

Abd Allah Ibn Saba Myth Exploded



Toyib Olawuyi

Al-Islam.org

Author(s):

Toyib Olawuyi [3]

This text carefully examines and refutes the claims of Ahlul Sunnah about Abd Allah Ibn Saba.

Category:

Early Islamic History [4]

Miscellaneous information:

Abd Allah Ibn Saba Myth Exploded, Author: Toyib Olawuyi.

Person Tags:

Abdullah b. Saba [5]

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

محمد نبينا

بنوره هادينا

من مكة حبيبى نوره

سطع في المدينة

This research is dedicated to my beloved master, ‘Ammar b. Yasir, the noble companion of the Messenger of Allah and Amir al-Muminin,

‘alaihima al-salam

, may Allah be pleased with him and his blessed parents.

Special thanks to Tural Islam, Aneela Sultan, Ali Baker, Ahmad Olawuyi, Sa’dudeen Mahmud (Alfa Tira), Lukman Ibrahim, and the following brothers and sisters, for their encouragement: Shaykh Muhammad Nura Dass, Shaykh Muhibullah ‘Ali, Shaykh Abu Bakr Bello Salati, Waheed Afolabi, Dr. ‘Abdullateef Saliu, Mikail Zakariyah, Ra’ouf Ali-Zadeh, Jafar Mer, Steve Davies, Jaffer Abbas, Jibreel Ibn Mikael, Muhammad Ali Khalil, Ahmed Hakim, Hassan Bokhari, Syed Jarry Haider, Omidiji Nurudeen, Ibrahim Olasunkonmi Bello, Kassim Agbonika Salihu, Ilani Abubakar, Mounir Bahsoun, Kamal Ishmael, Bilal Bernard Nolan, Dylan Esteban, Aquib Mehdi Rizvi, Syed Ali Raza, Sajjad Abu Ja’far Baktash, Radwan Hamoud, Akram Abbas, Ali Hussnain, Nader Carun, Henna Rai, Rizziandrie Zairul, Nasir Hasan, Sayed Umaar Kazmi, and Hussain Ali Nasser. May Allah bless them all and all our loving brothers and sisters from the Shi’ah Imamiyyah and the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama’ah.

Every Shi’i who seeks to debate a Sunni must insist on certain ten principles:

1. Both parties must swear before Allah to pursue, defend and follow the truth alone.
2. Both parties must agree on a specific topic, and also set the boundaries of the discussion.
3. Each party must declare beforehand what exactly must be proved by the other party in order to win the debate.
4. Each side must swear before Allah to strictly stay on the topic of the debate, and not deviate, digress or venture into any other throughout the discussion.
5. Each party must swear before Allah to present only authentically transmitted reports from both the Sunni books and the Shi’i books.
6. The Sunni party *must* always present reports with reliable chains from the Shi’i books only in order to convince the Shi’i on any point. In the same manner, the Shi’i must always present reports with reliable chains from the Sunni books in order to convince the Sunni on any point.
7. Authenticity of the reports is determined primarily through the chains of narration. Each party must either present the opinions of the relevant leading *rijal* experts on each *riwayah* or do a thorough *rijal* breakdown of its narrators using the strictest appropriate *rijal* standards. If either party has an objection to the authentication by the ‘*ulama* of any particular report, he must present convincing evidence to prove their error.

8. The opinions of scholars on issues are not valid as proof unless reliably transmitted evidence can be provided to back them up.

9. It is he who claims that something exists, or that it is true, that *must* provide the cogent evidence for it. The party denying it has no obligation to provide proof of his denial. However, where the claimer has provided his proof, the onus shifts to the denier. The denier must either accept the evidence supplied, or provide solid academically sound and orthodox reasons to reject it.

10. There shall never be any vulgar abuse of the other party or anyone respected by his sect or *madhhab*. The debate shall be entirely decorous, and the choice of words shall be respectful.

Unfortunately, not many Sunnis or Shi'is have the necessary skills or temperaments to accept all the conditions stated above. Therefore, we almost always see very poor pseudo-debates, especially on online forums. We often see each side quoting *dha'if* reports from even his own sources, as well as from those of the opposing party, to drive home his weak points! In most cases, no original research is ever done on the topic by either side. Rather, each of them merely copy-pastes heavily from websites and parrots statements by others.

In the end, nothing useful is achieved from the debate. On a lot of occasions, the discussion turns into a cursing contest; and the party with the vilest tongue declares victory. It is our absolute conviction that whatever is worth doing at all, is worth doing best. It is more advisable for pseudo-debaters to take time to train themselves in the necessary skills – academic and emotional – needed for a real debate before (re-)taking the podiums. The damage and evil caused by the pseudo-debates outweigh any benefits that might come from them.

Let us take the question of “Ibn Saba” as a case study for the ten rules above. Our brothers from the Ahl al-Sunnah always make the following claims about him:

1. He was a descendant of Saba, and belonged to one of the Sabai tribes.
2. He was a black Arab with a black slave mother.
3. He was a Jew from Sana in Yemen.
4. He accepted Islam during the *khilafah* of ‘Uthman b. ‘Affan.
5. He stirred up the public, especially the Egyptians, against ‘Uthman and caused the latter’s bloody overthrow.
6. He was the first to claim that ‘Ali, *‘alaihi al-salam*, was the designated successor of the Messenger of Allah, *sallallahu ‘alaihi wa alihi*.
7. He was the first to proclaim belief in *al-raj’ah* – that is, that the return to this world after death by

certain dead people.

8. He was the first to publicly criticize or revile Abu Bakr and 'Umar.

9. He was popularly called *Ibn al-Sawda* – son of the black mother.

10. Imam 'Ali was frustrated with him, and abused him by calling him “the black container” and also banished him to al-Madain.

11. Amir al-Muminin 'Ali b. Abi Talib saw it as legitimate to execute him for reviling Abu Bakr and 'Umar, and would have done so had people not talked him out of the decision.

12. 'Ali burnt him (i.e. Ibn Saba) and his followers alive for calling him (i.e. 'Ali) Allah.

Since it is the Sunni in any debate who makes these claims, the onus is on him to provide reliably transmitted evidence for each and every point. The Shi'i – who denies them – has no initial obligation or responsibility to bring any evidence to refute them¹.

Normally, the question is: who exactly is the Sunni trying to convince on these matters? If he only seeks to convince his Sunni brothers, then he must present reliable *riwayat* from the *Sunni* books to back up all the points². However, if his aim is only to convince the Shi'ah, in that case he has no other choice but to quote nothing but authentic *Shi'i* reports in support of himself.

Incidentally, there are only three reliable *athar* concerning Ibn Saba throughout all Shi'i books. Shaykh 'Ali Al Muhsin has compiled the Shi'i *riwayat* about 'Abd Allah b. Saba, and examined their various chains³, and has thus concluded:

والصحيح من تلك الروايات منحصر بثلاث روايات مروية في رجال
الكشي، وهي تثبت وجود عبد الله بن سبأ، وأنه ادّعى الألوهية في أمير المؤمنين،
فأحرقه بالنار، ولا تثبت أكثر من ذلك.

The authentic from these reports are only three reports recorded in *Rijal al-Kashi*, and they establish the existence of 'Abd Allah b. Saba, and that he claimed divinity for Amir al-Muminin, and that he ('Ali) therefore burnt him (i.e. Ibn Saba) with fire. **Nothing more than that is proved.**⁴

This is the first of the three reports, as quoted by Al Muhsin:

رواه الكشي أيضاً بسنده عن هشام بن سالم، قال: سمعت أبا عبد الله يقول
وهو يحدث أصحابه بحديث عبد الله بن سبأ وما ادّعى من الربوبية في أمير

المؤمنين علي بن أبي طالب, فقال: إنه لما ادّعى ذلك فيه استتابه أمير المؤمنين, فأبى أن يتوب فأحرقه بالنار.

Al-Kashi narrated it too with his chain from Hisham b. Salim, who said: I heard Abu ‘Abd Allah saying, while addressing his companions on the issue of ‘Abd Allah b. Saba and his claim of divinity for Amir al-Muminin, ‘Ali b. Abi Talib: “When he made that claim concerning him, Amir al-Muminin asked him to repent. But, he refused to repent. So, he burnt him with fire.”⁵

Al Muhsin also copies the second *hadith*:

رواه الكشي أيضاً في كتابه المذكور بسنده عن أبان بن عثمان, قال: سمعت أبا عبد الله يقول: لعن الله عبد الله بن سبأ, إنه ادّعى الربوبية في أمير المؤمنين, وكان والله أمير المؤمنين عبداً لله طائعاً, الويل لمن كذب علينا, وإن قوماً يقولون فينا ما لا نقوله في أنفسنا, نبرأ إلى الله منهم, نبرأ إلى الله منهم.

Al-Kashi records again in his mentioned book with his chain from Aban b. ‘Uthman, who said: I heard Abu ‘Abd Allah saying: “**May Allah curse ‘Abd Allah b. Saba.** Verily, he claimed divinity for Amir al-Muminin. I swear by Allah, Amir al-Muminin was only an obedient slave of Allah. Woe unto whosoever lies upon us. A group say concerning us what we never say about ourselves, we dissociate ourselves from them unto Allah. We dissociate ourselves from them unto Allah.”⁶

And this is the third report, cited by Shaykh Al Muhsin:

رواه أيضاً بسنده عن أبي حمزة الثمالي, قال: قال علي بن الحسين: لعن الله من كذب علينا, إني ذكرت عبد الله بن سبأ فقامت كل شعرة في جسدي, لقد ادّعى أمراً عظيماً, ما له لعنه الله! كان علي والله عبداً لله صالحاً, أخو رسول الله, ما نال الكرامة من الله إلا بطاعته لله ولرسوله, وما نال رسول الله الكرامة من الله إلا بطاعته.

He narrated again with his chain from Abu Hamzah al-Thumali, who said:

‘Ali b. al-Husayn said: “May Allah curse whosoever lies upon us. I remember ‘Abd Allah b. Saba, and every hair on my body rises. He made a terrible claim. What was wrong with him? **May Allah curse**

him. I swear by Allah, ‘Ali was only a righteous slave of Allah and the brother of the Messenger of Allah. He did not achieve honour from Allah except through his obedience to Allah and to His Messenger. The Messenger of Allah too did not achieve honour from Allah except with his obedience of Him.⁷

Then, Al Muhsin comments about the three *ahadith*:

وهذه الروايات الثلاث صحيحة السند

These three reports have *sahih* chains.⁸

Any Sunni who wants to debate any Shi’i on the topic of ‘Abd Allah b. Saba, *la’natullah ‘alaihi*, can therefore only quote the three *riwayat* above if he is sincere. However, he would NEVER be able to establish the Sunni claims below, through those authentic Shi’i *ahadith*:

1. ‘Abd Allah b. Saba was a black Arab with a black mother.
2. He was a Jew from Sana in Yemen.
3. He accepted Islam during the *khilafah* of ‘Uthman b. ‘Affan.
4. He stirred up the public, especially the Egyptians, against ‘Uthman and caused the latter’s bloody overthrow.
5. He was the first to claim that ‘Ali was the designated successor of the Messenger of Allah.
6. He was the first to proclaim belief in *al-raj’ah* – that is, that the Prophet will one day return to this world after death.
7. He was the first to publicly criticize or revile Abu Bakr and ‘Umar.
8. He was popularly called *Ibn al-Sawda* – son of *the* black mother.
9. Imam ‘Ali was frustrated with him, and abused him racially by calling him “the black container” and also banished him to al-Madain.
10. Amir al-Muminin ‘Ali b. Abi Talib saw it as legitimate to execute him for reviling Abu Bakr and ‘Umar, and would have done so had people not talked him out of the decision.

Therefore, our brothers from the Ahl al-Sunnah will *always* lose any debate on Ibn Saba with any Shi’i as long as both sides are honest.

Meanwhile, what about the Sunni sources? What if a Sunni only intended to convince another Sunni

concerning ‘Abd Allah b. Saba? Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) outlines the necessary rules here:

و الجواب من وجوه أحدها انه لا بد من إقامة الدليل على صحة المنقول إلا
فلاستدلال بما لا تثبت

The reply is from several angles. One of them is: **evidence *must* be presented for the authenticity of whatever is quoted.** Unless this is done, using it as proof is invalid.⁹

Elsewhere, in rejecting a report, he adds:

فيقال أولاً هذه الحكاية لم يذكر لها إسناداً فلا تعرف صحتها فإن المنقولات إنما
تعرف صحتها بالأسانيد الثابتة

It is said (in reply) that first and foremost, he has not mentioned any chain for this narration. Therefore, its authenticity is unknown. **This is because the authenticity of quoted reports is known only through their authentic chains.**¹⁰

He further reiterates:

ومعلوم أن من احتج في أي مسألة كانت بشيء من النقل فلا بد أن يذكر إسناداً
تقوم به الحجة

It is well-known that whosoever relies upon as proof any narration in any issue, **he *must* mention (at least) a chain which establishes it as a *hujjah* (proof).**¹¹

So, every Sunni must do the following with every report he mentions on ‘Abd Allah b. Saba:

1. Quote the report *with the full chain*.
2. Provide clear evidence for the reliability of the chain.

Interestingly, our dear Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah himself has failed completely to comply with either of the two obligatory rules in his discourses about Ibn Saba. For instance, this is his submission about how that controversial, “elusive” character mounted onto the Islamic scene:

وأما بيعة عثمان فلم يتخلف عنها أحد مع كثرة المسلمين وانتشرهم من إفريقية إلى خراسان ومن سواحل الشام إلى أقصى اليمن ومع كونهم كانوا ظاهرين على عدوهم من المشركين وأهل الكتاب يقاتلونهم وهي في زيادة فتح وانتصار ودوام دولة ودوام المسلمين على مبايعته والرضا عنه ست سنين نصف خلافته معظمين له مادحين له لا يظهر من أحد منهم التكلم فيه بسوء

ثم بعد هذا صار يتكلم فيه بعضهم وجمهورهم لا يتكلم فيه إلا بخير وكانت قد طالعت عليهم إمارته فانه بقي اثنتي عشرة سنة لم تدم خلافة أحد من الأربعة ما دامت خلافته فإن خلافة الصديق كانت سنتين وبعض الثالثة وخلافة عمر عشر سنين وبعض الأخرى وخلافة على أربع سنين وبعض الخامسة ونشأ في خلافته من دخل في الإسلام كرها فكان منافقا مثل ابن سبأ وأمثاله وهم الذين سعوا في الفتنة بقتله

As for the *bay'ah* of 'Uthman, there was no one who did not pledge it despite the great number of the Muslims and their spread from Africa to Khurasan (in Iran, Turkmenistan and Afghanistan), and from the plains of Syria to the remotest places of Yemen. This was also despite their victories over their enemies, such as the idolaters and the *Ahl al-Kitab* who fought them. This was accompanied by conquests and the survival of the state and the survival of the Muslims; and they (i.e. the Muslims) followed him and were pleased with him for six years – which was half of the period of his *khilafah*. They showed great respect to him, and praised him. There was not a single one of them who criticized him.

Then, after this, appeared those who criticized him. Yet, the majority of them did not talk about him except in good terms. However, his rule had gotten too long for them, for it lasted twelve years. The *khilafah* of none of the four (rightly guided *khalifahs*) lasted as long as his *khilafah*. The *khilafah* of al-Siddiq was for just a little over two years; the *khilafah* of 'Umar lasted a little over ten years; and the *khilafah* of 'Ali was for a little over four years. **During his ('Uthman's) *khilafah*, there were those who entered Islam unwillingly, and they were hypocrites, such as Ibn Saba and his likes, and they were those who started the *fitnah* (crisis) by killing him.** 12

Really? 'Abd Allah b. Saba “unwillingly” accepted Islam and, within a short period, successfully masterminded the assassination and overthrow of the mighty *khalifah*?! Is there *any* reliable evidence for this? Well, our Shaykh makes no attempt to pretend that there is any! He has neither quoted any *riwayah* with any *sanad*, nor has he provided any evidence whatsoever for the authenticity of any report on his claims.

All right then, is there anything else we should know about ‘Abd Allah b. Saba? Our Shaykh says “yes”:

ولا ريب أن كثيراً ممن يحب الرسول من بني هاشم وغيرهم وقد تشيع قد تلقى من الرافضة ما هو من أعظم الأمور قدحا في الرسول فإن أصل الرفض إنما أحدثه زنديق غرضه إبطال دين الإسلام والقبح في رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كما قد ذكر ذلك العلماء وكان عبد الله بن سبأ شيخ الرافضة لما أظهر الإسلام أراد أن يفسد الإسلام بمكره وخبثه كما فعل بولص بدين النصارى

There is no doubt that a lot of those who loved the Messenger among the Banu Hashim and others – and who also became Shi’ah – imbibed from the Rafidhah some of the most blasphemous matters concerning the Messenger. **This is because *al-rafdh* was founded by an infidel, whose aim was to destroy the religion of Islam, and to blaspheme the Messenger of Allah**, peace be upon him, as mentioned by the scholars. ‘Abd Allah b. Saba – the *shaykh* of the Rafidhah – when he professed Islam, he intended to corrupt Islam with his plots and malice, as Paul did with Christianity. 13

Interestingly, once again, our Shaykh fails to provide *any* proof whatsoever for his claims!

So, what exactly did ‘Abd Allah b. Saba do to found Shi’ism? Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah thinks he has a clue on that as well:

قد علم أهل العلم أن أول ما ظهرت الشيعة الإمامية المدعية للنص في أواخر أيام الخلفاء الراشدين وافترى ذلك عبدالله بن سبأ وطائفة الكذابون فلم يكونوا موجودين قبل ذلك

The scholars have known that the Shi’ah Imamiyyah, who claimed the *nass* (for ‘Ali), first appeared during the last periods of the rule of the *khulafa al-rashidin* (i.e. the rightly guided *khalifahs*). **That was invented by ‘Abd Allah b. Saba and a group of liars**. So, they never existed before then. 14

He adds:

وهذا معروف عن ابن سبأ واتباعه وهو الذي ابتدع النص في علي وابتدع أنه معصوم

And this is well-known about Ibn Saba and his followers. **He was the one who innovated the *nass* (i.e. a claim of prophetic appointment as *khalifah*) for ‘Ali, and innovated the claim that he (‘Ali) was *mas’um* (infallible).** 15

The only problem here is that there is ZERO evidence provided to support these claims. Merely claiming that the rumours were “well-known” is not sufficient. An authentically transmitted eye-witness account is required in cases like this. None is quoted anyway, anywhere!

Were there any the other “innovations” created by ‘Abd Allah b. Saba? Our Shaykh proceeds:

قلنا نعم وأشهر الناس بالردة خصوم أبي بكر الصديق رضي الله عنه وأتباعه
كمسيلمة الكذاب وأتباعه وغيرهم وهؤلاء تتولاها الرافضة كما ذكر ذلك غير
واحد من شيوخهم مثل هذا الإمامي وغيره ويقولون إنهم كانوا على الحق وأن
الصديق قاتلهم بغير حق ثم من أظهر الناس ردة الغالية الذين حرقهم علي
رضي الله عنه بالنار لما ادعوا فيه الإلهية وهم السبائية أتباع عبدالله بن سبأ
الذين أظهروا سب أبي بكر وعمر

We say: yes, the most notorious of mankind for apostasy were the enemies of Abu Bakr al-Siddiq, may Allah be pleased with him, and his followers, such as Musaylamah the Liar and his followers and others. These people (i.e. the apostates) are loved by the Rafidhah, as mentioned by many of their *shuyukh*, like this Imami and others. They say that they (those apostates) were upon the truth, and that al-Siddiq fought them unjustly.

Those who were most notorious among mankind for extreme apostasy were **those burnt with fire by ‘Ali**, may Allah be pleased with him, **when they called him Allah. They were the Sabaiyyah, followers of ‘Abd Allah b. Saba, those who were the first to curse Abu Bakr and ‘Umar.** 16

He reiterates the same elsewhere:

وأين شبهة مثل أبي موسى الأشعري الذي وافق عمرا على عزل علي ومعاوية
وأن يجعل الأمر شورى في المسلمين من شبهة عبدالله بن سبأ وأمثاله الذين
يدعون أنه إمام معصوم أو أنه إله أو نبي

Where is the confusion of the likes of Abu Musa al-Ash’ari who concurred with ‘Amr to dethrone (both) ‘Ali and Mu’awiyah and to subject the matter to consultation among the Muslims from the confusion of

‘Abd Allah b. Saba and his likes who called him (i.e. ‘Ali) an infallible Imam, or that he was Allah, or that he was a prophet?’¹⁷

Once more, our Shaykh makes no attempt to quote any report or chain for his submissions. Meanwhile, we have decided to help him out and his followers by actually checking the authenticity of all the primary Sunni *riwayat* about ‘Abd Allah b. Saba – especially all those ones that Sunnis table as evidence concerning him – in order to distinguish the truths from the fables. We sincerely hope that this work of ours will be highly beneficial to every soul seeking to learn the *real* truth about the character called Ibn Saba and the activities and doctrines that have been attributed to him. In this book, we have adopted the same strict investigative and transparent research methodology as we did in our first and second books. We implore Allah to forgive us all our mistakes, and to accept this as a worthy act of *‘ibadah*. And may Allah send His *salawat* and *barakat* upon our master, Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah, and upon his purified offspring.

1. We must emphasize at this point that we, the Shi’ah Imamiyyah, do NOT deny the existence of ‘Abd Allah b. Saba. Those of us who do that are in error, and their opinion does not bind our madhhab. It is only the Qur’an and our authentic ahadith that do that. There indeed was once a man with that name, as our sahih reports establish. However, the only statement that is true about him – from all that the Ahl al-Sunnah claim – is that he considered Amir al-Muminin to be a god. Everything else is false, as nothing else is established in any reliable Sunni or Shi’i riwayat.

Absolutely nothing else at all! As such, all the political roles that the Ahl al-Sunnah have given to Ibn Saba, and all the other doctrines and beliefs that they have attributed to him, are only distortions of the true history. Meanwhile, our belief in the existence of the man, and his consideration of Imam ‘Ali as a god, are based strictly and solely upon our own authentic Shi’i ahadith. As for Sunnis, they do not have a single reliable report in all their books to establish even the existence of Ibn Saba, much less all the fairytales that they have attached to him!

2. We have seen efforts by some Sunni brothers to prove all the Sunni claims about ‘Abd Allah b. Saba by mentioning the existence and doctrines of a group called al-Sabaiyyah. In their opinion, if they can prove that a sect which attributed itself to Ibn Saba existed, then they have already proved the existence of the man himself. Moreover, if they are able to establish the doctrines of this sect, then they have established the original doctrines of the man. This is however a very poor methodology, which is based upon clear logical fallacies.

The fact that a group of people attribute themselves to an individual or an entity does NOT necessarily prove that he/she/it existed. Qur’an 7:71 and 53:19–23 give vivid examples. Al-Lat, al-‘Uzza and Manat were three Arab idols which existed only in “names”. They had no real existence. A lot of the other idols are like that. However, it is possible to find people who attribute themselves to such imaginary idols, and who even spread weird legends about the idols’ “achievements” and “teachings”! Besides that, it is quite possible to find people who have attributed themselves to a real being, but who do NOT truly or accurately represent him at all. Examples of these kinds of adherents abound in our midst. For instance, there are Christians who attribute themselves to the Christ, Prophet ‘Isa b. Maryam, ‘alaihim al-salam. Would it be accurate to determine the existence and true doctrines of the Christ through the existence and doctrines of Christians? On a more specific note, is it correct to claim that the Christ believed in his own divinity, or that he was the Son of God, simply because Christians make these claims? Of course, that would be very wrong!

