



REVEALING THE TRUTH

Fadak; The property of Fatima al-Zahra [as]

Work file: fadak_of_al_zahra.pdf
Project: Answering-Ansar.org Articles

Revisions:

No.	Date	Author	Description	Review Info
2.0.0	01.12.2004	Answering-Ansar.org	Many more sub chapters and scans included.	2 nd Edition.
1.0.1	20.02.2004	Answering-Ansar.org	Spelling mistake and other aesthetic fixes done.	
1.0.0	01.02.2004	Answering-Ansar.org	Created	

Contents

1. <u>FADAK; THE PROPERTY OF FATIMA AL-ZAHRA [AS]</u>	15
1.1 PREFACE	15
1.2 SPECIAL APPEAL	16
2. <u>GENERAL FACTS ON FADAK</u>	17
2.1 WHAT IS FADAK?	17
2.2 OBJECTION RAISED BY SUNNI SCHOLARS	17
FADAK WAS ONLY A VILLAGE, IN WHICH THERE WERE SOME DATE TREES. HOW DID IT BECOME A CITY?	17
WHY WAS IT NAMED FADAK?	18
WHAT WAS THE VALUE OF PROPERTY OF FADAK?	18
THE INCOME FROM FADAK	18
THE LAND OF FADAK AND INCOME FROM ITS DATES	18
BLESSINGS THAT CAME FROM THE DATES OF FADAK	18
DID IMAM RIDHA (AS) EXAGGERATE OVER THE SIZE OF FADAK?	19
REPLY	19
THE INCOME OF FADAK WAS USED FOR MILITARY PURPOSES	19
2.3 THE STATUS OF FADAK UNDER THE SHARI'AH	20
2.4 WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GHANIMAH AND FAY?	20
2.5 FADAK WAS THE FAY PROPERTY	20
2.6 COMMENTARIES OF THE QUR'AN CONFIRM THAT FADAK WAS FAY PROPERTY	20
COMMENT	21
2.7 HOW DID THE PROPHET ATTAIN FADAK?	21
COMMENT	21
2.8 THE PROPHET (S) OWNED ALL OF FADAK	22
COMMENT	22
2.9 UMAR ALSO DEEMED FADAK TO BE THE EXCLUSIVE PROPERTY OF RASULULLAH (S)	22
2.10 WAS ABU BAKR MERELY IMPLEMENTING THE WILL OF RASULULLAH (S)	23
REPLY	23
2.11 THE MEANS VIA WHICH SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) ACQUIRED FADAK	23
NOTE:	24
2.12 COMMON OBJECTION RAISED BY ABU BAKR'S DEFENDERS	24
REPLY ONE	24
REPLY TWO - SOME VERSES WERE REVEALED IN MAKKA AS WELL AS IN MADINA	24
COMMENT	25
REPLY THREE - THE QUR'AN CONTAINS MADANI VERSES IN MAKKAN SURAH'S	25
REPLY FOUR - THE MERITS OF AYESHA	25
COMMENT	25
REPLY FIVE	26
2.13 THE PROPHET (S) ALSO GAVE FATIMA ZAHRA (AS) A WRITTEN INSTRUCTION ABOUT FADAK	26
2.14 THE CONTENTS OF THE WRITTEN PAPER	26
COMMENT	27
3. <u>THE CLAIM OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)</u>	28

3.1 ABU BAKR USURPED THE LAND OF FADAK AND FATIMA ZAHRA (AS) ASKED HIM FOR HER RIGHT	28
3.2 SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) DEEMED FADAK TO HAVE BEEN GIFTED TO HER	29
REPLY	30
PROOF ONE	30
PROOF TWO - ABU BAKR ACCEPTED SAYYIDA FATIMA'S EXISTING POSSESSION OF FADAK	31
PROOF THREE - IF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) HAD NO CONTROL OF FADAK WHY DID ABU BAKR GIVE WRITTEN INSTRUCTION THAT IT BE RESTORED TO HER?	31
COMMENT	31
PROOF FOUR - MAULA 'ALI CONFIRMED THAT SAYYIDA FATIMA ALREADY HAD CONTROL OF FADAK	31
COMMENT	32
PROOF FIVE - RASULULLAH (S) GAVE FADAK TO SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) DURING HIS LIFETIME	32
PROOF SIX - MAULA 'ALI (AS) TOLD ABU BAKR THAT THE PROPHET (S) HAD GIVEN FADAK TO HER DURING HER LIFETIME	32
COMMENT	32
PROOF SEVEN - IF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) HAD NO CONTROL OVER FADAK THEN UMAR IBN ABDUL AZIZ WOULD NOT HAVE RETURNED IT TO THE DESCENDANTS OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	33
COMMENT	33
PROOF EIGHT - IF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) HAD NO CONTROL OF FADAK THEN THE JUST KHALEEFA AND HAFIDH OF THE QUR'AN MAMUN WOULD NOT HAVE RESTORED THE LAND TO THE DESCENDANTS OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	33
COMMENT	34
PROOF NINE - THE VERSE 'DHUL QURBA' PROVES THAT FADAK HAD BEEN GIFTED TO SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	34
AN APPEAL TO JUSTICE	34
3.3 AL KHIDER'S ATTEMPTS TO USE LOGIC TO REFUTE THE CLAIM OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	35
REPLY ONE - THIS IS THE GREATEST PROOF THAT NO OTHER DAUGHTERS EXISTED	35
REPLY TWO - MAULA 'ALI (AS) WAS THE ONLY SON IN LAW OF THE PROPHET (S)	36
COMMENT	36
REPLY THREE - THE TITLE DHUL NURAYN [POSSESSOR OF TWO LIGHTS] CANNOT BE LOCATED IN THE AUTHENTIC SUNNI WORKS	36
REPLY FOUR - THE NASIBI DON'T EVEN BELIEVE THE PROPHET (S) WAS CREATED FROM NUR	36
REPLY FIVE - THE AHL'UL SUNNAH BELIEVE THAT THE PROPHET (S) WAS UNJUST!	37
COMMENT	37
3.4 ABU BAKR HAD NO RIGHT TO SEIZE LAND UNDER SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)'S POSSESSION	38
<u>4. ABU BAKR'S REJECTION OF WITNESSES' TESTIMONY</u>	<u>39</u>
COMMENT	41
4.1 ABU BAKR'S DEMANDING WITNESSES IS PROOF THAT HE DID NOT DENY HER CONTROL OF THE LAND	41
4.2 HEIRS HAVE THE RIGHT TO DEMAND WITNESSES ON MATTERS OF INHERITANCE, NOT A JUDGE	41
4.3 AN EXECUTOR ADMINISTERING THE DECEASED'S ESTATE HAS THE RIGHT TO INITIATE INQUIRY NOT A JUDGE	42
COMMENT	42
4.4 ABU BAKR AS JUDGE HAD NO RIGHT TO DEMAND WITNESS CORROBORATION	43
4.5 THE ONUS WAS ON ABU BAKR TO PRODUCE WITNESSES NOT SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	45

4.6 RATHER THAN DEMAND WITNESSES WHY DIDN'T ABU BAKR ALLOW THE MUSLIMS TO RULE ON THE MATTER?	46
4.7 SAYYIDA FATIMA WAS 'SIDDIQAH' HENCE IT WAS ABU BAKR'S DUTY TO ACCEPT HER CLAIM WITHOUT DEMANDING WITNESSES	47
COMMENT	48
4.8 SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) IS THE EXAMPLE OF MARYAM (AS)	48
COMMENT	49
4.9 THE TRUTHFULNESS OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) AND HADHRAT MARYAM (AS) IS PROVEN FROM THE QUR'AN	49
COMMENT	49
4.10 THE TESTIMONY OF HADHRAT AYESHA THAT SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) WAS SIDDIQAH	49
COMMENT	49
4.11 SAYYIDA FATIMA SIDDIQAH (AS) IS MASUM (INFALLIBLE)	50
4.12 COMMENTARY OF THE WORDS "FATIMA IS A PART OF ME"	50
4.13 COMMENTARY OF THE WORDS "PART OF MY BODY"	51
4.14 THE HADEETH PROVES THE INFALLIBILITY OF SAYYIDA FATIMA AL SIDDIQAH	51
4.15 SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)'S INFALLIBILITY IS PROVEN FROM THE VERSE OF PURITY	51
THE VERSE REFERS TO A 'SPECIFIC' HOUSEHOLD	52
ONLY FIVE PEOPLE WERE INCLUDED IN THE CLOAK	52
THE PROPHET(S) WOULD RECITE THIS VERSE OUTSIDE THE HOME OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) FOR THE NEXT SIX - NINE MONTHS (FOLLOWING REVELATION)	53
4.16 THE WIVES OF THE PROPHET ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE AHLULBAYT	54
POINTS TO CONSIDER	54
4.17 THE FINAL ATTEMPT OF THE AHL'UL SUNNAH TO COUNT WIVES AS AHL'UL BAYT (AS)	55
OBJECTION:	55
REPLY ONE:	55
REPLY TWO - THE WIFE OF NABI IBRAHEEM (AS) WAS INCLUDED DUE TO HER BLOOD LINEAGE WITH FUTURE PROPHETS	55
COMMENT	56
4.18 THE AHL'UL BAYT (AS) ARE EXEMPT FROM ALL FORMS OF RIJS	56
4.19 QUESTION - WAS A MASUM'S SOLE TESTIMONY ACCEPTABLE DURING THE LIFETIME OF RASULULLAH (S)	58
COMMENT	58
4.20 LOGICAL PROOF THAT AN INFALLIBLE TESTIMONY IS ACCEPTABLE WITHOUT THE NEED FOR WITNESSES	58
4.21 WHEN IT SUITED HIM ABU BAKR WOULD OPPOSE A QUR'ANIC VERSE	59
COMMENT	59
COMMENT	60
4.22 WHEN ABU BAKR FELT LIKE IT, HE WOULD ACCEPT A CLAIM WITHOUT THE NEED FOR WITNESSES	60
COMMENT	61
4.23 THE AHL'UL SUNNAH BELIEVE THAT THE TESTIMONY OF THE SAHABA WITHOUT WITNESSES IS ACCEPTABLE	61
COMMENT	61
COMMENT	62
4.24 RASULULLAH (S) DEEMED HIS AND 'ALI (AS)'S HAND TO BE EQUAL IN DISPENSING JUSTICE	62
COMMENT	62
4.25 AHL'UL SUNNAH BELIEVE THAT THE TESTIMONY OF A SINGLE PERSON PROVIDED HE IS JUST SHALL SUFFICE	63
COMMENT	63
COMMENT	63

4.26	THE TESTIMONY OF ANY JUST PERSON IS ACCEPTABLE	64
4.27	ABU BAKR, UMAR AND UTHMAN WOULD ISSUE RULINGS BASED ON THE TESTIMONY OF ONE PERSON SWEARING ON OATH	64
4.28	THE PILLAR OF THE SHARI'AH RASULULLAH (S) ALSO RULED ON THE TESTIMONY AND OATH OF ONE PERSON	64
	COMMENT	65
4.29	THE SUNNI ULEMA HAVE GRADED THE TESTIMONY OF THE KILLERS OF HUSAYN (AS) TO BE SUPERIOR TO SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	66
4.30	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR OPPOSED THE QUR'AN BY FAILING TO SIDE WITH THE TRUTHFUL	67
	COMMENT	67
4.31	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR ABANDONED 'THE ROPE OF ALLAH'	68
	COMMENT	68
4.32	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR OPPOSED THE 'PEOPLE WHO KNOW'	68
	COMMENT	69
4.33	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR REJECTED ONE WHO TESTIFIED TO THE PROPHETHOOD	69
	COMMENT	69
4.34	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR REJECTED ONE WHO POSSESSED KNOWLEDGE OF THE BOOK	70
	COMMENT	70
4.35	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR REJECTED ONE WHO WAS 'SUFFICIENT FOR ALLAH'	71
	COMMENT	71
4.36	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR REJECTED THE 'ONE WITH THE TRUTHFUL TONGUE'	71
	COMMENT	71
4.37	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR REJECTED THE VERSE OF PURIFITY	72
	COMMENT	72
4.38	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR REJECTED THE HADEETH OF THE 'TWO WEIGHTY THINGS'	72
4.39	ONE WHO OPPOSES AHL'UL BAYT (AS) IS FROM THE PARTY OF SHAYTAN AND HENCE OUTSIDE THE DEEN	74
	COMMENT	74
4.40	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR REJECTED HADEETH-SAFINA	74
	COMMENT	76
4.41	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR REJECTED THE HADEETH 'ALI IS WITH THE TRUTH AND THE TRUTH IS WITH ALI'	76
	COMMENT	76
4.42	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR REJECTED THE HADEETH 'ALI IS WITH THE QUR'AN AND THE QUR'AN IS WITH 'ALI'	77
	COMMENT	77
	COMMENT	78
4.43	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR REJECTED THE CLAIM OF HADHRAT 'ALI (AS) 'I AM THE GREAT TRUTHFUL ONE'	78
	COMMENT	79
4.44	BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONY OF IMAM 'ALI (AS), ABU BAKR REJECTED THE HADEETH 'I AM THE CITY OF KNOWLEDGE AND 'ALI IS ITS GATE'	79
	COMMENT	81
	COMMENT	81

COMMENT	81
COMMENT	82
COMMENT	82
4.45 REFUTING THE DEFENCES PRESENTED BY ABU BAKR'S ADVOCATES	82
4.46 DEFENCE ONE: THE NUMBER OF WITNESSES REQUIRED TO SUBSTANTIATE A CLAIM WERE NOT MET	82
REPLY	82
4.47 DEFENCE TWO - CHILDREN CANNOT TESTIFY IN SUPPORT OF THEIR PARENTS	83
REPLY ONE	83
REPLY TWO - THE KHALIFAS CHILDREN HAVE NARRATED HADEETH PRAISING THEIR FATHERS	84
REPLY THREE - IMAM 'ALI (AS) PRESENTED HIS SON AS HIS WITNESS IN A COURT CASE	84
COMMENT	84
4.48 DEFENCE THREE - UNDERAGE CHILDREN CANNOT TESTIFY IN FAVOUR OF THEIR PARENTS	85
REPLY ONE - THE SUPERIORITY OF THE AWLIYA ALLAH IN INFANCY	85
HADHRAT ESAU (AS) WAS GRANTED PROPHETHOOD WHILST STILL A CHILD	85
ALLAH (SWT) MADE HASSAN (AS) AND HUSAYN (AS) WITNESSES TO THE PROPHETHOOD WHILST THEY WERE STILL INFANTS	85
IMAM JAFER AL SADIQ (AS) WOULD EXPLAIN THE WAY OF ALLAH (SWT) WHEN HE WAS A CHILD	85
IMAM ABU HANIFA TESTIFIED TO THE SUPERIOR KNOWLEDGE OF A YOUNG IMAM MUSA KADHIM (AS)	86
IMAM TAQI (AS) GAVE NEWS OF THE UNSEEN AT A YOUNG AGE	86
YOUNG IMAM ASKARI (AS) OFFERED ADVICE TO BAHLOOL	86
IMAM MAHDI (AS) ATTAINED KNOWLEDGE AT A YOUNG AGE	86
REPLY ONE	86
REPLY TWO - YOUNG CHILDREN ARE SEEN AS INNOCENT AND TRUTHFUL	87
BY REJECTING THE TESTIMONIES OF HASSAN (AS) AND HUSAYN (AS), ABU BAKR INFLICTED INJUSTICE ON THE AHL'UL BAYT (AS)	87
REPLY THREE - ABU BAKR'S DAUGHTER NARRATED THE SPIRITUAL MIR'AJ OF RASULULLAH (S)	87
COMMENT	87
REPLY FOUR - INFANT AYESHA ALSO NARRATED THE EVENTS OF HIJRAH	88
COMMENT	88
REPLY FIVE - A THREE YEAR OLD CHILD BECOMES HIS MOTHER'S WALI AND PERFORMS HER NIKAH	88
COMMENT	88
REPLY SIX - THE ESTEEMED GRANDSON OF ABU BAKR NARRATED THE EVENT OF KHANDAQ AT THE AGE OF THREE	88
4.49 DEFENCE FOUR - A HUSBAND CANNOT ACTS AS WITNESS FOR HIS WIFE	89
REPLY	89
UMM AYMAN ALSO TESTIFIED IN THE FADAK DISPUTE	89
COMMENT	90

5. IMAM 'ALI (AS)'S POSITION ON FADAK **91**

5.1 HADHRAT 'ALI (AS)'S VIEW OF ABU BAKR'S RULING ON THE FADAK DISPUTE	91
5.2 WHY DIDN'T HADHRAT 'ALI RAISE HIS SWORD TO GET FADAK BACK AT THE TIME? 91	91
5.3 THE COMMON SUNNI/NASIBI COUNTER ATTACK AND ALLEGED SHIA DEFENCES FOR KHALIFA ALI (AS)'S FAILURE TO RECLAIM FADAK	91
REPLY	93
REPLY	93

REPLY	94
REPLY	95
5.4 WAS MAULA 'ALI (AS) 'ASHAMED' TO RECLAIM FADAK	95
REPLY ONE	95
REPLY TWO	96
REPLY THREE	97
5.5 SO 'WHY' DIDN'T KHALIFA 'ALI (AS) TAKE FADAK BACK?	98
REPLY ONE	98
COMMENT	99
REPLY TWO - THE SITUATION FOR IMAM 'ALI (AS) MADE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR HIM TO TAKE BACK FADAK	99
REPLY THREE - HADHRAT 'ALI (AS) WAS MERELY ADHERING TO THE SUNNAH OF RASULULLAH (S)	100
COMMENT	100
REPLY FOUR - THE WISDOM BEHIND NOT RECLAIMING FADAK	101
COMMENT	101
REPLY FIVE	101
COMMENT	101
REPLY SIX	102
COMMENT	102
REPLY SEVEN - WHEN HADHRAT 'ALI BECAME KHALIFA, FADAK WAS IN THE HANDS OF MARWAN	102
REPLY EIGHT - NASIBI DOUBLE STANDARDS	103
REPLY NINE - ACCORDING TO AHL'UL SUNNAH 'DIFFICULTIES' MEANT RASULULLAH (S) WAS UNABLE TO FORCEFULLY GET HIS DAUGHTER BACK	103
COMMENT	104
REPLY TEN	104
REPLY ELEVEN	104
REPLY TWELVE	105
REPLY THIRTEEN	105
REPLY FOURTEEN - A BEDOUIN'S INSULT OF AYESHA AND THE SILENCE OF RASULULLAH (S)	106
5.6 A NASIBI'S FALSE CLAIM THAT MAULA 'ALI (AS) WAS IMPLEMENTING THE SUNNAH OF ABU BAKR	106
REPLY	107
<u>6. RULES OF INHERITANCE IN THE QUR'AN</u>	<u>108</u>
6.1 THE QUR'AN CONFIRMS THAT A DAUGHTER INHERITS FROM HER FATHER	108
PROOF ONE	108
REPLY ONE	108
REPLY TWO	108
PROOF TWO	109
PROOF THREE	109
PROOF FOUR	109
6.2 DENYING THE DAUGHTER OF RASULULLAH (S) HER INHERITANCE WOULD BE AGAINST THE JUSTICE OF ALLAH (SWT)	110
6.3 DENYING THE DAUGHTER OF RASULULLAH (S) HER INHERITANCE RIGHTS IS A PRACTISE OF JAHILIYYA	110
6.4 DEFENCE OF SHAH ABDUL AZIZ	111
6.5 AL KHIDER'S FALSE CLAIM THAT DAUGHTERS HAVE NO RIGHTS OF INHERITANCE UNDER SHI'A FIQH	112
REPLY ONE	112
REPLY TWO	113

6.6	OUR NOTE	114
7.	<u>THE INHERITANCE OF PREVIOUS PROPHETS</u>	115
7.1	QUR'ANIC PROOF THAT PROPHETS LEAVE INHERITANCE TO THEIR OFFSPRINGS	115
7.2	AL KHIDER'S ABSURD CLAIM THAT PROPHETS LEAVE NO MATERIAL POSSESSION AS INHERITANCE	115
	REPLY ONE	115
	REPLY TWO	115
	THE BOOKS OF AHL'UL SUNNAH PROVE THAT PROPHET SULAYMAN (AS) INHERITED HIS FATHER'S WORLDLY POSSESSIONS	115
	PROPHET SULAYMAN (AS) INHERITED ONE THOUSAND HORSES FROM HIS FATHER	116
7.3	AL KHIDER'S FALSE CLAIM THAT SULAYMAN (AS) INHERITED PROPHETHOOD, KNOWLEDGE AND WISDOM FROM HIS FATHER, NOT MATERIAL POSSESSIONS	117
	REPLY ONE - PROPHETS ARE PROPHETS FROM THE TIME THEY ARE BORN (PROPHETHOOD IS NOT SOMETHING TO BE INHERITED)	118
	REPLY TWO - HADHRAT SULAYMAN (AS) WAS PROPHET AT THE SAME TIME AS HIS FATHER DAWOOD (AS)	118
7.4	AL KHIDER'S QUERY AS TO WHY HADHRAT DAWOOD'S OTHER SONS ARE NOT MENTIONED IN THIS VERSE	119
	REPLY ONE	119
	REPLY TWO	119
	REPLY THREE	119
	REPLY FOUR	120
	REPLY FIVE	120
	REPLY SIX	120
	REPLY SEVEN	121
	REPLY EIGHT	121
	REPLY NINE - SHI'A UNDERSTANDING OF THIS VERSE	121
7.5	AL KHIDER'S CLAIM THAT THE INHERITANCE OF MATERIAL POSSESSIONS IS A MATTER TOO TRIVIAL TO APPEAR IN THE QUR'AN	122
	REPLY ONE	123
	REPLY TWO - DENYING ACCESS TO A FATHER'S MATERIAL POSSESSIONS DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A BOUNTY FROM ALLAH (SWT)	123
	OUR CHALLENGE TO ALL NASIBIS	124
	REPLY THREE - PROPHET ZAKARIYA PRAYED FOR SOMEONE TO INHERIT HIS MATERIAL POSSESSIONS	124
7.6	'YAD THANA' IN THIS VERSE MEANS WORLDLY POSSESSIONS	125
7.7	'YAD THANA WA YARS MIN A LAI YAQOOB' ALSO REFERS TO MATERIAL POSSESSIONS	125
7.8	'YAD THANA WA YARS MIN A LAI YAQOOB' CAN ALSO LOGICALLY BE PROVEN AS MATERIAL POSSESSIONS	127
7.9	AL KHIDER'S SUGGESTION THAT IT WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE FOR A PROPHET (S) TO PRAY FOR SOMEONE TO INHERIT HIS MATERIAL POSSESSIONS	127
	REPLY	127
7.10	AL KHIDER'S GUESSWORK THAT PROPHET ZAKARIYA WAS TOO POOR TO LEAVE ANY INHERITANCE	129
	REPLY ONE	129
	REPLY TWO	130
7.11	HADHRAT ZAKARIYA (AS) PRAYED FOR OFFSPRING TO INHERIT HIS WORLDLY POSSESSIONS	130
	REPLY THREE - WHY DID IMAM 'ALI (AS) AND ABU BAKR NOT CONCUR WITH AL KHIDER'S UNDERSTANDING OF THESE VERSES?	131

7.12	THE INHERITANCE LEFT BY HADHRAT ADAM (AS)	132
7.13	PROPHET ISAAC [AS]'S DAUGHTER INHERITED HIS STRAP/BELT	133
	COMMENTS:	134
7.14	PROPHET IBRAHIM[AS]'S SHIRT WAS INHERITED BY ISAAC[AS] TILL IT REACHED PROPHET YAQUB[AS]	134
7.15	AL KHIDER'S FALSE CLAIM THAT PROPHETS NEVER KEPT ANYTHING BEYOND THEIR NEED	134
	REPLY	135
7.16	BIBLICAL PROOF THAT PROPHETS LEAVE INHERITANCE FOR THEIR CHILDREN	135
7.17	SOME INCIDENTS FROM THE BIBLE	135
	SOLOMON (AS) INHERITED THE KINGDOM FROM DAVID (AS)	135
	ADONIJAH [SON OF DAVID (AS) AND ELDER BROTHER OF SOLOMON (AS)] TRIED TO OCCUPY THE KINGDOM	136
	NOT ONLY SOLOMON INHERITED DAWUD (AS), BUT ALSO REHOB'O'AM (SON OF SOLOMON) INHERITED FROM HIS FATHER	137
	JACOB'S LAND (AS) WAS GIVEN TO HIS DESCENDANTS AS INHERITANCE (AND NOT GIVEN TO THE POOR AS SADAQAH)	137
	A PROPERTY OF ABRAHAM (AS) WAS MAINTAINED BY HIS CHILDREN AND WAS NOT DISTRIBUTED AS CHARITY	137
	PROPHET JOB (AS) ALSO GAVE THE SHARE OF INHERITANCE TO HIS DAUGHTERS	138
	ALLAH PROMISED ABRAHAM TO GIVE HIM A SON IN OLD AGE WHO WOULD INHERIT HIM EVERYTHING	138
7.18	DO THE REFERENCES FROM BIBLE HAVE ANY IMPORTANCE?	138
	COMMENT	139
8.	<u>ANALYSING THE JUDGEMENT OF ABU BAKR</u>	140
8.1	SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) ASKED FOR HER INHERITANCE RIGHTS AND ABU BAKR REJECTED HER CLAIM	140
8.2	ABU BAKR CLAIMED THAT THE WARIS OF RASULULLAH (S) IS HIS KHALIFA	140
	COMMENT	140
8.3	ABU BAKR ADMITTED THAT THE WARIS OF RASULULLAH (S) ARE HIS CHILDREN	141
8.4	UNDERSTANDING THE WORDS 'OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE (I.E. PROPHETS) LEAVE IS SADAQAH (TO BE USED FOR CHARITY)'	141
	COMMENT	142
8.5	SUMMING UP THE ARGUMENTS	142
8.6	HADHRAT 'ALI REJECTED THE CLAIM OF ABU BAKR 'OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE (I.E. PROPHETS) LEAVE IS SADAQAH'	143
8.7	ANYONE WHOM HADHRAT 'ALI DEEMS TREACHEROUS IS ALSO TREACHEROUS IN THE EYES OF THE SAHABA	145
8.8	THE HADEETH 'OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE (I.E. PROPHETS) LEAVE IS SADAQAH (TO BE USED FOR CHARITY)' WAS NOT USED BY ABU BAKR TO CONFISCATE THE LAND THAT RASULULLAH (S) LEFT FOR THE SAHABA	145
	COMMENT	146
8.9	THE HADEETH 'OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE (I.E. PROPHETS) LEAVE IS SADAQAH (TO BE USED FOR CHARITY)' WAS EVEN REJECTED BY THE WIVES OF THE PROPHET (S)	146
	REPLY	146
8.10	AYESHA ALSO DID NOT SUPPORT ABU BAKR'S STANCE	148
8.11	THE WIVES OF THE PROPHET (S) INHERITED THEIR APARTMENTS FROM RASULULLAH (S) WHICH PROVES THAT THE HADEETH 'OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE LEAVE IS SADAQAH' IS FALSE	149

- THE THREE KHALEEFA'S INHERITING THE RING OF THE PROPHET IS PROOF THAT THE HADEETH 'OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE LEAVE IS SADAQAH' IS FALSE 150
- 8.12** AYESHA INHERITED THE GARMENTS OF RASULULLAH (S) WHICH PROVES THAT THE HADEETH '*OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE LEAVE IS SADAQAH*' IS FALSE 151
- 8.13** AYESHA'S INHERITING LAND FROM RASULULLAH (S) IS PROOF THAT THE HADEETH '*OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE LEAVE IS SADAQAH*' IS FALSE 152
- 8.14** UMAR GAVE AYESHA POSSESSION OF THE VERY SAME LAND THAT ABU BAKR DENIED SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) 153
COMMENT 153
- 8.15** UMAR'S GIVING RASULULLAH'S PROPERTY IN MADINA TO MAULA 'ALI AND ABBAS IS PROOF THAT THE HADEETH '*OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE LEAVE IS SADAQAH*' IS FALSE 154
- 8.16** RASULULLAH (S) OPENED A THOUSAND DOORS OF KNOWLEDGE FOR HADHRAT 'ALI (AS) WHO REMAINED IGNORANT OF THE HADEETH '*WHATEVER WE (I.E. PROPHETS) LEAVE IS SADAQAH*' 155
COMMENT 156
COMMENT 156
- 8.17** THE FAILURE OF RASULULLAH (S) TO TELL HIS WASI (ALI) THAT '*OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE (I.E. PROPHETS) LEAVE IS SADAQAH (TO BE USED FOR CHARITY)*' IS FURTHER PROOF THAT IT IS FALSE 156
COMMENT 157
- 8.18** THE ANGER OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) UPON HEARING THE HADEETH '*OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE (I.E. PROPHETS) LEAVE IS SADAQAH (TO BE USED FOR CHARITY)*' IS PROOF THAT IT WAS A LIE 157
- 8.19** SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) WAS TRUTHFUL AND MASUM 158
- 8.20** THE CONTINUAL DEMAND OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) THAT ABU BAKR GIVE HER FADAK IS PROOF THAT THE HADEETH '*OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE (I.E. PROPHETS) LEAVE IS SADAQAH (TO BE USED FOR CHARITY)*' WAS FALSE 159
- 8.21** ABU BAKR'S ASKING FOR WITNESSES TO SUPPORT THE CLAIM OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) SERVES AS A PROOF THAT THE HADEETH '*OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE (I.E. PROPHETS) LEAVE IS SADAQAH (TO BE USED FOR CHARITY)*' IS FALSE 159
- 8.22** ABU BAKR'S FAILURE TO IMPLEMENT THE HADITH '*OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE (I.E. PROPHETS) LEAVE IS SADAQAH (TO BE USED FOR CHARITY)*' IS FURTHER PROOF THAT IT IS FALSE 160
- 8.23** THE FACT THAT SADAQA IS HARAAM ON BANU HASHIM IS PROOF THAT THE HADEETH '*OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE LEAVE IS SADAQAH*' IS FALSE 160
COMMENT 161
- 8.24** IMAM ZAYN'UL ABIDEEN (AS)'S POSSESSION OF THE SWORD BELONGING TO THE PROPHET (S) IS PROOF THAT THE HADEETH '*OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE LEAVE IS SADAQAH*' IS FALSE 162
- 8.25** THE DU'A OF PROPHET ZAKARIYA (AS) PROVES THAT THE HADEETH '*OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE (I.E. PROPHETS) LEAVE IS SADAQAH*' IS FALSE 162
COMMENT 162
- 8.26** RASULULLAH (S)'S OBJECTION TO THE SAHABA GIVING AWAY OVER A THIRD OF THEIR PROPERTY TO CHARITY IS A PROOF THAT THE HADEETH '*OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE (I.E. PROPHETS) LEAVE IS SADAQAH*' IS FALSE 162
- 8.27** FURTHER PROOF THAT THE HADEETH RECITED BY ABU BAKR '*OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE (I.E. PROPHETS) LEAVE IS SADAQAH (TO BE USED FOR CHARITY)*' IS A LIE - AHL'UL SUNNAH'S AQEEDAH THAT PROPHETS ALSO INHERIT FROM NO ONE 164
- 8.28** RASULULLAH (S) INHERITED LIVESTOCK BELONGING TO HIS FATHER 164

8.29 RASULULLAH (S) INHERITED A SWORD FROM HIS FATHER	164
8.30 RASULULLAH (S) INHERITED A MALE AND FEMALE SERVANT FROM HIS FATHER	165
8.31 THE TRADITION NARRATED BY ABU BAKR DOES NOT MEET THE STANDARDS OF HADEETH AUTHENTICITY SET BY THE SUNNI ULEMA	165
1. ACCORDING TO THE AHL'UL SUNNAH A TRADITION CONTRARY TO REASON IS FALSE	166
OBSERVATION ONE	166
OBSERVATION TWO	168
OBSERVATION THREE	169
OBSERVATION FOUR	170
OBSERVATION FIVE	170
2. ACCORDING TO AHL'UL SUNNAH A TRADITION THAT CONTRADICTS THE QUR'AN IS FALSE	172
SUNNI AND SHI'A AGREEMENT	174
ALLAH (SWT)'S CONDEMNATION ON HE WHO TURNS HIS BACK ON THE QUR'AN	175
OPEN CHALLENGE TO AHL'UL SUNNAH	175
3. ACCORDING TO THE AHL'UL SUNNAH A TRADITION THAT OUGHT TO HAVE BEEN KNOWN TO ALL AND SUNDRY, BUT HAS ONLY A SINGLE NARRATOR IS FALSE	175
OBSERVATION ONE	175
OBSERVATION TWO	175
FIRST 'MISSED' OPPORTUNITY	176
SECOND 'MISSED' OPPORTUNITY	176
THIRD 'MISSED' OPPORTUNITY	176
8.32 IBN TAYMEEYA AL NASIBI'S FALSE CLAIM THAT THE HADEETH 'OUR PROPERTY WILL NOT BE INHERITED, WHATEVER WE LEAVE IS SADAQAH' IS MUTTAWATIR	178
REPLY ONE	178
REPLY TWO	178
REPLY THREE - MUTAWATTIR HADITH DEFINED	179
REPLY FOUR	180
REPLY FIVE – UTHMAN AND THE WIVES OF THE PROPHET (S) HAD NO KNOWLEDGE OF THE HADEETH	181
8.33 ABU BAKR'S DECISION IN THE FADAK DISPUTE CONTRADICTED HIS OWN METHOD OF RULING	181
8.34 ABU BAKR DID NOT HONOUR HIS GROUNDS FOR USURPING FADAK	182
8.35 ABU BAKR PREVENTED THE RECITAL OF HADEETH THAT CAUSED DISPUTES	183
8.36 ABU BAKR'S HADEETH BURNING CAMPAIGN	184
OVERALL ANALYSIS OF THE HADEETH	184
8.37 THE MISUSE OF SHI'A TRADITIONS TO DEFEND ABU BAKR	185
REPLY	185
REPLY	185
REPLY ONE	187
REPLY TWO	187
REPLY THREE	188
REPLY FOUR	188
REPLY FIVE	188
REPLY SIX - ANALYSING THE WORDS IN THE TRADITION	189
REPLY SEVEN	189
REPLY EIGHT	189
REPLY NINE	190
REPLY TEN	190
REPLY ELEVEN	191
8.38 AL KHIDER'S DISHONEST TRANSLATION OF A SHI'A TEXT SO AS TO STRENGTHEN HIS ARGUMENT	191
REPLY	191
8.39 THE USURPATION OF KHUMS	192
THE RIGHT OF BANU HASHIM TO KHUMS HAS BEEN PROVEN FROM THE QUR'AN	192

8.40	ABU BAKR PROHIBITED GIVING A PORTION OF KHUMS TO THE ORPHANS AND NEEDY FROM BANU HASHIM	192
8.41	UMAR ALSO PROHIBITED GIVING BANU HASHIM ANY KHUMS	193
8.42	ABU BAKR'S FAVOURABLE TREATMENT OF THE SAHABA COMPARED TO SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	193
8.43	UMAR'S FAVOURABLE TREATMENT OF THE KUFFAR COMPARED TO SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	194
9.	<u>SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)'S RESPONSE TO THE CONFISCATION OF FADAK</u>	195
9.1	THE KHUTBAH OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	195
9.2	ABU BAKR'S DENIAL OF KHUMS AND FADAK INCURRED THE ANGER OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	195
9.3	SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) WAS SO ANGRY AT ABU BAKR'S CONFISCATION THAT SHE REFUSED TO REPLY TO HIS SALAAMS	196
9.4	SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) SAID THAT SHE WOULD COMPLAIN ABOUT THE SHAYKHAYN BEFORE RASULULLAH (S) AND WOULD CURSE THEM IN EVERY SALAT	196
9.5	IBN KATHEER'S DISRESPECT OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	197
	REPLY	197
	COMMENT	197
9.6	SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) LEFT A WILL THAT ABU BAKR BE PREVENTED FROM ATTENDING HER FUNERAL	197
	REPLY ONE - SAHIH AL BUKHARI DESTROYS THIS FALSE CLAIM	198
	REPLY TWO - MAULA 'ALI PREVENTED ABU BAKR FROM PARTICIPATING IN THE FUNERAL PRAYER	198
	REPLY THREE - THE SUNNI MUHADATHEEN HAVE THEMSELVES DISCREDITED NARRATIONS WHEREIN ABU BAKR LED THE FUNERAL PRAYERS OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	199
	REPLY ONE	199
	REPLY TWO - ASMA BINTE UMAYS PHYSICALLY PREVENTED AYESHA FROM PARTICIPATING IN SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)'S FUNERAL RITES AND EVEN REJECTED ABU BAKR'S ATTEMPTS TO INTERCEDE FOR HER	199
9.7	RASULULLAH (S) SAID THAT YOU CANNOT BE ANGRY AT A MUSLIM FOR MORE THAN THREE DAYS	200
9.8	NASABIS HAVE SOUGHT TO PORTRAY SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) AS DYING THE DEATH OF JAHILYAH [NAUDHOBILLAH]	201
9.9	NASABIS DEEM AHL'UL BAYT (AS) RAFIDHIS	202
9.10	SIPAA-E-SAHABA'S FALSE CLAIM THAT SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) RECOGNISED ABU BAKR AS THE LEGITIMATE KHALIFA	202
	REPLY	203
	REPLY ONE	203
	REPLY TWO	203
	REPLY THREE - DEMANDING RIGHTS BEFORE AN UNJUST KHALEEFA IS THE SUNNAH OF PROPHETS MUSA (AS) AND YUSUF (AS)	204
9.11	A NASIBI'S EFFORTS TO SUGGEST THAT THE DISPUTE WAS A 'MINOR MATTER'	204
	REPLY	205
9.12	RATHER THAN RETURN FADAK TO ITS RIGHTFUL HEIRS, ABU BAKR SWORE AT THE AHL'UL BAYT (AS)	205
9.13	SWEARING AT HADHRAT 'ALI AND SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) IS ON PAR WITH SWEARING AT RASULULLAH (S)	206
9.14	ONE WHO SWEARS AT HADHRAT 'ALI (AS) AND SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) HAS FAILED TO PAY THE 'WAGE' OF PROPHETHOOD	207
9.15	THE TESTIMONY OF RASULULLAH (S) THAT THE SAHABA BORE HATRED IN THEIR HEARTS TOWARDS IMAM 'ALI (AS)	208

10. RELATIONS BETWEEN SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) AND MAULA 'ALI (AS) 210

COMMENT	210
10.1 FOUR FALSE INCIDENTS CITED BY THE AHL'UL SUNNAH	211
FIRST INCIDENT	211
REPLY ONE	211
REPLY TWO	211
REPLY THREE	211
SECOND INCIDENT	211
REPLY ONE	212
REPLY TWO	212
REPLY THREE	212
INCIDENT THREE	213
REPLY ONE	213
REPLY TWO	213
REPLY THREE	213
REPLY FOUR	214
REPLY FIVE	214
REPLY SIX	214
REPLY SEVEN	214
COMMENT	215
REPLY EIGHT	215
ANALYSING THE EVENT FROM SUNNI SOURCES	215
OBSERVATION ONE	215
OBSERVATION TWO	215
OBSERVATION THREE	216
OBSERVATION FOUR	216
OBSERVATION FIVE	216
THE FOURTH INCIDENT	217
REPLY ONE - UNDERSTANDING THE BACKGROUND TO THESE WORDS	217
REPLY TWO - TENSIONS BETWEEN NABI MUSA (AS) AND THE ANGEL OF DEATH	218
COMMENT	219
REPLY THREE - THE INCIDENT OF MUSA (AS) AND KHIDER (AS)	219
COMMENT	220
REPLY FOUR - THE QUARREL BETWEEN TWO ANGELS	220
REPLY FIVE - TENSIONS BETWEEN NABI MUSA (AS) AND NABI HAROON (AS)	220
COMMENT	221
REPLY SIX - THE WORDS OF HADHRAT MARYAM (AS)	221
COMMENT	221
10.2 THE BLASPHEMY OF MULLAH MURADABADI	222
REPLY ONE	222
COMMENT	223

11. THE SHI'A POSITION ON ABU BAKR 224

11.1 ABU BAKR'S ADMISSION OF HIS MISTAKES ON HIS DEATH BED	224
11.2 AL KHIDER'S EFFORTS TO WATER THE ENTIRE DISPUTE DOWN TO A MERE 'DIFFERENCE' OF OPINION, FOUNDED ON PROOF	225
REPLY	225
11.3 AL KHIDER'S FAILED EFFORTS TO EXPLAIN AWAY THE DISPUTE AS A MERE DIFFERENCE AMONGST MUJTAHIDS	226
REPLY	226

11.4	AL KHIDER'S SUGGESTION THAT THE SHI'A JUDGE ABU BAKR ACCORDING TO SENTIMENT RATHER THAN FACT	226
	REPLY	227
11.5	ALLAH (SWT)'S VERDICT ON THOSE THAT USURP INHERITANCE	227
11.6	RASULULLAH (S) TOLD ABU DHARR THAT HIS FAI PROPERTY WOULD BE USURPED AFTER HIM	228
11.7	ABU BAKR FAILED TO MEET THE DESIRE OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	229
11.8	THE VERDICT ON THOSE THAT DISPLEASE SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	230
11.9	THE FINAL DESTINATION OF THOSE THAT USURPED THE RIGHTS OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS), IN THE EYES OF RASULULLAH (S)	231
	COMMENT	233
11.10	THOSE THAT WERE UNJUST TO SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) SHALL APPEAR ON THE DAY OF JUDGEMENT DEVOID OF LIGHT ON THEIR FACES	233
11.11	THE QUR'AN MAKES IT CLEAR THAT AN UNJUST PERSON CANNOT BE A KHALIFA	233
11.12	THOSE THAT HAVE INCURRED ALLAH (SWT)'S WRATH ARE DHAALIM AND CANNOT BE DEEMED AS IMAMS	234
12.	<u>CONCLUSION</u>	<u>235</u>
13.	<u>COPYRIGHT</u>	<u>237</u>

1. Fadak; The property of Fatima al-Zahra [as]

1.1 Preface

Fadak is a controversial issue that has since the death of Rasulullah (s) created an open wound between the Sunni and Shi'a schools of thought. The best summary exists from Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 325:

Narrated Ayesha (mother of the believers), 'After the death of Allah's Apostle Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Apostle asked Abu Bakr As-Siddiq to give her the share of inheritance from what Allah's Apostle had left of the Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting) which Allah had given him. Abu Bakr said to her, "the holy prophet (saww) had said, 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)."' Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Apostle got angry and stopped speaking to Abu Bakr, and continued assuming that attitude till she died. Fatima remained alive for six months after the death of the Holy prophet (saww).

The scholars of Ahle Sunnah have fought tirelessly to uphold the decision of Abu Bakr as correct. The reason that they do so is because so much hangs on upholding Abu Bakr's stance. After all if he is proven wrong then they will have to admit that the Khalifa coined a tradition to justify the usurpation of Fadak from Sayyida Fatima (as). The matter would not just end there it will raise more serious issues such as:

1. The Justice of the Sahaba - If the 'best friend' of the Prophet (s) could behave in such an unjust manner what can we expect of the other Sahaba?
2. If Abu Bakr ruled in such an unjust manner then how can he be deemed the rightly guided Khalifa of the Prophet (s)?
3. If hatred for Abu Bakr is a sin then why did Sayyida Fatima (as) hate Abu Bakr until her dying day?

This is why Fadak is such a 'taboo' subject for the Ahl'ul Sunnah. The scholars prefer not to openly discuss it with their followers, if they are ever forced to do so they present the matter in such a simplified shallow manner, gleaming over facts such as Qur'anic verses, so as to ensure that Abu Bakr comes out of the dispute as perfect as possible. At the forefront of this attitude are Ansar.org and in their publication "*Fadak area between Abu Baker and Fatima*" the author Muhammad Al-Khider provided a concise discussion on the topics of Fadak and inheritance. He had sought to counter the wrong things that are said against Abu Bakr on this matter. As far as the issue of Sayyida Fatima (as)'s right to Prophetic inheritance was concerned, Al Khider failed in even citing a word in her favour, on the contrary this advocate of Abu Bakr dedicated his entire efforts on proving that Abu Bakr's approach was the correct one. He was undeterred even if it meant denying the Qur'an and Sunnah in the process.

Not to be hard done an unknown author of '*The Issue of Fedek: A rebuttal to common lies propagated against Ahl al-Sunnah regarding Ahlul-Bayt*' advanced all manner of defence to prove that Sayyida Fatima (as) had no claim to Fadak.

Then we have the efforts of the founder of Sipah-e-Sahaba, Haq Nawaz Jhangvi in his article '*Alleged Row Between Hadhrat Fatimah & Hadhrat Abu Bakr Over Share In Fadak*' whose net conclusion was that Sayyida Fatima (as) was wrong in making her claim. Indeed other articles by the Ahl'ul Sunnah (which we shall highlight) have sought to question the truthfulness and exalted rank of the Ahl'ul bayt (as). They of course were merely following in the footsteps of

their early scholars of the likes of al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz and Ibn Taymeeya who wrote vehemently against the concept of Prophetic inheritance. The net conclusion of all these efforts are one that Abu Bakr was correct and the claim that had been brought by Sayyida Fatima (as) was wrong.

We shall present the complete picture from the esteemed works of Ahl'ul Sunnah, and shall analyse the correctness of Abu Bakr's judgement against the Qur'an, Sunnah and Books of Seerah, Tareekh and Fiqh. Our aim is two fold, to clarify any doubts that are brought up by these articles and to uphold the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) as correct and truthful. We shall also address and refute the excuses that Al Khider and Co. had made on the topic of Prophetic inheritance. By the end of the book readers will need to ask themselves '**Which party was wrong in this dispute, Sayyida Fatima (as) or Abu Bakr?**' They will need to make the difficult choice, in relation to which side of the fence they wish to sit on. They will have to decide where their affiliations lie. With the School of Ahl'ul Bayt (as) or the School of the Companions.

1.2 Special Appeal

Whilst all our articles are aimed at inviting our Sunni brethren to the truth, as is the case here we have decided to make a special appeal to Sunni Sayyid's. Our experience from the Indian Subcontinent is that the descendents of Rasulullah (s) enjoy immense respect in their communities; people stand up when they see them, kiss their hands etc. Some of these have attained the rank of "Peers" [spiritual leaders] and have a massive following that brings with it respect and huge financial rewards. Followers adhere to their every word, deeming anything that they utter from their mouths to be the truth that must be adhered to. Clearly these Sayyid Peers carry an immense responsibility on their shoulders. Unfortunately, rather than fulfilling this duty they live in a hidden world, where making money overrides their Deen. The key to this money making lies in attacking others, as a means of discouraging their followers from seeking out other means of guidance. Their mud slinging is focussed at one group the Shi'as of Maula 'Ali (as). These Peers heap all manner of lie against the shias to generate emotion amongst their followers. Whilst many topics are touched upon by the scandal mongers, the most sensitive topic that guarantees high emotion is the topic of the Sahaba, and in particular the Shi'as opposition to Abu Bakr. We appeal directly to these Peers:

All this respect and honour that you have attained is based on one reason only, your lineage to Sayyida Fatima (as). If your blood was (you were) not linked to Sayyida Fatima (as) you would not have attained the respect that you have today. With this being the case don't you think that you owe it to your mother Sayyida Fatima (as) to distance yourself from those that hurt her? Your followers shower you with vast amounts of cash and lands due to your being a Sayyid, and your luxury lifestyles are thanks to Sayyida Fatima (as). Whilst you have benefited from your relationship to her, your mother was forced to live a life of destitution because Abu Bakr seized her land and denied her inheritance rights. Don't you think you owe it to your mother to speak out and condemn those that pained her? This is just a temporary world and all the benefits and riches you have gained are temporary pleasures that shall be of no avail to you on the Day of Judgement. How will you face Sayyida Fatima (as) on the Day of Judgement, when despite your lineage to her you humiliated her by upholding the stance of those who deprived her of her justified rights, deeming her wrong in the process? Have some shame.

2. General facts on Fadak

2.1 What is Fadak?

For evidence as to how much area constituted fadak, we are relying on the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Maujam-ul-Buldan by Yaqoot Hamawi, v14, p238
2. Tareekh-e-Khamees, v2, p88
3. Wafa-ul-Wafa by Noor-ud-Deen Al-Samhoodi, v4, page1480

"Fadak was a city, which was situated 2 or 3 days of travel from Madina. There were wells of water and trees of dates in it. It was the same Fadak, about which Fatima Zahra (r) said to Abu Bakr, "My father gave me this Fadak as a present". Abu Bakr asked her in reply to produce witnesses."

Note: Upon this demand of Abu Bakr, Hadhrat Fatima (as) recited this verse of the Qur'an:

"Nay, but ye have yourselves contrived a story (good enough) for you. So patience is most fitting (for me).

Al-Qur'an, Surah 12, Ayah 83, translation by Yusufali

2.2 Objection raised by Sunni scholars

Fadak was only a village, in which there were some date trees. How did it become a city?

In Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work "Dairat-ul-Ma'arifa", v7, p135, it is written:

"Fadak is the name of a "Qarya" near Khayber.

The term "Qarya" according to Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work "Al-Qamoos", chapter "Bab ul Wa'a Waliya" is as follows:

"In all respects, "Qarya" means "Masar Jameh".

In Ahl'ul Sunnah's esteemed work "Tafseer Ibne Katheer", Urdu edition, v1, page118, under the Tafseer of following Quranic verse:

And remember We said: "Enter this Town 'Qarya', and eat of the plenty therein as ye wish;

Al-Qur'an, Surah 2, Ayah 58, translated by Yusufali

Ibn Katheer in his commentary of this verse states that:

"Qarya' means Bait-ul-Muqaddas"

Now people with rational minds should recognise that Bait-ul-Muqaddas was not a village, but it was the first Qibla, and in the same way that the second Qibla is situated in a city, the first Qibla was also situated in a city.

The question no doubt comes to mind, "Why is there a dispute in the meanings of "Qarya"?"

Our response is that the defenders of the Sahaba want to prove that Fadak was not a large property hence taking a small piece of land was not such a contentious issue. They should of course accept the orders of the Qur'an, where we are told that:

And oppression is the biggest evil.

Why was it named Fadak?

We read in the esteemed Sunni works, "Maujam-ul-Buldan", v14, p240 and "Wafa-ul-Wafa", v4, page1281:

"This city was named Fadak, while the son of Adam (as) Ham first came to this place and he put the foundation of this city".

What was the value of property of Fadak?

Fourteen centuries have passed since the advent of Islam and historians, either due to their genuine inability or enmity towards Ahl'ul Bait, have never described it fully. That's why it is difficult to estimate the true value of this property. Nevertheless, we shall provide some historical facts, which will help to understand the income generated from this land.

The income from Fadak

In the authority work of Ahl'ul Sunnah, "Sunan Abu Dawud", v3, p144, Dhikr Fa'y, it is written:

"Abu Dawud says that when Umar bin Abdul-Aziz became Caliph, the income from the property of Fadak was 40,000 Dinars.

The land of Fadak and income from its dates

It is written in "Sharh Ibn Abi Al-Hadeed, v4, p108:

"Umar expelled the Jews from Fadak. And the value of land along with its dates was 50,000 Dirhams."

Blessings that came from the Dates of Fadak

Ibn Abi Al-Hadeed in Sharh Nahj ul Balagha wrote in v4, p108:

"There were eleven fruit trees in Fadak, that Rasulullah (s) planted with his own hand. The children of Fatima used to present them to Hajj pilgrims and they would give them Dinars and Dirhams for this service."

Did Imam Ridha (as) exaggerate over the size of Fadak?

The brilliant scholar Imam from Ansar.Org Muhammad al Khider presents this devastating proof as evidence that the Shi'as exaggerate over the size of Fadak:

Ansar.org states:

Al-Kulayni narrates in al-Kafi:
Abul Hasan [Imam 'Ali ar-Rida] came to [the 'Abbasid Khaleefah] al-Mahdi and saw him redressing grievances and returning property to its owners that was unrightfully appropriated). He [Imam Rida] asked, "What about our grievance? Why is it not returned?" Al-Mahdi asked. "And what might that be, Abul Hasan?" He replied, "When Allah granted his Prophet the conquest of Fadak..." Al-Mahdi asked, "Abul Hasan, describe to me the extent of this property." He [Imam Rida] replied, "One side of it is Mount Uhud. Another side is al-'Arish in Egypt. Another side is the coastline. Another side is Dawmat al-Jandal." (al-Kafi, Bab al-Fay' wal-Anfal, vol. 1 p. 543; also Bihar al-Anwar, vol. 48 p. 156)
How can a piece of land in Khaybar possibly fit this description? Is this the extent to which people will allow themselves to be duped and deceived?

Reply

This is a figurative term in the same way that the Ahl'ul Sunnah often claim that Umar spread Islam throughout the world, whilst in reality he did not even conquer the entire Asian Sub Continent. The need for such usage was because the Imam (as) was seeking to point out that Fadak was not the only thing that was usurped from the rightful heirs, there was also their legal entitlement to the rule of Islamic State. It is a matter of fact that the nascent Islamic State was stabilized via the financial benefits that had been gained from the lands of Khayber, that Sayyida Fatima (as) made a claim to. Prior to the conquest of Makka the Muslims did not had enough food to satiate their stomachs, the situation changed after this conquest and to this effect we read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 548, Chapter Military Expeditions led by the Prophet (s) (Al-Maghaazi):

Narrated Ibn Umar:

We did not eat our fill except after we had conquered Khaibar.

The Estates of Fadak and Khayber created financial stability for the Islamic State, and the Imam (as) was pointing out this significant fact through this figurative term.

The income of Fadak was used for military purposes

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's esteemed work Insanul Ayun fi Seerah al Halbeeya Volume 3, p487-488, Chapter "The death of the Prophet [s]"

"Umar was angry with Abu Bakr and said, "If you give Fadak back to Fatima, where

the expenses for army and defence will come from for at present all the Arabs are fighting against you. He then took the papers of Fadak from Fatima (as), and tore them into shreds".

 [Insanul Ayun fi Seerah al Halbeeya, Vol. 3, Page 487 & 488](#)

As we have shown, the historical facts are clear that Fadak was property from which not only one family could live easily, but which could help maintain the entire army. Tragically, the State usurped it so that its political opponents, the family of the Prophet (s), would be weakened and so prevent them from ever contemplating to oppose them.

2.3 The status of Fadak under the Shari'ah

There were several types of things, upon which Rasool Allah (saww) had a right to -E.g. Zakat, Ghanimat, Fay etc.

2.4 What is the difference between Ghanimah and Fay?

We read in Tafseer Kabeer, v8, p125, and Tafseer Muraghi, under the commentary of Surah Hashar:

"Ghanimah is that property (or money), in which Muslims had worked to get it, while Fay is that property (or money), in which Muslims didn't have to ride the horses and camels."

2.5 Fadak was the Fay Property

The Qur'an has ruled on the status of Fadak as property of Fay.

What Allah has bestowed on His Messenger (and taken away) from them - for this ye made no expedition with either cavalry or camelry (like Fadak): but Allah gives power to His messengers over any He pleases: and Allah has power over all things.
Al-Qur'an, Surah 59, Ayah 6, translated by Yusufali

2.6 Commentaries of the Qur'an confirm that Fadak was Fay property

1. Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 10 page 506
2. Tafseer Mazhari, p238
3. Tafseer Ruh Al-Ma'ani, Tafseer Surah Hashr.
4. Tafseer Muraghi, Tafseer Surah Hashr.
5. Tafseer Durr-e-Manthur, Tafseer Surah Hashr.
6. Tafseer Juwahir Tantawi, Tafseer Surah Hashr.

Imam Fakhrudeen Radhi writes in Tafseer Kabeer:

"This verse was revealed with regard to Fadak, which the Prophet (s) acquired as it was conquered without any fighting."

 [Tafseer al-Kabeer, Vol. 10, page 506](#)

Comment

From all these Sunni commentaries it is clear that Fadak was property of Fay, which the Prophet gave to Fatima Zahra (as) as a gift. But after the death of Allah's Apostle, Abu Bakr seized it by force. And Qur'an says:

الْأَخْسَارَ لَا يَزِيدُ الظَّالِمِينَ

2.7 How did the Prophet attain Fadak?

The following Sunni works shed light on this fact:

1. Fathul Buldan, p46, by Abi al-Hassan Baladhuri.
2. Mujmu ul Baldan, p139, v14
3. History of Tabari, v3, p1583
4. Tareekh Kamil, v2, p108, by Ibn Atheer Jazari
5. Tareekh Khamees, v2, page58, by Husayn Diyar Bakari.

All of the books record the following:

"When the Prophet (s) returned from Khayber, he sent Muhisa bin Masood to propagate Islam to the people of Khayber. The leader of the Jews of Khayber at that time was Yusha bin Nun. The people of Fadak refused to accept Islam, but offered to give them half of their Land of Fadak. The Prophet (s) took half the land and allowed them to live there. This half Land of Fadak was property of the Prophet (s), as the Muslims didn't ride horses over it".

Comment

There are several more references which show clearly that no battle was fought to conquer Fadak. The fathers of Hadhrat Ayesha and Hadhrat Hafsa neither rode their horses over this land, nor displayed their legendary bravery to acquire the land. The Prophet (s) acquired this land from the Jewish occupants who gave it to him in return of not being fought against.. He (s) presented it to his daughter Sayyida Fatima (as). It is indeed sad that after his death, the Shaykhayn failed to display their exemplary mercy and snatched it away from her.

الظالمون۔ پ، ابراهيم لا تحسين الله غافلا عما يعمل

2.8 The Prophet (s) owned all of Fadak

For proof we shall cite the following Sunni works:

1. Nawawi in Sharh Sahih Muslim, Volume 2, p92
2. Sunan Nasai, v7, p137
3. Wafa ul Wafa, v4, p1280
4. Sirat un Nabi by Ibn Hisham, v3, p353
5. Tareekh Abul Fida, p140, Dhikr Ghazwa Khayber

Imam Nawawi writes in his Sharh of Sahih Muslim:

"Half the Land of Fadak, which was given by Jews after the peace treaty, was purely the property of Rasool Allah (s). Similarly, 1/3rd of the Valley of Qari and 2 castles of Khayber were the exclusive property of the Prophet (s) and no one else had a share of it".

Comment

However as opposed to all other Sunni historians, Shah Waliyullah in "Quratul Ain" p228 and Ibn Taymeeya in his Minhaj al Sunnah, Dhikr of Fadak, both have impertinently refused to accept that Fadak was in possession of the Prophet (s). We have proven from 5 esteemed Sunni works that the Prophet (s) had exclusive ownership of Fadak.

Those who conceal the right of Sayyida Fatima (s) deserve the recital:

الكاذبين لعنة الله على

2.9 Umar also deemed Fadak to be the exclusive property of Rasulallah (s)

This is proven from al Farooq Volume 2 page 289-290 by Shams al Hind Allamah Shibli Numani:

"...after the conquest of Syria and Iraq Omar addressed the companions, he declare on the basis of the Holy Qur'an that the conquered territories were not the property of any man, but that they were a national trust, as has been discussed under Fay. However, from the verse of the Qur'an it appears that the lands of Fadak were the Holy Prophet's own property, and that Omar himself understood the verse to imply so: What Allah has made this people (i.e. Bani Nadir) deliver to his Apostle, to conquest which you did not lead any camels or horses, but Allah empowers his Apostles over who, he pleases". On reading this verse Omar declared that the land was reserved for the Holy Prophet. The matter is mentioned in Sahih al Bukhari in detail in the chapters on Khums al Maghazi and al Mirath"

 [Al-Farooq, Vol. 2, Page 289 & 290](#)

2.10 Was Abu Bakr merely implementing the will of Rasulullah (s)

The author of *'The Issue of Fedek: A rebuttal to common lies propagated against Ahl al-Sunnah regarding Ahlul-Bayt'* makes this curious unfounded claim in his article, namely that Abu Bakr used the land in exactly the same manner that Rasulullah (s) wished.

un named author states:

Ahmad Jawdat Pasha al-Lofji writes in his Qisas-e-Ambiya:

"Rasulullah Sallallahu alayhi wa Sallam devoted his date orchard named Fadak in Khaybar to the pious foundation and dictated how it was to be utilized. He advised in his will that income from the orchard should be given to foreign ambassadors, to visitors, guests and travellers. Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Radhi Allahu 'Anhu implemented this will during his Khaleefat".

Reply

The author's assertion that Khayber and Fadak were used for supporting guests, travellers and ambassadors is a complete lie. Let us see how Fadak and Khayber was utilised by Rasulullah. We read in Sahih Muslim, Bab ul Fai Book 019, Number 4347:

It has been narrated on the authority of Umar, who said: The properties abandoned by Banu Nadir were the ones which Allah bestowed upon His Apostle for which no expedition was undertaken either with cavalry or camelry. These properties were particularly meant for the Holy Prophet (may peace be upon him). He would meet the annual expenditure of his family from the income thereof, and would spend what remained for purchasing horses and weapons as preparation for Jihad.

Umar said that the land was given to support his family and for weapons, al Lofji claims that it was to meet the expenditure of foreign ambassadors, visitors, guests and travellers. Now the reader has to decide whose words are to be relied upon Umar or those of al Lofji?

If Abu Bakr was merely implementing the 'will' of Rasulullah (s) then how did he have possession of it and not his descendants? Who is to be in possession of the will after the death of the deceased, his legal heirs or the khalifa e waqt? Moreover If this Will ever existed then why wasn't this presented as evidence during the Fadak dispute? Why do we not find any Sunni sources proving that Abu Bakr produced this will, or made reference to the will of the Prophet (s)? This Nasibi Mullah has attribute something to Abu Bakr that he never himself claimed. At no time did Abu Bakr say that he was implementing the will of Rasulullah (s).

2.11 The means via which Sayyida Fatima (as) acquired Fadak

Allah declares in the Holy Qur'an:

And render to the kindred their due rights, as (also) to those in want, and to the wayfarer: But squander not (your wealth) in the manner of a spendthrift.

Al-Qur'an, Surah 17, Ayah 26, translated by Yusufali

Note:

Allah who owns every thing has provided a means for his Servants to acquire some of these things. Land e.g that is acquired without fighting is Fay and the Prophet (s) is it's sole owner. He could give it to whoever he pleased, either as a gift, or by any other mode. Accordingly, when this verse was revealed he (s) gave the land of Fadak to Fatima Zahra (as) under the order of Allah. This is proven from the following authority works of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

1. Tafseer Durre Manthur v4, p177
2. Kanzul Ummal, v2, p158
3. Lababul Naqool, p137, Sura Isra
4. Tafseer-e-Mazhari, in Tafseer of above mentioned verse
5. Tafseer Ruh Al-Ma'ani

In Tafseer of above mentioned verse:

"Abu Saeed al Khudri and Abdullah Ibn Abbas narrate that when the verse relating to giving rights to kindred was revealed, the Prophet called Fatima Zahra (as) and gifted the land of Fadak to her".

 [Tafseer Dur al-Manthur, Vol. 4, page 177](#)

2.12 Common objection raised by Abu Bakr's defenders

One of the objections raised by the sunni scholars to deny Syeda Fatimas right to the land of fadak is that Sura Isra (also known as Sura Bani Israel) is a Makkan Sura which incorporates the verse on giving close relatives their rights. Whereas Fadak was acquired in Madina. How is it that an incident that took place in Madina, is referred to in a Makkan verse?

Reply One

The present Qur'an was arranged during Uthman's era, he didn't arrange verses according to their revelation. As there is no specific proof (by any tradition) that this verse was revealed in Makka, it cannot be claimed as a Makkan verse.

Reply Two - Some verses were revealed in Makka as well as in Madina

There are several verses, which were revealed twice. Fakhrudeen Radhi for example stated that Surah Fateha descended in Makka and Madina. Similarly Ibn Hajar al Makki in "Sawaiqh-e-Muhriqa", page 102 writes:

"Akrama Khariji claimed that verse of "Muwaddah" was revealed in Makka, but the great scholar of Tafseer Ibne Abbas said that it was revealed in Madina.

Comment

Ibn Hajr is in effect stating that if the position of Ibn Abbas is correct, then this verse was revealed twice. We shall likewise advance that the verse of 'Dhul Qurba' was revealed twice.

Reply Three - The Qur'an contains Madani verses in Makkan Surah's

It is important to highlight here the legal position of the Quranic verses when it is to be decided whether a sura is Makkan or Madani.

While determining whether a quranic sura is makkan or madani it is seen whether it was revealed before the hijra or after it. If a sura has been revealed before hijra it is designated makkan no matter where the holy prophet was at the time of revelation. On the other hand if the sura is revealed after the hijra, it is considered madani no matter where the holy prophet was at the time of its revelation. However a problem arose with some quranic Suras whose revelation started in Makka (before Hijra) but which were completed after the Hijra (in Madina). To deal with such a situation, the unanimous agreement among the sunni scholars is that such Sura is to be considered Makkan as its revelation started before Hijra even though some of its portion has been revealed after Hijra. Acting on this accepted principle we can very safely say without any contradiction that the verse of quraba in Sura Isra had been revealed in Madina though the sura was first revealed before Hijra in Makka.

Umdah' thul Qari fi Sharh Sahih al Bukhari is an esteemed Sunni work. In its Volume 9, p202 we are told:

"These three Sunni scholars Maqatil, Qalabi and Ibn Abbas said that Surah Taghibun was a Makki Sura containing Madani verses."

The same position with regard to another Quranic verse is highlighted in the authority work of Ahl'ul Sunnah "Asbabul Nazool", p280 where it is written:

"Sura Shura is a Makki Surah but verse of "Muwaddat" is a Madani verse."

We shall accordingly advance that Sura Isra was a Makkan Surah that included "Dhul Qurba" a Madani verse.

Reply Four - The merits of Ayesha

In authority work of Ahl'ul Sunnah, "Lababul Naqool", p 137, Sura Isra, it is written:

"Once the Prophet (s) asked Ayesha to spend all that they had. Ayesha replied then nothing would be left for them. After that this verse was revealed "Wala taj'al". Allamah Suyuti writes that this verse is Madani"

Comment

The Verse of "Dhul Qurba" is 26th verse of Sura Isra. And the above mentioned verse "Wala taj'al" is 29th verse of Sura Isra. Since this verse showed the merits of Ayesha and proves that Ayesha was in the house of the Prophet (s) in Madina, the Nasibis accepted that this verse (in a Makkan Sura) was Madani not Makki.

We appeal to justice, when it comes to the rank of Ayesha it can be accepted that some verses

of a Makkan Surah were revealed in Madina, but when it comes to Fatima Zahra (as) her right is denied solely on the basis that the Surah is Makki, so the verse of "Dhul Qurba" could not have been revealed in Madina! Is this not a clear contradiction?

Reply Five

Even if we accept for the sake of argument that the verse ordering the prophet(s) to give his relatives their rights is a makkan verse and not madani this still does not negate Syeda Fatima's claim to the land of Fadak. We as muslims believe that the Quaran is a book whose every Aya is valid and applicable till the day of judgement. If a verse is revealed in Makka, does it lose its validity when the Prophet moves to madina? Of course any command by Allah to His Prophet holds good wherever the Prophet is and the Prophet is under an obligation to act upon it. If the Prophet gifted Fadak to his daughter in Madina, this was no doubt an implementation of the will of Allah.

2.13 The Prophet (s) also gave Fatima Zahra (as) a written instruction about Fadak

Following are the proofs from authority works of Ahl'ul-Sunnah:

1. Ruzatul Safa as quoted in Tashdheed-ul-Mathaeen page 102
2. Ma'arij-ul-Nabuwwah, part 4, chapter 10, page 228
3. Habeeb-us-Siyaar vol 1, Dhikr of Ghazwa-e-Khayber

The texts read as follows:

"Jibrael (as) came to Prophet Muhammad (s) and told him that Allah (swt) had ordered that he give the "Dhul Qurba" (close relatives) their rights. Rasulullah (s) asked who was meant from "Dhul Qurba" and what is meant from "Right".

Jibrael (as) replied that "Dhul Qurba" refers to Fatima Zahra (r), and from right it is meant the property of "Fadak".

The Prophet (s) called Fatima and presented Fadak to her giving her a written paper about it. This is the same written paper which was presented to Abu Bakr after the death of Rasool Allah (saww) by Fatima Zahra (as) and she said that it was the same written paper which the Prophet (s) wrote for her, Hasan and Husayn"

2.14 The contents of the written paper

In Fatawa Azizi, page 165, (published Karachi) al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz sets out the contents of the written document:

Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Abdul Muttalib bin Hashim bin Abd Manaf has given this piece of land, whose premises are known, to his daughter Fatima Zahra. And after her, this land is entrusted to her children. And anyone who denies it after hearing it, then it's sin is on his head. And Allah is "Sami" and "Aleem".

Comment

We have proved from 10 Sunni works that the Prophet (s) presented Fadak to Fatima Zahra (as) as a gift by the orders of Allah (swt) and it was in her possession. But the same Shah Abdul Aziz in "Tuhfa Ithna Ashari", "Shah Wali Ullah" in "Quratul Ain" and Ibn Taymeeya in "Minhaj-us-Sunnah" and their modern day apprentice al Khider in 'Fadak' continue to lie by denying this fact. May Allah's curse be upon these liars!

3. The claim of Sayyida Fatima (as)

3.1 Abu Bakr usurped the land of Fadak and Fatima Zahra (as) asked him for her Right

As evidence we have relied on the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 325 and Volume 5, Hadeeth number 546, pp 381-383
2. Sahih Muslim, Volume 2 page 72, Chapter 'Prophets leave no inheritance
3. Sunan Abu Dawood Book 19, Tribute, Spoils, and Rulership (Kitab Al-Kharaj, Wal-Fai' Wal-Imarah) Number 2967:
4. Sunan al Kabeera Volume 6 page 30 (published in Hyderabad)
5. Riyadh al Nadira Volume 4 page 231 (Baghdad publishers)
6. Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 21 Bab Muthaeen Abu Bakr
7. Maujam-ul-Buldan Volume 14 page 239, Dhikr Fadak
8. Tafseer Kabeer Volume 8 page 125 Ayat Fay
9. Kanz al Ummal Volume 3 page 129, Kitab al Khilafath ma al Imara
10. al Milal wa al Nihal Volume 1 page 18
11. al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 5 page 245
12. Tareekh Tabari Volume 4 page 1825
13. Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal Volume 1 page 158
14. Tareekh Khamees Volume 2 page 174
15. Futhu al Buldan page 44
16. Wafa al Wafa page 995
17. Tabaqat Ibn Sa'd (Book of the Major Classes, d. 852 AD.), Volume 2, page 392 translated by S. Moinul Haq assisted by H.K. Ghazanfar M.A.
18. Naseem al Riyadh, Sharh Shifa Qadhi Khan Volume 3 page 414

We read in Riyadh:

When the Prophet died, Abu Bakr took Fadak from Fatima. Fatima went to him and said 'Restore the land of Fadak to me, as my father the Prophet (s) gave it to me'.

Tafseer Kabeer:

When Rasulullah (s) died, Fatima claimed that Fadak was land bestowed to me by my father the Prophet (s); Abu Bakr said 'I don't know if you are telling the truth'.

We read in Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 325:

Narrated 'Ayesha: (mother of the believers) After the death of Allah's Apostle Fatima the daughter of Allah's Apostle asked Abu Bakr As-Siddiq to give her, her share of inheritance from what Allah's Apostle had left of the Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting) which Allah had given him. Abu Bakr said to her, "Allah's Apostle said, 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity).'" Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Apostle got angry and stopped speaking to Abu Bakr, and continued assuming that attitude till she died. Fatima remained alive for six months after the death of Allah's Apostle.

al-Bukhari under the Chapter of "The battle of Khaibar", Arabic-English,v5, tradition #546, pp 381-383, narrates from Ayesha that:

".. Fatimah became angry with Abu Bakr and kept away from him, and did not talk to him till she died. She remained alive for six months after the death of the Prophet. When she died, her husband 'Ali, buried her at night without informing Abu Bakr and he said the funeral prayer by himself".

Tabaqat Ibn Sa'd:

"... Verily Fatimah, the daughter of the apostle of Allah, may Allah bless him, sent (a message) to Abu Bakr asking him about her share in the inheritance of the Apostle of Allah, may Allah bless him, which Allah had bestowed on His Apostle as booty (without bloodshed). She at that time claimed (a share from) the (Arabic text) of the Prophet, at al-Mad'inah, Fadak and what had remained of the Khums of Khaybar. Thereupon Abu Bakr said: Verily, the Apostle of Allah, may Allah bless him, said: We do not leave inheritance, what we leave goes into sadaqah. Verily the members of Muhammad's family will get provision from this money. By Allah! I shall not change the distribution of the sadaqah of the Apostle of Allah from what it was in the time of Apostle of Allah, may Allah bless him. I shall continue to spend them under the same heads as the Apostle of Allah was spending. So Abu Bakr refused to give anything to Fatimah. Consequently Fatimah, may peace be on her, became angry with Abu Bakr and left him. She did not talk with him till she died. She lived six months after the Apostle of Allah, may Allah bless him."

We have proven from the most authentic Sunni work that Abu Bakr usurped the land of Fadak from Sayyida Fatima (as) and Sayyida Fatima demanded it back. Abu Bakr was not ready to give even an inch of land, and this so distressed Sayyida Fatima (as) she refused to talk to him until her dying day.

