

‘Umar attacked Fāṭimah and burned her house down

Allegation

‘Umar was ordered to confront Fāṭimah and others to take the pledge and kill them if they refused. ‘Umar executed this order with a group of men, he then threatened Fāṭimah, set her door on fire, and attacked her so viciously that it resulted in her miscarriage. ‘Alī was then dragged through the streets and forced to give the pledge. This has been reported in following Books of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

1. *Al-Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abī Shaybah
2. *Al-Istī‘āb* by Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr
3. *Kanz al-‘Ummāl* by ‘Alī Muttaqī
4. *Tārīkh Ṭabarī* by Ibn Jarīr
5. *Ansāb al-Ashraf* by al-Balādhurī
6. *Al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* by Ibn Qutaybah
7. *Iqd al-Farīd* by Ibn ‘Abd Rabiḥ
8. *Al-Mukhtaṣar fī Akhbār al-Bashr* of Abū al-Fidā

Answer

The incident of the house being set on fire and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا—may our parents be sacrificed for her—being assaulted and then miscarrying her child is not mentioned in any book of the Ahl al-Sunnah. It is an outright fabrication and pure work of fiction.

As for the references cited for this alleged incident aside from failing to meet the criteria of acceptance, it does not contain any of these exaggerated and false details.

1. Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah

Ibn Abī Shaybah records the narration as follows:

حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ بَشْرٍ حَدَّثَنَا عُبَيْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ عُمَرَ حَدَّثَنَا زَيْدُ بْنُ أَسْلَمَ عَنْ أَبِيهِ أَسْلَمَ أَنَّهُ حِينَ بُوِيَعَ لِأَبِي بَكْرٍ بَعْدَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَآلِهِ وَسَلَّمَ كَانَ عَلِيٌّ وَالزُّبَيْرُ يَدْخُلَانِ عَلَى فَاطِمَةَ بِنْتِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَآلِهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَيُشَاوِرُونَهَا وَيُرْتَجِعُونَ فِي أَمْرِهِمْ، فَلَمَّا بَلَغَ ذَلِكَ عُمَرُ بْنُ الْخَطَّابِ خَرَجَ حَتَّى دَخَلَ عَلَى فَاطِمَةَ فَقَالَ يَا بِنْتَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَآلِهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَاللَّهِ مَا مِنْ أَحَدٍ أَحَبَّ إِلَيْنَا مِنْ أَبِيكَ وَمَا مِنْ أَحَدٍ أَحَبَّ إِلَيْنَا بَعْدَ أَبِيكَ مِنْكَ وَأَيُّمَ اللَّهِ مَا ذَاكَ بِمَانِعِي إِنْ اجْتَمَعَ هَؤُلَاءِ النَّفَرُ عِنْدَكَ إِنْ أَمَرْتَهُمْ أَنْ يَحْرِقَ عَلَيْهِمُ الْبَيْتَ قَالَ فَلَمَّا خَرَجَ عُمَرُ جَاءَ وَهِيَ فَقَالَتْ تَعْلَمُونَ أَنَّ عُمَرَ قَدْ جَاءَنِي وَقَدْ حَلَفَ بِاللَّهِ لئنْ عَدْتُمْ لِيَحْرِقَنَّ عَلَيْكُمْ الْبَيْتَ وَأَيُّمَ اللَّهِ لِيَمْضِينَ لِمَا حَلَفَ عَلَيْهِ فَاَنْصَرَفُوا رَاشِدِينَ فَرَوَا رَأْيَكُمْ وَلَا تَرْجِعُوا إِلَيَّ، فَاَنْصَرَفُوا عَنْهَا فَلَمْ يَرْجِعُوا إِلَيْهَا حَتَّى بَايَعُوا لِأَبِي بَكْرٍ

Muḥammad ibn Bishr narrated to us — ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Umar narrated to us — Zayd ibn Aslam narrated to us — from his father, Aslam, the freed slave of ‘Umar:

When Abū Bakr received the pledges of allegiance after the Messenger of Allah, ‘Alī and Zubayr used to enter the presence of Fāṭimah the daughter of the Messenger of Allah and consult with her and discuss their affair.

