu’lu’at al-Baḥrayn pg. 47
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/20. The entire text was quoted previously.
The Shīʿah, despite their abundant sects and differences, unanimously accept all of that which is in Nahj al-Balāghah to be from the speech of Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, relying wholly upon the narrations, trustworthiness and reliability of al-Sharīf. Denying their attribution to him (ʿAlī) is like denying the obvious, except for a few of them. All the sermons, books, laws, and etiquettes mentioned therein are of the same condition as that which is reported from Nabī ʿAlī.\(^1\)

The reality, on the other hand, is that the book Nahj al-Balāghah is questionable on the basis of both, its isnād as well as its contents. It was compiled three and a half decades after the demise of Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī, without any isnād attached to it. The Shīʿah claim that it was compiled by al-Sharīf al-Radī, who was not considered a reliable person by the scholars of ḥadīth as far as the matters of his beliefs were concerned. This was in the case when he produced an isnād. What can be said about his book, which does not even have an isnād? Nonetheless, the scholars of ḥadīth are of the opinion that the book Nahj al-Balāghah was, in fact, compiled by his brother, ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn.\(^3\) Ibn Taymiyyah says:

> The scholars are aware that most of the sermons in this book are fabrications in the name of ʿAlī. This is why most of them are not found in any of the earlier books and they do not have any known isnāds.\(^4\)

---

1. Al-Hādī Kāshīf al-Ghiṭā: Midrāk Nahj al-Balāghah pg. 190-191
There are many other signs which indicate that this book was a fabrication.\(^1\) However, we cannot afford to discuss all of them here. The crux of this discussion is that the Shī‘ah have stipulated the condition that the isnād should be unbroken and continuous, yet they authenticated this book, which has no sign of it. Their scholars (who accepted the methodology of authentication) have always been guilty of not upholding their own rules. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī states regarding their scholar, al-Ṭūsī:

\(\text{یقول: هذا ضعیف، لأن روایة فلان ضعیف، ثم نراه یعمل بروایة ذلك الروایي بعینه، بل بروایة من هو}
\text{أضعف منه في مواضع لا تحصی، وکثیراً ما یضعف الحديث بأنه مرسال ثم یستدل بالحديث المرسل، بل}
\text{کثیراً ما يعمل بالمراسيل وبروایة الضعفاء، ویرد المسند وروایة الثقاف}

He says, “This is unauthentic because so and so narrator in it is unreliable.” Thereafter we see him practising upon the narration of that very narrator. In fact, he practises upon the narrations of those who are much weaker than him on countless occasions. Many a time he declares a narration weak on account of it being \textit{mursal} (a narration whose chain of narration does not reach the Imām), but there are many instances in which he practises upon mursal narrations and the narrations of those who are unreliable. On the other hand, he rejects narrations which have complete isnāds and the narrations of reliable narrators.\(^2\)

Al-Baḥrānī’s (d. 1186 A.H.) confession, in which he admits that true application of their principles of al-Jarh wa al-Ta’dīl (despite its flaws) will result in most of their narrations being discarded, is outclassed by the claim of their scholar, al-Ardabīlī\(^3\) (d. 1101 A.H.). After compiling his book \textit{Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt} (in the eleventh

---


2 \textit{Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah} 20/111

century), he stated that the status of as many as twelve thousand narrations from the scholars of the past will now change. His exact words are:

بسبب نسختي هذه يمكن أن يصیر قریباً من اثني عشر ألف حدیث أو أکثر من الأخبار التي کانت بحسب المشهور بين علمائنا - رضوان الله علیهم - مجهولة أو ضعیفة أو مرسلة معلومة الحال وصحيحة لعناية الله تعالى، وتوجه - کذا - سیدنا محمد وآله الطاهرین

By virtue of this writing of mine, it is possible that twelve thousand or more narrations, which were famously known among our scholars to be unknown, mursal, or unreliable, will now be known and authentic. This is due to the help of Allah and the attention of our master Muḥammad and his pure family.¹

The author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb uses this statement to support his claim, saying that it is not impossible that the narrations of Taḥrīf were considered unauthentic by their former scholars on account of their lack of knowledge of the authentic isnāds, by means of which they would have considered all the narrations to be authentic.²

Al-Majlisī, in his book, Mirʿāt al-ʿUqūl, declares some narrations of al-Kāfī as unauthentic, even though he says:

فإننا لا نحتاج إلى سند لهذه الأصول الأربعة، وإذا أوردنا سنداً فليس إل للتیمن والتبرك والقتداء بسنة السلف

We do not require isnāds for these four foundational books. When we mention the isnāds, it is only to acquire blessings and to follow the path of the predecessors.³

This is a strange contradiction. Another scholar of theirs, Hāshim Maʿrūf states:

¹ Al-Ardabīlī: Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāṭ (the introduction)
² Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 354
³ Al-Imām al-Ṣādiq pg. 470-471
Classifying this amount of narrations from *al-Kāfī* as unauthentic does not mean that it is impermissible to rely upon them in the matters of religion.

If the narration is classified unauthentic from the perspective of its isnād, it is still possible that it is authentic on account of other reasons, such as; it is found in one of the four hundred foundational books or any other reliable book or it is practised upon by the scholars. Most of the jurists have clearly stated that if practising upon an unreliable narration becomes common, and it is relied upon, it becomes like the other narrations, i.e. it is authentic. At times, it even takes precedence over them, when they contradict one-another.

It is for this reason that their scholar, al-Shaʿrānī stated that although most of the isnāds of *al-Kāfī* are unreliable, its content is authentic. It should be noted that these are attempts by them to stay away from applying the principles laid down for them by Ibn al-Muṭahhar in the seventh century, which lays to waste most of their narrations, as admitted by al-Baḥrānī. However, they needed to prove that these narrations are authentic; otherwise there would be no point in having them recorded in ‘the authentic books’, the foremost of which is *al-Kāfī* – which was presented to their Mahdī. Thus, they hunted for any other sign to substantiate this.

Additionally, he stated that the narrations of *al-Kāfī* can be classified as authentic

---

1 They state that that *al-Kāfī* contains 9485 ḍaʿīf narrations, 5072 ṣaḥīḥ ones, 144 ḥasan narrations, 178 muwaththaq narrations and 302 qawī narrations.
Refer to *al-Dharīʿah* 17/245-246, al-Nūrī: *Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil* 2
2 Hāshim Maʿrūf: *Dirāsāt fī al-Ḥadīth wa al-Muḥaddithīn* pg. 137
3 Al-Shaʿrānī: *Taʿālīq ʿIlmiyyah* 2/123
if they are from one of the four hundred foundational books.\(^1\) However, their scholars are of the opinion that the four books as well as the other reliable books, such as *al-Khišāl*, *al-Amālī*, *Madīnat al-ʿIlm*, etc., are sourced from the four hundred uṣūl.\(^2\) So, how did they state that a narration of *al-Kāfī* should be declared authentic if it appears in one of the four hundred uṣūl, whereas the entire book is supposedly taken from them?

**The Status of the Imāms Regarding whom the Shīʿah Make their Claims**

It is no secret that most of the narrations in all of the books of the Shīʿah are attributed to the Twelve Imāms, with most of them being attributed to Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. Only a handful of narrations (which cannot be found without difficulty) are attributed to the Rasūl of Guidance.\(^3\) Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has even indicated that they stay away from the narrations of Rasūlullāh, fearing that they might be from the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah.\(^4\)

Thus, this sect has no interest in the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh. They do not wish to differentiate between the authentic and unauthentic narrations. Also, they have distanced themselves from the sayings of the Ṣaḥābah and the Tābiʿīn, due to which they are unaware of their methodology and interpretations. In other words, they do not wish to resolve their matters by referring to Allah and His Rasūl.\(^5\)

Rather, their interest lies in that which they falsely attribute to some members of the Ahl al-Bayt, not even all of them. Hence, al-Ṭūsī rejected the narrations of Zayd ibn ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn.\(^6\) As if that was not enough, they even declared a large

---

1 The scholars of the Shīʿah claim that their predecessors would rely upon four-hundred compilations which they referred to as ‘al-Uṣūl’. Thereafter, these books were summarized and gathered in certain books, the best of which are the four books. *Al-Wasāʾil* 20/67
2 *ibid* 20/391
3 *Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah* 20/67
4 *Mihāj al-Sunnah* 3/40
5 Refer to *Al-Istibṣār* 1/66
number of the members of the Ahl al-Bayt as kāfir, simply because they did not accept the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms. If only they chose to confine themselves to the narrations of Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ʿAlī, or the mursal narrations of the Tābiʿīn such as ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn! Instead, they chose individuals who appeared much later, such as the ‘Askarīs, and claimed that anything that was said by them was said by Nabī as well.

It is undisputable that the ‘Askarīs were no different to the rest of the Hāshimites in their era. They had no such knowledge by means of which they could have been distinguished from the rest, and due to which others would be dependent upon them. The people of knowledge would not study under them, but rather, they would study under the scholars of their time. This is unlike the cases of ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn, his son Abū Jāʿfar, and his grandson Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad, who were distinguished scholars, from whom students would acquire knowledge, just as they would acquire it from the rest of the scholars.

No influential or well-known scholar is reported to have studied under the ‘Askarīs. Despite this, these people wish to equate their speech to the speech of the Rasūl, who was sent to guide the entire universe. They wish to equate the speech of these individuals to the Qurʾān and the mutawātir sunnah. Who would accept this and base his religion upon such statements, except the one who is far away from the path of the people of knowledge and īmān?

Ibn Ḥazm commented on this claim of the Rāfiḍah saying:

As for those who appeared after Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad, we cannot trace any knowledge to them; neither narrations, nor verdicts. This is despite their era being close to ours. If they did possess this knowledge, it would have been known, just as the narrations of Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī, his son Jaʿfar, and others are from whom people narrate are known.

1 Refer to Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/372, Biḥār al-Anwār 25/112-114
2 Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/40-41
3 Al-Fiṣal 4/175
As for those who appeared before Jaʿfar, they possessed the same knowledge as their contemporaries. Ibn Taymiyyah says regarding those whose words are taken to be equivalent to the word of Allah and His Rasūl  by the Rawāfiḍ:

Among them is one who was a rightly guided Khalīfah, whose obedience was binding, just like the obedience of the Khalīfah caliphs before him was binding. He was ʿAlī ʿṣ. Then, there were some who were leading spiritual and academic personalities, the likes of ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn, Abū Jaʿfar al-Bāqir, and Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq. They deserve all that which is deserved by the leaders in knowledge and religion. Besides them, there are those who were of a lesser standing.¹

On another occasion, he explains who those ‘who were of a lesser standing’ were. He explains:

Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar did not narrate many aḥādīth. He reported from his father and his brother ʿAlī reported from him. Al-Tirmidhī and Ibn Mājah have recorded narrations from him. As for those after Mūsā, no knowledge was acquired from them. There are no narrations from them in the famous books of ḥadīth, no verdicts from them in those places where the verdicts of the predecessors are mentioned, or any tafsīr etc., reported from them. However, they did have the virtues and merits that they ought to have had. May Allah be pleased with them.²

It is as if Ibn Taymiyyah made a correction to the statement of Ibn Ḥazm, as he added Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar, explaining that a narration of his is recorded from him in the books of ḥadīth. However, his narrations are not many in number. Al-Dhahabī counted his narrations in the six books and concluded that he has two narrations in al-Tirmidhī and Ibn Mājah.³ However, a narration from his son, ʿAlī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā, is also recorded in Ibn Mājah, as pointed out by al-Dhahabī and Ibn Ḥajar

---

¹ Majmūʿ Fatāwā 19/69
² Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/155
³ Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalā 6/270
(who indicated towards it by a ‘Qāf’ under his biography).\(^1\) Al-Mizzī has pointed out that it is only one narration.\(^2\)

This narration is reported from Abū al-Ṣalṭ al-Harawī\(^3\), whose narrations cannot be used as proof. Al-Dāraquṭnī says, “(He is) a wretched Rāfiḍī. He is accused of concocting the narration of īmān in the heart.”\(^4\) This is the very narration which appears in Sunan Ibn Mājah from ‘Alī ibn Mūsā through Abū al-Ṣalṭ. It is for this reason that Ibn al-Samʿānī said, “The problem with the narrations of ‘Alī al-Riḍā is the narrators. Only the ones whose narrations are discarded have reported from him.”\(^5\) Ibn Ḥajar says regarding al-Riḍā, “He was outstandingly honest; however, those who narrate from him cause the problem.”\(^6\)

Perhaps this is what Ibn Taymiyyah was referring to when he said, “None of the scholars of ḥadīth reported anything from him, and not a single ḥadīth is reported from him in the books of the Sunnah. It is only Abū al-Ṣalṭ al-Harawī and his likes who narrate writings from his forefathers, in which there are such lies, from which Allah exonerated all the truthful ones.”\(^7\)

---

1 Al-Dhahabī: al-Kāshīf 2/296, Ibn Ḥajar: Taqrīb Al-Tahdhīb 2/44-45
2 Al-Mizzī: Tahdhīb al-Kamāl 2/993
4 Mīzān al-l‘tīdāl 2/616
5 Al-Ansāb 6/134, Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb 7/389
6 Taqrīb Al-Tahdhīb 2/45
7 Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/156. Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb contains examples of these ridiculous lies that Abu al-Ṣalṭ reports from ‘Alī al-Riḍā. Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb 7/388-389. One example is their narration in which he says:

السبت لنا، والأحد لشيعتنا، والاثنين لبني أمية...

Saturday is ours, Sunday is for our Shi‘ah, and Monday is for the Banū Umayyah. (Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb 7/388-389)

His narrations are reported in the reliable books of the Shi‘ah. Refer to ʿUyūn al-Akhbār pg. 207, Wasā’il al-Shi‘ah 8/258
As for those who appeared after ʿAli al-Riḍā, who was the eighth Imām of the Twelvers, there are no narrations from them in the books of ḥadīth. When Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī claimed that “the masses (Ahl al-Sunnah) have many narrations from Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī (the eleventh Imām)”, Ibn Taymiyyah rejected it saying, “This is a baseless claim and a definite lie. There are no famous narrations in the books of the scholars which are reported from Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī al-ʿAskarī by the scholars who were well known for narrations in his era.”

He further says, “The teachers of the authors of the books of Sunnah (al-Bukhārī, Muslim, Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasaʿī, and Ibn Mājah) were of the same era as him and they were not far from him. Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū al-Qāsim Ibn ʿAsākir had gathered the names of the teachers of all of them (al-Bukhārī, Muslim, etc.) but none of them have narrated from Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī al-ʿAskarī, even though they narrated from thousands of others. How can it then be said that the masses have many narrations from him? Where are all of these narrations?” ¹ I have seen that Ibn Ḥajar mentioned, under the biography of Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī al-ʿAskarī that Ibn al-Jawzī considered him to be a weak narrator in his book al-Mawḍūʿāt.² Look at the difference between this and the view that his speech is no different to revelation!

Ibn Ḥazm took the Shīʿah to task on the basis of a historical fact, i.e. one of these Imāms lost his father at the age of three. Thus, he says, “We ask them: Where did this toddler acquire all the knowledge of sharīʿah from, as he was way too young for his father to have taught it to him?” The only answer that they may offer is; through revelation. This would mean that he is a Nabī, which is clear-cut kufr. They will not go to the extent of claiming that he was a Nabī and that he was granted the miracle of his speech being corrected. Thus, these are baseless claims. None of them have ever come close to being a reality. Yes, they may claim that he was inspired. Anyone can make the same claim (thus, it holds no weight).”³

---

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/163-164
² Lisān al-Mīzān 2/240
³ Al-Fiṣal 4/172
It seems as if Ibn Ḥazm is predicting that which the Shīʿah were soon to add to their religion, or he was exposing that which they tried to hide. They have it in their books that the Imām receives both, inspiration as well as revelation, as explained previously. Their narrations also emphasise that children were Imāms. The following appears in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*:

عن ابن بزیع قال: سألته يعني أبا جعفر - رضي الله عنه - عن شيء من أمر الإمام، فقلت: یكون ابن أقل من سبع سنین؟ فقال: نعم، وأقل من خمس سنین

Ibn Bazīgh reports, “I asked him (Abū Jāʿfar) regarding a certain matter of the Imām. I said, ‘Can he be a child who is younger than seven?’”

He replied, ‘Yes, (he can be) even younger than five years old.’

They state that al-Jawwād became an Imām at the age of five. The pinnacle however, is the awaited one, to whom they have attributed narrations when he was only a day old. These have been quoted previously. These fairy-tales are all that a person needs in order to realise the extent of the nonsense in their narrations. The law which is established by the Qur’ān, the mutawātir Sunnah, and ijmāʿ is that it is incumbent to take care of the likes of these children as far as their wealth and lives are concerned. The responsibility of caring for them and protecting their wealth lies on the shoulders of the closest Islamic guardian. They are not even commanded to perform a single ṣalāh, as they are under the age of seven (which is the age after which they should develop the habit of ṣalāh).

When this is the law regarding them, how does anyone take them to be infallible Imāms, whose words are no different, in status, to the words of Allah and His Rasūl? Who holds such beliefs, besides the one whose heart is blinded by Allah? Even some of the sects of the Shīʿah (as stated in their books regarding sects) have rejected the Imāmah of al-Jawwād, due to his tender age. They were of the opinion that being mature was one of the conditions of Imāmah.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/103
To prove this, they state that if Allah commanded people to obey one who is a minor, then he would have also made minors accountable for their deeds (which is obviously not the case). Just as it impossible that a minor is taken to task, similarly it is impossible that he is able to judge between people, as there are some cases which are obvious, but others are intricate. In the same way, it cannot be fathomed that he understands the intricacies of the laws of dīn and all else that was taught by Nabī سَليْلَيْهِ هُدًى, which encompasses all the worldly and religious needs of the ummah until the day of Qiyāmah.¹

The result of taking toddlers as Imāms was that they were forced to accept the narrations of liars who attributed to the Imāms that which was not said by them, as they only met them in the state of their childhood. Al-Mamaqānī states under the biography of Muʿallā ibn Khanīs:

> إن المعلى قتل لأربع وثلاثين ومانة، والكاظم طفل لأنه ولد سنة ۲۸ أو ۲۹ ومانة، فعمره عند قتل المعلى ست أو سبع سنوات

Muʿallā was killed in the year 134 A.H, when al-Kāẓim was still an infant, as he was born either in the year 128 or 129 A.H. Thus, his age at the time of Muʿallā’s killing was six or seven.²

However, Muʿallā reports from al-Kāẓim, and the Shīʿah accept these narrations. Al-Mamaqānī explains this:

> وفيه أن صغرهم لا يمنع من علمهم بالأحكام، ألا ترى إلى إمامة الجواد وهو صغير فيمكن أن يكون المعلى سأل الكاظم وهو صغير فروى عنه

Their childhood does not negate their knowledge of the laws. Do you not see the Imāmah of al-Jawwād, who was a child? It is thus possible that Muʿallā asked al-Kāẓim whilst the latter was a child, and thereafter reported from him.³

---

¹ Al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shīʿah* pg. 87-88, Al-Qummī: *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* pg. 90
² *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* of al-Māmaqānī (under the biography of Muʿallā)
³ ibid
Further, they do not look for an isnād for that which they report from some of the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt, to ascertain whether or not it was actually said by him. This is because they have no knowledge regarding the ḥadīth and isnād.¹ The reality is that they do not have any Imāms who speak to them directly, besides their scholars who devour their wealth without any valid basis and stop them from the path of Allah.² This is why they found books that were attributed to their former scholars, without any isnād to them — as they feared the Islamic Khilafah (as stated by them). Thereafter, they simply told their people to practise upon them as they are authentic, as explained previously.

Their scholars would then accept all the contents of these books without scrutinising them. It was only in the seventh century that Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī began classifying their narrations as ṣaḥīḥ, ḍaʿīf etc., and the first book on the subject of ḥadīth terminology that was authored by them appeared as late as the tenth century. This too, was not appreciated by all of them, and thus we find the Akhbārīs opposing them. They expose and disgrace their brothers by admitting that this is nothing more than an attempt at imitating the Ahl al-Sunnah and copying their principles.

Many Muslim luminaries have testified that lying is an integral part of Shīʿī civilisation, and they believe it to be part of their religion, by virtue of the doctrine of Taqiyyah (as explained previously). Nonetheless, their fanaticism reached its peak when they accepted the narrations of established liars, some of whom even rejected one or more of the Imāms, simply because they upheld other beliefs of the Shīʿah, yet they rejected the narrations of those who were praised by Allah and His Rasūl, i.e. the Ṣaḥābah.³

There is no limit to the absurdity of their principles of commendation (of a narrator). Whoever claims that he saw the awaited one, attributes excessive lies

---

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/246
2 Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/134, al-Muntaqā pg. 163
to the Ahl al-Bayt, claims that he was guaranteed by them a place in Jannah or done anything extreme regarding them is considered by them to be reliable and trustworthy. On what stretch of logic is a person declared reliable due to the amount of lies that he speaks?

1 This is because they narrate from their Imāms:

اعرفوا منزل الناس على قدر روایتهم عنا

Know the stature of people on the basis of the amount of their narrations from us. (Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/50)

2 The Imāms guarantee of Jannah is one of the highest forms of commendation. Refer to Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 20/118, number 20, Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 381, number 714, pg. 567, number 1073, Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 98, 158. One example of these guarantees is that which they report under the biography of Abū Maḥmūd, regarding whom Al-Kashshī says:

روى عنه أحمد بن محمد بن ʿĪsā مسائل موسى - رضي الله عنه - (یعني موسى الكاظم) قدر خمس وعشرين ورقة، وعاش بعد الرضا

Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā reported from him the verdicts of Mūsā (i.e. al-Kāẓim). They amount to approximately twenty five pages. He lives after al-Riḍā.

He is declared reliable based on the following alleged narration of al-Kashshī:

عن إبراهیم ابن أبي محمود، قال: دخلت على أبي جعفر - إلى أن قال - فقلت: جعلت فداك تضمن لي عن ربك أن تدخلني الجنة؟ قال: نعم، قال: فأخذت رجله فقبلتها

Ibrāhīm ibn Abū Maḥmūd reports, “I entered upon Abū Jaʿfar... ‘May I be sacrificed for you, can you guarantee me on behalf of your Rabb that you will enter me into Jannah?’

He replied, ‘Yes.’

Thereupon, I grabbed his leg and kissed it. (Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 567)

The one who holds such beliefs regarding the Imāms is undoubtedly out of the fold of Islam, yet this very statement is taken by them as a reason to accept his narrations. Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq declared those who hold these types of beliefs regarding them as disbelievers. Refer to Mīzān al-Iʿtidāl 1/69-70.

3 Regarding a narrator of theirs, who was referred to as Wāṣil, Rijāl al-Ḥillī states that he is authentic. This is substantiated by the author from the following narration of al-Kashshī:

حذفني وصل، قال: طلبت أبا الحسن - رضي الله عنه - بالنورة، فسددت مخرج الماء من الحمام إلى البير، ثم جمعت ذلك الماء، وذلك النورة، وذلك الشعر ضرره كله

Wāṣil reported to me, I sought Abū al-Ḥasan by the plants. I blocked off the drain pipe of the bathroom, which was connected to the well, and thereafter gathered the water, the hair, and the plants; and drank all of it. (Rijāl al-Kashshī pg. 614)

Ibn al-Muṭahhar says:

وهذا يدل على علم اعتقاده، والسنده صحيح

This indicates the high level of his beliefs and the isnād is authentic. (Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 177-178)
Moreover, if a person studies the men in their isnād, in the light of that which appears in their books regarding narrators, he will see that the senior narrators and those who narrate excessively have been severely criticised and cursed by the Imāms. The Imāms would declare them liars and distance themselves from them. All of this is narrated in the books of the Shīʿah. However, the scholars of the Shīʿah disregard the sentiments of the Imāms on the feeble excuse of Taqiyyah, which, in these instances, is an excuse that is weaker than a spider’s web.

Besides the isnād, the texts of their narrations are highly problematic. As we have seen from the chapters and sections of this book, many of their narrations are obvious lies, for the one who has any amount of knowledge regarding Islam. This becomes all the more evident to the one who reads through Uṣūl al-Kāfī, al-Biḥār, Tafsīr al-Qummī, al-ʿAyyāshī, Rijāl al-Kashshī, etc. This is because they contain criticism of the Book Allah, defilement of the Sunnah of His Rasūl ﷺ, and they declare the best of people after the ambiyā’, as well as all of those who follow diligently in their footsteps; to be out of the fold of Islam. To make matters worse, they then try to establish such beliefs which cannot be proven in any way from the Qur’ān. Thus, a study of the texts of their narrations is sufficient to realise the status thereof.

وكل متن يباين المعقول، أو يخالف المنقول، أو ينافض الأصول فاعلم أنه موضوع على الرسول

Know well that any text which is definitely contradictory to the intellect, contradicts that which was passed on (i.e. the Qur’ān and Sunnah) or goes against the basics is a fabrication against the Rasūl ﷺ.¹

¹ Ibn al-Jawzī: al-Mawdū‘āt 1/106
Chapter Three

Their Beliefs Regarding Ijmāʿ (consensus of the Ummah)

Ijmāʿ is the third principle of the Ahl al-Sunnah, after the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Rasūl. It is relied upon in religious matters.¹ Hence Ibn Taymiyyah says, “Whoever accepts the Book of Allah, the Sunnah, and Ijmāʿ is from the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʿah.”² The Ahl al-Sunnah weigh all sayings and actions related to religion on the basis of these three sources.³ They are referred to as al-Jāmāʿah (the group) as al-Jamāʿah denotes unanimity, the opposite of which is alienation.⁴ However, the ijmāʿ that is being referred to here is the ijmāʿ of the pious predecessors, as after them the ummah split into many different factions.⁵ The Shīʿah, on the other hand, do not accept the ijmāʿ of the Ṣaḥābah, pious predecessors, or the rest of the ummah as a valid ijmāʿ. Their beliefs regarding this are totally different. We will discuss them below.

1. Proof Lies in the Statement of the Imām, not in Ijmāʿ

The books of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding principles have it that the Shīʿah accept Ijmāʿ as a proof, not because of it being the consensus of the Ummah, but rather on account of it including the view of the Imām. According to them, his statement independently serves as proof.⁶ Below, we will study the viewpoint of the Shīʿah from their sources. Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī says:

الإجماع إنما هو حجة عندنا لاشتماله على قول المعصوم، فكل جماعة كثرت أو قلت كان قول الإمام في
جملة أقواله، فإجماعها حجة لأجله لا لأجل الإجماع

3 Majmūʿ Fatāwā 3/346
4 Majmūʿ Fatāwā 3/157
5 However the word Jamāʿah is used (literally) for any group who gets together. ibid
6 Al-Isnawi: Nihāyat al-Sūl 3/247
Ijmāʿ is only a proof according to us due to the fact that it includes the view of the infallible one. The *ijmāʿ* (consensus) of any group, small or large, which includes the Imām, is proof, not on account of the *ijmāʿ* that took place, but rather on account of him (being amongst them).

The same was stated by many of their scholars. Thus, in essence, *ijmāʿ* cannot serve as a proof without the presence of the ‘infallible’ Imām. In other words, in *ijmāʿ* his view is taken as proof, instead of the actual consensus. Therefore, the reality is that they do not accept *ijmāʿ* as a proof. They only accept the view of the Imām as proof. This means that their claim of acceptance of *ijmāʿ* as a proof is nothing more than a meaningless claim.

There is no meaning to the statement of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī who said, “*Ijmāʿ* is a proof according to us.” If he wished to say something meaningful, he should have rather said, “*Ijmāʿ* does not count as proof according to us, as proof lies in the statement of the Imām.” This is the actual position of their madh-hab. The Imām, according to them, is equal to or greater than the Nabī. They believe that he receives whisperings in his ear, the angel comes to him, he sees figures who are greater than Jibrīl and Mīkā’īl and a number of other beliefs which we have already discussed under the section of the Sunnah.

When this is what they believe, they will have no need for *ijmāʿ* as long as the Imām is amongst them, just as the Şaḥābah did not need *ijmāʿ* whilst Rasūlullāh was present amongst them. They have a ‘Nabī’ in every era, who is referred to as the Imām. His statements are regarded as proof, instead of *ijmāʿ*. This is why they say:

ونحن لما ثبت عندنا بالأدلة العقلية والنقلية كما هو مستقصى في كتب أصحابنا الإمامية أن زمان التكليف لا يخلو من إمام موصوم حافظ للشرع يجب الرجوع إلى قوله فيه، فتمنى اجتمعت الأمة على قول كان

1 Ibn al-Muṭahhar: *Tahdhīb al-Wuṣūl ilā ʿIlm al-Uṣūl* pg. 70 (printed in Tehran in the year 1308 A.H.)
2 Refer to al-Mufid: *Awāʾil al-Maqālāt* pg. 99-100, *Qawāmī al-Fuḍūl* pg. 305, Ḥusayn Maʿtūq: *Al-Marjiʿiyah al-Dīniyyah al-ʿUlyā* pg. 16, as well as their other books on the subject.
Since it is proven, according to us, on the basis of intellectual as well as textual proof (as the books of our Imāmī scholars cover this in a comprehensive manner) that an era in which people are responsible for their actions cannot be void of an infallible Imām, who carries the sharīʿah in his bosom, it is thus incumbent to refer to his statements regarding it. Thus, whenever the ummah unites upon a view, and his view is included in there (as he is the master of the ummah and he is infallible), this ijmāʿ will be counted as proof. Therefore, ijmāʿ serves a proof according to us, only because it reveals to us the actual proof, which is the view of the infallible one.¹

The earth can never be void of an Imām, as they claim:

**لو خلت الأرض من إمام لساحت**

If the earth is empty of an Imām, it will sink.²

This means that the value of ijmāʿ will never be realised. If a person ponders over their definition of the sunnah and their definition of ijmāʿ, he will realise that there is no difference between the two, except their names. The sunnah, according to them, is the sayings of the infallible one, and valid ijmāʿ, according to them, is that which reveals the view of the infallible one. Their inclusion of ijmāʿ among the sources of sharīʿah (in their books on the principles of Islam), whereas it does not really have any meaning, is indeed illogical. They have stated that the views of their jurists, even if they are one hundred in number, hold no weight. One of their scholars writes:

**أما الإجماع فعندنا هو حجة بانضمام المعصوم، فلو خلا المائة من فقهائنا عن قوله لما كان حجة، ولو كان في اثنين لكان قولهما حجة، لا باعتبار اتفاقهما بل باعتبار قوله**

---

¹ Al-Naḥārīrī: *Maʿālim al-Dīn* pg. 406

² *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/179
Ijmāʿ, according to us is a proof when it includes the infallible one. Thus, if a hundred of our jurists do not hold his view, it will not be proof. However, if (his view is found among) two of them, it will be proof, not on account of their agreement, but rather on account of his view.¹

This means that ijmāʿ serves no purpose according to them. They have merely given another name to that which they refer to as the Sunnah. It seems as if this objection was raised against the Shīʿah in the early eras. Their scholars quote al-Sharif al-Murtaḍā, who stated:

إننا لسنا بادئين بالحكم بحجیة الإجماع حتى یرد کونه لغواً، وإنما بدأ بذلك المخالفون، وعرضوه علینا، فلم نجد بدأ من موافقتهم عليه.. فوافقناهم في أصل الحكم لكونه حقاً في نفسه، وإن خالفناهم في علته ودلیله

We were not the first ones to take ijmāʿ as a proof, due to which the objection of it being meaningless could be raised against us. It was the opposition who started this and presented it to us. We had no option but to agree with them... Thus, we agreed with them regarding the actual law, as it, in itself, is the truth. However, we disagree with them as far as its reason and proof is concerned.²

In other words, they are merely imitating the Ahl al-Sunnah. The author of Qawāmiʿ al-Fuḍūl goes on to state:

تنعدم فائدة الإجماع لو علم حال شخص الإمام خروجاً أو دخولً أو حال قوله تقیة أو نحوها، لكن الذي يسهل الخطب هو أن عقد باب الإجماع منهم دوننا كي يتجه علينا ذلك

The object of ijmāʿ will be lost if the position of the Imām is known; whether he is in or out of it, or whether he agreed on account of Taqiyyah or not. However, the matter is made easy by the fact that they are the ones who introduced the concept of ijmāʿ, not us. Thus the objection cannot be raised against us.³

1 Maʿālim al-Dīn pg. 405
2 Qawāmiʿ al-Fuḍūl pg. 305
3 Qawāmiʿ al-Fuḍūl pg. 305
The Ahl al-Sunnah have kept up to their principles. Ijmāʿ is given its due importance. The question is, if your belief of Imāmah demands that a concept like ijmāʿ cannot exist, why did you accept it in the first place? Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar offers another bizarre explanation:

إن الإجماع لا قيمة علمية له عند الإمامية ما لم يكشف عن قول المعصوم. فإذا كشف على نحو القطع عن قوله فالحجة في الحقيقة هو المنكشف لا الكاشف، فيدخل حينئذ في السنة، ولا يكون دليلاً مستقلاً في مقابلها.

Ijmāʿ has no academic value according to the Imāmiyyah, as long as it does not reveal the view of the infallible one. If it reveals his view in a definite manner, then the proof is actually in his view and not in ijmāʿ. Thus, it will then fall under the category of the Sunnah, and it will not be an independent proof like the Sunnah.¹

Riḍā al-Ṣadr says:

وأما الإجماع عندنا - معاشر الإمامية - فليس بحجة مستقلة تجاه السنة، بل يعد حاكيًا لها، إذ إنه يستكشف رأي المعصومين عليهم السلام.

Ijmāʿ, according to us (the Imāmiyyah), is not an independent proof like the Sunnah. Rather, it informs about it. The view of the infallible one is revealed by it.²

A contemporary scholar of theirs, Muḥammad Jawād al-Mughniyah writes:

أن ثمة تباينًا بين موقف متقدمي الشيعة وبين موقف متأخرين في مسألة الإجماع، حيث اتفق المتقدمون (من الشيعة) على أن مصادر التشريع أربعة: الكتاب، والسنة، والإجماع، والعقل، وغالبًا في الاعتماد على الإجماع حتى كادوا يجعلونه دليلاً على كل أصل وكل فرع، وعند المتأخرين أنظف الإجماع مع هذه المصادر ولكنهم أهملوه، بل لم يعتمدو عليه إلا منضماً مع دليل آخر في أصل معين.

There is a difference between the stance of the former and the latter scholars of the Shīʿah on the matter of ijmāʿ. The former scholars (of the

---

¹ Al-Muẓaffar: Uṣūl al-Fiqh 3/92
² Riḍā al-Ṣadr: al-ʾIjtihād wa al-Taqlīd pg. 17
Shīʿah) were unanimous that there are four sources of Islāmic law; the Qurʾān, the Sunnah, Ijmāʿ, and the intellect. They exceeded the bounds in their reliance upon ijmāʿ, so much so that they almost used it as proof in every matter; fundamental or subsidiary. The latter day scholars counted the word ijmāʿ amongst these sources as well. However, they did not pay attention to it. In fact, they would not rely upon it except if it was paired with another proof on an acceptable matter.¹

The above should not be taken to be a general statement, as there are some latter day scholars who also accept ijmāʿ as an independent proof.² Nevertheless, their scholarship recognizes ijmāʿ as a secondary source.

1 Mughniyah: Uṣūl al-Fiqh lī al-Shīʿah al-Imāmiyyah Bayn al-Qadīm wa al-Ḥadīth (this appeared as an article in the magazine Risālat al-Islām (year two, edition 3) page 284-286).

2 Their scholar, al-Shaʿrānī (who was given the title ‘the well-versed scholar’ by them) believes that ijmāʿ does serve as an independent proof. Al-Shaʿrānī: Taʿālīq ʿIlmiyyah ‘alā Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ lī al-Māzindarānī 2/414. Hence, the statement of Mughniyah cannot be accepted. However, I understand this to be another difference of opinion between the Uṣūlīs and Akhbārīs. We find al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī, who belongs to the Akhbārīs, stating:

كل ما هو مذكور في هذا البحث في كتب الأصول فهو من العامة ل دلیل علیه، ولا رجا له أصلاً.

Whatever is stated under this discussion in the books of principles is taken from the masses (Ahl al-Sunnah). There is no proof for it, and there is absolutely no explanation to it. Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah pg. 214.

On the other hand, the Uṣūlīs have researched this ‘principle’ and have established it in their books regarding the principles of jurisprudence, even though their belief in Imāmah does not allow them to do so. Al-Shaʿrānī, one of their contemporary scholars writes in support of ijmāʿ:

روى الطربي في الاحتجاج عن أبي الحسن علي بن محمد العسكري في حديث طويل قال: اجتمعت الأمة قاطبة لا اختلاف بينهم في ذلك على أن القرآن حق لا ريب فيه عند جميع فرقهم، فهم في حالة الإجتماع عليه مصيبين، وعلى تصديق ما أنزل الله مهتدون؛ لقول النبي صلى الله علیه وسلم: لا تجمع أمتي على الضلال.. قال الشعراني: وهو يدل على حجة الإجماع، وكونه دليلاً مستقلاً، وإمكان العلم به، وتصديق لصحة الحديث المشهور “لا تجمع أمتي على ضلالة”.

Al-Ṭabarsī reports in al-Iḥtijāj from Abu al-Ḥasan ‘Ali ibn Muhammad al-ʿAskarī, in a lengthy narration, “The ummah is unanimous, with no difference between them that the Qurʾān is the truth. There is nothing doubtful in it according to all its sects. Thus by uniting upon this, they are correct and by believing in that which Allah revealed, they are guided, as Nabi said, “My ummah will not unite upon deviation.” This proves that ijmāʿ is an independent proof. It is thus possible to have knowledge of it. It is a verification of the famous ḥadīth, “My ummah will not unite upon deviation.” Al-Shaʿrānī: Taʿālīq ʿIlmiyyah 2/414
Imām has not been around since the third century. Thus, how should his opinion, which will reveal the status of ijmā', be known? Their scholar, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī, as well as others from the Akhbārīs who followed his footsteps were of the opinion that it is impossible to learn of his opinion in his absence. Therefore, ijmā' can never be established, as one will never know whether he is amongst them. He cannot be traced since he went into hiding, so it is unknown whether he is in the sea or the land, the east or the west.1 The Uṣūlīs are adamant that ijmā' is established and his view may be learnt.

Al-Hamdānī (one of their scholars) states in Miṣbāh al-Faqīh:

The basis of taking ijmā' as a proof, as far as the view which is accepted by the latter day scholars, is that it neither has to be the agreement of everyone nor the agreement of all of them in one era. Rather it is based upon unveiling the view of the infallible. This is done by guessing2 his view from the verdicts of the scholars of the shīʿah who have encompassed the sharīʿah. However, this could change on different occasions. In some matters, the agreement of the Imām cannot be ascertained, even if all of the luminaries agree, whilst there can be certainty of his agreement in other matters, merely by them being popular.3

We learn from the above text that they figure out the view of their Imām through conjecture. Thus, guessing the view of the Imām, according to them,

---

1 Al-Ḥā'irī: Muqtabas al-Athar pg. 63
2 The Arabic word Ḥadas literally means the act of guessing. However, here they could be using the philosophical term which means refers to the very first thought that comes up in the mind when thinking about a particular subject. It is similar to the first glance or inspiration. Refer to Mukhtār al-Ṣiḥāḥ and al-Mu'jam al-Falsafī for further details.
3 Miṣbāh al-Faqīh pg. 436, al-Ijtihād wa al-Taqlīd pg. 17
takes precedence over the unanimity of the pious predecessors. These are the most illogical contradictions. They cannot be sure that a certain view is held by the Imām, even if all the scholars are unanimous upon it, yet they are sure that another view is upheld by the Imām simply because it is the popular view! These are principles which, on the one hand do not make any sense, but at the same time they are confessions that all of their scholars can unanimously opt for misguidance.

Although they have rejected the true meaning of ijmāʿ, they establish that the view of an unknown group is to be accepted and the view of those who are known should be rejected. This is the result of their love for adopting that which is abnormal. Their explanation of this is that the Imām is among the unknown. The author of Maʿālim al-Dīn says:

إذا اختلفت الإمامیة على قولین، فإن كانت إحدى الطائفتین معلومة النسب ولم يكن الإمام أحدهم كان
الحق مع الطائفة الأخرى، وإن لم تكن معلومة النسب..

When the Imāmiyyah have two different opinions; if the lineage of one of the two groups are known and the Imām is not one of them, the truth will be with the other group, even if their lineage is not known.¹

They go to the extent that they stipulate the presence of an unknown group as a condition for ijmāʿ to take place in the absence of the Imām. They state:

الحق امتناع الاطلاع عادة على حصول الإجماع في زمننا هذا وما ضاهه من غير جهة التنقل، إذ لا سبيل
إلى العلم بقبول الإمام، كيف وهو موقوف على وجود المجتهدين المجهولين ليدخل في جملتهم ويكون
قوله رضي الله عنه مستنداً بين أقوالهم، وهذا مقطوع بالمنظار، فكل إجماع يدعي في كلام الأصحاب مما
يقرب من عصر الشيخ إلى زمننا، وليس مستنداً إلى نقل متواتر وآحاد حيث يعتبر أو مع القرائن المفيدة
للعلم، فلا بد أن يراد به ما ذكره الشهيد من الشهرة

The truth is that it is generally impossible for ijmāʿ or its likes to take place in this era of ours, without divine texts; as there is no way that the view

¹ Maʿālim al-Dīn pg. 406
of the Imām can be known. How can it take place when it is dependent upon the existence of unknown mujtahids (so that he could be amongst them and his view hidden between theirs). This has definitely come to an end. Thus, wherever in the speech of our scholars, from the eras close to the Shaykh until our era, ijmāʿ — which is not accompanied by reliable narrations (mutawātir or acceptable āḥād) or indications which carry weight — is claimed, it is undoubtedly a reference to the popularity mentioned by al-Shahīd.¹

The most reliable view, according to them, is the view of the unknown group, who are almost non-existent. Since the era of Shaykh al-Ṭa‘ifah al-Ṭūsī, they could not be found. The only ijmāʿ that presently exists is al-Ijmāʿ al-Manqūl.² Perhaps this ijmāʿ did exist (according to them) prior to the era of al-Ṭūsī. How paradoxical it is, that the same group who disregards the ijmāʿ of the Ṣaḥābah searches for the view of unknown people and then practices upon it! The choice of disregarding the view of their scholars, despite their unanimity upon

¹ Ma‘ālim al-Dīn pg. 406

² According to the Imāmiyyah, ijmāʿ is of two types:

1. Al-Ijmāʿ al-Muḥaṣṣal – this is the ijmāʿ that a faqīḥ finds by going through the verdicts of those who were 'eligible' to pass verdicts.

2. Al-Ijmāʿ al-Manqūl – this ijmāʿ is not found by the faqīḥ himself. Rather, it is conveyed to him by another faqīḥ who found it. There could be one person or many people between him and the one who conveyed it to him. Further, it could be narrated by many people, which would make it equivalent to mutawātir. In this case, it is no less than al-Muḥaṣṣal, as far as being a proof is concerned. It could also be reported to the extent of an āḥād narration. When the Uṣūlīs refer to al-Ijmāʿ al-Manqūl, they generally refer to the second one. There is a difference of opinion amongst them as far as it being a proof is concerned. Al-Muẓaffar: Uṣūl al-Fiqh 3/101

Al-A‘lamī says in Maqtabas al-Athar that word ijmāʿ is used in a few different ways, according to the terminology of the fuqahā (of the Ja‘fariyyah). One of them is the normal ijmāʿ, which means that certainty is reached regarding the view of the Imām. A second usage is al-Ijmāʿ al-Muḥaṣṣal. Regarding this, he comments, ‘It is non-existent.’ A third usage is al-Ijmāʿ al-Manqūl which is reported on the level of āḥād narrations. He comments regarding this type saying, “This is accepted”. Maqtabas al-Athar 3/62
something is indeed commendable. However, their rejection of the ijmā’ of the Ṣaḥābah and the pious predecessors is nothing less than disastrous.

Then, in their application of what they refer to as ijmā’, they once again committed very serious blunders. Hence, the contradictions here turned out to be no less than the contradictions in their narrations. You will realise this by reading their books like Al-Istibšār, al-Biḥār and others. Even the view of one specific scholar regarding ijmā’ is not without contradiction. For example, they state regarding Ibn Bābāwayh al-Qummī, the author of Man Lā Yaḥḍūrhī al-Faqīh – one of the four foundational books of their religion:

> إنه ليدعى الإجماع في مسألة ويدعى إجماعاً آخر على خلافها وهو كثير

He claims that ijmā’ took place regarding a certain matter and thereafter claims that another ijmā’ (contrary to this one) took place. He does this often.¹

The author of Jāmi’ al-Maqāl says:

> ومن هذه طريقته في دعوى الإجماع كيف يتم الاعتماد عليه والوثوق بنقله

How can one who chooses this manner in claiming ijmā’ be relied upon, and how can his quotations be accepted?²

They sometimes go to the extent of claiming ijmā’ upon a certain view, which is in fact not upheld by anyone. Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī says:

> ربما يدعي الشيخ والسيد إجماع الإمامية على أمر وإن لم يظهر له قائل

At times al-Shaykh and al-Sayyid claim ijmā’ of the Imāmiyyah on a certain matter, whereas apparently, no person holds that view.³

---

¹ Al-Ṭarīḥī: Jāmi’ al-Maqāl fī mā Yatʿallaq bī Aḥwāl al-Ḥadīth wa al-Rijāl pg. 15
² ibid
³ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb pg. 34
Al-Ṭabarsī admitted that there are contradictions in their ijmāʿ. He emphasises this in the following statement:

(There exists) contrary ijmāʿāt (plural of ijmāʿ) from one person, two contemporaries and those whose eras were close to one-another. Sometimes a claimant retracts a verdict regarding which he previously claimed ijmāʿ. At times ijmāʿ is claimed regarding matters which are not specific in the speech of the one who preceded the claimant, and in matters in which the opposite became popular after his era, in his era or even before his era.¹

This is the statement of al-Ṭabarsī, who is a well-versed researcher of their books. He was forced to expose them on this issue, in order to prove his stance, on account of which he authored Faṣl al-Khiṭāb. He rejected the existence of ijmāʿ (amongst them) on account of its contradictions. Whilst his motive behind explaining this was completely incorrect, we have nonetheless benefited as he exposed to us their contradictions as far as defining and applying the concept of ijmāʿ is concerned.

Additionally, despite their claim that ijmāʿ is that which reveals the view of the infallible one, they do not apply this. Rather, they search for the unanimity of their scholars instead of the view of the infallible one. Thus, one of their scholars (whilst explaining that the view of the infallible one is the truth and not the independent unanimity of the scholars) laments:

والعجب من غفلة الأصحاب عن هذا الأصل وتساهلهم في دعوى الإجماع عند احتجاجهم به للمسائل الفقهية، حتى جعلوه عبارة عن مجرد اتفاق الجماعة من الأصحاب فعدلوا به عن معناه الذي جرى عليه الاصطلاح من غير قريبة جلية، ولا دليل على الحجة معتداً به

¹ ibid
It is surprising that the scholars are negligent towards this principle and they unscrupulously claim *ijmāʿ* when trying to prove matters of jurisprudence by means of it. This is to the extent that they use it to refer to the mere unanimity of a group of scholars. Thus, they have turned it away from the meaning which was stipulated for it without any strong indication and without any reliable proof that it is fit to be used as evidence.¹

On the one hand, they do not accept *ijmāʿ* in its true sense. On the other hand, they accept that it is one of the sources of sharīʿah (law). Thereafter, they go on to contradict themselves time after time as far as its existence and application is concerned. These contradictions reveal to us the false nature of their claims. To give you a clearer understanding of the difference between the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah on *ijmāʿ*, and their stance, understand the following; if Muḥammad al-Jawwād, who they believe assumed Imāmah at the age of five, held a view at this age of his, or if some Rawāfiḍ attributed a view to him regarding the sharīʿah, and the rest of the ummah holds the opposite view, his view will be accepted as the truth!²

Also, if anything is attributed to their awaited one, whose existence is rejected by history – which will be discussed, even through the medium of pieces of paper, and the rest of the ummah opposes him, his view will be taken. Preference is given to the one who does not exist, and the view of the entire ummah is totally disregarded. Al-Mufīd explains this:

فلو قال قوله لم يوافقه عليه أحد من الأنام لكان كافيا في الحجة والبرهان

If he says anything, but none else from the human race agrees with him, it is sufficient a proof and evidence.³

1 *Maʿālim al-Dīn* pg. 405-406
2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* states that the Imāmah of an Imām can be established even if he is three years old. Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* (Bāb al-Ishārah wa al-Naṣṣ ‘alā Abī Jaʿfar al-Thānī) 1/321. *Al-Irshād* (by al-Mufīd-pg. 298) and *Aʿlām al-Warā* (by al-Ṭabarsī pg. 331) state that he may even be less than three years of age. Refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/102-103 as well.
3 *Awāʾil al-Maqālāt* pg. 100
Does this need any scrutiny? Al-Mufīd boasts that this is a view held only by his sect. He says:

وِهْذَا مَذْهِبُ أَهْلِ الْإِمَامَةَ خَاصَّةً، وِيَخَالُفُهُم فِيهِ الْمَعَتَزِلَةُ وَالْمُرْجِيَّةُ وَالْخَوَارِجُ وَأَصْحَابُ الْحَدِيثَ...

This is the view of the Imāmiyyah only. They are opposed in it by the Mu’tazilah, Murji’ah, Khawārij, scholars of ḥadīth...

2. Guidance Lies in Opposing the Masses (Ahl al-Sunnah)

Ijmā’, according to all Muslims is the view which is agreed upon by the ummah, as the ummah cannot unite upon falsehood. Allah says:

بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ الْهُدٰى وَیَتَّبِعْ غَیْرَ سَبِیْلِ الْمُؤْمِنِیْنَ نُوَلِّهِ مَا تَوَلّٰى وَنُصْلِهِ جَهَنَّمَ وَسَاءَتْ مَصِیْرًا

And whoever opposes the Messenger after guidance has become clear to him and follows other than the way of the believers – We will give him what he has taken and drive him into Hell, and evil it is as a destination.

Nabī said:

1 ibid
2 Sūrah al-Nisā: 115. Thus, whoever opposes the ijmā’ of the ummah has chosen a path other than that of the Muslims. Refer to Majmūʿ Fatāwā 19/194. It is on account of this verse that al-Imām al-Shāfiʿī declared it forbidden to oppose the ijmā’ of the ummah. He arrived at this conclusion after a great deal of thinking and contemplation. It is undoubtedly one of the best and most accurate deductions. Some have objected to it and thus opined that it (the verse) should not be used as proof. Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 1/590. Ibn Taymiyyah wrote an excellent piece regarding this verse and ijmā’. Refer to Majmūʿ Fatāwā 19/178, 179, 192. Also refer to Tafsīr al-Qāsimī 5/459. Ibn Kathīr says, “The phrase ‘...and follows other than the way of the believers’ is attached to the first part. Sometimes opposition is of the texts of sharī’ah and sometimes it is of the consensus of the ummah of Muḥammad which is known without doubt. Their consensus is a guarantee against error. This is an honour that they have been blessed with and glorification of their Nabī. There are many authentic aḥādīth regarding this. Some scholars have stated that the meaning is mutawātir. Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 1/590
A group from my ummah will always be steadfast upon the command of Allah. Those who desert them or oppose them will not harm them, until the matter of Allah comes, whilst they are dominant over the people.¹

Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم also said (which is reported in many narrations):

لا تجتمع أمتي على ضلاله

My Ummah will never unite upon misguidance.²

This refers to the unanimity of the Muslims. As for the Shī‘ah, they search for the ijmā‘ of the Imām instead of the entire ummah. The deciding factor, according to them, is whether or not the view is from people who accept the Twelve Imāms. The Imām either has to be amongst them or their view should reveal the view of the Imām, as explained previously. There is no consideration given to the scholars of the ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ.

It does not end there. They go a step further by stating that guidance lies in opposing the ijmā‘ of the Muslims. Opposition of the Muslims is one of their principles as far as deciding between two opinions is concerned. It has become one of the foundations of their madh-hab. They have many texts which emphasise this ‘principle’ and encourage it. Uṣūl al-Kāfī records the following conversation with one of the Imāms:


¹ Muslim Kitāb al-Jihād 2/1524. Al-Bukhārī narrates a ḥadīth of the same meaning in Kitāb al-Iʿtiṣām bī al-Kitāb wa al-Sunnah 8/149

² Al-Sakhāwī says, “(This is a) famous text, reported with many isnāds and corroborations both from the aḥādīth of Nabī ﷺ as well as the sayings of those after him.” Al-Maqāṣid al-Ḥasanah pg. 460
"If we find one narration corresponding to the masses and the other opposing them, which of the two should we take?"

He replied, “Guidance lies in that which opposes the masses.”

I (the narrator) asked, “May I be sacrificed for you, what if both conforms to them?”

He replied, “Find the one towards which their judges and rulers are more inclined towards. This one will be left and the other one will be taken.”

I asked, “If their judges are inclined towards both?”

He said, ‘If that is the case, then delay the matter until you meet your Imām. It is better to stay away from the doubtful matters than to plummet into something destructive.’

Their ‘reliable scholar’, al-Kulaynī mentions that one of the manners in which a decision can be reached when the narrations are contradictory is as stated by the Imām:

Leave that which corresponds to (the view of) the nation, as guidance lies in opposing them.

Abū ʿAbd Allah says (according to their fabrications):

2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī pg. 8 (introduction), Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 18/80
If there are two contradictory narrations before you, then take the one that opposes the people.¹

Ḥasan ibn Jahm reports:

I asked the pious slave (i.e. the Imām), “Do we have any choice regarding those matters which have reached us from you besides submitting to your decisions?”

He replied, “No, by the oath of Allah you have no choice but to submit to our decisions.”

I asked, “How about the case when something is reported from Abū ʿAbd Allah and the opposite is also reported from him, which one do we take?”

He answered, “Take that which opposes the people, and stay away from whatever conforms to their (view).”²

They explain that the rationale behind this principle is that which Abū Baṣīr attributes to Abū ʿAbd Allah:

By the oath of Allah, you and they have absolutely nothing in common. Oppose them, as they have no portion of the true religion.³

---

¹ *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 18/85

² *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 18/85

³ ibid
The heretics, who thrive upon creating division in the ummah, have duped the ignorant ones (who divorced their intellectual abilities after filling their souls with that which they refer to as ‘sacrifices for the Ahl al-Bayt’, and intoxicating themselves with the unrealistic rewards promised to them for nothing other than ‘love for the Ahl al-Bayt’). They said to them:

إن الأصل في هذا المبدأ أن علیاً - رضي الله عنه - لم يكن يدین الله بدین إل خالف علیه الأمة إلى غیره إرادة لإبطال أمره، وكانوا يسألون أمیر المؤمنین عن الشيء الذي لا يعلمونه، فإذا أتفهم جعلوا له من عندهم ليلتبسوا على الناس

The basis of this principle is that ‘Alī would not worship Allah in any manner, except that the ummah would oppose him and do something else. They did this in order to destroy his matter. They would ask Amīr al-Mu'minīn regarding that which they did not know. When he would give them a verdict, they would attribute something else to him from their own side to confuse the people.¹

They contradict themselves yet again. They claim that ʿUmar would seek his counsel in every matter, minor or major. He would then accept it and practise upon it. They further claim that the Ṣaḥābah would consult him regarding all their difficult matters.² ʿUmar is reported to have said (according to their narrations), “May I not live in ummah for whom you are not there for, o Abū al-Ḥasan. May I not live to encounter a difficulty if Abū al-Ḥasan is not there to solve it.”³

Now, which of the two claims should we believe? These fabricators have no limit to contradicting themselves, as is usual with liars. Hereunder is another guideline to ensure that their followers can never bridge the gap between themselves and the Muslims. ‘Alī ibn Asbāt reports:

¹ Ibn Bābāwayh: ‘Ilal al-Sharā‘ī’ pg. 531, Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 18/83
² Refer to Minhāj al-Sunnah, where he quotes the speech of Ibn al-Muṭahhar regarding this. 4/160
³ Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib 1/492-493, al-Ṣadiqī: ‘Alī wa al-Ḥākimūn pg. 120
I said to al-Riḍā, “A matter surfaces, which I am forced to learn about. However, in the place in which I am, there are none of your supporters, from whom I may find out.”

He replied, “Approach the jurist of the area and ask him regarding your matter. When he passes a verdict for you, do the opposite of that, as the truth lies therein.”

One of their scholars comments on this narration saying:

Among the greatest bounties of Allah upon this true sect is that he cleared the path between the devil and the scholars of the masses. Thus, he misguided them in all academic matters, to the extent that opposing them has become one of our principles. Similar to this is the narration regarding women, “Consult them and oppose them.”

These texts are capable of causing colossal damage, and there is no doubt that they are from the fabrications of a heretic who wished to destroy Islam as well as the Muslim ummah. He attempted to open a huge door from which people can exit the fold of Islam, as they will rush towards opposing the Muslim ummah in every religious matter. When this is the case, then how can it make any sense that the same sect calls towards unity? Can there ever be unity if guidance always lies in opposing the Ahl al-Sunnah?

---

2 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: al-Īqāz min al-Hajʿah pg. 70-71
Analysing this View

Added to the indications made by us whilst presenting their view, we wish to elucidate further on the matter. Accepting ijmāʿ as a proof has been discussed at length in the books of principles. There it has been proven to be a correct and accurate view in a convincing and a satisfying manner. Thus, we will not delve into it here. As far as the Shīʿah are concerned, they accept it by name, but reject its reality.

Their contemporary scholar, al-Mughniyah states that the former scholars of his sect all agreed upon accepting ijmāʿ, and the latter day scholars have counted it as one of their proofs, but they have not relied upon it. This means that they have either opposed ijmāʿ, which they counted as one of their fundamental proofs, opposed the truth upon which their former scholars agreed upon or the former Shīʿah united upon misguidance. The reality is that the sum total of all the opinions is rejection of ijmāʿ, even though some of them make extensive claims regarding this, especially in their books on principles. This is because the claim of ijmāʿ, after scrutiny, is proven to be a meaningless one, with the purpose being defeated.

Added to that, the confusion amongst them as far as deciding whether or not ijmāʿ took place in certain issues is further proof that they are clueless on the issue. The greatest sign, however, is their stipulation (as a condition) that a scholar whose lineage is unknown should be amongst the group so that he could be imagined to be the Imām. Ibn Taymiyyah wrote this off as the severest form of ignorance. He says, “I have seen in the books of their scholars that if they have two different opinions regarding a matter; and it is known who held one of the views, but unknown who held the opposing view, they choose the latter as the correct view as they say, “If the man behind the view is unknown, then it must be the view of the Imām.” Is this not the worst type of ignorance?

Take a moment to get over this. They believe that their lack of knowledge regarding the person and the authenticity of his view is actually proof that the
view is authentic! Ibn Taymiyyah poses a few pertinent questions; on what basis do they decide that the second view is definitely that of the Imām? Why have they ruled out the possibility that he could have agreed with the other view? What convinces them that the unknown person had any idea on the matter, and was not just a scamp from the humans or jinn? Thus, they have established ignorance on the basis of ignorance, as their only proof of a view being held by the Imām is that they do not know who stated it! This is the end-result of the one who turns away from the light of the sunnah, which Allah revealed upon His Messenger ﷺ. He ends up in the centre of heaps of darkness.¹

Their scholar, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī (the author of al-Wasāʾil) refuted their stance² saying:

Their condition that a person of unknown lineage should be amongst them is most weird and bizarre. Which proof establishes this? How does that lead them to know, or even think that he is the infallible one?³

There is yet another question that begs to be asked. How is it that they have taken the view of a five year old, who is unable to take care of himself to be equivalent to the consensus of the ummah? In fact, they actually believe that the view upon which the ummah have consensus should be discarded and the view of this child (who does not really exist) should be accepted. This is the peak of misguidance.

Further, if one does some research regarding their ijmāʿ (which only exists by name), which supposedly reveals the view of the Imām, he will find but contradictions. One merely has to browse through the narrations of Al-Tahdhib

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/265-266
² He belongs to the Akhbārīs, who do not accept ijmāʿ as a proof.
³ Maqtabas al-Athar 3/63
and Al-Istibṣār to see this. This was even admitted by al-Ṭūsī in the introduction of Al-Tahdhīb. According to him, this is one of the reasons why many people are leaving Shīʿism.

The most important matter, according to the Shīʿah is the acceptance of the Imām. However, the different sects among them have disagreed on his appointment. There are strong differences amongst them on this matter, as explained in the books regarding sects written by both the Ahl al-Sunnah as well as the Shīʿah. Thus, how is it possible to have ijmāʿ when the foundation of the religion is being eaten away by differences?

Then, as explained, their claims of ijmāʿ are contradictory. However, their views regarding the matters in which they claim ijmāʿ and oppose the majority are totally ludicrous, whether they are related to the foundation matters or the subsidiary ones. Among these views are; their acceptance of the awaited one, who did not ever exist, their extremism regarding the Imām and his miracles and so on. We will discuss some of these in detail at a later stage. Ibn Taymiyyah says, “The Shīʿah do not have a single view upon which they agree.”

This is the absolute truth. The Shīʿah themselves admit it. Uṣūl al-Kāfī contains the following narration:

عن زرارة بن أعين عن أبي جعفر - رضي الله عنه - قال: سألته عن مسألة فأجابني، ثم جاءه رجل فسأله عنها، فأجابه بخلاف ما أجابني، ثم جاءه رجل آخر فأجابه بخلاف ما أجابني وأجاب صاحبي، فلما خرج الرجلان قلت: يا ابن رسول الله، رجلان من أهل العراق من شيعتكم قدما يسألن فأجبت كل واحد منهما بغير ما أجبت به صاحبه؟ فقال: يا زرارة، إن هذا خير لنا ولكم، ولو اجتمعتم على أمر واحد لصدقتم الناس علينا، ولكنا أقلّ لبقائنا وبقائكم.

Zurārah ibn Aʿyan reports regarding Abū Jaʿfar, “I asked him regarding a certain matter so he answered me. Thereafter, another man came to him and asked him regarding it. He gave him an answer contrary to the one

---

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/129
that he gave me. Then, a third man came and he gave him an answer that was neither like the one he gave me, nor like the one he gave the man after me. When the two men walked out, I asked, “O son of Rasūlullāh, two men from Iraq—from your Shīʿah—came to you and asked you (regarding the same matter), but you gave each one of them a different reply?”

He responded, “O Zurārah, this is better for me and you. If you all hold one opinion, the people will believe that it is your opinion, which will be shorten my and your existence.”

This establishes that it is among the core principles of their religion that (on the basis of Taqiyyah) their views should always be contradictory, to ensure (as they claim) that their enemies do not ever realise their actual stance. The truth is, this has resulted in their religion becoming a total mess, as they cannot pinpoint the ‘views of the Imāms’. When this is the case, how will they ascertain the view of the Imām in any matter?

Imām Abū Jaʿfar was undoubtedly free from all of their claims. This narration is another fabrication of the heretics, aimed at keeping the Shīʿah in the dark as far as the views of Imām Abū Jaʿfar and the other scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt are concerned. They do this to create space for themselves, so that they can spread their kufr and extremism. Whenever the Imāms exposed them by rejecting these heretical beliefs, they bluffed their public by claiming that the Imām was practising Taqiyyah.

The great scholar of India, who authored al-Tuḥfah al-IthnāʿAshariyyah states, “As for ijmāʿ, their claim that it is one of their proofs is baseless. They do not accept it as an independent proof, but rather take it as proof due to their belief that it contains the view of the Imām. Thus, the basis of it is the Imām, not ijmāʿ.” They also have differences regarding the infallibility of the Imām, just as they disagree regarding the appointment of some.

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/65
The ijmāʿ of the people of the first era (before the great fitnah took place) holds no weight according to them. The people of the first era were unanimous upon the khilāfah of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān, the fact that the possessions of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم could not be inherited by anyone, and the impermissibility of Mutʿah. However, each of these views is baseless according to them. When the ijmāʿ of this era is not accepted by them, then how can they accept any ijmāʿ that takes place thereafter (when differences and sectarianism plagued the ummah), especially regarding controversial issues which require sound proofs?

The author of *al-Tuhfah* then points out some of their contradictions, wherein some claim ijmāʿ regarding a matter but their claims are rejected and belied by others. Their scholar al-Shahīd al-Thānī (who is greatly revered by them) dedicated a special chapter to point out the places in which al-Ṭūsī claimed ijmāʿ, but passed opposing verdicts on other occasions.¹ The author of *al-Tuhfah* then quotes him verbatim.²

In essence, they ‘accept’ ijmāʿ because it reveals the view of the Imām, and not because they believe that the ummah cannot unite upon deviation, as believed by the Ahl al-Sunnah. The truth about them is that they reject ijmāʿ, as well as the narration which is established in their books:

لا تجتمع أمتي على ضلالة

My ummah will not unite upon misguidance.³

---

¹ Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿĀmilī (al-Shahīd al-Thānī) gathered forty rulings regarding which al-Ṭūsī claimed ijmāʿ but opposed most of them on other occasions. Some of their scholars go as far as claiming ijmāʿ regarding their personal views. Al-Majlisī explains the cause of this to be that they forgot the principles laid by them after getting involved in the subsidiary matters. Thus, they claimed ijmāʿ in most matters, whether there existed a difference of opinion or not. They did not even take into consideration whether or not there were different narrations. Refer to *al-Shīʿah fī al-Mīzān* pg. 323

² Refer to *al-Tuhfah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah* page 118, *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuhfah* pg. 51

³ Al-Shaʿrānī: *Taʿālīq ʿIlmiyyah* 2/414
We have already explained that this ḥadīth is established in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah as well. We wish to ask them: Why do they ignore this ḥadīth, which is accepted by both sects? Added to this narration, al-Iḥtijāj (one of their authentic books according to al-Majlisī and others) has a lengthy narration from Abū al-Ḥasan Alī ibn Muḥammad al-ʿAskarī. Part of it reads:

The entire ummah has agreed, without any difference between them that the Qurʾān is undoubtedly the truth. There is no doubt regarding this, according to all of its sects. Thus, in their agreement upon this, they are on the right path and by believing in that which Allah revealed, they are guided, as Nabī ﷺ said, “My ummah will not unite upon misguidance.” Thus, he explained that whatever the ummah unites upon and do not oppose one-another regarding it, is the truth. This is the meaning of the ḥadīth. It is not as interpreted by the ignorant and stubborn ones, who wish to do away with the commands of the Book of Allah, preferring fabricated and false narrations and destructive lowly desires which contradict the text of the Qurʾān and the reality of the illuminated and clear verses...¹

As you have seen in this narration, their Imām did not say, “Search for that which was agreed upon by the group with whom the Imām was and leave the view of the other group. Search for the group for who has a person whose lineage is unknown, as the Imām could be amongst them, or he could be the one whose lineage is unknown.” Instead, he said to them that the truth is in those matters in which they agree and do not oppose one another. He further explained that the basis of finding the truth is the Qurʾān and Sunnah, and that ijmāʿ is definitely a sign of

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 2/225
the truth as Nabī ﷺ said, “My ummah will not unite upon misguidance.” He even warned them of following false narrations.

So why is it that this sect persists upon being different and taking these false narrations? Why do they discard the view of their Imām and distance themselves from the rest of the ummah, belittling their ijmāʿ? Why do they prefer the view of a child, or a non-existent one over the ijmāʿ of the ummah of Islam? Do they do all of this to uphold the fabrication of a heretic, who told them that guidance lies in opposing the majority?

Thus, they took opposition of the Ahl al-Sunnah (who followed the footsteps of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ) to be the basis of salvation. If the Ahl al-Sunnah abstains from something, they grab on to it and if the Ahl al-Sunnah upholds something they discard it. In so doing, they have left the fold of Islam. They are clearly upon misguidance and surely they will gain everything but salvation.1

Allah ﻪ says:

وَمَن يُشَاقِقِ الرَّسُوْلَ مِن بَعْدِ مَا تَبَیَّنَ لَهُ الْهُدٰى وَیَتَّبِعْ غَیْرَ سَبِیْلِ الْمُؤْمِنِیْنَ نُوَلِّهِ مَا تَوَلَٰى وَنُصْلِهِ جَهَنَّمَ وَسَاءَتْ مَصِیْرًا

And whoever opposes the Messenger after guidance has become clear to him and follows other than the way of the believers – We will give him what he has taken and drive him into Hell, and evil it is as a destination.2

If this principle — guidance lies in opposing the Ahl al-Sunnah — was from the Imāms (as claimed by this sect), they would have been the first ones to practice upon it. The truth, which the Shīʿah scholars accept, is that ‘Alī ﷺ would not oppose the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ. Al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā explains:

1 Al-Ālūsī: Kashf Ghayāhib al-Jahālāt pg. 6
2 Sūrah al-Nisā: 115
He accepted their opinions, performed ṣalāh behind them, accepted their gifts, married their captives, got them married, and took part in the meetings.¹

He did not ever oppose them in a matter in which they all agreed. He would dislike differences, as reported by al-Bukhārī:

اقضوا کما کنتم تقضون، فإني أکره الخلاف حتى یكون الناس جماعة

Pass judgments as you were passing them, so that the people can remain together. I dislike differences.²

Ibn Ḥajar says, “His statement, ‘I dislike differences,’ refers to those differences which create fights. Ibn al-Tīn says, he meant he did not want to oppose Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. Others say that he meant such differences which lead to disputes and strife. This is supported by the other portion of his statement, ‘so that the people can remain together’.”³ The views of the Shīʿah, in which they oppose the rest of the people, are not in conformity to the guidelines of ‘Alī. He was with the ummah in their ijmāʿ, as this was guidance. There is no guidance in opposing them, as claimed by this bigoted group, whose only wish is to disunite the ummah.

This is why we find no answer to ʿAlī’s conformity to the ummah besides Taqiyyah. In other words, they claim that he was behaving like a hypocrite towards the Ṣaḥābah. Indeed Allah has exonerated him from their lies. This claim, added to it being rejected by the dīn, is a mockery of the intelligence of the masses and it is denied by history. The scholars of the Shīʿah were unable to find

¹ Al-Murtaḍā: *Tanzīh al-Ambiyāʿ* pg. 132
² Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (with Fath al-Bārī) 7/71
³ Fath al-Bārī 7/73
an example of ʿAlī’s application of this ‘principle’. Instead, as stated by al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (one of their senior scholars), they admit that he would agree with the stances of the ummah.

They cannot even prove his opposition of the ummah from the era in which he was the Khalīfah, in which Taqiyyah is discarded. They cannot deny that at this juncture too, he agreed with the views of the ummah. Their scholar, Ni‘mat Allah al-Jazā’iri says:

 ولما جلس أمیر المؤمنین - علیه السلام - على سریر الخلافة لم یتمكن من إظهار ذلك القرآن وإخفاء هذا؛ لما فیه من إظهار الشنعة على من سبقه، کما لم یقدر على النهي عن صلاة الضحی، وکما لم یقدر على إجراء المتعتین متعة الحج ومتعة النساء، وکما لم یقدر على عزل شریح عن القضاء، ومعاویة عن الإمارة

When Amīr al-Mu‘minīn sat upon the pedestal of khilāfah, he was unable to present that Qur’ān and hide this one, as it would entail showing a dislike for those who preceded him. Similarly, he was unable to prevent (people) from the ṣalāh of the mid-morning, just as he was unable to implement the two Mut‘āhs; the Mut‘āh of Ḥajj and the Mut‘ah of women. He also could not remove Shurayḥ from the post of being a judge or Mu‘āwiyah from the post of leadership.1

As you have seen, the Ahl al-Sunnah as well as the Shī‘ah, both agree that Amīr al-Mu‘minīn did not go against the ijmāʿ of the ummah. The Imāmiyyah have thus opposed him when they laid for themselves the principle of opposing the ummah. Thus, neither are they his Shī‘ah (supporters or followers), nor is he their Imām.

---

1 Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah 2/362
Section Two

This section contains four chapters:

1. Their belief regarding the Oneness of Allah as the Ilāh (deity).
2. Their belief regarding the Oneness of Allah as the Rabb (nourisher).
3. Their belief regarding the attributes and qualities of Allah.
4. Their belief regarding Īmān and its fundamentals.

Chapter One

Their Belief Regarding the Oneness of Allah as the Ilāh.

The meaning of the Oneness of Allah in terms of him being the Ilāh is that Allah should be worshipped exclusively, as He is the only one who deserves to be worshipped. Allah has no partners. Acts of worship should be dedicated entirely to Him. No act of worship should be directed, in any way or form, to anyone other than Him.1 This is the oneness toward which the Ambiyā’ invited, for the Oneness of Allah in terms of him being the Rabb was already acknowledged by their people as Allah informs us in the Qur’an regarding the invitations of His Messengers: Nūḥ, Hūd, Ṣāliḥ and Shu‘ayb to their people:

أَعْبُدُواْ اللّٰهَ مَا لَكُم مِّنْ إِلَـهٍ غَیْرُهُ

Worship Allah; you have no deity other than Him.2

Allah informed us that this was the message of all the Messengers. He says:

وَلَقَدْ بَعَثْنَا فِيْ کُلِّ أُمَّةٍ رَّسُوْلً أَنِ اعْبُدُواْ اللّٰهَ وَاجْتَنِبُواْ الطَّاغُوْتَ

And we certainly sent a Messenger to every nation, [saying], “Worship Allah and avoid the Ṭāghūt.”3

1 Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah pg. 16; Lawāmiʿ al-Anwār 1/29; Taysīral-ʿAzīz al-Ḥamīd pg. 36
2 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 59, 65, 73, 85
3 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 36
Elsewhere, Allah says:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِن قَبْلِكَ مِن رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا نُوحَيْ إِلَیْهِ أَنَّهُ لَ إِلٰهَ إِلَّ أَنَا فَاعْبُدُوْنِ

And we have not sent before you any Messenger except that we revealed to him, “There is no deity except Me, so worship Me.”

This is the foundation of success and the fundamental requirement for the acceptance of worship. Allah says:

إِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَ يَغْفِرُ أَن یُّشْرَكَ بِهِ وَيَغْفِرُ مَا دُوْنَ ذٰلِكَ لِمَن یَّشَا

Indeed, Allah does not forgive that a partner be ascribed to him, and forgives whomsoever he wills for any wrong besides that.

Do the Shī’a uphold this fundamental principle and foundational pillar? Or, did their beliefs regarding the Imāms impact the belief in the Oneness of Allah? This is what we will analyse below. I shall present the following seven discussions regarding the topic, Allah willing:

1. Their belief regarding verses which discuss the Oneness of Allah in terms of Allah being the only One worthy of worship; the integral most principle of Dīn (faith) and in which many nations have deviated. Their belief that the motive behind these verses is the establishment of the immediate succession of ‘Alī after the Rasūl without anyone sharing that privilege with him.

2. Their belief that the acceptance of all devotions is based upon believing in the Twelve Imāms and their Imāmah instead of the Oneness of Allah.

3. Their belief that the Imāms are intermediaries between Allah and His creation, to the extent that they deify them and supplicate to them in prosperous and adverse times.

1 Sūrah al-Ambiyā: 25
2 Sūrah al-Nisā: 48, 116
4. Their belief that the Imāms have the right of legislation, declaring the impermissible permissible and vice versa.

5. Their belief that the sand of the grave of Ḥusayn  is a cure for all illnesses, and a protection from all fears.

6. Their usage of charms and esoteric symbols to alleviate difficulties and chronic conditions, and their seeking of help for guidance from unknown entities.

7. Their seeking of goodness in matters that resemble the practices of Jāhiliyyah (pre-Islam).¹

¹ The last four points can also be included in Tawḥīḍ al-Rubūbiyyah. There is no doubt that the two are inter-twined.
Discussion One

Interpreting the Verses of Tawhīd to be a Reference to the Imāms

The first aspect that sends shivers down our spines is that they have re-interpreted all the Qur’ānic verses in which the instruction to worship Allah alone is issued to refer to the Imāmah of ‘Alī and the Imāms after him. As for the verses regarding *shirk* (polytheism), they take the purport of these to be ascribing partners to the Imāms.

a. First verse

As an example, *al-Kāfī* (the most authentic book of narrations according to them), *Tafsīr al-Qummī* (their best tafsīr) as well as other books which they consider reliable³ under the commentary of the verse:

وَلَقَدْ أُوْحِيَ إِلَیْكَ وَإِلَیْ الَّذِیْنَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ لَئِنْ أَشْرَکْتَ لَیَحْبَطَنَّ عَمَلُكَ

And it has been revealed to you and to those before you that if you should associate [anything] with Allah, your devotions would surely become worthless, and you would surely be among the losers.⁴

They state:

یعني إن أشركت في الولاية غيره

This means that if you associate any partners with him in Wilāyah (immediate succession and leadership).⁵

---

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/427, number 76
2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/251
3 *Al-Burhān* 4/83, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 4/328
4 Sūrah al-Zumar: 65
5 These are the words of al-Kulaynī in *al-Kāfī*
In other words:

لا يحتفظ لينكلي احذة احذة مع ولاية علي من بعدك لياتبعت عمالك

If you (O Muhammad) command that anyone be granted Wilāyah along with ‘Alī, after you, your devotions will become worthless.\(^1\)

The author of *al-Burhān fī Tafsīr al-Qur’ān* has quoted four narrations to prove the above interpretation of the verse.\(^2\) Regarding the revelation of this verse, they say:

إن الله عز وجل ببَلْغَ مَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيا مِن رَّبِّي شُكا رسول الله صلى الله علیه وسلم إلى جبریل فقل “أَنا أَدِيرُونَكَ وَاِنْتَ لَكَ، وَيَحْبَطُ عَمَلَكَ وَيَكُونَنَّ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِينَ”

When Allah revealed to his Nabī that he should establish ‘Alī as a symbol of direction for the people, Mu‘adh ibn Jabal sneaked in and said, “Add to his Wilāyah the first and the second (i.e. Abū Bakr and ʿUmar), so that the people be contented with your verdict and they believe you.”

When Allah revealed, “O Messenger, convey that which has been revealed to you from your Lord.”\(^3\) Rasūlullāh complained to Jibrīl, “People are belying me and they do not want to accept from me.” Thereupon, Allah revealed, “If you associate a partner, your actions will certainly become worthless, and you will surely be among the losers.”\(^4\)

We will now quote the verse that precedes this verse as well as the verse which follows it, along with the correct exegesis so that the reader realises the extent to

---

1 These are the words of al-Qummī in his tafsīr.
2 *Al-Burhān* 4/83
3 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 67
4 *Al-Burhān* 4/83
which they have gone in corrupting the dīn and in changing its most fundamental principle. Allah says:

قُلْ أَفَغَيْرَ اللّٰهِ تَأْمُرُوْنِّي أَعْبُدُ أَیُّهَا الْجَاهِلُوْنَ وَلَقَدْ أُوْحِيَ إِلَیْكَ وَإِلَى الَّذِیْنَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ لَئِنْ أَشْرَکْتُ لَیَحْبَطَنَّ عَمَلُكَ وَلَتَكُوْنَنَّ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِیْنَ بَلِ اللّٰهَ فَاعْبُدْ وَکُن مِّنْ الشَّاکِرِیْنَ

Say (O Muḥammad), “Is it other than Allah that you order me to worship, O ignorant ones?” And it has been revealed to you and to those before you that if you associate (anything) with Allah, your actions will become worthless, and you will surely be among the losers. Worship Allah alone instead, and be among the grateful.¹

The verse, as is apparent from its context, is concerning the command of dedicating acts of worship to Allah alone. They have changed the verse, and linked it to ‘Alī whereas there is absolutely no reference to him. They have interpreted the word “Allah” to mean ‘Alī, and the word “worship” to mean Wilāyah. The verse is quite clear and its purport is equally unambiguous. There is no link between the meaning of the verse and their interpretation thereof.

The scholars have explained this verse in the following manner:

Allah commanded His Nabī to say this to the polytheists when they invited him to the worship of idols. They said to him, “It is the religion of your forefathers.”² The meaning of this verse is, “Say O Muḥammad, to the polytheists among your people, ‘Are you commanding me to worship anyone other than Allah, O those who are ignorant regarding him?’” Since the instruction of worshipping anyone besides Allah can only be issued by a foolish ignoramus, He addressed them as “O ignorant ones”. Thereafter, Allah explained that the warning, “If you associate (partners with Allah) your work will become worthless.” was revealed to Nabī as well as the messengers who preceded him. This was to highlight the gravity and

---

¹ Sūrah al-Zumar: 64-66
² Ibn Kathīr narrated from some of the salaf that this was the reason behind its revelation. Refer to Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 4/67, Tafsīr al-Baghawī 4/284.
heinousness of shirk. The one who would never have done it was being commanded to abstain from it, hence anyone besides him should be even more wary. Thereafter, Allah says, “Worship Allah only instead”, i.e. do not worship that which the polytheists are instructing you to worship but worship Allah alone, leaving out all other deities and idols.¹

Thus, as you have seen, the meaning is quite clear and obvious. Only a prejudiced follower of his desires (who is blinded from discerning the truth) will accept another interpretation. The ultimate goal of those who fabricated this interpretation was to forge for themselves some sort of proof to back their claims regarding Imāmah. Unsurprisingly, they stooped to the lowest of levels. Their proof is not backed by the rules of language or reason. It is only a far-fetched hallucination that this kind of ‘proof’ can have any religious significance.

I do not consider it far-fetched that those behind this fabrication intentionally chose this type of ludicrousness with the intention of distancing the youth and the intelligentsia of the Shīʿah from Islam. When they see the illogical nature of these proofs and their likes, whilst believing that this is Islam, they will most certainly doubt the truth of Islam itself. This is in fact one of the long-term objectives of this group, who have been relentlessly planning and plotting against the Ummah and its religion.

A point that begs to be highlighted in the above quotation is their attack on the Rasūl Ṣallallāhu ʿalayhī wa sallam. They claim that he initially failed to uphold the command of his Lord, and thus disobeyed Him. In this way, they have tried to tarnish the image of the one who was truly infallible. The irony of the matter is that they are the same people who exceed the limits in claiming the infallibility of those who are not even Ambiyā’ (i.e. the Imāms). It should be remembered that bad-mouthing a Nabī is disbelief.² He is further discredited in the above quotation, as they portray

¹ Refer to Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 24/24, Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī 15/276-277, al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ (by Abū Ḥayyān) 7/438, Fatḥ al-Qadīr (by al-Shawkānī) 4/474, Rūḥ al-Maʿānī (by al-Ālūsī) 24/23-24
² Refer to Risālah fī al-Radd ʿalā al-Rāfiḍah pg. 6
him as one who was dominated by fear of his people owing to which he would hesitate in carrying out the commands of his Lord. Hence, they state that he did not change his stance until the warning of his deeds being void of acceptance was sounded to him.

b. Second verse

Another example of this kind of distortion is their interpretation of the verse:

فَهَلْ إِلَى خُروْجٍ مِّن سَبِیْلٍ

So is there any way to an exit?¹

This is a question that will be asked by the polytheists, to whom it will be told:

ذٰلِكُم بِأَنَّهُ إِذَا دُعِيَ اللّٰهُ وَحْدَهُ کَفَرْتُمْ

This is because, when Allah alone was invoked you disbelieved.²

In other words, you are facing this punishment due to your aversion (in the worldly life) from the belief that Allah alone should be called upon and your rejection of the Oneness of Allah. Conversely:

وَإِن یُشْرَكْ بِهِ تُؤْمِنُوْا

But when partners were associated with Him you believed.

Allah explains the reason as to why they will not be entertained when they will plea to be removed from hellfire, i.e. their refusal to accept the Oneness of Allah and their insistence upon associating a partner with him in worship, at the core of which is Duʿāʾ (invocation). Thus, this verse as well as the one that precedes is a

¹ Sūrah al-Ghāfir: 11
² Sūrah Ghāfir: 12
description of the punishment that will be apportioned for the polytheists in the hereafter. They will be doomed to hell forever, with no possibility of them ever emerging therefrom. They will beg to be returned to the worldly life, only for their plea to be ignored, since they associated partners with Allah by worshipping others along with Him.¹

The Shi‘ah, however, narrate from their Imāms an interpretation very different from that of the Muslims:

عن أبي جعفر في قوله عز وجل ذٰلِكُم بِأَنَّهُ إِذَا دُعِيَ اللّٰهُ وَحْدَهُ کَفَرْتُمْ بأن لعلي ولیة وَإِن یُشْرَكْ به من ليست له ولاية تؤمنوا فالحكم لله العلي الکبير

It is narrated from Abu Ja‘far regarding the verse, “This is because, when Allah was called upon alone, you disbelieved” that ‘Alī is deserving of Wilāyah. “But if others were associated with Him” who did not deserve Wilāyah, “you believed. So the judgment is with Allah, the Most High, and the Grand.”²²³

It is obvious that this interpretation is very akin to the interpretations of the Bāṭiniyyah. Neither do the words of the verse nor does its context lend any support to it. It is for this reason that the author of Majma‘ al-Bayān shunned these interpretations of his sect, which they allegedly report from their Imāms and explained the verse in light of its apparent meaning and the sayings of the Salaf.⁴ However, moderate views do not survive in environments that are dominated by Taqiyyyah.

There are many other examples of their erroneous interpretations, which are very similar to that which has already been discussed.

2 Sūrah al-Ghāfir: 12
4 Majma‘ al-Bayān 5/186
c. Third verse

We present to you a third example. This one is regarding the verse:

أَإِلَهٌ مَّعَ اللّٰهِ بَلْ أَکْثَرُهُمْ ل یَعْلَمُوْنَ

Is there a deity with Allah?¹

Their concocted narrations state:

قال أبو عبد الله أي إمام هدى مع إمام ضلال في قرن واحد

Abū ʿAbd Allāh said, “The Imām of guidance with the Imām of deviation in one era.”²

This narration and its likes create a fertile ground for the rest of their extremist views, such as taking ʿAlī as a deity, the manifestation of which we see amidst them from time to time. The reality is that this verse has absolutely no connection with their Imāms. Rather, the Oneness of Allah is being established, as Allah says (in the preceding verses):

قُلْ الْحَمْدُ للّٰهِ وَسَلامٌ عَلٰى عِبَادِهِ الَّذِیْنَ اصْطَفٰى آللّٰهُ خَیْرٌ أَمَّا یُشْرِکُوْنَ أَمَّنْ خَلَقَ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالأَرْضَ وَأَنزَلَ لَكُم مِّنَ السَّمَا

Say, (O Muḥammad), “Praise be to Allah, and peace upon His servants whom He has chosen. Is Allah better or that which they associate with Him? Is he not the being who created the heavens and the earth and showered for you rains from the sky, wherewith he produced orchards of joyful beauty? It is beyond your capacity to create of it a tree. Is there a deity with Allah? [No], but they are a people who ascribe equals (to Him).³

¹ Sūrah al-Naml: 61
² Biḥār al-Anwār 23/391, Kanz Jāmiʿ al-Fawāʾid pg. 207
³ Sūrah al-Naml: 59-60
At the end of each verse, Allah says:

أَلَيْهِ مَعَ اللّٰهِ

Is there a deity with Allah?

In other words, is there any other deity who is doing all of this along with Allah? This is a rhetorical question, the purpose of which is the negation of all other deities, as the polytheists had accepted that none besides Allah was responsible for the above-mentioned. The verse proved to them that the outcome of their own logic and understanding is that none besides Allah was deserving of being worshipped.¹

d. Fourth verse

A fourth example of these interpretations is their explanation of the verse:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِن قَبْلِكَ مِن رَّسُولٍ إِلَّ نُوْحِيْ إِلَیْهِ أَنَّهُ لَ إِلهَ إِلَّ أَنَا فَاعْبُدوْنِ

And we sent not before you any messenger except that we revealed to him that, “There is no deity except me, so worship me.”²

Those who fabricated the narrations of this sect wished to either challenge this verse or contradict it. Hence, they say (while explaining the verse):

ما بعث الله نبيًا فَإِلَّا بوليتنا والبراء من أعدائنا

Allah did not send any Nabī but to support us and dissociate himself from our enemies.³

---

¹ Sharh al-Ţahawiyyah pg. 25
² Sūrah al-Anbiyā’: 25
³ Al-Burhān 2/367, Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 3/134
Another narration states:

ولايتنا ولاية الله التي لم بعثت نبياً قط إلا بها

Allegiance to us is allegiance to Allah. No Nabī was ever sent but with this.¹

Thus, they made the essence of the call of the Ambiyā’ a call towards the Imāms who were not yet born.² Further, there is almost no verse in the Qur’ān in which the Oneness of Allah and the prohibition of shirk is mentioned except that they have distorted its meaning by way of these thumb-sucked narrations.

One of their scholars goes as far as claiming that this is a set principle regarding the verses of the Qur’ān. He says:

كل ما ورد ظاهره في الذين أشتروا مع الله سبحانه ربًا غيره من الأصنام التي صنعوا بأيديهم ثم عظموها وأحبوا والتزموا عبادتها وجعلوهم شركاء ربهم، وقالوا: هؤلاء شفعاؤنا عند الله بغیر أمر من الله بل بأرائهم وأهوائهم، فبطنه وارد في الذين نصبوا أئمة بأيديهم وعظموهم وأحبوا والتزموا طاعتهم وجعلوهم شركاء إمامهم الذي عينه الله لهم

All the verses, the outer meanings of which refer to those who ascribed partners to Allah in the form of idols which they crafted with their hands, honoured, loved, insisted on their worship, took them as the partners of

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/437

² To add salt to the wound, they attribute these claims to Ja’far al-Ṣādiq and his father, whom Allah had protected from this type of heresy. The reason behind this attribution was to hoodwink their simple-minded blind followers, who refuse to use their ability to think. Thus, along the course of their life, they (the followers) are bombarded with a variety of forgeries pertaining to the difficulties endured by the Ahl al-Bayt, merits of love for the Ahl al-Bayt, the fight between the Ahl al-Bayt, and the Ṣaḥābah etc. All of these tales leave the poor victim with a heart filled with hatred and rancour for the noble Ṣaḥābah as well as all other Muslims. It is thus necessary to dedicate a special study to the psychological effects that these narrations leave on the mind of the common-man and the incidences to which they eventually lead. This will reveal the dangerous nature of these forgeries. Once the cause of the trouble is identified, it will be easier to minimise its effects. Also, it will reveal the extent to which the Bāṭiniyyah connived against the Ummah and its religion.
their Rabb and said—based on their own whims and views, without any such instruction from Allah—‘These are our interceders before Allah;’ they are inwardly regarding those who appointed Imāms with their own hands, respected them, loved them, took it upon themselves to obey them, and made them partners along with the Imām who Allah had appointed for them....

The fact that they could stipulate this as a principle means that their narrations are replete with this nonsense. They have openly admitted this:

إنّ الأخبار متضافرة في تأويل الشّرك بالله والشرك بعباده بالشرك في الولاية والإمامة؛ أي يشرك مع الإمام من ليس من أهل الإمامة، وأن يتخذ مع ولاية آل محمد رضي الله عنهم (أي الأئمة الأثنان عشر) ولاية غيرهم

The narrations are replete with interpretations wherein associating a partner with Allah and worshipping others along with him are interpreted to mean Wilāyah and Imāmah. That is, to appoint an unworthy person with the Imām and to support anyone else alongside the family of Muḥammad 

In this way, the meanings of all the verses in the Qur’ān pertaining to the subject of the Oneness of Allah and the prohibition of ascribing a partner to him have been distorted by the Shi‘ah. The actual meanings of these verses are lost and converted to the Wilāyah and Imāmah of ʿAlī and the subsequent Imāms. They were not bothered by the fact that these verses were clear, definite, and explicit in their meanings. Thus, these interpretations are the key to all evil and the door to all types of trouble. This cannot be doubted for they are tempering with the very core of Islam toward which all the Ambiyā’ called, and for the

1 Mir‘āt al-Anwār pg. 100, 58.
2 Mir‘āt al-Anwār pg. 202
3 Ibn al-Qayyim wrote an important article on the damage caused by unfounded interpretations. He stated that the basis of destruction in this world as well as the hereafter is those interpretations that have not been sanctioned by Allah and His Rasūl in their speech, nor did they indicate that this could be its meaning. Refer to Iʿlām al-Muwaqqiʿīn 4/240-254
establishment of which their books were revealed. They were selected solely for this mission and on this very basis will humanity be segregated into the people of heaven and the people of hell.

Before concluding our discussion on this topic, I would like to point out a narration from their books in which these interpretations have been declared invalid, and their origin has been exposed. Their tafsīr, Al-Burhān states:

Ḥabīb ibn al-Mu‘allā al-Khath‘amī reports, “I mentioned to Abū ‘Abd Allāh that which Abū al-Khaṭṭāb says.”

He said, “Yes, tell me what he says.”

I said, “He says regarding the verse of Allah, ‘And when Allah is mentioned alone’, this refers to Amīr al-Mu‘mīn ‘but when those other than Him are mentioned’ this refers to so and so.”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh said (thrice), “The one who said this is a polytheist who has ascribed partners to Allah. I have nothing to do with them. Allah only referred to Himself. What about the other verse, in Ḥā Mīm which reads as, ‘That is because, when Allah was called upon alone, you disbelieved.’

I answered, “He claims that it is regarding Amīr al-Mu‘mīnīn.”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh exclaimed (thrice), “The one who said this is a polytheist who has associated partners with Allah. I have nothing to do with him. Allah only referred to Himself.”

---

1 i.e. Abū Bakr and ‘Umar

2 Al-Burhān 4/78
We have already mentioned that the interpretation of the second verse in the manner done by Abū al-Khaṭṭāb appears in a number of their reliable sources such as al-Kāfī, al-Burhān, Al-Biḥār, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī etc. As for the second verse, it is also interpreted by them in the heretical manner that Abū 'Abd Allāh refuted (as confessed by them). His condemnation of their interpretations has been mentioned by the author of al-Kāfī,1 and the author of Al-Biḥār2 amongst others.3 We have thus learnt that Abū 'Abd Allāh declares the scholars of the Shīʿah who accept these interpretations to be polytheists.

Besides these interpretations, they have many independent narrations in which this heresy is established as a principle of their religion. One narration states:

من أشرك مع إمام إمامته من عند الله من لیست إمامته من الله کان مشرکا

Whoever adds as a partner to an Imām who is appointed by Allah an Imām who is not appointed by Allah, he is a polytheist.4

There are many other narrations which echo this meaning.5 One of their celebrated scholars, who is referred to as al-Ṣadūq (the truthful one), Ibn Bābuwayh states:

إن الله هو الذي لا يخلیهم في کل زمان من إمام معصوم، فمن عبد ربًا لم یقم لهم الحجة، فإنما عبد غیر الله عز وجل

Undoubtedly, Allah is the One who does not leave them without an infallible Imām in every era. Therefore, whoever worships a Lord who did not appoint for them an Imām, then there is no doubt that he worshipped a (deity) other than Allah.6

---

1 Rawḍat al-Kāfī pg. 304
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 23/362, 368
3 Refer to al-Barqī: Kanz Jāmiʿ al-Fawāid
4 Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah pg. 82, Biḥār al-Anwār 22/78
5 As an example, refer to Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/437
6 'Ilal al-Sharāʿ pg. 14, Biḥār al-Anwār 23/83
In other words, if a person believes in Allah and worships Him with sincerity but he also holds the belief that Allah did not appoint ‘Alī as the khalīfah, nor did He explicitly state that ‘Alī should be the Imām; then he has worshipped a deity besides Allah. On the basis of these texts and their likes, they managed to declare as kāfir everyone besides themselves. Al-Majlisī says:

اعلم أنّ إطلاق لفظ الشّرك والكفر على من لم يعتقد إمامة أمیر المؤمنین والأئمّة من ولده عليهم السلام، وفضل عليهم غيرهم يدلّ أنّهم كفّار مخلّدون في النار

Know well! The usage of the words 'shirk' and 'kufr' is regarding those who do not believe in the Imāmah of Amīr al-Mu’minīn and the Imāms from his progeny, and give preference to others over them. This is clear that they are disbelievers who are destined to hell.¹

All of these claims have no basis in the noble Qurʾān. They are totally foreign to the religion of Islam. If they had any importance in Islam, they would have been mentioned in many verses of the Qurʾān, in an explicit and unambiguous manner. It is not possible that such an important matter was not explained to the Ummah in definite terms. Furthermore, Rasūlullāh would have taught this to the ummah in a convincing and clear manner, and the entire ummah would have narrated it from him, generation after generation. It would have been among the definite and well-known aspects of Islam, instead of being a tale transmitted by a handful of fibbers.

If there was any truth to these claims, the Šahābah—who spent their wealth, sacrificed their lives and left their homes, families and children for the sake Islam—would have not turned away from it or hesitated in the least in upholding it. The verses of the noble Qurʾān unequivocally state that the fundamental principle and the focal point of this religion is to believe in the Oneness of Allah and to dedicate all acts of worship to Him alone. Many verses can be quoted to prove this. Allah says:

¹ Bihār al-Anwār 23/390. A few more narrations will be quoted regarding their labelling of the Šahābah and others as kāfir on the basis of them not believing in their Imāms.
And your Lord has decreed that you not worship except Him.¹

And (recall) when we took the covenant from the Children of Israel, [enjoining upon them], “You will not worship but Allah.”²

Say, “I have only been commanded to worship Allah and not associate [anything] with Him.”³

There is absolutely no mention, anywhere in the Qur’ān of the Twelve Imāms. As we have pointed out, this is even admitted in their books. Thus, these false interpretations are a major innovation, which destroys our great religion from its very core. It opens up the doors and pathways to Shirk.

---

¹ Sūrah al-Isrā: 23
² Sūrah al-Baqarah: 83
³ Sūrah al-Ra‘d: 36
Discussion Two

Wilāyah is the Basis for the Acceptance of Deeds

In Islam, the basis for the acceptance of all actions is Tawḥīd, and they are rejected on account of *shirk* (associating partners with Allah). Allah says:

\[
\text{إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُغْفِرُ أَن يُّشْرَكَ بِهِ وَيُغْفِرُ مَا دُوْنَ ذٰلِكَ لِمَنْ يَشَاءُ}
\]

Indeed, Allah does not forgive association with Him, but He forgives what is less than that for whom He wills.\(^1\)

However, the Shīʿah have changed all of this to mean believing in the Twelve Imāms. They have narrations in which it is stated that the one who brings sins equivalent to the entire earth will be met with forgiveness, the pleasure of Allah, and the gardens of Paradise simply because he believed in Imāmah. On the other hand, if a person did not believe in Imāmah, he will be expelled from Jannah and thrown into the fire. They state:

\[
\text{إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَزّ وَجَلّ نَصَبَ عَلِیًّا عِلْمًا بَینَهُ وَبَینَ خَلْقِهِ فَمَنْ عَرَفَهُ كَانَ مُؤْمِنًا وَمَنْ أَنْكرَهُ كَانَ كَافِرًا وَمَنْ جَهَلَهُ كَانَ ضَالًّا وَمَنْ نَصَبَ مَعَهُ شَيْئًا كَانَ مَشْرِكًا وَمَنْ جَاءَ بِبَوْلِيَتِهِ دَخَلَ الْجَنَّةُ}
\]

Allah made ʿAlī the symbol of guidance between Him and the creation; whoever recognizes him is a believer and whoever rejects him is a disbeliever. Whoever is ignorant regarding him is deviant and whoever associates a partner to him is a polytheist. Whoever comes (to the hereafter) whilst believing in his Wilāyah will enter Jannah.\(^2\)

They go on to state in their narrations:

\[
\text{فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ عَزّ وَجَلّ تَبَيَّنَ عَلَیَّ مَا تَبَيَّنَ عَلَیْهِ وَصَوْمَهُ وَرَزَاَتِهِ وَحَجِهِ وَإِنْ لمْ يَتَبَيَّنَ عَلَیَّ عِنْدَ الْلَّهِ}
\]

---

1 Sūrah al-Nisā: 48, 116
2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/437
Whoever concedes our Wilāyah and whilst believing therein he dies, his ṣalāh, fasting, zakāh and Ḥajj, all will be accepted. And if he does not concede our Wilāyah before Allah, Allah will not accept any of his actions.¹

Abū Ṭabd Allāh said (according to their claims):

من خالفكم وإن تعبد منسوب إلى هذه الية وُجُوهٌ يَّوْمَئِذٍ خَاشِعَةٌ عَامِلَةٌ نَّاصِبَةٌ تَصْلٰى نَارًا حَامِیَةً

Whoever opposes you, even if he may be a great worshipper, is the subject of this verse, “[Some] faces, that Day, will be humbled. Working [hard] and exhausted. They will burn in an intensely hot Fire.”²,³

They claim that Jibrīl عليه السلام appeared before Muḥammad ﷺ and said to him:

یَا مُحْمَّدُ السَّلامُ یُقِرِّئَكَ السَّلامُ وَیَقُولُ خَلْقَ السَّمَاوَاتِ السَّبْعِ وَمَا فِيهَا الْأَرْضَيْنِ السَّبْعِ وَمَا عَلَيْهَا وَمَا خَلْقْتُ مَسْطُوحًا أَكْبَرَ مَنِ الرَّكْنِ وَالْمَقَامِ وَلَوْ أَنْ عَبْدًا دَعَانِي هَذِهِ الزَّمَانِ مِنْ خَلْقِ السَّمَاوَاتِ الْأَرْضَيْنِ ثُمَّ لَقَيْنِي جَاهِدًا لِلْوِلَايَةِ عَلَيْهِ لَا كِبْرِيَتِهِ فِي سَقْر

O Muḥammad, Allah has conveyed his greetings to you and has said, “I created the seven heavens and all therein and the seven earths and all therein. I have not created an area that is more virtuous in rank than the Rukn (Ḥajr Aswad) and Maqām (the standing place of Ibrāhīm عليه السلام). However, if any of my bondsmen supplicates to me (being there) from the time I created the heavens and the earths and then meets me whilst rejecting the Wilāyah of ʿAlī, I will throw him face-down into hell.”⁴

They go to extremes to emphasiae that the acts of worship of the one who does not believe in the Wilāyah of ʿAlī are void of acceptance. A narration states:

---

¹ Amālī al-Ṣadūq pg. 154-155
² Sūrah al-Ghāshiyah: 2-4
³ Tafsīr al-Qummī 2/419
⁴ Amālī al-Ṣadūq pg. 290, Biḥār al-Anwār 27/167
If he prostrates until his neck snaps, then too Allah will not accept anything except (that which is done) after believing in our Wilāyah.

As if attributing lies to Jibrīl is not enough, they go on to state that Allah said:

O Muḥammad, if a slave exhausts himself by worshipping me to an extent where he becomes like a water-skin (lean and weak), but he comes to me rejecting their Wilāyah, I will not grant him residence in my heaven and nor will I grant him shade under my ʿArsh.¹

They attribute the following forgeries to the Rasūl:

If one of you comes on the Day of Judgment with good deeds the size of mountains, but comes without believing in the Wilāyah of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Allah will throw him headlong into hell.²

If a slave comes on the Day of Judgment with the actions of seventy Ambiyā”, Allah will not accept from him unless he meets Him (believing in) my Wilāyah and the Wilāyah of my household.³

They believe that Tawḥīd itself cannot be accepted if it is not accompanied by the belief in Wilāyah. One of their narrations states:

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 27/169
2 Amālī al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī 1/314
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 27/172
Rasūl Allah said, “Whoever says, ‘There is no deity besides Allah’ will enter paradise.”

Thereupon, two men from his companions said, “We say, ‘There is no deity besides Allah’.

The Rasūl of Allah replied, “The testimony that there is no deity besides Allah is only accepted from this one (pointing to ʿAlī) and his followers.”

Then he placed his hand on the head of ʿAlī and said, “The sign of that (of your allegiance to him) is that you do not occupy his position and you do not belie him.”

This means that, according to them, Wilāyah takes precedence over the Shahādatayn (the testimonies of faith) and it is the basis of their acceptance. Shahādatayn will not be accepted from anyone besides the “followers of ʿAlī”. Belief in the doctrine of Imāmah is that which draws Allah’s pardon and forgiveness and rejecting it is the cause of His anger and punishment. Many narrations have been reported by the Shīʿah to establish this. They report from ʿAlī, who reports from the Rasūl who in turn reports from Jibrīl, who quotes Allah as saying:

By my honour and grandeur I will punish all people who lived under an undeserving Imām who was not appointed by Allah, even if they were pious

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 27/201
and good; and I will overlook all people who lived under a rightful Imām who was appointed by Allah, even if their actions were evil and wicked.¹

They have a huge amount of narrations regarding this belief, most of which are mentioned by the author of Biḥār al-Anwār, e.g. under the chapter, ‘They are the people of Aʿrāf...none will enter Jannah, except those who recognize them and whom they recognize’², he has cited twenty narrations. Thereafter, he has quoted seventy one narrations under the chapter, ‘Actions are not accepted except by believing in Wilāyah.’³

None of these narrations have any basis in Islam. The Book of Allah is in our midst. It does not contain any of their claims. It is the original source and the ultimate judge in any Islamic matter. The noble Qurʾān states that the basis for the acceptance of actions is Tawḥīd and the basis for rejection thereof is shirk. Allah says:

إِنَّهُ مَن يُّشْرِكْ بِاللّٰهِ فَقَدْ حَرَّمَ اللّٰهُ عَلَیْهِ الْجَنَّةَ وَمَأْوَاهُ النَّارُ

Indeed, he who associates others with Allah, Allah has forbidden for him Paradise, and his refuge is the Fire.⁴

إِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يَغْفِرُ أَنْ يُّشْرِكَ بِهِ وَيَغْفِرُ مَا دُوْنَ ذٰلِكَ لِمَنْ يَّشَآءُ

Indeed, Allah does not forgive association with Him, but He forgives anything besides that for whom He wills.⁵

The heresy of the Shīʿah is refuted in the Qurʾān. Allah says:

---

¹ Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah pg. 83, Biḥār al-Anwār 27/201
² Biḥār al-Anwār 24/247-256
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 27/166-202
⁴ Sūrah al-Māʾidah: 72
⁵ Sūrah al-Nisā: 48
They claim that believing in the Twelve Imāms is more important in Islam than şalāh and the other fundamentals. This is despite the fact that şalāh is explicitly mentioned in no less than eighty places in the Qur’ān, whereas their doctrine is not even mentioned once. The question that faces them is: Did Allah wish to misguide his creation or did he fail to explicate the formula of success to them. Exalted is Allah from these shameless slanders! He says:

And Allah would not let a people stray after He has guided them until He makes clear to them what they should avoid.

As usual, there are narrations which contradict the above quoted claims, but on account of its moderate nature they are quickly buried, forgotten, or brushed off as Taqiyyah by them. I will nonetheless mention them to highlight the contradictions that exist in their texts. Tafsīr al-Furāt states:

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 62
2 Sūrah al-Mā‘īdah: 69
3 Refer to the chapter of Imāmah in this book.
4 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 115
'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib said, “I heard Rasūl Allah  saying upon the revelation of the verse, ‘Say, ‘I do not ask you for it (this message) any payment but only affection due to kinship.’” Jibrīl said, ‘O Muḥammad, every religion has a basis and foundation upon which rests its branches and structure. The foundation and basis of religion is the utterance of ‘There is no deity besides Allah’ and its branches and structure is the love for you the Ahl al-Bayt in matters that conform to the truth and advocate it.’”

This text goes against their narrations, as it confirms that the basis of the religion is the declaration of Tawḥīd, instead of Wilāyah and it also states that loving the Ahl al-Bayt is only a branch, which is conditional to their conformity to the truth.

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 23
2 Tafsīr Furāt pg. 148-149, Bihār al-Anwār 23/247
Discussion Three

Their Belief that the Imāms are the Intermediaries between Allah and the creation

The Shi‘ah claim that their twelve Imāms are the intermediaries between Allah and His creation. Al-Majlisī says regarding his Imāms:

فإنهم حجب الرب والوسائط بينه وبين الخلق

They are the veils of the lord and the intermediaries between Him and the creation.\(^1\)

In fact, he dedicated an entire chapter to this claim titled, ‘People cannot be guided except through them and they are the intermediaries between the creation and Allah and none will enter Jannah except those who recognised them.’\(^2\) One of their narrations state that Abu ʿAbd Allāh said:

نحن السبب بينكم وبين الله عزّ وجلّ

We are the intermediate between you and Allah.\(^3\)

In the book ‘Aqāʾid al-Imāmiyyah, it is stated that the twelve Imāms are:

أبواب الله والسبل إليه... إنهم كسفينة نوح من ركبها نجا ومن تخلف عنها غرق

The doors and the pathways that lead to Allah... They are like the ship of Nūḥ. Whoever climbs aboard will be saved and whoever stays behind will drown.\(^4\)

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 23/97
2 ibid
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 23/101
4 ‘Aqāʾid al-Imāmah by al-Muẓaffar pg. 98-99
Furthermore, the Muslims believe that the Ambiyā’ are the ones who convey the message and commands of Allah to His creation. The Imāmiyyah, on the other hand, believe that this responsibility lies upon the shoulders of the Imāms as well. According to them, the Imāms receive revelation from Allah, as explained under the chapter regarding their beliefs regarding the Sunnah. That is not all: they even attribute to them such things which a Muslim believes to be the doing of Allah alone. This removes the one who believes in them from the religion of Tawḥīd to the religion of shirk.

A few examples of these polytheistic beliefs and acts are:

- Believing that the guidance of the creation lies in the hands of the Imāms,
- Supplications are not accepted unless their names are invoked,
- They are to be called for help at the time of difficulty,
- Pilgrimage is carried out to their graves,
- Ḥajj to their graves is greater than to the House of Allah (which Allah made as a sign for humanity),
- Karbalā’ has more sanctity than the Ka’bah,
- The visitation of these graves have rites that are necessary to carry out (which are referred to as Manāsik al-Mashāhid),
- Ṭawāf is done of these graves and they are taken as the Qiblah just like the sanctified House of Allah.

If Allah permits, I will quote for you these beliefs, without any dishonesty, from the reliable books of the Shi‘ah. However, before presenting these quotations, I would like to highlight the fact that the concept of an intermediate between Allah and His creation is one that is completely foreign to Islamic teachings. Rather, it is a doctrine that was upheld by the polytheists. The very purpose of the Ambiyā’ was to liberate humanity from this type of polytheism. There are no barriers between a Muslim and his Lord. He does not need to turn to an intermediary
when carrying out acts of worship or supplication. Allah says:

وَإِذَا سَأَلَكَ عِبَادِيْ عَنِّيْ فَإِنِّي قَرِيْبٌ أُجِیْبُ دَعْوَةَ الدَّاعِ إِذَا دَعَانِ فَلْیَسْتَجِیبُواْ لِيْ وَلْیُؤْمِنُواْ بِيْ لَعَلَّهُمْ

And when my servants ask you concerning me—indeed I am near. I respond to the invocations of the caller when he calls upon me. So let them respond to me [by obedience] and believe in me so that they be [rightly] guided.¹

سُوْرَة الْبَقْرَةِ: ۱٨٦

And your Rabb says, “Call upon me; I will respond to you.” Indeed, those who disdain my worship will enter Hell contemptibly.²

سُوْرَة الْغَفْرَٰنِ: ۶٠

The people of knowledge are unanimous upon the fact that the one who places an intermediary between himself and Allah by relying upon him, asking him to fulfil his needs or supplicating to him has committed shirk and left the fold of Islam, as these were the beliefs of the polytheists. Allah relates the excuse that they would present for their acts:

مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّ لِیُقَرِّبُوْنَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفٰى

We only worship them so that they bring us nearer to Allah in position.³

سُوْرَة الْزُّمُرَ: ۳

When Ibn Taymiyah was asked regarding one who says, “It is necessary for us to have an intermediary between us and Allah, as we cannot reach Him except through it,” he replied:

If he means that we need someone to convey the laws of Allah, then this is correct. The creation cannot learn about the pleasure of Allah, His

¹ Sūrah al-Baqarah: 186
² Sūrah Ghāfir: 60
³ Sūrah al-Zumar: 3
commandments and prohibitions except through the Messengers, who were sent by Allah to His creation. This is a fact that is agreed upon by the Muslims, Jews and Christians. All establish this intermediary between Allah and his creation. They are undoubtedly the Messengers of Allah who conveyed His commandments and prohibitions. Allah says:

اللَّهُ یَصْطَفِی مِنَ الْمَلائِکَةِ رُسُلاً وَمِنَ النَّاسِ

Allah chooses from the angels Messengers and from the people.¹

Whoever rejects these intermediaries is a disbeliever according to all the religions.

On the other hand, if he means that it is necessary for the slaves of Allah to have an intermediary between them and Allah to whom they should supplicate and from whom they should seek favours so as to draw good and repel harm (for example he believes that the intermediary can provide sustenance for people, help them and guide them), then this is from the most sever forms of shirk, due to which Allah declared the polytheists as disbelievers. This (declaration) was on account of them taking others as guardians and intercessors. They would attempt to draw good towards themselves and ward off evil by means of these deities.

Thus, the one who takes the messengers, angels, A’immah, or pious personalities as intermediaries and supplicates to them, depends on them, asks them for goodness or to repel evil (e.g. he asks them to forgive sins, guide hearts, remove difficulties or eliminate poverty) is a disbeliever according the consensus of the Muslims.

He goes on to say:

Whoever establishes intermediaries between Allah and His creation, like the intermediaries between a king and his people (i.e. in the sense that

---

¹ Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 75
they are the ones who present to Allah the needs of the creation and Allah
guides the creation, helps them and provides for them as the creation
asks them and they ask Allah just as the intermediaries in the court of
the king are requested to ask the king for the needs of the people due
to their closeness to him and the awe that is maintained for him by the
public or because their requests hold greater weight) is a disbeliever and a
polytheist. It is necessary to ask him to repent. If he repents (then he will
become a Muslim), otherwise he will be killed.¹

Now, I will present the texts that I indicated to—in which polytheism is upheld
and called towards, so that the polytheism that is hidden in Twelver Shi‘ism may
be seen in its true form.

a. Their belief that the guidance of mankind lies in the hands of the
Imāms

Abū ‘Abd Allāh says (as they allege):

بلیة الناس عظیمة إن دعوناهم لم یجیبونا وإن ترکناهم لم یهتدوا بغیرنا

The calamity of the people is great. If we call them, they do not respond to
our call and if we leave them they will not be guided without us.²

This quotation establishes that people cannot be guided except through the
Imāms, and that people are undergoing perpetual difficulty on account of not
responding to the call of the Imāms. Both of these claims (confining the guidance
of the people to the Imāms and claiming that everyone is upon misguidance)
are baseless lies. They go against divine texts, reason as well as reality. Another
narration states:

1 Ibn Taymiyyah: Majmū‘ Fatāwā 1/121. Also refer to Abū Baṭīn: Al-Intiṣār lī Ḥizb Allah al-Muwaḥḥidīn pg.
30-31, killing a renegade can only take place in a legitimate Islamic state.
2 Amālī al-Ṣadūq pg. 363, Biḥār al-Anwār 23/99
Abū ‘Abd Allāh said, “It is only by means of us that Allah is worshipped, recognised, and taken as one who is free from partners.”

In this text, guidance is not just confined to the Imāms, but they are even declared its source. The truth is that guidance—in the sense that one is given the ability to accept the truth—is distributed only by Allah, the Rabb and the controller of hearts. He may intervene between a man and his heart and when He wishes for anything to happen he merely says “Be!” and it becomes. The Shīʿah, by stating these narrations without any clauses, have made their Imāms partners with Allah as far as granting guidance is concerned. This is the greatest form of shirk. Allah alone is the One who guides. He has no partners.

Allah says:

من يهدي الله فهو المهدي ومن يضل فلا تنجد له وليا مدرسا

He whom Allah guides is the guided, but he whom He leaves astray – never will you find for him a protecting guide.\(^2\)

Allah addressed His Nabī saying:

إنك لا تهدي من أحببت ولكن الله يهدي من يحبه

Indeed you do not guide whom you like, but Allah guides whom he wills. And he is most knowing of the (rightly) guided.\(^3\)

As for guidance in the form of pointing out the truth and directing people towards it, this was the responsibility of the Messengers and those who followed diligently in their footsteps. It cannot be confined to the Twelve Imāms. Allah says:

---

1 Biḥār al Anwār 23/103
2 Sūrah a-Kahf: 17
3 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 56
Say, “This is my way; I invite to Allah with insight, I and those who follow me.”

The claim that humans cannot be guided without the Imāms is indeed a bold statement against Allah.

b. Their belief that supplications are not accepted except if they contain the names of the Imāms

It is claimed by them that the one who supplicates to Allah without the Imāms cannot be successful. One of their narrations from the Imāms states:

من دعا الله بنا أفلح، ومن دعا بغیرنا هلك واستهلك

Whoever supplicates to Allah with our names will be successful and whoever supplicates with others will be ruined and destroyed.²

Their audacity reached a level where they even claimed:

إنّ دعاء الأنبیاء استجیب بالتّوسل والستشفاع بهم صلوات الله علیهم أجمعین

The supplications of the Ambiyā’ were accepted due to considering them (the Imāms) as mediums and intercessors.³

Al-Majlīsī supported this claim by means of eleven narrations.⁴ He quotes many similar narrations in the chapters regarding the conditions faced by the Ambiyā’, especially in the chapters regarding Ādam, Mūsā, and Ibrāhīm عليه السلام. Another

---

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 108
3 This is the name of one of the chapters in Biḥar al-Anwār 26/319
4 ibid
chapter in which these appear is the chapter regarding the miracles of Nabī Ṭalḥa.\(^1\) Many narrations which convey the above meaning appears in their reliable works.\(^2\) This dangerous claim is the stepping stone—in a discreet and disguised form—towards taking the Imāms as deities. They are seen as the ones to whom one should turn at the time of need, just as they are perceived to be the savours of those who are in trouble, the protectors of those who are in fear, the direction of those who supplicate and the ones whose names have to be added to supplications in order for them to have any effect. Is there any difference between these beliefs and the beliefs held by the polytheists regarding their idols?

Yes, there is one difference! The polytheists would at least adopt monotheism at the time of extreme difficulty. Allah says:

\[ فَإِذَا رَكِبُوْا فِي الْفُلْكِ دَعَوُا اللَّهَ مُخْلِصِیْنَ لَهُ الْدِّیْنَ \]

And when they board a ship, they supplicate to Allah, with all sincerity to Him in religion (i.e. faith and hope).\(^3\)

The Shīʿah, on the other hand, commit shirk in both; times of ease as well as extreme difficulty. In fact, they believe that their difficulties cannot be removed except by uttering the names of their Imāms in their supplications. One of their narrations state:

\[ عن الرضا علیه السلام قال: لمّا أشرف نوح علیه السّلام على الغرق دعا الله بحقّنا فدفع الله عنه الغرق، ولمّا رمي إبراهیم في النّار دعا الله بحقّنا فجعل الله النّار علیه بردًا وسلامًا، وإنّ موسى علیه السّلام لمّا ضرب طریقًا في البحر دعا الله بحقّنا فجعله یبسًا، وإنّ عیسى علیه السّلام لمّا أراد اليهود قتله دعا الله بحقّنا فنجّي من القتل فرفعه الله \]

It is reported from al-Riḍā that he said, “When Nūḥ was about to drown, he supplicated to Allah through our right, so Allah saved him

---

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/334
3 *Sūrah al-ʿAnkabūt*: 65
from drowning. When Ibrāhīm was thrown in the fire, he supplicated to Allah through our right, so Allah made the fire cool and peaceful for him. When Mūsā took the path of the sea, he supplicated to Allah through our rights, so Allah made it dry. When the Jews wanted to kill Isā, he supplicated to Allah by way of our rights, so Allah saved him from being killed and raised him.”

If the above sent shivers down your spine, then try to prepare yourself for what is still coming. As if the claim that the supplications of the Ambiyā’ were only accepted because of the Imāms was not heretical enough, they go on to claim that the conditions that came upon certain Ambiyā’ was on account of the stance held by them towards the Imāms. This is what they say regarding Ādam:

لما أسكنه الله الجنة مثل له النبي وعلي والحسن والحسین صلوات الله علیهم فنظر إلیهم بحسد، ثم عرضت عليه الولاية فأنكرها فرمته الجنة بأوراقها، فلما تاب إلى الله من حسده وأقر بالولاية ودعا بحق الخمسة محمد وعلى وفاطمة والحسن والحسین صلوات الله عليهما عرف الله له وذلك قوله فَتَلَقّٰى آدَمُ مِن رَّبِّهِ کَلِمَاتٍ

When Allah placed him in Jannah, Nabī, ʿAlī, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn appeared before him whom he looked at with jealousy. Thereafter, Wilāyah was presented to him which he rejected. Thereupon, Jannah threw all its leaves at him. When he repented to Allah from his jealousy, accepted the Wilāyah, and supplicated regarding through the medium of the five; Muḥammad, ʿAlī, Fāṭimah, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn; Allah forgave him. This is what is being referred to in the statement of Allah, “Then Adam received from his Lord [some] words and He accepted his repentance.”

As for Yūnus, they claim that Allah kept him in the stomach of the whale due his rejection of the Wilāyah of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, and Allah only removed him when he accepted it.  

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 26/325, Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 4/1143  
2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 37  
The quotation above can be found in Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/41 and Biḥār al-Anwār 26/333-334  
3 Tafsīr Furāt pg. 13, Biḥār al-Anwār 26/333-334
These are the concoctions and fabrications of the Shīʿah. The message of Allah is in stark contradiction to their claims. He says:

وَلِلّٰهِ الأَسْمَاء الْحُسْنَى فَادْعُوْهُ بِهَا

And to Allah belong the best names, so invoke Him by them.¹

Allah did not say, ‘invoke Him by the names of the Imāms’ or ‘at their graves and tombs.’ Similarly, He says:

وَقَالَ رَبُّكُمُ ادْعُوْنِيْ أَسْتَجِبْ لَكُمْ

And your Lord says, “Call upon me; I will respond to you.”²

If the acceptance of supplications was based upon mentioning the names of the Imāms, he would have said, “Invoke me by the names of the Imāms and I will accept”. The reality is that these concoctions of the Shīʿah are actually reasons for supplications to be rejected, as the foundation for the acceptance of supplications is sincerity and not associating anyone as a partner with Allah. Allah says:

فَادْعُوا اللّٰهَ مُخْلِصِیْنَ لَهُ الدِّیْنَ وَلَوْ کَرِهَ الْكَافِرُوْنَ

So invoke Allah, being sincere to Him in religion, although the disbelievers dislike it.³

وَادْعُوهُ مُخْلِصِیْنَ لَهُ الْدِّیْنَ

And invoke Him, being sincere to Him in religion.⁴

---

¹ Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 180
² Sūrah Ghāfir: 60
³ Sūrah Ghāfir: 14
⁴ Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 29
These Imāms are from the human race. They are no different. Allah says:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَدْعُونَ مِن دُونِ اللّهِ عِبَادٌ أَمْثَالُكُمْ فَادْعُوهُمْ فَلْيَسْتَجِيِّبُوا لَكُمْ إِن كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ

Indeed, those whom you call upon besides Allah are servants just like you. So call upon them and let them respond to you, if you should be truthful.¹

As far as worshipping Allah and invoking him is concerned, He did not place any pious person, angel, or Nabī in between. All are the slaves of Allah. He says:

لَن یَسْتَنكِفَ الْمَسِیْحُ أَن یَّكُوْنَ عَبْداً لِّلّٰهِ وَلَ الْمَلآئِکَةُ الْمُقَرَّبُوْنَ

Never would the Messiah ever be disdained to be a servant of Allah, nor would the angels near (o Him in status)]²

إِن کُلُّ مَن فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالأَرْضِ إِلَّآ اتَّبَعَ الرَّحْمَنَ عَبْدًا

There is no one in the heavens and earth but that he will appear before the Most Merciful as a servant.³

The nurturing that a Shīʿī undergoes by saying all of his supplications and invocations to Allah in the above-stated manner is indeed dangerous. The seeds of turning towards a being other than Allah are planted in his heart and mind. The tendency of turning towards humans instead of Allah grows within him. He is then enveloped in this type of polytheistic beliefs and his children and grandchildren are made to follow suit. At times, it reaches such extremes that he completely forgets Allah, as the names of Imāms are always on his tongue and heart at the time of supplicating. This is the end result of following his seniors and uttering those words.

¹ Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 194
² Sūrah al-Nisā: 172
³ Sūrah Maryam: 93
Some of their narrations explicitly support this. It is stated in one narration that a Shīʿī wrote to his Imām complaining to him or asking him:

إنّ الرّجل يحبّ أن يفضي إلى إمامه ما يحبّ أن يفضي إلى ربّه

A man wishes to say to his Imām that which he wishes to say to His Rabb.

The reply was:

إذا كانت لك حاجة فحرّك شفتِك، فإنّ الجواب يأتيك

When you have a need, move your lips. A reply will come to you.¹

It is as if they are quicker to respond and have a greater ability to fulfil needs. The extremism of this shirk makes the shirk of the pre-Islamic era seem mild. The bitter fruits of these tales can be witnessed at the graves of the Imāms. The preposterousness of the claim that the supplications of the Ambiyā’ were accepted only after they invoked the Imāms as intermediaries is self-evident, as the Imāms did not exist in the lifetime of the Ambiyā’. It is also a call towards shirk, as they (Twelvers) believe that the basis for the acceptance of supplications is the mention of the Imāms names. This is not dissimilar to the claims of the polytheists that their idols would draw them closer to Allah. Their claim is debunked in the Qur’ān, as Allah states that the Ambiyā’ called out to Him alone, using nothing besides His blessed name. He says regarding Yūnus ʿa.s.:

فَنَادَى فِي الظُّلُمَاتِ أَن لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا أَنْتُ سُبْحَانَكَ إِنِّيْ کُنتُ مِنَ الظَّالِمِينَ

And he called out within the darkness, “There is no deity except you; exalted are you. Indeed, I have been of the wrongdoers.”²

The statement uttered by Ādam ʿa.s. and his honourable wife was recorded by Allah and conveyed to us. The Qurʾān quotes them:

1 Bhār al-Anwār 94/22
2 Sūrah al-Anbiyā’: 87
They said, “Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves, and if you do not forgive us and have mercy upon us, we will surely be among the losers.”

The aforementioned narration of the Shīʿah, therefore, is an outright forgery, for those who know what Islam is about. It has emerged from the whimsical fantasy of a disbeliever and endeavoured to inject polytheism into Islamic beliefs. Allah says regarding such people:

They want to extinguish the light of Allah with their mouths, but Allah will perfect His light, although the disbelievers dislike it.¹

The irony of it all is that the narrations regarding the supplications of the Imāms to Allah in the books of the Shīʿah belie this belief of theirs. Amīr al-Muʾminīn would say, as recorded in their books:

O my lord! I ponder over your (willingness to) pardon due to which my sins seem trivial to me. Then I ruminate over the severity of your punishment, and my tribulation thus seems overwhelming to me. Aah! (How will I fair?) If I read in the scroll of deeds a sin that I had forgotten but you had recorded. You thereafter say “Grab him!” Pity upon the one who will be held without his relatives being of any avail to him and his tribe of any benefit.²

---

¹ Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 23
² Sūrah al-Ṣaff: 8
³ Amālī al-Ṣadūq pg. 48, Biḥār al-Anwār 94/92
The above is not a rare supplication. In fact, many such supplications are narrated from each Imām. Al-Majlisī narrates most of them in his Biḥār.¹

c. Istighāthah from the Imāms

Istighāthah² is only sought from Allah. However, the Shīʿah call towards seeking Istighāthah from their Imāms in matters which are not in the control of anyone besides Allah. Some narrations stipulate a specific role for each Imām. One narration says:

Seeking the help of ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn is to be safe from the tyranny of rulers and from the spells of the devils, as to Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī and Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad, their help is sought for matters of afterlife and in order to attain the obedience of Allah. Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar, seek through his medium overall well-being from Allah. Seek protection in deserts and the oceans through ʿAlī ibn Mūsā. Draw your sustenance from Allah with Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī. The help of ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad should be sought for non-obligatory acts, good behaviour towards brothers and that which you seek from the obedience of Allah. Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī is for the hereafter. If you are about to be slain with a sword then call out to the Imām of the era (Mahdī), and he will help you.³

¹ Especially in the 94th volume.
² Istighāthah means to call for help. It is similar to duʿā, except that it is done specifically at the time of difficulty, whereas supplication is done at all times. Refer to Ibn Taymiyah: al-Radd ʿalā al-Bakrī pg. 88, Sulaymān ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb: Taysīr al-ʿAzīz al-Ḥamīd pg. 214-215, Ibn Saʿdī: al-Qawl al-Sādīd pg 48-49
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 94/33
The author of *Al-Biḥār* followed this by a supplication which included all of these unacceptable forms of Istighāthah, which he considered an explanation of the text.\(^1\) Al-Majlisī stated regarding them:

الشفاء الأكبر والدواء الأعظم لمن استفسف بهم

The greatest cure and the greatest medicine is for the one who seeks cure through them.\(^2\)

According to them, the Imāms are the ones from whom help should be sought and in who one places his reliance. Thus, a Shīʿī turns his attention towards his Imām (as stated in their narrations) and says regarding their awaited Imām:

أركان البلاد وقضاة الأحكام وأبواب الإيمان... منائج العطاء بكم إنافذه مقترونا فما شيء منه إلا وأنتم له السبب وإليه السبيل... فلا نجاة ولا مفرع إلا أنتم ولا مذهب عنكم يا أعين الله الناظرة

The pillars of the countries, the judges of the law, the doors of Īmān... the givers of gifts! It is by your blessing that a task is accomplished in a definite and joint manner. There is nothing thereof except that you are its cause and pathway... there is no way to being saved and no place of refuge except you. It is not possible to go away from you, O seeing eyes of Allah...\(^3\)

The attribution of aspects that are the sole prerogative of Allah to the Imāms in the above text is quite evident. They are considered the cause behind all happenings, there is no refuge but with them, granting favours becomes definite through them etc. There are many more invocations that resemble the above quoted one as far as deviation and extremism regarding the Imāms is concerned. They go to the extent of declaring them the creators of the earth and the heavens. These can be found in their compilations on invocations such as Mafātīḥ al-Jinān, *ʿUmdat al-Zāʿir*, etc. These also appear in their reliable books under the chapters

---

1 ibid
2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/33
3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/37
concerning the tombs and invocations. Studying and analysing them would require a separate discussion. You will see the true and appalling face of Saba’ism in invocations which suggest that ʿAlī was a deity.

They even write letters and place them on the graves of the Imāms, as they believe that these graves (which cannot harm or benefit anyone) are the stations of hope and the places that are to be rushed to at the time of need. They say:

إذا كان لك حاجة إلى الله عزّ وجلّ فاكتب رقعة على بركة الله، واطرحها على قبر من قبور الأئمة إن شئت، أو اكتبها واختمها واجعلها فيه، وأطرحها في نهر جارٍ، أو بئر عميقة، أو غدير ماء، فإنّها تصل إلى السيد عليه السلام وهو ينال بقضاء حاجتك بنفسه

If you need something from Allah, write a note with the blessings of Allah and throw it upon one of the graves of the Imāms, if you want. Alternatively, tie it up, put a seal on it, knead clean soil, place it inside and throw it in a flowing river, deep well, or a pool of water. It will definitely reach the Master and he will personally fulfil your need.¹

Thereafter, they explain the manner in which the note should be written:

بسم الله الرّحمن الرّحیم، کتبت إلیك یا مولي صلوات الله علیك مستغیثًا..، فأغثني یا مولي صلوات الله عليك عند اللّهف، وقدّم المسألة لله عزّ وجلّ في أمري قبل حلول التّلف وشماتة الأعداء، فبك بسطت النّعمة عليّ، واسأل الله (الخطاب للإمام في قبره) جلّ جلاله لي نصرًا عزیزًا

In the name of Allah, the entirely merciful, the most gracious. I write to you O my master, may the blessings of Allah be upon you, asking for help... So help me, O my master (may the blessings of Allah be upon you) at the time of distress and present my matter to Allah before destruction comes my way and the enemies celebrate. It is only because of you that bounties have become my lot. (And addressing the Imām) Allah help me with a mighty victory.²

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 94/29
² Biḥār al-Anwār 94/29-30
Then he should climb up at a river or pool and call out to one of the doors of the awaited one saying:

O so and so! May the greetings of Allah be upon you! I testify that your death was in the path of Allah and you are alive by Allah, receiving sustenance. I speak to you in your life that you have by Allah. This is my request and need to our master, so hand it to him as you are reliable and trustworthy.

They state:

Thereafter, throw it in the river and imagine that you are handing it to him.

There are many letters (not just notes) that are sent to this non-existent awaited one. Genealogists and historians who have researched the subject have found that the person who is anticipated by the Shīʿah was never born as Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī passed away without having any children, as will be discussed. It is for this reason that Ibn Taymiyyah said regarding him:

He has no reality and he never existed.

---

1 There are four doors, i.e. ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd, his son Muḥammad, Ḥasan ibn Rūḥ and ʿAlī al-Samarī. *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/30. Refer to the chapter on Ghaybah in this book as well.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/3

3 ibid

4 *Majmūʿ Fatāwā* 28/401
Despite this, they have fabricated narrations to establish that it is part of the religion to send notes to the non-existent one seeking his help in such matters that are in the sole control of Allah. Another example of this is:

A note should be written to the Imām of the era in which it should be stated, “In the name of Allah, the entirely Merciful, the most Gracious. I take as an intermediary the proof of Allah, the pious successor Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Mūsā ibn Ja’far ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib; who is the great news, the straight path, the strong rope, the protection of the refugee, the divider of (the inhabitants) Heaven and Hell. I ask you through the blessings of your pure fathers... and your pure mothers, who were embodiments of unceasing good that you be an intermediary for me by Allah for removing my plight, solving my problem, removing my regret and eliminating my dilemma...”

They continue:

Then, another note should be written for Allah and subsequently, both should be fragranced. The note to Allah should be placed inside the note to the Imām and both should be thrown in a flowing river or in a well, after they are placed in hot soil.

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 94/29
2 This means such soil which has no pebbles in it. Biḥār al-Anwār 94/28
Look at the titles with which the non-existent Imām is addressed. He is described as; the protection of the refugee, the one who removes regrets and eliminates dilemmas. These are attributes that are not used for any being besides the one who answers the call of the hard-pressed when he supplicates and removes evil; the one who guides to the straight path those who turn in submission to Him, i.e. Allah. However, these people have assigned these attributes to one who does not even exist. Ponder over the sentence that appears towards the end of the quotation, i.e. “The note to Allah should be placed inside the note to the Imām”. It is as if they have placed their Imām at the forefront at the time of seeking their needs.

Al-Majlisī quotes another supplication to the awaited one. This one reads:

ارجع فيما أنت بسبيله إلى الله تعالى، واستعن بصاحب الزمان عليه السلام، واتخذه لك مفعلاً، فإنه نعم المعين، وهو عصمة أولئك المؤمنين.. وقال: السلام عليك يا إمام المسلمين والمؤمنين، السلام عليك يا وارث علم النبيين، السلام عليك يا عصمة الدين، السلام عليك يا مع المؤمنين المستضعفين، السلام عليك يا مصداق الكافرين المتكررين الظالمين، السلام عليك يا مولاي يا صاحب الزمان.. يا مولاي، حاجي كذا وكذا فاشفع لي في نجاحها

Turn to Allah in your affairs and seek help from the Imām of the era. Take him as your place of refuge, as he is the best helper and protector of his believing friends... Say, “Peace be upon you, O Imām of the Muslims and Mu’mins, peace be upon you, O heir of the knowledge of the Ambiyā’, peace be upon you, O protector of the religion, peace be upon you O the honourer of the weak believers, peace be upon you, O the disgracer of the oppressive and proud disbelievers, peace be upon you, O my master, O the man of the era...O my master! These are my needs, so intercede for me for its success.”

How is it that the ‘man of the era’ is described in the above manner when, according to them, he was unable to appear before his followers due to his fear of being killed (as stated in their authentic narrations—which will appear later)?

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 94/31-32
How is it that a being like him is asked to fulfil needs, which can only be fulfilled by the remover of all difficulties (i.e. Allah)? The Imām is unable to protect himself, which is why he has been hiding in his cave, far out of the sight of everyone!

d. Their belief that Ḥajj to the tombs is greater than Ḥajj to the House of Allah

Ibn Taymiyyah says:

Reliable people have informed me that amongst them are those who believe that Ḥajj to the tombs is greater than Ḥajj to the Kaʿbah. Thus, they believe that committing shirk is greater than worshipping Allah alone. This is the greatest form of faith in the devil.¹

This matter, regarding which a scholar from the Ahl al-Sunnah—who went the extra mile to follow the developments in the Rāfiḍī camp—stated that it reached him through reliable sources is openly declared in the reliable books of the Shīʿah. Tens of narrations emphatically state that visiting the tombs is greater than Ḥajj to the sanctified House of Allah. The following is stated in al-Kāfī and other books:

إنّ زیارة قبر الحسین تعدل عشرین حجّة، وأفضل من عشرین عمرة وحجّة

Visiting the grave of Ḥusayn is equivalent to twenty Ḥajj, and greater than twenty Ḥajj and Ῥumrahs.²

On one occasion, a follower said to the Imām:

إنّي حججت تسع عشرة حجّة، وتسع عشرة عمرة

I performed Ḥajj nine times and Ῥumrah nineteen times.

---

¹ Mīhāj al-Sunnah 2/124
The Imām (sarcastically) replied:

حجّ حجة أخرى، واعتمر عمرة أخرى، تكتب لك زیارة قبر الحسین علیه السلام

Perform one more Ḥajj and one more ʿUmrah, you will get the reward of visiting the grave of Ḥusayn  السلام.

It is as if he is saying, ‘Why did you undertake all the difficulty when visiting the grave of Ḥusayn is greater than your acts?’ He asks him to undertake one more Ḥajj and one more ʿUmrah for this reward to be accrued instead of simply telling him to visit the grave of Ḥusayn once, thus mocking him and making him regret his actions. Their narrations go on expounding the superiority of visiting the grave of Ḥusayn  السلام and the other Imāms over the fifth pillar of Islam (Ḥajj to the House of Allah).

The contents of these narrations makes one believe that their inventor uttered them without being in his senses, or he was a totally bigoted disbeliever. They cannot be surpassed as far as the extent to which they have strayed in this aspect is concerned. A person, after reading their narrations will be convinced that this is the religion of polytheists and not monotheist Muslims. All of these teachings are unheard of among Muslims. It is the teachings of their so-called scholars and Ayatollahs and certainly not the religion of the Rabb of the universe. Their source is not that which was revealed upon the leader of the Messengers but rather it is the guesswork and imaginations of their own men. A closer look at these narrations leaves one convinced that there was a definite motive behind them, i.e. changing the religion of the Muslims and turning them away from their Qiblah, the House of the Rabb of the universe.

This is the message that is presented in their narrations, in many different ways. The idea behind this repetition is to entrench this belief in the hearts of the simple-minded and the ignorant ones, as innovations are quickly accepted

Our observation can be understood from the following narration of theirs:

A villager from Yemen sets out to visit the grave of Ḥusayn—as stated in the narration. On the way, he meets who they refer to al-Ṣādiq (as Jaʿfar ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣādiq has nothing to do with them and their narrations), who asks him regarding the effects of visiting the grave of Ḥusayn. The villager replies:

إنه يرى البركة من ذلك في نفسه وأهله وأولاده وأمواله وقضاء حوائجه

He will see the blessings therefrom in himself, his family, his children, his wealth and when he fulfils his needs.

Abū ʿAbd Allāh then says (as their narration claims):

أفلا أزيدك من فضله فضلاً يا أخا اليمن؟

Should I not add a virtue to its virtues for you, O brother from Yemen?

The villager replies, “Increase me, O son of Rasūl Allah”

Then, the following took place:

إنه زيارة أبي عبد الله عليه السلام تعدل حجة مقبولة زاكية مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وآله فتعجب من ذلك، فقال له: أي والله وحجتيتين مبرورتين متقابلتين زاكيتين مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فتعجب، فلم يزل أبو عبد الله عليه السلام يزيد حتى قال: ثلاثين حجة مبرورة متقابلة زاكية مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

Abu ʿAbd Allāh said to him, “Visiting Abū ʿAbd Allāh (himself) is equal to a pure Ḥajj in the company of Rasūl Allah."

---

1 It is for this reason that Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī would say, ‘It is from the good-fortune of a new-Muslim and a non-Arab that Allah guides them to a scholar from the Ahl al-Sunnah’. Sharḥ Uṣūl Iʿtiqād Ahl al-Sunnah.
Thereupon the villager expressed surprise so he added; “By the oath of Allah, it is equal to performing Ḥajj which is righteous, accepted and pure in the company of Rasūl Allah  ḥalf twice.”

The villager was still surprised, so Abū ʿAbd Allāh kept adding to the numbers until he said, “Ḥajj which is righteous, accepted and pure in the company of Rasūl Allah ḥalf thirty times.”

Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq is alleged to have established in this strange manner, which is more like the talks of children, that visiting the graves is greater than performing Ḥajj thirty times. They even attribute these lies, in the same laughable manner, to Rasūl Allah . However, in this case the words alone expose their lies, unlike the case of the Imām where it was only the meaning of the narrations. The narration states:

كان الحسين عليه السلام ذات يوم في حجر النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو يلعبه ويطمعه، وإن عائشة قالت: يا رسول الله ما أشد إعجابك بهذا الصبي!! فقال لها: وكيف لا أحبه وأعجب به وهو ثمرة فؤادي وقرة عيني، أما إن أمتي ستفتنه فمن زاره بعد وفاته كتب الله له حجة من حججي، قالت: يا رسول الله حجة من حججي؟!، قال: نعم وحجتين، قالت: حجتين؟ قال: نعم وأربعًا. فلم تزل تزيد وهو يزيد حتى بلغ سبعين حجة من حجج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بأعماره

Ḥusayn was once on the lap of Rasūl Allah ḥalf who was playing and laughing with him. ‘Ā’ishah said, ‘O Rasūl Allah, your amazement with this child is indeed immense.’

He replied to her saying, “How can I not be amazed with him and love him when he is the fruit of my heart and the coolness of my eyes? Listen! My ummah will kill him. So, whoever visits him after his death, Allah will write for him a Ḥajj from my Ḥajj.”

She said, “O Rasūl Allah, a Ḥajj from your Ḥajj?”

---

1 Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī: Thawāb al-Aʿmāl pg. 52, Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 10/350-351
He replied, “Yes, two Ḥajj.”

She asked ‘Two Ḥajj?’

He answered, “Yes, four.”

She continued to add and he increased until it reached seventy Ḥajj from the Ḥajj of Rasūl Allah ﷺ along with their ʿUmrahs.¹

Another narration states:

من زار قبر أبي عبد الله كتب الله له ثمانين حجة مبرورة

Allah will record eighty accepted Ḥajj for the one who visits the grave of Abū ʿAbd Allāh.²

Another narration surpasses this and states:

من أتى قبر الحسین علیه السّلام عارفًا بحقّه كان كمن حجّ مائة حجّة مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

Whoever visits the grave of Ḥusayn, understanding his rights, he is like one who performed Ḥajj a hundred times with Rasūl Allah ﷺ.³

One hundred is only the entry level for these fabricators. The other narrations run in the thousands. When that too is not enough, they add on a variety of other rewards, as if the religion is only about gallivanting to graves and standing by them. Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah (as well as other books) report that Abū Jaʿfar said to Muḥammad ibn Muslim:

لو يعلم الناس ما في زيارة الحسین عليه السلام من الفضل لنمانوا شوقًا، وتقتطعت أنفسهم عليه حسرات،

---

1 Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 10/351-352
2 Thawāb al-Aʿmāl pg. 52, Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 162, Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 10/350
3 Thawāb al-Aʿmāl pg. 52, Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 10/350
If people knew what is (achieved) in the visitation of Ḥusayn, they would die out of enthusiasm and their souls would shred to pieces in regret.

Muḥammad ibn Muslim asked:

وما فيه؟

And what is in it?

Abū Jaʿfar replied:

قال: من زاره تشوقًا إلیه كتب الله له ألف حجّة متقبّلة، وألف عمرة مبرورة، وأجر ألف شهيد من شهداء بدر، وأجر ألف صائم، وثواب ألف صدقة مقبولة، وثواب ألف نسمة أريد بها وجه الله، ولم يزل محفوظًا سنته من كلّ آفة أهونها الشيطان، وكل به ملك كريم يحفظه من بين يديه ومن خلفه وعن بنيته وعن شماله ومن فوق رأسه ومن تحت قدمه، فإن مات سنته حضرته الملائكة الزّهمن يحضرون غسله وأكفانه والاستغفار له ويشيئونه إلى قبره بالاستغفار له، ويفسح له في قبره مّذ بشره، ويؤمنه الله من ضغطة القبر، ومن منكر وتكير برعاشة، ويفتح له باب إلى الجنة، ويعطى كتابه مبلى ومنكر ونكير يروعانه، ويطمئن به يوم القيامة نور يضيء لنوره ما بين المشرق والمغرب، وينادي ومناد هذا من زوار الحسين شوقًا إليه، فلا يبقى أحد يوم القيامة إلا

Whoever visits him with enthusiasm towards him, Allah will record for him a thousand accepted Ḥajj, a thousand virtuous ʿUmrah, the reward of a thousand martyrs like the martyrs of Badr, the reward of a thousand fasting people, the reward of a thousand accepted charities, a thousand souls which were only intended for Allah, he will be protected from every calamity for a year, the least of them being Shayṭān. And a noble angel will be appointed to protect him from his front, back, right, left, above his head and below his feet.

If he dies in that year, the angels of al-Raḥmān will present themselves before him; they will witness the washing (of his body), the shrouding (of his body in burial-cloths), the forgiveness that is sought for him and they will accompany him to his grave whilst seeking forgiveness for him. They
will widen his grave as far as his eyes can see, save him from the squeezing of the grave and from Munkar and Nakīr (who would have otherwise) scared him and the door of heaven will be opened for him. He will be given his book in the right hand. He will be given light on the Day of Judgment that will shine from the east to the west and an announcer will announce, ‘This is the one who visited Ḥusayn out of enthusiasm for him.’ There will be no person on the Day of Judgment, except that he will wish that he was from those who visited Ḥusayn.¹

Another narration recounts the rewards of visiting his grave:

إن الرجل منكم يغسل في الفرات ثم يأتي قبر الحسین عارفًا بحقه فيعطيه الله بكل قدم يرفعها أو يضعها مائة حجة مقبولة، ومائة عمرة مبرورة، مائة غزوة مع نبي مرسل أو إمام عادل

A man amongst you who takes a bath in the Euphrates and then comes to the grave of Ḥusayn, understanding his rights; Allah will grant him in return for every time that he raised or dropped his foot, one hundred accepted Ḥajj, one hundred righteous ʿUmrah, and a hundred campaigns under a Nabī who was sent or a just Imām.²

A third narration states:

من زار الحسین عليه السلام يوم عاشوراء حتى يظل عنده باكياً لقي الله عز وجل يوم القیامة بثواب ألف حجة، وألف عمرة، وألف غزوة، وثواب كل حجة وعمرة وغزوة كثواب من حج واعتمر وغزا مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ومع الأئمة الراشدين صلوات الله عليهم

Whoever visits Ḥusayn on the day of ʿĀshūrā and stays by him until he cries will meet Allah on the Day on Judgment with the reward of two million Ḥajj, two million ʿUmrah, and two million campaigns. The reward of each of (these) Ḥajj, ʿUmrah and campaigns is equivalent to the (reward) of one who did Ḥajj, ʿUmrah and went out on a campaign with Rasūl Allah and the guided Imāms.³

---

¹ Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 1/353, Bihār al-Anwār 101/18
² Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 10/379, Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 185
³ Bihār al-Anwār 101/290, Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 176
The narration goes on to mention that this reward will also be accrued by one who could not visit his grave on this day as long as he climbs on the roof of his house and greets him by gesture, curses his killers, wails and cries for him and he does not go out on that day for any of his needs. Narrations of this type are found in abundance in their books. Quoting all of them will waste a lot of our resources and sicken our hearts, as they are narrations which are aimed at turning people away from worshipping the Allah—the Majestic—to worshipping the creation, who are themselves in need.

The ultimate goal of these narrations is to drive people towards discarding and forsaking the laws and teachings of Islam. Unimaginable rewards are kept in merely moving one's feet in the direction of a certain grave. Why then, will a person not believe that contravening all the prohibitions will not affect him? It is obvious that he will take his crimes very lightly and he will eventually turn away completely from the commands of Allah.

If there was any truth to these promises, the Noble Qur'ān would have definitely mentioned it in some way or the other. Is it not strange that the Qur'ān clearly mentions Ḥajj but makes absolutely no mention of visiting the graves, whereas, according to them, visiting the grave holds much more virtue? This was picked up by one of the Shī'ah who could not understand why visiting the grave of Ḥusayn held so much of virtue, to the extent that it exceeded the rewards of Ḥajj manifold, even though it was not mentioned in the Qur'ān (which is a sign that indicates the falseness of narrations). Hence, after hearing about these rewards from the Imām, he asked:

قد فرض الله على الناس حج البيت، ولم يذكر زيارته قبر الحسين عليه السلام

(Why is it) that Allah made Ḥajj of the House compulsory upon the people, but did not mention the visiting of Husain’s grave?

The Imām replied (in a most imprecise manner):
Since it is like that, this is a matter that Allah has made like this.¹

They have confessed that the Qur’ān is free of any such nonsense, despite the fact that they are the masters of ‘hidden interpretations’. This is sufficient a proof to debunk all that their books contain on the subject, as there is no greater proof then a confession. They destroyed their home with their own hands! It is as if the Imām said, “I have no answer for this. The matter is like that. Allah did not explain to His slaves the manner and guidelines of worshipping Him.”

After presenting his imprecise answer, he wishes to redeem himself by giving an answer that is not even remotely related to the question. He said:

Did you not hear the statement of Amīr al-Mu’minīn, “The bottom of the foot² is more deserving of being wiped than the top of the foot, but Allah ordained this (wiping of the top of foot) upon the slaves.”³

Here, they are confessing that visiting the graves is like the bottom of the foot, i.e. it is not among that which was commanded by Allah. Thereafter, he continues with his meaningless speech:

Do you not know that if the place of standing (at ʿArafāt) was in the Ḥaram, it would have been better, on account of the Ḥaram? However, Allah placed it away from the Ḥaram.⁴

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 101/33, Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 266
² The more accurate version of the statement of ʿAlī is ‘the bottom of the leather sock’.
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 101/33, Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 266
⁴ Biḥār al-Anwār 101/33, Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 266
This is another confession that visiting the graves was not made compulsory, even though this sect believes that it holds a greater position. Furthermore, in their attempt to present an excuse, they consider themselves in a position to pass comments regarding the decisions of Allah. They hint that Allah did not do that which was more appropriate and correct (Allah is way above all that which the foolish say), as He did not place ʿArafāt inside the Ḥaram. In this way, the bigoted sect, who fabricated narrations to fool the ignorant, have puked out the negativity that was hidden in them regarding the law and wisdom of Allah, and they have portrayed themselves as advisors regarding His matters.

As stated before, their narrations on this subject are abundant. I have before me a huge amount of this filth, which will boggle the mind of one who has not been polluted with these tales. There are so many narrations that I cannot decide as to which ones I should take and which ones I should leave. Each one of them contains such statements that will shock and disturb one who has the slightest relationship with the Book of Allah, or the slightest amount of concern for his religion. They are only acceptable to those who have shackled their brains in their fanaticism and desires and those who take pride in doing evil simply to promote their sect and stance.

If only the Shīʿah could pause for a moment, remove themselves from subservience to these narrations and ponder with impartiality regarding these narrations which take them into the abyss of shirk! They are made to forget their Rabb and instead hold onto the grave of one of the creation, who cannot even decide regarding his own benefit, harm, life and resurrection. Allah says:

ِإِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَدْعُوْنَ مِنْ دُوْنِ اللّٰهِ عِبَادٍ أَمْثَالُكُمْ

Indeed, those you [polytheists] call upon besides Allah are servants [i.e., creations] like you.

Another surprising matter related to the subject is that when a narration appeared to contradict these lies which emphasise the superiority of this innovation over
Hajj to the sanctified House of Allah, al-Majlisī (the distinguished scholar of the Shī'ah) rejected this, practicing upon Taqiyyah. One narration states:

عن حنان قلت لأبي عبد الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: ما تقول في زيارة قبر الحسین صلى الله عليه فإنه بلغنا عن بعضكم أنه قال: تعدل حجة وعمرة؟ قال فقال: ما أضعف هذا الحديث ما تعدل هذا كله ولكن زوروه ولا تجهوه فإنه سيد شباب أهل الجنة

Ḥannān says, “I asked Abū ʿAbd Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, ‘What do you say regarding visiting the grave of Ḥusayn, as it has reached us from one of you that he said, ‘It is equal to Ḥajj and Umrah’?”

He replied, “This narration is extremely weak. It is not equal to all of that. They have forged this. However, do not become indifferent towards him as he is the leader of the youth of Jannah.”

Al Majlisī explains in his interpretation of this text, which demolishes the stack of narrations quoted by him and exposes the deviance that his people hold onto:

Perhaps it means that it is not equal to the obligatory Ḥajj and Umrah, but the more likely possibility is that it should be taken as Taqiyyah.

In other words, Imām Jaʿfar lied to please the Ahl al-Sunnah, or out of fear for them, but his statement (without any interpretation) has no place in the Shī'ī religion. This is what the Rāfiḍah do to all the narrations of the Ahl al-Bayt, which do not suit their agenda; they render them meaningless by means of the ever-ready excuse of Taqiyyah. The result of this is that Shī'ism has turned into a religion based totally on the desires of their so-called scholars, and it has nothing to do with the Ahl al-Bayt.

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 101/35, Qurb al-Isnād pg. 48
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 101/35, Qurb al-Isnād pg. 48
Visiting Karbalāʼ on the Day of ‘Arafāh is greater than visiting it on any other day

Among the strong indications that these narrations were forged with the purpose of turning the Muslims away from the House of their Rabb, causing disunity among them, jeopardising their matters and causing them to turn away from one another (on account of this annual get-together) is that visiting on the Day of ‘Arafāh is given special virtue. They say:

من أتى قبر الحسین عارفًا بحقّه في غیر یوم عید کتب الله له عشرین حجّة وعشرین عمرة مبرورات مقبولت.. ومن أتاه في یوم عید کتب الله له مائة حجّة ومائة عمرة.. ومن أتاه يوم عرفة عارفًا بحقّه کتب الله له ألف حجّة وألف عمرة مبرورات متقبّلات، وألف غزوة مع نبي مرسل أو إمام عادل

Whoever visits the grave of Ḥusayn on a day other than the day of Īd, Allah will record for him twenty accepted and virtuous Ḥajj and ‘Umrah... Whoever visits him on the day of Īd, Allah will record for him one hundred Ḥajj and ‘Umrah. Whoever visits him on the day of ‘Arafāh, knowing his rights, Allah will record a thousand accepted and virtuous Ḥajj, ‘Umrah and a thousand campaigns with a sent Nabī or a just Imām.¹

Some of their narrations have explicit mention of the ultimate goal. Ja’far al-Ṣādiq said (according to their slander):

لو أتى حذتكم بفضل زیارته وفضل قبره لترکتم الحجّ رأسًا وما حجّ منكم أحد، ویحك أما علمت أنّ الله اتخذ کربلاء حرمًا آمنًا مبارکًا قبل أن یتخذ مکة حرمًا

If I were to tell you the virtues of visiting him and the virtues of his grave, you would have left Ḥajj completely, and none of you would have performed Ḥajj. Woe unto you, do you not know that Allah made Karbalāʼ a sanctified peaceful and blessed land even before he made Makkah a sanctified place...²


² Biḥār al-Anwār 101/33, Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 266
Did you not see how he (the forger of the narration) subtly indicated that it is preferable to abandon the command of Ḥajj and to head to Karbalā’ instead? He also says:

إنّ الله یبدأ بالنّظر إلى زوّار قبر الحسین بن علي عشیّة عرفة قبل نظره إلى أهل الموقف

Allah begins by looking at the visitors of the grave of Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī on the evening of ‘Arafāh, even before looking at the people of ‘Arafāh.

The narrator asked him regarding the reason behind this. He replied:

لأنّ في أولئك أولد زنا ولیس في هؤلء أولد زنا

Because there are illegitimates among those and there are no illegitimates among these.¹

Illegitimates, according to the Shīʿah, refer to non-Shīʿahs.²

---

¹ Al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī: Al-Wāfī vol. 2, 8/222
² Proof of this is the statement attributed to Abū Jaʿfar in al-Kāfī. He said (as they allege):

والله إنّ النّاس کلّهم أولد بغایا ما خلال شیعتنا

By Allah, people are all sons prostitutes, besides our Shīʿah.

Al-Kulaynī: al-Rawḍāh min al-Kāfī pg. 135 (Lukhnow print 1996). Refer to Biḥār al-Anwār 24/311

Ibrāhīm ibn Abī Yaḥyā relates that Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad said:

ما من مولود يولد إلا وإبليس من الأبالسة بحضرته، فإن علم الله أنّ المولود من شیعتنا حجبه من ذلك الشّیطان، وإن لم يكن المولود من شیعتنا أثبت

Not a single child is born except that one of the senior devils are present by him. If Allah knows that the child will be from our Shīʿah, He veils him from that devil. If he is not from our Shīʿah, the devil inserts his finger into the backside of the boy, causing him to become a sissy, and into the private part of the girl, causing her to become an evil doer.

Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 2/218, al-Burhān 2/139.

Al-Majlisī dedicated a chapter to this subject in his Biḥār, under the title, ‘People will be called by the names of their mothers, except the Shīʿah’. He quotes twelve narrations in this chapter. Biḥār al-Anwār 7/237. Refer to Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaqalayn 2/513 as well.
It seems as if the objective behind these narrations was attained, at least in some cases. One of the narrators of these tales, after hearing the supplication that Imām Jaʿfar made on behalf of those who visit the grave of Ḫusayn said:

والله لقد تمنيت أن يزره ولم أحج

By Allah, I really wish I had visited him instead of doing Ḥajj.\textsuperscript{1}

Another narration states:


Whoever wishes to perform optional Ḥajj or ʿUmrah, but he is held back due to involvement in worldly occupations or difficulties, and thus goes to Ḫusayn ibn ʿAlī on the Day of ʿArafāh, it will be sufficient for him (as far as performing his Ḥajj is concerned) and Allah will multiply (his reward) manifold on account of that.

I (the narrator) asked, “How many Ḥajj and ʿUmrah will it be equal to?”

He replied, “That cannot be counted.”

I asked, “A hundred?”

He replied, “Who can count that?”

I asked, ‘A thousand?’

He replied, ‘Even more.’

Then, he added, “If you count the bounty of Allah, you will not encompass it.”\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1} Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 10/321, Furūʿ al-Kāfī 335, Thawāb al-Aʿmāl pg. 35

\textsuperscript{2} Al-Wāfī vol. 2, 8/223
As you may have realised, the beginning of this narration indicates that Ḥajj holds more virtue than visiting the grave of Ḥusayn, which only serves as compensation. The same text does not end until this is reversed! Their scholar, al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī comments on the narrations which state the merits of visiting the grave of Ḥusayn saying:

إن هذا ليس بكثیر على من جعله الله إمامًا للمؤمنین، وله خلق السّماوات والأرضین، وجعله صراطه وسبیله، وعینه، ودلیله، وبابه الذي يؤتى منه، وحبله المتّصل بینه وبين عباده من رسل وأنبیاء وحجج وأولیاء، هذا مع أنّ مقابرهم رضی الله عنهم فیها أیضًا إنفاق أموال، ورجاء آمال، وإشخاص أبدان، وهجران أوطان، وتحمّل مشاق، وتجديد میثاق، وشهادت شعائر، وحضور مشاعر

This is not a lot upon the one who Allah made the Imām of the believers, for whom he created the heavens and the earths, whom he made his road, path, eye, guide, the door from which he is approached and His rope which connects him to His messengers, Ambiyā’ Ḥujjahs, and friends from the creation. This is despite the reality that (for) their graves money is spent, bodies are presented, hometowns are left, difficulties are undertaken, promises are renewed, the great signs are witnessed and rituals are performed.¹

Ponder over this extremism! Ḥusayn is made the rope and intermediary between Allah and His creation. He is even named the ‘eye and door to Allah’. Look at how he tries to establish the virtues of visiting the grave of Ḥusayn by citing such actions which are from the very pathways to shirk such as; undertaking a special journey to the grave, spending money for or at the grave whilst seeking intercession, pinning hopes upon it and all the other pathways to shirk. Despite all the shirk in this ritual, it is considered by them to be the best action.²

¹ Al-Wāfī vol. 2, 8/223
² One wonders, when this is what their narrations state, then why is it that their scholars have not practiced upon them. Why have they not abandoned Ḥajj? One possible reason is that they wish to be present at the largest gathering in the world in order to spread their baseless ideas among all other Muslims. Another reason is that they fear criticism from the Muslims, which would then spoil their opportunities to carry out their efforts in calling towards their cult (an act that they take as an obligation). The reality is that these narrations remove from a person’s heart any desire that might have been there to visit the House of Allah.
Visiting the grave of Ḥusayn is the best action

Visiting the grave of Ḥusayn is not only better than Ḥajj according to this sect, rather; it is the most virtuous act. Their narrations state that it is:

أفضل ما يكون من الأعمال

The best of actions.¹

Another narration states:

من أحبّ الأعمال زیارة قبر الحسین

From the most beloved actions is the visitation of the grave of Ḥusayn.²

Al-Majlisī dedicated an entire chapter to this, in which he has quoted narrations of this nature.³ It is in this manner that the directives and laws of Islam are forgotten. They devote themselves to shrines and graves and consider this to be the best of actions without any proof, except that which their imaginations concoct and their devils reveal. As a result, they sculpt a religion which has nothing to do with Allah.

Karbala’ is greater than the Ka’bah

The Qiblah of the Muslims and the most honourable and virtuous land of the Muslims is the sanctified House of Allah. It is the only place around which Ṭawāf (circumambulation) is mandatory. It is that piece of land that Allah made a place of return and security. Muslims gather annually on this blessed land, and all the Muslims face its direction. However, the narrations of the Shi‘ah have a different message. They state that this blessed land is nothing more than a humiliated and valueless tail of Karbala’.⁴

---

¹ Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 146, Biḥār al-Anwār 49/101
² Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 146, Biḥār al-Anwār 49/101
³ The name of the chapter is, ‘Visiting his grave is the best of actions’. Biḥār al-Anwār 101/49
⁴ The exact text will appear along with the reference.
The motive behind these tales is obvious. The annual gathering of the Muslims in these pure lands robs the enemies of their peaceful sleep. Their eyes are hurt by the sight of so many Muslims in one place. Thus, they have exhausted all their resources and tried in every possible manner to turn the hearts of the Muslims away from these places. The ready-made path to this was Shi‘ism. Thus, they said, “The grave of Ḥusayn is greater than the Ka‘bah, the sanctified House.” Thereafter, they concocted narrations and falsely attributed them to members of the Ahl al-Bayt to prove that their belief does have some basis. In this way they hoped to get their idea into the hearts of the inattentive ones, the ignorant, those who follow their desires, the innovators, bigots, disgruntled ones and those seeking to cause disunity and mayhem in the ummah.

The Shi‘ah consider Karbalā’ and the other cities in which the graves of their Imāms are situated (as they claim) to be holy and sanctified cities. Thus, Kūfah, Qum, and the other cities are all regarded as sanctified places. One narration states:

إنّ الكوفة حرم الله وحرم رسول الله صلى الله علیه وسلم حرم أمیر المؤمنین، وإنّ الصلاة فیها بألف صلاة والدّرهم بألف درهم

Kūfah is the Ḥaram (sanctified area) of Allah, His Rasūl, and Amīr al-Mu‘minīn. Ṣalāh in it is equal to a thousand ṣalāh and a dirham spent there is equivalent to a thousand dirhams.¹

They report from Ja‘far al-Ṣadiq:

إنَّ لله حرمًا هو مكّة، ولرسوله حرمًا وهو المدینة، ولأمير المؤمنین حرمًا وهو الكوفة، ونا حرمًا وهو قم ستتّفن فيه امرأة من ولدي نسمى فاطمة، من زارها وجبت له الجنة

Allah has a Ḥaram, which is Makkah; His Rasūl has a Ḥaram, which is Madīnah; Amīr al-Mu‘minīn has Ḥaram, which is Kūfah and we have a Ḥaram, which is Qum. A woman from my offspring, by the name of Fāṭimah

¹ Al-Wāfī vol. 2, 8/215
will be buried there. Whoever visits her, Jannah will become compulsory for him.¹

ʿAlī ibn Ḥasan (as they allege) said:

أَتَّخَذَ اللَّهُ أَرْضَ كَرْبَلَاء حَرَمًا آمِنًا مُبَارَكًا قَبْلَ أَن يَخْلِقَ اللَّهُ أَرْضَ الْكَعْبَة وَيَتَّخَذَهَا حَرَمًا بَرَاءةً وَعَشَرِينَ أَفَعَامِ، وَقَدَّسَهَا وَبَارَكَ عَلَيْهَا، فَمَا زَالَتْ قَبْلَ خَلْقِ اللَّهِ الْخَلْقُ مُقَدَّسَةً مِبَارَكَةً وَلَا تَزَالَ كَذَلِكَ حَتَّى يَجْعَلَ اللَّهُ أَرْضَهَا أَبْعَضَ أَرْضٍ فِي الْجَنَّةَ، وَأَبْعَضَ مَنْزِلٍ وَمَسْنَدٍ يُنَبِّئُهَا بِأَوْلِيَاءِهَا فِي الْجَنَّةَ

Allah made Karbalā’ sanctified, secure, and blessed land twenty four thousand years before he created the land of the Ka’bah and sanctified it. He made it sacred and blessed. It remained sacred and blessed, even before Allah created the creation, and it will remain like that until Allah makes it the best land in Jannah, and it will be the best place and house in which his friends will stay when in Jannah.²

Karbalā’ is revered as it has in it the body of Ḥusayn ʿa. The question now arises; was Ḥusayn ʿa buried twenty four thousand years before the creation of the Ka’bah? Another question is; why is Madīnah not given this merit, as it contains the blessed body of Rasūl Allah ʿs? Indeed, this is an open contradiction which pulls the carpet from under their feet. It reveals that the motive and goal of these narrations is not to revere Ḥusayn ʿa, but rather to plot against the ummah and their religion.

There are many narrations in their books which grant superiority to Karbalā’ over the House of Allah. Amongst their tales is a conversation that took place between Karbalā’ and the Ka’bah. Besides the irreligious contents of this tale, it even reflects their lack of any intelligence. They attribute to Ja’far al-Ṣādiq:

---

¹ A famous city in Iran. All the inhabitants of this city belong to the Twelver Shī‘ah. Refer to Mu’jam al-Buldān 4/397. The reason why they revere the city is because the daughter of the seventh Imām, Fāṭimah bint Mūsā is buried there. Refer to ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Ḥusaynī: Mashāhid al-ʿItrah pg. 62.

² Biḥār al-Anwār 101/107
The land of the Ka’bah said, “Who is like me? The House of Allah was built upon me. People come to me from every nook and corner and I was made the Haram of Allah and His secure land.”

Thereupon, Allah revealed to it, “Stop and calm down. The merit that you have been given in comparison to that which Karbalā’ has been accorded, is like a needle that was dipped in the ocean and carried some of its water. Had it not been for the sand of Karbalā’, I would not have granted any merit to you. If it was not for that which the land of Karbalā’ contains, I would not have created you or the house on the basis of which you are being proud, so calm down and be a humiliated and valueless tail without any haughtiness or pride for the land of Karbalā’, otherwise I will become angry with you and fling you into the fire of Jahannam.”

The Ka’bah (as they claim) did not take heed to this advice. It did not express humility before the land of the Ka’bah by becoming the humiliated and valueless tail. Thus, the punishment descended upon it. In fact, every place and all the waters of the world, besides Karbalā’ received this punishment. Their narrations state:

There is no land or water, except that it was punished for not having humility before Allah. Allah gave the polytheists power over the Ka’bah and he sent salty water to Zam Zam, which gave it a bad taste.}

1 Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 270, Bihār al-Anwār 101/109
2 Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 270, Bihār al-Anwār 101/109
It is only Karbalā’ that was saved from the punishment, even though it boastfully stated (as they imagine):

أنا أرض الله المقدسة المبارکة، الشفاء في تربتي ومائي ولا فخر

I am the sacred and sanctified land of Allah. Cure lies in my soil and water and I have no pride.\(^1\)

This is only a portion of that which they claim regarding Karbalā’. Gathering and studying all of their narrations would require a separate volume. However, it would be an insult to the intellect to scrutinise these narrations as they have a greater resemblance to the blabbering of insane people as opposed to the speech of mentally balanced people. If I did not find it in their reliable books and in many of their narrations, I would have brushed it aside as something that is not established (in their religion). Undoubtedly, these narrations are a scathing attack against the Ahl al-Bayt, who they claim to love and support. They are in reality, more vicious towards them than the open enemies. The shamelessness contained herein is so severe that it leads a civilised Shīʿī (who reads it and wishes to believe it) towards the brink of deviation and atheism.

The fabricator of these tales failed miserably in his attempt to turn Muslims away from the Ka‘bah, as the only people who are affected by these narrations and visit Karbalā’ are those whose ears have been blocked from the truth and their eyes have been blinded from it on account of their fanaticism. The result is that they continue to dwell in the valleys of misguidance.

As long as the Book of Allah remains among the Muslims, they will never be affected by these plots. It is only those who abandon the Book of Allah, and instead take the word of the Ḥujjahs, Sayyids, Ayatollahs and that which his sect does—even though it has no proof from the Qur‘ān—who will be affected. The one who narrates this tale from Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq is a person by the name of Ṣafwān

\(^{1}\) Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 270, Biḥār al-Anwār 101/109
al-Jammāl. The Shīʿah declare him to be reliable.¹ He is the one who will bear the burden of these lies, if this chain is not another hallucination, as I did not find anyone by this name in the books of narrators of the Ahl al-Sunnah that I referred to.

The angels appear before the visitors of Ḥusayn and Allah has private conversations with them

The extremism of the Shīʿah as far as their narrations concerning the merits of visiting the grave of Ḥusayn surpassed all imaginable limits. The intelligence is stunned upon seeing the extent to which they went. Imam Jaʿfar is alleged to have said:

من خرج من منزله يريد زیارة الحسین كتب الله له بكلّ خطوة حسنة.. إلى أن قال: وإذا قضى مناسكه.. أتاه ملك فقال له: أنا رسول الله، ربّك یقرئك السّلام ویقول لك: استأنف فقد غفر لك ما مضى

Whoever leaves his home with the desire to visit Ḥusayn, Allah records for him a good deed upon every step...When he completes his rites, an angel appears before him and says, “I am the messenger of Allah, your Rabb. He is sending greetings to you and saying to you, ‘Start afresh, as he has forgiven whatever passed.’”²

The angels meet the visitors of the grave, convey to them the greetings of Allah and distribute among them certificates of forgiveness. This claim surpasses the speech of the insane by a few levels. Much worse is the following claim:

فإذا أتاه (یعني آتى الزّائر قبر الحسین) ناجاه الله فقال: عبدي، سلني أعطك، ادعني أجبك

When he (the visitor of the grave of Ḥusayn) comes to him, Allah personally converses with him saying, “My slave, ask me, I will grant you. Call out to me, I will answer.”³

¹ Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth 9/121
³ Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 132, Wasā’il al-Shīʿah 10/342, Thawāb al-Aʿmāl pg. 51
In this way, they attribute lies to Allah, an act which can only be carried out by one who does not believe in Allah at all. This is their claim despite the fact that they have adopted the viewpoint of those who do not believe in the attributes of Allah regarding the speech of Allah. “Allah personally speaks to the visitors of Ḥusayn.” Most certainly, this is a dangerous lie and a great slander!

As usual, they were not satisfied with the degree of their extremism. They go on to claim that Allah (who is far beyond all the claims of the evil ones) himself visits the graves of the Imāms, along with the Shīʿah. Al-Biḥār of al-Majlisī states:

إنّ قبر أمير المؤمنين يزوره الله مع الملائكة ويزوره الأنبیاء ويزوره المؤمنون

Allah visits the grave of Amīr al-Muʿminīn along with the angels. The Ambiyā’ as well as the believers also visit it.¹

Heinous indeed is that which comes out of their mouths and is written by their pens. They say nothing but lies.

**The rites of the graves**

Visiting the graves is among the obligations of their religion.² The one who leaves it out is considered a disbeliever (kāfir).³ Al-Majlisī dedicated a chapter thus titled, ‘the chapter (proving that) visiting him is obligatory, compulsory and it has been commanded and the criticism, reproach and warning that is narrated

---

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/258


3 *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* narrates from Hārūn ibn Khārijah who asked Abū ʿAbd Allah:

سألته عمن ترك الزیارة زیارة قبر الحسین علیه السلام من غير علة، فقال: هذا رجل من أهل النار

I asked him regarding one who leaves out visiting the grave of Ḥusayn without any excuse. He replied, “This is a man from the people of the fire.”


4 i.e. Ḥusayn
for its abandoning. In this chapter, he quotes forty of their narrations.\(^1\) This is the starting point. It is followed by their stipulation of rites like the rites carried out during Ḥajj. Ibn Taymiyyah says:

Their scholar, Ibn al-Nuʿmān—more well-known as al-Mufīd by them—authored a book titled, \textit{Manāṣik al-Mashāhid}, in which he made the graves of the creation places around which Ṭawāf is performed just as it is performed around the Kaʿbah which Allah made as a place of support for the people. It is the first house that was placed for people. Hence it is the only place around which Ṭawāf is performed, the only place towards which ᵐ صلى الله عليه وسلم should performed and the only place which is travelled to for Ḥajj (by divine command).\(^2\)

However, in this day and age, their scholar, Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī has revealed to us in his book, \textit{Kitāb Al-Dharīʿah}, that the compilations that are exclusively regarding the graves and their rites are no less than sixty in number.\(^3\) All of these books were written to lay the foundations of shirk that was to follow. Besides these books, their reliable books of narrations have specific chapters dedicated to the subject, as will be expounded upon. Below, we present to you some of the rites:

\textbf{i. Performing Ṭawāf around graves}

Ibn Taymiyyah says:

There is consensus among the Muslims that Ṭawāf does not take place around anything besides the Kaʿbah.\(^4\) The scholars of the Shīʿah on the other hand, have ordained for their followers Ṭawāf around the graves of the deceased ʿImāms. To support this shirk, they fabricated narrations in

---

\(^1\) \textit{Bīḥār al-Anwār} 101/1-11
\(^2\) \textit{Minhāj al-Sunnah} 1/175, \textit{Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā} 17/498
\(^3\) Refer to \textit{Al-Dharīʿah} 20/316-326
\(^4\) \textit{Majmūʿ Fatāwā} 4/521
the names of the Ahl al-Bayt. Al-Majlisī states that in one of (the narrations regarding) visitation of some of the Imāms, it is stated, “Except that we perform Ṭawaf around your tombs,” and in other narrations it is stated, “Kissed the sides of the grave.” He also states that al-Riḍā (according to his beliefs) would perform Ṭawaf around the grave of Rasūl Allah 1.

He established these polytheistic rites in his religion from texts like the one quoted above. He did not look at the explicit and categorical texts in the Book of Allah which prohibit polytheism and promise that the Fire of Jahannam will be the ghastly abode of those who engage in it. Furthermore, he was confused by the contradictory narrations, as usual, which demolishes their view on these aspects. Since these narrations are also reported from the Imāms, he resorts to interpreting them differently.

Some of their narrations prohibit doing Ṭawaf around the graves of the Imāms. They report from their Imām:

لا تشرب وأنتم قائم ولا تطف بقبر، .. فكأن من فعل ذلك فلا يلوم إلا نفسه، ومن فعل شيء من ذلك لم يكن يفارقه إل ما شاء الله

Do not drink whilst standing and do not do Ṭawaf of a grave... Whoever does so should not blame anyone besides himself and whoever does any of that, it will not leave him except for the period that Allah wishes.2

Al-Majlisī really put himself through trouble trying to get around this one. He says:

يحتمل أن يكون النهي عن الطواف بالعدد المخصص الذي يُطاف بالبيت

It is possible that the specific number of Ṭawafs which are performed around the Ka’bah is being prohibited.3

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 100/126
2 Ibn Bābuwayh pg. 283, Biḥār al-Anwār 100/126
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 100/126
Ponder over this act of al-Majlisī. Instead of attempting to comply with that which is in the Book of Allah, the practice of the Muslims and the narration of the Shī‘ah which says, “Do not do Ṭawāf of a grave,” by prohibiting his people from this innovation (in which lies his salvation as well as theirs), he chooses to interpret the text so that it does not go against this act of theirs. He simply had to accept this narration as it is and interpret the other narrations, as they are unestablished and they lead to misguidance and shirk. However, he chose to insist that his deviant cult-rite is established by further stating:

یحتمل أن يكون المراد بالطواف المنفي هنا التغوط

It is possible that the prohibition from Ṭawāf here refers to relieving oneself.\(^1\)

The religion of the Shī‘ah is not that which is established from the Imāms. Rather, it is that which al-Majlisī establishes (as you have read). Similarly, the actions of the Shī‘ah are an imitation of the actions of their scholars and not the actions of the Imāms. They turned away from the command of the Imām, who said, “Do not do Ṭawāf around a grave,” just as they turned away from the commands of Allah, His Rasūl \(\text{صلى الله عليه وسلم} \) and the consensus of the Muslims. Thus, they deviated from the straight path and led their people astray.

\textbf{ii. Ṣalāh at the grave}

It is from the rites of visiting the tombs that a person performs two or more units of ṣalāh at the graves of the Imāms. At times, they even take these graves as the Qiblah. The reward of each unit (rak‘ah) surpasses that of hundreds of Ḥajj. One narration states:

الصلاة في حرم الحسين لك بكلّ ركعة تركة عنده كثواب من حجّ ألف حجّة، واعتبر ألف عمرة، وأعتق ألف رقية، وكأنّما وقف في سبيل الله ألف ألف مرّة مع نبي مرس

\(^1\) \textit{Biḥār al-Anwār} 100/127
For each rak‘ah that you perform in the Haram of Husayn, you will be granted the reward of one who carried out a thousand Hajj, a thousand ‘Umrah, and it is as if one stood in the path of Allah a million times in the company of a Nabī who was sent.¹

This reward is not specific to the grave of Husayn ﷺ. It applies to the graves of all the Imāms. Al-Biḥār states:

من زار الرضا أو واحدًا من الأئمة قصلي عنده... فإنه يكتب له... وله بكل خطوة مائة حجة، ومائة عمرة، وعطٌ فریقة في سبيل الله، وكتب له مائة حسنة، وخط عنه مائة سیئة

Whoever visits al-Riḍā² or one of the Imāms and performs ṣalāh at his grave side, he will be granted...³ and upon each step, he will receive one hundred Hajj, one hundred ‘Umrah, freeing of one hundred slaves, one hundred good deeds, and one hundred sins will be wiped out.⁴

Ṣalāh at the grave is considered more virtuous than Hajj to the House of Allah. They prefer that which is akin to shirk over Tawḥīd. This is not surprising, as the polytheists have always claimed that their religion is superior to the religion of Allah, and that they are more guided than the believers. Rasūlullāh curse those who perform ṣalāh at graves. He said:

لعنة الله على اليهود والنصارى اتخذوا قبور أنبیاءهم مساجد

May Allah curse the Jews and Christians. They took the graves of their Ambiyā’ as places of ṣalāh.⁵

---

¹ Al-Wāfī vol.2, 8/234
² The grave of ‘Ali al-Riḍā is considered the most important place in Iran. It is the most revered place by the Shi‘ah. It has a huge dome covered in gold. ‘Abd Allah Fayyād: Mushāhādatī fī l-Irān pg. 102. This is because the graves, looking after them, and performing rituals at them are from the core of their religion.
³ He mentions the same rewards as those mentioned in the previous narrations along with a few additions.
⁴ Biḥār al-Anwār 100/137-138
⁵ Al-Bukhārī (with Fatḥ al-Bārī) 1/532, 3/200, 3/255, 6/294, 8/140, 10/277. The meaning of this ḥadīth is reported in Muslim (pg. 376-377), Ahmad 1/218, 6/80, 84, 121, 146, 229, 252, 255, 275 and al-Dāramī 1/326 as well.
Al-Bukhārī and Muslim report that during the final illness of Rasūlullāh صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم, a church in Abyssinia was mentioned in his presence. It was praised for its beauty and pictures. Thereupon, he said:

إن أولئك إذا مات فيهم الرجل الصالح بنوا على قبره مسجدًا، وصوروا في تلك التصاویر، أولئك شرار الخلق عند الله

When a pious person would pass away from these people, they would build a Masjid upon his grave and place in it those pictures. They are the worst of creation according to Allah.¹

This is not something that is a “Sunni view”. The same appears in the books of the Shīʿah. However, as per their habit, the scholars of the Shīʿah do away with it by way of interpretation.

iii. Prostrating at the graves

Among the rites of visiting the grave is prostrating towards it, rubbing ones cheeks on it, kissing the entrance, and speaking to the person inside until one runs out of breath, as they explain. Al-Majlisī, under the chapter, ‘That which is desirable to do at his grave’² mentions that the one who they refer to as the Shaykh al-Ṭāʾifah says whilst describing the actions that are to be done on a Friday visit:

ثم تنكبّ على القبر وتقول: مولي إمامي، مظلوم استعدى على ظالمه، النصر، النصر حتى ينقطع النفس

Then he will fall upon the grave (prostrate) and say, “My master, my Imām. I am oppressed. His oppressors have transgressed against me. Help! Help!” until his breath runs out.³

² Biḥār al-Anwār 101/285
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 101/285
In most of their discussions regarding these visitations, they emphasise prostrating upon the grave and supplicating to it during the visit and at the end of it. In Imām Ja’far’s advice concerning the rites of visiting Husayn (as they allege), they are commanded to fast for three days prior to their visit. This should be followed by bathing, wearing clean clothes, and performing two units of ṣalāh. Thereafter, he says:

فيما أتیت الباب فقف خارج القبة، وأوم بطرفك نحو القبر وقل: یا مولي یا أبا عبد الله یا ابن رسول الله عبدك وابن عبدك وابن أمتك، الذّلیل بین يديك، المفصّر في علو قدرك، المعترف بحقّك، جاعك مستجیرًا بدمتّك، فاصّده إلی حرملك، متوجّهًا إلی مقامك – إلى أن قال: - ثمّ انكبّ على القبر وقل: یا مولي أتیتك خائفًا فآمنني، وأتیتك مستجیرًا فأجرني.. ثم انكبّ على القبر ثانية

When you reach the door, stand outside the dome, indicate with your eyes towards the grave and say, “O my master, O Abū ʿAbd Allāh, O son of Rasūlullāh, your slave, the son of your slave, the son of your slave-girl... the humiliated one before you, the one who falls short regarding your lofty status and the one who acknowledges your rights has come to you seeking your protection, heading towards your Ḥaram, going towards your place...” Then you should fall prostrate upon the grave and say, “O my master, I have come to you in a state of fear, so grant me safety, and I came to seeking protection so protect me...then fall prostrate upon the grave a second time...”1

The narration continues to mention supplications that will be directed to the creation instead of Allah, along with humbling oneself at their graves in the same manner that one humbles himself before Allah. If this is not shirk, then what is shirk? Al-Mufīd said something similar to this:

فإذا أردت الخروج فانكبّ على القبر وقبله... ثمّ ارجع إلى مشهد الحسين وقل: السلام عليك يا أبا عبد الله، أنت لي جَئُهَا من العذاب

When you wish to exit, fall prostrate upon the grave and kiss it... then

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 101/257-261, Ἄn al-Mazār al-Kabīr by Muḥammad al-Mash-hadī pg. 143-144
return to the grave of Ḥusayn and say, “Peace be upon you, O Ḥusayn, you are my shield from the punishment.”¹

Thus, in their religion, associating partners with Allah is from that which is recommended. Prostrating to the grave or towards the one inside it is termed by them as ‘inkibāb’. Then, they supplicate to one who has passed away and does not even have control over that which is beneficial or harmful for him as if they are supplicating to the Creator of the heavens and the earth, who has complete control over everything. Allah says:

وَمَنْ أَضَلُّ مِمَّنۡ يَّدْعُوْ مِنْ دُوْنِ اللَّهِ مَنْ لَ یَسْتَجِیْبُ لَهُ إِلٰی یَوْمِ الْقِیَامَةِ وَهُمْ عَنْ دُعَائِهِمْ غَافِلُوْنَ

And who is more astray than he who invokes besides Allah those who will not respond to him until the Day of Resurrection [i.e., never], and they, of their invocation, are unaware.²

They believe that this act of shirk is “the best act of worship and they bluff their followers into thinking that it makes compulsory the forgiveness of sins, entry into Jannah, salvation from the fire, shedding of evil deeds, raising of ranks, and acceptance of supplications.”³ This act also makes “compulsory a long life, protection of ones being and wealth, increase in sustenance, ease of difficulties, and fulfilment of needs.”⁴ Furthermore, it is “equal to Ḥajj, ‘Umrah, Jihād, and freeing slaves”,⁵ among the other imaginary virtues that they have attached to it. Who can now doubt that they add to the religion of Allah that which has absolutely no basis?

² Sūrah al-Aḥqāf: 5
³ This is a chapter-heading of Biḥār al-Anwār. The chapter contains 37 narrations to ‘prove’ this. 101/21-28
⁴ This is another chapter-heading of Biḥār al-Anwār. The chapter contains 17 narrations. 101/45-48
⁵ This is yet another chapter-heading of Biḥār al-Anwār. The chapter contains 84 narrations. 101/28-44
They hold onto any acts of shirk, major or minor, even if they cannot find any proof from their books (which have so many acts of shirk that they do not need to go beyond them) to substantiate it. As an example, al-Majlisī says:

وأمّا تقبّل الأعتاب فم نقف على نصّ يعتدّ به ولكن علیه الإمامیّة

As for kissing the entrances, we did not come across any reliable text. However, the Imāmiyyah have been doing it.¹

In other words, they do these acts in blind-imitation of their predecessors. It is as if their souls were not satisfied with the abundant shirk and acts thereof which is found in their books. Thus, they held on to that which their predecessors were doing. They are no different to the polytheists who said:

إِنَّا وَجَدْنَا آبَاءنَا عَلَى أُمَّةٍ وَإِنَّا عَلَى آثَارِهِم مُّهْتَدُوْنَ

Indeed, we found our fathers upon a religion, and we are, in their footsteps, following.²

Each Imām has a new set of polytheistic ideas attributed to him. This is to the extent that the awaited one—who is yet to be born—also has new ideas regarding the subject, such as facing the grave in ṣalāh whilst facing ones back to the Ka'bah (as will appear later) and rubbing the cheeks on the grave; as they believe that the command to do this was issued from the ‘blessed corner’, i.e. from the awaited Mahdi through the medium of the representatives. They believe that the Mahdi said:

وَالذِّي علیه العمل أن يضع خدّه الأيمن على القبر

That which is practiced upon is that he places his right cheek upon the grave.³

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 100/136, Umdat al-Zāʾir pg. 29
2 Sūrah al-Zukhruf: 23
3 Umdat al-Zāʾir pg. 31
It is for this reason that their scholars state that among the etiquette of visiting these graves is:

وضع الخدّ الأيمن عند الفراغ من الزّيارة والدّعاء

Placing the right cheek upon completing the visit and supplication.¹

They state:

لا كراهة في تقبيل الصّرايح؛ بل هو سنّة عندنا ولو كان هناك تقية فتركه أولى

There is no problem with kissing the grave. In fact, it is Sunnah according to us. However, if there is (a reason to do) Taqiyyah, then it is better to leave it out.²

These are new ideas that were innovated by the evil scholars of the Rāfiḍah. The Muslims are unanimous that nothing should be touched or kissed besides the two right Rukns (the two pillars of the Kaʿbah). The Ḥajr Aswad is touched and kissed, whilst the Rukn Yemāni is only touched. There is a view that it should also be kissed, however, this view is weak. There is nothing else that should be kissed or touched, even the rest of the Kaʿbah, the boulder, the room of Nabī مسجد النبي ﷺ, and the rest of the graves of the Ambiyā’.³

The motive behind these ideas is to stop people from the religion of Allah and to call towards shirk. The pathway to it is set by these acts. There are some supplications which go hand in hand with these rituals the end result of which is the deification of the Imāms which makes the Shirk of the Shīʿah far worse than that of the polytheists of the pre-Islamic era.

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 100/134, ’Umdat al-Zā’ir pg. 30
² Biḥār al-Anwār 100/136
³ Majmūʿ Fatāwā 4/521
iv. Taking the grave as a Qiblah like the House of Allah

The leading scholar of the Shīʿah, al-Majlisī says:

إنّ استقبال القبر أمر لزم، وإن لم يكن موافقًا للقبلة.. واستقبال القبر لزّائر بمنزلة استقبال القبلة وهو وجه الله، أي جهته التي أمر النّاس باستقبالها في تلك الحالة

Facing the grave is a mandatory matter, even if it is not in the same direction as the Qiblah... Facing the grave, for the visitor is like facing the Qiblah; and it is the face of Allah, i.e. His direction, that he commanded the people to face in that condition.¹

Look at what al-Majlisī does when he finds (as usual) the following two narrations of his sect contradicting one another:

عن أبي جعفر محمد الباقر يقول: "إن رسول الله صلى الله علیه وسلم.. قال: لا تتخذوا قبري قبلاً ولا مسجدًا، فإنّ الله عزّ وجلّ لعن الذين اتخذوا قبور أنبیائهم مساجد

Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad al-Bāqir said, “Rasūlullah صلى الله علیه وسلم said, ‘Do not take my grave as a Qiblah or a place of ṣalāh, as Allah cursed those who took the graves of their Ambiyā’ as places of ṣalāh.’”²

كتب الحمیري إلى النّاحیة المقدّسة يسأل عن الرّجل یزور قبور الأئمّة علیهم السّلام.. هل یجوز لمن صلّى عند بعض قبورهم علیهم السّلام أن یقوم وراء القبر ویجعل القبر قبلاً أم یقوم عند رأسه أو رجليه؟ وهل يجوز أن یتقدم القبر ویصلي ویجعل القبر خلفه أم ل؟ فأجاب.. أمّا الصّلاة فإنّها خلفه ویجعل القبر أمامه، ولا يجوز أن يصلّي بين يديه ولا عن يمينه ولا عن يساره؛ لأن الإمام صلى الله عليه لا يتقدم عليه ولا يساوي

Al-Himyarī³ wrote to the sacred corner (the non-existent awaited Mahdi) asking about a man who visits the graves of the Imāms, “Is it permissible

---

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 101/369
² Ibn Bābuwayh: ‘Ilal al-Sharāʿi’ pg. 358, Biḥār al-Anwār 100/128
³ ‘Abd Allah ibn Jaʿfar ibn Mālik al-Ḥimyarī. One of the great liars who claimed to have had correspondences with the awaited Mahdi. He is considered reliable by the Rawāfiḍ. Refer to al-Fahrist of al-Ṭūsī pg. 132, Rijāl al-Ḥillī pg. 106
for the one who performs ṣalāh at the graves of some of them to stand behind the grave and take the grave as Qiblah and should he stand by the head or feet? Is it permissible to stand in front of the grave and perform ṣalāh with the grave behind him or not?”

The (imaginary) Mahdī replied, “As for ṣalāh, it is behind the Imām and the grave should be in front of him. It is not permissible to perform ṣalāh in front of it, to the right of it or to the left of it, as the Imām is not stood in front of, nor is he stood next to.”

Al-Majlisī gives preference to the second one. He says:

يمكن حمل الخبر السابق على التّقیة أو على أنّه ل یجوز أن یجعل قبورهم بمنزلة الكعبة یتوجّه إلیها من كلّ جانب

It is possible to interpret the first narration as Taqiyyah or that it is not permissible to take their graves to be like the Ka’bah, which is faced from every direction.

Among the scholars are those who interpret the first narration to mean ṣalāh in congregation and the second to mean individual ṣalāh. The narrations which support the second narration (of taking the grave as a Qiblah) will appear under the chapters of visiting.

This is how their scholars supported shirk and rejected the truth, even though it appeared in their books. Al-Majlisī gives preference to that which is reported from the awaited one, which has no reality to it and rejects that which is reported from Abū Ja’far from Rasūlullāh, which matches the teachings of the Qur’ān,

1 Al-Ṭabarsī: al-Iḥtijāj 2/312, Biḥār al-Anwār 100/128
2 As it (the grave) is only the Qiblah from one direction according to them, unlike the Ka’bah which is the Qiblah from all directions. This is not out of their reverence for the Ka’bah but rather because they fear that it may lead to someone being in front of the grave, as is indicated to in al-Tawqī’.
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 100/128
the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Muslims. Another juncture where al-Majlisī was reluctant to accept the word of his Imām is when he spoke regarding the manner of visiting the grave from far. He said:

اغتسل يوم الجمعة أو أي يوم شئت، والبس أطهر ثيابك واصعد إلى أعلى موضع في دارك أو الصحراء، فاستقبل القبلة بوجهك بعدما تبين أن القبر هناك

Bath on Friday or any other day that you wish, wear your clothes which are most pure and climb to the highest place of your house or an open field. Face the Qiblah after ascertaining that the grave is there (in the same direction).

Al-Majlisī could not stomach this, as facing the grave is compulsory in his religion. Thus he said:

قوله: فاستقبل القبلة بوجهك لعله عليه السلام إنما قال ذلك لمن أمكنه استقبال القبر والقبلة معاً، ويحتمل أن يكون المراد بالقبلة هنا جهة القبر مجازًا.. ولا يبعد أن تكون القبلة تصحيف القبر

His statement, ‘Face the Qiblah’; perhaps he only said that regarding one for whom it is possible to face both, the grave as well as the Qiblah... It is possible that the figurative meaning of Qiblah i.e. the grave, is meant here... It is not far-fetched that ‘Qiblah’ was mistakenly written in place of ‘grave’.

He had to go present all of these interpretations and twist the meaning to this extent to defend this stance of his regarding his sect:

حكموا باستقبال القبر مطلقًا وهو الموافق للأخبار الأخر في زياره البعيد

They have declared that the grave should be faced at all times (i.e. during the different types of visitations), and this is in compliance with the other narrations regarding visiting from afar.

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 101/369
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 101/369-370
He also says:

إنه مع بعد الزائر عن القبر یستحسن استقبال القبر في الصلاة واستدبار الكعبة

Even though the visitor is far from the grave, it is preferable that he should face the grave and face his back towards the Ka'bah.

This is regarding the two rak'ats of Ziyārah (visiting), regarding which they say:

إن رکعتي الزیارة لبد منهما عند کل قبر

The two rak'ats of Ziyārah are necessary at every grave.

This is not surprising from a nation who believes that Karbalā’ is greater than the Ka'bah. What is the name of this religion, which tells its followers to face their backs to the Ka'bah and their faces to the graves of the Imāms? What is the name of the religion of the scholars who call towards this? They may adopt any name for themselves, except Islam. Islam is a religion of monotheism. The Rasūl of Islam strictly prohibited performing ṣalāh at graves. What then do you think he would say regarding performing ṣalāh towards the grave?

The irony, yet again, is that the prohibition from taking graves as places of ṣalāh and facing them appears in the very books of the Shī'ah such as Al-Wasā’il of al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī amongst others. Similarly, their books also state that performing ṣalāh towards any direction besides the Qiblah is incorrect. The endless contradictions

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 101/135
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 101/134
3 It is narrated in the books of the Shī'ah that ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn said, “Nabī said, ‘Do not take my grave as a Qiblah or a Masjid. Indeed Allah cursed the Jews upon taking the graves of their Ambiyā’ as Masjids.’” Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh 1/57, Wasā’il al-Shī’ah 3/455. However, the religion of these people is based upon their scholars, who laid for them a foundational principle, “Oppose the masses (Ahl al-Sunnah).” Thus, they have led their people far away from the straight path.
4 The author of al-Wasā’il quoted five narrations in which this meaning is conveyed. Refer to Wasā’il al-Shī’ah 3/277. For further reading of the invalidity of performing ṣalāh towards any direction besides the Qiblah according to them, refer to Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh 1/79, 122, Tahdhib al-Aḥkām 1/146, 178, 192, 218, Furū’ l-Kāfī 1/83
in this religion is quite amazing! Nonetheless, that which was presented to you is only a fraction of what appears in their reliable sources on the topic of the graves. There is much more to it. The matter of the graves and its rites received the same amount of attention by them as the matter of Imāmah.

The reliable books of their religion dedicate special sections to this, yet you will not find any of this in the books of the Muslims, who uphold monotheism. In Biḥār al-Anwār of al-Majlisī, there is a special book which is titled, Kitāb al-Mazā’ (the book of the tomb). This book contains many chapters and hundreds of narrations. This book takes up almost three volumes of the latest print of Biḥār al-Anwār.¹

Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah of al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī contains 106 chapters under the title, ‘Chapters of the tomb’.² Al-Wāfī (which gathers the four seminal Shī‘ī books) by al-Kāshānī has thirty three chapters under the title, ‘The chapters of the tombs and graves’.³ Man Lā Yahḍurhū al-Faqīh by Ibn Bābuwayh (one of their reliable works) has many chapters regarding the tombs and honouring them such as ‘The chapter regarding the soil of Ḥusayn and the precincts of his grave’ and ‘Chapters regarding visiting the Imāms and its virtues’.⁴ Mustadrak al-Wasā’il contains 86 chapters in which 276 narrations regarding visitations and the tombs are quoted.⁵ This is besides that which is contained in their other books which are equal in status to the eight fundamental sources (according to them) like Thawāb al-Aʿmāl of Ibn Bābuwayh and others.

Besides all of the above, they have special books that were written in the past and in recent times regarding these visitations. A few of them are; Kāmil al-Ziyārāt by Ibn Qūlawayh, Mafātīḥ al-Jinān by ‘Abbās al-Qummī, ‘Umdat al-Zā‘ir by Ḥaydar al-Ḥusaynī and Ḍiyā’ al-Ṣāliḥīn by al-Jawhari, etc. All of these books state the (fictitious) merits accrued by one who undertakes a special journey to visit the graves of the Imāms, do Ṭawāf around them, supplicate in their precincts and call out for help to the ones inside them. They also mention hundreds of

---

1 They are 100, 101 and 102.
2 10/251
3 Vol. 2 8/193
4 Refer to Man Lā Yahḍurhū al-Faqīh 2/338
5 Refer to al-Nūr al-Ṭabarsī: Mustadrak al-Wasā’il 2/189-234
supplications in which the extreme utterances regarding the Imāms raise them to the point of taking them as partners to the Creator. Only Allah knows the exact extent to which they go to in committing shirk.

The effect of their commitment to this doctrine, which destroys the foundation of Tawḥīd is quite visible in the lands of the Shīʿah. There, you will see that the houses of shirk, referred to as Mash-hads are well-attended, whereas the houses of Tawḥīd (the Masjids) are neglected. To this day, they remain committed to these acts of Shirk, as will be explained, Allah willing.\(^1\)

**Analysing the practice of visiting the graves**

The Muslims have one Kaʿbah which they face when performing ṣalāh and at the time of supplication. It is the only place towards which they travel for the purposes of Ḥajj and Ṭawāf. The Shīʿah on the other hand have Mazārs, Mash-hads, and Kaʿbah which are all the graves of dead people believed to be the Imāms\(^2\) as well as others.\(^3\) These graves (according to them) compete with the House of Allah and even surpass it. Shirk is upheld in them and Tawḥīd is destroyed.

---

1 Refer to chapter three of the fourth section.

2 Many of these graves which are attributed to the Imāms do not contain their bodies. Neither is the place in Najaf, which is believed to be the grave of ʿAlī ʿaṣf, his actual grave nor is the place in Karbalāʾ, which is believed to be the grave of Ḥusayn ʿaṣf, his actual grave. This is something that is supported by historical records, even if the Shīʿah insist on denying it. Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb: al-Muntaqā pg. 158.

For further reading, refer to Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā 27/446. Ibn Taymiyyah says, “The reality of this is that most of these graves and tombs are disputed and false. Only a few of them can be traced with some certainty, after lengthy research. This is because knowing them and building masjids upon them is not part of the teachings of Islam.”

3 The extremism of the Ṭaʿlīṣ in their attachment to graves led them towards showing devotion to the graves of people besides the Imāms as well. For example, refer to the chapter of the ‘virtues of visiting the grave of ‘Abd al-ʿAẓīm al-Ḥasanī’ in Biḥār al-Anwār (102/268). In here it is stated that Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī said:

من زار قبر عبد العظیم كان زار قبر الحسن

Whoever visits the grave of ‘Abd al-ʿAẓīm is like the one who visited the grave of Ḥusayn. Biḥār al-Anwār 102/268, Thawāb al-ʿA māl pg. 89, Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 324

Similarly, al-Majlisi has a chapter about visiting Fāṭimah bint Mūsā in Qum. Refer to Biḥār al-Anwār 102/265
It is sometimes claimed that shirk and tombs are wide-spread in the lands of the Ahl al-Sunnah as well. Ibn Taymiyyah dealt with this question under the discussion regarding the exaggeration of the Shī‘ah with regard to their Imāms due to which they innovated many an practices. He says, “If it is said, ‘A lot of that which you have described from the extremism, shirk, and innovations of the Shī‘ah regarding their Imāms is found among those who are attributed to the Sunnah...’” He then replies by saying that whatever is prohibited by Allah and His Rasūl is definitely worthy of criticism, whether the person doing it is attributed to the Sunnah or he is from the Shī‘ah. However, that which the Rāfiḍah do in these aspects (which contradict the Qur’ān and Sunnah) surpasses that which is done by the Ahl al-Sunnah.¹

An important difference that I would like to highlight is that those of the Ahl al-Sunnah who carry out these acts are doing so whilst turning away from their beliefs whereas the Shī‘ah who carry out these acts do so due to the encouragement and rewards promised in their books for these acts. In other words, these acts are proven from Shī‘ī texts and refuted in Sunnī texts. Based on this, that which is found among the Ahl al-Sunnah can be corrected and reformed as opposed to that which is found among the Shī‘ah, as it will be necessary to first change their seminal books.

The greatest danger and sickness is that shirk is portrayed as the truth in the reliable books of the Shī‘ah, and it has become the actual dīn. Their seminal books, have many chapters, which include hundreds of narrations in which shirk is strengthened and re-iterated. As we explained, they even dedicated complete books to this evil. The Shī‘ah adopted the same extremism regarding their Imāms that the Christians adopted regarding ĪsāMLS.

The Rawāfiḍ have left out worshipping Allah, hence you will see the Masjids (which Allah commanded to be raised and wherein his name should be remembered) are deserted whilst they revere the tombs that are built upon the graves. They attach

¹ Refer to Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/177-178
themselves to these places in the same way that the polytheists would attach themselves to their idols. They perform Ḥajj to these places instead of the House of Allah, and they consider travelling to them, doing Tawāf of them, performing ṣalāh by them, offering sacrifices in their vicinity, prostrating upon the grave, seeking help from it, and asking it for cure to be the greatest acts of worship, as proven earlier.

Who can be more misguided than those who prefer shirk over Tawḥīd, the Mash-hads over the Maṣjids, and Karbalā’ over Makkah, ‘Arafāh, and Minā?1 Who can be more misguided than one who exchanges the truth for falsehood and then believes that he is more rightly-guided than those who believe in Allah? It is obvious that Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not command his Ummah to do any of these deeds at the Mash-hads, nor did he ask them to carry out any ‘rites’ when visiting the graves of the Ambiyā’ and the pious. Rather, this is from the religion of the polytheists regarding whom Allah said:

وَقَالُوْا لَتَذَرُّنَّ آلِهَتَكُمْ وَلَتَذَرُّنَّ وَدًّا وَّلَسُوَاعًا وَلَیَغُوْثَ وَیَعُوْقَ وَنَسْرًا

And they said, “Never leave your gods and never leave Wadd, Šuwā’, Yaghūth, Ya’ūq and Nasr.”2

Ibn ʿAbbās and others have stated:

هؤلاء.. أسماء رجال صالحين من قوم نوح، فلما هلكوا أوحى الشيطان إلى قومهم أن انصبوا إلى مجالسهم التي كانوا يجلسون أتشابا وسموها بأسمائهم، ففعلوا، فلم تعبد، حتى إذا هلك أولئك وتنسخ العلم عبدت

These were the names of pious men from the nation of Nūḥ. When they passed away, the devil inspired their nation that they should erect statues at the places that these people would sit and name them after them. Thus,

1 Al-Jurjānī: al-Muʿāraḍah fi al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah scroll 71
2 Sūrah Nūḥ: 23
they did this. The (statues) were not worshipped (by them), however when this generation passed away and knowledge faded, they were worshipped.¹

Amīr al-Mu’minīn ’Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib said to Abū Hayāj al-Asadī:

ألا أبعثك على ما بعثني رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم؟ أن لا تدع تمثالًا إلا طمسته، ولا قبرًا مشرفًا إلا سوّيتة

Should I not send you to do that for which Rasūlullāh sent me? Do not leave any statue except that you destroy it and do not leave any raised grave except that you flatten it.²

Hadīth of similar meaning are found in Shī‘ī narrations as well. Al-Kulaynī reports from Abū ‘Abd Allāh:

قال أمير المؤمنين صلى الله عليه وسلم: بعثني رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى المدينة فقال: لا تدع صورة إلا محوتها ولا قبرًا إلا سوّيتة

Amīr al-Mu’minīn said, “Rasūlullāh sent me to Madīnah and said, ‘Do not leave any picture, except that you scratch it out and do not leave any grave except that you flatten it.’”³

Another narration states:

بعثني رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في هدم القبور وكسر الصور

Rasūlullāh sent me to destroy graves and pictures.⁴

---

¹ Al-Bukhārī with Fatḥ al-Bārī pg. 8/667
³ Furūʿ al-Kāfī 2/227, Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 2/829
⁴ Furūʿ al-Kāfī 2/227, Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 2/870
Abū ‘Abd Allāh says:

نهى رسول الله صلى الله علیه وسلم أن یصلى على قبر أو یقعد علیه أو یبنى علیه

Rasūlullāh prohibited performing ṣalāh, sitting on, and building upon a grave.¹

Abū ‘Abd Allāh said on another occasion:

لا تبنوا على القبور... فإنُّ رسول الله صلى الله علیه وسلم کره ذلك

Do not build upon graves... Rasūlullāh disliked that.²

He also reports from his fore-fathers, who in turn report that Rasūlullāh:

نهی أن یجصّص المقابر

He forbade plastering graves.³

Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī claimed that this prohibition included all graves “besides the grave of Rasūlullāh and the Imāms, and that this prohibition was merely to show dislike.”⁴ The above narrations are quite explicit in their purport, and they contain no exceptions. Similarly, there is no ambiguity in the fact that prohibition (and not merely dislike) was being declared. Al-ʿĀmilī has no proof to back his claim besides the acts confined to his nation and the fabrications that are found in their books.

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām 1/130, Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 2/869
2 Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām 1/130, al-Barqī: al-Maḥāsin pg. 612, Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 2/870
4 This is clearly stated in the chapter heading (Building upon the grave of anyone besides the grave of Rasūlullāh and the Imāms is disliked). Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 2/869. However, the strange reality is that none of the narrations in this chapter substantiate his claim. Rather, they oppose the stance of the Shī‘ah.
This is in fact a proof that the act is unfounded, as it does not conform to the Qur’ān, Sunnah or the consensus of the Ummah—amongst whom are the Ahl al-Bayt, who warned against these acts on account of them leading towards shirk. Further, the wisdom behind the prohibition does not differ from grave to grave. In fact, there is greater danger of shirk at the graves of the Imāms as compared to normal people. The origin of shirk is exaggeration and extremism regarding the pious.¹

The Shīʿī books contain narrations which are in stark conflict with their polytheistic beliefs. The supplications of the Imāms to Allah, their display of humility in His court and their confinement of their attention to him (which the Shīʿah narrate) expose the falseness of their beliefs and they expose the fact that the happenings at the tombs have no link at all with the teachings of these illustrious people. Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq says in his supplication (as admitted by the Shīʿah in their books):

اللهم إنّي أصبحت لا أملك لنفسي ضرًا ولا نفعًا ولا حياة ولا موتًا ولا نشورًا، قد ذلّ مصرعي، واستكان عذري، وقل ناصري، وأسلمني أهلي ووالدي وولدي بعد قيام حجتك مضجعي، وظهر ضري، وانقطع عليّ، وظهور براهينك عندي، ووضوح أدلتك لي.

و اللهم وقد.. أعیت الحیل، وتغلقت الطرق، وضاقت المذاهب، ودرست المال إل منك، وانقطع الرّجاء إل من جهتك..

O Allah I am witnessing the morning in a state that I do not have any control over that which is harmful for me, beneficial for me, my life, my death, and my resurrection. The strongest point of my body has become humble, my side has become motionless, my difficulty has become apparent, my excuse has come to an end, and my helpers have become few. My family, my father, and my son have handed me over after your proof became established against me and your evidence and substantiations have become clear to me. O Allah... plans have become useless, roads have been blocked and paths have become narrow. Allah hopes have faded except in you and all expectations have come to an end except from you.²

---

¹ Refer to Kitāb al-Tawḥīd (with its commentary Taysīr al-ʿAzīz al-Ḥamīd) pg. 305
² Biḥār al-Anwār 86/318, Mahj al-Daʾwāt pg. 216
This is the manner in which Ja’far al-Ṣādiq pleads in the court of His Rabb. He does not have any control over that which is beneficial or harmful for him. How is it then that he has control of this for others? This supplication was whilst he was alive. After his death, how can anything be expected from him? Similar supplications have been narrated from many of the Imāms.¹ The Shīʿah also report the supplication of ‘Alī, whilst picturing himself in his grave. He said:

إلهی کأسی بنفسي قد أضجعت في حقرتها، وانصرف عنها المشیعون من جبرتها... ولم يخف على الناظرين ضرّ فاقتها... قد توسدت الثرى وعجز حیلتها..

O my Lord, it is as if I am made to lay in its lowest part and those who accompanied it (my body) have turned away from its vicinity... The harmfulness of its deficiency was not hidden to the onlookers... It took the soil as a pillow and its plans have become useless...²

He has no plan of his own. Rather, he relies upon the mercy and benevolence of Allah. How then can a person ask for intercession and forgiveness at his grave and forget the One Whose mercy is all-Encompassing and Whose bounty is tremendous. Ḥusayn could not defend himself from being killed, so how could he be asked for that which is not in the control of anyone besides Allah? Added to that, the books of the Shīʿah report that Rasūlullāh would seek protection on behalf of Hasan and Ḥusayn using these words:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحیم: أعیذ نفسي ودیني وأهلي ومالي وولدي وخواتیم عملي، وما رزقني ربي وخولني بعزة ربي وعظمة الله...

In the name of Allah, the Entirely Merciful, the Most Merciful. I seek protection with the honour and grandeur of Allah for myself, my religion, my family, my wealth, my offspring, my final acts, and that which my Rabb provided me with and gave me.³

---

¹ Refer to Bihār 86/240, 94/89
² Bihār al-Anwār 94/93-94
³ Bihār al-Anwār 94/264, Mahj al-Da’wāt pg. 13
He is unable to protect himself from the evil that comes his way except through the protection of Allah. If this was whilst he was alive, then what can be said about him after his death? In a nutshell, there are no intermediaries between Allah and His creation. If someone wants to insist that intermediaries did exist, his claim will only be correct if he is intending those intermediaries who passed the message of Allah to the creation, i.e. the Ambiyā”. Besides them, there are no intermediaries of any type.
Discussion Four

Their Belief That the Imām can Prohibit and Make Lawful What he Desires

One of the fundamental aspects of Tawḥīd is the belief that Allah alone is the legislator; He can authorise what He desires and prohibit what He desires. The Messengers of Allah are merely propagators of His law. Whoever claims that his Imām can make lawful or prohibit whatever he desires is indeed included in the verse of the Qur’ān:

بِهِ اللّٰهُ ۢ أَمْ لَهُمْ شُرَکَاءُ شَرَعُوْا لَهُم مِّنَ الدِّیْنِ مَا لَمْ یَأْذَنْ يَا للّٰهُ

Do they believe in associates who have legislated for them a religion which Allah has not sanctioned?

The Shīʿah claim, as stated in their narrations:

خلق الله محمدا و علیا و فاطمة فمكثوا ألف دهر ثم خلق جميع الأشياء فأشهدهم خلقها و اجري طاعتهم عليها و فوض أمورهم إليها فهم یحلون ما یشاءون و یحرمون ما یشاءون.

Allah created Muḥammad, ʿAlī, and Fāṭimah. He made them witnesses over the creation which he created a thousand years later, ordained obedience to them upon it, and handed its affairs over to them. They, therefore, have the authority to authorise or prohibit whatever they want.

Al-Majlīsī has also quoted a portion of this narration:

و أجري طاعتهم عليها أي أوجب وألزم على جميع الأشياء طاعتهم حتى الجمادات من السماويات و الأرضيات كشق القمر و إقبال الشجر و تسبيح الحصي و أمثالها مما لا يحصي و فوض أمورها إليهم من التحليل و التحرير و العطاء و المنع. أحكام التحليل و التحرير إليهم.

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 21
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/441; Biḥār al-Anwār 25/340
'And ordained obedience to them upon it' means that he has made obedience to them compulsory in everything including inanimate entities, the heavenly creations, as well as the earthly ones; e.g. the splitting of the moon, the submission of trees, the glorification (Tasbīḥ) of pebbles, etc. 'And has handed its affairs over to them' i.e. in terms of legitimisation (Taḥlīl), prohibition (Taḥrīm), granting ('Atā') and deprivation (Man').

He then goes on to explain that the evident meaning of this text proves that the prerogative of legitimisation and prohibition was accorded to them.


من احللنا له شیئا أصابه من أعمال الظالمین فهو حلال لأن الأئمة منا مفوض الیهم فما أحلوا فهو حلال وما حرموا فهو حرام.

The one for who we make lawful a vice usually considered from the doings of oppressors which he does is permissible for him. Because the Imāms amongst us have been accorded the divine authority; thus whatever they make lawful is lawful and whatever they prohibit is forbidden.”

In this way the Shīʿah affirm that their Imāms have the prerogative of legislation, legitimisation, and prohibition. Thus whatever they deem lawful from the general treasury of the Muslims is fine and whatever they deem forbidden is forbidden.

They have made their Imāms deities other than Allah by attributing the prerogative of prohibition, legitimisation, and legislation to them; thus ascribing partners to Allah in his exclusive oneness as a Rabb. The reason being that sovereignty and divine legislation are the exclusive qualities of Allah, just

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 25/341-342
2 The term ‘Oppressors’ according to the Shīʿah refers to all the rulers of the Islamic empire besides ‘Alī and Ḥasan, since the other Imāms did not rule even for a day. And every other ruler is therefore an oppressor and a usurper of the Imāms as they assume.
3 Al-Ikhtiṣās p. 330; Biḥār al-Anwār 25/334; Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt p.113.
as their adherence to a law which is in complete contrast with the law of Allah and which might at times abrogate, confine, or specify elements of the law introduced by Rasūlullāh, equates to the worship of deities other than Allah.

Nevertheless, the prerogative of legislation is the sole right of the Rabb of Man. The Messengers are merely propagators on his behalf. They cannot prohibit or legitimise anything besides that which Allah orders them to or reveals to them.

Allah has plainly mentioned in the Qurʾān the status of a person who follows his seniors in what they allow and prohibit after having discarded the law of Allah. Allah says:

اتَّخَذُوْا أَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهْبَانَهُمْ أَرْبَابًا مِّنْ دُوْنِ اللّٰهِ

They have taken their priests and Rabbis as deities besides Allah.¹

Allah equates their obedience to their seniors in matters which they legitimate and prohibit (as appears in the exegesis of the verse²) to worshipping them:

تلقوا الحلال و الحرام من جهتهم و هو أمر لا يلتقي إلا من جهة الله عز و جل.

They were receptive to the self-prescribed permissions and prohibitions of their leaders, whereas they ought to be received only from Allah.³

---

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 31.
2 Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 10/113-114; Tafsīr Ibn al-Kathīr 2/373-374. In Uṣūl al-Kāfī there is a narration from Abū ʿAbd Allāh which affirms this interpretation. It reads as follows:

Behold! I swear in the name of Allah that they had not called them to the worship of idols. Had they done so the people would not have obeyed them. But they legitimised the impermissible and prohibited the permissible so conspicuously that they, the people, did not realise. Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/53; Ṭabarsī: Majmaʿ al-Bayān 3/48-49; al-Baḥrānī: al-Burhān 2/120-121; al-Kāshānī: Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 2/336.
This Shīʿī belief resembles the Christian belief regarding their leaders in that they all have taken their priests and rabbis as deities other than Allah.

After the Shīʿah considered their Imāms to be the source of legislation, they took a step further by claiming that all people are the slaves of the Imāms. This makes their polytheism even more obvious. Al-Riḍā states:

الناس عبيد لنا في الطاعة موال لنا في الدين فليبلغ الشاهد الغائب.

People are our slaves in worship and sincerely faithful to us in religion. Hence, those who are present should convey this to those who are absent.¹

Whereas Allah says in the Noble Qurʿān:

ما كان ليسن أن يُؤتِّيَ الله الْكِتَابَ وَالْحُكْمَ وَالْنُّبُوَّةَ ثُمَّ يَقُولُ لِلنَّاسِ كُونُوا عِبَادًا لِّي مِنْ دُونِ اللهِ

It is not behoving of a human that Allah endows him with a divine book, wisdom and nubuwwah then he goes about preaching to people: Become my servants rather than Allah’s.²

So, people in totality are the servants of Allah, not of anyone else even if he be from among the Messengers of Allah bestowed with divine revelation, wisdom and nubuwwah. What can be said then about the Imāms of the Shīʿah or anyone else who is claimed to be an Imām.

Furthermore, just as the Imāms are the source of legitimisation and prohibition, they equally have the right to either convey these laws to people or conceal them. It appears in al-Kāfī and other books:

عن معيي بن محمد عن الوشاء قال: سألت الرضا رضي الله عنه فقلت له: جعلت فداك فاسألوا أهل الذكر إن كنتُم لا تعلمون فقال نحن أهل الذكر ونحن المسؤولون فائتم المسؤولون ونحن السائلون؟ قال

¹ Al-Mufid, al-Amālī p. 48; Bihār al-Anwār 25/279.
² Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 79
I asked al-Riḍā saying, may my soul be sacrificed for you (what is the explanation of the verse) “Ask the people of knowledge if you do not know.”

He said, “We are the people of knowledge and we are a reference for the people.”

I asked, “So you are the reference and we are the seekers?”

He said, “Yes”

I further added, “So, it is our duty to refer to you?”

He responded in the affirmative. I then asked, “Is it then equally your duty to respond to our questions?”

He replied, “No! That is left to our discretion; we can answer if we want to and if we desire we can refuse.”¹

There are many other narrations in this regard.

This privilege was not even accorded to the Rasūl of guidance, the best of all the prophets. Allah says:

وَأَنزَلْنَا إِلَیْكَ الذِّکْرَ لِتُبَیِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ مَا نُزِّلَ إِلَیْهِمْ

We revealed the admonishment (al-Dhikr) to you so that you may preach to the people that which has been revealed to them.²

Likewise he says:

² Sūrah al-Naḥl: 44
O Messenger! Convey that which has been revealed to you by your Lord. And if you do not do so you have not conveyed your message (holistically).¹

Allah has sounded a very grave warning for the one who conceals the truth and guidance which He has revealed. He says:

```
إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْتُمُونَ مَا أَنزَلْنَا مِنَ الْبَيِّنَاتِ وَالْهُدَىٰ مِنْ اللَّهِ وَيَلْعَنُهُمُ اللَّهُ وَيَلْعَنُهُمُ اللَّادِنَّوْنَ
```

Verily those who conceal the clear verses and guidance which we have revealed after we have plainly mentioned them in the book, upon them is the curse of Allah and the curse of the cursers.²

Likewise, there is a tradition which has been narrated in variant ways from Nabī in which he states:

```
مَنْ سَئِلَ عَنِ ٱلْعِلْمِ ثُمَّ كَتَمَهُ ٱلنَّارُ يَوْمَ ٱلۡقِيَامَةِ بَيۡنَ ٱلۡمِلَّاتِ مِنَ النَّارِ
```

A person who is asked about knowledge which he keeps concealed will be bridled with a bridle of fire on the Day of Judgment.³

Is it still then possible to claim that the propagation of the guidance and truth which is indispensable for the commonality is based upon personal motives, temperament, and desire; owing to which it is claimed that:

---

¹ Sūrah al-Mā‘idah: 67
² Sūrah al-Baqarah: 159
³ Musnad Aḥmad 2/263, 305, 344, 353, 495, 499, 508; Sunan Abī Dāwūd 4/67; Sunan al-Tirmidhī 5/29. Tirmidhī has graded this ḥadīth as Ḥasan. Sunan Ibn Mājah 1/96; Mustadrak al-Ḥākim 1/101. It is considered Ṣaḥīḥ according to al-Dhahabī as well. Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān 1/260.
Answering is not compulsory upon us; if we desire we answer or else we don’t.¹

It is due to the preaching of religion being left to the discretion of the Imāms that the Shi‘ah have remained in the dark with regards the teachings of their faith as is attested to in their traditions:

لا يعرفون مناسك حجهم و حلالهم و حرامهم حتي كان أبو جعفر (محمد الباقر) ففتح لهم و بين مناسك حجهم و حلالهم و حرامهم.

They were unaware of the rites of their Ḥajj, likewise of permissible and impermissible matters, till eventually Abū Ja‘far Muhammad al-Bāqir came. Who explicated their faith for them, educated them regarding the rites of Ḥajj, and permissible and impermissible affairs.²

The Shi‘ah did not suffice on this, rather they postulated that their Imāms have the prerogative of leading people astray and giving them various conflicting answers. In al-Ikhtiṣās by al-Mufīd—and other books as well—there appears a narration from Mūsā ibn Ashyam. He relates:

دخلت علي أبي عبد الله فسالته عن مسألة فأجبني فيها بجواب،فأنا جالس إذا دخل رجل فسأله عنها بعینها فأجابه بخلاف ما أجابني،فدخل رجل آخر فسأله عنها بعینها فأجابه بخلافما أجابني و خلاف ما أجاب به صاحبي،ففزعت من ذالك و عظم علي،فما خرج القوم نظر إلي و قال:یا ابن اشیم إن الله فوض إلي داور أمور ملكه فقال: هذا عطاؤنا فامنن أو أمسك بغیر حساب و فوض إلي موسى بن عائش و سلم و الرسول عليه و سلم و آله و سلم أمر دينه فقال وما ناكم الرسول فذهبو و ما نهاكم عنه فانتهوا. و إن الله فوض إلي الأئمة ومنا و إلينا ما فوض إلى محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم فلا تجزع

I went to visit Abū ʿAbd Allāh and asked him a question which he answered. While I was sitting by him there appeared a man who posed the exact same question, to which he responded differently. Thereafter, a third person emerged who similarly posed the very same question, surprisingly he gave

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/212
² Ibid 2/20
an answer different to the answers he gave me and my companion. I was thus startled and appalled. Hence, when everyone had left he looked at me and said, “O Ibn Ashyam! Allah gave Dāwūd authority over his kingdom. He thus said, ‘This is our grant to thee. So be graciously therein or withhold without any reckoning.’ And he likewise gave Muḥammad authority over the affairs of his religion. Hence he said, ‘Embrace that which the Rasūl has given you and desist from that which he has prohibited.’ And Allah has conferred upon the Imāms from amongst us the authority he had conferred upon Muḥammad so do not worry.”

It is in this manner that they fabricate against these illustrious personalities. In essence according to their narrations their Imāms are legislators and the authority of legitimisation and prohibition is under their jurisdiction. They have the right to conceal from people that which is indispensable for them with the inclusion of the fundamentals of Islam and its core structures; if they want they can answer and if they desire they can refuse. And thus the Shī‘ah were ignorant regarding the rituals of Ḥajj till the era of al-Bāqir. For they did not and do not subscribe to the teachings of Rasūlullāh and the Ṣaḥābah. They strictly subscribe to the preaching of their Imāms who concealed from them the knowledge of worship.

And the chain of forgeries crafted by this cult against the religion of Allah, His Book, His Rasūl, and the Ahl al-Bayt continue unceasingly. By their claim of partisanship for the Ahl al-Bayt they camouflage the true nature of these reprehensible doctrines and blasphemous ideas. Thus, one would rightfully ask: Are these people really the Shī‘ah (partisans) of ‘Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and ‘Alī Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn despite fabricating all these lies against them, accusing them of not preaching issues permissible or impermissible, and those of Ḥajj; claiming that concealing the truth and misleading people by offering them conflicting answers is an integral part of their faith?

1 Sūrah Ṣād: 39
Discussion Five

Their Belief That the Sand of Ḥusayn’s Grave is a Cure for Every Sickness.

The Shi'a claim—against the divine texts, rationality, English and Greek medicine—that the sand of Ḥusayn’s grave is a guaranteed cure for all sorts of ailments and diseases. It is as if they have placed their faith in something which by experiment, observation, nature, and logic has been proven to be of no benefit. They deem it beneficial and claim that cure can be procured from soil and not from the Lord of lords. Opposing the verse of Allah

\[
\text{وَإِنْ يَّمْسَسْكَ اللهُ بِضُرٍّ فَلاَ کَاشِفَ لَهُ إِلَّ هُوَ}
\]

And if Allah inflicts you with difficulty there is no one that can alleviate it save him.\(^1\)

Likewise the verse:

\[
\text{أَمَّنْ یُّجِیْبُ الْمُضْطَرَّ إِذَا دَعَاهُ وَیَکْشِفُ السُّوْءَ}
\]

Who is the one who responds to the distressed when he calls out to him and alleviates hardship?\(^2\)

And the verse:

\[
\text{وَإِذَا مَرَضْتُ فَهُوَ يُشْفِیْنِ}
\]

And when I take ill he cures me.\(^3\)

---

1 Sūrah Yūnus: 107
2 Sūrah al-Naml: 62
3 Sūrah al-Shu’arā’: 80
Hence, they mirrored the polytheists in their belief that stones can benefit and harm by claiming that sand can provide cure.