In the same manner, it is wrong to try to prove the existence and doctrines of ‘Abd Allah b. Saba through the claims and doctrines of al-Sabaiyyah, who attributed themselves to him. Rather, separate authentic reports must be provided to independently and directly establish the existence of the man himself and his personal doctrines, beliefs and teachings.

3. ‘Ali Al Muhsin, ‘Abd Allah b. Saba: Dirasat wa Tahlil (1st edition, 1422 H), pp. 45–50

4. Ibid, p. 49
5. Ibid, p. 47
6. Ibid
7. Ibid
8. Ibid
9. Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muasassat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 7, p. 136
10. Ibid, vol. 3, p. 138
11. Ibid, vol. 5, p. 481
12. Ibid, vol. 8, pp. 315–316
13. Ibid, vol. 8, pp. 478–479
14. Ibid, vol. 8, p. 251
15. Ibid, vol. 7, p. 220
16. Ibid, vol. 3, pp. 458–459
17. Ibid, vol. 2, p. 61

Reports and statements in Sunni books mentioning the name “Abd Allah b. Saba” are generally of three types:

1. *Riwayat* with full chains of transmission.
2. *Riwayat* with NO chain of transmission.
3. Unsupported testimonies and submissions of Sunni *‘ulama* who were never eye-witnesses to the events.

Apparently, the last two categories are *mursal* by default, and are therefore *dha’if* evidences. Chainless and unsupported testimonies are not acceptable as proof, especially in crucial matters like this. So, we will naturally confine ourselves only to reports in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah with chains of narration.

Narration One

Imam Ibn Jarir al-Tabari (d. 310 H), in his *Tarikh*, records:

فيما كتب به إلي السري عن شعيب عن سيف عن عطية عن يزيد الفقعسي قال
كان عبدالله بن سبأ يهوديا من أهل صنعاء أمه سوداء فأسلم زمان عثمان ثم
تنقل في بلدان المسلمين يحالو ضلالتهم فبدأ بالحجاز ثم البصرة ثم الكوفة ثم
الشام فلم يقدر على ما يريد عند أحد من أهل الشام فأخرجوه حتى أتى مصر
فاعتمر فيهم فقال لهم فيما يقول لعجب ممن يزعم أن عيسى يرجع ويكذب بأن
محمدًا يرجع وقد قال الله عز و جل إن الذي فرض عليك القرآن لرادك إلى

معاد فمحمد أحق بالرجوع من عيسى قال فقبل ذلك عنه ووضع لهم الرجعة فتكلموا فيها ثم قال لهم بعد ذلك إنه كان ألف نبي ولكل نبي وصي وكان علي وصي محمد ثم قال محمد خاتم الأنبياء وعلي خاتم الأوصياء ثم قال بعد ذلك من أظلم ممن لم يجز وصية رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ووثب علي وصي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وتناول أمر الأمة ثم قال لهم بعد ذلك إن عثمان أخذها بغير حق وهذا وصي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

Al-Sirri – **Shu'ayb** – **Sayf** – 'Atiyyah – **Yazid al-Faq'asi**:

'Abd Allah b. Saba was a Jew from the people of San'a (the capital of Yemen). His mother was black. He accepted Islam during the rule of 'Uthman. Then he roamed the cities of the Muslims trying to turn them into heretics. He started with the Hijaz (in Saudi Arabia), then Basra (in Iraq), then Kufa (in Iraq), then Syria. But he did not achieve his aim with any of the people of Syria. Rather, they expelled him and he went to Egypt, and he settled among them. Then, he said to them, "It is strange of he who claims that 'Isa will return but rejects that Muhammad will return. Meanwhile, Allah the Almighty has said, 'Verily, He Who has ordained the Qur'an upon you (O Muhammad) will surely bring you back to a place of return' (28:85). As such, Muhammad is more entitled to return than 'Isa." So, it was accepted from him, and he created for them (the doctrine of) *al-raj'ah*, and they spoke about it. Then he said, "Muhammad is the last of the prophets and 'Ali is the last of the designated (immediate) successors (of prophets)." Then he added after that, "Who is more unjust than he who did not fulfil the testamentary will of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and jumped over the designated successor of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and administered the affairs of the *Ummah*?" Then he said to them, "Verily, 'Uthman unjustly seized it, and this ('Ali) is the designated successor of the Messenger of Allah."1

The same report, with very slight variations, is later re-narrated by Imam Ibn Asakir (d. 571 H) as well:

أخبرنا أبو القاسم إسماعيل بن أحمد أنا أحمد بن النقر أنا محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن العباس أنا أبو بكر بن سيف نا السري بن يحيى نا شعيب بن إبراهيم نا سيف بن عمر عن عطية عن يزيد الفقعسي قال كان ابن سبأ يهوديا من أهل صنعاء من أمة سوداء فأسلم زمن عثمان بن عفان ثم تنقل في بلاد المسلمين يحاول ضلالتهم فبدأ بالحجاز ثم بالبصرة ثم الكوفة ثم الشام فلم يقدر على ما يريد عند أحد من أهل الشام فأخرجوه حتى أتى مصر فاعتمر فيهم فقال لهم فيما كان يقول العجب ممن يزعم أن عيسى يرجع ويكذب بأن محمدا يرجع وقد قال الله عز وجل إن الذي فرض عليك القرآن لرادك إلى معاد فمحمد أحق

بالرجوع من عيسى قال فقبل ذلك عنه ووضع له الرجعة فتكلموا فيها ثم قال بعد ذلك إنه كان ألف نبي ولكل نبي وصي وكان علي وصي محمد ثم قال محمد خاتم النبيين وعلي خاتم الأوصياء ثم قال بعد ذلك من أظلم ممن لم يجز وصية رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ووثب على وصي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم تناول الأمة ثم قال لهم بعد ذلك إن عثمان قد جمع أموالاً أخذها بغير حقها وهذا وصي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

Abu al-Qasim Isma'il b. Ahmad – Ahmad b. al-Nuqur – Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman b. al-'Abbas – Abu Bakr b. Sayf – al-Sirri b. Yahya – **Shu'ayb b. Ibrahim – Sayf b. 'Umar** – 'Atiyyah – **Yazid al-Faq'asi**:

Ibn Saba was a Jew from the people of San'a (the capital of Yemen), from a black slave-woman. He accepted Islam during the rule of 'Uthman. Then he roamed the cities of the Muslims trying to turn them into heretics. He started with the Hijaz (in Saudi Arabia), then Basra (in Iraq), then Kufa (in Iraq), then Syria. But he did not achieve his aim with any of the people of Syria. Rather, they expelled him and he went to Egypt, and he settled among them. Then, he said to them, "It is strange of he who claims that 'Isa will return but rejects that Muhammad will return. Meanwhile, Allah the Almighty has said, 'Verily, He Who has ordained the Qur'an upon you (O Muhammad) will surely bring you back to a place of return' (28:85). As such, Muhammad is more entitled to return than 'Isa." So, it was accepted from him, and he created for them (the doctrine of) *al-raj'ah*, and they spoke about it. Then he said, "There were one thousand prophets, and each prophet had a designated successor. And 'Ali was the designated successor of Muhammad." Then he said, "Muhammad is the last of the prophets and 'Ali is the last of the designated (immediate) successors (of prophets)." Then he added after that, "Who is more unjust that he who did not fulfil the testamentary will of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and jumped over the designated successor of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and administered the *Ummah*?" Then he said to them, "Verily, 'Uthman unjustly embezzled funds, and this ('Ali) is the designated successor of the Messenger of Allah."2

This *riwayah* of Yazid al-Faq'asi is the only one – with a chain of narration – throughout all books of the Ahl al-Sunnah that makes the following claims:

1. 'Abd Allah b. Saba, *la'natullah 'alaihi*, had a black slave mother.
2. He accepted Islam during the rule of 'Uthman.
3. He believed that Imam 'Ali, *'alaihi al-salam*, was the designated successor of Prophet Muhammad, *sallallahu 'alaihi wa alihi*.
4. He believed in the *'aqidah* called *al-raj'ah*.

So, if the report collapses, all the four points above go down with it. There would be absolutely nothing else to base those assertions upon. Therefore, let us examine the narrators.

In the chain of the *riwayah*, there is Shu'ayb b. Ibrahim. Who was he? Was he reliable or not? Al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) helps us out here:

شعيب بن إبراهيم الكوفي: رواية كتب سيف عنه فيه جهالة انتهى. ذكره ابن عدي وقال ليس بالمعروف وله أحاديث وأخبار وفيه بعض النكرة وفيها ما فيه تحامل على السلف وفي ثقات ابن حبان شعيب بن إبراهيم من أهل الكوفة يروي عن محمد بن أبان البلخي روى عنه يعقوب بن سفيان فيحتمل أن يكون هو والظاهر أنه غيره

Shu'ayb b. Ibrahim al-Kufi: the narration of the books of Sayf was by him. **There is obscurity concerning him.** Ibn 'Adi mentioned him and said, “**He is unknown.** He narrated *ahadith* and stories, **and there is some repugnancy concerning him.** Among his narrations are those which are prejudiced against the *Salaf*.” In *al-Thiqat*, Ibn Hibban said, “Shu'ayb b. Ibrahim, from the people of Kufah. He narrated from Muhammad b. Aban al-Balkhi and Ya'qub b. Sufyan narrated from him”. It is possible that he (i.e. the Shu'ayb mentioned by Ibn Hibban) was him (i.e. the Shu'ayb who narrated from Sayf), but what is obvious is that he was not him.³

Therefore, Shu'ayb b. Ibrahim is *majhul* (unknown). Ordinarily, we should simply ignore the other narrators in the chain. This singular fact about Shu'ayb itself has torpedoed the entire report. But, there is more!

Imam al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) wants us to know about Sayf too:

سيف بن عمر التميمي الأسدي: ويقال الضبي الكوفي. صاحب كتاب الفتوح وكتاب الردة وغير ذلك. روى عن: جابر الجعفي، وهشام بن عروة، وإسماعيل بن أبي خالد، وعبيد الله بن عمر، وطائفة كثيرة من المجاهيل والإخباريين. روى عنه: النضر بن حماد العتكي، ويعقوب بن إبراهيم الزهري، وشعيب بن إبراهيم الكوفي، وأبو معمر إسماعيل القطعي، وجبارة بن المغلس، وآخرون. قال يحيى بن معين: ضعيف الحديث. وقال أبو حاتم: متروك. بابه الواقدي. وقال أبو داود: ليس بشيء. وقال ابن حبان: اتهم بالزندقة. وروى عباس عن يحيى قال: سيف بن عمر الضبي يحدث عنه المحاربي، ضعيف.

وكذا قال النسائي. وقال الحاكم: سيف بن عمر الضبي أتهم بالزندقة، وهو ساقط في رواية الحديث. وروى ابن حبان بإسناد إنه كان يضع الحديث.

Sayf b. ‘Umar al-Tamimi al-Usaydi: He is also called al-Dhabi al-Kufi, author of *Kitab al-Futuh*, *Kitab al-Riddah* and others. He narrated from: Jabir al-Ju’fi, Hisham b. ‘Urwah, Isma’il b. Abi Khalid, ‘Ubayd Allah b. ‘Umar, and a lot of unknown narrators and storytellers. Those who narrated from him are: al-Nadhar b. Hamad al-‘Atki, Ya’qub b. Ibrahim al-Zuhri, Shu’ayb b. Ibrahim al-Kufi, Abu Ma’mar Isma’il al-Qat’i, Jabarah b. al-Muglis, and others. Yahya b. Ma’in said: “**He is *dha’if* in *hadith***”. Abu Hatim said, “**He is *matruk* (rejected)**, the same kind with al-Waqidi”. Abu Dawud said, “**He is nothing**.” Ibn Hibban said, “**He is accused of disbelief**”. And ‘Abbas narrated that Yahya said, “Sayf b. ‘Umar al-Dhabi narrated *ahadith* from al-Muharibi. **He is *dha’if***.” Al-Nasai said the same thing. Al-Hakim said, “Sayf b. ‘Umar al-Dhabi. **He is accused of disbelief**, and he is a failure as long as *hadith* narration is concerned.” Ibn Hibban narrates with a chain that **he used to fabricate *ahadith***.⁴

‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) also says:

وأما سيف بن عمر ؛ فمعروف؛ لكنه متهم بالوضع؛ قال الذهبي في "المغني": "له تواليف، متروك باتفاق".

As for Sayf b. ‘Umar, he is well-known. However, **he has been accused of fabricating reports**. Al-Dhahabi said in *al-Mughni*: “**He wrote books. He is rejected (*matruk*) by consensus**.”⁵

Elsewhere, the ‘Allamah adds:

قلت: وفي هذا نظر، فإن أكثر الطرق المشار إليها مدارها على سيف بن عمر والواقدي وهما كذابان

I say: There is an error in this, for most of the indicated chains, their pivot is **Sayf b. ‘Umar and al-Waqidi, and they both were LIARS**.⁶

Apparently, no one can ever be more unreliable than Sayf!

It is even further interesting that the man who was supposed to have witnessed all of ‘Abd Allah b. Saba’s actions – including all his journeys and experiences in Hijaz, Basra, Kufa, Syria and Egypt – Yazid al-Faq’asi is completely and *absolutely* unknown (*majhul*). It is so bad that he does not even have

a single entry in any Sunni book of *rijal*!

With the above, it is crystal clear that the *only* report throughout all Sunni books – which connects one ‘Abd Allah b. Saba with Judaism, Yemen, a black mother, the doctrine of *al-raj’ah*, the *wisayah* (designated succession) of Amir al-Muminin ‘Ali, and acceptance of Islam during ‘Uthman’s rule – is absolutely *mawdu’* (fabricated). No report can be more worthless than it is.

Narration Two

So, let us find out if there is an alternative Sunni report which refers explicitly to ‘Abd Allah b. Saba. Through our investigations, we discovered that only six more exist, apart from the *mawdu’* one above. This is one of those six, recorded by Imam Ibn Asakir:

أخبرنا أبو البركات الأنماطي أنا أبو طاهر أحمد بن الحسن وأبو الفضل أحمد بن الحسن قالوا أنا عبد الملك بن محمد بن عبد الله أنا أبو علي بن الصواف نا محمد بن عثمان بن أبي شيبة نا محمد بن العلاء نا أبو بكر بن عياش عن مجالد عن الشعبي قال أول من كذب عبد الله بن سبأ

Abu al-Barakat al-Anmati – Abu Tahir Ahmad b. al-Hasan and Abu al-Fadhl Ahmad b. al-Hasan – ‘Abd al-Malik b. Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah – Abu ‘Ali b. al-Sawaf – **Muhammad b. ‘Uthman b. Abi Shaybah** – Muhammad b. al-‘Ala – Abu Bakr b. ‘Ayyash – **Mujalid** – al-Sha’bi:

The first one to tell a lie was ‘Abd Allah b. Saba.⁷

This chain, however, is *mawdu’* too! Imam al-Khatib al-Baghdadi (d. 463 H) documents under his biography of Muhammad b. ‘Uthman b. Abi Shaybah:

أخبرنا علي بن محمد بن الحسين الدقاق قال قرانا علي الحسين بن هارون عن أبي العباس بن سعيد قال سمعت عبد الله بن أسامة الكلبي يقول محمد بن عثمان كذاب أخذ كتب بن عبدوس الرازي ما زلنا نعرفه بالكذب

وقال بن سعيد سمعت إبراهيم بن إسحاق الصواف يقول محمد بن عثمان كذاب ويسرق حديث الناس ويحيل على أقوام بأشياء ليست من حديثهم

قال سمعت داود بن يحيى يقول محمد بن عثمان كذاب وقد وضع أشياء كثيرة
يحيل على أقوام أشياء ما حدثوا بها قط

وقال سمعت عبد الرحمن بن يوسف بن خراش يقول محمد بن عثمان كذاب
بين الأمر يزيد في الأسانيد ويوصل ويضع الحديث

وقال سمعت محمد بن عبد الله الحضرمي يقول محمد بن عثمان كذاب ما زلنا
نعرفه بالكذب مذ هو صبي

وقال سمعت عبد الله بن أحمد بن حنبل يقول محمد بن عثمان كذاب ...

وقال سمعت جعفر بن محمد بن أبي عثمان الطيالسي يقول بن عثمان هذا
كذاب يجيء عن قوم بأحاديث ما حدثوا بها قط متى سمع أنا عارف به جدا ...

وقال سمعت محمد بن أحمد العدوي يقول محمد بن عثمان كذاب...

وقال حدثني محمد بن عبيد بن حماد قال سمعت جعفر بن هذيل يقول محمد
بن عثمان كذاب....

‘Ali b. Muhammad b. al-Husayn al-Daqaq – al-Husayn b. Harun – Abu al-‘Abbas b. Sa’id – ‘Abd Allah
b. Usamah al-Kalbi: “**Muhammad b. ‘Uthman is A LIAR.** He took the books of Ibn ‘Abdaws al-Razi.
We have ALWAYS known him as A LIAR”.

Ibn Sa’d – Ibrahim b. Ishaq al-Sawaf: “**Muhammad b. ‘Uthman is A LIAR.** He steals the *ahadith* of the
people and he falsely attributes things to people which are never part of their *ahadith*.”

Ibn Sa'd – Dawud b. Yahya: “**Muhammad b. 'Uthman is A LIAR. He FABRICATED a lot of things.** He falsely attributes things to people which they never narrate at all.”

Ibn Sa'd – 'Abd al-Rahman b. Yusuf b. Kharash: “**Muhammad b. 'Uthman is a LIAR within the matter.** He falsely adds and connects names to the chains (of narrations) **and he FABRICATES *ahadith*.**”

Ibn Sa'd – Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Hadhrami: “**Muhammad b. 'Uthman is A LIAR. We have ALWAYS known him as A LIAR since he was a child.**”

Ibn Sa'd – 'Abd Allah b. Ahmad b. Hanbal: “**Muhammad b. 'Uthman is a LIAR....**

Ibn Sa'd – Ja'far b. Muhammad b. Abi 'Uthman al-Tayalisi: “**This Ibn 'Uthman is A LIAR.** He attributes to people *ahadith* which they never narrated since he started hearing (as a child). **I know him very well**”...

Ibn Sa'd – Muhammad b. Ahmad al-'Adawi: “**Muhammad b. 'Uthman is a LIAR...**”

Ibn Sa'd – Muhammad b. 'Ubayd b. Hammad – Ja'far b. Huzayl: “**Muhammad b. 'Uthman is A LIAR....**”⁸

We need not comment further about him!

In the chain is another problematic narrator: Mujalid. Imam al-Dhahabi says about him too:

مجالد بن سعيد الهمداني. مشهور صاحب حديث على لين فيه.

روى عن قيس بن أبي حازم، والشعبي. وعنه يحيى القطان، وأبو أسامة،
وجماعة.

قال ابن معين وغيره: لا يحتج به. وقال أحمد: يرفع كثيرا مما لا يرفعه الناس،
ليس بشيء. وقال النسائي: ليس بالقوي. وذكر الأشج أنه شيعي. وقال الدارقطني:
ضعيف. وقال البخاري: كان يحيى بن سعيد يضعفه، وكان ابن مهدي لا يروى
عنه.

Mujalid b. Sa'id al-Hamdani: well-known, a narrator of *hadith*, **with weakness in him.**

He narrated from Qays b. Abi Hazim and al-Sha'bi, and Yahya b. al-Qattan, Abu Usamah and a group narrated from him.

Ibn Ma'in and others said, "**He is not accepted as a *hujjah* (proof).**" Ahmad said, "**He attributes to the Prophet lots of what people do not attribute to him. He is nothing.**" Al-Nasai said, "**He is not strong.**" Al-Ashja' mentioned that he was a Shi'i. Al-Daraqutni said, "***Dha'if***". Al-Bukhari said, "**Yahya b. Sa'id declared him *dha'if*, and Ibn Mahdi did not narrate from him.**"⁹

Apparently, this second narration is extremely *mawdu'* as well! Yet, we constantly see some Sunni brothers proudly quoting it as evidence!

Narration Three

Let us now examine the third existing Sunni report on 'Abd Allah b. Saba. Imam Ibn Asakir documents:

أنبأنا أبو بكر محمد بن طرخان بن بلتكين بن يجكم أنا أبو الفضائل محمد بن أحمد بن عبد الباقي بن طوق قال قرئ على أبي القاسم عبيد الله بن علي بن عبيد الله الرقي نا أبو أحمد عبيد الله بن محمد بن أبي مسلم أنا أبو عمر محمد بن عبد الواحد أخبرني الغطافي عن رجاله عن الصادق عن آبائه الطاهرين عن جابر قال لما بويع علي خطب الناس فقام إليه عبد الله بن سبأ فقال له أنت دابة الأرض قال فقال له اتق الله فقال له أنت الملك فقال له اتق الله فقال له أنت خلقت الخلق وبسطت الرزق فأمر بقتله فاجتمعت الرافضة فقالت دعه وأنفه إلى ساباط المدائن فإنك إن قتلتَه بالمدينة خرجت أصحابه علينا وشيعته فنفاه إلى ساباط المدائن فثم القرامطة والرافضة قال ثم قامت إليه طائفة وهم السبيئة وكانوا أحد عشر رجلا فقال أرجعوا فإني علي بن أبي طالب أبي مشهور وأمي مشهورة وأنا ابن عم محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم فقالوا لا نرجع دع داعيك فأحرقهم بالنار وقبروهم في صحراء أحد عشر مشهورة فقال من بقي ممن لم يكشف رأسه منهم علمنا إنه إله واحتجوا بقول ابن عباس لا يعذب بالنار إلا خالقها قال ثعلب وقد عذب بالنار قبل علي أبو بكر الصديق شيخ الإسلام رضي الله عنه وذلك أنه رفع إليه رجل يقال له الفجاءة وقالوا إنه شتم النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم بعد وفاته فأخرجه إلى الصحراء فأحرقه بالنار قال فقال ابن عباس قد عذب أبو بكر بالنار فاعبدوه أيضا

Abu Bakr Muhammad b. Tarkhan b. Baltakin b. Yahbakum – Abu al-Fadhail Muhammad b. Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Baqi b. Tawq – Abu al-Qasim ‘Ubayd Allah b. ‘Ali b. ‘Ubayd Allah al-Raqi – Abu Ahmad ‘Ubayd Allah b. Muhammad b. Abi Muslim – Abu ‘Umar Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahid – **al-Ghatafi – his men** – al-Sadiq – his pure fathers – Jabir:

When ‘Ali was given the *ba’yah* (oath of allegiance), he addressed the people. Then, ‘Abd Allah b. Saba stood up to him and said, “You are the *Dabbah* from the Earth.” He (‘Ali) said, “Fear Allah.” He (‘Abd Allah b. Saba) said, “You are the King.” He (‘Ali) replied, “Fear Allah.” He (‘Abd Allah b. Saba) told him, “You created the creation and you spread the *rizq* (sustenance)”. Then, he (‘Ali) ordered his execution.

But the Rafidhah gathered and said, “Leave him. Instead, banish him to Sabat of al-Madain. If you killed him in Madinah, his companions and followers would rebel against us.” Therefore, he (‘Ali) banished him to Sabat of al-Madain. So, the Qaramitah and the Rafidhah re-grouped (there). Then a group called al-Sabaiyyah rose to him (‘Ali) and they were eleven men. He (‘Ali) said, “Recant, for I am ‘Ali b. Abi Talib. My father was well-known, and so was my mother. And I am the cousin of Muhammad, peace be upon him.” They replied, “We will not recant. Call your caller.” So, he (‘Ali) burnt them with fire, and buried them in eleven well-known deserts. Those who survived, whose heads were not exposed among them, said, “We know that he is Allah.” And they used the words of Ibn ‘Abbas – “None punishes with fire except its Creator” as proof.