When news of this reached ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, he came out until he entered Fāṭimah’s presence and said, **“Daughter of the Messenger of Allah, none in all creation was more dearly beloved to me than your father, and none is more beloved to us after him than you.** However, by Allah, this shall not prevent me, **if that group** gathers in your house, to order that **their door be set afire!**”

When ‘Umar went out, they came and she said, “Do you know that ‘Umar came to me and swore by Allah that if you were to come back, he shall surely burn the door with you inside! By Allah, he shall certainly fulfil what he swore, so go away in peace, flee from your opinion, and do not come back to see me.”

They left her and did not return to see her until they pledged their allegiance to Abū Bakr.

The chain of this narration, despite its flaws, is the strongest of all that has been reported about this incident. Before we discuss the flaw in the chain of narration, let us examine its content:

1. Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه praised Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and recognised her virtue, saying she was most beloved to the people and him after her father.
2. Sayyidunā ‘Umar did not threaten Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, but warned her about those gathering in her house. This can be seen by the statement *Alayhim* (them) and not *Alaykum* (you all) in the statement “if that group gathers in your house, to order that their door be set afire.”
3. There is no mention of this being ordered by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه.
4. There is no mention of a “group” of men going with ‘Umar, or ‘Umar actually setting fire to the house and other false emotional propaganda.
5. Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها herself warned those in her house to leave and not return until they had sorted their affairs out.
6. All pledged allegiance and that was the end of it. This narration establishes that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه also pledged his allegiance and any possible conflict was avoided.

Defect in the chain

It is extremely strange that an incident as huge as this was only narrated by a single narrator from ‘Ubayd Allāh, namely Muḥammad ibn Bishr al-‘Abdī. And ‘Ubayd Allāh was the only narrator to transmit it from Zayd ibn Aslam’s companions. Moreover, Aslam was definitely not in Madīnah at that time, simply because he was from the war booty of Yemen and ‘Umar رضي الله عنه got him in Makkah in the year 11

A.H.¹ Thus, he did not witness this event, it cannot be ascertained when and from who did he learn of this event. Hence, the one who invented the narration is simply unknown and not included in the given chain of narrators.

2. Al-Istī'āb

Ibn 'Abd al-Barr in his *al-Istī'āb* reports:

حدَّثنا محمد بن أحمد حدثنا محمد بن أيوب حدثنا أحمد بن عمرو والبزاز حدثنا أحمد بن يحيى حدثنا محمد بن نسير حدثنا عبد الله بن عمر عن زيد بن أسلم عن أبيه أنّ عليّاً والزبير كانا حين بُويع لأبي بكر يدخلان على فاطمة فيشاورانها ويتراجعان في أمرهم فبلغ ذلك عمر فدخل عليها عمر فقال يا بنت رسول الله ما كان من الخلق أحد أحبّ إلينا من أبيك وما أحد أحبّ إلينا بعده منك ولقد بلغني أنّ هؤلاء النفر يدخلون عليك ولئن بلغني لأفعلنّ ولأفعلنّ ثمّ خرج وجاءوها فقالت لهم إنّ عمر قد جاءني وحلف لئن عدتم ليفعلنّ وأيم الله ليفينّ بها

The above narration is the exact same narration with an identical chain resting upon Zayd ibn Aslam from his father, Aslam, except that this one does not even contain any mention of a threat to burn the door and rather mentions that 'Umar said, "I shall do this and that unless you come out (to pledge)." The same defect in the narration of *Muṣannaf ibn Abī Shaybah* is found here.

3. Kanz al-'Ummāl

Al-Muttaqī indicated his source for the incident in *Kanz* with "sh" which is a reference to Ibn Abī Shaybah's *Muṣannaf*. We have already discussed this narration above.

4. Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī

The narration is as follows:

حدثنا ابن حُميد قال حدثنا جرير عن مغيرة عن زياد بن كليب قال أتى عمر بن الخطاب منزل علي وفيه طلحة والزبير ورجال من المهاجرين فقال والله لأحرقنّ عليكم أو لتخرجنّ إلى البيعة فخرج عليه الزبير مصلاً بالسيف فعثر فسقط السيف من يده فوثبوا عليه فأخذوه

Ibn Ḥumayd narrated to us, he said—**Jarīr** narrated to us—from **Mughīrah**—from **Ziyād ibn Kulayb**: 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb came to the house of 'Alī, and Ṭalḥah, Zubayr and other Muhājirīn were inside.

He said, "By Allah I will burn the house down or you will come to pledge allegiance."

Zubayr stepped out to confront him with his sword drawn, but he slipped and the sword fell from his hand. So they jumped upon him and seized him.

Muḥammad ibn Ḥumayd

Regarding Ibn Humayd it states in the *Tahdhīb* of Ibn Hajar:

¹ See Abū Nu'aym: *Ma'rifat al-Sahābah*, 1/255.

- » Ya‘qūb ibn Shaybah said, “Muḥammad ibn Ḥumayd: Narrates many Munkar reports.”
- » Al-Bukhārī said, “There is scepticism concerning his narrations.”
- » Al-Nasā’ī said, “He is not thiqaḥ.”
- » Faḍlak al-Razī said, “I have 50000 narrations from him, I will not narrate a word from it.”
- » While others have even called him a liar.¹

Jarīr ibn Ḥāzim

Jarīr ibn Ḥāzim was thiqaḥ, but he got confused in the end of his life. Ibn Ḥajar said that he has errors when narrating from his memory.

Mughīrah ibn Miqsam

Mughīrah ibn Miqsam’s was a Mudallis and in this narration he has not clarified who he heard the narration from.

Ziyād ibn Kulayb

Ziyād ibn Kulayb Abū Ma‘shar al-Kūfī. He was a reliable narrator but he was not a Ṣaḥābī. In *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* his date of demise is recorded to be sometime between 110 or 119 AH. Making it unlikely that Ibn Kulayb was an eye witness to this event, thus the person who he heard it from is unknown.

Despite the weakness of this narration, it still does not contain the fabricated details which the Shī‘ah wish to prove. No house was set on fire nor was anybody harmed.

5. Ansāb al-Ashrāf

The narration is as follows:

المداثني عن مسلمة بن محارب عن سليمان التيمي وعن ابن عون أن أبا بكر أرسل إلى علي يريد البيعة فلم يبايع. فجاء عمر ومعه قيس فتلقته فاطمة على الباب فقالت فاطمة يا بن الخطاب أتراك محرقا علي بابي قال نعم وذلك أقوى فيما جاء به أبوك وجاء علي فبايع وقال كنت عزمتم أن لا أخرج من منزلي حتى أجمع القرآن

Al-Madā’inī — from **Maslamah ibn Muḥārīb** — from **Sulaymān al-Taymī** and from **Ibn ‘Awn**: Abū Bakr called on ‘Alī, for him to pledge allegiance as he had not [as yet]. ‘Umar arrived with a torch and met Fāṭimah at the door.

She asked, “O Ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, do you intend to set fire to my door?”

‘Umar said, “Yes, and that is the strongest of that which your father brought.”

‘Alī came and pledged his allegiance, and said, “I had taken a vow not to leave my house until I had compiled the Qur’ān.”

¹ *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, 8/82.