3.2 Sayyida Fatima (as) deemed Fadak to have been gifted to her

The lying Nasibi seeks to expose a flaw in the Shi'a argument as follows:

Ansar.org states:

All of the above concerns the status of Fadak as inheritance from Rasulullah . On the other hand, if it is maintained that Fadak was a gift from Rasulullah -as claimed by al-Kashani in his tafsir, as-Safi (vol. 3 p. 186)-the matter needs to be looked into.

This claim is first and foremost contradicted by authentic reports of both the Ahl as-Sunnah and the Shi'ah which state that Sayyidah Fatimah radiyallahu 'anha requested Fadak as her

inheritance from Rasulullah 'alayhi wa-alihi wasallam.

Reply

There is no contradiction over Sayyida Fatima (as) claiming Fadak as a gift and inheritance. The initial demand of Sayyida Fatima (as) was that Abu Bakr returns the land that had been gifted to her by her father. Sayyida Fatima (as) had the land in her possession but Abu Bakr ignored this and the written bequest of her father (s) and refused to return the land. Abu Bakr deemed the land as that of the Prophet which was in possession of his daughter held on trust as long as he (s) lived and which reverted back to the State upon his death. Sayyida Fatima (as) used this assertion to challenge Abu Bakr's right to control the land. After all he usurped the land on the basis that it belonged to the Prophet (s). Sayyida Fatima (as) was still entitled to the land as the Legal Heir so she had every right to make a claim on this basis. Abu Bakr refused her claim that the land was under her control, and he also rejected her claim that she was her father's Waris (legal heir). We shall now set out proofs that leave no doubt that Fadak was in fact the land that had been given to Sayyida Fatima (as) as a gift.

Proof One

The greatest proof that Fadak had been given as a gift to Sayyida Fatima (as) by Rasulullah (s), lies in the fact that she already had possession of the land at the time of her father's death. This would not have been the case if the land belonged to Rasulullah (s). Property which is given as a gift is handed over to the transferee at the time when gift is made (even before the death of the testator). Whereas the share in estate of deceased is taken hold of only after the death of the deceased. The fact that Syeda Fatima was already in possession of the land of fadak at the time of The Prophets death clearly shows that this land was given to her as a gift in the lifetime of her father and there was no question of its being treated as a share in inheritance.

We read in al Milal wa al Nihal page 13, wherein Allamah Sharastani discusses the disputes that arose following the death of Rasulullah (s):

"The 6th dispute concerned Fadak and the inheritance of Rasulullah (s). Sayyida Fatima deemed it her land, and the claim of Fatima to its ownership"

 [Al-Milal wa al-Nihal, page 13](#)

This reference proves that Fadak was not the same as the inheritance that Sayyida Fatima (as) was claiming. She (as) already had control of Fadak and now wanted her rights as Heir of her deceased father's Estate.

If Nasibi such as al Khider have lied to the maximum by claiming that Fadak had not been gifted to Sayyida Fatima (as) they should know that this claim is destroyed by the very testimony of the claimant herself. Sayyida Fatima (as)'s claim was that her father (s) had given Fadak to her, and this makes the comments of al Khider null and void. We have already cited this reference from Riyadh al Nadira Volume 4 page 231 (Baghdad publishers):

"When the Prophet died, Abu Bakr took Fadak from Fatima, she went to him and said "Restore the land of Fadak to me, as my father the Prophet (s) gave it to me".

We also read in Maujam-ul-Buldan Volume 14 page 239, Dhikr Fadak:

"After the death of the Prophet, Hadhrat Fatima [r] said to Abu Bakr, my father the

Prophet gave Fadak to me, restore it to me".

Fathul Buldan page 44:

"Sayyida Fatima said to Abu Bakr, the land of Fadak was given to me, as my father gave it to me".

What greater proof can there be than the claim brought by Sayyida Fatima (as) **"Restore the land of Fadak to me, as my father the Prophet (s) gave it to me"** she could not have advanced such a claim without having possession of this land at the time, no common person would make a claim that is baseless, particularly when they know that they will be proven wrong.

Proof Two - Abu Bakr accepted Sayyida Fatima's existing possession of Fadak

If it was not in her possession then why didn't Abu Bakr point this out to Sayyida Fatima (as)? Al Mihāl proves that Sayyida Fatima (as) had the land in her possession. Why didn't Abu Bakr dismiss this claim straight away, stating 'You never had possession of Fadak'? The fact that he didn't challenge this aspect of Sayyida Fatima (as)'s claim serves as proof that the land was in her possession.

Proof Three - If Sayyida Fatima (as) had no control of Fadak why did Abu Bakr give written instruction that it be restored to her?

We read in Seerah al Halbeeya Volume 2 page 488:

"Sibt ibn Jauzi narrates that after Fatima made her claim to the ownership of Fadak, Abu Bakr heard her claim and Abu Bakr left a written instruction that it be restored to her, then Umar came to Abu Bakr, and asked 'Who is this document for?' The Khalifa said 'It's with regards to Fadak this is a written document for Fatima in relation to her father's inheritance. Umar said 'then how will you spend for the Muslims, when the Arabs are preparing to fight you, Umar then took the document and ripped it up".

 [Insan al-Ayun fi Seerah al-Halbeeyah, Vol. 3, page 487 & 488](#)

Comment

This proves that the Hadith *'Prophet's leave no inheritance'* is a lie, since Abu Bakr did in fact accept the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as). If the Hadeeth proves the correctness of Abu Bakr's position, then Al Khider's assertion is a lie, since al Mihāl confirms that the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) was over her ownership of Fadak, Abu Bakr accepted this claim.

Proof Four - Maula 'Ali confirmed that Sayyida Fatima already had control of Fadak

The greatest proof that Fadak was in the possession of Ahl'ul bayt (as) comes from the comments of Maula 'Ali (as). We are quoting from the Sunni commentary of Nahj ul Balagha page 45 letter to Abi Uthman bin Haneef Ansari:

"Of course, all that we had in our possession under this sky was Fadak, but a group

of people felt greedy for it and the other party withheld themselves from it. Allah is, after all, the best arbiter."

Comment

Maula Ali said Fadak was in his hands, anything in one's hands is one's possession, and this destroys the assertion of liars such as al Afriki, who claim that the Shi'a lie when they claim Sayyida Fatima (as) had been gifted with Fadak during the lifetime of Rasulullah (s).

Proof Five - Rasulullah (s) gave Fadak to Sayyida Fatima (as) during his lifetime

Further proof can be ascertained from Sunan Abu Dawood Book 19, Tribute, Spoils, and Rulership (Kitab Al-Kharaj, Wal-Fai' Wal-Imarah), Hadeeth Number 2998:

"...Banu an-Nadir were deported, and they took with them whatever their camels could carry, that is, their property, the doors of their houses, and their wood. Palm-trees were exclusively reserved for the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him). Allah bestowed them upon him and gave them him as a special portion.

He (Allah), the Exalted, said: What Allah has bestowed on His Apostle (and taken away) from them, for this ye made no expedition with either camel corps or cavalry." He said: "Without fighting." So the Prophet (peace be upon him) gave most of it to the emigrants and divided it among them; and he divided some of it between two men from the helpers, who were needy, and he did not divide it among any of the helpers except those two. The rest of it survived as the sadaqah of the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) which is in the hands of the descendants of Fatimah (Allah be pleased with her)".

Proof Six - Maula 'Ali (as) told Abu Bakr that the Prophet (s) had given Fadak to her during her lifetime

As evidence we shall quote directly from the article 'Early Differences and Sects in Islam' - adapted largely from *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq (The Difference between the Sects)* by Abu Tahir `Abd al-Qahir al-Baghdadi that appears on this Sunni Website:

 <http://webpages.marshall.edu/~laher1/firaq.html> - [Cached](#)

"Next, they differed regarding inheritance of the land of Fadak. This was a piece of land which the Prophet had acquired as a form of booty, and which he retained during his lifetime. When he passed away, `Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) said that the Prophet (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) had assigned it to Fatimah (may Allah be pleased with her) during his lifetime".

Comment

The claim of Maula 'Ali (as) before Abu Bakr that Rasulullah (s) gave Fadak to Sayyida Fatima (as) during his lifetime, proves that she had existing possession of it, it was no inheritance.

Proof Seven - If Sayyida Fatima (as) had no control over Fadak then Umar ibn Abdul Aziz would not have returned it to the descendants of Sayyida Fatima (as)

We read in Wafa al Wafa page 99:

"When Umar Ibn Abdul Aziz became Khalifa he restored the land of Fadak to the descendants of Sayyida Fatima, and wrote to his representative in Madina on this regards"

Comment

One can only restore something to someone who had an existing control, and that is why Umar Ibn Abdul Aziz returned Fadak to the descendants of Sayyida Fatima (as).

In 'A short history of Islam' Sunni scholar Dr A. Rahim page 168, Chapter Umar II, provides a worryingly poor representation of facts whilst praising Umar ibn Abdul Aziz. He writes:

"Umar II was very fair and generous to the members of 'Ali's family. He restored to them the property of Fadak which was appropriated by Marwan".

If only this scholar had looked into the truth of the matter! Marwan did not misappropriate Fadak. Poor destitute Marwan was gifted this land from his kind hearted relative, who happened to also be the Khaleefa of the time Uthman ibn al Affan. Uthman took control of it following Umar's death, who had it following Abu Bakr's death. It was Abu Bakr who misappropriated Fadak, which Umar ibn Abdul Aziz then returned to the children of Fatima (as), and the author has shown maximum dishonesty as part of his efforts to protect Abu Bakr's actions.

Proof Eight - If Sayyida Fatima (as) had no control of Fadak then the Just Khaleefa and Hafidh of the Qur'an Mamun would not have restored the land to the descendants of Sayyida Fatima (as)

As evidence we shall rely on the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Fathul Buldan page 46
2. Wafa al Wafa page 999

We are quoting from Fathul Buldan page 46-47:

"In 210 Hijri Ammerul Mmineen Mamun gave an order that Fadak be given to the family of Fatima. This order was given to his representative in Madina Quthum bin Jafar. I Commander of the Faithful as the successor of the Prophet have a duty to follow the way of the Prophet in implementing Allah's laws. Anything or Sadaqah that the Prophet (s) gave must be given by the Commander of the Faithful, all his virtues come from Allah, and my aim is to do that which pleases my Creator. I have found that the Prophet (s) gave Fadak as a gift to his daughter and made her the sole owner and this is such a clear matter that carries no doubt amongst the Prophet's family. Verily the Commander of the Faithful deems it correct to return Fadak to the descendants of Fatima so as to implement the Justice of Allah (swt) and get closer to him in the process, and implement the order of the Prophet (s) and attain a good reward. The Commander of the Faithful gives order that the return of

Fadak be recorded in a Register and that this Order be sent to employees. Since the death of the Prophet (s) the tradition has remained that Pilgrims on Hajj give an invitation to the People to claim anything Prophet (s) gave as Sadaqah or gift to the People, their words would be accepted, in this circumstance Sayyida Fatima has a greater right that her claim regarding the possession of Fadak after the Prophet (s) be accepted. The Khaleefa has told his Servant Mubarak Tabari 'Return Fadak to the Waris of Fatima, all its boundaries, rights, production and Servants should be returned. Muhammad bin Yahya bin Husayn bin Zaid bin 'Ali bin Husayn bin 'Ali Ibn Abi Talib and Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Husayn bin Ali bin Abi Talib, have been appointed by the Commander of the Faithful as Agents over Fadak. Verily you should be made aware that this is the opinion of the Commander of the Faithful and this is that which has come to him from Allah (swt) so as to receive the blessing of Allah and his Prophet. Your subordinates should be informed that Muhammad bin Yahya and Muhammad bin Abdullah be treated in the same manner as you dealt with Mubarak Tabari, these two should be supported with the production processes, profits should given to them so as to attain reward from Allah (swt). Wasallam Wednesday 2nd Zeekat 210 Hijri"

Comment

If Sayyida Fatima (as) had no control of Fadak then this Sunni Khaleefa would not have restored it to her descendants.

Proof Nine - The verse 'Dhul Qurba' proves that Fadak had been gifted to Sayyida Fatima (as)

Al Khider can bark all he likes but the bottom line is when this verse descended it was incumbent upon Rasulallah (s) to act upon it, and give Sayyida Fatima (as) her rights. We have established from the authentic works of Ahl'ul Sunnah that Rasulallah acted upon this verse accordingly, by gifting the land of Fadak to Sayyida Fatima (as). Possession occurs when a thing is handed over without any conditions. Rasulallah (s) never took it back, nor personally administered it after gifting it to Sayyida Fatima (as).

An appeal to justice

If Sayyida Fatima (as) did not have an existing possession of Fadak:

1. Sayyida Fatima (as) would not have made such a claim.
2. Why did the other Sahaba and Wives of Rasulallah (s) remain silent? It would have been incumbent on them to interject and point out that she had no existing possession of the land.
3. Maula 'Ali (as) would not have permitted Sayyida Fatima (as) to make such a claim in court, nor would he (s) had testified in her favour.
4. Imam Hassan (as) & Imam Hassain (as) would not have testified in favour of their mother.
5. Why didn't Abu Bakr challenge the assertion and demand that she present witnesses confirming her existing possession of the land ?

3.3 Al Khider's attempts to use logic to refute the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as)

As part of his massive effort to reject the notion that Sayyida Fatima (as) had no possession of Fadak as a gift, al Khider asserts:

Ansar.org states:

However, even if this claim is assumed to be an authentic one, we still cannot accept it. We cannot accept it since it is diametrically opposed to the precept of parental fairness to children espoused by Islam.

The Sahabi Bashir ibn Sa'd came to Rasulullah 'alayhi wa-alihi wasallam, telling him that he had given one of his sons a garden as a gift, and requesting Rasulullah to be witness thereto. Rasulullah asked whether he had given a similar gift to all of his children. When he replied in that he had not in fact done so, Rasulullah 'alayhi wa-alihi wasallam told him, "Go away, for I will not be a witness to injustice." (Sahih Muslim, Kitab al-Hibat, no. 14)

Rasulullah denounced the act of giving one child more than the other as injustice. Is it then at all plausible that one such as he, as an infallible Nabi who refuses to be witness to injustice, would himself perpetrate that injustice? Is it imaginable that he, who is entrusted with the Trust of the Heavens, could breach a mundane trust of this world by giving Fadak as a gift to Fatimah alone amongst all his daughters? We all know that Khaybar was taken in the 7th year after the Hijrah, and that Zaynab died in the 8th year, and Umm Kulthum in the 9th year after the Hijrah. How can it then be thought that Rasulullah would give something to Fatimah but not to his other daughters?

Reply One - This is the greatest proof that no other daughters existed

If anything this serves as the greatest proof that Sayyida Fatima (as) was the sole daughter of Rasulullah (s). If these daughters indeed existed then Rasulullah (s) would have certainly apportioned them their share of inheritance as he had done with Sayyida Fatima (as). The very fact that we have no historical evidence of him ever giving them anything as a gift / inheritance is the clearest evidence that they did not exist. If they did exist then we have to accept that Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s) were unjust. After all the same Prophet (s) who marries Sayyida Fatima (as) according to revelation from Allah (swt) marries the other three daughters to kaafirs!

The same Prophet that showered all manner of honour on Sayyida Fatima (as) deeming her

pain to be on par with his, giving her the title Leader of the Women of Paradise does not bother to relay even a single Hadith in praise of his other daughters. Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work Mishkat al Masabeeh, under the Chapter 'Bab Fadail Ahl'ul bayt' has 49 traditions with regard of the relatives of the Prophet including his uncle Abbas, even his adopted son Zaid. Curiously the author of a book that takes traditions from TEN esteemed Sunni works fails to cite even a single Hadeeth on the "other daughters" in this chapter.

Reply Two - Maula 'Ali (as) was the only son in law of the Prophet (s)

The truth is that Maula 'Ali (as) was the only son in law of the Prophet (s) as we read in 'Riyadh al Nadira' Volume 3 page 220, Dhikr Fadail 'Ali:

Rasulullah (s) said to 'Ali 'You possess three virtues not possessed by anyone else

1. You have a father in law like me.
2. You have received my truthful daughter as your wife
3. You have received pious sons such as Hassan and Husayn

Comment

This virtue (Rasulullah being father in law) would not be exclusive if Rasululllah (s) also had other son in laws! If Nawasib try to argue that Uthman's marriage may have occurred later we should point out that according to the Ahl'ul Sunnah the daughters of Rasululllah (s) were married long before Sayyida Fatima (as), and were the wives of two of Abu Jahl's sons. Rasululllah (s) could not have praised 'Ali (as) for this exclusive honour if he had other sons in law!

Reply Three - The title Dhul Nurayn [possessor of two lights] cannot be located in the authentic Sunni works

The famed title of Uthman 'Dhul Nurayn' coming from the mouth of the Prophet (s)(as asserted by sunnis) is not present in any of the six esteemed works of Ahl'ul Sunnah. When the very existence of these daughters cannot be established then how can we accept that Uthman was the possessor of two lights?

Reply Four - The Nasibi don't even believe the Prophet (s) was created from Nur

It is indeed ironic that the Salafi and Deobandi Nawasib reject the notion of our Prophet (s) being created from Nur (Light), rather they deem him an ordinary human like us created from mud. Curiously when it comes to honouring Uthman suddenly he is deemed Dhul Nurayn 'the possessor of two lights'. If Prophet (s) is not 'Light' then how can Uthman become the possessor of 'Two Lights'? How can this then be used as an excuse that he married the 'supposed' two daughters of the Prophet (s)?

Reply Five - The Ah'lul Sunnah believe that the Prophet (s) was unjust!

We would urge Al Khider to abandon using such principles of logic when debating with us. Particularly when your esteemed works paint the picture of Rasulallah (s) being unjust to his wives. See Sahih al Muslim Bab Fadil Sahaba Book 031, Number 5984:

A'isha, the wife of Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him), said: The wives of Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) sent Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him), to Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him). She sought permission to get in as he had been lying with me in my mantle. He gave her permission and she said: Allah's Messenger, verily, your wives have sent me to you in order to ask you to observe equity in case of the daughter of Abu Quhafa. She ('A'isha) said: I kept quiet. Thereupon Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said to her (Fatima): O daughter, don't you love whom I love? She said: Yes, (I do). Thereupon he said: I love this one. Fatima then stood up as she heard this from Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) and went to the wives of Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) and informed them of what she had said to him and what Allah's messenger (may peace be upon him) had said to her. Thereupon they said to her: We think that you have been of no avail to us. You may again go to Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) and tell him that his wives seek equity in case of the daughter of Abu Quhafa. Fatima said: By Allah, I will never talk to him about this matter. 'A'isha (further) reported: The wives of Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) then sent Zainab b. jahsh, the wife of Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him), and she was one who was somewhat equal in rank with me in the eyes of Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) and I have never seen a woman more advanced in religious piety than Zainab, more God-conscious, more truthful, more alive to the ties of blood, more generous and having more sense of self-sacrifice in practical life and having more charitable disposition and thus more close to God, the Exalted, than her. She, however, lost temper very soon but was soon calm. Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) permitted her to enter as she ('A'isha) was along with Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) in her mantle, in the same very state when Fatima had entered. She said: Allah's Messenger, your wives have sent me to you seeking equity in case of the daughter of Abu Quhafa. She then came to me and showed harshness to me and I was seeing the eyes of Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) whether he would permit me. Zainab went on until I came to know that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) would not disapprove if I retorted. Then I exchanged hot words until I made her quiet. Thereupon Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) smiled and said: She is the daughter of Abu Bakr.'" This Hadeeth has also been narrated on the authority of Zuhri with the same chain of transmitters, but with a slight variation of wording.

Comment

Sayyida Fatima (s) appeals on behalf of the prophet's wives that he be just to them all and not show favouritism

Rasulullah doesn't deny this to be the case, but rather says *'She is the daughter of Abu Bakr'*

Now the Shari'i view on equity to wives is as follows:

1. **"Marry women of your choice, Two or three or four; but if ye fear that ye shall not be able to deal justly (with them), then only one, or (a captive) that your right hands possess, that will be more suitable, to prevent you from doing injustice," (4:3)"**

Rasulullah (s) was unjust to his wives giving preference to Ayesha so did he contradict the Qur'an?

2. We read in Sunan Abu Dawood Bab ul Nikah Book 11, Number 2128:

The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: When a man has two wives and he is inclined to one of them, he will come on the Day of resurrection with a side hanging down.

In light of the tradition are we to therefore conclude that Rasulallah (s) was inclined to Ayesha more, even though this contradicted the Qur'an and Sunnah?

We ask Al Khider to look at this reference closely. In their efforts to praise Ayesha sunni Ulema have accepted that Rasulallah (s) abandoned the principles of equity. Clearly if (according to Ahl'ul Sunnah) Rasulallah (s) was unjust to his wives they can't rule out the possibility of him being unjust to his daughters also!

3.4 Abu Bakr had no right to seize land under Sayyida Fatima (as)'s possession

If Abu Bakr was indeed the rightful Khaleefa of Rasulallah (s), then he only had a right to control those lands that were in the possession of Rasulallah (s) prior to his death. This was not the case with Fadak; it was in the hands of Sayyida Fatima (as), so what right did he have to interfere in land that was in her possession? Hadhrat Abu Bakr should have had a different approach, enquiring into the matter and then deciding *'if the truth is established then I shall seize the land'*. Abu Bakr's failure to make a claim, in the absence of proof, and decision to annex the land of another person cannot be deemed appropriate behaviour by the State.

4. Abu Bakr's rejection of witnesses' testimony

The author of Fedak asserts:

un names author states:

Ibne Mutahhir Hilli, a famous Shi'i clergyman (who was educated by Ahlus-Sunnah 'Ulema), states in his book, Minhaj al-Karamah, "When Fatimah said to Abu Bakr that Fedek had been bequeathed to her, Abu Bakr wrote an answer asking for witnesses. When no witnesses were produced he dismissed the case." If this report is correct, the case of Fedek, like any other case pertaining to inheritance, gifting or bequeathing, lapses from Hadhrat Abu Bakr (Radhi Allahu Ta'ala Anhu). So, there is no reason for blaming Hadhrat Abu Bakr even from their own books in addition to the actions taken by the Ahlul-Bayt A'immah.

First and foremost Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi said that '**proof that a Hadeeth is correct comes from corroboration from a Hadeeth scholar**'. This narration carries no chain, and contradicts all the major Sunni and Shi'a sources that confirm that witnesses were produced, and this was even acknowledged by a die hard Sunni scholar such as Ibn Hajr al Makki. We also know from Sunni and Shi'a sources that the Fadak dispute did NOT occur via written correspondence between the parties, it was face to face and there is a complete unanimity on this point with Ahl'ul Sunnah's greatest masterpiece Sahih al Bukhari confirming it. This comment is not in line with what has been acknowledged in Sunni and Shi'a works and is therefore without foundation. In the same article this mystery writer asserts confidently:

un names author states:

Claim

It is stated in a Hadeeth ash-Sharif, "What we leave behind is to become alms." The so-called allegation of a will could not be true in light of this Hadeeth ash-Sharif. If there had been such a will and Hadhrat Abu Bakr had not heard about it, he would not have been held excusable unless it had been proven by testimony.

The irony of the matter lies in the fact that **it was proven by witness testimony**. Sayyida Fatima (as) brought forth witnesses to corroborate her claim, and he still rejected her claim. The scholars of Ahl'ul Sunnah do not deny that witnesses were presented (as this Nasibi is claiming). They state that (for various reasons) those testimonies were not accepted.

One of the main defences that Abu Bakr's advocates like Ibn Hajr al Makki on the Fadak dispute present is that the number of witnesses required were not met. This is mentioned in the following authentic Sunni works:

1. Sharh ibn al Hadeed Volume 4 page 113
2. Fathul Buldan page 44-45 printed 1350 Hijri, Egypt.
3. Tafseer Kabeer Volume 10 page 506

4. Seerath al Halabeeya Volume 3 page 498
5. Sharh Muwaqqaf page 735
6. Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 22 Bab Mathaeen Abu Bakr
7. Maujam-ul-Buldan Volume 4 page 239
8. Wafa al Wafa Volume 3 page 999 Bab Sadaqath un Nabi

We read in Fathul Buldan:

"Malik bin Jawad narrates from his father that Fatima said to Abu Bakr 'Rasulullah (s) bestowed Fadak to me, so return it. 'Ali testified in her favour, Abu Bakr asked for another witness, and Umm Ayman testified in support of Fatima. Upon this Abu Bakr said 'O daughter of Rasulullah (s) such testimony is unacceptable unless you have two males or one male and two females, upon hearing this Fatima left. It has reached us, via a chain through to Muhammad bin Jafar bin Muhammad that Fatima said to Abu Bakr, 'Return Fadak to me as it was given to me by Rasulullah (s)'. Abu Bakr demanded witnesses and Umm Ayman and Rabah the Servant of Rasulullah (s) testified in support of her claim. He said that such testimonies were unacceptable unless presented by one man and two women.

Umm Hani states that Fatima daughter of Rasulullah (s) appeared before the Court of Abu Bakr and asked 'When you die who shall act as your Waris?' He replied 'My family and descendants'. Upon hearing this Fatima said 'What is your stance when you seize the inheritance of the Prophet (s) and do not give it to us?' He said 'I heard Rasulullah (s) say that 'Gold and Silver are not included in inheritance' he did not take this or that. Fatima then said 'Give us our share of Khayber, Fadak is our exclusive control'. He [Abu Bakr] replied 'Daughter of Rasulullah (s) I heard the Prophet (s) say that Fadak is a 'Pillar that Allah (swt) has provided for me as a source of earnings during my lifetime, verily when I die, distribute this amongst the Muslims!."

Tafseer Kabeer:

"After the death of Rasulullah (s), Fatima raised the issue of Fadak, Abu Bakr said 'I don't know if you are telling the truth'. Fatima brought forwards a female servant called Umma Ayman and a male Servant called Rabah. Abu Bakr said 'bring forth another witness whose word is acceptable'.

 [Tafseer al-Kabeer, Vol. 10, page 506](#)

Wafa al Wafa:

"Fadak was that land that Hadhrat Fatima claimed Rasulullah (s) had given to me. Abu Bakr demanded witnesses. 'Ali and Umm Ayman testified. The Khaleefa replied 'Only the testimony of a man and two women are acceptable'".

We read in Seerath Halbeeya:

"Abu Bakr asked Fatima to produce witnesses to corroborate her claim that Fadak had been given to her. Abu Bakr said 'Do you have any proof? 'Ali gave testimony as did Umm Ayman. Abu Bakr said the witness numbers are not met by the testimony of a male and female. The Shi'a say that Fatima [r] was Masum due to the verse of purification and the words of the Prophet (s) 'Fatima is a part of me', and [they say] that Hasan, Husayn and Umme Kalthum also gave testimonies. That which was said [about Fatima] was merely figurative and said out of love, children are not

permitted to testify in favour of their parents.

 [Insan al-Ayun fi Seerah al-Halbeeyah, Vol. 3, page 487 & 488](#)

Sharh Muwaffaq:

"If its advanced that Fatima claimed that Rasulullah had bestowed Fadak to her and that 'Ali, Hassan, Husayn, Umme Kalthum testified in her favour, and that its true that Umm Ayman testified, and that Abu Bakr's rejection of their testimonies prove that he was unjust, then we say Hassan and Husayn were rejected because they were offspring and underage, this leaves 'Ali and Umm Ayman, it was unacceptable as their stipulated numbers were not met"

If the Nasibi are still not convinced then we now present the admission of Ibn Hajr al Makki in his Sawaiqh al Muhriqa, Page 138 & 139. He defends Abu Bakr as follows:

Fatima made a claim that Rasulullah (s) left Fadak for her and she presented the testimonies of Umm Ayman and 'Ali in her favour, yet the criteria for witness numbers was not met. There are differences amongst the scholars as to whether a husband can testify in favour of a claim made by his wife. It can also be said that Fatima did not ask her witnesses to make a claim on oath. People have also said that Hassan, Husayn and Umm Kalthum testified in support of Fatima's claim, this is Batil, the testimony of offspring or underage children in favour of their parents is unacceptable.

 [Sawaiq al-Muhriqa, Page 138 & 139](#)

Ibn Hajr was a major defender of Abu Bakr and opponent of the Shi'a. We will Inshallah address his defence in this chapter, but the key point worthy of note is the fact that he accepts that Sayyida Fatima made a claim to her father's Estate of Fadak via the rules of inheritance - and that this claim was made before Abu Bakr. She (as) also presented Imam 'Ali (as), Hassan (as), Husayn (as), Umm Ayman and Umme Kalthum (as) as witnesses to corroborate her claim, but he rejected all of them.

Comment

We have proven from eight authentic Sunni works that Sayyida Fatima made her claim to the Estate of Fadak, and that Hadhrat 'Ali (as), Hassan (as), Husayn (as), Umme Kalthum(as), Umm Ayman and Rabah testified in her favour.

4.1 Abu Bakr's demanding witnesses is proof that he did not deny her control of the land

Al Khider rejects the notion that Sayyida Fatima (as) had possession of Fadak during the lifetime of her father, if Abu Bakr held this view he would have no doubt told her and dismissed the case forthwith, after all why demand witnesses when you know she did not have existing possession of the land? Abu Bakr's demanding witness testimony serves as proof that he did not dismiss that land belonged to Sayyida Fatima (as), and demonstrates his uncertainty over whether the land belonged to the Muslims.

4.2 Heirs have the right to demand witnesses on matters of inheritance, not a Judge

Abu Bakr had no right to reject the assertion that the land had been bestowed to Sayyida

Fatima (as). This was a matter that concerned the heirs, let us give an example:

"The deceased is survived by two Heirs. One Heir makes a claim that my father had bequeathed this property to me, this claim affects the other Heir nobody else".

Upon the death of Rasulullah (s) no other Heir challenged the claim that had been made by Sayyida Fatima (as), not then, nor at any other time. No other claimants came forward either, so what was the use in Abu Bakr seeking to locate witnesses? If it was only for the purposes of having a thorough investigation, he could have located the other Heirs, if they upheld the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as), then the matter would have been settled there and then.

4.3 An Executor administering the deceased's Estate has the right to initiate inquiry not a Judge

We read in this Sunni Site:

'Common errors and solutions pertaining to inheritance and winding up of estates'

 <http://www.eastcoast.co.za/muawiya/inherit.html> - [Cached](#)

A person who is appointed by someone to take charge of his affairs after his death is known as the wasiy' (executor / trustee). The wasiy' will be responsible for the winding-up of the estate of the deceased, which includes the payment of debts, distribution of the inheritance and taking care of matters relating to the family of the deceased.

The wasiy' (executor) has an extremely delicate task to fulfil. His position is one of total trust. A person is only appointed as a wasiy' by the deceased, due to his reliance upon the former and his trust in him. Since the one who appoints a wasiy' realises that he will be in his grave when the executor takes charge, he very carefully selects such a person as a wasiy' who he expects will work in the best interests of the heirs and who will ensure that all the matters are executed properly. Thus to abuse this position of trust is the height of deception and dishonesty. Therefore, in such a matter it is imperative to a much greater extent that one should at all times remember his being accountable to Allah Ta'ala.

Comment

There is no evidence that Abu Bakr had been appointed as the Executor of the Prophet (s) who would administer the distribution of his Estate after him. There is absolutely no Hadeeth to confirm this and we challenge the Ahl'ul Sunnah to produce us a single authentic Hadeeth proving that the Prophet (s) ordered Abu Bakr to take charge of his Estate as his Wasi after him. If anyone had been appointed as the Executor of Rasulullah (s) it was Maula 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (as) for the Prophet (s) declared at the at the Feast of Kinsmen before his close relatives the following about Hadhrath 'Ali:

"This is my brother, Wasi (agent) and successor among you. Listen to him and obey him".

This can be located in the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Tareekh Tabari, (English translation) by W.M.Watt, Vol 6 pp 90-91
2. Tafseer Tabari Vol 19, p 121

3. Tareekh ibn Atheer, Vol 2 p 62
4. Musnad Ahmed Ibn Hanbal, Vol 1 p 159
5. Khasais, by al Nasai, p 18

The Sunni website also says that paying debts is one of the main tasks of Wasi/executer. Now if we look who was given the authority of paying debts of Prophet(s), we will know who was His(s) true Wasi.

Imam Ali (as) said that he heard the Messenger of Allah (as) saying:

I have granted in Ali five things, none of which was granted to any Prophet (s) before me. One of these is that Ali will repay my debts and will bury me.

This Hadeeth has been recorded in the following Sunni works:

1. Musnad of Imam Ahmed, v5, p45
2. Musnad of Imam Ahmed, v6, p155
3. Kanz al-Ummal, v6, pp 153,155,404

We learn that Imam 'Ali (as) then fulfilled this duty as Wasi at a practical level following the death of the Prophet (s). We read in Tabaqat ibn Sad Volume 2 page 396:

"Muhammad ibn - 'Abd Allah ibn Jafar - Abdul Wahid ibn Abi Awn - "When the Prophet died, 'Ali ordered a crier to cry if there was any to whom the Apostle of Allah, owed anything or to whom he had made a promise, he should come to him. He continued to his death sending one crier to every Festival of Sacrifice al Al-'Aqabah to proclaim it. Then al Hasan ibn 'Ali followed him (i.e. this practice) till he died. Then Al Husayn did it and the practise ceased after him".

Hence the role of administering the Estate of the Prophet (s) fell on the shoulders of Maula 'Ali (as), no one else. Abu Bakr had no right to intervene in this matter, appoint himself Executor, take control of the deceased's land and refuse to return it to his legal heir. If any enquiry was to be conducted it had to be done by Hadhrat 'Ali (as) and no one else. If the argument is advanced that Abu Bakr's role as Khaleefa made him the Executor of the Prophet's Estate, the prophet(saww) left no inheritance to be distributed, then we will say that this would make him the Wasi of the Prophet's Seat [Khilafath] nothing else! The Prophet (s) explicitly appointed Maula 'Ali (as) as his Wasi so if anyone was going to distribute the Prophet's belongings / land subject to his wishes that was the duty of Maula 'Ali NOT Abu Bakr! If Imam 'Ali (as) as the Wasi was unsure over an heir's assertion that land had been bequeathed to them, then it was as Wasi perfectly within his rights to bring the matter to the court of law as it was his duty to distribute inheritance in accordance with the wishes of the Holy Prophet(s). This serves as clear proof that Abu Bakr interfered in a matter that he had no right under the Shari'ah to do.

4.4 Abu Bakr as Judge had no right to demand witness corroboration

Abu Bakr had no right to adjudicate over this matter. The claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) was against Abu Bakr, or at minimum was against the State, that was lead by Abu Bakr. In either case Abu Bakr came within both i,e he was a party to the action. It is a settled rule of law that the Head of a State does not both contest and rule on a matter that is challenging his initial decision. No just legal system allows a party to an action to adjudicate over it. Place yourself in

the shoes of Sayyida Fatima (as):

"You own a plot of land that your father had given to you as a birthday present. The land is rich in agriculture and supports the finances of you and your family. One morning you decide to visit the plot to see how the produce is harvesting, and notice that Council Officers are walking along the land, taking the produce away. You see a Notice on the land stating 'This Property belongs to the Local Authority'. You are absolutely outraged and immediately make a formal complaint to the Chief Executive of the Local Authority, he replies 'I as Chief Executive of the Local Authority have taken the decision to take charge of the land, as I was a close friend of your father, and he told me that he didn't want to leave any inheritance, all that he owned should be handed over to the poor and destitute in the community'. You find this somewhat unusual; after all wouldn't your father have conveyed this information to you? Angered you decide to challenge this assertion, the laws of inheritance make you the legal Heir of this property and you decide to challenge this confiscation in a Court of Law, setting out your case before a fair, impartial Judge. You enter the Court and find that the Judge is the same Chief Executive who annexed your land in the first place".

Ask yourself:

1. Would you deem this to be a 'fair trial?'
2. There is a principle enshrined in English Law 'Justice should not only be done, but should undoubtedly and manifestly be seen to be done' - Has justice been seen to be done here?
3. Is it appropriate for a Judge to rule on the correctness of a decision taken by him?

In the same way that Abu Bakr would seek to resolve other matters by consulting the Sahaba, he should have gathered the Muslims in the Mosque, informed them of the dispute and appointed a Judge, where Khaleefa Abu Bakr would have been given the opportunity to advocate his stance. This was the approach of Rightful Khaleefa 'Ali (as). During his reign a Jew obtained possession of his armour. Rather than exercise his power as Khaleefa and take it back, he (as) made a petition before a Judge, and presented his case as plaintiff in Court, representing himself. This is what we call justice.

Think about this from a logical point of view:

Witnesses are required when the testimony of the claimant is challenged. In this dispute the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) could have been challenged by the wives of Rasulullah (s), Banu Hashim and other Muslims and yet not one of this group challenged the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as), nor did they make a claim to Fad. What right did the Khaleefa have to challenge the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) and confiscate her land?

Look at the practice of the Secular West. When a claim is made against the Government, the matter is not decided by the State itself. Rather the Government has a representative, and the case is presented before the Court which decides the matter. The Government is prevented from ruling on the matter.

We ask the '**jurists**' of Islam who defend Abu Bakr by stating that the testimony of children for their mother is unacceptable in Islam. Why have they failed to look at the fact that here a party to the action is also ruling on the dispute! Even if the claim was against the Government, Abu Bakr still had no right to adjudicate the matter. The matter was made more serious by the fact that the land had been directly confiscated by Abu Bakr making him the defendant, hence it was extremely important for just decision of the case that he removed his every influence from its adjudication. He should have said that '*Fadak is land that all Muslims should benefit from, and I hold it for them - and I shall appoint an Independent Judge to pass judgement on my assertion*'.

But ignoring the practice of Rasulullah (s) he deemed himself the rightful owner of Fadak and kept the property in his own hands. Not a single narration exists suggesting that Abu Bakr distributed Fadak amongst the Muslims. The clearest proof comes from the written instruction of Mamun al Rashid (that we cited earlier from Fathul Buldan), that the descendants of Sayyida Fatima (as) be deemed the owners of Fadak in the same manner as his representative Mubarak Tabari was:

"Your subordinates should be informed that Muhammad bin Yahya and Muhammad bin Abdullah be treated in the same manner as you dealt with Mubarak Tabari"

As the land was under the personal ownership of the Khalifa's Servant it was under his control. Sayyida Fatima (as)'s claim was against Abu Bakr's control of the land, and accepting this claim was against Abu Bakr's personal benefit.

4.5 The onus was on Abu Bakr to produce witnesses not Sayyida Fatima (as)

The rule of law is that the burden of proof is on the party who denies the ownership of party in possession.

So the question arises. Which party had the burden to prove its case, which would in turn require it to bring forth witnesses to corroborate its claim.

Sayyida Fatima (as) had already this land in her control. The onus was therefore on Abu Bakr to prove the correctness of his decision to interfere and annex then land from her. Let us also look at this matter from another angle. Sayyida Fatima (as) made her claim as legal heir to her father's property. The law of inheritance supported her stance. In contradiction to the Qur'anic injunctions on inheritance, Abu Bakr advanced a Hadith that was rejected by Sayyida Fatima (as). In these circumstances the onus of proving the authenticity of this Hadeeth was on Abu Bakr, as Sayyida Fatima (as) had textual evidence (the Book of Allah [swt]) to support her right of inheritance while Abu Bakr was seeking to negate this legitimate right on the basis of hearsay evidence. Obviously for textual evidence to be refuted clearer evidence needs to be adduced to show that a Hadeeth exists that makes verses on Prophetic inheritance null and void. The sole oral evidence of Abu Bakr (uncontradicted by any other witness) who also happened to be the Judge was clearly not satisfactory. It required others to come forward to confirm that the Prophets leave no inheritance. The onus was on Abu Bakr to prove that the Hadeeth he cited was correct not on Sayyida Fatima (as) to prove that she was heir to the Estate of the Prophet (s).

Although the settled rules of both Islamic and common law are sufficient to clarify our point, we here cite an example to further elaborate the position to readers who do not know the legal points in depth.

"You are one of the Tabi'een (generation after the Prophet) and wish to marry a Christian woman. On the day of the Wedding the Imam you had asked to perform the Nikah refuses to do so, stating that 'he was told that the Prophet (s) said that marriage with 'the people of the Book' is haraam'.

Upon whom does the burden of proof lie? You or the Imam? The burden does not fall on you since the Book of Allah (swt) permits such a marriage, so you don't need witnesses to corroborate your claim, the Book is your witness. The Imam has made a claim that contradicts the Book of Allah (swt). Therefore the onus falls upon him to summon witnesses who can confirm that they heard the Prophet (s) say these words that render this verse abrogated.

The same facts apply here, Sayyida Fatima (as) required no witnesses to prove her status as

Heir, the Qur'anic verses on inheritance vouched for this. As Abu Bakr had made an assertion that in effect challenged the validity of a Qur'anic verse the onus fell on him to produce witnesses to support his claim.

4.6 Rather than demand witnesses why didn't Abu Bakr allow the Muslims to rule on the matter?

If Abu Bakr was not the claimant then he should have referred the matter to those he deemed parties to the action. He was of the opinion that the entire Estate of Fadak belonged to all the Muslims, so he should have placed the matter into the hands of the Muslims. If they upheld the opinion of Sayyida Fatima (as) there would have been no need for summoning witnesses. This is what is in line with Islamic Fiqh. This entire matter was based on Fiqh, so why did he ignore the other claimants in the matter? Abu Bakr should have said, 'Look Fadak is land that all Muslims should benefit from' but the reality is he deemed Fadak to be the personal property of the Prophet (s), which is why he brought it under his own control. There is not a single narration from the books of Ahl'ul Sunnah that would suggest that the land of Fadak had been distributed amongst the Muslims. Of interest is the fact that Umar also held such a viewpoint, when it came to ruling on Muslim lands:

In Volume 2 page 51 of Hayatus Sahaba under the Chapter 'The practice of seeking advice of the elite by Hadrat Abu Bakr (r)' we read a narration transmitted by Ibn Abu Shaibah in Tarikh by al Bukhari, Ibn Asakir, Baihaqi and Yaqoob bin Sufyan:

"Ubaida reports 'Aina bin Hasan and Aqra bin Habis approached Hadrat Abu Bakr (rad) and said 'O Caliph of the Messenger of Allah!' There is some fallow land in our area. If you deem it considerable, give us the land so that we can cultivate it to earn our livelihood. He donated it to them and wrote a decree in support thereof. He also put down the name of Hadrat Umar (ra) on it as a witness. On seeing the document Hadrat Umar spat over it and erased its contents. Both of them grew angry and admonished Hadrat Umar (Rad). He replied 'The Holy Prophet (s) infused love for Islam in both of you. It was the time when Islam was unstable, but now it has gained an honourable status. You therefore go and do as you like. May Allah allow you concession if you seek any. Both of them went gambling to Hadrat Abu Bakr (Rad) and said, 'Tell us who is the Caliph, yourself or Umar?' In a way he (umar) is the Caliph, because he could become Caliph if he wanted to be so said Hadrat Abu Bakr (Rad). In the meantime Hadrat Umar said 'Does the land you have donated to these two persons belong to you or to the Muslims as a whole? Hadrat Abu Bakr replied, 'It is the property of the Muslims as a whole' Hadrat Umar (Rad) said 'What made you to reserve this piece of land for these two persons ignoring the Muslims as a whole? Hadrat Abu Bakr (Rad) said, 'The people around me had advised me to do so'. At this Hadrat Umar (Rad) said, 'Had you consulted only the people around you or had you sought the opinion of all the Muslims who are the real owners of the property?' Hadrat Abu Bakr (Rad) replied, 'I had told you that you are stronger than me in matters of Caliphate, but you did ignore my pleas and put me as Caliph [Al Kanz (Volume 2 page 189) al Isabah (Volume 3 page 55) Al Bukhari (Volume 1 page 59). This Hadith has been mentioned by the above sources with a correct Isnad...]'".

 [Hayat us-Sahaba, Vol. 2, Page 51 & 52](#)

To summarise the facts of this narration are as follows:

1. Abu Bakr donated Muslim land to the Sahaba to aid them with livelihood.
2. Abu Bakr arrived at the decision by seeking out advice of 'the people around me'

3. Umar overruled Abu Bakr, stating that the land was Muslim land and hence all the Muslims required consultation on the matter.

Clearly Umar's opinion was also applicable here, so why did the Khalifa's key adviser not advance this line of argument in the Fadak dispute? Like the land in the above scenario, Abu Bakr had also ruled that Fadak upon the death of the Prophet (s) had become land belonging to the Muslims - so why did Umar not insist that the opinion of all Muslims be sought on the matter? Umar's approach on Fadak was indeed very different, we have already cited his approach as found in Seerah al Halbeeya Volume 2 page 488:

"Sibt ibn Jauzi narrates that after Fatima made her claim to the ownership of Fadak, Abu Bakr heard her claim and Abu Bakr left a written instruction that it be restored to her, then Umar came to Abu Bakr, and asked 'Who is this document for?' The Khalifa said 'It's with regards to Fadak this is a written document for Fatima in relation to her father's inheritance. Umar said 'then how will you spend for the Muslims, when the Arabs are preparing to fight you, Umar then took the document and ripped it up'".

Why did Umar not intervene in this matter and insist that as Fadak belonged to all Muslims the opinion of all Muslims should be sought? That was his line of argument when it came to Abu Bakr's donating Muslim land to the Sahaba, but when it came to giving land to Sayyida Fatima (as) Umar deemed it his sole entitlement to rule on the matter, without the need to consult the Muslims! If anything this references serves as proof of the contradictory approach that Umar took when ruling on 'Muslim lands', showing clear prejudice towards Sayyida Fatima (as).

We read in Tabaqat ibn Sad Volume 2 page 451 [English translation], under the Chapter 'The learned and those who gave Fatwas from among the companions of the Apostle of Allah, May Allah bless him:

"Muhammad ibn Umar al Aslami informed us; (he said): Jariyah ibn Abi Imran informed us on the authority of Abd al-Rahman Ibn al Qasim, he on the authority of his father; Verily when Abu Bakr confronted with an important affair about which he needed council of the wise and the jurists, he called some Muhajirs and Ansars. He called Umar, Uthman, 'Ali, 'Abd-al Rahman Ibn Awf, Mu'adh ibn Jabal, Unayy Ibn Ka'b and Zayd Ibn Thabit, every one of whom gave Fatwas during the Caliphate of Abu Bakr. The cases of the people for Fatwas were referred to them(the companions). This continued till the end of Abu Bakr's life".

 [Tabaqat Ibn Sa'ad, Vol. 2, Page 451 & 452](#)

When Abu Bakr had a Council of scholars to clarify legal disputes then why did he not utilise this Panel of scholars during the Fadak dispute?

Either Abu Bakr deemed himself to be a claimant.

OR

He feared handing over the matter to the Muslims as claimants to the action since they may rule in favour of the claimant.

4.7 Sayyida Fatima was 'Siddiqah' hence it was Abu Bakr's duty to accept her claim without demanding witnesses

Sayyida Fatima (as) was clear and firm in her claim, namely that Rasulullah (s) had given Fadak to her, and that she was entitled to her Share from Khayber and outskirts of Madina as Khums. She had a legal right to the property of Rasulullah (s).

Sayyida Fatima was convinced about the correctness of her opinion and did not believe that her truthfulness would be challenged. When witnesses were demanded she verified the truthfulness of her claim by producing the testimonies of Imam 'Ali (as), Imam Hassan (as), Imam Husayn (as), Umm Ayman, Umm Kalthum (as), Rabah the Servant of Rasulullah (s).

Why didn't Abu Bakr accept the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) in the first instance? Why did he ask for witness corroboration? If the court believes in the witness testimony, or that given by the claimant, then judgement can be passed. Additional witnesses are required to confirm the truthfulness of a claim, to convince a Judge. If a thing is truthful, then it remains true whether you have one witness or ten witnesses. The witness of a credible witness followed by many witnesses who are not as strong in no way weakens a case if the first witness's credibility is proven. The Ulema of Islam have set conditions on the number of witnesses in general circumstances which refers to specific situations, but this does not apply where the Ruler has direct knowledge on a matter. Let us cite an example:

I am a Judge and I witness a man robbing another man, no other witnesses are present. Will I apply the Islamic penalty or shall I state 'I demand two witnesses to verify what I saw'. Failure to do shall lead to me to dismiss the case'.

Witnesses are summoned as a matter of clarity, to arrive at a correct judgement. If a Judge does not have clear direct knowledge on matter then he can utilise reliance on witness testimony. Hadhrat Abu Bakr should have accepted Fatima's belief in the correctness of her claim - after all Sunnis Fiqh stipulates that the testimony of one just Sahaba is all that is needed (Fathul Bari Volume 9 page 44). That is a general rule, but Sayyida Fatima (as)'s is far above that of any Sahaba, we read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work 'Riyadh al Nadira' Volume 3 page 220, Dhikr Fadail 'Ali:

Rasulullah (s) said to 'Ali 'You have three virtues not possessed by anyone else

1. **You have a father in law like me.**
2. **You have received my truthful daughter as your wife**
3. **You have received pious sons such as Hasan and Husayn**

Comment

Three things are proven from this tradition

1. No one other than Maula 'Ali (as) was the son in law of Rasulullah (s)
2. No descendents are superior to Hassan and Husayn
3. Other than 'Ali (as) no one has a truthful wife

The tradition testifies to the truthfulness of Sayyida Fatima (as).

4.8 Sayyida Fatima (as) is the example of Maryam (as)

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work Kanz al Ummal Volume 6 page 219 Bab Fadail Min Qism al Kaul:

"Rasulullah said 'the first to enter Paradise shall be Fatima as she is the example of Maryam for this Ummah'"

Dr Tahir al Qadri in 'Al Durr'athul Baydha fee Mana'iq Fatima al Zahra (as)' page 106 also recorded this narration from Kanz, counting it as one of her virtues.

 [Al Duratul Baydha fee Mana'iq Fatima al Zahra \(as\), Page 106](#)

Comment

In this Hadeeth Rasulallah (s) has compared Sayyida Fatima (as) to Hadhrat Maryam (as) that confirms her status as Siddiqah and Batool.

4.9 The truthfulness of Sayyida Fatima (as) and Hadhrat Maryam (as) is proven from the Qur'an

We read in Surah Maida verse 75:

Christ the son of Mary was no more than a messenger; many were the messengers that passed away before him. His mother was a woman of truth.

Al-Qur'an, Surah 5, Ayah 75, translated by Yusufali

Comment

In the Hadeeth earlier we showed that Rasulallah (s) compared Sayyida Fatima (as) to Hadhrat Maryam (as) and the Qur'an confirms that Maryam (as) was Siddiqah as is the case with Hadhrat Fatima (as).

4.10 The testimony of Hadhrat Ayesha that Sayyida Fatima (as) was Siddiqah

As evidence we shall rely on the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. al Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 page 161
2. al Istiab Volume 4 page 366
3. al Kamil fi Isma al Rijjal al Isab al Mushkwaath page 29 Dhikr Fatima binte Rasul (printed Kanpur)
4. Hilayath al Awliya Volume 2 page 42

"Apart from Rasulallah, I never witnessed anyone more truthful than Fatima. When any dispute arose between me and Fatima he would ask Fatima as he knew that she would not lie"

 [Al-Mustadrak al-Hakim, Vol. 3, page 160 & 161](#)

Comment

We appeal to justice. Would you ever accept that Ayesha and Hafsa would lie to gain material

possessions? If you could never accept that these mothers of the faithful and daughters of the Khaleefa would lie for worldly gain, then is it possible that the daughter of Rasulullah (s) would bring a false case and lie for worldly gain? We are talking about Sayyida Fatima (as) who shares her blood with Rasulullah (s), whose happiness and anger is on par with the happiness and anger of Rasulullah (s), whose truthfulness is declared by Allah (swt) in the Qur'an. The word of Rasulullah (s) is proof, and when this truthful woman made a claim for Fadak, how is it that Tafseer Kabere suggests that Sayyida Fatima (as)'s claim was a lie (astaghfirullah).

Sayyida Fatima (as) is the example of Maryam (as), and Maryam verified the truthfulness of her claim by relying on the testimony of her infant son, and this testimony was accepted by her people. Sayyida Fatima (as) sought to verify the truthfulness of her claim by relying upon the testimonies of her young sons, and yet this did not convince Khaleefa Abu Bakr.

4.11 Sayyida Fatima Siddiqah (as) is Masum (Infallible)

For evidence we shall rely on the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Sahih al Bukhari Volume 5, Book 57, Number 61, Bab Fadail Fatima & Volume 7, Book 62, Number 157 Bab ul Nikah
2. Sahih Muslim Book 031, Number 6000 Bab Fatima Binte Rasul
3. Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 159 Bab Fadail Fatima
4. Kanza Thamil Volume 6 page 219 Kitab Fadail min Qism al Kaul
5. al Isaba Volume 4 page 366
6. Hilayath al Awliya Volume 20
7. Ruzatul Ahbaab page 608

For the sake of brevity we shall cite only a handful of sources.

Sahih al Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 157 Bab ul Nikah:

"Fatima is a part of my body, and I hate what she hates to see, and what hurts her, hurts me."

Sahih al Bukhari Volume 5, Book 57, Number 61, Bab Fadail Fatima:

Allah's Apostle said, "Fatima is a part of me, and he who makes her angry, makes me angry."

Sahih Muslim Book 031, Number 6000 Bab Fatima Binte Rasul:

Miswar b. Makhramah reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: Fatima is a part of me. He in fact tortures me who tortures her.

4.12 Commentary of the words "Fatima is a part of me"

In Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work Naseem al Riyadh, Shah Shifa Qadhi Khan Volume 4 page 565, the author Shuhabudin al Hanafi writes:

"The author of Nihaya said the words "Bazz'aa' whether with 'Fatha' or Kasra are

both acceptable but the Kasr is better known as Biza' means a piece of flesh, the Hadeeth means that Fatima is a piece of me since Fatima is a part of Rasulullah (s), this Hadeeth proves the virtuous rank of Sayyida Fatima, one that no other woman can attain"

4.13 Commentary of the words "part of my body"

Qadhi Badrudeen A'ini in his famous commentary of Sahih al Bukhari, Umdah thul Qari Volume 7 page 665, comments on this tradition as follows:

"Bayhaqi has deduced from the above Hadeeth, that anyone that swears at this lady is a Kaafir".

Commenting on this Hadeeth at another place (Umdathul Qari Volume 9 page 514) A'ini states:

"From the above Hadeeth this ruling is proven that one whose pains Fatima, pains Rasulullah (s), inflicting even the slightest pain to them is haraam"

We have proven the authenticity of this Hadeeth from seven Sunni works, and we have produced the commentaries from two esteemed Sunni works 'Naseem al Riyadh' and 'Umdah thul Qari'. The conclusion that can be deduced is that inflicting pain upon Sayyida Fatima (as), is haraam in the same way it is to pain Rasulullah (s) and that cursing Sayyida Fatima is Kufir as is the case with cursing Rasulullah (s).

4.14 The Hadeeth proves the infallibility of Sayyida Fatima al Siddiqah

The tradition proves that making Sayyida Fatima angry is on par with inflicting pain upon Rasulullah (s), both are haraam. When hurting Sayyida Fatima (as) is haraam, such a position can only occur when Sayyida Fatima (as) is infallible like Rasulullah (s). If Sayyida Fatima was not infallible then hurting her in certain scenario's would not have been haraam, but hurting Fatima (as) whatever the circumstances are is haraam, and this can only be the case when Sayyida Fatima (as) is infallible.

If Rasulullah (s) said to Abu Bakr *'this land belongs to me, so return it to me'* and Abu Bakr challenged his claim by insisting on witnesses this would constitute major disrespect, neigh it would be haraam. Similarly one should contemplate on Fatima's infallibility like the Prophet (s) hence Abu Bakr's demanding witnesses in the Fadak dispute was major disrespect and a sin on his part. By rejecting Sayyida Fatima's claim on the grounds that witnesses' criteria was not met caused pain to her, and one that pains Sayyida Fatima (as) pains Rasulullah (s).

4.15 Sayyida Fatima (as)'s infallibility is proven from the verse of purity

Note: Ansar.Org have written an article on this claiming that the verses refers to the wives of the Prophet (s). We shall Inshallah dedicate a separate article to refute their lies.

The Holy Book of Allah mentions Ahlul-Bayt and their exceptional virtue in the following verse which is known as "Verse of purity" (Ayah al-Tat'hir):

"Verily Allah intends to keep off from you every kind of uncleanness O' People of the House (Ahlul-Bayt), and purify you with a perfect purification".
Al-Qur'an, Surah Al-Ahzab, Ayah 33

We shall now cite evidences to prove in whose honour this verse was descended:

1. Sahih Muslim, Chapter of virtues of companions, section of the virtues of the Ahlul-Bayt of the Prophet (PBUH&HF), 1980 Edition Pub. in Saudi Arabia, Arabic version, v4, p1883, Tradition #61.
2. Jami al Tirmidhi Volume 2 page 589 Bab Manaqib Ahl'ul bayt (as)
3. Tafseer Gharab al Qur'an Part 22 (Qur'an) page 11, commentary of Surah Ahzab
4. Tafseer Kabeer Volume 6 page 579 commentary of Surah Ahzab
5. Tafseer Rul al Ma'ani Part 22 (Qur'an) page 13, commentary of Surah Ahzab
6. Tafseer Fathul Qadeer Volume 4 page 270
7. Tafseer Ibn Katheer Volume 4 page 4 commentary of Surah Ahzab
8. Tafseer Mazhari Volume 7 page 373
9. Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 5 page 198 (printed Egypt)
10. Tafseer Jauhar al Qur'an Part 22 (Qur'an) page 28, commentary of Surah Ahzab
11. Tafseer al Itqan Volume 2 page 173
12. Tafseer Asbaab al Nazool page 627
13. Sharh Fiqh Akbar page 121
14. Mishkat al Masabeeh Volume 2 page 254
15. Mustadrak al Sahihayn, Bab fadhail al-ahlulbayt

The verse refers to a 'specific' household

If we analyse the verse we see that Ahl'ul bayt (as) are addressed with the masculine / plural term 'Kum' whilst in the Qur'an the wives of the Prophet (s) are addressed in the plural feminine 'Kun'. We challenge the followers of Mu'awiya to show us a single verse of the Qur'an where the wives of the Prophet are addressed with a masculine term.

When Allah (swt) addresses the houses of the Prophet's wives the terms 'Bayootikun' is used. "Bayoot" is the plural (3 or more) of 'Bayt' whilst the verse of purification makes reference to 'Bayt' (single) meaning a house. The verse refers to a house wherein the majority of inhabitants are male this cannot be the case with wives of the Prophet (s). We therefore need to analyse the books of Ahadeeth and Tafseer to understand in whose honour the verse has been descended.

Only five people were included in the cloak

We read in Sahih Muslim:

Narrated Ayesha:

One day the Prophet (PBUH&HF) came out afternoon wearing a black cloak (upper garment or gown; long coat), then al-Hasan Ibn Ali came and the Prophet

accommodated him under the cloak, then al-Hussain came and entered the cloak, then Fatimah came and the Prophet entered her under the cloak, then Ali came and the Prophet entered him to the cloak as well. Then the Prophet recited: "Verily Allah intends to keep off from you every kind of uncleanness O' People of the House (Ahlul-Bayt), and purify you with a perfect purification (the last sentence of Verse 33:33)."

We read in al Mustadrak al Hakim:

'The narrator states, when the revelation descended, the Rasul (s) said, "call them to me, call them to me," Safia asked the Rasul(s) "Ya Rasulullah whom shall I call" then the Prophet(s) replied "My family namely, Ali, Fatima, Hassan and Hussain"

When they came, the Prophet(s) wrapped them under the cloak and raised his hand in prayer and said "Ya Allah this is my progeny, send your blessings to me and my progeny"

Thereafter Allah sent down the revelation of Ayat ul Tatheer'

NB: This tradition can be summarised by the following four points

1. The word "Ahl"(Family) is mentioned in this verse.
2. The word Ahl'ulbayt.
3. The revelation of Ayat ul Tathir is mentioned
4. Four members of the family are also mentioned in this tradition.

So it becomes clear that this revelation has been revealed to those members of the family who are 'Ali, Fatima, Hassan and Hussain.

This tradition shows and proves beyond doubt that this verse has been revealed in the glory of the above mentioned members of the family. If there is a tradition that contradicts the glory of the Ahulbayt(s) then surely this tradition will hold no weight when brought in front of the Qur'an.

The Prophet(s) would recite this verse outside the home of Sayyida Fatima (as) for the next six - nine months (following revelation)

We shall cite the following proofs from famous Ahl'ul Sunnah scholars:

1. Fathul Qadeer by Allamah Shukani page 271 Volume 4
2. Tafseer Muraghee, V7 P 22
3. Tafseer Durre Manthur, V5, P199
4. Tasfeer Khazan, P213, V54
5. Mustadrak al Hakim P158, V3

al Hakim states:

Anas states: The Prophet(s) after fajr prayer recited the verse for the next six

months outside the home of Sayyida Fatima.

Tafseer Muraghee:

Ibn Abbas states, we have witnessed that the Prophet (pbum), after every prayer used to visit Ali Ibne Abi Talib door and recited Ayatu Tatheer. He did this continuously for 9 months. He did this fives times a day.

There is absolute agreement that Sayyida Fatima (as), 'Ali (as), and their two sons are counted as Ahl'ul bayt (as), while this consensus has not been established with regards to the wives. On the contrary their inclusion has been questioned. It is common sense that we embrace a matter that has no doubt and leave one that is doubtful.

The Prophet (s) visited his wives separately, but we find no evidence from the works of Ahl'ul Sunnah of him reciting the verse of purification before entering their homes.

The above evidence proves beyond doubt that the verse of purity has been revealed for the five members of the family.

4.16 The Wives of the Prophet are not included in the Ahlulbayt

We cite the following proof:

1. Tafseer Ibne Katheer P4 v4 Al Azhab
2. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani P22 V13
3. Tafseer Kabeer p213 Volume 5 [printed Egypt]
4. Tafseer Durre Manthur p189 Volume 5
5. Nazool Al Ibrar p58
6. Dhukhair al Ukba P22

In this case we will only cite an extract of the book Nazool Al Ibrar:

Allama Badgashey Hanbal states that Umme Salma said that Rasul was in my house, the servant told us the Ali and Fatima have arrived, the Prophet stated, "Oh Umme Salama, please go elsewhere as my Ahlulbayt(as) has arrived, Umme Salma stated that I got up and sat in one corner of the room. The Prophet took Hassan and Hussain in his laps and he put his hands on Ali and Fatima's head and showed his affection toward them. He put the mantle on them and raised his hands to the sky and prayed, Oh Allah, for your sake me and my Ahlul Bayts(as)...

Points to consider

1. The Prophet told Umme Salama that 'my Ahlulbayt have arrived, please go elsewhere'. If the wife of the Prophet were a member of Ahlulbayt then Rasul would not have asked her to move away.
2. It is stated in Tafseer Durre Manthur that Umme Salama asked the Prophet (s) whether or not she was included amongst the Ahlulbayt(as) The Prophet replied that you are amongst the wives of the Prophet(as). Abu Bakr and the wives of the Prophet are not

included in the people of purity. If anyone does not accept this out of enmity then it is between him and Allah. We cannot see any clear Hadeeth that mentions the wives of the Prophet or Abu Bakr within the fold of the Ahlulbayt of the Prophet (as).

4.17 The final attempt of the Ahl'ul Sunnah to count wives as Ahl'ul Bayt (as)

We read in Surah Hud verse 73:

They said: "Dost thou wonder at Allah's decree? The grace of Allah and His blessings on you, O ye people of the house! for He is indeed worthy of all praise, full of all glory!"

Al-Qur'an, Surah Hud, Ayah 73, translated by Yusufali

When the Angels gave glad tidings to Lady Sarah that she would conceive a child, she was shocked on account of her old age, but if Allah wills then He can give progeny to a 90 year old mother of the Faithful whilst keeping an 18 year old mother of the faithful to be barren.

Objection:

The Ahl'ul Sunnah state in this verse that Lady Sarah (as) a wife of a Prophet is counted as Ahl'ul Bayt, as would be the case for the wives of the Prophet (s).

Reply One:

This point can only be made by those ignorant of research of Tafseer and their translations. Esteemed Deobandi scholar Allamah Ashraf 'Ali Thanvee has translated the words in this verse as follows:

'O people of this family'

Had Ahl'ul bayt (as) in this verse meant wife, then Thanvee would have translated the verse as 'Zawaaj un Nabi'.

If the meaning of the word Ahl'ulbayt is linked to the wives of the Prophet only then the scholars should have addressed the wives as Zawaaj un Nabi (i.e. wives of the Prophet) instead of using the terminology Ahl'ulbayt.

Reply Two - the wife of Nabi Ibraheem (as) was included due to her blood lineage with future Prophets

Allamah Qadhi Thanauallah Panee Pathee al Hanafi in his esteemed Sunni exegesis of the Qur'an, Tafseer Mazhari Volume 5 page 38 [commentary of Surah Hud] stated:

"Rehmat means Prophethood, Burqath means loins of Bani Israeel, since all Prophets come from the loins of Bani Israeel, all are from the children of Sara"

Comment

Qadhi is making an important point:

Hadhrat Sara shared blood lineage with Hadhrat Ibraheem (as). She was his uncle's daughter, was the mother of Prophet Isaac and the grandmother of Prophet Yaqoob (as). All Prophets come from Banu Israeel so she was counted as Ahl'ul bayt (as) due to the fact that she shared her blood lineage with the Prophets. Amongst the wives of the Prophet (s) only Hadhrat Khadeeja had such an honour, she was mother of the Leader of the Women of Paradise and was the grandmother of eleven Imams, all of whom traced their lineage back to her.

4.18 The Ahl'ul bayt (as) are exempt from all forms of Rijs

There are no contradictions in the words of Allah (swt). In the verse under discussion, Allah (swt) makes it clear that the Ahl'ul bayt (as) are those individuals that are exempt from all forms of Rijs. Rijs is a term that carries many meanings in the Holy Qur'an, wherein Allah (swt) identifies deeds such as Shirk and hypocrisy to be Rijs. Rijs is a term that includes physical and spiritual impurity. In the Hans Wehr dictionary of modern written Arabic page 327:

Rijs is defined as "**dirt, filth, dirty thing or act, atrocity**".

Now were the wives of the Prophet (s) exempt from all forms of Rijs as Allah (swt) guaranteed to Ahl'ul bayt (as) in the verse of purity? If they were then they are indeed the Ahl'ul bayt. If they were not then they cannot come within this definition, for Allah (swt) would not deem a group to be free from all forms of Rijs when they are not. In Islam the state of Janub is a form of physical impurity in which a remedial action requires a complete Ghusl of the body. For men this is linked to the excretion of semen, it is required of married couples after sex. For women an additional form of Rijs innate in females is menstruation. Allah (swt) deems menses to be Rijs. A woman remains in this impure state until her period ends and she performs Ghusl.

Now if we analyse Bab ul Haidh in Sahih al Bukhari we see clear tradition showing that the wives also experienced this type of Rijs. Sayyida Fatima (as) was protected from this type of Rijs, Rasulullah (s) gave her the title 'Batool' that means purity from Menses. This is vouched for in al Mustadrak al Hakim.

Hadhrath 'Ali narrates that in one occasion he asked the Prophet (s) 'What does Bathool mean? Since I have heard you refer to Maryam and Fatima as Bathool? The Prophet (s) said 'Bathool is she who has never seen blood, i.e. has never had a period, since the daughters of Prophets have been kept free of menses'.

Mustadrak al Hakim, quoted by Rabeh al Muttalib page 308

As for the state of Janub, in his lifetime (s), only two people were protected from such a state, the Prophet (s) and Maula 'Ali (as). In that there is no doubt and in this connection we shall rely on two traditions narrated by al Hafidh Jalaludeen as Suyuti in Tareekh ul Khulafa. We are quoting from the partial English translation of Abd as-Samad Clarke. On page 179 we read:

Sa'd said: The Prophet [p] said to 'Ali 'It is not permitted for anyone to be in a state of Janub (requiring the complete washing of the body known as Ghusl) in the Mosque apart from me and you'.

 [Tareekh ul-Khulafa, Page 179](#)

On page 180 we read the envy of Umar in this regards:

Abu Hurraira said: 'Umar ibn al Khattab said, 'Ali was given three qualities any one of which I should prefer the gift of over high-bred camels'. He was asked 'And what

are they?'. He said 'He married him his daughter Fatimah, his dwelling at the mosque wherein what is not permitted to me in it is permitted to him; and the standard on the Day of Khayber'

 [Tareekh ul-Khulafa, Page 180](#)

The fact that Maula 'Ali (as) and Sayyida Fatima (as) were exempt from such states is proof that this verse was in honour of them and their sons not the wives of the Prophet (s). If any doubt remains then allow us to cite this tradition recorded by a leading contemporary Hanafi scholar Dr Tahir al Qadri. In his book 'Maraja al-Bahrayn fi Manaqib al-Hasnayn' page 48, he records this tradition:

"Umme Salma (ra) narrates that she heard the Prophet (s) say 'It is never halaal for a person in a state of Janaba or menstruation to enter this Mosque, apart from the Prophet of Allah (swt), 'Ali, Fatima, Hassan and Husayn. With the exception of them no one else is permitted to enter the Mosque of the Prophet (s). Go forth! I have told you the names to ensure that you are not lead astray".

 [Maraja Al-Bahrayn fi Manaqib al-Hasnayn, Page 48](#)

The significance of this tradition lies in the number of esteemed sources that Qadri relied on:

1. Sunan Bayhaqi Volume 7 page 65 Hadeeth number 13178-13179
2. Kanz al Ummal Volume 14 page 101 Hadeeth number 34183
3. Tareekh Ibn Asakir Volume 14 page 166
4. Fadail min al Seerah Volume 1 page 283 [by Ibn Katheer]
5. Khasais al Kubra Volume 2 page 424

Clearly rules apply to all. States of Janaba and Haidh require bathing and no person can enter the precincts of a Mosque before doing so. Rasulullah (s) would not have exempted himself, Sayyida Fatima (as), 'Ali (as) and their sons unless they stayed aloof from such impurity. The fact that Rasulullah (s) named only these personalities is the greatest proof that they were protected from impurities innate in all other humans.

The verse of purity has been descended in honour of five individuals. Sayyida Fatima (as) is the only woman that came within this verse, Allah (swt) vouched for her purity from any form of error. One whose protection from wrong is guaranteed from Allah (swt) has no need to produce witnesses to support her claim. To demand witnesses from her is due to doubts about the truthfulness of her claim. One who demands witnesses from a woman, whose purity and perfection is assured by Allah (swt), is in effect mocking the Word of Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s).

When this verse of purity descended for Sayyida Fatima (as) then why did Abu Bakr deny her rights and question her claim by demanding further witnesses? Witnesses are only required when there is evidence that a person might be lying. Abu Bakr's demanding witnesses in the Fadak dispute is a proof that he did not believe the truthfulness of her claim. By doing this Abu Bakr has gone against the rulings of Allah, and His Prophet (s) and has incurred the anger of Sayyida Fatima (as), Rasulullah (s) and Allah (swt) as a result.

When Sayyida Fatima (as) made a claim that her father had bestowed the land of Fadak to her, then Abu Bakr should have taken account of her truthfulness, purity and infallibility and not asked any further questions. Yet Abu Bakr for political reasons rejected her claim and counted it as land for all Muslims. Abu Bakr's unlawful confiscation of Sayyida Fatima (as)'s land caused her extreme grief. Anyone that has a daughter has mercy, was Muhammad's daughter not an acceptable mercy?

4.19 Question - Was a Masum's sole testimony acceptable during the lifetime of Rasulallah (s)

Our answer to this shall be based on the following Sunni sources:

1. Sunan Abu Dawood The Office of the Judge (Kitab Al-Aqdiyah) Book 24, Hadeeth Number 3600
2. Hayaat al Haywaan Volume 2 page 155 Dhikr al Fars
3. Tareekh Khamees Volume 2 page 125 Dhikr Khayl Rasulallah (s)
4. al Isaba Volume 1 page 425 Dhikr Khudeema

We read in Sunan Abu Dawood:

Narrated Uncle of Umarah ibn Khuzaymah:

The Prophet (peace be upon him) bought a horse from a Bedouin. The Prophet (peace be upon him) took him with him to pay him the price of his horse. The Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) walked quickly and the Bedouin walked slowly. The people stopped the Bedouin and began to bargain with him for the horse as they did not know that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had bought it.

The Bedouin called the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) saying: If you want this horse, (then buy it), otherwise I shall sell it. The Prophet (peace be upon him) stopped when he heard the call of the Bedouin, and said: Have I not bought it from you? The Bedouin said: I swear by Allah, I have not sold it to you. The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: Yes, I have bought it from you. The Bedouin began to say: Bring a witness. Khuzaymah ibn Thabit then said: I bear witness that you have bought it. The Prophet (peace be upon him) turned to Khuzaymah and said: On what (grounds) do you bear witness?

He said: By considering you trustworthy, Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him)! The Prophet (peace be upon him) made the testimony of Khuzaymah equivalent to that of two people.

Comment

So, if here in view of the Prophet's (PBUH&HF) truthfulness, one evidence in his favor was deemed to be equal to two, then could not the evidence of Ali and Umm Ayman be regarded enough for Fatima in view of moral greatness and truthfulness?

4.20 Logical proof that an infallible testimony is acceptable without the need for witnesses

You can have two types of evidence, clear strong evidence, and weak evidence. When a clear proof exists then weak evidence should be discarded. Testimony is needed when the truthfulness of a claim is called into question, and the claimant's argument is weak. If a strong clear proof is presented then there is no need to summon witnesses. For example:

'If someone accepts a person's legal claim to land, then this is perfectly logical, no supporting witnesses are required'.

