

Ayesha

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

Revisions:

No.	Date	Author	Description	Review Info
0.0.2	06.02.2002	Answering-Ansar.org	Made some grammatical corrections.	
0.0.1	23.01.2002	Answering-Ansar.org	Created	

Contents

<u>1. THE REBELLION OF HADHRATH AYESHA AGAINST HADHRATH 'ALI (AS)</u>	5
1.1 HADHRATH AYESHA'S ENTRY ONTO THE BATTLEFIELD OF JAMAL WAS A VIOLATION OF THE QUR'AN	5
1.2 IMAM ALI (AS)'S LETTER TO HADHRATH AYESHA TESTIFIES TO HER BEING ON THE WRONG PATH	6
1.3 HADHRATH AYESHA'S REPLY DEMONSTRATES HER UNCOMPROMISING ATTITUDE TOWARDS AN AMICABLE SETTLEMENT	6
1.4 LETTER OF UMMUL MOMINEEN HADHRATH UMME SALMAH TO STOP HADHRATH AYESHA FROM PARTICIPATING IN THE BATTLE OF JAMAL IS CONCRETE EVIDENCE THAT HAZRAT AYESHA WAS IN ERROR	7
1.5 THE PROHIBITION ON HADHRATH HAFSA THAT SHE NOT JOIN AYESHA PROVES THAT AYESHA WAS MISGUIDED	8
1.6 THE BARKING OF HAWABS DOGS AT AYESHA PROVES SHE HAD LEFT THE RIGHT PATH	8
1.7 AYESHA WANTED TO INSTALL HERSELF AS THE IMAM OVER THE NATION	8
1.8 RASULULLAH (S) CONDEMNED WOMEN AT THE HELM OF A PEOPLE	8
<u>2. WAS AYESHA SEEKING TO REFORM THE UMMAH?</u>	10
<u>3. ANSWERING THE IBN SABA DEFENCE CARD</u>	11
3.1 AYESHA'S KILLING OF THE SHI'A OF 'ALI AT BASRA DESTROYS THE IBN SABA DEFENCE CARD	11
<u>4. WAS AYESHA SEEKING QISAS FOR THE BLOOD OF UTHMAN?</u>	12
4.1 IMAM 'ALI (AS) REJECTS AYESHA'S DEMAND OF QISAS FOR UTHMAN	12
4.2 THE IMAM CAN ONLY IMPLEMENT QISAS	12
4.3 HADHRATH AYESHA'S INCITEMENT AGAINST UTHMAN REFUTES THE DEFENCE OF QISAS	12
<u>5. ANSWERING THE DEFENCE OF IJTIHAD</u>	16
5.1 IJTIHAD CANNOT CONTRADICT THE QUR'AN AND SUNNAH	16
5.2 AYESHA'S DISOBEDIENCE OF 'ALI (AS) CONTRADICTED THE QUR'AN	16
5.3 BY TURNING AWAY FROM 'ALI (AS), AYESHA OPPOSED EXPLICIT HADITH OF RASULULLAH (S)	17
5.4 RASULULLAH (S) SAID THAT ZUBAYR WOULD BE ZALIM BECAUSE HE FOUGHT 'ALI (AS)	18
5.5 FIGHTING IMAM 'ALI (AS) IS ON PAR WITH FIGHTING RASULULLAH (S)	18
5.6 AYESHA'S TEARS WHEN RECALLING JAMAL ARE CLEAR PROOF OF HER BEING ON THE WRONG PATH	20

5.7	HADHRATH AYESHA DEEMED HER REBELLION A GREAT SIN THAT WAS UNFORGIVABLE	20
5.8	AYESHA DIDN'T WANT TO BE BURIED NEXT TO RASULULLAH (S)	21
5.9	AYESHA'S REGRET ON HER DEATHBED PROVES THAT SHE WAS MISGUIDED	21
5.10	RASULULLAH'S HADITH 'FITNAH SHALL APPEAR FROM THE HOUSE OF AYESHA' IS CLEAR PROOF THAT SHE WAS ON THE WRONG PATH	22
5.11	THE DUTY WAS TO KILL THE OATH BREAKERS AND REBELS	23
<u>6. THE STANCE OF IMAM 'ALI (AS)</u>		<u>25</u>
6.1	IMAM 'ALI (AS) WAS WITHIN HIS RIGHTS AS KHALIFA TO QUELL THE FITNAH OF AYESHA AND HER SUPPORTERS	25
6.2	IMAM 'ALI HAD NO DOUBT THAT HIS STANCE WAS CORRECT	25
<u>7. HADHRATH AYESHA'S ENMITY TOWARDS IMAM 'ALI (AS)</u>		<u>27</u>
7.1	HADHRATH AYESHA'S REFUSAL TO MENTION IMAM 'ALI (AS) BY NAME IS PROOF THAT SHE HATED HIM	27
7.2	HADHRATH AYESHA HATED BANU HASHIM AND IMAM 'ALI (AS)	28
7.3	AYESHA'S REACTION AT THE DEATH OF IMAM 'ALI (AS)	28
7.4	AYESHA'S HAPPINESS AT THE DEATH OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	29
7.5	AYESHA'S HAPPINESS AT THE DEATH OF IBRAHIM IBNE RASULULLAH (S)	29
7.6	FATWA OF SHAH ABDUL AZIZ DEHLAVI, "ONE THAT EXPRESSES HAPPINESS AT THE SUFFERING OF AHL'UL BAYT (AS) IS A MURTAD."	29
<u>8. WAS HADHRATH AYESHA THE MOST SUPERIOR WIFE OF RASULULLAH (S)?</u>		<u>30</u>
8.1	HADHRATH AYESHA'S JEALOUSY OF HADHRATH KHADIJA IS CLEAR PROOF THAT SHE WAS NOT THE MOST SUPERIOR WIFE	30
<u>9. WERE ABU BAKR AND AYESHA THE MOST BELOVED OF RASULULLAH (S)?</u>		<u>32</u>
9.1	THE MOST BELOVED ARE THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHOSE LOVE HAS BEEN MADE COMPULSORY IN THE QUR'AN	33
9.2	RASULULLAH SELECTED HIS MOST BELOVED ON THE DAY OF BROTHERHOOD	33
9.3	HADHRATH AYESHA'S TESTIMONY AS TO WHO THE MOST BELOVED WERE	34
<u>10. DOES THE QUR'AN GUARANTEE HADHRATH AYESHA'S PROTECTION FROM CRITICISM?</u>		<u>35</u>
10.1	ALLAH (SWT) HAS CONDEMNED HADHRATH AYESHA IN THE QUR'AN	35
10.2	HADHRATH AYESHA'S CONDEMNATION IN THE QUR'AN IS FURTHER PROOF THAT SHE WAS NOT THE MOST SUPERIOR WIFE OF RASULULLAH (S)	38
<u>11. DO THE SHI'A SLANDER HADHRATH AYESHA?</u>		<u>39</u>
11.1	THE SAHABA SLANDERED THE CHARACTER OF HADHRATH AYESHA	39

12. THE 'TRUE' SHIA POSITION WITH REGARDS TO HADHRATH AYESHA	41
12.1 DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN SLANDER AND OBJECTIVE CRITICISM	41
12.2 HADHRATH AYESHA FAILED TO RECOGNISE THE İMAM OF HER TIME	41
12.3 ONE WHO OPPOSES AHL'UL BAYT (AS) IS FROM THE PARTY OF SHAYTHAN	41
13. COPYRIGHT	43

1. The rebellion of Hadhrath Ayesha against Hadhrath 'Ali (as)

1.1 Hadhrath Ayesha's entry onto the battlefield of Jamal was a violation of the Qur'an

Allah (swt) states clearly with regards to the wives of Rasulallah (s):

"And stay quietly in your houses, and make not a dazzling display, like that of the former Times of Ignorance;...." Al-Quran 33:33

In Tafsir Durre Manthur Volume 5 page 196 under the commentary of this verse we read a narration that states

"when Hadhrath Saudah (RA), wife of the Prophet (s), was asked why she did not perform Hajj and Umrah (regularly) like other wives of the Prophet (s)? Saudha (RA) said, "I have performed Hajj and Umrah (before) and Allah has given me the order to stay at home. By God I will not leave home until my death." The narrator added "by God, Saudah (RA) did not leave her home after the Prophet (s) until her death, when her funeral was taken out".

This verse came down exclusively for the wives of Rasulallah (s) and in the commentary of this verse we can see that Hadhrath Sauda deemed it as a clear injunction for her to remain at home. Despite this, Abu Sulaiman seeks to defend Ayesha's position as follows:

Ansar.org states:

Ordering to stay at houses does not contradict leaving the house for an ordered benefit as when the woman leaves the house to go to hajj or omrah, or leaves with her husband in a travel. This verse came down in the life of the Prophet peace be upon him and the prophet peace be upon him traveled with his wives afterwards, as the prophet peace be upon him traveled with Aysha and others to Hijjat Al-Wida'a. Also, the Prophet peace be upon him sent Aysha with Abdulrahman, her brother ... Hujjat Al-Wada'a happened before the Prophet's demise by less than three months after the revelation of this verse.

Abu Sulaiman's defence is contradicted by the fact that Rasulallah (s) had told his wives during the final pilgrimage this WAS their first and last Hajj and that in future they were to remain within their homes. To prove our claim we present al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 7 page 104, where Ibn Kathir under the Chapter "Zainab binte Jahsh" records the following:

"During the Farewell Hajj, Prophet (s) had told his wives that "This is your last Hajj, after that you have to pray on floor mats". The narrator then added that except for Zainab bint e Jahsh (RA) and Saudah(RA) all other wives used to go for Hajj but these two used to say that "nothing shall move us".

Rasulallah's order and Hadhrath Saudah's commentary of this verse is clear proof that there was a mandatory duty was placed by Allah on the wives of Rasulallah (s), that they remain within the confines of their homes. Despite this Hadhrath Ayesha opposed this explicit verse of the Qur'an and left her home to instigate opposition against the Imam of the time.

Abu Sulaiman claims:

Ansar.org states:

Accordingly, if it is allowed for the prophet's wives to travel for a benefit, then Aysa thought that by her departure a reformation for the Muslims could happen. She interpreted in that matter."

We have already proven that this verse placed an unconditional order on the wives to stay at home. With regards to Abu Sulaiman's claim that she 'interpreted in that matter', we challenge Ansar.org to show us when she cited this verse and said I interpret this as follows. The fact is that they can try as hard as they can, Abu Sulaiman and his Ansar cronies have no evidence that Ayesha interpreted the verse in this manner. On the contrary we read in *Tafsir Durre Manthur Volume 5 page 196* commentary of Surah Ahzab, *Hilayat al Awliya Volume 2 page 48*, Chapter "*Dhikr Ayesha*" and *Tabaqat al Kabeer Volume 8 page 81* under the Chapter "*Dhikr Ayesha*" that:

"When Hadhrath Ayesha used to recite the Ayat ("And stay quietly in your houses, and make not a dazzling display, like that of the former Times of Ignorance;.." Al-Quran 33:33) she used to cry so much that her cover used to get wet with tears".

We have already proven the fact that Rasulallah (s) had told his wives during Hajjatul Wida that this was their last Hajj and that they would have to stay at home after this. Those wives who followed this command used to recite this ayat to prove their point. Therefore we can say that it was mandatory for Hadhrath Ayesha to stay at home. The crying of Hazrat Ayesha at the recitation of the verse is clear proof that during her battle with Imam 'Ali (as) she had gone against this ayat which is specific for the Prophets (s) wives.

If as Abu Sulaiman asserts it was not mandatory for her to stay at home and that she had an alternative interpretation of this verse that permitted her to rebel against the Imam of the time, then why was she crying whenever she recited it? Abu Sulaiman can advance as many excuses as he likes but the truth is that the realisation had dawned her, that by leaving her house and fighting Imam 'Ali (as) she had violated this Qur'anic order, one that placed a condition on the wives of Rasulallah (s) to remain within their homes. Ansar have no basis to provide their alternative translation for their commentary contradicts the command of Allah (swt), the order of Rasulallah (s) and the testimony of Ayesha against herself.