Tha’lab said, “But, Abu Bakr, the *shaykh* of Islam, may Allah be pleased with him, had punished with fire before ‘Ali. It was when a man called al-Faja was brought to him, and they accused him of insulting the Prophet, peace be upon him, after his death. Then he (Abu Bakr) took him out into the desert and burnt him with fire. So, Ibn ‘Abbas said, “Abu Bakr also punished with the fire. Therefore, worship him too.”¹⁰

First and foremost, there is a man called al-Ghatafi in the *sanad*. He is completely unknown and untraceable. Worse still, he narrated from “his men”, who are also completely unknown and untraceable! As such, the chain is at least doubly *majhul*, and therefore *very dha’if*, on account of these facts alone!

Apart from its severe weakness, the report is also historically inaccurate. It assumes that there were groups called the Rafidhah, the Qaramita, and the Sabaiyyah during the rule of Amir al-Muminin! That simply is ridiculous. This, for instance, is what Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) has to say about the origin of the Rafidhah:

لكن لفظ الرافضة إنما ظهر لما رفضوا زيد بن علي بن الحسين في خلافة
هشام وقصة زيد بن علي بن الحسين كانت بعد العشرين ومائة سنة إحدى
وعشرين أو اثنتين وعشرين ومائة في أواخر خلافة هشام

But the word “Rafidhah” (Rejecters) was first used when they rejected (*rafadhu*) Zayd b. ‘Ali b. al-

Husayn during the *khilafah* of Hisham, and the incident of Zayd b. ‘Ali b. al-Husayn occurred after 120 H, 121 H or 122 H, during the last days of the *khilafah* of Hisham.¹¹

Elsewhere, he reiterates:

قلت الصحيح أنهم سمو رافضة لما رفضوا زيد بن علي بن الحسين بن علي
بن أبي طالب لما خرج بالكوفة أيام هشام بن عبد الملك وقد ذكر هذا أيضا
الاشعري وغيره

I say: the correct opinion is that they were named Rafidhah when they rejected Zayd b. ‘Ali b. al-Husayn b. ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, when he rebelled in Kufah during the days of Hisham b. ‘Abd al-Malik. Al-Ash’ari and others have also mentioned this.¹²

So, the Rafidhah and their name surfaced only almost a century after the death of Imam ‘Ali!

Narration Four

At this point, we move to the fourth, explicit Sunni report on ‘Abd Allah b. Saba. Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah submits in his *Minhaj*:

وروى أبو عاصم خشيش بن أصرم في كتابه ورواه من طريقه أبو عمرو
الطلمنكي في كتابه في الأصول قال أبو عاصم حدثنا أحمد بن محمد وعبد
الوارث ابن إبراهيم حدثنا السندي بن سليمان الفارسي حدثني عبد الله بن
جعفر الرقي عن عبد الرحمن بن مالك بن مغول عن أبيه قال قلت لعامر الشعبي
ما ردك عن هؤلاء القوم وقد كنت فيهم رأسا قال رأيتهم يأخذون بأعجاز لا
صدور لها ثم قال لي يا مالك لو أردت أن يعطوني رقابهم عبيدا أو يملئوا لي
بيتي ذهباً أو يحجوا إلى بيتي هذا على أن أكذب على علي رضي الله عنه لفعلوا
ولا والله لا أكذب عليه أبدا يا مالك إني قد درست الأهواء فلم أر فيها أحق من
الخشبية فلو كانوا من الطير لكانوا رخما ولو كانوا من الدواب لكانوا حمرا يا
مالك لم يدخلوا في الإسلام رغبة فيه لله ولا رهبة من الله ولكن مقتا من الله
عليهم وبغيا منهم على أهل الإسلام يريدون أن يغمصوا دين الإسلام كما غمص
بولص بن يوشع ملك اليهود دين النصرانية ولا تجاوز صلاتهم آذانهم قد حرقهم
علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه بالنار ونفاهم من البلاد منهم عبد الله بن سبأ

يهودي من يهود صنعاء نفاه إلى ساباط وأبو بكر الكروس نفاه إلى الجابية
وحرق منهم قوما أتوه فقالوا أنت هو فقال من أنا فقالوا أنت ربنا فأمر بنار

Abu 'Asim Khashish b. Asrama recorded in his book; and through his route, Abu 'Amr al-Talmanki documented it in his book on *al-Usul*. Abu 'Asim said: Ahmad b. Muhammad and 'Abd al-Warith b. Ibrahim – **al-Sanadi b. Sulayman al-Farisi** – 'Abd Allah b. Ja'far al-Raqqi – '**Abd al-Rahman b. Malik b. Migwal** – his father:

I said to Amir al-Sha'bi, "Why did you leave these people, while you used to be their head?"

He replied, "Their opinions are derived from invalid sources. They lack any basis." Then he said, "O Malik, If I had demanded that they became my slaves or filled my house with gold, or made *Hajj* to this house of mine, and that in exchange I would lie upon 'Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, they would have done so. But, by Allah, I will never lie upon him, never! O Malik, I have studied the various sects. However, I have never seen among them any which is more stupid than the Khashabiyyah. If they were from birds, they would have been vultures; and if they had been from animals, they would have been donkeys. O Malik, they did not enter Islam out of hope in it from Allah, nor from fear of Allah. Rather, it was due to the hatred of Allah upon them, and their rebellion upon the people of Islam. They seek to corrupt the religion of Islam as Paul b. Yusha', king of the Jews, corrupted Christianity. Their *salat* never exceed their *azan*. 'Ali b. Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him, had burnt them with fire, and banished them from the towns. Among them was 'Abd Allah b. Saba the Jew from the Jews of San'a. He banished him to Sabat (of the Madain area). As for Abu Bakr al-Karus, he banished him to al-Jabiyyah. He (also) burnt a group among them who came to him and said, 'You are Him.' He asked, 'Who am I?' They replied, 'You are our God.'" So, he ordered for a fire.¹³

In the chain is 'Abd al-Rahman b. Malik b. Migwal. Al-Hafiz says about him:

عبد الرحمن بن مالك بن مغول: روى عن أبيه والأعمش. قال أحمد والدارقطني
متروك وقال أبو داود كذاب وقال مرة يضع الحديث وقال النسائي وغيره ليس
بثقة

'Abd al-Rahman b. Malik b. Migwal: he narrated from his father and al-A'mash. Ahmad and al-Daraqutni said: "**Matruk (rejected)**". Abu Dawud said, "**A LIAR**", and also said, "**he FABRICATED ahadith**". Al-Nasai and others said, "**He is NOT trustworthy.**"¹⁴

'Allamah al-Albani also states about another chain containing his name:

قلت: ورجاله ثقات غير عبد الرحمن بن مالك بن مغول، وهو كذاب كما قال أبو داود، وقال الدارقطني: متروك، فهو آفة هذا الإسناد

I say: Its narrators are trustworthy except ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Malik b. Migwal, **AND HE WAS A LIAR**, as stated by Abu Dawud. And al-Daraqutni said, “*Matruk* (rejected)”, and he is the defect in this chain.¹⁵

As if this was not enough, al-Sanadi b. Sulayman al-Farisi – also in the chain under inspection – is absolutely *majhul*, with no trace in the Sunni books of *rija*! We honestly wonder how Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah dared to use such a report as *evidence* to establish points about the Shi’ah.

Narration Five

A twin report is further documented by Ibn Taymiyyah:

روى أبو حفص بن شاهين في كتاب اللطيف في السنة حدثنا محمد بن أبي القاسم بن هارون حدثنا أحمد بن الوليد الواسطي حدثني جعفر بن نصير الطوسي الواسطي عن عبد الرحمن بن مالك بن مغول عن أبيه قال قال لي الشعبي أحذركم هذه الأهواء المضلة وشرها الرافضة لم يدخلوا في الإسلام رغبة ولا رهبة ولكن مقتا لأهل الإسلام وبغيا عليهم قد حرقهم علي رضي الله عنه بالنار ونفاهم إلى البلدان منهم عبد الله ابن سبأ يهودي من يهود صنعاء نفاه إلى ساباط

Abu Hafs b. Shahin recorded in *Kitab al-Latif fi al-Sunnah*: Muhammad b. Abi al-Qasim b. Harun – Ahmad b. al-Walid al-Wasiti – Ja’far b. Nasir al-Tusi al-Wasiti – ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Malik b. Migwal – his father:

Al-Sha’bi said to me, “I warn you concerning these heretical sects, and the worst of them are the Rafidhah. They do not enter Islam out of hope (in it from Allah), nor from fear (of Allah). Rather, they do so out of hatred of the people of Islam and in rebellion against them. ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, had burnt them with fire and banished them to towns. Among them was ‘Abd Allah b. Saba, a Jew from the Jews of San’a. He (‘Ali) exiled him to Sabat (of al-Madain).¹⁶

In the chain is ‘Abd al-Rahman, who was a liar and *hadith* fabricator. So, the *riwayah* is *mawdhu’*.

Besides, this is what al-Hafiz records about al-Sha’bi:

قال أبو سعد ابن السمعاني ولد سنة عشرين وقيل سنة ٣١ ومات سنة ١٠٩

Abu Sa'd b. al-Sam'ani said: "He (al-Sha'bi) was born in 20 H, and it is said 31 H, **and he died in 109 H.**" 17

Meanwhile, this is what Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah himself confesses about the term "Rafidhah":

لكن لفظ الرافضة إنما ظهر لما رفضوا زيد بن علي بن الحسين في خلافة هشام وقصة زيد بن علي بن الحسين كانت بعد العشرين ومائة سنة إحدى وعشرين أو اثنتين وعشرين ومائة في أواخر خلافة هشام

But the word "Rafidhah" (Rejecters) was first used when they rejected (rafadhu) Zayd b. 'Ali b. al-Husayn during the *khilafah* of Hisham, and the incident of Zayd b. 'Ali b. al-Husayn occurred after 120 H, 121 H or 122 H, during the last days of the *khilafah* of Hisham. 18

In simpler words, al-Sh'abi had already died before that word was ever used in human history! How then did he manage to tell 'Abd al-Rahman's father about the Rafidhah from his grave?!

Narration Six

Al-Hafiz gives us the sixth existing explicit Sunni report on 'Abd Allah b. Saba:

وقال أبو إسحاق الفزاري عن شعبة عن سلمة بن كهيل عن أبي الزعراء عن زيد بن وهب أن سويد بن غفلة دخل على علي في إمارته فقال اني مررت بن بنفر يذكرون أبا بكر وعمر يرون انك تضرمر لهما مثل ذلك منهم عبد الله بن سبا وكان عبد الله أول من أظهر ذلك فقال علي مالي ولهذا الخبيث الأسود ثم قال معاذ الله أضرمر لهما الا الحسن الجميل ثم أرسل إلى عبد الله بن سبا فسيره إلى المدائن وقال لا يساكنني في بلدة ابدا ثم نهض إلى المنبر حتى اجتمع الناس فذكر القصة في ثنائيه عليهما بطوله وفي آخره الا ولا يبلغني عن أحد يفضلني عليهما الا جلده حد المفتري

Abu Ishaq al-Fazari narrated from Shu'bah from Salamah b. Kuhayl from **Abu al-Za'ra** from Zayd b. Wahb that Suwayd b. Ghaflah entered upon 'Ali during his rule, and said, "I passed by a group who

were mentioning Abu Bakr and ‘Umar, claiming that you hold the same views towards them both. Among them was ‘Abd Allah b. Saba, and he was the first to manifest that. So, ‘Ali said, “What does this evil black man want from me?” Then he said, “I seek Allah’s refuge. My opinion of them both (i.e. Abu Bakr and ‘Umar) is nothing but good and beautiful.” Then he sent a messenger to ‘Abd Allah b. Saba and exiled him to al-Madain, and said, “He shall not live in the same town as me ever again”. Then he rushed to the pulpit and gathered the people, and delivered a long speech to praise them both (i.e. Abu Bakr and ‘Umar). At its end, he said, “Verily, if it reaches me that anyone places me above them both, I will whip him with the whipping of a lying slanderer.”¹⁹

So, who was Abu al-Za’ra? Al-Barqani (d. 425 H) disagrees with a popular choice here, as documented by al-Hafiz:

وروى البرقاني في اللفظ من طريق شعبة عن سلمه بن كهيل عن أبي الزعراء
وعن زيد بن وهب أن سويد بن غفلة دخل على علي في أمارته فقال يا أمير
المؤمنين اني مررت بنفريذكرون أبا بكر وعمر الحديث. قال البرقاني أبو
الزعراء هذا هو حجية بن عدي وليس هو صاحب ابن مسعود ذاك اسمه عبد
الله بن هاني.

Al-Barqani narrated in the text from the route of Shu’bah from Salamah b. Kuhayl from **Abu al-Za’ra**, and from Zayd b. Wahb that Suwayd b. Ghaflah entered upon ‘Ali during his rule, and said, “O Amir al-Muminin! I passed by a group who were mentioning Abu Bakr and ‘Umar.” The *hadith*. Al-Barqani said: **“This Abu al-Za’ra was Hujayyah b. ‘Adi, and not the companion of Ibn Mas’ud, whose name was ‘Abd Allah b. Hani.”**²⁰

Al-Barqani has corroboration from Imam Muslim (d. 261 H), who identifies Hujayyah as:

أبو الزعراء أحجية بن عدي الكندي

Abu al-Za’ra Hujayyah b. ‘Adi al-Kindi²¹

However, these positions of both al-Barqani and Muslim are of no convincing basis in the eyes of al-Hafiz, who submits elsewhere in the same book that only three people – *excluding* Hujayyah – were actually known as Abu al-Za’ra:

من كنيته أبو الزعراء

أبو الزعراء الأزدي الأكبر، اسمه: عبد الله بن هاني، تقدم.

أبو الزعراء الجشمي الأصغر، اسمه: عمرو بن عمر، تقدم.

أبو الزعراء الطائي، اسمه: يحيى بن الوليد الكوفي، تقدم.

Those whose *kunya* was Abu al-Za'ra:

1. Abu al-Za'ra al-Azdi al-Akbar: his name was 'Abd Allah b. Hani.
2. Abu al-Za'ra al-Jashmi al-Asghar: his name was 'Amr b. 'Umar.
3. Abu al-Za'ra al-Tai: his name was Yahya b. al-Walid al-Kufi.²²

In his *Taqrib*, he has equally omitted "Abu al-Za'ra" from the names of Hujayyah²³. Meanwhile, other major Sunni *rijal* scholars who have also conspicuously omitted "Abu al-Za'ra" from the names of Hujayyah include: Imam Ibn Sa'd (d. 230 H)²⁴, Imam al-'Ijli (d. 261 H)²⁵, Imam Ibn Abi Hatim (d. 327 H)²⁶, Ibn Hibban (d. 354 H)²⁷, Imam al-Mizzi (d. 742)²⁸, and Imam al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H)²⁹.

Besides, the *riwayah* transmitted by Hujayyah (which is also often quoted on Ibn Saba) is *very different* from that narrated by "Abu al-Za'ra". Imam Ibn Abi Khaythamah (d. 279 H) reports:

حدثنا محمد بن عباد المكي قال نا سفيان قال نا عبد الجبار بن عباس الهمداني
عن سلمة عن حجية بن عدي الكندي: رأيت عليا على المنبر وهو يقول من
يعذرني من هذا الحميت الأسود الذي يكذب على الله يعني ابن السوداء

Muhammad b. 'Abbad – Sufyan – 'Abd al-Jabbar b. 'Abbas al-Hamdani – Salamah – **Hujayyah b. 'Adi al-Kindi**:

I saw 'Ali upon the pulpit and he was saying, "Who will excuse me of **this evil black CONTAINER**, who tells lies upon Allah?" He meant *Ibn al-Sawda*.³⁰

For Allah's sake, how exactly does the above look like this one:

وقال أبو إسحاق الفزاري عن شعبة عن سلمة بن كهيل عن أبي الزعرار عن زيد بن وهب أن سويد بن غفلة دخل على علي في إمارته فقال اني مررت بن نفر يذكرون أبا بكر وعمر يرون انك تضرر لهما مثل ذلك منهم عبد الله بن سبا وكان عبد الله أول من أظهر ذلك فقال علي مالي ولهذا الخبيث الأسود ثم قال معاذ الله أضمر لهما الا الحسن الجميل ثم أرسل إلى عبد الله بن سبا فسيره إلى المدائن وقال لا يساكنني في بلدة ابدا ثم نهض إلى المنبر حتى اجتمع الناس فذكر القصة في ثنائيهما بطوله وفي آخره الا ولا يبلغني عن أحد يفضلني عليهما الا جلده حد المفترى

Abu Ishaq al-Fazari narrated from Shu'bah from Salamah b. Kuhayl from **Abu al-Za'ra** from Zayd b. Wahb that Suwayd b. Ghaflah entered upon 'Ali during his rule, and said, "I passed by a group who were mentioning Abu Bakr and 'Umar, claiming that you hold the same views towards them both. Among them was 'Abd Allah b. Saba, and he was the first to manifest that. So, 'Ali said, "What does **this evil black MAN** want from me?" Then he said, "I seek Allah's refuge. My opinion of them both (i.e. Abu Bakr and 'Umar) is nothing but good and beautiful." Then he sent a messenger to 'Abd Allah b. Saba and exiled him to al-Madain, and said, "He shall not live in the same town as me ever again". Then he rushed to the pulpit and gathered the people, and delivered a long speech to praise them both (i.e. Abu Bakr and 'Umar). At its end, he said, "Verily, if it reaches me that anyone places me above them both, I will whip him with the whipping of a lying slanderer."

Where is the similarity? Do they even resemble in any way or by any means? Apparently, there is NOTHING in common between them. Yet, we find some Sunni brothers referring to the first report as evidence that Abu Za'ra in the second is Hujayyah?! In fact, some of them go as far as claiming that both reports are the same?! How do these people reason?

So, as we can see, many top Sunni *rijal* scholars contradicted the suggestion that Hujayyah had the nickname "Abu al-Za'ra". Also, what Salamah narrated from "Abu al-Za'ra" was *fundamentally* different, in all aspects, from what he narrated from Hujayyah. These facts, obviously, sufficiently confirm that the "Abu al-Zar'a" in the *riwayah* of al-Fazari was NOT Hujayyah b. 'Adi.

In that case, which of the three Abu Za'ras identified by al-Hafiz was the "Abu al-Za'ra" of al-Fazari's report? Imam al-Mizzi helps us out here. He states about the first of them:

عبد الله بن هانئ الكندي، الأزدي أبو الزعرار الكوفي الكبير، من بني البداء بن الحارث. وهو خال سلمة بن كهيل.

روى عن: عبد الله بن مسعود، وعمر بن الخطاب. روى عنه: ابن أخته سلمة بن كهيل.

قال البخاري: لا يتابع في حديثه. وقال علي بن المديني: عامة رواية أبي الزعراء، عن عبد الله بن مسعود، ولا أعلم أحدا روى عنه إلا سلمة بن كهيل، واسمه عبد الله بن هاني. وقال النسائي نحو ذلك....

. وأما أبو الزعراء الأكبر هذا. فلا تعرف له رواية، إلا عن ابن مسعود، وعمر بن الخطاب، ولا يعرف له راو، إلا سلمة بن كهيل، ولم يدركه سفيان بن عيينة، ولا أحد من أقرانه.

وذكره ابن حبان في كتاب "الثقات" روى له الترمذي حديثا، والنسائي آخر.

‘Abd Allah b. Hani al-Kindi, al-Azdi, Abu al-Za’ra al-Kufi al-Kabir, from Banu al-Bada b. al-Harith. He was the uncle of Salamah b. Kuhayl.

He narrated from ‘Abd Allah b. Mas’ud and ‘Umar b. al-Khattab. **His nephew, Salamah b. Kuhayl, narrated from him.**

Al-Bukhari said, “**He is NOT followed in his *hadith*.**” ‘Ali b. al-Madini said, “Most of the reports of Abu al-Za’ra are from ‘Abd Allah b. Mas’ud. **I do not know anyone who narrated from him except Salamah b. Kuhayl**, and his name was ‘Abd Allah b. Hani.” Al-Nasai said the like of that too....

With regards to this Abu al-Za’ra al-Akbar, **there is NO known narration by him except from Ibn Mas’ud and ‘Umar b. al-Khattab, and there is NO known narrator from him except Salamah b. Kuhayl.** Sufyan b. ‘Uyaynah never met him, nor did anyone else among his (i.e. Sufyan’s) contemporaries.

Ibn Hibban mentioned him in *Kitab al-Thiqat*. Al-Tirmidhi narrated a single *hadith* from him, and al-Nasai narrated the other.³¹

Apparently, this is our guy!

Concerning the second Abu al-Za'ra, al-Mizzi also submits:

عمرو بن عمرو، ويقال: ابن عامر ابن مالك بن نضلة الجشمي، أبو الزعراء الكوفي، ابن أخي أبي الأحوص الجشمي.

روى عن: عبيد الله بن عبد الله بن عتبة بن مسعود، وعكرمة مولى ابن عباس، وعمه أبي الأحوص عوف بن مالك بن نضلة الجشمي.

روى عنه: سفيان الثوري وسماه عمرو بن عامر، وسفيان ابن عيينة، وعبيدة بن حميد.

‘Amr b. ‘Amr, and he is also called Ibn ‘Amr, Ibn Malik b. Nadhlah al-Jashmi, Abu al-Za’ra al-Kufi, nephew of Abu al-Ahwas al-Jashmi.

He narrated from ‘Ubayd Allah b. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Utbah b. Mas’ud, ‘Ikrimah freed slave of Ibn ‘Abbas, and his uncle Abu al-Ahwas ‘Awf b. Malik b. Nadhlah al-Jashmi.

Sufyan al-Thawri narrated from him and named him ‘Amr b. ‘Amir. Sufyan Ibn ‘Uyaynah also narrated from him, as well as ‘Ubaydah b. Humayd.³²

Without doubt, this is *not* the Abu al-Za’ra in the report on ‘Abd Allah b. Saba! Salamah did not narrate from him. The same was the case with the third Abu al-Za’ra:

يحيى بن الوليد بن المسير الطائي ثم السنبسي، أبو الزعراء الكوفي.

روى عن: سعيد بن عمرو بن أشوع، ومحل بن خليفة الطائي.

روى عنه: زيد بن الحباب، وسويد بن عمرو الكلبي، وأبو عاصم الضحاك بن

مخلد، و عبد الرحمان بن مهدي، وأبو حميد عصام بن عمرو البغدادي، ويحيى بن المتوكل الباهلي.

Yahya b. al-Walid b. al-Musayyar al-Tai al-Sinbasi, Abu al-Za'ra al-Kufi.

He narrated from Sa'id b. 'Amr b. Ashwa' and Muhil b. Khalifah al-Tai.

And the following narrated from him: Zayd b. al-Hubab, Suwayd b. 'Amr al-Kalbi, Abu 'Asim al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid, 'Abd al-Rahman b. Mahdi, Abu Hamid 'Isam b. 'Amr al-Baghdadi, and Yahya b. al-Mutawakil al-Bahili.³³

Needless to say, "our guy" is only the first of them: 'Abd Allah b. Hani. Meanwhile, al-Mizzi has confirmed that "there is NO known narration by him except from Ibn Mas'ud and 'Umar b. al-Khattab." This reveals an *'illa* (hidden defect) in all narrations by this Abu al-Za'ra from other than Ibn Mas'ud and 'Umar. All of them are disconnected and therefore *dha'if*, and so is this particular narration of his from Zayd b. Wahb as well!

A "counter-proof" often deployed by our opponents is this report, quoted by al-Hafiz:

وروى البرقاني في اللفظ من طريق شعبة عن سلمه بن كهيل عن أبي الزعراء وعن زيد بن وهب أن سويد بن غفلة دخل على علي في أمارته فقال يا أمير المؤمنين اني مررت بنفر يذكرون أبا بكر وعمر الحديث. قال البرقاني أبو الزعراء هذا هو حجية بن عدي وليس هو صاحب ابن مسعود ذاك اسمه عبد الله بن هاني.

