

Legitimacy Claims of Shī'a and Falsification of Sirah

Şia'nın Meşruiyet İddiaları ve Siyer'in Tahrifi

Mustafa Köse

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, KSÜ İlahiyat Fakültesi, İslam Mezhepler Tarihi Ana Bilim Dalı
Assist. Prof., KSU Faculty of Theology, Department of History of Islamic Sects
Kahramanmaraş / Turkey
mustafakose@ksu.edu.tr
orcid.org/0000-0002-1197-5319

Makale Bilgisi / Article Information

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi / **Article Type:** Research Article
Geliş Tarihi: 22 Ekim 2020 / **Date Received:** 22 October 2020
Kabul Tarihi: 25 Kasım 2020 / **Date Accepted:** 25 November 2020
Yayın Tarihi: 1 Ocak 2021 / **Date Published:** 1 January 2021
Yayın Sezonu: Ocak 2021 / **Pub Date Season:** January 2021

Atıf: Köse, Mustafa. "Legitimacy Claims of Shī'a and Falsification of Sirah". *Akademik Siyer Dergisi* 3 (Ocak 2021), 43-65.

Citation: Köse, Mustafa. "Legitimacy Claims of Shī'a and Falsification of Sirah". *Journal of Academic Sirah* 3 (January 2021), 43-65.
<https://doi.org/10.47169/samer.815127>

İntihal: Bu makale, iTenticate yazılımınca taranmıştır. İntihal tespit edilmemiştir.

Plagiarism: This article has been scanned by iTenticate. No plagiarism detected.

web: <http://dergipark.gov.tr/samer> **e-mail:** akademiksiyerdergisi@ksu.edu.tr

Copyright © Published by KSÜ Siyer-i Nebi Araştırmaları Uygulama ve Araştırma Merkezi
KSU Sirah Researches Application and Research Center
Kahramanmaraş 46100 Turkey

Bütün hakları saklıdır. / All right reserved.

Abstract

The first divisions and conflicts in the Islāmic world were experienced in the political field. Political debates around the concepts of imāmate/caliphate determined the direction of the divergences in Islāmic thought. As a basic feature of eastern societies where the politics are intertwined with the religious, the debates brought a religious separation. Shi'ism, which is at the center of these debates that lead to the transformation of 'Alī into a superhuman figure, can be regarded as a typical example of the charismatic leadership mentality. Shi'ism put forward some rational and transmissible evidence in order to impose the authority of the people it named as imāms in determining the religious/political. A typical example of the use of religion in line with legitimacy claims was experienced around the proof of the imāmate of 'Alī. It can be said that the meanings of verses and hadiths have been distorted, taken out of context and reconstructed within the framework of current problems. Shī'a preferred to accept 'Alī as an imām since the first years of Islām in order to defend its claims. In this article, the way of evaluating some historical events that can be considered as an example of this approach of Shi'ism within the framework of allegations of imāmate is discussed. These allegations have been tried to be criticized based on the first history and Hadith sources. In here, historical obstacles to the political re-design of the past have been put forward. In this sense, the opinions of neither Shī'a nor Sunnī authorities were taken into the center.

Keywords: Sirah, History of Islamic Sects, Legitimacy, Shī'a, Imāmate.

Öz

İslām dünyasındaki ilk ayrışma ve ihtilaflar siyasi sahada yaşanmıştır. İmamet/hilafet kavramları etrafında sürdürülen siyasi tartışmalar İslām düşüncesindeki ayrışmaların yönünü de belirlemiştir. Siyasi olanın dini olan ile iç içe olduğu doğu toplumlarının temel bir özelliği olarak tartışmalar dini bir ayrışmayı da beraberinde getirmiştir. Hz. Ali'nin beşer üstü bir figüre dönüştürülmesine kadar götürülen bu tartışmaların merkezindeki Şiilik, karizmatik liderci zihniyetin tipik bir örneği olarak kabul edilebilir. Şiilik, dini/siyasi olanı belirleme noktasında imam olarak isimlendirdiği kişilerin otoritesini kabul ettirebilmek için akli ve nakli birtakım deliller ileri sürmüştür. Dinin meşruiyet iddiaları doğrultusunda kullanılmasının tipik bir örneği Hz. Ali'nin imametinin ispatı etrafında yaşanmıştır. Ayet ve hadislerin manalarının tahrif edildiği, bağlamından koparıldığı ve güncel sorunlar çerçevesinde yeniden kurgulandığı söylenebilir. Şia, kendi iddialarını savunma adına Hz. Ali'yi İslām'ın ilk yıllarından itibaren imam olarak kabul etmeyi tercih etmiştir. Bu makalede Şiiliğin bu yaklaşımına örnek olarak kabul edilebilecek bir takım tarihi olayların imamet iddiaları çerçevesinde nasıl değerlendirildiği ele alınmıştır. Söz konusu iddialar ilk tarih ve hadis kaynaklarından hareketle kritik edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Burada geçmişin siyasi amaçla yeniden dizayn edilmesinin önündeki tarihsel engeller ortaya konulmuştur. Bu manada ne Şii ne de Sünni otoritelerin görüşleri merkeze alınmamıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Siyer, İslām Mezhepleri Tarihi, Meşruiyet, Şia, İmamet.

1. IMĀMATE IN TERMS OF SHI'ISM

Shi'ism has been a leader and charisma-oriented movement. In the second century of the Hijrī, Dırār b. 'Amr said "when the rumors differed, the conflicts increased and the Muslims opposed each other and provoked them," They imitated the individuals (whom they saw as leaders). They decided that guidance was subject to them, seeing what they see good as good and bad as bad.¹ These sentences are remarkable in terms of showing the orientation of Shī'a.

For the first time after the Prophet,² Muslims disagreed about imāmate,³ and imāmate was at the root of the Shi'ī-Sunnī divide in Islāmic thought.⁴ Shi'ism agreed that a religious/political guide is ultimately necessary, regardless of whether it is called as imām or caliph.⁵ They accept that reason alone is not enough for the realization and obligation of religious goals. According to Shī'a, who sees a spiritual leader/imām necessary, one cannot even imagine a moment in life without an imām.⁶ Therefore, according to Imāmi thinkers, one of the last two people in the world must be an imām to the other.⁷ For this purpose, they draw attention to the distinction between prophet and rasul they adopt and the need for a prophet for the implementation of shari'ah.⁸

Sunnism, in which it positions itself as the opponent of the Shi'ite identity, agrees with them on the necessity of an imāmate. However, they differ as to whether the imāmate is by election or appointment. While the Sunnī theory emphasized the choice of the ummah,⁹ Shi'ism claimed that