1.2 Imam Ali (as)'s letter to Hadhrath Ayesha testifies to her being on the wrong path

We read in al Tadhkirath al Khawwas page 38, Matalib al Sa'ul page 112 and Fusul ul Muhimma page 72 that

"Prior to the Battle of Jamal he [Imam Ali] wrote a letter to Ayesha in which he said 'by leaving your home you have opposed the order of Allah (swt) and his Rasul (s)'"

Ansar can feel free to offer as many excuses as they like, the fact of the matter is that the Imam of Truth, Ali (as) felt that Ayesha had no basis to support her stance, she was acting in opposition to Allah (swt) and his Rasul (s). Whose opinion should we rely on, Abu Sulaiman's or the Gate of knowledge Imam 'Ali ibne abi Talib (as)?

1.3 Hadhrath Ayesha's reply demonstrates her uncompromising attitude towards an amicable settlement

Matalib al Sa'ul page 116 and Fusul ul Muhimma page 72 both record Hadhrath Ayesha's defiant reply to Imam 'Ali (as)'s letter:

"Son of 'Abu Talib, the difference between us is irreconcilable, time is running out, and we shall not submit to your authority, whatever you wish to do, do it".

We suggest Abu Sulaiman mull over this letter carefully. He had himself cited the following verse to prove that both parties were believers:

Ansar.org states:
The Believers are but a single Brotherhood: so make peace and reconciliation between your two (contending) brothers." (49:9-10)

What type of efforts for peace and reconciliation are present in this reply? Hadhrath Ayesha had demonstrated open opposition to Imam 'Ali (as), a refusal to accept his authority and a challenge to him to stop her opposition party. Imam 'Ali (as) hence was left with no other choice but to quash the opposition. Hadhrath Ayesha had made clear that her intention was that of open defiance and disobedience to the Imam of the time.

1.4 Letter of Ummul Momineen Hadhrath Umme Salmah to stop Hadhrath Ayesha from participating in the Battle of Jamal is concrete evidence that Hazrat Ayesha was in error

For authentic references from the books of Ahl'ul Sunnah, see following:

1. An-Nihaya by Mubarak bin Muhammad bin Abdul Karim Ibn Athir Jazri (d. 606 A.H.) vol 2, page 353; Ibid. vol 1, page 226-237; Ibid. vol 3, pages 271, 331 and 434; Ibid. vol 5, pages 35, 64, 115, 132, 137 and 158
2. Al-'Iqd al Farid by Abu Umar Ahmed bin Abd Rabbah Qartabi (d. 328 A.H.) vol 2, page 327 (description of battle of Jamal)
3. Qamus by Firozabadi (d. ???) page 371
4. al Imama wal Siyasa by Muhammad bin Qutaybah Dinuri (d. 276 A.H.) vol 1, page 53 (description of battle of Jamal)
5. Sharh Nahjul Balagha by Azzuddin Abdul Hamid al-Madaini (also known as Ibn Abi al-Hadid M'autazali) (d. 655 A.H.) vol 2, page 124
6. Balaghatun Nisa by Ahmed ibn Abi Zahir ibn Tayfur (d. 280 A.H.) page 7

"When Ummul Momineen Aisha decided to go for Jamal, Ummul Momineen Umme Salmah wrote to her: "From Umme Salmah wife of the Holy prophet to Aisha Ummul Momineen, And I praise Allah, There is no God except Allah, and then (I want to say), you are the medium between the prophet and his followers (Ummah). And you are guardian of his honour. The Holy Quran has gathered you so don't despair.... Pillars of this religion cannot be upheld on women. Women are praised for keeping down their eyes and hiding their bodies. Allah has exempted me and you from this task (of leading the battle). What will you say on the day of Judgement when Allah's Prophet will denounce you from Paradise on the deserts that you torn the veil which Allah had concealed you with". Then the announcer will announce that the mother (Umme Salmah) remained here (didn't go for the battle) so should you".

The Qur'an has clearly ordered wives of Prophet to stay in their houses (and stay in your homes, 33:33). This order of Allah is only for the wives of Prophet (S) and Hazrat Ayesha's participation in battle of Jamal against Hadhrat Ali (AS) is a clear violation of order of Allah in the Holy Quran and his Prophet (S).

1.5 The prohibition on Hadhrath Hafsa that she not join Ayesha proves that Ayesha was misguided

We read in al Bidaya Volume 7 page 231 that:

"Hadhrath Hafsa binte Umar made preparations to join Ayesha, but (her brother) Abdullah Ibne Umar prevented her from going".

If the stance of Ayesha was correct then why did 'Abdullah Ibne Umar; a leading companion prevent his sister from joining in the rebellion? Clearly he deemed it inappropriate for the wife of Rasulallah (s) to behave in such a manner.

1.6 The barking of Hawabs dogs at Ayesha proves she had left the right path

We read in al Imama wal Siyasa page 59 Chapter "Dhikr Jamal" with regards to Ayesha that:

"When she began her opposition to 'Ali, she and her supporters began to make their way to Basra. On route, the dogs of Hawab began to bark at them. Ayesha asked Muhammad bin Talha "Which place is this?". He said "Its is Hawab" to which Hadhrath Ayesha replied "Take me back for on one occasion Rasulallah (s) said, 'Amongst you (wives) is one at whom the dogs of Hawab shall bark.' He (s) said to me specifically, 'Be careful in case it is you'." Muhammad bin Talha said 'Leave these things and proceed' and the Sahabi Abdullah bin Zubayr swore by Allah that they had left Hawab during the first part of the night, he brought some men who testified likewise. The Ulema of Islam have declared the event of Hawab to have been the first false testimony in Islam".

1.7 Ayesha wanted to install herself as the Imam over the nation

In Tadkhirath al Khawwas page 43 Chapter "Dhikr Jamal" the narrator states:

"I was walking through Jamal and witnessed a man on the ground rubbing his heels and reciting poetry, another narrators states that someone asked (the same man) 'Who are you?' to which he replied 'I am in that woman's army who intends to become Ameerul Momineen".

1.8 Rasulallah (s) condemned women at the helm of a people

We read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 219:

Narrated Abu Bakra: During the battle of Al-Jamal, Allah benefited me with a Word (I heard from the Prophet). When the Prophet heard the news that the people of the Persia had made the daughter of Khosrau their Queen (ruler), he said, "Never will succeed such a nation as makes a woman their ruler."

In Sharh Muqassad Volume 2 page 377 Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Sa`duddeen Taftazanee sets out the conditions to be an Imam:

1. Free
2. Man
3. Just

4. Adult and sensible

Then in his discussion of the conditions he states clearly that a woman CANNOT be an Imam:

"...because she possesses innate impurity with regards to certain matters of Deen, hence she is prohibited from sitting as Judge or participating in battle".

2. Was Ayesha seeking to reform the Ummah?

Ansar.org states:

That Aysha ignited the Battle of the Camel is a plain truth. That is because Aysha did not come out to fight, but to reform between Muslims.

The only way that one can 'ignite' a battle is via a campaign of propaganda in order to amass support for military action. I would be just as culpable if I provided petrol and a lighter to a man who subsequently set fire to a house. Similarly incitement to call people to mass opposition and rebellion against the Imam of the time is blatant violation of the Shari'a and there exist clear provisions under the Shari'a to quell such acts of fitnah.

We would also ask Ansar and their fellow advocates 'could reform not have been achieved by co-operating 'with' Imam Ali (as) rather than opposing and rebelling against him?' This 'reform' entailed mass opposition / rebellion against the Imam of the time - a clear violation to the Shari'a that makes obedience to the rightful Head of State unconditional. In consequence those that supported Hadhrath Ayesha in her alleged 'reform' had likewise contradicted the Qur'an through their disobedience of Imam 'Ali (as), can participation in an ijimali (combined) sin be deemed as 'reform'?

3. Answering the Ibn Saba Defence Card

In line with his Master advocates Ibn Taymeeya, Ibn Kathir and Shah Abdul Aziz - Abu Sulaiman has likewise sought to play down the situation with the claim that the two parties had resolved hostilities and that the battle of Jamal was in fact started by the followers of Ibn Saba hiding within Imam 'Ali (as)'s army, hence they should be blamed for the fitnah.

3.1 Ayesha's killing of the Shi'a of 'Ali at Basra destroys the Ibn Saba defence card

Hadhrath Ayesha and her supporters got to Basra before Imam 'Ali (as) did. We read in al Maarif page 90 that:

"The Governor of Basra Uthman bin Haneef was arrested and imprisoned and 50 men in the treasury were killed."

In Tadkhirath al Khawwas page 26 we are informed that:

"Uthman bin Haneef was arrested and a messenger was sent to Ayesha for her opinion on what should be done to him. Ayesha said that he should be killed. A woman pleaded for his (Uthman's) life so Ayesha ordered that he be imprisoned, he was flogged 40 stripes and the hair from his hair, beard and eyebrows was removed. Ayesha and her supporters also killed a further 70 people without reason".

In al Istiab Volume 1 page 322 we are told that:

"Ayesha and her companions killed 40 people inside the treasury and arrested Uthman bin Haneef, she stated that he should be executed".

In Muttalib al Saul page 119 we are told:

"In Kufa Abu Burdha Azdi asked Hadhrath 'Ali, 'why were people killed at Jamal?'. 'Ali replied 'They killed my Shi'a and my officials without any justification, then they fought me, despite the fact that they gave me bayya, they killed 1000 of my companions".

We have proven from these references that the Fitnah had already started with the entry of Ayesha and her supporters in Basra. It was here that they took hold of the treasury, and massacred the Shi'a of 'Ali (as). There is no way that the Ibn Saba defence card can be used here since this fitnah had taken place before Imam 'Ali (as) and his alleged Sabaites arrived on the scene.

In light of these facts lets us now contemplate the claim of Abu Sulaiman:

Ansar.org states:

"She did not left her house to fight Ali, but to makpeace between people after people desired her to go".

We would like to know from Ansar, 'What efforts at peace was this?' Can one really construe actions such as open opposition to the rightful Imam, the gathering of people against him, attacking Basra, killing 40 men in the treasury as acts that constitute major efforts towards peace?

4. Was Ayesha seeking Qisas for the blood of Uthman?

Abu Sulaiman claimed that:

Ansar.org states:
"Aysa did not hate Ali but she argued with him about the blood of Uthman".

What Ansar.org fail to point out is the fact that Ayesha's demands for Qisas i.e. that the killers of Uthman be handed over, was also contrary to the Sharia since Islamic penalties are implemented by the Head of State not the public, as and when they feel like it. Moreover Ayesha was not the Waris of Uthman to demand Qisas, he was survived by sons who were baligh. It was their right to demand, but even if they did, that is all that they could do, they could NOT incite and rebel against Imam 'Ali (as). They did not get there way as Ayesha did.

4.1 Imam 'Ali (as) rejects Ayesha's demand of Qisas for Uthman

In Muttalib al Saul page 116 we read that when Ayesha reached Basra, Hadhrath 'Ali wrote a letter to her, part of it stated here:

"...Tell me Ayesha what role do women have in leading armies and reforming the Ummah? You claim that you want to avenge Uthman's blood, Uthman was a man from Banu Ummaya whilst you are a woman from Banu Taym Ibn Murra".

This letter is clear proof that that Hadhrath Ayesha had no basis under the Sharia to seek Qisas for Uthman, hence Ayesha's claim was false. When Imam 'Ali (as) had rejected her claim, then it was her duty under Sharia to accept his decision. The demand for Qisas could ONLY come from his next of kin, which Ayesha was not. Despite this fact, Ayesha chose to ignore the comments of Imam 'Ali (as). These Nasibis are so illogical that they are unable to speak justly - they accuse Imam 'Ali (as) of entering the battlefield and causing the death of thousands, when according to Sharia, the act of rebellion against the rightful Khalifa of the Time is so serious that Hadhrath Ayesha could have been executed.

4.2 The Imam can only implement Qisas

Hadhrath Ayesha's very demand that the killers of Uthman are handed over to her, contradicts the Shari`a since the Head of State can ONLY enforce the Law of Qisas.