Al-Barqani narrated in the text from the route of Shu'bah from Salamah b. Kuhayl **from Abu al-Za'ra, AND from Zayd b. Wahb** that Suwayd b. Ghafilah entered upon 'Ali during his rule, and said, "O Amir al-Muminin! I passed by a group who were mentioning Abu Bakr and 'Umar." The *hadith*.³⁴

They argue that Salamah narrated from both Abu al-Za'ra *and* Zayd b. Wahb. As such, whether Abu al-Za'ra's report is *dha'if* or not would be inconsequential, as there would be a separate route to establish the *riwayah*. However, al-Barqani (d. 425 H) never met Shu'bah (d. 160 H), and the *sanad* between them is unknown. Therefore, it is impossible to rely upon this report of al-Barqani. Most probably, one of the unknown narrators in the truncated chain muddled up the *isnad*. So, basically, our opponents have no valid objection, and the *riwayah* of Abu al-Za'ra 'Abd Allah b. Hani from Zayd b. Wahb is *dha'if*.

In addition, the *riwayah* is equally, historically inaccurate. The report, for example, is quick to point out

that the first ever human being to “mention” Abu Bakr and ‘Umar negatively was ‘Abd Allah b. Saba. This, however, is untrue! Amir al-Muminin himself had earlier described both Abu Bakr and ‘Umar with shocking words. Imam Muslim (d. 261 H) quotes ‘Umar saying to both Imam ‘Ali and ‘Abbas:

فلما توفي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قال أبو بكر أنا ولي رسول الله
صلى الله عليه و سلم فرأيتماه كاذبا آثما غادرا خائنا والله يعلم إنه لصادق
بار راشد تابع للحق ثم توفي أبو بكر وأنا ولي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم
وولي أبا بكر فرأيتماني كاذبا آثما غادرا خائنا

When the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, died, **Abu Bakr said: “I am the *wali* of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him.”.... So both of you (‘Ali and ‘Abbas) thought him (i.e. Abu Bakr) to be a liar, sinful, a traitor and dishonest.** And Allah knows that he was really truthful, pious, rightly-guided and a follower of the truth. **Abu Bakr died and I became the *wali* of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, and the *wali* of Abu Bakr. So both of you thought me to be a liar, sinful, a traitor and dishonest.**³⁵

Amir al-Muminin declared both Abu Bakr and ‘Umar to be traitors, sinful and dishonest liars! This, of course, was during the lifetimes of both of them, long before ‘Abd Allah b. Saba could ever have surfaced.

Besides, what “praise” exactly would Amir al-Muminin have had for Abu Bakr and ‘Umar in view of his extremely negative opinions of them? It is simply illogical to assume that Amir al-Muminin would *ever* consider people whom he thought to be “liars, traitors, sinful and dishonest” as better than himself!

What seals the series of fallacies in the report is its last sentence:

“Verily, if it reaches me that anyone places me above them both, I will whip him with the whipping of a lying slanderer.”

Many of the Sahabah, *radhiyallahu ‘anhum*, and Tabi’in actually considered him to be the best of the entire *Ummah* after the Messenger of Allah, and he never condemned or punished them. Imam Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (d. 463 H), among others, submits:

وروى عن سلمان وأبي ذر والمقداد وخباب وجابر وأبي سعيد الخدري وزيد
بن الأرقم أن علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه أول من أسلم وفضله هؤلاء على
غيره

Salman, Abu Dharr, al-Miqdad, Khabab, Jabir, Abu Sa'id al-Khudri and Zayd b. Arqam narrated that 'Ali b. Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him, was the first to accept Islam, **and they considered him the most superior (among the Sahabah).**³⁶

Al-Hafiz adds about another Sahabi, Abu al-Tufayl, *radhiyallahu 'anhu*:

قال أبو عمر كان يعترف بفضل أبي بكر وعمر لكنه يقدم عليا

Abu 'Umar said: He accepted the merit of Abu Bakr and 'Umar **but he considered 'Ali to be the most superior.**³⁷

Did 'Ali ever reproach Khabab, Jabir, Abu Sa'id al-Khudri, Zayd b. Arqam and Abu al-Tufayl or anyone like them? The answer is a loud "no"!

Narration Seven

Imam Abu Nu'aym al-Isfahani (d. 430 H) in his *al-Hilya* records the last report:

حدثنا إبراهيم بن محمد ثنا عبد الله ثنا يوسف بن أسباط ثنا محمد بن عبد العزيز التيمي الكوفي عن مغيرة عن أم موسى قالت بلغ عليا أن ابن سبأ يفضل علي أبي بكر وعمر فهم علي بقتله فليل له أقتل رجلا إنما أجلك وفضلك فقال لا جرم لا يساكنني في بلدة أنا فيها قال عبدالله بن خبيق فحدثت به الهيثم بن جميل فقال لقد نفي ببلد بالمدائن إلى الساعة

Ibrahim b. Muhammad – 'Abd Allah – **Yusuf b. Asbat** – Muhammad b. 'Abd al-'Aziz al-Tamimi al-Kufi – **Mughirah** – **Umm Musa**, who said:

It reached 'Ali that Ibn Saba was placing him (i.e. 'Ali) in merits and virtues above Abu Bakr and 'Umar. So, he decided to kill him. But, it was said to him, "Will you kill a man who only thinks highly of you and considers you superior?" Then, he said, "Surely, he shall not live with me in the same town."

'Abd Allah b. Khabiq narrated from al-Haytham b. Jamil who said: "He was permanently exiled to a town in al-Madain."³⁸

Concerning Yusuf b. Asbat, 'Allamah al-Albani says:

يوسف بن أسباط؛ ضعيف أيضاً.

Yusuf b. Asbat is *dha'if* too.39

Elsewhere, he comments about a *sanad* containing Yusuf's name:

قلت: وهذا سند ضعيف من أجل يوسف بن أسباط قال أبو حاتم: كان رجلاً عابداً، دفن كتبه، وهو يغلط كثيراً، وهو رجل صالح، لا يحتج به، كما في "الجرح" (4 / 2 / 418)

I say: **This chain is *dha'if*, due to Yusuf b. Asbat.** Abu Hatim said: "He was a devout worshipper. He buried his books, **and he used to make A LOT of mistakes**, and he was a righteous man. **He is NOT accepted as a *hujjah***" as stated in *al-Jarh* (4/2/418).40

Also, Mughirah in the chain is a *mudalis*, and has narrated in an '*an-an*' manner. Al-Hafiz submits:

المغيرة بن مقسم بكسر الميم الضبي مولاهم أبو هشام الكوفي الأعمى ثقة متقن إلا أنه كان يدلس ولا سيما عن إبراهيم

Al-Mughirah b. Miqsam al-Dhabi, their freed slave, Abu Hisham al-Kufi, the Blind: *Thiqah* (trustworthy), precise, **except that he used to do *tadlis***, especially from Ibrahim.41

'Allamah al-Albani too says about him:

فلا أدري كيف غفل عنها الذهبي وهو نفسه قد أورد المغيرة هذا في "منظومته" في المدلسين؟! وهي معروفة مطبوعة عدة طبعات، وذكره فيهم غيره من الحفاظ المتقدمين والمتأخرين، وأورده خاتمتهم العسقلاني في الطبقة الثالثة منهم الذين أكثروا التدليس، فلم يحتج الأئمة من أحاديثهم إلا بما صرحوا فيه بالسمع

I do not know how al-Dhahabi missed it, while he personally has included this al-Mughirah in his *Manzumah* among the *mudalisin* (i.e. those who do *tadlis*)?! And it is well-known, published several

times. Others from the classical and later *hadith* scientists also included him (i.e. al-Mughirah) among them (i.e. *mudalisin*). **The last of them, al-‘Asqalani, included him (i.e. al-Mughirah) in the third *tabaqat* among them, those who did *tadlis* A LOT. Therefore, the Imams do not accept their *ahadith* as *hujjah* except what they explicitly transmit with *sima*’.**⁴²

The last defect in the *sanad* is Umm Musa, the main narrator herself. Al-Hafiz declares about her:

أم موسى سرية علي قيل اسمها فاخنة وقيل حبيبة مقبولة

Umm Musa, mistress of ‘Ali. It is said that her name was Fakhtah or Habibah: *Maqbulah* (i.e. accepted only when seconded).⁴³

While analyzing another *riwayah* of Mughirah from the same Umm Musa, ‘Allamah al-Albani also says:

قلت: وفيه نظر من وجهين:

الأول: أن أم موسى هذه، لم تثبت عدالتها وضبطها. وقد أوردتها الذهبي نفسه في "فصل النسوة المجهولات" من "الميزان"، وقال فيها: "تفرد عنها مغيرة بن مقسم. قال الدارقطني: يخرج حديثها اعتباراً". ولذلك لم يوثقها الحافظ في "التقريب" بل قال فيها: "مقبولة". يعني: عند المتابعة....

والآخر: أن المغيرة – وهو ابن مقسم الضبي – وإن كان ثقة متقناً؛ إلا أنه كان يدلّس؛ كما قال الحافظ، وقد عنعنه.

I say: These are two problems with it:

The first: is that this Umm Musa, her ‘*adalah* (uprightness) and truthfulness are NOT established. Al-Dhahabi has himself mentioned her in the “Chapter on *Majhulah* (Unknown) Women” in *al-Mizan*, and he said concerning her: “Mughirah b. Miqsam was the only one who narrated from her. Al-Daraqutni said: ‘Her *ahadith* are recorded for support purposes.’” This is why al-Hafiz in *al-Taqrīb* did NOT declare her *thiqah* (trustworthy). **Rather, he said concerning her “*maqbulah*”, that is (she is accepted) where she is seconded.**

The other: is that al-Mughirah – and he was Ibn Miqsam al-Dhabi – even though he was *thiqah* (trustworthy), precise, **except that he used to do *tadlis*, as al-Hafiz stated. And he has narrated it in an ‘an-‘an manner.**⁴⁴

The bottomline is that the report of Abu Na'im is *dha'if jiddan* (very weak). It has several serious defects in it: Yusuf b. Asbat is *dha'if*; al-Mughirah is a *mudalis* and has narrated in an ‘an-‘an manner; and Umm Musa is *majhulah* (unknown) or *maqbulah* and has NOT been seconded in her report. Besides, there were many of the Sahabah who considered Amir al-Muminin to have been superior to Abu Bakr and 'Umar – and he never punished or killed them! This exposes the clear fallacy of the fairytale from Abu Na'im.

As things stand, these are the only seven reports in the Sunni books which mention 'Abd Allah b. Saba *explicitly*, and all of them are both very unreliable and blatantly false.

1. Abu Ja'far Muhammad b. Jarir al-Tabari, Tarikh al-Umam wa al-Muluk (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1407 H), vol. 2, p. 647
2. Abu al-Qasim 'Ali b. al-Hasan b. Habbat Allah b. 'Abd Allah, Ibn Asakir al-Shafi'i, Tarikh Madinah Dimashq (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: 'Ali Shiri], vol. 29, pp. 3–4
3. Shihab al-Din Abu al-Fadhl Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Lisan al-Mizan (Beirut: Manshurat Muassasat al-'A'lam li al-Matbu'at; 2nd edition, 1390 H), vol. 3, p. 145, # 517
4. Shams al-Din Muhammad b. Ahmad b. 'Uthman al-Dhahabi, Tarikh al-Islam wa Wafiyat al-Mashahir wa al-'Alam (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-'Arabi; 1st edition, 1407 H) [Dr. 'Umar 'Abd al-Salam Tadmiri], vol. 11, pp. 161–162, # 4
5. Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadiith al-Dha'ifah wa al-Mawdu'ah wa Athariyah al-Sayyiah fi al-Ummah (Riyadh: Dar al-Ma'arif; 1st edition, 1412 H), vol. 11, p. 748, # 5440
6. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadiith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqhiyah wa Fawaidihah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 3, pp. 101–102, # 1110
7. Abu al-Qasim 'Ali b. al-Hasan b. Habbat Allah b. 'Abd Allah, Ibn Asakir al-Shafi'i, Tarikh Madinah Dimashq (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: 'Ali Shiri], vol. 29, p. 7
8. Abu Bakr Ahmad b. 'Ali al-Khatib al-Baghdadi, Tarikh Baghdad (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah), vol. 3, pp. 45–46, # 979
9. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad b. 'Uthman al-Dhahabi, Mizan al-I'tidal fi Naqd al-Rijal (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah) [annotator: 'Ali Muhammad al-Bajawi], vol. 3, p. 438, # 7070
10. Abu al-Qasim 'Ali b. al-Hasan b. Habbat Allah b. 'Abd Allah, Ibn Asakir al-Shafi'i, Tarikh Madinah Dimashq (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: 'Ali Shiri], vol. 29, pp. 9–10
11. Abu al-'Abbas Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 1, pp. 34–35
12. Ibid, vol. 3, p. 471
13. Ibid, vol. 1, pp. 28–30
14. Shihab al-Din Abu al-Fadhl Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Lisan al-Mizan (Beirut: Manshurat Muassasat al-'A'lam li al-Matbu'at; 2nd edition, 1390 H), vol. 3, p. 427, # 1676
15. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadiith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqhiyah wa Fawaidihah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 2, p. 471, # 824
16. Abu al-'Abbas Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah (Muassasat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 1, p. 23

17. Shihab al-Din Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1404 H), vol. 5, p. 59, # 110
18. Abu al-'Abbas Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah (Muasassat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim], vol. 1, pp. 34-35
19. Shihab al-Din Abu al-Fadhl Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Lisan al-Mizan (Beirut: Manshurat Muasassat al-A'lami li al-Matbu'at; 2nd edition, 1390 H), vol. 3, p. 290, # 1225
20. Shihab al-Din Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1404 H), vol. 2, p. 190, # 399
21. Muslim b. al-Hajjaj, al-Kuna wa al-Asma (Madinah al-Munawwarah: al-Jami'ah al-Islamiyyah; 1st edition, 1404 H) [annotator: 'Abd al-Rahim Muhammad Ahmad al-Qushqari], vol. 1, p. 346, 1249
22. Ibid, vol. 12, p. 90
23. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 1, p. 192, # 1154
24. Muhammad b. Sa'd, al-Tabaqat al-Kubra (Beirut: Dar al-Sadir), vol. 6, p. 225
25. Abu al-Hasan Ahmad b. 'Abd Allah b. Salih al-'Ijli al-Kufi, Ma'rifat al-Thiqat (Madinah: Maktabah al-Dar; 1st edition, 1405 H), vol. 1, p. 288, # 275
26. Abu Muhammad 'Abd al-Rahman b. Abi Hatim Muhammad b. Idris b. al-Munzir al-Tamimi al-Hanzali al-Razi, al-Jarh wa al-Ta'dil (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi; 1st edition, 1371 H), vol. 3, p. 314, # 1400
27. Abu Hatim Muhammad b. Hibban b. Ahmad al-Tamimi al-Busti, Kitab al-Thiqat (Hyderabad: Majlis Dairat al-Ma'arif al-'Uthmaniyyah; 1st edition, 1398 H), vol. 4, p. 186
28. Abu al-Hajjaj Jamal al-Din Yusuf al-Mizzi, Tahdhib al-Kamal fi Asma al-Rijal (Beirut by Muasassat al-Risalah; 4th edition, 1413 H) [annotator: Dr. Bashir 'Awad Ma'ruf], vol. 5, p. 485, # 1141
29. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad b. 'Uthman al-Dhahabi, Mizan al-I'tidal fi Naqd al-Rijal (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifat; 1st edition, 1382 H) [annotator: 'Ali Muhammad al-Bajawi], vol. 1, p. 466, # 1759; Shams al-Din Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad b. al-Dhahabi al-Dimashqi, al-Kashif fi Ma'rifat Man Lahu Riwayat fi al-Kutub al-Sittah (Jeddah: Dar al-Qiblah li al-Thaqafat al-Islamiyyah; 1st edition, 1413 H), vol. 1, p. 315, # 956
30. Abu Bakr Ahmad b. Abi Khaythamah Zuhayr b. Harb, Tarikh Ibn Abi Khaythamah (al-Faruq al-Hadithiyyah li al-Taba'ah wa al-Nashr; 1st edition, 1424 H), vol. 3, p. 177, # 4359
31. Abu al-Hajjaj Jamal al-Din Yusuf al-Mizzi, Tahdhib al-Kamal fi Asma al-Rijal (Beirut by Muasassat al-Risalah; 4th edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Bashir 'Awad Ma'ruf], vol. 16, pp. 240-242, # 3627
32. Abu al-Hajjaj Jamal al-Din Yusuf al-Mizzi, Tahdhib al-Kamal fi Asma al-Rijal (Beirut by Muasassat al-Risalah; 1st edition, 1413 H) [annotator: Dr. Bashir 'Awad Ma'ruf], vol. 22, p. 166, # 4417
33. Ibid, vol. 32, pp. 30-31, # 6942
34. Shihab al-Din Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1404 H), vol. 2, p. 190, # 399
35. Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj al-Qushayri al-Naysaburi, Sahih Muslim (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Fuad 'Abd al-Baqi], vol. 3, p. 1376, #1757
36. Abu 'Umar Yusuf b. 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Barr b. 'Asim al-Nimri al-Qurtubi, al-Isti'ab fi Ma'rifat al-Ashab (Beirut: Dar al-Jil; 1st edition, 1412 H) [annotator: 'Ali Muhammad al-Bajawi], vol. 3, pp. 1090, # 1855
37. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, al-Isabah fi Tamyiz al-Sahabah (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1415 H) [annotators: Shaykh 'Adil Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Mawjud and Shaykh 'Ali Muhammad Ma'udh], vol. 7, p. 193, # 10166
38. Abu Na'im Ahmad b. 'Abd Allah al-Isfahani, Hilyah al-Awliya wa Tabaqat al-Asfiya (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-'Arabi; 4th edition, 1405 H), vol. 8, p. 253
39. Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Dha'ifah wa al-Mawdu'ah wa Athariyah al-Sayyiah fi al-Ummah (Riyadh: Dar al-Ma'arif; 1st edition, 1412 H), vol. 11, p. 118, # 5073
40. Ibid, vol. 1, p. 325, # 175
41. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 2, p. 208, # 6875

42. Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, *Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Dha'ifah wa al-Mawdu'ah wa Athariha al-Sayyiah fi al-Ummah* (Riyadh: Dar al-Ma'arif; 1st edition, 1412 H), vol. 13, p. 633, # 6289
43. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, *Taqrib al-Tahdhib* (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 2, p. 673, # 8820
44. Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, *Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Dha'ifah wa al-Mawdu'ah wa Athariha al-Sayyiah fi al-Ummah* (Riyadh: Dar al-Ma'arif; 1st edition, 1412 H), vol. 10, p. 649, # 4945

There is only one report in the Sunni books mentioning a man named 'Abd Allah al-Sabai. This is the *riwayah* as documented by Imam Ibn Abi 'Asim (d. 287 H):

حدثنا أبو بكر بن أبي شيبة حدثنا محمد بن الحسن الأسدي حدثنا هارون بن صالح عن الحارث بن عبد الرحمن عن أبي الجلاس قال سمعت عليا يقول لعبدالله السبائي ويلك ما أفضي إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بشيء كتمه أحدا من الناس ولقد سمعته يقول إن بين يدي الساعة ثلاثين كذابا وإنك أحدهم

Abu Bakr b. Abi Shaybah – Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-Asadi – **Harun b. Salih** – al-Harith b. 'Abd al-Rahman – **Abu al-Jalas**:

I heard 'Ali saying to '**Abd Allah al-Sabai**: "Woe to you! The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, did not inform me of anything which he hid from anyone among mankind. I had heard him (i.e. the Prophet) saying, 'Before the Hour, there will be thirty liars'. Verily, you are one of them."¹

'Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) has this verdict on it:

إسناده ضعيف، أبو الجلاس كوفي مجهول كما في "التقريب". وهارون بن صالح مجهول أيضا، وفي "التقريب": مستور.

والحديث أخرجه أبو يعلى من طريقين آخرين عن الأسدي به

Its chain is *dha'if*. Abu al-Jalas Kufi is *majhul* (unknown), as stated in *al-Taqrib*. Harun b. Salih too is *majhul*. In *al-Taqrib*, he is called *mastur* (hidden).

And the *hadith* is recorded by Abu Ya'la through two *other* chains from al-Asadi with it.²

So, let us find out the other two chains recorded by Imam Abu Ya'la (d. 307 H). This is the first:

حدثنا أبو كريب محمد بن العلاء حدثنا محمد بن الحسن الأسدي حدثنا هارون بن صالح الهمداني عن الحارث بن عبد الرحمن عن أبي الجلاس قال سمعت عليا يقول لعبد الله السبائي : ويلك ! والله ما أفضى إلي بشيء كتمه أحدا من الناس ولقد سمعته يقول : إن بين يدي الساعة ثلاثين كذابا وإنك لأحدهم

Abu Kurayb Muhammad b. al-'Ala – Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-Asadi – **Harun b. Salih al-Hamdani** – al-Harith b. 'Abd al-Rahman – **Abu al-Jalas**:

I heard 'Ali saying to '**Abd Allah al-Sabai**: "Woe to you! I swear by Allah, he (i.e. the Prophet) did not inform me of anything which he hid from anyone among mankind. I had heard him (i.e. the Prophet) saying, 'Before the Hour, there will be thirty liars'. Verily, you are one of them."³

The annotator, Shaykh Dr. Asad comments:

إسناده ضعيف

Its chain is *dha'if*.⁴

What about the second? Abu Ya'la says:

حدثنا أبو بكر بن أبي شيبة حدثنا محمد بن الحسن بإسناده مثله

Abu Bakr b. Abi Shaybah narrated to us – Muhammad b. al-Hasan narrated the like of it to us with his chain.⁵

Apparently, this is the same chain from Ibn Abi Asim. Abu Bakr b. Abi Shaybah narrated it, and has identified "his chain" simply as – Harun b. Salih al-Hamdani – al-Harith b. 'Abd al-Rahman – Abu al-Jalas. It is indeed very strange that 'Allamah al-Albani refers to the chains in *Musnad Abu Ya'la* as "two *other* chains", even though the *isnad* of Ibn Abi Asim, and the two chains of Abu Ya'la, are all one and the same!

We know already that the report is unreliable. So, the alleged event never took place. Amir al-Muminin, *'alaihi al-salam*, never said those words to any 'Abd Allah al-Sabai. But, there are still other issues we would like to address.

The *athar* does NOT mention “‘Abd Allah b. Saba”. It only says “‘Abd Allah al-Sabai”, which literally means “‘Abd Allah from the offspring of Saba”. Obviously, ‘Abd Allah b. Saba could rightly be also called ‘Abd Allah al-Sabai. But, there were other ‘Abd Allahs as well, from the same lineage of Saba, who were also known with that title. Imam al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) tells us about one of them:

(وقعة النهروان)

وفيهما سارت الخوارج لحرب علي، فكانت بينهم وقعة النهروان، وكان علي الخوارج عبد الله بن وهب السبائي، فهزمهم علي وقتل أكثرهم، وقتل ابن وهب.

The Incident of al-Nahrawan

In it, the Khawarij marched to fight a war against ‘Ali. So, the Incident of al-Nahrawan was between them. The head of the Khawarij was ‘**Abd Allah b. Wahb al-Sabai**. ‘Ali defeated them and killed most of them, and he killed Ibn Wahb.⁶

As such, “‘Abd Allah al-Sabai” could well have been a reference to this Kharijite, or to some other “‘Abd Allah” from the offspring of Saba!