-
- ¹ Dırār b. Amr, *Kitābu't-Tahrîş*, ed. Hüseyin Hansu, trans. Mehmet Keskin (İstanbul: Litera Pub., 2014), 137-139.
- ² According to Shi'ah scholars, the discussion also includes the pre-death period. See Kummî - Nevbahtî, *Şiî Fırkalar Kitābu'l-Makâlât ve'l-Fırak Fıraku's-Şia*, trans. Hasan Onat etc. (Ankara: Ankara Okulu Pub., 2004), 49.
- ³ Ebû'l-Hasen el-Eş'ârî (d. 324/936), *İlk Dönem İslam Mezhepleri Makâlâtü'l-İslâmiyyîn ve İhtilafu'l-Musallîn*, trans. Mehmet Dalkılıç-Ömer Aydın (İstanbul: Kabalcı Pub., 2005), 27. For different opinions about the divergence on Imāmate issue see Abdulkâhir b. Tâhir b. Muhammed el-Bağdâdî (d. 429/1037), *Mezhepler Arasındaki Farklar*, trans. Ethem Ruhi Fıglalı (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Pub., 2008), 16; Ebu'l-Feth Muhammed b. Abdulkerim eş-Şehristânî (d. 548/1153), *el-Milel ve'n-Nihal*, trans. Mustafa Öz (İstanbul: Litera Pub., 2008), 25-29, 35.
- ⁴ Ahmet el Katip, *Nedenleri Tarihte Kalmış Siyasi Ayrılık: Sünnilik-Şiilik*, trans. Muharrem Tan (İstanbul: Mana Pub., 2009), 26-31.
- ⁵ There are thinkers who try to distinguish between Imāmate and Caliphate. See Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı, *Tarih Boyunca İslâm Mezhepleri ve Şiîlik*, İstanbul: Derin Pub., 2011, 309; Ali Şeriatî, *Ali Şiası Safevî Şiası*, trans. Feyzullah Artinli (İstanbul: Yöneliş Pub. 1990), 80-81. It can be said that the Shi'ites preferred the concept of imām more because of the identity of the caliph in the early period.
- ⁶ Abū al-Ḥasan Ali b. Ḥusayn b. Bābawayh al-Qummî (d. 329/941), *al-Imāmah wa-t-tabşirah al-khayrah* (Qom: Madrasah al-Imām al-Mahdî, 1404/1363), 25-32; Shaykh Mufid (d. 413/1022), *Awāil al-maqālāt*, ed. İbrāhim al-Anşārî (Qom: Mihr Pub., 1413/1993), 39.
- ⁷ Eş'ârî, *Makâlâtü'l-İslâmiyyîn ve İhtilafu'l-Musallîn*, 331; Kummî - Nevbahtî, *Şiî Fırkalar Kitābu'l-Makâlât ve'l-Fırak Fıraku's-Şia*, 243, 264.
- ⁸ Shaykh Mufid, *Awāil al-maqālāt*, 44-45.
- ⁹ Kummî - Nevbahtî, *Şiî Fırkalar Kitābu'l-Makâlât ve'l-Fırak Fıraku's-Şia*, 52. Ibn Ḥazm primarily pointed to the covenant of the ummah, but later the Prophet chose Abū Bakr as the imām of prayer in a way that was incompatible with this. And on the basis of some rumors, he did not act differently from Shī'a, which he criticized his ideas about the imām. See Ibn Hazm (d. 1064), *el-Fasl Dinler ve Mezhepler Tarihi*, trans. Halil İbrahim Bulut (İstanbul: TYEK Pub., 2017), 3/216-220; Eş'ârî, *Makâlâtü'l-İslâmiyyîn ve İhtilafu'l-Musallîn*, 328, 330.

this could be done by the determination of the Prophet, that is, Allāh.¹⁰ Accordingly, imāmate is a basic principle that should be defended just like prophethood. Not knowing the Imām means not knowing the prophet.

Shi‘ism considered it a religious requirement to bring people under an innocent authority. According to Ibn Shahrashūb, who interprets the 30th verse of the Sūrah al-Baqarah, Allāh said that he would create a caliph before the creatures.¹¹ According to a hadith that points to hierarchy, Allāh made Ibrāhīm a servant, prophet, apostle, friend and imām. Then, when he said, “I will make you an imām for all people” Ibrāhīm asked the state of his generation, and Allāh said, “The brutals cannot reach my word”.¹² With these approaches, Shī‘a basically thinks of gathering people under a certain divine authority.

The Shi‘ites, who did not accept the demilitarization/routinization of authority, solved the task of ruling Muslims by accepting a group of relatives (Ahl al-Bayt), which had a spiritual authority over all others, as the sole authority.¹³ According to this, Muḥammad’s charisma/spiritual power passed to ‘Alī because he had no son. ‘Alī’s light was created 14.000 years before Adam was created.¹⁴ According to this theory, which accepts an uninterrupted and innocent relationship between the first man/prophet and imāms, the religious position of Abū Ṭālib and Āminah bint Wahb, which is not accepted by most scholars, is also considered in this sentence.¹⁵

The rationalism of the Mu‘tazilah the Shī‘a authority saw the legitimacy of the authority in maintaining the charisma of the Messenger of Allāh against the traditionalism of hadith supporters. They have defended this with the idea of testament. Accordingly, Shi‘ism is a sect that existed in the time of the Prophet. There are two types of Shi‘ism: the spiritual Shi‘ism in the life of the Prophet and the political Shi‘ism formed by the election of Abū Bakr as the caliph.¹⁶

¹⁰ See, Ayətullah əl-Üzma Hacı Şeyx Hüseyin Vəhid, *Usulid’dinlə Tanışlıq* (s.l.: Baqirul-Ülum Medresesi, n.d.), 102. Also see Ibn Hazm, *al-Fasl*, 3/168-169.

¹¹ ‘Abdullāh Fayyāz, *Tārīkh al-Imāmiyyah wa aslāfuhum min al-Shī‘a* (Baghdad: Es‘ad Pub., 1970), 131-132.

¹² Muḥammad Hūsayn al-Ṭabaṭabāi, *al-Mīdhān fī tafsīr al-Qur‘ān*, profreader Hūsayn al-A‘lemī (Beirut: Muassasah al-A‘lamī li-l-Maṭbū‘āt, 1417/1997), 1/272-274.

¹³ Charles Lindholm, *İslām Toplumlarında Gelenek ve Değişim*, trans. Nihal Çelik etc. (Ankara: Elips Pub., 2004), 119; Allama Tabatabāi, *Tüm Boyutlarıyla İslām’da Şī‘a*, trans. Kadir Akaras-Abbas Akyüz (İstanbul: Kevser Pub., 2009), 28.

¹⁴ Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241/855), *Faḍāil al-şahābah*, ed. Waşıyyullāh Muḥammad ‘Abbās (Beirut: Muassasah al-Risālah, 1403/1983), 2/662; Murtaḍā al-Ḥusaynī Firūzābādī, *Faḍāil al-khamsah min al-şihāh al-sittah* (Qom: Menshūrātu Firūzābādī, 1424), 1/203 etc.

¹⁵ Shaykh Mufid, *Awāil al-maqālāt*, 46. According to a rumor from Ibn ‘Abbās, the Prophet equated the innocence of Alī with the innocence of himself and Allāh. See Shaykh Şadūq, Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b.‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. Mūsā b. Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381/991), *Man lā yahzuruh al-faqīh*, profreader Hūsayn al-A‘lamī (Beirut: Muassasah al-A‘lemī, 1406/1986), 3/136.

¹⁶ Fayyāz, *Tārīkh al-Imāmiyyah wa aslāfuhum min al-Shī‘a*, 44; Hüseyin Atay, *Ehl-i Sünnet ve Şī‘a* (Ankara: AÜİF Pub., n.d.), 18. Shī‘a scholars accepts that Alī’s imāmate lasted for thirty-years and his caliphate lasted for four years and nine months. See Fayyāz, *Tārīkh al-Imāmiyyah wa aslāfuhum min al-Shī‘a*, 41.

Shī'a accepts that the meaning of 'Alī's imāmate/caliphate is based on a secret or open testament.¹⁷ Sect thinkers, who argue that the testament has continued since Adam, did not hesitate to use Islāmic law to defend the imāmate, which is actually a religious issue. Using the testament of all the prophets to the next one as evidence, Shī'a argued that the Prophet also bequeathed 'Alī.¹⁸ According to them, this job cannot belong to anyone other than the sons of 'Alī except in cases of persecution and dishonesty. Shi'ism faced a partial disagreement on whether bequeath of 'Alī's is by name or by virtue. While Imāmiyyah argued that the testament of the imām (not by implication)¹⁹ was uninterrupted in himself and after the Prophet,²⁰ Zaydism emphasized the qualities he had. They permitted the imāmate of the less virtuous (maḥḍūl) and thus harmonized their ideas with historical realities. In addition, Zaydism splitted from the Imāmiyyah by accepting that imāms were not innocent.²¹ In all these approaches, it has been maṣlaḥah (considering the public benefit) that determined Shī'a thought. Therefore, the benefit of the general public cannot be left to the choice of a certain segment.