Before we examine the chain, in this narration too there is no mention of the hyperbolic atrocities perpetrated against the Ahl al-Bayt. The most that it contains is a threat and then Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ pledging his allegiance. Nonetheless, the narration is extremely flawed:

Maslamāh ibn Muḥārib

The status of Maslamah ibn Muḥārib as a narrator is *Majhūl* (unknown). Ibn Ḥibbān may have included him in his book *al-Thiqāt*, but Ibn Ḥibbān was known for including people that he does not know (majhūl narrators) in this book. Furthermore, no other scholar has discussed his status as a narrator either.

Sulaymān al-Taymī

Sulaymān al-Taymī passed away in the year 143 AH, and was not present when this alleged incident transpired.

Ibn ‘Awn

‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Awn died in the year 150 AH and was definitely not present.

Thus, there is a clear break in the chain of narration, with it being unclear as to who they heard this from.

6. Al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah

Ibn Qutaybah and the book *Al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah*

The book *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* is also known by an alternate name, *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’*, and is falsely attributed to Ibn Qutaybah.

‘Abd Allāh ibn Muslim ibn Qutaybah, Abū Muḥammad al-Dīnawarī (213-276) was born in Kūfah, Iraq, and lived in the East. He served as a judge in Dīnawar. He was considered a polymath who wrote on diverse topics including tafsīr, fiqh, ḥadīth, grammar, history, theology and philosophy. He was well-known for his contributions to Arabic literature as well as his work on reconciling conflicting ḥadīth titled *Ta’wīl Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*.

Opinions regarding him varied in the subjects of ḥadīth and theology. Al-Dhahabī said:

The man is not an authority in ḥadīth even though he is an accomplished scholar who was grounded in diverse disciplines and skilled at important subjects.¹

Ibn Qutaybah has a respected position amongst the scholars. He is, according to them, from the Ahl al-Sunnah and reliable in his knowledge and his dīn.

» Al-Silafī says, “Ibn Qutaybah was of the reliable scholars and of the Ahl al-Sunnah.”

» Ibn Ḥazm says, “He was reliable in his dīn and his knowledge.”

¹ *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’*, 13/300.

» Ibn Taymiyyah says, “Ibn Qutaybah was of those who subscribed to Aḥmad, and Ishāq, and the supporters of the famous schools of the Ahl al-Sunnah.”¹

Ibn Qutaybah was a renowned scholar and many scholars have compiled biographical notes about him, as well as an index of his works. None of Ibn Qutaybah’s biographers have mentioned the book *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* among his works. The only books attributed to him in the subject of history are *Kitāb al-Ma‘ārif* and *Tārīkh Ibn Qutaybah*.²

Ibn Qutaybah is not known to have travelled; in fact he never left Baghdād except for Dīnawar.³ There are passages in the book *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* which are inconsistent with all his other works. These passages infer that he travelled to Damascus and transmitted from its scholars. How is it possible for him to have transmitted from the scholars of Damascus when he had restricted himself to the East? Why is there no indication of these details in all his other works?

The book *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* contains an abundance of clear historical mistakes. For example, he speaks of Abū al-‘Abbās and al-Saffāḥ as if they were two separate individuals; whereas Abū al-‘Abbās al-Saffāḥ is one person. He also makes Hārūn al-Rashīd the direct successor of al-Mahdī. Also, he asserts that Hārūn al-Rashīd entrusted the khilāfah to his son al-Ma’mūn (first) and after him to his (other) son al-Amīn. When we review Ibn Qutaybah’s *Kitābal-Ma‘ārif* he provides us with accurate accounts about al-Saffāḥ and Hārūn al-Rashīd, contradicting what the author of *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* stated.⁴ The factual and historical contradictions in *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* with Ibn Qutaybah’s other works are too obvious to ignore.

The methodology and style of the author of *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* is completely inconsistent with that of Ibn Qutaybah in his other books. Ibn Qutaybah is famous for lengthy introductions wherein he outlines his methodology and the purpose behind the compilation; whereas the introduction to *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* does not exceed three lines. We have not seen this in any of Ibn Qutaybah’s other works.⁵

What is also noticeable from the book *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* is that the author does not pay much attention to structure and flow of ideas in his writing. He mentions a narration, then another, then returns later to complete the first. This haphazard, jumbled style is inconsistent with Ibn Qutaybah’s other works which are distinguished by their excellent structure and flow.

