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Abstract
Within the realm of Islamic political thought, one of the pivotal matters of discussion pertains to the stance adopted by the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) regarding the system of government to be established after his demise. Divergent viewpoints have emerged on this subject. On one hand, there are proponents who argue that the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him and his Household) did not express a specific opinion concerning the government system, suggesting his inclination towards allowing the community the freedom to select a suitable system that aligns with the contextual circumstances. On the other hand, an opposing perspective posits that the Prophet should have articulated a stance on this matter, supported by the contention that his comprehensive mission encompassed all aspects of life, including the establishment of a governmental system conducive to the application of Sharia law. This discussion seeks to explore these divergent viewpoints and shed light on the Prophet’s approach during his lifetime, taking into account both internal and external challenges faced by the nascent Islamic state.
Introduction

The 7th century CE witnessed a historical event that left a lasting impact on both time and place, namely the mission of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him and his Household) in the Arabian Peninsula and the changes it brought about in various aspects of life. After twenty-three years of continuous work, God revealed the following verse: “This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favor upon you and have approved for you Islam as religion” Maida: 3. The Prophet passed away, leaving behind a detailed and comprehensive legal system for all matters, as God stated: “We have not neglected anything in the Book” Anam: 38, and “And We have revealed to you the Book as an exposition of all things and as guidance and mercy and good tidings for the Muslims” Nahl: 89. It is also mentioned: “And He is the one who has sent down to you the Book, containing explicit verses” Anam: 114.

However, while the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) has departed from this world, the legal system did not depart with him. If the Prophet was the guardian of the legal system during his lifetime, who will take his place? Surely, the successor must possess some qualities of prophethood in order to be qualified to understand the law with the intended comprehension from heaven. Among the components of the legal system is the question of governance after the Prophet. Understanding the nature of the governance system will shed light on the extent to which the implementation of the legal system should occur. As the saying goes, “People follow the religion of their kings.”

If the responsibility of upholding the legal system was entrusted to the scholarly class, the question of governance after the Prophet has become one of the most controversial issues in Islamic thought. Al-Ash’ari stated* 1 2 3 4 5 6 , “The first difference that occurred among Muslims after the death of their Prophet was their disagreement over leadership.” 7 Al-Shahrastani also

---

1 Al-Baghdadi, Al-Khatib: Tarikh Baghdad 11/346.
3 Al-Sobki, Tabaqat al-Shafi’iyyah, 3/347.
4 Subhi, Fi ’Ilm al-Kalam, 2/43-88.

* His name is Abu al-Hasan Ali ibn Ismail al-Ash’ari. He was born in Basra in the year 260 AH. It is said that he was initially influenced by Mu’tazilism under the guidance of his stepfather Abu Ali al-Jubba’i, a Mu’tazilite, until he engaged in a debate with his teacher and defeated him according to Ash’ari theology. At that point, he abandoned Mu’tazilism and developed a new school of thought in which he attempted to reconcile the rigidity of Salafism and the rationalism of Mu’tazilism. However, the claim that he was a Mu’tazilite for forty years lacks evidence, except for the assertions of the Ash’ari school. All that he left behind in terms of writings and ideas is attributed to the Ash’ari tradition, and there is nothing indicating his Mu’tazilite heritage. Among his works are “Masa’il al-Islamiyyin” (The Issues of the Muslims), “Al-Ibanah” (The Elucidation), “Ithbat al-Qiyas” (Establishing Analogy), and others. He passed away in the year 324 AH.
said* 8 9 10 11, “The greatest dispute within the Ummah is the dispute over leadership, as no sword has been unsheathed in Islam based on a religious basis as much as it has been unsheathed for leadership in every era.”12 13

At this point, it is worth questioning: What was the stance of Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) regarding the governance system after him? We are presented with two opinions:

The first opinion argues that the Prophet did not express any opinion regarding the governance system after him. 14 15

The second opinion asserts that it is necessary for the Prophet to have had an opinion regarding the governance system after him. 16

First View:

Some argue that the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) passed away without having a say in the system of government to follow him. They perceive that Muslims faced a significant shock after his demise and felt the need for a leader to take charge of their affairs. This is especially evident as the Prophet did not establish fundamental principles for Muslims to adhere to after his departure, nor did he specify the form of government or the characteristics of the ruler.17

Philip Hatti**18 further asserts, “Muhammad combined in his person the functions of

---

9 Abu al-Fida, Al-Mukhtasar, 3/27.
11 Salahib, Ilm al-Kalam wa al-Tarikh, pp. 244-259.
12 Al-Shahrastani, Al-Milal wa al-Nihal, p. 17.
13 Ibn al-’Ibri, Tarih Mukhtasar al-Duwal, p. 98.
14 Al-Baqillani, Al-Tamhid, p. 165.
15 Al-Rasafi, Maroof, Kitab Al-Shakhsia Al-Mohamadia, pp. 36-43.
16 Al-Mazaffar, Al-Saqifa, pp. 32-33.
18 Murad, Mojam Darasat Al-Mostashreqin (Glossary of Orientalists), pp. 312-214.
* His name is Muhammad ibn Abdul Karim al-Shahrastani. He was a theologian among the Ash’arites (479 AH - 548 AH). He was a philosophical theologian and authored works in the field of Islamic theology, including “Al-Milal wa al-Nihal” (The Sects and Religions) and “Nihayat al-Iqdam fi Ilm al-Kalam” (The Ultimate Conclusion in the Science of Theology), as well as “Mafatih al-Asrar” (Keys to the Mysteries).
** His name is Philip Khuri Hitti (1886-1978 CE). He was born in Lebanon and attended the American University of Beirut, where he obtained a bachelor’s degree in sciences. He then joined Columbia University in America, where he earned his doctorate. The university appointed him as a professor in the Department of Oriental Studies. He established a center for Arab studies and founded an Arab-Islamic library to collect Arabic manuscripts and documents. Later, he returned to Lebanon and worked as a professor of Arab history at the American University of Beirut. Refer to: Morad: Mu’jam Asma’ al-Mustashriqeen (Dictionary of Orientalists’ Names), pp. 312-314.
prophecy, legislation, imamate, judiciary, command of the army, and civilian leadership over the nation. However, Muhammad has now passed away, leaving a crucial question: who will succeed him after his death? Since Muhammad did not clearly appoint a successor, the caliphate became the longstanding dilemma that Islam has grappled with and continues to struggle with even today.”\(^\text{19}\)

Watt\(^\text{20}\) states, “Before his death, Muhammad did not make any preparations for the continuation of managing the affairs of the Islamic state.”\(^\text{21}\)

However, the negative attitude of the Prophet (may God bless him and his family) towards the issue of ruling after him can be explained by several arguments put forth by these scholars.

**First: Tribal Rules Power Among Arabs**

Arnold\(^\text{22}\), an Orientalist scholar, asserts: “It is illogical to inquire why the Messenger neglected the system of government despite his exceptional organizational abilities. He did not take precautions for the future of Muslims. It is possible that he recognized the strong influence of Arab tribal sentiments, which did not adhere to the principle of inheritance in their primitive political life. Instead, it was left to the members of the tribe to choose their own leader.”\(^\text{23}\)

According to Hitti, “The role of the Messenger, as the Seal of the Prophets and the greatest among them, is inherently non-transferable to a successor through inheritance. The Prophet did not leave any male heirs except for his daughter Fatima, who was married to Ali. In terms of leadership or sheikhdom among the Arabs, it was not purely based on inheritance, but predominantly conducted through electoral processes, where the eldest member of the tribe assumed leadership. Therefore, if the Prophet did not designate his own sons, the complex problem that Islam faced after his passing remains unresolved.”\(^\text{24}\)

The essence of their statements suggests that the Arab culture is accustomed to the tribal system, which rejects appointments and inheritance in matters of power.

---

20 Al-Aqiqi, Al-Mostashreqoon (Orientalists) 2/132; Al-Shimary, Nabi Mohammed fi Moalifat Montgomery Watt (Prophet Mohammed in the Thoughts of Montgomery Watt), pp. 48-58.
21 Muhammad al-Nabi wa Rajul al-Dawla, p. 296.
22 Murad, “Mu’jam Asma’ al-Mustashriqeen” (Dictionary of Orientalists’ Names), pp. 94-95.
* William Montgomery Watt: A Scottish British Orientalist (1909-2006). He studied at the University of Lahore and George Watson’s College in Edinburgh, among others. He became a pastor of several churches and specialized in the biography of the Prophet Muhammad and the history of Islam. He served as the head of the Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies at the University of Edinburgh. Some of his works include Muhammad at Mecca and Muhammad at Medina.
** Thomas Walker Arnold: A British Orientalist (1864-1930). He began his academic career at the University of Cambridge, where he studied Arabic. He worked as a researcher at Aligarh Muslim University in India, during which he wrote his book “The Call to Islam” and his book “The Caliphate.” In 1904, he became an Assistant Librarian at the Library of the Government of India under the British Foreign Office, and he was a member of the editorial board of the Islamic Encyclopedia.
Therefore:

A - The Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) aimed to revolutionize various corrupt systems, including the tribal system that relied on blood relationships. He nullified the significance of blood ties, as in the following verse: “Perished by the hands of Abu Lahab” Masad: 1 and replaced it with ideological ties, by proclaiming, “Salman is one of us, Ahl al-Bayt.”25 26 27 28 He established an ideological society centered around Islam, which dismantled tribal affiliations that fostered revenge and violence, with the exception of matters related to kinship and the settlement of blood money through wise judgment29. Therefore, it is questionable to suggest that the Prophet acknowledged the power of tribal sentiments, considering that he tirelessly worked to weaken them, except in cases where they served the interests of the individual Muslim.