However, there is some evidence that the “‘Abd Allah al-Sabai” in the report of Abu Ya’la was actually ‘Abd Allah b. Saba, and none else. Al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir (d. 774 H) copies:

وقال الحافظ أبو يعلى : حدثنا أبو كريب، حدثنا محمد بن الحسن الأسدي، حدثنا هارون بن صالح الهمداني ، عن الحرص بن عبد الرحمن، عن أبي الجلاس قال : سمعت علياً يقول لعبد الله بن سبأ ، ويلك والله ما أفضي إليّ بشيء كتمه أحداً من الناس ، ولقد سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول : إن بين يدي الساعة ثلاثين كذاباً وإنك لأحدهم .

Al-Hafiz Abu Ya’la said: Abu Kurayb – Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-Asadi – Harun b. Salih al-Hamdani – al-Hars b. ‘Abd al-Rahman – Abu al-Jalas:

I heard ‘Ali saying to ‘**Abd Allah b. Saba**: “Woe to you! I swear by Allah, he did not inform me of anything which he hid from anyone among mankind. I had heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, saying, ‘Before the Hour, there will be thirty liars’. Verily, you are one of them.”⁷

Al-Hafiz too submits:

وقال أبو يعلى الموصلي في مسنده ثنا أبو كريب ثنا محمد بن الحسن الأسدي
ثنا هارون بن صالح عن الحارث بن عبد الرحمن عن أبي الجلاس سمعت عليا
يقول لعبد الله بن سبا والله ما أفضى إلي بشئ كتمه أحدا من الناس ولقد
سمعت يقول إن بين يدي الساعة ثلاثين كذابا وإنك لأحدهم

Abu Ya’la al-Mawsili said in his *Musnad*: Abu Kurayb – Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-Asadi – Harun b. Salih – al-Harith b. ‘Abd al-Rahman – Abu al-Jalas:

I heard ‘Ali saying to ‘**Abd Allah b. Saba**: “I swear by Allah, he did not inform me of anything which he hid from anyone among mankind. I had heard (him), saying, ‘Before the Hour, there will be thirty liars’. Verily, you are one of them.”⁸

Yet, even these facts do not help the Sunni claims, as all these reports have the same *dha’if* chain.

1. Abu Bakr b. Abi ‘Asim, Ahmad b. ‘Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1400 H) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 1, p. 462, # 982
2. Ibid
3. Abu Ya’la Ahmad b. ‘Ali b. Muthanna al-Mawsili al-Tamimi, Musnad (Damascus: Dar al-Mamun li al-Turath; 1st edition, 1404 H) [annotator: Dr. Husayn Salim Asad], vol. 1, p. 349, # 449
4. Ibid
5. Ibid, vol. 1, p. 350, # 450
6. Shams al-Din Muhammad b. Ahmad b. ‘Uthman al-Dhahabi, Tarikh al-Islam wa Wafiyat al-Mashahir wa al-A’lam (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-‘Arabi; 1st edition, 1407 H) [Dr. ‘Umar ‘Abd al-Salam Tadmiri], vol. 3, p. 588
7. Abu al-Fida Ibn Kathir al-Dimashqi, al-Nihayah fi al-Fitan wa al-Malahim (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1408 H) [annotator: Prof. ‘Abduh al-Shafi’i], vol. 1, p. 50. We had earlier very strongly criticized this rendition of the hadith by Ibn Kathir. However, upon further researches, we accept the possibility that he had only used a now extinct version of the book of Abu Ya’la. He has been corroborated by al-Hafiz.
8. Shihab al-Din Abu al-Fadhl Ahmad b. ‘Ali b. Hajar al-‘Asqalani, Lisan al-Mizan (Beirut: Manshurat Muasassat al-‘Alami li al-Matbu’at; 2nd edition, 1390 H), vol. 3, p. 289–290, # 1225

According to Sunni ‘*ulama*, ‘Abd Allah b. Saba was “well-known” as *Ibn al-Sawda* – the son of the black woman. Imam Ibn al-Athir (d. 630 H), for instance, submits:

وكان عبد الله بن سبأ المعروف بابن السوداء

He was ‘Abd Allah b. Saba, *well-known* as *Ibn al-Sawda*.¹

The only existing testimony concerning the colour of his mother, however, is the *mawdu’* (fabricated) report of Yazid al-Faq’asi. Therefore, there really is absolutely **NO** evidence that ‘Abd Allah b. Saba had a black mother. As a result, there is no basis for naming him *Ibn al-Sawda* or for suggesting that he could be called that.

Secondly, there is equally no reliable proof that the contemporaries of ‘Abd Allah b. Saba ever called him *Ibn al-Sawda*. Rather, his own existence at all is not even established through *any* authentic chain in the Sunni books! Logic demands that whichever Sunni wants to claim that ‘Abd Allah b. Saba was *Ibn al-Sawda*, or that he was well-known as that, must do the following:

1. Provide at least a single authentic, explicit Sunni report proving the existence of a man called ‘Abd Allah b. Saba.
2. Provide at least a single authentic, explicit Sunni *riwayah* showing that the man named ‘Abd Allah b. Saba was addressed as *Ibn al-Sawda* by his contemporaries.

The truth is – no Sunni has *ever* been able to do either of the above, and no Sunni will be able to do so till the Day of *al-Qiyamah*. Therefore, as things stand, there is no valid Sunni evidence that a man named ‘Abd Allah b. Saba *ever* existed, or that such a man was *ever* called *Ibn al-Sawda* by those who knew him. With this background fact, we are good to proceed to some Sunni reports on the unknown son of the black woman!

Narration One

Imam Ibn Asakir (d. 571 H) helps us with the first of them:

قال ونا سيف عن أبي حارثة وأبي عثمان قالا لما قدم ابن السوداء مصر عجمهم
واستخلاهم واستخلوه وعرض لهم بالكفر فأبعدوه وعرض لهم بالشقاق
فأطعموه فبدأ فطعن على عمرو بن العاص وقال ما باله أكثركم عطاء ورزقا ألا
ننصب رجلا من قريش يسوي بيننا فاستحلوا ذلك منه وقالوا كيف نطبق ذلك
مع عمرو وهو رجل العرب قال تستعفون منه ثم يعمل عملنا ويظهر الائتمار
بالمعروف والطعن فلا يرده علينا أحد

Sayf – Abu Harithah and Abu ‘Uthman:

When **Ibn al-Sawda** arrived in Egypt, he tested them. He was delighted with them and they were delighted with him. He presented *kufr* (disbelief) to them, and they distanced themselves from it. He then suggested sedition to them and they gave him hope. Then he began and slandered ‘Amr b. al-As, saying, “Why is his pension and salary the largest among you?” Will a man from Quraysh not be put forward to settle the matter between us?” They were pleased with that from him, and said, “How can we achieve this with ‘Amr when he is the man of the Arabs?” He said, “Seek his dismissal! Then we will play our role and begin to publicly command the good and to defame. At that time, no one will hold us back.”²

In this chain again is Sayf b. ‘Umar. We will only remind ourselves of the words of ‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) concerning him:

قلت: وفي هذا نظر، فإن أكثر الطرق المشار إليها مدارها على سيف بن عمر
والواقدي وهما كذابان

I say: There is an error in this, for most of the indicated chains, their pivot is **Sayf b. ‘Umar and al-Waqidi, and they both were LIARS.**³

As such, the *sanad* is *mawdu’* and the *riwayah* is thereby a fabrication.

Ibn Asakir apparently assumes that the “Ibn al-Sawda” in the report was ‘Abd Allah b. Saba – which is why he has placed the *riwayah* under his biography of the latter. However, there is no valid proof that ‘Abd Allah b. Saba had a black mother, to begin with! Even Ibn Asakir makes no attempt to provide any, either! Meanwhile, decency and common sense dictate that whosoever seeks to rely upon the above report to prove the existence of ‘Abd Allah b. Saba – as Ibn Asakir did – must first do the following:

1. Bring convincing, solid proof that there was a man – at that period in time – named ‘Abd Allah b. Saba who had a black mother.
2. Supply reliable evidence that the black mother of this man was well-known among the people, and was widely recognized as “*the black woman*”.
3. Provide an authentically transmitted eye-witness testimony which establishes that the man – ‘Abd Allah b. Saba – was also known as *Ibn al-Sawda*.

We are absolutely certain that no creature can fulfil any of the above conditions till the Hour! As such, we believe that anyone who claims that *Ibn al-Sawda* in the fabricated *riwayah* was ‘Abd Allah b. Saba (whoever that was) – apparently with no valid evidence at all – is a bigot who only plays dirty games with

the truth. Undoubtedly, there is zero evidence to establish that ‘Abd Allah b. Saba was *ever* referred to or known as *Ibn al-Sawda* by any of his contemporaries. Therefore, it is clearly impossible to connect the above tale of Sayf to him. So, the report is completely useless and irrelevant, since it is strictly about a hopelessly unidentifiable character.

Narration Two

With the collapse of the first *riwayah*, Imam Ibn Asakir takes us to another:

قرأنا على أبي عبد الله يحيى بن الحسن عن أبي الحسين بن الآبنوسي أنا أحمد بن عبيد بن الفضل وعن أبي نعيم محمد بن عبد الواحد بن عبد العزيز أنا علي بن محمد بن خزفة قالنا محمد بن الحسن نا ابن أبي خيثمة نا محمد بن عباد نا سفيان عن عمار الدهني قال سمعت أبا الطفيل يقول رأيت المسيب بن نجبة أتى به ملببة يعني ابن السوداء وعلي على المنبر فقال علي ما شأنه فقال يكذب على الله وعلى رسوله

Abu ‘Abd Allah Yahya b. al-Hasan – Abu al-Husayn b. al-Abnusi – Ahmad b. ‘Ubayd b. al-Fadhl and Abu Na’im Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahid b. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz – ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. Khazafah and Muhammad b. al-Hasan – Ibn Abi Khaythamah – Muhammad b. ‘Abbad – Sufyan – Ammar al-Duhni – Abu al-Tufayl:

I saw al-Musayyab b. Najabah, bringing him – **that was *Ibn al-Sawda*** – while ‘Ali was on the pulpit. So, ‘Ali said, “What is his problem?” He replied, “He lies upon Allah and upon His Messenger.”⁴

This report suffers from the same fatal defect as the first. We do not know who this *Ibn al-Sawda* was, and there is no reliable Sunni *riwayah* to connect him to ‘Abd Allah b. Saba. Meanwhile, even if we assumed, for the sake of argument, that he was Ibn Saba, the *athar* still does not prove any of the primary Sunni claims about him. For instance, it does not prove that he was negative towards Abu Bakr and ‘Umar, or that he believed in the succession or *‘isma* (sinlessness) of Amir al-Muminin ‘Ali, *‘alaihi al-salam*. It also says nothing about ‘Abd Allah b. Saba’s alleged belief in *al-raj’ah* or his claimed participation in the bloody overthrow of ‘Uthman b. ‘Affan. It is therefore basically an utterly valueless report, as long as Ibn Saba is concerned.

Narration Three

Imam Ibn Abi Khaythamah (d. 279 H) reports:

حدثنا محمد بن عباد المكي قال نا سفيان قال نا عبد الجبار بن عباس الهمداني
عن سلمة عن حجية بن عدي الكندي: رأيت عليا على المنبر وهو يقول من
يعذرني من هذا الحميت الأسود الذي يكذب على الله يعني ابن السوداء

Muhammad b. ‘Abbad – Sufyan – ‘Abd al-Jabbar b. ‘Abbas al-Hamdani – Salamah – **Hujayyah b. ‘Adi al-Kindi:**

I saw ‘Ali upon the pulpit and he was saying, “Who will excuse me of this evil black container, who tells lies upon Allah?” **He meant *Ibn al-Sawda*.**⁵

Imam Ibn Asakir has also transmitted the same *riwayah*:

أنبأنا أبو عبد الله محمد بن أحمد بن إبراهيم بن الخطاب أنا أبو القاسم علي بن
محمد بن علي الفارسي ح وأخبرنا أبو محمد عبد الرحمن بن أبي الحسن بن
إبراهيم الداراني أنا سهل بن بشر أنا أبو الحسن علي بن منير بن أحمد بن منير
الخلال قال أنا القاضي أبو الطاهر محمد بن أحمد بن عبد الله الذهلي نا أبو
أحمد بن عبدوس نا محمد بن عباد نا سفيان نا عبد الجبار بن العباس الهمداني
عن سلمة بن كهيل عن حجية بن عدي الكندي قال رأيت عليا كرم الله وجهه
وهو على المنبر وهو يقول من يعذرني من هذا الحميت الأسود الذي يكذب على
الله ورسوله يعني ابن السوداء

Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Ibrahim b. al-Khattab – Abu al-Qasim ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. ‘Ali al-Farisi; AND Abu Muhammad ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Abi al-Hasan b. Ibrahim al-Darani – Sahl b. Bishr – Abu al-Hasan ‘Ali b. Munir b. Ahmad b. Munir al-Khalal – al-Qadhi Abu al-Tahir Muhammad b. Ahmad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Dhuhli – Abu Ahmad b. ‘Abdus – Muhammad b. ‘Abbad – Sufyan – ‘Abd al-Jabbar b. al-‘Abbas al-Hamdani – Salamah b. Kuhayl – **Hujayyah b. ‘Adi al-Kindi:**

I saw ‘Ali, *karamallah wajhah*, while he was upon the pulpit and he was saying, “Who will excuse me of this evil black container, who tells lies upon Allah and His Messenger?” **He meant *Ibn al-Sawda*.**⁶

This *riwayah* is inconsequential as well. First, the phrase “He meant *Ibn al-Sawda*” is an interpolation (*idraj*) of one of the narrators. But, who was it? It could have been anyone from Muhammad b. ‘Abbad to Hujayyah. There is no explicit proof to establish that the interpolation came from Hujayyah, the eye-witness, and not from any of the sub-narrators. As such, there is no sufficient basis to rely upon it in identifying whoever ‘Ali allegedly called an “evil black container”. Moreover, even if we assumed, for the

sake of argument, that it was Hujayyah who made the identification, then the report would still be of zero value. The only thing it would have done in such a case is to show that Amir al-Muminin once called one *Ibn al-Sawda* a “black container” – nothing more, nothing less. Meanwhile, the exact identity of this *Ibn al-Sawda* remains unknown through any reliable Sunni report. Therefore, the report would still be redundant and unusable.

Narration Four

This is the fourth “evidence” of Imam Ibn Asakir, allegedly about ‘Abd Allah b. Saba:

أخبرنا أبو بكر أحمد بن المظفر بن الحسين بن سوسن التمار في كتابه
وأخبرني أبو طاهر محمد بن محمد بن عبد الله السنجي بمرو عنه أنا أبو علي
بن شاذان نا أبو بكر محمد بن جعفر بن محمد الآدمي نا أحمد بن موسى
الشطوي نا أحمد بن عبد الله بن يونس نا أبو الأحوص عن مغيرة عن سباط
قال بلغ عليا أن ابن السوداء ينتقص أبا بكر وعمر فدعا به ودعا بالسيف أو قال
فهم بقتله فكلّم فيه فقال لا يساكني ببلد أنا فيه قال فسيره إلى المدائن

Abu Bakr Ahmad b. al-Muzaffar b. al-Husayn b. Susan al-Tamar – Abu Tahir Muhammad b. Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Sinji – Abu ‘Ali b. Shadhan – **Abu Bakr Muhammad b. Ja’far b. Muhammad al-Adami** – Ahmad b. Musa al-Shatawi – Ahmad b. ‘Abd Allah b. Yunus – Abu al-Ahwas – Mughirah – **Sabat**:

It reached ‘Ali that *Ibn al-Sawda* was reviling Abu Bakr and ‘Umar. So, he sent for him and called for the sword, or he decided to kill him. But, he was persuaded against it. Then he said, “He cannot live with me in the same town”. So, he banished him to al-Madain.⁷

This report is very *dha’if*.

Al-Khatib al-Baghdadi (d. 463 H) has done a *tarjamah* for Abu Bakr Muhammad b. Ja’far b. Muhammad al-Adami but has mentioned no *tawthiq* for him whatsoever concerning his narrations. None exists in any other Sunni book either. By contrast, al-Baghdadi has actually recorded this under the said *tarjamah*:

قال محمد بن أبي الفوارس سنة ثمان وأربعين وثلاثمائة فيها مات محمد بن
جعفر الآدمي وكان قد خلط فيما حدث

Muhammad b. Abi al-Fawaris said: "In the year 348 H, Muhammad b. Ja'far died, **and he used to mix things up in what he narrated.**"⁸

This makes him *dha'if* as a narrator.

Besides, the main narrator of the report too, Sabat, is completely unknown in the Sunni books of *rijal*. No mention of him whatsoever is made. So, he is perfectly *majhul*.

But, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H) thinks it is not over yet:

فروى أبو الأحوص عن مغيرة عن شباك عن إبراهيم قال: بلغ علي بن أبي طالب أن عبد الله بن السوداء ينتقص أبا بكر وعمر فهم بقتله ف قيل له: تقتل رجلا يدعو إلى حبكم أهل البيت؟ فقال: "لا يساكنني في دار أبدا".

وفي رواية عن شباك قال: بلغ عليا أن ابن السوداء يبغض أبا بكر وعمر قال: فدعاه ودعا بالسيف أو قال: فهم بقتله فكلم فيه فقال: "لا يساكنني ببلد أنا فيه" فنفاه إلى المدائن وهذا محفوظ عن أبي الأحوص وقد رواه النجاد وابن بطة واللالكائي وغيرهم

ومراسيل إبراهيم جواد لا يظهر علي رضي الله عنه أنه يريد قتل رجل إلا وقتله حلال عنده ويشبهه والله أعلم أن يكون إنما تركه خوف الفتنة بقتله

Abu al-Ahwas narrated from Mughirah **from Shibak from Ibrahim** that he said, "It reached 'Ali b. Abi Talib that 'Abd Allah b. al-Sawda was reviling Abu Bakr and 'Umar. Then he decided to kill him. But it was said to him, 'Will you kill a man who calls towards love of you, Ahl al-Bayt?' Then he said, 'He can never again stay with me in the same house.'"

In another report from Shibak, he said: "It reached 'Ali that *Ibn al-Sawda* hated Abu Bakr and 'Umar. Then he sent for him and called for the sword, or he decided to kill him. But he was dissuaded from it. As a result, he said, 'He can not stay in the same town with me.' So, he banished him to al-Madain."

This is accurately preserved (*mahfuz*) from Abu al-Ahwas, and al-Najad, Ibn Battah, al-Lalikai and others have recorded it.

And the *marasil* (i.e. disconnected narrations) of Ibrahim are good (*jiyyad*).⁹

The pretensions of Ibn Taymiyyah nonetheless, both reports are unreliable! Imam Ibn Hibban (d. 354 H) tells us why:

إبراهيم النخعي وهو إبراهيم بن يزيد بن عمرو بن الأسود أبو عمران كان مولده
سنة خمسين ومات سنة خمس أو ست وتسعين

Ibrahim al-Nakha'i: he was Ibrahim b. Yazid b. 'Amr b. al-Aswad, Abu 'Imran. **He was born in 50 H** and died in 95 or 96 H.¹⁰

It is unanimously agreed upon within the *Ummah* that Amir al-Muminin 'Ali b. Abi Talib was martyred in 40 H, some 10 years before this Ibrahim was born! That means he was narrating as an eye-witness what occurred long before his birth! Yet, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah – who apparently admits that the report of Ibrahim is *mursal* (disconnected) – wants us to believe it was a “good” testimony. What happened to his common sense?

It gets worse with the *riwayah* of Shibak – which our Shaykh has graded as “correctly preserved”. He too was not an eye-witness, and had only gotten his story – as he personally indicated – from Ibrahim! In fact, even though Imam 'Ali belonged to the first *tabaqah* (i.e. generation of narrators), Shibak only fell in the sixth – a fact which throws him far, far away from the time of the alleged incident! Yet, al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) has some further damaging information about him:

شباك ... الضبي الكوفي الأعمى ثقة له ذكر في صحيح مسلم وكان يدلس من
السادسة.

Shibak ... al-Dhabi al-Kufi, the Blind: *Thiqah* (trustworthy). He is mentioned in *Sahih Muslim*. **He used to do *tadlis*. He was from the sixth (*tabaqat*).**¹¹

The bottom-line of all this is obvious. Both Shibak and Ibrahim were completely cut off from the time of Amir al-Muminin. So, neither of them could have validly narrated about events which occurred during his *khilafah*. Secondly, in the chain of Ibrahim is Shibak, a *mudalis*, who has narrated from the former in an 'an-'an manner. This is another, independent evidence of the unreliability of the chain of Ibrahim! So, both reports quoted by Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah are not just *dha'if* – they are *very weak* (*dha'if jiddan*) But, what have we got our Shaykh stating about them instead?! This is how some people behave when they become desperate about their fallacies.

Even then, these reports only show that one *Ibn al-Sawda* hated and reviled Abu Bakr and ‘Umar during the *khilafah* of Imam ‘Ali. It nowhere identifies him as Ibn Saba. Also, it does not confirm the Sunni claims that ‘Abd Allah b. Saba believed in *al-raj’ah*, or in the *wisayah* or *‘isma* of ‘Ali, nor does it establish his guilty in the murder of ‘Uthman.

1. Ibn al-Athir, Abu al-Hasan ‘Izz al-Din ‘Ali b. Abi al-Karam Muhammad b. Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Karim b. ‘Abd al-Wahid, *al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh* (Beirut: Dar Sadir; 1385 H), vol. 3, pp. 144–145
2. Abu al-Qasim ‘Ali b. al-Hasan b. Habat Allah b. ‘Abd Allah, Ibn Asakir al-Shafi’i, *Tarikh Madinah Dimashq* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: ‘Ali Shiri], vol. 29, p. 6
3. Abu ‘Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, *Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqhiyah wa Fawaidihah* (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma’arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 3, pp. 101–102, # 1110
4. Abu al-Qasim ‘Ali b. al-Hasan b. Habat Allah b. ‘Abd Allah, Ibn Asakir al-Shafi’i, *Tarikh Madinah Dimashq* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: ‘Ali Shiri], vol. 29, p. 7
5. Abu Bakr Ahmad b. Abi Khaythamah Zuhayr b. Harb, *Tarikh Ibn Abi Khaythamah* (al-Faruq al-Hadithiyyah li al-Taba’ah wa al-Nashr; 1st edition, 1424 H), vol. 3, p. 177, # 4359
6. Abu al-Qasim ‘Ali b. al-Hasan b. Habat Allah b. ‘Abd Allah, Ibn Asakir al-Shafi’i, *Tarikh Madinah Dimashq* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: ‘Ali Shiri], vol. 29, p. 8
7. *Ibid*, vol. 29, p. 9
8. Abu Bakr Ahmad b. ‘Ali al-Khatib al-Baghdadi, *Tarikh Baghdad* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah), vol. 2, p. 149, # 565
9. Taqiy al-Din Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. ‘Abd al-Salam b. ‘Abd Allah b. Abi al-Qasim b. Muhammad b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani al-Hanbali al-Dimashqi, al-Sarim al-Maslul ‘ala Shatim al-Rasul (Saudi Arabia: al-Haras al-Watani al-Sa’udi) [annotator: Muhammad Muhy al-Din ‘Abd al-Hamid], p. 584
10. Abu Hatim Muhammad b. Hibban b. Ahmad al-Tamimi al-Busti, *Mashahir ‘Ulama al-Amsar* (Dar al-Wafa li al-Taba’at wa al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Marzuq ‘Ali Ibrahim], p. 163, # 748
11. Ahmad b. ‘Ali b. Hajar al-‘Asqalani, *Taqrib al-Tahdhib* (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-‘Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa ‘Abd al-Qadir ‘Ata], vol. 1, pp. 410–411, # 2742

There are Sunni reports which allege that Imam ‘Ali, *‘alaihi al-salam*, called someone – or perhaps each of a set of people – “the black container”. We have quoted one of such *riwayat* in the last chapter. We will here proceed to examine all the other existing Sunni *riwayat* on “the black container”.