The author of Biḥār al-Anwār has quoted eighty three narrations with regards to the soil of Ḥusayn, its virtues, etiquettes, and rulings. These narrations claim that it is a healing balsam for every sickness and a fortified fort against every fear. It cures the sickly so effectively that it leaves him without any trace of sickness. If a child is made to suck upon it, it becomes a source of protection for him from every threat. If it is placed in the grave of a deceased person it guarantees him safety from its punishment. A person who holds it in his hand and plays with it receives the reward of those who glorify Allah, for it glorifies Allah in his hand even though he does not.

---

1 Ibid 101/118-140
2 There are many narrations in this regard, e.g. Ḥārith ibn Mughīrah says, “I Asked Abū ‘Abd Allāh, ‘I have a large family and am a very sickly person. I have experimented with every type of medicine but to no avail.’ He said, ‘Don’t you know about the sand of Ḥusayn’s grave, in it there is a cure for every ailment and security from every threat.’” (Al-Ṭūsī: Amālī 1/415; Biḥār al-Anwār 101/119, also refer to Wasā’il al-Shīʿah 10/415; Kāmil al-Ziyārāt, p. 278, 285.
3 They have forged many narrations and tales in this regard. Each one of the narrators reports the tale of his personal ailment and pain, then his subsequent consumption of the soil of Ḥusayn which cured him completely as if he was not afflicted with any sickness whatsoever. One of them says at the end of his tale, “When the drink settled in my belly it was as if I was released from ropes.” (Biḥār al-Anwār 101/121-122; Kāmil al-Ziyārāt, p. 278.
4 Abū ‘Abd Allāh says, “Make your infants suck upon the sand of Ḥusayn for in it lies safety.” (Kāmil al-Ziyārāt, p. 278; Biḥār al-Anwār 101/124).
5 It appears in Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām of al-Ṭūsī that Muḥammad al-Ḥimyarī said, “I wrote a letter to the awaited Mahdi asking him if it was permissible for a man to make Tasbīḥ with the sand of the grave? And is there any virtue in it? He replied thus, I read his signature on the letter which was later copied, “Read Tasbīḥ with it for it supersedes all other forms of Tasbīḥ. One of its virtues is that if the reader forgets to read the Tasbīḥ and merely handles the sand in his hand then to will he still reap the reward of Tasbīḥ.” (Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām 6/75; Biḥār al-Anwār 101/132-133). The following appears in another narration, “If he handles it whilst remembering Allah he gets forty rewards and if he handles it merely playing with it without remembering Allah he gets twenty rewards.” (Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām 6/75; Biḥār al-Anwār 101/132). They have equated playing and futility to the worship of Allah and have legislated whatever is in harmony with their desires.
If any Shi‘ī experiences the pains of sickness and its severity he should head to the sand of the tomb—for which he ought to select an appropriate time (as is mentioned in their narrations)—in the depth of a jet-black night, preferably its last portion, then he should take a bath and wear the cleanest of his clothing. When he reaches there he should stand at the head (of Ḥusayn) and pray. When he is done praying he should do a prolonged prostration wherein he should repeat the word “Shukran” (thanks) a thousand times. Thereafter he should stand and embrace the tomb, saying:

بَا مَوْلَاي یَابِن رَسُولِ اللَّهِ إِنِّی أَخَذْتُ مِنْ تَرَبَّکَ بِإِذْنِكَ اللَّهُمَّ فَاجْعَلۡهَا شِفَاءً مِّنْ كُلِّ دَاءٍ وَعَزَا مِنْ كُلِّ ذَلٍّ وَأَمانًا مِّنْ كُلِّ خَوَفٍ وَغَنِی مِّنْ كُلِّ فَقَرٍ.

O my master! O the grandson of Rasūlullāh! I desire to take some of your soil if you permit; O Allah make it thus a cure for every ailment, an honour against every disgrace, a guard against all fears and a means of affluence against poverty. Lastly, he should take three fingers-full of the sand and (as ordered in the narrations) place it in a clean piece of material and cover it with a silver ring the stone of which should be carnelian. He should thereafter use the amount of a chickpea at the time of need. This will guarantee him a cure.

Another narration adds that he should pretend to cry and say:

بِسَمِ اللَّهِ وَبِحَقِ هَذِهِ الْتَّرَبَّةِ الْمَبَارِکَةِ وَبِحَقِ الْوَصَّیٰ الَّذِی تَوَارَیَه وَبِحَقِ جَدِهِ وَأَبِی وَأَمِهِ وَأَخِی وَبِحَقِ أَوْلَادِهِ الْصَّادِقِینَ وَبِحَقِ الْمَلَائِکَةِ الْمُقیِّمِینَ عَنۡدَ قَبۡرِهِ يَنَظُّرُونَ نَصُورَتُهُ صَلِی عَلَیۢہِمۡ أَجَمِیۢعِنَّ وَاجِعِل لِیۡ وَلَآۡهِلِیۡ وَأَخوِیۡ فِیۡهِ الشِّفَاءِ مِنۡ كُلِّ دَاءٍ.

In the name of Allah, with the help of Allah, with the right of this blessed sand, with the right of the successor (of the prophets) which it covers, with the rights of his grandfather, father, mother, and brother, with the rights of his righteous progeny, and with the rights of the angels that throng around

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 101/37; Miṣbāḥ al-Zā‘īr p. 136.
2 Ibid.
his grave ever waiting to aid him. Send salutations upon them all and place in this sand cure from every ailment for me, my family, my offspring, and my siblings...”

Another narration suggests other methods of seeking healing by the medium of the sand. It reads as follows:

Abū ʿAbd Allāh says, “Allah has made the soil of the grave of my grandfather a cure for every sickness and a guard against all threats. Hence when any of you takes it in his hand he should first kiss it, pass it over his eyes, and thereafter, his entire body. Then he should say:

اللهم بحق هذه التربة و بحق من حل بها و ثوي فيها...

O Allah I ask you with the right of this sand and with the right of the one who resides within it...

And yet another narration states the method of taking the sand in terms of quantity and method. Imām Jaʿfar is alleged to have said:

إذا تناول التربة أحدكم فليأخذ بأطراف أصابعه و قدره مثل الحمصة فلیقبلها و لیضعها علي عینه...

When any of you intends to take the sand he should take with the tips of his fingers the amount equivalent to a chickpea. Subsequently he should kiss it and place it upon his eyes...

In essence, this is a mobile hospital that every Shīʿī is able to carry with him.

Nevertheless, it seems as if this sand worsened their ailments instead of curing them, for (as the proverb goes) he who attaches himself to something is handed

1 Bihār al-Anwār 101/138
2 Al-Ṭūsī: Amālī 1/326; Bihār al-Anwār 101/121
3 Makārim al-Akhlāq p. 189; Bihār al-Anwār 101/120
over to it. Hence, we see that one of the Shīʿah complained to his Imām about his inability and weakness, whereupon the Imām consoled him by saying:

کذالک جعل الله أولیاءنا و أهل مودتنا و جعل البلاء إلیهم سریعا

This is how Allah has made our friends and our admirers. And Allah has made trials come their way very fast.”¹

Moving on, just as a Shīʿī resorts to his sand idol when afflicted with a sickness he likewise resorts to it at the time of fear and confrontation of the enemy. Hence, he carries it with him in times of fear as well. Their Imām says:

إذا خفت سلطانا أو غير سلطان فلا تخرجن من منزلك إلا ومعك من قبر الحسین

When you fear a ruler or anyone else do not leave your house except that you have some sand from the grave of Ḥusayn with you."²

The Imām further instructs him to supplicate thus:

اللهم إني أخذته من قبر ولیك و إبن ولیك فاجعله لي أمنا و حرزا لما أخاف وما ل أخاف

O Allah! I have taken this from the grave of your friend; the son of your friend. Thus, make it a guard and a fort for me against things which I fear and things which I don’t."³

The narrator of this narration does not forget to remind his people that when he done this he was secured from whatever he feared and did not fear, and that he did not witness anything unpleasant."⁴

---

1 Kāmil al-Ziyārāt p. 275; Biḥār al-Anwār 101/120
2 Amālī 1/325; Biḥār al-Anwār 101/118
3 Ibid
4 Ibid
Likewise, to procure this sand is the desire of the damsels of Jannah. They, thus, (as is narrated in the fairy tales of the Shī‘ah) request the angels to bring back some sand from the grave of Ḥusayn as gifts for them when they descend to the earth.¹

Similarly, they claim that prostrating on this sand penetrates all seven veils (between a person and his creator).²

These are but a few claims of the Shī‘ah regarding the sand of Ḥusayn. It is almost as if, due to these beliefs of theirs, they have outdone the polytheists who merely claimed that their idols were intermediaries who took them closer to Allah. This is due to the fact that they have ascribed attributes to the sand which are purely the attributes of Allah and thus deified it together with him.

The idea of seeking cure from this sand is utterly reprehensible and a blatant lie. It is definitely from the dogma of the Shī‘ah and not from the religion of Islam. There is no mention of it whatsoever in the Qur’ān, nor in the teaching of our Nabī. Allah says:

وَمَنْ يَّبْتَغِ غَیْرَ الإِّسْلاَمِ دِیْنًا فَلَنْ یُّقْبَلَ مِنْهُ وَهُوَ فِي الْخِرَةِ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِیْنَ

And anyone who seeks any other religion besides Islam it will never be accepted from him. And in the afterlife he will be from amongst the losers.³

Similarly:

قُلْ هُوَ لِلَّذِیْنَ آمَنُوْا هُدًى وَّشِفَاءٌ

Say it (the Qur’an) is a source of guidance and cure for those who believe.⁴

---

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 101/134; Muḥammad al-Mahdi Kitāb al-Mazār p. 119
² Al-Ṭūsī Miṣbāḥ al-Mujtahid p. 511; Biḥār al-Anwār 101/135
³ Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 85
⁴ Sūrah al-Fuṣsilāt: 44
Likewise:

وَنُنَزِّلُ مِنَ الْقُرْآنِ مَا هُوَ شِفَاءٌ وَرَحْمَةٌ لِّلْمُؤْمِنِیْنَ

And we reveal from the Qur’ān that which is a cure and a mercy unto the believers.¹

The Sunnah of Rasūlullāh  is in a like manner orientated upon supplication and daily worship. Therein a person is exhorted to turn to Allah  alone and not to any sand or idol; in fact not even to any esteemed angel or sent prophet. And by way of the Sunnah (through the permission of Allāh ⁴) safety and security come to fruition for a Muslim.² Obviously not forgetting that a Muslim has been ordered to utilise the natural causes of cure.

As for consuming sand, it is a major innovation and a joke only to be found in the creed of the Shīʿah.

---

¹ Sūrah al-Isrā': 82
Discussion Six

Their Supplication by way of Charms and Esoteric Symbols and Their Seeking of Help From Unknown Entities

One form of their misguidance and shirk is their supplications with charms and letters which they consider to be from their Imāms’ forts, their supplications and shield. They write these charms and read them in order to gain cure and safety. In this regard al-Majlisī has quoted many a narration in his book Al-Biḥār; similarly he has documented words which do not possess any meaning and has placed sketches of some charms which are written in a very eerie font claiming that this was the method of the Imāms in order to gain cure.¹

According to the Shīʿah, riddled letters which have no meanings were used by their Imāms to seek refuge from evil.² Whereas Allah ﷺ says:

وَلِلّٰهِ الأَْسْمَاءُ الْحُسْنٰى فَادْعُوْهُ بِهَا

And Allah has beautiful names so call unto him by way of them.³

---

1 An example of one such charm is the following: the treasure of Amīr al-Mu'mīnīn ﷺ for an enchanted person, a possessed person, an unconscious person, a poisoned person, for protection against the ruler, the devil and all that a person fears. It reads as the following:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحیم أي کنوش أي کنوش أرشش عطنیطنیطح یا مطیطرون فریا لسنون ما و ما ساما سویا طیطشا لوش خیطوش...

Thereafter there is a sketch of weird symbols in the form of intertwining lines... (Biḥār al-Anwār: 94/193). There are similarly sketches of this nature on p. 229, 265, 297 of the same volume.

One of the protective supplications of the Imāms read as follows:

أعوذه بیا آهیا شراهیا

The reference is same as the above cited narration.

2 One such example is the following:

الفهم بالعين والميم والفاء الخاءین بنور أبو الأشباح... إفتحي شر من دب ومشی...

They consider these to be a barrier which the Imāms read to secure themselves against the evil of any who intended bad for them. (Ibid).

3 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 180
Writing such riddles and charms with letters and amulets is indeed ascribing partners with Allah, the unique and the powerful. For it is a form of supplication to others besides Allah due to it not containing any of his names or attributes. And the names of Allah are those which appear in the Qur’ān and the Sunnah; they are based upon divine sources and hence, it would not be permissible for us to call unto him with any other name.

Similarly, these charms have no specific meaning. Imām al-Ṣāghānī, therefore, says:

و ربما يكون التلفظ بتلك الكلمات كفراً لأننا لا نعرف معنیها بالعربیة،و قد قال الله تعالي ما فرطنا في الكتاب من شيء

And at times the enunciation of these words can lead to disbelief because we do not know their meanings in Arabic. Allah says, “We have not left any aspect of the book unaddressed.” And yet he (the Shī‘ī) still says:

آهیا شراهیا

Āhiyā Sharāhiyā.

Al-Ṣāghānī further goes onto mention that many people were led astray due these unfounded supplications.

As to seeking help from unknown entities, they seek help from them when losing direction on a journey; very similar to how they seek help from the dead (as has passed earlier). Whereas seeking help from the dead, from among the angels, Jinns, and humans who are not visible to those who seek help from them (in order to derive benefit or circumvent harm), is a type of shirk which Allah will not forgive unless a person repents sincerely from it. Because seeking help in this manner is considered to be an ‘Ibādah which is not permissible but for Allah.

---

1 Sūrah al-An’ām: 38
2 Mawḍū‘āt al-Ṣāghānī p. 63
3 Ibid
The evidence for this is what Allah has taught us to read in the verse:

إِیَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَإِیَّاكَ نَسْتَعِیْنُ

It is only thee that we worship and it is only from thee that we seek help.¹

Likewise the verse:

وَقَضَىٰ رَبُّكَ أَلَّ تَعْبُدُوْا إِلَّ إِیَّاهُ

Allah has decreed that you worship none but him.²

There are many other verses which establish the same point.³

The following appears in their reliable books:

عن ابي بصیر عن ابي عبد الله قال:إذا ضللت الطریق فناد یا صالح أو یا ابا صالح أرشدونا إلي الطریق یرحمكم الله.

Abū Basīr narrates from Abū ʿAbd Allāh that he said, “When you lose your way on journey announce thus, “O Ṣāliḥ,” or “O Abū Ṣāliḥ, show us the way. May Allah shower His Mercy upon you.”⁴

Ibn Bābuwayh states the following after citing the previous narration under the chapter, ‘the prayer of a person who loses his way’:

---

¹ Sūrah al-Fāṭiḥah: 5
² Sūrah al-Isrā': 23
³ This was the legal verdict (Fatwā) given by the council of scholars for academic discussions (al-Lajnah al-Dā’īmah li al-Buḥūth al-ʿIlmiyyah). Refer to: Jarīdah al-Jazīrah (published on Friday the 6th of Rajab 1407 A.H.).
⁴ Ibn Bābuwayh: Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh 2/195; Al-Barqī: al-Mahāsin p. 362 (with a slight variation); Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 8/325.
It is reported that Ṣāliḥ is appointed over the land and Ḥamzah is appointed over the ocean.¹

Who is Ṣāliḥ and who is Ḥamzah? In al-Khiṣāl of Ibn Bābuwayh, there appears a narration which defines the personality of Ṣāliḥ for us. It reads as follows:

He who goes astray on a journey and fears upon himself should call out, “O Ṣāliḥ! Help me!” Amongst your Jinn brothers there is a jinn by the name of Ṣāliḥ who, with the hope of reward, traverses all the cities in order to guide you. So when he hears the voice he responds, guides the stray among you, and holds the reigns of his animal.²

They have ostensibly inherited this from the people of the era of the first ignorance, for this was part of their culture as is alluded to in the following verse of Qur'ān:

And verily there were men that would seek the refuge of Jinns. Thus they increased them in anxiety.³

The scholars write: it was the wont of the Arabs in the days of ignorance that when they would halt at a place they would seek the refuge of a notable jinn so that he does not afflict them with any evil; just as when they would enter the territories

---

2 Al-Khiṣāl 2/618; Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 8/325.
of the enemies they would seek the refuge and amnesty of a respectable person. When the Jinns saw that the humans are seeking their refuge due to fear they increased them in their anxiety, fear and terror till eventually they became more fearful than they were before. Qatādah says, “‘They increased them in anxiety’ means that the Jinns’ insolence increased against them... so when they would seek the refuge of the jinn they would harass them and make them feel more anxious.”

After the advent of Islam they sought the refuge of Allah alone and abandoned the Jinn. Which implies that seeking refuge from the jinn is seeking refuge from those besides Allah.

وَإِنْ یَّمْسَسْكَ اللّٰهُ بِضُرٍّ فَلاَ کَاشِفَ لَهُ إِلَّ هُوَ وَإِنْ یُّرِدْكَ بِخَیْرٍ فَلاَ رَادَّ لِفَضْلِهِ یُصِیْبُ بِهِ مَنْ یَّشَاءُ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ وَهُوَ الْغَفُوْرُ الرَّحِیْمُ

If Allah inflicts upon you hardship there is none that can remove it save Him. And if He intends good for you then there is none that can reverse His favour. Allah grants it to whomsoever He wishes from His bondsmen. And verily He is the Very Forgiving the Most Merciful.

1 Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 4/455; Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 29/108; Fath al-Qadīr 5/305. The same has been narrated in the Tafsīr books of the Shi‘ah as well. Refer to: al-Burhān 4/391; Tafsīr al-Qummī; Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 5/235; Tafsīr Shibr p. 535.

2 Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 29/109

3 Kitāb al-Tawhīd p. 175.

4 Sūrah Yūnus: 107.
Discussion Seven

Istikhārah in ways That Resemble the Divination of the Days of Ignorance

In their era of ignorance the Arabs would, when intending to journey or wage war or do anything else, spin arrows in order to divine the future. They would use three arrows; upon the first would be written “Do”, upon the other would be written “Don’t” and the third would be blank. Some say that upon one there would be written, “My Lord has commanded me”, upon the other, “My Lord has prohibited me,” and the third would be empty. Hence, they would spin these arrows and if the “Do” arrow appeared they would go ahead, if the “Don’t” arrow appeared they would resist and if the empty arrow appeared they would repeat.¹

A multitude of people had been affected by divination by way arrows just as they had been affected by erecting idols and worshipping them; Anṣāb is primarily the worship of others besides Allah and Azlām is fortune telling and seeking that knowledge which is the exclusive domain of Allah. In essence, the former is for practice and the latter is for knowledge. And the religion of Allah is in complete contrast to both of them.

Now, the Twelver Shīʿah have made Istikhārah by way of arrows part of their religion and they have made a few additions to it as well which they name al-Riqā’. Therefore, we see that al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has established a chapter named, ‘chapter regarding the commendableness of Istikhārah with al-Riqā’ and its method’.² In this chapter he has cited five narrations. As for al-Majlisī, he has mentioned many different ways in which this Istikhārah can be done; he has established three chapters in this regard, ‘chapter regarding Istikhārah with

---

¹ Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/12; Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 9/510
² Wasā’il al-Shīʿah 5/208-213
al-Riqā’

1 ‘chapter regarding Istikhārah with Banādiq’

2 and ‘chapter regarding Istikhārah with Subḥah and Ḥaṣā’.

The method of doing all these different types of Istikhārah (as the books of the Shī‘ah elucidate) although might slightly differ from the ways of the people of ignorance in terms of them containing a ṣalāh and a supplication—a ṣalāh which is performed in an innovated way and a special supplication—but their end result is no different than the practice of the ignorant era, i.e. in terms of divining good by moving the beads of Tasbīḥ (without recitation) or writing “Do” and “Don’t” on pieces of paper and doing that a few times.

An example of this is the narration documented by al-Kulaynī, al-Ṭūsī, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī and others which Hārūn ibn Khārijah reports from Abū ʿAbd Allāh. It reads as follows:

إذا أردت امرا فخذ ست رقاع فاكتب في ثلاث منها:بسم الله الرحمن الرحیم خیرة من الله العزیز الحكیم
لفلان بن فلانة و في ثلاث منها:بسم الله الرحمن الرحیم خیرة من الله العزیز الحكیم لفلان بن فلانة
لا تفعل، ثم ضعها تحت مصلاك ثم صل ركعتين فاذهب، ثم إذا فرغت فاسجد سجدة و قل فيها مائة مرة:استخبر الله
برحمته خيرته في عافية ثم استولجا و قال: اللمح خريلي و اخترلي في جميع أموري في بسر ملك و عافية ثم
استولجا و قال: ثم اضرب بفكك إلى الرقاع فشوشها و أخرج واحدة واحدة، فإن خرج ثلاث متواليات
أفعل. فافعل الأمر الذي تريد، و إن خرج ثلاث متواليات لا تفعل فلا تفعله، و إن خرجت واحدة أفعل و
والخري لا تفعل فخرج من الرقاع الب خمس فانظر أكثرها فاعمل به و دع السادسة لا تحتاج إليها

When you intend to do anything take six pieces of paper and write in three of them, “In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful. This is seeking of goodness for so and so the son of such and such a lady from the All

---

1 Biḥār 91/226-234
2 Ibid 91/235-240
3 Ibid 91/247-251
4 Al-Furūʿ min al-Kāfī 1/131
5 Al-Tahdhīb 1/306
6 Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 5/208
7 Al-Muqniʿah p. 36; al-Miṣbāḥ p. 372
Powerful, the Most Wise; do”. And in the other three write, “In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful. This is seeking of goodness for so and so the son of such and such a lady\(^1\) from the All Powerful, the Most Wise; don’t”. Thereafter place them under your prayer mat and read two raka‘āts of ṣalāh. After having performed the ṣalāh do a long Sajdah and say the following a hundred times therein, “I seek goodness from Allah through his grace, goodness without any hardship.” Then sit upright and say the following, “O Allah choose good for me and decide the best for me in all my affairs with ease and well-being.” Then take the pieces of paper mix them up and choose one. Do this three times. If three “Do” pieces emerge consecutively go ahead and do what you intend. And if the three “Don’t” pieces appear consecutively do not desist from doing what you intend. And if one “Do” and one “Don’t” emerge then continue drawing till you have drawn five pieces. See which one is more and practice accordingly. Leave the sixth for you will not need it.

As for seeking good with lumps of sand (\textit{Banādiq}), it is explained as follows:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{انو الحاجة في نفسك ثم اكتب رقعتين في واحدة لا وفي واحدة نعم، وجعلهما في بندقتين من طين ثم صلى رقعتين واجعلهما في ذلك وقل: أني أشاورك في أمري هذا وانت خير مستشار ومشير فأشر علي مما فيه صلاح وحسن عاقبة ثم ادخل يدك فإن كان فيها نعم فإنك فيها تم ففعل وإن كان فيها لا فلا تفعل.}
\end{align*}\]

Make an intention of the need you have in your heart. Then take two pieces of paper and write on one of them, “Yes,” and on the other, “No.” Place each of them into two lumps of sand. Thereafter, read two raka‘āts of ṣalāh, place them under your garment and say, “O Allah I seek your council in this issue of mine; you are the best of those whose council is sought and the best adviser. Hence, guide me to that which is good and will have a pleasant result.” Subsequently, put your hands in the lumps; if it is “Yes” then go ahead and if it is “No” then do not.\(^2\)

---

1 The attribution is to the mother. Whereas Allah says:

\[\text{اذْعَوْهُمْ لِبَآئِهِمْ}\

Call them by their fathers.

2 \textit{Al-Furū’ min al-Kāfī} 1/132; \textit{Al-Tahdhīb} 1/306; \textit{Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah} 5/209.
Likewise their narrations also state that:

The Istikhārah of Amīr al-Mu’minīn is that you should conceal your intention and then write this Istikhārah (the above mentioned). Follow this by placing them in lumps of soil—which should be weighed with a scale.1 Take the lumps and place them into two separate containers; write on one of them, “Do” and on the other “Don’t”. Whichever of the two lumps appears first to the surface of the water follow it and do not go against it.2

It goes without doubt that Amīr al-Mu’minīn ʿAlī was free from the blemishes of the ignorant era and its superstitions and that this is something that the Shīʿah have forged against him. Therefore, we find that this is not narrated by anyone besides them.

With regard to Istikhārah with al-Subḥah and al-Ḥaṣā (pebbles), their Shaykh al-Majlisī has written the following:

I heard my father narrate the following from his teacher al-Shaykh al-Bahāʾī... We have heard the following from our teachers (merely by way of revision) who narrate from the Mahdī regarding Istikhārah with a Tasbīḥ. He should take it and send salutations upon Nabī and his household three times and then hold the Tasbīḥ and count two beads at a time. If, at the end, one bead remains its positive and if two remain its negative.3

1 This is the explanation given by al-Majlisī in Al-Biḥār 91/239.
2 Biḥār 91/238
3 Ibid
All these divinations have their roots in the pre-Islamic era of ignorance. The Shīʿah have tried to give it an Islamic image.

Whereas, Allah has ordered the believers—when they are two-minded in their matters—to seek his council by worshipping him and imploring him for goodness in affairs that they intend. As is narrated by Imām Aḥmad and Imām Bukhārī, and the authors of the Sunan collections on the authority of Jābir ibn ʿAbd Allāh. He narrates the following:

ٍكان رسول الله صلي الله علیه وسلم یعلمنا الإستخارة کما یعلمنا السورة من القرآن. یقول: إذا هم أحد کم بالأمر فلیرکع رکعتین من غیر الفریضة ثم لیقل: اللهم إني أستخیرك بعلمك وأستقدرك بقدرتك واسألك من فضلك العظیم فإنك تقدر ول أقدر وتعلم ول أعلم وأنت علام الغیوب...

Rasūlullāh would teach us Istikhārah just as he would teach us a chapter from the Qur’ān. He would say, “When any of you intend to do something he should read two rakaʿāts of optional prayer and then supplicate thus, “O Allah, I seek goodness from you due to your knowledge and I seek the ability from you due to your might and I ask you due to your immense grace. For verily, you are capable and I am not, you know and I do not and you are the possessor of the knowledge of the unseen…”

Surprisingly, this form of Istikhārah has been narrated in the books of the Shīʿah with exactly the same words as the above narration which appears in the canonical ḥadīth source texts of the Muslims (the Ahl al-Sunnah). However, the doctrine of Taqiyyah which is one of the primary stimuli in distancing the Shīʿah from concurring with the majority compelled some of the Shīʿī scholarship to give preference to Istikhārah with al-Riqā’ over everything else with the lame pretext that this was the isolated practice of a group who digressed from the way of Muṣṭafā, referring to the Ahl al-Sunnah. This is because any of

1 Al-Bukhārī 2/51: under the chapters regarding nocturnal prayer, 8/168: chapter regarding the Āyah Say he is the most powerful; Sunan Abī Dāwūd 2/187-188; Sunan al-Tirmidhī 2/349; Sunan al-Nasāʾī 6/80-81; Sunan Ibn Mājah 1/440; Sunan Aḥmad 3/344.

their narrations which are in complete harmony with the stance of the majority becomes problematic for the Shīʿah in terms of practice due to there being the possibility of Taqiyyah, according to their paradigm. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī states:

وقد رجح ابن طاووس العمل باستخارة الرقاع بوجوه كثير من بحرة... أنها تحتمل التقیة لأنه لم ينقله أحد من العامة.

Ibn Ṭāʿūs has given various reasons for why Istikhārah with al-Riqā’ is preferred. Among them... There is no possibility of it being narrated by way of Taqiyyah for none of the common populace (the Ahl al-Sunnah) have narrated it.¹

This is acknowledgement on their path that none of the Ahl al-Sunnah has narrated Istikhārah with al-Riqā’.

Furthermore, it seems as if Istikhārah with al-Riqā’ troubled some of their scholars who felt it was rather something very odd. Hence, one of them says:

وأما الرقاع وما يتضمن افعل ولا تفعل ففي حيز الشذوذ.

As for al-Riqā’ and the “do” and “don’t” that it contains, it falls in the realm of odd practices.²

Not forgetting that he has even criticized its chain of transmission.³

This opinion of his, nevertheless, did not resonate well with the later Shīʿah who discarded it saying:

إنه لا مأخذ له مع اشتهرها بين الأصحاب وكيف تكون شاذة وقد دونها المحدثون في كتبهم والمصنفون في مصنافاتهم.

1 *Wasā’il al-Shīʿah* 5/211
2 Jaʿfar ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥillī (d 676 A.H.). He is titled al-Muḥaqqiq by the Shīʿah.
3 Their scholar Ibn Idrīs states, “It is a very rare narration because it has been narrated by the Faṭḥīyyah who are worthy of being cursed. E.g. the likes of Zurʿah and Samāʿah. (*Bihār* 91/287).
This opinion has no basis especially when it is popularly known among the learned scholars. How can it be an odd practice when the scholars of ḥadīth have documented it in their collections, the authors have mentioned it in their books.¹

They further claim that one of their scholars has compiled a voluminous book regarding the various types of Istikhārah.² In this book, he considers the narration of Istikhārah with al-Ｒiqā‘ as reliable and makes mention of the weird and strange effects that it has.³ Thus they assert that only a select few have rejected it but their rejection does not hold much weight due to them being in the minority.⁴

This was the detailed elucidation regarding Istikhārah with al-Ｒiqā‘, al-Banādiq, al-Subḥah and al-Ｈaṣṣā together with the dispute around them. These are without a doubt in complete conformity with the manner in which the polytheist would do Istikhārah, i.e. “Do” and “Don’t”. The only difference is that they have added to it a ṣalāh and a supplication; and some narrations specify that the Istikhārah should be done by the grave of Ḥusayn⁵, which makes the Shirk even more clear. This is an innovation exclusive to this cult which has made them attached to it, and base their planning around, that to which the arrows guide them.

Whereas Allah ﷺ says:

¹ Biḥār 91/288.
² His name is Raḍī ibn Ṭā‘ūs al-Hasanī.
³ Biḥār 91/288.
⁴ The Shī’ah have differed as to who was the first of their scholars to reject it. Shaykh al-Shahīd claims that no one besides Ibn Idrīs and those who followed suit like al-Shaykh Najm al-Dīn rejected it. (Biḥār 91/288).
However, al-Majlisī claims that al-Mufīd was the first to reject it. After citing the narration he mentions, “This is a very odd narration... we have mentioned it to reveal its status of permissibility not so that any one should practice upon it.” Then came along the later scholars who claimed that no such statement was made by al-Mufīd; someone had included it in his book without it being from him. (Biḥār 101/285). This is also proof that they change the books of their scholars.
⁵ Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 5/220; Biḥār 101/285.
“Carrion and blood have been prohibited for you” until Allah says, “and that you divine by way of arrows.”

The meaning of which is abundantly clear that O you who believe, Allah has made it forbidden that you divine by way of arrows.\(^1\) Istiqsām literally means to seek a lot or a share through the medium of arrows. Ibn ʿAbbās says, “Azlām are arrows by way of which they would determine their affairs”\(^3\) i.e. the knowledge of that which has been apportioned for them.\(^4\)

Likewise Allah says:

\[
ذٰلِكُمْ فِسْقٌ
\]

That is sinful.

In other words, practicing divination is sinful, misguidance, ignorance, and ascribing partners to Allah.\(^5\)

These Rawāfiḍ in these variant Istikhārah of theirs have followed the path of the polytheists and they have given preference to divination\(^6\) over the method of Istikhārah prescribed by the Sharī‘ah. Solely because of its exclusivity to their creed, which according to them is a sign of its authenticity. They have in a similar manner made it mandatory upon their followers to follow the result of the divination and have warned against opposing it.\(^6\) It is as if they believe that

---

1 Sūrah al-Mā‘īdah: 3  
2 Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/12  
3 Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 6/78  
4 Ibn al-Qayyim: Ighāthah al-Lahafān 1/227  
5 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: al-ʿĪqāẓ min al-Hajʿah: p. 3, 71-71  
6 “And if he finds all of them to be “Don’t” he should be wary of not going against them.” (Bihār al-Anwār 91/288
it brings knowledge from Allah. And this is exactly what the polytheists would do. Ibn al-Qayyim says, “Divination is that they would compel themselves to practice on that which the arrows commanded them to do as is the case when taking an oath...”

So how is it possible for a Shīʿī to claim that the result of these pieces of paper with which he seeks good is the precisely the decree of Allah. Did he somehow become aware of the unseen or does he have a promise by Allah (that he will be informed)? These pieces of paper compel him to do something or not to do it without any sound evidence or proof, as was the condition of the polytheist. And maybe there is no disparity whatsoever between that and between the saying of the astrologist, “Do not travel due to this star or that star.” Allah says:

وَمَا تَدْرِيْ نَفْسٌ مَّاذَا تَكْسِبُ غَدًا

No souls knows what it will earn the next day.

Whereas the Shīʿah continue to base their decisions on the outcome of pebbles and inanimate entities.

1 Ighāthah al-Lahafān 1/227
2 Sūrah Luqmān: 34. This discussion is taken from Ighāthah al-Lahafān 1/227
Chapter Two

Their Beliefs Regarding the Oneness of Allah in Terms of Him Being the Rabb

The Oneness of Allah (الرب) in terms of him being the Rabb (nourisher) entails that the attributes: Ownership, creation, and planning of the universe, only be ascribed to Him. A servant should believe that Allah alone is the creator, sustainer, giver of life, giver of death, causer of benefit and harm, sovereign owner and planner. To Him alone belongs the power of creation and the authority of rule. Allah says:

أَلَ لَهُ الْخَلْقُ وَالأَْمْرُ تَبَارَكَ اللّٰهُ رَبُّ الْعَالَمِیْنَ

Behold! To him belongs creation and the authority of rule. Blessed is Allah the Lord of the universe.1

In another verse Allah says:

وَلِلّٰهِ مُلْكُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالأَرْضِ وَإِلَى اللّٰهِ الْمَصِیْرُ

And for Allah is the kingdom of the heavens and the earth. And to him is the return.2

Allah has no partner and no equal.

The theme of the discussion is not studying this principle. Rather it is the study of the Shi`ī doctrine in this regard and an inquiry into whether this principle has been affected due to the Shi`ī belief regarding theirs Imāms.

1 Sūrah al-A`rāf: 54
2 Sūrah al-Nūr: 42
The Qur’ān has mentioned that the polytheists from among the Quraysh, together with their disbelief in Allah and ascribing partners to him in worship, believed that He was the Creator and the Sustainer. Allah says:

وَلَئِنْ سَأَلْتَهُمْ مَّنْ خَلَقَهُمْ لَیَقُولُنَّ اللَّهُ

If you were to ask them who created them they would most certainly say Allah.¹

Likewise he says:

قُلْ مَنْ یَّرْزُقُكُمْ مِّنَ السَّمَاءِ وَالأَرْضِ أَمَّنْ یَّمْلِكُ السَّمَاعَ وَالأَبْصَارَ وَمَنْ یُّخْرِجُ الْحَيَّ مِنَ الْمَیِّتِ وَیُخْرِجُ الْمَیِّتَ مِنَ الْحَيِّ وَمَنْ یُّدَبِّرُ الأَمْرَ فَسَیَقُولُوْنَ اللّٰهُ فَقُلْ أَفَلاَ تَتَّقُوْنَ

Say: “Who provides for you from the sky and the earth? Or who owns the ears and the eyes? And who extracts the living from the dead and the dead from the living? And who plans all matters?” They will reply: Allah. Say, “Do you not then fear?”²

Despite this, they ascribed partners to Allah in worship. Hence Allah says:

وَمَا يُؤْمِنُ أَکْثَرُهُمْ بِاللَّهِ إِلَّ وَهُمْ مُّشْرِکُوْنَ

And the majority of them do not believe in Allah but that they ascribe partners to him.³

Mujāhid comments:

Their Īmān in Allah refers to their statement, “Allah created us, nourishes us and gives us death.” So this is their Īmān in Allah which is accompanied by ascribing partners to Allah in worship.⁴

---

1 Sūrah al-Zukhruf: 87
2 Sūrah Yūnus: 31
3 Sūrah Yūsuf: 106
4 Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 231/77-78; Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/532
So are the Shīʿah more intense in their heresy then these polytheists?

Scholars have mentioned that belief in Allah as the soul creator and nourisher is intrinsic to human nature and that polytheism in this regard (in the sense of believing in two creators who are identical in their attributes and doings) has not been professed by any cult or creed throughout history. Only a few idolaters have held the opinion that there exists a creator who created only some of the universe.¹

And therefore the question: Has this principle been affected in the Shiʿī dogma? I.e. in the sense that they are guilty of partially ascribing partners to Allah due to the importance they accord their Imāms, the attributes they ascribe to them, and the titles they confer upon them?

This will become evidently clear after analysing the narrations and reports which feature in their canonical works with regards to their Imāms. In this regard I shall present five discussions:

1. Their claim that Rabb is the Imām.
2. Their belief that this world and the afterlife both belong to the Imām.
3. Their belief that the formation of clouds and the thundering of lightening is due to the order of the Imām (I have named this discussion: Attributing cosmic occurrences to the Imām)
4. Their claim that a portion of Allah incarnated into the Imām.
5. Their claim that the Imām can benefit and harm.

Similarly, under the chapter regarding the fundamentals of Īmān there will come a discussion on their belief regarding Qadr (predestination) and that a person gives existence to his actions; this also amounts to ascribing a partner to Allah in terms of him being the Rabb. I have left this discussion to be covered there so that we can have a more holistic view of their fundamentals of Īmān.

¹ Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā 3/96-97; Sharḥ al-ʿAqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah p. 17-18
Discussion One

Their belief that Rabb is their Imām

It appears in their narrations that ʿAlī allegedly said, “I am the lord of the land due to whom it remains stable.”

Look at their audacity and fanaticism Is not Allah alone the Mighty Lord of the earth, is it not him who created the heavens and the earth, and is the one that is upholding them.

إِنَّ اللّٰهَ يُمْسِكُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالأَرْضَ إِنْ تَرْزُوْلاً وَلَيْنَ إِنِّي أُمَسَّكُهُمَا مِنْ أَحَدٍ مِّنْ بَعْدِهِ

Allah withholds the heavens and the earth from moving. If they ever move there will be none to withhold them besides him.

Yet they ascribe to their Imām that he said, “I am the sovereign of the land,” i.e. the ruler of the land. And they further claim that the Imām is meant in the verse:

وَأَشْرَقَتِ الأَْرْضُ بِنُوْرِ رَبِّهَا

And the earth eliminated with the light of its lord.

Likewise they say that:

آَمَّا مَنْ ظَلَمَ فَسَوْفَ نُعَذِّبُهُ ثُمَّ يُرَدُّ إِلَىٰ رَبِّهِ فَیُعَذِّبُهُ عَذَابًا نُّكْرًا

As for him who oppresses, we shall soon punish him. Thereafter, he will be returned to his Lord who will afflict upon him a severe torment.

2 Sūrah al-Fāṭir: 41
3 Sūrah al-Zumar: 69
4 Sūrah al-Kahf: 87
They claim the oppressor will be brought before ʿAlī  who will afflict him with a severe torment.¹

Similarly they claim:

وَلا يُشْرِكْ بِعِبَادَةِ رَبِّهِ أَحَدًا

And he does not ascribe in the worship of his Lord anyone.

It is reported in *Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī* that this refers to submission to ʿAlī  and that one may not consider an unworthy and inapt person to be his partner in authority.² This is also reported in *Tafsīr al-Qummi*.³

Do not assume that these interpretations are due to the word Rabb being in the meaning of owner or master, because these verses are so explicit regarding Allah  as the Rabb that they cannot bear any other meaning. The genitive construction has only made the word Rabb definite and specific.

Furthermore the scholars of language have written that when the word Rabb appears with a َال, thus its purport becomes specific to Allah ⁴.

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

Names and attributes are of two types: One type is those names which are exclusive to Allah ⁵, e.g. names like *al-Ilāh* (God), *Rabb al-ʿĀlamiṇ* (Sustainer of the Universe), and other names of this nature. These cannot be used for a servant at all. It is in this type that the polytheists have faltered and have considered others to be equal to Allah ⁶.

The second type is those attributes and names which can, to a certain extent, be attributed to the servant, e.g. *al-Ḥayy* (the living), *al-ʿĀlim* (the

1 *Miḥār al-Anwār* p. 59 with reference to *Kanz al-Fawāʾid*.
3 *Tafsīr al-Qummi* 2/47
knower), \textit{al-Qādir} (the capable). In this case, it would be necessary not to attribute these qualities to the creation in the same level as it is attributed to Allah.\textsuperscript{1}

However these people have named their Imām “\textit{al-Rabb}” (which is a name exclusive to the being of Allah) due to their unceasing interpretations.

These interpretations were concocted by an irreligious imposter who intended to avert the Shī'ah away from their Lord, and unsurprisingly we find followers among the Shī'ah who have consumed from this stagnant contaminated pool of water, which is preserved within the canonical works of the Twelver Shī'ah.

\textsuperscript{1} Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/342
Discussion Two

Their Belief That This World and the Afterlife Both Belong to the Imām.

The author of al-Kāfī has established a chapter by the name, ‘chapter regarding the earth being the soul property of Imām’. One of the narrations which appear therein reads thus:

عن أبي بصیر عن أبي عبد الله علیه السلام قال: أما علمت أن الدنیا و الخرة للإمام یضعها حیث یشاءویدفعها إلي من یشاء جائز له ذالک من الله.

Abū Baṣīr narrates from Abū ʿAbd Allāh, “Do you not know that the world and the afterlife are the properties of the Imām. He can operate as he desires and can confer either of them upon whomsoever he wishes. This is the permission granted to him by Allah.”¹

Does this not amount to equating the Imām to Allah in his authority as the Rabb? Because Allah says:

أَلَمْ تَعْلَمْ أَنَّ اللّٰهَ لَهُ مُلْكُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالأَْرْضِ

Do you not know that for Allah alone is the kingdom of the heavens and the earth?²

وَللهِ مُلْكُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالأَْرْضِ وَمَا بَيْنَهُمَا وَإِلَیْهِ الْمَصِیْرُ

For Allah is the kingdom of the heavens and the earth and whatever is between them and to Him is the return.³

---

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/409
2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 107
3 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 18
For Allah is the dominion of the heavens and the earth and whatever is within them.¹

The One to Who belongs the dominion of the heavens and the earth; Who has no children and Who has no partner in kingdom.²

And for Allah is the next life and the first life.³

Say, “Who provides for you from the heavens and the earth?” Say, “It is Allah.”⁴

Is there any other creator besides Allah who is sustaining you from the heavens and the earth?⁵

Search for sustenance by Allah, worship Him, and thank Him.⁶

---

¹ Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 120
² Sūrah al-Furqān: 2
³ Sūrah al-Najm: 25
⁴ Sūrah al-Saba’: 24
⁵ Sūrah al-Fāṭir: 3
⁶ Sūrah al-ʿAnkabūt: 17
How do the Shi‘ah then claim abilities for their Imāms which no human has authority over and how do they accord their Imāms a characteristic which is from the necessary attributes of Allah as the Rabb. They have no evidence in this regard besides that which the devils dictate and their irreligious write. Even more surprising is the fact that they attribute the kingdom, knowledge, rights, and actions of Allah to their Imāms and then they say, “That is with the consent of Allah and His approval.” Is this not conveniently veiling their blasphemy? Or is it not an endeavour to conceal the prime objective of their devils which is to deify the Imāms and confer upon them the attributes of Allah?
Discussion Three

Attributing Cosmic Occurrences to the Imāms

Whatever happens in the cosmos is all because of the command of Allah and His arrangement, in which he has no partner. However the books of the Shīʿah intrigue one's interest in this regard, for they have attributed some of the occurrences of the cosmos to their Imāms. Samāʿah ibn Mihrān narrates:

Once I was in the company of Abū ʿAbd Allāh and the sky thundered and emitted lightening. Thereupon Abū ʿAbd Allāh said, “Behold all thunder and lightning is due to the order of your leader.”

I enquired, “Who is our leader?”

He said, “Amīr al-Muʾminin.”

This implies that all thunder and lightning is due to the order of Amīr al-Muʾminin and not because of the order of Allah, the One, the All Mighty.

What conclusion will an unbiased Muslim draw from this narration when Allah says:

He is the one that shows you lightening which (at times) you fear and (at times) you have hope in and he is the one creates heavy clouds.2

---

1 al-Ikhtiṣāṣ p. 327; Biḥār al-Anwār 37/33; al-Burhān 2/482
2 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 112
Is this not the belief of the Saba’iyyah, which is raising its disfigured head in the books of the Twelvers? Is this not claiming that ‘Alī  is the Rabb or that he has some share in the operation of the universe? How bold of al-Majlisī, and al-Mufīd before him, to write such blasphemy and ascribe it to Imām Ja’far  For such heresy was plainly clear to them as well. Only a heretic and an irreligious person will believe in such doctrines. Indeed appalling is the affair of a people who procure their religion from books that contain such blasphemy, who revere scholars who openly professed such heresies. Is there no person of sound intellect and healthy religious propriety among this cult who can raise his voice and express his condemnation against this widespread misguidance, and who can exonerate the pure members of the Ahl al-Bayt from such devastating filth. Is there no one who will purify Shi‘ism from the filth that the scholars of the Safawid era soiled it with?

Or is it that every sincere scholar who raises his voice is assassinated as they did with al-Kisrawī, or his opinion is interpreted as Taqiyyah (dissimulation) as they did with many of their narrations and opinions of their scholars. Has this dogma reached a stage where it has now become impervious to rehabilitation and the light of the truth?

I assume that the impressionable lay Shī‘ah adherents perceive that there exists no other Islam out there but this. Because many factions of both Sunnī and Shī‘ah have impressed upon them that there is no difference between the two save in a few secondary issues. Thus they shut the door of deliberation, investigation, and research upon them due to this grave widespread misunderstanding.¹

They also say that the clouds are the conveyance of ‘Alī  in which he rides as he desires. Their narrations state:

ما كان من سحاب فيه رعد وصاعقة و برق فلاساحكم و صاعقة و برق فلاساحكم برکبه، أما أنه سيركب

السحاب بوبرق في الأسباب أسباب السماوات و الأرضين السبع خمس عوامر و ثنتان خراب

¹ Refer to the book: Fikrah al-Taqrīb bayn al-Sunnah wa al-Shī‘ah
Any cloud that emits thunder, a storm, and lightening is ridden by your companion. Behold! He will ride the clouds and ascend the stories, the stories of the heavens and the earths. Five thereof are populated and two are empty.¹

This statement indirectly implies that ‘Alī drives the clouds which amounts to disbelief in the verse wherein Allah:

\[
\text{حتى إذا أفلت سحابًا ثقالًا سفناًّا}
\]
\[
\text{إِذَا أَقَلَّت سَحَابًا ثِقَالٌ سُقْنَاهُ لِبَلَدٍ مَّيِّتٍ فَأَنزَلْنَا بِهِ الْمَاءَ}
\]

When they (the winds) have carried laden clouds we drive them to barren land and shower upon it water.²

Likewise the verse:

\[
\text{اللّٰهُ الَّذِي يُرْسِلُ الرِّيَاحَ فَتُثِیْرُ سَحَابًا فَیَبْسُطُهُ فِي السَّمَاءِ کَیْفَ یَشَاءُ}
\]

Allah is the one that sends the winds which carry the clouds spreading them in the sky as he wishes.³

Their claim that “ʿAlī rides the clouds” is an extension of the blasphemous belief of the Sabaʾiyyah belief, which was:

هو الذي يجيء في السحاب و الرعد صوته و البرق تسمه

He is the one that appears in the clouds; the thunder is his voice, and the lightening is his smile.⁴

1 Al-Ikhtiṣāṣ p. 199, p. 327; Biḥār al-Anwār 27/32
2 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 57
3 Sūrah al-Rūm: 48
4 Al-Shahrastānī: al-Mīlāl wa al-Nihāl 1/173
Furthermore, al-Majlisī quotes a lengthy narration which consists of eight pages; this narration accords 'Alī supernatural abilities. To name a few:

- He can transfer his followers to places in the heavens and the earth,
- He can demonstrate before them miracles greater than the miracles of the prophets,
- He can destroy an entire nation with one slap.

The climax of it all is the claim:

إني لأملك من ملكوت السموت و الأرض ما لا تحتملون العلم ببعضه

I own such entities from the kingdom of the heavens and the earth, the knowledge of which you cannot comprehend.

Al-Majlisī says about this narration:

أن علیا أوما إلي سحبتين فأصبحت كل سحابه كأنها بساط موضوع فرکب علي سحابة بمفرده، وركب بعض أصحابه—كما تقول الرواية—كسلمان والمقداد... السحابة الأخرى، وقال علي وهو فوق السحابة:

أنا عين الله في أرضه، أنا لسان الله الناطق في خلقه، أنا نور الله الذي لا يطفأ، أنا باب الله الذي يؤتي منه، وحجته علي عباده.

'Alī pointed at two clouds. Each one thus became (flat) like a spread carpet. Thereafter, 'Alī mounted one and some of his companions like Salmān and al-Miqdād mounted the other. He then said, “I am the eye of Allah on the earth, I am the speaking tongue of Allah in his creation, I am the light of Allah which will never be distinguished, I am the door to Allah wherefrom he should be approached, and I am his proof against his servants.”

The narration continues in a very strange manner... The friends of ‘Alī ask him regarding the miracles of the Ambiyā’ whereupon he says:

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 27/34
2 Ibid.
I will show you greater than that. He said, "By the one who split the seed and created the soul I own from the kingdom of the heavens and the earth such things that if you were to learn of them your hearts would not be able to withstand them; the great name of Allah (al-Ism al-Aʿẓam) consists of seventy two letters. Āṣif ibn Barkhiyā possessed the knowledge of only one letter owing to which, Allah caused the earth between him and the throne of Bilqīs to sink in till he was able procure her throne. Subsequently, the earth returned to what it was in less than the blink of an eye. As for us, we have by the oath of Allah all seventy two letters, and one letter Allah has kept exclusive to himself in the realm of the unseen.”

This fairy tale goes onto mention that they, as they progressed, passed by some strange worlds wherein ʿAlī visited the Ambiyā'. Among them they saw a prophet who began crying when seeing Amīr al-Muʿminīn. And when he was asked as to the cause of his crying he said:

إن أمیر المؤمنین کان یمر بي عند كل غداة فیجلس فتزداد عبادتي بنظري إلیه فقطع ذلك منذ عشرة أیام فأقلقني ذلك.

Amīr al-Muʿminīn used to pass by and visit me every morning. My reward of devotion would increase due to looking at him. He has not visited me now for the last ten days, therefore, that put me into distress.²

The tale also mentions that ʿAlī told his friends, “Lower your gazes.” Thereafter he transported them to a city wherein the Bazaars were bustling and its people were taller than date-palms. He informed them that this is the people of ʿĀd. Then he stunned them and destroyed them.³

---

1 Ibid
2 Ibid
3 Bhār al-Anwār 27/39
And the story continues... till eventually they return with the clouds carrying them. They land in the house of Amīr al-Mu’minīn in less than a blink of an eye. They report:

وکان وصولنا إلي المدينة وقت الظهر والمؤذن يؤذن، وكان خروجنا منها وقت علت الشمس.

We reached Madīnah at the time of the Zuhr ṣalāh whilst the Mu’adhin was still calling out the adhān. Whereas we left just after the sun had risen up high.¹

Lastly Amīr al-Mu’minīn says:

لو أنني أردت أن أجوب الدنيا بأسرها والسموت السبع وأرجع في أقل من الطرف لفعلت بما عندي من اسم اللہ الأعظم، فقالنا: يا أمير المؤمنين أنت والله الیة العظمي والمعجز الباهر.

“If I want I can tour the entire world and the seven heavens and return in less than the winking of an eye because of the knowledge of the great name of Allah that I possess.”

So we said, “O Amīr al-Mu’minīn! You are the greatest sign of Allah and his astounding miracle.”²

This lengthy narration with all its flaws and problems has not been rejected by al-Majlisī despite his acknowledgement:

لم نره في الأصول التي عندنا. لا نردها ونرد علمها إليهم عليهم السلام.

I have not seen it in our canonical works. We do not reject it, rather we consign its knowledge to the Imāms.³

Astonishing indeed! A narration which is not found in their mother-works and which consists of such inconceivable exaggerations, yet al-Majlisī did not have the courage to reject it. So what then about the ludicrous narrations which appear in their mother-works. They will be most certainly be overlooked and accepted.

¹ Ibid
² Ibid
³ Ibid
Discussion Four

A Divine Portion has Translocated into the Imāms

The Shī'ah have narrations which suggest that a fraction of Allah’s Nūr translocated into ʿAlī. Abū ‘Abd Allāh says:

ثم مسحنا بيمينه فأفضي نوره فينا

Then we rubbed his right hand. His light thus permeated our existence.¹

و لكن الله خلطنا بنفسه

But Allah made us mingle with himself.²

This divine fraction which has translocated into their A'immah—as they claim—enabled them with supernatural abilities. Therefore, a person who reads what they term “the miracles of the A'immah” which are reported in hundreds of narrations will reach the conclusion that they are just like Allah E, the Rabb of the universe (exalted is he from what they say) in terms of giving life and death, creating and sustaining.³ Yes, in order to mislead and confuse their narrations suggest that all of this happens by the command of Allah E.

For example: ʿAlī is the reviver of the dead. A narration from Abū ‘Abd Allāh in al-Kāfī states the following:

---

1. Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/440; Ibid 1/441-442
2. Ibid 1/435.
3. Biḥār al-Anwār ‘chapter regarding his (ʿAlī) comprehensive miracles’ 42/17 (17 narrations), ‘the chapter regarding his strange miracles’ 42/5-56. They have even attributed such miracles to his grave which are exclusively the domain of Allah E; the author of Al-Biḥār has established an entire chapter in this regard, ‘chapter regarding the miracles that transpired at his tomb’ 42/311-339. This is the case with all twelve of their Imāms. The sand of the grave of Ḥusayn, however, supersedes the miracles of the Imāms in that they have ascribed divine powers like sustaining, curing, and granting of well-being to it.
Amīr al-Mu’minīn had maternal relations in the Banū Makhzūm tribe. A youngster from among them came to him and said, “O my uncle my brother passed away and I am grieving immensely over his demise.” He said, “Do you desire to see him?” the youngster replied in the affirmative. He then said, “Show me his grave.” Hence, he went whilst he was dressed in the shawl of Rasūlullāh. When he reached the grave his lips moved after which he kicked the grave. And thus the dead man emerged from his grave speaking Persian. Amīr al-Mu’minīn said to him, “Did you not die as an Arab?” He said, “Yes. But because we died following the ways of so and so, and so and so (i.e. Abū Bakr and ‘Umar) our tongues changed.”

They claim that ‘Alī revived the entire graveyard of al-Jabānah. And when he struck a stone a hundred camels emerged.

Salmān says (according to their fabrications):

If Abū al-Ḥasan takes an oath to revive the people of the past and the people still to come he will be capable of doing so.

1. Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/457; Biḥār al-Anwār 41/192; Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt p. 76
2. Biḥār al-Anwār 41/194 with reference to al-Kharā’ij wa al-Jarā’īh which is not published as yet.
3. Ibid 41/198 with reference to al-Kharā’ij wa al-Jarā’īh which is not published as yet.
4. Ibid 41/201
Indeed they have procured these beliefs from the polytheist creeds which confer upon their idols that which is exclusive to Allah ﷺ. Merely envisioning such beliefs is sufficient in rendering them baseless. Because they are against the divine texts, rationality, the laws of nature, and the true state of the Imāms and their statements. Rasūlullāh ﷺ is instructed by Allah ﷺ to say:

قُلْ لَا أَمْلِكُ لِنَفْسِيْ نَفْعًا وَلَا ضَرًّا إِلَّا مَا شَاءَ اللّٰهُ

Say, “I do not own for myself benefit nor harm save that which Allah wills.”¹

What is very interesting is that the Shīʿah despite revering the Imāms and exaggerating in their beliefs regarding them narrate the diametrically opposite of the aforementioned. This brings about plain contradiction in what they claim (This is the nature of every lie and falsehood). Rijāl al-Kashshī states that Imām Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad said:

فو الله ما نحن ال عبید الذي خلقنا و اصطفانا، ما نقدر علي ضر ول نفع،و إن رحمنا فرحمة،و إن عذبنا عذبا شدیدا

By Allah! We are but servants of the One Who created us and selected us. We are not able to benefit or harm. If we are shown mercy it is due to His grace and if we are punished it is due to our sins. By Allah! We have no guard against Allah and nor do we enjoy exoneration accorded to us by Him. We are going to die, be resurrected, made to stand before Allah and questioned. Woe be upon them! What is wrong with them? May Allah curse them. They have offended Allah, His Messenger who lies in his grave, Amīr al-Muʾminīn, Fāṭimah, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn, and Muḥammad

¹ Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 188
ibn ʿAlī. I bear witness that I am a man from the progeny of Rasūlullāh ﷺ who enjoys no exoneration before Allah. If I obey Him He will show mercy to me and if I disobey Him He will punish me severely.”

However the scholars of the Shīʿah consider such admissions of the Imāms to be nothing more than Taqiyyah² whereby they have misguided the people. And the creed of the Shīʿah has thus become the creeds of their scholars and not the creed of the Imāms.

This belief of theirs (some illustrations of which were presented above) which claims that a divine portion translocated into the Imāms, has progressed according to some of their scholars; its implications have increased to the extent that there exists only one being who is the essence of all existence.³ They have considered it to be the highest form of belief in Tawḥīd as is propounded by their scholar al-Nirāqī.⁴

---

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 225-226
2 Refer to p 151 and the discussion of Taqiyyah coming ahead.
3 i.e. the existence of the creation is the very existence of Allah. (Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā 1/140).
4 Mahdī ibn Abī Dhar al-Kāshānī al-Nirāqī (d. 1209 A.H), Al-Dharīʿah 5/58; Jāmiʿ al-Saʿādāt p. 132-133.
Discussion Five

Their Belief That Days and Nights Secure Benefit and Cause Harm

Allah says:

وَمَا بِكُمْ مِّنْ نِّعْمَةٍ فَمِنَ اللّٰهِ ثُمَّ إِذَا مَسَّكُمُ الضُّرُّ فَإِلَیْهِ تَجْأَرُوْنَ

Whatever bounties you enjoy are all from Allah. Then when difficulty afflicts you it is Him that you beseech.¹

So benefit and harm is only from Allah. Days and nights do not effect either of the two. However, the Shīʿah defy this by claiming that some days carry bad omen due to which a person’s needs are not fulfilled. Abū ‘Abd Allāh says:

لا تخرج يوم الجمعة في حاجة، فإذا كان يوم السبت و طلعت الشمس فاخرج في حاجتك

Do not leave for an errand on Friday. When Saturday comes and its sun rises then leave for your needs.²

He likewise said:

السبت لنا، و الأحد لبني أمية

Saturday is for us and Sunday is for the Banū Umayyah.³

He also said:

فأي يوم أعظم شؤمًا من يوم الاثنين...لا تخرجوا يوم الاثنين و اخرجوا يوم الثلاثاء

Is there any day which is more replete with bed-luck then Monday. Do not leave on Monday for you needs but leave of Tuesday.⁴

---

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 53
2 Man lā Yāḥḍuruhū al-Faqīḥ 1/95; Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 8/253
3 Man lā Yāḥḍuruhū al-Faqīḥ 2/342; Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 8/253
He has also said:

لا تسافر يوم الاثنين ولا تطلب فيه حاجة

Do not travel on Monday and do not seek to fulfil your needs therein.¹

Just as he has said:

اخر أربعاء في الشهر يوم نحس مستمر

The last Wednesday of the month is a day of continuous misfortune.²

Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ʿAlī (according to their fabrications) is reported to have said:

يوم السبت يوم مكر و خدشة و يوم الأحد يوم غرس و بناء، و يوم الاثنين يوم سفر و طلب، و يوم الثلاثاء
يوم حرب و دم، و يوم الأربعاء يوم شؤم يتطير فيه الناس، و يوم الخميس يوم الدخول على الامراء و قضاء
الحواجب، و يوم الجمعة يوم خطة و نكاح

Saturday is a day of ploy and deception. Sunday is a day of planting and building. Monday is a day of quest and journey. Tuesday is a day of war and bloodshed. Wednesday is a day of misfortune wherein people forebode. Thursday is a day of visiting the influential and fulfilling needs. And the day of Friday is a day of proposal and marriage.³

They have other narrations as well which purport the same meaning.⁴ The comprehensive understanding of these narrations entails that the days: Friday, Sunday, Monday, and Wednesday are days of ingrained misfortune. Hence a person should not fulfil his needs therein.

¹ Al-Maḥāsin p. 346; Wasāʾīl al-Shīʿah 8/257
² Al-Khiṣāl 2/27; Wasāʾīl al-Shīʿah 8/257
But if you noticed, the last narration suggests that Monday is a day of quest and journey. This opposes the narrations that passed. Therefore, their scholar al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has interpreted this to be said in Taqiyyah.¹

Based on this, all four days are days of misfortune according to the Shīʿah. Which leaves a Shīʿī with only three days in the week to do work.

This is a type of foreboding², i.e. pessimism generated due to certain days, birds, names, words and lands, etc. This phenomenon is from the practices of the people of ignorance and the polytheists. Allah has condemned them and despised them in the Qurān. Rasūlullāh has likewise prohibited us from foreboding (known as Taṭayyur), and informed us that it is tantamount to ascribing partners with Allah. It cannot in any way effect procuring benefit or repelling harm and that it is from the whisperings of Shayṭān and his threats.

Allah says:

أَلَ إِنَّمَا طَائِرُهُمْ عِندَ اللّٰهِ وَلٰكِنَّ أَکْثَرَهُمْ لَ یَعْلَمُوْنَ

Behold! Their misfortune is with Allah but most of them do not know.³

---

1 Wasāʿil al-Shīʿah 8/258
2 The foreboding is the days of ignorance was where people would rely upon birds. If any of them would leave on an errand and would see the bird flying to the right he would consider it a good omen and continue his journey, and if it would fly to the left he would forebode evil and return. Some of them would actually incite the bird to fly. They would name these birds al-Sāniḥ and al-Bāriḥ. Al-Sāniḥ was the bird that would fly from a left of a person to his right and al-Bāriḥ was the bird that would fly from the right of a person to his left. They would derive good omen from the former and bed omen from the latter. (Fath al-Bārī 10/212-213; Lisān al-ʿArab 4/512)
Some have differentiated between bed omen (Ṭiyarah) and pessimism (Taṭayyur). Ṭiyarah they say is the evil thought that lingers in a person’s mind and Taṭayyur is the bad that comes to being due to that evil thought. The author of ʿAwn al-Maʿbūd has attributed this to al-ʿIzz ibn ʿAbd al-Salām. (ʿAwn al-Maʿbūd 10/406).
3 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 131
ʿAlī ibn Ṭalḥah narrates from Ibn ʿAbbās ʿاللله ʾالله يُقُولُ: مصائبهم عند الله ولكن أكثرهم لا يعلمون

The verse, “Behold! Their misfortune is with Allah,” implies that calamities befall them from Allah but most people do not know.

And Ibn Jarīr mentions that Ibn ʿAbbās ʿاللله ʾالله would say that “Behold their misfortune is with Allah” means that it comes from Allah ʿاللله ʾالله.\(^1\)

Ibn Masʿūd ʿاللله ʾالله narrates that Rasūlullāh ʿاللله ʾالله said:

الطیرة شرك الطیرة شرك ثلاثا

“Foreboding is Shirk. Foreboding is Shirk.” He said this three times.\(^2\)

This is unequivocal in the prohibition of foreboding due the heart therein being connected to others besides Allah ʿاللله ʾالله.\(^3\)

Ibn Ḥajr ʿاللله ʾالله says:

و إنما جعل ذالك شراكا ل عتقادهم أن ذلك يجلب نفعا أو يدفع ضرا فكأنهم اشركوه مع الله تعالى

And this has been equated to Shirk because of their belief that it would procure for them benefit or repel from them harm. So it is as if they ascribed a partner to Allah ʿاللله ʾالله.\(^4\)

It is false claim meant to waste time, delay needs, turn the hearts of people away from Allah ʿاللله ʾالله to creation that cannot benefit nor harm.

---

1 Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/257
2 Sunan Abī Dāwūd, ‘chapter regarding foreboding’ 4/230; Sunan al-Tirmidhī, ‘chapter regarding foreboding’ 4/160-161. He has classified this narration as Ḥasan Ṣaḥīḥ; Sunan Ibn Mājah 2/1170; Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān narration no. 1427.
3 Fatḥ al-Majīd p. 361
4 Fatḥ al-Bārī 10/213; Lisān al-ʿArab 4/513
Nevertheless, there is no peculiarity that one will find in the books of the Shīʿah but that he will find within their own books narrations that contradict it. There are narrations that completely defy this belief. Usually the most effective debunking tool is the one done by the opponent against himself. The books of the Shīʿah report that Abū ʿAbd Allāh said:


لا طيرة

There is no foreboding.¹

He also said:


کفارة الطيرة التوكل

The expiation of foreboding is relying upon Allah.²

Abū al-Hasan al-Thānī (al-Riḍā) says:


من خرج يوم الأربعاء..خلافا علي أهل الطيرة وقي من كل افة و عوفي من كل عاهة و قضي الله له حاجته

That person who leaves on a Wednesday for a need (against the practice of the people of foreboding) will be saved from every calamity, will be granted relief from every difficulty and Allah will fulfil his need.³

Likewise there appears a narration which reads as follows:


إذا تطیرت فامض

When you sense a bed omen continue (and do not withdraw).⁴

---

¹ Rawḍah al-Kāfī p. 196; Wasāʾ il al-Shīʿah 8/262
² Rawdah al-Kāfī p. 198; Wasāʾ il al-Shīʿah 8/262
³ Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh 1/95; al-Khiṣāl 2/27
⁴ Tuḥaf al-ʿUqūl p. 50
And there appears a narrations in *Al-Biḥār*:

أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم كان يحب الفأل، و يكره الطيرة، و كان عليه السلام يأمر من رأى شياً يكرهه، و يتطير منه أن يقول (اللهم لا يؤتي الخير إلا أنت ولا يدفع السئيات إلا أنت ولا حول ولا قوة إلا بك).

Nabī Ḥ loved good omens and despised bed omens. And when Rasūlullāh  would see something unpleasant due to which he would have a sense of foreboding he would say, “O Allah no one grants good but you, no one dispels evil but you and there is no resistance (from sinning) and no power (to do good) but through you.”

So this is wholesale contradiction. And contradiction is a sign of the invalidity of a creed. However, the principle of Taqiyyah and the opposition of the majority (Ahl al-Sunnah) prevent the Shīʿah from benefitting from such narrations. Hence, you see their scholar interpreting the narration of Monday being a day of Quest and it being a day of journey is considered Taqiyyah.

---

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 95/2-3; al-Ṭabarsī: *Makārim al-Akhlāq* p. 403
Chapter Three

Their Belief Regarding Allah’s Names and Attributes

There are four deviations of the Shi’ah in this regard:

1. The deviation of Tajsīm (anthropomorphism)
2. The deviation of the Ta’ṭīl (denying) of some of his names and attributes.
3. The deviation of ascribing the names of Allah and his attributes to the Imāms.
4. The deviation of Taḥrīf (distortion) the verses of the Qur’ān due to the belief in the denial of the attributes of Allah.

I shall endeavour to pause at each of these discussions and mention the doctrine of the Shi’ah with regards to them, Allah willing.

Discussion One

Tajsīm (Anthropomorphism)

The deviation of Tajsīm (anthropomorphism) was very common among the Jews. However, the first among the Muslims to invent anthropomorphic beliefs regarding Allah were the Rawāfiḍ. Therefore al-Rāzī says:

1 In the Qur’ān there features proof to establish this. Allah says:

وقالت اليهود عزیر ابن ابن الله

And the Jews said, “Uzair is the son of Allah.”

In the current Old Testament (Tawrāt) there are many examples in this regard. E.g. And Adam and eve heard the sound of God as he was walking in the cool of the day. (Genesis: 3:8), “Then Moses Aron ascended... accompanied by seventy men of the Israelites. They saw the god of Israel and his feet was something like a pavement made of lapis lazuli [deep blue metamorphic rock], as bright as blue as the sky. (Exodus: 24:10.). There are many other examples of this nature refer to the following: Genesis: 32: 22; Deuteronomy: 34: 10; Judges: 6: 11; Exodus: 24: 4...
Most of the Jews are anthropomorphists. The beginning of anthropomorphism in Islam was with the Rawāfiḍ like Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī, Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qummī and Abū Ja’far al-Aḥwal.¹

All of the aforementioned are regarded by the Twelvers to be the forerunners among their scholars and authentic transmitters of their creed.²

Ibn Taymiyyah has identified the first person who was the proponent of this grave fallacy. He says:

وأول من عرف في الإسلام أنه قال إن الله جسم هو هشام بن الحكم

And the first person who is known to have claimed that Allah has a body is Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam.³

And al-Ash’arī who preceded Ibn Taymiyyah asserts that the former Shī‘ah were all anthropomorphists. He then goes into the details of their variant views and quotes some of their statements in this regard. However, he says that some of the latter Shī‘ah were of the opinion of denying the attributes of Allah [known as Ta‘til].⁴

---

¹ Ḳiṣṣa‘ al-‘Arab wa‘l-Muṣrīn p. 111.
² See: Muḥsin al-Amīn: ‘Īyān al-Shī‘ah 1/106. In the books of Firaq (heresiography) there is mention of sects that subscribed to views of these people. E.g. al-Ash‘arī says, “Al-Hishamiyyah are the followers of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam... etc. (Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/106) And “The Yūnusiyyah are the followers of Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qummī (Ibid 1/109). And “The Hishāmiyyah are the followers of Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī (Ibid 1/109. The common factor among them all is Shī‘ism.
³ Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/20.
This tells us that denying the attributes of Allah was something that transpired very early in the history of Shī‘ism. The views regarding the stipulation of the era in which this transpired will be presented ahead.¹

The heresiographers have documented statements of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam which are drenched in anthropomorphism; such that they leave the believer’s hair standing on end due to their blasphemous nature.

ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī says:

زعم هشام بن الحكم أن معبوده جسم ذو حد و نهاية و أنه طويل عريض عميق و أن طوله مثل عرضه

Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam claimed that his lord is a body with boundaries and limits, and that he has height, width, and depth. His height is just like his width.²

He also says:

إن هشام بن سالم الجوالیقی مفرط في التجسیم و التشبیه لأنه زعم أن معبوده علي صورة الإنسان...و أنه ذو حواس خمس كحواس الإنسان وكذلك ذكر أن يونس بن عبد الرحمن القمي مفرط أيضا في باب التشبيه و ساق بعض أقواله في ذلك

Most certainly Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī was an exaggerator in anthropomorphism and Tashbīh (likening Allah to the creation) because he claimed that his lord has a humanly appearance... and that he possesses the five senses that humans possess.³ He also mentions that Yūnus ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Qummī was likewise an extremist in likening Allah to the creation and he quotes some of his verdicts in this regard.⁴

---

¹ In the second discussion.
² Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq p. 65.
³ Ibid p. 68-69.
⁴ Ibid p. 70.
Ibn Ḥazm mentions:

قال هشام إن ربه سبعة اشبار بشبر نفسه

Hishām said that the height of his lord is seven hand spans of his own hand.¹

Al-Asfarāʾīnī, after quoting the anthropomorphist views of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and Hishām al-Jawālīqī, comments:

والعاقل بأول وهلة يعلم أن من كانت هذه مقاتلة لم يكن له في الإسلام حظ

An intelligent person at the first instance will recognise that any person bearing such opinions has no share in Islam whatsoever.²

The books of Firaq (Heresiography) are filled with the exaggerated anthropomorphist opinions of Hishām al-Ḥakam and his followers.³ Some of the books of the Muʿtazilah and the Zaydī Shīʿah also contain some of them. From amongst the Muʿtazilah al-Jāḥiẓ has documented these beliefs; he says:

وتكلمت هذه الرافضة وجعلت له صورة وجسد، وكرفت من قال بالرؤية علي غير التجسیم والتصوير،

و كذلك ابن الخياط، و القاضي عبد الجبار

These Rawāfiḍ have spoken and attributed a form and a body to him. They have thus dubbed as Kāfir any person who believes in seeing Allah without a body and form.⁴

Likewise they have dubbed Ibn al-Khayyāṭ⁵ and al-Qāḍī ʿAbd al-Jabbār⁶ as Kāfir.

---

1 Al-Faṣl, 5/40.
6 Tathbīt Dalāʾīl al-Nubuwwah 1/225.
From among the Zaydī Shī‘ah, Ibn al-Murtaḍā al-Yamānī has stated:

بنأن جل الروافض علي التجسیم إل من اختلط منهم بالمعتزلة

Most of the Shī‘ah belief in anthropomorphism save those who mixed with the Mu‘tazilah.

So, likening Allah to the creation was part of Jewish belief. It then made its way to Shī‘ism due to it being the abode of any person who intended to conspire against Islam and its adherents. The first to propound this belief was Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam; others after him, who are identified in the books of heresiography as spear-headers of deviant cults, followed in his footsteps.

However, we find that the scholars of the Twelvers have gone out of their way in trying to defend the position of these devious people, the reports of whose heresy has been largely transmitted and whose evil was immensely widespread. Hence, the Twelvers issue far-fetched interpretations of their statements or try to refute them completely.

Al-Majlisī says:

و لعل المخالفین نسبوا إلیهما هذین القولین معاندة

It is very possible that the opposition ascribe these views to them out of obstinacy.

1 It should be remembered that the Zaydīs subscribe to the Mu‘tazīlite school of thought in theology. Hence al-Shahrastānī says, “As for theology, they subscribe to the school of the Mu‘tazilah completely.” (Al-Mīlāl wa al-Nīḥal 11/162; al-Muqbilī: al-ʿIlm al-Shāmikh p. 319.
3 See p 270 onwards of this book for more details (under the discussion of how the belief in the distortion of the Qur‘ān of which Hishām was a proponent spread like wild fire in the Twelver dogma.)
5 Referring to Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī.
I say that it is completely normal for the Shīʿah to deny this. For they are known to refute clear realities and believe in open lies and heresies. As for their defence of these devious people, it is something inherent in their culture which should not be considered strange. For they always try to defend their people. To the extent that some of them have specialised in defending the most uncharacteristic people whose evil is well-known and regarding whose deviance and heresy many traditions are reported. Whereas, astonishingly, they will go out of their way in criticising and dubbing as infidels those who are lauded by Allah ﷺ and His Rasūl ﷺ.

The objection could be raised that all the previous statements of Hishām and his followers were only cited from the books of the opposition, therefore, they cannot serve as evidence against the Shīʿah.

Although it is true that all these citations have been quoted from the books of heresiographers belonging to various schools and leanings who are more truthful than the Rāfiḍah in speech and much more reliable in transmission, and whose books have proven that the Rāfiḍah were the ones who introduced this heresy into Islam. However the statement that these accusations of anthropomorphism only appear in the books of their opposition and do not appear in any of the books of the Shīʿah might convince someone who reads only the refutations of the Shīʿah, whereas in reality the complete opposite is true.

For there are many narrations which feature in the mother-books of the Shīʿah which suggest that the theologians of the Shīʿah, the likes of Hishām ibn al-Hakam, Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī, and Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qummī did not merely suffice on establishing the attributes of Allah ﷺ as entailed in the Qur’an and the Sunnah, rather they exceeded that and went down the path of anthropomorphism.

It appears in Uṣūl al-Kāfī of al-Kulaynī and al-Tawḥīd of Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī and other books that the Shīʿah were in major consternation in the year 255 A.H. because they engaged in the contention with regards to the form of Allah ﷺ.
Some opined that he had a form of some type whilst others asserted that he had a body. The narration that Shaykh al-Ṣadūq narrates from Sahl reads as follows

I wrote to Abū Muḥammad in the year 255 A.H enquiring, “O my Master, our companions have debated regarding Allah. Some say that he has a body (jylland) whilst others says that he owns a form. Would you deem it appropriate to inform me of something in this regard that I can learn and will not exceed. I shall comply diligently?

Hence he responded saying, “You have asked regarding Allah whereas he is aloof from you. He is one and alone, independent, he did not beget and nor was he begotten. There is no equal to him. He is the creator, not the created; he creates bodies which he intends and fashions forms which he desires, but himself does not possess any form. His praise is exalted and his names are sacred. He is free from an equal. There is nothing like him and he is the All Hearing and the All Seeing.2

Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī played a major role in the anthropomorphist leanings of the Shīʿah as is alluded to in a number of their

1 The word Body (jylland) and others like it are invented words, the refutation or the establishment of which does not feature in the Qurʾān and the Sunnah. Therefore, the right path is not to assert these types of words nor to refute them. As for the meanings of these words, if the intended meaning is congruous with the truth it will be accepted and if it is incongruous with the truth it will be rejected. And if it is a hybrid of both, a detailed investigation will be required and the truth will have to be separated from the falsehood. (Al-Tadmuriyyah p. 65 (with the research of Muḥammad ’Awdah al-Saʿūdī); Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islam 12/316-318: the meaning of Jism according to the theologians and debaters.

narrations. In *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* there appears a narration on the strength of Muḥammad ibn al-Faraj al-Rakhajī which states:

I wrote to Abū al-Ḥasan asking him about the statement of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam about the body (of Allah) and that of Hishām ibn Sālim about the form (of Allah). He wrote, “Cast aside the confusion of those who are confused and seek the refuge of Allah. What both the Hishāms have stated is not the reality.”

The Imāms denounced them and their claims. And when a Shīʿī came to the Imām and said:

I affirm the verdict of Hishām.

The Imām said to him:

What do you have to do with the verdict of Hishām? The one who claims that Allah has a body is not from amongst us. We are free from him in this world and in the afterlife.

And some of their narrations reveal what the Imāms said with regards to Allah. One of the Shīʿah tells Abū ʿAbd Allah al-Ṣadiq about the anthropomorphist beliefs of some of the Shīʿah saying:

---


3 His name is Yaʿqūb ibn al-Sirāj. He is deemed reliable by the Shīʿah (al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fihrist* p. 214).
Some of our friends claim that Allah has a form like that of humans whilst others say that he has the features of a beardless boy with curly hair.

Abū 'Abd Allāh fell into prostration. He, thereafter, raised his head and said, “Pure is the One who nothing resembles Him, whom the eyes cannot encompass, and knowledge cannot fully comprehend.”

Likewise Ibn Bābuwayh has narrated the following on the authority of Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad al-Kharrāz and Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn:

We went to visit Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā. So we told him about the narration wherein it is reported that Muḥammad saw his lord in the form of a handsome man in His thirties wearing green. We said, “Hishām ibn Sālim, Ṣāḥib al-Ṭāq, and al-Maytham say that he is hallow till the belly and the rest of his body is firm.” He fell into prostration and said, “You are pure; they have not recognised You, and nor have they believed in Your Oneness, hence they have described you [in this manner]. You are pure; if only they recognised You, if only they described You in the manner that you have described Yourself...”

---
1 al-Tawḥīd p. 103-104; Biḥār al-Anwār 3/304.
2 Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ‘Alî ibn al-Nuʿmān al-Aḥwal: Since he was known as Shayṭān al-Ṭāq (the devil of the corner), the Shīʿah however call him Muʿmin al-Ṭāq (the believer of the corner).
3 ʿAlî ibn Ismāʿīl ibn Shuʿayb ibn Maytham ibn Yahyā al-Ṭammār. He was from amongst the leading theologians of the Shīʿah and authored a few books; one of them being al-Imāmah. (Rijāl al-Najāshī p. 176)
4 al-Tawḥīd p. 113-114; Biḥār al-Anwār 4/40; Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/101.
As you can see, their major theologians overstated the attributes of Allah which led them to likening Him with the creation and that constitutes disbelief. This is because this goes against the verse:

لَیْسَ کَمِثْلِه شَيءٌ

There is nothing like Allah.¹

They have denied the attributes of Allah which befit His majesty by describing Him in ways that He did not describe Himself. And their Imām would disapprove this way of theirs and would order them to stick to the manner in which Allah has described Himself. There are multiple narrations in this regard.²

So by overstating the attributes of Allah they have superseded the correct affirmation of the attributes of Allah which was the creed of the Ahl al-Bayt; this led to two conflicting view points in the Shīʿī dogma; i.e. the anthropomorphist view of Hishām and company, and the non-anthropomorphist view of the Ahl al-Bayt as is mentioned in the narrations of the Shīʿah and is stated in the books of the scholars.³

---

¹ Sūrah al-Shūrā: 11.
² For more details see: al-Tawḥīd, p 97-104: chapter regarding Allah not possessing a body or a form; Uṣūl al-Kāfī, 1/104-106: chapter regarding the prohibition of ascribing a body or form to Allah; Bihār al-Anwār: there are forty eight narrations under the chapter regarding negating a body and a form; there are similar narrations in this regard documented under the biographies of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, Hishām ibn Sālim, and Yūnus ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān in Rijāl al-Kashshī, also refer to the book Majālis al-Muwahhidīn fi Uṣūl al-Dīn: p 23 of al-Ṭabaṭabāʾī.
³ Minhāj al-Sunnah: 20/144.
Discussion Two

Their Denial of the Attributes of Allah

After they had exaggerated in affirming the attributes of Allah وَقَالَ اللَّهُ ﴿مَا كَانَ لِلَّهِ مِثَالٌ﴾, the Shīʿī dogma began to change in the latter portion of the third century. This was primarily due to the Shīʿah being highly influenced by the school of the Muʿtazilah (rationalists) whose salient feature was the denial of the attributes of Allah وَقَالَ اللَّهُ ﴿مَا كَانَ لِلَّهِ مِثَالٌ﴾ confirmed in the Qurʿān. This tendency rapidly increased in the fourth century with the works of al-Mufīd, al-Mūsawī (also known as al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā), and Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭūsī who relied greatly upon the works of the Muʿtazilah; to the extent that many of the aspects they cover in their books were copied verbatim from the books of the Muʿtazilah.¹ Likewise, the exegesis which they present for the verses of the Ṣifāt (attributes) of Allah وَقَالَ اللَّهُ ﴿مَا كَانَ لِلَّهِ مِثَالٌ﴾ and those pertaining to Qadr (pre-destiny) are all sourced from the exegeses of the Muʿtazilah.²

Hence, the one who studies the works of the later Shīʿī scholars will not sense any difference at all between them and the works of the Muʿtazilah with regards the names and attributes of Allah وَقَالَ اللَّهُ ﴿مَا كَانَ لِلَّهِ مِثَالٌ﴾, for rationalism (as they claim) is the criterion which induces all their opinions. The issues that the Muʿtazilah assert in this regard are the very same issues asserted by the later Shīʿī scholars, e.g. the issue of the Qurʿān being the created word of Allah وَقَالَ اللَّهُ ﴿مَا كَانَ لِلَّهِ مِثَالٌ﴾, denying the belief that the believers will see Allah وَقَالَ اللَّهُ ﴿مَا كَانَ لِلَّهِ مِثَالٌ﴾ in the afterlife, and refuting the attributes of Allah وَقَالَ اللَّهُ ﴿مَا كَانَ لِلَّهِ مِثَالٌ﴾. In fact, the doubts that the Muʿtazilah once raised are the very doubts raised by the later Shīʿī scholars.

Yes, the only difference that the reader will pick up is that the Shīʿah have in this regard forged narrations (which emphatically deny the attributes of Allah) and projected them to the Imāms. Whereas as Ibn Taymiyyah states:

---

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah, 1/229.
² Ibid, 1/356.
They have decided in principle that in aspects pertaining to the oneness of Allah and his attributes they will not subscribe to the conclusions of their intellect.¹

This (applying reason and intellect in matters of belief) is very clearly noticeable in their polemical works the likes of al-Nukat Al-ʻI'tiqādiyyah of al-Mufīd and Nahj al-Mustarshidīn of Ibn Muṭahhar among others.

This is in complete contrast with the Sharī (legal), academic, and rational proceedings of our dīn, for the attributes of Allah are from the realm of the unseen and hence the knowledge thereof is purely based upon the Qur'ān and the Sunnah.

Despite the reliance of the Shīʿah upon logical arguments like the Muʿtazilah, you will notice that they present many narrations to support their stance with regards the denial of the attributes of Allah, they fabricate reports and ascribe them to Amīr al-Muʿminīn ʿAlī and some of the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt like Muḥammad al-Bāqir and Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, suggesting that they were also of the opinion of denial. Hence, we find that one of their contemporary scholars asserts that this is the fundamental proof for their denial of the attributes of Allah. He says:

هل يبقي مجال للبحث عن الصفات وهل له طريق إلا الإذعان بكلمة أمير المؤمنين رضي الله عنه كمال الإخلاص تغي الصفات عنه

Is there any room for any discussion with regards to the attributes, and is there any other way besides having conviction in the verdict of ʿAlī: “Complete devotion to him is by denying the attributes.”²

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah (with the research of Muḥammad Rashād Sālim), 2/78-79 or 1/232 of the Amīrīyah print.

You thus see that this nation has no fixed approach, this is obviously because any stance that is based on uncritical following is vulnerable to contradiction. So at times they rely upon logic and at times they rely upon reports. And, thus, they are swaying between a purely tradition based approach and a completely rationalistic one.

Having said this, it is established from ʿAlī and the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt that they affirmed the attributes of Allah ... The narrations in this regard are abundant and authentic in the books of the scholars. Likewise, amidst the appallingly plentiful narrations of denial some narrations of theirs also concede this, a few of which will feature in the pages to come.

The examples of narrations ascribed to the Ahl al-Bayt which emphatically deny the attributes of Allah are overwhelming. E.g.

و كمال التوحید نفي الصفات

The completeness of Tawḥīd lies within the denial of the attributes.

Likewise:

و حمد الله نفي الصفات عنه

And the praise of Allah is in denying the attributes.

و لا نفي (للتشبیه) مع إثبات الصفات

Rejecting anthropomorphism is not possible with affirming the attributes.

Their scholar Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī has emphatically stated that their stance is like that of the Muʿtazilah. Some of them have even said:

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/144.
2 al-Tawḥīd p. 57.
3 Ibid p. 34-35
And (our stance) is like that of the philosophers.¹

Just as a great many of their narrations describe Allah َلِسْتَ مَهْيَةً وَلَسْتَ مَكْتُوبًا with negative attributes, which they have made part of their denial of the established attributes of Allah َلِسْتَ مَهْيَةً وَلَسْتَ مَكْتُوبًا, Ibn Bābuwayh has documented more than seventy narrations which state that:

لا يوصف بزمان ولا مكان، ولا كيفية، ولا حركة، ولا نقل، ولا شيء من صفات الأجسام، ولا حسا ولا جسمانيا ولا صورة

Allah cannot be described with time and space, movement and locomotion, nor with any of the attributes of bodies. He is not discernible, a possessor of body, or a form...²

Their scholars have all treaded this beguiling path of denying the attributes which feature in the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, and of describing Allah َلِسْتَ مَهْيَةً وَلَسْتَ مَكْتُوبًا with negative traits. Their scholar Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī, famously known as al-Qazwīnī, (d. 1300 A.H) who they awarded the title of the ‘thirteenth Imām’ due to him meeting the awaited Mahdī three times. He says in describing Allah َلِسْتَ مَهْيَةً وَلَسْتَ مَكْتُوبًا:

لا جزء له، ولا ما ليس جزء له، لا تركيب فيه، ولا ما ليس بتركيب ليس بتركيب، ولا غرض وما ليس بتركيب ليس بتركيب، ولا جسم وما ليس بجسم ليس في مكان ولا في جهه ولا في وقت، ولا ما ليس في جهه لا كم له ولا كيفية له، ولا كم له ولا كيفية له، ولا في مكان ولا في جهة ولا في وقت، ولا ما ليس في مكان ولا في جهة ولا في وقت، ولا ما ليس في مكان ولا في جهة ولا في وقت، ولا ما ليس في مكان ولا في جهة ولا في وقت، ولا ما ليس في مكان ولا في جهة ولا في وقت، ولا ما ليس في مكان ولا في جهة ولا في وقت

He has no composite parts; and that which does not comprise of composite parts does not possess a collective whole; and that which does not have a collective whole is not a substance or abstract; and that which is not a substance is not intelligent, self-subsistent, material and is not characterised by form or body; and that which does not have a body is space-less and timeless, it is not in a direction or in a specific time; and that which does not have a direction does not have quantity, quality, and a

¹ Majālis al-Muwaḥḥidīn fī Uṣūl al-Dīn p. 21.
² al-Tawḥīd p. 57.
status; and that which does not have quantity, quality, and a direction does not have a specific shape; and that which does not have a shape and does not exist in time or space has no apposition and external link; and that which has no external links has no actions and emotions; and that which is not a body nor a colour nor does it exist in a place or direction cannot be seen or grasped.¹

As you can see, he has sourced this pure denial from the works of the philosophers and heretics which entails the denial of the existence of Allah ﷺ.

Pure is your Lord, the Lord of honour, from that which they describe. And peace be upon the Messengers, and all praises belong to Allah—the Lord of the Universe.²

This is nothing new, for this is the path of all those who digressed from the way of the Ambiyāʾ ﷺ, such as the disbelievers, the polytheists, the People of the Book, those who infiltrated their ranks from amongst the Sabians³, the

3 Many of the Sabians have adopted the stance of describing Allah ﷺ with negative traits. Bayrūnī thus mentions regarding the Sabians of Ḥarrān: they describe Allah ﷺ with negative qualities rather than positive ones, e.g. he cannot be confined, cannot be seen, does not oppress and does not wrong. They apply the beautiful names of Allah ﷺ to him metaphorically, for they do not believe in the literal attributes. Just as they ascribe the running of the world to the skies and its orbiting bodies. (Al-Āthār al-Bāqīyah ʿAn al-Qurūn al-Ḥāliyah p. 205). There is difference of opinion with regards to the ethnicity of the Sabians; Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī has documented a narration wherein Mujāhid and others mention, “The Sabians are a people who are not purely fire-worshippers nor Jews or Christians; they do not really have a faith (Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 2/146). This is the preferred opinion of Ibn Kathīr as well (Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 1/107). Al-Rāzīs preferred opinion is that they were a sect that worshiped stars in the era of Ibrāhīm S (Iʿtiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa al-Mushrikīn p. 142). Shahrastānī states that there were two groups: the Sabians and the Ḥunafāʾ, (the monotheists) (al-Milal wa al-Nihal: 1: 230). They were known as the Ṣābi’īah (denouncers of faith) due to digressing from the teachings of the Ambiyāʾ, for Ṣabaʿa literally translates as going astray (Ibid 2/5). Also refer to al-Asfārāʾīnīs al-Tābṣīr Fī al-Dīn p. 89.; Ibn Taymiyyahs al-Raddʿalā al-Manṭiqīyīn p. 287-289, 454-457; al-Muqrīzīs al-Khuṭṭāt 2/344.
philosophers, the Jahmiyyah, and the Bāṭiniyyah, etc. For they describe Allah with negative attributes with completeness of detail whereas, on the other hand, they only affirm the existence of Allah generically which amounts to nothing in essence; for this leads to ultimately denying the very existence of Allah. This is because their denial of the names and attributes of Allah ultimately leads to the denial of his existence. Just as it necessitates Tamthil (assimilating Allah with the creation) in the sense that they assimilate Allah with improbabilities, non-existent entities, and inanimate things.

They all try to avoid one thing but eventually get gripped in something just like it or even worse. That is besides the fact that they become victims of interpolation and denial.

Whereas Allah has sent the Ambiyā’ with the elaborate affirmation of his attributes and the general denial of traits that do not befit his majesty. This is exactly what we see in the Qur’ān as well (i.e. the detailed affirmation of the attributes of Allah and a general negation of all unsuitable traits). Allah says:

1 The followers of al-Jahm ibn Ṣafwān. From amongst his deviances is the denial of the attributes and other innovative beliefs such as Īrjā’ (sinning with īmān is not harmful) and Jabr (the belief that all servants are divinely coerced) and that Jannah and Jahannam will one day perish. See: Imām Aḥmad: al-Radd ʿalā al-Jahmiyyah p. 64; al-Bukhārī: Khalq Afāl al-ʿIbād p. 118; al-Ashʿarī: Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/214; al-Malāṭī: al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd p. 218; al-Asfarāʾīnī: al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn p. 63; al-Maqdisī: al-Bad’ wa al-Tārīkh 5/146 and Tārīkh al-Jahmiyyah wa al-Muʿtazilah etc.
The term ‘Jahmiyyah’ was not only applied to the followers of Jahm ibn Ṣafwān. Ibn Taymiyyah says, “The pious predecessors would dub any person who denied the attributes of Allah, said that the Qur’ān is the creation of Allah, or believed that Allah will not be seen in the afterlife, as a Jahmī.” (Majmaʿ al-Fatāwā 12/119) He says in another place, “And from among the Jahmiyyah are the philosophers and the Muʿtazilah who claim that the word of Allah is created.” (Ibid 12/523)

2 One of the titles of the Ismāʾīlī Shīʿahs.

3 Ibn Taymiyah: al-Tadmuriyyah p. 16.


5 Ibid p. 8.

6 Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah p. 49.
لَيْسَ كَمِثْلِهِ شَيْءٌ وَهُوَ السَّمِیْعُ الْبَصِیْرُ

There is nothing like Him and He is the All Hearing, All Seeing.\(^1\)

Hence, the negation is general. This is the methodology of the Qur’ān in most cases. Allah ﷺ says:

هَلْ تَعْلَمُ لَهُ سَمِیًّا

Do you know a namesake for Allah?\(^2\)

In other words, an equal who deserves the same name as him. It is also said: Any competitor who can compete with him.\(^3\)

This is the meaning of what is narrated from Ibn ʿAbbās صلّى الله عليه وسلم, “Do you know any equal to him or anyone similar to him.”\(^4\)

Likewise Allah ﷺ says:

وَ لَمْ یَكُنْ لَّه کُفُوًا أَحَدٌ

And there is no one equal to Him.\(^5\)

As for the affirmation of the attributes of Allah ﷺ, it is explained in complete detail like:

وَهُوَ السَّمِیْعُ الْبَصِیْرُ

And He is the All Hearing All Seeing.

---

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 11.
2 Sūrah Maryam: 65.
3 Al-Tadmuriyyah p. 8; Lisān al-ʿArab (under the root letters سمي)
4 Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 16/106.
And like the concluding verses of Sūrah al-Ḥashr:

َّهُوَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْ لَ إِلٰهَ إِلَّ هُوَ عَالِمُ الْغَیْبِ وَالشَّهَادَةِ هُوَ الرَّحْمٰنُ الرَّحِیْمُ هُوَ الْمَلِكُ الْقُدُّوْسُ السَّلاَمُ الْمُؤْمِنُ الْمُهَیْمِنُ الْعَزِیْزُ الْجَبَّارُ الْمُتَكَبِّرُ سُبْحَانَ اللّٰهِ عَمَّا یُشْرِکُونَ

He is Allah besides Who there is no deity. He is the Sovereign, the Most Pure, the Giver of Peace, the Giver of Security, the Vigilant, the Mighty, the Dominant, and the Glorious. Pure is Allah from what they ascribe to Him. He is the Creator, the Perfect Maker, the Fashioner. For Him are beautiful names. All that is in the heavens and the earth glorify Him. And He is the Mighty, the Wise.¹

There are many examples of this nature.²

Therefore, the method of these people is not in harmony with the Qur’ān, just as it is inharmonious with sound human disposition and evident rationality. Instead it is frowned upon by humans in praise of humans. So how can Allah, the Lord of the multi-verse, be praised in this manner?³

Although the Shīʿah narrate from the Imāms that “the creator should not be described but with attributes with which he has described himself”, they have disregarded this just as they have disregarded the Book of Allah, the demands of rationality, and the dictates of sound disposition. All of this is

---

1 Al-Ḥashr: 24.
3 The commentator of al-Taḥāwiyyah states: “Pure negation does not entail any praise. Not forgetting that with it is disrespectful. If you were to say to the king, “You are not a street sweeper, a cupper or a weaver.” He would admonish you even though you are articulating the truth. However, if you negating all negative traits in very broad terms saying, “You are not like any of your subjects” is indeed extolling his virtues and showing respect to him. (ʿAlī ibn Abī al-ʿIz: Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah p. 50.
affected by uncritical following and the remnants of perishing philosophies. Or else why would an intelligent person rely upon an inadequate brain, a faltering thought-process, self-contradictory human assumptions, and their conflicting conjecture in matters of the unseen; which can only be affirmed and realised by way of divine revelation.

The scholars of Islam have very vehemently refuted the claims of these Muʿaṭṭilah (deniers of the attributes of Allah), thus, I will not repeat the same and return to their refutations... However it would be fruitful to sketch this contentious issue from the books of the Shīʿah, from the narrations of their Imāms, and the statements of their scholars, since these are primarily in support of the deniers. In this way the extent of their contradiction, aloofness from their Imāms, and the extent to which the Sabaʿī hands were influential in corrupting the creed of the Imāms, forging narrations of denial, and uncritically approbative of its outcomes, will become abundantly clear.

For this, I will choose three issues:

1. The created/uncreated nature of the Qurʾān.
2. Seeing Allah in the afterlife.
3. Divine descent.

Thereafter, I will endeavour to illustrate by way of textual proof extracted from Shīʿī sources that the stance of the Imāms were moderate; neither was it exaggeratedly anthropomorphic, nor was it rigidly denying. This exactly is the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah and it is in accordance with reliable texts and profound reason.

1. **Their stance with regards to the Qurʾān being created**

The Qurʾān is the revealed uncreated Word of Allah. This is what is asserted in the Qurʾān, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the early scholars of
the Ummah.¹ The Ithnā ʿAshariyyah on the other hand have treaded the path of the Jahmiyyah in positing that the Qurʾān is the created word of Allah شبهة و عقالة. Al-Majlisi, the grand Shiʿī scholar of his time, has established a chapter in his Biḥār regarding the Qurʾān, which he titled, Chapter regarding the Qurʾān being created.² Therein, he has documented eleven narrations. However, most of these narrations prove the opposite of his viewpoint, but the Shiʿah have a method of manipulating them which we will mention after a while.

The Shiʿī scholar Muḥsin al-Amīn states:

قالت الشیعة والمعتزلة القرآن مخلوق.

The Shiʿah and the Muʿtazilah say that the Qurʾān is created.³

This is due to them denying the attribute of speech for Allah شبهة و عقالة and due to them claiming that Allah شبهة و عقالة:

یوجد الكلام في بعض مخلوقاته كالشجرة حين کلم موسي وکجبرئیل حین أنزله بالقرآن

Creating speech in some of his creation, like the tree when it conversed with Mūsā, and Jibrīl when Allah sent him with the Qurʾān.⁴

This is some of what their scholars have said in this regard.⁵

---


² Biḥār al-Anwār 92/117-121.

³ Aʿyān al-Shīʿah 1/461.

⁴ Ibid 1/453.

⁵ Ibn Taymiyyah when asked regarding a person who holds this view, ruled that he is an infidel and that he should be asked to repent. He also said that he will be hailed an infidel even though he says, I do not disbelieve in the verse, “Allah specially spoke to Mūsā,” (al-Nisāʾ: 164) rather I affirm that these words are true but I deny its literal meaning. He says, “These are the Jahmiyyah regarding whom the early scholars and leaders are unanimous that they are the worst of the deviant sects, to the extent that some of them have even excluded them from the seventy two sects of Islam.” (See: Ibn Taymiyah, Majmūʿah al-Rasāʾil wa al-Masāʾil 1/474; Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 12/502). He says in another place, “The early scholars of the Ummah have dubbed the Jahmiyyah who say that Allah شبهة و عقالة created speech in some bodies which Mūsā شبهة و عقالة heard as infidels.” (Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 12/533).
If you source the narrations which they transmit on the authority of the Ahl al-Bayt you will find that most of them oppose this stance which the Shīʿah have taken. One of them is the narration which appears in Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshi:

عن الرضا أنه سئل عن القرآن فقال... إنه كلام الله غير مخلوق.

Al-Riḍā was asked regarding the Qurʿān he said, “... It is the uncreated Word of Allah.”

And in Rijāl al-Kashshī it is mentioned:

إن الكلام ليس بمخلوق

The speech is uncreated.

And in Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī’s book al-Tawḥīd the following is mentioned:


Abū al-Hasan Mūsā was asked, “O the son of Rasūl Allah! What is your opinion regarding the Qurʿān? Because the people in our region have disputed the matter; some say that it is created while others say that it is uncreated.”

He replied, “Behold! I do not say what they say. Instead I say that it is the Speech of Allah.”

There are many narrations in this regard. However, the Shaykh of the Shīʿah in his time Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī whilst interpreting these reports has leaned

---

1 Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshi 1/8.
2 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 490.
3 al-Tawḥīd p. 224.
4 Al-Biḥār 92/117-121; al-Tawḥīd p. 223-229.
toward a totally different view; he proves that the words “uncreated (Ghayr Makhlūq)” means:

أنه غير مخلوق أي غير مكذوب لا يعني به أنه غير محدث

It is Ghayr Makhlūq, i.e. it is not a lie. It does not mean that it is not created.¹

He further says, “The reason why we refrained from applying the meaning of ‘creation’ is because the word Makhlūq literally at times means a lie; it is said: Kalām Makhlūq, i.e. a lie.”²

There is no doubt that this interpretation is not sound, because it is obvious that the previously cited narrations oppose the stance taken by the Muʿtazilah with regards to the creation of the Qurʾān. Hence, the pious predecessors refuted their claims asserting that it is the uncreated Word of Allah. They did not intend that it is not a lie as Ibn Bābuwayh and others claim, for no one amongst the Muslims ever claimed that it was a lie, instead this is blatant disbelief which every Muslim is aware of. In essence, what they (the Muʿtazilah) said was that Allah created his speech in something. This is what the pious predecessors rejected it, as is documented in multiple narrations and in many books.³

In Tafsīr al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm of Ayatollah al-Burūjardī he quotes a text of Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī wherein he interprets the aforementioned texts with the taint of Taqiyyah. Thus, he says:

و لعل المنع من إطلاقه الخلق على القران إما للتقیة مماشاة مع العامة أو لكونه موهما لمعنى اخر أطلق الكفار عليه بهذا المعني في قولهم إن هذا إلا اختلاق

It is very likely that abstaining from attributing creation upon the Qurʾān was either due to Taqiyyah in order to outwardly agree with the commonality (i.e.

¹ al-Tawḥīd p. 225; Al-Biḥār 92/119.
² Ibid.
³ Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 12/301.
the Ahl al-Sunnah) or due to it insinuating an undesirable meaning which the infidels would intend in their saying, “This is not but a fabrication.”

It is clear that these scholars found nothing to support their stance besides the idea of Taqiyyah and its like. This proves that they have no solid anchorage and that the mere possibility of Taqiyyah being present in every text has ruined their faith and has stripped it of any essence. Their faith has thus become the faith of al-Majlisī, al-Kulaynī or Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī rather than it being a faith based upon the traditions of the Imāms.

It thus became plausible for every shaykh, heretic, or fraudster—who masquerades as a shaykh and flaunts his knowledge—to choose a view from among these conflicting views which appeals to his heterodoxy, ignorance, or ego; and discard the other views even though they may be true. In supporting his stance he substantiates it by way of Taqiyyah or by the claim that it opposes the view of the Ahl al-Sunnah—for in opposing them lies guidance. In this deceitful way does he destroy knowledge, the truth, and the faith, and predetermines disunity and discord for the Ummah by way of these methodologies which stem from the inspiration of the devil and his cunningness.

If any Shīʿī scholar desired good for the Shīʿah he would have treaded the path of the majority and would have accepted from Shīʿī narrations only those which are harmonious with the Qurʾān and those which are accepted by the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamāʿah. He would have freed himself from the ploys of al-Qummī, al-Kulaynī, and al-Majlisī; especially when the Imāms have time and again complained of the fraudsters who forged things and attributed lies to them. They said:

1 Tafsīr al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm 1/304.
2 See: al-Durrah al-Najafiyyah of Hāshim al-Bahrānī p. 60 onwards, for he has endeavoured to explain the variant narrations which exist due to Taqiyyah and he has revealed their confusion with regards to which view is to be taken; should the first one be adopted or the last, should the matter be left pending, should any of the two be chosen or what should he do with these conflicting reports and views. Hence, Taqiyyah has, as al-Bahrānī states, the basis of any ruling is not void of doubt and confusion due to the excessive divergence of opinion and the contradictory supporting elements. (Al-Durrah al-Najafiyyah p. 61). Also see the chapter of Taqiyyah in this book.
People are obsessed with lying against us.¹

If you really intend to apply this methodology, i.e. accepting those narrations of the Ahl al-Bayt which are in harmony with the traditions of the Ahl al-Sunnah; you will find that the books of the Shīʿah record many narrations from the Ahl al-Bayt which clearly state that the word of Allah is revealed and uncreated; just as you will find that the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah are replete with narrations containing the same. Imām al-Bukhārī in his book *Khalq Afʿāl al-ʿIbād*², Ibn Abī Ḥātim³, Abū Saʿīd al-Dārīmī⁴, al-Ājurrī in *al-Sharīʿah*⁵, al-Bayhaqī in *Al-Iʿtiqād*⁶ and *al-Asmāʾ wa al-Ṣifāt*⁷, al-Lālikāʾī in *Sharḥ Uṣūl Iʿtiqād Ahl al-Sunnah*⁸, and Abū Dāwūd in *Masāʾil al-Imām ʿAḥmad*⁹ have all documented a narration on the authority from Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq that he was asked with regards to the Qurʾān whereupon he replied:

ليس خالق ولا خلق

Neither is it the Creator nor is it created.

¹ *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 135-136. For more details refer to the chapter regarding their belief with regard to the Sunnah of this book.


³ *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (revised by Muḥammad Rashād Sālim) 2/187-188.


⁵ *Al-Sharīʿah* p. 77.

⁶ *Al-Iʿtiqād* p. 36. Al-Bayhaqī thereafter states, “This is a famous authentic report from Jaʿfar, it has been narrated from Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad from his father, from ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn. And al-Zuhrī has narrated it from ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn. We have narrated it in variant ways from Mālik ibn Anas and this is the stance of all the former and latter scholars. (Ibid p. 39)

⁷ *Al-Asmāʾ wa al-Ṣifāt* p. 247.


⁹ *Masāʾil al-Imām ʿAḥmad* (Beirut) p. 265 or p. 106-107 (in the compilation of the beliefs of the pious predecessors).
Ibn Taymiyyah says that this has been very popularly narrated from Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq.¹

So why is the unanimously agreed upon meaning not taken and why is the falsehood not discarded, for it is not supported but by the verdicts of scholars who desire to plant the seeds of disquiet and dispute in the Ummah, who seek peculiarity and aloofness in order to conveniently amass big sums of money in the name of Khums (one fifth of the wealth of people) and so that they may preside over the lofty position of representing the hidden Mahdī; therefore, we find them always emphasising that in any thing that opposes the Ahl al-Sunnah there is guidance.

Whereas if the word al-ʿĀmmah (commonality) is taken in its literal sense the Muʿtazilah whom they have emulated also fall part of it, for the stance of the Qurʾān being created was the stance of the Muʿtazilah. ʿAbd al-Jabbār says in his Sharḥ al-Uṣūl al-Khamsah:

و أما مذهبنا في ذالك (اي في القرآن) فهو أن القرآن كلام الله تعالي ووحيه و هو مخلوق محدث

As to our stance with regards to this matter, the Qurʾān is the speech of Allah and His revelation and it is created and brought into existence.²

This is one of the many ideas of the Muʿtazilah which the Shīʿah have assimilated into their dogma... which suggests that they didn’t really succeed in opposing the ‘commonality’.

The first person to invent this idea was al-Jaʿd ibn Dirham.³ ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Abī Ḥātim states:

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/163.
3 Ibn Ḥajar says, “Al-Jaʿd is considered from the era of the Tābiʿīn; he was a deviant innovator who claimed that Allah had not befriended Ibrāhīm and had not conversed with Mūsā. He was executed in Iraq on the day of Naḥr (tenth of Dhū al-Ḥijjah). There are many narrations discussing his deviations. (Lisān al-Mīzān 2/105; Mīzān al-ʿītīdāl 1/399; Ibn Nabāṭah, Sarḥ al-ʿUyūn p. 293–294.
The first person to coin the idea of the creation of the Qur’ān was al-Ja’d ibn Dirham. Similarly he is the first person to deny the attributes of Allah; thereafter, al-Jahm ibn Ṣafwān learnt them from him.

Some suggest that this idea returns in its origins to foreign influences, for Ibn al-Athīr, Ibn Taymiyyah, and others have mentioned that al-Ja’d had taken this idea from Abān ibn Sam‘ān, and he from Ṭālūt—the son of the sister of Labīd ibn al-A’ṣam (the Jew who had poisoned Nabī, who was of the opinion that the Tawrāh (old testament) is created. Ṭālūt was irreligious and was the first to write a book in this regard. Then, al-Ja’d promulgated it. Just as al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī mentions that the father of Bishr al-Murrīsī, one of the proponents of the idea of creation from among the Mu’tazilah, was a Jew.

From here the Jewish influence on this idea becomes evident.

Ibn Taymiyyah makes further mention of foreign influences upon the idea. He mentions that al-Ja’d ibn Dirham was from Ḥarrān, wherein there were some Sabians and philosophers who rejected the message of Ibrāhīm. He thus denied that Allah conversed with Mūsā and that he befriended Ibrāhīm concurring in this regard with Fir‘awn and Namrūd based on their principle of denial in that neither speech can co-exist with Allah, nor can love for someone else. Hence, the Muslims had him executed subsequent to which many devious people followed his path.

---
1 Sharḥ Uṣūl l’tiqād ahl al-Sunnah p. 382. After this text the following is mentioned, “He promulgated this idea somewhere after 120 A.H.” However the author has not critiqued this narration despite the fact that al-Ja’d was executed around the year 118 A.H.
3 Tārīkh Baghdād, 7/61.
4 Dar’ Ta’āruḍ al-‘Aql wa al-Naql 7/175-176.
Those narrations which feature in the books of the Shīʿah which assert that the Qur’ān is revealed and uncreated represent the position of the early scholars among the Shīʿah as is indicated by the scholars;¹ for the position that the Qur’ān is a creation is from the innovations of the later Shīʿī scholarship.²

Likewise the position that the Qur’ān is revealed and uncreated is proven to be the position of the Ahl al-Bayt. For there is not a single Imām from the Ahl al-Bayt, the likes of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, Abū Jaʿfar al-Bāqir, and his son Jaʿfar, who was of the opinion that the Qur’ān is created. However, the Shīʿah oppose majority of the principles of the Ahl al-Bayt.³

As for their statement that Allah ⁴ created his speech in a tree when conversing to Mūsā, it is in complete contrast with the explicit verse:

وَکَلَمَ اللّٰهُ مُوْسٰی تَكْلِیْمًا

And Allah spoke to Mūsā specially.⁴

The emphasis with the verbal noun ‘taklīm’ denies any possibility of a metaphorical explanation of the verse. Hence, many scholars have said that emphasis created by way of a verbal noun disallows the concession of metaphor.⁵

If their interpretation was to be considered correct, then there remains no exclusive virtue for Mūsā, mention of which Allah ⁴ makes in the Qur’ān:

من سمع كلام الله من ملك او من نبي أناه به من عند الله أفضل مرتبة في سماء الكلام من موسى،لانهم سمعوه من نبي،موسي سمعه من شجرة...ويلزمهم أن تكون الشجرة هي التي قالت: إنني أنا الله لا آله إلا أنا فاعبدني. وهذا ظاهر الفساد.

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/296.
² Al-Ashʿarī: Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/114.
³ Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/296.
⁴ Sūrah al-Nisā’: 164.
⁵ Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām 12/515.
A person who hears the Speech of Allah from an angel or from a Nabī who conveys it on his behalf is more privileged than Mūsā عليه السلام, because they are hearing it from a Nabī whereas Mūsā عليه السلام heard it from a tree... this also obviously posits that the tree addressed Mūsā عليه السلام saying, “Indeed I am Allah, there is no deity besides me, so worship me.” And this is evidently wrong.¹

The refutation of the Jahmiyyah who are deniers of the attributes of Allah is abundantly found in the works of the Tābi‘īn (the successors of the Ṣaḥābah), their successors, and the great luminaries. There are extensive narrations discussing the nature of the Qur’ān² which are documented in dedicated works. However, it would be interesting to add here in critiquing the Shī‘ī doctrine after the emergence of their literature to the fore and its proliferation that they, despite not according this virtue to Mūsā عليه السلام by denying that Allah علیه السلام spoke to him and claiming that the tree in fact spoke to him, did not deny this in respect of their Imām and they completely overlooked this issue when extolling the virtues of the A’immah.

There appears a chapter in one of their canonical works Biḥār al-Anwār by the name Chapter: Regarding Allah علیه السلام conversing with the Imām³ in this chapter the author presents a few narrations discussing the topic and thereafter he attributes them—as is his habit—to a group of their reliable books. One of these narrations state:

لما بعث رسول الله صلي الله علیه وسلم ببراءة مع أبي بكر و انزل الله علیه:تترك من ناجیته غیر مرة، و تبعث من لم أناجه؟ فأرسل رسول الله صلي الله علیه وسلم فأخذ براءة منه و دفعها الي علي رضي الله عنه فقال له علي:أوصني يا رسول الله، فقال له، إن الله یوصیك و یناجیك، قال: فناجاه یوم براءة قبل صلاة الاولي إلى صلاة العصر

When the Rasūl of Allah سلیم الله علیه وسلم sent Abū Bakr with Sūrah Barā’ah, Allah revealed to him, “You are leaving the person whom I addressed a few times

¹ Al-Iʿtiqād ʿalā madhhab al-Salaf p. 33.
² Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām 12/418.
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 39/151.
and are sending someone who I did not converse with at all?”

The Rasūl of Allah thus sent for him, took Sūrah Barā‘ah away from him and gave it to ʿAlī.

ʿAlī thus said, “O Rasūl of Allah, advise me.”

He said, “Allah will advise you and address you.”

He says that Allah conversed with him on the Day of Barā‘ah from before the Ṣalāt al-Fajr up until Ṣalāt al-ʿAṣr.

Another narration states the following:

إن الله ناجاه (یعني علیا) يوم الطائف و يوم عقبة تبوك، و يوم حنین

Allah conversed with ʿAlī on the Day of Ṭā'if, the Day of Tabūk, and the Day of Ḥunayn.

And in Baṣā‘ir al-Darajāt, al-Ikhtiṣās, and Biḥār al-Anwār there is a narration which says:

عن أبي عبد الله قال: قال رسول الله صلي الله علیه وسلم لأهل الطائف: لأبعثن الیكم رجلا کنفسي یفتح

الله به الخیبر، سوطه سیفه (ثم تذكر الروایة اختبار علي لهذه المهمة، و أن الرسول لحق به و لما وصلها)

(کان علي علي رأس الجبل فقال له رسول الله سلي اله علیه وسلم :اثبت فثبت، فسمعنا مثل صریر الزجل

فقبل يا رسول الله ما هذا؟قال: إن الله يناجي عليا رضي الله عنه

Abū ‘Abd Allah al-Ṣādiq says that the Rasūl of Allah said to the people of Ṭā‘if, “I will send to you a man like me upon whose hands Allah will give victory in Khaybar; his whip will be his sword…”

1 Take note that at this juncture they allegedly claim that Allah reprimanded Rasūl Allah and exposed his mistake…This blatantly opposes the claim of complete infallibility with which they describe Rasūl Allah and the Imāms…contradiction is very rampant in all their texts.


(The narration then mentions that ʿAlī ʿa.s. was chosen for this task and that the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ tagged along behind him. When he reached him,)

ʿAlī was at the head of the mountain.

So the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ said to him, “Remain firm, remain firm.”

Thus we heard something like thundering. It was said, “O Rasūl of Allah! What is that?”

He said, “Allah is conversing with ʿAlī ʿa.s.”

Aside from the historical flaws in the narration and confounding the battles of Khaybar and Tabūk, the reader will most probably note the resemblance given to the speech of Allah ﷺ; for the element of anthropomorphism is clear in the words “like thundering”. And the narration does not indicate that ʿAlī ʿa.s. heard this from a tree or anything of that sort. So what is wrong with them? At times they lean toward utter denial whilst at other occasions they lean toward anthropomorphism. Do these narrations perhaps suggest the phases through which Shīʿism traversed from first being anthropomorphist and then switching to utter denial in the third century when the winds of Iʿtizāl were violently blowing? Or is it that the fabricators of these narrations represent every creed with the result that each one of them fabricates that which his creed dictates to him?

In essence, love for ʿAlī ʿa.s. is a virtue so meritorious that coupled with it no sin is harmful, as they allege.

And they do not find any reason to justify their standing besides Taqiyyah. And not one of their scholars is able to identify the view which is based on Taqiyyah from the other except by asserting that it is the one that opposes the commonality (i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah), for in it lies guidance. If only they said, “That which is harmonious with the Qur’ān is the truth and that which opposes it is Taqiyyah.”

---

1 The translation is taken from the explanation given in: Bihār al-Anwār 39/156; al-Ikhtiṣās p. 200.
2 Al-Ikhtiṣās p. 200-201; Bihār al-Anwār 39/155-156; Al-Ṣaffār: Başāʾir al-Darajāt (refer to previous reference).
Lastly, is it not sufficient in exposing the falsity of their dogma that it is a foreign element to the ummah, that it is against the creed of the Ahl al-Bayt, that it is against many of their narrations which are in harmony with the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and that their narrations are all riddled with contradiction?

2. Seeing Allah in the afterlife

For the people of Jannah to see Allah، without encompassing His Being and without any specific manner, is true as is mentioned in the Qur’ān:

وَجُوْهٌ يَّوْمَئِذٍ نَّاضِرَةٌ إِلَىٰ رَبِّهَا نَاظِرَةٌ

On that day some faces will be radiant, gazing at their lord.1

As for the traditions of Nabī and his Ṣaḥābah which establish seeing Allah، they are mass transmitted and have been documented by the authors of the Şihāh, the Masānīd, and the Sunan.2

The Ṣaḥābah، their successors, and the renowned acclaimed scholars of the Ummah who were known for their supremacy in dīn were all proponents of seeing Allah. Likewise was the opinion of all the theologians who subscribed to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā’ah.3

The Jahmiyyah، Mu’tazilah، Khawārij (those who rebelled against ʿAlī)، and the Twelver Shi‘ah4 were opponents of seeing Allah. Their stance, however, is baseless and rejected by the Qur’ān، the Sunnah، and the consensus of the pious predecessors.5

---

1 Sūrah al-Qiyāmah: 22، 23. The text is cited from Imam al-Ṭaḥāwī (see: Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah p. 146.
3 Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah p. 146.
4 Ibid.
Hereunder I shall quote the opinion of the Shīʿah from their sources in this regard:

The Shīʿah have, due to conforming to the Muʿtazilah, inclined toward the denial of seeing Allah. There are many narrations which Ibn Bābuwayh has cited in his al-Tawḥīd, majority of which were later quoted by al-Majlisī in his Biḥār al-Anwār. These narrations reject that which appears in clear-cut verses and traditions with regards to the believers seeing Allah in the afterlife. These narrations, for example, falsely allege that Abū ʿAbd Allah Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq was asked:

\[\text{عن الله تبارك و تعالى هل يرى في المعاد؟ فقال سبحان الله و تعالى عن ذالك علواً كبيراً... إن الأبصار لا تدرك إلا ما له لون و كيفية، والله خالق الألوان و كيفية.}\]

“Will Allah Taʿālā be seen in the afterlife?”

He said, “Pure is Allah and Exalted is He from that… The eyes can only grasp that which has colour and modality whereas Allah is the creator of colour and modality.”

This narration contradicts what the author of al-Kāfī has reported from Abū ʿAbd Allah. He said:

\[\text{ولكن لا بد من إثبات أن له كيفية لا يستحقها غيره ولا يشارك فيها ولا يحاط بها ولا يعلمها غيره.}\]

However, it is necessary to affirm his modality which no one else besides him is worthy of, no one besides him can share, which cannot be fully grasped, and no one can have knowledge of.”

Jaʿfar al-Najafī, the student of Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ states:

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 4/31. He has referenced this from the Amālī of al-Ṣadūq.
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/85.
If a person ascribes some attributes to Allah such as the possibility of Him being seen, he will be considered a renegade.¹

Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has enumerated the denial of seeing Allah from the fundamental beliefs of the Imāms. He has established a chapter to prove this which is, Chapter: that no eye will see Allah in this world and the hereafter.²

So their denial of seeing their Lord in the afterlife is digressing from the dictates of the divine texts just as it is defecting from the creed of the Ahl al-Bayt. Some of their narrations confirm this. Hence, Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī narrates from Abū Baṣīr that he asked Abū ʿAbd Allah:

أخبرني عن الله عز و جل هل يراهم المؤمنون يوم القيامة؟ قال: نعم

“Tell me about Allah E. Will the believers see him on the day of judgement?”

He said, “Yes.”³

3. The descent of Allah

Furthermore, the descent of Allah is something that is very extensively narrated in the Sunnah of the Rasūl, the pious predecessors of the Ummah, and the scholars of Sunnah and Ḥadīth have all unanimously accepted it⁴ and established it (as it befits his majesty and is unique to his grandeur).

---

¹ Kashf al-Ghiṭā’ p. 417.
³ al-Tawḥīd p. 117; Biḥār al-Anwār p. 4/44; Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 450 (narrations no. 848).
However, there are many a narrations which feature in the books of the Twelvers which negate this.\(^1\) Whereas simultaneously there are other narrations which establish the descent of Allah; these are the narrations which are in harmony with the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah. The following narration appears in the books of the Shi'ah:

`قال سئل لأبي عبد الله: تقول إنه ينزل إلي السماء الدنيا؟ قال أبو عبد الله: نقول بذالك، لأن الروايات قد صحت به و الأخبار`  

A person asked Abū 'Abd Allah, “Do you say that Allah descends to the first heaven?”

Abū 'Abd Allah said, “That is what we say, because this is what is authentically proven in the narrations and reports.”\(^2\)

A similar narration to this appears in *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, the most authentic and fundamental exegesis of the Shi'ah as is asserted by the author of *Al-Biḥār*,\(^3\) even though the publisher of the book and its commentator modified the meaning\(^4\) by adding on to it without realising, however, the rest of the narration exposes the counterfeit addition.\(^5\)

\(^{1}\) *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/125-127; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/311-314.  
\(^{2}\) *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/331. Al-Majlisi has sourced this narration from *al-Tawḥīd* of Ibn Bābuwayh. Upon referring to the book I found the narration but with the portion affirming the descendence omitted. However, the reviser of the book has alluded to the presence of it in some manuscripts of the book in the footnotes. But he does not bring it in the book because it goes against his stance (See: *al-Tawḥīd* p. 248)  
\(^{3}\) *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/315.  
\(^{4}\) He says, “His command descends.” (See: *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/204).  
\(^{5}\) For the narration goes as follows:

إن الرب تبارك و تعالي ينزل كل ليلة... فإذا طلع الفجر عاد الرب إلي عرشه

Verily the blessed and exalted lord descends every night... when the dawn breaks he returns to his throne.

(*Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/315; *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/204). It should be noted that the sentence, “Then he returns to his throne,” is overstating this specific attribute of Allah.
The apparent contradiction in these narrations necessitates that one of them is undoubtedly false. An there is no doubt as to the fact that the narrations which are coherent with the Qur’an, the Sunnah of the Rasūl ﷺ, and the unanimous stance of pious predecessors are the valid ones; despite the Shī‘ah denying them due to their conformance with the Mu‘tazilah.

In addition, the difference of opinion which we find between the early Shī‘ī scholarship and its successive scholarship necessarily suggests that either the early or the later scholars were astray.¹ Narrations from the Shī‘ī literature posit that the stance of the Ahl al-Bayt in this regard was one of moderation; not exaggeratedly affirming like that of the early Shī‘ah and neither exceedingly denying like that of the later scholars.

The author of al-Kāfī has established a chapter, Chapter: Regarding the prohibition of describing Allah in a manner that he has not described himself. In this chapter he has cited twelve narrations from the Imāms. He commences the chapter with the following narration:

عبد الرحيم بن عتیک القصیر قال كتبت علي یدي عبد الملك بن أعین إلي أبي عبد الله علیه السلام إن
قوما بالعراق يصفون الله بالصورة والتطعیط فكتب إلي سألت رحمك الله عن التوحید وما ذهب إلیه
من قبلك فقالوا الله الذي ليس كمثله شيء و هو السمیع البصیر تعالي عما يصفه الواصفون المشهون
الله يخلق الفسفرون علي الله فاعلم رحمك الله أن المذهب الصحيح في التوحید ما نزل به القرآن من
صفات الله جل وعز فانف عن الله تعالى البطلان و التشیه فلا تسبه... لا تعدوا القرآن فتفضلوا
بعد البيان

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAtīk al-Qaṣīr mentions, “I dictated the following to ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Aʿyan in a letter to Abū ʿAbd Allah ﷺ, ‘A group of people in Iraq describe Allah with a form and with elaborate details.’

He wrote back saying, ‘You have asked, may Allah have mercy on you, about the oneness of Allah and the view that some have adopted in your region. So Allah is exalted, there is nothing like him, he is All Hearing and All

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/275.
Seeing. He is beyond the descriptions of those who describe Him, likening Him to the creation, and who falsely forge things against Him. Behold! The correct stance pertaining to the oneness of Allah is that which the Qurʾān has descended with regarding the attributes of Allah. Hence, negate from Allah ḏūʾ ḍād (baselessness) and ṭashbīḥ (assimilation). There is no room, thus, for complete negation of his attributes. Neither is there any permissibility for likening him with the creation...

Do not transgress the limits of the Qurʾān, or else you will go astray after clear guidance.”

Mufaḍḍal says:

سألت أبا الحسن عن شيء من الصفة فقال: لا تجاوز ما في القرآن

I asked Abū al-Ḥasan about an aspect pertaining to the attributes of Allah.

He said, “Do not exceed that which is in the Qurʾān.”

Note that this text which appears in the most authentic of their four early canonical works orders them to follow that which is revealed in the Qurʾān with regards to the attributes of Allah. Therefore, whoever uncritically follows the Muʿtazilah or makes his reason the criterion and turns away from the Qurʾān has not followed the Qurʾān, nor has he followed the bequest of his Imām.

1 The stance of the Salaf is a moderate stance between two extreme stances and guidance between two deviations, i.e. affirming the attributes of Allah coupled with the denial of his assimilation with the creation. So the verse: ‘There is nothing like him’ is a refutation of those who assimilate Allah with the creation. And the verse, ‘And He is All Hearing and All Seeing,’ is a refutation of those who negate his attributes (Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām; 5/196). However, the word ṭashbīḥ (assimilation) has now become a very vague word; at times the correct meaning is intended and that is negating what the Qurʾān has negated and is rationally supported, i.e. none of the creation can be described with the attributes of Allah, nor is any of the creation like Him in any of his attributes. And at times the incorrect meaning is intended, and that is denying the attributes of Allah completely. (Sharḥ al-Tahāwiyah p. 40)

2 Ṣūūl al-Kāfī 1/100.

3 Ibid 1/102.
Al-Riḍā says:

People have three opinions with regards to the oneness of Allah: Complete denial of His attributes, assimilating Him with the creation, and affirming them without assimilating Him with the creation. Hence, the stances of denial and assimilation are unacceptable, for there is nothing that resembles Allah. Therefore the straight path is in the third stance which is affirmation without assimilation.¹

The early Shī‘ah leaned toward assimilation and the later Shī‘ah leaned toward denial and they all collectively discarded the moderate stance which was the stance of the Imāms as is attested to by their books. This shows that they have no sound grounding in this regard, for they have not taken the approach of the Qur‘ān and the Sunnah, nor have they adopted the stance of their Imāms who they claim are their leaders. Instead they first went the way of the assimilators and opposed the verse, “There is nothing like him,” then they treaded the path of the deniers and disregarded all the texts containing the attributes of Allah.

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 3/263.
Discussion Three

Describing their Imāms with the Names and Attributes of Allah

This is something exclusive to the Shīʿah wherein they are isolated from the rest of the Ummah. The early scholars from among the Shīʿah attributed to Allah the features of the creation. Subsequently, this was followed by a diametrically opposite stance which can be deemed as its counter, and that is the stance of Taʿṭīl (denial). Hence, they assimilated Allah with non-existent, inanimate and impossible objects thereby refuting and denying the texts containing his names and attributes.

As a result, they did not describe Allah in the manner he described himself nor in the manner that the Rasūl described Him. Not in their first standing and not in their second. And if this is really the case then they haven’t stopped there. Instead the matter has escalated to the extent that they have ascribed to their Imāms some of the attributes which are exclusive to Allah; giving birth to a third stance which is assimilating the creation with the creator—resembling the Christians, just as they, in turn, resembled the Jews.

They have contrived an innovation in the Ummah of Muḥammad by claiming that their Imāms are the Asmā’ (names) of Allah; for they aver that the names of Allah mentioned in the Qur’ān refer to their twelve Imāms. This entails denying the names of Allah and according them to the creation. They also claim that there is emphatic mention of this from the infallibles. This is a blatant lie, so woe be to them due to their fabrications. Al-Kulaynī narrates in Uṣūl al-Kāfī:

عن أبي عبد الله في قول الله عز و جل: (و لله الأسماء الحسني فادعوه بها) قال: نحن والله السماء الحسني التي ل يقبل الله من العباد عملا إل بمعرفتن

Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ṣādiq states regarding the verse, And Allah has beautiful names so call unto him by way of them. “We are the names of Allah

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 180.
This subject matter has been narrated by the founding fathers of the dogma who all narrate it from Ja'far al-Ṣādiq and others.²

Allah says, “And for Allah there are beautiful names.” And these people say, “We are the beautiful names.” Can there be any opposition to Allah and his book more blatant than this? It is from these contaminated sources that the Bāṭiniyyah (those who believe in esoteric knowledge rather than exoteric) and those who dieficate their Imāms draw, and from its dirty waters do they saturate themselves.

Some narrations unpack what has been vaguely transmitted in these reports. Hence they narrate from Abū Ja'far that he said:

نحن وجه الله نتقلب في الأرض بين أظهركم ونحن عين الله في خلقه ويده المبسولة بالرحمة علي عباده عرفنا من عرفنا وجهلنا من جهيلنا.

We are the countenance of Allah who roams among you on the earth. We are the eye of Allah in his creation. We are His hand of mercy which has been spread out to the creation. Those who have recognised us have recognised us and those who are ignorant of us are ignorant of us.³

Another narration from Abū ʿAbd Allāh states:

و عن أبي عبد الله (إن الله خلقنا فأحسن صورنا وجعلنا عيننا في عباده وله سماواتنا في خلقه ويده المبسولة علي عباده بالرطبة والرحمة ووجهه الذي يبتغي منه وليه الذي يدل عليه وزهاءه في سماه وارضه، ونا أمرت الأشجار وانبعث الثمار، وجرت الأنهار، ونا ينزل غيث السماء ونبت عشب الأرض وعبادتنا عبد الله وولوانا ما عبد الله.

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/143-144.
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/143; al-Burhān 3/240.
Allah created us and perfected our creation and then made us His eye among his servants, His tongue amidst his creation, His hand that has been spread with compassion and mercy, His countenance wherefrom he is approached, His door which leads to him and His treasurers in the heavens and the earth. Through us do trees bear fruit, fruits ripen, rivers flow, rains pour and the earth gives of its proceeds. And it is due to our worship that Allah is worshipped. If it were not for us Allah would not have been worshipped.¹

Likewise, they allege that Amīr al-Mu‘minin ‘Alī said:

و زعموا أن أمیر المؤمنین علیا قال: (أنا عین الله و أنا ید الله و أنا جنب الله و أنا باب الله
I am the hand of Allah, I am the side of Allah, and I am the door of Allah.²

He also said (as they allege):

و قال کما یفترون- أنا علم الله و أنا قلب الله الواعی، و لسان الله الناطق، و عین الله الناظره، و أنا جنب الله و أنا ید الله
I am the knowledge of Allah, I am the retaining heart of Allah, the speaking tongue of Allah, the observing eye of Allah, the side of Allah, and the hand of Allah.³

In al-Tawḥīd of Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī Abū ‘Abd Allāh is narrated to have said:

إن لله عز و جل خلقا من رحمته، خلقه من نوره...فهم عین الله الناظره و اذنه السامعة و لسانه الناطق في خلقه بإذنه...بهم يمحو السیئات، و بهم يدفع الضیم، و بهم ينزل الرحمة، و بهم يحيي ميتا، و بهم يمیت حیا، و بهم يبتلي خلقه، و بهم يقضي في خلقه قضیته
Verily for Allah there is a creation from His divine mercy; He has created them from His light... they are His observing eye, His hearing ear, and His

² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/145; Biḥār al-Anwār 24/194.
³ al-Tawḥīd p.164; Biḥār al-Anwār 24/198.
speaking tongue amidst His creation... Through them does He omit evil, suppresses oppression, sends down mercy, revives the dead, gives death to those who are alive, tests His creation, and decrees His intention regarding them.

Al-Majlisī has quoted thirty six traditions which purport that the Imāms are the countenance of Allah and his hand. The following is reported from ‘Alī in Rijāl al-Kashshī:

أنا وجه الله أنا جنب الله أنا الول و أنا الآخر و أنا الظاهر و أنا الباطن

I am the countenance of Allah, the side of Allah, the First, the Last, the Apparent, the Hidden.

Similarly, there are many a narrations in several of their sources which explain the following verses:

وَيَبْقَى وَجْهُ رَبِّكَ ذُو الْجَلاَلِ وَالإِِکْرَامِ

Only the countenance of your Rabb the majestic and benevolent will remain.

كُلُّ شَيْءٍ هَالِكٌ إِلَّ وَجْهُهُ

Everything but his countenance will perish.

With narrations which they narrate from Imām Ja’far such as:

1 al-Tawḥīd p.167.
2 Bihār al-Anwār 24/191-203.
3 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 211; Bihār al-Anwār 94/180; Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt p. 151.
4 Sūrah al-Raḥmān: 27.
نحن وجه الله

We are the countenance of Allah.¹

نحن الوجه الذي يؤتي الله منه

We are the countenance of Allah wherefrom he is approached.²

نحن وجه الله الذي لا يهلك

We are the countenance of Allah which will perish.³

There are many other narrations of this nature.⁴

In Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshi there appears a narration which makes the bodies of the believers quiver; it describes the happenings of the Day of Judgment. The end of the narration states the following:

ثم يؤتي بنا فنجلس علي عرش ربنا

Then we will be summoned and we will be made to sit upon the 'Arsh of Allah.⁵

We seek the protection of Allah from such a slander and fabrication.

Furthermore, their texts which explain the names and attributes of Allah with the Imāms are found in abundance. Similarly, they have accorded the Imāms some of the exclusive attributes of Allah, such as having knowledge of the unseen. The author of al-Kāfī has established a chapter in this regard, Chapter:

1 This narration was cited previously.
2 This narration was cited previously.
4 al-Tawḥīd p. 149-153; Bihār al-Anwār 24/191; al-Burhān 30/240-242: there are thirteen narrations from various books of the Shīʿah in al-Burhān which convey this message.
Regarding the Imāms having knowledge of the past and the future, and that nothing is hidden from them.¹ In this chapter he has included a number of narrations. Likewise, he has established another chapter with the title, Chapter: The Imāms acquire knowledge when they intend to do so. Hereunder as well he has mentioned many a narrations. One of the narrations reads as follows:

Abū ʿAbd Allāh says, “Most certainly I know what is in the heavens and what is on the earth. I know what is in Jannah and what is in Jahannam. I know what transpired in the past and what is to ensue in the future.”

Sayf al-Tammār relates that he and a group of the Shīʿah, were with Abū ʿAbd Allāh in the Ḥijr (the area around the Kaʿbah where Ismāʿīl is buried).

Abū ʿAbd Allāh said, “Is there a spy watching us?”

We looked to the right and to the left and did not spot anyone so we informed him that there is no spy watching us. Thereupon he said, “By the Lord of the Kaʿbah and the Lord of this structure (three times)! If I were between Mūsā and Khiḍar I would inform them that I am more knowledgeable than them, and I would inform them of what is in their hands. Because they were granted the knowledge of previous events, not of future happenings ,nor of things to happen till the emergence of Qiyāmah. Whereas we have inherited that from the Rasūl of Allah.”²

---

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/260-262.
² Ibid 1/258.
Nevertheless, these words do not require any comments. They are the remnants of the esoteric sects which had some appearance in the history of Islam; who believed in the deification of ʿAlī and the Imāms. The Twelvers have included them all in the very edifice of their dogma.

They project all of this to the Ahl al-Bayt in order to use them as a springboard by the aid of which they can spread their erroneous ideas. Or else why would someone say, “I am the First, the Last, the Apparent, and the Hidden.” Is there any difference between him and Firʿawn who claimed, “I am your supreme lord?” And how can the leading Shīʿī scholars, the likes of al-Kashshī and al-Ṭūsī, narrate such blasphemous beliefs. And how can the Shīʿah consider al-Kulaynī to be a reliable narrator when he narrates such blatant heresies. Is there any excuse for any apologetic?

Nonetheless, Al-Majlisī, their supreme Shaykh, has resorted to metaphor in trying to explain some of their texts in this regard. He says,

إن تلك المجازات شائعة في كلام العرب فيقال لفلان وجه عند الناس، ولفلان يد علي فلان و أمثال ذلك والوجه يطلق علي الجهة، فالأئمة الجهة التي أمر الله بالتوجه إليها، ولا يتوجه إلي تعالى إلا بالتوجه إليهم، و كل شيء هالك باطل مضمل إل إلا دينهم و طريقتهم و طاعتهم، و هم عين الله أي شاهده علي عباده، فكما أن الرجل ينظر بعينه لطلع علي الأمور فكذالك خلقهم الله ليكونوا نانا من الله عليهم ناظرين في أمورهم، و إطلاق اليد علي النعمة و الرحمة و القدرة شائع فهم نعمة الله التامة، ورحمته المسبوطة، و مظاهر قدرته الكاملة، و الجانب الناحية وهم الجانب الذي أمر الخلق بالتوجه إليهم، و يحتمل أن يكون كتابة عن أن قريب الله تعالى لا يحصل إلا بالتوجه بهم، كما أن قريب الملك يكون بجنبه.

These metaphors are very frequently used in the Arabic language. It is said, “so-and-so has a Wajh (good social standing) with the people,” and “so-and-so has a favourable hand over so-and-so,” among other examples. Sometimes the word Wajh (lit. face) is translated as direction. Hence the Imāms are the direction which Allah has ordered us to face; a person cannot truly be devoted to Allah if he is not devoted to the Imāms. Everything is going to perish and be doomed to destruction besides their creed, their path, and obedience to them. And they are the eye of Allah,
i.e. the witnesses of Allah upon his servants; hence, just as a person sees with his eyes in order to grasp things, likewise, Allah created them so that they be his witnesses over the creation and see into their affairs. The use of the word Yad (lit. hand) in the meaning of bounty, mercy, and ability is widespread, hence, they are the complete bounty of Allah, his enveloping mercy, and the manifestation of his complete power. As for the word Janb (lit. side) it means angle or direction, and they are the direction that Allah has ordered the creation to face. It is also possible that it implies that proximity to Allah can only be attained through proximity to them (just as the close associate of a king is always by his side).¹

This apologetic approach is an indication that their scholars are satisfied with this outright disbelief. Or else why would someone search for a way out from such blatant heterodoxy? Why did al-Majlisī not discard it completely and why did he not cleanse the garb of Shīʿism from the defilement of the leading heretics and the lords of disbelief? Al-Majlisī’s interpretation can only be valid if the interpretation of Fir’awn’s claim, “I am your supreme lord,” is proven to be valid as well. Otherwise, this is merely a camouflage of falsehood and an egotistic defence of the heretics’ verdicts and stances.

A metaphorical meaning, if it is assumed that it was intended², cannot be applied at this juncture. For in order to apply a metaphorical meaning there has to be a link between the actual literal meaning and the metaphorical one, coupled with the presence of a clear indicator which makes the actual meaning inapplicable.³ The literal meaning is primary; the metaphorical meaning will not be applied unless the literal meaning is practically inapplicable.⁴

Therefore, we find that many sub-sects of the Twelvers have taken these statements in their literal sense, the result of which is that they deified the

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 24/202
Imāms due to the purport of these heresies which the scholars of the Twelvers have transmitted to them. These statements actually deserved to be discarded and belied, for there is no reason to resort to metaphor. Can there possibly be any indicator which allows the attribution of the attributes of Allah to the Imāms? Where is the indicator in their statement that the names of Allah, viz. *al-Awwal* (the first), *al-Ākhir* (the last), *al-Ẓāhir* (the Apparent) and *al-Bāṭin* (the Hidden), are traits of the Imāms? With regards to the verse, “Allah has beautiful names so call unto him by way of them,” where is the indicator which averts this verse from its literal meaning—i.e. the names of Allah? There is no such indicator unless it is their claim that the Imāms share a portion of the divinity of Allah. Hence al-Kulaynī has documented the following narration:

إن الله خلطنا بفسه

Allah has mingled us with himself.¹

If this is the indicator, then it establishes their exaggeration and does not deny it. And it accords the Imāms a portion of the attributes of Allah. You will notice that the commentary of al-Majlisī suggests exaggeration with regards to the Imāms and is almost an echo of those extreme narrations.

So is it possible to draw a comparison between the proverb of the Arabs: So-and-so has a face (status) among people and the alleged statement of the Imām, “I am the face of Allah,” and would it be fine to assert that the link between the two is that ‘Alī and the Imāms are the direction which Allah has instructed us to face? Do they have any evidence in this regard which they can furnish for us?

People do not turn but to Allah in their devotions and supplications, and do not face but the House of Allah in their prayers. There are no intermediaries between Allah and His creation except in the aspect of conveying His revelation to them, and those intermediaries were none other

¹ *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/146.
than the Prophets of guidance; every person besides the Rasūl of Allah is such that some of his views are worth approval and some not. So how is it then possible to claim that the Imāms are the direction to which the people are obligated to face?

As to the claim, “The Imāms know what happened and what is to happen and that nothing is concealed from them,” this is an attribute of Allah which is exclusive to him. Allah says:

قُلِّ لَا يَعْلَمُ مَنْ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالأَرْضِ الْغَیْبَ إِلَّا اللّٰهُ

Say, “No one besides Allah has knowledge of the unseen in the heavens and the earth.”

وَعِندَهُ مَفَاتِحُ الْغَیْبِ لَیَعْلَمُهَا إِلَّ هُوَ

And by him are the keys of the unseen, no one besides him possess knowledge thereof.

إِنَّ اللَّٰهَ لَیَخْفَى عَلَیْهِ شَيْءٌ فِي الأَرْضِ وَلَ فِي السَّمَاءِ

Verily Allah, nothing in the earth and heaven is concealed from him.

And Allah ordered the best of his creation and the Prophet of guidance to say:

وَلَوْ كُنْتُ أَعْلَمُ الْغَیْبَ لَسْتَكْثَرْتُ مِنَ الْخَیْرِ وَمَا مَسَّنِيَ السُّوْءُ

And if I possessed knowledge of the unseen I would have sought good in abundance and no evil would have come my way.

---

1 Sūrah al-Naml: 65.
2 Sūrah al-Anʿām: 59.
3 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 5.
4 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 188.
Say, “I do not say to you that I have the treasures of Allah and I do not have knowledge of the unseen.”

So Allah ordered him to handover all his affairs to Him and that he inform the people that he does not possess knowledge of the unseen nor does he have any information regarding it with the exception of that which Allah reveals to him as Allah states:

He is the knower of the unseen. Hence he does not inform anyone of it besides those whom he selects, i.e. a Messenger.

The scholars have stated that whoever lays claim to any aspect of the knowledge of the unseen is out of the fold. For Allah has attributed the knowledge of the unseen to Himself specifically in many verses of the Noble Qur’ān; He does not, thus, inform anyone about it beside his chosen Messengers. And this is the true knowledge of the unseen which has been barred from the creation.

---

1 Sūrah al-An‘ām: 50.
2 Sūrah al-Jinn: 26, 27. The text is from the Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/293.
3 Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī 7/2-3.
4 The scholars have categorised the knowledge of the unseen into two: Completely unseen: which is the knowledge which only Allah possesses. This is what is meant by ‘completely unseen’ and it is regarding this type of knowledge that Allah says, “Say: no one in the heavens and the earth has knowledge of the unseen besides Allah.” And relatively unseen: which is the knowledge that some might have while others do not. E.g. the angels have knowledge of their realm which humans do not or for example that some humans have with regards to usage of some means which other humans do not have. So this is not included in the purport of the ‘unseen’ which is mentioned in the Qur’ān (which is the exclusive domain of Allah) because it is only ‘unseen’ considering the individuals who don’t possess it but it is attainable knowledge for those who possess it. All people are such that they are unaware of things which others are aware of so this will relatively unseen and not completely unseen. (Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 16/110; Tafsīr al-Manār 7/422.)
Amidst all these heterodox and foolish claims with regards to the Imāms, I came across some narrations in the books of the Shīʿah which strip the Imāms of these attributes which are only appropriate for Allah. Abū ʿAbd Allāh says (as the author of al-Kāfī narrates):

Eerie indeed are those who claim that we have knowledge of the unseen. Only Allah has knowledge of the unseen. I intended to hit my slave girl so-and-so, thus she ran away and I do not know in which of the rooms of the house she is hiding.¹

If Abū ʿAbd Allāh really had knowledge of the future and nothing was concealed from him, and if he really could attain knowledge whenever he desired, as al-Kulainī proves by establishing chapters in this regard after citing this narration, then the place of the slave girl would not have been concealed on him.

The Imāms would always complain regarding the false claims of such people, whose statements are compiled by the author of al-Kāfī and which he has attributed to the Imāms. Therefore, it appears in a narration cited by the author of Al-Biḥār and the author of al-Iḥtijāj that some of the Imāms said:

Exalted is Allah from what they ascribe to him. We are not His partners in His knowledge and power. Instead no one knows the unseen besides Him as He has mentioned in his divine revelation, “Say: No one in the heavens and

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/257.
the earth know the unseen besides Allah.” The ignorant and the foolish
of the Shī‘ah have harmed us. The one who subscribes to the creed of the
wing of a mosquito is weightier than this. I make Allah my witness, the
one besides Who there is no deity, and Allah is sufficient a witness... I am
free before Allah and His Rasūl from any person who says, “We know the
unseen or that we are partners with Him in his kingdom or that He will
station us in a position other than the position He selected for us.”

Hence, we see that the narrations of the Shī‘ah expose what is contained within
them by themselves and they contradict each other as well.

And the claim of the Imāms that they are the source of sustenance and rain, etc.,
as well as many such claims which are narrated by the scholars of the Twelvers
are the remnants of the extremists among them whose ideologies were rejected
by the Imāms. It has appeared in their narrations that when Abū ‘Abd Allāh was
told:

إن المفضل بن عمرو يقول: إنكم تقدرون أرزاق العباد

Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Amr says, “You destine the sustenance of the bondsmen.”

He said:

والله ما یقدر أرزاقنا إل الله. ولقد احتجت إلي الطعام لعیالي فضاق صدري وأبلغت إلي الفكرة في ذلك
حتی أحرزت قوتهم فعندها طابت نفسي. لعنه الله وبرئ منه.

By the oath of Allah! No one but Allah decrees our sustenance. I needed
food for my family due to which I was uneasy. My concern induced a
solution for me after which eventually I managed to amass provisions for
them. Then only did I feel relieved. May Allah curse him and be free from
him.”

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 25/301; Rījāl al-Kashshī p. 323. See a similar narration in Biḥār al-Anwār 25/32; Rījāl
These narrations are, however, like a white hair upon a black ox. In Taqiyyah there is a loophole for every narration which induces unrest upon the scholars of the Shīʿah. If you want an example, then listen to what the commentator of al-Kāfī has to say regarding the narration I cited above shortly (wherein Abū ʿAbd Allāh expresses his astonishment at people who ascribe the knowledge of the unseen to him. After which he, in refuting that, mentions that his slave girl hid away in the house and he did not know where she was, implying that how can the knowledge of past and the future, then, be attributed to him). The commentator of al-Kāfī says:

The reason for this astonishment and its expression is to prevent the laymen from deifying him. Or, in order to save himself, he said that to eliminate the suspicion of a person who was present who did not concede his virtue. Otherwise, he possessed the knowledge of the past and of the future so how would the hiding spot of the slave girl be obscure to him. If you say, “For him to give information of this sort necessitates him lying.” My reply is: It would only necessitate a lie if he did not intend dissimulation whereas he intended it; because he meant to say: I did not know, via a medium of knowledge other than Allah, in which of the rooms of the house she was.¹

How weird indeed is this obscure interpretation in order to refute this narration and prove that the Imām had knowledge of the past and the future. So much so that he went on to ascribe a lie to the Imām and in doing so, destroyed one of their principal beliefs which is the infallibility of the Imāms.

If the Imāms intent by this statement as alleged was to prevent the laymen from deifying him then is it your endeavour—through your affirmation—to invite

towards his deification? And where is the evidence that there was a person present whom the Imām feared whereas the chain of transmission consists of Shī'ah alone? And on the basis of which law of language can this be considered dissimulation?

As for al-Sha'rānī, another scholar of theirs who added additional notes to the commentary, he was not impressed with this wild interpretation of the narration. Therefore, he concluded that the narration is a fabrication.¹

And like this, the heretics propagate these false beliefs in the name of the Ahl al-Bayt. Then when they (the Ahl al-Bayt) debunk their fabrications and expose their falsity before the masses, the scholars of the Shī'ah interpret their denial as Taqiyyah. Taqiyyah has thus become a ploy which the extremists deploy in order to keep Shī'ism in the confines of extremism, denial of the truth, and disrespect to the Ahl al-Bayt.

Zurārah ibn A'yan had claimed that Ja'far ibn Muḥammad had knowledge of the people of Jannah and the people of Jahannam. Ja'far refuted this claim when it reached him and considered its proponent to be out of the fold. However when Zurārah was told of this he said to the person, “لقد عمل معك بالتقية

He has practiced Taqiyyah with you.²

---

¹ Taʿālīq ʿIlmiyyahi 6/31.
² Mīzān al-lʿīdāl: biography of Zurārah 2/69-70.
Discussion Four

Interpolation in Order to Support Their Stance of Denial

This is adopted by none besides them and is an isolated view exclusive to them. For they, in order to obfuscate the verses containing the names and attributes of Allah in the Qur'an, have made a grave claim (which we have dealt with in detail in the previous chapters). We are going to very briefly suffice on what is linked directly with the subject of the names of Allah and his attributes. This claim is the claim of *Tahrīf* (interpolation) in some of the verse. For example, Ibn Bābuwayh reports the following from ‘Alī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā regarding the verse:

![Verse](image)

They are not waiting but for Allah and the angels to come to them in the shadows of clouds and for matters to be decided. And to him do all affairs return.¹

![Verse](image)

The verse actually is: ‘They are not anticipating but that Allah sends to them angels in shadows of clouds.’ And this is how it was revealed.²

The intent of the Shī'ah is quite clear from this interpolation; they intend to negate from Allah his ‘coming’ just like the Mu'tazilah. In *al-Iḥtijāj* of al-Ṭabarsī Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī is reported to have addressed one of the heretics with the following in order to convince him about Islam:

![Verse](image)

And as for the verse, “Everything will perish but His countenance.” It was revealed as: everything besides his dīn will perish; for it is impossible that everything of His besides his countenance will perish. He is far more exalted and great than that.\(^1\)

It is evident that the fabricator of this narration is ignorant, unacquainted with any aspect of the Arabic language, and an inveterate heretic out to accuse the Book of Allah, to deny the attributes of Allah سَمِيَّةَ وَرَحِمَةَ، and then attribute that to Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ʿAlī ﷺ. The extent of his stratagem lies in the fact that he claims that ʿAlī ﷺ responded in this manner in order to satisfy one of the heretics.

This approach suggests that this particular sect, which has forged these narrations, does not honour any sanctity in trying to defend its principals and knows no bounds in this regard.

All the sects that had denied the attributes of Allah سَمِيَّةَ وَرَحِمَةَ, among whom were the Muʿtazilah, never endeavoured to adulterate even a word of the book of Allah; they resorted to metaphorical interpretations. This sect, however, has exceeded all limits and violated all the key principles of Islam, thus taking them out of the fold of Islam. This clearly shows that some of the sects that deny the attributes of Allah are out there to conspire against this Ummah by attacking the very basis of its dīn, i.e. the book of Allah سَمِيَّةَ وَرَحِمَةَ. Their ploy has, nonetheless, been exposed and they are now humiliated. Allah سَمِيَّةَ وَرَحِمَةَ is well aware of what they do.

\(^1\) al-Iḥtījāj p. 253.
Chapter Four

Their Belief Regarding Īmān and its Fundamentals

In this chapter I will present two discussions:

• Their view with regards to īmān, the promises, and warnings of Allah ʿālāʾī, and their view regarding the fundamentals of Īmān.

In the first discussion, five aspects will be discussed:

1. The definition of Īmān according to the Shīʿah.
2. A third Shahādah (testimony of faith) with the Shahādatayn (testimonies of faith).
3. Their belief in Irjāʾ (violation of the commands of Allah is of no consequence if a person has Īmān).
4. Their view regarding the promises of Allah.
5. Their view regarding the warnings of Allah.

And in the second discussion I will shed light upon their belief in the fundamentals of Īmān.

Discussion One

Their view regarding īmān, the promises, and warnings of Allah

1. Their definition of īmān:

The Ithnā ʿAshariyyah have included believing in the Twelve Imāms in the definition of īmān.1 In fact, they have considered it to be Īmān itself. In Uṣūl al-Kāfī the following narration appears:

1 Al-Ash'arī has classed this to be the doctrine of majority of the Shīʿah. (Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/125)
Islam is what we see prevalent in the lives of the people, viz. testifying that there is no deity but Allah, who has no partners, and that Muḥammad is his servant and Messenger... (Thereafter he makes mention of the remaining fundamentals thereof and then states,) Īmān is recognising this aspect [that the Imāms are divinely appointed] with that; if a person accepts them without acknowledging this aspect he will be a Muslim but he will be deviated.¹

They also aver that reward in the hereafter is not purely upon Islam, rather upon īmān. The author of al-Kāfī has established a chapter with the title, Amnesty of life is due to Islam and reward will be in lieu of īmān. Concerning the following verse:

Say, “We have brought faith in Allah, in that which is revealed to us, in that which was revealed to Ibrāhīm, Ismāʿīl, Ishāq, Yaʿqūb and the descendants, in that which was given to Mūsā and ʿĪsā, and that which the rest of the prophets were given from their Lord. We do not differentiate between any of them and we are Muslims [in submission] to Him. If they bring faith just as you brought faith they are rightly guided and if they turn away, they are only in dissension.²

They render the interpretation:

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/24.
2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 136, 137.
Abū Jaʿfar al-Bāqir says, “ʿAlī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and Fāṭimah are meant in this verse. After them the same applies to the Imāms.”

He then said, “Then Allah addresses the people and says, “If they (the people) bring faith just as you have, i.e. ʿAlī, Fāṭimah, Hasan, Ḥusayn, and the Imāms that followed, they will be rightly guided and if they turn away, they are only in dissension.”

Therefore Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī states the following:

إن مسألة الإمامة (إمامة الأئمة عشر) هي أحد أركان الإيمان المستحق بسبب الخلوص في الجنة والتخلص من غضب الرحمن

The issue of Imāmah (the leadership of the Twelve Imāms) is one of the fundamentals of īmān due to which a person will become worthy of everlasting bliss in Jannah and will be freed from the punishment of the Merciful.

Muḥammad Jawwād al-ʿĀmilī states the following:

الإيمان عندنا إنما يتحقق بالإعتراف بإمامة الأئمة الأثني عشر عليهم السلام، إلا من مات في عهد أحدهم فلا يشترط في إيمانه إلا معرفة إمام زمانه و من قبله

Īmān according to us is established when the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms is acknowledged, with the exception of a person who lived in the era of one of the Imāms; it will suffice for him to acknowledge the Imām of his time and the Imām before him.

Amīr Muḥammad al-Qazwīnī (one of their contemporary scholars) says:

إن من يكفر بولاية علي وإمامته رضي الله عنه فقد استطاع إيمان من حسابه و أحبب بذلك عمله

1 Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/62; Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/92; al-Burhān 1/157.
3 Miftāḥ al-Karāmah 2/80.
Whoever denies the Wilāyah and the Imāmah of ‘Alī has discarded his faith and thereby destroyed his actions.¹

2. The third testimony of faith

Naturally, due to the nature of their faith which is unknown but to them, they have contrived a third testimony of faith which is the hallmark of this new definition of Īmān. It is:

أشهد أن علیا ولي الله

I testify that ‘Alī is the Walī of Allah.

They repeat this testimony in their adhān, after their ṣalāh, and they instruct their fatally ill to pronounce it. So acceptance of the Imāms together with the Shahādatayn is pronounced after every ṣalāh. Al-Hurr al-‘Āmilī has established an entire chapter to prove this.²

It appears in their narrations that Zurārah reported the following from Abū Jaʿfar al-Bāqir:

لو أدركت عكرمة عند الموت لنفعته، فقيل لأبي عبد الله علیه السلام: بماذا کان ینفعه؟ قال: یلقن ما أنتم عليه

“If I was to meet ‘Ikrimah’ before his death I would have benefitted him.”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh was asked as to how his father would benefit him.

He said, “By urging him to read what you believe.”⁴

1 Al-Shī‘ah fi Ḥaqā’idihim wa Aḥkāmihim p. 24.
2 Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 4/1038, Chapter regarding the desirability of acknowledging the Imāms together with the Shahādatayn.
3 This refers to ‘Ikrimah the freed slave of Ibn ʿAbbās, a great scholar, narrator, and exegete (Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’ 5/12). This is the value these people have for him (Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 216; therein it is mentioned that this suggests denigration).
4 Furūʿ al-Kāfī 1/34; Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh 1/41; Tahdhib al-Aḥkām 1/82; Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 216; Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 2/665.
Abū Baṣīr narrates the following from Abū Jaʿfar:

لقنوا موتاكم عند الموت شهادة أن لا إله إلا الله و الولیة

Instruct your fatally ill to attest the Shahādatayn and Wilāyah at the time of death.¹

The deceased is instructed with the same when he is being entered into the grave,² likewise when the people are leaving. Al-Majlisī has established a chapter with the title, Chapter: Regarding the desirability of the relative instructing the deceased with the Shahādatayn and the acknowledgement of the Imāms together with their names after the leaving of the people,³ he has cited a few narrations therein.

This new testimony is a testimony regarding the doctrine of Imāmah regarding which Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī asserts the following:

أهمية المطالب في أحكام الدين و أشرف مسائل المسلمين

The most important aspect of dīn and the noblest of the belief of the Muslims.⁴

In conclusion, considering the doctrine of the Twelve Imāms to be a fundamental component of Īmān, or Īmān itself, and the most important aspect of dīn; this is one of the unequivocal evidences and clear signs of the falsity of their dogma. And of the fact that they have inserted into the dīn of Allah that which He has not sanctioned as there is no evidence in this regard, neither in the Qur’ān or in the Sunnah.⁵ Therefore, Ibn Taymiyyah opined that the belief of Imāmah

---

¹ Furūʿ al-Kāfī 1/34; Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām 1/82;Wasā’il al-Shi‘ah 2/665.
² Furūʿ al-Kāfī 1/53; Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām 1/91; Wasā’il al-Shi‘ah 2/843.
³ Wasā’il al-Shi‘ah 2/862.
⁵ Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/20. More details will come in the chapter of Imāmah.
(just Imāmah, without taking into account their belief in the Imāmah of the Twelve Infallibles which is their exclusive position) amounts to disbelief and apostasy. Because it is categorically established that īmān in Allah َلاَّ إِلَّاَ خَالِدُ َبِرَحْمَةِ َعَزِيزُ الْعَلَمِ and His Messenger ﷺ are the pivotal parts of our dīn.¹

Furthermore if this is really the status of Imāmah according to them then the Shīʿah are the furthest away from adherence to it. For according to them any flag that is raised before the emergence of the non-existent Mahdī whom they call the ‘awaited’ is a flag of ignorance.² They also dub all the Khulafā’ besides ‘Alī and Ḥasan ¹ العسكري as disbelievers.

It should also be remembered that merely knowing the Imāms is not sufficient to obtain the rank of honour, because a person will not attain honour if he merely knows the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ and does not follow his instructions and obey his commands.³

3. The view of Irjā’

According to the Shīʿah, īmān is in essence acknowledging the Twelve Imāms. They take it the an extent further by confirming that merely knowing the Imāms is sufficient for the validity of one’s faith and for admission into Jannah; thereby adopting the stance of the Murji’ah.⁴ Therefore, the author of al-Kāfī has established a chapter titled, With Īmān no evil is harmful and with disbelief no good is of benefit. Therein he presents six narrations; one among them is the following:

1 Mīnhāj al-Sunnah 1/20.
2 Al-Nu’mānī: al-Ghaybah p. 7: chapter regarding a person who raises the flag before the appearance of the Mahdī being a devil.
3 Mīnhāj al-Sunnah 1/31.
4 Those who make a clear distinction between īmān and actions; who aver that īmān is purely the recognition of Allah َلاَّ إِلَّاَ خَالِدُ َبِرَحْمَةِ َعَزِيزُ الْعَلَمِ. Amongst them some say, “No one from the people of the Qiblah will enter hell-fire despite the countless sins that he has committed (Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/213; al-Mīlal wa al-Nīhal 1/139; Al-Farq bayn al-Fīraq p. 202-207; al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd p. 43; al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn p. 59; al-Bad’ wa al-Tārikh 5/144; I’tiqādāt Fīraaq al-Muslimīn wa al-Mushrikīn p. 107; al-Khuṭṭat 2/350-439.)
With īmān no action is harmful and with disbelief no action is beneficial.¹

And īmān according to them is love and veneration of the Imāms.

When Ibn Taymiyyah said, “Most of the Shīʿah believe that the love of ʿAlī is such a virtue that thereafter no evil is harmful.”² One of their scholars in contemporary times denied that saying the following:

ما نسبه إلي كثير من الشيعة من القول بأن حب علي حسنة لیس یضر معه سیئة فإنه بهتان منه فإنه فیهم جميعا
متفقون علي ذلك فتخصیصه الكثير منهم بهذه العقیدة ليس له وجه سوي الکذب.

What he has attributed to many of the Shīʿah regarding the love of ʿAlī being a virtue after which no evil is harmful is a slander. Because this is not just the belief of some rather it is the unanimous belief of all of them. So for him to only identify a few of them with this belief has no other possible interpretation besides that of a lie.³

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

وإذا كانت السیئات لا تضر مع حب علي فلا حاجة إلي الإمام المعصوم الذي هو لطف في التکلیف فإنه إذا
لم يوجد إنما توجد سیئات و معاص فإذا كان حب علي كافیا فیا فسواء وجد الإمام أو لم يوجد.

If evil sins are of no harm with the presence of the love of ʿAlī then there exists no need for an infallible Imām who is a bounty in terms of a divine code of conduct. Because, if the Imām is non-existent there will obviously only be evil and vice, so if the love of ʿAlī is sufficient then the existence/non-existence of the Imām does not make much of a difference.⁴

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/463.
² Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/31.
⁴ Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/31.
Hence, the issue of the leadership of an infallible which is based upon him being a bounty for the creation falls apart because of the issue of mere love for him. As a general rule, every view of theirs contradicts and violates another. And this is the nature of any creed which does not originate from Allah.

The only way in which the Shī`ah are different from the Murji`ah is that the latter asserts that īmān is the recognition of Allah whereas the former says that it is the recognition of the Imāms.

Their narrations can be found in abundance in this regard. One of their narrations assert:

وهل الدین إل الحب

And is religion anything else but love?¹

Al-Majlisī has established a chapter named, Chapter: Regarding the reward of loving them and supporting them, and that they are a protection from hell.² Another chapter is named as follows, Alliance with ‘Alī is a means of protection from the punishment of the All Powerful, and that if the people would all have united to love him, Allah would not have created the Fire.³ Likewise one of their narrations state:

لا يدخل الجنة أحد إلا من أحبه من الأولين والأخرين ولا يدخل النار أحد إلا من أبغضه من الأولين والأخرين

No person will enter Jannah besides the one who loves him from the first to come till the last to come. And no person will enter Jahannam besides the one who hates him from the first to come till the last to come.⁴

1 Tafsīr al-ʻAyyāshī: 1/167; Biḥār al-Anwār 27/95.
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 21/73-144.
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 39/32.
4 'Ilal al-Sharā‘ī p. 162.
Based on this narration, the very bases of īmān on Allah, His Rasūl Հ, the religious doctrines, and all the Sharīʿ obligations and duties is discarded. Nothing but the love of ʿAlī remains. This type of fabrications has led many people astray, who have a passion for liberty and fulfilling their carnal desires.¹

These narrations necessitate that the Qur’ān did not descend for the guidance of mankind but for their deviation, because no mention is made therein of loving ʿAlī or hating him whereas that is the principle on which a person will enter Jannah or Jahannam.

Al-Suwaidī says:

If mere love for Allah and His Rasūl Հ, without īmān and good actions, is not sufficient for salvation and emancipation from the punishment, then how can love for ʿAlī be sufficient? This is against the verse of the Qur’ān, Whoever does evil will be punished for it,² and the verse, Whoever does an iota of evil will see it.³ In fact it violates their principles and traditions as well. As for violating their principles, if a Shīʿ commits major sins and is not taken to task by Allah it amounts to Allah discarding an obligation according to them. And as for its violation of their tradition, it is reported through authentic chains of transmission that ʿAlī, al-Sajjād, and the Imāms would—in their authentically proven supplications to Allah—cry and seek his refuge from his punishment; hence, if they were so humbled and

¹ Naqḍ ʿAqāʾid al-Shīʿah p. 34 (manuscript).
² Sūrah al-Nisā': 123.
³ Sūrah al-Zalzalah: 8.
fearful of the punishment of Allah then how would it ever be permissible for anyone else to be deceived by their love and depend solely upon it for salvation without doing any action.¹

Likewise, look at their claim that no one will enter hell besides a person who hated him from the first to come to the last to come. You will realise that this clearly indicates that the likes of Fir‘awn, Hāmān, Qārūn, and all the Lords of disbelief will not enter hell because they did not hate ʿAlī, rather they did not know him. See to what extent has their extremism driven them. There is no doubt that in refuting this claim not much effort is required due to its falsity being clearly evident in Islam. If the reality was really as they state it to be, Messengers would not have been sent, Books would not have been revealed, and divine legislation not implemented.

Sadly, however, the remnants of these beliefs still have their mark in the Shīʿah world which has led them to undermining the Sharīʿah of Allah and has made them bold against His commandments.

4. Their view with regards to the promises of Allah

Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī states:

إعتقادنا في الوعد أن من وعد الله علي عمل ثوابا فهو منجزه

Our belief is that whatever promise Allah has made upon any action He is bound to fulfilling it.²

They have went to great lengths in defining the promises of Allah; they have thus fabricated narrations and reports which they have ascribed to Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq and others. These narrations establish rewards for deeds regarding which Allah has not revealed any evidence. Instead, evidence suggests the improbability, prohibition, or even consideration of such deeds to polytheistic or

---

¹ Naqḍ ʿAqāʾid al-Shīʿah p. 34, 35.
heretic in their nature, such as: cursing the Ṣaḥābah of the Rasūl, which they have deemed the best act of worship, slapping the cheeks, tearing the garments, inflicting pain upon one’s self, and wounding oneself with knives and swords in the name of the commemoration of the martyrdom of Husayn, which again, according to them, is the greatest of all devotions. Likewise, performing the pilgrimage to the tombs of the Imāms, circummambulating around them, supplicating to them, and seeking help from them is also considered a very meritorious act of devotion according to them. And in this way do they concoct acts of devotion sanctioning that regarding which Allah has not revealed any proof and attaching to them tremendous rewards.

In addition, some of their narrations go on to mention that their Imāms have the prerogative of entering their Shīʿah into Jannah. In fact, they actually testified for some of their partisans specifically that they will enter Jannah. So they can promise reward and they can make that reward materialise.

A narration of this nature appears in Rijāl al-Kashshī. It reads as follows:

آن أبا الحسن قد ضمن له الجن

Ziyād al-Qandī narrates from Ṭālī ibn Yaqtīn that the Imām Abū al-Ḥasan gave him glad-tidings of Jannah.

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 27/218.
3 Refer to the discussion regarding their belief regarding the oneness of Allah.
4 Biḥār al-Anwār, chapter regarding the deeds of the day and night of Ghadīr and the supplications to be made therein 98/298-323, chapter regarding the actions of the day of Nowruz and whatever is linked to it 98/419; Wasā’il al-Shīʿah, chapter regarding the desirability of fasting on the day of Nowruz, bathing therein, and wearing fine clothing and perfume 7/346, chapter regarding the desirability of fasting on the twenty ninth of Dhī al-Qa’dah and that it is an expiation for the sins of seventy years 7/333, likewise the chapters regarding the ṣalāh of Jaʿfar 5/194, 197, the ṣalāh of Fāṭimah 5/243, the ṣalāh of the day of Mubāhalah which is equal to a hundred thousand Ḥajjis as they allege 5/287.
5 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 430.
Another narration states:

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥajjāj says that he said to Abū al-Ḥasan that ‘Alī ibn Yaqṭīn sent me with a letter to him asking him to supplicate on his behalf.

He asked, “Regarding the affairs of the afterlife?”¹

To which I responded by saying yes.

He placed his hand on his chest and said thus, “I take responsibility that the fire will not touch ‘Alī ibn Yaqṭīn.”²

Look at how they make covenants on behalf of Allah as if they have the treasures of the Mercy of Allah and in their hands are the keys to everything; hence, they can guarantee without even leaving the matter pending upon the decision of Allah, they can distribute the certificates of forgiveness and mercy. Do they have a plan in place with Allah? Or did any Messenger bring down revelation to them? Or were they able to acquire the knowledge of the unseen? Or do they have an agreement with Allah?

Claims of this sort clearly pronounce that their fabricators are a group of heretics who do not believe in the Qur‘ān and the Sunnah, and whose only purpose is to destroy Islam. They found no better ploy to carry out this agenda of theirs besides that of partisanship of the Ahl al-Bayt. ‘Alī ibn Yaqṭīn for whom these heretics guaranteed Jannah probably is a member of their team, for Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī has mentioned that he was killed in 169 A.H upon his heretic beliefs.³

¹ Note that the Imām had to ask what the objective of the supplication was, whereas the narration suggests that he knew the abode of the seeker and took responsibility for him. This is a fabrication of dim-witted people. Or maybe it is just that Allah wanted to expose the disgrace of their creed by way of such widespread contradiction which is found in their narrations.

² Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 431 (he has cited quite a few narrations of the same nature on p. 431-433.

³ Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī 8/190.
Lastly, there are multiple narrations in the books of the Twelvers wherein the Imāms guarantee their followers admission into Jannah.¹

5. Their view regarding the warnings of Allah

Al-Mufîd says:

The Imāmiyyah are unanimous that the warning of remaining forever in the Fire of Jahannam is directed to the disbelievers specifically. The sinful among those who have obtained the recognition of Allah and acknowledged his commandments by carrying out their ṣalāh are not included. And they by their commission of major sins do not leave the fold of Islam even though they will be considered sinful because of their sins.²

This statement outwardly is in accordance with the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They have however, failed in the implementation of this rule due to their very broad definition of disbelief and things that render a person a disbeliever, such as the following:

The Twelvers are unanimous that people aligned to innovated creeds are disbelievers, and that it is the duty of the Imām to compel them to repent after engaging with them and establishing evidence. If they repent from

---

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/474, 475; Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 447-448, 484; Rijāl al-Ḥillī p. 98, 185. In all these references mention is made of the Imāms guaranteeing their partisans entry into Jannah; this is considered to be an authentication of that narrator by the Shīʿī scholarship and thus they cite the narrations of such individuals in their books.

their innovations and move to the right path, well and good, or else they will be killed owing to their disbelief. And if any of them die upon his innovative beliefs he will be from the people of Jahannam.¹

Likewise they have unanimously dubbed as a disbeliever any person who opposed ʿAlī. Likewise, all such people are disbelievers, they are astray and accursed due to their opposition of Amīr al-Muʿminīn. And hence they will be doomed forever in the fire of Jahannam.² This is the blanket ruling they pass regarding anyone who opposes them; therefore, Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī has said:

واعتقادنا في من خالفنا في شيء واحد كاعتقادنا في من خالفنا في جميع أمور الدين.

Our stance regarding a person who has opposed us in one aspect of the categorically established aspects of dīn is that he is equal to the one who has opposed us in all aspects of dīn.³

So they are in terms of this Waʿīdiyyah (extremists in sounding warnings). Hence, Ibn Taymiyyah has asserted that the later Shīʿah are Waʿīdiyyah in the names of Allah and his commandments.⁴

Al-Ashʿarī goes onto mention that a group of the Shīʿah have the following approach:

They only establish the warnings against those who oppose them saying that they will be punished, etc., but they do not establish them against those who are in harmony with them. Rather they aver that Allah will

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
4 Al-Fatāwā 6/55.
enter them into Jannah, and if he admits them into Jahannam he will take them out. They have narrated about the Imāms that they will intercede to Allah regarding the sins that the Shī‘ah have committed subsequent to which Allah will forgive them. And the sins the Shī‘ah committed against the Imāms will be forgiven. Regarding the sins they committed against the people the Imāms will intercede on their behalf to the implicated people who will consequently forgive them.¹

The exact same is conveyed by al-Majlisī in his book. A chapter therein reads as follows, Chapter: Regarding the forgiveness of the Shī‘ah; therein he has cited ninety seven narrations and after citing them, it seems as if he considered them to be meagre so he reminds the readers that many more narrations of the same category have passed in the chapters of Ma‘ād (afterlife), the pond of Nabī Ḥ, intercession, the state of the believers and criminals in the afterlife, and the chapters pertaining to the virtues of the Imāms.² The first narration that he cites in this chapter asserts the assessment of al-Ash‘arī. It reads as follows:

إذا كان يوم القيامة ولينا حساب شیعتنا، فمن كنت مظلمته فيما بينه وبين الله عز و جل حكمنا فيها فأجابنا، ومن كنت مظلمته فيما بينه وبين الناس استهوبناها فوهبت لنا، ومن كنت مظلمته فيما بينه وبيننا كنا أحق من عفا وصفح.

On the day of Judgment we will take charge of the accounting of our Shī‘ah. Hence, whoever is responsible of a crime between him and Allah we will decide regarding it and He will approve. And whoever is responsible of a crime between him and the people we will seek it as a gift from them which we will consequently be granted. And if someone is responsible of a crime between him and us then we are more rightful to forgive.³

In conclusion, they are Wa‘īdiyyah (extremist in sounding warnings) when it comes to those who oppose them and Murji‘ah when it comes to those who agree with them.

¹ Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/126.
² Bihār al-Anwār 68/99; ʿUyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā 2/68.
³ Ibid 68/99; ʿUyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā 2/68.
Discussion Two

Their belief regarding the fundamentals of īmān

The fundamentals of īmān comprise of the following: belief in Allah, His angels, His books, His Messengers, the Day of Judgement, and Taqdīr (pre-destiny) as is mentioned in the verse:

لَّیْسَ الْبِرَّ أَن تُوَلُّوا وُجُوْهَكُمْ قِبَلَ الْمَشْرِقِ وَالْمَغْرِبِ وَلٰكِنَّ الْبِرَّ مَنْ أٰمَنَ بِاللّٰهِ وَالْیَوْمِ الأٰخِرِ وَالمَلَائِکَةَ وَالْنَّبِیِّینَ

Piety is not that you turn your faces to the east and the west, rather piety is (the piety of the one) who believes in Allah, the Last day, the Angels, the Book, and the Messengers.¹

Likewise the verse:

إِنَا كُلَّ شَيْءٍ خَلَقْنَاهُ بِقَدَرٍ

Verily we have created everything with a specific measure.²

The discussion regarding how the Shīʿah have deviated in their beliefs regarding Allah E, His status as a Nourisher and Lord of the universe, as well as His names and attributes has been discussed previously.

We will now discuss their beliefs regarding the other fundamentals of īmān, since the doctrine of Imāmah has impacted them as well. So despite them believing in the fundamentals of īmān, i.e. having faith in Allah, His angels, His books, His Messengers, Taqdīr, and the Day of Judgement; the doctrine of Imāmah has left its clear mark on them. This will be highlighted in the pages to come.

¹ Sūrah al-Baqarah: 177
² Sūrah al-Qamar: 49.
İmān in the angels

This belief has received a good share of distortion in their creed. The angels have been created from light and they are the servants of the A’immah according to them; some amongst them appointed specifically to stand at the grave of Ḥusayn ְعَلَیْهِ ٱلسَّلَامَ.

Their narrations state:

خلق الله من نور وجه علي بن أبي طالب سبعین ألف ملك یستغفرون له ولمحبیه إلي یوم القيامة

Allah created seventy thousand angels from the radiance of the face of ʿAlī, who continuously seek forgiveness for him and for his admirers.¹

Sometimes they claim that Allah created the angels from the light of ʿAlī.²

Likewise, they allege that amongst the angels there are some who have not been assigned for anything other than crying at the grave of Ḥusayn ְعَلَیْهِ ٱلسَّلَامَ and repeatedly visiting him. They say:

و كل الله بقبير الحسین أربعة آلاف ملك شعث غير يبكونه إلي يوم القيامة

Allah has assigned four thousand dishevelled and dusty angels at the grave of Ḥusayn who will mourn his death till the Day of Judgment.³

And visiting the grave of Ḥusayn is the desire of the dwellers of the heavens. They assert:

و ليس شيء في السماوات إلا و هم يسألون الله ان يؤذن لهم في زيارة الحسین ففوج ينزل وفوج ي برع

There is nothing in the heavens but that it seeks the permission of Allah to visit the grave of Ḥusayn. Hence, scores go and scores come.⁴

1 Kanz Jāmiʿ al-Fawāʿid p. 334; Biḥār al-Anwār 23/320.
2 Al-Maʿlim al-Zulfā p. 249.
3 Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 10/318; Furūʿ al-Kāfī 1/325; Thawāb al-Aʾmāl p. 49; Kāmil al-Ziyārāt p. 189.
4 Al-Ṭūsī: Al-Tahdhīb 2/16; Thawāb al-Aʾmāl p.54; Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 10/322.
Similarly, they also say:

إن الملائكة لخدمتنا و خدام محبينا

The angels are our attendants and the attendants of those who love us.¹

In another lengthy narration it appears that Jibrīl supplicated to Allah to make him the servant of the Imāms. Hence, they say, “Jibrīl is our attendant.”²

Ibn Taymiyyah whilst refuting Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī for citing such names which the Shīʿah accord to the angels states:

فَتَسْمِيَةٌ جَبْرِیْل الرَّسُول اللَّه إِلَي مُحَمَّد صَلِّ اللَّه عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمْ خَادُّما عَبْرَةً مِنْ لَا يُعْرِفُ قُدرِ الْمَلَائِكَةَ وَقُدْرِ إِرْسَالِ اللَّه لِهِمْ إِلَى الأَنْبِيَاء

To name Jibrīl—the messenger of Allah sent to Muḥammad—an attendant is an indication of one not knowing the status of the angels and the privilege of Allah sending them to the Ambiyā’...?³

How can this lowly title be accorded to the one whom Allah has describes as:

ذِي قُوَّةٍ عِنْدَ ذِي الْعَرْشِ مَكِیْنٍ إِنَّهُ لَقَوْلُ رَسُوْلٍ کَرِیْمٍ

Verily it is the word of a noble messenger, who is mighty and holds a lofty rank by the Owner of the Throne.⁴

They have many more claims of this nature. As if the angels have no other obligation or duty but to serve the Twelve Imāms; or as if they are the angels of the Imāms and not the angels of Allah.

---

3 Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/158.
4 Sūrah al-Takwīr: 19-20
Abū ʿAbd Allāh (al-Ṣādiq) states:

The angels descend upon us in our travel canopies, they frequent our beds, and are present at our eating cloths. They come to us from every fresh and dry plant of the time, they spread their wings over us and our children, they prevent the animals from attacking us, and they come to us at the time of every ṣalāh to offer it with us. No day or night passes but that we have knowledge of the people of the earth and of the events to happen therein. Likewise, no king dies except that they come to us with the news of his death and with a briefing of his conduct whilst he was in the world.¹

They also allege that the pillows and the ornaments of their children are prepared from the wings of the angels. In fact the angels are in charge of babysitting their children. Abū ʿAbd Allāh says, “They are more compassionate to our children than we are to them.”²

Furthermore, according to the narrations of the Shiʿah the angels were also obligated to believe in the Wilāyah of ʿAlī. However, despite there being a punishment in place for those angels who refuse to believe in his Wilāyah (as they allege), none of them accepted besides the angels close to Allah to the extent that one of the angels was punished by breaking his wings due to his refusal to believe in the Wilāyah of Amīr al-Muʾminīn. He only recovered when he rubbed himself against the cradle of Ḥusayn.⁴

---

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/356; Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt p. 27.
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/340; Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt p. 20.
⁴ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/341; Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt p. 20.
Similarly, the angels only obtained honour after accepting the Wilāyah of ʿAlī 
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And the life of the angels depends upon the Imāms owing to the following reason:

لیس لهم طعام و لا شراب إلا الصلاة علي علي بن أبي طالب و محبیه، و الاستغفار لشیعته المذنبین

They have no food or drink besides sending salutations to ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib and his lovers, and seeking forgiveness for his sinful partisans.²

Another narration states the following:

وکانت الملائكة ل تعرف تسبیحا ول تقدیسا من قبل تسبیحنا (یعني تسبیح الأئمة) وتسبیح شیعتنا.

The angels did not know any type of Tasbīḥ or glorification before they learnt how to glorify us (the Imāms) and our partisans.³

In addition, the angels take special care of the Shīʿah specifically, hence when a Shīʿī has a private moment with another Shīʿī, the scribes of the deeds separate from them for that time addressing each other saying, “Come let us go away, for they are having a secret moment which Allah has kept concealed upon them.”⁴ Whereas Allah ﷺ says:

إِذْ یَتَلَقَّیَانِ عَنِ الْیَمِینِ وَعَنِ الشِّمَالِ قَعِیْدٌ

When the two receivers receive whilst sitting on the right and the left.⁵

---

1 Tafsīr al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī p. 153; al-Iḥtijāj p. 31; Biḥār al-Anwār 26/338.
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 26/349.
3 Ibn Bābawayh: Jāmiʿ al-Akhbār p. 9; Biḥār al-Anwār 26/344.
4 Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 8/563-564.
5 Sūrah Qāf: 17-18
Likewise:

أَمْ يَحْسَبُونَ أَنَّا لَنَسْمَعُ سِرَّهُمْ وَنَجْوَاهُمْ ۚ بَلْ وَرُسُلُنَا لَدَیْهِمْ يَكْتُبُوْنَ

Or do they think that we do not hear their secrets and their stealthy meetings? Most certainly we do. And our scribes are with them writing.¹

Nevertheless, they make various claims wherein they disregard the close angels of Allah and slander them by way of eerie exaggerations and weird assumptions which are tantamount to the denial of the angels all together. Because denying the duties assigned to them through which Allah honoured them, ascribing the obligation of believing in the Wilāyah to them, and attributing the act of ascribing partners to Allah by asserting that the duty of some of the angels is merely to encircle the tomb of Ḥusayn; all make it very easy for a person to deny the angels completely.

They have almost denied the angels due to them interpreting the names of the angels which appear in the Qur’ān with the Imāms or by averring that the duties of the angels are only to see to the Imāms. Hence, al-Majlisī has established a chapter named: Chapter regarding the Imāms being the following: al-Ṣāffūn (the ones who form rows), al-Musabbiḥūn (the glorifiers), the possessors of al-Maqām al-Maʿlūm (a fixed position), the bearers of the Throne of Allah, and the noble and good scribes.²

This is what they have to say regarding the angels, whereas Allah says:

بَلْ عِبَادٌ مُّكْرَمُوْنَ لَ یَسْبِقُوْنَهُ بِالْقَوْلِ وَهُم بِأَمْرِهِ یَعْمَلُوْنَ

Rather they are honourable servants. They do not speak before him and they duly carry out his orders.³

---

1 Sūrah al-Zukhruf: 80.
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 24/87.
3 Sūrah al-Ambiyā': 26-27
Likewise:

من كان عدو الله وملائكته ورسله وجبيريل وميكل فإن الله عدو الكافرين

Whoever is an enemy of Allah, His angels, His Messengers, Jibrīl, and Mikāl then Allah is the enemy of the disbelievers.¹

Ímān in the divine books

The Shīʿah have been majorly influenced in this regard due to their deviant beliefs regarding Imāmah and other aspects; hence they have brought faith upon books regarding which Allah ﷺ has made no mention; for they claim that Allah revealed books to the Imāms from the heavens just as he had previously revealed books upon the Ambiyā’-Qurʾān. Similarly, they also claim that the Imāms had possession of all the books that were revealed to the Ambiyā’ in the past; they would read these books and extract rulings therefrom.

Now read this for yourself from the authoritative books of the Shīʿah.

1. Their belief that divine books descended upon the Imāms²

The authoritative and classical books of the Shīʿah contain such extraordinary claims and such grave assumptions that do not have any existence in the real world, nor is there any trace of it whatsoever, and pertaining to which there exists no shred of evidence.

These claims entail that there exists holy books which came down from the heavens as revelation from Allah the Almighty to the Imāms. At times the Shīʿah cite narrations which they claim were extracted from these books based upon which they establish their beliefs and principles.

¹ Al-Baqarah: 98.
² There are other books as well which they claim were preserved by their Imāms. Mention was made of these books in the chapter regarding their beliefs about the Sunnah. These books also share some sort of holiness, however, they do not share in the aspect of being revealed from the heavens.
From all of this it seems as if the founding fathers of Tashayyuʿ, in order to substantiate their fundamental doctrines, did not suffice upon all the claims that have passed in the previous pages with regards to the Book of Allah etc. They feared that they would not be sufficient to fulfil the purpose, due to which their adherents would flee from them and their legacy would become redundant. As a result they will lose their wealth, status, and sanctity which they receive from the adherents in the name of Khums and the representation of the Hidden Imām. They, therefore, concocted all these claims so that they may succeed in fulfilling their goals and strike another blow against the Ummah and its pristine dīn.

These claims are not very much different from the claims of most false prophets who also claimed that divine books were revealed to them or that they received revelation.

It is very possible that the inception of this particular doctrine happened in the time of ʿAlī, as a narration of Imām al-Bukhhārī's Ṣaḥīḥ suggests: Abū Juḥayfah says:

قلت لعلي هل عندكم كتاب؟ قال لا إلا كتاب الله أو فهم أعطيه رجل مسلم أو ما في هذه الصحيفة. قال

قلت فما في هذه الصحيفة قال العقل والفكاك ألسير ول يقتل مسلم بكافر

I said to ʿAlī, “Do you have any special book?”

He said, “No, only the Book of Allah, the understanding a Muslim man is bestowed with or that which is in this script.”

I enquired, “What is in the script?”

He said, “Rules pertaining to the paying of blood money, the releasing of a prisoner, and that a Muslim will not be killed in lieu of a Non-Muslim.”

---

1 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 1/204.
Another version of the narration in the Ṣaḥīḥ goes as follows:

هل عندكم شيء من الوحي إلا ما في كتاب الله

Do you have any aspect of revelation besides that which is contained in the Book of Allah?¹ (This explains what is intended by the word ‘book’ in the previous narration).

Ibn Ḥajar states that the reason why Abū Juḥayfah posed this question to him was that a group of the Shīʿah were falsely claiming that the Ahl al-Bayt in general and ‘Alī in particular were exclusively given some aspects of dīn by the Rasūl of Allah which others were not given. Similarly, ‘Alī is reported to have been asked the same question by Qays ibn ‘Abbād and Ashtar al-Nakha‘ī; their narration appears in Sunan al-Nasā‘ī.²

Hence it is understood from here that the seed of this doctrine was planted at a very early period in history. As for who was responsible for it, the booklet al-Irjā’ of Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥanafiyyah indicates that the Saba‘iyyīn (followers of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’) were the ones who began propagating such heresies among the people. They would say to them:

هدينا لوحي ضل عنه الناس، و زعموا أن النبي الله كتم تسعة أعشار القرآن

We have been guided to a revelation which is not known to the people. They also claimed that Nabī concealed nine tenths of the Qur’ān.³

Likewise, in the book Aḥwāl al-Rijāl it appears that ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ would claim that the Qur’ān is only one part of nine parts and that the knowledge of those parts is with ‘Alī.⁴

---

¹ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 1/167.
² Fatḥ al-Bārī 1/204.
³ Risālah al-Irjā’ (which is incorporated in the Kitāb al-Īmān of Muḥammad ibn Yahyā al-‘Adnī) p. 249-250.
Nonetheless, the claims of the Saba’iyyah indicate towards some treasured knowledge that ʿAlī had. This suggests the origins of this doctrine. In time to come, it took different forms and shapes which all stem from the primary belief that the Ahl al-Bayt possessed knowledge which others did not; exactly what ʿAlī had denied and rejected. That which stems from falsehood is false. Therefore, just as the primary claim is erroneous, so is that which stems from it.

Hereunder, with all honesty I present before you some excerpts of what I found in their books in this regard.

**a. The Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah:**

The books of the Shi‘ah allege that a special Muṣḥaf (divine scroll) was revealed to Fāṭimah after the demise of the Rasūl. One of the narrations of al-Kāfī states the following:

> إن الله تعالى لما قبض نبیه صلى الله عليه و آله دخل علي فاطمة علیها السلام من فاته من الحزن ما لا يعلمه إلا الله عز وجل فأرسل الله إلیها ملكا یسلي غمها و یحدثها فشكت ذلك إلى أمیر المؤمنین رضي الله عنه فقال: إذا أحسست بذلك، و سمعت الصوت قولي لي فأعلمته بذلك فجعل أمیر المؤمنین رضي الله عنه يكتب كل ما سمع حتى أثبت من ذلك مصحفا.. أما إنه لیس فیه شيء من الحلال و الحرام ولكن فيه علم ما يكون

When Allah captured the soul of his Nabī, only Allah knows what grief gripped Fāṭimah. Hence, Allah sent an angel to her in order to pacify her and console her.

She complained of this to Amīr al-Mu‘minīn who said to her, “When you feel that (the presence of the angel) and you hear his voice let me know.”

She thus informed him subsequent to which ʿAlī started to document whatever he heard the angel saying which resulted in it evolving into a Muṣḥaf... Behold! There are no rulings of permissible and impermissible therein. However, in it is contained the knowledge of the future.¹

---

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/240; Biḥār al-Anwār 26/44; Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt p. 43.
So, this narration suggests that this Muṣḥaf was specifically for the consolation and condolence of Fāṭimah after the demise of her father. It also tells us that the subject matter thereof is the knowledge of the future. I am not quite sure how that would console her if the future of which she was being informed entailed the killing of her sons and grandsons, and of the miseries which befell the Ahl al-Bayt.

Similarly, how is it possible that Fāṭimah be accorded knowledge of the unseen when the Messenger of guidance were ordered by Allah to say the following?

وَلَوْ كُنتُ أَعْلَمُ الْغَيْبَ لَسْتَكْثَرْتُ مِنَ الْخَيْرِ

And if I knew the unseen, I could have acquired much wealth.

So is she more superior to the Rasūl of Allah ?

This narration also asserts that ʿAlī was the one who documented whatever the angel had dictated. But at the same time some of their other narrations suggests that he was engrossed in compiling the Qur’ān. Naturally, lies are meant to contradict and oppose one another.

They also claim that this Muṣḥaf was triple the size of the Qur’ān. The following narration appears in al-Kāfī:

Abū Baṣīr says that he went to visit Abū ʿAbd Allāh (thereafter he narrates a lengthy narration which talks of the exclusive knowledge Allah had given

---

1 Refer to pg. 310 of this book.
the Imāms wherein Abū 'Abd Allāh says the following) “And we possess the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah.” The narrator says that he asked, “What is the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah?” He replied, “A Muṣḥaf wherein there is thrice the amount of what is in your Qur’ān but it does not have a letter that appears in your Qur’ān.”

This narration which their Thiqat al-Islām narrates and which is authenticated by their scholars posits that their Muṣḥaf is more voluminous then the Qur’ān in its size and it differs in its subject matter from it. Does this mean that the Qur’ān is inferior to the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah and that her Muṣḥaf is more comprehensive than the Book of Allah regarding which Allah has said?

تِبْیَانًا لِّكُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَهُدًى وَّرَحْمَةً وَّبُشْرٰی لِلْمُسْلِمِیْنَ

A clarification for all things and as guidance and mercy and good tidings for the Muslims.

And which Allah has ordained to be the constitution and way of life to be followed for the Ummah till the Day of Judgement? Is the Ummah in need of another book besides the Book of Allah in order to complete dīn? And will dīn be considered incomplete if it is deprived of the Muṣḥaf whereas the entire Ummah unanimously agrees today of the non-existence of such a Muṣḥaf? Furthermore, how can a book of consolation and condolence surpass the Qur’ān in its comprehensiveness? Is this not the limit of absurdity and boldness to invent lies?

Nonetheless, their narrations differ very much in the description of the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah, as is the nature of all lies. The above mentioned narration

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/239.
2 The title they award to Abū Ja‘far al-Kulaynī which literally means an authentic transmitter of the Muslim world.
4 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 89.
suggests that it was the dictation of one of the angels and that it was revealed to her after the demise of the Rasūl of Allah. But another narration states the following:

وخلفت فاطمة علیها السلام ما هو القرآن، ولكنه کلام من کلام الله أنزله علیها إملاء رسول الله و خط علي

And Fāṭimah left behind that which is not Qur’ān, but it is the Word of Allah which He revealed to her with the dictation of the Rasūl of Allah and the documentation of ʿAlī.¹

Hence, this narration suggests that her Muṣḥaf was existent in the time of Rasūl Allah and the dictator was Rasūl Allah and the word was the word of Allah.

The latter part of this narration contradicts the former. For how is it possible that it descended upon her but it was dictated by the Rasūl of Allah and documented by ʿAlī. Nor did any angel come to her and console her so that ʿAlī may write his consolation; nothing of this sort happened. Based on this narration, it was just what she was inspired with after the demise of her father, not during his lifetime.

Another narration suggests:

مصحف فاطمة علیها السلام ما فیه شيء من کتاب الله وإنما هو شيء القي علیها

The Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah does not contain anything of that which is in the Book of Allah. It is something with which she was divinely inspired.²

This narration conversely suggests that she was divinely inspired with the Muṣḥaf; there was no dictation from the Rasūl nor any documentation on the part of ʿAlī, nor did any angel come to her and console her so that ʿAlī may write his consolation; nothing of this sort happened. Based on this narration, it was just what she was inspired with after the demise of her father, not during his lifetime.

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 26/42; Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt p. 42.
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 26/48; Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt p. 42.
Furthermore, the Imāms (as the books of the Shīʿah allege) would use the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah as a medium to procure the knowledge of the unseen and of events to transpire in the future; Abū ʿAbd Allāh says:

**Heretics will emerge in 128 A.H. This is because I referred to the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah.**

1

Meaning: I inferred this from there. When analysing the history of this particular year which is stipulated in this tale there are no major events that happened (as is apparent from the books of history) besides the killing of a few spearheads of some heterodox movements like Jahm ibn Ṣafwān and others; this obviously proves the very opposite of what the tale claims. Another narration says:

**I had a look at the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah a while ago. I did not find the share of Banū Fulān [a specific family or tribe] in that (referring to something specific) but as little as the dust of a shoe.**

2

This tale is tainted with a little bit of Taqiyyah (dissimulation); because he did not specify who is Banū Fulān (the tribe), nor did he specify what the pronoun ‘hā’ refers to. Al-Majlisī, as is his wont, did not clarify these two aspects as well. Possibly, the children of Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib are meant by Banū Fulān and Khilāfah (rulership) is meant by the pronoun ‘hā’. For the simple reason that the Shīʿah have much to say about his family, e.g. they claim that jealousy and love for the material world persuades them to reject (the leadership of the children of Ḥusayn).

3

---

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/240.
2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/48; *Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt* p. 44
3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/305-306.
Nonetheless, the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah is a medium by way of which they endeavour to discover the events of the world. If this was really true then history would have been something else altogether. And the Imāms would not have suffered such trial and afflictions which the books of the Shīʿah sketch, nor would the awaited Mahdī hide away and disappear into occultation owing to the fear of getting killed, nor would there be the slightest need for Taqīyyah; for ostensibly they would save themselves from all sorts of afflictions by procuring prior knowledge of their occurrence and they would obtain all desirable conditions by procuring the knowledge of the means thereof. If they claim that they do not have the prerogative to change anything therefrom then they are just like the rest of the people who are bound by the Qadr (pre-destiny) of Allah and the knowledge of those future events would serve no purpose but the provocation of their grief.

The content of the aforementioned narrations was that the subject matter of the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah is the knowledge of the future. However, another narration which is reported by al-Kulaynī states that Abū ʿAbd Allāh said the following with regards to it:

ما أزعم أن فيه قرآنا و فيه ما يحتاج الناس إلينا ولا نحتاج إليه أحد حتى فيه الجلدة و نصف الجلدة و ربع الجلدة و أربع الخدع

I do not assume that therein there is anything of the Qurʾān; therein is contained those aspects in which people will need us and we will not need anyone. To the extent that it contains the rulings of a lash, half a lash, quarter of a lash and the penalty for a scratch.¹

This narration asserts that the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah, in addition to having mention of the future events, also contains the knowledge of Islamic penal law, to the extent that it also describes the penalty for a scratch. Instead it contains knowledge of the entire Sharīʿah which has made the Imāms independent of everyone else. Does this mean that they are not in need of the Book of Allah, or that they can

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/240.
dispense with the Qur’ān and replace it with the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah? As a result, they will have another law and the Muslim community will have another?

And does it imply that the great Islamic constitution did not reach its culmination via the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, and therefore it had to be completed with the aid of the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah جاع ، or does her Muṣḥaf suffice on behalf of all of them?

The purport of these narrations is unequivocal. Bestowing the Imāms with the knowledge of the unseen is conferring upon them one of the exclusive attributes of Allah ﷺ ، i.e. the knowledge of the unseen. And considering the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah to be comprehensive of the penal and compensatory law of Islam is subtly levelling an allegation against the Sharīʿah in terms of it being incomplete.

In addition, they have another narration that states that the knowledge of the Sharīʿah is contained in the Jāmiʿah and not in the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah; they say:

إن عندنا لصجیفة يقال له الجامعة ما من حلال ول حرام إل و هو فيها حتي أرشن الخدش

We are in possession of a script which is known as the Jāmiʿah, there is no permissible or impermissible act but that it is contained therein, even the compensation of a scratch.¹

Likewise they have another script which is known as the script of penal law. In there the punishment of even a third of a lash is mentioned:

ثالث جلدة من تعدي ذلك كان عليه حد جلدة

One third of a lash, whoever exceeds it will receive the punishment of one lash.²

---

As for the knowledge of the future, they believe that the source of it is not the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah. Rather it is contained in the skin of a big lamb which in its size is bigger than Jibrīl and Mikā‘īl. They say:

ما يقلب طائر في الهواء إلا وعندنا فيه علم

No bird turns in the skies but that we have knowledge regarding it.¹

After all of this, they still then claim that all knowledge is derived from the Qur’ān, the Book of Allah. Abū ʿAbd Allāh says:

إني أعلم ما في السماوات وما في الأرض،و أعلم ما في الجهة،و أعلم ما في النار و أعلم ما كان و ما يكون،قال(الراوي):ثم مكث هنیهة فرأي أن ذالك کبر علي من سمعه منه فقال: (علمت ذلك من کتاب الله عز و جل،إن الله عز و جل يقول فيه تبيان كل شيء

I know what is in the heavens, what is in the earth, what is in Jannah, what is in Hellfire, and I have knowledge of what transpired in the past and what is to happen in the future. (The narrator says) then he paused for a while and realised that the congregation was finding it difficult to accept this claim so he said, “I obtained the knowledge of this from the Book of Allah; verily Allah says regarding the Qur’ān that it has clarity with regards to everything.”²

Similarly, it was mentioned previously that some contemporary Shi‘ī scholars believe that the Qur’ān is free from distortion because it was compared with the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah (and found to be identical).³ But al-Khunayzī on the other hand states that the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah is very different from the Qur’ān and also avers that this is what their narrations confirm as well;⁴ while other statements and narrations contradict this entirely. The Shi‘ah are not even embarrassed by this contradiction because their dīn rests upon Taqiyyah.

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 26/19; ʿUyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā p. 200.
2 The reference has passed. Refer to p. 165 of this book.
3 See p. 265 of this book
4 Al-Khunayzī: al-Daʿwah al-Islāmiyyah 1/47.
Furthermore, in the book Dalā’il al-Nubuwwah which is considered to be a reliable book according to them, a narration appears which describes this particular Muṣḥaf in the following manner:

Therein is contained the knowledge of the past and the future till the Day of Judgement. In it is the knowledge of every heaven, of the amount of angels in every heaven, of the amount of humans Allah has created including the prophets and others, the knowledge of their names, the names of the people they were sent to, the names of those who accepted and those who rejected, the names of all those whom He created from the believers and the disbelievers, the description of all those who belied the prophets, the description of the previous nations and their stories, the information of all tyrant rulers, their period of rule and their exact count, the names of the Imāms, their descriptions, and what each one possessed... In it is contained the knowledge of everything that Allah has created—coupled with its lifespan, the description of the people of Jannah, their amount, and the amount of people who will enter Jahannam and the names of these people and those people. In it is the knowledge of the Qur’ān as it was revealed, the knowledge of the Tawrāh as it was revealed, the knowledge of the Injīl

1 Al-Majlisī has said the following regarding the book, “It is from the widespread reliable books. Many scholars who succeeded him benefited from it the likes of Ibn Ṭā’ūs and others. The author is a reliable transmitter of the Twelvers (his name is Muḥammad ibn Jarīr ibn Rustum al-Ṭabarī) he is not the Ibn Jarīr from the opposite side who has written a book on history.” (al-Majlisī: Bihār al-Anwār 1/39/40) The introduction to the book states the following, “This book has remained a reliable reference of the Shi‘ah in the aspects of Imāmah and ḥadīth. A book which is an attraction and an authentic source from then till the present time. (introduction: p. 5)
as it was revealed and the knowledge of the Zabūr. Similarly the knowledge of the count of every tree and every pebble in every town.¹

It further states that all of this is contained in the first two pages of the Muṣḥaf.² The narrator also says that their Imāms have said:

و ما وصفت لك بعد ما في الورقة الثالثة ولا تكلمت بحرف منه

I have not even communicated to you as yet what is contained in the third page and onwards nor have I mentioned a word therefrom.³

We do not know what the size of this ‘page’ is, nor are we able to ascertain the reason for the Imāms not benefitting from this great knowledge in order to reclaim their right to leadership wherefrom they were deprived according to the Shīʿah.

Furthermore, why does not their awaited Mahdī emerge from his cave and why is he afraid of death (as the Shīʿah assert is his reason for going into occultation) if he has the wealth of this phenomenal knowledge?

The narration of Dalāʾil al-Nubuwwah, furthermore, gives a different account of how the Muṣḥaf was revealed as opposed to the previous narration of al-Kāfī which states that ʿAlī documented the dictates of the angel which eventually took the form of a Muṣḥaf; the narration mentions:

إنه نزل جملة واحدة من السماء بواسطة ثلاثة من الملائكة وهم جبرائيل و إسرافیل و میکائیل...فهبطوا به و هي قائمة تصلي فما زالوا قياما حتي فقدت، و لما فرغت من صلاتها سلموا علیها و قالوا:السلام يقرئك السلام و وضعوا المصحف في حجرها. فقالت: لله السلام و منه السلام و إلیه السلام و علیكم یا رسول الله السلام

1 Dalāʾil al-Nubuwwah p. 27-28.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
It descended all at once with the agency of three angels: Jibrīl, Isrāfīl, and Mikā’īl. They came down with it whilst she was performing ṣalāh. Hence, they remained standing till she sat and completed her ṣalāh, thereafter, they greeted her and said, “Al-Salām (Allah) has conveyed his greetings to you.” Subsequently they placed the Muṣḥaf in her lap.¹ She responded, “Peace belongs to Allah, from him does it originate and to him does it return, and may his peace be upon you, O Messenger of Allah.”

The narration continues:

Thereafter they returned to the heavens and Fāṭimah continuously read the Muṣḥaf from after the Fajr ṣalāh up to the time of Zawāl (when the sun reaches its zenith) till she completed an entire reading. And Fāṭimah was such that loyalty to her was obligatory upon all the creations of Allah i.e. jinn, mankind, birds, animals, the prophets and the angels. (The narrator says) I enquired, “May I be sacrificed for thee! Who inherited this Muṣḥaf from her after her demise?” “She passed it on to Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn. After him it went to Ḥasan, then to Ḥusayn, then to his family till it was passed on to the rightful claimant of this affair.”²

This is just a glimpse of what appears in their books with regards to the alleged Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah. It tells us that a Muṣḥaf was revealed to Fāṭimah after the demise of the Rasūl of Allah wherein was contained the knowledge of the unseen, the knowledge of the penal law of Islam and much more, and that today it rests with the hidden Imām! It is likewise a revelation just like the Qur’ān, just that it is three times more voluminous and does not contain even a letter of it. So did this Muṣḥaf come down in order to complete the Qur’ān?

¹ Dalā’il al-Nubuwwah p. 27-28.
² Ibid.
Nonetheless, there are many other books of this nature regarding which the Shīʿah have made very similar claims. This is a very vast topic and requires an exclusive treatise. Hence, omitting all the details I shall present the names of some of them coupled with a brief introduction to each one.

b. A book that was revealed to the Rasūl of Allah before his demise:

Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣādiq says:

Allah revealed a book upon his Nabī before death overtook him.

Hence he said, “O Muḥammad! This book is your bequest to the noble member of your household.”

The Rasūl enquired, “And who is the noble member of my household, O Jibrīl?”

He replied, “ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib.”

The book comprised of letters that were sealed with gold seals which the Rasūl of Allah handed over to ʿAlī ibn Ṭālib instructing him to open one of them and practice upon its content. Hence, he opened one of them and practiced upon it, thereafter he handed it to Ḥasan who also opened one of them and practiced upon it.
Subsequently, he gave it to Ḥusayn who also opened one of them and found the following order: Advance towards martyrdom with a group of people for whom martyrdom is not destined but with you and hand yourself over to Allah ۔ۦۭە۔۷۳۳۳۳, hence that is what he did.

He handed it over to 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn who when opening one of the seals found the following order: Remain silent, stay in your house, and worship your Lord till death comes your way, hence, he did so.

He then handed it over to Muḥammad ibn 'Alī. He also opened one of them and found thus: Educate the people, answer their queries, and do not fear anyone besides Allah for no one will have the upper hand over you.

He, thereafter, passed it on to me so I opened a seal and I found the following: Educate the people, answer their questions, propagate the knowledge of your household, affirm the mission of your pious forefathers, and do not fear anyone besides Allah, for you are in his security and protection, thereafter I will pass it on to Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar and he will pass it on to his successor. In this manner should this book be passed on till the emergence of the Mahdī.¹

What emanates from this report is that the Rasūl of Allah ۔ۦۭە۔۷۳۳۳۳ did not know who was the noble member of his household till the very time of his demise, which is why he enquired about him. This implies that he had not made any official announcement to the people regarding his successor which makes all the narrations of Shīʿah worthless and unacceptable. If it is said that there were many noble members within the Ahl al-Bayt and the enquiry was just for the stipulation of one of them, then too the claims of the Shīʿah regarding the superiority of ʿAlī ۔ۦۭە۔۷۳۳۳ hold no basis whatsoever.

Furthermore, the report does not give any details with regards to the orders that were given to ʿAlī and Hasan ۔ۦۭە۔۷۳۳۳ and it mentions the order given to Ḥusayn, i.e.

his quest for martyrdom. But this historically defies reality due to the fact that Ḥusayn یا حسین did not anticipate martyrdom when he left, and also because those who were responsible for the dreadful consequences that Ḥusayn یا حسین faced were the very people who incited him and beguiled him to come to them, and when he came to them they abandoned him and turned away from helping him despite claiming to be his partisans. They had written multiple letters to him inducing him to intend their lands and when he came close to their lands they turned their backs on him. Instead most of them joined the ranks of the enemies, either due to fear or due to hope, and became the cause of his martyrdom and the martyrdom of those who were with him.¹ It is for this reason that the books of the Shīʿah have labelled those who succeeded Ḥusayn یا حسین after his demise as apostates with the exception of three people.² So is this report an endeavour to secure the position of these people (the Forsakers).

Then how do they differentiate between the Imāms in terms of the obligation of daʿwah and the propagation of knowledge; among them are some who are required to remain at home whilst others are obligated to propagate knowledge and openly advance the cause of Islam. Another glaring aspect of this ḥadīth is that it concedes the fact that the Shīʿah did not have any transmitter of knowledge and propagator thereof till the advent of Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. This is confirmed by another narration wherein it is stated:

کانت الشیعة قبل أن یكون أبو جعفر و هم لا يعرفون مناسك حجهم و حلالهم و حرامهم، حتي کان أبو جعفر یفتح لهم، و بین لهم مناسك حجهم و حلالهم و حرامهم.

Before the advent of Abū Jaʿfar the Shīʿah did not know the rites of Ḥajj and what was lawful or unlawful for them till he came and opened this chapter of knowledge to them and educated them regarding the rites of Ḥajj and the aspects of Ḥalāl and Ḥarām.³

---

¹ Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah p. 62.
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/380.
³ Ibid 2/20.
This implies that the Shīʿah before the advent of Abū Jaʿfar were worshipping Allah ignorantly.

Furthermore, did ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn, implementing the order issued to him, remain at home and give preference to seclusion? Or did he violate it and go out to propagate knowledge and call towards Allah with wisdom and foresight? ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn is from among the senior successors of the Ṣaḥābah in terms of his knowledge and piety. He is the one who is reported to have said the following regarding these fabricators:

أحبونا حب الإسلام فوالله ما زال بنا ما تقولون حتی بغضبتما إلي الناس

Love us in accordance with the teachings of Islam! For by Allah what you say is being continuously ascribed to us till it has reached a point where you have made the people despise us.¹

Al-Zuhrī says:

ما رأیت قرشیا أفضل منه و ما رأیت أفقه منه

I have not seen a Qurayshī more intelligent and more knowledgeable than him.²

He was a trustworthy and prolific narrator of ḥadīth.³

Shaykh al-Mufid has acknowledged that he had propagated knowledge. He says:

وقد روي عنه فقهاء العامة- يعني أهل السنة- من العلوم ما لا يحصر كثرة، و حفظ عنه من المواعظ و الأدعية و الحلال و الحرام، والمغازي والأيام ما هو مشهور بين العلماء و لو قصدنا إلي شرح ذلك لطال به الخطاب

¹ Ṭabaqāt Ibn Saʿd 5/214.
³ Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/153.
The scholars of the commonality (the Ahl al-Sunnah) have narrated from him such knowledge that cannot be enumerated due to its copiousness. And many advices, supplications, permissible and impermissible issues, and the events from the time of Nabī محمد ﷺ have been documented and preserved from which are very commonly known amongst the scholars. The discussion would become too long if we were to expound on them all.\(^1\)

This is how their narrations contradict each other and their statements oppose one another which is a sign of fabrication.

c. The Tablet of Fāṭimah:

This is different from the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah (as they allege), for the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah descended after the demise of the Rasūl of Allah محمد ﷺ through the agency of an angel whose dictates ‘Alī محمد documented, or it came down all at once through the medium of three angels, etc. As for the Tablet of Fāṭimah it has other features: it was revealed to the Rasūl of Allah محمد who subsequently gifted it to Fāṭimah, among others. They have extracted some texts from this tablet which support their beliefs. It seems that the information regarding the Tablet of Fāṭimah has been kept very discreet from others. Hence it is a secret from their secrets. We do not now how the information about it leaked and when did it leak.

Here is a narration which the author of Al-Wāfī reports from al-Kāfī on the authority of Abū Baṣīr who narrates from Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣādiq:

قال أبي لجابر بن عبد الله الأنصاري: إن لي إلیك حاجة مني يخف عليك أن أخلو بك فأسألك عنها؟ قال له جابر: في أي الأحوال أحببت فخلا به في بعض الأيام فقال له، يا جابر أخبرني عن اللوح الذي رأيته في يد أمي فاطمة بنت رسول الله صلی الله علیه وسلم و آله و ما أخبرتك به أمي أنه في ذلك اللوح مكتوب، فقال جابر: أشهد بالله أنه دخلت علي أمي فاطمة صلی الله علیها وسلم في حیاة رسول الله صلی الله علیه وسلم فتمهت بها أبی هزيمة فرأيت في يدیها لوحا أخضر ظننت أنه من زمرد و رأيت فيه كتابا أبيضشبه لون الشمس قبلت لهما وأمي أنت يا بنت رسول الله ما هذا اللوح فقالت: هذا لوح أهداؤه الله تعالى إلي رسوله صلی الله عليه وسلم و آله فيه اسم أبي و اسم علي و اسم ابنه و اسم الأوصياء من ولدي و أعطاني أبي ليبشري بذلك. قال جابر: فأعطنتني أمك فاطمة صلی الله علیها وسلم فأقرنها واستنفختها فقال أبو:

فهل لك يا جابر أن تعرضه علي؟ قال: نعم، فمشي معه أبي إلى منزل جابر فأخرج صحیفة من رق فقال:
يا جابر انظر في كتابك لأقرأ عليك، فنظر جابر في نسخته و قرأ أبي، فما خالف حرف حرفًا، فقال جابر:
أشهد بالله أنى هكذا رأيتاه في اللوح مكتوبا: يسم الله الرحمن الرحيم هذا كتاب من الله العزيز الحكيم
لمحمد نبيه و نوره و سفيره و حجابه و دينه نزل به الروح الأمين من عند رب العالمين عظم يا محمد
أسمائي و اشكر نعمائي.

My father said to Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allāh, “I have a query. Please let me know whenever it is convenient for you or when it is possible for me to meet with you in privacy so that I may ask you. Jābir replied, “I am available at any time you want.”

Hence he met with him one of the days and asked him, “O Jābir! Tell me of the tablet that you saw in the hands of my mother, Fāṭimah, the daughter of the Rasūl of Allah. And what did my mother tell you about the contents therein?”

Jābir said, “I testify by Allah that I went to visit your mother in the lifetime of the Rasūl of Allah to congratulate her on the birth of ʿHuṣayn. There I saw a green tablet in her hand which I assumed was of emerald, and therein I saw a letter which in its radiance was like the sun. so I said to her, ‘May my parents be sacrificed for thee! O daughter of the Rasūl of Allah, what is this tablet?’ She replied, ‘This is a tablet which Allah sent to the Rasūl of Allah. In it is contained my father’s name, the name of ʿAlī, the name of my son, and the names of his successors among my children. My father gifted it to me in order to break the good news to me.’ Your mother then gave me the tablet to have a look at it. I read it and was delighted by its content.”

My father then asked him, “Would it be possible for you, O Jābir, to let me have a look at it?”

He responded in the affirmative. He then accompanied Jābir to his house and took out a script of paper and said, “Look into your copy so that I may read to you from mine.”

Hence, Jābir read his copy whilst my father read his and there was not a letter’s difference in the two of them.
So Jābir said, “I testify by Allah that this is exactly how I found it written in the Tablet. It reads as follows:

In the name of Allah, the Most Compassionate, the Most Merciful.
This is a letter from Allah, the Almighty, the All Wise, to Muḥammad, His Nabi, His light, His vicegerent, His veil, and His proof. Jibrīl, the trustworthy spirit, has come down with it from the Lord of the universe. O Muḥammad glorify my praises and show gratitude for my bounties…”

**d. Their claim that twelve scripts descended from the heavens which comprised of the attributes and the features of the Imāms:**

The following is an excerpt of a long narration which Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (al-Ṣadūq) narrates:

إن الله تبارك و تعالي نزل علي علي اثني عشر خاتما و اثني عشر صحیفة اسم کل إمام علي خاتمه و صفته

Allah revealed twelve rings to ʿAlī and twelve scripts. Each ring contains the name of one of the Imāms and each script has a description of one of them.

They have many other claims in this regard.

---

1 Refer to the following books: al-Kāfī 1/527-528; al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī: Al-Wāfi 2/72; al-Ṭabarsī: al-Iḥtijāj 1/84-87; Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī: Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 301-304; al-Ṭabarsī (the author of Majmaʿ al-Bayān): Aʾlām al-Warā p. 152; al-Karājakī: al-Istinṣār p. 18. Note: It should be remembered that the Shiī narrators have not narrated this allegedly divine letter in an identical manner; e.g. compare the narration of Ikmāl al-Dīn with the narration of al-Kāfī. A picture will be given ahead.

2 Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 263.

3 There are other books other than the ones mentioned above, e.g. the script of Fāṭimah... which they claim is a white script made of a pearl wherein the names of the Imāms are mentioned. It is forbidden for the people to touch it as it appears in a narration, “It is forbidden to touch it but for a Nabī, his Waṣī (his appointed successor) or the household of a Nabī.” They have given snippets of this script. One reads as follows: “Abū al-Qāsim, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allah al-Muṣṭafā, his mother is Āminah; Abū al-Ḥasan, ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib al-Murtaḍā, his mother is Fāṭimah bint Asad...” etc. See Biḥār al-Anwār 36/193-194; Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 178; ʿUyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā p. 24, 25.
After the basis of the belief in the Imāms being shaken due to not having any evidence in the Qur’ān, the Shī‘ah have in this manner endeavoured to establish it; they went onto claim that divine books descended with the Qur’ān. This claim of theirs can be added to the list of their fabrications and deceptions.
Analysing this doctrine

Allah ﷺ says:

The People of the Scripture ask you to bring down to them a book from the heaven. But they had asked of Mūsā [even] greater than that and said, “Show us Allah outright,” so the thunderbolt struck them for their wrongdoing.¹

And Allah ﷺ says:

And they say, “We will not believe you until you break open for us from the ground a spring. Or [until] you have a garden of palm trees and grapes and make rivers gush forth within them in force [and abundance]. Or you make the heaven fall upon us in fragments as you have claimed or you bring Allah and the angels before [us]. Or you have a house of ornament [i.e. gold] or you ascend into the sky. And [even then], we will not believe in your ascension until you bring down to us a book we may read.” Say, “Exalted is my Lord! Was I ever but a human messenger?”²

Likewise Allah ﷺ says:

---
¹ Sūrah al-Nisā’: 153.
² Sūrah al-Isrā’: 90-93
And even if we had sent down to you, [O Muḥammad], a written scripture on a page and they touched it with their hands, the disbelievers would say, “This is not but obvious magic.”

Hence, those who asked the Rasūl of Allah for a divine book from Allah are the disbelievers: the Jews and the Christians. Their demand was not granted.

Al-Kulaynī and his likes who spread this false belief then came about and intended to make this Ummah—the best of nations which has been selected for the benefit of mankind—worse in its disbelief than the Jews and the polytheist by averring that it did not believe in the divinely revealed books and scripts of Allah (i.e. it did not acknowledge and believe in the Twelve Imāms)

The verse is unequivocal in rendering the claims of the Shī’ah baseless, for if there was anything of the sort there would have at least been some type of indication to it in the Qur’ān without any rejection thereof. Or the Rasūl of Allah would at least instruct the Ummah to hold on firmly to the revelations which descended upon Fāṭimah or ‘Alī, or upon what was to descend upon the Imāms. However, we find none of the above, which clearly exposes the falsehood in these claims.

Furthermore, why would the Ummah transmit the Qur’ān and the Sunnah and brush aside these alleged books leaving them for a specific people to transmit them? And why didn’t any member of the Ummah, any historian or any person belonging to any religion have any knowledge regarding them? And why do the Shī’ah differ so fiercely with regards to the divinely appointed Imāms if they are in possession of them?

Amazingly, I came across a narration in al-Ｋāfī which contradicts all of the above claims. This narration is narrated by Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ṣādiq (in whose name they forge all these narrations). He says:

1 Sūrah al-An’ām: 7.
Allah has sealed prophethood with the advent of your Nabī, hence there is no Nabī to come after him. He has likewise sealed all the books with the revelation of your Book so no book will descend thereafter. And Allah has revealed in it the clarity of everything, your creation, the creation of the heavens and the earth, the stories of the previous nations, the deciding factors for your internal disputes, the information of the life to come, the tales of Jannah and Jahannam, and the final abode that you will one day return to.¹

This narration does not require any explanation or footnote. It by itself debunks all the previously mentioned claims and very sternly denies the revelation of any books.

In another narration al-Riḍā is reported to have said:

The Sharīʿah of Muḥammad will not be abrogated till the Day of Judgement. Hence, whoever claims prophethood after him or produces a book besides the Qur’ān is lawful to kill for any person who hears that from him.²

Nonetheless, in these pages we have confronted the Shīʿah according to their mentality. Or else merely presenting their views are enough a refutation of them themselves; the Ummah unanimously concurs that there exists no divine book

1 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī 1/31; Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/269; Miftāḥ al-Kutub al-Arbaʿah 8/64-65; Biḥār al-Anwār 79/221, 11/34-35 (with reference to 'Ilal al-Sharāʿiʿ of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī).

2 Biḥār al-Anwār 79/221, 11/34-35 (with reference to 'Ilal al-Sharāʿiʿ).
besides the book of Allah and that any person who claims to have a divine book other than the Qur‘ān is a liar and a heretic.

What would the purpose of the revelation of the Qur‘ān then be? Whereas Allah says:

وَنَزَّلْنَا عَلَیْكَ الْكِتَابَ تِبْیَانًا لِّكُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَهُدًى وَّرَحْمَةً وَّبُشْرَى لِلْمُسْلِمِیْنَ

And we have sent down to you the Book as clarification for all things and as guidance and mercy and good tidings for the Muslims.¹

Likewise:

إِنَّ هٰذَا الْقُرْآنَ یَهْدِی لِلَّتِي هِیَ أُفُومٌ وَیُبَشِّرُ الْمُؤْمِینَ الَّذِیْنَ یَعْمَلُوْنَ الصَّالِحَاتِ أَنَّ لَهُمْ أَجْرًا کَبِیْرًا

Indeed, this Qur‘ān guides to that which is most suitable and gives good tidings to the believers who do righteous deeds that they will have a great reward.²

And where are these divines books and scripts today? Is there any trace of them? And what is the benefit of them being secured by the awaited Mahdī?

It seems as if the pioneers of Shī‘ism forged these narrations out of the fear that they would lose their following due to the fact that their belief system does not rest upon any firm basis in the Qur‘ān. Over and above that, they were intent on plotting against this Ummah and its dīn, and distancing the Shī‘ah from the rest of the Ummah with books other than the Book of Allah.

What is very astonishing is that there are many among the early and contemporary Shī‘ah who deny the viewpoint of the interpolation of the Qur‘ān, shun it aside as not being part of Twelver Shī‘ism and rate the narrations (even though they

---

¹ Sūrah al-Naḥl: 89.
be copious) of interpolation as forgeries which have seeped into the Twelver dogma. Yet they have not taken the same stance (as far as I know) regarding these erroneous claims which were initiated by al-Kulaynī and his cohorts; they have turned a blind eye toward them, whereas they are no less than the claim of interpolation in their gravity. Instead, Ibn Bābawayh and al-Ṭabarsī despite not believing in the interpolation of the Qurʾān, have also spread and transmitted these beguiling beliefs. Is this all because the Muslims are aware of the former claim of the Shīʿah and not the latter?

These claims entail some very serious consequences. Among them:

1. Revelation did not end and prophethood was not sealed,
2. the Imāms share a position equal to the Ambiyāʾ or even higher due to them receiving numerous books from the heavens which did not even materialise for the Rasūl of Allah,
3. and considering the Ṣaḥābah in specific and the Ummah in general to be on falsehood because of not believing in these divine books.

These claims are one of the many signs wherefrom we gather that this cult has been infiltrated by inveterate liars who do not feel ashamed of blurting out any drivel; they have attributed lies to the Rasūl of Allah by forging aḥādīth in his name, and they projected lies to Allah by concocting these books. Only those who do not believe in Allah attribute lies to him.

2. Their claim that the Imāms are in possession of all the divine books

The Shīʿah claim that the Twelve Imāms are in possession of every book that descended from the heavens and that they can read them all despite their disparate languages. The author of al-Kāfī has established a chapter by the title, Chapter regarding the Imāms having possession of all the books which came down from Allah, and that they are well acquainted with them despite their
different languages.¹ In this chapter he cites multiple narrations. The author of Al-Biḥār has also established a chapter with a similar title.² In this chapter he cites twenty-seven narrations.

These narrations state that:

كل كتاب نزل فهو عند أهل العلم و نحن هم.

The people of knowledge, meaning us, have the knowledge of every book that was revealed.³

Another narration states:

إن عندنا صحف أبراهيم وألواح موسى.

We have the scriptures of Ibrāhīm and the tablets of Mūsā.⁴

Likewise another narration mentions:

إن عندنا علم التوراة و النجیل و الزبوب و بيان ما في الألواح.