B - The study of Arab history, both past and present, reveals that the Arabs have predominately operated within the tribal system. This can be observed in their political entities, such as the Lakhm family of Al-Manathira in Al-Hirah30 31, the Thawr family in Kinda32 33, and the Jaffna family in the Ghassanid kingdom in the Levant34 35. Similarly, in Yemen, the state of Ma’in was governed by seven hereditary families36 37, while the rule of the Mokarabis*38 39 40 41 in Hadh-
ramout\textsuperscript{43}, Qataban\textsuperscript{44, 45} and Saba\textsuperscript{46, 47} followed a hereditary system. This pattern extended to cities like Mecca\textsuperscript{48, 49} and Yathrib\textsuperscript{50}, as well as the tribes scattered across the desert\textsuperscript{51}. Even today, many Arabs maintain a strong attachment to their tribal and political affiliations.

**Second: The Nature of the Prophet’s Mission**

The mission of the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) pertained to his prophethood, which concluded with his death. Consequently, matters that transpired after his passing were not within the scope of his mission. As Al-Khudari explains\textsuperscript{52}, “The Prophet had two roles to fulfill for the Ummah. Firstly, he conveyed divine revelations and legislated on behalf of God, guiding the people, protecting them from evil, and serving as the arbiter in their disputes according to the revealed laws. This first role ended with his demise, after having legislated what God intended. Subsequently, there remained the obligation to adhere steadfastly to the rules of the Sharia and deduce from its principles.”

Al-Mallah\textsuperscript{53, 54} further clarifies, “The reason behind the Prophet’s abstaining from establishing a political system to govern the Islamic state is that he did not assume political authority in a personal capacity but rather as the Messenger of God. Since his role as a messenger or prophet concluded with his death as the Seal of the Prophets, and prophethood is not inheritable, the political power derived from it is likewise not inheritable or transferable.”

Hitti\textsuperscript{55} states, “The function of the Prophet lies in his role as the seal of the prophets and the greatest among them. By its very nature, this role cannot be passed on to a successor who inherits it from him.”

Therefore:

It is noteworthy that the Prophet did not personally assume authority over gover-

\textsuperscript{45} Buru: Tarikh Al-Arab Al-Qadim, p. 69-71.
\textsuperscript{47} Buru: Tarikh Al-Arab Al-Qadim, p. 72-80.
\textsuperscript{49} Al-Ali: Tarikh Al-Arab Al-Qadim, p. 141.
\textsuperscript{50} Ali, Jawad: Al-Mufassal, vol. 4, p. 96-106.
\textsuperscript{51} Buru: Tarikh Al-Arab Al-Qadim, p. 198.
\textsuperscript{52} Al-Dawla Al-Umayyah, p. 148.
\textsuperscript{53} Asalib Tadawul Al-Sulta fi Al-Dawla Al-Arabiya Al-Islamiya, p. 7-33.
\textsuperscript{54} Al-Wasit fi Al-Sira Al-Nabawiya, p. 231.
\textsuperscript{55} Tarikh Al-Arab, p. 195.
nance but rather entrusted the task of delivering the Sharia to the entire human community. Had the Prophet designated a particular successor, the Sharia would have remained valid until the Day of Judgment. It became the responsibility of the Prophet, in his capacity as the Messenger of God, to ensure the continuous application of this divine law. One of the key agents entrusted with its implementation are the rulers, to the extent that it is said that people follow the religion of their kings.\(^{56}\) Therefore, it was incumbent upon the Prophet to establish a system of governance that aligns with the objectives of the divine law, ensuring the application of Sharia based on the divine will.

**Third: Choice of the Nation**

The intention of the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) was to allow the Muslim community to select a system of government that aligns with the changing circumstances of time and place. Since the Prophet did not specify a particular caliph and left the decision to the nation, it was up to the people to choose whom they deemed fit for the responsibility\(^ {57} \) \(^ {58} \). The selection process was to be based on the prevailing customs and traditions of the society.\(^ {59} \)\(^ {60} \) It was believed that the circumstances of the era necessitated such flexibility, and thus, the decision-making was entrusted to the people in accordance with their own conditions and the requirements of their time.\(^ {61} \)

Al-Khudari\(^ {62} \) states, “There is no explicit mention in the Sunnah regarding a specific procedure for electing a caliph, except for some advice emphasizing the importance of unity and avoiding division. It appears that the Sharia intended to leave this matter to the Muslims for them to resolve.”

Another viewpoint posits, “With the passing of the Prophet, prophecy came to an end. Prophethood is not hereditary, just as his political authority does not pass through inheritance. Instead, it returns to the nation, which grants it to the person they choose.”\(^ {63} \)

Khalaf Allah\(^ {64} \) expresses the view that Islamic law lacks a specific directive regarding the

---

\(^{57}\) Al-Ash’ari: Al-Maqalat wa Al-Firaq, p. 3.
\(^{58}\) Al-Nubakhti: Firaq Al-Shi’a, p. 3.
\(^{59}\) Al-Mulah: Asalib Tadawul Al-Sulta fi Al-Dawla Al-Arabiya Al-Islamiya, p. 7-33.
\(^{60}\) Al-Wasit fi Al-Sira Al-Nabawiya, p. 231-232.
\(^{62}\) Al-Dawla Al-Umayyah, p. 151.
\(^{64}\) Mafahim Qur’aniyya, p. 120.
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wisdom behind leaving the matter of government to human intellect, which would allow for adaptation to the circumstances of time, place, and the evolving understanding of the responsibilities of a head of state or caliph.

This perspective is notable, as it suggests that if the nation possessed the capability to select a system of government in accordance with changing conditions, it would be commendable. However, it is observed that the opposite has occurred, with the nation facing significant failures in this regard. Instead, there is a tendency to revert to tribal systems, which many Arabs yearn for. Consequently, disputes are often settled through armed conflict, and the history of the nation is replete with ongoing wars. Islamic societies have historically resorted to revolutions and uprisings as the means to address their problems, as a viable solution remains elusive.

The argument posits that returning the decision-making power for governance to the nation leads to anarchy and an uncontrollable state of disagreement. It claims that people inherently differ in their opinions, ideas, emotions, and tastes, even reaching the level of disagreement between twins. Furthermore, it argues that achieving consensus on a ruling among the inhabitants of a single town is implausible, let alone among the diverse population of a large nation over an extended period. The theatrical nature of governance, influenced by personal emotions, goals, and inclinations, further compounds the complexity of establishing a genuine public opinion. As a result, many developed countries have resorted to majority rule as a means to resolve differences within the nation.

However, the assertion that the Prophet prescribed the opinion of the majority as the criterion for selecting a ruler finds no support. No explicit scriptural evidence or prophetic tradition supports such a claim. It is worth noting that Abu Bakr, who found his election as caliph to be fortuitous and divinely protected, did not base his ascension on the preference of the majority. Likewise, when faced with the dilemma of selecting a successor, Umar preferred a consultative approach, giving precedence to Abd al-Rahman bin Auf’s candidacy, despite the preferences of others. Conversely, when the people of Medina chose Imam Ali (peace be upon him), his nomination was rejected by opposing factions, leading to a series of violent conflicts.

The narrative surrounding the selection of rulers raises the question of why the responsibility is ascribed to the Prophet, who is known to speak only by divine revelation, as stated in the Quran: “Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed.” Al-Najm, verses 3-4. The Prophet himself warned of the trials and tribulations that would befall the Muslim community, likening them to scattered parts of the dark night. Thus, it is erroneous.

---

* Umar ibn al-Khattab said, “The pledge of allegiance to Abu Bakr was initially turbulent and fraught with difficulties, but it eventually concluded, and it was indeed as such. However, Allah averted its harm.”
to attribute the legislative authority regarding the system of government solely to the Prophet. Abu Bakr and Umar, recognizing the challenges associated with relying exclusively on the nation’s choice, adopted alternative approaches.

Interestingly, Aisha, the Prophet’s wife, emphasized the importance of not leaving the nation of Muhammad without a leader\textsuperscript{70}. However, it is intriguing to observe that no one referred to the Prophet himself when expressing this concern. It is plausible that the Prophet was consulted on this matter and provided guidance, but historical accounts may have interpreted his response differently, leading to varied opinions. Therefore, the absence of explicit Quranic or prophetic evidence necessitates caution when attributing the notion of leaving the system of government to the discretion of the nation to the Prophet. The Quran, in highlighting the divine prerogative of choosing what is best for humanity, asserts, “And your Lord creates what He wills and chooses; not for them was the choice.” Al-Qasas, verse 68.\textsuperscript{71}

A Critical Reading

According to the following, all the claims that propose that the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) did not have an opinion on the issue of governance after his demise may be refuted.

First: Nation’s Consensus of Obligatory Imamate

The significance of having a ruler who assumes the responsibility of governing the nation has been a matter of concern among statesmen since the immediate aftermath of the demise of the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household). Abu Bakr, for instance, emphasized the necessity of having a leader who would lead prayers, command the community, and defend them against their enemies. He stated, “You must have a man who gives you commands, prays with you as an imam, and fights your enemy”\textsuperscript{72}. Imam Ali, upon hearing the Kharijites’ claim that there is no judgment except for God, clarified the truth of the matter by saying, “It is a true slogan that intends falsity. Yes, there is no judgment but God, but those who say there is no command but God need a ruler, whether righteous or immoral, to whom the believers submit, the unbelievers are subjected, and through whom God establishes justice and security”\textsuperscript{73} \textsuperscript{74} \textsuperscript{75} \textsuperscript{76}.