In terms of Imāmiyyah, which we can accept as the main element of today's Shi'ism, imāmate is accepted within the style of religion.²² According to Qummī, one of the principles that the Prophet should convey is custody.²³ Imāmate is considered as the continuation or even the second front of prophethood. Because the imām, who will fill the world with justice, is the basic basis on which religious principles are also based. The earth can only be regulated by an imām, and anyone who dies without knowing such a person has died in Jāhiliyyah. The community of believers has to believe in the imāmate of the person who is accepted as "owner of time", just like tevhid (monotheism), nubuvvah (prophethood) and maād (eschatology).²⁴

Imāmiyyah argued that the knowledge of imāms was of divine origin. Later, divine knowledge was sent down from the sky to the Prophets and finally to his family (Ahl al-Bayt).²⁵ In this context, the holy period, which is referred to as "the period of nass", started with the Prophet and continued until the disappearance (ghaybah) of the twelfth imām.²⁶ The knowledge of the

¹⁷ Qummī, *al-Imāmah wa-t-tabṣīrah al-khayrah*, 1-2. Also see Yaşar Kutluay, *Tarihte ve Günümüzde İslâm Mezhepleri* (İstanbul: Pınar Pub., 2003), 105; Saffet Sarıkaya, *İslâm Düşünce Tarihinde Mezhepler* (İstanbul: Rağbet Pub., 2011), 148-149.

¹⁸ Qummī, *al-Imāmah wa-t-tabṣīrah al-khayrah*, 1-2, 16, 21; Shaykh Şadūq, *Man lā yahzuruh al-faqīh*, 3/132-134. For a detailed testament of the Messenger of Allāh to 'Alī, See Shaykh Şadūq, *Man lā yahzuruh al-faqīh*, 3/258 etc.

¹⁹ Shaykh Mufid, *Awāil al-maqālāt*, 40-41; Eş'ârî, *Makâlâtü'l-İslâmiyyîn ve İhtilafu'l-Musallîn*, 330; Şehristânî, *el-Milel ve'n-Nihal*, 38-39, 135, 147. Also see Atay, *Ehl-i Sünnet ve Şîa*, 109.

²⁰ Shaykh Mufid, *Awāil al-maqālāt*, 35.

²¹ Shaykh Mufid, *Awāil al-maqālāt*, 39.

²² Qummī, *al-Imāmah wa-t-tabṣīrah al-khayrah*, 15; Shaykh Mufid, *Awāil al-maqālāt*, 35.

²³ Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī b. İbrāhīm al-Qummī, *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, ed. Muassasah al-Imām al-Mahdī (Qom, s.n., 1435), 3/1164, 2/738.

²⁴ Mazlum Uyar, *İmamiyye Şîasında Düşünce Ekolleri: Ahbârîlik* (İstanbul: Ayışığı Kitapları, 2000), 20. Also see Qummī, *al-Imāmah wa-t-tabṣīrah al-khayrah*, 2/82-83.

²⁵ Qummī, *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, 1/22-23.

²⁶ See Gölpinarlı, *Tarih Boyunca İslâm Mezhepleri ve Şîilik*, 307; Uyar, *İmamiyye Şîasında Düşünce Ekolleri: Ahbârîlik*, 17.

Imām is based on the Book and the Sunnah as it is based on the Prophet.²⁷ According to the Shī'a scholars who made comparisons regarding the limits of the knowledge of the imāms, the knowledge of an imām is superior to other prophets, if not from the Prophet Moḥammad.²⁸

The imāmate theory of Shi'ism, which we tried to summarize, was supported by reason, book²⁹ and sunnah. The first two are not related to the subject of this study. Third, the Shī'a claims surrounding it are related to the reinterpretation of history/sier from the perspective of a certain historical period. For, just as human beings were included in history not only as perpetrators but also as storytellers,³⁰ Shī'a has also been included in history. Throughout history, they have tried to maintain a systematic propaganda over certain rumors that do not agree with the facts.³¹ The rumors in question and the discussions around them cannot be understood without taking into account the theoretical framework of the imāmate theory.

1.1. Indhār/Dār Narrative³²

The narration in question is called indhār because it means warning and dār because it takes place at home. According to this, the Prophet was assigned to convey his religion to the people around him for the first time with verse "And admonish thy nearest kinsmen, and lower thy wing to the Believers who follow thee. Then if they disobey thee, say: "I am free (of responsibility) for what ye do!"³³ and "So proclaim what you have been commanded, and turn away from the polytheists."³⁴

According to historical sources, the Messenger of Allāh probably gathered the sons of 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib at a dinner in his house in accordance with the divine order.³⁵ In Ibn Ishāq (d. 151/768) version of the narrative, it is told that sheep are sacrificed each time (twice in total) for dinner, plenty of ayran is prepared and water is brought in a large bowl. In addition, neither 'Alī nor his

²⁷ Muḥammad Baqır al-Şadr, *al-Ma'ālim al-Jadīdah li-l-usūl* (Beirut: Dār al-Ta'āruf li-l-Matbū'āt, 1410/1989), 61.

²⁸ See Shaykh Mufīd, *Awā'il al-maqālāt*, 71; Muḥammad Bāqır al-Majlisī (d. 1110/1689), *Biḥār al-anwār al-jāmi'ah li-durari akhbār al-aimmah al-aṭkhār* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 1983/1403), 38/1 etc.

²⁹ What is meant by the book is either the apparent / first meaning of the verses or the meanings interpreted by innocent imāms. See Muḥammad al-Marī al-Amin al-Antākī (d. 1383), *li-Mādhā akhtartu madhhab al-Shī'a madhhab Ahl al-Bayt*, ed. 'Abd al-Karīm al-'Uqaylī (Qom: al-I'lām al-Islāmī, 1417), 79. The claim that what is meant in verse 31 of Sūrah al-Qiyāmah, "He neither confirmed nor supported the Prophet" is Muāwiyah, Muḡhirah b. Shu'bah and Abū Mūsā al-Ash'ārī, who refused to swear allegiance to 'Alī in Ghadīr Khumm, is just one example of nassa. See Qummī, *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, 3/1159-1160.

³⁰ See Michel - Rolph Trouillot, *Geçmiş Susturmak Tarihin Üretilmesi ve İktidar*, trans. Sezai Ozan Zeybek (İstanbul: İthaki Pub., 2015), 29.

³¹ Montgomery Watt, *İslām Düşüncesinin Teşekkül Devri*, trans. Ethem Ruhi Fığlalı (Ankara: Sarkaç Pub., 2010), 51.

³² It is quoted as Dār/Inzār in Shī'a sources. See Anṭākī, *li-Mādhā akhtartu madhhaba al-Shī'a madhhaba Ahl al-Bayt*, 193.

³³ al-Shu'arā', 26/214-216.

³⁴ al-Hijr, 15/94.