We have knowledge of the Tawrāh, the Injīl, the Zabūr, and the details of the tablets.⁵

Yet there is another narration which gives a detailed account of the tablets of Mūsā. It explains that they were made of the peridot of Jannah, they comprised of the clear exposition of everything that is to happen till the Day of Judgement, they were in the Hebrew language, and the Rasūl of Allah gave them to Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ‘Alī ordering him thus:

---

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/227.
² Biḥār al-Anwār 26/180.
³ Uṣūl al-Kāfī (with the commentary of al-Māzindarānī) 5/355.
⁴ Ibid.
⁵ Ibid.
“Hold on firmly to these! For in them is contained the knowledge of the first and the last; these are the tablets of Mūsā which Allah has ordered me to give to you.”

He said, “O Rasūl of Allah, I do not have the ability to read them.”

The Rasūl replied, “Jibrīl has ordered me to instruct you to place them under your head tonight by virtue of which you will be able to read them by the morning.”

Hence ʿAlī states that he kept them under his head that night and by the morning Allah had inspired him with the knowledge of everything therein. Subsequently, the Rasūl of Allah told him to copy the contents thereof on the skin of big lamb. This skin thus contains the knowledge of the first to come and the last to come, and we are in possession of it.¹

This narration defines the lamb-skin to be comprehensive of the tablets of Mūsā. Another narration, however, does not stick to this; it states that Abū ʿAbd Allāh said:

Most certainly I am in possession of the white skin. It consists of the Zabūr of Dāwūd, the Tawrāh of Mūsā, the Injīl of ʿĪsā, the scriptures of Ibrāhīm, the laws of permissible and impermissible entities, and the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah. I do not assume that it consists of any portion of the Qurʿān. In addition,

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 26/180.
it contains those aspects in which people will require our guidance and in which we will not require anyone; it also mentions the ruling of a lash, half a lash, a quarter of a lash, and even the ruling of scratch.\(^1\)

The commentator of *al-Kāfī* seemingly deemed all of this to be too much to be contained on the *Jafr*, skin of a lamb (as the previous narration asserts). Hence he says:

\[\text{الظاهر أن الجفر وعاء فيه هذه الصحف لا أنها مكتوبة فيه.}\]

It is apparent that the *Jafr* is a container wherein all these scriptures and books are kept and not a skin in which all of them are documented.\(^2\)

Whereas the previous narration emphatically mentions that ʿAlī \(^1\) had documented them on the skin of lamb. This clearly suggests that the skin of a lamb can never possibly contain all of these books; especially when just one of these, i.e. the tablets of Mūsā contains the knowledge of the first and the last. It also tells us that the person who forged these narrations was not very adept at doing so. Similarly, every intelligent person will conclude that history would be something else all-together if the Imāms had knowledge of the first and the last.

The claim that the Imāms are in possession of all the divine books did not just remain a theory but it exceeded that to the practical realm. Hence, Abū al-Ḥasan is reported to have recited a portion of the *Injīl* before Barīh the Christian who after hearing him read the *Injīl* exclaims:

\[\text{إياك كنت أطلب منذ خمسين سنة، ثم إن النصراني (كما تقول الرواية) آمن وحسن أسلامه. قال للإمام: إنني لكم التوراة والإنجیل وکتب الأنبیاء؟ فقال: هي عندنا وراثة من عندهم نقرأها کما قرأوها. ونقولها كمَا قالوا: إن الله لا يجعل حجة في أرضه يسأل عن شيء يقاله لا أدري.}\]

It is you that I was in search of for the past fifty years. Thereafter he embraced Islam on the hands of Abū al-Ḥasan and became a good Muslim.

---

He then asks the Imām, “How did you procure the Tawrāh, the Injīl, and the books of the Ambiyā’?”

He said, “We obtained them by way of inheritance and we read them just as they would read them. And we also claim as they claimed: Allah does not place upon the earth his evidence (in the form of a messenger) who says ‘I don’t know,’ when asked regarding something.”

What this narration implies is that the Imāms study the Tawrāh, the Injīl, and other divine books just as the Ambiyā’ did in order to procure answers to the questions of people.

In fact the matter has exceeded this to the level that judgements and rulings will be passed in accordance with previous divine scriptures; the author of al-Kāfī has established a chapter titled, Chapter regarding the Imāms issuing rulings in accordance with the laws of Dāwūd and his family for which there will not be asked to produce any evidence.

One of the narrations that he presents in the chapter reads as follows:

 عن جعید الهمداني عن علي بن الحسین رضي الله عنه قال: سألته بأي حكم تحكمون؟ قال: حكم آل داؤد فإن أعیانا شیئ تلقانا به روح القدس.

Ju’aid al-Hamdānī narrates from ’Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn.

He says I asked him, “Based on which law do you issue rulings?”

He said, “With the law of the family of Dāwūd; if we happen to come across a complexity which we cannot resolve then the Holy Spirit inspires us with its answer.”

---

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī (with the commentary al-Jāmi’) 5/359; Biḥār al-Anwār 26/181,182; al-Tawḥīd p. 286-288.
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/359.
3 Ibid.
There are many similar narrations which state that even the Mahdī after his advent will issue rulings in accordance with the law of the family of Dāwūd for which he will not have to provide evidence. These narrations contain multiple examples of the type of rulings the Mahdī will issue based on the special constitution that he will be granted, e.g. he will not accept taxes from the people of the book, he will kill every twenty year old who has not acquired the knowledge of dīn, he will issue rulings in accordance with the law of Dāwūd, and much more.¹

Likewise there are many narrations which state that 'Alī would say,

 لو تمكنت من الأمر لحكمت لكل طائفة بكتابها.

If I were took charge of affairs I would issue rulings for every denomination in accordance with its book.²

One of these narrations state:

 لو ثبت لي وسادة أو لو ثني لي الناس كما ثني لابن صوحان لحكمت بين أهل التوراة بالتوراة... ولحكمت بين أهل الإنجيل بالإنجيل... ولحكمت بين أهل الزبور بالزبور... ولحكمت بين أهل القرآن بالقرآن.

If I were to take charge of affairs, or if people were to give me authority over their affairs just as they gave to Ibn Ṣūḥān,³ I would issue rulings in accordance with the Tawrāh for the people of the Tawrāh, for the people of the Injīl in accordance with the Injīl, for the people of the Zabūr in accordance with the Zabūr, and for the people of the Qur’ān in accordance with the Qur’ān.⁴

---

¹ Ibid 1/398 onwards.
² Al-Sha’rānī: Taʿālīq ʿIlmiyyah (with the commentary of al-Kāfī by al-Māzindarānī) 6/393.
³ Al-Majlisī says, “The mention of Ibn Ṣūḥān in the narration is strange, it was possibly Ibn Abī Sufyān. Nonetheless it means that if I had authority like Ibn Ṣūḥān amongst my followers...”
⁴ Biḥār al-Anwār 40/137.
Analysing this doctrine

Allah sent Rasūl Allah to all of mankind and Jinn. He sealed prophethood upon him, and abrogated all other religions by way of his religion:

وَمَن يَبْتَغِ غَيْرَ الإِّسْلاَمِ دِیْنًا فَلَنْ یُّقْبَلَ مِنْهُ وَهُوَ فِي الأْٰخِرَةِ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِیْنَ

And whoever desires other than Islam as religion—never will it be accepted from him, and he, in the Hereafter, will be among the losers.\(^1\)

It is reported that if Mūsā and ʿĪsā were alive they would be from his followers.\(^2\) And when ʿĪsā will descend he will rule in accordance with the Sharīʿah of Muḥammad because Allah has abrogated all the divine books with the revelation of the Qurʾān; Allah says:

And we have revealed to you, [O Muḥammad], the Book [i.e. the Qurʾān] in truth, confirming that which preceded it of the Scripture and as a criterion over it. So judge between them by what Allah has revealed and do not follow their inclinations away from what has come to you of the truth. To each of you we prescribed a law and a method. Had Allah willed, He would have made you one nation [united in religion], but [He intended] to test you in what He has given you; so race to [all that is] good. To Allah is your return all together, and He will [then] inform you concerning that over which you used to differ. And judge, [O Muḥammad], between them by what Allah has

---

1 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 85.
2 Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah p. 513.
revealed and do not follow their inclinations and beware of them, lest they tempt you away from some of what Allah has revealed to you.¹

Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī has written the following in his commentary on the verse, “So judge between them by what Allah has revealed”:

و هذا أمر من الله تعالى ذكره نبيه محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم أن يحكم بين المحتمدين إليه من أهل الكتاب وسائر أهل السنة يكتبها الذي أنزله إليه وهو القرآن الذي خصه بشريته. فلله سبحانه أنزل القرآن مصدقا لما بين يديه من الكتاب ومهيمنا عليه، رقیبا يقضي علي ما قبله من سائر الكتب قبله

This is the command of Allah directed to his Nabī Muhammad wherein he commands him to judge by way of the book which he revealed to him, i.e. the Qur‘ān, which Allah has made exclusive to his Sharī‘ah, between those who seek his judgement whether they be from the People of the Book or from any other religion. This is because Allah has revealed the Qur‘ān as a confirmer of the truthfulness of the previous books, a guardian over them (from any distortions or interpolations), and a protector which has abrogated all the previous scriptures and books.²

Conversely, the books of the Shī‘ah suggest that the Imāms will judge according to the law of Dāwūd or that they will issue rulings for every denomination according to its book. So is this not violating the Sharī‘ah of Islam? Or is it a call for unifying all the religions? This can serve as part of the evidence which asserts the fact that Shī‘ism is the refuge of every religion and creed; wherein the deviant is able to find whatever deviation he desires and through the medium of which he is able to infuses poison into the dīn of Islam.

As for the claim of the Shī‘ah that the Imāms are in possession of the books and scriptures of the Ambiyā’, they have no evidence to establish this besides a few claims which are not complemented by reality. How can this be possible for them when it was not the case for the Rasūl of Allah, as is documented in the Ṣaḥīḥayn:

¹ Sūrah al-Mā‘idah: 48, 49.
The Jews came to the Rasūl of Allah and informed him of a man and a woman among them who had committed adultery.

The Rasūl of Allah asked them, “What is the ruling in the Tawrāh with regards to lapidation (stoning)?”

They said, “We are required to disgrace them and lash them.”

ʿAbd Allāh ibn Salām said, “You are lying, the ruling in the Tawrāh is that of lapidation.”

Subsequently, they brought the Tawrāh and opened it and one of them placed his hand on the verse of lapidation and read the verse before it and the verse after it.

ʿAbd Allāh ibn Salām said to him, “Raise your hand.”

He raised his hand and from beneath it appeared the verse of lapidation.

Consequently, they conceded, “He has spoken the truth; the verse of lapidation actually does exist.”

Thereafter, the Rasūl of Allah ordered that they be stoned.1

---

1 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, chapter of merits: chapter regarding the verse, “They recognise him as they recognise their own sons.” 6/631; Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, chapter of capital punishments, sub-chapter regarding the lapidation of the Jews and non-Muslim citizens, 2/1326; Sunan Abī Dāwūd, chapter regarding capital punishments, sub-chapter regarding the lapidation of Jews, 4/593; Sunan Ibn Mājah, chapter of capital punishments, sub-chapter regarding the lapidation of the Jewish man and Jewish woman, 2/854-855; Muwaṭṭa’ Mālik, chapter regarding capital punishments, sub-chapter regarding lapidation, 2/819; Musnad ʿAḥmad 2/5; al-Śāfiʿī: al-Risālah (the revised addition of ʿAḥmad Shākir): paragraph number: 692.
The scholars state regarding the question: What is the ruling in the Tawrāh with regard to lapidation? It is possible that the Rasūl of Allah Ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam had foreknown the ruling due to revelation from Allah Ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam, or that he had obtained the knowledge thereof from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Salām and the other Jewish Rabbis who had accepted Islam, or it is very likely that he asked them regarding the ruling in the Tawrāh in order to verify the veracity of their claim by seeking revelation from Allah Ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam.¹

The scholars did not mention the possibility of him questioning them due to him having possession of the Tawrāh. This proves that this doctrine is the innovation of the Shī‘ah.

If the claim of the Shī‘ah were valid, he would have opened the copy of the Tawrāh which he had in his possession and showed them the ruling therefrom, or he would have instructed ‘Alī ra to produce it.

Nonetheless, the Shī‘ah also claim that the previous divine books which the Imāms are in possession of are free of interpolation and distortions. Whereas Allah Ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam has in many places in the Qur’ān informed of us of how the People of the Book interpolated many verses and of how they even discarded a good portion thereof by way of which they were admonished. With the result that they were left with only a portion of the Book and were deprived of the rest of it due to their negligence.

When the People of the Qur’ān studied the history of the People of the Book it dawned upon them that the Jews had irretrievably lost the original Tawrāh which Mūsā saw Ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam had written. Consequently, some of their Rabbis collaborated and endeavoured to re-write it from memory resulting in much of that which was not part of the Tawrāh becoming part of it. The Tawrāh that they have today establishes this.²

1 Al-Bājī: al-Muntaqā 7/133; Fatḥ al-Bārī 12/168; ‘Awn al-Ma‘būd 12/131.
2 Tafsīr al-Manār 6/396.
As for the Injīl, it suffers from more distortion and confusion than the Tawrāh. The different copies of the Zabūr differ from each other very drastically in many of the verses and meanings. Seeing which a person can definitively conclude that it is a fabrication against the actual Zabūr of Dāwūd.

We are not in a position where we can study this phenomenon in depth. The objective is, however, to point out the conclusion of studies that show that all the previous divine books were not safe from distortion. Conversely, the Shīʿah claim that they are in possession of all these books and that they have not suffered from any distortion. If the Imāms really were in possession of the divine books it was their obligation to confront the Christians and the Jews, to bring them back on to the straight path and to bring to the fore the narrations and verses which contain within them mention of the emergence of Nabī and the duty of being loyal to him. Had they done this, most of the Christians and Jews would have repented and this would have been widely known about them.

Perhaps the person who hears these claims will ask: Where are these divine books today and in whose possession are they? What is the purpose of them being in the possession of the Imāms, is it so that they perfect the constitution of Islam and will bring it to its culmination? And why do they not expose the interpolation of the People of the Book and establish evidence against them?

These are questions to which there are no answers, due to the simple reason that all these claims are fallacies which do not hold any water. These claims are not strange for a people who have attributed almost everything to their Imāms. What is really astonishing, however, is the multitudes of people who actually believe in them in today’s world.

Therefore, we see that the Shīʿah also state that these books are meant to be secretive, that they are heavenly scriptures, and that they are the inheritance of the Ambiyāʾ, etc., which are all in the possession of the Man in Occultation, the

---

1 Ibn Taymiyyah: Daqaʿīq al-Tafsīr 3/58.
fictitious Mahdī. The followers of the Shīʿah have dangled upon this deceptive mirage many fallacies which follow one another.

Belief in the Prophets

The deviance of the Shīʿah in this respect is represented in many beliefs, e.g. the Imāms receive revelation\(^1\) (as was previously mentioned in the section of Sunnah, likewise, under the issue of belief in the books), they are infallible, the necessity of adhering to their orders,\(^2\) etc. They have by way of these beliefs accorded the Imāms the station of prophet-hood. Ibn Taymiyyah, therefore, says:

\[
\text{فمن جعل بعد الرسول معصوما يجب الإيمان بكل ما يقوله فقد أعطاه معني النبوة و إن لم يعطه لفظها}
\]

Whoever attributes infallibility to anyone averring that, after Rasūl Allah, he is entitled to obedience in everything he says, has in essence accorded him the station of prophet-hood. Even though he does not verbally claim that.\(^3\)

They have exceeded all bounds by further asserting that the Ambiyā’ were the followers of ʿAlī, and that some of them were penalised due to not believing in his succession. One narration states:

\[
\text{عن حبة العرني قال: قال أمیر المؤمنین علیه السلام: إن الله عرض ولیتي علي أهل السموات و أهل الأرض أقر بها من أقر، و أنكرها من أنكر، أنكرها یونس فحبسه الله في یطن الحوت حتي أقر بها.}
\]

chestra al-ʿUranī mentions that Amīr al-Muʾminin said, “Allah presented my allegiance to the dwellers of the heavens and the inhabitants of the earth. Those that conceded, conceded and those that rejected, rejected. Yunus rejected. Allah consequently imprisoned him in the belly of the fish till he conceded.”\(^4\)

---

1 In fact, they state that the Imāms only speak through revelation (see: Bihar al-Anwār 17/155, 54/237).
2 Refer to the section regarding infallibility.
4 Bihar al-Anwār 26/282; Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt p. 22.
They have many similar traditions in this regard.\(^1\)

Hence, they assert the following:

1. The Imāms are superior to the Ambiyā’.
2. They came with miracles in order to establish evidence against the entire creation.

These are the two aspects that I will be discussing in somewhat detail in the pages to come.

**Holding the Imāms in Higher Esteem than the Ambiyā’**

The prophets are the best of humans and the most deserving of the station of prophet-hood. Allah prepared them for the highest level of servitude, the propagation of his message, and striving in his path. Allah says:

\[
اللّٰهُ أَعْلَمُ حَیْثُ یَجْعَلُ رِسَالَتَهُ
\]

Allah is most knowing of where [i.e. with whom] He places His message.\(^2\)

Hence they enjoy the distinct privilege of prophet-hood over everyone else.\(^3\)

Allah has made obedience to them compulsory upon the creation. He, the Almighty, says:

\[
وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِن رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا لِیُطَاعَ بِإِذْنِ اللّٰهِ
\]

And we did not send any messenger except to be obeyed by permission of Allah.\(^4\)

---

1 Al-Majlisī has made mention of them under the chapter regarding the Imāms being more superior to the Ambiyā’ 26/267-319.
4 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 64.
No human is better than them. Al-Ţahâwî mentions the following in his exposition of the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah:

وَلَا نَفْضُلْ أَحَدًا مِّنَ الأُولِيَّاءِ عَلَيْ مَنْ أَنْبِيَاءِ عَلَى هُمْمَا السَّلَامُ وَنُقُولُ: نَبِيٌّ وَاحِدٌ أَفْضَلُ مِّنْ جَمِيعَ الأُولِيَاءِ

We do not hold any saint in higher esteem than the Ambiyā’. Instead we confirm that one Nabī is better than all the saints.¹

Giving preference to the Imāms over the prophets is the stance of the extremist Shī‘ah as is asserted by ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī,² al-Qāḍī ʿAyāḍ,³ and Ibn Taymiyyah.⁴ Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb states:

من اعتقدم في غير الأنبیاء كونه أفضل منهم و مساویا لهم فقد کفر و قد نقل الإجماع علي ذلك غير واحد من العلماء

Whoever believes the superiority of anyone over the Ambiyā’ or that he is equal to them in rank has left the fold of Islam. The consensus of the Ummah in this regard has been documented by many a scholars.⁵

Therefore, al-Qāḍī ʿAyāḍ states:

نقطع بتكفیر غلاة الرافضة في قولهم: إن الأئمة أفضل من الأنبیاء

We definitively conclude that the extremist Shī‘ah are out of the fold of Islam due to their belief in the superiority of the Imāms over the Ambiyā’.

---

¹ Al-ʿAqīdah al-Ţahâwiyyah (with the commentary of Ibn Abī al-ʿIz) p. 493.
² Al-Baghdādī: Uṣūl al-Dīn p. 298.
³ Al-Qāḍī ʿAyāḍ: al-Shifā’ p. 1078.
⁴ Minhâj al-Sunnah 1/177.
⁵ Risālah fī al-Radd ʿalā al-Rawāfiḍ p. 29.
⁶ Al-Shifā’ p. 1078.
Surprisingly, this is one of the cornerstone beliefs of Twelver Shīʿism. The author of *al-Wasā’il* has averred that the belief in the superiority of the Imāms over the Ambiyā’ is a core tenet of the Shīʿī dogma, ascribing it to the Imāms.¹ He further says that the narrations confirming this belief are too many to be enumerated.² Likewise, in his *Biḥār al-Majlisī* has established a chapter named: Chapter regarding the Imāms being superior to the Ambiyā’ and the entire creation, regarding the covenant that was taken from them, the angels, and the entire creation; and regarding the high ranking prophets only attaining a high position due to their love for the Imāms.³

Al-Majlisī, substantiates this belief with 88 narrations which are all attributed to the Twelvers⁴ and then says:

و الأخبار یعني أخبارهم في ذلك أكثر من أن یحصي و إنما أوردنا في هذا الباب قلیلا منها و هي متفرقة في الأبواب لا سيما باب صفات الأنبیاء و أصنافهم عليهم السلام و باب أنهم عليهم السلام كلمة الله و باب بدو أنوارهم و باب أنهم أعلم من الأنبیاء و أباب فضائل أمیر المؤمنین و فاطمة صلوات الله عليهما.

And the narrations in this regard are too many to be enumerated, we have just cited a few of them. They are all scattered in different chapters, especially the chapters regarding the qualities of the Ambiyā’ and their different categories, the chapter regarding the Imāms being the word of Allah, the chapter regarding the radiance of their light, the chapter regarding them being more knowledgeable than the Ambiyā’, and the chapters containing the virtues of Amīr al-Mu’minīn and Fāṭimah.⁵

In his *Iʿtiqādāt*, which the Shīʿah treat as a fundamental book in the Imāmiyyah canon, Ibn Bābawayh states:

¹ *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah fī Uṣūl al-A’immah*: chapter regarding Nabī  and the Imāms being better than all the creation i.e. the prophets, their successors, the angels and everyone else: p. 151.
³ *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/267-319.
⁴ Ibid 26/267-319.
⁵ Ibid 26/297-298.
It is mandatory to believe that Allah has not created anyone better than Muḥammad and the Imāms, that they are the most beloved of his creation to him and the most honourable, and that they were the first to acknowledge the covenant of the prophets in the Dhar (realm of particles after the creation of Ādam). And that Allah granted every Nabī his favours and bounties based on his submission to Rasūl Allah and his advancement in conceding his prophet-hood. Likewise he should believe that Allah has created whatever he has created for him and for his household; if it was not for them he would not have created the heavens, the earth, Jannah, Jahannam, Ādam, Ḥawwā’, the angels, and any of his other creation, may the peace of Allah descend upon them.¹

The author of Bihār after citing this text in his book explains thus:

Know well that whatever he has mentioned pertaining to the superiority of our Nabī and our Imāms over all the creations and regarding the merit of our Imāms over all the Ambiyā’ is something that a keen follower of their legacy cannot doubt at all. For the traditions in this regard are beyond count... This is the core belief of the Imāmiyyah which only an ignoramus can deny.²

---

² Bihār al-Anwār 26/297-298.
Some have, in fact, even written exclusive books on this topic.¹

This is the very same belief of Khomeini, as he has asserted in his book *al-Hukūmah al-Islāmiyyah*, and his cohorts in contemporary times openly proclaim (the text will be quoted shortly).

In attributing merit to the Imāms, these narrations make claims which are steeped in exaggeration and deviance, and which make the hair on the bodies of the believers stand on ends (some of these have passed in the sections regarding their belief in the oneness of Allah in terms of Him being the deity and the nourisher).

Furthermore, the Imāms are not only superior to the Ambiyā’. But all the merits that the Ambiyā’ enjoy is due to Wilāyah (allegiance). Their Imām is reported to have said:

Adam  did not deserve the privilege of Allah creating him with his hand and blowing in him his soul but because of his allegiance to ʿAlī  . And Allah did not directly converse with Mūsā but because of his allegiance to ʿAlī  . Nor did Allah establish ʿĪsā ibn Maryam as his sign but because of his servitude to ʿAlī. He then said, “The best of them all is that no one becomes worthy of seeing his (Allah’s) countenance but after his allegiance to us.”²


² *Al-Ikhtiṣāṣ* p. 250; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/294.
If I were to go on citing similar narrations from Biḥār and other books, I would cover many lengthy pages.¹

Despite all the changes and developments the Twelver dogma has underwent, it seems as if this has remained a principle belief; which is not odd because al-Māmaqānī suggests that the nature of the dogma is progression toward extremism.

The Shīʿah in this issue, i.e. the issue of the Imāms being superior to the Ambiyā’ have diversified into three sects (as al-Ashʿarī states):

1. A sect that believes that the Ambiyā’ are better than the Imāms. Some among the adherents of this sect allow the position of the Imāms being superior to the angels.
2. A sect that believes that the Imāms are superior to the Ambiyā’ and the angels.
3. A sect that together with believing in Imāmah believe in rationalism as well. They say that the angels and the Ambiyā’ are superior to the Imāms.²

Al-Mufīd has added a forth sect in his book Awā’il al-Maqālāt, and that is the sect that asserts that the Imāms are better than the Ambiyā’ with the exception of the Ulū al-ʿAzm (the five Resolute Ambiyā’, referring to the five high ranking prophets) He thereafter does not express his preference but chooses to rather remain silent.³

Ostensibly, all of these sects have disintegrated with the efforts of the scholars of the Safawid Empire and the extremist stance of giving preference to the Imāms

---

¹ Refer to the twenty sixth volume of Biḥār, especially the chapter: the preference of the Imāms over the Ambiyā’: p. 267-319; and the chapter: the prayers of the Ambiyā’ being accepted due to them supplicating to Allah through the medium of the Imāms: p. 319-334.
² Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/120.
³ Awā’il al-Maqālāt p. 42-43.
over the Ambiyā’ has prevailed in the Shīʿī dogma. To the extent that al-Majlisī in his Bihār mentions the following under the chapter which he has dedicated to this topic:

إن أولي العزم إنما صاروا أولي العزم بحبهم صلوات الله عليهم

Verily the resolute Ambiyā’ procured the status of being resolute due to their love for the Imāms.

He does not exclude any of them, not even our Nabī Muḥammad 淮安.

Likewise, they have narrations which draw a comparison between Rasūl Allah 淮安 and ʿAlī. These narrations ultimately conclude that ʿAlī淮安 has more merit than Rasūl Allah淮安 due to him sharing all the accolades and feats of Rasūl Allah淮安 and exclusively being the holder of many feats which Rasūl Allah淮安 does not share with him. The author of Bihār has even established a chapter by the title: Chapter regarding Rasūl Allah saying to ʿAlī, ‘You have been bestowed with three merits which I was not granted’.

Al-Kāfī, Bihār, and other books are filled with narrations which suggest that ʿAlī淮安 and the Imāms hold the same status as Rasūl Allah淮安 and deserve the obedience that he enjoys. But these narrations then progress to a point where

1 See: Bihār al-Anwār 39/89. Here is a narration which appears therein:

Rasūl Allah 淮安 said, “I have been given three merits which ʿAlī淮安 shares with me and ʿAlī淮安 has been bestowed with three merits which I do not share with him.”

It was asked, “O Rasūl Allah! What are the three merits which ʿAlī淮安 shares with you?”

He replied, “I possess the flag of Ḥamd (praise) and ʿAlī is its bearer, the Kawthar belongs to me but ʿAlī淮安 will be the one serving therefrom, and Jannah and Jahannam are for me but ʿAlī淮安 will be my partner in them. And as for the three merits which I do not share with him, they are the following: he is granted a cousin like me but I have not been granted someone like him, he has been bestowed with Fāṭimah and I have not been granted a wife like her, and he is blessed with Hasan and Ḥusayn whereas I am not blessed with sons like them.”

they assert that the Imāms are superior to Rasūl Allah SAW. Instead they posit that ’Alī and the Imāms enjoy such feats and merits that no one else in the creation enjoys. By deliberating over these feats and merits you will realise that they are the exclusive attributes of Allah SW. An illustration of one such feat will suffice to show what the Shī‘ah attribute to ’Alī:

لم يفتنني ما سبقني و لم يعزب عنني ما غاب عنني

Whatever preceded me has not missed me and whatever is not in my reach is not unknown to me.¹

How grave are their fabrications against Allah SW, his Dīn, his Nabī SAW, ’Alī, and the Ahl al-Bayt. Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ’Alī expressed his disapproval against those who gave preference to him over Abū Bakr and ’Umar, and sounded a warning of inflicting upon such people the punishment of a calumniator.² In eighty different transmissions which have been widely reported from him he is recorded to have said upon the pulpit of Kūfah, “The most virtuous of this Ummah after its Nabī is Abū Bakr and ’Umar,”³ which the books of the Shī‘ah have also documented.⁴ What would his reaction be if he were to learn that this cult which claims to be his partisans accords more virtue to him than even the Ambiyā’ of Allah? His refutation of them will without a doubt be much more stern and severe. Some scholars are of the opinion that a person who holds ’Alī in higher esteem than Ibrāhīm or Muḥammad is steeped in more disbelief than the Jews and Christians.⁵

The books of the Shī‘ah report that when Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn was told, “You are a prophet,” he responded saying,

---

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/197. The author has documented many narrations of this sort (see: p. 847, 848 of this book wherein I shall present some narrations).
2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/137. This has been recorded with authentic chains of transmission (see: *al-Fatāwā* 28/475).
4 *Talkhīṣ al-Shāfī* 2/428; *‘An al-Shī‘ah wa Ahl al-Bayt* p. 52.
5 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/69.
Woe unto you! I am just a servant of Muḥammad.

Ibn Bābawayh explaining this statement says, “I.e. a servant in terms of loyalty, nothing more.”

It is very possible that this extremist stance which became the basis of the Twelver dogma is due to the influence of one of the ancient Shīʿī sects which alleged that ‘Alī is superior to Muḥammad. It was known as the ‘Albā’iyyah.

And according to me the doctrine of the infallibility of the Imāms led to the birth of this stance and many others. This is because they ascribe to the Imāms such attributes which none of the messengers and Ambiyā’ of Allah possess.

But when a person resorts to the Qur’ān he will not find any mention of the Twelve Imāms let alone them being more virtuous than the Ambiyā’. Just as he will notice that the Ambiyā’ due to their lofty rank are mentioned before the pious as in the verse:

فَأُولَٰئِكَ مَعَ الَّذِیْنَ أَنْعَمَ اللَّٰهُ عَلَیْهِم مِّنَ النَّبِیِّیْنَ وَالصِّدِّیْقِیْنَ وَالشُّهَدَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِیْنَ

They will be with the ones upon whom Allah has bestowed favour of the prophets, the steadfast affirmers of truth, the martyrs, and the righteous.

---

1 Ibn Bābawayh: al-Tawḥīd p. 174, 175; Bihār al-Anwār 8/283; al-Iḥtijāj (same pages as previous).
2 al-Tawḥīd p. 175.
3 ‘Albā’iyyah: the followers of al-‘Albā’ ibn Dhirā’ al-Dawsī or al-Asadī. He would give preference to ‘Alī over Nabī and he would make denigrating remarks regarding him saying that he was sent to invite people toward ‘Alī but he invited the people to himself (al-Milal wa al-Nihal 1/175; Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 571, the name therein is ‘Alyā’iyyah; Bihār al-Anwār 25/305).
Allah has mentioned four categories of the successful in this verse.\(^1\) And the Qur’ān in all its verses asserts the selection and nomination of the Ambiya’ over the entire world.\(^2\)

Likewise, the Muslims of the first three centuries unanimously concur that the Ambiya’ are superior to everyone. This consensus is evidence against the Shi’ah, especially because all the Imāms were from those times.\(^3\)

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

\[
اتفق سلف الأمة و أئمتها و سائر أولياء الله تعالى علي أن الأنبئاء أفضل من الأولياء الذين ليسوا أيها.
\]

The predecessors of the Ummah comprising of its scholars and saints all concur that the Ambiya’ are more virtuous than the pious who are not prophets.\(^4\)

Even reason clearly suggests that making obedience to a Nabī mandatory, appointing him as the sole commander, prohibitor and sovereign ruler, and appointing the Imām as his deputy and subject... cannot be understood without the superiority of the Nabī over the Imām. This phenomenon is true for every Nabī but not for every Imām. Therefore, an Imām can never be more virtuous than a Nabī. It is impossible.\(^5\)

Furthermore, in the books of the Shi’ah there are narrations which are in harmony with the text of the Qur’ān, the consensus of the Ummah, and reason. They debunk these heresies; the narration which al-Kulaynī narrates from Hishām al-Aḥwal, who narrates from Zayd ibn ‘Alī reads as follows:

---

\(^1\) Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 11/221.


\(^3\) Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqiʿ p. 186-187.

\(^4\) Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām 11/221.

The Ambiyā’ are better than the Imāms. Whoever, believes anything else is astray.¹

Likewise, Ibn Bābawayh has narrated from al-Ṣādiq that the Ambiyā’ are more beloved to Allah than ‘Alī.²

Lastly, there is no doubt regarding the falsehood of this stance; its falsehood can be identified by reason, the categorically established aspects of dīn, and history. There is no effort required to debunk it and it is one of the proofs of the corruptness of the Shīʿī dogma.

The miracles of the Imāms

The stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding miracles³ is that no one besides the Ambiyā’ have the capacity to produce them.⁴ As opposed to the Shīʿah who aver that one of the signs of an Imām is that he should be able to produce miracles. Because they believe that Imāmah is the continuation of prophet-hood.⁵ Hence

---

1 Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqiʿ p. 187.
2 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah p. 100.
3 Miracles are signs and evidences which no one has the ability to produce besides Allah and which Allah brings to being at the hands of his prophets in order to establish their truthfulness. Ibn Taymiyyah has mentioned that the word Muʿjizāt (miracles) does not exist in the Qurʾān and the Sunnah; only the words Āyah (sign), Bayyinah (evidence), and Burhān (proof) feature in them (al-Jawāb al-Ṣaḥīḥ 4/67). He further states that Muʿjizah literally refers to anything which is against the norm. According to the tradition of the early scholars like Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and others miracles were termed Āyāt (signs). However the later scholars make a distinction in the terms Muʿjizah and Karāmah; the former refers to the miracle of a prophet and the latter to the miracle of a saint although they both share the meaning of being against the norm. (See: Qāʿidah fi al-Muʿjizāt wa al-Karāmāt (published by al-Manār) p. 2; Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 11/311-312; Ibn Taymiyyah: al-Nubuwwāt; al-Jurjānī: al-Taʿrīfāt p. 282; Sharḥ al-ʿAqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah p. 495).
5 ‘Aqāʾid al-Imāmiyyah p. 94.
just as Allah selects who he intends for prophet-hood and aids him by way of miracles, likewise does he handpick who he wants for the station of Imāmah.¹

Their hadīth books are replete with traditions and tales pertaining to them. All they did is that they named the karāmāt (the miracles of saints) muʿjizāt (miracles of the prophets).

No doubt it is one of the principle beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah to believe in the miracles of saints and all the extraordinary events that materialised on their hands. This applies to miracles related to various types of knowledge, divine inspirations, different types of abilities, and ways of impacting others; as is narrated regarding the early nations in Sūrah al-Kahf and other sūrahs, and is reported regarding the Ṣaḥābah, their successors, and the people of the early generations. And miracles will always exist in this Ummah till the Day of Judgment.²

Naming the Karāmāt as Muʿjizāt is thus merely a difference of terminology. Therefore, Ibn Taymiyyah criticized the statement of Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, “and many muʿjizāt materialised on his hands,” with the following:

فَكَانَهُ يُسَمِّى كِرَامَاتَ الْأَوَلِيَّاءِ مِعْجَازَاتٍ وَهذَا اسْتِغْلَاكُ كَثِيرٌ مِنَ النَّاسِ فِي قَالَ عَلِيٌّ أَفْضَلُ مِنْ كَثِيرٍ مِنْهُ كِرَامَاتٍ مُتَوَابِراتٌ عَنْ كَثِيرٌ مِنْ عَوْامِ أَهَلِ السُّنَّةِ الذِّينَ يُفْضِلُونَ أُبَّا بَكْرٍ وَعُمْرَةٍ فَكَيْفَ لَكُمْ تُكُونُ كِرَامَاتٌ ثَابِتَةً لِعَلِيٍّ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ، وَلَيْسَ فِي مَجَالِدِكِرَامَاتٍ مَا يَدُلُّ عَلَى أَنْ أَفْضَلُ مِنْ غَيْرِهِ

It is as though he is naming the Karāmāt of the pious Muʿjizāt; this (the interchangeable nature of both the words) is the terminology of many people. It is thus said, “ʿAlī is superior to many a people who have Karāmāt. Karāmāt are authentically proven to have materialised at the hands of the commonality of the Ahl al-Sunnah who give preference to Abū Bakr and ʿUmar so why would there not be any Karāmāt reported from ʿAlī?” But mere Karāmāt cannot be the criterion for his superiority over others.³

¹ Aṣl al-Shīʿah wa ʿUsūluhā p. 58.
² Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Īslām 3/156.
³ Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/156.
Ibn Taymiyyah was of the view that the reason why the Shīʿah lend so much of importance to what they attribute to their Imāms is that they—because of their ignorance, oppression, and distance from the ways of the friends of Allah—do not experience any noteworthy miracles. Hence when they, because of their bankruptcy in this regard, hear of a miracle they extol it just as a pauper extols money and a famished person extols a piece of bread.\(^1\)

However, do the Shīʿah really consider these supernatural occurrences to be Karāmāt and merely call them Muʿjizāt?

A person who reflects over the Twelver dogma will learn that they have an entirely different stance in this regard; they assert that Muʿjizāt are indispensable to establish Imāmah and inculpate the creation. Because, as they allege, their Imāms are the evidence of Allah under the skies and above the earth.\(^2\)

In fact al-Kulaynī mentions:

إن الحجة ل تقوم لله علي خلقه إلا بإمام

The evidence of Allah cannot be established upon the creation but through an Imām.\(^3\)

There are multiple narrations of this nature. Hence, the Imāms are reported to have said:

فنحن حجج الله في عباده

We are the evidence of Allah upon his bondsmen.

And:

\(^1\) Ibid 4/196.
\(^2\) Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/192; al-Muẓaffar: ʿAlam al-Imām p. 43.
\(^3\) This a chapter in al-Kāfī which comprises of four narrations (Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/177).
If it was not for us Allah would not have been worshipped.\(^1\)

Another narration states:

The successors (Imāms) are the doors of Allah wherefrom he is approached; if it was not for them Allah would not have been recognised, and through them Allah established his evidence upon his creation.

Hence, al-Baḥrānī says in his book which he has written about the Muʿjizāt of the Imāms:

Muʿjizāt and proofs come to being on their hands because they are the evidence of Allah upon his creation.\(^2\)

From the aforementioned it is clear that they treat the Imāms like the Ambiyā’ and messengers of Allah through whose medium Allah establishes evidence upon the creation. Hence they also require Muʿjizāt to prove their selection for his mission just as the Ambiyā’ required.

Instead the Imāms have, in terms of their virtue, the obligation of obedience to them and the materialisation of Muʿjizāt procured the rank of the best of prophets and the greatest of them. Abū ʿAbd Allah says (as they allege):

I implement everything ʿAlī came with and I refrain from everything he prohibited. He enjoys the status of Muhammad ﷺ....

---

1 Ibid 1/193.

Likewise is the virtue of each successive Imām. They allege that Amīr al-Mu‘minin would often say:

لقد أعطيت خصال ما سبقني إلیها أحد قبلي، علمت المنایا و البلایا و الأنساب و فضل الخطاب، فلم
یفتني ما سبقني و لم یعزب عني ما غاب عني أبشر بإذن الله و أودي عنه کل ذلك مكنی فیه یعلمه

I have been bestowed with qualities which no one before me ever had. I have been taught the knowledge of death, difficulties, lineages, and the unmistakable judgment. Hence, what preceded me has not missed me and what is away from me is not unknown to me. I give glad tidings with the permission of Allah and I discharge all these matters on his behalf. He has given me a good grasp over them through His knowledge.¹

As you will notice, adhering to any of the Imāms is equivalent to adhering to Nabī or even more virtuous. Hence, Imām Ja‘far prefers adhering to ʿAlī rather than to Rasūl Allah according to them.² He then substantiates this by making mention of the miracles and qualities ʿAlī exclusively enjoyed apart from Rasūl Allah; he says, “I am the one who will send people to Heaven or Hell,” This is further emphasised by the statement, “I have been bestowed with qualities which no one before me ever had...” In this narration he confers upon ʿAlī the attributes of Allah when he says, “I have been taught the knowledge of death and difficulties...” Likewise when he says, “What has preceded me has not missed me and what is away from me is not unknown to me...” The being who nothing is hidden from and who is such that nothing can miss him is only Allah.

So in essence these are not miracles rather these are lies which deify the Imāms.

The Shī‘ah nonetheless aver that these miracles materialised on the hands of the Imāms in order to establish the evidence of Allah upon the creation and

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/196-197. There are many similar narrations all which feature in the chapter: Chapter regarding the Imāms being the foundation of the earth. (See: the section of infallibility in this book).
² We exonerate Ja‘far and all the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt from these heresies. If anyone believes that he can reach Allah without the medium of Nabī is a heretic and a disbeliever.
they are no ordinary miracles but they are Mu’jizāt like that of the Ambiyā’ or even greater. The author of Biḥār has established a chapter with the title Chapter regarding the Imāms having the ability to revive the dead, cure the congenitally blind and leapers, and the ability to produce all the Mu’jizāt of the prophets.”¹ Therein he brings multiple narrations. And therefore, their Shaykh al-Qazwīnī defines the miracles of the prophets like this:

ما كان خارقا للعادة أو صارفا للقدرة عند التحدي مع عدم المعارضة، والمطابقة للدعوي

Whatever is against the norm, incapacitates the abilities (of others) in a challenge, reigns supreme and is in harmony with the claim is a miracle.²

This definition also affirms the fact that these miracles are meant for challenges to validate the claims of the Imāms.

They have written voluminous books regarding the Mu’jizāt of their Imāms in a similar manner the Ahl al-Sunnah write books about the Mu’jizāt of Rasūl Allah H.³ Their narrations in this regard in fact elevate the Imāms from the realm

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 27/29-31.
2 Qalāʿīd al-Kharāʾīd p. 72.
3 E.g. the book: Ḥusayn ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb (of the fifth century): ʿUyūn al-Muʿjizāt this book has been published for the third time by the Aʿlamī institution for publications in the year 1403 A.H. hereunder are some of the miracles mentioned therein:

The Imāms revive the dead (p. 32), they can communicate with animals and the animals testify to their Imāmah (p. 17, 22, 25, 32), they tell the people about the knowledge of the past and the future (p. 57), and they can envisage all the actions of people through a pillar of light which is with them from the time they are born (p. 80), etc.

And the book of Hāshim al-Baḥrānī: Yanābīʿ al-Maʿājiz wa Uṣūl al-Dalāʾīl. In this book there are twenty one chapters; the title of the fifth chapter is ‘the Imāms have knowledge of what is in the heavens, what is in the earth, the knowledge of the past, the knowledge of the future, the knowledge of whatever happens during the day and the night, the knowledge of every moment, the knowledge of the prophets and much more (p. 35-42). The sixth chapter is: chapter regarding the Imāms having the ability to procure knowledge whenever they desire, regarding their hearts being the locus of the will of Allah and when Allah intends something they intend it as well (p. 43-46).
of humanity to the status of Allah، the one and only Creator.

Nonetheless, this cult has a unique obsession with narrating strange tales which at time seem as if they are the doings of magicians and tricksters and at time seem as if they are wild imaginations or weird dreams. They still then claim that this is the fundamental evidence for the establishment of Imāmah. Instead they have ascribed miracles to the followers of the Imāms which are equal in their magnanimity to that of the Imāms.¹

Someone might assume that these tales might have been long forgotten with the demise of the Imāms. It is rather the opposite; these miracles are renewed and reborn in the Shī‘ī world today, not only by reading them in gatherings and stupefying the brains. But they have taken a practical form which is represented in two ways:

---

Al-Baḥrānī has another book as well. It is probably the most extensive book on the subject. He has named it Madīnah al-Ma‘ājiz. Therein he mentions the miracles of each Imām separately. E.g. The first chapter is regarding the Mu‘jizāt of ʿAlī and it contains five hundred and fifty miracles. Some amongst them are: the miracles of his birth (p. 5), the communication of Allah with him (p. 9), his ascension to the heavens (p. 12), the communication of the earth with him (p. 16), and the communication of Shayṭān with him (p. 16). He also makes mention of many miracles which transpired before his death. One of them is that ʿAlī was present by the pharaoh of Egypt. Rasūl Allah Hūd thus said to him, “Allah Eaided the prophets with you discreetly and he aided me with you openly.”

In this manner he makes mention of the miracles of every Imām, even the fictitious ‘awaited’ Mahdī who does not have any existence. Some of his miracles are: he read the divine books at the time of his birth and he ascended to throne of Allah, etc. He goes on to mention such incidents which a sane person cannot fathom. They make one wonder as to what extent their scholars have gone in exploiting and beguiling the masses. And makes one wonder as to how gullible people actually are to follow such fallacies.

¹ Ḥusayn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb: ʿUyūn al-Mu‘jizāt P. 101: Al-Kāẓim attests that Rashīd al-Hajarī has knowledge of death. And in Rijāl al-Kashshī it is mentioned that he would meet a person and tell him, “You are going like this and you are going to be killed like this. And that person would die as he would say.” (Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 76).
1. In the miracles which they ascribe and attribute to the ‘awaited’ Mahdī which a group of his close associates narrate from him. For example, Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī at one occasion borrowed a very voluminous book from a person who when lending it to him only allowed him to use it for a night. He says that the Mahdī came to his aid and wrote the entire book for him in one night.\(^1\) The miraculous incidents which they claim transpired through the intervention of the Mahdī are numerous. Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī has mentioned a good amount of them in his book *Jannat al-Ma’wā*. Hence, till today as they allege many miracles occur through the medium of the Mahdī which he causes to materialise on the hands of the scholars of the Shi‘ah.

2. In the miracles which they claim transpire at the graves of the Imāms thereby misguiding their people from the straight path and inducing them to indulge in polytheism. Al-Majlisī has established many chapters in his *Biḥār* discussing these miracles, e.g. the twenty ninth chapter: *the Mu’jizāt and Karāmāt that transpired at the sacred grave*,\(^2\) and the fiftieth chapter: *the desecration of his grave by the rulers and the miracles that transpired from it, its sand, and when visiting it*.\(^3\) He goes on, in this manner, mentioning the alleged miracles of every Imām. In this regard as well they have compiled many books.\(^4\)

These tales tell us of the miracles that occurred at the tombs of the Imāms. Al-Majlisī has cited many of them in separate chapters which he has established for every Imām. In them he brings fictitious stories that leave one wondering at the extent to which these people love fables which have found a path to their hearts very easily.

---

1. The details have passed on page 461 of this book.
3. Ibid 45/390.
4. E.g. Muḥammad ‘Alī al-Baldāwī: *al-Mu’jizāt*. In this book he has compiled all the ‘miracles’ which he alleges transpired at the graves of the Kāẓimīs and the ‘Askarīs (See: *al-Dhari‘ah* 21/215).
Stories that speak of incurable diseases being cured. One such story says that the vision of a blind person was restored just by him visiting the tomb of an Imām.\(^1\) They also speak of animals who came to the graves of the Imāms to ask them for cure. Hence, a narration makes mention of an animal which was rolling in the sand near the grave asking for cure after which it was cured.\(^2\)

Instead they have allegedly attributed to the Imāms (whilst they are enclosed in their graves) the ability of doing the actions and transactions of the living. Hence, it is mentioned that if trusts are entrusted to the inmate of the grave he will safeguard it.\(^3\)

Seemingly, the fabricator of these fables was not content with the money that he collected from the ignorant people who lavishly spent at the graves of the Imāms and thus he tried to get more out of them through stealing and deception.

Likewise, the grave can be addressed and it will respond. A narration mentions that one of the visitors of the grave tore his shawl and said that he wanted its compensation only from the inmate of the grave. Subsequently his wish was fulfilled.\(^4\)

All of these incidents are presented in a style of narratives in order to affect the hearts of the riffraff and the commonality. They are contained in long tales which in essence conclude in ascribing partners with Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَ, stupefying the brains, shunning intellect, and preventing a person from doing virtuous deeds. At times they can lead a person to disbelief and complete renouncement of Īmān if he believes them to be logically necessary.

Ja`far al-Ṣādiq found many of the exaggerations the people of Kūfah attributed to him to be reprehensible. Hence, he says:

---

1 \textit{Biḥār al-Anwār} 42/317.
2 Ibid 42/312.
3 Ibid 42/318.
4 Ibid 42/316.
و لله لو أقررت بما يقول في أهل الكوفة لأخذتني الأرض، وما أنا إلا عبد مملوك لا أقدر علي شيء
بضرولا بنفع

If I were to concede the claims of the people of Kūfah the earth would swallow me. I am not but a servant who belongs to Allah; I do not have the capacity to give benefit nor inflict harm.¹

It is very likely that these exaggerated claims regarding the Imāms which have raised the Imāms to the status of Allah and which they call Mu’jizāt are inherited from the Zoroastrians who disguise themselves as partisans of the Ahl al-Bayt in order to conspire against Islam, or in order to introduce their beliefs into the dīn with the name of Islam. This is because the Zoroastrians attribute more miracles to Zarādasht then the Christians did to Ḥūṣain.²

As for their claim that their Imāms are the evidence of Allah upon his creation without whom the creation cannot be inculpated and thus miracles transpired on their hands, this is a claim for which if you were to search for any shred of evidence in the Qur’ān you will not find any. Instead you will find the complete opposite, i.e. the proof of Allah was established upon his creation through his messengers and prophets. Allah says:

بَعْدَ الرُّسُلِ لِئَلاَّ یَكُوْنَ لِلنَّاسِ عَلَى اللّٰهِ حُجَّةٌ

So that mankind will have no argument against Allah after the messengers.³

It is therefore clear that all these claims are pure fabrications.

As for the miracles which they attribute to the graves of the Imāms and to the ‘awaited’ hidden Mahdi, they are also lies and fabrications which stem from the evil inspirations of Shayṭān. Because the ‘hidden’ Imām does not have any

1 Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl 3/332.
2 Tathbīt Dalā’il al-Nubuwwah 1/185.
3 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 165.
existence, as many sects among the Shīʿah confirm and as is documented by
the scholars of lineage and history, except of course in the imagination of the
Shīʿah. The miracles of the graves and the tombs are the invitations of the devil to
ascribing partners with Allah, for these are dead people who have reached what
they had sent forth and who do not possess for themselves any harm or benefit.
And they would whilst they were alive resort to Allah and negate all strength and
ability from themselves.

The books of the Shīʿah have also cited many narrations of this sort. Allah
instructs his Nabī to say:

قُل لَّ أَمْلِكُ لِنَفْسِي نَفْعًا وَلَ ضَرًّا إِلَّا مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ
Say, “I hold not for myself [the power of] benefit or harm, except what
Allah has willed.”

And:

قُل لَّ أَمْلِكُ لِنَفْسِي ضَرًّا وَلَ نَفْعًا إِلَّا مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ
Say, “I possess not for myself any harm or benefit except what Allah should
will.”

And:

قُل لَّ أَقُولُ لَكُمْ عِندِيْ خَزَائِنُ اللَّهِ وَلَ أَعْلَمُ الْغَيْبَ
Say, [O Muḥammad], “I do not tell you that I have the depositories
[containing the provision] of Allah or that I know the unseen.”

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 188.
2 Sūrah Yūnus: 49.
3 Sūrah al-Anʿām: 50.
And:

قُلْ سُبْحَانَ رَبِّيْ هَلْ کُنتُ إِلَّ بَشَرًا رَّسُوْل

Say, “Exalted is my Lord! Was I ever but a human messenger?”¹

And:

قُلْ إِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ مِّثْلُكُمْ

Say, “I am only a man like you.”²

This is the condition of the Messenger of guidance, the Seal of the Prophets, and the Master of the first and the last; then what would the condition of those inferior to him be?

Belief in the Last Day

Related to this fundamental belief they have many reprehensive views and many innovations. They have interpreted the verses of the Qur’ān pertaining to the hereafter with the Rajʿah (the return of ‘Alī). This is a very cunning ploy which the fabricators have used in order to deny the Day of Judgement completely. The minimal effect that this would have upon the Shīʿah is that it would divert their hearts from that Day or at least eradicate therefrom the horrors thereof. This is due to the fact that they read every verse related to the Day of Judgment understanding it be regarding Rajʿah as is asserted by their scholars.

One of their innovations in this regard is that they aver that the affairs of the afterlife are under the jurisdiction of the Imāms. The author of al-Kāfī mentions:

1 Sūrah al-Isrā’: 93.
2 Sūrah al-Kahf: 110.
The afterlife belongs to the Imām. He can place it wherever he desires and give it over to whomsoever he wishes. The permission for this is given to him by Allah.¹

Why does the Imām have full control of the afterlife? This is a subsidiary belief of their conception of Jannah and Jahannam. For they say:

لولا الأئمة ما خلقت الجنة و النار

If there were no Imāms Jannah and Jahannam would not have been created.²

And:

إن الله خلق الجنة من نور الحسين

Allah created Jannah from the light of Ḥusayn.³

Their scholar al-Baḥrānī has established a chapter related to this topic with the aforementioned as the title.⁴

At times they even assert that Jannah is the dowry of Fāṭimah which she received upon her marriage to ʿAlī.

I do not know how Jannah can be her dowry if it was created from the light of her son. For it is the default ruling of marriage that the dowry should be given in advance.

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/409.
² Ibn Bābawayh says, “It is compulsory to believe that if it was not for them Allah would not have created the heavens, the earth, Jannah, Jahannam, Ādam, Ḥawwā’, the angels, or any of his other creations (Al-Iʿtiqādāt p. 106-107).
Al-Ṭūsī has narrated the following from Abū Baṣīr that Abū ʿAbd Allah al-Ṣādiq said:

إن الله تعالى أمهر فاطمة رضي الله عنها ربع الدنيا فربعها لها، و أمهرها الجنة و النار، تدخل أعداءها النار و تدخل أولئها الجنة

Allah gave Fāṭimah a quarter of the world as dowry hence it belongs to her. He likewise gave her Jannah and Jahannam as part of her dowry. Her enemies will enter Jahannam and her partisans will enter Jannah.¹

The author of Maʿālim al-Zulfā has actually established a chapter with the title, Chapter four regarding Jannah being in the dowry of Fāṭimah,² i.e. being part of her dowry.

Furthermore, the Imāms enjoy the benefits of this dowry in the world, hence they say that the Imāms eat from the bounties of Jannah in this world. Al-Baḥrānī in establishing this aspect establishes a chapter by the name, Chapter regarding no one having the honour of eating the food of Jannah in this world besides a Nabī and the successor of a Nabī. In this chapter he cites various narrations from their reliable sources which suggest that the fruits, pomegranates, and trays of Jannah—which are laden with food—come down upon the Imāms from Jannah wherefrom they eat. All of this is presented in lengthy stories.

They, in their claim that only a Nabī or his successor is privileged with eating the food of Jannah, forgot to add ‘the daughter of a Nabī’ thereby depriving Fāṭimah of her dowry and from the bounties which were created from the light of her son. Because she admittedly is not from amongst the successors. Ostensibly, they did not include her, fearing that the daughters of the other Ambiyā’—who do not deserve any respect in the Shīʿī dogma—would also be included.

1 Ibid p. 350
2 Ibid 317-319.
Due to the fact that the afterlife according to this denomination belongs to the Imāms in the ways mentioned above, they have tainted all the events of the afterlife with exaggerated tales regarding their Imāms. Hence, they say that the Imāms are present at the time of a person’s death. Al-Majlisī, under the discussion of the beliefs of his sect mentions:

It is mandatory to believe that Nabī Muhammad ( sarcast none ) and the Twelve Imāms are present at the departing moments of the pious, the impious, the believers, and the disbelievers. They thus help the believers in the pangs of death and its difficulties. And they intensify the agony of the hypocrites and the haters of the Ahl al-Bayt. It is not permissible to delve into the manner of their appearance; they either appear in their physical bodies or in abstract ones or without any of them.¹

And when the deceased is placed in the grave some sand from the grave of Ḥusayn is placed with him therein due to it being a source of security according to them. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has established a chapter titled, Chapter regarding the desirability of putting the sand of Ḥusayn in the camphor, the winning sheet, and the grave.² The author of Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil has likewise dedicated a chapter to this topic with the same title.³ Therein he mentions that one of the advices that they dispense in this regard is that the sand of the grave of Ḥusayn should be placed with the deceased in his grave for it has been reported to be a source of safety.⁴ They have many other traditions in this regard.⁵

---

¹ Al-Iʿtiqādāt p. 93-94.
² Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 2/742.
³ Mustadrak al- Wasāʾil 1/106.
⁴ Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil 1/106.
The assignment of Obligations, as they allege, the elevation of stages and the doing of good deeds all are possible for a deceased whilst he is in his grave. Al-Kulaynī in his al-Kāfī narrates the following from Ḥafṣ:

 سمعت موسى بن جعفر يقول لرجل أحب البقاء في الدنيا؟ قال نعم، فقال: ولم؟ قال: لقراءة قل هو الله أحد. فسكت عنه فقال له بعد ساعة: يا حفص من مات من أولياءنا وشيعتنا ولم يحسن القرآن علم في قبره ليرفع الله به من درجته، فإن درجات الجنة علي قدر آيات القرآن.

I heard Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar asking a man, “Should a person love staying in this world?”

The man replied, “Yes.”

He asked him why and the man replied, “In order to recite Surah al-Ikhlāṣ.”

Thereafter Mūsā remained silent for a while and then said, “O Ḥafṣ! Whoever dies from amongst our friends and partisans without perfecting the recitation of the Qur’ān is inspired with its recitation in the grave so that Allah raises his ranks. For the ranks of Jannah are proportionate to the amount of verses a person knows of the Qur’ān.”

This narration suggests that a Shīʿī is taught the Qur’ān in the grave which he continues to read thereby accruing rewards even after his death. This is yet another belief which is exclusive to them. Can this not be considered a ploy against the memorisation and the preservation of the Qur’ān because of it making people anticipate its acquisition in the grave?

Furthermore, the first question that a person will be asked in the grave is with regards to his love and veneration of the Twelve Imāms. They claim:

أول ما يسأل عنه العبد حقنا أهل البيت

The first question a servant will be asked is regarding his love for us the Ahl al-Bayt.

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/606; al-Maʿālim al-Zulfā p. 133.
The angels will thus ask him:

من يعتقد من الأئمة واحدا بعد واحد، فإن لم يجب عن واحد منهم يضربانه بعمود من نار يمتلئ قبره
نارا إلي يوم القيامة

About each Imām that he believed in one after the other. If he does not respond regarding any one of them he will be beaten with a pillar of fire which will fill his grave with fire till the Day of Judgment.¹

However:

إذا كان في حياته معتقدا بهم فإنه يستطيع الرد علي أسئلتهم و يكون في رغد إلي يوم الحشر

If he believed in them whilst he was living he will easily be able to answer the questions of the angels due to which he will remain in comfort till the Day of Judgment.²

They also believe in a resurrection after death which no one else besides them concedes. Al-Majlisī says the following in his Iʿtiqādāt:

یحشر الله تعالى في زمن القائم أو قبيله جماعة من المؤمنين لتقر أعينهم برؤية أئمتهم ودولتهم، وجماعة من الكافرين والمخالفين للانتقام عاجلا في الدنيا

In the era of the ‘Mahdī’ Allah will resurrect a group of believers so that they may be blessed with the seeing of their Imāms and their rule. He will also resurrect a group of disbelievers and enemies in order to punish them in advance in this world.³

As for their belief regarding the actual resurrection which will ensue on the Day of Judgment, they have many eerie views. One of their narrations suggest that on

¹ Al-Iʿtiqādāt p. 95.
³ Al-Iʿtiqādāt p. 98.
the Day of Judgment the resurrection will not include everyone as is the belief of
the Muslims. Instead there will be groups who will be saved from resurrection
on that day and from its horrors. They will not have to stand for accountability
before Allah, nor will they have to cross the bridge of Ŝirāṭ. They will enter Jannah
from their graves directly.

This group is the people of Qum, as their narrations suggest:

إن أهل مدينة قد يحااسبون في حفرهم و يحشرون من حفرهم إلى الجنة

The people of Qum will be held accountable for their deeds in their graves
and will be sent from their graves to Jannah directly.¹

Not only that, there is a door in Jannah which is reserved for the people of Qum
as they allege. Abū al-Hasan al-Riḍā says:

إن للجنة ثمانية أبواب، و لأهل قم واحد منها فطوبي لهم فطوبي

Verily Jannah has eight doors. One door from them will be exclusive to the
people of Qum. How very fortunate are they.²

And:

ходят خيار شيعتنا من بين سائر البلاد خمر الله تعالى ولاينا في طينتهم

They are the best of our partisans in all the cities. Allah has made allegiance
to our household part of their nature.³

ʿAbbās al-Qummī, one of their contemporary scholars, states:

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 60/ 218; ʿAbbās al-Qummī: al-Kunā wa al-Alqāb 3/71.
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 60/215; Safīnah al-Biḥār 1/446.
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 60/216.
Many narrations have been narrated from the Ahl al-Bayt regarding the virtues of Qum and its people. One of them being that a door of Jannah has been opened for them.\(^1\)

They have mentioned many more exclusive merits which Qum enjoys.\(^2\) They have gone to the extent of inducing people to purchase its land. They deceived them by telling them that the space of land covered by a horse is worth a thousand Dirhams.\(^3\) Hence they tried to influence the people spiritually and materialistically, and possibly there might be some political agenda as well behind the city, for Qum was the capital of Safawid Iran. Not forgetting the heinous habit this cult has to spread disbelief, free thinking, and distancing the Shī‘ah from the dīn of Islām. It is very possible that they are assisted in doing so by the devils from amongst the Jinn which is nothing extraordinary. Because it is possible for them to appear in the garb of the ‘hidden Mahdi’ and include into their creed whatever they desire.

One of their contemporary scholars has increased the number of the doors of Jannah through which the people of Qum will be granted entry. He mentions that a report from al-Riḍā states the following:

\[
\text{للملطة ثمانية أبواب فثلاثة منها لأهل قم}
\]

Jannah has eight doors, three of them are reserved for the people of Qum.\(^4\)

They have, furthermore, ascribed full authority over the bridge of Širāṭ, the scale of deeds, Jannah, and Jahannam to the Imāms. Abū ‘Abd Allah is reported to have said:

---

1 Al-Kunā wa al-Alqāb 3/7.
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 60/212-221.
3 Ibid. 60/215.
The issues of the Ṣirāṭ, the issues of the scale and the issues of accountability are all under our jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{1}

Al-Ḥur al-ʿĀmilī has gone on to mention that part of their fundamental beliefs regarding the Imāms is that the accountability of the entire creation will be under their jurisdiction on the Day of Judgment.\textsuperscript{2}

There are likewise many narrations which state that no one will be able to cross the bridge of Ṣirāṭ but if he was aligned to ʿAlī\textsuperscript{3} or due to a pass which will contain the mention of allegiance to him\textsuperscript{4} or with a letter wherein emancipation will be assured due to his allegiance.\textsuperscript{5}

Ibn Bābawayh in his book \textit{Al-Iʿtiqādāt} has mentioned the following under the chapter regarding the Ṣirāṭ:

و الصراط في وجه آخر اسم حجج الله قم نعرفهم في الدنيا و أطاعهم أعطاهم الله جوازا علي الصراط الذي هو جسر جهنم يوم القيامة...قال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لعلي: يا علي إذا كان يوم القيامة أقعد أنا و أنت و جبران علي الصراط فلا بجوز علي الصراط إلا من كانت معه براءة بوليتة

The Ṣirāṭ in other terms is a name for the evidences of Allah, hence whoever acknowledged them in this world and obeyed them Allah will grant him the ability to cross over it on the Day of Judgment. \textit{Nabī}, said to ʿAlī, “O ʿAlī on the Day of Judgement I with you and Jibrīl will sit upon the Ṣirāṭ. Hence besides the one who has the certificate of emancipation due to his allegiance to you, no one will be able to cross the Ṣirāṭ.”\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{Rijāl al-Kashshī} p. 337.
\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah} fi \textit{Uṣūl al-Aʿimmah}: p. 171.
\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Al-Maʿālim al-Zulfā} p. 239.
\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Biḥār al-Anwār} 8/68; \textit{al-Burhān} 4/17.
\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Biḥār al-Anwār} 8/66.
\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Al-Iʿtiqādāt} p. 95.
He also states that there will be an incline by the bridge whose name is Wilāyah:

یوقف جمیع الخلائق عندها فیسألون عن ولایة امیر المؤمنین و الأئمة من بعده فمن أتى بها نجا و جاوز
و من لم یأت بها بقي

The entire creation will be stopped there and asked regarding their allegiance to ‘Alī; whoever concedes it will gain salvation and whoever does not will remain behind.¹

Al-Majliṣī has established a chapter titled, *Chapter regarding him being a partner in Jannah, Jahannam, and in the crossing of the Bridge.*² Al-Baḥrānī has likewise established a similar chapter.³ They have in these chapters quoted the narrations of their leading scholars and reliable books.

The actual meaning of ‘Alī being a partner in Jannah and Jahannam is not shared but with the elite. This is because Ma’mūn (the Abbasid Ruler) once asked al-Riḍā about ‘Alī being a partner in Jannah and Jahannam to which he replied by saying that love for ‘Alī is īmān and hatred for him is disbelief making him thus a partner in them. But when Abū al-Ṣalt al-Harawī meets al-Riḍā and asks him:

 إنما كلمت من حیث هو ولقد سمعت أبي يحدث عن علي رضي الله عنه أنه قال: قال لي رسول الله صلي الله علیه وآله یا علي أنت قسیم الجنة و النار یوم القیامة تقول للنار هذا لي و هذا لك

I just responded to him according to his position. I heard my father narrating from his forefathers who narrate from ‘Alī that he said, “Rasūl Allah said to me, ‘O ‘Alī you are the one who will send people to Jannah and Jahannam; you will say to Jahannam, “This is for me and that is for you.”⁴

¹ Ibid. p. 96.
² *Bihār al-Anwār* 39/193.
³ *Al-Maʿālim al-Zulfā* p. 167.
⁴ ‘Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā p. 239; *Bihār al-Anwār* 39/194.
They also assert that he is the owner of Jannah and Jahannam. Their narrations mention:

إذا كان يوم القيامة وضع منبر يراه الخلق يصعده رجل يقوم ملك من يمينه وملك عن شماله، ينادي
الذي عن يساره: يا معشر الخلق هذا عليبن أبي طالب صاحب النار يدخلها النار

When the Day of Judgment will come a pulpit which the entire creation will be able to see will be placed. A man will ascend it, on his right will be an angel and on his left will be an angel. The one on his right will announce, “O creation this is ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib the owner of Jannah. He will admit therein whoever he desires.” The one on his left will announce, “O creation! This is ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib the owner of Jahannam. He will enter therein whoever he desires.”¹

They have, in addition, went on to believe that he will be the one responsible for taking people to task on the Day of Judgment. Mufaḍḍal ibn ʿUmar al-Juʿfī states that he heard Abū ʿAbd Allah saying:

إن أمير المؤمنين علي بن أبي طالب لديان الناس يوم القيامة

Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib will be the questioner of the people on the Day of Judgment.²

And this Jannah that the Shīʿah talk of is exclusive for them; no one will share it with them as it belongs to their Imāms. Likewise, the keys of Jahannam, which is in place for their enemies, are in the possession of the Imāms. They say:

إنما خلقت الجنة لأهل البيت والنار لمن عاداهم

Jannah has been created for the Ahl al-Bayt and Jahannam has been created for their enemies.³

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 39/200; Baṣāʿīr al-Darajāt 122.
² Refer to the above to references and: Tafsīr al-Furāt p. 13.
³ Al-Maʿālim al-Zulfā p. 251.
They at times surprisingly forget these narrations and assert the following:

الشیعة یدخلون الجنة قبل سائر الناس من الأمم بثمانین عاما

The Shīʿah will enter Jannah eighty years before the rest of the people.¹

The following belief is also part of their primary beliefs:

أن الناس یدعون بأسماء امهاتهم يوم القیامة إل الشیعة فیدعون بأسماء آبائهم

The people will be summoned with their mothers’ names on the Day of Judgment besides the Shīʿah, for they will be called with their fathers’ names.²

Furthermore, they believe in a Jannah other than the everlasting Jannah of the hereafter which they name the Jannah of this world. Likewise in a Jahannam other than the Jahannam of the hereafter. Al-Majlisī says:

ویجب أن یعتقد أن لله تعالي في الدنیا جنة ونارا سوي جنة الخلد ونار الخلد

It is compulsory to believe that there exists in this world a heaven and hell different than the everlasting ones of the hereafter.³

Hence, the inmates of the grave go to them. According al-Majlisī:

بعد السؤال وضغطة القبر ینتقلون إلي أجسادهم المثالیة فقد یكونون علي قبورهم ویطلعون علي زوارهم

وینتقلون إلي نجف

3 Al-Iʿtiqādāt p. 98: They say that this is the Jannah wherein Ādam was kept. Ibn Taymiyyah says, “According to the Ahl al-Sunnah unanimously the Jannah wherein Ādam and his wife were kept is the everlasting Jannah of the hereafter. Whoever claims that it was a Jannah in this world is either a philosopher, a heretic, or an innovator. For only they subscribe to this view.” (al-Fatāwā 4/347).
After the questioning and the severe grip of the grave they will go into their abstract bodies. They will then both remain at their graves and see their visitors or they proceed to Najf.¹

Their claims related to this topic are too copious to be enumerated, excessive and reprehensible innovations, what I have cited is just a glimpse of what they believe. If I were to present all their narrations and comment upon them I would require many pages.

Nonetheless, these are all innovations which cannot be substantiated from the Qur'ān. Nor is there any mention of them or any trace of them in the books of Ummah. In exposing their duplicate nature and knowing the falsehood that is contained within them it is sufficient to merely present them. They have in essence made the hereafter the exclusive ownership of the Imāms. Whereas Allah says:

فَلِلّٰهِ الأْٰخِرَةُ وَالأُْوْلٰی

Rather, to Allah belongs the Hereafter and the first [life].²

Their claims in this regard are very similar to the claims the Jews would make regarding the hereafter. Allah says:

قُلْ إِنْ کَانَتْ لَكُمُ الدَّارُ الأٰخِرَةُ عِنْدَ اللهِ خَالِصَةً مِّنْ دُوْنِ النَّاسِ فَتَمَنَّوُا الْمَوْتَ إِنْ کُنْتُمْ صَادِقِیْنَ بِالظَّالِمِیْنَ وَلَنْ یَّتَمَنَّوْهُ أَبَدًا بِمَا قَدَّمَتْ أَیْدِیهِمْ وَاللّٰهُ عَلِیْمٌ

Say, “If the home of the Hereafter with Allah is for you alone and not the [other] people, then wish for death, if you should be truthful.” But never will they wish for it, ever, because of what their hands have put forth. And Allah is knowing of the wrongdoers.³

¹ Al-Iʿtiqādāt p. 97. I.e. Najf is Jannah.
² Sūrah al-Najm: 25.
³ Sūrah al-Baqarah: 94-95.
They have similarly ascribed to the Imāms all jurisdiction on the Day of Judgement, whereas Allah says:

لَهُ الْحَمْدُ فِي الأُولِيَّةِ وَالْآخِرَةِ وَلَهُ الْحُكْمُ وَإِلَیْهِ تُرْجَعُوْنَ

To Him is [due all] praise in the first [life] and the Hereafter. And His is the [final] decision, and to Him you will be returned.¹

They also claim that Jannah belongs to the Imāms like the Jews:

وَقَالُوْا لَنْ یَدْخُلَ الْجَنَّةَ إِلَّا مَنْ کَانَ هُوْدًا أَوْ نَصَارَى تِلْکَ أَمَانِیُّهُمْ قُلْ هَاتُوْا بُرْهَانَكُمْ إِنْ کُنتُمْ صَادِقِیْنَ

And they said, “None will enter Paradise except one who is a Jew or a Christian.” That is [merely] their wishful thinking. Say, “Produce your proof, if you should be truthful.” Yes, [on the contrary], whoever submits his face [i.e. self] in Islam to Allah while being a doer of good will have his reward with his Lord. And no fear will there be concerning them, nor will they grieve.²

We say to the Shīʿah regarding the claims that have passed:

هَاتُوْا بُرْهَانَكُمْ إِنْ کُنتُمْ صَادِقِیْنَ

Produce your proof, if you should be truthful.

Instead, you are humans like the rest of humanity. And your claims are weak, malicious and heretic. Before us is the Book of Allah which does not leave any way for these wild assumptions to enter the hearts of those who resort to it and make it their guide.

---

1 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 70.
2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 111-112.
As for the one whose heart is blocked, who becomes arrogant about his evil when it is brought to his notice and whose thoughts are blinded due to his fanaticism, he will face the consequences:

وَاتَّقُوْا یَوْمًا لَّ تَجْزِيْ نَفْسٌ عَنْ نَّفْسٍ شَیْئًا وَّلَ یُقْبَلُ مِنْهَا عَدْلٌ وَّلَ تَنفَعُهَا شَفَاعَةٌ وَّلَ هُمْ یُنصَرُوْنَ

And fear a Day when no soul will suffice for another soul at all, and no compensation will be accepted from it, nor will any intercession benefit it, nor will they be aided.¹

Their Belief in Pre-destiny

Ibn Taymiyyah states:

قدماة الشيعة كانوا متفقين علي إثبات القدر وإنما شاع فيهم نفي القدر من حين اتصلوا بالمعتزلة

The early Shīʿah unanimously believed in pre-destiny. The denial thereof only prevailed among them when they associated with the Muʿtazilah.²

This was during the latter portion of the third century. Its denial increased even more in the fourth century with the works of al-Mufīd and his followers.³

All the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt likewise are reported to have unanimously believed in pre-destiny.⁴

Al-Ashʿarī explains that the Shīʿah in terms of their belief regarding the actions of men are divided into three sects:

1. A sect that believes that the actions of men are created by Allah.

---

¹ Sūrah al-Baqarah: 123.
² Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/29.
³ Ibid. 1/229.
⁴ Ibid. 2/29.
2. A sect that believes that they are not his creation

3. A sect that has chosen the middle path, i.e. the stance that there is no coercion upon men in their actions (as al-Jahmī and others believed) nor is there complete free will (which is the view of the Muʿtazilah).

This is, as they allege, what is narrated from the Imāms. This sect has, however, not taken up the task of clarifying its stance regarding the actions of men, are they created or not?¹

Ibn Taymiyyah has considered the last sect to be unsure in this regard whilst considering the first one to be positive and the second negative.²

The author of *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* has not mentioned anything much in this regard besides the fact that a servant according to the Shīʿah creates his own actions.³

This is what the references of the Ahl al-Sunnah say. After accessing the books of the Shīʿah the following is understood:

Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, who is known as al-Ṣadūq, documents the following is his ‘ʿAqāʾid (which the Shīʿah treat as a seminal work which represents their beliefs and is famous by the name: ‘ʿAqāʾid al-Ṣadūq):

اعتقادنا في أفعال العباد أنها مخلوقة خلق تقدر ل خلق تكوين ومعني ذلك أن له يزل الله عالما بمقاديرها

Our belief regarding the actions of men is that they are created in pre-destiny, but not physically. Which means that Allah always had knowledge of them.⁴

---

¹ *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/114, 115.
² *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/386.
³ *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* p. 90.
⁴ *ʿAqāʾid al-Ṣadūq* p. 75.
This statement only establishes the knowledge of Allah about the actions of men. It does not establish his general and all-encompassing will and thus does not prove that he is the creator of the action of men. Moreover al-Mufid has followed this text with the following:

The correct view regarding the Ahl al-Bayt is that they believed that the actions of men are not created by Allah, and what is narrated from Abū ʿAbd Allah is discarded, has a flawed chain of transmission, and is opposed by many authentic narrations. Nowhere in the Arabic language does the word ‘knowledge’ appear in the meaning of creation.\(^1\)

He further states:

When Abū al-Ḥasan was asked about the actions of men being created by Allah he responded by saying, “If he did created them he would not have exonerated himself from them whereas he has said, ‘Allah and His Messenger are free from the polytheists.’” Of course he does not intend exonerating himself from their creation, rather from their polytheism and evil.\(^2\)

The outlandish nature of this substantiation which al-Mufid has ascribed to al-Riḍā is quite evident. For the exoneration of Allah from the polytheists due to his dislike for their actions does not necessarily negate his all-encompassing ability to create. Allah says:

---

1 Sharḥ ’Aqāʾid al-Ṣadūq p. 12.  
But if Allah had willed, they would not have associated.¹

In addition, some of their narrations are in harmony with the truth and deny the aforementioned stance. Hence, they say:

ما خلا الله فهو مخلوق والله خالق كل شيء

Everything besides Allah is the creation and Allah is the creator of everything.²

Furthermore, although al-Mufid is a proponent of the view that men are the creators of their own actions, however, he does not find the expression very pleasant. Hence he says:

أقول إن الخلق يفعلون ويحدثون ويختارون ويصنعون ولكنهم لا أطلق عليهم بأنهم خالقون ولا هم خالقون ولا أتعدي ذكر ذلك فيما ذكره الله تعالى ولا أتجاوز به مواضعه من القرآن وعلي هذا القول إجماع الإمامية والزيدية والبغداديين من المعتزلة و أکثر المرجئة و أصحاب الحديث

I say that the creation does, invents, innovates, makes and earns. I, however, do not assert that they create or that they are creators. And I do not digress from the expression Allah has used in the Qur’ān. The Imāmiyyah, Zaydiyyah, the Muʿtazilah of Baghdad, the Murjiʿah and most of the followers of hādith are unanimous in this regard. The Muʿtazilah of Baṣrah have defected from the majority by using the expression of creation for men.³

So he abides by the approach of the Qur’ān. Because the Qur’ān has called men ‘doers’ and ‘agents’ but not ‘creators’. However, the aforementioned consensus

---

1 Al-An‘ām: 107.
2 Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah p. 35.
3 Awā’il al-Maqālāt p. 25.
of the Shīʿah did not last due to some of their scholars adopting the view of the
Muʿtazilah of Baṣrah and using the expression of creation.1 And the nominal
difference which existed between the Shīʿah and the Muʿtazilah of Baṣrah fell
away due to the stances of some of their leading scholars.

Hence, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī (d. 1104 A.H. the author of Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah,) in discussing
the principle beliefs of their Imāms establishes a chapter by the title, Chapter
regarding Allah being the creator of everything besides the actions of men.2 Therein
he says:

أقول مذهب الإمامیة و المعتزلة أن أفعال العباد صادرة عنهم وهم خالقون لها

I say that the stance of the Imāmiyyah and the Muʿtazilah is that the actions
of men emit from them and they are the creators thereof.3

1 They say that once Abū al-Ḥasan was asked, “Is there any other creator besides Allah, the
Magnificent?” He replied by saying, “Allah says, ‘Blessed is Allah, the Best of Creators.’” (Al-Muʿminūn:
14). Hence, amongst his servants there are creators and those who do not create; one among them is
ʿĪsā who could create from soil a bird. (al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah p. 81).
This type of interpretation is attributed to some of the early scholars as well. Hence Ibn Jurayj is
reported to have said, “Allah said ‘creators’, in its plural form, because ʿĪsā could also
create as he said, “I create for you from soil...” Allah therefore informs us regarding Himself
that He is the Best of Creators (Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 12/11; Tafsīr al-Baghwī 3/304). But ʿĪsā did not
create by himself but with the permission of Allah. Hence there is no supreme creator with Allah.
Therefore the scholars have mentioned, “Creation in the verse means destining as the Arabic language
suggests. Or as Mujāhid has said, “They make and Allah makes and Allah is the Best of Makers (Tafsīr
al-Baghwī 3/304). After citing the statements of both Ibn Jurayj and Mujāhid, Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī
concludes thus, “The statement of Mujāhid is closer to the truth because the Arabs call every maker
a creator (Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 12/11). The issue of the Shīʿah is not only in the use of an expression which
has a meaning other than creation; but in their stance that a person creates his actions by himself.
Likewise, the interpretation of their Imām that ʿĪsā creates is no evidence due to it not being
true for every person. Because that was a miracle which would transpire with the permission of Allah
ترکب. Furthermore, he explicitly told the people, “I create for you.” Whereas the Shīʿah generalise
his statement and omit the ‘you’...

2 Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah p. 80.
3 Ibid. p. 81.
Similarly, al-Ṭabaṭabā’ī says:

The Imāmiyyah and the Muʿtazilah are of the view that the doings of men and their movements all happen with their free will and they are the creators of them. Those verses which assert that Allah is the creator of everything are specific and the actions of men are excluded therefrom. Or the interpretation thereof is that He is the creator of everything either directly or indirectly through the medium of His various creations.¹

Al-Qazwīnī likewise says:

The actions of men are from their creation.²

Many other scholars besides the aforementioned also hold the same view.³

As you can see, this is the exact stance of the Muʿtazilah. So did the Muʿtazilī stance influence the Shīʿī dogma or was this their stance from the beginning; the stance of their antecedent scholars and those who succeeded them?

---

² Qalāʾīd al-Kharāʾīd p. 60.
³ Like Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī in his book Nahj al-Mustarshīdīn p. 52: he says, “The forth discussion: Regarding the creation of actions. Therein he asserts that this is the stance of his sect and the stance of the Muʿtazilah. He asserts the same in the eleventh chapter of his book. Likewise in his book Khashf al-Murād p. 332. Al-Majlisī has confirmed the same in his Bihār; he says, “The Imāmiyyah and the Muʿtazilah are of the view that the doings of men and their movements all happen with their free will and they are the creators of them (Bihār al-Anwār 4/148). Al-Miqdād al-Ḥillī also confirms the same. (See: al-Nāfiʿ Yawm al-Ḥashr fī Sharḥ al-Bāb al-Ḥādī ʿAshar p. 32-33).
The best reference to ascertain this would be the ḥadīth literature of the Shīʿah. I resorted to the ‘reliable’ ḥadīth books of the Shīʿah, specifically to the seminal and classical works among them. What I discovered is that their narrations oppose the dominant view in the Shīʿī dogma, i.e. the view of the Muʿtazilah regarding the creation of the action of men; they also defy what a group of their scholars have averred in this regard (as was mentioned previously with reference to al-Mufīd, Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī, and others).

Hence one of their narrations mention:

قال أبو جعفر وأبو عبد الله إن الله أرحم بخلقه من أن يجبر خلقه علي الذنوب، ثم يعذبهم عليها، والله اعز من أن يريد أمرًا فلا يكون قال: فسئلا علیهما السلام هل بین الجبر والقدر منزلة ثالثة؟ قال نعم أوسع ما بين السماء والأرض.

Abū Jaʿfar and Abū ʿAbd Allah said, “Allah is too merciful to His servants to coerce them into sinning and to subsequently punish them upon them. And His might does not permit that He intend something and it does not happen.”

They both were then asked, “Is there a stance between Jabr (coercion) and Qadr (free will)?”

He said, “Yes a position which is vaster than what is between the heavens and the earth.”¹

I.e. between Jabr and Qadr there is third stance which is moderate.

A fair amount of their narrations state that their stance regarding pre-destiny is a moderate one; no Jabr (coercion) and no Tafwīḍ (grant of complete capacity and free will).²

---

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/159.
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/155: chapter regarding Jabr, Qadr and the moderate position; Bihār al-Anwār 5/22, 56; al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah p. 72.
Al-Majlisī, therefore, says:

اعلم أن الذي استفاض عن الأئمة هو نفي الجبر والتفويض وإثبات أمر بين أمرين

Know well that the common view of the Imāms is the denial of Jabr and Tafwīḍ and the affirmation of the moderate stance between the two of them.¹

The denial of Jabr is clear. It is the renunciation of the stance of the Jabariyyah (those who believe that humans are puppets with no free will). However, what do they mean by the denial of Tafwīḍ?

Al-Majlisī says:

أما التفویض فهو ما ذهب إلیه المعتزلة من أنه تعالى أوجد العباد، وأقدرهم علي تلك الأفعال وفوض إليهم الاختیار فهم مستقلون بإیجادها وفق مشيئتهم وقدرتهم وليس لله في إفعالهم صنع

Tafwīḍ is the stance of the Muʿtazilah, which is to say that Allah created men and enabled them to do actions and gave them free will. Hence they create their actions independently according to their will and Allah has no say in the actions.²

Similarly, they have many other narrations which condemn the stance of the Muʿtazilah and criticize the proponents thereof. Hence these narrations are a refutation of the Shīʿah themselves. In Tafsīr al-Qummī, their Imām is reported to have condemned the Muʿtazilah and their likes for their denial of pre-destiny. He says:

القدریة الذین یقولون ل قدر یزعمون أنهم قادرون علي الهدی والضلالة وذلك أنهم إذا شاؤوا اهتدوا و أن شاؤوا ضلوا وهم مجوس هذه الأمة وکذب أعداء الله المشیئة والقدرة لله کَمَا بَدَأْکُمْ تَعُوْدُوْنَ فَرِیْقًا هَدَی وَفَرِیْقًا حَقَّ عَلیْهِمُ الضَّلاَلَةُ من خلقه الله شقیا یوم خلقه کذلك یعود إلیه شقیا ومن خلقه سعیدا یوم

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 5/82.
² Ibid. 5/83.
The Qadariyyah who deny pre-destiny claim that they are capable of guidance and misguidance; meaning: if they want they can choose guidance and if they want they can choose misguidance. They are the Zoroastrians of this Ummah; they have denied executive will and authority for Allah whereas He says, “A group he guided and a group deserved error.”¹ Whoever Allah created wretched will return to him wretched and whoever he created fortunate will return to him fortunate. Rasūl Allah صلی الله علیه وآله said, “Wretched is the one who became wretched in the womb of his mother, and fortunate is the one who became fortunate in the womb of his mother.”²

Abū ʿAbd Allah is likewise reported to have said:

إنك لتنسّل عن كلام أهل القدر وما هو من ديني ول دين آبائي ولا وجدت أحدا من أهل بيتي يقول به

You are asking me about the deniers of pre-destiny whereas that is not my creed nor the creed of my fore-fathers and nor have I known any supporter thereof in my family.³

He has also said:

ويح هذه القدرية أما يقرأون هذه الآية إلا امرأته قَدْرَانَا مِنْ الْغَابِرِينَ ويحهم من قدرها إل الله تبارك وتعالي.

Woe be to the Qadariyyah! Do they not read this verse, “Except his wife. We have decreed that she is of those who remain behind.” Woe be to them! Who ordained that besides Allah?⁴

---

³ Biḥār al-Anwār 5/56.
⁴ Biḥār al-Anwār 5/56.
There are many other narrations as well.¹

All of these narrations inform us of the stance of the Ahl al-Bayt, which is the affirmation of pre-destiny; they also randomly tell us of the stance of the early Shī'ah. The later Shī'ah have nonetheless diverted from these narrations without any evidence besides blindly following the Mu'tazilah; they turned a blind eye to all the narrations which oppose their stance. Instead they have included the concept of 'Adl (the obligation of justice upon Allah) as part of their fundamental beliefs just like the Mu'tazilah. Although outwardly this sounds very nice but in reality it implies a very grave result which is the denial of pre-destiny.

One of their scholars says:

أما الإمامية فالعدل من أركان الإيمان عندهم بل ومن أصول الإسلام

As for the Imāmiyyah 'Adl is one the fundamentals of īmān according to them, rather it is a principle aspect of Islam.²

In spite of the statements of the Imāms, as documented in their canonical works, not clearly denying pre-destiny mostly, and refuting the Mu'tazilah in their denial thereof, as many of their narrations establish that the truth is not with the Mu'tazilah and the deniers of pre-destiny, nor with the Jabariyyah (who aver that humans are puppets who have no free will), and asserting that it is in a third position which is moderate between the two. But what exactly is this moderate position?

Some of their narrations appear rather hesitant in expounding upon this and seem satisfied with just making the vague statement mentioned above. Hence, when Abū 'Abd Allah was asked regarding the meaning thereof he did not answer. The narrations suggest the following regarding his stance:

---

¹ See Biḥār al-Anwār 5/116: narrations: 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 69, etc.
He turned his hand two or three times and then said, “If I give you any answer in this issue you will disbelieve.”

Some of their scholars have interpreted this response of Abū ʿAbd Allah as Taqiyyah. For he concealed the right answer because he knew that the understanding of the questioner would not be able to grasp it correctly due to which he would engage in disbelieving.

It is very possible that this indefinite stance is the third stance of the Shīʿah in general, as asserted by al-Ashʿarī. The first stance as articulated by al-Mufīd is that the actions of men are not the creation of Allah. The view of al-Ashʿarī is qualified as you have read and understood in the narrations presented above. Hence, the Twelver tradition is comprehensive of all three views presented by al-Ashʿarī in his Maqālāt as the views of the Shīʿah in general.

Al-Ṣadūq in his Ḥaqīqat has mentioned a narration which explains the moderate stance. The narrations states:

Abū ʿAbd Allah was asked, “What is the stance between the two stances?”
He said, “It is like a man who you see indulging in sin, you prevent him but he does not desist consequent to which you leave him. Hence if you leave him is his condition on the basis of his refusal it will be as though you ordered him to do the sin.”

1 Ibn Bābawayh: al-Tawḥīd p. 363; Biḥār al-Anwār 5/53. Another narration appears wherein he says that it is one of the secrets of Allah (Biḥār al-Anwār 5/116) or that the middle stance is that which is between the heavens and the earth (Ibid. 5/116)
3 Sharḥ Ḥaqīqat al-Ṣadūq p. 10-12.
4 Ḥaqīqat al-Ṣadūq p. 75.
In this narration he explains pre-destiny as enjoining good and prohibiting evil, which is not enough in stating the correct stance, because it implies that Allah has no authority over men with the exception of His orders and prohibitions.

We, however, find a scholar of theirs who has interpreted this stance in accordance with the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah with the aid of those narrations from their tradition which affirm pre-destiny. Hence, after making mention of the deviation of the Jabariyyah in the stance that they have taken and averring that they have attributed oppression to Allah and after mentioning the stance of the Qadariyyah in the stance that they have taken and averring that they have ascribed partners to Allah in his quality of creation he says:

Our belief in this regard is subject to what has been proven from our pure A'immah, i.e. the moderate stance which avoids both extremes. For our Imām al-Ṣādiq in affirming the moderate stance has said, “No Jabr and no Tafwīḍ but between the two of them.” How brilliant is this statement and how profound is its meaning and essence: our deeds in terms of them being our deeds are a reality and we are the natural causes of their occurrence; they are subject to our capacity and free will. And when analysed differently they are destined by Allah and are under his jurisdiction because He is the initiator of existence and the giver thereof. So He has not coerced us to do our actions thereby oppressing us into his disobedience, because he has given us ability and free will in what we do. Nor has he given us the ability to create our actions thereby removing us from His supreme dominion. To Him belongs creation and order; He is capable of everything and is fully aware of His servants.¹

This text does not oppose the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding the actions of men. It tells us that among the later Shī‘ah there are still some who have held on to the stance of the antecedent scholars and to the dictates of many of their narrations. This is of course if we do not doubt him of euphemistically employing some sort of interpretation or some type of dissimulation. The knowledge of that is only by Allah.

But this still does not debunk the fact that the leading scholars of the Shī‘ī dogma have taken the stance of the Mu‘tazilah.

We can say possibly that in the antecedent times the affirmation of pre-destiny was the primary belief and the negation thereof is the result of later influence by the Mu‘tazilī dogma. Hence the later scholars are mostly deniers even though a handful of them are still affirmers.

Lastly, there is no doubt as to the fact that the deniers have conveniently taken some proofs and discarded the others. Likewise is the case of Jabariyyah who have taken the other side of the evidence and discarded the rest. As for those who have treaded the middle path, they have comprehensively taken all of them. The verses of the Qur‘ān establish ability, free will and action for men but all under the jurisdiction and will of Allah. He says:

وَمَا تَشَاءُوْنَ إِلَّ أَنْ يَشَاءُ اللّٰهُ

And you do not will except that Allah wills.¹

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

The majority of the Ahl al-Sunnah, from the antecedent times to those who succeeded them, all aver that man has ability, free will and doing and that Allah is the creator of everything as is suggested by the Qur‘ān and the Sunnah.

¹ Sūrah al-Insān: 30; Sūrah al-Takwīr: 29.
He then lists all the proofs in this regard.¹

The copious narrations of the Shī‘ah, some of which has passed in the previous pages, are the strongest evidence from their dogma itself for the falsity of the stance of the Mu‘tazilah which their scholars have opted to adopt.²

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/20-21.
Section Three

This section contains eight chapters:

1. *Imāmah*.
2. *ʿIsmah*
3. *Taqiyyah*.
4. *Ghaybah* and the Hidden Mahdī
5. *Rajʿah*.
6. *Ẓuhūr*
7. *Badāʾ*
8. *Ṭīnah*.

Chapter One

Imāmah

Imāmah is the basis of the Shīʿī dogma around which their ḥadīth legacy is based and upon which the edifice of their beliefs rests.

The Shīʿah in ancient times and in recent times have paid immense attention to it.

In the pages to come I will present some of the crucial aspects thereof, Namely: The concept of Imāmah, its inception, its rank in the Shīʿī dogma, the initial concealment thereof by the Shīʿah then the subsequent substantiations for it by their scholars, an exposition of their strongest proofs in favour of it and their analyses, a discussion regarding their *Takfīr* (ex-communication) of the one who denies it (to the extent that they have excommunicated the Ṣaḥābah, the Ahl al-Bayt, the Muslim rulers, judges, all the Muslim metropolises, and the different denominations that reside in them).

This will all become evident from their own ‘reliable’ sources in the pages to come.
The concept of Imāmah according to the Shīʿah and its inception:

Perhaps the first person to propound the concept of Imāmah as it stands today in the Shīʿī dogma was Ibn Saba’, who began propagating the idea that Imāmah by definition is the successorship of a Nabī which is exclusive to an appointed successor. If anyone besides him presides over it, then it will be compulsory to disassociate from him and dub him a disbeliever. The books of the Shīʿah concede the aforementioned:

كان أول من أشهر القول بفرض إمامة علي،و أظهر البراءة من أعدائه، و كشف مخالفیه و کفرهم

He was the first to popularize the view of the incumbency of the rulership of ‘Alī, the first to disassociate with his enemies and expose them by dubbing them infidels.²

The underlying reason for this was that he was a Jew who believed that Yusha’ ibn Nūn was the successor of Mūsā. Hence after embracing Islām he expressed the same view regarding ‘Alī I.³

Imāmah is the unanimous doctrine of the Shīʿah. Hence Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, when documenting the beliefs of the Shīʿah in the fourth century, states:

یعتقدون بأن لكل نبي وصي أوصي إليه بأمر الله تعالي

They believe that every Nabī has a successor who he has appointed at the behest of Allah.⁴

---

1 Imāmah literally means leadership and an Imām is any person who people follow, whether they be upon the straight path or astray. The word Imām is also used in the meaning of Khalīfah (successor), a scholar who has a followership, and a person who leads a congregation in şalāh (See: al-Lisān, Al-Qāmūs, and al-Miṣbāḥ under the root letters أم). Also see the definition of Imāmah according to the Ahl al-Sunnah in: al-Māwardī: al-Aḥkām al-Sulṭāniyyah p. 5; Muqaddamah Ibn Khaldūn 2/516-518).

2 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 108-109; al-Qummī: Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq: p. 20; al-Nawbakhti: Firaq al-Shīʿah p. 22; al-Rāzī: al-Zīnah p. 305. Also refer to: al-Mīlal wa al-Nīhal: 1/174. Al-Shahrastānī therein says that Ibn Saba’ was the first to express the idea of the divine appointment of ‘Alī یاباپ

3 All the previously cited references.

4 ‘Aqāʿid al-Ṣadūq p. 106.
He also mentions that the total amount of successors were a hundred and twenty thousand.\(^1\) While al-Majlisī asserts that ‘Alī was the last among them.\(^2\)

Some of the chapters in al-Kāfī read as follows:

- Chapter regarding Imāmah being the command of Allah from one person to the next.\(^3\)
- Chapter regarding Allah and his Rasūl appointing the Imāms one after the other.\(^4\)

In these chapters al-Kulaynī has cited a significant amount of their indubitable narrations. Miqdād al-Ḥillī (d. 821 A.H.), therefore, states:

\[
\text{يكون شخصًا معهودًا من الله تعالى ورسوله لا أي شخص آخر}
\]

The Imām has to be a person appointed by Allah and his Rasūl, not just any random person.\(^5\)

Muḥammad Husayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’, one of the contemporary leading Marājiʿ (scholars) of the Shīʿah, states:

\[
\text{أن الإمامة منصب إلهي كالنبي، فكما أن الله سبحانه يختار من يشاء من عباده للنبي فكذاك يختار للإمامة من يشاء و يأمر نبیه بالنص عليه و أن ينصبه إمامًا للناس من بعده}
\]

Imāmah is a divine station just like Nubuwwah. Just as Allah chooses whomsoever He wants to from his servants for Nubuwwah and Risālah,

---

1 Ibid.
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 39/342. This means that there is no successor to come after ‘Alī which necessarily means that the Imāmah of those who succeeded him is invalid thereby rendering the Twelver Dogma invalid.
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/227.
4 Ibid. 1/286.
5 Al-Nāfiʿ Yawm al-Ḥashr p. 47.
and aids him with miracles which serve as the proof for his legitimate appointment... similarly for Imāmah too, He selects whomsoever He wishes and orders his Nabī to emphatically appoint him and make him the leader of the masses after him.¹

As you can discern, the concept of Imāmah according to them is akin to that of Nubuwwah. Hence, just as Allah chooses Ambiyā’ from among his creation, he chooses Imāms. He emphatically appoints them, informs the creation about them, and establishes his evidence by means of them, aids them with miracles, reveals books to them, and sends revelation to them; thereby making them not speak or practice but in accordance with commandments of Allah and His revelation. In other words, Imāmah is Nubuwwah itself and the Imām is a Nabī, the difference in them is but nominal. Al-Majlisī therefore says:

إن استنباط الفرق بين النبي و الإمام من تلك الأخبار ل یخلو من إشكال

Establishing a difference between a Nabī and an Imām from these narrations is not free from objection.²

He further says:

و لا نعرف جهة لعدم اتصافهم بالنبوة إلا رعاية خاتم الأنبياء،ولا يصل عقولنا فرق بين النبوة و الإمامة

We do not know any reason for them not being privileged with Nubuwwah besides the consideration of the Seal of Nubuwwah. Our minds cannot fathom the difference between Nubuwwah and Imāmah.³

This is their conception of Imāmah. In its refutation it is sufficient to note that they have no evidence to substantiate it besides Ibn Saba’ and the Jews.

---

¹ Aṣl al-Shīʿah wa Uṣūluhā p. 58.
² Biḥār al-Anwār 26/82.
³ Ibid.
The position of Imāmah according to them

The issue of Imāmah, according to the Ahl al-Sunnah, is not an integral component of dīn wherein ignorance is intolerable, as has been asserted by the people of knowledge.¹ According to the Shīʿah, however, based on its Sabaʿī conception it has a totally different standing all together. Hence, al-Nawbakhtī mentions that according to some sects of the Shīʿah Imāmah holds the loftiest position after Nubuwwah.² According to Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ it is a divine station just like Nubuwwah,³ whilst according to some traditions of al-Kāfī it is a station higher than Nubuwwah.⁴ This last view has been backed by many of their scholars; Niʿmat Allah al-Jazāʾirī mentions:

الإمامة العامة التي هي فوق درجة النبوة والرسالة

Imāmah is a position higher than Nubuwwah and the vicegerency of Allah.⁵

Hādī al-Ṭahrānī, one of their acclaimed scholars in recent times, likewise states:

الإمامة أجل من النبوة، فإنها مرتبة ثالثة شرف الله تعالى بها إبراهيم بعد النبوة و الخلقة

Imāmah is loftier than Nubuwwah, for it is a third position with which Allah honoured Ibrāhīm after Nubuwwah and friendship.⁶

Furthermore, in al-Kāfī there are many narrations which suggest that Imāmah is the greatest principle of dīn. Al-Kulaynī narrates the following from Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣādiq:

---

² Fīraq al-Shīʿah p. 19.
³ Aṣl al-Shīʿah p. 58
⁴ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/175.
⁵ Zahr al-Rabīʿ p. 12.
⁶ Wadāyiʿ al-Nubuwwah p. 114.
Islam is based upon five pillars: Salah, Zakah, Sawm, Hajj and Wilayah. Nothing was emphasised like Wilayah. The People subsequently latched onto the first four and abandoned Wilayah.¹

As you can see, they have discarded the Shahadatān (the two testimonies of faith) from the fundamentals of Islam after replacing it with Wilayah, as is clear from the statement, “and nothing was emphasised like Wilayah,” and as is understood from another narration of theirs wherein the following addition features:

قلت (الراوي) وأي شيء من ذلك أفضل؟ فقال: الولیة أفضل

I said (i.e. the narrator), “Which of them is the best?”

He said, “Wilayah is the best.”²

There is yet a narration similar to the first narration with the addition:

فرخص لهم في أشياء من الفرائض الأربع ولم يرخص لأحد من المسلمین في ترك ولیتنا، لوهل ما فيها رخصة

Concessions have been given for the first four fundamentals³ but no Muslim is given any concession to decline our allegiance. No, by Allah! There is no concession therein.⁴

---

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī: Kitāb al-Īmān wa al-Kufr, chapter regarding the fundamentals of Īmān, 2/18. This ḥadīth has been classed reliable and given the status of a reliable ḥadīth. Hence it is an acceptable narration according to their standards (See: al-Shāfi’ī Sharḥ al-Kāfī 5/28).

² Ibid. this narration has an authentic chain of transmission, as attested to by their scholars (see: al-Shāfi’ī 5/59). This narration also appears in Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/191, al-Burhān 1/303 and Biḥār al-Anwār 1/394.

³ Al-Majlisī says, “E.g. shortening the salah on journey, not fasting when on journey or after taking ill and the concession of not discharging zakāh, and not performing Hajj when not having the means. (Mir‘āt al-ʿUqūl 4/369).

Their narrations have went on to mention that:

Nabī was made to ascend the heavens a hundred and twenty times. At each time Allah ordered him to pledge his allegiance to ʿAlī and the subsequent Imāms; more than the orders he issued to him regarding the other Farāʿīḍ (mandatory acts).

And:

Allah has not pressed upon his servants regarding any injunction more than he has pressed upon them regarding the acknowledgement of Imāmah. They would thus not deny anything more magnanimous than it.

We find their contemporary scholars also affirming such deviance. Hence one of them says:

The greatest aspect of dīn with which Allah sent his Nabī is Imāmah.

This is the status of the Imāmah of the twelve Imāms according to them. I do not know what the evidence for this alleged superficial position is? Whereas the greatest constitution of Islam—the Qurʾān—time and again repeats the fundamentals of Islam, viz. the testimonies of faith, Ṣalāh, Ṣawm, Zakāh and Ḥajj. But does not make mention anywhere of the allegiance of their Imāms...

1 Ibn Bābawayh: al-Khiṣāl p. 600-601; Bihār al-Anwār 23/69.
3 Hādī al-Ṭahrānī: Wadāyiʿ al-Nubuwwah p. 115; Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭāʾ: Risālah ʿAyn al-Mīzān p. 4
The secrecy of this doctrine

The doctrine of Imāmah, based on its Shī‘ī conception, thus necessarily required that there be a very surreptitious movement which would invent this doctrine in order to destroy the Muslim empire. Hence when during the Khilāfah Rāshidah (the righteous reign) it first surfaced, Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ʿAlī took a very stern stance against it. He thus banished ʿAbd Allah ibn Saba’ to Madā’in and refuted all the claims that he had tried to spread in the Muslim society, as is attested to by the books of the Shī‘ah themselves.¹

This surreptitious movement then again went into complete secrecy. Hence, in the time of ʿAlī al-Riḍā, falsely attributing their agenda to him, they would say:

ولاية الله أسرها إلي جبريل، و أسرها جبريل إلي محمد،و أسرها محمد إلي علي، و أسرها علي إلي من شاء الله، ثم أنتم تذيعون ذلك، من الذي أمسك حرفا سمعه?

It is the Wilāyah of Allah regarding which he secretly informed Jibrīl, Jibrīl secretly informed Muḥammad, and Muḥammad secretly informed ʿAlī. ʿAlī, then secretly informed whoever he intended. Do you then disclose it? Who is the one who is able to hold back that which he has heard?²

Abū Jaʿfar al-Bāqir is reported to have said:

في حكمة آل داود ينفي للمسلم أن يكون مالكا لنفسه مقبلا علي شأنه عارفا بأهل زمانه، فاتقوا الله، ولتذيعوا حدثنا

One of the wisdoms of Dāwūd was: It is behoving of a Muslim to take control of himself, pay attention to his affairs, and know the people of his time. Therefore, fear Allah and do not spread our matter.³

---

² Al-Māzindarānī: Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ 9/123.
³ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/224.
The aforementioned texts suggest that from the time of its revelation from Allah Wilāyah has remained a secret belief. Which is why it was not permissible to talk about it. This implies that in the golden era of Islam there was no trace of Wilāyah. The commentator of al-Kāfī whilst explaining the reason for this says:

لما كانت الن명ة شديدة في عصرهم عليه السلام أمروا شيعتهم بكتمان أسرارهم و إمامتهم و أحاديثهم و أحكامهم المختصة بمذهبهم

Due to Taqiyyah being very difficult in their times, the Imāms ordered their followers to conceal their secrets, Imāmah, traditions, and rulings which were specific to their creed.¹

Al-Kulaynī in one of his narrations mentions:

ول تبثوا سرنا، ولا تذيعوا أمرنا

Do not divulge our secret and do not disclose our affair.²

The commentator of al-Kāfī explains ‘our affair’ saying:

و هو أمر الإمامة و الخلافة

The affair of Imāmah and Khilāfah...³

In another narration which al-Kulaynī attributes to Jaʿfar he says:

المذيع حديثنا كالجاد له

A person who discloses our secret is like the one who denies it.⁴

1 Al-Māzindarānī: Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ 9/118.
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/222.
4 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/224.
He further says:

و أعلم أنه على السلام كان خائفا من أعداء الدين على نفسه المقدسة وعلى شيعته، وكان في تقية شديدة من عدو من فذل ذلك نهي عن إذاعة خبر إمامته أو إمامة آبائه

Know well that he was fearing the safety of his life and the safety of his partisans from the enemies of dīn, (thus) the need for him to practice Taqiyyah was greater than theirs. Thus he ordered them not to divulge his Imāmah and the Imāmah of his forefathers.¹

Furthermore, they had pledged to perpetually work in secrecy. Hence they are reported to have said:

إن أمرنا مستور مقنع بالميثاق فمن هتك علينا أذله الله

Our affair is hidden and concealed by the pledge.² May Allah disgrace the one who discloses our secret.³

Nonetheless, some of their narrations identify the time wherein the doctrine of Wilāyah was divulged. Hence, they suggest:

ما زال سرا مكتوما حتي صار في يد ولد كيسان فتحدثوا به في الطريق وقرى السواد

Our affair remained a secret till it fell in the share of the children of Kaysān.⁴ They went about talking about it in the streets and in the villages of Sawād (a place of Iraq).⁵

---

1 Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ 10/26.
2 The reviser of al-Kāfī has commented thus upon this narration: “This refers to the pledge Allah and his Rasūl had taken from the Imāms to keep the matter of Imāmah a secret from others.” Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/227.
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/227.
4 Kaysān is the title of Mukhtār ibn ʿUbayd al-Tahqafī who is the eponym of the Kaysāniyyah. Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ 9/121-122.
5 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/223.
This surreptitious movement which laid the foundations of the concept of Wilāyah in accordance with the Saba’ī approach did not forget to disguise its true identity and masquerade as proponents of the moderate Shī‘ah in order to spread its thoughts among the people. Hence in Uṣūl al-Kāfī the following appears:

کفوا السنتكم و الزموا بیوتكم فإنه لا يصيبكم أمر تخصون به أبدا، ولا تزال الزیدیة لكم وقاء أبدا

Hold back your tongues, remain in your homes. You will not be afflicted with a calamity which will befall you specifically. For the Zaydiyyah will always remain a shield for you.¹

This stratagem possibly implies that the Zaydiyyah, due to their expression of the desire of Wilāyah, will be implicated and you will remain clear due to practicing Taqiyyah, as is suggested by the commentator of al-Kāfī.²

If Wilāyah is the counterpart of Nubuwwah or even greater, then why was it kept discreet. To the extent that even Rasūl Allah ﷺ, who was ordered to convey what was revealed to him, concealed it and stealthily informed ‘Alī  about it, who then communicated it secretly to whoever he wanted.

These narrations do not identify the people to whom it was communicated. They rather leave that to the discretion of ‘Alī thereby giving him the choice of informing whoever he wanted. As for those besides ‘Alī ⁴, they were not given any such discretion! So how can Wilāyah then be the basis of salvation, the acceptance of deeds, and the criterion for belief and disbelief? How could it have remained a secret till the children of Kaysān who contravened the default ruling of secrecy by disclosing it?

The nature of these narrations posits that the concocters of this doctrine were the ardent enemies of Islam who had exploited it to carry out their desires. They had confined it to secrecy and attributed it to the Ahl al-Bayt in order to find a way to the hearts of the people who were tremendously affected by the afflictions that befell them; of which they were the cause despite their ‘partisanship’.

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/225.
² Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ 9/126.
Confining the Imāms to a specific number

Ibn Saba’ merely claimed that ʿAlī was the successor of Nabī. However, he was succeeded by others who generalised this claim for his posterity. In spite of the Shīʿī movements operating in secrecy, some of their claims would reach the Ahl al-Bayt, who would deny them openly just like their grandfather, Amīr al-Mu’minīn ʿAlī. Hence, they contrived the belief of Taqīyyah and ascribed it to them, thereby facilitating the propagation of their ideas with assurance of the masses not being influenced by the honest and exposing stances of the Ahl al-Bayt.

In Rijāl al-Kashshī, one of their seminal works, there appears a narration which suggests that Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was the first person to propound the idea of Imāmah being confined to specific people of the Ahl al-Bayt. And that when Zayd ibn ʿAlī learnt of this he sent him a message in order to ascertain the truth of the matter:

Zayd said to him, “It has reached me that you claim that in the household of Muḥammad there is an Imām whose obedience is mandatory?”

Shayṭān al-Ṭāq responded in the affirmative and said, “Your father ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn was one of them.”

Thereupon Zayd said, “How can that be whereas he would make a morsel of food cold in his hands and then feed me? Do you really think that he feared the heat of the morsel for me but did not fear the fire of Jahannam?”

Shayṭān al-Ṭāq thus said, “He disliked informing you fearing that you would disbelieve depriving you thus of his intercession in your favour before Allah.”

The narration of al-Kulaynī in al-Kāfī reads as follows:

قال زید بن علي لأبي جعفر: یا أبا جعفر كنت أجلس مع أبي علي الخوان فيلقمني البضعة السمينة، و برد لي اللقمة الحارة حتى تبرد، شفقة علي،و لم يشفق علي من حر النار، أذ أخبرك بالدین و لم يخبرني به؟أجابه شيطان الطاق: جعلت فداك من شفقته عليك من حر النار لم يخبرك، خاف عليك أن لا تقبله فتدخل النار، وأخبرني أنا، فإن قبلت نجوت وإن لم أقبل لم يبالي إن أدخل النار.

Zaid ibn ʿAlī said to Abū Jaʿfar [i.e. Shayṭān al-Ṭāq], “O Abū Jaʿfar! I would sit with my father on the table cloth where he would feed me a nice chunk of meat; out of his fear for me he would make a hot morsel of food cold. But he did not fear the heat of Jahannam for me, for he informed you of the dīn but not me?”

Shayṭān al-Ṭāq responded to him saying, “May I be sacrificed for you. Due to his fear of the fire of Jahannam for you he did not inform you; he feared that you would not accept because of which you would enter Jahannam. But he informed me, because if I accept I attain salvation and if I reject and enter Jahannam, he would not bother.”…

After citing this narration from al-Māmaqānī’s Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl, Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb concludes that Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was the first person to contrive this erroneous doctrine of Imāmah, legislation, and infallibility being exclusive to a few members of the Ahl al-Bayt.

He has likewise cited this quotation from Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl in his additional notes upon Mukhtaṣar al-Tuhfah and followed it with the following remarks:

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 186.
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/186.
3 Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl 1/470.
4 Majallah al-Fatḥ (issue no. 862, Dhū al-Hijjah 1367 A.H.) p. 5.
Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was in this way successful in forging the fallacy of Imāmah which has now become the core doctrine of the Shīʿī dogma. He accused ʿAlī Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn ibn al-Ḥusayn of concealing the basis of dīn from his son who was one of the elite erudite members of the Ahl al-Bayt. Just as he accused Imām Zayd of not reaching the level of even the most wretched of the Shīʿah in his ability to concede the Imāmah of his father. The Shīʿah narrate this quotation in the most authentic of their books and openly proclaim that Shayṭān al-Ṭāq—despite his wickedness—knew from the father of Imām Zayd more than even what he knew regarding the fundamentals of dīn. This is not extraordinary for Shayṭān al-Ṭāq. For al-Jāḥiẓ in his book on Imāmah narrates from him that he averred that Allah did not reveal (the verse), “The second of the two when they were in the cave.”

The books of the Shīʿah mention that when the arguments which Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was promoting for the validity of Imāmah reached Jaʿfar, he said:

 لو شاء ظریف من مخاصمیه أن یخصمه فعل؟ قلت (القائل هو الراوي کیف ذاك؟ فقال یقول:أخبرني عن کلامك هذا من کلام إمامك؟ فإنقال: نعم، کذب علینا، و إن قال: لا قال له: كيف تتكلم بکلام لم يتكلم به إمامك، ثم قال: (أي جعفر الصادق) إنهم يتكلمون بكلام إن أنا أقررت به و رضيت به أقمن علي الضلالة، وإن برئت منه شق علي، نحن قبل و عدونا كثير، قلت: (أي الراوي) جعلت فذاك فأبلغه عن ذلك؟ قال: أما إنهم قد دخلوا في أمر ما يمنعهم من الرجوع عنه إلا الحمیة، قال: فأبلغته أبا جعفر الأحول ذلك فقال: صدق بأبي و أمي ما يمنعني من الرجوع عنه إلا الحمیة.

If a witty person of his opponents wants, he can destroy him.

---

I, the narrator said, “How would that be possible for him?”

He said, “He should ask him thusly, ‘These statements of yours, are they sourced from your Imāms?’ If he says, ‘yes,’ he is lying and if he says, ‘no,’ he should say to him, ‘How are you then spreading ideas which your Imām is not a proponent of.’”

Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq then said, “They make such eerie claims, if I believe them and accept them, I would become firm in disbelief, and if I reject, things would become difficult for me; we are a few and our enemies are a lot.”

I, the narrator, said, “May I be sacrificed for you! Should I not inform him of this?”

He said, “They have delved into a matter, from the retraction of which nothing is preventing them but fanaticism.”

The narrator says, “I conveyed this message to Abū Ja‘far al-Aḥwal who said, “He has spoken the truth! By the oath of my parents nothing is preventing me from retracting besides fanaticism.”

Another person who was instrumental with Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam (d. 179 A.H.). Al-Qāḍī ʿAbd al-Jabbār in fact avers that the person who claimed Naṣṣ (the divine appointment of the Imāms) and induced the people to revile Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, the Muhājirīn, and the Anṣār was Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam. He was the fabricator of the idea of divine appointment; no one before him made such a claim.

In Rijāl al-Kashshī there appears a narration which states that the conspiracy of Hishām reached Hārūn al-Rashīd:

---

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 190-191.
2 Tathbit Dalā‘il al-Nubuwwah 1/225. Perhaps the intention of al-Qāḍī is the divine appointment of specific individuals of the Ahl al-Bayt besides ‘Alī. Because the idea of his divine appointment was presented by Ibn Saba’.
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Yaḥyā al-Barmakī said, “O Amīr al-Muʾminīn! I have investigated the affair of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, he claims that there is an Imām besides you on the earth whose obedience is mandatory.”

He said, “Subḥān Allah!”

Yaḥyā said, “Yes! He also claims that if this Imāms tells him to rebel he will rebel.”

This narration suggests that Hārūn was amazed, which implies that this idea was still in its initial stages.

Hishām had told the people that whatever he says, he says as the representative of Mūsā al-Kāẓim. The Abbasid Ruler Mahdī subsequently imprisoned him and punished him badly. He then released him and took a pledge from him that he will not rebel against him or anyone of his progeny. To which he replied by saying:

والله ما هذا من شأني وحدثت فيه نفسي

By Allah! That is not my temperament and nor have I proposed that from my side.

Furthermore, Ibn Taymiyah has suggested that Mūsā al-Kāẓim was convicted of wanting to overthrow the rule of Hārūn due to which he was imprisoned. Ostensibly, this was because of that being attributed to him by Hishām and his cohorts. Therefore, we find that the books of the Shīʿah attest to the fact that he was imprisoned due to the statements and the lies which revolve around Imāmah

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 258.
2 Ibn Kathīr: al-Bidāyah wa Al-Nihāyah 10/183.
3 Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/155.
and the right of the Ahl al-Bayt to it being attributed to him... Hence, when these claims of Hishām reached Hārūn he ordered his governor thus:

شد يدك بهذا وأصحابه وبعث إلي أبي الحسن موسي علیه السلام فحبسه. فكان سبب حبه مع غيره من الأسباب

Keep a tight grip on this person and his cohorts. He then sent his police to imprison Abū al-Ḥasan Mūsā. So this was the reason for his imprisonment, among other reasons.¹

The books of the Shīʿah have likewise suspected Hishām of being part of those who assassinated Mūsā al-Kāẓim.² Hence their books say:

هشام بن الحكم...ضال مضل شرك في دم أبي الحسن

Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam... a deviant person who lead others astray. He was part of those who killed Abū al-Ḥasan.³

Mūsā al-Kāẓim had requested him to desist from making such statements. After desisting for a month he started again whereupon he said:

أيسر كأن تشرك في دم امرئ مسلم؟ قال: لا، قال: وكيف تشرك في دمي، فإن سكت وإلاأ فهو الذبح. فما سكت حتي كان من أمره ما كان (صلي الله عليه وسلم).

Mūsā al-Kāẓim asked him, “Does it please you to play a role in the murder of a Muslim?”

“No,” he said.

Mūsā al-Kāẓim then said to him, “Then why would you want to play a role in my murder? If you do not desist I will be slaughtered.”

He, however, did not remain silent, till eventual what happened, happened.⁴

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 262.
2 Because the Shīʿah claim that he was poisoned and killed in the prison of Hārūn al-Rashīd.
3 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 268.
Therefore al-Riḍā said, as the books of the Shīʿah allege:

هشام بن الحكم فهو الذي صنع بأبي الحسن ما صنع وقال لهم وأخبرهم أتري أن الله يغفر له ما ركب منا

Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam did whatever he did to Abū al-Ḥasan (al-Kāẓim).
He then told them of what he had did and said, “Do you think Allah will forgive him for the crimes he has committed against us.”

The books of the Shīʿah also reveal that Hishām was brought up by heretics. Hence in Rijāl al-Kashshī the following narration appears:

وهشام كان من غلمان أبي شاكر وأبو شاكر كان زنديقا

Hishām was the slave of Abū Shākir who was a heretic.

Despite this assertion, one of the contemporary scholars of the Shīʿah states the following regarding Hishām, the man of all this mayhem as documented in the most reliable books of the Shīʿah:

لم يعثر أحد من سلفنا علي شيء مما نسبه الخصم إليه

No one has come across the evils that the opponents ascribe to him.

I am not sure if the reality is not known to him. Or if he is denying it by way of Taqiyyah thinking that people have no knowledge of what is in their books.

The conclusion nonetheless is that Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, Shayṭān al-Ṭāq, and their protégés were the ones who had revived the idea of ‘ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saba’ which was specific to ‘Alī and thereafter generalised it for the other members

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 278.
2 Abū Shākir al-Dīşānī the eponym of the Dīşāniyyah. He was one of the people who had misguided Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam (al-Rāfī: Taḥt Rāyut al-Qur’ān p. 176).
of the Ahl al-Bayt. In doing so, they took advantage of some of the atrocities that befell them, like that of the martyrdom of ʿAlī and his son Ḥusayn. This paved the way for them to provoke the feelings of the people and influence their hearts in order to accomplish their malicious agendas which they harboured against the Muslim Ummah.

Ostensibly, it seems that the belief of Imāmah being confined to specific people gained a lot of traction in Kūfah1 with the efforts of the followers of Hishām and Shayṭān al-Ṭāq. One of those who were invited to believe in this doctrine made a trip to Jaʿfar in order to ascertain the veracity thereof. Hence al-Kashshī narrates the following from Abū Saʿīd al-Aʿraj:

کنا عند أبي عبد الله رضي الله عنه فاستأذن له رجلان فإذن لهما فقال أحدهما: أفیكم أمام مفترض الطاعة؟ قال: ما أعرف ذلك فینا، قال: بالكوفة قوم يزعمون أن فيكم أماماً مفترض الطاعة، وهم لا يکذبون أصحاب ورع واجتهاد... منهم عبد الله بن يعفور وفلان وفلاو، فقال أبو عبد الله رضي الله عنه: ما أمرتهم بذلك، ول قلت لهم أن يقولوه، قال فما ذنبي! واحمر وجهه وغضب غضبا شدیدا، قال: فلما رأيا الغضب في وجهه قاما فخرجا، قال أتعرفون الرجلین؟ قلنا: نعم هما رجلان من الزیدة

We were sitting with Abū ʿAbd Allāh (al-Ṣādiq) when two people sought his permission to enter, and he granted them permission.

One of them said, “Is there an Imām amongst you whose obedience is compulsory?”

He replied, “I do not know any such person.”

On this the same person said, “In Kūfah there are people who claim that among you there is an Imām whose obedience is compulsory, they don’t seem to be lying because they are people of piety and sacrifice. Some of them are ‘Abd Allah ibn Yaʿfūr, so and so, and so and so.”

Abū ʿAbd Allah 2 thus said, “I did not instruct them to say any of that.”2

---

1 Bihār al-Anwār 100/259.
2 There is a subtle indication in this answer that the denial of Jaʿfar was by way of Taqiyyah.
He further said, “What is my mistake?” as his face became red and he was infuriated.

The narrator says, “When they saw his anger they stood up and left.

Abū ’Abd Allah asked, “Do you know these two people?”

We replied, “Yes! These are two men of the Zaydiyyah.”

Hence, the concept of the Imāms being confined to a specific number was planted in the second century by a group of people who falsely claimed to be the partisans of the Ahl al-Bayt, the likes of Hīshām ibn al-Ḥakam and Shayṭān al-Ṭāq.

Moving on, the Shīʿah have tremendously differed as to the exact count of their Imāms; the author of Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah mentions:

اَعْلَمْ أَنَّ الْإِمَامِيَّة قَالُونَ بِالْحَصْرَ الأَئِمَّة، وَلَكِنَّهُمْ مُخْتَلِفُونَ فِي مَقَادِرِهِمْ، فَقَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ: خَمْسَةٌ، وَبَعْضُهُمْ: سَبْعَةٌ، وَبَعْضُهُمْ: ثَمَانِيَةٌ، وَبَعْضُهُمْ: اِثْنَانِ عَشْرٍ، وَبَعْضُهُمْ: ثَلاَثَةٌ عَشْرٍ

Know well that the Imāmiyyah hold the view that their Imāms are specified but they have differed in their specific count. Some of them say five, some say seven, some say eight, some say twelve, and some (even) say thirteen.²

They have numerous views in this regard. If I were to present all their views sourcing them from the books of heresiography, the reader would presumably give up reading out of boredom and fatigue. The basis of all these variant opinions is one, and that is after the demise of each Imām of the Ahl al-Bayt many sub-sects would come into existence. Some would be indefinite about the death of the Imām thereby assuming him to be the last Imām upon whom they would terminate Imāmah and the count of the Imāms. Whereas some would go in search of another member of the Ahl al-Bayt and make him the new ‘Imām’

1 Rījāl al-Kashshī p. 427.
2 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah p. 193.
securing in this manner the niche to introduce into dīn its old inherited rituals or its cultural and racist inclinations thereby securing the clout to carry out its enmities and accomplish its aspirations. It will suffice for the reader to read the books of heresiography to learn all of this. In fact even the books of the Shīʿah have recorded some examples of these differences and contradictions, whether they be the books of the Ismāʿīliyyah like that of Masāʾīl al-Imāmah of al-Nāshiʿ al-Akbar and al-Zīnah of Ibn Abī Ḥātim, or the books of the Twelvers like that of Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq of al-Ashʿarī al-Qummī and Firaq al-Shīʿah of al-Nawbakhṭī, or the books of the Zaydiyyah like that of al-Munyah wa al-Amal of al-Murtaḍā.

Not forgetting that the issue of Imāmah is not a secondary issue in their creed wherein difference of opinion is unobjectionable. It is rather the very basis of their dogma and its most crucial component, for a person who does not believe in their ‘Imām’ is not a believer. Which is why we see them dubbing each other infidels. Sometimes even the followers of one Imām excommunicate and curse each other.¹

The Twelvers have settled upon twelve Imāms. In the family of Rasūl Allah H, the Banū Hāshim, during the reign of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, and ʿAlī, however, there was no one who proposed the view of twelve Imāms.² The belief of twelve Imāms only came into existence after the demise of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, as has passed already.³

Hence we find some narrations in the tradition of the Twelvers which give of some indications as to the confusion and quandary that they encountered in the number of Imāms. This ostensibly suggests that they are forgeries which were fabricated before the demise of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī and that prior to that the belief of the twelve Imāms, to whom the Twelvers subscribe, did not exist. Or that

---

¹ This was a common problem amongst them (see: Rījāl al-Kashshī p. 498-499) also refer to p. 1014 of this book.
² Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/111.
³ See p.130 of this book.
they were fabricated before this became the established belief of the Jaʿfariyyah (a sect which emerged after the demise of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī). These narrations themselves are certainly a critique of the Twelver stance.

Hence the narrations of al-Kāfī which state that “ʿAlī could secretly inform whoever he wanted regarding Wilāyah,” ¹ (which is explained by the commentator of al-Kāfī to mean, “Whoever he wanted to inform from the infallible Imāms.”)² do not stipulate any number or specify any individuals. So it is as if the matter was not settled at the time of the fabrication of these narrations. You will also find narrations which state that the total sum of the Imāms is seven. They state:

سابعنا قائمنا

Our seventh Imām is our Mahdī.³

This is the stance of the Ismāʿīliyyah. However, when the number of the Imāms increased according to the Mūsawiyyah or the Qaṭʿiyyah, who later formed into Twelvers, the aforementioned narration induced doubt in the doctrine of Imāmah for their followers. Thus the pioneers thereof endeavoured to eradicate this doubt with the following narration:

عن داود الرقي قال: قلت لابي الحسن الرضا رضي الله عنه: جعلت فداك إنه ولله ما يلج في صدري من أمرك شئين إلا حدثتني سمعته من ذريح يرويه عن أبي جعفر رضي الله عنه قال لي: وما هو؟ قال: سمعته يقول: سابعنا قائمنا إن شاء الله قال: صدقته وصدق ذريح وصدق أبي جعفر رضي الله عنه، فزادت والله شكا، ثم قال: يا داود بن أبي خالد! أما والله لولا أن موسي قال للعالم للعالم ستجدني إن شاء الله صابرا ما سأله

Dāwūd al-Raqqī says, “I asked Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā: may I be sacrificed for thee! I have no scepticism in my bosom regarding any of your teachings besides one narration which I heard from Dharīḥ which he narrates from Abū Jaʿfar ⁴.”

---

¹ This has passed on p. 892
² Al-Māzindarānī: Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ 9/123.
³ Rijāl al-Kashšī p. 373.
Al-Riḍā asked, “Which narration is that?”

I said, “I heard him saying, ‘Our seventh Imām will be our Mahdī if Allah wills.’”

Al-Riḍā responded, “You have spoken the truth, Dharīḥ has spoken the truth, and Abū Jaʿfar has spoken the truth.”

This made me doubt even more.

Thereafter al-Riḍā said, “O Dāwūd, the son of Abū Khālid! If Mūsā had not said [to Khidr], ‘You will find me to be patient,’ he would not have asked him regarding anything; likewise if Abū Jaʿfar had not said, ‘If Allah wills’ what he said would have transpired.”

The narrator says, “I thus believed him.”

It seems as though they consider this to be the result of Badā’ and the changing of the intention of Allah, which is one of their fundamental beliefs (as will feature soon). In this belief they find a means of deflecting this narration and its likes.

The first book of the Shīʿah which surfaced was the book of Sulaym ibn Qays. Therein it is mentioned that the total sum of the Imāms is thirteen. This was one of the reasons for the Twelvers condemning his book. In al-Kāfī, the most authentic of their four early canonical works, many narrations appear which suggest that there were thirteen Imāms. Hence al-Kulaynī narrates the following from Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq:

إني واثني عشر إماما من ولدي وأنت یا علي زر الأرض، يعني أوتادها وجبالها. بنى أوتند الله الأرض أن تسخ باهلها فإذا ذهب الإثنى عشر من ولدي ساحت الأرض بأهلها ولم ينظروا

Rasūl Allah said, “I, the twelve Imāms from my progeny, and you, O ‘Alī, are the pegs of this earth and its mountains. Allah has kept the

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 373-374.
earth firm by way of us so that it does not sink with its inhabitants. When the Twelve Imāms leave the world it will sink with its people and there will be given no respite.”

This narration posits that the Imāms are twelve excluding ‘Alī and thirteen including him. Thus it destroys the basis of the Twelvers. In his al-Ghaybah al-Ṭūsī, seeing the obvious problem, distorted the narration and presented it thus:

إني وأحد عشر من ولدي

I and eleven Imāms from my progeny.

The books of the Shīʿah likewise narrate the following from Abū Jaʿfar who narrates from Jābir:

دخلت علي فاطمة وبین یدیها لوح فیه اسماء الأوصیاء من ولدها فعددت اثني عشر آخرهم القائم ثلاثة
منهم محمد و ثلاثة منهم علي

I went to visit Fāṭimah and before her was a tablet wherein was documented the names of all the appointed successors from her posterity. I thus counted twelve Imāms, the last of whom was the Mahdī; three among them were Muḥammad and three among them were ‘Alī.

Consider, they have considered all their Imāms to be from the progeny of Fāṭimah. This implies that ‘Alī is not one of them because he is her husband and not her son. Or the other conclusion would be that they have thirteen Imāms including him. Another hint in this narration which suggests that he is not part of the Imāms is the statement ‘three among them are ‘Alī’. This is due to the fact that there are four Imāms among the Ahl al-Bayt whose names are ‘Alī, viz. Amīr al-Muʿminīn ‘Alī, ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, ‘Alī al-Riḍā, and ‘Alī al-Hādī.

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/534.
2 Al-Ghaybah p. 92
Ibn Bābawayh, ostensibly distorted this narration by omitting ‘from her posterity’ but forgot to take heed of the rest of the text which is, “Three among them are ‘Alī,” hence he maintains it as it appears in the references of the Twelvers. However, in his book ‘Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā he, or someone else, changes the text in both places.

Astonishingly, one of their scholars classed the book of Sulaym ibn Qays a fabrication due to it containing the mention of thirteen Imāms. But he does not make a similar judgement regarding al-Kāfī and the other sources which cite similar narrations.

The view of thirteen Imāms was upheld by a sub-sect of the Shīʿah. It is probably due to their influence that these narrations exist. Al-Ṭūsī has made mention of this sub-sect and its opposition of the view of Twelve Imāms, to which he subscribes. Al-Najāshī likewise has mentioned the same in the biography of Hibat Allāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad. Each of these sects claims to be on the straight path and that the narrations regarding the legitimacy of its Imāms are widespread. It simultaneously refutes the claims of the remaining Shīʿī sects. This is an evident sign of them having no basis for what they believe, for if the narrations of any sect were widespread there would not have been any bickering at all. Hence, these are claims which they have forged against the Ahl al-Bayt in accordance with the demands of the time. Every sect would thus claim an Imām for itself in order to collect Khums (one fifth of the booty), monetary vows, and gifts from their followers in the name of their alleged Imām, and thereby live

3 Al-Ghaybah p. 137.
4 He mentions, “Hibat Allah engaged in the sciences of theology and attend the gatherings of Abū al-Ḥusayn ibn Shaybah al-‘Alawī who was a Zaydī. He wrote a book and mentioned therein that there are thirteen Imāms including Zayd ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn. In substantiating his stance he drew support from a narration which appears in the book of Sulaym ibn Qays al-Hilālī which reads thus, “There are twelve Imāms from the posterity of Amīr al-Mu’minīn.” (see: Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 343).
luxurious lives. Those who succeeded them then followed them without any evidence which consequently caused them to fall into the pit of deviance:

إِنَّهُمْ أَلْفَوْا أٰبَاءَهُمُ الْضَّالِّيْنَ فَهُمْ عَلَىٰ أَثَرِهِمْ يُهْرَعُونَ

Indeed they found their fathers astray. So they hastened [to follow] in their footsteps.\(^1\)\(^2\)

### Analysing the belief of confining the Imāms to a specific number

Allah says:

ياَ أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوْا أَطِیْعُوا اللّٰهَ وَأَطِیْعُوا الرَّسُوْلَ وَأُولِي الأَْمْرِ مِنْكُمْ

O you who have believed, obey Allah and obey the Messenger and those in authority among you.\(^3\)

Allah has not specified a number of the ‘people of authority’ which is obvious.

If the doctrine of divine appointment of the Imāms is the most crucial aspect of dīn according to them and is equal to Nubuwwah in its rank or even greater, then why did Allah not make mention of it in His Book? Similarly, why did he not make mention of the Imāms, their names, and their personalities? There is no mention of their Imāms in the Qur’ān, nor is there any widespread narration which serves as an emphatic text for their appointment. Had there been any, the Shi‘ah would not have disputed as dramatically in their appointment, as the books of heresiography have recorded. Rasūl Allah in the narrations which are widely narrated from him does not confine the people of authority

---

1 Sūrah al-Ṣaffāt: 69-70.
2 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah p. 200.
3 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 59.
to a specific number. The narration of Abū Dhar in the Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī and Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim reads as follows:

إن خلیلي أوصاني أن أسمع وأطیع وإن کان عبد حبشیا مجدع الأطراف

My friend advised me to listen and obey, even though the ruler be an Abyssinian slave whose limbs are severed.¹

There are many more narrations of this sort.²

As for the books of the Twelvers, they are replete with narrations which limit the Imāms to twelve. However, it should be noted that these narrations were circulated in secret and the Imāms would disassociate from the narrators thereof, which is enough to stir scepticism regarding their authenticity. Especially, when the Book of Allah (which the Imāms were commanded to have recourse to when passing judgements) does not support any of them; unless of course through esoteric interpretations of its verses and through forged narrations which have consequently assumed the status of their best evidence in spite of their falsehood being empirically established. Likewise, the early scholars who had forged all these narrations, the likes of Ṣaffār, Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, and al-Kulaynī were all extremists who necessarily have to be excommunicated due to their documentation of the narrations of the interpolation of the Qur’ān. They are thus unreliable and their books unworthy.

Furthermore, the book Nahj al-Balāghah, which is accorded the status of the most authentic book, does not contain any mention of the twelve Imāms and their personalities. In fact there appears a narration therein which defies the doctrine of the twelve Imāms. The author of Nahj al-Balāghah hence says:

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/105. The wording of al-Bukhārī is thus: Nabī said to Abū Dhar, “Listen and obey even if the ruler be a slave whose head is like a raisin.” Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: chapter regarding Adhān: the sub-chapter regarding the leadership of an astray and innovator: 2/188. The wording mentioned in the above is that of Muslim. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: chapter regarding leadership: sub-chapter regarding the incumbency of obedience to the leaders in matters which are not sins: 2/1467.

² Ibn Taymiyah has mentioned some of them in Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/105-106.
It is compulsory for the people to have a ruler, pious or impious, with who the enemy can be subdued, the roads secured, and the rights of the weak demanded from the strong so that the noble people be at ease and the wretched ones done away with.¹

This narration does not limit the Imāms to a number. So where are the Shī‘ah going whereas they claim to follow every letter of the *Nahj*?

Similarly, the disparate views of the Shī‘ah in this regard, the stark differences of their sects in the specification of the Imāms and their personalities also expose the reality of this idea. For every sect debunks the claims of the other and belies it. And Allah is sufficient for the believers in war.²

Furthermore, the concept of the Imāms only being twelve in total is not acceptable logically and practically; for will the Ummah remain without an Imām after the termination of the specific number? Because the era of the open Imāms of the Shī‘ah does not exceed two and a half centuries.

The Shī‘ah were, therefore, compelled to somehow find a solution to the confinement of the Imāms by asserting that the Mujtahid holds the position of representing the Imām. They have then differed as to the limitations of this representation.³ In recent times they have practically discarded this principle, which holds the most integral position in their religion, by electing a president for their country through the process of election. They have moved on from quantitative limitation to a qualitative one; they have thus limited the position of presidency to a Shī‘ī *Faqīh* (scholar).⁴

---

¹ *Nahj al-Balāghah* p. 82.
² See the writings of Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī regarding the doubts he creates regarding the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms from after Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq in his book *al-Zīnah* (manuscript): p. 232-233.
³ Muḥammad Mughniyah: *al-Khumaynī wa al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 68.
With that being said, the Shīʿah, in substantiation of the idea of twelve Imāms, use a narration which appears in the books of ḥadīth which is narrated from Jābir ibn Samurah. It says:

یکون اثنا عشر أمیرا- فقال كلمة لم أسمعها فقال أبي إنه قال: كلهم من قریش

“There will be twelve leaders.” Then he said something which I did not hear. My father explained that he said, “All of them will be from the Quraysh.”

This is the wording of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī.¹ The narration of Muslim from Jābir goes as follows:

سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول: لا يزال الإسلام عزیزا إلي اثني عشر خليفة ثم قال كلمة لم أفهمها. فقلت لأبي: ما قال؟ قال: كلهم من قریش

I heard Rasūl Allah saying, “Islām will remain supreme till twelve rulers.” He then said something which I did not understand. So I asked my father what he said. He said, “They will all be from the Quraysh.”²

Another version states:

لايزال هذا الدین عزیزا منیعا إلي اثني عشر خليفة

This dīn will reign supreme and glorious till twelve rulers.³

While yet another version states:

لايزال أمر الناس ماضيا ما وليهم اثنا عشر رجلا

The affairs of the people will run smoothly till twelve men rule over them.⁴

---

¹ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, chapter regarding legal judgments, sub-chapter regarding appointing a successor, 8/127.
² Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, chapter regarding leadership, sub-chapter regarding people being subject to Quraysh in matters of khilāfah, 2/1453.
³ Ibid.
⁴ Ibid. p. 1452.
The narration of *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* reads thus:

لا إزال هذا الدين قائما حتي يكون عليكم اثنا عشر خليفة، كلهم تجتمع عليهم الأمة.

This dīn will remain established till twelve rulers rule over you. The entire Ummah will unite upon each one of them.¹

Another narration of Abū Dāwūd which he narrates through the transmission of Aswad ibn Saʿīd from Jābir has the following addition:

فَلما رجع إلى منزله اتته قريش فقالوا: ثم ماذا؟ قال: الهرج

When he returned home the Quraysh came to him and asked him, “Then what will happen?”

He said, “Large scale fighting.”²

The Shī‘ah cling onto these narrations and present them as evidence against the Ahl al-Sunnah, not because they believe in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah³ but to establish evidence against them by way of that which they concede.

By deliberating over these texts with impartiality and objectivity we will learn that these twelve individuals are described as:

- People who will assume the position of khilāfah,
- Islam in their era will be mighty and glorious,
- Their subjects will unanimously accept them as the rulers,
- Their leadership will be a means of people’s affairs running smoothly.

---

2 Ibid. 4/472. In *Musnad al-Bazzār* this narration is mentioned with a slight variation which is as follows: ‘He then returned home so I came to him and asked him, “Then what will happen?” He said, “large scale fighting.”’ (Ibn Ḥajr al-ʿAsqalānī: *Fatḥ al-Bārī* 13/211).
None of these prove true for the twelve individuals whom the Shīʿah regard as their Imāms with the exception of ʿAlī and Ḥasan who ruled for a short period, then too, the Ummah did not unite upon them. Similarly, the affairs of the Ummah were not stable in their eras, rather they were constantly unstable; oppressors, neigh disbelievers,¹ ruled over them; the Imāms themselves practiced dissimulation and remained discreet in the matters of their dīn. The era of Amīr al-Muʿminīn ʿAlī is similarly, considered to be an era of Taqiyyah,² as is mentioned by al-Mufīd,³ wherein he was unable to reveal the true Qurʾān and establish many of the injunctions of Islam, as attested to by al-Jazāʾirī.⁴ He was compelled to collaborate with the Ṣaḥābah and work with them to the detriment of dīn, as conceded by al-Murtaḍā.⁵ Hence the ḥadīth is completely unrelated to the claim that they make.

Furthermore, the ḥadīth does not confine the Imāms to twelve, rather it is a prophecy of Rasūl Allah that Islam will reign supreme during the reign of twelve individuals.

The era of the righteous Khulafā’ and the Umayyads was an era wherein Islam was mighty and glorious. Hence Shaykh al-Islam mentions:

إن الإسلام وشرائعته في زمن بني أمية أظهر وأوسع مما كان بعدهم

Islam and its injunctions were more established and pervasive during the era of the Umayyads.

He then substantiates his positions with the following narration:

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/210; al-Muntaqā p. 533. Their narrations which assert that all the people turned renegade after demise of Rasūl Allah besides three people, likewise after the martyrdom of Ḥusayn besides three people, are coming ahead.
² Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqiʿ p. 43-44.
³ See p. 57 of this book.
⁴ See p. 268 - 269 of this book.
⁵ See p. 565 - 566 of this book.
This dīn will reign supreme till the rule of twelve rulers who will all be from the Quraysh.

He further says:

And this is exactly how things were; the Khulafā’ were Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān and ʿAlī. They were succeeded by whom the Ummah unanimously accepted, Muʿāwiyah, his son, Yazīd, and ʿAbd al-Malik and his four sons. Between them was the rule of ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. After them the condition of dīn started deteriorating and has continued to deteriorate till today.¹

Furthermore, according to the Twelvers the rulership of the ‘awaited Mahdī’ will remain till the end of time. This implies that there will be no era which will be void of the rule of the Twelve Imāms; there will be no two eras, i.e. an era wherein the affairs of the Ummah will be stable and an era wherein they will be unstable. This is obviously against the purport of the ḥadīth.² It is likewise against the doctrine of the Shīʿah which asserts that the era of the Twelve Imāms is an era of Taqiyyah until the emergence of the ‘Mahdī’; a Shīʿī who does not practice Taqiyyah therein is equal to a person who abandons ṣalāh.³

In addition, just as the Ummah did not unite upon the Imāms due to the fact that they did not rule, the Shīʿah themselves did not unite upon them; they have amidst themselves held variant views regarding the Imāms, their precise conditions.

---

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/206.
³ Refer to the section of Taqiyyah.
amount, and their personalities. Such variant views which cannot be enumerated but with difficulty. An evident exposition of this can be found in the books of heresiography.

Another aspect which Ibn Taymiyah mentions regarding the ḥadīth is that it states, “They will all be from the Quraysh.” This means that these rulers do not necessarily have to be from the family of ʿAlī; had that been the case, he would have mentioned a family line which would create a distinction between them and the others. Consider, Rasūl Allah did not say that they will be from the posterity of Ismāʿīl or that they will be Arabs even though they all were. This is because he intended to specify the tribe which makes them different from the others. Hence if they really were required to be from the Banū Hāshim or from the family of ʿAlī, he would have described them accordingly. But they were required to be from the Quraysh due to the assertion in the narration that they will be from the Quraysh; not from a specific family thereof, but from its different branches like that of the Banū Taym, Banū ʿAdī, Banū ʿAbd Shams, and the Banū Hāshim to which all the righteous rulers belonged.1

Therefore, besides the aspect of the number “twelve” which cannot prove anything, this ḥadīth does not hold any evidence for what the Shīʿah intend to prove. Do you not know that this very number which is used to describe the righteous rulers, is used in another narration to describe their opposites? Hence the narration of Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim reads as follows:

في أمتي اثنا عشر منافقاً

In my Ummah there will be twelve hypocrites.2

It apparently seems as if this number which the Twelver Shīʿah adore is derived

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/211.
2 Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: chapter regarding the characteristics of the hypocrites and their rulings: 3/2143-2144.
from the old Jewish conjecture which is mentioned in the book of Daniel,\(^1\) as is indicated by Ibn Taymiyah.\(^2\)

**Their Evidence Regarding Imāmah:**

One of the principle beliefs of the Shīʿah is that it is impermissible for the masses to elect an Imām. Rather Naṣṣ (divine emphatic appointment) is required.\(^3\) Hence Imāmah cannot be without Naṣṣ.\(^4\) Rasūl Allah  emphatically appointed ʿAlī and his children.\(^5\) They will thus be the Imāms till the Day of Judgment.

We had previously studied that this doctrine was contrived by the Sabaʼiyyah, the Hishāmiyyah, and the Shayṭāniyyah. The scholars of the Shīʿah, however, aver that this doctrine is the institution of Allah, his Rasūl , and the Ahl al-Bayt...

In substantiating this doctrine, they took many texts, all unknown to the experts of the Sunnah and the transmitters of the Sharīʿah, transmitted them and interpreted them in accordance with their dogma. Most of them are in fact either forgeries, narrations with flawed chains of transmission, or narrations which do not accommodate their invalid interpretations.\(^6\)

---

1 In his book which he has compiled regarding the Mahdī Abū al-Ḥasan ibn al-Munādī mentions, “I found the following in the book of Daniel, ‘When the ‘Mahdī’ dies five men from the tribe of the biggest son (of Israel), then five men from the tribe of the youngest son (of Israel). The last among them will then bequeath that the rule should be passed on to a man from the children of the eldest son. He will be followed by his son which brings the total amount to twelve. Each one of them will be guided.’” (Fatḥ al-Bārī 13/310).


5 Uṣūl al-Kāfī: chapter regarding the Imāms being emphatically appointed by Allah and his Rasūl: 1/286.

6 Ibn Khaldūn: al-Muqaddamah (with the revision of ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Wāḥid al-Wāfī) 2/ 527.
They have exceeded all bounds, as they usually do, in accumulating narrations and texts which establish this doctrine. Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī has even prepared a book by the name _al- Alfayn fī Imāmah Amīr al-Mu’minīn_, i.e. Two thousand reports for the Imāmah of Amīr al-Mu’minīn.¹

Due to it being the most crucial aspect of their dīn there is hardly a Shī‘ī scholar who has not written regarding it.²

You should know that, according to the standards of the Shī‘ah, all these narrations were only narrated by lone individuals, rather by ‘Alī alone, due to him being the door (of the city of knowledge); to the extent that a person who claims to hear from any one besides him is considered to have committed a crime equivalent to ascribing a partner to Allah.³ Similarly, besides ‘Alī and a few among the Ṣaḥābah (three, four or seven), as the books of the Shī‘ah state, the rest of the people renounced Islam; thus rendering their narrations unacceptable.

The narrations of a lone person are expected to be doubted, especially when a very large group of people narrates completely conflicting reports. This, posing an obvious predicament to the Shī‘ah, made them invent the concept of ‘Iṣmah (infallibility). However this “infallibility” itself is dubitable. For it cannot be established for a person who alone claims it for himself. They were thus compelled to formulate another concept, the concept of Mu’jizah (miracles for the Imāms). Hence, the doctrine of Imāmah revolves around these three concepts: Naṣṣ, ‘Iṣmah, and Mu’jizah.

Their scholar al-Mufīd asserts:

---

¹ He has, however, fallen short of reaching two thousand narrations; he has sufficed on mentioning a thousand and thirty eight reports which he considers evidence for his claim (al-A’lamī: _Muqaddamah al-Alfayn_ p. 10).
² _Al-Dharī‘ah Ilā Taṣānīf al-Shī‘ah_ 1/320.
³ _Uṣūl al-Kāfī_ 1/377.
Imāmah according to the Twelvers establishes the following three things for its incumbent: Naṣṣ, ʿIṣmah, and Muʿjizah.¹

The discussion regarding Muʿjizāt only transpiring at the hands of the Ambiyā’, the attribution thereof to the Imāms by the Shīʿah due to according them the status of Nubuwwah and their belief that the Imāms are the evidence of Allah upon the creation (despite not having any evidence besides blindly following what the heretics of the previous centuries had invented) has passed already. Allah says:

لِئَلاَّ یَكُوْنَ لِلنَّاسِ عَلٰى اللّٰهِ حُجَّةٌ بَعْدَ الرُّسُلِ

So that mankind will have no argument against Allah after the messengers.²

He does not make any mention of the Imāms after the prophets. Hence the evidence of Allah was established upon his bondsmen through his Messengers whom He had aided with miracles.

The Shīʿah do not have any evidence to substantiate the miracles of their Imāms besides empty claims which any cunning and deceitful person is able to concoct with the sleight of his hand.³

Even if we hypothetically consider the Muʿjizāt to have transpired, they are dependent upon reports; but how can the reports of ‘renegades’ elicit reliability. Likewise is the case of ʿIṣmah. In spite of this the Shīʿah lend tremendous importance to the reports which represent Naṣṣ and Waṣiyyah (appointment by bequest) which they treat as the foundation of their dogma and the principle belief for their theological structure.

₁ Al-ʿUyūn 2/127.
₂ Sūrah al-Nisā’: 165.
₃ See p. 845 of this book.
As for the issue of ʿIṣmah, due to its pivotal role in the Shīʿī dogma I have dedicated the coming subchapter to it.

There is no doubt as to the fact that emphatically appointing the rulers who are to rule over the Ummah till the Day of Qiyāmah is impossible but according to the Shīʿī logic. This has led them to belief in a very grave misconception, i.e. the belief in a person who according to them is alive for centuries (the ‘Mahdī’ whose return they anticipate). They have thus become the laughing stock for people. ʿAlī al-Riḍā rebutted this misconception of theirs with a response which can be considered the strongest and most rhetorically superior in this regard. The Shīʿah have cited it in their most reliable books. Hence he is reported to have said:

لو كان الله يمد في أجل أحد بني آدم لحاجة الخلق إليه لمد الله في أجل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله

If Allah were to prolong the age of any human due to him being an indispensable asset for the creation he would have prolonged the age of Rasūl Allah.\(^1\)

However, they have defied this primary remark and have believed over the centuries that the ‘awaited Mahdī’ is alive due to the creation, rather the entire world, being in need of him; should this earth be deprived of him it will face ruination with its inhabitants.

After these comments on the issue of Naṣṣ, I do not think there is a need to delve into their narrations which they present in this regard. Because it has ultimately reached the stage of just believing in the fictitious ‘Mahdī’ whose presence is not felt or seen and regarding who there is no shred of evidence or information. If the people really needed him, Rasūl Allah—who was better than him—was more deserving of staying alive. But the Ummah, thanks to its Qurʿān and the rich legacy of its Nabī, does not need an imaginary ‘Mahdī’ nor an imaginary book. The details of this will come in the discussion regarding occultation.

---

\(^1\) Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 458.
The Shīʿah, nonetheless, claim that the Qurʾān makes emphatic mention of the Imāmah of their Imāms and that the issue of Naṣṣ is unanimously accepted by both the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah. They have thus endeavoured to make the Ahl al-Sunnah part of their imaginary beliefs in order to deceitfully ensnare its adherents. If this is the case, then we ought to study what the books of the Shīʿah offer in this regard.

I shall thus first present their strongest evidences from the Qurʾān and the Sunnah, and thereafter present their evidences which are exclusive to them.

I shall thereafter terminate with a discussion on the issue of Naṣṣ in light of the Qurʾān, the Sunnah, reason, and the commonly known and universally accepted aspects of our dīn.

**Their Evidences from the Qurʾān:**

Shaykh al-Ṭāʿifah al-Ṭūsī mentions:

وأما النص علي إمامته من القرآن فأقوي ما يدل عليه قوله تعالى: إِنَّمَا وَلِیُّكُمُ اللّٰهُ وَرَسُوْلُهُ وَالَّذِیْنَ آمَنُوا 

الَّذِیْنَ یُقِیْمُوْنَ الصَّلاَةَ وَیُؤْتُوْنَ الزَّکَاةَ وَهُمْ رَاکِعُوْنَ 

As to his emphatic appointment in the Qurʾān, the strongest evidence for that is the verse, “Your ally is none but Allah and His Messenger, and those who have believed—those who establish ṣalāh, give zakāh, and they bow in worship.”

Al-Ṭabarsī mentions:

وهذه الآية من أوضح الدلائل علي صحة أمامة علي بعد النبي بلا فصل

This verse is from amongst the strongest proofs for the legitimacy of his immediate succession, Imāmah, after Rasūl Allah.

---

1 Sūrah al-Māʿidah: 55
2 Talkhīṣ al-Shāfī 2/10.
3 Majmaʿ al-Bayān 2/128.
Their scholars seem to unanimously concur that this verse is the strongest evidence according to them, for in their works, they always present it first when substantiating their stance.¹

But how exactly do they derive their evidence from this verse? They state that:

The exegetes of the Qurʾān and the scholars of ḥadīth from the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah all concur that it was revealed regarding ʿAlī when, amidst a group of the Ṣaḥābah, he gave his ring as charity to a poor person whilst performing ṣalāh. This narration is recorded in the six authentic books.² ‘إِتا’ gives off the meaning of restriction according to the linguists and ‘Walī’ in this context is in the meaning of the most deserving of administration which is synonymous to an Imām and a Khalīfah.³

As you will notice, the Shīʿah in substantiating their position have taken refuge in the incident which is said to be the cause of its revelation. Their evidence is thus not the verse of the Qurʾān but the incident. Now, is this incident authentic or not? And is their substantiation therefrom correct? This will become clear with the following considerations:

1. Their claim that the Ahl al-Sunnah unanimously concur that this verse was revealed regarding ʿAlī is the most blatant of lies. The consensus

² The name ‘authentic books’ is a false name. Because the Ahl al-Sunnah do not name all six books Șihāh (books which contain only empirically sound narrations). They instead call them the ‘six books’. But this is not strange because the Shīʿah are known for their exaggeration especially when they have fabricated lies against Allah and his Rasūl.
³ Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn 1/144; ‘Aqāʾid al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnay ʿAshariyyah 1/81-82.
of the exegetes of the Qur’ān is that it was not revealed regarding ʿAlī specifically, nor is it true that he gave his ring in charity whilst is ṣalāh. And the consensus of the scholars of ḥadīth is that the aforementioned incident is a fabrication. Likewise the assertion that it appears in the ‘six authentic books’ is also a lie, for it does not appear in any of them. Hence, after citing all the narrations which suggest that this verse was revealed regarding ʿAlī when he gave his ring as charity, Ibn Kathīr concludes thus:

None of these narrations are authentic due them consisting of flawed chains of transmission and due to the narrators thereof being unknown persons.

2. This proof, which the Twelvers present to support their stance, actually debunks it. Because it restricts Wilāyah to ʿAlī by way of ‘إن’ which negates the Imāmah of the rest of the Imāms. If they answer by averring that the restriction in the verse only applies for a specific period, i.e. the period of his rule, and does not by necessity implicate the Imāmah of the others,

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/4.
2 It is a lie which the Shi‘ah are not ashamed of asserting. For it is strange that this is what is stated by some of their senior Ayatollahs in contemporary times, the likes of Shibr and al-Zanjānī, etc. So is it really unknown to them that it does not appear in the six books?

In our times there is no scarcity of catalogued ḥadīth books and lexicons which will reveal the reality (Check: ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib’ in al-Mu`jam al-Mufahras li Alfaż al-Ḥadīth and Kunūz al-Sunnah. And refer to the books which are dedicated to compiling the explanatory narrations for the verses of the Qur’ān and incidents which prompted the revelation thereof like that of al-Durr al-Manthūr 3/104-106. Or the books which are dedicated to compiling the narrations of the six books like that of Jāmi‘ al-Uṣūl. You will not find any ground for their evidence whatsoever. Therefore Ibn Taymiyyah states that the majority of the Ummah did not even hear this incident, nor does it feature in any of their seminal works, not the Șihāh and not the Sunan, not the Jawāmi‘ (comprehensive books of ḥadīth) and not the Mu‘jamāt (lexicons of ḥadīth). It likewise does not appear in any of the canonical works. See: Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/5.

3 Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/76-77.
then they have concurred with the Ahl al-Sunnah who assert that general Wilāyah was restricted to him during his rule and not prior to that, i.e. during the Khilāfah of the three righteous rulers.¹

3. Allah ﷺ does not commend a person but for something that is commendable according to him, whether it be compulsory or optional; and giving charity during ṣalāh is not a commendable act according to the consensus of the scholars. Had it been commendable Rasūl Allah ﷺ would have done it, encouraged others to do it, and would have done it repeatedly. But in ṣalāh there is a different type of engagement. Giving charity to the poor can wait for another time, for it is possible for a person to do that after completing his ṣalāh. Some scholars have, as a matter of fact, opined that dispensing charity whilst in ṣalāh nullifies the ṣalāh.²

4. Even if charity is hypothetically considered permissible in ṣalāh, it would not be specific to the posture of Rukū’. So how can it be said that none except those who give charity whilst in Rukū’ can be the rulers. If it said that the only reason why this specific posture is mentioned is to describe ‘Alī ʿa.s, it can be said that ‘Alī ʿa.s had many known and conceded characteristics, why then is he not being described with them but rather with one which—besides those who heard about it and acknowledged it—people barely know? The majority of the Ummah has not heard this incident nor does it feature in any of its reliable books.³

5. The assertion that ‘Alī ʿa.s discharged his zakāh in ṣalāh is opposed to reality. This is because ‘Alī ʿa.s due to being a pauper in the time of Rasūl Allah ﷺ was not liable to pay zakāh. For the zakāh of silver is only compulsory upon a person who owns the Niṣāb (minimum amount liable to payment of zakāh) whereas he did not own it at that time.

---

¹ Rūḥ al-Maʿānī 6/168.
² Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/208, 4/5.
³ Ibid. 4/5.
Similarly, according to many scholars giving a ring is not good enough to absolve a person of his responsibility of paying zakāh, unless the view of zakāh being compulsory in jewellery is taken wherein one opinion is that it should be discharged from the type of jewellery owned. And even though some have given the permission to evaluate the jewellery and discharge the zakāh accordingly, but doing so in ṣalāh is impossible, for values fluctuate in different conditions.¹

6. Now that it has become clear that all the narrations which they use to interpret the verse are flawed in their content and chains of transmission, the conclusion is that they cannot elicit evidence therefrom. Rather the verse is evidence against them. Because it orders the believers to establish relationships of fealty with the believers and prohibits them from doing so with the disbelievers,² an injunction unknown to the Shīʿah (as their history and legacy records).

This is obvious from the context wherein this verse features; prior to this verse Allah says:

وَمَن يَتَوَلَّهُم مِّنكُمْ فَإِنَّهُ مِنْهُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَيَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الظَّالِمِیْنَ

O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are [in fact] allies of one another. And whoever is an ally to them among you—then indeed, he is [one] of them. Indeed, Allah guides not the wrongdoing people.³

This is an emphatic prohibition of allying with the Jews and the Christians and having cordial relationships with them, and according to everyone

---

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/5.
² Even though the incident which prompted the revelation of this verse is specific. But the generality of the words is what is headed, not the specific incident of revelation.
³ Sūrah al-Māʾidah: 51.
(including the Shī‘ah) this does not imply Wilāyah in the meaning of leadership, for there is no room for that. Allah then mentions those with whom one should have alliance, i.e. Allah, His Rasūl, and the believers. Hence the alliance which was negated in the previous verse is the very alliance which the believers are ordered with in this verse based on the rule of juxtaposition which is an accepted rule in the Arabic language.

Al-Rāzī mentions:

لما نهي الله في الآيات المتقدمة عن موالة الكفار أمر في هذه الآية بموالاة من تجب موالاته

Allah in the previous verse prohibited alliance with the disbelievers and in this verse ordered alliance with those with whom fealty is necessary.¹

Ibn Taymiyah likewise mentions:

إنه من المعلوم عند أهل التفسير خلفا عن سلف أن هذه الآية نزلت في النهي عن موالاة الكفار الأمر بموالاة المؤمنين

According to the early exegetes and those who succeeded them it is a well-known and established aspect that this verse was revealed regarding the prohibition of allying with the disbelievers and the order of allying with the believers.²

7. Averring that ‘Your ally is none but...’ refers to leadership does not tie up with what follows it, i.e. ‘Your ally is none but Allah, His Messenger, and those who have faith...’ This is because Allah is not described as being the governor of his servants and their ruler, because He is their Creator, Sustainer, Lord and Owner; to Him belongs creation and order; it

---

¹ Tafsīr al-Fakhr al-Rāzī 12/25.
² Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/5.
cannot be said that Allah is *Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn* in the like manner that ‘Alī ﷺ or anyone else is accorded that title.¹ As for Walāyah, translated as love—the opposite of enmity, Allah ﷻ can be described as the One who befriends His believing bondsmen, as One who loves them and they love Him, as One who is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and as One who declares war against a person who harasses any of His friends.² This is the correct purport of this verse.³

Furthermore, the description ‘and they bow in worship’ means that they are humble before their Lord and they are subservient to His orders. The word ‘*Rukū*’ literally means humility. The verse would thus mean that they establish ṣalāh and discharge zakāh with humility and subservience.⁴

8. The difference between *Wilāyah* (with the kasrah) and *Walāyah* (with the Fatḥah) is obvious in the Arabic language. The latter (Walāyah) is the opposite of enmity. This is the one mentioned in these verses; not the former (Wilāyah) which means leadership. The Shīʿah, however, thanks to their ignorance, do not differentiate between the two despite it being obvious:

---

¹ In fact, even Rasūl Allah ﷺ cannot be described as the ruler of the believers and their governor, for his status is beyond that. Even Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq was, during his reign, only called Khalīfat Rasūl Allāh (the successor of Rasūl Allāh). The first person to be called Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn was ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/9.)

² This friendship, unlike the friendship of humans which is based upon need, is His mercy upon us. Allah ﷻ says:

> وَقُلِ الحَْمْدُ للهَِِّ الَّذِي لمَْ یَتَّخِذْ وَلَدًا وَلمَْ یَكُن لَّهُ شرَِیكٌ فيِ المُْلْكِ وَلمَْ یَكُن لَّهُ وَلَیٌِّ مِّنَ الذُّلِّ  وَکَبرِّْهُ تَكْبِيرًا

> And say, “Praise to Allah, who has not taken a son and has had no partner in [His] dominion and has no [need of a] protector out of weakness; and glorify Him with [great] glorification.”

So Allah ﷻ does not befriend any one out of weakness. Instead he says:

> من کانَ یُرِیدُ الْعِزَّةَ فَلِلَّهِ الْعِزَّةُ جمَِیعًا

> Whoever desires honour [through power] – then to Allah belongs all honour (Fāṭir: 10) (Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/9).

³ Ibid.

• Walā’ (with a Fathah) is the opposite of enmity; the nouns Mawlā and Walī (friend) are derived therefrom.

• And Wilāyah is with a Kasrah wherefrom the knowns Wālī and Mutawallī (ruler/governor) are derived.¹

The jurists have, therefore, mentioned that if the Wālī (ruler) and the Walī (family member) happen to be at the funeral of a deceased person, the latter will take precedence over the former. This also shows that both the words are different.²

If Allah Ш for leadership then He would have phrased the verse thus:

إِنَّمَا يَتَولِي عَلَيْكُمْ... None can rule over you but...

In conclusion, this verse is about the alliance which the believers should have for each other,³ which is why the plural form, “and those who have believed,” is brought in the verse.

If this is the reality of their strongest argument, then it is obvious that they have no basis whatsoever for what they claim. The magnanimity of this doctrine, which according to the Shī'ah is the most crucial aspect of their dogma, necessarily requires evidence which is unequivocal and to the point which all classes of people are able to comprehend, a layman should be able to understand it as clearly as a scholar is able to grasp it, the later generations should be able to understand it as the earlier generations were able to understand it and the Bedouins should be able to understand it like the people of the cities are able to understand it. But, such evidence is not found in the Book of Allah لا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ. This clearly suggests that there was no Naṣṣ (emphatic appointment) as they allege. Whereas the Qur’ān

---

¹ Al-Maqdisī: Risālah fi Al-Radd ʿAlā Al-Rāfiḍah p. 220-221; Mukhtar al-Ṣiḥāh (under the roots letters لی و).  
³ Ibid. also refer to Tafsīr al-Rāzī 12/25; Tafsīr al-Ālūsī 6/167.
was revealed in the clear Arabic language this verse and the others verses which they use in substantiation do not contain expressions and words which are used in the Arabic language for emphatic appointment.

So where can the Shīʿah go henceforth? Either toward renouncing the Qurʾān which is tantamount to renouncing Islam or toward shunning their extremism and fanaticism and return to the truth which is what they are required to do.

Besides this verse there are other verses as well which they present in support of their position. They have been documented by Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and Ibn Taymiyyah has responded to them comprehensively. Any person who refers to their books of tafsīr and ḥadīth will notice that they have made Wilāyah and the Imāms the central theme of the Qurʾān, as has passed already in this book, which is a sign of their helplessness in this regard.

From this discussion it has become evident that the apparent wording of the Qurʾān does not accommodate the emphatic appointment of ‘Alī and the remaining Imāms. They thus avert the meanings of the verses which they use according to their whims and fancies based on fabricated narrations and invalid interpretations. So in reality they do not derive evidence from the Qurʾān itself, but from narrations. Hence, their claim that they derive evidence from the Qurʾān is an empty claim which has no reality.

**Their evidence from the Sunnah**

The Shīʿah have primarily taken the virtues and merits of ‘Alī which appear in the books of ḥadīth of the Ahl al-Sunnah and used them to prove his explicit nomination. It should be noted that Faḍā’il (merits) is a topic wherein fabrication is not unusual. And it is said that the Shīʿī are the forerunners in forging narrations in this regard. Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd mentions:

---

1 Professor ‘Alī al-Sālūs has done a comprehensive study of verses of the Qurʾān which they use for substantiating the doctrine of Imāmah in his books al-Imāmah ‘ind al-Ja’fariyyah wa al-Adillah min al-Qurʾān al-ʿAẓīm. He has concluded that all their proofs are related to incidents which prompted the revelation of verses of the Qurʾān which are not reliable enough to prove as evidence for their doctrine.
Forgeries in the topic of Faḍā’il have all come from the Shī‘ah.¹

That is why you will find more forgeries in the merits of ʿAlī١ than in the merits of the remaining three Khulafā’.

However, the narrations which mention the merits of ʿAlī١ do not in any way contain words or expressions of his explicit nomination and the bequest of his succession. Not according to the Arabic language, not according to the conventions of the Arabs, not according to the Sharī‘ah of Islam, and not according to the understanding of the intellectuals. They are just mere merits which the Shī‘ah have exploited to support their stance. Ibn Ḥazm after doing a comprehensive study of the virtues of ʿAlī١ asserts thus:

وأما الذي صح من فضائل علي فهو قول النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم: أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسي إلا أنه لا نبي بعدي وهذا لا حجة فيه للرافضة و قوله عليه السلام: لأعطين الرأية غدا رجلا يحب الله و رسوله، ويجبه الله و رسوله وهذه صفة واجبة لكل مسلم و فاضل و عهده عليه السلام: أن عليا لا يحبه إلا مؤمن ولا يغضبه إلا منافق وقد صح مثل هذا في الأنصار-رضي الله عنهم-أنه لا يغضبه من يؤمن بالله اليوم الآخر وأما من كنت موله فعلي موله، فلا يصح من طريق الثقات أصلًا. و أما سائر الأحاديث التي تتعلق بها الارفضة فموضوعة، يعرف ذلك من له أدنى علم بالأخبار ونقلتها

As for the virtues of ʿAlī, the only narrations which are authentically proven are, “You are to me like how Hārūn was to Mūsā. However, there is no Nabī after me.”² This narration does not hold any evidence for the

---
² The complete narration of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī states that when Rasūl Allah left for Tabūk he told ʿAlī to take charge over Madīnah. ʿAlī asked him, “Are you leaving me behind with the children and women?” Whereupon Rasūl Allah said, “Does it not please you, O ʿAlī, that you be to me as Hārūn was to Mūsā, however, there is no Nabī to come after me.” (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: Chapter Regarding the Campaigns: Sub-chapter Regarding the Battle of Tabūk: 8/12; see also: Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: Chapter Regarding the Campaigns: Sub-chapter Regarding the Battle of Tabūk: 2/1870; Sunan al-Tirmidhī: Chapter of Virtues: 5/640-641; Sunan Ibn Mājah: Introductory Chapter: 1/42-43; Musnad Aḥmad 1/170, 173, 174, 175, 177, 179, 182, 184, 185, 330; 3/32, 338; 6/369, 438.
And the narration, “Tomorrow I will give the flag to a person who

1 In expounding upon this Ibn Ḥazm says, “This does not prove his superiority upon the others and
does not establish his leadership after Rasūl Allah H. Because Hārūn S did not take charge
of the affairs of the Banī Isrāʾīl after Mūsā S, rather it was his assistant and companion Yūshaʿ ibn Nūn, who accompanied him on his journey to meet Khidar S, who took charge of affairs after him.

In a like manner, after Rasūl Allah H his companion in the cave and on the journey of Hijrah (migration) was the one who succeeded him.

Hence, considering the fact that ʿAlī was not a Nabī like Hārūn S and the fact that Hārūn did not
succeed his brother Mūsā S after his demise, the only appropriate purport of the ḥadīth would be
that he was to Rasūl Allah H as Hārūn S was to Mūsā in kinship.

Furthermore, Rasūl Allah H said this to him when he appointed him as his deputy over Madīnah
during the battle of Tabūk. Whereupon the hypocrites remarked, “Rasūl Allah H regarded him
as inferior” (this is the text which appears in the revised version of his al-Faṣl. Maybe it ought to be
‘regarded him as a burden’). Hence, ‘Alī subsequent to that caught up with Rasūl Allah H
and complained to him. Rasūl Allah H told him, “You are to me as Hārūn was to Mūsā.” That is,
he meant to say that I have not appointed you as my deputy considering you to be a burden, but I
have done so willingly.

In addition, it should be noted that Rasūl Allah H had, prior to the Battle of Tabūk and thereafter,
appointed many other Ṣaḥābah besides ʿAlī S as his deputies over Madīnah. So this specific incident
does not entail any merit which ‘Alī S alone enjoys. Nor does it necessitate that he was the only
one deserving of rulership after him. For if this phenomenon, leadership, was not true for the others,
then so too was it not true for ‘Alī. (Al-Faṣl 4/159-160).

Similarly, likening ʿAlī to Hārūn S is not in any way more virtuous than likening Abū Bakr to
Ibrāhīm and ʿIsā S, and likening ʿUmar to Nūḥ and Mūsā S, as is narrated in Musnad Ahmad
1/383, Mustadrak Ḥākim 3/21-22 and Sunan al-Tirmidhī: Chapter Regarding Jihad: 4/213. This is due
to the fact that these four Ambiyāʾ were definitely much more virtuous that Hārūn S. And Abū
Bakr and ʿUmar S are likened not just to one prophet but to two. This simile is thus superior to
the simile of ‘Alī S. More so when the merit of appointment as deputy was not enjoyed by ‘Alī S
alone, but by others besides him as well whereas Abū Bakr and ʿUmar S had no partners in
the merits owing to which they were likened to the other prophets. Hence appointing him was not a
merit exclusive to him and nor was likening him to a Nabī in just some aspects exclusive to him (al-
Muntaqā p. 314-315).

loves Allah and his Rasūl and Allah and his Rasūl love him.” ¹ Which is a quality required of every devout Muslim.² And the statement of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, “‘Alī, only a believer will love him and only a hypocrite will hate him.”³ But this type of virtue is proven for the Anṣār as well. Rasūl Allah ﷺ said that only a person who believes in Allah and the Last Day will love them.⁴ As for the narration, “Whosoever’s mawlā I am ‘Alī is also his mawlā.”⁵ It is not transmitted through reliable narrators at all. And as to the remaining narrations which the Shī‘ah use, they are forgeries which any person who has a little knowledge regarding hadīth can identify.⁶

¹ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: Chapter Regarding the Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-chapter Regarding the Merits of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib: 7/70; Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: Chapter Regarding the Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-chapter Regarding the Merits of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib: 2/1871-1873.

² Meaning, this description does not fit ʿAlī only, because others besides him also love Allah and his Rasūl and Allah and His Rasūl Allah love them in return. The narration, however, is just a testification of his loyalty, which is akin to the glad tidings of Jannah which Rasūl Allah ﷺ gave to the ten Ṣaḥābah. So this again is not a merit exclusive to him, let alone it being evidence for his explicit nomination after Rasūl Allah ﷺ and his infallibility.

Furthermore, The Shī‘ah who claim that all the Ṣaḥābah turned apostate after the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ cannot hold this narration in their favour. This is because the Khawārij who rebelled against ʿAlī considered him to be an apostate as well. Al-Ashʿarī states, “The Khawārij are unanimous regarding the disbelief of ʿAlī (al-Maqālāt 1/167). The Ahl al-Sunnah have, however, refuted this allegation of the Khawārij with abundant evidence which comprehensively asserts that (together with ʿAlī) the first three Khulafā‘ were also Muslims. (Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/98-99).

³ Sunan al-Tirmidhī: Chapter of Merits: 5/643. Imām Tirmidhī has rated the ḥadīth as Ṣaḥīḥ and Ḥasan (authentic and good).

⁴ Rasūl Allah ﷺ is reported to have said, “A person who has faith in Allah and the Last Day will never despise the Anṣār (Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: Chapter Regarding Īmān: Sub-chapter Regarding Love for the Anṣār Being a Proof of Īmān and a Sign thereof, and Hate for them Being a Sign of Hypocrisy: 1/86). There are other narrations as well wherein the wording is identical to that of the narration regarding ʿAlī. Rasūl Allah ﷺ said, “The Anṣār, only a believer will love them and only a hypocrite will despise them.” (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: Chapter Regarding the Virtues of the Anṣār: Sub-chapter Regarding Love for the Anṣār Being a Sign of Īmān: 7/113; Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: previously mentioned details; Sunan al-Tirmidhī: Chapter of Merits: Sub-chapter Regarding the Virtues of the Anṣār and the Quraysh: 5/712).

⁵ Details will come ahead.

⁶ Al-Faṣl 4/224.
Ibn Taymiyah has cited this text of Ibn Ḥazm and commented thus:

If it is said that Ibn Ḥazm did not mention the narrations which appear in the Ṣaḥīḥayn like, “I am from you and you are from me.”¹, the narration of Mubāhalah (mutual imprecation),² and the narration of Kisāʾ (the shawl),³ the answer is that Ibn Ḥazm only intended to respond to those authentic

1 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (with the commentary Fath al-Bārî): chapter regarding settling arguments: 5/303-304, chapter of wars: sub-chapter regarding the 'Umrah al-Qaḍā’ 7/499.
2 The narration of Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ wherein he says, “…When the verse:

فَقُلْ تَعَالَوْا نَدْعُ أَبْنَاءَنَا وَأَبْنَاءَکُمْ

Come, let us call our sons and your sons…(Āl ʿImrān: 61)

was revealed, Rasūl Allah ﷺ called ʿAlī, Fāṭimah, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn and said, “O Allah this is my household.” (Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: chapter regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah; sub-chapter regarding the merits of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭalib: 2/1871).

This ḥadīth does not entail any evidence for the Imāmah of ʿAlī or his superiority, for immediate family is one of the requirements of Mubāhalah. Hence entering the Mubāhalah with those who were not related to him would not have served the purpose in spite of them being more virtuous than ʿAlī and his relatives (See: Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/34-36; al-Maqdisī: Risālah fī al-Radd ’alā al-Rāfiḍah p. 243-245).

3 This narration appears in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim. ʿĀ’ishah reports that Rasūl Allah ﷺ one day came out. He was wearing a coloured shawl (a shawl which usually had the print of camel-men) which was made of black hair. Subsequently, Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī came, he took him under the shawl. Then Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī came, he also came into the shawl. Thereafter Fāṭimah came, he took her under it as well. She was followed by ʿAlī who was also taken therein. Subsequent to that he said,

إِنَّمَاَ یُرِیدُ اللهَُّ لِیُذْهِبَ عَنكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَیْتِ وَیُطَهِّرَکُمْ تَطْهِيرًا

“O household! Allah intends to remove from you the impurity (of sin) and to purify you with intensive purification.”(al-Ḥazāb: 33)

(Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: chapter regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the merits of the Ahl al-Bayt: 2/1883; Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/20-25; Risālah fī al-Radd ʿalā al-Rāfiḍah p. 246; Mukhtaṣar al-Tuhfah p. 155-156).
narrations which contain the exclusive mention of ʿAlī. As for these narrations, they contain his mention with the mention of others; in the first narration Rasūl Allah said to Jaʿfar, “You resemble me in my features and my character.” And he said to Zayd, “You are our brother and our friend.” And in both the Mubāhalah and Kisā’ narrations, along with ʿAlī, mention is made of Fāṭimah, Ḥasan, and Husayn. So Ibn Ḥazm is free of the objection.¹

The Shīʿah have, nonetheless, exceeded all limits in this regard. They have invented narrations and have likewise made false additions to authentic ones. The books dedicated to forgeries have documented a good amount of these narrations of the Shīʿah.² Ibn al-Jawzī mentions:

فضائله-یعني عليا- الصحیحة کثیرة غیر أن الرافضة لم تقنع، فوضعت له یضع ول یرفع

The authentic merits of ʿAlī are numerous. However, the Shīʿah were not satisfied, so they fabricated more narrations; narrations which denigrate him instead of venerating him.³

Many a time they deceitfully and falsely attribute some of these narrations to the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah whereas you will not find any trace of them whatsoever. Ibn Taymiyah therefore says:

و رأيت كثير امن ذالك المعزو الذي عزاه أولئك (یعني بهم شيوخ الروافض الذين اطلع علي كتبهم)إلي المسند والصحيحين وغيرهما باطلا لحقیقة له

Many a times I have found their attribution of many of these narrations to the Musnad and the Ṣaḥīḥayn, etc., to be false and without any reality.⁴

---

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/86.
3 Ibid. 1/338..
4 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/27.
These narrations, which they cite as proof, have been compiled by Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī. And Ibn Taymiyah has very conclusively separated the truth from the falsehood in responding to them.¹

Nonetheless, the Shi‘ah have their deceitful and cunning ploys through the medium of which they endeavour to derive evidence from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Perhaps the first person to expose these ploys was the great scholar of India Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Dehlawī in his book Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah.² Shaykh Muḥammad Naṣr Allah al-Hindī al-Makkī, the teacher of the scholars and luminaries, a man unique and unparalleled in his knowledge, as al-Ālūsī describes him, has likewise done the same in his book al-Ṣawāqi‘ al-Muḥriqah which Al-Ālūsī has condensed and titled al-Suyūf al-Mushriqah.³ Another scholar who has done work in this regard is al-Shaykh al-Suwaydī who has written Naqḍ ‘Aqā‘id al-Shī‘ah.⁴ And I have mentioned some of these ploys in my book Fikrah al-Taqrīb⁵ so there is no need to repeat them here.

Having said this, I will now mention their strongest evidence from the Sunnah just as I had previously mentioned their strongest evidence from the Qur‘ān.

**Their Strongest Evidence from the Sunnah**

Their strongest evidence from the Sunnah is ‘Ḥadīth al-Ghadīr’. The importance that the Shi‘ah lend to this ḥadīth can be gaged from the fact that one of their

---

¹ Especially in the last volume. Professor ‘Alī al-Sālūs has likewise compiled all the narrations which appear in the six books, the Muwaṭṭa’ and the Musnad of Imām Aḥmad and has done a comprehensive study of their wording and chains of transmission. He has concluded with the remarks that the Sunnah does not support the stance of the Ja‘fariyyah in the issue of Imāmah, rather the opposite is true, for many an authentic narrations debunk it (see: al-Imāmah ‘ind al-Ja‘fariyyah fi Ḍaw‘ al-Sunnah).

² Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah p. 44 onwards; Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah p. 32 onwards.


⁴ Naqḍ ‘Aqā‘id al-Shī‘ah (manuscript wherein the pages have not been numbered as yet. But it is the 25th page from the beginning.)

⁵ Fikrah al-Taqrīb p. 52 onwards.
contemporary scholars has written a book comprising of sixteen volumes named, *Ghadīr in the Qur’ān, the Sunnah, and Arabic literature*. They aver that Rasūl Allah, upon reaching Ghadīr Khum1 on his return from the Farewell Ḥajj told the people that ʿAlī is his successor and the ruler after him. For Allah ordered him in the Qurʾān:

\[
\text{يَا أَيُّهَا الرَّسُولُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنزِلَ إِلَیْكَ مِن رَّبِّكَ  وَإِن لَّمْ تَفْعَلْ فَمَا بَلَّغْتَ رِسَالَتَهُ}
\]

O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord, and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His message.2

Al-Majlisī after citing a hundred and five such narrations3 avers:

\[
	ext{إِنَا وَمُخْالِفِينا قَدْ رَوَيْنَا عَن النَّبِيِّ صَلِی اللَّه عَلیه وَسَلَّمَ أَنَّهُ قَامَ يُومَ غَدِیر خَم وَقَدْ جَمَعَ الْمُسْلِمُونَ فَقَالَ:}
\]

We and our opponents concur that when Rasūl Allah reached Ghadīr Khum he addressed the people saying, “O people! Am I not closer to the believers than themselves?” they responded, “Most certainly.” Whereupon Rasūl Allah said, “Whosoever’s mawlā I am ῬAli is his mawlā.4 O Allah befriend the one who befriends him, oppose the one who opposes him, help the one who helps him and abandon the one who abandons him.”5

Their books of Qurʾānic exegesis similarly quote this narration in establishing his Imāmah under the commentary of the aforecited verse. Likewise, all their

---

1 Khum is a valley between Makkah and Madinah by Juḥfah. There, there is a pond which is known for its squalidity (*Mujam al-Buldān* 2/389).
4 The word ‘mawlā’ has many meanings in the Arabic language. In this context the Shīʿah translate it as ‘master’, ‘Imām’ and ‘leader’ and the Ahl al-Sunnah translate it as ‘friend’ and ‘associate’.
5 Ibid. 37/225.
books which discuss the issue of Imāmah cite it as well. This narration takes the foremost position among all their narrations which they present against the Ahl al-Sunnah. Their scholar ‘Abd Allah Shibr says:

ما روي العامة لأسرهم بطرق متواترة و أسانيد متضافرة تنفي علي مائة طريق و اتفقوا علي صحته و اعترفوا بوقوعه وهو حديث الغدیر.

The narration which the commonality, the Ahl al-Sunnah, have reported with more than a hundred widespread and supportive transmissions, and upon the authenticity of which they have all agreed, and the occurrence of which they have all conceded is the incident of Ghadīr.

Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī similarly used this narration in support of his argument which was subsequently very aptly rebutted by Ibn Taymiyyah. Likewise Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb also debated the stance of al-Muṣṭid regarding the narration based on its Shī‘ī conception. Most of the scholars who have combatted the Shī‘ah have in a like manner shed light upon this narration. Hereunder I will briefly present the responses given by the Ahl al-Sunnah:

Firstly, the fabricators have added on to the actual text of the narration. And besides the statement ‘whosoever’s mawlā I am ‘Alī is his mawlā’ the rest of the

---


2 Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn 1/153. Al-Ṣādiqī says, “The narration of Ghadīr is one of the most authentically established narrations transmitted by the narrators (‘Alī wa al-Ḥākimūn p. 73). It is evidence against those who were present and those who were not. So that no excuse remains for anyone after its establishment (Ibid. 73).


4 Risālah fī al-Radd ʿalā al-Rāfiḍah p. 6-7.

narration which follows thereafter is not authentic according to a group of scholars. Whilst another group of scholars aver that the narration in its entirety is unauthentic. Ibn Ḥazm mentions:

و أَما مَن كَنت مُولَاه فَعَلِي مُولَاه فَلا يَصْحُ مِن طُرِيق الْبَلَاغَات أَصَلًا

And as for the narration ‘whosoever’s mawlā I am ‘Alī is his mawlā’, it is not narrated through the transmission of reliable narrators.²

Rating the narration as weak and flawed is thus narrated from Imām Bukhārī, Ibrāhīm al-Ḥarbī, and a group of scholars.³

---

1 Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb: Risālah fī al-Radd ʿalā al-Rāfiḍah p. 13. The narration appears in Sunan al-Tirmidhī: Sub-chapter regarding the virtues of ʿAlī: 5/633. It states that Rasūl Allah said:

من کنت مولاه فعلي مولاه

"Whosoever’s mawlā I am ‘Alī is his mawlā."

Imām Tirmidhī commenting on it states that it is a Ṣaḥīḥ Ḥasan narration (authentic and good). The version of Sunan Ibn Mājah reads as follows: Barāʾ ibn ʿĀzib narrates:


We returned with Rasūl Allah from his Ḥajj which he performed. He stopped on the way and ordered the people to gather for ṣalāh. He then took the hand of ʿAlī and said, “Am I not more deserving of the believers than they are of themselves?” The people responded, “Most certainly.” He asked again, “Am I not more deserving of the believers than they are of themselves?” To which the people responded, “Most certainly.” He then said, “Then he is the wali of the one whose mawlā I am. Oh Allah befriend the one who befriends him and oppose the one who opposes him.” (Sunan Ibn Mājah 1/43).

However, the author of Al-Zawā'id mentions, “The chain of transmission is weak because of the weak narrator ‘Alī ibn Zayd ibn Jaḍān (one of the narrators of Sunan Ibn Mājah).” (Al-Zawā id p. 69). The narration appears in Musnad Aḥmad 1/84. Shaykh Aḥmad Shākir commenting thereupon mentions, “The text of the narration is authentic. It is established in many variant ways most of which are documented in Majma’ Al-Zawā'id.” (See: al-Musnad 2/56 –with the revision of Shākir; Majma’ Al-Zawā'id 9/103-109).


3 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/86.
Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

وأما قوله: من كنت موله فعلي موله فليس هو في الصحاح، لكن هو مما رواه أهل العلم و تنازع الناس
في صححه و أما قوله: اللهم وال من واله و عاد من عاداه و انصر من نصره و اخذل من خذله فهو كذب
باتفاق أهل المعرفة بالحديث

As for his statement, “Whosoever’s mawlā I am ʿAlī is his mawlā”, it does not appear in the authentic books of ḥadīth. It is rather an addition which the scholars have transmitted and debated.¹ And as for his supplication, “O Allah befriend the one who befriends him, oppose the one who opposes him, help the one who helps him, and forsake the one who forsakes him”, it is a lie according to the consensus of the scholars of ḥadīth.²

He further goes on to mention that a forgery can be identified by merely looking at its text. He explains:

لإن قوله أللهم انصر من نصره خلاف للواقع التاریخي الثابت فلا يصح عن رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم أصلا وأما قوله اللهم وال من واله و عاد من عاداه فهو مخالف لأصل الإسلام، فإن القرآن قد بين أن المؤمنين إخوة مع قتالهم و بغي بعضهم علي بعض

The supplication, “O Allah help the one who helps him,” is not harmonious with historical reality and therefore cannot be the supplication of Rasūl Allah.³ Likewise the supplication, “O Allah befriend the one who befriends him and oppose the one who opposes him,” is against the primary text of Islam, the Qur’ān, which states that the believers are brothers despite their internal wars and transgressions against each other.⁴

---

¹ Ibid.
² Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/16.
³ Because many people fought by his side in the Battle of Ṣiffīn but still did not attain victory and many people did not fight by his side but were not forsaken by Allah. For example: Saʿd who conquered Iraq did not fight with ʿAlī. Similarly, the army of Muʿāwiya and the Umayyads, despite fighting against him, conquered many cities of the disbelievers with the help of Allah (Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaikḥ al-Islām 4/418).
⁴ Ibid.
Secondly, Ibn Taymiyyah, after mentioning the variant views of the scholars regarding the authenticity of the statement, “Whosoever’s mawlā I am ‘Alī is his mawlā,” states:

If this was not the statement of Rasūl Allah 
 then there is no debate. But, hypothetically, even if it is, he did not intend to appoint ‘Alī as the Khalīfah after him. Because the wording of the narration does not accommodate that, more so when this is a pivotal issue which requires unequivocal and emphatic expression. Muwālāt in this narration is thus the opposite of enmity which is established for every Muslim. Which implies that ‘Alī is a believer from among the believers who befriend each other and befriend him as well. The narration, however, is a testification to the internal faith of ‘Alī and to the fact that he is deserving of friendship inwardly and outwardly; it is thus a refutation of what the Khawārij and the Nawāṣib, his enemies, accuse him of. But it does not in any way suggest that there is no master/leader for the believers besides him. Why would that be the situation when Rasūl Allah had many other Mawālī besides him, i.e. the pious believers?

Al-Fīroz’ābādī, the author of Al-Qāmūs mentions:

Al-Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/86.
And as for the assumption of the Shī‘ah that the verse or the narration is evidence that ʿAlī is the Khalīfah after Rasūl Allah, it is the result of ignorance which is wrong with a doubt. Because Walāyah with a Fathah is the opposite of enmity and the nouns derived therefrom are, Mawlā and Wālī. And Wilāyah with a Kasrah means leadership and the nouns derived therefrom are Wālī and Mutawallī. Hence Muwālāt (affinity) is the opposite of Muʿādāt (enmity) and it is reciprocal, as in the verse, “But if you cooperate against him – then indeed Allah is his friend, and Gabriel and the righteous of the believers. And the angels, moreover, are [his] assistants,” the verse, “That is because Allah is the Protector of those who have believed and because the disbelievers have no protector.” And the verse, “The believing men and believing women are allies of one another.” There are many verse of this nature.

Ostensibly, the Shī‘ah realised that this narration does not serve their purpose. They thus made many additions to it.

Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb averred that many of these additions are tantamount to disbelieve according to the entire Ummah. If a person reads these additions from the Biḥār of al-Majlisī he will see open disbelief and deviance. Such that can only be explained and elaborated upon in lengthy pages. Just looking at the texts thereof is enough to determine that they are forgeries.

Thirdly, Sharī‘ah aside, it is a known fact in terms of language, reason and public convention that appointment of a Khalīfah cannot be valid with such ambiguous

---

1 Referring to the verse إنما ولیكم الله ورسوله... Refer to the previous discussion on p. 922
3 Sūrah Muḥammad: 11.
4 See al-Mu‘jam al-Mufahras: under the root letters walī.
5 Risālah fi al-Radd ʿalā al-Rāfiḍah p. 6 onwards.
words. Therefore, when Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib was asked, “Did not Rasūl Allah 弩ملكsay, “Whosoever’s mawlā I am ‘Alī is his mawlā.” He replied thus:

Behold! By the oath of Allah! If Rasūl Allah’s intended purpose was leadership over the people and successorship after him he would have made that clear to them in no uncertain terms. Just as he clarified ṣalāh, zakāh, fasting in Ramaḍān and Hajj for them; he would have said, “This is the person in charge of your affairs after me so listen to him and obey him.” In this statement, which Rasūl Allah would more likely have said due to him being the best well-wisher for the Muslims, there would have been no ambiguity whatsoever.¹

The purport of the narration is general for every believer. But the reason why ʿAlī is specifically mentioned is that some of his fellow companions were disillusioned with him. They continuously complained of him to Rasūl Allah before he left Madīnah when he sent him to Yemen during the Farewell Hajj.² Imām al-Bayhaqī therefore says:

² Sīrah Ibn Hishām 2/603; al-Bidāyah wa Al-Nihāyah 5/104-105.
Even if the narration is regarded authentic it does not yield any evidence for the leadership of 'Alī after Rasūl Allah, for in the chapter of merits we have mentioned through his transmission the reason owing to which Rasūl Allah made exclusive mention of him. That is, when he sent him to Yemen, many people were disillusioned with him and they expressed hatred for him. So Rasūl Allah remedying the situation informed them that 'Alī is his bosom friend and enjoys his admiration thereby encouraging them to love him and befriend him, which is why he said, “Whoever’s wāli I am ‘Alī is his wāli.” And some narrations state, “Whoever’s mawlā I am ‘Alī is his mawlā. His intention was the friendship of Islam and the love induced thereby. This is general for all the Muslims; they should befriend one another and should not be antagonistic to each other.¹

¹ Al-Iʿtiqād p. 181. In conclusion, consider the following regarding the incident of Ghadīr:

1. The verse:

O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord,

was revealed long before the Farewell Ḥajj of Rasūl Allah whereas the Day of Ghadīr was on the eighteenth of Dhū al-Ḥijjah upon his return from Ḥajj (see: Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/84). So the assertion that when it was revealed Rasūl Allah delivered the sermon of Ghadīr is an obvious fabrication of person who does not know how to fabricate.

2. Regarding The narration of Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim which states the following:

I am but a human. Soon the messenger of my lord will come to whom I will respond. I am leaving the Thaqalayn (two weighty things) among you: the first is the Book of Allah wherein is contained guidance and light. So practice upon the Book of Allah and firmly hold on to it.” Rasūl Allah emphasised the Book of Allah and encouraged us regarding it. He then said, “And my household! I remind you of Allah regarding my household… (Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: Chapter regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah: Subchapter regarding the virtues of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib: 3/1884).
After analysing their most crucial evidences from the Qur’ān and from the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, I will leave the analyses and critique of their remaining evidences to the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah which have extensively covered and extirpated the misconceptions they deceitfully raise from the books of the Sunnah.

It goes without a doubt that it is very easy to study these misconceptions and debunk them, for it is enough to have recourse to Minhāj al-Sunnah and books like it from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. However, analysing all of them will require many volumes which will not prove anything new. Therefore, I have sufficed upon their strongest evidence from the Qur’ān and the Sunnah.

Another very important reason for not delving into them is that the Shi’ah do not believe anything that is established through the medium of the Ahl al-Sunnah, however authentic it might be. But they create these misconceptions for one of two reasons:

1. In order to satisfy the doubters and sceptics among their followership.
2. That is by deceiving them into believe that these ‘beliefs’ are a locus

---

1 continued from page 946

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions, “This is a narration exclusive to Muslim which al-Bukhārī has not narrated. The only emphasised order therein is that of holding on to the Book of Allah, which is an order Nabī ﷺ had already previously given in the Farewell Ḥajj. He did not give an order to follow his household; he merely said, “I remind you of Allah regarding my household.” Which means that Muslims should adhere to what he had previously mentioned, long before the incident of Ghadīr, regarding the fulfilment of their rights and the prohibition of wronging them. It is thus clear that at Ghadīr there was no institution of Sharī‘ah which was revealed, not regarding ʿAlī and not regarding anyone else.” ( Minhāj al-Sunnah 4-85).

And al-Fīroz’ābādī mentions, “The statement of Rasūl Allah ﷺ ‘I remind you of Allah regarding my household’ is not exclusive to ʿAlī ﷺ, rather it is general for all of the Ahl al-Bayt, viz. the family of ʿAlī, the family of Jaʿfar, the family of ʿAqīl, and the family of ʿAbbās. Strangely, the Shi’ah are the furthest away from acknowledging this, for they disregard the majority of the Ahl al-Bayt and collaborate against them with the disbelievers…” (al-Qīḍāb al-Mushtahir p. 13)
of consensus between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī‘ah but the Ahl al-Sunnah, out of their arrogance, do not concede them.

2. In order to keep the Ahl al-Sunnah busy with these misconceptions so that they are not spared the time to study the seminal works of the Shī‘ah in hadīth and Qur’ānic exegesis and their transmitter dictionaries with a keen eye whereby they are able to expose the truth to the lay followers.

I therefore say that the Ahl al-Sunnah have made tremendous efforts in combatting the first aspect. But they were unable to do so with regard to the second. For the scarcity of the books of the Shī‘ah made it difficult for them to critically analyse them and expose the erroneous beliefs contained within them. Yes in the belated centuries the scholars of India and Pakistan played a significant role in this regard. This issue thus still requires us to continue on this journey by uniting and synergising our efforts in presenting objective and academic studies which will expose the reality of this cult before the gullible and the vulnerable.

After analysing their strongest evidence from the Sunnah, we return to the issue of Naṣṣ analysing it as it appears in the books of the Shī‘ah.

**Naṣṣ in the Books of the Shī‘ah:**

The basis of the stance of the Shī‘ah on Imāmah is Naṣṣ (explicit nomination).

Their evidences in support of it are variant. At times they are divine books which came down from the heavens with the explicit nomination of ‘Alī and the subsequent Imāms; but they disappeared according to them in 260 A.H with the occultation of the ‘Mahdī. At times they are emphatic verses of the Qur’ān which contain their unequivocal selection; but they also vanished from the Qur’ān because of the doings of the Ṣaḥābah. At times they are clear ‘narrations’ from Rasūl Allah which were first contrived by Ibn Saba’, as is mentioned in

---

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/356.
2 See p. 797 of this book.
3 See p.265 of this book.
Rijāl al-Kashshī and other books; but the Ummah unanimously decided to conceal them.\(^1\) And at times they are esoteric interpretations of the verses of the Qur’ān which are not known to anyone besides the Imāms.\(^2\)

They support these evidences with eerie claims of the Imāms having extraordinary miracles, complete infallibility, inherited books, divine inspirational knowledge, and signs in them which make them distinct from the rest of the creation, etc.

Ibn Saba’ was the first person to contrive the idea of Naṣṣ. This idea was then generalised for the other members of Ahl al-Bayt, about whom the Shī’ah have differed greatly in terms of who among them were the Imāms and how many there were. And as asserted by a group of scholars, the ones who were mainly responsible for the promotion of this idea were Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and Shayṭān al-Ṭāq. Subsequent to that, after the year 260 A.H, owing to a group of people who contrived the idea of the hidden Mahdī and claimed to be his representatives, thereby eating the money of people in his name, the idea of the twelve Imāms came into being (as will be mentioned under the topic of occultation).

Their narrations which discuss Naṣṣ have covered a large portion of their classical books like that of al-Kāfī, Biḥār al-Anwār, their books of Qur’ānic exegesis, and the books of their scholars in general, the likes of al-Mufīd, al-Ṭūsī, and Ibn Muṭahhar, etc.

So long as it remains an agreed upon fact in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī’ah that the idea of Naṣṣ was first contrived by Ibn Saba’, and that, as the books of the Shī’ah assert, it was circulated surreptitiously by the founding fathers of Shī’ism in a way that it was never disclosed before any of the scholars of Islam, including the ‘Imāms’ of the Ahl al-Bayt, and that the systematic development thereof ensued at the hands of people who have nothing to do with Islam, like that of Ṣaffār, al-Qummī, and al-Kulaynī; so long as these remain facts, I do not

---

1 See p. 885 of this book.
2 See p. 161 of this book.
think it is possible for any Muslim to believe the texts containing it, especially when they have always been on the increase across the ages.

Sometimes even some of the *Uṣūlis* (legists) among the Shīʿah do not completely rely upon everything that features in these developmental collections. So much so that Jaʿfar Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ states in his book *Kashf al-Ghiṭā’*, to which the Shīʿah have constant recourse in our times. He says:

قال المحمدون الثلاثة: كيف يوثق بتحصیل العلم عليهم

The three Muḥammads, how can they be trusted in the acquisition of knowledge.\(^1\)

*Nahj al-Balāghah* is the only book, every letter of which the Shīʿah undisputedly accept, notwithstanding its late compilation in the fourth century of the quotes of Amīr al-Muʾminin ʿAlī—I who was from the first century—and it not having any known and reliable chain of transmission to him.\(^2\) If this is the status of their most reliable book then what would the condition of their other books be? Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

ليس أحد من الإمامية ينقل هذا النص بإسناد متصلا فضلا عن أن يكون متواترا

There is no Shīʿī who narrates these narrations with a consistent chain of transmission, let alone it being widely narrated.\(^3\)

In spite of its dubious status, if we refer to it in order to investigate the issue of Naṣṣ, we will find narrations therein which debunk it and everything else that they have claimed alongside it. The following narration thereof states that when the people expressed the desire to pledge their allegiance at the hands of Amīr al-Muʾminin ʿAlī he said:

---

1. This quotation has passed on p. 497. He is referring to the three Muḥammads who authored their four early canonical works.

2. See p. 527

Leave me alone and look for someone else besides me. For we are to encounter in the near future such an affair which will have different angles and forms, an affair which the hearts will not be able to bear and before which intellect will not remain firm. If you leave me, I will be just an ordinary person like you. And perhaps I will be the most submissive and obedient among you to the one whom you choose. I am better off as your minister than as your ruler.¹

This narration clearly suggests that Rasūl Allah did not explicitly nominate ‘Alī as the Imām. Or else it would not have been permissible for him to say, “Leave me,” or, “And perhaps,” and, “I am for you.”²

For how is it possible for the infallible Imām to turn down the allegiance of the people saying, “leave me,” considering the fact that it is the most important

¹ In Al-Irshād, al-Mufīd says that the following is one of the sermons of ‘Alī which the scholars have preserved:

أنتتموني قلتباعنا فقلت بایعنا فقلت ل أفعل فقلت بلي فقلت ل وقبضت یدي فبسطتموها، ونازعتكم فجذبتموه—کذا—وتداکكتم علي تداك الابل الهمم علي حياضها يوم ورودها حتي ظننت أنكم قاتلي، وإن بعضكم قاتل بعض لدي فبسطت یدي فبایعتموني...

You came to me and said, “Accept our allegiance.” To which I said, “I will not.” Then you said, “Most certainly you will.” I withdrew my hand and you made me extend it. I fought with you and you pulled it—this is how the narration is recorded. And you crowded me like camels that crowded one another for water when reaching it, to the extent that I thought that you were going to kill me or one another in front of me. And so you pledged your allegiance to me... (Al-Irshād –al-Aʿlamī, Beirut p. 130-131, al-Ḥaydariyyah, p. 143-144).

Will a person who is desirous of Khilāfah talk in this manner? And will he go with Fāṭimah to the houses of the Ṣaḥābah asking them to pledge allegiance to him, as the books of the Shīʿah record? And does there remain any basis for the issue of Naṣṣ and the excommunication of those who do not concede it? Is it possible for a person to perceive that ‘Alī invited the people to disbelief (based on the Shīʿī belief that a person who does not acknowledge the divinely appointed Imām is a disbeliever) by himself refusing to accept the allegiance of the people?

² Maḥmūd Shukrī Ālūsī: Taʿlīqāt ʿalā Rudūd al-Shīʿah (manuscript).
principle of dīn? And why would he order them to pledge their allegiance to someone else saying, “Look for someone else besides me,” whereas the books of the Shī'ah state that among the three people whom Allah will not look at on the Day of Judgment is a person who pledged his allegiance to an Imām who is not from Allah.¹

So is he ordering them to disbelieve after having īmān? Or is it that the claims of the Shī'ah in this regard have no genuine connection with ʿAlī and are rather the forgeries of a hater or the doings of an ardent disbeliever whose primary objective is to disunite the Ummah and instigate discord amongst its ranks?

Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī states that a person who relinquishes the position of Imāmah cannot be an Imām, for if he was an Imām it would not be permissible for him to do so.² So what then would be the status of a person who rejects the allegiance of the masses and orders them to pledge allegiance to someone else? Does that not with more reason prove that there is no Naṣṣ regarding him from Rasūl Allah ﷺ?

The narration of Nahj al-Balāghah is thus harmonious with the historical facts and happenings which suggest that the rightly guided Khulāfā’ were never desirous of assuming the station of Khilāfah and they never aspire for it. Because they treated it as a great trust and an ominous responsibility.

In addition, the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah unanimously agree that during the Khilāfah of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān; ʿAlī did not call upon the people to pledge allegiance to him and nor did anyone do that.³ The Shī'ah, however, motivate this with an explanation which is not behoving of Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn. For they believe that he did intend to do that and that he was the one deserving of Imāmah but, owing to his inability, he did not succeed.⁴ Hence he resorted

---
¹ See the entire text on p. (Page number missing in the Kitāb). yahaa
³ Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/255.
⁴ Ibid.
to Taqiyyah (dissimulation) and consequently discarded the greatest principle of dīn (as they allege). This—i.e. his disregard for Imāmah—is what inspired one of the Shīʿī sects, the Kāmiliyyah, to excommunicate him from the Muslims. This is because the one who contrived this belief did not do so out his support and partisanship for Amīr al-Mu’minīn, but in order to create disunity in the Ummah and conspire against it. Consequently, his invention resulted in the excommunication of the entire Ummah including Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī.

Anyway, further in this narration Amīr al-Mu’minīn asserts in his statement, “And perhaps I will be the most obedient and submissive among you to the one whom you give charge of your affairs,” that he will be adherent to the individual whom the Muslims choose as their Khalīfah. This obviously debunks the claim of him practicing Taqiyyah when pledging his allegiance to and obeying those who preceded him. Because a person who practices Taqiyyah cannot be like the other loyal Muslims let alone being the most obedient and submissive.

Furthermore, “To the one whom you give charge of your affairs,” establishes that the issue of appointing a ruler is left to the discretion of the Muslim populace and their consensus, not to the alleged Naṣṣ. It is likewise not restricted to a specific person.

For a second time in this narration he again repels the prospect of his leadership when he says, “I am better off as your minister than as your ruler.” This debunks the flaunting of merits and the demonstration of extraordinary miracles which the Shīʿah attribute to him. It likewise debunks his criticism of the previous Khulafā’ which they allege he used to do in order to prove his worthiness of Imāmah.

Furthermore, in another narration he explains that he did not assume the station of Khilāfah due to aspiring for it or desiring it, but due to the Muslims pressing upon him to accept; he does not claim Naṣṣ and Waṣiyyah (bequest). He says:

و الله ما كنت لي في الخلافة رغبة ولا في الولاية إربة، ولكنكم دعوتموني إليها، وحملتموني عليها
I had no inclination toward the Khilāfah, nor did I have any desire to become the ruler. But you called upon me to accept it and pressed upon me to preside over it.¹

He also mentions that the establishment of his Khilāfah materialised due to the allegiance of the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār who were the people of Shūrā (consultation), for their consensus was reliable in this situation. If they were apostates, as the books of the Shīʿah describe them, then accordingly their consensus would hold no meaning. In the same vein, if Naṣṣ really existed he would not have required their allegiance and consensus. Amīr al-Muʾminīn mentions, as Nahj al-Balāghah records:

إنه بايعني القوم الذين بايعوا أبا بكر و عمر و عثمان علي ما بايعوه عليه (فطريقة بيعته لا تختلف عن سبقه) فلم يكن للشاهد أن يختار ولا للغائب أن يرد (وهذا يوحي بأن بيعته لم تكن ثابتة من قبل كما يزعم الإمامية وإنما بعد ثبوتها بالبيعة لم يكن ثمة مجال للرد حينئذ) وإنما الشوري للمهاجرين والأنصار فإن اجتمعوا علي رجل وسموه إماما كان ذلك رضي (فإن جمعتهم هو الأصل في الاختيار لا النص) فإن خرج عن أمرهم خارج بطعن أو بدعة ردوه إلي ما خرج منه فإن أبي قاتلوه علياتباعه غير سبيل المؤمنين وولاه ما توللي

Certainly the people who pledged allegiance to Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān upon whatever they pledged allegiance to them are the very same people who have pledged allegiance to me (so he was not elected any differently from the way they were elected). Hence the present cannot nominate, and the absent cannot reject (this suggests that his Imāmāh did not exist prior to this as the Shīʿah claim. It only came to being after his official election where after there remained no room for its denial.) Shūrā (consultation) is the prerogative of the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār; if they unite upon a person and endow him with the title ‘Imām’ that will be regarded as consensus (i.e. their consensus is key in the election, not Naṣṣ). If anyone, thereafter, rebels against their decision by way of criticism or innovation they will compel him to give up his rebellion. If he refuses, they will fight him for following a path other than that of the believers and they

¹ Nahj al-Balāghah p. 322.
will give him what he has chosen (make him responsible for the choice he has made).  

This is an unequivocal text for the non-existence of Naṣṣ. The Shūrā was for the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār; whoever they elected was the Imām and whoever thereafter rebelled had to be fought due to following a way other than that of the believers. If there was Naṣṣ regarding ʿAlī he would have definitely made mention of it.

All of these texts are from Nahj al-Balāghah which according to the Shīʿah is beyond doubt and which cannot be corrupted by falsehood due to it containing the statements of the infallible Imām. The Shīʿah do not doubt a single word thereof. These narrations debunk all their claims of Naṣṣ regarding ʿAlī and the Imāms.

This conception of leadership which is reported from ʿAlī in the Nahj is in harmony with what is established in the legacy of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding him. Thus making both the parties unanimous in this issue. Imām Aḥmad has narrated the following narration in his Musnad from Wakīʿ — from Aʿmash — from Sālim ibn Abī al-Jaʿd — from ʿAbd Allah ibn Sabuʿ who says that he heard ʿAlī saying when it was mentioned that he will be killed:

 وقالوا: فاستخلف علينا قال: لا، ولكن أترككم إلى ما ترككم إليه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قالوا: ما تقول لربك إذا أتته؟ قال: أقول: اللهم تركتني فيهم ما بدا لك ثم قبضتني إليك و أنت فيهم، فإن شئت أصلحتهم، وإن شئت أفسدتهم

They said, “Appoint a ruler over us.”

He said, “No but I will leave you in the condition in which Rasūl Allah left you.”

They asked, “How will you answer to Allah when you appear before him?”

---

1 Nahj al-Balāghah p. 366-367; see also Al-Irshād (al-Aʿlamī) p. 130, (al-Ḥaydariyyah) p. 143.
He said, “I will say, ‘O Allah you kept me amongst them for as long you deemed appropriate. Then you gave me death whilst you were still with them. If you wanted you could have reformed them and if you wanted you could have destroyed them.’”¹

He narrates a similar narration from Aswad ibn ‘Āmir — from A’mash — from Salamah ibn Kuhayl — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sabu’.² There are other similar narrations as well.³

Likewise ‘Abbās said to ‘Alī⁴:

فاذهب بننا إليه (يعني إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم) فنسأله فيمن هذا الأمر؟ فإن كان فينا عرفناه و إن كان في غیرنا أمرناه فوصاه بنانا

Let’s go to him, i.e. Rasūl Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم, and ask him as to who will take charge of this affair? If he is a person from amongst us we will get to know him and if he is from another family we will tell Rasūl Allah to advise him regarding our rights.⁴

This transpired on Monday, the day Rasūl Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم passed away. Which is evidence of the fact that Rasūl Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم passed away without appointing anyone.⁵

It also appears in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī that once the people made mention of ‘Alī⁴ being the appointed successor of Rasūl Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم to ‘Ā’ishah جمila who said:

---

¹ Musnad Aḥmad 2/242, Aḥmad Shākir says that the chain of this narration if Ṣaḥīḥ, authentic; see also Majma’ Al-Zawā'id 9/137, al-Haythamī therein says, “Aḥmad and Abū Ya’lā have recorded this narration. And its narrators are the narrators of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī. Al-Bazzār has also narrated it with a Ḥasan, good chain of transmission.
² Al-Musnad 2/240: narration no. 1339 which Aḥmad Shākir has deemed as Ṣaḥīḥ.
⁴ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: Chapter regarding Permission: 7/251.
⁵ Al-Bidāyah wa Al-Nihāyah 5/251.
When did he appoint him? I was making him recline upon my chest or (she said) my lap. He asked for a tray. Thereafter he turned in my lap and I did not realise that he passed away. So when did he appoint him?¹

Likewise it has authentically been narrated by Ibn ʿAbbās that the Rasūl did not appoint anyone. This is recorded by Ibn Abī Shaybah — from Arqam ibn Shuрайب who narrates from him.²

**Deriving Evidence from the Widely Known and the Unanimously Established Aspects of Dīn**

The Ahl al-Sunnah have authentically established evidences regarding the fact that Rasūl Allah did not explicitly nominate ʿAlī as the Imām after him. And the texts which the Shīʿah attribute to the Ahl al-Bayt are flawed either in their transmission or their purport thus rendering them baseless against the Ahl al-Sunnah.

The Shīʿah also have their evidences which they have documented in their books. But the Ahl al-Sunnah do not concede them and aver that they have been fabricated and projected to the Imāms by some of the Shīʿah. As for the narrations which appear in their books but debunk their claims on this issue, like that of the narrations of *Nahj al-Balāghah*, they resort to interpretations and Taqiyyah in order to discredit them.

---

¹ *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter of Bequests: 3/186; Chapter of Battles: 5/143; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter of the Bequest; Sub-chapter regarding not bequeathing for a person who does not deserve anything: 2/1257; *Sunan al-Nasāʿī*: Chapter of Aḥbās: Sub-chapter regarding whether Rasūl Allah bequeathed or not: 6/240; *Musnad Aḥmad* 6/32.

Hence in analysing this issue, which holds the most crucial position in the Shi'i dogma, let us rather resort to the widely known and unanimously accepted principles of our din. For as Ibn Taymiyah says:

نقدر-أن الأخبار المتنازع فيها لم توجد أو لم يعرف أية الصحح، وترك الاستدلال بها في الطرفين وترجم إلي ما هو معلوم بغير ذلك من التواتر وما يعرف من العقول والعادات وما دلت عليه النصوص المتفق عليها

Let us for a moment assume that these contentious narrations did not exist at all, or that we are unable to ascertain which of them are correct and which not. We thus leave them aside and resort to those aspects which are widely known, which can be understood via reason and convention and which are established through the unanimously accepted texts.¹

Hereunder we will shed light upon some of these aspects which are so many that they require a separate book be dedicated to them.²

Firstly, Let us leave the contentious narrations aside and resort to the Book of Allah by trying to understand it in light of the Arabic language alone. This is because Allah revealed the Qur'an in the clear Arabic language. And the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shi'ah unanimously accept the laws thereof just as they both unanimously accept the meanings that its words ought to have. Therefore it can serve as an arbitrator in this issue.

So do we find the mention of the Twelve Imāms with their names in the Qur'ān as clearly as we find the mention of Rasūl Allah with his names and attributes? Because the Imām according to them is like a Nabī and hence the denier of an Imām is like the denier of a Nabī or even worse.

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/120.
² Ibn Taymiyah mentions, “The people of knowledge categorically know that Rasūl Allah did not convey anything to the Ummah with regards to the Imāmah of ʿAlī. They have many ways in which they can prove this.” (Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/14).

It will suffice to make mention of the various aspects he has made mention of in different parts of his book for they are a great wealth.
And do we find any explicit mention therein of Imāmah in a like manner that we find the explicit mention of the fundamentals of Islam in various places thereof, in understanding which we do not require esoteric interpretations or fabricated narrations? For Imāmah according to them is the greatest principle of Islam.

How is it possible that they are not mentioned or even subtly implied? Is this not evidence of the fact that the claims of the Shī'ah in this regard do not have any basis? If it is, then the only way forward is to give them up because of them being in complete contrast with the book of Allah.

Ibn Taymiyyah has hinted to this approach in his exchange with Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī. Hence he says:

`فإن تركوا الروایة رأسا أمكن أن ترك الروایة`  

If they intend to give these narrations up completely it is possible.¹

He has then applied this approach in debunking the claims of the Shī'ah regarding Imāmah by saying:

`وذهب أنا لا نحتاج بالحديث فقد قال الله تعالى: إنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الَّذِینَ إِذَا ذُکِرَ اللَّهُ وَجِلَتْ قُلُوبُهُمْ وَإِذَا تُلِیَتْ عَلَیْهِمْ آیَاتُهُ زَادَتْهُمْ إیمَانًا وَعَلَىٰ رَبِّهِمْ یَتَوَکَّلُونَ الَّذِینَ یُقِیمُونَ الصَّلاَةَ وَمِمَّا رَزَقْنَاهُمْ یُنفِقُونَأُولَٰٓئِکَ هُمُ الَّذِینَ آمَنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ ثُمَّ لَمْ یَرْتَابُوا وَجَاهَدُوا بِأَمْوَالِهِمْ وَأَنفُسِهِمْ فِی سَبِیلِ اللَّهِ أُولَٰٓئِکَ هُمُ الصَّادِقُونَ. فجعلهم صادقين في الإیمان من غیر ذکر الإمامة.`

And assume for a while that we do not derive evidence from ḥadīth. But Allah says, ‘The believers are only those who, when Allah is mentioned, their hearts become fearful, and when His verses are recited to them, it increases them in faith; and upon their Lord they rely –. The ones who establish prayer, and from what we have provided them, they spend. Those are the believers, truly. For them are degrees [of high position]

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/32.
with their Lord and forgiveness and noble provision.”\(^1\) So Allah ﷺ has attested to their complete faith without making mention of the doctrine of Imāmah (as part of the fundamentals). He also says, “The believers are only the ones who have believed in Allah and His Messenger and then doubt not but strive with their properties and their lives in the cause of Allah. It is those who are the truthful.”\(^2\) Here as well Allah ﷺ talks of their sincerity of faith without the mention of Imāmah.

Ibn Taymiyyah goes on to mention other examples of this sort.\(^3\) These and other examples besides them establish the fact that the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms, which the Shīʿah treat as the cornerstone of their dogma and its very core, does not have any basis in the Book of Allah ﷺ.

Secondly, the grandeur of this phenomenon is such that it should have been widely transmitted; if it had any basis it would have been transmitted as efficiently as the other teachings of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. Especially when considering the fact that many fabricated and baseless narrations have been reported regarding the merits of ‘Alī ﷺ. So why was the truth not transmitted whereas it was meant for the people? For Rasūl Allah ﷺ had ordered the people to convey whatever they heard from him. Owing to which it was impermissible for them to conceal that which Allah ﷺ ordered them to convey.\(^4\) Similarly, if the Ṣaḥābah concealed the explicit appointment of ‘Alī ﷺ they would have concealed his merits as well and not reported anything thereof. However that is in contradiction with the reality. Hence it is evident that if there was anything of that sort it would have been reported.

This is also because the explicit appointment of a Khalīfah is a very great event. And great events usually necessitate large-scale popularity. So if such popularity

---

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 2, 3, 4.
2 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 15.
3 Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/14.
4 Ibid. 4/14.
did indeed materialise, his opponents and proponents would have known it alike. But the mere fact that it did not reach any of the jurists and scholars of ḥadīth suggests that it is a lie.¹ The only people that have reported it are the Shīʿah, who are the claimants (and thus have to provide sound evidence) and whose narrations yield a lot of suspicion due to their lies, transgressions, innovations, treading the path of deviance by claiming impossible things which defy reason, and due to them reviling the Companions of Rasūl Allah Ḥ.²

Furthermore, the Ṣaḥābah conveyed every aspect of the life of Rasūl Allah to us, whether it be his statements and actions, his orders and prohibitions, his eating and drinking, his sitting and sleeping, or anything else related to his life. It is thus unreasonable to postulate that they did not convey his explicit nomination of ʿAlī.

Ibn Ḥazm says:

The most conclusive evidence in this regard is that Rasūl Allah passed away and the majority of the Ṣaḥābah, apart from those who were teaching people dīn in the outskirts of Madīnah, were present. Not one of them even hinted toward Rasūl Allah emphatically appointing ʿAlī. It is impossible to conceive that a followership comprising of more than twenty thousand people despite their disparate endeavours, ambitions, and ethnicities succeeded in doing away with a bequest of Rasūl Allah. And apart from one narration which is narrated through the transmission

1 Al-Rāzī: Uṣūl al-Dīn p. 137.
of unknown people who narrate from an unknown person by the name of Abū al-Ḥamrā’, I do not know of any narration which talks of the alleged explicit nomination.\footnote{Al-Faṣl 4/161.}

Thirdly, Imāmah is one of the mandatory aspects which concern the wellbeing of the populace. So to say that Rasūl Allah \(\text{ṣ} \) emphatically nominated ‘Alī \(\text{ṣ} \) but the Ṣaḥābah distorted his nomination, would open the door for any heretic to claim, for example, that ṣalāh initially comprised of ten prayers but owing to their base desires the Ṣaḥābah concealed five and kept five. If someone succeeds in this manner in distorting the emphatic orders of Rasūl Allah \(\text{ṣ} \), then to distort any mandatory aspect of dīn will become possible too. Consequently, this will reach a stage wherein no aspect of dīn will remain reliable.\footnote{Daf’ Shubah al-Khawārij wa al-Rawāfiḍ p. 15.}

Fourthly, the claim of the Shīʿah regarding the explicit nomination of ‘Alī \(\text{ṣ} \) is akin to the claim regarding the explicit nomination of ‘Abbās \(\text{ṣ} \). If they aver that the explicit nomination of ‘Abbās \(\text{ṣ} \) is invalid it can similarly be said that the explicit nomination of ‘Alī \(\text{ṣ} \) is also invalid. For by refuting the appointment of ‘Abbās the appointment of ‘Alī automatically loses credibility due to there being no valid and explicit appointment in both cases. Therefore we find that there are many sub-sects among the Shīʿah who differ greatly with the Twelvers regarding the explicit nomination of many of those who they take as their Imāms. To the extent that regarding the Twelfth Imām there are twenty variant subsects. Each one refutes the “Naṣṣ” of the other.

Furthermore, Naṣṣ is derived from the word Mināṣṣah which means: a person who is mounted on a horse and is conspicuous. So where is the conspicuousness of the Naṣṣ regarding ‘Alī \(\text{ṣ} \)? If it had any basis it would have been perceptible, famous, reported widely and on the tongues of the people; the elite and the commonality would have known it alike. If they say that there was Naṣṣ but the people concealed it, it can also be said that there was Naṣṣ regarding ‘Abbās but the
people concealed it as well. If an issue of this magnitude can be done away with, then someone can also claim that Rasūl Allah ﷺ had a son whom he had explicitly appointed but the Ṣaḥābah were jealous of him and consequently killed him. There is a great amount of similarity in these claims which no intelligent person will ever make.¹

Fifthly, we all know that no two people disputed Abū Bakr’s nomination of ʿUmar, nor did any confusion ensue in that regard. When ʿUmar similarly appointed the consultative committee consisting of six people it became so widely known that no one could deny it. Rasūl Allah ﷺ was the most virtuous; the readiness of the people to adhere to his orders was by far more than their readiness to adhere to anyone else; and their desire to transmit his orders and teachings was far greater. Based on this it is impossible to believe that no dispute ensued regarding Abū Bakr’s nomination and likewise ʿUmar’s, instead even Muʿāwiyah’s nomination of his son Yazīd gained a lot of popularity and was widely known to an extent that it was undisputed, but Rasūl Allah’s nomination was not reported by one person,² as the Shīʿah acknowledge that Imāmah and the narrations regarding it were a secret from among their secrets.

Sixthly, it is not possible to conceive that the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār unanimously accepted ʿUmar as the undisputed successor of Abū Bakr but they did not accept ʿAlī as the appointed successor of Rasūl Allah ﷺ? For were the Muslims more obedient to Abū Bakr than they were to Rasūl Allah ﷺ?

How can an intelligent person concede and how can it occur to any person pious or impious (except those of course whom Allah has intended to misguide) that the Muhājirīn, the Anṣār and those who meticulously succeeded them despite knowing that Rasūl Allah ﷺ nominated ʿAlī as his successor and ordered them to befriend him disobeyed him (Rasūl Allah) and discarded his bequest. But when Abū Bakr ordered them to make ʿUmar their ruler they

1 Ibid. p. 14.
obeyed. Likewise when ʿUmar ordered them to appoint a consultative committee consisting of six people they obeyed without hesitation.¹

Furthermore, it is impossible to think that the Muslims established ṣalāh, zakāh, fasting, Ḥajj, striving in the path of Allah, and all the other injunctions of Islam but neglected the greatest of them all, i.e. allegiance to ʿAlī which is enough to render all their deeds unaccepted. And what benefit was there for them in pledging their allegiance to Abū Bakr and not to ʿAlī?²

Lastly, if the Naṣṣ regarding ʿAlī existed and was valid it would not have been permissible for him to become part of the consultative committee appointed by ʿUmar.³ Thus he should have said, “I am the appointed ruler and therefore there is no need for me to be part of the committee.” Nor would it have been permissible for him to give his allegiance to Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān.⁴

It is not reasonable to think that he, being a lion in his bravery, withheld the information of Naṣṣ due to the fear of death. For he was willing to sacrifice his life several times during the lifetime of Rasūl Allah in order to defend Rasūl Allah and during his reign in the Battles of Jamal and Ṣiffīn. So why would he become a victim of cowardice between these two periods owing to which he had to resort to Taqiyyah?

Furthermore, if he was the appointed ruler and he was given charge of the Ummah’s affairs after Rasūl Allah, he was entrusted with a responsibility which he should have diligently carried out, and in securing which he should have

---

¹ Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Ḥātim ibn Zanjūyah: Imāmah Abī Bakr al-Ṣiddīq (manuscript).
² Ibid.
³ Dafʿ Shubah al-Khawārij wa al-Rāfiḍah p. 15. Imām al-Bukhārī has cited the narration about the incident of the election of ʿUthmān and the people’s unanimous approval thereof (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: Chapter regarding the Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-chapter regarding the story of allegiance and the unanimous election of ʿUthmān… 4/204, onwards.
⁴ Al-Faṣl 4/162.
repressed all opposition. If he had failed in doing so without a valid reason then he had violated the rights thereof (which is very unlikely given his position and repute). And if he was helpless owing to which he could not take any action, then some sort of incapacitating occurrence should have been recorded which would hint at his endeavour to procure his right and subsequent inability, especially when he was the man in charge. Consider, ʿUthmān Ibn ʿAffān—who according to you was weaker than ʿAlī Ibn Abī Ṭālib—did not give this task up and was rather happy with the decree of Allah and His order; he did not neglect the responsibility entrusted to him. Likewise, when in his time the people turned apostate and refused to pay zakāh, Abū Bakr Ibn ʿAbbās did not leave the problem unattended. Had he done so Islam would have vanished. But he fought them and Allah E aided him against them. There was no one among the Ṣaḥābah similarly who remained silent when it came to establishing the truth.¹

So how can the Shīʿah possibly ascribe acquiescence with falsehood, cowardice, and fear to Amīr al-Muʿminīn ʿAlī Ibn Abī Ṭālib due to which he failed to demand his legitimate right? So much so that all the people besides a few turned apostate due to him postponing the demand of his right, notwithstanding that he was the Lion of Allah and His Rasūl.