\textsuperscript{70} Ibn Qutaybah: Al-Imama wal Siyasa, vol. 1, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{71} Al-Madhafar: Al-Saqifa, p. 35-44.
\textsuperscript{72} Ibn Qutaybah: Al-Imama wal Siyasa, vol. 1, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{73} Al-Sharif Al-Radi: Nahjul Balagha, p. 82.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibn Abi Shaybah: Al-Musannaf, vol. 8, p. 735.
\textsuperscript{75} Al-Bayhaqi: Al-Sunan Al-Kubra, vol. 8, p. 184.
\textsuperscript{76} Al-Nasrallah: Al-Imam Ali (a) fi Fikr Mu’tazila Baghdad, p. 308.
In theological discussions, al-Baghdadi\textsuperscript{77} highlighted the obligatory nature of imamate (leadership) upon the nation. He argued that the establishment of an imam is necessary to appoint judges and trustees, safeguard borders, distribute booty, and seek justice for the oppressed from their oppressors. Similarly, al-Nasafi\textsuperscript{78} asserted that the Prophet’s statement, “He who dies without recognizing the Imam of his time, he dies in a pre-Islamic state,”\textsuperscript{79 80 81 82} signifies the importance of having an imam at all times. He further stated that anyone who denies the concept of imamate also denies its associated obligations, which would lead to disbelief.\textsuperscript{83}

Given the prominence of imamate as a system of government in Islamic thought, one might question why the Prophet seemingly neglected to explicitly address it.

\textbf{Second: the Realistic Biography of the Rulers}

When observing the historical trajectory of rulership after the passing of the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household), one can discern that subsequent leaders placed great emphasis on the issue of succession. For instance, Muawiyah, in an effort to prevent discord, designated his son, Yazid, as his successor according to their perspective.

This raises an important question: Which approach is more correct? Was it the Prophet Muhammad’s stance of leaving the matter of the ruling system without explicitly defining its nature, as some argue? Or was it the approach adopted by rulers throughout history, who prioritized establishing a clear system of governance as they understood it?

\textbf{Third: The Negative Impact of Not Establishing System of Imamte}

The absence of a clearly established system of government by the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household), as perceived by some, has yielded unfavorable outcomes for the nation. The notion of Imamate, in particular, has been a significant source of contention and

\textsuperscript{77} The Difference between the Sects, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{78} Bahru al-Kalam, p. 171.
\textsuperscript{79} Al-Saffar: Basa’ir al-Darajat, p. 279.
\textsuperscript{80} It is also mentioned as: “Whoever dies without pledging allegiance (to the Imam) dies the death of ignorance.” Ibn Hazm: Al-Muhalla, vol. 1, p. 45.
\textsuperscript{81} Al-Nawawi: Al-Majmu’, vol. 19, p. 190.
\textsuperscript{82} And it is also said: “Whoever dies without knowing his Imam, dies the death of ignorance.” Al-Barqi: Al-Mahasin, vol. 1, p. 154.
\textsuperscript{83} Bahru al-Kalam, p. 172.
discord within the Islamic community.\textsuperscript{84} Al-Shahrastani affirms this by stating, “And the greatest disagreement between the nation is the disagreement of the Imamate, as no sword was drawn in Islam on a religious basis like what was asked about the Imamate at all times.”\textsuperscript{85}

When examining the historical trajectory of the caliphate system and its ensuing repercussions, Al-Khudari asserts\textsuperscript{86}, “The conclusion is that the issue of the Islamic caliphate and succession did not proceed with time in a way in which stumbling is secured. [It] is the cause of most of the incidents that afflicted Muslims, and created what will come back to you of the types of discord and continuous wars that seldom is free from, whether it is between two houses or between two people.”

Thus, it becomes evident that in case of truth, the absence of a definitive governance framework established by the Prophet has engendered enduring challenges and conflicts within the Muslim community.

\textbf{Second View}

This front believes that the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) must have a say in regard to rulership after his demise. They present a number of evidences to prove their claim:

\textbf{First: Comprehensiveness of Islamic Legislation}

The comprehensive and detailed nature of the Prophet’s law, as a source of blessings and good tidings for the Muslims, is evident. The Quran affirms this by stating, “We have not neglected in the Book a thing.” Al-An’am, verse 38 God also states in the Quran: “And We have sent down to you the Book as clarification for all things and as guidance and mercy and good tidings for the Muslims”. An-Nahl, verse 89 He also adds: “He who has revealed to you the Book explained in detail”. Al-An’am, verse 114 Securing the implementation of Sharia provisions stands as a paramount concern for the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) through the establishment of an appropriate system of government.

When examining the Prophet’s biography in terms of teaching and disseminating Sharia law to the members of the Muslim community, it becomes evident that he spared no effort in addressing even the most mundane aspects of life.* This includes guidance on outdoor activities, clothing, footwear, sleeping positions, eating manners, sitting etiquettes in the streets, greeting formulas for Muslims and people of the book, proper conduct with one’s spouse, visiting the sick, attending funerals, and other similar matters that are extensively covered in hadith, jurispru-

\textsuperscript{84} Al-Ash’ari: Maqalat al-Islamiyyin, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{85} Al-Shahrastani: Al-Milal wa al-Nihal, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{86} The Umayyad Dynasty, p. 156.
* Examining the details, one can refer to the books of Prophetic traditions and jurisprudence, considering their various schools of thought, to elucidate these intricacies. Al-Jaziri’s work, \textit{Al-Fiqh on the Four Schools of Thought}, is presented in five volumes. Additionally, Mughniyya’s compilation, \textit{Al-Fiqh on the Five Schools of Thought}, is structured into two parts.
It is perplexing, however, that the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) seemingly neglected or overlooked the matter of succession and governance after his time. Considering that sacred texts provide guidance on matters of lesser importance and danger, it raises questions as to why the Prophet did not entrust the issue of caliphate and the system of government to the intellect and efforts of people, allowing them to adapt to the needs and circumstances of their times and places.

It is puzzling that the Prophet addressed matters that are more susceptible to changes in time and place, such as sales, rent, partnership, pre-emption, reviving dead land, and looting, among others. He did not leave these matters for Muslims to formulate rules and regulations according to their specific contexts. Delegating the ruling system to human jurisprudence contradicts basic principles of logic, as Islam restricts the jurisprudence of Muslims in ordinary matters of lesser significance while leaving a crucial and vital matter in the lives of Muslims to their discretion.\(^\text{87} \quad \text{88}\).

Therefore, the apparent discrepancy between the attention given to everyday matters and the apparent neglect of the ruling system in the Prophet’s teachings calls for further investigation and analysis.

**Second: Prophet’s Message to Khosrow**

In his practical life, the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) demonstrated the appointment of rulers whenever he traveled, even if for a temporary period. This raises the question of how he could leave the world without ensuring a system of government for the Muslims. Al-Waqidi\(^\text{89}\), a historian, mentioned specific instances where the Prophet appointed individuals to manage the affairs of different cities during his military expeditions. For example, Saad bin Ubadah was appointed during the Battle of Wadan and the Battle of Bawat, Saad bin Moaz in the request of Karaz bin Jaber Al-Fihri, Zaid bin Haritha in the Battle of Dhi al-Ashira, Abu Salama bin Abd al-Asad al-Makhzoumi in the Battle of Badr al-Qatal, Abu Lubabah bin Abdul Mundhir al-Omari in the Battle of al-Suwaiq and the Battle of al-Kadr, Ibn Umm Maktum in the Battle of Uhud, Hamra al-Asad, Bani Nadir, Badr al-Ma’oed, and others.

What is also known is that the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) entrusted the leadership of Medina to Imam Ali (peace be upon him), stating, “You are to me as Aaron was to Moses, except that there is no prophet after me.” This indicates that the Prophet recognized

---

87 Abdul Karim: The Historical Roots of Islamic Sharia, pp. 103-104.
88 Abdul Hameed: History of Islam, pp. 129-130.
the need for a successor or a figure to lead and guide the community.\footnote{Ibn Hanbal: Musnad, vol. 1, p. 170.}

By appointing rulers and designating Imam Ali as his deputy in Medina, the Prophet demonstrated his concern for establishing a system of governance. While he did not explicitly outline a detailed framework for the future leadership of the Muslim community, his actions and statements imply the importance of leadership and authority in maintaining the unity and well-being of the Ummah.