Zameer Sayyid Sharred in Sharh Muwaffaq page 530 comments:

"The Imam's duty is to implement the Shari'a, rules on Qisas, nikah jihad, Eid, the rules cannot be implemented without an Imam".

In Sharh al Maqasid page 251 we read:

"The appointment of the Imam is an absolute necessity, he implements the Shari'a and places the required limits upon man".

4.3 Hadhrath Ayesha's incitement against Uthman refutes the defence of Qisas

Being the lead advocate demanding Qisas following his murder, could Abu Sulaiman inform us about what steps Hadhrath Ayesha had taken to defend the slain khalifa during his lifetime?

Surely a woman who was so determined that she was willing to go to war to avenge Uthman's death would have been just as vocal in defending him during his lifetime. Curiously we find that this was not the case and we have this testimony by Imam 'Ali (as) in a letter written to Ayesha as recorded in Seerath al Halabiyya Volume 3 page 356:

"You have acted in opposition to Allah (swt) and his Rasul (s) by leaving your home, you have made demands for those things that you have no right. You claim to wish to reform the Ummah, tell me, what role do women have in reforming the Ummah and participating in battles? You claim that you wish to avenge Uthman's murder despite the fact that he is a man from Banu Umayyaa and you are a woman from Banu Taym. If we look in to the matter it was only yesterday that you had said 'Kill Nathal May Allah (swt) kill him because he has become a kaafir".

Ayesha ordering to kill Uthman also available in:

[insaan_al_ayyun.jpg](#)Insaan al-Ayyun by Ali bin Burhanudin al-Sha'afi, page 356

Ibn Atheer in Nahaya page 80 Volume 5 and Ibn Mansur in Lisan al Arab Volume 11 Chapter "Lughuth Nathal" page 670 both record that:

"Nathal is one who has a long beard and Ayesha said kill this Nathal, by Nathal she was referring to Uthman".

[lisan_al_arab.jpg](#)Lisan al Arab by Ibn Mansur Volume 11 Chapter "Lughuth Nathal" page 670

In Tareekh Kamil Volume 3 page 100 Ibn Atheer records that:

"Ubayd bin Abi Salma who was a maternal relative of Ayesha met her as she was making her way to Madina. Ubayd said "Uthman has been killed and the people were without an Imam for eight days" to which Ayesha asked "What did they do next?". Ubayd said "The people approached 'Ali and gave him bayya". Ayesha then said 'Take me back! Take me back to Makka". She then turned her face towards Makka and said, 'Verily Uthman was murdered innocently, and By Allah, I shall avenge his blood'. Ubayd then said 'You are now calling Uthman innocent, even though it was you who said 'Kill Nathal, this Jew".

[tareekh_kamil.jpg](#)Tareekh Kamil Volume 3 page 100

Hadhrath Ayesha'a specific fatwa that Uthman should be killed can be located in the following classical works of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

1. Manaqib by Khawarzmi, page 117
2. Tadkhirath al Khawwas page 38
3. Asadul Ghaba Volume 3 page 14, "Dhikr Jamal"
4. Al Istiab Volume 2 page 185
5. Al Nahaya Volume 5 page 80
6. Qamus page 500 "lughut Nathal" by Firozabadi
7. Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 117 "Dhikr Jamal"
8. Sharh Nahjul Balagha Ibn al Hadeed Volume 2 page 122
9. Shaykh Mudheera page 163

al-Baladhuri, in Ansab al-Ashraf Part 1, Volume 4 page 74 narrates that:

When the situation became extremely grave, Uthman ordered Marwan Ibn al-Hakam and Abdurrahman Ibn Attab Ibn Usayd to try to persuade Ayesha to stop campaigning against him. They went to her while she was preparing to leave for pilgrimage, and they told her: "We pray that you stay in Medina, and that Allah may save this man (Uthman) through you." Ayesha said: "I have prepared my means of transportation and vowed to perform the pilgrimage. By God, I shall not honour your request... I wish he (Uthman) was in one of my sacks so that I could carry him.

I would then throw him into the sea."

In al Tabaqat al Kubra Volume 3 page 82 we read that:

"Musruq said to Ayesha, 'Uthman died because of you, you wrote to people and incited them against him".

In Iqd al Fareed page Volume 2 page 210 we learn that:

"Marwan approached Ayesha and said 'Uthman died because of you, you wrote to people and incited them against him".

Also in Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 218 and al Imama wal Siyasa page 45 we are told that:

"Sad ibne Abi Waqqas was asked 'who killed Uthman? Sad replied, 'the sword was lifted by Ayesha and it was sharpened by Talha".

Also in Iqd al Fareed on Volume 2 page 219 we read that:

"Mugheera bin Shuba approached Ayesha and she said to him, 'In Jamal some of the arrows that were fired, nearly pierced my skin.' Mugheera replied 'If only an arrow had killed you, that would have acted as repentance for the fact that you had incited the people to kill Uthman".

In al Imama wal Siyasa page 60 we read that:

"Someone asked Muhammad bin Talha who killed Uthman? He replied that "one third of his death was attributable to Ayesha and one third was due to my father Talha".

We have faithfully cited these sources, proving that the classical Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah have recorded that Hadhrath Ayesha was the lead opponent of Uthman during his lifetime. She incited people to kill him, declaring him a kaafir.

So Ansar.org answer us this:

- If calling any Sahaba a kaafir makes someone a kaafir, what is your fatwa for Hadhrath Ayesha here?
- If Hadhrath Ayesha was wrong then does this suggest that she was lying?
- If Hadhrath Uthman had indeed become a kaafir, according to the fatwa of Ummal Momineen Ayesha, then why do Ahl'ul Sunnah deem him a rightful khalifa and a martyr?

It is interesting that Abu Sulaiman poses this question:

Ansar.org states:
"if Aysha was delighted for the death of Uthman, then why she would go after Uthman's murderers? Did she come out to prevent Ali from taking the Caliphate?"

In light of the lead role Hadhrath Ayesha took in inciting people to kill Uthman, it would be much more appropriate for Abu Sulaiman and his Ansar cronies to answer this question themselves. We have proven from the sources cited that during his lifetime Hadhrath Ayesha was a severe critic of Hadhrath Uthman, to the point that she advocated his killing. When hearing that Imam 'Ali (as) had become the khalifa, her tone had changed immediately. All of a sudden she portrayed Uthman as being killed unjustly and she chose to rebel against Imam Ali

(as) on the premise that his killers should be apprehended. Why did she leave Makkah, portray Hadhrath Uthman as a victim and mobilise opposition from Basrah? Was this decision based on her desire to defend Hadhrath Uthman or was it motivated by her animosity towards Hadhrath Ali (as)? These are questions that Abu Sulaiman and his fellow advocates always shy away from.

5. Answering the defence of ijtiḥad

Ansar.org states:

"...that the two warring factions tried to reach to the truth, and none of the two factions was an oppressor because the death of Uthman divided the Islamic nation to two parties. One party sees to kill the killers of Uthman immediately, and they are Talha, Al-Zubair, and Aysha. The other party sees also to kill the killers of Uthman but wait for the moment until they reach to their goals because these killers had tribes that would defend them. Ali and his companions shared the second opinion. These killers are responsible for the battle of the Camel, and none of the two parties had any responsibility to ignite the battle as I clarified earlier"

For a stance to be correct it needs to have a basis in Qur'an and Sunnah. The fact of the matter is that Imam Ali (as) WAS the legitimate khalifa at the Head of the Ummah and the Qur'an makes it clear that obedience to the Ul'il Umr, Allah (s) and Rasulullah (s) are one and the same. Obedience is unconditional.

5.1 Ijtiḥad cannot contradict the Qur'an and Sunnah

The core component of ijtiḥad is that this is in effect a last resort measure when NO SOLUTION is found in the Qur'an or Sunnah. Any act that contradicts these two sources cannot be deemed as ijtiḥad since it has gone against nass (clear text). It is here that the advocates of Hadhrath Ayesha fall flat on their face because the actions of Ayesha and her supporters was a violation of the Qur'an and Sunnah, as we shall seek to prove:

5.2 Ayesha's disobedience of 'Ali (as) contradicted the Qur'an

Abu Sulaiman had stated:

Ansar.org states:

There is no doubt that Aysha, Talha, and Al-Zubair were seeking the killers of Uthman before obeying to Ali as an obeisance to Allah.

In other words Ayesha had entered a campaign of disobedience against Imam 'Ali (as). The difficulty that Abu Sulaiman has here is the Qur'an, which places an unconditional duty upon the believer to obey the Ul'il Umr (those in authority). This is written clearly in the Qur'an.

"O you who believe! Obey Allah and his Apostle and those in authority among you" (Surah Nisa verse 59).

According to Ahl'ul Sunnah once bayya is given to a leader, he is the Ul'il Umr and hence obedience to him is unconditional. The people of Madina had given bayya to Imam 'Ali (as) without any coercion, he was the legitimate khalifa. Therefore, his obedience was compulsory. The obedience is a duty and is on par with obedience to Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s). Obedience is not based on pre-conditions being met BEFORE obedience is given. It is explicit obedience, is clear and unambiguous.

There is no basis in either the Qur'an or Sunnah that you hold the rightful Ul'il Umr to ransom, oppose and fight him if you don't get your way. If such a provision exists we challenge Ansar to bring their proof. In accordance with this verse, it was incumbent upon Hadhrath Ayesha and

her supporters to give Imam 'Ali (as) their unconditional support, they had to obey his every word. Hadhrath Ayesha's failure to do this, not only to disobey the Imam of the Ummah but encouraging others to do likewise to the point of mass rebellion and war against him, is a blatant violation of this verse.

5.3 By turning away from 'Ali (as), Ayesha opposed explicit hadith of Rasulullah (s)

Ansar.org states:

"each side thought the truth lies with him/her and interpreted the mistake of the other party differently. Both parties came out to reform as I said, and none of the two parties wanted to fight, but it happened. Allah has the matter in His hands, before it, and after it".

Even if we accept this feeble claim, we should point out that only one party had the Qur'an and Sunnah to support its position and that party was Imam 'Ali (as)'s. He was the Ul'il Umr so his decision had to be honoured. Moreover, how could Hadhrath Ayesha's party have been searching for the truth by turning away from Imam 'Ali (as)? Rasulullah (s) had told the faithful **"Ali is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ali"** - This hadith and can be located in the following texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

1. Nuzul ul Abrar page 24
2. Kanz al-`ummal Volume 6 page 157 Chapter "Fadail 'Ali"
3. Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyyah page 216
4. Tafsir Kabir 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. Kunuz al Haqaiq page 160
9. Seerath Halbeeya Volume 3 page 236
10. Manaqib by Ibne Maghazli page 144

This hadith is accepted by Ahl'ul Sunnah as Sahih. It clearly means that the further away an individual is from 'Ali (as), the further away he is from finding the truth. If the truth rests with Imam Ali (as), then how can those who rejected, disobeyed and fought him be 'rewarded' in their search for the truth? This hadith proves that the 'only' way that individuals could remain on the true path was if they attached themselves to Imam 'Ali (as), the Ul'il Umr upon whom obedience is wajib. Abu Sulaiman advances the common excuse namely that...

Ansar.org states:

"none of the two factions was an oppressor because the death of Uthman divided the Islamic nation to two parties"

This defence also fails because Rasulullah (s) had told his followers where to turn in times of fitnah, he said:

"Shortly after me, discord and hatred will arise among you, when such a situation arises, go and search out Ali because he can separate the truth from falsehood"

Kanzul Ummal, by Ali Muttaqi al Hind, volume 2 page 612 (Kutab Dhieri, Multan)

The duty was to attach themselves to Ali (as) NOT to separate from him, in this regard we have the explicit words of Rasulullah (s):

"After me, people shall experience fitna, you will split in to groups", he then pointed at 'Ali and said, "Ali and his companions shall be on the right path" [Kanz ul Ummal hadith number 33016].

So from this tradition it is clear that the ONLY way that the Ummah could save itself from fitnah and division was to side with Imam 'Ali (as). Did Hadhrath Ayesha's party adhere to the words of Rasulullah? Clearly not! Rather than follow the words of Allah (swt) [The Qur'an 4:59] and his Rasul (s) and affiliate themselves with Imam 'Ali (as), Ayesha deemed it fit to oppose, rebel and fight him.