³⁵ For the information that the invitation was at the house of his uncle, Abū Ṭalīb, See Gölpınarlı, *Tarih Boyunca İslām Mezhepleri ve Şi'lik*, 32; Cahit Külekçi, "Tarihin Araçsallaştırılmasında İmāmiyye Örneği", *Din Algısı İnşasında Tarihin Araçsallaştırılması*, ed. Adnan Demircan (İstanbul: Mana Pub., 2019), 177. It is also stated in the narrations that the dinner is on Safa hill or in Abṭah. See Şaban Öz, *Mevzû Haberlerin Tarihi Değeri* (İstanbul: Neva Pub., 2016), 79.

merits are mentioned.³⁶ Likewise, Ibn Hishām (d. 218/833) was content with giving verses about this incident that occurred in the third year of the prophethood and did not mention any details about the dinner.³⁷

According to Ibn Sa'd's report, the meal that 'Alī brought with the order of the Prophet was actually enough for one person. But from this sippet, exactly forty people ate, and they were all full. Later, on his order, he brought only enough water for one person, and everyone drank this water to the fullest. When Abū Lahab considered this incident as magic, the group dissolved. At the second meeting a few days later, after the dinner, the Messenger of Allāh said, "Who will obey me as a vizier in return for being my brother and paradise?" 'Alī said, "Me, O Messenger of Allāh!" Then everyone was silent and the Messenger of Allāh said, "O Abū Ṭālib, don't see your son?", Abū Ṭālib said, "Leave him! He only gets good from his uncle's son."³⁸

In the narrative in Ṭabarī, the Prophet first shied away from the reactions that might occur when the verse came, but then he collected them because he was warned as, "O Prophet! Communicate what has been sent down to you from your Lord! If you do not do this, you will not be the emissary of your Lord."³⁹ It is also stated that, at the end of the meal, he said, "Behold this is my brother, guardian and caliph, listen and obey him." However, very strikingly, a group of people who stepped in at this point in the narrative laughed at Abū Ṭālib saying, "(Muḥammad) Orders you to listen to your son and obey him." In another rumor, 'Alī described the invitation given by the Messenger of Allāh when he was asked how he was the successor to his uncle's son, not his uncle. The Messenger of Allāh said, "Sons of Muṭṭalib! I have been sent specifically to you and to all people in general. You saw what happened. Who will swear allegiance to me as my brother, friend and heir?" Every time he said that, 'Alī came to the fore, the Messenger of Allāh put his hand on 'Alī's hand and said, "That's why I made my uncle son my heir, not my uncle."⁴⁰

As can be seen, the oldest version of the Indhār narration has turned from a plain narrative to a miracle of abundance, especially with 'Alī in the center, and has taken on a form that glorifies 'Alī by referring to his being a "vizier". Again, one of the interesting points here is that Abū Ṭālib, who died without believing prophet, saw Islām and standing next to the Prophet best for his son. In the narration in Ṭabarī, the fact that the Messenger of Allāh made his uncle's son, not his uncle 'Abbās inheritor, clearly reminds us of the 'Abbāsīd-Ṭālibī struggle happened at 'Abbāsīd Period and the government's pursuit of legitimacy. The story, in its current form, serves the purpose of the Ṭālibī family and justifies the claims of succession in the caliphate.

³⁶ Muḥammad b. Ishāq al-Muṭṭalibī (d. 151/768), *Kitāb al-Siyar wa-l-maghāzī*, ed. Suhayl Dhakkār (s.l.: Dār al-Fikr, 1398/1978), 145-146.

³⁷ Ibn Hishām (d. 218/833), *al-Sīrah al-nabawīyyah*, ed. Umar 'Abd al-Salām Tadmurī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Arabī, 1410/1990), 1/295-296.

³⁸ Muhammad b. Sa'd b. Menī el-Hāşimī el-Basrī (d. 230/845), *Kitābü't-Tabakāti'l-Kebîr*, trans. ed. Adnan Demircan, trans. Musa Kazım Yılmaz (İstanbul: Siyer Pub., n.d.), 1/174-175.

³⁹ al-Māidah: 5/67.

⁴⁰ Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923), *Tārīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, ed. Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl İbrāhīm (Eqypt: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1387/1967), 2: 320-322. Also see Qummī, *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, 1/254-255.

The incident of indhār has been approached by Shī'a authors from a different perspective within the framework of the political attitude of the school. According to Gölpinarlı, the banquet was repeated three times due to the obstacle of Abū Lahab each time.⁴¹ Actually, the knowledge of Abū Lahab's denial of the miracle or sabotaging the feast, which is not included in the first sources, seems to have been added to prevent the hate element and objection to the miracle. According to Ṭabaṭabāī, when the Messenger of Allāh said "whichever of you accepts my invitation first, is my guardian and vizier", 'Alī stood up before anyone else and accepted Islām. According to him, it is not possible for a Prophet to not protect the person who accepted his cause in this way at first and supported him throughout his life.⁴²

While the Messenger of Allāh was going to call on the allegiance to Islām and himself for example in Aqaba long after these dates, the invitation of the Makkan polytheists to obey a child who is only ten years old is not compatible with the general principles of the invitation and the principles of reason. What is tried to be accomplished by rule of thumb is nothing more than determining the imām/guardian/caliph of the future through people who are not yet considered believers.

Another point that should not be overlooked here is that a Prophet, whose most important duty is to preach religion -the troubles he suffered in the following years for this duty are historically fixed- refrains from doing his duty. The fact that the Shī'a imagination suspects the institution of Prophethood just to highlight 'Alī and prove the belief of imām⁴³ can be explained only by sectarian bias. This is such a zealous effort that 'Alī did not speak out this task, which was entrusted to him in his childhood, even once during the period of the first three caliphs. In addition, the fact that this issue was not referred to at the meeting in the canopy of Banī Sā'idah must be the clearest proof that such acceptance is not yet in minds.

After all this, the following can be said: As the verses indicate, the Messenger of Allāh carried out an indhār activity. However, matters such as whether he organized a meal for this, whether this meal was a miracle of abundance and 'Alī's appointment as the caliph and guardian after the meal seem to have been built over time. At this point, the narration of Ṭabarī, which carries the typical reflections of the Shī'a imagination defending 'Alī's right to inheritance against his uncle 'Abbās, and Ibn Sa'd's narrative of an endless meal, although the Prophet is not yet poor, deserves the same degree of criticism.

Finally, here it is necessary to mention another narration about 'Alī's succession. According to this, it is reported that after the Migration, 'Alī bonded with the Prophet in Medina with a bond of brotherhood and this was expressed by the Prophet many times.⁴⁴ It is reported in Ibn Sa'd that the Rasulullah said to 'Alī, "You are my brother, you will be my successor and I will be your successor

⁴¹ Gölpinarlı, *Tarih Boyunca İslâm Mezhepleri ve Şiilik*, 32-33.

⁴² Tabatabâi, *Tüm Boyutlarıyla İslâm'da Şia*, 32-33. Also see Firūzābādī, *Faḍāil al-khamsah*, 1/380.

⁴³ Furāt b. İbrāhīm al-Kūfī, *Tafsīr al-Furāt al-Kūfī*, ed. Muḥammad al-Kāzım (Tahran: Muassasah Wizārah al-Thaqāfah wa-l-İrshād al-Islāmī, 1410/1990), 301.

⁴⁴ See Firūzābādī, *Faḍāil al-khamsah*, 1/370 etc. Also see Balādhurī, Aḥmed b. Yaḥya b. Jābir (d. 279/892-3), *Ansāb al-ashrāf*, ed. Suheyl Dhaqqār and etc. (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1417/1996), 2/378.

too" and this decree was removed after the verse about inheritance was revealed.⁴⁵ Obviously, it seems historically more reasonable to think that this is related to property, as it first comes to mind, since there is no statement as to whether the inheritance referred to here is about the imāmate.

1.2. Manzilah Narrative

The second narration, which we will present as an example of the historical abuses of the Shī'a, includes the words that the Messenger of Allāh told 'Alī, "Your position (status) is like the position of Hārūn next to Mūsā, however there is no prophet after me."⁴⁶ It is controversial that when the story was told. Shī'a has often tried to link this with Ghadīr Khumm. Because the narration of Ghadīr is more politically centralized and turned into a fiction suitable for political purposes. However, it is inevitable that this issue will encounter some objections.

Contrary to the Shi'ite claims in the aforementioned narrative, Hārūn did not undertake the rule of the Israelites after Mūsā. On the contrary, Joshua b. Nūn led them. In addition, it should be remembered that Abū Bakr, not 'Alī, undertook the leadership of the Muslims. It should also be remembered that 'Alī is not a prophet like Hārūn. What is meant by this word is that 'Alī has an important place next to the Prophet in terms of being a relative.