\textbf{Thirdly}: it is noted that the Prophet used to say, “When three people go on a journey, let one of them be appointed as their leader”\footnote{Al-Bukhari: Sahih, vol. 4, p. 208.} \footnote{Muslim: Sahih, vol. 7, p. 120.} \footnote{Ibn Majah: Sunan, vol. 1, p. 43.} \footnote{Al-Sharif Al-Murtada: His Epistles, vol. 4, p. 76.} \footnote{Al-Bayhaqi: Al-Sunan al-Kubra, vol. 9, p. 40.} \footnote{Regarding the controversy surrounding the hadith, refer to Al-Milani: Hadith al-Manzilah, pp. 7-79.} \footnote{Abu Dawood: Sunan Abi Dawood, vol. 1, p. 587.} \footnote{Abu Ya’la: Musnad Abu Ya’la, vol. 2, p. 319.} \footnote{Al-Tabarani: Al-Mu’jam Al-Awsat, vol. 8, p. 100.} \footnote{Ibn Abd al-Barr: Al-Tamhid, vol. 20, p. 7.} \footnote{Ibn Shabah: Tarikh al-Madina, vol. 3, p. 924.} \footnote{Al-Tabari: Tariikh, vol. 3, p. 293.} \footnote{Ya’qut al-Hamawi: Mu’jam al-Buldan, vol. 4, p. 293.} \footnote{Ya’qut al-Hamawi: Mu’jam al-Buldan, vol. 4, p. 294.} \footnote{Ali, Jawad: Al-Mufassal, vol. 3, p. 231.} \footnote{* Dhu Qar was a location near Kufa, situated between it and Wasit, and it was the site of the famous Battle of Dhi Qar.} In fact, Umar ibn al-Khattab even imposed on the consultative companions that they should not go for three days without appointing a leader amongst them.\footnote{Abu Ya’la: Musnad Abu Ya’la, vol. 2, p. 319.} \footnote{Al-Tabari: Tarikh, vol. 3, p. 293.}

\textbf{Fourth: Internal and External Risks}

The Prophet (may God bless him and his Household) was compelled to safeguard his state from the dangers that threatened it, both internally and externally. The external dangers primarily originated from the Byzantine Romans and the Sasanian Persians, while the internal dangers involved the Jews, hypocrites, and individuals claiming prophethood.

Regarding the external dangers, there were three significant events on the Arabian Peninsula that had an impact on the Sasanian circles. One of these events was the Battle of Dhi Qar\footnote{Ya’qut al-Hamawi: Mu’jam al-Buldan, vol. 4, p. 293.} \footnote{Ya’qut al-Hamawi: Mu’jam al-Buldan, vol. 4, p. 294.}. The exact timing of this battle is debated, with some sources suggesting it took place during the Prophet’s birth, while others claim it occurred after his participation in the Battle of Badr\footnote{Ali, Jawad: Al-Mufassal, vol. 3, p. 231.}. \footnote{Ibn Shabah: Tariikh al-Madina, vol. 3, p. 924.} \footnote{Al-Tabari: Tarikh, vol. 3, p. 293.}
During this battle, the Sasanian forces* confronted the Arabs who rallied around the slogan “O Mansur, kill” in retaliation for the persecution they had endured from the non-Arabs, as informed by the Prophet. **

Second: The Prophet and his Message to Khosrau:

As the Prophet Muhammad was a universal Messenger unlike the rest of the prophets, the Almighty said: “We have not sent you, [O Muhammad], except as a bringer of good tidings and a warner to all of mankind, but most of the people do not know.” Saba, verse 28 He also stated in the Quran: “And We have not sent you except as a mercy to the worlds”. Al-Anbiya, verse 107 Therefore, the Prophet took the initiative to send letters to the kings and rulers of his time, inviting them to Islam. Among these letters was the one addressed to Khosrau Parvez, the king of the Sasanian Persians.

In his letter, the Prophet began with the Islamic invocation, “In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful,” and introduced himself as the Messenger of God. He conveyed his message of peace to those who follow guidance, believe in God and His Messenger, and testify to the oneness of God and the prophethood of Muhammad. The purpose of the letter was to invite Khosrau to embrace Islam and recognize the truth of the Prophet’s mission. The Prophet wrote:

“In the name of the Almighty, the Merciful, from Muhammad, the Messenger of God, to the noble Chosroes of Persia: May peace be upon those who tread the path of righteousness, who hold firm belief in God and His Messenger, and bear witness to the singular divinity of God, transcendent and without equal, and to the prophethood of Muhammad, His humble servant and chosen envoy.

I extend to you this invitation, guided by the divine commandments, for I am the Messenger of God sent to all humanity. My purpose is to warn the living against disbelief and falsehood, proclaiming the veracity of the Word of God. May you find security and tranquility by embracing the truth. However, should you decline this call, know that the burden of sin shall rest upon the followers of the Magian faith.”***

There are several notes to be considered in this regard:

---

106 Al-Mayah: Al-Fikr al-Askari al-Sasanani, pp. 73-78.
109 Ibn Abd al-Barr: Al-Isti’ab, vol. 1, p. 73.

* The title is used for the ruler of the Sasanian Empire, and it means “king” in English.
** Khusrow IV, son of Hormuz the Fourth (195–826), faced a rebellion led by Bahram Chobin. This led Khusrow to seek assistance from the Byzantine Emperor Maurice, agreeing to cede control of the Levant, which had fallen into the hands of the Sasanians. He successfully regained his throne, and during his reign, the Battle of Thievar took place. However, relations with the Byzantines soured after Maurice’s death. Khusrow managed to seize control of Jerusalem and Ma’arrat al-Nu’man. Still, Heraclius quickly reestablished his influence over Emesa and the Levant. Eventually, Khusrow was killed by his son Shirweh.
***And some add to the statement of the Prophet the following words: “and by me, you are victorious”.

The Prophet’s View of Government System After him:
1- The correspondences of the Prophet with the kings of his time are indisputable. He fulfilled the divine command in his role as the Gentile Prophet, sent to all people, including the jinn, as evident in the Noble Qur’an.* Additionally, various primary sources such as biography, history, jurisprudence, hadith, interpretation, literature, language, and others reinforce this fact.112 113 114 115 116 117 118

2- However, it is crucial to inquire whether the method of conveying the message and its contents align with the Qur’anic methodology of inviting others to the path of the Lord with wisdom, goodly exhortation, and the best arguments, as stated in the verse “Invite to the way of your Lord with wisdom and goodly exhortation, and argue with them in a way that is best” An-Nahl, verse 125. While it is observed that the Prophet occasionally employed expressions of admonishment and intimidation.

3- It is well-known that the Prophet possessed astute political acumen. Therefore, one may question the appropriateness of addressing Chosroes, who referred to himself as the “Shahanshah” or king of kings119 120. How could the Prophet anticipate Chosroes to listen to his message and believe in him?

4- Historical accounts confirm that during that era, the Sassanid Empire held significant global influence alongside the Byzantine Empire, while the Arabs possessed limited power and consisted of scattered tribes in the desert, comprised of both strong and weak factions. The Sassanids provided protection to the Arab tribes by issuing a warning from Al-Hirah to curb attacks, thereby establishing a subordinate relationship. Similarly, the Ghassanid Romans were granted kingship in the Levant for the same purpose121. Was this context absent from the Prophet’s address to Khosrau, warranting such speech?

112 Tabari: History 2/295.
113 Al-Jassas: Ahkam al-Qur’an 1/68.
116 Al-Ayni: ‘Umda al-Qari 18/58.
118 Al-Ahmedi: Makatib al-Rasul (saw) 2/316-332.
119 Al-Ya’qubi: History 1/177.
120 Al-Mas’udi: Muruj al-Dhahab 1/271.
121 Buru: Tarikh al’Arab al-Qadim 147.

*Say, [O Muhammad], “It has been revealed to me that a group of the jinn listened and said, ‘Indeed, we have heard an amazing Quran. It guides to the right course, and we have believed in it. And we will never associate with our Lord anyone. And [it teaches] that exalted is the nobleness of our Lord; He has not taken a wife or a son. And that our foolish one has been saying about Allah an excessive transgression. And we had thought that mankind and the jinn would never speak about Allah a lie. And there were men from mankind who sought refuge in men from the jinn, so they [only] increased them in burden. And they had thought, as you thought, that Allah would never send anyone [as a messenger]. And we have sought to reach the heaven but found it filled with powerful guards and burning flames. And we used to sit therein in positions for hearing, but whoever listens now will find a burning flame lying in wait for him. And we do not know [therefore] whether evil is intended for those on earth or whether their Lord intends for them a right course. And among us are the righteous, and among us are [others] not so; we were [of] divided ways. And we have become certain that we will never cause failure to Allah upon earth, nor can we escape Him by flight. And when we heard the guidance, we believed in it. And whoever believes in his Lord will not fear deprivation or burden. And among us are Muslims [in submission to Allah], and among us are the unjust. And whoever has become Muslim [those have sought right conduct]. But as for the unjust, they will be, for Hell, firewood.’” Jinn: 1-15.
5- Perhaps there exists another discourse of the Prophet that aligns with his role as a prophet when addressing others. How could the Prophet expect someone to hear his message, follow him, and forsake their religion and mighty kingdom based on a few words dominated by threats? It should be noted that the Prophet resided among his people for forty years, who referred to him as the Truthful and Trustworthy. However, when he called them to worship God, they disbelieved in him and accused him of lying, witchcraft, madness, and soothsaying.

6- It is plausible that the narration derived from historical realities wherein the Sassanian state fell, disintegrated, and came under the sovereignty of the Islamic state. Consequently, it was attributed to the Prophet that he proclaimed, “May God tear his kingdom,” following his knowledge of Khosrau’s tearing of the Prophet’s letter. However, it should be noted that the fragmentation of the Sassanian state occurred during the reign of Khosrau Parviz and was succeeded by Yazdegerd III.

Third: Yemen

According to accounts, it is reported that Khosrau, upon receiving the Prophet’s letter, became angry and tore it up. Subsequently, he wrote to the Emir of Yemen, who was a follower of the Sasanians at that time, instructing him to arrest the Prophet and send him to Khosrau.