5.4 Rasulullah (s) said that Zubayr would be Zalim because he fought 'Ali (as)

Ansar.org states:
"true hadeeths, which proves that neither Aysha, Al-Zubair, Talha, nor Ali wanted to fight each others".

First and foremost, Abu Sulaiman fails to cite any of these hadith. Even if we accept the claim that these three individuals had NO intention to fight Imam 'Ali (as), the fact of the matter is they did and Rasulullah (s) had told Zubayr that he would fight 'Ali (as) and made it clear what that meant. To prove this we present Al Imama wal Siyasa page 67 and al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 7 page 241 in which we learn that:

"Before the Battle of Jamal began, Ali called out to Zubayr "Zubayr remember the time when Rasulullah (s) said, "Zubayr you will fight 'Ali and you will be Zalim [Hadhrath 'Ali said this to remind Zubayr] upon which Zubayr said 'yes I remember' he then separated himself (from the fighting) and turned back, on his way he was killed by Ibn Jurmuz".

We ask Ansar:

1. Was this hadith praising or condemning Zubayr?
2. Can an individual declared by Rasulullah (s) as Zaalim on account of his actions, be defended for using ijthihad for which he shall be rewarded?
3. Did Rasulullah (s) state that Zubayr will fight 'Ali (as) having exercised ijthihad for which he shall receive one reward and his mistake forgiven?
4. If Rasulullah (s) did not declare that Zubayr would exercise ijthihad then on what basis have Abu Sulaiman and his fellow advocates reached this conclusion? Are they more knowledgeable than Rasulullah (s)?

Zubayr's only act of fighting against Imam 'Ali (as) was at Jamal, and Rasulullah (s) deemed him to have been Zaalim on account of his opposition to Hadhrath 'Ali (as). Abu Sulaiman had confidently asserted *"none of the two factions was an oppressor"* but this hadith PROVES that those who fought Imam 'Ali (as), were so misled that they were deemed by Rasulullah (s) to be Zaalim (i.e.) they WERE oppressors. It would be incorrect to suggest that this only referred to Zubayr because he had not entered into a duel against Imam 'Ali (as). He was at the helm of the opposition group. If he was Zaalim on account of his war with 'Ali (as), then so were his associates, such as Hadhrath Ayesha.

5.5 Fighting Imam 'Ali (as) is on par with fighting Rasulullah (s)

We would ask those with objective minds to think over this scenario:

You are sitting in the midst of Rasulullah (s) and have turned to him to resolve a dispute. He (s) rejects your claim. Rather than accept the decision, you leave his presence, enter the neighbouring town and encourage others to support your cause. You inform the people that you have been hard done by and that you will force Rasulullah (s) to concede to your demands. You whip up a frenzy, challenging Rasulullah's authority and go to war against him".

If you had behaved in this way i.e. disobeying, rebelling and going to war with Rasulullah (s), could you defend your decision by stating that your decision was on account of your interpreting the Deen i.e. ijtiḥad? Would Allah (swt) reward you for your efforts to interpret the Shari'a in this way?

With this in mind let us now contemplate this ḥadith, taken from Riyadh al Nadira Volume 2 page 199 Chapter "Manaqib 'Ali":

Hadhrath 'Abu Bakr narrates:

"I saw the Messenger of God pitch a tent in which he placed 'Ali, Fatima, Hasan, and Husayn. He then declared: 'O Muslims, I am at war against anyone who wars against the people of this tent, and am at peace with those who show peace toward them. I am a friend to those who befriend them. He who shows love toward them shall be one of a happy ancestry and good birth. Nor would anyone hate them except that he is of miserable ancestry and evil birth"

Nasibis shall no doubt seek to place the onus on Hadhrath Ali (as) by alleging that he initiated the war, and hence his opponents were not at war against him per se, rather they were defending themselves. To this our reply is clear, whoever takes a stand against Hadhrath Ali (as) is taking a stand against the Prophet (s). If Imam Ali (as) declares war on a group the Prophet (s) is likewise at war with such individuals. There is no room to excuse their behaviour on account of mistaken ijtiḥad.

In this there is no doubt, the Prophet (s) made this point absolutely clear with these words, as narrated by Zaid bin Arqam found in Sunan Ibn-I-Majah, English translation by Muhammad Tufail Ansari, Volume 1 page 81

"Allah's Messenger (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) said regarding 'Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain (Allah be pleased with them all): I am at peace with those with whom you make peace and I am at war with those whom you make war"

Al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi in Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyyah Chapter 11 page 392 makes this admission:

Sunni and Shi'a are in agreement that Rasulullah (s) told 'Ali, "Whoever fights you, fights me and whoever is at peace with you is at peace with me".

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Allamah Sa`duddeen Taftazanee in Sharh Muqassad Volume 2 page 305 states:

"Proof that the opponents of 'Ali were fasiq comes from the fact Rasulullah said 'O 'Ali whoever fights you fights me'.

We would ask those with open minds to contemplate the seriousness of this ḥadith. Fighting Ali (as) and Rasul (s) are one and the same - this being the case how can Hadhrath Ayesha and her supporter's actions be defended as having exercised ijtiḥad when they had in effect gone to war against Rasulullah (s)? Can those who fight Rasulullah (s) be rewarded for ijtiḥad and forgiven for their mistake?

5.6 Ayesha's tears when recalling Jamal are clear proof of her being on the wrong path

Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi in Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyyah page 385 and Ibn Taymiyya in Minhajj as Sunnah Volume 2 page 185 both record that:

"When Ayesha would recall the event of Jamal she would cry so profusely that her scarf would be soaked in tears".

Had Hadhrath Ayesha exercised ijtiḥad then why would she cry so profusely? Shaikh Al Saleh Al Uthaimin in his book of Fatwas "The Muslim's Belief", translated by Ar Maneh Hammad al Johani, p 23 sets out the standard defence for the Sahaba who fought 'Ali (as), namely:

"We believe that the disputes that took place among the Prophet's companions were the result of sincere interpretations they worked hard to reach. Whoever was right among them would be rewarded twice, and whoever was wrong among them would be rewarded once and his mistake would be forgiven"

If this is indeed the case and Hadhrath Ayesha would be forgiven, even if she was wrong, then why would she express such regret?

Abu Sulaiman had also cited this reference in his defence of Ayesha, namely her testimony:

Ansar.org states:

"I wish I was a fresh branch of a tree and never walked this walk." [13] ... if Aysha wanted to fight instead of making peace, then why the regret?

Perhaps it would be more appropriate for Abu Sulaiman to answer the fact 'If Ayesha had used exercised ijtiḥad for which she will be rewarded and forgiven if wrong - then why the regret? Clearly Ayesha did not deem her alleged 'ijtiḥad' as an interpretation for which she would be rewarded and forgiven even if it was a mistake. Hadhrath Ayesha was fully aware that the fitnah that she had caused carried serious consequences along with the fact that she also knew what Rasul (s) had said about his (s)'s Ahlul Bai't.... **'O 'Ali whoever fights you fights me'**.

5.7 Hadhrath Ayesha deemed her rebellion a great sin that was unforgivable

In Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work Mawaddatul al Qurba page 32 by Sayyid 'Ali Hamdani, Chapter "Mawaddathul Saum" we read that:

"Hadhrath Ayesha narrates the Prophet said 'Allah asked me 'Whoever doesn't accept Ali's khilafath and rebels and fights him is a kaffir and will perish in the fire' Someone asked her "Why did you rebel and fight him?" She replied "I forgot this Hadith on the Day of the Battle of Jamal, I remembered it again when I returned to Basra and I asked for Allah's forgiveness, I don't think that I will be forgiven for this sin"

Had Hadhrath Ayesha exercised ijtiḥad there would have been no need for her to cry or seek repentance for her actions - because this is a such a great act that even the individual interpreting a matter incorrectly *"would be rewarded once and his mistake would be forgiven"*. Hadhrath Ayesha clearly did not feel that this 'reward' applied to her and her testimony that she found it unlikely that she would be forgiven is clear proof that she had committed a grave sin not a mistake in ijtiḥad. Advocates like Abu Sulaiman write belatedly to explain and defend Ayesha, the irony is they provide her defences that she herself never acknowledged.

5.8 Ayesha didn't want to be buried next to Rasulallah (s)

We read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 9, Book 92, Number 428:

Narrated Hisham's father: 'Aisha said to 'Abdullah bin Az-Zubair, "Bury me with my female companions (i.e. the wives of the Prophet) and do not bury me with the Prophet in the house, for I do not like to be regarded as sanctified (just for being buried there)."

In Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 232 Dhikr Jamal:

"Someone asked Ayesha should we bury you next to the Prophet (s). She said, 'No! As I committed bidah after him (s). Bury me with my female companions (i.e. the wives of the Prophet).' Bidath refers to the fact that Rasulallah (s) had told Ayesha that the dogs of Hawab would bark at her, and that she would become zalim fighting 'Ali'".

Again Ayesha's desire was that she not be buried beside Rasulallah (s) on account of her actions. This is a clear admission of her error. Clearly she was conscious of the fact that her actions were extremely serious. Had they been mistakes in ijtiḥad that still guarantee Allah (swt)'s pleasure, then why the insistence that she be buried away from Rasulallah (s) on account of her actions at Jamal?

5.9 Ayesha's regret on her deathbed proves that she was misguided

In Nasa al Kaafiya page 28 we learn that:

On her death bed Hadhrath Ayesha seemed perplexed and uncomfortable, when asked why she replied, "The day of Jamal is dogging my mind".

Abu Sulaiman will no doubt take comfort that Hadhrath Ayesha's regret on her death-bed constitutes Allah's forgiveness. The fact of the matter is she may have regretted her participation in the battle, but she NEVER asked forgiveness for her opposition to Imam 'Ali (as). This was never a matter of regret for her and there is no evidence of her ever repenting for her opposition to the Imam of Guidance. In fact her hatred was unrelenting. She continued to bear enmity towards him even after Jamal and later on, towards his sons. Even if we, for arguments sake, are to interpret (no doubt Abu Sulaiman will) her words on her deathbed as her asking for repentance, by now it was too little, too late. We read in Surah Yunus verses 90 - 92 (A. Yusuf 'Ali's translation) that Pharaoh's acknowledgement of Allah (swt) when death approached him, was deemed too late by Allah (swt):

"We took the Children of Israel across the sea: Pharaoh and his hosts followed them in insolence and spite. At length when overwhelmed with the flood he said: "I believe that there is no God except Him Whom the Children of Israel believe in: I am of those who submit (to Allah in Islam)." (It was said to him): "Ah now! but a little while before wast thou in rebellion! and thou didst mischief (and violence)!" This day shall We save thee in the body, that thou mayest be a sign to those who come after thee! but verily, many among mankind are heedless of Our Signs!"

Yusuf Ali in his commentary of this verse states clearly:

"This was death-bed repentance, and even so it was forced by the terror of the catastrophe. So it was not accepted (cf. iv. 18) in its entirety".

His last minute plea of forgiveness could not save him from the wrath of Allah (swt).

5.10 Rasulallah's hadith 'Fitnah shall appear from the House of Ayesha' is clear proof that she was on the wrong path

We read the following tradition in Sahih al-Bukhari Hadith: 4.336

"Narrated Abdullah: The Prophet stood up and delivered a sermon, and pointed to the house of Aisha, and said: "Fitna (trouble/ sedition) is right here," saying three times, "from where the side of the Satan's head comes out."

We also read in Sahih Muslim Arabic version, the Chapter of Seditions, v4, p2229 from Ibn Umar: who said:

"The Prophet of Allah (PBUH&HF) emerged from the house of Aisha and said. 'The pivot of disbelief is from here, where the horns of Satan will rise.'"

Abu Sulaiman seeks to cover up the truth with this 'alternative' definition:

Ansar.org states:

"If the prophet peace be upon him was meaning the house of Aysha, then he would say "to", not "towards." Muslim narrated from Ibn Omar, "The Messenger of Allah peace be upon him came out from Aysha's house and said, "The head of disbelief comes from here, where the horn of the devil arises." Meaning the east."