If we conclude the kalami evaluations here and touch on the different variants of the event and the reason why the hadith is said (reason of wurud), it will be seen how true our opinion is. However, as we will state below, Shī'a ignores that these words were spoken in another context in another time period.

First of all, it is noteworthy that the mentioned narration has three different variants. The first of these narrates the narration as part of a certain chain of events. According to this, the only war that 'Alī -who never broke his allegiance to the Messenger of Allāh, including the battle of Uḥud- did not participate in is the Expedition of Tabūk. The Prophet left him to proxy in his behalf in Madīnah and take care of his family while he was going to Tabūk expedition. It is stated that 'Alī, who was upset about this situation, was uncomfortable staying with women and children.⁴⁷ Probably this was due to the fact that some people who were jealous of 'Alī mocked him. As a matter of fact, he was saddened when he reached the words of the people who were not known, such as "the Prophet despised 'Alī"⁴⁸ and "The Prophet did not go out with him because he considered being with him hideous."⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Ibn Sa'd, *Kitābū't-Tabakāti'l-Kebīr*, 3/22. Also see Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-ashrāf*, 2/378.

⁴⁶ Firūzābādī, *Faḍāil al-khamsah*, 1/347 etc.

⁴⁷ Ibn Sa'd, *Kitābū't-Tabakāti'l-Kebīr*, 3/23; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Faḍāil al-ṣaḥābah*, 2/569, 592, 610; Abū 'Abdullāh Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl Bukhārī (d. 256/870), *al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. Muḥammad Zuhayr b. Naṣr (s.l.: Dār Ṭawq al-Najāh, 1422/2001), "Maghāzī", 78 (No. 4416); Abū al-Ḥusayn Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj Muslim (d. 261-875), *al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. Muḥammad Fu'ād 'Abd al-Bāqī (Cairo: s.n., 1374-75/1955-56), "Faḍāil al-ṣaḥābah", 2404; Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-ashrāf*, 2/349; Tirmidhī, "Manāqib", 20 (No. 3724).

⁴⁸ Ibn Hazm, *el-Fasl*, 3/174. Also see Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, 3/103-104; Firūzābādī, *Faḍāil al-khamsah*, 1/347-348, 353-354.

⁴⁹ Ibn Sa'd, *Kitābū't-Tabakāti'l-Kebīr*, 2/23-24. Also see Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-ashrāf*, 2/348.

In Ibn Hishām, the event is described differently and those who gossip are pointed out. The Messenger of Allāh left him with his family and told him the situation. However, when the hypocrites mocked, saying, “The Messenger of Allāh left him behind to humiliate and belittle him,” he could not stand it and grabbed his sword.⁵⁰ Despite all this, it is stated in the sources that ‘Alī wanted to be with the Messenger of Allāh⁵¹ and even cried.⁵² On the other hand, the Prophet reacted to the misunderstanding and to restore his dignity, to ‘Alī he said “Are you not willing to be in a position like Hārūn next to Mūsā? However, there is no prophet after me” and soften him. Thereupon, ‘Alī accepted this gesture, was satisfied⁵³ and returned with joy.⁵⁴ With this attitude, the Messenger of Allāh emphasized that just as Mūsā elected Hārūn, he also elected ‘Alī. However, it should not be forgotten that this kind of action was not happened for ‘Alī for the first time, and in the narratives in question, the Messenger of Allāh especially emphasized that “there is no prophet after me”. Therefore, privatization of a general situation, which has been done several times, about ‘Alī is only possible from the point of view of a political ideology.

In the second variant in the literature, it is reported that the Messenger of Allāh said, “Your position next to me is like Hārūn’s position next to Mūsā. However, there is no prophet (or prophethood in some narrations) after me.”⁵⁵ According to another remarkable rumor about ‘Alī’s position, the Messenger of Allāh stated that the prophethood was over after him and said “If it was not finished, it would be you.”⁵⁶ The narrations in question are, in this state, ambiguous and independent of time and place. It is thought that link of these narrations with the Tabūk Ghazvah, knowingly or unknowingly, were severed by the narrators. This paved the way for Shi‘ism to use this narrative for its own political purposes. In the last narration, which refers to the Messenger of Allāh establishing a bond of brotherhood between Muslims, the Prophet expressed his brotherhood (muākhāt) with ‘Alī and said, “You are from me, and I am from you. Your position next to me is like Hārūn’s position next to Mūsā.”⁵⁷ It can be said that this last narration is nothing more than a mixture of several different events.

1.3. Thaḡalayn Narrative

⁵⁰ Ibn Hishām, *al-Sīrah al-nabawīyah*, 4/159; Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, 3/104.

⁵¹ Abū Bakr ‘Abdurrazzāk b. Hammām al-Şan‘ānī (d. 211/826-827). *al-Muşannaḡ*, ed. Ḥabīburrāhmān al-A‘zamī (Beirut: Maktabah al-Islāmī, 1403), 5/405; Ibn Sa‘d, *Kitābū’t-Tabakāti’l-Kebīr*, 3/24; Aḡmad b. Ḥanbal, *Faḡāil al-Şaḡābah*, 2/567, 592.

⁵² Aḡmad b. Ḥanbal, *Faḡāil al-Şaḡābah*, 2/592, 682.

⁵³ See Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-ashraf*, 2/346; Ibn Mājah, *Sunan Ibn Mājah*, “Faḡāil Aşḡāb al-Nabī”, 6 (115); Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, 3/104; Ibn Hazm, *el-Fasl*, 3/174; Fīrūzābādī, *Faḡāil al-khamsah*, 1/351, 354-355. Ṭabarī did not mention this scene of joy. See Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, 3/104.

⁵⁴ Ibn Sa‘d, *Kitābū’t-Tabakāti’l-Kebīr*, 3/24.

⁵⁵ See Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-ashraf*, 2/350; Aḡmad b. Ḥanbal, *Faḡāil al-Şaḡābah*, 2/566, 568, 592, 598, 611, 633, 638, 642-643, 670; Bukhārī, “Faḡāil Aşḡāb al-Nabī”, 62 (No. 3706); Muslim, “Faḡāil al-Şaḡābah”, 2404 a/b; Tirmidhī, “Manāqib”, 50 (No. 3730-3731), Ibn Mājah, “Muḡaddimah” (No. 115, 121).

⁵⁶ Fīrūzābādī, *Faḡāil al-khamsah*, 1/439.

⁵⁷ Aḡmad b. Ḥanbal, *Faḡāil al-Şaḡābah*, 2/603, 786.

Thaqal is derived from the root th-q-l and means 'important thing that is protected and valued.'⁵⁸ The narratives that the Messenger of Allāh left two things (big and small⁵⁹)/thaqalayn (or amrayn,⁶⁰ khalīfatayn⁶¹) are frequently emphasized, especially in Shi'ism. The narration known as "Thaqalayn" in our sources and not included in the first period sier texts is included in the sier and hadith literature with different deeds. The narration, which is not in all of the hadith literature but reported with different meaning contents, is accepted as one of the most important evidence of imāmate in terms of Shī'a.

But what were the thing(s) that the Messenger of Allāh left as a religious guide, and what event in his life was it related to? It can be said that the answer to this question is actually different in terms of what believers understand about religion and how they evaluate it.

It is seen that the aforementioned narratives are gathered in three axes in general.⁶² The first of these is the narrative accepted by those who advocate a religious understanding centered on the Qur'an. Accordingly, the only thing that the ummah will not deviate from is the book of Allāh.⁶³ Although such a narrative interrupts the Shi'ite claims,⁶⁴ it must be accepted that completely biased (wrong) interpretations cannot be avoided. The fact that the only thing left is the Quran and the determination of religious thought by interpreting it, has been adopted by those who are based on reason rather than transmitting like Mu'tazilah/Ahl al-Ra'y.