If this account is accurate, it sheds light on the reality of the situation. It seems unlikely that Khosrau, who viewed himself as the “king of kings,” would give heed to the words of an Arab from a seemingly insignificant place. Therefore, he tore up the letter and commanded the Emir of Yemen, who was loyal to him, to arrest the Prophet for delivery to Khosrau. This suggests that Khosrau considered the Prophet’s authority to be subordinate to that of the governor of Yemen, as Khosrau held a status similar to that of the Roman Caesar or the Turkish Khaqan.

The Emir of Yemen complied with Khosrau’s orders and dispatched individuals to investigate the matter concerning the Prophet and apprehend him for transport to Khosrau. However, after meeting the Prophet and hearing his words, these individuals became convinced of his message. They carried the Prophet’s message back to the Emir of Yemen, who also recognized the

---

123 Al-Qurtubi: Al-Jami’ li Ahkam al-Qur’an 19/75.
124 Like Quran’s saying: “And they wondered that there has come to them a warner from among themselves, and the disbelievers say, ‘This is a magician, a liar.’” Surah Sad, verse 4.
125 Like Quran’s saying, “And they say, ‘O you upon whom the message has been sent down, indeed you are mad.’” Surah Al-Hijr, verse 6.
126 As in Quran’s saying, “And not with the saying of a soothsayer; little do you remember.” Surah Al-Haqqah, verse 42.
129 Tabari: History 2/296.
Prophet as a sent prophet and embraced Islam.\textsuperscript{131} Subsequently, the Prophet dispatched Imam Ali (peace be upon him) to Yemen, leading to the region’s conversion to Islam and its affiliation with the Islamic state.\textsuperscript{132 133 134}

The Arabs achieved victory over the Persians for the first time in the Battle of Dhi Qar, and Khosrau Parviz received a message from the Prophet inviting him to accept Islam. Additionally, the loss of the Sasanian-controlled Yemen to the Muslim Arabs likely had an impact on the Sasanian circles, raising concerns about a new threat emerging from the Arabian Peninsula. Given the Prophet astute organizational skills, it is reasonable to assume that he was aware of the potential danger posed by the Sasanians to his nascent state.

2- The Byzantine Empire:

The Byzantine Empire encompassed the eastern portion of the Roman Empire following the loss of the western territories to the Germanic ruler Odoacer in 476 AD.\textsuperscript{135} The Arab territories, on the other hand, were situated on the periphery of the Byzantine Empire in the Levant, which was under Byzantine control. These circumstances set the stage for interactions and dynamics between the two entities.

First: The message of the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) to Heraclius:

Since Prophet held the unique position of being the last Prophet and Messenger, distinct from his predecessors, it is important to note that the Almighty proclaimed in the Qur’an: “We have not sent you, [O Muhammad], except as a bringer of good tidings and a warner to all of humanity. But most of the people do not know.” Saba, verse 28 He also states: “And We have not sent you except as a mercy to the worlds” Al-Anbiya, verse 107. Consequently, the Prophet corresponded with the kings and rulers of his time, extending invitations to embrace Islam. Among these correspondences was his letter to Heraclius*, the Emperor of the Byzantine Empire, wherein he conveyed his invitation to Islam with the following words:

“In the name of God, the Most Compassionate, the Most Merciful:

From Muhammad bin Abdullah to Heraclius*, the esteemed leader of the Romans: May peace be upon those who follow the guidance. I invite you to accept the message of Islam. By embracing it, you shall find security and safety. God will bestow upon you a twofold reward. If you reject my invitation, you shall bear the sins of your people. Let us come to a mutual agreement that we shall worship none but God, associating no partners with Him, and that we shall not elevate anyone amongst us to the status of deities besides Allah. If they turn away, then bear witness

\textsuperscript{131} Ibn al-Jawzi: Al-Muntadhim 3/283.
\textsuperscript{132} Al-Waqidi: Al-Maghazi 709-712.
\textsuperscript{133} Ibn Sayyid al-Nas: ‘Uyun al-Athar 2/358.
\textsuperscript{134} Al-Amili: Al-Sahih min Sirat al-Imam Ali (as) 6/155-174.
\textsuperscript{135} Edward Gibbon: The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (all pages).
that we submit ourselves to God (Muslims)”. Al Imran, verse 64

Here are several noteworthy points to consider:

1- We must refer back to the previously discussed points concerning the Prophet’s message to Khosrau, as outlined in comments 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

2- According to the narration, it is indicated that a person named Dihya al-Kalbi was entrusted by the Prophet to deliver the message to Heraclius. It is important to note that the selection of an individual for such a mission implies their significance in the context of Islam. However, due to a lack of concrete evidence about Dihya and the presence of ambiguity throughout his life, it becomes challenging to establish the veracity of his existence.

3- Furthermore, it is noteworthy that some individuals have exploited this opportunity to fabricate virtues attributed to Abu Sufyan, despite his status as a disbeliever. The meeting between Abu Sufyan and Heraclius, which may have been a moment of pride at that time, involved an Arab interacting with the esteemed Roman ruler.

4- It is plausible that the narration was influenced by the Quranic stance towards Christians, which acknowledges their humility and lack of arrogance: “and you will find the nearest of them in affection to the believers those who say, ‘We are Christians.’ That is because among them are priests and monks and because they are not arrogant” Ma‘idah, verse 82. Thus, the narrative expressed a positive disposition of Heraclius towards the Prophet. However, the hindrance to accepting the message by Heraclius stemmed from the opposition posed by the Christian clergy.

Second: Battle of Mu‘ta (8 A.H)

One of the significant events in the historical dynamics between the Byzantine Empire and the Islamic state was the Battle of Mu‘tah, which took place in the year 8 AH. The catalyst for this battle was the Prophet sending an envoy to the prince of the Ghassanids, extending an invitation to Islam. However, instead of accepting the invitation, the prince became enraged and killed the messenger of the Prophet. He then sent the severed head of the messenger to Caesar, the Byzantine ruler.

---

137 Al-Amiri and Al-Awad: Ummiya al-Da’wa al-Islamiya 353-365.
139 Al-Ya’qubi: History 2/78.

* Heraclius: Flavius Augustus Heraclius (575 - February 11, 641) ascended to the Byzantine Empire in 608. He led a successful revolution against the Emperor Phocas, who assumed power after the deposition of Emperor Maurice. Heraclius lacked significant popularity amid the turmoil the empire was facing. He is considered the founder of the Heraclian dynasty, which ruled the Byzantine Empire until 711. He initially faced the expansion of the Sassanids on the borders of Egypt and the Levant, leading him to engage in several wars to reclaim them. He then faced the Muslim Arabs after receiving a message from the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) inviting him to Islam. He ultimately lost Syria, Egypt, and Libya in multiple battles in favor of the Muslims.

** Dahyah al-Kalbi is a controversial figure who raises suspicions. How was his early life in Islam? When did the Prophet choose him as a messenger to Heraclius? What was his fate afterward?
tine Emperor, as an act of defiance.

Upon learning of this incident, the Prophet made the decision to dispatch an army to discipline the Ghassanids. The prince of the Ghassanids, in a state of panic, sought assistance from Heraclius, who promptly provided him with a sizable army. As a result, the Muslims found themselves encircled, and despite their courage and resolve, they suffered losses, including the martyrdom of the three appointed leaders by the Prophet. Ultimately, the Muslim army had to retreat, thereby concluding the Battle of Mu’tah.*

**Third: Battle of Tabuk**

The battle of Tabuk took place in the year 9 AH when the Prophet undertook efforts to secure the northern borders of the Islamic state. He dispatched reconnaissance units to monitor the situation, which resulted in skirmishes with the Roman forces and their allies, including the Ghassanids. In response to these developments, the Prophet decided to personally lead an army consisting of a significant number of his followers to Tabuk in the Levant.

Although the expedition did not involve any major military confrontation, it is believed that the Prophet’s decision to mobilize his forces served as a deterrent to the Romans and their allies. By demonstrating the strength and readiness of the Muslim army, the Prophet sought to maintain stability in the region and discourage any hostile actions from his adversaries.  

**Fourth: Osama’s Cohort**

In 11 AH, during the Prophet final illness, he made the decision to send Osama bin Zaid bin Haritha at the head of an army to confront the Byzantine Romans. The motivation behind this expedition was to seek revenge for the killing of Osama’s father, Zaid, in the Battle of Mu’tah. Notable companions such as Abu Bakr, Umar, Abu Ubaidah, Abd al-Rahman ibn Awf, Talha, and al-Zubayr joined the army alongside Osama.