Ibn Asakir (d. 571 H) records:

أخبرنا أبو القاسم يحيى بن بطريق بن بشرى وأبو محمد عبد الكريم بن حمزة
قالا أنا أبو الحسن بن مكي أنا أبو القاسم المؤمل بن أحمد بن محمد الشيباني نا
يحيى بن محمد بن صاعد نا بNDAR نا محمد بن جعفر نا شعبة عن سلمة عن زيد
بن وهب عن علي قال ما لي ومال هذا الحميت الأسود قال ونا يحيى بن محمد
نا بNDAR نا محمد بن جعفر نا شعبة عن سلمة قال قال سمعت أبا الزعراء يحدث
عن علي عليه السلام قال ما لي ومال هذا الحميت الأسود

Abu al-Qasim Yahya b. Batriq b. Bushra and Abu Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Karim b. Hamzah – Abu al-Hasan b. Makki – Abu al-Qasim al-Muammal b. Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Shaybani – Yahya b. Muhammad b. Sa’id – Bundar – Muhammad b. Ja’far – Shu’bah – Salamah – Zayd b. Wahb:

‘Ali said, “What do I have to do with this black container?”

And Yahya b. Muhammad – Bundar – Muhammad b. Ja’far – Shu’bah – Salamah – Abu al-Za’ra:

‘Ali, *‘alaihi al-salam*, said: “What do I have to do with this black container?”¹

These ones are even more redundant than the previous one. No information whatsoever is given on the “black container”. Who was he? What did he do? Nothing! Absolutely nothing! If we connected them with the other report, then we would have the identity of the “black container” as simply *Ibn al-Sawda* and his crime as telling lies upon Allah and His Messenger, *sallallahu ‘alaihi wa alihi*. But, who was that even?!

The final Sunni *riwayah* on the “black container” is this one, reported by Imam Ibn Abi Khaythamah (d. 279 H):

حدثنا عمرو بن مرزوق قال أنا شعبة عن سلمة بن كهيل عن زيد بن وهب قال قال علي ما لي [ولهذا الحميت الأسود يعني عبد الله بن سبأ وكان يقع في أبي بكر وعمر

كذا قال : عن سلمة عن زيد بن وهب

‘Amr b. Marzuq – Shu’bah – Salamah b. Kuhayl – Zayd b. Wahb:

‘Ali said, “[What do I have to do] with this black container?”. **He meant ‘Abd Allah b. Saba and he used to attack Abu Bakr and ‘Umar.**

That was how he said: from Salamah from Zayd b. Wahb.²

Imam Ibn Asakir also reports:

أخبرنا أبو محمد بن طاوس وأبو يعلى حمزة بن الحسن بن المفرج قالاً أنا أبو القاسم بن أبي العلاء أنا أبو محمد بن أبي نصر أنا خيثمة بن سليمان نا أحمد بن زهير بن حرب نا عمرو بن مرزوق أنا شعبة عن سلمة بن كهيل عن زيد قال

قال علي بن أبي طالب ما لي ولهذا الحميت الأسود يعني عبد الله بن سبأ وكان
يقع في أبي بكر وعمر

Abu Muhammad b. Tawus and Abu Ya'la Hamzah b. al-Hasan b. al-Mufarraj – Abu al-Qasim b. Abi al-
'Ala – Abu Muhammad b. Abi Nasr – Khaythamah b. Sulayman – Ahmad b. Zuhayr b. Harb – **'Amr b.**
Marzuq – Shu'bah – Salamah b. Kuhayl – Zayd:

'Ali b. Abi Talib said, "What do I have to do with this black container?". **He meant 'Abd Allah b. Saba and he used to attack Abu Bakr and 'Umar.**³

This report has some serious problems. First and foremost, it is *mudraj* (interpolated). The sentence "He meant 'Abd Allah b. Saba and he used to attack Abu Bakr and 'Umar" was inserted by a narrator, and we have no explicit proof of who it was. It could have been any of the narrators from Amr b. Marzuq to Zayd b. Wahb. With no solid evidence to pinpoint a particular narrator as the source of the interpolation, it is impossible to rely upon it as an eye-witness testimony. So, that identification is *dha'if*.

Meanwhile, we have already seen the version of the *athar* transmitted by Muhammad b. Ja'far from Shu'bah from Salamah from Zayd. It does NOT contain the last phrase above, identifying the "black container" explicitly as 'Abd Allah b. Saba, and explaining his lies upon Allah and His Messenger as his attacks on Abu Bakr and 'Umar! Therefore, neither Shu'bah, nor Salamah, nor Zayd, was the source of that addition. Rather, the only possible origin of that interpolation was 'Amr b. Marzuq. This then rightly leads to the conclusion that the *idraj* is NOT an eye-witness account. By contrast, it was made by someone who was disconnected from the reported incident by about one century! That confirms its invalidity.

Moreover, 'Amr b. Marzuq in the chain is *dha'if*. Al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) says about him:

عمرو بن مرزوق الباهلي أبو عثمان البصري أثنى عليه سليمان بن حرب
وأحمد بن حنبل وقال يحيى بن معين ثقة مأمون ووثقه ابن سعد وأما علي بن
المديني فكان يقول اتركوا حديثه وقال القواريري كان يحيى بن سعيد لا يرضى
عمرو بن مرزوق وقال الساجي كان أبو الوليد يتكلم فيه وقال ابن عمار
والعجلي ليس بشئ وقال الدارقطني كثير الوهم

قلت: لم يخرج عنه البخاري في الصحيح سوى حديثين أحدهما حديثه عن
شعبة عن عمرو بن مرة عن عروة عن أبي موسى في فضل عائشة وهو عنده

بمتابعة آدم بن أبي إياس وغندر وغيرهما عن شعبة والثاني حديثه عن شعبة عن ابن أبي بكر عن أنس في ذلك الكبائر مقرونا عنده بعبد الصمد عن شعبة فوضح أنه لم يخرج له احتجاجا والله أعلم

‘Amr b. Marzuq al-Bahili, Abu ‘Uthman al-Basri: Sulayman b. Harb and Ahmad b. Hanbal extolled him; and Yahya b. Ma’in said, “*Thiqah* (trustworthy), reliable” and Ibn Sa’d declared him *thiqah* (trustworthy). **As for ‘Ali b. al-Madini, he used to say, “Reject his *ahadith*”!** Al-Qawariri also said, “Yahya b. Sa’id was not pleased with ‘Amr b. Marzuq”. Al-Saji said, “Abu al-Walid used to criticize him”. Both Ibn ‘Ammar and al-‘Ijli said, “**He is nothing**”. And al-Daraqutni said, “**He hallucinated A LOT**”.

I say: al-Bukhari has not narrated from him in his *Sahih* except two *hadiths* only. One of them is his *hadith* from Shu’bah, from ‘Amr b. Marrah, from ‘Urwah, from Abu Musa concerning the merit of ‘Aishah, and with him, it is with him through the *mutaba’at* of Adam b. Abi Iyas, Ghandar and others from Shu’bah. In his second *hadith* from Shu’bah from Ibn Abi Bakr from Anas concerning that *al-Kabair*, he is conjoined (in the chain) with ‘Abd al-Samad from Shu’bah, with him (i.e. al-Bukhari). **So, it becomes clear that he did NOT narrate from him as a *hujjah* (proof),** and Allah knows best.⁴

If a narrator is *thiqah* (trustworthy), but hallucinates *a lot*, then his uncorroborated reports are *dha’if*. No wonder, al-Bukhari (d. 256 H) did not accept ‘Amr b. Marzuq as a *hujjah*, and only conjoined him with others from Shu’bah in the chains. Therefore, the above chain of ‘Amr b. Marzuq – in which he has stood alone without support – is *dha’if*.

However, some of our Sunni brothers attempt to defend ‘Amr by quoting these further submissions of al-Hafiz:

قال أبو زرعة سمعت أحمد بن حنبل وقلت له ان علي بن المديني يتكلم في عمرو ابن مرزوق فقال عمرو رجل صالح لا أدري ما يقول علي ... قال أبو زرعة وسمعت سليمان ابن حرب وذكر عمرو بن مرزوق فقال جاء بما ليس عندهم فحسدوه وقال الفضل بن زياد سألت أبو عبيد الله الحداني عن أحمد بن حنبل فقال ثقة مأمون فتشنا على ما قيل فيه فلم نجد له أصلا

Abu Zur’ah said: I heard Ahmad b. Hanbal and I said to him that ‘Ali b. al-Madini criticized ‘Amr b. Marzuq. He said, “ ‘Amr is a righteous man. I do not know what ‘Ali says” ... Abu Zur’ah said: I also heard Sulayman b. Harb and he mentioned ‘Amr b. Marzuq and said, “He came with what they did not have. So, they envied him.” Al-Fadhl b. Ziyad said: Abu ‘Ubayd Allah al-Hadani asked about him from Ahmad b. Hanbal and he said, “Trustworthy, reliable. We investigated what was said about him, and

we did not find any basis for it.”⁵

Then, our opponents claim through these that all the criticisms against ‘Amr were due to envy! However, this line of argument does not offer much help to our Sunni brothers. Sulayman b. Harb (d. 224 H) and Ahmad b. Hanbal (d. 241 H) were obviously referring to the contemporaries of ‘Amr in their objections. It is possible that *some* of those people were indeed influenced by envy in their castigation of him. It is equally possible that Sulayman and Ahmad were heavily biased in favour of him, or were both unable to conduct sufficient probes to determine the truth about him. In any case, what we primarily rely upon against him is from Imam al-Daraqutni (d. 385 H) and Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H), later scholars who apparently had investigated his reports and had then drawn their conclusions. Obviously, the charge of envy does not affect the duo. Al-Hafiz submits about ‘Amr:

وقال ابن عمار الموصلي ليس بشئ وقال العجلي عمرو ابن مرزوق بصري
ضعيف يحدث عن شعبة ليس بشئ وقال الحاكم عن الدارقطني صدوق كثير
الوهم وقال الحاكم سيئ الحفظ

Ibn ‘Ammar al-Mawsili said: “**He is nothing.**” Al-‘Ijli said, “**‘Amr b. Marzuq Basri is *dha’if*.** He narrated from Shu’bah. **He was nothing.** Al-Hakim narrated that al-Daraqutni said: “Very truthful. **He hallucinated A LOT.**” And al-Hakim said, “**He had a defective memory.**”⁶

Certainly, the reports of a narrator like this are *dha’if*, without doubt! Most importantly, the criticisms against him are “explained”. Therefore, they take precedence over any praise of him.

1. Abu al-Qasim ‘Ali b. al-Hasan b. Habbat Allah b. ‘Abd Allah, Ibn Asakir al-Shafi’i, Tarikh Madinah Dimashq (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: ‘Ali Shiri], vol. 29, p. 7
2. Abu Bakr Ahmad b. Abi Khaythamah Zuhayr b. Harb, Tarikh Ibn Abi Khaythamah (al-Faruq al-Hadithiyyah li al-Taba’ah wa al-Nashr; 1st edition, 1424 H), vol. 3, p. 177, # 4358
3. Abu al-Qasim ‘Ali b. al-Hasan b. Habbat Allah b. ‘Abd Allah, Ibn Asakir al-Shafi’i, Tarikh Madinah Dimashq (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: ‘Ali Shiri], vol. 29, pp. 7–8
4. Ahmad b. ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Hajar al-‘Asqalani al-Shafi’i, Hadi al-Sari Muqaddimah Fath al-Bari (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-‘Arabi; 1st edition, 1408 H), pp. 431–432
5. Shihab al-Din Ahmad b. ‘Ali b. Hajar al-‘Asqalani, Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1404 H), vol. 8, p. 88, # 160
6. Ibid, vol. 8, p. 89, # 160

The aim of those who ceaselessly peddle the Ibn Saba fables is primarily to prove:

1. that he was the origin of the claim that Amir al-Muminin ‘Ali, *‘alaihi al-salam*, was declared *khalifah* by his Prophet, *sallallahu ‘alaihi wa alih;* and

2. that he founded the claim that *khilafah* belongs exclusively to ‘Ali and the offspring of Muhammad; and
3. that he was the first to express belief in *al-raj’ah*.

However, even in the authentic Sunni *ahadith*, evidence can be produced to establish that belief in the *khilafah* of the Ahl al-Bayt, ‘*alaihim al-salam*, as well as in *al-raj’ah*, was part of the *original* teachings of Islam. For instance, Imam Ibn Abi ‘Asim (d. 287 H) records:

ثنا محمد بن المثنى، حدثنا يحيى بن حماد، عن أبي عوانة، عن يحيى بن سليم
أبي بلج عن عمرو بن ميمون، عن ابن عباس قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله
عليه وسلم لعلي: أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنك لست نبيا وأنت
خليفة في كل مؤمن من بعدي.

Muhammad b. al-Muthanna – Yahya b. Hammad – Abu ‘Awanah – Yahya b. Sulaym Abu Balj – ‘Amr b. Maymun – Ibn ‘Abbas: **The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to ‘Ali:** “You are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, with the exception that you are not a prophet. **And you are my *khalifah* over every believer after me.**”¹

Dr. al-Jawabirah says:

إسناده حسن. رجاله رجال الشيخين غير أبي بلج واسمه يحيى بن سليم بن بلج،
قال الحافظ: صدوق ربما أخطأ. وله شواهد

Its chain is *hasan*. Its narrators are narrators of the two Shaykhs, except Abu Balj, and his name is Yahya b. Sulaym b. Balj. Al-Hafiz said: “*Sadug* (very truthful), *maybe* he made mistakes.” **There are witnesses for it (i.e. the *hadith*).**”²

‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) also comments on the *sanad*:

إسناده حسن. ورجالہ ثقات رجال الشيخين غير أبي بلج واسمه يحيى بن سليم
بن بلج قال الحافظ: "صدوق ربما أخطأ".

Its chain is *hasan*. Its narrators are trustworthy, and are narrators of the two Shaykhs (i.e. al-Bukhari and Muslim) except Abu Balj. His name is Yahya b. Sulaym b. Balj. Al-Hafiz said: “*Sadug* (very truthful),

maybe he made mistakes.”³

Assessing the same chain, Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) declares:

هذا حديث صحيح الإسناد

This *hadith* has a **sahih** chain.⁴

And Imam al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) seconds him:

صحيح

Sahih.⁵

‘Allamah Ahmad Shakir (d. 1377 H) too has the same verdict on same *isnad*:

إسناده صحيح

Its chain is *sahih*.⁶

And Imam al-Busiri (d. 840 H) holds the same view, concerning the chain:

سند صحيح

A *sahih* chain.⁷

This *hadith* is explicit, straightforward, and authentic⁸. It leaves no room for doubt or manipulation. It absolutely establishes that Imam ‘Ali was indeed the designated *khalifah* of Muhammad, the Messenger of the Lord of the worlds.

‘Allamah al-Albani has a second *hadith* for our research:

إني تارك فيكم خليفتين: كتاب الله جبل ممدود ما بين السماء والأرض وعترتي

أهل بيتي وإنهما لن يتفرقا حتى يردا علي الحوض

I am leaving behind over you two *khalifahs*: the Book of Allah – a rope stretching between the heaven and the earth – **and my offspring, my Ahl al-Bayt**. Verily, both shall never separate from each other until they meet me at the Lake-Font.⁹

Then, the ‘Allamah comments:

صحيح

*Sahih*¹⁰

On the same page, al-Albani copies another similar *hadith*:

إني تارك فيكم ما إن تمسكن به لن تضلوا بعدي أحدهما أعظم من الآخر كتاب الله حبل ممدود من السماء إلى الأرض وعترتي أهل بيتي ولن يتفرقا حتى يردا علي الحوض فانظروا كيف تخلفوني فيهما

I am leaving behind over you that which if you adhere to it you will never go astray after me, one of them both is greater than the other: **the Book of Allah** – a rope stretching from the heaven to the earth – **and my offspring, my Ahl al-Bayt**. Both shall never separate from each other until they meet me at the Lake-Font. Therefore, watch carefully how you treat them in my absence.¹¹

Again, ‘Allamah al-Albani says:

صحيح

*Sahih*¹²

This *hadith* too grants and limits the *khilafah* to ‘Ali and his offspring through Sayyidah Fatimah¹³.

We therefore ask our brothers from the Ahl al-Sunnah, especially the Salafiyyah: are you going to play your “Ibn Saba” card against the Messenger of Allah too?!

With regards to the second issue, there is need for some little explanations in order to make the matter

clearer. The word *al-raj'ah* literally means “the return”. Any “return” to anything is a *raj'ah*. For instance, an ex-Muslim who “returns” to Islam has done a *raj'ah* back to the true faith. In the same manner, a traveller who “returns” home has done a *raj'ah*. Technically, however, *al-raj'ah* is the “return” of *any* dead person into this world *through resurrection*. It is therefore completely different from other concepts such as rebirth or reincarnation. It is the same body, with the same soul, that returns to this world from *Barzakh* by Allah’s Command. At a more specific level, *al-raj'ah* – in Shi’i theology – is the “return” after death of certain people to this earth – through resurrection – during the “End Times” period. Another word for this, in Shi’i terminology, is *al-karrah*¹⁴.

There is, without doubt, a general rule set in the Book of Allah:

حتى إذا جاء أحدهم الموت قال رب ارجعون لعلي أعمل صالحا فيما تركت
كلا إنها كلمة هو قائلها ومن ورائهم برزخ إلى يوم يبعثون

Until when death comes to one of them, he says, “My Lord! Send me back, so that I may do good in that which I have left behind!” No! It is but a word that he speaks, **and behind them is *Barzakh* until the Day when they will be resurrected.**¹⁵

So, anyone who dies is prevented from ever returning to this world. He is rather locked behind the *Barzakh* till *al-Qiyamah*. Al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir (d. 774 H) states under the above verse:

وقال مجاهد : البرزخ : الحاجز ما بين الدنيا والآخرة. وقال محمد بن كعب :
البرزخ : ما بين الدنيا والآخرة. ليسوا مع أهل الدنيا يأكلون ويشربون ، ولا مع
أهل الآخرة يجازون بأعمالهم. وقال أبو صخر : البرزخ : المقابر ، لا هم في
الدنيا ، ولا هم في الآخرة ، فهم مقيمون إلى يوم يبعثون.

Mujahid said: “The *Barzakh* is a barrier between this world and the Hereafter.” Muhammad b. Ka’b said, “The *Barzakh* is what is between this world and the Hereafter. They are not from the people of this world who eat and drink, and are not with the people of the Hereafter who are rewarded according to their deeds.” Abu Dhakhr said, “**The *Barzakh* refers to the graves. They are not in this world and they ARE NOT in the Hereafter. They will remain there till the Day of Resurrection.**”¹⁶

However, Allah has provided some exceptions to this general rule – and those are the instances of *al-raj'ah*. Examples of them are given in His Book. For instance, Allah states:

وَإِذْ قُلْتُمْ يَا مُوسَى لَنْ نُؤْمِنَ بِكَ حَتَّى نَرَى اللَّهَ جَهْرَةً فَأَخَذَتْكَ الصَّاعِقَةُ وَأَنْتُمْ
تَنْظُرُونَ ثُمَّ بَعَثْنَاكَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَوْتِكَ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَشْكُرُونَ

And when you said, “O Musa! We shall never believe in you until we see Allah plainly.” But you were seized with a thunderbolt while you were looking. **Then, We resurrected you after your death**, so that you may be grateful. 17

And:

أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ خَرَجُوا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ وَهُمْ أُلُوفٌ حَذَرَ الْمَوْتِ فَقَالَ لَهُمُ اللَّهُ مُوتُوا
ثُمَّ أَحْيَاهُمْ

Did you not see those who went forth from their homes in thousands, fearing death? Allah said to them, “Die”. **Then, He resurrected them.** 18

And:

أَوْ كَالَّذِي مَرَّ عَلَى قَرْيَةٍ وَهِيَ خَاوِيَةٌ عَلَى عُرُوشِهَا قَالَ أَنَى يُحْيِي هَذِهِ اللَّهُ بَعْدَ
مَوْتِهَا فَأَمَاتَهُ اللَّهُ مِائَةَ عَامٍ ثُمَّ بَعَثَهُ

Or like he who passed by a town and it had tumbled over its roofs. He said: “Oh! How will Allah ever bring it to life after its death?” **So, Allah caused him to die for a hundred years, and then resurrected him.** 19

The Qur'an also quotes Allah as having said to 'Isa, one of the Israilite prophets:

وَإِذْ تَخْرُجُ الْمَوْتَى بِإِذْنِي

And when **you resurrect the dead** with My Permission²⁰

Prophet 'Isa himself said this to his people, as reported by the Book of Allah:

وَأَحْيِي الْمَوْتَى بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ

And **I resurrect the dead** by Allah's Permission.²¹

These are all instances of people “returning” from *Barzakh* into this world through resurrection. They are all instances of *al-raj'ah*.

We see from these verses that *al-karrah* occurred in the previous *Ummahs* before ours, especially among the Israilites. There is significance in this fact for our research. This is on account of this *hadith*, documented by Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 H):

حدثنا محمود بن غيلان حدثنا أبو داود الحفري عن سفيان الثوري عن عبد الرحمن بن زياد الأفريقي عن عبد الله بن يزيد عن عبد الله بن عمرو قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ليأتين على أمتي ما أتى على بني إسرائيل حذو النعل بالنعل حتى إن كان منهم من أتى أمه علانية لكان في أمتي من يصنع ذلك وإن بني إسرائيل تفرقت على ثنتين وسبعين ملة وتفرق أمتي على ثلاث وسبعين ملة كلهم في النار إلا ملة واحدة قالوا ومن هي يا رسول الله قال ما أنا عليه وأصحابي

Mahmud b. Ghilan – Abu Dawud al-Hafari – Sufyan al-Thawri – ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Ziyad al-Afriqi – ‘Abd Allah b. Yazid – ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Amr:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “**Verily, everything that occurred to the offspring of Israil will occur to my *Ummah* in identical manners, such that if any of them had sexual intercourse with his mother publicly, there will certainly be in my *Ummah* someone who will do that.** Verily, the offspring of Israil divided into seventy-two religions; and my *Ummah* will divide into seventy-three religions, all of them will be in the Fire except one religion.” They said, “Who are those, O Messenger?” He replied, “That which I and my Sahabah follow.”²²

‘Allamah al-Albani comments:

حسن

Hasan²³

Of course, *al-raj'ah* occurred to the offspring of Israil too. Therefore, it *certainly* is part of our *Ummah* as well.

The Qur'an too proclaims:

سنة الله في الذين خلوا من قبل ولن تجد لسنة الله تبديلا

That was the *Sunnah* of Allah in the case of those passed away of old, **and you will not find any change in the *Sunnah* of Allah.**²⁴

And:

سنة الله التي قد خلت من قبل ولن تجد لسنة الله تبديلا

That has been the *Sunnah* of Allah already with those who passed away before. **And you will not find any change in the *Sunnah* of Allah.**²⁵

Al-Raj'ah was without doubt part of the *Sunnah* of our Lord with the previous *Ummahs*. Obviously, it is compulsorily part of His *Sunnah* with our *Ummah* too. There is never any change in the *Sunnah* of Allah with the various *Ummahs*.