In fact it is not recorded anywhere that he invited the people to himself or that he even defended his leadership, not to mention anything about fighting to secure it. For had any of that happened it would have been famous. Despite the occurrence of some very crucial occasions whose very nature demanded that he disclose his appointment, like that of the incidents of Saqīfah and the Shūrā, he did not make any mention of Naṣṣ.² He rather called upon his partisans to pledge

---

¹ Dafʿ Shubah al-Khawārij wa al-Rāfiḍah p. 16.
² Their scholar al-Bayāḍī says that he did not make mention of the Naṣṣ for one of two reasons: The people would have denied if he were to mention it which would render them out of the fold of Islam due to denying a widely accepted principle of dīn.

By resorting to a consultative process they intended to choose the best; so he marshalled such evidence against them so as to prove his own superiority (al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm 1/299).
their allegiance to him, as the Shi‘ah acknowledge, but he did not claim Naṣṣ, his explicit nomination.¹

Ibn Taymiyyah has mentioned that one of the evidences wherefrom we can definitively conclude that Rasūl Allah  did not convey anything to the Ummah regarding the explicit nomination of ʿAlī  is that after his demise one of the Anṣār proposed the idea that two rulers should be elected, one from the Anṣār and one from the Muhājirīn.² But the Ṣaḥābah rejected and asserted that leadership is only for the Quraysh;³ they are reported to have narrated many reports from Rasūl Allah  which state that rulership is for the Quraysh.

---

continued from page 965

Consider his answer, you will find that it is baseless. For he claims that ʿAlī  did not reveal the Naṣṣ due to the possibility of it being denied which would make the denier an apostate. But they excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah due to their denial of Naṣṣ. It is baseless also because it implies that people should not be invited to core aspects of dīn because of the possibility of them being denied and the consequent apostasy of their deniers.

As for his reasoning for ʿAlī  not mentioning the Naṣṣ in the incident of Shūrā, his acknowledgement that ʿAlī  did not reveal the Naṣṣ is sufficient to support our case. Because his assertion that ʿAlī  did not see the need to mention it there is inharmonious with reason and rationality. Especially when the context is that of Imāmah and leadership which according to them is one of the fundamentals of dīn.

1 Al-Bayāḍī says, “If they say: ‘The fact that ʿAlī asked his partisans to pledge allegiance to him is evidence that there was no Naṣṣ regarding him,’ our response will be: ‘Khilāfah was his right so he could pursue it however he wanted.’ (al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm 1/299). This proves that when ʿAlī  assumed the position of Khilāfah after ʿUthmān he did not prove his right to it by way of Naṣṣ. Had there been any Naṣṣ he would have revealed it and he would not have required the process of allegiance and election. As to his statement, “So he could pursue it however he wanted,” it does not hold any value. Because Khilāfah according to them is not just the right of the Ahl al-Bayt, because the belief and disbelief of the people is attached to it; it is a station equal to prophethood or even greater. But, as is the nature of the Shi‘ah, they always make claims which openly contradict and violate each other.

2 This is conceded by the Shi‘ah as well (see: al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm 1/299).

3 Musnad Aḥmad 3/129, 4/421; Musnad Abī Dāwūd al-Ṭayālisī p. 125: narration no. 926 and 2133. Imām Muslim has narrated this narrations with the words, “People are the subjects of Quraysh.” Another wording of the reads as follows, “This matter will remain for the Quraysh even if there are only two people.” (Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: chapter regarding leadership: 2/1451-1452).
Despite all of this, not one person in that gathering reported anything that suggested that ʿAlī was more rightful of it and hence the people pledged their allegiance to Abū Bakr. Notwithstanding that most of the Banū ʿAbd Manāf, comprising of the Banū Hāshim and the Banū Umayyah, had a very strong inclination toward the leadership of ʿAlī but none of them made any mention of his explicit nomination by Rasūl Allah. The exact same ensued during the reign of ʿUmar and ʿUthmān. Similarly when he took charge of affairs in his era he did not make mention of Naṣṣ, nor did anyone from his household or from the popular Ṣaḥābah make any such claim.

Furthermore, if Naṣṣ existed there would have been no disputes during his rule. But the reality is that the Ummah did not unanimously accept him, nor did they accept anyone else besides him.

Even when the incident of arbitration took place and most of the people were in his favour there was no one among his partisans, let alone anyone else besides them, who made any reference to his explicit nomination despite the context demanding that. They rather presented the narration regarding the rebellious party killing ʿAmmār as their evidence. This narration is at most narrated by three people or so; it is not a widespread narration. But Naṣṣ according to the Shīʿah is widespread. Subḥān Allah, eerie indeed, how did the partisans of ʿAlī deem it appropriate to support their stance with this ḥadīth (which is not narrated by more than three people) but not with Naṣṣ (which is allegedly widespread)?

As for the claim regarding the Naṣṣ or explicit nomination of the Twelve Imāms, its improbability is much more, its falsity more evident, and its deception more

---

obvious. For the Twelvers are the only ones who reported it whereas they are one sect of the Shi’a, who comprise of seventy different sects, who all deny their claims in this regard.

And the Nuṣūṣ (texts) which contain explicit nomination, which the Twelvers cite in support of their stance are all opposed by the texts of the other multitudes of Shi’ah sects which they present in support of those besides the Twelve whom they take as their Imāms.

These claims did not come into existence but two hundred and fifty years after the demise of Rasūl Allah. For they were contrived by the later Shī’ah; the ones who preceded them did not aver the same.

The Ahl al-Sunnah and their scholars, who are ten times more than the Shī’ah, know without a shadow of doubt that they are all lies which have been attributed to Rasūl Allah and are willing to enter into Mubāhalah (mutual imprecation) with the Shī’ah regarding that.

Likewise, the legacy of the Ahl al-Bayt which has been widely reported and documented attest to the fact that they are lies and that the Ahl al-Bayt did not claim Naṣṣ for themselves. Rather they refuted and belied any person who claimed it, let alone affirning the Naṣṣ regarding the Twelve Imāms.¹

If the issue of Imāmah was really as the Shī’ah describe it to be it would not have been permissible for Ḥasan to relinquish his Imāmah to Mu‘āwiyah and thereby aid him in deviance, invalidating the truth, and demolishing the dīn owing to which he would be considered his partner in every evil. Likewise it would not have been permissible for him to disregard the bequest of Rasūl Allah. Nor would it have been permissible for his brother, Ḥusayn, to agree with him to the extent that he did not violate his allegiance to Mu‘āwiyah till he passed away. To reiterate, why did Ḥasan and Ḥusayn consider

it lawful to disregard the bequest of Rasūl Allah Ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam willingly without any coercion, especially when there were more than a hundred thousand souls with Hasan Ibn ‘Alī who were willing to give their lives for him. By Allah, if Hasan Ibn ‘Alī did not know that he had the option of handing his Imāmah over to Mu‘āwiyah and equally the option of not handing it over to him he would not have combined the two by securing it for himself for six months because of it being his right and subsequently relinquishing it to Mu‘āwiyah without any genuine need to do so. Instead it was best for him. Because his grandfather Rasūl Allah had prophesised that upon the pulpit when he said:

إن ابني هذا سيد ولعل الله أن يصلح به بين فئتتين عظيمتين من المسلمين

Verily this son of mine is a leader. And perhaps Allah will unite two big great groups of the Muslims through him.

This is the wording of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī.¹

Nonetheless, there are many sound and definitive arguments in this regard. Some are enough for the guidance of a person who strips himself from following his ego and fanaticism.

The Ruling regarding a Person who denies the Imāmah of One of the Twelve Imāms

According to the Shī‘ah Imāmah is equivalent to Nubuwwah (prophethood) or even greater. And it is the most crucial principle of dīn.

The ruling of the Shī'ah regarding a person who denies the Imāmah of one of the twelve Imāms further asserts this extremism. For they excommunicate such a person and aver that he is deserving of everlasting punishment in the fire of Jahannam.

Ibn Bābawayh says:

واعتقادنا فيمن جحد إمامة أمير المؤمنين والأئمة من بعده أنه بمنزلة من جحد النبوة الأنبیاء. واعتقادنا فيمن أقر بأمیر المؤمنین وأنكر واحدا من بعده من الأئمة أنه بمنزلة من آمن بجمیع الأنبیاء ثم أنكر نبوة الأنبیاء

It is our belief that a person who denies the Imāmah of Amīr al-Mu'mīnīn and the subsequent Imāms is like a person who denies the prophethood of the Ambiyā'. We likewise assert that a person who believes in the Imāmah of Amīr al-Mu'mīnīn, but denies the Imāmah of any of the subsequent Imāms is like a person who believes in all the Ambiyā’ and then denies the prophethood of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.

This text suggests that the Shī'ah excommunicate all the denominations of the Muslims, including the variant sects of the Shī'ah which existed throughout history, notwithstanding the fact that they have received their legacy from them. Because many of their narrators are members of those sects.

Their scholar al-Ṭūsī mentions:

و دفع الإمامة كفر، كما أن دفع النبوة كفر، لأن الجهل بهما علي حد واحد.

The denial of Imāmah is disbelief just as the denial of Nubuwwah is disbelief, because ignorance regarding them is of the same level.

This verdict apparently, was not sufficient to satisfy Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī who asserted that the denial of Imāmah is even graver than the denial of Nubuwwah. He thus says:

---

1 Al-ʿtiqādāt p.111; Biḥār al-Anwār 27/62.
2 Al-Ṭūsī: Talkhīṣ al-Shāfī 4/131; Biḥār al-Anwār 8/368.
Imāmah is a general mercy and Nubuwwah is a special mercy. This is because of the possibility of an era being empty of a Nabī but not of an Imām. And the denial of the general mercy is graver than the denial of the special mercy.¹

So he has deemed a person who does not believe in their Imāms to be worse than the Jews and the Christians, based on the fact that no era will ever be empty of an Imām. This is an indication to their belief regarding the existence of the awaited ‘Hidden Imām’ whose existence many Shī‘ī sects have denied and regarding who the genealogists and the historians assert that he was never born. But this scholar of the Shī‘ah asserts that his denial is the worst form of disbelief.

Their scholar al-Mufīd has written that the excommunication of the Muslim Ummah is their unanimous stance. He says:

The Imāmiyyah unanimously agree that a person who denies the Imāmah of one of the Imāms and denies the obedience that Allah has ordained for them is a deviant Kāfir (disbeliever) who deserves everlasting punishment in the fire of Jahannam.²

This reached a stage where their scholar Ni‘mat Allah al-Jazā‘īrī openly announced the detraction of the Shī‘ah from the Muslim Ummah due to the doctrine of Imāmah. He says:

1 Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī: al-Alfayn p. 3
2 Al-Mufīd: al-Masā’il. Al-Majlisī also cites this verdict of his in Biḥār al-Anwār 8/366.
We do not concur with them on the same deity, the same Nabī, and the same Imām. This is because they believe that their Lord is the one whose Nabī was Muḥammad, who was succeeded by Abū Bakr, whereas we do not believe in such a Lord and such a Nabī; instead we say, “The deity whose Nabī was succeeded by Abū Bakr is not our deity and that Nabī is not our Nabī.”

After this blanket excommunication of all the Muslims they have specifically issued rulings of apostasy regarding all the categories of the Muslims besides the Twelvers; hence their excommunication includes the following categories:

1. The Ṣaḥābah. Foremost in the list are the most virtuous individuals of this Ummah after its Nabī, Abū Bakr and ʿUmar.

2. The vast majority of the Ahl al-Bayt.

3. The Muslim rulers and their respective rules.

4. The Muslim metropolises and their inhabitants.

5. The Muslim judges.

6. The scholars of the Muslims and their Imāms (in terms of the various schools of thought).

7. The Muslim denominations.

8. The Ummah at large.

In the coming pages I shall discuss their assertions regarding all these categories.

The Ṣaḥābah

The books of the Shīʿah are replete with curses and rulings of apostasy regarding those whom Allah was pleased with and who were pleased with him, i.e.

---

1 Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah 2/279.
the Muhājirīn, the Anṣār, the veterans of Badr, the people of the pledge of Riḍwān, and all the Ṣaḥābah. Besides a few Ṣaḥābah who do not amount to even the of fingers on the hand, they have not spared anybody.

After the disclosure of their books this issue no more remained one which could be hidden by way of Taqiyyah, even though previously it might have been unclear to many of the scholars of Islam. Therefore, we find that in his commentary of Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim al-Nawawī mentions that the Imāmiyyah maintain that the Ṣaḥābah erred in giving precedence to others over ʿAlī but they do not dub them disbelievers.¹

However, from among the scholars and the heresiographers there were some who were aware of the issue; al-Qāḍī ʿAbd al-Jabbār states:

و أما الإمامية فقد ذهبت إلي أن الطريق إلي إمامة اثني عشر النص الجلي،الذي يكفر منن أنكره، و يجب تكفيره، فكفروا لذلك صحابة النبي

As for the Imāmiyyah, they assert that the Twelve Imāms assumed the position of Imāmah through Naṣṣ Jalī (explicit nomination) the denier of which is dubbed an apostate whose excommunication is obligatory. It is on this basis that they have excommunicated the Ṣaḥābah of Nabī.²

ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī,³ Ibn Taymiyyah⁴ and others⁵ have remarked along the same lines.

But I have not found a scholar from among them who has mentioned the correct amount of Ṣaḥābah which the Shīʿah exclude from their blanket excommunication which is in harmony with that which appears in their books. Hence ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Baghdādī says:

---

¹ Al-Nawawī: Sharḥ Muslim 15/174.
³ Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq p. 321.
⁴ Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/128.
As for the Imāmiyyah, most of them believe that all the Ṣaḥābah turned apostate after the demise of Rasūl Allah with the exception of ‘Alī, his two sons, and thirteen other individuals.

And Ibn Taymiyyah says:

The Shīʿah say that the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār concealed the Naṣṣ. They have, therefore, excommunicated all of them besides a few, roughly thirteen or more. They then at times claim that Abū Bakr ʿUmar and their likes were always hypocrites. And at times they say that they brought faith but subsequently disbelieved.

You will see that the number they exclude is far less than what these scholars have mentioned.

This is what appears in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the others about the stance of the Shīʿah regarding the Ṣaḥābah. Henceforth you will see their actual stance in light of what appears in their seminal works.

The books of the Twelvers state that, besides three people, all the Ṣaḥābah turned apostate due to nominating Abū Bakr as their ruler. Some narrations make an addition of another three or four people who later conceded the rulership of ʿAlī. Which makes the sum total seven. They do not go beyond that.

---

1 Note that ʿAbd al-Qāhir does generalise this stance for all the Imāmiyyah; al-Ashʿarī thus alludes to the fact that there are two sects among them in this regard (see: Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/128-129).

2 Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 3/356.
The Shīʿah have documented this fallacy in the most authentic of their books. They have documented it in their first book which came to the fore, i.e. the book of Sulaym ibn Qays. Subsequently, the books that followed consistently affirmed it and promoted it. Foremost among them is al-Kāfī, which is considered the most authentic of the four early canonical works, Rijāl al-Kashshī, their primary work in transmitter biographies, and their other works; Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī, al-Burhān, al-Ṣāfī, Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaqalayn, al-Ikhtiṣāṣ, al-Sarāʿir, and Biḥār al-Anwār.

The contents of these books are not just views which some of their scholars held, rather they are narrations which are reported from their infallible Imāms who carry the merit of ‘sacredness’ and ‘infallibility’.

As for reviling the Ṣaḥābah, that unique generation which is lauded in the Qur’ān, their scholars have blackened the pages of their books with it.

If I were to present to the reader everything I read in this regard it would require many volumes. Hence I will suffice on citing those narrations which clearly excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah, for they will expose the nature of the remaining revilements and criticisms.

Al-Kulaynī narrates in al-Kāfī:

عن حمران بن أعين قال: قلت لأبي جعفر علیه السلام: جعلت فداك ما أقلنا لو اجتمعنا علي شاة ما أفنیناها؟ فقال: لا أحدثك بأعجب من ذلك، المهاجرين والأنصار ذهبوا إلا - وأشار بيده- ثلاثة

1 Book of Sulaym ibn Qays p. 74-75.
2 Al-Kulaynī: al-Kāfī 2/244.
3 Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/199.
4 Hāshim al-Baḥrānī: al-Burhān 1/319.
5 Muḥsin al-Kāshānī: al-Ṣāfī 1/389.
6 Al-Ḥuwayzīnī: Nūr al-Thaqalayn 1/396.
7 Al-Mufīd: al-Ikhtiṣāṣ p. 4-5.
9 Biḥār al-Anwār 22/245, 351, 352, 440.
Ḥamrān ibn A’yan reports, “I asked Abū Ja’far thus, ‘May I be sacrificed for thee! How few are we in number; if we all gather to eat a lamb we will not be able to finish it.’”

He said, “Should I not tell you of something even more baffling: the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār all turned apostate besides (and he indicated with his hand) three.”

This narration as it stands, includes the most virtuous of the companions of Rasūl Allah Ḥūsain’s companions, i.e. the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār. It also mentions that in the era of Abū Ja’far the Shī‘ah, in comparison to the broader Muslim community, were so few in number that if they were to gather to eat a lamb they would not be able to finish it, of which they complained to their Imām. And in order to console them, the Imām told them that even the Shī‘ah of the bygone era did not exceed more than three individuals because the rest of the people back then had turned apostate.

The purport of this narration also tells us of the Shī‘ah being a few in number in the era of Abū Ja’far Muḥammad al-Bāqir, of their movement not gaining much momentum and popularity, their survival in the dungeons of Taqiyyah and concealment, and that they would comfort their followers by forging and ascribing narrations of its kind to the Ahl al-Bayt.

This narration does not disclose the names of the three Ṣaḥābah who were allegedly free from ‘apostasy’ due to them concurring with the stance of the Shī‘ah. In another narration, however, there names are explicitly mentioned:

1 One of their contemporaries, ʿAlī Akbar al-Ghafārī commenting upon this narration states, “Meaning that he indicated with three fingers of his hand. He meant Salmān, Abū Dhar and Miqdād. (al-Kāfī 2-244: footnotes). As you can see this fallacious belief did not leave the minds of their scholars till these times. More details will appear in the Chapter regarding the contemporary Shī‘ah.

2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī: Chapter regarding belief and disbelief: Sub-chapter regarding the meagre number of the believers: 2/244; Rījāl al-Kashshī p. 7; Biḥār al-Anwār 22/345.
Hanān ibn Sadīr narrates from his father who narrates from Abū Jaʿfar that he said, “The people renounced Islām after the demise of Rasūl Allah besides three people.”

I asked, “Who are these three people?”

He said, “Miqdād ibn Aswad, Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī, and Salmān al-Fārisī. And then after a while the people realised.”

He further said, “Upon these people does the mill spin; they were the ones who refused to pledge their allegiance to Abū Bakr until Amīr al-Muʾminīn was brought and forced to pledge his allegiance.”

Furthermore, with the exception of one, the other two were not safe from doubt concerning the Imām, which according to them is the basis of Īmān. Hence when Abū Jaʿfar said that all the people turned apostate besides three, he followed it by saying:

If you want to know the one who did not doubt and who had no suspicion, it was Miqdād. As for Salmān it occurred to him that why is Amīr al-Muʾminīn acting in this manner when he knows the Ism Aʿẓam (greatest name) of Allah which if he was to utter the earth would grip its

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 6; al-Kāfī (with the commentary of al-Māzindarānī): Chapter regarding the Orchard: 12/321-322
people. Hence he was pulled by his collar\(^1\) and his neck was beaten\(^2\) till looked as it he had been burnt.

Amīr al-Muʾminīn passed by him and said, “O Abū ʿAbd Allah! This is because of that. Pledge (allegiance).”

Subsequently, he pledged.

And as for Abū Dhar, he ordered Amīr al-Muʾminīn to keep quiet and did not fear the criticism of anyone regarding the commands of Allah. However, Amīr al-Muʾminīn refused but to speak. So when ʿUthmān passed Abū Dhar gave him an order regarding him...\(^3\)

Furthermore, these three individuals who were safe from apostasy were not safe from the criticisms of the Shīʿah. Hence their narrations mention that the relationship between them was outwardly a pleasant one. But if each one of them were to know what was in the heart of the other he would have killed him or at least made a supplication of mercy for the one who killed him. This is because each one of them was a stranger to the other in terms of his beliefs and ideas. The following narration appears in *Rijāl al-Kashshī*:

> قال أمير المؤمنين: یا أبا ذر إن سلمان لو حدثك بما یعلم لقلت رحم الله قاتل سلمان

Amīr al-Muʾminīn says, “O Abū Dhar if Salmān were to tell you what he knows you will say, ‘May Allah have mercy on the killer of Salmān.’”\(^4\)

Abū Baṣīr narrates:

> و عن أبي بصیر قال: سمعت أبا عبد الله رضي الله عنه یقول: قال رسول الله صلی الله علیه وسلم یا سلمان لو عرض علمك علي مقداد لكفر،یا مقداد لو عرض علمك علي سلمان لكفر

\(^1\) Talbīb means to gather the clothes by the neck and then pull them (*Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 11).

\(^2\) Waja’a in the Arabic language means to strike with the hand or the knife (Ibid.)

\(^3\) *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 11; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/440.

\(^4\) Ibid. p. 15.
I heard Abū ʿAbd Allah saying, “Rasūl Allah ﷺ said, “O Salmān if your knowledge is presented to Miqdād he will kill you. And O Miqdād if your knowledge is presented to Salmān he will consider you an apostate.””

This suggests that the communication which existed between these three, whom the Shīʿah consider to be the pure Shīʿah, was based on Taqiyyah and concealment. To further prove this, Abū Jaʿfar narrates from his father that he said:

ذکرت التقیة یوما عند علي عليه السلام فقال: إن علم أبو ذر ما في قلب سلمان لقتله، و قد آخي رسول الله بينهما فما ظنك بسایر الخلق

One day I made mention of Taqiyyah to Amīr al-Muʿminīn ʿAlī and he said, “If Abū Dhar learns of what is in the heart of Salmān he will kill him. The brotherhood that Rasūl Allah ﷺ had established between them notwithstanding. So what do you think would be the case of the rest of the creation?”

These narrations portray the characteristics of the people of innovation and disbelief, for you will consider them to be united but their hearts will be disunited; the Ṣaḥābah were free from these traits.

But from these texts we gather that the Shīʿah excommunicate the Companions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. We, likewise, learn of the true image of the Shīʿah, one which is not easily known of them, in terms of their numbers, the disunity of their hearts, the malicious intentions they harboured against each other, and their belief that no one is upon īmān besides them. These were distinctive characteristics of their first generation, so you can well imagine what would be the condition of those who followed.

Nonetheless, the narrations of the Shīʿah assert that these three individuals were later joined by another four, which makes the total number of believers

1 Ibid. p. 11.
2 Ibid. p. 17.
(or Shī‘ah) in the era of the Saḥābah seven. They have not exceeded this number. This is what their narrations mention:

Hurīth ibn Mughirah al-Naṣarī said that he heard ‘Abd al-Malik ibn A’yan continuously asking Abū ‘Abd Allah questions. He eventually asked him, “Were all the people doomed to destruction then?”

Whereupon Abū ‘Abd Allah said, “Yes, O son of A’yan! They were all doomed to destruction.”

I said, “Those in the east and those in the west?”

He said, “Their lands were conquered with misguidance and, therefore, by the oath of Allah they were doomed to destruction besides three individuals. They were later joined by Abū Sāsān, ‘Ammār, Shatīrah, and Abū ‘Amrah. They thus became seven.”

---

1 Meaning after the demise of Rasūl Allah and the allegiance of the people to Abū Bakr (according to the Shi‘ah).
2 Their scholar al-Ardabīlī says, “Abū Sāsān’s name was Ḥusayn ibn Mundhir. It also said that his name was Abū Sinān.” He then cites the narration of al-Kashshī (Jāmi‘ al-Ruwaṭ 2/387). Ibn Ḥajar has mentioned that he was rather known as Ḥuḍayn ibn al-Mundhir ibn al-Ḥārith al-Raqqāshī. He further says that he was one of the commanders of ‘Alī in the Battle of Siffin. He was a reliable transmitter who passed away at the beginning of the second century. (Taqrīb Al-Tahdhib 1/185).
3 Referring to ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir.
4 Al-Ardabīlī says that Shatīrah was one of the companions of Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn. He then cites the narration of al-Kashshī for a second time. (Jāmi‘ al-Ruwaṭ 1/398)
6 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 7.
Many of their narrations assert that the number of individuals did not increase more than this. Abū Ja’far says:

وكانوا سبعة، فلم يكن يعرف حق أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام إلا هؤلاء السبعة

They were seven. Besides these seven no one acknowledged the right of Amīr al-Mu’minīn.¹

Abū ʿAbd Allah used to actually take an oath and say:

فوالله ما وفي بها إلا سبعة نفر

By the oath of Allah! No one besides these seven fulfilled its right.²

Their narrations differ as to the specification of some of these seven.³ This difference is apparently because of the views of the various Shīṭī sects about their personalities; every sect includes its own persons. Or maybe it is just due to contradiction and incoherence being the natural result of lying.

Nonetheless, these narrations still affirm the wholesale excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah and the possibility that these seven people (who were actually extremist deviants who adopted the names of these noble companions) were the first conspirators who spearheaded the movement of Shīʿism. Because their attributes, mutual relationships and stances have no similarity with that of the Ṣaḥābah.

¹ Ibid. p. 11-12.
² Al-Ikhtiṣāṣ p. 63; al-Ḥimyarī: Qurb al-Isnād p. 38; Biḥār al-Anwār 22/322.
³ Do a comparison between this narration which I have cited here with reference to al-Kashshī and al-Ṭūsī and the narration which features in Qurb al-Isnād of al-Ḥimyarī. It reads as follows:

فوالله ما وفي بها إلا سبعة: سلمان و أبو ذر، وعمر، والمقداد بن الأسود، والكندي، وجابر بن عبد الله، وسلم يدعى ثعبان، وزيد بن أرقم

By Allah only seven people fulfilled its right viz. Salmān, Abū Dhar, ʿAmr, al-Miqdād ibn al-Aswad, al-Kindi, Jābir ibn ʿAbd Allah al-Anṣārī, a slave of Rasūl Allah who was known as Thubayt, and Zayd ibn Arqam.” (Qurb al-Isnād p. 38; Biḥār al-Anwār 22/322).
Moving on, the Shīʿah at times interpret the verses of the Qur’ān which laud the Ṣaḥābah to refer to the three individuals whom they exclude from their blanket excommunication. Hence in Tafsīr al-Qummī, under the commentary of the verse:

إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُوْنَ الَّذِیْنَ إِذَا ذُکِرَ اللّٰهُ وَجِلَتْ قُلُوْبُهُمْ وَإِذَا تُلِیَتْ عَلَیْهِمْ أٰیَاتُهُ زَادَتْهُمْ إیْمَانًا وَعَلٰى رَبِّهِمْ لَّهُمْ دَرَجَاتٌ ۚ یَتَوَکَّلُوْنَ الَّذِیْنَ یُقِیْمُوْنَ الصَّلاَةَ وَمِمَّا رَزَقْنَاهُمْ یُنفِقُوْنَ أُولٰئِکَ هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُوْنَ حَقًّا عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ وَمَغْفِرَةٌ وَّرِزْقٌ کَرِیْمٌ

The believers are only those who, when God is mentioned, their hearts become fearful, and when His verses are recited to them, it increases them in faith; and upon their Lord they rely. The ones who establish prayer, and from what we have provided them, they spend.²

The following is mentioned:

فإنها نزلت فی أمیر المؤمنین عليه السلام، و أبي ذر و سلمان و المقداد

It was revealed regarding Amīr al-Mu'minīn, Abū Dhar, Salmān, and al-Miqdād.³

But it did not occur to them that the Shīʿah commend these three individuals and consider them believers not because of the aforementioned attributes but because of their acknowledgement of the Imāmah of ʿAlī and the denial of the Imāmah of Abū Bakr. This factor, which differentiated them from the rest, is not mentioned in the verse which they claim is an attestation to their faith. Likewise is the case of all the other verses of the Qur’ān. They are thus a proof against them and not for them.

---

1 Because at other times they interpret them to mean their Imāms.
2 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 2, 3.
3 Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/255; Biḥār al-Anwār 22/322.
Conversely, all the verses which contain the mention of disbelief, disbelievers, polytheism, and polytheists according to them refer to the rest of the Ṣaḥābah, as is mentioned in a number of chapters in al-Kāfī and Bihār al-Anwār.¹

In spite of this blanket ruling regarding the apostasy of the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allah, his helpers, and his bosom friends; they specifically revile and excommunicate the seniors among them. Their narrations in this regard are such that they leave the hair of the believers standing on ends.

Hence they have allotted the largest share of their onslaught to Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān—the ministers of Rasūl Allah and his relatives by law. In his Bihār al-Anwār, which one of their contemporary scholars has regarded to be the only reliable source for understanding the different aspects of their dogma,² al-Majlisī has established a chapter by the title, Chapter regarding the disbelief of the Three, their hypocrisy and their disgraceful actions.³ Likewise their scholar al-Baḥrānī has also established many chapters on this topic:

Chapter no. 97: The sins of the Two who preceded Amīr al-Muʾminīn are like that of all the sins of the Believers till the Day of Judgment,⁴ and

Chapter no. 98: Regarding Iblīs having a higher rank than ʿUmar in Jahannam and that Iblīs has been given preference over him in the fire of Jahannam.⁵

Their narrations on this topic are steeped in disbelief. Hence at times they do not just excommunicate the Shaykhayn (Abū Bakr and ʿUmar) but assert that the greatest form of disbelief is to consider them Muslims. The author of al-Kāfī narrates:

---

¹ See for example al-Kāfī: Chapter regarding the subtle indications to Wilāyah: 1/412-436: therein there are ninety two narrations. And also refer to p. 194 of this book.
² Al-Bahbūdī: Muqaddamah al-Biḥār p. 19.
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 8/208-252.
⁴ Al-Maʿālim al-Zulfā 324.
⁵ Ibid. p.325.
Allah will not talk to and will not purify three people on the Day of Judgement and they will receive a very painful punishment:

1. He who falsely claims Imāmah from Allah without it being his right,\(^1\)

2. He who denies the Imām selected by Allah,\(^2\)

3. and he who claims that the Two of them have a share in Islam.\(^3\)

And at times they describe them as the Jibt (superstition) and Ṭāghūt (idols).\(^4\)

They at times curse them intensively, especially in the supplications which are rendered when visiting the shrines\(^5\). They have similarly replaced the devotions to be made after ṣalāh with cursing the Shaykhayn and all the Muslims.\(^6\)

Some contemporary scholars who have written on the Shīʿah have disclosed some of their appalling traits with regards to the excommunication of the Şiddīq, the most truthful, of this Ummah and its Fārūq, the most apt differentiator between truth and falsehood.\(^7\) But I would like to add that in the writings of the scholars of the Safawid era the excommunication of the Şahlābah is emphatic and clear. And in the writings of the earlier scholars who lived in the era of al-Kulaynī and thereafter it was subtle and euphemistic; the later Shīʿah scholars removed

---

1. This narration clearly excommunicates all the Muslim rulers till the Day of Judgment.
2. This is the excommunication of any person who does not believe in the Twelve Imāms which entails the excommunication of all the Muslims from the first to the last.
the ambiguity of these euphemistic claims when to a certain extent the law of Taqiyyah was suspended (due to living under the Safawid rule) and the Twelver dogma came to the fore in its true colours.

For example, one of their special terms was naming the Shaykhayn, al-Faṣīl and Ramʿ. They did this because they did not have the courage to emphatically mention the names due to being under the mighty empire of Islam. The following appears in Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī:

I said (the narrator), “Who are the enemies of Allah, may Allah keep you sound?”

He replied, “The four idols.”

I asked, “Who are they?”

He said, “Abū al-Faṣīl, Ramʿ, Naʿthal, and Muʿāwiyah. Likewise every person who treads their path. Whoever opposes them has indeed opposed the enemies of Allah.”

Their scholar, al-Majlisī, whilst explaining these terms says:

Al-Faṣīl is Abū Bakr, because the words Faṣīl and Bakr are almost synonymous. Ramuʿ is ʿUmar written backwards, and ʿNaʿthal’ is ʿUthmān.

---

1 Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 2/116; Biḥār al-Anwār 27/58.
2 Both mean ‘young camel’.
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 27/58.
Likewise under the commentary of the verse:

لَهَا سَبْعَةُ أَبْوَابٍ لِّكُلِّ بَابٍ مِّنْهُمْ جُزْءٌ مَّقْسُومٌ

It has seven gates; for every gate is of them [i.e., Satan’s followers] a portion designated.¹

Al-ʿAyyāshī has narrated the following from Abū Baṣīr who narrates from Abū Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad:

یؤتی بجهنم لها سبعة أبواب، بابها الأول للظلم و هو زریق، و بابها الثاني لحبتار، و الباب الثالث للثالث، و الرابع لمعاویة، و الباب الخامس لعبد الملك، و الباب السادس لعسكربن هوسر، و الباب السابع لأبي سلامة فهم أبواب لمن اتبعهم

Jahannam will be brought and it will have seven doors. The first door is for the oppressor who is Zurayq. The second is for Ḥabtar, the third for the third, the fourth for Muʿāwiyah, the fifth for ʿAbd al-Malik, the sixth for ʿAskar ibn Hawsar, and the seventh for Abū Salāmah. Hence they are the doors to Jahannam for whoever follows them.²

Al-Majlisī in explicating this narration mentions:

زریق كتابية عن الأول، لأن العرب تشام بزرقة العين، و الحبتار هو العلاب، و لعله إنما كتب عنه لحيته و مكره، و في غيره من الأخبار وقع بالعكس وهو أظهر، إذ الحبتار بالأول أсужر و يمكن أن يكون هنا أيضا المراد ذلك، و إنما قدم الثاني لأنه أشقي و أفظ و أفظع، و عسكربن هوسر كتابية عن بعض خلفائه بني أمية أو بني العباس، وكذا سلامة كتابية عن أبي جعفر الدواني، و يحتمل أن يكون عسكر كتابية عن عائشة و ساير أهل الجمل إذ كان اسم جمل عائشة عسكرا و روي أنه كان شيطانا

“Zurayq” refers to the first one because the Arabs augur evil in the blueness of the eye. “Ḥabtar” means fox. Possibly he referred to the second one in this manner because of his cunningness and plotting. In some narrations

¹ Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 44
the sequence is opposite, which is more correct because the title Ḥabtar suites the first one better. And possibly this is what is intended in this narration as well. However, the second one is mentioned first because of him being more wretched, callous, and staunch. ‘Askar ibn Hawsar’ refers to one of the Umayyad or Abbasid rulers. Abū Salāmah refers to Abū Jaʿfar al-Dawānīqī. It is also possible that ‘Askar refers to ‘Āʾishah and all the participants of Battle of Jamal due to ‘Āʾishah’s camel’s name being ‘Askar. One narration mentions that it was a devil.¹

Similarly, many of the narrations refer to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar as ‘so and so’ and ‘so and so’, as in the following narration which is narrated from Abū ‘Abd Allah regarding the verse:

لا تنَبِيِّعوا خطوات السَّيَّانِ

Do not follow the footsteps of Satan.²

وخطوات الشَّيْطَانِ والله ولاية فلان وفلان

He said, “The footsteps of Shayṭān by the oath of Allah was the rulership of ‘so and so’ and ‘so and so’.³

Likewise regarding the verse:

أو كظُلُمَاتٍ فِي بَحْرٍ لَّجِيٍّ يَغْشَاهُ مَوْجٌ مِّن فَوْقِهِ مَوْجٌ مِّن فَوْقِهِ سَحَابٌ

Or [they are] like darknesses within an unfathomable sea which is covered by waves, upon which are waves, over which are clouds — darknesses, some of them upon others.⁴

---

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 4/378, 8/220.
³ Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/102; al-Burhān 1/208; Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/242.
⁴ Sūrah al-Nūr: 40.
They say that “darknesses” refers to “so and so” and “so and so”, “within an unfathomable sea which is covered by waves” refers to Na’thal, “upon which are waves” refers to Ṭalḥah and Zubayr, and “darknesses some of them upon the others” refers to Mu‘āwiyah.¹

Al-Majlisī says that “so and so” and “so and so” refers to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar and “Na’thal” refers to ‘Uthmān.²

Similarly, another set of titles which they use to refer to the Shaykhayn is what appears in the commentary of the verses:

وَالنَّهَارِ إِذَا جَلاَّهَا. وَاللَّيْلِ إِذَا یَغْشَاهَا

And [by] the day when it displays it. And [by] the night when it covers [i.e., conceals] it.³

The narration states that “and by the day when it displays it” refers to the emergence of the Mahdī and “and by the night when it covers it” refers to ‘Ḥabtar’ and ‘Dalām’ who covered the truth from him.⁴

Al-Majlisī, the grand scholar of Safawid Iran in his time, says that ‘Ḥabtar’ and ‘Dalām’ refer to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar.⁵

You will similarly find that when the later scholars narrated the reports of the early scholars’ books which contained subtle indications to the Shaykhayn, they changed the subtle indications with emphatic names.⁶

---

1 Tafsīr al-Qummī 2/106; Biḥār al-Anwār 23/304-305.
3 Sūrah al-Shams: 3, 4.
4 Kanz al-Fawā’id p. 389-390; Biḥār al-Anwār 24/72-73.
5 Biḥār al-Anwār 24/73.
6 See: Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/301. He subtly indicates to the Shaykhayn with the titles ‘so and so’ and ‘so and so’. But when al-Kāshānī reports the narration from him he rather emphatically mentions the names (Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 2/359).
They have likewise levelled apostasy and criticism against many other Ṣahābah and, in doing so, they always targeted the best among them and the most virtuous. So just as they revile and excommunicate the three Khulafā’, they likewise do the same regarding the other virtuous and elite Ṣahābah, like ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf, Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, Abū ʿUbaydah ibn Jarrāḥ, and Sālim Mawlā Abī Ḥudhayfah. The following narration appears in *Tafsīr al-Qummī* and *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī*:

When Rasūl Allah ﷺ halted at Ghadīr Khum there were seven hypocrites by his side: Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf, Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, Abū ʿUbaydah, Sālim Mawlā Abī Ḥudhayfah, and Mughīrah ibn Shu’bāh.

ʿUmar said,¹ “Don’t you see that his eye looks like the eye of an insane person, i.e. the eye of Nabī. He will stand up now and say, “My Lord said to me...”²

Subsequent to that Nabī ﷺ stood up and said, “O people! Who is more deserving of you than yourselves?”

They replied, “Allah and his Rasūl.”

---

1 This is the wording of *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī*. And in *Tafsīr al-Qummī* the wording is ‘the second said’.
2 It is not unclear to an intelligent person that the fabricator of this statement intended to attack the integrity of Nabī ﷺ himself before anyone else. Because he wants the people to assume that if his close associates did not accept his message despite living with him and seeing his miracles then others would more so not accept his message. He likewise wants them to assume that he was an evil person who had evil companions, as was previously elucidated by the pious predecessors. The Shīʿah thus criticise Islam itself in a very deceitful and surreptitious way in order to misguide the gullible, i.e. by criticising the transmitter in order to discredit the transmitted.
Whereupon he said, “Behold! Whoever’s mawlā I am ‘Alī is his mawlā.”

The people thus acknowledged his message regarding the rule of Amīr al-Mu’minīn. Thereafter Jibrīl descended and informed Rasūl Allah of what the hypocrites had said. He thus called them and asked them. But they denied and took false oaths due to which Allah revealed the verse: They swear by God that they did not say [anything against the Prophet] while they had said the word of disbelief.¹

Similar to the attacks they have launched against these Ṣaḥābah, they have launched attacks against the other meritorious transmitters of Sharīʿah, like that of Abū Hurayrah,² Anas ibn Mālik,³ al-Barā’ ibn ‘Āzib,⁴ Ṭalḥah, and Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām,⁵ etc.

As for the comments and the remarks which their scholars have passed regarding these luminaries, they have blackened the pages. For you will not find a single book of theirs which deals with Imāmah or any issue of its sort void of excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah, their criticism, and curses upon them; such that no Muslim can ever fathom. This is obviously because they do not consider the Ṣaḥābah to be Muslims at all, and take them to be the most ardent enemies who oppressed them by pledging allegiance to Abū Bakr, ’Umar, and ’Uthmān M. And because they were united in their times, they were brothers owing to the bounty of Allah ـ، they established the Islamic empire, they conquered

¹ Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 2/359; Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/301.
² Bihār al-Anwār 22/242; al-Khiṣāl 1/190. A contemporary Shīʿī scholar by the name of ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawī has written a book regarding Abū Hurayrah. Therein he concludes that he was a hypocrite and a disbeliever (See: Abū Hurayrah). And likewise study the responses written in the following: Muḥammad ’Ajaj al-Khaṭīb p. 601; ’Abd al-Mun’im al-ʿAzzī: Difāʿ ʿan Abī Hurayrah; ’Abd al-Raḥmān al-Zarṭ: Abū Hurayrah wa Aqlām al-Ḥāqidīn.
³ Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 45.
⁴ Ibid.
⁵ They have said regarding the two of them, “They were both leaders from the leaders of disbelief.” (See: Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 2/77-78; al-Burhān 2/107; Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 2/324).
lands, they spread Islam among the people, they distinguished the fire of fire worship, they destroyed the devil of idol worship, and they took the people out from the worship of servants to the worship of the Lord of the servants and their Creator. Their superiority and sovereignty thus incited the heretics and haters of those conquered lands, and the adherents of those false religions to conspire against the Ummah and destroy it under the disguise of *Tashayyuʿ*, partisanship for the Ahl al-Bayt. And naturally, due to the nature of their plot, the issue of Imāmah was their main target and what kept them continuously busy. Thereafter what ever happened, happened. Subsequent to that, their main strategy and the crux of their ploys formed the basis of the belief of the Shīʿah who, based on it, excommunicated the rulers and subjects. Ibn Bābawayh says:

\[
\text{فمن أدعى الإمامة وليس بإمام فهو الخصم الملعون، و من وضع الإمامة في غيرأهلها فهو ما لمعلون}
\]

That person who claims leadership in spite of not being a leader is an accursed oppressor. Likewise a person who chooses anyone else besides the rightful is also an accursed oppressor.\(^1\)

So this is a blanket excommunication of all the rulers and their subjects throughout the ages (with the exception of ‘Alī and Hasan of course).

When their scholar al-Mufīd, whom they accord the titles *Rukn al-Islām* (the pillar of Islam) and *Āyat Allāh al-Malik al-ʿAllām* (the proof of Allah, the Owner the All Knowing) was asked regarding the narration which states that Amīr al-Muʾminīn ‘Alī said, “If any person who gives preference to me over Abū Bakr and ʿUmar is brought to me, I will punish him with the punishment of a calumniator.”, he said:

\[
\text{إن الوجه فيه أن المفاضل بينه وبين الرجلين إنما وجب عليه حد المفتري، لأن المفاضلة لا تكون إلا بين منتقرين في الفضل، و كان الرجلان يحدهما النص قد خرجا عن الإيمان بطل أن يكون لهم فضل في الإسلام فكيف يحصل لهما من الفضل ما يقارب فضل أمير المؤمنين، و حتى فضل إنسان أمير المؤمنين عليهما فقد تقر في التفضيل لأمير المؤمنين عليهم من حيث كذب في إثبات فضل لهم في الدين.}
\]

\(^1\) *Al-ʾtiqādāt* p. 112-113, *Bihār al-Anwār* 27/62.
The reason why a person who draws a comparison between him and the two men is punished is that usually comparisons are only drawn between two people who are almost equal in virtue. But the two men, due to their denial of the \( \text{Naṣṣ} \), turned apostate and it is thus invalid to assert that they enjoyed any merit in Islam. Therefore, how can a comparison be drawn between them and Amīr al-Mu’minīn in terms of merit. So when a person gives preference to Amīr al-Mu’minīn over them he, by doing so, lies in terms of according merit to them in dīn. He is thus like a person who gives preference to a noble Allah-conscious Muslim over an apostate disbeliever, and like a person who gives preference to Jibrīl over Iblīs, and Rasūl Allah over Abū Jahl ibn Hishām.¹

Consider, how he has equated the best individuals of this Ummah after its Nabī to Shayṭān and Abū Jahl. This surprisingly is the consensus of their scholars; he says:

\[
\text{فقد حصل الإجماع علي كفره (يعني عمر) بعد إظهاره الإيمان.}
\]

Consensus has occurred regarding his apostasy (i.e. ʿUmar) after he had outwardly expressed īmān.²

Likewise, al-Majlisī says:

\[
\text{و مما عد من ضروريات دين الإمامية استحلال المتعة، و حج التمتع، و البراءة من أبي بكر و عمر و عثمان و معاوية}
\]

Among those aspects which are considered to be categorically established in the dīn³ of the Imāmiyyah is to believe in the permissibility of Mutʿah,

---
¹ Al-ʿUyūn wa al-Maḥāsin 2/122-123.
² Ibid. 1/9.
³ See how he uses the word 'Dīn'. It indicates that the “dīn” of the Imāmiyyah is a dīn by itself which is different than the dīn of Islam. And without a doubt, based on what al-Majlisī has documented in his Biḥār, it is a dīn by itself which has nothing to do with dīn of Islam.
They also say that:

و من لم برأ من أبي بكر و عمر و عثمان فهو عدو و إن أحب عليا

A person who does not disassociate himself from Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān is an enemy even if he loves ʿAlī.

This is exactly why they consider cursing the three Khulafāʾ, the other luminaries among the Ṣaḥābah, and some of the mothers of the believers; after every ṣalāh to be an act of worship. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has established a chapter by the name, Chapter regarding the desirability of cursing the enemies of dīn after every ṣalāh with their names. Therein he cites the narration which al-Kulaynī reports on the authority of Thuwayr and Sirāj which reads as follows:

سمعنا أبا عبد الله رضي الله عنه و هو يلعن في دبر كل مكتوبة أربعة من الرجال و أربعا من النساء، فلنا و فلانا و خلفانا (الخلفاء الثلاثة) و يسمينهم و معاوية، و فلانة و فلانة (عائشة و حفصة رضي الله عنهما) و هند و أم الجكم أخت معاویة

We heard Abū ʿAbd Allah cursing four men and four women after every ṣalāh: so and so, so and so, so and so (i.e. the three Khulafāʾ), he would take their names, Muʿāwiyah, so and so lady, so and so lady (referring to ʿĀ’ishah and Ḥafṣah), Hind, and Umm al-Ḥakam—the sister of Muʿāwiyah.

In Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil their scholar al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī has established a chapter named, Chapter regarding the desirability of cursing the enemies of dīn after ṣalāh with their names. Therein he cites many of their narrations, one them being the following:

2 Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 5/389.
3 Furūʿ al-Kāfī 1/95; al-Ṭūsī: Tahdhīb 1/227; Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 4/1037.
4 Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil 1/342.
Abū ʿAbd Allah said, “It is our right upon our partisans and associates that none of them should leave until he supplicates thus, ‘O Allah, double your curse, your grip, your exemplary punishment, and your chastisement upon the two who denied your bounty, threatened your prophet, breached his bequest regarding his successor, did away with his order regarding the Khalīfah after him, wrongly assumed his space, adulterated his decisions, changed his ways, interpolated his dīn, underestimated your evidence and proofs, oppressed them, treaded the path of violence, opposition, and murder against them. They stopped your Khalīfah from blocking the cracks, straightenening the crookedness, establishing the commands, expressing the dīn of Islam, and reviving the injunctions of the Qurʾān. O Allah, curse them, their daughters, and every person who has the same tendencies, who treads their path, follows them in their ways, and openly proclaims their innovations. Curse them in a manner that the mind cannot fathom and wherefrom the people of Jahannam seek refuge. Curse every person from the first and the last who accepts their views, follows their orders, advocates their leadership, and doubts their disbelief.¹

See how they, by means of these wretched words, curse all the Muslims from the first to the last, and how they specifically curse and excommunicate the two individuals who established the dīn of Islam after Rasūl Allah ﷺ and spread the dīn of Allah far and wide. Notice how they consider them and whoever followed them to be the enemies of dīn. So which dīn do these people, who regard the Ṣaḥābah and those who meticulously followed them the enemies of dīn,
follow? It can be any other din but not the din of Islam. These curses approve the fact that the one who forged them was one of the followers of those ancient religions which Islam destroyed under the rule of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and their brothers in Islam.

Likewise, through these prayers, the planting of hatred, the spreading of acrimony and the provocation of enmity take place regularly in their shrines in the form of continuously cursing the people of the best era. Hence when visiting the grave of Fāṭimah they curse Abū Bakr and the rest of the Ṣaḥābah saying:

السلام عليكم يا فاطمة، يا سيدة نساء العالمين! لعن الله ماتعك إرتك ودافعك عن حقك، والراد عليكم قولك. لعن الله أشيعهم وأتباعهم وألحقهم بدرك الجحيم

Pease be upon you, O Fāṭimah, O the queen of the women of the world. May Allah curse the one who deprived you of your inheritance, prevented you from your right, and rejected what you had to say. May Allah curse their supporters and their followers. May Allah make them reach the Fire of Jahannam.¹

It should be noted that the person who fabricated this prayer intended to curse the most truthful of the Ummah and then all his followers by extension. Hence Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī is also implicated, because he was definitely from the supporters of Abū Bakr and his helpers, which was certainly not unknown to the fabricator of this prayer. However he is an enemy of all of them who feigns partisanship of the Ahl al-Bayt. Because the Shīʿah easily buy into such narrations due to the absence of reason and intellect as a result of their overwhelming emotions (mostly based on lies) regarding the sufferings of the Ahl al-Bayt, the oppression they underwent, the discarding of their rights, and their continuous conflict with the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah. In this regard they have compiled a huge amount of stories which leave the heart of a believer

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār: Chapter regarding visiting Fāṭimah 100/197. Also refer to p. 198 and p. 200 of the same volume.
filled with hatred, the desire for vengeance, and the thirst for spilling blood; as is apparent from their current condition.¹

**The Alleged Shortcomings of the Ṣaḥābah:**

Together with the excommunication and the cursing of the Ṣaḥābah they have filled their books with the alleged shortcomings of the Ṣaḥābah as well.² Some scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah have busied themselves in countering them,³ but what is important to understand in this regard is that the Shīʿah use all of these accusations as a cover for the underlying reason for their stance regarding the Ṣaḥābah. This is because even if the Ṣaḥābah were hypothetically infallible and indifferent to vice and evil, the Shīʿah would still not be pleased with them. Because their greatest crime was their allegiance to Abū Bakr and not to 'Alī. And every crime can be forgiven but not this one. Just as they aver that a person who has sins equal to the earth will be forgiven if he believes in Imāmah.

---

¹ See for example some of their fallacious narrations regarding the alleged conflict with regards to the bequest of Rasūl Allah  which they attribute to al-Masʿūdī (Murūj al-Dhahab p. 122, onwards).
³ Ibn Taymiyah has answered all the allegations that the Shīʿah raise on this topic in detail. He also gives a brief answer which can be summarised thus:

1. Among them some are blatant lies. And some have been distorted with additions and omissions which make them seem as if they are allegations. Most of the demerits and allegations which they raise are of this type. They are reported by liars and fabricators like Abū Mikhnaf Lūṭ ibn Yahyā, Hishām ibn al-Sāʿīb al-Kalbī, and others; regarding whose lies and dubious narrations the scholars are unanimous.

2. Some of them are true, but in most of them the Ṣaḥābah had genuine reasons and excuses which take them out of the realm of sin and make them part of those issues which require Ḥujjād (deliberation), wherein a person receives double reward if he reaches the correct conclusion and one reward if he does not. Most of the issues reported regarding the first three Khulafā’ are of this nature.

Even if we hypothetically consider those actions to be outright evil, they do not in any way taint their virtues, feats, and the aspect of them being from the people of Jannah. Because the punishment of a confirmed sin can be lifted in the Hereafter for many reasons, some being: repentance, good deeds which wipe out evil deeds, and calamities which expiate the sins of a person. (Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/19).
Many a times the Imāmiyyah ask regarding ʿUthmān appointing his relatives, and regarding Ṭalḥah, Zubayr, and ʿĀ’ishah going to Baṣrah. They ask regarding these aspects because of their weakness and inability. Even if ʿUthmān did not appoint his relatives and he did not do what he did, he would still have been considered a disbeliever and a polytheist because of claiming leadership for himself and for Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. And even if Ṭalḥah, Zubayr, and ʿĀ’ishah were part of the army of Amīr al-Muʾminīn and were among those who fought with him, they would have still been polytheists because of them believing in the leadership of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān. So a person who debates the Imāmiyyah in these issues is like a person who debates a Jew in the issue of intention being compulsory when doing ablution, or like a person who debates a Christian regarding the permissibility of wine. Therefore, a person should only debate a person who claims that the only mistakes ʿUthmān made were the designation of a sanctuary and the appointment of his relatives to government offices; if it was not for these issues he would have been like ʿUmar. Or a person who claims that the only wrong that Ṭalḥah, Zubayr, and ʿĀ’ishah committed was their going to Baṣrah, otherwise they would have been like Abū ʿUbaydah, ʿAbd al-Rahmān, and Ibn Masʿūd. So do not talk to them regarding these issues. But talk to them regarding the Naṣṣ that they claim, for that is the basis of their dogma.¹

¹ Tathbīt Dalāʾil al-Nubuwwah 1/294.
The Ahl al-Bayt

The aforementioned narrations which explicitly excommunicate the unique and exemplary generation (and which do not exclude more than seven people in their estimates), do not exclude as part of these seven any of the members of the household of Rasūl Allah صلی الله علیه وآله وسلم. Besides one narration which exclude ‘Alī only. This is the narration of Fūḍayl ibn Yasār which he narrates from Abū Jaʿfar:

 وقال: صار الناس كلهم أهل جاهليّة إلا أربعة: عليّ، ومقداد، وسلمان، وعثaina. فقلت: فعمار، فقال: إن كنت تريد الذين لم يدخلهم شيء فهؤلاء الثلاثة

All the people reverted to ignorance besides four: ‘Alī, Miqdād, Salmān, and Abū Dhar.

[The narrator says,] I asked, “What about ‘Ammār?”

He said, “If you want to know those people who did not have any doubt, then they are these three.”¹

Hence, the ruling of apostasy is inclusive of the Ṣaḥābah and the household of Rasūl Allah صلی الله علیه وآله وسلم which comprised of his wives and his relatives, yet the fabricator of this narration claims to be a supporter of the household of Nabī ﷺ notwithstanding. So is this not evidence of the fact that the ‘partisanship’ for the Ahl al-Bayt is just a pretext which is being exploited in order to accomplish malicious objectives against Islam and its adherents? And of the fact that the fabricators of these narrations are the enemies of both the Ṣaḥābah and the Household of Nabī ﷺ? It is not far-fetched to assume that the names which are excluded do not really have personalities behind them, rather they were assumed by the first conspirators and spearheaders of Shīʿism; they do not in any way refer to the Ṣaḥābah. Why then were the members of the Ahl al-Bayt not mentioned with them? And why are any of these Ṣaḥābah not reported to have remonstrated and boycotted the first two Khulafāʾ, but rather are reported to have supported them and loved them?

¹ Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/199; al-Burhān 1/319; Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī 1/389.
Based on the aforementioned narrations, they have passed the ruling of apostasy regarding Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, the family of ʿAqīl, the family of Jaʿfar, the family of ʿAbbās, the consorts of Rasūl Allah— the mothers of the believers.

Instead the Shīʿah have made specific members of the Ahl al-Bayt targets of their criticism and excommunication, like the uncle of Nabī, Abbās, for they say that the following verse was revealed regarding him:

وَمَنْ كَانَ فِي هٰذِهِ أَعْمٰى فَهُوَ فِي الأَخِرَةِ أَعْمٰى وَأَضَلُّ سَبِیْلاً

And whoever is blind in this [life] will be blind in the Hereafter and more astray in way.¹

And like his son, ʿAbd Allah ibn Abbās, the great scholar of this Ummah and the interpreter of the Qurʿān. The narration of al-Kāfī suggests his excommunication and that he was an ignorant and obtuse person.² The narration of Rijāl a-Kashshī reads as follows:

اللهم العن ابني فلان واعم أبصارهما، كما عميت قلوبهما، واجعل عمي أبصارهم دليلا علي عمي قلوبهما

O Allah curse the two sons of so and so and blind their vision just as you have blinded their hearts, and make the blindness of their eyes a proof of the blindness of their hearts.³

Their scholar Ḥasan al-Muṣtafawī has commented on this narration thus:

هما عبد الله بن عباس و عبیدة بن عباس

This refers to ʿAbd Allah ibn Abbās and ʿUbayd Allah ibn Abbās.⁴

---

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 53. And the verse is verse no. 72 of Sūrah al-Isrā’.
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/247.
3 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 53.
4 Ibid.
The daughters of Rasūl Allah  are likewise victims of the anger of the Shī‘ah and their hatred, for they are also not mentioned amongst those who are excluded from the blanket excommunication. Instead some have even gone to the extent of saying that besides Fāṭimah, the others were not the daughters of Rasūl Allah .¹ Is it really possible for someone who makes such claims regarding the daughters of Nabī  to love him?

The author of al-Kāfī has very explicitly mentioned that whoever does not believe in the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms is a disbeliever even if he be from the family of ʿAlī and Fāṭimah .² This verdict in reality entails the excommunication of the first generation which comprised of both the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Bayt. Because none of them had knowledge about the doctrine of the Twelve Imāms which only came into existence after the year 260 A.H.

They have also excommunicated all the wives of Nabī , for they have not excluded any of them as well in their narrations. But from among all of them they specifically target ‘Ā’ishah and Ḥafṣah with criticisms, curses, and apostasy. Hence their scholar al-Majlisī has established a chapter titled, Chapter regarding the conditions of ‘Ā’ishah and Ḥafṣah. Therein he cites seventeen narrations⁵ and for the rest of them he refers the reader to the other chapters.⁶ They have caused a great deal of pain to Rasūl Allah in these narrations.

---

¹ Ja‘far al-Najafī: Kashf al-Ghiṭā’ p. 5; Ḥasan al-Amīn: Dā’irat Ma‘ārif al-Shī‘ah 1/27.
² Al-Kāfī: Chapter regarding a person who claims Imāmah without being deserving thereof, and a person who denies all the Imāms or some of them, and a person who concedes it for someone who is not rightful: 1/372-374.
³ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/300; Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 57-60; Biḥār al-Anwār 53/90.
⁴ Biḥār al-Anwār 22/246.
⁵ Biḥār al-Anwār 22/227-247.
⁶ He says, “Some of the incidents of ‘Ā’ishah have passed in the chapters regarding the marriage of Khadijāh, and the children of Rasūl Allah in the narration which states that she accused Māriyāh due to which the verse of Ifk were revealed (see how they distort the reality). The rest of her incidents will come in the narrations of the Battle of Jamal.” (Biḥār al-Anwār 22: 245).
They have gone to the extent of accusing of adultery the one whom Allah vindicated from above the seven heavens, ‘Ā’ishah—the truthful, the daughter of the truthful. This repugnant allegation features in their most canonical work on

1 The text reads as follows:

لا قال علي بن أبراهيم في قوله (وضرب الله مثلا) ثم ضرب الله فیهما (یعني عائشة و حفصة زوجتي رسول الله صلی الله وسلم) مثلا

فقال:ضرََبَ اللهَُّ مَثَلاً لِّلَّذِینَ کَفَرُوا امْرَأَتَ نُوحٍ وَامْرَأَتَ لُوطٍ کَانَتَا تحَْتَ عَبْدَیْنِ صَالِحَِینِْ فَخَانَتَاهُا. قال: والله ما عني بقوله

فخانتاها إلا الفاحشة، وليقيمن الحد علي فلانة فيها أتت في طريق البصرة، وكان فلاناً يحبها، فلما أرادت أن تخرج إلى البصرة قال لها

فلان: لا تخرج لك أن تخرجين-كذا- من غير محرم. فزوجت نفسها من فلان

ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī mentions regarding the verse, and Allah presents an example of those who disbelieved, “Then Allah presents an example regarding the two of them (i.e. ‘Ā’ishah and Ḥafṣah, the wives of Nabī), hence he says, “And Allah presents an example of those who disbelieved: the wife of Nuḥ and the wife of Lūṭ. They were under two of our righteous servants but betrayed them...” By Allah he did not intend anyone but the obscene lady in “but they betrayed them”. He will most certainly establish the punishment upon so and so for the crime she perpetrated on the way to Baṣrah. So and so used to love her, so when she wanted to leave for Baṣrah then so and so said to her, “You cannot leave without a Maḥram.” So she married herself to him...

(This is the text of al-Qummī as documented by al-Majlisī in Bihār al-Anwār 22/240. As for the text from the exegesis of al-Qummī itself, the text does feature there. But the person who revised the book omitted the word Baṣrah which appears twice and replaced it with dots. (See: Tafsīr al-Qummī 2/377).

This text does not explicitly mention names. So who is meant in the statement, “Hhe will most certainly establish the punishment,” and who are meant by ‘so and so lady’ and ‘so and so man’? The Shaykh of the Shīʿah, al-Majlisī, due to living under the Safawid rule, has removed the veil of Taqiyyah and has explicitly mentioned the names. He says, “He will most certainly establish the punishment upon her refers to the Mahdī when he will return, as will be mention ahead (I have cited the text he is referring to under the discussion of Ghaybah. Therein he explicitly mentions the name of ‘Ā’ishah. However, he alleges that the reason for her punishment is the accusation she levelled against Māriyah; he does not boldly accuse her here of that which he accuses her of here). And ‘so and so man’ refers to Ṭalḥah. (Bihār al-Anwār 22/241).

This text as you have seen, appears in the exegesis of al-Qummī which is classed a reliable source by their contemporary scholars. The reviser thereof does not critique his exegesis in any way. Hence this an indictment to them and their predecessors. The reviser of Bihār al-Anwār has, however, commented upon this text but in defence of their scholar al-Qummī and not in defence of ‘Ā’ishah the mother of the believers. She does not require the testification of anyone to her chastity after the testification of Allah in her favour, but I am just mentioning this to show the gravity of their slander.
Qur’ānic exegesis (the exegesis of al-Qummī) which implies the refutation of the Qur’ān. In his exegesis of Sūrah al-Nūr, Ibn Kathīr mentions the following:

أجمع أهل العلم-رحمهم الله- قاطبة علي أن من سبها ورماها بما رماها به بعد هذا الذي ذكر في الآية فإنه كافر، لأنه معاند للقرآن

The people of knowledge unanimously conquer that a person who accuses her of what he (the leader of the hypocrites Ibn Salūl) accused her of after the revelation of these verses is a disbeliever. Because he is opposing the Qur’ān.¹

And al-Qurṭubī says:

فكل من سبها مما برأها الله منه مكذب لله، و من كذب الله فهو كافر

Anyone who accuses her of that which Allah exonerated her from has belied Allah, and whoever belies Allah is a disbeliever.²

Nonetheless, the phenomenon of excommunication is not restricted to the Ṣaḥābah even though they were the first victims thereof due to them being the bearers of the Sharīʿah, the transmitters of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, and the conveyers of the dīn on behalf of Rasūl Allah Ḥ. Hence reviling them is in actual fact reviling dīn;³ this was the goal of the heretics in attacking them. And to date, excommunication continues unabated in their circles.

The Muslim Rulers and their Governments

According to the Twelver dogma every government besides the government of the Twelvers is invalid and the ruler thereof is a tyrant and an idol who has been deified. Likewise, whoever pledges allegiance to him is an idolater who worships others besides Allah.

² Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī 12/206.
³ Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/5.
Al-Kulaynī has established this in many chapters, for example, Chapter regarding a person who claims Imāmah for himself without being worthy, regarding a person who denies the Imāms or some of them and regarding a person who affirms Imāmah for someone who is not eligible. In this chapter he cites twelve narrations from their Imāms. Likewise, Chapter regarding a person who adheres to the commands of Allah without an appointed Imām from him. Therein there are five narrations. In Biḥār al-Anwār the following chapter features, Chapter regarding the punishment for a person who claims Imāmah unrightfully, who raises the banner of tyranny or adheres to a tyrant ruler.

So all the rulers of the Muslims, with the exception of ‘Alī and Ḥasan, are idols (according to their belief) even though they called toward the truth, revered the Ahl al-Bayt, and established the dīn of Allah. For as they allege:

كل راية قبل راية القائم رضي الله عنه صاحبها طاغوت

Every flag which is raised before the flag of the Mahdī, the raiser thereof is an idol.

The commentator of al-Kāfī comments thus:

و إن كان رافعها يدعو إلي الحق

Even though the raises thereof calls toward the truth.

And al-Majlisī has classed this narration ‘authentic’ according to their principles.

1 Al-Kāfī: 1/372-374.
2 Al-Kāfī: 1/274-276.
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 25/110, onwards.
4 Al-Kāfī with the commentary of al-Māzindarānī 12/371; Biḥār al-Anwār 25/113.
6 Mirʿāt al-ʿUqūl 4: 378.
As for those rulers who ruled before the year 260 A.H, al-Majlisī says the following regarding the *al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidūn*, the rightly guided successors of Rasūl Allah ﷺ:

إنهم لم يكونوا إلا غصبين جائرين مرتدين عن الدين لعنة الله علیهم وعلي من اتبعهم في ظلم أهل البيت من الأولين والاخرين

They were not but usurpers, tyrants, and renegades. May the curse of Allah be upon them and upon those who followed them in their oppression against the Ahl al-Bayt from the first and the last.¹

**The Muslim Metropolises**

In many of their narrations the excommunication of many of the Muslim cities features. They specifically target those cities the inhabitants of which are devout Muslim who adhere to the Sunnah. Hence, they have excommunicated the people of Makkah and the people of Madīnah in the golden eras. Ja’far al-Ṣādiq is reported to have said the following regarding the people of Makkah and Madīnah:

أهل الشام شر من أهل الروم (يعني شر من النصارى) وأهل المدينة شر من أهل مكة، وأهل مكة يكفرون بالله جهرة

The people of Syria are worse than the people of Rome (i.e. worse than the Christians). And the people of Madīnah are worse than the people of Makkah, and the people of Makkah openly disbelieve in Allah.²

Abū Baṣīr narrates from one of the two Imāms that he said:

إن أهل مكة ليكفرون بالله جهرة وإن أهل المدينة أخبث من أهل مكة، أخبث منهم سبعين ضعفا

The people of Makkah openly disbelieve in Allah and the people of Madīnah are worse than the people of Makkah by seventy times.³

---

¹ *Biḥār al-Anwār* 4: 385.
² *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/409.
³ Ibid. 2/410.
It is a known fact that the people of Madīnah, especially in the golden eras, abided more to the teachings of Rasūl Allah than the people of any other city. This is exactly why one of the scholars of Islam considered the consensus of the people of Madīnah to be evidence upon those besides them.\(^1\)

The people of Madīnah adhered to their ancient school of thought by remaining affiliated to the school of thought of Imām Mālik till the beginning of the sixth century or some time before that or some time after that. Till eventually the Shī'ah from the east infiltrated them and corrupted many of them.\(^2\)

This adherence to Islam enraged many of the heretics due to which they expressed their hatred in these kinds of words. And history repeats itself. So we find that one of their scholars said that Makkah is governed by a group of people who are worse than the Jews.\(^3\)

One of their contemporary scholars has disclosed and explicated the reason behind the aforementioned narrations in his footnotes on al-Kāfī. He says:

لعل هذا الكلام في زمن بني أمية وأتباعهم، كانوا منافقين يظهرون الإسلام و يبطنون الكفر، والمنافقون شر من الكفار وهم في الدرك الأسفل من النار.. و يحتمل أن يكون هذا منيا علي أن المخالفين غير المستضعفين مطلقا شر من سائر الكفار كما يظهر من كثير من الأخبار

This possibly refers to the era of the Umayyads who outwardly expressed iḥān but inwardly concealed disbelief. And hypocrites are worse than disbelievers and they deserve the lower most section of Jahannam... It

\(^1\) It is famous regarding Mālik and his students that they would consider the consensus of the people of Madīnah to be evidence. The other scholars have disputed this stance of theirs. However, it is only the consensus of those golden ages which is evidence. As for the times that followed, all the scholars are unanimous that the consensus of the people thereof is not evidence. (Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 20/300)

\(^2\) Al-Fatāwā 20/299-300.

\(^3\) The mention of this will come ahead under the topic of the empire of the Ayatollahs. In the fourth section of the book.
is also possible that it based on the fact that the opposition (besides the weak) in general is far worse than the disbelievers, as is understood from many of the narrations.¹

So according to him, he feels that this excommunication is correct and concludes that they are worse than the believers for one of two reasons: either because of their submission to the Umayyads i.e. because of them pledging allegiance to the Muslim Umayyad rulers which according to them is the greatest hypocrisy. Or because, as a matter of fact, the opposition (of the Shīʿah) are according to them worse than the disbelievers. Based on this explanation, the excommunication becomes inclusive of all the Muslim lands throughout the ages.

They also say the following regarding Egypt and its people:

أبناء مصر لعنوا علي لسان داود عليه السلام، فجعل الله منهم القردة والخنازير وما غضب الله علي بني إسرائيل إلا أدخلهم مصر، ولا رضي عنهم إلا أخرجهم منها إلي غيرها

The people of Egypt were cursed upon the tongue Dāwūd S, hence Allah disfigured them into monkeys and pigs.² Whenever Allah was displeased with Banī Isrāʾīl, he took them to Egypt, and whenever he was pleased with them he removed them from there to another place.³

Consider the following two narrations as well:

بئس البلاد مصر أما إنها سجن من سخط الله عليه من بني إسرائيل

The worst of cities is Egypt. It is a prison of the wrath of Allah for the Banī Isrāʾīl.⁴

2 Biḥār al-Anwār 60/208; Tafsīr al-Qummī p. 596.
4 Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/305; Biḥār al-Anwār 60/210; al-Burhān 1/457.
Stay away from Egypt and do not desire to stay there. Because staying there breeds indecency.¹

They have many other narrations of this nature wherein they talk evil of Egypt, criticise its people, and warn others from residing in it. They have attributed these narrations to Rasūl Allah ﷺ, Muḥammad al-Bāqir, and ʿAlī al-Riḍā. This is how the Shīʿah view the Egypt of the glorious days of Islam. Hence after citing these narrations, al-Majlisī comments thus:

بأن مصر صارت من شر البلاد في تلك الأزمنة، لأن أهلها صاروا من أشقي الناس وأكفرهم

Egypt became the worst of places in those times. Because its people became the most wretched of people and the most ungrateful.²

All of this venting is because its people did not buy into Shīʿism. And it is possible that these narrations were forged before or after the Ismāʿīlī government in Egypt. Because the Twelvers will never oppose anyone who is like them in Shīʿism, or who establishes an empire wherein their disbelief will be tolerated.

It is not likewise far-fetched to assume that these narrations are a reflection of the hatred and the acrimony the Shīʿah harbour for Egypt due to the fall of the Ismāʿīlī rule therein at the hands of the great general Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, who purified the land of Kinānah from their defilement and impurities. Furthermore, do a comparison between these narrations and the narrations which Imām Muslim has cited in his book under the chapter, The bequest of Rasūl Allah ﷺ regarding the people of Egypt.³

Nonetheless, they have made disparaging remarks regarding many of the cities of Islam and their inhabitants. With the exception of a very few cities which hold the Shīʿī viewpoint, they have not excluded any other city. Hence they say:

¹ *Biḥār al-Anwār* 60/211.
² *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/2970.
³ *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 2/2970.
The Muslim Judges

Their narrations consider the Muslim judges as transgressors because of their association with illegitimate governments as they allege. In al-Kāfī the following narration is narrated from ʿUmar ibn Ḥanẓalah.

He says, “I asked Abū ʿAbd Allah regarding two people from our community who due to a dispute in a matter of religion or inheritance referred to the ruler and the judges; I asked that is it permissible for them to do so?”

He said, “Whoever goes to them for a judgement in reality is going to the Ṭāghūt. And whatever right he acquires due to the ruling being passed in his favour is impermissible for him even though it be his established right. This is because he took it with the judgement of the Ṭāghūt whom Allah has ordered not to believe. Allah says, ‘They wish to refer legislation to the Ṭāghūt while they were commanded to reject it.’”

So as you can see, they consider the Muslim judges to be idols or devils, and their rulings to be invalid; to the extent that a person who procures his right through them is procuring Ḥarām. This ruling is general regarding all the Muslims.

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 60/209 (with reference to Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt)
2 Transgressor, devil, idol.
3 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 60. And the narration appears in Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/67.
throughout the centuries and across all generations. Hence it necessarily includes the judges in the time of Ja’far al-Ṣādiq, as is clear from their attribution of the narration to Ja’far. So if this is their opinion regarding the judges of the best generations, then what would the status of the judges that followed thereafter be?

It seems as though they all exalt only those judges who pass judgements based on the tales of *al-Riqā‘*, the huge lamb-skin, the *Jāmi‘ah* (which according to them encompasses the knowledge of everything), the *Muṣḥaf* of Fāṭimah, and the rulings of the family of Dāwūd. They are not required to provide evidence as appears in their narrations.¹ They do not exalt judges who issue rulings in accordance with the Qur’ān, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah. Hence they themselves are the purport of this verse which they use to substantiate their case, for it was revealed regarding some hypocrites who gave preference to the judgement of the Ṭāghūt over the judgement of Muhammad ibn ʿAbd Allah.² Which is not unusual, because these Shī‘ah belong to the category of the hypocrites.

The stance of their scholars has not changed in the least in these times. Hence after the aforementioned narration Khomeini comments thus:

الإمام عليه السلام نفسه ينعي عن الرجوع إلي السلاطين و قضائهما و يعتبر الرجوع إليهم رجوعا إلي الطاغوت

The Imām prohibits going to their rulers and judges. And considers their rulings to be the rulings of the devil.³

And the commentator of *al-Kāfī* mentions:

والآية بتأكيد الخبر تدل علي عدم الترافع إلي حكم الجور مطلقا، و ربما قيل بجواز التوسل بهم إلي أخذ الحق المعلوك، اضطرارا مع عدم إمكان الترافع إلي الفقه العدل

1 See: Chapter regarding Sunnah and the discussion regarding belief in the books. Likewise see the chapter regarding occultation.
2 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 8/507; *Tafsīr al-Baghawī* 1/446.
3 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 74.
The verse together with the support of the narration posits that one should not take his case to the oppressive rulers at all. However, at times permission is granted to procure one’s right through their medium when it is not possible to take the case to an upstanding jurist.¹

However, it seems as if these principles, which were concocted by the heretics, did not gain acceptance by many of their followers. Because they find such justice by the Muslim judges which they do not find by their people. Some have even acknowledged before Ibn Taymiyyah that:

أنتم ( يعني أهل السنة) تصفونا ما لا ينصف بعضنا بعضا

You people are more just to us than we are to each other.²

Some of their men likewise complained to the Imām that they find more trustworthiness, good character, and decorum by the Ahl al-Sunnah and find the opposite traits in the Shīʿah which makes them grieve.³

The Imāms of the Muslims and their Scholars

They have prevented their people from acquiring knowledge from the scholars of the Muslims and they have considered them to be like the people of Shirk:

عن هارون بن خارجة قال: قلت لأبي عبد الله عليه السلام: إننا نأتي هؤلاء المخالفين فنسمع منهم الحديث يكون حجة لنا عليهم؟ قال: لا تأتهم ولا تسمع منهم يعنهم الله، و لعن ملكهم المشركة

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/67 (footnotes)
² Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/39. A judge from the Ahl al-Sunnah who is appointed as a judge in an area which is populated by the Shīʿah told me that the Shīʿah are keen on bringing their cases to the Ahl al-Sunnah in order to procure their rights; they prefer not going to their own scholars. Ostensibly, they only go to their scholars when they are forced to do by way of threats and warnings of depravation and Jahannam.
³ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/4.
[Hārūn ibn Khārijah says,] I said to Abū ‘Abd Allah, “We go to our opponents and we hear such narrations from them which are evidence for us against them.”

He said, “Do not go to them and do not listen to their traditions. May Allah curse them and their polytheist religions.”

And in al-Kāfī the following narration appears on the authority of Sadīr who narrates from Abū Ja’far:

“O Sadīr should I not show you the people who have become an obstacle for the dīn of Allah?”

He then looked at Abū Ḥanīfah and Sufyān al-Thawrī who were present in some gatherings in the Masjid and said, “These are the people who prevent others from the dīn of Allah without any guidance from Allah or the Qur’ān. If only these filthy people remained in their homes. The people would then go around and they would not find anyone to tell them about Allah and his Rasūl, hence they would come to us and we would tell them of Allah and his Rasūl.”

This narration shows that these people became filled with fury when they saw the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah teaching the Qur’ān and the Sunnah to the people, calling them to the dīn of Allah, them being the centre of attraction the dissemination of knowledge; their gatherings would populate the masjid,

1 This is the title they normally use for the Ahl al-Sunnah. It can also include everyone who opposes them.
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 2/216. He attributes the narration to al-Sarāʾir of Ibn Idrīs.
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/392-393; Tafsīr al-Thaqalayn 4/132.
be packed with people and adorned with knowledge. Tranquillity would cover them, mercy would enshroud them, and the angels would surround them. These scholars were the leaders of the pious and their role-models. On the other hand, these haters were confined to their homes. No one would give them attention. Disgrace and neediness had become their hallmark and they became deserving of the anger of the people and their ridicule. Hence they forged these narrations and attributed them to the Ahl al-Bayt in order to mislead their gullible followers and create enmity between the Ahl al-Bayt and the scholars of the Muslims. Their plan was to excommunicate the scholars of the Muslims and empty the land of them so that they would then get the chance to carry out their agenda.

The Islamic Denominations

They have targeted many Muslim denominations with excommunication and revilement, specifically the Ahl al-Sunnah; who they at times call the Nawāṣib (enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt) and at times the Murji’ah (postponers). In al-Kāfī the following narration appears:

عن أبي مسروق قال: سألني ابن عبد الله عن أهل البصرة ما هم؟ فقلت: مرجئة و قدریة، و حروریة فقال: لعن الله تلك الملل الكافرة المشرکة التي لا تعبد الله علي شيء

Abū Masrūq says that Abū ʿAbd Allah asked him regarding the creed of the people of Basrah, to which he responded by saying, “They are Murji’ah (the postponers), Qadariyyah‘ (the deniers of pre-destiny) and Ḥarūriyyah (the faction which rebelled against ʿAlī [a]).”

Thereupon Abū ʿAbd Allah said, “May Allah curse these deviant and polytheist sects which do not worship Allah on the basis of any sound evidence.”

1 It has passed already that the later generations of the Shīʿah also denied pre-destiny. Hence this curse encompasses them as well.
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/387, 409.
Their intention when using the term Murji’ah is the Ahl al-Sunnah. Hence, al-Majlisī, explaining this narration mentions the following:

اللهم العن المرجئة فهم أعداؤنا في الدنيا و الآخرة

O Allah curse the Murji’ah, for they are our enemies in this world and the hereafter.¹

He thereafter explains that the Irjā’ which is mentioned in the narration refers to postponing the ruling of ‘Alī to the fourth level.²

It should also be noted that the Zaydiyyah were likewise not spared from the criticism of the Twelvers. Hence a narration which is narrated form ʿUmar ibn Yazīd reads as follows:

سألت أبي عبد الله عن الصدقة علي الناصب و علي الزیدیة قال: لا تصدق عليهم بشيء ولا تسقهم من الماء إن استطعت، وقال لي: الزیدیة هم النصاب

I asked Abū ʿAbd Allah regarding giving charity to the Nawāṣib and the Zaydiyyah, to which he responded saying, “Do not give them charity at all and do not give them any water to drink.”

He then said, “The Zaydiyyah are the actual Nawāṣib.”³

Another narration in al-Kāfī states the following:

عن عبد الله بن المغیرة قال: قلت لأبي الحسن رضي الله عنه: إن لي جارين أحدهما ناصب و الآخر زیدی ولا بد من معاشرتهما فمن أعاشر؟ فقال: هما سیان من کذب بآیة من کتاب الله فقد نبذ الإسلام وراء ظهره و هو المکذب بجمیع القرآن و الأنبیاء والمرسلین،ثم قال: إن هذا نصب لك،و هذا الزیدی نصب لنا

1 Furūʿ al-Kāfī (with the commentary Mirʾāt al-ʿUqūl) 4/371
3 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 199; Biḥār al-Anwār 72/179.
[ʿAbd Allah ibn al-Mughīrah states,] I asked Abū al-Ḥasan, “I have two neighbours, one is a Nāṣibī and the other is a Zaydī. And I have to interact with either of them, so who should I interact with?”

He said, “They are the same; a person who denies even a verse of the Book of Allah has left the fold of Islam and has belied the entire Qur’ān and all the messengers and prophets.”

He then said, “He (the Nāṣibī) is your opponent and the Zaydī is our opponent.”

The fact that the Zaydiyyah promulgated the right of ʿAlī to rule and were his partisans was not good enough according to the Twelvers because of them also acceding the rule of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, which according to them is a sin that cannot be pardoned. Instead mere love for Abū Bakr according to them is disbelief. In Bihār al-Anwār the following narration appears:

[Abū ʿAlī al-Khurāsānī narrates from a slave of Abū al-Hasan,] I was with him in privacy and I asked him, “I have a right upon you that you tell me about these two men: Abū Bakr and ʿUmar.”

He said, “They are both disbelievers and whoever loves them is also a disbeliever.”

1 Al-Ḳāfī (with the commentary of al-Māzindarānī): Kitāb al-Rawḍah 12/304; Miftāḥ Kutub al-Arba‘ah 8/76.
2 Bihār al-Anwār 72/181.
3 Bihār al-Anwār 72/181.
They have likewise considered the mere acknowledgement of the rule of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar Ṭallāb to be enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt which according to them is the worst type of disbelief. Al-Majlisī therefore says:

قد يطلق الناصب علي مطلق المخالف غير المستضعف كما هو ظاهر من كثير من الأخبار

The word Nāṣib (enemy) is at times used only for a person who is merely an opponent and is not weak, as is obvious from many narrations.¹

He also says:

لا تجوز الصلاة علي المخالف لجبر أو تشبیه أو اعتزال أو خارجية أو أنكار إمامة إل للتقیة، فإن فعل

لعنه بعد الرابعة

It is not permissible to read the ṣalāh of a person who opposes Jabr (the idea that men do not have freewill), anthropomorphism, rationality, extremism or a person who does not belief in Imāmah, unless he does so by way of Taqiyyah. If he does so (i.e. reads the ṣalāh of such a person by way of Taqiyyah) he should curse him after the fourth Takbīr.²

Al-Mufīd has likewise mentioned that all the people of innovation are disbelievers.³ And that is exactly why al-Majlisī established a chapter by the title, Chapter regarding the Disbelief of the opponents and the Nawāṣib.⁴

Al-Majlisī further says:

كتب أخبارنا مشحونة بالأخبار الدالة علي كفر الزیدیة و أمثالهم من الفطحیة و الواقفة

The books of our tradition are filled with narrations which suggest that the Zaydiyyah and their likes, like that of the Faṭḥiyyah and the Wāqifah are disbelievers.⁵

---

¹ Miṭrāt al-ʿUqūl 4/72.
² Ibid. 4/72-73.
³ Awāʾil al-Maqālāt p. 15.
⁴ Biḥār al-Anwār 72/131.
⁵ Ibid.
The aforementioned sects are all denominations of the Shīʿah themselves. If this is the ruling regarding them then what would the status of the rest besides them be?

We in fact also find that the Twelvers among themselves excommunicate one another. Study what al-Kashshī has narrated, upon which Shaykh al-Ṭāʿifah (the leader of their group) is in agreement with him, regarding their excommunication and bickering among themselves; he mentions that in the year 190 A.H sixteen people convened at the house of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā. One of them whose name was Jaʿfar ibn ʿĪsā said to him:

Jaʿfar said, “O my master I complain to Allah and to you regarding the state of our companions.”

He asked, “What is the matter?”

Jaʿfar said, “They call us heretics, excommunicate us, and disassociate themselves from us.”

He replied, “This was the condition of the followers of ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn, Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī, Jaʿfar, and Mūsā—may the peace of Allah descend upon them. Likewise the students of Zurārah would also excommunicate others, just as the others would excommunicate them as well…”

And Yūnus said, “They claim that we are heretics.”

1 Because he refined Rijāl al-Kashshī and chose to work on it.
2 To phrase the sentence in this way is prohibited due to it polytheistic implication. It should rather be said, “We complain to Allah first and then to you.” But the deviance of the Shīʿah is way beyond this one point. However, I mentioned this for the benefit of the reader.
3 Rijāl al-Kashshī 498-499.
This is the condition of the first generation among them who would falsely fabricate lies and attribute them to the Ahl al-Bayt. One can well imagine what the condition of those who succeeded them would be.

The Entire Ummah

Cursing the Ummah and excommunicating it in its entirety is something very commonly found in the books of the Shi‘ah. That is why all the prayers that the Shi‘ah offer and often repeat at the tombs and holy sites are filled with curses upon this blessed Ummah whose hallmark is moderation.

Hence when visiting the grave of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn they supplicate thus:

لعن الله من خالفك و لعن الله من افتري عليك و ظلمك، و لعن الله من غصبك، و لعن الله من بلغه ذلك فرضي به،Ana إلی الله منهم بريء، لعن الله أمة خالفتك و أمة جحدتك، و جحدت ولايتك، و أمة تظاهرت عليك، و أمة حادت عنك و خذتلك، اللهم العن الجوابیت و الطواغیت و الفراعنة، واللاد و العزی، و كل ند يدعی دون الله،و كل مفتر، اللهم و أتباعهم و أعوانهم، و محیبهم لعنا کثیرا

May Allah curse the one who opposed you. May he curse the one who forged lies against you and oppressed you. May he curse the one who usurped your right. And may he curse the one who received the news of this and was fine with it. I disassociate myself from them before Allah. May Allah curse the Ummah which opposed you, the Ummah which belied you and your rulership, the Ummah which collaborated against you, the

---

1 Oppression and usurpation according to them is the rulership of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān. (See: Al-I‘tiqādāt p. 112-113).
2 I.e. was happy with the rulership of Abū Bakr. Because according to them it was based on oppression and usurpation. In this way this curse includes the entire Ummah with the exception of the extremist Shi‘ah of course.
3 By appointing Abū Bakr.
4 The Wilāyah of ʿAlī starts from the time of the demise of Rasūl Allah. Hence whoever concedes the rulership of the first three Khulafā’ according to them denies the rulership of ʿAlī. (See: Al-Irshād p. 13)
Ummah which abandoned and forsook you. All praise belongs to Allah who has made hell-fire their final abode; indeed a very bad abode and indeed bad will be its incumbents... O Allah curse the devils, the idols, and the pharaohs, Lāt and ‘Uzzā, any equal who is worshiped besides Allah,¹ and every liar. O Allah curse them, their partisans, their followers, their allies, their helpers, and their lovers; excessively.²

These curses which incessantly flow from the tongues of these people instead of the glorification of Allah and his praises have their effect in filling their hearts with malice and hatred for the Ummah and its dīn.

Furthermore, the Twelvers have accorded such despicable titles to the Ummah which are not found in the books of any other denomination besides them. Not for any other reason, but because the Ummah was happy with those whom the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār chose as their rulers.

Hence at times they accuse the entire Ummah of debauchery.³ At times they claim that the entire Ummah is the illegitimate children of adultery owing to which they will be called with the names of their mothers on the Day of Judgement.⁴ And at times they claim that all the individuals of the Ummah are disfigured,

---

¹ From Jawābīt, onwards, according to them these terms refer to the Muslim rulers, especially the first three rulers, and the Umayyad rulers. And the equal who is worshipped besides Allah is an Imām or leader who people give their allegiance to other than the Twelve Imāms. (Refer back to their belief regarding the oneness of Allah in terms of him being the deity who is worthy of worship).
² Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh 2/354.
³ They say that at the birth of every child a devil comes to him in order to incite him to do evil. And no one besides the Shīʿah according to them is safe from this. Their narrations and citations in this regard have passed on p. 626 footnote 2 of this book.
⁴ They say that the entire Ummah besides the Shīʿah are the children of prostitutes. This has likewise passed already... See p. 626 footnote 2 of this book
⁵ This is one of the Chapters of Biḥār al-Anwār 7/237.
they are not humans, rather they are monkeys and pigs.\(^1\) And the list of curses and accusations goes on...

It is clear from the details that have passed that the Shīʿah have not spared anybody of this Ummah from their criticism and excommunication. They have specifically targeted the companions of Rasūl Allah \(^2\), the Muhājirīn and Anṣār, the household of Rasūl Allah \(^2\), the Muslim metropolises and their inhabitants, the Islamic denominations and the entire Ummah at large. They curse all the aforementioned categories in their supplications, prayers and when visiting their holy sites. Have they excluded anybody? Yes they have excluded the following group and have supported them and praised them...

---

1 One such example is the following narration which is narrated from Abū Baṣīr, “I asked Abū Jaʿfar thus, “I am your supporter and your friend. And I have weak vision, so can you promise me Jannah?” He said, “Should I not show a sign of the truthfulness of the Imāms?” I said, “You will not suffer any loss if you have to do so.” He thus said, “Do you really want to see it?” I said, “Why not?” Hence he rubbed his hand over my eyes and suddenly I was able to see the entire orchard wherein he was sitting. He then said, “O Abū Muḥammad! This is your vision, so see what you can see.” I thus looked around and I could not see anything besides dogs, pigs, and monkeys, so I asked, “What is this disfigured creation?” He said, “This is the majority of this Ummah. If the veils were raised, the Shīʿah would not see the people who oppose them in any other condition besides this condition.” He then asked, “O Abū Muḥammad! If you want I can leave you as you are and Allah will take you to task. And if you want I can guarantee you Jannah and change your condition to what it was previously.” I told him, “I have no need to see this disfigured creation. Reinstate my previous condition, for Jannah is invaluable.” He thus rubbed his hand on my eye and I became as I was. (Biḥār al-Anwār 27/30. He has sourced the narration from al-芰Enumerate the key points from the text:

1. The Shīʿah have not spared anyone from their criticism and excommunication.
2. They specifically targeted the companions of Rasūl Allah \(^2\), the Muhājirīn and Anṣār, the household of Rasūl Allah \(^2\), the Muslim metropolises, and their inhabitants.
3. They curse these categories in their supplications, prayers, and when visiting their holy sites.
4. They have excluded a particular group and supported them, praising them.

---

\(^1\) One such example is the following narration which is narrated from Abū Baṣīr, “I asked Abū Jaʿfar thus, “I am your supporter and your friend. And I have weak vision, so can you promise me Jannah?” He said, “Should I not show a sign of the truthfulness of the Imāms?” I said, “You will not suffer any loss if you have to do so.” He thus said, “Do you really want to see it?” I said, “Why not?” Hence he rubbed his hand over my eyes and suddenly I was able to see the entire orchard wherein he was sitting. He then said, “O Abū Muḥammad! This is your vision, so see what you can see.” I thus looked around and I could not see anything besides dogs, pigs, and monkeys, so I asked, “What is this disfigured creation?” He said, “This is the majority of this Ummah. If the veils were raised, the Shīʿah would not see the people who oppose them in any other condition besides this condition.” He then asked, “O Abū Muḥammad! If you want I can leave you as you are and Allah will take you to task. And if you want I can guarantee you Jannah and change your condition to what it was previously.” I told him, “I have no need to see this disfigured creation. Reinstate my previous condition, for Jannah is invaluable.” He thus rubbed his hand on my eye and I became as I was. (Biḥār al-Anwār 27/30. He has sourced the narration from al-ኢEnumerate the key points from the text:

1. The Shīʿah have not spared anyone from their criticism and excommunication.
2. They specifically targeted the companions of Rasūl Allah \(^2\), the Muhājirīn and Anṣār, the household of Rasūl Allah \(^2\), the Muslim metropolises, and their inhabitants.
3. They curse these categories in their supplications, prayers, and when visiting their holy sites.
4. They have excluded a particular group and supported them, praising them.
The group which the Shīʿah Exclude from their Blanket Excommunication and Curses

After excommunicating the Ṣaḥābah, the Ahl al-Bayt, the rulers, the judges, the scholars, and all the denominations—which include some Shīʿī denominations as well—it would be interesting to see who they exclude.

In my readings of their literature I have found that they extol the scum of this Ummah and the worst of humans. In fact I have found that they praise and support outright disbelievers, hypocrites, and heretics (after all the souls are all categorised into clusters. Those among them who recognise each other tend to bond with one another).

Therefore we see that the Shīʿah defend the integrity of renegades like Musaylamah the liar,1 heretics like Mukhtār ibn Abī ‘Ubayd2 and Naṣīr al-Ṭūsī,3 liars like Jābir al-Juʿfī4 and Zurārah ibn A’yan,5 and fire worshippers who were the ardent enemies of Islām like Abū Lu’lu’ al-Majūsī—the murderer of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb—whom they title Bābā Shujāʿ al-Dīn (the brave hero of dīn).6

Similarly, they have received their legacy from disbelievers who believed in the interpolation of the Qur’ān and considered the companions of Rasūl Allah

---

4 See p. 506 of this book.
5 See p. 511 of this book.
6 ʿAbbās al-Qummī: al-Kunā wa al-Alqāb 2/55. The day of the assassination of ‘Umar is considered a day of great celebration according to them. Hence they say, “This is a day of celebration and it is one of our best celebrations.” (See: al-Jazāʾirī: Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah: Chapter regarding a divine light which reveals the reward for the day ‘Umar was killed: 1/108, onwards. This the belief they hold regarding one of the giants of Islam. The reason why they harbour this malice against ‘Umar is that he was the one who conquered the lands of Persia and annexed them to the Muslim empire. Therefore, they respect his killer and celebrate the day of his murder.
to be renegades and disbelievers, like that of Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, al-Kulaynī and their likes whom they consider reliable transmitters of their dīn and the cornerstone of their legacy.

**Analyses**

Does this stance, the blanket excommunication of the entire Ummah without any exception, require any analyses? Its invalidity is so obvious that it does not have to be mentioned, and its falsity is so apparent that it does not have to be highlighted. In essence, the excommunication of the Ummah is an extension of the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah; the reason is the same in both cases.

A person who hates the Companions of Rasūl Allah, reviles them, and excommunicates them will naturally hate the Ummah and excommunicate it as well, as is mentioned by one of the pious predecessors:

لا يغل قلب أحد علي أحد من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلا كان قلبه علي المسلمين أغل

No person's heart will be filled with rancour for the Ṣaḥābah except that his heart will be filled with more rancour for the Muslims in general.¹

Can a person who is not pleased with Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, the veterans of Badr, the participants of the pledge of Riḍwān, the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār, who had attained the highest levels of piety and virtue; ever be pleased with anyone after them?

The basis of this stance is the claim of the Shīʿah that the Ṣaḥābah rejected the emphatic nomination of ʿAlī and pledged their allegiance to Abū Bakr. The refutation of this baseless claim in light of the Qurʾān, the Sunnah,

---

¹ Ibn Baṭṭah: al-İbānah p. 41.
reason, and the categorical aspects of dīn has passed already. And whatever is based upon a baseless precept is baseless itself.

The mere fact that the Shīʿah excommunicate the unique generation which is extolled in the Qurʿān is enough evidence of the falsehood of their dogma and of the fact that its very basis was laid down by a group of heretics. The invalidity of this stance of theirs is very clear. Aḥmad al-Kisrawī, an Iranian and a Shīʿī by origin, therefore, mentions the following:

As for their claim that the Muslims turned renegade after the demise of Rasūl Allah, it stems from their boldness in speaking lies and casting allegations. For it is possible for someone to say: Why would they turn renegade when they were the Companions of Rasūl Allah who embraced his faith when others rejected it, who defended him and underwent difficulties in supporting his cause, who stood by his side in all his battles and who did not give preference to themselves over him. What benefit really was there for them in the rulership of Abū Bakr due to which they were willing to leave the fold of Islam? Which of the two are more likely: I belie one or two people who had ulterior motives or the apostasy of a few hundred Muslims? Give us an answer if you have any.¹

Nonetheless, even though their dogma rests on no solid grounding, due to it being contrary to Sharīʿah, reason, history, and those aspects which are categorically considered to be part of Islam, it is still necessary for us to halt here—even for a little while—to refute it. Because there were many people in the past and there are many people currently who are unaware of the proofs in this regard. It is sufficient for you to know that one of their contemporary scholars, Muḥammad

¹ Al-Shīʿah wa al-Tashayyuʿ p. 66.
al-Khāliṣī, who is known for advocating the slogans of unity of the Ummah and continuously highlighting them in his publications, speeches, and journeys; wrote the following letter to Shaykh Muḥammad Bahjah al-Bayṭār on the 26th of Rabī’ al-Awwal 1382 A.H. It reads as follows:

I have not mentioned the Ṣaḥābah in good light because I do not want to become a victim of the punishment of Allah and his displeasure by going against His Book and the Sunnah in praising those whom they both have condemned, and in extolling those whose actions have been condemned in the Qur’ān and the widespread traditions of Rasūl Allah. All I can say is that the Qur’ān and the Sunnah have not highlighted the Ṣaḥābah positively. And the fact that they were Ṣaḥābah is not sufficient to prove their virtue.

As you have noticed, al-Khāliṣī does not wish to speak favourably of the Ṣaḥābah despite the fact that their virtue is very well established in the holy texts. Conversely, he asserts regarding the Twelve Imāms that they are the pillars of īmān and that Allah will not accept the actions of men but after their allegiance to them. Whereas in the Qur’ān there features no mention whatsoever of the Twelve Imāms, nor their respective rulerships. Notice how they belie clear-cut realities and how they believe in outright lies. If this is the case, then it is our duty to refute their claims and establish the virtue of the Ṣaḥābah in light of the Qur’ān, the Sunnah, the verdicts of the Imāms, history, reason and the categorically established aspects of Dīn. In doing so, we will also expose the person who invented this belief and introduced it to the Shīʿī dogma.

1 See, for example, al-Islām Fawq Kull Shay’ p. 65.
3 Al-Khāliṣī: al-Iʿtiṣām bi Ḥabl Allah p. 42.
This will simultaneously serve as a refutation of their excommunication of the rest of the Ummah, because they excommunicate the Ummah for the very same reason that they excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah. The only difference is that the Ṣaḥābah were attacked more than the others by the Shīʿah with the sole purpose of invalidating the Sharīʿah which they transmitted.

The Qurʾān

The verses of the Qurʾān bear testimony to the fact that the Ṣaḥābah were people of upstanding character and that Allah was pleased with them and praised them in many emphatic and clear verses. We do not require any esoteric interpretations to realise this, as is the method of the Twelvers in interpreting the verses of the Qurʾān.

Allah says:

كُنتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ

You are the best nation which has been taken out for the benefit of people.¹

It is sufficient an honour for them that Allah has addressed by the “the best of people,” for they were most certainly the first addressees of this verse. And there can be no status loftier than the status of a people whom Allah chose for the company of his beloved and his support.²

The Salaf have interpreted this verse in various ways all of which eventually conclude that this verse was revealed regarding the Ṣaḥābah. Allah told them that they are the best of people.³

---

¹ Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 110.
³ Ibn ʿAṭiyyah: al-Muharrar al-Wajīz: 3/193. Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Wazīr, one of the senior scholars of the Zaydiyyah, mentions the following after shedding some light on the lives of these illustrious companions the likes of who no nation on earth has ever seen before: “These feats caution an unwary person and they increase the insight of an intelligent person. Otherwise the verse, ‘You are the best of nations’ is sufficient a proof of their virtue. (Al-Rawd al-Bāsim 1/56-57. See also: Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb: al-Jīl al-Thānī p. 19.
Likewise Allah says:

وَالسَّابِقُوْنَ الأَْوَّلُوْنَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِیْنَ وَالأَْنصَارِ وَالَّذِینَ اتَّبَعُوْهُم بِإِحْسَانٍ رَّضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوْاَ

And the first forerunners [in the faith] among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār and those who followed them with good conduct — Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great attainment.¹

This verse very clearly states that Allah was pleased with the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār, and those who followed them meticulously. It promises them great success and everlasting bliss in Jannah. Ibn Kathīr therefore says:

فیا ویل من أبغضهم أو سبهم، أو أبغض أو سب بعضهم ولا سبأون سید الصحابة بعد الرسول و خیرهم و

So woe be to the one who hates them and reviles them, or hates and reviles some of them, especially the leader of the Šāhābah, the best among them, and the most virtuous after Rasūl Allah, i.e. al-Ṣiddīq the great successor. The Shī‘ah harbour enmity against the best among the Šāhābah, they oppose them and revile them.² May Allah save us from that. This is evidence of the fact that their intelligence is reversed and their hearts are inverted. Can they possibly have any faith in the Qur‘ān if they revile the Šāhābah?³

Allah also says:

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 100.
2 Instead they have taken it a step ahead and have dubbed them disbelievers and renegades.
3 Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/410.
Certainly was Allah pleased with the believers when they pledged allegiance to you, [O Muhammad], under the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so He sent down tranquillity upon them and rewarded them with an imminent conquest.¹

Ibn Hazm says:

Allah is informing us that he knew what is in their hearts, he was pleased with them and that he send down tranquillity upon them. Hence, after this it is not permissible for any person to remain hesitant in their matter and doubt their integrity.²

Those who pledged their allegiance to Rasūl Allah under the tree at the mountain of Tanʿīm,³ were in total more than 1400 Ṣaḥābah. They pledged their allegiance to him when the polytheists barred him from performing ʿUmrah.⁴

These were the very same people, as Ibn Taymiyah mentions, who pledged allegiance to Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān.⁵

A person who denies the proclamation of his Lord that He was pleased with those who pledged their allegiance under the tree is indeed a loser. Any person who

---

1 Al-Fath: 18
2 Al-Faṣl: 4/225.
3 The mountain of Tanʿīm is situated at a distance of three to four miles from Makkah. This name was given because on its right is the Nuʿaym and on its left is the Nāʾim Mountains. And the valley’s name is Naʿmān.
4 Minhāj al-Sunnah (the revised version of Rashād Sālim) 2/15-16.
5 Ibid. 1/206.
has a little knowledge knows without any doubt that Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, ʿĀlī, Ṭalḥah, Zubayr, Ṭalḥah, ʿAmmār, and Mughīrah ibn Shuʿbah were all part of this glad-tiding. The Khawārij and the Shīʿah on the other hand have obstinately disassociated themselves from them, opposing Allah.

Allah likewise says:

Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer], seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their mark [i.e. sign] is on their faces [i.e. foreheads] from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah. And their description in the Gospel is as a plant which produces its offshoots and strengthens them so they grow firm and stand upon their stalks, delighting the sowers so that He may enrage by them the disbelievers. Allah has promised those who believe and do righteous deeds among them forgiveness and a great reward.

Ponder over the great status of the Ṣaḥābah, for Allah has praised them with these great qualities and has informed us that they are described in this manner in the Torah and the Injīl. Some scholars are of the opinion that the purport of this verse implies that the Shīʿah are disbelievers. Because they harbour enmity for the Ṣaḥābah and Allah in the verse mentions, “So that He may enrage by them the disbelievers.” Hence the conclusion is that whoever harbours enmity for them is from the disbelievers.

---

1 Al-Faṣl 4/226.
2 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29
Furthermore, Allah says:

لا يَسْتَوِي مَنْ أَنفَقَ مِنْ قَبْلِ الْفَتْحِ وَقَاتَلَ أُولَٰئِكَ أَعْظَمُ دَرَجَةً مِّنَ الَّذِیْنَ أَنفَقُوْا مِنْ بَعْدُ وَقَاتَلُوْا وَکُلَّا وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الْحُسْنٰی

Not equal among you are those who spent before the conquest [of Makkah] and fought [and those who did so after it]. Those are greater in degree than they who spent afterwards and fought. But to all God has promised Ḥusnā, the best [reward].¹

And Allah mentions the following regarding all those whom he has promised Ḥusnā:

إِنَّ الَّذِیْنَ سَبَقَتْ لَهُم مِّنَّا الْحُسْنٰی أُولٰئِكَ عَنْهَا مُبْعَدُوْنَ لَ یَسْمَعُوْنَ حَسِیْسَهَا وَهُمْ فِيْ مَا اشْتَهَتْ أَنفُسُهُمْ خَالِدُوْنَ لَ یَحْزُنُهُمُ الْفَزَعُ الأَْکْبَرُ

Indeed, those for whom Ḥusnā, the best [reward] has preceded from us – they are from it far removed. They will not hear its sound, while they are, in that which their souls desire, abiding eternally. They will not be grieved by the greatest terror.²

Understanding both these verses comprehensively proves that Allah has promised Ḥusnā for anyone who accompanied Nabī. And Allah says that he does not go against his promises.³ Likewise Allah clearly mentions that any person who has been promised Ḥusnā will be kept so far from the fire of Jahannam that he will not even hear its sound, he will remain forever in Jannah fulfilling all his desires and the horror of the great day will not grieve him. And the hypocrites and disbelievers are not from the Companions of Rasūl Allah.⁴

Allah also says:

1 Sūrah al-Ḥadīd: 10
2 Sūrah al-Ambiyā’: 101, 102, 103.
3 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 9.
4 Al-Muhallā 1/42.
For the poor emigrants who were expelled from their homes and their properties, seeking bounty from Allah and [His] approval and supporting Allah and His Messenger, [there is also a share]. Those are the truthful. And [also for] those who were settled in the Home [i.e. al-Madīnah] and [adopted] the faith before them. They love those who emigrated to them and find not any want in their breasts of what they [i.e. the emigrants] were given but give [them] preference over themselves, even though they are in privation. And whoever is protected from the stinginess of his soul – it is those who will be the successful. 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.”

This verse comprises of praises for the Muhājirīn, the Anṣār, and those who succeed them and seek forgiveness for them; asking Allah to create no resentment in their hearts for them. It also mentions that these three categories are the people who are deserving of *Fay*. It goes without doubt that the Shīʿah are not part of any of these three categories. Because they do not seek forgiveness for the predecessors, rather they harbour enmity against them. In essence, the verse praises the Şahābah and the Ahl al-Sunnah who befriend them, and it necessarily excludes the Shīʿah. This itself is enough to debunk the Shīʿī dogma.

There are many more verses related to this topic, but have sufficed with the boave in proving our point.

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 8, 9, 10.
2 Booty acquired without battle.
3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/204.
The Pristine Sunnah of Rasūl Allah

The books of Sunnah are filled with the praises of the Ṣaḥābah and the mention of their merits by Rasūl Allah هـ.

Some narrations praise the entire fraternity of Ṣaḥābah. For example the narration:

لا تسبوا أصحابي، لا تسبوا أصحابي، فوالذي نفسي بيده لو أن أحدكم أفنف مثل أحد ذهبا ما أدرك مد أحمدهم ولا نصيبه

Do not revile my Companions, do not revile my Companions. For By Allah, if any of you were to spend gold equivalent to the mountain of Uḥud as charity it would not equate to the Mudd of any of them or even half its amount.²

And the narration:

خير الناس قرني، ثم الذين يلونهم، ثم الذين يلونهم، قال عمران: فلا أدري أذكر بعد قرنه قرنين أو ثلاثة

The best of people are the people of my generation, then those who succeed them, and then those who succeed them.

‘Imrān says, “I do not know whether he made mention of two generations after his or three.”³

---

1 A special measurement used in those days.
2 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: Chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah of Nabī هـ: 4/195; Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: Chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-chapter regarding the impermissibility of reviling the Ṣaḥābah: 2/1967; Sunan Abī Dāwūd: Chapter regarding Sunnah: Sub-chapter regarding the prohibition of swearing the Ṣaḥābah of Nabī هـ: 5/45; Sunan al-Tirmidhī: Chapter of Merits: Sub-chapter no. 59: 5/695-696.
3 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: Chapter regarding testimonies: Sub-chapter regarding not falsely testifying...: 3/151; Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: Chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-Chapter regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah and those who succeeded them, and those who succeeded them: 2/1962 (with similar wording).
Some narrations extoll the virtues of specific groups among them. For example, Rasūl Allah  said the following regarding the participants of Badr:

وَمَا یَدْرِكُ ۖ لَعَلَّ ٱللَّهُ اَلْعَلْوَى عَلَى أَهْلِ بَدْرٍ فَقَالَ: اَعْمِلُوا مَا شَآءْتُمْ فَقَدْ غَفَرْتُ لَكُم

And don’t you know that Allah  gazed at the people of Badr and said, “Do what you want for I have forgiven you.” 1

Likewise the narrations which comprise of the merits of the participants of the pledge of Riḍwān. Rasūl Allah  said:

لا یَدْخُلُ النَّارُ مِنْ أَصْحَابِ ٱلشَّجْرَةِ أَحَدُهُمُّ الَّذِينَ بَيَاءَعُوْا فِيهَا

None of those who pledged allegiance beneath the tree will enter hell-fire. 2

Whilst there are other narrations which specifically extoll the virtues of individuals amongst the Ṣaḥābah. They are numerous and are documented in the Ṣiḥāḥ, Sunan, and the Masānīd. 3

However, the Shīʿah have opted to distance themselves from this vast resource of knowledge. For they do not draw evidence from it. Hence, it is meaningless for us to marshal evidence from our narrations against them because they will not accept them. Likewise, it is meaningless for them to marshal evidence against us from their legacy because we will not accept it. Hence it will only be appropriate

---

1 Šaḥīḥ Muslim: Chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-chapter regarding the virtue of the people of Badr: 2/1941.
2 Šaḥīḥ Muslim: Chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-chapter regarding the virtue of the people of the tree: 2/1942.
for each of the parties to furnish such evidence which the opposite party will be willing to accept and concede, whether the furnishing party believes in its validity or not.¹

I have therefore sufficed at this juncture on referring to the seminal works of Sunnah which contain the merits of the Ṣaḥābah ً¹. For in them is contained a vast amount of traditions regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah ً², their praise, and the impermissibility of reviling them. Subsequently, I shall try to establish inculpatory evidence against them from their books and from the narrations of their Imāms which they treat as equal to the traditions of Rasūl Allah ً³.

The Commendation of the Ṣaḥābah by the Imāms

In his al-Khiṣāl Ibn Bābawayh has cited the following narration:

کان أصحاب رسول الله صلي الله علیه وسلم اثني عشر ألفا، ثمانیة آلف من المدینة و الفان من أهل مکة، و الفان من الطلقاء لم یر فیهم قدري، ول مرجی، ول حروری، ول معنلی، ول صاحب رأی كانوا یبكون اللیل والنهار

The Companions of Rasūl Allah ً³ were twelve thousand in total,² eight thousand belonged to Madīnah, two thousand belonged to Makkah, and

---

1 Al-Faṣl 4/159.
2 This is a fabrication of ignorant people. Because the amount of the Ṣaḥābah ً¹ who participated with Rasūl Allah ً³ in the Battle of Ḥunayn itself was twelve thousand, and that also was without those who tagged along by the way and the women. Thereafter the people of Hawāzin came to him and embraced Islām. And Rasūl Allah ً³ had left Makkah filled with people. Very similar to this was the case of Madīnah. Similarly all the tribes that he passed had accepted Islam. All of the aforementioned were thus Muslims. Subsequent to that, in the Battle of Tabūk so many people were with him that a register could not encompass them. The crowds were similar in his farewell Hajj as well. And all these people without doubt were honoured with Ṣuḥbah (his companionship) (see: Ibn al-Athīr: Usd al-Ghābah 1/12). Abū Zur‘ah asserts that Nabī ً³ passed away and the amount of people who saw him and heard from him were more than a hundred thousand, males and females. (See: Taqrīb al-Rāwī 2/221; al-Iṣābah p. 4; al-Dhahabī: Tajrīd Asmā’ al-Ṣaḥābah P. ب. The most reliable stance in this regard is that their accurate amount is not known. (See: Fath al-Mughīth 3/111).
two thousand were those who were released (at the Conquest of Makkah). Not one amongst them was known to be a Qadarī (denier of pre-destiny), a Murji’ (postponer), a Ḥarūrī (an extremist), a Muʿtazilī (rationalist) and a follower of his own views. They were people who cried day and night.¹

And in *Biḥār al-Anwār* the following narration in narrated from al-Ṣādiq who narrates it from his forefathers who narrate it from ʿAlī:

أوصيكم بأصحاب نبیكم ل تسبوهم الذین لم یحدثوا بعده حدثا و لم یؤوا محدثا، فإن رسول الله صلی الله علیه بهم الخیر

I emphasise upon you regarding the Companions of your Nabī. Do not revile them. For indeed they did not bring about innovations into the dīn after him, nor did they give amnesty to an innovator. Rasūl Allah also bequeathed that they should be treated amiably.²

The following narration also appears in *Biḥār al-Anwār*:

طوبي لمن رآني، و طوبي لمن رأي من رآني، و طوبي لمن رأي من رأي من رآني

Fortunate is the person who saw me. Fortunate is the person who saw the person who saw me. And fortunate is the person who saw the one who saw me.³

Their seventh Imām, Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar, narrates that Rasūl Allah said:

أنا أمنة لأصحابي، فإذا قبضت دنا من أصحابي ما یوعدون، و أصحابي أمنة لأمتي، فإذا قبض أصحابي دنا من أمتي ما یوعدون ول یزال هذا الذین ظاهرا علي الأدیان کلها ما دام فیهم من قد رآني

I am a source of security for my companions; when I pass away that which my Companions are promised will come their way. My Companions are

---

¹ Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī: *al-Khiṣāl* p. 639-640. See also: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/305.
² *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/305, 306.
³ *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/305; Amālī al-Ṣadūq p. 240-241.
likewise a source of security for my Ummah; when they are taken away that which the Ummah is promised will come their way. As long as there remains amongst you one person who saw me, this dīn will reign supreme over all other religions.¹

Similarly, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī has narrated the following in his book Maʿānī al-Akhbār:

Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad narrates from his forefathers that Rasūl Allah said, “Whatever you find in the Book of Allah, practicing it is your duty; you have no excuse to abandon it. And that which you do not find in the Book of Allah and find in my Sunnah, you have no excuse not to practice upon it. And in aspects for which you do not find guidance in my Sunnah, follow that which my Companions say. For my Companions are like the stars, whichever one you will follow you will attain guidance; likewise whichever of the views of my Companions you will follow you will attain guidance. (The portion which follows is of course the addition of those who desire to disunite the Ummah). It was then asked, “Who are your companions oh Rasūl Allah?” He said, “My Household.”²

It is very clear that interpreting “Companions” as “Household” is completely far-fetched. Their scholar al-Ṣadūq realised the far-fetched nature of this interpretation and therefore commented:

The Ahl al-Bayt do not have differences amongst themselves, rather they always tell the Shīah to follow the truth even if it be bitter. And at times they order them to practice Taqiyyah. Hence those statements which are contrary to their usual statements are based on Taqiyyah and Taqiyyah is a mercy for the Shīah.¹

In this comment he concludes that the commendation of the Ṣaḥābah was based on Taqiyyah. Whereas logic and reason reject this interpretation completely. For how can praising the Ṣaḥābah whom Allah and his Rasūl praised and to whose merits and efforts history has attested, be by way of Taqiyyah? And how can reviling them be based on reality and the stance of the Imāms? They have no evidence for this besides the fact that it resonates well with the enemies of the Ummah.

Furthermore, the aforementioned text is narrated by Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq from Rasūl Allah. So is it possible to aver that Rasūl Allah, out of Taqiyyah, spoke a lie to the Ummah, or that Jaʿfar fabricated a lie and attributed it Rasūl Allah and the Ahl al-Bayt and a clear rejection of the texts.

Nonetheless, in Nahj al-Balāghah ‘Alī is reported to have made the following remarks regarding Abū Bakr or ‘Umar, based on the variant views of the Shīah scholars in this regard²:

لله بلاء فلان فلقد قوم الأود وداوي العمد، و أقام السنة..و خلف الفتنة، ذهب تقي الثوب، قلیل العیب

To Allah belongs the credit for the efforts of so and so.³ He straightened the crookedness,⁴ cured the maladies,⁵ established the Sunnah, and left the

---

1 Ibid.
3 Meaning his efforts for the path of Allah (see: Maytham al-Baḥrānī: Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah 4/97).
4 Translation is taken from the commentary given in the above mentioned reference.
5 See: The notes of Ṣubḥī Ṣāliḥ on Nahj al-Balāghah p. 671.
Fitnah (trial) behind.\(^1\) He departed from this world with a clean garment and with very few faults. He partook of the good of this world and avoided its evil. He fulfilled the right of the obedience of Allah and feared as he was required to.\(^2\)

This is a very crucial text which debunks all their alleged claims regarding the enmity and tension which existed between ‘Alī and Abū Bakr and ‘Umar.

Narrations of this nature have always baffled the Shī‘ah. This one has in particular because it appears in *Nahj al-Balāghah*, which according to them is a categorically established book. Maytham al-Baḥrānī\(^3\) has sketched the nature of this confusion, he says:

واعلم أن الشیعة قد أوردوا هنا سؤال فقالوا: إن هذه الممادح التي ذكرها في حق أحد الرجلین تنافي ما أجمعنا عليه من تخطئتهم وأخذهما من منصب الخلافة، فإما أن لا يكون هذا الكلام من كلامه رضي الله عنه وإما أن يكون أجماعنا خطأ.

Know well that the Shī‘ah have raised a question at this point. They say: These feats which are mentioned in praise of one of the two men violate our consensus regarding considering them wrong and believing that they usurped the Khilāfah. Hence either these words are not the words of ‘Alī or our consensus is invalid.

They try to resolve this conundrum by asserting that these words were said by way of Taqiyyah, i.e. he only made mention of these praises in order to rehabilitate the people who believed in the legitimacy of the rule of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar and attract their hearts. In other words, according to them, ‘Alī intended

---

1 I.e. he left the Fitnah behind; he did not reach it, nor did it reach him. (Ibid.)
2 *Nahj al-Balāghah* (the revised version of Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ) p. 350.
3 Maytham al-Baḥrānī (Kamāl al-Dīn) is one of the scholars of the Twelvers from Baḥrayn. Amongst his works are: *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* and *Tawaffī al-Baḥrayn*. He died in 679 A.H. (See: *Mu’jam al-Mu’allifūn* 13/55).
to deceive the Ṣaḥābah. He thus expressed sentiments which he did not really hold and he lied in front of the people when delivering the sermon. This is the answer those who claim to be the partisan of ʿAlī give.¹ I do not think any intelligent person will treat it as a satisfactory answer. We, therefore, assert that the consensus of the Shīʿah is based on deviation and the statement of ʿAlī is based on the truth and the reality, for indeed he was a person who did not fear the criticism of the critics when it came to the dīn of Allah.

Someone could possibly say: The aforementioned narrations are in complete contrast to the previously cited narrations regarding how the Shīʿah excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah and revile them. In response I say: Yes. Because the very nature of the legacy of the Shīʿī dogma is contradiction. And their scholars have put a few principles in place in order to do away with such narrations and in order to find a niche out of these contradictions. For example, one of their principles is that this contradiction is actually required in order to conceal the reality of the dogma, thereby not allowing the commonality (the Ahl al-Sunnah) to annihilate it completely.²

When narrations are in conflict with each other they say:

خذوا بما خالف العامة فإن فيه الرشاد

Practice upon that which opposes the commonality, for in it lies guidance.³

It is for this reason that their scholars assert that these positive narrations were articulated by way of Taqiyyah. And also because they are far less than the narrations which contain the excommunication and curses. They thus do not regard them acceptable. Al-Mufīd says:

---
¹ Maytham al-Baḥrānī: Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah 4/98.
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/65.
³ See p. 553 of this book.
Those narrations which were said by way of Taqiyyah are not as many in number as are the narrations which are implemented.¹

That is why you will find that the comments of Ibn Bābawayh after the narration which entails the praises of the Ṣaḥābah suggest that it was said by way of Taqiyyah. Similarly you will notice the same in the comments of Maytham al-Baḥrānī.

This being the case, I have only cited these narrations here in order to show the contradictory nature of the Shīʿī dogma to the people of intellect. And in order to guide a person who is in search of the truth that these narrations are based on reality and not on Taqiyyah because of their coherence with the Qur’ān and the consensus of the Ummah. Furthermore, to demonstrate that the doctrine of Taqiyyah has made the dogma a toy in the hands of their scholars which they can use to twist the traditions in any which way they desire. With the result that it has no more remained the religion of the Ahl al-Bayt, but rather the religion of al-Kulaynī, al-Qummī, al-Majlisī, and their likes.

Evidence sourced from reason, history, the categorically established aspects of dīn and the consensus of the Ummah:

Firstly, it is a very well-known fact which is known to the commonality and the erudite that Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān had a very special relationship with Rasūl Allah. In fact they were the closest to him in terms of spending time in his company and always being around him. Rasūl Allah had, through the medium of marriage, developed a relationship with them (they were all his family by law). He loved them immensely and praised them often. Now, they were either upstanding people internally and externally during his lifetime and after his demise, or, conversely, they were not people of upstanding character

¹ Taṣḥīḥ al-Iʿtiqād p. 71.
during his lifetime or after his demise. If we postulate that they were not people of upstanding character despite enjoying such proximity to Rasūl Allah ﷺ then one of two conclusions are inevitable. Either Rasūl Allah ﷺ was not aware of their actual condition or he compromised his principles for their sake. Whichever of the two is regarded, it tarnishes the reputation of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. As the poet says:

\[
\text{فإن كنت لا تدرى فتلك مصيبة وإن كنت تدرى فالمصيبة أعظم}
\]

*If you do not know, it is a problem and if you know, the problem is even greater.*

And if we postulate that they had deviated after previously having upright conduct, then it is a sign of Allah ﷻ leaving his Nabī ﷺ helpless by leaving his bosom associates and his elite Companions to go astray. Whereas Allah ﷻ had promised him that he will make his religion reign supreme over all other religions. So how is it possible for his special and elite Companions to go astray? The Shīʿah thus again are severely tarnishing the reputation of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, as Mālik and others have mentioned:

\[
\text{إنما أراد هؤلاء الرافضة الطعن في رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم ليمصرق قائل: رجل سوء كان له أصحاب سوء، ولو كان رجلا صالحا كان أصحابه صالحين ولهذا قال أهل العلم: إن الرافضة دسية الزنادقة.}
\]

*The intention of the Shīʿah is to tarnish the reputation of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. So that a person can claim that he was a bad person who had bad Companions. Had he been a good person, his Companions would have also been good people. Therefore the scholars say that the Shīʿah are planted by the heretics.¹*

Secondly, an apostate only turns apostate due to doubts or temptations. It is a known fact that in the initial stages of Islam the doubts and temptations were much more overwhelming, for the Muslims were very few at that time and the disbelievers were dominant on majority of the land; the Muslims suffered a great

---

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/122.
deal of hardship, only known to Allah, in Makkah at the hands of their polytheist relatives and others which they bore patiently despite its bitterness. They followed Rasūl Allah who was alone and poor, lowly and fearful, overpowered and dominated and in whose opposition the entire peninsula had united; despite this they sacrificed their homes and belongings and bid farewell to their social standing and popularity all out of the love of Allah and His Rasūl Allah.

They did all of this willingly. If this was the condition of their īmān in the very initial stages of Islam, then one can well imagine what the strength thereof would have been after the realisation of its signs and evidences. Especially when the reason owing to which the Shī'ah excommunicate them, i.e. the allegiance to Abū Bakr instead of 'Alī, did not entail anything so enticing that would prompt them to abandon their faith, lose all their previous feats and sacrifices, and trade the afterlife for this world just because of Abū Bakr. What made them do so? Especially when they allegedly knew that it was disbelief in their Lord and turning away from their dīn. And what made them not obey the alleged order of Rasūl Allah regarding the rulership of 'Alī when they knew that doing so was a means of obeying Rasūl Allah and steadfastness upon their faith. Is it really possible to conceive that the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār disbelieved in Allah due to their loyalty to Abū Bakr? Or that they preferred not to abide by the order of Rasūl Allah regarding the right of 'Alī to leadership? Whereas they were the same people who initially sacrificed their homes in search of the grace of Allah and his mercy, and who aided the dīn of Allah and His Rasūl and who were truthful and honest.

Thirdly, the stance of the Shī'ah regarding the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah necessarily implies the excommunication of 'Alī also because of his failure to uphold the injunctions of Allah. Likewise it necessitates the invalidity and the unauthenticity of the Sharīʿah because of its transmitters being apostates. It leads to criticising the Qurʾān because it reached us through the medium of Abū Bakr,

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/128.
ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, and their brothers. Accomplishing this was the objective of the concocter of this ideology. Hence Abū Zurʿah says:

إذا رأيت الرجل ينتقص أحد من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فاعلم أنه زنديق، وذلك أن الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم حق والقرآن حق، وإنما أدي إلينا هذا القرآن والسنة أصحاب رسول الله، وإنما يريدون أن يجرحوا شهودنا لكي يبطلوا الكتاب والسنة. والجرح بهم أولي وهم الزنادقة.

If you see anyone reviling the Companions of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم know that he is heretic. This is because Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم is true and the Qurʾān is true.

It was the Companions of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم who conveyed his teachings and the Qurʾān to us. Hence they intend to discredit our traditional legacy of the Qurʾān and the Sunnah by discrediting the transmitters thereof. They therefore are more deserving of criticism and they are heretics.¹

The books of the Shīʿah thus also concede that the first person to concoct this ideology was Ibn Saba’. They say:

أول من أظهر الطعن في أبي بكر وعمر وعثمان الصحابة، وتبرأ منهم، وادعى أن علیا علیه السلام أمره بذلك.

He was the first one to revile Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, and the Ṣaḥābah and the first to disassociate himself from them and the first to claim that ʿAlī ordered him to do so.²

Fourthly, ʿAlī did not excommunicate anyone who opposed him or fought against him, not even the Khawārij. He did not even imprison their children and take their belongings as spoils. This is vastly different to the stance of the Ṣaḥābah regarding the the people of Banū Ḥanīfah and their likes, who they pronounced as apostates. ʿAlī did not pass a ruling of apostasy against those who fought against him but instead would supplicate that the pleasure of Allah descend upon Ṭalḥah and Zubayr even though they fought him. And he considered them

1 Al-Kifāyah p. 49.
and the people of Muʿāwiyah Muslims. It is authentically established that his announcer had announced on the day of Jamal that no fleeing person should be followed, no wounded person should be killed, and no belongings should be taken as booty. And there are many widespread narrations which prove that he said the following regarding the army of Muʿāwiyah:  

 إنهم جميعا مسلمون، ليسوا كفارا ولا منافقين

 They are all Muslims. They are not disbelievers or hypocrites.

This is also established in the books of the Shīʿah. Hence it is narrated in their reliable books that Jaʿfar narrates from his father that his father ʿAlī would not ascribe disbelief or hypocrisy to anyone who fought against him. But he would say, “They have rebelled against us.”

However, the belief of Taqiyyah which they hold makes their dogma the religion of their scholars and not of the Imāms. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has thus commented with the following remarks after this narration:

أقول هذا محمول علي التقیة

I say that this was by way of Taqiyyah.

In the letter which ʿAlī wrote to the people of the various cities he depicts what had transpired between him and the people of Šīffīn. He writes:

وكان بدأ أمرنا التقینا والقوم من أهل الشام، والظاهر أن ربنا واحد ودعوتنا إلى الإسلام واحدة، ولا نستزيدهم في الإیمان بالله والتصدیق برسوله، ولا يستزيدونا. والأمر واحد إلا ما اختلفنا فيه من دم عثمان ونحن منه براء.

1 This is what the Khawārij disagreed with when Ibn ʿAbbās debated with them (Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/181).
2 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/181.
4 Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 11/62.
It all started when we and the people of Syria confronted one another. Obviously our Lord is one and our propagation of Islam is the same. We were not confronting them to increase them in their faith in Allah and in the affirmation of his Rasūl. Nor were they confronting us for that. The conflict was for one reason, viz. the blood of ʿUthmān in which we are completely innocent.¹

He likewise reproached those who criticised Muʿāwiyah and his comrades. He said:

إني أكره لكم أن تكونوا سبابين، ولو وصفتم أعمالهم وذكرتم حالهم كان صواب في القول وأبلغ في العذر، وقلتم مكان سبكم إياهم: اللهم احقن دماءنا ودماءهم أصلح ذات بيننا وبينهم.

I dislike that you criticise excessively. But if you describe their crimes and state their condition, that would be more accurate in terms of speech and more effective in absolving you of your responsibility. Likewise it would be better for you to say, “O Allah safeguard our blood and their blood and resolve the differences between us and them.”²

Hence, based on what features in their most authentic books, the tendency of reviling and criticising was not the way of Amīr al-Muʾminīn.

Fifthly, those whom the Shīʿah exclude from their blanket ruling of apostasy, like Salmān, ʿAmmār, and Miqdād, they only exclude them assuming that they had the Shīʿī tendencies of excommunicating Abū Bakr and ʿUmar,⁴ and of considering their rule to be illegitimate. This again is one of the many ploys of the Shīʿah. For no one is known to have struggled for authority against Abū Bakr and ʿUmar during their rule; not these people and not anyone else. Salmān was in fact appointed as the governor of Madāʾin by ʿUmar and he would invite the people to be loyal and obedient to him. Likewise ʿAmmār was appointed as the governor of Kūfah by ʿUthmān. And Miqdād and the

1 *Nahj al-Balāghah* p. 448.
2 Ibid. p. 323.
other Ṣaḥābah participated in the expeditions in their eras. So can the deceit of the Shīʿah be successful?¹

Sixthly, the condition of the Ṣaḥābah is very clear from history and its famous incidents i.e. they did not give preference to anything over Allah even when they were confronted with the most difficult of conditions. They sacrificed their lives for Allah and Allah aided them with his Nabī and utilised them for the propagation of His dīn. So how can a person who barely knows Allah revile them? Or how can someone who claims to be a Muslim have the audacity to revile and belittle them?² Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, therefore, says:

ألا أنه لو لم يرد من الله عزوجل فيهم شيء مما ذكرناه لأوجبت الحال التي كانوا عليها من الهجرة الجهاد والنصرة وبذل المهيج والأموال وقتل الآباء والأولاد والمناصحة في الدين وقوة الإيمان واليقين الققطع على عدالتهم والإعتقاد بنزأهم.

Even if hypothetically the previously mentioned commendations by Allah were not revealed regarding them, their migration, striving, helping the dīn of Allah, sacrificing their lives and belongings, claiming the lives of their fathers and children, well-wishing for the dīn and strong īmān all demand that we conclusively decide that they were people of upstanding conduct and innocent.³

A person who will study the incidents of the life of Rasūl Allah and the difficulties and harassments which he and his Companions underwent when the Arabs all united in their attack against them, and the manner in which they bore the persecution of Quraysh in Makkah, persevered the harshness of the boycott in the valley, left their mother-land, families and tribes and migrated to Abyssinia and Madīnah, took up the task of striving in the path of Allah and sacrificed therein, fought their own families and tribes, etc.; I say, if a person studies all of this he will appreciate the value of this unique generation, its strong faith, and its loyalty for the cause of dīn.

---

¹ Abū al-Maḥāsin al-Wāsiṭī: al-Munāẓarah p. 66. Also refer to p. 87 of this book.
² Al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd p. 10-11.
³ Al-Kifāyah p. 49. See also: al-Ījī: al-Mawāqif p. 413.
Seventhly, there are many academic evidences and hard historical facts from the life of Amīr al-Mu’minīn ʿAlī ʿAṣğūl which establish the true affinity and close relationship which he had with Abū Bakr ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān the elite among the Ṣaḥābah. The strongest of evidence in this regard is the wedding of Amīr al-Mu’minīn ʿAlī of his daughter Umm Kulthūm to ʿUmar ʿUmar. So if ʿUmar ʿUmar, according to the Twelvers was worst in his disbelief then even Shayṭān, why do they not for a while reflect over their stance and why do they not realise the falsity of their dogma. For if Abū Bakr and ʿUmar were really disbelievers, then for ʿAlī to get his daughter Umm Kulthūm married to a disbeliever and an imposter like ʿUmar would be making his daughter vulnerable to adultery, for a disbelieving man to have conjugal relations with a Muslim women cannot be termed as anything but adultery.

An intelligent person who is impartial, free from ulterior motives and is sincere in his partisanship to the Ahl al-Bayt cannot deny this fact, i.e. the fact that there existed amiable relationships, love and respect among the four Khulafā’. Hence when Muʿizz al-Dawlah, Aḥmad ibn Buwayh who was staunch Shīṭī who would revile the Ṣaḥābah, was told that ʿAlī wed his daughter to ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb he was immediately gripped with compunction and he said, “I did not know of this.” He then repented and gave charity of most of his wealth and freed his slaves. He thereafter desisted from much of his oppression and he cried till he fell unconscious. This was because he realised the severity of his crime which made him revile and criticise these poor people after being influenced by the Shīṭāh.

And as usual, the scholars of the Shīṭāh have again tried to curb the impact of this evidence by forging narrations which state that:

1 See: al-Shaikh al-Farūqī: ‘Aqd Umm Kulthūm; Muḥammad ʿAbū Qīq: al-Taqīq al-Jalī fi Tazwīj Umm Kulthūm Bint ʿAlī.
2 Al-Samʿānī: al-Ansāb 1/347.
This is the first of our women who was forcibly taken from us.¹

They without realising, made the problem even more complicated. For by the aforementioned assertion the have portrayed Amīr al-Muʿminīn to be a pander who was unable to defend the honour of his family and allowed adultery. Can someone perceive this regarding Amīr al-Muʿminīn ʿAlī, may Allah be pleased with him and elevate his status? The lowest of Arabs in stature will defend his integrity and will fight on behalf of the womenfolk of his household, so how can they prove this type of shortfall regarding Amīr al-Muʿminīn who was bold, valiant, the lion of Banū Ḥāshim, and the lion of Allah among the people of the east and west.²

Hence, ostensibly some of their scholars were not satisfied with this interpretation of the incident so they tried to do away with it by an even more weird assertion; they asserted that Umm Kulthūm was not the daughter of ʿAlī but she was a Jinniyyah (a female jinn) who took the form of Umm Kulthūm.³

Lastly, another very strong proof is the kinship, and the expression of love which existed between them. For ʿAlī, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn named some of their children with the names Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. Will someone ever name his children after his most ardent enemies in terms of hate and disbelief? And can he bear the names of these enemies being continuously repeated in his home multiple times?⁴

---

1 Furūʿ al-Kāfī 2/10; Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 7/434-435.
2 Al-Suwaydī: Muʾtamar al-Najaf p. 86.
3 Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah 1/83-84. A similar interpretation is mentioned in the books of the Ismāʿīliyyah (see: al-Haft al-Sharīf p. 84).
4 For details in this regard read the book of Muḥībb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb. He has made mention of the marital-relations which existed between the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah ṣallāhu ʿalaihim wa al-sallām. And of the children of the Ahl al-Bayt who were named after the three Khulafāʾ and others among the Ṣaḥābah. (Hamalah Risālah al-Islām al-Awwalūn wa ma Kānū ʿAlayhi min al-Maḥabbah wa al-Taʿāwun p. 11, onwards; Nashʿah al-Shīʿah wa Taṭawwuruhū p. 12, onwards. Also refer to what Iḥsān Ilāhī Ẓahīr has written in this regard in his book al-Shīʿah wa Ahl al-Bayt. There is no need for repetition here.
Chapter Two

ʿIṣmah of the Imāms

The Shīʿah hold the doctrine of ʿIṣmah (Infallibility) in great esteem¹ as it is one of the fundamental aspects of their dogma.²

The word ʿIṣmah according to the Arabs means: protection. And the protection of Allah for his slave is that he protects him from that which can destroy him. Likewise ‘so and so sought the protection of Allah’ means that he was safeguarded by him.³

As for the precise definition of ʿIṣmah (infallibility) according to its Shīʿī conception, it differs in the various developmental stages of Shīʿism and its phases. However, it seems as if the definition thereof has settled upon what the Shaykh of the Shīʿah in his time, al-Majlisī (the author of Bihār al-Anwār, d. 1111 A.H), has asserted:

اعلم أن الإمامية اتفقوا على عصمة الأئمة - عليه السلام - من الذنوب - من الذنوب - صغيرها و كبيرةها فلا يقع منهم ذنب أصلاً ولا عمداً ولا نسياناً ولا لخطأ في التأويل ولا للإسهاء من الله سبحانه

Know well that the Imāmiyyah are unanimous regarding the infallibility of the Imāms; they are free from minor and major sins. Hence they can never commit a sin intentionally, forgetfully, due to an error in judgement, or due to Allah making them heedless.⁴

Al-Majlisī has accorded the Imāms infallibility from all possible perspectives; he has accorded them infallibility from sins of all types and from mistakes, heedlessness, and forgetfulness.

---

3 Tahdhīb al-Lughah: under the root letters عصم
This type of infallibility, which al-Majlisī claims is the locus of consensus among the Shīʿah, was not enjoyed by the Amībiyā’ of Allāh and his Rasūls, as is understood from the Qurʾān, the Sunnah and the consensus of the Ummah. Hence this understanding of infallibility is foreign to Islam. For the complete negation of heedlessness and forgetfulness from the Imāms is tantamount to likening them to the one who does not slumber and sleep, i.e. Allāh. Hence when al-Riḍā, the eighth ‘infallible’ Imām of the Shīʿah, was told:

إن في الكوفة قوما يزعمون أن النبي صلى الله عليه وآله لم يقع عليه السهو في صلاته

In Kufah there are people who claim that Nabī did not err in his ṣalāh.

He said:

كذبوا-لعنهم الله- إن الذي لا يسهو هو الله الذي لا إله إلا هو

They have lied, may Allāh curse them. The one who does not err is Allāh.

This narration, provided it is sound, implies that the denial of heedlessness and errors, which formed the basis of the doctrine of infallibility according to the later Shīʿah, was in the era of al-Riḍā the belief of just a few people who feigned partisanship for the Ahl al-Bayt and who were not known, either due to their small count or due to them being unimportant, and obscure in their beliefs; they would make this eerie claim regarding the best of creation, i.e. Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh. This extremist stance, due to it giving him resemblance to the one who does not slumber and sleep, was met with curses, refutation, and excommunication by the Imāms of the Shīʿah. So what would the reaction of al-Riḍā be regarding people who make the same claim regarding him and others from his forefathers and progeny? Surely his disapproval would be much more intense.

1 Fikrah al-Taqrīb p. 299.
It also implies that this doctrine only came about after the era of al-Riḍā.

This intrigues us to investigate the roots of this doctrine and its development to the phase where it stands today.

The Inception of the Doctrine of ‘Īṣmah and its development

Ibn Taymiyyah asserts that the doctrine of infallibility was one of the views of Ibn Saba’. However, I have not come across a report which ascribes the word ‘Īṣmah (infallibility) to Ibn Saba’, even though that which has been reported from him amounts to infallibility and even beyond. For he is reported to have deified Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ʿAlī. But he did not coin the doctrine of infallibility as it stands as a Shīʿī doctrine today. More so when his views were restricted to Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn to such an extent that he was the first person to concoct the belief of Tawaqquf among the Shīʿah, i.e. waiting for the reappearance of Imām ʿAlī and his return.

Al-Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār was of the opinion that the infallibility of the Imām, the idea that he is pure from mistakes and errors in all conditions and that he is not overcome by heedlessness and negligence were not known in the era of the Ṣaḥābah and their successors till the era of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam who took the responsibility of contriving them.

Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb also agrees with him in specifying the era wherein the doctrine of infallibility was born. But he attributes the invention thereof to one of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam’s contemporaries. He says:

و أول من اخترع لهم هذه العقيدة الضالة خبيث يسمى المسلمون شيطان الطاق و تسمى الشيعة (مؤمن آل محمد) و اسمه محمد بن علي الأحول

1 Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 4/518; Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/60.
3 Al-Qummī/ Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq p. 20.
4 Tathbīt Dalā’il al-Nubuwwah 2/528.
The first person to invent this devious doctrine for them was a wretched person who the Muslims called Shayṭān al-Ṭāq, and the Shī‘ah called Mu‘min Āl Muḥammad.¹ His name was Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Āhwal.²

And Donaldson hints to the possibility of the doctrine of infallibility coming about in the era of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq.³

It should be noted that Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and Shayṭān al-Ṭāq were the contemporaries of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq. Hence it is very possible that the Shī‘ah began to learn of this doctrine from these individuals in the era of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq. Thereafter it developed and past many phases till it eventually settled on what al-Majlisī explained it to be.

The Different Phases of the Doctrine of ‘Īṣmah

When we endeavour to study the texts of the Shī‘ah which make mention of infallibility in order to determine the various phases it passed we find that the books of the Shī‘ah attribute the following to Zayn al-‘Ābidīn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn:

المعصوم هو من اعتصم بحبل الله، و حبل الله هو القرآن

A Ma‘ṣūm (an infallible person) is the one who firmly holds on to the rope of Allah, and the rope of Allah is the Qur’ān.⁴

Whether the attribution of this narration to ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn is authentic or not, it gives us the correct understanding of infallibility which was in line with the beautiful teachings of Islam in those early stages of Shiasm. Hence holding on to the Qur’ān is in essence a source of protection and salvation. But this understanding thereof is not limited to a specific people. For Allah says:

---

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 185: Mu‘min al-Ṭāq is the name which appears there. Shayṭān al-Ṭāq means devil of the corner and Mu‘min al-Ṭāq means the believer of the corner.
2 Majallah al-Fatḥ 18/277.
And hold firmly to the rope of Allah all together.¹

Likewise Allah  says:

وَمَن يَعْتَصِم بِاللهِ فَقَدْ هُدِيَ إِلَىٰ صِرَاطٍ مُّسْتَقِيمٍ

And whoever holds firmly to Allah has [indeed] been guided to a straight path.²

Subsequent to this in the next phase we find that Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, to whom al-Qāḍī ʿAbd al-Jabbār attributes the invention of the doctrine of infallibility, responds with the following when Ḥusayn al-Ashqar poses a question to him:

ما معني قولكم: إن الإمام ل یكون إل معصوما؟ فقال هشام: سألت أبا عبد الله (جعفر الصادق) عن ذلك فقال: المعصوم هو الممتنع بالله من جميع محارم الله وقال تبارك وتعالي: وَمَن يَعْتَصِم بِاللهِ فَقَدْ هُدِيَ إِلَىٰ صِرَاطٍ مُّسْتَقِيمٍ

“What do you mean when you say that the Imām is not but infallible?”

Hishām said, “I asked Abū ʿAbd Allah regarding this and he said, ‘An infallible person is the one who is protected by Allah from all the prohibitions of Allah’. He then recited the verse, ‘And whoever holds firmly to Allah has [indeed] been guided to a straight path.’”³

Another Shīʿī by the name Ibn Abī ʿUmayr says the following:

ما استنفدت من هشام بن الحكم في طول صحبتي إياه شئا أحسن من هذا الكلام في عصمة الإمام وهو: أن الإمام لا يذنب لأن منافذ الذنوب الحرص والحسد والغضب والشهوة، وهذه الأوجه منتفية عن الإمام

¹ Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 103.
I have not learnt anything more beneficial from Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam during the time I stayed in his company than the explanation he gave regarding the infallibility of the Imām. And that is that the Imām does not sin. Because greed, jealousy, anger, and lust are the avenues of sin and they are not found in the Imām.¹

This understanding of infallibility, nonetheless, is nowhere close to the extremist understanding of al-Majlisī. And the implications thereof are not as grave as the later understanding of it which is more extreme in terms of it equating the words of the Imām to revelation which cannot be adulterated from ahead or from behind, and in terms of denying all human defects, like that of heedlessness, negligence, and forgetfulness from them; ultimately elevating them from humans to possessors of divine attributes.

Likewise it should be noted that averring that the Imām is divinely protected from sinning and is propelled to do good implies that he is coerced by Allah. This goes against the stance of the Twelvers regarding Taqḍīr (pre-destination). For they believe in complete freedom and free will and in man being the creator of his own actions. This is evidence of the fact that this understanding of infallibility precedes their stance on pre-destination which they adopted from the Muʿtazilah in the third century.

We therefore find that after the influence of the Muʿtazilī thought on the Shīʿī dogma the understanding of infallibility became tainted with some of its ideas, like that of divine Lutf (divine grace) and free human will. This is clearly discernible from the definition which al-Mufīd (d. 413 A.H.) gives of infallibility; he says:

بآنها لطف يفعله الله - تعالى - بالمكلف بحيث يمنع منه وقوع المعصية، وترك الطاعة مع قدرته عليها

Infallibility is the Lutf (grace) of Allah with which He favours His responsible

slave. He by way of it protects him from falling into disobedience and from abandoning good when having the capacity to do it.¹

So based on this definition, the Imām is not coerced by Allah to leave evil, rather Allah showers His Alṭāf (grace) upon him owing to which he willingly does not disobey Him. See how he uses the terminology of the Muʿtazilah to explain the doctrine of infallibility.

Moving on, the doctrine of infallibility did not stop at the extent of negating sins from the Imāms, rather it exceeded that. Hence in the fourth century Ibn Bābawayh asserts the following regarding infallibility in his book Al-Iʿtiqādāt:

Our belief regarding the Imāms is that they are infallible and purified from all defilements. They do not commit any sins, minor or major. They do not disobey Allah in what he has ordered them, and they do as they are told to do. A person who does not belief in their Infallibility in any aspect of their lives is a disbeliever. Likewise whoever does not know about them is also a disbeliever. Our belief regarding them is that they are infallible and they are characterised by perfection, completeness, and knowledge from the beginning of their affairs to the end. In none of their affairs are they ever described as deficient, sinful, or ignorant.²

In this explanation, he denies disobedience, ignorance, and deficiency from the Imāms. And he establishes perfection for them from the beginning of their lives to the end. He also excommunicates whoever does not believe in this. This was thus another phase in the development of the doctrine of infallibility.

But he does not explicitly negate making mistakes as does al-Majlisī and the later Shi‘ah scholars. In his book *Man lā Yahḍuruhū al-Faqīh* he rather asserts that negating mistakes from Rasūl Allah is the stance of the extremist and the Mufawwiḍah. He says:

The extremist and the Mufawwiḍah, may the curse of Allah be upon them, negate the mistakes of Nabī. They say, “If it is possible for him to err in ṣalāh then it is possible for him to err in his propagation of dīn as well, for just as ṣalāh is an obligatory injunction, so is propagation an obligatory injunction…”

Whereas Nabī’s mistakes are not like our mistakes. For Allah made him err so that it is understood that he is a created human and thus is not taken as a deity who is worshipped besides Allah. And so that the rulings of erring are derived from his mistakes. Our teacher Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Walīd used to say, “The first step to extremism is the negation of mistakes from Nabī.” And I hope of reward from Allah in compiling a book to prove the mistakes of Nabī and refuting the claims of those who deny them.¹

As is clear from this narration, Ibn Bābawayh who is the leader of the Shi‘ah, as they call him, disapproves the claim of those who assert that Nabī did not err. So how could it be true for the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt who were less than him in status? He likewise considers the negation of erring to be indicative of extremism and says that it is the view of the extremists. He likewise points

---

¹ *Man lā Yahḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 1/234.
out that the negation of erring implies the likening of the creation to the Creator Most High.

Hence the negation of erring is the addition of the later Shī‘ah to the doctrine of infallibility. That is why all the reports which their early scholars allegedly narrate from the Imāms oppose it. For example: Abū ‘Abd Allah would say the following when asked about erring:

أو ينفلت من ذلك أحد ربما أقعدت الخادم خلفي يحفظ علي صلاتي

Can anyone escape therefrom? At times I make my servant stand behind me so that he monitors my ṣalāh.¹

And as has passed previously, al-Riḍā would curse the one who negated erring from Rasūl Allah  and he would say:

إن الذي لا يسهو هو الله سبحانه

The one who does not err is Allah .

And the books of the Shī‘ah have reported narration regarding the Prophet erring in his ṣalāh.²

It is eerie indeed that despite their consensus being violated by the Shī‘ī scholars of the fourth century they still furnish it as evidence for their stance. It is the temptation of extremism which makes them say:

إن أصحابنا الإمامیة أجمعوا علي عصمة الأئمة- صلوات الله عليهم- من الذنوب الصغيرة و الكبيرة عمدا

و خطأ و نسيانا من وقت ولادتهم إلى أن يلقوا الله عز و جل

Our Imāmī scholars are unanimous regarding the infallibility of the Imāms from all types of minor and major sins, whether they be intentionally, by

---

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 25/351.
² Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh 1/233.
mistaken, or forgetfully; from the time they were born till when they will meet Allah.¹

When they are asked that how can there be consensus in this regard when your scholar Ibn Bābawayh and his teacher Ibn al-Walīd have opposed your stance? They say:

إن خروجهما لا يخل بالإجماع لكونهما معروف النسب

Their opposition does not really violate the consensus due to them having a known lineage.²

Which implies that the identity of some or all of those who are of the opinion of complete infallibility is not known. It is thus possible that the hidden Mahdī emerged from his occultation and voiced his opinion with them and it is his opinion which forms the basis of their consensus.³ In other words, in establishing the validity of their consensus it is sufficient to prove the possibility of the hidden infallible Imām being on the side of those who do not ascribe mistakes and errors to the Imāms.

Astonishing indeed! They reject clear narrations of their Imāms which prove mistakes which appear in their seminal works but cling onto a consensus which rests upon the possible backing of the hidden Imām.

But at the end of the day, the Shīʿī dogma is not the creed of the Imāms, rather it is the creed of their scholars.

Al-Majlisī was baffled when he saw the copious narrations which oppose the consensus of his fellow scholars. He thus says:

---

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 25/350-351.
² Ibid. 25/351.
³ Refer to the section of consensus.
This is a very difficult issue. For there are many narrations and verses which prove that the Imāms made mistakes. Whereas the consensus of our friends is on the impossibility of them making mistakes.¹

The aforementioned is an acknowledgement from al-Majlisī that the consensus of the later Shīʿī scholars regarding the infallibility of the Imāms opposes their narrations completely. It is also evidence of the fact that they at times concur upon complete misguidance and upon issues which are not backed by any evidence whatsoever.

Their evidence regarding the Infallibility of the Imāms

Their evidence from the Qurʿān:

In spite of the fact that the Qurʿān does not contain any mention of the Twelve Imāms, let alone their infallibility, the Twelvers cling on to the Qurʿān to prove the doctrine of infallibility. And all their scholars unanimously try to establish it with the following verse:

And [mention, O Muḥammad], when Ibrāhīm was tried by his Lord with words [i.e., commands] and he fulfilled them. [Allah] said, “Indeed, I will make you a leader for the people.” [Ibrāhīm] said, “And of my descendants?” [Allah] said, “My ʿAhd (covenant), does not include the oppressors.”²

In his Biḥār al-Anwār al-Majlisī has initiated a chapter pertaining to infallibility

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 25/351.
² Sūrah al-Baqarah: 124.
with this verse. The chapter is *Chapter regarding the necessity of infallibility for the Imām*.¹

Likewise many contemporary scholars as well use this verse to establish the infallibility of the Imāms; they do not present any other verse in substantiation. Some being Muḥsin al-Amīn² and Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshīf al-Ghiṭā’ who asserts that this verse explicitly establishes the infallibility of the Imāms.³

The author of *Majma’ al-Bayān* takes the responsibility of expounding on the manner in which their scholars infer evidence from the purport of this verse; he says:

> استدل أصحابنا بهذه الآية علي أن الإمام لا يكون إلا معصوما من القبيح، لأن الله-سبحانه- نفي أن ينال عهده الذي هو الإمامة ظالم،و من ليس بمعصوم فقد يكون ظالما إما لنفسه، و إما لغيره

Our scholars have used this verse as evidence to prove that the Imām is not but immune from all types of vice. Because Allah in this verse clearly states that an oppressor is not eligible for his ʿAhd, vicegerency⁴. And a person who is not infallible will most certainly oppress; he will either oppress himself or he will oppress others.

If it is said that an oppressor is not eligible whilst he is an oppressor, but if he repents, he no more remains an oppressor and hence becomes eligible.

The answer would be: Even if he repents, he is still included in the verse because of previously having oppressed. Hence when Allah has denied an oppressor the privilege then he has decreed that he will never attain it. And the verse is completely general, it is not specific to any time, hence

---

¹ *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/191.
² *Aʿyān al-Shīʿah* 1/458.
³ *Aṣl al-Shīʿah* p. 59.
⁴ The early scholars have differed as to the meaning of ʿAhd. But the Shīʿah only take that meaning which is in harmony with their desires.
it should be kept general and inclusive of all times. An oppressor will not attain the privilege of vicegerency even if he repents later.¹

**Critiquing their evidence:**

Firstly, the early scholars have differed as to the precise meaning of ‘Ahd. Ibn ‘Abbās and al-Suddī say that ‘Ahd in the verse translates as Nubuwwah (prophethood). Mujāhid says that it means leadership, i.e. I will not make an oppressor a leader whose example can be followed. Qatādah, Ibrāhīm al-Nakhāṭ, ‘Aṭā’, al-Ḥasan, and ‘Ikrimah are of the opinion that an oppressor will not enjoy the covenant of Allah in the afterlife. As for this life, he will enjoy it due to which he will be safe and live enjoyably. al-Zujāj agrees and says that this is a very good interpretation, i.e. the oppressors will not enjoy my protection, meaning that I will not protect them from my punishment; and ‘oppressor’ means a polytheist. Al-Rabīʿ ibn Anas and al-Ḍaḥḥāk say that ‘Ahd means dīn. The verse will then mean that the oppressors will not be blessed with the dīn of Allah. Don’t you see that Allah says:

\[
\text{وَبَارَکْنَا عَلَیْهِ وَعَلٰى إِسْحَاقَ وَمِن ذُرِّیَّتِهِمَا مُحْسِنٌ وَظَالِمٌ لِّنَفْسِهِ مُبِیْنٌ}
\]

And we blessed him and Isḥāq. But among their descendants is the doer of good and the clearly unjust to himself [i.e., sinner].²

Allah in this verse says that not all of your posterity will be on guidance, O Ibrāhīm.

And lastly Ibn ‘Abbās has narrated the following: My ‘Ahd will not benefit the oppressors means that the oppressors do not deserve loyalty in an agreement. Hence when you enter into an agreement with them they violate it.³

---

As you can see, the early scholars greatly differed as to the precise interpretation of the verse; it has no connection at all with leadership according to most of them. Even those who interpret it as leadership, intend leadership in knowledge, piety, and being role models, not Imāmah based on its Shīṭī conception.

Secondly, even if the verse is regarding Imāmah, in no way does it establish infallibility. Because it is not possible to say that a person who does not do wrong does not err, forget, or is not overtaken by heedlessness, etc., as is the understanding of infallibility according to the Shīṭah. Or else their stance would imply that a person who forgets is an oppressor and a person who errs is an oppressor. This of course is not in harmony with the teachings of Islam and no one agrees with them regarding it as well. Hence there is a very big difference between establishing infallibility and negating oppression. Because negating oppression proves justice but not infallibility.

Thirdly, it is not correct to say that a person who repents from his oppression is still considered an oppressor and that repentance does not avail him in the alleviation thereof. Because the greatest oppression is ascribing partners to Allah: Allah says:

الَّذِیْنَ آمَنُوْا وَلَمْ یَلْبِسُوْا إِیْمَانَهُمْ بِظُلْمٍ

They who believe and do not mix their belief with injustice.¹

Thereafter Allah explains the oppression mentioned in this verse in another verse:

إِنَّ الشِّرْکَ لَظُلْمٌ عَظِیْمٌ

Indeed, association [with Him] is great oppression.²

---

¹ Sūrah al-Anʿām: 82.
² Sūrah Luqmān: 13.
But then too Allah ﷺ announces the following regarding the disbelievers:

قُلْ لِّلَّذِیْنَ کَفَرُوْا إِنْ یَّنتَهُوْا یُغْفَرْ لَهُم مَّا قَدْ سَلَفَ

Say to those who have disbelieved [that] if they cease, what has previously occurred will be forgiven for them.¹

But the Shīʿī reasoning demands that a person who ascribes partners to Allah ﷺ even for a moment, or a person who commits a sin, even though minor, is an oppressor from who the trait of oppression becomes inseparable. Based on this, if a person who ascribes partners to Allah ﷺ accepts Islam he is still a polytheist because oppression is ascribing partners to Allah ﷺ.²

This extreme stance makes them even more staunch then the Khawārij who only establish the punishment for a perpetrator of a major sin who does not repent from his sin.

Aside from Sharīʿah, convention, and language, it is an obvious aspect even according to reason that a person who repents and makes amends after his disbelief or oppression cannot be called a disbeliever or an oppressor. Or else it would be permissible to call an old man a child, a person who is awake a sleeper, a poor person rich, a satiated person hungry, and a dead person alive and vice versa. Likewise it would necessitate that the oath of a person who swears not to greet a disbeliever and then greets a Muslim who was previously a disbeliever be violated. Whereas no one is of that opinion.³

---

¹ Sūrah al-Anfāl: 38.
² Even they take oppression to mean polytheism. Because their main objective is to invalidate the rule of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar ﷺ due to them accepting īmān after polytheism. And it did not part from them after they accepted īmān according to the Shīʿah. That is why al-Kulaynī says, “This verse nullifies the rule of every oppressor.” (Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/199)
It is also a well-established fact that sometimes a person who repents from his oppression turns out to be better than a person who did not fall into oppression at all. Any person who believes that a person who did not disbelieve, murder or sin is necessarily better than a person who accepted īmān after disbelief, attained guidance after deviance, and repented after sinning; has indeed opposed the undeniable history of Islam. Because it is fact that the forerunners of Islam (who were previously disbelievers) are more virtuous than their children. Can any intelligent person ever equate the children of the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār to their fathers in rank?¹

This substantiation of theirs also demands that all the Muslims, including the Shīʿah and the Ahl al-Bayt (besides those who they accord infallibility) be considered oppressors due to them not being infallible. Whereas their scholar al-Ṭūsī says that the title oppressor is a bad title and should only be used for a person who is deserving of the wrath of Allah, as in the verse:

أَلَ لَعْنَةُ اللهِ عَلَى الظَّالِمِيْنَ

The curse of Allah is upon the oppressors.²

Lastly, I end of the critique with what one of the scholars of the Zaydiyyah has mentioned in refutation of the substantiation of the Shīʿah from this verse. He says:

احتج بعض الرافضة بالآية علي أن الإمامة لا يستحقها من ظلم مرة، ورام الطعن في إمامة أبي بكر و عمر، و هذا لا يصح لأن العهد إن حمل علي النبوة فلا جحة، و إن حمل علي الإمامة فمن تاب من الظلم لا يوصف بأنه ظالم، ولم يمنعه-تعالى- من نيل العهد إلا حال كونه ظالما

Some of the Shīʿah draw evidence from this verse to prove that a person who was guilty of oppression once in his life is not deserving of leadership,

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/301-303.
thereby intending to illegitimate the rule of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar ʿAbd Allāh. But this is incorrect. Because if the word ʿAhd is taken in the meaning of Nubuwwah then it is not evidence for the Shiʿah. And if it is taken in the meaning of leadership, then the one who repents from his oppression cannot be called an oppressor. And Allah ṣāliḥ has not deprived him from leadership except when he is an oppressor.¹

**Their evidence from the Sunnah**

They present some of the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah in order to establish their case against the Ahl al-Sunnah and in order to beguile their people into believing that the issue of infallibility is a locus of consensus between both parties. However, all these narrations are either outright lies or very far from what they try to prove. The discussion in this regard has passed already in the section pertaining to Imāmah.

Those narrations which they present are mostly related to the Ahl al-Bayt, but they cannot serve as evidence for the Twelvers because the Twelvers do not have any association whatsoever with the Ahl al-Bayt, besides, of course, the artificial relationship they claim to have with some members thereof, i.e. ʿAlī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn ʿAskarī and some members of the posterity of Ḥusayn. Even so, their relationship with the Ahl al-Bayt has long ended with the death of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī who died without having any children in 260 A.H. Since then they are affiliated to scholars who claim to be the representatives of a fictitious person who does not exist. These scholars are the people who have taken this cult to those horrendous ideas and beliefs some of which we have studied in the previous pages.

Likewise, in the previous pages some examples of how they excommunicate the Ahl al-Bayt have also passed. Therefore their claim that the Ahl al-Bayt are infallible is just a mere deception.

¹ Yūsuf ibn Aḥmad al-Zaydī: *al-Thamarāt al-Yāniʿah* (manuscript) 1/60.
Nonetheless, the Shīʿah try to establish the infallibility of the Imāms with narrations which the author of al-Kāfī, Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, al-Majlisī, and their likes narrate. Narrations whose very wording is reprehensible let alone their chains of transmission. Al-Majlisī for example has cited twenty three narrations from his scholars al-Qummī, al-ʿAyyāshī, al-Muğfīd, and others in the chapter he has dedicated to infallibility. He has cited all of them after presenting the aforementioned verse of Sūrah al-Baqarah wherefrom their substantiation is utterly incorrect.

As to al-Kulaynī, he has established many chapters in his al-Kāfī regarding the alleged infallibility of the Imāms. Therein he cites multiple narrations which he allegedly narrates from the Hidden Imām. These narrations suggest that the Imāms claimed that they were infallible, rather the partners of Rasūl Allah H in his prophethood, and possessors of some of the divine attributes; this has passed previously in the chapter regarding their beliefs regarding the fundamentals of dīn. You will find an example of this in the chapter: Chapter regarding the Imāms being the Pillars of the Earth. In this chapter he cites three narrations which prove that the Twelve Imāms are like Rasūl Allah H in loyalty being mandatory for them, in virtue, and in their duties. Hence it is reported that after the demise of Rasūl Allah H ʿAlī I and the remaining Imāms are deserving of the same level of loyalty which Rasūl Allah H deserved.1 These narrations thereafter go on to raise ʿAlī I beyond the position of Rasūl Allah H and equate him to Allah E. Hence it is reported:

أعطیت خصائص لم يعطهن أحد قبلي، علمت علم المنایا و البلایا..فلم يفتني ما سبقني و لم يعزب عنی ما غاب عنی

I have been given such attributes which no one before me was given; I possess the knowledge of deaths and calamities, that which has preceded me is not unknown to me and that which is hidden from is not away from me.2

---

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/198.
2 Ibid. 1/197.
Whereas the only one who possesses the knowledge of deaths and calamities is Allah. Allah says:

وَمَا تَدْرِيْ نَفْسٌ مَّاذَا تَكْسِبُ غَدًا وَمَا تَدْرِيْ نَفْسٌ بِأَيِّ أَرْضٍ تَمُوتُ

And no soul perceives what it will earn tomorrow, and no soul perceives in what land it will die.\(^1\)

Likewise the one who nothing is hidden from and who nothing of the creation can surpass is Allah. Allah says:

لا يَغْرَبُ عَنْهُ مِثْقَالُ ذَرَّةٍ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَ فِي الأَرْضِ

Not absent from Him is an atom's weight within the heavens or within the earth.\(^2\)

So it is not just a matter of infallibility, rather it is a matter of progression therefrom to prophethood and deification, the aftermath of which is the renunciation of Islam.

There are many chapters in \textit{al-Kāfī} which assert the same.\(^3\) All these chapters contain the narrations of false prophets and heretics across history. It is just that they ascribed them to the pure household of Nabī.

---

\(^1\) Sūrah Luqmān: 34.

\(^2\) Sūrah Saba': 3.

\(^3\) See: \textit{Uṣūl al-Kāfī}: Chapter regarding Loyalty to the Imāms being Compulsory 1/185: therein there are seventeen narrations; Chapter regarding the Imāms being the Administrators of the Matters of Allah and the Treasurers of his Knowledge 1/192: therein there are six narrations; Chapter regarding the Imāms being the Vicegerents of Allah on the Land and the Medium through which He is Reached 1/193; therein there are three narrations among many other chapters and narrations whose falsity is categorically known in the dīn of Islam.
Their Logical Substantiations for the Doctrine of Infallibility:

Their logical substantiations for the infallibility of the Imāms can easily be condensed in one claim. And that is the claim that the entire Ummah is prone to mistakes and misguidance and the Imām is the only one who can save them from misguidance.

All their evidences revolve around this axis. Hence they assert that the Ummah requires an infallible leader who will rectify its mistakes. If he also has the potential to make mistakes, then another person will be required to correct his mistakes and this will then lead to infinite regress. That is why it is important to believe in the infallibility of the Imām.

This implies that their reliance is upon the lone Imām and not upon the Ummah. They also aver that he is the protector of the Sharīʿah. The Qur’ān, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah thus do not enjoy any credence.¹

The reality, however, is that this entire argument is baseless due to the fact that the Ummah is preserved/infallible as a whole through the medium of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, i.e. the Ummah will never unite upon misguidance. Hence the infallibility of the Ummah as a whole makes it independent from the infallibility of an Imām. The following is what the scholars have said in connection with the infallibility of the Ummah:

When any of the previous nations would deviate and corrupt its dīn, Allah ﷺ would send a prophet to them with the truth. In this Ummah specifically, there is no Nabī to come after its Nabī, hence its infallibility is equivalent to prophethood. Hence no one will endeavour to distort any of its teachings but that Allah ﷺ will give rise to someone who will point out his blunders in his corruption. This is exactly why Allah ﷺ

has coupled the way of the believers to obedience to him and to his Nabī in the verse:

بَعْدِ مَا تَبَیَّنَ لَهُ الْهُدٰى وَیَتَّبِعْ غَیْرَ سَبِیْلِ الْمُؤْمِنِیْنَ نُوَلِّهِ ما تَوَلّٰی وَمَنْ یُشَاقِقِ الرَّسُوْلَ مِنْ اَلْهُدَآ وَیَتَّبِعْ غَیْرَ سَبِیْلِ الْمُؤْمِنِیْنَ نُوَلِّهِ ما تَوَلّٰی

And whoever opposes the Messenger after guidance has become clear to him and follows other than the way of the believers – We will give him what he has taken and drive him into Hell, and evil it is as a destination.¹

The idea of the immunity of the Ummah from misguidance, as is established in many Sharī texts, therefore, is in complete contrast with idea of the infallibility of just one individual among the Muslims which posits the possibility of the entire Ummah being misguided in his absence.²

Furthermore, all the logical reasons for the need for an infallible Imām (with which they have filled many pages) were all fulfilled by the existence of Rasūl Allah. That is why at times of dispute the Ummah is required to refer its conflicts back to the Qur’ān and the Sunnah Rasūl Allah came with, but not to the Imām. Allah says:

فَإِن تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِی شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوْهُ إِلَی اللّٰهِ وَالرَّسُوْلِ

And if you disagree over anything, refer it to Allah and the Messenger.³

The scholars explain: i.e. to the book of Allah and to his Nabī whilst he is alive or to his Sunnah after his demise.⁴ And thanks to the guidance of the Qur’ān and the

¹ Sūrah al-Nisā’: 115.
² Al-Muntaqā p. 410.
³ Sūrah al-Nisā’: 59.
Sunnah it will as a whole not unite upon deviation. Because there will be no era which will be void of people who will abide by them till the Day of Judgment.

This is exactly why the evidence of Allah was established against the creation through the medium of the prophets. Allah says:

٦٥٥٥

Indeed, we have revealed to you, [O Muḥammad], as we revealed to Nūḥ and the prophets after him... (until the verse:) so that mankind will have no argument against Allah after the messengers.¹

Allah in this verse does not make mention of the Imāms. This is a refutation of those who make the entire Ummah independent upon the Imāms.²

Likewise the end result of all their logical arguments for the need of an infallible Imām, without who the Ummah will not enjoy safety and pure faith, is the invalidation of the doctrine of infallibility. This is due to fact that the requirements of Imāmah were not fulfilled by their Imāms.

For instance, to prove this it is will suffice to note that after the year 260 A.H. the emergence of an Imām came to an end. Whether it is believed that he did not exist, as was the view of the majority of the sects which emerged after the demise of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, the view of the family of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī—at the forefront being his brother Jaʿfar—and as is established by the scholars of genealogy and history; or that he existed but went into occultation, as is the view of the Twelvers. Whichever of the two is asserted, it is quite clear that the Ummah did not benefit from this alleged Mahdī in the matters of its dīn or worldly life. This is such a flaw in the Twelver dogma that cannot be undone; it leaves no regard or weight for any of its assertions and evidences.

1 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 165.
2 Ibn Taymiyah: al-ṣafāwā 19/66.
Similarly, none of his forefathers before him, with the exception of 'Alī and Ḥasan prior to his relinquishment, took charge of the affairs of the Ummah. The scholars, therefore, say that the Shī'ah do not have any evidence whatsoever to back the doctrine of infallibility besides their claim that Allah, owing to his grace and the benefit of the Ummah, has not left the world void of an infallible Imām at any given time. And that also is flawed. Because it is well-known that the Ummah did not receive any grace or benefit from the Mahdī or his forefathers as it received from Nabī after emigration. For he was the leader of the believers whose obedience was compulsory upon them and through whose medium they received bliss and success. After his rule no one for whom they claim infallibility assumed leadership besides 'Alī. And it is fact that the benefit and the grace the believers enjoyed during the rule of the first three Khulafa’ was by far more than the grace and the benefit it enjoyed during the rule of 'Alī which was filled with wars, tribulations, and disunity.¹

As for those besides 'Alī, people would benefit from their knowledge and piety just as they would benefit from their contemporaries; 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, his son Abū Ja'far and his son Ja'far would impart knowledge to the people just like other scholars of their time. In fact in their time there were people more knowledgeable than them and who benefitted the Ummah more than them, as is known to the erudite. Even if we, for argument sake, consider them to have been more knowledgeable and of more benefit to the Ummah, then too the scholars of dīn could not possibly have the same influence the rulers and kings had in enforcing the truth and forcibly inhibiting evil.

As for the remaining Imāms who followed after these three, viz. the ‘Askarīyīn, they were not known to possess knowledge which benefitted the Ummah, nor did they have any authority wherefrom the Ummah benefitted. Rather they were like the other Hāshimīs who deserved honour and status. They had the necessary knowledge of Islam which others besides them also had and which many laymen also possess. The scholars thus did not benefit from them as they did from the previous three.²

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/104.
² Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/248.
A general analysis of the doctrine of the infallibility of the Imāms

The claim of Infallibility for the Imāms smacks of assimilating them to the Ambiyā’. For it is compulsory to obey an infallible in everything he says; it is not permissible to oppose him in any way. This is the speciality of the Ambiyā’, which is why Allah has ordered us to believe in what he revealed to them. He says:

قُوْلُوْا آمَنَّا بِاللّٰهِ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَیْنَا وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَیْ إِبْرَاهِیْمَ وَإِسْمَاعِیْلَ وَإِسْحَاقَ وَیَعْقُوْبَ وَالأَْسْبَاطِ وَمَا أُوْتِيَ مُوْسٰى وَعِیْسٰى وَمَا أُوْتِيَ النَّبِیُّوْنَ مِنْ رَّبِّهِمْ لَ نُفَرِّقُ بَیْنَ أَحَدٍ مِّنْهُمْ وَنَحْنُ لَهُ مُسْلِمُوْنَ

Say, [O believers], “We have believed in Allah and what has been revealed to us and what has been revealed to Ibrāhīm and Ismā’il and Isḥāq and Ya’qūb and the Descendants and what was given to Mūsā and ʿIsā and what was given to the prophets from their Lord. We make no distinction between any of them, and we are Muslims [in submission] to Him.”

Allah in this verse orders us to proclaim that we believe in what the Ambiyā’ were given. Hence having faith in the Ambiyā’ and proclaiming that faith is our duty. This is unanimously accepted by all Muslims. So whoever attributes infallibility to anyone after the Ambiyā’ has indeed attributed the essence of prophethood to him even though he does not accord him the title of prophethood.

This is in clear contrast with the Qur’ān, the Sunnah, the consensus of the Ummah, and its scholars.

As for its opposition of the Qur’ān, Allah says:

أَطِیْعُوا اللّٰهَ وَأَطِیْعُوا الرَّسُوْلَ وَأُولِی الَّذِی نُعْلِمُ فَإِنَّ نَأَرَوْنَ فِی شَیۡءٍ مَّن کَانَ غَیرُ الّهِ وَالرَّسُوْلِ

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 136.
Obey Allah and obey the Messenger and those in authority among you. And if you disagree over anything, refer it to Allah and the Messenger.\(^1\)

Allah has not ordered us to refer to anyone in our disputes besides Allah and His Rasūl. Had there been an infallible besides Rasūl Allah, Allah would have ordered us to refer our disputes to him. This establishes that no one is infallible besides Rasūl Allah.\(^2\)

Likewise Allah says:

\[
\text{وَمَنْ یُطِعِ اللّٰهَ وَالرَّسُوْلَ فَأُولٰئِكَ مَعَ الَّذِیْنَ أَنْعَمَ اللّٰهُ عَلَیْهِمْ مِّنَ النَّبِیِّیْنَ وَالصِّدِّیْقِیْنَ وَالشُّهَدَاءِ}
\]

And whoever obeys Allah and the Messenger – those will be with the ones upon whom Allah has bestowed favour of the prophets, the steadfast affirmers of truth, the martyrs and the righteous. And excellent are those as companions.\(^3\)

And Allah says:

\[
\text{وَمَنْ یَّعْصِ اللّٰهَ وَرَسُوْلَهُ فَإِنَّ لَهُ نَارَ جَهَنَّمَ خَالِدِیْنَ فِیْهَا أَبَدًا}
\]

And whoever disobeys Allah and His Messenger – then indeed, for him is the fire of Hell; they will abide therein forever.\(^4\)

Hence the Qur’ān in multiple places establishes that whoever obeys Rasūl Allah will be from the people of good fortune, the Qur’ān does not place the condition of obeying any other infallible person besides him. And whoever

---

\(^1\) Sūrah al-Nisā’: 59.

\(^2\) Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/105.

\(^3\) Sūrah al-Nisā’: 69.

\(^4\) Sūrah al-Jinn: 23.
disobeys Rasūl Allah Ḥalīlum Allāh even if we hypothetically assume that he obeyed an infallible person.

Apart from Rasūl Allah Ḥalīlum Allāh, regarding everyone else the scholars of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah are unanimous that some of his statements and opinions are worth acceptance and some not. It is only compulsory for a person to believe in everything Rasūl Allah Ḥalīlum Allāh informed us of, follow all his instructions, refrain from his prohibitions and worship Allāh in the ways he has institutionalised. Because he is the infallible being who did not speak based on his desires; whatever he said was revelation through and through.

There is ample evidence for this in the Sunnah, but the Shī’ah only consider the verdicts of their Imāms to be of worth. Therefore ahead I shall present the verdicts of the Imāms which debunk the doctrine of infallibility.

In Nahj al-Balāghah, a word of which they do not doubt, a narration which debunks all of their claims regarding the infallibility of the Imāms appears. It says that Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn said:

لا تخالطوني بالمصانعة ولا تظنوا بي استثقال في حق قيل لي، ول التماس إعظام النفس فإنه من استثقل الحق أن یقال بحق، أو مشورة بعدل، فإنی لست في نفسي بفوق أن أخطيء ولا آمن ذلك من فعلی

Do not socialise with me with dissimulation. And do not think that I consider the truth which is said to me to be a burden and that I seek to aggrandize myself. For verily a person who treats the truth that is said to him as a burden and dislikes that he be reminded of justice, finds it difficult to practice upon them. Hence do not withhold the proclamation of truth and the advising of justice. Because I do not consider myself immune from mistakes and nor am I sure that I will never err.¹

Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn in this narration is advising his friends not to hesitate in advising him and voicing their opinions to him and is telling them not to be

¹ Nahj al-Balāghah 3/175.
barred from doing so by dissimulation and flattery. Likewise he is advising them not to assume that he will not accept the truth if it said to him considering it to be a burden or due to regarding himself beyond reformation. For verily a ruler who does not accept the suggestions of his subjects and is not happy with people telling him that he is wrong is very far from practicing the truth and justice. Simply because a person who considers the advice of others to be a burden is the most incapable of implementing it. Hence what he is implying here is that advise me and voice the truth before me because the entire Ummah as a whole is closer to infallibility and the truth, but a person by himself is not immune from erring. Hence he completely debunks the infallibility that the Shīʿah attribute to him. Instead he emphasises that he does not have any immunity against erring. He likewise does not proclaim that he is independent of consulting his subjects, rather he presses upon them that they advise him of the truth and justice, because the Ummah will never unite upon misguidance but an individual thereof has the potential of going astray. This very clearly proves that infallibility is the invention of the Shīʿah.

Likewise the following narration also appears in Nehj al-Balagah:

لا بد للناس من أمير بر أو فاجر يعمل في إمرته المؤمن، و يجمع به الفيء و يقاتل به العدو و تأمن به السبيل، و يؤخذ به للمتضعف من القوي

The people have to have a ruler, pious or impious, under whose rule a believer can freely practice, booty can be accumulated, the enemy can be subdued, roads can be secured and the rights of the weak can be claimed from the strong.\(^1\)

As you can see, he does not stipulate infallibility as a requirement for the ruler and he does not hint to it even in any way. Rather he says that such a ruler has to be appointed through whose rule the well-being of the people and the state is taken care of. He does not say that an infallible Imām should take charge of the affairs

---

\(^1\) Nehj al-Balagah p. 82.
of the Ummah and that every flag that is raised before the flag of the infallible Mahdī is a flag of ignorance, as the books of the Shī'ah assert. He likewise does not confine rulership to the twelve infallible Imāms and does not excommunicate the remaining Muslim rulers, as is the view of the Shī'ah. Instead he highlights the need for a ruler, even though sinful, and considers his rule to be legitimate by legitimising the Jihād which is fought under his rule. How far indeed is this from what the Shī'ah claim that Jihād is not permissible till the emergence of the Mahdī1 because of leadership being confined to the Twelve Imāms?

Furthermore, the Imāms would confess their crimes and they would seek the forgiveness of Allah سبحة و توبة.

Hence Amīr al-Mu’minīn would say the following in his supplication:

اللهم اغفر لي ما أنت أعلم به مني. فإن عدت فعد علي بالغفرة. اللهم اغفر لي ما وأيئ من نفسي ولم تجد له وفاء عندي. اللهم اغفر لي ما تقربت به أليك بلساني ثم خالفه قلبي. اللهم اغفر لي رمزات الألحاظ وسقوطات الألفاظ وشهوات الجنان وهفووات اللسان.

O Allah forgive me for what you know best about me. If I happen to recommit my sins then forgive me again. O Allah forgive me for the promises I made to you which you found that I did not fulfil. O Allah forgive me for the words with which I sought your closeness but did not complement with the feelings of my heart. O Allah forgive me for the sneaky gazes, the mistakes of words, the desires of the bosom, and the slips of the tongue.2

In this narration you find the confession of sins, recommitting them after having repented, the confessions of the mistakes of speech, the desires of the bosom and the heart’s opposition of the tongue... all of this debunks the infallibility that the Shī'ah claim. For if ʿAlī and the Imāms were really infallible their seeking forgiveness would be in vein. It has thus been reported regarding all the Imāms that they sought the forgiveness of Allah from sins and shortfalls. Had they been infallible they would not have any sins whatsoever.

---

1 See chapter regarding occultation and the Mahdī: p. 1109 of this book.
2 Nahj al-Balāghah p. 104.
Abū ʿAbd Allah is reported to have said:

إنا لنذنب و نسيء ثم نتوب علي الله متابا

We sin and do evil deeds and then we sincerely repent to Allah.¹

And Abū al-Hasan (Mūsā al-Kāẓim) would, according to the reports of the Shīʿah, supplicate thus:

رب عصیتك بلساني ولو شئت وعزتك لأخرستني،و عصیتك ببصري بیدي ولو شئت و عزتك لکنعتني، و عصیتك بفرحچی ولو شئت وعزتك لأعقمتني، و عصیتك برجلیي ولو شئت و عزتك لجذمتني، و عصیتك بجميع جوارحي التي أنعمت بها علي ولم یكن هذا جزاك مني

O my Lord I disobeyed You with my tongue, if You wanted, by Your honour, You could have made me dumb. I disobeyed You with my eyes, if You wanted, by Your honour, You could have impaired my vision. I disobeyed You with my ears, if You wanted, by Your honour, You could have made me deaf. I disobeyed You with my hands, if You wanted, by Your honour, You could have paralysed me. I disobeyed You with my private parts, if You wanted You could have made me sterile. And I disobeyed You with my legs, if You want You could have amputated my legs. And I have disobeyed You with all the body parts You bestowed me with and did not repay You back for them adequately.²

These supplications and narrations have left the scholars of the Shīʿah baffled due to them opposing their doctrine of infallibility.

One of them has sketched his confusion and bafflement around the aforementioned narration. He states:

کنت أفكر في معناه وأقول: کیف یتنزل علي ما تعتقد الشیعة من القول بالعصمة وما اتضح لي ما یدفع التردد الذي یوجه

1 Bihār al-Anwār 25/207.
2 Bihār al-Anwār 25/203.
I was contemplating over the purport of this narration and saying, “How does this fit into what the Shi‘ah believe regarding infallibility?” And the answer which resolves this contention did not become clear to me.

Thereafter he mentions that he raised this contention to one of his scholars whose name is Raḍī al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Mūsā ibn Ṭāʿūs al-ʿAlawī al-Ḥasanī. To which he responded by saying:

إن الوزیر مؤید الدین العلقمي سألني عنه فقلت: كان یقول هذا لیعلم الناس

The minister Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn al-ʿAlqamī had previously asked me about the same. So I told him the following, “He would say this to educate the people.”

Ibn al-ʿAlqamī was seemingly satisfied with the response. But the questioner furthered the question and raised the objection that:

إني فكرت بعد ذلك فقالت: هذا یقال في سجده في الليل وليس عنده من يعلمه

I thought about the answer thereafter and I said, “He would make this supplication at night when there was no one there who he could teach.”

He then says:

ثم خطر ببالي جواب آخر وهو أنه كان يقول ذلك علي سبيل التواصل

Another answer occurred to me. And that is that he would supplicate in this manner out of humility.

But he still was not satisfied and eventually concluded that the Imāms considered their permissible activities such as eating, drinking, and marriage, to be sins for which they would seek the forgiveness of Allah. He then says that this is the definitive answer in this regard and hopes that Ibn al-ʿAlqamī is alive so that he may guide him to this discovery and remove his bewilderment.¹

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 25/203-205.
But this answer, which he considers the definitive answer in this regard, is inharmonious with the Sharīʿah of Islam which prohibits a person from making that which is lawful unlawful and which denounces monasticism. Allah says:

قُلْ مَنْ حَرَّمَ زِیْنَةَ اللّٰهِ الَّتِيْ أَخْرَجَ لِعِبَادِهِ وَالطَّیِّبَاتِ مِنَ الرِّزْقِ

Say, “Who has forbidden the adornment of [i.e., from] Allah which He has produced for His servants and the good [lawful] things of provision?”¹

Why would the Imāms consider these activities to be unlawful; why would they consider marriage, which is one of the injunctions of Sharīʿah, a sin when Allah says:

فَانْكِحُوْا مَا طَابَ لَكُم مِّنَ النِّسَاءِ

Then marry those that please you of [other] women.²

Likewise, why would they consider eating and drinking unlawful when Allah says:

کُلُوْا مِنْ طَیِّبَاتِ مَا رَزَقْنَاکُمْ

Eat from the good things with which We have provided you.³

The only answer which can resolve this issue and is in harmony with the actual lives of the Imāms is that the doctrine of infallibility, as asserted by the Shīʿah, is baseless and that the Imāms are not protected from mistakes and sins. For as much as this is in accordance with the divine texts of Sharīʿah, it is also in

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 32.
2 Sūrah al-Nisāʾ: 3.
3 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 160; Sūrah Ṭāhā: 81.
harmony with the actual lives of the Imāms. And only in this way would they serve as role models for their followers.

That is why the Ambiyā’ were ordinary humans who ate food and went to the market places, and strived for the propagation of the message of Allah, underwent hardships at the hands of their people, and persevered the difficulties of this grave mission. All of this was so that they could serve as role models and so that they could pave the way and provide guidance for those to come after them.

Another point which invalidates the doctrine of infallibility from the books of the Shī‘ah is the differences of opinion and the contradiction which the Imāms displayed regarding some issues. For the judgments and actions of the infallibles ought not be contradictory, rather they ought to compliment and support each other. Contradiction thus invalidates infallibility, which according to them is a provision for Imāmah, and by extension it invalidates Imāmah itself. This possibly, i.e. contradiction in the actions of the Imāms, was the reason owing to which many Shī‘ah denounced Shī‘ism. An example of this is the report documented by al-Qummī and al-Nawbakhtī regarding what had transpired after the martyrdom of Ḥusayn. It read as follows:

After the martyrdom of Ḥusayn a faction of his followers disputed and said, “The stance of Ḥasan and the stance of Ḥusayn have confused us. For if the stance of Ḥasan regarding reconciling with Mu‘āwiyah and relinquishing the Khilāfah when being unable to subdue him despite the multitudes of
supporters he had and their strength, is correct then the stance of Ḥusayn regarding opposing Yazīd to the extent where he and his comrades were killed is incorrect and unnecessary. Because Ḥusayn had more reason to reconcile with Yazīd and not initiate a rebellion against him than Ḥasan had when he chose not to oppose Muʿāwiyyah. And if the stance of Ḥusayn regarding combatting Yazīd till he and his comrades were eventually martyred is correct, then the stance of Ḥasan regarding his reconcilement with Muʿāwiyyah despite enjoying the support of multitudes of people is incorrect. They thus doubted the Imāmah of both of them and assimilated themselves with the general public.¹

As for their difference of opinions in jurisprudential issues, it is very vast and was also one of the causes for many of the Shīʿah detracting from Shiʿism. Shaykh al-Ṭāʿifah al-Ṭūsī has attested to this and said that all their traditions are contradictory; to the extent that there is not a single report but that it is contradicted by another and there is not a single narration but that it is opposed by another. He has considered this to be the greatest flaws of the Shiʿī dogma and the reason for many of the Shīʿah detracting therefrom.²

The narrations of two of the seminal works of the Shīʿah, viz. Al-Tahdhib and Al-Istibṣār, are the greatest testimony to this mammoth contradiction. Although al-Ṭūsī has tried to resolve this contradiction by stating that it was because of Taqiyyah, but he has just complicated it even more.

The Shīʿah have in order to camouflage the drastically disparate views of their Imāms, invented the doctrines of Taqiyyah and Badā’. One of the Shīʿah discovered this and thus forsook Shiʿism. He says:

إن إئمة الرافضة وضعوا لشیعتهم مقالتين لیظهرون معهما من أئمتهم علي کذب أبدا وهما القول بالبداع والتجربة النافعة.  

1 Al-Qummī: Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq p. 25; al-Nawbakhtī; Firaq al-Shīʿah p. 25-26.
2 See: p. 487 of this book.
The spearheaders of the Shīʿah have invented two ideas for their adherents owing to which they will never be able to discover any lie from their Imāms. They are: Badāʿ and the permissibility of Taqiyyah.\footnote{Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq p. 78; Firaq al-Shīʿah p. 55-56. This person was Sulaymān ibn Jarīr who is the eponym of the Sulaymāniyyah, a sub-sector of the Zaydiyyah.}

The books of the Shīʿah report that at times whilst seated in one gathering the Imām would give three different answers to the same question and he would justify this with the excuses of Taqiyyah, the freedom of the Imām in issuing a ruling and the flexibility of the Imām in stating a ruling with increase or decrease.

A person of the Shīʿah by the name ʿUmar ibn Riyāḥ is reported to have went to the Imām to ask him a question. After the Imām gave him the ruling he went away and returned the next year and asked him the same question. This time the Imām gave him an answer different to the answer he had given him yesteryear. He was perplexed and said:

“This is not the answer you had given me last year regarding the same issue.”

To which the Imām replied, “I gave my answer by way of Taqiyyah.”

This caused the person to doubt the Imām and his interactions. He thus left from there and met a Shīṭī by the name Muḥammad ibn Qays and told him of what had transpired and subsequently said, “Allah knows that I did...
not ask him the question but with the sincere intention of practicing on the ruling he would give me. There was thus no reason for him to practice Taqiyyah in responding to me.”

Muhammad ibn Qays said to him, “Possibly there was someone present who the Imām feared.”

He said, “No one was present besides me at both instances but it seems as if both the answers were given by way of estimation. Which is why he did not remember the answer he had given yesteryear and thus failed to give a similar answer (this year).”

He thus denounced the Imām and said, “A person who issues false rulings cannot be an Imām.”

Likewise al-Kulaynī has narrated the following from Zurārah ibn Aʿyan regarding Abū Jaʿfar:

I asked him regarding an issue for which he gave me an answer. Subsequently another person came and asked regarding the same, he gave him an answer different to the one he gave me. Thereafter a third person came who asked the same question, the Imām gave him an answer different to the ones he gave me and my friend.

Hence when the two men left I asked him, “O son of Rasūl Allah! Two men of Iraq who are your supporters came and asked the same question, but you gave each one of them an answer different to the answer you gave his two companions.”

1 Fīraq al-Shīʿah p. 59-61.
He said, “O Zurārah. This is best for us and for you. For if you were to unite upon common grounds the people would accept what you say over what we say and that would result in shortening our existence as well as yours.”

At times he is likewise reported to have given three different interpretations for one verse of the Qur’ān, and he justifies this by saying that the Imāms have been given the prerogative of interpreting the verse as they desire.

You have noticed the different answers given in one gathering regarding one issue; this is inharmonious with infallibility.

All of this of course was based on the Shīʿī perspective. Otherwise none of this had transpired. For it does not behove a man like Abū Jaʿfar to issue a false ruling because of fear and by way Taqiyyah; his knowledge, piety and adherence to the dīn could not have allowed to do such. But these narrations are, however, the fabrication of those who invented the doctrine of infallibility in order to camouflage the discrepancies and contradictions which are the aftermath of their doings. Such contradictions which only suit their ignorance.

Lastly, their infallible Imām was unable to save them from arguing regarding Imāmah, the most crucial aspect of their dogma. Hence you will find that they dispute with one another, forsake one another, curse one another, and excommunicate one another due to their difference of opinion regarding the number of Imāms, their personalities, and the confusion of waiting for the return of the previous Imām or moving on to the follow the next. This is besides the many contradictory narrations pertaining to the various issues of dīn, comprising of both the fundamental and the secondary issues. Hence the alleged infallibility did not save them from dispute. The fact that it did not have any discernible impact on the Shīʿah is a sign of it being non-existent.

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/65.
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/265-266.
Having studied all of this, it is possible that the doctrine of infallibility was inherited by the Shīʿah from the Zoroastrians, because the Zoroastrians claim regarding their awaited leader and his companions that they will not lie, disobey Allah, or commit any minor or major sin.¹

In conclusion, someone might say that the doctrine of infallibility in today’s world does not hold any importance due to the line of Imāms effectively ending in the year 260 A.H. All that remains is the appearance of the alleged promised Mahdī.

I say that this doctrine still has its impact in the Shīʿī world today and it represents itself in various ways:

1. Their adherence to what is narrated from their Imāms as diligently as the Muslims adhere to the Qurʾān and the Sunnah.

2. Their extremism and exaggerations at the graves and shrines of the Imāms. For their extremism in asserting the infallibility of the Imāms has led them to ascribing divine attributes to them which has translated into exaggeration at their graves and shrines which they circumambulate and wherefrom they seek help.

3. The Shīʿī Mujtahid in Shīʿī circles enjoys a portion of infallibility. For they consider the one who rejects his teachings equal to the one who rejects Allah. At times it reaches the level of ascribing partners to Allah.² This is a very grave matter because it is the Shīʿī scholars who are in charge of affairs today in the Shīʿī country. Hence the people carry out their teachings as if they are revealed by Allah and they do not fear falling into polytheism by doing so.

4. Believing in this doctrine and living by it.

¹ Tathbīt Dalāʾil al-Nubuwwah 1/179.
² Some of their texts in this regard will be cited in the section of occultation and the Mahdī In Shā Allah.
Chapter Three

Taqiyyah (dissimulation)

The Definition of Taqiyyah

Al-Mufid gives the following definition of Taqiyyah:

التقية كتمان الحق، و ستر الاعتقاد فيه، و كتمان المخالفين، و ترك مظاهرتهم بما يعقب ضررا في الدين أو الدنيا

Taqiyyah is concealing the truth, discreetly believing in it, not disclosing it in front of the opposition and not confronting them in a way which will bring about harm to person in worldly or religious matters.²

1 The verb اِتَّقَي: means to exercise caution (Lisān al-ʿArab: under the root letters وقي). Ibn Ḥajr therefore says:

الحذر من إظهار ما في النفس من معتقد وغيره للغ

Taqiyyah is concealing that which is in the heart, i.e. beliefs and everything besides it. (Fatḥ al-Bārī 12/314)

This means to hide the truth. And at times a person is compelled to say with his tongue that which is not in his heart. Ibn ʿAbbās says:

التقیة باللسان والقلب مطمئن بالإیمان

Taqiyyah is with the tongue whilst the heart is still content upon īmān.

And Abū al-ʿĀliyah says:

التقیة باللسان وليس بالعمل

Taqiyyah is linked with the tongue; it has nothing to do with practice. (Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī, with the revision of Shākir 6/314-315; Fatḥ al-Bārī 12/314).

So Taqiyyah in essence means expressing that which is contrary to what is in heart (See: Ibn Athīr: Al-Nihāyah 1/193). And majority of the Arabs use the word Tuqāt instead of Taqiyyah. That is why in the Qurʿān the verse of Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 28 also contains the word Tuqāt. But to pronounce it as Taqiyyah is also correct, as asserted by al-Farrā’, for it does reads as Taqiyyah as well according to another dialect (see: al-Farrā’: Maʿānī al-Qurʿān p. 205; Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 6/317).

2 Sharḥ ʿAqāʾid al-Ṣadūq (it is published jointly with Awā’il al-Maqālāt) p. 261.
Al-Mufīd defines Taqiyyah as concealing the truth out of fear from the opposition who are the Ahl al-Sunnah, as is apparent from their frequent usage of the word ‘opposition’ for them. In other words, it is expressing the religion of the Ahl al-Sunnah which they consider baseless and concealing the dogma of the Shī‘ah which they consider the truth. Based on this some scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah have asserted that the Shī‘ah are worse than the hypocrites, because the hypocrites inwardly know that the disbelief that they believe in is false but they express Islam out of fear. As for these people, they inwardly believe their dogma to be the truth and that it is in harmony with the ways of prophets and Imāms.1

Taqiyyah in Islam is practiced against the disbelievers. Allah  says:

لاَّ أَنْ تَتَّقُوا مِنْهُمْ تَقَاةَ

Except when taking precaution against them in prudence.2

Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī says:

التقية التي ذكرها الله في هذه الآية إنما هي تقية من الكفار لا من غيرهم

The Taqiyyah which Allah  has mentioned in this verse is against the disbelievers, not anyone else.3

That is why some scholars are of the opinion that it became impermissible to practice Taqiyyah after Allah had made Islam victorious. Mu‘ādh ibn Jabal and Mujāhid say:

كانت التقية في جدة الإسلام قبل قوة المسلمين، أما اليوم فقد أعز الله المسلمين أن يتقوا منهم تقاة

Taqiyyah was practiced in the initial stages of Islam before it had gained

1 Ibn Taymiyyah: Risālah fī ʿIlm al-Ẓāhir wa al-Bāṭin (as part of Majmū‘ah al-Rasā’il al-Munīriyyah) 1/248.
2 Sūrāh Āl ʿImrān: 28
3 Ṭafsīr al-Ṭabarī 6/316.
strength. As for today, Allah has given glory to Islam thus leaving no need for them to practice Taqiyyah.¹

But the Shīʿah practice Taqiyyah with the Muslims, in general, and with the Ahl al-Sunnah in specific. To the extent that they consider the golden era of Islam to be the era of Taqiyyah, as is asserted by al-Mufīd² and as is easily understood from the many narrations which they attribute to the Imāms. As they consider the Ahl al-Sunnah worse than the Jews and the Christians in their disbelief due to the denier of Imāmah according to them being worse than the denier of prophethood.³

Taqiyyah is only permitted in situations of complete desperation. That is why Allah has excluded it from the prohibition of befriending the disbelievers. He says:


Let not believers take disbelievers as allies [i.e., supporters or protectors] rather than believers. And whoever [of you] does that has nothing [i.e., no association] with Allah, except when taking precaution against them in prudence. And Allah warns you of Himself, and to Allah is the [final] destination.⁴

Allah has prohibited us from befriending the disbelievers and has sounded a very serious warning for those who do so. He says:

¹ Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 4/57; al-Shawkānī: Fath al-Qadīr 1/331.
² This has passed on p. 59 of this book.
³ See p. 967 onwards of this book.
⁴ Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 28.
Meaning a person who does that which Allah has prohibited in this regard has indeed freed himself of his relationship with Allah. Thereafter Allah says:

إِلَّا أَنْ تَتَّقُوْا مِنْهُمْ تُقَاةً

Meaning with the exception of the person who in some places and at sometimes fears their evil, for it is permissible for him to exercise Taqiyyah outwardly but not inwardly and intentionally.¹

Likewise the scholars all unanimously concur that Taqiyyah is only to be practiced in times of desperation. Ibn al-Mundhir says:

أجمعوا علي أن من أکره علي الكفر حتي خشي علي نفسه القتل فكفر و قلبه مطمئن بالإیمان أنه لا يحكم عليه بالکفر

They have agreed that the ruling of disbelief will not be passed against a person who outwardly utters the words of disbelief when he is coerced in a way that he fears murder upon himself, as long as his heart in content upon īmān.²

However a person who sticks to the ideal at this juncture he is better. Ibn Baṭṭāl says:

و أجمعوا علي أن من أکره علي الكفر واختار القتل أنه أعظم أجرا عند الله

They have agreed that a person who is coerced to utter the words of disbelief and chooses murder will attain more reward from Allah.³

---

¹ Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 1/371. Refer to other Tafsīrs also and see the commentary of the verses: Āl ʿImrān: 28 and al-Naḥl: 106.

² Fatḥ al-Bārī 12/314.

However the Taqiyyah that the Shīʿah practice is very different. For it is not just a concession but it is one of the fundamentals of their dogma, like that of ṣalāh or even greater. Ibn Bābawayh says:

اعتقادنا في التقیة أنها واجبة من ترکها بمنزلة من ترك الصلاة

Our belief regarding Taqiyyah is that it is compulsory. A person who leaves it is like a person who leaves ṣalāh.¹

Al-Ṣādiq is reported to have said:

لو قلت أن تارک التقیة کتارک الصلاة لكنت صادقا

If I were to say that the person who abandons Taqiyyah is like a person who abandons ṣalāh I would be speaking the truth.²

They in fact attribute this to Rasūl Allah صل الله عليه وسلم. They say that he said:

تارک التقیة كتارک الصلاة

A person who abandons Taqiyyah is like a person who abandons ṣalāh.³

They have further elevated it from just being a fundamental to being nine tenths of dīn. And taking it further, they assert that Taqiyyah itself is complete dīn; so a person who does not practice Taqiyyah has no dīn. The following narration appears in Uṣūl al-Kāfī:

إن تسعة أعشار الدين في التقية ولا دين لمن لا تقية له

1 Al-ʾtiqādāt p. 114.
3 Jāmiʿ al-Akhbār p. 110; Biḥār al-Anwār 75/412.
Ja’far ibn Muḥammad said, “Nine tenths of dīn are in Taqīyyah. And there is no dīn for a person who does not practice Taqīyyah.”

They have considered not practicing Taqīyyah a sin equivalent to ascribing partners with Allah which cannot be forgiven. Their narrations mention:

يغفر الله للمؤمن كل ذنب، يظهر منه في الدنيا وال الآخرة ما خللا ذنبين: ترك التفية، وتصييع حقوق الإخوان

Allah will forgive every sin of a believer which he commits in this world and in the hereafter, besides two sins: forsaking Taqīyyah and not fulfilling the rights of the brothers.

Whereas Taqīyyah in Islam which is a dīn of striving and propagation cannot be the default decorum of a Muslim. Nor can it be one of the salient features of a Muslim society. Instead it is more a time-confined concession based on a person’s personal situation of desperation and the inability to migrate which later falls away with the passage of the period of coercion.

Conversely, according to the Shīʿī perspective it is considered to be the very basis of their structure. Abū ʿAbd Allah says:

إنكم علي دين من كنتمه أعزه الله، و من أذاعه أذله الله

You are upon a dīn, whoever conceals it Allah will elevate him. And whoever propagates it Allah will disgrace him.

He is also reported to have said:

---

2 Tafsīr al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī p. 130; Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 11/474; Bihār al-Anwār 75/415.
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/222.
Allah is not pleased for us in our dīn with anything else besides Taqiyyah.

So Taqiyyah according to them is a continuous practice which forms part of the social ethos of the community. Ibn Bābawayh has mentioned the following in his book Al-Iʿtiqādāt (which is also known as The Dogma of the Imāmiyyah):

- and the practice is obligatory, it is not permissible to abandon it till the emergence of the Mahdī. Whoever abandons it before his emergence has left the dīn of Allah and the creed of the Imāmiyyah. He has likewise opposed Allah, his Rasūl and the Imāms.

Likewise the books of the Shīʿah narrate the following from ʿAlī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā:

- There is no faith for a person who does not practice Taqiyyah. And the most honourable among you is the one who practices Taqiyyah the most.

He was asked, “Till when, O son of Rasūl Allah?”

He replied, “Till the day of the specified time, i.e. the day of the emergence of our Mahdī. Hence a person who abandons Taqiyyah before the emergence of the Mahdī is not from amongst us.”

---

1 Ibid. 2/218.
3 It is as if they interpret the verse: “إن أُكَرِّمَكُمْ عِندَ اللهِ أَتْقَاكُمْ” (al-Ḥujurāt: 13)
Furthermore, Taqiyyah is inseparable from the Shīʿah in all the Muslim lands. To the extent that they call the Dār al-Islam, Muslim state, ‘the abode of Taqiyyah’. It is mentioned in their narrations that:

والنقية في دار النقية واجبة

And Taqiyyah in the Taqiyyah abode is compulsory.¹

They also call it the ‘abode of falsehood’. They say:

من كان يؤمن بالله واليوم الآخر فلا يتكلم في دولة الباطل إلا بالنقية

That person who believes in Allah and the last day should not talk in the abode of falsehood but by way of Taqiyyah.²

They also call it ‘the abode of the oppressors’. They say:

النقية فريضة واجبة علينا في دولة الظالمين، فمن تركها فقد خالف دين الإمامية و فارقه

Taqiyyah is mandatory upon us in the abode of the oppressors. Whoever does not practice it has opposed the dīn of the Imāmiyyah and denounced it.³

They also emphasise that the interactions between the Shīʿah and the Ahl al-Sunnah should be purely based on Taqiyyah. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has actually established a chapter by the title, Chapter regarding the interactions with the commonality (Ahl al-Sunnah) being compulsory by way of Taqiyyah.⁴

In this regard, they have attributed the following to Abū ʿAbd Allah:

---

1 Jāmiʿ al-Akhbār p. 110; Biḥār al-Anwār 75/411.
2 Jāmiʿ al-Akhbār p. 110; Biḥār al-Anwār 75/412.
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 75/421.
4 Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 11/470.
A person who reads ṣalāh with them in the first row is like a person who read ṣalāh with Rasūl Allah  in the first row.¹

Likewise:

A person who performs ṣalāh behind the hypocrites by way of Taqiyyah is like a person who reads ṣalāh behind the Imāms.²

And the author of *Kashf al-Ghiṭā’* says:

Taqiyyah is compulsory. So when a person carries out a good deed without it, it is void of acceptance. There is a lot of encouragement regarding it in the narrations. Likewise it is mentioned that it is from the dīn of Muḥammad and that there is no īmān for a person who does not practice Taqiyyah.³

Taking it a step ahead, Taqiyyah is compulsory even though there might not be a valid reason for it. Hence their narrations encourage a person to practice Taqiyyah even with those whom they feel safe so that by frequently practicing it, it becomes part of their disposition and nature. Which will then make it easier to practice it without any formalities with those who they sense a threat from and who they fear. Their books narrate:

---

¹ *Bihār al-Anwār* 75/421.
² *Jāmiʿ al-Akhbār* p. 110; *Bihār al-Anwār* 75/412.
You should firmly hold on to Taqiyyah. For that person who does not make it his inner and outer covering with those who he does not fear till it becomes his usual style of interaction with those who he fears, is not from us.¹

Taqiyyah, of course, when practiced in this manner is nothing but lies and hypocrisy through and through. And it is despised by people of sound disposition and upright character; it is not worth acceptance according to the people of intellect. The narrations of the Shī'ah, therefore, induce them to live by it by trying to make it plausible. Hence they suggest that it is the 'ībādah (worship) of Allah, rather the most beloved of acts of worship to him. Al-Kulaynī narrates:

Hishām al-Kindī says, “I heard Abū 'Abd Allah saying, ‘By Allah! Allah cannot be worshipped in any way which is more beloved to him than Khab.’

I asked him, ‘What is Khab?’

He said, ‘It is Taqiyyah.’”²

The following narration similarly appears in al-Kāfī and other books:

Muḥammad ibn Marwān narrates from Abū 'Abd Allah, “My father would often say, ‘Is there anything more soothing to my eyes than Taqiyyah.’”³

---

¹ Amālī al-Ṭūsī 1/199; Wasā'il al-Shī'ah 11/466; Bihār al-Anwār 75/395.
³ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/220.
Likewise another narration mentions:

ما خلق الله شيئا أقر لعين أبيك من التقية

Allah has not created anything more soothing to the eyes of your father than Taqiyyah.¹

These are the characteristics of Taqiyyah according to the Twelvers. The author of al-Kāfī has produced all the narrations in this regard under the chapters of Taqiyyah,² Kitmān (concealing),³ and Idhā’ah (spreading).⁴

And al-Majlisī has produced a hundred and nine narrations in his Biḥār in the chapter, Chapter regarding Taqiyyah and affability.⁵

As to this exaggeration in the issue of Taqiyyah, it is the result of many reasons. Some being the following:

Firstly, the Shī‘ah consider the rule of the first three Khulafā’ to be illegitimate. They consider them and those who pledged allegiance to them disbelievers. Notwithstanding that ʿAlī pledged his allegiance to them, read ṣalāh behind them, fought alongside them, established marital relations with them, and received concubines as booty after their Jihāds. And when he assumed rulership he treaded their path and did not make any changes to the institutions put in place by Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, as is attested to in the books of the Shī‘ah themselves.⁶ This extirpates the Shī‘ī dogma from its very roots. They thus endeavoured to find a way out of this apparent contradiction which poses a threat to them by inventing the doctrine of Taqiyyah.

---

² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/217.
³ Ibid. 2/221.
⁴ Ibid. 2/369.
⁵ Biḥār al-Anwār 75/393-443.
⁶ See p. 566 of this book.
Secondly, they claim that the Imāms are infallible and that they are not overcome by heedlessness, mistakes or forgetfulness. This claim is in stark contrast with what is known about the Imāms. To the extent that the traditions of the Shīʿah conflict one another; so much so that there is not a single narration but that it is opposed by another, as is attested to by their scholar al-Ṭūsī.¹

This also violates the doctrine of infallibility. Hence they invented the idea of Taqāyyah in order to justify the apparent conflict and contradiction. The author of al-Kāfī narrates the following from Manşūr ibn Ḥāzim:

> فلأت لأبي عبد الله - عليه السلام - ما بالي أسألك عن المسألة فتجيبني فيها بالجواب، ثم يجعلك غيري فتجيبه فيها بجواب آخر؟ فقال: إن نجيب الناس علي الزيادة والنقصان

I asked Abū ‘Abd Allah, “Why is it that when I ask you a question you give me an answer and when someone else asks you the same questions you give him a different answer?”

He replied, “I answer to people with increase and decrease.”²

The commentator of al-Kāfī comments on this narration:

> أي زيادة حكم عند التقیة، ونقصانه عند عدمها... ولم يكن ذلك مستندا إلى النسيان والجهل بل لعلمهم بأن اختلاف كلامهم أصلح لهم، واتفع لبقائهم إذ لو اتفقوا لعرفوا بالتشييع وصار ذلك سببا لقتلهما، وقتل الأئمة عليهم السلام

I.e. with increase when practicing Taqāyyah and with decrease when not practicing it. it was not because of forgetfulness or ignorance. Rather it was because they knew that their variant answers were better for them and more effective in their prolonged existence. For if they were to agree they would have become associated with Shīʿism which subsequently would be the cause of their murder and the murder of the Imāms.³

---

¹ See p. 487 of this book.
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/65.
It is for this reason that Sulaymān ibn Jarīr al-Zaydī considered Taqiyyah to be a cover up for the differences and contradictions. Hence when they noticed the Imāms giving different answers for the same question and at times the same answer for different questions, the Imāms said to them:¹

إنما أجبنا بهذا للتقیه، ولنا أن نجيب بما أجبنا و كيف شنتنا، لأن ذلك إلينا، و نحن نعلم بما يصلحكم، وما فيه بقاؤنا و بقاؤكم، و كيف عدوكم عننا وعنكم،

We have given this answer on the basis of Taqiyyah. And we have the prerogative to answer however we want and with whatever we want. Because we have been given this authority. And we know what is more suited for you and what is more effective for our existence and yours and what will avert your enemy from us and from you.

He thus says:

قال: فمتي يظهر من هؤلاء علی كذب، ومتى يعرف لهم حق من باطل

So when will a person then come to know of any lie from them and how will he ever be able to differentiate between the truth and falsehood.²

Thirdly, the doctrine of Taqiyyah was invented in order to facilitate the easy accomplishment of the agenda of the liars and in order to cloud the actual religion of the Ahl al-Bayt. This is by giving the followers the impression that whatever they (the inventers of Taqiyyah) report from them is their actual religion and that whatever is well-known about them, or whatever they say and do in front of the general Muslims does not represent their actual religion due to them just doing that by way of Taqiyyah. Hence in this way it would become very easy for them to reject the verdicts of the Imāms, manipulate them, and belie the truth which is narrated from them. Hence you will find that they reject the verdicts of Muḥammad al-Bāqir and Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq which they said in front of the people

¹ Based on what their evil scholars narrate from them.
or which the reliable transmitters of Sharīʿah transmit from them by merely alleging that they were practicing Taqiyyah because of the presence of a Sunnī. And conversely, they accept the narrations which inveterate liars like Jābir al-Juʿfī and his like narrate from them asserting that there was no one present because of who he had to practice Taqiyyah.

In this regard it is sufficient to note that Imām Zayd ibn ʿAlī who is a member of the Ahl al-Bayt narrated from ʿAlī that he would wash his feet in Wuḍū’, as is narrated in the books of the Twelvers themselves. But Shaykh al-Ṭā’īfah al-Ṭūsī refused to accept this narration and has no valid reason to reject it besides Taqiyyah. Hence he narrates the narration Zayd ibn ʿAlī narrates from his grandfather ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib in his book Al-Istibṣār:

و غسلت – إني أن قال – و غسلت قدمي، فقال لي يا علي خلل بين الأصبع لا تخلل بالنار

“I set to perform Wuḍū’ and when I started it Rasūl Allah came.” Till he said, “And I washed my feet.”

So he told me, “O ʿAlī! Make Khilāl of your toes (pass a wet hand through them) so that they are not afflicted with the fire of Jahannam.”

As you can see, ʿAlī would wash his feet in Wuḍū’ and Rasūl Allah pressed upon him to make Khilāl of his toes, but the Shīʿah oppose this Sunnah of Rasūl Allah and his practice in this regard. They do not pay any attention to these narrations despite them appearing in their books and being narrated from their Imāms. Their scholars do not want to burden themselves to investigate these narrations and study them due to their ever ready and universal answer of Taqiyyah. Therefore, Al-Ṭūsī, after citing it, says:

هذا خبر موافق للعامة (يعني أهل السنة) وقد ورد مورد التقیة لأن المعلوم الذي لا يتخالج منه الشك من مذاهب أئمنا عليهم السلام القول بالمسح علي الرجلين.

1 Al-Istibṣār 1/65-66.
This narration is in harmony with the practice of the commonality (the Ahl al-Sunnah). It was said by way of Taqiyyah. This is because it is undoubtedly the unanimous stance of all our Imāms to make Masah of the feet (pass a wet hand over them).¹

He further says:

إن رواة هذا الخبر كلهم عامة ورجال الزيدية. وما يختصون به لا يعمل به

The narrators of this narration are all from the commonality (the Ahl al-Sunnah) and the Zaydiyyah. And whatever they exclusively narrate is not worth practicing.

He likewise documents a narration of washing the feet from Abū ‘Abd Allah Ja’far al-Ṣādiq and interprets it to be by way of Taqiyyah.²

Likewise he also interprets the narrations of Adhān which are not harmonious with their stance to have been said by way of Taqiyyah.³

Similarly in issues of inheritance they assert that a woman will not inherit properties, houses and lands at all.⁴ And when they are confronted with a narration which is narrated from their Imāms which opposes this, they say that it was said by way of Taqiyyah. Abū Ya’fūr narrates that he asked Abū ‘Abd Allah the following:

سألته عن الرجل هل يرث من دار امرأته أو أرضها من التربة شيئاً أو يكون في ذلك منزلة المرأة فلا يرث من ذلك شيئاً فقال: يرثها وتزدها من كل شيء يترك وتركت

1 Al-Istibṣār 1/65-66.
2 Ibid: 1/65.
3 Ibid. 1/308. (For example: the narration which states that he should say الصلوة خير من النوم (Ṣalāh is better than sleep) in the Fajr Adhān.
I asked him regarding a man. Can he inherit a share from his wife’s house or her land, or is that specifically the ownership of the wife wherein the husband has no share?

He said, “He will inherit from her and she will inherit from him anything that he or she has left behind.”

Al-Ṭūsī whilst commenting on this narration says:

نحمله علي الثقية، لأن جميع من خالفنا يخالف في هذه المسألة، وليس يوافقنا عليها أحد من العامة، وما يجري هذا المجري يجوز الثقية

We interpret this narration to be by way of Taqiyyah. Because all our opponents oppose us in this issue; no one is in harmony with us. And usually when this is the case in any issue it is permissible to practice Taqiyyah when mentioning it.

Regarding marriage as well, there are many narrations which prohibit Mut‘ah (temporary marriages). It is narrated in their books that Zayd ibn ‘Alī narrates from his fathers who narrate from ‘Alī that Rasūl Allah prohibited consuming the meat of donkeys and Mut‘ah one the day of Khaybar.

Their scholar al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī say the following about this narration:

أقول حمله الشیخ و غيره علي الثقية يعني في الرواية، لأن إباحة المنعة من ضروريات مذهب الإمامية

I say that Shaykh has considered this to have been said by way of Taqiyyah, because the permissibility of Mut‘ah is one of the salient features of our dogma.

---

2 Ibid. 4/155.
4 When Shaykh is said in the Shī‘ī books al-Ṭūsī is meant.
5 Wasāʿil al-Shī‘ah 7/441.
Fourthly, the doctrine of Taqiyyah has been invented to keep the Shī‘ah aloof from the Muslims. Their narrations prove this. Hence their Imām Abū ʿAbd Allah is reported to have said”

ما سمعت مني يشبه قول الناس فيه التقية، وما سمعت مني لا يشبه قول الناس فلا تقية فيه

Whatever you hear me say that is in accordance with the views of people is by way of Taqiyyah, and whatever you hear me say that does not resemble the views of the people is not by way of Taqiyyah.¹

This is a very grave stance, for it takes the Shī‘ah out of the fold of Islam and includes them in the rank of the heretics and apostates. This is because they have made the opposition of the Muslims their principles and that necessarily implies that they agree with the disbelievers and disagree with the believers. See to what extent the heretics of the past centuries have manipulated them.

One of the results of the doctrine of Taqiyyah is that the Shī‘ah have lost the true religion of their Imāms due to them not being able to differentiate what was said by way of Taqiyyah and what was not.² It likewise gave birth to a principle which is entirely based on extremism, i.e. whatever opposes the commonality entails guidance.³

The author of al-Ḥadā‘iq has conceded that very little of the actual religion of the Imāms is known because of the practice of Taqiyyah. He says:

فلم يعلم من أحكام الدين علي اليقين إلا القليل لا متزاج أخباره بأخبار التقية، كما قد اعترف بذلك

ثقة الإسلام محمد بن يعقوب الكليني في جامعه الكافي حتى أنه تخطأ العمل بالترجيحات المروية عند

تعارض الأخبار والتجأ إلى مجرد الرد والتسليم للأئمة الأبرار

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 2/252. (with reference to Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām)

² See the arguments al-Suwaydī presents in this regard against the Shī‘ah and their inability to answer him (Mu‘tamār al-Najaf p. 106).

³ Refer back to the section of their stance regarding the consensus of the Ummah.
From the rulings of dīn none but a few are known with certainty because of their reports being mixed with the reports of Taqiyyah. *Thiqat al-Islam* al-Kulaynī has conceded this in his book *al-Kāfī*. To the extent that he considers practicing upon the narrations which are preferred over those which contradict them incorrect, and he resorts to merely submitting himself to the righteous Imāms.¹

Furthermore, when it comes to the application of Taqiyyah, it is completely clear that it is not a concession for times of dire need and desperation. Hence the author of *al-Ḥadāʾiq* also concedes the following:

They give conflicting rulings even though none of those people (the Sunnīs) are present. Hence you will find them giving various answers regarding one particular issue even when none of the opposition is present with them.²

The examples which demonstrate this are copious.

Al-Kulaynī narrates the following:

1 Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī: *al-Ḥadāʾiq al-Nādirah* 1/5.
2 Ibid.
Mūsā ibn Ashyam says, “I was in the presence of Abū ‘Abd Allah. One person asked him regarding a verse of the Qur’ān. He informed him about it. Thereafter another person came and asked regarding the same and he gave an answer different to the one he gave the first person.”

He further says, “That which Allah intended entered my heart and I felt as if my heart was being cut with knives. I said to myself, ‘I left Abū Qatādah in Syria who does not make a mistake in even a Waw (the alphabet و) and its likes and came to this person who makes such grave blunders. Whilst I was still grappling with this another person came and asked him regarding the same verse and he gave him an answer different to the answers he had given me and my friend. My heart was immediately at ease and I knew that he was answering by way of Taqiyyah. He then turned to me and said, “Allah gave his Nabī authority and said, ‘And whatever the Messenger has given you – take; and what he has forbidden you – refrain from’. So whatever authority he was given we are also given.”

See how they attribute leading people astray with incorrect interpretations and the propagation of reprehensible interpretations of the Qur’ān to Ja‘far. And then they still claim that dīn was his prerogative which he could temper with it as he desired. This is not Taqiyyah, this is rather heterodoxy and being an obstacle for others to enter the dīn of Allah. Was there any need for Taqiyyah when interpreting the Qur’ān in the best of eras and that also from a scholar of the Ahl al-Bayt?

They also claim that their Imāms would issue rulings of impermissible things being permissible and vice versa due to practicing Taqiyyah without any valid reason. Hence in al-Kāfī the following narrations appears:

 عن أبان بن تغلب قال: سمعت أبا عبد الله يقول: كان أبي عليه السلام يفتي في زمن بني أمية أن ما قتل البازи والصقر فهو حلال وكان يتقيهم، وأنا لا أتقيهم وهو حرام ما قتل

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/265-266.
Abān ibn Taghlib mentions that he heard Abū 'Abd Allah saying, “My father would in the era of the Umayyads issue the ruling that whatever is hunted with falcons and vultures is permissible to consume. He would issue this ruling by way of Taqiyyah. I do not fear them (and thus do not have to practice Taqiyyah) and thus I say that whatever they hunt is impermissible.”

One of the clearest evidences of the fact that Taqiyyah is not but blatant unjustified lies is the narration which al-Kulaynī narrates from Muḥammad ibn Muslim. He says:

I went to Abū 'Abd Allah and Abū Ḥanīfah was present by him.

I asked him, “May I be sacrificed for thee. I have seen a very strange dream.”

He said to me, “O son of Muslim! Mention it for the knower of its interpretation is seated here.”

And he indicated towards Abū Ḥanīfah. (Thereafter the narrator presents his dream to Abū Ḥanīfah and he provides an answer, as they allege).

Thereupon Abū 'Abd Allah said, “O Abū Ḥanīfah surely you answered accurately.”

The narrator says that subsequent to that Abū Ḥanīfah left whereupon I said to the Imām, “May I be sacrificed for thee, I dislike the interpretation of this Nāṣib (enemy of the Ahl al-Bayt).”

---

1 Furūʿ al-Kāfī 8/292: Chapter regarding the hunted animals of falcons and vultures.
He responded, “O the son of Muslim! May Allah never make you witness evil. Our interpretations are never in harmony with theirs and their interpretations are never in harmony with ours. And the interpretation is not what he had said.”

So I said to him, “May I be sacrificed for thee. So then what was your statement ‘you answered accurately’ and your oath thereupon supposed to mean?”

He said, “Yes I took an oath and I meant that he was accurate in giving the wrong answer.”

A point worth noting: was there any valid reason to practice Taqiyyah in this context? And was Abū Ḥanīfah a person of authority and governance that he was feared and owing to whose presence Taqiyyah had to be practiced? And was there any need to falsely praise him and take an oath thereupon and then dub him an enemy of the Ahl al-Bayt and invalidate his answer after his departure? Can there be any other explanation for this besides deceiving and lying without any valid reason. We exonerate Jaʿfar from this lie which is attributed to him and say that this is criticising and reviling Jaʿfar by those very people who claim to be his diehard supporters.

Furthermore, according to the Shīʿah the status of a person is ascertained by the amount of lies he speaks. So the more a person speaks lies the higher his status goes in the eyes of the Shīʿah. Therefore, we find that Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr lavishly praises Ḥusayn ibn Rūḥ and says and that he very adequately carried out the task of the Bābiyyah because:

كان مسلكه الالتزام بالتقية المضاعفة بنحو ملفت النظر بإظهار الإعتقاد بمذهب أهل السنة

His strategy was to exercise Taqiyyah abundantly in a way that he would give the impression that he is on the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

1 Rawḍah al-Kāfī 8/292.
2 Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā p. 411.
The following narration appears in the Ghaybah of al-Ṭūsī:

ʿAbd Allah ibn Ghālib mentions, “I did not see anyone more intelligent than Abū al-Qāsim al-Ḥusayn ibn Rūḥ. I recall that one day he was at the house of Ibn Yasār (he was a person who was well-respected; al-Sayyid and al-Muqtadir and the masses would also respect him) and I recall that two people were debating. One claimed that Abū Bakr was the most virtuous after Rasūl Allah H, then ʿUmar, and then ʿAlī. And the other claimed that ʿAlī was more virtuous than ʿUmar. The discussion ensued for quite a while between them till eventually Abū al-Qāsim said, “The stance that the Ṣaḥābah agreed upon is giving preference to Abū Bakr, then ʿUmar, then ʿUthmān, the bearer of two lights, and then ʿAlī, the successor of Rasūl Allah H. The scholars of ḥadīth also concur on the same. And this is the correct stance according to us as well. This left all the people in the gathering astounded. The commonality in the gathering were almost about to pick him up on their heads and people made lots of supplication in his favour and criticised those who cursed him of being a Shīʿī. So I felt the urge to laugh but I controlled myself and I put my sleeve in my mouth in order to prevent myself from laughing. I feared that I would become exposed and hence left the gathering. Al-Ḥusayn ibn Rūḥ saw me and understood what was happening.
When I subsequently reached home I heard a knock on the door. I immediately came out and it was Abū al-Qāsim al-Ḥusayn ibn Rūḥ mounted on his mule. He had come to visit me before going home.

He said to me, “O Abū ‘Abd Allah, may Allah aid you, why did you laugh and intend to give the impression that what I had said is not the truth according to you?”

I said to him, “The matter is the same according to me.”

He then said, “Fear Allah, O person! For I do not give you the permission to consider this statement too grave to be said by me.”

I replied, “O my master! If a person who considers himself the representative and companion of the Imām makes such statements, then it is not strange that someone laughs at him.”

He said to me, “By your life, if you do that again in the future I will not interact with you.”

He then bid me farewell and went away.²

Despite the length of this incident I cited it here to show how they deceive the Ahl al-Sunnah, how they say with their tongues that which is not in their hearts and how they laugh amongst themselves at how they outwardly agree with the Ahl al-Sunnah out of hypocrisy and lying. Sadly, the Shī‘ī mentality in our times still adheres to this hypocrisy.³

They have many more narrations of this nature. If it was not for the limitedness of time I would have presented them all and subsequently analysed them. This

---

1 To take an oath with anyone other than Allah is from the Sharī‘ah of the representative and the infallible Imām and his Bāb (door).
2 Al-Ghaybah p. 236-237.
3 Muhammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr: Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā p. 385. Therein he makes mention of this story approving it and praising the strategy.
topic requires an exclusive study which will expose the strategies of the Shīʿah and their ploys.¹

**Their Evidence for Taqiyyah:**

The Shīʿah have tried to substantiate their doctrine of Taqiyyah² with the verses of Sūrah Āl ʿImrān³ and Sūrah Naḥl,⁴ etc.⁵ But their substantiation from both these verses is incorrect, as has become clear from the exposition of their conception of Taqiyyah in the previous pages. Hence the scholars have, after understanding the reality of the Shīʿah, concluded that their Taqiyyah is nothing but lies and hypocrisy. This has already become clear to us from a text from the Shīʿī sources which was cited previously.

So as you have seen, the Taqiyyah of the Shīʿah is nothing but hypocrisy and lies. Despite that they consider it to be part of dīn, rather dīn itself. You have also realised that their situation is more akin to the hypocrites then it is to a coerced

---

¹ See some of these narrations in: Biḥār al-Anwār 75/402, onwards.
³ Verse no. 28.
⁴ Verse no. 106:

> من كَفَرَ بِاللهِ مِن بَعْدِ إِیَمَانِهِ إِلَّ مَنْ أُکْرِهَ وَقَلْبُهُ مُطْمَئِنٌّ بِالإِْیَمَانِ
> Whoever disbelieves in [i.e., denies] Allah after his belief...662 except for one who is forced [to renounce his religion] while his heart is secure in faith.
⁵ They try to prove their case by way of esoteric interpretations of the remaining verses. For example:

> فَإِذَا جَاءَ وَعْدُ رَبيِّ جَعَلَهُ دَکَّاءَ
> But when the promise of my Lord comes [i.e., approaches], He will make it level.