---

* It is a battle that took place between the Muslims and the Byzantine Romans in Jumada al-Awwal of the 8th year after Hijrah. It was triggered by the killing of Al-Harith bin Umair al-Azdi, the messenger sent by the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) to the ruler of Busra, inviting him to Islam. He was intercepted by Sharhabil bin Amr al-Ghassani, who killed him to please the Romans. There is a disagreement regarding the leader of the Muslims in this battle, whether it was Ja’far ibn Abi Talib or Zaid ibn Haritha. Both Ja’far and Zaid were martyred, and it is said that Abdullah ibn Rawaha assumed leadership after their martyrdom.
However, the army experienced delays due to the reluctance of some of Osama’s commanders.*149. Despite this, the Prophet emphasized the importance of proceeding with the mission and expressed his displeasure with those who hesitated. During this time, the Prophet momentarily lost consciousness. Upon awakening, he inquired about Osama’s departure and was informed that preparations were underway. The Prophet then commanded that Osama’s mission be carried out and invoked a curse upon those who remained behind. Subsequently, Osama and a group of the Muhajireen and Ansar departed.**150

As the army approached a cliff, they were informed of the Prophet’s death by the messenger of Umm Ayman. In response, Osama immediately turned back and entered the city, carrying the banner in his hand. He proceeded until he affixed the banner to the door of the Prophet.151 152

Now, let us address some observations regarding the above events:

Firstly, the question arises as to why the Prophet Muhammad chose Osama bin Zaid to lead this army. The narration suggests that the reason for his selection was rooted in the revenge for the killing of Osama’s father, Zaid, in the Battle of Mu’tah against the Byzantines. However, it is worth noting that in that battle, Jaafar al-Tayyar, Zaid bin Haritha, and Abdullah bin Rawaha153 were all martyred. So why specifically seek revenge for Zaid and not the others? Additionally, why did the Prophet not choose the son of Jaafar or the son of Abdullah bin Rawaha? Furthermore, what is the significance of seeking revenge in this context? Did the Prophet seek revenge for the martyrs of the battles of Badr, Uhud, and others as well? If so, it would have been more appropriate to seek revenge for Al-Harith bin Umair Al-Azdi, whom the Prophet had sent to the king of Busra, only to be intercepted and killed by Shurhabil Al-Ghassani in service to his Roman masters.155 156

These questions and observations prompt a deeper exploration of the motives and principles underlying choosing Osama and the concept of revenge in the context of the historical events leading up to the year 11 AH.

Second: It is worth noting that Osama bin Zaid was only eighteen years old at the time. This raises questions about why the Prophet chose him to lead notable companions such as Abu

149 Al-Tabaqt al-Kubra, volume 2, p. 190.
151 Al-Jawhari: Al-Saqifa wa Wadak, pp. 76-77.
* Ibn Saad indicated that the reason lies in underestimating Osama, but is the underestimation based on his age or his lineage?
** Al-Jarf with a fatha (ـَ) and then a sukun (ـْ), a place located three miles from Al-Madinah towards Al-Sham.
Bakr, Umar, Abd al-Rahman bin Awf, Talha, al-Zubayr, Usaid bin Hudair, and Bashir bin Saad. Is it plausible that the Prophet intended this appointment for psychological purposes, seeking revenge for Osama’s father?

Third: The Prophet emphasized the importance of Osama’s expedition, engaging in dialogue with him until Osama was convinced. The Prophet’s insistence was so strong that he even cursed those who lagged behind in joining the march. This highlights the significance attached to Osama’s mission.

Fourth: It is worth noting that after the Prophet assured Osama of the necessity of the journey, Osama commenced his march towards the outskirts of the city. However, he halted there, and the Prophet passed away before the expedition could fulfill its role. What does this indicate? Did Osama intentionally deceive the Prophet by leaving after receiving his confirmation, falsely implying that he had proceeded towards the Levant? Alternatively, did the companions accompanying him dissuade him and refuse to follow the path, evading the expedition with their words until the Prophet’s passing?

Fifth: The person who informed Osama of the Prophet’s death—was he truly a messenger of Um Ayman? Or was he dispatched by someone else?

Sixth: It is noteworthy that Abu Bakr was present as part of the army and marched alongside Osama until they reached the outskirts of the city. He remained there until the Prophet Muhammad’s death. How can we reconcile this account with the narration that mentions the Prophet’s instruction for Abu Bakr to lead the people in prayer during his illness?

Although the expedition led by Osama did not commence or fulfill its intended role until after the Prophet’s passing, its significance cannot be overlooked. Its repercussions reverberated within Byzantine circles, as Medina, situated close to the Levant, allowed for swift dissemination of news to the Ghassanid court, which was connected to the Byzantine court.

Thus, it can be argued that the message conveyed by the Prophet, including his audacious call to the Roman Emperor Caesar to embrace Islam, the subsequent Battle of Mutah—marking the first military clash between the Arab Muslims and the Romans—and the covert operations led by Osama bin Zaid, all had an impact on Byzantine circles. They perceived a potential threat emanating from the Arabian Peninsula, and the Prophet was aware of this danger, prompting him to safeguard the future of his fledgling state.
Second: Interior Risks:

1- Jews:

One hypothesis proposed regarding the migration of the Jews to Yathrib is rooted in their discussions about the prophecies mentioned in their sacred texts, which foretold the advent of an unlettered Prophet in Thebes (Yathrib). They anticipated that this Prophet would arise from among them\textsuperscript{157} 158 159 160. Thus, they migrated from the Levant to Yathrib\textsuperscript{*} 161 162. In the event of a conflict between the Jews and the Aws and Khazraj tribes of Yathrib, the Jews would proclaim that the time had come for the appearance of a Prophet who would lead them to victory. However, when a scripture from God arrived confirming what was already with them, they chose to disbelieve\textsuperscript{163}164. The Quran states: “And when there came to them a Book from God confirming what is with them – although before they used to pray for victory against those who disbelieved – but [then] when there came to them what they recognized, they disbelieved in it; so the curse of God will be upon the disbelievers”. Al-Baqarah, Verse 89

Upon the Prophet’s arrival, the people of Yathrib were quick to embrace his message,\textsuperscript{165} while the Jews rejected him.\textsuperscript{166} The Prophet established a system known as the “Constitution of Medina” among the diverse communities in the city to regulate its affairs\textsuperscript{167} 168. Among these communities were Jewish tribes such as the Banu Qaynuqa’, the Banu al-Nadir, and the Banu Qurayza. However, these tribes soon became aware of the truth of the Prophet’s message, yet they persisted in their denial, engaging in plots, violating agreements, and conspiring against him. Consequently, the Prophet took decisive action, expelling these tribes one by one. They eventually congregated in Khaybar\textsuperscript{169} 170 171 172, where the Prophet even-

\textsuperscript{157} Ibn Hisham: Al-Seerah al-Nabawiyya, vol. 1, p. 139.
\textsuperscript{159} Al-Hamawi, Ya’qut: Mu’jam al-Buldan, vol. 5, p. 84.
\textsuperscript{160} Al-Malih: Al-Waseet fi Seerat al-Nabawiyya, pp. 248-249.
\textsuperscript{161} Ahmed Sussa: Al-Arab wa al-Yahud ‘Abr al-Tareekh, p. 689.
\textsuperscript{163} Ibn Hisham: Al-Seerah al-Nabawiyya, vol. 1, p. 137.
\textsuperscript{165} Ibn Hisham: Al-Seerah al-Nabawiyya, vol. 1, p. 137.
\textsuperscript{166} Ibn Ishaq: Al-Seerah wa al-Maghazi, p. 204.
\textsuperscript{167} Al-Malih: Al-Waseet fi Seerat al-Nabawiyya, pp. 199-211.
\textsuperscript{168} Group of Authors: Wathiqat al-Madinah, pp. 7-245.
\textsuperscript{169} Al-Waqidi: Al-Maghazi, pp. 441-484.
\textsuperscript{171} Al-Dahis: Al-Seerah al-Nabawiyya fi al-Ru’ya al-Istishraqiyya, pp. 308-367.
\textsuperscript{172} Tahir: Al-Mujtama’ al-Islami, pp. 158-184.
\textsuperscript{*} Regarding the reasons for the migration of the Jews to the Arabian Peninsula.
tually conquered them in 7 AH. Nevertheless, the Jews continued to harbor animosity and sought opportunities to undermine Islam. Some Jews, under duress, publicly declared their conversion to Islam while intellectually challenging its teachings. Prominent figures such as Ibn Salam, Ka‘b al-Ahbar, al-Qarzi, and others pursued this strategy. They also managed to infiltrate Islamic thought. Moreover, they repeatedly attempted to assassinate the Prophet, and it is suggested that they may have ultimately succeeded in poisoning him.

The Prophet was fully aware of the danger posed by the Jews to his nascent state. This understanding compelled him to take measures to secure the future of his state and protect it from the threats posed by the Jewish tribes.

2. The Hypocrites:

When the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) migrated to Medina, the society became divided into four categories: the Muhajirun (emigrants from Mecca), the Ansar (the supporters from Medina), the Jews, and the polytheists from the people of Medina. Later they converted to Islam, but hid their disbelief, to be known as hypocrites. It is narrated that during the Battle of Uhud, when the Prophet reached to a place called Hamra Al-Asad, the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him and his Household) reached on the day of Uhud while pursuing the polytheists.