Infallibility is greater proof than both of these, and when you have such strong proof, then there is no need for weaker proof. The testimony was by an infallible person hence no witnesses were required.

This is clear from logic and text, that the testimony of an infallible being is acceptable without the need for witnesses.

Sayyida Fatima (as) was definitely Siddiqah, Masum, the verse of purity had descended in her honour. Hence when this great Lady asserted her claim that she was the legal owner of Fadak, it was incumbent on Abu Bakr to accept the word of this truthful woman without calling upon additional witnesses. This would have led him to avoid incurring the anger of Sayyida Fatima (as) and so that of Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s).

Three things are for certain in the Fadak dispute:

1. A gift is not proven without actual possession
2. Abu Bakr's demanding witnesses clarifies the fact that Sayyida Fatima (as) had possession of the land at that time.
3. The demand of witnesses suggests that Abu Bakr had doubts over whether the Prophet's property belonged to Muslims.

Now let us present some examples of the way that Khaleefa Abu Bakr resolved disputes, readers can then ask themselves why he adjudicated over this matter differently...

4.21 When it suited him Abu Bakr would oppose a Qur'anic verse

We read in Surah al Maida verse 105:

O ye who believe! When death approaches any of you, (take) witnesses among yourselves when making bequests,- two just men of your own (brotherhood) or others from outside if ye are journeying through the earth, and the chance of death befalls you (thus). If ye doubt (their truth), detain them both after prayer, and let them both swear by Allah: "We wish not in this for any worldly gain, even though the (beneficiary) be our near relation: we shall hide not the evidence before Allah: if we do, then behold! The sin be upon us!"

Al-Qur'an, Surah 5, Ayah 105, translated by Yusufali

Comment

Some Nasibis claim that Abu Bakr was merely acting upon the Word of Allah (swt) as is stipulated in the Qur'an. We should point out that in the Fadak dispute this was satisfied by the fact that both Imam 'Ali (as) and the Servant Rabah testified in support of Fatima (as)'s claim hence the criteria of two just witnesses had been met. It should also be pointed out that Abu Bakr was not firm in his application of this verse, and this is evidenced by the esteemed Sunni work al Isaba Volume 1 page 195-196, Dhikr Thabit bin Qays bin Shammas:

"Thabit said 'I shall give you a will and do not ignore it by deeming it a dream. When I am killed my armour has been taken by a person who resides in such a place, his tent contains a water pot containing an old rope. He also has a saddle, go to Khalid and tell him to get the armour back. Then go to Abu Bakr and tell him 'I am in debt, so return what I owe to this child'. The man became anxious by the dream and told Khalid about it. Khalid got the armour and told Abu Bakr about the dream. Abu Bakr

upheld his will as correct".

 [Al-Isaba fi tameedh al-Sahaba, Vol. 1, page 195 & 196](#)

Comment

The Qur'an deems a will valid when two just witnesses confirm it. The fact that Abu Bakr upheld a will on the basis of a dream proves that Abu Bakr cared little about the law of inheritance as set out in the Qur'an.

We appeal to justice, a claim of Hadhrat 'Ali (as) can not be in violation of the Qur'an, hence in Fadak there was no possibility of Hadhrat 'Ali lying to obtain personal gain, his word should have meant that no further testimony was required. Abu Bakr's willingness to accept the will on the basis of a dream without requiring any witnesses, whilst at the same time rejecting the testimony of Hadhrat 'Ali (as) shows clearly that he was unjust in his treatment of Imam 'Ali (as).

Abu Bakr in the Fadak decision contradicted nine verses of the Qur'an by his opposition to the stance of Hadhrat 'Ali and Sayyida Fatima (as). This is a clear proof that he was in error.

4.22 When Abu Bakr felt like it, he would accept a claim without the need for witnesses

As proof we have relied on the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Sahih al-Bukhari Hadeeth Volume 3, Book 48, Number 848: Book of Witnesses
2. Sahih, Muslim, Volume 2 page 291
3. Sahih, al Tirmidhi, vol 5 p 129
4. Sunan al Kabeera Volume 6 page 302
5. Musnad, Ahmad Hanbal, vol 3 p 307-308
6. Tabaqat, Ibn Sa'ad, vol 2 part 2 p 88-89
7. Riyadh al Nadira Volume 1 page 227
8. Tareekh ul Khulafa page 69, Fadail fi Abu Bakr

We read in Sahih al Bukhari:

Narrated Muhammad bin Ali:

Jabir bin Abdullah said, "When the Prophet died, Abu Bakr received some property from Al-Ala bin Al-Hadrami. Abu Bakr said to the people, "Whoever has a money claim on the Prophet, or was promised something by him, should come to us (so that we may pay him his right)." Jabir added, "I said (to Abu Bakr), Allah's Apostle promised me that he would give me this much, and this much, and this much (spreading his hands three times)." Jabir added, "Abu Bakr counted for me and handed me five-hundred (gold pieces), and then five-hundred, and then five-hundred."

Comment

All that it took was the word of Jabir that Rasulullah (s) owed him money; no witnesses were presented to corroborate his evidence. Abu Bakr's opinion was that the money should be returned to Jabir, without the need for witnesses, he didn't say anything that contradicted the Qur'an, yet when Sayyida Fatima (as) claimed that the land of Fadak was bequeathed to her as inheritance, he refused to grant her the land, on the premise that her words were questionable and the stipulated witnesses required to give evidence were not met.

If Jabir made a claim from the treasury, then by the same token Fadak also did not belong to Abu Bakr's ancestors, rather it belonged to Sayyida Fatimah al Zahra (as), but the Khaleefa said that the land belonged to Muslims. If Jabir can receive monies from the Muslim treasury without the need of witnesses, then by the same token the Khaleefa could have also given Sayyida Fatima land from the Muslim treasury.

The narration informs us that Abu Bakr made the declaration at the time of the Hajj for people to come forward and make their claims in relation to whatever had been promised to them by Rasulullah (s). We ask those with brains, was Sayyida Fatima (as) a liar who presented false witnesses to substantiate her claim? Sayyida Fatima's (as) testimony is false. The testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), and his two sons are also false, yet an ordinary Sahaba's claim without any witness corroboration is acceptable and he can attain property from the State treasury so as to prove the correctness of his claim.

4.23 The Ahl'ul Sunnah believe that the testimony of the Sahaba without witnesses is acceptable

In the annotations of this tradition, al A'ini in Umdatul Qari, Volume 5 page 675 said:

This tradition leads to the conclusion that the evidence of one just companion can also be admitted as full evidence though it may be in his own favour, because Abu Bakr did not ask Jabir to produce any witness in proof of his claim.

Comment

Subhanallah! If Jabir's claim is acceptable without witnesses due to his station of Just Companion, then Sayyida Fatima (as) in addition to the rank of Sahaba and Just, had also attained the rank of purity and infallibility, and hence her exceptional testimony should have been accepted without question, yet Abu Bakr's heart was not willing to concede to her claim, he considered her claim to be of lesser value than that of an ordinary Sahaba.

We also read in Umdah thul Qari Volume 5 page 675 (Printed in Egypt):

"By not seeking additional witnesses to back up Jabir's claim was an adherence the principles of the Qur'an and Sunnah, since in the Qur'an Allah (swt) says you are the Khayr ul Ummah (Best of Ummah's), an Adil Ummah (Just Ummah) - if Jabir is not counted in the best and most just of Ummah's then who is? He acted on a Hadeeth in this way, Rasulullah (s) said "Whoever intentionally attributes a lie to me shall enter Hell" hence whilst the comments of a normal Muslim cannot be relied upon, it cannot be that a Sahaba would apportion lies to the Prophet (s). If this problem arose today it would be unacceptable in the absence of witnesses.

We should also highlight the fact that we read in Ahle Sunnah's authority work Al Alam al Moqeen page 36:

"The truth is when you have just one witness; a ruling should be based on their truthfulness. It is established that the Prophet (s) ruled on the Abu Qathada's killing a Pagan, on the basis of sole testimony, and rewarded him his armour on this basis, he did not even ask for the clear testimony of Abu Qathada, rather the testimony of a single witness was deemed acceptable".

Comment

We appeal to justice - It's hard to believe that a Sahaba neigh a common run of Muslim would ever attribute a false utterance to Rasulullah (s) which is why Jabir's testimony was accepted by Abu Bakr without the need for witnesses. Then we have Sayyida Fatima (as) superior in rank than other Muslims, including the Sahaba, a woman in whose honour Allah (swt) sent down the verse of purity, who has been given the title of Sayyida tul-Nisa' ul-Jannah [Leader of the Women of Paradise]. We cannot believe that this pure and truthful woman would attribute a false statement to her father Rasulullah (s). It was incumbent on Abu Bakr to immediately accept the claim that had been made by Sayyida Fatima (as).

4.24 Rasulullah (s) deemed his and 'Ali (as)'s hand to be equal in dispensing justice

This is clear from the following Sunni sources:

1. Tareekh Baghdadi Volume 5 page 37 Dhikr Ahmad ibn Ahmad bin Abu Bakr al Tamadh
2. Manaqib by Ibne Maghazli al Shaafi page 98,
3. Kanz al Ammal Volume 11 page 604
4. Riyadh al Nadira Volume page 154

Tareekh Baghdad records as follows:

"Jaysh bin Janada states 'I was sitting next to Abu Bakr and he [Abu Bakr] announced 'Claim anything that the Prophet owed you'. One man said Rasulullah (s) promised me six handfuls of dates. Abu Bakr then summoned 'Ali and told him the matter and asked that he distribute the dates with handfuls, he did do. Abu Bakr said 'Gather them' there were seven dates in each"

All four books then have the testimony of Abu Bakr:

"Verily Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s) spoke the truth, I heard Rasulullah (s) say on the night of Hijrah as we left Makka 'My hand and Ali's hand are EQUAL in dispensing justice.

Comment

Abu Bakr accepted this person's claim without recalling witnesses, perhaps he was one of his supporters (a Saqifite). From this instance and that of Jabir Ibn Abdullah we see Abu Bakr's willingness to show laxity/compromise on the rules of Shari'ah, and hence on this same basis the testimony of the Sayyida Fatima (as) should also have also been accepted.

Rasulullah's deeming Ali's hand of justice to be on par with his own, serves as proof that both

were equally just in words also. Hadhrat 'Ali (as) testified in Sayyida Fatima (as)'s favour, and Abu Bakr rejected this testimony, this serves as proof that on the issue of Fadak he was not prepared to accept the testimony of any just person.

4.25 Ahl'ul Sunnah believe that the testimony of a single person provided he is just shall suffice

We read in Sahih al Bukhari Chapter 52. Book of Setting Free, Hadeeth number 2481:

It is related from 'Abdullah Ibn Abi Mulayka that the two sons of Suhayb, the client of Ibn Jud'an, laid claim to two houses and a room, saying that the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, had given that to Suhayb. Marwan asked, "Who will testify to that on your behalf?" They said, "Ibn 'Umar." He summoned him and he testified that the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, had given Suhayb two houses and a room. Marwan judged in their favour on the basis of his testimony.

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Badradeen A'ini has given his commentary of this Hadeeth in Umdah Thul Qari Fi Sharh Sahih al Bukhari Volume 6 page 307:

Ibn Theen said that a principle is established from the fact that Marwan passed judgement on the basis of this lone witness testimony - Marwan was Judge and the Leader of the time, and it is within the rights of a judge to grant booty if he so wishes, and this is counted as Fay"

Comment

Here we see that one witness shall suffice to grant land, as was done by Marwan, hence the defenders of Abu Bakr are left in a confused state. When the Ahl'ul Sunnah admit that on the issue of Fay a Judge can exercise the right to grant it to whosoever he wishes as Marwan did with Banu Saeed, we appeal to justice did Abu Bakr not possess greater powers than Marwan?

On the same page of Umdah thul Qari, Allamah A'ini also comments:

"If an individual possesses the virtue of justice, then a Judge can rule on the basis of his single testimony. Some Fuqaha of Kufa have said that the Judges ruled on one testimony".

Comment

If this is the case then why did Abu Bakr choose to discard the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as)? Whilst we the Shi'a deemed Ali (as) to be Masum, Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi in Tuhfa Ithna Ashari stated:

"the Ahl'ul Sunnah believe that 'Ali was Mahfuz [protected from sin]'.

Imam 'Ali (as) had a high ranking station in the realms of justice, rather no one could exceed him as his justice was on par with that of Rasullullah (s). According to the madhab of Ahl'ul Sunnah, when Imam 'Ali (as)'s rank was so high in the field of justice, then all that a Judge needed to hear was his sole testimony in order to arrive at a decision. Applying this principle to the facts, when Imam 'Ali (as) testified to support the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as), then it was incumbent upon Abu Bakr to return Fadak to her. Unfortunately power is an opium that drives people away from the truth.

4.26 The testimony of any just person is acceptable

When it comes to testimony there is always a standard, there are different levels to measure a person's truth, it is linked to an individual's character. In this day and age there is a viewpoint that that a pious educated individual will not be a liar. The need for witness corroboration in court arises when the credibility of a witness comes into question. When a person is untruthful the individual's character comes under scrutiny, a common accusation is that the individual will never say anything against his relatives. If we were to say to a member of Sipaa-e-Sahaba 'Your leader Haq Nawaz Jhanvi spoke at a venue where he made a statement that was a lie' they will resort to physical violence to protect their beloved Imam, because they deem of decent noble character. Perhaps al Khider could offer us some explanation as to which aspect of Sayyida Fatima (as)'s character was such that it caused Abu Bakr to question the truthfulness of her claim? Whilst Nasabi's would never tolerate any questions on the truthfulness of their Imam, they should realise that their Khaleefa Abu Bakr considered Sayyida Fatima (as) a liar; and no ordinary one at that, one wherein she (falsely) claimed the Prophet (s) left land for her.

4.27 Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman would issue rulings based on the testimony of one person swearing on oath

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work Kanz al Ummal Volume 4 page 48:

"Ali narrates that Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman would rule upon the witness testimony and oath of one person".

4.28 The Pillar of the Shari'ah Rasulallah (s) also ruled on the testimony and oath of one person

Here we rely on the following authentic Sunni works:

1. Sunan ibn Majah page 173 Bab al Qaza Bashad wa alamayn
2. Sunan Abu Dawud, The Office of the Judge (Kitab Al-Aqdiyah) 'Book 24, Number 360'3:
3. Musnad Imam Shafeeya page 179, Kitab al Ahkam
4. Muwatta Imam Malik, Book of Judgements Book 36, Number 36.4.5

Sunan Ibn Majah:

Ibn Abbas narrates that Rasulallah (s) ruled on the basis of the oath and testimony of a single witness

Sunan Abu Dawud:

Narrated AbuHurayrah:

The Prophet (peace be upon him) gave a decision on the basis of an oath and a single witness.

Muwatta Imam Malik:

Yahya said, "Malik said from Jafar ibn Muhammad from his father that the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, pronounced judgement on the basis of an oath with one witness."

Of interest is the fact that Ibn Taymeeya al Nasabi in Minhajj al Sunnah Volume 2 page 166 also stated:

"The scholars of Hadeeth and Hejaz have ruled that the testimony of a sole witness with the claimant swearing on oath is permissible".

Comment

The land of Fadak was bestowed by Rasulallah (s) upon his beloved daughter Sayyida Fatima Zahra (as). Abu Bakr should have adopted his famous kind heartedness in this dispute, and if he wanted to uphold legal principles he could have asked Sayyida Fatima (as) to swear on oath that the property had been bequeathed to her, [as there was absence of witnesses] and on this basis restored Fadak back to her. Worthy of notice is the fact that Imam Malik in his Muwatta, Book of Judgements Section: Judgement Based on Oaths with One Witness, having cited the fact that the Prophet would pass judgement on the basis of the oath and testimony of a single witness, comments:

"The precedent of the sunna in judging by an oath with one witness is that if the plaintiff takes an oath with his testimony, he is confirmed in his right. If he draws back and refuses to take an oath, the defendant is made to take an oath. If the defendant takes an oath, the claim against him is dropped. If he refuses to take an oath, the claim is confirmed against him."

Malik said, **"This procedure pertains to property cases in particular"**.

This was a property dispute and all that Khalifa Abu Bakr needs to do was take the sole testimony of Sayyida Fatima (as)(on oath) so as to confirm the truthfulness of her claim.

Sadly, Abu Bakr did not adhere to this principle, his objective was to make the Ahl'ul bayt (as) as weak as possible. Abu Bakr's behaviour in the Fadak dispute proves that the Hadeeth *'the most merciful in this Ummah is Abu Bakr'* is a fabrication - for he afforded harsh treatment to the daughter of the Prophet (s). If he (the supposed best friend of the Prophet) was so unjust what could be expected from the rest of the Ummah? Sayyida Fatima (as) was shocked by this treatment, she had not envisaged such a response which is why she initially presented her case without witnesses. When Abu Bakr refused to entertain her claim, she brought forth several witnesses who were:

1. Imam 'Ali (as)
2. Imam Hassan (as)
3. Imam Husayn (as)
4. Umme Kalthum (as)
5. The servant of Rasulallah(s) Rabah
6. The maid of Rasulallah (s) Umm Ayman.

Hence the advocates can present as many excuses as they like. If there were not sufficient witnesses, it was still fine as Rasulallah (s) and the three Khalifas ruled on the testimony and oath of one person. If the stipulated number of witnesses had been satisfied then Abu Bakr had to rule in their favour. This was the case here as Imam 'Ali (as) and Rabah were both men and the testimony of two male witnesses satisfy legal criteria. Despite this Abu Bakr struck out the claim of Lady Fatima (as).

At this point it is most appropriate to analyse the comments of Bilal Philips in 'Tafseer Soorah al Hujuraat' page 63:

In his analysis of verse 6 of this Surah '*O Believers if an unrighteous person comes to you with information, you should verify it*' wherein Allah (swt) warned Muslims against accepting the word of the Fasiq Waleed bin Utbah, Philips comments:

"It should be noted that based on this verse Islamic scholars have unanimously ruled that the testimony of one who is known to be unrighteous should be rejected as evidence in court unless verified. If his testimony can be confirmed it is obligatory to do so and if it cannot be confirmed it should flatly be rejected. The converse also holds true. The testimony of a just righteous person does not require verification except in special cases identified by the Qur'an or the Sunnah".

 [Tafseer Soorah al Hujuraat, Page 63](#)

Perhaps Dr Philips could contribute to this debate and offer his valuable input as to whether he believes that the Leader of the Women of Paradise was a just and righteous person whose testimony required no further verification? If he does, then can he offer any explanation as to why her sole testimony was deemed as unacceptable in the Fadak case? Philips has dedicated his life to exposing the dangers of Shi'aism to the unsuspecting Sunni public, and has made it his mission to highlight the degrading / humiliating portrayal of the Sahaba from Shi'a works. Perhaps he could shed some light on the degrading / humiliating treatment that Abu Bakr afforded Sayyida Fatima (as), whose witness credibility was graded to be on par with that of a Fasiq (transgressor), to the point that the Khaleefa said blatantly '*I don't know if you are telling the truth*' [Tafseer al Kabeer Volume 10 page 506]? We then see her humiliation compounded yet further when the witnesses she produces are also rejected! Were Maula 'Ali, Rabah, Umm Ayman, Hasan, Husayn also Fasiq's who had jointly conspired to secure land for Sayyida Fatima (as) that she had no legal right to?

We would like to ask Philips:

How would you feel if you walked into a Shariah Court lodging a petition to land, and the Judge despite knowing your esteemed rank and knowledge challenged the truthfulness of your claim and demanded witnesses. How would the Judge's demand make you feel? Would you not feel humiliated by such a comment?

Let's change scenarios, imagine that you are a Judge and Hadhrath Ayesha makes a petition to you for land that her father Abu Bakr left her. Would you contemplate demanding that she bring witnesses to corroborate her claim? Don't you think it would be an insult to her if you told her to go and get witnesses? If so, why do you not have the same viewpoint when it comes to the treatment of Sayyida Fatima (as)?

4.29 The Sunni Ulema have graded the testimony of the killers of Husayn (as) to be superior to Sayyida Fatima (as)

Whilst these Nasabi have set out a vast array of defences to justify Abu Bakr's demands for witness corroboration, they have failed to take stock of the fact that according to Sunni Fiqh the word of a Thiqah narrator requires no further witness corroboration. If for example there exists a chain, wherein a Tabieen narrated a Hadeeth on the authority of a Sahaba – if the Tabieen in the chain is Thiqah (Very reliable) then his exemplary truthful character means that no separate chain needs to be sought to corroborate 'his' claim. The only analysis that needs to be conducted is the chain down. Now we would like to ask all those that support Abu Bakr, what about the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as)? Was this a faulty chain? Sayyida Fatima (as)'s claim was based on what her father has said to her directly. The claim that Abu Bakr heard was based on this chain, her direct testimony. Could Abu Bakr's advocates tell us if they believe that

Sayyida Fatima was a Thiqah narrator? We are sure that no sincere Muslim would doubt this; in fact we have the testimony of the Ayesha that in effects proves that no one was more Thiqah than her. Tahir ul Qadri in his in '*Al Durr'athul Baydh fee Manaqib Fatima al Zahra (as)*' page 110 recorded this tradition from Hilayath al Awliya Volume 2 page 41-42:

“Umro bin Dunyaar narrates that Ayesha said: ‘Other than her father, no one is more truthful than Fatima in this world’.

When Sayyida Fatima (as vouched for by Ayesha) was the most truthful in the Ummah after the Prophet (s), why have the Ahl'ul Sunnah upheld Abu Bakr's insistence that she produce witnesses to substantiate the truthfulness of her claim? It is indeed unfortunate that the Sunni scholars of Rijjal have graded the killers of Imam Husayn (as) – Umar ibn Sa'd and Shamir to be Thiqah narrators (see our article 'Who killed Imam Husayn'). What conclusion should we reach about a school of thought that grades the testimonies of the killers of Imam Husayn (as) as superior to Sayyida Fatima (as)?

4.30 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr opposed the Qur'an by failing to side with the truthful

Allah (swt) says in Surah Tauba verse 19:

O ye who believe! Fear Allah and be with those who are true (in word and deed).

We shall now rely on the following Sunni commentaries of this verse:

1. Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 3 page 290
2. Tafseer Mazhari Volume 4 page 320
3. Ya Nabi al Muwaddah page 119
4. Tadhkirathul Khawwas page 10, Bab Sha'afi
5. Tafseer Fathul Qadeer Volume 2 page 529
6. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani Part 11 page 45

For the sake of brevity we shall only quote verbatim Fathul Qadeer, Mazhari and Durre Manthur:

"Ibn Abbas 'to be with the truthful' refers to Hadhrat Ali'

 [Fathul Qadeer, Vol. 3, page 529](#)

Comment

This verse refers to the progeny of Rasulullah (s) since you can interpret 'Sadiqeen' in any way you choose, but Ahl'ul bayt (as) will fall within this definition, others may come within this (but their identities are unknown) whilst there is no doubt that the Ahl'ul bayt are included here. It would be better for sensible people to leave that in which there is doubt and embrace that which is proven. The 'truthful' are those that are purified from sin, since there is no sense in having a man of truth that indulges in sins. Sadiqeen refers to the family of the Prophet and this is proven from their perfection/infallibility. The testimony of the truthful without need for witnesses should be accepted, if it is not then there exists no distinction between a man of truth and a liar.

Sayyida Fatima (as) was from the 'Sadiqeen', it was Abu Bakr's duty to accept her claim without demanding supporting witnesses' testimony. Hadhrat 'Ali (as) was also counted as amongst the Sadiqeen, again he could have accepted his word, but Abu Bakr threw out their claims, and hence in the process opposed the Qur'anic verse commanding us **'to be with the truthful'**.

4.31 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr abandoned 'the rope of Allah'

We read in Surah Aal-e-Imran:

Hold tight the rope of Allah and do not be divided amongst yourselves

We will rely on the following Sunni Tafseers to establish the identity of the rope:

1. Sawaiqh al Muhriqa, Page 517, Ayat al Khum Fadail Ahl'ul Bayt
2. Ya Nabi al Muwaddah page 116

We read in Sawaiq al Muhriqa:

"In Tafseer Thalabi it is narrated on the authority of Imam Jafar al Sadiq that the rope of Allah refers to the Ahl'ul bayt"

 [Sawaiq al-Muhriqa, Page 517](#)

Ya Nabi al Muwaddah states:

"Ibn Abbas narrates that we were sitting with the Prophet when an Arab approached and asked "Master I heard you say that we should grasp the Rope of Allah, what is the Rope of Allah? Rasulullah (s) placed his hand on 'Ali's and said 'Obey him firmly'

Comment

A rope is flexible, it can bend in the same way that man can, and one can climb up and down it. Obedience of 'Ali takes you from the foot upwards and opposition brings you to the ground, in a disgraced state.

Applying this Hadeeth to the facts, it was incumbent on Abu Bakr to obey the claim of Imam 'Ali (as) in the Fadak dispute. If he had , he would have attained a high rank in the process. Sadly Abu Bakr denied Sayyida Fatima (as)'s claim for Fadak, he rejected the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as) in the process and removed himself from gaining any respect.

4.32 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr opposed the 'people who know'

"Ask those who know"

Let us now turn to the Sunni commentaries of this verse:

1. Ya Nabi al Muwaddah page 119

2. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani commentary of verse 23 of Surah Nail, page 148

We read in Ya Nabi al Muwaddah:

Jabir narrates from Ali, 'the people of knowledge refers to us'

Comment

Dhikr refers to the Qur'an or the Prophet hence Ahl'ul Dhikr in either context refers to the progeny of the Prophet (s). When the verse of the Qur'an had a clear or hidden meaning, it was incumbent on Abu Bakr to seek clarification from *'those who know'*.

Both Hadhrat 'Ali (as) and Sayyida Fatima (as) were the Ahl'ul Dhikr, hence before ruling on the Fadak dispute it was incumbent on Abu Bakr to get clarification on what their position was on Fadak. Instead of doing so he rejected their positions and usurped the land, removing all rights that the progeny had over the Estate. In doing so Abu Bakr openly rejected the Ahl'ul Dhikr.

4.33 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr rejected one who testified to the Prophethood

We read in Surah Hud verse 17:

Is he (to be counted equal with them) who relieth on a clear proof from his Lord, and a witness from Him reciteth it, and before it was the Book of Moses, an example and a mercy?

Al-Qur'an, Surah Hud, Ayah 17, translated by Pickthal

The witness refers to Imam 'Ali (as) as has been vouched for in the following classical Sunni works:

1. Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 3 page 586
2. Tafseer Khazan Volume 3 page 183
3. Ya Nabi al Muwaddah page 99
4. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani Part 12 al Hud page 28

We read in Ruh al Ma'ani:

"Rasulullah said 'clear proof' refers to the Prophet (s) and the witness refers to Ali"

We read in Tafseer Khazan:

"In the above verse, the witness refers to 'Ali Ibn Abi Talib and 'Mina' refers to Rasulullah (s) - and Ali was witness to this, as he remained with the Prophet (s), and in the end 'Ali is Rasulullah's immediate Khalifa".

 [Dur al-Manthur fi tafseer al-Mathur, Vol. 3, page 586](#)

Comment

The individual claiming Prophethood is an esteemed personality, as is the one testifying to his

Prophethood. When Allah (swt) made Ali witness to the Prophethood of Muhammad (s) then he is proven to have an esteemed rank. When such an esteemed figure who testified to the Prophethood (s) gives evidence in a dispute, can can be a likelihood of his testimony being fraudulent?

When Hadhrat 'Ali (as) testified that Fadak was the right of Sayyida Fatima (as) and his evidence was not upheld (inspite of the respect and dignity Ali (as) enjoyed) it becomes clear that Abu Bakr bore some enmity towards the Ahl'ul Bayt (as). If the Khalifa had the slightest respect for these figures he should have accepted the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) without demanding witnesses, when they were called he could have at least accepted the word of Hadhrat 'Ali (as). Sadly the faith that Abu Bakr had in the Sahabi Jabir Ibn Abdullah was not shared when it came to the purified members of Rasulullah's household. Abu Bakr preferred the claim of common men to that of Sayyida Fatima (as), Leader of Women of Paradise, and of Hadhrat 'Ali 'Witness to the Prophethood'.

4.34 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr rejected one who possessed knowledge of the Book

We read in Surah Rad verse 43:

The Unbelievers say: "No messenger art thou." Say: "Enough for a witness between me and you is Allah, and such as have knowledge of the Book."

Al-Qur'an, Surah Rad, Ayah 43, translated by Yusufali

The following Sunni sources have confirmed that knowledge of the Book refers to Imam 'Ali (as)

1. Ya Nabi al Muwaddah, Chapter 3
2. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani page 166, Commentary of Surah Rad

We read in Ya Nabi al Muwaddah:

"Fadhil bin Atheer narrates from Imam Muhammad Baqir that this verse descended in the honour of Imam 'Ali, research has established that Rasulullah is the Aalim of this Ummah"

The text of Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani reads:

'Min undh IIm Kitab' refers to 'Ali and 'Ali Nazeer Kitab' refers to the Qur'an, by my life the entire knowledge of the Qur'an was with 'Ali"

 [Tafseer Ruh al-Ma'ani, page 166](#)

Comment

The verse confirms that Hadhrat 'Ali had an absolute knowledge of the Qur'an. Imam 'Ali (as) recited verses on inheritance to prove that Fadak was the right of Sayyida Fatima (as). To rely on the poor commentaries provided by Ibn Katheer is to in effect suggest that Imam 'Ali (as) did not have the understanding of these verses, rather Ibn Katheer knew better! To interpret the verses in away that differed to Imam 'Ali (as)'s opinion is not only an insult to Hadhrat 'Ali it is also an insult to Allah (swt) for He (swt) praised his 'Knowledge of the Book' and yet this same man was unable to grasp the true meaning of the verses of inheritance. The verse and commentary proves that apart from Rasulullah (s), Hadhrat 'Ali (as) was the Sahabi who

possessed the greatest knowledge of the Qur'an.

Imam 'Ali (as) possessed a greater knowledge the rules of witness testimony. When he testified in favour of his wife in the Fadak Case, ignorant of the conditions of witnesses, then there would be no substance in Allah's (swt) words declaring him as one who possesses 'knowledge of the Book'. Abu Bakr rejected Imam 'Ali (as)'s understanding of the Qur'anic verses of inheritance and in doing so rejected the Qur'anic verse confirming 'Ali (as) as possessing 'knowledge of the Qur'an'.

4.35 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr rejected one who was 'Sufficient for Allah'

We read in Surah Anfal verse 62:

Should they intend to deceive thee,- verily Allah sufficeth thee: He it is That hath strengthened thee with His aid and with (the company of) the Believers;
Al-Qur'an, Surah Anfal, Ayah 62, translated by Yusufali

The 'believers' whom Allah (swt) deemed the strength of RasulAllah(s) refers to Hadhrat 'Ali (as). This is supported by the Sunni book Manaqib Murtazvi written by Allamah Muhammad Salaeh Kasjafi Tirmidhi al Hanafi page 31:

"The Hanbali Hadeeth scholars have commented that all the scholars of Tafseer are in agreement that 'Manit'aa ba-ik' refers to 'Ali"

Comment

This verse proves that Hadhrat 'Ali was sufficient for Rasulullah (s), hence his every word would suffice for Rasulullah (s) - so why was his testimony in favour of Sayyida Fatima (as) not sufficient in the Fadak case? The Khalifa by rejecting the testimony of Hadrat Ali(as) in fact rejected this verse of the Quran.

4.36 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr rejected the 'one with the truthful tongue'

We read in Surah al Shuara verse 84:

"Grant me honourable mention on the tongue of truth among the latest (generations);
Al-Qur'an, Surah ash-Shuara, Ayah 84, translated by Yusufali

Allamah Muhammad Salaeh Kashafi Tirmidhi al Hanafi in Manaqib Murtazvi Chapter 1 page 138 states:

"Manqan Ibn Murdhaya narrated from Imam Muhammad Baqir that the truthful tongue refers to 'Ali"

Comment

The tradition confirms that Allah (swt) referred to Hadhrat 'Ali as the truthful tongue. When Allah (swt) affirms a man as 'truthful tongue' that clearly means that he does not lie, in any

circumstance. When this truthful tongue gave testimony supporting Sayyida Fatima (as)'s claim, then it was Abu Bakr's duty to accept the word of Hadhrat 'Ali (as). Sadly Abu Bakr rejected the word of a man whom Allah praised as the truthful tongue and hence he also rejected this verse of the Qur'an.

Abu Bakr openly rejected 8 verses of the Qur'an in praise of Hadhrat 'Ali and Sayyida Fatima (as). The Qur'an and Ahl'ul bayt (as) were the two weighty things; one who opposes them has no rightful claim to the Khilafat. We the Shi'a don't bear any personal grudge to Abu Bakr; we are angered at him because he usurped the legal right of the daughter of Rasulallah (s) and made her upset in the process.

4.37 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr rejected the verse of purify

We have already proved from numerous source that Hadhrat 'Ali (as) is included in this verse. The verse is in honour of the Ahl'ul bayt (as), and in Ahl'ul Sunnah's esteemed work 'Sawaiq al Muhriqa' page 85, Ibn Hajr al Makki, after collating the traditions concludes that the verse was in honour of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) of the Prophet (s). He then said:

"In this verse Rijs means sins, verily the Ahl'ul bayt (as) are aloof from all types of sin, and this is an illuminating proof of their supreme station... in every time Saints from the Ahl'ul bayt shall exist.

 [Sawaiq al-Muhriqa, Page 489 & 490](#)

Comment

The verse proves the perfection of Sayyida Fatima (as), her husband and sons; hence it was incumbent on Abu Bakr to honour the testimonies of these individuals. By rejecting their testimony he put this verse of the Quran in contempt.

Now let us look at Abu Bakr's decision in light of the Hadeeth of Rasulallah (s)...

4.38 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr rejected the Hadeeth of the 'two weighty things'

For evidence we shall rely on the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. al'Imam al-Hafiz Abu `Abd Allah alHakim alNaysaburi, alMustadrak `ala al-Sahihayn [Dar alMa`rifah li alTiba`ah wa alNashr: Beirut), vol. iii, pp. 109-110).
2. alHafiz Ibn Abi Shaybah, as in Kanz al`ummal (1st ed.), i, 48;
3. al`Uqayli in alDu`afa' alKabeer, ii, 250;
4. alHakim alTirmidhi, Nawadir al-'usul, 68, 50th asl;
5. alTabarani, alMu`jam alKabeer, iii, 63, no. 2679;
6. alKhatib, alMuttafiq wa almuftariq, cf. Kanz al`ummal, i, 48 and Majma' alzawa'id, v, 195; ix, 163, x, 363, 268;
7. alBaghawi, al-Masabih, ii, 206;

8. Ibn al'Athir, Jami` al'usul, i, 277, no. 65;
9. al-Rafi`i, alTadwin, ii, 264 (in the biographical account of Ahmad ibn Mihran alQattan; this Hadeeth has been deleted in the Indian print, but is present in the manuscripts of the book !);
10. alMizzi, Tahdhib alkamal, x, 51, and Tuhfat al'ashraf, ii, 278, no. 2615;
11. alQadi alBaydawi, Tuhfat al'ashraf;
12. alKhwarazmi, Maqtal alHusayn (A), i, 144;
13. alKhatib alTabrizi, Mishkat almasabih, iii, 258;
14. Ibn Kathir, Tafseer (Bulaq edition, on the margin of Fath al-bayan), ix, 115;
15. al-Zarandi, Nazm aldurar alsimtayn, 232;
16. alMaqrizi, Ma`rifat ma yajib li Al alBayt alNabawi, 38.

These books have this tradition worded in different ways. We are quoting directly from al-Mustadrak `ala al-Sahihayn [Dar alMa`rifah li alTiba`ah wa alNashr: Beirut), vol. iii, pp. 109-110).

(AlHakim says:) Narrated to us Abu Bakr Muhammad ibn alHusayn ibn Muslim, the faqih of Ray, from Muhammad ibn Ayyub, from Yahya ibn al-Mughirah alSa`di, from Jarir ibn `Abd alHamid, from alHasan ibn `Abd Allah alNakha`i, from Muslim ibn Subayh, from Zayd ibn Arqam, may God be pleased with him, who said: "The Messenger of Allah , may Allah's peace and benedictions be upon him and his progeny, said, 'Verily, I leave behind two weighty things amongst you: the Book of Allah and my ahl albayt. Verily, the two will never separate until they come back to me by the side of the Pond.'"

AlHakim says:

This Hadeeth is Sahih al'isnad according to the conditions laid down by the Shaykhayn (alBukhari and Muslim), though they did not record it.
alHakim, op. cit., vol. iii, p. 148

Sunni scholars have confirmed the authenticity of this Hadeeth, Shah Abdul Aziz in Fatawa Azizi page 201 acknowledged:

'It should be known that both Sunni and Shi'a are in agreement that this Hadeeth is proven'.

The renowned Hanafi scholar Mullah 'Ali Qari in his commentary of Mishkat al Masabih, 'Murqat Volume 11 page 376 writes:

"Thaqalayn the letter Thay and Kaaf are all conquering they carry two great orders, they are the Qur'an and Ahl'ul bayt, since these are the greatest. Thaqal is a form of luggage that is placed on the back of a carrier, Jinn and Mankind have been referred to as Thaqalayn as they are a weight on earth. Qur'an and It'rat are referred to in this tradition...Jinn and Man have been called Thaqalayn is they have a distinction, and the Qur'an and Ahl'ul Bayt are distinct from other books and people"

If Nasibi try to advance the claim that Thaqalayn actually refers to adherence to the Qur'an and Sunnah, then our reply is that both sources are silent and correct understanding comes from

seeking knowledge of the Qur'an from Imam 'Ali (as) and the other Imams from the Ahl'ul bayt (as).

4.39 One who opposes Ahl'ul bayt (as) is from the Party of Shaytan and hence outside the Deen

al-Hakim on page 149, Vol. 3, of Al-Mustadrak stated:

"The stars protect the inhabitants of earth against drowning, and my Ahl alBayt protect my nation against dissension. If a tribe among the Arabs differs from them, they will all then differ and become the party of Satan." (Ibn `Abbas. Al-Hakim adds: "This is an authentic Hadeeth though they (both Shaykhs, i.e. Bukhari and Muslim) did not include it (in their books)."

Shah Abdul Aziz in Tuhfa Ithna Ashari page 130 also admitted:

"Shi'a and Sunni are in agreement that Rasulullah (s) said 'I am leaving among you two things that are exalted...

Verily we can see that on the principles of Shari'ah, Rasulullah (s) gave the order to obey both, any madhab that on principles of aqeedah or practice opposes any one of them is a liar. Anyone who opposes the Qur'an and Ahl'ul bayt falls outside the realms of the Deen, we will see who amongst Sunni and Shi'a opposes adhering to the Qur'an and Ahl'ul bayt (as)."

Comment

Let us decide on the Fadak dispute in line with these comments:

1. We have proven the authenticity of the Hadeeth Thaqlayn from over 18 recognised Sunni works
2. The tradition is authentic in terms of chain of narrators and is Muttawatir
3. Tuhfa, Sawaiqh and Lughut al Hadeeth have proven that 'Itrat' refers to Sayyida Fatima (as), Imams 'Ali (as), Hassan (as), Husayn (as) and their pure descendants.

Applying this to the facts, Sayyida Fatima (as) claimed Fadak as land that was her legal entitlement, and Imam 'Ali (as) and Hasnayn (as) also testified to support her claim. Hadeeth Thaqlayn made it Abu Bakr's duty to obey the Ahl'ul bayt (as), but he opposed their position. The great advocate of the Sahaba Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi has stated that those who oppose the Itrat of Rasulullah (s) fall outside the Deen. Now its left to the Ahl'ul Sunnah to decide where the comments of this famed debater leave Abu Bakr.

4.40 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr rejected Hadeeth-Safina

This hadith has been mentioned in the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. al-Mustadrak, by al-Hakim, v2, p343, v3, pp 150-151 [chapter 'on the authority of Abu Dhar'.]

2. Mishkat al Masabih Volume 2 page 258
3. Fadha'il al-Sahaba, by Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v2, p786
4. Tafseer al-Kabeer, by Fakhr al-Razi, under the commentary of verse 42:23, Part 27, p167 al-Bazzar, on the authority of Ibn Abbas and Ibn Zubair with the wording "drowned" instead of "perished".
5. al-Sawaiq al-Muhriqah, by Ibn Hajar Haythami, Ch. 11, section 1, p234 under Verse 8:33. Also in section 2, p282. He said this Hadeeth has been transmitted via numerous authorities.
6. Tareekh al-Khulafa and Jami' al-Saghir, by al-Suyuti
7. al-Kabeer, by al-Tabarani, v3, pp 37,38
8. Hilyatul Awliya, by Abu Nu'aym, v4, p306
9. al-Kuna wal Asma, by al-Dulabi, v1, p76
10. Yanabi al-Muwaddah, by al-Qundoozi al-Hanafi, pp 30,370

For the sake of brevity we are quoting directly from al Mustadrak and Mishkat:

"Abu Dharr narrates that Rasulullah (s) said ' Beware! My Ahlul-Bayt are like the Ark of Noah. Whoever embarked in it is SAVED, and whoever turned away from it is perished".

There is no doubt about the authenticity of this Hadeeth. Al hakim in al Mustadrak has graded it as Sahih.

The great Hanafi scholar Mullah 'Ali Qari in Murqat Sharh Mishkat Volume 11 page 399 [Dhikr Manaqib Ahl'ul bayt] writes:

"Abu Dharr, narrated, the same Abu Dharr with a truthful tongue. It is well known that this is a Thiqah [very authentic] narration, anyone who narrates this Hadeeth is correct, there is no room to refute it. About Abu Dharr, Rasulullah (s) indicated that "Heaven has not shaded, nor has the earth carried a person more truthful than Abu Dharr".

With regard to the meaning of this tradition let us quote the comments of Ibn Hajr al Makki in his anti Shi'a book Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 91:

'Rasulullah compared his Ahl'ul bayt to the boat, since the boat was a means of salvation, and any person who loves the Ahl'ul bayt, shall respect them and act upon their knowledge and guidance, shall be protected from destruction and kuffar, whoever opposes them shall drown in misguidance".

The comments of leading Deobandi Imam [similarly loved by the Salafi] Shah Ismail Shaheed are also worthy of note. Having narrated this Hadeeth in his classical source 'Taqwitatul Iman' page 228, Chapter 'The Companions and Ahl-e- Bait of the Messenger of Allah' he offers his understanding of the Hadeeth:

"It is clear from this Hadeeth that those who follow the ways and modes of the ahl-bait (members of the Prophet's house) are saved from Unbelief and Hell, like those who were saved by mounting on the Ark of Noah. Those who refused to be in the Ark were ruined, including a son of Noah who was also among the Unbelievers",

Comment

Rasulullah (s) had set out how the Ummah could protect itself from error/ misguidance, by comparing the Ahl'ul bayt (as) to the Ark of Noah. In the same way that the Ark was a source of salvation for the Sahaba of Prophet Nuh (as), the Ark of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) was a source of guidance for the Sahaba and all generations that followed them.

We have cited 10 authentic Sunni sources to prove the veracity of the Hadeeth along with the commentaries of the tradition by three renowned Sunni scholars. We previously also cited the comments of Shah in Tuhfa, namely one who opposes the Ahl'ul bayt (as) is misguided. We have also shown the identities of the Ahl'ul bayt under the verse of purity, namely Sayyida Fatima (as), 'Ali (as) and Hasnayn (as). Hence opposing them is misguidance.

The Shah said opposing them is misguidance we leave it to those with open minds where this leaves Abu Bakr who did just that.

4.41 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr rejected the Hadeeth 'Ali is with the truth and the truth is with Ali'

As evidence we are relying on the following authentic Sunni sources:

1. Nuzul ul Abrar page 24
2. Kanz al-`Ummal Volume 6 page 157 Chapter "Fadail 'Ali" Hadeeth number3301
3. Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyyah page 216
4. Tafseer Kabeer Volume 1 page 105
5. Jama Tirmidhi, Volume 2 page 573 Chapter "Manaqib 'Ali Ibne 'Abi Talib"
6. Fara'id us Simtayn page 174 Chapter 36
7. Manaqib, by Khawarzmi Chapter 8 page 56
8. Kanzul al Haqaiq page 160
9. Seerath Halbeeya Volume 3 page 236
10. Manaqib by Ibne Maghazli page 144

All these books contain this tradition:

"'Ali is with the Truth and the Truth is with 'Ali"

This Hadeeth is authentic and the great Sunni scholar Shah Abdul Aziz in Tuhfa Ithna Ashari page 211 said:

"The Ahl'ul Sunnah accept this and are prepared to place this on our eyes"

Comment

This is a crucial Hadeeth proving that attaching oneself to the teachings of 'Ali (as) guarantees

religious guidance. In this connection Sunni scholar Imam Radhi in his Tafseer Kabeer Volume 1 page 105 'al Masalath al Tasam' states:

When Imam Ali would pray Salat he would say 'Bismillah' in a loud voice, and this is proven from Tawatur traditions. Anyone who takes religious guidance from Ali shall be on the path of truth, since Rasulullah said, 'O Allah, turn the truth in whichever direction Ali is'.

The fact that Imam Ali (as)'s position is always the correct one is clearly evidenced by this tradition, so when he (as) took the side of Sayyida Fatima (as) testifying to support her claim, then his position was indeed one of truth. Abu Bakr rejected this testimony of truth. Ahl'ul Sunnah need to decide with whom was the truth, was it with Imam 'Ali (as) or Abu Bakr?

4.42 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr rejected the Hadeeth 'Ali is with the Qur'an and the Qur'an is with 'Ali'

As evidence we shall cite the following Sunni sources:

1. al-Mustadrak, by al-Hakim, v3, p124 on the authority of Umm Salama
2. al-Sawaiq al-Muhriqah, by Ibn Hajar, Ch. 9, section 2, pp 191,194
3. al-Awsat, by al-Tabarani; also in al-Saghir
4. Tareekh al-Khulafa, by Jalaluddin al-Suyuti, p173
5. Kanz ul Ummal Hadeeth number 32912

All the above references contain these words of Rasulullah (s):

"'Ali is with the Qur'an and the Qur'an is with 'Ali, the two shall not separate until they meet me at the Fountain of Kauthar"

Comment

We have relied on numerous Sunni sources containing this tradition that proves the exalted rank of Imam 'Ali (as). If Imam 'Ali (as) does the opposite, it renders the words of the Prophet(s) without any substance. According to the Hadeeth we are relying on, his testimony would be on par with the Qur'an, yet Abu Bakr rejected this testimony, he therefore rejected a Hadeeth of Rasulullah (s). Our opponents need to decide on the Fadak dispute, was the Qur'an with Hadhrat 'Ali (as) or was it with Abu Bakr?

In addition to this let us hear Imam 'Ali (as)'s own claim of superiority with regard to the knowledge of the Qur'an. These words can be located in the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Tareekh ul Khulafa (part English translation page 194, Dhikr 'Ali)
2. Hilayath al Awliya page 68 Chapter 7
3. Kanz al Ummal Volume 6 page 405
4. Nathajab Kanz al Ummal Volume 5 page 48

5. al Istiab Volume 3 page 463
6. Dhukhair al Aqba page 83 Chapter 112
7. al Isaba Volume 4 page 503
8. Fayz al Qadeer Volume 3 page 42 Chapter 23
9. Tadhkirathul Khawwas page 28

We quote verbatim from Tareekh ul Khulafa:

"Abu Tufayl said: 'Ali said 'Ask me about the Book of Allah because there is no Ayah but that know where it was revealed, at night or in day time, on the plain or in the mountain'

 [Tareekh ul-Khulafa, Page 194](#)

Also on the same page of Tareekh ul Khulafa: we read:

"... 'Ali said, By Allah, an ayah has not been revealed without me knowing about what it was revealed, when it was revealed, and about whom it was revealed. My Lord has given me a very intelligent heart and a true and articulate tongue".

These words of Imam 'Ali (as) also appear in Tabaqat ibn Sa'd Volume 2 page 238, Chapter 8 and Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 13.

In addition to this Ibne Masud narrates:

"Verily the Qur'an was revealed in seven dialects and there is a dialect that is clear and hidden, Ali possesses knowledge of both clear and hidden".

1. Fathul Uloom page 35'

2. Fasl ul Khitab page 313

3. Ya Nabi al Muwaddat page 57

Comment

The two claims of Imam Ali (as) attest to the superior knowledge of the Quran that Hadhrat 'Ali (as) possessed. He was aware of the dates, timing, places and reasons for revelation. In addition we have the testimony of Ibne Masud wherein he made it clear that Imam Ali (as) had a command of the clear and hidden meanings of the Quranic verses.

We also have these comments of Shaybi in Dhur Simtayn by Muhammad bin Yusuf Dhurundhi page 128:

"All that has been revealed to Rasulullah (s) is between these covers [i.e. the Qur'an] and in the Ummah no one knows more of it than 'Ali".

4.43 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr rejected the claim of Hadhrat 'Ali (as) 'I am the great truthful one'

As evidence we shall rely on the following authentic Sunni sources:

1. Sunan Ibn Majah Volume 1 page 69, (chapter Fadail 'Ali ibn abi Talib)

2. Al Riyadh al Nadira Volume 3 page 136 Part 3
3. Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 74 Hadeeth number 30
4. Kanz al Ummal Bab Fadail 'Ali Volume 6 page 394

We quote verbatim from Ibn Majah:

'I am a man of Allah, the brother of the Prophet, and the Great truthful one (Siddiq Akbar), anyone who claims this other than me is a liar, I offered Salat 7 years before anyone else'.

 [Sunan Ibn Majah, Vol. 1, Page 69](#)

We read in Mansab-e-Imamate, page 105 by the Great Imam of the Deobandis Shah Ismail Shaheed:

"Imamate is the Shadow of the Prophethood. The Imam's leadership is openly declared. Whereas history provides evidence of Saints that remained silent, the Imam announces whatever powers he possesses as Imam Ali did when he declared 'I am the Siddiq al Akbar (The Great Truthful One) and whoever declares this after me is a liar and I am the talking Qur'an".

 [Mansab-e-Imamate, Page 105](#)

Comment

Despite this high rank of Hadhrat 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr rejected his testimony in favour of Sayyida Fatima (as) in the Fadak dispute, Ahl'ul Sunnah will need to decide who the great truthful one was here, was it Imam 'Ali (as) or Abu Bakr?

4.44 By rejecting the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as), Abu Bakr rejected the Hadeeth 'I am the City of Knowledge and 'Ali is its Gate'

As evidence we are relying on the following Sunni sources:

1. Sahih al-Tirmidhi, v5, pp 201,637
2. Kanz al Ummal, Volume 6 page 401, Baba al Fadail min Qasim al Kawl
3. al-Mustadrak, by al-Hakim, v3, pp 126-127,226, Chapter Virtues of Ali, narrated on the authority of two reliable reporters: one, Ibn Abbas, whose report has been transmitted through two different chains of narrators, and the other, Jabir Ibn Abdullah al-Ansari. He said this tradition is Authentic (Sahih).
4. Fadha'il al-Sahaba, by Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v2, p635, Tradition 1081
5. Jami' al-Saghir, by Jalaluddin al-Suyuti, v1, pp 107,374; Also in Jami' al-Jawami'; Also in Tareekh al-Khulafa, p171. He said this tradition is accepted (Hasan).
6. al-Kabeer, by al-Tabarani (d. 360); Also in al-Awsat
7. Ma'rifah al-Sahaba, by al-Hafidh Abu Nu'aym al-Isbahani
8. Ihyaa al-Uloom, by al-Ghazzali

9. History of Ibn Kathir, v7, p358
10. History of Ibn Asakir
11. Tareekh, by al-Khateeb al-Baghdadi, v2, p337; v4, p348; v7, p173; v11, pp 48-50; v13, p204
12. al-Isti'ab, by Ibn Abd al-Barr, v3, p38; v2, p461
13. Usdul Ghabah, by Ibn al-Athir, v4, p22
14. Tahdhib al-Athar, by Ibn Jarir al-Tabari
15. Majma' al-Zawa'id, by al-Haythami, v9, p114
16. Bahr al-Asateed, by al-Hafidh Abu Muhammad Hassan Samarghandi (d. 491)
17. Siraj al-Muneer, by al-Hafidh Ali Ibn Ahmad Azizi Shafi'i (d.1070), v2, p63
18. Manaqib, by Ali Ibn Muhammad Ibn Tayyib al-Jalaabi Ibn Maghaazi (d. 483)
19. Firdaws al-Akhbar, by Abu Shuja'a Shirwayh Hamadani al-Daylami (d. 509)
20. Maqtal al-Hussain, by Khateeb Kharazmi (d. 568), v1, p43
21. Manaqib, by Khateeb Kharazmi (d. 568), p49
22. Alif Ba'a, by Abul Hajjaaj Yusuf Ibn Muhammad Andalusi (d.605), v1, p222
23. Matalib al-Su'ul, by Abu Salim Muhammad Ibn Talhih Shafi'i (d. 652), p22
24. Jawahi al-Aghdi'in, by Noor al-Din al-Shafi'i (d. 911)
25. Yanabi' al-Muwaddah, by al-Qundoozi al-Hanafi, in Chapter 14
26. Tadhkirat al-Khawwas al-Ummah, by Sibte Ibn al-Jawzi (d. 654), p29
27. Kunz al-Badradeen, by Shaikh Khathri
28. Kifayat al-Talib, by Yusuf al-Ganji al-Shafi'i (d. 658), Chapter 58
29. Kanz al-Ummal, by al-Muttaqi al-Hindi, part 15, p13, Traditions #348-379
30. al-Sawaiq al-Muhriqah, by Ibn Hajar al-Haythami, Ch. 9, section 2, p189

We read in Tareekh ul Khulafa by Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti (d. 911 AH), p. 170

"... al-Tirmidhi and al-Hakim has quoted on the authority of 'Ali who said: The Messenger of God, peace and blessings be upon him, said: 'I am the city of knowledge and 'Ali is its gate'..."

We read in Kanz al Ummal, Page 155:

"Suyuti stated that Ibn Jareer testified in favour of this Hadeeth, when I looked into this I performed istikhara and became convinced that the Hadeeth 'I am the city of knowledge and 'Ali is its gate' has a position.

Comment

Some modern day Salafis in line with their great Nasibi Imams Ibn Taimeeya and Ibn Jauzi have deemed this Hadeeth to be a fabrication. It is indeed shameful that they have the audacity to deem a Hadeeth weak that Suyuti had graded as correct. Even if for arguments sake we were to accept that this was Da'eef, there is still nothing for these Nasibis to cry about, we read in *Tatheer al Janaan*, under the footnote of *Sawaiqh al Muhriqa* page 45:

"All of our Imams, whether from amongst the Fuqaha or Saliheen, or Hafidh are in agreement, that a weak Hadeeth is evidence when discussing Manaqib or Fadail (merits).

These Nasibi should have some shame. Not a single Sahih Hadeeth exists in praise of Mu'awiya, which is why your Imam Bukhari did not compile a Chapter on the Fadail of Mu'awiya. Despite this the lovers of the Banu Umayyad regime, as part of their efforts to praise their Imam have devised a concept that weak Hadeeth can be evidenced when discussing Manaqib or Fadail. When this is the case why do they suffer from palpitations when asked to accept a Sahih Hadeeth in praise of Imam al Muttaqeen, Ali Ibn Abi Talib (as)?

Besides numerous other Ahadith also attest to the correctness of this tradition such as:

'Ali is my door of knowledge, and on the Shari'ah whatever matters create differences in the Ummah, 'Ali shall clarify clearly

Kanz al Ummal Volume 6 page 156 Bab Fadail 'Ali

'Ali is the Gate of Knowledge and shall declare the Shari'ah after me, on that which has been sent down, his love is Iman, his hared is hypocrisy, to look at his face is an act of Ibadat'

Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 122 Chapter 22

Comment

This tradition clearly makes it clear that it was the duty of Imam 'Ali (as) to clarify the Shari'ah of Rasulullah (s). Since Shari'ah is made up of two components the Qur'an and Sunnah, Hadhrat 'Ali (as)'s ruling should be the final say in all disputes. When Hadhrat 'Ali (as) declared the Islamic position on Prophetic inheritance during the Fadak dispute relying on the Qur'anic verses it was imperative for Abu Bakr to accept the position of Imam 'Ali (as) .

"Uns narrates from Rasulullah (s), on all that has been revealed by Allah (swt) the one with the greatest knowledge is 'Ali

Manaqib Sayyida 'Ali by A'ini, page 12

Comment

Why did Abu Bakr refuse to accept the viewpoints of the one with the greatest knowledge in the Fadak case?

Tafseer Gharab al Qur'an Part 3, Surah Aal-e-Imran, commentary of Mubahila and Tafseer Kabbeer page 465 Volume 2 Ayat Mubahila state:

'Whoever wishes to see the knowledge of Adam, should look at Ali ibn Abi Talib'

Ibne Abbas narrates: "when anyone can prove something on the authority of Ali then we would not turn to any one else for an answer"

Comment

When Imam Ali (as) position was deemed by the Sahaba as the final say on any matter then why did Abu Bakr refuse to accept his position in the Fadak dispute?

Qalabi narrates from Ibn Abbas "Allah (swt) bestowed knowledge upon the Prophet (s). Ali is the inheritor of the Prophet's knowledge, my knowledge is nothing compared to that of 'Ali, my knowledge and that of the Sahaba compared to 'Ali's is like a drop in seven Seas".

Al Sharaf al Muwabbad by Nubhaneh page 58, Qawqub al Dhuree page 297

Comment

When Hadhrat 'Ali (as) was the ocean of knowledge whilst all others were mere trinkets of water what right did Abu Bakr have to reject the knowledge of Hadhrat Ali (as) in the Fadak dispute?

The tradition proves that after Rasulallah (s), Imam 'Ali (as) was the most superior in knowledge and those that required guidance on a matter should turn to him. This is a fact that today's fake Sunnis (Salafi and Deobandi) find impossible to accept. The tradition makes it clear that if matters require clarification, the Ummah should turn to Imam 'Ali (as). In the Fadak dispute it was Abu Bakr's duty to avail from the knowledge of Ali(as)(the Gate of Knowledge) and get the matter clarified in accordance with the orders of Rasulallah(s). Abu Bakr failed to do so, he rejected the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as) and by doing so he rejected the Hadeeth < its is ?Ali and Knowledge of City the am>.

The harsh reality is by rejecting the witness testimonies of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) Abu Bakr demonstrated his open rejection of Qur'anic verses and Hadeeth that had descended in their honour. We are not willing to accept a man who does injustice to the daughter of Rasulallah (s) as the Khalifa of Rasulallah (s).

4.45 Refuting the defences presented by Abu Bakr's advocates

The witnesses produced in fadak dispute were chosen by Allah to testify on behalf of Rasulallah (s) during the Mubahila. Despite this these testimonies were rejected on the following grounds:

1. The number of witnesses required to substantiate a claim were not met.
2. Children cannot testify on behalf of their parents.
3. Hassan, Husayn and Umme Kalthum were too young to testify in the dispute.

Let us analyse each of the points:

4.46 Defence One: The number of witnesses required to substantiate a claim were not met

Reply

We have already mentioned the fact that there is no need for further witnesses when no other

claimant is challenging a claim. Witnesses are required by a Judge when he has no other means of ascertaining the truth. When a Judge is definite on a matter then there is no need for him to ask for witness testimony. The irony of the matter is that the stipulation for witness numbers had been met, there was 'Ali (as), Rabah, Umm Ayman, Umm Kalthum (as), Hassan (as), Husayn (as).

Although they did not all give testimony at the same time, they testified when the need arose. If we accept that Imam 'Ali (as) and Umm Ayman testified in the first instance, then the witness stipulation had been satisfied, since Sayyida Fatima (as) and umm Ayman were both women and Imam 'Ali was a male. The argument that a claimant's testimony cannot be included, (i.e. someone other than Sayyida Fatima (as) was needed) is baseless since independent witnesses are required when a plaintiff's claim is being challenged by another party, this was not the case here.

No one came forward during the dispute to counter the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) by making oath before Allah (swt) that he remained closely with Rasulallah (s) every day through his life, and at no time did he (s) make a declaration to bestow this land to Sayyida Fatima (as). If such a situation had arisen then this would have meant a direct challenge to Sayyida Fatima (as)'s testimony. In such a situation, the claim of the claimant and the rejection of a the plaintiff's claim by a second party would negate the testimonies of both sides. It would then be necessary to summon witnesses other than Sayyida Fatima (as).

Abu Bakr was acting in the capacity of Ruler and without any knowledge, adopted a dictatorial mindset demanding witnesses. There were no other claimants nor was anyone challenging the claimant's assertion hence in such a scenario the claimant's lone testimony is perfectly acceptable. The testimonies of Imam 'Ali (as) and his two sons also fulfilled the requirement of witness numbers. If the excuse is provided that these children were under age the rule of law is that if a child possesses common sense and knowledge then his/her testimony is acceptable.

One should think that when on the Day of Mubahila Rasulallah (s) presented Sayyida Fatima (as), Imam 'Ali (as), Hassan (as) and Husayn (as) as witnesses to his Prophethood, the Christian delegation did not raise a hue and cry that the witness stipulation had not been met. Rasulallah (s) was also one of the witnesses, in exactly the same that Sayyida Fatima (as) was a witness in the Fadak dispute.

No further witnesses were summoned on the Day of Mubahila, their testimonies formed part of a Supplication, and if the challenge had been accepted the following claim would have been made in the first instance, that Rasulallah (s) was a truthful Prophet (s) and Esau (as) was Man selected by Allah (swt), the Christians would reject this notion then both parties would curse one another.

Their testimony was that Rasulallah (s) was a true Prophet (s) and Esau (as) was a Prophet, not the Son of God.

4.47 Defence Two - Children cannot testify in support of their parents

Reply One

There is absolutely no proof from the Qur'an that would substantiate such a defence. In fact Qur'anic evidence is quite the opposite, wherein we see that an infant Hadrath Esau testified in support of his mother Hadrath Maryam (as). If we accept this argument then it forms a real mockery in the eyes of Non Muslims, who will state *'Muslims are so unreliable that children cannot testify in favour of their relatives!'*

If you look at the West we see how children's testimonies have come to be seen as acceptable in a court of law. Not only can children testify in favour of their parents, they can even be claimants in a dispute. This in effect recognises that a child's testimony is acceptable and can be presented as evidence, the Ahl'ul Sunnah opposing view has only been formulated to protect Abu Bakr, it has nothing to do with Islamic justice.

Reply Two - The Khalifas children have narrated Hadeeth praising their fathers

There is no Quranic basis that stipulates that a child cannot testify in support of his/her parents claim. If this is indeed true then by the same token all the virtues of Abu Bakr and Umar that have been narrated by their offsprings such as Ayesha, Hafsa and Abdullah Ibn Umar should likewise be rejected. This is indeed concerning when we learn that the sole narrator of the famous tradition wherein Abu Bakr led the prayers during the last sickness of Rasulullah (s) was none other than Ayesha. Although a Prophet's children cannot testify on behalf of their parents, The Khalifas children can. Their testimonies of their father's virtues are acceptable and none raises even an eyebrow of concern. Compare this to the Judicial rules that operate in the Christian West, where people's interests are put on high station, not only can children testify in favour of their parents claims, the testimony of the claimant is also deemed evidence in his favour. Unfortunately our opponents love of principles, has in effect given ammunition to critics to attack our religion!

Reply Three - Imam 'Ali (as) presented his son as his witness in a court case

Imam 'Ali (as) knew the Shari'ah better than any other Sahaba .We read in Tareekhul Khulafa [partial English translation] page 193:

"The Qadi Shurayh said: When 'Ali was setting out to Siffin, he found that he was missing a coat of armour of his. When the war was over and he returned to Kufa, he came across the armour in the hands of a Jew. He said to the Jew, 'the armour is mine, I have not sold it or given it away. The Jew said, 'It is my armour and it is in my hand'. He said, 'Let us go to the Qadi'. 'Ali went first, sat beside the Qadi...Suhyayh said, 'Speak Amir al Muminin'. He said 'Yes this armour which this Jew has is my armour; I did not sell and I did not give it away. Shurayh said, 'What do you say Jew?' He said 'It is my armour and it is in my possession'. Shurayh said, 'Do you have any evidence Amir ul Muminin' He said, 'Yes. Qanbar and al Hassan will witness the armour is mine'. Shurayh said, 'A son's testimony is not acceptable on behalf of his father 'A man from the Garden, and his testimony is not acceptable? I heard the Prophet may Allah bless him peace saying, 'al Hassan and al Hussein are the two Lords of the youth of people of the Garden'...

 [Tareekh ul-Khulafa, Page 193](#)

Comment

If a son's testimony in support of a parent is unacceptable then Imam 'Ali (as) would not have presented his son in this case. His testimony was presented because he was one of the people of Paradise. Sadly in the Fadak dispute Abu Bakr heard the testimonies of four people of Paradise Imam 'Ali (as), Hassan (as), Husayn (as) as well as the initial claim Sayyida Fatima (as). He rejected all of their testimonies! If the testimony of offspring for their parents is unacceptable then the testimonies of Ayesha, Hafsa and Abdullah Ibn Umar should also be rejected when it comes to narrating the virtues of Abu Bakr and Umar.

4.48 Defence Three - Underage children cannot testify in favour of their parents

Reply One - The superiority of the Awliya Allah in infancy

Hadhrat Yahya (as) was granted Prophethood whilst an infant.

We read in Surah Maryam verse 12:

(To his son came the command): "O Yahya! take hold of the Book with might": and We gave him Wisdom even as a youth,
Al-Qur'an, Surah Maryam, Ayah 12, translated by Yusufali

Hadhrat Esau (as) was granted Prophethood whilst still a child

We read in Surah Maryam verses 29-30:

But she pointed to the babe. They said: "How can we talk to one who is a child in the cradle?" He said: "I am indeed a servant of Allah: He hath given me revelation and made me a prophet;
Al-Qur'an, Surah Maryam, Ayah 29 & 30, translated by Yusufali

Allah (swt) made Hassan (as) and Husayn (as) witnesses to the Prophethood whilst they were still infants

Allah (swt) declares in Surah Aal-e-Imran verse 061:

If any one disputes in this matter with thee, now after (full) knowledge Hath come to thee, say: "Come! let us gather together, - our sons and your sons, our women and your women, ourselves and yourselves: Then let us earnestly pray, and invoke the curse of Allah on those who lie!"
Al-Qur'an, Surah Al-e-Imran, Ayah 61, translated by Yusufali

The above verse is clear proof that on the day of Mubahila, Rasulullah (s) was accompanied by Hassan (as) and Husayn (as) in order to testify to his Prophethood. It is therefore clear that you cannot compare these children to others via the use of Qiyas. The testimony of ordinary men requires them to be baligh, this was not the case here as Allah (swt) deemed these infant's testimonies to be correct.

Imam Jafer al Sadiq (as) would explain the way of Allah (swt) when he was a child

We read in Ya Nabi al Muwaddah page 415:

Muhammad Ibn Arabi narrates that at a young age Jafer could converse on the realities of the ways of Allah (swt)

Imam Abu Hanifa testified to the superior knowledge of a young Imam Musa Kadhim (as)

We read in Tuhfa Ithna Ashari Part 82 page 69:

"Abu Hanifa was sitting down, when the son of Imam Jafer, Musa came out, he was not baligh. Imam Abu Hanifa stood up to honour the child, and afforded him respect, and then asked him a question. Upon hearing the answer he was astounded and said 'Allah (swt) knows best with regards to the House wherein he sent Prophethood"

Imam Taqi (as) gave news of the unseen at a young age

For this we shall rely on the following two esteemed Sunni sources:

1. Shawahid al Nubuwwa page 205, Bab Dhikr Imam Muhammad Taqi
2. Sawaiqh al Muhriqa, Page 682 & 683, Dhikr 'Ali Raza

Mamun Abbasid went hunting, left an eagle and it went missing from his sight. When the eagle returned it carried a fish in his break. Mamun placed the fish in his handkerchief. On his return children of Baghdad were playing on the road, when they saw him they ran off save one boy. Mamun asked "Tell what's in my hand, he said "God from his creations has created fish in the Sea, some Kings hunt them with eagles and via them the family of the Prophet are tested".

 [Sawaiq al-Muhriqa, Page 682 & 683](#)

Young Imam Askari (as) offered advice to Bahlool

We read in Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 687 Fadail al Askari:

"Bahlool once saw a child crying in the street where all the other children were busy playing with their toys. Bahlool said 'Shall I purchase a toy for you?' the child replied: "We have not been created to play!"

Bahlool asked 'Why have you been created'. The child said to attain knowledge and perform Ibadah"

 [Sawaiq al-Muhriqa, Page 687](#)

Imam Mahdi (as) attained knowledge at a young age

Reply One

As evidence we shall cite the following classical Sunni works:

1. Sawaiqh al Muhriqa, Page 689, Fadail Abu Muhammad
2. Ya Nabi al Muwaddah page 452

We are quoting verbatim from Sawaiqh:

Imam Mahdi was five years old when his father died, Allah (swt) bestowed wisdom on him at that age

 [Sawaiq al-Muhriqa, Page 689](#)

Reply Two - Young children are seen as innocent and truthful

We cited the fact that Nabi Esau (as) testified for his mother whilst still in the cradle. This verse reflects the common notion that young children are seen as pure and innocent, which is why their words are commonly accepted as fact, since young children will speak the truth without fear of the consequences / repercussions of such a comment. In this regard we have the episode wherein an infant Imam Hasan (as) told Abu Bakr to move from his father's pulpit.

Suyuti records that:

"Al Hassan Ibn Ali came to Abu Bakr when he was upon the mimbar of the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, and said 'Come down from my father's seat'. He said 'You have told the truth, it is your father's seat,' and he placed him in his lap and wept'. Ali said 'By Allah this was not from my command'.

History of the Khalifahs who took the right away, by: Al Hafiz Jalaludin Suyuti. English translation by Abdasamad Clark Page 71. Taha Publishers

Rather than brush aside this comment as the mutterings of a child fantasist, he said to the infant Imam Hasan (as) *'You have told the truth'*, thus proving in Abu Bakr's eyes that the testimony of an infant is acceptable.

By rejecting the testimonies of Hassan (as) and Husayn (as), Abu Bakr inflicted injustice on the Ahl'ul Bayt (as)

Anyone who rejects the high rank of the Awliya Allah possesses a weak Iman. These two young boys were not ordinary members of the Ummah, where a baligh testimony was required. Such rulings are not applicable to Prophets and Imams and we have already cited the example of Khuzamah ibn Thabit (al Bukhari, Abu Dawood) who was bestowed the title of 'Dhul Shahadatayn' (one whose evidence is equivalent to the evidence of two witnesses)

Reply Three - Abu Bakr's daughter narrated the spiritual Mir'aj of Rasulullah (s)

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work Zaad al Maad Volume 2 page 54, Dhikr Miraaj:

"Ayesha and Mu'awiya narrated that the Mir'aj of Rasulullah (s) was spiritual, his body did not disappear"

Comment

The Mir'aj occurred before the Hijrah in Makka, this was a time when Ansar.Org's Imam Mu'awiya was a Kaafir, and Ayesha was a mere child, she was unmarried and was in her father's home, and had never seen the bed of Rasulullah (s).

Reply Four - Infant Ayesha also narrated the events of Hijrah

We read in Zaad al Maad Volume 2 page 59:

"Ayesha narrates that we prepared the belongings of Rasulullah and Abu Bakr at the time of the Hijrah. We placed baked bread in a pot that was tied by Asma".

Comment

Ayesha was not baligh at the time of the Hijrah, yet as this event is a virtue of Abu Bakr, she is a narrator. We appeal to justice, at the time of Hijrah and Mir'aj, Ayesha had not attained puberty, rather she was a mere child, yet the testimony of this infant daughter of Abu Bakr is acceptable. Curiously the testimony of Hadhrat Hassan (as) and Husayn (as) was rejected by Abu Bakr in the Fadak case on the ground that they had not attained puberty. Is this not a proof of bias and double standards?

Reply Five - A three year old child becomes his mother's Wali and performs her Nikah

We read in Zaad al Maad Volume 1 page 40:

"Rasulullah (s) asked Umar bin Salma for his mothers hand in marriage, he then performed the Nikah of his mother, he was a child at the time"

Comment

Later in the same text Ibn Qayyim states that Umar was three years of age. We have proven from the books of Ahl'ul Sunnah that they accept the testimonies of children. We have the example of Ayesha who narrated the event of Mir'aj when she was a mere infant, yet for the sake of exalting the rank of her father Abu Bakr her words are perfectly acceptable. When it comes to such narrations the Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah blindly accept such narration's, deeming them as part of their Iman. On the other hand the words of a family whose children have knowledge of the unseen, who can discuss the ways of Allah (swt) at the age of six, are completely rejected. Imam Hassan (as) and Husayn (as) were the Leaders of the Youth of Paradise and they testified to the truthfulness of their mothers claim to Fadak. Abu Bakr should have accepted their words, but did not and made the land a part of Muslim treasury; by doing this he undoubtedly opposed the Qur'an and Sunnah.

Reply Six - The esteemed grandson of Abu Bakr narrated the event of Khandaq at the age of three

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's esteemed work Sahih Muslim, Sharh Nawawi Volume 2 page 281, Bab Fadail Zubayr:

"Abdullah bin Asma binte Abu Bakr narrated the state of Zubayr, his father at the time of the battle of Khandaq. Ibn Zubayr was born in the first Hijrah, the Battle of Khandaq occurred in the 4th Hijrah".