Although there are abundant Ahl al-Bayt/'Itrah narration, which is based on Shi'ite claims in our sources, Sunnism, especially the supporters of Hadith, highlighted those who state that the inheritance is the Book and Sunnah. In this sense, Mālik b. Anas, Ibn Hishām, Wāqidī, Ibn Sa'd, Balādhurī, Ṭabarī and many other authors agree that the two heavy things left are the book of Allāh and the sunnah of the Messenger of Allāh. The Hudaybiyah Agreement and the Farewell Pilgrimage/'Arafah are shown as the place of utterance.⁶⁵

⁵⁸ Abū al-Faḍl Muḥammad b. Mukarram b. 'Alī al-Anṣārī Ibn Manẓūr (d. 711/1311), *Lisān al-Arab* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1414), 11/88.

⁵⁹ Qummī, *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, 1/21.

⁶⁰ Mālik b. Anas b. Mālik b. 'Amir al-Asbaḥī al-Madanī (d. 179/795), *al-Muwatta'*; ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Aẓamī (s.l.: Muassasah Zāyid b. Sulṭān al-Imārāt: 1425/2004), 5/1323. I. Mālik's characterization of the order draws attention to an emphasis on practice.

⁶¹ Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Faḍāil al-ṣaḥābah*, 2/603.

⁶² See Bünyamin Erul, *Sahabenin Sünnet Anlayışı* (Ankara: TDV Pub., 1999), 26-32.

⁶³ See Muslim, "Haj", 15 (No. 1218 a); Abū Dāwūd, "Kitāb al-Manāsik", 11 (No. 1905); Ibn Mājah, "Kitāb al-Manāsik", 25 (No. 84); al-Nisābūrī, Abū 'Abdullāh al-Ḥākim Muḥammad b. 'Abdullāh b. Muḥammad b. Ḥamdawayh b. Hakem (d. 405/1014), *al-Mustadrak alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, ed. Muṣṭafā 'Abd al-Qadīr 'Aṭā' (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Imiyyah, 1411/1990), 3/613.

⁶⁴ The narration in Nisābūrī only referred to the abandonment of the book of Allāh, and then the Messenger of Allāh stood up and holding 'Alī's hand, said "Whoever I am a friend with, 'Alī is his friend too." See Nisābūrī, *al-Mustadrak alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, 3/613. Also see Firūzābādī, *Faḍāil al-khamsah*, 1/201.

⁶⁵ For detailed information, see Mālik b. Anas, *el-Muwatta'*; "Qadar", 3; Ibn Hishām, *al-Sīrah al-nabawiyah*, 4/249; Wāqidī, Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. Wāqid (d. 207/823), *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*, ed. Marsden Jones (Beirut: 'Ālem al-Kutub, 1996), 2/579; Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, 3/151.

Third and lastly, some of the “Thaqalayn” narrations in Muslim and Tirmidhī were constructed exactly as the Shī’a mentality wanted. The incident took place in Ghadīr Khumm. Taking different narrations into his work, Muslim also drew a picture compatible with the ‘Abbāsīd political imagination regarding who the Ahl al-Bayt was. According to this, the relatives of the Prophet are the family of ‘Alī, ‘Akīl, Ja‘far and Abbās.⁶⁶

In addition to this approach, which only points to partial blood ties, another version of the narration also discussed the wives of the Messenger of Allāh. The solution was expressed by Zayd b. Arqam. The wives of the Prophet are not counted in the Ahl al-Bayt by mentioning that they could divorce and marry later, which has not happened in history. Here again, as if to prevent possible attacks on Ahl al-Bayt in the future, the Messenger of Allāh said, “I remind you of Allāh about my Ahl al-Bayt.” three times. Obviously, this narrative draws attention with its more sharing approach regarding the limits of the Ahl al-Bayt. From another point of view, the suspicion that the narrators confuse the events and add to the narrations, becomes stronger. In our opinion, it is problematic to consider this assignment as a mistake of him⁶⁷ and to defend it with the thesis that the Companions may not be innocent, based on the deed of the narrative that Zayd b. Arqam described the Ahl al-Bayt. Because, when we pay attention to the fiction of the text, a very clear reflection of the political imagination of the next period is encountered. The fact that the Companions are infallible is another matter, but here it is thought that our narrative culture should be seriously subjected to textual criticism.

In the narrative, the concept of Ahl al-Bayt appears to be the biggest problematic when one of the two Thaqals mentioned is considered “Ahl al-Bayt” or “‘Itrah”, Sunnah when it is considered “sunnah.”. Although the term sunnah gained in later ages is not our subject, Shī’a accepted the generation as Ehl-i Bayt. However, this approach did not prevent the Shī’a thought from confronting with some problems. In this sense, whether ‘Alī’s son Ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah, who is not from Fātimah, will be included in this group⁶⁸ or which of the grandchildren of Ḥasan-Ḥusayn, acting in opposition to each other, will be imām (Ismāīliyyah-Imāmiyyah),⁶⁹ are the most important problems. However, due to the clear vision of the ideology, a monolithic and innocent Ahl al-Bayt was assumed and religion continued to be based on it.

Some problems are ignored in this ideological approach of Shi‘ism regarding the past. That is to say, since the past is not a fixed reality, the information about the past is not fixed. Just like the past standing there, words and concepts as a more technical usage bear the political burden of the time. As Derrida put it, “no element, whether at the level of spoken discourse or written discourse, can only function as a sign without referring to another element that does not exist in itself.”⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Tirmidhī, “Manāqīb, 46 (No. 3786); Muslim, “Faḍā’il”, 44 (No. 2408 a); Gölpınarlı, *Tarih Boyunca İslâm Mezhepleri ve Şîlik*, 41-43. cf., Muslim, “Faḍā’il”, 44 (No. 2408 d).

⁶⁷ Adil Yavuz, “Ehl-i Sünnet’e Göre Ehl-i Beyt’in Konumu -Sekaleyn Hadisi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme”, *Marife* 5/3 (2005), 358.

⁶⁸ Qummī, *al-Imāmah wa-t-tabṣīrah al-khayrah*, 60.

⁶⁹ That is why Qummī has made a special heading that the imām will belong only to the sons of Ḥusayn, not to Ḥasan. See Qummī, *al-Imāmah wa-t-tabṣīrah al-khayrah*, 47 etc.

⁷⁰ Jacques Derrida, *Göstergebilim ve Gramatoloji*, trans. Tülin Akşin (İstanbul: Afa Pub., 1994), 49.

These residues that define the boundaries of language and surround the concepts must be reckoned with. In order to get out of the text and do this, it is necessary to get rid of the facts that impose themselves on the text and to settle accounts with them. With a deconstructive approach, the social matrix should be analyzed and the essence should be reached. Of course, our conclusions are also assumptions, but their manifestation as a result of certain intellectual processes will separate them from an ideological perspective.

Erul, who examined the different forms of the rumor in the first three centuries in seven parts, made the following evaluations about the attributions of the narrations: "As it is seen, the first four of these narrations are without isnads, mu'allaq, mu'dal; others are weak narrations according to the classical hadith method, since they are reported by weak or very weak narrators."⁷¹

Dölek, who does not agree with these evaluations regarding the isnad, claims that the narration was transmitted by more than twenty companions, taking into account the different isnads in the works that were later copied.⁷² According to Dölek, the narration is mutawatir (successive narration) in meaning. In addition to this, the author, who does not see any problem in using the allegations of the Shi'ites to prove himself, obviously does not seem to be very aware of the results of this approach. In addition, it is too certain to require explanation how a narration with different meanings can be mutawatir. However, the author, interestingly, was able to find a solution to the problem, believing that what was meant by 'itrah could be the sunnah transmitted from them.⁷³

Why was the Messenger of Allāh able to say different things in different places about the two principles on which religion will be built. If you try to find a solution to this question by talfiq (a proper integration of juristic opinions) among the different meanings expressed by the rumors, you may be consistent to some extent. However, this cannot be done and a critical approach to other narratives is ignored in order to accept the sunnah as one of the basic sources of religion.