I.e. They were unable to penetrate it because of practicing Taqiyyah. And the verse:

> فَإِذَا جَاءَ نُذُرُ وَعُّدُّ رَبِّي جَعَلَهُ مُجَعَّلًا

But when the promise of my Lord comes [i.e., approaches], He will make it level.

They aver that Taqiyyah will be raised subsequent to which Allah will take revenge from his enemies. (See: Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 2/351; al-Burhān 2/486; Biḥār al-Anwār 5/168, etc.). There are many other verses as well. See: Fikrah al-Taqrīb p. 220-221.
person who is coerced to say the words of disbelief whilst his heart is content upon īmān.

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions the following regarding the difference between the Taqiyyyah of hypocrisy and the Taqiyyah of Islam:

Taqiyyah is not that I lie and say with my tongue that which is not in my heart; that is hypocrisy, but Taqiyyah is to do what I am capable of doing. Hence when a believer is amidst disbelievers and imposters, it is not his duty to combat them with his hand when being unable to do so. Rather it is his duty to combat them with his tongue, or else with his heart, but without lying and saying that which is not in his heart. That is he can either express his faith or conceal it, and when concealing it he will not agree with them completely in the practices of their faith. In essence, his condition should be akin to the condition of the believer of the family of Pharaoh who did not agree with them in every aspect of their creed, lie or say with his tongue that which was not in his heart. Rather he would conceal his faith. Therefore, concealing your faith is one thing and expressing a wrong faith is another. The latter was never permitted by Allah but for a person who is coerced, for it is permissible for him to utter the words of disbelief. Allah will excuse such a person but he will not excuse a liar and a hypocrite.

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/260.
Furthermore, a believer who has to desperately live among disbelievers and conceal his īmān will, due to the dictates of his īmān, deal with them with honesty, trustworthiness, well-wishing and goodness even though he does not agree with them in their faith. This was how Yūsuf istrāf lived amidst the people of Egypt as an advisor even though they were disbelievers, as opposed to a Shīṭī who is not willing to leave any stone unturned in causing harming to those who oppose him is his creed.¹

¹ Ibid.
Chapter Four

The Doctrine of the Mahdī and Occultation

In this chapter, with the help of Allah ﷺ, I will endeavour to discuss the doctrine of the Mahdī and his occultation according to the Shīʿah in general. Thereafter I will shed light upon the inception of this doctrine in the Twelver dogma specifically. Subsequent to that I will present an overall understanding of this doctrine according to them, the evidences they present in substantiation thereof, the arguments they present to defend the extended period of the occultation of their Mahdī, who is now in occultation for more than eleven centuries and a brief analyses thereof.

Thereafter I will make mention of the utopian state which the Shīʿah envisage will come into existence after the emergence of their Mahdī; a state based merely upon their imaginations which they have expressed in the form of narrations which they attribute to the Ahl al-Bayt in order to accord them sanctity and reverence in the sight of their followers. Hence I will present what they say regarding his Sharīʿah, his personal life and his army.

Subsequently, I will present what the Shīʿah believe regarding the period of occultation, the principles that they have invented for this period, the many rulings of Sharīʿah which they have rescinded because of this doctrine and the endeavour of their scholars to make up for the absence of their Mahdī by contriving the doctrine of the representation of the Mahdī.

I will thereafter end this discussion with a general analyses and critique of these doctrines.
The Doctrine of the Mahdī and the Occultation According to the Various Sects of the Shi’ah

The idea of believing in a hidden and absent Imām exists in majority of the belief structures of the various Shi’ī denominations. After the death of its Imām each of them believes that he did not die; each one asserts that he will live forever, he is in hiding and he will return to the people as the Mahdī in the future. These sects, in actual fact, only differ regarding the identity of the Mahdī whom they assume will return to the world, which is akin to the difference which they have regarding the personalities of the Imāms one among who is the Mahdī.

The Saba’iyyah (followers of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saba’) are considered to be the first people, as is asserted by al-Qummī, al-Nawbakhtī, al-Shahrastānī, and others; to believe in the re-emergence of ʿAlī and his occultation. They would claim thus:

إن عليا لم يقتل و لم يمت ول يقتل ول يموت حتي يسوق العرب بعصاه و يملأ الأرض عدلا و قسطا كما ملئت ظلما و جورا

ʿAlī has not been assassinated, nor has he died; and he will not be killed and he will not die till he drives the Arabs with his stick and fills the land with justice just as it was previously filled with injustice and oppression.

And when ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saba’ was informed of the demise of ʿAlī whilst he was in Madā’in he said:

كذبت لو جئتنا بدماغه في سبعين صرة، و أقمت علي قتله سبعين عدلا لعلمنا أنه لم يمت ولم يقتل ول يموت حتي يملك الأرض

You are lying. If you bring me his brains in seventy bags and you establish seventy upright people as attesters to his assassination we will still have

1 I.e. they did not claim the continuation of Imāmah after him.
3 Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq p. 19; Firaq al-Shi‘ah p. 22; Maqālāt al-Islāmīyyīn 1/86.
confidence that he has not passed away or been killed. And he will not die till he establishes dominion over the entire world.¹

The Saba’iyyah continued to anticipate the re-emergence of ‘Alī  from his hiding. Thereafter this doctrine spread from them to some of the sub-sects of the Kaysāniyyah like that of the Kurabiyyah². When Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah passed away they claimed the following regarding him:

لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

He is alive and has not passed on. He is currently in the Raḍwā Mountain between Makkah and Madīnah. On his right there is a lion and on his left there is a cheetah who are both appointed to safeguard him till the time of his re-emergence.³

---

1 *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* p. 23; *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 21.

2 Kurabiyyah: the followers of Abū Kurayb al-Ḍarīr (a brief analyses of the Kaysāniyyah has passed previously).

3 One of their poets has also said the following poem in this regard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ولاء الحق أربعة سواء</th>
<th>إلا إن الأئمة من قريش</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>هم الأسباط ليس بهم خفاء</td>
<td>عل و الثلاثة من بنه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وسط غياث إيان و صدره</td>
<td>فسط سبئ إيان و صدر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يقود الحبل يقدمها اللواء</td>
<td>وسط لا يذوق الموت حتي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يرضاي عنده عمل و ماء</td>
<td>تغيب لا يرى عنا زمانا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Behold the Imāms are from Quraysh, they are the guardians of the truth and are four.
‘Alī and three of his sons, they are his posterity without there being any ambiguity regarding them.
One son was a son of faith and truthfulness, and Karbalā’ made the second son disappear.
And the third son will not taste death, till he drives the horses who will be led by a flag.
He has disappeared from us and will be seen for a period of time, in Raḍwā where he has honey and water.

See: *Masā’il al-Imāmah* p. 26; *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1.92-93; *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 41. The books of heresiography contain the poems of other poets as well, see: *Masā’il al-Imāmah* p. 26, 27, 28, 29. Al-Baghdādī has composed a few poems in refutation of these. See: *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 41-43.
They would also claim that he was the awaited Mahdī;¹ they would assert regarding
him that he is gone into occultation for a period of seventy years in the mountain
of Raḍwā and will appear thereafter and establish a kingdom for them, and kill
the tyrants of the Banū Umayyah.² However, when seventy years passed and none
of their hopes materialised some of their poets endeavoured to make this belief
seem plausible to the followers and convince them to anticipate his return even if
the ‘Mahdī’ was gone into hiding for the duration of the age of Nūḥ.³

From here onwards the doctrine of the Mahdī, his occultation, and his re-
emergence became a salient belief of the other Shīʿī denominations as well. 
Hence after the demise of each Imām of the Ahl al-Bayt there would emerge a 
new sect from among his followers who would make this claim regarding him 
and anticipate his return. This is why we find that the Shīʿī sects have differed
tremendously as to the personality of the Imām who they terminate the line of
Imāmah on and whose return they anticipate. Hence al-Samʿānī says:

ثمن إنهم في انتظارهم الإمام الذي انتظروه مختلفون اختلافا يلوح عليه حمق بلغ

From the mammoth differences which the Shīʿah have regarding the 
anticipation of the Imām who they await, their outright dim-wittedness 
is completely clear.⁴

To the extent that even a sub-sect of the Zaydiyyah, i.e. the Jārudiyyah, were
influenced by the devious belief of awaiting the return of their Imām who passed

---

² Masāʾil al-Imāmah p. 27.
³ One of their poets says:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>منا النفس يأنه سؤوب</th>
<th>ولو غاب عنا عمر نوح أيقنت</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>قد كان يأمل بعوض يعقوب</td>
<td>إلى لارجوه وأمله كا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even if he stays away from us for the duration of the lifespan of Nūḥ, our hearts are determined to
believe that he will return.
I have hope in him and await him, just as Yaʾqūb anticipated Yūsuf.
Masāʾil al-Imāmah p. 29.
⁴ Al-Ansāb 1/345.
away. The adherents of this sub-sect then differ regarding the actual person whom they await, as is asserted by al-Ashʿarī, al-Baghdādī, al-Shahrastānī, and others. Therefore the claim of some like Aḥmad Amīn and the suggestion of some like Goldzhier that the Zaydiyyah refute this doctrine is not correct.

This is the backdrop of the doctrine of occultation according to the various sects of the Shīʿah. It was a doctrine which they held regarding known members of the Ahl al-Bayt who did actually exist in history and who lived their lives like all other people. But when they died the Shīʿah made these claims regarding them because they were not willing to accept their death and claimed that they went into hiding and will return after some time.

As for this doctrine based on its Twelver conception, it is different in the sense that it is linked to a fictitious person who did not exist at all according to the Shīʿah who lived and witnessed the era of its inception. According to them he is more like a figurative person who the people did not see and did not know, whose whereabouts they were not aware of due to him disappearing immediately after his birth. Even the birth itself was not witnessed by anyone and transpired in complete secrecy and inconspicuousness. In fact even the family of this person, its representatives, and the closest people thereof did not know of his conception and his birth. Therefore they all denied his existence. Added to that, the Shīʿah did not come to know of his existence but by way of people who claimed to be his representatives and have contact with him.

This figurative personality is the personality of the Mahdī according to them, and believing in him is one of the cornerstones of their dogma and the fundamental

---

1 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/141-142.
2 *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 31-32.
3 *Al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/158-159.
4 Nashwān: *al-Ḥūr al-ʿĪn* p. 156.
5 *Ḍuḥā al-Islām* 3/243.
6 *Al-ʿAqīdah wa al-Sharīʿah* p. 211.
doctrine of their faith. For after the demise of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, believing in the occultation of his alleged son became the basis of their beliefs and the foundation of their creedal assertions which keeps their doctrinal edifice from collapsing.

But how did this doctrine come about in the Twelver dogma? This will be investigated ahead.

The Inception of the Doctrine of Occultation according to the Twelvers and its Development

The Condition of the Shīʿah after the demise of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī

In order to discuss the inception of this doctrine it is first necessary to examine the condition of the Shīʿah after the demise of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī due to its very strong link with the inception thereof.

After the demise of Ḥasan (their eleventh Imām) in 260 A.H, he was not known to have left a successor or a son. Hence his inheritance was distributed and shared by his brother Jaʿfar and his mother, as is asserted by the books of the Shīʿah themselves.

This caused major consternation in the Shīʿah world and disunited them, because they were left without an Imām on whose existence their dogma is based; due to him being the evidence of Allah upon the land according to them. To the extent that not even the Qurʾān is evidence unless it is coupled with the Imām, as has passed already, and upon him is based the existence of the world. For, as it appears in a narration, if the world is left without an Imām it will sink. Furthermore, he is a source of security for the people. Hence if the Imām is taken from this world it will sway with its inhabitants just as the ocean sways with

1 Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq p. 102; Firaq al-Shīʿah p. 96: therein it is mentioned that no successor of his was seen.
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/188.
3 Ibid. 1/179.
those who travel upon it. However, the Imām dies without issue and the earth is deprived of an Imām but none of these catastrophes transpired. The Shīʿah were thus gripped with confusion and they disputed greatly in the greatest and most crucial principle of their dogma, i.e. the appointment of an Imām. The Shīʿah thus further diversified either into fourteen sects, as is asserted by al-Nawbakhtī, or fifteen sects, as is asserted by al-Qummi, notwithstanding that both these scholars were Twelvers and were from amongst those who witnessed the divergence of the various sects due to them both being from the third century. Hence their input with regards to what had actually transpired after the demise of Ḥasan is invaluable.

Subsequent to their era, the difference increased. Hence al-Masʿūdī, a Shīʿī who died in 346 A.H, mentions what reached him regarding the division which transpired after the demise of Ḥasan and states that the divergent sects had reached twenty. You can well imagine what happened after his time.

These sects all assumed different positions regarding Imāmah, some said that:

إن الحسن بن علي حي لم يمت، و إنما غاب وهو القائم ، ول يجوز أن يموت ول ولد له ظاهر، لأن الأرض لا تخلو من إمام

Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī is alive, he did not pass away, he has just disappeared and he is the Mahdī. For it is not possible for him to pass away without leaving a known son, for the earth can never be void of an Imām.

So this sect stopped at Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī and claimed that he is the Mahdī, as was the wont of the Shīʿah after the demise of each individual whom they take as their Imām.

---

1 Ibid.
3 Al-Maqālāt wa al-Fīraq p. 102.
4 Murūj al-Dhaha 4/190. See also: al-Ṣawāʾiq al-Muḥriqah p. 168
5 According to me the emergence of new sects only stopped after al-Samarrī allegedly claimed to be the representative of the Mahdī, as will come ahead, and devised the idea of Bābiyyah
6 Fīraq al-Shīʿah p. 96; Al-Maqālāt wa al-Fīraq p. 106.
Yet another sect was inclined to his death but claimed that he came back to life after his death, however, due to being in occultation he will only re-emerge at a later stage.\(^1\) Whilst we find another sect averring that Imāmah had shifted from him to his brother Jaʿfar\(^2\) and still another sect opining that his Imāmah was invalid due to him dying without issue.\(^3\)

As for the Twelvers, they opined that Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī had a son whose birth and affairs he had kept a secret due to difficult times and the ruler of the time being in search of him. As a result, his son did not come to the fore during his lifetime nor did majority of the people come to know about him after his demise.\(^4\)

Converse to all of these views was another view which suggested the following:

The demise of Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī and his forefathers is a confirmed fact which is established by way of incontrovertible reports, the testimony of hordes of people who have testified to their deaths and the unanimity of friends and foe in this regard. Hence there is no room for any doubt in this regard whatsoever. Likewise by way of similar evidences it is established that he did not have a son. When both these aspects are well established, it is obvious that there is no Imām to come after Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī and that Imāmah has reached its end. Hence, just as Nubuwwah terminated after the demise of Muḥammad, so is it possible for Imāmah to end. Because nubuwwah is higher in ranking, it is more indispensable for the creation than Imāmah, the evidence of Allah through its medium is more

\(^1\) Fīraqq al-Shīʿah p. 97; Al-Maqālāt wa al-Fīraqq p. 107.
\(^2\) Al-Maqālāt wa al-Fīraqq p. 110.
\(^3\) Al-Maqālāt wa al-Fīraqq p. 109; Fīraqq al-Shīʿah 100-101.
\(^4\) Al-Irshād p. 389.
complete and the excuses for disbelief much more minimal; also keeping in mind that with Nubuwwah came along clear-cut evidences and awe-inspiring personalities, but it still came to an end. Likewise it is possible for Imāmah to come to an end.¹

This is how their views differed and their standpoints diversified and they split into groups and sects, each sect happy with what it believed. The confusion at that time was so overwhelming that some actually chose neutrality:

نحن لا ندري ما نقول في ذلك وقد اشتبه عليه الأمر

We do not know what to say in this regard for the issue has become convoluted upon us.²

This was a broad outline of the differences that occurred after the demise of Ḥasan among the Shīʿah.

**Impetuses for believing in occultation**

Perhaps the reader will be appalled at the adamancy of believing in the Imāmah of a specific individual of the Ahl al-Bayt to the extent of denying the death of the one who died, claiming his life after his demise, or imaginatively contriving a son for a person who had no children. Very few among them reverted to guidance after the obscurities crystallised after the demise of the Imām without issue, abandoned their fanaticism and ‘partisanship’, and became of the opinion that Imāmah had reached its culmination and continued with life. Probably it was this batch of people who were really the sincere partisans of the Ahl al-Bayt all along, but when the issue became clear and the obscurities were revealed they stepped back.

The most crucial reason for this adamancy becomes clear from the disputes of these sects in order that each sect supports its viewpoint and succeeds with the

largest followership (for every sect would lay claim to a ‘Mahdi’ and would refute the claims of the others) and amidst all of this the reality leaks out so that we may come to know of it. For example, we come to know of what the Twelvers (who believe in the termination of Imāmah upon the alleged son of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī) say in exposing the reality of the claim of another sect which believed in the occultation and termination of Imāmah upon Mūsā al-Kāẓim. The Twelvers says:

مات أبو إبراهیم (موسي الكاظم) وليس من قوامه أحد إلا وعنده المال الكثیر. وکان ذلك سبب وقفهم وجحدهم موته طمعا في الأموال. کان عند زیاد بن مروان القندي سبعون ألف دینار وعند علي بن أبي حمزة ثلاثون ألف دینار.

The father of Ibrāhīm (Mūsā al-Kāẓim) passed away and there was none among his representatives but that he possessed a huge sum of money. Hence the reason why they stopped at him and denied his death was due to their greed for wealth; Ziyād ibn Marwān al-Qandī had seventy thousand Dirhams and ʿAlī ibn Abī Ḥamzah had thirty thousand Dirhams.¹

There are many similar narrations which feature in their books in this regard which divulge the reality of the matter.² Hence the underlying reason for the claim of the occultation of the Imām and the anticipation of his return was the greed of wealth. There were always groups of people who benefitted tremendously from their deceiving claims of ‘partisanship for the Ahl al-Bayt’ by entrapping the laity and amass their wealth with the pretence of being the representatives of the Imāms. And when the Imām would pass away they would deny his death so that the money that they amassed would remain in their possession and so that they may continue to amass wealth with the pretence of Khums (one fifth) for the hidden Imām. In this way did the proceedings of usurpation and larceny come to being. Unfortunately it is the laity and the riffraff who are the victims, who give their wealth to those whom they assume are the representatives of the Imām in the Islāmic countries, to people who have found this easy amassment

² See: the aforementioned reference p. 43, onwards; Rijāl al-Kashšī: Narrations no. 759, 871, 888, 893.
of booty very plausible. Hence they continue to kindle in the hearts ‘love for the Ahl al-Bayt’ and deep resentment for the ‘oppression’ that they suffered from by continuously talking about the tribulations of the Ahl al-Bayt and claiming their rights. All of this with the intention of disuniting the Ummah and amassing wealth in order to nourish their clandestine movements and organisations which are working toward the destruction of the Muslim empire.

Another reason perhaps for believing in a ‘Mahdí’ and his occultation was the desire of the Shī‘ah to establish an independent political system different to that of the Islamic empire. This is what we can gather from the importance they lend to the doctrine of Imāmah. But when their aspirations remained unfulfilled and they were overpowered, dominated, and debased they endeavoured to run away from reality and resort to dreams and false hopes, more of a psychological escape for themselves from frustration and for their followers from despondency. Hence they started to evoke hope in the hearts of their followers assuring them that the end result will be in their favour. Therefore, believing in a ‘Mahdí’ and his occultation provides enough of impetus for his false propagators to contend with the overwhelming causes of despondency and the loss of morale, the monetary benefits that come along notwithstanding.

Similarly, Shī‘ism has always been the convenient abode for people of variant religions and denominations. For in it they find the suitable milieu wherein they can accomplish their goals and find basis for their devious beliefs. Hence different types of people, holding extreme views and beliefs, joined the caravan of Shī‘ism. This amalgam of people then slowly drove the ‘Shī‘ah’ back to their devious inherited beliefs, especially after the Shī‘ah had separated themselves from the core beliefs of the Ummah and its unanimity.

Therefore, it can safely be said that the belief in the ‘Mahdí’ and his occultation, based on its Shī‘ī conception, has its roots in other religions and devious sects due to which it is not difficult to assert that the adherents of these religions played a pivotal role in entrenching this belief in the hearts and minds of the Shī‘ah.
Hence some of the Orientalists are of the opinion that this doctrine has its roots in Judaism, because the Jews believe that Elijah was raised to the heavens and he will return at the end of time. He is thus fit to be an exemplar for the Imāms of the Shīʿah who are in hiding.¹

However, according to me this is insufficient to show Judaic origins, because in Islam ʿĪsā (Jesus) was raised to the heavens and he will return at the end of time. So this ideology that they have presented is not foreign to the principles of Islam, but because the Orientalists do not believe in the idea of a Mahdī they have made this assertion. The Judaic influences on the Shīʿī dogma, however, can be noted in many other ways, one being that the idea of occultation was founded by Ibn Saba’ who was a Jewish rabbi.

Likewise, one of the Shīʿī poets has averred that the doctrine of the Mahdī is sourced from the narrations and tales of Kaʿb al-Aḥbār who was a Jew prior to Islam. This is emphatically clear in the poem of Kathīr ʿIzzah, a poet of the Kaysāniyyah, which he said regarding Ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah:

هو المهدي خبرناه كعب أخو الأحبار في الحقب الخوالي

He is the Mahdī, of that Kaʿb informed us, who was the friend of the Rabbis in the time that has passed.²

And Van Vloten says, “As for us, the people of the west, the doctrine of the awaited Mahdī has attracted the attention of especially the Orientalists amongst us.”³

He then goes on to establish a link between this doctrine and the Israelite narrations and eventually concludes that it is originally from Judaism and Christianity. He avers this because it falls under the realm of prophecies regarding certain

---

¹ Goldzhier: Al-ʿAqīdah wa al-Sharīʿah p. 192.
² Dīwān Kathīr ʿIzzah 1/275.
³ Al-Siyādah al-ʿArabiyyah wa al-Isrāʾiliyyāt p. 110.
individuals and specific events. And these types of prophecies are abundantly found in the books of the Israelites and were not commonly known among the Arabs initially, but it reached them through the medium of the Jews and the Christians who accepted Islam.¹

It is obvious that this link that he creates between this doctrine and Judaism and Christianity merely because it falls under the realm of prophesising regarding aspects of the unseen, which was unknown to the Arabs as he alleges, is a very weak link. Simply because one of the miracles of the Arabian Hashimī prophet of Islam Ṣaʿīd ibn ʿAbd al-Muḥammad was foretelling some of the events of the unseen. However, these people try to resolve these issues based on their disbelieving mentality and their negative viewpoint regarding the prophethood of Muḥammad ⁲

My preference in this regard is that the Twelver doctrine of the Mahdī and his occultation originated from Zoroastrians because most of the Shīʿah were from Persia and one of the prevalent religions of Persia back then was Zoroastrianism. And the Zoroastrians claim that they have an awaited leader who is alive and will be rightly guided, he is from the children of Bishtasif the son of Bahrasif and his is known as Abshāwathan. He is in a very big fort which is somewhere between Khorasan and China.²

This is in accordance with the very core of the Twelver dogma.

The Founder of the Doctrine of Occultation According to the Twelvers:

If Ibn Saba’ was the founder of the doctrine of Naṣṣ, emphatic nomination, regarding ʿAlī, as is documented in the heresiography books of the Shīʿah and the others, there was another Ibn Saba’ who contrived the substitute for the doctrine of Imāmah after it had effectively ended with the termination of the posterity of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, or he was one among those who contrived this substitute,

---
¹ Ibid. 112.
² Tathbīt Dalāʿil al-Nubuwwah 1/179.
but surely a key role player in its invention. This person was known as ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd al-ʿAmrī.¹ He played his role very secretively, for he was a businessman who dealt in butter in order to keep the conspiracy a secret. He would collect the monies which were collected from the followers with the pretext of Khums and the right of the Ahl al-Bayt and place them in bags and skins of butter exercising precaution and due to fear.² In his claims he alleged that Ḥasan had a son who went into hiding at the age of four³ and that no one could meet him besides him due to him being the representative between him and the Shīʿah; his duty was to collect their wealth, and take details of their queries and problems and present them to the Imām.

What is astonishing is that the Shīʿah claim that they do not accept the edicts of anyone besides the infallible Imām, to the extent that they are willing to abandon the consensus of the Ummah if the infallible Imām is not part of it. But here in one of its most crucial beliefs it embraces the claims of a fallible individual, notwithstanding that they were other people also who made similar claims as him, each one claimed that he is the Bāb (door) to the hidden Imām and the bickering that ensued because of that was outrageous. Each one of them would produce an endorsed letter which he claimed was the letter of the awaited hidden Imām which entailed the refutation of the other claimants and curses upon them. Al-Ṭūsī has made mention of their names under the chapter ‘mention of the impugned who claimed to be the Bāb may Allah curse them’.⁴

---

¹ Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb is of the opinion that the person who invented the idea of occultation was Muḥammad ibn Naṣīr, one of the clients of Banū Namīr (al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah p. 37). In the books of the Twelvers it appears that he was the one who claimed to be the Bāb (the door) to the absent Imām. Prior to him a person known as al-Sharīʿī made a similar claim and many others followed him in making similar claims. (See: al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah p. 244.


³ Al-Ghaybah p. 258. They have differed greatly as to the age wherein he went into occultation due to their disparate narrations in this regard, as will come shortly. Al-Majlisī says: Most of the narrations suggest that he was a less than five years old by a few months or by a year and a few months (Biḥār al-Anwār 25/123).

⁴ Al-Ghaybah p. 244.
And as the books of the Shīʿah record, ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd had representatives in most of the Muslim metropolises who would claim the Imāmah of this fictitious Mahdī and allege that ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd was the Bāb to him. Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī has listed these representatives, the most exhaustive list of them according to Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr.1 Besides these representatives there were others as well who were not approved of by ʿUthmān and his comrades, mention of seven of whom al-Ṭūsī has made under the title, ‘mention of the impugned among the representatives of the Imāms’.2

The difference, according to them, between the Bāb and the representative is that the Bāb meets with the hidden Imām and the representative meets with the Bāb and does not have any access to the Imām. He merely serves as a link between the Shīʿah and the Bāb.3

After the demise ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd, the first reliable Bāb according to the Twelvers, his son Muḥammad was appointed. However some people were not happy with his appointment owing to which disputes and mutual imprecation ensued.

Hence when one of the opponents who was known as Aḥmad ibn Hilāl al-Karkhī was asked:

"Do you not accept the appointment of Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān and resort to him whereas he was emphatically appointed by the Imām whose obedience is mandatory."4

---

1 Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā p. 60.
2 Al-Ghaybah p. 213-214.
3 Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā p. 609.
4 They are referring to the hidden Imām. Because they consider what the first Bāb said to be the edict of the Imām due to him being the Bāb to him and his only vicegerent. Hence his appointment of his son was treated as holy and from the Imām the denier of which deserves to be cursed.
He said, “I did not hear him emphatically appointing him to the station of representation. I do not deny the station of his father, but I will not take the courage of asserting that Abū Jaʿfar is the representative1 of the man of the time.”

They retorted, “But others besides you heard it.”

To which he responded by saying, “I leave you to what you heard...”

Hence they eventually cursed him and disowned him.2

Some of their documents reveal the reason for this dispute. Al-Ṭūsī, for example narrates from a person by the name Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn Bilāl who refused to accept the Bāb status of Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān al-ʿAmrī because of which the famous dispute ensued between the two of them, as he alleges. The underlying reason was that the former hoarded the wealth that he had of the Imām and refused to hand it over and claimed that he was the representative till eventually the people disowned him and cursed him.3

So as you can see, he was ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd’s partner in the representation, but when ʿUthmān died he took the wealth for himself. These disputes and quarrels regarding being a Bāb and being a representative were due to amassing wealth. For if there really was an absent Imām who was controlling the affairs of his followers through the intermediary of the Bābs all this wealth would not have ended up in the possession of this cunning person, and he would not have been the confidant of the Imām, the man of the time, due to him having knowledge of the past and the future. Why did the Imām not issue a warning against this person from the very beginning in order not to allow him to collect the wealth of the people? The reality is that there was no Imām, rather there were groups of

---

1 It should be noted that the narration calls him a Wakīl, a representative, whereas the Twelvers call him the Bāb and they differentiate between the Wakīl and the Bāb.

2 Al-Ghaybah p. 245.

3 Ibid.
people who were falsely devouring the wealth of the people under the pretext of Shīʿism and Islam, and were quarrelling because of the wealth as well.

Thereafter, in the year 304 A.H/305 A.H Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd died after having presided over the position of the Bāb for approximately fifty years wherein the people would bring their wealth to him and he would produce fully approved letters with the handwriting with which these letters would appear during the lifetime of Hasan. In these letters was contained the important affairs of dīn and this world and eerie answers to the questions people would come with.⁴

After him a person by the name Abū al-Qāsim Ḥusayn ibn Rawḥ presided over this position. Towards the latter part of the life Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān, according to their narrations, he would carry out the responsibilities of the Bāb due to being entrusted by him to collect the wealth of the followers. Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Aswad says:

I would take the monies which would accumulate at Bāb al-Waqf to Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān al-ʿAmrī and he would collect them from me. At one occasion I took some monies to him toward the end of his life, about two to three years before his demise, and he told me to hand them over to Abū al-Qāsim al-Rawḥī. At times I would ask him to give me receipts, of which he complained to Abū Jaʿfar (Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān) who told me not to ask him for any receipts and said, “Anything that reaches Abū al-Qāsim reaches me.” Hence I would take those monies to him and I would not ask him for receipts.⁴

---

1 Al-Ghaybah p. 223; Rijāl al-Ḥillī p. 149.
2 Al-Ghaybah p. 223; Rijāl al-Ḥillī p. 149.
3 Al-Ghaybah p. 223.
And when one of them hesitated in submitting his wealth to Abū al-Qāsim ibn Rawḥ, Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān al-ʿAmrī became angry with him and the following ensued:

 ولم لم تمتثل ما قلته لك

Why did you not comply with what I told you?

The man fearing that he would produce and endorsed letter with an order to curse him and disown him, tried to pacify him and speak to him leniently saying:

لم أجسر علي ما رسمته لي

I did not have the courage to do what you prescribed for me.

However he answered him angrily saying:

قم كما أقول لك. فلم يكن عند غير المبادرة. فصرت إلي أبي القاسم بن روح وهو في دار ضيقة فعرفته ما جري فسر به وشكر الله عزوجل ودفعت إلیه الدنانیر وما زلت أحمل إلیه ما یحصل في یدي بعد ذلك من الدنانیر

“Go and do as I tell you to do.”

The man says:

I had no other option but to comply immediately. Hence I went to Abū al-Qāsim ibn Rawḥ who was at that time seated in a very small house and told him what had happened. He was delighted and thanked Allah. I gave him the Dinars and thereafter continuously submitted all the Dinars that came into my possession.¹

You can see the sanctity, infallibility, and the compulsory compliance that the Shīʿah accord to their symbols and signs, so much that a person who does not comply is cursed and disowned.

¹ Al-Ghaybah p. 224.
Likewise, you will have noticed that the prevalent language in the endorsed letters which they attribute to the Mahdī, and which were conveyed via the communication of the Bābs and the representatives, was that of money.

The reason why Abū al-Qāsim was chosen is that he preserved the secret of the whereabouts of the Mahdī very well. This was because the election of a Bāb materialised at the hands of the Shī‘ī offices after having fulfilled specific requirements. The most important of which was probably being able to keep the secret and not let it come to the fore. This is understood from a narration which al-Ṭūsī cites in his al-Ghaybah, it reads as follows:

إن سهلا النوبختي سئل فقيل له: كيف صار هذا الأمر إلى الشيخ أبي الفاسم الحسين بن روح دونك؟ قال: هم أعلم وما اختاروها ولكن أنا رجل ألفي الخصوم وأناظرهم ولو علمت مكانه كما علم أبو القاسم وضغطتني الحجة علي مكانه كنت أدل علي مكانه. وأبو القاسم فلو كانت الحجة تحت ذيله وقرض بالمقاريب ما كشف الذيل عنه.

Sahl al-Nawbakhṭī was asked, “How did Abū al-Qāsim ibn Rawḥ become the incumbent of this position and not you?”

He said, “They know better whom they have chosen. I am, however, a person who meets with the opponents and debates with them. And if I knew the exact place of the Mahdī just as Abū al-Qāsim knows and if in a debate I would be pressurised to furnish evidence regarding his whereabouts I would direct the people to his place. As for Abū al-Qāsim, even if the Ḥujjah (the Mahdī) was right beneath his garb he would not expose him even though he be cut into pieces with scissors."

Despite all of this, the election of Abū al-Qāsim ibn Rawḥ gave rise to much controversy among the secretive movements of the Shī‘ah. As a result, many of their leaders defected and claimed to be the Bābs for themselves subsequent to which mutual imprecation ensued.

---

1 Note that he ascribed the election of the Bāb to the scholars of the Shī‘ah whereas according to them that is purely the purview of the Mahdī.

2 Al-Ghaybah p. 240.
Some among them eventually gave away the secret of what the reality of being a Bāb actually was due to not succeeding with a very good followership. Among them was Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Shalmaghānī who was killed in 323 A.H, he was one of those who claimed to be the vicegerent of the Mahdī of the Shī’ah and vied with Abū al-Hasan in that regard. He exposes them by saying:

ما دخلنا مع أبي القاسم الروح إلا ونحن نعلم فيما دخلنا فيه. لقد كنا نتهارش علي هذا الأمر كما تهارش الكلاب علي الجيف

We did not enter this affair with Abū al-Qāsim but after fully knowing what we were getting ourselves into. We would quarrel over this matter just as dogs quarrel over carrion.²

Commenting on this narration Aḥmad al-Kisrawī al-Īrānī (a Shī’ī formally) says:

لقد صدق فيما قال فإن التخاصم لم يكن إلا لأجل الأموال. كان الرجل يجمع المال ويطمع فيه فديعي البابية لكيلا يسلمه لآخر

He has uttered the truth in what he has said, for their dispute was really only over money. A person would gather wealth and would have greed for it due to which he would claim being the Bāb so that he would not have to hand it over to someone else.³

Moving on, Ibn Rawḥ died in the year 326 A.H, and the station of the Bāb, due to his bequest, moved on to a fourth person who goes by the name Abū al-Hasan ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Samarrī.⁴ He had assumed the position after seventy years had already lapsed since the occultation of the Mahdī and the anticipation of the Shī’ah had been of no avail thus far, despite their eagerness for his emergence.

---

1 For more details regarding him see: al-Ghaybah p. 248; al-Bidāyah wa Al-Nihāyah 11/179; al-Kāmil 8/290.
2 Al-Ghaybah p. 241.
3 Al-Tashayyuʿ wa al-Shīʿah p. 33.
4 Al-Ghaybah p. 244
The promises of the Shīʿah regarding the emergence of the Mahdī did not materialise due to which doubt started to engulf the Shīʿī circles and reality gradually began coming to the fore after a very virulent dispute ensued between the Bāb claimants. Hence the vibrancy of the last Bāb came to a complete stop, which is why you will not find any endorsed letters, which they attributed to the Mahdī, attributed to his time as you would find them attributed to his predecessors before him. One of the Shīʿī scholars has acknowledged this, even though by evadingly averring that it was due to the immense pressure that was on the Shīʿah at that time.¹

Al-Samarrī presided over this artificial position for three years² and probably he was gripped by compunction and realised the trivialness of his post as the vicegerent of the hidden Imām.³ Hence when he was asked upon his death bed as to who would be his successor after him he said:

لله أمر هو بالغه

Allah has a plan in place which he is to complete.⁴

In this manner did the claims of direct communication with the Imām end. Because the false letters and documents came to the fore due to there being intense competition around them.

As a result, the idea of occultation reached a dead end due to the idea of the Bāb not being successful. But the scholars of the Shīʿah, nevertheless, produced an endorsed letter ascribing it to the Mahdī via the medium of al-Samarrī stating that direct contact with the Imām has reached its end and it will now be replaced with general representation which will be for the scholars of the Shīʿah in general, as will come ahead.

---

1 Muhammad Bāqir al-Sadr: Ṭārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā p. 414
4 Al-Ghaybah p. 242.
Hence after this change, the idea of the occultation of the Mahdī was rescued, the disputes around the position of the Bāb were diffused, the wealth was distributed among all involved equally and the idea of general representation was established which we will discuss in depth after having dealt with the doctrine of the Mahdī.

These four Bābs: ʿUthmān ibn Saīd, Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān, Ibn Rawḥ, and al-Samarrī are the founding fathers of the doctrine of the Mahdī and his occultation. Or in other words, they played a pivotal role in contriving the doctrine of the Mahdī based on its ShīĪ conception. The period wherein they presided over the artificial position of the Bāb is known as al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā, the minor occultation which remained for a period of seventy years or more.¹

Ahead we will have a look at the doctrine of the Mahdī and his occultation as it appears in the books of the Twelvers and we will delve into some of its discussion because today it has become the cornerstone of the ShīĪ dogma.

A Broad Overview of the Story of the Mahdī According to the Twelvers

The story of the Mahdī which appears in the books of the Shīāh is indeed a very strange one. The threads thereof are woven by imagination which reaches its wildest limits in sketching the related events. The story has thus transformed into one of the greatest fictitious stories for which there is no room of acceptance according to reason or sound human disposition. No wonder it was rejected by majority of the ShīĪ sects which witnessed its inception.² Hereunder I shall present

---

¹ One of their scholars and their Āyats Jaʿfar al-Najafī says that the Ghaybah Ṣughrā lasted for about seventy four years (see: Kashf al-Ghiṭā’ p. 13). However, it seems as if this time frame is not unanimously accepted among them. In Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl of al-Māmaqānī it is debated. He says, “The seventy four years that is said to be the period of the occultation is an oversight without a doubt, unless it is considered from the time of birth (i.e. the birth of the Mahdī).” He then says that it lasted for sixty eight or sixty nine years minus a month. (Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl 1/189). Al-Sadr on the other hand mentions that it was seventy years (see: Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā p. 345).

a broad overview of the incident, starting from Ḥasan choosing the mother of the Mahdī, to his birth, his occultation, his return, and finally his personal conduct.

As for the meeting of Ḥasan with the mother of the Mahdī, the books of the Shīʿah have sketched its events in a manner that resembles the love tale of a thousand nights. For the choosing of Hasan of the concubine, to who they attribute the son, materialised, based on the Shīʿī reports, by way of having access to the knowledge of the unseen. The details go as follows:

Ḥasan sends his slave to the bazaar where concubines are being sold, he gives him the details of the required concubine, her clothing, the conversation she will strike when purchasing her, and what will happen when bidding for her. He sends with him a letter in the Roman language, of which he informs him that when she will see it she will cry profusely and rub her body with it. Then when the slave goes and is astonished at all the happenings, she discloses her identity and tells him that she is Malīkah, the daughter of Yūshaʿ ibn Qayṣar—the king of Rome. She goes on to tell him her entire life story and of the difficulties that she had to encounter before her marriage and the proposal to it. She tells him that in a dream she saw that Rasūl Allah came to propose for her to ʿĪsā and said to him, “O the mercy of Allah! I have come to you to propose for the daughter of your apostle Shamʿūn, Malīkah, for this son of mine,” indicating with his hands toward the father of Muḥammad (i.e. Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī). She continues to see such visions till one day the mother of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī visits her and with her comes along Maryam, the daughter of ʿImrān, and a thousand maidens from the maidens of Jannah. Maryam says to her, “This is the queen of the women of Jannah, the mother of your husband Abū Muḥammad. The mother of the Mahdī thus clings to her crying and complaining of the resistance of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī from visiting her. And the mother of Ḥasan tells her, “My son, Muḥammad, cannot visit you whilst you ascribe partners to Allah.” The story continues till eventually she accepts Islam due to the effects of these dreams and thus subsequently Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī starts to visit her in her dreams. She then goes on to tell the slave of 1 Abū Muḥammad does not visit her because of her disbelief, but the queen of the women, Maryam, and the maidens of Jannah visit her in this state.
how she was imprisoned by the Muslims, why she had chosen the name Narjis in order to conceal her identity and how she had exhorted her master not to sell her to anyone besides the one whom she is pleased with (the person who came with a full description of who she was regarding whom she was informed in her dreams). She then meets with Ḥasan and does not experience any strangeness when meeting him due to previously knowing him and communicating with him in her dreams. He subsequently gives her the glad tidings of a child who will in the future rule the world from the east to the west and who will fill the land with justice and fairness.¹

As for her conception with the Mahdī, it is even more astonishing and weird. This is due to the fact that there were no signs of pregnancy whatsoever despite Ḥakīmah bint Muḥammad,² as they allege, trying to confirm her pregnancy; She jumps toward her, as their narrations allege, and turned her from front to back but could not discern any signs of pregnancy. She returns to Ḥasan and informs him, but he assures her that conception has taken place and tells her, “When Fajr time comes the child will be born.”³ What is even more astonishing is that the mother of the child herself did not know of her conception till the night of delivery, to the extent that she said to Ḥakīmah, “O my mistress! I do not see any signs of this in me.”⁴

Apparently, denying any signs of pregnancy upon her was a ploy or an endeavour to avoid a fact confirmed even according to the Shīʿah regarding Jaʿfar (the brother of Hasan al-ʿAskarī) confining all the wives and concubines of Ḥasan (after his demise) in order to ascertain whether their wombs were occupied or not. Consequently, it became evident to the judge and the ruler that their wombs were empty which led to the distribution of the inheritance of Ḥasan.⁵

¹ See: Ibn Bābawayh: Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 395-400: Chapter regarding what had been narrated regarding the Narjis the mother of the Mahdī.
² Ḥakīmah bint Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq.
³ Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 404.
⁴ Ibid. p. 404.
⁵ Al-Ghaybah p. 74.
Astonishingly, the very narration which denies the signs of pregnancy being visible even to the mother of the child contradicts itself and towards the end states that the child was speaking in the womb of his mother. Ḥakīmah says:

فأجابني الجنين من بطنها يقرأ مثل ما أقرأ سلم علي

The child responded to me from her womb by reading whatever I was reading and greeting me.¹

Likewise, al-Ṭūsī narrates from Ḥakīmah herself that when Ḥasan called her to his house to oversee the birth of the Mahdī from his concubine she said:

جعلت فداك يا سيدي الخلف ممن هو؟ قال: من سوسن- تقول- فأدرت نظري فيهن فلم أر جارية عليها

أثر غير سوسن ...

“May I be sacrificed for you, O my master! Your deputy, from who is he?”

He said, “From Sawsan.”

She further says, “I had a brief look at all the concubines and I found that none had any signs of pregnancy besides Sawsan.”²

So according to this narration she could easily discern the signs of pregnancy, but in the narration of Ibn Bābawayh she tilted her from front to back but still could not see any signs. Likewise in this narration her name is Sawsan whereas in the previous narration her name was Narjis. And in other narrations she is recorded with other names.³ Each one adds his own details to the narration and the books of the Twelvers encompass all the various narrations.

Nonetheless, when he was born the following ensued:

---

1 Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 404.
2 Al-Ghaybah p. 141.
3 For example: Rayḥānah and Ṣaqīl (see: Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 408).
He fell from the belly of his mother straight on his knees, raising both his index fingers to the heaven. He then sneezed and said, “All praise is due to Allah, the Lord of the universes, may his peace be upon Muḥammad and his household. The oppressors claim that the evidence of Allah has been defeated, if we were given the permission to speak all doubts would have vanished.”

In another narration it appears that he fell into prostration before Allah reciting the Tashahhud and praying thus:

اللهم أنجز لي ما وعدتي

O Allah fulfil the promise you have made to me.

He is then taken to the heavens with the conveyance of green birds, and when his mother Narjis cries out of fear over him Ḥasan placates her by saying:

سيعاد إليك كما رد موسى إلى أمه

He will be returned to you just as Mūsā was returned to his mother.

As for his development, it was completely against the principles of Allah in his creation, it violated all the rules of nature through which every living organism grows and reaches it culmination. This is easily understood from the narration narrated by Ḥakīmah in this regard, she says:

لما كان بعد أربعين يوما دخلت علي أبي محمد علیه السلام فإذا مولنا الصاحب يمشي في الدار فلم أر وجه أحسن من وجهه ولا لغة أفصح من لغته. فقال أبو محمد عليه السلام: هذا المولود الكريم علي الله

---

1 Ibid. p. 406; see also: al-Ghaybah p. 147.
2 Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 404-405.
3 Ibid. p. 405.
When forty days had passed since his birth I went to visit Abū Muḥammad and behold! I saw our master walking around the house. I did not see a face more beautiful than his, nor did I hear language more eloquent than his.

Abū Muḥammad told me, “This child is very dear to Allah.”

I thus asked him, “O my master! I am seeing what I see of him and he is only forty days old.”

He smiled and said, “O my aunt. Don’t you know that we the Imāms grow as much in a day as others besides us grow in a year?”

And the narration of al-Qummī mentions:

A child from amongst us is such that when a month passes upon him he, in his development, is like the one who a year passes upon. A child from amongst us speaks in the womb of his mother, reads the Qur’ān, worships Allah in his infancy, and the angels obey him and descend upon him morning and evening.

Surprising indeed! This child who came with a host of all these extraordinary phenomena is not known to anyone nor is there any trace of his whereabouts. What then was the benefit of all these miracles?

1 Al-Ghaybah p. 144.
2 This is what appears in the manuscript. Maybe it ought to be ‘feed him’.
3 Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 144.
Shortly thereafter he disappeared and no one knew of his affair and his occultation besides Ḥakīmah who, as the narration allegedly claims, said that Ḥasan ordered her not to divulge the matter of this child until she sees the dispute of his followers after his demise. He is reported to have ordered thusly:

فإذا غيب الله شخصي وتوفاني ورأيت شیعتي قد اختلفوا فأخبري الثقات منهم فأن ولي الله یغیبه الله عن خلقه ویحجبه عن عباده فلا یراه أحد حتي یقدم له جبریل علیه السلام فرسه لیقضی الله أمرا کان مفعولا

When Allah makes my body disappear and gives me death and you see my followers quarrelling, then tell the reliable among them (regarding the Mahdī). For verily Allah makes his friend disappear from his creation and obstructs them from him so that no one is able to see him till Jibrīl will present his horse to him so that Allah may fulfil a matter which is bound to happen.¹

Hence the issue of the Mahdī and his occultation leaked out to the Shīʿah through the medium of Ḥakīmah, as the narration of al-Ṭūsī suggests. I do not know how the Shīʿah so readily accept the narration of a lone fallible woman regarding the very core belief of their faith, whereas they are at times willing to part with the unanimity of the Ummah if an infallible Imām is not part of it, even though it be pertaining to a secondary issue.

You will have noticed that the Imām ordered that the matter of the Mahdī be kept a secret but from his reliable partisans, whereas according to them a person who does not know the Imām is equal to a person who knows and worships gods other than Allah,² and a person who dies in this condition dies a death of disbelief and hypocrisy.³

As to the time of his disappearance, the narrations of the Shīʿah are contradictory in this regard. So al-Ṭūsī narrates the following from Ḥakīmah:

1 Al-Ghaybah p. 142.
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/181.
3 Ibid. 1/184.
After three had passed upon his birth, I was desirous of seeing the friend of Allah, so I went to them. I started with the room in which Sawsan was and saw no sign and heard no mention. I disliked querying and thus went to Abū Muḥammad and there also I felt ashamed of initiating the probing. But he spoke first and said, “O aunt, in the mercy of Allah, His protection, His concealment, and His knowledge till when He grants him permission.”

A second narration mentions that she did not see him after seven days, whilst a third narration mentions that she saw him walking in the house after forty days and did not see him subsequent to that. And yet another narration mentions that Ḥakīmah would frequently go to the house Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, she would visit after every forty days. A few days before his demise (when the age of the Mahdī was five at most) she went to their house as was her wont. She says:

I saw a person whom I did not recognise. So I said to my nephew, “Who is this person who you are ordering me to sit in front of?”

He said, “This is the son of Narjis, this is my successor. Soon you will miss me so listen and obey.”

In this manner did the Mahdī disappear and no one knew of his matter besides Ḥakīmah who only dispensed the information of his occultation to the reliable Shīʿah as their narrations suggest.

---

1 Al-Ghaybah p. 142.
2 Ibid. 142.
3 Ibid. 144.
4 Because according to their narrations he was born in 255 A.H and al-ʿAskarī passed away in 260 A.H.
5 Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 405-406.
As to the place of his occultation, it was kept a secret, and when the Shīʿah eventually got to know of his alleged occultation they tried to search for his place. The Bāb, however, who claimed to have a link with him refused to divulge any information about him and sufficed on producing an endorsed letter attributing it to the Mahdī which stated:

إن عرفوا المكان دلوا عليه

If they know of the place they will inform others of it.¹

So this narration states that he was in a specific place and in a hiding spot of which no one was aware besides the Bāb and that the reason for concealing his occultation from his Shīʿah was his fear of them informing others of his whereabouts.

But surprisingly some narrations of al-Kāfī inform us of the town wherein he sought to hide. A narration for example mentions:

لا بد لصاحب هذا الأمر من غیبة. ول بد له في غیبته من عزلة ونعم المنزل طيبة

It is incumbent for the person of this affair to go into occultation. And in his occultation it is necessary for him to be in seclusion. And what a wonderful place is Ṭaybah.²

So this narrations states that he is hiding in Madīnah Munawwarah, for Ṭaybah is one of its names.³ This is supported by another narration wherein Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī was asked the following:

إن حدث بك حدث فأين أسأل عنه؟ قال: بالمدينة

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/333.
³ Muʿjam mā Ustuʿjim 2/900.
"If anything happens to you then where should I ask about him?"

He said, "In Madīnah."¹

On the hand al-Ṭūsī in his *al-Ghaybah* narrates that he is residing in the Raḍwā Mountain. He says in his narration:

عن عبد الأعلي مولي آل سام: قال خرجت مع أبي عبد الله عليه السلام فلما نزلنا الروحاء نظر إلي جلها مطلا عليها فقال لي: ترى هذا الجبل يدعى رضوي من جبال فارس أحبابنا فنقله الله إلينا. أما إن فيه كل شجرة مطعم ومنعم آمان للخائف مرتين: إما إن لصاحب هذا الأمر غيبتين: إما إن لصاحب هذا الأمر غيبيتين: إحدى قصيرة الأخرى طويلة

‘Abd al-Aʿlā, the ally of the people of Sām says, "I went with Abū ’Abd Allāh S. When we halted at al-Rawḥā'² he gazed at its mountain and said to me, ‘Do you see this mountain? This mountain is known as Raḍwā³ from the mountains of Persia. Due to its love for us Allah moved it near us. Behold on it is every nourishing tree and what a pleasant abode of amnesty it will be for the fearful at two occasions. The Man of the time will hide in it at two instances, the first will be short and the next will be long.’⁴

Whilst some other narrations suggest that he is hiding in the valleys of Makkah. Hence in *Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī* the following narration is narrated from Abū Jaʿfar:

يكون لصاحب هذا الأمر غيبي في بعض هذه الشعاب-ثم أومأ بيده إلي ناحية ذي طوي

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/328. In the commentary of this narration al-Māzindarānī mentions, “Probably he meant Surr Man Raʿā.” (see: *Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ* 6/208). However, this possibility does not seem very plausible in the first narration.

2 Al-Rawḥā’ is a village belonging to the Muzaynah tribe, between it and Madīnah are 41 miles. (See: *Muʿjam mā Ustuʿjam* 1/681).

3 It is a mountain in Madīnah which has a lot of trees, treasures, and lots of water. It is the very mountain regarding which the Kaysāniyyah assert that Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah is living in and is being sustained. (See: *Muʿjam al-Buldān* 3/51).

4 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 103.
“The man of this affair will disappear in some of these valleys,” he then pointed with his hand toward Dhī Ṭawā.¹

However, it should be noted that their narrations regarding invocations and visitations of the tombs of the Imāms suggest that he is residing in the basement of Sāmarrā’,³ this is understood from the following:

Then go to the basement of occultation and stand between the two doors, holding the sides of the doors with your hands, then cough as if seeking permission, take the name of Allah, and sit with utmost tranquillity and sobriety. Thereafter read two raka‘āt towards the breadth of the basement and supplicate thus, “O Allah, the anticipation has become lengthy, the enemies are rejoicing at our misfortune, and combating them has become difficult upon us. O Allah, show us the countenance of your blessed friend, during our lifetime and after our demise. O Allah, I acknowledge his return for you in front of the man of this land. Help! Help! Help! O the man of the time. In wanting to visit you I have ended all disputes, I have left my homelands and I have concealed my matter from the people of the cities so that you may intercede for me before your Lord and mine... O my master, O the son of Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī; I have come to you to visit you.”⁴

¹ Dhī Ṭawā: A valley in Makkah.
² Ṭafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 2/56; al-Burhān 2/81-82; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/341.
³ Yāqūt says, “Sāmarrā’ is a town on the shores of the Euphrates River, it is north of Baghdad and the distance between them is thirty Farsakhs (one Farsakh is approx. five kilometres). It was initially known as Surr man Ra’ā, but the people abbreviated it and called it Sāmarrā’ Therein is the basement of the Jāmi‘ Masjid wherefrom the Shī‘ah claim that their Imām will emerge. (See: Mu‘jam al-Buldān 3/173).
Some narrations even suggest that with him in his occultation are thirty of his friends who are there to give him company in his solitude:

وما بثلاثين من وحشة

There is no solitude in the presence of thirty.\(^1\)

Specifically allocating prayers, communication, and seeking permission when visiting the basement smacks of what the fabricators of these narration wanted to give their followers the impression of his existence therein. Hence Ibn Khallikān says:

والشيعة ينتظرون خروجه في آخر الزمان من السرداب بسر من رأي

The Shīʿah anticipate his emergence at the end of time from the basement of Surr man Raʿā.\(^2\)

Likewise Ibn Athīr has mentioned that they believe that their Mahdī is hiding in the basement of Sāmarrā’.\(^3\)

Despite the glaring evidence in this regard a contemporary Shīʿī still claims that which is opposed to what is fact according to them. He says:

لم يرد خبر ولا وجد في كتاب من كتب الشيعة أن المهدي غاب في السرداب... ولا أنه عند ظهوره يخرج منه بل يكون خروجه بمكة ويباحث بين الركن والمقام

No report has reached us nor is it mentioned in any of the books of the Shīʿah that the Mahdī disappeared in the basement nor that he will emerge therefrom. Rather he will remerge in Makkah and he will accept the allegiance of people between the Rukn (the pillar holding the black stone) and the Maqām (the stone holding the imprints of the feet of Ibrāhīm).\(^4\)

---

3 *Al-Kāmil* 5/373.
But, as we have seen, the practice of the Shīʿah is in complete contrast with this and is in harmony with what appears in their books of Ziyārah (visitation). For the Shīʿah, as asserted by Amīr ‘Alī, would till the end of the fourteenth century of the common era, wherein Ibn Khaldūn compiled his magnanimous history, convene every night after the Maghrib Ṣalāh at the door of the basement of Sāmarrā’ and would call out his name and induce him to make his appearance till the stars would become clearly visible, they would then return to their homes after a very long wait feeling crestfallen and despondent.¹

This wait was a reason for the Shīʿah being ridiculed by the mockers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>كلمتموه بجهلكم ما آنا</th>
<th>مَا آن للسرداب أَن يلد الذي</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>تلثم العنقاء والغیلانا</td>
<td>فعلي عقولكم العفاء فإنكم</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_The time has not come for the basement to produce the one you talk to out of your ignorance. Indeed it has not come._

_Your minds have become rusty for surely you have provided a third for legendary birds and ghosts._²

Ibn Qayyim mentions:

_ولقد أصبح هؤلاء عارا علي بني آدم وضحكة يسخر منهم كل عاقل_

_These people have become an indictment to humanity and a laughingstock for every intellectually sound person._³

It is for this reason that their prayers also smack of the fact that they have become victims of ridicule and disdain. Hence whilst addressing the awaited Mahdī each of them is required to say, “The anticipation has become long and the imposters have rejoiced at our condition.”⁴

---

⁴ The narration has passed on this page first paragraph.
Some of their supplications suggest the confusion which has engulfed them regarding the hiding spot of the Mahdī. Hence they call him saying:

لیت شعري أین استقرت بك النوي، بل أي أرض تقلك أو ثري، أبرضوي أم غيرها أم ذي طوي

If I only I knew where distance has settled you, or which ground is holding you or which under land. Is it Raḍwā or another place, or is it Dhī Ṭawā?\(^1\)

Having said this, some of their narrations posit that the Mahdī is not in a steady place, rather he lives between the people, and he is present at the occasion of Ḥajj and sees the people but they cannot see him.\(^2\)

This is how disparate their narrations are in stipulating his whereabouts; every group goes its own way based on the various Shīʿī families or based on different conditions and times, or of course till forging and misrepresenting continues.

It is no surprise that they have differed, because after all the Mahdī does not exist in the real world.

Furthermore, if his hiding spot was a matter that had to be concealed, his name was also concealed from his Shīʿah. From the endorsed letters of the Mahdī which the Bāb conveyed to the people one read as follows:

لو دللتم علي الإسم لأذاعوه

If you inform them of the name they will popularise it.\(^3\)

This narrations states that his name was unknown just as his place of residence and his birth and upbringing were unknown. In the Shīʿī narrations, however, his name appears as Muḥammad, but together with that the narrations prohibit calling him by his name. Hence in one narration the following appears:

\(^1\) Biḥār al-Anwār p. 102-108.


\(^3\) Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/333.
It is not permissible for you to make mention of him by his name.¹

Rather these narrations have dubbed a person who calls the Mahdī by his name a disbeliever. Hence a narration mentions:

صاحب هذا الأمر لا يسميه باسمه إل کافر

The man of this matter, no one besides a disbeliever will call him by his name.²

Therefore you will find that when his name appears in their narrations they write each letter of his name separately as م ح م د.³ And when they asked Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī as to how to mention him he said:

قولوا الحجة من آل محمد صلوات الله عليه وسلامه

Say the evidence from the family of Muḥammad.⁴

In the ancient Shīʿī circles he was not known but with allusive names which were not known to anyone besides them, like Gharīm (responsible) for example. This is how al-Mufīd comments on this name by saying:

هذا رمز كانت الشيعة تعرفه قديما بينها ويكون خطابها عليه السلام - كذا- للتقية

This was an allusive name which the Shīʿah in the bygone era knew among themselves. The addressee of this name was the Mahdī for reasons of Taqiyyah.⁵

---

1 Ibid. 1/333; Al-Irshād p. 394; Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 608.
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/333; Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 607.
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/329.
4 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/333; Al-Irshād p. 394.
5 Al-Irshād p. 400.
There were many allusive names which they gave to the Mahdī. To mention a few:

القائم، الخلف، السيد، الناحية المقدسة، الصاحب، صاحب الزمان، صاحب العصر، صاحب الأمر وغيرها

The upholder, the successor, the master, the sacred pillar, the person, the man of the time, the man of the era, and the man of the matter, etc.¹

A conspiracy of this magnitude suggests that there was a clandestine movement secretly operating in the Muslim world. The adherents whereof would choose to speak allusive language and communicate by way of hints in order to understand each other. Whilst at the same time it was an effort to conceal the falsehood and keep the reality hidden. Furthermore, it defies their claim that their Mahdī is mentioned by name and description.²

As to the period of his occultation, the inventors of this doctrine would give their followers false hopes of his emergence in the near future. So much so that they promised their followers that his occultation will not last for more than six years at worst. A narration of al-Kāfī which is allegedly reported from ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib ⁴ states the following:

تكون له غيبة وحيرة يضل فيها أقوم ويهتدي فيها أخرون

There will be an occultation for him and a confusion. Many people will go astray during this time whilst many others will attain guidance.³

And when he was asked as to how long the occultation and the confusion would last he said:

---

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/333. One of their scholars is of the opinion that not clearly stating the name is specific of the era of fear and Taqiyyah (see: al-Māzindarānī: Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ 6/216-217).
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī: chapter regarding Allah emphatically appointing the Imāms one by one: 1/286, onwards.
³ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/338.
Six days, six months, or six years.\(^1\)

It seems as if this narration was invented in the wake of the inception of the doctrine of occultation in order to placate the uneasy hearts and console the confused people who came to realise the truth when the Imām passed away without issue and when the deceit came to the fore, the reality becoming crystal clear. Hence they associated the doctrine of occultation with this report so that it may be plausible to accept and digest, and so that they may secure immediate wealth under the pretext of the Ahl al-Bayt which was to be ‘handed to the Mahdī’ as soon as he makes his appearance.

In the doctrines of Badā’ and Taqiyyah there is enough room for interpretation and retraction of verdicts in the future. Hence this is what occurred to the later scholars of the Shīʿah regarding this narration. For one of them avers:

\[
\text{یحتمل أن يكون المراد أن الغیبة والحیرة في ذلك القدر من الزمان أمر محتوم ویجري فیهما البداء بعد ذلك}
\]

Possibly what he meant was that the occultation and confusion during that period were bound to happen and thereafter Badā’ can probably happen (i.e. it can occur to Allah otherwise and he can prolong the period).\(^2\)

And others have tried to evade the issue with responses other than this,\(^3\) but no one dared question the validity of the doctrine of occultation itself.

---

\(^1\) Ibid.


\(^3\) Some said, “Possibly he intended to confine the confusion to this period and not the occultation.” (Ibid) Whereas the confusion lasted alongside the occultation, as will become obvious to you from the books that have been compiled in this regard and from the fact that these books were written because of this very confusion and doubt which had engulfed many a people. (See: \textit{Ikmāl al-Dīn} of Ibn Bābawayh p. 2).
Likewise some of their narrations suggest that the emergence will happen within seventy years from the occultation. Thereafter it was altered and changed to a hundred and forty years and then to an unknown period.¹ And they attributed to the Imāms that they could figure out the time of the emergence of the Mahdī from the ٌHurūf Muqaṭṭaʿāt (disjoined letters) which appear in the beginning of the Sūrahs.²

What one gathers from their narrations is that the allusive language which kept Shīʿism going would give its adherents hope of the salvation and emergence of the hidden Mahdī in the near future, so much so that some of the Shīʿah would expect his emergence either now or then, i.e. at any time. Hence some of their narrations mention that among them some left business transactions and work out of eagerness for the emergence of the Mahdī and eventually they complained of their condition thus:

لقد تركنا أسواقنا انتظارا لهذا الأمر حتي لیوشك الرجل منا أن یسأل في یده

We left our markets in anticipation for this matter, to the extent that a person from among us can be asked regarding what remains in his possession.³

But as was mentioned previously, the underlying reason for all these types of promises was to keep their game going and to remove the suspicion of their followers and scepticism. This had always been their style, i.e. they sicken the Shīʿah with false hopes and confuse them with false promises. They have conceded this in their reports:

إن الشیعة تربي بالأماني منذ مائتي سنة. و سبب ذلك أنه لو قیل لهم أن هذا الأمر ل یكون إلي مائتي سنة أو ثلاثمائة سنة لقست القلوب ولرجعت عامة الناس عن الإسلام (یعني مذهبهم). ولكن قالوا ما أسرعه وما أقربه تألفا لقلوب الناس وتقریبا للفرج

² Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 2/2; al-Burhān 2/3; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/106-109.
The Shīʿah are growing based on false hopes since the last two centuries.¹ And the reason for this that if they are told that this matter is not going to materialise for the next two to three hundred years, the hearts of the people would become hard and they would denounce Islam (i.e. the Shīʿī conception of Islam). Instead they chose to tell them, “Very soon indeed,” or “How near is his time,” in order to win the hearts of the people and make the opening seem impending.²

Furthermore, the narrations which were invented to deal with the obvious predicament of specifying the timeframe of the occultation differ tremendously as well. Sometimes they demand submission and state:

إذا حدثناكم بحديث فجاء علي خلاف ما حدثناكم به فقولوا: صدق الله. و إذا حدثناكم بحديث فجاء علي خلاف ما حدثناكم به فقولوا: صدق الله. توجروا مرتين

When we communicate a tradition to you and the reality happens to materialise differently from what we told you, say, “Allah has spoken the truth.” And when we communicate a tradition to you and the reality happens to materialise differently from what we told you, say, “Allah has spoken the truth.” Your reward will be two fold.³

Sometimes the blame for their promises about the Mahdī failing to come to pass is put squarely upon the Shīʿah, for having divulged his secret. For example, one of them says:

ما لهذا الأمر أمد ينتهي إليه ويريح أبداننا. قال بلي: ولكنكم أذعتم فأخره الله

“Is there no time limit for this matter at which it will end and cause us comfort?”

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/369; al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah p. 198; al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah p. 207-208; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/102. The narration is allegedly reported by ʿAlī al-Riḍā.
² Ibid.
³ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/369; al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah p. 197; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/118.
The Imām said, “Definitely! But Allah prolonged the period because you divulged the secret.”

Other narrations state:

إن الله تبارك وتعالي قد كان وقت هذا الأمر... إلي أربعين ومائة. فحدثناك فكشفتم قاع
الستر ولم يجعل الله له بعد ذلك وقتنا عندنا

Allah had stipulated a time for this matter, a hundred and forty. but when we communicated that to you, you spread the information and divulged the secret subsequent to which Allah did not stipulate any time for him.

Sometimes they attribute it to the martyrdom of Ḥusayn. Abū ‘Abd Allāh is reported to have said:

إن الله تبارك وتعالي قد كان وقت هذا الأمر في السبعين فلما أن قتل الحسین صلوات الله عليه اشتد
غضب الله تعالي علي أهل الأرض فأخره

Allah had stipulated a time for this matter within seventy years, however, when Ḥusayn was martyred Allah’s anger intensified upon the people of the earth so he prolonged it.

And they incooperate all of this in the doctrine of Badā’. That is why al-Māzindarānī says:

1 Al-Nu‘mānī: al-Ghaybah p. 194; al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah 263; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/117.
3 Obviously the doctrine of occultation only came about after the demise of Ja‘far, but the Shī‘ah attribute narrations regarding it to all the Imāms.
The time stipulation of this matter is one related to Badā’ and hence Badā’ happened therein.¹

And, lastly, at times they disregard the narrations of the time limitations completely. Some narrations state:

کذب الوقاتون، وهلك المستعجلون ونجا المسلمون

The time stipulators have lied, the hasteners are doomed, and the Muslims are saved.²

And:

کذب الوقاتون. إنا أهل البيت لا نوقت

The time stipulators have lied; we the Ahl al-Bayt do not stipulate times.³

Likewise:

ما وقتنا فيما مضى ولنوقت فيما يستقبل

We did not stipulate a time in the past, nor will we stipulate a time in the future.⁴

Similarly:

من وقت لك من الناس شيئا فلا تهابين أن تكذبه فلسنا نوقت لأحد وقتا

---

4 Al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah p. 262; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/103.
Whoever stipulates a time from you from the people, do not be afraid of belying him because we do not stipulate a time for anyone.¹

And lastly:

أبي الله إلا أن يخالف وقت الموترين

Allah has refused but to violate the time of the time stipulators.²

This is how their narrations differ and contradict one another. Simply because forging happens based on conditions and occasions.

As to reason of his occultation, the following narration appears in al-Kāfī from Zurārah:

سمعت أبا عبد الله يقول: إن للفائز عليه السلام غيبة قبل أن يقوم. قلت: ولم؟ قال: إنه يخاف-وأومأ بيده إلى بطنه- يعني القتل

I heard Abū 'Abd Allāh saying, “The Mahdī will go into occultation before he assumes power.”

I asked, “Why?”

He said, “He will fear,” and pointing toward his stomach he said, “Murder.”³

There are many other narrations of this sort.⁴ Al-Ṭūsī has confirmed this reason in his following statement:

لاعالة تمنع من ظهوره إلا خوفه علي نفسه من القتل. لأنه لو كان غير ذلك لما ساغ له الاستشار وكان يتحمل المشاق والأذي. فإن منزل الأئمة وكذلك الأنباء عليهم السلام إنما تعظم لتحملهم المشاق العظيمة في ذات الله تعالى

There is no reason that prevents him from emerging besides his fear for being killed. For if it were due to any other reason he would not have went into occultation and he would have underwent difficulties and harassment. This is because the only reason the Imāms and likewise the Ambiyā’ enjoy such lofty positions is due to their perseverance upon difficulties for the pleasure of Allah علیه السلام.¹

However, this rationale which Shaykh al-Ṭā’ifah confirms, is inconceivable regarding the Imāms, based on what the Shī‘ah believe about them. Since according to them “the Imāms know when death will overtake them and they do not die but by their own choice”, as is approved by al-Kulaynī in al-Kāfī in many narrations. In fact the name of the chapter wherein he cites these narrations is the same as above.² Al-Majlisī has also established the same in his Biḥār al-Anwār and he has established a chapter by the title, Chapter regarding them knowing when they going to die and that death will not occur but with their choice.³ So how do they solve this contradiction?⁴

Similarly, the Shī‘ah believe that the Imām has knowledge of what happened and what is to happen, nothing is concealed from them,⁵ as is established by al-Kulaynī in a chapter which goes by the same title. So it was within the capacity of the Imāms to avoid danger better than anyone else.

Furthermore, why were none of the four vicegerents—who claimed to have first-hand contact with the Imām—killed despite them not being like the Imāms in terms of them not dying when they decide to?

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah: chapter regarding the reason preventing the Mahdī from emerging p. 199.
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/258.
4 I referred to al-Māzindarānī’s commentary of al-Kāfī in order to see how he explains the narrations which mention the reason for his occultation as being the fear to be killed... But he avoids making any comments on them and passes clean.
5 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/260.
Likewise, there was ample amnesty for the Imām to make his appearance after the establishment of many Shīʿī states, why did he not make his appearance then so that the people may be relieved by his emergence and benefit from his knowledge, his weaponry, and his strength. And later, after the fall of those states he could go back into occultation. Aḥmad al-Kisrawī, therefore, states:

إذا كان منتظرهم قد اختفي لخوفه علي نفسه فلم لم يظهر عندما استولي آل بویه الشیعیون علي بغداد وصیروا بني العباس طوع أمرهم. فلم لم يظهر عندما قام الشاه إسماعیل الصفوي وأجري من دماء السنیین أنهارا؟ فلم لم يظهر عندما كان کریمخان الزندری وهو من أكبر سلاطین إیران يضرب علي السكة اسم أمامكم ويبعد نفسه وكیلا عنه؟ وبعد فلم لا يظهر اليوم وقد كمل عدد الشیعین میلیونا وأکثرهم من منتظریه.

If their awaited Imām went into occultation due to fear then why did not make his appearance when the Buyid dynasty took over Baghdad and subjugated the Abbasid rulers? And why did he not emerge when the Safawid Shah Ismāʿīl arose and made bloody rivers flow with the blood of the Sunnīs? And why did he not appear when Karīm Khān al-Zandī, who was considered to be one of the greatest monarchs of Iran, would engrave the name of your Imām upon the currency and would consider himself his vicegerent? And even today when the amount of the Shīʿah has reached sixty million, all waiting his return, he has not made his appearance.¹

Likewise today, after the era of al-Kisrawī, when the state of the scholars is well established he has still not come out to them, despite their earnest prayers and seeking help from him since the bygone centuries.

Conversely, some narrations assert that the reason for his occultation was to test the hearts of the Shīʿah. This reasoning which those narrations portray probably was an attempt to mitigate the doubt which had crept into the hearts of the Shīʿah, because this doctrine had not found a way into the minds of many of the Shīʿah which ultimately led them to denouncing Shīʿism entirely.

¹ Al-Tashayyuʿ wa al-Shīʿah p. 42.
The Shīʿah were similarly tired of waiting for the hidden Imām, to the extent that one of them said:

قد طال هذا الأمر علينا حتي ضاقت قلوبنا ومتنا كمدا

This matter has become too long for us to bear, our hearts are grieved and we are dying out of exasperation.¹

The gloomy clouds of doubt and suspicion which had enveloped the Shīʿah was attested to by their scholar Ibn Bābawayh after his visit to Nīsābūr:

راجع إلى نيسابور وأقيمت فيها وجدت أكثر المختلفين علي من الشيعة قد حيرتهم الغيبة ودخلت عليهم في أمر القائم عليه السلام الشبهة

I visited Nīsābūr and stayed there. I found that the majority of the people who visited me from the Shīʿah were gripped in confusion regarding the occultation and they were having doubts about the matter of the Mahdī.²

Their narrations, which were invented to treat this problem, sketch the confusion of the Shīʿah regarding the matter of the Mahdī, his prolonged occultation and inaccessibility of any information regarding him. The following narration appears in al-Kāfī:

عن زرارة قال: سمعت أبا عبد الله يقول: إن للغلام غيبة قبل أن يقوم... وهو المنتظر وهو الذي يشك في ولادته. منهم من يقول: مات أبوه بلا خلف ومنهم من يقول: حمل ومنهم من يقول: إنه ولد قبل موت أبيه بستين وهو المنتظر، غير أن الله عزوجل يحب أن يمتحن الشيعة فعند ذلك يرتاب البطلون

Zurārah said, “I heard Abū ʿAbd Allāh saying, “There will be an occultation for the boy before he takes charge... He will be the awaited Mahdī and regarding his birth there will be doubt. Some will say, “His father died without issue.” And some will say, “He was conceived.” Whilst others will

¹ Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah p. 120.
² Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 2.
say, “He was born two years before the death of his father and he is the awaited.” But Allah loves to test the Shī‘ah. Hence at that trying time the deniers will doubt.¹

So this variance of opinion, according to them, was a test for the Shī‘ah. The books of heresiography have recorded that this exactly what had happened to them after the demise of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, as has passed. So this narration and others of its type were seemingly forged to treat the confusion and doubt which had engulfed them after the demise of their Imām without issue. Hence we find plenty narrations which are along the same lines and which sketch the reality of the Shī‘ah very clearly. The following narration appears in al-Kāfī:

No, by Allah, that to which you raise your gazes will not happen till you are not sifted. No, by Allah, that to which you raise your gazes will not happen till you are not purified. No, by Allah, that to which you raise your gazes will not happen till you are not separated. No, by Allah, that to which you raise your gazes will not happen but after you lose hope. No, by Allah, that to which you raise your gazes will not happen till the wretched become wretched and the fortunate become fortunate.²

So they claim that the anxiety which gripped them due to the occultation of the Mahdī was due to purifying and testing them. Once that was done the Mahdī would return. They have attributed the following to Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq:

1 ʿUṣūl al-Kāfī 1/337.
2 ʿUṣūl al-Kāfī 1/370.
A student of his visited him and he was crying like a bereaved woman because he (allegedly) had a look at the goat skin book which contained the knowledge of calamities and deaths and the knowledge of what happened and what was to happen till the Day of Judgment and said, “I contemplated in it the birth of our Mahdī, his occultation, his delayed arrival, the confusion, and test of the believers thereafter, the creeping of doubts into the hearts of the Shī‘ah owing to his prolonged absence and the apostasy of majority of them from his creed... 1

This narration which is allegedly attributed to Ja‘far talks of the apostasy of many of the Shī‘ah due to the occultation which was becoming too long. This narration, like others, was invented after this problem had already engulfed them in order to encourage them to remain within Shī‘ism by claiming that this was a reality which the Imāms foretold and it is one of the signs of the return of the absent Imām.

Their scholar al-Nu‘mānī of the third century who lived in the early period of the Shī‘ah inception attested to this, so his attestation in this regard is of utmost importance. He attested to the doubts the Shī‘ah were experiencing at that time besides a few:

We have seen many groups who are affiliated to Shī‘ism, to Muḥammad  and his household, who believe in Imāmah, their unity has been shattered, their stances have diversified. They have disregarded the injunctions of Allah and stepped into the prohibitions of Allah. Some of them have steeped into extremism whilst others into negligence. They have all, besides a few, doubted the Imām of their time, the guardian

1 Al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah p. 105-106.
of their affairs and the evidence of their lord due to the test which this occultation imposes.¹

The anarchy had reached a level where they started insulting, disowning, and excommunicating one another, as the narration of al-Nuʿmānī portrays:

لا يكون الأمر الذي ينتظر حتى يبرأ بعضكم من بعض ويظلم بعضكم في وجه بعض يشهد بعضكم علي بعض بالكفر ويلعن بعضكم بعضًا

The matter that is anticipated will not come to being till you do not denounce each other, some of you spit in the faces of others, some attest to the disbelief of others, and you curse each other.²

This narration portrays this grave phenomenon as good because it foretells the coming of the Mahdī. It says:

الخير كله في ذلك الزمان يقوم قائما ويدفع ذلك كله

All good will prevail in that time. Our Mahdī will take charge of affairs and repel all of this.³

From these narrations it seems as if the Ḥadīth scholars of the Shīʿah forged these narrations and attributed them to the Ahl al-Bayt in an event to combat this devastating phenomenon. They filled the content of these narrations with the alleged purification, the test, and apostasy which was going the way of the Shīʿah in order to encourage them to remain within Twelver Shīʿism.

Despite all these testimonies and acknowledgements, the doctrine of occultation which the Shīʿah were compelled to believe in caused great upheaval which had the potential to destroy it from its very basis in the Shīʿī circles. Despite all of this they still say:

¹ Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah p. 11.
If Allah knew that they would be uneasy he would not have disappointed his evidence even for the winking of an eye.¹

Can there be any uneasiness worse than the doubting of the majority with the exception of a few and disunity and mutual imprecation.

The excessive belying of Shī'ah of the doctrine of occultation is clearly noticeable in these narrations, especially in its stages of development. Perhaps the reason for this was that the falsehood thereof had become manifest to the people who had lived in its era and witnessed the condition which gave birth to it. And hence the architects of this belief rose to block those gaps wherefrom the winds of doubts would blow, and those niches wherefrom the falsity thereof would become evident. So they treated the factual phenomena of refutation, imprecation, and division by forging narrations which primarily communicated the happening of these phenomena as a glad tiding for the near and imminent arrival of the Mahdī. However, all these phenomena ensued and the Mahdī still did not make his appearance. Likewise they treated what had reached the Shī'ah regarding the family of Ḥasan belying the doctrine in question by forging narrations which stated that “The Mahdī will go into occultation and his family will deny it,” and when Zurārah, the person to whom this narration is falsely attributed² asked as to the reason for this denial Abū Ja'far said, “They will fear.” And he pointed to his stomach.³

Likewise another niche wherefrom this doctrine could easily be denied was the fact that the family of Ḥasan, nor anyone else, knew of his birth and his upbringing. Hence they forged narrations such as:

² Because he passed away before the doctrine of occultation came into existence.
³ Al-Nu'mānī: al-Ghaybah p. 188.
Allah will send a boy from amongst us for this matter. His birth and upbringing will be unknown.¹

If someone has to study these narrations from this perspective he will definitely be gripped by surprise.

Furthermore, on the other hand they forged narrations which glorified the anticipation of the Mahdī and stated that it is the best of actions. This was to repel the anxiety of such a profoundly prolonged existence and the despondency and deprivation which was beginning to creep into the hearts of the people. This can be gaged from the following narration of al-Kāfī:

أقرب ما يكون العباد من الله جل ذكره وأرضي ما يكون عنهم إذا افتقدوا حجة الله جل وعز ولم يظهر لهم ولم يعلموا مكانه وهم في ذلك يعلمون أنه لم تبطل حجة الله جل ذكره ولميثاقه. فعندها فتوقعوا الفرج صباحا ومساء

The closest the bondsmen can ever be to Allah and the most happiest Allah can ever be with them is when they anticipate the evidence of Allah and he does emerge to them nor do they know of his whereabouts. But they are confident that the evidence of Allah and his promise have not been violated. When this happens, then wait for relief, either in the morning or the evening.²

In this narration they have made the occultation a sign of relief being imminent, whereas today more than a thousand and a hundred years have passed to the occultation have passed and none of these promises have come to being. So what impression will these narrations leave in a person who reads these empty hopes of the Shī‘ah? Will not the doubt increase in his heart till he eventually will leave the fold of Islam and search for another religion purely because he is deceivingly told that this Mahdī is unanimously accepted by the Sunnīs and the Shī‘ah?

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/341-342; al-Nu’mānī: al-Ghaybah p. 112.
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/333; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/145.
They have many other narrations regarding the doctrine of anticipation, al-Majlisī has cited 77 narrations under a chapter which he has titled, Chapter regarding the virtues of anticipation and praising the Shī‘ah during the era of occultation and what is to be done in it. To the extent that they even forged a narration and attributed it to Rasūl Allah: 

أفضل إعمال أمتي انتظر فرج الله عزوجل

The best deed of my Ummah is to wait for relief from Allah.

They have made anticipation the most beloved action to Allah and the people who anticipate the best people of every era, and they claim that Rasūl Allah told his companions:

سيأتي قوم من بعدكم الرجل الواحد منهم له أجر خمسين منكم. قالوا يا رسول الله نحن كنا معك ببدر وأحد وحنين ونزل فينا القرآن فقال: إنكم لو تحملوا ما حملوا لم تصبروا صبرهم.

“A people will come after you, the reward of one person among them will be equal to that of fifty among you.”

They asked, “O Rasūl Allāh! We were with you in Badr, Uḥud, and Ḥunayn; and regarding us the Qur’ān would come down.”

He said, “If you were tested as they will be, you would not be able to persevere as they will.”

The status of the Ṣaḥābah, according to the Shī‘ah, clearly did not occur to the forgerer of this narration.

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 52/122-150; see also: Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 603, onwards.
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 52/122.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
Likewise there are narrations which mitigate the anxiety the Shīʿah have to see the emergence of the Mahdī, hence one narration states:

من عرف هذا الأمر ثم مات قبل أن يقوم القائم عليه السلام كان له مثل أجر من قتل معه

The one who acknowledged this matter and then passed away before the emergence of the Mahdī will receive the reward of those who will be martyred with him.¹

Coupled with these rewards on one hand, on the other hand there are narrations which threaten with excommunication and eternity in Jahannam any person who denies the occultation of the Mahdī, to the extent that they have equated it to denying the prophethood of Nabī Muḥammad ﷺ. Rather they have considered it to be equivalent to the disbelief of Iblīs. Al-Ṣadūq narrates the following with his alleged chain of transmission from Abū Yaʿfūr:

عن أبي یعفور قال: قال أبو عبد الله علیه السلام: من أقر بالأئمة من آبائي وولدي وجحد المهدي من ولدي كان كمن أقر بجميع الأنبیاء ومجحد محمد صلى الله عليه وآله. فقلت یا سیدي: ومن المهدي من ولدك؟ قال الخامس من ولد السابع یغیب عنهم شخصه ولیحل لهم تسمیته

Abū ‘Abd Allāh said, “That person who acknowledges the Imāms from my forefathers and children and denies the Mahdī of my progeny is like a person who acknowledges all the Ambiyā’ and denies the Muḥammad ﷺ.”

So I asked, “O my master, who is the Mahdī of your progeny?”

He said, “The fifth from the children of the seventh, he will disappear from them and it will not be permissible for them to mention him by name.”²

They have also allegedly attributed the following to Rasūl Allah ﷺ:

¹ Ibid. 52/130.
² Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 288.
The one who denies the Mahdī of my progeny is like the one who denies me.\(^1\)

And al-Ṣadūq said:

\[
\text{مثل من أنكر القائم عليه السلام في غيبته مثل إبليس في امتناعه في السجود لآدم.}
\]

The one who denies the Mahdī in his absence is like the Iblīs in his denial to prostrate before Ādam.\(^2\)

Furthermore, the doctrine of occultation has, because of the scholars of the Shī'ah, become a source of enmity for the Ṣaḥābah and those who followed them diligently. Their scholar al-Jazā'irī said:

\[
\text{إني كلما أشكلت علي مسألة أوجب علي نفسي لعنهم لنهم سبب في استتار الحجة}
\]

Whenever I find it difficult to understand an issue I make it compulsory for myself to curse the Ṣaḥābah because they were the cause of the evidence going into occultation.\(^3\)

As you can see, they are trying to channel the resentment and the enmity which is seated deep down in their hearts due to their embittered anticipation of the Mahdī who is defeated, subdued, and contested in his rightful position,\(^4\) and due to the Shī'ah being victims of bloodshed and looting at the hands of the enemies of Allah.\(^5\) Thus the avenue that they choose to channel this resentment is the best generation ever known to humanity and those who followed them.

---

1 Ibid. p. 390; Luṭf Allah al-Ṣāfī: Muntakhab al-Athar p. 492.
2 Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 13.
3 Sharḥ al-Ṣaḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah p. 37.
5 Ibid.
Evidence for the Occurrence of the Ghaybah

The Twelvers have given a lot of importance to establish the validity of the occultation of the Mahdī by way of evidence. In their search for evidence they focused on the book of Allah سِبْعَةُ مَعَالَاتِ رَبِّكَ, but when they did not find what they wanted they contrived, as is their wont, esoteric interpretations of the verses thereof which are filled with stark artificiality and immense exaggeration, they have interpreted many verses of the Qur’ān in this manner.

The following appears in the most seminal book of the Shī‘ah in Qur’ānic exegesis, Tafsīr al-Qummī, regarding the verse:

وَالْنَّهَارِ إِذَا تَجَلّٰى

And [by] the day when it appears.¹

النهار هو القائم منا أهل البيت

He said, “The day is the Mahdī from amongst us the Ahl al-Bayt.”²

In the most authentic work from their four early canonical works, the following appears regarding the verse:

قُلْ أَرَأَیْتُمْ إِنْ أَصْبَحَ مَاؤُکُمْ غَوْرًا فَمَن يَّأْتِیْكُمْ بِمَاءٍ مَّعِیْنٍ

Say, “Have you considered: if your water was to become sunken [into the earth], then who could bring you flowing water?”³

إذا غاب عنكم إمامكم فمن يأتيكم بإمام جديد

¹ Sūrah al-Layl: 2
² Tafsīr al-Qummī 2/425.
³ Sūrah al-Mulk: 30
He said, “If your Imām goes away from you, who can bring a new Imām for you.”

And in Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī the following is reported regarding the verse:

وَأَذَانٌ مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَرَسُوْلِهِ إِلَى النَّاسِ يَوْمَ الْحَجِّ الأَْکَبَرِ

And [it is] an announcement from Allah and His Messenger to the people on the day of the greater pilgrimage.

خروج الفاتان وأذان دعوته إلى نفسه

He said, “This is the emergence of the Mahdī and his call of invitation to himself.”

There are numerous examples of this type of narrations, to the extent that some of them have compiled books on this topic, for example: Mā Nazl Mīn al-Qurʿān Fī Ṣāḥib al-Zamān (that which has been revealed of the Qurʿān regarding the man of the time) and al-Maḥajjah Fīmā Nazl Fī al-Qāʾim al-Ḥujjah (the straight path regarding that which came down regarding the Mahdī, the evidence). The latter was published recently with the revision of a contemporary Shīʿī scholar.

In it the author has interpreted more than a hundred and twenty verses of the Qurʿān with their awaited Mahdī, all of which are undoubtedly from their flaws which cannot be concealed. Amazingly, the reviser of the book was not satisfied with this amount, so he added another twelve verses to it from the Book of Allah and he attached them at to the end of the book under the title ‘Addendum of the Evidence’.

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/339. See also: Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 2/76; Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 239; al-Burhān 2/102.
2 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 3
3 Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 2/76; al-Burhān 2/102.
5 The book of Hāshim al-Baḥrānī.
6 It was published in 1403 A.H. by Muʾssasah al-Wafā’ in Beirut.
7 He goes by the name Muhammad Munīr al-Maylānī. He has referenced the narrations of the book to a substantial number of their reliable works.
An impartial and objective study of these esoteric interpretations whereby substantiation for the doctrine of occultation is intended clearly reveals that they entail colossal exaggeration and distortion of the Book of Allah, therein there is no evidence whatsoever. It also reveals the invalidity of this doctrine which they are trying to establish from its ‘origins’.

Likewise the Shī'ah tend to seek evidence from the absence/disappearance of the Ambiyyā’ in order to prove the validity of the occultation of their Mahdī. So, for example:

- They draw evidence from the incident of Mūsā escaping from his homeland in order to be saved from the Pharaoh and his people, as is mentioned in the Qur’ān,
- From the story of Yūsuf and the information of his whereabouts being concealed from his father, till eventually Allah disclosed his whereabouts and united him with his father and brothers, which is also mentioned in a chapter of the Qur’ān,
- From the story of Yūnus ibn Mattā’ with his people when he left them after their adamancy in opposing him and their violation of his rights; he went away from them and from everyone else to the extent that none of the creation knew of his abode; Allah concealed him and kept him alive through his wisdom till a certain period had lapsed where after Allah returned him to his people and united him with them.¹

They likewise draw evidence from the hiding of our Nabī Muḥammad in the cave. Al-Ṭūsī has produced this incident as evidence against those who object by saying, “If your Imām is responsible of up-keeping the order of Allah and bearing the burden of Imāmah, then how could he have disappeared?”² He says:

"أليس النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قد اختفي في الشعب ثلاث سنين لم يصل إليه أحد و اختفي في الغار ثلاثة أيام"

¹ Al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah p. 77.
² Ibid. p. 13.
Did not Nabī disappear in the valley for a period of three years wherein no one had access to him and did he not hide in the cave for three days?\(^1\)

However, the reality is that these similarities that the Shī‘ah draw in trying to convince their followers and those who doubt the doctrine of the occultation do not in any way help in extirpating the doubt which is embedded in the hearts of the people, which continues to perplex them wherever they ponder over it. To the extent that Ibn Bābawayh had written a book in order to convince one of their senior scholars who was doubting the doctrine, and likewise to convince those who were always around him who were who were also victims of doubt and confusion, as he has indicated in his book.\(^2\)

I reiterate, these similarities are of no benefit in establishing the doctrine of the occultation for many reasons, one being the following: regarding the disappearance of Mūsā, ʿĪsā, Yūnus, Yūsuf, and Muḥammad, Allah has informed us in the Qur’ān with clear and emphatic verses wherein there is no confusion and intricacy. As opposed to the occultation of the their Mahdī, for the narrations in that regard end at Ḥakīmah (that is if the attribution of them to her is correct) and the four Bābs whose eligibility for attestation is dubious due to them vesting in their interests, i.e. focusing on amassing excessive wealth. Therefore, we find that many claimed to be the Bāb.

Another reason is that the disappearance of the Ambiyā’ was known to their people because they had previously stayed among them. As for their Mahdī, no one knew him, nor did anyone see any trace of him, so much so that his own family denied his existence, as is attested to by reliable historians that al-Ḥasan al-’Askarī died without issue.

---

1 Ibid.
3 As for the three years in the valley of Abū Ṭālib, that was a boycott and not a disappearance, so it is unrelated to our topic.
Furthermore, the disappearance of the Ambiyā’ was for a specific time and to a specific place. They went away for a while and then returned to their people and families.

Likewise, the Messengers of Allah who disappeared for a while established the evidence of Allah against their people and conveyed his message to their generation, as opposed to their Mahdī upon who many generations have passed but we have not heard anything about him.

In addition, the disappearance of the Ambiyā’ was due to natural reasons. For example, Yūsuf’s disappearance was due to the separation from his father Ya’qūb and his travel to a distant land, which is just like a person who travels from one city to another. It was limited to a specific time. All of their disappearance was exceptional, for despite them being a lot in number it only happened to a few of them.

As for the substantiation of the Shīʿah from the hiding of Nabī in the cave for three days, it is incongruous. Because the hiding of Nabī was not in order to conceal his prophethood, but a strategy deployed in adverse conditions, so that the disbelievers do not prove to be an impediment in his progress. Likewise, he only went into hiding for three days. So justifying the occultation of their Mahdī based on his situation is very foolish. Simply because there is a very big difference between disappearing for three days which served as a preamble for the victory and dominance of dīn and between going into occultation for an abnormally extended period of time, the result of which is helplessness, the discarding of propagation, and the proliferation of tyranny.¹

How the Shīʿah Justify the Prolonged Period of the Occultation:

One of the many reasons whereby the false claim of the Shīʿah regarding the existence of their Imām can be discerned is the improbability of him being alive after almost a thousand and a hundred years have passed since his occultation.

¹ Mukhtāṣar al-Tuḥfah p. 119.
Since such a prolonged life for a Muslim is something the falsehood of which can be picked up by the prevalent system of Allah regarding the Ummah of Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم, i.e. no one is known to have lived for a hundred and twenty years during the era of Islam, let alone living for the aforementioned period of time. It appears in Šaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī that Rasūl Allah ﷺ said the following regarding the end of his life:

أرأيتم ليلتكم هذه فإن علی رأس مائة سنة منها لا يبقى على وجه الأرض أحد

Do you notice this night of yours, none of the people who are upon the surface of the earth today will remain after hundred years have passed on it.¹

Hence whoever at that time was one year of age did not live for more than a hundred years without a doubt. And if the ages of people did not exceed this limit in those times, then the times to follow thereafter would more so entail this prevalent norm. Likewise the ages of the members of this Ummah are between sixty and seventy; very few people actually exceed that,² as is established in an authentic narration.³

---

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/65. See the narration in Šaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: chapter of knowledge: sub-chapter regarding discussing academic issues at night: 1/37; Musnad Ahmad 1/121, 131.

2 Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/165. See the narration in Sunan al-Tirmidhī: Chapter of Zuhd: Sub-chapter regarding the ending of the lives of people between sixty and seventy years: 4/566, Chapter regarding Du‘ā’: sub-chapter regarding the Du‘ā’ of Nabī ﷺ of Nabī ﷺ 5/553. Commenting of the narration al-Tirmidhī says, “This narration is sound but only transmitted with one transmission; it is only known with this transmission.” Ibn Ḥajr commenting on this says, “It is strange of him to say that, because he himself has narrated the narration in the chapter of Zuhd with another chain of transmission from Abū Hurayrah ﷺ. (See: Fayḍ Qadīr 2/11). Sunan Ibn Mājah: chapter of Zuhd: sub-chapter regarding hopes and death: 2/1415; Fayḍ al-Qadīr 2/11: the narration of Abū Ḥayyān; Mustadrak Ḥākim 2/427; al-Khaṭīb: Ṭārīkh Baghdād 6/397, 12/48; al-Suyūṭī: al-Jāmi‘ al-Ṣaghīr p. 48: he has classified it to be Ḥasan, sound; Ibn Ḥajr has labelled it sound as well (see: Fayḍ al-Qadīr 2/11); Ḥākim has dubbed it authentic and in accordance with the requirements of Muslim, and al-Dhahābī has agreed with him (al-Mustadrak 2/427); al-Albānī has commented thusly, “It is Ḥasan Li Dhātihī and Ṣaḥīḥ li Ghayrihī” i.e. sound but not authentic. (Silsilah al-Aḥādīth al-Ṣaḥīḥah 2/397; al-Albānī: Šaḥīḥ al-Jāmi‘ 1/354.

3 Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/165.
This objection sort of strangles the Shīʿah and extirpates their dogma. The Shīʿah scholars have tried to dispel it by again drawing similarities between their Mahdī and some of the Ambiyā’ whose lives extended over the average ages of people. Hence the Mahdī, according, them is like Nūḥ who stayed amongst his people for 950 years. They have attributed this juxtaposition to some of the Ahl al-Bayt in order to lend it some credence. Hence Ibn Bābawayh has narrated the following with his chain of transmission to ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn:

فِي القائم سنة من نوح عليه السلام وهو طول العمر

In the Mahdī there is a trait of Nūḥ and that is prolonged age.

Likewise, they say that the prolonged life of the Mahdī is like that of Ūsā ibn Maryam, Khīḍar, and Ilyās. They also draw a comparison between him and Iblīs. They attribute a good few of these comparisons to the Ahl al-Bayt in order to blow within them the status of certainty for their followers, giving them the impression that they are the verdicts of the infallibles. They likewise seek evidence in the abnormally long lives of some humans. The only comparison that they forgot to make is between him and Jibrīl and Mikā‘īl and all the angels of the heavens and the earth.

But the Shīʿah themselves destroy this argument by asserting that their Mahdī is the legitimate ruler of the Ummah for the past eleven centuries or more, he is the safeguarder of the Qurʾān without who it cannot be understood and without who there is no guidance for the humans therein, he possess the entire Qurʾān, the manuscript of Fāṭimah thereof, the goat skin — the Jāmiʿah and everything else that the Ummah needs in their worldly and religious affairs. Considering

---

1 Al-Ghaybah p. 79.
2 Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 488.
3 ʿAqāʾid al-Imāmiyyah p. 108.
4 Al-Ḥāʾirī: Ilzām al-Nāṣib 1/283.
6 Al-Ṭūsī: Al-Ghaybah p. 79, onwards.
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this, their Mahdī is responsible for the Ummah, and with him are all the means of their good fortune in this world and the hereafter. As for those prophets and humans by way of who they support their arguments, they are very different than the ‘Mahdī. For example: Nūḥ Ṣt stayed amongst his people for nine hundred and fifty years, inviting them till Allah Ḥ revealed to him:


لَنْ یُّؤمنَ مِنْ قَوْمِكَ إِلَّا مَن قَدْ آمَنَ

No one will believe from your people except those who have already believed.¹

He did not disappear into a cave in a way that no one had knowledge of his whereabouts; or in a way that he would see the people going astray but he would go away from them and they would thus not see him for ages and centuries. Not forgetting that the age of the Mahdī has now even exceeded the age of Nūḥ Ṣt. Similarly, ʿĪsā Ṣt conveyed the message of Allah Ḥ to his people, established the evidence against them, and fulfilled the trust he was entrusted with before being raised to the heavens. Hence his disappearance did not in no way impact upon his followers, as opposed to the their Mahdī who disappeared since his childhood and left his Shīʿah disputing over his existence and his vicegerency, being blinded by Taqiyyah from understanding the reality of the religion he brought and quarrelling to the extent of excommunicating each other.

As for Khiḍar and Ilyās Ṣt, the research scholars are of the opinion that they both had passed away.² And even if they are hypothetically assumed to have

---

¹ Sūrah al-Hūd: 36.
² Al-Muntaqā p. 26. According to Ibn Ḥazm the view of the life of Ilyās and Khiḍar Ṣt is taken from Judaism because the Jews believed in the life of Ilyās, Finḥās ibn al-ʿĀzār ibn Hārūn Ṣt. Some Sufis followed them in claiming that they met Ilyās Ṣt in the jungles (see: al-Faṣl 5/37). Likewise some Sufis were of the opinion of the life of Khiḍar Ṣt, there are stories regarding them meeting him and benefitting from him (see: Ibn ‘Arabī: al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah 1/241; Ibn ‘Aṭāʾ al-Iskandarī: Ḥaṭrāt al-Minan p. 52-53; Ṭabaqāt al-Shaʿrānī 1/97, 2/5; see also: al-Faṣl 5/37-38; Ibn Ḥajr: Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb 7/477. Ibn Ḥazm has considered the claims of the Sufis of benefitting from Khiḍar Ṣt to be against the belief of Khatm al-Nubuwwah (see: al-Faṣl 5/38).
remained alive, the similarity is still not valid, because they were not entrusted with providing guidance for this Ummah and leading it. As opposed to their Mahdī who is according to them responsible for all the Muslims in all their affairs.

As for Iblīs, the information regarding his prolonged life appears in the Qurʾān, but the Mahdī’s existence was denied by his families and many factions of his followers. Furthermore, Iblīs exhorts all his efforts in misleading the creation from the way of Allah (and it is undeniably clear that the adherence of the Shīʿah to a non-existent person is definitely from his efforts). As for their awaited, there is no sign of his existence, nor any information. Likewise Iblīs is not a human, so drawing a similarity with him is not free from questions in all conditions.

As for the remaining humans who enjoyed prolonged lives, despite them having reached whatever age they reached they cannot even come close to a portion of the age they claim for their Mahdī. All the examples their scholars mentioned in the fourth century do not hold any weight today due to the age of their awaited Mahdī exceeding them by a thousand years and more, and also because the aforementioned examples were of people who did not have the responsibility of the Mahdī and his tasks.

One of their contemporary scholars has endeavoured to give a logical explanation of the possibility of the existence of the Mahdī and his life for such an extended period of time in light of modern day medical language. He says:

وطول الحياة أكثر من العمر الطبيعي أو الذي يتخيل أنه العمر الطبيعي لا يمنع منها الطب ولا يحيلها، غير أن الطب بعد لم يتواصل إلي ما يمكنه من تعميره حياة الإنسان وإذا عجز عنه الطيب فإن الله قادر علي كل شيء.

1 continued from page 1172

And the claim that Khiḍar is alive till today is against evidence and the views of the research scholars. See: Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/28; Ibn al-Qayyim: al-Manār al-Munīf p. 67-76. And for details regarding Khiḍar see: Ibn Kathīr: al-Bidāyah wa Al-Nihāyah 1/325-327; Ibn Ḥajr: Fath al-Bārī 6/309-312; al-Iṣābah 2/286-335. Ibn Ḥajr has written a small booklet in investigating the matter of Khiḍar at the end of which he is strongly inclined to the opposite of what the commonality believe regarding his continuous life (see: al-Zahr al-Naḍr fi Naba’ Khiḍar as part of Majmū’ah al-Rasā’il al-Minbariyyah 2/234).
The exceedingness of life over the average age or what is considered to be the average age is not an impossibility according to medicine. However, medicine has not reached the extent whereby it can elongate the life of a human, but if medicine is incapable then Allah is capable of doing anything.1

And Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ says:

أن أکابر فلاسفة الغرب قالوا بإمكان الخلود في الدنيا للإنسان

Some of the great philosophers of the west suggest that it is possible for humans to remain forever in this world.2

He further says:

قال بعض کبار علماء أوروبا: لولا سيف بن ملجم لكان علي بن أبي طالب من الخالدین. لأنه قد جمع جمع صفات الكمال والاعتدال

A great scholar of Europe said, “Had it not been for the sword of Ibn Muljim3 ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib would have lived forever, because he was an embodiment of all the qualities of perfection and balance.”4

This is what some of the views of the disbelievers, on condition that this proven from them, suggest in this regard, however, Allah says the following to his Nabī:

---

1 ‘Aqā’id al-Imāmiyyah p. 108.
2 Aṣl al-Shī‘ah p. 70.
3 This is based upon the Muʿtazīlī viewpoint who aver that a murderer reduces the life of the murdered person. This is a view in complete contrast with what is firmly established in Qur’ān and the Sunnah which prove that whoever dies only dies after he has completed his time (see: Majmūʿ Fatāwā Ibn Taymiyyah 8/516; Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah p. 92; Lawāmi‘ al-Anwār 1/348).
4 Aṣl al-Shī‘ah p. 70.
And We did not grant to any man before you eternity [on earth]; so if you die – would they be eternal?¹

And he says:

كِلُّ نَفْسٍ ذَائِقَةُ الْمَوْتِ

Every soul shall taste death.²

Likewise he says:

نَحْنُ قَدَّرْنَا بَيْنَكُمُ الْمَوْتَ وَمَا نَحْنُ بِمَسْبُوْقِیْنَ

We have decreed death among you, and We are not to be outdone.³

He knows his creation better than anyone else and is the most truthful of all speakers. Hence after what he says, there is no room for the opinion of a disbeliever whose desire is to live forever in this world even though it be by clinging on to false hopes.

There is a very accurate statement of ʿAlī al-Riḍā, which is documented in the books of the Shīʿah, which he said in refuting those many Shīʿī sects who believed in the life of some members of the Ahl al-Bayt, refused to accept their death and claimed that they are in occultation and that they will return; this statement is one of the strongest refutations of the Twelvers from their own narrations. In Rijāl al-Kashshī it is reported that when ʿAlī al-Riḍā was told that some people have terminated the line of Imāmah upon your father and they claim that he did not die, he said:

1 Sūrah al-Ambiyāʾ: 34.
3 Al-Wāqiʿah: 60.
They have lied. And they are disbelievers in what Allah has revealed upon Muḥammad. If Allah were to extend the lifetime of any person he would have extended the lifetime of Rasūl Allah.¹

But they oppose the statement of their Imām and claim that Allah extended his life, i.e. the Mahdī, due to the people being in need of him, and due to everything in life revolving around him. For if it were not for him, the earth would sink and drown all its people.²

The Mahdī after his Alleged Return:

The Sharīʿah of their Mahdī:

Ibn Bābawayh has pointed out in his book Al-Iʿtiqādāt, which also known as the religion of the Imāmiyyah, that when the Mahdī will return he will abrogate the constitution of Islam regarding inheritance. He narrates from al-Ṣādiq that he said:

إن الله آخي بین الأرواح في ألأظلة قبل أن يخلق لأبدان بألفي عام. فلو قد قام فائمنا أهل البيت أورث الأخ الذي آخي بينهما في الأظلة لم يرث الأخ من الولادة.

Allah established brotherhood between the souls in the shadows two thousand years before he created the bodies. Hence when our Mahdī will emerge he will make a brother inherit from his brother from the shadows and not from his brother from birth.³

Perhaps this narration discloses the intent of the spearheaders of this band on basing relationships on partiality and movements instead of basing them on

---

1 Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 458.
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/179.
3 Al-Iʿtiqādāt p. 83.
blood and kinship in inheritance, thereby usurping the wealth of people under the pretext of this so called relationship and brotherhood. It similarly divulges that which they aspire to achieve after the establishment of their promised rule, i.e. the implementation of these base ambitions and also the fact that they endeavour to give credence to them by attributing them to the Ahl al-Bayt.

This narration also exposes the position of the fabricators thereof regarding the implementation of the Sharīʿah of Islam and their desire to discard it. It thus mirrors a heretic notion of striving to discard the Sharīʿah and rebel against the belief of Khatm al-Nubuwwah (seal of prophethood).

Together with these claims being diametrically opposed to the Sharīʿah of Islam they are against the reasoning of logic. Simply because inheritance is based upon the outward relationship people have with each other which is based upon birth and kinship, as for the alleged brotherhood which existed from time immemorial, how do humans identify it and thus how can it be a basis for distributing inheritance.

Their awaited Mahdī will likewise alter the Sharīʿah ruling of collecting tax from the people of the book, and their narrations clearly mention that their awaited Mahdī will in doing so oppose the precedent of Rasūl Allah. The narration states:

ولا يقبل صاحب هذا الأمر الجزية كما قبلها رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

And the man of this matter will not accept tax as Rasūl Allah had accepted.¹

This acknowledgement is enough to show how drastically juxtaposed he will be from the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah and how he will intentionally alter it. This raises the question: Was the intention of the fabricator of these narrations to

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 52/349.
make the Sharīʿah of Islam lose its importance in the hearts of his followers and to instigate them to revolt against it?

Rather even the rulings of the courts of the Mahdī will be issued against the Sharīʿah of Nabī ʿabl. In al-Kāfī and other books the following narration appears:

إذا قام قائم آل محمد حكم بحكم داود وسلیمان ولايسأل بينة

When the ruler from the family of Muḥammad will emerge he will issue rulings in accordance with the rulings of Dāwūd and Sulaymān and he will not be asked for evidence.¹

Another version of the narration states:

إذا قام قائم آل محمد حكم بین الناس بحكم داود علیه السلام ولايجتنع الي بينة

When the ruler of the family of Muḥammad will emerge he will issue rulings regarding the disputes of people in accordance with the rulings of Dāwūd and he will require no evidence.²

Al-Kulaynī, the reliable transmitter of their Islam, has adopted this belief and established a chapter by the title, Chapter regarding the Imāms issuing rulings in accordance with the rulings of Dāwūd and the family of Dāwūd without being required to provide any proof.³ The Jewish connotations that this holds is not hidden. This is even more evident from the comment of one of them on this title:

أي إنهم ينسخون الدين المحمدي ويرجعون إلي دين اليهود

i.e. They will abrogate the Dīn of Muḥammad and return to the Dīn of the Jews.⁴

---

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/397.
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/397.
See how the fabricators of these narrations, who have misleadingly worn the garb of Shīʿism, yearn for a state wherein rulings are issued contrary to the Sharīʿah of Islam.

Some of their narrations suggest that sometimes he will issue rulings in accordance with the rulings of Ādam, sometimes Dāwūd, and sometimes Ibrāhīm عليه السلام. They further state that some of his followers will oppose him due to not ruling in accordance with the Sharīʿah of Islam, however, he will tackle them with severity by issuing an order of their execution.¹

The narrations present some examples of his rulings and judgements:

إنه يحكم بثلاث لم يحكم بها أحد قبله: يقتل الشيخ الزاني، ويقتل مانع الزكاة، ويورث الأخ أخاه في الأظلة، وإن يقتل من بلغ العشرين ولم يتفقه في الدين.

He will issue three rulings which no one before him ever issued: He will kill a married person who commits adultery, he will kill the person who refuses to pay Zakāh, he will make his brother from the shadows inherit from his brother,² and he will kill any youngster who reaches the age of twenty and has not acquired the knowledge of Dīn.³

Likewise the rule of the awaited Mahdī will be based upon issuing rulings for every denomination in accordance with its religion, whereas according to Islam it is impermissible to rule but in accordance with the Sharīʿah of the Qur’ān. This is unanimously agreed upon by all Muslims.⁴ One of their narrations state:

إذا قام القائم قسم بالسوية وعدل في الرعية واستخرج التوراة وسائر كتب الله تعالى من غار بانطاكية، حتي يحكم بين أهل التوراة بالتوراة وبين أهل الإنجيل بالإنجيل وبين أهل الزبور بالنبر و بين أهل القرآن بالقرآن.

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 52/389.
³ Al-Ṭabarsī: Aʿlām al-Warā p. 431; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/152.
When the Mahdī emerges he will distribute with fairness, he will exercise justice with his subjects, he will extract the Torah and all the divine books from the cave of Antioch and issue rulings for the people of the Torah with the Torah, for the people of the Bible with the Bible, for the people of the Zabūr with the Zabūr, and for the people of the Qur’ān with the Qur’ān.¹

This institution which the fabricators of these narrations aspire to implement and whose implementation they attribute to the Mahdī is to a very large extent in harmony with the idea of a global religion which is being espoused by the freemasons. It is a heretical idea which is based upon discarding all heavenly religions under the pretence of freedom of thought and belief.

Amidst all of these devious ideas which strive to abrogate the Qur’ān, invent new rulings which Allah has not sanctioned, having recourse to the rulings of Dāwūd and not to the Sharīʿah of Muḥammad and implementing the constitutions of other religions other than the injunctions of the Qur’ān, we learn of a poisonous idea which can be considered the aftermath of all the aforementioned changes. The crux of this idea is the discarding of the Qur’ān and supplanting it with another book. This is what the narration of al-Nuʿmānī which he narrates from Abū Baṣīr suggests:

 قال أبو جعفر رضي الله عنه: يقوم القائم بأمر جدید وقضاء جدید. لكأني أنظر إلیه بین الرکن والمقام یبایع الناس على كتاب جدید

Abū Jaʿfar said, “The Mahdī will emerge with a new matter, with a new book, and with a new constitution.² It is as if I can see him accepting the allegiance of the people between the black stone and Maqām (the stone which holds the imprints of the feet of Ibrāhīm upon a new book.”³

Whilst some other narrations state that their Mahdī will try to avert the people from the Qur’ān claiming that it is interpolated and he will produce another

---

¹ Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah p. 157; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/351.
³ Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah p. 176; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/135.
book which is opposed to it. He will try and misguide the people by claiming that his book is the complete book which Allah revealed upon Muḥammad. The non-Arabs will be the ones making an effort to propagate it amongst the people and instruct them in it. And in doing so, they will encounter tremendous difficulty because of wanting to change the sentiments of the people regarding the Book of Allah.¹

These are the narrations which were being surreptitiously circulated regarding the rule of the Mahdī after his return during the glorious days of the Islamic empire.

A person who does not believe in the doctrine of their Mahdī might assume that it is purely based upon imagination and has no reality to it, because the Mahdī does not exist and thus his fictitious rule will never reach realisation, so discussing it might just be an exercise in futility. Whilst this is true, it is important to understand that these narrations expose the inner intentions of their fabricators and their goals against the Sharīʿah of Islam. They are inferiority complexes which entail grave implications which sort of smack of the aspirations of these fabricators and the type of governance they are yearning for; They are dreams which divulge the ploys of those elements which crept into the ranks of the Muslim empire under the disguise of Shīʿism with the intention of interpolating the Qurʾān. Their struggle against the Muslim empire under the pretext of ‘there is no rule but for the Imāms’ is intended to destroy the Muslim empire and replace it with another one which will be governed by the governance of the alleged awaited Mahdī.

The Life and Deeds of the Awaited Mahdī:

As for his way of life, it entails characteristics of his new Sharīʿah. He will be responsible for harassing the Muslims regarding their holy places and Masjids, i.e. he will be responsible for demolishing the two holy Ḥarams. Their narrations state:

¹ This has passed already on p. 345 - 346 of this book.
The Mahdī will demolish the *Masjid Ḥarām* (Masjid Aqsa) and return it to its foundation, the *Masjid of Rasūl Allah* and return it to its foundation, and he will return the *Ka‘bah* to its place and establish it on its foundations.¹

Similarly, he will advance toward the graves of Rasūl Allah and his two Companions and will start, as their narrations suggest, with demolishing the wall around them. He will then remove them from their graves (i.e. Abū Bakr and ʿUmar) fresh and full of life. Subsequently, he will curse them, denounce them, crucify them, take them down, burn them, and then dispose of their ashes in the wind.² Another narration mentions:

> أول ما يبدأ به القائم... يخرج هذين رطبين غضين فيحرقهما ويزدريهما في الريح ويكسر المسجد

The first thing the Mahdī will start with is that he will extract these two from their graves fresh and kicking. He will burn them and scatter their ashes in the air and demolish the Masjid.³

They have attributed to Allah, and Pure is He from what the transgressors attribute to Him, that He told Nabī the following on the journey of Miʿrāj:

> وهذا القائم. هو الذي يشفي قلوب شيعتك من الظالمين والجاحدين والكافرين، فيخرج اللات والعزي

This Mahdī will cool the hearts of your partisans from the two oppressors, deniers, and disbelievers; he will remove Lāt and ʿUzzā from their graves (i.e. the two successors of Rasūl Allah) fresh and he will burn them.⁴

---

2. *Bihār al-Anwār* 52/386.
3. Ibid.
Their narrations also state that this will cause upheaval amongst the Muslims:

ثم يحدث حدثا فإذا فعل ذلك قالت قریش: أخرجوا بنا إلي هذا الطاغیة، فوالله لو كان مهديا ما فعل، ولو كان علويما ما فعل ولو كان فاطميا ما فعل

Then he will do something unprecedented and the Quraysh will say, “Let us go out to combat this tyrant. By Allah if he was a Muḥammadī he would not have done so, and if he was an ʿAlawī he would not have done so, and if he was a Fāṭimī he would not have done so.”

Commenting on this narration, their scholar and pride al-Majlisī says:

لعل المراد بإحداث الحدث إحراق الشیخین المعونین، فلذا يسمونه علیه السلام الطاغیة

Perhaps what is meant by doing something unprecedented is his burning of the two accursed Shaykhs, due to which they will call him the tyrant.

It is unambiguously clear that these promises regarding the doings of the Mahdī which are replete in their narrations smack of the intent of their hearts on relegating the Dīn of Islam and plotting against it, so much so that they yearn for an opportunity wherein they can demolish the two holy sites of the Muslims, and exhume the graves of the two pure men. But when they find themselves unable to carry out these ploys due to the might of the Islamic empire at that time, they pacify themselves, console themselves, and cool the grudges in their hearts against those who conquered their lands, destroyed their monarchies and propagated Islam among them with these dreams and hopes. These narrations, thus, in essence expose what they desire to accomplish if they are given an opportunity to rule and dominate.

It is in this connection that their contemporaries desire to conquer Makkah and Madīnah, as has been heard from their scholars, i.e. in order to accomplish their

1 *Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī* 2/58; *Bihār al-Anwār* 52/342.
2 One of the titles accorded to him is ‘The pride of the Ummah,’ as you will find on the cover of his books.
3 *Bihār al-Anwār* 52/346.
dreams which are recorded in their narrations, as will appear. They plan and Allah plans, and Allah is the best of planners.

Their Mahdī will not suffice upon this, rather he will go about killing the Arabs and annihilating them from their roots. Their narrations portray the Arabs as victims who will suffer at the hands of their Absent Imām; when he returns he will not leave any man, woman, child or adult, rather he will inflict all of them without exception. Al-Nu‘mānī narrates:

عن الحارث بن المغیرة وذریح المحاربي: قال أبو عبد الله علیه السلام: ما بقي بینن وبین العرب إلا الذبح

Ḥārith ibn al-Mughīrah and Dharīḥ al-Muḥāribī say that Abū ‘Abd Allāh said, “Nothing besides slaughter remains between us and the Arabs.”

This narration seemingly does not differentiate between those who are Shīʿah and those who are not, but their narrations emphasise that no one from the Arabs will be a partisan of their Mahdī. They state:

اتق العرب فإن لهم خبر سوء إما إنه لم يخرج مع القائم منهم أحد

Fear the Arabs for there is bad news for them. Behold none of them will join the Mahdī.

But there are a lot of Shīʿah amongst the Arabs. Their narrations, however, mention that they will be cleansed till only a very few will remain.

They specifically mention the various types of murder tactics which will be carried out against the tribe of Rasūl Allah, the Quraysh, wherefrom were

1 In the chapter regarding contemporary Shīʿah and their connection with their predecessors.
2 Al-Nu‘mānī: al-Ghaybah p. 155; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/349.
4 Al-Nu‘mānī: al-Ghaybah p. 137; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/114.
his elite Companions. In Al-‘Irshād of al-Mufīd the following narration appears:

‘Abd Allah ibn Mughīrah narrates from Abū ‘Abd Allah S that he said, “When the ruler from the family of Muḥammad will rise he will make five hundred members of the Quraysh stand and he will decapitate them. He will then again make five hundred stand and he will decapitate them and then another five hundred. He will do this six times.”

I asked, “Will their numbers reach that amount?”

He said, “Yes, including them and their allies.”

It is clear that specifically targeting the Arabs and killing them posits the nationalist inclinations of the inventors of these narrations. It also tells us of the deep seated enmity the godfathers of Shi‘ism had for the Arabs and the desire to mitigate their anguish by killing, in actual fact, is not due to their ethnicity but due to the religion that they adhere to.

Furthermore, their narrations do not forget to inflict the pure family of Rasūl Allah H with a catastrophe from the catastrophes of their Mahdī: they claim that the Mother of the Believers, ‘Ā’ishah J, the truthful daughter of a truthful father and the beloved of Rasūl Allah H, will be raised from her grave before the Day of Judgment. This is because, as they lie, she committed a crime inducing a capital punishment in the time of Rasūl Allah H, but Rasūl Allah H did not execute the punishment upon her, as they claim. Whereas he is the one who is reported to have said:

وأيام الله لو أن فاطمة بنت محمد سرقت لقطع تيدها

1 Al-‘Irshād p. 411; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/338.

2 This is based on their doctrine of Raj‘ah which will discuss after this discussion if Allah wills.
By Allah! If Fāṭimah the daughter of Muḥammad were to steal I would cut her hand.¹

They claim that his mercy for her had stopped him from executing the punishment upon her, whereas Allah ﷺ says:

وَلَ تَأْخُذْکُمْ بِهِمَا رَأْفَةٌ فِي دِیْنِ اللّٰهِ إِنْ کُنْتُمْ تُؤْمِنُوْنَ بِاللّٰهِ

And do not be taken by pity for them in the religion [i.e., law] of Allah.²

Therefore he did not execute the punishment upon her, but ironically their Mahdī will execute what the Best of Creation was unable execute; and this will be in the era of Raj‘ah (return), as they allege.³

---

¹ A portion of a Ḥadīth which features in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: Chapter of the Ambiyā’: 4/151, Chapter regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the mention of Usāmah ibn Zayd: 4/214, Chapter of capital punishments: sub-chapter regarding amputating the hand of a thieve: 2/1315; Sunan Abī Dāwūd: chapter of capital punishments: sub-chapter regarding intercession in a capital punishment: 4/537; Sunan al-Tirmidhī: chapter of capital punishments: subchapter regarding the undesirability of intercession in capital punishments: 4/37-38; Sunan al-Nasāʾī: chapter regarding amputating the hand of a thieve: sub-chapter regarding the mention of the Makhzūmiyyah who stole: 8/72; Sunan Ibn Mājah: chapter of capital punishments: sub-chapter regarding intercession in capital punishments: 2/851; Sunan al-Dārimī: chapter of capital punishments: sub-chapter regarding capital punishments in front of the ruler: 1/569, etc.

² Sūrah al-Nūr: 2.

³ The narration which is allegedly attributed to Abū Jaʿfar states:

إِما لَوْ قَامَ قَائِمًا أَنْ كَذَبْتُ إِلَى الْخَمْرَاءِ حَتَّى يُقَلِّدْهَا الْحَدَّ وَحَتَّى يَنْتَقِمْ لَنَا مَذَاقُ سَلَامٍ عَلَى الْحُمَيْرَاءِ. قَالَتْ: جَعَلْتُ فِدَاكَ وَلَمْ يُقَلِّدْهَا الْحَدَّ؟ قَالَ: لَفَرِيتَاهَا عَلَى أَمِّ أَبِي إِبْرَاهِيمَ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ. قَالَتْ: فَكَيْفَ أَخْرَجَ اللّٰهُ لِقَلَامِهِ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. فَقَالَ لَهُ: إِنَّ اللّٰهَ تَبَارَى وَتَعَالَى بِعَدَّةٍ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَآذَانَهُ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ نَقْمَةً.

“Behold, when our Mahdī will emerge, Ḥūmayrā’ (a title of ‘Ā’ishah ) will be brought to him so that he may execute the punishment upon her and so that he may take revenge for Fāṭimah the daughter of the Nabī from her.”

I asked, “May I be sacrificed for you, why will she be punished?”

He said, “Because of her allegation against the mother of Ibrāhīm.”

I asked, “So why did Allah delay it till the emergence of the Mahdī?”

He said, “Allah ﷺ sent Muḥammad ﷺ as a mercy and he will send the Mahdī as a punishment.” (See: ‘Ilal al-Sharā‘ī’ p. 579-580; Bihār al-Anwār 52/314-315).
This suggests that their Mahdī is more competent than Nabī H, the Seal of All Prophets, and is more capable of implementing the Dīn of Allah than the one who was sent as an exemplar for the world.

This is explicitly mentioned in some of their narrations, for Ibn Bābawayh narrates the following from Abū Baṣīr:

قال أبو عبد الله عليه السلام في قوله عزوجل:  هُوَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلَ رَسُوْلَهُ بِالْهُدٰى وَدِیْنِ الْحَقِّ لِیُظْهِرَهُ عَلَى

Abū 'Abd Allah said regarding the verse, It is He who has sent His Messenger with guidance and the religion of truth to manifest it over all religion, although they who associate others with Allah dislike it,1 “By Allah its interpretation has not come down as yet, nor will it come down but after the emergence of the Mahdī…”2

In other words, the Mahdī will accomplish that which the Ambiyā’ were unable to accomplish. This is also clear from the statements of some of their scholars in contemporary times3 which were denounced by the Muslim world, as will come. ‘This is so because they claim that the knowledge that their Mahdī will be tenfold more than that of the Ambiyā’.’ The following appears in Bihār al-Anwār and other books:

Commenting on this narration one of their contemporary scholars provides a text which makes mention of the allegation:

إن إبراهِيم لِسَنَة سَنَة وإنه ابن فلان القبطي

Ibrāhīm is not from you, he is the son of so and so Coptic.

The narration states that Nabī entrusted ‘Alī with executing her but ‘Alī revealed her innocence. (See: Bihār al-Anwār 52/315: the footnotes).

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 33.
2 Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 628; Bihār al-Anwār 52: 324.
3 Khomeini for example.
4 In the chapter: ‘the contemporary Shī‘ah and their link with their predecessors.
Abān narrates from Abū ʿAbd Allah that he said, “Knowledge has twenty seven dimensions; all the knowledge of the Ambiyāʾ equates to two dimensions, as result, people only knew two dimensions of knowledge to date. When our Mahdī will emerge he will reveal the other twenty five dimensions of knowledge and spread them amongst the people. He will include the two dimensions to them and propagate them as twenty seven dimensions.”

Moving on, the formidable operation of slaughtering which the Twelver Shīʿah dream of will include all denominations and ethnicities with the exception of their sect. This is because their Mahdī will emerge as:

A revengeful, angry, and depressed person... who will place the sword on his shoulder.

He will start killing and exterminating the Ahl al-Sunnah whom the Shīʿah at times dub ‘the Murjiʿah’ (postponers) regarding whom the Imām said:

Woe be to the Murjiʿah. By who will they seek shelter tomorrow when our Mahdī will emerge?

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 52/336: Taken from al-Kharāʾij of al-Rāwandī, as is indicated by al-Majlisī (ibid).
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 52/361.
3 Their scholar al-Ṭarīḥī says, “They have been dubbed ‘the Murjiʿah’ because they claim that Allah suspended the appointment of an Imām so that his appointment takes place by way of the election of the Ummah of Muḥammad.” See: Majmaʿ al-Baḥrayn 1/177-178; see also: Miʿrāt al-ʿUqūl 4/371.
4 Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah p. 190; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/357.
He will only exclude the one who repents, i.e. the one who accepts their creed, hence he says:

من تاب تاب الله عليه، ومن أسر نفاقا فلايعد الله غيره، ومن أظهر شيئا آخرق الله دمه.

The one who repents he will accept his repentance. The one who hides his hypocrisy Allah will not distance anyone besides him. And the one who reveals some of it Allah will burn his blood.

He then said:

ثم یذبحهم والذي نفسي بیده کما یذبح القصاب شاته- وأومأ بیده إلي حلقه

He will slaughter them, by the one in whose hand is my life, like a butcher slaughters his sheep. He said this indicating with his hand to his neck.¹

And at times they call them Nawāṣib and they say:

إذا قام قائمنا عرضوا کل ناصب علیه. فإن أقر بالإسلام وهي الولیة وإل ضربت عنقه أو أقر بالجزیة فأداها

When the Mahdī will emerge, they will present every Nāṣibī to him. If he concedes Islam, which is the Imāmah of the Imāms, well and good, or else his head will be decapitated. Or he can commit to paying taxes like the non-Muslim citizens.²

However, some of their narrations aver that taxes will be accepted from them as they will be accepted from the People of the Book. For their Imām was asked regarding the situation of the non-Muslim citizens under the rule of the Mahdī and he said:

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 52/357; al-Nu’mānī: al-Ghaybah p. 190-191.
2 Tafsīr Furāt p. 100; Biḥār al-Anwār 52: 373. The aspect of accepting taxes from them is against those narrations which state that they will not be accepted from them, as has passed already under the discussion of his Sharī‘ah.
He will grant them amnesty just as Rasūl Allah ﷺ had granted them amnesty. And they will pay taxes with humiliation.¹

As for the others who oppose the Shī‘ah, the Imām says the following regarding them:

ما لمن خالفنا في دولتنا نصيب. إن الله قد أحل لنا دماءهم عند قیام قائمنا

There is no share for those who oppose us under our rule. Allah ﷻ has made their blood permissible for us after the emergence of our Mahdī.²

To the extent that their Imām will hunt the Zaydiyyah, a non-extremist Shī‘ī sect, and kill them. Their narrations state:

إذا قام القائم علیه السلام سار إلي الكوفة فیخرج منها بضعة عشر آلف أنفس یدعون البتریة علیهم السلاح. فیقولون له: ارجع من حیث جئت فلا حاجة لنا في بني فاطمة فیضع فیهم السیف حتي یأتي علي آخرهم

When the Imām will emerge, he will go to Kufah and banish therefrom ten thousand and some odd people who will be known as the Batriyyah³ and will be armed. They will say to him, “Return from where you came, for we have no need for the Banū Fāṭimah.” He will thus unsheathe the sword upon them till he will kill all of them.⁴

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 52/ 376.
² Ibid.
³ Al-Batriyyah: the followers of al-Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Ḥayy and the followers of Kathīr al-Nawā who was known as Abtar. They are also known as the Ṣāliḥiyyah. Part of their beliefs is, as al-Ash‘arī states, that they deny the return of the dead before the coming of the Day of Judgement and they do not believe in the rule of ʿAlī ٓابی طالب but after his election. They are the subsect of the Zaydiyyah. (See: Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/144; al-Milal wa al-Nihal 1/161; al-Khuṭaṭ 2/352).
⁴ Al-Irshād p. 411-412; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/338.
Instead their narrations mentions that he will kill innocent people:

إذا خرج القائم قتل ذراري قتلة الحسین بفعل آبائها

When the Mahdī emerges he will kill the children of the murderers of Ḥusayn for what their forefathers did.¹

In light of these narrations their Mahdī will have no other task but to kill people. He will not leave anyone alive² and he will not accept the repentance of anyone.³

Some of their narrations portray the extent to which bloodshed will reach at the hands of the Mahdī, they state:

لو يعلم الناس ما يصنع القائم إذا خرج لأحب أكثبرهم ألا يروه مما يقتل من الناس...حتي يقول كثير من الناس: ليس هذا من آل محمد. لو كان من آل محمد لرحم

If people come to know of what the Mahdī will do after his appearance most of them would prefer not to see him due to the amount of people he will kill... To the extent that many people will say, “This person is not from the family of Muḥammad. Had he been from the family of Muḥammad he would have had mercy.”⁴

This takes the Mahdī out of the characteristic of mercy and justice for which the Ahl al-Bayt were known, rather with this behaviour he has parted from the Sunnah of Nabī. In fact they actually boldly claim this:

ستل الباقر: أيسير القائم بسيرة محمد؟ فقال: هيهات! إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم سار في أمته بالحنين وكان يتألف الناس، والقائم أمر أن يسير بالقتل وألا يستتب أحدا، فويل لمن ناوأه

---

1 ʿIlal al-Sharāʿiʿ p. 411-412; ʿUyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā 1/273; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/313.
2 Biḥār al-Anwār 52/231.
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 52/249. One version of the narration mentions that he will not appoint anyone as his deputy i.e. he will do all the killing himself (see: Ibid).
4 Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah p. 154; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/354.
Al-Bāqir was asked, “Will the Mahdī tread the way of Muḥammad?”

He said, “Far-fetched indeed! Rasūl Allah Ḥ treaded the path of mercy with his Ummah and he united the hearts of the people, as for the Mahdī, he will tread the path of murder, he will not accept the repentance of anyone. So woe be to one who disassociates from him.”

So the Shīʿah claim that he will be instructed with a way other than the way of Rasūl Allah Ḥ. Whereas the unanimity of the Muslims asserts that whatever goes against the way of Rasūl Allah Ḥ is not part of Islam. So will he be sent with another message other than Islam?

And how is it possible that he will be ordered to oppose the way of Rasūl Allah Ḥ? Will he be a Nabī who will receive revelation afresh, whereas it is an accepted fact that there is no Nabī after the Seal of the Prophets and there is no revelation after his demise? And any person who claims the contrary is a liar and a fraudster due to him opposing the epistemologically certain texts and the unanimity of the Ummah regarding the termination of revelation and Nubuwwah with the demise of Rasūl Allah Ḥ.

These narrations, nonetheless, portray what is in the hearts of their fabricators, viz. hatred for people, especially the Muslim Ummah, which opposes them in their ways, their yearning for a day to come wherein they can make their dreams a reality, the reality which is divulged in these narrations, and which is represented in the Shīʿī world of the Safawid era, the country of the scholars and in their movements in Lebanon, as will come.

It is an undisputed fact that Amīr al-Muʾminīn ṬAlī Ṭ, whom they claim to be partisans of, did not excommunicate his opponents and did not combat but those who rebelled against him. It follows that their Mahdī who will do all these horrendous acts and those who follow him in doing so, are not from the partisans

---

1 Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah p. 153; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/353
2 In the chapter regarding the influence of the Shīʿah on the Islāmic world.
More so when they have acknowledged in their narrations that their Mahdī will not tread the way of ʿAlī; it is narrated that al-Ṣādiq was asked:

“Will the Mahdī tread a path other than that of ʿAlī?”

He said, “Yes. And that is because ʿAlī treaded the path of forgiving and withholding due to having knowledge that his partisans will be defeated in the future. As for the Mahdī, he will tread the path of the sword and imprisonment due to knowing that his Shīʿah will never be defeated after him.”¹

Whilst addressing some of the Shīʿah Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq said:

“What will be your condition when you see the companions of the Mahdī erecting their tents in the masjid of Kufah? The Mahdī will then extract the new example which will be severe upon the Arabs.”

The narrator says that he asked, “May I be sacrificed for you, what will that be?”

Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq said, “Slaughter.”

He asked, “How will he deal with them? Like how ʿAlī dealt with the people of Iraq?”

Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq said, “No! ʿAlī implemented what is in the white goat skin, i.e. withholding, knowing that his partisans will be defeated after him.

And the Mahdī will implement that which is the red skin, i.e. slaughter, knowing that his Shīʿah will never be defeated after him.”

In this way, the alleged Mahdī will emerge with a new matter, a new book, a new way and a new constitution.

This is enough in explaining that what the Shīʿah dream of has no basis in the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of his Nabī /fs. Rather it is a new innovation which their Mahdī will emerge with.

And when people will be living in bloodshed, severed bodies, and fear from the Mahdī of the Shīʿah whose emergence will be a punishment upon them—just as the prophethood of Nabī /fs was a mercy—the army of the Mahdī and his companions will be living a completely different life which will be filled with all types of bounties and delights. He will tell them not to carry any food, drink, or fodder on their campaigns whereupon his companions will say:

إنه يريد أن يقتلنا ويقتل دوابنا من الجوع والعطش، فيسبر ويسبرون معه. فأول منزل ينزله ضرب الحجر
فينعي منه طعام وشراب علف فيأكلون ويسروون ودوابهم حتى ينزلوا النجف من ظهر الكوفة

“He intends to kill us and kill our animals out of starvation and thirst.”

But he will advance and they will as well alongside him, and in the first place where he will halt he will strike the rock and food, water, and fodder will gush forth therefrom. They will thus eat, drink, and their animals will be satiated. They will then halt in Najf which is behind Kūfah.

1 ُbihār al-anwār 52/318: the narration appears in Basāʿır al-Darajāt, as indicated by al-Majlisī (ibid).
2 Ibid. 52/231.
3 Al-Kulaynī has narrated in al-Kāfī that Allah یسُرُّ مُحَمَّدَ یسُرُّ مُحَمَّدَ sent Muḥammad یسُرُّ مُحَمَّدَ as a mercy and he will send the Mahdī as a calamity. (See: ُbihār al-anwār 52/376: he attributes the narration to the chapter of Rawḍah in al-Kāfī p. 233).
4 This shows that they will be in doubt regarding the decisions of the Mahdī, so how can they be from his people?
5 Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah p. 158.
In this manner:

لاينزل منزل إلا انبعث منه عيون، فمن كان جائعا شبع ومن كان ظمآن روی

He will not halt at any place but that springs will gush forth. Hence whoever will be hungry will be satiated and whoever will be thirsty will be quenched.¹

And wherever he will stand the wealth of the world will accumulate by him from within the land and from without. He will thus give his companions so much wealth from there that no one before had given. Sustenance will increase in his rule due to which he will give two salaries a month and two bonuses a year.² So much so that a Shīʿī will not find anyone to give his Dinars and Dirhams to.³

These narrations to the contrary, portray the desires and ambitions which overwhelm the hearts of the Shīʿah in anticipation for tomorrow. They also portray the materialistic inclinations that they share with the Jews, i.e. the proliferation of the communist system in the world which was invented by Carl Marks.

As for the details regarding the army of the Mahdī and his people who will be with him in his slaughtering campaign, and who will enjoy his bounties and abide in his paradise, I shall present the details thereof ahead.

The Army of the Mahdī

Some of their narrations suggest that the army of the Mahdī will primarily consist of slaves and non-Arabs and that their total will be twelve thousand. The Mahdī will provide them with weaponry from his side which will be a sword and a double sided shield. He will then say to them:

---

¹ Ibid.
² Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah p. 158.
³ Ibid.
Whoever is not upon the belief you are, kill him.¹

And the narration of al-Nuʿmānī states that the amount of followers the Mahdī will have is three hundred and thirteen all of who will be from the children of non-Arabs.²

Whilst on the other hand, the narrations of Bihār al-Anwār states:

إذا قام قائم آل محمد استخرج من ظهر الكعبة سبعة وعشرین رجلا، خمسة وعشرین من قوم موسى الذين يقضون بالحق وبه يعدلون، وسبعة من أصحاب الكهف، ويوشع رضي موسي، ومؤمن آل فرعون، وسلمان الفارسي، وأبا دجانة الأنصاري، ومالك الأشتر

When the Mahdī of the family of Muḥammad will emerge, he will extract from the Kaʿbah twenty seven men: twenty five men will be from the nation of Mūsā who pass their decisions based on the truth and with which they establish justice, seven will be from the sleepers of the cave, Yūshaʿ ibn Mūsā, the believer of the family of the Pharaoh, Salmān al-Fārisī, Abū Dujānah al-Anṣārī, and Mālik al-Ashtar.³

In this narration the strong element of Judaism which was part of those who fabricated these narrations is completely clear.

Likewise, it is clear that Shīʿism is an umbrella for various types of elements, each one doing what his desires dictate to him and what his tribalism dictates to him.

¹ Bihār al-Anwār p. 214.
³ This is how the narration appears in Bihār al-Anwār: 52/346. The committee of revising the book did not comment on this narration despite al-Majlisī stating that the total amount of soldiers will be twenty seven and when he went on to give details of these soldiers they amounted to thirty seven! And in Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/32 it is mentioned: “Fifteen men from the people of Mūsā,” this narration is in harmony with the total amount ‘twenty seven’. As for Tafsīr al-Burhān 2/41, the author has added ‘and’, he says, “Twenty seven men and twenty five men from the nation of Mūsā...” The ‘and’ obviously is an addition to make the narration more sensible.
Hence the non-Arabs fabricate narrations in their favour and so do the Jews. In this way the collections of the Shīʿah have included everyone without sifting.

In some of their narrations the details of the names of each soldier is mentioned one by one. Together with that there is mention of the place, the tribe, and the occupation of each one of them. For example:

ومن أهل الشام رجليين يقال لهما إبراهيم بن الصباح يوسف بن جريا (صریا). فيوصف عطار من أهل دمشق وأبراهيم قصاب من قرية صویقان

From the people of Syria there will two men who will be known as Ibrāhīm ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ and Yūsuf ibn Jarya (Ṣarya).¹ Yūsuf, the perfume merchant, will be from Damascus and Ibrāhīm, the butcher, will be from the Ṣuwayqān village.

He goes on to mention their names till he makes mention of three hundred and thirteen men, which is the amount of the veterans of Badr.²

When reading these names you cannot help but laugh when you notice the clear falsity of this narration and the foolish endeavour to conceal it. One cannot stop musing at the boldness to lie and the disregard for intellect. What is even more appalling is that the Shīʿah of our times are not ashamed of producing such an indictment for public consumption, revising it, and publishing it! Or maybe it is just that Allah intends to expose them and disclose their falsehood.

The Shīʿah and the Occultation of their Mahdī:

During the period of the occultation which the Shīʿah subscribe to and in accordance with which they lived for more than a thousand and a hundred years, the scholars of the Shīʿah stopped many injunctions of the Dīn, due to their

1 This is how the narration appears in the source. Seemingly the reviser penned both names as they appeared in two variant manuscripts.

2 Al-Baḥrānī; al-Ḥujjah p. 46, the author has given reference to Dalāʿīl al-Nubuwwah p. 314.
'representation' of the Mahdī. Likewise they invented many beliefs and rulings which are not sanctioned by Allah سُبُهًا وَطَعَالَ.

For example: the Shī‘ah have due to the occultation of the Mahdī stopped the Jumu‘ah Ṣalāh just as they have prohibited the appointment of a ruler for the Muslims, they said:

الجمعة والحكومة لإمام المسلمين

The Jumu‘ah and leadership is only for the Imām of the Muslims.

And the Imām is the awaited Mahdī.

That is why majority of the Shī‘ah do not perform Jumu‘ah till today, to the extent that some of the later scholars have said:

إن الشيعة من زمن الإمام كانوا تاركين للجمعة

The Shī‘ah were deserters of the Jumu‘ah prayer from the time of the Imāms.

Similarly, the Shī‘ah do not believe in allegiance but to the Awaited Mahdī, they, therefore, renew their allegiance on a daily basis. Hence in a prayer of theirs which is known as the ‘prayer of allegiance’ their say the following:

---

1 Miftāḥ al-Karāmah: chapter of Ṣalāh: 2/69.
2 Kāẓim al-Kifā‘ī, one of their contemporary scholars from Iraq, says, “All the Shī‘ah besides al-Shaykh al-Khālīṣī who performs Jumu‘ah in the Ṣafawid Masjid, in the Kāẓimī courtyard do not perform the Jumu‘ah Ṣalāh.” (He wrote this in a letter to Doctor ’Alī al-Sālūs which the latter published in his book Fiqh al-Shī‘ah p. 263). And in Kuwait none besides Ibrāhīm Jamāl al-Dīn, the scholar of the Akhbā‘īs, performs Jumu‘ah (see: al-Sālūs: Fiqh al-Shī‘ah p. 203). When one of the Shī‘ah asked one of their senior scholars who goes by the name Muḥsin al-Ḥakīm regarding the evidence for the presence of the Mahdī to be condition for Jumu‘ah, he told him that he should not ask such questions. Likewise some of their scholars assert that Jumu‘ah is obligatory but they do not perform it (see: Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Riḍā al-Asadī: Naṣṣ al-Kitāb wa Mutawwā‘ir al-Akhbār ‘alā Wujāb al-Jumu‘ah fī Kul al-Aṣār p. 24/27-28).
3 Al-Bahbā‘ī in his footnotes upon al-Madārik. The very same has been quoted by their scholar al-Khālīṣī in his book al-Jumu‘ah p. 131
O Allah I renew in the morning of this day of mine and the evenings of my days an allegiance and a pact for him which is my responsibility. I will never turn away from it or give it up.¹

Al-Majlisī says that he should then put his right hand into his left hand as in a handshake when pledging allegiance.²

Furthermore, the Imām whose obedience is obligatory upon the Muslims from 260 A.H till today is their awaited Mahdī who is hiding in the basement. Before the year 260 A.H the obedience of the remaining twelve Imāms was obligatory. As a result, the Jihad which was fought in the times of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, and the remaining Muslim rulers was illegitimate and Ḥarām just as carrion and blood are Ḥarām. It is narrated in al-Kāfī and other books that Abū ʿAbd Allāh said:

Fighting with an Imām whose obedience is not obligatory is impermissible just as carrion, blood, and pork are impermissible.³

The armies of the Muslims who safeguard the borders, strive in the path of Allah not wanting authority and without causing corruption upon earth, and those who conquered the lands of Persia are not but murderers according to the Shīʿah. There is destruction awaiting them due to them wanting to hasten to their abode. Al-Ṭūsī narrates the following in Al-Tahdhīb:

3 Furūʿ al-Kāfī 1/334; Tahdhīb al-Ahkām 2/45; Wasā’il al-Shīʿah 11/32.
'Abd Allah ibn Sinān narrates:

I asked Abū 'Abd Allāh, “What do you say regarding those who patrol the borders and get killed doing so?”

He said, “They are seeking destruction in advance; they are murderers in this world and murderers in the hereafter. By Allah only our Shī'ah attain martyrdom, even if they die on their beds.”

As you can see, according to the Shī'ah the Jihād of the Muslims across history is illegitimate, there is no reward therein nor any compensation, to the extent that they describe the Muslim soldiers as murderers and they strip them of the names: Mujāhid and Shahīd with which Allah privileged them.

Can any person who is sane and free from being subject to his fanaticism and base desires ever doubt that the fabricators of these narrations are enemies seeking revenge and a group of jealous heretics; a people who are waiting for calamities to overtake the Ummah and who want it to meet ruination, who do not want Jihad for the cause of Allah to remain in order to protect his Dīn and his lands. The conspiracy reaches an extent where they attribute these fabrications to Ja'far al-Ṣādiq and other members of the Ahl al-Bayt so that they may advocate these lies amongst their people on the one hand and so that they may harm the Ahl al-Bayt on the other by tarnishing their reputation.

The Shī'ah have likewise prohibited the establishment of the capital punishments of Allah in a Muslim state due to the absence of their Imām, because, as they allege, the execution of the capital punishments is the duty of the emphatically appointed Imām. According to them Allah has only emphatically appointed the Twelve Imāms, the last among who went into occultation during the mid-third century and anticipation for who is compulsory in order to establish the capital punishments. However, after approximately seventy years from his occultation

1 Al-Tahdhīb 2/42; Wasā'il al-Shī'ah 11/21.
he gave permission to the Shī‘ah scholars only—and not any judge from the judges of the Muslims—to execute the capital punishments on his behalf. Hence if none of their scholars are found in any given place, it is not permissible to execute the capital punishments due to that solely being the prerogative of the hidden Imām and his representatives from the scholars of the Shī‘ah. Their scholar Ibn Bābawayh narrates the following:

٢٠٠١

ِ١٢٠١

And al-Mufīd mentions:


2 Al-Muqni’ah p, 130; Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah 18/338.

Similarly, the narrations of the Shī‘ah warn against going to the courts of the Muslims and their judges:
Whoever raises his case to them in a matter of truth or falsehood has indeed raised his case to the idols. And whatever he receives because of their decision in his favour is Ḥarām even though it be his legitimate right due to him taking it with the decision of the idols.¹

These are but few examples of the injunctions of the Sharīʿah of Islam which the Shīʿah have forbidden and postponed till the emergence of their Imām due to his absence.

They have on the other hand contrived many injunctions for themselves during the period of his occultation, such injunctions which are not sanctioned by Allah. One among them is Taqiyyah which in Islam is a concession which is temporary and should only be practiced at the time of need. They made it a compulsory action which has to continually be practiced during the era of the occultation, it is not permissible to leave it till the emergence of the Mahdī who is never going to return due to him never being born, as emphasised by the historians the genealogists and many sects of the Shīʿah themselves, returns. Whoever does not practice upon Taqiyyah is like a person who abandons ṣalāh.²

Another one is that they have given a person the status of martyrdom when he dies solely because of embracing Shīʿism and awaiting the Mahdī, not because of striving in the path of Allah. Hence a Shīʿī is a martyr even if he dies upon his bed. Their Imām is reported to have said:

إذا مات منكم ميت قبل أن يخرج قائمنا كان شهيدا، ومن أدرك قائمنا فقتل معه، و كان له أجر شهيدين

If anyone of you passes away before the emergence of our Mahdī, he is a martyr. And a person who finds the era of our Mahdī and fights with him will get the reward of two martyrs.³

¹ Furūʿ al-Kāfī 7/412; Al-Tahdhīb 6/218; Wasā’il al-Shīʿah 18/4.
² See the chapter of Taqiyyah.
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 52/123, it is narrated in the Amālī of al-Ṭūsī as well (see: Ibid, 52/122-123).
Their scholar al-Bahrānī has established a chapter in his book al-Maʿālim al-Zulfā with the title Chapter 59: Regarding the Shi‘ah being martyrs even if they die upon their beds.¹ Therein he cites multiple narrations.

Their exaggeration, as usual, than increases, to the extent that Ibn Bābawayh narrates the following from ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn:

من ثبت علي موالاتنا في غیبة قائمنا أعطاه الله عزوجل أجر ألف شهید من شهداء بدر وأحد

Whoever remains firm upon our alliance during the absence of the Mahdī, Allah will grant him the reward of a thousand martyrs from the martyrs of Badr and Uḥud.²

Likewise one of the injunctions is allegiance to the absent Imām being compulsory, to the extent that allegiance to him is renewed several times by way of prayers when visiting the tombs of the Imāms, as has passed. This is because the narration states:

من أصبح من هذه الأمة ل أمام له من الله جل وعز ظاهرا عادل أصبح ضال تائها، وإن مات علي هذه الحال مات میتة کفر ونفاق

Whoever in this Ummah becomes such that he does not have allegiance to the Imām whom Allah has appointed as an open³ and just Imām is misguided and lost. If he dies in this condition he will die a death of disbelief and hypocrisy.⁴

As for the greatest principle which they have invented during the period of occultation, it is the representation of the Shi‘ī jurist for the absent Imām. Owing to this artificial representation the Shi‘ī jurist has made many things permissible.

---

2 Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 315; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/125.
3 This suggests that their Mahdī is not an Imām because he is not open.
4 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/375.
The Shīʿah scholars, however, have differed as to the limitations of this representation. Some keeping it very limited whilst others establishing it to a very large extent, to the extent of representation in the highest levels of the responsibility; i.e. ruling a state and a referendum for enacting a state in the present country of the scholars, despite them not believing but in the explicitly nominated Imām. Due to the graveness of the idea of representation and because, at least according to me, it represents the ‘definite’ emergence of the ‘Mahdī due to a very large number of their scholars claiming it, we will analyse it in the next chapter.

The Representation of the Hidden Mahdī

The foundations of the doctrine of occultation became firmly grounded, as has passed, and the existence of a representative who could be entrusted with the responsibility of taking charge of the affairs of the Ummah and who could serve as an intermediary and the Bāb to the Imām, who was absent in the basement, the mountains of Raḍwā, or the valleys of Makkah. Hence the first representative who took charge of the affairs of the Shīʿah after the demise of al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, as has been mentioned in the books of the Twelvers, was a woman. And as Nabī  said:

ما أفلح قوم ولو أمرهم امرأة

A nation who gives charge of their affairs to a woman will never be successful.1

After the demise of al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, the widespread news of his hiding son and the Shīʿah being left without an overt Imām, the Shīʿah began to ask who they should resort to. Hence in the year 262 A.H, two years after the demise of

Hasan al-ʿAskarī, one of the Shīʿah, went to his house and asked, Khadījah bint Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Riḍā as the narration states, regarding Hasan’s alleged son and who told him the name of the son. The reporter mentions:

قلت لها فأين الولد؟ قالت: مستور، فقلت: إلي من تنزع الشیعة؟ قالت: إلي الجدة إم أبي محمد عليه السلام

I asked her, “Where is the boy?”

She said, “He is hiding.”

I then asked, “To whom should the Shīʿah resort?”

She said, “To the granny, the mother of Abū Muḥammad.”

Ostensibly the Shīʿah wanted the representation of the absent Imām to remain within the family of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī and thus they told their followers in the beginning about the mother of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī being his representative. And it seems as if this appointment was in order to create the right milieu for the growth of this doctrine among the followers, because the mother of Ḥasan was his curator and naturally she would be responsible for his alleged son after his demise. However, the severe opposition of his household to the idea of a son, as will come, compelled the Shīʿah to appoint a representative from outside the Ahl al-Bayt. Therefore the following narration of al-Ṭūsī’s al-Ghaybah mentions:

ولد الخلف المهدي صلوات الله علیه سنة خمسین ومائتین ووکیله عثمان بن سعید، فلما مات عثمان بن سعید، أوصي إلي أبي جعفر محمد بن عثمان، وأوصي أبو جعفر إلي أبي القاسم الحسین بن روح، وأوصي أبوالقاسم إلي أبي الحسن علي بن محمد السمري

The Mahdī, the successor, was born in the year 256 A.H and his representative was ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd. When ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd died he appointed Abū
Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān. And Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān appointed Abū al-Qāsim ibn Rawḥ, who in turn appointed Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Samarrī.¹

These four representatives were contested by others who also claimed representation from the household of Ḥasan. And their representation represents a personal relationship with the awaited Mahdī, which is why the era of their representation is known as the minor occultation.

The rights that these representatives enjoyed were very similar to the rights of the Imām in terms of obedience to them being compulsory and in terms of their reliability in transmission. In al-Ghaybah of al-Ṭūsī it appears that Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī said:

هذا إمامكم من بعدي (وأشار إلي ابنه) وخلفيتي عليكم أطیعوه ولتتفرقوا من بعدي فتتهلكوا في أديانكم. ألا وإنكم لا ترونوني من بعد يومكم هذا حتي يتم له عمر فافروبا من عثمان (الباب الأول) ما يقوله، وانتهوا إلى أمره فهو خليفه إمامكم والأمر إليه. فما قاله لكم فعني يقوله وما أدي إليكم فعني يؤديه

“This is your Imām after me,” saying this he pointed to his son, “and my successor, so obey him and do not disunite after me, for if you do so you will face destruction in your religion. Behold, you will not see him after this day till he completes a certain age, so accept from ʿUthmān what he is saying and stop at his orders, for he is the representative of your Imām and the charge of affairs will be in his hands.² Whatever he tells you he will be telling you from my side and whatever he submits to you he will be submitting from me.”³

In this manner did the Bāb receive the right to represent the Imām and take charge of affairs, his verdicts also enjoyed the credence of infallibility and sanctity due to speaking on behalf of the Imām and submitting on his behalf. Whoever opposed

---

2 Ibid. p. 217.
3 Ibid. p. 15.
these four Bābs thus would be cursed and destined for the fire of Jahannam, as had appeared in the endorsed letters of the Imām regarding the deniers.¹

The idea of representation, then, accords these four individuals the prerogative to legislate because of them speaking on behalf of the infallible Imām who has the authority to specify, confine, and abrogate the texts of the Sharīʿah, as has passed. Hence the endorsed letters which they would produce would hold the same value as the verdicts of the Imāms or even more, as has passed.² It likewise gives them the authority to issue certificates of forgiveness and deprivation, and to collect the monies of Zakāh, Khums, and endowments.

But this representation came to an end when al-Samarrī was asked to appoint a successor, for he said at that time, “For Allah is a matter which he is going to fulfil.” Hence from then onwards the major occultation started.³

The agreement of the Shīʿah to terminate the status of Bābs at al-Samarrī and to spread that amongst the people possibly was in order to safeguard the doctrine of the occultation from being exposed and revealed, for there were many Shīʿī scholars who aspired to assume the Bāb station, especially in the era of Abū al-Qāsim ibn Rawḥ, and disputes increased between them till it reached the extent of mutual imprecation, excommunication, and denouncement; as can be noticed in many of the endorsed letters which the Bābs produced attributing them to the Mahdī.

And thus al-Samarrī deemed it appropriate to close the chapter of the Bābs.

At this stage another very crucial development transpired in the idea of representation specifically and in the Shīʿī dogma in general, and that is according the status of representation to the scholars of the Shīʿah in general, for the

---

¹ Ibid. p. 244.
² See p. 450 onwards of this book.
Shīʿah agencies produced an endorsed letter attributing it to the Mahdī after the announcement of the termination of the Bāb station which stated the following:

أما الوقائع الحادثة فارجعوا فيها إلى رواة حديثنا فإنهم حجتي علیكم وأنا حجة الله

As for the newly arising issues, refer to the narrators of our tradition, for they are my evidence upon you and I am the evidence of Allah.¹

This letter announced the termination of direct communication with the Mahdī and the according of representation to the narrators of the Shīʿī tradition and the fabricators of their narrations.

This announcement accomplished many goals, the most crucial being this that the station of the Bāb no more remained restricted to one person, by way of which the spurious reality thereof could very easily be exposed due to many aspiring for it, for that was the cause of a lot of doubt and denial during the period of the minor occultation.

Likewise it circumvented the competition regarding the station of the Bāb which had already caused enough mayhem, and made it a common station for the scholars of the Shīʿah. It closed the door of exclusive representation and transformed it into a general representation which then marked the start of the major occultation. Hence the Imām now had two occultations: the minor and the major, despite their narrations only making mention of one occultation.²

---

¹ Al-Kāfī (with the commentary Mirʿāt al-ʿUqūl 4/55; Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 451; al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah p. 177; al-Iḥtijāj p. 163; Wasāʿil al-Shīʿah 18/101; Muhammad Makkī al-ʿĀmilī: al-Durrah al-Ṭāhirah p. 47.

² Some of their narrations apparently were fabricated in the wake of the death of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, they portray the occultation of the alleged son. For example, “If you receive any news regarding the occultation of your companion, do not deny it.” (Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/340). This narration seemingly throws the idea of the occultation of the Mahdī without any emphasis in order to assess the reaction of the people and counter react with appropriate action. It also mentions that the Mahdī will only have one occultation.
The Shīʿah, however, had soon rescued the situation by inventing narrations which talked of two occultations. The inventor mentions:

Abū Abd Allāh said, “The Mahdī will have two occultations: one will be short and the other will be long; in the first only his special partisans will know of his whereabouts, and in the second only his associates in Dīn.”¹

As you can see, this narration talks of two occultations: in the first only his special partisans will have access to him, which is maybe an indication to the vicegerency of the four representatives who successively claimed to be the Bāb. In the second his close associates had access to him, the narration of al-Kāfī suggests that they were thirty. But in both conditions the narrations do not deny immediate access to the Imām, whereas when al-Samarrī assumed the station he produced an endorsed letter stating:

من ادعي مشاهدة المنتظر فهو كاذب

Whoever claims to have seen the Mahdī is a liar.²

---

1 Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah 113.
2 The text has passed on p. 460 of this book.
Likewise, their scholars mention that in the major occultation ‘the great deprivation from the Imām’ ensued. Their scholar al-Nuʿmānī makes the following remarks after talking about the two occultations:

These narrations which make mention of the two occultations of the Mahdī are authentic according to us. As for the first occultation, it is the occultation wherein the vicegerents were appointed as open intermediaries who were present physically, at whose hands remedies in the form of knowledge, intricate wisdom, and answers to all the difficult and confusing questions that were being posed came about. This was the short occultation which ended and lapsed after a period of time. In the second occultation the intermediary in the form of the vicegerents was removed.\(^1\)

Despite this, the Shīʿah scholars claimed to be representatives of the Mahdī during the era of the second occultation and they based their representation upon the endorsed letter which al-Samarrī produced from their awaited Mahdī and which ordered the people to refer to the transmitters of their tradition in all arising issues.

Hence it should be noted that he did not refer the people to the Qur‘ān and the Sunnah, rather he referred them to the scholars.

Owing to this, the scholars thus assumed the station of the Bāb and thereby earned themselves sanctity and holiness amongst their followers. That is why they call their scholars who have reached the station of representation of the Imām ‘Marājiʿ’ and ‘Āyāt’, for they are a reflection of the Imām. We therefore find one of their contemporary scholars asserting that denying any of the teachings

---

1 Al-Nuʿmānī: al-Ghaybah p. 115.
of the Imām is tantamount to denying anything from Allah as in ascribing partners to Allah. This is all because of the idea of representation. Their scholar al-Muẓaffar:

Our belief regarding a Mujtahid who is eligible for Ijtihād is that he is the representative of the Imām in his absence; he is the judge and he is the highest authority; he enjoys all the rights the Imām enjoys in decision making and conflict resolution; whoever rejects him has rejected the Imām, and whoever rejects the Imām has rejected Allah E; he is on the point of ascribing partners to Allah, as appears in a narration from the truthful (Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq) of the Ahl al-Bayt. Hence a Mujtahid who is eligible is not just a reference in jurisprudential rulings, rather for him is all encompassing authority: he should be referred to in rulership matters and judicial matters. This is his prerogative specifically, no one besides him can assume his position but with his permission. Likewise it is not permissible to establish the capital punishments and discretionary punishments but with his permission. Likewise he should be referred to regarding monies which are from the rights of the Imām and his privileges.

This great position, or this all-encompassing authority which the Imām has accorded to the Mujtahid who is eligible is so that he may be his representative during his absence, which is why he is known as Nā’ib al-Imām (the representative of the Imām).¹

¹ 'Aqā’id al-Imāmiyyah p. 57.
As you might have noticed, the scholars of the Shi‘ah have completely disassociated from the Ahl al-Bayt and have clung onto this fictitious and non-existent figure. They have, thereafter, positioned themselves in the position of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt under the pretext of representing a non-existent person. This was a very big bonus. Hence we find that as soon as they united upon terminating the idea of the Bāb all their differences regarding it diffused and many of the Shi‘ah returned and abided by this idea. Simply because it gave each of those Shi‘ī figures the status of ‘the Imām’, ‘the guided’, ‘the supreme authority’ and ‘the collector of wealth’ in a way that no one from the Ahl al-Bayt would share these positions with them and nor would he expose them and their reality.

The representation which the Mahdī allegedly accorded the scholars of the Shi‘ah by way of his endorsed letter was apparently restricted to representation in issuing Fatwās regarding newly arising issues because it states, “As for the newly arising issues, refer them to the transmitters of our tradition,” as has passed, he did not grant them a fully-fledged representation. But the Shi‘ah expanded this representation till it reached its pinnacle in these times at the hands of Khomeini.¹

This is also clear from the aforementioned statement of their scholar al-Muẓaffar regarding their belief in this regard.

Over and above this, their scholars have made sweeping claims regarding their connection with the Mahdī after his major occultation, as has passed.²

Analysing the Doctrine of Occultation and the Mahdī According to the Twelvers

All the Muslim denominations oppose the Shi‘ah in the birth of the Mahdī, then how would they come to common terms with them regarding his puberty,

¹ See the chapter regarding the country of the scholars in chapter four.
² P. 461, onwards of this book.
his uprightness, his Imāmah, his infallibility, and his Mahdī status. Sadly, in substantiating any of the aforementioned the Shīʿah have no sound evidence,¹ as has passed in the previous pages when studying the various aspects of the doctrine.

The Ahl al-Sunnah thus conclusively conclude, in light of Sharʿī texts and logical reasoning, that the doctrine of the occultation of the Mahdī, based on its Twelver conception, is nothing but a fallacy, for no one has ever seen him or any sign of him, there is no information regarding him or any of his traces, no one has benefitted from him in worldly matters nor in religious matters, rather the harm and corruption which has overtaken the world due to believing in his existence cannot be known to anyone besides Allah, the Lord of the servants.²

The historians and genealogists have likewise mentioned that Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī did not have any children or offspring.³

Furthermore, they say that the Mahdī hid away in the basement after the demise of his father when his age was two, three or five—based on various narrations—and ever since he became the Imām of the people despite his childhood and occultation. Whereas according to the ruling of the Qurʿān, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah it is necessary for this orphan, if he existed, to be in the guardianship of his immediate family. Likewise it is necessary that his wealth be in the possession of a person who will protect it from him till signs of maturity are discerned in him. So how can a child who is restricted in his physical self and his wealth be an infallible Imām of all the Muslims in a way that no one’s faith is complete until he believes in him?⁴ And how can belief in him be incumbent when he is non-existent or absent for such a long a period of time; a Muslim judge is required to get a woman whose husband is missing married so that her

---

² Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/213.
³ Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/163.
⁴ Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/163.
well-being does not go to waste, then how can the welfare and well-being of this Ummah be left to waste with the absence of the Imām for such an extended period of time.\(^1\)

Even if one turns a blind eye to the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding the Mahdī of the Twelvers and his occultation, if one is to carefully study the texts of the Twelvers themselves regarding the Mahdī and his occultation he will pick up an important point which is worth careful consideration. And that is that this claim did not gain acceptance in the ranks of the Shīʿah themselves but in a relatively belated time after the Shīʿah had made an effort anew to revive it by discarding the idea of the Bāb station which exposed the doctrine anew. Hence their scholar al-Nuʿmānī, who lived during the period of the minor occultation, asserts that all of the Shīʿah besides a few were victims of doubt. Their doubt was because the signs of falsity were obvious to them, for Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī had passed away without issue, he was not known to have had a son because of which his brother and his mother distributed his inheritance.\(^2\)

The following narration appears in *al-Kāfī* which is considered the most authentic book of their four early canonical works:

> عن عبد الله بن أحمد بن خاقان قال… لما مات الحسن العسكري سنة ستين ومائتين ضجت سر من رأى ضجة واحدة مات ابن الرضا، وبعث السلطان إلي داره من يفتشها يفتش حجرها وختم علي جميع ما فيها، وطلعوا أثر ولده، وجاؤوا بناء يعرف الحمل فدخلان إلي جوهره ينظرونه ذكر بعضهن أن هناك جارية بها حمل، فوضعت تلك الجارية في حجرة ووكل بها بعض النساء، ثم أخذوا بعد ذلك في تهيئتهن… فلم فرغوا من ذلك بعد السلطان إلي أبي عسي بن المتوكل للفحص عليه، فلم فرغوا من الفحص عليه… كشف عن وجهه فعرضه علي بني هاشم من العلوية والعباسي والقواد والكتاب… ثم قال: هذا الحسن بن علي بن محمد الرضا، مات حسن أنه علي فرائه، حضره من حضره من خدم أمير المؤمنين وثقاته… ثم صلى عليه… وبعد دفنه أخذ السلطان والناس في طلب ولده كثر الفحص في المنازل والدور، وتم توقفوا عن قسمة ميراثه، ولم يزل الذين ويكلا يحفظ الجارية التي توهمة عليها الحمل ملازمين لها حتى تبين بطلان الحمل، فلم فرغوا من الفحص عليه قسم ميراثه بين أمه وأخيه جعفر.

---

1. Ibid. 1/30; al-Muntaqā p. 31; Risālah Ra’s al-Ḥusain p. 6.
2. See p. 1114 of this book.
Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd Allah ibn Khāqān narrates, “When Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī passed away in the year 260 A.H the whole of Surr Man Raʾā echoed the news of his demise. The governor sent people to his house to search it and all its rooms and to seal the house thereafter. They searched for any trace of his son, hence they brought ladies who were experts in identifying pregnancies, and they entered upon his concubines to assess them. One of them mentioned that there is a concubine who has signs of pregnancy, she was thus placed in a room and some ladies were appointed to see to her. They then started to make preparations for the burial. Having done that, the ruler sent a message to Abū ʿĪsā ibn al-Mutawakkil to perform his funeral prayer. When he came close to him he opened his face and showed it to the Banū Hāshim, the ʿAlawīs, and the ʿAbbāsids among them, the generals, and the scribes. He then said, “This is al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Riḍā, he died a natural death on his bed.” From the servants and the confidants of Amīr al-Muʾminīn many people attended his funeral. Thereafter the funeral prayer was performed. After his burial the ruler and the people began searching for his son and the investigations increased in houses and places. The distribution of his inheritance was halted. And those people appointed to see to the concubine who apparently had signs of pregnancy continuously remained with her until eventually it became clear that she was not pregnant. Subsequently, he distributed the inheritance between his mother and his brother Jaʿfar.

As you can see, the Twelvers cited this narration in order to point out the falsity of those Shī′ah who stopped the line of Imāmah at Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī refusing to accept his death, but simultaneously the narration also points out the falsity of the claim of him having a son. Because the family of Ḥasan, the guardians of the Ahl al-Bayt, and the ruler all investigated the reality of the matter openly in order to debunk what the Shī′ah were claiming in this regard. Al-Qummī and al-Nawbakhtī have, therefore, documented that after the demise of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, the Shī′ah had split into many groups, most of whom denied the existence of a son, to the extent that some of them said:

---

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/505; Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 41-42.
2 Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq p. 102-116; Firaq al-Shī′ah p. 96-112.
We searched for the son in every way possible but we did not find him. Hence if it were permissible for us to claim that Ḥasan had a hidden son then it would be permissible to make a similar claim regarding any person who dies without issue. Likewise, it would be permissible to say regarding Nabī that he left a prophet son, for the information of the demise of Ḥasan without a son is similar to the information regarding Nabī passing away without a son from his progeny. Hence the claim of the son is completely false.¹

It was this hard fact, in my opinion, which compelled the Shīʿah scholars to invent narrations which communicated one of the characteristics of the Mahdī to be the inconspicuousness of his conception and his birth and the suspicion surrounding them, in an endeavour to pass this period wherein the reality of Shīʿism potentially could be divulged.

Besides the stern disapproval of the majority of the Shīʿah, the Ahl al-Bayt also held an unequivocal stance in this regard which is one of the clearest evidences for the falsity of this doctrine, for it appears in Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī under the discussion of the events of the year 302 A.H (i.e. during the reign of the ʿAbbāsid Khalīfah al-Muqtadir) that a person claimed that he was Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ibn Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar, where after the Khalīfah summoned all the scholars of the family of Abū Ṭālib, at the head of who was Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd al-Ṣamad, the chief of the Ṭālibīn at that time who was known as Ibn Ṭūmār, and the following transpired:

فقال له ابن طومار: لم يعقب الحسن. وقد ضج بنو هاشم من دعوي هذا المدعي وقالوا: يجب أن يشهر هذا بين الناس ويعاقب أشد عقوبة. فحمل علي جمل وشهر يوم التروية ویوم عرفة ثم حبس في حبس المصريين بالجانب الغربي

¹ Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq p. 114-115; Firaq al-Shīʿah p. 103-104.
Ibn Ṭūmār said to him, “Ḥasan did not leave a son.”

And the claim of this claimant had caused a lot of upheaval in the Banū Ḥāshim and they have said, “It is necessary to expose this man in public and penalise him severely.”

Hence he was made to mount a camel and he was exposed in the public on the Day of Tarwiyyah (8th of Dhī al-Ḥijjah) and the Day of ʿArafah (9th of Dhī al-Ḥijjah). He was then imprisoned in the prison of the Egyptians which was to the west.¹

This testimony of the Banū Ḥāshim in general and the chief in specific is of paramount importance, because it is a testimony from the chief of the ʿAlawiyyīn who was very particular about keeping official records of each child that was born in the family.² And also because it was given in a very ancient time, i.e. during the period of the minor occultation, wherein the claims of this alleged Imām and his representation had immensely increased at the hands of various Shīṭī figures.

Furthermore, over and above the testimony of the chief of the ʿAlawiyyīn and the Banū Hāshim, the closest person to Hasan al-ʿAskarī—his brother Jaʿfar—also emphatically states that his brother died without issue.³

The Shīṭah concede this, instead they even assert that he confined his brothers consorts and concubines in order to ascertain whether they were pregnant or not,⁴ and that he very severely refuted any person who claimed that and called upon the Islamic empire of the time to take action against him.⁵ Al-Ṭūsī in trying to evade this says:

---

³ Al-Ṣawāʿiq al-Muḥriqah p. 168.
⁴ Al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah p. 75.
⁵ Safinah al-Bihār p. 162.
The denial of Ja’far is not worth consideration due to the consensus of everyone that he did not enjoy infallibility like the Ambiyā’ owing to which he abstain from denying the truth and claiming that which is false. It was possible for him to make mistakes.¹

So al-Ṭūsī does not accept the denial of Ja’far because he is fallible, but simultaneously he and the Twelvers accept the claim of ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd in proving a son and claiming his representation, whereas he is also fallible. Is this not a contradiction?

Why would Ja’far, who is the brother of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī from the Ahl al-Bayt and the guardian of the Ahl al-Bayt after his demise, be belied? And how can a person who is a stranger to the Ahl al-Bayt and is suspected of lying, due to him vesting in his own monetary and popularity interests by claiming to be the Bāb, be believed? Should not a person whose status is such be doubted and should not his testimony be rejected?

It is due to this emphatic and stern stance of Ja’far against the endeavours of the leading Shiʿī figures in proving a son that the Shiʿah became agitated with him, so much so that they dubbed him ‘Ja’far the liar’² and they fabricated narrations attributing them to the long gone members of the Ahl al-Bayt which carried their prophecies regarding the matter of Ja’far and warnings of staying away from him. So, for example, they have attributed the following narration to al-Sajjād:

وحرصا علي قاله أن ظفر به طمعا في ميراث أبيه بأخذه بغیر حقه

1 Al-Ghaybah p. 75.
2 Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 312; Safīnah al-Bīḥār 1/162; Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/504; Muqtabas al-Athar 14/314. They said, “He is given the title Ja’far ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq in contrast to this Ja’far whom they titled the liar or the inveterate liar (see: Muqtabas al-Athar 14/314). Hence it is very possible that the title al-Ṣādiq was accorded to Ja’far, the Imām, in order to spite his nephew Ja’far.”
It is as if I can see Jaʿfar the liar pressing upon the tyrant ruler of his time to investigate the matter of the absent friend of Allah who will disappear into the protection of Allah, due to being ignorant of his birth and because of wanting to kill him and wanting to secure his inheritance from his father without any right to it.¹

We will notice in this narration that they have accused Jaʿfar of denying the birth of the Mahdī out of his greed for inheritance, as the Arabic proverb goes:

*She infused me with her sickness and she escaped.*

In other words, it was the fabricators of these narrations who claimed the birth of the son and subsequently claimed to be his representatives in their greed for wealth, as has passed. Similarly, the narration is contradictory, because on the one hand it claims that Jaʿfar will not know of the birth whilst on the other hand it states that he will be desirous of killing him. If he was unaware of his birth then how would he desire to kill a person whose existence is not known? Furthermore, one should also study how they defend the probity of ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd and accuse Jaʿfar despite them claiming partisanship for the Ahl al-Bayt.

Moving on, Jaʿfar was not the only member of the Ahl al-Bayt who denied the birth of the Mahdī, rather their narrations suggest that denial had aroused in the house of the alleged son and from his paternal cousins. Evidence for this is the following narration which appears in the books of the Shīʿah:

Iṣḥāq ibn Yaʿqūb² says, “I asked Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān al-ʿAmrī³ to convey my letter wherein I had many questions which were bothering

---

¹ Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 312; Safīnah al-滨州r 1/162.
² Notice the Jewish names.
³ The second Bāb.
me. The response which came with the signature of the Mahdī\(^1\) entailed the following, ‘As for the question you have posed, may Allah guide you, regarding those who deny my existence from my household and my cousins, know well that there is no kinship between Allah and anyone. Whoever denies my existence is not from me and his end-result will be like that of the son of Nūḥ. As for the end-result of my brother Jaʿfar and his children it will be like the end-result of Yūsuf and his brothers.\(^2\)

This narration tells us that denying his existence started from his household and his paternal family, and the claim of his existence started from the outside. So who of the two is more worthy of acknowledgement, can the nobles of the Ahl al-Bayt be belied, and an ego-centric figure who is not known to have any firm grounding in Dīn, knowledge, family background, etc., be believed?

It can be averred that maybe his household and his paternal family were concealing his matter in order to save him, however, the aforementioned letter which was issued by the alleged Mahdī posits that their denial was based on reality, because therein he asserts that their disbelief is like that of the son of Nūḥ\(^\text{3}\) due to there being no kinship between Allah and the creation, the basis of their dogma being based upon the merit of the Imāms due to their kinship with Rasūl Allah\(^\text{4}\) notwithstanding.

Likewise their vitriolic attack against Jaʿfar, dubbing him a liar and attributing every fault and blemish to him\(^3\) also posits that this denial from the family of Ḥasan was based on reality. Their denial specifically was the reason why the spearheads of this movement invented all those narrations which attacked Jaʿfar,

\(^1\) How would they know that it was the letter of the Mahdī, that is if he existed, when writings resemble writings and the person producing the letter is infallible and is suspected due to him vesting in his personal interests, more so when the one who is transmitting this letter from Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān holds a Jewish identity.

\(^2\) Ikmāl al-Dīn p. 415; al-Iḥtijāj (printed in Najf in 1386 A.H.) 2/283, (Beirut print 1401 A.H.) 2/469; Safīnah al-Bihār 1/163; Muqtabas al-Athar 14/316.

\(^3\) See p. 1216: footnote no. 2 of this book.
the household of the awaited, and his paternal family, warned against them and were replete with hatred for them. Nonetheless, their stance still had its effects in those times, for all of the Shīʿah had doubted this doctrine besides a few, as is attested to by al-Nuʿmānī and others.

Apart from all of this, Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī himself, to who this fictitious son is attributed, denied having any son, for in his fatal illness he addresses his bequest to his mother and he gives the responsibility of taking charge of all his endowments and charities, he also makes the prominent people of the state and people eligible for testifying in the court to that, as is narrated by al-Kulaynī in his al-Kāfī\(^1\) and Ibn Bābawayh in Ikmāl al-Dīn,\(^2\) and others.\(^3\) Had he had a son who possessed all those supernatural and perfect characteristics it would not have been permissible for him to appoint anyone besides him, for a person who is the vicegerent of Allah in his creation, the ruler of the Ummah, a source of safety for the universe and the humans residing within it surely will be able to uphold the responsibilities of the endowments of his father and his charities despite his occultations. Hence not appointing him is a sign that he did not exist.

The statement of al-Ṭūsī that Ḥasan done so in order to conceal the matter of his son and save him from the ruler of the time\(^4\) does not in any way impact on this argument due to it being without any evidence.

Due to the aforementioned reasons the invalidity of his existence and whatever is based on it is completely clear.

This is the testimony of the Ahl al-Sunnah, majority of the Shīʿī sects, the chiefs of the Ahl al-Bayt, the family of Abū Ṭālib, his brother Jaʿfar, and Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī himself. All these testimonies and evidences debunk the claim of a son, they

---

2. *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 42.
3. Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 75.
4. *Al-Ghaybah* p. 75.
debunk the claims of those strange people who claimed to be his Bābs and to have seen him. How much more inevitable would the evidence then become when the improbability of his existence for centuries on end is added to all the aforementioned. If Allah were to increase the life of any human due to the creation being in need of him he would have extended the life of Rasūl Allah, as Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā mentioned. Not forgetting that till today no one knows where he is, nor is there any reliable person who can bring us information about him.

Whoever had to hide from an oppressive ruler due to fear for his life or for other reasons, the period of his hiding was short and was not unknown to everyone.

Furthermore, how can the first responsible person of the Ummah go into occultation for such a long period? Is this all not evidence of the fact that the doctrine of occultation is based upon a fairy tale which was invented by the heretics and haters?

Apparently there were monetary and political benefits behind this doctrine, for the greed for exclusively amassing wealth and the endeavour to make the Muslim empire crumble were the two main impetuses for the invention of this doctrine. And the evidence for this is that the language of money prevailed among the Shīʿī sects, money was the basis of their disputes and differences, as the books of the Twelvers have preserved, as has passed.

Likewise the issue of political dominance and Imāmah was the central discussion of these covert Shīʿī movements around which they revolved, and inventing the idea of a Hidden Imām would emancipate them from the Ahl al-Bayt and place control into their hands.

They hardly exhorted their intellect, deliberation, and contemplation in reaching this goal; because they had already found the basis of this idea in the Zoroastrianism, for the Zoroastrians claimed that they have a living leader whose anticipation they await, as has passed already.
Chapter Five

Rajʿah (The Return)

Rajʿah is one of the fundamentals of the Shīʿī dogma, one of their narrations state:

ليس منا من لم يؤمن بكرتنا

He who does not believe in our return is not from amongst us.¹

And Ibn Bābawayh mentions the following in his Al-ʿIʿtiqādāt:

واعتقادنا في الرجعة أنها حق

Our belief regarding the Rajʿah is that it is true.²

And al-Mufīd says:

واتفقت الإمامية علي وجوب رجعة كثير من الأموات

The Imāmiyyah are unanimous regarding the return of many of the deceased.³

Likewise al-Ṭabarsī, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī, and other Shīʿah scholars assert that it is a locus of consensus between the Shīʿah,⁴ that it is one of the categorically established aspects of their Dīn⁵ and that they are ordered to verbally profess it,

---

¹ See p. 62 of this book.
² Al-ʿIʿtiqādāt p. 90.
³ Awāʾil al-Maqālāt p. 51.
⁵ Al-Īqāẓ min al-Hajʿah p. 60.
believe in it and acknowledge it in their prayers, visitations, on Fridays and every given moment, just as a person is required to acknowledge the oneness of Allah 

\( \text{الله} \), the prophethood of Nabī \( \text{النبي} \), the Imāmah of the A’immah, and the Day of Judgement.\(^1\)

**The meaning of Rajʿah**: Returning to the world after death.\(^2\) Ibn Athīr mentions that it was a well-known belief of an Arab tribe in the days of ignorance.\(^3\)

Many Shī'a sects believed that their Imāms will return to this world: some acknowledged their death and believed in their subsequent arrival, whilst others asserted that they have not died but have gone into occultation and will return after a period of time, as has passed already in the discussion of occultation. The first person to espouse the idea of Rajʿah was Ibn Saba’, he, however, believed that ‘Alī disappeared, he did not die, and will return.

Initially the doctrine of Rajʿah was specific to the return of the Imāms according to the Saba’iyyah and the Kaysāniyyah. According to the Twelvers, however, it evolved into believing in the return of the Imām and various other people as well. Al-Ālūsī suggests that this important evolution transpired in the third century.\(^4\)

Some Shī‘ī sects even became known as the Rajʿiyyah due to their strong belief in Rajʿah and lending it a lot of importance.\(^5\)

As for the general understanding of the doctrine of Rajʿah according to the Twelvers, it comprises of three types:

1. Ibid. p. 64.
5. Ibn al-Jawzī has made mention of them as a distinct sect in Talbīs Iblīs p. 22. The following scholars have also mentioned them as distinct groups: al-Qurṭubī: *Bayān al-Firaq* (manuscript) p. 3; ʿĀlam Muḥammad Effendī: *al-Risālah al-Firaqiyyah* (manuscript) p. 2; al-Salkhī: *Sharḥ al-Ithnayn wa al-Sabʿīn firqah* (manuscript) p. 13.
1. The twelve Imāms, for the Mahdī will emerge from his hiding place and the remaining Imāms will be brought to life after their demise and made to return to this world.

2. The Muslim rulers who usurped the Khilāfah, according to them, from its Sharʿī and rightful candidates, i.e. the twelve Imāms. These rulers will be raised, at the forefront of who will be Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān. They will be made to return to this world, as the Shīʿah dream, so that retribution is taken from them, hence they will be punished, killed, or crucified.

3. Common people, more specifically, those who had pure faith, i.e. The Shīʿah because they are only 'believers', as is conclusively suggested in their narrations and the verdicts of their scholars,¹ and those who were steeped in disbelief, i.e. all the people besides the weak and vulnerable.²

They have, therefore, said the following in defining Rajʿah:

رجعة كثير من الأموات إلي الدنيا قبل يوم القيامة وعودتهم إلي الحیاة بعد الموت في صورهم التي كانوا عليها

The return of many of the dead to this world before the Day of Judgement and their life after death³ in the appearances which they had in this world.⁴

---

¹ See p. 775 of this book.
² The term Mustaḍʿafūn (weak and vulnerable) based on the Shīʿī narrations and the opinions of their ancient and contemporary scholars refers to, as al-Majlisī says, people with weak intelligence like old women, dim-witted people, and their likes; it also refers to people upon who the evidence has not been established due to them passing away during the period of Fatrah (discontinuation of prophets) or who did not receive the news of the Imām. The fate of these people is left to the discretion of Allah, he can either punish them, or he can forgive them due to which there will be hope of salvation for them. (Biḥār al-Anwār 8/363; al-Majlisī Al-Iʿtiqādāt p. 100)
³ Al-Mufīd: al-Maqālāt p. 95.
⁴ Awāʾil al-Maqālāt p. 95.
And those who will return to this world will be:

النبي الخاتم وسائر الأنبیاء والأئمة المعصومون ومن محض في الإسلام ومن محض في الكفر دون الطبقة الجاهلیة المعبر عنها بالمستضعفین

The last prophet, all the Ambiyā’, the infallible Imāms, those sincere in faith, and those steeped in disbelief, with the exemption of the people who lived during the era of ignorance who are known as the weak.¹

Or in other words, as al-Mufīd states:

من علت درجه في الإیمان، ومن بلغ الغایة في الفساد کلهم یرجعون بعد موتهم

Those who have high ranks in faith and those who reach the utmost degree of corruption, all of them will return to the world.²

Likewise, the one who has to take retribution, even though he is not high in ranking will return and take revenge from his murderer.³

The period of the general Raj’ah will be, as their scholar al-Mufīd asserts, during the emergence of the Mahdī of the family of Muḥammad and his return from his occultation.⁴ However, one of their scholars avers that the general Raj’ah is not linked with the emergence of the Mahdī due to the Raj’ah being distinct from the emergence. Because the Imām is alive and in occultation, and he will emerge, if Allah wills, when dominion will not have been snatched due to which he will have to return. Hence the beginning of the Raj’ah will be from the return of Ḥusayn to the world.⁵

---

1 Jawwād Tārā: Dā’irat al-Maʿārif al-ʿAlawiyyah 1/253.
2 Awāʾil al-Maqālāt p. 95.
This is in harmony with some of their narrations which state:

أول من تنشق الأرض عنه ويرجع إلي الدنيا الحسين بن علي عليه السلام

The first person for who the land will split where after he will return to the world is Ḥusayn.¹

Some of their narrations state that the Rajʿah will begin after demolishing the room of Nabī H and removing the pure bodies of the two rightly guided successors of Rasūl Allah H, as they envisage, for their narrations state that the Mahdī said:

وأجئ إلى يثرب فأهدم الحجرة، وأخرج من بها وهما طرائنا فأمر بهما نجاه اليقين، وأمر بخشتيين يصبان عليهما فثوران من تحتهما، فيشتحن الناس بهما أشد من الأولي، فينادي منادي الفتنة من السماء يا سماء انبذي ويا أرض خذي. فيومئذ ليبقى علي وجه الأرض إلا مؤمن (أي إلا شيعي) ثم يكون بعد ذلك الكرة والرجعة

I will come to Yathrib (Madīnah) and demolish the room. I will take out its inmates fresh and alive and will order that they be taken to Baqīʿ. I will then order that two planks be erected whereupon they will be crucified. Subsequent to which they (the planks) will grow leaves which will confuse the people more than the first time. The announcer of the tribulation will announce, “O heavens throw, and O earth catch.” On that day no one besides a believer (a Shīʿī) will remain. Thereafter the Rajʿah and the return will begin.²

The objective for the Rajʿah will be the vengeance of the Imāms and the Shīʿah from their enemies,³ namely all the Muslim besides the Shīʿah and the weak; the swords of the Shīʿah will be dripping with blood due to killing the Muslims excessively, so much so that Abū ʿAbd Allah is reported to have said:

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 53/39.
² Ibid. 53/104-105.
³ Al-Īqāẓ min al-Hajʿah p. 58.
It is as if I can see Ḥumrān ibn A’yan and Maysar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz dropping the people between Ṣafā and Marwā with their swords.¹

There is no doubt in the fact that specifying the holy Ḥaram for killing very strongly suggests that the Muslims will be the targets of murder, and that this is what the Shīʿah dream of doing. This narration and others of its like, their fictitious nature notwithstanding, give us an image of the thoughts of the Shīʿī figures who fabricated these narrations, and of their plans and goals; they are projections of a people whose endeavours were defeated and whose tendencies were subdued, of a people who wait for calamities to befall this Ummah.

These narrations which were being circulated clandestinely² also clarify the mass-murder that the Qarāmiṭah carried out upon the Ḥujjāj in the Holy Ḥaram. They would use this type of narrations which are falsely attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt in order to defend their positons of massacring the Muslims.

They also explain why the contemporary Shīʿah are enthusiastic about conquering Makkah and Madīnah as if they currently exist in the hands of disbelievers.³

Another prominent event which will take place during the Rajʿah is the accountability of people’s actions at the hands of Ḥusayn. Abū ‘Abd Allah says:

إن الذي يلي حساب الناس قبل يوم القيامة الحسین بن علي عليه السلام، فأما يوم القيامة فإنما هو بعث إلى الجنة وبعث إلى النار

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 53/40, attributing it al-Ikhtiṣāṣ of al-Mufīd, however I did not find it in the edition I had before me.
² Because Rajʿah was one secret from their many secrets.
The person who will be responsible for taking people’s reckoning before the Day of Judgement will be Ḥusayn. As for the Day of Judgement, it is meant for sending people either to Jannah or Jahannam.¹

Likewise, during the Rajʿah the Ambiyā’, who are the paragons of Allah’s creation, will be demoted to the position of soldiers in the army of ʿAlī, as these fraudsters assert:

لم ببعث الله نبیا ولا رسول إلا رد جميعهم إلى الدنيا حتى يقاتلو بيد علي بن أبي طالب أمير المؤمنين

There is no Nabī or Rasūl who Allah has sent to this world but that he will return to this world and fight in front of Amir al-Mu’minīn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib.²

Similarly, the Shīʿah dream that during the period of Rajʿah they will be living in such bliss and prosperity as cannot be imagined:

یكون أكلهم وشربهم من الجنة، ولیسألون الله حاجة من حوائج الدنيا والخرة إلا يقضي لهم

Their foods and drinks will be from Jannah.³ And they will not ask Allah for any need of this world or the hereafter but that it will be fulfilled for them.⁴

A Shīʿī will be given the choice in his grave to either return to this world or to stay in the grave. It will be said to him:

يا هذا إنه قد ظهر صاحبك فإن تشاء أن تلحق به فالحق وإن تشاء أن تقيم في كرامة ربك فأقم

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār: chapter regarding Rajʿah 53/43.
² Ibid. 53/41.
³ Ibid. 53/116.
⁴ Ibid.
O you! Your companion has emerged, if you thus desire to join him, join him, and if you desire to remain in the boons of your Lord, then stay.¹

The Rajʿah for the Shīʿah will end with the killing of those who died naturally and the death of those who were killed previously. This end is stated as one of the objectives of the Rajʿah, they say:

ليس أحد من المؤمنين قتل إلا سيرجع حتى يموت ولا أحد من المؤمنين مات إلا سيرجع حتى يقتل

There is no believer who was previously killed but that he will return and die naturally, nor will there be any believer who died naturally but that he will be killed.²

Nevertheless, the doctrine of Rajʿah was a secret from the secrets of the Shiʿī dogma, Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Khayyāṭ, one of the scholars of the Muʿtazilah,³ states:

بإنهم قد تواصوا بكتمانها وأل یذکروها في مجالسهم ولا في کتبهم إل فیما قد أسروه من الكتب ولم

They have sworn to keep it a secret and not to mention it in their gatherings and their books, with the exception of those books which they keep to themselves.⁴

There are narrations in the books of the Twelvers which indicate to the aforementioned claim of al-Khayyāṭ, for the Shīʿah narrate the following from Abū Jaʿfar:

لا يقولوا الجبت والطاغوت ولا يقولوا الرجعة فإن قالوا لكم فإنكم قد كنتم تقولون ذلك فقولوا: أما اليوم فلا تقول

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah p. 276; Bihār al-Anwār 53/92.
2 Taḥsīr al-Qummī 2/131; al-Burḥān 3/211; Taḥsīr al-Ṣâfī 4/76; Bihār al-Anwār 53/40, see also: 39, 41, 53, 77 and 137 of the same volume; Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 407-408.
3 He lived before 300 A.H. (See: Muʿjam al-Muʿallifīn 5/223).
4 Al-Intiṣār p. 97.
Do not say *Jibt* and *Ṭāghūt*¹ and do not say Rajʿah. If they say to you that you used to say that, retort, “As of today we don’t say.”

In another narration which they attribute to al-Ṣādiq the following appears:

لا تقولوا الجبت والطاغوت وتقولوا الرجعة، فإن قالوا: قد كنتم تقولون؟ قولوا: الآن لا نقول، وهذا من التقية التي تعبد الله به عباده في زمن الأوصياء

Do not say Jibt and Ṭāghūt and do not say Rajʿah. If they ask you, “You people would indeed say those things?” Tell them, “As of now we don’t say.” This is Taqiyyah which Allah has ordered his servants to practice during the era of the successors.²

These were secret phenomena which the Shīʿah would discuss, and in order to infuse them with certainty and strength they attributed them to some of the members of the Ahl al-Bayt so as to mislead the laymen, the new-Muslims and non-Arabs.

**Their Evidence for the Doctrine of Rajʿah**

The Shīʿah focused their attention to the Book of Allah in order to derive evidence therefrom to substantiate the doctrine of Rajʿah, a doctrine unique to them apart from the Muslims. When they did not succeed in their endeavour they resorted to, as is their wont, esoteric interpretations; they mounted the conveyance of exaggeration and recklessly contrived such evidences which rather became evidence against them, a proof of the falsity of the doctrine and the invalidity of their dogma. For this reality to become clear to us we are going to analyse some of their strongest evidences in this regard.

---

¹ Al-Majlisī comments, “I.e. do not make mention of those two accursed men with these names, or do not make any mention of them.” (*Bihār al-Anwār* 53/40), in this he making reference to the two successors of Rasūl Allah, his fathers-in-law and his beloveds; Abū Bakr and ʿUmar.

² Ibid. 53/115-116.
Their leading scholar asserts in *Tafsīr al-Qummī* that the strongest evidence for the doctrine of Rajʿah is the following:

وَحَرَامٌ عَلٰى قَرْیَةٍ أَهْلَكْنَاهَا أَنَّهُمْ لَ يَرْجِعُونَ

And it is prohibited to [the people of] a city which we have destroyed that they will [never] return.¹

He says regarding the verse:

هذه الآية من أعظم الأدلة علي الرجعة، لأن أحدا من أهل الإسلام لا ينكر أن الناس كلهم يرجعون يوم القيامة من هلك ومن لم يهلك

This verse is one of the greatest evidences for Rajʿah, for no one from the Muslims denies that all the people will return on the Day of Judgment, those who died and those who never.²

Whereas this verse is against them, for it rejects the idea of returning to this world. It means, as stated by Ibn ʿAbbās, Abū Jaʿfar al-Bāqir, Qatādah, and many others that it is completely impossible for a nation who was destroyed because of its sins to return to this world before the Day of Judgment.³ This is akin to the verse wherein Allah states:

أَلَمْ یَرَوْا کَمْ أَهْلَكْنَا قَبْلَهُم مِّنَ الْقُرُوْنِ أَنَّهُمْ إِلَیْهِمْ لَ یَرْجِعُونَ

Have they not considered how many generations we destroyed before them – which they to them will not return?⁴

And the verse:

1 Sūrah al-Ambiyā’: 95
2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/76: on the top of the page he has established the title: ‘the greatest verse which proves Rajʿah’.
3 *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 3/205.
4 Sūrah Yāsīn: 31.
And they will not be able [to give] any instruction, nor to their people can they return.\footnote{Sūrah Yāsīn: 50.}

The additional \( \lambda \) (negating particle) in the verse under question is in order to emphasise the negation which is already conveyed in the word Ḥarām. This is one of the profound and eloquent styles of the Qur’ān which is very intricate. The reason why Allah \( سُنَّةٌ وَقَدْ أَحْلَىٰ \) informs of there being no return is in order to clearly state that which troubles them the most and hurts them immensely, i.e. their everlasting destruction and the nonrealization of their biggest hope which is staying in this world forever.\footnote{Tafsīr al-Qāsimī 11/293.}

And even if the verse intends to prove a return it definitely proves the return of people on the Day of Judgment,\footnote{Some scholars have opined this and assert that this verse focuses at establishing faith in the afterlife; and it is a culmination for what appears before it, i.e. the verse, “Each one will return to us.” (al-Ambiyā’: 93). The ‘\( \lambda \)’ in the verse will then be in its literal meaning and when coupled with Ḥarām it negates the negative which brings about a positive meaning. The meaning of the verse will then be: It is impermissible for a destroyed nation not to return to the hereafter, it is rather necessary for it to return for compensation and punishment. Hence the verse is in place to debunk the view of those who do not concede the afterlife. (Tafsīr al-Qāsimī 11/293).} i.e. them returning to us for recompense is completely impermissible.\footnote{Fatḥ al-Qadīr 3/426.} And specifically making mention of the impermissibility of them not returning despite it already being included indirectly in the verse:

\[ کُلٌّ إلَیْنَا رَاجِعُوْن \]

Each one will return to us.

is because they denied resurrection.\footnote{Rūḥ al-Maʿānī 17/91.}
Another verse which the Shī‘ah use to substantiate the doctrine of Raj‘ah is:

وَیَوْمَ نَحْشُرُ مِّنْ کُلِّ أمَّةٍ فَوْجًا مِّمَّن یُکَذِّبُ بِآیَاتِنَا فَهُمْ یُوزَعُوْنَ

And [warn of] the Day when we will gather from every nation a company of those who deny our signs, and they will be [driven] in rows.¹

This verse, as the exegetes of the Qur‘ān have mentioned, is pertaining to the Day of reckoning and accountability, the day when people will stand before Allah.²

The Shī‘ah however use this verse to prove their doctrine of Raj‘ah, hence their scholar Shibr states that it has been explained with their narrations of Raj‘ah.³

And al-Ṭabarsī says:

استدل بهذه الآية علي صحة الرجعة من ذهب إلي ذلك من الإمامية بأن قال: إن دخول من في الكلام
یوجب التبعیض. فدل بذلك علي أنه يحشر قوم دون قوم وليس ذلك صفة يوم القيامة الذي يقول فيه
سبحانه: وَحَشَرْنَاهُمْ فَلَمْ نُغَادِرْ مِنْهُمْ أَحَدًا

Those of the Imāmiyyah who are of the opinion of the validity of the Raj‘ah draw evidence from this verse and say, “The ‘من’ (lit. From) in the verse gives the meaning of ‘some’, which implies that some people will be raised and some will not. This will not be the case on the Day of Judgment as Allah says, “And we will gather them and not leave behind from them anyone.”⁴,⁵

As for ‘من’ (in the first verse) at times giving the meaning of ‘some’, it is completely regular,⁶ for every nation comprises of acceptors and beliers, so in light of this the

¹ Sūrah al-Naml: 83.
³ Tafsīr Shibr p. 369.
⁴ Sūrah al-Kahf: 47.
⁵ Tafsīr al-Ṭabarsī 5/251-252
verse would mean: On the day when those who belied our verses will be gathered from every nation from the nations of the prophets or from the nations of any of the ages. This interpretation of the verse does not in any way suggest any return to this world after death in any condition. But the Shī‘ah due to not having any evidence which supports their doctrine resort to all the verses in the Qur‘ān which talk of people’s return to Allah in the afterlife and interpret them as Raj‘ah.

Specifying the deniers with this resurrection does not necessarily approve what they claim due to it being in order to rebuke them and punish them after the general and all-encompassing resurrection of the creation. As for the من in the second verse, it is explanatory, it is explaining the words ‘droves’. One of the contemporary Shī‘ī exegetes picked up the deviance of the Shī‘ah in this regard and said the following in interpreting the verse:

The من here is explanatory, it is not giving the meaning of ‘some’. It is like when we say a ring from iron. And the meaning of the verse is: Nations are either acceptors of the verses of Allah and his evidences or their deniers, he will raise all the deniers for accountability and punishment without any exception. Allah, however, specifically makes mention of their resurrection because he intends to rebuke them and sternly warn them.

One of the verse which they use is:

1 Rūḥ al-Ma‘ānī 20/26; see the previously cited references for the interpretation of the verse (footnote no. 42)
3 Rūḥ al-Ma‘ānī 20/26.
Destroyed [i.e. cursed] is man; how disbelieving is he.¹

In Tafsīr al-Qummī the following is mentioned under the commentary thereof:

قَالَ: هُوَ أَمِيرُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ، قَالَ: مَا أَكْفَرَهُ أي مَا فَعَلَ وَأَذْنَبَ حَتَّى قَتَلَهُ... ثُمَّ أَمَاتَهُ فَأَقْبَرَهُ ثُمَّ إِذَا شَاءَ أَنْصَرَهُ

He said, “He is Amīr al-Mu’minīn.” Allah says regarding him, “What made him a disbeliever,” i.e. what sin did he commit because of which they killed him... Then Allah gave him death, and buried him. And subsequently Allah will raise him when he wants. Allah then says, ‘No! He has not as yet fulfilled what he ordered him,’ i.e. Amīr al-Mu’minīn has not fulfilled that which Allah ordered him with, he will thus return and fulfil the orders of Allah.²

There are few aspects worth consideration here:

Firstly, their scholar al-Qummī has interpreted ‘man’ in the verse: ‘destroyed is man; how disbelieving is he’ as ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, whereas the wording of the verse, and the context wherein it appears both determine that a disbeliever is meant by ‘man’, which is why the early scholars have said the following in the explanation of the verse:

May a disbelieving man be accursed, how ungrateful is he?³

---

1 Sūrah ʿAbas: 17.
2 Tafsīr al-Qummī 2/405.
3 Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 30/54.
So is this interpretation aimed at satirising Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn subtly, or is it the aftermath of the influence of the Kāmiliyyah, a sub-sect of the Shī‘ah, who excommunicate Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn and the remaining Ṣaḥābah which the Shī‘ah have imbibed, or is it that the fabricator of this interpretation is a non-Arab who is ignorant of the language of the Qur’ān and merely wrote what his fanaticism and heresy dictated to him.

Whatever the case maybe, it shows the lack of evidence which these people possess in trying to prove their point.

Secondly, he interprets the verse, ‘And subsequently Allah will raise him when he wants,’ which is emphatic regarding resurrection to mean Raj‘ah. Apart from this being a distortion of the meaning of the Qur’ān, it averts a person who believes in these narrations from believing in the hereafter to believing in this innovated doctrine. It is for this reason that we find that many Shī‘ī sects did not believe in the Last Day but rather believed in the transmigration of souls.2

In this regard it should be noted that the Twelvers have taken every verse of Qiyāmah and interpreted it with Raj‘ah, and it has passed already that this has become a general principle according to them.3

Thirdly, these narrations suggest that the purpose for the return of ‘Alī is due to him not fulfilling the orders of Allah. This is very slanderous, for it

---

1 Kāmiliyyah: They excommunicated ‘Alī due to him not revolting against the Ṣaḥābah when they pledged their allegiance to Abū Bakr. They likewise excommunicated all the Ṣaḥābah due to them not acknowledging the right of ‘Alī to leadership. According to al-Nāshi‘ al-Akbar they were known as the Kumayliyyah, they were the followers of Kumayl ibn Ziyād. He then goes onto mention their school of thought. According to al-Ash‘arī, al-Baghdādī, and al-Shahrastānī they were known as the Kāmiliyyah. Al-Ash‘arī states that they were the followers of Abū Kāmil. (See: Masā‘il al-Imāmah p. 45; Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq p. 14; Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/89; al-Farq bayn al-Firaq p. 54; al-Milal wa al-Nihal 1/174).


3 See p. 238 of this book.
suggests that Amīr al-Muʾminīn discarded the commandments of Allah سَبِيلَةِ وَقِيَال so that he could fulfil them after his return. Do they intend to liken him with the polytheists who will desire to return to this world after they will have witnessed the punishment which awaits them? How disrespectful are not these people to the Ahl al-Bayt.

Another verse which the Shīʿah use to establish the doctrine of Rajʿah is:

کُلُّ نَفْسٍ ذَائِقَةُ الْمَوْتِ

Every soul shall taste death.¹

They aver the following in the explanation of this verse:

لم يذق الموت من قتل ول بد أن يرجع حتى يذوق الموت

A person who was killed did not taste death, hence he will have to return to this world to taste death.²

This narration proves Rajʿah for all the people so that each one of them experiences murder and death, as they believe, whereas, as seen previously, they aver that Rajʿah will be specific to those who are pure in faith and those who are steeped in disbelief. Furthermore, this interpretation is due to being ill-informed in the Arabic language in which the Qurʾān was revealed, because it considers murder not to be a type of death which is mentioned in the verse. This unfortunately is the extent of their knowledge.

Besides these verses, the Shīʿah latch onto many other verses and interpret them with extremely esoteric interpretations, as is their wont in making excessive interpretations and attributing them to the Ahl al-Bayt to lend them

---

¹ Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 185.
² Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 1/210; Biḥār al-Anwār 53/71.
credence. Hence according to al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī the amount of verses which they have interpreted with Rajʿah is seventy two; therein their interpretations have reached unprecedented levels of artificiality. Not forgetting that al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī does not cite all their substantiations in this regard, he rather apologises for not penning the rest down due to not having access to all their books.

The Shiʿah also draw evidence from some of the miracles of the Ambiyāʾ, of which Allah has informed us in the Qurʾān. For example, the reviving of the dead by Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī, or from all those incidents in the Qurʾān where Allah discusses reviving the dead. One such verse is the following:

َّ أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِیْنَ خَرَجُوْا مِنْ دِیَارِهِمْ وَهُمْ أُلُوْفٌ حَذَرَ الْمَوْتِ فَقَالَ لَهُمُ اللَّهُ مُوْتُوْا ثُمَّ أَحْیَاهُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَذُوْ فَضْلٍ عَلَى النَّاسِ وَلٰكِنَّ أَکْثَرَ النَّاسِ لَ یَشْكُرُوْنَ

Have you not considered those who left their homes in many thousands, fearing death? Allah said to them, “Die”; then He restored them to life. And

1 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: al-Īqāẓ min al-Hajʿah p. 72-98
2 In addition to the above-cited verses, here are some more examples which smack of their appalling indiscretion in this regard. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī says, “The third chapter: verses of the Qurʾān which prove the validity of Rajʿah”. In this chapter some of the verses that he cites are the following:

وَلَفَّدُ أَبْنَآ إِلَيْهِ بِغَزْدَةٍ فَطَسْلاً

And we certainly gave Dāwūd from us bounty. (Saba’: 10). See the previously cited reference: p. 92.

وَلَقَدْ آتَیْنَا دَاوُودَ مِنَّا فَضْ

And we have enjoined upon man, to his parents, good treatment. His mother carried him with hardship and gave birth to him with hardship. (al-Aḥqāf: 15) Ibid. p. 94.

وَوَصَّیْنَا الإِْنسَانَ بِوَالِدَیْهِ إِحْسَانًا

And in the heaven is your provision and whatever you are promised. (al-Dhāriyāt: 22) Ibid. 95.

ۖ حَمََلَتْهُ أُمُّهُ کُرْهًا وَوَضَعَتْهُ کُرْهًا ۖ

This is the level of their substantiation and the height of their evidence. They have in doing so combined the innovative belief of Rajʿah and the interpolation of the meanings of the Qurʾān.

3 Al-Īqāẓ min al-Hajʿah p. 98.
Allah is full of bounty to the people, but most of the people do not show 
gratitude.\textsuperscript{1,2}

In this method of substantiation it seems as if the Shīʿah endeavour to prove the 
power of Allah, which is not the point of divergence due to no one ever 
denying any supernatural occurrence which is recorded and established through 
undeniable and mass-transmitted reports. The point of divergence, however, is 
the claim of returning to this world after death for accountability and recompense 
or retribution. This is so erroneous that there is no evidence to prove it, more so 
when one of the motives behind it is weakening people’s belief in the Last Day. 
Aside from that, there is no dispute regarding the miracles of the Ambiyā’ and the 
extravagant signs of Allah in his creation.

Lastly, the anomaly in their substantiations reaches staggering levels when they 
assert that the clearest and most conclusive evidence for the validity of the 
doctrine of Rajʿah is the fact that no one besides the Imāmī Shīʿah\textsuperscript{3} believe in it.\textsuperscript{4} 
They say:

\textit{لم يقل بصحتها أحد من العامة (وهم ما سوي الشيعة الإمامية) وكل ما كان كذلك فهو حق. لأن الأئمة 
قالوا في حق العامة: والله ما هم علي شيء مما أنتم عليه، ولأنتم علي شيء مما هم عليه فخالفوهم فيما 
هم من الحنفية علي شيء.}

No one from the commonality (i.e. everyone besides the Shīʿah) believes 
in the validity thereof, and whatever is of this sort is the truth.\textsuperscript{5} This is 
because the Imāms are reported to have said, “By Allah! You are not on 
anything which they are on, nor are they on anything which you are on. So 
oppose them, for they have nothing in common with the Ḥanifiyyah (the 
pure religion).”\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{1} Sūrah al-Baqarah: 243.
\textsuperscript{2} See: \textit{Biḥār al-Anwār} 53/129; \textit{al-Īqāẓ min al-Hajʿah} p. 131.
\textsuperscript{3} Those who believe in the line of Imāms.
\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Al-Īqāẓ min al-Hajʿah} p. 98.
\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Al-Īqāẓ min al-Hajʿah}. p. 69.
\textsuperscript{6} Ibid. p. 69.
It is owing to this that al-Ṭabarsī asserts that the unanimity of the Shīʿah in this regard is the greatest evidence in this regard.¹

However, the following should be noted regarding this substantiation:

Unanimity is not evidence according to the Shīʿah, as has passed. How can they then use it as the basis for establishing the doctrine of Rajʿah? But they might treat the acceptance of the doctrine of Rajʿah by all the Shīʿah without exception to be evidence of the fact that the infallible Imām is concurring with them and thus the credence of their unanimity. Because unanimity is only evidence for the Shīʿah when it reveals or leads to the opinion of the infallible.

However, the Zaydī Shīʿah report abundant narrations which emphatically exonerate the Imāms from the doctrine of Rajʿah and oppose the narrations of the Twelvers. It is for this reason that the ardent adherents of the Zaydī creed refute this claim very severely, and they debunk it in detail in their books.² So how do the Twelvers then assertively attribute the doctrine of the Rajʿah to the Imāms when the reports of the Shīʿī sects are at variance? Instead amidst the Twelvers themselves there are individuals who deny the Rajʿah and interpret the narrations thereof with the establishment of the Shīʿī state, as is reported by the scholars of the Shīʿah.³ Does any unanimity remain thereafter? And are the narrations of the approbation of the Imāms really authentic?

Furthermore, nothing has been reported regarding the Rajʿah from any of the Ṣaḥābah inclusion Amīr al-Muʾminīn as the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Shīʿah, and the Zaydiyyah are unanimous in this regard. Had there been anything like the Rajʿah it would have been known and popular. The idea of Rajʿah was initiated by Ibn Saba’, as is established in the books of the Shīʿah, who was an inveterate liar who was cursed by the Imāms, as is documented in the books of the Shīʿah and others.

² Al-Ālūsī: Rūḥ al-Maʿānī 20/27; Aḥmad Ṣubḥī: al-Zaydiyyah p. 77.
³ Majmaʿ al-Bayān 5/252; Biḥār al-Anwār 53/127.
As for the subsequent times, it was Jābir al-Juʿfī who opted for the sin of propagating it, he also, however, is suspected of lying in the books of the Shīʿah, let alone the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, as has passed.¹

**Analysing the Doctrine of Rajʿah:**

The doctrine of Rajʿah is in complete contrast with the text of the Qurʿān. It is completely false due to the assertions in many verses of the Qurʿān to the contrary. Allah  says:

\[\text{حَتّٰى إِذَا جَاءَ أَحَدُهُمُ الْمَوْتُ قَالَ رَبِّ ارْجِعُوْنِ لَعَلِّي أَعْمَلُ صَالِحًا فِیْمَا تَرَکْتُ کَلاَّ إِنَّهَا کَلِمَةٌ هُوَ قَائِلُهَا وَمِنْ وَرَائِهِم بَرْزَخٌ إِلٰی یَوْمِ یُبْعَثُوْنَ}\]

[For such is the state of the disbelievers] until, when death comes to one of them, he says, “My Lord, send me back. That I might do righteousness in that which I left behind. No! It is only a word he is saying; and behind them is a barrier until the Day they are resurrected.”²

The verse, “And behind them is a barrier until the Day they are resurrected,” is emphatic in there being no return to this world.³

\[\text{آَلَمْ یَرَوْا کَمْ أَهْلَکْنَا قَبْلَهُم مِّنَ الْقُرُوْنِ أَنَّهُمْ إِلَیْهِمْ لَ یَرْجِعُوْنَ}\]

Have they not considered how many generations we destroyed before them – which they to them will not return?⁴

---

1 See p. 506 of this book.
3 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuhfah p. 201.
4 Sūrah Yāsīn: 31.
And warn the people of a Day when the punishment will come to them and those who did wrong will say, “Our Lord, delay us for a short term; we will answer your call and follow the messengers.” [But it will be said], “Had you not sworn, before, that for you there would be no cessation?\(^1\)

If you could but see when the criminals are hanging their heads before their Lord, [saying], “Our Lord, we have seen and heard, so return us [to the world]; we will work righteousness. Indeed, we are [now] certain.”\(^2\)

If you could but see when they are made to stand before the Fire and will say, “O would that we could be returned and not deny the signs of our Lord and be among the believers.” But what they concealed before has [now] appeared to them. And even if they were returned, they would return to that which they were forbidden; and indeed, they are liars.\(^3\)

All the aforementioned people will ask Allah to return to this world at the time of death, when being presented before Allah and when seeing the fire of Jahannam but their requests will not be exceeded to. It is for this reason that the scholars have considered the idea of Raj’ah to be the worst type of extremism born under the Shī‘ism which is foreign to Islam. Ibn Ḥajr states:

\[\text{التشیع محیة علي وتقديمه علي الصحابة، فمن قدمه علي أبي بكر وعمر فهو غال في تشیعه ویطلق علیه رافضی، وإلا فشیعي، فإن انضاف إلي ذلك السب والتصريح بالبغض فغال في الرفض، وإن اعتقد الرجعة إلى الدنيا فأشد في الغلو.}\]

1 Sūrah Ibrāhīm: 48.
2 Sūrah al-Sajdah: 12.
Shīʿism is all about loving ʿAlī and giving him preference over the Ṣaḥābah. A person who gives him preference over Abū Bakr and ʿUmar is an extremist in his Shīʿism and is known as a Rāfiḍī or else he is known as a Shīʿī. And if vilifying the Ṣaḥābah and expressly hating them comes about with that, then he will be an extremist in Rafḍ. And if he believes in Rajʿah, the extremism then goes to a higher degree.¹

In the Musnad of Imām Aḥmad the following narration is narrated:

أن عاصم بن ضمرة (وكان من أصحاب علي) قال للحسن بن علي: إن الشیعة یزعمون أن علیا یرجع. قال الحسن: کذب أولئك الكذابون، لوعلمنا ذاك ما تزوج نساؤه ولقسمنا میراثه

ʿĀṣim ibn Ḍamurah (who was one of the disciples of ʿAlī) asked Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī, “The Shīʿah claim that ʿAlī will return.”

He said, “They are lying. If we knew that his wives would not have married, nor would his wives get married.”²

Believing in returning to this world after death for retribution or recompense is in complete contrast with the nature if this world which is not an abode for reward and punishment. Allah says:

وَإِنَّمَا تُوَفَّوْنَ أُجُوْرَکُمْ یَوْمَ الْقِیَامَةِ فَمَنْ زُحْزِحَ عَنِ النَّارِ وَأُدْخِلَ الْجَنَّةَ فَقَدْ فَازَ وَمَا الْحَیَاةُ الدُّنْیَا إِلَّ مَتَاعُ الْغُرُوْرِ

And you will only be given your [full] compensation on the Day of Resurrection. So he who is drawn away from the Fire and admitted to Paradise has attained [his desire]. And what is the life of this world except the enjoyment of delusion.³

¹ Hady al-Sārī (the introduction to Fatḥ al-Bārī) p. 459.
² Musnad Aḥmad 2/312: Aḥmad Shākir states that the transmission is authentic; Ṭabaqāt Ibn Saʿd 3/39.
³ Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: p. 185.
It likewise weakens a person’s faith in the afterlife and the Day of Judgement which seemingly was one of the objectives of the doctrine.

This is actually represented by the interpretations of the Twelvers of all the verses of the Last Day with Rajʿah. Likewise it is represented in the impact these interpretations had upon some of the sub-sects of the Shīʿah which led them to denying the Last Day and believing in the transmigration of souls to which the doctrine of Rajʿah is the door. Not forgetting that some of their narrations also espouse the idea of transmigration.

Some research scholars are of the opinion that the doctrine of Rajʿah creeps into Shīʿism due to Jewish and Christian influences,1 it entered Shīʿism with the influence of the followers of those religions. Their scholar al-Ṣādiqī, a contemporary scholar, concludes that the doctrine of Rajʿah in its origins returns to what features in the books of the Jews2 and has considered that to be a glad tiding for the Shīʿah.3

Ibn Saba’ the Jew, had played an instrumental role in laying the foundation of this doctrine, as is equally transmitted in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah, but back then it was confined to the return of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib whose death he was unprepared to concede like the Twelvers in their treatment of the Mahdī who they claim is alive.

Apparently, the person who carried the sin of propagating the doctrine, generalising its horizons and interpreting many of the verses of the Qurʾān with it was Jābir al-Juʿfī, to the extent that the books of the Shīʿah have praised him for having thorough knowledge in the doctrine of Rajʿah. Hence the following appears in Tafsīr al-Qummī:

---

2 He has quoted some texts in this regard and he has attributed them to the book of Daniel: 12/1-13.
Abū Jaʿfar said, “May Allah have mercy on Jābir. His knowledge was of such a high level that he knew the interpretation of this verse, ‘Indeed, He who imposed upon you the Qurʿān will take you back to a place of return,’ i.e. the Rajʿah.”

In conclusion, the doctrine of Rajʿah is, as al-Suwaydī asserts, against that which is categorically known to be part of Dīn, i.e. that there is no resurrection before the Day of Judgment and that whenever Allah warns a disbeliever or an oppressor he warns him of the Day of Judgement. It likewise opposes the verses of the Qurʿān and the mass-transmitted tradition which emphatically mention that there will be no return to this world before the Day of Judgement.

The Shīʿah scholars, however, insist on approving it and they consider their anomaly in this regard to be a sign of its validity. Shayṭān has indeed beautified their actions for them and has dictated to them.

---

1 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 85. Ibn Kathīr says the following in the explanation of this verse, “Allah instructing Rasūl Allah tells him to convey the message and read the Qurʿān to the people. And Allah informs him that he will be returned to his abode, which is afterlife, where he will question him regarding the responsibility which he had given him of Nubuwwah. And the meaning of ‘Imposed the Qurʿān upon you’ is that he imposed the propagation of the Qurʿān to the people upon him (see: Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 3/419). The word Maʿād (place of return) has been interpreted in other ways as well, all of which eventually return to approving the Day of Judgement (see: Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 3/420); also see: Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 20/123-126; Tafsīr al-Baghawī 3/458-459; Zād al-Masīr 6/249-251.

2 Tafsīr al-Qummi 2/147.

3 But the Shīʿah warn those who oppose them with the Rajʿah.

Chapter Six

The Doctrine of Ṭuhūr (Emergence)

This refers to the emergence of the Imāms for some people after their demise and their subsequent return to their graves. Al-Majlisī has established a chapter by the title, Chapter regarding them emerging after their deaths and extraordinary things occurring at their hands.¹ Hence according to the Shīʿah the Imāms can emerge after their deaths and some people can see them. This emergence is not specific to a time like Rajʿah, rather it is subject to the intention of the Imāms, so much so that they have attributed the following to Amīr al-Muʿminīn:

یموت من مات منا وليس بموت

Whoever dies from amongst us does not really die.

Their narrations also mention that Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā would meet his father after his death, he would receive advices and suggestions from him.²

One Shīʿī even narrates that he went to visit Abū ‘Abd Allāh:

تشتهي أن تري أبا جعفر (بعد موته)؟ قال: قلت: نعم. قال: قم فادخل البيت فدخلت فإذا هو أبو جعفر

Abū ‘Abd Allāh said to him, “Do you desire to see Abū Jaʿfar (after his demise)?”

He said, “Yes.”

Hence he told him, “Stand up and enter the room.”

When he entered the room suddenly he saw Abū Jaʿfar.³

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 27/303-304; Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt p. 78.
² Biḥār al-Anwār 27/303-304; Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt p. 78.
³ Biḥār al-Anwār 27/303-304; Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt p. 78.
Another Shīʿī claims that he went to visit Abū al-Ḥasan:

أحب أن تري أبا عبد الله يقول: فقلت: وددت والله. فقال: قم فادخل ذلك البيت فإذا
أبو عبد الله عليه قاعد

Abū al-Ḥasan said to him, “Do you desire to see Abū ʿAbd Allāh?”

He said, “By Allah I desire to see him.”

He thus said, “Stand up and enter that room.”

And when he entered the room he saw Abū ʿAbd Allāh sitting.¹

And Abū ʿAbd Allāh is reported to have said:

أتي قوم من الشیعۃ الحسن بن علي عليه السلام بعد قتلى أمیر المؤمنین علي عليه السلام. فسألوه فقال: تعرفون
أمیر المؤمنین إذا رأيتوه؟ قالوا: نعم. قال: فارفعوا الستر فعرفوه فإذا هم بأمیر المؤمنین عليه السلام
لا ينكرون

Some Shīʿah came to visit Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī after the assassination of Amīr al-Muʿminīn and asked him (about Amīr al-Muʿminīn).

He replied, “Will you recognise Amīr al-Muʿminīn if you see him?”

They said, “Yes.”

He thus told them, “Lift the veil,” and when they did, Amīr al-Muʿminīn was suddenly before them without doubt.²

This belief of theirs extends even further when they claim that the people who passed away centuries ago can emerge from their graves for them. The following narration appears in Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt:

---
¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 27/303-304; Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt p. 78.
² Ibid.


Their narrations also state that ʿAlī would go to the graveyard of the Jews and he would address them:

فأجابوه من جوف القبور: لبیك لبیك مطاع فقال: کیف ترون العذاب؟ فقالوا: بعصیاننا لك کهارون،
فنحن ومن عصاك في العذاب

They would respond to him from the bellies of the graves and say, “We are present, we are present, O the one who deserves obedience.”

He would ask them, “How do you find the punishment?”

They would say, “Because of disobeying you like how we disobeyed Hārūn. Hence we and whoever disobeys you will be in the punishment.”

Their narrations likewise state that Nabī emerged after his death to order Abū Bakr to obey ʿAlī, likewise Abū Bakr and ʿUmar emerge for the Imāms in every season of Ḥajj so that they may pelt them whilst pelting the Jamarāt. It is therefore narrated that Muḥammad al-Ḥārām once took five pebbles and threw them at a place besides the Jamarāt, and when he was asked as to why he had done so, he said:

1 Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt p. 81; Biḥār al-Anwār 27/305.
2 Kanz al-Fawāʾid p. 82; Biḥār al-Anwār 27/306.
3 Biḥār al-Anwār 27/304; Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt p. 82.
4 Biḥār al-Anwār 27/305; Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt p. 82.
When the season of Ḥajj comes, the two sinful usurpers are extracted from their graves, they are then separated and no one besides the just Imām is able to see them. Hence I threw the first of them with two pebbles and the other with three due to the latter being worse than the former.

These are but some narrations which I have presented in this treatise. Al-Majlisī has mentioned that he has stated most of the narrations related to this topic under the following chapters: Chapter regarding Barzakh (life in the grave), Chapter regarding the disbelief of the three, Chapter regarding the disbelief of Muʿāwiyah, and the Chapters regarding the miracles of Amīr al-Muʿminīn and the rest of the Imāms. Their narrations regarding this fallacy are thus abundant. Al-Majlisī has asserted that this emergence of theirs will be in their actual bodies, he then says:

Having over-all belief in these phenomena and consigning the actual implications and meanings thereof to the Imāms is sufficient for an adhering Muslim.

Analysis of this Doctrine

I have not come across anyone who has analysed this doctrine of the Shīʿah despite it being popularly narrated in their narrations and reports. It is such a doctrine that merely presenting it is enough to show its falsity, for under no circumstances can it be in harmony with the authoritative texts, clear reasoning, and sound human disposition. It is an indictment to the Shīʿī dogma which

---

1 Biḥār al-Anwār 27/305-306; Baṣāʿir al-Darajāt p. 82.
relegates it to those fallacious dogmas which were born in the minds of people. It is one of the many aspects of this dogma which clearly indicate to the invalidity of Shi‘ism along with the doctrine of occultation, Raj’ah and Badā’. The copious narrations which they have in this regard strongly indicate to the proliferation of lies in their tradition, and to the fact that their narrations do not enjoy any authenticity whatsoever despite their abundance, as long as they support their fallacious beliefs which are refuted by reality. They are so fallacious that they are only reported by a small amount of Shi‘ah, had they existed they would have been widely narrated by the Muslims.

The invalidity of the return of the dead to this world before the Day of Judgement is established through the divine texts and the consensus of the Ummah, as has passed. These fallacious beliefs upon which their dogma rests are considered to be from their flaws and disgracing assertions. It is probably the wisdom of Allah that they have been exposed, for it is the system of Allah that he disgraces and debases those who endeavour to attribute to him a religion that he did not reveal, as is established by the facts of history.
Chapter Seven

The Doctrine of Badā’

One of the fundamental beliefs of the Twelvers is believing in Badā’ regarding Allah ﷺ, they have exaggerated so much in this regard that they have said the following:

ما عبد الله بشيء مثل البداء

Allah has not been worshiped with anything better than Badā’.¹

They also say:

ما عظم الله عزوجل بمثل البداء

Allah has not been glorified with anything like Badā’.²

And:

 ولو علم الناس ما في القول بالبداء من الأجر ما فتروا من الكلام فيه

If people knew the reward which is contained in Badā’ they would not stop talking about it.³

And:

وما بعث الله نبيا قط إلا بتحریم الخمر وأن یقر لله بالبداء

Allah has not sent any prophet but with the prohibition of wine and the acknowledgement of Badā’.⁴

---


4 Ibid.
It seems as if the person who laid the foundation of this doctrine in the Twelver dogma is their scholar al-Kulaynī whom they title Thiqaat al-Islām (the reliable transmitter of Islam) d. 328/329 A.H. For he has dedicated a sub-chapter in his Uṣūl al-Kāfī to it which he has placed under the chapter of Tawḥīd. Therein he has cited sixteen narrations attributing them to the Imāms.

He was succeeded by Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381 A.H) who also documented it as part of their dogma and established a dedicated chapter to it in his book al-Iʿtiqādāt which is also known as the Religion of the Imāmiyyah. He has done the same in his book al-Tawḥīd.

Their scholar al-Majlisī (d. 1111 A.H) paid a lot of attention to the doctrine of Badā’ and dedicated a specific chapter to it by the title Chapter regarding abrogation and Badā’, therein he makes mention of seventy narrations from their scholars.

This doctrine is also mentioned by their contemporary scholars in their books. Astonishingly, their scholars have written twenty five books dedicated to this topic, as is mentioned in al-Dharī‘ah.

Perhaps the Muslim reader will be appalled at this doctrine which is foreign to Islam and the Muslims, of which there is no mention in the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of Nabī, despite it being the greatest way through which Allah is worshiped, the primary teaching of all the Messengers, there being such reward therein that if a Muslim were to know of it his tongue would be moist with its mention just as it is when professing the Oneness of Allah, as they allege.

---
1 Al-Iʿtiqādāt p. 89.
2 al-Tawḥīd p. 331.
3 Bihār al-Anwār 4/92-129.
If we refer to the Arabic language to ascertain the meaning of Badā’ we will find the following:

Badā, the verb, means to become clear; the matter became clear to him means that he developed an opinion regarding it.¹ Hence Badā’ literally has two meanings:

First: Becoming visible after being invisible. It is said, for example, the wall of the city became visible (after it was invisible).