We have no idea what wrong the family of Ali (as) had perpetuated against the Muslims that lead them to rejecting the testimonies of Hadhrat Hassan (as) and Husayn (as) on the grounds

that they were not baligh. The testimony of Abu Bakr's three year old grandson is acceptable, but the testimony of the grandsons of Rasulullah (s) that their grandfather bestowed the land of Fadak to their mother is unacceptable. If you accuse us of bearing enmity towards the Sahaba then let it be known that you bear enmity to the Ahl'ul bayt (as); this dispute shall ultimately be decided on the Day of Judgement. We bear no personal grudge towards Abu Bakr, but our affiliation is with the leader of the women of Paradise.

4.49 Defence Four - A husband cannot acts as witness for his wife

Reply

If Imam 'Ali (as) was amongst those who on account of worldly gain and personal benefit preferred gathering at Saqifa to Rasulullah's funeral then their might well have been grounds to question his testimony. The reality is Imam 'Ali (as) was a pious humble man and rejecting his testimony was a major injustice.

We appeal to such advocates, we all have to die one day and held answerable to God. Have you ever contemplated that your Imam Abu Hanifa or Muhammad Ismail Bukhari would lie to achieve some personal benefit ? If you believe that these individuals would never do such a thing then how do you believe that the Chief of the Pious, Hadhrat 'Ali (as) would lie to gain personal benefit?

In any case a husband is allowed to testify in support of his wife by your own scholars. Imam of the Nasibis Ibn Taymeeya in Minhaj al Sunnah Volume 2 page 166 Dhikr Fadak states:

"On a husband's testimony there exist two views, Abu Hanifa said it was not acceptable, whilst Imam Sha'afi, Abi Sawar, Ibn Mazazir stated a husband can testify in favour of his wife".

A clearer proof can be galvanised from Ahle Sunnah's authority work Al Alam al Moqeen page 41:

"Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s) never raised doubts over the testimony of a father for his son, or a brother or any other near relative. There exists no ijma'a amongst the Muslims refuting this notion.

Abdul Razzaq (narrates from this chain) - Abi Bakr bin Abi Samra - Abi Zanaad - Abdullah bin Umar bin Zubay who heard Umar ibn al Khattab [ra] say 'The testimony of a father for his son, or vice versa, or by a brother for a brother is permissible. He also narrated without a chain from Zuhri that the Salaf had no objections to the testimony of a father for his or vice versa, or brother, or husband for a wife"

Umm Ayman also testified in the Fadak dispute

The truthfulness of Umm Ayman can be proven from the fact that Sunni works have confirmed that she is a woman of Paradise. We read in Insaan al Yaun Volume 1 page 84, Bab Wafaath Waladayn Nabi:

Zaid bin Harith married Umm Ayman when he heard Rasulullah (s) say 'Whoever wishes to marry a women of Paradise should marry Umm Ayman"

Comment

In the eyes of Ahl'ul Sunnah Umm Ayman was a woman of Paradise, a woman of Paradise cannot be a liar according to your aqeedah. In the Fadak Case this Paradise bound woman testified in favour of Sayyida Fatima (as), hence it was Abu Bakr's duty to accept her testimony.

Some of Abu Bakr's advocates have sought to mislead their followers by claiming that Umm Ayman was the only witness for Sayyida Fatima (as) in the Fadak dispute. Whilst we have already refuted this assertion, even if this was the case her testimony in this dispute would have been sufficient, we read in Ahle Sunnah's book of rulings Al Alam al Moqeen page 34:

"We have a Saheeh Hadeeth from the Prophet (s) that if an resolution can be established from a woman's testimony, then that shall suffice as proof, even if she is a Servant"

5. Imam 'Ali (as)'s position on Fadak

5.1 Hadhrat 'Ali (as)'s view of Abu Bakr's ruling on the Fadak dispute

Nasibis can offer as many defences for Abu Bakr as they like, but the bottom line is that Imam 'Ali (as) did not deem Abu Bakr's position to be correct, rather he was scathing in his criticism. We read in Sahih Muslim Book 019, Number 4349 that Umar acknowledged the following to Imam 'Ali (as):

Umar's Words:

When the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) passed away, Abu Bakr said: " I am the successor of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him)." Both of you came to demand your shares from the property (left behind by the Messenger of Allah). (Referring to Hadhrat 'Abbas), he said: You demanded your share from the property of your nephew, and he (referring to 'Ali) demanded a share on behalf of his wife from the property of her father. Abu Bakr (Allah be pleased with him) said: The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) had said: " We do not have any heirs; what we leave behind is (to be given in) charity." So both of you thought him to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest.

5.2 Why didn't Hadhrat 'Ali raise his sword to get Fadak back at the time?

Imam Ali's reasons for not fighting at the time to restore Fadak are the same as why he didn't fight to claim his rightful throne back, and we have addressed these points in our article on Taqiyyah.

 [Taqiyyah \(Expedient dissimulation\)](#)

If Nasibis are still not satisfied then allow us to give a more comprehensive reply from Kanz al Ummal Volume 6 page 29, Bab al Fitan:

"Rasulullah (s) said, 'Ali when people love this world, and shall usurp inheritance what shall you do? Ali replied I shall leave them alone, and shall seek out Allah (swt), his Prophet (s) and the next world. I shall bear patience in relation to worldly problems until I meet you'. Rasulullah (s) said 'You spoke correctly, O Allah! Give 'Ali patience'".

We appeal to justice. Abu Bakr loved this world and denied to Sayyida Fatima (as) her justified right. If Hadhrat 'Ali chose not to exercise force to get Fadak back, preferring the matter to be resolved on the Day of Judgement, he was acting in a way that had been endorsed as correct by Rasulullah (s).

5.3 The common Sunni/Nasibi counter attack and alleged Shia defences for Khalifa Ali (as)'s failure to reclaim Fadak

Al Khider employs the common counter attack method on the Fadak dispute:

Ansar.org states:

It is therefore concluded that Fadak was neither inheritance nor a gift. This was exactly the

position of Imam 'Ali. When he became the Khaleefah he did not treat Fadak as the estate of his deceased wife Sayyidah Fatimah, by taking a quarter for himself and distributing the remaining three quarters between , Husayn and Umm Kulthum according to the rule "to the male twice the share of the female". This is an established fact of history.

In the article Fadak, the author then sets out what he deems are Shi'a responses to Khalifa 'Ali (as)'s decision not to restore Fadak to the Ahl'ul bayt (as). He attributes four common excuses (conjured up in his mind) and then refutes each one of them. What is amusing is the fact that he fails to provide even a single Shi'a source wherein such a defence has been put forward .He falsely attributes these defences to the Shi'a and then refutes them! Let us see the work of his genius mind.

un named author states:

1. "Members of the Ahlul-Bayt will not resume property usurped from them. As a matter of fact, when Rasulullah, Sallallahu Alayhi wa Sallam, conquered Mecca, he did not take his home back from the Meccans who had usurped it from him."

This answer is not sound. Hadhrat Khalif 'Umar bin Abdul-'Aziz (Radhi Allahu Anhu), during his Khulafa, gave the orchard called Fedek to Hadhrat al-Imam Sayyid Muhammad al-Baqir (Radhi Allahu Anhu), who accepted it, so that it was possessed by the Ahlul-Bayt A'immah until it was seized by Abbasid Khalifas. Then, in 203 Hijra, Khalifa Ma'mun wrote to his official, Qusam bin Ja'far and thus the orchard was given again to one of the Sayyid Imams, namely to al-Imam Ali Rida, and upon his death the same year, it was given to Yahya, a grandson of Zayd, who was the grandson of Sayyidina al-Husayn (Radhi Allahu Ta'ala Anhu). This person should not be mistaken for his namesake, Zayd, who was Hadhrat Sayyidah Nafisa's grandfather and at the same time Hadhrat Sayyidina al-Hasan's son. The orchard was usurped again by Khalifa Mutawakkil, who was Mamun's grandson. Later on Mu'tadid gave it back again. If members of the Ahlul-Bayt (Radhi Allahu Ta'ala Anhum Ajma'een) would not take back their usurped property, then why did these Imams (who were members of the Ahlul-Bayt) take the orchard back? By the same token, it is asserted that Hadhrat Abu Bakr (Radhi Allahu Ta'ala Anhu) usurped the office of Khalifa which belonged to Hadhrat Ali (Radhi Allahu Ta'ala Anhu) by rights. Why did Hadhrat Ali (Radhi Allahu Ta'ala Anhu) accept this "usurped" right later? Furthermore, why did Hadhrat al-Husayn (Radhi Allahu Ta'ala Anhu) try to win his usurped right of Khaleefah

back from Yazid so earnestly that he attained the gardens of martyrdom in the end?

Reply

No Shi'a would advance such a pathetic argument, and the author has just attributed this to the Shi'a so that he can respond to it himself! What is interesting is his admission that three of the Khalifas, Umar Ibn Abdul Aziz, Mamun and Mu'tadid restored Fadak to the descendants of Sayyida Fatima (as). If Fadak was not their legal right then why did these Khalifas offer this rich land to them? Why did these descendants accept the land if it was not their legal right? By advancing this argument the author has shot himself in the foot, for he has inadvertently cited three Khalifas who rejected Abu Bakr's decision in the Fadak dispute.

un named author states:

2. "Hadrat Ali imitated Hadhrat Fatimah 'radi-allahu anhumah' and did not accept any share from Fedek."

This answer makes no sense. Why did the Ahlul-Bayt A'immah (Radhi Allahu Ta'ala Anhum Ajma'een) who accepted Fedek (afterwards) not imitate Sayyidah Fatimah az-Zahra (Millions of Sallams upon her)? If it was a fard to imitate her, why did they ignore this fard, bearing in mind that their belief regarding the Ahlul-Bayt A'immah are without error and contradiction. If it was supererogatory (Wajib) and not fard, then why did Hadhrat Ali (Karamallahu wajhu) do this supererogatory act at the cost of omitting an act that was fard? Hadhrat Ali would never omit a fard act. For it is fard to give everyone his or her due. Moreover, it might be reasonable to imitate someone's optional behavior. If this behavior is a result of coercion, then it should not be imitated. If Hadhrat Sayyidah Fatimah's (Radhi Allahu Ta'ala Anha) not utilizing Fedek was due to someone else's oppression, then she had to waive her right because she had no other way. In this case it would have been senseless to imitate her.

Reply

Again the Shi'a never advance this imitation argument, if Imam 'Ali (as) was imitating anyone it was Rasulullah (s) by not taking an action that would cause Fitnah, and we shall elaborate this later.

un named author states:

3. "Hadrat Ali (radi-allahu ta'ala) had witnessed Fedek's being bequeathed to Hadhrat Fatimah. In order to show that this witnessing was done for

Allah's sake and not for worldly advantages, he did not accept any advantage from Fedek."

Al Khidhr replies to this:

Those who knew about Hadhrat Ali's witnessing and those who rejected it were dead by the time he became Khalifa. Furthermore, some Ahlul-Bayt Imams' accepting the orchard named Fedek made the group called Khariji consider that Hadhrat Ali might have done this witnessing in order to obtain advantages for his children. In fact, in matters concerning real estates, such as fields, houses, vineyards and orchards, one thinks of one's children's advantages rather than one's own. Perhaps, Hadhrat Ali might have advised his children not to utilize Fedek, lest his witnessing be tarnished. And his children might have refused Fedek both to imitate Hadhrat Fatimah and to fulfill this secret advice. Such is Ulama's comments on the matter.

Reply

Again this is not a Shi'a argument the reason that Imam 'Ali (as) did not take the land back was because of the situation that he faced when he came to power. Those who rejected the claim may have been dead by the time, but their memory lived on in the minds of their die hard adherents led by Ayesha, Marwan and Mu'awiya, all of whom rejected the Khilafat of Imam 'Ali (as) and were willing to use any type of propaganda to damage him.

un named author states:

Claim

4. *"Hadrat Ali's not accepting the orchard called Fedek was intended for Taqiyya. Taqiyya is necessary for Shi'ah."*

Al Khidhr replies to this:

Taqiyya means to lie and Shi'ah believe it is fard to lie, especially to those of the Ummah of Sayyidina Rasul-e-Akram, Sallallahu alayhi wa Sallam, known as Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah. This statement of theirs is untenable. For, according to the adherents of Shi'ism, "when an Imam takes the battlefield and begins to fight it is haram for him to do Taqiyya. It was for this reason that Hadhrat Husayn did not do Taqiyya." To say that Hadhrat Ali (Radhi Allahu Ta'ala Anhu) did Taqiyya during the period of his Khaleefat would mean to say that he committed haraam. Astaghfirullahal-Azeem.

Reply

Firstly Taqiyyah does not mean to lie and we have addressed the concept in two of our articles:

 [The creed of Shia'a; explained](#)

 [Taqiyyah \(Expedient dissimulation\)](#)

Like the author we also believe that Imam 'Ali (as) did not adopt Taqiyyah, his silence was because he did not want any action to be used in the propaganda campaign against him and again we shall address this in the later part of this article.

5.4 Was Maula 'Ali (as) 'ashamed' to reclaim Fadak

Al Khider advances this earth shattering reference:

Ansar.org states:

Sayyid Murtada (known as 'Alam al-Huda) narrates in his book on Imamah entitled ash-Shafi, that when 'Ali became the khalifah he was approached about returning Fadak. His reply was: "I am ashamed before Allah to overturn something that was prohibited by Abu Bakr and continued by 'Umar." (al-Murtada, ash-Shafi fil-Imamah, p. 231; and Ibn Abil Hadid, Sharh Nahj al-Balaghah, vol. 4

Reply One

We should point out that Ibn al Hadeed's reference is of no use to us since Ibn al Hadeed was a Mutazzalite scholar not Shi'a. The text cited by al Murtada has not been verified by an Shi'a Hadeeth scholar, and to quote the comments of our Shah Abdul Aziz in Taufa Ithna Ashari, Chapter 9 page 266 Muthaheen Abu Bakr:

In the eyes of Ahl as-Sunnah, only those hadith are reliable that appear in the authoritative texts of hadith scholars.

The tradition claims that Imam Ali (as) was ashamed before Allah to overturn something that was prohibited by Abu Bakr and continued by 'Umar.

This conflicts with the most authentic Ahadeeth in Sunni literature that presents an entirely different scenario. Sahih al Bukhari informs us that Abu Bakr prohibited Fadak by using the Hadeeth of "No heirs of Prophet" while Mawla Ali (as) was not convinced with it and deemed Abu Bakr to be a liar.

Not only during the life of Abu Bakr, but also after his death (i.e. in the time of Umar's reign) Maula Ali (as) tried his utmost to get his share of Fadak back. Mawla Ali (as) and Abbas went to Umar and demanded the right of Fadak.

Sahih Muslim Book 019, Number 4349 and 4350 demonstrates that Hadhrat 'Ali (as) was in no way ashamed to overturn Abu Bakr's decision, on the contrary he (as) deemed the Khalifa's confiscation of Fadak as proof of him being a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest.

If Maula Ali (as) was really ashamed of overturning something that was prohibited by Abu Bakr,

why would he make a claim before Abu Bakr in the first place?

Both Ahadith confirm the fact that when Hadhrat Umar continued to follow the practice of Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Mawla Ali (as) also of thought him as a *'lair, dishonest, treacherous and sinful'*.

There is therefore no question of Maula 'Ali (as) being ashamed of reclaiming something that had been prohibited by Abu Bakr and Umar.

Reply Two

Al Khider wants to suggest that Maula 'Ali (as) was ashamed of changing the status quo set by Abu Bakr and questions why he failed to take remedial steps to claim back Fadak, yet according to Ahl'ul Sunnah's most authentic work Sahih al Bukhari Hadhrat Umar entrusted Mawla Ali (as) and Hadhrat Abbas to take care of property of Fadak in accordance with the conditions set by Abu Bakr. Whilst we reject such a notion, we here seek to present the Sunni historical perspective, which differs from the Shi'a point of view. We will give Shi'a point of view about this afterwards.

According to Sahih Bukhari, Maula Ali (s) and Hadhrat Abbas didn't care for these conditions and disputed with each other. Later on Maula Ali (as) overpowered Hadhrat Abbas and took the full control of Fadak.

Note: We are only representing the Authentic Sunni Point of View on this historical incident, which differs from Shi'a point of view. We will give Shi'a point of view about this later on.

Why is Al Khider seeking to rely on a tradition suggesting Maula Ali (as)'s desire not to restore Fadak to its rightful heirs?

We now present the tradition from Sahih al Bukhari that confirms that Mawla Ali (as) disputed with Hadhrat Abbas over Fadak and later on overpowered him.

Sahih Bukhari, Volume 5, Book 59, Number 367:

Narrated Malik bin Aus Al-Hadathan An-Nasri,

...Then 'Umar turned towards 'Ali and 'Abbas and said, ...So I kept this property in my possession for the first two years of my rule (i.e. Caliphate) and I used to dispose it of in the same way as Allah's Apostle and Abu Bakr used to do; and Allah knows that I have been sincere, pious, rightly guided and the follower of the right (in this matter. Later on both of you (i.e. 'Ali and Abbas) came to me, O 'Abbas! You also came to me and the claim of you both was one and the same. So I told you both that Allah's Apostle said, "Our property is not inherited, but whatever we leave is to be given in charity." Then when I thought that I should better hand over this property to you both or the condition that you will promise and pledge before Allah that you will dispose it off in the same way as Allah's Apostle and Abu Bakr did and as I have done since the beginning of my caliphate or else you should not speak to me (about it).' So, both of you said to me, 'Hand it over to us on this condition.' And on this condition I handed it over to you. Do you want me now to give a decision other than that (decision)? By Allah, with Whose Permission both the sky and the earth stand fast, I will never give any decision other than that (decision) till the Last Hour is established. But if you are unable to manage it (i.e. that property), then return it to me, and I will manage on your behalf." The sub-narrator said,.....So, this property (of Sadaqah) was in the hands of Ali who withheld it from 'Abbas and overpowered him. Then it came in the hands of Hasan bin 'Ali, then in the hands of Hussain bin 'Ali, and then in the hands of Ali bin Hussain and Hasan bin Hasan, and each of the last two used to manage it in turn, then it came in the

hands of Zaid bin Hasan, and it was truly the Sadaqah of Allah's Apostle ."

Readers can also consult traditions on this subject: Sahih Bukhari Hadeeth: 9.408, 8.720 4:326.

Can Al Khider explain why he does not ascribe to what his most authentic Hadeeth scholar Imam Bukhari has recorded? Once you accept that which has been authentically transmitted to you (according to your standards), then why are you (al Khider) producing a weak Hadeeth suggesting that Imam 'Ali (as) was ashamed of doing things which Abu Bakr prohibited?

As far as the Shi'a point of view is concerned, we believe that the sub-transmitter of Bukhari's Hadeeth made some mistake in giving the correct account.

The facts are as follows:

1. For two years in Umar's reign, both Mawla Ali (as) and Hadhrat Abbas came to Umar and demanded their right of Fadak (while they never accepted the fake Hadeeth by Abu Bakr).
2. Umar restored Fadak to them on condition that they maintain it as Abu Bakr had done. But they didn't observe this condition and wanted to take possession of Fadak.

After some time, Maula Ali (as) overpowered Hadhrat Abbas and took control of whole Fadak property (while he considered Fadak to be the right of Fatima Zahra (Salam Allah Alaiha). This dispute reached a level where both Hadhrat Abbas and Hazrat Ali(as) went to Umar to settle this dispute between them (while Abbas was also of view that he had a share and Abu Bakr only lied upon Rasool (saww) by fabricating a Hadeeth).

3. Umar told them that they cannot maintain the property while they disputed over possession. So, he placed it under his custody. This matches with history, it remained in the hands of the state proven by the fact that when Uthman succeeded Umar as Khalifa, the kind generous Khalifa who looked out for the needs of his poor relatives gave the entire Estate of Fadak to Marwan bin Al-Hakam.

One needs to be aware that Mawla Ali (as) and Abbas approached Umar on two occasions.

First Occasion: Umar entrusted them the entire Estate of Fadak.

Second Occasion: Umar restored Fadak back to his custody (on account of the dispute between Ali (as) and Abbas).

Clearly, the sub-transmitter of Bukhari's Hadeeth seems to have made a mistake by thinking that Mawla Ali (as) overpowered Abbas after they went to Umar the second time.

The overpowering had occurred before the second incident, prior to Abbas's going to Umar. Following the second incident (after Umar took Fadak back), there was no property left for Maula Ali (as) to overpower Abbas.

Reply Three

The tradition suggests that Maula 'Ali (as) was ashamed to do anything that would contravene a decision of Abu Bakr. If this was even remotely true, then there would have been no reason to for him to reject the offer of Khilafath (the third time) on the condition that he adhered to the Qur'an, Sunnah and to the practices of Abu Bakr and Umar! Whilst agreeing to the Qur'an and

Sunnah he (as) refused to adhere to the practices of Abu Bakr and Umar. This fact can be located in the following esteemed works of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

1. Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 7 page 146
2. Sharh Fiqh Akbar page 66 "Fadail Naas badh ai Rasulullah"
3. Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 213
4. Tareekh Abu Fida Volume 1 page 166 Dhikr Maqaathil Umar
5. Tareekh Khamees Volume 2 page 255
6. Tareekh Tabari Volume 14 pages 158-159
7. Tareekh Kamil Volume 3 page 35 Dhikr Shura

If Hadhrat 'Ali (as) was 'ashamed' to contravene Abu Bakr's rulings then he would have accepted this condition whole heartedly. What would be the reason for Imam 'Ali (as) refusing to abide by the decision of a Khalifa whose rulings he was too ashamed to change? The refusal of Imam 'Ali (as) to accept this condition serves as the greatest proof that he wanted to distance himself from their Bidah rulings. The fact that this rejection by Maula 'Ali (as) of the so called hadeeth cited by Abu Bakr is replete in Sunni books of Tareekh and Fiqh leaves no doubt that it is fabricated, and this clear proof makes the narration cited by al Khider as completely baseless.

5.5 So 'Why' didn't Khalifa 'Ali (as) take Fedak back?

After these great responses, the author of the article Fedek arrives at the following conclusion:

un named author states:

Conclusion with common sense...

Hadhrat Abu'l-Barakat Abdullah Suwaydi al-Baghdadi writes in his Hujaj-e-Qatiya:
 "Supposing all these evidences are disigned and it is still presumed that the Khalifa Abu Bakr as-Siddiq took the date orchard called Fedek by force; then why did Hadhrat 'Ali (Radhi Allahu Ta'ala 'Anhu) not give the date orchard to Hadhrat al-Hasan and al-Husayn when he became the Khaleefah and everything was now in his hands, under his command? Why did he not change what had been done by the three Khalifas previous to him? Hadrat Ali's following the same policy as had been followed by the previous three Khaleefahs concerning the date orchard is a plain evidence for the fact that it had not been taken by force by Abu Bakr."

Reply One

We read in the esteemed Shi'a work Rudhutul Kafi, Sermon of Al-Fatan wa Al-Bidah, page 59, published in Iran:

"The Caliphs before me intentionally practiced such acts in which they went against Rasool Allah (saww). They broke the promises (which they made with Rasool) and changed the Sunnah of Rasool Allah (saww). If (today) I ask people to leave all these things (innovations) and restore things back to the way they were at the time of Rasulallah (s), my army shall rebel and abandon me, and I shall be left alone. All that shall remain turning to me shall be those Shi'a who recognise my virtues and rank.

Then he further explained by giving some examples that: "If I return Fadak to the heirs of Fatima (as), and if I order to restore the "SA'a" (a unit for measuring wheat) of Rasool Allah (s). And if I return the properties, which were given by Rasool (s) to their original owners, and deny the decisions which were based on injustice (and tyranny), and snatch the women who were illegally taken by some people and return them to their husbands, and if I deny the (unjust) distribution of Fadak, and start giving the shares to every one equally (as were originally given by Rasool (s), but earlier caliphs started giving according to status), and restore the condition of Khums of Rasool (saww), and to bring Masjid-e-Nabi to it's original position, and to make "Mash alal Khaffin" haram, and to issue punishment ("Had") for drinking "Nabeedh" (alcohol made out of barley), and give the fatwa for Mut'ah being Halaal, and start saying 5 Takbirs at funeral, and make it obligatory upon people to recite "Bismillah" loudly during Salat and ask people to follow the Quranic and Sunnah way of giving Talaq, and ask people to give all the Sadaqat, and to restore the way of abulation, ghusal and Salah to it's original form and time, and give back the fidya (which was unjustly taken) to Ahl-e-Najran, and return the slave girls of Ahle Faras, and ask people to return to Qur'an and Sunnah of Rasool (s), then all people will abandon me (and I will be left alone). I ordered people that they should only gather for Fardh (obligatory) prayers during Ramadhan, and told them that congregation (Jamah) in Nafal (i.e. Tarawih) is a Bidah (innovation) then all of these people started shouting that Sunnah of Hadhrat Umar has been changed."

Comment

Thanks to the efforts of the early Khalifas, the Estate of Fadak had ultimately reached the hands of evil characters. Had Imam 'Ali (as) the Khalifa restored Fadak by force, these people would have reacted with open opposition, and spread rumours / Fitnah and hatred against the Imam (as). It was due to this difficult situation that Hadhrat 'Ali (as) chose not to raise the Fadak matter, to avoid the propaganda, namely *'the moment Hadhrat 'Ali (as) came to power he annexed the land belonging to his political opponents'*. Fadak was in the hands of Banu Umayyad, sworn enemies of Hadhrat 'Ali (as), and he knew that they would never return Fadak of their own accord. Any attempt to take the land would have lead to vocal opposition, they would have raised a hue and cry towards Hadhrat 'Ali (as) stating:

'You are taking land that was bestowed to us by the slain third Khalifa Uthman Ibn Affan', and on becoming the Khalifa you have perpetuated injustice against us'.

Aware of the potential ramifications of claiming Fadak back, Hadhrat 'Ali (as) restrained from any physical aggression to wrest Fadak back, but condemned the usurpers through his eloquent sermon.

Reply Two - The situation for Imam 'Ali (as) made it impossible for him to take back Fadak

One needs to look at the situation that Imam 'Ali (as) faced when coming to power. This was not some simple transition to power. Uthman had been murdered and the people had begged

Maula 'Ali to take helm of the State to prevent matter falling into further anarchy. Imam 'Ali (as) was surrounded by Fitnah all around, no sooner had Talha and Zubayr given bayya that they broke it, joining Ayesha in a movement against the Khaleefa, whipping up support demanding he hand over the killers of Uthman. Their refusals to abandon their Fitnah lead to the Battle of Jamal. At the same time Mu'awiyah was also taking advantage of the situation, presenting the bloodied shirt of Uthman, and his wife severed fingers throughout Syria he was cooking up a frenzy of agitation towards Imam 'Ali (as) in Syria that lead to the Battle of Siffeen. Surrounded by opposition / civil strife all around the slightest action that could have been exploited would have been. If Maula 'Ali (as) took back Fadak, his enemies would have argued that the Khaleefa's objective in attaining power was to gain personal gain, taking land rather than peace. The Banu Umayya were master tacticians in the field of propaganda and they would have pounced on the slightest glimmer of opportunity, getting people to turn on the Khaleefa. Let us not forget that in his letter to Mu'awiyah as recorded in Nahj ul Balagha the Imam (as) questioned what right he had to accept his authority when:

Verily, those who took the oath of allegiance to Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman have sworn allegiance to me.

Nasabi love to misinterpret this letter suggesting that Maula 'Ali (as) endorsing the legitimacy of the three Khaleefas. What he was actually doing was entering into a polemical debate with Mu'awiyah. In Sunni / Shi'a polemics debates are based on one party quoting sources of the opposing camp as proof, and this is exactly what Imam 'Ali (as) was doing. He (as) was telling Mu'awiya since he believed that legitimacy of a Khaleefa's rule is based on gaining bayya then he had also come to power on this basis. What Imam 'Ali (as) was also presenting was the fact that those that had given him bayya were supporters of the first three Khaleefas in other words they were the early remnants of what later developed as Sunni aqeedah! Had Imam 'Ali (as) taken back Fadak, then those that had given bayya to his predecessors would have attacked him for changing their practises; this would have increased the likelihood of them deserting him and joining the ranks of Mu'awiyah. Maula 'Ali (as) was in effect walking on egg shells, and of interest are his words recorded in Fathul Bari Volume 3 page 387:

"I shall maintain the type of orders that I had done in the past, until the people gather under a single group, even it means dying like my predecessors, as I do not like differences".

This best explains why Maula 'Ali (as) failed take remedial action to take back Fadak, his fear of further division, that would only weaken his support base further.

Reply Three - Hadhrat 'Ali (as) was merely adhering to the Sunnah of Rasulallah (s)

We read in Sahih al Bukhari, Book of Knowledge Volume 1, Book 3, Number 128:

Narrated Aswad:

Ibn Az-Zubair said to me, "Ayesha used to tell you secretly a number of things. What did she tell you about the Ka'ba?" I replied, "She told me that once the Prophet said, 'O 'Ayesha! Had not your people been still close to the pre-Islamic period of ignorance (infidelity)! I would have dismantled the Ka'ba and would have made two doors in it; one for entrance and the other for exit.'" Later on Ibn Az-Zubair did the same.

Comment

Was it incumbent on Rasulallah (s) to re-design the Ka'aba, Yes or No? If it was not then why

did Rasulallah (s) say *'Had not your people been still close to the pre-Islamic period of ignorance (infidelity)! I would have dismantled the Ka'ba and would have made two doors in it'*. If it was compulsory then why did Rasulallah (s) fail to carry out this religious duty on account of his fear of the reaction by the newly converted Sahaba?

The Hadeeth proves that a fear of Fitnah amongst the people led Rasulallah (s) to abandon an important act. By the same token, Hazrat Ali(as) also did not take hold of Fadak and return it to his children. Since Fadak was in the hands of usurpers, if he moved to take it back forcefully he would have faced fierce resistance, Fitnah and a major backlash which would have been extremely harmful to the nascent Islamic state and religion. Hadhrat 'Ali (as) therefore adhered to the Sunnah of Rasulallah and maintained silence on the matter for the sake of maslahat.

Reply Four - The wisdom behind not reclaiming Fadak

In his commentary of the above Hadeeth (destruction of the Ka'aba) Allamah Badr'adeen A'ini in his commentary of Sahih al Bukhari Umdah thul Qari Volume 1 page 615, Bab al Ilm makes an interesting comment:

"Ibn Bathil said that the following principle is established from the above Hadeeth, if 'Amr bil Maroof' (a good act is carried out), but the fear of Fitnah and anger from the people shall lead to its opposition, then the decision to order such a pious act should be abandoned"

Comment

According to this Sunni principle Hadhrat 'Ali (as)'s not taking back Fadak was Amr bil Maroof, and if a good act creates a fear of inciting anger and Fitnah amongst the people leading to chaos in the society then it is permissible to abandon its implementation. Based on the facts, Imam 'Ali (as) was in a difficult situation when it came to getting back Fadak, he knew that doing so would lead to open hatred and opposition from the followers of the first three Khalifas. It was this fear that led Imam 'Ali (as) to prefer to adhere to the Sunnah of Rasulallah (s) and maintain silence.

Reply Five

Allamah A'ini continues with his commentary of the Ka'aba tradition in Umdah thul Qari Volume 1 page 615, Bab al Ilm:

"The people desired that the Deen be implemented in the manner that they were used to, and that this be adhered to in the same strict manner as the compulsory acts such as Salat, Fasting"

Comment

By the time Hadhrat 'Ali (as) came to power the Estate of Fadak had been usurped for 45 years. The initial Usurpers had died, but many amongst their subjects had witnessed Fadak as being in the hands of the descendants of Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. Facing already opposition of Kharjites and many others to his rule, Imam 'Ali (as) was faced with a difficult situation when it came to dealing with those who had usurped his wife's land. If he adopted a firm approach and took it back by force then this act would have created widespread Fitnah and opposition. His

fear of the nefarious activities of the Banu Umayyad and Ayesha, lead him to steer clear of this matter.

Reply Six

Imam Nawawi says in his commentary of this Hadeeth, in his Sharh Muslim Volume 1 page 429 Bab Naqs al Kibt wa Bana:

"This Hadeeth proves principles of Ahkam. When two issues conflict with one another, when a problem that carries benefit, conflicts with another, support should be given to that option that has wider support. Rasulullah saw a benefit in reconstructing the Ka'aba. He (s) also feared Fitnah from the new Muslims, who carried the risk of them becoming apostates, which is why he abandoned this beneficial matter and chose not to reconstruct the Ka'aba".

Comment

The restoration of Fadak carried a benefit, but would have created an image that Imam 'Ali (as) had reclaimed land that had been taken by the earlier Khalifas. He was aware that the current unlawful occupiers would openly resist this and would spread Fitnah throughout the empire, complaining against Imam 'Ali (as) 'unjust usurpation' of the land that had been given to them by the third Khalifa. The owners at that time were sworn enemies of Hadhrat 'Ali (as). Had Imam 'Ali (as) forcefully claimed back Fadak at that critical time it would have created a very negative image, and would have been mere fodder for the propaganda machine that was the Banu Umayyad. Hadhrat 'Ali (as) therefore preferred silence on this matter.

Reply Seven - When Hadhrat 'Ali became Khalifa, Fadak was in the hands of Marwan

As evidence we are relying on the following esteemed Sunni sources:

1. Murqat Sharh Mishkat Volume 8 page 106 Bab al Fi Fadail al Thani
2. Sunan al Kabeera Volume 6 page 301 Kitab al Fi
3. Wafa al Wafa Volume 3 page 1000 Dhikr Fatima min Abu Bakr Siddique
4. Sunan Abu Dawood, Kitab al Khazan

We read in Murqat:

"During the reign of Uthman, he through planning bestowed Fadak to Marwan, and made this his personal property".

By granting the entire estate of Fadak to one man Uthman Ibn Affan contradicted the practises of the Shaykhayn. Hadhrat 'Ali was faced with the land being in possession of Marwan, who was his enemy in the same way as Iblis was an enemy of Hadhrat Adam (as). Hadhrat 'Ali (as) was therefore faced with a difficult situation. Marwan would have argued that Fadak had been bestowed to him and if anyone had usurped the land it was the early Khalifas, and he deemed them to be rightful Khalifas, who would decide matters subject to Islamic Shari'ah, he would have then argued:

you have become Khalifa and are committing an injustice towards me, if you are with the truth you should maintain silence as you had done so in the past.

Marwan knew Hadhrat 'Ali (as) would never wrest Fadak from him.

Reply Eight - Nasibi double standards

It is indeed incredible that our opponents are fond of questioning why the all powerful Khalifa 'Ali (as) never used force to take his rights back, but fail to ask why Uthman the Khalifa failed to use force to defend his right of Khilafath! After all Nasibis claim that none of the inhabitants of Madina or the surrounding areas rebelled against Uthman, rather it was the evil Sybarites from Egypt, who were responsible for starting the agitation, laying siege to Uthman's residence for forty days and finally killing him. We often quiz our accusers as to 'why the residents to Madina failed to defend Uthman?' The reply of great debaters like Ansar.org is that Uthman didn't want bloodshed in Madina, so he didn't ask people to fight against the rebels.

Curiously when we argue that Maula Ali (as) didn't fight Marwan and Bani Umayyad to restore Fadak, so as to prevent bloodshed, they reject such an assertion. This clearly shows double standards of the Nasibis.

Had Maula Ali (as) taken Fadak back at that time, his opponents would have seized the opportunity to propagate that it was Ali himself who assisted in killing of Uthman, so as to ultimately take Fadak. The same had already shamelessly blamed Muhammad bin Abi Bakr, Ammar Yasir and Malik bin Ashtar for the killing of Uthman. Imam Ali (as) taking Fadak back would have been the perfect excuse for them to add his name to the 'Killer List'.

When Ayesha, Marwan, Talha, Zubayr and Mu'awiya were recruiting people in their armies against Ali (as) for the accusation that he was hiding the killers of Uthman, taking Fadak back would have been the perfect opportunity to paint him as the mastermind who wanted Uthman killed so as to attain Fadak.

Reply Nine - According to Ahl'ul Sunnah 'difficulties' meant Rasulallah (s) was unable to forcefully get his daughter back

We read in the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Tareekh Khamees Volume 1 page 273 Hijrat Zaynab
2. Seerath Ibn Hisham Volume 3 page 652 Dhikr Hijrat Zaynab

Tareekh Khamees:

"Ayesha narrates that Zaynab(the daughter of the Prophet (s) according to Ahlul Sunna) was married to Abi al Aas. Islam had caused a separation with her husband, but Rasulallah (s) was in such a desperate situation that he was unable to separate her from this Kaafir"

We read in Seerath Ibn Hisham:

"Rasulallah (s) was in such a difficult situation that he was unable to make something halaal or haraam, and when Zaynab became Muslim this caused a separation with her husband Abi al Aas bin al Rabeh. Despite this Rasulallah (s) due to difficulties was unable to separate Zaynab from Abi al Aas. Zaynab despite

embracing Islam remained with the Kaafir; he remained a polytheist at the time that Rasulallah (s) migrated".

Comment

Zaynab according to Ahl'ul Sunnah was the daughter of Rasulallah (s) and al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 3 page 332, states that she embraced Islam at the time of the first revelation. Her husband Abi al Aas remained a Kaafir, and he embraced Islam after the battle of Badr. According to Ayesha, Zaynab's embracing Islam caused a rift between husband and wife, but for Rasulallah (s) the situation in Makka made him so desperate that he was unable to physically take his daughter away from the clutches of the Mushrikeen, even though he had the power to create a crack in the moon. Let us not forget that by his side was Umar Ibn al Farooq who Ahl'ul Sunnah acclaim as powerful, brave, and tough against the Kuffar. We would like to know of what use was his power and strength in Makka when instead of taking immediate remedial action Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman all remained silent. If these three were indeed Rasulallah's closest friends then why did they not fight and risk their lives so as to ensure that Zaynab was returned to Rasulallah (s)? It is indeed sad that all these virtues were present and yet Abu Bakr's kindness, Umar's firmness against the Kuffar and Uthman's shyness were of no use here.

We appeal to justice, the Fadak dispute concerned worldly possession, whilst Zaynab was a human being; there is a world of difference between the two. If Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman were indeed the closest friends of Rasulallah (s), then why do the sources portray Rasulallah (s) as so desperate in Makka? If Rasulallah (s) was unable to claim his daughter back from the clutches of her Kaafir husband, then Hadhrat 'Ali (as) was not superior to Rasulallah (s). If he was in difficulty following the reigns of the first three Khalifas who made it impossible for him to claim back Fadak from the usurpers, then no objections should be raised, since the Ahl'ul Sunnah have portrayed Rasulallah (s) in such a desperate manner, that discussing the matter causes immense shame.

Reply Ten

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's esteemed work al Isti'ab Volume 1 page 49, the letter 'ra', Dhikr Rafa bin Rafa:

"When Talha and Zubayr rebelled against 'Ali, he said 'This is a astonishing from Talha and Zubayr. When Allah (swt) brought his Prophet back to him, and we said 'We are the Ahl'ul bayt of Rasulallah (s), we are the Friends of Allah (after Rasulallah (s) we are the inheritors of his knowledge) we have no dispute with their leader, our criticism is our people made others their Leader. By Allah! Had it not been a fear of dissension and a return to apostasy, and my fear of the destruction of the Deen, we would have altered the planning of our opponents and restored our rights but we maintained silence".

Khilafat and Fadak were both the rights of the Ahl'ul bayt (as); both had been usurped. Just as fear of disputes and return to Jahiliyya prevented Hadhrat 'Ali (as) from claiming his right of Khilafat back, the same applied to the Fadak dispute.

Reply Eleven

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's esteemed work Lughut al Hadeeth Volume 2 page 97, Kitab Jeem:

'Ali said 'had Rasulallah (s) not made me promise I would have killed my opponents'

As we have already proven when Imam 'Ali (as) was the Khalifa, Fadak was in the hands of his enemy Marwan. It was Marwan's duty to return the land back of which he had no intention. Marwan was a trickster, and a master in stirring dissension, the rich source of the Fadak land, served as a major financial benefit to him. Had Imam Ali (as) moved to forcefully take back Fadak it would have no doubt led to the death of his opponents that would have in turn constituted a breach of the promise that he (as) made to Rasulullah (s). Hadhrat Ali (as) honoured his promise with Rasulullah (s) and adopted patience, his stance in no way means that he deemed the Khilafat of the three Khalifas to be rightful, neither does it prove that Imam 'Ali (as) deemed Abu Bakr's usurpation of Fadak to be correct.

Reply Twelve

We read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Hadeeth Number 428: Narrated Jabir bin 'Abdullah:

We were in a Ghazwa (Sufyan once said, in an army) and a man from the emigrants kicked an Ansari man (on the buttocks with his foot). The Ansari man said, "O the Ansar! (Help!)" and the emigrant said. "O the emigrants! (Help!) Allah's Apostle heard that and said, "What is this call for, which is characteristic of the period of ignorance?" They said, "O Allah's Apostle! A man from the emigrants kicked one of the Ansar (on the buttocks with his foot)." Allah's Apostle said, "Leave it (that call) as is a detestable thing." 'Abdullah bin Ubai heard that and said, 'Have the (the emigrants) done so? By Allah, if we return Medina, surely, the more honourable will expel there from the meaner." When this statement reached the Prophet. 'Umar got up and, said, "O Allah's Apostle! Let me chop off the head of this hypocrite ('Abdullah bin Ubai)!" The Prophet said "Leave him, lest the people say that Muhammad kills his companions." The Ansar were then more in number than the emigrants when the latter came to Medina, but later on the emigrant increased.

The reference makes it clear that a hypocrite was sitting in the midst of the Sahaba, Umar offered to have him killed, but the Prophet (s) refused stating that he did not want outsiders to think that Rasulullah (s) kills his Sahaba. On the same principle Hadhrat 'Ali (as) did not force Marwan to return Fadak to him. Had he done so opposition would have led to resistance and bloodshed, and people would have said '*Ali the Khalifa is killing his subjects for worldly benefits*'. For the reason that Rasulullah (s) remained silent, Imam 'Ali (as) did the same.

Reply Thirteen

We read in Sahih al-Bukhari, Arabic-English version, Volume 9, p212: {Between Traditions 9.281 and 9.282}:

(21) CHAPTER. If a judge has to testify in favour of a litigant when he is a judge or he testified for him before he became a judge (can he pass a judgment in his favour accordingly or should he refer the case to another judge before whom he would bear witness?). And the judge Shurayh said to a person who sought his witness, "Go to the ruler so that I may bear witness (before him) for you." And 'Ikrima said, "Umar said to 'Abdur-Rahman bin 'Auf, 'If I saw a man committing illegal sexual intercourse or theft, and you were the ruler (what would you do)?' 'Abdur-Rahman said, 'I would regard your witness as equal to the witness of any other man among the Muslims. 'Umar said, 'You have said the truth.' 'Umar added: If I were not afraid of the fact that people may say that 'Umar has added to the Qur'an extra (verses), I would have written the Verse al-Rajm (stoning to death of married adulterers) with my own hands.

We appeal to justice, if Imam 'Ali (as)'s abstaining from taking back Fadak from Marwan was due to the difficult situation in which he had found himself in, namely that he feared the stead of Fitnah, then this is no different to the position that had been adopted by Umar Ibn al Khattab, who through the fear of Fitnah chose not to add a verse of Rajm into the Qur'an. If this fear, does not alter Ahl'ul Sunnah's portrayal of Umar as a firm, strong Sahaba, then Imam 'Ali (as)'s not taking back Fadak also does not alter his position as a brave warrior.

Reply Fourteen - A Bedouin's insult of Ayesha and the silence of Rasulallah (s)

We read in al Istiab Volume 3 page 316 & 317, Dhikr A'ini bin Hasan:

"On one occasion Aineea entered the home of Rasulallah (s) without seeking permission. Rasulallah (s) asked why he failed to ask for permission, he replied 'Master I have never sought permission from anyone from the Hazr tribe'. At the time Ayesha was sitting next to Rasulallah (s), and the Chief of Bedouins asked 'Who is this red faced women?' He (s) replied 'This is my wife Ayesha'. The Bedouin said 'Master if you allow me I shall give you a more beautiful woman in exchange for her'. Ayesha asked 'Who is this disgraceful person?' Rasulallah (s) said 'As you see, he is the Chief of his tribe'.

 [Al-Istiab, Vol. 3, Page 316 & 317](#)

If a man enters your home without permission and offers to exchange your red cheeked wife with another, and you have no response to such behaviour, then only two conclusions can be reached:

You are either:

A shameless person, devoid of any sense of dignity or honour.

OR:

You have maintained silence in response to the difficult situation that you find yourself in.

Applying this to the facts, Rasulallah's failure to address a man's entering his home without prior permission and his subsequent insult of Ayesha was not because he (s) had no dignity (astaghfirullah) rather he remained silent on account of the situation he was confronted with.

By the time Hadhrat 'Ali (as) became Khalifa, he had witnessed Abu Bakr usurp Fadak belonging to his wife. If Hadhrat 'Ali (as) failed to take back Fadak during his rule it was due to the difficult situation facing him. Had he taken it Marwan would have incited dissension throughout the Ummah. Hadhrat 'Ali (as) did not alter the situation as he knew that any manoeuvring on his part would serve as propaganda fodder for his opponents, that would in turn lead to mass Fitnah. Imam 'Ali (as) therefore adopted silence in exactly the same manner that Rasulallah (s) had done. Let us not forget that according to the Ahl'ul Sunnah, Ayesha was the most beloved wife of Rasulallah (s), and Angels delivered a photo of Ayesha to him (s) prior to marriage [Sahih al Bukhari]. The Bedouins comments, namely his attempted exchange for this beloved wife was a major insult, and Rasulallah' silence to this was definitely due to some hidden reason or foreseen problems.

5.6 A Nasibi's false claim that Maula 'Ali (as) was implementing the Sunnah of Abu Bakr

The author of Fedak advances this claim:

un named author states:

If there had been such a will and Hadhrat Ali (Karramallah wajhu) had known about it, it would have been necessary and permissible for him to fulfill it during his khilafat. However, he followed the example of Hadhrat Abu Bakr (Radhi Allahu ta'ala Anhu) and dealt the property out to poor, destitute and stranded people. If it should be maintained that he dealt out his share, then why did he deprive the Sahibayn wa Syedayn, al-Imam al-Hasan and al-Imam al-Husayn Radhi Allahu Ta'ala Anhuma of the property they were to inherit from their blessed mother (may millions of Salaams be upon her)?

Reply

Hadhrat 'Ali (as) did not take control of the property in his reign. We challenge this Nasibi to show us which authentic Sunni source confirms that he followed the Sunnah of Abu Bakr with regards to its distribution. The property had been given to Marwan by the Khalifa Uthman and he did NOT take it back. This is one of the main arguments that Ahl'ul Sunnah use against us, namely he left it as it was, whilst this author claims he took control of the land and then distributed it among the poor and needy from it!

There's a world of difference between the approach taken by Abu Bakr and 'Ali (as). Abu Bakr usurped land that was in the lawful possession of somebody else, whereas Maula 'Ali (as) despite his being the Head of State did not exercise force to reclaim this land. The difference between these two approaches is like comparing night to day.

6. Rules of Inheritance in the Qur'an

Upon becoming Khalifa Abu Bakr quickly moved to annex the legal right of Sayyida Fatima (as). Abu Bakr refused to entertain her claim that the land had been gifted to her by her father (s) during his lifetime. If any person receives possessions (by whatever means) he/she can claim it in any means that he/she chooses. Hence Sayyida Fatima (as) also sought to claim Fadak by another claim, namely that Fadak and the lands of Khayber were the personal possessions of her father, a daughter can legally inherit from her father and hence she was the Waris of Rasulullah (s). Abu Bakr rejected this claim also on the rationale that he heard the Prophet (s) say *'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)'*. Sayyida Fatima (as) rejected this argument and left never talking to the Khalifa again.

6.1 The Qur'an confirms that a daughter inherits from her father

Proof One

With regard to inheritance, the verse of Surah Nisa 004.007 reads:

From what is left by parents and those nearest related there is a share for men and a share for women, whether the property be small or large, a determinate share.

Al-Qur'an, Surah an-Nisa, Ayah 7, translated by Yusufali

The verse proves that a daughter is the Waris of her father; Sayyida Fatima (s) inherited from her father. This verse is sufficient to destroy the claim in the article Fedak:

un named author states:

It would have been irrational to make a will on uninheritable property. Consequently, it would be wrong to say that his lordship, Sayyidina Rasulullah, Sallallahu Alayhi wa Sallam, bequeathed the orchard, called Fedek, to Sayyidah Fatima-tuz-Zahra (Alayhas-Salaam). For Rasulullah, Sallallahu Alayhi wa Sallam, would not have done something which would have been wrong.

Reply One

The verse that we have cited proves that everyone is the heir of someone, hence Rasulullah (s) leaving Fadak for his daughter was perfectly in accordance with what is stipulated in the Qur'an so how can this author assert that Rasulullah (s) acting in such a manner would be wrong?

Reply Two

We know that Fadak was bequeathed to Sayyida Fatima (as) and this is attested to in the books of Ahl'ul Sunnah. Hence denying her this right was clear injustice, and in violation to the Qur'an. One who commits injustice can never be deemed rightly guided, this is clear from Surah al Maida 005.045:

And if any fail to judge by (the light of) what Allah hath revealed, they are (No better than) wrongdoers.

Al-Qur'an, Surah 5, Ayah 45, translated by Yusufali

Proof Two

The verse on inheritance in Surah Nisa 004.011 reads:

Allah (thus) directs you as regards your Children's (Inheritance): to the male, a portion equal to that of two females: if only daughters, two or more, their share is two-thirds of the inheritance; if only one, her share is a half.

Al-Qur'an, Surah an-Nisa, Ayah 11, translated by Yusufali

In this verse Allah (swt) has laid out rules for Muslims with regard to inheritance, making it clear that all children inherit from their parents. Rasulallah (s) also comes within this order, hence Sayyida Fatima (as) was his Waris. Denying her this right was an injustice. Sayida Fatima (as) and the Qur'an were Thaqlayn; hence rejecting both is an act so severe that the perpetrator shall not even smell the fragrance of Paradise.

Proof Three

We read in Surah Nisa 004.033:

To (benefit) every one, We have appointed shares and heirs to property left by parents and relatives. To those, also, to whom your right hand was pledged, give their due portion. For truly Allah is witness to all things.

Al-Qur'an, Surah an-Nisa, Ayah 33, translated by Yusufali

Allah (s) has made EVERY ONE the Waris of someone. This verse clearly incorporates Rasulallah (s), he inherits from his parents, and his offspring inherit from him (s). Hence issuing a ruling that contradicts this verse is rejecting an order of Allah (swt) and constitutes Kufr as is clear from Surah Maida verse 44:

If any do fail to judge by (the light of) what Allah hath revealed, they are (no better than) Unbelievers.

Al-Qur'an, Surah 5, Ayah 44, translated by Yusufali

Proof Four

We read in Surah Ahzab 033.006:

...Blood relations among each other have closer personal ties in the Decree of Allah than (the Brotherhood of) Believers and Muhajirs

Al-Qur'an, Surah 33, Ayah 6, translated by Yusufali

The verse of the Qur'an places this order on all blood relations and the children of Rasulallah (s) fall within blood relations. An order which seeks to exempt the blood relations of Rasulallah (s) is an injustice against Rasulallah (s), and one who opposes the Qur'an is a Fasiq, as declared by Allah (swt) in Surah al Maida 005.04:

Let the people of the Gospel judge by what Allah hath revealed therein. If any do fail to judge by (the light of) what Allah hath revealed, they are (no better than)

those who rebel.

Al-Qur'an, Surah 5, Ayah 4, translated by Yusufali

6.2 Denying the daughter of Rasulallah (s) her inheritance would be against the Justice of Allah (swt)

We read in Tafseer Ibn Katheer Part 4, 'Surah Nisa 004.011 ' Allah (thus) directs you as regards your Children's (Inheritance)':

The verse means that on the issue of children Allah (swt) is Just. During the era of Jahiliyya all possessions would go to the male, females would go empty handed. Allah (swt) therefore apportioned them their right.

In light of this commentary, denying the daughter of the Prophet(s) her right of inheritance was against the Justice of Allah (swt).

6.3 Denying the daughter of Rasulallah (s) her inheritance rights is a practise of Jahiliyya

We read in Tafseer al Kabeer Volume 3 page 153 'Surah Nisa 004.011 ' Allah (thus) directs you as regards your Children's (Inheritance)':

"During the period of Jahiliyya people would inherit via two means....

No.1 is missing

(2) Nasab (Family tree) - Women and underage children were not accepted as Waris, rather only male relatives were accepted as Waris who participated in battle and received a share of the booty"

Sunni scholar and English translator of Saheeh al Muslim, provides the following introduction to the 'Kitab al-Fara'id' (the book pertaining to the rules of inheritance):

"...The law of inheritance in Islam is based upon five main considerations: In the pre-Islamic world and even in modern societies the law of inheritance has so many evils in it, which may be summed up in the following points:

*** Women had been completely denied the share of inheritance. They were rather regarded as part of the property of the deceased and, therefore, their right to property by inheritance was out of question. Islam introduced so many reforms in the laws of inheritance which can be succinctly summed up as follows.**

*** It made the female, who had been previously thought a chattel, the co-sharer with the male and thus not only restored her dignity, but safeguarded her social and economic rights".**

Islam put an end to this discriminatory practice, and Abu Bakr resurrected it by denying Sayyida Fatima (as) her inheritance rights.

Nasibi such as Ibn Taymeeya and Shah Abdul Aziz have argued that these verses of inheritance are of general applicability to the Muslim Ummah, not the Prophet (s). To respond to such an excuse we shall rely on the words of Allah (swt) in Surah Az-Zukhruf 043.044:

The (Qur'an) is indeed the message, for thee and for thy people; and soon shall ye (all) be brought to account.

Al-Qur'an, Surah 43, Ayah 44, translated by Yusufali

The verse makes it clear that the Ummah and Rasulallah (s) are subject to the Qur'anic rulings, and unless an exemption can be established, the obligation (that Rasulallah (s) left inheritance for his daughter) is established. He had to act upon this order.

We have proven that Sayyida Fatima (as) was the Waris of Rasulallah (s) through verses of the Qur'an. The verse, 'To (benefit) every one' prevents any excuse that the verse did not apply to Rasulallah(s). The verse addresses him(s) in exactly the same way as the other three verses include him(s).

Worthy of note is the fact that we read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's esteemed work Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani Part 4, under the commentary of Surah Nisa 004.011 '*Allah (thus) directs you as regards your Children's (Inheritance)*':

"With regards to this verse one viewpoint is that it refers to all Believers another is it refers to all those with off spring"

Rasulallah (s) is included amongst the Believers and those with children hence he is included on both counts, as are the rest of the believers.

After Rasulallah (s) those with a correct understanding of the Qur'an are the Ahl'ul bayt (as) and they did not state that the verse Surah Nisa 004.011 '*Allah (thus) directs you as regards your Children's (Inheritance)*' does not cover Rasulallah (s). Hence one asserting an opposing view is a munafiq, for he holds an opinion that contradicts the Thaqalayn - the Qur'an and Itrat of Rasulallah (s).

6.4 Defence of Shah Abdul Aziz

In Tuhfa Ithna Ashari page 275 the Shah states:

'In the same way that the verse 'Allah (thus) directs you as regards your Children's (Inheritance)' - does not incorporate children that have been murdered or are apostates, the children of the family are also exempt from this verse'.

Reason for excluding a kaafir and murderer from inheritance is clear and understandable but Shah fails to give any reason why the children of Prophet(s) shall not inherit from him.

The Shah has committed a major blasphemy against the Ahl'ul bayt (as). No doubt kaafirs and murderers fall outside this verse, but they are being penalised for committing a major sin! Let's give an example:

"A man has two daughters, if one either apostates or kills him, she is not entitled to her father's inheritance. The other daughter who neither murdered her father nor became an apostate will still be entitled to inherit her father's possessions".

To argue that the daughter of Rasulallah's example was like that of a Kaafir daughter is amazing and is a rejection of the concept of inheritance. Whilst there is proven evidence that a father's murderer and Kaafir children are not included in inheritance the same is not the case with the family of the Prophet (s). A murderess and Kaafir child falls outside the verse as she is being punished, what act did Sayyida Fatima (as) commit that led Allah (swt) to punish her by ruling that she could not inherit from her father?

6.5 Al Khider's false claim that daughters have no rights of inheritance under Shi'a Fiqh

Ansar.org states:

A Woman's Inheritance

A more astounding revelation-of which many people happen to be uninformed-is the fact that in the Fiqh of the Imami Shi'ah a woman does not inherit land or fixed property. How is it that the Shi'ah accept it for Sayyidah Fatimah radiyallahu 'anha to inherit Fadak, when their own jurisprudence does not allow the succession of a woman to land or fixed property?

* In al-Kafi al-Kulayni has included a chapter entitled "Women do not inherit land". In this chapter he narrates a hadith from Imam Muhammad al-Baqir, "Women do not inherit anything of land or fixed property." (al-Kafi, vol. 7 p. 127, Kitab al-Mawarith, hadith no. 1)

* Al-Tusi in Tahdhib al-Ahkam, and al-Majlisi in Bihar al-Anwar have narrated from Maysarah that he asked Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq about what a woman inherits. The Imam replied: "They will get the value of the bricks, the building, the wood and the bamboo. As for the land and the fixed property, they will get no inheritance from that." (Tahdhib al-Ahkam, vol. 9 p. 299; Bihar al-Anwar, vol. 104 p. 351)

* Al-Tusi records in Tahdhib al-Ahkam and al-Istibsar from Muhammad ibn Muslim that Imam Muhammad al-Baqir said: "A woman will not inherit anything of land and fixed property." (Tahdhib al-Ahkam, vol. 9 p. 298; al-Istibsar, vol. 4 p. 152)

* He also records from 'Abd al-Malik ibn A'yan that either Imam Muhammad al-Baqir or Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq said: "Women will have nothing of houses or land." (Tahdhib al-Ahkam, vol. 9 p. 299; Bihar al-Anwar, vol. 104 p. 351)

Reply One

This Nasibi has tried to brainwash the weak minded that a woman does not inherit land or property under Shi'a Fiqh. He has intentionally taken a tradition, interpreted it with his own spin and then presented it as Shi'a Fiqh! This is blatant dishonesty. Let's apply this approach to his camp. There are narrations found in Sunni sources where Ayesha said about Uthman: **'Kill this old fool (Na'thal), for he is unbeliever'** (Tareekh of Ibn Atheer, v3, p206, Lisan al-Arab, v14, p141).

Now should we accept whatever is stated in Sunni narration books, give our own interpretation and then say that Sunnis believe that Uthman the 3rd Caliph is a Kaffir?

Is that a fair approach? Clearly not, so why is Al Khider applying this to defame the Shi'a?

Reply Two

All the Shi'a Mujtahideen from 1st the century up till the present, are unanimous on the point that these Ahadeeth refer to the Inheritance of "Widow", not of daughter (who has right to all the things including land and fixed property).

But Ansar.org want to spread and propagate confusion, so that their ideas can get support.

As we have mentioned Allah (swt) sets out a daughters right to inheritance in the Qur'an as follows:

"God (thus) directs you as regards your Children's (Inheritance): to the male, a portion equal to that of two females: if only daughters, two or more, their share is two-thirds of the inheritance; if only one, her share is a half. For parents, a sixth share of the inheritance to each, if the deceased left children; if no children, and the parents are the (only) heirs, the mother has a third; if the deceased Left brothers (or sisters) the mother has a sixth. (The distribution in all cases ('s) after the payment of legacies and debts. Ye know not whether your parents or your children are nearest to you in benefit. These are settled portions ordained by God; and God is All knowing, All wise."

Al-Qur'an, Surah 4, Ayah 11

The Shi'a Ulema have on the basis of this verse drawn up rules on inheritance.

We read in the Resalah of Tawdhih-al-Masael by Grand Ayatullah. Fazel Lankarani:

2886. If out of the first group, there is only one heir of the deceased (for example, father or mother or only one son or only one daughter), he/she inherits the entire estate, and if there are several daughters or sons, the estate is divided equally and if there is one daughter and one son, the estate should be divided to 3 parts, two parts for the son and one part for the daughter. And if, there are more than one son and daughter, the estate is divided among them in such away that each son gets twice the share of each daughter.

Similar we read in Grand Ayatullah Seestani's 'Islamic Laws':

1. The first group consists of the dead person's parents and children, and in the absence of children, the grand children, however low, and among them whoever is nearer to the dead person inherits his property. And as long as even a single person from this group is present, people belonging to the second group do not inherit.

2. The second group consists of paternal grandfather, paternal grandmother, and sisters, brothers, and in the absence of sisters and brothers their children, whoever from among them is nearer to the dead person, will inherit from him. And as long as even one person from this group is present, people belonging to the third group do not inherit.

3. The third group consists of paternal uncles and paternal aunts and maternal uncles and maternal aunts, and their descendants. And as long as even one person from the paternal uncles and paternal aunts and maternal uncles and maternal aunts of the dead person is present, their children do not inherit.

However, if the paternal step uncle and the son of the real paternal uncle are present, the son of the dead person's real paternal uncle will inherit from him to the exclusion of the paternal step uncle. But if there are several paternal uncles and several paternal cousins, or if the widow is alive, then this rule is not without Ishkal.

He then states:

2740: If out of the first group, there is only one heir of the deceased (for example, father or mother or only one son or only one daughter) he/she inherits the entire estate, and, if there are more than one sons or daughters, the estate is divided among them in such a way, that each son gets twice the share of each daughter.

6.6 Our Note

That is the category that Sayyida Fatimah (as) falls under.

7. The Inheritance of Previous Prophets

7.1 Qur'anic proof that Prophets leave inheritance to their offsprings

Allah (swt) declares in Surah Naml 027.016:

And Solomon was David's heir. He said: "O ye people! We have been taught the speech of birds, and on us has been bestowed (a little) of all things: this is indeed Grace manifest (from Allah.)"

Al-Qur'an, Surah 27, Ayah 16, translated by Yusufali

The verse is clear proof that Suleiman (as) the son of a Prophet inherited from his father, hence the claim that the Prophet's leave no inheritance for their children is a blatant lie. Sayyida Fatima (as) inherited her Prophet father, in exactly the same way that Suleiman (as) inherited from his Prophet father. Any ruling rejecting her entitlement to her father's inheritance, contradicts the Qur'an.

7.2 Al Khider's absurd claim that Prophets leave no material possession as inheritance

In Ansar.Org's masterpiece '*Fadak Area Between Abu Baker and Fatima*', the author Muhammad Al-Khider provides the following explanation to this verse:

Ansar.org states:

The same is applicable to the argument in which the verse "And Sulayman inherited Dawud" (an-Naml:16) is used as proof that the Ambiya do leave a material inheritance. The inheritance in this case was not of material possessions. Rather, it was of prophethood, wisdom and knowledge.

Reply One

In Surah Nisa 004.011 - '**Allah (thus) directs you as regards your Children's (Inheritance)**' and this rules includes everybody.

Reply Two

The books of Ahl'ul Sunnah prove that Prophet Sulayman (as) inherited his father's worldly possessions

As evidence we shall rely on the following authentic Sunni sources:

1. Tafseer Khazan Volume 5 page 112, Surah Naml
2. Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 5 page 193 Surah Naml

3. Tafseer Rul al Ma'ani Part 19 Page 170 Surah Naml
4. Tafseer Mazhari Part 16, Volume 7 page 100 Surah Naml
5. Tafseer Muraghee Part 19 page 127 Surah Naml
6. Tafseer Jauhar Volume 13 page 135 Surah Naml
7. Tafseer Gharab al Qur'an Part 18 page 88
8. Tafseer Kashaf Volume 3 page 140
9. Tafseer Mu'allim al Tanzeel under the commentary of Khazan Volume 5 page 112
10. Tafseer Fathooath al Ilayha Volume 3 page 202
11. Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 5 page 290
12. Tareekh Abu'l Fida Volume 1 page 24

We read in Tafseer Kashaf:

"Waris refers to Kingdom and Prophethood"

 [Al-Kashif, Vol. 3, Page 140](#)

Tafseer Khazan:

"Sulayman was the Waris of Dawood's Kingdom, Knowledge and Prophethood"

Tafseer Durre Manthur:

"Sulayman inherited both Kingdom and knowledge"

 [Dur al-Manthur fi Tafseer al-Mathur, Vol. 5, page 193](#)

Ruh al Ma'ani:

"One view is that he inherited Prophethood, another view is he inherited the Kingdom"

Gharab al Qur'an:

"The view on this verse is that inheritance here means the inheritance of possessions"

We have cited 12 authentic Sunni sources that Prophet Dawood (as) inherited the worldly possessions of his father, similarly Sayyida Fatima (as) was also the Waris of her father Rasulullah (s). Denying her this inheritance right was a clear violation of the Qur'an.

Prophet Sulayman (as) inherited one thousand horses from his father

We read in Surah Sa'd verses 30-31:

To David We gave Solomon (for a son), how excellent in Our service! Ever did he turn (to Us)!

Behold, there were brought before him, at eventide coursers of the highest

breeding, and swift of foot;

Al-Qur'an, Surah Sa'd, Ayah 30 & 31, translated by Yusufali

These horses were inheritance, and as proof we shall cite the following classical Sunni sources:

1. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani Part 23 Surah Sad page 183
2. Tafseer Gharab al Qur'an Part 23, Surah Sad page 90
3. Tafseer Khazan Part 23, Volume 6 page 45
4. Tafseer Kashaf Volume 2 page 284
5. Hayat al Haywaan page 314, Dhikr al Jawad
6. Tafseer Mazhari Volume 8 page 145 Surah Sad

For the sake of brevity we shall only cite a few of the references verbatim.

We read in Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani:

"Maqathil narrates that there were one thousand horses, and Sulayman inherited these from his father".

 [Ruh al-Ma'ani, Vol. 23, Page 183](#)

Gharab al Qur'an:

"Sulayman was the Waris of these horses from his father who attained this from Amaalka"

Hayaat al Haywan:

"The view of the majority of the Tafseer scholars is that Prophet Sulayman (as) attained one thousand horses, they were inheritance".

These 14 sources prove that Sulayman inherited the material possessions of his father and this included one thousand horses, this verse proves that the verse '**And Sulayman inherited Dawud**' refers to the inheritance of material possessions not knowledge.

Whilst this should serve as sufficient proof to destroy this Nasibi's claim, it is also important that we highlight one of their claims that al Khider made...

7.3 Al Khider's false claim that Sulayman (as) inherited Prophethood, Knowledge and Wisdom from his father, not material possessions

Ansar.org states:

The inheritance in this case was not of material possessions. Rather, it was of prophethood, wisdom and knowledge.

Reply One - Prophets are Prophets from the time they are born (prophethood is not something to be inherited)

We read in Surah Maryam 019.030 the following about Hadhrat Esau (as):

He said: "I am indeed a servant of Allah: He hath given me revelation and made me a prophet;

Al-Qur'an, Surah Maryam, Ayah 30, translated by Yusufali

Similarly, Allah (swt) praises Hadhrat Yahya in these words in Surah Maryam 019.012:

(To his son came the command): "O Yahya! take hold of the Book with might": and We gave him Wisdom even as a youth,

Al-Qur'an, Surah Maryam, Ayah 12, translated by Yusufali

The stories of Prophet Esau (as) and Prophet Yahya (as) serve as clear proof that Prophet's attain the rank of Prophethood from the time of birth.

Reply Two - Hadhrat Sulayman (as) was Prophet at the same time as his father Dawood (as)

We read in Surah Anbiya 021.079:

To Solomon We inspired the (right) understanding of the matter: to each (of them) We gave Judgment and Knowledge;

Al-Qur'an, Surah 21, Ayah 79, translated by Yusufali

We read in Surah Naml 027.015:

We gave (in the past) knowledge to David and Solomon: And they both said: "Praise be to Allah, Who has favoured us above many of his servants who believe!"

Al-Qur'an, Surah 27, Ayah 15, translated by Yusufali

These verses do not prove that Dawood (as) possessed knowledge first and that his son Sulayman (as) later inherited it after his death. Prophets are Prophets from birth and hold this excelled office from the time they come in this world along with all the attributes such as knowledge etc. As Sulayman (as) was born during the lifetime of his father, he attained Prophethood during his father's lifetime. Inheritance is something which is attained after death, this is an agreed fact. This verse therefore clearly proves that inheritance in this verse does not mean Prophethood rather it refers to material possessions.

The 16th Ayah of Surah Naml points to the fact that Prophet Suleiman was already a Prophet, had knowledge and used to pass judgements during the lifetime of his father, how can it be said that the inheritance, which he received, was of Prophethood, wisdom and knowledge?

To Solomon We inspired the (right) understanding of the matter: to each (of them) We gave Judgement and Knowledge; it was Our power that made the hills and the birds celebrate Our praises, with David: it was We Who did (all these things).

Al-Qur'an, Surah 21, Ayah 79, translated by Yusufali

The 15th verse of Sura Naml (which falls before Ayah 16th), also makes it clear that Knowledge was already given to Sulayman (as) then how can it be accepted that the inheritance which Prophet Sulayman received was to do with Knowledge and Wisdom only?

The 15th verse of Sura Naml(which falls before Ayah 16th), also makes it clear that

Knowledge was already given to Sulayman (as) then how can it be accepted that the inheritance which Prophet Sulayman received was to do with Knowledge and Wisdom only?

Al-Qur'an, Surah 21, Ayah 15, translated by Yusufali

Sayyida Fatima (as) inherited her father's worldly possessions in exactly the same manner that Prophet Sulayman (as) inherited from his father Dawood (as). The claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) was in line with the Qur'anic verse "**And Sulayman inherited Dawud**". Abu Bakr's rejection of her claim, despite this verse is proof that Abu Bakr's decision was in contradiction to this Qur'anic rulings.

7.4 Al Khider's query as to why Hadhrat Dawood's other sons are not mentioned in this verse

Al-Khider offers the following Batil Qiyas to this verse:

Ansar.org states:

It is well known that Dawud 'alayhis salam had 100 wives and 300 concubines. He had numerous children from these wives and concubines. If this verse is assumed to speak of the inheritance of material possessions, why is Sulayman mentioned as the sole heir?

Reply One

It is a generally accepted rule that proof is required when someone advances a claim that contradicts an established law. It is a general rule that the land belonging to someone is distributed amongst his legal heirs. When Al Khider is stating that some individuals do not benefit from this general principle, the onus then falls upon him to prove 'why' this is the case. Our claim is that according to the common laws of Shari'ah, Sulayman (as) became the Waris of his father Dawood (as), and this precedent is proven from the Law (as set out in the Qur'an). Al Khider is advancing a claim that is against the established law, namely that Sulayman (as) was not the Waris of Dawood (as), hence the onus is upon Al Khider to prove Sulayman's status as not being the heir when the Qur'an proves his position as **a heir**.

Reply Two

Why has al Khider relied on a Jewish tradition that presents Hadhrat Dawud as having 400 women to have sex with? Can anyone imagine a pious Nabi of Allah, Hadhrat Dawud (s) having 100 wives and 300 concubines [i.e. a total of 400 women for having sex]?

Reply Three

The assertion of al Khider is a blatant lie; we read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's work Sharh ibn al Hadeed Volume 4 page 126 that the claim that Sulayman (s) had sons other than Dawood (s) is a Jewish claim. Reports that they were alive at the time that Dawood (as) died are not reliable.

Reply Four

When is Prophethood inherited? If Prophethood was gained through inheritance then why didn't all the children of Dawood (as) that Muhammad al-Khider mentioned become Prophets?

Sunni Turkish scholar Professor Nureddin Uzongolu make a crucial point in this respect in his Book, 'History of the Prophets' page 164, Chapter 'Solomon':

"Solomon was thankful to his Lord for these blessing bestowed on him: 'And Solomon was David's Heir. And he said 'O mankind! We have been taught the language of birds, and have been given (abundance) all things. This surely is evidence favour" [Surah Saba Verse 12]

Here the point in the above verse is that Solomon not only inherited his father's kingdom, but his spiritual insight and the prophetic office, which do not necessarily pass from father to son"

Reply Five

Even if we accept that they were alive, then this bears no relevance, for Allah (swt) states in Surah Baqarah 2:251:

So they put them to flight by Allah's permission. And Dawood slew Jalut, and Allah gave him kingdom and wisdom, and taught him of what He pleased.

Al-Qur'an, Surah 2, Ayah 251

It was the kingdom of Dawood, which was inherited by Sulayman. About other sons of Dawood, only Allah (swt) knows how many existed but NO tradition suggests that they received nothing. They may have received a share, but the Kingdom was bestowed on Hadrath Sulayman (as) It should be pointed out that a King has two types of land, a King's personal property that is distributed amongst his heirs, and Sovereign Land that goes solely to the person occupying his Seat. Prophet Sulayman (as) inherited both, he had his share with his brothers from King Dawood's personal property and had exclusive inheritance over Sovereign Land. This is like the other kingdoms in which the Crown Prince receives kingdom alongwith his father's personal property while other princes also get their share.

Reply Six

Allah (swt) says in Surah Sad 38:30:

To David We gave Solomon (for a son),- How excellent in Our service! Ever did he turn (to Us)!