This argument is baseless for the following reasons:

1. al-Bukhari has put the tradition related to Aisha in a section named: **"what went on in the houses of the wives of the Prophet"**. This shows that al-Bukhari did not understand the tradition as the East as Abu Sulaiman suggests. If the author ever thought that the Prophet (s) meant The East in that particular tradition, he wouldn't have put the tradition in the section of 'what was going on in the houses of the wives of the Prophet (s)'. He probably would have put it in the Chapter of al-Fitna or elsewhere. Could Abu Sulaiman kindly explain the correlation between the East and the house of Aisha! Does Abu Sulaiman have a better understanding of this tradition than al Muhaddith Shaykh Ismail al Bukhari?

2. With regards to Abu Sulaiman's comment:

Ansar.org states:

"If the prophet peace be upon him was meaning the house of Aysha, then he would say "to", not "towards."

- How can he explain the fact that he mentioned in that particular tradition "right here" and the pointing was so clear that the companions understood that he was pointing to the house of Ayesha, as it is mentioned in the text of the tradition? The East can not be "right here" in Madina, in front of the Prophet. In Arabic the text uses the word "ha ona" meaning here - as in within close proximity. The East is NOT within close proximity and if the reference was indeed towards the East then it is there at a distance, Rasulallah (s) would have used the words "honak" - "there" to denote distance.

3. For arguments sake, if the tradition denotes east, then it would certainly have been so vague as to require further elaboration. For example, if there is trouble brewing in the city centre and I state that "Problems are occurring over there" (pointing to the direction of the centre) would those people I told this to, understand what I was saying? Would they not ask

me to elaborate as to where exactly I was pointing at i.e. Location? If I had said to the East even then people would ask me to clarify "East which part of the East? Would they not want me to break the area down further? It would be completely normal for further questions to be asked to get a precise understanding of where I was pointing. Does it make sense that Rasulallah (s) by the pointing of his finger, was able to convey successfully to EVERY Sahabi present that he was pointing in the direction of the east? Would the companions not have asked him to clarify which part of the east he was referring to, asking questions about any town / city / province from where this fitnah would rise? This is clearly a feeble attempt to deflect the fact that Rasulallah (s) was pointing at the house of Ayesha. The Sahaba saw no need to ask further questions on the matter. They, through Rasulallah's pointing at Ayesha's house, recognised that fitnah would come from her home.

4. If Abu Sulaiman insists on maintaining this flimsy defense, we would like to know how he would explain the fact that there are traditions in which Rasulallah (s) makes no reference to pointing east? We read in Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal Volume 8 page 373 that:

"Rasulallah (s) came out of the house of Ayesha and said 'the Head of Kufr shall rise from HERE from where Satan's horn shall rise'".

Again the Arabic says here "min ha ona" indicating that Rasulallah's referring to closeness not a distance away.

If we delve in to the facts of history, it is lucid how true the words of Rasulallah (s) rang clear. She rebelled against the Caliphate of Imam 'Ali (as), incited opposition to him seeking support from Basra that led to mass revolt and war. This was the act of fitnah that Rasulallah (s) had predicted, and he had placed the blame squarely at her feet, referring to her as the horn of Satan and pivot of disbelief. Rasulallah's clear use of the words referring to the act as "kufr" and "fitnah", destroys the fallacy that Ayesha had exercised ijtiḥad for which she shall be rewarded.

5.11 The duty was to kill the oath breakers and rebels

We read in al Bidaya Volume 7 page 304 "Dhikr Khwaarij"

The texts of all three are similarly worded:

"Ali said that I was ordered to fight three types of people 1. Nakisheen (oath breakers) 2. Qasatheen. (those who refrained from giving bayya to the Imam) 3. Marakeen (Khwaarij).

In Sharh Muqassad Volume 2 page 304, Allamah Sa`duddeen Taftazanee after narrating this hadith of Rasulallah (s), states clearly **"the oath breakers were Talha, Zubayr and Ayesha"**.

In Matalib al Sa'ul p 68 we read

"The Sahaba and Ayesha fought Ali and they were amongst oath breakers, Ali fought Mu'awiya and he was amongst the Qasatheen"

In Usdul Ghaba page 114 Volume 4 "Dhikr 'Ali"

Abu Sa'id narrates:

"Rasul ordered us to fight Nakisheen, Qasatheen and Marakeen, we asked under who he said Ali ibn abi Talib".

Also in Usdul Ghaba Volume 4 page 114 we read that:

"Someone asked Abu Ayub "Are you are using the same sword with which you stood beside Rasulallah (s) killing polytheists to now kill Muslims? He replied that Rasulallah (s) ordered that I kill those that break the oath of allegiance".

It is proven from these traditions that those who opposed 'Ali were breaking the oath of allegiance, the duty was to kill them this was based on the order of Rasulallah (s). Talha, Zubayr and Ayesha were at the forefront of this group.

Hadhrath Ayehsa's duty was to obey the Imam of the time as is stipulated by Allah (swt) as a general rule and explicitly in relation to Maula 'Ali (as) by Rasulallah (s) who declared:

"Whoever obeys 'Ali, obeys me, whoever obeys me, obeys Allah, whoever disobeys 'Ali, disobeys me, whoever disobeys me, disobeys Allah" [Kanz al-`ummal, hadith numbers 32973]

This hadith is absolutely explicit, obedience to 'Ali (as) is unconditional, it is on par with obedience to Rasulallah (s) and Allah (swt). Applying this to Rasulallah's orders, it is clear that the onus was to kill those that broke the oath. This duty applied to ALL individuals and to excuse Ayesha's actions as an exercise in ijtiḥad, is baseless because in the view of Rasulallah (s), the duty was to kill the perpetrators of such an act would not reward them for their efforts of interpretation.

6. The stance of Imam 'Ali (as)

To understand the decision taken by Imam 'Ali (as) and answer Nasibi claims that he was responsible for the Battle of Jamal, we need to take in to account that Imam 'Ali (as) WAS the rightful Head of State. The opposition was such that not only was it aimed at winning the hearts and minds of the people against Imam 'Ali (as), its aim was to cause a mass revolt against him, as we shall see.

6.1 Imam 'Ali (as) was within his rights as Khalifa to quell the Fitnah of Ayesha and her supporters

Surah al Maida verses 32:

Because of that We ordained for the Children of Israel that if anyone killed a person not in retaliation of murder, or (and) to spread mischief in the land - it would be as if he killed all mankind,

Surah al Maida verses 33:

The recompense of those who wage war against Allâh and His Messenger and do mischief in the land is only that they shall be killed or crucified or their hands and their feet be cut off on the opposite sides, or be exiled from the land. That is their disgrace in this world, and a great torment is theirs in the Hereafter.

These verses like all verses, are applicable at all times. If the duty on Rasulullah (s) was to quell fitnah against him by killing the proponents, then his rightful successor ' U'l'il Umr likewise inherited this same right. If his opponents were insisting on refusing to obey him, preferring to spread fitnah inciting opposition and animosity towards him, the Head of the State was entitled to uproot these seditious elements and kill them.

Surah Rad verse 25:

And those who break the Covenant of Allâh, after its ratification, and sever that which Allâh has commanded to be joined (i.e. they sever the bond of kinship and are not good to their relatives), and work mischief in the land, on them is the curse (i.e. they will be far away from Allâh's Mercy); And for them is the unhappy (evil) home (i.e. Hell)

Surah Sad verse 28:

Shall We treat those who believe (in the Oneness of Allâh Islâmic Monotheism) and do righteous good deeds, as Mufsidûn (those who associate partners in worship with Allâh and commit crimes) on earth? Or shall We treat the Muttaqûn (pious - see V.2:2), as the Fujjâr (criminals, disbelievers, wicked, etc)?

Surah Qasas verse 83:

That home of the Hereafter (i.e. Paradise), We shall assign to those who rebel not against the truth with pride and oppression in the land nor do mischief by committing crimes. And the good end is for the Muttaqûn

6.2 Imam 'Ali had no doubt that his stance was correct

In Manaqib by Ibne Maghazli page 118 we read that:

"When the people of Basra began to fire arrows at 'Ali and his supporters, some of

Ali's men got injured, others said 'Ameerul Momineen they have wounded our men'. Imam 'Ali then said 'O Allah, I tried everything, I tried to warn them, and you are my witness'. He ('Ali) then raised his sword placed his turban on his head and climbed on to the horse of Rasulallah (s). 'Ali then asked for a copy of the Qur'an. He then called for a War Standard upon receiving it; he placed it in to the hands of his son Muhammad. He then gave the order to attack".

In Muttalib Saul page 116 we read:

"When Imam 'Ali prepared for the Battle of Jamal, he first of all raised his hands to the skies and made this supplication 'O Allah, Talha bin Abdullah gave me bayya without any coercion, he subsequently broke it. May Allah (swt) avenge this and give him no more time, O Allah, Zubayr bin Awam also broke his bayya to me, he provided assistance to my enemies and ignited the flames of war propaganda'. After this the two armies began to gradually get closer to one another. 'Ali stood in between both and then said something to Zubayr who withdrew his participation in the battle, whilst Ayesha and Talha remained firm in their position".

From here it is proven that Imam 'Ali (as) deemed his position to be the correct one. Nasibi opinions attacking Imam 'Ali (as) are baseless. He deemed his position to have been the right one and Rasulallah (s) said, **"Ali is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ali"** - so the Nasibi comments are without foundation. The advocates of Mu'awiya, like Ibn Taymeeya, are particularly fond of playing the 'Ibn Saba' defence card when pushed in to a corner, but the fact of the matter is - those that opposed and fought Imam 'Ali (as) were by definition baghis (rebels) and there was a duty to kill them, they had spread fitnah through the Islamic State, the death of 20,000 Muslims can be placed squarely at the feet of Ayesha and her supporters.

It is little wonder that we read the following in Iqd al Fareed about Hadhrath Ayesha in Volume 2 page 232 "Dhikr Jamal":

"After the battle of Jamal a woman asked Ayesha "What shall be the punishment if I murder my infant children? To which Ayesha replied "The fire". The woman then asked "What is the punishment for a woman that kills twenty thousand of her offspring at one place?". Ayesha understood (the reason behind) the question and said "Apprehend this enemy of God".

7. Hadhrath Ayesha's enmity towards Imam 'Ali (as)

Hadhrath Ayesha's enmity to Imam 'Ali (as) would open like a pot

'Ali Muttaqi al Hind in Kanz al-`ummal, Chapter 8 Kitab "Mawa azafee katheeya'thul taweela" records the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as):

Hadhrath Ali said, "Ayesha fought me because firstly being a woman she possessed a weak judgement and secondly she bore enmity towards me and it would open in the same way a pot is opened. She would have never fought anyone other than me in that way".

7.1 Hadhrath Ayesha's refusal to mention Imam 'Ali (as) by name is proof that she hated him

Ansar.org states:

"Al-Tijani claims that the historians mentioned Aysha as not wanting to mention the name of Ali. And I ask him, which historians? Can you tell me exactly so that we know the liar from the truth teller? And on which references did you depend?"

There is no need for 'Abu Sulaiman to get agitated, for this fact can be located in a number of sources of Ahl'ul Sunnah. And we will fare one better than Tijani, we shall cite the traditions from their books of hadith.

A mild version can also be located in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 3 hadith 761:

Ubaidullah bin 'Abdullah told me that 'Aisha had said, "When the Prophet became sick and his condition became serious, he requested his wives to allow him to be treated in my house, and they allowed him. He came out leaning on two men while his feet were dragging on the ground. He was walking between Al-'Abbas and another man." 'Ubaidullah said, "When I informed Ibn 'Abbas of what 'Aisha had said, he asked me whether I knew who was the second man whom 'Aisha had not named. I replied in the negative. He said, 'He was 'Ali bin Abi Talib."