From the book one gets the impression that the author is relating the conquest of Andalus directly from some contemporaries as it was occurring. It is well-known that the conquest of Andalus occurred during the year 92 AH, close to 120 years before the birth of Ibn Qutaybah.

1 *Kitāb al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah fī Mizān al-Taḥqīq al-‘Ilmī*, ‘Abd Allāh ‘Īlān, p. 28.

2 *Kitāb al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah fī Mizān al-Taḥqīq al-‘Ilmī*, ‘Abd Allāh ‘Īlān, p. 23.

3 Op. cit., p. 23.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., p. 24.

The narrations in *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* show Ibn Qutaybah to have directly transmitted from Ibn Abī Laylā. Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Laylā was a famous jurist and judge in Kūfah, who died in the year 148 AH; whereas Ibn Qutaybah was only born in the year 213 AH. How is it possible for him to have heard ḥadīth from a teacher who passed away 65 years before he, Ibn Qutaybah, was born?¹

Ibn Qutaybah’s teachers, whom he usually transmits from in all his other works, are completely absent throughout *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah*.² Furthermore, the author of *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* narrates from transmitters whom Ibn Qutaybah has never narrated from in any of his other books, such as Abū Maryam and Ibn ‘Ufayr.³ The author of *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* narrates from two senior scholars of Egypt. Ibn Qutaybah never visited Egypt and never took knowledge from any of its scholars.

If one considers all these inconsistencies, flaws, and contradictions, it becomes increasingly evident that the book *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* is indeed a forgery and falsely ascribed to Ibn Qutaybah. Even the Orientalists examined the origins of this book and they all came to the same conclusion; that it is impossible to ascribe it to Ibn Qutaybah.⁴

The narration regarding placing the door on fire and so forth is only found in this one book. The previous narrations—even though weak—merely mention Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه issue a warning.

7. ‘Iqd al-Farīd

‘*Iqd al-Farīd* is not a history book at all, but rather it is a literary novel that contains elements of fiction in it. ‘*Iqd al-Farīd* was written by Ibn ‘Abd Rabiḥī who was well known for his pro-Shī‘ah inclinations. The author is Abū ‘Umar Shihāb al-Dīn ‘Umar ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Rabiḥī. He was born in the year 246 AH and raised in Qurṭubah during the rule of the Banū Ummayah. He became well known due to his exuberant poetry and his book ‘*Iqd al-Farīd*. He died in 328 AH. His book, ‘*Iqd al-Farīd*, is a chain-less literary piece in which his inclusion criteria is only that the text be eloquent Arabic; the text in his book was not chosen for its historical accuracy or authenticity, but rather his book was a compilation of any text that was eloquent in nature. As such, the author included texts from Shī‘ah sources so long as they were eloquently written.

The Shī‘ah spent excessive amounts of time writing poetry about Karbalā’ and in fact there are beautiful poems written by the Shī‘ah on this incident; however, they lack in historical accuracy and are rather things of legends and myths. Likewise, the Shī‘ah spent much time crafting poetry in the name of ‘Alī and forging supposed counter-responses by his so-called opponents such as Mu‘āwiyah and ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها. The author of ‘*Iqd al-Farīd* included these texts due to their literary value, but the truth is that no matter how beautifully worded these texts are, they cannot at all be considered authentic.