Al-Qur'an, Surah 38, Ayah 30, translated by Yusufali

According al Khider, Allah (swt) bestowed other sons on Dawood so why did He (swt) only refer to Sulayman (as) in this verse? Can Al Khider and his Nasibi cronies offer an explanation or do they also question Allah for omitting to mention them? (after all they are in the habit of questioning everything) In the same way that reference to Sulayman (as) in this verse does not negate the existence of other sons, so the verse of inheritance wherein only Sulayman is referred to, does not deny the other brothers their inheritance.

Reply Seven

We read in Surah Anaam verses 83-84:

That was the reasoning about Us, which We gave to Abraham (to use) against his people: We raise whom We will, degree after degree: for thy Lord is full of wisdom and knowledge. We gave him Isaac and Jacob: all (three) guided: and before him, We guided Noah, and among his progeny, David, Solomon, Job, Joseph, Moses, and Aaron: thus do We reward those who do good

Al-Qur'an, Surah 83, Ayah 84, translated by Yusufali

In this verse Allah (swt) counts the progeny of Prophet Ibraheem (as) as David, Solomon, Job, Joseph, Moses, and Aaron, what about all the other children in the progeny of Ibraheem (as), why are they not mentioned here? Just as the reference to David, Solomon, Job, Joseph, Moses, and Aaron in this verse does not negate the existence of the other progeny of Ibraheem (as), so the verse of inheritance wherein only Sulayman is referred to does not deny the other brothers their inheritance.

Reply Eight

Allah (swt) does not mention each and every thing in his Holy Book. Allah (swt) mentions something when it bears relevance to a subject matter. The theme that Allah (swt) addresses here is concerning lineage of Prophets, which is why Allah (swt) makes a specific reference to the esteemed station of Hadhrat Sulayman (as) the Prophet of Allah (swt). Like Sulayman his brothers were also entitled a share in the inheritance of their father, yet the verse only makes reference to Hadhrat Sulayman (as), as he was also the successor to the throne of Dawood (as), which is why Allah (swt) makes a specific reference to his inheriting his father, the other sons would have no doubt received a share under the Shari'ah but their mention here would have been of no relevance when Allah is talking about His prophets only and their characteristics.

Reply Nine - Shi'a understanding of this verse

It is stated in Minhaj al Sadiqeen that prophet Dawood had nineteen sons, every one of them wanted to inherit his father's kingdom. Allah sent Dawood nine questions with answers and asked him to appoint the son who gave the right answers as his successor. These were the questions:

QUESTIONS

ANSWERS

(i)

Which is the nearest thing?

Hereafter.

(ii)

Which is the farthest thing?

Time passed away

(iii)

What phenomenon manifests love?

Body with soul.

(iv)

What phenomenon manifests dread?

Body without soul.

(v)

Which things remain the same?

Sky and earth.

(vi)

Which things ever remain different?

Day and night.

(vii)

Which things are opposed to each other.

Life and death.

(viii)

What ends in - goodness?

Patience and forbearance at the time of anger.

(ix)

What ends in evil?

Haste at the time of anger

None save Sulayman, the youngest son, gave the correct answers, so he was made the heir to Dawud's kingdom..

About other sons of Dawood, NONE of the traditions point to them being denied their share. If other sons existed we are in no doubt that they would have also received inheritance, but Kingdom was bestowed on Suleman. Let us see the pathetic interpretation that Ansar.Org's favourite son makes...

7.5 Al Khider's claim that the inheritance of material possessions is a matter too trivial to appear in the Qur'an

Ansar.org states:

If this verse is assumed to speak of material inheritance there does not remain much sense for it being mentioned in the Qur'an, since it is then reduced to an ordinary and trivial matter. "Material inheritance is not something laudable, neither to Dawud nor to Sulayman 'alayhimas salam. Even a Jew or Christian inherits the material possessions of his father. The purpose of this verse is to extol the excellence of Sulayman and to make mention of that which was granted specifically to him. Inheriting material

possessions is an ordinary and trivial matter that is common to everyone, like eating, drinking and burying the dead. This is not the kind of thing that would be mentioned about the Ambiya, since it is simply inconsequential. Only such things would be related about the Ambiya which carry lessons or benefit. Things like 'He died, and his son inherited his property,' or 'They buried him,' or 'They ate and drank slept' is not the kind of information that would be conveyed in the stories of the Qur'an." (Mukhtasar Minhaj as-Sunnah, vol. 1 p. 240, with minor adjustments)

Reply One

Who is this Nasibi to decide what is sensible enough to be in the Qur'an? Many trivial matters are in the Qur'an, and yet al Khider's absurd logic would argue that nothing trivial should appear in the Qur'an. Allah (swt) knew that amongst the Ummah of Muhammad (s) unjust men would come who would seek to deny to the Prophet's daughter her inheritance, hence Allah (swt) especially for lying Nasibi's such as Muhammad al Khider of Ansar.org, made the specific reference to Prophet Sulayman (as) inheriting from his father.

Reply Two - Denying access to a father's material possessions does not constitute a bounty from Allah (swt)

We read in Surah Naml 027.016:

And Solomon was David's heir. He said: "O ye people! We have been taught the speech of birds, and on us has been bestowed (a little) of all things: this is indeed Grace manifest (from Allah.)"

Al-Qur'an, Surah 27, Ayah 16, translated by Yusuf Ali

We should point out that Mr. Yusuf Ali has made tahreef in translating this verse. The verse says that Allah (swt) bestowed ALL things on Prophet Sulayman as the heir of Dawood (as) but Yusuf Ali adds the word 'a little' that is no where to be found in the Arabic. Pickthal's translation is much closer to the actual Arabic:

And Solomon was David's heir. And he said: O mankind! Lo! we have been taught the language of birds, and have been given (abundance) of all things. This surely is evident favour

Translated by Pickthal

The Qur'an is not just restricted to Tarawih recitals during Ramadhan, rather it resolves all disputes. Inspection needs to be given to the words '**wa theena min kul shay'**. Its literal meaning is Allah had granted us all things in the world, and all things clearly includes the material possessions of Dawood, and Prophet Sulayman (as) counted these worldly possession as a bounty from Allah (swt). If Prophet Sulayman (as) was exempt from his father's material possessions, then he would not have counted this as a bounty from Allah (swt). Think logically, no person would deem his being denied to his father's material possessions to be a bounty from Allah (swt), rather such exclusion is due to the wrath of Allah (swt) that is meted out on children who murder their father or become an apostate. This is a punishment from Allah (swt) not a bounty.

Allah deemed children's inheritance of their Prophet father's possession to be a bounty from Allah (swt), as is proven from the episode of Dawood (as), whose property was inherited by Sulayman (as). Sadly when it came to the era of our Prophet Muhammad (s) this bounty was usurped by Abu Bakr. Rasulallah (s) had only one daughter, and there is no doubt that a daughter is a Mercy from Allah (swt). Sadly Abu Bakr failed to live up to his famed kindness and counted Rasulallah's Estate of Fadak as belonging to the Ummah, and hence denied the daughter of Rasulallah (s) her inheritance right.

When the Qur'an is a witness to the fact that a Prophet's son inherited from him and Sayyida Fatima (as) made a similar claim, denying her that right contradicted this Qur'anic verse.

Our challenge to all Nasibis

We challenge Al Khider and Co to present even a single authentic report proving that the Kingdom of Dawood (as) was distributed among the poor of his nation as Sadaqah after his death.

If you are unable to produce a single authentic Proof to this effect then we challenge you to produce a weak tradition demonstrating that the kingdom of Dawood (as) had been distributed amongst the needy after his death.

If you cannot produce a weak tradition,(then we challenge you further to produce a single report (from a Sunni / Shi'a sources, Christian or Jewish source), that shows that property of even a single Prophet (out of 1,24,000 prophets) was distributed amongst the poor as Sadaqah when they died.

Reply Three - Prophet Zakariya prayed for someone to inherit his material possessions

In Surah Maryam 019.004-6, Allah (swt) refers to the supplication of Prophet Zakariya:

Praying: "O my Lord! infirm indeed are my bones, and the hair of my head doth glisten with grey: but never am I unblest, O my Lord, in my prayer to Thee! Now I fear (what) my relatives (and colleagues) (will do) after me: but my wife is barren: so give me an heir as from Thyself,- (One that) will (truly) represent me, and represent the posterity of Jacob; and make him, O my Lord! one with whom Thou art well-pleased!"

Al-Qur'an, Surah 19, Ayah 4 - 6, translated by Yusufali

The wife of Hadhrat Zakariya (as), Umme Kalthum binte Imran was also his niece and the desire to have children exists in all humans. Zakariya (as) therefore made a supplication that he be given offspring who shall spend his material possessions in pious manner.

The verse proves that Prophets do indeed leave inheritance, and Prophet Zakariya (as) asked that Allah (swt) grant him a child to inherit his material possessions. Al Khider of course finds this fact unpalatable and explains away the verse as follows:

Ansar.org states:

The word al-irth (inheritance) does not refer to material possessions exclusively. It is also used to denote knowledge, prophethood or sovereignty. Examples of such usage are found in Surah Fatir:32, where Allah says: "Thereafter We gave

the Book as inheritance (awrathna) to such of Our servants as We have chosen"; and in Surah al-Mu'minun:10-11, where Allah says: "Those are the Inheritors (al-warithun) who will inherit Paradise."

Some people are so filled with their enmity of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) that any verse that establishes their legal rights, is automatically misinterpreted in such a false way to ensure that those rights are denied to them. This type of attitude is only on account of their blind love for the Sahaba, Sayyida Fatima (as) never committed any wrong against any Muslim.

7.6 'Yad Thana' in this verse means worldly possessions

As evidence, we shall rely on the following esteemed Sunni sources:

1. Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 2 page 467
2. Tafseer Kabeer Volume 5 page 521 verse 'Yad Thana'
3. Tafseer Khazan Volume 4 page 194
4. Ma'alim al Thanzeel bhar Hasheeya Khazan Volume 4 page 194
5. Tafseer Gharab al Qur'an Part 12 Page 38, Surah Maryam
6. Sahih Muslim Sharh Nawawi Volume 2 page 92

We read in Tafseer Durre Manthur:

'Ibn Abbas narrates that 'Yad Thana' means someone to inherit my material possessions'

 [Dur al-Manthur fi Tafseer al-Mathur, Vol. 2, Page 467](#)

Tafseer Kabeer:

"The scholars al Saadi, Mujahid, Shaybi and narrators Ibn Abbas, Hasan and Dhaalik have stated that 'Yad Thana' means material possessions".

Gharab al Qur'an:

"There are differences amongst the Ulema over the meaning of inheritance here, in the view of Ibn Abbas, Hassan and Dhaalik 'Yad Thana' refers to the inheritance of worldly possessions".

We have proven from these seven authentic Sunni sources that Prophet Zakariya (as) was praying for a child to inherit his worldly possessions.

7.7 'Yad Thana wa Yars min lai Yaqoob' also refers to material possessions

As evidence we shall cite the following authentic Sunni sources:

1. Tafseer Kashaf Volume 2 page 503, Surah Maryam
2. Tafseer Rul al Ma'ani page 63, Surah Maryam
3. Tafseer Muraghee page 35, Surah Maryam
4. Tafseer Abi Saud bhar Hasheeya Tafseer Kabeer Volume 6 page 560

We read in Tafseer Muraghee:

"The sons inherited the Kingdom of Bani Mathan".

Abi Saud:

"Hadhrat Zakariya was the Chief of the Ahbar tribe; his intention was to have a son who would be the inheritor of Bani Mathan".

Ruh al Ma'ani and Tafseer Kashaf have both stated that:

'Yad Thana min' refers to the Kingdom of Bani Mathan

 [Al-Kashif, Vol. 2, Page 503](#)

We have cited four authentic sources to prove that the words of Allah (swt) 'Yad Thana min lai Yaqoob' refer to the inheritance of worldly possessions.

Still if this Nasibi does not agree, then allow us to present a question for him to ponder over:

If 'Yad Thana' means knowledge then could he elaborate what type of knowledge this is?

1. If knowledge means knowledge of the Heavenly Books, then heavenly books are counted as material possessions, this therefore proves the inheritance of material possessions.
2. If knowledge refers worldly issues and principles of Shari'ah, then it should be known that Hadhrat Zakariya had delivered this type of knowledge through his Dawah activities, hence there was no risk of such knowledge being stolen.
3. If Ilm means past and future events there would be no need for him to fear his cousins, since this type of knowledge poses no danger to him or his elderly wife.

If these Nasibi put aside the enmity of Fatima (as) they would soon understand that this verse has nothing whatsoever to do with the inheritance of knowledge. In Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work 'Tafseer Fathul Qadeer' the author in his commentary of this verse lists the different categories of people who were the Heirs of Zakariya:

"His fear was in relation to the second category of heir Bani Umm, his cousins, and their becoming the Warisin of his material possessions, he therefore prayed for a son".

 [Fathul Qadeer, Vol. 3, Page 398](#)

7.8 'Yad Thana wa Yars min a lai Yaqoob' can also logically be proven as material possessions

If we analyse the words of Prophet Zakariya (as) 'Now I fear (what) my relatives (and colleagues) (will do) after me', the following points come to ones mind:

1. A fear occurs of something that can be stolen such as material possessions, whilst Prophethood is a station that is appointed by Allah (swt), and is hence a position that cannot be taken by force. If Zakariya (as) meant that he feared that his Prophetic knowledge would be taken, namely that after someone may take it by force, it makes no sense, and such an interpretation disrespects the status of a Prophet. Prophetic Knowledge comes from Allah (swt) and He gives it to whomsoever He chooses, a Prophet has no right to interfere in such a matter, and appeal for it to be handed to his descendants. Can al Khider produce a single reference where following the death of a Prophet, a Fasiq / Faajir forcefully occupied the station of Prophet?
2. Worldly possessions are items that can be held by Muslim, Kaafirs, fajirs, fasiqs, hence it is natural to fear having material possessions being usurped. Hadhrat Zakariya (as) had some material possessions and as he had no offspring these possessions would have fallen into the hands of his nephews, who were not pious individuals. Hadhrat Zakariya (as) feared that his nephews would invest these possessions in bad things. That is why Hadhrat Zakariya (as) asked for a Waris who would be pious and would spend these possessions in a manner that would benefit the Deen. This is logical for when offsprings perform good deeds blessings also reach the parents. Hadhrat Zakariya (as) wanted his offspring to spend in the way of Allah (swt) so that the reward / blessings would also reach him.

7.9 Al Khider's suggestion that it would be inappropriate for a Prophet (s) to pray for someone to inherit his material possessions

Al Khider uses Qiyas in his effort to deny Sayyida Fatima (as) her inheritance rights. In his commentary of this verse he states:

Ansar.org states:

It is not fit or proper for a pious man to ask Allah for an heir to inherit his possessions. How can it then be found acceptable that a noble prophet like Zakariyya 'alayhis salam asked Allah for a son to inherit his wealth? What Zakariyyah 'alayhis salam really asked for was a son who would bear aloft the standard of Prophethood after him, and in whom the legacy of the progeny of Ya'qub would continue.

Reply

On the one hand Nasibi such as al Khider in accordance with the comments of their Salaf Ulema like Ibn Taymeeya and Ibn Katheer believe that Prophets are humans just like us and on the other side they believe that for such men to pray for someone to inherit their possessions is improper and impious. Taking Afriki's moralistic approach on board let us see his proper and pious depictions of Rasulullah (s), in his Madhab, namely that he would:

- receive Satanic verses.
 1.  [Ghanyatul Talibeen, by Shaykh Abdul Qadir Gilani, Page 172](#)
 2.  [Tafseer al-Kashaf, Vol. 3, Page 164](#)
 3.  [Ahkam al Qur'an, Vol. 3, Page 246](#)
 4.  [Tafseer al-Tabari, Vol. 17, Page 186](#)
 5.  [Irshad al Sari \(Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari\] by Qasthalani, Vol. 7, Page 194](#)
 6.  [Tafseer Ibn Katheer, Vol. 3, Page 229](#)
 7.  [Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Al-Bukhari, Vol. 2, Page 354](#)
 8.  [Tafseer al-Jalalayn, Page 284](#)

- Sleep with nine wives in one night (Sahih al Bukhari Volume 1 Hadeeth number 225).

- Copulate with Ayesha during her periods (Sahih al Bukhari Volume 1 Hadeeth number 165).

- Mistakenly lead the prayers whilst Junub (in an impure state) (Sahih al Bukhari Volume 1 Hadeeth number 298).

- Forget the number of rakaats that he had prayed (Sahih al Bukhari Volume 1 Hadeeth number 682).

- Become affected by witchcraft (Sahih al Bukhari Volume 7 Hadeeth number 661)

- Be unsure as to what would happen to him on the Day of Judgement (Sahih al Bukhari Volume 2 Hadeeth number 334)

Now Al Khider if you deem it fit, proper and pious for Rasulullah (s) to behave in such a manner then why the revulsion to a Prophet praying for someone to inherit his material possessions? Let us not forget that Prophet Sulayman (as) had thanked Allah (swt) for being bestowed with worldly Kingdom, and Prophet Yusuf (as) asked the Kaafir Pharaoh to appoint him as the State Treasurer. If the acts of these two Prophets do not constitute improper conduct on their part, then the du'a of Prophet Zakariya (as) that someone inherits his possessions also does not constitute conduct unbecoming of a Prophet.

We would like to challenge the assertion of al Khider, would it be impious for a religious man to:

- Worry about what will happen to his elderly wife in the eventuality of him dying?
- Worry about his material possessions being utilised for immoral / irreligious purposes after his death?

Wealth can lead to destruction if used inappropriately and it can be a blessing if used by the methods explained by Allah. Hence there are many lawful reasons for a person to ask Allah for an heir to inherit his possessions.

Example: If a pious person is showered with Allah's grace and he fears that his possessions will go to waste or used in prohibited things by going to his relatives then can't this person ask Allah for an heir to inherit his possessions and to spend it appropriately?

Let's cite another example:

"Al Khider is pious man, and has dedicated his life to serving religious causes, through writing articles. He is married but has no children. Apart from his principle home he also has a property (that he has rented out) and land that is rich in agriculture. He donates a vast bulk of the profits made from these material possessions to support Dawah activities such as purchasing books, printing pamphlets, supporting a Website. The only close relatives he has are his nephews. Unlike al Khider they are not interested in religion; they live for tomorrow, spending their time indulging in gambling, sins of the flesh and alcohol. They are just waiting in anticipation, hoping that Al Khider dies quickly so that they can take control of both properties, turning one into a Pub, the other into a brothel"

Faced with such a bleak future, would it be impious for Al Khider to pray for a child to inherit / administer his material possessions, thus ensuring that that they were not used for sinful purposes, whilst at the same time providing protection for his elderly wife?

Leaving material inheritance has clear advantages, as is commented on the article 'Inheritance in Islam' that can be located at this Deobandi site.

http://www.islamsa.org.za/library/pamphlets/inheritance_in_islam.htm - [Cached](#)

"If one is righteous and keeps his financial matters clean, the barakah of his wealth is enjoyed by generations after him. The Quraan relates the event of Khidhar alaihis salaam putting a wall right on the objection of Moosa alaihis salaam that the people of that town did not host them. Khidhar alaihis salaam should not have served them especially without remuneration. Khidhar alaihis salaam explained that the inheritance of some orphans was buried there and had to be protected because their parents were righteous".

7.10 Al Khider's guesswork that Prophet Zakariya was too poor to leave any inheritance

Prophet Zakariya (as) also had reasons for asking Allah to grant him an heir to inherit him and His family.

Ansar.org states:

It is well know that Zakariyya 'alayhis salam was a poor man who earned his living as a carpenter. What wealth could he have had that would prompt him to request an heir from Allah? In fact, it was a general rule with the Ambiya that they did not hoard anything beyond their need, and that they spent any surplus in charity.

Reply One

We would like al Khider to inform us which time machine he had got into that enabled him to confidently conclude the meagre livelihood of Prophet Zakariya? Al Khider has no means to know what Prophet Zakariya had or did not have. He had an elderly wife, a job, a house, perhaps land and it was his fear that his relatives would seize these material possessions and trample on the rights of his elderly wife that lead him to make this Du'a.

Reply Two

Allah (swt) states in Surah Nur 024.015:

Behold, ye received it on your tongues, and said out of your mouths things of which ye had no knowledge; and ye thought it to be a light matter, while it was most serious in the sight of Allah.

Al-Qur'an, Surah 24, Ayah 15, translated by Yusufali

It is amusing that the great Imam of the Deobandis Mahmud Ahmad Rizvi in his article "Bagh Fadak" made the claim that during the Fadak dispute Abu Bakr presented all his own possessions to Syeda Fatima(s) and offered her to take whatever she wished. We would like to ask how this is possible, when Hadhrat Abu Bakr was a mere pauper, who had given all his possessions in the way of Allah (swt)?

7.11 Hadhrat Zakariya (as) prayed for offspring to inherit his worldly possessions

We read in Surah Aal-e-Imran 003.038:

There did Zakariya pray to his Lord, saying: "O my Lord! Grant unto me from Thee a progeny that is pure: for Thou art He who heareth prayer!"

Al-Qur'an, Surah 3, Ayah 38, translated by Yusufali

Similarly we read in Surah Anbiya verse 89:

And (remember) Zakariya, when he cried to his Lord: "O my Lord! leave me not without offspring, though thou art the best of inheritors."

Al-Qur'an, Surah al-Anbiya, Ayah 89, translated by Yusufali

Hadhrat Zakariya (as) prayed for a helper and someone to inherit his worldly possessions, and as proof we shall rely on the following Sunni sources:

1. Tafseer Fath'ul Qadeer Volume 3 page 526
2. Tafseer Khazan Volume 4 page 459
3. Tafseer Gharab al Qur'an Part 16 page 38
4. Tafseer Kashaf Volume 2 page 53
5. Tafseer Kabeer Volume 6 page 132

We read in Tafseer Fath'ul Qadeer:

"Differences have arisen amongst the Tafseer scholars as to whether he prayed for a son to be his Waris, or whether he prayed for a successor, whether it was a son or someone else. The first viewpoint is clear as it is supported by Aal-e-Imran "O my Lord! Grant unto me from Thee a progeny that is pure" this verse in Surah Anbiya also confirms this O my Lord! leave me not without offspring, though thou art the best of inheritors."

 [Fathul Qadeer, Vol. 3, Page 526](#)

We read in Tafseer Khazan:

"The intention of Hadhrat Zakariya was that Allah (swt) may not leave him in a situation where he has no son as helper, and grant him an inheritor"

We read in Tafseer Kabeer:

"Hadhrat Zakariya desired a son who would be his and would support him in religious and worldly matters and would take care of matters after him".

Reply Three - Why did Imam 'Ali (as) and Abu Bakr not concur with Al Khider's understanding of these verses?

The Following narration, informs us of the conversation between Imam Ali (as) and Abu Bakr during the Fadak dispute. We are quoting Ibn Sad's Tabaqat Al-Kabeer, Vol-11, p393, by S. Moinul Haq:

English translation:

Muhammad Ibn Umar informed us; (he said): Hisham Ibn Sa'd related to me on the authority of Abbas Ibn 'Abd Allah Ibn Ma'bad, he on the authority of Ja'ffar; he said: Fatima came to Abu Bakr and demanded her share in the inheritance. Al-Abbas Ibn Abd al-Muttalib came to him and demanded his share in the inheritance. Ali came with them. Thereupon Abu Bakr said: The Apostle of Allah said: We leave no inheritance, what we leave behind us is sadaqah. I shall make provisions for those for whom the Prophet had made. On this Ali said: Sulayman (Solomon) inherited Dawud (David); and Zakariya said: He may be my heir and the heir of the children of Ya'qub. Abu Bakr said: This is as this is. By Allah! You know it as I know. Thereupon Ali said: This is the book of Allah that speaks. Then they became quite and retired.

 [Tabaqat Ibn Sa'ad, Vol. 2, Page 393](#)

During the Fadak dispute Hadhrat 'Ali (as) cited the verses of inheritance relating to Sulayman (as) and Zakariya (as) saying '**This is the book of Allah that speaks**' and Abu Bakr offered no explanation as to the meaning of these verses or interpreted them in reply as alkhider has done. What can be deduced from Abu Bakr's silence? Imam 'Ali (as) clearly viewed these verses as a proof that Prophets leave material possession as inheritance for he was relying on these verses to prove that Sayyida Fatima (as) could inherit her father's land. The learned al Khider claims that these verses have nothing to do with the inheritance of material possessions, but refer to the inheritance of knowledge. Will al Khider go on record and declare that his knowledge of the Qur'an was superior to that of Imam 'Ali (as)? This would indeed be deeply impressive when we have the testimonies of Rasulullah (s) and the Sahaba confirming that none surpassed Hadhrat 'Ali (as) with regards to knowledge of the Qur'an:

"Uns bin Malik narrates 'Ali had the greatest knowledge of whatever had been revealed by Allah (swt)"

Manaqib Sayyidina 'Ali page 16 by A'ini

"Shaybi narrates 'All that has been revealed by Allah (swt) is contained between these two covers, and no one possesses greater knowledge of it than 'Ali"

Durre Simtayn page 128, by Muhammad bin Yusuf Dhurudhi

Umar ibn al Khattab narrates 'The Prophet said to 'Ali, You possess the greatest knowledge of the verses of Allah (swt)

Rabeh al Muttalib page 139

"Rasulullah (s) said 'Ali possesses the greatest knowledge of the Qur'an and Sunnah"

al Imama wa al Siyasa page 103

In light of these traditions is it believable that an individual who exceeded all in knowledge of the Qur'an was completely ignorant of the true meaning behind the verses of Prophetic inheritance?

If we are to accept al Khider's understanding of these verses then we are left with three options:

Option One: Imam 'Ali (as) was completely ignorant in relation to his understanding of this verse, and it came to later day adherents of Mu'awiya such as Ibn Taymeeya and Ibn Katheer to clarify the truth.

Option Two: Imam 'Ali fully concurred with Al Khider about the meaning of the verse, but still decided to present the verses as evidence as a deceptive means of gaining property for his wife.

Option Three: Imam 'Ali (as) cited the verses BECAUSE they were proof that Prophets leave behind material possession as inheritance.

Clearly neither of the first two options are acceptable. We are not prepared to accept that Imam 'Ali (as), whom Rasulullah (s) declared as the gate of the city of knowledge failed to comprehend the true meaning of these verses, and it thankfully took Nasibi such as Ibn Taymeeya, Ibn Katheer and Al Khider to set the record straight. Option two is even less palatable, our Imam (as) would never misinterpret a verse for personal gain. The only acceptable option is the third one that our Imam (as) presented the verse because he deemed it as proof that the Prophets leave material possessions that is inherited. Whose understanding of the Qur'an has greater value Hadhrat 'Ali (as) or al-Khider of Ansar.org?

We would also like to ask al Khider and his cohorts as to why Abu Bakr failed to refute the verses presented? If the verses mean inheritance of knowledge and Prophethood as al Khider has advanced then why did not Abu Bakr clarify his understanding of these verses during the Fadak dispute? The Ahl'ul Sunnah often advance that Abu Bakr was the most knowledgeable from amongst the Sahaba so why did he maintain his silence here? If he felt that Imam 'Ali (as)'s understanding of these two verses was incorrect then why did he not seek to correct him by pointing out that the verses refer to the inheritance of knowledge and not material possessions? The advocates claim that the verses refer to the inheritance of knowledge but Abu Bakr failed to say anything of the sort during the Fadak dispute, rather his only response was that he heard the Prophet say *'whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah'*. Why are these advocates explaining the verse in this manner, when their client Abu Bakr failed to do so? Can we conclude that the knowledge of Ibn Taymeeya, Ibn Katheer and al-Khider with regard to the meaning of this verse was greater than that of Abu Bakr?

7.12 The inheritance left by Hadhrat Adam (as)

Surah Baqarah 002.248 reads:

And (further) their Prophet said to them: "A Sign of His authority is that there shall come to you the Ark of the covenant, with (an assurance) therein of security from your Lord, and the relics left by the family of Moses and the family of Aaron, carried by angels. In this is a symbol for you if ye indeed have faith."

Al-Qur'an, Surah 2, Ayah 248, translated by Yusufali

These relics reached the hands of Hadhrat Adam (as) and his descendants and as proof we shall rely on the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Tafseer Kabeer Volume 2 page 506 & 507
2. Tafseer Khazan Volume 1 page 216
3. Al Jamah la Hukam Al Qur'an, by Qurtubi 2nd edition, Page 247, Published Beirut

Tafseer Kabeer:

"The Ashab narrate that Allah (swt) sent some relics to Adam (as) which contained pictures of the Prophets, and these relics were inherited by the children of Adam, to the point that they reached Hadhrat Yaqoob (as)"

 [Tafseer al-Kabeer, Vol. 2, Page 506 & 507](#)

Qurtubi, in his commentary of this verse states:

This Covenant was sent by Allah (SWT) to Prophet Adam (A.S), and it remained with him until it reached Prophet Yaqoob (as), after which it remained with Bani-Israel, and they kept overcoming their opposing armies due to the blessings of this chest, until they disobeyed Allah (swt), and were defeated by Amaliqans, who took the chest from them.

Did no paupers exist during the period of Hadhrat Adam (as) till Hadhrat Yaqoob (as)? If the possessions of Prophets are Sadaqah for the Ummah, then why were these relics not distributed as Sadaqah when these prophets died?

7.13 Prophet Isaac [as]'s daughter inherited His Strap/Belt

We read in Holy Quran :

[Yusufali 12:77] They said: "If he steals, there was a brother of his who did steal before (him)."...

Allamah Qadhi Thanauallah Panee Pathee in commentary of above mentioned verse explains as to why the brothers of Yusuf[as] said "If he steals, there was a brother of his who did steal before (him)..." Qazi writes:

Muhammad bin Isaac narrates from Mujahid that following the death of Yusuf's mother, he[as] started living with his paternal aunt (Bint-e-Isaac), she loved him a great deal, and it was she who nourished him, when he grew older, Hadhrath Yaqub[as] started loving him deeply and requested his sister: "Sister! Now hand over Yusuf to me, as his absence from my sight for even a moment has become unbearable for me." Hadhrath Yaqub's [as]'s sister deemed this impossible, whereas Hadhrath Yaqub[as] said that he could not leave Yusuf[as]. His sister asked that she be allowed to keep Yusuf for a few more days, as Allah might grant her patience in regards to him. Hadhrath Yaqub[as] agreed to this. Hadhrath Isaac [as]'s strap (cloth worn around the waist) was to be inherited by the eldest child, being elder than Hadhrath Yaqub[as], his sister had inherited that strap and it was in her possession. She tied this strap around Hadhrath Yusuf's [as] waist, underneath his clothes and then proclaimed that Hadhrath Isaac's [as]'s strap had gone missing and that family members be searched. All the household were checked and the strap was recovered from Hadhrath Yusuf [as], hence Hadhrath Yaqub's [as] sister proclaimed that from now on Yusuf[as] was to live with her. Hadhrath Yaqub[as] replied that if he had indeed done such an act, he should remain with her (Under the Shari'ah of Hadhrath Isaac [as] the owner of an appropriated belonging owned the

thief as well), through this planning she kept Hadhrath Yusuf[as] till her death.

 [Tafseer e Mazhari, Volume 6 Page 121](#)

Comments:

We can see that the inheritance of Prophet Isaac[as] was not distributed as charity rather his daughter inherited his belongings. If the daughter of Prophet Isaac[as] was entitled to inherit him then why not the daughter of the Holy Prophet[s] ? There are many traditions in the books of our opponents, that demonstrate that the children of the Prophet (s) inherited from them. And there is not even a single Report (either Authentic or Weak), which shows that child of any prophet was refused for inheritance except incident of Abu Bakr. It's our challenge to these nasabis to produce such evidence, from even one report.

7.14 Prophet Ibrahim[as]'s shirt was inherited by Isaac[as] till it reached Prophet Yaqub[as]

We read in Holy Quran:

[Shakir 12:93] Take this my shirt and cast it on my father's face, he will (again) be able to see, and come to me with all your families.

Qadhi Thanauallah under the commentary of above mentioned verse writes in Tafseer e Mazhari, Volume 6, Page 135-136, published by Daar ul Isha` t Karachi:

"...Take this shirt of mine and spread it over my father's face, this would make his vision come back", or it means that his father would return to him being able to see. Hasan said that Hadhrath Yusuf[as] might have been told by Allah Almighty, that is why he said that his father would be able to see, he couldn't have said such a thing without being informed by Allah. Mujahid says that Hadhrath Jibrael[as] had conveyed Allah's order to Hadhrath Yusuf[as] to send his shirt to Hadhrath Yaqub[as]. This shirt belonged to Hadhrath Ibrahim[as], when he was about to be thrown into the fire, his clothes were taken off, then Hadhrath Jibrael[as] had brought a silk shirt for him from the heaven, the shirt remained with Hadhrath Ibrahim[as], after his death the shirt was inherited by Hadhrath Isaac[as] and it went to Hadhrath Yaqub [as] afterwards."

 [Tafseer e Mazhari, Volume 6, page 135-136](#)

Need we to comment any more? If Prophet's leave no inheritance then how did the shirt of Ibrahim transfer through two generations of Prophets? Were these two Prophet's so ignorant of the Shari'ah that they did not even know that this shirt had to be distributed to the poor and needy? Did not even a single poor destitute man exist during the era of Isaac (as) and Yaqub (as) who was entitled to this shirt?

As we shall demonstrate later not only Sunni books, but the Old and New Testament depict the Inheritance of Earlier Prophets.

7.15 Al Khider's false claim that Prophets never kept anything beyond their need

Ansar.org states:

In fact, it was a general rule with the Ambiya that they did not hoard anything beyond their need,

and that they spent any surplus in charity.

Reply

Al Khider has very confidently advanced this as a 'fact' and 'general rule', could he therefore cite us a single verse in the Qur'an or authentic Hadeeth literature whereby Prophet's were ordered not to live beyond their need and spend their surplus in charity? Prophet Dawood (as) and Prophet Sulayman both had Kingdoms with all the perks that come with this position, e.g. Palaces, land, money etc. Was such a royal lifestyle not beyond their need? We have already mentioned that Prophet Sulayman (as) had 1000 horses in his possession, was such lavishness not beyond his need?

7.16 Biblical Proof that Prophets leave inheritance for their children

The Bible provides a detailed insight into the lives of Prophets and their properties. It is strange that there is not even a single clue to substantiate Abu Bakr's claim (i.e. the properties of all the prophets from Adam (as) till Muhammad (s) were distributed as Sadaqah and that their children received no share).

On the contrary we see at various points that when Prophets die their properties do not become charitable donations but are inherited by their offspring. It seems that throughout the history of mankind, Abu Bakr stands alone with his claim that prophets' children don't inherit them. No one from amongst Muslims confirmed the correctness of his claim, no one else narrated this from the Prophet, and no such evidence can be deduced from the Bible either.

7.17 Some incidents from the Bible

Now let us quote some of the incidents from Bible, which clearly prove that children of earlier prophets also inherited from them.

Solomon (as) inherited the Kingdom from David (as)

Ansar.org states:

It is well known that Dawud 'alayhis salam had 100 wives and 300 concubines. He had numerous children from these wives and concubines.

It is indeed unfortunate that Al Khider chose to attribute Jewish fable to Prophet Dawud (as). He did have several wives and concubines but this is ridiculous to exceed their number to 400 in total. Even Bible also doesn't support this assertion.

Al-Khider wants to prove that Dawud (as) had hundreds of sons which is also wrong. according to Bible, he had 6 sons while he was in Hebron.

2 Samuel 3:2-5 says:

**Two Sons were born to David in Hebron:
His firstborn was Amnon the son of Ahinoam of Jezreel;**

his second, Kileab the son of Abigail the widow of Nabal of Carmel;
 the third, Absalom the son of Maacah daughter of Talmai king of Geshur;
 the fourth, Adonijah the son of Haggith;
 the fifth, Shephatiah the son of Abital;
 and the sixth, Ithream the son of David's wife Eglah.

And in Jerusalem, again he got 13 children.

1 Chronicle 14:4 reads:

These are the names of the children born to him there (Jerusalem): Shammua, Shobab, Nathan, Solomon, I Bhar, Elishua, Elpelet, Nogah, Nepheg, Japhia, Elishama, Beeliada and Eliphelet.

Moreover, also see "2 Samuel 5" (which claims 11 children in Jerusalem). This makes total children of Dawud (as) around 17 to 19. This tallies with the tradition of the Shi'a Imams in Minhajus Sadiqeen (presented earlier) which also tells that there were 19 children of Dawud (as).

According to Bible, the Kingdom of Dawud (as) was not left as Sadaqah, but it was the same Kingdom which was inherited by Sulayman (as). We will prove it later, but first we will tell the whole story behind this Kingdom which shows that none of the children of Dawud (as) considered this inheritance to be the Sadaqah for poor.

Adonijah [son of David (as) and elder brother of Solomon (as)] tried to occupy the Kingdom

"1 Kings 1" tells that when David (as) got older, one of his sons Adonijah conspired and tried to occupy the Kingdom. Let us see what Bible is saying:

And Adonijah slew sheep and oxen and fat cattle by the stone of Zoheleth, which is by Enrogel, and called all his brethren the king's sons, and all the men of Judah the king's servants: 10 But Nathan the prophet, and Benaiah, and the mighty men, and Solomon his brother, he called not. 11 Wherefore Nathan spake unto Bathsheba the mother of Solomon, saying, Hast thou not heard that Adonijah the son of Haggith doth reign, and David our lord knoweth it not?

... And Bathsheba said unto him, My lord, thou swearest by the LORD thy God unto thine handmaid, saying, Assuredly Solomon thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne. 18 And now, behold, Adonijah reigneth; and now, my lord the king, thou knowest it not:

...And king David said, Call me Zadok the priest, and Nathan the prophet, and Benaiah the son of Jehoiada. And they came before the king. 33 The king also said unto them, Take with you the servants of your lord, and cause Solomon my son to ride upon mine own mule, and bring him down to Gihon: 34 And let Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet anoint him there king over Israel: and blow ye with the trumpet, and say, God save king Solomon. 35 Then ye shall come up after him, that he may come and sit upon my throne; for he shall be king in my stead: and I have appointed him to be the ruler over Israel and Judah.

Hence Solomon (as) became the heir of Dawud's (as) kingdom and it refutes the claim by Mr. Al-Khider that Qur'an was talking about Solomon (as) as heir to David (as) only in terms of Knowledge and Prophethood.

In the next chapter of 1 Kings, Adonijah tells the mother of Solomon (as), that whole Bani

Israel was looking at him to inherit the Crown. This also shows that Bani Israel never deemed that Prophet's property is a Sadaqah, but always believed it to be distributed only among the family of Prophets according to the rules of earlier Sharias.

Not only Solomon Inherited Dawud (as), but also Rehobo'am (son of Solomon) inherited from his father

It is Interesting to see the following verses of Bible which confirms that Solomon's son also inherited the same kingdom from Solomon (as):

2 Chronicles 9:31:

And Solomon slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David his father; and Rehobo'am his son reigned in his stead.

2 Chronicles 10:1:

Rehobo'am went to Shechem, for all Israel had come to Shechem to make him king.

The chapter 10 of Book of Chronicles 2 tells that Rehoboam was not a prophet but a fallible person. And he was not chosen by Allah, but by people as the inheritor of kingdom of Solomon (as).

Jacob's land (as) was given to his Descendants as inheritance (and not given to the poor as Sadaqah)

Bible also confirms that Inheritance of Jacob (as) was also given to his descendants, instead of being divided amongst the poor as charity.

Book of Joshua 24:32:

The bones of Joseph which the people of Israel brought up from Egypt were buried at Shechem, in the portion of ground which Jacob bought from the sons of Hamor the father of Shechem for a hundred pieces of money; it became an inheritance of the descendants of Joseph.

In other places in Bible, we find the whole history of this Land of Shechem and why Prophet Joseph's(s) bones were brought to this place after his death.

"Genesis 34" give full details how Jacob (as) came to this land of Shechem, and how he bought it and why he had to leave it later.

And before Joseph died (at the age of 110), he made a 'will' that his bones must be brought to this Promised Land. This whole incident can be found in Genesis 50.

Genesis 50:24-25:

Joseph said to his brothers: "I am about to die. God will surely take care of you and lead you out of this land to the land that he promised on oath to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Then, putting the sons of Israel under oath, he continued, "When God thus takes care of you, you must bring my bones up with you from this place."

A Property of Abraham (as) was maintained by his children and was not distributed as charity

"Genesis 49" tells us that Abraham (as) bought a property from Hittite. After his death, this

property was not distributed as charity, but remained in the hands of his descendants.

Genesis 49:29-33:

The Death of Jacob

Then he gave them these instructions: "I am about to be gathered to my people. Bury me with my fathers in the cave in the field of Ephron the Hittite, 30 the cave in the field of Machpelah, near Mamre in Canaan, which Abraham bought as a burial place from Ephron the Hittite, along with the field. 31 There Abraham and his wife Sarah were buried, there Isaac and his wife Rebekah were buried, and there I buried Leah. 32 The field and the cave in it were bought from the Hittites."

When Jacob had finished giving instructions to his sons, he drew his feet up into the bed, breathed his last and was gathered to his people.

Prophet Job (as) also gave the share of inheritance to his daughters

Job 42:15:

And in all the land there were no women so fair as Job's daughters; and their father gave them inheritance among their brothers.

Allah Promised Abraham to give him a son in old age who would inherit him everything

Genesis 15:2:

Later the LORD spoke to Abram in a vision, "Abram, don't be afraid! I will protect you and reward you greatly." But Abram answered, "LORD All-Powerful, you have given me everything I could ask for, except children. And when I die, Eliezer of Damascus will get all I own. You have not given me any children, and this servant of mine will inherit everything." The LORD replied, "No, he won't! You will have a son of your own, and everything you have will be his." Then the LORD took Abram outside and said, "Look at the sky and see if you can count the stars. That's how many descendants you will have." Abram believed the LORD, and the LORD was pleased with him.

The Qur'an also refers to similar Dua by Zakariya (as) when he prayed to Allah Almighty for a child, who may inherit from him, while he feared that all his possessions would go to his relatives.

In brief, we have showed from the Qur'an that Sulayman (as) inherited from Dawud (as), and Zakariyyah (as) prayed for a child who inherit him, and showed Ahadeeth from Aima of Ahle-Bait (as), and also showed Ahadeeth from Sunni books that sons of earlier Prophets inherited from them. Now it's challenge for our opponents to show us a single Quranic verse, or Hadeeth or even from Bible that properties of all the Prophets from Adam (as) till Muhammad (s) had been distributed as charity among the poor.

7.18 Do the References from Bible have any Importance?

The case of Bible is some what like Ahadeeth, which are not 100% authentic, but people added a lot in them according to their wishes. Similarly Bible went through a lot of corruption. But still there are a lot of things in Bible, which you will find completely in accordance with Qur'an and authentic Ahadeeth of Rasool Allah (saw).

We will not go in details about Bible here, but we must keep the following facts in mind:

1. Mostly the changes, that are made in Bible, concerns the part of Beliefs. But the stories about the inheritances of Prophets does not come under Beliefs. So there is very less probability that corruption took place in them.
2. There is a term "Tawatur" in Ahadeeth. It means that if any report comes through several different sources, then even if these chains have deficiencies still such report is considered to be authentic. Similar is the case of inheritance of Prophets in Bible. In presence of so many different reports about Prophets' children getting the share in inheritance, it is unlikely that all these reports have been fabricated and included by people in the Bible.

Please also note that the conditions/standards set for a "Muttawatir" report of ahadeeth (sayings of Rasool (s)) is strict, as it concerns the part of our Beliefs. But in case of historical events, these conditions are lenient. And the stories of inheritance in Bible come under these standards.

3. Ibn Taymeeya al Nasabi in his book "al-qaida al-jaleela fit- tawwasali wal-waseela", with commentary of Dr. Rabi'a bin Hadi 'Umayr al-Mudkhali, professor in the Islamic University of Madinah al-Munawwara, Page 162, - gives a detailed discussion on the fact that it is acceptable to use a hadith whose authenticity is unknown, as long as the hadith is known not to have been an actual lie. On the same page paragraph 480 Ibn Taymeeya states same principle can be applied to Jewish traditions:

"This is like the [situation] of the Isra'iliyyaat [stories related by the Jews]. It is permissible to be narrated as long as we know that it is not a lie, for encouraging or discouraging in what we know that Allah has ordered in our law [shar'] or forbade in our law [shar']."

Comment

Applying the principle established by Ibn Taymeeya to the Biblical references, we can that these narrations in no way conflict with the Law of Allah (swt) as set out in the Qur'an, wherein we learn that Prophets Dawood (as) and Zakariya (as) left inheritance - on the contrary they corroborate these verses. It is therefore perfectly acceptable to cite Biblical references to Prophetic inheritance.

8. Analysing the Judgement of Abu Bakr

8.1 Sayyida Fatima (as) asked for her inheritance rights and Abu Bakr rejected her claim

As evidence we shall advance the following authentic Sunni works:

1. Sahih al Bukhari, Bab al Khums Volume 4, Book 53, Number 325:
2. Sahih Muslim No. 019 The Book of Jihad and Expedition (Kitab Al-Jihad wa'l-Siyar)
3. Sunan Abu Dawood Book 19, Tribute, Spoils, and Rulership (Kitab Al-Kharaj, Wal-Fai' Wal-Imarah) Number 2967
4. Sunan Nasai Kitab Kism al Fai Volume 7 page 132
5. Sunan al Kabeera, Kitan Kism al Fay Volume 6 page 300
6. Al Muthaqa, Dhkir Khums page 494
7. Neel al Authar, Volume 6 page 78 Bab Meerath al Anbiys
8. Wafa al Wafa Volume 3 page 995 Dhikr Talib Fatima min Abu Bakr Siddique
9. Kanz al Ammal Volume 3 page 129, Dhikr Kism Fay
10. Tabaqat al Kabeera Volume 2 page 315 Dhikr Meerath Rasulallah (s)
11. Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal Volume 1 page 27 Hadeeth 25
12. Riyadh al Nadira Volume 1 page 231 Dhikr Meerathal Anbiya
13. Izalathal Khifa Part 2 Volume 3 page 112 [Karachi edition]
14. Sharh ibn al Hadeed Volume 2 page 113

8.2 Abu Bakr claimed that the Waris of Rasulallah (s) is his Khalifa

Sunan Abu Dawood Book 19, Tribute, Spoils, and Rulership (Kitab Al-Kharaj, Wal-Fai' Wal-Imarah) Number 2967 reads:

Narrated Abu Bakr:

Abu Tufayl said: Fatimah came to Abu Bakr asking him for the inheritance of the Prophet (peace_be_upon_him). Abu Bakr said: I heard the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) say: If Allah, Most High, gives a Prophet some means of sustenance that goes to his successor.

Comment

Shibli Numani's vigorous argument that Abu Bakr as the Khalifa of Rasulallah (s) in effect became his Waris is unacceptable. If he was an Heir then he was an Heir who inherited the Government. One should remember that during his lifetime (s) and after that, there was no such thing as State owned land. The lands of Khayber were immediately distributed amongst the people. The scholars of Islam formulated this concept (of state owned land) much later

.Anything that came into the possession of the Government was automatically distributed amongst the Muslims, there was not even a system of set stipends for the army, it was seen as a single unit, their participation in Jihad was compulsory, distribution of stipends would occur when the army were gathered together. A more formal system of a Stipends Register was developed by Umar, and it was at that time that the need to the concept of State Ownership dawned on the Government, yet even then land was not included as part of State ownership. In any case what is certain is that during the lifetime of Rasulallah (s) there was no such thing as State owned land so as to make it legitimate for Abu Bakr to take RasulAllah's(s) land alongwith the Khilafat.

Abu Bakr may be presented as a Waris (Heir) but the Hadeeth which he presented '**Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)**' is proof that he acknowledged that Rasulallah (s) possessed personal property, but that his progeny was excluded from inheriting it. If this was a ruling of Rasulallah (s), then this land would have been distributed during his(Abu Bakr's)lifetime but it was not which proves that it was not State Land, hence Abu Bakr was not the Waris of Fadak.

8.3 Abu Bakr admitted that the Waris of Rasulallah (s) are his children

We read in Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal and Riyadh al Nadira:

"Hadhrat Fatima went to Abu Bakr and said "Is Abu Bakr the Waris of the Prophet (s) or his children? Abu Bakr said 'I am not the Waris, rather his children are. Fatima then said 'Why have you taken the Prophet's portion?' Abu Bakr said: I heard the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) say: If Allah, Most High, gives a Prophet some means of sustenance that goes to his successor".

We appeal to justice. These three references prove that Sayyida Fatima (as) asked for her inheritance rights and Abu Bakr contradicted himself by claiming to be RasulAllah's Waris on one occasion and saying that the children were his Waris on another. All three references serve as proof that at no time did Abu Bakr state that the Prophet (s) has **no** inheritor. The two responses of Abu Bakr were very weak, yet Abu Bakr feared the weakening of his rule and hence remained firm in his view, a view that was a major injustice towards Sayyida Fatima (as). Al Khider and his Cronies need to show some honesty, and admit that the Khalifa's two replies clearly contradicted ten verses of the Qur'an and that his decision serves as proof that he had unlawfully usurped land that was the legal entitlement of Sayyida Fatima (as).

8.4 Understanding the words '**Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)**'

We quote verbatim from Sahih al Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 325 [although similar reports can be found in Sahih Muslim and Sunan Nasai]:

Narrated 'Ayesha(mother of the believers):

After the death of Allah's Apostle Fatima the daughter of Allah's Apostle asked Abu Bakr As-Siddiq to give her, her share of inheritance from what Allah's Apostle had left of the Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting) which Allah had given him. Abu Bakr said to her, "Allah's Apostle said, 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)." Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Apostle got angry and stopped speaking to Abu Bakr, and continued assuming that attitude till she died. Fatima remained alive for six months after the death of Allah's Apostle.

Comment

These three books from the Saha Sittah establish the fact that Sayyida Fatima (as) turned to Abu Bakr in order to claim her inheritance rights and Abu Bakr held that Prophets leave no inheritance; rather whatever they leave is Sadaqah.

There can be the following two meanings of Abu Bakr's words:

Meaning One - Anything that Prophet's leave as Sadaqah cannot be inherited. Such words do not benefit Abu Bakr in the slightest, since it proves that he usurped Fadak and the portion of Rasulallah (s) property, thus proving injustice on his part and this injustice destroys Abu Bakr's Khilafat.

Meaning Two - Anything that Prophet's leave behind them is Sadaqah and has no Waris, if we understand this in this manner then this is also absolutely incorrect as already proved by us.

8.5 Summing up the arguments

Following the death of her father (s), Sayyida Fatima (as) asked Abu Bakr with regards to the inheritance of three things:

1. The Estate of Fadak in Madina that was Fay
2. The Estate of Fadak
3. Khums from the attributes of Khayber

Sayyida Fatima (as)'s claim was that all three belonged to Rasulallah (s), and she was the Waris of Rasulallah (s) as the Qur'an stipulates that a daughter is legally the Waris of her parents.

Abu Bakr gave three responses to the claims of Sayyida Fatima:

1. After the Prophet (s) I have possession over these things.
2. Prophet's have no Waris rather everything they owned becomes Sadaqah.
3. After Rasulallah (s) these things go to the children of the Prophet (s).

If any person was to make these three contradictory claims in a Court of Law, his case would clearly be seen as weak. Yet the Justice of the Sahaba is indeed very unusual, all three comments of Abu Bakr are acceptable. Even if those comments contradict the Qur'an, the support from Al Khider and Co continues unabated.

The Khalifa's first and second response contradict the Qur'an and is therefore not correct, the third is correct but the Khalifa did not act on it, due to political reasons, namely the fact that the Ahl'ul Bayt (as) were his political opponents, financial support that would strengthen them, may in turn be used to mount a political campaign to topple him.

Every generation of Sunni throughout to the Neo Nasibi such as al Khider has deemed the reply of Abu Bakr 'Prophet's leave no inheritance' to be a brilliant correct one. Let us analyse these words and see how true Abu Bakr's claim was:

8.6 Hadhrat 'Ali rejected the claim of Abu Bakr 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah'

1. Kanz al Ummal Volume 4 page 52 Dhikr Meeras al Nabi
2. Neel al Authar Volume 6 page 88 Dhikr Meeras al Nabi
3. Sunan al Kabeera Part 1, Volume 6 page 298, Kism al Fay
4. Sahih Muslim Book 019, Number 4349 The Book of Jihad and Expedition (Kitab Al-Jihad wa'l-Siyar)
5.  [Sahih Muslim Sharh Nawawi, Vol. 12, Page 75](#)
6.  [Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, Vol. 3, Page 128](#)
7.  [Musnad Abi Awana, Vol. 4, Page 137](#)
8. Umdah thul Qari fie Sharh Sahih al Bukhari Volume 11 page 476 Bab
9. Sharh Sahih Muslim, by Nawawi Volume 2 page 90 Kitab al Fai
10. Fathul Bari fi Sharh Sahih al Bukhari Volume 13 page 280
11. Irshad al Sari, Sharh Sahih al Bukhari Volume 28 page 52

We read in Kanz al Ummal taken from Ibn Hanbal with a Hasan [Good] chain.

"On one occasion Hadhrat Umar said to 'Ali and Abbas - Abu Bakr said 'I heard the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) had said:" We do not have any heirs; what we leave behind is (to be given in) charity." So both of you thought him to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest".

We read in Neel al Autaar:

"Hadhrt Umar cited the position of 'Ali and Abbas, that on the issue of the inheritance of the Prophet (s), you held your opponent to be Dhaalim, as is discussed in Sahih al Bukhari"

 [Neel al-Autaar, Vol. 6, Page 88](#)

We read in Sunan al Kabeera:

On one occasion Hadhrt Umar said the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) had said: "We do not have any heirs; what we leave behind is (to be given in) charity." So both of you thought him to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest".

Of course the seriousness of these words lead to Muhammad Ismaeel Bukharee seeking to cover up the issue as much as possible. He replaced the offensive terms We read in Sahih Bukhari Hadith: 9.408:

"... Then he (Umar) turned to 'Ali and 'Abbas and said, "You both claim that Abu Bakr did so-and-so in managing the property".

Ibn Hajr Asqalani in Fathul Baree addresses this issue as follows:

"Bukharee narrated the Hadeeth with Umar saying 'You both deemed Abu Bakr, the

commentary of this Hadeeth is located in Sahih Muslim, that they deemed him liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest

Umdah thul Qaree informs us that:

"Umar said 'Ali and Abbas you both deemed Abu Bakr to be on the wrong path".

Irshad Saree in his Sharh Saheeh al Bukharee states:

"Umar said that Abbas and 'Ali both deemed the usurpation of Fadak to be a sinful, treacherous deceit. This has been narrated by the Hadeeth scholar Zubayr, on some occasions he provides a commentary to the words of Umar on other he gives a mere hint".

All manner of excuse has been advanced to explain the words used, Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Qasthalani in his Sharh Saheeh al Bukharee, page 436, under the sixth footnote of the Hadeeth counters critics as follows:

"If the objection is raised as to why Abbas and 'Ali whilst Sattu representatives disputed over distribution of inheritance in the presence of Umar, our reply is that both individuals were of the opinion that they both believed the Hadeeth 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we leave is Sadaqah' was not general but referred only to specific items"

What can we say about this level of Sunni scholarship, one that portrays Hadhrath Abbas and Hadhrath 'Ali (as) as so ignorant of this Hadeeth, that they completely failed in galvanising its true meaning, Abu Bakr during his two year reign was unable to get them to understand it, and for the next two years of Umar's reign they still could not get their heads around what the Hadeeth meant, so much so that they yet gain made a claim to the inheritance of the Prophet (s).

Some Nasabi have seen some heart, by creating the counter, pointing out that Abbas used the same derogatory term about Imam 'Ali at the beginning of the Hadeeth in Saheeh Muslim, hence the use of such terms was just common between friends. Worthy of note is the fact that other than Sahih Muslim, none of the other sources contain these words which clearly indicates that these words are a fabrication. The most effective response comes to this counter argument comes from none other than Shams al Hind, Allamah Shibli Numani, who in Sirat ul Nabi pages 67-68 states:

"In the Sahih Muslim, in the Book of Jihad, Chapter 'al Fai', it is recorded that once Abbas and 'Ali came to Umar, Abbas said to 'Umar, 'O Caliph, be judge between me and this liar, this criminal, this misappropriator of trusts, this traitor. As no Muslim could utter such words for 'Ali, many traditionists have omitted them from their books [al Nawawi, Sharh Sahih Muslim, commentary on this Hadith, Kitab al Jihad, Chapter al Fai] Al Imam Mazari says 'When we cannot interpret it any other way, we shall say the narrator must have been a liar' [al Nawawi, Sharh Sahih Muslim, commentary on this Hadith, Kitab al Jihad, Chapter al Fai]

 [Seerat un-Nabi, Page 67 & 68](#)

This is interesting since Shibli was a die hard Sunni scholar and dedicated his life to portraying the Sahaba in an image that suggested that they were the best of friends that never disputed with one another. Shibli rejects the notion of Abbas uttering such terms against Maula 'Ali (as), he makes no comment to the fact that the very same tradition in Saheeh Muslim records the fact that 'Ali (as) and Abbas deemed Abu Bakr and Umar to be liars, treacherous, sinful and dishonest. Had Shibli had even the slightest doubt in his minds with regards to these words used against Abu Bakr and Umar this paragraph would have given him the opportunity to also reject the tradition outright. His silence on the matter, serves as proof that this bulwark of

Sunni Islam also conceded to the fact that Abbas and Maula 'Ali deemed the Shaykhayn to be 'liars, treacherous, sinful and dishonest'.

In relation to Abu Bakr's decision to usurp Fadak on the basis that Prophet's leave no inheritance, Hadhrat 'Ali (as) deemed him to be *a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest*. Rasulallah (s) had said *'Ali is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ali'*, hence anyone that Hadhrat 'Ali deems to be 'a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest' is indeed one. If Imam 'Ali (as) did not believe this then why did he fail to correct Umar when these comments were said to him? The silence of Hadhrat 'Ali (as) in response Umar's comments proves that he held this position. Umar's additional statement that he was also aware that Imam 'Ali (as) and Abbas also deemed him to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest, proves that that their view of Abu Bakr never changed, rather they deemed Umar the same for upholding Abu Bakr's decision! This in many ways destroys all the romantic notions of closeness of the four friends that has been penned by the classical Sunni scholars, most notably the assertion that Maula 'Ali (as) accepted Abu Bakr as the legitimate khalifa of the Prophet (s) - ask yourself, would Maula 'Ali (as) have pledged his fealty / undying loyalty to a man that he deemed to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest?

8.7 Anyone whom Hadhrat 'Ali deems treacherous is also treacherous in the eyes of the Sahaba

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work Tafseer Mazhari Part 12, Volume 5 page 14, commentary of Surah Hud:

"In our view it is established that Hadhrat 'Ali was the axis of Wilayath and all other Saints including the Sahaba follow his station of Wilaya"

When Abu Bakr perpetrated injustice towards the daughter of the Prophet (s), Hadhrat 'Ali (as) deemed him to be 'liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest'. If the Sahaba follow in the footsteps of the Wilaya of Imam 'Ali (as) then Hadhrat 'Ali (as)'s view of such a person is also shared by the Sahaba.

8.8 The Hadeeth '*Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)*' was not used by Abu Bakr to confiscate the land that Rasulallah (s) left for the Sahaba

We read in Fathul Buldan page 33:

'The wealth of Banu Nazir included those lands that Allah (swt) had bestowed to Rasulallah (s), since Muslims did not run camels and horses across it to capture it, This was under the exclusive ownership of Rasulallah (s). He distributed it amongst the Muhajireen, he gave nothing to the Ansar save two people, who were poor Samak bin Kharsha, Abu Dajana and Sahil bin Haneef'

Fathul Buldan page 31 reads:

The wealth and property of the Banu Nazir were the exclusive ownership of Rasulallah (s), and Rasulallah (s) would use the land to under the date tress for cultivations, produce would then be distributed to his family, anything that was outstanding would be purchased for weapons, Rasulallah (s) gave some of the lands of Banu Nazir to Abu Bakr, Abdur Rahman bin Auf, Abu Dajana, Samak bin Kharsha and al Sa'adi as a gift.

Fathul Buldan Page 34:

"The arid land for building properties were given by the Prophet to Zubayr. Abdullah bin Numair states that Umar gave the entire Aqeeq Valley to Zubayr."

Comment

These references demonstrate that Rasulallah (s) had bestowed land to Zubayr, Abdur Rahman ibn Auf and Abu Dajana, why did not Abu Bakr ask these individuals to prove that the land had been bestowed to them? If the Hadeeth he recited to quash Sayyida Fatima (as)'s claim was true then why did he not use it to justify the seizure of lands belonging to these Sahaba? Why were witnesses not asked of them by Abu Bakr? Why was no action taken against them to vest control of these lands?

If the excuse is given that no claim was brought by these individuals, then this is baseless because Sayyida Fatima (as) was in effect forced to bring a claim because the Khalifa had seized her property and placed it under his own control. Had the same approach been taken against these individuals there is no doubt that they would have likewise petitioned against Abu Bakr in a similar manner.

8.9 The Hadeeth '*Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)*' was even rejected by the wives of the Prophet (s)

Al Khider manages to display his extreme ignorance in his efforts to defend Abu Bakr by asserting:

Ansar.org states:

In addition, if Fadak had to be inheritance, the wives of Rasulallah like 'A'ishah, and his daughters like Zaynab and Umm Kulthum would have had a share in it. However, Abu Bakr, for the sake of the hadith, did not give anything of it to the wives or daughters of Rasulallah, not even to his own daughter 'A'ishah. Why are the wives and the other daughters of Rasulallah 'alayhi wasallam not mentioned as parties in the dispute over Fadak, and why is all attention focused only on Sayyidah Fatimah.

Reply

Whilst we reject the notion that Rasulallah (s) had other daughters, even if this was true, the books of Ahl'ul Sunnah attest to their deaths during the lifetime of Rasulallah (s), and this is admitted by al Khider in this same article. He writes:

Ansar.org states:

We all know that Khaybar was taken in the 7th year after the Hijrah, and that Zaynab died in the 8th year, and Umm Kulthum in the 9th year after

the Hijrah.

How these alleged daughters could claim their stake to the Prophet's inheritance when they were already dead?

The reason why the wives of the Prophet [s.] are not mentioned disputing over Fadak is because they knew that Fadak belonged to Fatima Al-Zahra (as) but that does not mean that they didn't ask for their share of their inheritance. Al Khider is a blatant liar for seeking to suggest that they had not done so. As evidence we shall rely on the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Sahih al Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 367 Kitab al Maghaazi
2. Sahih Muslim Volume 3 page 72, Hukm al Fay
3. Sunan ibn Abu Dawood Volume 3 page 145 Bab al Fay
4. Sunan al Kabeera Volume 6 page 301 Kitab Fay
5. Muhimmal Buldan Volume 14 page 239 Dhikr Fadak
6. Al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 5 page 285 Dhikr Meeras al Nabi
7. Mudhaarj al Nubuwwa Volume 2 page 445 Dhikr Taqseem Meeras al Nabi
8. Kashaf al Ghimma Volume 2 page 42 Dhikr Meeras al Nabi
9. Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 22 Dhikr Thaan Ghasb Fadak

We read in Sahih al Bukhari:

.... "I told 'Urwa bin Az-Zubair of this Hadeeth and he said, 'Malik bin Aus has told the truth" I heard 'Ayesha, the wife of the Prophet saying, 'The wives of the Prophet sent 'Uthman to Abu Bakr demanding from him their 1/8 of the Fai which Allah had granted to his Apostle. But I used to oppose them and say to them: Will you not fear Allah? Don't you know that the Prophet used to say: Our property is not inherited, but whatever we leave is to be given in charity?"

Allah (swt) says in his Holy Book that the reason why we are supposed to have one male witness and two female witnesses, is that if one the females forgets the other will remind her [2:282]

But what we see in the narration above is that one female does not forget and a large number had forgotten that the Prophet had said a thing. It is indeed unfortunate that Muhammad Ismail Bukhari failed to record the reply that these nine wives had given to Ayesha.

This tradition proves that the wives of Rasulallah (s) did not deem the Hadeeth cited by Abu Bakr striking out the concept of Prophetic inheritance to be correct, if they did they would have not have sent Uthman to claim their inheritance share. No doubt Nasibi will argue that this tradition from Ayesha supports Abu Bakr's stance then our reply is simple - if during the Fadak case, the testimony of Hasnayn (as) was rejected due to them being too young, then by the same token the testimony of Abu Bakr's daughter who played with dolls in 9 Hijri should also be rejected.

8.10 Ayesha also did not support Abu Bakr's stance

As evidence we shall cite Ma'arij-ul-Nabuwwah Volume 2 page 756:

"Ayesha narrates after the death of Rasulullah (s) I went to claim my share of inheritance that was Khayber, Fadak and the land of Banu Nadheer, but Abu Bakr gave nothing, he gave the same reply that he had given to the other wives of the Prophet and Fatima daughter of the Prophet (s)".

 [Ma'arij-ul-Nabuwwah Volume 2 page 756](#)

The tradition proves that Ayesha believed that the Prophet left inheritance, and she felt that the reply that her father had given in Sahih al Bukhari was very weak. Hence the Ahl'ul Sunnah predecessors fabricated the tradition from Ayesha so as to portray her support for her father's stance. The reality is Ayesha had never heard the words from the Prophet (s), the first that she heard that he (s) left no inheritance was from her father, we read her testimony in Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 14:

"No one knew about the inheritance of the Prophet save Abu Bakr".

This proves that Ayesha did not know either. If we for arguments sake accept she upheld her father's words whilst also believing (as Sunni do) that witness numbers had not been met on the part of Sayyida Fatima (as) then Nasabi should know that Ayesha stood alone with regards to backing her father's claim, two witnesses were required, and in fact two separate witnesses after all according to Ahl'ul Sunnah a child cannot testify in support of a parent! Balance this against the number of witnesses that were corroborating the claim of Sayyida Fatima.

If she really believed the tradition to be true then she wouldn't have made a claim for inheritance having already been aware that Abu Bakr had rejected the claims of Sayyida Fatima (as) and the other wives of the Prophet (s) by relying on this alleged Hadeeth.

Now there are only two options for Ahl'ul Sunnah to accept:

Option 1: Ayesha believed the Hadeeth to be correct and still wanted a share of the Prophet's inheritance.

Option 2: Ayesha deemed the Hadeeth to be false and still maintained this position after all the other wives claims had been rejected.

If we accept Option 1, then we are in effect saying that Ayesha 'The truthful' was prepared to turn a blind eye to a Hadeeth, as it was to her financial advantage. This destroys the credibility of Ayesha since it suggests that she preferred material possessions to the Prophet's words, and anyone who prefers filling his/her stomach to a Prophetic ruling can never be deemed a truthful narrator of traditions.

If Option 2 is accepted, then this means that Ayesha deemed the Hadeeth advanced by Abu Bakr, to be false. Think about this logically, 8 wives and 1 daughter of Rasulullah (s) had already made their claim for inheritance and Abu Bakr rejected it claiming that he heard the Prophet (s) say *'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah'*. Now Ayesha was aware that these claims had been struck out on the basis of this alleged Hadeeth, if she believed her father's position then why also make a stake for the inheritance? Logic dictates that you don't make a claim in a court of Law, when you are fully aware those 9 claimants before you made the same claim that was rejected by the same Judge. You only make such a claim if you believe that the Judge's decision is wrong.

Ansar.org states:

However, Abu Bakr, for the sake of the Hadeeth,

did not give anything of it to the wives or daughters of Rasulullah, not even to his own daughter 'A'ishah

What a magnificent research! We shall now present before our readers our response to this false claim. Denying Ayesha inheritance of the Prophet was due to political considerations. Had Ayesha received this right she would have received one ninth share, and this was the Fay that the Khalifa denied to his daughter, and made himself the owner. Now what damage did this bring to Ayesha? What was the loss to a widow with no offspring who received 12,000 Dinars as yearly stipend compared to the other wives who received 10,000 Dinars? On a wider level Khilafath remained in her household and unlike Sayyida Fatima (as) she was also entitled to inherit her father's possessions. The wives of the Prophet (s) were entitled to maintain possession of anything they held. Ayesha was particularly fortunate; we read this tradition in Saheeh al Bukharee Volume 4, Chapter of Gifts in between Hadeeth number 773 and 774:

“Asma said to al Qasim bin Muhammad and Ibn Abu Atiq ‘I inherited some land in the forest from my sister Ayesha and Mu’awiyah offered me 100,000 for itm but I give it to both of you as a gift”.

Consider this carefully. Rasulullah (s) left no inheritance for her, which in effect meant that she had to live on a very basic standard of living, with a very basic staple diet. This being the case, how did she attain possession of land valued at 100,000 dirhams? What Islamic Law gave her entitlement to such rich land? Ayesha’s riches are clear evidence that the State took no remedial steps that would cause financial difficulties to her.

The only financial loss was to Sayyida Fatima (as) whose financial aid was stopped upon the death of Rasulullah (s), her only means of additional support would have been from her step mother, and the ways of such mothers are well known.

Rasulullah (s) transferred Fadak to his daughter for her financial support, yet this land was illegally taken, and the Leaders objected to returning the inheritance of Rasulullah (s). There is a world of difference between the treatment of Sayyida Fatima (as) and Ayesha. Abu Bakr took every step to ensure that the needs of his daughter were met, whilst Hadhrat Fatima (as) left the world in tears, and cursed Abu Bakr until she died. In clear contradiction to this the wives of the Prophet (s) were treated very differently and somewhat curiously they inherited land and material possessions from Rasulullah (s) despite Abu Bakr's recollection of the Hadeeth '*whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah*'. Let us cite some evidence to this effect:

8.11 The wives of the Prophet (s) inherited their apartments from Rasulullah (s) which proves that the Hadeeth '*Our property will not be inherited, whatever we leave is Sadaqah*' is false

If the Hadeeth '*whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah*' is correct then why did Abu Bakr not take possession of the homes belonging to Ayesha, Hafsa and the other wives of the Prophet (s) that they had attained as inheritance upon the death of the Prophet (s)? It is a fact that these properties belonged to Rasulullah (s) and his wives attained them (s) as inheritance after his death.

See: Wafa al Wafa ba Khabr Da Mustafa Part 1 page 325 Bab al Rabba Fasl al Thasa

Allamah Shibli Numani in his famed work Sirat-ul Nabi Volume 3 page 164, under the Chapter 'The Sacred House' sheds light on this matter, referring to the arrival of the Prophet (s) in Madina he states:

"When he laid the foundation of Masjid-I-Nabvi, he got built small apartments

adjoining to it. He then sent a message and called his family from Makka to live in these apartments...

The reference makes it clear that these apartments belonged to the Prophet build around his Mosque this is where he housed his wives. What happened to these apartments following the death of the Prophet? The answer is given by Allamah Shibli on the very next page:

"These apartments remained in the possession of the wives after his death. Whenever any one of his wives died, the apartment went to the possession of the relatives".

 [Seerat un-Nabi, Vol. 3, Page 164 & 165](#)

The reference states that the apartments belonged to the Prophet and he housed his wife's there. Upon his (s) death why were these wives not evicted by Abu Bakr, and these apartments given to the poor and needy of Madina? If they remained the possession of the Prophet (s) and he had bequeathed that they remain in there till they die, then upon their deaths these properties should have automatically gone to the poor as Sadaqa (as the Hadeeth stipulated), Rather than this happening we learn that the apartments went to the wife's heirs. This therefore proves that wives had inherited these properties as heirs upon the death of the Prophet (s), that they in turn left as inheritance when they died.

If the argument is advanced that the wives had existing possession of the apartments during the lifetime of the Prophet (s), then we will respond by pointing out Sayyida Fatima (as) also had existing possession of Fadak, so why was this usurped by Abu Bakr on these apartments?

The three Khaleefa's inheriting the ring of the Prophet is proof that the Hadeeth 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we leave is Sadaqah' is false

We read in Saheeh al Bukharee Volume 7, Book 72, Number 767:

Narrated Anas:

that when Abu Bakr became the Caliph, he wrote a letter to him (and stamped it with the Prophet's ring) and the engraving of the ring was in three lines: Muhammad in one line, 'Apostle' in another line, and 'Allah' in a third line. Anas added: 'the ring of the Prophet was in his hand, and after him, in Abu Bakr's hand, and then in 'Umar's hand after Abu Bakr. When Uthman was the Caliph, once he was sitting at the well of Aris. He removed the ring from his hand and while he was trifling with it, dropped into the well. We kept on going to the well with Uthman for three days looking for the ring, and finally the well was drained, but the ring was not found.

In this regard we have some Questions:

1. during the Fadak dispute Abu Bakr said that Prophets leave no inheritance, rather all that they leave becomes charity, so why didn't Abu Bakr give this ring away as Sadaqa – after all it was a possession of the Prophet?
2. Why was this ring transferred from Khaleefa to Khaleefa?
3. Isn't it funny the Khaleefa's can successively inherit a possession of the Prophet (s), but his daughter was not allowed to inherit anything?

The ring was a possession of Rasulullah (s) and Abu Bakr cited the fact that Prophet leave no inheritance, rather all they leave becomes Sadaqah - so it was Abu Bakr's duty to distribute this

to the needy not hoard it for himself and then make it some system of lineal succession! Why didn't he implement the Hadeeth that he cited?