Yavuz argues that the differences in words distort the meaning tawātur, but the section about embracing the book of Allāh can be an exception. Is it not possible for the Prophet to say the 'Kitābullāh' (The book of Allāh)- probably next to another group of people who came later - in the Farewell sermon, in addition to "the Sunnah of the Prophet" and to demand respect for the Ahl al-Bayt in Ghadīr Khumm besides Kitābullāh? Is the Prophet a cassette player that can say the same thing everywhere, never add something new?⁷⁴

Here it is necessary to say that the meaning meant by Ahl al-Bayt/'Itrah has put not only Sunnī scholars but also Shi'ites in a deadlock. Because if the word is taken absolutely, an entire lineage will be included in this scope. This will lead to greater religious dilemmas, such as accepting new authorities that cannot be agreed upon. However, in order to solve this issue, Imāmiyyah had to draw a narrow frame about the qualifications of those who are accepted as imāms. The following statement of Ibn Bābawayh indicates this: "The imāmate does not change,

⁷¹ Bünyamin Erul, "Hz. Peygamber'in Bize Biraktığı Miras", *Dinbilimleri* 7/1 (2007), 28.

⁷² Adem Dölek, "Sekaleyn Hadisi ve Değerlendirilmesi", *Marife* 4/3 (2004), 168.

⁷³ Dölek, "Sekaleyn Hadisi ve Değerlendirilmesi", 171.

⁷⁴ Yavuz, "Ehl-i Sünnet'e Göre Ehl-i Beyt'in Konumu -Sekaleyn Hadisi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme", 354-356.

the lineage is not cut, neither increases nor decreases in number (s)."⁷⁵ However, the divergence in the form of news-procedure proves us historically that new authority needs are inevitable. As a matter of fact, today walāyah al-faqīh theory has been legalized by maintaining the procedural systematic of thought.

On the other hand, Sunnism has to face a similar problem. Because if religion is reduced to two sources, this will confront us with other dilemmas. What will be the subject of comparison and, more importantly, *ijmā* (consensus or agreement of Islāmic scholars on a point of Islāmic law) in the hierarchy of norms? Moreover, we do not even talk about the contribution of *sharī'ah* evidence (*sadd adh-dharāi'*(obstructing hazards), *istiḥsān* (to consider something good), *istiṣlāḥ* (public interest) etc.) to *fiqh*. Therefore, it has to be questioned how much this approach, which puts *sunnah* at the center, is capable of representing all *Sunnī* thought. For, contrary to what is believed, according to this approach, the Messenger of Allāh did not leave us his mind and the common will of the *ummah* and the ability to solve problems.

In addition to the criticism of both *Sunnī* and *Shi'ite* perspectives from many points, the approach that only the *Qur'ān* is left to us based on the problem in the narratives, at first glance, does not solve any problem, although its rhetorical value is high. Because it is obvious that the text is not capable of speaking alone. Well-intentioned efforts in this direction will bring us face to face with bigger problems, contrary to popular belief. The multi-meaning/relativity that endless new texts will cause us to be confronted by the interpretation of the text will mean the evaporation of meaning.

The authenticity of the narration in question is suitable for us to be criticized from different angles. However, we think that the second heavy thing has been distorted by the influence of political concerns and restrictive perspectives on religion. It can be said that there is a consensus on the expression the book of Allāh as the common point of different narrations. However, it should not be forgotten that, contrary to what is believed, religious thought opened the door to intellectual confusion rather than unity.

1.4. Ghadīr Khumm Narrative

The Ghadīr Khumm event, which is accepted as one of the greatest holidays of *Shi'ism*,⁷⁶ is based on an event in both the *Shi'ite* and *Sunnī* literature. According to *Shi'ites*, the Prophet had to stop in accordance with the divine warning⁷⁷ when he came to this position, which was located on the old pilgrimage route and was not suitable for accommodation. The fact that this place, where there is a divine intervention in history from the perspective of the *Shi'ite* world, is located in a narrow passage devoid of trees and water has not been seen as a matter to be emphasized. However, we have to investigate the background of the events taking place on the human plane, even if divine, and to link the events with objective reasons.

⁷⁵ Qummī, *al-Imāmah wa-t-tabṣīrah al-khayrah*, 1.

⁷⁶ It was started to be celebrated as a holiday in A.H. 352 under the rule of Mu'izzuddawlah/Buwayhī. See Abū al-Fidā Ismā'īl b. Umār b. Kathīr (d. 774/1373), *al-Bidāyah wa-l-nihāyah*, ed. 'Abdullāh b. 'Abd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī (s.l. Dār Hijr, 1418/1998), 15/261.

⁷⁷ Māidah: 5/67.

It is also reported in Sunnī sources that the mentioned event took place in the mentioned place.⁷⁸ However, the narrative of Buraydah in Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal⁷⁹ as the cause of the incident provides us with enlightening information. This narrative does not carry divine emphasis, as the Shi'ites claim, and shows some humane situations.

Buraydah, who accompanied 'Alī in the Yaman campaign, pointed out that 'Alī was angry because of some of the events that took place here. According to Ibn Hishām, the incident started because the officer 'Alī left in his place dressed the soldiers who remained without his permission to wear clothes made of booty goods. Thinking that this was wrong, 'Alī had the clothes put back, but those who were not satisfied with the situation complained about 'Alī on the pilgrimage way. The Messenger of Allāh said that he would not be complained in the way of Allāh.⁸⁰ When the Messenger of Allāh learned about the adversities of a military and administrative officer assigned by him, he was impressed by the situation and asked Buraydah, "Don't you know that I am closer to the believers than their own?" He took 'Alī's hand⁸¹ after their acknowledgment by saying "yes", and wanted to express that the complaints were ultimately injured and made against him.

The Shi'ites, on the other hand, intend to see this event as the most important event in history, where 'Alī was at the center. Some Shī'a authors, on the other hand, referred to the rumor mentioned above as the reason for the incident, and mentioned the support of the Messenger of Allāh to 'Alī, but they did not dwell on the connection with the Ghadīr Khumm incident.⁸²

According to the rumors accepted by the Shi'ites, the Messenger of Allāh gathered the whole group together and performed the noon prayer with them and then communicated them the verse that was sent to him.⁸³ Later, he said, "Whoever I am his mawlā, 'Alī is also his mawlā."⁸⁴ "Whoever I am the prophet, this ('Alī) is their commander." Also later addressing 'Alī he said "'Alī! Your position next to me is like Hārūn's position next to Mūsā. It is obligatory to obey you after me." In the narration of Quleynī, the Prophet bequeathed to his ummah to commemorate his Ahl al-Bayt well, to make them a commander by putting them forward and not to prevent them.⁸⁵

⁷⁸ Nisābūrī, *al-Mustadrak alā al-Şaḥīḥayn*, 3/126.

⁷⁹ For detailed information, see Adnan Demircan, *Gadīr-i Hum Olayı* (İstanbul: Beyan Pub., 2014), 65 and etc.

⁸⁰ See Ibn Hishām, *al-Sirah al-nabawīyyah*, 4/344-345; Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, 3/149; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāyah wa-l-nihāyah*, 7/391-393.

⁸¹ Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Faḍāil al-şahābah*, 2/584; Nisābūrī, *al-Mustadrak alā al-Şaḥīḥayn*, 3/119. cf., Ibn Hishām, *al-Sirah al-nabawīyyah*, 4/248. Also see Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, 3/131-132, 149.