Despite this, the narration in ‘*Iqd al-Farīd* only states this much:

1 Ibid., p. 24.

2 Ibid., p. 25.

3 Ibid., p. 26.

4 Ibid., p. 22-23.

الذين تخلفوا عن بيعة أبي بكر علي والعباس والزبير وسعد بن عبادة فأما علي والعباس والزبير فقعدوا في بيت فاطمة حتى بعث إليهم أبو بكر عمر ابن الخطاب ليُخرجهم من بيت فاطمة وقال له إن أبوا فقاتلهم فأقبل بقبس من نار على أن يُضرم عليهم الدار فلقيته فاطمة فقالت يا بن الخطاب أجتت لتُحرق دارنا قال نعم أو تدخلوا فيما دخلت فيه الأمة

Those who delayed in giving the pledge to Abū Bakr were ‘Alī, ‘Abbās, Zubayr, and Sa’d ibn ‘Ubādah. As for ‘Alī, ‘Abbās, and Zubayr; they sat in the house of Fāṭimah until Abū Bakr sent ‘Umar to remove them from the house of Fāṭimah saying, “If they refuse then fight them.” He advanced carrying a torch intending to burn the house on them. Fāṭimah met him and said, “O Ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, do you come to burn down our house.”

He said, “Yes, or you all enter into that which the Ummah has entered.”

It has no chain of narration, and is thus not valid proof. Secondly, it does not contain any of the hyperbolic details mentioned by the Shī’ah despite its unreliability.

8. Al-Mukhtaṣar fi Akhbār al-Bashr

The book of Abū al-Fidā was written by the governor of Ḥamāh, Ismā’īl ibn ‘Alī ibn Maḥmūd (d. 732 AH) and is a relatively late source. In his book he states after mentioning the narration regarding Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ threatening Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا:

كذا نقله القاضي جمال الدين بن واصل وأسنده إلى ابن عبد ربه المغربي

This was related by Qāḍī Jamāl al-Dīn ibn Wāṣil, who attributed it to Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihī al-Maghribī.

Thus it is the same report from *‘Iqd al-Farīd*.

Every SINGLE narration in the books of Ahl al-Sunnah being quoted by the Rafiḍah are fabrications, weak, or in the best case like by Ibn Abī Shaybah have serious defects. Thus, the Rafiḍah have no valid proof to substantiate their claim.

Shī’ī Narrations

The sequence of events as detailed in the question above is only found in Shī’ī sources, which have no worth in the eyes of the Ahl al-Sunnah. However, even according to Shī’ah standards none of these narrations meet the criteria of acceptance as outlined by their own research scholars. In simple words, they do not have a single authentic report according to their own standards proving this alleged event.

Shī’ī scholars such as Ayatollah Sayyid Abū al-Qāsim al-Khu’ī, Ayatollah Muḥammad Ḥusayn Faḍl Allāh, Aḥmad al-Qabanjī, Yasser Awde, Aḥmad al-Kātib and others have rejected this myth.¹

Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd al-Shī’ī states:

1 False Incident of Broken Ribs: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UVCHmZgCa1A>

Did Omar kill Fatima?: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1SIIa0U0f5U>

وَأَمَّا مَا ذَكَرَهُ مِنَ الْهَجُومِ عَلَى دَارِ فَاطِمَةَ وَجَمْعِ الْحَطَبِ لِتَحْرِيقِهَا فَهُوَ خَبْرٌ وَاحِدٌ غَيْرٌ مُوثِقٌ بِهِ وَلَا مَعْمُولٌ عَلَيْهِ فِي حَقِّ الصَّحَابَةِ بَلْ وَلَا فِي حَقِّ أَحَدٍ مِنَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ مِمَّنْ ظَهَرَتْ عَدَالَتُهُ

Concerning what he reported of raiding Fāṭimah's house and gathering firewood to burn it, it is a solitary narration and is unreliable. It is also not relied upon in respect of the Ṣaḥābah nor any of the Muslims whose honesty is manifest.¹

We ask Allah to protect us from deviation and ever straying from the Straight Path.

All praise belongs to Allah in the beginning and the end. May Allah bless and send peace on our leader Muḥammad, his family, and his Companions.

¹ *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah*, 4/631, Beirut print.