Second: To develop a new opinion. Al-Farrā’ says, “Badā lī Badā’ means another opinion occurred to me. And al-Jawharī says, “Badā lahū fi al-Amr Badā’ means an opinion occurred to him in the matter.”²

Both meanings feature in the Qur’ān. For example, the first meaning appears in the verse:

وَإِن تُبْدُوا مَا فِي أَنفُسِكُمْ أَوْ تُخْفُوهُ یُحَاسِبْكُم بِهِ اللَّهُ

Whether you show what is within yourselves or conceal it, Allah will bring you to account for it.³

And the second meaning appears in the verse:

ثُمَّ بَدَا لَهُم مِّن بَعْدِ مَا رَأَوُا الْیَاتِ لَیَسْجُنُنَّهُ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ لِيُسْجِنُنَّهُ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَتّٰٰ لَهُم مَا رَأَوُا آنَابَاتِهِ حَتّٰٰ ۚ حَت**

Then it occurred to them after they had seen the signs that he [i.e. al-Azīz] should surely imprison him for a time.⁴

It is obvious that Badā’ with both its meanings necessitates the precedence of ignorance and the subsequent realisation of knowledge, both of which are

---

1 Al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ: under the root letters 4/302.
2 Al-Ṣiḥāḥ 6/2278; Lisān al-ʿArab 14/66; also see: al-Ṭarīḥī: Majmaʿ al-Bahrāyn 1/45.
3 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 284.
4 Sūrah Yūsuf: 35.
impossible for Allah ﷺ; attributing them to Allah is the greatest disbelief. How can the Shīʿah then claim that it is the greatest act of worship and likewise claim that Allah cannot be worshiped with anything like Badā’? Pure are you O Allah. This is indeed a very great slander.

This abhorrent meaning is found in the books of the Jews as well, for emphatic texts which entail the attribution of Badā’ to Allah ﷺ appear in the Torah which the Jews interpolated based on their desires.1

Apparently it seems as if Ibn Saba’, the Jew, tried to spread this belief which he had thumb-sucked from his interpolated Torah in Muslim society which he tried to influence under the disguise of Shīʿism and the call for the partisanship of ʿAlī ʿa. This is because all Saba’ī sects believe in Badā’ and assert that every now and then otherwise occurs to Allah ﷺ.2

This doctrine, thereafter, moved on to the Kaysāniyyah or the Mukhtāriyyah, the followers of Mukhtār ibn ʿUbayd al-Thaqafi. It was this sect which became famous for lending importance to the doctrine of Badā’ and espousing it amongst people.

1 For the example, the following appears in the Torah: The Lord seen that the evil of men increased upon the land... He thus regretted creating men upon the earth and his heart was troubled. And the Lord thus said, “I will certainly destroy men whom I had created upon the face of this earth...” (Book of Genesis: the sixth chapter: paragraph no. 5) This type of false phenomenon features frequently in their Torah. See: the Book of Exodus: chapter 32: paragraph no. 12-14; the Book of Judges: second chapter: paragraph no. 18; Book one of Samuel: chapter fifteen: paragraph no. 10 and 34; Book two of Samuel: chapter 24: paragraph no. 16; Book one of Chronicles: chapter 21: paragraph no. 1; Book of Jeremiah: chapter 42: paragraph no. 10; Book of Amos: chapter 7: paragraph 3; Book of Jonah: chapter 3: paragraph no. 10.

This is what appears in the Torah of the Jews, whereas they do not believe in abrogation since, according to them, it leads to Badā’. (Masā’il al-Imāmah p. 75; Manāhil al-ʿIrfān 2/78). See their contradiction and see how they refute the truth and accept falsehood.

The Heresiographers write that the reason why the Kaysāniyyah considered it permissible to attribute Badā’ to Allah is the following:

إن مصعب بن الزبير أرسل جيشا قويا لقتال المختار وأتباعه فبعث المختار إلي قتالهم أحمد بن شميث مع ثلاثة آلاف من المقاتلة وقال لهم: أوحي إلي أن الظفر يكون لكم فهزم ابن شميث فيمن كان معه فعادوا إليه فقالوا: أي الظفر الذي قد وعدتنا؟ فقال المختار: هكذا كان قد وعدني ثم بدأ فإنه سبحانه وتعالى قد قال: يَمْحُو اللَّهُ مَا یَشَاءُ وَیُثْبِتُ ۖ وَعَنَّدِهِمُ الْأُمُّ الْكِتَابِ

Muṣʿab ibn Zubair sent a powerful army to combat Mukhtār and his people, so Mukhtār sent Aḥmad ibn Shamīṭ to fight them with three thousand warriors and told them, “It has been revealed to me that victory will be for you.”

However, Ibn Shamīṭ was defeated with those who were with him and subsequently returned to him and asked, “Where is the victory that you had promised us?”

He said, “That is what He had promised me, but then otherwise occurred to Him, for verily Allah says, Allah eliminates what He wills or confirms, and with Him is the Mother of the Book.”1,2

The reason, as you can see, for Badā’ was Mukhtār claiming to have knowledge of the unseen and of events to happen in the future. And subsequently when things transpired against what he had foretold he said, “It has occurred to your Lord.”

This very same phenomenon is found in the books of the Twelvers, for they propagated to their followers that the Imāms possess knowledge of the past and the future and that nothing is hidden from them.3 Subsequently, when they attributed foretellings to the Imāms which did not materialise they said that this is due to Badā’.

1 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 39.
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī: chapter: the Imāms possess knowledge of the past and the future and that nothing is hidden from him 1/260.
The following narration appears in *Biḥār* under the chapter of Badā’:

قال أبو جعفر وأبو عبد الله عليهما السلام: یا أبا حمزة إن حدثناك بأمر أنه یجيء من ههنا فجاء من ههنا فإن الله یصنع ما یشاء. وإن حدثناك بحدیث وحدثناك غدا بخلافه فإن الله یمحو ما یشاء ویثبت

Abū Ja’far and Abū ʿAbd Allāh said, “O Abū Ḥamzah, if we tell you of a matter that it is going to come from here and it ends up coming from there, certainly Allah does as He wishes. And if we tell you of something today and the next day we tell you something in complete contrast with it, Allah erases what he wants and he keeps what he wants.”

The scholars of the Shī‘ah would give false hopes to their followers that one day, eventually, power will return to them, so much so that they had promised that it would return within seventy years according to one narration which they attribute to Abū Ja’far. But when the seventy years passed and nothing came to being and the followers complained, the spearheaders of the dogma very conveniently found a way out by asserting that otherwise occurred to Allah which demanded that He change His promise.

Likewise the narrations of the Shī‘ah which were being circulated during the lifetime of Ja’far al-Ṣādiq, and which they attributed to him, foretold that Ismā‘īl, the son of Ja’far, will be the Imām after him. But when things did not go as planned with Ismā‘īl passing away during the lifetime of his father, it posed a big threat to the Shī‘ah and the biggest split in the history of Shī‘ism which remains to date occurred; i.e. the defection of a very big group of the Shī‘ah and their assertion that Ismā‘īl is the Imām; they are known as the Ismā‘īliyyah. This defection happened even though they had resorted to Badā’ in order to resolve this conundrum. Hence they attributed narrations to Ja’far, narrations which stated:

---


Nothing has ever occurred to Allah as has occurred to him regarding my son Ismāʿīl, for He took him away before me only to realise that there is no Imām after me.¹

The Twelvers had accepted this interpretation of the problem and accepted his brother, Mūsā, as the Imām instead of Ismāʿīl.

Similarly, the founding-fathers of Shīʿism claimed that their Imāms had knowledge of events that happened, events that are to happen, the lives of people, and their destinies; but the followers and other people did not see any of this in them, nor did the Imāms ever inform of any of these things, because they were never the prerogative of the Imāms, nor did they claim that for themselves. Hence the founding fathers did not find anything by way of which they could justify this inability besides the doctrine of Badā’. Hence they have narrated from their Imāms that they would not inform people of the unseen because they feared that otherwise would occur to Allah owing to which he would change his decision.²

They also claim that the Imāms were given the knowledge of life, sustenance, calamities, afflictions, and sickness but with the condition of Badā’ (i.e. otherwise occurring to Allah).³ This was another ploy which they deployed to cover their lies when they were exposed with incidents not happening as previously informed.

It is due to the nature of this belief that the Shīʿah have ordered their followers to accept these contradictions, differences, and lies. In a lengthy narration which

---

¹ Ibn Bābawayh: al-Tawḥīd p. 336; see also: Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/327.
² For example, they have attributed the following to ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn:

لاولا البدا لدنتكم يا يكون إلي يوم القيامة

If it was not for Badā’, I would have told you of everything to happen till the Day of Judgement. (See: Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī 2/215; Biḥār al-Anwār 4/118).
appears in *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, which talks of the end of the Abbasid Dynasty, the following appears:

إذا حدثناكم بشيء فكان کما نقول فقولوا صدق الله ورسوله. وإن کان بخلاف ذلك فقولوا: صدق الله ورسوله توجوا مرتین

When we inform you of something and it happens as we inform you, say, “Allah and His Rasūl spoke the truth.” And if it happens against that, say, “Allah and His Rasūl spoke the truth.” You will get double the reward.¹

In the wake of the doctrine of Badā’ signs of doubt already began to envelope the intelligent among the Shīʿah; some of them had already picked up on how the game was being played and had thus denounced the Imāmī dogma completely. Some of the books of heresiography have recorded the story of at least one such person whose name was Sulaymān ibn Jarīr, the eponym of the Sulaymāniyyah, a sub-sect of the Zaydiyyah. He is thus recorded to have said the following:

إن أئمة الرافضة وضعوا لشیعتهم مقالتين لیظهرون معهما من أئمتهم علي کذب أبدا. وهما القول بالبداء

إن أئمتهم لما أحلوا أنفسهم من شیعتهم محل الأنبیاء من رعیتها فی العلم فیما كان وما یكون، والأخبار بما یكون في غد، وقالوا لشیعتهم أنه سیكون غدا وفي غابر الأیام کذا کذا، فإن جاء ذلك الشيء على ما قالوه قالوا لهم: ألم نعلمكم أن هذا يكون فنحن نعلم من قبل الله عزوجل ما علمته الأنبیاء. وبنينا وبين

Subsequent to that, whilst living in the Shīʿī society and associating with them he picked up how they use Badā’ as a cover up for their false attribution of the knowledge of the unseen to the Imāms. He thus says:

إن أئتمهم لما أحلوا أنفسهم من شیعتهم محل الأنبیاء من رعیتها في العلم فيما كان وما يكون، والأخبار بما يكون في غد، وقالوا لشیعتهم أنه سیكون غدا وفي غابر الأیام کذا کذا، فإن جاء ذلك الشيء على ما قالوه قالوا لهم: ألم نعلمكم أن هذا يكون فنحن نعلم من قبل الله عزوجل ما علمته الأنبیاء. وبنينا وبين


² *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 78; *Firaq al-Shīʿah* of al-Nawbakhtī p. 64.
When their Imāms accorded themselves the status which the prophets enjoyed among their people in terms of having knowledge of the past and the future and information of what is to happen the next day, and when they told their partisans that such and such an event is going to happen tomorrow and such and such an event happened previously. Then when that particular incident happened as they informed they would say “Did we not tell you that this was going to happen, for we know from Allah what the prophets knew; and between us and Allah are the very same mediums of knowledge through which the prophets received knowledge.” And if it happens against what they had communicated to their people they would say, “Otherwise occurred to Allah and thus he did not let it materialise.”

He then goes onto explain how they deceive their followers through the belief of Taqiyyah, where after some of the Shī′ah were convinced and they followed him.

Having read this, you might have realised that if the doctrine of Badā’ falls away the Twelver dogma is destroyed from its very roots. This is because all their narrations and promises which did not materialise debunks the status of Imāmah for their supposed Imāms.

This is the reason for which the Shī′ah scholars are so enthusiastic about the issue of Badā’ and why they defend it so fervently and consider it to be the greatest of all devotions.

1 Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq p. 78; Firaq al-Shī′ah p. 64-65. Also see: al-Rāzī: Muḥaṣṣal Afkār al-Mutaqaddimīn wa al-Muta‘akhirīn p. 249. Although Sulaymān ibn Jarīr attributes this deception to the Ahl al-Bayt, it was these heretics who were in reality exploiting the name of the Ahl al-Bayt to amass wealth wrongly and to plan and plot against Islam.

2 Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq p. 78; Firaq al-Shī′ah p. 65.
However, the doctrine of Badā’ brought about the most disastrous result for
them, i.e. a new reason for their disbelief and apostasy.¹ Because thereby they
endeavoured to exonerate the creation, i.e. the Imām, from his foretellings not
being true, from there being contradictions in his statements, from change in his
opinion, and the development of a new opinion; but they attributed all of that
to the Knower of the visible and the unseen. Pure is Allah سبحان و توابعه from what the
transgressors attribute to Him.²

Hence they exonerated the creation but not the creator. This was probably
because their exaggerations regarding the Imāms did not leave any respect in
their hearts for Allah سبحان و توابعه owing to which they became victims of this grave
disbelief.

The scholars of the Shi‘ah have tried to somehow or the other find a way out of
this shameful stance and an escape from this disbelief.

We thus find that al-Nāṣīr al-Ţūsī d. 672 A.H, whom al-Majlisī accorded the title
Muḥaqqiq (research scholar), denied the existence of Badā’ as a doctrine of the
Twelver dogma and averred thusly:

إنهم لا يقولون بالبداء وإنما القول بالبداء ما كان إلا روایة رووها عن جعفر الصادق أنه جعل إسماعیل
القائم مقامه، فظهر من إسماعیل ما لم يرضه منه، فجعل القائم موسي. فسئل عن ذلك فقال: بدا لله في
أمر إسماعیل وهذه روایة وعندهم أن الخبر الواحد ل يوجب علمًا و عملا

They do not believe in Badā’, approving Badā’ was not but due to one narration
which they narrated from Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq when he appointed his son Ismā‘īl as
his successor. But Ismā‘īl expressed certain things which Ja‘far did not like about
him and he thus appointed Mūsā as his successor. And when he was asked about
that he said, “Otherwise occurred to Allah regarding the matter of Ismā‘īl. This is
just a mere narration; it has been transmitted to us through a single transmission

¹ Al-Ghazālī: al-Mustaṣfā 1/110.
² Al-Washī‘ah p. 172.
which does not give the benefit of certainty and does not yield the requirement of practice.¹

But this, as you might have noticed, is against reality, for Badā’ is certainly from one of their established beliefs, of which their narrations and reports talk abundantly. Al-Majlisi, therefore, asserts that it is indeed an eerie response from al-Ṭūsī, and he asserts that it is on account of him not having a comprehensive grasp over the narrations.²

Whilst on the other hand, we find another group of Shīʿah who acknowledge the doctrine of Badā’ but try to interpret it with an interpretation which is viable.

Hence Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī tries to interpret their narrations in a way which smacks of confusion. Initially he says:

لیس البدائـا کـما يظنه جهال الناس بأنه بدء ندامة تعالي الله عن ذلك، ولكنه يجب علينا أن نقر لله عزوجل بأنه البداء معناه أن له أن يبدأ بشيء من خلقه فيخلقه قبل شيء ثم يعدم ذلك الشيء و يبدأ بخلق غيره

It is not the Badā’ which the ignorant understand it to be, i.e. the Badā’ which brings about regret, for Allah is Pure from that. But what it means is that it is necessary for us to concede that for Allah there is Badā’ in the sense that he has the prerogative to start creating something which he can thereafter destroy and subsequently start to create something else in its stead.³

As you might have noticed, his discussion here is unrelated to the subject under the discussion, for he is talking of Badā’ (which means starting to do something) and not of Badā’ (which is the occurrence of another view after having previously asserted otherwise). No Muslim disputes what he has stated above, if this was what they really meant by Badā’ no one would have denied it, nor would they

---

¹ Al-Ṭūsī: Talkhīṣ al-Muḥaṣṣal p. 250.
² Bihār al-Anwār 4/123.
³ al-Tawḥīd p. 335.
look for ways to resolve the contradiction which overwhelms their narrations or for ways to explain the nonrealization of their foretellings.

Allah says:

وَبَدَأَ خَلْقَ الإِّنسَانِ مِن طَينٍ

And began the creation of man from clay.¹

إِنَّهُ يَبْدَأُ الْخَلْقَ ثُمَّ يُعِيدُهُ

He begins the [process of] creation and then repeats it.²

وَرَبُّكَ يَخْلُقُ مَا يَشَاءُ وَيَخْتَارُ

And your Lord creates what He wills and chooses.³

He, thereafter, recants his previous assertion and explains Badā’ to be abrogation. Hence after his previous explanation he states the following:

أو يأمر بأمر ثم ينهي عن مثله أو ينهي عن شيء ثم يأمر بمنه مثل ما نهي عنه وذلك مثل نسخ الشرائع وتحويل القبلة وعدة المتوفي عنها زوجها

Or he orders something and then prohibits from something of its like, or he prohibits from something and orders something of its sort. It is just like abrogating rulings of the Sharīʿah, changing the direction of the Qiblah and the waiting period of a woman whose husband passes away.⁴

But this is either ignorance or portraying ignorance. Because there is no Badā’ in abrogation wherein a ruling has a specific time in the Knowledge of Allah

---

¹ Sūrah al-Sajdah: 7.
² Sūrah Yūnus: 4.
³ Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 68.
⁴ al-Tawḥīd p. 335.
wherein He has prior knowledge of the ruling ending before its allocated time even approaches. Yes, in terms of the relationship of the abrogation to us it becomes clear to us after the abrogating ruling is revealed, but not to Allah.\(^1\)

Hence Allah is pure from being described with Badā’, because the concept of Badā’ is in stark contrast with the All Encompassing Knowledge of Allah. Allah is not free from abrogation, because abrogation is only stating the end of the period of the first ruling as per its previous existence in the Knowledge of Allah, even though according to us the revelation thereof for us is an outward occurrence of the otherwise.\(^2\)

Allah has stipulated a specific time for every ruling in His Infinite Knowledge, hence when its time ends, another ruling replaces it; either order of prohibition, and thus it does not necessitate a change coming about in his Eternal Knowledge.\(^3\)

Allah states:

\[
\text{ما نَنسَخْ منْ أٰیَةٍ أَوْ نُنسِهَا نَأْتِ بِخَیْرٍ مِّنْهَا أَوْ مِثْلِهَا}
\]

We do not abrogate a verse or cause it to be forgotten except that we bring forth [one] better than it or similar to it.\(^4\)

‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī has very severely condemned the Shī‘ah for equating abrogation with Badā’ and claiming that when Allah orders something and subsequently abrogates it, it is due to otherwise occurring to him.\(^5\)

---

1 Al-Washī‘ah p. 183.
2 Muṣṭafā Zayd: al-Naskh fi al-Qur‘ān 1/20
4 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 106.
5 Al-Milal wa al-Niḥal p. 52.
The Shi‘ah have went headlong into this deviance, and the author of *Biḥār al-Anwār* has presented some abrogated narrations as examples of Badā’ despite there being no link between the two.²

Nonetheless, towards the end of his explication of Badā’ Ibn Bābawayh asserts the following:

إنَّمَا هُوَ ظْهُورُ أَمْرٍ، يَقُولُ الْأَرْبَاطُ بَدَا لِي شَخْصٍ فِي طَرِيْقِيْ أَيْ: ظُهِرَ. قَالَ ﷺ عِزَّوجَلَ: وَبَدَا لَهُمْ مِّنَ اللَّهِ مَا لَمْ يَكُونُوا يَحْتَسِبُونَ. أي ظُهِرَ لَهُمْ وَمَتَى ظُهِرَ لِلَّهِ تَعَالَ ذِكْرَهُ مِنْ عَبْدِ صَلَةٍ لِرَحْمَهُ زَادَ فِي عَمْرِهِ. وَمِتَى ظُهِرَ لَهُ مَنْ قُطْعَةٍ لِرَحْمَهُ نَقَصَ مِنْ عَمْرِهِ

Badā’ is not but for something to become clear. The Arabs say, ‘Badā’ lī Shākṣ fi Ṭarīqī (a person became clear to me on the way), i.e. He appeared. Allah says, “And there will appear to them from Allah that which they had not taken into account,” i.e. became clear to them. And when it becomes clear to Allah that his servant fosters family ties he increases his age, and when it becomes clear to him that he severs them he decreases his age.³

This is again repeating the very same deviant belief but after changing it and presenting it differently...

Increasing the age of the one who joins family ties has nothing to do with Badā’ (or the occurrence of something to Allah which was not previously in his knowledge). But fostering family ties is a means of the elongation of life, and Allah has decreed both lifespan and the means for increase in it. Hence, Allah decreed that so and so will foster family ties due to which he will

---

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 93/83-84.
3 al-Tawḥīd p. 336.
achieve that end result; if it were not for that he would not have achieved this end result. He has likewise decreed that so and so will sever his family ties and thus will live for such and such amount of time.¹

On the other hand, al-Ṭūsī has opted for a rather safer way of interpreting the doctrine of Badā’ than Ibn Bābawayh. He states:

Saying Badā Lillah (it occurred to Allah) actually means Badā min Allah (it occurred from Allah). This is the interpretation of all those narrations which state that otherwise occurred to Allah regarding Ismāʿīl, i.e. otherwise occurred from Allah. For the people were thinking that Ismāʿīl ibn Jaʿfar was going to be the Imām after his father, but when he passed away they came to realise (from Allah) that their assumption was wrong.²

This is the apologetic answer of al-Ṭūsī. It is obvious that if the occurrence of a new thought or idea happens to the creation when something unexpected happens, it does not impact the Islamic faith in any way.

One of the contemporary scholars of the Shīʿah has followed al-Ṭūsī in this explanation, and that Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’, he thus says:

Even though Badā’ means the clarity of something after its obscurity, but here it does not mean that something becomes clear to Allah after it was

¹ Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah p. 92.
previously obscure upon him. How can any person of sound intellect and thoroughness ever say something like that? Rather it means clarity coming from Allah for whomsoever he wants in his creation after the matter having previously being obscure upon them. And when we say, “It became clear to Allah,” it means the command of Allah or the matter of Allah.\(^1\)

However, a person who studies their narrations will never find them to be harmonious with this interpretation, for they attribute Badā’ to Allah and not to the creation, which is why their Imāms refused to inform of the unseen due to the fear of Badā’ (otherwise occurring to Allah). They have attributed to Lūṭ  that he sought the punishment hastily from the angels fearing that otherwise might occur to Allah, he told them:

\[
\text{Tأخذونهم الساعة فإنني أخشى أن يبدو لربى فيهم. فقالوا بُلط أن موعدهم الصبح ليس الصبح قريب}
\]

Punish them immediately, for I fear that otherwise will occur to my Lord regarding them, the angels said, “O Lūṭ their time is the morning, is not the morning near.”\(^2\)

And in al-Kāfī the following narration appears:

\[
\text{عن أبي هشام الجعفري قال: كنت عند أبي الحسن عليه السلام بعد مضي ابنه أبي جعفر وإنني أفكر في نفسي أريد أن أقول كأنهما يعني: أبي جعفر وأبي عبد الله، في هذا الوقت كأبي الحسن موسى وإسماعيل ابن جعفر بن محمد عليه السلام، وإن قضيتهما كقصتهما، إذ كان أبو محمد المرجي بعد أبي جعفر عليه السلام فأقبل علي أبي الحسن قبل أن أنطق فقال: نعم بعلب أساطيري، بدأ لله، كنت على نحن في أبي محمد بعد أبي جعفر عليه السلام ما لم يكن يعرف له، كما بدله في موسى بعد مضي إسماعيل ما كشف به عن حاله وهو كما حدثتك نفسك وإن كره المبطلون}
\]

Abū Hāshim al-Jā’farī says, “I was by Abū al-Ḥasan after his son Abū Ja’far passed away, I was thinking about that and wanted to say that they both, i.e. Abū Ja’far and Abū Muḥammad, were just like Abū al-Ḥasan

\(^{1}\) Al-Dīn wa al-Islām p. 173.
\(^{2}\) Furūʿ al-Kāfī 5/546.
Mūsā and Ismā'īl, the two sons of Ja'far ibn Muḥammad, their story is just like theirs, for Abū Muḥammad was the next candidate after Abū Ja'far. But before I could say anything Abū al-Ḥasan said, “Yes O Abū Hāshim! It occurred to Allah regarding Abū Muḥammad after Abū Ja'far that which he did not know about him, just as it occurred to him regarding Mūsā after the demise of Ismā'īl that which disclosed his condition. And the matter is as your heart suggests to, even if the wrongdoers dislike it.’

Focus on the statement, “It occurred to Allah regarding him that which he had not previously known about him,” you will find that they emphatically attribute Badā’ to Allah. These people therefore do not have any reverence for Allah and they have used the doctrine of Badā’ to keep the opportunity of choice in the Ahl al-Bayt and the recanting thereof without them being blamed by their followers. But they did not consider the Right of Allah when devising this plan. This is because the fabricators of these narrations were such that their hearts were void of the fear of Allah and hope in Him.

Furthermore, if Badā’ was really the occurrence of a new opinion to the people from Allah then what is the reason for all this exaggeration regarding it; why is it the best of devotions and a fundamental belief. Likewise, the word Badā’ linguistically bears a very bad meaning in the Arabic language in which the Qur’ān was revealed, so how can it be considered a foundational pillar of Dīn and how can there be an effort to thereafter find a ‘suitable’ interpretation for it.

Their Evidence for the Doctrine of Badā’

After the doctrine of Badā’ attained firm grounding in the Shī‘ah dogma thanks to the invented narrations of al-Kulaynī, the scholars of the Shī‘ah sought evidence for it in the Book of Allah. Seemingly it was not enough for them to attribute this lie to Allah so they went on to claim that the Book of Allah also contains it. Hence they latched onto the verse:

1 ʿUṣūl al-Kāfī 1/327.
Allah eliminates what He wills or confirms, and with Him is the Mother of the Book.¹

It should be noted that the first person to use this verse in substantiation of the fallacy of Badā’ was Mukhtār ibn ʿUbayd al-Thaqafi;² he was subsequently followed by the scholars of the Shīʿah who contrived narrations attributing them to some scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt.³ Their drawing evidence from this verse is indeed erroneous and marked with stark artificiality. Because elimination and confirmation both happen with the Knowledge and the Power of Allah without anything occurring to Him which He had not previously known. How can Badā’ be perceived regarding him when he has the of the mother book and possesses eternal and All Encompassing Knowledge:

And with Him are the keys of the unseen; none knows them except Him. And He knows what is on the land and in the sea. Not a leaf falls but that He knows it. And no grain is there within the darknesses of the earth and no moist or dry [thing] but that it is [written] in a clear record.⁴

Not absent from Him is an atom’s weigh within the heavens or within the earth or [what is] smaller than that or greater, except that it is in a clear register.⁵

---

¹ Sūrah al-Raʿd: 39.
² See p. 1255 of this book.
⁴ Sūrah al-Anʿām: 59.
⁵ Sūrah Saba’: 3.
There are many other verses of this sort. Affirming Badā’ for Allah tends to belie all these verses.\(^1\) Allah states at the end of the verse that all elimination and confirmation happen with His will and are recorded in the Mother Book.\(^2\)

---


The exegetes have differed as to the meaning of elimination and confirmation and there are eight opinions in that regard (see: Ibn al-Jawzī: Zād al-Masīr 4/337-338). Some aver that Allah eliminates rulings of Sharīʿah by abrogating them, and he confirms others, both based on His will. The commentator of al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah avers that this meaning is harmonious with the context (Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah p. 94). Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī says, “The most preferred interpretation of the verse is that Allah threatened the polytheists who ask Rasūl Allah for miracles with his punishment and told them:

وَمَا كَانَ لِرَسُوْلٍ أَنْ يَأْتِيَِ بِآِیَةٍ إلَّ بِإذْنِ اللهِ لِكُلِّ أَجَلٍ کِتَابٌ

It is not possible for a messenger to bring a miracle but with the permission of Allah, for every time there is a record. (Al-Raʿd: 38)

Thereby informing them that there is a set time for Allah’s decree regarding them, till which they will be given respite, he then tells them that when that time arrives Allah will eliminate those whose death is imminent and whose sustenance has seized. Simultaneously he will confirm or keep those who still have time and sustenance in this world (see: Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 13/170). Others have given preference to the generalisation of the elimination and confirmation to everything (see: Fatḥ al-Qadīr 3/88).

However, Ibn Juzay objected to those who generalise the verse and says that it is debunked by the established principle that the decree of Allah does not change, nor does his knowledge (see: al-Tashīl 2/136.) Al-Shawkānī responding to this says that generalising the verse is not against that principle due to elimination and confirmation also being part of what Allah has decreed (see: Fath al-Qadīr 3/88).

And al-Qasimī has interpreted the word Āyāt to mean miracles (see: Tafsīr al-Qasimī 13/372-373). Also refer to Tafsīr al-Baghawī 3/22-23; Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/559-561; Tafsīr al-Ālūsī 13/169-172; al-Saʿdī Taysīr al-Karīm al-Raḥmān 4/116-117.

These are some of the interpretations of the Muslims in this regard; none of them said anything like that of the blasphemous interpretation of the Shiʿah.

\(^2\) ʿAbd al-Razzāq ʿAfīfī: commentary of Āmidī’s al-Iḥkām 3/111.
Narrations in the Books of the Twelvers which Refute the Doctrine of Badā’

Debunking the argument of the opponent with his own assertions is the strongest form of debunking, because he destroys himself with his own weapon and the existence of contradiction in his assertions is a sign of them being invalid. Hence you will find many narrations in the books of the Shī‘ah wherein the Imāms are reported to have cursed those who believe in Badā’ with disgrace. These narrations contradict the narrations that have passed previously.

It is very possible that these narrations are authentically linked to the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt due to them revealing the reality which is congruous with these erudite people. And they probably are the remains of the moderate Shī‘ah which left their mark in the books of the Twelvers. Likewise it is not improbable that the heretics who invented the narrations of Badā’ contrived these narrations as a cover up for their doctrine of Badā’.

Be it as it may, citing these narrations will show the extent of contradiction which is found in the narrations of this cult and will illustrate that it is based upon anomalous views which are in complete contrast with the majority and their tradition. Because according to them what opposes the majority entails good and guidance, as has always been the motto of the heretics, in such a way that it takes a person out of the fold of Islam.

The following narration appears in al-Tawḥīd of Ibn Bābawayh:

عَنْ مَنْصُورِ بْنِ حَازِمِ قَالَ: سَأَلَتْ أَبا عَبْدِ اللَّهِ عَلَيهِ السَّلاَمْ: "هَلْ يَكُونُ الْيَومُ شَيْءًا لَا يَكُونُ فِيهِ اللَّهُ عَلَى تَعَالَ؟" قَالَ: "لَا، مَنْ كَانَ قَالَهُ فَخَزَاهُ اللَّهُ. \n
("Manṣūr ibn Ḥāzim mentions, “I asked Abū ʿAbd Allāh, ‘Can anything which was not in the Knowledge of Allah yesterday happen today?’”

He said, “No. May Allah disgrace whoever says that.”
I thus said, “Is it not that whatever happened and whatever is to happen till the Day of Judgement in the knowledge of Allah?”

He said, “Indeed. Allah had prior knowledge of everything even before creating the creation.”

There is no doubt that the doctrine of Badā’ in terms of its literal meaning, in light of the narrations of the Twelvers, and in light of the interpretation of their scholars; suggests that what Allah had no knowledge of yesterday might occur to Him today.

It is indeed a very grave indictment for the Shī‘ah that they exonerate their Imāms of such a flaw but attribute it to Allah. Hence when the foretelling of the Imām does not materialise they exonerate the Imām but they attribute the flaw thereof to Allah. And if you study their beliefs regarding the Oneness of Allah in terms of Him being the deity and the nourisher and His Oneness in His Names and Qualities, you will find that they have given their Imāms the position of Allah in their hearts and minds, all because of the influence of those infectious narrations with which their books are replete. The doctrine of Badā’ is likewise the aftermath of their exaggeration regarding the Imāms.

1 al-Tawḥīd p. 334; Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/148. See another narration with a similar meaning in al-Kāfī 1/148.
Chapter Eight

The Doctrine of Ṭīnah

This is one of their secretive beliefs regarding which they emphasise that it should be kept a secret even from their laymen. Because if a lay Shīṭī comes to learn of it he will intentionally commit major sins in order to acquire the temporary pleasures of this world due to him knowing that the evil consequences of those sins will be on others besides him on the Day of Judgment.¹

This doctrine was considered reprehensible by some of the early erudite Shīṭah like al-Murtaḍā and Ibn Idrīs, because according to them although the narrations thereof frequently feature in the books of the Shīṭah, but due to them being transmissions of single narrators which oppose the Qurʾān, the Sunnah, and the unanimity of the Ummah it is compulsory to discard it.²

Nonetheless, these narrations increased with the passage of time, to the extent that their scholar Niʿmat Allāh al-Jazāʾirī (d. 1112) states the following:

إن أصحابنا قد رووا هذه الأخبار بالأسانيد المتكررة في الأصول وغيرها، فلم يبق مجال في إنكارها والحكم عليها بأنها أحاديث. بلصارت مستفيدة مشهورة

Our scholars have narrated these narrations with copious transmissions in the canonical works and other works, hence there is no room for denying them and averring that they are transmissions of single narrators. Rather they have now become wide-spread and undeniably authentic.³

He said this in refuting the two aforementioned scholars who refused to acknowledge it.

---

¹ Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah 1/295.
² Ibid. 1/293.
³ Ibid.
Again, the person who ostensibly was responsible for founding this doctrine and according it firm grounding was their scholar al-Kulaynī who established a chapter by the title, *Chapter regarding the Ţīnah of a believer and a disbeliever*, wherein he cites seven narrations.¹

Subsequently these narrations continued to increase, so much so that their scholar al-Majlisī documented sixty seven narrations in the chapter he established by the title, *The Ţīnah and the pledge*.²

Probably the reader would be intrigued to learn the details of this doctrine which makes a Shī‘ī believe that whatever sin he will commit the evil consequences thereof will be upon the Ahl al-Sunnah. And conversely, whatever good the Ahl al-Sunnah will carry out will be preserved for the Shī‘ah. It is owing to this that their scholars do not divulge it to their commonality so that they do not go about causing havoc on the land and in the lives of people.

The most detailed narration regarding this doctrine appears in Ḥāl al-Sharā‘i‘i’ of Ibn Bābawayh which cover five pages and upon which he terminates his book.³ Commenting on the status of this narration one of their contemporary scholars comments that it is a musky ending with which he has ended his book, Ḥāl al-Sharā‘i‘i’.⁴

The crux of the narration is that a Shī‘ah has been created from a specific type of soil and a Sunnī has been created from a specific type of soil, and both the soils were mixed in a very unique way. Hence all the sins which are found in a Shī‘ī are due to the influence of the Sunnī soil and all the good that is found in a Sunnī is owing to the influence of the Shī‘ī soil. As a result, on the Day of Judgment all the evils and vices of the Shī‘ah will be placed upon the Ahl al-Sunnah and all the good of the Ahl al-Sunnah will be granted to the Shī‘ah.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/2-6.
3 Ḥāl al-Sharā‘i‘i‘ p. 606-610.
More than seventy of their narrations revolve around the same theme.

The reason for the invention of this doctrine can be ascertained from the questions which were being posed to the Imāms and the complaints which were being raised to them. The Shīʿah would complain of the indulgence of their people in major sins, disastrous actions, ill treatment of one another, and the depression that they were suffering from; but the cause of which they could not identify. And the Imām responds to all of that by saying that they are because of the Shīʿī soil being effected by the Sunnī soil.

Let us have a look at some of these interesting questions which reveal the reality of the Shīʿī society back then. Ibn Bābawayh has written the following with his chain of transmission:

Abū Isḥāq al-Laythī says: I asked Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Bāqir the following, “O son of Rasūl Allah! Tell me regarding an insightful believer who reaches the pinnacle of recognition and is perfect, is it permissible for him to fornicate?”

He said, “By Allah, no.”

I asked, “Can he consume wine?”

He said, “No.”
I further asked, “Can he commit any of the major sins or any obscene act?”

He again said, “No.”

I then said, “O son of Rasūl Allah! I see some of your partisans consuming wine, highway robbing, endangering the roads, fornicating, sodomising, eating usury, committing obscene acts, being lax in ṣalāḥ, fasting, and discharging zakāh, severing family ties and indulging in major sins. So can this be possible and why?”

He said, “O Ibrāhīm! Is anything else besides this troubling you also?”

I said, “Yes, O son of Rasūl Allah, a problem even graver than this.”

He asked, “What is that O Abū Isḥāq?”

I said, “And I see among your enemies and your haters people who perform ṣalāḥ, fast, and discharge zakāh excessively, who follow their Ḥajj up with ʿUmrah, who are desirous to strive in Jihād, who give preference in matters of good, join family ties, fulfil the right of the brothers and sympathise with them with their wealth, and who refrain from consuming wine, fornicating, sodomy, and all other obscene crimes. Why is that? Explain to me, O son of Rasūl Allah, provide evidence for me and tell me. For by Allah my thoughts have increased, my nights are sleepless, and I feel very restless.”

This is but one query which reveals the perturbation of the Shīʿah regarding their sad reality which was filled with sins and destructive crimes in comparison to the pious predecessors of this Ummah, the Imāms of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and the majority of the commonality who were on piety, trustworthiness, and good. The answer given to this query was in line with the doctrine of Ṣīnah, i.e. the sins which are found in the Shīʿah are the result of the ill-effect of the soil of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the virtue which prevails in the Sunnī society is the result of the good-effect of the soil of the Shīʿah.

1 'Ilal al-Sharāʾiʿ p. 606-607; Biḥār al-Anwār 5/228-229.
Another inquirer by the name Isḥāq al-Qummī comes and says to Abū Jaʿfar al-Bāqir:

May be sacrificed for you, I see a believer who affirms the oneness of Allah, believes in what I believe, considers your Imāmah to be an act of devotion to seek proximity to Allah and between him and I there is no difference, I see this person drinking wine, fornicating and sodomising, and when I come to him for a need I find him to be frowning, dull, reluctant to help me and slow. And at times I see a hater and an opponent who goes against me in my beliefs and knows me for who I am, I come to him for a need and I find him to be smiling congenial and quick to fulfil my need; he loves fulfilling my need, performs ṣalāh, fasts, and gives charity excessively. He discharges his zakāh and is trustworthy when entrusted with a trust.

This person adds a new dimension to his complaint, i.e. the bad interaction of his companions, their callous nature, and their lack of loyalty; whilst on the other hand he finds the Ahl al-Sunnah—his enemies—to be better to him than his companions, more willing to fulfil his needs, and better in character, interaction, and devotion.

Similar to this is the complaint the Shīʿah raised to Abū ʿAbd Allāh. It reads as follows:

1 i.e. that I am a Shīʿī.
I see a person from our companions, who says what we say, to be bad-mouthed, poor in his companionship and disloyal in his promises, and that hurts me a lot. And I see a person from our opponents to be good in his manners, good in his ways, and loyal in his promises, and that also causes me to grieve.¹

A fourth inquirer comes and he complains of the depression and grief which he is experiencing without knowing the cause of it. Their narration states:

عن أبي بصیر قال: دخلت علي أبي عبد الله ومعي رجل من أصحابنا فقلت له: جعلت فداك یا ابن رسول الله، إني أغتم وأحزن من غير أن أعرف لذلك سببا

Abū Baṣīr says, “I went to Abū ʿAbd Allāh and with me was a person from my friends. I thus said to him, ‘O son of Rasūl Allah! I feel depressed and grieved and I do not know the reason thereof...’”²

Seemingly the cause for his grief was the obscure dogma which he adhered to and which all the Shīʿah lived by, but the Imām again explains this in light of the doctrine of Ṭīnah.

There are many questions and complaints of this type.³ They give us an idea of the Shīʿī make up in its temperament, connections, character, dealings, and religion. The scholars of the Shīʿah tried to counter this complexity from which some truthful Shīʿah were suffering due to these disturbing and threatening phenomena and their efforts thus eventually lead them to answering these persistent questions and complaints with the doctrine of Ṭīnah. Let us, therefore, have a look at some of the answers given to these questions.⁴ Their Imāms are reported to have said:

² Biḥār al-Anwār 5/242, he attributes the narration to ‘Ilal al-Sharāʾiʿ p. 42.
³ You will find them under the chapter of Ṭīnah in al-Kāfī and Biḥār al-Anwār. Some more examples will be coming in the chapter regarding the influence of the Shīʿah upon the Muslim world.
⁴ The answer cited below was given, as they allege, to the question of Isḥāq al-Qummī which has passed on page no. 1277 of this book. Due to fear of elongating the discussion I will suffice on the previously cited references, because they all ultimately prove the same phenomenon...
"O Ishāq (the narrator of the report) Do you know from where you were brought into existence?"

I said, “May I be sacrificed for you, certainly not, unless you tell me.”

He thus said, “O Ishāq, when Allah was alone He created everything from nothing, He then made sweet water flow upon a pure and fertile land for seven days and nights where after the water became dry. He then took a handful of the choicest soil thereof, which is our soil, the soil of the Ahl al-Bayt. He then took a handful of soil from beneath that soil, which is the soil of our partisans. He then chose us for himself. So if the soil of our Shī‘ah was left just as our soil was left no one among them would sin, steal, sodomise, consume wine, or do any of the sins you mentioned. But Allah made saline water flow upon an accursed land for seven days and nights where after the water dried up. He then took a handful of soil which was accursed.
and was made of black smelly sand, i.e. it was the sand of defilement, this was the sand of our enemies. If Allah  left their soil as he had taken it you would not have seen the traits of men in them, nor would they have professed the Shahādatān, fasted, performed ṣalāh, discharged zakāh, went for Ḥajj, and nor would you have seen anyone of them with good conduct. However, Allah  mixed both the soils (your soil and their soil), he mixed them and scrubbed them just as a skin is scrubbed and thereafter mixed them with the two waters. Hence whatever evil you see in your brother, i.e. being bad mouthed, fornicating and whatever else like drinking and the rest that you made mention of, they are not inherently from him and are not part of his faith, rather he committed these wrongs because of the influence of the haters. All the good that you see in a hater in terms of his conduct, his congeniality, fasting, performing ṣalāh, going for Ḥajj, giving charity and doing good, they are also not inherently from him, rather he does all of this because of the influence of īmān which he acquired.”

I further asked, “So when the Day of Judgment comes then what?”

He said, “O Isḥāq can Allah  combine good and evil in one place? When the Day of Judgement will come Allah will remove the influence of īmān from them and give it to our partisans and he will likewise remove the evil influence of the haters with all the evil that they (the Shīʿah) did and return them to our enemies and everything will return to its origins.”

I then asked, “Will their good be taken and returned to us? And will our evil be taken and returned to them?”

He said, “Yes By the one besides who there is no one who is worthy of worship.”

This is the doctrine of Ṭīnah, in the narration of al-Qummī the following appears in the beginning:

---

Pay attention to a satisfying answer for your query and a hidden treasure of knowledge from the Knowledge of Allah and His secrets.¹

And the end of the narration states:

Take this, O Abū Isḥāq, for it is from our illuminating narrations, our innermost secrets and our hidden treasures. Go and do not tell anybody besides an insightful believer of our secret. If you divulge our secret you will be tested in yourself, your wealth, your wife, and children.²

As you can see, this was one of their secret beliefs which has been circulated in the wake of the mighty Islamic empire; the secrecy thereof is emphasised in the beginning and the end. So did the mere thought of this doctrine falling in the hands of the Ahl al-Sunnah who will announce it before the people as one of the flaws of the Shīʿah even cross the mind of the inventor thereof?

Analysing the Doctrine of Ṭīnah

Firstly, these narrations are self-contradictory, because the Shīʿī, as you have noticed in these complains and questions, is more immersed in crime, much more indulgent in sins and destructive actions, worse in his dealings, and pathetic in his religion and conduct. So how can such a person be better in terms of his origins and purer in his creation?

Secondly, Allah ﻟﻠﻪ ﺳﺒﺤﺎﺋﺔ وﻊﻠﺎﻗَة has created everybody upon the disposition of Islam. Allah ﻟﻠﻪ ﺳﺒﺤﺎﺋﺔ وﻊﻠﺎﻗَة says:

¹ 'Ilal al-Sharāʿiʾ p. 607; Biḥār al-Anwār 5/229.
² 'Ilal al-Sharāʿiʾ p. 610; Biḥār al-Anwār 5/233.
So direct your face [i.e., self] toward the religion, inclining to truth. [Adhere to] the Fiṭrah of Allah upon which He has created [all] people. No change should there be in the creation of Allah. That is the correct religion.¹

Separating men and sound disposition is something unique to Shīʿism.

Thirdly, the Shīʿah have contradicted their stance on the actions of men due to believing in the reports of Ṭīnah, for the purport of these narrations suggest that man is forced to do what he does without him having any choice, i.e. he does everything because of his Ṭīnah. Whereas their stance is that every person creates his own actions as is the stance of the Muʿtazilah.²

Fourthly, this belief entails that all the evil of the Shīʿah will be placed upon the shoulders of the Ahl al-Sunnah and all the good of the Muslims will be given to the Shīʿah. This is against the divine justice of Allah and is not harmonious with clear reason and sound human disposition, let alone it being harmonious with the authoritative texts of the Sharīʿah and the fundamentals of Islam. Allah says:

وَلاَ تَزَرِّعَ وَازْرَةً وِزْرًّا أَخْرِيٍّ

No soul will carry the burden of another.³

Likewise:

کُلُّ نَفْسٍ بِمَا کَسَبَتْ رهِیْنَةٌ

1 Sūrah al-Rūm: 30.
2 See p. 870 of this book.
3 Sūrah al-Fāṭir: 18.
Every soul will be held back for what it earned.¹

Likewise:

فَمَنْ يَّعْمَلْ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ خَيْرًا یَّرَه وَمَنْ يَّعْمَلْ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ شَرًّا یَّرَه

Whoever does an iota of good will see it and whoever does an iota of bad will see it.²

Likewise:

اَلْیَوْمَ تُجْزَی کُلُّ نَفْسٍ بِمَا کَسَبَتْ لَوْلَا عَلَى الْیَوْمِ الْمَعْلُومِ

Today every soul will be rewarded for what it earned. There will be no oppression today.³

The invalidity of this doctrine is unquestionable, the falsity thereof becomes clear from merely thinking of it; it is indeed an indictment to the Twelver dogma and a disgrace to it.

The Shīʿah to date do not hesitate in openly proclaiming this doctrine, hence you will find that a contemporary Shīʿī scholar whilst commenting on the narrations of Bihār al-Anwār and al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah in this regard makes remarks which smack of his approval and approbation for it.

And if you have no modesty then do as you wish.

1 Sūrah al-Muddaththir: 38.
2 Sūrah al-Zilzāl: 7, 8.
3 Sūrah al-Muʿmin: 17.
Section Four

The Contemporary Shi’ah and Their Link with Their Predecessors

Introduction:
In this chapter I shall, with the permission of Allah ʿazza wa jall, discuss the creed of the contemporary Twelver Scholars. You will thus not find herein anything besides their views, yes with the exception of a few ancient views which will be quoted when handling a specific topic. What I mean by ‘contemporary’ is the scholars of the previous century, the last hundred years.

I shall elaborate the extent to which they are in agreement with their classical sources wherein those very problematic issues, some of which have passed, occur.

I shall also expound upon the type of relationship they maintain with the ancient Shi’i sects, i.e. a relationship of acceptance and agreement or one of disdain and rejection.

Thereafter, I shall present some of their views regarding some doctrinal issues in order to ascertain as to whether the Twelver Shi’ism of today is any different from that of the past.

And finally I shall shed light upon the country of the Ayatollah and the reality of Shi’ism which can be understood therefrom.
Chapter one

Relationship in the sources of Talaqqī (acquisition)

Subscription to the same sources of acquiring and learning is the first and the last cause of uniformity in ideologies and views according to any sect or denomination, and it is these sources that link the later generations with the earlier ones.

The contemporary Shī‘ah have relied upon their four early canonical works in acquiring their creed, i.e. al-Kāfī, al-Tahdhīb, al-Istibṣār and Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh. This is affirmed by many of their scholars, some among them being Āghā Buzruk al-Ṭahrānī in his book al-Dharī‘ah,¹ Muḥsin al-Amīn in A‘yān al-Shī‘ah² and others.³

ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawī, their senior scholar and leading cleric in contemporary times, states the following regarding their four books:

وهي الكافي والتهذیب والإستبصار ومن ل یحضره الفقیه، وهي متواترة، ومضامینها مقطوع بصحتها،
والكافي أقدمها وأعظمها وأحسنها وأتقنها

They are al-Kāfī, al-Tahdhīb, al-Istibṣār and Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh. They are widely transmitted and their content is categorically established. From amongst them al-Kāfī is the oldest, the greatest, the best, and the most outstanding.⁴

Having said this, the question is: Are the contemporaries any different from al-Kulaynī and his likes, especially when they all subscribe and have recourse to the same set of canonical works? Naturally they can never be different, especially in the fundamentals and politics.

The matter, however, does not stop there...

¹ Al-Dharī‘ah 17/245.
² A‘yān al-Shī‘ah 1/280.
³ See for example the introduction of Safinah al-Biḥār.
⁴ Al-Murāja‘āt p. 311.
Rather their contemporary scholars have accorded what their scholars of the twelfth and the thirteenth century have compiled, the last of who was al-Nūrī (d. 1320 A.H.) in his book Mustadrak al-Wasā'il, canonical status and have classed them ‘the four later books’. Notwithstanding that in doing so they have placed their reliance in narrations which were documented only in the belated fourteenth century from the Imāms who lived in the first centuries of Islam.

Furthermore, these books, with the exception of Mustadrak al-Wasā'il, were all compiled in the era of the Safawids. They thus comprise of such extremist and exaggerative tendencies that did not even cross the minds of the earlier Shī'ah, as you will find in the Biḥār of al-Majlisī. And in spite of that these books have earned acclaim in the ranks of the contemporary scholars which implies that a very grave development has taken place in contemporary Shī'ism which has pushed them further into the abysses of misguidance and radicalism.

And that is not all, rather the contemporary Shī'ah have placed their reliance in tens of books which allegedly link them to their predecessors and have considered them equal in rank to the four early canonical works in terms of substantiation and derivation of law. This is explicitly clear in the introductions written to these books. Following al-Majlisī who has accorded these books the status of canonicity they have adopted the same approach to them.

Surprisingly, even some of the books of the Ismā'iliyyah have been given the status of classical books by the contemporary Shī'ah clergy, as in the case of Daʿā'im al-Islām of al-Nuʿmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr (d. 363 A.H.) who is recorded as an Ismā'īlī in some of the books of the Twelvers themselves.1 Despite this, their senior scholars have recourse to it.2

---
1 The Twelver Shī'ī Ibn Shar Āshūb (d. 588 A.H.) states, “The Judge al-Nu’mān ibn Muḥammad is not an Imāmī.” (Maʿālim al-ʿUlamāʾ p. 139). As you have previously learnt, the Twelvers class those who do not believe any of their Imāms as one who rejected the prophethood of one of the prophets, i.e. a disbeliever. And the Ismā’īlīs reject the Imāmah of all the Imāms after Ja’far al-Ṣādiq, despite that the Twelvers still have recourse to their books which implicitly implies that they receive their knowledge from infidels.
2 Khomeini for example refers to him in his book al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah p. 68.
In fact, some of the contemporary scholars of the Shi‘ah go on to assert that there is uniformity in the classical texts of the Ismā‘iliyyah and the Twelvers. Hence one of them says:

وإذا لم يكن الفاطمیون علي المذهب الإثني عشري فإن هذا المذهب قد اشتد آزره ووجد منطلقا في عهدهم، فقد عظم نفوذه ونشط دعاته... ذلك أن آل الإثني عشریة والإسماعیلیة وإن اختلفوا من جهات، فإنهم يلتقو فی هذه الشعائر بخاصة في تدریس علوم آل البیت والتفقه بها وحمل الناس علیها

Even though the Fatimids were not Twelvers, the Twelver creed definitely gained prominence and progressed in their era, for its infiltration increased and its propagators became more active. This is because, even though the Twelvers and the Ismā‘iliyyah differ in many ways, they converge upon these symbols, more specifically teaching the knowledge of the Ahl al-Bayt, gaining an in depth understanding of it and persuading the people to practice upon it.¹

And in Dā‘irat al-Ma‘ārif al-Islāmiyyah the following appears regarding the opening that the extremist found to the Twelver dogma:

علي أن الحدود لم تقفل تماما إمام الغلاة يدل علي ذلك التقدیر الذي دام طويلا للكتاب الأکبر

Not forgetting that the doors did not completely close upon the extremists. The evidence for this is the veneration which the most crucial book of the Ismā‘iliyyah named Da‘ā‘im al-Islām enjoyed for a very long time²

This is a fact, for whoever will study some of the books of the Ismā‘iliyyah will find many similarities between the two denominations.³

¹ Muhammad Jawwād Mughniyah: al-Shī‘ah fī al-Mīzān p. 163
² Dā‘irat al-Ma‘ārif al-Islāmiyyah 14/72.
³ One such similarity is their report: “He who does not believe in our return is not from amongst us.” This appears in the books of the Ismā‘iliyyah (see p. 67 under the discussion of the four books of the Ismā‘iliyyah) just as it appears in the books of the Twelvers (see p. 57).
All of this implies that the Twelver sect has placed itself in a deep ocean of darkness by choosing to accord canonical status to all those books which have reached them from the people of the bygone eras...

We find that in these times there has come about a movement which is calling for the revival of the ancient scriptural Shī‘ī legacy and for popularising it among the masses. This legacy is replete with criticisms of the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah. It is likewise replete with the curses, excommunication and tails of the everlasting damnation of the people of the first century of Islam, at the forefront of who are the three Khulafā’ī, some of the Mothers of the Believers, and the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār who were pleased with Allah and with who Allah was pleased, as is established in the Qur’ān.

This movement was initiated by the most prominent Mujtahidīn of the Shī‘ah in this era, and they have revised, annotated many of these books and even written prefaces upon them. And in spite of all of that we do not find any of them disavowing or condemning the appalling disbelief and heresy that appears in these books. Is this not approval from their side for whatever features in them?

Furthermore, professor ‘Alī al-Sālūs posed a question to one of the contemporary scholars of the Shī‘ah inquiring about his view regarding the preposterous and hyperbolic narrations which appear in Uṣūl al-Kāfī. He replied with the following which is his letter verbatim:

As for the narrations which our scholar al-Kulaynī has documented in his book al-Kāfī they are authentic according to us. And all those narrations in
al-Kāfī which talk of the Imāms possessing all types of knowledge which was dispensed to the angels, the Prophets and Messengers, of them having the ability to know when they intended to know, of them having knowledge of when they are going to die and that they do not die but when they want to, of them having knowledge of the past and the future and of nothing being hidden from them (are true), for verily they were the friends of Allah who were sincere in his worship.” (He then cites a quotation of their Imāms which reads as,) “Say regarding us what you want, but do not deify us.”

This does not require any explanation, for he has affirmed for his Imāms such attributes which are only suited to Allah ﷺ. And this is not just the view of al-Kifāʾī alone regarding the exaggerated content of Uṣūl al-Kāfī, rather al-Khunayzī who has written a book in which he calls for Sunnī Shīʿah unity also treats these very issues in a way that is no different than that of al-Kifāʾī. Keeping in mind that this book was written under the guise of Taqiyyah (dissimulation) in order to call towards the alleged unity which they claim exists between the Ahl al-Sunnah and them and which they have used as a deceptive missionary tool in order to beguile the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Likewise, another scholar of theirs who goes by the name Luṭf Allāh al-Ṣāfī responded to Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, who cited some of the exaggerations suggested by the headings of some of the chapters in Uṣūl al-Kāfī, with the following:

أن الأبواب المعنونة ليست إلا عناوين لبعض ما ورثوا عن جدهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

These are but a reflection of some of the knowledge they inherited from their grandfather Rasūl Allah ﷺ.  

1 Correspondence with al-Kāẓim al-Kifāʾī, the original copy published by ‘Alī al-Sālūs in Fiqh al-Shīʿah p. 265).
3 Al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah p. 149.
Read what one of their clerics has to say regarding what their Imāms have left for their followers as evidence of their Imāmah:

إن لهم آثارا تدل علي تلك الإمامة المقصودة، ولا أريد أن أذكر علي مجامع عديدة رويت عنهم وألفت في عصورهم أو ما قاربها... أمثال تحف العقول وبيثار الدراجات والجرائح واحتجاج الطراسي والخصائص والتوحيد للصدق... إلي ما يكثر تعداده. بل إنما أريد أن أذكر علي أثر واحد جامع، وفيه القدح المعلي لكل إمام، إلا وهو أصول الكافي لثقة الإسلام محمد بن يعقوب الكليني... وقد ألف هذا الكتاب النفيس في عشرين عاما وأثبت فيه لكل إمام في كتبه وأبوابه من الأحاديث ما يثبت علي أن ذلك الفرات السائغ يمتد من ينبوع الفيض الإلهي، وإن الناس فارغة الحقائب عن مثل تلك النفائس.

They have signs which establish the desired position of Imāmah, I do not want guide to you to great books which have been reported from them and compiled in their eras. The likes of Tuḥaf al-ʿUqūl, Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt, al-Kharāʾij wa al-Jarāʾih, al-Iḥtijāj of al-Ṭabarsī, al-Tawḥīd of al-Ṣadūq, etc., rather I would just like to guide you to one among them, a book which is the principle work of every Imām (literally translated as the chief arrow among the divining arrows). And that is Uṣūl al-Kāfī of the reliable transmitter of Islam Muḥammad ibn Yaʿqūb al-Kulaynī. He compiled this magnum opus in a period of twenty years and he has included the narrations of every Imām in the chapters and sub-chapters thereof. This is sufficient to inform you that this immense knowledge extends from the inundating Knowledge of Allah Ḥāfiz. It is likewise enough to suggest to you that peoples bags are empty of these gems.¹

He then goes on to extoll the virtues of Uṣūl al-Kāfī and goes on to press upon the reader to refer to some of its chapters in order to really appreciate it.²

Regarding al-Kāfī the reality has already come to the fore in terms of it containing such exaggerations and disbelief which are beyond the comprehension of men. It is sufficient to merely scan through the titles of the chapters to ascertain this.

² Al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah p. 102.
Chapter Two

Their Link with the Ancient Sects

What is the link between these people and the old Shī‘ī sects that feature frequently in the books of heresiography?

What I have noticed is that when the contemporary Shī‘ah clergy talk of their sect, its scholars and its empires, they attribute all the Shī‘ī sects, dynasties and scholars to it even though they might be from the Ismā‘īliyyah, the Bāṭiniyyah (those who believe in the esoteric interpretation of the Shar‘ī texts), the atheistically inclined heretics or the extremist anthropomorphists.

So, for example, when they talk of the dynasties of the Shī‘ah, at the very top of the list they talk of the Fatimid dynasty despite it not subscribing to the Twelver dogma.¹

Likewise, when making mention of their scholars you will find many of the spearheaders and subsequent eponyms of various deviant sects and heretical groups, which had no affiliation to the Twelver creed, mentioned among them.

Hence, by way of example, you will notice that the Shī‘ī scholar Muḥsin al-Amīn makes the following approbatory remarks regarding the Hishāmiyyah, the followers of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, the Yūnusiyyah, the followers of Yūnus ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Qummī, the Shayṭāniyyah, the followers of Muḥammad ibn al-Nu‘mān (commonly known as Shayṭān al-Ṭāq) and other groupings:

إنهم عند الشيعة الإمامية كلهم ثقات صححوا العقيدة فكلهم إمامية وإثنا عشرية

According to the Imāmiyyah they are all reliable people and bearers of the correct dogma, hence they are all Imāmiyyah and Twelvers.²

² A’yān al-Shī‘ah 1/21.
In fact what is even more grave is that the Twelvers endeavour to embrace every sect which somehow or the other was associated to Shīʿism, even though it might have been on clear disbelief as acknowledged in the classical books of the Shīʿah themselves.

You will thus notice that they accord sanctity and holiness to the likes of the Nuṣayriyyah who are extremist in their disbelief according to the consensus of the Muslims. One of their contemporary scholars Ḥasan al-Shīrāzī has written a booklet which goes by the title The ʿAlawīs, The Partisans of the Ahl al-Bayt (ʿAlawī is one of the names of the Nuṣayriyyah). In this booklet he mentions that he met the Nuṣayrīs in Syria and Lebanon upon the order of their chief scholar Muḥammad al-Shīrāzī and his impressions were that he found them to be from the partisans of the Ahl al-Bayt, characterised by purity of sincerity, and the feat of abiding by the truth. They are affiliated to ʿAlī by way of believing in his successorship and some by way of that and by way of lineage...

He further states, “The terms ‘Alawiyyin’ and ‘Shīʿah’ are synonymous just as the terms ‘Imāmiyyah’ and ‘Jaʿfariyyah’ are synonymous.¹

Surprisingly, none of the scholars of the Twelvers have disavowed the sentiments of al-Shīrāzī, despite the fact that the Nuṣayrīs are infamous for their disbelief and heresies,² and despite the fact that the ancient books of the Shīʿah excommunicate them and consider them to be a sect out of the fold of Islam.³ But the contemporaries treat them as part of the Jaʿfariyyah even though they have identified themselves differently.

One of their senior clerics has actually gone to the extent of asserting that there no more exists extremist sects among the Shīʿah today, the presence of the Nuṣayriyyah, the Durūz and the Agā Khāniyyah notwithstanding. It is as if he is classing them as non-extremist. Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ says:

---
² Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 35/145, onwards.
All the extremist sects have come to end. Not even a blower in the fire from among them is to be found today.\(^1\)

Commenting upon this professor Sulaymān Dunyā writes the following:

فما يكون الأغاخانية أليساوا قائلين بالحلول؟ أم ليسوا مع قولهم بالحلول ملاحدة؟ أم ليسوا منتسبين إلى الشيعة... ثم أليساوا علي رقعة الأرض اليوم

Then what is the status of the Agā Khāniyyah? Are they not proponents of incarnation? Or are they not heretics despite being proponents thereof? Or are they not affiliated to the Shīʿah? Or do they not exist on the surface of the earth?\(^2\)

It would be correct to thus say that the names of many Shīʿī sects have disappeared into oblivion, but their beliefs have made their way into the books of the Twelvers.

When the contemporaries assert their belief in the eight books and those that are equivalent to them in ranking, they implicitly accept all the doctrines and ideas of the various Shīʿī sects throughout history. Simply because these eight books were the rivers into which all the other minor Shīʿī streams and rivulets made their way. This is a reality for which there is abundant evidence, for you will notice that there is no belief which is upheld by any of those sects but that you will find some mention of it in the books of the Twelvers.

So, for example, the doctrine of Badāʾ was considered by the heresiographers to be the doctrine upheld by the extremist sect\(^3\) known as the Mukhtāriyyah.\(^4\) In

---

\(^1\) Aṣl al-Shīʿah wa Uṣūluhā p. 38; see also: Da’wah al-Taqrīb p. 75.

\(^2\) Bayn al-Sunnah wa al-Shīʿah p. 37.

\(^3\) See: Al-Shahrastānī: al-Milal wa al-Niḥal 1/173.

\(^4\) They were the followers of Mukhtār ibn ’Ubayd al-Thaqafī. One of his beliefs was Badāʾ (al-Milal wa al-Niḥal 1/147-148). See the definition of Kaysāniyyah that has passed.
spite of that there appears sixteen narrations regarding it in their most canonical work *al-Kāfī*. Likewise, in *Biḥār al-Anwār* there are more than seventy narrations regarding the doctrine of *Badā’* and abrogation. And even though their scholars try to find a plausible explanation of *Badā’* in order to escape being excommunicated by the Muslims, it stands as one of the confirmed beliefs of their dogma.

Another example is the doctrine of *Raj’ah* which was also considered from the beliefs of the extremist. For the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah state and the books of the Twelvers concede that *Raj’ah* was one of the principle beliefs of Ibn Saba’, despite that it is a confirmed doctrine in the dogma of the Twelvers.\(^1\)

Likewise, the doctrine of deifying the Imāms was the doctrine of the extremist sects like the Saba’iyyah. But you will find narrations which deify the Imāms in *al-Kāfī*, *al-Biḥār*, in their Quranic exegesis like that of *Tafsīr al-Qummī* and *Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī*, and in their transmitter dictionaries like that of *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, as has passed already.

Another issue is according preference to the Imāms over the Ambiyā’. This was also the stance of the extremist, as has been established by ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī (d. 429 A.H), al-Qāḍī ʿAyāḍ (d. 544 A.H), and Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 A.H). However, this doctrine was also inherited by the Twelvers.\(^2\)

Discussing this topic in depth requires a dedicated research. For studying the views of the ancient Shī‘ī sects and juxtaposing them with what appears in the books of the Twelvers is a unique study which will reveal the extent to which this cult is linked with those ancient sects.

And the niche wherefrom these eerie beliefs found their way into Shī‘ism was the scholars of the Shī‘ah themselves whose bigotry compelled them to accept the narrations of a Shī‘ah irrespective of his affiliations thereby rejecting the

---

1 Refer back to the chapter regarding Raj’ah pg 1223 of this book.
2 See p. 836 of this book.
narrations of those whom they term ‘the commonality’, i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah. Hence their scholar al-Ṭūsī has conceded that most of their ḥadīth transmitters belong to deviant schools but then still asserts that their books are reliable. This is abundantly clear to anyone who has any recourse to their books, for he will find some even affiliated to the Wāqifīyyah, the Faṭḥiyyah¹ and others.

Similarly, a contemporary Shīʿī thinker has acknowledged that the Twelver thought has encapsulated the views and ideologies of all the ancient Shīʿī sects. He says:

But before we put the pen down it is important to note that all the ideas of the Shīʿah which we have discussed, each of which was an idea specific to a particular denomination, have all now been assimilated into the Twelver dogma and has been further substantiated and supported with evidence. Present day Shīʿism is thus an amalgam of all the previous Shīʿī movements from ‘Ammār to Ḥujr ibn ‘Adī, from Kaysān to Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah, from Abū Hāshim to Bayān ibn Samʿān, from the Kufi extremists to the extremist supporters of ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Ḥārith, the Zaydīs and the Ismāʿīlīs. Furthermore, the Imāmiyyah who later became the Twelvers and took up the task of assimilating everything are the theologians of the Shīʿah and their leading scholars.²

Present day Shīʿism is thus the essence of all the various Shīʿī ideologies with their extremism and radicalism. To the extent that even the extremist Sabaʿī tendency of deifying ‘Alī stares at us from the narrations of the Twelvers.

1 See the chapter regarding Sunnah pg. 413 of this book.
This will be clear to anyone who merely peruses through the topics of the chapters established in *al-Kāfī* and *al-Biḥār*.

Likewise the *Bāṭinī* (esoterical) tendency is also glaring in light of their interpretations of the Qur’ān, the fundamentals of Islam and their views regarding dissimulation and the concealment of knowledge. Hence the Twelver dogma has become the final pool for the various Shīʿī ideologies with their flaws and discrepancies. Every extremist will thus find therein his need and that which will support his school.

A very serious acknowledgment and controversial confession of one of their most senior contemporary scholars in the science of transmitter-impugning and approbation came to the fore. One of the aspects contained therein is the admission that the dogma is continuously changing and evolving, and that the beliefs that the Twelvers hold today were considered extreme by the ancient Shīʿah, and that they, today, hold such beliefs which they consider essentially part of the dogma previously considered to be heretical. ʿAbd Allāh al-Mamaqānī says the following in defending the reputation of Mufaḍḍal ibn ʿUmar al-Juʿfī who was criticised by some of the ancient scholars:

> إننا قد بینا غير مرة أن رمي القدماء الرجل بالغلو لا يعتمد عليه ولا ينكر إليه لوضوح قولون القول بأدني مراتب فضائلهم ( يعني الأئمة) غلو عن القدماء، وكون ما نعده اليوم من ضروريات مذهب التشیع غلو عند هؤلاء، وكشفنا في ذلك عند الصدوق نفي السهو عنهم غلوًا، مع أنه اليوم من ضروريات المذهب، وكذلك إثبات قدرتهم علي العلم بما يأتي ( أي علم الغيب) بتوسط جبرائیل والنبي غلوًا عندهم ومن ضروريات المذهب اليوم

We have mentioned more than once previously that the criticisms of the ancients regarding someone being an extremist are not worth consideration. For it is clear that enumerating the least of their accolades, i.e. of the Imāms, was considered exaggeration according to the early scholars. Likewise what we consider today to be essentially part of the Shīʿī dogma was also considered extremism according to them. In illustration thereof, it suffices to say that al-Ṣadūq considered the negation of forgetfulness
from the Imāms to be an exaggeration, but today it is treated as one of the integral tenets of our dogma. Likewise the aspect of them having access to the knowledge of the unseen was considered an exaggeration whereas today it is one of the essentials elements of the dogma.¹

It is abundantly clear from this text that the present day Shīʿah did not just suffice in following the heritage they inherited from the predecessors, rather they superceded them in their extremism and radicalism. To the extent that al-Ṣadūq and other scholars of the fourth century considered the one who believes that the Imāms do not forget or that the Imāms have knowledge of events to happen or, as suggested by al-Kulaynī, they have knowledge of all that happened and all that is to happen and that nothing is hidden from them, to be heretical and extremist beliefs. However, the dogma has evolved and these beliefs have now been incorporated therein, as is acknowledged by al-Mamaqānī. This means that according to the ancient Shīʿah the contemporaries ought to be treated as extremists whose statements are not worth accepting.

Take note that the holders of these beliefs were not deemed extremists by the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah but by the scholars of the Shīʿah themselves. Furthermore, this was their view in the fourth century when the dogma had already evolved and taken a specific form, then what do you suggest would be the view of the initial Shīʿah regarding them whose only understanding of Shīʿism was giving preference to ʿAlī I over ʿUthmān I.

It is probably these phenomena that lead Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb to conclude that the understanding of religion always shifts and changes according to the Shīʿah. Alluding to this statement of al-Māmaqānī he states:

هذا تقرير علمي في أكبر وأحدث كتاب لهم في الجرح والتعديل يعترفون فيه بأن مذهبهم الآن غير مذهبهم قديما، فما كانوا يعدونه قديما من الغلو وينبذونه وينبذون أهله بسبب ذلك صار الآن -أي الغلو- من ضروريات المذهب، فمذهبهم اليوم غير مذهبهم قبل الصفوين، ومذهبهم قبل الصفوين غير مذهبهم.

1 Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl 3/240; see also: 506 - 507 of this book.
This is an affirmation which appears in one of their latest and most monumental works in the science of impugning and approbating transmitters wherein they concede that their dogma today is very different than what it was previously. Hence what they considered as extremist ideas and casted aside has now become part of the essentials of the dogma. Their dogma today is thus very different to what it was before the Safawids, and their dogma before the Safawids was very different to what it was before Ibn Muṭahhar. Likewise their dogma before Ibn Muṭahhar was different from what it was before the family of Bābawayh, and what it was before the family of Bābawayh was different from what it was before Shayṭān al-Ṭāq, and lastly, their dogma before Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was very different from what it was during the lifetime of Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn.¹

¹ Ḥāmish al-Muntaqā p. 193.
Chapter Three

The Doctrinal Connection between the Early Scholars and the Contemporaries

As long as there remains uniformity in the sources of acquisition, is there any need for us to investigate the doctrinal link between the early scholars and the contemporaries? Especially when those early sources have encapsulated majority of what the books of heresiography have documented of the views of the extremist Shī‘ah and what they have not.

The question again is that is there any need for this type of a study?

In reality there is a need. This is because the contemporary Shī‘ah have published booklets and opuscules in abundance. They have likewise excessively spread their propagators in the Muslim world. All to establish that the creed of the Shī‘ah is no different from the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and to propagate that they have been wronged by their opponents who have accused them of beliefs and views with which they have nothing to do whatsoever. Many of their missionaries have actively called toward uniting the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī‘ah and have raised the banners of Islamic unity. Many centres have been erected, books have been compiled and missionaries have specialised in this particular area...

It has likewise been claimed that the contemporaries have disavowed the extremism which was infamously known to be the hallmark of their predecessors, and that the time has indeed come for the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī‘ah to converge on common grounds due to the plot of the enemy being too grave and in the condition of the Muslim world being too volatile.

Furthermore, when talking to them and telling them that in your books there is a particular narration or that a certain scholar of yours holds a particular view we will very often hear them saying “We do not agree with everything that appears
in our books,” or “Whatever a specific scholar says is his responsibility, for there is no binding evidence but in the words of the infallible Imāms.” And even, “The Ahl al-Sunnah aver the same.” In this regard we will find very often that they fabricate, exceed limits, and plot cunningly in strange ways.

There is thus a pressing need to discuss the views of the contemporary Shīʿah regarding crucial matters of Islam which make them very different from the majority or which are an obstacle between them and Islam.

Similarly, there are many Shīʿah writers who have been assigned the task of providing literature for the Muslim world and rebutting all the contentious issues which are raised around Shīʿism. And the doctrine of Taqiyyah has accorded them freedom of speech and laxity in applying rulings. Notwithstanding that there are special books which are not propagated in the Muslim world.1 In other words there is an external face of the Shīʿah which is presented to the people through the different Shīʿī media platforms which popularise Shīʿism in the world and propagate it. And there is an internal face which does not come to the fore but in the Shīʿī seminaries and societies and in their fundamental most works like that of al-Kāfī and Tafsīr al-Qummī.

Unfortunately there are people who have fallen prey to this two-faced approach and have accepted it. And Shīʿism found its way into the hearts of a large amount of youth in the Muslim world and in the hearts of those who claim to have some sort of affiliation to Islamic movements; into the hearts of such people whom the tragic reality of the Muslim world has overwhelmed and caused to cry. As a result they started looking for solutions and answers. The image of the outright enemy which was vividly clear in front of them with all his might and cunningness obscured the identification of the hidden enemy who camouflaged himself with the disguise of Islam, so they accepted what was being said at face value and

---

1 For example the book Faṣl al-Khiṭāb of Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, some portions of Biḥār al-Anwār and the book Nubuwwah Abī Ṭālib, i.e. the prophethood of Abū Ṭālib which is written by the Shīʿī scholar Muzzammil Ḥusayn al-Maythamī al-Ghadīrī, amongst others.
were hasty in drawing conclusions. And they assumed that whatever is being promulgated regarding the divide between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī‘ah is all made-up, superficial, and not backed by any factual evidence whatsoever.¹

It is therefore necessary to listen to what some of their contemporary scholars have written regarding their integral beliefs which make them different from the Muslims. From these I will select those beliefs regarding which claims of reform, overhauling or addition brought about by extremism have been made so that the extent of their link with their predecessors becomes clear.

¹ See: al-Sunnah wa al-Shī‘ah Ḍajjah Mufta’ilah (The Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī‘ah a superficial divide).
Discussion 1: The Belief of the Contemporaries Regarding the Book of Allah

We will talk about this from two different perspectives:

1. First Perspective: Analysing the content of the books of the Shīʿah which claim that interpolation took place in the Qurʾān and likewise the views of some of the heretics among them who made such claims, and what do the contemporary Shīʿah say regarding this crucial issue which is an obstacle between them and Islam, whereas they actively call toward uniting with the Ahl al-Sunnah and raise the banners of Islamic unity.

2. Second Perspective: What do the contemporary Shīʿah say regarding those esoteric interpretations the implication whereof is the interpolation of the Qurʾān, and which make it a book other than the one which the Muslims are familiar with, as was presented in the discussions that have passed.

The First Perspective

Hereunder we will analyse the views of the contemporaries regarding the accusation of interpolation which is a frequently featuring theme in the books of the Shīʿah.

We will study the following four reactions:

1. Outright denial of its existence and appearance in their books.
2. Acknowledging its existence and an attempt to give a plausible explanation.
3. Defiantly proclaiming it and providing evidence for it.
4. Pretending to reject it and attempting to establish it in deceitful ways.
The First Reaction: Outright denial of its existence in their books

A group of their scholars have taken the route of completely denying its existence in their books. One such scholar is ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn al-Amīnī al-Najafī, in his refutation of Ibn Ḥazm who attributes this preposterous belief to the Shīʿah he says the following in his book al-Ghadīr:

If only this brash person pointed to a reliable source from the books of the Shīʿah, or at least quoted a scholar who is held in great esteem by the Shīʿī clergy. If not that then he should have referred to an ignorant person from amongst their ignoramuses, or even a Bedouin or a chatterbox from their simple people, as is the condition of this person who without restraint lodges accusations. Here are all the sects of the Shīʿah at the forefront of who is the Imāmiyyah, and they all unanimously agree that whatever is between the two covers is that book wherein there is no doubt.¹

Likewise ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn al-Mūsawī:

It has been attributed to the Shīʿah that they aver that interpolation has occurred by way of the omission of few words and verses. I say, “We seek the refuge of Allah from such a view and we express our disassociation before Allah from such ignorance. Whoever has attributed this to us is ignorant of our creed and is an accuser, for the wise Qurʿān is widely transmitted through our transmissions with all its verses and words.”²

---

² Ajwibah Masāʾil ḽār Allah p. 28-29.
Luṭf Allāh al-Ṣāfī has likewise denied the fact that the book Faṣl al-Khiṭāb was written to establish this preposterous belief and avers that it was rather written to debunk it.\(^1\) Just as there are others who have tried to defend al-Kulaynī, who is one of the spearheads of this belief.\(^2\)

**Analyses**

Denying that which is already there does not help the apologetics, and will be construed as Taqiyyah according to the Shī‘ah and those of the Ahl al-Sunnah who

---

2. The author of ‘Aqidah al-Shī‘ah says the following:

> النقص لا يدعوه أحد من علماء الإمامية حتي ثقة الإسلام الإمام الكلیني رضي الله عنه، فإنه يعتقد بنزاهة القرآن وصياًتة عن النقص والزيادة، ومع ذلك فقد تهجم الشيخ أبو زهرة وتحمل عليه وأكثر من الطعن فيه.

None of the scholars of the Shī‘ah, including al-Kulaynī claim that omission occurred in the Qur‘ān! For he (al-Kulaynī) believed that the Qur‘ān is pure from omissions and additions. But despite that Abū Zuhrah has brazenly lampooned him and has excessively criticised him. (‘Aqidah al-Shī‘ah p. 162).

He also says:

> إن الكلیني ل يقول بنقص القرآن، فكيف يجوز لمسلم أن ينسب إليه هذا القول، وكيف جاز للشيخ أبو زهرة أن ينسب إليه دون ترعرع، وكيف جاز له أن يهاجمه تلك المهاجمة القاسية.

Al-Kulaynī was not of the opinion of omission taking place in the Qur‘ān. How is it then possible for a Muslim to attribute that to him? And how is it then permissible for Shaykh Abū Zuhrah to attribute that to him without caution? How is it ok for him to attack him so ferociously?”

In refutation thereof I say that this was initially attributed to him by the scholars of the Shī‘ah themselves. And his book *al-Kāfī* is a testimony to this and it is an indictment upon him and upon the Shī‘ah till the end of time. Had a copy of *al-Kāfī* reached the scholars of Islam their ruling regarding the Twelvers would have been very different than what it is. Abū Zuhrah relied upon the attribution of al-Kāshānī who has attributed this belief to him in his *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* (*Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 1: 52: introduction no. 6). And al-Kāshānī is one of the central scholars of the Twelver dogma, for he is the author of *al-Wāfi* which combines all four of their early canonical works and is considered one of the reliable books of the dogma according to them.

Similar has been attributed to him by Nūrī the last prominent cleric and hadīth scholar in his book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* (see: *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 30-31) and others, as has passed already.

So do these people think that this is unknown to the Ahl al-Sunnah? And how do they defend the position of al-Kulaynī who has blurted such disbelief and satirised the Ṣaḥābah with whom Allah was pleased and who were pleased with him.
are aware of what appears in their books. Hence the issue at hand today is much graver than can be simply brushed aside. For the publishing houses of Najaf and Tehran have disgraced them and have divulged their secrets. And their scholar al-Ṭabarsī has disclosed that which was hidden in what he has put together in his book Faṣl al-Khiṭāb. This type of an approach is thus of no avail.

Unsurprisingly, this is the approach that they go by in everything that distinguishes them from the Muslims, as has been alluded to by their scholar al-Ṭūsī in his book al-Istibṣār in more than one place. He mentions that whatever is the locus of consensus among the Ahl al-Sunnah is fertile grounds for practicing Taqiyyah.1 It is based on this principle that they have rejected all those narrations which are in harmony with the Muslim majority and which reflect the true creed of the Ahl al-Bayt, and have ever since lived with Muslims deceitfully agreeing with them overtly and opposing them covertly. However, it wasn’t long before this Taqiyyah was exposed in contemporary times, for their books have become accessible to many.

So, for example, the Najafī scholar, who in his refutation of Ibn Ḥazm, demanded that he, Ibn Ḥazm, establish his claim by referring to any reputable Shīʿī scholar, do you think that he was unaware of what appears in al-Kāfī and Biḥār al-Anwār and that which their scholars have written regarding this blasphemous belief, mention of aspects whereof has passed? And was he really thinking that anyone who has access to any of their books wherein it features would be easily misled?

What is more surprising is that although he himself has refuted the existence of this belief in the third volume of his book, he has gone on to establish it explicitly in the ninth volume. Hence he says, amidst his discussion regarding the allegiance that the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār pledged to Abū Bakr which had united the Ummah and deflated the plots of the enemies:

بيعة عمت شؤمها الإسلام وزرعت في قلوب أهلها الآثام... وحرفَت القرآن وبدلت الأحكام

---

1 Al-Istibṣār 4/155.
It was a pledge the bad-omen whereof engulfed Islam and planted sins in the hearts of its adherents. By virtue of it the Qur’ān was interpolated and the injunctions were distorted.\(^1\)

Rather he has even cited a forged verse in this book.\(^2\) In this way does he go about affirming what he was previously negating. This particular approach, i.e. affirming at times and denying at times, or making a presence before people with contradictory opinions and non-conforming texts is a normal approach which we find in their traditions and in the statements of their scholars. And the reason for this approach is mentioned in some of their reports, which is taking advantage of the ignorance of the Ahl al-Sunnah with regards to the reality of their dogma owing to which they will have no room to target them in any way.\(^3\)

As for the style of ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn in rebutting this blasphemous belief, it entails such cunningness and prevarication as cannot be picked up by someone who is not aware of their strategies and plots. Reflect over his statement, “For the wise Qur’ān is widely transmitted through our transmissions with all its verses

\(^1\) Al-Ghadīr 9/388.

\(^2\) The fabricated verse reads as follows:

اليوم أكملت لكم دينكم بإمامته فمن لم يأتم به ومن كان من ولدي من صلبه إلي يوم القيامة فأولئك حبطت أعمالمهم في النار هم خالدون. إن إبلیس أخرج آدم علیه السلام من الجنة مع كونه صفوة الله بالحسد فلا تحسدوا فتحبط أعمالكم وتزل أقدامكم

Today I have completed your Dīn for you with his Imāmah. Hence whoever does not follow him and those who of his children from my progeny till the Day of Judgment, their deeds are indeed rendered invalid and they will remain forever in hell-fire. Verily Shayṭān removed Ādam from Jannah despite him being the chosen servant of Allah because of jealousy. Therefore do not be jealous or else your deeds will be rendered invalid and your feet will stagger. (Ibid. 1/214-215).

The fabricated nature of the verse is obvious from its otherwise poor language and meaning. Despite that this Rāfiḍī claims that Rasūl Allah \( \text{صلى الله عليه وسلم} \) said that it was revealed regarding ‘Alī \( \text{بن أبي طالب} \). And in an attempt to mislead the readers he attributes this lie to the Sunnī Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, whereas in actual fact it ought to be attributed to the Shī‘ī Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, provided that the attribution exists. He has thus lied against Allah \( \text{عَزَّ وَجَلُّ} \), His Messenger \( \text{صلى الله عليه وسلم} \), and the scholars of the Muslims.

\(^3\) Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/65; Biḥār al-Anwār 2/236.
and words.” What does he mean by the Qur’ān being transmitted by way of mass transmission through their chains? Does he mean the Qur’ān which is in front of us or the Qur’ān which is with the awaited Mahdī, as they allege.

The specification that it is widely transmitted through their chains subtly suggests the second meaning. This is because one of the crucial reasons for the preservation of the Qur’ān was the importance and attention accorded to it by the two giants of Islam, Abū Bakr and ʿUmar әә, whose efforts were subsequently culminated with the efforts of their brother ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān әә who compiled it and unified its script, as a manifestation of the promise of Allah әә:

\[
\text{إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ}
\]

Indeed, it is We who sent down the Qur’ān and indeed, We will be its guardian.¹

And the belief of the Shīʿah regarding the first three Khulafā’ is known, so the Qur’ān then is not actually widely transmitted through them.

As to the foolish attempt of Luṭf Allāh al-Ṣāfī and Āghā Buzruk al-Ṭahrānī to conceal the greatest indictment upon the Twelver dogma which cannot be denied, i.e. the book Faṣl al-Khiṭāb, it is an attempt in vein. Especially when it has now left the Shīʿī circles and has reached the hands of the Ahl al-Sunnah, it has rather reached the hands of the enemies of the Muslims who can learn how to plot against the Ummah and its traditional legacy.²

In addition, the author thereof has explicitly mentioned his goals in his introduction and has tried to advance evidence to prove his point. Is it then still possible to conceal his position when he has gathered all their fallacious reports and the views of their scholars which were scattered in this regard?

---

¹ Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9.
² A Shīʿī scholar by the name Muḥammad Mahdī al-ʿAṣfahānī has made mention of this in his book Aḥsan al-Wadīʿah p. 90.
The Second Reaction: Acknowledging its Existence and Attempting to Give a Plausible Explanation

This acknowledgement has taken many forms. Hence one of their scholars has written a book wherein he acknowledges that there are some narrations which talk of the interpolation of the Qur’ān but then further says:

إنها ضعيفة شاذة وأخبار آحاد لتفيد علمًا ولاعمالًا، فإما أن تؤول بنحو من الإعتبار أو يضرب بها الجدار

They are weak, anomalous and reported by single narrators which do not give the benefit of epistemological certainty nor categorical practice; they can either be given some sort of consideration or they can be smashed against the wall.¹

Another scholar has written that they are established reports but:

المراد في كثير من روایات التحریف من قولهم على السلام كذا نزل هو التفسیر بحسب التنزیل في مقابل البطن والتأویل

What is meant by the narrations of interpolation in their statements, “this is how it was revealed,” is the exegesis in terms of revelation in comparison to esoteric interpretations.²

Whilst a third set of scholars have written that the Qur’ān that we have ahead of us is not interpolated, rather it is incomplete and the verses regarding the immediate succession of ʿAlī have fallen away and:

كان الأولي أن يعنون السبب تثقيص الوحي أو يصرح بنزول وحي آخر وعده حتى لا يتمكن الكفار من التمويه على ضعفاء العقول بأن في كتاب الإسلام تحریفا باعتراف طائفة من المسلمين

---

¹ Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā': *Aṣl al-Shīʿah* p. 63-64.
The discussion revolving around it ought to be labelled ‘omission of the revelation’ or ought to be explicitly stated as ‘the descendence of another revelation or its absence’. This is so that the disbelievers are not afforded the opportunity to confuse the vulnerable people by claiming that interpolation has taken place in the book of Islam as is acknowledged by a group of the Muslims.¹

And yet a fourth scholar has written that:

نحن معاشر الشیعة تعتقد بأن هذا القرآن الذي بين أيدينا الجامع بين الدفتين هو الذي أنزله الله تعالى علي قلب خاتم الأنبیاء صلى الله عليه وسلم من غير أن يدخله شيء بالنقص أو بالزيادة كيف وقد كفل الشاعر نفسه تعالى: إِنَّنا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّکْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ علي أنا معاشر الشیعة (الإثني عشریة) نعترف بأن هناك قرآنا كتبه الإمام علي رضي الله عنه بيد الشیعة بعد أن فرغ من كفن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وتنفيذ وصاياه، فجاء به إلى المسجد النبوي فنفیت الفاروق عمر بن الخطاب قائلا للمسلمين حسبنا كتاب الله وعندكم القرآن، فرده الإمام علي إلى بیته ولم يزل كل إمام يحفظ عليه كودیعة إلهیة إلى أن ظل محفوظ عند الإمام المهدي القائم عجل الله تعالى فرجنا به

We the Shīʿah believe that this Qurʾān which is gathered between the two covers is revealed by Allah upon the heart of the Seal of all Prophets without any addition or omission. How could it have been otherwise when Allah the legislator has himself said, “Indeed, it is We who sent down the Qurʾan and indeed, We will be its guardian.” However, we the Shīʿah (Twelvers) do concede that there is another Qurʾān which Imām ʿAlī has written with his blessed hand after having finished the burial procedures of Rasūl Allah and executing his bequests? He then brought it to the Masjid of Nabī but ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb disregarded it saying to the Muslims that the Book of Allah is sufficient for you and you already have a Qurʾān. Hence the Imām returned it to his household and every subsequent Imām preserved it considering it to be a divine trust. It finally became secured by the Mahdī, may Allah grant us quick relief by way of his emergence.²

² Al-Khurāsānī: al-Islām ʿalā Ḍawʿ al-Tashayyuʿ p. 204.
The fifth viewpoint posits the following:

وقع بعض علماء المتقدمين بالإشتباه فقالوا بالتحریف ولهم عذرهم كما لهم اجتهادهم وإن أخطأوا بالرأي، غير أنا حينما فحصنا ذلك ثبت لنا عدم التحریف فقلنا به وأجمعنا عليه

Some of our early scholars fell into the blunder of interpolation. They are excused, for they had their reasoning and evidence even though they erred. But when it became clear to us that interpolation has not occurred we accepted it and unanimously affirmed it.¹

And the sixth position taken by some is that only those scholars who could not differentiate the authentic narrations from the unauthentic ones took the position of interpolation, i.e. the Akhbāris (the textualists). As for the Uṣūlis, they deny this blasphemy.²

Analyses

We will analyse these reactions in the sequence that they were presented:

Firstly: To say that those blasphemous assertions are weak or anomalous narrations according to the Shī‘ah is debunked by the fact that a group of their leading scholars like al-Mufīd, al-Kāshānī, and Ni‘mat Allah al-Jazā’irī have opined that they are widespread and categorically established. Rather al-Majlisī has concluded that they are as authentic in their abundance and popularity as are the narrations of Imāmah, as has passed. Furthermore interpolation was the official position taken by many of their great scholars.

Denying those narrations and merely reducing them to anomalous ones despite their abundance, as acknowledged by many of their scholars, is indeed a reflection of the extent of the lying which exists in this cult. If this view was really based on truth, then it should have prompted further investigation into the other beliefs of the Shī‘ah which have separated them for the Muslims. It should likewise

have prompted the overall scrutiny of all their narrations and transmitters. Subsequently, whoever has narrated those problematic narrations and made them his official creedal position like that of al-Kulaynī and Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, who have played the biggest role in entrenching this belief in the Shi‘ī ideology and its propagation; should no more have been trusted and relied upon.¹

**Secondly:** As for the view that what is meant by the Shi‘ī narrations in this regard is the interpolation of some texts which were revealed for the exegesis of the verses of the Qur‘ān, it is just an affirmation of interpolation and not a defence thereof. This is so, due to the fact that the one who is willing to distort, reject, and discard those texts which came down from Allah to expound on the Qur‘ān and clarify it would be more willing to reject and distort the verses themselves. For how can someone who is not trustworthy in the meaning be trustworthy in the wording. Furthermore, if the meanings are lost to distortion than what value remains for the mere words? Also, how can the exegesis of the Ṣaḥābah be distortions according to this cult and the ‘distortions’ of al-Qummī, al-Kulaynī, and al-Majlisī which when read by anyone who has even a little knowledge of the Arabic language will pick up that they are heresies, be valid exegesis? And if the meanings of the Qur‘ān are lost and have disappeared with the awaited Mahdī, then how is the Ummah expected to receive guidance? Or should it remain lost and misguided?

You will furthermore notice that the examples of the exegesis of the Imāms which they present before us, merely deliberating over them is enough to discern their

¹ However, the holder of this view which we are analysing, i.e. Muḥammad Āl Ḥusayn Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’, reveres some of these heretical Shi‘ah who openly proclaim this disbelief. He thus says the following regarding al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, the author of *Fasl al-Khiṭāb*:

حجة الله علي العالمين محجب الملائكة بتقواه، من لو تجلى الله خلقه لقال هذا نوري، مولنا ثقة الإسلام حسين النوري

The evidence of Allah upon the world, admired by the angels for his piety. A man of such calibre that if Allah were to appear before his creation he would say, “This is my Nūr. This is our master the authentic transmitter of Islam al-Nūrī. (Muḥammad Āl Ḥusayn Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’; introduction of *Kashf al-Astār* (published by: Mu’ayyid al-ʿUlamā’ al-Jadīdah, Qum) of al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī. This lauding was after al-Nūrī had perpetrated this crime.
falsity. So how can these be the divine exegesis which the Ṣaḥābah rejected, as they allege?

Lastly, this explanation of the blasphemous belief is not coherent with many of their narrations, for many among them explicitly state that the divine text itself was affected by change and omission in its words.¹ So this explanation is not a safe route out of this blasphemy and indictment. The right stance is the outright rejection of these narrations and the excommunication of those who believed in them.

Thirdly: To likewise say that the Qur’ān is incomplete and is not distorted is like the previous stance, not a defence of the Qur’ān but rather an affirmation of their fables and a criticism of the Qur’ān in a way which resembles a defence of it. For

¹ For example they say that ʿAlī said:

وأما ما حرف من كتاب الله فقوله: كنتم خير أمّة أخرجت للناس فحرفت إلى خير أمّة. ومنهم الزناة واللاطة والسراف وتقطع الطريق والظلمة وشرب الحمر والمضمونون للفائض الله العادون عن حدوده، أتري الله تعالى مدد من هذه صفته، ومن قوله تعالى: أن تكون أمّة هي أربى من أمّة فحرفوها وجعلوها أمّة. ومنه في سورة عم ويقول الكافر بالبيتني كنت ترابا فحرفوها وقلاوا ترابا وذلك لأن الرسول كان أكثر من شاكطين بأبي تراب ومثل هذا كثير.

As for that which interpolated of the Qur’ān, it is the verse, “You are the best of Imāms who have been taken out for the benefit of humanity,” it was distorted to “The best of nations,” whereas in it are adulterers, sodomisers, thieves, highway robbers, oppressors, drunkards, those who discard the injunctions of Allah and those who transgress his limits. Do you think that Allah will ever praise such a people?

(The fabricator of this narration may Allah curse him, attempts to tarnish the reputation of the Companions of the Prophet @example because the Qur’ān was revealed regarding them, and the Shīṭī dogma is based upon their revilement, so they criticised the Qur’ān for that reason. The narration continues:

Another verse is, “So that one nation be more plentiful than the Imams,” and they interpolated it to ‘nation’... likewise the verse, “Likewise we made you intermediary Imāms (i.e. between the prophet and the people) and they interpolated it to ‘nation’. Similar is the verse in Sūrah al-Naba’, it was “And the disbeliever will say I wish a was a Turābī (one who follows Abū Turāb, i.e. ‘Alī) and they interpolated it to Turāb (sand). And this is because Nabī would often address me as Abū Turāb. And there are many other examples. (Biḥār al-Anwār 93-26-28)
a person who has the ability to omit a portion of the Qurʾān surely will have the
ability to interpolate it. But a thing which emerges from its homelands is not
considered strange, for the holder of this view is Āghā Buzruk al-Ṭahrānī who
was the student of al-Nūrī—the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb Fī Taḥrīf Kitāb Rabb al-Arbāb*
(The definitive conclusion in proving the distortion of the book of the absolute
Lord of the lords).

It is due to this that you will see that this Tehrani tries to deceive the Muslims by
claiming that the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* directly told him that his intention was
defending the Qurʾān but he mistakenly titled his book wrongly.1 But in doing so
he exposes himself, for he claims that there is a remaining portion of the Qurʾān
which is the completion of the Qurʾān and that it was more appropriate to have
titled the book ‘the incomplete nature of the Qurʾān and the descent of another divine
revelation’. How does he still have the audacity to claim that this is defending
the Qurʾān from the enemies? This is the extent to which he tries to defend the
Qurʾān and Islam! Pure are You, O Allah, this is indeed a great slander.

**Fourthly**: As for the assertion of the fourth category who claim that their Mahdī
has another Qurʾān, it entails that the Dīn has not reached its culmination,
whereas Allah ُسَبَّحُهُمْ أَعْمَلَتْ لَكُمُ دِينَكُمْ
says:

ِالْیَوْمَ أَکْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِینَكُمْ

This day I have perfected for you your religion.2

Furthermore, of what benefit is this absent book to the Ummah, which has
disappeared with their Awaited Mahdī upon whose occultation centuries have
passed? And if it is indispensable then what do the Shīʿah say regarding their
predecessors who have passed centuries ago whilst being upon misguidance?
And if the Ummah without it is on guidance then of what value are these claims.

---

1 He has mentioned this in his book *Aʿlām al-Shīʿah* in the first vol. of the second section p. 550.
2 Sūrah al-Māʿidah: 3
In reality all this nonsense is to convince their followership of their anomalous beliefs which have no support from the Book of Allah ﷺ. Hence they try to confuse them by telling them that the evidence for a particular issue is found in the other Qur’ān, or the complete Qur’ān, or that the expounder of the Qur’ān is the awaited Absent Imām.

Furthermore, the aspect of the existence of another Qur’ān and that of criticising the current one are both found in the canonical works of the Shī’ah as one issue; they both cannot be separated from each other. For they claim that ʿAlī compiled the Qur’ān in its entirety and presented it to the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ who subsequently rejected it and compiled their own Qur’ān wherein they omitted the mention of his immediate succession; and the alleged Qur’ān thus remained with the Imāms who successively inherited it till it eventually reached the hands of the Mahdī.

Hence this Shī‘ī and whoever follows his approach intend to deceive and misguide. They gradually progress in their discussion in order to make this blasphemy plausible to the people by merely citing one angle of the discussion.

**Fifthly:** As to the fifth party which says that the stance of the interpolation of the Qur’ān is a wrong stance and is a deviation of our past which we once believed, but the truth has now become evident to us and we have thus abandoned it. Their recantation from this false stance indeed pleases a Muslim. However, it should be heeded that this assertion might be influenced by Taqiyyah. The indication of this is that the authors of the books which contained this disbelief are still venerated by these people. Whereas honesty in this regard demands that they completely disavow those scholars and their books. So for example al-Kulaynī in his al-Kāfī and al-Qummī in his Tafsīr have asserted this disbelief, but despite that how are they treated as leading scholars and reliable transmitters? Why are their books treated as seminal works for the derivation of doctrine and law; and why are their views trusted and actions emulated?

Furthermore, asserting that the Twelvers have unanimously withdrawn from this belief is violated by the doings of their contemporary scholar Ḥusayn al-Nūrī
al-Ṭabarsī who wrote his book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* in order to prove this heresy. It is likewise violated by the book *Tahrīf al-Qur‘ān*, in Urdu,1 of another contemporary scholar ‘Alī Taqī al-Sayyid Abū al-Ḥasan al-Naqwī al-Lakhnawī (d. 1323 A.H.) and other books. It is likewise contradicted by the aforementioned stances of Āghā Buzruk al-Ṭahrānī, al-Amīnī al-Najafi and the others; a group amongst them always have a share in this heresy and deviance.

In addition, why should a person who holds an anomalous view regarding an issue which the Muslims have unanimously agreed upon, i.e. the soundness of the Book of Allah and its preservation, be considered excused on the basis of his reasoning? After all is it an issue wherein there is scope for reasoning? And are there any excuses or room for a plausible interpretation in such an issue?

**Sixthly:** As for the assertion of the last group that this heresy was not propounded by all the Twelvers but by a group amongst them, i.e. the Akhbārīs who do not make a distinction between authentic and lackluster narrations. This was an approach adopted by one of the old Shi‘ī scholars, al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā. He says:

من خالف في ذلك من الإمامیة لیعتد بخلافهم، فأن الخلاف في ذلك مضاف إلي قوم من أصحاب الحديث (من الشیعة) نقلوا أخبارا ضعیفة وظنوا صحتها لیرجع بمثلها عن المعلوم المقطوع علي صحته

The opposition of those who have opposed the Shi‘ah in this regard is not worth consideration. Simply because it is attributed to a group of the literalists (amongst the Shi‘ah) who narrated lackluster narrations and considered them to be authentic, such weak narrations that it is not permissible to divert from the categorically established based on them.2

This idea that the doctrine of interpolation is exclusive to the Akhbārīs, has likewise been emphasised and propounded by the greatest Shi‘ī scholar and reference of his time Ja‘far al-Najafī (d. 1227).

---

1 *Al-Dharīʿah ilā Taṣānīf al-Shī‘ah* 3/394.

2 Al-Ṭūsī has quoted this from him in *al-Tībān* 1/3 and so has al-Ṭabarsī in *Majma‘ al-Bayān* 1/15.
But despite him being from the Uṣūlīs, the stance he takes regarding the narrations of interpolation is no less in its gravity then the stance of his Akhbārī brothers. This is because he states the following after mentioning the viewpoint of the Akhbārīs and debunking it by saying that it is invalid traditionally and logically and in light of that which is categorically known to be part of Dīn:

 فلا بد من تنزيل تلك الأخبار إما علي النقص من الكلمات المخلوقة قبل النزول إلي سماء الدنيا، أو بعد النزول إليها قبل النزول إلي الأرض، أو علي نقص المعني في تفسيره. والذي يقوى في نظر القاصر التنزيل علي أن النقص بعد النزول إلي الأرض فتكون القرآن قسمين: فقسم قرأه النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم علي الناس وكتبه وظهر بينهم وقام بإعجاز، وقسم أخفاه ولم يظهر عليه أحد سوا أمير المؤمنين رضي الله عنه، ثم منه إلي باقي الأئمة الطاهرين. وهو الآن محفوظ عند صاحب الزمان جعلت فداءه

Therefore it is necessary to interpret those narrations to mean omission in those created words’ before their descendence to the first heaven, or after their descendence to the first heaven and before their revelation to the earth. The Qur’ān is thus of two types: One: that which Rasūl Allah read to the people which they subsequently wrote and established and which had its incapacitating nature. And the other is that which he concealed from the people and did not disclose to anyone besides Amīr al-Mu’minīn and he to the remaining pure Imāms. It is now preserved by the man of the time (the Mahdī) may I be sacrificed for him.

The author of Kashf al-Ghiṭā’ was not so bold as to make the claims that al-Murtaḍā made, but he deviated in a jungle of conjecture and unappealing reasoning owing to which he ended in a situation worse than the one he was trying to avoid. He claimed that Nabī concealed a portion of the Qur’ān and did not convey it to anyone in his Ummah besides ‘Alī and that he passed it on to his children and that today it is preserved by the Mahdī! Is there anything more to say after such a blatant slander?

---

1 This is because they believed like the Mu’tazilah that the Qur’an is a creation.

2 Kashf al-Ghiṭā’ p. 299.
The Third Reaction: Defiantly Proclaiming and Providing Evidence for it

The Person responsible for this catastrophe is Ḥusayn al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (d. 1320) who wrote his book Faṣl al-Khiṭāb in order to establish this alleged belief.

Probably it was the first time in history that the fables of the Shīʿah, the views of their scholars, and the fabricated verses which they claim in this regard were gathered in one book and printed and published. This book has become an indictment upon the Shīʿah for the rest of time. And if the Muslims had the strength and authority, many tribunals would have been called for in order to decide the faith of the Twelvers in light of this book, i.e. are they Muslims or are they out of the fold. The Muslims would have sighed with relief with the absence of those mercenaries who infiltrate the Muslim world in order to spread Shīʿism. And all those gullible people whom the scholars of the Shīʿah easily deceive would have awoken from their slumber—people who do not understand Shīʿism to be anything other than loving the Ahl al-Bayt—which will grant them entry into Jannah without reckoning.

Shaykh Iḥsān Ilāhī Ẓahīr has published a very large portion of this book in his work al-Shīʿah wa al-Qur'ān coupled with citing the evidence of this calumniator and the misconceptions that his raises. Despite this exposing the Twelver Shīʿah to a very large extent, however, Shaykh Iḥsān has sufficed on citing these without any annotation or critique, which is extremely crucial especially when the author has raised twelve misconceptions in order to prove his conclusion. And although they are nothing but the threads of a spider web, but at times they can be misleading to people who have no knowledge of the Sharīʿah. It is therefore necessary to unfold his misconceptions, deconstruct them, and extirpate them from their roots. Therefore a brief presentation of the contents of this book will be presented hereunder, considering that the author thereof is a contemporary Shīʿī scholar, coupled with criticising it and deconstructing its misconceptions and blunders with the help of Allah.

Although the book of Iḥsān has reached every place in the Muslim world. But he did not reject or at least critique any of its content due to the matter being clearer
than should be clarified and due to presenting this false belief being enough to show its falsity. I say that whilst this approach is correct in terms of the belief itself, however, there is most certainly a need for refuting and deconstructing the misconceptions that appear therein.

The author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb has lifted the veil from the belief of the Shī’ah regarding the interpolation of the Qur’ān, and in this regard has gathered all their scattered narrations and the verdicts of their scholars regarding them being widely transmitted and exceeding two thousand in amount. He has accused the Ṣaḥābah of interpolating the Qur’ān and unanimously conspiring on doing so. He has not excluded anyone besides Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ʿAlī, which in anyway is just a nominal exclusion because it necessitates the concurring of all (including ʿAlī), for he did not reveal the unadulterated Qur’ān that was by him, not even during his Khilāfah.

He then presents 1062 narrations most of which state that many of the verses of the Qur’ān are incorrect. He then mentions the alleged correct verses from their fallacious books thereby rejecting what the Ummah has united upon and accepting what a handful of calumniators have asserted.

He was likewise not ashamed of documenting some chapters in their entirety which are normally circulated in the circles of the Shī’ah and do not feature in the normal Qur’ān. The signs of fabrication and forgery are clear from their wordings and meanings; they are not unclear but to an ignorant non-Arab person and cannot possibly be propagated by anyone besides a spiteful heretic.

He has likewise refuted the claims of those scholars who deny interpolation and has mentioned that the denial of the early scholars was based on Taqiyyah and that denying the narrations of interpolation is tantamount to denying the narrations of Imāmah due to them being interlinked.

This book which contains all this disbelief was published in Iran in 1298 A.H. It had not still fully made its appearance and the Shī’ah were already expressing their agitation toward it; one of their scholars describing this condition states:
You will not enter any gathering from the gatherings of the academic seminary but that you will hear the people decrying this book and opposing it, its author and its publisher vitriolically.\(^1\)

Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb opines that the reason for the decry was that they wanted the issue of the interpolation of the Qur‘ān to remain a secret within their circles and the narrations thereof to remain scattered within their reliable books; they did not want them to be gathered in one book, thousands of copies whereof would be published and which their opponents would come to know and would thus hold as evidence against them. And when some of their intelligent people expressed these concerns the author wrote a counterargument in the form of the book *Radd Baʿḍ al-Shubuhāt ʿan Faṣl al-Khiṭāb fī Ithbāt Taḥrīf Kitāb Rabb al-Arbāb* (dispelling some misconceptions from *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*).\(^2\)

Although some of the extremist Shī‘ah have tried to conceal this preposterous belief at most times by way of *Taqiyyah* which has become the best resort and fort for them, and although many of those who believed in it and were actively part of the protest considered it crucial to conceal it in order to preserve the social status of the Shī‘ah and their religion from being disparaged so negatively that it will bring the entire edifice of Shī‘ism crumbling down, I do not concur with Muḥibb al-Dīn in this generalisation regarding all the Shī‘ah. Rather I assert that there has always been a group among the Shī‘ah who deny this disbelief and disavow it. They have also written books in refutation of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* due to this reason, like the book written by one of their scholars Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Mar‘ashī titled *Risālah Fī Ḥifẓ al-Kitāb al-Sharīf min Shubhah al-Qawl bi al-Taḥrīf*.\(^3\)

\(^2\) *Al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah* p. 11.
\(^3\) Manuscript (see *al-Ma‘ārif al-Jaliyyah* p. 21).
I likewise have noted that in various places in *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* he has refuted the arguments of those who deny this disbelief from among his people and he debates with them. Whoever reads the book will realise that it was compiled in order to convince those Shīʿah who were not willing to accept this heretical belief.¹

Furthermore, the book that the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* wrote by the title *Radd Baʿḍ al-Shubuhāt ʿan Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* was not, ostensibly, in order to debunk the viewpoint of those who said that this issue should remain a secret within their circles. This is because what Muḥibb alluded to actually played out like this:

When the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* emerged their scholar Maḥmūd ibn Abī al-Qāsim (famously known as Muʿarrib al-Ṭahrānī) wrote a refutation thereof by the title *Kashf al-Irtiyāb fī Ṭadh Tharīf al-Kitāb*. The author of *al-Dharīʿah* has documented for us the first argument of the *Kashf al-Irtiyāb* which implies the denial of interpolation and not a call for its concealment. The author of *al-Dharīʿah* says:

> وأول شبهات كشف الإرتيباب هو أنه إذا ثبت تحرير القرآن فللهود أن يقولوا إذا لا فرق بين كتابنا وكتابكم في عدم الإعتبار

The first misconception² of *Kashf al-Irtiyāb* is that if the interpolation of the Qur’ān is established then it would give the Jews the niche to say that there is no difference between our book and your book in terms of not being preserved.³

Al-Ṭabarsī subsequently wrote a refutation thereof, which is probably what Muḥibb was referring to, titled *al-Radd ʿalā Kashf al-Irtiyāb*.⁴ The author of *al-Dharīʿah* says:

---

¹ *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 360, onwards.
² Notice that he has named the arguments misconceptions. This is because the author of *al-Dharīʿah* holds the same view as the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* and he thus names the arguments of *Kashf al-Irtiyāb* misconceptions plunging deeper into this belief. And why not, especially when the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* is his teacher whom he has very lavishly praised and exaggeratingly extolled.
³ Āghā Buzruk al-Ṭahrānī: *al-Dharīʿah ilā Taṣānīf al-Shīʿah* 18/9: under the letter ژ.
⁴ Ibid. 10/211.
And he would advise every person who had a copy of ُ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb to add this booklet to it wherein he dispelled the misconceptions raised by Shaikh Maḥmūd. It is in Persian and has still not been printed.

The response of al-Ṭabarsī in his refutation of the arguments of Kashf al-Irtiyāb was more of an attempt to recant and thus is evidence of contradiction. This is because he says the following:

This is a semantic misunderstanding, for what is meant by interpolation is not what the word outwardly suggests, i.e. change, distortion, addition and omission, etc., all of which has definitely occurred in the books of the Jews. Rather what is intended by the term interpolation is omission specifically in verses other than the verses of law. As for addition to the Qurʾān, the established unanimity of all the various sects of the Muslims and the general consensus of all those who subscribe to Islam is that no one’s speech has been added to the Qurʾān which is characterised of whatever is between the two covers, even if it be the amount equal to the smallest verse which can be termed as eloquent. Rather the consensus of the Ummah is that not even a word has been added to the Qurʾān in a way that it cannot be pointed out. So what a vast difference between overall omission and what the term ostensibly suggests? And is this not but a semantic misunderstanding?

1 Al-Dhariʿah 10/221.
This is just a little of what appears in the two books which the author of Al-Dharīʿah has conveyed to us. And this discloses to us that the debate was really about whether interpolation occurred in the Qurʾān or not. It was not about the necessity of keeping it concealed although it does not rule out the possibility that there existed among the Shīʿah many who felt that it was necessary to keep it hidden in order to save the integrity of the dogma. However, it does rule out the generalisation of this possibility.

Having said that, the afore cited argument that the author has presented to us after having digested it from the actual Persian booklet written by the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb which I have cited verbatim is not void of traces of incorrectness in its Arabic, obscurity, contradiction, and Taqiyyah; the evidence whereof is completely clear from his speech, as is normally the habit of these Shīʿah.¹

Moving on, the author, may he receive from Allah what he deserves, has organised this book in to three introductory chapters and two other chapters.

In the first introduction he has cited a number of their narrations which talk of the compilation of the Qurʾān, based on their understanding thereof. For example, the narration of their ‘reliable’ scholar which reads as follows:

ما ادعي أحد من الناس أنه جمع القرآن كله، كما أنزل إل کذاب. وما جمعه وحفظه كما أنزله الله إل علي

بن أبي طالب والائتمان من بعده

¹ Notice that first he had denied any addition whatsoever being made to the Qurʾān, and then he steps back and says “Rather the consensus of the Ummah is that not even a word has been added to the Qurʾān in a way which we cannot point out” reflect over his statement ‘which we cannot point out’. By way of this statement he is subtly inclining to the view of the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb that indeed additions have been made to the Book of Allah. The author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb, whilst making mention of the various ways in which change came about in the Qurʾān, ways inspired to him by the devil and motivated by his hatred for Islam and its people, says the following:

البائعة زيادة الكلمة كزيادة عن في قوله تعالى يسألونك عن الأنفال

The seventh way: adding a word, like in the verse (Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 25).

Likewise his assertion that only omission has occurred in the Book of Allah does not excuse him from belying the verse, “Verily We have revealed the Remembrance, and We are its Protectors.”
Besides the liar, no one has ever claimed that he compiled the entire Qur’ān as it was revealed. And no one compiled it nor preserved it in the way it was revealed besides ʿAlī and the subsequent Imāms.

This is based upon the Shīʿah doctrine of only considering one person, ʿAlī, infallible and considering the entire Ummah astray. And this doctrine came about due to remnants of the Persian culture which consecrated its kings.

How foolish indeed! He rejects that upon which all the Ṣaḥābah concurred and then claims that only the transmission of one person is reliable. These claims have no evidence to back them up and they only exist in the imagination of these people. This is because ʿAlī himself and the Ummah has not known any other Qur’ān but this Qur’ān.

He then goes on to narrate narrations regarding the Qur’ān of ʿAlī wherefrom, as they allege, not one letter was omitted. He cites a group of their narrations which when studied make a person realise that the Shīʿī psyche is the quickest to believe in hogwash and fables. For it believes in a book that does not exist anywhere other than in their fables, and disbelieves in a book which was unanimously accepted by the Ummah, including the Imāms. These fables talk of how ʿAlī had compiled the Qur’ān and how the Ṣaḥābah refused to accept it.

One among these narrations is the narration of the Shīʿī who allegedly met the awaited Mahdī (who was not born at all) and whom the Mahdī addressed by saying the following:

لما انتقل سيد البشر محمد بن عبد الله صلى الله عليه وآله من دار الفناء وفعلت مما فعلا معاً لما فقالوا من نصب الخلافة جمع أمير المؤمنين رضي الله عنه القرآن كله ووضعه في إزار وأتي به إليهم وهم في المسجد، فقال لهم: هذا كتاب الله سبحانه وتعالى أمرني رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن أعرضه عليكم ليقتم الحجة عليه أن يتم العرض بيني وبين الله تعالى، فقال فرعون هذه الأمة ونمرودها: لسنا محتاجين إلى قراء كأنما أردت بذلك إلقاه الحجة عليكم فرجع أمير المؤمنين إلى منزله... فنادي ابن أبي قحافة بالمسلمين وقال لهم: كل من عنده قرآن من آية أو سورة فليأت بها ففاجأه أبو عبيدة بن الجراح، وعثمان، وسعد بن أبي وقاص، ومعاوية بن أبي سفيان،
When the leader of humanity Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allah departed from this ephemeral world and the two idols of Quraysh did what they did regarding the nomination of a Khalīfah, Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī compiled the entire Qurʾān and covered it in a loin cloth, brought it to the masjid, presented it to them and said the following, “This is the book of Allah which Rasūl Allah has ordered me to present to you in order to establish evidence against you on the Day of Reckoning before Allah.” In response, the Firʿawn and the Namrūd of this Ummah said the following, “We are not in need of your Qurʾān.” To which he replied, “My beloved had foretold me of your response, I, however, only presented it to you in order to marshal evidence against you,” and subsequently returned to his house. Ibn Abī Quḥāfah proclaimed amongst the Muslims, “Whoever has any portion of the Qurʾān written should produce it.” subsequented, Abū ʿUbaydah ibn al-Jarrāḥ, Ṭalḥah ibn ʿAbd Allah, Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, Ḥassān ibn Thābit, and droves of Muslims came to him and they compiled the Qurʾān. After the demise of the master of the prophets they, however, omitted all the demerits that were contained therein, which they were guilty of. You will thus find that the verses are not organised systematically. As for the Qurʾān that Amīr al-Muʾminīn compiled, it is preserved in his hand writing by the lord of the time [Mahdī] (may Allah hastened his release). Therein is everything, even the recompense for a scratch. As for the status of this Qurʾān, there is no doubt in its authenticity and in it being the word of Allah. This is what the Mahdī had said.

1 Referring to al-Ṣiddīq and al-Fārūq, the two who established the empire of Islām after Rasūl Allah
2 Referring to ʿUmar al-Fārūq who conquered the lands of Persia and spread Islām therein. The only reward these people could think of for him was revilement and excommunication.
3 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 9-10
I have cited the narration in its entirety despite its length due to all their stories revolving around it. In essence the belief is thus a result of the hatred these people have for the Ṣaḥābah and for the Dīn that they barred.

As you can see, the discussion is about the demerits of the Ṣaḥābah and that whoever compiled the Qurʾān omitted them. They have thus divulged the hidden secret and what their hearts bare is even greater.

But, if the Ṣaḥābah abandoned the Qurʾān then why was the actual Qurʾān which ʿAlī presented to them kept away from the people of the subsequent centuries? For if it served as inculpatory evidence against the Ṣaḥābah it cannot be such evidence against the subsequent generations? And why did ʿAlī not establish this evidence against the people when he was in an authoritative position during his rule and Khilāfah? Their fables contradict one another internally.

And if the Ṣaḥābah rejected it, surely there would be someone throughout the subsequent centuries who would have accepted it, especially when they claim that some among them accompanied the Imāms and even met the awaited Mahdī, also notwithstanding that autonomous Shīʿī empires came about. So why would they then be deprived? And why should it then remain with the Mahdī in his hiding? Does this all not make it very clear that this is all nothing but nonsense, leaving aside all other evidences and their analyses?

Furthermore, the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb goes on to mention narrations in his introduction which suggest that ʿAlī refused to give the Qurʾān to the Ṣaḥābah when they requested him for it due to averring that none but the pure could touch it and that no one is pure besides the Twelve Imāms.¹

This is indeed problematic. For it implies that ʿAlī refused to convey the Qurʾān by claiming that it is specific to him and his children. No Muslim will dare to say this, let alone Amīr al-Muʿminīn. The motive behind this is tarnishing the

¹ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 7.
reputation of the Ahl al-Bayt and lampooning them. It is for this reason that one of the Shi‘ī sects, the Kāmilīyyah excommunicated ʿAlī from the community of the Muslims. These narrations which feature in the books of the Twelvers invariably lead to this conclusion. These people, thus, are cohorts of Shayṭān but definitely not the supporters of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn. Those who exonerate Amīr al-Mu‘minīn from all these falsities are indeed his supporters and helpers.

In the second introduction he produces examples of the types of interpolation which allegedly occurred in the Qur’ān. He cites various examples of interpolation in Sūrahs, verses, words and letters, all of which are of course a result of the whisperings of his devil to him.

He establishes that adding a chapter and replacing one with another is impossible due to the verse:

\[
\text{وَإِن كُنتُمْ فِي رَيْبٍ مِّمَّا نَزَّلْنَا عَلَىٰ عَبْدِنَا فَأْتُوا بِسُورَةٍ مِّن مِّثْلِهِ وَادْعُوا شُهَدَاءَکُم مِّن دُونِ اللّٰهِ إِنَّكُنَّ صَادِقِينَ}
\]

And if you are in doubt about what we have sent down [i.e., the Qur’ān] upon Our Servant [i.e., Prophet Muhammad], then produce a sūrah the like thereof and call upon your witnesses [i.e., supporters] other than God, if you should be truthful.²

He thus asserts that in the Qur’ān which the Muslims have access to there is no addition of any chapter whatsoever, due to humans being incapable of producing a chapter like any of the chapters of the Qur’ān, but he then contradicts himself by stating that decreasing a chapter is very possible and cites as an example the omission of the chapter of Wilāyah.³

---

2 Al-Baqarah: 23.
This is because this claim in itself entails an additional chapter to the present Qur’ān, i.e. the chapter of Wilāyah, whereas he had just denied the possibility thereof earlier. Over and above that, the wording of the Sūrah suggests that it is a complete fabrication, this is attested to by one of the scholars of the Shī‘ah themselves.1 This chapter is characterised by a concocted text, a ludicrous structure, and disreputable meaning; all of which make it clear that it was fabricated by an ignorant non-Arab, as will appear.

He further asserts that increasing a verse in the Qur’ān or decreasing one is also impossible by way of consensus. But then he contradicts his claim by stating that decrease is possible.2

As for adding a word to the Qur’ān, in light of their fables he concludes that it is possible. He gives an example stating that the word عن in the forthcoming verse is an addition in the verse of the Qur’ān?

They ask you, [O Muhammad], about the bounties [of war].3

The purpose behind this claim is that according to them the spoils of war were exclusively for Rasūl Allah and subsequently for the twelve Imāms that succeeded him. But the Ṣaḥābah were asking Rasūl Allah to give them the spoils as charity and were not asking him about the ruling of the spoils. This meaning is only possible if the word عن (regarding) is omitted.

He further states that omitting a word is very common, like the omission of the word ‘Alī in many a verses, i.e. the name of ‘Alī had occurred multiple times according to them in the Qur’ān but the Ṣaḥābah omitted it.

---

1 His name is Muḥammad Jawwād al-Balāghī: in his book Ālā’ al-Raḥmān p. 24-25.
3 Al-Anfāl: 1.
This claim is made in order to satisfy their followers who are doubtful regarding their dogma which is not backed by any verses in the Qur’ān. This is one of the most likely reasons which drove the Shīʿah to believe in this blasphemy. As for unlikely reasons, they are in order to destroy Shīʿism completely and distance the Shīʿah from Islam completely.

He then goes on to mention the various ways in which this alleged change in the words occurred in the Book of Allah and establishes in light of their fallacious narrations that this has indeed happened. He thus says: like changing the words ‘Al ʿImrān: أٰل محمد

إنَّ اللَّهَ اصْطَفَىٰ أٰدَمَ وَنُوحًا وَأٰلَ إِبْرَاهِیمَ وَأٰلَ عِمْرَانَ عَلَى الْعَالَمِینَ

Indeed, God chose Ādam and Nūḥ and the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of ʿImrān over the worlds...

The purpose of the Shīʿah from this is to look for anything by way of which they can establish the mention of their Imāms in the Book of Allah, for how is it possible that the family of ʿImrān is mentioned in the Qur’ān but their Imāms are not mentioned at all?

He then goes on to discuss particles and asserts in light of their fables that adding and omitting particles from the Qur’ān is possible and has occurred. He states, “like the omission of the particle أ in the verse:

كُنتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ

You are the best nation produced [as an example] for mankind.

And the omission of the ي in the verse:

1 Āl ‘Imrān: 33.
2 Āl ‘Imrān: 110.
And the disbeliever will say, “Oh, I wish that I were dust!”

The motive behind this forgery is obvious, for the Ummah of Muḥammad according to this cult, whose hearts hatred has devoured, is accursed, astray and oppressive due to it conquering their lands and destroying their empires and propagating Islam amongst its people. It hurts them to find that Allah has praised this Ummah, they have thus tried to divert the praise to their Twelve Imāms the last amongst whom was not even born at all. Therefore, they said that the word was actually A‘īmmah and not Ummah.

Likewise the motive behind the forgery of the word Turābiyy is to attribute to ‘Alī who was given the title Abū Turāb which implies that the disbeliever will say, “How I wish I was a Turābiyy,” i.e. from the partisans of ‘Alī. The question is why would he not desire to be from the partisans of Muḥammad? Is ‘Alī better than Muḥammad?

And his senseless jabber which has put the Shīʿah into the worst of positions and has tarnished their position forever continues.

The third introduction: therein he has mentioned the views of the Shīʿī clergy regarding the interpolation of the Qurʿān. He thus says:

اعلم أن لهم في ذلك أقوال مشهورها اثنان، الأول: وقوع التغییر والنقصان فیه

Know well that they have many views in this regard. Famous amongst them are two: first: the occurrence of distortion and decrease in the Qurʿān.”

He thereafter lists those scholars who held this view, like al-Qummī in his Tafsīr, al-Kulaynī in his al-Kāfī (as he has asserted, they both have very vehemently

1 Al-Naba’ 40.

In this way does he go about enumerating all their prominent scholars who were proponents of this fallacious belief mentioning their names with pompous titles, and at times even describing some of them by saying that they never ever erred in their lives, notwithstanding that this blunder itself is sufficient to gage how steeped they were in misguidance and disbelief. He also presents their statements in this regard, which have exposed the Shīʿah in the belated centuries. So for example, he quotes the statement of their scholar Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf, the author of Miḥrāt al-Anwār wherein he asserts that believing in this belief is part of the categorically established aspects of the Shi'i dogma.¹

He then says:

Second: the non-occurrence of change and omission therein and that whatever came down upon Rasūl Allah ﷺ is what is found in the two covers which is accessible to the people. To this view al-Ṣadūq has leaned in his ‘Aqā'id, likewise al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā and Shaykh al-Ṭā'īfah in al-Tībyān. No one from the early scholars is known to have sided with them in this view with the exception of what al-Mufīd has related regarding a group of the Shīʿah. But apparently he intended al-Ṣadūq and his followers.²

Notice that he endeavours to prove that the viewpoint of interpolation is the default view of the Shi'i dogma. Otherwise the early scholars of the Shi'i dogma

---

¹ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 32.
² Ibid. p. 33.
were free from this disbelief. The discussion regarding the roots of this belief and how it started has passed already.

He then goes on to mention the statements of the deniers and he debates their denial based on some narrations which appear in their books which establish this belief and eventually reaches the conclusion that it was not based on truth but rather it was a ploy in order to deceive the Ahl al-Sunnah.¹

And in the first chapter: he presents what he calls ‘the evidence which they use, whereas they can be used in substantiation of interpolation occurring in the Qur’ān’.

Therein he mentions twelve misconceptions, equal to the number of his A’immah.

**The First Misconception**

The heretic says:

الدليل الأول أن اليهود والنصاري غيروا وحرفوا كتاب نبيهم بعده، فهذه الأمة أيضا لا بد وأن يغيروا القرآن بعد نبينا صلى الله عليه وآله، لأن كل ما وقع في بني إسرائيل لا بد وأن يقع في هذه الأمة على ما أخبر به الصادق المصدق صلى الله عليه.

The first proof is that the Jews and the Christians distorted and interpolated the books of their prophet after them, this Ummah will thus also ineluctably distort the Qur’ān after our Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم. This is because whatever occurred in the Banī Isrā‘îl is bound to occur in this Ummah as has been told to us by the truthful and the believed صلى الله عليه وسلم.²

This misconception can be answered in various ways:

---

¹ Ibid. 33, onwards.
² Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 36.
First of all, we agree that whatever occurred in the Banī Isrā‘īl will occur in the Ummah of Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم, but we assert that whatever is excluded by way of evidence is not part of this general statement, and one such issue is the interpolation of the Qur’ān. For it is an exception to this generalisation due to the verse of the Qur’ān:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

Indeed, it is we who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur’ān], and indeed, we will be its guardian.¹

Can there be anything more powerful than limiting a ḥadīth with an explicit verse from the Qur’ān? Where are the brains of these people? It is for this reason that al-Bāqillānī has said:

أول جهلكم أنكم قطعتم بخبر واحد علي أن القرآن غير وبدل مع ردكم لما هو أقوى منه

The first sign of your ignorance is that you have averred on the basis of a limitedly transmitted report that the Qur’ān was distorted and interpolated, thereby rejecting that which is more powerful.²

Furthermore, Allah ﷻ had entrusted the people of the book with the preservation of the Torah and ordered them to preserve it. But they had breached the trust and failed to preserve it; they wittingly wasted it. Conversely, Allah ﷻ did not entrust anyone with the preservation of Qur’ān thereby allowing for its dissipation. Rather he himself assumed the responsibility of its preservation, as he mentions in the verse:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

Indeed, it is we who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur’ān], and indeed, we will be its guardian.

¹ Sūrah Al-Ḥijr: 9.
² Nukat al-İntiṣār p. 104.
And the in the verse:

لا يأتيه الباطل من بين يديه ولا من خلفه تنزل من حكيم حميد

Falsehood cannot approach it from before it or from behind it; [it is] a revelation from a [Lord who is] Wise and Praiseworthy.1

This is because the Qur’ān is his final revelation, and Nabī  is His Final Messenger and with his death revelation came to an end. So it is the sheer grace of Allah  that he has taken it upon himself to preserve his book till the Day of Judgement so that it serves as a source of illumination and guidance for the Ummah till the end of time.

Second, the premise that whatever occurred in the Banī Isrā‘īl is bound to occur in this Ummah is not acceptable in all respects. And therefore the conclusion that he draws from this premise is false. This is because it is based upon a premise which is not as general as it is purported to be. The evidence thereof is that the Banī Isrā‘īl killed their prophets but his Ummah did not, despite the efforts of some hypocrites to do so. Likewise they worshipped the calf but no such worship has occurred in this Ummah. The premise is thus not completely general. And the interpolation of the Qur’ān is more deserving of being an exception due to it being excluded via an explicit verse of the Qur’ān, as we have mentioned, even though some hypocrites have tried to distort it under the guise of Shī‘ism.

Likewise our Ummah is very different from the Banī Isrā‘īl. For in this Ummah there will always remain a group which will remain upon the truth, whom those who oppose them and those who forsake them will not harm them till Judgement Day. Which is why Allah  will not make an enemy from outside overcome them and eventually annihilate them. Both these aspects are established in authentic narrations from Nabī  . Indeed he has informed us that there will always remain a group which will be steadfast upon the truth, whoever opposes

1 Sūrah Fuṣṣilat: 42.
them will not harm them, till the Day of Judgement.¹ He has likewise informed us that he asked his Lord that he should not give dominance to an external enemy over his followers and He granted him that. And he asked him not to destroy them with universal famine and He granted him that. And he asked him that their in-house fighting not be very ferocious and He did not accede to that.²

As opposed to the previous nations, for there was not amongst them a group which was steadfast and assisted in adhering to the truth. External enemies were thus made to destroy them, as in the case of the Banī Isrā‘īl whose kingdom did not remain and in whose era al-Quds was ransacked twice.³

**Third**, if we hypothetically consider that the Qur’ān is not exempted from the generality of the aforementioned narration, then it is the Shī‘ah who interpolate the meaning of the Qur’ān coupled with trying to interpolate its words as well. And what we have presented previously is evidence of this. However, they were unable to reach their objective due to Allah taking it upon himself to preserve it as is clearly mentioned in the afore cited verse.⁴

---

¹ The reference has passed on p. 556 of this book.

² Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: chapter regarding signs of the hour: sub-chapter regarding the destruction of the Ummah at each other’s hands: 3: 2216; Sunan al-Tirmidhī: Tribulations: sub-chapter regarding Nabī making three prayers for his Ummah: 4/471-472; Sunan Ibn Mājah: chapter regarding tribulations: sub-chapter regarding various tribulations that will transpire: 2/303; Musnad Ahmad: 1/175, 181, 3/146, 156, 5/108, 240, 243, 6/396.


⁴ At this juncture Doctor Muḥammad Rashād Sālim dictated the following to me: The resemblance between the doings of both the nations is that in the Ummah of Muḥammad there have been those who have tried to interpolate the Qur’ān, like the Shī‘ah and the Rāfiḍah, or interpret it in ways completely invalid, like the Jahmiyyah. However, the difference is that the outcomes were different; for in the Banī Isrā‘īl, who concealed the actual Torah and preached the interpolated one, interpolation actually took place. Likewise is the case regarding the Injīl of the Christians. As for the Ummah of Muḥammad, Allah has taken it upon himself to preserve their holy book, the Qur’ān.
The second misconception

The heretic says:

الدليل الثاني أن كيفية جمع القرآن وتأليفه مستلزم معتادة لوقوع التغيير والتحريف فيه، وقد أشار إلى ذلك العلامة المجلسي في مراة العقول، حيث قال: والعقل يحكم بأنه إذا كان القرآن متفرقا متشرعا عند الناس وتصدي غير المعصوم لجمعه يمنع أن يكون جمعه كاملا موافقا للواقع.

The second proof is that the manner in which the Qur’ān was compiled and collected necessitates that change and interpolation take place. Al-Majlisī has alluded to this in Miṣrāt al-ʿUqūl, for he says, “And reason demands that if the Qurʾān was scattered amongst the people and an infallible person thereafter takes up the task of compiling it, it is impossible that his compilation be fully successful and in accordance with the actual revelation.”

Response: This misconception is based upon the Shīʿī perception that the entire Ummah is on error despite its unanimity and, on the other hand, one person who is not even a prophet is correct, as is discernible from his statement “and an infallible person thereafter takes up the task of compiling it”. And this is a completely false notion, as has been explained already under the discussion of infallibility. And whatever is based upon falsehood is false.

The manner in which he has framed his argument posits that many of the scholars in the Shīʿī clergy are calumniators who deny crystal clear realities and believe in falsities and nonsensical things. The compilation of the Qurʾān indeed was realised in the most meticulous of ways and the most reliable of them in terms of precision and perfection; for the scribes of revelation were on the one hand writing and the memorisers thereof were on the other hand memorising. Over and above that the Ummah in its entirety was repeating the verses of the Qurʾān in its prayers and circles of learning. Whenever any portion of the Qurʾān was revealed they would advance in memorising it, documenting it, learning it,

1 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 97.
and practicing it. It is therefore impossible for there to have been a letter which was increased or decreased. It is due to this that the Ummah has concurred upon it. And the unanimity of the Ummah is infallible.

Let us thus apply our minds and understand that this claim was not made by any of the sects amongst the Shi‘ah besides the Twelvers. The Twelvers talk of the Qur‘ān which ʿAlī compiled by himself, which is complete and perfect according to them, and deny that which the Muslims have concurred upon. So what should we believe, the Qur‘ān or an unknown book, the appearance whereof is based upon a fictitious awaited Mahdī and which was compiled according to them by one individual.

The Shi‘ah have produced some verses of this alleged book which cannot possibly be from the word of Allah due to the language therein being inferior to the language of an ordinary person, so how can it then be the incapacitating word of the Lord of the universes?

Moreover, the person to whom the Shi‘ah attribute the compilation of this alleged book (ʿAlī) reads the same Qur‘ān which is accessible to the Muslims and considers reading it to be an act of worship, but the Shi‘ah claim that was due to him doing Taqiyyah. Can Taqiyyah be practiced in a matter of this magnanimity wherefrom will come about the dissolution of Dīn and the misguidance of generations? This is an answer the falsity whereof is clear even through mere observation and experience. It is the decree of Allah in order that the reality of this cult be revealed to all the Muslims as long as they live among them with Taqiyyah.

Furthermore, it is a known fact that the compilation of the Qur‘ān reached fruition during the era of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq and ʿUthmān after the consensus of the Ṣaḥābah. And at the forefront of the scribes was Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ʿAlī; to the extent that the transmissions of most of the popular readings of the Qur‘ān return to him, as is conceded by the Shi‘ah themselves, as has passed already.¹

¹ See p. 359 of this book.
And in all the transmissions of the Qur’ān which go back to him there is nothing which opposes the present Qur’ān in any way. Over and above that ‘Alī is reported to have praised al-Ṣiddīq and Dhū al-Nūrayn for their efforts and accomplishments with regards to compiling the Qur’ān.¹ Can the light of the sun which is not dimmed by the clouds be denied, or should we accept fables narrated by a fringe minority from the enemies of the Ummah and its Dīn? Can there be any one more devious than the one who calls on his followers to disavow the Book of Allah and anticipate the emergence of a forged book which “exists” with a fictitious Imām, or with an Imām who went into occultation for now more than a thousand years? And how can evidence be marshalled against humanity by way of such a book when the Shī‘ah themselves have no knowledge of it and no access to it? They do not follow but conjecture and they do nothing but surmise!

**The third misconception**

The heretic says:

Most of the commonality (the Ahl al-Sunnah) and some of the elite (Shī‘ah) have averred, in the various categories of abrogated verses that in some verses the recitation is abrogated but not the ruling and vice versa, i.e. the ruling is abrogated but not the recitation. They have cited examples for both types and have narrated many clear and emphatic narrations of verses and words which do not feature at all in the current Qur’ān but existed during the era of Nabī and were read by the Companions. They

¹ See p. 294 of this book.
have considered such verses and words to belong to one of the two types without any explicit or indicative evidence. According to us, the abrogation of recitation is not valid and thus the only possible interpretation of these verses and words is that they fell away or they (the compilers) omitted them either unknowingly or intentionally, but definitely not with the permission of Allah and his Rasūl Allah which is crucial.¹

This misconception is raised very often by the contemporary Shīʿī scholars. By raising this misconception they endeavour to impact upon the reader by creating an impression upon him that the verses the recitation whereof is abrogated according to the Ahl al-Sunnah are not unlike the narrations of interpolation according to the Shīʿah. You will barely find a book from the books of this cult but that therein will feature the discussion of this accusation; you will find that they try to justify the fables which appear in their books by using the narrations which talk of abrogation in the legacy of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

There is no doubt as to the fact that their argument in this regard is untenable. This is because abrogation is from Allah as he states in the Qurʾān:

مَا نَنسَخْ مِنْ آيَةٍ أَوْ نُنسِهَا نَأْتِ بِخَيْرٍ مِّنْهَا أَوْ مِثْلِهَا

We do not abrogate a verse or cause it to be forgotten except that we bring forth [one] better than it or similar to it.²

However interpolation is from the actions of men, and there is a vast difference between the two. It is for this reason we will find that many of their scholars have adopted this false stance regarding the Qurʾān (of interpolation) due to the implications of their fables, but we will not find one scholar from amongst the Ahl al-Sunnah who adopted it; because abrogation and interpolation are two completely distinct concepts.

1 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 106.
2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 106.
Rather there is no place whatsoever for this fallacious belief in the dogma of the Muslims. This is clear from the fact that we find mention of the deviance which crept into the Muslims regarding the Qur’ān in issues like the inquisition of the created-increate nature of the Qur’ān and its likes. But the viewpoint that the Qur’ān is interpolated is found nowhere in the legacy of the Muslims. So how can abrogation and interpolation then be considered the same? This is not but outright misguidance and a sinister plot.

The most that the narrations in question indicate is that those verses and words were part of the Qur’ān for a while and were subsequently abrogated and raised during the lifetime of Nabī  when the system of revelation was still in function. That is why they are discussed under a dedicated topic of Qur’ānic sciences in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. It never occurred to any scholar that they are indicative of interpolation. Conversely, the narrations of interpolation according to the Shī'ah attribute interpolation to the Companions of Nabī  owing to believing in liars and calumniators who belie categorically established aspects of Dīn, the diffusely transmitted narrations and the testimony of Allah and His Rasūl  in favour of them.

According to the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Ṣaḥābah were too pious and Allah conscious to have did something like that. And even if we hypothetically accept that they tried to do so, Allah would not have given them the ability to successfully accomplish that. Otherwise that would necessitate that he did not live up to His promise which is impossible. Hence it is impossible for interpolation to have occurred even mistakenly at their hands, because it is Allah  who has promised to preserve the Qur’ān.

Furthermore, in spite of al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī emphatically denying the abrogation of recitation—minus reading and attributing that to all the Shī'ah in order to bolster his false agenda—the Shī'ah themselves have conceded its occurrence. Even if there is some basis to his claim, then too it would only be referring to some of the Contemporary Shī'ah. In which case it implies that they have plunged
deeper into this misguidance than their predecessors. Hereunder is a brief list of some their ancient scholars who have conceded it.

Shaykh al-Ṭabarsī (d. 460 A.H.) acknowledges thus in his book Majma‘ al-Bayān:

ومنها ما يرتفع اللفظ ويثبت الحكم كآية الرجم

And from them are those verses whose recitation has been lifted but their ruling is maintained, like the verse of Rajm (stoning the adulterer).¹

Notwithstanding that al-Ṭabarsī was a denier of interpolation, and the scholars of the Shī‘ah advance his stance as evidence to prove that their dogma is free of that indictment. Despite that none of their scholars has averred that his affirmation of abrogation is an affirmation of interpolation.

Before him, Shaykh al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 A.H.) says the following in his al-Tibyān:

لا يخلو النسخ في القرآن الكريم من أقسام ثلاثة: أحدها نسخ حكمه دون لفظه والثاني ما نسخ لفظه دون حكمه كآية الرجم، فإن وجوب الرجم علي المحصنة ل خلاف فيه، والآية التي كانت متضمنة له منسوحة بلا خلاف، وهي قوله: والشیخ والشیخة إذا زنیا.

Abrogation in the Qur‘ān is one of three types:

1. Where the ruling is abrogated but not the wording

2. Where the wording is abrogated but not the ruling, like the verse of Rajm; for there is no dispute regarding stoning being compulsory upon a married woman; the verse which entailed this was abrogated without dispute and it reads as follows, the married man and married woman, if they commit adultery...²

He also says in another place:

¹ Majma‘ al-Bayān 1/180.
² Al-Tibyān 1/13
Some people have denied the possibility of the Qur'an being abrogated. But in what we have mentioned there is proof of their assertion being false; for there are abundant narrations which state that there were verses in the Qur'an whose recitation was abrogated.¹

And prior to them, the shaykh of the Shī'ah, al-Murtaḍā (d. 436 A.H.), who was also one of the deniers of interpolation; who was excluded by Ibn Ḥazm from the viewpoint of the Twelver majority; and whose view is used to show that the Shī'ī dogma is free from the blasphemy in question, admits that abrogation of recitation is possible. He states the following in his book Al-Dharī'ah:

فصل في جواز نسخ الحكم دون التلاوة، ونسخ التلاوة دونه

Chapter regarding the possibility of the abrogation of the ruling minus the recitation and the abrogation of the recitation minus the ruling.

He then expounds on both types.²

Hence the acknowledgement of the abrogation of recitation is a locus of consensus between both parties.

Finally, part of the plot of the Shī'ah and their cunningness is that you will not come across a contemporary Shī'ī scholar who has written on this topic but that he has outwardly expressed the view that the Shī'ah are free from this preposterous belief by citing the views of al-Murtaḍā, al-Ṭabarsī, and has thereafter tried to attribute it to the Ahl al-Sunnah due to them acknowledging abrogation of recitation. Whereas al-Ṭabarsī and al-Murtaḍā also acknowledged it. But this plot is in place in order to accomplish an objective which they are not brave enough to reveal and that is their belief in this blasphemy.

¹ Ibid. 1/394.
² Al-Dharī'ah Ilā Uṣūl al-Sharī'ah p. 428-429.
The fourth misconception

The heretic says:

الدليل الرابع أنه كان لأمير المؤمنين قرآنا مخصصاً -كذا- مخالف الموجود في الترتيب، وفيه زيادة ليست من الأحاديث القدسية، ولا من التفسير والتولی

The fourth proof is that Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn had a special Qur’ān which was very different in its structure to the present one; therein were additions which were not from Qudsī narrations¹, exegesis or interpretation.

In response I say: had Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn had a Muṣḥaf he would have revealed it to the Muslims; for it would not have been permissible for him to keep it concealed. And if for whatever reasons, as they surmise, he was not able to reveal it during the reign of those who preceded him then he was certainly capable of doing so during his rule. And failing to do so is tantamount to misguidance and disbelief. Hence whoever attributes this to Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn is indeed not from his partisans, but rather from his enemies due to claiming that he concealed the truth owing to fear and cowardice, notwithstanding that he was the Lion of Allah and His Rasūl ; for concealing the very basis of Dīn constitutes leaving the fold of Islam.

Furthermore, if he did not reveal it during his time then Ḥasan could have revealed it when he came into power. But that to which everyone attests, including the Shī’ah, is that ’Alī is not recorded to have read in his prayers or passed judgments by way of any other book save the current Qur’ān which we behold. Likewise is reported regarding all the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt, as has passed already.² This debunks all the claims of the Shī’ah whose beds became restless, eyes sleepless, unity shattered, and affairs alloyed after having realised that the Mighty Book of Islam is completely silent about their anomalous beliefs. Hence they contrived another ‘Qur’ān’ when they did not find what they wanted

---

¹ Narrations the words and meanings whereof are inspired by Allah to Nabī .
² P. 357, onwards of this book.
in the Book of the Muslims, just as they contrived a fictitious Imām when their deceased Imām passed away without issue.

Even if Ṭulūb al-Muḥāferīn had a Muṣḥaf of his own which opposed the seminal Muṣḥaf, it is an accepted rule that due to the unanimity of the Ummah being infallible whatever opposes that which the Muslims have unanimously agreed upon is to be discarded. Notwithstanding that Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn Ṭulūb al-Muḥāferīn was at the forefront of those who compiled the Qur’ān; he concurred upon it with the rest and sanctioned the stances taken by Abū Bakr and Ḫūlid b. Ṭalhah. This is well known, as has passed.

Al-Bāqillānī says:

If they say, “The reason why he did not change that or condemn it is that he was practicing Taqiyyah” we will say to them: Was there anyone who was stronger than him considering that he was from the Banū Hāshim and that he was well-respected, valorous, and well-secured. This is indeed impossible and invalid.¹

He then alludes to the contradiction of the Shīʿah; for on the one hand they say that he was very brave, assertive when establishing the truth, and not silent upon falsehood; but on the hand they make such ludicrous claims. He then states that the reality which Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn lived during his Khilāfah rebuts even the mere possibility of Taqiyyah:

Is there any room for Taqiyyah when he unsheathed his sword and fought in Siffīn and waged war against those who opposed him in matters which

---

¹ Nukat al-Intīṣār p. 108.
were less important than the interpolation of the Qur’ān and its distortion? This response is thus obviously invalid and utterly impossible.¹

The fifth misconception:

The heretic says:

الخامس: أنه كان لعبد الله بن مسعود مصحف معتبر فيه ما ليس في القرآن الموجود.

‘Abd Allah ibn Mas‘ūd had a reliable Muṣḥaf. And in it was contained that which is not found in the current Qur’ān.

He then gives examples of verses which appeared in the Muṣḥaf of Ibn Mas‘ūd, as their narrations claim. One of the verses he cites is the following:

وکفي الله المؤمنین القتال بعلي بن أبي طالب ورفعنا لك ذكرك بعلي صهرك

Allah was sufficient for the believers in the war through ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. And we elevated for you your mention through ‘Alī, your son in law.²

In response I say: There is no dispute regarding the fact that some of the Ṣaḥābah had their own Muṣḥafs wherein they documented what they heard and assimilated from Nabī. This in no way undermines the status of the seminal Muṣḥaf nor does it in anyway allude to what these people claim. Because what the Muslims united upon is what holds value and not that which some among them might have isolatedly possessed.

The aim behind postulating that the Muṣḥaf of Ibn Masʿūd was reliable is clear, namely because the mention of ‘Alī features therein. However the examples which he presents suggests that they are fabrications and not actual verses from the Muṣḥaf of Ibn Masʿūd. For example the verse:

1 Ibid.
2 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 136.
We raised for you your mention.

This verse is from Sūrah Inshirāḥ which in its entirety is a Makkī Sūrah, as is known. The addition:

وجعلنا عليا صهرك

And we made 'Alī your son in law

reveals their fabrication. This is because Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم only had one son-in-law in Makkah, i.e. Abū al-'Āṣ ibn Rabī‘. They have thus fabricated but not so cleverly due to them being ignorant of history. Furthermore, was it possible for Ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه to document that which is against reality and against what he heard from Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم?

Likewise the second example:

وكفني الله المؤمنين القتال بعلي

And Allah was sufficient for the believers in the war through 'Alī.

is also against the text of the Qur’ān and against reality. Because Allah ﷺ has informed us of those by virtue of whom he sufficed for the believers and that is in the verse:

إذ جاء نكيم جنود فأرسلنا عليهم ريحًا وجنودًا لم ترواها

When armies came to [attack] you and we sent upon them a wind and armies [of angels] you did not see.¹

¹ Sūrah Aḥzāb: 9.
Hence the early scholars have said the following in the interpretation of this verse:

أي بجنود من الملائكة والريح التي بعثها عليهم

i.e. with an army of angels and the storm which he sent over them.\(^1\)

As for its contradiction with reality, ‘Alī himself was not sufficient for the believers. And if there were none with Rasūl Allah ﷺ besides ‘Alī he would not succeed in establishing his Dīn, for ‘Alī was of no avail to himself despite having all the armies of the land with him in his war against Mu‘āwiyyah.\(^2\)

It is for this reason that al-Bāqillānī says:

فأما ادعاؤهم أن ابن مسعود قرأ وكفي الله المؤمنين القتال بعلي وما أشبه ذلك من الأحاديث فإنه إفك ووزور لیصح

As for their claim that Ibn Mas‘ūd read (the aforementioned verse) and other similar verses, they are all lies and fabrications.\(^3\)

And Ibn Ḥazm says:

وأما قولهم: إن مصحف عبد الله بن مسعود ضي الله عنه خلاف مصحفنا فباطل وكذب وإفك، مصحف عبد الله بن مسعود إنما فيه قراءته بلا شك، وقراءته هي قراءة عاصم المشهورة عند جميع أهل الإسلام، في شرق الأرض وغربها

As for their claim that the Muṣḥaf of Ibn Mas‘ūd was at variance with our Muṣḥaf, it is a lie and a fabrication,\(^4\) for therein is contained his Qirā‘ah (recitation), and his Qirā‘ah is the acclaimed Qirā‘ah of ʿĀṣim which is popular in all parts of the Muslim world, the east and the west.\(^5\)

---

1 Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 21/148; Fath al-Qadīr 4/272.
2 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/56.
3 Nukat al-İntiṣār p. 107; Rūḥ al-Maʿānī 21/175.
4 Referring to the Christians; their doubts and objections regarding Islam are similar to the doubts and objections of the Shī‘ah.
5 Al-Faṣl 2/212.
The sixth misconception

The heretic says:

الدليل السادس أن الموجود غير مشتمل لتمام ما في مصحف أبي المعتبر عندنا

The sixth proof is that the current Muṣḥaf does not comprise of everything which was found in the Muṣḥaf of Ubayy which is credible according to us.

Look at the extent of his fanaticism? The Muṣḥaf of Ubayy is credible according to them and not the Muṣḥaf of the Ummah.

What evidence is there to prove that the Muṣḥaf of Ubayy is credible and not the Muṣḥaf of the Ummah? They have no evidence whatsoever, but they insist on discrediting the Qurʾān in which they will never succeed; for there is no other Muṣḥaf besides the current one. Their statements have returned on them with the worst of outcomes.

Although it is true that Ibn Masʿūd, Ubayy ibn Kaʿb, ʿĀʾishah, and Sālim the freed slave of Abū Ḥudhayfah each had their personal Muṣḥafs, as is attested to in the reports of both the Sunnīs and the Shīʿah, however, these Muṣḥaf were private ones which were prepared by their possessors for themselves, but not with the intention that the Ummah will adhere to them. It is for this reason that these individual Muṣḥafs cannot be marshalled as evidence against the Ummah; for the other Maṣāḥīf beside the Muṣḥaf of ʿUthmān are not categorical but rather treated as individual personal copies which are not enough to yield evidence.¹

And if something in these Maṣāḥīf happen to oppose what is in the Muṣḥaf of ʿUthmān, it is natural and inadvertent due to them compiling and writing them for themselves. That is why they would write the exegesis of some of the

¹ Al-Burhān 1/222.
verses in the very Muṣḥaf due to them having no fear of confusing the two because they were personal copies.

Ibn al-Jazarī mentions:

وربما كانوا يدخلون التفسير في القرآت إيضاحا وبيانا، لأنهم محققون لما تلقوا عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قرآنا فهم آمنون من الالتباس وربما بعضهم يكتبه معه.

At times they would include exegesis of the different readings for clarification and elucidation, because they were confidently sure of what they had assimilated from Rasūl Allah as Qur’ān. Hence they were protected from confusion and thus would at times even write it (the exegesis) with it (the verse).¹

And at times they would even document the abrogated verses:

ولذلك نص كثير من العلماء علي أن الحروف التي وردت عن أبي وابن مسعود وغيرهما مما يخالف هذه المصاحف منسوخة... ولاشك أن القرآن نسخ منه وغير فيه في العرضة الأخيرة.

Therefore may scholars have opined that the variant readings and dialects which feature in the Maṣāḥif of Ubayy, Ibn Masʿūd, and others, which oppose the central Muṣḥafs is abrogated; there is no doubt that much of the Qur’ān was abrogated and changed in the last presentation (revision with Jibrīl).²

To reiterate, all of this was because they wrote for themselves, notwithstanding what the Shīʿah have forged and falsely attributed to these Maṣāḥif.³ As for the Qur’ān, the bearers thereof among the Ṣaḥābah handled the task of its compilation based on what the scribes of revelation had documented in the scripts under the

---

² Ibid.
³ That is why one of the Types of Qirā’ah, as stated by the scholars, is fabricated Qirā’ah. See al-Itqān 1/77.
supervision of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and was settled upon in the last presentation of Jibrīl ALER to Nabī ﷺ. And this is what is in front of us today without any addition or omission. We, therefore, see that no two people have disputed regarding its credibility, not even ‘Alī ﷺ had denied a letter or more of it.¹

The seventh misconception

The heretic says:

السابع أن عثمان لما جمع القرآن ثانیا أسقط بعض الكلمات والیات

The seventh proof is that when ‘Uthmān compiled the Qurʾān for the second time he omitted some words and verses.²

He goes on to establish evidence for this claim and says:

العلم بمطابقة ما جمعه لتمام المنزل... متوقف علي... عدالة الناسخین والكاتبین أو صدقهم أو العرض

Knowledge of his compilation being in accordance with the entire Manzil... depends upon... the uprightness of the scribes and their truthfulness, or the juxtaposition thereof with the complete Muṣḥaf...³

Which according to him is impossible.

Notice that he has based his claim upon the negative viewpoint that the Shīʿah hold regarding the Ṣaḥābah which is against Qurʾān, Sunnah, the consensus of the Ummah and all the incidents and happenings which have been transmitted diffusely.⁴

¹ Al-Nashr 1/33.
² Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 150.
³ Ibid. p. 154.
⁴ For a refutation of their viewpoint regarding Ṣaḥābah see p. 1021, onwards of this book
Likewise notice that he has considered the misconception of the Shīʿah that ʿAlī had a Muṣḥaf which was inherited from him by the subsequent Imāms to be the benchmark for assessing the central Muṣḥaf, which is obviously tenuous, as tenuous as all those narrations and verdicts which he has cited from their books in order to establish this idea.

Moving on, it is a known fact that the entire Qurʿān was already documented during the lifetime of Rasūl Allāh. Abū Bakr did not order but to rewrite that which was already written; and thus we find that he suspended the documentation of the last verse of Sūrah Barā’ah till he found it written despite knowing it and having memorised it. This was because they relied upon both memory and documentation when compiling the Qurʿān and not only on memory, for their intention was to copy precisely that which was written in the presence of Rasūl Allāh and not merely put on paper what they memorised.

Furthermore, Allah has informed us in the Qurʿān that it, the Qurʿān, is compiled in Ṣuḥuf (scriptures) in the verse:

(A messenger from Allah) reciting purified scriptures.

Hence the Qurʿān was documented in scrolls which were scattered. And Abū Bakr compiled them in one place. Thereafter it remained secure till eventually ʿUthmān ordered that it be replicated and the replicated copies be sent to various cities.

Ibn Taymiyyah, discussing the process of compiling the Qurʿān says the following:

3. Sūrah al-Bayyinah: 2
In the year wherein Nabī passed away Jibrīl presented the Qur’ān to him twice. The last presentation was the Qirā’ah of Zayd ibn Thābit and others. It was regarding this Qirā’ah that Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān and ʿAlī ordered that it be compiled and documented in the Maṣāḥif; Abū Bakr and ʿUmar had ordered Zayd ibn Thābit to document the Qur’ān in a single Muṣḥaf which he did. ʿUthmān had then subsequently ordered that it be replicated and documented in various Maṣāḥif and, thereafter, be sent to the various cities. He then made the Ummah concur upon them with the consensus of the Ṣaḥābah, ʿAlī and those besides him.1

Hence a person who considers Abū Bakr and ʿUthmān to have erred has indeed attributed error to ʿAlī and all the Ṣaḥābah. Because it is an undeniable fact that ʿUthmān had compiled the Qur’ān with the unanimity of the Ṣaḥābah.2

If what the Shī‘ah postulate really transpired, it would not have been permissible for anyone to remain silent upon the distortion of the primary text of Islam and its foundational book. And everyone would have been misled including ʿAlī. Whereas abundant and agreed upon evidence suggests that the Ṣaḥābah would not have remained silent on issues even of lesser importance than this.

They waged war against those who refused to pay Zakāh. And ʿAlī and Muʿāwiyah fought over an issue of even lesser importance. Likewise had what the Shī‘ah postulate really happened, it would have been documented by the enemies

1 Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām 13/395.
2 Al-Murshid al-Wajīz p. 53
of Islam who look for every niche to criticise Islam, but the Shīʿah have isolatedly narrated this fable.

Despite the Shīʿah narrating this fallacious belief they have documented reports which contradict it. For example, Ibn Ṭāʿūs who is one of the leading scholars of the Shīʿah narrates that:

عثمان جمع المصحف برأي مولنا علي بن أبي طالب

'Uthmān compiled the Qur’ān due to the view of our master ‘Alī.¹

This, due to it being in harmony with the consensus of the Ummah, defies what the Shīʿah have always been claiming across the centuries. This is an acknowledgement on their path, and an acknowledgment of the opponent is much more convincing than the acknowledgement and approval of the likeminded.

The only response the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb was able to muster against this, despite his fervour to establish this erroneous belief, is the following, “It is indeed really strange.”² But the statement is only strange according to him and those who concur with him.

Ibn Abī Dāwūd has narrated with an authentic chain of transmission, as is stated by Ibn Ḥajr, that Amīr al-Muʿminīn ‘Alī said the following:

لا تقولوا في عثمان إلا خيرا، فوالله ما فعل ما فعل في المصاحف إلا عن ملأ منا

Do not say regarding 'Uthmān but good. For indeed he has not done whatever he done in respect to the Maṣāḥif but in our presence.³

Having said all of this, the greatest attestation to the fact that these people are liars is the examples they present to illustrate what 'Uthmān had omitted. So we

---

find that the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* cites four narrations from four of their books all of which state that ʿAlī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā said:

لا والله لا يرى منكم اثنان في النار أبدا، لا والله ولوا واحدة. قال: أصلحك الله أين هذا من كتاب الله تعالى؟ قال: هو في الرحمن، وهو قوله بارك وتعالي لا يسأل عن ذنبه منكم إنس ولا جان، قال: قلت: ليس فيها منكم؟ قال: يلي، والله إنه لمثبت فيها وأن أول من غير ذلك لأ يكون أروي

“No! By the oath of Allah no two among you will be seen in the fire of Jahannam. No! By Allah not even one.”

He said (the narrator), “I said, May Allah see to your affairs, where is this in the Book of Allah?”

To which he replied, “It is in Sūrah al-Raḥmān and it is the verse: No human from amongst you will be questioned regarding his sin nor any Jinn.”

I retorted that there is no ‘from amongst you’ in the verse?

He said, “Indeed it is established in it, but the first person to omit it was Ibn Arwā.”

The other three narrations more or less convey the same. And ʿUthmān is intended by Ibn Arwā.

This example, which the Shīʿah present as proof of what ʿUthmān had omitted reveals the hidden reality; for indeed at the instance of the revelation of the Qurʾān there were no Shīʿah, Murjiʿah, nor anyone else, but this verse—as they claim—proves that a Shīʿī will not be asked regarding his sin. This is indeed a very grave claim which has no support of evidence, rather it is contrary to emphatic verses of the Qurʾān and to what is categorically known of the matters of Islam. It also has grave ramifications, for it can invariably lead to exempting oneself from the commandments and dictates of Sharīʿah and becoming emboldened in committing sins and cataclysmic crimes.

---

Furthermore, their Imām on oath says that none of his Shīʿah will enter the fire of Jahannam. Did he somehow come to know the unseen or did he make a covenant with Allah? They are, in light of this claim, much more extreme than the Jews who say:

وَقَالُوا لَنْ تَمَسَّنَا النَّارُ إِلَّآ إِيَّامًا مَّعْدُوْدَةً

And they say, “Never will the Fire touch us, except for [a few] numbered days.”

Which Allah has refuted by saying:

قُلْ أَتَّخَذْتُمْ عِندَ اللّٰهِ عَهْدًا فَلَنْ يُّخْلِفَ اللّٰهُ عَهْدَهُ أَمْ تَقُولُوْنَ عَلَى اللّٰهِ مَا لَ تَعْلَمُوْنَ.بَلَىٰ مَنْ کَسَبَ سَیِّئَةً وَّأَحَاطَتْ بِهِ خَطِیْئَتُهُ فَأُولٰئِكَ أَصْحَابُ النَّارِ هُمْ فِیْهَا خَالِدُوْنَ

Say, “Have you taken a covenant with Allah? For Allah will never break His covenant. Or do you say about Allah that which you do not know?” Yes, [on the contrary], whoever earns evil and his sin has encompassed him – those are the companions of the Fire; they will abide therein eternally.¹

These verses reveal the falsity of all these claims and that the motive behind the claim of interpolation is actualising an anomalous position not supported by the Qur’ān or authentic Sunnah. Furthermore, they also reveal that the forger of this narration is an ignorant heretic who has no knowledge of the meanings of the Book of Allah; for the verse in question is regarding the evildoers and he assumes that it is regarding the pious and thus applies it to the Shīʿah. He further tries to enforce this erroneous understanding by adding ‘from amongst you’ and justifies this addition by saying that had it not been added, punishment would have fallen away from the entire creation whereas it is only meant to fall away from his Shīʿah, as he alleges. Not realising that another verse mentions:

¹ Sūrah al-Baqarah: 80, 81.
The verse is thus regarding the people of crimes and sins. And Ibn ʿAbbās has, therefore, said the following in the interpretation of this verse:

*لا يسألهم هل عملتم كذا وكذا، لأنه أعلم بذلك منهم.*

They will not be asked, “Did you commit such and such a sin,” because he will have more knowledge of that than themselves.

And Mujāhid has said:

*لا يسأل الملائكة عن المجرم، يعرفون بسِمَائِهِم.*

The angels will not ask about the sinner because they will know them from their signs.²

We sum up the answer to this discussion with what Jāḥiẓ has said in refutation of their misconceptions regarding the compilation of ʿUthmān:

والذي يخطئ عثمان في ذلك فقد خطأ على علي وعبد الرحمن وسعدا والزبير وطلحة وعلي الصبحاء. ولو لم يكن ذلك رأي علي لغيره، ولو لم يكبه النعيرا لقال فيه، ولو لم يكبه في زمن عثمان لأمكنه في زمن نفسه. وكان لا أقل من إظهار الحجة إن لم يملك تحويل الأمة. وكان لا أقل من التجربة إن لم يكن من النجح على ثقة، بل لم يكن لعثمان في ذلك ما لم يكن لجميع الصحابة وأهل القدر والقدرة. ومع أن الوجه فيما صنعوا واضح، بل لا نجد لما صنعوا وجها غير الإصابة والاحتياط والإشفاق والنظير في العواقب وحسم طعن الطاغين.

ولو لم يكن ما صنعوا لله تعالى فيه رضا لما اجتمع عليه أول هذه الأمة وأخرى، وإن أرادا اجتمعت عليه المعتزلة والشيعة، والخوارج والمرجئة لظاهر الصواب وصعاب البرهان على اختلاف آوازهم.

---

1 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 78.
Whoever considers ʿUthmān to have erred in this regard has averred the same regarding ʿAlī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, Saʿd, Zubayr, Ṭalḥah, and the erudite among the Ṣaḥābah. Had that not been the view of ʿAlī he would have changed it, and if he did not have the capacity to change it he would have at least condemned it. And if it was not possible for him to do so in the era of ʿUthmān it was certainly possible for him to do so during his reign. The least he could do was establish the evidence even if he would not have succeeded in diverting the Ummah. Likewise the bare minimum he could do was at least try even though he was not confident that he would succeed. Rather the fact of the matter is that just as the other Ṣaḥābah, who were people of prominence and leadership, did not err so did ʿUthmān not err. All the more so when the reasons for which they had embarked upon the enterprise are completely clear; for there is no other viable explanation for what they done besides that of: aiming for precision, exercising precaution, fearing evil consequences, looking deeply into potential outcomes, and shutting the prospect criticism of the criticalisers.

If in what they had done were not the pleasure of Allah, the early Ummah and its latter would never have united upon it. But the fact that the Muʿtazilah, the Shīʿah, the Khawārij and the Murjiʿah have united upon it despite their divergent motives is obviously evidence of its accuracy and overwhelming soundness.

If someone says that the extremist Shīʿah (Rawāfiḍ) reject it in its totality, criticise it, and consider it interpolated we shall say: The extremist Shīʿah have nothing to do with our consensus; for those whose Adhān is different from our Adhān, whose ṣalāh is different from our ṣalāh, whose divorce process is different from our process, whose emancipation is variant to ours, whose Ḥajj is not like our Ḥajj, whose scholars and distinct from our scholars, whose Imāms are different from our Imām, whose reading of the
Qur’ān is different than our reading, whose Ḥalāl is not like our Ḥalāl, and whose Ḥarām is not like our Ḥarām; they can never possibly be from us nor can we be from them.¹

**The eighth misconception**

The heretic says:

الثامن في أخبار كثيرة دالة صريحا علي وقوع النقصان زيادة علي ما مر رواها المخالفون

The eighth proof lies in the copious narrations which clearly indicate that omission of other verses has occurred, besides those which have passed, as is narrated by the opposition.²

He thereafter mentions all the narrations which are narrated by the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding the abrogation of recitation. But there is no evidence for them in this argument, as we have previously stated. Those narrations are specifically mentioned in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah under the discussion of abrogation. We will not repeat what we have already presented previously, for the author is repeating the same arguments but in different styles in order to make them reach twelve which is the amount of his Imāms.

He has, however, at this juncture documented a fabricated Sūrah which he claims he came across in the book *Dabistān Madhāhib³* and did not come across it in any other book. He subsequently says that it is probably the Sūrah of Wilāyah to which some of the scholars of the Shi‘ah alluded in their writings. He cites this entire Sūrah, which is characterised by poor expressions, meaningless words, ludicrous

---

² *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 162.
³ A book in the Persian language of Muḥsin Fānī al-Kashmīrī. It has been published a few times in Iran. And the Orientalist Theodor Noldeke has cited this Sūrah from this book in his work *Tārīkh al-Maṣāḥif* 2/102. This Sūrah was published in the French Asian paper in 1842 (p. 431-439) (see: *al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah* p. 13)
O you who believe in the two lights which I have sent down who recite to you my verses. Verily those who fulfil and his prophet, in verses for them are the gardens of bliss. And those who disbelieve after having believed due to violating their pledge and that upon which the messenger agreed with them will be thrown in the Jahannam. They oppressed themselves and disobeyed the successor, they will be made to drink from Ḥamīm. Verily Allah is the one who has illuminated the heavens and the earth with what he wanted and selected from among the angels and made from the believers those from his creation, he does what he desires... Surely ʿAlī is from the pious and we will give him his full share on the Day of Reckoning... For him and his progeny are the patient ones. And their enemy is the leader of the criminals... O prophet we have placed for you in the necks of the believers a pledge so claim it and be thankful of the fact that ʿAlī is a worshipper by night. He fears the hereafter and hopes for the reward of his lord. Say are those who oppress equal, whereas they know of my punishment. Shackles will be placed in their necks and they will regret over their actions...¹

¹ Ibid. p. 180-181.
This is a passage thereof. It does not require any analyses due to it being meaningless speech and lowly commodity; even the lowest of linguists will not want it to be attributed to him let alone considering it to be from the Book of Allah which has incapacitated the experts of language and the masters of eloquence.

Shaykh Yūsuf al-Dajawī has written an analyses of this Sūrah in his book al-Jawāb al-Munīf fī al-Radd ‘alā Mudda‘ī al-Taḥrīf fī al-Qur’ān al-Sharīf. The Shī‘ī scholar al-Balāghī has likewise rejected it in his exegesis ‘Ālā’ al-Raḥmān. The falsity of this Sūrah is more obvious than can be pointed out, there is thus no need to cite what the aforementioned scholars have mentioned; for you will notice that the matter is quite clear even to someone who merely sees its wording. Take for example the sentence:

واصطفي من الملائكة وجعل من المؤمنين أولئك في خلقه

And he selected from among the angels and made from the believers those from his creation.

You will realise that the one who has forged this is a non-Arab who does not know how to express what he intends. What did he choose from the angels? The sentence is incomplete. Probably he meant that he chose from the angels messengers to the successors but was unable to complete the sentence. Likewise, what did he make from the believers? And what is the meaning of ‘them in his creation’?

You will always find that whoever tries to copy the Qur’ān in its style Allah defeats him with helplessness and disgraces him before everyone.

---

1 See: al-Jawāb al-Munīf p. 174, onwards.
2 ‘Ālā’ al-Raḥmān p. 24-25.
The ninth misconception

The heretic says:

إنه تعالى ذكر أسامي وأوصيائه وشمائلهم في كتبه المباركة السالفة، فلا بد أن يذكرها في كتابه المهيمن عليه

Allah makes mention of the names of the successors and their attributes in his previous divine books. Therefore he necessarily would mention them in the Qur’ān which is their guardian.¹

In other words due to there being no mention of them in the Qur’ān, it is indicative of interpolation according to him. He then cites a fair amount of their narrations which state that the mention of their Twelve Imāms has featured in the previously revealed books.²

In response I say: This claim is based upon the premise that the names of the Twelve Imāms were mentioned in the books of the previous Ambiyā’, and that is completely false and based upon false. It is a false assertion whose factuality is based upon another false assertion. Is there anyone who will agree that the Imāms were mentioned in the previous books and subsequently agree that they were mentioned in the Qur’ān as well? Here we have before us the scriptures of the previous prophets wherefrom people have pointed out the mention of Nabī Sa‘īd, but there is no such mention of ʿAlī, let alone the other Imāms. Even those who embraced the faith of Islam, none among them is known to have made mention of ʿAlī in their scriptures.³

The glad tidings of the advent of Rasūl Allah definitely features in the previous books. Allah says:

الذين يتبعون الرسول النبي الأمي الذي يجدونه مكتوبًا عندهم في التوراة والإنجيل

¹ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 184.
² Ibid. p. 184-204.
³ Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/46.
Those who follow the Messenger, the unlettered prophet, whom they find written [i.e., mentioned] in what they have of the Torah and the Gospel.¹

Likewise praise for the Ṣaḥābah also features in the Tawrāh and the Injīl. Allah says:

 صحيح رسول الله والذين معه أشداء على الكفار ورحمة بينهم تراهم وكعا سجدا يبتغون فضلا
من الله ورضوانا سماهم في وجوههم من آخر السجود ذلك مثلهم في التوراة ومثلهم في
الإنجيل كزرع آخرج شطانه...

Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer], seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their mark [i.e., sign] is on their faces [i.e., foreheads] from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah. And their description in the Gospel is as a plant which produces its offshoots...²

It was obviously difficult for this cult to note that Allah makes mention of the Messenger of guidance and his Companions but makes no mention of their Imāms despite the fact that the Ṣaḥābah according to them were all apostates and that the Imāms hold much higher ranks than the prophets and messengers; what could they say to their followers? They thus invented narrations which state that their Imāms were mentioned in the previous scriptures. But then the question is why not in the Book of Allah? To this they found no answer but to surmise that the Book of Allah is interpolated, which has resulted in the worst of indictments for them.

The tenth misconception

He says:

² Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29.
There is no dispute amongst the Muslims that much change has occurred in the words of the Qur‘ān in terms of increase and decrease and that eventually the unanimity of the opposition settled upon seven of their Qurrā‘ (transmitters of the Qur‘ān) or ten, and that also notwithstanding the differences that exist between them, and that they have dedicated themselves to find a plausible explanation for their variant readings and trace their origins back to Nabī, as they allege. Based on this, the Qur‘ān in and of itself and from the very instance of its revelation is based upon change. But because there exists no changes and difference of readings in the actual Qur‘ān it is obvious that these readings are not divinely revealed from Allah.

He follows this up with a set of narrations which commonly state that the Qur‘ān is one and is revealed by one being but the differences are due to the narrators. He impugns the integrity of the seven transmitters and asserts that their readings are not worth acceptance because:

أول طبقات القراء هم الذين استبدوا الراء ولم يبایعوا إمام زمانهم أمیر المؤمنین

The first generation of the Qurrā‘ exclusively held their own views and did not pledge allegiance to the Imām of their time Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn.¹

This heretic is trying to draw evidence for the divergent readings of the Qur‘ān in order to establish the heresy of his cult despite there being no evidence for them therein; for none of them in anyway even allude to what he is alleging. This is because his argument would only hold weight if each of the Qurrā‘ who

differed with the others in the recitation of some verses would be reading on his own accord based on what he felt was plausible. But the narrations and reports clearly indicate that each one of them had taken his particular reading from the readings of Rasūl Allah. They also state that each reading was different from the other and that Nabī sanctioned all of them and informed that that is how they were revealed.⁠¹⁴ Hence it is clear that all of them were revealed by Allah and thus the difference between them and the fallacious belief of the Shīʿah is completely obvious.

What is unclear to this heretic is the difference between the readings of the Qurʾān and the Qurʾān itself, due to him considering them one on account of his clear ignorance; because the Qurʾān is diffusely transmitted according to all Muslims unanimously, passed on from one generation to another, whereas the various readings of the Qurʾān are of variant degrees: some are diffusely transmitted and thus categorical, whilst others are transmitted by limited narrators and yet others anomalous, containing explanatory side notes and still some completely fabricated.

No one has ever said that the Qurʾān was transmitted by the seven or ten Qurrāʾ, for every reading is an exclusive school of reading which an Imam from the Imams of Qirāʾah has adopted and is at variance with the others.

In this regard al-Zarkashī states:

واعلم أن القرآن والقراءات حقائقان متغایرتان، فالقرآن هو الوحي المنزل علي محمد صلی الله عليه وسلم للبيان والإعجاز، والقراءات اختلاف الوحي المذكور في كتابة الحروف أو كيفية من تخفيف وتنقبل وغيرها

Know that the Qurʾān and the readings thereof are two completely different realities: The Qurʾān is the revelation which was revealed to Muḥammad

---

⁠¹ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (and its commentary al-Fath) 9/22.

⁠² Al-Itqān p. 77.
for propagation and in order to establish its incapacitating miracle, and the variant readings are the various versions of this same revelation in terms of writing the letters and pronouncing them differently, like reading with Tathqīl (reading doubled or similar letters as one) or without it, etc.¹

The seven readings (Qirā’ah) are different from the seven Aḥruf² which this Rāfiḍī denies. Although the authenticity of the ḥadīth regarding the seven Aḥruf is well established, he conflates the two.³

Narrations regarding the Qur’ān being revealed upon seven Aḥruf appear in the books of the Shī‘ah as well, to the extent that al-Qummī has established a chapter for it in his al-Khiṣāl.⁴

A person who carefully reflects over the chains of transmissions through which these readings were conveyed will find that they contain within them those whom the Shī‘ah acknowledge like Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī, Ja‘far, and those besides them. This has passed already.⁵

The eleventh misconception

The Heretic says:

1 Al-Burhān 1/318.
2 There is no dispute in this regard between the scholars. Only simpletons will think that they both one and the same. This is because the first person to compile all seven readings was Abū Bakr ibn Mujāhid during the fourth century. (See: al-Murshid al-Wajīz p. 146; Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām 13/390; al-Nashr 1/24).
3 A ḥadīth of this nature is narrated by Imām al-Bukhārī in the chapter of Faḍā’il al-Qur’ān under the sub-heading ‘the Qur’ān was revealed upon seven Aḥruf: (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī with its commentary Fath al-Bārî) 9/23: ḥadīth no. 4992; It also appears in the following books: Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, chapter regarding the Ṣalāh of travellers, sub-chapter regarding the Qur’ān being revealed upon seven Aḥruf and its meaning: ḥadīth no. 818; Sunan Abī Dāwūd, chapter of Ṣalāh, sub-chapter regarding the Qur’ān being revealed upon seven Aḥruf: 2/158: ḥadīth no. 1475.
4 Al-Khiṣāl p. 358.
5 On p. 359-360 of this book.
The eleventh proof is in all those reliable and emphatic narrations regarding omission and decrease occurring in the present Qur’ān; which talk of it being lesser than the revelation which came down upon the heart of the leader of men and jinn as an incapacitating miracle. These narrations are scattered in our reliable books which have been the locus of authenticity according to our scholars.

Thereafter he mentions a fair amount of narrations from their books on the topic.

These narrations which he has used in support of his position do not in any way suggest the interpolation of the Qur’ān upon which the unanimity of the entire Ummah has settled; the Qur’ān whose preservation Allah has taken upon Himself, and regarding whose authenticity and soundness abundant and categorical evidence is established. Rather the aforementioned facts attest to the falsity of these narrations which they attribute to their Imams and their unworthiness. These facts prove that their narrations are not authentic and that their books are indeed interpolated and corrupted. The corruption and interpolation therein have both come to the fore by virtue of this erroneous belief and this preposterous fallacy.

The purport of the narrations he has adduced can only be used in substantiation against the Shī‘ah, as for against the Muslims, never.

In fact there is an in-house witness, i.e. from among the Shī‘ī clergy, who acknowledges that the narrations in this regard are narrated only by extremists and inveterate liars whose transmissions and reports are not worth acceptance. This in-house witness is their scholar al-Balāğhī the author of ‘Ālā’ al-Raḩmān; for he states:
Having said this, the contemporary scholar of ḥadīth has tried in his book Faṣl al-Khiṭāb to gather all the narrations which suggests omission. However, some of them cannot possibly be true, whilst others eventually lead to contradiction and conflict in their purport... Notwithstanding that the chains of transmission in most of them go back to just a few individuals. And each one of them has been described by the scholars of transmitter biographies as a weak narrator in ḥadīth who holds an incorrect dogma and is distant from the art of narration; or as a narrator of conflicting narrations and an adherent of a confused dogma whose narrations entail both acceptable and reprehensible narrations; or suspected of lying from whom I do not consider it permissible to narrate even one narration of his exegesis; or as infamous for holding the view of Waqf (consignment of the knowledge of who is the rightful Imam to Allah) and being an arch enemy of al-Riḍā; or as a weak transmitter who is not worth consideration nor can be trusted and is from the liars; or accused of having an erroneous belief and being an extremist. It is clear that the abundance of such narrations does not help in any way.¹

Likewise, the leading cleric of the Shīʿah in his time Mīrzā Mahdī al-Shīrāzī mentions that their narrations in this regard are anomalous, their chains of transmission are weak and their texts are contradictory. He states:

As for those narrations the apparent meaning of which suggests that interpolation has occurred in some verses of the Qur‘ān, they fail to truly establish that due to them being anomalous and weak in their chains of transmission; for many of them are narrated by al-Sayyārī who has been unanimously impugned by all the scholars of transmitter biographies, as is found in *al-Fihrist* of Shaykh al-Ṭā’ifah; in *al-Khulāṣah* of ʿAllāmah and in *al-Rijāl* of al-Najāshī that he a weak narrator of ḥadīth, deviated in his creed and far from pure transmission.²

He then illustrates the contradiction in their texts he says:

They contradict each other in two ways: first: they contradict each other in terms of specifying what actually was omitted... second: it appears in some narrations that the name of ʿAlī fell away in many places, whereas some narrations clearly mention that Allah did not mention ʿAlī by name in the Qur‘ān.³

This is what al-Balāghī and al-Shīrāzī have to say about their transmitters their transmission.

In no way are we in need of the judgements of the Shīʿah, however, we present them in order to illustrate the contradiction in their verdicts and how they themselves

---

1 The following is mentioned in his biography: Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Sayyār, Abū ʿAbd Allah, the scribe from Basrah. He is known as al-Sayyārī. He is weak in ḥadīth, far from transmission thereof and excessively narrates *Marāsīl* (narrations where the link between him and the Imām or the prophet is omitted). See: *al-Fihrist* p. 51; *Rījāl al-Najāshī* p. 62; *Rījāl al-Ḥillī* p. 203. Ibn Ḥajr states that he lived in the latter portion of the third century, see *Lisān al-Mīzān* 1/252.

2 *Al-Maʿārif al-Jaliyyah* p. 18.

realise the absurdity of their views and their invalidity. Also to illustrate how
they try to cover up for their dogma and deny this shameful and blasphemous
belief which was introduced into their dogma by their early scholars by giving
space to it in their canonical works, i.e. the likes of al-Kulaynī, Ibrāhīm al-Qummī,
al-Majlisī and their likes.

It is for this reason that we cite their rulings regarding their transmissions.

**The Twelfth Misconception**

The heretic says:

The twelfth proof is reports contained in specific sources about the Qur’ān
which indicate that some words, verses and chapters were distorted in one
of the aforementioned ways. These narrations are abundant (i.e. according
to their fallacious reports). To the extent that Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī has
averred in some of his works, as is reported from him, that the narrations
which are indicative of this are more than two thousand. And a group of
scholars like al-Mufīd, al-Muḥaqqiq al-Dāmād, al-‘Allāmah al-Majlisī, and
others have opined that they are widely transmitted. Rather Shaykh has
also emphatically stated in *al-Tibyān* that they are abundant. Instead a
group of scholars have concluded that they are categorically established
due being diffusely transmitted (*Mutawātir*). Here under I will mention that
which will affirm their claims.¹

He then starts to mention whatever appears in their narrations regarding what
they claim is the pure and unadulterated Qur’ān. He cites a thousand and sixty

---
¹ *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 251-252.
two examples following the sequence of the chapters of the Qur’ān which covers over a hundred pages. I shall make mention of some of them in order to reveal the actual objectives which they aspire to meet by way of these fabrications.

But before that, I would want to say that their copious narrations in this regard are only binding evidence for the Shīʿah, not for us. Furthermore, this stupendous amount indicates that the Shīʿī creed is an embodiment of lies through and through, and that it is all about plotting against Islam by attacking its foundational source upon which its edifice stands; i.e. the Qur’ān.

Furthermore, this heretic claims that these false reports are well attested to and diffusely transmitted, and yet at the same time there are others who claim that they are rare and anomalous, notwithstanding that both categories are from the acclaimed scholars of the Shīʿah. Is this not evidence of the stark contradiction which exists in this creed and between its scholars?

This grave claim which he considers to be evidence for his purpose is in turn evidence for his disbelief and an indictment with which he has tarnished his people for eternity. When you are bereft of shame then do as you please and there is no sin more heinous than disbelief. By making this claim he intends to distance his people from the Qur’ān. Because their book is still with the fictitious Mahdī who is in everlasting seclusion and perpetual occultation due to him not being born.

As for the examples that he has presented, they are a poor attempt to ground their beliefs in the Book of Allah and to convince their confused and sceptical followers who were appalled by the fact that the seminal book of Islam does not contain any mention of the Wilāyah of the Twelve Imāms despite it being all of Dīn according to them. Hereunder is some of what this heretic has said:

سورة البقرة: ...عن جابر بن الجعفي عن أبي عبد الله في قول الله عزوجل: وإذا قيل لهم آمنوا بما أنزل الله عزوجل: وإذا قيل لهم آمنوا بما أنزل الله (في علي) قالوا نؤمن بما أنزل علينا.
Jābir al-Juʿfī narrates the following from Abū ʿAbd Allah: And when it is said to them “Belief in what Allah has revealed (regarding ʿAlī)” they say we believe in what was revealed upon us.¹

As you can see, they added ‘regarding Ṭāli’ to the verse, failing to realise that the verse is regarding the Banū Isrāʾīl and that the context does not allow for such an addition. This is because the very wording of the verse refutes their claim; for the words ‘we believe in what was revealed upon us’ is emphatic that the verse is not regarding this Ummah. But sadly these forgers were either non-Arab heretics who did not understand the meanings of the verses, or probably this is something they intended to do in order to misguide the Shīʿah and divert them to the ways of disbelief and heresy.

سورة الأنعام: روي الكلیني عن أبي عبد الله: إن الذين فارقوا أمیر المؤمنین وصاروا أحزابا

Sūrah al-Anʿām: al-Kulaynī narrates the following from Abū ʿAbd Allāh: verily those who parted from Amīr al-Muʾminin and diversified into various groups...²

This was an attempt to change the verse:

إِنَّ الَّذِیْنَ فَرَّقُوْا دِیْنَهُمْ وَکَانُوْا شِیَعًا لَّسْتَ مِنْهُمْ فِيْ شَيْءٍ

Indeed, those who have divided their religion and become sects – you, [O Muhammad], are not [associated] with them in anything.³

Sadly they did not know how to forge this verse; for the verse is Makkī (revealed before migration), and during the lifetime of Nabī

---

¹ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 254.
² Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 262.
³ Sūrah al-Anʿām: 159.
no Amīr al-Mu‘minīn existed due to everyone being his followers and not the followers of ʿAlī which would result in parting from him.

Sūrah Barā’ah: al-Kulaynī and al-ʿAyyāshī narrate from Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā that Ḥusayn ibn Jahm said the following to him: they marshal as evidence against us the following verse: ‘the second of the two when they were in the cave’. He replied, “There is no evidence for them therein, for indeed Allah says: ‘And Allah sent down His tranquillity upon his prophet’. He has not made any praiseworthy mention of him (Abū Bakr).” I asked, “Is this how the verse should be read?” “This is how it ought to be read,” he replied.

A similar narration is narrated from Abū Jaʿfar, but he also adds the following, “Do you not see that tranquillity only descended upon His Messenger and he made the word of those who disbelieved the lowest, referring to what ʿAtīq had said (i.e. Abū Bakr).”

Thereafter commenting upon the narration the heretic says, “This verse is proof of the Companion not being a believer.¹

As you might have noticed, they have tried to distort the following verse:

فَأَنزَلَ اللّٰهُ سَكِینَتَهُ عَلَیْهِ

And Allah sent down His tranquillity upon him.²

¹ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 266.
² Sūrah al-Tawbah: 40.
They have tried to do so by replacing ‘upon him’ with ‘upon his prophet’. And the purpose thereof is to prove the disbelief of Abū Bakr by distorting the verse which spells out his greatest virtue. But they did not realise that this change does not really accomplish their purpose.¹

From these examples it is clear that their distortions and fables revolve around the orbit of Wilāyah and the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah. Most of the fables that this heretic has cited read along similar lines.

After having raised these twelve misconceptions² he endeavours to rebut the claims of the other party of the Shīʿah which refused to acknowledge this fallacious belief due to is falsity being absolutely clear. He has thus established a chapter in his book for this. And therein he presents their proofs and tries to answer them.

Hereunder I will cite the proofs of the deniers, present the answers proposed by this heretic and analyse his answers.

In reality, in this chapter that he has established he has undone all his previous allegations and assertions. Because he was unable to provide satisfactory answers to the opponents of his blasphemous belief, as you will see.

¹ Ibn Kathīr says the following under this verse, “Allah sent down his tranquillity upon him, i.e. upon Rasūl Allah according to the popular of the two views (Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr: 2/384). And another view is: ‘upon Abū Bakr’, this is the view of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Ibn ʿAbbās and Ḥabīb ibn Abī Thābit (Zād al-Masīr 3/41).

² To read an extensive refutation of the fallacies of the Shīʿah on this topic the reader can refer to al-Intiṣār of al-Bāqillānī (the first vol. in manuscript form is available at the institution for Arabic manuscripts in Cairo; It consists of three hundred and four pages). Likewise to Nukat al-Intiṣār li Naql al-Qurʾān of Muḥammad Zaglūl. The misconceptions that he has raised are not new, for his heretic predecessors also raised them in their times. And the scholars of the Muslims rebutted them accordingly. It seems as though this heretic has retrieved these misconceptions from the writings of some Muslim scholars who documented them without rebutting them. He has done so in order to misguide his people (contrast his misconceptions with those which feature in al-Intiṣār of al-Bāqillānī).
The heretic says:

الباب الثاني في ذكر أدلة القائلين بعدم تطرق التغيير مطلقا في كتاب الله تعالى، وإن الموجود هو تمام ما أنزل علي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم... وهي أمور عديدة

The second chapter: making mention of the proofs of those who claim that no change has ever occurred in the Qur’an and that the current Qur’an is exactly that which was revealed upon Muḥammad ﷺ. These are few in number:

No. 1: the verse:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّکْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

Indeed, it is we who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur’an], and indeed, we will be its guardian.¹

The heretic says:

واعترض بأن المراد الحفظ من تطرق شبه المعاندين، حیث ل یوجد فیه بحمد الله مدخل إلی القد ح فیه

The objection against this is that the verse means safeguarding against the prospect doubts of the opposition; for, by the grace of Allah there is no niche for anyone to target the Qur’an from that avenue.²

Look at this foolish objection levelled by him; he considers the view of interpolation not to be part of the doubts of the oppositions and thus considers it not part of the broad promise of preservation.

The closest meaning of ‘preservation’ is preservation against change and distortion. The verse is thus general despite the uneasiness of the disbelievers.

¹ Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9.
² Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 360.
He further says:

واعترض أيضاً بأن الضمير في قوله له راجع إلى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لا إلى القرآن فلا شاهد فيه

The pronoun in 'له' refers to نبی صلى الله عليه وسلم and not to the Qur’ān. There is thus no evidence in the verse.¹

Whereas it is completely clear that it is referring to al-Dhikr (message), for the pronoun in the Arabic language refers back to the closest noun. This is also clear from the context of the verse.² Furthermore, is it behoving of Allah to safeguard his Prophet but not his Book. What is wrong with these people? They fail to understand anything at all.

He also says:

ولو سلم شموله للحفظ من التغيير أيضاً فإنما هو القرآن في الجملة، لا لكل فرد. فإن ذلك واقع، بل ربما مزق كما صنع الوليد وغيره

Even if, for arguments sake, the verse is taken as comprehensive of preservation from change³, it still refers to the Qur’ān being preserved as a whole. It does not refer to every copy being preserved, for change has definitely occurred (in some of them). Instead at times it was also torn apart like in the case of what al-Walīd and others had done.⁴

This is an ignorant claim which claims that one copy of the Qur’ān getting burnt entails its interpolation. One of their scholars who denies this blasphemy comments thus:

---

¹ Ibid.

² Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/592.

³ i.e. and not considered to only be preserved against the doubts of the opposition, as is the view of these heretics.

⁴ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 360.
This statement was not said with deliberation. Because what is intended is that with which Muḥammad was sent, and not that which was documented in the manuscripts; for they will all one day eventually perish, but the Qur’ān will remain preserved in the hearts. To the extent that if we hypothetically envisage the dissipation of each copy on the surface of the earth, the Qur’ān will still remain preserved.¹

No. 2: the verse:

لا يأتيه الباطل من بين يديه ولا من خلفه تأويل من حكيم حميد

Falsehood cannot approach it from before it or from behind it; [it is] a revelation from a [Lord who is] Wise and Praiseworthy.²

He fumbles when trying to give an answer against this verse. Hence he first says:

إن الحذف والتغيير وإن كان باطلا لكن ليس المراد من الآية

Although omission and change are part of falsehood, but they are not meant in the verse.³

But why wouldn’t change be intended when it is the worst form of falsehood? His fanaticism forces him to say the following:

ظاهرها (يعني الآية) أن لا يجوز أن يحصل فيه ما يستلزم بطلاطه من تنافض أحكامه أو كذب في إخباراته وقصصه

¹ Muḥsin al-Kāẓimī: Sharḥ al-Wāfiyah. The author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb has cited this on page 360 of his book.
² Sūrah Fuṣṣilat: 42.
The apparent meaning of the verse is that all that which will necessitate the invalidity of the Qur’ān cannot occur, i.e. contradiction in its rulings or lies in its information and stories.¹

Look at this interpretation, it smacks of either poor intellect or hidden heresy or both together. Since it is obvious that if what he believes (interpolation) were to occur in the Qur’ān than necessarily there would come about contradiction in its rulings and lies in its stories.

He further says:

وأما ثانًٍا، فإنه منقوض بمنسوخ التلاوة والحكم أو التلاوة فقط

And secondly, the verse is violated by all those verses the recitation and ruling of which were abrogated or those whose recitation only was abrogated.²

This is revisiting the misconception which we already answered. It is as though he is belying Allah due to him claiming that abrogation falls part of falsehood which has indeed occurred in the Qur’ān. Can you see how heinous is his crime?

Abrogation is no doubt true due to it being directly from Allah himself. And the scholars of this heretic, the likes of al-Murtaḍā, al-Ṭūsī and al-Ṭabarsī have conceded it.³ It is thus clear that he and those who concur with him from the contemporaries have gone a step further in their extremism, such that was not envisioned by their predecessors.

He goes on to say:

فیکفی في انطفاء الباطل عنه انتفائه من ذلك الفرد المحفوظ عند أهل البيت

¹ Ibid.
² Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 362.
³ See p. 1342 of this book.
The absence of falsehood from the individual copy which exists with the Ahl al-Bayt is sufficient for the realisation of this promise.¹

Muse at the viewpoint of these Rawāfiḍ and at how they interpret the verses which speak of Allah preserving his book; they interpret them with a non-existent book which exists with their fictitious hidden Mahdī, regarding both the Ummah has not known anything nor seen any trace.

Furthermore, how does its preservation by the Mahdī help in anyway, does it benefit the people in any way; it only gives the benefit of it remaining unadulterated by Allah. Whereas there is no doubt as to the fact that Allah preserved the Qur'ān after its revelation in order for it to remain the constitution of the Ummah till the Day of Judgment; there is no meaning or wisdom to its preservation in anything other than that.

**No. 3:** their abundant narrations regarding the virtues of various Sūrahs of the Qur'ān.²

Al-Ṣadūq says:

> وما روي من ثواب قراءة كل سورة من القرآن، وثواب من ختم القرآن كله، وجواز قراءة سورتين في ركعة نافلة، والنهي عن قراءة سورتين في ركعة فرضية تصديق لما قلناه في أمر القرآن، وأن مبلغه ما في أيدي الناس، وكلي ما روي من النهي عن قراءة القرآن كله في ليلة واحدة، وأنه لا يجوز أن يختم القرآن فائق من ثلاثة أيام تصديق لما قلناه

The reward that is mentioned for reciting every Sūrah of the Qur'ān; the reward of completing the entire Qur'ān; the permissibility of reading two Sūrahs in a rak‘ah of optional prayer and the impermissibility of doing so in a rak‘ah of an obligatory prayer, all attest to what we have opined regarding the Qur'ān and that whatever is accessible to the people is ultimately the Qur'ān. Likewise, everything that is reported regarding

---

¹ *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 363.
the prohibition of reading the entire Qur’ān in one night and that it is impermissible to complete the Qur’ān in less than three days also attest to what we have said.¹

No. 4: the diffusely transmitted narrations from Nabī  and the Imāms wherein they have ordered that their narrations be judged in light of the Qur’ān. It is obvious that judging them in light of the interpolated and distorted version is useless, and judging in light of the preserved version is impossible.²

¹ Al-Iʿtiqādāt p. 102; Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 363. He has endeavoured to answer this by averring that the instruction to read the Qur’ān and complete it does not entail it not being interpolated. And in order to support this claim he advances another argument which is based upon falsehood, he says, “It is just like encouraging people to firmly follow the Imām... which is followed by the inability to do so due to the Imām not being able to reveal what is by him due to fear or practicing Taqiyyah,” (Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 363).

This is based upon the viewpoint of the Shīʿah pertaining to occultation, Taqiyyah, and the leadership of the Imām; the refutation of all of which has passed already and that they are against revelation, reason, and whatever is categorically known in Dīn on account of its widespread transmission. Advancing this specific argument at all is a reflection of their anomalous belief having no basis whatsoever in the Book of Allah.

² Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 364. This exposes the contradiction of the Shīʿah to a very great extent. Answering this particular argument posed a great problem for the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb. He thus tried to rebut it but in a way that he conceded some of the truth. He says thus,

“This is an indication that the omitted has not impacted upon the present, notwithstanding that both are revealed in order to establish the incapacitating miracle of the Qur’ān. Hence there is no impediment from judging the narrations in light of it (i.e. the present). More so when this juxtaposition is specific to the verses of laws, due to the Khulafā’ not being impugned for (trying to adulterate) them.” (Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 364).

This answer, however, does not eliminate the contradiction which still exists between the narrations which command the juxtaposition of the traditions of the Imāms with the Qur’ān on the one hand and the narrations of interpolation on the other. The claim that this is specific to the verses of laws is baseless; because their narrations are general in the directive of all their narrations being judged in light of the Qur’ān; they do not specify the verses of laws.
No. 5: One of the proofs that the opponents of interpolation have advanced is the diffusely transmitted narration wherein the directive is given to firmly hold on to the Book and the Ahl al-Bayt. This is evidence that the Book will be found in every era, for it is not possible that the Ummah be ordered to hold on to something which it is unable to hold on to.1

No. 6: If any portion of it was omitted, it would no more be reliable for us to return to it.2

1 Al-Ṭūsī: al-Tibyān 1/3; Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 364. He has rebutted this proof based on their erroneous belief. For in their narrations the directive of holding firmly to the Ahl al-Bayt features, but despite that the Imām is absent for centuries now. Likewise is the case of the Book. One of their scholars Muḥsin al-Kāẓimī in Sharḥ al-Wāfiyah writes the following response:

إن التمسك بهم... ممكن في الغیبة (یعني غیبة منتظرهم) للعلم بهم وطريقتهم، وهذا بخلاف التمسك بالكتاب فإنه يتحقق بالأخذ به، ولا يمكن إلا بالإطلاع عليه.

Holding on to them (the Ahl al-Bayt) is possible even during the occultation (of the Mahdī) due to having full knowledge of them and their path. Unlike holding on to the Book; for that will only happen when it is practiced upon and that is only possible after having knowledge of it. (Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 365)

The heretic was not pleased with this answer. In refutation thereof he thus says:

إن العلم بجمیع طریقة الإمام في الغیبة لم یدعه أحد من الأعلام

No eminent scholar has ever claimed to have full knowledge of the path of the Imām.

He goes on... The crux of his response is that just as having knowledge of some of the path of the Imām is sufficient, likewise having knowledge of some of the Qur’ān which is preserved is sufficient. (Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 365). In this way does the Shīʿī dogma destroys itself.

2 The author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb is exposed once again in the response he gives to this proof, He says:

إن هذا لا يقبح لاحتیال كون الظاهر المصروف عن ظاهره من الظواهر الغیر المتعلقة -كذا- بالأحكام الشرعیة العملية التي أمرنا بالرجوع فيها إلى ظاهر الكتاب.

This does not pose a problem, due to the possibility of the literal which is diverted from its literal purport not being linked to the practical laws of Sharīʿah in which we are ordered to go with the literal of the book. (Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 365).

Perhaps he is alluding to the fact that their reference to the Qur’ān is only in the verses of laws, or put another way, they resort to their esoteric interpretations in all the verses of the Qur’ān save the verses of laws, for therein they resort to the literal. He further says:

Continued on next page.....
No. 7: Given the intensive recording procedure and the attention paid, it is highly improbable that something might have been omitted. The honourable commentator of al-Wāfiyah\(^1\) says:

The longevity of time serves as more of a catalyst for the preservation of that for which necks are stretched and is not reported but for a purpose. How can something like the Qur’ān remain hidden when he would be overwhelmed by the weight of revelation when it would descend upon him, so much so that if he was mounted on an animal its legs would quiver? Then when that condition would dissipate he would read to them the revelation like a prolific orator or profound poet who is well versed at citing poem after poem and delivering speech after speech which is brimming with wisdom and opportune for the need, especially when there is a known cause and an obvious sign. Nabī would convey to them promises and warnings, encouragements and discouragements, new imposing laws, the tales of the previous nations and strange sayings. All of this was anxiously anticipated for by droves of people with hope and at

\[\text{continued from page 1384}\]

\[\text{فإن إرشاد الأئمة إلى التمسك بها ( يعني آيات الأحكام) وتقريرهم الأصحاب عليه وتمسكهم بها في غير واحد من الموارد كاذب عدم سقوط ما يوجب الإجمال-كذا- في الموجود من آيات الأحكام وغير مناف للسقوط في غيرها}\]

For surely the directive of the Imāms to hold on them (the verses of laws), their approbation of their companions doing so and using them as evidence in more than one source, all reveal the non-omission of all that which could bring about ambiguity in the present verses of laws. They thus do not contradict the possibility of omission occurring in all else besides them. (Ibid).

Here he is now making his narrations and fables the deciding factor over the Qur’ān, i.e. their directive of referring to the verses of laws will be accepted and all the narrations which emphasise the importance of holding on to the Book will be interpreted in light of them.

In reality, the contradiction is quite clear. For on the one side the directive to hold on to the Book includes all the verses, verses of laws and otherwise, and on the other side the narration of interpolation are just as inclusive and general. And contradiction is evidence of their narrations being unreliable and that they are not upon anything substantial.

1 Muḥammad ibn al-Sayyid Ḥasan al-Aʿrajī al-Ḥusaynī al-Kāẓimī (d. 1227 A.H.). The author of Sharḥ al-Wāfiyah or al-Maḥṣūl. The author of Al-Dharīʾah says that he saw few copies of it by some of his scholars (Al-Dharīʾah 20/ 151).
times with fear. He further ordained upon them to learn the Qur’ān, read it, memorise it, deliberate upon its meanings and promised them Jannah if they done so. He classed its recitation as the greatest of worships and amongst them there were thus those who spent the entire night reading it. He did not only suffice on that, rather he appointed fourteen individuals\(^1\) to document it, memorise it, preserve it study it by him and regularly report to him. All of this was because, it was a miracle for his prophethood, a source of the Sharī‘ rulings, a Book to which the Ummah could have recourse and a witness for the Imāms. To the extent that a group of them completed the entire Qur’ān by him several times.

Its popularity continued to increase, its light to spread and its radiance to rise day by day, year by year, and century by century till eventually it became the greatest of diffusely transmitted matters in its clarity. After knowing this, you will come to learn the secret of what our master al-Murtaḍā said, as quoted from him by our scholar Abū ‘Alī in *al-Majma‘*; he says, “Knowledge of the authenticity of the transmission of the Qur’ān is like having knowledge of various cities, major events and great happenings... (He cites the quotation of al-Murtaḍā we have previously cited in this book).\(^2\)

He goes on to say, “The glorious Qur’ān was not so much that it could not be compiled, nor was it so scattered that it could not be put together. Rather its parable is like a compendium of poetry belonging to a great poet. Therein is contained profound poetry, interesting points of wisdom and rare proverbs; a compendium which is preserved by transmitters, memorisers, and people who quote it in their gatherings and write it in their notebooks. They do all of this so meticulously that even if they were

---

\(^1\) The scribes of Nabī  are many. A number of scholars have captured their names; Abū Shāmmah has enumerated twenty five name (see: *al-Murshid al-Wajīz* p. 46. Ibn al-Qayyim has enlisted seventeen (see: *Zād al-Ma‘ād* 1/117. Probably the largest account given is that of al-Ḥāfiẓ al-‘Irāqī, for he has mentioned forty two scribes of Nabī  (see: *al-Kattānī*: *al-Tarātīb al-Idāriyyah* 1/116). And finally, al-Burhān al-Ḥalabī has enumerated forty three in annotations of *al-Shifā’* (see: Ibid. 1/117). Also refer to: al-Ṣabbāgh: *Lamaḥāt fī ʿUlūm al-Qur’ān* p. 67.

to miss a verse, aside from an entire poem, they would search for it. And the announcer of the king would announce to its transmitters, memorisers, singers and writers that bring forth to us what you have. Do you think that anything of it can possibly go missing after all of this?

The Qur’ān is greater than the parable we have mentioned. Its transmitters, scribes and memorisers are more, and the interest of people much more immense. Moreover, it has many readers and memorisers; in the time of Rasūl Allah  already a group had collected it, hence al-Qurṭubī says that seventy among them were martyred in the Battle of Yama‘mah, and yet another seventy during the era of Nabī  in the incident of the well of Ma‘ūnah. And al-Bukhārī narrates from Qatādah the following, “I asked Anas ibn Mālik regarding those who compiled the Qur’ān in the time of Rasūl Allah , He replied, “Four of the Anṣār: Ubayy ibn Ka‘b, Mu‘ādh ibn Jabal, Zayd ibn Thābit, and Abū Zayd.” I asked, “Who is Abū Zayd?” he replied, “One of my uncles.”

Added to all of this is the immaculate attention given to it by Allah himself and the truth of his promise to preserve it and make this religion of which the Qur’ān is the greatest principle reign supreme. So much so that he made the greatest opponents of its supremacy and the least bothered of its high stature from those who strive to preserve it and secure it, just as he preserved the fort of Islam from ruination despite the ardent desire of the enemies to extirpate his progeny.¹

Furthermore, there were abundant stimuli for its propagation for the Muslims, the disbelievers and the hypocrites due to the challenge it poses, its incapacitating miracle, its entailment of primary laws; due to its recitation, its studying and teaching for them and their children; due to it being completed in the month of Ramaḍān, once every month, every seven days, three days, in a day, or reading a portion of it every night; due to its preservation, the nobility of bearing it, and contemplating over its meanings, its proverbs, its promises and warnings. These are some among the innumerable stimuli for its preservation, notwithstanding the great

¹ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 365-367.
number of Muslims and their supremacy, for in the Battle of Tabūk the army of Islam consisted of thirty thousand soldiers and in the farewell Ḥajj seventy thousand had converged.¹

The author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb was really perturbed when quoting these words from the opponents of interpolation from amongst his ranks. He comments thus subsequently:

انتهى ما أوردنا نقله من الكلمات التي تشبه بكلام من لا عهد له بمباحث الإمامة، وحال أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وآله في الضلالة والغوایة في حياته وبعد وفاته.

This is the end of the quotation we have cited, which is very much like the arguments of those who have no knowledge of the discussion of Imāmah and the condition of the Companions of Nabī in their deviation and misguidance during his lifetime and after his demise.²

Nonetheless, a number of their scholars have made similar remarks in rebutting this blasphemy due to its falsity being clear. Hence we find that al-Ālūsī has made the following remarks after citing al-Ṭabarsī’s refutation thereof:

وهو كلام دعاه إلی ظهور فساد مذهب أصحابه حتي للأطفال. والحمد لله علي أن ظهر الحق وکفي الله المؤمنين القتال.

He was driven to make such a statement due to the viewpoint of his fellow companions being clearly false, even to children. And all praise is due to Allah for having made the truth reign supreme and Allah was sufficient for the believers in battle.³

In conclusion, this book which its author has penned and with which he has targeted the Book of Allah has not harmed the Book of Allah at all. Rather it has bounced back upon his cult with the worst of ramifications; for

¹ Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 367.
² Ibid.
³ Rūḥ al-Maʿānī 1/24.
it has become the biggest disgrace for the Shīʿah. And it is concrete evidence of the fact that their narrations are unreliable and baseless, and that despite being diffusely transmitted they are not worth consideration. It is for this reason that one of the contemporary Shīʿī scholars made the following remarks:

He did not do well in writing it, nor did he meet the truth in compiling it. If only he did not write it, and if he wrote it, if only he did not publish it. Its harm is more than its benefit, rather there is no hope of any benefit whatsoever in its publication, for he has prepared arms for the opposition.

He further says:

And it is said that some of the enemies of Dīn and the opponents of the dogma incited him to write this book and he, may Allah have mercy on him, did not realise the sinister motive hidden therein. This assumption or report in not unlikely.¹

In this way do they want this issue to remain hidden and not open, and its narrations scattered and not collected. Because now its harm has far surpassed its benefit, instead there is no benefit in its propagation and thus it should be imparted and shared clandestinely. Does this suggest that they have books which are not yet published due to their content being too provocative for the Muslim world and grave effects being too grave, owing to which they remain discreetly disseminated? This is not far-fetched.²

---


² Instead it is probably a reality, for you find that some volumes of Bihār al-Anwār are banned from being published due to the directive issued by their seminaries.
The Forth Reaction: Overtly denying this Blasphemy whilst trying to prove it in Deceitful and Discreet Ways at the Same Time.

One of their contemporary scholars has embarked on denying this blasphemy overtly and defending the Book of Allah محمدًا ﷺ. You will, however, discern evil in the slips of his tongue and you will see falsehood discreetly inserted into his speech here and there. The worst of those who have treaded this path is their scholar al-Khū’ī in his Tafsīr al-Bayān. He says the following:

إن المشهور بين علماء الشيعة ومحققيهم بل المتسالم علیه بینهم هو القول بعدم التحریف

What is popular among the Shīʿī clergy and its research scholars, rather what is unanimously agreed upon by them is the view of non-interpolation.²

But at the same time he authenticates a fair amount of narrations of interpolation. So he says:

إن کثرة الروایات تورث القطع بصدور بعضها عن المعصومین ولا أقل من الإطمئنان بذلك، وفيها ما روی بطرق معتبر

The abundant narrations necessitate the certainty of some of them emanating from the infallibles. There is no lesser degree than being satisfied with them, for among them there are narrations which are narrated in reliable ways.³

He then analyses all their narrations in this regard and considers all those narrations which speak of the Muṣḥaf of ʿAlī, wherein are additions which are not found in the Book of Allah, to be Qur’ān. Notwithstanding that in these narrations what appears is the names of their Imāms and the fables which speak

---

1 Abū al-Qāsim al-Mūsawī al-Khū’ī, the present scholar who people treat as their authoritative reference in Iraq and elsewhere.
2 Al-Bayān p. 226.
3 Ibid. p. 222
of interpolation; he considers all these narrations to be reliable according to their standards. However, he considers them to be explanatory narrations which have descended from Allah ﷺ, i.e. these additions are exegetical notes in light of which the speech can be interpreted, or they were revealed by Allah ﷺ in order to clarify the purport of the verses.¹

As for their fables which are indicative of interpolation, based on his particular understanding, they are twenty narrations, as acknowledged by him. And what he means by them is all those narrations which speak of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ interpolating the Qur’ān and distorting it. He presents the following narration as evidence for his claim:

Al-Kāfī and al-Ṣadūq narrate the following with their chain of transmission from ʿAlī ibn Suwayd, “I wrote a letter to Abū al-Ḥasan” (he cites the answer of Abū al-Ḥasan in its entirety and part of his answer was the following) “They were entrusted with the Book of Allah but they interpolated it and distorted it.”

Hence his stance regarding such narrations is that of acceptance. But he avers that they do not suggest the interpolation of the words of the Qur’ān, rather:

The obvious meaning of these narrations is that interpolation occurred in meaning, i.e. by taking the verses to mean what they did not. Had this type of interpolation not occurred the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt would still be secure and the sanctity of Nabī ﷺ still regarded. And the matter would

---
¹ Ibid. p. 223, onwards.
not have reached where it has reached in terms of violating their rights and harassing Nabī ﷺ because of them.¹

So he claims that the Ummah, at the forefront of whom are the Ṣaḥābah, interpreted verses with meanings other than their actual meanings. But he considers the distortions of al-Kulaynī, al-Qummī, and al-ʿAyyāshī of the Qur’ānic verses to be the actual exegesis of the Book of Allah. If this is the state of the greatest Shīʿī reference of our time and this is his best defence of the Book of Allah, then the condition of the Shīʿah is really worrying. Whilst adding this poison here and there he does not forget to pacify the anger of his reader, especially when he knows that his particular interpretation seems very far-fetched to those who know their texts and their narrations. He thus says:

وإذا لم يتم هذا الحمل فلا بد من طرح هذه الروايات

If this interpretation is not viable than these narrations have to necessarily be discarded.²

Furthermore, he says the following regarding the fables of omission occurring in the Qur’ān:

أكثر هذه الروايات بل كثيرها ضعيفة السند

Most of these narrations, rather many of them have weak chains of transmission.

He then quotes the following from one of their scholars:

إن نقصان الكتاب مما لا أصل له، وإلا لاشتهر وتوار نظرا إلى العادة في الحوادث العظيمة وهذا منها بل أعظمها

¹ Al-Bayān p. 229.
² Ibid. p. 230-231.
Omission occurring in the Qur’ān has no basis whatsoever. Otherwise it would have been well known and diffusely transmitted considering the norm in great events. This is indeed one of them, instead the greatest of them all.¹

He says the following regarding their fables which speak of interpolation occurring in the Qur’ān by way of addition and omission and which suggest that the Ummah changed some words after the demise of Rasūl Allah  and substituted them with others after presenting a few examples, one of which is:

ما عن العیاشي عن هشام بن سالم: قال سألت أبو عبد الله رضي الله عنه عن قوله تعالى: إِنَّ اللهَ اصْطَفى ءَادَمَ وَنُوْحًا وَءَالَ إِبْرِیمَ وَءَالَ عِمْرَانَ. قال: هو آل إبراهیم وآل محمد على العالمین، فوضعوا اسمًا مكان اسم، أي أنهم غيروا فجعلوا مكان آل محمد آل عمران.

Al-ʿAyyāshī narrates the following from Hishām ibn Sālim, “I asked Abū ʿAbd Allāh regarding the verse: “Certainly Allah chose Ādam, the family of Nūḥ, the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of ʿImrān upon the worlds.” He said, “It is actually ‘the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of Muḥammad upon the worlds’. But they substituted one name with another, i.e. they changed the verse and place ‘the family of ʿImrān’ in place of ‘the family of Muḥammad’.

He avers that they are against the Qur’ān, the Sunnah, and the unanimity of the Muslims regarding not even a letter being added to the Qur’ān, to the extent that even the proponents of interpolation concur.²

Notice the extent of deceit in his comment; by making this comment on this last set of narrations he is giving the reader the impression that the falsity of all the other types of their fables which were mentioned before is not unanimously agreed upon by the Muslims. Likewise he is considering the viewpoint of the proponents of interpolation worth consideration in the unanimity of the Muslims.

¹ Ibid. p. 233.
This is merely a pleasant but deceitful covering intended to accomplish a sinister goal. And that is attacking the Book of Allah in deceitful and secretive ways; it is owing to his cunningness that his book did not cause such eruptions as did the book Faṣl al-Khiṭāb. In fact some have even considered his work to be a defence of the Qur’ān. However you have seen that he tries to prove their blasphemy using the methods of the Ahl al-Sunnah in very strange and cunning ways. Here is another example, wherein he appears to be defending the Book of Allah, where he says:

إن القول بنسخ التلاوة هو بعینه القول بالتحریف، وعليه فاشتهار القول بوقوع النسخ في التلاوة عند علماء أهل السنة يستلزم - في زعمه- اشتهر القول بالتحریف

Holding the view of the abrogation of recitation is itself holding the view of interpolation. And the popularity of the view of abrogation of recitation according to the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah necessitates the popularity of the view of interpolation.¹

He likewise says:

إن اللتزام بصحة هذه الروايات ( يعني: روایات نسخ التلاوة) التزام بوقوع التحریف في القرآن

Averring that the narrations of abrogation of recitation are authentic necessitates averring that interpolation has occurred in the Qur’ān.²

He further says:

فيمكن أن يدعى أن القول بالتحریف هو مذهب أكثر علماء أهل السنة لأنهم يقولون بجواز نسخ التلاوة

It is thus okay to claim that the viewpoint of interpolation is the view of the majority of Sunnī scholars due to them holding the view of abrogation of recitation being permissible.³

---

¹ Ibid. p. 201.
² Ibid.
³ Ibid. p. 206.
This deceptive argument which is advanced by the most senior Shi'i scholar of the present day is nothing new. Some heretics had advanced the same argument in the past and the Ahl al-Sunnah had rebutted it then already.¹

The issue is quite clear, and the difference between abrogation and interpolation is stark and can only be obscure to someone who is blinded by his ego, as has already passed; interpolation is from the doings of man and Allah has censured the one who does it, he says:

يُحَرِّفُونَ الْكَلِمَ عَنْ مَوَاضِعِهِ

Those who distort words from their [proper] places.²

And abrogation is directly from Allah, he says:

مَا نَنسَخْ مِنْ آيَةٍ أوْ نُنسِهَا نَأْتِ بِخَيْرٍ مِّنْهَا أَوْ مِثْلِهَا

We do not abrogate a verse or cause it to be forgotten except that we bring forth [one] better than it or similar to it.³

This does not in any way entail tempering with the Book of Allah. The early scholars of the Shi'ah who were opponents of this blasphemy approved it, the likes of al-Ṭabarsī in Majmaʿ al-Bayān, al-Murtaḍā in Al-Dharīʿah and others, as has passed.

Furthermore, you will come to realise his deception once more when he asserts that:

إن القول بعدم التحریف هو المشهور بل التسالم علیه بین علماء الشیعة ومحققیمهم

¹ See al-Bāqillānī: Nukat al-İntiṣār p. 103.
³ Sūrah al-Baqarah: 106.
The viewpoint of non-interpolation is famous, rather agreed upon with unanimity by the Shi‘ī clergy and its research scholars.¹

And in supporting his claim he cites what al-Ṭabarsī has said in Majma‘ al-Bayān when denying this blasphemy. Al-Ṭabarsī on the other hand himself, just a few pages later, has approved of abrogation of recitation whilst al-Khū‘ī on the other hand avers that abrogation of recitation is tantamount to interpolation. Is this not a contradiction?

In fact, he says that the view of non-interpolation is the view of the Shi‘ī clergy and its research scholars, but some of the central scholars of the Shi‘ī dogma, the likes of al-Kulaynī, al-Qummī, al-Ṭabarsī (the author of al-Iḥtijāj) and others believed in openly proclaiming this heresy. Is this not deception?

It gets even worse. And that is because their scholar Ibrāhīm al-Qummī has narrated abundant narrations regarding this blasphemy in his Tafsīr. And, among other scholars of the Shi‘ah, that is what he believed. Al-Kāshānī says:

وأما اعتقاد مشايخنا في ذلك فالظاهر من ثقة الإسلام محمد بن یعقوب الكلیني أنه کان یعتقد التحریف والنقصان في القرآن... وکذلك أستاذه علي بن إبراهیم القمي، فإن تفسیره مملو منه وله غلو فیه.

As to the belief of our scholars regarding it, what is apparent regarding Thiqat al-Islām Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī is that he believed in the interpolation of the Qur‘ān and omission occurring therein. Likewise was the view of his teacher ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, for his Tafsīr is filled with those narrations and he holds an extreme view in it.

He further goes on listing all their scholars who treaded the same path.²

As you can see, al-Kāshānī admits that the Tafsīr of al-Qummī is filled with narrations of this blasphemy. In spite of that al-Khū‘ī who overtly appears to be

---

¹ Al-Bayān p. 200
² Tafsīr al-Ṣafī: the sixth introduction: 1/52.
an opponent is of the view that his *Tafsīr* is authentic; he concludes that all the narrations which appear therein are all well established and transmitted from the infallible Imāms due to them reaching him (al-Qummī) through reliable scholars of the Shīʿah, as he alleges.¹

It is now evident that al-Khūʿī the author of *al-Bayān* had the same goal in mind as that of the author of *Faṣl al-Khitāb*. However, the latter deployed a more straightforward way whilst the former played the card of deceit and trickery.

¹ *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* (first publication: Najf, 1398 A.H.) 1/63; or third publication: Beirut, 1403 A.H. p. 49. This entire quotation has passed in the introduction.
The Second Angle to the discussion: The Viewpoint of the Contemporaries regarding Interpreting the Book of Allah

Are the contemporary Shīʿah free from the approach of Qurʾānic exegesis which is steeped in esoteric interpretation which was adopted by their early scholars like that of al-Qummī, al-Kulaynī, al-Kāshānī, al-Baḥrānī and their likes, or did they unhesitantly follow in their footsteps?

A person who does a comprehensive study of what the contemporaries have written will find that their mentality is mostly confined to those esoteric interpretations which were suggested by their early scholars, and some of which we have discussed previously. The proof of this is that those ancient esoteric Tafsīr hold and unmatched position in authenticity and reliability according to them. And there can be no clearer evidence to this than that of the approbation of al-Khūʿī, the senior most Shīʿī scholar of present, of the transmission chains contained in the Tafsīr of al-Qummī.¹ Notwithstanding that his Tafsīr has reached the furthest extent of esoteric interpretation; it has rather surpassed it.

Similarly, al-Ṭabaṭabāʾī, one of the prominent scholars of contemporary times, considers the Tafsīr of al-ʿAyyāshī reliable and trustworthy according to the Shīʿah. And his Tafsīr follows the pattern of Tafsīr al-Qummī in adopting the extremist esoteric approach which excommunicates the Ṣaḥābah and interprets all the verses of the Qurʾān to mean the Imāms and their opponents. And in his Tafsīr the narrations of interpolation are also added.

And like this, all their exegetical works, the approach whereof is extreme, enjoy the authentication of the Shīʿah and their reliance, for example, Tafsīr al-Burhān, Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī, Mirʿāt al-Anwār, etc.²

Does anything remain after this?

¹ See p. 29 of this book.
² See the quotation of al-Ṭabaṭabāʾī which we have cited in the introduction.
As for the approach of the contemporaries in interpreting the Book of Allah, it takes on two different extremes: the very extreme and radical and the moderate and balanced (in comparison to the radical approach). The signs of extremism have surfaced in many of their interpretations of the verses of the Qur’ān when they interpreted them to mean their anomalous beliefs. Hence one of their contemporary scholars who goes by the name ‘Alī Muḥammad Dakhīl whilst discussing the occultation of their awaited Mahdī (whose book according to some Shī‘ah writers is the most popular book authored on the issue of occultation) establishes a chapter by the title *The Mahdī in the Qur’ān* and presents in it fifty verses of the Qur’ān which he interprets to mean the Mahdī. He subsequently draws the conclusion that the doctrine of the Mahdī is no different from the other categorically established tenets of Islam, and that denying it is equivalent to denying one of the categorically established aspects of Dīn.¹

In fact the amount of verses which their later scholars interpret to mean the Mahdī has reached a hundred and twenty.² And that also did not satisfy some of them and hence he added by way of an addendum more verses which brought the total to a hundred and thirty two verses.³

Furthermore, their contemporary scholar Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ṭabīsī al-Najafī (d. 1365 A.H.) has interpreted seventy six verses of the Qur’ān to mean their doctrine of *Rajʿah*.⁴ This is an extreme which the early scholars also did not reach; the interpretation of Rajʿah started with one verse which Ibn Saba’ interpreted.⁵ The matter gradually increased, and we find that their early scholars interpreted some twenty odd verses to mean *Rajʿah*.⁶ Subsequent to that al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī in

---

¹ Dakhīl: *al-Imām al-Mahdī* p. 162.
³ Muhammad Munīr al-Maylānī: *Mustadrak al-Ḥujjah*.
⁴ In his book *al-Shī‘ah wa al-Rajʿah* which was published in 1385 A.H.
⁵ Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī 4/340.
⁶ Jawwād Tārā: *Dā’irat al-Maʿārif al-ʿAlawiyyah* p. 256.
the twelfth century interpreted sixty four verses to mean this false doctrine.¹ And finally the last development in this extremism was at the hands of al-Ṭabīṣī and other contemporary scholars. Probably there will be further developments.

In Tafsīr al-Mīzān of their most prominent scholar Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ṭabaṭabā’ī there are likewise many esoteric interpretations which he has cherry picked from the ancient exegesis books of their scholars. He cites them under the title: ‘interpretive discussion’. One of the examples which he has cited and approved is the following from Tafsīr al-Burḥān under the interpretation of the verse:

 inglés:

God presents an example of those who disbelieved: the wife of Noah and the wife of Lot.²

He says:

الآية مثل ضربه الله لعائشة وحفصة إن تظاهرتا علي رسول الله وأفشتا سره

The parable Allah has mentioned is for ʿĀ’ishah and Ḥafṣah when they teamed up against Rasūl Allah and divulged his secret.³

Likewise when interpreting the verse:

وَيَبْقَىٰ وَجْهُ رَبِّكَ

And there will remain the Face of your Lord.⁴

---

² Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 10.
³ Al-Ṭabaṭabā’ī: al-Mīzān 19/246.
⁴ Sūrah al-Raḥmān: 27.
He cites the following narration which they narrate from al-Ṣādiq:

نحن وجه الله

We are the face of Allah.¹

This is how the esoteric approach is perpetuated from past to present; the same method and the same form. And there are many more examples.

However, on the other hand, there is a contemporary approach which is more balanced. And its moderation is due to three aspects: first: the absence of that extremism due to which many verses of the Qur’ān are interpreted to mean Imāmah and whatever is related to it; second: its purity from all suggestions of interpolation, its narrations and reports; third: purity from emphatic excommunication of the greatest people mankind has ever known, i.e. the generation of the Ṣaḥābah مه. Examples of this approach are the two Tafsīrs of Muḥammad Jawwād al-Mughniyyah: Tafsīr al-Kāshif and al-Tafsīr al-Mubīn.

Hence you will notice that he praises the Ṣaḥābah مه in the interpretation of the verse:

لِلْفُقَرَاءِ الْمُهَاجِرِیْنَ الَّذِیْنَ أُخْرِجُوْا مِنْ دِیَارِهِمْ وَأَمْوَالِهِمْ

For the poor emigrants who were expelled from their homes and their properties...²

He thus says:

لا شيء إلا لوقوفهم مع الحق وإعلاه كلمة الإسلام وتضحيتهم في سبيله

¹ Al-Mīzān 19/103
² Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 8
(They were not expelled) not for anything but due to them standing by the truth and uplifting the word of Islam and striving in its path.

Seeking bounty from Allah and [His] approval and supporting Allah and His Messenger, [there is also a share].

He explains:

In faith, word and practice. It is by virtue of these emigrants and their likes from the Anṣār that Islam became established and spread to the east of the earth and its west. And this is no surprise, for their commander was Muḥammad and the Ummah could not have been otherwise after having such a righteous leader.

And [also for] those who were settled in the Home [i.e., al-Madīnah] and [adopted] the faith before them...