8.12 Ayesha inherited the garments of Rasulallah (s) which proves that the Hadeeth 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we leave is Sadaqah' is false

We read in the English Translation of Sahih Muslim, Book 24, under the Chapter The Book Pertaining to Clothes and Decoration (Kitab Al-Libas wa'l-Zinah) Book 024, Number 5149 as follows:

Abdullah, the freed slave of Asma' (the daughter of Abu Bakr), the maternal uncle of the son of 'Ata, reported: Asma' sent me to 'Abdullah b. 'Umar saying: The news has reached me that you prohibit the use of three things: the striped robe, saddle cloth made of red silk, and the fasting in the holy month of Rajab. 'Abdullah said to me: So far as what you say about fasting in the month of Rajab, how about one who observes continuous fasting? -and so far as what you say about the striped garment, I heard Umar b. Khatab say that he had heard from Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him): He who wears silk garment has no share for him (in the Hereafter), and I am afraid it may not be that striped garment; and so far as the red saddle cloth is concerned that is the saddle cloth of Abdullah and it is red. I went back to Asma' and informed her whereupon she said: Here is the cloak of Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) and she brought out to me that cloak made of Persian cloth with a hem of brocade, and its sleeves bordered with brocade and said: This was Allah's Messenger's cloak with 'A'isha until she died, and when she died, I got possession of it. The Apostle of Allah (may peace be upon him) used to wear that, and we washed it for the sick and sought cure thereby.

We also read in the same chapter of Sahih Muslim Book 024, Number 5181:

Abu Burda reported: I visited A'isha and she brought out for us the coarse lower garment (of Allah's Messenger) made in Yemen and clothes made out of Mulabbada cloth, and she swore in the name of Allah that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) died in these two clothes.

These traditions prove that Ayesha had possession of the very garments that were worn by Rasulallah (s) when he died. Ayesha's father had denied Sayyida Fatima (as) Fadak by advancing the Hadeeth '*whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah*'. This Hadeeth has in fact been narrated from Abu Bakr via Ayesha. It stipulated in the supposed Hadeeth '*whatever we leave*' that means all material possessions left by Prophets become Sadaqah upon their deaths, this incorporates property, money and clothes. One therefore wonders why Ayesha was holding onto this material possession (the garment of Rasulallah [s]) if she indeed believed in the truth of the Hadeeth cited by her father. If it is true why was she withholding this Sadaqah from the Ummah? The Ahl'ul Sunnah count wives as Ahl'ul bayt (s) and Rasulallah (s) said that Sadaqah is haraam on the Ahl'ul bayt (as), was she therefore indulging in sin by holding onto this garment? Why did Abu Bakr not take this shirt from Ayesha and give it to the Ummah as Sadaqah? The fact that Ayesha maintained possession of this shirt is proof that the Hadeeth '*whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah*' is fabricated, and was only advanced to deny Sayyida Fatima (as) her inheritance rights.

8.13 Ayesha's inheriting land from Rasulullah (s) is proof that the Hadeeth '*Our property will not be inherited, whatever we leave is Sadaqah*' is false

We read in the English Translation of Sahih Bukhari, Book 23: Chapter Funerals (Al-Janaa'iz) Volume 2, Book 23, Number 475:

Narrated 'Amr bin Maimun Al-Audi:

I saw 'Umar bin Al-Khattab (when he was stabbed) saying, "O 'Abdullah bin 'Umar! Go to the mother of the believers Ayesha and say, 'Umar bin Al-Khattab sends his greetings to you,' and request her to allow me to be buried with my companions." (So, Ibn 'Umar conveyed the message to 'Ayesha.) She said, "I had the idea of having this place for myself but today I prefer him ('Umar) to myself (and allow him to be buried there)." When 'Abdullah bin 'Umar returned, 'Umar asked him, "What (news) do you have?" He replied, "O chief of the believers! She has allowed you (to be buried there)." On that 'Umar said, "Nothing was more important to me than to be buried in that (sacred) place. So, when I expire, carry me there and pay my greetings to her ('Ayesha) and say, 'Umar bin Al-Khattab asks permission; and if she gives permission, then bury me (there) and if she does not, then take me to the grave-yard of the Muslims.

To understand the significance of this tradition one needs to be aware that when someone dies under Sunni and Shi'a Fiqh the deceased can be buried in three places:

1. His ancestral graveyard
2. A Muslim graveyard
3. Land belonging to somebody else.

For the first two options, no express permission is required BUT the third option requires the express permission of the owners of that Land. Now let us consider the facts in this tradition:

- Umar is stabbed
- He asks the express permission of Ayesha to be buried with Abu Bakr and Rasulullah (s)
- Ayesha said that she had reserved this plot for herself, but would allow Umar to be buried there.

Umar would not need to have asked for permission to be buried in the Muslim graveyard, and he also acknowledges this, stating if Ayesha rejects his request *'then take me to the grave-yard of the Muslims'*. The fact that Umar asked for the express permission of Ayesha proves that this plot belonged to her, and she admits this saying *'I had the idea of having this place for myself'*. According to Ahl'ul Sunnah, Rasulullah (s) was buried at the very place where he died and this was in the house of Ayesha which belonged to Rasulullah (s). Rasulullah (s) was not buried in the Muslims graveyard he was buried in his own land. Ayesha had reserved her burial place next to Rasulullah (s), and this could 'only' have been done if she had inherited this space from Rasulullah (s). If she was not the inheritor (owner) of this plot then why did Umar seek her permission to be buried there? This was land that was privately owned and it was distinct from the Muslim graveyard which is why he turned to Ayesha, Waris of that land to seek permission to be buried there. If Prophets leave no inheritance then why did Ayesha inherit this plot of land from Rasulullah (s)?

8.14 Umar gave Ayesha possession of the very same land that Abu Bakr denied Sayyida Fatima (as)

Anyhow what is even more extremely surprising is that Hadhrat Ayesha who silenced the other wives of the Holy Prophet [saww] by addressing them that they are not entitled to inheritance herself gets a better deal!

It is narrated in Sahih Al Bukhari: Volume 3, Book 39, Number 521:

The Prophet concluded a contract with the people of Khaibar to utilize the land on the condition that half the products of fruits or vegetation would be their share. The Prophet used to give his wives one hundred Wasqs each, eighty Wasqs of dates and twenty Wasqs of barley. (When 'Umar became the Caliph) he gave the wives of the Prophet the option of either having the land and water as their shares, or carrying on the previous practice. Some of them chose the land and some chose the Wasqs, and 'Aisha chose the land.

Comment

It is indeed sad that Ayesha inherited the very land that her father had denied Sayyida Fatima (as). This is clear from Sahih Al- Bukhari: Volume 4, Book 53, Number 325:

Narrated 'Aisha: "...She used to ask Abu Bakr for her share from the property of Allah's Apostle which he left at Khaibar, and Fadak, and his property at Medina (devoted for charity). Abu Bakr refused to give her that property and said, "I will not leave anything Allah's Apostle used to do, because I am afraid that if I left something from the Prophet's tradition, then I would go astray." (Later on) Umar gave the Prophet's property (of Sadaqah) at Medina to 'Ali and 'Abbas, but he withheld the properties of Khaibar and Fadak in his custody and said, "These two properties are the Sadaqah which Allah's Apostle used to use for his expenditures and urgent needs.

The above narrations clearly demonstrate that Khaibar, from which Fatima (as) claimed her share, should have been given to her as inheritance. Abu Bakr disallowed her claim on the basis that the Prophet of Allah (s) did not bequeath an inheritance. The shares to be given to the family of the deceased are set out in Sura Nisa Verse 11:

Allah (thus) directs you as regards your Children's (Inheritance): to the male, a portion equal to that of two females: if only daughters, two or more, their share is two-thirds of the inheritance; if only one, her share is a half. For parents, a sixth share of the inheritance to each, if the deceased left children; if no children, and the parents are the (only) heirs, the mother has a third; if the deceased left brothers (or sisters) the mother has a sixth. (The distribution in all cases ('s) after the payment of legacies and debts. Ye know not whether your parents or your children are nearest to you in benefit. These are settled portions ordained by Allah; and Allah is All-knowing, Al-wise.

Al-Qur'an, Surah an-Nisa, Ayah 11, translated by Yusufali

Sayyida Fatimah was entitled to half of the Prophet's possessions. The next verse states that the wives were entitled to an eighth.

In what your wives leave, your share is a half, if they leave no child; but if they leave a child, ye get a fourth; after payment of legacies and debts. In what ye leave, their share is a fourth, if ye leave no child; but if ye leave a child, they get an eighth; after payment of legacies and debts. If the man or woman whose inheritance is in

question, has left neither ascendants nor descendants, but has left a brother or a sister, each one of the two gets a sixth; but if more than two, they share in a third; after payment of legacies and debts; so that no loss is caused (to any one). Thus is it ordained by Allah; and Allah is All-knowing, Most Forbearing.

Al-Qur'an, Surah an-Nisa, Ayah 12, translated by Yusufali

The instructions of the Qur'an are clear and unambiguous, with regard to 1/2, 1/4th and 1/8th of the deceased's wealth. The above narration of Sahih al Bukhari clearly shows that 'Umar divided Khaybar in the days of his Caliphate among the wives of the Prophet (s) and gave them the *option of owning the land or taking the wasaq (i.e. share of the crops), with Ayesha choosing the land*. Is it not amazing that Sayyida Fatima (as) who was under Qur'anic law entitled to half of her father's Estate received nothing from Abu Bakr, whilst the wives of Abu Bakr who were only entitled to an eighth of the Prophet's inheritance, inherited the ENTIRE land of Khaybar that belonged to the Prophet!

Now perhaps al Khider could answer us these questions:

- ✦ If The Prophet [saww] did not leave behind material inheritance, as Abu Bakr quoted, then how is it that Hadhrat Ayesha, the Wife of the Holy Prophet [saww] inherited? And how is it that the Daughter of the Holy Prophet [saww] was deprived of inheritance?
- ✦ Who was right in his dealings? Abu Bakr or Umar? They both can't be right because both of them contradicted one another and one of them had seriously violated the laws of inheritance?
- ✦ If Hadhrat Abu Bakr was right in his claim, then Umar and Ayesha not only went against the actions of the first Caliph but also went against the Prophet's Hadeeth and as such against the Holy Qur'an. And if Hadhrat Abu Bakr was wrong, then who will pay for the wrong of confiscation?

8.15 Umar's giving Rasulullah's property in Madina to Maula 'Ali and Abbas is proof that the Hadeeth 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we leave is Sadaqah' is false

We read in Saheeh al Bukharae Volume 4, Book 53, Number 325 with regards to the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as):

Narrated 'Ayesha: (mother of the believers) After the death of Allah 's Apostle Fatima the daughter of Allah's Apostle asked Abu Bakr As-Siddiq to give her, her share of inheritance from what Allah's Apostle had left of the Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting) which Allah had given him. Abu Bakr said to her, "Allah's Apostle said, 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity).'" Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Apostle got angry and stopped speaking to Abu Bakr, and continued assuming that attitude till she died. Fatima remained alive for six months after the death of Allah's Apostle.

She used to ask Abu Bakr for her share from the property of Allah's Apostle which he left at Khaibar, and Fadak, and his property at Medina (devoted for charity). Abu Bakr refused to give her that property and said, "I will not leave anything Allah's Apostle used to do, because I am afraid that if I left something from the Prophet's tradition, then I would go astray." (Later on) Umar gave the Prophet's property (of Sadaqa) at Medina to 'Ali and 'Abbas, but he withheld the properties of Khaibar and Fadak in his custody and said, "These two properties are the Sadaqa which Allah's Apostle used to use for his expenditures and urgent needs. Now their management

is to be entrusted to the ruler." (Az-Zuhri said, "They have been managed in this way till today.")

1. If the Hadeeth (Prophets leave no inheritance) was true why did Umar violate the actions of Rasulallah (s) and hand this property of Rasulallah (s) over to 'Ali and Abbas?
2. If Imam 'Ali and Abbas weren't entitled to this property (due to the Hadeeth) why did they accept it?
3. Abu Bakr said that all that the Prophet leaves becomes Sadaqa upon his death. The tradition says 'Umar gave the Prophet's property (of Sadaqa) at Medina to 'Ali and 'Abbas' If this is true, how could 'Ali (as) and Abbas accept this property when Sadaqa is haraam on the family of 'Ali (as) and Abbas (ra)? Were Umar, 'Ali (as) and Abbas ignorant of the ruling?
4. Why are there completely different views taken by the two Khaleefas over the inheritance of the Prophet, evidenced from just this one narration. Abu Bakr said that Fadak belonged to the Muslims as Sadaqa, Umar's attitude was that it came under the control of the Khaleefa! Which of these individuals is telling the truth?

If we accept the Hadeeth Abu Bakr attributed to the Prophet (s), then we have to question the integrity of the companions of the Prophet, two of whom the Ahl'ul Sunnah count as Rightly Guided Khaleefas – are the Ahl'ul Sunnah content with that? This would be an unpalatable proposition, but you can't have your cake and eat it – You cannot accept the Hadeeth as Saheeh and also accept the integrity of three Sahaba that openly violated the instructions of the Prophet.

For us, the matter is clear cut, Umar's bestowing the property of the Prophet and Imam 'Ali (as) and Abbas accepting it, is proof that the Hadeeth was a lie. Upon the death of Rasulallah (s) the property of the Prophet (s) did not become Sadaqa, rather it went to the heirs of the Prophet (s).

8.16 Rasulallah (s) opened a thousand doors of knowledge for Hadhrat 'Ali (as) who remained ignorant of the Hadeeth '*whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah*'

As evidence we shall rely on Tafseer Kabeer Volume 2 page 233 'In Ali Safathi' Adam wa Nuh'

Hadhrat Ali said 'Rasulallah (s) taught me one thousand doors of knowledge, and every door contained another thousand doors of knowledge'

Recognised Sunni scholars have recorded the following:

'Umar ibn al Khattab used to seek refuge with Allah from every difficult question or case for which there is no Abu Hasan (in which he was not present.

1. *Tareekh'ul Khulafa by al Hafidh Jalaladeen Suyuti page 178;*
2. *al-Isti'ab, by Ibn Abd al-Barr, v3, page 39;*
3. *al-Tabaqat, by Ibn Sa'd, v2, page 338*

Hadhrath Ali' (as)'s superiority in resolving disputes is even acknowledged by the Wahabie scholar Syed Abul Hasan Nadwi, he writes:

"A number of reports testify that the Prophet said: "Ali is most capable among you to deliver a correct judgement". Ali is on record that he was a comparatively younger man when the Prophet asked him to go to Yemen. Ali reports: "thereupon I

said to the Apostle of God 'You are sending me to a people who would be having disputes among them but I have no experience of deciding cases". The Prophet replied, 'Allah will help you to say only what is right and just and you would be yourself satisfied by it'. Ali then adds that he never had any doubt about the correctness of his judgement since then. Umar was often exacerbated if Ali was not available to solve an entangled problem. He often used to say: 'Umar would have been ruined if Ali was not there'.

The Life of Caliph 'Ali, page 202, by Abul Hasan Nadwi

Comment

The tradition proves that the knowledge of Abu Bakr was not even an iota compared to that possessed by Hadhrat 'Ali (as). Umar depended on Maula 'Ali in resolving disputes. Rasulallah (s) taught Hadhrat 'Ali one thousand doors of knowledge, and yet he failed to tell him that Prophets leave no inheritance, rather this was a top secret that only reached the ears of Abu Bakr.

Let us not forget that Maula 'Ali (as) shared the virtues of past Prophets, as is evidenced in the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Nur al Absar page 6 by Shibliji
2. Riyadh al Nadira Volume 2 page 239, Dhikr Ali ibn Abi Talib
3. Tafseer al-Kabeer, by Fakhrudeen al-Razi, under the commentary of the Verse of Imprecation (Mubahila), v2 p288.

The Prophet (s) said:

"He who wants to see Adam (as) in his knowledge, Noah (as) in his determination, in his clemency, Moses (as) in his intelligence and Jesus (as) in his religious devotion should look at Ali Ibn Abi Talib (as)"

Comment

Worthy of note is the fact that Radhi in Tafseer Kabeer recorded the tradition and graded it as Sahih.

This tradition proves that Hadhrat 'Ali (as) possessed some of the virtues prevalent in Prophets. When one with such esteemed knowledge graded Abu Bakr as a liar when he recited this hadeeth then there remains no doubt that this Hadeeth is false.

8.17 The failure of Rasulallah (s) to tell his Wasi (Ali) that '*Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)*' is further proof that it is false

We have already cited the words of the Prophet (s), right at the beginning of his mission. The Prophet (s) said at the Feast of Kinsmen before his close relatives the following about Hadhrath 'Ali:

"This is my brother, Wasi (agent) and successor among you. Listen to him and obey him".

1. *Tareekh Tabari, (English translation) by W.M.Watt, Vol 6 pp 90-91*
2. *Tareekh ibn Atheer, Vol 2 p 62*
3. *Musnad Ahmed Ibn Hanbal, Vol 1 p 159*
4. *Khasais, by al Nasai, p 18*

Comment

The role of a Wasi is an administrative one, to pay off any debts and oversee the transition of the deceased's property to his legal heirs. Now is it believable that Rasulullah (s) appoint Imam 'Ali (as) his Wasi but fails to inform him that upon his death he leaves no inheritance rather all that he owns becomes Sadaqah for the Muslims? How could Rasulullah (s) fail to convey this message to his appointed Wasi, but remember to tell Abu Bakr? Of interest is the fact that we read the testimony of Ibn Masud in Tareekh'ul Khulafa page 178:

"The most knowledgeable of the people of Madinah in the laws of inheritance and in judicial decisions is 'Ali ibn Abi Talib".

Is it not curious that Maula 'Ali (as) was the most knowledge amongst the Sahaba on the laws of inheritance, but was completely ignorant of the laws in relation to Prophetic inheritance, when he should have known more than anyone, having been appointed as the Wasi of the Prophet!

8.18 The anger of Sayyida Fatima (as) upon hearing the Hadeeth '*Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)*' is proof that it was a lie

1. Sahih al Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 325, Book of Khums
2. Sahih Muslim Volume 3 page 72, Hukm al Fay
3. Iزالathul Khifa Part 2 Volume 3 page 109
4. Sunan al Kabeera Volume 6 page 301 Kitab Fay

We read in Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 325:

Narrated 'Ayesha: (mother of the believers) After the death of Allah 's Apostle Fatima the daughter of Allah's Apostle asked Abu Bakr As-Siddiq to give her, her share of inheritance from what Allah's Apostle had left of the Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting) which Allah had given him. Abu Bakr said to her, "Allah's Apostle said, 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)." Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Apostle got angry and stopped speaking to Abu Bakr, and continued assuming that attitude till she died. Fatima remained alive for six months after the death of Allah's Apostle.

al-Bukhari under the Chapter of "The battle of Khaibar", Arabic-English,v5, tradition #546, pp 381-383, narrates from Ayesha that:

".. Fatimah became angry with Abu Bakr and kept away from him, and did not talk to him till she died. She remained alive for six months after the death of the Prophet. When she died, her husband 'Ali, her at night without informing Abu Bakr and he said the funeral prayer by himself".

Sunan Kabeera:

"When the Khalifa recited the Hadeeth We the Prophets leave no inheritance, Fatima became angry at Abu Bakr and never spoke to him until she died"

In Sahih al Bukhari Volume 5 Hadeeth 61, we read the honour bestowed on Sayyida Fatima (as), by Rasulullah (s):

"Allah's Apostle said, "Fatima is a part of me, and he who makes her angry, makes me angry."

We appeal to justice. Abu Bakr recited a false Hadeeth and Sayyida Fatima (as) became angry at him, and whoever angers Sayyida Fatima (as) also angers Allah (swt) and his Rasul (s) and cannot be deemed the Khalifa of Rasulullah (s).

8.19 Sayyida Fatima (as) was truthful and Masum

We read in Surah Aale Imran verse 38:

"When she was delivered she said: "O my Lord! behold! I am delivered of a female child!" And Allah knew best what she brought forth, "and nowise is the male like the female. I have named her Mary and I commend her and her offspring to Thy protection from the Evil One the Rejected."

Al-Qur'an, Surah Ale Imran, Ayah 38, translated by Yusufali

Rasulullah (s) made the same du'a for his daughter. Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Qadhi Thanauallah Panee Pathee in Tafseer Mazhari Volume 2 page 41, under the commentary of this verse states:

"It is true that when Rasulullah (s) married his daughter to 'Ali he made this supplication 'O Creator I commend her and her offsprings to Thy protection from the Evil One the Rejected'. This supplication has been narrated from Ibn Habban and was also made for Hadhrat 'Ali. Rasulullah (s) had a greater right than the wife of Imran to have the du'a accepted. We are confident, neigh definite that Sayyida Fatima and her children are protected from Shaytan".

Also of relevance is the fact that Dr Tahir al Qadri in 'Al Durr'athul Baydh fee Manaqib Fatima al Zahra (as)' page 76:

"Hadrath Abdullah ibn Masud narrates that the Prophet (s) said 'Hadhrath Fatima had protected her exalted status and purity in such a manner that Allah (swt) deemed the Fire of Hell to be haraam on her descendents".

 [Al Durathl Baydha fee Manaqib Fatima al Zahra \(as\), Page 76](#)

Qadri took this Hadeeth from the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. al Musnad Buzaar Volume 5 page 223
2. Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 page 165
3. Hilayath al Awliya Volume 4 page 188
4. Meezan al Itidal Volume 5 page 261
5. Fayd al Qadeer Volume 2 page 462

Sayyida Fatima (as) was Masum like her father, and if an infallible personality is angry at someone, so is Allah (swt), and when Sayyida Fatima was angered at Abu Bakr's recital of this

Hadeeth, then there is no doubt that this Hadeeth was a lie, otherwise she would never have got upset. She was angered at a man unworthy of the Khilafat who issued a ruling on the basis of a false Hadeeth that contradicted the Qur'an.

8.20 The continual demand of Sayyida Fatima (as) that Abu Bakr give her Fadak is proof that the Hadeeth '*Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)*' was false

We shall now cite the tradition recorded in Saheeh al Bukhari 4.325 from another angle:

"After the death of Allah's Apostle Fatimah (AS), the daughter of Allah's Apostle asked Abu Bakr As Siddiq to give her, her share of inheritance from what Allah's Apostle (PBUH) had left of the Fai which Allah had given him. Abu Bakr said to her: "Allah's Apostle said: `Our Property will not be inherited, what ever we (Prophets) leave is Sadiqa (to be used for Charity)"

... Fatimah remained alive for six months after the death of the Prophet (PBUH). She used to ask Abu Bakr for her share from the Property of Allah's Apostle which he (PBUH) left at Khaibar and his Property at Medina ...

This report informs us that she made the demand for her right repeatedly. The continued demand of Sayyida Fatima (as) despite the excuse advanced by Abu Bakr is further proof that it was false! If Sayyida Fatima (as) was convinced of the correctness of Abu Bakr's decision in the first instance, there would have been no need for her to continue to demand her inheritance rights!

8.21 Abu Bakr's asking for witnesses to support the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) serves as a proof that the Hadeeth '*Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)*' is false

This point is worthy of note. Abu Bakr is praised for his determination in sticking to the Sunnah of the Prophet. He claimed that he had heard the Prophet (s) say 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah'. His citing these words should have constituted conclusive proof, that rendered the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) baseless. When he allegedly heard these words from Rasulullah (s) why did he continue to entertain the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) and demand that she produce witnesses who could verify her claim? The level of confusion is demonstrated e.g by contemporary Deobandi scholar Sayad Athar Husain who in his Book 'the Glorious Caliphate' praises the Khalifas. Of those who have appraised this work are none other than Sayyid Abu Hasan Nadwi who himself wrote the introduction to this book, praising the author and the accuracy of his work. On pages 42 and 43 of this book Husain advances this appraisal of Abu Bakr:

"To him the word of the Prophet was the law. In obeying it, he went to the length of incurring the displeasure of the beloved daughter of the same Master. She claimed he right, upon the basis of inheritance, in an orchard at Fidak and some other property of her father. Abu Bakr pointed out that "the Prophet had said, 'No one shall be my heir, that which I leave will be for alms". Now therefore, the family of the Prophet shall not eat of these lands, for by the Lord 'I will alter not a little of that which he hath ordained'. "But" added he, "If thou art certain that they father have thee this property I will accept they word and fulfil his promise". She replied she had no evidence except of the aged nurse, Umme Ayman. So Abu Bakr did not alter his decision. When 'Ali remonstrated with him he replied, "I swear my one who holds my life that the relations of the Prophet are dearer to me that my own

relations. In the matter of the dispute over the property left by him, I have not deviated one hair's breadth in my decision from the rule of the Prophet himself".

Umme Ayman is portrayed by the author as 'aged', so now we also have being 'too old' as a ground to reject witness testimony. Whilst Husain intentionally makes no reference to the fact that Sayyida Fatima (as) also had other witnesses, we shall focus purely on the decision of Abu Bakr. Abu Bakr rejects the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) by pointing out that her father (s) said that he left no inheritance. He also tells Imam 'Ali (as) that he will never deviate from the Sunnah of the Prophet (s). If Abu Bakr was definite that this was the Sunnah of the Prophet, having heard it himself why did he then add "**But If thou art certain that they father gave thee this property I will accept they word and fulfil his promise**". Having ruled on the Hadeeth heard from the Prophet (s) why add the words 'But'? The word 'But' serves as clear proof that he himself didn't believe in the truth of the Hadeeth he was advancing! Its like somebody saying 'I went shopping yesterday, and it began to rain so heavily that I had to out my umbrella up, **BUT** I may be wrong!' Is this logical?

8.22 Abu Bakr's failure to implement the Hadith '*Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)*' is further proof that it is false

If the Hadeeth is indeed correct and everything owned by Prophets becomes Sadaqah then why was this land not distributed by Abu Bakr to his Muslim subjects? Why did he keep it under his own control? He had taken the land from Sayyida Fatima (as) claiming that the land belonged to all Muslims as it was Sadaqah so why did he not distribute this Sadaqah during his reign? His failure to do so serves as clear proof that he concocted the Hadeeth to deny Sayyida Fatima (as) her right.

8.23 The fact that Sadaqa is haraam on Banu Hashim is proof that the Hadeeth '*Our property will not be inherited, whatever we leave is Sadaqah*' is false

To understand this argument one needs to analyse the significance of Abu Bakr's words as set out in Saheeh al Bukharee Volume 5, Book 57, Number 60 reads as follows:

Narrated 'Aisha:

Fatima sent somebody to Abu Bakr asking him to give her inheritance from the Prophet from what Allah had given to His Apostle through Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting). She asked for the Sadaqa (i.e. wealth assigned for charitable purposes) of the Prophet at Medina, and Fadak, and what remained of the Khumus (i.e., one-fifth) of the Khaibar booty. Abu Bakr said, "Allah's Apostle said, 'We (Prophets), our property is not inherited, and whatever we leave is Sadaqa, but Muhammad's Family can eat from this property, i.e. Allah's property, but they have no right to take more than the food they need.'

Abu Bakr is claiming that all the Prophet (s) left converts into Sadaqa, and the Ahl'ul bayt (as) are entitled to get their share of this Sadaqa. How can this Hadeeth be Saheeh when Sadaqa is haraam on the family of Maula 'Ali (as)? In this connection we this Hadeeth in Saheeh Muslim Book 5, Number 2347, Bab al Zakath, under the Sub heading '*The posterity of the Holy Prophet (may peace be upon him) is not allowed to make use of sadaqa*' includes these words of the Prophet (s):

It does not become the family of Muhammad (to accept) sadaqat for they are the impurities of people.

We also read this tradition in Saheeh al Bukharee Volume 4, Book 52, Hadeeth Number 306:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Al-Hasan bin 'Ali took a date from the dates of the Sadaqa and put it in his mouth. The Prophet said (to him) in Persian, "Kakh, kakh! (i.e. Don't you know that we do not eat the Sadaqa (i.e. what is given in charity) (charity is the dirt of the people))."

In this connection we pose five questions:

1. If Imam Hasan (as) was prohibited from eating a single date that was Sadaqa, how could Rasulullah (s) have left an edict that after his death the family of 'Ali (as) could satiate their stomachs with the same Sadaqa that he (s) deemed 'the dirt of the people'?
2. If we accept the ruling that Sadaqa is haraam on the Ahl'ul bayt (as) are we then saying that Khaleefa Abu Bakr was prepared to satiate the stomachs of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) with haraam food?
3. Were the family of Maula 'Ali (as) so ignorant of the Shari'ah that they were making a claim to Sadaqa land that was haraam on them?
4. If the Hadeeth that Abu Bakr cited is true, did Rasulullah (s) fail to tell the Ahl'ul bayt (as) that Sadaqa was halaal on them after his death? If so, why did he make such a glaring omission?
5. Both Sunni and Shi'a schools of thought are in absolute agreement that Sadaqa is haraam on the Banu Hashim. We can for example cite the Fatawa of Deobandi scholar Ashraf Ali Thanvi says in 'Behishthi Zewar', under the Chapter of Zakat:

It is not permissible to give zakât to the progeny of Hadrat Fâtimah radiallahu anha, the progeny of Hadrat Ali radiallahu anhu, Hadrat Abbas radiallahu anhu, Hadrat Ja'far radiallahu anhu, Hadrat Aqeel radiallahu anhu, Hadrat Hârith bin Abdul Muttalib radiallahu anhu. Similarly, the charities which have been made wajib by the Shariah cannot be given to the progeny of the above Sahabah. Such charities are, nazr, kaffarah, ushr, sadaqatul fitr. Apart from these, all other charities can be given to them.

How could the Sunni Ulema past and present give such a ruling when Abu Bakr claimed the Prophet (s) deemed his inheritance as Sadaqa that the Ahl'ul bayt (as) could benefit from? If they believe that the Hadeeth was true why no Sunni scholar has ever issued a Fatawa deeming Sadaqa halaal on Sayyid's, by relying on the Hadeeth cited by Abu Bakr?

Comment

The very fact that Sadaqa is haraam on Ahl'ul bayt (as) serves as clear evidence that the Hadeeth quoted by Abu Bakr was a lie. The Sunni Ulema are in complete agreement that Sadaqa was and remains haraam on Sayyids until the Day of Judgment. Sunni aqeedah on this matter serves as proof that even they have rejected the Hadeeth that Abu Bakr attributed to the Prophet. The Ahl'ul Sunnah cannot have their cake and eat it. You cannot believe that Sadaqa is haraam on Ahl'ul bayt (as), and also believe Abu Bakr's claim that they were entitled to Sadaqa.

How could something that the Prophet (s) deemed haraam during his lifetime suddenly become Halal when he died? This is clearly illogical and further supports our stance that the Hadeeth Abu Bakr cited was a fabrication.

8.24 Imam Zayn'ul Abideen (as)'s possession of the sword belonging to the Prophet (s) is proof that the Hadeeth 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we leave is Sadaqah' is false

We read in Saheeh al Bukharee Volume 4, Book 53, Number 342:

Narrated 'Ali bin Al-Husain:

That when they reached Medina after returning from Yazid bin Mu'awiya after the martyrdom of Husain bin 'Ali (may Allah bestow His Mercy upon him), Al-Miswar bin Makhrama met him and said to him, "Do you have any need you may order me to satisfy?" 'Ali said, "No." Al-Miswar said, "Will you give me the sword of Allah's Apostle for I am afraid that people may take it from you by force? By Allah, if you give it to me, they will never be able to take it till I die."

The fact that Imam Zayn'ul Abideen (as) possessed the sword belonging to Rasulullah (s) could only have been attained if it had been passed on to him by his ancestors. In the tradition, it is clear from the words of Al-Miswar 'Will you give me the sword of Allah's Apostle' - that this was the personal possession of the Prophet (s). If the Prophet left no inheritance then the Ahl'ul bayt (as) would not have kept this sword in their possession. Abu Bakr asserted that all possessions of the Prophet (s) became Sadaqa upon his death, Sadaqa is haraam on Sayyid's, is it believable that the Ahl'ul bayt kept hold of items which the Shari'ah deemed haraam for them to have? The fact that the grandson of Maula 'Ali (as) had in his possession the sword of Rasulullah (s) is major proof that the Hadeeth is a fabrication.

8.25 The Du'a of Prophet Zakariya (as) proves that the Hadeeth 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah' is false

This is a supplication made by Prophet Zakariya (as) wherein the Prophet (as) prays for someone to inherit him.

In Surah Maryam 019.004-6, Allah (swt) refers to the supplication of Prophet Zakariya:

Praying: "O my Lord! infirm indeed are my bones, and the hair of my head doth glisten with grey: but never am I unblest, O my Lord, in my prayer to Thee! Now I fear (what) my relatives (and colleagues) (will do) after me: but my wife is barren: so give me an heir as from Thyself, - (One that) will (truly) represent me, and represent the posterity of Jacob; and make him, O my Lord! one with whom Thou art well-pleased!"

Al-Qur'an, Surah Maryam, Ayah 4 - 6, translated by Yusufali

Comment

We have already proven that the fear of Prophet (s) of his relatives squandering his possessions led him to make this supplication. If Prophet's leave no inheritance then this supplication would be pointless. Why make a du'a to have an Heir to inherit when one leaves no inheritance, rather all that he owns becomes Sadaqah for the people when he dies? This explicit du'a of Zakariya (as) serves as a proof that the Hadeeth that Abu Bakr advanced was fabricated.

8.26 Rasulullah (s)'s objection to the Sahaba giving away over a third of their property to charity is a proof that the Hadeeth 'Our property

will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah' is false

In theory a person can dispose of his property however he chooses, but the Islamic Shari'ah places a condition that he make a '*Wasiyya*' (will) stipulating where his property should be distributed. This should not be confused with the payment of legacies i.e shares. So to clarify this term we quote from Ahmad ibn Naqib al Misri's *Reliance of the Traveller - A Classic Manual of Islamic Sacred Law*, translated by Nuh Ha Mim Keller, Revised Edition, 1994, amana publications, page 462:

"The difference between will (Wasiyya) and estate division (irth) is that a will is the act of a living person disposing of his own property, even if it is to be implemented after his death, while estate division occurs after his death according to the Koranic rules of inheritance".

In other words, in his or her will a person specifies whether anyone, and if so, how much and who receives part of the property as bequest(gift).

Nasibi cannot argue that Rasulullah (s) had made a will that all he owned goes to Charity, because according to the Ahl'ul Sunnah, Rasulullah (s) did not leave a will at all.

Narrated Talha bin Musarrif:

I asked 'Abdullah bin Abu Aufa, "Did the Prophet make a will?" He replied, "No," I asked him, "How is it then that the making of a will has been enjoined on people, (or that they are ordered to make a will)?" He replied, "The Prophet bequeathed Allah's Book (i.e. Qur'an)."

Sahih Al-Bukhari, 'Book of Wills and Testaments' Volume 4, Book 51, Number 3

In the absence of a bequest the specified shares set out under the Qur'an applied and Sayyida Fatima (as) was entitled to half of her father's Estate. If for arguments sake we were to accept that there was a will to give away all his property to Muslims, Nasibi should know that Rasulullah (s) had himself said that giving away anything under a will above one third is haraam! As evidence we have the words of Rasulullah (s):

Mus'ab b. Sa'd reported on the authority of his father. I was ailing. I sent message to Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) saying: Permit me to give away my property as I like. He refused. I (again) said: (Permit me) to give away half. He (again refused). I (again said): Then one-third. He (the Holy Prophet) observed silence after (I had asked permission to give away) one-third. He (the narrator) said: It was then that endowment of one-third became permissible.

Sahih Muslim, The Book of Bequests (Kitab Al-Wasiyya) Book 013, Number 3994

Narrated Ibn 'Abbas:

I recommend that people reduce the proportion of what they bequeath by will to the fourth (of the whole legacy), for Allah's Apostle said, "One-third, yet even one third is too much."

Sahih al-Bukhari, 'Book of Wills and Testaments' Volume 4, Book 51, Number 6

Narrated Ibn 'Abbas:

The Prophet said, "Give the Fara'id, (the shares prescribed in the Qur'an) to those who are entitled to receive it, and then whatever remains, should be given to the closest male relative of the deceased."

Sahih al-Bukhari, Volume 8, Book 80, Number 729

Did Sayyida Fatimah (as) not have rights like other people? Bequeathing property to charity requires a will and the Ahl'ul Sunnah believe that the Prophet (s) never left one. Even with such a legally binding will, Rasulullah (s) said only one-third of the deceased's property could be

charity, how could the Prophet (s) then contradict his own ruling and give away all his property as charity? We cannot accept that Rasulallah (s) would act in such a hypocritical manner, and the above two ahadith Hadeeth serve as further proof that the Hadeeth advanced by Abu Bakr, contradicted a ruling of the Prophet (s) and is therefore false!

8.27 Further Proof that the Hadeeth recited by Abu Bakr 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)' is a lie - Ahl'ul Sunnah's aqeedah that Prophets also inherit from no one

As evidence we shall cite the following esteemed Sunni works:

1.  [Mudhaarj un Nubuwwa Volume 2 page 756-757 Dhikr Taqseem Meeras al Nabi](#)
2. Izalathul Khifa Volume 3 page 90
3. Quruth ul Aynain Part 2 Dhikr Fadak page 228 by Shah Waliyullah Dehlavi
4. Aftaab ai Hidayath page 240, Dhikr Fadak by Maulana Kareem'udeen

We read in Quruth:

The great truthful one said that Rasulallah (s) said neither do we leave inheritance, nor do we inherit from anyone, and this report is Muttawatir"

We read in Aftaab:

The Sahih Hadeeth is present, namely that Prophets do no inherit, nor do they leave inheritance, all they leave is Sadaqah"

The three references assert that Sayyida Fatima (as) claimed her inheritance rights, and Abu Bakr replied by saying that *"Prophets neither inherit nor do they leave any inheritance whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)"*. And this Hadeeth according to the Ahl'ul Sunnah is Sahih and Muttawatir.

The assertion that Prophets inherit from no one is a blatant lie and to prove our case, we advance the following Sunni sources:

8.28 Rasulallah (s) inherited livestock belonging to his father

1. Dalail al Nubuwwa page 121 by Naeem Ahmad bin Abdullah al Safani (printed Hyderabad)
2. Insaan al Haywaan Volume 1 page 85 by Burhanadeen Halabi (Egypt print)

Both sources state that Abdullah the father of the Prophet had five camels, a stable, and a herd of sheep which Rasulallah (s) inherited from him.

8.29 Rasulallah (s) inherited a sword from his father

As evidence we have relied on the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Zaad al Maad Volume 1 page 48 Dhkir Sulha
2. Seera Halbeeya Volume 3 page 247 Dhikr Sulha
3. Mudharij'athul Nubuwwa Chapter 11 Dhurby Sulha Akhzaath Volume 2 page 596
4. Ruzatul Ahbaab page 299

We read in Zaad:

"Rasulullah (s) owned nine swords,one was called Mashur.This was first sword that was included amongst the possessions of Rasulullah (s) that he inherited from his father".

8.30 Rasulullah (s) inherited a male and female Servant from his father

In al Maarif page 64, Dhikr Maw'l Rasulullah (s) Ibn Qutaybah informs us:

"Rasulullah (s) inherited a Servant called Shuqran from his father"

Many Sunni sources confirm that Rasulullah (s) also inherited a female servant called Umm Ameen Burra from his father and this is attested in the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 5 page 325 Dhikr Umm
2. Dalail al Nubuwwa, Dhikr Rujoo al Muktha page 1221
3. Tabaqat al Kabeera Volume 1 page 497 Dhikr Khadim Rasulullah (s)
4. Tareekh Khamees Volume 2 page 18 Dhikr Mawaleeyath
5. Naseem al Riyadh, Sharh Shifa Qadi Iyad Volume 3 page 420 Fadail Sahaba
6. al Isaba Volume 4 page 415 Fasl Fahmeen Urf ba Quneeyuth min al Nisa Dhikr Umm Ameen
7. al Istiab, Dhikr Burkutha binte Thalba Volume page 243
8. al Maarif page 63 Dhikr Mawl Rasul

We have proven from established Sunni works that Rasulullah (s) was indeed the heir of his father and upon his death he inherited camels, livestock, a sword and two servants from him. This refutes the claim of Abu Bakr's advocates that Rasulullah (s) did not inherit from anyone. Sayyida Fatima (as) was the rightful heir of her father's property, Abu Bakr's denying this caused her wrath and his advancing this baseless Hadeeth is shameful.

8.31 The tradition narrated by Abu Bakr does not meet the standards of Hadeeth authenticity set by the Sunni Ulema

The issue of proof is a key component required to arrive at a correct decision in a dispute. Abu Bakr cited a single Hadeeth to strike out the inheritance claim, a Hadeeth that no one else had heard. If justice really was being sought then clearly the onus was on Abu Bakr to prove the

authenticity of the Hadeeth, then we would have seen whether or not the requirement of witnesses could be met. No one would have been located save Umar and Ayesha unless of course the Government adopted more coercive methods. The scholars have developed certain rules as means of determining the authenticity of a Hadeeth. We are quoting directly from Sirat-un Nabi Volume 1 page 42, by Hanafi scholar Shibli Numani:

"...the following categories of reports are to be discredited without an enquiry into the characters of their narrators:

1. **The traditions that are contrary to reason**
2. **The traditions that go against accepted principles**
3. **The traditions that belie common observations and physical experience**
4. **The traditions that contradict the Qur'an or a Muttawatir Hadeeth...**
5. **The tradition that threatens severe punishment for a minor fault**
6. **The tradition that sounds absurd and nonsensical...**
7. **The tradition that promises big rewards for trivial acts of piety**
8. **A tradition narrated by a single person who has never personally contacted the man from whom he narrates**
9. **A tradition that ought to have been known to all and sundry, but has only a single narrator**
10. **Any tradition concerning an incident so noteworthy that, if it had actually taken place, it ought to have been related by many, and yet there is but a single narrator to it".**

 [Seerat un-Nabi, Page 42](#)

For the purposes of this discussion we shall refute this Hadeeth in light of rules 1, 2 and 10.

1. According to the Ahl'ul Sunnah a tradition contrary to reason is false

Observation One

'Our property will not be inherited, nor do we inherit whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)'

Now the question that we ask is simple, are Prophets subject to the rules that they bring? The Ummah were told not to lie, steal, fornicate, drink alcohol, was Rasulullah (s) also bound by these rules? Was he bound by rules relating to Salat, Saum etc? If Rasulullah (s) is bound by all these rules, then why is he exempt with regards to the Law of inheritance? Not every Prophet became a Head of State, nor did every one attain land or property. Upon their deaths were their clothes and bowls down to the last spoon distributed amongst the Ummah? If an individual has attained considerable possessions via inheritance through his father and forefathers, and he is then subsequently given the mantle of Prophethood, he must then immediately get rid of all that he inherited, he will die of hunger and thirst. One cannot even guess why Allah (swt) would want his Prophet to live a life of dependency on his Ummah. We cannot find such examples of extreme dependency from the reign of Umar. Just consider the

illogical thinking offered on this Sunni Website "Benadir-Islam" in their article '*Prophet Solomon (Sulaiman)*':

<http://www.benadir-islam.com/sul.htm> - Cached

Benadir Islam states:

Solomon inherited David's prophethood and dominion. This was not a material inheritance, as prophets do not bequeath their property. It is given away to the poor and needy, not to their relatives. Prophet Muhammad (pbuh) said: "The prophets' property will not be inherited, and whatever we leave is to be used for charity." (Sahih Al-Bukhari).

If the Hadeeth and Benadir's understanding is correct then this means that upon the death of his father, Prophet Sulayman (as) should have become a Pauper rather than becoming a King. If for Prophets-upon attaining Prophethood- the first inheritance that they attain becomes haraam on them, what is a poor Prophet to do? He will go to the homes of the Kuffar begging for food whilst at the same time condemning their pagan practices such as idol worship. What is the likelihood of him receiving any form of food to fill his stomach, particularly when Allah (swt) mentions that past peoples had killed Prophets? The Kuffar will want him to die as soon as possible. No doubt a Prophet in such a situation would soon die of starvation. A very unusual situation develops. The Prophet has no financial stability, he is penniless and has no support from his people, and his opponents refuse to give him anything.

If it is said that words '*nor do we inherit*' in the tradition are wrong and the tradition only contains the words, 'they don't leave any inheritance, meaning thereby they can inherit but leave no inheritance, then a very unusual conclusion comes out from this Hadeeth. Let us cite an example:

"A deceased father is survived by three sons. All he owned is divided up in three equal portions between the brothers. After some time Allah (swt) bestows the mantle of Prophethood on the first brother. Some time later the second brother dies, his inheritance is therefore divided between the Prophet brother and brother three. The Prophet Brother now dies, everything that he owned including his home and all its contents are automatically distributed to the Ummah. Has injustice not been perpetuated against the third brother? This deceased brother benefited from the inheritance of his father and brother, yet when he dies the brother is left without anything, everything that the Prophet had has gone to the Ummah. The issue does not just end there. A widow and children survive the Prophet; the responsibility to maintain their upkeep is now borne onto the shoulders of this surviving brother. If he refuses to help them then they will in effect be rendered homeless fending for themselves by begging on the streets".

Allah (swt) would never want a Prophet's family to be treated in such an inhumane and unjust manner. The unusual thing is that no verse has descended making it incumbent on the Ummah to give a portion of their wealth to the Prophet (s). The Ummah were entitled to take all of the Prophets possessions, but there was no duty to reciprocate that favour by meeting the needs of the poor homeless surviving relatives. The only financial benefit that the Prophet has is in times of war. The constant demands on the Prophet (s) by the Sahaba asking the same questions repeatedly led to an order by Allah (swt) placing a requirement in Surah al-Mujadila verse 12

"O ye who believe! When ye consult the Messenger in private, spend something in charity before your private consultation. That will be best for you, and most conducive to purity (of conduct). But if ye find not (the wherewithal), Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful".

Al-Qur'an, Surah Al-Mujadila, Ayah 12, translated by Yusufali

The failure of the Sahaba to make any form of payment led to this verse being revoked. If this verse had not been revoked who would have fulfilled it? If the Sahaba were incapable of making charitable contributions prior to seeing Rasulallah (s) what was the likelihood of them meeting the financial needs and protecting the Prophet's family that had become penniless and homeless upon his death?

The net conclusion of this Hadeeth is that upon his death, all that a Prophet owns goes to the fortunate Ummah, but in return there is no onus on their part to meet the needs of his orphaned children and widowed wife, they have to fend for themselves. Previous Prophet's had many wives and concubines so let us set another example for readers to ponder over:

'A Prophet has many wives and concubines and has twenty children, whose age ranges from infant to nearly baligh. The Prophet dies. That same night these grieving relatives are on the Street, homeless and destitute since everything that the Prophet owned (Property and belongings) has now been distributed amongst the Ummah. They now are destined to a life of poverty, fending through rubbish to find food and depending on kind handouts from generous passers by. Every day is an uphill struggle for survival, they thank the Spirit of the Prophet (s) that someone was kind enough to feed them. Their plight is just like that of the destitutes we see scowering through garbage cans and begging for money outside Subways.

One should point out that in one of his articles al Khider has made the following claims:

Ansar.org states:

It is well known that Dawud 'alayhis salam had 100 wives and 300 concubines. He had numerous children from these wives and concubines.

If we apply the Hadeeth cited by Al Khider to the example we have just given, what this in effect means is that on the Day that Prophet Dawood (as) died, Allah (swt) blessed his surviving relatives with the honour of destitution, the Ummah took hold of all his material possessions, in his Kingdom, down to the last brick and every content inside the house. Dawood (as) was therefore survived by one hundred wives, three hundred concubines and numerous children, unable to inherit their deceased relative's material possessions, penniless and without a home they were forced into a life of street begging to satiate their stomachs.

Observation Two

Let us cite another scenario with some questions to ponder over:

"A deceased man is survived by his wife and infant son. He leaves a large piece of land. His entire income came from this land produce".

Based on these facts, what options are open for this widow and her son?

Option One - She can administer the land herself,

Option Two - She can remarry and get her new husband to provide for her and her son

Option Three - She can spend her life living on charitable donations

Now which of these options were open to the wives of Rasulallah (s)?

Option One - Not Possible. They were not allowed to inherit any land, as (according to Abu Bakr) Prophet's leave no inheritance.

Option Two - Not possible. The wives of Rasulallah (s) were prohibited from remarrying.

Option Three - Not possible. Charity is haraam on the Ahl'ul bayt (as) and the Ahl'ul Sunnah include the wives as Ahl'ul bayt (as)

When none of these options were available to the wives of the Prophet (s) then how do you think they survived? Did Abu Hurrayra knock from door to door every night to pick up any scraps of food and bread for them? If anything, this example proves how illogical the Hadeeth advanced by Abu Bakr was. If it was true then it in effect meant that wives of Rasulullah (s) would have been forced to live a life of extreme poverty! It would simply not be logical for Allah (swt) to create a scenario that would in effect force the wives of the Prophet (s) to live a life of extreme destitution, and of relevance is this narration in Sahih al-Bukhari, Volume 8, Book 80, Number 725:

Narrated Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas:

I was stricken by an ailment that led me to the verge of death. The Prophet came to pay me a visit. I said, "O Allah's Apostle! I have much property and no heir except my single daughter. Shall I give two-thirds of my property in charity?" He said, "No." I said, "Half of it?" He said, "No." I said, "One-third of it?" He said, "You may do so, though one-third is also too much, for it is better for you to leave your offspring wealthy than to leave them poor, asking others for help. And whatever you spend (for Allah's sake) you will be rewarded for it, even for a morsel of food which you may put in the mouth of your wife."

If the Hadeeth advanced by Abu Bakr is true then it means that Rasulullah (s) had done exactly what he had told Sa'd not to do! He (s) told Sa'd to give priority to the needs of his family, ensuring that any charitable distribution does not render his family poor, but has no concern when it comes to the upkeep of nine wives! The same Prophet (s) who deems the donating a third of his property to charity as excessive, gives everything he owned (land, property) to charity! Is this logical?

Observation Three

The immediate distribution of property to charity would have impeded efforts of Prophets to spread the Deen.

It needs to be recognised that charity does not just involve the immediate distribution of material possessions. Such a hasty action, may well find a temporary solace, but it can stop longer term plans in their tracks. Think logically the role of all Prophet's was to spread the Deen. Charity is not just about distributing material possession such as food / clothing to the poor and needy. Charity plays a major educational function also and can in fact entail purchasing and administering fixed assets (buildings) and material possessions (books, tables etc). In the West educational and religious organisations (including Islamic Organisations) are granted the status of 'registered' Charities, who as well as distributing material possessions also purchase land / building so as to facilitate Dawah activities. Land is used to build religious schools, orphanages, shops housing Islamic materials etc. The purchase of building is part of a strategy, and is the springboard through which the Deen can be propagated for decades to come!

Let us give an example for people to think about:

"Imran is a pious man that has been blessed by Allah (swt) with immense riches. He owns a large industrial mill, which produces steel throughout the country. The business provides employment 1,000 members of the local community. He sets aside vast portions of his wealth towards the Propagation of Islam, paying for the publishing of religious materials etc. His aim is that the entire local community embrace Islam. His son works for his father and also wants his father's vision to be implemented. Upon his death Imran bequeaths that all that he owns be given away to the poor and needy, the factory can become the home of the needy, they can seize the equipment and sell it to support their daily existence. Will this decision aid or impede

the propagation of the Deen? Housing the poor and needy might well satisfy the humanitarian need, but what about the vision to propagate the Deen? His son will be unable to carry through this religious function, since his father left him nothing, he does not even have a job, he like 1000 colleagues in unemployed! The net result of this decision is that all of Imran's material possession have got into the hands of the poor, nothing has been used for religious activities. Would the better approach not have been for him to leave the factory to his son as Legal Heir who could administer the property accordingly, thus ensuring that his father's dream of religious propagation was met?"

As this example demonstrates there are scenarios where material assets are used to aid, spread the Deen. This is why religious Charities have clear five,ten year strategies setting out their vision, with targets on what needs to be done to aid religious propagation! They will for example have plans to locate land where they can build a religious institution / orphanage. When fallible humans have seen the value of having assets to aid religious activities, don't you think Allah (swt) who is the greatest of planners would see the sense of Prophets utilising their land and other assets as a mechanism to spread the Deen? How could Prophet Zakariya (as) ensure that his successor continue this mission if he did not have a house wherein he could invite the poor and needy in and speak to them about the Deen? Would a homeless Prophet Sulayman (as) who had distributed every possession belonging to his father as charity, be more successful in propagating the Deen, or King Sulayman (as) commanding Palaces wherein he could house, feed and educate the poor and needy? The immediate distribution of inheritance would in effect stop Dawah activities in their tracks! Allah (swt) would never create a scenario that would create unnecessary obstacles for his Messengers to spread the Deen, the immediate distribution of material possessions in charity would have been one such obstacle!

Observation Four

If we are to accept the notion that Prophet's leave no inheritance, rather their belongings go to the Ummah, then surely some reference to such an act (mass distribution of Prophet's possessions) should be present in the other religious texts whether Heavenly Books or otherwise.

Is it not unusual that an order that was the same for all Prophets of Allah (swt)'s is correct accordingly to Ahl'ul Sunnah, but cannot be evidenced in the Torah, Gospels, Psalms or the Qur'an? We also cannot find any historical reference that a dead Prophet's Estate from Kingdom to all its contents was given away upon his death. Is it not curious that no other Prophet (s) issued such an order, rather only the Final Messenger (who at the last stages of his life) managed to convey this crucial information into Abu Bakr's ear? Allah (swt) sent 1,24000 Prophets from Adam to Muhammad (s) and not one of them made this order; rather it was left to Rasulullah (s) to convey this fact? If this was such a crucial matter then why did Allah (swt) not bother revealing it in any of the other Heavenly Books, or even the Quran? Abu Bakr's recital of this Hadeeth is not acceptable, no previous people had any knowledge of this, and it is unacceptable to apportion such absurdity to the last Prophet(s) of Allah, fault lies with the narrators.

Observation Five

The Deobandi magazine "Islamic Voice" has an old habit of writing anti shi'a articles. One such classic titled "Shias and Sunnis" published in July 2000, can be located online at:

 <http://www.islamicvoice.com/july.2000/dialogue.htm> - [Cached](#)

Whilst this is not the appropriate place to discuss all the fine points in the article, the comment on Fadak is very interesting which we reproduce here:

"He and his wife Hazrat Fatima were not happy over the Caliph's decision not to hand them over the property of Fidak owned by the Prophet as he remembered to have heard the Prophet (Pbuh) say that there is no inheritance from the prophets' property for their progeny. Apparently Ali and Fatima thought that he must have erred in hearing this from the Prophet (Pbuh) because had it been so, the Prophet's descendants would have been the first to be informed of this by him. Hazrat Ali did not even inform Hazrat Abu Bakar of Hazrat Fatima's death and he could not attend her funeral. However after his Bai'at, he remained a sincere and loyal advisor to the Caliph".

If this was indeed the reason 'why' Sayyida Fatima (as) and Maula 'Ali (as) believed Abu Bakr narrated a false hadeeth, was their reasoning wrong? Would it not have been expected of Rasulullah (s) to tell his potential heirs this matter?

We read in Tafseer Kabir Volume 3, page 157, verse Yau Sakeem Allah:

Only Ali, Fatima and Abbas were affected by the ruling with regard to Prophetic inheritance, they were amongst the highest ranks of knowledge and honesty. Abu Bakr did not come within this ruling nor could he even contemplate that he was the Waris of Rasulullah (s), How can it be Rasulullah's rank that those who came within the ruling were not informed whilst those who were not affected were told".

The reference is clear that Rasulullah (s) would inform people of the ruling that referred specifically to them. On this basis the rulings on his (s) inheritance affected his own family and yet he did not inform them of any such ruling, this is not logical and proves that no such ruling had been issued on the part of Rasulullah (s).

If this Hadeeth was true then Sayyida Fatima (as), 'Ali (as), Hassan (as), Husayn (as) would have known of it, after all they were the affected party who would suffer due to the ramifications of this Hadeeth. It was incumbent on Rasulullah (s) to convey this to them, telling them that they could not claim anything he (s) left as inheritance, and hence should not disturb his Successor by making such a petition before him. But he failed to do so leaving thereby an obligation lying upon his shoulders unfulfilled.

Of relevance in this discussion are the comments of the late Deobandi scholar Sayyid Abul Hasan Nadwi who dedicated his life to defaming the Shi'a. In his article *'The Life of Caliph Ali'*, he offers this false Qiyas to negate the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as):

There are other reports also which corroborate the determination of Abu Bakr never to deviate, [not] even slightly, from the practice of the Prophet and follow only what he knew to be the Prophet's will. Fatima, however, continued to insist on her right of inheritance either because she was not aware of the Prophet's will or she considered the Caliph competent to meet her wishes.

 http://muslim-canada.org/ali_abubakr.html - [Cached](#)

Is this a reasonable argument? What we certainly know is that Sayyida Fatima (as) did not approach Abu Bakr for State handouts, what is clear from the Fadak dispute is she made a claim as the legal heir to her father's Estate. This therefore leaves us with Nadwi's curious assumption, that she was unaware of her father's will. Is it really believable that the Prophet (s) would keep his daughter in the dark over this matter, but informs a party that had no connection with such a ruling? Don't you think that the Prophet (s) would have taken his daughter aside and told her:

'Fatima you are dearer to me than anything in this world, but I must tell you that I fear for welfare of my poor Sahaba such as Abu Hurrayra, hence when I die all that I own shall go to the Ummah, you cannot claim anything, all must be handed over. I'm telling you this so that you won't waste the time of the Khalifa that succeeds me'

Don't you think that the Prophet (s) would have given his daughter this crucial piece of information, or would he have left it for her to learn of this information when she brought such a claim before the Khalifa?

The renowned modern day Egyptian scholar Haykal in his famous work *'The Life of Muhammad'* pages 515-516, provides this rather curious analysis of the dispute in his Section *'Prophets leave no inheritance'*:

"After the death of the Prophet his daughter Fatimah asked Abu Bakr to return to her the land the Prophet which kept for himself at Fadak and Khayber. Abu Bakr however answered her by quoting her father's words; 'We the Prophets do not leave any inheritance for anyone, whatever we do leave shall be given out in charity". Continuing with his own words Abu Bakr said 'However if it was the case that your father had made a grant to you to you of this property then I shall certainly honour your word to this effect and fulfil his commandment. At this Fatimah answered that her father had not made any such grant to her, but that Umm Ayman had informed that this might have been Muhammad's purpose. Abu bakr therefore resolved that the lands of Fadak and Khaybar should be kept by the public treasury of the Muslims as State domain".

Firstly there was no such thing as nationalised property at the time.

Secondly Abu Bakr's actions automatically contradicted the very Hadeeth he had sought to rely on since the Hadeeth he cited stated that all the Prophet (s) owns goes to charity, his failure to do so proves that the Hadeeth is a lie.

If Sayyida Fatima (as) had made a claim on the assumption of Umm Ayman that the Prophet (s) may have wished to grant the land to her then why was she making a claim on the basis of the laws of inheritance? Is it not curious that Umm Ayman assumed the Prophet's intention, Abu Bakr knew the Prophet's intention but the affected party (the Heir) Sayyida Fatima (as) didn't know on what condition she would receive the land. Also she didn't have a clue that her father left no inheritance.

Only two options can be reached if we accept that this Hadeeth is Sahih. There was either major failing on the part of Rasulullah (s) for not conveying this crucial fact to his family, or Sayyida Fatima (as), 'Ali (as) and Hasnayn (as) despite their knowledge of this Hadeeth still made a false claim to procure financial gain that in effect renders them deceptive personalities. We are not prepared to accept either conclusion.

2. According to Ahl'ul Sunnah a tradition that contradicts the Qur'an is false

The claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) was supported by the Qur'an. Abu Bakr rejected her claim by advancing an alleged Hadeeth that contradicted 10 Qur'anic verses.

Surah Nisa 004.011:

Allah (thus) directs you as regards your Children's (Inheritance): to the male, a portion equal to that of two females: if only daughters, two or more, their share is two-thirds of the inheritance; if only one, her share is a half.
Al-Qur'an, Surah 4, Ayah 11, translated by Yusufali

Allah deemed every person to be entitled to inheritance, hence Sayyida Fatima (as) was the Waris of her father; the Hadeeth advanced by Abu Bakr contradicted the Qur'an. Any Hadeeth that contradicts the Qur'an cannot be acted on.

Surah Nisa 004.007:

From what is left by parents and those nearest related there is a share for men and a share for women, whether the property be small or large,-a determinate share.

Al-Qur'an, Surah 4, Ayah 7, translated by Yusufali

When a woman is the Waris of her father then Sayyida Fatima (as) was the Waris of her father, Abu Bakr's advancing of this Hadeeth was of no value.

Surah Nisa 004.033:

To (benefit) every one, We have appointed shares and heirs to property left by parents and relatives. To those, also, to whom your right hand was pledged, give their due portion. For truly Allah is witness to all things.

Al-Qur'an, Surah 4, Ayah 33, translated by Yusufali

When every person inherits from their parents then Sayyida Fatima (as) likewise inherited from her father (s).

Surah Ahzab 033.006:

Bloodrelations among each other have closer personal ties, in the Decree of Allah. Than (the Brotherhood of) Believers and Muhajirs

Al-Qur'an, Surah 33, Ayah 6, translated by Yusufali

When the Qur'an bestows the closest ties to blood relations, then they clearly are the closest when it comes to inheritance. Rather than make judgement based on this alleged Hadeeth, Abu Bakr should have recognised that Sayyida Fatima (as) was closest in ties to Rasulullah (s), hence when Sayyida Fatima (as) produced Qur'anic evidence of her right to inherit her father's property, his advancing this Hadeeth was not correct.

Surah Naml 027.016:

And Solomon was David's heir.

Al-Qur'an, Surah 27, Ayah 16, translated by Yusufali

When Prophet Sulayman (as) was the Waris of Prophet Dawood (as) then by the same token Sayyida Fatima (as) was the heir of Prophet Muhammad (s). This makes the Hadeeth advanced by Abu Bakr null and void.

Surah Sad verses 30-31:

To David We gave Solomon (for a son),- How excellent in Our service! Ever did he turn (to Us)!

Behold, there were brought before him, at eventide coursers of the highest breeding, and swift of foot;

Al-Qur'an, Surah Sad, Ayah 30 & 31, translated by Yusufali

We have already cited classical Sunni commentaries of this verse, where we learnt that the breed referred to one thousand horses, which Hadhrat Sulayman (as) inherited from his father.

Sayyida Fatima (as) was likewise the Waris of her father, Abu Bakr alleged Hadeeth recollection contradicted this verse of the Qur'an.

Surah Maryam 019.004-6:

Praying: "O my Lord! ... give me an heir as from Thyself,- (One that) will (truly) represent me, and represent the posterity of Jacob; and make him, O my Lord! one with whom Thou art well-pleased!"

Al-Qur'an, Surah 19, Ayah 4 - 6, translated by Yusufali

If Prophets do not leave inheritance, Prophet Zakariya (as) would not have prayed for an offspring to inherit him. Sayyida Fatima (as) was likewise the Waris of her father.

Surah Anbiya verse 89:

And (remember) Zakariya, when he cried to his Lord: "O my Lord! leave me not without offspring, though thou art the best of inheritors."

Al-Qur'an, Surah Anbiya, Ayah 89, translated by Yusufali

This verse reminds us of the supplication of Prophet Zakariya (as), if Prophet's cannot inherit then Allah (swt) would have surely told him that Prophets leave no inheritance.

We read in Surah Aal-e-Imran 003.038:

There did Zakariya pray to his Lord, saying: "O my Lord! Grant unto me from Thee a progeny that is pure: for Thou art He that heareth prayer!"

Al-Qur'an, Surah 3, Ayah 38, translated by Yusufali

Hadhrat Zakariya (as)'s fear that his property would be usurped by his relatives, led him to pray for a pious offspring. If Prophets do not inherit then Allah (swt) would have rebuked Zakariya (as) for making such a supplication. The 'Hadeeth' advanced by Abu Bakr also contradicted this Qur'anic verse.

Surah Baqarah 002.248:

And (further) their Prophet said to them: "A Sign of his authority is that there shall come to you the Ark of the covenant, with (an assurance) therein of security from your Lord, and the relics left by the family of Moses and the family of Aaron, carried by angels. In this is a symbol for you if ye indeed have faith."

Al-Qur'an, Surah 2, Ayah 248, translated by Yusufali

These relics remained in the family of Yaqoob (as) why were they not given away as Sadaqah?

Sunni and Shi'a agreement

Both Sects are in agreement that any Hadeeth that contradicts the Qur'an should be rejected. The Hadeeth advanced by Abu Bakr '*Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqa'* contradicted 10 verses of the Qur'an, hence the Hadeeth could not be advanced as evidence.

We the Shi'a bring evidence from the Quran proving the inheritance of the Prophet (s), the Ahl'ul Sunnah advance the comment of Abu Bakr. We appeal to justice, what value should we give to the ruling of Abu Bakr, when we measure his judgement against the Qur'an? The ruling violated 10 Qur'anic verses, and denying Sayyida Fatima (as) her inheritance right was a major injustice. One who perpetuates such injustice against her (as) can never be deemed a rightly guided Khalifa.

Allah (swt)'s condemnation on he who turns his back on the Qur'an

We read in Surah as Sajdah 032.022:

And who does more wrong than one to whom are recited the Signs of his Lord, and who then turns away there from? Verily from those who transgress We shall exact (due) Retribution.

Al-Qur'an, Surah 32, Ayah 22, translated by Yusufali

Open challenge to Ahl'ul Sunnah

The Ahl'ul Sunnah have a habit of challenging the Shi'as to prove Matum, Tatbeer from the Qur'an saying that this is a Book containing all answers. These sensible types never bother to contemplate that no verse exists stipulating that Prophets leave no inheritance. We have proven through 10 verses of the Qur'an that the inheritors of Prophets are their offspring - now in the spirit of your second Khalifa Umar Ibn al Farooq who said *'The Qur'an is sufficient for us'* we challenge you to produce a single verse that proves that no one can inherit from Prophets.

3. According to the Ahl'ul Sunnah a tradition that ought to have been known to all and sundry, but has only a single narrator is false

Observation One

The Qur'an clearly stipulates that all people have inheritors. If Rasulullah (s) was exempt on such a rule then he would have surely sought to give the matter maximum publicity, making it clear to his potential heirs that they would get nothing. This exemption was so significant that failure to give it wide publicity would result in a major dispute upon the death of the Prophet (s) between his Heirs and those who claimed his property as charity. At the minimum he would have told this ruling to the affected parties who would have otherwise inherited his material possessions.

Let us not forget that Abu Bakr attributed these words to the Prophet (s) *'whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah'* - in other words the beneficiaries to this land were the poor Muslims. Would Rasulullah (s) not have made an open declaration to the Sahaba that Fadak was to be transferred to the poor when he died? Is it not curious that neither the Heirs nor beneficiaries knew of this ruling, rather this was only known to Abu Bakr? Think about this logically:

A man has a property and a large piece of land. He has a wife and three children. His desire is to give his home to his wife and children as inheritance. As for the land he wants it to be used for by a small local Charity to build a play park. Will he not seek to give convey this intention to his wife and son? Will he not seek to tell the Charity of this intention also? Or will he keep this matter top secret and only tell his close friend about it? Would there be any sense in him only telling his friend not telling his Heirs or the lucky beneficiaries?

Observation Two

Curiously no one else seems to have recalled hearing this Hadeeth directly from the Prophet other than Abu Bakr, and even he failed to point out the context and time when he heard these crucial words. We ask Al Khider a simple question.

When did this alleged tradition descend?

Just as a Qur'anic verse was revealed at a specific time, place, event, the same is the case with Hadeeth. Rasulallah (s) would state something in accordance with a specific situation or event so that the Sahaba could understand the relevance and context in which Rasulallah (s) was speaking. Rasulallah (s) would on different occasions state something that would correspond, elaborate something which he had said in the past. There are for example numerous Hadeeth relating to loving Imam 'Ali (as).

Rasulallah (s) also highlighted the knowledge of Imam 'Ali on different occasions, in different guises. If you pick up Sahih al Bukhari and Sahih Muslim you will find how the same Hadeeth had been said on different occasions, but correspond to the same event or topic in question. Unusually this tradition *'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah'* has no context as to 'when' it was said nor is it supported by any other Hadeeth. This Hadeeth was only cited out of necessity. It was fabricated to manouver the situation to ones personal ends.

In the same way that Hadeeth-e-Manzila, Hadeeth-e-Ghadir were appraisals of Hadhrat 'Ali (as) linked to certain events and having a particular context, the Hadeeth stipulating that Prophets leave all their possessions as inheritance also required recital as to the context, about when and upon whose death this Hadeeth was said. This could have occurred at various points:

First 'missed' opportunity

The verses of inheritance are general and include Rasulallah (s) also. If Rasulallah (s) was exempt from these rulings, then clearly Rasulallah (s) would have seen the risk of Fitnah amongst the Sahaba after him, had he failed to point this fact out. Therefore Rasulallah (s) in spirit with the order of Allah (swt) *'and warn your near kinsmen'* had a duty to inform his daughter and all the Muslims that:

'All Muslims leave inheritance behind them, except me, all that Prophets leave behind is Sadaqah'.

Rasulallah's(s) failure to declare that he left no inheritance when the verses of inheritance were revealed(perfect time for him to declare this) serves as evidence that this was a lie.

Second 'missed' opportunity

When Rasulallah (s) attained possession of the lands of Khayber and Fadak, it was the incumbent upon him to say:

'Allah (swt) has given me these lands, my ownership is limited to my lifetime, after I die my daughter cannot inherit it, as everything I own becomes Sadaqah for my Sahaba when I die'.

The Leader of the Shari'ah made no such declaration at the time of attaining ownership of the lands of Khaybar and Fadak which further suggests that this tradition was coined as a means of denying the Ahl'ul bayt (as) their inheritance rights.

Third 'missed' opportunity

Its relevance would have clearly arisen when Rasulallah (s) was in his final illness, yet he (s) did not even make reference to it at this crucial time. Prior to his death (on his sick bed) it would

have been incumbent on Rasulallah (s) to inform his daughter and the Muslim Ummah that he left no inheritance rather his possessions would become Sadaqah for his poor Sahaba such as Uthman Ibn Affan. Rasulallah (s) made no such declaration in his final illness that is further evidence that this Hadeeth is a lie. Failure of Rasulallah (s) to convey this message to the Ahl'ul Bayt (as) means that he failed to convey his Prophetic duty (Naudhobillah), when Surah Maida deemed the Deen to have been completed. All rules and regulation cover the people, and the entire duty of Rasulallah (s) was to propagate the Deen to the masses, starting from the first verses through to the last Rasulallah (s) made sure that his teaching reached the Faithful. To his Ahl'ul bayt (as) he was given a specific order to convey the message 'verse 'warn your kinsmen' it was incumbent upon Rasulallah (s) to deliver this message to them. Failure to convey this message to his close relatives would have therefore constituted a rejection of the Qur'an. Rasulallah (s) can never act against the Qur'an.

If we accept that Rasulallah (s) failed to convey the ruling on his inheritance to his family, but rather conveyed it to a third party who had no interest in the matter, then the suggestion would be that the Prophet (s) failed to convey one aspect of his teachings (astaghfirullah). If the Ahl'ul Sunnah wish to protect the Prophet (s) then they will need to reject the Hadeeth presented by Abu Bakr.

The fact that Rasulallah (s) failed to highlight the fact that he left no inheritance at these three critical moments, proves that the Hadeeth *'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah'* was a concoction. It is not acceptable to believe that Rasulallah (s) would keep this matter hidden from Banu Hashim, (when disputes on inheritance would no doubt arise) - and that he just whispered this into Abu Bakr's ear, as this would cause Fitnah amongst the Sahaba and Ahl'ul bayt (as). No logical person would believe that Rasulallah (s) would maintain silence on such an important matter. The truth of the matter is Abu Bakr was clearly in error here. In his inaugural speech he said that he had a Shaytan that misled him and his usurpation of Fadak from its rightful executor is the perfect example of this.

We have consulted the books of Sunni Tafseer yet in none do we read this Hadeeth being narrated when the verses on inheritance descended. When the historians and Tafseer scholars are unable to determine when these words were said by Rasulallah (s), it was Abu Bakr's duty to clarify the occasion / context when he heard these words. During the Fadak dispute Sayyida Fatima (as) had all the evidence in her favour, Abu Bakr had no exit route and the only way he sought to rebut her claim was by promptly citing this Hadeeth, if it was true then no doubt Abu Bakr would have sought to set the background in relation to the occasion when he heard these momentous words.

At this point we feel that it would be appropriate to cite the comments of a renowned Hanafi scholar Ihtisham ud'Deen Muradabadi from Pakistan in his glorious attack on the Shi'a, in "Naseeyat ai Shi'a" [Advice for the Shi'a] Volume 3 page 544:

"The amusing thing is the same Allah (swt) who has addressed all issues of Iman and aqeedah in detail, leaves such a shortage on the issue of Imamate, that nothing can be deduced, when such a shortage occurs on the part of Allah (swt), then Rasulallah (s) also did not deem it to be his position to clarify the definition of 'Maula' that carries multiple meanings".

Using this logic, we the Shi'a will reply that the issue of Prophetic inheritance had been settled. On Fadak Muradabadi should have said:

*"The amusing thing is that the same Allah (swt) who has addressed all issues of Iman and aqeedah in detail, leaves such a shortage on the inheritance, that nothing can be deduced, when such a shortage occurs on the part of Allah (swt), then Rasulallah (s) also did not deem it to be his position to clarify the issue of his **inheritance**."*

This destroys Abu Bakr's Khilafat. When such a lack of clarification occurs on the part of Allah

(swt), and Rasulallah (s) did not deem it his duty to clarify the matter, rather kept his Executors in the dark on the matter, preferring to whisper into the lone ear of Abu Bakr *'whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah'* - words that also carry multiple meanings, and yet Rasulallah (s) failed to clarify this to Abu Bakr, and Abu Bakr in order to protect his Khilafath attributed this to Rasulallah (s). After all Abu Bakr was not infallible all people can makes mistakes.