1. Abu Bakr b. Abi 'Asim, Ahmad b. 'Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (Dar al-Sami'i li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi') [annotator: Dr. Basim b. Faysal al-Jawabirah], vol. 1, pp. 799-800, # 1222
2. Ibid
3. Abu Bakr b. Abi 'Asim, Ahmad b. 'Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1400 H) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 2, p. 565, # 1188
4. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 3, p. 143, # 4652
5. Ibid
6. Abu 'Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Dar al-Hadith; 1st edition, 1416 H) [annotator: Ahmad Muhammad Shakir], vol. 1, p. 331, # 3062
7. Ahmad b. Abi Bakr b. Isma'il al-Busiri, Itihaf al-Khiyarah al-Maharah bi Zawaid al-Masanid al-'Ashara (Riyadh: Dar al-Watan; 1st edition, 1420 H), vol. 7, p. 184, # 6630
8. This author has published an entire book entitled On the Khilafah of 'Ali over Abu Bakr: A Dictionary of Sahih Sunni Ahadith in which he has explored the above hadith and several similar others in great detail.
9. Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, Sahih al-Jami' al-Saghir wa Ziyadatuhu (Al-Maktab al-Islami), vol. 1, p. 482, # 2457
10. Ibid
11. Ibid, vol. 1, p. 482, # 2458
12. Ibid
13. This author has a book on the two hadiths, entitled Hadith al-Thaqalayn: The Deposed Will of the Last Prophet to Humanity. In it, he has done an extensive research on the authenticity, meaning and history of the hadiths.
14. The word al-karrah has been used in the Book of Allah to mean the return of a dead person to life on the earth through resurrection after death. See Qur'an 2: 167, 26: 102 and 39:58

15. Qur'an 23:99–100

16. Abu al-Fida Isma'il b. 'Umar b. Kathir al-Qurshi al-Dimashqi, Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azim (Dar al-Taybah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 2nd edition, 1420 H) [annotator: Sami b. Muhammad Salamah], vol. 5, p. 494–495

17. Qur'an 2:55–56

18. Qur'an 2:243

19. Qur'an 2:259

20. Qur'an 5:110

21. Qur'an 3:49

22. Abu 'Isa Muhammad b. 'Isa al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi, al-Jami' al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 5, p. 26, # 2641. This authentic hadith establishes some fundamental principles. First, it shows that the similar occurrences between our Ummah and that of the Israilites may not be 100% identical. What matters most is the basic fact common to both examples as well as the substantial similarity between them. For instance, the offspring of Israil divided into 72 religions. However, our own Ummah will divide into 73 religions. 73, of course, is not the same as 72, even though they are close together. Yet, the basic fact remains: the Israilites divided, and we too are divided. Another crucial principle from this hadith is that anything that a Sahabi said or did – which was never said or done by the Prophet – is misguidance, from one of the 72 heretical religions. The Messenger was careful to emphasise that the truth is not what his Sahabah alone were upon, but what he and his Sahabah followed together.

23. Ibid

24. Qur'an 33:62

25. Qur'an 48:23

'Umar b. al-Khattab, the second Sunni *khalifah*, was one of the earliest to publicly declare belief in *al-raj'ah*, long before even the unproved profession of the same *'aqidah* by Ibn Saba. Imam al-Bukhari (d. 256 H) records:

حدثنا إسماعيل بن عبد الله حدثنا سليمان بن بلال عن هشام ابن عروة عن عروة بن الزبير عن عائشة رضي الله عنها زوج النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم : أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم مات وأبو بكر بالسنح – قال إسماعيل يعني بالعالية – فقام عمر يقول والله ما مات رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قالت وقال عمر والله ما كان يقع في نفسي إلا ذاك وليبعثنه الله فليقطعن أيدي رجال وأرجلهم .

Isma'il b. 'Abd Allah – Sulayman b. Bilal – Hisham b. 'Urwah – 'Urwah b. al-Zubayr – 'Aishah, may Allah be pleased with her, the wife of the Prophet, peace be upon him:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, died while Abu Bakr was at a place called al-Sunah (i.e. al-'Aliyah). 'Umar stood up, saying, "I swear by Allah! The Messenger of Allah is not dead!" She ('Aishah) narrated: 'Umar said, "I swear by Allah! Nothing occurred to my mind except that. **Verily! Allah will RESURRECT¹ him and he will cut the hands and legs of some men.**"²

It is this very belief that has been attributed to ‘Abd Allah b. Saba in the *mawdhu’* (fabricated) report documented by Imam Ibn Jarir al-Tabari (d. 310 H):

فقال لهم فيما يقول لعجب ممن يزعم أن عيسى يرجع ويكذب بأن محمدا يرجع
وقد قال الله عز و جل إن الذي فرض عليك القرآن لرادك إلى معاد فمحمدا أحق
بالرجوع من عيسى قال فقبل ذلك عنه ووضع لهم الرجعة فتكلموا فيها

Then, he said to them, “It is strange of he who claims that ‘Isa will return but rejects that Muhammad will return. Meanwhile, Allah the Almighty has said, ‘Verily, He Who has ordained the Qur’an upon you (O Muhammad) will surely bring you back to a place of return’ (28:85). As such, **Muhammad is more entitled to return than ‘Isa.**” So, it was accepted from him, and he created for them (the doctrine of) *al-raj’ah*, and they spoke about it.³

It is indeed strange that the Ahl al-Sunnah ignore ‘Umar and attack Ibn Saba instead for this *‘aqidah*, despite the *complete* lack of evidence to establish that the latter *ever* believed it?! Indeed, wonders never end.

Meanwhile, there is also good Sunni evidence to support a theory that Amir al-Muminin ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, *‘alaihi al-salam*, equally believed in his own *raj’ah* before the *Qiyamah*. Imam al-Tabari again records:

حدثنا محمد بن المثنى، قال: ثنا محمد بن جعفر، قال: ثنا شعبة، عن القاسم بن
أبي بزة، عن أبي الطفيل، قال: سمعت عليا وسأله عن ذي القرنين أنبيا كان؟
قال: كان عبدا صالحا، أحب الله فأحبه، وناصح الله فنصحته، فبعثه الله إلى
قومه، فضربوه ضربتين في رأسه، فسمي ذا القرنين، وفيكم اليوم مثله.

Muhammad b. al-Muthanna – Muhammad b. Ja’far – Shu’bah – al-Qasim b. Abi Bazzah – Abu al-Tufayl:

I heard ‘Ali while they asked him about Dhu al-Qarnayn: “Was he a prophet?” He replied, “He was a righteous servant. He loved Allah and Allah loved him. He sought the guidance of Allah and He guided him. Then, Allah sent him to his people. **But, they struck him twice on his head. As a result, he was named Dhu al-Qarnayn. And among you today is an example of him.**⁴

Commenting upon this exact *riwayah*, Prof. Ibn Yasin pronounces:

وسنده صحيح

Its chain is *sahih*.⁵

So , the matter is clear and undisputable.

This *sahih athar* proves the following:

1. Dhu al-Qarnayn, *'alaihi al-salam*, was not a prophet. But, he was a righteous servant loved by Allah, and he was rightly guided by Him.
2. He was given that name only because he was *fatally* struck twice on his head.
3. Even though he was not a prophet, Allah nonetheless “sent” him to his people, like a prophet. This shows that non-prophets can be given *some* qualities and jobs of prophets.

Imam al-Tabari further presents:

حدثنا محمد بن بشار، قال: ثنا يحيى، عن سفيان، عن حبيب بن أبي ثابت، عن أبي الطفيل، قال: سئل علي رضوان الله عليه عن ذي القرنين، فقال: كان عبدا ناصح الله فناصره، فدعا قومه إلى الله، فضربوه على قرنه فمات، فأحياه الله، فدعا قومه إلى الله، فضربوه على قرنه فمات، فسمي ذا القرنين.

Muhammad b. Bashar – Yahya – Sufyan – Habib b. Abi Thabit – Abu al-Tufayl:

‘Ali, *ridhwanullah 'alaihi*, was asked about Dhu al-Qarnayn, and he replied, “He was a servant who sought the guidance of Allah, and He guided him. He called his people to Allah. **So, they struck him on his *qarn*, AND HE DIED. But, Allah RESURRECTED him, and he (again) called his people to Allah. They (once again) struck him on his *qarn*, AND HE DIED. Therefore, he was named Dhu al-Qarnayn.**⁶

This report too is *sahih*. Al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) states about the first narrator:

محمد بن بشار بن عثمان العبدي البصري أبو بكر بNDAR ثقة

Muhammad b. Bashar b. ‘Uthman al-‘Abdi al-Basri, Abu Bakr Bundar: **Thiqah (trustworthy)**.⁷

Concerning the second narrator, he also says:

يحيى بن سعيد بن فروخ بفتح الفاء وتشديد الراء المضمومة وسكون الواو ثم
معجمة التميمي أبو سعيد القطان البصري ثقة متقن حافظ إمام قدوة

Yahya b. Sa'id b. Farrukh al-Tamimi, Abu Sa'id al-Qattan al-Basri: **Thiqah (trustworthy)**, extremely precise, a *hadith* scientist, **an Imam, a leader**.⁸

On the third narrator, al-Hafiz submits:

سفيان بن سعيد بن مسروق الثوري أبو عبد الله الكوفي ثقة حافظ فقيه عابد
إمام حجة

Sufyan b. Sa'id b. Masruq al-Thawri, Abu 'Abd Allah al-Kufi: **Thiqah (trustworthy)**, a *hadith* scientist, a jurist, a devout worshipper of Allah, **an Imam, a hujjah (authority)**.⁹

The fourth narrator is *thiqah* (trustworthy) too, as al-Hafiz declares:

حبيب بن أبي ثابت قيس ويقال هند بن دينار الأسدي مولا هم أبو يحيى الكوفي
ثقة فقيه جليل وكان كثير الإرسال والتدليس

Habib b. Abi Thabit Qays, and he is called Hind, b. Dinar al-Asadi, their freed slave, Abu Yahya al-Kufi: **Thiqah (trustworthy)**, a jurist, meritorious. He used to do a lot of *irsal* and *tadlis*.¹⁰

The only problem here is that Habib was a *mudalis*, and he has narrated in an 'an-'an manner from Abu al-Tufayl, *radhiyallahu 'anhu*. However, this matter is resolved by the *mutaba'ah* of al-Qasim b. Abi Bazzah, which has already been examined above. Therefore, the report of Habib is *sahih* through the *mutaba'ah* of al-Qasim.

Meanwhile, Imam Ibn Abi Shaybah (d. 235 H) has also documented a slightly more detailed *riwayah* through the same narrators:

حدثنا يحيى بن سعيد عن سفيان عن حبيب بن أبي ثابت عن أبي اللفيل

قال:سئل علي عن ذي القرنين فقال: لم يكن نبيا ولا ملكا، ولكنه كان عبدا ناصح الله فنصحه فدعا قومه إلى الله فضرب على قرنه الأيمن فمات فأحياه الله، ثم دعا قومه إلى الله فضرب على قرنه الأيسر فمات فأحياه الله فسمي ذا القرنين.

Yahya b. Sa'id – Sufyan – Habib b. Abi Thabit – Abu al-Tufayl:

'Ali was asked about Dhu al-Qarnayn, and he replied, "He was neither a prophet nor an angel. Rather, he was a servant who sought the guidance of Allah, and He guided him. He called his people to Allah. **So, he was struck on his right *qarn*, AND HE DIED. But, Allah RESURRECTED him, and he (again) called his people to Allah. He was (once again) struck on his left *qarn*, AND HE DIED. Then, Allah RESURRECTED him (again). Therefore, he was named Dhu al-Qarnayn.**¹¹

Of course, the *sanad* is *sahih* through its *mutaba'ah*, as we have already established.

Prof. Ibn Yasin quotes another report for us:

قال الضياء المقدسي: أخبرنا أبو المجد زاهر بن أحمد بن حامد بن أحمد الثقفي – بقراءتي عليه بأصبهان – قلت له: أخبركم أبو عبد الله الحسين بن عبد الملك ابن الحسين الخلال – قراءة عليه وأنت تسمع – أنا الإمام أبو الفضل عبد الرحمن ابن أحمد بن الحسن بن بندار الرازي المقرئ، أنا أبو الحسن أحمد بن إبراهيم ابن أحمد بن علي بن فراس، ثنا أبو جعفر محمد بن إبراهيم الديلي، ثنا أبو عبيد الله سعيد بن عبد الرحمن المخزومي، ثنا سفيان ابن عيينة عن ابن أبي حسين، عن أبي الطفيل قال: سمعت ابن الكواء يسأل علي بن أبي طالب – رضي الله عنه – عن ذي القرنين فقال علي: لم يكن نبياً ولا ملك، كان عبداً صالحاً، أحب الله فأحبه، وناصح الله فنصحه الله، بُعث إلى قومه فضربوه على قرنه فمات فبعثه الله، فسمى ذي القرنين.

Al-Dhiya al-Maqdisi said:

Abu al-Majd Zahir b. Ahmad b. Hamid b. Ahmad al-Thaqafi – Abu 'Abd Allah al-Husayn b. 'Abd al-Malik b. al-Husayn al-Khalal – Imam Abu al-Fadhl 'Abd al-Rahman b. Ahmad b. al-Husayn b. Bundar al-Razi al-Muqri – Abu al-Hasan Ahmad b. Ibrahim b. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Faras – Abu Ja'far Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Duyali – Abu 'Ubayd Allah Sa'id b. 'Abd al-Rahman al-Makhzumi – Sufyan b. 'Uyaynah –

Ibn Abi Husayn – Abu al-Tufayl:

I heard Ibn al-Kawa asking ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him, about Dhu al-Qarnayn, and ‘Ali replied, “He was not a prophet, and he was not an angel. He was rather a righteous servant. He loved Allah; so, He loved him too. He sought the guidance of Allah; and so, He guided him. He was sent to his people. **But, they struck him on his *qarn* AND HE DIED. Then, Allah RESURRECTED him, and he was thereby named Dhu al-Qarnayn.** 12

Giving the source, our professor states:

(المختارة 2/175 ح 555) وصححه الحافظ ابن حجر بعد عزوه للمختارة
للحافظ الضياء (الفتح 6/383).

(*Al-Mukhtarat* 2/175, # 555) and al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar declared it **sahih** after attributing it to *al-Mukhtarat* of al-Hafiz al-Dhiya (*al-Fath* 6/383) 13

These are the exact words of al-Hafiz in his *Fath*:

أخرجه سفيان بن عيينة في جامعه عن ابن أبي حسين عن أبي الطفيل نحوه
وزاد وناصح الله فناصحه وفيه لم يكن نبيا ولا ملكا وسنده صحيح سمعناه في
الأحاديث المختارة للحافظ الضياء

Sufyan b. ‘Uyaynah recorded it in his *Jami’* from Ibn Abi Husayn from Abu al-Tufayl, and he added: “He sought the guidance of Allah; and so, He guided him” and in it is “He was not a prophet, and he was not an angel”. **Its chain is sahih.** We heard it in *al-Ahadith al-Mukhtarat* of al-Hafiz al-Dhiya. 14

Obviously, al-Hafiz only declares the much shorter chain of Sufyan in his *Jami’* as **sahih**. However, he confirms that what we find in *al-Ahadith al-Mukhtarat* of al-Dhiya is the same as that which was recorded by Sufyan in his book. Meanwhile, al-Hafiz’s *tashih* actually comes *before* his mention of al-Dhiya’s book, contrary to the erroneous submission of our professor. In any case, this **sahih** report is, apparently, an additional strengthening *mutaba’ah* for the *riwayah* of Habib b. Abi Thabit.

Imam Ibn Abi Asim (d. 287 H) here presents the seal of these *athar*:

حدثنا أبو بكر بن أبي شيبة نا وكيع عن بسام عن أبي الطفيل عن علي رضي

الله عنه قال كان ذو القرنين عبدا صالحا نصح الله عز و جل فنصحه فضرب
على قرنه الأيمن فمات فأحياه الله عز و جل ثم ضرب على قرنه الأيسر فمات
فأحياه الله عز و جل وفيكم مثله

Abu Bakr b. Abi Shaybah – Waki’ – Bassam – Abu al-Tufayl – ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him:

Dhu al-Qarnayn was a righteous man. He sought the guidance of Allah the Almighty, and He guided him. So, he was struck on his right *qarn*, AND HE DIED. But, Allah the Almighty RESURRECTED him. Then, he was struck on his left *qarn*, AND HE DIED, and Allah the Almighty RESURRECTED him (again). **And among you is an example of him.**¹⁵

Concerning the first narrator, al-Hafiz says:

عبد الله بن محمد بن أبي شيبه إبراهيم بن عثمان الواسطي الأصل أبو بكر بن
أبي شيبه الكوفي ثقة حافظ صاحب تصانيف

Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. Abi Shaybah Ibrahim b. ‘Uthman, of Wasiti origin, Abu Bakr b. Abi Shaybah al-Kufi: **Thiqah (trustworthy)**, a *hadith* scientist, author of books.¹⁶

On the second narrator, he states as well:

وكيع بن الجراح بن مليح الرؤاسي بضم الراء وهمزة ثم مهملة، أبو سفيان
الكوفي ثقة حافظ عابد

Waki’ b. al-Jarah b. Malih al-Ruwasi, Abu Sufyan al-Kufi: **Thiqah (trustworthy)**, a *hadith* scientist, a devout worshipper of Allah.¹⁷

And, about the last narrator, al-Hafiz submits:

بسام بن عبد الله الصيرفي الكوفي أبو الحسن صدوق

Bassam b. ‘Abd Allah al-Sayrafi al-Kufi, Abu al-Hasan: **Saduq (very truthful)**.¹⁸

So, the *isnad* is *hasan*, due to Bassam, and the *hadith* itself is *sahih* on account of its *mutaba’at* and

shawahid.

In the above *athar*, we read two interesting phrases:

وفيكُم اليوم مثله.

And among you today is an example of him.

And:

وفيكُم مثله

And among you is an example of him.

In simpler words, there was someone alive at that very moment who was an example of Dhu al-Qarnayn. That person too:

1. was not a prophet, but a righteous, sincere servant loved by Allah;
2. sought the guidance of Allah and was guided by Him;
3. though not a prophet, was “sent” by Allah to his people; and
4. would be hit on the head and thereby killed, but would be resurrected by Allah and then hit on the head again and murdered a second time.

Who was it? The answer is apparent, of course. If Allah were to send any non-prophet to the *Ummah* at that point in time, it would have been none other than Amir al-Muminin ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, ‘*alaihi al-salam*. He was the best creature alive – in all good qualities, especially in terms of piety, knowledge and guidance – at that moment. Therefore, ‘Ali could not have been referring to anyone except to himself in those statements, anyway. Besides, he was martyred by Ibn Muljam, *la’natullah ‘alaihi*, who struck him on the head, like Dhu al-Qarnayn was. So, that too is a clear indication.

Imam Ibn Salam (d. 224 H), a grand ancient Sunni *hadith* linguist, has the same conclusion as well:

ولنا وذلك أنه ذكر ذا القرنين فقال: دعا قومه إلى عبادة الله فضربوه على قرنيه وإنما اخترت هذا التفسير على الأول لحديث عن علي نفسه هو عندي مفسر له

ضربتین وفیکم مثله. فنرى أنه أراد بقوله هذا نفسه – یعنی أنى أدعو إلى الحق
حتى أضرب على رأسی ضربتین یكون فیهما قتلی.

I have only chosen this explanation instead of the first due to a *hadith* from ‘Ali himself. It (the *hadith*), in my view, explains it to us. And that is, he (‘Ali) mentioned Dhu al-Qarnayn and said, “He called his people to the worship of Allah, and they struck him on his *qarn twice*. **And among you is an example of him**”. **So, we see that he (‘Ali) was referring to himself with this statement of his** – he meant: I will call to the Truth until I will be struck on my head twice. My death will be in them.”¹⁹

Imam Ibn al-Athir (d. 606 H), a leading classical Sunni *hadith* linguist, also submits:

ومنه حدیث علی وذكر قصة ذي القرنين ثم قال وفیکم مثله فیرى أنه إنما عنى
نفسه لأنه ضرب على رأسه ضربتین إحداهما یوم الخندق والأخرى ضربة ابن
ملجم

And from it is the *hadith* of ‘Ali. He mentioned the story of Dhu al-Qarnayn, and then said: “And among you is an example of him.” **So, it is seen that he was only referring to himself because he was struck on his head twice:** one of them on the Day of al-Khandaq and the other was the strike of Ibn Muljam.²⁰

This explanation of Ibn al-Athir is slightly misleading. Dhu al-Qarnayn was given two *fatal* blows, which resulted in his deaths twice. Since ‘Ali was an example of him, then he too would be *fatally* struck twice. The blow on the Day of al-Khandaq was NOT *fatal*. So, it is automatically ruled out. Amir al-Muminin was, of course, martyred by Ibn Muljam, who struck him on his head. But, he has not been resurrected by Allah yet – as He did with Dhu al-Qarnayn. Therefore, the incident will definitely happen in the future. ‘Ali will come back, and will be fatally hit again on his death. He will die a second time, on the surface of this earth. Dhu al-Qarnayn was revived once more after the second death, and our *mawla*, ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, will still “return” after his own second death as well.