He explains:

The people meant in ‘those’ are the Anṣār, and ‘settled’ means stayed, and ‘home’ refers to Madīnah and ‘faith’ is the object of an implied verb. Allah has praised the Anṣār by saying: “They love those who emigrated
to them and find not any want in their breasts of what they [i.e., the emigrants] were given but give [them] preference over themselves, even though they are in privation. And whoever is protected from the stinginess of his soul – it is those who will be the successful."

وَالذِينَ جَآؤُوا مِن بَعْدُهُمْ...

And those who came after them...

He explains:

جَآؤَ فِي الْتَفَاسِيرِ: أَنَّ الْمَرَادَ بِالذِّينَ جَآؤُوا مِنْ بَعْدِ الصَّحَابَةِ الْتَابِعِينَ لَهُمْ بِإِحْسَانٍ أَخْذًا بِقَرَانِةِ السَّيَاقِ، وَمَعَ هَذَا فَإِنَّ الْثَّناَءَ يَغْلِبُ وَيَشَمِلُ كُلُّ مِنِ السَّارِ بِسَبِيلِ الصَّحَابَةِ إِلَى يَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ.

It appears in the *Tafāsīr* that the people meant by ‘those’ are the ones who came after the Ṣaḥābah and followed in their footsteps meticulously, gaging from the context of the verse. And hence the praise includes all those who follow in their footsteps till the Day of Judgment.¹

When you read this explanation you will never be able to tell that the author is from the Shīʿah who excommunicate the Companions of Rasūl Allah and revile them. As has passed already, the author has some criticisms against some of the Ṣaḥābah but he has not emphatically excommunicated any of them like the rest of his Shīʿah friends.

Likewise when interpreting the verse:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُوْنَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur’ān], and indeed, We will be its guardian.²

---

1 *Al-Tafsīr al-Mubīn* p. 631; compare this interpretation with the narrations of the Imāms which al-Bahrānī has compiled at this place, see: *al-Burhān* 4/316-319.

He says the following:

What is meant by ‘message’ is the noble Qur’ān, and the pronoun ‘its’ refers back to it. The meaning of the verse is that the Qur’ān which is between the two covers and with which all the people are well acquainted is indeed the very Qur’ān which came down upon Muḥammad, without any addition and omission. As opposed to the book known as the Torah, for it is other than the book with which Mūsā was sent, and the book Injīl for it is likewise other than the book with which ʿĪsā was sent.

We still nonetheless find that he did actually interpret some verses in accordance with the demands of his dogma but not with emphatically being radical and extreme in his interpretation like the others. Hence in his *Tafsīr al-Kāshif* when interpreting the verse:

\[
\text{الْيَوْمَ أَکْمِلْتُ لِكُمْ دِیْنَكُمْ}
\]

Today we have completed for you your religion.¹

He states the following:

The meaning of the verse is that Allah completed Dīn in this day by explicitly nominating ʿAlī for the succession (of Rasūl Allah).

This somewhat balanced approach is definitely the result of him relying upon *Jamʿ al-Jawāmiʿ* of their scholar al-Ṭabarsī, as has been alluded to in the introduction.

---

¹ Sūrah al-Māʿidah: 3.
And al-Ṭabarsī in turn relied upon the exegetical works of the Ahl al-Sunnah, as suggested by Ibn Taymiyyah.¹

There are thus two extremes of the Shīʿī approach to the interpretation of the Qurʿān: one is extreme and the other is somewhat balanced. This is not unlike the previous centuries where there existed exegetical works which were heavily influenced by the esoteric approach like that of the works of al-Qummī, al-ʿAyyāshī, al-Kāshānī, al-Baḥrānī, and others; just as alongside them there existed more balanced works like Ṭūsī’s Tafsīr al-Tibyān and al-Ṭabarsī’s Majmaʿ al-Bayān and Jamʿ al-Jawāmiʿ.

In their narrations there features a directive which orders them to adopt two variant approaches so that people do not come to learn their actual creed; their Imām says:

إن هذا خير لنا ولكم، ولو اجتمعتم على أمر واحد لصدقكم الناس علینا (أي لعرف الناس المذهب)
ولكن أفل ابقاتنا وابقائكم

This is best for us and for you. For if you were to unite upon one matter the people would believe you against us (i.e. they will come to know the actual dogma) and that would minimise our existence and your existence.²

When comparing the two approaches you will find that the extreme approach draws all its material stringently from the narrations of the Shīʿah and their reports. As for the balanced approach, you will notice that its bearers have opened their hearts and minds to the exegetical narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah and their reports thereby becoming safe from the extreme taint, either by way of Taqīyyah or due to really being convinced. But you will never find a single Shīʿī exegetical work which purely relies upon their narrations free from the esoteric method of interpretation.

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/246.
² Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/65.
So which of the two approaches really represents the Shīʿī dogma?

Previously I had mentioned that some Shīʿī scholars have endeavoured to uproot the balanced interpretive method by suggesting that it is a product of Taqiyyah.¹

Rather al-Majlisī has emphatically stated that advancing the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah is merely to establish evidence against them. And for this he establishes a chapter by the title ‘the twenty eighth chapter: What the commonality (i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah) narrate of the reports of the Rasūl of Allāh, and which of them are authentic according to them (i.e. the Shīʿah), and the prohibition of having recourse to the reports of the opponents’.² In this chapter he makes one exception, and that is for the purposes of establishing evidence against them (the Ahl al-Sunnah) to spread Shīʿism.

Instead, al-Khūʿī, the supreme authority of the Shīʿah in Iraq, considers the exegetical narrations of the Ṣaḥābah to mean the interpolation of the Qurʾān which appears in their narrations.³

And when Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb suggested that the Qurʾān which ought to have been the uniting factor between us and them, and a catalyst for coming closer to converging, their supreme authorities interpreted the verses of the Qurʾān and diverted them to meanings which were not understood by the Ṣaḥābah from Nabī of Allāh صلَّى الله عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّم, and to meanings which were not understood by the great scholars of Islam from the generation upon which the Qurʾān descended.⁴ When he mentioned this, one of the scholars of the Shīʿah responded with the following:

إن الشيعة ترى من الكيد للإسلام أن يأخذوا... تفسيرهم للقرآن عمن تقصدهم وتعنيهم بالذات أمثال أبي هريرة وسمرة بن جندب... وأنس بن مالك من ألقنوا صناعة التلفيق والدس والكذب والافتراء

---

¹ See p. 263 of this book.
² Biḥār al-Anwār 2/214.
³ You can see a number of their fables which speak of the Ṣaḥābah interpolating the Qurʾān in terms of its interpretation here: al-Bayān p. 229.
⁴ Al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah p. 10.
The Shīʿah consider it a sinister plot against Islam to imbibe their interpretation of the Qurʾān from those very people whom the Qurʾān attacks and impugns, like Abū Hurayrah, Samurah ibn Jundub, and Anas ibn Mālik; each of who were dexterous in inventing, shoving in, lying, and fabricating.¹

He attributes this response of his to the Shīʿah. If the reality is that the Shīʿah consider taking their Dīn from the Ṣaḥābah to be a sinister plot against Islam then for them is their creed and for us is ours. This is because the ineluctable conclusion of this stance is forsaking Islam altogether.

Does this not then imply that the balanced approach is just another exercise of Taqiyyah?

Muḥammad Jawwād al-Mughniyyah, who is one of those who have adopted the balanced approach, does not acknowledge the existence of an extremist esoteric interpretive notion. He asserts that the Twelvers are the most distant from these innovations and heresies and that their books which are accessible to all clearly attest to this.² Similarly, although Muḥsin al-Amīn acknowledges that they do exist in their books, but he concludes that they are anomalous narrations.³ Similar is the view of al-Khunayzī who has rejected some narrations which appear in their books.⁴

Is not denial of what exists a sign of Taqiyyah? The matter is not just about a few anomalous narrations, as they allege, rather it is about complete exegetical works the specific approach of which is esoteric interpretation; at the forefront of them all is Tafsīr al-Qummī which has been approved by their prominent scholars. Likewise, the most authentic of their canonical works like Uṣūl al-Kāfī and Biḥār al-Anwār, among others, contain complete chapters which are inclusive of tens of narrations which interpret the Qurʾān in the esoteric way. So why the boldness

---

² Tafsīr al-Kāshif 7/104.
³ Al-Shīʿah bayn al-Ḥaqāʾiq wa al-Awhām p. 419-420.
in denying established realities? Do they think that they are rendering a service to their dogma?

Moreover, this denial is clearly debunked by the approach of a group of their contemporary scholars who still blurt all those heresies. In fact their scholar ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn has opined that all these esoteric interpretations of the verses and those which are reported regarding the Imāms are the locus of the acceptance of the Shīʿah due to being categorically established.¹

1 This was when Mūsā Jār Allah said that:

So ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn responded thus:

As for what has come down regarding the merits of the Imāms and their Shīʿah, it is accepted due to the reported traditions of the science of exegesis being categorical and due to their causes of revelation being well established in the Sunnah. And as for parts of the Qurʾān being revealed regarding the disbelief of so and so, and so and so, we exonerate ourselves before Allah from them and the onus in them is upon some of the extremist Mufawwidah. Probably all of this was in their books and this gentleman happened to come across it there, whereafter he targeted the innocent with the stone of the guilty, as is always the case with those who are unaware of the reality of matters. (Ajwibah Masāʾil Jār Allah p. 67).

As you have noticed, this scholar considers all those interpretations of the Qurʾān which mean, according to them, ‘the Imām’ or ‘Imāmah to be unanimously accepted due to them being categorically established. But he deploys Taqiyyah when he negates those interpretations of verses of ‘disbelief’ and ‘disbelievers’ which mean Abū Bakr and ‘Umar according to them, and claims that they are not found in Uṣūl al-Kāfī. continued ....
In conclusion, the method of interpretation between the ancient and the recent Shi‘ī scholarship is very similar. The only new aspect which the contemporaries have is their approbation of what their early scholars had written, even of what the relatively later scholars like al-Majlisī and others had written. As a result, the contours of interpretation drastically increased thanks to the efforts of the scholars of the Safawid dynasty who exceeded all bounds. However, some of their contemporaries wrote balanced exegetical works following in the footsteps of their early scholars who had done so, and denied the existence of these extreme interpretations. This denial, however, could probably be accepted in the past, as to today when the publication industry is booming it does not really help or benefit in any way. And necessarily it will be interpreted as Taqiyyah.

As for them emerging with two different faces, this is something that is well-founded in their dogma so as not to let the people come to learn who they actually are.¹

continued from page 1408

This is without doubt Taqiyyah, because he denies that they exist in Uṣūl al-Kāfī, whereas they do feature therein, and they represent tens of narrations which interpret the verses of ‘disbelief’ and ‘disbelievers’ with Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. (See Uṣūl al-Kāfī: chapter: some points and excerpts from the revelations regarding Wilāyah: 1/412.)

But this man intends to deceive the people and deny that which is concrete reality and attribute to the Mufawwiḍah that which not even historians have attributed to them (see: al-Mufīd: Sharḥ ʿAqāʿid al-Ṣadūq p. 258 for more details on the beliefs of the Mufawwiḍah). Furthermore this sect no more exists, not its members and not its books, as acknowledged by Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ (see: Aṣl al-Shī‘ah p. 38).

¹ Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/65. This has passed already on p. 1405.
None of the views of the contemporary Shīʿī scholarship has changed regarding any of the issues we discussed under the discussion of the Sunnah. To date, they consider the verdicts of their Twelve Imāms equal to the verdicts of Allah ﷺ and His Rasūl ﷺ. Their scholar Khomeiny says the following:

إن تعاليم الأئمة كتعاليم القرآن يجب تنفيذها واتباعها

The teachings of the Imāms are just like the teachings of the Qur’ān in that they have to be implemented and followed.¹

And Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah says:

قول المعصوم وأمره تماما كالتنزيل من العزیز العلیم وَمَا یَنطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَى إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّ وَحْیٌ یُوحَىٰ

The verdict of the infallible and in his directives are exactly like revelation from the all mighty the all-knowing; nor does he speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed.²,³

It is as though they have considered these Imāms—among who is the fictitious absent Imām who did not come into existence at all and al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī whom Ibn al-Jawzī has dubbed a weak narrator in his book al-Mawdūʿāt—to be just like the Messengers of Allah and his Prophets. This is due to their belief that they are infallible and the falsity thereof has already become evident to us in the previous pages.

As to their claim that Rasūl Allah ﷺ concealed a portion of the Sharīʿah and entrusted ‘Alī with it, this is something they never cease to mention even in their books of prayers, as is documented by their scholar Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ in his book Aṣl al-Shīʿah wa Uṣūluhā.⁴

¹ Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah p. 13.
² Sūrah al-Najm: 3, 4.
⁴ Aṣl al-Shīʿah wa Uṣūluhā p. 77. I have already cited this on p. 179.
And as to those imaginary books, i.e. the *Jafr* and the *Jāmiʿah*, which features in their books, when Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allāh decried the state of the contemporary Shīʿah for believing in such fantasies, one of the contemporary Shīʿī scholars Muḥsin al-Amīn, without any shame, responded to him thusly:

إن ضاعت صحیفة الفرائض والجفر والجامعة وما ذکر معها عنده وعند أمثاله (یعني موسى جار الله)
فلم تضع عند أهلها

If he (Mūsā Jār Allah) and his likes have lost the Ṣaḥīfah al-Farāʾīd, the *Jafr* and the *Jāmiʿah*, then its rightful recipients have not.¹

In fact among their senior scholars of the present age there are those who boast by mentioning these imaginary treasures, names which carry no reality, and enumerate them very conveniently. They boast over the copiousness of these fantasies and when asked as to where these alleged books are, they respond by saying that they are with the Mahdī. If not for fear of longevity I would have cited their statements in this regard.²

Furthermore, the awaited Mahdī of the Shīʿah, in whose life and occultation they believe, is away now for centuries, owing to which the claim of his occultation has become an indictment upon the Shīʿah and a taint to their reputation which are ever increasing. But despite the fact that he was not born at all, some of these inveterate liars have attributed to him some parchments which we have already discussed and analysed.³

It was expected of the contemporary Shīʿah, especially when they are the ones who raise the banners of building relations and initiate the call for unity with the Ahl al-Sunnah, that they might have at least cleansed their dogma and their followership from the fables of the past. But nothing has happened; they actually

---

¹ *Al-Shīʿah Bayn al-Ḥaqā'iq wa al-Awhām* p. 254.
³ See p. 332. (Add page number)
consider these alleged parchments to be the Sunnah which cannot be overtaken by falsehood.¹

What is even more appalling is that they allege that this fictitious Mahdī is still in contact with some of their scholars up to the present day. This implies a continuity in the narrative of approvals and issuing of flawless Fatwās and directives which in their status are just like revelation, as they allege.

Their scholar Muḥammad Taqī al-Madarrisī says:

لا نستبعد -بل هو کائن فعلا- وجود علاقات سریة بین الإمام و بین مراجع الشیعة، وهذا هو السر العظیم

We do not consider it far-fetched (rather it is a reality) that there be secret relationships between the Imām² and the prominent authorities of the Shīʿah. And this is the biggest secret.³

In spite of their reliance upon these fantasies and their acceptance of the narrations of liars, they are still lost in their deviation of shunning the Sunnah of Nabī⁴ which was transmitted by his Companions. And that also not because of any evidence, but owing to the lame claim that they refused to acknowledge the emphatic appointment of ʿAlī as the Imām. To the extent that one of their authorities of this time says:

إن ما یرویه مثل أبي هریرة وسمرة بن جندب وعمرو بن العاص ونظائرهم لیس لهم عند الإمامة مقدار بعوضة

Verily that which the likes of Abū Hurayrah, Samurah ibn Jundub, ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, and others is not worth the wing of a mosquito according to the Imāmiyyah.⁴

Rather one of their contemporaries considers accepting the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah Ḥādīyyah to be a sinister plot against Islam.⁵

---

1 Al-Khunayzī: al-Daʿwah al-Islāmiyyah 2/112.
2 i.e. the absent Imām who is not but a figment of the imagination of the Shīʿah.
3 Al-Fikr al-Islāmī Muwājahah Ḥaḍāriyyah p. 305.
4 Aṣl al-Shīʿah wa Usūluhā p. 79.
5 See p. 1061. (Add page number)
It is for this reason that one of their contemporaries says:

إن الشیعة لا تعول على تلك الأسانيـد (أي أسانيـد أهل السنة)، بل لا تعتبرها ولا تعرج في مقام الاستدلال
عليها فلا تبالي بها وافقت مذهبها أو خالفته

The Shīʿah do not rely upon those transmission chains (i.e. the transmission chains of the Ahl al-Sunnah), rather they do not see them fit for consideration and being advanced as evidence. And, therefore, they do not bother whether they are in harmony with their dogma or not.¹

He also says:

إن لدى الشیعة أحادیث أخرى من طرقهم المعتبة عندهم و دونوها في کتب لهم مخصوصة وهي
کافیة لفرع الدين وأصوله، علیها مدار علمهم وعملهم وهي لا سواها الحجة عندهم

The Shīʿah have traditions which they have extracted from their reliable chains of transmissions and documented in their specific books. They are sufficient for the secondary and primary issues of Dīn. Upon them do they rely in their knowledge and practice. And they alone, not anything else, are evidence for the Shīʿah.²

This is the reality of their stance regarding the Sunnah of Nabī ﷺ. And they play a very active role in opposing the Sunnah and raising doubts regarding it. In fact some of their senior scholars have launched very vehement attacks against those Ṣaḥābah who narrated abundant narrations. One such example is the work of ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn regarding Abū Hurayrah. They likewise impugn and malign the senior ḥadīth scholars of the Ummah and the seminal books of the Muslims in ways not found in any other disbelieving sect, as we will find in Kitāb al-Ghadīr of al-Amīnī. The scope of the discussion does not permit citing some excerpts from this nonsense.

---

¹ ʿAbd Allah al-Sabīṭī: Taḥt Rāyat al-Ḥaqq p. 146.
² Ibid. p. 162.
Discussion 3: Consensus of the Ummah according to the contemporaries

There is nothing new in this discussion that we can shed light on. Yes of course with the exception of them trying to fit their dogma into the consensus of the Ummah by deploying deceitful ways due to which a person who is not really aware of their reality can be easily deceived. For example Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah says:

إجماع الصحابة بأن تتفق كلمة الأصحاب جميعا على حكم شرعي، وقد أوجب السنة والشیعة الأخذ بهذا الإجماع واعتباره أصلا من أصول الشريعة.

The consensus of the Ṣaḥābah in a manner that they all concur upon a particular Sharʿī ruling is unanimously accepted by the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah and is considered to be a principle pillar from the pillars of the Sharīʿah.

He then explains that the reason why the Shīʿah accept such a consensus as evidence is due to the Imām being present and concurring with the Ṣaḥābah.¹

Look at this cunningness, for the outcome of his assertion is that the Shīʿah consider the verdict of the infallible Imām to be evidence and not the consensus itself. But he has deployed this obscure way to say this in order to deceive and beguile.² And some people have indeed fallen for the trick.³

---

¹ Al-Shīʿah Fī al-Mīzān p. 321.
² See what has passed under the discussion of Ijmāʿ on p. 543 and onwards.
³ Like Muḥammad al-Ghazālī. He cites this statement of Mughniyah and thereafter concludes that there is no difference between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah in the principle rulings of Sharīʿah (see: Lays min al-Islām p. 79-80).
Discussion 4: Their Belief regarding the Fundamentals of Dīn

When talking of Tawḥīd al-Rubūbiyyah, the oneness of Allah in terms of him being the nourisher, some of their contemporaries have made such statements in conceding for their Imāms attributes which purely belong to Allah that were not previously reported from their early scholars. One of their scholars ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn al-ʿĀmilī, regarding whom they falsely claim that he is one of the Āyāt (signs) of Allah, says the following when praising ʿAlī (may Allah purify him from what they attribute to him):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>وأبا حسن أنت عين الإله</th>
<th>وعنوان قدرته السامية</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>فهل عندك تعزب من خافية</td>
<td>وأنت المحيط بعلم الغيب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ونعتا أيجادها الباقية</td>
<td>وأنت مدير رحي الكائنات</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وإن شئت تسفع بالناصية</td>
<td>لك الأمر إن شئت تنجي غدا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O the father of Ḥasan, you are Allah himself and a manifestation of his great power.

You encompass the knowledge of the unseen. Can any discreet thing then possibly be hidden from you?

You are the one giving motion to the mill of all that happens. And you are the cause of its enduring existence.

For you will be the prerogative tomorrow, if you wish you will grant salvation, and if you want you will grab by the forelock.¹

See how he has made a creation from the creations of Allah the deity himself, and the one who possesses all the divine attributes of maintaining the world and creating it, of giving life and giving death; he is allegedly the administrator of all that happens, the cause of its existence and a manifestation of the divine power; he has all-encompassing knowledge of the unseen and will be the reckoner on

¹ Dīwān al-Ḥusayn 1/ p. 48. (Under the second category which is exclusive to Arabic literature).
Judgement Day; for him solely will the prerogative on that day and thus the salvation and ruination of the bondsmen will depend upon him.¹

This is no surprise, for it is the natural product of the narrations of al-Kulaynī, al-Qummī, al-Majlisī, and the rest; narrations which take on this very extreme. We have presented some examples of them in the previous chapters.

The Twelvers of today represent in their narrations and via the representation of some of their scholars the Saba’iyyah and the other extremist sects who deified ʿAlī, regarding who we assumed that they no more existed. But suddenly we come to learn that they are still alive amidst the Twelver dogma, so much so that it can be claimed that ‘Saba’iyyah’ was the old name and ‘Twelver’ is the new name due to them sharing the same reality. These words did not emanate from a layman of the Shī‘ah or a junior writer, rather it has emanated from one of their Āyāt to whom thousands of people have recourse.

You will likewise find that Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshīf al-Ghiṭā’, also one of their supreme authorities and someone who always calls for unity between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī‘ah, saying the following when praising the Imāms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>عاملاك فعرضه ميخانها</th>
<th>يا كعبه الله إن حجت لها ال</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أشياء بل ذرت بها ذراتها</td>
<td>أنتم مشيئته التي خلقته بها</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ما لم تقله في المسيح غلاتها</td>
<td>أنا في الورى قال لكم أن لم أجل</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O the Ka‘bah of Allah, when the angels perform the pilgrimage to it they consider the throne of Allah to be their Mīqāt.

You are the will of Allah by virtue of which things were created, rather by virtue of which their particles were produced.

¹ Another poet actually clearly says that all the divine attributes have converged in ʿAlī. he says:

| وما اجتمعت إلا لسر وحكمة | جميع صفات الرب فيه تجمعته |

All the attributes of the nourisher have converged in him. And they have not converged but owing to a secret and a wisdom. (See: al-Ḥā’irī: Muqtabas al-Athar 1/246).
I would be your hater in the world if I do not say regarding you that which the extremist Christians did not say regarding the Messiah.¹

He considers his Imāms the Ka’bah to which the angels perform pilgrimage, and the Throne of Allah the Mīqāt wherefrom they start. He considers them to be the will of Allah and His power through which things were created. He has taken a pledge upon himself to say regarding his Imāms what the extremist Christians did not say regarding īsā. Probably by enlisting these attributes he has reached the goal he intended.

This is what one of the supreme authorities of the Shīʿah has to say, an authority that represents them in conferences and who is considered by some of the Ahl al-Sunnah, who are not aware of his reality, to be from the moderate Shīʿah. Owing to this misunderstanding they made him their Imām in the first conference of al-Quds,² i.e. owing to the fact that he is two faced and that the secrets and ways of Taqiyyah know no limits for them.

If I were to document everything I came across in this regard I would be giving longevity to the discussion.³ However, I will say that in the poetic material which the poets of the Shīʿah and their writers left behind this extremism is found to an appalling extent. It seems as if the flame of emotion and the spark of enthusiasm overpowers the reigns of Taqiyyah and thus the reality comes to the fore without manipulation and deception. Maybe that is why this particular topic requires a dedicated study.

And as with regard to Tawḥīd al-Ulūhiyyah, the oneness of Allah in terms of him being the only deity worthy of worship, the shrines of the Shīʿah and their

---

² See the al-Azhar magazine for the first conference of al-Quds: 25/506, 638, 979; al-Muslimūn 6/45. Also see the comments of Rashīd Riḍā in the al-Manār magazine upon making Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ the Imām in ṣalāh: 29/628.
³ For more examples see: al-Ḥā’irī: Muqtabas al-Athar 1/153-245, 248; Muḥsin al-Amīn: A’yān al-Shīʿah 5/219; Dīwān al-Ḥusayn of a group of their scholars; ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Amīnī: al-Ghadir 7/34-67, etc.
holy sites have become the greatest manifestations of Shirk. And there is no hope of reforming this vice for them, due it being supported by those narrations which are falsely attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt. As opposed to the reality of the Ahl al-Sunnah, for this is considered a deviation according to them and is vehemently opposed in their principle sources. Anyone who visited these sites has witnessed the Shirk which takes place there.

Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allāh, after having visited Iran and Iraq for a few months, concludes that their holy sites and shrines are worshiped.¹

And Shaykh Abū al-Ḥasan al-Nadwī says the following after visiting the shrine of ʿAlī al-Riḍā:

فإذا دخل غريب في مشهد سیدنا علي الرضا لم یشعر إل أنّه داخل الحرم فهو غاص بالحجیج مدوي بالبكاء والضجیج، عامر بالرجال والنساء، مزخرف بأفخر الزخارف والزینات. قد تدفقت إلیه ثروة الأثرياء وتبرعات الفقراء

When a stranger enters the shrine of our master ʿAlī al-Riḍā he will not feel but as if he is in the holy Ḥaram. For it is packed with pilgrims, echoing with cries and shouts, filled with men and women and adorned with the most lavish of embellishments and decorations. The wealth of the rich and optional charities of the poor have been emptied into it.²

And the author of al-Tuhfah al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah has stated that they continue to do extreme practices at the graves of the Imāms and circumambulate them. Rather they even perform ṣalāh toward them whilst their backs are facing the Qiblah. They do many other such actions that when compared with the devotions of the idol-worshippers for their idols the latter seems insignificant.³ He then says, “If you are in doubt, then go to some of their sites and have a look for yourself.”⁴

---

1 Al-Washīʿah: Introduction.
3 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuhfah al-Ithnay ʿAshariyyah p. 300
4 Ibid.
Furthermore, you will find that in his book ‘Aqāʾid al-Imāmah which he compiled in order to elucidate the beliefs of his cult, and which was accepted by the Shīʿah due to us not finding anyone who criticised it, and which he compiled in order to call people toward Shīʿism, one of their contemporary scholars Muḥammad al-Muẓaffar does not hold back in emphasising the belief of the Shīʿah regarding the shrine of the Imāms. He thus says regarding the shrines of the Imāms that one of the specialities of his cult is the following:

Fortifying them and erecting huge buildings upon them. And because of them they sacrifice every lavish and ordinary thing with faith and with generosity of heart.\(^1\)

He then clearly mentions that the reasons for this is:

The emphasised directives of the Imāms and their exhortations to visit their shrines, and their promises of the great rewards contained therein by Allah ... and due to considering the fact that these graves are the best locations for the acceptance of prayers\(^2\) and for being devoted to Allah.

---

\(^1\) Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar: ‘Aqāʾid al-Imāmah p. 133.

\(^2\) If they really were the best of places and if they really had such great merit, then at least some of that should have appeared in the Qurʾān and the Sunnah and they should have been well established and known; they should not have remained unknown to the Ummah and transmitted only by a bunch of infamous liars who were known for their fabrications against the Ahl al-Bayt. And if there was any truth to any of what they say Nabī ﷺ would not have emphatically prohibited the Ummah from transforming graves into Masjids.

\(^3\) Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar: ‘Aqāʾid al-Imāmah p. 133.
He further goes onto mention the etiquettes and actions of the visitations without any shame and fear of openly proclaiming the manifestations of idolatry.¹

Moreover, a group of their scholars till today openly proclaim without any qualms and compunction that Karbalā’ is more virtuous than the holy Ka’bah. Here we have one of the senior authorities of the Shi‘ah, a scholar who spearheads the movement of calling for unity between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shi‘ah, claiming that Karbalā’ is more virtuous than the Ka’bah which Allah made a source of people sound existence, a place to which people continuously flock, a place of amnesty and a place filled with blessings, as is mentioned in the Qur‘ān. Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ hymns the following poem which is against the text of the Qur‘ān and the unanimity of the Muslims:

ومن حديث كربلاء والكعبة*** لكربلاء بان علو الرتبة

Part of the discussion regarding Karbalā’ and the Ka’bah is that for Karbalā’ higher merit has become evident.

He considers this to be from the categorically established tenets of his dogma due to their narrations and reports attesting to it and he thus says:

أشرف بقاع الأرض بالضرورة

Necessarily the noblest of places on earth.²

The attestation of their narrations to this is more than enough evidence of the fact that all their narrations are lies. And also of the fact that whoever forged them is out of the fold of Islam and that whoever believes in them has parted with the unanimity of the Muslims. What status can Karbalā’ have when Allah says:

---

¹Ibid. p. 135-139.
Indeed, the first House [of worship] established for mankind was that at Bakkah [i.e., Makkah] – blessed and a guidance for the worlds. In it are clear signs [such as] the standing place of Ibrāhīm. And whoever enters it [i.e. the Haram] shall be safe. And [due] to God from the people is a pilgrimage to the House – for whoever is able to find thereto a way. But whoever disbelieves [i.e., refuses] – then indeed, God is free from need of the worlds.¹

Does there remain any room for any other view after this?

Then do they not reflect upon the Qur'ān, or are there locks upon [their] hearts?²

In conclusion, the statements of their scholars in this regard are abundant.³

---

¹ Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 96, 97.
² Sūrah Muḥammad: 24.
³ For example: Mīrzā Ḥusayn al-Ḥā'irī says the following:

Karbalā’ is that pure and sublime soil, and that sanctified land in reference to which the Lord of the heavens and the earths said addressing the Ka’bah when it boasted about itself before all the other pieces of land, “Settle down and calm down, for had it not been for the land of Karbalā’ I would not have created you.”

He further says:

And after having become the resting place of the Imām, like this did this blessed land transform into a holy site for the Muslims, into the Ka’bah for those who believe in the oneness of Allah, a place regularly encircled by the kings and rulers and a masjid for those who pray. (Al-Ḥā’irī: Aḥkām al-Shīʿah 1/32). continued . . .
Where on the one hand we find the ancient books of the Shīʿah mentioning that Allah forgave the Ambiyā’ due to them imploring him through the agency of the Imāms, we on the other hand find that this belief (which is steeped in extremism, which entails according the Imāms superiority over the Ambiyā’ and which is the epitome of gullibility and heedlessness due to it presupposing the existence of the Imāms during eras of the previous Ambiyā’) is affirmed by some of their senior authorities of the present. Hence ʿAbd Allah al-Māmaqānī advises his son with the following advice:

وعلیك بني بالتوسل بالنبي وآله صلى الله علیهم أجمعین، فإني قد استقصیت الأخبار فوجدت أنه ما تاب الله على نبي من أنبيائه من الزلة إلا بالتوسل بهم

And, O my son, hold on to praying through the agency of the Nabī and his household, may Allah have mercy on all of them. For after having done an in-depth study of the narrations I found that Allah did not forgive any Nabī from the Ambiyā’ for a mistake but after he prayed through their agency.  

continued from page 1423

And ʿAbd al-Jawwād Āl Ṭuʿmah avers in his book Tārīkh Karbalā’ that their narrations have classed Karbalā’ as the best piece of land on earth. Hence the Shīʿah consider it to be the chosen, sanctified and blessed land of Allah. And according to their standards it is the Ḥaram of Allah and his Rasūl and the Qiblah of the Muslims. In its soil is cure. And it holds such virtues as not found in any other piece of land, not even the Kaʿbah. (Tārīkh Karbalā’ p. 115-116. This book has been authenticated by a number of their scholars; see the introduction of the book for more details).

Similarly their scholar Muḥammad al-Shīrāzī says:

Their graves should be kissed just like how the black stone and the skin of the Qur’ān are kissed. (Muḥammad al-Shīrāzī: Maqālat al-Shīʿah p. 8)

1 This is the view of the extremist among the Rawāfiḍ as stated by al-Qāḍī ʿAyāḍ, al-Baghdādī and Ibn Taymiyyah. And Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb has cited that a person who believes in this is unanimously out of the fold. (See: p. 838 of this book).
2 See how they acknowledge mistakes for the prophets but claim completely infallibility for their Imāms!
3 Mirʾāt al-Rashād p. 104.
And where their ancient sources classify visiting the grave of Ḥusayn as better than doing Ḥajj to the House of Allah, we likewise find this grave belief being repeated by some of their contemporary scholars. They actively invite toward it due to there being immense reward in doing so considering the fact that it is the best of actions and devotions, as they allege.¹

Hence ʿAbd Allah al-Māmaqānī advises his son to visit the grave of Ḥusayn every day and says:

وعليك بني بزيارة قبره ( يعني قبر الحسین) في كل يوم من البعد مرة، والضي إلیه في كل شهر مرة، وإن كنت في بلدة بعيدة ففي السنة مرة

And, O my son, you should visit his grave (the grave of Ḥusayn) everyday once from a distance. And you should proceed to it once in every month. And if you are in a town which is far, then once a year.²

Notice that this scholar does not advise his son to perform ṣalāh, rather he tells him to go to the grave where shirk is committed because that is the best of devotions for them. This is obviously the way of the polytheists.

His son³ makes the following comment upon this advice:

وقد ورد أن من زاره عارفا بحقه کتب الله له ثواب ألف حجة وألف عمرة

It appears in the tradition that whoever visits him knowing his right, Allah will record for him the reward of a thousand Ḥajj and a thousand ʿUmrahs.

Till he says:

---

1 ‘Aqā’id al-Imāmiyyah p. 133.
2 Mir’āt al-Rashād p. 105-114.
3 Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Māmaqānī.
And it is as if he has visited Allah. It becomes incumbent upon Allah not to punish him with hell fire. Behold, acceptance of prayers is under his dome and cure is in his sand.¹ And whoever visits the grave of Ḥusayn on the fifteenth night of Shaʿbān, the night of Ṭīd al-Fiṭr, and the night of ʿArafah—all in one year—Allah will record for him a thousand accepted Ḥajj and a thousand accepted ʿUmrahs, and a thousand of his needs of this life and the afterlife will be fulfilled.² And whoever comes to him on the Day of ʿArafah being fully aware of his right, Allah will write for him the reward of a thousand Ḥajj, a thousand ʿUmrahs, and a thousand wars fought with a sent Nabī or a just ruler.³

This is how the ancient and recent books of the Shīʿah converge upon this polytheistic belief and how they attribute it to the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt and to Islam whereas the Muslims have no knowledge of it. It is only transmitted by a group of Shīʿī narrators. It can be said without doubt that by way of these anomalies they are announcing their falsehood and disgracing their creed. These alleged narrations had a great influence in the world of the Shīʿah due to them reviving the belief of the polytheists in the shrines of the Shīʿah and their holy sites. Hence these sites are frequently visited and the Masjīds are abandoned. Despite all of this their scholars endorse this evil and strive to entrench it and perpetuate it.

On the other hand, some of their narrations explicitly warn against this evil, but their scholars conceal such narrations and do not want them to become known to their gullible followership. In fact they even deny the existence of such narrations thereby distancing their followership even further away from the light of truth.

---

¹ Mirʿāt al-Rashād p. 110 (see footnote).
² Mirʿāt al-Rashād p. 113 (see footnote).
³ Ibid.
One of their supreme authorities, as they describe him, Muḥsin al-Amīn whilst defending the Shīʿah in them converting graves into Masjids, in his book al-Ḥuṣūn al-Manīʿah says that all those narrations which appear in the seminal works of the Muslims which bear the prohibition of converting graves into Masjids and building upon them that they are exclusively narrated through the transmissions of the Ahl al-Sunnah and oppose the diffusely narrated traditions of the Ahl al-Bayt.

In response I say that this prohibition appears in many narrations which are narrated through Shīʿī transmissions as well. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has cited them in his book Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah just as others have as well. So it is one of two things: either this person who is known as al-Amīn (trustworthy) is no so trustworthy after all, due to him wanting to conceal what features in their books, or he is ignorant of what appears in their collections despite him being falsely described as the Āyat Allāh (a sign of Allah).

Moving on, and regarding the names and attributes of Allah their contemporary scholars hold the view of their later scholars, i.e. the view of Taʿṭīl (denial of the attributes of Allah). And in this regard they follow the Muʿtazilah completely, to the extent that they believe that the Qurʾān is created, they deny that the believers will see Allah in the afterlife, they deny the attributes of Allah which are established in the Qurʾān and the Sunnah, and they describe Allah with negatives. Hence their scholar al-Muẓaffar says the following under the topic: our belief regarding Allah:

لا يُشار إليه ولا زمان ولا حركة ولا مكان ولا خفة ولا ثقل ولية صورة وليس جسم

1 Muḥsin al-Amīn: al-Ḥuṣūn al-Manīʿah p. 27.
2 See what I have cited from their reliable books in this regard on p. 652.
5 Al-Ghadīr 3/139.
He does not have a body nor a form; he is not substantial nor abstract; He is not characterised by heaviness or lightness; nor by motion or stagnation; He is not confined by space and time nor can he be pointed at.¹

As you might have picked up, in describing Allah with these sheer negatives they actually deny the existence of Allah altogether. This is nothing new for them, for these very words were repeated again and again by the Jahmiyyah before them. They are merely blindly following them. From here it is clear that those who assume that the Jahmiyyah, the deniers of the attributes of Allah, no more exist are mistaken.

Furthermore, they excommunicate all those who oppose them in the stance of Taʿṭīl. Hence al-Muẓaffar says:

ومن قال... إنه ينزل إلى السماء الدنيا، أو إنه يظهر إلى أهل الجنة كالقمر، أو نحو ذلك فإنه بمنزلة الكافر

And he who says that he descends to the first heaven, or that he will appear before the people of Jannah like the moon, or anything of that sort, is equal in status with the one who disbelieves in him... And so will a person be like a disbeliever if he believes that Allah will be visible to his creation on the Day of Judgement.²

They claim that reason guided them to Taʿṭīl.³ Amazing, was reason ever a decisive medium for receiving knowledge of the unseen? And can sound reason ever accept describing Allah with these negative traits for which there is no evidence and which openly violate aspects of revelation?

Furthermore, what is the crux of all those ideologies and philosophies which discussed this issue without any recourse to divine revelation? The crux is that

1 'Aqāʿid al-Imāmiyyah p. 59.
2 Ibid. p. 59-60.
3 Ibid. p. 60.
they did not leave behind but a heap of contradictions and frivolities like the frivolities of kids. Ultimately all their views became a source of their confusion and anxiety. Likewise, what was the end result of all those theologians who made reason their guide and their navigator in Islamic history? Was it not confusion and ruination? Indeed those who worked with the methods of Kalām and the thinking processes of philosophy found that they do not quench any thirst nor satisfy any need. They realised that the best way is the way of the Qur’ān. But when they shunned it, all their efforts became in vain, they wasted their time and efforts, they unnecessarily occupied the Ummah and diverted it from its mandatory obligations.

The method of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding the names and attributes of Allah is indeed a great method. Because it abides by the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, and because it preserves the time, efforts, strength and reason of a Muslim from being wasted in investigating issues which he is not obligated to investigate and for knowing the precise description of which there is no way.

Nonetheless, there remains one thing, and that is another view of their contemporaries regarding Tawḥīd which they have adopted following in the footsteps of the Sufis who opine that there are different levels of Tawḥīd, the lowest of which is the apparent purport of the Kalimah Lā Ilāh illā Allah. These Sufis contrived in the Dīn such things for which Allah gave no authority. And owing to these various levels they ultimately reached open disbelief i.e. the view of Ittiḥād (singularity of existence) and the view that the creation is itself the creator. Hence they deviated from reason and revelation, and they superseded the Christians (who believe in Īsā being god-incarnate) in their shirk due to them believing in a general incarnation whereas the Christians believe in a specific one.

Despite all these problems, the scholars of the Shī‘ah, who can be characterised as those who across the centuries transmitted to their people the scum of all the

innovative sects and the defilements of all the flawed human ideologies, adopted this problematic Sufi stance and transmitted it to their people, rather they even considered it part of their authentic beliefs.

Their scholar Ibrāhīm al-Zanjānī¹ in his book ‘Aqāʾid al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah² says the following under the title: ‘the belief of the Shīʿah regarding Tawḥīd:

إن مراتب التوحید أربع... توحید العوام، وتوحید الخواص، وتوحید خواص الخواص، وتوحید أخص الخواص، والأولى مدلول كلمة لا إلإ الله.

There are four levels of Tawḥīd: the Tawḥīd of the commonality, the Tawḥīd of the elite, the Tawḥīd of the elite of the elite and the Tawḥīd of the most elite. The first level is the apparent purport of the Kalimah Lā Ilāh Illā Allāh.³

Commenting on this he says that, apart from the rest of the Muslims, his cult is privileged with the Tawḥīd of elite of the elite and the Tawḥīd of the most elite.⁴

He further says that although the text does not allow for the elucidation of these levels, but, he says that, that they imbibed this from the teachings of Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī:

أول الدين معرفة، وكمال معرفته التصديق به، وكمال التصديق به توحیده، وكمال توحیده... نفي الصفات عنه. فمن وصف الله سبحانه فقد قرنه، ومن قرنه فقد ثناه، ومن ثناه فقد جزأه، ومن جزأه فقد حله، ومن جله فقد أشار إلیه، ومن إشار إلیه فقد حده، ومن حده فقد عده

The beginning of Dīn is recognition; and the perfection of recognition is in affirmation; and the perfection of affirmation is in Tawḥīd; and the

¹ Al-Khūʾī describes him as the pillar of Islam and the support of the ‘Ulamā’.
² This book has been approbated by some of their seniors like al-Khūʾī and Ḥasan al-Mūsawī.
⁴ Ibid.
perfection of Tawḥīd is in denying any attribution of qualities to Him. Hence whoever attributes any quality to Him has coupled Him, and whoever has coupled Him has doubled Him, and whoever has doubled Him has considered him divisible, and whoever considers Him divisible is ignorant of Him, and whoever is ignorant of Him will point toward Him, and whoever will point toward Him will confine Him, and whoever will confine Him will enumerate Him.¹

This narration which they falsely attribute to Amīr al-Mu’minnīn ‘Alī اَلِيَّ اَل م م ي ن ي ت endeavals denying the attributes of Allah ﷺ which are established in the Qur’ān and the Sunnah. And the belief that the perfection of Tawḥīd is the denial of the attributes is the stance of the Jahmiyyah who considered Tawḥīd to be one of their principles but then made it inclusive of the denial of the attributes; the aftermath of their stance was the denial of the Being of Allah. This is because denying the attributes necessarily leads to denying the Being, for one cannot envision the existence of a being without attributes in the external.

And because the stance of the Jahmiyyah regarding the denial of attributes is a product of the stance of Ḥulūl, incarnation, and Ittiḥād, singularity of existence,² it became his basis for the view he adopted regarding Tawḥīd being categorised into Tawḥīd of the elite and the Tawḥīd of the elite of the elite.

In order to understand the extent of their deviation, it is sufficient to note that they class the Tawḥīd with which the Messengers came and with which the divine books descended and to believe in which Allah commanded the first and last as the lowest level thereof. A level that is only behoving of the commonality. Do they have any evidence that they can present to us to prove this?³

Here we have in front of us the Word of Allah which descended upon his Rasūl and the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and the verdicts of the best generations

¹ Ibid. p. 24.
² Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah p. 16.
³ Ibid.
after him, did this categorisation come from any one of them? They do not follow but the views of their scholars and their heretics; and apart from conjecture, following the demands of the ego and the dictates of devils from the Jinn and Men they have no firm knowledge.

Likewise, in order to understand the extreme extent which they have reached in ascending these levels, which according to them do not fall under the purport of Lā Ilāh Illā Allāh, it is sufficient to understand that it eventually makes a person who treads this path reach the pits of heresy, i.e. the belief in incarnation and singularity of existence.¹

¹ Shaykh al-Islām has mentioned that the beginning of the view of Ittihād in the Ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ was during the era of Tatar dynasty (Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 2/171).
Discussion 5: Imāmah

Imāmah as per the acknowledgement of the contemporaries is just like Nubuwwah\textsuperscript{1} and a continuation of Nubuwwah,\textsuperscript{2} or it is a station granted by Allah which is like Nubuwwah.\textsuperscript{3}

It is one of the fundamentals of Islam according to them, Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ says:

إن الشيعة زادوا في أركان الإسلام ركنًا آخر وهو الإمامة

The Shīʿah have added one more pillar to the pillars of Islam, and that is Imāmah.\textsuperscript{4}

I did not find anything different in their position regarding Imāmah from the extremist position which was previously discussed. However, there are new claims regarding three pertinent issues in their books which they publish for the consumption of the Muslim world. These three issues are: their excommunication of the one who rejects Imāmah, their stance regarding Muslim governments, and their excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah.

The First Issue: the stance of the contemporaries regarding the excommunication of the Muslims which is found in their seminal works

You will find two outwardly divergent views among the contemporaries regarding this issue. They can easily be considered as two views by someone who is not aware of their heritage (but in actual fact they are one and the same).

The first view says that the denier of Imāmah does not leave the fold of Islam. It condemns those who say that the Shīʿah excommunicate those besides them.

---

\textsuperscript{2} Al-Muẓaffar: ‘Aqā’id al-Imāmiyyah p. 94.
\textsuperscript{3} Al-Samāwī: al-Imāmah 1/65.
\textsuperscript{4} Aṣl al-Shī‘ah wa Uṣūluhā p. 58. This is a clear confession that the Shī‘ah added a pillar to the pillars of Islam.
And the second view openly excommunicates without any Taqiyyah or compunction.

As with regard to the first view, when Mūsā Jār Allāh made the following claim:

إن کتب الشیعة صرحت أن کل الفرق کافرة وأهلها نواصب

The books of the Shī’a unequivocally state that all the sects are disbelievers and that their adherents are haters of the Ahl al-Bayt.¹

Muḥsin al-Amīn responded by saying:

سبحانك اللهم هذا بهتان عظیم، ول یعتقد أحد من الشیعة بذلك، بل هي متفقة على أن الإسلام هو ما عليه جميع فرق المسلمين من الإقرار بإشihadتين إلا من أئگر ضروريا من ضروريات الدین كوجوب الصلوة وحرمة الخمر وغير ذلك، وعمدة الخلاف بين المسلمين هو في أمر الخلافة، وهي ليست من ضروريات الدين بالبدیهة، لأن ضروري الدين ما يكون ضروريا عند جميع المسلمين وهو ليست كذلك

Pure are you, O my Lord. This is indeed a great accusation. None of the Shī’a believe this. Rather all of them unanimously agree that Islam is what is embodied by all the sects of the Muslims, i.e. the confession of the Shahādatayn, yes with the exclusion of a person who rejects an aspect of Dīn which is categorically established like the obligation of ṣalāh and the prohibition of consuming wine, etc. The issue of Khilāfah is the crux of the dispute which exists between the Muslims. And it is obviously not from the categorically established aspects of Dīn. This is owing to the fact that an article of faith is only classed as categorical if it is incontrovertibly established according to all the Muslims and Khilāfah fails to meet this requirement.²

And Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ says the following:

ومن لم یؤمن بالإمامة فهو مسلم ومؤمن بالمعنى الأعم، تترتب عليه جميع أحكام الإسلام من حرمة دمه وماله وعرضه، وواجب حفظه وحرمة غيته وغير ذلك، لا أنه بعدم الاعتقاد بالإمامة یخرج من کونه مسلمًا-معاذ الله- نعم یظهر أثر التدین بالإمامة في منازل القرب والكرامة يوم القيامة

¹ Al-Washī‘ah p. 105. This has been proven already from the sources of the Shī’ah on p. 1012.
And a person who does not believe in Imāmah is a Muslim and a believer in the general sense of these terms. All the rulings of Islam will apply to him in terms of his life, his property and his dignity being sacred, and in terms of amnesty being necessary for him and the impermissibility of backbiting regarding him; the implication is not that due to not believing in Imāmah he no more remains a Muslim. Yes of course the benefits of believing in Imāmah will become evident on the Day of Judgement in the form of attaining proximity to Allah and dignity.

Similar statements have been made by other contemporary Shīʿah as well.

And as with regard to the second view, there still remains amongst their scholars and Āyāt those who blurt this misguidance and openly excommunicate the Muslims, like ‘Alī al-Yazdī al-Ḥāʾirī, ’Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Rashatī and ’Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍalī.

1 Why do you revile the Ṣaḥābah then if according to your confession they were only opposers of Imāmah?
2 Aṣl al-Shīʿah p. 58-59.
4 Whom they describe as ‘the senior of the jurists and the Mujtahīdīn, the evidence of Islam and the Muslims, and the greatest sign of Allah in the universe’, whereas Islam is free from him. One of his books is: Ilzām al-Nāṣib Fī Ithbāt al-Ḥujjah al-Ghāʾib. According to him the Ahl al-Sunnah and all the Muslims who do not believe in their fictitious Mahdī are Nawāṣib, haters of the Ahl al-Bayt. He died in 1333 A.H.
5 He openly excommunicates the entire Ummah to the exclusion of his cult. And he opines that the cause of the disbelief of the Ummah is Abū Bakr and ’Umar. He says:
إن أبابكر وعمر هم السبب لإضلال هذه الإمة إلى يوم القيامة
Abū Bakr and ’Umar are the cause of the deviance of this Ummah till the Day of Judgement.
(Kashf al-Ishtibāh p. 98.)

See how these scholars remain victims of the ideologies of the heretics of the bygone era. Nonetheless, he writes this view which he openly claims in response to some of the Ahl al-Sunnah, Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allāh. This implies that Taqiyyah has various levels and shades and that what is concealed from us is even more severe.
6 Footnote on next page.
Then sometimes some of their scholars tread both paths, i.e. they at times emerge with the view of excommunication and at times with the contrary, given various situations and conditions, thanks to the flexibility Taqiyyah allows. One such scholar is Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar who in his book ‘Aqāʾid al-Imāmiyyah suggests that a Muslim is the one who concedes the Shahādatayn irrespective of which denomination he belongs to.1 But, in his other book al-Saqīfah he excommunicates all the Muslims from after the demise of Rasūl Allah. He says:

مات النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ولا بد أن يكون المسلمون كلهم-لا أدرى الآن- قد انقلبوا على أعقابهم

Nabī passed away and all the Muslim back then –I do not know of today– turned away on their heels.2

See how he passes the ruling of apostasy upon the Ṣaḥābah, the Ahl al-Bayt and the entire Ummah, and how he expresses doubt regarding any of them having īmān. With the exception of what is attributed to the Kāmiliyyah, none of the Shīʿah ever took on this extreme in the past. The Kāmiliyyah excommunicated ʿAlī for not demanding his right just as they excommunicated the Ṣaḥābah for not pledging their allegiance to him. But this sect does not exist with this name today, and one would think that no one bears any of their views in this time and that its ideology has ceased to continue. But then we are appalled to find that it is still alive and kicking in the dogma of the Twelvers and that some of their senior scholars still openly subscribe to it.

Footnote 6 of page 1435
He acknowledges that Imāmah is a pillar from the pillars of Dīn (al-Tarbiyah al-Dīniyyah p. 63), which implies that a person who rejects Imāmah in actual fact rejects a pillar of Dīn and thus is from the disbelievers. He contrives this ill whilst he stays amidst the Ahl al-Sunnah and benefits from their bounties after having lived as an exile (for his is originally from Iraq but now stays in Saudi and works in some of its universities).

1 ʿAqāʾid al-Imāmiyyah p. 155.
2 Al-Saqīfah p. 19.
This is not surprising, because the Twelver dogma has the ability to bring to the fore many of the extremist sects of the past with its books and collections all of which are filled with all types of anomalies to the greatest possible extent.

This type of approach is adopted by other contemporary Shīʿī scholars as well.¹

These are the two approaches which seemingly are different, but in actual fact they are the same; for those who consider the Ummah Muslims are no different from those who excommunicate them. Here under we will explain why.

Those who consider the people Muslims only outwardly consider them to be so. As for covertly, they likewise consider them disbelievers and doomed to Jahannam forever as per the consensus of their cult.

This stance has been proclaimed by their early scholars and their contemporaries. And if you ponder well enough you will find subtle indications toward this in the verdicts of those who do not excommunicate the Muslims; a person who is aware of their belief in this regard and is acquainted with their ways of practicing Taqiyyah will pick this up.

One of their early scholars who has made mention of this is Zayn al-Dīn ibn ‘Alī al-ʿĀmilī, ‘al-Shahīd al-Thānī’ (the second martyr), who died in 966 A.H. He says:

¹ Consider for example ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawī. He claims in a number of his books that the Shi‘ah do not excommunicate the Muslims (see: his letter to the academy of Arabic knowledge, situated in Damascus which was published in Najaf in the year 1387 A.H.; Ajwibah Masā’il Jār Allāh p. 39, etc.). But on the other hand he excommunicates the great Ṣaḥābī and the most prolific narrator of ḥadīth Abū Hurayrah. In fact he even excommunicates any person who does not believe in his Twelve Imāms because he claims that Imāmah according to them is from the pillars of Dīn (see: al- Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah p. 32). He likewise asserts that narrations which talk of the general īmān of the believers have to be qualified with belief in the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms because they are the door of forgiveness and only the one who enters it will be forgiven (Ibid. p. 32). And finally he says that a person who gives an alternate interpretation of Imāmah or errs regarding it will not be excused according to their consensus (Ibid. p. 45).
The intent of those who hold the opinion of the Islam of the opposition (i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah and the rest of the Muslims beside their cult) is that the rules of Muslims are applicable to them outwardly; not that they are Muslims in reality. That is why the Shi’ah are unanimous that they will enter Jahannam.\(^1\)

He further says:

The wisdom behind this\(^2\) probably is making it easy for the believers\(^3\) due to the need for associating with them always being present in most times and places.\(^4\)

And their scholar al-Majlisî says;

What seems apparent from some narrations, actually from many of them, is that even in this world they hold the status of disbelievers. But because Allah knew that tyrant rulers and their followers will rule over the Shi’ah and that the latter will be tested with socialising with the former, out of His mercy He made the rules of Islam applicable to the former.

---

1 \textit{Bihâr al-Anwâr} 8/368.
2 i.e. the wisdom behind outwardly considering them Muslims
3 Referring to his cult. Because they consider imân to be their exclusive quality.
4 \textit{Bihâr al-Anwâr} 8/368.
Hence when the Mahdī will emerge he will enforce upon them all the rules of the disbelievers. And in the hereafter they will enter Jahannam forever with the disbelievers. This is how the contradictory narrations can be reconciled, as is suggested by al-Mufid and al-Shahīd al-Thānī.¹

As for the views of the contemporaries in this regard, their supreme authority, Shihāb al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī al-Mar‘ashī al-Najafī says that the fundamentals of Dīn are of two types:

One type is those fundamentals upon the existence of which the rules which apply to a Muslim become applicable, and they are: testifying to the Oneness of Allah and testifying to the Prophethood of Nabī. The other is those fundamentals whereupon is based salvation in the afterlife, attaining the pleasure of Allah and gaining admission into Jannah. Hence a person who does not acknowledge them will be deprived from entry therein. He will be dragged to Jahannam with the band of disbelievers. This type is known as the fundamentals of īmān.

He further goes on to mention examples of the second type. He says:

Believing in Imāmah and acknowledging the Imām.

He then says:

Ibid. 8/369-370.
The proof for this is the apostasy of a group of the Ṣaḥābah after the demise of Nabī ﷺ. For it is a known fact that no such action occurred on the path of the Ṣaḥābah which would necessitate apostasy; they did not turn away from their confession of the Oneness of Allah and Nubuwwah but they rejected Imāmah.¹

From these quotes the smokescreen of Taqiyyah dissipates and it becomes clear that when some of their scholars consider their opponents Muslims what they actually mean is ‘outward Islam’ according to the definition they have invented. If you deliberate on their statements you will surely grasp their intent. For example, consider the statement of Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ and you will notice that he has alluded to this in his words:

نعم يظهر أثر التدین بالإمامة في منازل القرب والكرامة یوم القیامة

Yes of course the benefits of believing in Imāmah will become evident on the Day of Judgement in the form of attaining proximity to Allah and dignity.

In spite of this, some affiliates of the Ahl al-Sunnah still gave credence to his statement.²

As for Muḥsin al-Amīn, he has also alluded to this erroneous position in a number of sentences in his speech. Consider:

إلا من أنكر ضروریات الدین من ضروریات الدین کوجوب الصلوة وحرمة الخمر

Yes a person who rejects an aspect of Dīn which is categorically established, for example the obligation of ṣalāh, the prohibition of consuming wine, etc., (will be out of the fold of Islam).

And as is obvious, Imāmah is greater than the obligation of ṣalāh and the prohibition of wine without any dispute between them. He thus alluded to the superior by invoking the inferior.

Likewise:

وعدمة الخلاف بين المسلمين هو في أمر الخلافة، وهي ليست من ضروريات الدين بالبدية

The crux of the dispute between the Muslims is the issue of Khilāfah. And it is obviously not from the categorically established aspects of Dīn.

The Taqiyyah hidden herein is not easily discernible by those who are not aware of their style. Hence some people did not pick it up and were deceived by it.¹

His intention here is Khilāfah according to the Muslims, not the doctrine of Imāmah which they believe in, which is why he used the word ‘Khilāfah’.

According to them they are two completely different concepts. One of their scholars says:

الإمامة تعني رئاسة الدين، والخلافة رئاسة دولة كما فهم من النصوص الواردة

Imāmah means providing leadership in Dīn whilst Khilāfah means leadership of a dynasty, as is understood from the relevant texts.²

And that is why they aver that the Imāmah of ‘Alī started with the demise of Rasūl Allah Ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wasallām³ but the Şaḥābah in their Khilāfah ‘separated Dīn from the dynasty’.⁴

---

1 Al-Zu’bī: Lā Sunnah wa lā Shīʿah p. 84.
The second Issue: their stance regarding Muslim governments

When Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allāh said:

إن الشیعة تعتبر الحكومات الإسلامیة وقضاتها طواغیت

The Shīʿah consider Muslim governments and their judges to be Ṭawāghīt (devils or idols). ¹

One of the Shīʿī scholars responded thus:

الطواغیت من الحكومات وقضاتها عند الشیعة إنما هم الظالمون الغاشمون المستحلون من آل محمد ما حرم الله ورسوله... أما غيرهم من حكومات الإسلام فأن من مذهب الشیعة وجوب مؤازرتهم في أمر يتوقف عليه عز الإسلام ومنعته، وحماية ثغوره حفظ بيضته. ولا يجوز عندهم شق عصا المسلمین وترق جماعتهم بمخالفته. بل يجب أن تعامل سلطانها القائم بأمورها والحامي لثغورها معاملة الخلفاء بالحق

According to the Shīʿah only those governments and their judges are devils who are oppressors of the household of Muḥammad and who desacralize what Allah has rendered sacred of their rights... As for all other Islamic governments, the stance of the Shīʿah regarding them is that it is compulsory to support them in matters which are prerequisites for the glory of Islam, its might, the safety of its borders and the preservation of its territory. It is not permissible according to them to split asunder the unity of the Muslims and divide them by opposing any such government. Rather it is compulsory for them to treat its ruler and the protector of its boundaries in a like manner that just rulers are treated. ²

A similar stance is adopted by other Shīʿī scholars. ³

Does this stance represent the detraction of the contemporaries from the default position of their dogma in this regard which we have discussed already in the

---

¹ Al-Washīʿah p. 105. This has passed already on p. 1002.
previous chapters? Or is it tainted with Taqiyyah and manipulation due to the addressee being a Sunnī and the address being directed to the Ahl al-Sunnah, for whenever there is dialogue of this nature Taqiyyah is always part of it.

In answering this I say the following:

A group of their contemporary scholars still continue to proclaim that their dogma only acknowledges the rulership of the Twelve Imāms; they proclaim this without suggesting that there is a divergent view.

Their scholar Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah says:

إن شروط الإمامة لم تتوافر في واحد ممن تولى الخلافة غير الإمام علي وولده الحسن بخاصة من جاء بعدهما-كذا- فمن الطبيعى إن-كما يقول- أن لا يعترفوا بإمامة أي حاكم غير علي وابنه، وإن ينظروا إليه نظراً إلى من غصب أهل البيت حقهم الإلهي ودفعهم عن مقامهم ورتبهم التي رتبهم الله فيها، وكان الحاكم يرى في الشيعة العدو اللدود والحزب المعارض لحكمه

With the exception of Imām ʿAlī and his son Ḥasan, the conditions of Imāmah were not found in any of those who assumed the Khilāfah, and more so in those who came after them. It is thus natural that the Shīʿah did not concede the rulership of any ruler besides ʿAlī and his children. Likewise it is normal that they viewed them as those who usurped the divine right of the Ahl al-Bayt and repelled them from the positions which Allah had accorded them. On the flip side, the rulers would also see in the Shīʿah an ardent enemy and a threat to their rule.

He further says:

فمبدأ التشیع لا ينفصل بحال عن معارضة الحاکم إذا لم تتوفر فيه الشروط. وهي النص والحكمة، والأفضلية... ومن هنا كانوا يمثلون الحزب المعارض دينا وإيمانا

The concept of Shīʿism then is inseparable from the idea of opposing the ruler if he does not embody the necessary prerequisites. Which are: divine appointment, wisdom and virtue. They have always, therefore, represented the opposing side in creed and in faith.¹

¹ Al-Shīʿah wa al-Ḥākimūn p. 24.
As you can see, he attributes the disavowing of every rulership with the exception of the rulership of the ‘divinely appointed Imāms’ to all the Shī’ah. And that is why they hold a similar stance regarding the righteous Khilāfah, the Khilāfah of Nubuwwah. Their scholar al-Ṣādiqī¹ says:

الخلفاء الثلاثة شركاء في التآمر على الإسلام

The three Khulafā’ were partners in conspiring against Islam.²

And another of their scholars says:

تلاعبت الأيدي الأثيمة بالإسلام والمسلمين من الحكام والحاكمين منذ وفاة النبي الكریم صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم

The sinful hands of the rulers have manipulated Islam and the Muslims since the demise of Nabī H.³

Similarly, they aver that the rulership of the Muslim Ummah is the sole prerogative of the Hidden Mahdī, and thus whoever else assumes it besides him is a usurper. Some of them, however, do exclude Wilāyah al-Faqīh (the authority of the jurist) due to him having the right of representation. Their scholar ʿAbd al-Hādī al-Faḍalī says:

إن دولة المنتظر هي دولة الإسلام

The empire of the awaited is the empire of Islam.⁴

And besides his empire no empire is truly an Islamic one. He says:

1 The representative of the academic seminary in Najaf, as he describes himself.
2 ‘Alī wa al-Ḥākimūn p. 78. Also see p. 83.
4 Fī Intīzār al-Imām p. 57.
We should live in the era of occultation with anticipation of the promised day which the awaited Imām will commence with putting an end to disbelief.\(^1\)

However, the anticipation for the Mahdī does not entail having peaceful relations with Muslims governments, as he says:

What is deduced from the narrations on this topic is that anticipation means paving the way and setting the scene for the appearance of the Mahdī.\(^2\)

What does paving the way mean? He explains:

Paving the way for the emergence of the awaited Imām will be by way of political activism, i.e. by way of instigating the political conscience and giving rise to an armed revolution.\(^3\)

After studying all these statements you will notice that they disavow any Muslim government with the exception of a Shīʿī government. And that they intend to prepare the masses to accept their revolts via the medium of spreading their dogma with the various platforms. This is what al-Faḍalī deems the political conscience.

---

1 Ibid. 67.
2 Ibid. 69.
3 Ibid. 70.
It is not unclear that this approach to which the Twelver scholars have inclined is not in harmony with the approach of the Twelvers of past. Hence the following appears in *al-Ghaybah* of al-Nu’mānī:

> عن أبي الجارود عن أبي جعفر علیه السلام: قال: قلت له علیه السلام: أوصني، فقال: أوصيتك بتقوى الله، وأن تلزم بِتِك، وإياك والخوارج منا، فإنهم ليسوا على شيء ولا إلى شيء

Abū al-Jārūd says that he asked Abū Ja’far صلی الله علیه وآله وسلم, “Advise me.”

He said, “I advise you to fear Allah and to cling on to your house. And beware of the rebels amongst us, for they are not upon any foundation nor will their end result be anything substantial.”

Al-Majlisī explains:

> والخوارج منا أي مثل زید وبني الحسن

The rebels amongst us, i.e. Zaid and the children of Ḥasan.²

Their narration thus prevents them from revolting even if it be by following the Ahl al-Bayt. What then would be the ruling of revolting by following those besides them?

Abū ʿAbd Allah likewise ordered them, as appears in their narrations, to refrain from giving rise to upheavals after the occultation of the Mahdī:

> كونوا أحلاس بِتِكم فإن الفتنة على من أثارها

Become the doormats of your homes, for indeed the onus of the fitnah is upon the one who instigates it.³

---

1 Al-Nu’mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 129; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/136.
2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/136.
3 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 131.
And al-Bāqir is similarly reported to have said:

اَسْكِنِواْ مَا سَكَنَتْ السَّمَاوَاتُ وَالأَرْضُ، إِيَّا أَيْ وَلا تَخْرُجُواْ عَلَى أَحَدٍ

Remain calm as long as the heavens and the earth remain calm, i.e. and do not revolt against anyone.¹

Their scholar al-Nuʿmānī has established a chapter on this topic by the title chapter regarding those narrations which order the Shi‘ah to exercise patience, withhold, anticipate during the occultation and to not hasten in seeking the decree of Allah and his plan.² In this chapter he cites multiple narrations and thereafter makes the following comment:

انظروا رحمكم الله إلى هذا التأدیب من الأئمة علیهم السلام إلى أمرهم ورسملهم في الصبر والكف، والانتظار للفرح، وذکرهم هلاك المستعجلين

Look, may Allah have mercy on you, at the disciplining of the Imāms, at their order and directive to be patient, withhold and anticipate the opening, and at their mention of the destruction of the impatient.³

This is what the scholars of the third century had endorsed, so either the contemporaries do not know of their stance, or they no more lend any importance to the occultation due to them knowing that the awaited will never emerge due to him not being born. And maybe that is why they are calling for revolutions and for giving shape to an empire.

This is what the contemporaries proclaim. Over and above the excommunication of the Muslims governments which already existed, they added the call for revolutions against them before the emergence of the Mahdī. In fact their scholar Khomeini asserted that it is not permissible to initiate a Jihād until the

¹ Ibid. 134.
² Ibid. 129.
³ Ibid. 134.
awaited Mahdī appears, but he himself opposed his assertion by initiating the revolution with force, as will come. This is because their dogma changes with fluctuating conditions and situations due to it being subjugated to the fancies of their scholars. And also because the door of interpretation is very wide for them, rather it has no limits and contours.

Furthermore, it is owing to this stance that they consider the reign of disbelievers over Muslim lands to be better than the reign of Muslims. Shaykh Rashīd al-Riḍā thus quotes the Shīʿī scholar Abū Bakr al-ʿAṭṭās saying:

إن يفضل أن يكون الأنكليز حكاما في الأراضي المقدسة على ابن سعود

He prefers that the English rule over the blessed lands instead of the son of Saʿūd.

Likewise their scholar Ḥusayn al-Khurāsānī has revealed to us that every Shīʿī yearns for the conquest of Makkah and Madīnah and for eliminating the Wahhābī rule therein. He says:

إن طوائف الشيعة تترقبون من حين وآخر أن يوما قريبًا يفتح الله لهم تلك الأراضي المقدسة لمرة أخرى - كذا- ليدخلوها آمنين مطمئنين فيطوفوا بيت ربهم، ويؤدوا مناسكهم، ويزوروا قبور ساداتهم ومشايخهم... ولا يكون هناك سلطان جائر يتجاوز عليهم بهتک أعراضهم، وذهاب حرمة إسلامهم، وسفك دمائهم المحقرة ونهب أمورهم المحترمة ظلما وعدوانا حقق الله تعالى أمانينا

The various sects of the Shīʿah anticipate every now and then the coming of a day wherein Allah will conquer for them the blessed lands for a second time so that they may enter them with peace and serenity. And so that they may circumambulate around the house of their Lord, fulfil the rituals of their pilgrimage, and visit the graves of their masters and scholars. All of this without a tyrant ruler who will wrong them by

1 Tahrīr al-Wasīlah 1/482.
2 See the chapter regarding the empire of the Āyāt: p. 1172. (Add page number later)
3 Al-Manār vol. 9 p. 605.
defaming them, disenchanting their Islam, shedding their blood which is preserved and usurping their respected properties oppressively. May Allah make our wishes come true.¹

This is how this Rāfiḍī desires that the blessed lands be conquered, as if currently they are under the reign of the disbelievers. The reasoning he gives for this desire is that he intends to perform Ḥajj and do visitations, as if he and his cult are barred from doing so. In reality what he desires is to establish shirk and destroy Tawḥīd in the two pure Ḥarams.

Moving on, if this is what their scholars openly proclaim, and if upon this their seminal works are unanimous, then what is the reality of the stance of ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn and his likes?

In reality his stance is not unlike the stance of the scholars whose statements we just cited. The only difference is that he phrased his position with the disguise of dissimulation and in a way that deceives those who are not aware of their strategies in practicing Taqiyyah. Consider the following:

الطواغیت من الحكومات وقضاتها عند الشیعة إنما هم الظالمون  لل محمد

According to the Shīʿah only those governments and their judges are devils who are oppressors of the household of Muḥammad.

He has not parted from the default position of his dogma by making this statement, because according to them any person who assumes rulership besides ʿAlī Amīr al-Muʿminīn and Ḥasan is an oppressor; because Imāmah is their exclusive privilege and their right in which no one has any share. And thus whoever besides them will assume rulership will necessarily be a tyrant. Hence Ibn Bābawayh says:

 فمن ادعى الإمامة وهو غير إمام فهو الظالم الملعون

¹ Al-Islam ʿalā Ḍawʾ al-Tashayyuʿ p. 132-133.
Whoever lays claim to Imāmah without actually being eligible to be one is indeed the oppressor, the accursed.¹

And that is exactly why they deem Abū Bakr Ṭāhā to be the first oppressor.

Likewise consider:

فأن الشیعة ترى وجوب مؤازرتهم في أمر يتوقف عليه عز الإسلام

The Shī‘ah consider it compulsory to support them in matters which are prerequisites for the glory of Islam.

Here also he has not in any way parted with position of the Shī‘ah, because what he means by the ‘glory of Islam’ is the victory of his dogma and his cult. This statement would thus purport the following: being part of Muslim governments in order to destroy them and give authority to the Shī‘ah to implement their dogma, or squander their assets and channel them in their activities. And this why you will find that Khomeini endorsed what al-Naṣīr al-Ṭūsī had done when he when assumed office as minister of Hulagu in order to destroy the Islamic Khilāfah and glorify Shī‘ism. He says:

إن من باب التقیة الجائزة دخول الشیعی في رکب السلاطین، إذ کان من دخوله الشكلي نصر الإسلام
والمسلمین مثل دخول نصیر الدین الطوسي

Part of permissible Taqiyyah is that a Shī‘ī joins the court of the monarch when by him outwardly doing so there is hope of victory for Islam and the Muslims. Like how Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī had joined.²

In conclusion, as you can see, their dogma did not increase but in its extremism and radicalism.

1 Al-ʾɪtiqādāt p. 112.
2 Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islamiyyah p. 142.
The Third Issue: the stance of the contemporaries regarding the Ṣaḥābah

Has anything changed in the dogma of this cult regarding the Ṣaḥābah from what we have presented previously in light of their seminal works? Especially after the rise of calls for common understanding and unity, the pouncing of the infidel enemy upon the Ummah from every possible direction, and the passage of many centuries wherein the Ummah has not witnessed a generation nobler and more virtuous than that unique Qur’ānic generation, the generation of the Ṣaḥābah?

Have the minds of the Shīʿah and their hearts opened to the reality? Have they finally realised the gravity of the fables which their ancient books carry regarding the apostasy of the Ṣaḥābah and the alleged clash between them and the Ahl al-Bayt? Has not the time come for them to believe in the divine revelation, the pristine Sunnah, the unanimity of the Ummah and the incontrovertible facts of Dīn and history? Has not the time come for them to make a choice between latching on to that and between remaining beguiled by the reports of a bunch of liars who are infamous for their iniquity and their lies? Can sound reason ever accept the narrations of a band of liars and belie all the Ṣaḥābah who were pleased with Allah and with whom in turn he was pleased?

All those dark pages which contain the denigration, cursing and excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah, who transmitted this Dīn and passed it on to us, in actual fact entail criticising the religion of Islam and its Messenger . And therefore it is the obligation of the earnest and honest Shīʿah to announce their disapproval of all those anomalous and heretical views which target the noble Companions of Rasūl Allāh with curses and excommunication, especially if they want to form unity with the Muslims. They should inform their followership first and the rest of the Muslims thereafter that these narrations and views belong to some heretical and misguided sects of the past and that these sects will carry the blame thereof and the blame of all those who will follow them till the Day of Judgment. They should do this in order to alleviate the hatred which has long settled in the hearts of the Ahl al-Sunnah from the bygone centuries up until now. And the best way to remove this hatred is that they clarify that they do not believe in
the validity of all those views which cause a believer to recoil with indignance in whichever part of the world he may be. Because no sincere believer will ever be open to studying the beliefs of a sect, unless he is gifted with special mental abilities, if he learns that it considers cursing Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq, whose īmān if weighed with the īmān of the rest of the Ummah will outweigh it, or cursing ʿUmar, whose contributions to Islam are unmatched by that of anyone else, an act of worship? Likewise he will never trust the views of this sect if he comes to learn that it considers these curses to be devotions? Doing away with these defilements and anathemas is from the foundations of building common grounds and unity. If they are really sincere in uniting with the Muslims, then they should openly announce this disapproval and change.¹ They should not merely do so in order to spread their beliefs in the lands of the Ahl al-Sunnah deceptively.

Nonetheless, what do the contemporary Shīʿah say on this topic? One of the people who emerged in the present age is a person by the name Aḥmad al-Kisrawī. Professor Maḥmūd al-Mallāḥ says the following regarding him:

Since the inception of the term Shīʿī there hasn’t emerged a man of his calibre in the Shīʿah world."³

He worked as a lecturer in the University of Tehran and likewise presided over several judicial positions.⁴

Al-Kisrawī discovered the falsity of the stance of the Shīʿah regarding the Ṣaḥābah. He disavowed all those fables which were fabricated by the haters regarding them turning apostate due to opposing ‘the emphatic nomination of ʿAlī’, as they allege, and expounded upon the deviance of the Shīʿah in this regard. He says:

² What he intends by ‘Shīʿah’ and ‘Shīʿī’ is ‘Rāfiḍah’ and ‘Rāfiḍī’, not Shīʿah in general, otherwise this generalisation would not be correct.
⁴ For his biography see: Yaḥyā Dhakāʾ: Kārwand Kisrawī (introduction); al-Tashayyuʿ wa al-Shīʿah (Introduction); Muʿjam al-Muʿallifīn 2/53.
As for their assertion that, besides three or four individuals, all the Muslims apostatised after the demise of Nabī, it is based upon their boldness to lie and calumniate. For someone can object that how could they have apostatised when they were the Companions of Nabī who believed in him when everyone else belied him; who defended him and bore difficulties for his cause; and who stood by his side in all his campaigns and did not give preference to themselves over him? Furthermore, was there really any benefit for them in the Khilāfah of Abū Bakr owing to which they would abandon Islam? Which of the two is more likely: the lying of one or two people who had ulterior motives or the apostasy of hundreds of sincere Muslims? Give us an answer if you have any.¹

This stance of al-Kisrawī played a very pivotal role in some erudite members of the Shīʿah and their youth being attracted to him. Hence thousands of people followed him and took up the task of aiding him and propagating his views and his books.

However, he was killed by his Shīʿī counterparts before his views could become widely known.²

1 Al-Tashayyuʿ wa al-Shīʿah p. 66. This was cited previously but I recited here because of its importance and relevance.

2 See the references cited above regarding his biography. Someone informed me that he had some heretical views, I, however, did not come across substantial evidence that affirmed this. Probably this accusation was due to the propaganda of some of the Shīʿah against him. A person is judged by the books and works he has left behind, and I did not see in his books which I came across any manifestation of heresy. And his journals and papers did not reach me based on which I could have come to learn of that... Previously I cited the praise al-Mallāḥ has showered him with... And I did not cite here only that which is Ḥaqq and which gained a lot of support in the Shīʿī circles.
Moving on, the books of some contemporary Shī’ah scholars who outwardly advocate unity have surfaced of recent. And the actual objective of these books is to defend the dogma of the Shī’ah and proselytise for them in the lands of the Ahl al-Sunnah. In these books is contained the view that the Shī’ah do not revile the Ṣaḥābah, let alone excommunicate the three Khulafā’, and that they revere the Companions of Rasūl Allāh.

Thus al-Khunayzī says the following in his book *al-Da‘wah al-Islāmiyyah ilā Waḥdah Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Imāmiyyah*:

> بأن الإمامیة- في هذا العصر- لا تمس كرامة الخلفاء البيئة فهذة كتاباتهم، وهذه كتبهم تنفي علنا السب عن الخلفاء وثني عليهم

The Imāmiyyah, of this era, do not target the probity of the Khulafā’ at all. Here are their writings and here are their books, they openly deny the denigration of the Khulafā’, in fact they praise them.¹

He further says:

> ومن من صرح بنفي السب محمد باقر أحد مشاهیر المجتهدین في کربلاء في منظومته المطبوعة في بمبي قال:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>عثمان والذي تولى أولاً</th>
<th>فلا نسب عمرا كلا ولا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>حكم به قضى الإمام الصادق</td>
<td>ومن تولى سبه ففاسق</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amongst those who have denied the denigration is one of the prominent Mujtahids of Karbalā’ Muhammad Bāqir. He says the following in his poetry which was published in Mumbai:

> We do not revile ʿUmar. Never. Nor ʿUthmān and the one who assumed the Khilāfah first.

> Whoever bears the onus of reviling them is an open sinner. This is a judgement passed by Imām al-Ṣādiq.

¹ *Al-Da’wah al-Islāmiyyah* 1/256-257.
Al-Khunayzī then adds:

ونحن أيم الله لا نسب
وعندنا فلا يحل السب

And according to us as well it is not permissible to revile. And by the oath of Allah we do not revile.

We also find that al-Khunayzī accords ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb the title ‘Amīr al-Mu’minīn’ and supplicates for him. Likewise he uses the title ‘Ummhāt al-Mu’minīn’ for ‘Ā’ishah and Ḥafṣah, and the title ‘Amīr al-Mu’minīn’ for Abū Bakr.¹

He also says:

إن جعفر الصادق يقول مفتخرا ولدني أبو بكر مرتين، لأن أمه أم فروة بنت القاسم بن محمد بن أبي بكر
وأمها بنت عبد الرحمن بن أبي بكر، فهي بكرية أما وأبا.

Ja’far al-Ṣādiq would say with pride, “Abū Bakr gave birth to me twice.” This is because his mother was Umm Farwah the daughter of al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr. And her mother was the daughter of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr. Hence she belonged to the pedigree of Abū Bakr both paternally and maternally.

He likewise says:

إن من قضاء جعفر الصادق فسق من سب الثلاثة

Among the verdicts of Ja’far al-Ṣādiq is that a person who reviles the three Khulafāʾ is an open sinner.²

Similarly, Aḥmad Mughniyah opines that the Shī‘ah extol the virtues of ‘Umar and pray for the pleasure of Allah to descend upon him. And to say that

1 Al-Daʿwah al-Islāmiyyah 1/8.
2 Ibid. 1/9.
the Shīʿah vilify ʿUmar, he says, is the most despicable of plots. He then reveals the reason for the existence of this attribution to the Shīʿah by saying:

إن المفرقین وجدوا في اتفاق الاسمین: عمر بن الخطاب الخلیفة العظیم، عمر بن سعد قاتل الحسین میدانا واسعا یتسابقون فی تشویه الحقيقة والدس على الشیعة بأحات أنواع الدس... وكان طبعا أن يكون لعنة اللعنات عمر بن سعد، لأنه بطل الجریمة وقائد المجرمین الجبناء، ومن من المسلمین لا يلعن عمر بن سعد قاتل ابن بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم.

In the course of this, the differentiators found very wide scope for excelling in distorting the reality and plotting against the Shīʿah in the most despicable of ways in the similarity of the names: ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb the great Khalīfah and ʿUmar ibn Saʿd the murderer of al-Ḥusayn. Naturally the one upon who immense curses should descend is ʿUmar ibn Saʿd due to him being the infamous hero of the crime and the commander of the cowardly perpetrators; for is there anyone among the Muslims who does not curse ʿUmar ibn Saʿd the murderer of the son of the daughter of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ?

These sinful differentiators exploited the word “ʿUmar” and claimed that the Shīʿah vilify the Khalīfah of Nabī ﷺ ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb ﷺ. And whilst I am raging at these plotters and people driven by worthless motives and objectives, I do not deny that in the past there were some people from the community of the Shīʿah and their laity who did not differentiate between these two names, instead they did not even know that in the history of Islam there lived two ʿUmars: the pious and the wretched.¹

Hence he feels that the similarity in names, the exploitation of the differentiating enemies of that and the existence of some ignorant Shīʿah in the past who did not

¹ Ahmad Mugniyyah: al-Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq p. 113-114.
differentiate between the two ʿUmars all were instrumental in the attribution of the denigration of ʿUmar to the Shīʿah. As for the books of the Shīʿah and their scholars, they have nothing to do with this accusation due to them seeing in him as the great and pure Khalīfah of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ.

Furthermore, a Shīʿī scholar of Iraq migrated to Egypt in order to propagate Shīʿism. For this purpose he opened a centre by the name ‘Jamʿiyyah Ahl al-Bayt’ and accorded himself the title ‘Imām of the Shīʿah in the republic of Egypt’, notwithstanding that Shīʿah had no presence in Egypt after the efforts of the great commander Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī. Nonetheless, he published a book with the title Taqdīr al-Imāmiyyah li al-Ṣaḥābah (the veneration of the Imāmiyyah for the Ṣaḥābah) and therein he rejects the attributing cursing, vilifying and excommunicating Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and those followed them to the Shīʿah.1

He says:

إن الشیعة لو کفرتهما لكفرت علیا، لأنه بایعهما، ولكفرت سلمان وعمارا لأنهما بایعوهما، بل إن سلمان تولى على المدائن لعمر. فكيف یتصور منه أن یلي لعمر لو كان يرى كفره.

The Shīʿah would be necessarily excommunicating ʿAlī if they excommunicated them due to him pledging his allegiance to them. Likewise they would be automatically excommunicating Salmān and ʿAmmār due to them pledging allegiance as well. In fact Salmān assumed the governance of Madāʾin for ʿUmar. Hence how can it be perceived that he accepted this position for ʿUmar if he considered him to be a disbeliever?2

He further says that the Shīʿah believe in the Qurʾān and that the Ṣaḥābah have been praised in the Qurʾān. He then presents verse no. 100 of Sūrah Tawbah and verse no. 29 of Sūrah al-Fatḥ as evidence. Thereafter, he presents some excerpts from Nahj al-Balāghah and al-Ṣaḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah wherein the virtues

---

1 Taqdīr al-Imāmiyyah li al-Ṣaḥābah p. 36.
of the Ṣaḥābah are mentioned.¹ He then goes on to present the statements of some of their contemporary scholars wherein they praise the Ṣaḥābah and draw evidence from the following statement of Bāqir al-Ṣadr:

The Ṣaḥābah, in terms of them being the first batch of believers and seekers of light, were the best and most capable seed for the emergence of a nation purely based upon revelation. To the extent that the history of humanity has not witnessed a generation based on doctrinal foundations better and nobler than the generation prepared by the great commanding Messenger.²

And finally he ends of his discussion by saying:

The person who attributes this (the denigration of the Ṣaḥābah) to the Shīʿah is one of two people: either he is an opponent who has sinister motives, or he is someone who did not come to learn of the dogma of the Shīʿah but from the books of their opponents without having any recourse to the books of the adherents of the dogma themselves.³

Likewise Muḥammad Jawwād Mugniyyah, the head of the Jāʿfarī tribunal, say in *Tafsīr al-Kāshif* that the Shīʿah do not denigrate the Ṣaḥābah, and in substantiation presents the following prayer (which is regarding the followers of the prophets) of ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn which appears in *al-Ṣaḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah*:

---

¹ Ibid. 39-42.
³ Ibid. 46-47.
O Allah! And the Companions of Muḥammad, especially those among them who were loyal in their companionship and strove passionately in supporting him. They parted with their spouses and children in order to uplift his message, and they fought against their fathers and sons in establishing his prophethood.\(^1\)

Commenting on this he says:

This prayer appears in al-Šāḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah which the Shīʿah hold in great esteem and every letter of which they sanctify.\(^2\) It is indeed an unequivocal refutation of those who claim that the Shīʿah belittle the status of the Ṣaḥābah.\(^3\)

Many other contemporaries have expressed similar positions on this topic.\(^4\)

---

1. Al-Šāḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah p. 43-44.
2. Ibn Taymiyyah has said that most of this alleged al-Šāḥīfah, which they attribute to 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn and every letter whereof they sanctify, are lies forged upon him. (Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/209).
4. Like Ḥusayn Yūsuf Makkī al-ʿĀmilī who says:

We do not allow anyone to revile them (Abū Bakr and 'Umar) nor to attack their integrity. We have similarly not issued a Fatwā of it being permissible to revile them. For they hold such high status as to be deserving of respect. And we are always desirous of strengthening the bonds of love and unity among the Muslims. (ʿAqīdah al-Shīʿah fī al-Imām al-Ṣādiq [Beirut: Dār Al-Andalus, first edition] p. 19. Also see p. 30 of the previous reference).

And Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshīf al-Ghiṭā’ says:

And the status of the noble Ṣaḥābah of Nabī is loftier than can be reached by the birds of assumptions. (Aṣl al-Shīʿah p. 113).
Analyses:

Has the stance of the contemporary Shīḥah changed regarding the Ṣaḥābah?

Is what was presented reality or is it just another manifestation of Taqiyyah and superfluous flattery?

We say to al-Khunayzī, Aḥmad Mugniyyah, al-Rifāʿī, Muḥammad Jawwād Mugniyyah, and all those who display their veneration for the Ṣaḥābah, do not vilify them, and supplicate for them that those are very pleasant words which shower on our hearts coolness and serenity. We are always open to this unifying and consolidating spirit among the Muslims, and thus our hearts are always open to every word which unites and does not divide. We express our jubilation at all those honest attempts which aim at eliminating all those blasphemies and dark records heaped against the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ.

But, at the same time, is al-Khunayzī and the others not aware that the present libraries of the Shīʿah have published books which are filled with the denigration, criticism, and excommunication of the noblest Companions of Nabī ﷺ? Why do they still assert that the Shīʿah of today do not revile and that they consider reviling Abū Bakr and ʿUmar ﷺ to be a sin?

Here we have before us a Shīʿī scholar Ḥusayn al-Khurāsānī who wrote the book al-Islām ʿalā Ḍawʾ al-Tashayyuʿ and gifted it to Dār al-Taqrīb in Cairo. Upon the jacket of the book it is stated that it has been translated in three languages: Arabic, Persian, and English and that it received the approbation of the Iranian ministry of education. In this book he mentions:

تجویز الشیعة لعن الشیخین أبي بكر وعمر وأتباعهما، فإنما فعلوا ذلك أسوة لرسول الله صلى الله علیه وسلم واقتفاء لأثره فإنهم ولا شك- مما يفتری- قد أصبحوا مطرودین من حضرة النبي- كذا- وملعونین من الله تعالى بواسطة سفیره

The Shīʿah have, in allowing the cursing of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and their followers, followed the precedent of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ and treaded his
For Indeed they were banished from the presence of the Prophet and were cursed by Allah via his Messenger.²

See how, not one of their laity, but one of their Āyāt openly proclaims that the position of Shī‘ah is cursing and excommunicating the two greatest individuals of this Ummah and the most virtuous of people after the Ambiyā‘; and that it is based upon the directive of Rasūl Allāh to his Ummah to follow him; and that they consider cursing them to be endorsed by Dīn and Sharī‘ah. So how can these scholars deny the existence of such denigration despite it containing emphatic curses and excommunication and being published in various languages?

Furthermore, I came across a supplication book of theirs which has been sanctioned by six of their scholars, each of who describe the book as ‘a great sign’, among them is al-Khū‘ī, Khomeini, and Sharī‘atmadārī. In this book is contained a supplication in Arabic which is two pages long and in it you will find curses upon Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and their daughters—the honourable mothers of the believers—‘Ā’ishah and Ḥafṣah. A portion of this supplication reads as follows:

اللهم العن صنمي قریش وجبتیها وطاغوتیها، وإفكیها، وابنتیهما الذین خالفا أمرك وأنكرا وحیك وجحدا
إعفوك وعصيا رسولك وقلبك دينك وحرفا كتابك وأحبا أعدائك وجحدا آلهتك-كذا- وعطلا أحكامك,
والنها في آياتك

O Allah curse the two people who were the idols of Quraysh, their devils and their lies. And (Curse) their daughters. They opposed Your command, rejected Your revelation, denied Your bounty, disobeyed Your Prophet, altered Your Dīn, distorted Your book, befriended Your enemies, rejected Your boons, destroyed Your injunctions and perpetrated blasphemies in your verses.³

---

1 Al-Islām ‘alā Ḍaw’ al-Tashayyu’ p. 88 (footnote).
2 Ibid. p. 88.
3 Manṣūr Ḥusayn: Tuhfah al-‘Awwām Maqbul p. 423-424. You can find the entire supplication in my book Fikrah al-Taqrīb under the addendum of documents.
This is how these scholars encourage every Shi'i upon the face of the earth to make this supplication and deem it an act of devotion before Allah in order to implant hatred and malice in his heart against the best generations of humans and their followers till the Day of Judgment; and in order to place as many obstacles and hindrances as they can in the way of mutual agreement and unity; And in order to assure that their falsity does not become exposed, which is why they continue to deceive themselves and others by claiming that they do not vilify and by saying “let’s unite and support each other”!

Thus the Shi'ah have not given up reviling and cursing the Sahaabah ⁹⁴. A group of their scholars still continue to proclaim this misguidance and in following them the commonality also continue to revile and excommunicate.

After having visited the lands of the Shi'ah in Iran and Iraq, and after having attended their gatherings and circles of learning which they form in their houses, Masjids and seminaries, and learning of what really happens in the real world of the Shi'ah, Shaykh Musa Jar Allah has revealed to us the following:

The first thing I heard and despised was the curses against al-Ṣiddīq, al-Fārūq, the Mothers of the Believers, ʿĀ’ishah and Ḥafṣah, and the all the people of the first century. I used to hear this in the beginning and the end of every sermon, gathering and circle. And I used to read this in the prefaces of books, in small booklets, and in the prayers offered upon all the visitations (of the tombs and shrines). Even where water was being served, a server would not serve but after cursing and a consumer would consume but with cursing. At the beginning of every activity and action is sending salutation upon Muḥammad and his household, and cursing Abū
Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān who usurped the right of 'Alī and wronged him. Hence cursing has become the most ‘well-known good’, which the lecturer enjoys, the listeners enjoy and with which the congregation is at ease.¹

This dark reality wherein curses and statements of excommunication flow from the tongues of those who love it, is not surprising regarding a person who has fed upon the hatred of the Ṣaḥābah from his very childhood, and who is taught that whatever difficulties he encounters are all because of them. This is further entrenched in him with the processions and plays which take place every year wherein the ‘oppression that the Ahl al-Bayt’ which they suffered at the hands of Ṣaḥābah, as they allege, is depicted. The author of *al-Washīʿah* has alluded to some of what he saw in this regard and thereafter concluded that these processions and plays are filled with inciting hatred and enmity;² in fact they are a locus for implanting ill feelings and dislike for the people of the best century and their followers.

This is not from the doings of their simpletons, but from that of their scholars and Āyāt who instigate their followers to do so and propel them to it by using different incentives. In this regard, the following question was posed to their scholar Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā':

ما يقول مولانا حجة الإسلام... في المواکب المشجیة التي اعتاد الجعفریون اتخاذها في العشر من المحرم تمثیلا لفاجعة الطف وإعلاما لما انتهك فیها من حرمة الرسول صلى الله علیه وسلم في عترته المجاهدين بالتمثیل للشهداء وجهادهم، وما جرى على الأطفال من القتل والقسوة، وباعلانهم الحزن لذلك بأنواعه من ندب، ونداء، وعویل، ویکاء، وضرب بالاکف على الصدور وبالسلاسل على الظهور.

فهل هذه الأعمال مباحة في الشرع أم ل أفتونا مأجورین

What is the view of our master, the evidence of Islam... regarding the sorrowful processions which the Jaʿfarīs routinely lead in the ten days of Muḥarram in order to: mimic the tragedy of Ṭaf (Karbalā’); to provide information regarding the sanctity of Rasūl Allāh which was desecrated by ill-treating his striving family and their efforts, and

1 Mūsā Jār Allāh: *al-Washīʿah* p. 27.
regarding the massacre and atrocities which befell them and their children; and to express their grief upon all that by mourning, shouting, screaming, wailing, and flagellating oneself with the hands upon the chest and with chains upon the backs. Are these actions permissible in Sharīʿah or not. Please give us a fatwā, may you be rewarded.

And he responded with the following:

And he considers this grave innovation, which is characteristic of the greatest falsehood, to be from the symbols of Allah. If this is the view of their eminent scholar then what do you think will be the view of those inferior to him? Notwithstanding that in it is contained: punishing oneself, killing, excommunicating the Muslims—specifically the Ṣaḥābah and their successors—wailing, slapping the cheeks, ascribing partners to Allah by calling on to the creation, etc., all of which are categorically known to be false in Islam.

Despite all of this, their scholar Muḥsin al-Amīn boasts that he established a gathering of condolences in Damascus which was attended by a large amount of people and was terminated with very effective and inductive slapping.

These actions which they perform every year in the month of Muḥarram have no other theme besides reviling the Ṣaḥābah and openly ascribing partners to Allah.

1 Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 32, 33.
2 Al-Āyāt al-Bayyīnāt p. 5.
3 Rasā’il al-Tanzīh li A’māl al-Shābīh p. 30.
Hence you will hear them chanting: “O Ḥusayn, O Ḥusayn”. And you will hear them showering curses upon the first generation in general and the first three Khulafā’ in specific. As a result, such hatred is implanted in their hearts which knows no bounds. It is for this reason that you will see their contemporaries writing about the alleged clash between the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah, they write about it as though it is occurring at this very moment and as though it is a danger which has engulfed the Ummah and threatens its existence.

Having said this, besides the aforementioned, there are other avenues and sources through which the Shīʿah incessantly revile the Ṣaḥābah and excommunicate them. And their scholars support them in this deviance and encourage them without any shortfall. Hence from among these current avenues and sources which do not give birth but to the colocynth plants and do not implant but disunity, hatred and ill feelings are the following:

Firstly, up to the present moment there is an active Shīʿī movement which aims at rediscovering the lost Shīʿī heritage, publishing it, and making it popular amidst the people. This heritage is filled with cursing, excommunicating, and dooming to hell the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār with whom Allah was pleased and who were happy with Allah, especially the three Khulafā’ and the remaining ‘Asharah Mubashshrah, with the exception of Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ʿAlī.¹

So how can it be claimed that the Shīʿah of today do not revile the Ṣaḥābah when they have revived those dark pages in a new form and spread them among their followers without any analyses or criticism?

Secondly, there still remains among their contemporaries a group of scholars which has dedicated itself to this falsehood. Hence their only concern in whatever they write and publish is to revile the men of the first generation and impugn them as though the Shīʿah of this time have no other concern. There are thus books dedicated to this topic which, in their crudeness and vulgarity, have surpassed what appears in their ancient books. For example, the book al-Ghadīr of

---

¹ Whereas indirectly Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn has also become a victim of many of those accusations, as is clear to one who contemplates over their texts.
their contemporary scholar ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn al-Amīnī al-Najafī. This book is filled with accusations, lies, and criticisms regarding those who were pleased with Allah and with whom Allah was pleased. And many of their scholars have written positive reviews on it.

His attack on the Ṣaḥābah and specifically on the rightly guided Khalīfah ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb attained the admiration of some of the enemies of the Ummah. So for example you will notice this in the words of Bolas Salāmah, a Christian poet, who this Shīʿī requested to write a review in the introduction of the seventh volume of his book. He thus wrote such words wherein he expresses his admiration and envy at what this liar drummed up against the Ummah and its Dīn. Just as he expresses his support for his inflammatory attack against the Fārūq of this Ummah and its great and guided Khalīfah ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb whose conquests and accomplishments in spreading Islam agonized the enemies of Islam and remained a source of their perturbation up to the present day.¹

¹ This Rāfiḍī commenced the seventh volume of his book with the remarks of this Christian. In response the latter wrote to him:

وقد شرفتموني بإدراج رسالتي في المقدمة. وقد اطلعت على هذا السفر النفیس فحسبت أن لل البحار قد اجتمعت في غدیرکم... ولقد لفت نظري على الأخص ما ذكرتموه بشأن الخليفة الثاني. فلله درکم ما أقوى حجتكم

You have honoured me by including my letter in the introduction. And I came to learn of this valuable book and it occurred to me that the pearls of al-Bīḥār (ocean) have gathered in your Ghadīr (pond)...

And what specifically caught my attention is what you have mentioned regarding the second Khalīfah. For Allah is your goodness, how strong are your proofs. (al-Ghadīr vol. 7: p. ح)

And this simple-minded Rāfiḍī, or rather this heretic who masquerades as a Muslim was misled by the praise of this disbeliever and thus returned his praise by saying the following regarding his letter:

أتانا من بحاثة المسیحیین القاضی الحر والشاعر النبیل الأستاذ بولس سلامة... الخالد الذکر فشكرا له ثم شكرنا

A letter has come to us from the research scholar of the Christians, the lofty judge and the noble poet, professor Bolas Salāmah... whose praise will remain forever. Thanks to him and thanks to him again. (Al-Ghadīr 7: p. ح).

See how this Rāfiḍī on the one hand virulently attacks the Ṣaḥābah with all sorts of flaws and criticisms and how on the other hand he praises the disbelievers and seeks to draw near to them. This has always been the way of the Shīʿah from the bygone eras.
Another example is the book *Abū Hurayrah* of their scholar ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn al-Mūsawī wherein he accuses the greatest narrator of Islam Abū Hurayrah with lying and hypocrisy, whereas at the same time he defends liars and fabricators like Jābir al-Juʿfī¹ and others.²

Likewise the book *al-Saqīfah* of their scholar Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar wherein he portrays the Ṣaḥābah as a group of people who have no aim but to conspire against Islam. So much so that he says:

مات النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم و ل بد أن يكون المسلمون كلهم (لا أدرى الن) قد انقلبوا على أعقابهم

*Nabī* passed away and all the Muslims necessarily (I don’t know of the present) turned back on their heels.³

And there are many other books of this nature.⁴

---

1 *Al-Murājaʿāt* p. 75.
2 Like Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, see *al-Murājaʿāt* p. 312, 313.
3 *Al-Saqīfah* p. 19. And he describes the senior Ṣaḥābah as conspirators against ʿAlī, see *al-Saqīfah* p. 85.
4 Like the book *al-Naṣṣ wa al-Ijtihād* of ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn al-Mūsawī. In this book he tries to provide an excuse for the Ṣaḥābah in their opposition of the emphatic appointment of ʿAlī, but in doing so he presents an excuse filled with deceit and evil. He claims that they believed in the principle of segregating religion from the state and thus they did not adhere to the appointment. This is an open lie the falsity whereof is exposed by the praise of Allah and his Rasūl for them, their piety, their asceticism and their striving...

Another book is *al-Imām al-Ṣādiq wa al-Madhāhib al-Arbaʿah* of Asad Ḥaydar wherein he denigrates the Khulafāʾ of the Muslims and forges lies against prominent scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah like Imām Aḥmad in order to support his dogma. He also discusses the alleged tragedies of the Ahl al-Bayt.

Similarly, another book is ʿAlī wa Munāwiʿūhu of Professor Nūrī Jaʿfar. In the book he concocts a clash between ʿAlī and the Ṣaḥābah and alleges that it was a clash akin to the one that existed between Nabī and the Quraysh. He then says:

وإذا كان النصر قد كتب للنبي في نزاعه مع مناويهم لاعتصامهم بالأوثان، فإن النصر لم يكن في منناج الإمام لتقمص مناويهم رداء الإسلام

And whilst victory was destined for *Nabī* in his struggle with his opponents due to them latching on to idols, victory was not achievable for the *Imām* due to his opponents disguising themselves with the garb of Islam. (∗ʿAlī wa Munāwiʿūhu* p. 12) continued ...
Thirdly, all those supplications which the Shīʿah repeat on a daily basis. They are not empty of curses against the best of this Ummah, its leaders, the beloveds of Rasūl Allāh سdeploy, his relatives in law, and some of his wives—the Mothers of the Believers. Their books which have been written recently on this topic are not unlike their ancient books, as you will find in the book Mafātīḥ al-Jīnān of the contemporary scholar ʿAbbās al-Qummī and Ḏiyāʾ al-Ṣāliḥīn of Muḥammad al-Jawharī, amongst others.

Having studied all of this, is there any room for any other interpretation of the denial of these deniers other than Taqiyyah and lying.

Is al-Khunayzī who claims that the Shīʿah do not revile thus unaware of what their early and contemporary scholars have written on this topic? Al-Khunayzī himself has perpetrated the crime of reviling the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ; he impugns Abū Bakr 1 and thereafter claims that the excommunication and denigration of the Ṣaḥābah which features in Uṣūl al-Kāfī is closely matched with what appears in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī.2 Indeed a claim which has no basis apart from the fact that he is just trying to look for some opening to justify their stance regarding the Ṣaḥābah. Had there really been in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī narrations similar to those found in Uṣūl al-Kāfī there would have been among the Ahl al-Sunnah those who would revile and excommunicate like the Shīʿah. But the man is desperate to prove his false belief in whichever way possible.

continued from page 1467

As you can see, their thinking has not changed from that of the heretics of the past even though the author holds a high qualification.

One of their strange publications is the book al-Rasūl al-Aʿḍham maʿ Khulāfāʾihī of their scholar Mahdī al-Qurashī. In this book the author depicts, according to his imaginations and beliefs what will happen to Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and the Ṣaḥābah on Judgement Day. He likewise concocts conversations and claims that they will take place between Nabī ﷺ and his Ṣaḥābah and in them he will take them to task regarding not pledging their allegiance to ʿAlī.

1 Al-Daʿwah al-Islāmiyyah 1/12.
2 Ibid. 1/5-14.
As for Shaykh ʿAḥmad Mugniyyah who avers that the Shīʿah curse ʿUmar ibn Saʿd and not ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb and that the confusion is due to the similarity in their names, is he unaware of the fact that ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb is a victim of curses and excommunication in the reliable books of the Shīʿah, at the forefront of which is al-Kāfī, al-Biḥār, Tafsīr al-Qummī, Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī, etc. as has passed already.¹

And has it slipped his attention that the Shīʿah of the present still follow this pattern deviating in it without realising, as we seen in the case of the authors of al-Ghadīr, al-Saqīfah and al-Islām ʿalā Ḍaw' al-Tashayyuu’?

In fact some of their scholars, who advocate Islamic unity are still steeped in this deviance and they still calumniate and utter these hurtful statements. Hence their scholar Muḥammad al-Khāliṣī, one of the senior authorities of the Shīʿah in Iraq and one of those who spearheads the calls for Islamic unity, creates suspicion and doubt regarding the īmān of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar; he says:

وإن قالوا إن أبابكر وعمر من أهل بیعة الرضوان الذین نص على الرضى عنهم القرآن في قوله   لَّقَدْ رَضَيَ اللَّهُ عَنِ الْمُؤْمِنِینَ إِذْ یُبَایِعُونَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ. قلنا لو أنه قال: لقد رضي عن الذین یبایعونك تحت الشجرة لكان في الآية دلالة على الرضى عن كل من بایع. ولكن لما قال: لقد رضي الله عن المؤمنین إذ يبایعونك فلا دلالة فيها إلا على الرضى عن محض الإیمان

And if they say that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar are from the people of Bayʿah al-Riḍwān and the Qurʾān has emphatically announced the pleasure of Allah for them in the verse: “Indeed Allah was pleased with the believers when pledged to you under the tree.”² We will say, “Had Allah said that he was pleased with all those who pledged to you under the tree, then the pleasure in the verse would be inclusive of all those who pledged. But the fact that he says, “Allah was pleased with the believers when they pledged to you, it only suggests being pleased with those who had pure īmān.”³

¹ See p. 723, onwards (add page number)
² Sūrah al-Fatḥ: p. 18.
³ Al-Khāliṣī: Iḥyāʿ al-Sharīʿah fī Madhhab al-Shīʿah 1/63-64.
This implies that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar were not from those who had pure īmān and thus the pleasure of Allah did not include them according to this Rāfiḍī. Can there be a greater ill understanding than the one proposed here, i.e. the description of the Ṣaḥābah with īmān being evidence of the best among them not having īmān?

There are many other Shī‘ah who are just like al-Khāliṣī in the present era.\(^1\)

So was all of this unknown to Aḥmad Mugniyyah, or he intended to deceive the Ahl al-Sunnah? Allah knows best of the reality. And Taqiyyah has always been the problem of the Shī‘ah.

As for al-Rifā‘ī who claims that the Shī‘ah revere the Ṣaḥābah and that whoever attributes otherwise to them is an opponent with evil intent, is it hidden from him that it is their books which attribute this position to them, and that it is their scholars like al-Kulaynī, al-Qummī, al-ʿAyyāshī, al-Majlisī, and others who have documented this shameful position, not any opponent with evil intent or a person who is unaware of what appears in their books?

Furthermore, al-Rifā‘ī himself has referred to the Bihār of al-Majlisī when writing his book Taqdīr al-Imāmiyyah li al-Ṣaḥābah;\(^2\) that Bihār which contains such denigration, cursing, and excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah that it causes the skin of the believers to shiver; that Bihār in which the author establishes a chapter with the title Chapter regarding the disbelief of the three,\(^3\) i.e. the three Khulafā‘ before ʿAlī. How can he then claim that the Shī‘ah revere the Ṣaḥābah? If he really believes in revering the Ṣaḥābah, he should propagate that in the circles of the Shī‘ah, not in Cairo. And he should strive to convince his Imāmī friends to change this problem which has pervaded all their books, or at least shun them and announce that they are baseless. As for rejecting that which exists, it does not serve any purpose in defending the Shī‘ī dogma due to it inevitably smacking

---

1 Shīhāb al-Dīn ak-Najafī: in his footnotes on Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq of al-Shustarī 2/ 291, and other sections.
2 See p. 15, 17, 19.
3 Bihār al-Anwār 2/208-252.
off the conclusion of Taqiqyah for the Shīʿah and for those non-Shīʿah who have access to their books.

Likewise this al-Rifāʿī, who writes his book Taqdīr al-Imāmiyyah li al-Ṣaḥābah amidst the Ahl al-Sunnah in Cairo and outwardly displays ignorance for what appears in their ancient and contemporary works and for what actually happens in the real world of the laity and learned of Shīʿah, himself reviles prominent Ṣaḥābah. Hence he says what he does not do and he denies what he knows. He accuses ʿUmar, the Fārūq of this Ummah of conspiring against Islam and of being the first person to hold the view of Rajʿah.\(^1\) He likewise denigrates Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and Abū ʿUbaydah.\(^2\)

What is further astonishing is that he draws evidence from the booklet al-Tashayyuʿ Zāhirah Ṭabīʿiyah fī Iṭār al-Daʿwah al-Islāmiyyah of Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr despite it being an unfruitful attempt to prove a legitimate foundation for the Rāfiḍī dogma. And despite it proposing the idea that the Ṣaḥābah were not eligible for carrying and conveying the message of Rasūl Allāh and his Sharīʿah, and that ʿAlī alone was eligible for bearing them and conveying them. This idea, aside from it impugning the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allāh, is a foolish and ignorant idea, or at least it is a spiteful one which endeavours to attack the pristine Sunnah and the Tawātur (mass transmission in all generations) of this Dīn. This idea proposes that the transmission of an individual is superior to the transmission of an entire group. This is in a way endorses the doctrine of the infallibility of the Imāms and the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah.

As for the alleged praise for the Ṣaḥābah which he quotes from the booklet of al-Ṣadr, it was actually said by al-Ṣadr in order to mislead the reader into accepting what he was to forge against them thereafter. Al-Rifāʿī thus very cunningly omits the opening and the end of his statement due to it debunking his substantiation therefrom. Hereunder is what al-Ṣadr says:

---


\(^2\) Ibid. p. 46.
Despite the Ṣaḥābah, in terms of them being the first generation of believers, being the best and the most capable seed for laying the foundation of a nation based on the message of Risālah... despite this, it is important to acknowledge that there was during the lifetime of Nabī a widespread notion which inclined toward giving credence to Ijtihād in ascertaining benefit and deducing it from the situations over rigidly following the religious text. It was owing to this that Nabī had to suffer much of its bitterness in many conditions.¹ Do you see any praise in this text? He claims that the Ṣaḥābah would give preference to Ijtihād despite the existence of emphatic religious texts; rather they would abandon the orders of Rasūl Allāh and would follow their own interests. Is this venerating the Ṣaḥābah? It is a well-established principle that it is not permissible to do Ijtihād in the presence of emphatic texts and that opposing Rasūl Allāh is a major crime. Allah says:

فَلْیَحْذَرِ الَّذِیْنَ یُخَالِفُوْنَ عَنْ أَمْرِهِ أَن تُصِیْبَهُمْ فِتْنَةٌ أَوْ یُصِیْبَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِیْمٌ

So let those beware who dissent from his [i.e., the Prophet’s] order lest fitnah strike them or a painful punishment.² All these claims of this Rāfiḍī are thus in order to support his false assertions, i.e. the assertion that ʿAlī was emphatically nominated as the successor and that the Ṣaḥābah shunned adhering to that due to their personal interest. But really, was there any benefit for them in pledging allegiance to Abū Bakr?  

¹ Al-Tashayyu’ p. 80.  
² Sūrah al-Nūr: 63.
This Rifā‘ī does not merely suffice on quoting from the booklet of al-Ṣadr, but he spreads the falsehood contained therein and adorns it with his supportive review. He then writes in another book that the Imāmiyyah revere the Ṣaḥābah. What reverence is this? Unless reverence according to them entails reviling, cursing and excommunicating.

How bold are these people in speaking lies!

As for Muḥammad Jawwād Mugniyyah who claims that the Shī‘ah do not disrespect the Ṣaḥābah and substantiates his claim with the verdict of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, to him I say that you people did not follow the advice dispensed by ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn. Because he, as you acknowledge and report from him, would invoke the mercy of Allah for the Ṣaḥābah, may Allah be pleased with them all; but you have not followed your Imām, nor did you prove to be true and consistent in your speech. This Mugniyyah who writes these words is the very same person who, in his book Fī Ẓilāl Nahj al-Balāghah, says the following regarding the guided Khalīfah Dhū al-Nūrayn, the generous, the modest, the son-in-law of Nabī due to marrying his two daughters, the one who prepared the Jaysh al-ʿUsrah (the army of poverty), the one who emigrated in both the emigrations, and the one who was given glad tidings of Jannah from Rasūl Allāh:

إن عثمان انحرف عن سنة الرسول وخالف شريعة الإسلام، واستأثر هو وذووه بأموال المسلمين فامتلكوا القصور والمزارع والرياش والخيل والعبيد والإماء ومن حولهم ملايين الجياع والمعدمين

Surely ʿUthmān deviated from the Sunnah of Rasūl and opposed the Sharī‘ah of Islam. He gave preference to himself and his associates in the wealth of the Muslims, hence they took possession of palaces, orchards, furniture, horses, slaves and concubines whilst around them were millions of hungry and impoverished people.¹

He also says:

¹ Fī Ẓilāl Nahj al-Balāghah 2/264.
And Zubayr, Ṭalḥah, and ʿĀ’ishah were behind what happened to ʿUthmān; upon them is the blame of his blood.¹

He also accuses ʿUmar and the members of the Shūrā to whom ʿUmar had accorded the prerogative of nominating the next Khalīfah after him of deception and conspiracy.²

Where is the respect for the status of the Ṣaḥābah when this speech which is filled with hatred is directed toward the best among them? And can Nabī be more offended than by offending him due to denigrating his wives, his relatives-in-law, and his prominent Companions?

After all of this, how do we interpret this glaring contradiction of the Shīʿah? Is it a result of Taqiyyah for Taqiyyah according to them constitutes nine tenths of Dīn, and a person who does not practice it has no Dīn, or is it all just a ploy to proselytise Shīʿism?

Before ending off this discussion, I shall endeavour to disclose some crucial realities and some hidden secrets regarding their praise for the Ṣaḥābah; they are of such a nature that a person who does not consistently study their works and does not ponder over their ways and terms will never be able to pick them up.

The Reality of the Praise of the Shīʿah for the Ṣaḥābah

These Shīʿah claim that they love the Ahl al-Bayt and are loyal to them but in reality only intend their Twelve Imāms. As for the others, especially those who revolted against the rulers in order to attain rulership, they disrespect them and even denigrate them, impugn them, and consider them doomed to Jahannam. In a like manner, they claim at times that they respect the Ṣaḥābah but they actually

---

¹ Ibid. 1/292-293.
² Ibid. 2/ 2-3.
only intend three, four or seven amongst them who did not turn renegade according to their fables.

A person who does not know this reality will probably be deceived by their words and will never think that they hold a specific meaning for the term ‘Ṣaḥābah’.

Then there is another meaning of the term ‘Ṣaḥābah’ according to them and this meaning appears in some of their narrations. After praising the Ṣaḥābah and instructing the Ummah to refer to their views and consensus, their narrations mention that Rasūl Allāh was asked, “Who are your Companions?” to which he responded, “My Ahl al-Bayt.” Hence they interpret the term ‘Ṣaḥābah’ to mean ‘Ahl al-Bayt’.

There is also another approach which they adopt when praising the Ṣaḥābah, and that is Taqiyyah. Their scholar al-Ṭūsī has alluded to this, he says the following after denigrating Umm al-Mu’mīnīn ʿĀ’ishah:

If it is said, “Has it not been narrated from Abū Ja’far Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Bāqir that when a questioner asked him regarding ʿĀ’ishah and her participation in that battle he sought forgiveness for her? And when the narrator asked him, ‘Do you seek forgiveness for her and associate with her?’ He replied in the affirmative and said, ‘Do you not know what she would say: ‘I wish I was a tree, I wish I was a piece of clay’.” [Al-Ṭūsī says,] There is no evidence in this against out dogma. Because we consider it possible for him to have practiced dissimulation. And likewise it is possible that the questioner was from the enemy owing to which

1 See p. 762 (add page number)
the Imām defended himself with this statement and narrated therein a narration under Taqīyah without speaking a lie. After all, he suspended her repentance upon her desire to be a tree and a piece of clay, and, as we have mentioned, that is not enough for repentance and he is more aware of that.¹

Therefore, it is the responsibility of those who claim that the Shī'ah venerate the Ṣaḥābah to openly mention the errant nature of these approaches, acknowledge the falsity of those evil narrations, speak the truth and not contradict themselves in order for their position to be accepted from them.

Furthermore, why do these people go about rejecting the claims of the Ahl al-Sunnah when they say that the position of the Shī'ah is to impugn the Ṣaḥābah and excommunicate them, but they do not refute themselves, their books, and their contemporary scholars who still blurt this deviance.

And what benefit remains today in cursing, reviling, and excommunicating the Ṣaḥābah, with which they have filled their books, their market places, and their shrines; when the first era has passed already with everything that it entailed? The only apparent reason is to attack the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, and the Dīn in general; and to instigate mayhem and disunite the Ummah.

And what remains of our history and our glories if that first generation of pious, selected, and loyal leaders who spread Islam, established its empire, conquered lands, guided the bondsmen, erected a civilisation unprecedented in the history of humanity, and spearheaded all efforts of goodness, justice, and virtue; deserve to be cursed by their successive generations, and if their history is distorted, whereas they are the people who Allah and His Rasūl have praised and their merits and accolades honest history has documented with ink of light. Is there anyone then who deserves praise and acknowledgement? And what would be our history and our glory if this is their condition?

¹ Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Istīfā' fī al-Imāmah* p. 288 (of the manuscript).
Discussion 6: ʿIṣmah (Infallibility)

What is new regarding the stance of the contemporary scholars in this regard is that they have adopted the view of their later scholars in claiming absolute infallibility for the Imāms, a view that represents the highest level of extremism due to it entailing that the Imāms do not falter and forget.

This specific view was treated by the Shīʿah of the fourth century as an extremist radical view. To the extent that their scholar Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, the author of *Man lā Yahḍuruhū al-Faqīh*, has stated that the sign of extremism is negating forgetfulness from the Imāms. He says:

إن الغلاة والمفوضة ینكرون سهو النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم

The extremist and the consigners do not believe in the forgetting of Nabī.

Hence, likewise will be the case of those who negate forgetfulness from the Imāms.

Their scholar al-Majlisī concedes that many of their narrations indicate to the fact that their Imāms would at times forget. But their later scholars did not worry about that and unanimously opposed it by believing that the Imāms are free from forgetfulness. It is for this reason that al-Majlisī admits that this is a very contentious issue; i.e. he realised that many of his friends agreed upon opposing their copious narrations in this regard.

The contemporaries have treaded the path of the later scholars in opposing the narrations of the Shīʿah and what their senior scholars have said. We thus find one of their cotemporary scholars ʿAbd Allah al-Mamaqānī, also known as

---

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/351.
3 Ibid.
al-Āyah al-ʿUdhmā (the greatest sign) emphasising that rejecting the infallibility of the Imāms is to reject a categorically established aspect of the Shīʿī dogma.\(^1\) Surprisingly, he does not deny the fact that amongst their early scholars there were those who considered this to be extreme, but he comments:

إن ما يعتبر غلوا في الماضي أصبح اليوم من ضرورات المذهب

That which was considered to be extreme in the past has become an incontrovertible aspect of the dogma.\(^2\)

This view that the Imāms are infallible is repeatedly emphasised by their scholars. Hence al-Muẓaffar considers it to be a firmly established principle of the Imāmiyyah without even hinting to any dispute amongst the Shīʿah regarding it.\(^3\) Al-Khunayzī, in his book al-Daʿwah al-Islāmiyyah ilā Waḥdah Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Imāmiyyah, emphasises upon it without any Taqiyyah;\(^4\) and Khomeini, in his book al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah, negates even the possibility of the Imāms forgetting.\(^5\)

Where on the one hand the claim of infallibility for the Imāms equates them to Rasūl Allah in their verdicts and actions,

وَمَا يَنطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّ وَحْيٌ یُوْحَىٰ

By the star when it descends, your companion [i.e., Muhammad] has not strayed, nor has he erred.\(^6\)

On the other hand the claim that they do not forget/err or that it is inconceivable for them to forget/err is equivalent to deifying them. This is clearly understood from the following statement of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī:

---

2 Ibid.
3 'Aqāʿid al-Imāmiyyah p. 95.
4 Al-Daʿwah al-Islāmiyyah 1/92.
5 Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah p. 91.
6 Sūrah al-Najm: 2.
Allah made his Nabī forget so that it becomes known that he was a created human and thus is not thereafter treated as a deity besides Allah.¹

Furthermore, Ibn Bābawayh and other scholars of the fourth century considered the rejection of these narrations, i.e. the narrations of the forgetting of Nabī Ṣallallāhu ʿAlayhi wa Sallam, to amount to nullifying the Dīn and the Sharīʿah completely. Ibn Bābawayh says:

If it is possible to reject narrations with such content it would likewise be possible to reject all the narrations. And in rejecting them is the nullification of Dīn and the Sharīʿah. I am hopeful of reward in writing an exclusive book on the forgetfulness of Nabī Ṣallallāhu ʿAlayhi wa Sallam and so am I hopeful of reward in rebutting the claims of those who deny it, if Allah wills.²

However, the later scholars and the contemporary scholars did not pay any heed to the view of Ibn Bābawayh. They likewise did not pay heed to his denial of their erroneous belief of interpolation and to any view or voice which opposed what the scholars of the Safawid Empire agreed upon.

The contemporary scholars have, as represented by al-Mamaqānī, considered the denial of forgetfulness from Nabī Ṣallallāhu ʿAlayhi wa Sallam to be an integral aspect of the Shiʿī dogma. And their scholar Muḥsin al-Amīn has affirmed that whoever denies a categorical aspect of the Shiʿī dogma is a disbeliever according to them.³

---

¹ Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh 1/234.
² Biḥār al-Anwār 17/111.
³ Muḥsin al-Amīn: Kashf al-ʾIrṭiyāb: the 2nd introduction. This is also established in their book Muhadhdhab al-Aḥkām 1/388-393.
This necessarily implies that their later scholars excommunicate their earlier scholars due to them denying a categorical aspect of the Shi‘ī dogma. Just as it implies that the later scholars are victims of the curses of their early scholars due to them adopting the viewpoint of the extremist Mufawiḍah who were cursed by the Imāms.

Not only that, in the books which they publish and direct to the lands of the Ahl al-Sunnah we find\(^1\) that the belief that the Imāms are infallible is the view of all the Shi‘ah.\(^2\) And surprisingly, in other books of the Shi‘ah we find the view that the Shi‘ah unanimously concur on rejecting the infallibility of the Imāms,\(^3\) and that rejecting it is a categorically established aspect of the Shi‘ī dogma.\(^4\)

So who do we believe and who is actually representing the Shi‘ī dogma?

This is how the Shi‘ah excommunicate each other and contradict each other; each one claims that what he says is the official viewpoint of the cult.

\(^1\) Like in the writings of Muḥammad Jawwād Mugniyyah wherein we find that he has ‘freed himself’ from much of the extremism of the Shi‘ah and their fanaticism. But these books are spread in the lands of the Ahl al-Sunnah and thus the possibility of Taqiyyah still stands.


\(^3\) Muḥammad Āṣif al-Muḥsinī: Ṣirāṭ al-Ḥaqq 3/121.

\(^4\) As has been presented already i.e. the view of al-Mamaqānī in Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl.
Discussion 7: Rajʿah (the return)

What is new in the position of the contemporaries regarding Rajʿah is the emergence of a group of scholars amongst them who claim that there is no basis to the doctrine of Rajʿah, specifically those who outwardly spearhead the call for unity and building common understanding between the Shīʿah and the Ahl al-Sunnah. This group asserts the following:

The viewpoint of the research scholars in this regard is that there is no Rajʿah, with the exception of the emergence of the Twelfth Imām.

Whilst on the other hand there is another camp which does not deny it but avers that the issue of Rajʿah is not a core belief of their dogma; it is not a categorically established aspect thereof; it is not part of their beliefs; and it is not of any importance to them, even though mention of it appears in their narrations. Hāshim al-Ḥusaynī says:

Rajʿah is not from the beliefs of the Imāmiyyah, nor is it from their categorically established beliefs.

And Muḥammad Ḫusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ says:

And Al-Khunayzī: al-Daʿwah al-Islāmiyyah ilā Waḥdah Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Imāmiyyah 2/94.


---

1 Rajʿah: The Shīʿī belief that Allah will return, at the emergence of the Twelfth Imām, the Prophet, the other Imāms, a group of loyal Shīʿah—so that they may witness and testify to his Imāmah—and also a number of supposed enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt in order to take revenge from them. [translator]
2 Al-Khunayzī: al-Daʿwah al-Islāmiyyah ilā Waḥdah Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Imāmiyyah 2/94.
Believing in Raj’ah is not compulsory in the Shī‘ī dogma, and denying it is not detrimental even though it is categorically established.¹

He also says:

وليس لها (یعني) الرجعة عندي من الاهتمام قادر صغير أو كبير

And Raj’ah has no importance in my sight, not a little and not a lot.²

Probably the reader will pick up the contradiction in the aforementioned; and probably this contradiction is intended to suggest the possibility of Taqiyyah, as is their wont in circumlocuting in their speech; For how can it be categorically established despite belief in it not being compulsory, denying it not being detrimental, and despite it not having any importance, notwithstanding that the one who denies a categorically established aspect of their dogma is a disbeliever according to their scholars.³

Similar is the contradiction in the approach of Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar. He says:

إن الرجعة ليست من الأصول التي يجب الاعتقاد بها والنظر فيها

Raj’ah is not from the core beliefs in a manner that believing in it and deliberating over it is compulsory.⁴

Whereas on the other hand he says:

إن الرجعة من الأمور الضرورية فيما جاء عن آل البيت من الأخبار المتواترة

1 Aṣl al-Shī‘ah p. 35.
2 Ibid. p. 36.
4 ʿAqāʾid al-Imāmiyyah p. 113.
Raj’ah if from the categorically established aspects as it has been widely transmitted from the Ahl al-Bayt.¹

This is what the contemporaries have to say regarding Raj’ah: a group amongst them deny it; a group considers it to be secondary; and a group contradicts itself when mentioning their position regarding it; each one surprisingly claiming that what it says is the correct representation of Shī‘ī dogma. So whose view should we accept? Despite each one of them consisting of senior scholars of the Twelvers, and despite them all belonging to the same era you find such discrepancies and contradictions in their views. Is this all a result of them practicing Taqiyyah due to learning that some scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah consider Raj’ah to be an extremist tendency? Which is why probably their scholar al-Muẓaffar says:

إن الإعتقاد بالرجعة من أكبر من تنبز به الشيعة الإمامية ويشنع عليهم

Belief in Raj'ah is the greatest problem for which the Imāmiyyah are criticized and condemned.²

And whatever is as contentious as that, obviously Taqiyyah will be deployed when discussing it.

The books wherefrom these quotes were presented are all Shī‘ī books which have been written to target the Ahl al-Sunnah, as is obvious from their introductions, their approach, and their style in presenting the Shī‘ī beliefs.

However, you will find contemporary books of some of their scholars which still go to the extent of believing in Raj’ah and consider the rejecter thereof not to be a believer. Consider the following:

تضافرت الأخبار (يعني أخبارهم) ليس منا من لم يؤمن برجعتنا

1 Ibid. p. 113.
2 Ibid. p. 110.
The narrations jointly establish: He who does not believe in our Rajʿah is not from amongst us.¹

إن ثبوت الرجعة مما اجتمعت عليه الشيعة الحقة والفرقة المحقة بل هي من ضرورات مذهبهم

The true Shīʿah and the rightful sect is unanimous upon the validity of Rajʿah. In fact it is from the categorically established aspects of their dogma.²

ومنكرها خارج من رتبة المؤمنين فإنها من ضرورات مذهب الأئمة الطاهرين

The one who rejects it is excluded from the position of the believers, for it is a categorically established belief in the dogma of the Imāms.³

Likewise al-Zanjānī says the following in his book ‘Aqāʾid al-Ithnay Ashariyyah:

إن اعتقادي... واعتقاد علماء الثني عشریة قدس الله أسرارهم من أن الله تعالى یعید عند ظهور الإمام الثانی عشر جماعة من الشیعة إلى الدنيا لیفوزوا بثواب نصرته ومشاهدة دولته. ویعید جماعة من الظلمة والغاصبين والظالمین لحق آل محمد علیهم السلام لینتقم منهم.

My belief... and the belief of the Twelver scholars is that Allah will return, at the emergence of the Twelfth Imām, a group of Shīʿah to the world so that they may attain the reward of aiding him and witnessing his empire. He will also return a group from the oppressors and the usurpers of the right of the Ahl al-Bayt in order to take revenge from them.⁴

He also says:

وظني أن من يشك في أمثالها فهو شك في أئمة الدين

4 Ibid. 239.
And my assumption is that the one who doubts something like it, actually doubts the Imāms of the dogma.¹

Nonetheless, how do we interpret this contradiction? Have they really differed so drastically on this issue, or have they made everything permissible with the belief of Taqīyyah? If we have to take everything literally we will reach the following conclusion: A group among them has freed itself from following the legacy and has rebelled against their fables despite the claims of them being widely transmitted and well established. The voice of this group, however, is suppressed and its effect is obliterated due to the dangerous belief of Taqīyyah. No reformer can ever make any impact upon this cult as long as Taqīyyah remains an integral part of its beliefs. As a result their dogma will be based on the views of the extremist, not upon the views of the balanced scholars, and with that upon the views of their scholars not upon the legacy of the Imāms.

Having said this, up to the present moment the various fictitious incidents which their fables foretell still repeatedly feature in their speeches. And aside from their fictitious nature, they smack off hidden emotions, defeated feelings, and suppressed hatred against this Ummah. A Shi‘ī listens to these fictitious scenes of massacre which will play out in the alleged Raj‘ah with extreme interest. Which is why he consistently prays to be part of this return in which the promised revenge will take place.²

---

¹ Ibid. 240.
² As you will find in the supplication which they term ‘the supplication of ‘Ahd’. It reads as follows:

اللهم إن حال بني وبيته الموت الذي جعلته على عبادك حتما مقضیا فأخرجني من قبري مؤتزرا کفني شاهرا سیفي مجردا قناتي ملبیا دعوة الداعی فی الحاضر والبادی.

O Allah! If death, which you made an inevitable decree against your servants, becomes an obstacle between me and him, then take me out of my grave in a condition that I will adorn my winding sheet, unsheathe my sword, remove my spear and respond to the call of the caller, whether he be from the city or from the village.

(Al-Zanjānī: ‘Aqā‘īd al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnay ʿAshariyyah p. 236. The author has considered this supplication a proof for the validity of Raj‘ah)
Hence, despite the passage of centuries and the development of time, the sentiments of the contemporaries have not changed in this regard. Read the response one of their scholars gives regarding what will happen to the two rightful successors of Rasūl Allah, his beloveds and his relatives-in-law, Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, in the alleged Rajʿah:

As for the issue of exhuming the graves of the two Companions of Rasūl Allah, removing them from them fresh and alive, crucifying them upon a plank, and burning them due to them being responsible for all the oppression, crimes and evils from the time of Ādam till the Day of Judgment, it is indeed a very complex issue. And I do not have anything that can eliminate this objection. And it has been authentically proven from our Imāms that our narrations are difficult and very complex.

Can a person ever conceive that these type of myths find their way to such a scholar who has reached the level of the ‘grand Āyat’ and then too he does not take the courage to refute them and considers them to be very complex and difficult and resorts to another myth to answer them, and that is that their religion is difficult and very complex.

Without a doubt this difficult and complex religion can never be Islām. Because it opposes sound human disposition and can never be accepted by sound intellect due to it going against core fundamentals.

In conclusion, we say that the Shīʿah are still steeped in the myth of Rajʿah and whatever entails.
Has any considerable change occurred in the viewpoint of the contemporaries regarding Taqiyyah (subterfuge) which could be worth documentation? Or has it not changed from what we have mentioned regarding their predecessors and from what features in their reliable books?

One of their contemporary scholars has said:

إن الأمر قد تغير... وإنه لا تقية اليوم عند الشيعة... لأن الشيعة إنما التزمت بالتقية بسبب الظلم والواقع عليها في العصور البائدة، أما وقد ارتفع الظلم فلا تقية ولا كذب ولانفاق، بل صدق وصراحة ووضوح

Things have changed... There is no Taqiyyah today according to the Shī‘ah... Because the Shī‘ah only practiced Taqiyyah due to the oppression which was met out on them in the previous centuries. As for today, when oppression is alleviated, there is no Taqiyyah, lying or hypocrisy. Rather there should be truthfulness, transparency, and clarity.

Muḥammad Jawwād al-Mugniyah says the following:

إن التقية كانت عند الشيعة حيث كان العهد البائد عهد الضغط والطغيان، أما اليوم حيث لا تعرض للظلم في الجهر بالتشيع فقد أصبحت التقية خبر ما كان

Taqiyyah according to the Shī‘ah was practiced due to the past era being pervaded by suppression and oppression. As for today, when there is no fear of oppression in openly proclaiming Shī‘ism, Taqiyyah has become a phenomenon of the past.¹

He also says:

قال لي بعض أساتذة الفلسفة في مصر: أنتم الشيعة تقولون بالتقية... فقلت له: لعن الله من أحوجنا إليها. إذا تذهب الآن أن يشته من بلاد الشيعة فلا تجد لتقنية عينا ولا أثرا، ولو كانت دينًا ومذهبًا في كل حال لحافظوا عليها محافظتهم على تعليم الدين ومبادئ الشريعة

One of the teachers of philosophy in Egypt said to me, “You Shīʿah believe in Taqiyyah...” so I said to him, “May Allah curse those who compelled us to deploy it. Go now to wherever you want in the lands of the Shīʿah and you will not find any existence or effect of Taqiyyah. Had it been a religious practice they would have safeguarded it just as they safeguarded the other teachings of Dīn and principles of Sharīʿah.”

Similar are the views of their other contemporary scholars who are described as Marājiʿ (authorities) and Āyāt (signs of Allah); they all aver that Taqiyyah is only deployed at the time of need, i.e. when fear of death, loss of wealth, and desecration of honour is impending. They also say that this is not specific to the Shīʿah, but it only became the distinctive characteristic of the Shīʿah due to them repeatedly being victims of oppression.

So, is what these scholars say fact? Or is Taqiyyah being practiced to defend Taqiyyah, and to conceal their dogma as long as their reality can potentially be divulged and their dogma exposed before the Muslims? Let us delve into the reality of the matter and investigate the veracity of their claims...

Even if we agree with them that Taqiyyah has completely vanished from their circles and that the Shīʿah no more have any secret to conceal and any belief wherein the need for Taqiyyah exists, and as a result they openly proclaim whatever they believe before the Muslims with clarity and transparency. We will still say that the effects of Taqiyyah have not come to an end, and that their scholars still practice Taqiyyah to some extent regarding some of their traditions. This is the biggest problem and the gravest sickness which cannot be easily picked up by those who are unaware of their classical works.

1 Al-Shīʿah fi al-Mīzān p. 52.
To elaborate, this problem represents itself in the fact that the practice of Taqīyyah has made it virtually impossible for the Shī’ah to benefit from those narrations in their classical works which are in harmony with what the Muslims believe and which oppose their anomalous views and doctrines... This is so because you will not find a single stance of the Shī’ah in which they have parted with the Muslims but that you will find some narrations in their legacy which contradict it. The manner in which a Shī’ī scholar deals with these narrations (which go against his anomalies and agree with what the Muslims believe) is that he asserts that they were said by the Imām by way of Taqīyyah.

Their contemporary scholars have not differed at all with this approach of their early scholars. You will, therefore, find that one of their core principles, as is established in their early works and contemporary works, is taking the view which opposes the commonality, i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah. They apply this principle when they find contradictory narrations in their books by asserting that the narrations which are in agreement with the Ahl al-Sunnah are to be understood in light of Taqīyyah.

Considering the fact that their narrations are contradictory and that on every topic of belief and practice there are narrations which are in harmony with what the Muslims have, we will realise the gravity of the belief of Taqīyyah and its evil consequences in keeping the Muslims disunited. We do not claim that there are contradictions in narrations, rather it is a reality which their scholars concede. To the extent that al-Ṭūsī has acknowledged that there is barely a narration which is not contradicted by another.¹

This is the acknowledgement of al-Ṭūsī who is the author of two of their four canonical works in ḥadīth and two of their four classical works on transmitter biographies.

In all those narrations wherein there is contradiction, al-Ṭūsī could not muster any answer which could save him and his Shī’ah friends save the answer (that all

---

¹ Tahdhib al-Aḥkām 1/2.
those narrations which are in harmony with the Muslim-majority and against their anomalies) that they were said by way of Taqiyyah. This is clearly observable in many examples in his books *al-Tahdhīb* and *al-Istibšār*.¹

From the above it is clear that Taqiyyah is deployed in order to refute established narrations, find an opening for extremism; and keep disunity in the Ummah. How can it then be claimed that Taqiyyah no more exists today when the scholars inevitably practice upon it when discarding narrations?²

Furthermore, just as the doctrine of Taqiyyah became an obstacle from the Shīʿah benefitting from those narrations of their legacy which are in conformance with the majority of the Muslims, it likewise prevented the voice of any intelligent and balanced person rising among them from having any impact or benefit.

Probably those who invented this belief wanted that the Shīʿah to always remain such that they find it difficult to reform and realise the truth. This is not just a theoretical statement which is not supported by reality, rather the reality of the Shīʿah attests to this. For example, the greatest blasphemy of the Shīʿah and its most contentious issue is the erroneous belief of omission and interpolation taking place in the Qurʾān; a belief that has permeated their dogma and found its place in their major books. When scholars amongst the Shīʿah, like al-Murtaḍā, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, and al-Ṭabarsī disproved it and asserted that the Shīʿī dogma has nothing to do with it, their later scholars like Niʿmat Allāh al-Jazāʾirī and al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī interpreted their denial as Taqiyyah.³

¹ See: *al-Istibšār* 1/60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, onwards.

² Gathering the scattered narrations from their books which oppose their anomalies (and which they interpret with Taqiyyah) is a very beneficial work in this era, and some scholars of India and Pakistan have started this initiative. See for example: ‘Abd al-Sattār al-Tonsawī: *Manāqib al-Khulafāʾ al-Arbaʿah fi Muʿallfāt al-Shīʿah*. Probably the first person to start this was Shāh ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz in his book *Tuhfah Ithnay ʿAshariyyah*.

³ See: p. 377 of this book.
Considering the fact that they deploy Taqiyyah all the time in order to suppress the truth and nullify it, can it then be claimed that it has ended in the Shīṭī dogma? Likewise, when their scholar al-Ṭūsī started to write his exegesis and endeavoured therein to evade the esoteric interpretive tendency of the Bāṭiniyyah and inclined towards benefitting from the reports of the Salaf (pious predecessors), their scholars interpreted his enterprise as Taqiyyah.¹

As you have noticed, this belief has become a destructive measure which the extremist Shī‘ah deploy in order to keep the Shī‘ah within the confines of extremism and at variance with the Muslim majority or with Islam itself. Can it still be claimed that the era of Taqiyyah has ended when its poisonous effects have permeated the very core of the dogma and destroyed it from within?

If in this age where Kufr is reigning supreme and the might of the Muslims has dwindled, the Shī‘ah aver that there is no need for Taqiyyah, then in which age did the Shī‘ah really hold on to the principle of Taqiyyah? They consider the era of the three Khulafā’ and the golden age of Islam to be the era of Taqiyyah. This implies that they consider the condition of the Muslims in our times to have improved from what it was during the reign of the rightful Khulafā’. Hence their scholar al-Mufīd asserts that ʿAlī lived in the era of the three Khulafā’ with Taqiyyah and displaying outward agreement; he draws a parable and says that his condition at that time was like the condition of Rasūl Allah when he was amidst the polytheists in Makkah before migration.² This implies that he considers the Ṣaḥābah who were alive during the Khilāfah Rāshidah (righteous reign) equal to the polytheists by whose side Nabī lived in Makkah. Thus the relationship of ʿAlī with them was like the relationship of Rasūl Allah with the polytheists.

The conclusion is thus the following: the time in which the might of the Muslims is dwindling is the time of the glory of the Shī‘ah and their freedom, because

---

¹ See: p. 264 - 265 of this book.
² Refer back to p. 61 - 62.
their religion is different from the religion of the Ṣaḥābah (the generation which received its Dīn directly from Nabī, regarding whose time Nabī gave testimony of goodness, and the with whom Allah was pleased and who was pleased with Allah) their era according to this cult which has distanced its people from the straight path was the era of Taqiyyah and their generation a generation of disbelief. When these devious cults were gripped by confusion due to the many actions and sayings of Amīr al-Mu’minīn ʿAlī opposing their views and ideas during his own reign, they found no other solution but to consider the era of his reign an era of Taqiyyah as well. Their scholar Ni’mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī, who is described as ‘the authoritative master and the reliable pillar’, says the following:

And when Amīr al-Mu’minin sat he was unable to bring to the fore that Qur’ān and hide this one due to it entailing the victory of the Shī’ah upon those who preceded them. He likewise did not manage to ban the forenoon prayer, officially instate Mut’ah with women, and dismiss Shurayḥ from presiding over the judiciary, and Mu’āwiyah from leadership.\(^1\)

This is how they distort those facts which allude the true religion of ʿAlī by claiming that they were all based on Taqiyyah. Was there really any need for practicing Taqiyyah at that time, especially when the issue at hand was pertaining to the very basis of this Dīn, the Qur’ān? And was there any need for practicing Taqiyyah during the mighty days of Islam and the Muslims? Again, how can it then be claimed that the era of Taqiyyah has ended when the dogma of the Shī’ah is based upon it and when the scholars of the Shī’ah are steering the ship of Shī’ism to ruination with the flag of Taqiyyah.

---

1 i.e. he sat upon the throne of Khilāfah.
2 This refers to the Qur’ān which with their awaited absent Imām, as they allege. See p. 346, onwards and p. 1180.
Furthermore, the one who ponders over their texts will learn that Taqiyyah is not only a measure deployed at the time of need. Rather it is abused and misused to lie, deceive, make the permissible impermissible and vice versa. So much so that their narrations state that the Imāms would practice it in gatherings where there would be no one to fear and where there would be not the slightest reason for it permissibility, as has passed already.¹

Hence, Taqiyyah still continues to leave its effects upon the Shīʿī dogma; it was deployed in the past not due to any necessity, but intentionally and happily; it was deployed in a purely Shīʿī environment; and owing to it the Qurʾān was explained in unprecedented ways, so much so that the Imām would interpret one verse of the Qurʾān in three different ways in one gathering, each one different from the next, and that is all considered to be due to Taqiyyah,² despite it being impossible to perceive that Taqiyyah was needed when interpreting the Qurʾān during the mighty days of Islam and the Muslims. The conclusion is clear: Taqiyyah was not deployed at the time of need only, nor has its effects ended in the Shīʿī dogma.

This is further emphasised by their contemporary scholar Muḥammad Şādiq al-Rūḥānī, also known as al-Āyah al-ʿUdhmā (the greatest sign). He categorises Taqiyyah into four types (suggesting that there are other reasons other than necessity to practice Taqiyyah):

التقیة الخوفیة، والتقیة الإکراهیة، والتقیة الكتمانیة، والتقیة المداراتیة

Taqiyyah due to fear, due to coercion, with the intent of concealing, and with the intent of affability.³

Hence these people who claim that the Shīʿah only practice Taqiyyah at the time of need, their claim is only true regarding Taqiyyah due to fear and Taqiyyah due

---

¹ Refer to the chapter of Taqiyyah in this book: p. 1085, onwards.
² Refer to p. 1096 of this book.
to coercion. But it is not true regarding Taqīyyah with the intent of concealing and Taqīyyah with the intent of affability. This suggests that Taqīyyah is still deployed according to the Shīʿah; for its scope is wider than just necessity and fear. They have used Taqīyyah as a pretext to make lying, deceiving, and fabricating permissible, as will be illustrated ahead.

Having said all of this, in the authoritative books of the Shīʿah there are narrations which emphasise that, unless the Mahdī emerges, under no circumstances will it be permissible to give up Taqīyyah; the one who abandons it during the era of occultation is equal to a discarer of ʿṣalāh, rather a person who discards it, according to them, has parted with the dogma of the Imāmiyyah.

How can Mughniyah then claim that the era of Taqīyyah has ended? Is he unaware of the reality of his dogma?

Their reliable books document the following narration:

فمن ترك التقیة قبل خروج قاپینا فليس منا

He who leaves Taqīyyah before the emergence of our Imām is not from amongst us.¹

Similarly, their senior scholar and Āyat in this age Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr asserts that their narrations, in their abundance, have reached the extent of being widely transmitted and even the extent of Tawātur (such diffuse transmission as cannot be rejected).² He motivates that leaving Taqīyyah before the emergence would:

إلى بطء وجود العدد الكافي من المخلصين الممحصين، الذين يشكل وجودهم أحد الشرائط الأساسية للظهور

² Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Kubrā p. 353.
Lead to impeding the realisation of a sufficient amount of sincere and purified individuals whose existence represents one of the conditions for the emergence
text (of the Mahdi).

Their narrations also equate Taqiyyah to nine tenths of Dīn and they also class a person who does not practice Taqiyyah as one bereft of īmān, without any exception of any time.

The question is: Is Mughniyah and the other scholars of the Shīʿah unaware of all these realities owing to which they claim that the era of Taqiyyah has ended and that Taqiyyah is not part of their religion? I believe that after reading the aforementioned texts of the Shīʿah you will reach the same conclusion that professor Maḥmūd al-Mal Allāh reached:

إن قول معنیة: انتهى عهد التقیة اليوم عند الشیعة إنما هو تقیة على تقیة

The statement of Mughniyah that the era of Taqiyyah has ended today according to the Shīʿah is merely practicing Taqiyyah upon Taqiyyah.

Likewise in al-Wāfī, which is a compilation of the four early canonical works of the Shīʿah, the following texts appears:

یرتغی لا تظهروا للناس ما نكتمه عنهم ولا تقولوا لهم إن سرنا غير موافق لعلانیتنا، وإننا نكتم عنهم غير ما نظهر لهم، ونظهر غير ما ننكرم. فإن ذلك مفوت لمصلحة التقیة التي بها بقاونا وبقاء أمرنا. بل كونوا على ما نحن عليهなければ ما نقول، صامتين عما نصمت موافقين لنا غير مخالفين عن أمرنا

i.e. Do not disclose before people what we hide from them. Our secret is not in harmony with our external. For what we hide from them is different

---

1 Ibid. 253-254.
2 See p. 1089 of this book.
3 A contemporary Iraqi scholar who took up the task of combatting the conspiracies of the Shīʿah in Iraq which they were executing under the pretext of ‘Islāmic unity’. He done so by writing in the newspaper al-Sijil and by writing booklets in this regard. One of his books is al-Waḥdah al-Islāmiyyah bayn al-Akhdh wa al-Radd.
4 Majmūʿ al-Sunnah 1/111.
from what we reveal to them and what we reveal to them is different from what we hide from them. Doing otherwise is losing the benefit of Taqiyyah upon which is based our existence and the existence of the Shī'ah. Thus remain on what we are, say what we say, remain silent where we remain silent, agree with us and do not oppose us in our matter.1

It is as though he is saying, in the style of Mughniyah, ‘Don’t say to the people that the era of Taqiyyah still remains and that our internal is different from our external; for that will destroy the benefit of Taqiyyah.’

Realistically, should we expect Mughniyah to say that Taqiyyah is still practiced and we deal with you according to its demands, especially when he is talking to the professors of philosophy in Egypt? What he has stated is in accordance with what his dogma demands, i.e. concealing the matter of Taqiyyah itself.

A person who reads the contemporary books of the Shī'ah, deliberates over them, and compares them (with other material on the same topic) will reach the conclusion that Taqiyyah still continues to be practiced. We have already studied examples of how the Shī'ah reject their fundamental beliefs like that of Raj'ah; and how they deny the existence of texts which exist in dozens of their books, as we seen in the case of ‘Abd al-'Ḥusayn al-Najafī who emphatically denies the existence of any narration or text which suggests that interpolation and omission took place in the Qur'ān.

In fact at times one Shī'ī scholar will contradict himself due to him making statements based on the demands of Taqiyyah as per the situation and the people being addressed. For example, Mughniyah himself, despite claiming that the era of Taqiyyah has ended, claims that the Shī'ah do not denigrate the Ṣaḥābah in his exegesis al-Kāshif but then he denigrates senior Ṣaḥābah in his book Fī Ṣīlāl Nahj al-Balāghah, as has passed already.2 Likewise he claims in his book Ma‘ al-

2 See p. 1473 of this book.
Shī‘ah al-Imāmiyyah that Imāmah is not one of the fundamentals of Islam, rather it is a principle of the Shī‘ī dogma. And thus the one who denies it but believes in the oneness of Allah, the prophethood of Nabī  and the afterlife is a Muslim although not a Shī‘ī. But in another book al-Shī‘ah wa al-Tashayyu‘ he says the following regarding their festival of Ghaḏīr:

إن احتفالنا بهذا الیوم هو احتفال بالقرآن الكريم، وسنة النبي العظیم بالذات، احتفال بالإسلام ویوم الإسلام... إن النهي عن یوم الغدیر تعبیر ثان عن النهي بالأخذ بالكتاب والسنة وتعالیم الإسلام ومبادئه.

Celebrating this day is like celebrating the Qur’ān and the Sunnah of the great Nabī. It is celebrating Islam and the day of Islam. Rejecting the day of Ghaḏīr is in other words preventing people from practicing upon the Qur’ān, the Sunnah, the teachings of Islam and its principles.¹

He then presents as evidence the statement of their contemporary scholar ʿAbd Allah al-ʿAlāyilī which is:

إن عید الغدیر جزء من الإسلام فمن أنكره فقد أنكر الإسلام بالذات

The festival of Ghaḏīr is part of Islam, whoever rejects it has rejected Islam itself.²

By comparing both his statements the reality becomes clear. In the first statement he claims that the one who rejects Imāmah is a Muslim and in the second statement he asserts that the one who rejects the festival of Ghaḏīr, which is an innovation for which there is no evidence in the Qur’ān, rejects Islam itself. Is there any other plausible interpretation for this contradiction besides Taqiyyah?

But which of the two statements really represents the Shī‘ī dogma? The second statement without any doubt represents what appears in their classical works.

---

1 Al-Shī‘ah wa al-Tashayyu‘ p. 258.
2 Ibid. p. 258. Al-ʿAlāyilī had made this statement in a sermon which was broadcasted by the Lebanese radio station on the 18 of Dhī al-Ḥijjah 1380 A.H. (see: ibid. p. 258).
And probably what he has said therein is actually the actual stance which came to the fore due to his deep emotions and sentimental link to the innovated festival.

Furthermore, the Shi‘ī libraries have published many books in order to propagate Shi‘ism amongst the Ahl al-Sunnah. The person who reads them will probably reach the conclusion that the authors are one of two people: either a heretic whose goal is to misguide the servants of Allah with lying and deception, or a Shi‘ī who in the name of Taqiyyah considers everything to be permissible. The common phenomenon which permeates all these books is the excessive usage of Taqiyyah. And that is why, despite the element of lying being glaring in them, I have not come across any criticism rising from the Shi‘ī circles.

The most glaring example of this is the book *al-Murāja‘āt* of ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn al-Mūsawī. The proselytisers of Shi‘ism have lent a lot of credence to this book; they have used it as one of their most effective tools to mislead people, or in other words, to mislead their followers and the Shi‘ah. Simply because the Ahl al-Sunnah, more specifically the scholars among them have no knowledge whatsoever of these books which are printed and published by the publishing houses of the Shi‘ah.

The importance they accord to this book and their immense infatuation over it have increased to such an extent that it has been published more than a hundred times, as is claimed by some of the Shi‘ah.1

In its misleading nature and deceptive approach this book is probably like Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī’s book which was debunked and refuted by Ibn Taymiyah in his *Minhāj al-Sunnah*. Hopefully Allah will provide the means to expose the book in question in a similar manner by way of a dedicated study, but hereunder I allude to some aspects thereof:

The book is basically about the correspondence which took place between the leading scholar of al-Azhar, Shaykh Salīm al-Bishrī who, as this Rāfidī alleges,

---

1 Mughniyah: *al-Khumānī Aqwāluhū wa af‘āluhū* p. 45.
represents the Ahl al-Sunnah and defends their dogma, and ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn who represents the Shī‘ah and defends their dogma. The correspondence ends with the acknowledgment of the Shaykh of al-Azhar that the Sunnī dogma is wrong and the Shī‘ī dogma is valid and correct. It is without any doubt a cunning ploy of the Shī‘ah and a contrived correspondence aimed at propagating the Shī‘ism.

For a person who knows the dogma of the Shī‘ah and has recourse to their books, this style is no surprise. There is nothing new in it, it is an old approach which the Shī‘ah have always used; an approach wherein they wrote books containing the demerits of the Ṣaḥābah and the invalidity of the Sunnī creed, amongst other things, and attributed them to prominent scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Hence al-Shawkānī, in his book, al-Fawā‘id al-Majmū‘ah has established a chapter with the title al-Nusakh al-Mawḍū‘ah (fabricated books). After enlisting them he concludes that most of them have been contrived by the Shī‘ah clergy and that their followers still possess them.¹

Similarly, the author of al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay ʿAshariyyah has also alluded to this approach, and as an example has referred to the book Sirr al-ʿĀlamīn (a book which they falsely attributed to Imām Muḥammad al-Ghazālī and filled with erroneous ideas). In the introduction of the book they allege that he bequeathed that it be kept a secret and it be preserved. They also allege that he said that whatever is in this book is his belief and whatever is elsewhere is due to flattery and compromise.²

I have seen that in some of their contemporary works they draw evidence from this fabricated book against the Ahl al-Sunnah.³

---

1 Al-Fawā‘id al-Majmū‘ah p. 425.
2 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay ʿAshariyyah p. 33; also see: al-Suwaydī: Naqḍ ʿAqā‘id al-Shī‘ah p. 25.
3 See for example, the references cited in the book Kashf al-Ishtibāḥ of ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn al-Rashatī which was published in Tehran in 1368 A.H. by al-Maṭba‘ah al-ʿAskariyyah.
This book has likewise been published several times.¹

Regarding this particular book, professor ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Badawī has mentioned that three orientalists, viz. Goldzhier, Bouygues, and Macdonald, considered it a fabrication against al-Ghazālī.² He concurs with them and also concludes that the book is a complete fabrication and in substantiation thereof he says that on p. 82 of the book al-Ghazālī allegedly says:

أنشدني المعري لنفسه وأنا شاب في صحبته یوسف بن علي شيخ الإسلام

Al-Maʿarrī himself rendered his poetry before me when I was still a youngster in the company of Shaykh al-Islām Yūsuf ibn ʿAlī.

Whereas al-Maʿarrī passed away in 448 A.H. and al-Ghazālī was born in 450 A.H. Hence it was impossible for al-Maʿarrī to have rendered his poetry before al-Ghazālī.³

The purpose for opening this chapter of the past is to allude to the fact that the book al-Murājaʿāt is just another book in the same tradition; it is a link in the insidious conspiracies which have their roots deep in history, carried out by the Shīʿah in order not to lose their followers and to create discord in the Ummah and spread Shīʿism amongst the Muslims.

Nonetheless, I return to al-Murājaʿāt to briefly point out some of the signs which suggest that the book is a fabrication.

---

¹ It was first printed in Mumbai in 1314 A.H., then in Cairo in 1324 A.H. and 1327 A.H. It was likewise published in Tehran (no mention of date). See ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Badawī: Mu'allafāt al-Ghazālī p. 225.
² Muʿallaṭ al-Ghazālī p. 271. 
³ Ibid. p. 271. Surprisingly I found that al-Dhahabī attributes the book to him Mīzān al-ʿītidāl 1/500. Probably he was unaware of the reality, or that a book with this title was written by al-Ghazālī but was later lost and the Shīʿah thus took advantage of the name and compiled a book holding the same title and attributed to al-Ghazālī.
Firstly, one of the strongest indications that the book is a fabrication is that the style of the letters which are documented therein, which represent the views of two scholars who are different in their ideology, knowledge, social setup; is one and the same. There is no difference whatsoever in them. This clearly shows that the fabricator of these letters is one person and that is ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn.

Secondly, the leading scholar of al-Azhar had acquired such a prominent position due to his knowledge and eruditeness and not due to just obtaining a job. But in this book he is portrayed as a junior or an amateur student whose duty is to acknowledge everything that was said by this Rāfīḍī and at times even praise him for every line that he wrote. Notwithstanding that at times his answers consisted of such esoteric interpretations of Qurʾānic verses which have no link with them whatsoever and the deviance whereof can be picked up by beginners in the path of knowledge amidst the Ahl al-Sunnah, nay even by their laity.¹ And even though at times they contained authentication of forged narrations and emphasis upon one of their blasphemous beliefs. This Rāfīḍī has documented that the Shaykh of al-Azhar conceded the authenticity and diffuse transmission of many narrations which are weak according to the scholars of ḥadīth and some even complete fabrications. Their weak or forged status is not unknown even to beginners, let alone the Shaykh of al-Azhar who was the incumbent of a position which was only obtainable by someone who had saturated himself with knowledge and was well-versed in all the Islamic sciences.² Not only that, but this Rāfīḍī has depicted the Shaykh of al-Azhar as so inadequate in his knowledge as to not even know the references for narrations in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, not the books of the Shīʿah, owing to which he would ask this Rāfīḍī to point them out to him.³

Could the Shaykh of al-Azhar really be so ignorant? Could he be so incapable in maintaining a polemical discussion despite having access to libraries? Would he

---

1 See for example p. 62-73 in his book *al-Murājaʿāt*.
2 See for example p. 55-60 of *al-Murājaʿāt*; also see *al-Bayyināt fī al-Radd ʿalā Abāṭīl al-Murājaʿāt* p. 45, onwards.
3 See *al-Murājaʿāt* p. 237.
really give this Shi‘ah scholar the trouble to help him when he could easily seek the assistance of the scholars of al-Azhar and its students? And since when did this Rāfiḍī become a reliable transmitter of ḥadīth according to the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah?

Thirdly, his book emerged without any authorisation; there is nothing is his book which suggests that those alleged letters are credible; not even a picture of some of them despite them amounting to a hundred and twelve letters in total, fifty six being written by the Shaykh of al-Azhar.

All these alleged letters were written by hand, so why did he not produce one letter at least which would prove his claims, especially when in them was contained a very pivotal issue like that of the Shaykh of al-Azhar giving up the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah and taking up the creed of the Shi‘ah and converting from the truth to falsehood. His inability to prove any evidence in this regard reveals that his book is a forgery and that the letters attributed to Shaykh Salīm are lies. It actually extirpates the discussion from its very roots.

All these claims are only from one side, from this Rāfiḍī alone; Shaykh Salīm is not known to have said anything that alludes to this correspondence. Likewise there is not a shred evidence to be found during his lifetime that proves the validity of the claims of this Rāfiḍī. And thus he only dared to publish the book twenty years after the demise of Shaykh Salīm al-Bishrī.¹

Due to his inability to substantiate his claims with any evidence, and due to him forging letters which supposedly mimicked the style of al-Bishrī and not being able to produce a picture of the letters in his original writing, he was compelled to expose himself in the introduction by saying:

وأنا ل أدعي أن هذه الصحف تقتصر على النصوص التي تألفت يومئذ بيننا، ولا أن شيئًا من ألفاظ هذه
المراجعات خطط غير قلبي

¹ He passed away in 1335 A.H. (see al-A‘lām 3/180).
I do not claim that these pages strictly contain the texts which were exchanged between us, nor that some of the contents of these letters were written by a pen other than mine.¹

If these letters were not written by anyone else’s pen then why is he accusing the Shaykh of al-Azhar of writing this evil?

He has further exposed himself with the following sentence:

إنه زاد في هذه الرسائل ما يقتضي المقام والنصح والإرشاد

He has added in these letters things which the situation demands and also advice and directives.²

This is another confession that he has attributed to the Shaykh of al-Azhar things which he has not said; and he deems his lies against him to be fine under the pretext of advice according to the need of the situation; exactly the reason for which Taqiyyah is practiced.

As long as it remains a well-known fact that the Shīʿah lie against Allah, His Rasūl and the Ahl al-Bayt it should not come across as a surprise if they lie against others besides them.

This book represents one form of Taqiyyah in our times.

There are many other examples. And the lies which are spoken in the name of Taqiyyah are of various types which require a dedicated study.³

1 See the introduction of al-Murājaʿāt p. 27.
2 Ibid.
3 Another example is the book Limādhā Ikhtartu Madhhab al-Shīʿah (Why I Chose the Creed of the Shīʿah). This book contains a fabricated story which alleges that one of the senior scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah Muḥammad Marʿī al-Anṭākī gave up the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah and embraced the creed of the Shīʿah after ascertaining that the former is false and the latter is true. It is filled with forgeries, lies and accusations, as is the wont of the Shīʿah when practicing Taqiyyah. continued...
This style of forgery has its dangers. The Shīʿah have frequently deployed it in their works and it has become one of the offshoots of Taqiyyah. Al-Suwaydī thus mentions that many books were attributed to the Ahl al-Sunnah in this manner, and only people who are acquainted with the style of the dialogue of the Ahl al-Sunnah will detect their falsity.¹

Lastly, Allah at times reveals the truth upon the tongue of the Shīʿah. Hence one of their contemporary scholars has revealed the reality by conceding that the book of Sulaym ibn Qays and other books are forgeries (i.e. falsely attributed to their alleged authors), but for noble purposes.² As though suggesting that such fabrication is permissible as long as the purpose behind at is valid and ‘noble’.

We are not going to delve further into this topic, due to limitations,³ and because this chapter is dedicated to the contemporary Shīʿah.

---

¹ Al-Suwaydī: Naqḍ ‘Aqāʾid al-Shīʿah (manuscript) p. 25.
³ This topic specifically requires and in-depth study, due to it being crucial on the one hand and revealing the true face of Shīʿism on the other hand.
The Scholars of the Shīʿah practice Taqiyyah even with their Followers:

Although the Shīʿah, as represented by some of their scholars, claim that Taqiyyah no more exists, but they still continue to practice Taqiyyah, not with the Ahl al-Sunnah, but with their own followers. For surely amongst the contemporary scholars there are some who practice Taqiyyah with their followers, i.e. they express that which they do not believe.

This is not merely a claim, but a reality which is backed by their confessions. Three of their senior scholars hesitated in announcing a flaw in a secondary issue of *Fiqh* due to the fear of their followers. They would thus secretly give fatwas against it and would assert the contrary in front of their close associates.¹

What is interesting in this regard is that Muhammad Jawwād Mughniyah was the one who discovered this, notwithstanding that he is from amongst those who claim that Taqiyyah has come to an end. He says:

The view that the people of the book are impure has created a social problem for the Shīʿah and has placed them in difficulty and under constrains, especially when they travel to a Christian country like Spain, or to a place where Christians are found like Lebanon. I accompanied three scholars who hold prominent positions in issuing fatwas and whose views are followed: the first is from the noble Najf, Shaykh Muhammad

---

¹ Despite them boasting that the door of Ijtihād is still open in the Shīʿī dogma. If this is their condition in a secondary issue then how can it be hoped from them that they will revisit their primary issues wherein they have parted with the majority of the Muslims?
Riḍā Āl Yāsīn, the second is: al-Sayyid Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Ṣadr from Qum, and the third is al-Sayyid Muḥsin al-Amīn from Lebanon. They all issued the fatwa of purity and they covertly conveyed it to those who they trusted; but they did not openly proclaim it due to fearing the instigators. Yāsīn was nonetheless the bravest of them. And I am fairly convinced that many of the jurists of the present and the past held the view of purity, but they feared the ignorant people whereas Allah is more deserving of being feared.

Mughniyah also mentions in his exegesis al-Kāshif that their supreme scholar al-Khūʿī likewise secretively imparted his view to those who trusted him.

Likewise, Kāẓim al-Kifāʿī also acknowledges that their leader al-Ghiṭā’ issued the fatwā of purity and informed only his associates of it because he feared that the minds of the laity will not be able to withstand it.

Commenting upon this professor ʿAlī al-Sālūs says, “This is how knowledge is forsaken and lies are attributed to Islam, i.e. when people are entrusted with knowledge but they waste it and distort it due to fearing the people and not fearing Allah.”

Adding to that, I would say that one of the many reasons for which the Shīʿah scholars consider (and as a result practice Taqiyyah with) their ignorant followers is that these people are the source of their sustenance which they unrightfully receive from them in the name of Khums.

If this is the stance of five of their leading scholars in the present age regarding a secondary issue which they know for sure is wrong, how can it then be expected from them to entertain even the prospect of revisiting their primary issues.

1 Mughniyah: Fiqh al-Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq p. 31-33.
3 This is documented by professor ʿAlī al-Sālūs (see: Fiqh al-Imāmiyyah p. 81).
From all of this it is clear that the Shīʿah will never give up Taqiyyah and they will continue practicing it till the emergence of their Mahdī, as is emphasised in their narrations and endorsed by their actions, even though their use thereof decreases and increases as per the conditions and demands, i.e. their practice of Taqiyyah considerably decreases whenever they assume authority and rule a dynasty. This becomes evidently clear when comparing the writings of the scholars of the Safawid Dynasty (like the views of al-Majlīsī in *Biḥār al-Anwār*, Niʿmat Allāh al-Jazāʿīrī in *al-Anwār al-Nuʿmānīyyah*, al-Baḥrānī in *Tafsīr al-Burḥān*, amongst others) with those of their predecessors who were writing under an established Islamic Khilāfah; for you will find at the end of each of the latters’ texts the directive to keep it concealed and hidden,¹ to the extent that even the issue of Imāmah was secretively circulated in the initial stages.²

In conclusion, these are but a few views of their contemporary scholars and their beliefs which outline their theological boundaries which they abide by in the present age. I did not delve into beliefs wherein nothing new has developed or no new claims have been made, because as longs as the contemporaries and the ancients remain linked in deriving doctrine from the same classical books there is no hope of any change taking place for the better.

From the various discussions above, it is clear that the contemporaries have surpassed their predecessors, because they inherited the end-result of lies and fabrications which have incessantly continued throughout the ages and considered that to be their reliable sources. They facilitated publishing houses to spread these books. The weakness of the Muslims was one of the causes of their enthusiasm and the widespread ignorance of the Ahl al-Sunnah and their weakness were part of the reasons for people being impacted by them and being ensnared in their deviance.

---

¹ See for example the narrations regarding the doctrine of Ṭīnah on p. 1280 of this book.
² See p. 894 of this book.
The Fourth Chapter

The State of the Scholars

After having analysed the relationship between the contemporaries and the ancients and discovering that there still exists a strong link between them, and after learning that in many aspects what was considered to be extreme by the ancients has been integrated into the Shi'i dogma by the contemporaries, does there remain a need to study their dynasty? Is not the matter as clear as daylight to anyone who can see? There are two primary reasons for studying their current dynasty and they are:

Firstly: according to its prime leader and its constitution, this dynasty has espoused a new idea in the realm of Twelver Shiism which has provoked much controversy amongst the Shi'a scholars, causing their reactions to vary from approval to disproval. This idea is all about according the Shi'i jurist-consult the duties, capabilities, and prerogatives of the Mahdi, as will be discussed in depth in the coming pages; Khomeini presided over all the alleged duties of their awaited Mahdi after the emergence of their state.

Secondly, it has been claimed that this state represents Islam in this era, that its scholars are the reference scholars of the Muslims and that its founder is a revivalist. This gained acceptance amidst some Muslims, and after the emergence of the Shi'i state it was claimed that the Shi'i dogma has reverted to its pristine beginnings of associating with Allah and his Rasul and loving the Ahl al-Bayt sincerely in a manner that does not make its adherent lose respect for other Muslims, especially the Companions of Rasul Allah.\(^1\)

Furthermore, some newspapers even went on to aver that the results brought about by the movement of Khomeini was due to it being a fully Islamic movement.\(^2\)

---

1 Al-Balagh magazine: edition no. 512 (published on the 9th of Dhī Qa’dah 1399 A.H.
2 Al-I’tiṣām: the fifth edition (published in Rabī’ al-Awwal 1399 A.H.)
Likewise the *al-Ma’rifat al-Tūnisiyah* magazine considered Khomeini a candidate for receiving the grand prize of king Faisal for serving Islam.¹

Likewise, many other magazines like *al-Rā’id*,² *al-Da’wah*,³ *al-Risālah*,⁴ *al-Amān*,⁵ etc. adopted a similar stance, all them being the magazines of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Some affiliates of the Ahl al-Sunnah wrote books regarding Khomeini and his revolution wherein they extolled his merits and considered his rule to be a true reflection of the Islamic values.⁶

Similarly, some Islamic movements also issued statements wherein they praised the methodology of Khomeini. To the extent that in the international organization of the Ikhwān al-Muslimīn Khomeini’s rule was described as the only Islamic government in the world.⁷

Nonetheless, it was a very beguiling and deceptive fitnah whose effects still remain up to the present day. And even though some have realised the truth of the matter, others still consider the voices raised against Khomeini to be baseless.⁸

The Shīʿah have obviously exploited this climate to propagate their dogma and proselytise it. This media based propagation which took place through the Islamic newspapers and magazines played a part in obscuring the reality upon the Muslim youth; because all that they knew about the conflict between the Ahl

---

¹ *Al-Ma’rifat al-Tūnisiyah*: edition no. 9 (published in Dhī al-Ḥijjah 1399 A.H.)
³ *Al-Da’wah al-Miṣriyyah*: edition no. 30: p. 6 (published 1/12/1398)
⁵ *Al-Amān al-Lubnāniyyah*: edition no. 31 (published in Shawwāl 1399 A.H.)
⁶ Like the book: *al-Khumainī al-Ḥall al-Islāmī wa al-Badīl of Fatḥī ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz* which was published by Dar al-Mukhtār al-Islāmī; *Ma’ Thawrah Īrān* (the third study published by the Islamic centre in Aachen; and *Nahw Thawrah Islāmiyyah* of Muhammad ‘Anbar.
⁷ *Al-Shīʿah wa al-Sunnah Ḍajjah Mufta’ilah* (part of the publications of Dār al-Mukhtār al-Islāmī) p. 52.
⁸ Ibid.
al-Sunnah and the Shī‛ah is that it is a conflict regarding who was more rightful of leadership and the succession of Rasūl Allah ﷺ: ‘Alī or Abū Bakr ﷺ, and they assume that that is a generation that has passed and that this difference is of no relevance today.

The Shī‛ah, therefore, found fertile grounds for the spreading of Shī‛ism, and it is obligatory to divulge the reality and make the people aware of it. Just as it is compulsory to examine every claim of revivalism and every narrative of transformation and change. Probably the ideal way to reach an academic conclusion on the issue would be by studying the ideology of the founding father of this new state and its constitution.¹

The Ideology of its Founder

After referring to the writings of Khomeini in his books: *Kashf al-Asrār,*² *Tahrīr al-Wasīlah,* al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah, Miṣbāḥ al-Imāmah wa al-Wilāyah, Rasā’il al-Ta‘ādul wa al-Tarjīh wa al-Taqīyyah, Durūs fī al-Jihād wa al-Rafḍ, Sirr al-Ṣalāh, etc. it is evident that he had a number of eerie ideologies, the most crucial among them being the following:

1. Polytheistic leanings
2. Extremist Ṣufī leanings
3. The claim of prophethood
4. Extremism in Rafḍ
5. Complete representation of the hidden Mahdī

¹ I have already written regarding Khomeini and the idea of unity between the Ahl al-Sunnah in my research paper which I submitted for my master’s degree. In this book however I shall shed light upon new angles which have probably not been touched in all the literature written regarding Khomeini.
² This book is originally written in Persian. It was translated into Arabic by one of the Persian speaking scholars. And one of the teachers of the Islamic university sent me pictures of this translation. May Allah reward him with goodness.
Firstly: Polytheistic leanings

In his book *Kashf al-Asrār* he comes across as a defender of polytheism. He says:

ويمكن أن يقال أن التوسل إلى الموتى وطلب الحاجة منهم شرك، لأن النبي والإمام ليس إلا جمادين فلا يتوقع منهما الفئع والضرر. والجواب: إن الشرك هو طلب الحاجة من غير الله مع الإعتقاد بأن هذا الغير هو إل ورب، وأما إذا طلب الحاجة من غير من غير هذا الإعتقاد كذلك ليس يشرك، ولا فرق في هذا المعنى بين الحي والميت، ولهذا لو طلب حاجته من الحجر والمدر لا يكون شركا، مع أنه قد فعل فعلا باطلا. ومن ناحية أخرى نحن نستمد من أرواح الأنبیاء والمقدسة والأئمة الذين أعطاهم الله قدرة

The objection can possibly be raised that considering the dead to be agents and seeking needs from them is Shirk because the Nabī and the Imām are lifeless and thus no benefit or harm can be expected from them. The answer is: Shirk entails seeking needs from anyone besides Allah coupled with the belief that he is a deity and a sustainer. But if one seeks a need from him without considering him to be a deity then that is not shirk; in this the living and dead both are equal. Thus seeking ones need from a stone or a piece of clay will not be shirk even though the action is wrong. Seeing it from another perspective, we seek help from the pure souls of the Ambya’ and the Imams who are bestowed by Allah with abilities. It is established through categorical evidence and logical proofs that the souls lives after death and that they fully encompass the universe.

He then goes on to cite the views of the philosophers in order to prove his claims.

The aforementioned text entails the following:

Firstly, His belief that supplicating to stones, idols and shrines is not shirk unless the supplicator considers them to be deities and lords; this is baseless and false,

---

1 Despite its gravity, I have not come across anyone who has shed light upon this ideology of Khomeini.
and to refute this kind of shirk the prophets were sent and the Books revealed. This is the shirk of the polytheists of Makkah which Nabi  opposed and tried to eradicate. For it is clear that the polytheists would not consider their idols to be lords, rather they would say the following as described by Allah  in the Qur'ān:

مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِیُقَرِّبُوْنَا إِلَى اللّٰهِ زُلْفَىٰ

We only worship them that they may bring us nearer to God in position.¹

وَیَعْبُدُوْنَ مِنْ دُوْنِ اللّٰهِ مَا لَ یَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَ یَنفَعُهُمْ وَیَقُولُوْنَ هٰؤُلَءِ شُفَعَاؤُنَا عِندَ اللّٰهِ قُلْ أَتُنَبِّئُوْنَ اللّٰهَ بِمَا لَ یَعْلَمُ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَ فِي الأَْرْضِ سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ عَمَّا یُشْرِکُوْنَ

And they worship other than God that which neither harms them nor benefits them, and they say, “These are our intercessors with God.” Say, “Do you inform God of something He does not know in the heavens or on the earth?” Exalted is He and high above what they associate with Him.²

قُل لِّمَنِ الأَْرْضُ وَمَنْ فِیْهَا إِنْ کُنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُوْنَ.سَیَقُوْلُوْنَ لِلّٰهِ قُلْ أَفَلاَ تَذَکَّرُوْنَ.قُلْ مَن رَّبُّ السَّمَاوَاتِ السَّبْعِ وَرَبُّ الْعَرْشِ الْعَظِیمِ.سَیَقُوْلُوْنَ لِلّٰهِ قُلْ أَفَلاَ تَتَّقُونَ.قُلْ مَن بِیَدِهِ مَلَکُوتُ کُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَهُوَ یُجِیْرُ وَلَ یُجَارُ عَلَیْهِ إِن کُنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُوْنَ.سَیَقُوْلُوْنَ لِلّٰهِ قُلْ فَأَنَّىٰ تُسْحَرُوْنَ

Say, [O Muḥammad], “To whom belongs the earth and whoever is in it, if you should know?” They will say, “To God.” Say, “Then will you not remember?” Say, “Who is Lord of the seven heavens and Lord of the Great Throne?” They will say, “[They belong] to God.” Say, “Then will you not fear Him?” Say, “In whose hand is the realm of all things – and He protects while none can protect against Him – if you should know?” They will say, “[All belongs] to God.” Say, “Then how are you deluded?”³

---

¹ Sūrah al-Zumar: 3.
² Sūrah Yūnus: 18.
³ Sūrah al-Mu‘minūn: 84-89.
These verses establish that the polytheist amongst the Arabs conceded the Oneness of Allah and that He is the creator of everything, but despite that they were still considered polytheists. The shirk that Khomeini is espousing is no different from their shirk.

Secondly, his belief that the dead Imāms have the ability to benefit and harm and his acknowledgement that they seek help from them. This is without doubt the greatest form of shirk; because the dead cannot benefit or harm themselves. Is there any difference between this and the shirk of the polytheists of Quraysh and the polytheists of the various nations which passed before them. The only difference is that these people accord their shirk the name of Islam and consider it as part of the Dīn of Muḥammad, as you will see in the defences written for Khomeini.

Lastly, his claim that the souls encompass the entire universe completely and his seeking of evidence from the views of the philosophers. Encompassing the world is for Allah alone. He says:

\[
\text{وَكَانَ اللّٰهُ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ مُّحِیْطًا}
\]

And ever is God, of all things, encompassing.

The souls are created and controlled. After they leave the bodies they are either in bliss or punishment, and thus have no share in encompassing the universe. However when an idea originates from its locus it is not considered strange. A person who combines between the heresies of the philosophers and the extremism of the Shīʿah can only emerge with a view of this sort or even worst.

---

1 See: Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah p. 20.
2 Sūrah al-Nisā': 126.
His Belief in the Impact of Stars and Days upon the Movements of Men

The ideology of Khomeini has always remained tainted by the assumptions of Shirk and the Mushriks. He claims that in every month there are some wretched days wherein a Shīʿī should not do anything, and that in the transitioning of the moon to various stages there are negative effects on the actions of men. As such a Shīʿī should refrain from doing anything till the moon passes those phases.

There is no doubt that a person who believes that the days and the stars have an impact in a person’s fortune, in bringing about harm or preventing it is a polytheist; for this is the belief of the of the Ṣābi‘ah regarding the stars.

The evidence for this belief of Khomeini is the following text which appears in Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah:

ویكره إیقاعه (یعني عقد الزواج) والقمر في برج العقرب، وفي محاق الشهر، وفي أحد الأيام المنحوسة في كل شهر: وهي سبعة: يوم 3، يوم 5، ویوم 13، ویوم 16، ویوم 21، ویوم 24، ویوم 25 (وذلك من كل شهر).

It is disliked to contract a contract of marriage when the moon is in the Scorpio, the end of its month and in one of the wretched days; which are seven: the third day, the fifth day, the thirteenth day, the sixteenth day, the twenty first day, the twenty fourth day and the twenty fifth day (these days are found in every month).1

This is the belief of Khomeini and his followers. Thus what the author of Tuḥfah al-Ithnay ʿAshariyyah has said regarding them is true:

إن الصابئة كانوا يحترزون عن أيام يكون القمر بها في العقرب، أو الطرف أو المحاق، وكذلك الرافضة...

وكان الصابئة يعتقدون أن جميع الكواكب فاعلة مختارة، وأنها هي المدیرة للمعالم السفائي، وكذلك الرافضة.

1 Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah 2/238.
The Ṣābi’ah would refrain from those days wherein the moon would be in the Scorpio, the beginning of the month or its end. Likewise is the belief of the Rāfiḍah. The Ṣābi’ah would also believe that the stars do, that they have freewill, and that they administer the world at the bottom. And so is the belief of the Rāfiḍah.¹

The Reality of Shirk according to Khomeini

If the idol worship of the polytheist is not shirk according to him, then what constitutes Shirk according to him?

He says:

توجد نصوص كثيرة تصف كل نظام غير إسلامي بأنه شرك، والحاكم أو السلطة فيه طاغوت، ونحن مسؤولون عن إزالة آثار الشرك من مجتمعنا المسلم، ونبعدها تماما عن حياعنا.

There are texts which describe every non-Islamic government whose ruler or governing party is oppressive as Shirk. It is our responsibility to eliminate the effects of Shirk from our Muslim society and distance it completely from our lives.²

As you can see, his understanding of Shirk is that a person of the Ahl al-Sunnah rules over lands of the Muslims; such a person is a polytheist and so are his people. Hence the religion of these people is based on Wilāyah and not upon the Oneness of Allah. And thus we find that Shirk is so rampant in their lands.

Secondly Extremism in Taṣawwuf

His extremist leanings in this regard are as clear as can be in his books Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah ilā al-Khilāfah wa al-Wilāyah and Sirr al-Ṣalāh. Hereunder we will shed light on some of his extremist views:

1 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah p. 299; also refer to Fatḥ al-Majīd: chapter regarding astrology p. 365.
2 Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah p. 33-34; also refer to the discussion on their belief regarding the oneness of Allah in terms of him being the deity on p. 571 of this book.
1. Special incarnation

He says the following regarding Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī:

His Khalīfah (the Khalīfah of Rasūl Allah) who is his vicegerent in the kingdom of the seen and the unseen, who is one with him in his essence in grandeur and divinity, the roots of the ﺌُبَب(tree, the essence of the Տենր (the farthest lote tree), the highest companion at the position of ﺆؤ (referring to the journey of Miʿrāj), the teacher of the ascetics and the supporter of the Ambiyā’ and the prophets: ‘Alī Amīr al-Mu’minīn.¹

Consider his statement ‘who is one with him…..and divinity’, you will find that it is just like the belief of the Christians regarding the god and the human being one and the same. The extremist Shī‘ah had in the past also claimed that Allah ښښښښښtranscended into ‘Alī.² And sadly these extremist ideas still linger in the minds of these scholars.

Due to the claim that Allah ښښښښښtranscended into ‘Alī, as he beliefs, Khomeini attributes the following to Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī:

I was internally with the Ambiyā’ and externally with Rasūl Allah.³

Commenting upon this alleged narration he further says:

---

² For further details regarding the belief of incarnation according to the extremist sects of the Shī‘ah see: Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/ 83-86; al-Shahrastānī has averred that all the extremist Shī‘ah unanimously agree upon the belief of incarnation (al-Milal wa al-Niḥal 1/175).
³ Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah p. 142.
Hence he (ʿAlī) is the possessor of complete and unrestricted *Wilāyah* (authority as a result of succession). And *Wilāyah* is the internal component of *Khilāfah*... He, due to his complete *Wilāyah* is a guardian of every soul in what it has earned. And with everything there is a presence of a guardianship which is reflective of the ultimate divine guardianship. However because (his) *Wilāyah* was more in the prophets he made specific mention of them.  

As you can see, Khomeini comments upon this narration which is already extreme in its purport, and which is falsely attributed to Amīr al-Muʾminīn, with such words that are more steeped in extremism; for according to him he is not merely the guardian of the Ambīyāʾ but of every living soul. In substantiating this he chooses the purport of a verse which is exclusive to Allah رَبُّ الْعَالَمِينَ and attributes it to the creation. Allah ﷺ says:

> أَفَمَنْ هُوَ قَائِمٌ عَلَىٰ کُلِّ نَفْسٍ بِمَا کَسَبَتْ

Then is He who is a maintainer of every soul.  

I.e. Allah ﷺ is the guardian, the possessor of knowledge and the monitor of every living soul. Allah ﷺ says:

> وَمَا تَكُوْنُ فِيْ شَأْنٍ وَمَا تَتْلُوْ مِنْهُ مِنْ قُرْأَانٍ وَلَ تَعْمَلُوْنَ مِنْ عَمَلٍ إِلَّ کُنَّا عَلَیْكُمْ شُهُوْدًا إِذْ تُفِیْضُوْنَ فِیهِ

And, [O Muhammad], you are not [engaged] in any matter or recite any of the Qurʾān and you [people] do not do any deed except that we are witness over you when you are involved in it.  

---

1 Ṭafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/556.
2 Ṭafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/556.
3 Ṭafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/556.
4 Ṭafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/556.
Likewise Khomeini says the following regarding the verses:

\[
\text{یُدَبِّرُ الأَمْرَ یُفَصِّلُ الأْیَاتِ لَعَلَّكُم بِلِقَاءِ رَبِّكُمْ تُوْقِنُوْنَ}
\]

He arranges [each] matter; He details the signs that you may, of the meeting with your Lord, be certain.

أي ريكم الذي هو الإمام

i.e. your lord who is the Imam.

2. Complete Incarnation

Khomeini surpassed the idea of partial incarnation, specific to ‘Ali, and further believed in all-encompassing incarnation (i.e. the descendence of Allah into all of creation). Hence after elaborating on Tawḥīd and its various levels, based on his understanding, he says:

\[
\text{النتیجة لكل المقامات والتوحیدات عدم رؤیة فعل وصفة حتى من الله تعالى، ونفي الكثرة بالکلیة، وشهادت الوحدة الصرفة}
\]

The result of all the levels and the various types of Tawḥīd is: not witnessing any action or attribute, even if it be from Allah, the complete denial of multiplicity and the observation of a sheer singularity.

Probably his words ‘not witnessing any action or attribute, even if it be from Allah’ are to emphasise the stance of the Ittiḥādiyyah; because envisioning a distinct action and affirming a specific attribute for Allah entails conceding a distinct existence which results in two existences; which according to them is Shirk.

1 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 2.
2 Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah p. 145.
3 Ibid. 134.
He narrates that one of his Imāms said:

لنا مع الله حالات هو هو ونحن نحن، وهو نحن ونحن هو

We experience such conditions with Allah that he is who he is and we are who we are. And at times his is us and we are him.

And commenting upon this narration he says:

وكلمات أهل المعرفة خصوصا الشيخ الكبير محي الين مشحونة بأمثال ذلك مثل قوله: الحق خلق، والخلق حق، الحق حق، والخلق خلق. وقال في نصوصه: إن الحق المنزة هو الحق المشبه

And the words of the Gnostics, especially the great scholar Muḥy al-Dīn, are filled with such examples. For example he says, “The ultimate truth is the creation; the creation is the ultimate truth. And the ultimate truth is the ultimate truth and the creation is the creation.” And in one of his statements he says, “Verily the transcendent truth is the truth having similarity.” (With the creation)

He then goes on to cite a good few of the statements of Ibn ʿArabī. And thereafter says:

لاظهر ولا وجود إلا له تبارك وتعالى العالم خيال في خيال عند الإحرار

There is no emergence or existence but for him. And the world is merely a fantasy within a fantasy according to the elite.

He also says:

وإذا نطف دار التحقق من غبار الكثرة، وطوى الحجاب التورائية والظلمانية ونال مقام التوحيد الذاتي والفناء الكلي تحصل له الاستعادة الحقيقية

---

1 Ibid. 114
2 Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah p. 114.
3 Ibid. p. 123.
And when the abode of reality is cleansed from the dust of multiplicity, and the veils of light and darkness are folded and a person attains the level of essential Tawḥīd and complete annihilation of oneself, that is when he will attain the actual refuge...

He then says:

وقوله أیاك نعبد رجوع العبد إلى الحق بالفناء الكامل المطلق

And his words 'Only you do we worship' refers to the servant returning to the truth by completely becoming absorbed/annihilated in him.¹

Furthermore, you will find that very frequently he draws evidence from the statements of Ibn ʿArabī, whom he describes as ‘the great scholar’², and al-Qawanī, whom he describes as the successor of the great scholar,³ in substantiating his position on Waḥdat al-Wujūd (singularity of existence).

From this it is clear that Khomeini was of the view of the proponents of Ḥulūl (incarnation) and Ittiḥād (singularity of existence).

**Thirdly: Claiming Prophethood**

The fatuitous ideas of Taṣawwuf and the fantasies of philosophy engendered the emergence of eerie views and outright disbelief from him; for Khomeini has sketched four levels for the seeker:

The first journey ends at the stage of Fanā’, absorption/annihilation. In it is the concealed secret and extra concealed secret. In this stage Extremities come forth from him due to which he is deemed a disbeliever. Then if divine patronage saves

---

¹ *Sīr al-Ṣalāh* p. 178.
² See: *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah* p. 84, 94, 112.
³ See: Ibid. p. 110.
him he will profess slavery (being a servant) after having expressed divinity,\(^1\) as he alleges.

The second journey according to him ends with his Wilāyah (authority) becoming complete. Therein his essence, attributes and actions become absorbed/annihilated in the being of the ultimate truth, his attributes and his actions. In this journey absorption with absorption, which is the most secretive stage, take place, and the process of Wilāyah comes to an end.\(^2\)

As for the third journey, therein he attains Ṣahw, complete realisation, and subsists by the enablement of Allah. He travels in the realms of Jabarūt, divine realm, Malakūt, angelic realm, and Nāsūt, human realm. He also obtains a share of prophethood, but not the prophethood of legislation. At this stage the third journey ends and he starts the fourth journey.\(^3\)

And in the fourth journey he becomes a prophet who is endowed with the prophethood of legislation.\(^4\)

Hence the various stages of the journey according to him are: Fanā’ (absorption/annihilation of the self), Wilāyah wherein occurs absorption within the absorption, prophethood without legislation and complete prophethood.

These stages entail that Nubuwwah is obtainable through spiritual exercises, and the physical exertion practices prescribed by the Gnostics. They find their origins in ancient gnostic philosophy. Hence al-Qāḍī ʿAyāḍ states:

\[\text{ونكفر من ادعى النبوة لنفسه، أو جوز اكتسابها والبلوغ بصفاء القلب إلى مرتبتها كالفلسفة وغلاة الصوفية}\]

---

2. Ibid. 148, 149.
3. Ibid. 149.
4. Ibid. (same page).
We excommunicate anyone who claims Nubuwwah for himself or considers it possible to reach its station by virtue of the cleanliness of the heart like the philosophers and the extremist Gnostics.¹

Hence the aforementioned statements of Khomeini entail blatant disbelief, open heresy, the denial of Nubuwwah and the Ambiyā’ and leaving the fold of Islam. Apparently he claims that he has passed all these ‘stages’... He has furthermore mentioned in his book *al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* that a Shīʿī Jurist is equal in rank with Mūsā and ʿĪsā.²

It is also important to remember that the station of Imāmah according to them is higher than the station of Nubuwwah, as has passed already³ and will be presented from the statements of Khomeini himself. And despite this Khomeini is not known in Iran but by the title of ‘Imām’, i.e. by a station which is higher than the position of Nubuwwah according to them.⁴

Murtaḍā Kutbī⁵ and Jan Leon⁶ therefore say that the majority of the Iranian population does not consider Rūḥ Allah al-Khomeini merely an Āyat Allah, but rather an Imām, a title which was rarely accorded to any in the history of Islam.⁷

One of the Iranian officials, known as Fakhr al-Ḥijāzī, further emphasised this by asserting that Khomeini is greater than the prophets Mūsā and Hārūn. Owing to this he earned the delight of Khomeini who subsequently appointed him as the deputy of Tehran and the head of *Muʿassasah al-Mustaḍʿafīn*, the institution for the poor, the biggest money institution in the country.⁸

---

1 *Al-Shifāʾ* 2/1070-1071.
2 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 95.
3 See p. 891 of this book.
4 Because the term ‘Imām’ according to the Shī‘ah is very different from its understanding according to the Ahl al-Sunnah, the attention of the Ahl al-Sunnah is not drawn to the problematic implications thereof when it is used by the Shī‘ah.
5 The lecturer on Social sciences in the University of Tehran.
6 A French Journalist.
Similarly, we also find Muhammad Jawwād Mughniyah hinting that Khomeini is superior to the Nabī of Allah Mūsā. He says:

وَقَالَ الْسَّيِّدُ السَّمَتُ (يَعَنِي الْخَمِيْنِي) ص ۱۱۱ مِنْ الْحَكَمَةِ الْإِسْلَامِيَةِ: لَمَّا الْخَوَفُ ؟ فَلَيْكُنْ حِبْسًا اوْنِفًا أوْ قَتِلًا فَإِنَّ أُوْلَى الْلَّهِ يَشْرُونَ أنفسهم إِبْتَغَاءَ مَرْضَاةَ اللَّهِ.

And the master teacher (i.e. Khomeini) has said on p. 111 of his book al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah, “Why fear? Let it be imprisonment, exile or murder, for the friends of Allah have sold their souls for the pleasure of Allah.”

Then commenting upon this statement of Khomeini he says:

وَلَيْسَتْ هَذِهِ الْكُلُّمَاتُ مَجْرِدَةُ سُوُرَةٍ مِنْ سُوُرَاتِ الْعُضُبَ كَمَا فَعَلَ مُوسَىٰ (عُ) رَبُّ الْثَّلُّاثِ الْوَرَائِ (الْتَّوْراَةِ) وَأَخْذُ بِرَأسِ أَخِهِ يُجِرْهُ، بَلْ تُبْنَى أَيْضًا عَلَى الْعِلْمِ وَالْمَنْطَقَةِ الصَّارِمَةِ دُونَ أَنْ تَتَفَحَّقَ نَارُ الْعَاطِفَةِ

These words are not merely an outburst from the outbursts of anger like in the case of Mūsā when he through the tablets (the Torah) and grabbed the head of his brother pulling him. Rather they smack off knowledge and sound reasoning which do not emerge from inflamed emotions.¹

These are the exact words of Mughniyah. They suggest that Khomeini is more perfect than the Nabī of Allah, Mūsā, and that the doings of Khomeini are based upon knowledge and reason and that of Mūsā upon emotion and anger.

Mūsā is greater and nobler then can be compared with the most pious of people. How can Khomeini then be better than him and mentioned alongside him when drawing a comparison? But this is sadly the reasoning of the extremists and fanatics whose hearts are empty of the respect of Ambiyā’ of Allah and His Messenger; their extremism regarding their Imāms has emptied their hearts from the grand status of prophethood and those who were chosen by Allah to assume it.

¹ Al-Khumainī wa al-Dawlah al-Islāmiyyah p. 107.
It is also reported that Khomeini added his name in the call of Adhān and placed it before the Shahādatān (the two professions of faith). Pr. Mūsā al-Mūsawī says:

أدخل الخميني اسمه في أذان الصلوات، وقدم اسمه حتى على اسم النبي الكریم، فأذان الصلوات في إیران بعد استلام الخميني للحكم، وفي كل جوامعها كما يلي: الله أكبر، الله أكبر، خمینی رهبر، أي إن الخمینی هو القائد، ثم أشهد أن محمدا رسول الله

Khomeini added his name of the Adhān of the Ṣalāhs and placed his name even before the name of Nabī. Hence, after Khomeini came into power, the Adhān of the Ṣalāhs in Iran and in all its central mosques is as follows: Allah Akbar, Allah Akbar, Khomeini Rehbar, i.e. al-Khomeini is the commander, and that is followed by Ashhadu Ann Muḥammad Rasūl Allah.

(The aforementioned author has not made mention of testimony that there is no deity besides Allah, probably it is a mistake from his side).

In conclusion, if their scholar Ibn Bābawayh, who belongs to the fourth century, considers the addition Ashhadu Ann ‘Aliyyan Walī Allah (I testify that ‘Alī is the friend of Allah) to be a fabrication of the Mufawwiḍah, upon who may the curse of Allah descend, you will realise to what extent the contemporaries have parted from the way of the ancients. You will also realise that all the differences between the contemporaries and the extremists have become obliterated thereby resulting in them having no limits whatsoever at which they stop in making their dogma steep further in fanaticism and heresy.

1 He is the grandson of their scholar Abū al-Ḥasan al-Mūsawī al-Aṣfahānī and is a teacher who holds a doctorate from the University of Tehran and the University of Paris. He has served in various universities in the faculties of theology and economics.


3 The Mufawwiḍah: an extremist Shi‘ī sect who believed that Allah created Muḥammad and handed the creation or the universe and its administration of the universe to him. He in turn handed the administration thereof to ‘Alī and he is thus the second administrator. (See: Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/88; al-Farq bayn al-Firaq p. 251; ʿI tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa al-Mushrikīn p. 90; al-Khuṭaṭ of al-Muqrīzī: 2/351; and from the books of the Shi‘ah refer to the following: al-Mufīd: Taṣḥīḥ al-ʿI tiqād p. 64-65; Biḥār al-Anwār 25/345.

4 See: Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh 1/188-189.
Fourthly: Extremism in Shīʿī Belief

Regarding the leanings of Khomeini in Shīʿism, he is inclined toward the fanatical dogma of the Ghulāh (extremist).¹ The evidence for this is that he draws evidence from the statements of these extremists in establishing the virtue of the Imāms over the Ambiyā’ of Allah and His Messengers. He thus says:

إن من ضرورات مذهبنا أن لأئمتنا مقاما لِیبلغه ملك ومقاوم ولِنبي مرسل... وقد ورد عنهم (ع) أن لنا مع الله حالات لا يعدها ملك مقرب ولا النبي مرسل.

From the undisputable beliefs of our dogma is the belief that our Imāms enjoy such a high rank that cannot be reached by any close angel or sent prophet...It has been reported from them حسب الله، “We experience such conditions with Allah which are not behoving for any close angel or any sent prophet.”²

This was the stance of the extremists, as is established by ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī,³ al-Qāḍī ʿAyāḍ⁴ and Ibn Taymiyah.⁵

As you have noticed, Khomeini attributes this position to all the contemporaries and asserts that it is an undisputable fact according to them. Based upon this, the contemporaries are from the extremist Shīʿah according to the scholars of Islam.

Not only according to the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah, but the beliefs of Khomeini are the beliefs of the extremists even according to the leading scholars of the Shīʿah belonging to the fourth century. The evidence for this is that he considers his Imāms free from forgetfulness and inattentiveness.⁶ This belief according to

---

¹ Due to his obsession with the name ‘Rāfiḍah’ he has named one of his books Durūs fī al-Jihād wa al-Rafḍ (lessons regarding Jihād and Rafḍ).
² Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah p. 52.
³ Uṣūl al-Dīn p. 298.
⁴ Al-Shifā’ 2/290.
⁵ Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/177.
⁶ Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah p. 91.
their scholar Ibn Bābawayh, who is accorded the title ‘Raʾīs al-Muḥaddithīn’ (the chief of the ḥadīth scholars), is the belief of the extremists and the Mufawwiḍah regarding the Imāms; Ibn Bābawayh considers them to be worthy of being cursed, for he says:

إن الغلاة والمفوضة-لنعهم الله- ينكرون سهو النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم.

The extremists and the Mufawwiḍah, may Allah curse them, deny the forgetting of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم.¹

Ibn Bābawayh likewise narrates from his teacher Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Walīd that he considered the denial of forgetfulness of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم to be an extremist view.² And in his book al-ʾIʿtiqād he gives the following verdict regarding the extremists and the Mufawwiḍah:

اعتقادنا في الغلاة والمفوضة أنهم كفار بالله جل اسمه، وأنهم شر من اليهود والنصارى والمجوس.

Our belief regarding the extremists and the Mufawwiḍah is that they disbelieve in Allah whose name is great, and that they are worse than the Jews, Christians and the Fire-worshippers.³

In all his other beliefs, his views are not any different from the views of the Twelvers which we have discussed in the previous pages.

He excommunicates the Șaḥābah of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم in specific⁴ and the Ahl al-Sunnah in general; so much so that he describes them as ‘Nawāṣib’ (the enemies

---

1 Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh 1/234.
2 Ibid.
3 al-ʾIʿtiqād p. 109.
4 To the extent that in his book Tahrīr al-Wasīlah he establishes the legitimacy of disassociating with the enemies of Islam (and the enemies of Islam according to the Shīʿah are the Șaḥābah of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم with the exception of three or seven). See Tahrīr al-Wasīlah 1/169. Likewise in his book Kashf al-Asrār he emphatically excommunicates Shaykhayn. See: Kashf al-Asrār p. 112, onwards; also see: al-Nadwī: Șūratān Mutaḍāddatān p. 57-58; Muḥammad Manẓūr Nuʿmānī: al-Thawrah al-Irāniyah fi Mizān al-Islām p. 48, onwards.
of the Ahl al-Bayt) with the exception of those who they term the Mustaḍʿafūn (weak).

Instead he is inclined to the extreme most position in this regard, i.e. he averred that the Ahl al-Sunnah should be treated like the non-Muslim enemy. He says:

والأقوى إلحاق الناصب بأهل الحرب في إباحة ما اعتنمنهم وتعلق الخمس به، بل الظاهر جواز أخذ ماله أينما وجد، وبأي نحو كان ووجب أخراجه خمسه

And the more preferred view is that a Nāṣibī be treated like the non-Muslim foe in terms of that which is taken as booty from them being permissible and Khums being extracted therefrom. Rather what is obvious is that it is permissible to take his wealth wherever he is found and in whichever way possible, together with extracting its Khums being compulsory.

The people intended by the term ‘Nāṣibī’ is the Ahl al-Sunnah and those Shīʿah who are like them, i.e. the Zaydiyyah (besides the Jārūdiyyah, as has passed), not the Khawārij only who are the Nawāṣib according to the Ahl al-Sunnah due to them unanimously excommunicating Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī I. This is clear from the fact that he mentions the Khawārij as a different category alongside the Nawāṣib, like in the following statement:

وأما النواصب والخوارج لعنهم الله تعالى فهما نجسان

As for the Nawāṣib and the Khawārij, may Allah curse them, they are impure...

Furthermore, regarding their belief of the interpolation of the Qurʿān, Khomeini suggests that he accepts the fable that ʿAlī had a Qurʿān which he presented to the Ṣaḥābah which they rejected, and that it contained additions which are not in the present Qurʿān. He says:

1 Refer to p. 1225 of this book footnote 2.
2 Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah 1/352; Wa Jā` Dawr al-Majūs p. 186.
3 Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah 1/118.
Probably the Qur’ān which he (ʿAlī) compiled and intended to convey to the people after Rasūl Allah is the actual Qur’ān entailing all its internal specialities exclusive to his understanding and preserved by him due to the teaching of Rasūl Allah.¹

He likewise supplicates for the mercy of Allah to descend upon the heretic and fire worshipper, the author of Faṣl al-Khiṭāb. He quotes from his book Mustadrak al-Wasā’il and uses its content in substantiation of his arguments.² He likewise draws from their classical works which contain the heresy of interpolation, like the al-Kāfī of al-Kulaynī³ and the al-Iḥtijāj of al-Ṭabarsī,⁴ among others.

In addition to that, al-Nadwī has mentioned, in his translation of some of the texts of Kashf al-Asrār that which entails that al-Khomeini openly proclaimed this disbelief.⁵ In the translated text of Kashf al-Asrār which I present ahead Khomeini replies to the Question: why are the Imāms not mentioned in the Qur’ān, with the following:

إن الذين لم يكن ارتباطهم بالإسلام والقرآن إلا لأجل الرئاسة والدنيا، وكانوا يجعلون القرآن وسيلة لمقاصدهم الفاسدة، كان من الممكن أن يحرفوا هذا الكتاب السماوي في حالة ذكر اسم الإمام في القرآن وأن يمسحوا هذه الآيات منه وأن يلصقوا وصمة العار هذه على حياة المسلمين.

It is very possible that those who had no link with Islam and the Qur’ān but for leadership of this world and for exploiting it for their corrupt purposes would interpolate this Divine Book where it made mention of the name of

---

1 Risālah fī al-Taʿādul wa al-Tarjīḥ p. 26 (included in the second vol. of the letters and booklets of Khomeini).
2 Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah p. 77.
3 Ibid. p. 62, 63, 94.
4 Ibid. p. 77.
5 Ṣūratān Mutaḍāddatān p. 58.
the Imam and erase those verses from it thereby tainting the reputation of the Muslims.¹

Here he has not emphatically mentioned that interpolation occurred in the Qur’an but merely hinted to it. But he clearly states that it is possible for someone to interpolate the Qur’an whereas that entails belying the verse:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur’an], and indeed, We will be its guardian.²

Look at his fanatical and obscure reasoning, he claims that Allah did not make mention of the fundamental most aspect of Dīn, according to them, due to the fear that the Șahābah would interpolate it.

Furthermore, Khomeini also believed in the preposterous beliefs of Ghaybah and Raj’ah. In fact he says:

لقد جاء الأنبیاء جمیعا من أجل إرساء قواعد العدالة في العالم لكنهم لم ينجحوا حتى النبي محمد خاتم الأنبیاء الذي جاء لإصلاح البشرية... لم ينجح في ذلك وإن الشخص الذي سينجح في ذلك هو المهدي المنتظر

All the Ambiyā’ came to ground the foundations of justice in this world but were unsuccessful. To the extent that even Muḥammad, the seal of the Ambiyā’ who came to reform humanity, did not succeed. The one person who will be successful in this will be the awaited Mahdī.³

1 Kashf al-Asrār p. 114.
3 This was extracted from a talk Khomeini gave at the occasion of celebrating the birth of the Mahdī, according to their belief, on the fifteenth of Sha‘bān 1400 A.H this talk was broadcasted by the radio of Tehran. (Al-Ra’y al-ʿĀm al-Kuwaitiyah, Kuwaiti newspaper published on the seventeenth of Sha‘bān 1400 A.H.; Majallah al-Mujtama’ al-Kuwaitiyah: edition no. 488, published on 8/7/1980; Aḥmad al-Afghānī: Sarāb fī ʔĪrān p. 41-42; Nahj al-Khumainī p. 45-47).
The Muslims condemned these words of Khomeini. The Rābiṭah al-ʿĀlam al-Islāmī published a statement saying that they were in complete contradiction with Islam, what is found in the Qurʾān, the Prophetic Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah.1 Likewise disproval had been sounded from a number of places.2

Furthermore, the Magazine of al-Jamāʿah al-Islāmiyyah in Pakistan published the speech of Khomeini and commented upon it by saying that it entails the denial of Islam and the history of Islam, and it is a matter which not even the likeminded can tolerate.3

In this statement of his he has not parted from the extremist tendencies of his dogma, hence in his view the Imāms, amongst who is the Mahdī, are better than the Ambiyā’.

He likewise believes that all the Ṣaḥābah turned renegade after the demise of Rasūl Allah due to pledging allegiance to Abū Bakr rather than ʿAlī, and that the very crux of the prophethood of Rasūl Allah was the establishment of the Imāmah of ʿAlī; He thus says:

یعتبر الرسول لو ل تعیینه الخلیفة من بعده غیر مبلغ للرسالة

Rasūl Allah would be considered not having conveyed the message had he not appointed the Khalīfah after him.

And it is based upon this idea that he averred that Rasūl Allah was not successful, i.e. because ʿAlī did not assume the Khilāfah immediately after him.

1 See the condemnation thereof in Jarīdah al-Madīnah (of Saudi), fourth of Ramaḍān 1400 A.H.; Jarīdah Akhbār al-ʿĀlam al-Islāmī, ninth of Ramaḍān 1400 A.H.
2 The scholars of Morocco published a statement in this regard which was published in Majallah Daʾwah al-Ḥaqq, fourth edition, published in Shaʿbān-Ramaḍān; see Nahj al-Khumainī p. 49.
3 In the edition which was published on the twenty ninth of Dhī al-Hijjah1404 A.H. See Nahj Khumainī fī Mizān al-Fikr al-Islāmī p. 52.
Nonetheless, subsequent to this, Khomeini published a statement wherein he provided answers for the objections of the objectors. But in his answer there is nothing besides further enforcing this preposterous belief. He says:

ونقول بأن الأنبیاء لم یوفقوا في تنفیذ مقاصدهم، وإن الله یسبعث في آخر الزمان سخصا یقوم بتنفیذ مسائل الأنبیاء.

We aver that the Ambiyā’ were not blessed in fulfilling their objectives, and that Allah will send at the end of time a person who will take up the duty of fulfilling the tasks of the Ambiyā’.

He thereafter condemns the objectors and says that they are striving to create disunity amongst the Muslims.¹

Moving on, Khomeini asserts that the teaching of the Imāms are just like the teachings of the Qur’ān.² Instead he practices upon the fables of al-Riqā’ and accords it the same extent of importance which the Ummah accords to the Qur’ān and the Sunnah of Nabī.³ Likewise all the beliefs espoused by the Twelvers are the beliefs of Khomeini. In some of them at times he takes upon a severer level of extremism which we have no need to delve into; because the only purpose of this discussion is clarifying that Khomeini was not after all as the people with shallow knowledge regarded him.

However, I noticed that some people claim that Khomeini gave up some of his views regarding Taqiyyah⁴ and ordered his followers to perform ṣalāh with the Ahl al-Sunnah, which outwardly suggest that he was upright.

The answer to this is found in his booklet al-Ta‘ādul wa al-Tarjīḥ and in his booklet on Taqiyyah. It is sufficient to know that according to him the basis of their

¹ Khomeini: Mas’alah al-Mahdī al-Muntaẓar (with another booklet) p. 22.
² Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah p. 113.
³ He actually uses those narrations to prove the legitimacy of his theory Wilāyah al-Faqīh (see: al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah 76-77).
religion is opposition of the Ahl al-Sunnah and that this principle is the deciding factor in the case of conflicting narrations. Hence he says:

إن أخبارهم المرة بالخذ بخلاف العامة... كقوله: ما خالف العامة ففيه الرشاد... وقوله: دعوا ما وافق القوم فإنا الرشد في خلافهم هي من أصول الترجيح. وليس الترجيح بها بمحسن التباعد، بل لكون الخلافة لهم طريقا إلى الواقع، والرشاد في خالفتهم.

Their narrations which contain the order of opposing the commonality, like the narration: ‘There is guidance in that which goes against the commonality’ and the narration: ‘leave that which is in harmony with the people, for guidance is in opposing them’, are from the principles of giving preference. And giving preference based on them is not merely an act of worship (without any logical reasoning), but because their opposition being a very practical way wherein is guidance.¹

He then establishes a chapter with the title: ‘narrations which are regarding opposing the commonality’.² In this chapter he cites to types of narrations: 1) narrations which contain the order of adopting the views which oppose the commonality when there is conflict between the narrations of the Imāms, and 2) narrations which contain the order of unconditional opposition.

He mentions five narrations under the first category:

He says:

عن الحسن بن الجهم قال: قلت للعبد الصالح... یروى عن أبي عبد الله علیه السلام شيء یروى عنه خلافه فأیمها تأخذ؟ فقال: خذ بما خالف القوم وما وافق القوم فاجتنبه

Al-Ḥasan ibn al-Jahm says, I asked the pious servant,³ “Something is narrated from Abū ‘Abd Allah and at times the very opposite of it

1 Al-Ta‘ādul wa al-Tarjih p. 71.
2 Ibid. p. 80.
3 i.e. the Imām.
is narrated from him as well. So which one should we practice?” He said, “Practice that which opposes the people and that which is in harmony with them refrain from it.”

The other four narrations are not any different in their purport. However in some of them is contained the order to assess them by comparing them with the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah:

فاعرضوهما على أخبار العامة فما وافق أخبارهم فذروه وما خالف أخبارهم فخذوه

Present them (conflicting narrations) upon the narrations of the commonality. Then leave whatever is in harmony with their narrations and take whatever opposes their narrations.2

After presenting these narrations Khomeini makes the following remarks:

ولا يخفى وضوح دلالة هذه الأخبار على أن مخالفة العامة مرجحة في الخبرين المتعارضين مع اعتبار سنة بعضها، بل صحة بعضها على الظاهر واشتهر مضمونها بين الأصحاب، بل هذا المرجح هو المتداول العام الشائع في جميع أبواب الفقه وألسنة الفقهاء

The purport of these narrations is clear in that the opposition of the commonality is a preference indicator in two conflicting narrations, alongside (the other indicators like) considering the chain of transmission in some, instead its outward authenticity and its publicity amongst the scholars. In fact this preference indicator is what is most commonly applied in all the chapters of Fiqh and via the tongues of the Jurists.3

As you can see, Khomeini emphasises upon the importance of shunning all narrations which agree with the Ahl al-Sunnah, as if they are Jews and Christians whose imitation is impermissible. Some of their narrations actually state that the Ahl al-Sunnah are more steeped in disbelief than the Jews and the Christians.4

1 Ibid. 80-81.
2 Ibid. p. 80-81.
3 Al-Ta‘ādul wa al-Tarjīḥ p. 82.
4 See p. 969 onwards of this book.
As for the second type of narrations, they consist of instructions to unrestrictedly oppose the Ahl al-Sunnah, doing so by investigating the doings of the Ahl al-Sunnah, their views, and their beliefs only to thereafter oppose them. Under this type he mentions five narrations.

The first narrations orders the Shi'i to seek a fatwa in order to practice the opposite of it. It states:

Go to the Jurist of the town and seek a fatwa from him regarding your issue. And when he gives you a fatwa then practice upon its opposite, for verily in it is the truth.¹

This narration and other narrations of its like have posed a problem for the Shi'ah. That is because in the reports of the Ahl al-Sunnah, especially in the chapter of jurisprudence, there are many narrations which are in accordance with the narrations of the Shi'ah. Hence if the aforementioned narrations are practiced unrestrictedly it can lead to abandoning both dogmas all together. It is for this reason that Khomeini has tried to resolve this dilemma by commenting upon each of these narrations. He thus makes the following remarks after the aforementioned narration:

The context wherein it should be practiced is desperation and having no way to the reality. Hence the Imam guided him to a solution when all the ways are barricaded. It is thus not understood from this narration that it is permissible to reject our narration if it is in accordance with them.²

¹ Al-Ta‘ādul wa al-Tarjīḥ p. 82.
² Ibid.
Thereafter he says:

Falazārūh mni al-mukāfīn fī 'qā'āthumū mī Amr al-Imāmah wamī yirbat bihā, wā nādālan 'lī 'rd al-khīr al-mawāqīf līhām

Ostensibly, they refer to opposing them in their beliefs and in the matter of Imāmah and whatever is linked to it. But they do not suggest that a narration which is in harmony with them be rejected.1

As you might have noticed, Khomeini considers opposing the Ahl al-Sunnah in their principle beliefs to be a preference factor according to them. So where are those who extend their hands to unite with him? And where are those who claim that he no more practiced Taqiyyah with the Ahl al-Sunnah?

Moving on, as for his instruction to some of his followers to read Ṣalāh with the Ahl al-Sunnah, it is part of his practice of Taqiyyah regarding which he has not made any conclusive remarks in his booklet on Taqiyyah. But many of the Ahl al-Sunnah who take things for what they apparently seem without having knowledge of the reality of Shi‘ī dogma endorse such steps and enumerate them in the feats of Khomeini and his efforts in uniting the Muslims.2

This is in spite of the fact that he has established a chapter in his booklet on Taqiyyah with the title: ‘narrations which suggest the validity of Ṣalāh with the commonality’. Therein he mentions:

إنه قد وردت روایات خاصة تدل على صحة الصلاة مع الناس والترغيب في الحضور في المساجد ووالائتماء بها والاعتداد بها كصحيح حماد بن عثمان عن أبي عبد الله أنه قال: من صلى معهم في الصف الأول كان كمن صلى خلف رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في الصف الأول

There are special narrations which suggest the validity of Ṣalāh performed with the people, and which exhort one to attend their Masjids and follow

1 Al-Ta‘ādul wa al-Tarjīḥ p. 83.
in the Ṣalāh, together with deeming it valid. For example, the authentic narration of Ḥammād ibn ʿUthmān which he narrates from Abū ʿAbd Allah, “He who reads Ṣalāh with them in the first row is like a person who reads Ṣalāh behind Rasūl Allah in the first row.”

Commenting thereupon he says:

 ولا ريب أن الصلاة معه- يعني مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم- صحيحة ذات فضيلة جمة فكذلك الصلاة معهم حال التقیة

It is without doubt that Ṣalāh with him, i.e. with Rasūl Allah, is valid and holds immense virtue. And so is performing Ṣalāh with them whilst practicing Taqiyyah.¹

He thereafter says:

 وموثقة سماعه قال: سألته عن مناكمتهم والصلاة خلفهم؟ فقال: هذا أمر شديد لن تستطيعوا ذلك قد أنكح رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وصلى على وراءهم

And Mūthaqah Samāʿah says, “I asked him regarding marrying them and reading Ṣalāh behind them. He said, “This is a complex issue which you will not be able to withstand. Rasūl Allah married (his daughters to them) and ‘Alī performed Ṣalāh behind them.”²

Khomeini then points out that this type of Taqiyyah is not attached to necessity and that it is specifically practiced with the Ahl al-Sunnah; because in his view Taqiyyah can at times be due to necessity in the situation of fear, just as it can at times be due to cajolery; which is when Taqiyyah becomes the best of deeds according to them. As for the first situation, the matter is quite clear. But regarding the second situation he says the following:

---
¹ Risālah al-Taqiyyah p. 108 (incorporated in the second volumes of his letters and booklets).
² Risālah al-Taqiyyah p. 198.
As for the desired Taqiyyah which is practiced due to cajolery in the presence of which an act of worship becomes the most beloved and virtuous of actions, it is apparently specific to practicing Taqiyyah when dealing with the commonality, as is the focus of the narrations despite their abundance.¹

Hence practicing Taqiyyah with the Ahl al-Sunnah is the best of deeds, and it is unrestrictedly permissible.

Similarly, he points to a third type of Taqiyyah which entails concealment as opposed to exposition. He says:

"فتكون على حد تعبیره بمعنى التحفظ عن أفشاء المذهب وعن إفشاء سر أهل البيت"

"It will thus mean, according to his expression, safeguarding against exposing the dogma and the secret of the Ahl al-Bayt."²

Can it still be claimed that Khomeini gave up Taqiyyah and deceit? Those who claim that they were unaware of the various types of Taqiyyah and that practicing it with the Ahl al-Sunnah is the best of deeds and that it is not necessarily associated with need.

In conclusion, it is sufficient for you to know that he considers the era of the Khulafā’ Rāshidūn to be the era of Taqiyyah. He says:

"إن من بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى زمان خلافة أمير المؤمنين ومن بعده إلى زمن الغيبة كان الأئمة وشيعتهم مبتلين بالتقية أكثر من مائتي سنة"

¹ Ibid. p. 200.
² Ibid. 184.
From the era of Rasūl Allah ﷺ to the Khilāfah of Amīr al-Mu’minīn, and from his time till the era of occultation, the Imāms and their Shī‘ah were compelled to practice Taqiyyah for more than two hundred years.¹

It is clear that Khomeini was from the extremist Shī‘ah. In some cases he actually adopted views which were more reprehensible than the prevalent views. He would deliberately oppose the Ahl al-Sunnah, and at times when otherwise was seen it was due to Taqiyyah.

Fifthly: His view regarding the Comprehensive Authority of the Jurist

The Twelvers believe that comprehensive authority over the Muslims is the exclusive right of a few individuals whose names and amount are stipulated, and whom Allah has chosen just like he chose the Ambiyā’.² The orders given by these individuals are like the orders of Allah; their infallibility is like the infallibility of the Rusul, Messengers of Allah; and their virtue is like the virtue of the Ambiyā’.

However the last of these Imāms, according to them, is in occultation since the year 260 A.H, owing to which they consider it impermissible for anyone to assume the position of leadership till his emergence. Hence they say:

كل راجع ترفع قبل أن يقوم القائم فصاحبها طاغوت وإن كان يدعو إلى الحق

Every flag which is raised before the emergence of the guardian, its bearer is a devil even though he calls toward the truth.³

The Shī‘ah of the bygone centuries lived by this. However, they managed to secure official permission from the absent Imām for their scholars to assume some of the tasks which are exclusively his prerogative, not all. This official permission states:

---

¹ Ibid. 296.
² Refer to the discussion of Imāmah.
³ This has passed already on p. 1003.
As for the issues which newly arise, refer in them to the narrators of our legacy.¹

It is clear from this permission that he is ordering them to refer to the scholars in order to learn the rulings of newly arising issues. Therefore, the Shīʿah ultimately agreed that the representational authority of their scholars was restricted to the services of issuing Fatwas and its like. As for complete authority which includes, politics and establishing a state, it is the exclusive domain of the absent Imām and will remain suspended till his arrival. It is for this reason that the adherents of this dogma lived for centuries considering the leaders of the Muslims to be usurpers and lamented over the fact that they forcibly took control of the leadership of their Imām. They would thus supplicate to Allah at every moment to expedite his release so that he may establish their desired state and in the meanwhile practiced according to the dictates of Taqiyyah with the existing empires. But the occultation of the Imām stretched and continued for almost twelve centuries without him emerging. As a result the Shīʿah remained deprived of an empire based upon their dogma. The idea that the duties of the Mahdī be passed on to the scholars began to play on the minds of some of their later scholars at this time.

Hence Khomeini has indicated that their scholars al-Nirāqī (d. 1245 A.H.)² and al-Nāʿīnī (d. 1355 A.H.)³ both were of the view that the jurist can preside over all the duties and activities of the Imām pertaining to rulership, administration and politics.⁴

Besides the aforementioned, Khomeini has not made mention of any other earlier scholars who propounded the same. Had he found any of them averring

---

¹ See p. 1208 of this book.
² Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Mahdī al-Nirāqī al-Kāshānī (1185 A.H. to 1245 A.H.)
³ Ḥusain ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Najafī al-Nāʿīnī (1273 A.H. to 1355 A.H.)
⁴ Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah p. 74.
the same he would have made mention of them in order to justify his position. Therefore, the conclusion is that the idea of the comprehensive representational authority of the jurist was not found in the Shīʿī dogma before the thirteenth century. Khomeini thus latched onto the views of those before him and began propagating this idea coupled with propagating the need for an empire which is administered by the representative of the Imām in order to implement and enforce the Shīʿī dogma. He says:

Today –in the era of occultation- there is no emphatic text regarding a specific person who will administer the affairs of the empire. So what should the approach be? Should the injunctions of Islam be left altogether? Should we avert ourselves from Islam? Or should we say that Islam only came to rule over people for two centuries and thereafter neglect them? Should we say that Islam has neglected the matters of running a government? We know that the non-existence of a government entails the loss of the Islamic boundaries and its deterioration, just as it entails our negligence in safeguarding our lands. Can this be allowed in our Dīn? Is not government a necessity from the necessities of life?

And in another place he says:

---

1 Ibid. p. 48.
More than a thousand years have passed upon the major occultation of our Imam Mahdī, and probably another thousands of years will pass before circumstances demand that his emergence takes place. So will the injunctions of Islam remain neglected throughout this lengthy period wherein people will as a result practice whatever they want to? Will this not inevitably lead to massacre and disorder? All the laws which were legislated by the Nabī of Islam and which he strove to propagate, explain and implement for twenty three years, was all of that for a limited time only? Has Allah limited the life of Sharīʿah to two hundred years, for example? Leaning toward this view according to me is worse than believing that Islam has been abrogated.¹

He then says:

إذن فإن كل من ينتظار بالرأي القائل بعدم ضرورة تشكيل الحكومة الإسلامية فهو ينكر ضرورة تنفيذ أحكام الإسلام، ويدعو إلى تعطيلها وتجمدها، وهو ينكر بالتالي شمول وخلود الدين الإسلامي الحنيف

Hence anyone who is inclined to the view that there is no need to give shape to an Islamic government is in reality denying the necessity of implementing the laws of Islam; he is advocating its neglect and its subsequent stagnation. And he is, consequently, denying the comprehensive and perpetual nature of the pure religion of Islam.²

Owing to these justifications, Khomeini saw the need for a Shīʿī jurist and his followers to initiate an uprising in order to gain power and rule over the lands of Islam, doing so by representing the Mahdī. But by doing so Khomeini violated many of the established principles of their dogma and opposed the emphasised bequests of their Imāms regarding the importance of anticipating the emergence of the absent Imām and not hastening in leading rebellions.³

1 Ibid. 26.
2 Ibid. 26-27.
3 See p. 1442 of this book.
Hence one of their scholars and authorities in this era says:

وقد توارفت عنهم (ع) حرمة الخروج على أعدائهم وسلالين عصرهم

The impermissibility of revolting against their enemies and the rulers of their times has been diffusely narrated from them (the Imāms).¹

This is because the station of Imāmah according to them is only suitable for a person who is emphatically appointed by Allah and their silence thus does not necessarily entail their approval of other governments.

However, all these justifications which Khomeini has mentioned in order to legitimate the Shi‘ī empire and the representation of the Mahdī could have been diverted in another direction had the scholars of the Shi‘ah been sincere in their speech and well-wishers for their followers, i.e. toward analysing the dogma from its very basis, the fable of occultation and the anticipation of the absent Imam, which has led to such an abysmal end.

Nonetheless, this is a very important attestation from this scholar and authority regarding the Shi‘ī dogma being corrupt from its very basis, the consensus of its adherents throughout history being based upon falsehood and their idea of emphatic appointment of a specific Imām, regarding which they animatedly disputed with the Ahl al-Sunnah for years and due to which they excommunicated them, being baseless as per the evidence provided by history and reality. And now you see that they have become compelled to oppose their own Imām with the idea of ‘the comprehensive representation of the jurist’ after the times have prolonged upon them and after losing hope in the emergence of the one they call ‘the man of the time’. And as a result they laid claim to all his capabilities. Khomeini specifically allocated all his duties and responsibilities to himself and to some of the jurists who were like him in their thinking and dogma due to

¹ Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī al-Baghdādī (also known by the title: ‘the greatest Āyah and the highest religious authority’): Wujūb al-Nahḍah li Ḥifẓ al-Bayḍah p. 93.
seeing the need for taking care of the duties of the absent Imām in administering the state. And in order to satisfy his followers he wrote the books *al-Ḥukūmat al-Islāmiyyah* and *Wilāyat al-Faqīh*.

Furthermore, Khomeini does not agree with anyone presiding over the matters of the state, rather he restricts that to the jurists of the Shīʿah; he restricts rulership and leadership to them. Hence he says:

> وبالرغم من عدم وجود نص على شخص من ینوب عن الإمام (ع) حال غیبه, إلا أن خصائص الحاکم الشرعي... موجودة في معظم فقهاء عصرنا, فإذا أجمعوا أمرهم كان في میسورهم إیجاد وتكوين حكومة عادلة منقطعة النظیر

Despite the absence of an emphatic text regarding who specifically should represent the Imām in his absence, however, the specialities of a Sharʿī ruler are found in most of the jurists of our time. Therefore, if they unite it will be very easy for them to give shape to a government unprecedented in its justice.¹

The question though is that does there remain a need for the emergence of the awaited Mahdī when the scholars of the Shīʿah can give shape to a state unprecedented in its justice?

He also avers that the authority of the Shīʿī jurist is just like the authority of Rasūl Allah ⁸. He says:

> فالمحمدین وله وليا, ون описание ماده وليا, وهذا تى وليا, وكذلك إذا وليا. معنى وليا, أن أمرهما

Allah appointed the Rasūl as the guardian of all the believers. And after him the Imām becomes the guardian. And the implications of the guardianship/authority is that their Sharʿī rulings apply to all.²

---

¹ *Al-Ḥukūmat al-Islāmiyyah* p. 48-49.
² *Al-Ḥukūmat al-Islāmiyyah* p. 51.
He then says:

في نفس هذه القيادة والحكم موجودة لدى الفقيه، بفارق واحد هو أن ولاية الفقيه على الفقهاء الآخرين لا تكون بحيث يستطيع عزلهم أو نصبهم، لأن الفقهاء في الولاية متساوون من ناحية الأهلية.