Try as they might, even al-Bukhari alludes to the fact that Hadhrath Ayesha was unable to mention Imam 'Ali (as) by name. Abu Sulaiman would of course differ and seeks to deny that ANY animosity was borne by Ayesha towards Imam 'Ali (as). The difficulty for him is that the Ulema of Ahl ul Sunnah have conformed this fact. In his commentary of this hadith, Badr al Din Hanafi in "Umdah al Qari fi Sharh Sahih al Bukhari" Volume 2 page 740, Chapter 4 "Hud ul Mareez"- acknowledges that:

"Hadhrath Ayesha, could not bear hearing a good thing about 'Ali, and this is solid evidence of her being an enemy of Ali, for Nasibis to proclaim that the narrators of these Hadith are weak, is not a valid excuse, because this is testified in the annals of history".

Later on the same page Badr al Din Hanafi comments:

"Muammar narrates that Ayesha was never happy narrating anything good about 'Ali, Zuhri narrates that Ayesha did not possess the ability to say anything good of 'Ali".

If Abu Sulaiman still insists on denying this fact, we shall now present a 'complete' version of

this tradition which proves clearly that Ayesha failure to mention Imam 'Ali (as)'s name whilst recollecting this incident, was not on account of temporary amnesia but was in fact due to her hatred of him:

When Ubaidullah Ibn Utbah mentioned to Ibn Abbas that Aisha said "In his death-illness the Prophet was brought to (Aisha's) house while his shoulders were being supported by Fadhl Ibn Abbas and another person", then Abdullah Ibn Abbas said: "Do you know who this 'other man' was?" Ibn Utbah replied: "No." Then Ibn Abbas said: "He was Ali Ibn Abi Talib, but she is averse to name him in a good context."

The references for the above narration can be located in the following texts:

1. Musnad by Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v6, pp 34,228
2. al-Tabaqat al-Kabir, by Ibn Sa'd, v2, part 2, p29
3. History of al-Tabari (Arabic), v1, pp 1800-1801
This is also located in the English translation.
[al-tabari.gifHistory of al-Tabari \(English\) Volume 9 page 169-170](#)
4. al-Ansab al-Ashraf, by al-Baladhuri, v1, pp 544-545

7.2 Hadhrath Ayesha hated Banu Hashim and Imam 'Ali (as)

In Iqd al Fareed page 231 we read that:

"Following the Battle of Jamal Hadhrath Ali sent a message to Ayesha via Ibn Abbas that she leave Basra and return (from where she came). Ayesha replied 'Yes I am returning of all the cities, I hate this city the most since this is the one in which Banu Hashim reside'".

In Al Imama wal Siyasa Volume 1 page 45 we learn that:

"Following Uthman's murder Zubayr approached Ayesha in Makka and said 'Look they have made 'Ali Khalifa. She said, What right does 'Ali have to rule over our necks? I will not stay in Madina as long as 'Ali is in power'".

In Rauzathul Ahbaab Volume 3 page 65, we read that:

"After the Battle of Jamal Imam 'Ali approached Hadhrath Ayesha and said 'You have treated me like an enemy'".

We also read in Rauzathul Ahbaab Volume 3 page 10 that:

"Ayesha was clouded by her hatred of 'Ali'".

7.3 Ayesha's reaction at the death of Imam 'Ali (as)

Ansar.org states:

Al-Tijani says, "and when she learnt of his death she knelt and thanked Allah." Then he gave us in the footnotes the name of historians he took as references. These are his references, "AL-Tabari, Ibn Al-Atheer, Al-Fitnah Al-Kubra, and all historians who documented the incidents of the year 40 after the immigration of the prophet peace be upon him." [20] So, I went back to Al-Tabari and Ibn Al-Atheer for the stories of the year 40. And guess what! I did not find any trace for this claim! What a liar he is!

Again Abu Sulaiman is seeking to mislead people with false information, for these references can be located in these very books and we are attaching the link of the text from History of al Tabari Volume 17 page 224 (English translation) for our reader's perusal:

http://www.answerign-ansar.org/answers/ayesha/ayeshas_pleasure_at_Maula_Alis_death.gif
[Ayesha'a please at Maula Ali\[as\]'s death](#)

"When news of 'Ali's death reached Aishah, she said: And she threw down her staff and settled upon her place of abode, like the traveller happy to return home".

Perhaps Abu Sulaiman will seek to offer his own insight into the meaning of this verse, he need not bother for the English translator, Professor G. R. Hawting who states in the footnote on page 224:

"...the verse is proverbial and is cited indicate pleasure at something".

This reference can also be located in Tadkhirath al Khawwas page 181 and Shaykh ul Mudhira page 156. For Abu Sulaiman to use his authority and make this claim, knowing that his adherents blindly believe his every word since he is an advocate of Mu'awiya, is indeed a cause for concern. We would ask his readers to ask themselves honestly 'If Abu Sulaiman can not even be honest about such a basic fact, then how much credence should be given to anything that he says?'

7.4 Ayesha's happiness at the death of Sayyida Fatima (as)

We read in Sharh Nahj ul Balagha by Ibn al Hadid page 439 Chapter 2

"When the Prophets daughter died all the wives except Ayesha came to console Banu Hashim and she said that she was unwell and the message which she sent to Hadhrath Ali (as) clearly depicts her joy at this sad occasion".

7.5 Ayesha's happiness at the death of Ibrahim ibne Rasululullah (s)

In Sharh Nahj ul Balagha by Ibn Hadeed page 238 Volume 2 we learn that:

"When Ibrahim died Ayesha was happy inside, although she displayed sadness outside, Fatima and 'Ali were very saddened by his death".

7.6 Fatwa of Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi, "One that expresses happiness at the suffering of Ahl'ul bayt (as) is a murtad."

In Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyya Shah Abdul Aziz states on page 263:

"What view should we hold of those people who express happiness on Ashura when Imam Hussain was killed, who marry on that day who disrespect the family of the Prophet and the descendents of Sayyida Fatima? It is correct to refer to such individuals as Murtad".

8. Was Hadhrath Ayesha the most superior wife of Rasulullah (s)?

Abu Sulaiman stated:

Ansar.org states:

There is no doubt that Aysha is the best among the wives of the prophet peace be upon him because all true narrations indicate such a thing. Examples are found in Saheeh Bukhari and Muslim.

This proves Abu Sulaiman's ignorance of the aqeedah of Ahl'ul Sunnah. Books of aqaid have greater authority than Sahih al Bukhari and Muslim which are just books of traditions. Aqaid forms the basis of a school of thought. For Ahl'ul Sunnah one of the leading texts is Mullah 'Ali Qari's Sharh Fiqh Akbar. On page 143 he cites the following tradition from Tirmidhi:

Ibne Abbas narrates that he heard Rasulullah (s) "There shall be four Leaders of Women in Paradise, Maryum daughter of Imran, Fatima daughter of Muhammad, Khadija daughter of Khuwaylid and Asiya wife of Pharaoh"

Rasulullah had also said: "The most excellent of the women of all worlds whom Allah chose over all women are: Asiya the wife of Pharaoh, Mary the daughter of Imran, Khadija the daughter of Khuwaylid, and Fatimah the daughter of Muhammad"

This tradition can be located in the following books of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

1. Sunan al-Tirmidhi, v5, p702
2. al-Mustadrak, by al-Hakim, v3, p157, (who said this tradition is authentic based on the criteria of two Shaikhs **(al-Bukhari and Muslim)**);
3. Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v3, p135
4. Hilayat al Awliya, by Abu Nu'aym, v2, p344
5. al-Isti'ab, by Ibn Abd al-Barr, v4, p377

In Yanabi al Mawaddah Part 1-3 (Combined) page 203, Chapter 55 "Fadail Khadijathul Kubra and Fatima Zahra" Shaykh Sulayman Qundoozi cites this reference from Mawaddatul al Qurba:

"Ikrima narrates that Rasulullah drew four lines into the ground and then asked 'What is this?' Those present replied 'Allah and his Rasul know best'. He (s) replied 'Of the women in Paradise the most superior are Khadija, Fatima, Maryam and Asiya'".

8.1 Hadhrath Ayesha's jealousy of Hadhrath Khadija is clear proof that she was not the most superior wife

In Sahih Bukhari Hadith: 5.166 Ayesha herself narrates:

"I did not feel jealous of any of the wives of the Prophet as much as I did of Khadija though I did not see her, but the Prophet used to mention her very often, and whenever he slaughtered a sheep, he would cut its parts and send them to the women friends of Khadija. When I sometimes said to him, "(You treat Khadija in such a way) as if there is no woman on earth except Khadija," he would say, "Khadija was such-and-such, and from her I had children."

Jealousy is a trait inherent in a person who is envious of the superior position of another, and

Ayesha's admission "**I did not feel jealous of any of the wives of the Prophet as much as I did of Khadija**", is clear proof that Ayesha was fully aware of the superior rank of Hadhrath Khadija. Had Ayesha indeed been the most superior wife there would have been no need for her to be jealous.

These four women are the most superior in rank amongst women. Only one wife of Rasulallah (s) is selected in this group and that wife is Hadhrath Khadija (as) NOT Ayesha. This tradition PROVES that Khadija is the MOST superior amongst Rasulallah's wives. If Ayesha was, then why did Rasulallah (s) not elevate her to the station of Leaders of women in Paradise?

9. Were Abu Bakr and Ayesha the most beloved of Rasulallah (s)?

Abu Sulaiman sought to conclude his passionate exoneration of Ayesha by citing the following tradition:

Ansar.org states:
 Omro bin Al-A'as said, 'Once the prophet peace be upon him used me as a leader for an army. I went to him and said, "O Messenger of Allah, who is the most beloved to you?" He answered, "Aysha." I said, "What about men?" He replied, "Her father."'

This alleged hadith does not tally up to stronger explicit traditions that prove that there existed individuals who Rasulallah (s) had clearly indicated as superior on account of his love for them.

The most beloved individuals are those that are loved by Allah (swt) and his Rasul (s)

To locate the most beloved in they eyes of Rasulallah (s) it would need to be that individual who is also loved by Allah (swt). Such an individual attains that rank that cannot be attained by any other person. Following the successive failures of the Shaykhain in leading the Muslim army to conquer the fort of Khaiber, Rasulallah (s) made this declaration that we have cited from Sahih Muslim Book 031, Number 5918 Chapter "The merits of Ali ibne Abi Talib":

Sahl b. Sa'd reported that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said on the Day of Khaibar: I would certainly give this standard to a person at whose hand Allah would grant victory and who loves Allah and His Messenger and Allah and His Messenger love him also. The people spent the night thinking as to whom it would be given. When it was morning the people hastened to Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) all of them hoping that that would be given to him. He (the Holy Prophet) said: Where is 'Ali b. Abu Talib? They said: Allah's Messenger, his eyes are sore. He then sent for him and he was brought and Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) applied saliva to his eyes and invoked blessings and he was all right, as if he had no ailment at all, and conferred upon him the standard. 'Ali said: Allah's Messenger, I will fight them until they are like us. Thereupon he (the Holy Prophet) said: Advance cautiously until you reach their open places, thereafter invite them to Islam and inform them what is obligatory for them from the rights of Allah, for, by Allah, if Allah guides aright even one person through you that is better for you than to possess the most valuable of the camels.

So here Rasulallah (s) gave a clear guarantee that the individual who would be given the standard was a man loved by Allah (swt) and him. The fact that all the Sahaba were hoping for the Standard being given to them, vouches for the fact that they were fully aware of the significance, the rank that this individual held. The fact that it was 'Ali (as) and no one else testified to the fact that he WAS the most beloved to Rasulallah (s), one loved by Rasul (s) and his Creator.

With regards to Imams Hasan (as) and Husayn (as), we read in Sunan Tirmidhi Volume 2 page 24 that Rasulallah stated:

"Hasan and Husayn are both my sons, O Allah I love them so love them and those that love them".

In this supplication Rasulallah (s) has made clear his love for his beloved grandsons, so much so that, he has declared his love for those that love them

Rasulallah (s) said:

"God commanded me to love four, and He informed me that he loves them. People asked him: Messenger of God who are they? He said: Ali is from them (repeating that three times). And Abu Tharr and Salman and al-Miqdad."

This tradition can be located in the following texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

1. Sunan ibn Majah, v1 p53 Hadith 149;
2. The Khalifas who took the right way page 177 (A part translation of Suyuti's Tarikh ul Khulafa")
3. Mishkat al Masabih, Volume 4 page 131 Chapter "Companions in General" - English translation by Maulana Fazlul Karim.