8.32 Ibn Taymeeya al Nasibi's false claim that the Hadeeth *'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we leave is Sadaqah'* is Muttawatir

The Nasibis have been touting an alleged debate between a Shi'a scholar and their great Nasibi Imam Ibn Taymeeya wherein he gave earth shattering replies to the Shi'a scholar. Whilst the entire debate is about as reliable as the story of Peter Pan, allow us to refute the alleged comments of Ibn Taymeeya (that he also asserted in Minhaj al Sunnah) on this issue of Fadak. We have taken this debate from this website:

http://www.utdallas.edu/orgs/MSA/ibn_mutahhir.html - [Cached](#)

Ibn Taymeeya allegedly states:

Ibn Taymiyya: Your statement that this was "a narration which he alone transmitted" is a lie. On the contrary, Umar, Uthman, Ali, Talha, Az-Zubair, Abdur-Rahman bin Auf, Al-Abbas, the wives of the Prophet and Abu Huraira narrated this in addition to Abu Bakr. Furthermore, your statement that "he wanted it for himself" is a lie. Abu Bakr did not claim it for himself, rather it was sadaqa for those who deserve it. Also, the sahaba were convinced, and Ali was one of them, that the Prophet is not inherited.

Reply One

This claim is of no worth to us since none exists in Shi'a books, if traditions were coined after Fadak due to political affiliations it means nothing. Imam 'Ali rejected the tradition outright appearing as a witness for his wife and his verdict on Abu Bakr's usage of the tradition was that it served as evidence that he was a liar, treacherous sinful and dishonest(see sunni references already cited by us). It should be noted the Chief Nasibi Ibn Taymeeya in Minhaj asserted that the tradition was Muttawatir and received ijma of the Sahaba, but we reject any Ijma'a that the infallible Imams have not entered upon. Islam is not shaped by the Ijma'a of fallible humans. Hadhrat 'Ali (as) and Sayyida Fatima (as) rejected the Hadeeth, upon hearing it Sayyida Fatima (as) became upset with Abu Bakr, deeming him to be a liar, his assertion contradicted ten verses of the Qur'an, and according to al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi any position against the Ahl'ul bayt (as) is Batil. Since Nasibi such as Ibn Taymeeya have asserted that the Hadeeth has multiple narrators from amongst the Sahaba then we challenge these defenders of Abu Bakr to present us with even a single chain (other than that from Ayesha and Abu Bakr) from the Saha Sittah, where the Isnad is complete and all the narrators are Thiqah confirming this.

Reply Two

It is indeed fascinating that Ibn Taymeeya suggests this, since Imam 'Ali (as) never ascribed to

this viewpoint and continued to insist that Fadak remained the legal right of Sayyida Fatima (as).

English translation Sahih Bukhari Hadith: 8.720:

Narrated Malik Ibn Aus:

'Umar said to 'Ali and 'Abbas: "... Then I took charge of this property for two years during which I managed it as Allah's Apostle and Abu Bakr did. Then you both ('Ali and 'Abbas) came to talk to me, bearing the same claim and presenting the same case. (O 'Abbas!) You came to me asking for your share from the property of your nephew, and this man (Ali) came to me, asking for the share of his wife from the property of her father..."

Despite Abu Bakr's recital of this Hadeeth Maula 'Ali still made a claim to the inheritance of Sayyida Fatima (as) during Umar's reign, and continued to do so throughout his reign and upheld the position that his deceased wife was the Legal Heir of her father's Estate. If Nasabi try to water this incident down and misinterpret it to suggest that it had nothing to do with Prophetic inheritance then we should point out that Dar Qathnee in his "Sharh of Saheeh al Bukharae" Volume 6 page 145 whilst commenting on this Hadeeth refutes the assertion of Ibn Jauzi and Shaykh Muhiyudeen that it had nothing do with inheritance. He states that:

"The tradition from al Bukharae confirms that it was connected with inheritance since Abbas was staking his claim to the entitlement of his nephew a right that he would have received from his wife, that she would have received from her father. Umar made a reference to the distribution of inheritance".

If Imam 'Ali (as) remembered the Hadeeth cited by Abu Bakr, deeming it correct then why did he demand Sayyida Fatima (as)'s inheritance right during Umar's reign?

Reply Three - Mutawattir hadith defined

The reality is there is no basis to claim that the Hadeeth is Muttawatir. Let us cite the definition of Muttawatir as quoted by Dr. Suhayb Hasan, An Introduction to the Science of Hadeeth, Darussalam Publishers, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, page 30:

Ibn Hajar [al-'Asqalani] has dealt with different classes of Hadeeth in the Sharh Nukhbat al-Fikr at great length. The most important division of Hadeeth is into Muttawatir (continuous) and wahid (isolated). A Hadeeth is said to be Muttawatir (lit. repeated successively or by one after another) when it is reported by such a large number that it is impossible that they should have agreed upon falsehood, so that the very fact that it is commonly accepted makes its authority unquestionable. To this category belong Hadeeth that have been accepted by every Muslim generation down from the time of the Holy Prophet.[52] The Muttawatir Hadeeth are accepted without criticizing their narrators.

If we accept this tradition then we should make it clear that it does not apply to Abu Bakr's recital of the Hadeeth 'We the Prophets do not leave inheritance', and as evidence we shall rely on the following esteemed Sunni texts:

1. Kanz al Ummal Volume 6 page 312 Kitab Fadail
2. Tareekh Khulafa, [artial English translation] page 62 Dhikr Khilafath Abu Bakr
3. Sawaiqh al Muhriqa Chapter 1 page 19

We read in Kanz:

"Ayesha narrates that there were difference with regards to the inheritance of the Prophet, no one was aware of the ruling on this save Abu Bakr who said: 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)'.

We read in Tareekh ul Khulafa, on the authority of Ayesha:

'They disagreed about his inheritance and could find no one with knowledge on that point, then Abu Bakr said, 'I heard the Messenger of Allah may Allah grant him peace, saying 'We the company of the Prophets, we are not inherited from. What we leave is Sadaqah'.

 [Tareekh ul-Khulafa, Page 62](#)

These books prove that Abu Bakr was the sole narrator of this Hadeeth, a lone narration cannot be defined as Muttawatir. This shall suffice to shut the mouth of Ibn Taymeeya, and his modern day adherents.

Reply Four

If any doubt still remains then allow us to cite the comments from Sharh al Qushabee page 406, Bays al Imamate, wherein the author attacks the Shi'a position on Fadak:

"Tusi asserts that amongst Abu Bakr's bad deeds is the fact that he contradicted the Qur'an by refusing to apportion the Prophet's inheritance, and this was based on his lone narration, our reply is that although the Hadeeth is lone and may be doubtful sometimes a single narration can also constitute proof"

The admission from Sharh al Qashajee that the tradition recited by Abu Bakr is "ahad" or "khabar e wahid" destroys the claim of Ibn Taymeeya that it was Muttawatir. Sharah Qaushjee accepts that Abu Bakr narration was "ahad" and according to Ibn Taymeeya if the narration reminded everyone [of the Hadeeth] else then Ahl'ul Sunnah's great scholar Quashjee would not have deemed this to be a lone narration. Quashjee's research is clear proof that Ibn Taymeeya's claim is pure deception. The most incredible claim of this Nasibi is his passionate defence of Abu Bakr:

Ibn Taymeeya allegedly states:

Also, the sahaba were convinced, and Ali was one of them, that the Prophet is not inherited.

This is amazing, since the same Hadhrat 'Ali (who Ahl'ul Sunnah deem Mahfuz (protected) narrator and Shi'a deem Masum) after hearing Abu Bakr's recital of this tradition (according to Sahih Muslim, on the authority of Umar al Farooq) concluded that Abu Bakr was a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest! Imam 'Ali (as) did not remember the Hadeeth after Abu Bakr's recital, when he rejected this Hadeeth then the defence of others is worthless! If Nasibis are going to enter the world of fairy tales it would be advisable for them not to suggest the inability of a Shi'a scholar to refute a claim that a Shi'a school child could take apart! If there is any doubt as to the meaning and context of Hadhrat 'Ali (as)'s comments then let us cite the esteemed Sunni work al Awasim min al Qawasim page 194, by Qadhi Abi Bakr ibn Arabi:

"Umar saying that Abbas and Ali held a belief that Abu Bakr was unjust, dishonest and treacherous was linked to a ruling that caused conflict. It is linked to a report

that 'Ali and Abbas believed that the Prophet left inheritance, whilst Abu Bakr denied this view, and Abu Bakr and Umar in their views denied that the Prophet left inheritance, 'Ali and Abbas therefore deemed Abu Bakr unjust and treacherous for denying inheritance".

Ibn Arabi was a major Sunni scholar that accepted that Abu Bakr's decision to hold transfer Prophet's property as Sadaqah, led to Maula 'Ali, grading him as unjust and treacherous. Clearly when 'Ali (as) and Abbas (ra) heard Abu Bakr reciting this Hadeeth it was the first time that they had heard of such a claim, and they rejected the authenticity of the tradition, hence Ibn Taymeeya's claim that the Sahaba became convinced by Abu Bakr's citing the Hadeeth is a blatant lie, he even tried to include Hadhrat 'Ali (as) among those who agreed!

Reply Five – Uthman and the wives of the Prophet (s) had no knowledge of the Hadeeth

Ibn Taymeeya al Nasabi also counted Uthman and the wives of the Prophet (s) as narrators of the Hadeeth.

The simplest way to refute this comes from the Hadeeth (that we have already cited) in Saheeh al Bukharee Volume 5, Book 59, Number 367, Kitab al Maghaazi:

.... "I told 'Urwa bin Az-Zubair of this Hadeeth and he said, 'Malik bin Aus has told the truth" I heard 'Ayesha, the wife of the Prophet saying, 'The wives of the Prophet sent 'Uthman to Abu Bakr demanding from him their 1/8 of the Fai which Allah had granted to his Apostle. But I used to oppose them and say to them: Will you not fear Allah? Don't you know that the Prophet used to say: Our property is not inherited, but whatever we leave is to be given in charity?"

Ibn Taymeeya advanced Uthman and the wives as narrators of this Hadeeth, the reality is they had no knowledge of this Hadeeth, proven by the fact that they sent Uthman to present their inheritance claim on their behalf! If Uthman had heard this Hadeeth why did he not interject and say 'O Mothers, what inheritance are you referring to, Rasulullah (s) said'

The claim of the wives and Uthman going as their representative is proof that they had never heard of the Hadeeth, a Hadeeth that Ibn Taymeeya al Nasabi claims they narrated!

8.33 Abu Bakr's decision in the Fadak dispute contradicted his own method of ruling

We read in Izalathul Khifa Part 2, Volume 3 page 114:

"Whenever a dispute was brought before Abu Bakr, he would seek to direct him towards the Qur'an, or relevant Hadeeth of Rasulullah (s), if no evidence could be located from the Qur'an or Sunnah he would ask for the help of the Sahaba, if the Sahaba were agreed on Hadeeth he would take it, if a Hadeeth was not agreed upon he would gather selected people and seek their advice. When all the people agreed on an opinion, Abu Bakr would rule accordingly".

Abu Bakr's double standards have been exposed here! If Abu Bakr was indeed the just man as is claimed then when Fatima (as) made her claim to her father's property, this was a general dispute, Abu Bakr was himself a party to the dispute. He could have asked the Sahaba who would have arrived at the correct outcome. He could have applied justice, a dispute had occurred, Sayyida Fatima (as) was upset. Abbas and Ali did not concur with Abu Bakr's ruling so when Sayyida Fatima (as) made her claim why not convene a meeting including 'Ali, Abbas and

the Sahaba and ask them *'The daughter of Fatima has claim her inheritance to Rasulullah's Estate what is your opinion?'* He could have then made a ruling'. But Abu Bakr did not have the courage to entertain a hearing wherein Hadhrat 'Ali would be setting out his wife's case. After all Abdullah ibn Abbas had said:

'When anyone would establish something said on the authority of 'Ali, then we would not turn to anyone else for an answer'.

Rabbah al Muttalib, page 143

Deciding claims of normal people through advice, whilst ruling on the claims of Ahl'ul Bayt (as) through personal opinion, that incidentally is against them shows clear hypocrisy, and clearly proves that the different approach was politically motivated. Upon hearing the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) he automatically produced a Hadeeth and issued a ruling against her claim that the daughter of Rasulullah (s) a liar (Allah forbid) Neither did he consult the Qur'an for a ruling nor did he gather the Sahaba together to seek their counsel he ruled against her and pained her in the process.

8.34 Abu Bakr did not honour his grounds for usurping Fadak

In rejecting the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as), Abu Bakr based his decision on three points.

1. The number of witnesses required to give evidence had not been met, or (as claimed by his advocates) were unacceptable
2. Prophet's leave no inheritance
3. I shall not change the practice of the Prophet (s)

We have already refuted points 1, 2 so we shall now scrutinise point 3. Abu Bakr assertion that he was rigid in implementing the Sunnah of Rasulullah (s) is the greatest defence that his advocates present, who can condemn someone who was only enforcing the Sunnah of Rasulullah (s). *Sayyid Abul Hasan Nadwi* a leading Imam of the Deobandi's in his book *'The Life of Caliph Ali'* heaps glowing admiration on Abu Bakr's action:

There are other reports also which corroborate the determination of Abu Bakr never to deviate, [not] even slightly, from the practice of the Prophet and follow only what he knew to be the Prophet's will.

Excerpted from "The Life of Caliph Ali" by Abul Hasan Nadwi

 http://muslim-canada.org/ali_abubakr.html - [Cached](#)

If the Prophet (s) left no inheritance, Abu Bakr still has no right to control the land, administer it or distribute the profits thereof. The question of maintaining or changing a practice of Rasulullah (s) should not even be brought up, and if the claim is advanced that we shall maintain the needs of these individuals, even then no benefit reaches the State. The traditions show that when something was left from Sadaqah Rasulullah (s) would distribute the remainder to the poor and needy from Banu Hashim, lands other than Fadak were also under the control of Rasulullah (s), and meeting the needs of travellers and the needy came from these lands. There is no evidence that Rasulullah (s) utilised the land of Fadak in this manner when he attained possession of it. The claims to the other lands were on the basis of inheritance. Whilst he was alive, Rasulullah (s) had every right to give it to his family and to spend the outstanding monies in any way that he sought fit. Upon his death this entitlement was given to his Executor not the Head of State.

Let us accept that the property has been rightly usurped, Abu Bakr said that he was not in a position to change any practice of Rasulullah (s), tell us al Khider:

'Was your Khalifa really that rigid when it came to enforcing the Sunnah?'

If he was rigid on all matters of Sunnah then clearly his advocates could advance such a defence but when we analyse the works of Ahl'ul Sunnah it becomes clear that these were just token words that Abu Bakr never himself believed in. The Ahl'ul Sunnah have presented the aqeedah of Abu Bakr, that he believed that Rasulullah (s) appointed no one to succeed him as Head of State. With this in mind, why did Abu Bakr deem it fit to change this practice of Rasulullah (s) and appoint Umar as Khalifa?

We read in Sahih Muslim, The Book on Government (Kitab Al-Imara) Chapter 'Appointing anyone as a succeeding caliph or leaving aside the question of appointment' Book 020, Hadeeth Number 4485:

It has been narrated on the authority of 'Abdullah b. 'Umar who said: I was present with my father when he was wounded. People praised him and said: May God give you a noble recompense! He said: I am hopeful (of God's mercy) as well as afraid (of His wrath) People said: Appoint anyone as your successor. He said: Should I carry the burden of conducting your affairs in my life as well as in my death? (So far as Caliphate is concerned) I wish I could acquit myself (before the Almighty) in a way that there is neither anything to my credit nor anything to my discredit. If I would appoint my successor, (I would because) one better than me did so. (He meant Abu Bakr.) If I would leave You alone, (I would do so because) one better than me, i. e. the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him), did so. 'Abdullah says: When he mentioned the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) I understood that he would not appoint anyone as Caliph.

His willingness to ignore the Sunnah of Rasulullah (s) here proves that this alleged rigid enforcement of the Sunnah was a sham, and was said at the spur of the moment to strike out the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as).

8.35 Abu Bakr prevented the recital of Hadeeth that caused disputes

We read in Tadhkirathul Huffaz Volume 1 page 3 by Dhahabi:

"After the death of the Prophet (s) Abu Bakr gathered the people and said 'You recite such Hadeeth from Rasulullah, that you yourselves are at logger heads as to whether it is Sahih, people after you shall differ even more, stop quoting such Hadeeth. If anyone asks you about a matter then say the Book of Allah (swt) is between the two of us, whatever the Qur'an deems halaal, you deem halaal, whatever it deems haraam you also deem haraam".

The narration informs us that Abu Bakr prohibited the recital of a Hadeeth that's authenticity was in doubt and caused a dispute. We say that the Hadeeth *'We the Prophets leave no inheritance'* caused such opposition in the eyes of Maula 'Ali that he deemed the Khalifa a 'liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest'. Sayyida Fatima (as) and Abbas also rejected the Hadeeth. When Abu Bakr prevented his subjects from reciting Hadeeth that caused disputes over authenticity, then why did he recite a Hadeeth that contradicted the Book of Allah (swt), and opposed the views of Sayyida Fatima (as) and Hadhrat 'Ali (as)? - Both the Qur'an and these personalities were referred to by Rasulullah (s) as 'two weighty things' and according to Shah Abdul Aziz opposition to either is wrong, hence this Hadeeth cannot be deemed correct.

Abu Bakr wanted people to turn to the Qur'an for guidance on what is halaal and haraam, yet he ruled that no one could inherit the Prophet's possessions, in doing so he contradicted ten verses of the Qur'an. Why did Abu Bakr reject the claim brought by the daughter of the Prophet (s), upsetting her and violating the Qur'an in the process?

8.36 Abu Bakr's Hadeeth burning campaign

Dhahabi in Tadhkirathul Huffaz Volume 1 page 5 Dhikr Abu Bakr states:

"Ayesha narrates 'My father Abu Bakr gathered the Hadeeth of the Prophet, there were 500 in total, but following a difficult night of tossing from side to side, I heard the fear and asked 'Have you seen a nightmare?', or are you changing sides for some other reason? When dawn came Abu Bakr said "Daughter bring the Hadeeth that are in your possession, he then summoned fire, and burnt the Hadeeth. I asked 'Why did you burn them?' He said 'I was worried that they remain after I die, the Hadeeth I narrated from Thiqah narrators are not relayed in the same manner. If they are not reported in the same way I shall be culpable for such a mistake".

These were the close friends of Rasulullah (s) one threatened to set alight to the house of Sayyida Fatima (as).

Please see our article:

 [Burning the house of Fatima binte Mohammad\(saww\)](#)

One set alight manuscripts of the Qur'an and Abu Bakr set alight Hadeeth! Abu Bakr set them alight as he was unsure as to whether they were Sahih. The Hadeeth 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)' was narrated solely by Abu Bakr, one cannot even hazard a guess as to where he found this Hadeeth, yet he even set this on fire during the final stage of life.

The Ahl'ul bayt rejected the assertion that the Hadeeth *'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)'* was Sahih, so the claims of Abu Bakr's advocates mean nothing to us. If chains have been coined then this has been from the Sect who are Saqifites supporters of Abu Bakr's man made Khilafat. Their own client Abu Bakr was opposed to the narrating of Hadeeth that caused differences / disputes, hence his decision to deny Sayyida Fatima (as)'s inheritance by ruling on the basis of a Hadeeth that caused differences, so severe that Hadhrat 'Ali (as) deemed him a liar, clearly points to the fact that Abu Bakr had no right to make such a decision.

Overall analysis of the Hadeeth

When Sayyida Fatima (as) made a claim to her father's inheritance, Abu Bakr replied that he heard the Prophet say *'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)'*. This reply:

1. Contradicted the Qur'an, and anything that contradicts the Qur'an is batil.
2. Contradicted Muttawatir Sunnah and anything that contradicts Muttawatir Sunnah is batil.
3. Was rejected by Hadhrat 'Ali - Rasulullah (s) said 'Ali is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ali and 'Ali is with the Qur'an and the Qur'an is with 'Ali. A Hadeeth rejected by Hadhrat 'Ali (as) should likewise be rejected.
4. Was rejected by the wives of the Prophet (s) in particular Ayesha, who according to Ahl'ul Sunnah had the title Siddiqa, a reply rejected by Siddiqa should likewise be rejected.
5. Also contradicts logic and anything that rejects logic, will not be accepted by a logical person.
6. Was not supported by the Qur'an or Sunnah, a reply that has no support of these key sources is to be rejected.

8.37 The misuse of Shi'a traditions to defend Abu Bakr

The author of Fedak had made this bold claim:

un named author states:

When a Nabi (Alayhis-Salaam) passes away, the property he leaves behind is not inherited by anybody. This fact is written in Shi'i literature as well.

Reply

This claim is a shameless lie and complete failure of the author to cite any source points to the fact that he is merely regurgitating the vomit of his Nasibi Shaykh's without actually looking in to the matter. Whilst he was so lazy that he had not bothered to bring forth any evidence, al Khider brings his devastating evidence, but contradicts himself as follows:

Ansar.org states:

The fact of the matter is that the hadith "We, the Prophets do not leave heirs" is authentic by both the Ahl as-Sunnah and the Shi'ah. Why is it then that Abu Bakr is condemned for appropriating an authentic statement of Rasulullah sallallahu 'alayhi wa-alihi wasallam, and that he be accused of fabricating the hadith in order to dispossess Fatimah of Fadak?

Reply

Just look at how this Nasibi contradicts himself:

First he mentions that Shi'as accept the Hadeeth: **"We Prophets do not leave...." As Authentic.**

Then he mentions **"... Abu Bakr...and that he be accused of fabricating the Hadeeth in order to dispossess Fatima of Fadak."**

How can the Shi'as accept the Hadeeth to be 'Sahih' and then accuse Abu Bakr of Fabricating it? Al Khider has yet again exposed himself as a liar.

Ansar.org states:

Al-Kulayni narrates in al-Kafi:
Abu 'Abdillah (Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq) says that Rasulullah said: "... And the 'Ulama are the heirs of the Ambiya; and the Ambiya did not leave dinars and dirhams as inheritance; but they left knowledge. Therefore whosoever takes

knowledge has taken a great portion." (al-Kafi, vol. 1 p. 42)

Regarding the authenticity of this Hadeeth, 'Allamah Muhammad Baqir Majlisi states in his commentary on al-Kafi, entitled Mir'at al-'Uqul:

[This] Hadeeth has two chains of narration. The first is majhul [contains an unknown narrator], and the second is hasan or muwaththaq. [Together] they do not fall short of being Sahih. (Mir'at al-'Uqul, vol. 1 p. 111)

It is then a fact that this Hadeeth is reliable. Why do the 'ulama of the Shi'ah refrain from using it, despite the fact that it so well-known in their ranks?

The strange thing here is that the Hadeeth is authentic enough for Khomeini to utilise it as evidence of the validity of his monumental political theory of Wilayat al-Faqih (the Rule of the Jurisprudent). He writes under the heading "Saheehat al-Qaddah" (the authentic narration of al-Qaddah):

'Ali ibn Ibrahim narrates from his father, from Hammad ibn 'Isa, on the authority of ['Abdullah ibn Maymun] al-Qaddah that Abu 'Abdillah [Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq] 'alayhis salam said: Rasulullah 'alayhi wa-alihi wasallam said: "Whoever walks a path seeking therein knowledge, Allah will lead him on a road to Jannah... And the 'Ulama are the heirs of the Ambiya; and the Ambiya did not leave dinars and dirhams as inheritance; but they left knowledge. Therefore whosoever takes knowledge has taken a great portion." (al-Kafi, Kitab Fadl al-'Ilm, Bab Sifat al-'Ilm wa-Fadlihi, Hadeeth no. 2)

To this narration Khomeini appends the following remark:

The narrators of this tradition are all reliable and trustworthy. The father of 'Ali ibn Ibrahim [namely Ibrahim ibn Hashim] is not only reliable; he is one of the most reliable and trustworthy narrators. (al-Hukumat al-Islamiyyah, p. 133, published by Markaz Baqiyyat Allah al-A'zam, Beirut)

Thereafter Khomeini points to another narration to the same effect that is recorded in al-Kafi with a weak chain of narration, and comments as follows:

This narration has been narrated with a slight difference to the same effect through another chain of narration that is weak, meaning that the chain is authentic up to Abul Bakhtari, but Abul Bakhtari himself is weak. That narration is as

follows:

[It is narrated] from Muhammad ibn Yahya, from Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn 'Isa, from Muhammad ibn Khalid, from Abul Bakhtari, that Abu 'Abdillah [Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq] 'alayhis salam said: "Verily the 'Ulama are the heirs of the Ambiya. That is because the Ambiya do not leave dirhams or dinars as inheritance, but they leave their words." . (al-Hukumat al-Islamiyyah, p. 133)

It might be concluded from the above that the Hadeeth which states that "the Ambiya do not leave dinars and dirhams as inheritance, but they leave knowledge" is authentic in one of its two chains of narration, as attested to by Khomeini, and before him by Majlisi. Why should an authentically narrated statement of Rasulullah be spurned when it is a matter of consensus that there can be no Ijtihad when a Nass (text) exists? Again, why does this Hadeeth qualify to be used in support of Wilayat al-Faqih, but not for the issue of Fadak? Is this issue being judged subjectively?

Reply One

When the Ahl'ul Sunnah find this Hadeeth they dance with joy as if it is the Festival of Eid. There are three facts that cannot be called into doubt:

Ulema are not the actual son of Prophets

Prophets are not their actual fathers

Knowledge is not an actual possession that can be distributed.

In the same way that the Hadeeth refers to the Ulema as the figurative sons of Prophets and Prophets as their figurative fathers; knowledge is also a figurative possession. The entire Hadeeth is along the line of figurative terms, hence the term Waris can also be understood in a figurative manner - the Ulema attain some of the knowledge possessed by Prophets. The Waris Hadeeth cited by Abu Bakr in Sahih al Bukhari that preceded the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as), did not refer to the inheritance of knowledge but referred to the inheritance of possessions.

The Fadak dispute was in relation to a portion that had been set aside by Allah (swt) for Rasulullah (s). Abu Bakr's response that Prophet's leave no inheritance did not refer to knowledge, hence this proves that the Hadeeth in al Kafi that the Ulema are the Heirs of the Prophets Knowledge is a figurative term, it can not be advanced to prove that the Ahl'ul bayt (as) were prohibited from inheriting the Prophet's worldly possessions.

Reply Two

The Nasibi in many ways destroys his entire argument by posing this brain teaser:

Ansar.org states:

"...Why does this hadith qualify to be used in support of Wilayat al-Faqih, but not for the issue of Fadak?"

The very fact that Ulema have used this Hadeeth to support the concept of State rule and nothing else is proof that the Hadeeth of al Kafi is not addressing the children of the Prophet (s). The Ulema have correctly interpreted the Hadeeth to mean that the Property of Prophethood is only Knowledge (not Dinars and Dirhams) and it is this property that Prophets leave as inheritance for their Ummah (not Dinars and Dirhams). The heirs of this knowledge are Ulema (People with knowledge). The above narration is not talking about the inheritance of a material thing, i.e. a personal property or a land but it's talking about the knowledge of Prophets, which is inherited by the scholars of Islam.

Reply Three

The Hadeeth mentions scholars not family. The tradition is stressing that Prophet's did not come on the earth to horde vast amounts of wealth for the scholars that succeeded them, the only riches they left for the Ulema was their inheritance of knowledge.

The above Hadeeth is clear in its own context that the Prophets did not leave any of their material belongings for the scholars but what they left was knowledge.

"If Muhammad Al-Khider was a great scholar of Islam and I happen to be a student of his, I would inherit from him the knowledge which he has but I would not inherit his material belongings that is where his family comes in."

The laws of inheriting divine knowledge are very different from inheriting Material Possessions. Hence the Hadeeth of Knowledge cannot be used to justify the actions of Abu Bakr against Fatima Al- Zahra (as) because the Material Inheritance is connected to the family and is quite different from the inheritance of knowledge which is not connected to the family alone.

Reply Four

The tradition does not address the personal life and personal properties of Prophets (in which some of them were kings and some of them were poor), but it is dealing with the inheritance of Prophethood (in which all the prophets got knowledge).

Reply Five

When someone is dying it is common for his relatives to keep a check on his material possessions, such as land, business, property etc. What this Hadeeth is stressing is that Prophet's leave something of greater valuable than these tangible assets, what they leave is their manners, teachings, and way of life. When someone wishes to emphasise something of importance they will do so by highlighting / prioritising that matter above all others. The Prophet (s) in this Hadeeth was saying that Prophets should not be measured in terms of their wealth (the way people tend to measure others); they should be measured subject to their permanent legacy [knowledge] that they transfer on to the Ulema.

The tradition is telling adherents to concentrate on their teachings rather than their personal possessions. Let us cite an example:

"A religious scholar has lived a simplistic lifestyle at the local Mosque. He spends his time teaching students about issues such as Islamic Fiqh and writing books. At the time of his death the only savings that he has are £100 in the local bank. If it is commented that the Scholar 'Left no money, rather what left as inheritance was his knowledge that his students have inherited' - This statement does NOT mean that he died penniless, he left something but that was an issue that was only of relevance to the legal heirs, what was of greater importance was his eternal legacy the knowledge that he had conveyed to his students and placed in writing that his faithful students had inherited".

Similarly in this Hadeeth the tradition is stating that monetary inheritance of Prophets is an irrelevant issue, as this is a matter that is only relevant to legal Heirs - the only thing that followers need to know are the teachings that they leave behind that all the Ummah can benefit from with the Ulema at the helm.

Reply Six - Analysing the words in the tradition

1. **"Verily the 'Ulema are the heirs of the Ambiya.** If the tradition is advanced as proof that children do not inherit the Prophet's possessions, then we say that the tradition could also be interpreted to mean that the Ulema do not inherit from their own fathers since they inherit from the Prophets. Is it just to believe that the Ulema are the Heirs of Prophets and their fathers, and yet the Prophet's actual offspring inherit nothing from their fathers' as they are penalised for being the children of Prophets?
2. **That is because the Ambiya do not leave dirhams or dinars as inheritance, but they left knowledge.** If no one inherits the Dirhams / Dinars of Prophets, it does not mean that if a Prophet owns land that carries financial benefits such as money from the sale of produce, the heirs have no right to inherit such land. Sayyida Fatima (as) did not make a claim for Dinar's or Dirham, rather she made a claim for her father's Estate that she was entitled to inherit as his heir.
3. **Therefore whosoever takes knowledge has taken a great portion." - These words do not prove that Prophet's leave behind no material possessions. It is clear that is specifying.** These words also fail to prove that Prophets leave no inheritance, the words are clear that the family of Prophet's from the perspective of being scholars, are inheritors of the knowledge of Prophets, and from the perspective of being their descendants they inherit their material possessions.

Reply Seven

If this Nasibi is suggesting that that Prophets only leave knowledge as inheritance not material possessions we will say that this only refers to what they leave for the Ulema. The tradition is basically informing then Ulema of the inheritance that the Prophet (s) has left for them, Prophetic knowledge. They only the heirs of knowledge not material possessions - yet the Prophet's children inherit knowledge and the worldly possessions of Prophets.

Reply Eight

Material possessions are inherited after someone dies whilst knowledge can be obtained during

one's lifetime; hence a tradition that proves the inheritance of knowledge does not disprove the inheritance of material possessions.

Reply Nine

If the tradition proved that Prophets leave no material possessions then this should have appeared in the Chapter of Inheritance, it does not it appears in the Chapter of Ilm in Usool al-Kafi, and hence further strengthens our argument that the complier Kulayni also understood the Hadeeth to refer specifically to the inheritance of knowledge, nothing else.

Reply Ten

At no point does the Hadeeth state that inheritance left by Prophets is Sadaqah (charity) for the poor people of Ummah (as Abu Bakr claimed). The wording 'What we leave behind is charity' found in Sunni collections is an interpolation.

Ayatollah Khomeini also mentions that in his *Hukumat al-Islamiyah*, chapter 3, saying:

"In certain cases, the phrase: "What we leave behind is charity" has been added to the tradition, but it does not truly belong there. Found only in Sunni versions of the tradition, it has been added for political reasons"

This reference was Ayatullah Khomeini's criticism of Abu Bakr for usurping the land of Fadak from Sayyida Fatima (as) for what he deemed 'political considerations'. Of interest Haq Nawaz Jhangvi of Sipah Sahaba, Pakistan, in his article attacks Ayatullah Khomeini for these comments:

Jhangvi States:

AGAIN DWELLING ON THE LAW OF INHERITANCE STATED IN THE QUR'AN KHOMENI HAS WRITTEN IN HIS BOOK THAT ACCORDING TO QUR'AN HADHRAT FATIMA WAS ENTITLED TO HER SHARE OF INHERITANCE IN THE PROPERTY (FADAK GARDEN) LEFT BY RASUL-ALLAH (SAW) BUT ABU BAKR IN CLEAR VIOLATION OF THE QUR'ANIC INJUNCTION DEPRIVED HER FROM IT AND INSTEAD PRESENTED THE CONCOCTED HADITH MENTIONED ABOVE.

Clearly he could not have held such a position if he believed that Shi'a literature proves that Rasulullah (s) left no inheritance for his daughter! It's quite clear that both Ayatullah Khomeini and Kulayni interpreted this Hadeeth in terms of the role of the Ulema inheriting knowledge and nothing else, it had nothing to do with the inheritance that the Prophet (s) left his daughter. No Shi'a would ever be able to understand a Hadeeth that would in effect render Sayyida Fatima (as) to be a liar, although the Ahl'ul Sunnah have no difficulty with such a notion.

Khomeini's criticism of Abu Bakr's usurpation of criticism serves as the clearest proof that he did not understand the tradition in the fraudulent manner that Al Khider has sought to suggest!

Reply Eleven

Al Khider so as to prove his point has sought to suggest that the opening words in the tradition Verily the 'Ulama are the heirs of the Ambiya' are Kalima Hasr (an exclusive attribute) i.e. the realm of Prophetic inheritance is the exclusive domain of the Ulema. The Nasibi is of course seeking to suggest that the Prophet (s) left nothing save his knowledge that went solely to the Ulema. Unfortunately his attempt to deem this as an exclusive attribute falls apart when we read these two verses:

And so amongst men and crawling creatures and cattle, are they of various colours. Those truly fear Allah, among His Servants, who have knowledge: for Allah is Exalted in Might, Oft-Forgiving.

Al-Qur'an, Surah Fathir, Ayah 28, translated by Yusufali

The actual Arabic of '*who have knowledge*' in this verse is '*Ulema*'. Should we therefore conclude that no one other than the Ulema possess a fear of Allah? Can you only attain this state when you attain the rank of a scholar? The vast bulk of us cannot even think about attaining this esteemed rank, does that mean than none of the millions of Muslims fear Allah, save the Ulema?

The Believers are but a single Brotherhood: So make peace and reconciliation between your two (contending) brothers; and fear Allah, that ye may receive Mercy.

Al-Qur'an, Surah Hujuraath, Ayah 10, translated by Yusufali

If we literally accept this verse as we read it then we have to say that the bond of brotherhood is the exclusive domain of Muslims. Is this really the case? Do the Kuffar not have a close bond of friends that they can call a brotherhood?

If Al Khider is seeking to suggest that Prophetic inheritance takes the shape of knowledge not material possessions, and the Ulema are the sole beneficiaries of this inheritance then we shall say the exclusive attribute in this Hadeeth links solely to what the Ulema can receive from the Prophet (s). The Hadeeth states that if the Ulema attain anything from the Prophet (s) as inheritance it is his knowledge, this is not the case with the family of the Prophet (s) they can inherit both his material possessions and his knowledge.

8.38 Al Khider's dishonest translation of a Shi'a text so as to strengthen his argument

Ansar.org states:

[This] Hadeeth has two chains of narration. The first is majhul [contains an unknown narrator], and the second is hasan or muwaththaq. [Together] they do not fall short of being Sahih. (Mir'at al-'Uqul, vol. 1 p. 111)

Reply

The combined terms hasan or muwaththaq actually infers that the narrator is not a Shi'a and the Nasibi's mistranslation of the term 'la qaysar in al Sahih' as 'they do not fall short of being Sahih' - is befitting from one who shares his traits and ancestry with Mu'awiya. The actually meaning of this term is 'its root is not Sahih' - the term Qasr refers to the root of a tree, i.e. its foundation.

8.39 The usurpation of Khums

The right of Banu Hashim to Khums has been proven from the Qur'an

Allah (swt) says:

Know that whatever of a thing you acquire, a fifth of it is for Allah, for the Messenger, for the near relative, and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarer...
Al-Qur'an, Surah 8, Ayah 41, translated by Yusufali

The Ahle Sunnah have acknowledged that 'Qurba' in this verse refers to Banu Hashim. Suyuti in his commentary of this verse, in Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 1 page 386 stated:

"Rasulullah (s) gave a portion of the acquisitions to his close relatives from Banu Hashim and Banu Muttalib".

Sunni scholars have also acknowledged that the reference to orphans and needy in this verse refers to the orphans and needy from Banu Hashim. As proof we have relied on the following Sunni sources:

1. Tafseer Gharab al Qur'an, Ayat Khums, page 6
2. Tafseer Fathul Qadeer Volume 2 page 295 Ayat Khums

Gharab states:

'Hadhrat 'Ali was asked who is referred to in the context of orphan and needy in this verse? He replied the orphan and needy from Banu Hashim'

8.40 Abu Bakr prohibited giving a portion of Khums to the orphans and needy from Banu Hashim

As proof we are advancing the following Sunni sources:

1. Tafseer Gharab al Qur'an Ayat Khums page 6
2. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani Part 10 under the commentary of the verse of Khums

Both sources record that that:

"Abu Bakr prohibited giving Banu Hashim Khums".

Abu Bakr stopped giving Khums to the orphans and needy of Banu Hashim in violation to the Sunnah of Rasulullah (s), Sayyida Fatima (as) was angered at Abu Bakr's denial of Khums in the same way she was upset at his confiscating the land of Fadak. She made a claim before Abu Bakr as a needy close relative of Rasulullah (s) and Abu Bakr rejected this. We read in Kanz al Ummal, Kitab al Khulafa ma al Imara, Dhikr Abu Bakr Volume 3 page 135:

Sayyida Fatima approached Abu Bakr and asked him about a portion for the needy close relatives. Abu Bakr denied apportioning a share to the needy relatives saying

'I heard the Prophet (s) say that this portion is restricted to my lifetime, not after I die'.

8.41 Umar also prohibited giving Banu Hashim any Khums

As evidence we shall rely on the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Sunan Abu Dawood, Tribute, Spoils, and Rulership (Kitab Al-Kharaj, Wal-Fai' Wal-Imarah) Book 19, Number 2976:
2. Sahih Muslim Bab Ghazwa thal Nisa ma al Rijjal Volume 2 page 104

We read in Sunan Abu Dawood:

Narrated Abdullah ibn Abbas:

Yazid ibn Hurmuz said that when Najdah al-Haruri performed hajj during the rule of Ibn az-Zubayr, he sent someone to Ibn Abbas to ask him about the portion of the relatives (in the fifth). He asked: For whom do you think? Ibn Abbas replied: For the relatives of the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him). The Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) divided it among them. Umar presented it to us but we found it less than our right. We, therefore returned it to him and refused to accept it.

The comments of Allamah Shibli Numani are indeed worthy of note in this regard. He states in his classical work 'al Farooq' Volume 2 page 277:

"It is said of Omar that he did not at all hold the relatives of the Holy Prophet to be entitled to any share in the Fifth and never gave any member of the Prophet's family any share in it. Of the founders of the schools of law, Imam Abu Hanifa too, did not believe that the near of kin had any right to the Fifth".

After this, Numani fails in his passionate defence of his role model's actions, although here is not the place to refute each and every point, what we are seeking to prove is that Umar blatantly changed the Sunnah of Rasulallah (s) in this regards, for we have the admission of Numani in 'al Farooq' Volume 2 page 279:

"1. From among the near of kin, the Holy Prophet used to give shares only to the Hashemite and the Mutlbalalites. Ta Bani Naufal and Bani 'Abd Shams, though they were included in the 'near of kin' he never gave anything, though they demanded it"

If the edicts of the Qur'an are applicable until the Day of Judgement, then how can the share of Rasulallah (s) and his decendants become invalid after him, when this command is still in the Holy Qur'an? This is just a further example of the lengths that the Shaykhayn went to financially cripple the Ahl'ul Bayt (as). The prejudicial manner in which they were treated becomes all the more clear from the next two examples...

8.42 Abu Bakr's favourable treatment of the Sahaba compared to Sayyida Fatima (as)

Hayatus Sahaba by Maulana Mohammad Yousuf Kandlawi is a key modern day piece of work, held in high esteem amongst the Hanafi Sect in Pakistan particularly used by the Tableeghi Jamaath for Dawah purposes. The book provides a detailed backdrop to the lives of the Sahaba, with reliance on the classical Sunni sources. Although we have cited the complete narration from Volume 2 page 51 earlier we shall now analyse this narration from from another angle:

"Ubaida reports 'Aina bin Hasan and Aqra bin Habis approached Hadrat Abu Bakr (rad) and said 'O Caliph of the Messenger of Allah!' There is some fallow land in our area. If you deem it considerable, give us the land so that we can cultivate it to earn our livelihood. He donated it to them and wrote a decree in support thereof...[Al Kanz (Volume 2 page 189)al Isabah (Volume 3 page 55) Al Bukhari (Volume 1 page 59). This Hadith has been mentioned by the above sources with a correct Isnad...]".

Although the narration later on shows that Umar overruled Abu Bakr on the matter, the striking thing from this narration is the preferential treatment that Abu Bakr gave to the Sahaba compared to Sayyida Fatima (as). Like this land, Abu Bakr also deemed Fadak to be land belonging to the Muslims. Abu Bakr justified his confiscation of Fadak on this very basis, arguing that Sayyida Fatima (as) had no claim to the land, upon the death of the Prophet (s) it reverted to the Muslims. If Sayyida Fatima (as) had no right to claim land that (according to Abu Bakr) belonged to the Muslims, why was he willing to donate Muslim land to two Sahaba as a gift? Could he not have adopted the same approach with Sayyida Fatima (as)? Why was she treated differently? This reference clearly proves that Abu Bakr showed prejudicial treatment with regards to the way he treated Sayyida Fatima (as) in the Fadak dispute.

8.43 Umar's favourable treatment of the Kuffar compared to Sayyida Fatima (as)

Allamah Shibli Numani in al Faruq, Volume 2 page 95, whilst discussing the development of the Mosque of Kufa under Umar states:

"In front of the Mosque was built a vast pavilion, two hundred cubits long, which was supported on pillars of marble that were procured from the palaces of the ancient emperors of Iran. One fact should be remembered in this connection. There was no heir to the usages of the estates, the Caliph of Islam was their only rightful heir. But Umar had different ideas about the rights of states, paid the price of those pillars to his Magian subjects: their estimated price was credited to their jizya account, the amount of the latter being reduced accordingly".

 [Al-Farooq, Vol. 2, Page 95](#)

This reference alludes to the fact that the marble pillars were taken from the Iranian Palaces at the time that they were conquered by Muslims, via the sword, and the laws of war dictate that this land belonged to the Muslims as they had conquered it through fighting. The reference also points to the fact as there were no living heirs to these buildings. The justice of Umar came into force and he paid the price of these pillars to the Magians (Zoroastrians) even though they were not the lawful heirs of these buildings. Curiously when it comes to the legal entitlement of Sayyida Fatima, making her claim as a surviving Heir, equipped with the Qur'an and eye witnesses to support her claim to Khums and Fadak, - Khums is withheld and Fadak is snatched from her! Compare Umar's 'just' treatment of the Magians to the treatment he and his predecessor subjected Sayyida Fatima (as) and her descendants to! What wrong did Sayyida Fatima (as) do that led to even Kaafirs being afforded better treatment than her?

9. Sayyida Fatima (as)'s response to the confiscation of Fadak

9.1 The Khutbah of Sayyida Fatima (as)

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work Sharh ibn al Hadeed Volume 4 page 108, printed Beirut:

"When Sayyida Fatima found out that Abu Bakr had an intention to confiscate Fadak, She wrapped a cloth around her head, gathered some women from her tribe and went to Abu Bakr. At that time the Muhajireen and Ansar were summoned, a Pardah was made between Fatima and the Sahaba. The daughter of the Prophet sad in a distressed manner, that lead to the Sahaba crying. She after a break praised Allah, sent Salaam on her father the Prophet and said all things on the earth and sky seeks a Waseela to Allah, the Waseela for the people to reach Allah (swt) are us, and Allah's select people amongst creations are us, and then she introduced herself. I am Fatima the daughter of Rasul and said 'That which was bestowed to me has been taken, O Abu Bakr, if you are the inheritor of your father, and I am not my father's inheritor you adopted a wrong means. Then she said to the Muhajireen and Ansar requesting help, O Bani Queela the inheritance of my father has been annexed from me, before your very eyes. You are listening to my words why are you lax with regards to helping me? Why do you not support my right?"

9.2 Abu Bakr's denial of Khums and Fadak incurred the anger of Sayyida Fatima (as)

1. Sahih al Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 325, Book /of Khums
2. Sahih Muslim Volume 3 page 72, Hukm al Fay
3. Izalathul Khifa Part 2 Volume 3 page 109
4. Sunan al Kabeera Volume 6 page 301 Kitab Fay
5. Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal Volume 1 page 167, Musnad Abi Bakr
6. Kanz al Ummal Volume 3 page 129 , Kitab Khilafath ma al Imara
7. Sunan al Kabeera Volume 6 page 300, Dhikr al Fay
8. Wafa al Wafa Volume 3 page 995 Talib Fatima min Abu Bakr

We read in Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 325:

Narrated 'Ayesha: (mother of the believers) After the death of Allah 's Apostle Fatima the daughter of Allah's Apostle asked Abu Bakr As-Siddiq to give her, her share of inheritance from what Allah's Apostle had left of the Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting) which Allah had given him. Abu Bakr said to her, "Allah's Apostle said, 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)." Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Apostle got angry and stopped speaking to Abu Bakr, and continued assuming that attitude till she died. Fatima remained alive for six months after the death of Allah's Apostle.

We read in Musnad Ibn Hanbal:

Hadhrat Fatima Zahra became angry at Abu Bakr, and continued assuming that attitude till she died, because she claimed her share in the Prophet's Estate of Fadak, and Abu Bakr rejected her claim"

We read in Kanz:

Sayyida Fatima became upset at Abu Bakr as he denied giving her inheritance rights.

Sunan al Kabeera:

"Fatima became angry at Abu Bakr, and never spoke to Abu Bakr until she died"

Wafa al Wafa:

"Abu Bakr denied Fatima her right and she became angry never speaking to Abu Bakr until she died".

9.3 Sayyida Fatima (as) was so angry at Abu Bakr's confiscation that she refused to reply to his Salaams

Ibn Qutaybah in al Imamah wa al Siyasa page 13 records that:

"Hadhrat Umar said to Abu Bakr we have angered Fatima let us go to her and seek her forgiveness. They both went to the house and asked permission to enter. Sayyida Fatima did not grant them this permission. They then went to 'Ali and spoke to him, he allowed them to enter the house. When they sat before Fatima she turned her face away from them, they said Salaams to her but she did not deem them worthy enough to merit a reply".

9.4 Sayyida Fatima (as) said that she would complain about the Shaykhayn before Rasulullah (s) and would curse them in every Salat

Ibn Qutaybah in al Imamah wa al Siyasa page 14 records that:

"Fatima said 'When I meet my father the Prophet (s), then I shall' complain about the both of you (Abu Bakr and Umar), and said to Abu Bakr 'By Allah I shall curse you after every Salat".

 [Al-Imamah wa al-Siyasa, Vol. 1, Page 14](#)

Abu Bakr made every effort to seek forgiveness after that but it was too late. We read in Mudharij'athul Nubuwwa Volume 2 page 758, Dhikr Meeras al Nabi:

"On one extremely hot day Abu Bakr came to the door of Hadhrat Fatima and said 'I shall not leave until Fatima is pleased with me again".

These words serve as proof that the daughter of Rasulullah (s) was displeased with Abu Bakr. Sayyida Fatima (as) still refused to forgive him, since forgiveness is worthless without sincere repentance, neither did he return the usurped land of Fadak, nor did Sayyida (as) forgive him, the option of forgiveness would have only been a possibility had Abu Bakr returned the land. The anger of Fatima (as) towards Abu Bakr never subsided until she died, as is attested by

Mullah Qari in Murqat, Sharh Mishkat al Masabih Volume 3 page 453:

"The most difficult issue to convey to readers is the dispute of Fatima al Zahra. To say that Fatima was ignorant with regards to the Hadeeth cited by Abu Bakr, or that she did not concur with the Hadeeth when hearing it, creates difficulties. After all Abu Bakr recited this Hadeeth, and the testimony of the Sahaba upheld this, why did she not accept it and embrace it. If she was angry before the Hadeeth was recited, then why did she remain angry after it was quoted? The displeasure was so extreme that she remained angry with Abu Bakr, never talking to him".

This serves as the best proof that Sayyida Fatima (as) never changed her position nor forgave Abu Bakr.

9.5 Ibn Katheer's disrespect of Sayyida Fatima (as)

This Nasibi writes in al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 5 page 289

"If Sayyida Fatima became angry then so what, she was an ordinary woman, from the children of Adam, her anger is just like the common children of Adam".

Reply

Not all the children of Adam are the same; some are superior to others as is the case with Sayyida Fatima (as). We read in Tafseer Mazhari Volume 2 page 48, Surah Aal-e-Imran:

"The Hadeeth in Bukhari wherein Rasulullah (s) said Fatima is a part of my body proves that Fatima was superior to the men and women of the world, and Imam Malik said 'I don't know of anyone superior to Fatima az-Zahra".

Comment

Sayyida Fatima (as) is no doubt from the loins of Adam, but her anger and distress is on par with the anger and distress of Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s).

Ayesha was also from the loins of Adam, yet Ahl'ul Sunnah deem her to be the beloved of Rasulullah (s), reflected by the fact the Umar gave her greater stipends than any other woman.

9.6 Sayyida Fatima (as) left a will that Abu Bakr be prevented from attending her funeral

We read in Sharh Ibn al Hadeed Volume 4 page 136 Chapter Khutbah Bayan Fadak:

"Hadhrat Fatima's anger was such that she left a will stipulating that Abu Bakr not attend her funeral prayers"

This is a very painful reference for the followers of Abu Bakr to accept hence his advocates have presented a revised version of events, led by Imam of Sipah-e-Sahaba Haq Nawaz Jhangvi:

Haq Nawaz Jhangvi states:

THERE WAS SUCH A LOVE AND AFFECTION

BETWEEN HADHRAT ABU BAKR (R.A) AND HADHRAT ALI (R.A) THAT THE LATTER GOT THE FUNERAL PRAYER OF HADHRAT FATIMAH (R.A) LED BY HADHRAT ABU BAKR (R.A). HADHRAT ABU BAKR (R.A) ON THIS OCCASION ASKED HADHRATALI (R.A) TO LEAD THE FUNERAL PRAYER HIMSELF BUT WHEN HADHRAT ALI (R.A) INSISTED, HADHRAT ABU BAKR (R.A) ASKED HIM WHETHER HE WILL STAND AS A WITNESS BEFORE ALLAH THAT ABU BAKR LED THE FUNERAL PRAYER OF HADHRAT FATIMAH (R.A), ALI REPLIED IN THE AFFIRMITIVE. THEREUPON HADHRAT ABU BAKR (R.A) SAID: THIS WILL SUFFICE FOR MY SALVATION.

Reply One - Sahih al Bukhari destroys this false claim

The single narration in Sahih al Bukhari makes this claim baseless! We have already cited the fact that (according to Ahl'ul Sunnah's most authentic work) Imam 'Ali (as) led the funeral prayer over her, and did not inform Abu Bakr about it. When a book that the Ahl'ul Sunnah deem most authentic after the Qur'an has this narration then any narrations pleading otherwise has no value!

Reply Two - Maula 'Ali prevented Abu Bakr from participating in the funeral prayer

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's esteemed work Tabari, vol IX p 196 [The Events of the Year 11, English version:

Abu Salih al Dirari- Abd al Razzaq b. Hammam- Mamar- al Zuhri - Urwah- Aishah: Fatimah and al Abbas came to Abu Bakr demanding their [share of] inheritance of the Messenger of God. They were demanding the Messenger of God's land in Fadak and his share of Khaybar [s tribute]. Abu Bakr replied, "I have heard the Messenger of God say: 'Our [i.e the prophet's property] cannot be inherited and whatever we leave behinds is alms [i.e to be given in charity]. The family of Muhammad will eat from it. ' By God, I will not abandon a course which I saw the Messenger of God practicing, but will continue doing it accordingly." Fatimah shunned him and did not speak to him about it until she died. Ali buried her at night and did not permit Abu Bakr to attend [her burial].

The English translator of this edition of Tabari Ismail Poonawalla in the footnote of this narration cites three other Sunni sources wherein these facts can be found.

1. Tabaqat of Ibne Sad, vol VIII p 29,
2. Yaqubi History, vol II p 117,
3. Masudi in his Tanbih, p 250

Rauzathul Ahbaab page 434 states that:

"Upon the death of Fatimah [ra], 'Ali read her Funeral prayers. Some narrations

state that they were read by Ibn Abbas [ra]. The next day Abu Bakr Siddique, Umar ibn al Farooq and other elderly Sahaba issued a complaint to 'Ali that he had not informed them about the funeral, so that they could have been participants. He ['Ali] stated that he had acted in accordance with the wishes of Fatima.

In Wafa al Wafa page 94 the author states that Abu Bakr was aware of the death of Fatima:

"...But he desired that the reasons behind 'Ali hiding the matter be fulfilled".

Reply Three - The Sunni Muhadatheen have themselves discredited narrations wherein Abu Bakr led the funeral prayers of Sayyida Fatima (as)

Ibn Hajr Asqalani one of Ahl'ul Sunnah's greatest Hadeeth scholars wrote in al Isaba Volume 4 page 367, Dhikr Fatima Binte Muhammad:

"The narration wherein Abu Bakr lead the funeral of Fatima has reached us via Shaybi who narrated this from Waqidi, and this narration is Da'eef. Nuqtha and other scholars have narrated this from Jafar bin Muhammad, Dar Qathani graded this narration as Da'eef".

The Founder of Sipah-e-Sahaba also produces this devastating proof that Sayyida Fatima (as) was happy with Abu Bakr, namely:

<p>Haq Nawaz Jhangvi states:</p> <p>IT IS ALSO STATED IN ANOTHER SHIA BOOK (P. 73) THAT DURING THE ILLNESS OF HADHRAT FATIMAH (R.A), ASMA, WIFE OF HADHRAT ABU BAKR USED TO ATTEND HER AND AFTER HER DEATH GAVE HER THE LAST BATH.</p>

This Nasibi is of course suggesting that if Sayyida Fatima (as) was angry at Abu Bakr, then why was his wife a participant in her funeral arrangements?

Reply One

It is not necessary that the character of a husband and wife be the same. Hadhrath Nuh (as) and Hadhrath Lut (as) were bith Prophet's but their wives did not share their beliefs, on the contrary they were enemies of Allah (swt) condemned in the Qur'an. Rasulullah (s), loved Hadhrat 'Ali (as) and Sayyida Fatima (as), whilst Ayesha wife of the Prophet (s) bore enmity towards them. By the same example Asma binte Umays wife of Abu Bakr, loved the Ahl'ul bayt (as), whilst Abu Bakr bore enmity towards them. In the same way that Rasulullah (s) was unable to change the attitude of Ayesha, Abu Bakr was also unable to change the attitude of Asma.

Reply Two - Asma binte Umays physically prevented Ayesha from participating in Sayyida Fatima (as)'s funeral rites and even rejected Abu Bakr's attempts to intercede for her

As evidence we shall rely on the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. al Istiab Volume 4 page 367 Dhikr Fatima binte Muhammad
2. Jadhab al Kaloob al Dayaar al Mehboob page 219, Dhikr Kabar Fatima binte Muhammad
3. Wafa al Wafa ba Khabar Dhar Mustafai Volume 3 page 504
4. Kanz al Ummal Volume 7 page 114 Kitab Fadail min Qasim al Fa'il
5. Tareekh Khamess Volume 1 page 277 Dhikr Fatima bine Rasulullah (s)
6. Asad'ul Ghaba, Volume 7 page 262, The letter 'Fa'
7. Dhakhair al Akba page 53

We read in al Istiab:

"When Sayyida Fatima died, Ayesha arrived with the intention of coming in, but Asma physically prevented her from entering. Ayesha complained to Abu Bakr that 'this woman has prevented me from participating in the funeral rites of the Prophet's daughter' Abu Bakr then came himself and asked 'Asma why do you prevent the wife of the Prophet (s) from, entering?' She replied 'The Lady had personally ordered her exclusion'.

These references prove that Sayyida Fatima (as) was angry at both Abu Bakr and Ayesha, those that Sayyida Fatima (as) are angry at cannot be the most beloved of Rasulullah (s).

9.7 Rasulullah (s) said that you cannot be angry at a Muslim for more than three days

We read in Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 325:

... Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Apostle got angry and stopped speaking to Abu Bakr, and continued assuming that attitude till she died. Fatima remained alive for six months after the death of Allah's Apostle.

The end of this reference makes it clear that Sayyida Fatima (as) finished ALL relations with these individuals, she wanted nothing to do with them, and never spoke to them again while she remained alive. Nasibis often suggest that good cordial relations were resumed soon after the Fadak dispute though one wonders how this could be the case when Ayesha in the Sahih of Bukhari testifies to the fact the Leader of the Women of Paradise NEVER spoke to Abu Bakr again. Sayyida Fatima did not speak to Abu Bakr for the last six months of her life and this is significant since it is also stipulated in Sahih al Bukhari Bab al Adab, Volume 8, Book 73, Number 100:

"Narrated Abu Aiyub Al-Ansari:

Allah's Apostle said, "It is not lawful for a man to desert his brother Muslim for more than three nights. (It is unlawful for them that) when they meet, one of them turns his face away from the other, and the other turns his face from the former, and the better of the two will be the one who greets the other first."

Ibn Hajr Asqalani in Fathul Bari Volume 5 page 571, in his commentary of this Hadeeth said:

"Ibn Barr narrates that there is an ijma'a amongst the scholars, that it is not permissible to stay aloof from a Muslim for more than three days, failure to do so means that one is ignoring the Deen"

Sayyida Fatima (as) certainly did not concur with this ijma'a and one can clearly see the low estimation that she held of Abu Bakr. Such was the anger of Sayyida Fatima (as) with regards to the treatment that was meted out to her, she never spoke to Abu Bakr for the last six months of her life, and when Abu Bakr sought forgiveness (as we cited in al Imama wa al Siyasa) she turned her face away.

Deobandi scholar Ashraf Ali Thanvi in his famed book of Fatawas '*Behishthi Zewaar*' under the Book of Etiquette and Manners, cites a more explicit version of the Hadeeth of separation:

64. Rasûlullâh sallallâhu 'alayhi wa sallam said: "It is not permissible for a Muslim to stop talking with his fellow Muslim for more than three days. The person who stops talking for more than three days and passes away in such a state (i.e. before he can reconcile) will enter jahannam."

 <http://www.alinaam.org.za/bahishti/DEEDS.htm> - **Cached**

We would like to ask the Ahl'ul Sunnah about what their Fatwa is on Sayyida Fatima (as). Was she ignorant of the Hadeeth of her father? Or did she blatantly disregard the word of her father? Her anger at Abu Bakr went far beyond three days, how do you reconcile this with the fact that (according to this Hadeeth) one whose separation through anger of a fellow Muslim exceeds three days shall go to Hell?

9.8 Nasabis have sought to portray Sayyida Fatima (as) as dying the death of Jahilyah [Naudhobillah]

We read in Sahih Muslim Book 020, Number 4555:

It has been narrated on the authority of Abu Huraira that the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) said: One who defected from obedience (to the Amir) and separated from the main body of the Muslims-if he died in that state-would die the death of one belonging to the days of Jahiliyya (i.e. would not die as a Muslim)

We also read in Sahih Muslim Book 020, Number 4562:

.....One who withdraws his band from obedience (to the Amir) will find no argument (in his defence) when he stands before Allah on the Day of Judgment, and one who dies without having bound himself by an oath of allegiance (to an Amir) will die the death of one belonging to the days of Jahillyya.

There is a similar narration in Sahih Muslim Book 020, Number 4560.

This tradition can also be found in the Sunni and Shi'a texts with the words **"one who doesn't recognize the Imam..."**

Sharh Fiqh Akbar, by Mulla Ali Qari, p 175 (publishers Muhammad Saeed and son, Qur'an Muhall, Karachi

The term "Recognize" is used as it is not physically possible for each and every believer on the earth to approach the Imam of his time and give bayah, women are prohibited from doing so. The meaning of bayah is same in both sects. Here bayah is not just formal procedure of putting hand on the hand but it calls for the complete obedience and submission to the Imam and any opposition to the Imam will make all the deeds done by the person void to the extent that s/he will die the death of Jahilyah. Of relevance is this Hadeeth:

...Allah's Apostle said, "There will be three types of people whom Allah will neither speak to them on the Day of Resurrection nor will purify them from sins, and they will have a painful punishment: (2) a man who gives a pledge of allegiance to an

Imam (ruler) and gives it only for worldly benefits, if the Imam gives him what he wants, he abides by his pledge, otherwise he does not fulfill his pledge

Sahih Bukhari 9:319

We have already proven that Sayyida Fatima (as) didn't accept the decision of Abu Bakr (the Imam of her time according to Ahl'ul Sunnah). Not only this, but she died angry with him and Abu Bakr was not allowed to attend her funeral prayers.

Now the Nasabis have two options.

Option One: Fatima (as) died the death of Jahilyah (naudobillah).

Option Two: Fatima (as) didn't consider Abu Bakr the legitimate Imam of that time.

If the answer Option Two, then who was her Imam? And why do Nasabis apply the term '*Deviated Sect*' to those that reject the caliphate of their Rightly Guided Khalifas?

9.9 Nasabis deem Ahl'ul bayt (as) Rafidhis

The Nasabis call Shi`a Rafidhis or rejectors / dissenters because we reject the Khilafath of Abu Bakr & Co. They also misinform their believers that the Shia Sect was founded by Abdullah Ibn Saba. We have already proved that Maula Ali (as) and Fatima (as) were not happy and never accepted the decision of Abu Bakr and not only this, but she died angry with him and insisted that he not be permitted to attend her funeral prayers. Based on these facts,

Were Sayyida Fatima (as) and Maula Ali (as) rafidhis? (They would fall within the definition of rafidhi that Nasabis give)

If they were not Rafidi then the Shi`a are the true followers of Ahl' ul bayt (as) and not Abdullah Ibn Saba.

9.10 Sipaa-e-Sahaba's false claim that Sayyida Fatima (as) recognised Abu Bakr as the legitimate Khalifa

Sipaa-e-Sahaba who have turned lying and misinterpreting Shi'a Islam and History into a fine art advance this very curious argument in their article '*The theory of Imamte*'.

 <http://www.kr-hcy.com/statichtml/files/104294860870304.shtml> - [Cached](#)

Sipah Sahaba Pakistan states:

IT IS REPORTED THAT ON HADHRAT ABU BAKR'S ELECTION TO CALIPHATE, HADHRAT FATIMAH (R.A) ACCOMPANIED BY HER GRAND UNCLE HADHRAT 'ABBAS (R.A) WENT TO SEE HADHRAT ABU BAKR, AND ASKED HIM NOT ONLY TO DISTRIBUTE THE PROPERTY LEFT BY THE HOLY PROPHET AMONG HIS HEIRS, BUT ALSO TO GIVE THE REGION OF FADAK EXCLUSIVELY TO HER ETC. CAN SHE GO WITHOUT THE CONSENT AND EVEN DIRECTION OF HER HUSBAND HADHRAT ALI (R.A.)?

Reply

Sayyida Fatima (as) did indeed take Maula 'Ali (as) before Abu Bakr and we are in no doubt that this was under the consent of her husband. Maula 'Ali (as) had gone with her so as to testify in her favour, and to refute the assertions of Abu Bakr. Abbas went as he was also an Heir to the Prophet's inheritance.

Sipah Sahaba Pakistan states:

WHY DID SHE GO TO HIM, IF NOT BECAUSE SHE AND HER HUSBAND AND HER GRAND UNCLE, ALL RECOGNISED IN HIM A LAWFUL INCUMBENT OF THE CALIPHATE? FOR IF THAT WAS NOT SO SHE HAD TO TELL HADHRAT ABU BAKR TO QUIT THE OFFICE IN FAVOUR OF HER HUSBAND THE SO-CALLED HEIR-PRESUMPTIVE OF THE HOLY PROPHET (SAW).

Reply One

During the Fadak dispute, Abu Bakr's usurpation made him a defendant in the action, which is why she went to this unjust Khaleefa to claim the land back. Let us cite an example:

If you are at work and a colleague takes your watch that was on your table, you will go directly to him because he was the person that took your possession; you won't go to another colleague and dispute over the matter! The act of going there to him, demanding your right is because that person has usurped your property, it cannot be interpreted as you recognising him as your loyal friend.

Had Sayyida Zahra (as) had a dispute with another party she would have never had gone to Abu Bakr to resolve the dispute.

Reply Two

Had Sayyida Fatima (as) chose to remain silent and not issued proceedings before Abu Bakr, then his modern day advocates would have absolved Abu Bakr of all charges that we level against him, on the contrary they would have interpreted her silence as proof that she had acceded to Abu Bakr's decision. Sayyida Fatima (as) went to Abu Bakr to expose his injustice and present two blatant contradictions that this party applied. Upon the deathbed of the Prophet (s) when Rasulullah (s) ordered writing material to be brought to him, Umar replied 'The Qur'an is sufficient for us' - thus suggesting that the Qur'an had greater weight than the word (Sunnah) of the Prophet (s). Just days later during the Fadak dispute, Abu Bakr sought to strike out the claim of Sayyida Fatima (as) by presenting a Hadeeth he attributed to her father. Sayyida Fatima (as) pointed out that her right was established from the Qur'an, but now the Sunnah of the Prophet (s) was advanced to counter her claim. Sayyida Fatima (as) therefore exposed the Saqifite party by proving that they neither adhered to the Qur'an or Sunnah of the Prophet (s). She in effect exposed the activities of this party by pointing out that the same party who said 'The Qur'an was sufficient' ignored the Qur'an when it came to ruling on her inheritance rights! Alhamdulillah Sayyida Fatima (as) lifted the veils on the Shaykhayn's true attitudes!

Reply Three - Demanding rights before an unjust Khaleefa is the Sunnah of Prophets Musa (as) and Yusuf (as)

We read in Surah Taha verse 47, how Allah (swt) ordered Prophets Musa (as) and Harun (as) to appeal directly to Pharaoh, demanding their rights for their people:

"So go ye both to him, and say, 'Verily we are messengers sent by thy Lord: Send forth, therefore, the Children of Israel with us, and afflict them not: with a Sign, indeed, have we come from thy Lord! and peace to all who follow guidance!

Al-Qur'an, Surah Taha, Ayah 47, translated by Yusufali

We read in Surah Yusuf verse 55 that Prophet Yusuf (as) made a direct appeal to the Kaafir King of the time, demanding that he be appointed as treasurer:

(Joseph) said: "Set me over the store-houses of the land: I will indeed guard them, as one that knows (their importance)."

Al-Qur'an, Surah Yusuf, Syah 55, translated by Yusufali

We appeal to justice when Prophet Musa (as) demanded his right before Pharaoh and Yusuf (as) approached a Kaafir King demanding appointment as a treasurer, then does it prove that they recognised these leaders as the rightful Heads of State and gave them bayya? Did these Prophets tell these unjust Leaders to quit office so that they can take over the reigns of power? In the same way that the approach of these Prophets to unjust Khaleefas cannot be advanced as proof of their being lawful incumbents of State Leadership, Sayyida Fatima (as)'s approach to Abu Bakr cannot be produced as evidence that she deemed him to be the lawful incumbent of the Khilafath. If the failure of these two Prophets to tell these unjust Leaders to leave their positions cannot be advanced as proof that they were legitimate rulers, then Sayyida Fatima (as)'s 'failure' to tell Abu Bakr to abdicate his seat in favour of Maula 'Ali (as) cannot be advanced as proof that she deemed his Khilafath to be legitimate either. If Sayyida Fatima (as) said nothing to Abu Bakr at that time, then we will say that her son Imam Hasan (as) in effect echoed her sentiments during Abu Bakr's reign, Suyuti: records that:

"Al Hassan Ibn Ali came to Abu Bakr when he was upon the mimbar of the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, and said 'Come down from my father's seat'. He said 'You have told the truth, it is your father's seat,' and he placed him in his lap and wept'. Ali said 'By Allah this was not from my command'.

History of the Khalifahs who took the right away, by: Al Hafiz Jalaludin Suyuti. English translation by Abdasamad Clark Page 71. Taha Publishers

9.11 A Nasibi's efforts to suggest that the dispute was a 'minor matter'

Fatima remained alive for six months after the death of the Prophet. She held herself aloof from Abu Bakr which shows that her grievance also persisted. Such complaints and misunderstandings are, however, not uncommon among near relations. Often one becomes very touchy about minor matters, particularly if one considers oneself to be right. But the differences between Fatima and Abu Bakr never developed into animosity. Fatima's resentment was marked by a restraint which speaks of her civility and cordiality which were the essential features of her character.

Excerpted from "The Life of Caliph Ali" by Abul Hasan Nadwi

 http://muslim-canada.org/ali_abubakr.html - [Cached](#)

Reply

Consider the facts, property is usurped and the aggrieved party:

- Has her truthfulness challenged by the usurper
- Refuses to speak to the usurper for the rest of her short life
- Curses him in her prayers
- Orders that he not attend her funeral

Would you describe such a reaction as 'a minor matter'? Did Sayyida Fatima deem this as a 'common misunderstanding' or a 'minor matter'? Had one of Nadwi's relatives treated his daughter in such a manner, usurping her legal rights that he left behind, do you think he would have defined the dispute a 'minor matter'? - This Nasibi is so shameless that he calls himself a Sayyid and then beats the drum of the man who usurped his mother's inheritance rights! We ask our readers wouldn't you get 'touchy' if someone usurped your inheritance rights? Would you deem the usurping of your legal right to be a 'minor matter'? Maula 'Ali (as) clearly did not deem this to be a minor matter as we have already proven, he deemed Abu Bakr's usurpation of Fadak as proof that he was a *'liar, treacherous, sinful and dishonest'*.

9.12 Rather than return Fadak to its rightful heirs, Abu Bakr swore at the Ahl'ul Bayt (as)

We read in Sharh Ibn al Hadeed Khutbah page Fadak Volume 4 page 110:

Ahmad bin Abdul Aziz narrates that Sayyida Fatima appeared before the Court of Abu Bakr, and after the ruling on Fadak she gave a sermon wherein she made reference to her family lineage, and highlighted the injustice of the Shaykhayn with an one heart, When the Sermon finished and those present were moved by her words, Abu Bakr got on the pulpit immediately and said 'People what is wrong with you! You raise your ears to everything based on Truth and Falsehood [Ali] is like a fox whose witness is his tail [Fatimah] he wishes to reawaken Fitnah (Khilafat), and seeks the support of women, the majority of whom are fornicators'. Abu Bakr said to the Ansar I have heard and refuted and analysed the words of the stupid.

(Ibn al Hadeed) says I asked this from Abu Jafar Yahya bin Abi Zaid Basree and he said 'Abu Bakr was referring to 'Ali by these words.

We appeal to justice, a man that uses such filthy language against Sayyida Fatima (as), has no right to be referred to as the Khalifa of Rasulullah (s), it is not appropriate for a leader to use such language in his court before an ordinary member of the public and here Abu Bakr sought it fit to attribute such terms to Fatima (as) daughter of the Prophet (s).

We are of course fully aware that some Nasibi will seek to negate this reference by alleging that Ibn al Hadeed was a Shi'a. Those that deem Abu Bakr to be the rightful Khalifa are split into two groups Ashari or the Mutazzalite and Ibn al Hadeed was of the Mutazzalite Sect. Ibn Taymeeya the beloved of the Nasibis infact counted the Mutazzalite as Sunni's. He stated as follows in Minhaj as Sunnah Volume 1 page 89:

"The claim of the Shi'a Ulema that all groups of Ahl'ul Sunnah seek to prove the Khilafat of the first three Khalifas on Qiyas is false, since the Ahl'ul Sunnah are split into numerous sects such as the Mutazzalite, Fiqh Baghdhawiya, Dhareeya, and

individuals such as Dawood, Ibn Hazm and others did not prove their Imamate's by relying on Qiyas"

9.13 Swearing at Hadhrat 'Ali and Sayyida Fatima (as) is on par with swearing at Rasulallah (s)

As evidence we have relied on the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Mustadrak al Hakim, Volume 3 page 121, Bab Manaqib 'Ali
2. Tareekh ul Khulafa page 173 Bab Fadail 'Ali
3. Riyadh al Nadira Volume 3 page 157
4. Kanz al Ummal Volume 6 page 152 Fadail, min Qism al Kaul
5. al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 7 page 355
6. Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v6, p33
7. Ya Nabi al Muwaddah page 48
8. Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 74 Hadeeth Sa min ashra
9. Nur al Absar page 80, Bab Manaqib 'Ali

We read in Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal:

"Whoever curses (or verbally abuses) Ali, he has, in fact, cursed me, and whoever has cursed me, he has cursed Allah, and whoever has cursed Allah, then Allah will throw him into he Hell-fire."

