

The normative Sunni position on Amir Muawiyah

Imam Ahmad Rida Khan Baraylawi

Fatawa Ridawiyyah 29:226

Translated by *Muhammad Aqdas Ridawi*

Issues 79 to 82

Sent by Abdul Jabbar Khan Tayyib, Dhampur, Bijnor

27th Rabi al-Awwal 1335AH

1. That person who stands against the rightful caliph and fights him, is he worthy of respect and honour? And will *Hadrat* and *rahmatullah alayh* or *radiyAllahu anhu* be said with his name, whether he's a sahabi or not?

2. Was Hadrat Amir Muawiyah a rebel and wrongful against Hadrat Ali رضي الله عنه or was it mistaken ijtihaad and his opinion was different and he wasn't ill intentioned or sinful? Please elaborate.

3. Can any person after RasulAllah ﷺ be equal or greater than any prophet? Or is it wajib to believe the

rank of Hadrat Ali is greater than the prophets of Banu Israyil? A person attempts to prove this by saying that Hadrat Ali answered a similar question by replying: 'understand, that Adam was elevated for eating wheat once and I have eaten it so much, etc.' Is this hadith sahih and mutawatir and is its result what this person derives?

4. Should we argue about whether Hadrat Ali is superior or inferior to the first three caliphs? Is this from the necessary beliefs of hanafis?

The reply

1. The aqidah of Ahlu's Sunnah is that respecting every companion is obligatory [fard] and reviling any one of them is forbidden [haram] and delving into their differences is prohibited. The hadith says [al-Mu'jam al-Kabir, #1472, 2:96]:

'When my companions are mentioned, then abstain [from argumentation and delving].'

Allah ta'ala is knower of the unseen and apparent. He divided the companions into two: believers before the Conquest [of Makkah] – those that spent in the way of Allah and did jihad before Fat'h Makkah – and believers

after the Conquest. Allah gave superiority to the former over the latter:

'Not equal among you are those who spent before the conquest [of Makkah] and fought [and those who did so after it]. Those are greater in degree than they who spent afterwards and fought.' [57:10]

And with it, Allah said: *'And to all Allah has promised the best reward.'* [57:10]

Both groups are promised goodness by Allah. And He closed the door of criticism towards them by saying: *'And Allah is well acquainted with what you do'* [57:10]. Meaning, He Knows whatever you will do yet He has promised good for you all, whether you are from *Sabiqin* [forerunners] or *Lahiqin* [latters]. And ask the Quran too what it says about those Allah has promised good for:

'Undoubtedly, those for whom Our promise of good has already gone forth, they have been kept away from hell. They will not hear the faintest sound of it and they will abide eternally in that which their souls desire. The Great Terror shall not grieve them and the angels will come to greet them (saying): that this is your Day, which you were promised.' [21:101-103]

After hearing this speech of its Lord that includes every companion, a true Muslim heart will never hold a bad opinion of any of them nor will it delve into their actions. Even if they did err, are you the judge or Allah?

Do you know more or Allah? *'Are you more knowing or is Allah?'* [2:140]. The Knower of hearts and true judge has decided: 'I know all your actions and have promised good for you.' After this, what scope is there for a Muslim to oppose this?

Certainly, Hadrat will be added for every companion and definitely, radiyAllahu ta'ala anhu will be said. Certainly honouring and respecting every one of them is obligatory, *'even if the criminals disliked it.'* [8:8]

2. The answer to this has been clarified in the first answer. Without doubt, his error was an error of judgement [khata ijthadi] and to deem him sinful for it is against the above words of Allah.

3. There is consensus [ijma'a] of Muslims that a non-prophet can never be equal to a prophet. Whoever considers a non-prophet equal or greater than a prophet is an apostate [murtadd] by consensus. Never mind being wajib, to consider Mawla Ali [Allah ennoble his countenance] to be superior or equal to prophets of *Banu Israyil* or any prophet is pure kufr. The accursed anecdote quoted is laughable: if eating wheat is proof of superiority, then Mawla Ali didn't eat as much wheat as Zayd and Amr today. The diet of that king of the saintly realm [Mawla Ali], in obedience to RasulAllah ﷺ, was barley; and that too not a stomach full. Whereas Zayd and Amr, day and night, consume wheat. So they then, Allah forbid, are superior to both Adam 'alayhis salam and Mawla Ali. Such corrupt anecdotes are quoted only to indulge in gluttony.

4. This isn't only against hanafis, it is against the beliefs of all Ahlu's Sunnah. According to Ahlu's Sunnah, after the prophets 'alayhim assalam – the most superior amongst the first and the last is commander of the faithful, our master Abu Bakr Siddiq and then commander of the faithful, our master Umar رضي الله عنهما.

And Allah ta'ala knows best.