Such is the rank of the four individuals in this hadith that Allah (swt) has declared his love for them, so they have a rank of superiority that far outstrips that of the other Sahaba.

It is clear that the individuals in these traditions rank as the most beloved from amongst the faithful so much so that not only the Prophet (s) but Allah (swt) declared his love for them. We challenge Ansar to present any traditions in which Rasulallah (s) had declared that "Allah (swt)" loved Ayesha and 'Abu Bakr. No such hadith exists.

9.1 The most beloved are those individuals whose love has been made compulsory in the Qur'an

When seeking to identify the most beloved in the eyes of Rasulallah (s) one need to look no further than the Qur'an. Allah (swt) states the duty that has been placed on the Muslims:

Say: "No reward do I ask of you for this except the love of those near of kin." (42:23).

Jalaladin Suyuti in Tafsir 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'.

Other leading lights of Ahl'ul Sunnah have also conformed that this verse came down in respect of these four individuals:

1. Hilayat al Awliya page 201 Volume 3
2. Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 page 172
3. Sawaiq al Muhriqa page 101
4. Usdul Ghaba page 367 Volume 5
5. Kanz al-`ummal page 217 Volume 1

Clearly these four individuals are the most beloved to Rasulallah (s) to the extent that Allah (swt) has declared love towards them as the only wage required by Rasulallah (s), for providing the ummah with Allah's message – Islam. Therefore, their love is a part of the Deen. If Hadhrath Ayesha and Abu Bakr were indeed the 'most' beloved then why has Allah (swt) not stipulated love towards them as a duty upon the Muslims in the same way He (swt) has for Imams Ali (as), Hasan (as), Husayn (as) and Sayyida Fatima (as)?

9.2 Rasulallah selected his most beloved on the Day of Brotherhood

We read in Seerath Ibn Hisham Volume 1 page 55 that:

"The Prophet after the Hijrah said to the Muslims: Be brothers in God. Every two should be brothers. Then he took the hand of Ali Ibn Abi Talib and said this is my brother. Thus, the Messenger of God, the Leader of the Messengers, the Imam of the righteous, the one who has no equal among the servants of God and Ali Ibn Abi Talib became brothers. Al Hamzah, Lion of Allah and of his Messenger and Zaid Ibn Harith became brothers, and Abu Bakr and Kharajah Ibn Zuhair became brothers. Omar Ibn Khattab and Atban Ibn Malik became brothers"

Our question to Abu Sulaiman and his fellow advocates is 'If Hadhrath Abu Bakr was indeed the most beloved then why did the Holy Prophet (s) not select him to be his brother when he (s) divided the Sahaba in to pairs on the Day of Brotherhood?' This occasion was a clear declaration of the closeness between Imam 'Ali (as) and Rasulullah (s). If Hadhrath Abu Bakr was the most beloved then why did he prefer Imam Ali (as) over him?

9.3 Hadhrath Ayesha's testimony as to who the most beloved were

If the Ansar.org will continue to insist on their position that Ayesha and Abu Bakr were the most beloved in the eyes of Rasulullah (s), then why do they not accept the testimony of Hadhrath Ayesha herself, taken from the Ahlul Sunnah book, Mishkath al Masabih Volume 3 page 257 (Urdu translation Fareed Bookstall Publishers, Lahore):

Jami bin Umair narrates: 'I accompanied my aunt and approached Hadhrath Ayesha and asked her 'Who was the dearest among the people to Rasulullah?' she replied 'Fatima'. I then asked 'And amongst men? She replied 'Her husband'.

10. Does the Qur'an guarantee Hadhrath Ayesha's protection from criticism?

In his attempts to defend Hadhrath Ayesha, Abu Sulaiman states:

Ansar.org states:
 Aysa deserved all this respect, regard, and more from Ahl Al-Sunnah because she is the wife of the pure prophet peace be upon him that he chose to be his wife because she is pure too. Allah Almighty says, "Women impure are for men impure, and men impure for women impure and women of purity are for men of purity, and men of purity are for women of purity: these are not affected by what people say: for them there is forgiveness, and a provision honourable." (Surat Al-Noor, 26).

Here Allah (swt) is talking about the common example of people, a pious man will not intentionally search out an ill-chartered woman and vice versa. To say that this is a precedent that pious men ONLY have pious wives and impure men only have impure wives, is absolutely baseless and contradicts the Qur'an. To prove the fallacy of Abu Sulaiman's claim all we need to do is to cite these two verses from Surah Tahreem verses 66:10-11, which incidentally had descended as a warning to Ayesha and Hafsa:

"Allah has set forth an example to the disbeliever's, the wife Of Noah and the wife of Lot. They were both married to two servants from among our righteous servants, but they were deceitful/treacherous to their husbands. And they benefited nothing before Allah on the account of their (husbands). Instead they were told: "Enter the Fire with those who enter." Allah cited an example for the believers, the wife of Pharaoh when she said: "O my Lord, build for me a house in paradise, and save me from Pharaoh and his deeds; and save me from the people who do wrong".

If pious men ONLY marry pious women, how is it that Prophet's Nuh (as) and Lut (as) both had wives that are in Hell for their acts of deceit and treachery? If impious men only marry impious women then how is it Pharaoh, the enemy of Allah (swt) was married to Hadhrath Asiya, who is extolled for her piety?

We would look forward to Abu Sulaiman's commentary of these verses in light of his claim.

10.1 Allah (swt) has condemned Hadhrath Ayesha in the Qur'an

Whilst Allah (swt) refers to Rasulullah's wives in different guises, Hadhrath Ayesha and Hafsa are two wives who have been specifically admonished by Allah (swt) on account of their behaviour. Abu Sulaiman can offer as many defences as he chooses, Ayesha herself testifies to her scheming with Hadhrath Hafsa that led to the descent of this verse.

"O Prophet! Why holdest thou to be forbidden that which Allah has made lawful to thee? Thou seekest to please thy consorts" (Surah Tahreem verse 1, Yusuf Ali's translation).

This is what we read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 434:

"Narrated 'Aisha: Allah's Apostle used to drink honey in the house of Zainab, the daughter of Jahsh, and would stay there with her. So Hafsa and I agreed secretly that, if he come to either of us, she would say to him. "It seems you have eaten Maghafir (a kind of bad-smelling resin), for I smell in you the smell of Maghafir," (We did so) and he replied. "No, but I was drinking honey in the house of Zainab,

the daughter of Jahsh, and I shall never take it again. I have taken an oath as to that, and you should not tell anybody about it".

So Hadhrath Ayesha admits:

- Both her and Ayesha entered in to a secret plot in an effort to keep Rasulullah (s) away from the house of Ummul Momineen Zainab.
- To achieve this objective they both lied to Rasulullah (s).
- Allah (swt) exposed the two wives in this verse, so much so that in Surah Tahreem verse 4, He (swt) says:

"If ye two turn in repentance to Him, your hearts are indeed so inclined; But if ye back up each other against him, truly Allah is his Protector, and Gabriel, and (every) righteous one among those who believe,- and furthermore, the angels - will back (him) up".

Here is just a handful of Ahl'ul Sunnah texts that confirm Surah Tahreem descended following the planning by Ayesha and Hafsa:

1. Sahih al Bukhari Volume 6 hadith number 437
2. Sunan Nasai Volume 6 page 152
3. Musnad Ibn Hanbal Volume 1 page 252
4. Tafheemul Qur'an commentary of Surah Tahreem

For the sake of brevity we shall only cite the fatwa of Hadhrath Umar with regards to who this verse descended about:

Sahih al Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 437:

"Narrated Ibn Abbas: I intended to ask 'Umar about those two ladies who back each other against 'Allah's Apostle . For one year I was seeking the opportunity to ask this question, but in vain, until once when I accompanied him for Hajj. While we were in Zahran, 'Umar went to answer the call of nature and told me to follow him with some water for ablution. So I followed him with a container of water and started pouring water for him. I found it a good opportunity to ask him, so I said, "O chief of the Believers! Who were those two ladies who had backed each other (against the Prophet)?" Before I could complete my question, he replied, "They were 'Aisha and Hafsa."

The comments of Sayyid Abul A'la Maudoodi in his Tafheemul Qur'an, regarding this verse, a commentary which he has cited relying on some of the most revered and authentic Sunni sources, are of particular significance. We are translating the text direct from the Urdu version:

"The actual words are ' faqad saghat quloobukuma', Saghoo in Arabic grammar means bent or crooked. Shah Waliullah has translated this phrase: "har aaiyeena kaj shuda ast dil shuma", and Shah Rafiuddin translated the words as "crooked have become your hearts". Hadhraat Abdullah bin Masood, Abdullah bin Abbas, Sufyan Thuri and Dhahaak described the words as 'zaaghat quloobukuma' ie. "your hearts have diverted away from the right path". Imam Raazi in his commentary states "adlat wa maalat anilhaq wa huwa haqqar rasool sallal laho aliahey wa sallam" that means "you have removed yourselves from the truth, the truth in this context refers to Rasulullah (s). Allama Alusi in his explanation of this verse states "maalat anilwajib min muafiqatuh sallaho alahe wa sallam mujibbee maa yuhibuh waa karaahat maa yakrahu ila mukhaalifateh" that means "it is incumbent on you to support the Prophet in whatever he likes or not, but your hearts in this matter have turned away from supporting him to opposing him".

The Actual words are wa in tazaahara alaihee, tazaaharoo which means to mutually co-operate / unite against someone. Shah Abdul Qadir's translation is " If you two would mount a campaign against him", Maulana Ashraf Ali's translation is " If likewise you two continued to actively engage against the prophet. Maulana Shabbir Ahmed Uthmani in his commentary has defined the words "If you two continue to persist with such demonstrations."

The verses' are clearly addressing two women, and from the context it seems that these women are the holy wives of the prophet because from the first to the fifth verse of this chapter, matters relevant to the prophet's wives have been under discussion. As regards who these wives were and what that affair was on which this wrath descended, its detail can be located in hadeeth. Musnad Ahmed bin Hanbal, Bukhari, Muslim, Tirmidhi and in Nisai have been recorded the event, with slight variations in wording. Ibn Abbas ® says: For some time, I was curious to ask Hadhrat Umar about the identity of the Prophet's wives who had jointly colluded against the Prophet. about whom Allah Taalaa had said in this verse ' in tatoobaa ilallahee faqad saghat quloobukuma', but I couldn't dare due to his temper. At last, he once went for hajj and I accompanied him. On the way back, at one point I assisted him to make Wudhoo, I got the opportunity and I asked him the question. He said they were Ayesha and Hafsa. Then he started describing that we, the Quraysh, kept our women? under control. When we came to Madina, we met here people who were dominated by their wives, and the this led to our wives following their methods. One day, I got displeased with my wife, when she began to answer me back (the actual words are faa izaahiyaa turaajiuni); I found this intolerable. She asked why I was angered by her answering back, 'God be my witness prophet's wives answer back immediately (the actual word is leyurjenahu), among them are some who are estranged from the Prophet for the entire day (In the tradition of Bukhari, it is that Prophet remained displeased for the whole day). Upon listening to this I left my home and approached Hafsa (who was the daughter of Hadhrat Umar and the wife of the prophet). I asked her if she answered back to the Prophet, she said yes and I said was there anyone amongst you who the Prophet would separate from for the whole day? (Bukhari's tradition says that the Prophet (s) remains displeased with all day long), she said yes. I said 'that woman is very unfortunate and is at a considerable loss. Don't you fear that the Prophet's wrath may in turn lead to Allah's wrath and subsequent annihilation? Never exchange words with the Prophet, nor demand anything of him, ask of whatever you want of my possessions. Do not be deceived by the fact that your neighbour (meaning Hadhrat Ayesha) is prettier than you and more beloved to the Prophet. After this, I went to Umm Salma who was my relative and I talked to her on this matter and she said Ibn Khattab what an odd person you are, you have interfered in every affair, so much so, now you are interfering in the affairs of Prophet's wives. Her words broke my courage. Then it so happened that one Ansari friend of mine visited me at night and he called for me. We used to take turns in sessions with the Prophet, and whatever one of us heard on his turn of attendance was communicated to the other. The period was when we feared the invasion from Ghassan. As I came out to see him, he said that a big calamity has occurred. I said have the Ghassanis invaded? He said no, it is even more serious, the Prophet has divorced his wives...My translation might sound somewhat impudent but to tone it down constitutes interfering with the true import and intent of Divine words where Allah (swt) has supported Rasulullah (s) did and condemned his tormentors in the explicit unforgiving manner that they both so well deserved.