Along this line let us here the testimony of Umm'ul Momineen Salma (ra) in al Mustadrak:

Abdullah bin Manzila narrates I went to Umme Salama and she said 'Someone is cursing the Prophet whilst sitting on his pulpit, before your very eyes. I said 'God forbid' She said 'I heard the Prophet (s) say whoever swears al 'Ali, swears at me'.

Of interest is In Sharh Mishkat Volume 11 page 345, esteemed Hanafi scholar Mullah Ali Qari states:

'Imam Ahmad narrates from the Prophet(s) "Whoever curses Ali, he has, in fact, cursed me, and whoever curses me, has cursed Allah.", this Hadeeth means that cursing Hadhrat 'Ali is Kufr'.

Abu Bakr swore at Sayyida Fatima (as) and Hadhrat 'Ali (as) and also usurped the legal right of these esteemed figures, and these are major sins. What is the point in having a Khalifa that Rasulallah (s) shall not even wish to look at on the Day of Judgement? When Sayyida Zaynab (as) appeared before Yazid as a prisoner in Sham (Syria), even he never subjected her to the type of swear words that Abu Bakr exposed Hadhrat Fatima (as) to.

9.14 One who swears at Hadhrat 'Ali (as) and Sayyida Fatima (as) has failed to pay the 'wage' of Prophethood

Allah (swt) says in Surah ash Shura:

Say: "No reward do I ask of you for this except the love of those near of kin."

Al-Qur'an, Surah 42, Ayah 23, translated by Yusufali

Allah (swt) has made it incumbent upon al Muslims to love the close relatives of Rasulallah (s) and the Sunni scholars are in agreement that the verse refers to loving Imam 'Ali (as), Sayyida Fatima (as) and their children. As evidence we shall cite the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Hilayat al Awliya page 201 Volume 3 the verse of Muwaddat
2. Tafseer Durre Manthur page 7 Volume 5, the verse of Muwaddat
3. Tafseer Kashaf Volume 2 page 239 the verse of Muwaddat
4. Tafseer Kabeer Volume 7 page 309 the verse of Muwaddat
5. Tafseer Mazhari Volume 8 page 320
6. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani Part 25 the verse of Muwaddat page 31
7. Tafseer Gharab al Qur'an Part 25 the verse of Muwaddat page 28
8. Tafseer Fathul Qadeer Volume 4 page 522 the verse of Muwaddat
9. Tafseer Jauhar page 129
10. Tafseer Khazan Volume 6 page 104 the verse of Muwaddat
11. Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 page 172
12. Sawaiq al Muhriqa page 101, Bab al Hadi al Ashr Sadl Awal
13. Ya Nabi al Muwaddah Bab Saneeh wa Salehsoon page 106
14. Ausag al Ghaneen page 104 Bab al Saneeh
15. Usdul Ghaba page 367 Volume 5
16. Kanz al-`ummal page 217 Volume 1

Jalaluddin Suyuti in Tafseer Durre Manthur under the commentary of this verse records the following:

Abdullah Ibne Abbas narrates 'When this verse descended the people asked who are these close relatives whose love had been made compulsory?' Rasulallah said they are 'Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husayn'.

Gharab al Qur'an comments on the verse as follows:

Sad bin Jayr narrates after the descent of this verse Rasulallah (s) was asked 'who are your kinfolk who are these close relatives whose love had been made compulsory?' Rasulallah said they are 'Ali, Fatima, and their sons'. The commentator then added 'Verily there is no doubt that that this verse descended with regards to the Ahl'ul Bayt (as) as a matter of pride and superior rank

Let us now read a further reference from Tafseer Durre Manthur that is also in Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani:

'When Imam 'Ali al-Sajdah bin Hussain (as) was imprisoned in Damascus, a Syrian man expressed his joy in his presence. The Imam (as) asked 'Have you not read the verse of Muwaddat in the Qur'an? He replied 'Yes, does the kinfolk whose love is compulsory refer to you?' He [the Imam] replied 'yes'.

We read in Tafseer Mazhari:

Allah (swt) issued an order to his Prophet (s) to convey the ruling that his Ummah love his Ahl'ul bayt, this refers to Imam 'Ali and the Imams from his children, who are the poles of Wilayath (Mastership), which is why Rasulullah (s) said in praise of 'Ali 'I am the City of Knowledge and 'Ali is its Gate'.

We read in Sawaiqh al Muhriqa:

Abdullah Ibne Abbas narrates 'When this verse descended the people asked who are these close relatives whose love had been made compulsory?' Rasulullah said they are 'Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husayn'. One narrator in this chain was an extremist [Ghali] Shi'a yet this is still true. Hadhrat 'Ali said a verse in Surah Shuara descended in our honour and every believer is required to act upon it, he then recited the verse 'Say: "No reward do I ask of you for this except the love of those near of kin."

Allah (swt) had made love of Sayyida Fatima, Imam 'Ali (as) and their children compulsory in the Holy Qur'an, hence Abu Bakr's swearing at them is a clear breach of this Qur'anic verse and the Sunnah of Muhammad (s). One who breaches the edicts of the Qur'an and Sunnah has no right to occupy the throne of Rasulullah (s).

Let us for arguments sake accept Abu Bakr heard the Prophet (s) say Prophet's leave no inheritance, rather than hurt the feelings of Sayyida Fatima (as) could the Khalifa not have used another option and granted her the land? According to the Ahl'ul Sunnah the Khalifa has the power to do whatever he chooses. As is commented by Egyptian scholar Mahmud Abu Riyya in 'Risalath al Islam' page 518:

"It is permissible for the Khalifa to do whatsoever he chooses"

We had also cited earlier from Hayatus Sahaba Volume 2 page 51 that Abu Bakr used his famed kindness to donate Muslim lands to two Sahaba. So why did Abu Bakr not seek to pay back the wage of Prophethood by granting Fadak to Sayyida Fatima (as)?

9.15 The testimony of Rasulullah (s) that the Sahaba bore hatred in their hearts towards Imam 'Ali (as)

As evidence we shall rely on the following esteemed Sunni sources:

1. Izalathul Khifa Volume 1 page 487
2. Kanz al Ummal Volume 6 page 408 min Qism al Fayl
3. Riyadh al Nadira Volume 3 page 234 Chapter al Salabeh
4. Nur al Absar page 79, Bab Manaqib 'Ali

5. Tareekh Baghdad, Volume 12 page 398, Dhikr Fayz ibn Wasiq
6. Tadhkirat Khawwas al Ummah page 27 Bab Saneeh

We read in Izalathul Khifa:

"Hadhrat 'Ali narrates 'I went out with Rasulallah (s) and saw a beautiful garden and I praised it. Rasulallah (s) said 'A better garden is awaiting for you in Paradise'. Then Hadhrat 'Ali said 'When the route became clear Rasulallah (s) embraced me and began to cry profusely', I asked 'O Prophet of Allah, why this?' He said 'The hearts of the Sahaba bear hatred towards you that shall open up after my death'".

We have proved from an esteemed Sunni source that Rasulallah (s) acknowledged that the hearts of the Sahaba towards his true rightful Khalifa Imam 'Ali (as) were not pure. This hatred shone after the death of Rasulallah (s) the opponents of Imam 'Ali (as) headed by Abu Bakr, Umar and Abu Ubaydah sought it fit to squabble over the Khilafat whilst the funeral arrangements of Rasulallah (s) were being prepared by the other grieving Muslims. Abu Bakr then sought to legitimise his illegal right via public bayya, when Imam 'Ali (as) and his supporters refused to enter into this bayya Abu Bakr sent his Vizier Umar to force bayya, Umar even threatened to burn down Sayyida Fatima (as)'s home in the process [with her family in it].

 [Burning the house of Fatima binte Mohammad\(saww\)](#)

If these actions were not sufficient to prove Abu Bakr's hatred of Hadhrat 'Ali (as) then came the next stage in Abu Bakr's plan, financially crippling Imam 'Ali (as) so that he would be unable to have the financial clout to mount a campaign against Abu Bakr, that came via the usurpation of Fadak justified by concocting a false Hadeeth to maintain such an illegal act. The incorrect ruling on Fadak left Sayyida Fatima (as) so distraught that she would curse Abu Bakr after every Salat. Her will was that Abu Bakr not be present at her funeral as a result of which Imam 'Ali (as) buried her secretly at night. She died in a state of displeasure towards Abu Bakr. Abu Bakr's treatment of Imam 'Ali (as) and Sayyida Fatima (as) compliments the words of Rasulallah (s) that hatred towards Imam 'Ali (as) by the Sahaba would appear after his death, that hatred was lead by Abu Bakr.

10. Relations between Sayyida Fatima (as) and Maula 'Ali (as)

As part of their efforts to mock Ahl'ul bayt (as) so as to defend Abu Bakr, the Nasibi have sought to point out that if Sayyida Fatima (as)'s anger is on par with that of Rasulullah (s) then Shi'a books highlight her anger at 'Ali (as). Their logic is simple if Sayyida Fatima (as)'s has no impact on Imam 'Ali (as)'s esteemed status then the same rationale applies to Abu Bakr. This is a 'powerful' weapon used by the followers of Mu'awiya to silence the Shi'a. We have therefore decided to dedicate this chapter to exposing this falsehood by proving that Maula 'Ali (as) and Sayyida Fatima (as) were the shining examples of the perfect couple, always supporting one another their marital lives were an example for us.

Before we launch into countering such atrocious lies we feel it apt to site the way that Allah (swt) praises this marriage.

We read in Surah Mai'da 055.019 - 22:

**He has let free the two bodies of flowing water, meeting together:
Between them is a Barrier which they do not transgress:
Then which of the favours of your Lord will ye deny?
Out of them come Pearls and Coral:**
Al-Qur'an, Surah 55, Ayah 19 - 22, translated by Yusufali

Comment

The two rivers of chastity and purity are Ali (as) and Fatima (as). The barrier between them is the Holy Prophet (s) and pearl and coral are Hassan (as) and Husayn (as).

This is confirmed by the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 6 page 143
2. Tadhkirathul Khawwas al Ummah page 134
3. Ya Nabi al Muwaddah page 118 Chapter 39

Durre Manthur:

According to Ibn Abbas the two rivers mean 'Ali and Fatima. The barrier means the Holy Prophet and the pearl and coral mean Hasan and Husayn

Ya Nabi al Muwaddah:

The companions and the Imams in exegesis of this verse say that Fatima and Ali are two deep rivers of the secrets of nature, rivers that do not overstep each other and the barrier between them is the Holy Prophet and the pearls and corals extracted from them are Hasan and Husayn.

Deobandi scholar Shah Rafiudeen translated the words as follows:

They do not contravene each other

Allah (swt) has decreed that Ali (as) and Fatima (as) are two rivers of chastity who never transgress each other. Therefore strife between them is impossible or else God forbid the report

of the Qur'an is false. If an incident is found in any book that indicates that strife between the two contradicts the Qur'an and is therefore false.

10.1 Four false incidents cited by the Ahl'ul Sunnah

First Incident

Rehma Baneham has mentioned this incident from the book Bihar al Anwar, Chapter Kifayat al Mashr Volume 10 page 43. In summary it is as follows:

One day the Holy Prophet (PBUH) came out of his house happily. On asking of the companions he said that he had effected reconciliation between Ali and Fatima. A discord had occurred between them on some matter.

Reply One

It is our challenge to the Sunni scholars to look into the actual book and decide. The chain of this tradition reaches Abu Hurraira, who to Shi'as is an unreliable narrator. Thus this tradition is also false (unreliable).

If the question is raised as to why Majlisi would cite a false narration, then we should point out that there is no prohibition in citing traditions from other Sects (beliefs). Allah (swt) has also mentioned the beliefs of Kuffar and Munafiqeen in the Holy Qur'an.

Reply Two

After narrating this particular incident, Allama Majlisi himself rejects other similar traditions. A tradition which has been rejected by its own author is not to be advanced as proof by an opponent in a debate.

Reply Three

Allama Majlisi has on the same page of the book quoted Shaikh Sadooq as saying that '**We have no belief and trust in this tradition**'.

Shaikh Sadooq is a Shi'a narrator of Hadeeth. This tradition therefore becomes null and void. If Rahma Baneham had an ounce of justice he would not have cited this tradition.

Second Incident

Rehma Baneham has copied this from book Ilal Sharai chapter 130. In summary the incident is as follows:

Abu Dharr narrates that he and Jafar Bin Abi Talib migrated to Abyssinia (Habsha). A slave girl was gifted to Jafar. When we returned to Madina, Jafar gave the girl to his brother Ali. One day Fatima saw 'Ali resting his head in the girls lap. She was angered at Ali and complained to her father about him.

Reply One

It is sad to see the intellectual deficiency of this Mullah; he is blaming 'Ali (as) with regard to this incident. As the truth of the whole incident depends on the testimony of Abu Dharr we should highlight the fact that he never migrated to Abyssinia, hence the entire episode has been falsely attributed to Abu Dharr. As proof we shall rely on the following classical Sunni works:

- Al Istiab (chapter Bab Jandab) Volume 1 page 214
- Al Isaba (chapter The latter Dhaal) Volume 4 page 64

Both of the above mentioned texts explicitly state that Hadhrat Abu Dharr came back into his tribe after embracing Islam and stayed there. Then the battles of Badr, Uhud and Khandaq took place after which he migrated to Madina.

The onus is therefore on these Nasibi to prove that Abu Dharr migrated to Abyssinia, no such evidence exists, and the entire event is a lie.

Reply Two

The incident quotes Abu Dharr as saying that he and Jafar bin Abi Talib together came to Madina. Jafar came to Madina after the conquest of Khyber which took place in 7th Hijra whilst Abu Dharr arrived there after the battle of Khandaq which was fought in 5th Hijra. The conclusion arrived at is that Abu Dharr had reached Madina long before Jafar. Abu Dharr never went to Abyssinia nor did he return from there. This serves as further proof that the tradition is a fabrication.

Reply Three

One narration of this incident is Muhammad bin Israel who has been described in books as "**worthless**". This story seems to have been fabricated by him.

If the Ahl'ul Sunnah are happy at citing this fabricated tradition, then allow us to cite a tradition from their most esteemed Sunni work.

We read in Sahih al Bukhari, Volume 2, Book 23, Number 374, on the authority of Anas bin Malik:

We were (in the funeral procession) of one of the daughters of the Prophet and he was sitting by the side of the grave. I saw his eyes shedding tears. He said, "Is there anyone among you who did not have sexual relations with his wife last night?" Abu Talha replied in the affirmative. And so the Prophet told him to get down in the grave. And so he got down in her grave.

In his commentary of this tradition, Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah A'in Umdah thul Qari fi Sharh Sahih al Bukhari, 'Kitab ul Janaiz' Volume 4 page 85 states:

The text means that the night in which Ume Kulthum, the wife of Usman (and Holy Prophet's (saww) daughter according to ahl e Sunnah) was taking her last breaths, Hadhrat Usman was having sexual intercourse with one of his slave girls. The Holy prophet knew of this act of the companion and was angry at him for spending the

night with slave girl rather than tending to his wife. He (s) could not tolerate Usman descending in to the grave of Umme Kalthum at the time of her burial.

We would urge our opponents to ponder over this reference .Our opponents accuse Hadhrat 'Ali (as) of incurring the wrath of Sayyida Fatima (as) and Rasulallah (s) by putting his head in the lap of a slave girl. Our reply is the slave girl with respect to whom he has accused 'Ali (as) never existed in this world. The only witness of his having come from Abyssinia (Abu Dharr) never went to Abyssinia.

Let us assume for arguments sake that the Holy Prophet (s) was angered at Imam 'Ali (as) for his action what should be the verdict on Uthman Ibn al Affan? Can we imagine the amount of hate that Rasulallah (s) would have had towards him who was copulating with a slave girl on the same night that his wife was taking her last breath?

Incident Three

The author of *Rehm al Baneham* cites *ala al Shayr* Chapter 149 as follows:

"A suspicious man approached Sayyida Fatima and said "Don't you know that that 'Ali intends on marrying the daughter of Abu Jahil, she said 'Is this true?' he said "Yes it's true'. Fatima then became upset and took her children to the Prophet (s) and told him about the matter".

Reply One

This narration appears at four different points in *Sahih al Bukhari*, three times in *Sahih Muslim* and can also be located in *Sunan ibn Majah*. When we examine the books of *Rijjal* we learn that the tradition in fact goes back to just one person *Al-Miswar bin Makhrama* and it cannot even be established that he was a *Sahaba*, since at the time of making this narration his age was at maximum eight. Some of the traditions have chains via *Imam Zaynul Abideen (as)*, but even these originate from *Al-Miswar bin Makhrama*. Common sense cannot accept the way that these traditions are narrated. The biggest thing to note is the fact that, not even one tradition discloses the name of this daughter.

Reply Two

This is a blatant lie, Allah (swt) states in *Surah Hujuraath* verse 6:

O ye who believe! If a wicked person comes to you with any news, ascertain the truth...

Al-Qur'an, Surah Hujuraath, Ayah 6, translated by Yusufali

Sayyida Fatima (as) knew the *Qur'an* better than these individuals, a suspicious man is mentioned in the tradition, such a person is a *Fasiq*, hence it was against the status of *Sayyida Fatima (as)* to accept the word of this *Fasiq* without seeking to verify the truth first.

Reply Three

When the conquest of *Makka* occurred in 8th *Hijra* *Abu Jahil's* daughter was in *Makka* she had a bad mouth, for we read in *Ahl'ul Sunnah's* authority work *Tareekh Abu'l Fida* Volume 1 page

165:

"At the time of Zuhr on the day of the conquest of Makka Bilal climbed onto the roof of the Ka'aba and recited the Adhaan, Juwarya binte Abu Jahil said "Allah protected my father Abu Jahil's honour, since he is not present to hear the voice of Bilal"

We appeal to justice; this obscene praises the honour of her Kaafir father. There was no duress on the Imam 'Ali (as) to abandon his four children and marry such a woman.

Reply Four

Our Holy Prophet came to this world to teach equity and justice. The Shari'a which he preached allows every man to have four wives at one time. If Imam Ali (as) intended to marry Abu Jahl's daughter was this marriage permissible (halaal) or prohibited (haram) for him? If it was haram it would have been pointless for Hadhrat 'Ali (as) to express his desire to carry through a prohibited act and if it was halaal, if it was then there it was pointless for the Holy Prophet (s) and Fatima (as) to be angry at Ali carrying out what was a halaal act.

Reply Five

Ilal Sharai mentions this tradition as having been reported by Umro Ibne Abi Maqdam and Ziyad bin Ubaid Ullah. The compilers of traditions have designated Umro as "Da'eef" (weak). Ziyad bin Ubaid Ullah was Mu'awiya governor. He did not live up to the time of Hadhrat Imam Jafar Sadiq (as) and had a bad end like Iblis. Ziyad is the illegitimate child whom Mu'awiya made his brother. He was an open Nasibi. Hence this tradition is unauthentic.

Reply Six

The same book cited by the Nasabi, Ilal Sharai page 145 states:

Muhammad Ibne Ali Bin Husayn the author of this book says that the tradition which narrates strife between 'Ali and Fatima does not be relied upon as no unpleasant incidents occurred between 'Ali (as) and Fatima (as) that required the intervention and reconciliatory skills of Rasulullah (s). 'Ali and Fatima are leaders of all men and women and both are true reflection of the conduct of the holy prophet.

Reply Seven

We read in Kanz al Ummal page 53

Once after a quarrel with Umar, Ibn Abbas said that Ali never changed or modified anything taught by the Holy Prophet nor did he ever act contrary to his (the prophet's) liking.

We also read in Tareekh'ul Khulafa page 179:

"Ibn Abbas said: Allah did not reveal an Ayah beginning 'O you who believe...' but that 'Ali is its Amir and its eminence. Allah reproached the companions of Muhammad in more than one place but he never mentioned Ali but with approval".

Comment

The testimony of Ibn Abbas is clear on the point that Ali (as) never made the Holy Prophet (s) or Allah (swt) angry. Hence the story of Abu Jahl's daughter is a concoction.

Reply Eight

If anything this tradition lifts the veils on the true faces of the "Shaykhayn" It is a normal practice that when a dispute arises between two friends brought about by the scheming of others, those responsible for the clash are brought before these friends at the time of reconciliation. It is mentioned at the end of this narration that the holy prophet summoned Umar and Abu Bakr at the time of reconciliation between 'Ali (as) and Hadhrat Fatima (as). 'Ali (as) said to the Holy prophet that whatever had been reported to Zahra (as) was false and he would never contemplate such a thing. The Prophet (s) replied to him that he knew that 'Ali (as) was correct and that Zahra (as) was also correct.

Clearly the fact that this matter was concluded before Abu Bakr and Umar was because they were responsible for concocting the case of Abu Jahl's daughter to cause strife between Hadhrat 'Ali (as) and Hadhrat Fatima (as). Fatima (as) went to the Holy Prophet (s) pleading that he curtail the activities of these mischief makers. The Holy Prophet summoned them so as to highlight that they would never succeed in disrupting the marital life of his daughter. If Abu Bakr and Umar had not been guilty in this case there would have been no need to call them during the night.

Analysing the event from Sunni sources

All the main Sunni sources narrate this event in different guises, and the Nasibi love quoting it as this gives them the necessary ammunition to prove that Imam 'Ali (as) pained Sayyida Fatima (as) and Rasulullah (s) hence the comments 'Whoever hurts Fatima, hurts me' were directed at him. So let's analyse this event and pose some questions for the followers of Mu'awiya to mull over.

Observation One

Sunan Abu Dawood records the remarkable event as follows, Rasulullah said, "If 'Ali wants to marry the he should divorce my daughter and marry his daughter". We appeal to justice does any father climb onto a pulpit and declare his public opposition to an act that is permitted under the Shari'ah, insisting that his daughter be divorced? When the Ahl'ul Sunnah attribute such an action to Rasulullah (s) [to defame 'Ali (as)] are they not insulting Rasulullah (s) in the process?

Observation Two

These types of issues can be resolved within the confines of ones home. No one wishes to air one's daughter linen in public and make known to the people that marital tensions are taking place within the home. The first step is always to try and resolve things within the family, to in effect prevent the problem from exacerbating. Let us for example accept that this event is true, can the Ahl'ul Sunnah produce a single reference wherein Rasulullah (s) summoned Hadhrat 'Ali (as) to his home, telling him to refrain from this action?

Observation Three

Sahih Muslim Kitab Al-Fada'il Al-Sahabah Book 031, Number 6001 has Miswar bin Makhramah narrating that Rasulullah (s) sought to quell the plan of Maula 'Ali by...

"addressing the people on the pulpit. I was adolecing in those days. He said: Fatima is a part of me and I fear that she may be put to trial in regard to religion. He then made a mention of his son-in law who had been from the tribe of 'Abd Shams and praised his behaviour as a son-in-law and said: Whatever he said to me he told the truth and whatever he promised he fulfilled it for me. I am not going to declare forbidden what is lawful and make lawful what is forbidden, but, by Allah, the daughter of Allah's Messenger and the daughter of the enemy of Allah can never be combined at one place".

Is it not curious that this public humiliation of Maula 'Ali (as) takes place with Rasulullah (s) actually making his opposition known by addressing the people on the pulpit, and yet the only person who seems to have recollection of this event is Miswar bin Makhramah? Were all the other Sahaba deaf? We have already cited the fact that the Sunni Ulema have ruled that *'a tradition that ought to have been known to all and sundry, but has only a single narrator is false, should be rejected without the need to look into narrators'* - this rule clearly applies here.

Observation Four

Sahih Muslim Kitab Al-Fada'il Al-Sahabah Book 031, Number 6001 also attributes these comments to Rasulullah (s):

By Allah, the daughter of Allah's Messenger and the daughter of the enemy of Allah can never be combined at one place'.

The difficulty with this comment is Rasulullah (s) was married to Abu Sufyan's daughter, who was an enemy of Allah (swt). For proofs we shall cite Tareekh Abu'l Fida (Chapter Dhikr Fath Makka) Volume 1 page 143:

Abu Sufyan came to Madina and went to the house of his daughter Ume Habiba who was married to the Holy Prophet. He was about to sit on the Prophet's bed when his daughter rolled it back. He asked her why she disliked his sitting on the prophet's bed. She replied, "this is the Prophet's bed and u are a Mushrik (idol worshipper) and hence impure.

Abu Sufyan is an enemy of Allah and his daughter is in the house of the Prophet (s). If the daughter of the enemy of Allah (swt) cannot remain under the same roof with the daughter of Rasulullah (s), then how would he tolerate Sayyida Fatima (as) living in the same home as Enemy of Allah Abu Sufyan's daughter?

We should also point out that according to Ahl'ul Sunnah Abu Bakr is the beloved of Allah and his daughter Ayesha is also in the house of the Prophet (s). The daughters of the enemy of Allah and the beloved of Allah are both present in the house of the Prophet (s). This makes it evident that all the previous traditions which Ismail Bukhari and Co. narrated are absolutely lies.

Observation Five

The Ahl'ul Sunnah believe that Rasulullah (s) married off his two daughters to the Kaafir sons of Abu Lahab. Why was the anger with regards to marrying only vented against Hadhrat 'Ali (as)?

Why did he not make a declaration that his sons in laws divorce his daughters as their father was an enemy of Allah (swt)?

The fourth incident

Rehma Baneham has presented this incident from Ihtajaj e Tabarsi (on Fadak) page 745.

When Syeda Zahra came back, she complained to Ali (as) about Abu Bakr's treatment in these words: "O Son Of Abu Talib! you are hiding your self as a child is hidden in its mother's womb. You are sitting at home like the one who is not liked by anyone. Abu Bakr Ibne Qahafa is depriving me of the land which was given to me by my father. He has stood openly against me. Mahajreen and Ansar are not helping me. You have weakened yourself since the time you abandoned your sword. I wish i had died before seeing this day"

Similarly Nasibi often love citing this tradition:

Mullah Baqir Majlisi writes: 'Fatima described Ali thus: You are hiding like a malformed foetus in a womb; you have ran home like those who are guilty of being untrustworthy and after having destroyed the strongest men on earth you have been overcome by these wimps.'

Haqqul Yaqqin : 203

The Nasibi are overjoyed when they quote these traditions. Everyone shares his/her feelings with a well-wisher when in despair. When Abu Bakr deprived Syeda Zahra (as) of the land of Fadak, she (as) went to him but he paid no heed to this and refused to return the land. The Prophet (s)'s daughter was greatly aggrieved by this and there was no sympathiser in Madina except Ali (as). Her mother Hadhrat Khadeeja tul Kubra (as) had left her in childhood, the Prophet (s) had also died. She had neither brother nor sister nor any maternal or paternal aunt or uncle and her children were too young. She had no one to look to except Ali (as) her husband. The above mentioned dialogue of Fatima (as) is the tale of her grief and a complaint of Abu Bakr's injustice and maltreatment.

Reply One - Understanding the background to these words

The original Arabic text for in Haq al Yaqeen is as follows:

الزهراء ع على الاحتجاج ج 1 ص 107- احتجاج فاطمة
القوم
ثم انكفات ع و أمير
يتطلع طلوعها عليه المؤمنین ع يتوقع رجوعها إليه و
فلما استقرت بها الدار قالت لأمیر المؤمنین ع یا ابن
اشتملت شملة الجنین و قعدت حجرة أبي طالب
الظنین نقضت قادمة الأجدل فخانك ريش الأعزل..
أمیر المؤمنین ع لا ویل لك بل الویل لشانئك فقال

النبوة ثم نهني عن وجدك يا ابنة الصفة و بقية
 فما ونيت عن ديني و لا أخطأت مقدوري فإن كنت
 كفيلك مأمون و ما تريدن البلغة فرزقك مضمون و
 أعد لك أفضل مما قطع عنك فاحتسبي الله فقالت
 أمسكت حسبي الله و

An important thing must be taken into consideration is the context in which Lady Fatima (as) said what she said and know exactly what she meant.

Abu Bakr has just usurped what rightfully Fadak. Despite all her efforts along with Imam Ali (as) she was unable to reclaim her land. She goes to the Mosque and delivers her famous speech known as the Fadakiah Sermon. Imam Ali (as) is waiting for her at home. He gets worried. She comes back after delivering the sermon and debating with Abu Bakr but the efforts remain fruitless. When she sees Imam Ali (as) she says:

"Oh, Ali Ibn Abi Talib, you have taken the position of a foetus, and sat like a suspected [criminal], after having destroyed the strongest men on earth you have been overcome by these wimps.."

After studying the historical context of these words and having a good idea about the position of Imam Ali (as) and Lady Fatima (as) and their love and respect towards each other, one can conclude that Lady Fatima (as) meant absolutely no disrespect by those comments. She was merely stating the obvious misfortune of Imam Ali (as) and the oppression she and her husband had been subjected to. She is describing the position of Imam Ali (as) as if saying: "Look what they've done to you.."

The tyranny is being committed by Abu Bakr and this Mullah is blaming Ali (as) for this. If 'Ali (as) had not retaliated to this wrong with his sword is this not his patience on his part? The wrong has been committed by Abu Bakr, he was to blame.

Reply Two - Tensions between Nabi Musa (as) and the Angel of Death

We read in Sahih Muslim Book 030, Number 5851, Bab Fadail Musa:

Abu Hurraira reported that the Angel of Death was sent to Moses (peace be upon him) to inform of his Lord's summons. When he came, he (Moses) boxed him and his eye was knocked out. He (the Angel of Death) came back to the Lord and said: You sent me to a servant who did not want to die. Allah restored his eye to its proper place (and revived his eyesight), and then said: Go back to him and tell him that if he wants life he must place his hand on the back of an ox, and he would be granted as many years of life as the number of hair covered by his hand. He (Moses) said: My Lord what would happen then He said: Then you must court death. He said: Let it be now. And he supplicated Allah to bring him close to the sacred land. Thereupon Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said: If I were there, I would have shown you his grave beside the road at the red mound.

This has also been reported in Sahih al Bukhari Book 23 Volume 2, Book 23, Number 423, Book of Funerals:

Comment

This tradition has been narrated by Abu Hurraira and places the Ahl'ul Sunnah in a dilemma. This is because both Hadhrat Musa (as) and the Angel of Death are infallible and here we see one infallible slapping the other so hard that the other loses his eye.

Esteemed Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Nawawi in his Sharh Muslim, Bab Fadail Musa page 267 said:

"it is possible that Allah allowed Musa to slap Hadhrat Izrael (the angel of death) and perhaps this was a test for Izrael. Allah tests His creation the way he likes".

We deem Hadhrat 'Ali (as) and Hadhrat Fatima (as) to be Masum. When Fatima (as) was deprived of the land of Fadak she (according to the Ahl'ul Sunnah) addressed 'Ali (as) in anger. Now we say IF there is any element of anger in the words of Fatima (as), she might have been given permission of such an address (just as Musa was allowed to slap the angel). And 'Ali (as) was to be tested in his patience by listening to the angry discourse of Fatima (as) (just as the angel was to be tested in patience by Musa (as)'s slap). In the same way that the dignity and honour of Musa and Israel remain intact after this encounter, so does the dignity and honour of 'Ali (as) and Fatima (as) after this discussion. As far as Abu Bakr is concerned, he is not a Masum even in the eyes of Ahl' ul Sunnah. So when Sayyida Fatima (as) was angry at him, it is evident that Abu Bakr was in the wrong. We need no explanation to clarify him.

Reply Three - The incident of Musa (as) and Khider (as)

We read in Surah Kahf verse 71:

So they twain set out till, when they were in the ship, he made a hole therein. (Moses) said: Hast thou made a hole therein to drown the folk thereof? Thou verily hast done a dreadful thing.

Al-Qur'an, Surah Kahf, Ayah 71, translated by Pickthal

Let us see how the classical Sunni Ulema have translated the words 'Imr'

1. **"You are doing a dreadful act"**
Tafseer khazan Volume 4 page 182
2. **"Musa said have u killed an innocent person who had killed none? verily u have committed a thing Nukr 'MUNKAR' act [prohibited, evil, dreadful thing]"**
Tafseer by Ashraf Ali Thanvi
3. **(Verily, you have committed a evil thing.) About `Imr', Mujahid said: "An evil thing." Qatadah said, "An astounding thing." At this point, reminding him of the previously-agreed condition, Al-Khidr said.**

<http://www.Tafseer.com/default.asp?sid=18&tid=30635>

Fakhrudeen Radhi defined Nukr as:

"worse (more evil) and this is a reference to the killing of the child which is worse than piercing the boat because the boat can be repaired"

Comment

Both Musa (as) and Khidr (as) are Masum Prophets. One Masum is addressing the other in anger. Since there is always some wisdom in the words and actions of a Masum, a Muslim after reading these verses does not question them and Musa (as)'s harsh words do not undermine the dignity of the two prophets.

Similarly 'Ali (as) and Fatima (as) are Masum whose their entire life remained within the limits of chastity. The words of Fatima as mentioned in Ihtajaj have some wisdom just as the words of Musa (as) carry logic. Now remains Abu Bakr. As he is not considered a Masum even by Ahl'ul Sunnah it is quite clear that when Fatima (as) was angry at him regarding the land of Fadak the fault lay with him and this needs no explanation.

Reply Four - The quarrel between two angels

We read in Sura Sa'd (Ayat 22):

"When they entered in upon Dawood (David), he was terrified of them. They said," 'fear not! We are two litigants one of whom has wronged the other, therefore judge between us with truth and treat us not with injustice and guide us to the right way'"

Al-Qur'an, Surah Sa'd, Ayah 22, translated by Yusufali

In 1927 Sunni publishers in Delhi, combined the Tafseer's of two Sunni scholars, Shah Rafiudeen and Ashraf 'Ali Thanvi.

In the marginal notes of page 640 we read:

"some translators narrate a story here the major part of which has its origin in Judaism. However there is no tradition of the holy prophet which makes it obligatory for us to believe in it. Therefore it is recommended to confine oneself to mere recitation of this incident with the belief that only Allah knows of its wisdom as we know that the holy Qur'an and all its topics are truth"

The holy Qur'an has testified to the fact that the 2 angels came to Hadhrat Dawood (as) after a quarrel. This raises a question as to how Angels quarrel when they are Masum. The Ahl' ul Sunnah have resolved this problem by declaring that since the Qur'an is the truth as is everything contained within it we should suffice to mere reading of these verses and do not say anything undermining the dignity of prophet Dawood and two angels. By the same token, Sayyida Zahra (as) and Ali (as) are Masum and their piety is certain. If the Ahl'ul Sunnah fail to understand any words spoken by any one of them they should suffice to mere reading of these words and not say anything against their honour just as they have abstained from saying anything against the honour of Dawood (as) and the two angels. As far as Abu Bakr is concerned, no Qur'anic verse or prophetic tradition testifies to his piety and purity. He is neither an Imam / Prophet, Angel nor Saint. So when he deprived Fatima (as) of the land of Fadak, he was in the wrong. Since he is not a Masum we do not need any reason to justify his act.

Reply Five - Tensions between Nabi Musa (as) and Nabi Haroon (as)

We read in Surah Araf 007.150

And when Moses returned unto his people, angry and grieved, he said: Evil is that (course) which ye took after I had left you. Would ye hasten on the judgment of your Lord? And he cast down the tablets, and he seized his brother by the head,

dragging him toward him. He said: Son of my mother! Lo! the folk did judge me weak and almost killed me. Oh, make not mine enemies to triumph over me and place me not among the evil-doers.

Al-Qur'an, Surah Araf, Ayah 150, translated by Yusufali

Comment

Both Musa (as) and Haroon (as) are prophets but what they are presenting here is not worthy of Masumeen. If we find an Ayat or tradition / literal meaning that undermines the honour of a Masum, we resort to its explanation and even if the explanation is incomprehensible, we suffice it to mere recitation. The innocence of 'Ali (as) and Fatima (as) is certain as that of the Prophets. If we find words of either of them the literal meaning of which is against their dignity, we will likewise resort to their explanation and if the explanation is incomprehensible, we will confine ourselves to mere reading of these words. And since Abu Bakr is not a Masum, we presume that when Fatima (as) showed her displeasure at him, he was guilty and there is no need to change the apparent meaning of words for his sake.

Reply Six - The words of Hadhrat Maryam (as)

We read in Surah Maryam verse 23:

And the pains of childbirth drove her to the trunk of a palm-tree: She cried (in her anguish): "Ah! would that I had died before this! would that I had been a thing forgotten and out of sight!"

Al-Qur'an, Surah Maryam, Ayah 23, translated by Yusufali

We read in Tafseer Kabeer Volume 5 page 522, Surah Maryam:

"Maryam had also used the words at the time of Isa's birth that she wished she was dead"

The question arises as to why Hadhrat Maryam (as) used these words? In reply to this, Imam Radhi says:

...that pious people utter such words when facing a hardship.

Comment

When Abu Bakr denied the prophet's daughter her rights in the Fadak dispute he caused immense pain to her. Fatima (as)'s words expressing her wish to have been dead before being through this distress connote her anger at Abu Bakr. At the same time it is a complaint which she made to her kind husband 'Ali (as) about Abu Bakr.

Contemplate the shrewdness and wickedness of this Mullah who is shifting son from Abu Bakr to 'Ali (as). Alhamdulillah we have shaken the very foundation of this fake research and the edifice of this false research and propaganda has been shattered into pieces.

Anyone who shows disrespect to Ahl'ul Bayt (as) and says anything to dishonour them is not a Sunni but he is a Nasibi and a Khariji.

10.2 The blasphemy of Mullah Muradabadi

In Naseeth ai Shi'a (page 439) Muradabadi states having cited the above tradition:

"these words of Fatima imply harshness of her tone and this bitterness was not removed till end and their living together after this was for the sake of married life and her illness".

Reply One

The marriage of Maula 'Ali (as) and Sayyida Fatima (as) was via the Wahy of Allah (swt)

As evidence we shall cite the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Tabaqat Ibn Sa'd Volume 8 page 19 (chapter Dhikr Fatima)
2. Riyadh al Nadira(chapter Dhikr Tazweej ai Fatima) Volume page 188
3. Sharh Fiqh Akbar(chapter Dhikr Aulad e Rasul)page 190
4. Dhukhair al Aqba page 30 [printed in Cairo]

We read in Tabaqat:

"Abu Bakr asked the Holy Prophet for Fatima's hand in marriage. The prophet replied that he was waiting for Allah's command regarding Fatima's marriage"

Riyadh al Nadira:

"Afsar bin Malik narrates that he was with the Holy Prophet (s) when there he received a revelation. The Prophet (s) said that Jibrael has brought Allah's command that I marry Fatima to Ali Ibne Abi Talib"

Sharh Fiqh Akbar:

"The marriage of Sayyida Zahra with 'Ali took place in 3rd Hijra and this was by the command and Wahy (revelation) of Allah"

Dr Tahir al Qadri in 'Al Durr'athul Baydh fee Manaqib Fatima al Zahra (as)' page 77 records this Hadeeth:

"Hadrath Abdullah ibn Masud narrates that the Prophet (s) said 'Allah has ordered me to marry Fatima to 'Ali'".

 [Al Duratul Baydha fee Manaqib Fatima al Zahra \(as\), Page 77](#)

Qadri copied this narration from the following esteemed Sunni works.

1. al Muhajjim al Kabeer by Tabrani Volume 1 page 154
2. al Muhajjim al Kabeer by Tabrani Volume 22 page 407
3. Majmaa al Zawaad Volume 9 page page 204 the author Yashmi said the chain is Thiqah
4. Al Kashaf al Haseeyath Volume 1 page 174
5. Kanz al Ummal traditions 32979-32891

6. Kanz al Ummal Volume 13 Hadeeth 682
7. Tadkhirathul Khawwas page 276, narrated from Buraidha
8. Al Bayan al Tahreef Volume 1 page 174, who took this narration from Ibn Asakir and Khatteb Baghdadi
9. Fayz al Qadeer Volume 2 page 215

Comment

The above references are sufficient proof of the fact that Fatima (as) was married to 'Ali (as) by the command of Allah (swt). Thus it is impossible that any action of 'Ali (as) caused her grief. Otherwise questions would be raised on Allah's decision that he married his beloved prophet's daughter to a person who caused her sorrow.

Two marriages have been arranged by Allah (swt):

- A) Adam (as) and Hawa (as)
- B) 'Ali (as) and Fatima (as)

Discord never took place between either couple. Their pious lives are an example for the Ummah.

The Ahl'ul Sunnah has come up with all manner of lame excuse to defend Abu Bakr. When it dawned on them that they would lose in every case, they came up with an accusation which not even Mu'awiya (the greatest enemy of Ali (as)) could think of. They asserted that 'Ali (as) angered Sayyida Fatima (as) and presented the words from Intijaje al-Tabrasi as proof:

"O son of Abu Talib! You are hiding yourself as a child is hidden in his mother's womb. You are sitting at home as one who is not liked by anyone"

In no way do these sentences indicate that Ali (as) had grieved or angered Fatima (as). Some times we hear words in one's address, which are not meant to be taken in their real sense. In the above mentioned dialogue Fatima (as) did not intend the literal or apparent meaning of her words. Infact she returned from the mosque in a state of extreme anger over Abu Bakr and related her sorrow and displeasure to her kind husband.

11. The Shi'a position on Abu Bakr

11.1 Abu Bakr's admission of his mistakes on his death bed

As proof we shall cite:

1. Tareekh Tabari Volume 2 page 24
2. Kanz al Khitab al Khilafath ma al Maar Volume 3 page 135
3. Al Imama wa al Siyasa Volume 1 page 18, Dhikr Wafaath Abu Bakr
4. Murujh al Dhahab Volume 2 page 308 Dhikr Khilafath Abu Bakr
5. Iqd al Fareed, Dhikr Wafaath Abu Bakr Volume 2 page 208

We read in Tabari:

Abu Bakr said 'I did three things that I now regret, they are:

1. **That I failed to show respect towards the house of Fatima**
2. **I did not burn Fajaf Salmah**
3. **At Saqifa I transferred Khilafath to Abu Ubaydah or Umar**

There are three things that I wish I had done:

1. **When Asheesh bin Qays was brought before me as prisoner I should have had him killed**
2. **When I sent Khalid bin Waleed to the Land of the Kuffar I should have turned him in the direction of Zay Qasa**
3. **When sending Khalid to Syria I should have sent Umar to Iraq**

I regret that I did not get clarification from Rasulullah (s) on three matters:

1. **Whether the Ansar had a share in the Khilafath**
2. **Who would succeed him (s) as Khalifa**
3. **The inheritance of an aunt and nephew**

 [Tareekh al-Tabari, Vol. 2, Page 619](#)

These five esteemed Sunni scholars noted Abu Bakr's admission of his mistakes, so why do his modern day champions go mad when we accuse Abu Bakr of making a mistake on the Fadak issue? This is of course unpalatable for the followers of Abu Bakr, and their modern day advocate Al Khider tries his best to muddy the waters and present both parties as correct...

11.2 Al Khider's efforts to water the entire dispute down to a mere 'difference' of opinion, founded on proof

We would ask that our readers think about these opening comments of Al Khider. As yourselves, are they Logical or Illogical?

Ansar.org states:

"The difference between the Khaleefah Abu Bakr and Sayyidah Fatimah was an acceptable difference in which either side had an opinion founded on proof."

Reply

How can the opinion of both be founded on proof when there was a total contradiction between the two? The only conceivable fact is that ones opinion was based upon proof and ones opinion upon conjecture for the simple reason being that if something is based upon proof it is an evidence and confirmation of truth and truth does not contradict another truth, hence, the logic is ludicrous.

No man with a rational mind can accept the fact that both Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Fatima (as) were right in their claims, for the following reasons:

Imam Ali said: **"When there are two differing calls, then one is towards misguidance"**

- If Hadhrat Fatima (as) was wrong in claiming her right, then why did she become ANGRY with Abu Bakr, and did not forgive him till she died? ·
- Were not six months long enough to inquire about the Hadeeth ("We Prophets do not leave inheritance...") whether if it was genuine or not? **Could a sane person really imagine that Hadhrat Fatima's anger was based on assumption for the whole period of 6 months?**
- Had Hadhrat Fatima (as) been unaware of the Hadeeth quoted by Abu Bakr, then surely there were still many companions living, to be approached and questioned about the matter, but guess what? Abu Bakr was the only person who knew about it, hence she passed away while being angry with Abu Bakr.
- Was not Imam Ali (as), who was very well versed with the teachings of the Holy Qur'an, there to inform his wife, Hadhrat Fatima, that what Abu Bakr claims is authentic and not to dispute with him? Nay! The results were opposite! Imam Ali (as) himself went to Abu Bakr with the same claim. ·... Omar said: **"You have come to me with the same claim"...** **"You said Abu Bakr was so and so..."** (Sahih Bukhari Hadeeth: 5.367) Why did Imam Ali (as) and Hadhrat Abbas, go to Omar with the same claim, when Abu Bakr must have given them the same answer? And what does this sentence apply: "You said Abu Bakr was so and so" Does Omar mean to say that Imam Ali (as) and Hadhrat Abbas disbelieved in his words? Certainly they did! **Otherwise why would they go to the next Caliph for the same claim?**

11.3 Al Khider's failed efforts to explain away the dispute as a mere difference amongst Mujtahids

Al Khider then seeks to compare the dispute those that arise between Mujtahids:

Ansar.org states:

While setting out an example of two of the Maraji' of the Shi'ah, he say: "... The position of both disputants would then be viewed with equal respect and appreciation, in consideration of the fact that both persons base their claims upon textual evidence and proof, albeit that one of the two opinions would ultimately take precedence over the other."

Reply

Comparing the above example with the case of Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Fatima (as) is like comparing apples to oranges because:

- The Maraja's of the Shi'a wouldn't contradict one another when the Qur'an is clear on a certain matter; however Abu Bakr was refuted by Hadhrat Fatima (as) with many ayahs of the Holy Qur'an which he went clearly against.
- If the Shi'a Maraja's both base their claims upon textual evidences and proofs then there will not be a dispute between the two because their claims will be based upon the interpretation of the Imams of Ahl Al bayt and the Imams of Ahl Al bayt do not contradict one another like the 4 Imams of the Ahl Al Sunnah do.
- When there is no clear textual evidence from the Qur'an and Hadeeths that's when ijtihaad comes in. It's very rare that the Shi'a Maraja differ in their Fatwas nor do they totally oppose one another. The case of Fadak was not a case of Ijtihad because the laws for Inheritance and gifts are clearly mentioned in the Qur'an and Hadiths, hence again his reasoning is *unacceptable*.

11.4 Al Khider's suggestion that the Shi'a Judge Abu Bakr according to sentiment rather than fact

Having tried his best to water the matter down, Al Khider then seeks to whip up hatred towards the Shi'a. We would ask those with open minds to mull over these words are they Fair or Dishonest?

Ansar.org states:

However, when it comes to Abu Bakr and Fatimah there is a complete change of attitude. To the Shi'ah Abu Bakr is the enemy, and for as long as he be the enemy he will be considered evil incarnate, and error is inseparable from any of his judgements. Thus it is that sentiments

have become the standard by which matters such as this are judged"

Reply

Does this Nasibi know what sentiment means? Sentiment could mean emotion, feeling, view, etc, but it is true that we judge by emotions? As we have already demonstrated, there are many verses of the Holy Qur'an used by the Shi'a, as evidence which go against the character of Abu Bakr, let alone the anger of Hadhrat Fatima (as). Then how can he say that sentiments have become the standard by which matters as this are judged? Let us now analyse this difference of opinion, a difference that involved the confiscation of land, the denial of inheritance, and a position so severe that that claimant never spoke to the 'Mujtahid' again. All these defences have no bearing on reality. The bottom line is this:

- Rasulullah (s) gave Fadak to Sayyida Fatima (as) during her lifetime
- Abu Bakr unlawfully usurped her land as he deemed it to be the property of the Prophet (s)
- Sayyida Fatima (as) then claimed that as Executor of her father's Estate
- Abu Bakr rejected her claim by concocting a tradition that contradicted the Qur'an and logic.
- Abu Bakr dismissed the witness testimony of Sayyida Fatima (as), her husband, their sons, Umm Ayman and Rabah
- Sayyida Fatima (as) was so outraged she never spoke to him again, and ordered that he not attend her funeral.

This is the reality so let us see how Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s) judge such a person:

11.5 Allah (swt)'s verdict on those that usurp inheritance

We read in Sahih Muslim The Book of Transactions (Kitab Al-Buyu`) - *'It is forbidden to seize land and other things without legitimate right'*.

Book 010, Number 3920:

Sa'id b. Zaid b. 'Amr b. Nufail (Allah be pleased with them) reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: He who wrongly took a span of land, Allah shall make him carry around his neck seven earths.

We read in Sunan Tirmidhi Hadeeth 3078:

Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) said, "If anyone deprives an heir of his inheritance, Allah will deprive him of his inheritance in Paradise on the Day of Resurrection."

Ibn Majah transmitted it, and Bayhaqi transmitted it in Shu'ab al-Iman on the authority of Abu Hurrayra.

We read in Surah al Fajr verse 19:

And ye devour inheritance all with greed.

Al-Qur'an, Surah al-Fajr, Ayah 19, translated by Yusufali

The verse condemns those that take advantage of other people's inheritance. No one, not even the Sahaba are exempt from this verse. If the Nasabi defense mechanism kicks in, namely that this verse was Madani and that people were unaware of rules on inheritance at the time, then such advocates should know that these rulings date back to Arbrahamic Laws. As is proven from Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani Part 30 page 127:

"Underage Arab children and women could not inherit from their parents. The people would usurp their share until the Shari'ah of Ibrahim and Ismail made it clear that women and children were heirs to inheritance"

This shall suffice to refute the excuse that the Surah is Makkan whilst the verse is Madani.

11.6 Rasulallah (s) told Abu Dharr that his Fai property would be usurped after him

As evidence we shall rely on the following esteemed Sunni sources:

1. Murqat Sharh Mishqat, Kitab al Imara page 5 and in the Chapter al Qadha al Fasl al Shay Volume 5 page 224
2. Kanz al Ummal Volume 4 page 50

"Abu Dharr narrates that Rasulallah (s) asked me 'What will you do when the Imams after me shall take this property of Fai as their own? Abu Dharr said 'I swear by He who made you a Prophet, I shall raise my sword and declare war until I take it back'. Rasulallah (s) said .I shall give you a better option, be patient until you meet me'.

 [Mishkat al-Masabih, Page 322](#)

Ahl'ul Sunnah do not deny the truthfulness of Abu Dharr, he died in 32 Hijri during the reign of Uthman - he passed through the reigns of three Khalifas, Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman, and Rasulallah asked *'What will you do when the Imams after me shall take this property of Fai as their own?'*

If Rasulallah (s) was referring to the Imams that followed the death of Abu Dharr then it would be meaningless, since Rasulallah (s) issued instructions as to how to respond when witnessing this usurpation during his life time. So which Imams was Rasulallah (s) referring to? It was the same Imam who on the basis of a concocted Hadeeth 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)', justified the usurpation of the property of Fai from Sayyida Fatima (as) and this will be addressed on the Day of Judgement, which is why Rasulallah (s) told Abu Dharr to remain patient and not fight.

If Nasabi point out that Abu Bakr had sought forgiveness from Sayyida Fatima (as) then we will say that this was nothing more than a political gesture, if he was really sincere then he should have returned the land that he had usurped from Sayyida Fatima (as) he failed to do so, and will therefore be answerable before Allah (swt) about this in the next world when all injustices perpetuated shall be heard and perpetrators punished accordingly. The modern day Champion of the Salafi movement Abu Ameenah Bilal Philips sets out the conditions for repentance, in his 'Tafseer Soorah al Hujuraat' page 97-98:

"If the crime involved the rights of others, the fourth condition requires that the repentant rectify the situation by receiving the punishment or seeking forgiveness of others if slander was involved and returning stolen goods if property was involved [Muhammad as Siddeeqee, Daleel al Faaliheen (Egypt: al Halabee Press, 1971) volume 1 pp 78-80]. If the property has been usurped or damaged the repentant should use his or her own resources to replace it. This remains as a debt on the sinner until such time as it is paid in full or its owner releases him or her from the obligation. The Prophet (s) taught that Allaah does not pardon sins involving the rights of other humans. If these rights are not pardoned by their owners in this life, they may be demanded during the Final Judgement and paid in the form of righteous deeds subtracted from the scales of the sinner. The Prophet (s) once asked his companions if they knew who a truly bankrupt person was and they replied it was one who did not have any dirhams nor deenars. He then informed them that it was one who came before Allaah with his good deeds on the day of judgement, after having cursed and hit people and stolen their property in this life. Those whom he had abused would demand their rights, and good deeds would be taken from his scale to fulfil their rights until his good deeds run out. Then bad deeds would be taken from their scales and put on his scales until all of their rights were paid back in full. Following that he would be thrown into the Hellfire. [Sahih Muslim (Eng tr) Volume 4 page 1441 Hadith number 6655].

 [Tafseer Soorah al Hujuraat, Page 97-98](#)

11.7 Abu Bakr failed to meet the desire of Sayyida Fatima (as)

Sunni scholar Dr Tahir ul Qadri in his book on the virtues of Sayyida Fatima (as) '*Al Durr'athul Baydha fee Manaqib Fatima al Zahra (as)*' page 56 records this Hadeeth.

Miswar narrates that Rasulullah (s) said 'Verily Fatima is my ... I desire whatever she desires, and whatever pains her, pains me'

Qadri narrated this tradition from the following esteemed Sunni works:

 [Al Duratul Baydha fi Manaqib Fatima al-Zahra \(as\), Page 56](#)

1. al Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 page 168
2. Musnad Ahman ibn Hanbal Volume 4 page 332
3. Fadail as Sahaba by Ibn Hanbal Volume 2 page 765
4. Al Had wa'l Mushaaneer by Shaybaaneer Volume 5 page 362
5. Muhimm al Kabeer by Tabrani Volume 20 page 28
6. Muhimm al Zawaad Volume 9 page 203
7. Hilayathul Awliyaa by Abu Naeem Volume 3 page 206
8. Seera al Alam al Nada bu Dhahabi Volume 2 page 132
9. Fathul Baree bu Ibn Hajr Asqalani Volume 9 page 329
10. Tafseer ibn Katheer Volume 3 page 257

On the next page (57-58) Qadri records this narration recorded by Sakhawi in *Ishtajlab ir-Taqaa al-Gharf Bahib Aqrabaa ar-Rasool Wadhawi ash-Sharaf*, pages 96-97:

Sad bin Abi Qurshee narrates that Hadhrath Abdullah bin Hasan bin Hasan bin Ali

bin Abi Talib who had not yet attained puberty approached Umar bin Abdul Aziz in relation to a matter. Umar suspended his gathering heard the matter and fulfilled his need. He then squeezed his stomach in such a manner that he began to feel pain, with that he said to him 'Remember this on the Day of Judgement at the time of intercession'. When he left the people asked why he dedicated such time to this child. He replied 'I heard a Hadeeth from a Thiqah narrator who said 'I heard the Prophet (s) sayd 'Fatima is a part of my body I desire whatever she desires'.

He then said 'If Fatima was here then this would have been what she desired, in the way that I had treated her son. They then asked 'Why did you embrace him in such a manner and say what you did?'. Umar bin Abdul Aziz replied 'There is not even one person amongst the Banu Hashim who hasn't been given the rights of intercession, I desire to attain intercession through this boy.

 [Al Duratul Baydha fi Manaqib Fatima al-Zahra \(sa\), Page 57](#)

It is indeed unfortunate that whilst a later Khaleefa who the Sunnis grade as on par with the Rightly Guided Khalifa's afforded Sayyid's respect because he felt that this is what Sayyida Fatima (as) and would comply with the Hadeeth of the Prophet (s) the first Khaleefa has a complete disregard to this Hadeeth, and in fact passes a judgement that opposes her desire!

11.8 The verdict on those that displease Sayyida Fatima (as)

We read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 5 Hadeeth 61 the verdict of Rasulullah (s):

"Allah's Apostle said, "Fatima is a part of me, and he who makes her angry, makes me angry."

Modern day Sunni scholar Dr Tahir al Qadri in 'Al Durr'athul Baydh fee Manaqib Fatima al Zahra (as)' page 60-61:

Hadhrath 'Ali [r] narrated that Rasulullah (s) said to Fatima 'Verily Allah is displeased at your displeasure, and is pleased at your pleasure'

 [Al Duratul Baydha fi Manaqib Fatima al-Zahra \(sa\), Page 60 & 61](#)

Qadri relied on the following esteemed Sunni works for this Hadeeth:

1. al Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 page 167
2. al Muhajjim by Qadhi Abu Ya'ala page 190
3. A'la Jaudhoo al Mushanee by Shaybani Volume 5 page 363
4. al Muhajjim al Kabeer by Tabrani Volume 1 page 108
5. al Muhajjim al Kabeer by Tabrani Volume 22 page 401
6. Al Zurryath al Tahir by Dholaby page 120
7. Al Tadhween fee Akhbar Kadhween Volume 3 page 11
8. Majmaa al Zawaad Volume 9 page 309
9. Tadhkirathul Khawaas by Ibn Jauzi page 279
10. Asadal Ghaba Volume 7 page 219
11. Tadheeb al Tadheeb by Ibn Jajr Asqalani Volume 12 page 428

12. Al Isaba Volume 8 page 56-57
13. Dhukhair al Akba page 82

In this connection let us not forget the words of Allah (swt) in Surah Ahzab verse 57:

Those who annoy Allah and his Apostle Allah has cursed them in this world and in the Hereafter and has prepared for them a humiliating Punishment.

Al-Qur'an, Surah Ahzab, Ayah 57, translated by Yusufali

In the Fadak dispute Abu Bakr caused pain to Fatima (as) and he incurred her anger. One who pains her is on par with causing pain to Rasulallah (s), and such a thing is injustice towards Rasulallah (s) and his descendants, and Allah (swt) stipulated to Hadhrat Ibrahim (as) that the Covenant of Imamate would not was to one that is Dhaalim, hence he cannot be the Imam over the Muslims.

11.9 The final destination of those that usurped the rights of Sayyida Fatima (as), in the eyes of Rasulallah (s)

We read as follows in the English Translation of Malik's Muwatta, Book 21: Jihad Book 21, Number 21.14.32:

Yahya related to me from Malik from Abu'n-Nadr, the mawla of Umar ibn Ubaydullah that he had heard that the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, said over the martyrs of Uhud, "I testify for them." Abu Bakr as-Siddiq said, "Messenger of Allah! Are we not their brothers? We entered Islam as they entered Islam and we did jihad as they did jihad." The Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, said, "Yes, but I do not know what you will do after me." Abu Bakr wept profusely and said, "Are we really going to out-live you!"

Note - In his efforts to cover up the sins of Abu Bakr, the translator has changed the words of Rasulallah (s). A key word has been omitted, the comment of Rasulallah(s) "Yes, but I do not know what you will do after me." Should actually read *"Yes, but I do not know what 'bidah' you will do after me."*

Let us now see the Sunni commentary of the words of Rasulallah (s) "Ishad Ilayhum", taken from Tanveer al Lohal Sharh Muwatta Imam Malik by Allamah Suyuti Volume 1 page 307:

"Rasulallah said "I testify for them." As their Iman was correct and they were protected from being ruined and committing sins, they were protected from change and worldly greed".

In Wafa al Wafa Volume 3 page 931 by Allamah Nurudeen Samoudhi:

"Rasulallah stood next to the martyred bodies and said 'These are my Sahaba in whose favour I shall testify to on the Day of Judgement'. Abu Bakr said 'Are we not Sahaba?' Rasulallah(s) said 'Yes but I do not know of your deeds after me, it is established that these people left the World empty handed'.

The followers of the Sahaba are fond of citing the esteemed rank of Abu Bakr, but he himself asked Rasulallah (s) to testify to his Iman, his rank bore no benefit, since Rasulallah (s) knew that he would act unjustly towards his beloved daughter, so he flatly refused to testify to his Iman. Allah (swt) does not forgive those that pain Sayyida Fatima (as) and as evidence we shall cite the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Sahih al Bukhari Volum8 Hadeeth 578 Bab al Haud
2. Sahih al Muslim Volume2 page 282 Bab al Haud
3. Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal Volume 3 page 351 Dhikr Abdullah ibn Abbas
4. Sunan Nasai Volume 4 page 114 (Delhi); Dhikr al Bas
5. Mishkaat al Masabih pages 487-488 (Delhi);
6. Tafseer Kazaan Volume 7 page 451 (Beirut);
7. Tafseer Fathul Qadeer Volume 6 page 490 (Egypt);
8. Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 6 page 400 (Egypt);
9. Tafseer Ruh al Maani page 244 (Egypt).

Sahih Bukhari, Hadeeth: 8.578:

Narrated 'Abdullah:

The Prophet said, "I am your predecessor at the Lake-Fount". 'Abdullah added: The Prophet said, "I am your predecessor at the Lake-Fount, and some of you will be brought in front of me till I will see them and then they will be taken away from me and I will say, 'O Lord, my companions!' It will be said, 'you do not know what they did after you had left.'

Ummul Momineen Umm Salma (ra) narrates in al Istiab Volume 3 page 390 and Kanz al Ummal Volume 6 page 67 that:

"Amongst my Sahaba are some that I do not wish to look at, and after my death they shall not see me".

Commenting on this Hadeeth Deobandi scholar Shaykh ul Hadeeth Hadhrat Sarfaraz Khan Safdar states in Izalath al Rahab page 398;

"These are those individuals that recited the Shahada before Rasulallah (s) and after him became murtad (apostates), this includes later generations that became murtad and the people of Bidah"

For further details one can consult Sharh Nawawi Volume 1 page 129.

We read in Musnad and Nasai:

"Rasulallah (s) said some people from my Ummah will be brought before me and sent to Hell, I will state 'O Allah! These are my Sahaba' The reply will be 'You do not know of the innovations they introduced after you, since you left them they became apostates"

To get a clearer understanding of the words 'Zaat al Shamil' in this tradition we shall cite the comments from "Hasheeya Imam al Sindhi bhar Nasai Volume 4 page 118:

"Zaath al Shamil' means they shall be thrown into Hell"

Comment

Those who will be taken away from the Cistern will be those Sahaba that perpetuated injustice against the daughter of the Prophet (s) by preventing her from inheriting her father's property. Coining a fabricated tradition *'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to be used for charity)'* - led to Imam 'Ali (as) deeming Abu Bakr 'a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest'.

If only those that attack the Shi'a bothered to inspect their books. They accuse the Shi'a of attacking the Sahaba, what can we say of your justice, when Bukhari, Nasai, Muslim and Ibn Hanbal recorded traditions wherein the Sahaba were deemed Murtads, you deem them your Imams. When the innocent Shi'a quote these comments or criticise those that subjected Sayyida Fatima (as) to injustice, then the Fatwas of Takfeer are immediately issued!

11.10 Those that were unjust to Sayyida Fatima (as) shall appear on the Day of Judgement devoid of light on their faces

We read in Musnad Ibn Hanbal Volume 12 page 128, (printed Egypt) under the Chapter Musnad Abdullah bin Umro bin Aas:

Abdullah narrates at that time of the sun rising I was sitting next to Rasulallah (s) who said 'Allah (swt) shall raise a people with a leader on The Day of Judgement whose faces shall shine like the sun. Abu Bakr said 'O Rasulallah (s) are we those people?' He replied 'No these are the poor and the Muhajireen are famous on the Earth'.

The Ahl'ul Sunnah deem Abu Bakr as the most superior amongst the Sahaba, when this great figures face shall not be illuminated on the Day of Judgement, then the situation of the other members of this party who aided injustice against the daughter of the Prophet will dawn upon them. Abu Bakr usurped the legal right of Sayyida Fatima (as) which led to Imam 'Ali (as) grading the Khalifa as 'a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest'. We have proven from Hadeeth that the truth and the Qur'an is with 'Ali (as), is the Great Truthful one and purified in the Qur'an. Shah Abdul Aziz stated that 'the Ahl'ul Sunnah deem Hadhrat 'Ali (as) as protected', the words of Hadhrat 'Ali (as) are so damning that they make the Hadeeth presented by Abu Bakr false, and make any virtues he possessed null and void. Anyone that Hadhrat 'Ali (as) deems a liar is also a liar in the eyes of Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s).

11.11 The Qur'an makes it clear that an unjust person cannot be a Khalifa

Whoever committed Kufr was Dhaalim. Whoever did Shirk was a Dhaalim - Abu Bakr perpetuated both acts before embracing Islam, he was a Mushrik and Dhaalim, hence was not entitled to be an Imam over the Ummah. We have no personal grudge with the three Khalifas we bow in servitude at the Judgement of the Qur'an that deems idol worshippers to be Dhaalim and hence are not deserving of the contract of Imamate. If the world appointed the three as Imams then it is worthy to point out that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was also appointed as Imam by the people, there is no difference between Abu Bakr and Mirza since the people appointed them to the Station of Imamate. If man has a right then you should accept both of them, picking differences is an injustice, Alhamdulillah we the Shi'a have rejected both.

11.12 Those that have incurred Allah (swt)'s wrath are Dhaalim and cannot be deemed as Imams

"Ghayr al-Mughdhoobe alayhim wa ladh-Dhualeen"

Every Momin who prays five times a day makes this supplication at least 17 times a day before Allah (swt) 'Guide us to the Right Path...Allow us to follow the footsteps of those that have not unuttered Your wrath' we have honestly analysed the Qur'an and Sunnah and have concluded that these words in Surah Fateha place a prohibition on accepting Abu Bakr as an Imam, since Abu Bakr incurred the wrath of the daughter of Rasulallah (s). Those that believe in the truthfulness of Prophet Muhammad (s), and deem his every word as true, are reminded his words recorded in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 5 Hadeeth 61:

"Allah's Apostle said, "Fatima is a part of me, and he who makes her angry, makes me angry."

This Hadeeth makes it clear that Sayyida Fatima (as)'s anger is on par with the anger of Rasulallah (s). This is all the more significant when we recognize that one who incurs the wrath of Rasulallah (s) also incurs the wrath of Allah (swt), and Allah (swt) makes it clear in Surah Fateha that we should steer clear of those that incur the wrath of Allah (swt). If our opponents believe (as is in Sharh Fiqh Akbar) that the Prophet's parents and Uncle are Kaafirs and this belief does not make them criminals under the Shari'ah then their should be no objection if we believe that the Father in Law has incurred the Wrath of Allah.

12. Conclusion

May the Peace and Blessings be upon Muhammad and Ale Muhammad. We thank Hadhrat Fatima Al- Zahra (as) for removing the layers of darkness from our eyes and the obstacles from our path and for spreading the light for us in darkness, by going and speaking against such actions which were contradictory to the Holy Qur'an and Sunnah. And through her actions it became clearer to us that, if the property of the Holy Prophet (s) could be confiscated, if the most beloved to the Holy Prophet, Hadhrat Fatima al-Zahra (as), could be deprived of her rights, by the Companions of the Holy Prophet (saww) then surely it is reasonable to accept that Imam Ali (as) too was deprived of his Leadership in Islam.

Allamah Sadr'adeen al Hanafi in Riwaya al Mustafa page 36-37, published Ahmad Kanpur despite his being Sunni uttered the truth when he exposed the ruthless motive of Abu Bakr:

"We have proven that Abu Bakr took Fadak from Fatima without any basis. The grounds was a mere excuse based on political consideration that had the objective of lowering the esteem of Banu Hashim in people's eyes, make them dependent on others so that the people's hearts can focus towards us"

Whether readers agree with this assertion, is up to them but we have tried to present to our readers is the fact that the Ahle Sunnah have advanced all manner of excuse to defend Abu Bakr's injustice and 'explain' the anger of Sayyida Fatima (as), and the comments of Hanafi scholar Waheed uz-Zaman are particularly notable, in his footnote to the tradition in Saheeh al Bukhari he states.

"Hadhrat Abu Bakr heard this hadeeth himself from the Prophet(s), therefore how could he go against his(s)'s saying? And Hadhrat Fatima(s) became angry with him because she did not have the knowledge of this hadeeth."

 [Tayseer ul-Bari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari, Vol. 4, Page 243](#)

What exactly was Sayyida Fatima (as) angry at? Was she angry because Abu Bakr told her something she didn't want to hear? Why would she be angered at Abu Bakr, whose only wrongdoing was to convey something allegedly relayed to him by her father? We are left with two options.

Option One: She was angry at her father. This clearly makes no sense, moreover why would she have taken this anger out on Abu Bakr, boycotting him and insisting he not attend her funeral prayers? All this anger just because poor Abu Bakr told her the Hadeeth of her deceased father?

Option Two: She was angry at Khalifa Abu Bakr, because she did not believe the veracity of the Hadeeth that Abu Bakr had advanced. Saheeh al Bukhari certainly points to this, and if so why? Would she be angry at Abu Bakr for telling her the truth? What would be the basis for to hold such a grudge if she believed the word of Abu Bakr?

We have presented all the details of the Fadak dispute to our readers and hence it is now time to make the decision who was right and who was wrong in the is decision? There are only two conclusions available for readers to choose:

Conclusion One: Sayyida Fatima (as) whether through ignorance, forgetfulness or deviousness made a claim to her father's inheritance. Abu Bakr correctly pointed out that Prophets leave no inheritance. Rather than thank Abu Bakr for clarifying the matter, she bore malice towards him for telling the truth and kept aloof from him for the rest of her short life. By doing so she committed a grave sin (since you are only permitted to be angry with a fellow Muslim for a maximum of three days) and she died the death of Jahilyya since you refused to recognise Abu Bakr as the Imam of her time.

Conclusion Two: Sayyida Fatima (as) was perfectly right with her claim to her father's inheritance. Rather than give it Abu Bakr fabricated a tradition to justify the unlawful / unjust usurpation of Fadak, Sayyida Fatima (as) reacted by never speaking to Abu Bakr again, she did not recognise him as the Imam of her time, and did not even want him to participate in her funeral.

We now leave to our readers to decide which of these conclusions they wish to choose.

We would like to conclude this discussion with the comments of the Salafi Sects favourite son Bilal Philips also merit application here. He said in his '*Tafseer Soorah al Hujuraat*' page 47:

"Allaah and his Prophet (s) have laid down form rules for down treatment of disagreements which occur among Muslims. Some of the rules cover the correct method by which differences should be cleared up while others deal with the manner in which those involved should conduct themselves during and after arguments. For example, it is obvious that differences of opinion can only be satisfactorily resolved if a common set of ground rules is agreed on by the parties involved. Consequently, Allaah has clearly defined the ground rules in His statement, "And if you disagree about anything you should refer it to Allaah and his Messenger, if you believe in Allaah and the Last Day" (Soorah an Nisa (4):59). After the death of the Prophet (s), this verse can only be applied by using the Qur'an and the Sunnah as the basis if all decisions. It is also important that the solution should not be accepted begrudgingly or merely in words, or else ill feelings will remain and unconsciously manifest themselves in actions at a later time. Hence Allah linked the divine solution with Eemaan, true belief. Since the solution is of divine origin, it must be accepted if one truly believes in Allaah and his last Prophet Muhammad (s). This fact was emphasized by Allaah in the following verse, "By Allah, they do not truly believe until they make you (O Muhammad) the judge in between them, without finding within themselves any resistance to your decisions but accepting the completely".

 [Tafseer Soorah al Hujuraat, Page 47](#)

Now questions need to be asked:

1. Was Sayyida Fatima (as) aware that the criteria for resolving disputes were the Qur'an and Sunnah?
2. If she was aware then why did she hold a grudge against Abu Bakr for ruling on the basis of the Sunnah of her father?

Yet again we are faced with two options:

Option One: She accepted that Abu Bakr had heard these words from her father but was bitter because she wanted him to avoid these words and rule in her favour.

Option Two: She rejected the saying that Abu Bakr attributed to her father because it contradicted the behest of her father and the Book of Allah (swt).

If we accept Option one this in effect places Sayyida Fatima (as) in the category as one with a deficient Iman, whose grudge was because a ruling of her father (s) went against her vested interest.

If we accept Option two then we will have to accept that Sayyida Fatima (as)'s grudge against Abu Bakr was justified, for he had issued a ruling that contradicted the Qur'an and Sunnah, worse he fabricated a Hadeeth to justify his decision.

13. Copyright

All rights, including copyright, in the content of these Answering-Ansar.org web pages are owned or controlled for these purposes by the Answering-Ansar.org team.

You can distribute the download version of "Adobe® PDF" documents of the Answering-Ansar.org articles, as long as the documents remain in their original state and none of the contents are modified in any format.

The Answering-Ansar.org reserves the right over the contents of the articles if they are used in the original format. You can freely distribute the Islamic references and quotes that we use in our articles in any format.

When using our articles in your websites or if in distribution in print format, please include the source as Answering-Ansar.org.

Our web site contains links to third party sites. These links are used for the convenience of our users; however, they are not under the control of Answering-Ansar.org. We are not responsible for their contents, nor should they be considered endorsements of the individual linked sites.

However, it is possible that the site could contain typographical errors. If such a condition is brought to our attention, a reasonable effort will be made to fix or remove it.

If you wish to reproduce, print and distribute our articles in book format, then you will need a written permission of Answering-Ansar.org. If you wish to do so, then please contact us for further details.