This same level of authority and leadership is available for the jurist, but with one difference, and that is that the authority of the jurist over the other jurists in not such that he can dismiss them or appoint them. This is because in terms eligibility they are all equal in authority.¹

The idea of Khomeini is thus based upon two principles:

1. According the jurist comprehensive authority.
2. And that only a Shi‘ī jurist can assume the leadership of the state.

This is a departure from the belief that that the Imāms were divinely appointed and were only twelve number; because the jurists of the Shi‘ah are not restricted to a specific number, nor are they appointed emphatically. It also implies that they have returned to the understanding of leadership and Imāmah which the Ahl al-Sunnah hold, to some extent at least, and that they have indirectly confessed that their forefathers and predecessors were deviated.

Nonetheless they consider the idea of ‘the authority of the jurist’ to be a representation of the Mahdī till he returns and hence have not parted from the official stance of their dogma. That is why, according to me, this idea is no different from the idea of the Bābiyyah; for just as a Bāb claims to be the representative of the Mahdī so does the Shi‘ī jurist, with the only difference that Khomeini considers all the scholars to be Bābs, i.e. representatives.

Put another way, Khomeini has made the awaited Mahdī of the Shi‘ah emerge; and that is by allocating all his capabilities and duties to a Shi‘ī jurist. Instead he

¹ Ibid.
has not made one Mahdī emerge but he has made tens of them emerge due to many of them being capable of holding that office according to him. He says:

إن معظم فقهائنا في هذا العصر تتوفر فيهم الخصائص التي تؤهلهم للنیابة عن الإمام المعصوم

Most of our jurists in this age possess the special abilities which make them eligible for the representation of the infallible Imām.¹

And owing to this representation their orders hold the same weight as the orders of Rasūl Allah. He says:

هم الحجة على الناس كما كان الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم حجة الله عليه وسلم حجة الله عليهم، وكل من يتخلف عن طاعتهم فإن الله يؤاخذه ويدعو عنه ذلك

They are the evidence upon the people just as Rasūl Allah was the evidence of Allah upon them. Hence whoever falls short of obeying them Allah will take him to task.²

He also says:

وعلى كل فقد فوض إليهم الأنبیاء جمیع ما فوض إليهم واتمنوهم على ما اؤمنوا عليه

In essence, the Ambiyā’ have handed over to them all the duties that were handed over to them. And they entrusted them with whatever they were entrusted with.³

He likewise says that the state of the Shī‘ī jurist is just like the promised state of the Mahdī:

كلما يفقدنا هو عصا موسى وسیف علي بن أبي طالب (ع) وعزمهما الجبارة. وإذا عزمنا على إقامة حكم إسلامي ستحصل عصا موسى وسیف علي بن أبي طالب

¹ Al-Ḥukūmat al-Islāmiyyah p. 113.
² Ibid. p. 80.
³ Ibid.
All that we are missing is the staff of Mūsā and the sword of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib and their great resoluteness; and when we intend to establish an Islamic rule we will obtain both the staff of Mūsā and the sword of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib.¹

Combining the staff of Mūsā and the sword of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib is, according to me, emblematic of the collaboration of the Jews with the Shīʿah in the state of the scholars. The evidence for this is that some of this has already happened in the state of Khomeini, as is clear in the deals of weapons and the clandestine assistance which exist between the two as was reported by the agencies of news and is famous.

In addition, Khomeini admits that the Shīʿah of the past did not venture on giving shape to a Shīʿī state. He says:

في السابق لم نعمل ولم ننهض سویة لتشكیل حكومة تحطم الخائنین المفسدین

In the past we had not strove and risen fully to give shape to a government which would destroy the mischief making traitors.²

Likewise he says:

ولم تسنح الفرصة لأنمتنا للأخذ بزمام الأمور، وكانوا بانتظارها حتى آخر لحظة من الحياة، فعلى الفقهاء العدول أن يتحينوا هم الفرص ويتوزها من أجل تنظيم وتشكیل حكومة

The opportunity was never opportune for our Imāms to take hold of the reign of affairs. And they were waiting for it till the last moment of their lives. Hence it is the responsibility of the jurist to anticipate opportunities and take advantage of them in order to give shape to a government.³

1 These are part of the things the Mahdī allegedly inherited from the Ambiyā’ and the Imāms (Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/231).
2 Ibid. p. 40.
3 Al-Ḥukūmat al-Islāmiyyah p. 54.
It is crucial to note that there were Shīʿī empires that rose and fell in the past, but because they were not ruled by the scholars and the ‘representatives of the infallible Imām’ they were not considered to be Islamic. Hence they consider their state to be the first Islamic, i.e. Shīʿī, state. One of the Shīʿah scholars says:

إن الخميني أسس الجمهوریة الإسلامیة العظمی في إیران لأول مرة في تاريخ الإسلام وحقق حلم الأنبیاء والرسول الأعظم صلى الله عليه وسلم والأئمة المعصومین عليه السلام

Khomeini laid the foundation of the greatest Islamic republic in Iran for the first time in the history of Islam. He fulfilled the dream of the Ambiyā’ and the greatest Prophet and the infallible Imāms.

Furthermore, their scholar al-Ṭāliqānī opines that the government of Rasūl Allah and his Khulafā’ cannot match with their state and that the former merely paved the way for the establishment of the latter. He says:

إننا نعتقد أن الجمهوریة الإسلامية هي المؤهلة للحیاة في هذا الزمان، ولم تكن مؤهلة للحیاة في فجر الإسلام... إن التحولات الاجتماعية والسياسية التي شهدها العالم منذ الرسول الخلفاء الراشدون وحتى اليوم هي التي توفر الأساس الموضوعي لقيام الجمهوریة الإسلامية

We believe that the Islamic republic is what facilitates life in this era, whereas previously, at the dawn of Islam, it was not such... All the social and political changes which the world has witnessed from the time of Rasūl Allah and the rightly guided Khulafā’ up to the present day provide the objective foundation for the Islamic republic.

As you can see, the nature of the Shīʿī viewpoint in anything always progresses in extremism, in consecrating specific individuals and in holding fanatical beliefs, as

1 Ahmad al-Fihrī (also called ‘al-ʿAllāmah, the very knowledgeable); in his introduction to the book Sirr al-Ṣalāh of Khomeini (p. 10)
2 This was published by the al-Safīr magazine of Lebanon on 31-3- 1979; and it was cited by Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah who remarked that it is a novel understanding of the Islamic republic which cannot be advocate but by a person who lives the reality of Islam with his heart and mind! See: al-Khumaynī wa al-Dawlah al-Islāmiyyah p. 113.
is obvious in the viewpoint of al-Ṭāliqānī regarding the republic of Iran. Instead some have even went to the extreme that the Imāms had prophesized the coming of Khomeini.¹

Moving on, what the tasks of the Mahdī will be after his return from occultation has previously been mentioned already from the books of the Shī’ah; it was cited that the only duties he will have is killing and taking revenge, to the extent that he will be sent with the Jafr Aḥmar (red skin) and slaughter, and that he will carry out all his atrocities against the Arabs.² We see the signs of this alleged task becoming clear in the state of the scholars; for Khomeini and his cohorts have put into motion the institution of the state of the Mahdī by carrying out frightening massacres in and out of Iran.

The reality is that the fabricators of the narrations of the massacre which is promised to take place after the advent of the absent Imām knew very well that the concepts of occultation and the Mahdī are nothing more than fantasies. However they used the forgery of narrations to express the inner sentiments of their hearts and the hatred that they bear. Similar is the case of the scholars of the Shī’ah, most of who are heretics, who know that the concept of the Mahdī is a fable and thus whenever they deem the time opportune to fulfil their hopes of massacring the Muslims they take full advantage of it without waiting for the emergence of their Mahdī; they know very well that he will never emerge and that he does not exist at all.

The clearest evidence in this regard comes from Khomeini himself who in his book *Tahrīr al-Wasīlah* establishes that due to the absence of the Mahdī it is not permissible to engage in warfare:

في عصر غيبة ولي الأمر وسلطان العصر عجل الله فرجه الشريف يقوم نوابه وهم الفقهاء الجامعون لشرائط الفتوى والقضاء مقامه في إجراي السياسيات وسائر ما للإمام عليه السلام إلا البداية بالجهاد

---

² See: p. 1181, onwards of this book.
During the era of the absence of the guardian of the affair and the king of the time, may Allah expedite his noble release, his representatives who are the jurist qualified with all the requisites of fatwa and judicature, will fill his space in implementing all the policies and whatever else is the prerogative of the Imām with the exception of initiating Jihād.¹

But after having established his state he includes the following in its constitution:

إن جیش الجمهوریة الإسلامیة... ل یتحملان فقط مسؤولیة حفظ وحراسة الحدود، وإنما يتكفلان أيضا بحمل رسالة عقائدویة أي الجهاد فی سبيل الله، والنضال من أجل توسيع حاکمیة قانون اللہ فی كافة أرجاء العالم

The army of the Muslim republic... will not only assume the responsibility of safeguarding the boarders, but they will also be responsible for carrying a doctrinal message, i.e. doing Jihād in the path of Allah and struggling in order to broaden the comprehensive sovereignty of the law of Allah in all parts of the world.²

The contradiction is abundantly clear; in Ṭahrīr al-Wasīlah he states that Jihād falls part of the duties of the Mahdī and in the constitution of their state he states that it is the responsibility of the army and the jurist. This is due to his new idea of the ‘authority of the jurist’ wherein all the responsibilities of the Mahdī have been passed on to the Shīʿī jurist. In fact this is clearly mentioned in their constitution:

في زمن غیبة الإمام المهدي عجل الله تعالى فرجله تعتبر ولیة الأمر وإمامة الأمة فی جمهوریة إیران الإسلامیة بید الفقیه

During the era of the occultation of the Imām Mahdī, may Allah expedite his release, the authority of the affairs and the leadership of the Ummah in the Islamic republic of Iran will be in the hands of the jurist.³

---

1 Ṭahrīr al-Wasīlah 1/482.
2 Al-Dustūr li Jumhūriyyah Īrān (from the publications of Mu’assasah al-Shahīd) p. 16; also see the publication of Wizārah al-Irshād al-Īrāniyyah: p. 10.
3 Dustūr al-Jumhūriyyah al-Islāmiyyah fi Īrān (Wizārah al-Irshād al-Īrāniyyah) p. 18
As a result of this policy, the first thing that they did after the establishment of their state was attack the Muslims with their armies and allies in some parts of the Muslim world. Despite that Khomeini still claimed that these attacks fall under the ambit of defence. No limits indeed to their manipulation. He says:

إننا لا نريد أن نرفع السلاح ونهاجم أحدا. فالعراق يهاجمنا منذ مدة، بينما نحن لا نهاجمه، وإنما ندافع فقط فالدفاع أمر واجب

We do not want to raise weapons and attack anybody, but Iraq has been attacking us for a while now and we have not been attacking it. All we are doing is defending, for defence is compulsory.¹

But contrary to this, he asserts that he wants to export his revolution. He says:

إننا نريد أن نصدر ثورتنا الإسلامية إلى كافة البلاد الإسلامية

We want to export our Islamic revolution to all the Muslims lands.²

He does not intend to do so in peaceful ways, rather he wants to impose his dogma upon the Muslims with force. He indicated to this before the establishment of their state and confirmed that the way to go about achieving this objective is establishing a Shīʿī state which will take charge of this matter. He says:

ونحن لا نملك الوسيلة إلى توحيد الأمة الإسلامية وتحرير أراضيها من يد المستعمرين و إسقاط الحكومات العميلة لهم، إلا أن نسعى إلى إقامة حكومتنا الإسلامية. وهذه بدورها سوف تتكلل أعمالها بالنجاح يوم تتمكن من تحطم رؤوس الخيانة، وتتمزق الأوطان والأصنام البشرية التي تنشر الظلم والفساد في الأرض

We have no means to unite the Islamic Ummah,³ free its lands from the hands of the colonialists and overthrow the governments which are their

---

¹ The speech of Khomeini regarding the issue of liberating Palestine and the Mahdī p. 9-10.
² Ibid. p. 10.
³ i.e. upon the dogma of the Shīʿah.
agents with the exception of striving to establish our Islamic government. This government will crown its activities with success the day it succeeds in destroying the heads of betrayal and the human idols who are spreading oppression and corruption on the earth.¹

Interestingly, these Shīʿah do not criticise the governments for the aforementioned reason, because it is clear that even if a government be the best government on the surface of this earth it would still be despised and attacked by the Shīʿah, unless it is based on their dogma. This is clear from their view regarding the Khilāfah of the three Khulafā’ ⁰M­⁰.

Nonetheless, the alleged task of the Mahdī slaughtering the Muslims features in the speeches of their scholars who assert that Khomeini will initiate it due to him being the representative of the Mahdī. Owing to their tendency of impatience and lack of concealment, as described by their Imām,² one of their scholars has exposed this particular matter. Hence in an official republican ceremony which was held in Abadan on 17/3/1979 in support of the establishment of the Islamic republic, doctor Muḥammad Mahdī Ṣādiqī delivered a sermon which was transcribed in both Arabic and Persian and which was described by the broadcasting radio as ‘important, wherein he said:

أصرح يا إخواني المسلمين في مشارق الأرض ومغاربها أن مكة المكرمة حرم الله المن يحتلها شرذمة أشد من اليهود

I boldly mention, O my Muslims brothers in the east and the west of the earth, that Makkah is currently occupied by a group which is worse than the Jews.

Prior to that he mentioned that if the revolution is successful they will go to al-Quds, Makkah, Afghanistan and different places.³

---

¹ Al-Ḥukūmat al-Islāmiyyah p. 35.
² Uṣūl al-Kāfi 1/222.
³ This sermon was broadcasted from Abadan at 12:00 PM on 17/3/1979; see Wa Jā’ Dawr al-Majūs p. 344-347.
As you have noticed, they consider Makkah to be like al-Quds, i.e. occupied by the Jews, and like Afghanistan which was occupied by the communist. Whereas at the same time you will find that they sympathise with the disbelieving Nuṣayrī ruler of Syria and do not criticise him in any way.

Similarly, the al-Shahīd magazine (the voice of the Shīʿī scholars of Qum) in its 46th edition, published on the 16th Shawwāl 1400 A.H., published a picture which represented the blessed Ka'bah, and next to it was a picture which represented al-Masjid al-Aqṣā, and between them was a hand holding a gun under which was written:

سنحرر القبليتين

We will liberate the two Qiblahs.¹

The Opposition of some of the Shīʿī scholars of the idea of Khomeini regarding the Representational Authority of the Jurist

The idea of Khomeini, which transfers all the tasks and duties of the Mahdī to the jurist and restricts the authoritative leadership to him, induced opposition from many Shīʿah scholars. As a result a very animated dispute broke out between Khomeini and one of their leading scholars and references Sharīʿatmadārī.² A group of their scholars similarly openly announced their opposition of his position.³

---

¹ See the aforementioned edition of the al-Shahīd magazine; also see: the Saudi newspaper al-Madīnah, published on 27th of Dhī al-Qa’dah 1400 A.H.; also see what Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Qādir Āzād (the head of Majlis al-ʿUlamā’, Pakistan) has written regarding what he witnessed during his visit of Iran. He says that, on the wall of the Hilton hotel in Tehran where slogans are normally displayed, he saw written ‘We will free the Ka’bah’, al-Quds and Palestine from the hands of the disbelievers’ (see: Muḥammad Āzād: al-Fitnah al-Khumainiyah p. 9).


Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah likewise displayed his bafflement at the extent to which Khomeini went in asserting his idea, i.e. equalising the capacities of the infallible Imām and the Jurists. He says:

The verdict of the infallible and his order is just like revelation from Allah the Almighty and the All Knowing. 'Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed.' This implies that the infallible possess the right of obedience and leadership over the mature and the immature, the learned and the unlettered. It also implies that the spiritual and time-confined (to his presence) leadership is specific to him alone, without any partner. Or else it would entail that the authority is to his loss and not to his advantage, knowing fully well that there is no one besides Allah in whose control is creation and dominion above the infallible Imām... After this can it still be said that in his absence his authority is fully transferred to the jurist?

Hence the idea of Khomeini according to him is extremely fanatical due to the problem: how can the ruling of a jurist be equated to the ruling of the infallible Imām. He further explains:

1 Sūrah al-Najm: 3.
2 Al-Khumaynī wa al-Dawlah al-Islāmiyyah p. 59.
The ruling of the infallible is free from doubts because in itself it is evidence and is not derived from another evidence. It is also based on fact/reality and not upon apparent suggestions. As for the jurist, his ruling is derived (from textual evidence) and is based upon external suggestions. Not only that, but it is susceptible to forgetfulness, being overwhelmed by conceit and pride, personal emotions, encompassing impact, environment and change in economic conditions and social standing. I have witnessed many instances wherein oppressive rulings were passed. The context does not allow for citing examples. However, I have known a jurist to be disinclined from the world and pious before assuming leadership, but after assuming it people started to talk about his leanings changing with his children and relatives-in-law.¹

This is a testification from a scholar against his own; a testification which says that whenever a jurist secures an opportunity of leadership his image as a pious and ascetic scholar soon changes. And these scholars, whom he describes with the above, according to Khomeini are meant to be the leaders of the Ummah.

Hence the opponents of the viewpoint of Khomeini still feel that the authority of the jurist is much more restricted than the authority of the Infallible Imām.² According to them it does not exceed what is narrated in their legacy, i.e. the authority of issuing fatwas, assuming judicial positions, overseeing endowments, the wealth of the absent Imām and the inheritance of those who have inheritors.³

Al-Mughniyah has, in order to support his viewpoint, drawn evidence from the statements of a number of their senior scholars and has thereafter violated the evidences advanced by Khomeini. He clarifies that they do not in any way refer to the comprehensive authority which he seeks to prove.

¹ Al-Khumaynī wa al-Dawlah al-Islāmiyyah p. 59-60.
² Ibid. p. 61.
³ Ibid. p. 60.
Whilst there is no need for us to delve in to the details of this debate, it is crucial to note that Khomeini declares that the classical position of his dogma, due to it averring that the authority of the jurist does not include authority in leadership, entails the annulment of the injunctions of Islam and is equivalent to believing that Din is abrogated. But on the other hand, Khomeini’s proofs are not strong enough to support his viewpoint and thus the rulings he has passed regarding his dogma still remain true and that is that they are based upon principles contrary to Sharīʿah, reason and the nature of things.

Conversely, the opposite view returns the matter of leadership to the common people and does not consider it specific to the scholars of the Shiʿah. These scholars thus remain in the setting they were officially placed in, i.e. their restricted authority, till the Mahdī emerges and takes charge of both worldly and religious affairs. According to the secular language of these times this is referred to as separating religion from the state. The Shiʿī dogma thus oscillates between the extremism of Khomeini and the subtle call for separation between religion and the state. Any dogma which is based on falsehood will inevitably only emerge with such contradictions.

Likewise, both positions settle upon the invalidity of the Shiʿī dogma in its claim of emphatic appointments of the Imāms; because both of them do not restrict leadership to a specific individual except the Mahdī who is missing, absent and will never return due to him not existing at all.

The Constitution of the State of the Scholars

The Islamic republic of Iran had announced its constitution in a book which was published by the ministry of Islamic council. Its first edition was published in 1406 A.H and the contents of this constitution had previously been published in the Iranian magazine al-Shahīd in a special edition.¹

---

¹ The publication of Mu‘assasah al-Shahīd, Qum, 1979 A.H.
Hereunder I will present some of the contents of the constitution in order to see whether it really represents the constitution of a Muslim country, as they claim, or not.

The constitution establishes in its ‘twelfth law’ that:

الدين الرسمي لإیران هو الإسلام، والمذهب الجعفری الایشی عشري، وهذ الأصل يبقى إلى الأبد غير قابل للتغيير

The official religion of Iran is Islam and the Twelver Jaʿfarī dogma. This law will remain forever without any room for change.1

The constitution also emphatically makes mention of the Twelver conception of Imāmah and links the idea of Khomeini regarding the representational authority of the jurist to the issue of Imāmah. It states:

إن ولیة الفقیه اعتمادا (عني معتمدة) على استمرار ولیة الأمر والأمامة

The authority of the jurist is based upon the continuity of leadership and Imāmah.2

As you can see, they openly proclaim fanatical sectarianism but at the same time deem themselves the Islamic republic. Probably this statement of theirs suggests that their dogma does not fall part of Islam and thus it has to be mentioned separately alongside Islam as another religion. This is besides the fact that you will very frequently find them claiming that their dogma is not any different from the other Islamic denominations except in a few secondary issues. If that was really the case, then why do they unequivocally state the ‘Jaʿfarī dogma’ in their constitution?

Furthermore, what prevents this law from not changing forever? Do they have knowledge of the unseen or have they made an agreement with Allah? Why do

1 Al-Dustūr p. 20.
2 Ibid. 9.
they not open their eyes to the truth which is with the Ahl al-Sunnah and free themselves of their despised fanaticism? The name of the country should rather be the ‘Jaʿfarī republic’; because an Islamic state is based upon Islam and not upon the dogma of a particular denomination. Also because when the ruler adopts a particular dogma or takes a particular stance he does so based upon the strength of the evidence and not due to fanaticism and inheritance from the predecessors. But the Shīʿah have, by way of this law, made it clear that they follow some of their scholars who opine that Twelver Shīʿism is a religion and not a denomination.  

Part of the twelfth law suggests that the narrations of their Imāms are to replace the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. They thus exchange that which is superior for that which is inferior. It says:

The administration of the Islamic republic is based upon the continuous application of Ijtihād by the scholars who possess all the requisites, upon the basis of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah of the Infallibles, may the peace of Allah be upon them all.

In this article there is no acknowledgment of the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. This is for the simple reason that they do not believe in it, hence they only adopt the Sunnah of the infallibles whom they deem better than the Ambiyāʾ and the Messengers.

Can this constitution be considered an Islamic one when it does not acknowledge the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ?

As a result of this article they will draw from Uṣūl al-Kāfī, Bihār al-Anwār and other books with all the heresies and deviances which they contain. Because these are the books which have conveyed the Sunnah of the infallibles to them.

---

1 See the footnote no. 3 on p. 992 of this book.
2 Al-Dustūr p. 15, 16.
Furthermore, in some articles of the constitution you will find reference to ‘Persian slogans and nationalistic suggestions. The fifteenth law states:

اللغة والكتابة الرسمیة والعامة هي الفارسیة لشعب أیران، فيجب أن تكون الوثائق والمراسلات والمنشورات الرسمیة والكتب الدراسیة بهذه اللغة

The official and public spoken and written language for the Iranians is Persian. Hence it is compulsory that all documents, correspondence, official texts, and syllabi be in this language.

As you can see, this article is based upon Iranian nationalism. Islam has one language which is Arabic, not because it is the language of the Arabs, but because it is the language of the Qur’an, the Sunnah, the state of Rasūl Allah, the Ṣaḥābah, and their successors.

The sixteenth law states that their recourse will be to public opinion (not to Qur’an and Sunnah):

یجب أن تدار شؤون البلاد في جمهورية إیران الإسلامية على رأي الأمة

It is compulsory that the matters of the lands in the Islamic republic of Iran be administered according to the opinion of the Ummah.¹

There is no doubt that the affairs of an Islamic state are administered in light of the Qur’an and the Sunnah; the majority view is not the basis of governance in Islam, it is the basis of secular movements and organisations.

This principles is further elaborated in what appears in the fifty ninth law which states:

ممارسة السلطة التشريعيّة قد تتم أحيانًا عن طريق الاستفتاء الشعبي العام، وذلك في القضايا الاقتصادية والسياسية والاجتماعية والثقافية الهامة. ويجري هذا الاستفتاء العام بناء على طلب أكثر من ثلثي مجموع أعضاء المجلس

¹ Al-Dustūr p. 18.
Implementing the Sharī‘i jurisdiction at times will take place after inquiring the prevalent public opinion in economical, political, social, and important academic issues. This public inquiry will be based upon the demand of more than two thirds of the members of the parliament.¹

After having deprived themselves of the second legislative source, i.e. the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah صل الله عليه وسلم, it is no surprise that they resort to public opinion. Their scholar Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī, the author of al-Ḥadā‘iq, suggested to them that they should search for another procedure other than this one due to it no fulfilling what they want.²

This is just a glimpse of what appears in their constitution and is taken from the last edition which was published in 1406 A.H.³

1 Ibid. p. 46.

2 See his exact words and statements on p. 527 - 528 of this book.

3 It is crucial to note here that the translation of the constitution was published by the Lebanon newspaper al-Safīr by Muḥammad Ṣādiq al-Ḥusaynī, but with differences between it and the last official publication of the constitution. Probably Taqiyyah played its role in the changes that were made in order to save the image of the dogma from being tarnished.

Hizb al-Tahrir, which is apparently an organization that sympathises with the Iranian revolution, supports it and considers it to be the desired Islamic rule, assumed the task of examining the articles of the constitution as was published by the al-Safīr newspaper after having asked the Iranian embassy in Lebanon regarding the credibility of the published translation and receiving the response that it is precise and trustworthy. Following the study it became clear to them, as was published in a small booklet, that with the exception of the name the constitution has nothing to do with Islam. It also mentions that in the eighth section, which is regarding judicial authority, under articles no. 131, 132, 135 and 136 the contents suggest that the statutory civil law will be implemented in the courts (see: the text of the critique of the Iranian constitution which was published by Hīzb al-Taḥrīr p. 48).

The organisation concludes that:

ليس دستورا إسلاميا، ولم یأخذ أحكامه من كتاب الله وسنة رسوله، ویتبين أن واضعه یتمیز بعقلیة غربیة، ول یتمتع بعقلیة إسلامیة

It is not an Islamic constitution and has not drawn its rulings from the Book of Allah and from the Sunnah of His Rasūl. It is clear that its formalisers have a western mentality and do not have an Islamic one. (See: Ibid. p. 52).

continued...
It is clear that it does not represent an Islamic state, rather it represents a Persian and Rāfīḍī Jaʿfarī state; it does not draw its laws from the Qur’ān and the Sunnah and is instead associated with the narrations of al-Kulaynī and his likes, what they term as the Sunnah of the infallibles.

It also says:

إذا وضع هذا الدستور موضع التنفيذ فإنه ل يجعل الدولة دولة إسلامية

If this constitution is implemented it will not make the state and Islamic state.

It also says:

بأنه يجب أن يكون الدستور منبثقا من العقيدة الإسلامية، ومأخوذة كل مواده من كتاب الله وسنة رسوله

It is crucial that the constitution stem from Islamic belief and that all its articles be drawn from the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Rasūl. (Ibid.)

This is the analyses of Hizb al-Tahrir which supports the Iranian government and is similar to the Shīʿah in its ideology due to it suspending the implementation of some of the laws of Islam till the establishment of a Khilāfah (which is akin to the Shīʿah suspending some of the injunctions of their dogma till the emergence of the absent Imam.) Had it not been for fear of elongating the discussion I would have presented the issues that they raised. The analyses coupled with a proposed Islamic constitution was sent to Khomeini. It seems as if the Shīʿah benefitted from that and changed some of the articles which raise criticism against their constitution, as becomes clear by studying the last publication thereof. But despite the changes it is still not fully empty of misguidance, as was alluded to in the brief study. (To learn about Hizb al-Tahrir see: Salīm al-Hilālī and Ziyād al-Dabīj: Kitāb al-Jamāʿ āt al-Islāmiyyah fi Dawʾ al-Kitāb wa al-Sunnah p. 137, onwards).
The Fifth Chapter

This chapter comprises of:

1. Their influence on the Muslim World
2. The Ruling Regarding them

Their influence on the Muslim world

The influence the Shīʿah have had upon the Muslim world in the various stages of history is a very vast and great topic; it includes several topics and various dimensions which necessitate multiple books and demand a lot of effort. Studying the historical events which took place in Iraq alone in the fourth and the fifth centuries when the Shīʿah had a very great impact is a very broad topic. So how much more strenuous would it be to discuss their impact on the entire Muslim world. Likewise, studying the ever-increasing Shīʿī movements in our times in various parts of the Muslim world and the results that they are producing requires field studies, mass networks, and multiple journeys.

All of this cannot possibly be put together in a book, let alone a chapter of a book which is primarily concerned with studying and analysing the principle doctrines of the Shīʿah.

It is for these reasons that I will suffice in this chapter upon allusions, cursory glances and concise words. Similarly I will suffice on portions of the topic rather than its whole, on one example of one town and one time, for example, rather than doing an in-depth and extensive study.

In order to not let the discussion lose focus I will mention the impact they have had in various spheres of life, i.e. are the following:

1. Doctrinal and ideological sphere
2. Political sphere
3. Social sphere
4. Economical sphere

This is a mere categorisation, otherwise the influences they have had in these spheres are interlinked. This is because the misfortune of innovation is such that it affects all spheres of life. A person who will study the history of this Ummah and the development of various innovative ideologies which emerged throughout time will sense the harms thereof in the entire Muslim empire. Listen to, for example what Ibn Taymiyyah has said regarding the fall of the Umayyad Empire:

إن دولة بني أمية كان انقراضها بسبب هذا الجعد المعطل

The fall of the Umayyad Empire was due to this Jaʿd, the denier of the attributes of Allah1, amongst other reasons.2

He further says:

وهذا الجعد إليه ينسب مروان بن محمد الجعدي آخر خلفاء بني أمية، وكان شؤمه عاد عليه حتى زالت الدولة، فإنه إذا ظهرت البدع التي تخالف دين الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم انتمق الله ممن خالف الرسول وانتصر لهم

Marwān ibn Muḥammad al-Jaʿdī, the last of the rulers of the Banū Umayyah, is attributed to this Jaʿd. His misfortune turned against him and caused the fall of the empire. When innovations which oppose the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah3 emerge Allah takes revenge from those who oppose the prophets and grants them victory.3

---

1 i.e. al-Jaʿd ibn Dirham, the first person to deny the names and attributes of Allah
2 Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyah 13/182.
3 Ibid. 13/177.
This Islamic interpretation of historical events is in contrast to the approach of many historians who only analyse history from a purely materialistic perspective; it is that branch of knowledge which can only be understood by the people of īmān.

The Doctrinal and Ideological Sphere

This is a very vast topic, but hereunder we will allude to some aspects thereof.

Bringing about Shirk in the Ummah of Muḥammad

Their beliefs regarding Imāmah and the Imāms have had a clear influence in bringing about Shirk and other beliefs associated to it in the Muslim world. Some scholars thus assert that the Shīʿah were the first people to bring about Shirk and the worship of graves in the Ummah of Muḥammad. Hence we find that the exaggerations of the Shīʿah regarding the Imāms transformed into exaggerations regarding their graves. And in order to support their polytheistic tendencies they invented narrations.

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

وأول من وضع هذه الأحاديث في السفر لزيارة المشاهد التي على القبور أهل البدع من الروافض و نحوهم الذين يعطلون المساجد ويعظمون المشاهد التي يشرك فيها ويكذب فيها وينبذ عنها دين لم ينزل الله به سلطانًا فإن الكتاب والسنة إنما فيها ذكر المساجد والمشاهد

The first people to forge narrations regarding travelling to visit holy sites situated at graves are the Shīʿah innovators and others like them; people who abandon the Masjids and consecrate the shrines where shirk is committed, lies are spoken, and such innovations are done for which Allah has revealed no evidence. In the Qurʾān there is only mention of Masjids, not of shrines and holy sites.

---

1 See: al-Radd ʿalā al-Akhnāʿī: p. 47.
Today the holy sites of the Shīʿah and their shrines have become a locus of Shirk and the worship of others besides Allah. Many people who have visited the lands of the Shīʿah have attested to these polytheistic practices. And sadly the ill-effects of these practices have slowly seeped into the lands of the Ahl al-Sunnah as well. The Shīʿah are the originators of this, a reality to which their books attest.

There is no need for us to enlist the names of these shrines and holy sites and sketch what takes place in them due to all of that being very popular.

**Obstructing From the Dīn of Allah**

The Shīʿī ideology, with all its discrepancies and deviances which have passed, was and still remains accompanied by the great propaganda of their scholars who seek in whichever way possible to increase their numbers.

This propaganda is based upon a great lie which the Shīʿah are masters at manipulating, and which they deploy to mislead their followers and the ignorant among the Muslims. This lie says that the irregularities of the Shīʿah are supported by the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah, which is why you will more often than not hear them saying that there are no differences between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah.

Indeed, we very often read this type of approach being advanced in their books where they draw evidence from the books of those whom they term the ‘commonality’.

---

1 See: p. 1417 onwards of this book.

2 There probably isn’t a book from their later and contemporary books which does not deploy this approach. And the worst of them in its exaggerations is the book *Bulūgh al-Marām* which is fully based upon this approach and which is, owing to its blatant lies an indictment upon the Shīʿah for the rest of time. But despite that one of their scholars considers it to be a source of honour. (See: Muḥsin al-ʿĀmilī: *al-Shīʿah* p. 134; also see the documents and texts attached to my book on the topic on *Taqrīb*, bridging the gap between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah).
Many people whose hearts Allah has misguided were misled by this great lie. Consequently they assumed that the religion of Islam does not entail anything else other than what these innovators propagate. They thereafter deemed that to berationally flawed and thus left the fold of Islam and fell into the ditches of heresy and apostasy. An evident example of this is the Kharamiyyah, the followers of Bābak al-Kharmī, and the Qarāmiṭah, the followers of Abū Saʿīd al-Janābī, amongst others, who criticize the religion of Islam in its totality with their hands and tongues.

There is no doubt that propagating innovations in the name of Islam is the greatest means of obstructing from the path of Allah; for how can an intelligent person ever accept the erroneous beliefs of Ghaybah (occultation), Rajʿah, the revilement of the Ṣaḥābah and the esoteric interpretative tradition?

1 The Kharamiyyah consists of two sects: the first sect existed before the emergence of the Islamic state. They are the followers of Mazdak al-Ibāḥī who called for partnership in all wealth and sexual rights. They caused a lot of mischief in the lands of Persia and were eventually destroyed by the Persian king Anūshirwān, known as the just king, who died before the advent of Nabī H. The second sect emerged in the Islamic empire. They are the Bābikiyyah, the followers of Bābak al-Kharmī who first appeared on the outskirts of Azerbaijan and developed a large followership. He would deem all impermissible acts permissible. He defeated many of the Abbasid armies for a period of twenty years until eventually he was captured with his brother Ishāq and hanged in Surr man Raʿā under the reign of Muʿtaṣim in the year 223 A.H.

There is no doubt that the Kharamiyyah who appeared in the Muslim empire were an extension of the ancient Persian cult, i.e. the first Mazdakiyyah, and were responsible for the further deviation of the Shi‘ah. Al-Nawbakhtī says that extremism started from them, for they were the first ones to claim that the Imāms are deities and that they are their messengers. They likewise believed in the transmigration of souls and rejected the afterlife. (See: al-Nawbakhtī: Firaq al-Shī‘ah p. 36; Ibn al-Naḍīm: al-Fihrist p. 342, 344; al-Isfarā’īnī: al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn p. 79-80; al-Maḥmūdī: al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd p. 22; al-Ghazālī: Faḍā’iḥ al-Bāṭiniyyah p. 14, onwards).

2 One of the sects of the Ismāʿīliyyah which we have already introduced on p. 124 (footnote 4). They are known as the Qarāmiṭah due to the founding figure Hamdān Qarmaṭ who was one of their propagators in the initial stages. (See: Faḍā’iḥ al-Bāṭiniyyah p. 12).

3 Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/114.
Thus it is not far-fetched to assume in these times that the purpose for establishing
the state of the scholars was to curb the hopes of the Muslims regarding the return
of the Khilāfah and the unity of the Ummah. It was intended to guard against the
spread of an Islamic awakening in the world. Because it is undisputable that a
state which distorts Islam and gives a completely false impression regarding the
aspirations of the Muslims can destroy the hopes of the people, the fervour of
their aspirations and the flame of enthusiasm in the youth of the Ummah. The
disbelieving colonialists thus pay a lot of attention to these innovative ideologies
and follow their activities carefully via a group of researches, called ‘the
Orientalists’, who are mostly advisors in ministries of foreign affairs. As a result
the policies of most major countries are formulated after studying the works of
the Orientalists regarding the history of sectarian divisions within Islam. The
disbelieving colonialists have likewise not forgotten their history with us, as is
attested to by the stances they have taken and by the comments some of their
leaders have made, and as was exposed by Europeans like Muhammad Asad who
reverted to Islam in his book al-Islām ‘alā Muftaraq al-Ṭuruq.¹

Nonetheless, whether the establishment of the state of the scholars and the
ever-increasing influence of the Shī‘ah in the Muslims world are intended by the

¹ In his book he mentions, “The crusade wars had played the first and most important role in
determining the stance of Europe regarding Islam.” (al-Islām ‘alā Muftaraq al-Ṭuruq p. 55). He further
says that Europe benefitted from the Muslim world more than the Muslim world benefitted from it.
But it did not acknowledge this good, not even by lessening its hatred against Islam. Instead the very
opposite happened; enmity increased with the progress of time and subsequently became second-
nature. As a result this hatred would instigate public conscience whenever the word Muslim was
mentioned. It became so commonplace among them that it settled deep down in the heart of every
male and female European. (See: ibid. 59-60).

He also says that these hateful sentiments remained alive despite the passage of all the eras of
enlightenment and continuously increased despite the departure of the religious conscience which
had engendered all this hatred. He then says that this is not strange given the fact that psychologist
assert that at times even though a person loses all the religious tendencies he had assimilated in his
childhood, but some special traits still defy all rationality. (See: Ibid. 60-61).

I say that the established laws of psychology are applicable to the religions of Europe, but not to the
religion of Islam which is based upon sound human disposition.
disbelieving enemy or not, the effects in preventing from the Dīn of Allah and the emergence of heresy which seems persuasive to many Muslims are still the greatest problem. This will become clear from the following discussion.

**The Emergence of Heterodoxy and Heresy**

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions that the basis for the deviance of the Ismāʿīliyyah, the Nuşayriyyah and other heretics and hypocrites is that they believed the Rāfiḍah who promulgated regarding the interpretation of the Qurʾān and the Sunnah.¹ The ʿUbaydī Imams would base the validity of their claims upon the lies invented by the Rāfiḍah in order to win the support of their lay partisans. They would then take a person from criticising the Ṣaḥābah to criticising ʿAlī and then to criticising divinity, as laid out for them by the master of the biggest message and the greatest human. And thus Rafḍ has been the greatest door which leads to disbelief and heresy.²

The Rāfiḍah are thus the door through which these heretics enter into all types of heresies regarding the names of Allah and the verses of His clear Book, as is acknowledged by the heads of the heretics like the Qarāmiṭah and other hypocrites.³

From the discussions that have passed in this book, it is clear that the narrations of the Twelvers and their traditions which they claim to have received from the Ahl al-Bayt are the ideal locus and fertile ground for the emergence of fanatical ideologies and heretical denominations. Because their legacy is a collection of the remnants of the irregular views and ideas of various Shīʿī sects, despite their disparate ideas, which disunited this Ummah and destroyed its matter. At first their views reached us through the books of heresiography, but thereafter we found that the narrations of the Twelvers support them and attest to them.⁴

---

¹ *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/3.
² Ibid.
³ Ibid. 1/3.
⁴ See p. 1297-1298 of this book.
And hence many sects like the Shaykhiyyah, the Kashfiyyah, and the Bābiyyah, which were infamous for their extremism and disbelief, emerged from the Twelver dogma. The author of al-Muntaqā thus says that Rafḍ houses the worst of denominations.¹ He then enlists many of the heretical sects which live under the umbrella of Rafḍ. Al-Ghazālī likewise says:

إن مذهب الباطنية ظاهره الرفض، وباطنه الكفر المحض

The dogma of the Bāṭiniyyah is Rafḍ externally and sheer disbelief internally.²

They are thus disbelievers who disguise themselves with the garb of Shīʿism. It seems as if they form the majority today, to the extent that Ibn Taymiyah mentions:

کثیراً من أئمة الرافضة وعامتهم زنادقة لیس لهم غرض في العلم ولا في الدين

Many of the scholars of the Rāfiḍah and their commonality are heretics who have no real interest in knowledge and Dīn.³

In conclusion, the setting of Shīʿism is fertile ground for people of all types of leanings and tendencies. In fact Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb has written that Shīʿism served as the catalyst for the spread of Communism and Baha’ism in Iran.⁴

**Trying to Misguide the Muslims from the Sunnah of their Nabī**

Amongst the influences they have had in the ideological sphere is that a group of them joined the ranks of the transmitters of ḥadīth and endeavoured to add such narrations to the ḥadīth legacy which serve Shīʿism. To the extent that a

---

¹ Al-Muntaqā p. 77.
² Fadāʾiḥ al-Bāṭiniyyah p. 37.
³ Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/70.
⁴ Al-Khuṭūṭ al-ʿArīḍah p. 44-45.
fair amount of such narrations were found in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and their hadith collections. But the scholars of hadith picked up the problem, clarified the truth, and exposed the sinister Shi‘ah agenda. Al-Shaykh al-Suwaydī, whilst talking of this impact that the Shi‘ah have made in this regard states:

Some of their (Shi‘ah) scholars engaged in the sciences of hadith, heard narrations from reliable hadith scholars and preserved the authentic chains of transmissions of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They outwardly disguised themselves with piety and asceticism and were thus considered to be from the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Hence they would narrate Sahih and Hasan narrations and then added to them fabricated narrations which served their dogma. Many of the erudite of the Ahl al-Sunnah were deceived by this, let alone the laymen. But Allah by his grace chose the scholars of hadith who picked up the fabrications and stated that they are such. Hence their actual status became clear and all praise is for Allah. Furthermore, a group of their scholars who were exposed actually confessed that they would forge narrations. Those forged narrations are found till today in the narration lexicons and collections and have been used by the Tafdidilyyah and the Shi‘ah.

Also, al-Ālūsī mentions that Jābir al-Ju‘fī would often deploy this strategy.3

---

1 The Mufadhilah/ Tafdidilyyah are the Zaydiyyah and the others who consider ‘Alī to be more virtuous than Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. (See: Ibn Taymiyah: al-Tis‘īniyyah p. 40).

2 Al-Suwaydī: Naqḍ ‘Aqā‘id al-Shī‘ah (manuscript without numbered pages) p. 25-26 (see them after by counting); al-Ālūsī: al-Suyūf al-Mushriqah (manuscript) p. 50; Mukhtasar al-Tuhfah p. 32.

3 Al-Suyūf al-Mushriqah p. 50.
Likewise Ibn al-Qayyim has mentioned that Ḥāfiẓ Abū Yaʿlā has said the following in his book *al-Irshād*:

The Rāfiḍah have fabricated almost three hundred thousand narrations regarding the merits of ʿAlī.

Ibn al-Qayyim comments by saying:

We do not deem this far-fetched. For if you have to analyse whatever they have in this regard you will find the matter according to what he has said. ¹

### Overtly Entering the Dogma of the Ahl al-Sunnah in order to Misguide

Some of the effects which the Shiʿī plotting has left in the Muslim world are those which have come about as a result of some of their scholars overtly entering the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah and assuming the titles ‘Ḥanafī’ and ‘Shāfiʿī’ in order to misguide the people. After assuming these identities they wrote books which bolstered the Shiʿī dogma. ²

---

¹ *Al-Manār al-Munīf* p. 116.

² They have adopted different strategies in this regard which have all been exposed by the author of *al-Tuhfah al-Ithnay ʿAshariyyah*. At times they write a book regarding the merits of the four Khulafā’, and when they come to the discussion regarding the merits of ʿAlī they include in it that which supports the ideas of Rafḍi‘ like that of emphatic appointment and revilement of the Ṣaḥābah (see: *al-Tuhfah al-Ithnay ʿAshariyyah* {manuscript} p. 46). At times they write a book regarding the juristic rulings of one of the schools and will propagate that book in circles which do not adopt that particular school. They include therein some very grave issues like practicing upon reason and rejecting ḥadīth and approbating obscene acts. The author of *al-Tuhfah* has alluded in this regard to a book, al-Mukhtaṣar, which they forged against Imām Mālik wherein they falsely attributed to him that it is permissible to commit sodomy with slaves. (See: Ibid. p. 45). And at times they write books wherein they claim that they were following the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah but when its falsity became clear to them they forsook it (for example the book *Limādhā Ikhtartu Madhhab al-Shīʿah* which they attribute to a person with the name Marʿī al-Anṭākī). And they have other strategies as well, the details of which require a dedicated book.
Likewise some of their scholars, who overtly subscribed to the Ahl al-Sunnah, contrived ideas similar to those which exist in the Shi'i dogma and promulgated them in Muslims circles. Shaykh Muḥammad Abū Zuhrah was of the opinion that Najm al-Dīn al-Ṭūfī (d. 716 A.H.) intended to promulgate the Shi'i dogma deploying this strategy in his discussion regarding Maṣlaḥah, public interest, taking precedence over the textual evidence of Sharīʿah. Because this is exactly what the Shi'i dogma asserts: according to the Shi'ah it is permissible for the Imām to specify or abrogate any textual evidence after the demise of Rasūl Allah. Hence al-Ṭūfī transported this very idea but without mentioning the word ‘Imām’ and replaced it with the word Maṣlaḥah. Thereafter, Abū Zuhrah opines that al-Ṭūfī by virtue of him undermining the textual evidence and promulgating the idea of specification and abrogation in cases of Maṣāliḥ Mursalah, unspecified public interest, has in fact intended to undermine the sacredness which the Muslims accord to the dictates of the legislator, i.e. Allah and his Rasūl Allah.

Moving on, the Shi'ah have at times, taking advantage of the similarity which exists between the names of their scholars and the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah, included worthless ideological content in order to mislead the seekers of the truth; they search in the names of Sunnī scholars for credible names and whoever they find having a similar name to any of their scholars they attribute the narration or the view of that particular Shi'i to him.

One such example is Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, the famous Sunnī Imām and the author of a work in history and a work in Qur'ānic exegesis. The Shi'i scholar Muḥammad ibn Jarīr ibn Rustum al-Ṭabarī shares the same name as him. Added to that, they both were from Baghdād, they lived in the same era and passed

---

1 Ibn Ḥanbal: p. 326. Abū Zuhrah has mentioned the biography of al-Ṭūfī and has established that he was a Shi'i (Ibid. 324-325). In classing al-Ṭūfī a Shi'i he has relied upon the Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābilah of Abū Ya'lā.

2 He has written a few books on Shi'ism as well. For example: al-Mustarshid fī al-Imāmah and Nūr al-Mu'jizāt fī Manāqib al-A'immah al-Ithnay ʿAshar. (See: Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt 2/82-83; Bihār al-Anwār 1/177; Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl 2/91; also see: Lisān al-Mīzān 5/103).
away in the same year, the year 310 A.H. The Shī‘ah exploited this similarity and attributed to Imām Ibn Jarīr some things, like the book al-Mustarshid fi al-Imāmah\(^1\) (the book of the Shī‘ī Ibn Jarīr),\(^2\) which supports their dogma. And till today they attribute to him some narrations which bolster their dogma.\(^3\)

This plot of the Shī‘ah engendered problems for Ibn Jarīr during his lifetime. Ibn Kathīr mentions that some lay people accused him of being a Shī‘ī whilst others accused him of being a heretic.\(^4\) Likewise a book regarding Ghadīr Khum consisting of two volumes was attributed to him, and so was the view that it is permissible to wipe the feet in Wuḍū’.\(^5\)

And it seems as if some of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah learnt of this plot of the Shī‘ah. Hence Ibn Kathīr mentions:

\[
\text{ومن العلماء من يزعم أن ابن جریر اثنان أحدهما شیعي وإلیه ينسب ذلك وینزهون أبا جعفر من هذه الصفات}
\]

Some among the scholars claim that there were two Ibn Jarīrs and that one of them was a Shī‘ī. And they attributed all of this to him and exonerate Abū Ja‘far from having such traits.\(^6\)

This view which Ibn Kathīr has attributed to some scholars is the truth which became clear to us after studying the books of transmitter biographies and the legacy of each of the two. And where is the earth from the heavens, for the difference between the legacies of both men is obvious and cannot be compared. The creed of Imām ibn Jarīr has no similarity whatsoever with the creed of the Shī‘ah; he was indeed one of the great scholars of Islam in having knowledge regarding the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah \(Ṣ\) and practicing upon them.

---

4 Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 11/146.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
There is likewise another Shīʿī by the name Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭabarī.¹ He is different from the first one even though Professor Fuʿād Sazkīn has considered them to be one.² The al-Madīnah al-Munawwarah newspaper published a forged story of the latter which was titled ‘Iqd al-Zahrā’. It would never have made its way to the publishing house had the Shīʿah not exploited the similarity of names.³

And like Ibn Jarīr there are many others.⁴ But the context does not allow for a detailed discussion, for this topic requires a dedicated study.

1 Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Abī al-Qāsim ibn ʿAlī al-Ṭabarī, a Shīʿī scholar from the sixth century. (See: Ṭabaqāt Aʾlām al-Shīʿah fī al-Qarn al-Sādis p. 242-278.

2 He has thus mistakenly attributed the book Bashārah al-Muṣṭafā to the first (Ibn Rustum) whereas it is the work of the second (Ibn Abī al-Qāsim). (See: Tārīkh al-Turāth 2/260).

3 Al-Madīnah newspaper: edition no. 4721, published on Tuesday the 24th of Rajab 1399 A.H. The story was chosen by Muḥammad Sālim Salīm from the book Bashārah al-Muṣṭafā. Whereas this book Bashārah al-Muṣṭafā is steeped in fanatical ideas, one among them being interpreting al-Jibt wa al-Ṭāghūt to mean Abū Bakr and ʿUmar (see: p. 237). Likewise it is stated therein that whoever doubts in giving ʿAlī precedence, considering him most virtuous, deeming obedience to him being compulsory and acknowledging his Wilāyah will be deemed a disbeliever even if he displays Islam (see: p. 51).

4 Like Ibn Qutaybah, for there are two men with this name: one is the extremist Shīʿī ʿAbd Allah ibn Qutaybah and the other is the reliable Sunnī scholar ʿAbd Allah ibn Muslim ibn Qutaybah. The latter authored a book and named it al-Maʿārif, and in order to mislead the people the former wrote a book and also named it al-Maʿārif (see: Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay ʿAshariyyah p. 32; Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqiʿ, manuscript, p. 51; Naqḍ ʿAqāʾid al-Shīʿah, manuscript, p. 25). Research scholars were perplexed by the book al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah which is attributed to the Sunnī Ibn Qutaybah due to it containing many falsities. A scholar even tried to identify the actual author of the book but to no avail. He says, “I tried a lot to identify the actual author of the book al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah but I did not come across anything.” (ʿAbd Allah al-ʿUsaylān: al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah p. 20). Some opined that the author was one of the adherents of school of Imām Mālik (ibid. 20), despite the Shīʿī influence in the book being quite clear; it clearly reviles the Şahābah and claims that ʿAlī refused to pledge allegiance to Abū Bakr due to considering himself more rightful of leadership. Professor ʿAbd Allah al-ʿUsaylān has cited these examples and their like which appear in the aforementioned book (ibid. p.17-18-19). But what slipped his attention and the attention of many is the fabrications of the Shīʿah and that there were two Ibn Qutaybahs, and that the book al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah is from the works of the Shīʿī one. Despite its importance I have not come across who has alluded to this matter.
Spreading Shīʿism in the Muslim World

From amongst the evidences which suggest that the Shīʿah strive in proselytising their beliefs amongst the Muslims is their ancient narrations which state that only one city embraced their beliefs, Kūfah.

Abū ʿAbd Allah says:

إن الله عرض ولیتنا على أهل الأمصار فلم یقبلها إل أهل الكوفة

Allah presented our Wilāyah to the people of the cities but only the people of Kūfah accepted it.¹

Hence in the initial stages Shīʿism did not gain acceptance but in Kūfah due to it being far from knowledge and its people.² Their acceptance was due to the influence of ‘Abd Allah ibn Saba’ who had played a very active role there initially, to the extent that he only departed from it after winning followers who would operate according to his plans³

The great scholar of Kūfah, Abū Ishāq al-Sabīʿī (d. 127 A.H), noticed the difference which had transpired in his city. He had left Kūfah when its people were adhering to the Sunnah and when no one was doubting the merit of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar and deeming them the most virtuous, but when he returned he found that the reprehensible views of Rafḍ had appeared.⁴

Subsequent to that the virus of Shīʿism permeated the entire Muslim world. So much so that some researchers mention that today in every hundred Muslims ten are Shīʿah.⁵

---

¹ Biḥār al-Anwār 60/209, 100/259 (with reference to Baṣāʾīr al-Darajāt).
² See the introduction of this book p. 15
³ Sulaymān al-ʿAwdah: ‘Abd Allah ibn Saba’ p. 49.
⁴ See p. 73 - 74 of this book.
⁵ Rūm Lāndo: al-Islām wa al-ʿArab p. 95.
The proselytisers of Shīʿism in this era form movements which actively roam around the Muslim world in order to spread Shīʿism following a strategized plan. They utilise the funds provided by the academic seminaries which receive their donations from the perspiration and toiling of those gullible followers whose minds have been clouded and hearts overwhelmed by that beautiful and deceptive claim of the ‘love for the Ahl al-Bayt, a claim in which the Shīʿah clergy have no share save the name and the claim. Hence they take possession of great amounts of wealth under the pretext of the right of *Khums* for the Imām. The slogans and catchwords which these clandestine movements raise are very similar to those of the Freemasons, for at times they call for bridging the gap between the various Islamic schools of thought1 and at times introduce themselves as the ‘the council of the Ahl al-Bayt.’

Similarly, after the establishment of the state of the scholars in Iran all the Iranian embassies have transitioned into centres of the propagation of Shīʿism. They have likewise taken advantage of the Islamic centres and the Masjids, especially on Fridays, in order to spread Shīʿism.

To get an idea of this, the *al-Mujtamaʿ* magazine published a document regarding the activities of the Shīʿah in Europe. Therein it says:

The Iranian embassies and consulates in Europe have turned into centres for spreading their beliefs amidst the Muslims who are residing in Europe.

---

1 *Fikrah al-Taqrīb* p. 511.
2 Ibid. 514.
This is supported by the tens, rather the hundreds and thousands of booklets and publications which are dedicated to the Shi‘ī ideology and which are distributed amidst the European Muslims in places which unite them, especially at the doors of Masjids, via posts and other mediums. To the extent that even academic centres and libraries seem as if they have been established in order to spread Iranian Shi‘ism amidst the Muslim minority of Europe. Hence aside from the books and literature which these libraries contain regarding the Iranian revolution and its specific approach to belief, we find that these libraries organise lessons and clubs which are specific to the issues of belief.

The magazine then goes on to list some of the libraries in Europe which organize lessons and lectures pertaining to belief regarding the Iranian revolution on the Thursdays and Saturdays of every week, and which distribute magazines, booklets and voice recordings. The Muslims are invited to attend such gatherings as a tool to spread the Shi‘ī ideology as espoused by the Iranians.

Likewise, the Iranian centres have started to encourage youth who have been beguiled by them and whom they use as their agents to start going to Masjids and establish relationships with those who come to offer their Ṣalāh, especially on Fridays when many Muslims come together in order to offer the Jumu‘ah Ṣalāh. The magazine states that at times these encounters lead to clashes and problems in the Masjids and thereafter presents a few examples. It also avers that these Iranian activities will in the long run leave its negative effects upon the Muslims.¹

Furthermore, the activities of the Shi‘ah are dynamic and multi-faceted and do not take heed of any principles like is the case of the Ahl al-Sunnah. This is because the Shi‘ah consider Taqiyyah to be nine tenths of their Dīn. In fact one of their contemporary scholars has acknowledged without realising that Taqiyyah according to them is the objective which justifies the means.² I.e. in reaching

1 Al-Mujtama‘, edition no. 760, published on 15th of Rajab 1406 A.H.
the objective which they aim for, it is ok to adopt any means; in other words, it is just like the approach of Machiavellianism⁠¹ which is adopted by those who have no Dīn in order to reach their goals. In Islam the objective does not make impermissible means permissible.

Hence we find that the mediums which the Shīʿah deploy to propagate their dogma take on various forms of deception and misrepresentation, a result of which is that many Muslim tribes and individuals have lost their faith. They have actually at times propelled some seniors of various tribes to embrace Shīʿism by enticing them with Mutʿah marriages.⁠²

Al-Ḥaydārī published a very appalling report in ‘Unwān al-Majd wherein he enlists the amount of tribes which have become Shīʿah due to the efforts of the Shīʿah. He mentions:

وأما العشائر العظام في العراق الذين ترفضوا من قرب فكثیرون منهم ربیعة... ترفضوا منذ سبعین سنة، وتيمم وهي عشیرة عظیمة ترفضوا في نواحي العراق منذ سبعین سنة بسبب تردد شیاطین الرافضة إليهم، والخزاعل ترفضوا منذ أكثر من مائتا وخمسین سنة وهي عشیرة عظیمة من بني خزاعة فحرفت وسميت خزاعل... وعشرة زیید وهي کثیرة القبائل وقد ترفضت منذ سبعین سنة بتريث الرافضة إليهم وعدم العلماء عندهم. ومن العشائر المترفضة بنو عمیر وهم بطن من تيمم، والخزرج وهم بطن من بني مزیقیا من الأرد،

¹ Machiavellianism is a method in dealings which is characterized by deceit, trickery, breaching of trust and egoism. It is based on the principle 'the end justifies the means'. It is attributed to the Italian thinker Niccolo Machiavelli (born in 1469 A.H. and died in 1527 A.H.) the founder of this idea which he recorded in his book The Prince and presented to one of the Kings of Europe in the Medieval ages. (See: Āḥmad Āṭiyyah: al-Qāmūs al-Siyāsī p. 1105-1106).

² In the year 1326 A.H. Shaykḥ Muḥammad Kāmil al-Řāfītí revealed in a letter he sent to his friend Rashīd al-Řāḍī from Baghdād, which was published by the al-Manār magazine in the 16th vol. that whilst on his tour of these lands he discovered that the scholars of the Shīʿah invite the Bedouins to Shīʿism by making Mutʿah marriages permissible for them due to them always having the passion to amorously enjoy with many women.

At first the magazine published the letter without revealing the name of the writer. But subsequently in the 29th vol. Shaykḥ al-Řāḍī revealed the name and said that they did not publish the name of the writer at that time so that he does not encounter any harassment from the Ḩamīdī government which was infamous for its oppressive nature. (See: al-Manār, vol. 29; also see: vol. 2 p. 687).
As for the big families which converted to Shi‘ism in Iraq in recent times, they are many. Amongst them are: Rabī‘ah which converted to Shi‘ism seventy years ago, Tamīm, a big family situated at the borders of Iraq, converted to Shi‘ism sixty years ago owing to the frequent visits of the devils of the Shi‘ah to them, al-Khuza‘al which became Shi‘ah more than a hundred and fifty years ago –it is a big family which belongs to the Banū Khuzā‘ah tribe but later its name was distorted and it was named Khuzā‘al, and Zabīd which consists of many tribes and converted to Shi‘ism sixty years ago owing to the frequent visits of the Shi‘ah and the absence of scholars. Likewise from the families that converted to Shi‘ism are Banū ‘Umayr, a sub-tribe of Tamīm, Khazraj, a sub-tribe of Banū Mazīqiyya of Azd, Shamṛṭūkah which is a very large tribe and Dafāfi‘ah. In addition, the families of ‘Umārah Āl Muḥammad who are so many in number that they cannot be enumerated, the family of Banū Lām which is huge in number, the tribe of al-Dīwāniyya which constitutes of five families: the families of Āl Aqra‘, Āl Budayr, ‘Afj, al-Jabūr and Julayḥah (tribes which are likewise large in number); Aqra’ consists of sixteen tribes, each tribe having many numbers, Āl Budayr consists of thirteen tribes which are also huge in number, ‘Afj consists of eight huge tribes, Julayḥah consists of four huge tribes and likewise al-Jabūr. The family of Ka‘b and which is a very big tribe and has many sub-tribes also converted to Shi‘ism a hundred years ago.¹

Al-Ḥaydarī in this way goes on to enumerate all the tribes of the Ahl al-Sunnah which converted to Shi‘ism due to the negligence of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and due to these people being deceived by the words of the Shi‘ah who would tell them ‘let’s come together and help one another’, ‘let’s unite and bridge the divide’, ‘the differences between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shi‘ah are no different than the

¹ ’Unwān al-Majd fī Bayān Aḥwāl Baghdād wa al-Baṣrah wa Najd p. 112-118.
differences which exist within the various schools of the Ahl al-Sunnah’, etc. The Ahl al-Sunnah thus owing to their inactiveness prepared the land for the scholars of the Shīʿah to propagate their dogma, or else had the truth been explained no one would have been deceived by Shīʿism.

To this day they still continue to spread their dogma on all levels.

They likewise pay special attention to fostering relations with the heads of some states who they discern would accept their dogma. Like in the case of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī who established relations with Khudā Bandah.1 This relationship had great effects which are known to all. Likewise in contemporary times they done the same with the head of Libya who eventually displayed inclinations toward Shīʿism in his beliefs and leadership.

Similarly, they have bought over some writers whose hearts are void of īmān and deployed them to write literature in order to call to Shīʿism and write introductions to the books of the Shīʿah.2

---

1 Khudā in Persian means Allah and Bandah means servant, i.e. the servant of Allah. Khudā Bandah was the eighth king from the kings of the Ilkhanate dynasty and was the sixth descendant of the progeny of Genghis Khan. His real name was al-Jāṭiyū, the son of Arghūn, the son of Abghā, the son Hulagu. Ibn Kathīr mentions, ‘He remained upon the ways of the Ahl al-Sunnah for a year and thereafter converted to Shīʿism and established its symbols in his lands.’ (Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 14/77). This was because he had just recently accepted Islam and had no knowledge regarding the Islamic beliefs and the history thereof. Subsequently he met Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī who made the Shīʿī dogma appealing to him as a result of which he and his entire family and tribe converted to Shīʿism. Ibn Muṭahhar had written many books like Nahj al-Ḥaqq and Minhāj al-Karāmah in order to invite the following sultan to embrace the Shīʿī dogma.

Ibn Kathīr mentions, “During his times great problems and tragic calamities occurred. But eventually Allah gave reprieve to the land and the people by eliminating him and gave him death at the age of thirty six.” After his demise his son repented in the year 710 A.H from Shīʿism and reverted to the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah with the help of the Ahl al-Sunnah. He distanced the Shīʿah and thus al-Ḥillī had to flee to Ḥillah and likewise all their scholars. (See: al-Tuhfah al-Ithnay ʿAshariyyah p. 43 of the manuscript; Taʿliqāt Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb ʿalā al-Muntaqā p. 18-19).

2 You will notice this in some of the books which they send to the Muslim world in order to propagate Shīʿism. They get people like those mentioned above to write a few approbatory words. An example of this in the books Aṣl al-Shīʿah and ’Aqāʿīd al-Imāmiyyah, etc.
They also choose bright male and female students from the Muslims world and grant them free education in Qum in order to brainwash them and nurture them according to Shi‘ism so that they may return to their lands as proselytizers of Shi‘ism.

The supreme scholar of al-Azhar says:

The reports which reach us from all parts of the Muslim world suggest that this Iranian Khumainian movement is currently spreading violence. It is trying to attract the youngsters in many of the Muslims lands by enticing them with monetary and educational incentives to study in Iran, amongst other means which it deploys to create discord, attract these youth, and propel them to give rise to contentions in their countries and people. A movement of this sort and which holds such a reality will surely cause turbulence in the Muslim Ummah. I thus believe that the Muslims should be very wary of what is being brought to them through the medium of the Khumainiyyah and other movements. It is indeed a movement from those movements which are sent in order to disunite the Ummah and spread discord and dissent between it.¹

The Emergence of Shi‘ī Leanings in the Writings of some Writers who are Affiliates of the Ahl al-Sunnah

In the writings of some thinkers who affiliate themselves to the Ahl al-Sunnah signs of leanings toward the Shi‘ī ideology have emerged. The writings of these

¹ Akhībār al-Yawm, edition no. 2160, published on Saturday the 11th of Rajab 1406 A.H.
individuals have come to the fore as effected by the doubts and misconceptions raised by the Shi‘ah regarding the Šaḥābah and the issue of Imāmah. Any person who will read what some thinkers and writers have written regarding the history of the initial stages of Islam or the book Nash‘ah al-Fikr al-Falsafī fī al-Islām, or the book al-Imāmah wa al-Khilāfah will realise the extent to which the Shī‘ī ploy has succeeded in distorting facts before these people.

I, however, do not doubt that in this class of people there is a group which has been enticed with the glamour of wealth and propelled by the deceptive goods of this world in order to say what they have said and to write what they have written. The Shī‘ah pay money to famous figures so that they may write that which is in accordance with the Shī‘ī dogma. In the past, one of the pious predecessors is reported to have said, “If I wanted them to fill my house with money for lying regarding ‘Alī they would do so. But by Allah I will never lie regarding him.”

What would the situation today then be like when they have wealth in abundance and honesty has decreased in the hearts of many who have become deceived by the world and by the devil regarding the Dīn of Allah?

If you want an example of this Shī‘ī influence then here is one. Professor ‘Alī Sāmī, the author of Shuhadā’ al-Islām fī ‘Aṣr al-Nubuwwah writes the book Nash‘ah al-Fikr al-Falsafī fī al-Islām and includes in it that which cools the eyes of the Shī‘ah; he excommunicates some of the Šaḥābah of Rasūl Allah H. For example he says the following regarding Mu‘āwiyah: 1

---

1 This was al-Sha‘bī. See: ‘Abd Allah ibn Aḥmad: al-Sunnah 2/549.

2 The Arabic proverb says: ‘every utensil gives off what it contains’. Likewise another one says: ‘She accused me of her flaw and disappeared’. The head of the Ja‘farī Judiciary in Beirut Muhammad Jawwād Mughniyah accused professor Muḥammad Ḥusayn Haykal of omitting a particular text from his book Ḥayāt Muḥammad in lieu of five hundred Egyptian pounds. This accusation was levelled at him because he omitted a particular text from his book which he came to learn was weak and thus removed it in the second edition; this Shī‘ī accused him of this based on the practice of his people and their norms. Consider and muse. (See: Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah: al-Shī‘ah fī al-Mīzān p. 18: footnote.)
Irrespective of whatever has been said regarding Mu‘āwiyah and despite the efforts of the scholars of the later Salafī School and some of the Ahl al-Sunnah to include him amongst the Companions of Rasūl Allah, the man did not embrace Islam at all. He would very often release his blows against Islam but did not manage to anything more than that.¹

See how great his accusation is! This type of accusations was only previously known to be made by the Shī‘ah and their like. How can a Muslim ever blurt such a statement regarding a Companion who strove with Rasūl Allah and witnessed the Battle of Ḥunayn with him, who was entrusted with the task of documenting revelation and took charge of the affairs of the Muslims for forty years, at first as a governor and thereafter as a ruler, establishing for them the symbols of Islam?²

He further goes on to accuse the Ahl al-Sunnah by claiming that the view that Mu‘āwiyah was a Šaḥābī is the view of only some of the Ahl al-Sunnah, but the majority hold the same view as him. This is a lie and a fabrication, similar to what the Shī‘ah hold regarding the permissibility of lying. The īmān of Mu‘āwiyah is established by diffuse transmission and the consensus of the people of knowledge.³

Similarly he says the following regarding his father Abū Sufyān ibn Ḥarb:

Abū Sufyān was a heretic who would believe in the Persian fire worship.⁴

---

1 Nash’ah al-Fikr al-Falsafi 2/19.
2 Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām 4/458
3 Ibid. 4/472.
4 Ibid. 4/477.
5 Nash’ah al-Fikr al-Falsafi 2/31.
Whereas Nabī  used him as his governor; when Nabī  passed away he was the governor of Najrān. How could he be a heretic when Nabī  entrusted him with the welfare of the Muslims in aspects of knowledge and practice?\(^1\)

He also agrees with the Shīʿah when he says that only a few amongst the Ṣaḥābah deemed ʿAlī more deserving of rulership and that the matter was usurped from him. He says:

وقد أحس قلة من خلص الصحابة أن الأمر نزع من على للمرة الثالثة وأنه إذا كان الأمر قد سلب منه أولاً لكي يعطى للصاحب الأول، ثم أخذ منه ثانياً لكي يعطى للصاحب الثاني فقد أخذ منه ثالثاً لكي يعطى لشيخ متهاو متهاالك لا يحسن الأمر ولا يقيم العدل يترك الأمر لبقایا قریش الضالة

A small group of devout Companions realised that the matter was snatched from ʿAlī for the third time. And that where the matter was snatched from him the first time so that it be granted to the first person and thereafter it was snatched from him the second time so that it be granted to the second person, the third time it was snatched from him so that it be given to a weak and languorous man who was not good at administration and establishing justice and who left the matter to be taken care of by the remaining misguided individuals of the Quraysh.\(^2\)

He is referring to the rightly guided Khalīfah Dhū al-Nūrayn ʿUthmān  upon whose Khilāfah the Ṣaḥābah unanimously agreed. It is as though he is undermining all of them due this accusation.

He also says the following regarding the Rāfiḍah who call themselves the Twelvers and who believe and acknowledge all that has passed, and criticism of whom is excessively found in the statements of the scholars of Islam:

إن الأفكار الفلسفية للشيعة الأثني عشرية هي في مجموعها إسلامية بحجة

1 Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām 4/454, 35/66.
2 Nashʿah al-Fikr al-Falsafi 1/228.
The Philosophical thought of the Twelver Shīʿah is as a whole purely Islamic.¹

Look at how greatly and appallingly he has parted from the mainstream.²

He likewise says, as if a Shīʿī, that:

بأن شیعة علي الذین أحبوه عن یقین وإیمان وساروا في رکب الإمام وهم على إیمان مطلق بإنه الأثر الباقي

الحقیقة الإسلام الكبرى، ومجانب هذا العثمانیة والأمویة الذین کرهوا الإسلام أشد الكراهیة وامتلأت

صدورهم بالحقد الدفین نحو رسول الله وآله وأصحابه

The Partisans of ʿAlī who loved him with conviction and faith and joined his caravan with complete īmān are the remains of the greatest reality of Islam. Opposite to them are the ʿUthmānīs and the Umawīs who hated Islam very much and whose hearts were filled with malice for Rasūl Allah his household and his Ṣaḥābah.³

I will suffice upon this one example because this is also a topic which requires an in-depth study and analyses.

**Distorting the History of the Muslims**

The Shīʿah have literature in history which is aimed at distorting the history of the Muslim Ummah, as is clear from the narrations of al-Kalbī,⁴ Abū Mikhnaf,⁵

---

1 Ibid. 1/13.
2 Doctor Muḥammad Rashād Sālim informed me that due to having a suspicious relationship with a disbelieving wife, a trip to Europe due to the coercion of ʿAbd al-Nāṣir and a bad financial standing conditions befell him which had an impact upon his thought and ideology. Something of this sort is not too much to conceive regarding someone who disparages the Companions of Nabī.
3 Ibid. 1/228-229.
4 Muḥammad ibn al-Sāʾib al-Kalbī. Ibn Ḥibbān says that al-Kalbī was a Sabaʿī who would believe that ʿAlī did not die and that he will return to this world. He died in 146 A.H. See: *Mīzān al-Iʿtidāl* 3/558; Ibn Abī Ḥātim: *al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl* 7/270-271; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 9/178.
and Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim\(^1\); which are found in the \textit{Tārīkh} of al-Ṭabarī.\(^2\) But al-Ṭabarī cites all these narrations with their chains of transmission so that the people of knowledge come to learn their status.

As is also clear from the writings of al-Mas‘ūdī in \textit{Murūj al-Dhahab} and al-Ya‘qūbī in his \textit{Tārīkh}. Professor Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb has averred in his annotations on \textit{Al-ʿAwāṣim wa al-Qawāṣim} that the compilation of history started after the fall of the Umayyad Empire and that the Bāṭiniyyah and the various denominations which had adopted Shīʿism played a very big role in obliterating the symbols of good and darkening the bright pages of history.\(^3\)

This deceitful ploy becomes evidently clear to a person who studies the \textit{Al-ʿAwāṣim min al-Qawāṣim} of Ibn al-ʿArabī with the outstanding explanatory annotations of Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb.

The scholars of the Shīʿah have darkened thousands of pages in reviling the best century humanity has ever known and they have spent their time and their efforts in distorting and misrepresenting the history of the Muslims.

---


As for the narrations of Abū Mikhnaf, they are many and can be found in more than three hundred places. The Orientalist A. Bel states in the Encyclopaedia of Islam 1/399 that Abū Mikhnaf wrote thirty-two books on history regarding various issues which transpired in the first century of Islam. Al-Ṭabarī has preserved most of them by recording them in his \textit{Tārīkh}, but the books which have reached us and have been attributed to him are from the forgeries of the later scholars. (See: \textit{al-Aʿlām} 6/111: footnote).

The narrations of Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim can be found in 4/458, 465, 485, 487. (See: the detailed tables of contents prepared by Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm in the tenth volume of the \textit{Tārīkh}).

\(^3\) \textit{Al-ʿAwāṣim min al-Qawāṣim} (annotations) p. 177.
The copious ‘Shīṭ’ content, which you will come across in the books of history written by the Shīṭ scholars, or in the transmission of which they played a role, in their books of ḥadīth like al-Kāfī, al-Biḥār, and in other books which their scholars wrote in the bygone eras like Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq and in recent times like Kitāb al-Ghadīr, is what the enemies of Islam like the Orientalists and others have used as their reference material.

In following them, the spiritually ill generation of occidentalists which saw in the west its role model, assimilated everything that they wrote and made that their primary source, thereby adopting their views and spreading misconceptions and doubts in the lands of the Muslims. All of this left behind very grave consequences and changes in the thought of the Muslims and their academics. And it was Shīṭism that was the root of all of this evil.

Studying the views of the Orientalist and identifying the connection between them and the Shīṭah is a very crucial topic which requires a rigorous study. It is not possible for us to delve into it in this study due to constraints, but it is sufficient for us to allude to it and raise awareness regarding it.

The non-believing enemy started to benefit from the misconceptions and distortions of the Shīṭah regarding Islam and the Muslims at a time which is not very recent. In the era of Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456 A.H) already the Christians were exploiting the erroneous belief of the Shīṭah regarding the Book of Allah as evidence to their advantage in debating with the Muslims. Ibn Ḥazm responded to all their issues with resolution and revealed that the views of this particular cult are not worth consideration due to them not being Muslims.¹

**In Literature**

Arabic literature and poetry have likewise not been safe from the influence of Shīṭism; Shīṭism has left its evil effects upon them as well. The poets among

---

¹ See: p. 1647 of this book.
the Shī‘ah have always exploited the ‘atrocities’ suffered by the Ahl al-Bayt in provoking the sentiments of people and invigorating their feelings, thereby putting them into action against the Ummah and its Dīn.

In some of the literature that has reached us you will discern some leanings toward the beliefs of the Shī‘ah. You will also notice the exaggerations which are infused into depicting the difficulties that befell the Ahl al-Bayt in order to spread Shī‘ism and revile the Ṣahābah.

The spear headers of Shī‘ism have exerted themselves in propagating fables and fairy tales regarding their Imāms in the form of provocative narratives, talks and poetry characterised by exaggeration.

As a result, the beliefs of the lay community became affected, even their belief in the Oneness of Allah, owing to which they deified others besides Allah.

Hence Muḥammad Sayyid Kīlānī mentions:

You will notice that the Shī‘ah have produced a specific type of literature which consequently played a role in the downfall of the Muslims into the deep ditches of regression and backwardness. The Wahhābis were successful in eliminating much of these fables from their lands. As for the other Muslim lands, the condition is still as it was previously, even amidst the learning class.¹

¹ Muḥammad Sayyid Kīlānī: Athar al-Tashayyu‘ fī al-Adab al-ʿArabī (published by Dār al-Kutub al-ʿArabī in Egypt) p. 43
In order to gauge the extent of their influence it will suffice to study their famous and credible poem, the Azriyyah poem.¹

They have used literature to attack the Ummah by disparaging its leaders and distorting the image of the Muslim society. Hence you will find the overstating of the existence of mockery, deviance, and misguidance in the society. In fact at times even depicting the entire community and its leader in a very disparaging way, like how they did with the Khalīfah Hārūn al-Rashīd and his stories with Abū Nawās. Whereas he was the Khalīfah who would go out in Jihād one year and would go for Ḥajj the following year. In literature they also found breathing space for themselves, i.e. freedom from Taqiyyah due to an aura of sentiments and imaginations. Hence they would pour out their hatred and dislike for the Khalīfah and the Ummah in narratives, poetry, parables, or sermons. To understand all of this it would suffice to refer to the book al-Aghānī of the Shīʿī Abū al-Faraj al-Aṣfahānī.

¹ This poem was written by their scholar Muḥammad Kāẓim al-Azrī who died in 1211 A.H. (al-Dharīʿah 17/135). Professor Maḥmūd al-Mallāḥ critiqued this poem in a book which he named al-Raziyyah fī al-Qaṣīdah al-Azriyyah. Therein he mentions that their scholar Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar wrote an introduction to the poem wherein he mentioned that their scholar the author al-Jawāhir (Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn Bāqir al-Najafī {d. 1266 A.H.} His book al-Jawāhir is the commentary of Sharāʿiʿ al-Islām, one of their credible books in Fiqh. See: Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah: introduction to the book Sharāʿiʿ al-Islām) would desire that the Azriyyah poem be included in his works in place of his book Jawāhir al-Kalām. He then goes onto present some stanzas of the poem, stanzas brimming with Shirk and blatant disbelief, for example the following stanza which is regarding ʿAlī:

\[
\text{وهو الیة المحیطة في الكون  ففي عين کل شيء تراها}
\]

He is the sign which is all encompassing in the world, and thus in the essence of everything you will see it.

And the stanza:

\[
\text{كل ما في القضاء من کائنات أنت مولى بقائها وفناها}
\]

All that is decreed to happen, you are the guardian of its existence and ruination.

The Political Sphere

The Shīʿah, as their canonical sources emphasise, do not acknowledge the legitimacy of any empire or state in the Muslim world. They consider the Khalīfah of the Muslim world a Ṭāghūt, devil/idol, and his dynasty void of any Sharʿī status. They only consider the Khilāfah of Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī and Hasan to be exceptions to the rule. It has previously been mentioned that their narrations state that any flag which is raised before the emergence of the Mahdī, the raiser thereof is a Ṭāghūt.¹

Therefore, the enemy waiting for every opportunity to destroy the Muslim Ummah found its long lost need in the Shīʿah whom they utilised in accomplishing many of their goals; this is due to the existence of the aforementioned belief whose natural result is the absence of loyalty and obedience, and overt enmity and dislike for the Muslim ruler and subjects.

The Shīʿī denominations have thus always been a submissive tool in the hands of the enemy and an obedient mount which they have used to reach their objectives.

Furthermore, the doctrine of Taqiyyah made it easy for the Shīʿah to strategize and give shape to conspiracies. Much like a Masonic secretive movement disguised in the garb of Islam and the garment of love and obedience to the Imām of the Muslims, but covertly determined to conspire against the Ummah. Hence they say:

خالطوهم بالبرانیة وظاهروهم بالجوانیة إذا کانت الأمر صبیانیة

Intermingle with them outwardly and oppose them inwardly when leadership ends up in the hands of children.²

---

¹ See p. 1002 of this book.
² Uṣūl al-Kāfî 2/220.
The Shīʿah have thus been deployed in various eras of history by heretics who subjugated them to fulfil their goals and execute their plans. Likewise, many of the leaders of the heretics joined the ranks of Shīʿism so that it be possible for them to exploit the simpletons. Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

إن أكثر معتنقى التشيع لا يعتقدون دين الإسلام. إنما يتظاهرون بالتشيع لقلة عقل الشيعة وجهلهم ليتوسلوا بهم إلى أغراضهم

Majority of those who embrace Shīʿism do not really believe in the religion of Islam. They merely display Shīʿī tendencies due to lack of intellect in the Shīʿah and their ignorance by virtue of which they can easily exploit them in order to reach their motives.¹

The incidents and events of history attest to the fact that Shīʿism has been the ideal setting for any person who intended to destroy Islam and its people.

Many groups amongst the Persians whose empire the Muslims destroyed within seven years found in Shīʿism to be their long awaited opportunity. So did the Jews seize the opportunity of achieving their goals under the pretext of Shīʿism.

Till today the enemies of Islam and those who conspire against it disguise themselves with Shīʿism. During the conflict which broke out between various parties which all subscribe to the Twelver dogma, confessions had come to the fore from the people themselves. Hence one of the Shīʿah researchers has reported that the Russian ambassador in Iran Kanyāz Dakūrkī would attend the lessons of their scholar al-Rashatī,² the founder of the Kashfiyyah School which is a sub-sect of the Twelvers, which would be held in Karbalāʾ under the disguise of an invented name ‘Shaykh ʿĪsā al-Lankarānī’. This was disclosed by the al-Sharq magazine which was published by the Russian Soviet ministry of foreign affairs in the year 1924-1925.³

---

³ Āl Ṭuʿmah: Madīnah al-Husayn p. 53.
Likewise the retired English general Jaʿfar ʿAlī Khān (a name which he adopted to disguise himself apparently) would also disguise himself as a Shīʿī and attend the lessons of Kāẓim al-Rashatī.\(^1\)

The researcher states that this phenomenon is due to the fact that the enemies foreknew that the residents of these two lands, Iraq and Iran, are from the lovers of the Ahl al-Bayt and thus targeted them from the theological perspective.\(^2\)

Hence, via the medium of the Kashfī ideology they popularised extreme ideas regarding the Imāms and made them the partners of Allah in his attributes of creation and sustenance. They also fed them the idea that there is no punishment for any sin however small or big it might be.\(^3\)

He thereafter says:

\[
\text{وهيذا وجد الستعمال في هذه الديار العربية المسلمة أرضا خصبة لغرس شجرة العقيدة الحلولية}
\]

In this way did colonialism find fertile grounds for planting the colocynth plant of belief in these Arabian Muslim countries.\(^4\)

I would add that prior to this the Safawid propensity of extremism played a very pivotal role in implanting the seeds of extremism through the teachings and writings of some of their evil scholars like al-Majlisī, al-Jazāʾirī, al-Kāshānī and others.

Nonetheless, this enemy who disguises himself in the garb of Shīʿism and infiltrates the ranks of the Shīʿah at times obtains a very lofty position. Why wouldn’t this be so when their belief regarding the consensus of the Ummah accords the views of an unknown group and an unknown person precedence over all other views due to the possibility that he be the Mahdī?\(^5\)

---

1 Ibid. p. 53.
2 Ibid. Same page.
3 Ibid. p. 54.
4 See: Madīnah al-Ḥusayn p. 54.
5 And then he does not lose out on any of his passions which he would indulge in before overtly entering into Shīʿism. His lustful desires are thus gratified by way of Mutʿah marriages, the lending of sexual rights and anal sex with women, each of which is an institution in their dogma. continued...
Having said this, a person who analyses the events of history and its battles will realise that the problems caused by the claimants of Shi‘ism have been the most grave of all problems which the Muslim dynasties have encountered. This is because they are overtly with the Muslims but are covertly their greatest enemy. To the extent that Ibn Taymiyyah has said:

إِنَّ أَصِلُ كُلٍّ فَتَنَةٍ وَبَلِيهٍ هُمُ الْشَّیعَةُ، وَمَنْ اِنْصَوَى إِلَيْهِمْ، وَكَثِيرٌ مِّنَ السَّيِّفَاتِ الَّتِي سَلَتْ فِي الْإِسْلَامِ، إِنَّمَا كَانَ مِنْ جَهَّهُمْ وَبِهِمْ تَسْتَرَتْ الزَّنَادِقَةُ

The root of every problem and difficulty is the Shi‘ah and those who have sided with them. And many of the swords which were brandished in Islam were from the Shi‘ah. The heretics disguised themselves in them.¹

Furthermore, due to the fact that they consider the Muslims to be more steeped in disbelief than the Jews and the Christians, they form coalitions with the enemies of Dīn whose enmity is known to everyone, i.e. the Jews, the Christians and the Polytheists, and oppose the friends of Allah who are the most pious of people and the leaders of the pious.²

Ibn Taymiyyah says:

وَقَدْ رَأَيْنَا وَرَأَى المُسْلِمُونَ أَنَّهُ إِذَا ابْتَلِيَ اللَّيْلُ أَحَدُهُمْ أَحَدُ الْمُسْلِمِينَ

Continued from page 1593

As for Sharī‘ obligations, they are lightened by virtue of combining Ṣalāhs and at times even completely forgiven by virtue of love for the Ahl al-Bayt. Jihād is discarded till the emergence of the Mahdī. Thus there is no fear of loss of life. If he reaches the rank of a Āyah or Ḥujjah or a Marji‘ then lustrous gold is thrown at his feet under the pretext of Khums. Likewise he reaches the level of being the Bāb and consecration and reverence under the pretext of the ‘representation of the Imām’. So of what harm would it be to him to infiltrate their ranks and covertly operate for his people amidst the Shi‘ah camouflaging himself by wearing black clothing. At times he might just claim to belong to the progeny of the Ahl al-Bayt in order to gain popularity.

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/243.
2 See p. 969-970 of this book.
We have seen and the Muslims have seen that whenever the Muslims are tested with a non-Muslim foe they are always with them against the Muslims.¹

By way of example, the people witnessed that when Hulagu, the king of the Mongol disbelievers, entered Sham in the year 658 A.H. the Shīʿah were at the forefront of those helping in establishing his dominion, executing his orders and destroying the Muslim dynasty. Likewise the people all know, the learned and the lay, of the bloodbath that had occurred after the arrival of Hulagu in Iraq, the magnanimity of which is only known to Allah. The minister of the Khalīfah Ibn al-ʿAlqamī and the Shīʿah were his secret advisors who helped in many open and clandestine ways detailing all of which will prolong the discussion.²

Before that, the Shīʿah helped the grandfather of Hulagu, Genghis Khan, against the Muslims.

Similarly, the Muslims noticed on the shores of Shām that when the Muslims and the Christians were at war their inclination was toward the Christians whom they assisted as much as possible. They would dislike that the cities of the Christians be conquered as much as they hated that ‘Akkā and other places be conquered and would give preference to their victory against the Muslims. To the extent that when the Muslims were defeated at the hands of Ghāzān³ in the year five hundred and ninety nine and consequently the Muslim army evacuated Shām they went about wreaking havoc and causing destruction by murdering, usurping wealth, raising the flag of the cross, giving preference to Christians over the Muslims, and taking captives, wealth and weaponry from the Muslims to the Christians in Cyprus. This and other events were witnessed by the Muslims and has diffusely reached those were not present.⁴

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/110.
² Ibid. 3/38.
³ He was the brother of Khudā Bandah, from the grand children of Genghis Khan, the king of the Mongols. As for the details of the incident to which Ibn Taymiyyah is alluding refer to al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 14/6.
⁴ Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/244; also see p. 38-39 of the same volume; also see: 4/110-111; al-Muntaqā p. 329-332 and the annotations of Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb on the topic.
They were also one of the main reasons why the Christians gained control of Bayt al-Maqdis in the past till the Muslims succeeded in reclaiming it from them.¹

The discussion on this topic is very vast and the books of history are replete with reports which sketch these unpleasant realities.

Nonetheless, if this was the influence of the Shīʿah who stayed within the Muslim empire, then the influence of independent Shīʿī dynasties was much more severe. Hence Ibn Taymiyyah mentions that the dynasty of the Buwayhids² comprised of different types of reprehensible schools: some among them were heretics, some were Qarāmiṭah, some with Philosophical leanings, others Muʿtazilah and yet others who were Shīʿah.

The Muslims suffered such weakness during their reign as was not known even when Christians secured control over places which were situated at the boarders of the Muslim world. The Qarāmiṭah rapidly spread in Egypt, the west and the east and many events transpired.³

He also says the following regarding the rule of Khudā Bandah:⁴

See what they obtained during the dynasty of Khudā Bandah for who he wrote this book.⁵ The evil which came to fore was such that if it continued

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/110.
2 Emerged in Iraq and a portion of Iran in the year 334 and ended in the year 437 A.H. The Twelvers consider their dynasty to be from their dynasties. (See: *al-Shīʿah fī al-Tārīkh* p. 98; *al-Shīʿah fī al-Mīzān* p. 138-148).
4 See footnote no. 1 on p. 1581 of this book.
5 i.e. *Minhāj al-Karāmah* which Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī wrote and to which Ibn Taymiyyah wrote a response by the name *Minhāj al-Sunnah*. 
and intensified then most of the symbols of Islam would have been obliterated. But they want to extinguish the light of Allah and Allah refuses except to complete his light even though the disbelievers dislike that.¹

Up to the present day the Shīʿī influence is reaching the lands of the Muslims from the state of the scholars in Iran, from their organisations in Lebanon², and from their movements in the Arabian Gulf, etc.

Iḥsān Ilāhī Zahīr mentions that the Independence of eastern Pakistan from Pakistan was due to a Shīʿī conspiracy. He says:

وها هي باکستان الشرقیة ذهبت ضحیة بخیانة أحد أبناء قزلباش الشیعة یحیى خان في أیدي الهندوس

Here we have Eastern Pakistan which was lost to the Hindus due to the treachery of one of Qazalbāsh Shīʿah Yaḥyā Khān.³

The leading scholar of the Shīʿah in Pakistan opposed the implementation of the Islāmic Sharīʿah⁴ due to it minimising their freedom of carrying out their passions which they practice in the name of Mutʿah, and due to them being implicated for their crimes which they would otherwise very conveniently commit averring that with the love of ʿAlī no sin is harmful.

Nonetheless, these are just a few allusions to some very great issues the explanation and analyses whereof require volumes of books.

But hereunder I will choose two examples and deliberate over them so that we may take lessons:

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/244.
² See: al-Amal wa al-Mukhayyamāt al-Filaṣṭīniyyah of Muḥammad al-Gharīb.
³ Al-Shīʿah wa al-Sunnah p. 11.
⁴ See: Maẓālim al-Shīʿah p. 9-10. The leader of the Shīʿah, Muftī Jaʿfar Ḥusayn, said in a press conference that the Shīʿah disagree with the execution of the capital punishments because they will be executed according to the school of the Ahl al-Sunnah. (See: al-Anbāʾ al-Kuwaitiyyah 1/5/1979 A.C.)
The first is linked to the influence of the Shīʿah within the Muslim empire, and that is the incident of Ibn al-ʿAlqamī and his conspiracy in destroying the Muslim empire.

The second is linked to the influence of the Shīʿī dynasty upon the Muslims, i.e. and that is the Safawid dynasty.

The Conspiracy of Ibn al-ʿAlqamī the Shīʿī

The short of the story is that Ibn al-ʿAlqamī was the minister of the Abbasid khalīfah al-Mustaʿṣim who, like his father and forefathers, followed the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah. He was lenient and not very vigilant. Exploiting these traits the Shīʿī minister was plotting to finally destroy the Khilāfah, annihilate the Ahl al-Sunnah and establish a dynasty based on the dogma of the Shīʿah. He thus took advantage of his position and the heedlessness of the Khalīfah to execute his plots against the Khilāfah. The threads of his conspiracy can be summed up in three stages:

The First Stage: Weakening the army and harassing the people. He done so by trying to deprive the army from their stipends and the poor people from their allowances: Ibn Kathīr mentions:

And the minister Ibn al-ʿAlqamī would strive to divert the army and remove their names from the records. Hence the armies towards the latter part of the reign of al-Mustanṣir consisted of a hundred thousand soldiers, but he consistently worked at decreasing them till only ten thousand remained.1

The Second Stage: Correspondence with the Tatars. Ibn Kathīr mentions:

1 Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 13/202.
He then wrote to the Tatars and instilled in them greed to take the lands. He related the reality of the matter to them and revealed to them the weakness of the men.¹

**The Third Stage:** Stopping the people from combatting the Tatars and discouraging the Khalīfah. He stopped the people from fighting them² and made the Khalīfah assume that the king of the Tatars is only coming to enter into a truce with him. He suggested to the Khalīfah that he go out to him and agree with him on half of the taxes of Iraq being for him and half for the Khalīfah. Hence the Khalīfah went out to him in an entourage of seven hundred people who were all judges, jurists, leaders and luminaries. Through this ploy the massacre of the Khalīfah and the prominent members and leaders of the community came to being without any effort from the Tatars. The Shī‘ah and the hypocrites had told Hulagu not to enter into a truce with the Khalīfah; Ibn al-ʿAlqamī told him that the truce if enacted will only last for a year or two after which things will return to how they were. They embellished the killing of the Khalīfah for him and it is said that the ones who told him to kill the Khalīfah were Ibn al-ʿAlqamī and Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī.³

Thereafter they headed to the city and killed all the men, women, children and old people they got hold of. With the exception of the Jews and the Christians, whoever sought refuge from them and whoever sought refuge in the house of Ibn al-ʿAlqamī, no one else was spared.⁴

---

¹Ibid. 13/202.
²Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/38.
³Naṣīr was with Hulagu who had sought his company to serve him after he conquered the forts of al-Alamut and took them from the Ismāʿīliyyah. (Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 13/201).
⁴Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 13/201-202.
They had eventually killed approximately eleven million some odd people, or more or less. Islam had not seen a massacre of this magnitude in its history. They killed the Hāshimīs and took their Abbasid and non-Abbasid wives as captives. The question is: Can a person who makes the enemy march upon the family of Rasūl Allah  and all the Muslims, kill them, and imprison them be a partisan and a lover of the Ahl al-Bayt?1

They also killed the orators, Imams of the Masjids, and the bearers of the Qurʾān. The Masjids became empty and Ṣalāh in congregation and Jumuʿah Ṣalāh were discarded for months in Baghdad.2

The motive of Ibn al-ʿAlqamī was to annihilate the Sunnah completely and replace it with the innovation of Shīʿism. He also wanted to deactivate the Masjids and seminaries and build a huge centre for the Shīʿah through which they could propagate their dogma. But Allah had not allowed him to do so and deprived him of all his bounties and seized him a few months after this grave incident. He was subsequently followed by his children.3

Deliberate over this grave incident and appalling disloyalty. Also consider the good nature of some of the Ahl al-Sunnah, which has resulted in heedlessness, who want to bridge the divide with their staunchest of enemies. Also take note of the immense hatred which the Shīʿah bear for the Ahl al-Sunnah. This Šīʿī was the minister of al-Mustaʿṣim for fourteen years. His ministership had earned him such reverence and status as not enjoyed by any other minister. But these privileges did not help in any way to eliminate from his heart the hatred and malice which he bore for the Ahl al-Sunnah. What is even more interesting is that the later Shīʿah considered these crimes of Ibn al-ʿAlqamī and Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī against the Muslims to be from their great feats and achievements. Hence Khomeini, in commending the accomplishments of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī mentions:

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/38.
2 Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 13/203.
3 Ibid. 13/202-203.
People, i.e. the Shīʿah, feel that they have suffered a loss upon the demise of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī and his likes who offered great services for Islam.¹

The services intended here are what al-Khūwansārī, who lived before him, has enlisted in the biography of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī;

And from his famous, well-known, and reported matters is his cooperation with the demure king Hulagu Khan and his arrival with the entourage of the aided king who came to Dār al-Salām Baghdād with full preparation and reformed the bondsmen. They destroyed the kingdom of the Banū ʿAbbās carried out a mass murder of the followers of those lowly people till consequently their impure blood flowed like rivers and poured into the Tigris river and from there to Jahannam the house of ruination.²

Hence they consider his conspiring to massacre the Muslims from his greatest feats, for massacre according to them is the way to guide the bondsmen and reform the lands. They consider the Muslims who were martyred in this massacre to be destined to the fire, which entails that Hulagu the polytheist and his army are from the people of Jannah due to them soothing the grudges of the Shīʿah against the Muslims. Look at the extent of their hatred which makes the massacre of the Muslims their greatest hope in life and which makes the disbelievers closer to them than the community of the Muslims.

¹ Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah p. 128.
This is the story of Ibn al-ʿAlqamī which most of the books of history have recorded¹ and which is not only acknowledged by the Shīʿah but commended as well. But despite this, one contemporary Shīʿī has tried to reject this incident and question its authenticity. His evidence is that those who have reported it were not alive when it happened. And when he comes to the mention of those who lived during that era and recorded it, like Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Ismāʿīl (d. 665 A.H.) he responds by saying that although he lived during that era, but he was from Damascus and thus was not a first-hand witness of the incident.²

This is an attempt to reject that which is very well established according to the historians, similar to their attempt to deny the existence of Ibn Sabā.

After running a search through the books of history I came across a very important testimony of a great historian who possessed three attributes: 1) the Shīʿah consider him to be from their transmitters, 2) he is from Baghdad and 3) he passed away in 673 A.H.

Hence he was a Shīʿī who lived during the era of the incident in question and was from Baghdad. This is the Imām and jurist ʿAlī Ibn Anjab al-Sāʾī. He has attested to the crime of Ibn al-ʿAlqamī. He says:

In his days (i.e. Mustāʿṣim) the Tartars took over Baghdad and killed the Khalīfah. This brought an end to the Abbasid dynasty in the lands of Iraq. And the reason for this was that the minister of the Khalīfah Muʿayyid al-Dīn ibn al-ʿAlqamī was a Shīʿī… He continues to narrate the incident.³

1 Also refer to: Ibn Shākir al-Kutbī: Fawāt al-Wafayāt 2/312; al-Dhahabī: al-ʿIbar 5/225; al-Subkī: Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿīyyah 8/262-263, etc.
3 Mukhtaṣar Akhbār al-Khulafāʾ p. 136-137.
Muḥsin al-Amīn has considered Ibn al-Sāʾī from the narrators of the Shīʿah. He says:

‘Alī ibn Anjab al-Baghdādī, famously known as Ibn al-Sāʾī. For him is the book *Akhbār al-Khulafāʾ*. He died in 674 A.H.

A sufficient indication for the link between the Shīʿah and the atrocities of the Muslims and their desire that many others of the same kind transpire is the satisfaction which has come forth from the later scholars of the Shīʿah like al-Khūwansārī, Khomeini and others.

**The Safawid Dynasty**

Under the Safawid rule, which was founded by Shāh Ismāʿīl al-Ṣafawī, Twelver Shīʿism was forcibly imposed upon the Iranians and it was deemed the official dogma of Iran. Ismāʿīl was a harsh person who was thirsty for blood to an unconceivable extent. He would popularise regarding himself that he is infallible and that there is no barrier between him and the Mahdī and that he does not take any step but in accordance with the demands of the Imāms of the Twelvers.

He carried his sword and struck the Ahl al-Sunnah with it. He would test the people by asking them to curse the first three Khulafāʾ. Subsequently, whoever would hear the cursing would be obligated to say ‘*Besh Bād Kam Bād*’ which in the Azerbaijani language means that the listener is pleased with the swearing and is requesting for more. If someone would refuse to say this particular phrase he would immediately be slayed. The Shāh had ordered that the cursing take place upon the streets, in the markets, and upon the pulpits and threatened to

---

1 The Safawid Dynasty lasted from the year 905 A.H. to 1148 A.H. (See: *al-Shīʿah fī al-Mīzān* p. 182).
2 ʿAlī al-Wardī: *Lamaḥāt Ijtimāʿīyyah min Tārīkh al-ʿIrāq* p. 56.
kill those who opposed. Whenever he would conquer a city he would force the people to embrace Shi'ism by the might of his sword.

It is reported that when he conquered Tabriz and initially wanted to forcibly convert the people to Shi'ism, some of the scholars suggested that he give the matter some time due to two thirds of the city being the Ahl al-Sunnah who will not bear the cursing of the three Khulafā’ upon the pulpits. But he answered by saying:

إذا وجدت من الناس كلمة اعتراض شهرت سيفي بعون الله فلا أبقي منهم أحد حيا

If I find even a word of opposition from the people I will unsheathe my sword with the help of Allah and will thereafter not leave anyone of them alive.

On the other hand, in addition to his methodology of threatening and terrifying the people, he deployed the issue of the massacre of Ḥusayn as a means to provoke sentiments. Hence he ordered that gatherings be organised to commemorate the martyrdom of Ḥusayn in the ways we see them being commemorated today. And added to that he also included what is known as Majālis al-Ta‘ziyah (gatherings of condolences). Today these gatherings are known as ‘al-Shabīh’, and in them plays of the martyrdom of Ḥusayn are done. This had a very great impact upon the people and thus some have concluded that it was one of the greatest contributors to the spread of Shi’ism in Iran. The reason being that whatever it entails, i.e. the displays of remorse, wailing, and the beating of drums and the abundance of flags which go with them; all naturally lead to the entrenchment of the Shi’ī ideology in the recesses of the hearts by touching the sensitive cords therein.

1 Ibid. p. 58.
2 Ibid. p. 58; Tārīkh al-Ṣawafiyyīn p. 55.
Moving on, the scholars of the Shīʿah helped the Safawid rulers in taking Shīʿism through the various stages of extremism and enforcing it upon the people with weaponry and fire. The most prominent among them was their scholar ʿAlī al-Karakī whom the Shīʿah accord the title ‘al-Muḥaqqiq al-Thānī’ (the second eminent research scholar) and whom Shāh Tahmasp, the son of Shāh Ismāʿīl, had taken as a close advisor. The latter had accorded him the status of the obeyed issuer of orders in the state. This al-Karakī had contrived many innovations in Shīʿism, one being the sand upon which the Shīʿah prostrate in their prayers on which he wrote a book in the year 933 A.H. He also wrote a book regarding the permissibility of prostrating to a servant (human) due to complying with Ismāʿīl al-Ṣafawī whose friends would flatter him to the extent of even at times worshipping him and prostrating before him.

The many innovations which he contrived in the Shīʿī dogma propelled some non-Shīʿī writers to accord him the title the ‘Inventor of the Shīʿah’. He also wrote a book regarding reviling Abū Bakr and ʿUmar which he named Nafaḥāt al-Lāhūt fī Laʾn al-Jibt wa al-Ṭāghūt (the divine breezes regarding the cursing of Jibt and Ṭāghūt).

It is also said that he was the person to initiate the reviling of the Ṣaḥābah in the Masjids on Fridays.

Another scholar of the Safawid dynasty was al-Majlisī who partnered with the rulers in converting the Muslims in Iran. It is claimed that his book Nūr al-Yaqīn was the cause of the conversion of seventy thousand Iranian Sunnīs to Shīʿism.

---

1 ʿAlī ibn Hilāl al-Karakī d. 984 A.H. (See: Aʿyān al-Shīʿah 42/200-201; Muqtabas al-Athar 22/333)
2 Al-Fikr al-Shīʿī p. 416 (with reference to his biography in Rawāt al-Jannāt p. 404).
3 Al-Ḥaydarī therefore says that Ismāʿīl al-Ṣafawī parted from the path of Rafḍ and claimed divinity; his soldiers would prostrate before him. (See: ʿUnwān al-Majd 116-117).
4 Al-Nawāqid: al-Waraqah p. 98.
5 Al-Fikr al-Shīʿī p. 416.
6 Ibid.
7 Donalds: ʿAqīdah al-Shīʿah p. 302.
This is probably from the exaggerations of the Shīʿah, because Shīʿism did not gain traction in Iran by way of academics and persuasion, but rather by way of coercion and threatening.

The next generation grew up in an ambiance of the Ḥusaynī commemorations which were sensationalised to an extent that the younger generation would definitely be overwhelmed with hatred and anger. This led to them not wanting to listen to any evidence or argument.

Also, al-Majlīsī’s book Ḍīḥār al-Anwār had a very great effect in the spread of extremism in the Shīʿah. This is because the readers of the Taʿzīyah (condolences) and the orators would draw from it whatever they found appealing and as a result filled the minds of people with extremisms and myths.

This book was one of the first books which was published on a very large scale during the Qajar era. Many copies were sent to Iraq which led to the spread of much of its unreliable information amidst the circles of the Iraqi community, similar to what had transpired in Iran.¹

The other angle of the impact of the Safawid dynasty should also not be neglected; and that is the various wars that it waged against the Muslim empire, its collaboration with the Portuguese and the English, its approbation of building churches and the missionary movements of the priests with who they teamed up with them in combatting the Sunnah and its adherents.²

These are but a few indications to the influences of their dynasty in this sphere.

I conclude the discussion with the words of Ibn Taymiyyah regarding the topic, which if read and applied to the reality, and in light of which if history is read, you will see the truth of it as clear as the daylight. He says:

¹ Lamaḥāt Ijtīḥāḏīyyah p. 77-78.
Every intelligent person should consider all the trials, evils and corruptions that occurred in his time, and the near past. He will find that most of them are from the side of the Shīʿah. You will find that they are the greatest instigators of fitnah and that they do not desist from causing any fitnah, evil and corruption in the Ummah which is within their reach.¹

He also says:

وقد علمنا بالمعاينة والتواتر أن الفتن والشرور العظيمة التي لا تشبهها فتن إنما تخرج عنهم

And we know through observation and diffuse transmission that the great calamities and evils which are unmatched by any other in kind all come from them.²

The Social Sphere

This is a very vast topic, but I will allude to some aspects thereof.

Firstly: Their rapport with the Muslims

The Shīʿah live with the Muslims and carry a Muslim identity and there is no difference between them and the rest. And the default ruling in the relationships within Muslims is love, affection, mutual care and preference.

Islam has grounded the foundations of love between a Muslim and his brother, and the generation of the Ṣaḥābah ۹۸۶۶ set the highest precedent of love, loyalty, and adherence to the Qurʾān and the Sunnah. There is no doubt that this type of

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/243.
² Ibid. 3/245.
unity and mutual respect was always one of the targets of the enemy wanting to destroy the Ummah.

Hence the ploys of the enemy in destroying this firm Islamic structure have been many, one among them being their entrance into Shīʿism thereby deploying it as an instrumental tool to eliminate this firm and solid foundation of the Muslim society.

Hence it is very common and well-known that the relationship of a Shīʿī with others is based upon his desire to harm the next person in whichever way possible considering that to be a means of drawing closer to Allah  سبحانه وتعالى.

Bearing hatred and malice discreetly is from their characteristics, disloyalty and the discarding of rights is within their disposition and deception, breaching of trusts, cunningness and misrepresentation are from their well-known actions, which at times even reach the extent of murder.

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

As for the Shīʿī, he does not deal with anyone but by deploying hypocrisy with him. Because the false religion which is in his heart propels him to lie, breach trusts, deceive people and intend evil for them. Hence he does not fall short of causing them ruination and does not leave any evil which is within his reach but perpetrates it against them. He is despised even by those who do not know him due to the signs of hypocrisy being evident on his face and in his speech. Hence you will find that he always practices hypocrisy with the weak people and those who do not have any need for him due to the hypocrisy in his heart which weakens it.¹

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/260.
Similarly, Al-Shawkānī has presented a few personal experiences which he experienced during his stay with the Shīʿah in Yemen. He has revealed some very strange matters and has emphasised that:

لأمانة لرافضي قط على من يخالفه في مذهبه ويدين بغیر الرفض، بل یستحل ماله ودمه عند أدنى فرصة تلوح له، لأنه عنه سباح الدم والمال وكل ما يظهره من المودة فهو تقية يذهب أثره بمجرد إمكان الفرصة

A Shīʿī cannot be trusted at all regarding a person who opposes him in his beliefs and adheres to a creed other than the creed of the Shīʿah. He will violate his blood and wealth at the occurrence of the slightest opportunity due to his blood and wealth being violable according to him. All the love that he expresses is owing to Taqiyyah which fades away as soon as the possibility of an opportunity comes about.¹

Whilst discussing the factuality of this, he mentions the experiences he has had with this cult:

وكذلک جربنا هذا كثيرا فلم نجد رافضی اخلص المودة لغیر رافضی وإن آثره بجمیع ما يملكه، وكان له منزلة الخول، وتوعد إليه بكل ممكن، ولم نجد في مذهب من المذاهب المبتدعة ولا غيرها ما نجده عند هؤلاء من العداوة لمن خالفهم، فإنه يعن أقبح الالعاب ويبغض أفظع السب كل من تجري بينه وبينه أدنى خصومة وأحقر جدال، وأقل اختلاف، ولعل سبب هذا والله أعلم أنهم لما تجروا على سب السلف الصالح هان عليهم سب من عداهم، ولا جرم بكل شديد ذنب يهون ما دونه

We have experienced this a lot and did not find any Shīʿī who sincerely loves anyone besides a Shīʿī, even if he (the non-Shīʿī) give preference to him in everything that he owns, becomes to him like a slave (to his master), and tries to win his admiration in every possible way. We have not found the type of hatred we saw in them in any of the other heterodox sects or in any other group for that matter. Likewise the boldness to defame respected and prominent people which we have witnessed in them, we have not seen in anyone else. Hence a Shīʿī will curse in the worst of ways and swear abhorrently any person with who he happens to have the smallest of

¹ Ṭalab al-ʿIlm p. 70-71.
disputes and the most insignificant of quarrels. Probably the reason for this is, Allah knows best, that when they became bold in reviling the pious predecessors it became trivial for them to revile those besides them. And why not, because every severe sin trivialises those lighter than it.\(^1\)

Al-Shawkānī also alludes to the fact that they do not hesitate in committing any crime in an Islamic society and do not steer clear of any impermissible act. He says:

We have experienced and those before us also experienced. We have not found one Shīṭ person who steers clear of the impermissible acts of Dīn however severe they may be. Do not be deceived by the external, because a person might at times leave a sin in the presence of people and seem as if he is the most chaste and pure of people, but when the opportunity strikes he seizes it like a person who has no fear of hell-fire and no hope of Jannah.

He then goes onto mention some of his personal experiences. He says:

I saw a Mu’adhhdhin who was punctual in his congregational prayers but was later exposed and found to be a thief. Likewise there was another person who was an Imām in one of the Masjids of Ṣan‘ā’ and had very good conduct, a unique way and was always engaged in obedience. I would muse at the fact that how can such a person be a Shīṭ, but thereafter I heard such things about him as make the hair stand and the hearts tremor.

---

1. Ibid. p. 71.
He then makes mention of a third person who had slight leanings toward Shi'ism. Those leanings soon progressed and eventually resulted in him writing a book regarding the demerits of the Ṣaḥābah. Al-Shawkānī says:

وكتن أعرف عنه في مبادئ أمره صلاة وعفة، فقلت: إذا كان ول بد من رافضي عفيف فهذا. ثم سمعت منه بفواقو نسأل الله الستر والسلامة

In his initial stages I knew him to have firmness in faith and chastity, and I would thus say that if there is a Shi'i who is pure than it is this person. But subsequently I heard some back-breaking (grave) matters from him. We ask Allah for concealment and safety.¹

He thereafter says:

وأما وثوب هذه الطائفة على أموال الیتامى والمستضعفین ومن یقدرون على ظلمه كائنا من کان فلا یحتاج إلى برھان، بل یكفي مدعیه إحالة منكرة على الإستقرار والتتبع فإنه سيظفر عند ذلك بصحة ما ذكرناه

As for the capturing of this cult of the wealth of the orphans and the weak and whoever they can oppress, it does not require evidence. Rather it is sufficient for the one who claims this to direct the denier thereof to do a survey and study in this regard, for he will surely find that which attests to the veracity of what we have mentioned.²

These are important testimonies which al-Shawkānī has enlisted and in them he has illustrated what Shi'ism does to a person and how it impacts on his relationship with the Muslims. They are crucial because he stayed with this cult of the Shi'ah in Yemen who progressed from the confines of the Zaydī sect and eventually embraced Rafḍ, as is known regarding the Jārūdiyyah.³

---

¹ Ṭalab al-ʿIlm p. 73.
² Ibid. 74.
³ The Zaydi Jārūdiyyah, even though they have named themselves the Zaydiyyah, they are Rāfiḍah in that they excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah. Hence the leading scholar of the Twelvers al-Mufīd has deemed the Zaydiyyah not to be part of the Shi'ah in his book Awāʿl al-Maqālat but has excluded the Jārūdiyyah due to them being on his dogma. (See: p. 59 of this book).
Someone might object that this testification of al-Shawkānī is a testification of an opponent of the Shīʿah and hence cannot be held against them. But the reality is that the Ahl al-Sunnah are much more just, impartial, and pious than can slip into oppressing these sects and lying against them, as is established in history. In fact the Ahl al-Sunnah are better for the Shīʿah and are much more just to them than they are to each other. This is what they acknowledge themselves. They say, “Your justice for us is more than our justice for each other.”

Furthermore, I came across a very important narration in al-Kāfī of al-Kulaynī which confirms the statements of al-Shawkānī and acknowledges the veracity of what he has said and acknowledgement is the chief of all evidence. This narration talks of the propensity of a Shīʿī when he deals with people. It states that a Shīʿī by the name ‘Abd Allah ibn Kaysān asked their Imām:

إني... نشأني في أرض فارس وإنني أخالط الناس في التجارات وغير ذلك فأخالط الرجل فأرى له حسن السمت، وحسن الخلق، وكثرة أمانة، ثم أفتشه فأتيته من عداوكم (يعني أهل السنة). وأخالط الرجل فأرى منه سوء الخلق وقلة أمانة وزعارة ثم أفتشه فأتيته عن ولايتكم

I grew up in the lands of Persia and I mix with the people in business transactions and other interactions. I at times deal with a person and see that he has good conduct, good character, and immense trustworthiness. Subsequently when I investigate regarding him I discover that he is from your enemies (i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah). And at other times I deal with a person and see that he has bad conduct, lack of trust, and evil character. Subsequently when I investigate regarding him I discover that he is from your friends...

This narration acknowledges that the Ahl al-Sunnah have good character, immense trustworthiness, and sublime conduct and conversely it describes the Shīʿah with the opposite of these traits.

---

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/39.
2 Zaʿārah means evil character. And in some manuscripts the word is Daʿārah which translates as corruption, sinning and defilement.
3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/4; Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaqalayn 4/47.
In another narration of *al-Kāfī* a person complains to his Imām that he discerns rashness, sharpness, and anger in his fellow Shīʿah and that he is deeply saddened because of that, whereas on the other hand he discerns in their opponents the Ahl al-Sunnah good conduct. The Imām tells him:

لا تقل حسن السمت ولكن قل حسن السیمَا، فأن الله عز وجل یقول سِیْماهم فِي وُجَوْهِهم مِنْ أَثَرِ السُّجُود.

Do not say Ḥasan al-Samt¹ because Samt refers to a path, but rather say Ḥasan al-Sīmā because Allah E says: Their mark, i.e. sign, is one their faces, i.e. foreheads, from the trace of prostration.²

The narrator continues, “So I said, “I see him as having good Sīmā, signs, and dignity and am deeply saddened because of that...³

Likewise we have a third Shīʿī by the name ʿAbd Allah ibn Abū Yaʿfūr who cannot stop musing at the vast difference between the character of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the character of the Shīʿah. He raises the issue to his Imām and says:

إني أخالط الناس فیكثر عجبي من أقوام لا يтолونكم ويتولون فلانا فلانا لهم آمانة وصدق ووفاء، وأقوام يتونونكم (بعنی الرافضة) ليس لهم تلك الأمانة ولا الوفاء والصدق قال: فاستوى أبو عبد الله جالسا فأقبل علي كالفضبان، ثم قال: لا دين لمن دان الله بولاية إمام جائر ليس من الله، ولا عتب على من دان بولاية إمام عادل من الله. قلت: لا دين لأولئك ولا عتب على هؤلاء. قال نعم

“I intermingle with the people and my amazement increases regarding those who do not associate with you and associate with so and so and so

---

¹ It is a known fact in language that Samt is used in the meaning of dignity and conduct just as it is used in the meaning of path. The author of *al-Miṣbāḥ* says, “Samt means path, moderation, serenity, dignity and conduct.

² Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29.

³ *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/11. The answer of their Imām to these complaints was acknowledging them and assigning them to the nature of the essential soil wherefrom each group was created. Hence he confirms the matter and does not deny it. Also refer to what has passed regarding their doctrine of *al-Ṭīnah* on p. 1276 of this book.
and so due to them having trustworthiness, truthfulness, and loyalty; and regarding those who associate with you (i.e. the Shī‘ah) but do not have that level of trustworthiness, loyalty and truthfulness.” He said, “The Imām sat upright and faced me as though angry and said, “There is no Dīn for a person who worships Allah by acknowledging the rulership of a tyrant ruler who is not from Allah and there is no blame upon the one who is devoted to him by acknowledging the rulership of a just ruler who is from Allah.” I then asked, “There is thus no religion for those people and there is no blame upon these people?” He said, “Yes.”

This answer of the Imām which rejects any blame and reprimand which is directed to them even though they commit major sins is what has led them to this deep abyss of undermining and trivialising the perpetration of crimes. Because Dīn according to them is only acknowledging the Imām and the love of ʿAlī, in the presence of which no sin is harmful. Therefore, as long as this false premise is not reformed this phenomenon will remain in them.

It should likewise be noted that their books acknowledge kidnapping and eliminating the enemy therewith, and only consider the safety of the Shī‘ī to be prerequisite. The books of the Shī‘ah narrate from Dāwūd ibn Farqad that he asked Abū ʿAbd Allah the following:

ما تقول في قتل الناصب؟ فقال: حلال الدم، ولكني أتقي علیك فإن قدرت أن تقلب عليه حائطا أو تغرقه في ماء كيلا يشهد علیك فافعل

“What do you say regarding killing a Nāṣibī?”

He replied, “His blood is permissible to claim. But I fear for you. Hence if you can drop a wall on him or drown him in water so that he does not testify against you then do so.”

1 The people meant are Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, as stated by the commentators of al-Kāfī. Hence this is an indication to the Ahl al-Sunnah
2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/375.
Likewise in *Rijāl al-Kashshī* it is reported that one of the Shīʿah informs his Imām how he managed to kill a group of his opponents. He says:

> منهم من كنت أصعد سطحه بسلم حتى أقتله، ومنهم من دعوته بالليل على بابه فإذا خرج علي قتله، ومنهم من كنت أصحبه في الطريق فإذا خلا لي قتله،

Among them was a person whose roof I climbed with a ladder and thereafter killed him. Among them was a person who I would called out to at his door at night and when came out I killed him. And another person I would accompany on the street and when the streets would be empty I killed him.¹

He goes on to tell the Imām that he killed thirteen Muslims in this way because he assumed that they disassociate themselves from ʿAlī.²

Similarly, their scholar Niʿmat Allah al-Jazāʿirī states that the following appears in their traditions:

> إن علي بن يقطان وهو وزیر الرشید قد اجتمع في حبسه حماعة من المخالفین، فأمر غلمانه وهدموا أسقف المحبس على المحبوسین فماتوا كلهم وكانوا خمساً وثمانون رجل تقريباً، فأراد الخلاص من تبعات دماؤهم، فأرسل إلى الإمام مولنا الكاظم (ع) فكتب إلیه جواب کتابه بأنك لو كنت تقدمت إلي قبل قتلهم لما كان عليك شيء من دماؤهم وحيث إنك لم تتقدم إلي فكفر عن كل رجل قتلته من بني ونس ونس.

In the prison of the Minister of al-Rashīd ʿAlī ibn Yaqṭān³ a group of the opponents ended up together. Hence he ordered his slaves who demolished the roof of his prison upon the prisoners as a result of which they all died. They were five hundred in number. Thereafter, wanting to exonerate himself from their murder he sends a letter to the Imām our master al-

---

¹ *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 342-343.
² Ibid.
³ Al-Jazāʿirī has described him as one of the elite of the Shīʿah. (See: *al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah* 2/308). And al-Ṭabarī mentions that he was killed as a heretic. (See: p. 787-788 of this book).
Kāẓim who wrote back to him saying, “Had you come to me before you killed them you would not have been responsible. But because you did not come to me atone for each of them with one goat. And even a goat is better than them.”

See how they stay amidst the Muslims and wait for any opportunity to kill. These are their confessions which attest to their evil effects. Their Imām here sanctions the killing of five hundred Muslims just because they are not Shīʿah and orders the killer to atone for their murder with goats due to him not seeking permission in advance. This implies that if a Shīʿī seeks permission from the Imām or his jurist representative he can do whatever he wants, and if he does not seek permission then he should atone by giving a goat.

Commenting upon the goat as a blood penalty al-Jazā’irī says:

فانظر إلى هذه الدية الجزیلة التي لا تعادل دیة أخیهم الأصغر وهو کلب الصید فإن دیته عشرون درهما، ولا دیة أخیهم الأکبر وهو الیهودي أو المجوسي فإنها ثمانیات-کذا- درهم وحالهم في الخرة أخس وأبخس

Look at this big blood penalty which is not equal to the blood penalty of their small brother, the hunting dog, which is twenty Dirhams. Nor is it equal to the blood penalty of their elder brother, a Jew or a fire worshipper, which is eight hundred Dirhams. Their condition in the afterlife will be worse and more insignificant.

The reprehensibility of this statement speaks for itself and does not require any comment. It tells us of the amount of hatred they hold for the Ahl al-Sunnah and that they consider them to be more steeped in disbelief than even the fire-worshippers.

1 Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah 2/308.
2 Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah 2/308.
Secondly: Internal conflicts

These are the conflicts which they instigate due to reviling the Ṣaḥābah in their yearly mourning ceremonies. Hence since the era of the Buwayhids, from the fourth century in Baghdād, mourning ceremonies are organized in order to revive the martyrdom of Ḥusayn. In these ceremonies the Shīʿah instigate problems and conflicts which know no limits. As a result vehement conflicts break out between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah due to them boldly swearing and cursing the Ṣaḥābah. The first conflict which occurred in the history of Baghdād was in the year 338 A.H. and ever since these conflicts continue. In these conflicts many Muslims were killed and up to the present day the effects of this innovation still plague the Muslim world.

How many lives were lost, how much of hatred was planted, and how much of disunity and conflict were engendered. But despite this a leading scholar of the Shīʿah Khomeini worsens the problem and says on the Iranian television in one sentence:

إن شعار الفرقة الناجية وعلامتهم الخاصة من أول الإسلام إلى يومنا هذا إقامة المآتم

The distinctive symbol of the group which will attain salvation and their unique feature is establishing the ceremonies of mourning.

He also says:

إن البكاء على سيد الشهداء (ع) وإقامة المجالس الحسینیة هي التى حفظت الإسلام منذ أربعة عشر قرنا

Crying over the Leader of the Martyrs and establishing the Ḥusaynī gatherings is what kept Islam alive for fourteen centuries.

2 See for examples the incidents of the years: 406, 408, 421, 422, 425, 439, 443, 444, 445, 447, 478, 481, 482, 486, etc. in al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah and the other books of history.
3 This was reported by the Iranian Sunnī scholar Muḥammad Ḍiyāʾī in the al-Mujtamaʿ magazine, edition no. 589, published on the 18th of Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1402 A.H.
Likewise, the statement of one of their scholars regarding these mourning ceremonies being from the sanctified symbols of Allah has passed already.¹

Nonetheless, Allah had blessed Ḥusayn with martyrdom on that day. In those who were martyred before him these was an ideal example for him. His murder was indeed a great calamity, and Allah has made Istirjāʿ, saying Innā Lillāh wa Innā Ilayhi Rājiʿūn, lawful at the time of a calamity.² But what the Shīʿah do has nothing to do with Islam. The only motive of those who invented it is keeping the Muslim Ummah busy within itself so that it does not find space to spread the Dīn of Allah upon the earth.

Thirdly, Libertinism

Part of the influence they have had on the social level is the libertinism which they espouse, whose means they facilitate and which they practice in the Muslim society in the name of lending sexual rights,³ or what they otherwise call Mutʿah under the pretext of which they commit adultery. This is because their Mutʿah entails a secretive agreement⁴ upon cohabiting with any woman who consents

---

1 See p. 1460 of this book.
2 Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām 4/511.
3 In their narrations it appears that al-Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār says, “I asked Abū ʿAbd Allah regarding the lending of sexual rights and he said, “There is nothing wrong.” (Wasāʿil al-Shīʿah 7/536-537; Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām 2/185; al-Istibṣār 3/141.
4 Al-Ṭūsī says, “It is permissible for him to do Mutʿah with her without the permission of her parents and without any announcement...” (See: al-Nīḥāyah p. 490).
even though she be a prostitute\(^1\) or a married woman.\(^2\) It is okay for him to agree with her for a day or for one or two times.\(^3\)

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī says, “It is okay for a man to do Mutʿah with a prostitute (al-Nihāyah p. 490). And Khomeini says, “It is permissible to do Mutʿah with a prostitute (Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah 2/292). The following narration also appears in their books:


Iṣḥāq ibn Jarīr says, “I asked Abū ‘Abd Allah \(^\text{1}\) , “In Kūfah there is a woman who is well known for prostitution, would it be permissible for me to contract a Mutʿah marriage with her?” He asked, “Has she raised a banner?” I said, “No, if she raises a banner the ruler will take it.” He thus replied, “Yes contract a Mutʿah marriage with her.” He then turned toward one of his slaves and whispered something to him. Later when I met his slave I asked him, “What did he say to you?” He said, “He told me that even if she raised a banner there wouldn’t be any problem for him in marrying her. Because he would be taking her out from the unlawful to the lawful.” (Wasā’il al-Shīʿah 14/455; Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām 2/249).

2 The following appears in their narrations:

عن محمد بن عبد الله الأشعري قال: قلت للرضا (ع) الرجل يتزوج بالمرأة فقىي في قلبه أن لا زوجا. فقال: وما عليه

Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allah al-Ashʿarī mentions, “I asked al-Riḍā \(^\text{2}\) , “At times a person marries a woman and then it occurs to him that she is married.” He said, “There is no blame upon him.” (Wasā’il al-Shīʿah 14/457; Tahdhīb al-Akhām 2/187).

Likewise Jaʿfar was asked, as they allege:

إن فلانا تزوج امرأة متعة فقيل له إن لها زوجا فسألهما فقال أبو عبد الله (ع): ولم سألهما

So and so contracted a Mutʿah marriage with a woman. Later he was told that she has a husband. He thus asked her. Abū ‘Abd Allah said, “Why did he ask her?” (Previous two references).

And their scholar al-Ṭūsī says that a person does not have to ask a lady whether she has a husband or not. (Al-Nihāyah p. 490).

3 See: al-Nihāyah p. 491; al-Khūmainī Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah 2/290. It is recorded in their narrations that:

عن خلف بن حماد قال: أرسلت إلى أبي الحسن (ع) كم أدنى أجل المتعة؟ هل يجوز أن يتمتع الرجل بشروط مدة واحدة؟ فقال: نعم.

Khalaf ibn Ḫammād says, “I sent a message to Abū al-Ḥasan asking him, what the minimum period of Mutʿah is? Is it ok for a person do to Mutʿah with her with the condition of just one time?” He said, “Yes.” (Furūʿ al-Kāfī 2/46; Wasā’il al-Shīʿah 14/479).
Some have even confessed to Shaykh Muḥammad Naṣīf that the Shīʿah often engage in *Mutʿah Dawriyyah* as well due to a plan which some of their scholars have devised for them.¹

Al-Ālūsī therefore says:

A person who considers the condition of the Shīʿah in these times will not require any evidence to conclude that what they indulge in is prostitution. At times one woman commits fornication with twenty men in a day and night averring that she is doing Mutʿah. Likewise, there are several markets which have been prepared in which women are kept. These markets have managers who bring men to women and women to men. As a result they

---

¹ *Mutʿah Dawriyyah* is when a group of people all do Mutʿah with one woman one after the other (Mukhtasar al-Tuhfah al-Ithnay ʿAshariyyah p. 227). Also see what Shaykh al-ʿĀnī has mentioned regarding its proliferation in some seminaries of Najaf (al-Dhariʿah Li Izālah Shubah Kuttāb al-Shīʿah 45-46).

Shaykh Muḥammad al-Naṣīf was able to bring forth a confession from one of their scholars who goes by the name Aḥmad Sarḥān regarding Mutʿah Dawriyyah. Naṣīf asked the Shīʿī, “According to the Ahl al-Sunnah the abrogation of Mutʿah is confirmed, not so according to the Shīʿah. But I do not know what evidence you advance regarding Mutʿah Dawriyyah.” To which the Shīʿī responded:

A person who contracts a Mutʿah marriage with a woman contracts a permanent marriage with her after the duration of the Mutʿah and thereafter divorces her before consummating the (permanent) marriage with her owing to which she is not required to sit in *ʿIddah* (the waiting period). Subsequently another person then contracts a Mutʿah marriage with her and does exactly what the first person did. In this way one woman goes through different men without having to sit in *ʿIddah* (the waiting period). (See: The al-Fatḥ magazine, edition no. 845, published in Rajab 1366 A.H.)
choose what they like and stipulate a fee for the fornication. They hold
the hands of these ladies and take them toward the curse of Allah and his
anger.¹

He then goes onto mention the details and tales of what happens there.²

Furthermore, they drive men and women toward this act with threats and with
temptations due to it being the best of deeds according to them³ and due to
destruction awaiting the one who does not engage in it on the Day of Judgment.⁴

---

¹ Kashf ʿAyāhib al-Jahālāt p. 3 (manuscript).
² Ibid.
³ There are many Shīʿī traditions which suggest that Mutʿah is the best of deed according to them.
To the extent that in a fabricated narration which they attribute to Rasūl Allah the following
appears:

من تتع مرة فدرجة كدرجة الحسين، ومن تتع مرتين فدرجة كدرجة الحسن، ومن تتع ثلاث مرات فدرجة كدرجة علي، ومن تتع
أربع مرات فدرجة كدرجة جعلي

He who does Mutʿah once, his rank is like the rank of Ḥusain. He who does it twice, his rank is
like the rank of Ḥasan. He who does it thrice his rank is like the rank of ʿAlī. And he who does
it four times, his rank is the like my rank. (Tafsīr Minhāj al-Ṣādiqīn p. 356).

They have left no door which leads to enticing people to commit adultery except that they have
opened it. A person who reads their narrations in this regard will conclude that the fabricators
thereof were liberals who desired to satisfy their lustful desires with Muslim women. Hence their
narrations also state:

إذا تزوجها متعة لم يكلمهما كلمة إلا كتب الله له بها حسنة، ولم يمد يده إلیها إل کتب الله له حسنة... فإذا اغتسل غفر الله له... بعدد الشعر

If he contracts a Mutʿah marriage with her, he will not speak a word to her but that Allah will
record one good deed for him. He will likewise not extend his hand toward her but that Allah
will write a virtue for him. Thereafter when he will bath Allah will forgive him as much as the
hair on his body. (Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 14/442; Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh 2/151).

They also allege that a woman would turn down all those who proposed to her due to her not having
any inclination toward marriage, but she later sent a message to her cousin inviting him to marry her
through Mutʿah in order to disobey ʿUmar, as the narration suggests. Hence she gave preference to
adultery over the constitution of marriage. (Refer to their narrations regarding the alleged virtues of
Mutʿah in the book Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah: chapter regarding the desirability of Mutʿah 14/442, onwards).

⁴ One of their narrations state that a person who leaves the world without doing Mutʿah will appear
on the Day of Judgement with his nose and ears cut. (See: Tafsīr Minhāj al-Ṣādiqīn p. 356).
Their scholars likewise sanction anal sex. Their scholar Khomeini states:

والاقوى والأظهر جواز وطء الزوجة في الدبر

The stronger and more apparent view is that it is permissible to cohabit with a woman anally.¹

Now compare this with the verdict of Ibn Nujaym which states that considering anal sex with the wife to be permissible is Kufr, disbelief, according to majority of the scholars.²

All these various types of indulgence are not any different than the liberal tendencies of the Kharamiyyah, the followers of Mazdak and Bābak, and probably are not lesser than the liberal tendencies of the west as well.

The Shi‘ah have taken advantage of the widespread ethical chaos to entice students with affordable Mut‘ah so to embrace their faith, as has passed already.³

In fact some of their narrations clearly legalise adultery if it is done in lieu of a compensation:

 عن عبد الرحمن بن كثير عن أبي عبد الله قال: حاءت امرأة إلى عمر فقالت إني زنیت فطهرني فأمر بها أن ترجم فأخبر ذلك أمیر المؤمنین (ع) فقال: كیف زنیت. قال: مررت بالبادیة فأصابني عطش شدید فاستطقت أعرابا فأبى أن یسقیني إل إن أمكنه من نفسي فلما أجهدني العطش وخفت على نفسي سقاني فأتمكته من نفسي فقال أمیر المؤمنین: تزویج ورب الكعبة

‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Kathīr narrates from Abū ʿAbd Allah, “A woman came to ʿUmar and said, “I have committed adultery so purify me.” Hence he ordered that she be lapidated.

Thereafter Amīr al-Muʿminin was informed and he asked, “How did you commit adultery?”

¹ Tahrīr al-Wasīlah 2/241.
² Al-Ashbāh wa al-Naẓā’ir p. 191.
³ See p. 1579 of this book.
She said, “I was passing through the desert and was experiencing severe thirst. I thus sought water from a Bedouin, but he refused to give me water unless I gave him authority over myself. Hence when the thirst exhausted me and I feared upon myself he gave me water subsequent to which I gave him authority over myself.”

Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn replied, “A marriage by the Lord of the Ka’bah.”

Similarly, they do not confine their libertinism to their people, rather their Imām advises that they offer Mutʿah marriages to the women of the Ahl al-Sunnah and even the woman of the Jews and the Christians. Hence their libertinism is comprehensive. It has not left any society but that it has corrupted it. They are, therefore, adulterers who live amidst the Muslims and carry a Muslim identity, but cause mischief in the lands, to which their verdicts and traditions abundantly attest.

The Economical Sphere

Shīʿism has left its effects in the economical sphere of the Muslims’ lives in different ways. One among them is that Shīʿī figures have since the bygone eras taken the wealth of the Muslims under the deceiving pretext of the ‘right of the Ahl al-Bayt’, for which Allah has revealed no evidence. This wealth was always utilised in fulfilling their personal motives and exploited to conspire against the Ummah and plot against it.

Listen to this Serious Statement

The books of the Shīʿah say:

2 Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 14/452; Furūʿ al-Kāfī 2/44.
3 Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah 14/452; Furūʿ al-Kāfī 2/188; Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh 2/148.
Abū al-Ḥasan passed away and there was none among the caretakers of his wealth but that they had a lot of wealth, and thus that served as the cause for their hesitation and denial of his death. Ziyād al-Qandī had seventy thousand Dirhams and ʿAlī ibn Ḥamzah had thirty thousand Dirhams. One of the caretakers, whose name was ʿUthmān ibn ʿĪsā and who was based in Egypt, had a lot of wealth and six slave girls. Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā wrote to him regarding the money and the slave girls. In response he wrote, “Your father has not died.” To which Abū al-Ḥasan responded by saying, “My father has passed away, we have distributed his inheritance and the reports of his death are credible.

He responded, “If your father did not die than there is no share for you in the wealth, and if he has died, then he has not ordered me to give anything to you. As for the slave girls I have freed them and married them.”

This report is taken from the books of the Twelvers. We will leave that aspect of this narration for which they advance this narration, i.e. to establish the invalidity of suspending ruling regarding the death of the Imām by drawing evidence from the response of their Imām al-Riḍā, and will rather focus on the disclosure the narration gives us regarding the greed for wealth which underpins their activities. This narration reveals that the only motive all those people who traversed the lands and claimed to be representative of an Imām from the Imāms had in mind was securing the biggest possible amount of wealth for themselves.

Hence by way of these false claims for the Imāms they would gather huge sums of money and which these clandestine elements would share amongst themselves.

Any person who considers the abundant Shīʿī movements which emerged throughout the history of the Muslim Ummah, which distracted the Ummah from its enemies and which diverted its energies away from constructing the

1 ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusain ibn Bābawayh: al-Imāmah p. 75; Rijāl al-Kashshī p. 43 (no. 946), p. 598 (no. 1120; Biḥār al-Anwār 48/253; al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah p. 43.
The greatest Muslim empire should not be oblivious of the fact that all the funding for these movements was collected from the gullible followers in the name of the Ahl al-Bayt and their right of Khums, one fifth.

In fact, the Shi'i movements of the present age still solicit all their funding from this avenue. And the scholars of the Shi'a are thus considered to be from the prominent capitalists of the world. Therefore the position of being a scholar or a Marji' is a position which the hearts yearn for and which the gazes look up to, i.e. due to them being positions upon which heaps of golds and silver are poured.

Similarly, this avenue of income is what sustained and continues to sustain all the publishing houses which publish hundreds of publications and books which are replete with content against the Ummah and its Dīn.

Furthermore, this immense wealth which is poured upon the Ayāt, scholars, and Marāji', authorities, of the Shi'ah from the side of the beguiled followers is what has made the matter of the Shi'ah progress and their threat intensify. Hence, the scholars of the Shi'ah and their authorities began directing their fatwas to the ordinary people on the streets and concealed the realities and facts from them in order to conform to the populist information they were already exposed to.¹

The scholars of the Shi'ah have lent a lot of importance to the issue of wealth which they usurp from people in the name of Khums. To the extent that they consider a person who considers it permissible to withhold one Dirham to be a disbeliever.²

---

¹ See: p. 1366 onwards (The Tenth Misconception) of this book.
² They say, “A person who withholds one Dirham or less will be included in those who oppress them (i.e. the Ahl al-Bayt) and usurp their rights. Rather a person who considers that to be permissible is from the disbelievers. Abū Baṣīr narrates:

قلت لأبي جعفر عليه السلام: ما أيسر ما يدخل به العباد النار؟ قال: من أكل من مال اليتيم ونحن اليتيم

I asked Abū Ja’far S, “What is the lowest action due to which a servant will enter the fire?”

He said, “Eating the wealth of an orphan and we are the orphans.”

(Al-Yazdi: al-‘Urwah al-Wuthqā 2/366. In the footnotes are the annotations of their contemporary scholars) Professor ‘Alī al-Sālūs whilst mocking this principle says that if the Muslims of today want that the Shi'ah do not excommunicate them they should send one fifth of their earnings and capitals to the scholars of the Shi'ah. (See: Athar al-Imāmah fī al-Fiqh al-Ja'farī p. 394 (footnote).
A person who studies Islamic jurisprudence will not find a single chapter which is dedicated solely to the topic of Khums. All that he will find is narrations regarding the Khums retrieved from booty in the chapter of Jihād. Likewise he will find a narration regarding the Khums which is to be paid upon certain minerals.

But the matter is completely different according to the Shīʿah. For in their books there is a chapter which is dedicated to Khums. Hereunder are some of their rulings regarding Khums:

Khums will be taken out of whatever surplus remains after the expenses of the year are settled from the revenues of businesses and all other types of earnings, viz. occupations, farming, lease agreements, even sewing of clothes, writing, carpentry, hunting, the securing of things which are permissible by default and the wages paid for acts of worship for which wages are normally given: like Ḥajj, fasting, Ṣalāh, visitations, teaching children and all other actions for which wages are paid.¹

They even say:

بل الأحوط ثبوته في مطلق الفائدة، وإن لم تحصل بالإکتساب کالهبة والهدیة والجائزة والمال الموصى به ونحوها.

It is rather safer that Khums be established in any benefit even though it is not procured through earning, likes gifts, presents, allowances and wealth which is bequeathed, etc.²

They have also considered it safer to take out Khums from the capital itself and from all the instruments and tools which are used, like a carpenter’s instruments

---

¹ Al-ʿUrwah al-Wuthqā 2/389.
² Ibid.
of carpentry, a weaver’s instruments of weaving and a farmer’s instruments of farming. Hence it is safer to take out Khums for them as well in advance.¹

They even go to the extent of saying:

 لو زاد ما اشتراه وادخره للمؤمنة من مثل الحنطة والشاعر ونحوها مما يصرف عينه فيها يجب إخراج خمسه عند تمام الحول... ولو استغني عن الفرش والأواني والألبسة والعبد والفرس والكتب وما كان مبناه على بقاء عينه فالأحوج إخراج الخمس

If there is surplus in what he has bought and stored for seeing to expenses like wheat, barely and things of their kind which are used, it will be compulsory to take out one Khums from them as well at the end of the year... And if he does not require the spreads, utensils, clothing, the servant, the horse, the books and whatever else is itself required, then it is safer to take out one Khums from them as well.²

All this wealth is spent on whom?

The Shi‘ah say that in the period of the occultation it will be granted to the Shi‘ī jurist.³ Hence those who takeout Khums spend it upon the Shi‘ī jurists.

To explain, their scholars assert that the Khums will be distributed into six shares:

سهم لله، وسهم للنبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، وسهم للإمام. وهذه الثلاثة الآن لصاحب الزمان

A share for Allah, a share for Nabī H and a share for the Imām. All these shares are now the right of the man of the time.⁴

1 Al-‘Urwah al-Wuthqā 2/394-395.
2 Ibid. 2/395-396.
3 ‘Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’: al-Nūr al-Sāṭi‘: the chapter regarding the necessity of giving the Khums to the jurist in the era of occultation: 1/439.
4 Al-‘Urwah al-Wuthqā 2/403; Hidāyah al-‘Ibād p. 178.
i.e. for the awaited Mahdī who is absent and will never return from his occultation due to him never coming into existence. Hence in his absence the Shīʿī jurist becomes deserving of his share. The Shīʿah say:

النصف من الخمس الذي للإمام أمره في زمان الغيبة راجع إلى نائبه وهو المجتهد الجامع للشروط

Half of the Khums which is the share of the Imām will be entrusted to his representative during the era of occultation, i.e. to the Mujtahid, the supreme jurist, who possesses all the requirements.¹

The other three shares are for the orphans, the poor and the travellers,² on condition that they have faith,³ i.e. they adhere to the Shīʿī dogma due to faith only being exclusive to them, as they allege. Regarding these three shares which they aver should be spent upon these classes of people they say that it is safer to submit them to the Shīʿī jurist as well.⁴

The conclusion, therefore, is that the Khums in its entirety is given to the scholars of the Shīʿah so that they may utilise it to spend upon themselves and upon the latter three categories. In the book al-Nūr al-Sāṭī’ the following appears:

إن الفقيه يأخذ نصف الخمس لنفسه، ويقسم النصف الآخر منه على قدر الكفاية، فإن فضل كان له وإن أعوز أنه من نصيبه

The Shīʿī jurist will take half of the Khums for himself and will distribute the remaining half of it as required. If anything remains it will be for him and if it falls short he will complete it from his share.⁵

Professor ‘Alī al-Sālūs says:

1 Al-ʿUrwah al-Wuthqā 2/405; Hidāyah al-ʿIbād p. 179.
2 Al-ʿUrwah al-Wuthqā 2/403; Hidāyah al-ʿIbād p. 179.
3 Ibid.
4 Al-ʿUrwah al-Wuthqā 2/405; Hidāyah al-ʿIbād p. 179.
5 Al-Nūr al-Sāṭī’ 1/439.
The reality of the Shīʿah today is that we find that whoever intends to perform Ḥajj evaluates all his assets and thereafter takes out Khums from it and gives it to the Jurists who have issued the fatwa of Khums being compulsory and of the Ḥajj of the one who does not submit it not being accepted. They have thereby made the wealth of people lawful by way of falsehood.¹

I would add that probably this is the reason why the state of the scholars wants an increase in the quota of the pilgrims every year.

This belief regarding Khums is from a result of the many results of the belief of Imāmah. The idea that all the wealth belongs to the Imām was contrived by the heretics of the bygone centuries and since then it has continued till today. Whereas the idea of Khums is an innovation which was innovated by these people and was not found in the time of Rasūl Allah H and the rightly guided Khulafā’, in fact not even during the reign of Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ‘Alī whose lovers and partisans they claim to be.

Ibn Taymiyah mentions:

1 Athar al-Imāmah fi al-Fiqh al-Ja’farī p. 391.
As for the claim of the Shīʿah that one fifth of the earnings of the Muslims will be taken from them and spent on whom they consider the representative of the infallible Imām or others besides him, it is a claim that none of the Ṣaḥābah, not ʿAlī and not anyone besides him, nor the subsequent generation who followed them meticulously. Likewise this claim was not made by any of the family members of Rasūl Allah, the Banū Hāshim or anyone else.

Furthermore, whoever has reported this from ʿAlī and the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt, the likes of Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn, Abū Jaʿfar al-Bāqir, and Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad has indeed lied against them. Because this is against what is categorically known regarding the life of ʿAlī; he remained the Khalīfah of the Muslims for four odd years and did not claim anything from the wealth of the Muslims. Rather in his time there was never Khums which was to be distributed.

As for the Muslims, neither did he nor anyone else take Khums from their wealth. Yes when the wealth of the disbelievers was captured as booty Khums was taken therefrom in accordance with the Qurʿān and the Sunnah. But it should be noted that the Muslims were preoccupied with civil strife and internal conflict and thus did not have the time to wage war against the disbelievers during his reign. Likewise, it is a well-established fact that Nabī did not take Khums from the wealth of the Muslims, nor did he ask any Muslim for Khums from his wealth.¹

Nonetheless, this wealth which the scholars of the Shīʿah take under the pretext of it being an Islamic obligation and a right from the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt, owing to which wealth abundantly flows toward them from every direction like a deluge, is probably the greatest reasons for the subsistence of the Twelver dogma till today; to it can be attributed the animated defence of the Shīʿī scholars of their dogma. Because they consider any person who targets their dogma as a person who is trying to deprive them of this wealth which is granted to them.

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/154.
Hence professor ʿAlī al-Sālūs says:

وأعتقد أنه لولا هذه الأموال لما ظل الخلاف قائماً بين الجعفرية وسائر الأمة الإسلامية إلى هذا الحد، فكثر من فقهائهم يحرصون على إذكاء هذا الخلاف حرصهم على هذه الأموال

I presume that had it not been for these sums of wealth, the dispute between the Shīʿah and the rest of the Muslim Ummah would not have remained to this extent. For many of their jurists desire the instigation of disputes as much as they desire these moneys.¹

Moving on, from their obvious influences another is that they try to capture most of the business enterprises, companies and avenues of revenue in the cities they reside in in order to manipulate the provisions of people and their needs. The reality on the ground is the biggest attestation to this.²

Likewise, from the other obvious influences that they have had upon the economy of this Ummah is those surreptitious movements whose motive is to destroy the economy of the Muslim state. This is due to the fact that the wealth of the Muslims holds no sanctity according to them and therefore is violable without the slightest of doubt.

Their narrations order them to do so. One narration states:

خذ مال الناصب حیثما وجدته وادفع إلینا الخمس

Take the wealth of a Nāṣib wherever you find it and submit a Khums of it to us.³

Likewise Abū ʿAbd Allah is reported to have said, as they allege:

1 Athar al-Imāmah p. 408.
2 Wa Jāʾ Dawr al-Majūs p. 312, onwards.
The wealth of a Nāṣib and whatever he owns is violable.\(^1\)

It should be noted that the scholars of the Shī‘ah have broadened the implication of “Nāṣib” and have included everyone besides the Twelvers therein.\(^2\)

Similarly their books of jurisprudence mention:

إذا أغار المسلمون على الكفار فأخذوا أمولهم فالأخروى إخراج خمسها من حيث كونها غنيمة ولو في زمن الغيبة وكذا إذا أخذوا بالسرقة والغيلة

If the Muslims attack the disbeliever and take their assets, then it is safer rather more preferred to take out its Khums due to it being booty, even if it be during the era of occultation. Similar will be the ruling if they capture wealth by stealing or murdering.\(^3\)

Also the following:

 ولو أخذوا منهم بالربا أو بالدعوى الباطلة فالأخروى إخراج خمسه مطلقا

And if they take from them by way of usury or false claims, then the stronger position is that it be treated like the earned profits. Hence the surplus which remains after the expenses of the year will be taken into consideration. Although it is still safer to take out Khums therefrom unconditionally.\(^4\)

---

3 *Al-‘Urwah al-Wuthqā* (with the footnotes of their leading scholar of this age) 2/367, 368.
4 Ibid. p. 368; *Hidāyah al-‘Ibād* p. 168.
The term ‘disbeliever’ according to the Shīʿah applies to majority of the Muslims, rather to all of them besides their cult, as has passed already.¹ This implies that they consider it permissible to capture the wealth of the Muslims by attacking them, stealing from them and murdering them. Likewise they consider it permissible to take the wealth of Muslims by way of usury and false claims. This is clearly illustrated in the historical incidents which the Shīʿah were instrumental in. The theft which the state of the scholars exercises in the Arabian Gulf and the threat which its poses to the freedom of shipping therein, also, their capture over some of the steamships which pass in its waters considering them to be booty despite them being the property of Muslims are all attestations to this as well.

In conclusion, these are the influences and the ill-effects of the Shīʿah. But do they have any positives and good influences which they have left in the history of the Ummah?

A precise and in-depth academic answer to this question demands a rigorous and comprehensive study of their circumstances, mannerisms and the details of their history. Fortunately, the scholars of Islam have spared us the task of doing so and have drawn the following conclusions:

There is not a single Shīʿī Rāfiḍī scholar amongst the high ranking scholars of jurisprudence who are considered authorities in the field. Amongst the kings of the Muslims who served Islam, established it and strove against its enemies there is not a single Shīʿī Rāfiḍī. Likewise, amidst the ministers who were exemplars in their conduct we do not find anyone who was a Shīʿī Rāfiḍī.

Most of the Shīʿah are found either amongst the hypocrites and heretics, amidst the ignoramuses who have no knowledge of the sciences based on reason or those based on revelation; they are people who grew up in villages and mountains and were thus aloof from the Muslims, owing to which they did not intermingle with and benefit from the people of knowledge and piety. Or they are from those driven

¹ See: p. 969, onwards of this book.
by their personal motives and desires owing to which they procure leadership and wealth, or from those who have a pedigree to which they are obstinately loyal like the people of Jāhiliyyah. There is not one Rāfiḍī amidst those whom the Muslims consider to be people of knowledge and Dīn.¹

The question still lingers, however, that they have written works in Qur’ānic exegesis, the sciences of ḥadīth, and jurisprudence; is that not considered to be a commendable contribution to the Islamic thought? I say a person who studies these collections will conclude that the good therein is taken from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Hence whoever has written in the field of Qur’ānic exegesis, for example, has drawn from the exegesis works of the Ahl al-Sunnah,² and whatever they narrate from their people therein is darknesses enveloped in one another, like is clear from the Tafsīr al-Qummī and Tafsīr al-Burhān, etc.

As for ḥadīth, they are the most distant people from having knowledge regarding its chains of transmission and its texts. In whichever book they find what suits their fancies they quote it without any knowledge.³

As to Fiqh, jurisprudence, they are the furthest people therefrom. Whatever little benefit there is in their books is not originally from their scholars due to them being dependent upon the Ahl al-Sunnah in this regard. In Taymiyyah has revealed to us the ways in which they plagiarise the academic content from the books of the Jurists of the Muslims. He says:

وإذا صنف واحد منهم كتابا في الخلاف أخذوا حجة من يوافقهم، واحتجوا مما احتجوا به أولئك، وأجابوا بما يجبر به أولئك، فظن الجاهل أن هذا قد صنف كتابا عظیما في الخلاف والفقه والأصول، ولا يدري الجاهل أن عامته استعارة من كلام علماء أهل السنة الذين يكفرنهم ويعادونهم وما انفردوا به، فلا يساوي مما خلقه إن هذا يضر ولا ينفع

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/223.
² Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/246.
³ Ibid.
And when any of them writes a book regarding differences of the scholars or the principles of Fiqh, then if in a particular issue there is a dispute amongst the scholars they take the viewpoint of those who agree with them. They will use the evidences advanced by those scholars and will respond to counter arguments with their responses. Hence an ignorant person assume that so and so wrote a great work regarding the differences of scholars and the principles of Fiqh, but without realising that most of the content is plagiarised from the works of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah who oppose them. As for their isolated views, they are not even equal to ink; because ink is beneficial and harmful whereas this is only harmful.¹

¹ Ibid.
The Ruling regarding them

The First Discussion

The Ruling regarding them being Innovators and not Disbelievers

Imām al-Nawawī says:

إن المذهب الصحيح المختار الذي قاله الأکثرون والمحققون أن الخوارج لا يكفرون كسائر أهل البدع

Surely the correct and preferred opinion which is held by the majority and research scholars is that the Khawārij are not to be excommunicated like the rest of the innovators.¹

Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī understood from this statement that Imām al-Nawawī was not of the opinion of the excommunication of the Rawāfiḍ due to them being innovators. But he has alluded that the dogma of the Rāfiḍah progresses and changes with the passage of time, that the later Shīʿah are not like the early Shīʿah, and also that the Rāfiḍah of his time are not the Rāfiḍah whom Imām al-Nawawī is talking about. Hence he makes the following comment upon the statement of Imām al-Nawawī:

قلت: وهذا في غیر حق الرافضة الخارجة في زماننا فإنهم يعتقدون كفر أکثر الصحابة فضلا عن سائر أهل السنة الجماعة، فهم كفرة بالإجماع بلا نزاع

I say that this is true regarding others besides the Rāfiḍah of our time; because they hold the belief that most of the Ṣaḥābah are disbelievers, let alone the rest of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Hence they (the Shīʿah) are

---

1 Yaḥyā ibn Sharaf ibn Ḥasan ibn Ḥusayn al-Nawawī. Ibn Kathīr mentions that he was the leading scholar of the Shāfiʿī School during his time and the supreme jurist. He passed away in 676 A.H. (al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 3/278-279).
2 Sharḥ al-Nawawī ʿalā Šaḥīḥ Muslim 2/50.
3 His biography will come ahead.
disbelievers according to the consensus of the Ummah without any dispute.¹

I would add that the evidence for the fact that the Twelvers of al-Nawawī’s era did not excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah M, or that he probably did not know of this belief which they hold (which is more likely given the fact that the narrations which excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah [ram] are found in their canonical works which existed before his time) is that Imām al-Nawawī has not mentioned in his commentary of Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim that the Twelver Shī‘ah excommunicate the Ṣahābah M. Rather he has averred that excommunicating them is a belief exclusively held by the extremist Shī‘ah.²

¹ Mirqāt al-Mafātīḥ 9/137.
² See: Sharḥ Muslim 15/173.
The Second Discussion

The Ruling regarding their Kufr

This is the view that majority of the great Muslim scholars have held throughout history, the likes of Imām Mālik, Aḥmad, al-Bukhārī, etc.

Hereunder I will present the exact quotations of the great scholars of Islam regarding the Rawāfiḍ who are otherwise known as the Twelvers and the Jaʿfariyyah.¹

I will start with the mention of the Fatwā of Imām Mālik which I will follow up with the Fatwās of Imām Aḥmad and Imām Bukhārī. Thereafter I will present the Fatwās of the other scholars in accordance with their dates of death. I have chosen the Fatwās of only the eminent scholars of Islam, of scholars who lived with the Shī‘ah in one town or those who studied their dogma and wrote regarding them from the scholars of the Muslims.

Imām Mālik

Al-Khallāl narrates from Abū Bakr al-Marwadhī that he said:

سمعت أبا عبد الله يقول قال مالك: الذي يشتم أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لينص في الإسلام

I heard Abū ‘Abd Allah saying that Mālik said, “Those who curse the Companions of Nabī have no name or share in Islām.”²

1 See p. 132, 136, and 138 of this book.
2 In the previous discussions which have passed on p. 972, onwards, that the Shī‘ah consider it part of their Dīn to curse the Šaḥābah and excommunicate them, with the exception of individuals who barely amount to the amount of fingers on the hand.
3 Al-Khallāl: al-Sunnah 2/557. The annotator of the text says that the chain or transmission is authentic.
Ibn Kathīr mentions under the verse:

Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer], seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their mark [i.e., sign] is on their faces [i.e., foreheads] from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah. And their description in the Gospel is as a plant which produces its offshoots and strengthens them so they grow firm and stand upon their stalks, delighting the sowers – so that He [i.e., Allah] may enrage by them the disbelievers...

Imām Mālik has deduced from this verse that the Rawāfiḍ who hate the Ṣaḥābah are disbelievers, according one narration from him. He says, “Because they hate the Ṣaḥābah, and whoever hates the Ṣaḥābah is a Kāfir because of this verse.” A group of scholars have agreed with him in this regard.²

Al-Qurṭubī says:

Imām Mālik has made a profound statement and is indeed correct in his interpretation. Hence whoever denigrates any of them or criticises him in

---

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29.
his narrations\(^1\) has indeed rejected what Allah has said and has nullified the Sharīʿah of Islam.\(^2\)

**Imām Aḥmad**

Several narrations have been narrated from him regarding their excommunication...

Al-Khallāl narrates from Abū Bakr al-Marwadhī:

سألت أبا عبد الله عمن يشتم أبابكر وعمر وعائشة؟ قال: ما أراه على الإسلام

I asked Abū ʿAbd Allah regarding a person who reviles Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿĀ’ishah. He replied, “I don’t see him to be on Islam.”\(^3\)

Al-Khallāl also says that ʿAbd al-Mālik ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd informed him:

من شتم أخاف عليه الكفر مثل الروافض، ثم قال: من شتم أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لا نأمن أن يكون قد مرق من الدين

He who reviles, we fear disbelief upon him, like the Rawāfiḍ. He then said, “Whoever reviles the Companions of Nabī ﷺ we fear regarding him leaving the fold of Islam.\(^4\)

He also says that ʿAbd Allah ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal informed him that:

سألت أبي عن رجل شتم رجلا من أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال: ما أراه على الإسلام

---

1 The quote of one of the contemporary authorities regarding the narrations of Abū Hurayrah, ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, and Samurah ibn Jundub not equating even to the wing of a mosquito has passed already on page no. 466.
2 *Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī* 16/297.
3 Al-Khallāl: *al-Sunnah* 2/557. The annotator says that the narration is authentic; also see: Ibn Baṭṭah: *Sharḥ al-Sunnah* p. 161; *al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* p. 571.
4 Al-Khallāl: *al-Sunnah* 2/558. The annotator of the book says that the narration is authentic.
I asked my father regarding a person who reviles an individual from the Ṣaḥābah of Nabī Muḥammad. He replied, “I do not consider him to be upon Islam.”

Likewise the following appears in Kitāb al-Sunnah of Imām Aḥmad regarding the Rāfiḍah:

هم الذين يترأون من أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم سبهم ويتقصونهم ويكررون أبئه إلا أربعة: علي وعمار والمقداد وسلمان ولاتهم الرافضة من الإسلام في شيء

They are the people who disassociate themselves from the Ṣaḥābah of Nabī Muḥammad, revile them, and excommunicate all the leaders besides four: ‘Alī, ‘Ammār, Miqdād and Salmān. The Rāfiḍah have nothing to do with Islam.

As has passed, the Twelvers excommunicate all the Ṣaḥābah besides a few who do not amount to the fingers of the hand. They curse them in their prayers and their visitations of the shrines, holy sites, and in their canonical books. They also excommunicate all those who follow them till the Day of Judgment.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Qawī mentions:

وكان الإمام أحمد يكفر من تبرأ منهم (أي الصحابة) ومن سب عائشة أم المؤمنين ورماها مما برأها الله منه وكان يقرأ يَعِظُكُمُ اللَّهُ أَن تَعُودُوا لِمِثْلِهِ أَبَدًا إِن کُنتُم مُّؤْمِنِين

Imām Aḥmad would excommunicate any person who disassociated himself from the Ṣaḥābah and reviled ‘Ā’ishah, the Mother of the Believers, and accused her of what Allah has exonerated her from. He would often read the verse: Allah warns you against returning to the likes of this [conduct], ever, if you should be believers.

---

2 Imām Aḥmad: al-Sunnah p. 82. With the annotations of Ismāʿīl al-Anṣārī.
3 See p. 972, onwards, of this book.
Ibn Taymiyyah has, however, mentioned in his *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā* that there is difference of opinion regarding the excommunication of the Rawāfiḍ reported from Imām Aḥmad and others. But the citations from Imām Aḥmad that have passed are explicit regarding his excommunication of the Shīʿah.

Ibn Taymiyyah has alluded to the reason why some scholars have not excommunicated those who revile the Ṣaḥābah which maybe resolves the apparent contradiction in the statements of Imām Aḥmad:

وأما من سبهم سبا لا يقدح في عدالتهم ولا في دينهم مثل وصف بعضهم بالبخل أو الجبن أو قلة العلم أو عدم الزهد ونحو ذلك فقد هذا الذي يستحق التأدیب والتعزیر، ولا نحكم بكفره بمجرد ذلك وعلى هذا يحمل كلام من لم يكفرهم من أهل العلم

As for those who revile them in ways which do not tarnish their integrity and their Dīn, for example, by describing some of them with miserliness, cowardice, lack of knowledge and lack of disinclination from this world, etc., they deserve to be disciplined and punished. But we will not excommunicate them merely because of that. The statements of those who do not excommunicate them from the people of knowledge will be interpreted in this light.

In other words those who revile them in ways that tarnish their integrity and Dīn will be considered a disbeliever according to the people of knowledge.

**Al-Bukhārī (d. 256 A.H)**

He says:

ما أبالي صلیت خلف الجهمي والرافضي أم صلیت خلف الیهود والنصارى، ولا يسلم علیهم ولا يعادون ولايناكون ولاأشدون ولا نؤكل ذبائحهم

---

1 *Al-Fatāwā* 3/352.
2 *Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* p. 586; also refer to p. 571 to see the explanation given by Abū Yaʿlā for the narrations of non-excommunication.
I do not bother whether I read Ṣalāḥ behind a Jahmī and a Rāfiḍī or behind the Jews and the Christians. They will not be greeted, they will not be visited, marriages cannot be contracted with them, they cannot testify and their slaughtered animals cannot be eaten.¹

ʿAbd Allah ibn Idrīs²

He said:

ليس لرافضي شفعة إلا لمسلم

There is no right of Shufʿah³ for a Rāfiḍī but for a Muslim.⁴

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī⁵

Al-Bukhārī says that ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī said:

هما ملتان الجهمية والرافضية

They are two distinct religions: the Jahmiyyah and the Rāfiḍiyyah.⁶

---

1 Al-Bukhārī: Khalq Afʿāl al-ʿIbād p. 125.
2 ʿAbd Allah ibn Idrīs ibn Yazīd ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Awdī. Abū Ḥātim said about him, “An authority who can be cited as evidence, a leader from the leader of the Muslims.” And Imām Aḥmad said, “He was unique.” Ibn Saʿd said, “He was reliable, trustworthy, a narrator of many narrations, an authority and an adherent of the Sunnah and the majority.” He passed away in 192 A.H. (See: Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb 5/144-145; al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl of Ibn Abī Ḥātim 5/8-9). He was from the prominent scholars of Kufah (al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl p. 570) and Kufah was the hub of Shīʿism. He thus knew them and their dogma very well because every resident of the house knows better of its contents.
3 Right of buying the house for the neighbour.
6 Khalq Afʿāl al-ʿIbād p. 125; Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 35/415.
Al-Firyābī

Al-Khallāl has narrated:

أخبرني حرب بن إسماعیل الكرماني، قال: حدثنا موسی بن هارون بن زیاد قال: سمعت البریابی ورجل
یسأل عن اسمیمی ابی باقر قال: کافر، قال: فیصل عليه، قال: لا. سألته كيف يصنع به وهو يقول لا إلإ
الله، قال: لا تمسوه بأيديكم ارفعوه بالخشب حتى تواروه في حفرته

Harb ibn Isma‘īl al-Kirmānī informed me — Mūsā ibn Hārūn narrated to us, “I heard al-Firyābī saying when a person asked him regarding someone who reviles Abū Bakr, ‘He is a disbeliever.’ He further asked, “Will his funeral prayer be performed?” to which he replied, “No.” I then asked him what should be done with him when he professes that there is none worthy of worship besides Allah?” He replied, “Do not touch him with your hands, raise him with a stick till you cover him in a whole.”

Aḥmad ibn Yūnus

He said:

لو أن یهودیا ذبح شاة وذبح رافضی شاة لأکلت ذبیحة الیهودي ولم آکل ذبیحة الرافضی لأنه مرتد عن
الإسلام

1 Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Firyābī: Al-Bukhārī has narrated twenty six narrations from him. He was the most virtuous of people in his time. He passed away in 212 A.H. (Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb 9/535).
2 Al-Khallāl: al-Sunnah 2/577. The annotator of the book says, “In its transmission is Mūsā ibn Hārūn who I could not trace.”
3 Aḥmad ibn Yūnus ibn ’Abd Allah, attributed to his grandfather. He is one of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Sunnah and is from Kufah the hub of Shi‘ism. Hence he would know them and their dogma better than anyone else. Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal said to a person, “Go to Ahmad ibn Yūnus because he is the Shaykh of Islam.” The authors of the six canonical compilations have narrated from him. Abū Ḥātim says, “He was a reliable and proficient narrator.” Al-Nasā‘ī says, “He was reliable.” Ibn Sa‘d says, “He was reliable, truthful and an adherent of the Sunnah and the majority.” Ibn Ḥajr has mentioned that Ibn Yunus said, “I came to Ḥammād ibn Zayd and asked him to dictate to me some of the merits of ‘Uthmān رضی الله عنه. He asked, “Who are you?” I told him that I am from Kufah. He thus said, “A Kufi seeking the merits of ‘Uthmān رضی الله عنه! By Allah I will not dictate them to you except that I will stand and you will sit.” He passed away in 227 A.H. (Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb 1/50; Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb 1/29).
If a Jew slaughters an animal and a Shīṭ slaughter an animal, I would rather eat the slaughtered animal of the Jew and not eat the slaughtered animal of the Shīṭ, because he is an apostate.¹

Abū Zurʿah al-Rāzi²

He said:

إذا رأيت الرجل ينتقص أحداً من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فاعلم أنه زنديق، لأن مؤدى قوله إلى إبطال القرآن والسنة

If you see a person denigrating any of the Companions of Nabī then know that he is a heretic, because the implication of his statement is rendering the Qurʿān and the Sunnah false.³

Ibn Qutaybah⁴

He said:

بأن غلو الرافضة في حب علي المتمثل في تقديمه على من قدمه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وصحبته عليه، وإدعائهم له شركة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في نبوته، وعلم الغيب للأئمة من ولده ولذلك الأقاويل والأمور السرية قد جمعت إلى الكذب والكفر أفراط الجهل والغباء

The fanaticism of the Rāfiḍah in the love of 'Alī which is represented in giving him preference over those to whom Rasūl Allah and his

---

1 Al-Ṣārim al-Maslāl p. 570. The same is reported from Abū Bakr ibn Hāni’ (ibid); also see: al-Sayf al-Maslāl ‘alā man Sabb al-Rasūl page no. 71 (manuscript).
2 ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Abd al-Karīm ibn Yazīd ibn Farrūkh al-Makhzūmī (by way of the contract of Walā’, clientage) al-Rāzī. One of the great scholars of ḥadīth and eminent scholars. He knew a million ḥadīth and thus it used to be said that any ḥadīth which Abū Zurʿah does not know has no basis. He passed away in 264 A.H.
3 Al-Kifāyah p. 49. The entire text has passed on p. 1041.
4 Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allah ibn Muslim ibn Qutaybah al-Dīnawarī, the author of sterling books which consist of immense knowledge, as described by Ibn Kathīr. He passed away in 276 A.H. (Wafayāt al-A’yān 2/42-44; Tārīkh Baghdaḍ 10/170-171; al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 11/48).
Companions gave preference, their claim that he shared prophethood with 
Nabī, their claim that knowledge of the unseen was accorded to
the Imāms of his progeny, and all those other eerie views and clandestine
matters, have gathered ignorance and foolishness coupled with lies and
Kufr, disbelief.¹

ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī²

He said:

وأما أهل الأهواء من الجارودیة والهشامیة والجهمیة والإمامیة الذین أکفروا خیار الصحابة... فإنا نكفرها
ولا تجوز الصلاة عليهم عندنا ولا الصلاة خلفهم

As for the heretics, i.e. the Jārūdiyyah, the Hishāmiyyah, the Jahmiyyah and
the Imāmiyyah who excommunicate the Šaḥābah, we excommunicate
them. It is not permissible to perform their funeral prayers nor is it
permissible to read Ṣalāh behind them.³

He also says:

وتكفیر هؤلاء واجب في إجازتهم على الله البداء، وقولهم بأنه قد یرید شیئا ثم یبدو له، وقد زعموا أنه
إذا أمرشي، ثم نسخه فإنما نسخه لأنه بدأ له فيه. وما رآينا ولا سمعنا نوع من الكفر إلا وجدنا شعبة منه
في مذهب الراشفة

Excommunicating these people is compulsory because of their belief
of Badā’, i.e. their belief that he at times can intend something and
subsequently otherwise can occur to him; they claim that when he issues

¹ Al-Ikhtilāf fī al-Lafẓ wa al-Radd ʿalā al-Jahmiyyah wa al-Mushabbihah (published by Maṭbaʿah al-Saʿādah
in Egypt in the year 1349 A.H.) p.47.
² ʿAbd al-Qāhir ibn Ṭāhir ibn Muḥammad al-Baghdādī al-Ṭamīmī al-Isfarāʾīnī Abū Manṣūr. He was
accorded the title Šadr al-Islām, the heart of Islam, during his time. He would teach seventeen
different sciences. He passed away in 429 A.H. (al-Subkī: Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyah 5/136-145; al-Qifṭī:
³ Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq p. 357.
an order regarding something and thereafter abrogates it he abrogates it because otherwise occurred to him. We have not seen or heard of any type of disbelief but that we have found a portion of it in the dogma of the Rāfi’dhah.¹

Qāḍī Abū Ya’lā²

He said:

وأما الرافضة فالحكم فيهم.. إن كفر الصحابة أو فسقهم بمعنى يستوجب به النار فهو كافر

As for the Rāfi’dhah, the ruling regarding them... is that if he excommunicates the Ṣaḥābah or impugns them in a way that necessitates Hell-fire; he is a disbeliever.³

Ibn Ḥazm

He said:

وأما قولهم (يعني النصارى) في دعوى الروافض بتدیل القرآن فإن الروافض لیسوا من المسلمين، إنما هي فرقة حدث أولها بعد موت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بخمس وعشرين سنة... وهي طائفة تجري مجرى اليهود والنصارى في الكذب والكفر

As for their claim (the Christians) regarding the belief of the Rāfi’dhah regarding the distortion of the Qur’an, the Rawāfiḍ are not Muslims; their spearheaders emerged twenty five years after the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. They are a sect like the Jews and the Christians in falsehood and disbelief.⁴

---

¹ Al-Milal wa al-Nihal p. 52-53.
² Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Khalaf ibn al-Farrā’ Abū Ya’lā. The eminent scholar of his time in the principles of Sharī’ah and the secondary matters thereof. He passed away in 458 A.H.
³ Al-Mu’tamad p. 267.
⁴ Al-Faṣl 2/213.
He also says:

ومن قول الإمامية قديما وحديثا أن القرآن مبدل

The Imāmiyyah in the past and present aver that the Qur‘ān is distorted.¹

Thereafter he says:

القول بأن بين اللوحين تبديلا كفر صريح وتكذيب لرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

The view that distortion occurred between the two covers is emphatic disbelief and a refutation of Rasūl Allah.²

He also says:

ولا خلاف بين أحد من الفرق المنتمية إلى المسلمين من أهل السنة والمعتزلة والخوارج والمرجئة والزيدية في وجوب الأخذ بما في القرآن وأنه المتلو عندنا... وإنما خالف في ذلك قوم من غلاة الروافض وهم كفار بذلك مشركون عند جميع أهل الإسلام وليس كلامنا مع هؤلاء وإنما كلامنا مع أهل ملتنا

There is no dispute between the various subsects which subscribe to Islam, viz. the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Mu‘tazilah, the Khawārij, the Murji‘ah and the Zaydiyyah that it is compulsory to latch onto whatever is in the Qur‘ān and that it will be recited. Only the extremist Rawāfiḍ have differed in this regard. But they are disbelievers and polytheist according to all the Muslims and hence our discussion is not with these people, it is rather with the people of our religion.³

He also says:

واعلموا أن رسول الله لم يكتم من الشرعية كلمة فما فوقها، ولا أطلع أخص الناس به من ابنة أو ابن عم أو زوجة أو صاحب على شيء من الشرعية كتبه عن الأحمر والأسود ورعاية الغنم، ولا كان عنده عليه

1 Al-Faṣl 5/40.
2 He has excluded three individuals from them, as has passed.
3 Al-Iḥkām fī Uṣūl al-Aḥkām 1/96.
Know well that Rasūl Allah has not concealed a word or even less of the Sharīʿah, nor did he impart to the closest of people to him, his daughter, son-in-law, wife or any other Companion for that matter, any aspect of the Sharīʿah which he concealed from the red skinned, the black-skinned, and the shepherds. He likewise did not have any secret, sign or esoteric knowledge other than what he invited the people to. Had he concealed anything from them he would have failed to convey as he was ordered to. And whoever says this is a disbeliever...

Al-Isfarāʾīnī

After citing various beliefs of the Rawāfiḍ, like the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah, the interpolation of the Qurʿān, and their anticipation of the advent of the Mahdī who will come out to them and teach them Sharīʿah and thereafter asserting that all the sects of the Imāmiyyah unanimously believe in all these beliefs; he says:

 وليسوا في الحال على شيء من الدين، ولا مزيد على هذا النوع من الكفر إذ لا يبقى فيه على شيء من الدين

At the moment they are not upon anything of Dīn. And there is no extent of disbelief which is worse than this type of disbelief, for with it there is no remaining upon Dīn whatsoever.

1 Al-Faṣl 2/274-275. This belief based on which Ibn Ḥazm is excommunicating the one who holds it has become one of the principle beliefs of the Twelvers; their contemporary and ancient scholars assert this in their books. (See: p. 425 of this book).

2 Abū al-Muẓaffar Shahfūr ibn Ṭāhir ibn Muḥammad al-Isfarāʾīnī. The great jurist, exegete and master of the principles of Sharīʿah. He has written several books, two among them being al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr and al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn. He passed away in 471 A.H.

3 Al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn p. 24-25.
Due to the Rawāfiḍ not being able to fully grasp this concept\(^2\) they invented the idea of Badā’. Hence they narrate from ʿAlī \(^{1}\) that he would not give information regarding the matters of the unseen due to the fear that otherwise could occur to Allah due to which he would change a particular matter.\(^3\) Likewise they have narrated from Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad that he said, “In nothing has otherwise occurred to Allah as it occurred to him regarding Ismāʾīl, i.e. his order to slaughter him...”\(^4\) This is outright...
disbelief and attribution of ignorance and change to Allah. The impossibility of this is clearly indicated in the verse which states that he has encompassed everything in terms of knowledge.¹

He likewise says:

If someone unambiguously asserts the disbelief of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, then he has indeed violated the consensus of the Ummah and opposed it. He has rejected all the merits that have been reported regarding them deserving Jannah, regarding their praises, the validity of their Dīn, the firmness of their faith and their excellence over the rest of the creation, amidst other narrations. Hence if the narrations reach a person who holds this view and despite that he still avers that they are disbelievers, then he is a disbeliever due to him belying Rasūl Allah; any person who belies even a word of the statements of Rasūl Allah is a disbeliever according to the consensus of the Ummah.²

Qāḍī ʿAyāḍ³

He said:

---

¹ Al-Mustaṣfā 1/110.
² Faḍāʾiḥ al-Bāṭiniyyah p. 149.
We definitively excommunicate the extremist Rāfiḍah who aver that the Imāms are better than the Ambiyā’.

He also says:

Likewise the ruling of excommunication will be issued regarding a person who says that ‘Alī shared prophethood with Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم and (enjoys prophethood) after him as well, and that every Imām is equal to Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم in prophethood and authority (he has indicated that this is the viewpoint

---

See how initially their virtue is equivalent to that of the Ambiyā’ and however thereafter it ends with them being like Allah. Pure is Allah from what the transgressors say.
Likewise a person who claims that revelation is sent to him will also be excommunicated even though he does not claim Nubuwwah.¹

We also excommunicate anyone who rejects the Qur’ān or even a letter thereof, distorts anything therein or adds to it, as is the doings of the Bāṭiniyyah and the Ismā‘īliyyah.²

Al-Samʿānī³

He has said:

واجتمعت الأمة على تكفیر الإمامیة، لأنهم يعتقدون تضلیل الصحابه وینكرون إجماعهم وینسبونهم
إلى ما يلیق بهم

The Ummah has concurred upon the excommunication of the Imāmiyyah; because they believe in the deviance of the Ṣaḥābah, deny their consensus, and attribute to them what fits their (the Shīʿah) profile.⁴

1 The Twelvers assert that the Imāmah is higher than Nubuwwah in rank (see p. 891 of this book). Likewise they assert that the Imām is the evidence of Allah against the people just like the Ambiyā’ (see p. 849 of this book).

2 This is what the Rawāfiḍ claim. See p. 418, onwards.

3 It is important to note that although some scholars attribute the view of the interpolation of the Qur’ān to the Ismāʿīliyyah, but it is the view of the Twelvers. The Ismāʿīliyyah have merely adopted the position of esoteric interpretation.

4 The Imām, the preserver and great scholar of ḥadīth Abū Saʿd ʿAbd al-Karīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr al-Tamīmī al-Samʿānī. The author of the book al-Ansāb amongst others. He travelled and studied ḥadīth under four thousand scholars. Ibn Kathīr mentions, “Ibn Khallikān has mentioned several of his books, amongst them is a book wherein he compiled a thousand narrations from a hundred scholars and analysed them in terms of their chains of transmission and their wordings, a very beneficial book indeed.” He passed away in 562 A.H. (Wafayāt al-Aʿyān 3/209; al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 12/175).

5 This is how the text appears in the actual book. If the pronoun is referring to the Shīʿah, then it is correct; because it would then translate as ‘they attribute to the Ṣaḥābah that which is only characteristic of them. But if the pronoun is referring to the Ṣaḥābah, then probably there is a mistake and the more accurate sentence would be (that which not behoving of them).

6 Al-Ansāb 6/341.
Al-Rāzī\(^1\)

Al-Rāzī states that the Ashāʾirah excommunicate the Rawāfiḍ for three reasons:

أولها: أنهم كفروا سادات المسلمين، وكل من كفر مسلما فهو كافر لقوله عليه السلام: من قال لأخيه یا کافر فقد باء به أحدهما. فإذن يجب تكفيرهم.  
وثانيها: أنهم كفروا قوما نص الرسول عليه السلام بالثناء عليهم وتعظيم شأنهم، فيكون تكفيرهم تكذيبا للرسول عليه السلام  
وثالثها: إجماع الأمة على تكفير من كفر سادات الصحابة.

Firstly, because they excommunicate eminent figures of the Muslims, and any person who excommunicates a Muslim is a disbeliever due to the ḥadīth of Nabī Ḥ, “Whoever tells his brother, ۰ Kāfir, then one of them will return with it.” Hence it is compulsory to excommunicate them.

Secondly, because they excommunicate a people whom Rasūl Allah Ḥ has emphatically praised and extolled. Their excommunication (of these people) thus is a refutation of Rasūl Allah Ḥ.

Thirdly, the consensus of the Ummah upon the excommunication of all those who excommunicate the noble Ṣaḥābah.\(^3\)

**Ibn Taymiyyah**

He says:

من زعم أن القرآن نقص منه آيات وكتبت، أو زعم أن له تأویلات باطنة تسقط الأعمال المشروعة، فلا خلاف في كفرهم. ومن زعم أن الصحابة ارتدوا بعد رسول الله عليه الصلاة والسلام فهذا لا ريب أيضا في كفره، لأنه مكذب لما نصه القرآن في غير موضع من الرضى عنهم والثناء عليهم. بل من يشكك في كفر

---

1 Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar ibn al-Ḥusayn, also well known as ʿal-Fakhr al-Rāzī. He was an exegete, a theologian, a jurist and a master in the principles of Fiqh. He wrote al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr, al-Maḥṣūl, etc. a light extent of Shiasm is attributed to him. He passed away in 606 A.H. (Lisān al-Mīzān 4/426; al-Suyūṭī: Ṭabaqāt al-Mufassirīn p. 115; ‘Uyūn al-Anbāʾ p. 414-427).

2 The reference will come ahead.

3 Al-Rāzī: Nihāyah al-ʿUqāl (manuscript) p. 212.
He who claims that verses of the Qur’ān were omitted or concealed, or claims that they have esoteric interpretations which drop all Sharīʾi obligations, there is no doubt regarding their disbelief. Likewise, he who claims that the Ṣaḥābah apostatised after Rasūl Allah, there is no doubt regarding his disbelief as well; because he is thereby refuting the praises and the announcements of pleasure emphatically stated regarding them in the Qurʾān in several places. In fact a person who doubts the disbelief of such a person his disbelief is definite. This is because this view implies that the transmitters of Qurʾān and the Sunnah were either disbelievers or imposters; the verse, ‘you are the best of nations taken out for the benefit of men’ suggests that the best thereof was the first generation, but (according to this view) majority of them were either disbelievers or imposters, which implies that this Ummah is the worst of nations and that the first generation therein are the worst among them. The disbelief contained therein is obvious in the Dīn of Islam.

He also says:

إنهم شر من عامة أهل الأهواء، وأحق بالقتال من الخوارج

They are worse than most of the heterodoxies and more deserving of being combatted than even the Khawārij.

Thereafter he says that they have disbelieved in what Rasūl Allah came with in ways which are innumerable but by Allah.

At times they belie the traditions which are authentically reported from him and at times they deny the meanings and implications of the Qurʾān.

1 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 110.
3 Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 28/482.
This is so because of the following:

» Allah has mentioned the praises of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ in the Qur’ān, the
glad tidings of being pleased with them, and the exhortation to seek
forgiveness for them, all of which the Rawāfiḍ don’t believe.

» He has enjoined upon us in His Book the establishing of Jumuʿah, Jihād,
and loyalty to the rulers; which the Shīʿah are completely away from.

» He has emphasised in His Book the importance of associating with the
believers, loving them, and striving to bring about unity among them;
which they do not do.

» He has likewise emphasised the prohibition of associating with the
disbelievers and loving them; which they do not uphold.

» He has made forbidden in His Book the blood of Muslims, their wealth,
their integrity, backbiting, taunting, and denigrating; all of which the
Shīʿah violate and consider permissible.

» He has exhorted us in His Book to hold on to the majority and live with
mutual love and has forbade us from disunity and sectarianism; from
which the Shīʿah are the furthest of people.

» He has mentioned in His Book the importance of obeying Rasūl Allah
 Prophet , loving him, and carrying his orders; which they are very distant
from.

» He has mentioned in His Book the rights of the wives of Nabī ﷺ which the Shīʿah consider themselves exempted from.

» He has emphasised in His Book monotheism, acknowledging his dominion
alone, and worshipping him alone; which the Shīʿah are away from due
to them being the most extreme in their veneration of graves which they
have taken as deities besides Allah.

» He has informed of His names and attributes; which they do not believe
in.
» And lastly, He has also mentioned that He is capable of doing everything, that He is the Creator of everything, that only that which He wants will happen, and that there is no strength but from Allah; all of which they disbelieve in.

Ibn Taymiyyah then says:

Whoever from the people of knowledge avers that fighting these people is just like fighting those who rebel against the ruler due to an allowable interpretation, is indeed mistaken and ignorant of the Sharīʿah of Islām; because these people have departed from the Sharīʿah of Rasūl Allah and his Sunnah in ways which are more reprehensible than the departure of the Khawārij; they have no allowable interpretation. An allowable interpretation is one which is inherently permissible and the proponent thereof is left (to act upon it) if there is no counterargument. But these people do not have any such interpretations, as can be established from the Qur’ān, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah; their interpretations are like the interpretations of the Jews and the Christians and are the worst of interpretations propounded by the heterodox sects.

However, although Ibn Taymiyyah excommunicates the bearers of these views, but his excommunication of a specific individual is dependent upon the establishment of evidence and the reaching of the message. Hence he gave the following Fatwā when the Muslims captured the Shī‘ah in Shām:

1 Al-Fatāwā 28/484-485
2 Al-Fatāwā 28/486.
It is well-established that at the seaside of Shām there was a big mountain which was inhabited by thousands of Rāfiḍah who went about shedding the blood of people and usurping their wealth; they killed a great amount of people and took their belongings. When the Muslims were defeated in the year of Ghāzān they took the horses, weaponry, and prisoners and sold them to the disbelievers and the Christians in Cyprus. They also took whoever of the Muslims passed by them from the army and proved more harmful for the Muslims that all other enemies. One of their leaders even went to the extent of carrying the flag of the Christians who asked him, “Who is better, the Muslims or the Christians? To which he replied, “The Christians.” They thereafter asked, “With whom will you be raised on the Day of Judgment? He said, “With the Christians.” They handed over to them the lands of the Muslims.

Despite all of this when one of the governors consulted me regarding waging war against them, I wrote a detailed answer regarding fighting them... Subsequently we went to them and a group of their scholars visited me and debates and negotiations took place, which is too much to describe. And when the Muslims conquered their town and the Muslims had full control over them I prevented them from killing them and taking them as captives. Hence we made them settle in various parts of the Muslim lands so that they are not able to reunite.

1 See p. 1595 of this book. (Footnote 3)
2 Probably it appears in his Fatāwā 28/398.
This Fatwā of a leading scholar of the Ahl al-Sunnah in his time reveals that the Ahl al-Sunnah follow the truth which Rasūl Allah brought to them from his lord. They do not excommunicate everyone who opposes them, rather they know the truth better and are more merciful to the bondsmen. As opposed to the various heterodoxies who invent views and ideas and excommunicate anyone who opposes them in those ideas.¹

Ibn Kathīr²

After citing a few narrations which are well-established in the Sunnah and which entail a refutation of Naṣṣ (emphatic appointment), Waṣīyyah (bequest), which the Shī'ah claim for ʿAlī he mentions the following:

ولو كان الأمر كما زعموا لما رد ذلك أحد من الصحابة فإنهم كانوا أطوع لله ولرسوله في حياته وبعد وفاته، من أن يبنتوا عليه فيقدموا غير من قدمه، ويعززوا من قدمه نفسه، جاشا وكلا. ومن ظن بالصحابية رضوان الله عليهم ذلك فقد نسبهم بإجماعهم إلى الفجور، والتواطؤ على معاندة الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم ومضادتهم في حكمه ونصه، ومن وصل من الناس إلى هذا المقام فقد خلع ربقة الإسلام وکفر بإجماع الأئمة الإعلام، وكان إراقة دمه أحل من إراقة المدام.

Had the matter been as they claim, none of the șahābah would reject that; because they were more obedient to Allah and his Rasūl Allah during his lifetime and after his demise, than would invent lies against him and push forth a person other than the one whom he put forward with his emphatic appointment. This is never possible. Whoever thinks of the șahābah in this way has indeed tainted all of them with transgression, agreeing upon opposing Rasūl Allah and contradicting him in his orders and emphatic appointment. And hence whoever reaches this extent has indeed renounced his allegiance to Islam and is a disbeliever according

¹ Ibid.
² The Imām, ḥadīth scholar and expert Muftī, as described by al-Dhahabī. Abū al-Fidā’ Ismā‘īl ibn ʿUmar ibn Kathīr. Al-Shawkānī has said, “He has written many beneficial books, among them is his work on Qur'ānic exegesis which is from the best of works if not the best itself. He passed away in 774 A.H. (Ibn Ḥajr: al-Durar al-Kāminah 1/373-374; al-Shawkānī: al-Badr al-Ṭāliʿ 1/153).
It has passed already that the Rāfiḍah claim that Rasūl Allah Ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam emphatically nominated ʿAlī and that the Ṣaḥābah ʿAbbās rejected that appointment as a result of which they apostatised. This is unanimously propounded by their ancient and contemporary scholars.\(^2\)

**Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Maqdisī\(^3\)**

After discussing the various sects of the Shīʿah and their beliefs he concludes:

لايخفى على كل ذي بصيرة وفهم من المسلمين أن أكثر ما قدمناه في الباب قبله من عقائد هذه الطائفة الرافية على اختلاف اصنافها كفر صريح، وعناد مع جهل قبيح لیتوقف الواقف علیه من تكفیرهم والحكم علیهم بالمروق من دین الإسلام

It is not unclear to any person of insight and understanding from amongst the Muslims that most of what we presented in the previous chapter regarding the beliefs of this Rāfiḍah cult, with all the variances, is open disbelief, obstinateness, and despicable ignorance. A person who comes to learn of them will not hesitate in excommunicating them and issuing a ruling of them departing from the Dīn of Islam.\(^4\)

**Abū al-Maḥāsin Yūsuf al-Wāsiṭī\(^5\)**

He mentions a few reasons why they should be excommunicated. Amongst them are the following:

---

They are to be excommunicated due to them excommunicating the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah Ḥ whose integrity is established in the Qur'ān in the verse 'so that you may be witnesses upon the people'\(^1\) and by the testimony of Allah \(^2\) that they are not disbelievers in the verse 'But if they [i.e., the disbelievers] deny it, then We have entrusted it to a people who are not therein disbelievers.'\(^2\)

They are likewise to be excommunicated on the basis that they display independence from doing Ḥajj to the House of Allah Ḥ due to replacing it with visiting the grave of Husayn, which according to them is a source of forgiveness of sins and which they deem the al-Ḥajj al-Akbar, the great Ḥajj.

They will also be excommunicated due to them leaving Jihād against the enemy and waging war against them which according to them is not permissible but with an infallible Imām who is absent.\(^3\)

Similarly they will be excommunicated due to them criticising the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah Ḥ which are diffusely transmitted from him, for example adherence to congregational prayer, prayer of forenoon, emphasised Sunnah prayers which are to be performed before the five Śalāhs and after them, amongst other emphasised Sunnahs.\(^4\)

---

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 143.
2 Sūrah al-Anām: 89.
3 Al-Munāẓarah Bayn Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Rāfiḍah (manuscript) p. 66.
4 Ibid. p. 67.
ʿAlī ibn Sulṭān al-Qārī

He says:

وأما من سب أحدا من الصحابة فهو فاسق ومبتدع بالإجماع إلا إذا اعتقد أنه مباح كما عليه الشيعة وأصحابهم أو يترتب عليه ثواب كما هو دأب كلامهم أو اعتقد كفر الصحابة وأهل السنة فأنه كافر بالإجماع

As for the one who swears any of the Ṣaḥābah he is a sinner and an innovator according to the consensus of the Ummah, unless he considers doing so to be permissible, as is the view of the Shīʿah and their ilk, deems it to be yielding of reward, or believes in the disbelief of the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Sunnah. Such a person will then be a disbeliever according to the consensus of the Ummah.

He goes on to mention several evidences from the Qurʾān and the Sunnah which extoll the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah and thereafter deduces therefrom the disbelief of the Shīʿah due to their belief regarding them.

He also mentions that one of the reasons the Shīʿah are excommunicated is because they claim that omissions and distortions have taken place in the Qurʾān and presents some of their views in that regard.

Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb

Imām Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb has issued the ruling of several doctrines of the Shīʿah equating to disbelief. Hence after presenting the belief of the Twelvers

1 ʿAlī ibn Sulṭān ibn Muḥammad al-Harawī, well known as al-Qārī. A Ḥanafī scholar, one of the retainers of immense knowledge. He wrote many beneficial books amongst which is his commentary on Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ which is the biggest of them, Sharḥ Al-Shifāʾ, al-Nukhbah etc. He passed away in 1014 A.H. (Khulāṣah al-Athar 3/185-186; al-Badr al-Ṭāliʿ 1/445-446).
2 Shamāl al-ʿAwārid fī Dhamm al-Rawāfīd (manuscript) p. 6.
3 Ibid. p. 252-254.
4 Ibid. p. 259.
Now you have learnt that the verses of the Qur’ān regarding their virtues are abundant, and the diffusely transmitted narrations are all emphatic regarding their perfection. Hence any person who believes that they were sinners/their entire group was sinful, that they apostatised/their entire group apostatised, that it is correct and permissible to denigrate them, or denigrates them considering it to be correct or permissible; has indeed disbelieved in Allah  and His Rasūl . Being unaware of a categorically established phenomenon of Dīn is no excuse; likewise interpreting such a phenomenon with an interpretation which is not backed by evidence or diverting it from its established meaning is useless. For example, a person who rejects the obligation of the five daily Ṣalāhs due to not being aware of its obligatory status, because of his unawareness he will become a disbeliever; similarly if he interprets it with an interpretation other than the one we know he will become a disbeliever. The reason being that the knowledge which we draw from the verses of the Qur’ān and from the Sunnah which extoll their virtues is definitive.

وغالب هؤلاء الرافضة الذين يسبون الصحابة يعتقدون حقيقة سبهم أو إباحته بل ووجهه، لأنهم يتقربون بذلك إلى الله تعالى ويرعون ذلك من أجل أمر دينهم.
Whoever denigrates a specific individual from among them, if his virtue and nobility is established through diffuse transmissions, like the Khulafā‘, and the denigrator considers it correct or permissible to denigrate him, then he becomes a disbeliever, due to him belying that which is categorically established from Nabī ﷺ; and any person who denies such an aspect is a disbeliever. However if he reviles him not considering it to be correct or permissible then he is a sinner; because reviling a believer is a sin. Some have, however, unconditionally considered a person who reviles Abū Bakr and ʿUmar to be a disbeliever.

And if he is such that his virtue is not definitively established, then apparently the one who denigrates him is a sinner, unless he reviles him due to him being a Ṣaḥābī of Rasūl Allah ﷺ; for that is disbelief.

Most of these Rāfiḍah who revile the Ṣaḥābah consider it correct or permissible, in fact even compulsory to do so, because they aspire to seek closeness to Allah - by doing so and consider it to be the greatest aspect of their dogma.1

Thereafter he says:

And what is authentically established from the scholars regarding not excommunicating people of the Qiblah is based upon people whose innovations do not result in disbelief. It is without doubt that belying Rasūl Allah ﷺ in aspects which are categorically established from him

1 They have actually surpassed the limits of reviling and have steeped into excommunicating them. In fact they even say that whoever considers Abū Bakr and ʿUmar  to be Muslims Allah will not look at him and will talk to him and for him will be a severer punishment. (See: p. 982 onwards of this book.) Their evils regarding the Ṣaḥābah have always increased and become more extreme with the passage of time until they have now settled upon extremism after which there is no extremism.

2 Risālah fī al-Radd ʿalā al-Rawāfiḍ p. 18-19.
After presenting what features in their books regarding the interpolation of the Qur’ān and omission occurring therein he says the following:

This necessitates the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah including ‘Alī (due to it implying) that they were ‘pleased’ with it... It also necessitates rejecting the verse: ‘Falsehood cannot approach it from before it or from behind. Indeed it is a revelation from a [Lord who is] Wise and Praiseworthy,’ and the verse: ‘it is we who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur’ān], and indeed, we will be its guardian.’ Hence, any person who believes that the Qur’ān was not preserved from omissions and believes what is not actually part of it to be part of it has indeed disbelieved.

He likewise says the following regarding those who beseech others as intermediaries besides Allah, as is the case of the Shīṭah with their Imāms:

Whoever believes in intermediaries between him and Allah, whom he asks, seeks intercession from and relies upon, he has disbelieved according to the consensus of the Ummah.

He has also said that whoever gives preference to the Imāms over the Ambiyā’ he has disbelieved according to the consensus of the Ummah, as is reported by several scholars.

---

3 *Risālah Nawāqiḍ al-Islām* p. 283. (Incorporated in *al-Jāmiʿ al-Farīd* which is published by Jumaiḥ).
4 *Risālah fī al-Radd ʿalā al-Rawāfiḍ* p. 29. Also see p. 838 of this book.
Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Dehlawī

After doing a comprehensive study of the Twelver dogma from their reliable sources he concludes thus:

ومن استكشف عقائدهم الخبيثة وما انطووا عليه، علم أن ليس لهم في الإسلام نصيب وتحقق كفرهم لديه

A person who discovers their despicable beliefs and what they entail will realise that they have no share in Islam and their disbelief will become evident to him.²

Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Shawkānī

He says:

إن أصل دعوة الروافض كياد الدين ومخالفة شريعة المسلمين، والعجب كل العجب من علماء الإسلام وسلاطين الدين كيف تركوه على هذا المنكر البالغ في الفتح إلى غايته ونهائه، فإن هؤلاء المخالفين لما أرادوا رد هذه الشريعة المطهرة ومخالفتها علمنا في أعراض العقول الضعيفة بهذه الورقة الآلهة والوسيلة الشيطانية، فهم يظهرون السب واللعن لخبر الخليفة ويضروين العنان للشريعة ورفع أبحاكما عن العباد، وليس في الكمبيوتر أشنع من هذه الوسيلة بها إليه، فإنه أقبح منها لأنه عنان لله عزوجل ولرسوله ولشريعته، فكان حاصل ما هم فيه من ذلك أربع كبار كل واحدة منها كفر بواح: الأول: العناد لله عزوجل، والثاني: العناد لرسوله صلى الله عليه وسلم، والثالثة العناد لشريعة المطهرة ومحاولة أبطالها، والرابعة تكفير الصحابة رضي الله عنهم الموصوفين في كتاب الله بأنهم أشداء على الكفار، وإن الله تعالى يعيش بهم الكفار، وأنه قد ضغع عنهم مع أنه قد ثبت في هذه الشريعة المطهرة أن كفر مسلم كفر كما في الصحيحين

1 ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Aḥmad (Walī Allah) ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm al-ʿUmarī al-Fārūqī, accorded the title the lantern of India. Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb says, “He was a leading scholar of India and had thorough knowledge of the books of the Shīʿah.” He passed away in 1239 A.H. (al-Alām 4/138; Muqaddamah Mukhtasar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay ʿAshariyyah of Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb).
2 Mukhtasar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay ʿAshariyyah p. 300.
The very basis of the Rāfiḍī propagation is a plot against the Dīn and an opposition of the Sharīʿah of the Muslims.

Astonishing indeed is the case of the scholars of Islam and the rulers of Dīn. How did they leave these people upon this vice which has reached its furthest extent in despicableness? When these losers intended to reject the pristine Sharīʿah and oppose it, they tarnished the reputations of the bearers thereof, without whom we have no other way of accessing it. They misled people with weak minds by way of this accursed ploy and satanic means. Hence they openly revile and curse the best of creation and inwardly they bear enmity for the Sharīʿah and desire to lift it away from the bondsmen.

In the major violations there is not any means more reprehensible than the means they have adopted, due to it being outright rebellion against Allah E, His Rasūl H, and the Sharīʿah. Hence the crux of what they are steeped in is four major violations, each of which is open disbelief:

1. Rebellion against Allah.
2. Rebellion against His Rasūl.
3. Rebellion against His pristine Sharīʿah and an attempt to discard it.
4. Excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah whom Allah E has described in the Qurʿān by saying that they are stern against the disbelievers, that He enrages the disbeliever by way of them and that He is pleased with them.

This is besides the fact that it is well established in this pristine Sharīʿah that whoever excommunicates a Muslim himself enters disbelief, as is...
established in the narration of Ibn ‘Umar which appear in Ṣaḥīḥayn wherein Nabī ﷺ says: “When a person says to his brother, O disbeliever, one of them returns with it; if he is the way he said (then the pronouncer will be free), or else it will return to him (the pronouncer).”¹

From this it is evident that every Rāfīḍī is wicked and enters disbelief because of excommunicating even one Ṣaḥābī. What would the status of a person who excommunicates all the Ṣaḥābah and excludes only a few individuals in order to conceal his misguidance from the riffraff who do not fathom evidences, be?²

The scholars of the Ottoman Empire

Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn ibn Yūsuf al-Askūnī has reported in his book which he wrote during the reign of the Ottoman Sultan Muḥammad Khan ibn Sultan Ibrāhīm Khan that the later scholars of the empire all unanimously issued Fatwās of their disbelief.³

The Scholars of Mā Warā’ al-Nahr⁴

Ālūsī the author of the Tafsīr mentions:

ذهب معظم علماء ما وراء النهر إلى كفر الإثني عشرية وحكموا بإباحة دمائهم وأموالهم وفروج نسائهم، حيث إنهم يسبون الصحابة رضي الله عنهم ل سما الشيخین وهما السمع والبصر منه صلى الله عليه الصلاة

¹ The narration appears with similar wording in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: Chapter of etiquette: sub-chapter regarding a person who excommunicates his brother without a valid reason being as he said: 7/ 96; Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: Chapter of Īmān: sub-chapter regarding the Īmān of a person who says to his Muslim brother ‘oh Kāfir’: 1/79; Sunan Abī Dāwūd: chapter of Sunnah: sub-chapter regarding the increasing and decreasing of Īmān: 5/64; Sunan al-Tirmīdī: chapter of Īmān: sub-chapter regarding a person who accuses his brother of disbelief: 5/22; Muwaṭṭa’ Mālik: Chapter of speech: sub-chapter regarding disliked speech: p. 984; Musnad Ahmad 2/18, 23, 44, 47; Musnad al-Ṭayālisī p. 252.

² Al-Shawkānī: Nathr al-Jawhar ʿalā Ḥadīth Abī Dhar (manuscript) p. 15-16.

³ Al-Askūnī: al-Radd ʿalā al-Shī'ah (manuscript) p. 5.

⁴ Mā Warā’ al-Nahr refers to the areas after the Amu Darya which is in Khorasan. Whatever is to the east of the river was known as the lands of Hayāṭilah and after Islam it was termed Mā Warā’ al-Nahr. And whatever is to the west of it is Khorasan and Khwarazm.
 Majority of the Mā Warā’ al-Nahr scholars have opined that the Twelvers are disbelievers. They have issued the ruling of their blood, wealth, and women being permissible. This is because they revile the Ṣahābah, especially Abū Bakr and ʿUmar who were like the ears and eyes of Nabī, they reject the Khilāfah of al-Ṣiddīq and accuse ʿĀ’ishah of that from which Allah has exonerated her, they give preference to ʿAlī over the prophets besides the Ulū al-ʿAzm, some amongst them give preference to him over them as well; and they deny the preservation of the Qur’ān from additions and omissions.

These are some of the Fatwās of the scholars of Islam and their leaders in this regard. I will suffice on this amount.

In the books of Fiqh there are many more views regarding their disbelief which one can very easily refer to, and thus there is no need for mentioning them here.

---

1 Ambiyā’ endowed with earnestness and patience, refers to: Muḥammad, Ibrāhīm, Mūsā, Nūḥ and ʿĪsā.
2 Nahj al-Salāmah (manuscript) p. 29-30.
3 See for example: al-ʿUqūd al-Durriyyah fī Tanqīḥ al-Fatāwā al-Ḥāmidiyah of Ibn ʿĀbidīn wherein he cites the Fatwa of Shaykh Nūḥ al-Ḥanafi who has excommunicated them for many reasons. It is a long fatwa (al-ʿUqūd al-Durriyyah p. 92). Therein he also cites what the exegete Abū al-Saʿūd has said and has also reported the consensus of the scholars on their excommunication (ibid. p. 93).
Likewise the author of al-Fatāwā al-Bazzāziyyah Muḥammad ibn Shihāb, known as Ibn al-Bazzāz and passed away in 827 A.H., says, “It is necessary to excommunicate the Kaysāniyyah because of them allowing Badā’ for Allah. And it is necessary to excommunicate the Rawāfiḍ due to them believing in the Rajʿah of the dead…” (Al-Fatāwā al-Bazzāziyyah which is printed in the footnotes of al-Fatāwā al-Hindiyyah 6/318).
Also see: Nawāqiḍ al-Rawāfiḍ (manuscript) of Makhdūm al-Shīrāzī who has compiled the views of the scholars of the various schools regarding the excommunication of the Shīʿah: p. 187, onwards; Takfīr al-Shīʿah (manuscript) of Muṭahhar ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿIsā’il p. 51.
Important Points worth Consideration:

Firstly, these are the rulings of the scholars before the proliferation of the books of the Rawāfiḍ and their open disclosure of their beliefs which we see today. That is why the pages of this study include some beliefs of the Twelvers which the scholars of Islam previously attributed to the Bāṭiniyyah Qarāmiṭah, like the issue of the omissions and distortions in the Qur’ān which is well-recorded in their books; just as it includes a fair amount of their beliefs regarding the principles of Dīn. Over and above that, some of their beliefs which were not commonly known, like the belief of Ṭīnah and others, were also included in this discussion.

All of this implies that the ruling regarding them today should be more hard and stern.

Secondly, the later Rāfiḍah and the contemporaries among them have gathered the worst of ideas and the most reprehensible of them; they have adopted the idea of the Qadariyyah regarding the denial of Qadr, the ideas of the Jahmiyyah regarding the denial of the attributes of Allah and the Qur’ān being created, the viewpoint of the Sufis, in the view of some of their eminent scholars, regarding the deviance of Waḥdah (singularity of existence) and Ittiḥād (annihilation into the creator), the view of the Saba’īyyah regarding the deification of ʿAlī, the view of the Khawārij regarding the excommunication of the Muslims, and the view of the Murji’ah in asserting that with the love of ʿAlī no sin is harmful. Rather they have even treaded the path of the polytheists in venerating graves, going around them, performing Ṣalāh towards them with the Qiblah behind them, and all other actions which are purely from the religion of the polytheists.¹

After all of this, does there remain any doubt in this that this cult has chosen for itself a religion other than the religion of the Muslims? Although they have professed the Shahādatān but they have violated them with many a violations, as you can see.

¹ For the details of all of this refer to the second chapter of this book and also see p. 1417 onwards.
However, it is important to consider, according to the approach of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding excommunication that these ideas which they hold, which are in complete contrast with the teachings of Rasūl Allah, are surely disbelief; likewise their actions which are akin to the actions of the disbelievers are also disbelief. But excommunicating a specific individual from those who acknowledge the same Qiblah and issuing a ruling of him being doomed to Jahannam forever is dependent upon the conditions of excommunication being met and all impediments thereof being absent. That is to say that we will make general statements based on the proof-texts pertaining to promises, warnings, impugning, and excommunicating, but a ruling regarding a specific person falling part of those generalisations will be suspended until evidence demanding that is found and is not contradicted. That is why the scholars do not excommunicate a person who, due to newly accepting Islam or due to growing up in a very distant village, considers any of the forbidden acts to be permissible; because the ruling of disbelief can only be issued after the reaching of the message, and probably amongst these people there are those whom the texts which are contrary to what they believe have not reached and therefore does not know that Nabī was sent with them. Hence it will be said that a particular view constitutes disbelief, but only those people will be excommunicated against who such evidence is established that the denier thereof is rendered a disbeliever and not anyone else.1

1 Al-Fatāwā 28/500-501; also see for the details of this issue: al-Fatāwā 12/466, onwards; 23/345, onwards.
The Epilogue

All praise is due to Allah by Whose grace all good actions reach culmination. May His peace descend upon the one with whom He terminated prophethood, upon his household, and his Companions, who were loyal to Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allah and the truth that he came with, were partisans thereof, and were by the grace of Allah brothers at all times.

I have spent more than four years deliberating over the issues of this study. I spent this time gathering academically credible content from the reliable sources of the Shīʿah and other sources, organising it, presenting it, studying it, and analysing it. How difficult it is indeed to read regarding and listen to a people whom Allah has caused to be unfortunate, misguided, and blinded; a people who follow a non-existent Imām, believe in a non-existent book, a fictitious Jaʿfar and many other fables; a people whose narrations attack the Book of Allah which He revealed, preserved, and upon which the Muslims unanimously concurred throughout the centuries, who believe the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah—which the Ummah compiled and spent all its efforts in preserving, who discard the unanimity of the pious predecessors and adhere to the ‘views’ of an unknown group entertaining the possibility that the Mahdī might have emerged in disguise from his hiding spot and voiced his opinion with them; a people that excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah with whom Allah was pleased and who in return were pleased with Him, who strove in His path and propagated the word of Allah on the earth; all of this due to believing in lies and forgeries which some heretics attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt.

All praise is due to Allah upon the boons of intellect, īmān, and conviction.

At the end of this study it is crucial to pause and sum up some of the results which have come through. We will thus present, whilst focussing on some aspects of its various angles, the following points:
1. The literal meaning of *Tashayyuʿ* is to support and follow. This meaning is neither found in the Shīʿah of today nor in most of the Shīʿah of the past. Hence they are the Rāfiḍah as the pious predecessors dubbed them, or, in other words, they are Shīʿah by name but are far from being the partisans and supporters of ʿAlī.

2. The word *Tashayyuʿ* has appeared in the Qurʿān in most places with negative connotations. In the Sunnah there is no specific mention of this cult save in a few weak narrations wherein the word ‘Rāfiḍah’ appears, and that also with negative connotations.

3. Shīʿism has many phases, sects, and levels; some steeped in extremism and others more moderate. Hence the understanding of the term ‘extremism in Shīʿism’ was different for those of the early past in contrast to those who came thereafter. It has actually become evident that many of the beliefs of the contemporary Shīʿah were considered to be extreme according to their early scholars of the fourth century. What would then be the viewpoint of the initial Shīʿah regarding these beliefs?

The definition of Shīʿism is thus linked to the phases of its inception and the stages of its doctrinal development. Hence in the past a Shīʿī was a person who gave preference to ʿAlī over ʿUthmān. But after the scholars of the Shīʿah accepted the books of al-Kulaynī, al-Qummī, al-Majlisī, and their like as their primary sources; extremism became rampant amidst the Shīʿah. Shīʿism eventually settled upon fanaticism and radicalism, to the extent that we see al-Khūʿī, the supreme Shīʿī authority of the current era, authenticating the narrations of Ibrāhīm al-Qummī which he brings in his *Tafsīr* despite them entailing disbelief.

For any person who is in doubt regarding the Shīʿah, in order to realise that the Shīʿah have chosen for themselves a religion other than the religion of Islam, it is sufficient to have a look at this book which is authenticated according them.
Those who assumed a Shīʿī identity drew from the religions of Persia, Rome, Greece, and from the Jews and the Christians, amongst others. They infused whatever they had thumb sucked therefrom into Shīʿism. A true realisation indeed of a prophecy of Nabī ʿAlī wherein he foretold that some of the members of this Ummah will follow the ways of those who preceded them.

The attempt to infuse some of these ideas into Muslim societies started at the hands of Ibn Saba’ and his cohorts, but they did not gain acceptance in the cities of the Muslims except amidst a small group in Kufah. They did, however, managed to exploit some of the atrocities which befell the Ahl al-Bayt, like the murder of ʿAlī and Ḥusayn, and promulgated these heresies in the Muslim world under the disguise of Shīʿism.

The Shīʿah splintered into many sub-sects throughout history, into three hundred, as suggested by some. But in these times they are all confined within three sects: the Ismāʿīliyyah, the Zaydiyyah, and the Ithnay ʿAshariyyah which is the largest of them.

However, I have noticed an issue which I think should be studied and analysed in a dedicated study. And that is that there is barely a viewpoint which was propounded by a Shīʿī denomination in the various phases of history but that you will find evidence supporting it in the sources of the Twelvers. Hence you will find the heretical views of Ibn Saba’, Mukhtār ibn Abī ʿUbayd, Bayān ibn Samʿān, and Mughīrah ibn Saʿīd, amongst others, mentioned therein.

The Twelvers are also known as the Rāfiḍah, the Jaʿfariyyah, and the Imāmiyyah. In the past they were also dubbed the Qaṭʿiyyah and the Mūsawiyyah. However, many scholars have suggested that the term Shīʿah if said today only applies to them.

Also, From the Twelvers many sub-sects emerged. Some being: the Shaykhiyyah, the Kashfiyyah, and the Bābiyyah.
7. The Shīʿah have, in attempting to substantiate their irregularities, gone in every direction. Hence at times they claim that the evidentiary texts which support their position were omitted by the Ṣaḥābah, at times they resort to esoteric interpretations for which Allah has revealed no evidence, at times they claim that divine books descended upon their Imāms to support their dogma, and at times they cling onto narrations narrated through the transmissions of the Ahl al-Sunnah which are either forgeries or do not in any way establish what they claim. They have other deceitful ploys in this regard which even the Jews have no knowledge of even a tenth of. All of this is proof of the fact that they are incapable of establishing their dogma through sound Sharʿī principles.

8. Since the year 260 A.H. the Shīʿah are following a fictitious figure who does not exist. This renders them the Shīʿah of their scholars but not of the Ahl al-Bayt, or, put differently, they are the followers of the devils who assume the form of their ‘absent Imām’, as per the abundant reports which suggest their meeting with him.

Furthermore, all the Shīʿah have unanimously accepted the belief of this non-existent Imām due to it delivering them from the Ahl al-Bayt; because amongst the Ahl al-Bayt there were pious scholars, men of integrity, who exposed these heretics who ate the wealth of people in the name of the Ahl al-Bayt, and who innovated such innovations for which Allah has revealed no evidence and ascribed them to the Ahl al-Bayt. Thus by acknowledging this fictitious figure, all authority, wealth, and honour became the exclusive share of the scholars.

9. The Shīʿah assert that the Qurʿān cannot be evidence but with a guardian who has to be one of the Twelve Imāms. They say, “The Imām is the speaking Qurʾān and the Book of Allah is the silent Qurʾān.” They claim that all the knowledge of the Qurʾān is with this guardian and there is no one who shares that knowledge with him. Hence he is the explanation of the Qurʾān, rather the Qurʾān itself. Therefore, he has the prerogative of specifying the generalisations of the Qurʾān, restricting the unqualified,
clarifying the unclear, and abrogating whatever he wants. Beyond that, they have actually accorded the Imām cart blanche authority in all of Dīn.

They also claim that every verse has an esoteric meaning. They say, “Every verse has seven inner meanings.” Then their allocations of meanings to the verses drastically increase. They thus say, “Every verse has seventy inner meanings.”

Likewise, regarding the Book of Allah which He revealed to guide this Ummah to the straight path in all spheres of life, they claim that it was revealed regarding the Twelve Imāms and their enemies, who are the Ṣaḥābah according to them.

That is why we find that they have interpreted all the verses of Tawḥīd, Islam, the principles of īmān, permissible acts, and impermissible acts with the Twelve Imāms. Conversely, they have interpreted all the verses of Shirk, kufr, obscene acts, vice, and oppression with the Ṣaḥābah and whoever followed them from the believers.

It is evident that the origins of all these interpretations are from Mughīrah ibn Saʿīd and Jābir al-Juʿfī. Subsequent to them, the extremist Rawāfiḍ followed them and gradually made additions, exaggerated and consequently reached an extent unfathomable even to their predecessors. The scholars of these times consider these collections which contain this nonsense to be from their most reliable sources.

10. The fallacy of the interpolation of the Qurʾān was first propounded by the Shiʿah of the second century. The first proponents thereof are said to be Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and Shayṭān al-Ṭāq. One of the reasons which compelled them to espouse it was that they could not find any evidence wherewith they could convince their followers of their claims, due to the Book of Allah being empty of any explicit mention of their Imāms and their beliefs.
But with the start of the fourth century the entire Ummah unanimously impugned them and excommunicated them due to making such horrendous assertions. Hence their supreme scholar Ibn Bābawayh announced the disassociation of the Shī‘ah from this belief and deemed any person who attributes it to them to be a liar. He was followed by Ibn al-Murtaḍā, al-Ṭūsī, and al-Ṭabarsī.

It was probably owing to this denial that some scholars attributed this belief to the Bāṭiniyyah, whereas the Bāṭiniyyah did not get involved in this issue; the people who were responsible for it and forged many a reports regarding it were the Twelvers.

This belief was recorded in the first book of the Shī‘ah, the book of Sulaym ibn Qays, which according to many of their scholars is a fabrication and the author thereof is unknown.

11. Regarding the pristine Sunnah they hold some very reprehensible principles; like the belief that the Imāms received revelation, that the greatest of Allah’s creation Jibrīl would come to them and that a person who heard something from the Imām can relate it by saying that ‘Allah said’, because their speech is like the speech of Allah and obedience to them is like obedience to Allah. They also aver that the Holy Spirit is amongst them (the Imāms) and through his medium they learn of what is beneath the throne to what is beneath the soil; they see through his medium what is hidden from them in the various parts of the land and what is in the heavens. The Imāms also go to the throne of Allah every Friday to take whatever knowledge they desire.

They likewise say that Allah directly converses with ‘Alī and the Imāms.
All of this according to them is spontaneous knowledge. As for the documented knowledge which they inherited from Rasūl Allah ﷺ, it is contained in imaginary books, like the Jāmiʿah, the Jafr, the book of ‘Alī, the ‘Abīṭah, the Dīwān of the Shi‘ah, etc.

They go on to say that ‘Alī continually assimilated this knowledge and these books during the lifetime of Nabī ﷺ and even after his demise, to the exclusion of the rest of the Ṣaḥābah. Thus he alone is the gateway to the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, and whoever claims to have heard from anyone other than him has committed Shirk.

Furthermore, revelation to the Imāms did not seize to continue till the year 260 A.H. Another 74 years thereafter it continued via the medium of the representatives of the Mahdī; and thereafter through the medium of their scholars who had secret relationships with the Mahdī. Owing to this, their scholars would always invent new innovations for them, so much so that ‘Alī al-Karakī, the supreme scholar of the Safawid dynasty contrived for them the permissibility of prostrating to the creation and the ruling of prostrating upon soil. Khomeini likewise accorded himself and his state all the tasks and authorities of the Mahdī.

Furthermore, they have books exclusive to them which contain all these fallacies. These are four books: al-Kāfī, al-Tahdhīb, al-Istibṣār, and Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh. Their later scholars added four more books: al-Wāfī, al-Biḥār, al-Wasā’il, Mustadrak al-Wasā’il. Over and above these books they have deemed a number of other works of their scholars to be just like the four early works in terms of evidence.

Furthermore, at first they would accept everything which appeared in their narrations until Ibn Taymiyyah came about, refuted the claims of Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, and derided their ignorance regarding ḥadīth. This prompted them to categorise their narrations in to Ṣaḥīḥ, Ḥasan, Muwaththaq, and Ḍaʿīf. The catalyst for doing so was avoiding the criticism
of people, as is clear from the animated dispute which broke out between the Shīʿah due to their differences on the issue which divided them into Uṣūlīs and Akhbārīs. This is a very important conclusion which was reached in this study.

One of their scholars has actually admitted that if they apply the Sunnī principles of authenticating and impugning, nothing of their legacy will remain, and thus the Shīʿah would have to find themselves another dogma.

Moving on, amongst the transmitters of their narrations there are fictitious figures who do not exist, and most of them are affiliates of heterodoxies even according to the Twelvers themselves. Hence they are disbelievers, but they still accept their narrations due to them being Shīʿah. As for the Ahl al-Sunnah the Zaydiyyah and members of the Ahl al-Bayt beside the Twelve Imāms, they reject their narrations; they have even gone to the extent of rejecting the narrations of Zayd ibn ʿAlī. The narrations of an Imāmī who is upon their creed on the other hand, be he whoever he is, is accepted. Hence their scholars say, “A blemish in the Dīn of a person does not affect the authenticity of his narration.”

Lastly, the Rāfiḍah have based all their beliefs and principles upon the forged narrations of these liars which they attributed to the Imāms. The Imāms were free from them; because amongst them was ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib to whom obedience was compulsory, like the Khulafāʾ before him; amongst them were eminent leaders of knowledge and Dīn, like ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn, Abū Jaʿfar al-Bāqir, and Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq who deserved the same veneration the other scholars and religious people deserve; amongst them were those who were below that; amongst them were some who were impugned by the scholars, like al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī; and amongst them is the one who does not exist, i.e. the fictitious Mahdī who is absent since the year 260 A.H. Hence whatever they attribute to them is from the forgeries of the heretics of the bygone eras.
12. They do not believe in the consensus of the Ummah. Therefore, if an opinion is attributed to their non-existent Imām via one of his representatives and the entire Ummah opposes it, evidence will be in his opinion and not in the stance of the Ummah. Actually, opposing the Ummah is one of their established principles. They say, “Whatever opposes the Ummah bears guidance.” What is even more surprising is that if the Shīʿah themselves concur upon something and an unknown group avers something else, evidence will be in the position of the unknown group due to the possibility that the Mahdī might have emerged in disguise and voiced an opinion in harmony with theirs. The implication of this is that their dogma will continue to expand throughout time; because the evil Men and Jinn will continue to forge for them whatever they want as long as this cult holds onto this principle.

13. In their beliefs regarding the principles of Dīn it has become clear that they are Jahmiyyah in denying the attributes of Allah, Qadariyyah in denying Qadr, Murji’ah in believing that no sin is harmful after acknowledging the Imām, and Khawārij, in comparison to others, in excommunicating everyone besides themselves.

In their beliefs regarding the divine books and messengers some of their beliefs were the following: divine books descended upon the Imāms; they possessed the books of the previous prophets which they read and according to which they judged; the Imāms miracles were like the prophets; the Imāms are superior to the prophets and it is by virtue of them that evidence will be established upon the bondsmen.

In their beliefs regarding the afterlife they aver that it will be for the Imām, that Jannah was the dowry of Fāṭimah, that the Imāms enjoy the bounties of Jannah in this world and that the reckoning of the creation will be the prerogative of the Imām on the Day of Judgment. They believe that there is another Jannah and another Jahannam other than the Jannah and Jahannam the Muslims believe in, that Qum has a door to Jannah, and that the people of Qum will not be raised like the rest.
14. As for their exclusive beliefs which are unique to them, they are the following: the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms, their infallibility, Taqiyyah, belief in the absent Mahdī, Ghaybah, Rajʿah, Zuhūr, Tīnah and Badā’.

Hence the leadership of the Ummah is the exclusive right of the Twelve Imāms. Therefore, anyone who presides over the affairs of the Muslims besides them is a Ṭāghūt (devil/idol) whom Allah will not look at, will not talk to on the Day of Judgment and will punish with a painful punishment. Similar will be the end result of any person who accepts him as his ruler and pledges allegiance to him.

Furthermore, these Twelve Imāms do not err, forget, and make mistakes, since the time of their birth till as long as they live.

When the statements of the Imāms and their actions contradicted the belief of infallibility they invented the doctrines of Badā’ and Taqiyyah in order to conceal their false ideas. Hence the actions of the Imāms which are harmonious with the Muslims are to be interpreted as Taqiyyah and their foretellings which are against the reality are to be interpreted as Badā’.

In addition, the Shīʿah were faced with a conundrum when the line of Imāmah abruptly ended with the death of al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī without issue, due to them conceiving of the Imāms as specific individuals (who are divinely appointed).

Hence after a lengthy confusion, they contrived a son for him who went into occultation when he was still a child. This alleged figure is the Imām of the Muslims till today who will one day re-emerge.

Furthermore, Rajʿah entails that they and their enemies, the Ṣaḥābah, and whoever diligently followed them, will return to this world after death. Subsequently the Shīʿah will be afforded the opportunity to take revenge from them.
The belief of Ẓuhūr entails that the Imāms can emerge from their graves for specific people before the Day of Judgement and before the alleged Rajʿah. This is a novel belief which was documented by al-Majlisī in a dedicated chapter in Biḥār.

As for the belief of Ṭīnah, it is a secret belief which they hold. It suggests that the good of the Ahl al-Sunnah is for the Shīʿah and the bad of the Shīʿah is for the Ahl al-Sunnah. They use this to explain all the oppression, vice and evil which their societies were always replete with since the bygone eras.

15. The contemporary Shīʿah acknowledge the same sources as the ancient Shīʿah for the derivation of doctrine and law. In fact they have even integrated all the fabrications which the Safawid scholars fabricated and included the books which they authored, which are replete with disbelief and heresies, into their dogma. To add to the dilemma, all the publishing houses made it easy for them to spread all this evil. All of this made the Shīʿah even more fanatical.

But they deceive the Ahl al-Sunnah. Hence some of their scholars claim that they do not revile the Ṣaḥābah and do not believe in Rajʿah, for example. In the previous pages the reality of these claims was exposed.

They also claim that practicing Taqiyyah has come to an end. Whereas their source texts order them to practice it till the emergence of the Mahdī. In addition, their actions and statements suggest that they still practice it. Hence this statement is basically doing Taqiyyah over Taqiyyah.

There probably does not exist another cult on the surface of this earth which has deemed lying to be a commendable religious practice; because it constitutes nine tenths of their Dīn.

16. As for their influence in the Muslim world, it has become clear that they have left very grave ill-effects in the Ummah in the ideological sphere.
They brought about polytheism in the Ummah of Muḥammad, prevented people from the Dīn of Allah, engendered the emergence of many heretical sub-sects, and attempted to misguide the Muslims from the Sunnah of their Nabī. The negative influence they have had in the spheres of literature of history and upon some thinkers who are affiliates of the Ahl al-Sunnah are quite evident. Apart from this, they have other covert and overt means which they deploy to misguide the Ummah.

Likewise, they have left their influence in the social sphere by instigating internal strife within the Muslims, opposing and clandestinely plotting against Islamic leaderships and the Muslims whenever the opportunity arose. They also espoused obscenities and libertinism under the pretext of Mut‘ah Dawriyyah and its like.

Similarly, in the economic sphere their influence is quite clear from their usurpation of the wealth of the Muslims by force and deceit, and their attempts to debilitate the economy of the Muslims in whichever way possible. In addition, the wealth which they receive from the people in the name of the Ahl al-Bayt was and still remains one of the main reasons for the desire of their scholars to remain upon their anomalies and opposition of the Muslims.

17. It has been established that they are disbelievers, and that they have no share in Islam whatsoever due to their polytheism, their excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah, and their accusations against the Qur’ān, amongst others.

There is nothing more astonishing and appalling than the fact that this cult, which comprises of millions of people, still remains upon all its fallacies and fables. Probably the only explanation thereof is that the scholars of the Shī‘ah chose not to disclose the reality to their followers, doing so by deploying various deceptive means. Amongst these means the most glaring are the following: the
claim that their dogma is backed by what is transmitted through the sources of the Ahl al-Sunnah, the claim that their dogma is based upon the love of the Ahl al-Bayt and their partisanship, the plays which they do to retell the massacre of Karbalā’—which are known as al-Shabīh, and the establishment of gatherings of condolences which are filled with expressions of grief, mourning, and whatever else accompanies them, i.e. broadcasting, beating of drums, and relating the stories and tales of the alleged oppression. All of this leads to the inactiveness of the intellect and blind following, especially amidst the non-Arabs and the laity.

In conclusion, surely the greatest means to combat the problem of Shīʿism is promulgating the Sunnah amongst the Muslims in every place by deploying various means, and exposing the reality of the Shīʿah and how they oppose the principles of Islam without understating, overstating, and sensationalising.