Some other people declare my use of these as impertinence, although this could be impertinence only if we had dared assuming such words for Hadhrat Hafsa; we have only expressed the correct meanings of Hadhrat Umar's words, and these words were used by him to reprimand his daughter for her wrongdoing. To call it impertinence would imply that while a father is disciplining his daughter, he should

remain talking to her with deference...At this point one should ponder if the matter was so small and insignificant that the Prophet at times would say something to his wives and they would say one or two things back, then the question arises 'why was it given so much importance that in Quraan Allah (swt) takes it upon Himself to reprimand these holy wives?, in a manner so stern that Hadhrat Umar deemed the matter as so serious that he first disciplined his daughter and then went to the houses of the other holy wives, he made them fear the wrath of Allah. Are we really to believe that the Prophet was so highly sensitive that he got offended with his wives on trivial issues? May God forgive us, should we believe that he was so touchy that he considered separating from his wives on a minor matter secluding himself in his abode. Only two options are available. An individual is either so conscious of the reverence of the holy wives that he cares less for the honour of God and His prophet or he will readily admit that in that period the attitude of these holy wives had reached such a point that the prophet was justified in being offended with them, and more than him Allah (swt) Himself had the right to sternly censure these wives...That is why in Quran there are just only two such occasions where these revered women have been reprimanded, one chapter Ahzaab and one this chapter Tahreem".

These verses, particularly in light of Maudoodi's commentary, are indeed very interesting, for the aqeedah of Ahl'ul Sunnah is that ALL the Sahaba are just and truthful. This verse demonstrates the exact opposite, two wives of Rasulullah (s) have been exposed for lying.

10.2 Hadhrath Ayesha's condemnation in the Qur'an is further proof that she was not the most superior wife of Rasulullah (s)

Some Ahl'ul Sunnah assert that since Ayesha was the most superior wife then that means that she was the most superior of all women. Not only is the claim that she was the most superior wife baseless, the fact of the matter is in Surah Tahreem, Allah (swt) also states this:

"Perhaps if he divorces you, his Lord will give him wives who are better than you, who submit and believe (Qur'an 66:5)" - this clearly indicates that there were believing women among the Muslims who were much better than Ayesha.

11. Do the Shi'a slander Hadhrath Ayesha?

It's a blatant lie that is also without any authentic historic base that naudhabillah shi'a ulama suspect the character of Ummul Momineen Hadhrath Ayesha. The Shi'a never point fingers at the Wives of Prophet (s) including Hadhrath Ayesha. But it is a historic fact also mentioned in Holy Quran that some munafiq companions during the life of Holy Prophet accused Hadhrath Ayesha of adultery and they were punished by the order of Holy Prophet (S)....

11.1 The Sahaba slandered the character of Hadhrath Ayesha

This event is clearly mentioned in the Holy Quran: Surah Noor, Ayah 11. For authentic references from the books of Ahl'ul Sunnah, see the following:

1. Sahih al Bukhari Volume 5 hadith number 462, Chapter al Maghazi (Expeditions)
2. Sunan Nisai Volume 4 page 162 "Kitab Hudood"
3. Fathul Bari Volume 5 page 273 "Kitab Shahadath"
4. Irhsad al Sari Sharh Bukhari Volume 4 page 494 "Kitab Shahadath"
5. Nawawi's Sharh Muslim, Volume page 364 "Kitab Tauba"
6. al Bidayah al Nihaya by Ibn Kathir on page 160 Volume 4, Chapter "Dhir Ifk"
7. Tafsir Mazhari commentary of Surah Nur Volume 17 page 479
8. Tafsir Kabeer Volume 6 page 240 Surah Nur
9. Tafsir Fathul Qadeer Volume 5 page 49 Surah Nur
10. Umdah al Qari fi Sharh Sahih al Bukhari Volume 6 page 90 Bab Shahadath
11. Sirat un Nabi by Ibn Hisham, chapter 137 (the event of Ifik) page no 360.

Ibn Kathir in al Bidayah al Nihaya by Ibn Kathir on page 160 Volume 4, Chapter "Dhikr Ahfak writes the following:

"Hadhrath Ayesha was accused of illicit relations. Those responsible for spreading this allegation were Hadhrath Abu Bakr's cousin Mustha bin Hasasa and the Prophet's sister in law Humna binte Hajash and the poet Hasan bin Thabit. The Prophet ordered that they be flogged and they were punished accordingly"

This is how the event is narrated in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 5 hadith number 462:

"Whenever Allah's Apostle intended to go on a journey, he used to draw lots amongst his wives, and Allah's Apostle used to take with him the one on whom lot fell. He drew lots amongst us during one of the Ghazwat which he fought. The lot fell on me and so I proceeded with Allah's Apostle after Allah's order of veiling (the women) had been revealed. I was carried (on the back of a camel) in my howdah and carried down while still in it (when we came to a halt). So we went on till Allah's Apostle had finished from that Ghazwa of his and returned. When we approached the city of Medina he announced at night that it was time for departure. So when they announced the news of departure, I got up and went away from the army camps, and after finishing from the call of nature, I came back to my riding animal. I touched my chest to find that my necklace which was made of Zifar beads (i.e. Yemenite beads partly black and partly white) was missing. So I returned to look for my necklace and my search for it detained me. (In the meanwhile) the people who used to carry me on my camel, came and took my howdah and put it on the back of my camel on which I used to ride, as they considered that I was in it. In those days women were light in weight for they did not get fat, and flesh did not cover their bodies in abundance as they used to eat only a little food. Those people therefore, disregarded the lightness of the howdah while lifting and carrying it; and at that time I was still a young girl. They made the camel rise and all of them left (along with it). I found my necklace after the army had gone.

Then I came to their camping place to find no call maker of them, nor one who would respond to the call. So I intended to go to the place where I used to stay, thinking that they would miss me and come back to me (in my search). While I was sitting in my resting place, I was overwhelmed by sleep and slept. Safwan bin Al-Muattal As-Sulami Adh-Dhakwani was behind the army. When he reached my place in the morning, he saw the figure of a sleeping person and he recognized me on seeing me as he had seen me before the order of compulsory veiling (was prescribed). So I woke up when he recited Istirja' (i.e. "Inna lillahi wa inna lillaihi raji'un") as soon as he recognized me. I veiled my face with my head cover at once, and by Allah, we did not speak a single word, and I did not hear him saying any word besides his Istirja'. He dismounted from his camel and made it kneel down, putting his leg on its front legs and then I got up and rode on it. Then he set out leading the camel that was carrying me till we overtook the army in the extreme heat of midday while they were at a halt (taking a rest). (Because of the event) some people brought destruction upon themselves and the one who spread the Ifk (i.e. slander) more, was 'Abdullah bin Ubai Ibn Salul."

(Urwa said, "The people propagated the slander and talked about it in his (i.e. 'Abdullah's) presence and he confirmed it and listened to it and asked about it to let it prevail." Urwa also added, "None was mentioned as members of the slanderous group besides ('Abdullah) except Hassan bin Thabit and Mistah bin Uthatha and Hamna bint Jahsh along with others about whom I have no knowledge, but they were a group as Allah said. It is said that the one who carried most of the slander was 'Abdullah bin Ubai bin Salul." Urwa added, "'Aisha disliked to have Hassan abused in her presence and she used to say, 'It was he who said: My father and his (i.e. my father's) father and my honor are all for the protection of Muhammad's honor from you.'").....

In Sirat un Nabi by Ibn Hisham, chapter 137 (the event of Ifik) page no 360 we are told:

"the Sahaba that were punished (flogged) for slandering Ayesha were: Mistah ibn Uthatha, Hassan bin Thabit and Hamna bint Jahash".

As part of their propaganda, Nasibis often allege that we accuse Ayesha of this, but this is a blatant lie. Hadhrath Ayesha's innocence has been vouched for in the Qur'an and the Shi'a have stated this clearly in their commentaries. It is unfortunate that rather than attack us these masters of fitnah don't take into account that those who questioned Hadhrath Ayesha's character were none other than the Sahaba themselves.

12. The 'true' Shia position with regards to Hadhrath Ayesha

12.1 Distinguishing between slander and objective criticism

Unfortunately our opponents have difficulty distinguishing between criticism and slander. Criticism is perfectly legitimate if it is based on facts whether they are from the sources of Qur'an, Sunnah and annals of history. This is the Shi'a approach when we discuss topics such as this one; we present the facts from these three sources to show to our readers that if we have been critical of Hadhrath Ayesha, it is on account of her actions. Slander entails making uncorroborated comments about an individual, so as to destroy that person's character. As we have proven, slandering Hadhrath Ayesha was an approach adopted by the Sahaba. The Shi'a do NOT slander Hadhrath Ayesha, if we are critical of Ayesha or for that matter, any Sahabi, we can substantiate and elaborate our reasons, as this site sets out to do.

12.2 Hadhrath Ayesha failed to recognise the Imam of her time

We read in Sharh Fiqh Akbar, by Mulla Ali Qari, p 175 (publishers Muhammad Saeed and son, Qur'an Muhall, Karachi) we read:

"...there is a hadith in Sahih Muslim, narrated by Abdullah ibne Umar 'He who dies without recognising giving bayah and following his Imam dies the death of one belonging to the days of jahiliyya'. This is why the Sahaba viewed the appointment of the Imam as so important that they preferred it to attending the Prophet's funeral, because the Muslims need an Imam so that orders can be made on Jihad, and so that Islamic Laws can be implemented"

Imam 'Ali (as) WAS the Imam of the time his obedience was unconditional, it was incumbent on Ayesha to recognise his Leadership and follow him in all his decisions. Rather than do this she chose to oppose him, instigate rebellion against him and a war that lead to the deaths of thousands of her supporters, as a result these individuals died the death of jahilyya because they failed to recognise the Imam of the time. Not only did Ayesha fail to do so she led others in to misguidance, they fell in to error on account of her position.

12.3 One who opposes Ahl'ul bayt (as) is from the Party of Shaythan

"The stars protect the inhabitants of earth against drowning, and my Ahl al-Bayt 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." (al-Hakim on page 149, Vol. 3, of Al-Mustadrak from Ibn `Abbas. Al-Hakim adds: "This is an authentic hadith though they (both Shaykhs, i.e. Bukhari and Muslim) did not include it (in their own books)."

Hadhrath Ayesha's duty after Rasulullah (s) was to attach herself to the Ahl'ul bayt (as) not to openly dissent against them and mount armed rebellion against Imam 'Ali (as). Rasulullah (s) had declared that Ali was with the truth, and Hadhrath Ayesha's duty was to obey Imam 'Ali (as) not to oppose him. Allah (swt) had also made love of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) a duty in the Qur'an but rather than attach herself to the Ahl'ul bayt (as) and love them, Hadhrath Ayesha bore resentment towards them, fought Imam 'Ali (as) and rejoiced at his martyrdom.

Had Hadhrath Ayesha remained in her station as Ummul Momineen living a life of piety within the confines of her home, she would have indeed attained the esteemed respect that the wives

of Rasulullah (s) deserve. Unfortunately her envy and greed lead her to mount a mass rebellion against the Imam of the time 'Ali ibne abi Talib (as). By acting in the way that she did, she in effect set a precedent that it was perfectly legitimate to rebel against the rightful Imam to get your demands met. This in effect gave the green light to Mu'awiya and his clan to act in the same way towards Imam 'Ali (as) - for they saw a wife of the Prophet leading armed rebellion against the rightful Imam of the time.

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.

You can distribute this "downloaded document" version of the Answering-Ansar.org article, as long as this document remains in its original shape and none of the contents are changed in any format.