---

176 Ibn Ishaq: Al-Seerah wa al-Maghazi, pp. 75-76.
184 Al-Ta’i: Hal Ightila al-Nabi Muhammad (peace be upon him)?, pp. 5-162.
185 Al-Muhmmadawi: Ad’at fi al-Seerah al-Muhmmadiyyah al-Sharifah, pp. 271-274.
188 Ya’qut al-Hamawi: Mu’jam al-Buldan, volume 2, page 301.
* Also, regarding the assassination attempt during his commercial trip to Sham with his uncle Abu Talib
** And the assassination attempt by the Banu Nadir tribe using poison
*** And the assassination attempt in Khaybar with poison.
**** Hamrat al-Asad: Al-Asad Ahad al-Asad, with elongation and addition. It is a location eight miles away from Al-Madinah, where the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him and his Household) reached on the day of Uhud while pursuing the polytheists.
Abu Ibn Salul*\textsuperscript{189}, the leader of the hypocrites, returned with 300 of his hypocritical companions\textsuperscript{190} \textsuperscript{191}. This number of hypocrites was increasing, and they often caused problems for the Prophet, as seen in the Battle of Al-Mureesie\textsuperscript{192} \textsuperscript{193} and the incident of Al-Ifk.**\textsuperscript{194} \textsuperscript{195} ***\textsuperscript{196}

However, our information about these hypocrites is limited, and the exact number of hypocrites is not mentioned. Ibn Habib\textsuperscript{197} only mentioned 36 names among them. Their numbers increased with the conquest of Mecca and the entry of the freed slaves (Tulaqa)****\textsuperscript{198} and those whose hearts were reconciled to Islam*****\textsuperscript{200} ******\textsuperscript{201} under the rule of the Islamic state in the eighth year after the Hijra. The group of Bedouins, who opposed the teachings of Islam, faced strong criticism in the Holy Qur’an, which described them as more disbelieving and hypocritical and less likely to understand the limits set by God. The Quran harshly attacked them: “The Arabs of the desert are the worst in disbelief and hypocrisy, and more likely to be ignorant of the limits which God has revealed to His Messenger. And God is all Knowing and Wise.” Al-Tawbah, verse 97\textsuperscript{202}

\textsuperscript{189} Al-Nasrallah, Tahir, Attempted Assassination of the Prophet, pp. 105-108.
\textsuperscript{190} Ibn Ishaq: Al-Sirah wa Al-Maghazi, p. 324.
\textsuperscript{192} Al-Waqidi: Al-Maghazi, vol. 1, p. 305.
\textsuperscript{194} Al-Waqidi: Al-Maghazi, vol. 1, p. 312-320.
\textsuperscript{196} Al-Dhahis: Zawaj al-Nabi, pp. 218-260.
\textsuperscript{197} Al-Mahbar, pp. 467-470.
\textsuperscript{199} Al-Ghurayfi: Al-Talaqa’ fi al-Islam, pp. 25-405.
\textsuperscript{200} Al-Daruwish and Husayn: Al-Mu’allafa Qulubuhum fi ‘Asr al-Risalah, p. 5-86.
\textsuperscript{201} Tahir: Al-Mujtama’ al-Islami, pp. 88-114.
\textsuperscript{202} Tahir: Al-Mujtama’ al-Islami, pages 64-87.

* Perhaps one of the debated personalities, and much controversy has been raised about him, so he needs an academic study to clarify the validity of what was raised about him. He was accused of participating in the attempt to assassinate the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) in Al-Aqaba, but he was absent from the Battle of Tabuk.

** This incident was narrated by Lady Aisha and indicates that some companions and hypocrites accused Lady Aisha of indecency, and then the Quran was revealed to prove her innocence.

*** However, some argue that the accused was Lady Maria the Copt.

**** The term “tulaqa” refers to anyone who entered Mecca forcibly and was subdued by the sword by the Prophet, then converted to Islam or remained a non-Muslim, such as Safwan ibn Umayyah, who did not embrace Islam, and Muawiyah, who declared Islam. It also includes those who were captured during the battles of the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) and were either ransomed or not ransomed, such as Suhayl ibn Amr, who was ransomed, and Abu Azza al-Jumahi, who was not ransomed, and Amr ibn Abi Sufyan, who was ransomed in exchange for the release of a Muslim captive.

***** The phrase “qalubahum” is debated; whether they are the group that embraced Islam out of fear in Mecca and Ta‘if, or others who were not inclined towards Islam, so the Prophet (peace be upon him) would give them from the spoils to ease their hearts and keep them from harming Islam, such as Abu Sufyan, Muawiyah, and others.

****** Or they could be from among the followers of other religions who embraced Islam and were rejected by their people, so the Quran granted them rights in terms of charity.
In 9 AH, the Prophet prepared to lead an expedition to Tabuk\(^\text{203} \, 204\), which is located within the borders of the Levant. Before his departure, he entrusted the management of Medina to Imam Ali (peace be upon him). However, during the Prophet’s journey back from Tabuk, he was the target of an assassination plot orchestrated by a group of hypocrites\(^\text{205} \, 206\). They aimed to take his life, but the Prophet uncovered their scheme and was saved from their plot. Hudhayfah ibn al-Yaman\(^\text{207}\), who was with the Prophet at the time, possessed knowledge of these hypocrites or the Prophet had revealed their names to him. As a result, Hudhayfah became known as the keeper of the secret of the hypocrites.

It is believed that Surah At-Tawbah (Chapter 9) was revealed during this period, and it does not begin with the Basmalah (the phrase “Bismillah ir-Rahman ir-Rahim”). This Surah highlights the characteristics and actions of the hypocrites and their destructive role in undermining Islam, its Prophet, and the Muslim community.\(^\text{208}\) The number of hypocrites increased during the Year of Delegations\(^\text{209}\), referring to a period when various Arabian tribes sent delegations to Medina to establish or strengthen alliances with the Islamic state.

The hypocrites played a subversive role even during the Prophet’s final moments. When he requested writing materials and asked to dictate a message that would ensure their guidance after him, the hypocrites made excuses and fabricated false allegations of his hallucination.\(^\text{210}\) This angered the Prophet, who expelled them and said that you should never dispute in the company of hypocrites.

---

\(^\text{203}\) See: Al-Waqidi’s Al-Maghazi, pp. 655-707.
\(^\text{204}\) Yaqut Al-Hamwi’s Mu’jam Al-Buldan, 2/14-15.
\(^\text{205}\) Ibn Hazm: Al-Muhalla 11/224.
\(^\text{206}\) Al-Nasr Allah and Taher: The Attempt to Assassinate the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) in Aqaba, pp. 99-124.
\(^\text{208}\) Taher: The Islamic Society through Surat Al-Tawbah, pp. 18-220.

* Tabuk is a place located between Wadi al-Qura and the Levant. It is said to be situated between al-Hijr and the beginning of al-Sham, approximately four stages from al-Hijr, about halfway to al-Sham. It is a fortified stronghold that is attributed to the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Householder), featuring a spring, palm trees, and a wall. Tabuk is located between Mount Hasmi and Mount Sharoura. In the ninth year after the Hijrah, the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Householder) directed his migration towards Tabuk, which marked his final expeditions. He intended to confront a coalition that had gathered from the Romans, Amila, Lakhm, and those afflicted with leprosy. However, upon arrival, he found that they had already dispersed, and he did not encounter any hostilities. The Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) stayed there for some time, fostering good relations with its people. Then, on his way back, there was an assassination attempt by the hypocrites, but it failed.

** He is Abu Abdullah Hudhaifa bin Al-Yaman (Hasel) bin Jaber bin Asid bin Amr bin Malik Al-Absi, an ally of Bani Abd Al-Ash-hal, one of the early supporters who embraced Islam. He witnessed the Prophet’s (peace be upon him and his Householder) wars and became known as the possessor of the secret of the hypocrites. He narrated from the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household), and his son Abu Ubaidah bin Hudhaifa, Zaid bin Wahb, Abu Tufail, Abu Idris Al-Khawlani, and Zar bin Habish narrated from him. It is said that he witnessed the Battle of Yarmouk, took charge of the cities, and died before Imam Ali (peace be upon him) assumed the caliphate in the year 35 AH.

*** It is the ninth year after the Hijrah when Arab tribes realized, after the conquest of Mecca, the impossibility of confronting the power of the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household). Therefore, tribes began sending delegations declaring their entry under the rule of the Islamic state.
of a prophet.\textsuperscript{211} 212 213 214 215 216 217

3- Prophethood Claimants

During the time of the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household), the success of his message and the establishment of the Islamic state attracted the attention of some Arab soothsayers and individuals who sought to claim prophethood. These individuals emerged as rivals to the Prophet and aimed to lead their own people and expand their own power.\textsuperscript{218} 219 220 The phenomenon of false claimants to prophecy during that time included:

1. Al-Aswad Al-Ansi: Al-Aswad Al-Ansi, whose real name was Abhala bin Kaab, was a false claimant to prophethood during the time of the Prophet. He gained influence in parts of Yemen and proclaimed himself a prophet. Al-Aswad Al-Ansi’s reign of falsehood lasted for several months before the Muslims in Yemen, incited by the Prophet, revolted against him. They were able to defeat and kill him two months prior to the death of the Prophet Muhammad. However, news of Al-Aswad Al-Ansi’s death did not reach Medina until after Abu Bakr became the caliph.\textsuperscript{221} 222 223

2. Following the conquest of Mecca by the Prophet in 8 AH, the significance of this event as the stronghold of the Arabian Peninsula became evident to the Arab tribes. Consequently, in 9 AH, these tribes dispatched delegations to the Prophet, declaring their embrace of Islam. Among the delegations was one representing Bani Hanifa, which included an individual named Musaylimah. Ambitiously, Musaylimah proclaimed himself a prophet, seeking the allegiance of his people, much like the Quraysh had done previously.\textsuperscript{224} In a letter addressed to the Prophet, Musaylimah wrote, “From Musaylimah, the Messenger of God, to Muhammad, the Messenger of God. I have joined you in this matter, and we shall divide the land equally between us and the Quraysh. However, I find the Quraysh to be a transgressive people”.