Imam al-Nasafi (d. 710 H) has this comment about the words of ‘Ali too:

وعن علی رضي الله عنه أنه قال : ليس بملك ولا نبي ولكن كان عبداً صالحاً
ضرب على قرنه الأيمن في طاعة الله فمات ثم بعثه الله فـضرب على قرنه
الأيسر فمات فبعثه الله فسمي ذا القرنين وفیکم مثله أراد نفسه

It is narrated that ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, said (about Dhu al-Qarnayn): “He was neither an angel nor a prophet. But, he was a righteous servant. He was struck on his right *qarn* due to his obedience of Allah. So, he died. Then, Allah resurrected him. But, he was (again) struck on his left *qarn* and he died. Then, Allah resurrected him (once more). As a result, he was named Dhu al-Qarnayn. And there is an example of him among you.” **He meant himself.**²¹

Meanwhile, there is a *shahid* from the Messenger of Allah, *sallallahu ‘alaihi wa alihi*, for the words of Amir al-Muminin in the *athar*. Imam Ahmad (d. 241 H) records:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا عفان ثنا حماد بن سلمة ثنا محمد بن إسحاق عن
محمد بن إبراهيم التيمي عن سلمة بن أبي الطفيل عن علي بن أبي طالب رضي
الله عنه أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال له يا علي إن لك كنزا من الجنة
وانك ذو قرنيها

‘Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – ‘Affan – Hamad b. Salamah – Muhammad b. Ishaq – Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Taymi – Salamah b. Abi al-Tufayl – ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him:

Verily, the Prophet, peace be upon him, said: “**O ‘Ali!** Surely, you are the owner of a treasure in Paradise, **and you are its Dhu al-Qarnayn.**”²²

Shaykh al-Arnaut comments:

حسن لغيره

*Hasan li ghayrihi*²³

‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) too says:

حسن لغيره

*Hasan li ghayrihi*²⁴

Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) also documents:

حدثنا أبو العباس محمد بن يعقوب ثنا الحسن بن علي بن عفان العامري ثنا عبد الله بن نمير أخبرنا أحمد بن سهل الفقيه ببخارى ثنا أبو عصمة سهل بن المتوكل البخاري ثنا عفان وسليمان بن حرب قالوا : ثنا حماد بن سلمة عن محمد بن إسحاق عن محمد بن إبراهيم التيمي عن سلمة بن أبي الطفيل أنه عن أبيه عن علي رضي الله عنه قال قال لي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يا علي إن لك كنزا في الجنة وإنك ذو قرنيها

Abu al-‘Abbas Muhammad b. Ya’qub – al-Hasan b. ‘Ali b. ‘Affan al-‘Amiri – ‘Abd Allah b. Numayr – Ahmad b. Sahl al-Faqih – Abu ‘Ismah Sahl b. al-Mutawakil al-Bukhari – ‘Affan and Sulayman b. Harb – Hammad b. Salamah – Muhammad b. Ishaq – Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Taymi – Salamah b. Abi al-Tufayl – perhaps his father – ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to me: “O ‘Ali! Verily, you are the owner of a treasure in Paradise, **and you are its Dhu al-Qarnayn.**”²⁵

Al-Hakim declares:

هذا حديث صحيح الإسناد

This *hadith* has a *sahih* chain.²⁶

And Imam al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) agrees with him:

صحيح

*Sahih*²⁷

So, what does this *hadith* mean, especially the last part? The determining factor is the (ها) [“its”] in (قرنيها) [“its Dhu al-Qarnayn”]. To what does it refer. On the apparent, it refers to (الجنة) [“Paradise”] mentioned earlier in the *hadith*, especially since it also has a feminine grammar. If it is a reference to Paradise, then Amir al-Muminin will be its Dhu al-Qarnayn, and that is, its emperor. This is because the comparison then would be about kingdom, as opposed to personal merits or qualities. Dhu al-Qarnayn was the emperor of the earth during his lifetime, as the Qur’an testifies:

ويسألونك عن ذي القرنين قل سأتلو عليكم منه ذكرا إنا مكنا له في الأرض
وآتيناها من كل شيء سببا

And they ask you about Dhu al-Qarnayn. Say: "I shall recite to you something of his story: **'Verily, We established him over the earth, and We gave him the means of everything.'**"²⁸

Therefore, if Imam 'Ali is the Dhu al-Qarnayn of Paradise, then he will be its emperor. Allah will establish him over Paradise, and will give him the means of everything there. This, indeed, is an extremely great virtue of Amir al-Muminin. He will be the emperor over all the *awliya*, prophets, messengers and Imams except his own master, Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah – who naturally will be the Grand Emperor. Some scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah agree on this too. However, the stronger opinion among them is that Imam 'Ali is the Dhu al-Qarnayn of this *Ummah* only, according to the *hadith*. Imam Ibn Salam for instance states about the *riwayah*:

قد كان بعض أهل العلم يتأول هذا الحديث أنه ذو قرني الجنة – يريد طرفيها،
وإنما يأول ذلك لذكره الجنة في أول الحديث، وأما أنا فلا أحسبه أراد ذلك –
والله أعلم، ولكنه أراد إنك ذو قرني هذه الأمة، فأضمر الأمة

One of the people of knowledge interpreted this *hadith* to mean that he ('Ali) will be the Dhu al-Qarnayn of Paradise – intending its entire territories, and he made this interpretation only because of the mention of Paradise at the beginning of the *hadith*. As for me, I do not think that he (the Prophet) intended that, and Allah knows best. Rather, he (the Prophet) intended that "You are the Dhu al-Qarnayn of this *Ummah*", and thereby pronounised the *Ummah*.²⁹

Since the lifetime of the *Ummah* has exceeded that of 'Ali and his rule for more a millennium, obviously this alternative interpretation cannot be about political authority. He is the only Dhu al-Qarnayn of this *Ummah*, but not its only ruler. As such, the comparison between 'Ali and Dhu al-Qarnayn – as far as our *Ummah* is concerned – is apparently about their shared personal merits and qualities, and not about their political histories. Imam al-Mundhiri (d. 656 H) gives some further explanation:

قول صلى الله عليه و سلم لعلي وإنك ذو قرنيها أي ذو قرني هذه الأمة وذاك لأنه
كان له شجتان في قرني رأسه إحداهما من ابن ملجم لعنه الله والأخرى من
عمرو بن ود

His statement, peace be upon him, to ‘Ali “and you are its Dhu al-Qarnayn”, that is, the Dhu al-Qarnayn of this *Ummah*. **And this is because he had two head wounds on the two *qarns* of his head:** the first of them from Ibn Muljam, may Allah curse him, and the other from ‘Amr b. Wudd.³⁰

‘Ali Shiri, the annotator of *Tarikh Madinah Dimashq*, quotes a similar exegesis for the *hadith*:

جاء في الفائق للزمخشري ٣/١٧٣ في مادة قرن): قال صلى الله عليه وسلم
لعلي رضي الله عنه: إن ذلك بيتا في الجنة وإنك لذو قرنيها (الضمير للأمة
وتفسيره فيما يروى عن علي رضي الله عنه: إنه ذكر ذا القرنين فقال: دعا قومه
إلى عبادة الله فضربوه على قرنيه ضربتين وفيكم مثله يعني نفسه الطاهرة لأنه
ضرب على رأسه ضربتين: إحداها يوم الخندق والثانية ضربة ابن ملجم.

It is in *al-Faiq* of al-Zamakhshari 3/173 under the entry “Qarn”:

(He, peace be upon him, said to ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him: “Verily, that is a house in Paradise, and you are its Dhu al-Qarnayn”. **The pronoun (i.e. “its”) refers to the *Ummah*** and its explanation is in what it narrated from ‘Ali, may Allaah be pleased with him, that he mentioned Dhu al-Qarnayn and said, “He called his people to the worship of Allah, and they struck him on his *qarn* twice, **and among you is an example of him**”, **he meant his pure self, because he was struck on his head twice:** one of them on the Day of Khandaq and the second, the strike of Ibn Muljam.³¹

This escapist diversion, however, does not help either. Dhu al-Qarnayn was so named because he received two *fatal* blows to his head. Amir al-Muminin is his example in this *Ummah*, and our own Dhu al-Qarnayn. Therefore, the non-fatal strikes on ‘Ali’s head do not count in the comparison. He too *must* receive two *fatal* blows to his head. We know as a fact that he already was fatally struck by Ibn Muljam. We now await his *raj’ah*, and a second fatal blow to his head. After his second death, he is expected to resurrect again, and then die, perhaps naturally.

So, Amir al-Muminin is not coming back to this earth only once in the future, but actually twice; and he will die three times before the end of the world – *like Dhu al-Qarnayn*. This was ‘Ali’s own belief about himself.

1. A Sunni brother raises an objection to our translation of yab’ath as “resurrect”. He says that it only means “send” in this context, and not “resurrect”. Meanwhile, Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan, the Sunni translator of Sahih al-Bukhari, has also rendered the word as “resurrect” (see Sahih al-Bukhari, English Translation, Volume 5, Book 57, Number 19). The alternative translation – “send” – which is offered by our Sunni brother makes no sense. For instance, ‘Umar’s words would look like this: “Verily! Allah will SEND him and he will cut the hands and legs of some men.” But, Allah has already sent His Prophet decades before that period! Or, did ‘Umar not believe, up till that moment, that Muhammad was a messenger sent by Allah? What may be said here is that ‘Umar was double-speaking, perhaps due to the “shock” which he allegedly

suffered as a result of the “sudden” death of the Prophet, sallallahu ‘alaihi wa alihi, or for some other reasons that were well-known to his Lord. He was denying and also affirming the Messenger’s death at the same time! If he did not die, how would he resurrect? Was all this only a tactical drama by ‘Umar to stall time, in order to allow a certain plan to materialize? We believe so.

Interestingly, while ‘Umar later suddenly “believed” the death of the Prophet of Allah once Abu Bakr arrived and spoke, we have been unable to locate any authentic Sunni evidence showing that he ever recanted his other claim about the future raj’ah of Muhammad.

2. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Isma’il b. Ibrahim b. Mughirah al-Bukhari al-Ju’fi, al-Jami’ al-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Beirut: Dar Ibn Kathir; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafa Dib al-Bagha], vol. 3, p. 1341, # 3467
3. Abu Ja’far Muhammad b. Jarir al-Tabari, Tarikh al-Umam wa al-Muluk (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1407 H), vol. 2, p. 647
4. Abu Ja’far Muhammad b. Jarir b. Yazid b. Kathir b. Ghalib al-Amuli al-Tabari, Jami al-Bayan fi Tawil al-Qur’an (Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: Sidqi Jamil al-‘Attar], vol. 16, pp. 12–13. A Sunni opponent makes some very ridiculous claims about this riwayat. He is unable to reject its authenticity. So, he alleges that it is “very possible” that Amir al-Muminin learnt this hadith from the Israelites! Alas, Imam ‘Ali was, without any doubt, NOT among those Sahabah who used to go to the Israelites to learn their religion! Mawquf reports bordering on al-ghayb – like this one – from Sahabah like ‘Ali are graded marfu’ (i.e. from the Prophet). Even a beginner in Sunni ‘ilm al-hadith knows this! Our Sunni friend also claims that the Prophet was once asked about Dhu al-Qarnayn, and he did not know whether Dhu al-Qarnayn was a prophet or not. But, the explanation of thing is very simple. The Messenger of Allah made that statement before Allah informed him of the status of Dhu al-Qarnayn. However, when He eventually told him, he too narrated it to his Sahabah. That is the logical explanation in view of the ahadith of Amir al-Muminin.
5. Prof. Dr. Hikmat b. Bashir b. Yasin, Mawsu’at al-Sahih al-Masbur min al-Tafsir bi al-Mathur (Madinah: Dar al-Mathar li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’ wa al-Taba’at; 1st edition, 1420 H), vol. 3, p. 322
6. Abu Ja’far Muhammad b. Jarir b. Yazid b. Kathir b. Ghalib al-Amuli al-Tabari, Jami al-Bayan fi Tawil al-Qur’an (Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: Sidqi Jamil al-‘Attar], vol. 16, p. 12
7. Ahmad b. ‘Ali b. Hajar al-‘Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-‘Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa ‘Abd al-Qadir ‘Ata], vol. 2, p. 58, # 5772
8. Ibid, vol. 2, p. 303, # 7584
9. Ibid, vol. 1, p. 371, # 2452
10. Ibid, vol. 1, p. 183, # 1087
11. ‘Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. Abi Shaybah Ibrahim b. ‘Uthman b. Abi Bakr b. Abi Shaybah al-Kufi al-‘Ubsi, Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah fi al-Ahadith wa al-Athar (Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1409 H) [annotator: Prof. Sa’id al-Laham], vol. 7, p. 468, # 4
12. Prof. Dr. Hikmat b. Bashir b. Yasin, Mawsu’at al-Sahih al-Masbur min al-Tafsir bi al-Mathur (Madinah: Dar al-Mathar li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’ wa al-Taba’at; 1st edition, 1420 H), vol. 3, p. 322
13. Ibid
14. Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalani, Fath al-Bari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari (Beirut: Dar al-Ma’rifah li al-Taba’ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 6, p. 271
15. Abu Bakr Ahmad b. ‘Amr b. Abi ‘Asim al-Dhahhak al-Shaybani, al-Ahad wa al-Mathani (Riyadh: Dar al-Rayah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Dr. Basim Faysal Ahmad al-Jawabirah], vol. 1, p. 141, # 168
16. Ahmad b. ‘Ali b. Hajar al-‘Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-‘Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa ‘Abd al-Qadir ‘Ata], vol. 1, p. 528, # 3586
17. Ibid, vol. 2, p. pp. 283–284, # 7441
18. Ibid, vol. 1, p. 124, # 663
19. Abu ‘Ubayd al-Qasim b. Salam al-Harwi, Gharib al-Hadith (Haydarabad: Majlis Dairah al-Ma’arif al-‘Uthmaniyyah; 1st edition, 1385 H), vol. 3, p. 80
20. Ibn al-Athir, Abu Sa’adat al-Mubarak b. Muhammad al-Jazari, al-Nihayah fi Gharib al-Hadith wa al-Athar (Beirut: al-

Maktabah al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1399 H) [annotators: Tahir Ahmad al-Zawi and Mahmud Muhammad al-Tanahi], vol. 4, p. 52

21. Abu al-Barakat ‘Abd Allah b. Ahmad b. Mahmud al-Nasafi, *Tafsir al-Nasafi* (Beirut: Dar al-Nafais; 2005 CE) [annotator: Shaykh Marwan Muhammad al-Shi’ar], vol. 3, p. 40

22. Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, *Musnad* (Cairo: Muassasat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu’ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 1, p. 159, # 1373

23. Ibid

24. Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani, *Sahih al-Targhib wa al-Tarhib* (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma’arif; 5th edition), vol. 2, p. 189, # 1902

25. Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, *al-Mustadrak ‘ala al-Sahihayn* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa ‘Abd al-Qadir ‘Ata], vol. 3, p. 133, # 4623

26. Ibid

27. Ibid

28. Qur’an 18:83–84

29. Abu ‘Ubayd al-Qasim b. Salam al-Harwi, *Gharib al-Hadith* (Haydarabad: Majlis Dairah al-Ma’arif al-‘Uthmaniyyah; 1st edition, 1385 H), vol. 3, pp. 78–79

30. Abu Muhammad ‘Abd al-‘Azim b. ‘Abd al-Qawi al-Mundhiri, *al-Targhib wa al-Tarhib* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1417 H) [annotator: Ibrahim Shams al-Din], vol. 3, p. 24

31. Abu al-Qasim ‘Ali b. al-Hasan b. Habat Allah b. ‘Abd Allah, *Ibn Asakir al-Shafi’i*, *Tarikh Madinah Dimashq* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1417 H) [annotator: ‘Ali Shiri], vol. 43, p. 324, footnote # 4

1) ‘Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. Abi Shaybah Ibrahim b. ‘Uthman b. Abi Bakr b. Abi Shaybah al-Kufi al-‘Ubsi, *Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah fi al-Ahadith wa al-Athar* (Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1409 H) [annotator: Prof. Sa’id al-Laham]

2) ‘Ali Al Muhsin, *‘Abd Allah b. Saba: Dirasat wa Tahlil* (1st edition, 1422 H)

3) Abu ‘Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, *Musnad* (Cairo: Dar al-Hadith; 1st edition, 1416 H) [annotator: Ahmad Muhammad Shakir]

4) Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, *al-Mustadrak ‘ala al-Sahihayn* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa ‘Abd al-Qadir ‘Ata]

5) Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad b. ‘Uthman al-Dhahabi, *Mizan al-I’tidal fi Naqd al-Rijal* (Beirut: Dar al-Ma’rifah; 1st edition, 1382 H) [annotator: ‘Ali Muhammad al-Bajawi]

6) Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Isma’il b. Ibrahim b. Mughirah al-Bukhari al-Ju’fi, *al-Jami’ al-Sahih al-Mukhtasar* (Beirut: Dar Ibn Kathir; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafa Dib al-Bagha]

7) Abu ‘Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, *Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Sahihah wa Shayhun min Fiqhiyah wa Fawaidihah* (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma’arif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’; 1st edition, 1415 H)

8) Abu ‘Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh b. Tajati b. Adam al-Ashqudri al-Albani, *Sahih al-Jami’ al-Saghir wa Ziyadatuhu* (Al-Maktab al-Islami)

- 9) Abu 'Isa Muhammad b. 'Isa al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi, *al-Jami' al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani]
- 10) Abu 'Ubayd al-Qasim b. Salam al-Harwi, *Gharib al-Hadith* (Haydarabad: Majlis Dairah al-Ma'arif al-'Uthmaniyyah; 1st edition, 1385 H)
- 11) Abu 'Umar Yusuf b. 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Barr b. 'Asim al-Nimri al-Qurtubi, *al-Isti'ab fi Ma'rifat al-Ashab* (Beirut: Dar al-Jil; 1st edition, 1412 H) [annotator: 'Ali Muhammad al-Bajawi]
- 12) Abu al-'Abbas Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Halim b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani, *Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* (Muasassat Qurtubah; 1st edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salim]
- 13) Abu al-Barakat 'Abd Allah b. Ahmad b. Mahmud al-Nasafi, *Tafsir al-Nasafi* (Beirut: Dar al-Nafais; 2005 CE) [annotator: Shaykh Marwan Muhammad al-Shi'ar]
- 14) Abu al-Fida Ibn Kathir al-Dimashqi, *al-Nihayah fi al-Fitan wa al-Malahim* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1408 H) [annotator: Prof. 'Abduh al-Shafi'i]
- 15) Abu al-Fida Isma'il b. 'Umar b. Kathir al-Qurshi al-Dimashqi, *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azim* (Dar al-Taybah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 2nd edition, 1420 H) [annotator: Sami b. Muhammad Salamah]
- 16) Abu al-Hajjaj Jamal al-Din Yusuf al-Mizzi, *Tahdhib al-Kamal fi Asma al-Rijal* (Beirut by Muasassat al-Risalah; 4th edition, 1413 H) [annotator: Dr. Bashir 'Awad Ma'ruf]
- 17) Abu al-Hasan Ahmad b. 'Abd Allah b. Salih al-'Ijli al-Kufi, *Ma'rifat al-Thiqat* (Madinah: Maktabah al-Dar; 1st edition, 1405 H)
- 18) Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj al-Qushayri al-Naysaburi, *Sahih Muslim* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Fuad 'Abd al-Baqi]
- 19) Abu al-Qasim 'Ali b. al-Hasan b. Habat Allah b. 'Abd Allah, Ibn Asakir al-Shafi'i, *Tarikh Madinah Dimashq* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: 'Ali Shiri]
- 20) Abu Bakr Ahmad b. 'Ali al-Khatib al-Baghdadi, *Tarikh Baghdad* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah)
- 21) Abu Bakr Ahmad b. 'Amr b. Abi 'Asim al-Dhahhak al-Shaybani, *al-Ahad wa al-Mathani* (Riyadh: Dar al-Rayah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Dr. Basim Faysal Ahmad al-Jawabirah]
- 22) Abu Bakr Ahmad b. Abi Khaythamah Zuhayr b. Harb, *Tarikh Ibn Abi Khaythamah* (al-Faruq al-Hadithiyyah li al-Taba'ah wa al-Nashr; 1st edition, 1424 H)
- 23) Abu Bakr b. Abi 'Asim, Ahmad b. 'Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, *Kitab al-Sunnah* (al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1400 H) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani]

- 24) Abu Bakr b. Abi 'Asim, Ahmad b. 'Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, *Kitab al-Sunnah* (Dar al-Sami'i li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi') [annotator: Dr. Basim b. Faysal al-Jawabirah]
- 25) Abu Hatim Muhammad b. Hibban b. Ahmad al-Tamimi al-Busti, *Kitab al-Thiqat* (Hyderabad: Majlis Dairat al-Ma'arif al-'Uthmaniyyah; 1st edition, 1398 H)
- 26) Abu Hatim Muhammad b. Hibban b. Ahmad al-Tamimi al-Busti, *Mashahir 'Ulama al-Amsar* (Dar al-Wafa li al-Taba'at wa al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi'; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Marzuq 'Ali Ibrahim]
- 27) Abu Ja'far Muhammad b. Jarir al-Tabari, *Tarikh al-Umam wa al-Muluk* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1407 H)
- 28) Abu Ja'far Muhammad b. Jarir b. Yazid b. Kathir b. Ghalib al-Amuli al-Tabari, *Jami al-Bayan fi Tawil al-Qur'an* (Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: Sidqi Jamil al-'Attar]
- 29) Abu Muhammad 'Abd al-'Azim b. 'Abd al-Qawi al-Mundhiri, *al-Tarhib wa al-Tarhib* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1417 H) [annotator: Ibrahim Shams al-Din]
- 30) Abu Muhammad 'Abd al-Rahman b. Abi Hatim Muhamamd b. Idris b. al-Munzir al-Tamimi al-Hanzali al-Razi, *al-Jarh wa al-Ta'dil* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi; 1st edition, 1371 H)
- 31) Abu Na'im Ahmad b. 'Abd Allah al-Isfahani, *Hilyah al-Awliya wa Tabaqat al-Asfiya* (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-'Arabi; 4th edition, 1405 H)
- 32) Abu Ya'la Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Muthanna al-Mawsili al-Tamimi, *Musnad* (Damascus: Dar al-Mamun li al-Turath; 1st edition, 1404 H) [annotator: Dr. Husayn Salim Asad]
- 33) Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, *al-Isabah fi Tamyiz al-Sahabah* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1415 H) [annotators: Shaykh 'Adil Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Mawjud and Shaykh 'Ali Muhammad Ma'udh]
- 34) Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, *Taqrib al-Tahdhib* (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata]
- 35) Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Hajar al-'Asqalani al-Shafi'i, *Hadi al-Sari Muqaddimah Fath al-Bari* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi; 1st edition, 1408 H)
- 36) Ahmad b. Abi Bakr b. Isma'il al-Busiri, *Itihaf al-Khiyarah al-Maharah bi Zawaid al-Masanid al-'Ashara* (Riyadh: Dar al-Watan; 1st edition, 1420 H)
- 37) Ibn al-Athir, Abu al-Hasan 'Izz al-Din 'Ali b. Abi al-Karam Muhammad b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Karim b. 'Abd al-Wahid, *al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh* (Beirut: Dar Sadir; 1385 H)
- 38) Ibn al-Athir, Abu Sa'adat al-Mubarak b. Muhammad al-Jazari, *al-Nihayah fi Gharib al-Hadith wa*

al-Athar (Beirut: al-Maktabah al-‘Ilmiyyah; 1399 H) [annotators: Tahir Ahmad al-Zawi and Mahmud Muhammad al-Tanahi]

39) Muhammad b. Sa’d, *al-Tabaqat al-Kubra* (Beirut: Dar al-Sadir)

40) Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani, *Sahih al-Targhib wa al-Tarhib* (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma’arif; 5th edition)

41) Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, *Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Dha’ifah wa al-Mawdu’ah wa Athariha al-Sayyiah fi al-Ummah* (Riyadh: Dar al-Ma’arif; 1st edition, 1412 H)

42) Muslim b. al-Hajjaj, *al-Kuna wa al-Asma* (Madinah al-Munawwarah: al-Jami’ah al-Islamiyyah; 1st edition, 1404 H) [annotator: ‘Abd al-Rahim Muhammad Ahmad al-Qushqari]

43) Prof. Dr. Hikmat b. Bashir b. Yasin, *Mawsu’at al-Sahih al-Masbur min al-Tafsir bi al-Mathur* (Madinah: Dar al-Mathar li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’ wa al-Taba’at; 1st edition, 1420 H)

44) Shams al-Din Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad b. al-Dhahabi al-Dimashqi, *al-Kashif fi Ma’rifat Man Lahu Riwayat fi al-Kutub al-Sittah* (Jeddah: Dar al-Qiblah li al-Thaqafat al-Islamiyyah; 1st edition, 1413 H)

45) Shams al-Din Muhammad b. Ahmad b. ‘Uthman al-Dhahabi, *Tarikh al-Islam wa Wafiyat al-Mashahir wa al-A’lam* (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-‘Arabi; 1st edition, 1407 H) [Dr. ‘Umar ‘Abd al-Salam Tadmiri]

46) Shihab al-Din Abu al-Fadhl Ahmad b. ‘Ali b. Hajar al-‘Asqalani, *Lisan al-Mizan* (Beirut: Manshurat Muassasat al-A’lami li al-Matbu’at; 2nd edition, 1390 H)

47) Shihab al-Din Ahmad b. ‘Ali b. Hajar al-‘Asqalani, *Tahdhib al-Tahdhib* (Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1404 H)

48) Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalani, *Fath al-Bari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari* (Beirut: Dar al-Ma’rifah li al-Taba’ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition)

49) Taqiyy al-Din Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Halim b. ‘Abd al-Salam b. ‘Abd Allah b. Abi al-Qasim b. Muhammad b. Taymiyyah al-Harrani al-Hanbali al-Dimashqi, *al-Sarim al-Maslul ‘ala Shatim al-Rasul* (Saudi Arabia: al-Haras al-Watani al-Sa’udi) [annotator: Muhammad Muhy al-Din ‘Abd al-Hamid]

Source URL: <https://www.al-islam.org/abd-allah-ibn-saba-myth-exploded-toyib-olawuyi>

Links

- [1] <https://www.al-islam.org/user/login?destination=node/32625%23comment-form>
- [2] <https://www.al-islam.org/user/register?destination=node/32625%23comment-form>
- [3] <https://www.al-islam.org/person/toyib-olawuyi>
- [4] <https://www.al-islam.org/library/early-islamic-history>
- [5] <https://www.al-islam.org/person/abdullah-b-saba>