\textsuperscript{211} Ibn Hanbal: Al-Musnad vol. 1, p. 222.
\textsuperscript{212} Al-Bukhari: Sahih vol. 4, pp.31-66.
\textsuperscript{213} Muslim: Sahih vol. 5, p. 75.
\textsuperscript{214} Al-Bayhaqi: Al-Sunan Al-Kubra vol. 9, p. 207.
\textsuperscript{216} Al-Ayni: Umdat Al-Qari vol. 15, p. 90.
\textsuperscript{217} Taher: The Islamic Society, pp. 18-63.
\textsuperscript{218} Al-Baytar: Harb Al-Ridda pp. 11-16.
\textsuperscript{219} Al-Mallah: Al-Waseet, p. 326.
\textsuperscript{220} Al-Qurani: A New Reading of the Wars of Apostasy, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{221} Al-Tabari: Tarikh vol. 2, p. 420.
\textsuperscript{222} Ibn al-Jawzi: Al-Muntazam vol. 4, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{223} Al-Baytar: Harb Al-Ridda, pp. 11-13.
\textsuperscript{224} Al-Halak: Musaylimah Al-Hanafi: A Reading in the History of Mahram, pp. 13-177.
* Some believe that Musaylimah was the last remaining follower of Al-Ahnaf.
The Prophet responded to Musaylimah’s false claim of prophethood with a letter that commenced with the invocation, “In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful.” The letter, attributed to Muhammad, the Messenger of God, extended greetings of peace to those who followed the path of guidance. Following the death of the Prophet, Musaylimah persisted in asserting his deceptive prophetic pretense until his eventual defeat during the caliphate of Abu Bakr.

According to certain accounts, a woman named Sahjah, renowned for her prophecies in the Tamim region, joined forces with Musaylimah to counter the influence of the Prophet. Their collaboration reportedly involved a matrimonial alliance, with one of the agreed-upon terms being the abandonment of the Asr prayer by Sahjah’s followers. Notably, a group within the region continued to refrain from performing the Asr prayer even until the time of Abu al-Faraj al-Isfahani, considering it as part of their symbolic “dowry.”

**Third: Tulaiha bin Khuwailed Al-Asadi**

During the lifetime of the Prophet, Musaylimah, the self-proclaimed prophet, emerged and garnered support from many members of the Asad tribe. It is believed that he even participated in the Battle of Yamama alongside the polytheists, leading his own faction. Musaylimah and his followers faced significant opposition, and he narrowly escaped death during the conflict. However, his survival seemingly intensified his audacity. Following the death of the Prophet, Musaylimah continued to assert his claim to prophethood, until his eventual defeat during the caliphate of Abu Bakr.

These false prophets during the Prophet’s era likely posed a perceived threat to the future of the Islamic state and its legal system. Hence, it became imperative for the Prophet to ensure the continuity and security of his state, which was founded on divine law.

---

228 Ibn al-Jawzi: Al-Muntazam vol. 4, p. 22.
232 Al-Qurani: A New Reading of the Wars of Apostasy, pp. 135-220.
233 Abu Al-Faraj Al-Isfahani: Al-Aghani, vol. 21, p. 25.
238 Al-Baytar: The Wars of Apostasy, p. 16.
239 Al-Qurani: A New Reading of the Wars of Apostasy, pp. 41-98.
Conclusion

In summary, it can be concluded that the Prophet (may God bless him and his Household) laid the groundwork for the continuity of his law after his demise through the concept of Imamate. The significance of Imamate, as emphasized by the Prophet, lies in its role as a divinely appointed leadership after prophethood.

Prophethood and Imamate are two interconnected principles that are ordained by God Almighty. Just as God selects the Prophet, He also chooses the Imam. The Prophet, being infallible, was safeguarded from errors in his rulings, ensuring that his words and actions were based on divine revelation. Najm: 3-4 Whether it came through direct communication with God, as in the case of the Prophet’s ascent, or through sources like the Qur’an, holy hadiths, Gabriel, angels, visions, or inspirations, everything that emanated from the Prophet was considered a form of revelation.240 241

In the teachings of the Ahlulbait, the Prophet served not only as a simple messenger but also as an explainer of the Sharia, providing a deeper understanding of its meaning and implications. After his passing, this responsibility was transferred to the infallible Imam, who was chosen by God prior to their birth. This concept is supported by various sources, such as the verse of guardianship,242 the verse of purification (ayah al-tatheer)243, hadiths referring to the status of the Ahlulbait*244 245, the event of Ghadir Khumm**,246 247 the Hadith of Thaqalain**248 249 250.

242 Referring to the following verse: “Your ally is none but Allah and [therefore] His Messenger and those who have believed - those who establish prayer and give zakah while bowing. And whoever is an ally of Allah and His Messenger and those who have believed - indeed, the party of Allah - they will be the predominant.” Surah Al-Ma’idah, verses 55-56.
246 Ibn Hanbal: Musnad, vol. 5, p. 347. For further details on this hadith and its sources, refer to the comprehensive encyclopedia by Sheikh Al-Ameeni: Al-Ghadeer in eleven volumes.
* The statement of the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household) to Imam Ali (may Allah be pleased with him): “You are to me as Harun was to Musa, except that there is no Prophet after me.”
** This is a reference to the statement of the Prophet Muhammad on the day of Ghadir Khumm regarding Imam Ali: “Whoever I am his master, Ali is his master. O Allah, be a supporter of whoever supports him and an enemy of whoever opposes him. Support whoever supports him, and forsake whoever forsakes him, and guide the truth with him wherever he goes.”
the hadith of the bird, and others.

In essence, the Imamate represents the continuation of divine guidance and the preservation of the Prophet’s teachings and interpretations of the Sharia, ensuring that the Muslim community remains on the path of truth and righteousness.

Subsequently, the Imams continued to fulfill their role despite being deprived of political power. While assuming power may be one aspect of the Imam’s responsibility, the failure to do so does not invalidate their Imamate. Many prophets throughout history did not hold political authority, yet their status as prophets remained intact.

The Imams served as a point of reference for the Muslim community, including the caliphs themselves. Caliphs often sought guidance from the Imams, recognizing their knowledge and wisdom. For instance, Umar acknowledged the pivotal role of Ali, stating that without him, he would have faced perilous situations. Similarly, Muawiyah corresponded with Imam Hassan and sought his counsel, even reaching out to him on behalf of the Roman king. When faced with economic challenges, Abd al-Malik sought the assistance of Imam Sajad, who proposed a solution that liberated Islamic finance from external control. In another instance, the Abbasid ruler turned to Imam Hassan Al-Askari for help in addressing a Christian defiance issue.

262 Al-Shahid Al-Awwal: Al-Bayan, p. 185.
264 Al-Hurr Al-Amili: Wasa’il Al-Shi’a, vol. 9, p. 149.
265 Al-Najafi: Jawahir Al-Kalam, vol. 15, p. 177.
266 Al-Nasrallah: Dawr Al-Imam Zain al-Abidin (peace be upon him) fi Darb Al-Nuqud Al-Islamiyyah, pp. 331-349.
268 Al-Nasrallah: Masadirat Al-Haqq Al-Siyasi wal-Iqtisadi lil-Ahl Al-Bayt (peace be upon them), pp. 189-373.
269 Abu Al-Faraj Al-Isfahani: Maqtal Al-Talibiyin (all pages).

* Roasted bird meat was presented to the Prophet (peace be upon him and his Household), and he said, “O Allah, bring me the dearest of your creation to you who would share this bird with me.” Then Imam Ali came.
Historical accounts depict the harsh treatment that the Imams of Ahlulbait endured, including murder, imprisonment, and poisoning. These accounts emphasize the lack of sanctity attributed to Ahlulbait, as they lived under the authority of the caliphs, often confined in prisons or subjected to fatal actions. The narrative culminated in the house arrest of Imam Hadi and Imam Askari in Samarra, under the Abbasid caliphate. At the time of Imam Askari’s passing, his son, Imam Muhammad bin al-Hassan, known as Al-Mahdi, was merely five years old. The caliphate, supported by its juridical system, made various attempts to eliminate him but failed in their endeavors.

The belief in Mahdism, the Awaited Savior, is not exclusive to Islam but holds universal significance. According to this belief:

Firstly, the Awaited Savior is anticipated to be born towards the end of time, specifically from one of the branches of Banu Hashim, a lineage associated with the Prophet (may God bless him and his Household).

Secondly, it is believed that the actual birth of the Awaited Savior, Muhammad al-Mahdi, took place in the year 255 AH. However, he disappeared from public view in 260 AH due to prevailing injustice and oppression. It is believed that he is the son of Hasan al-Askari, who descends from a lineage tracing back to Ali bin Abi Talib, the cousin and son-in-law of the Prophet.

The nation, in this context, not only deprived Ahlulbait of their rightful position in interpreting and applying Islamic law but also infringed upon their basic right to life. The book *Maqatel Al-Talibeen* provides insight into this matter, highlighting the extent of this deprivation.

It is worth noting that the belief in the textual evidence supporting the Imamiyyah (Shi’a) perspective is not limited to their followers but has also been acknowledged by others. For example, the narration that suggests the Prophet commanded Abu Bakr to lead the people in prayer (if assumed to be authentic) has been considered by some as evidence of the Prophet’s preference for Abu Bakr. Additionally, the statement attributed to the Prophet that expresses his hypothetical choice of Abu Bakr as a friend also holds significance in this regard.

---

270 Al-Jawahiri: Al-Saqifah Wafdaka, p. 70.
271 Al-Muzaffar: Al-Saqifah, pp. 52-59.
272 Wat: Al-Madinah Al-Munawwarah, 29/9219.
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