⁸² 'Abd al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad al-Amīnī al-Najafī, *al-Ghadīr fī al-kitāb wa-s-sunnah* (Beirut: Muassasah al-'Alemī li-l-Matbū'āt, 1414/1994), 1/441-442; Ali Şeriatī-Cafer Şehidī, *Sīret*, trans. Kerim Güney (İstanbul: Ayışığı Pub., 1991), 169.

⁸³ Ethem Ruhi Fiğlalı, "Gadīr-i Hum", *TDV İslām Ansiklopedisi*, (Accessed 17 Nisan 2020).

⁸⁴ Balādthurī, *Ansāb al-ashraf*, 2/355-356; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Faḍāil al-şahābah*, 2/598, 705; Ibn Mājah, Abū 'Abdullāh Muḥammad b. Yazīd al-Qazwīnī (d. 273/887), *Sunan İbn Mājah*, ed. Muḥammad Fuād 'Abd al-Bāqī (S.l.: Dār Ihyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabī-Faysal İsā al-Bāqī al-Ḥalabī, n.d.), "Muqaddimah", 121; Tirmidhī, Muḥammad b. İsā b. Thawrah b. Mūsā b. Ḍahhāk (d. 279/892), *al-Jāmi' al-kabīr*, ed. Bashshār 'Awwād Marūf (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1998, "Faḍl al-Nabī", 1 (3606); Qummī, *Tafsūr al-Qummī*, 1/255, 2/431; Nisābūrī, *al-Mustadrak alā al-Şaḥīḥayn*, 3/118, 613; 1/44; Ibn Taymiyyah, *Minhāj al-sunnah*, 7/51-52; Fīrūzābādī, *Faḍāil al-khamsah*, 1/399 etc.

⁸⁵ Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, 38/123-124.

There are parts in a narration of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal that confirms this. After quoting the words of the Messenger of Allāh, the narrator, who stepped in right at this point in the narrative, reported that ‘Umar told ‘Alī, “You are blessed, son of Abū Ṭālib! “You have become the guardian of every men and women believer.”⁸⁶

According to the Shi‘ites, the event referred to is also related to a group of hypocrites who assassinated the Prophet before. The Messenger of Allāh became aware of the assassination with Gabriel’s warning and scolded those people who made it strange to leave the imāmate to Ahl al-Bayt,⁸⁷ and some of the Companions became hypocrites as a result of the assassination. An important problem that arises regarding this narrative is the conceptualization of words. The Shi‘ites have conceptualized the word fellow/mawlā as a politico-religious leadership.⁸⁸ The concept of guardianship continued to be used in Sunnī thought, especially in cults. However, the technical use of the guardian, which means fellow, helps/assisted, protects/protected, as a political concept has been used by the Shi‘ites. They expressed political partiality/otherness in the form of tawallā/tabarrā.

Another rumor that Nīsāburī refrains from talking about its authenticity is important in terms of showing the political dimension gained by the event mentioned above. Stating that ‘Alī did not make mistakes in his views in this narration reported from Sa‘d b. Mālik, Sa‘d stated that he loved him more than anyone else because of the three things he was given. Sa‘d pointed out what happened in Ghadīr Khumm, and later reported that the Messenger of Allāh removed his uncle ‘Abbās and the others from his mosque. ‘Abbās objected to this situation by stating that he was also a relative, but the Messenger of Allāh said, “I did not remove you and I did not place him. Allāh brought you out and settled him in.”⁸⁹ This narrative also seems to be the work of a mind that contemplates eliminating the ‘Abbāsīd dynasty by humiliating it.

Another incident described in *Mustadrak* draws attention with its opposite content. According to the narrative in question, ‘Alī recalled the words of the Messenger of Allāh about him during the battle of Jamal and asked why Ṭalḥah b. ‘Ubeydullāh was still fighting him, and Ṭalḥah stated that he did not remember such a thing.⁹⁰

Placing the Ghadīr Khumm incident on the basis of its political/religious claims, Shi‘ism tried to justify itself by arguing that the known verse in Sūrah al-Mā’idah, which states that the religion is completed,⁹¹ was revealed as a divine seal as a result of these events.⁹² However, this is another

⁸⁶ See Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-ashrāf*, 2/356-357, 378; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Faḍāil al-ṣaḥābah*, 2/585, 596; Gölpınarlı, *Tarih Boyunca İslâm Mezhepleri ve Şiîlik*, 43. cf., Shaykh Şadūq, *Man lā yahzuruh al-faqīh*, 3/135.

⁸⁷ al-Tawbah 9/74.

⁸⁸ See Mustafa Öz, “Teberrī”, *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, (Accessed 28 Temmuz 2020).

⁸⁹ Nīsāburī, *al-Mustadrak alā al-Şaḥīḥayn*, 3/126.

⁹⁰ Nīsāburī, *al-Mustadrak alā al-Şaḥīḥayn*, 3/419.

⁹¹ al-Māidah 5/3.

⁹² Abū Ali Faḍl b. Ḥasan al-Ṭabarsī, *Majma‘ al-bayān fi tafsīr al-Qur‘ān* (Beirut: Dār al-‘Ulūm, 1426/2005), 3/213. Qummī said that the verse in question was sent down in Juhfah, two miles away from Ghadīr Khumm, and Ṭabaṭabāi and Ibn Taymiyyah said it was set down in ‘Arafah. See Qummī, *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, 1/239; Ṭabaṭabāi, *al-Mīdhān fi tafsīr al-Qur‘ān*, 5/171; Ibn Taymiyyah, Abū al-‘Abbās Taqīyuddīn Aḥmed b. ‘Abd al-Ḥalīm 728/1328), *Minhāc al-sunnah al-nabawīyyah*, ed. M. Rashād Sālim (s.l.: 1406/1986), 7/314.

point of discussion that Sunnī and Shī'a thinkers do not agree on and probably cannot agree on because of ideological engagements.

1.5. Qirtās Narrative

This event, which is described as the first contention⁹³ between the companions each other by the owner of *al-Milel ve-n-Nihal*, is named after the word Qirtās, which means paper. Six of Bukhārī's and three of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal's and Muslim's narrations point to this event, and it is noteworthy that all of them came through Ibn 'Abbās. The most important point to note here is how a narrative attributed to the same person takes place differently in the sources.

According to a narrative reported from Ibn 'Abbās, the Prophet asked for pen and paper on Thursday, when he was on his deathbed, so that the ummah would not be confused. Umar and others, who knew well what his last will will say prevented this by saying "The Prophet's suffering has increased, Allāh's book is enough for us!" Upon the increase of noise among the Companions, the Messenger of Allāh said, "Get up and go because it is not right for you to quarrel around me."⁹⁴ According to Gölpınarlı, who evaluated these events, as it is understood from all these events, if the will had been written, it would not be accepted by the Companions. However, the will of the first caliph Abū Bakr was accepted.⁹⁵

Although Ibn Hishām does not mention the Qirtās incident, he refers to a conversation between 'Abbās and 'Alī. Accordingly, 'Abbās advised 'Alī to go to the Messenger of Allāh and to inspire him to leave the caliphate to him. However, he rejected the proposal, fearing that if the Messenger of Allāh did not give the caliphate to him, people would not give him this job ever again.⁹⁶ It can be said that Ibn Hishām and Ibn Ishāq, who do not refer to Qirtās although they are included in many sources, aimed to eliminate the Shi'ite claims and that they actually tried to prove that 'Alī did not have a testament from his mouth. Thus, it can be thought that a work written in the 'Abbāsīd period interferes with the past in line with the wishes of the government.

One of the important events underlying the Shi'ite hatred of 'Umar is his dominant role in this incident. As a matter of fact, the Shi'ites referring to 'Abbās evaluation of this incident as a "great calamity"⁹⁷ caused by Umar stated that the person who could not make the will of the Messenger of Allāh properly at the time of death would lack the mind and personality.⁹⁸

Despite all this, Sunnism also seems to have produced counter-arguments to support its claims. In this sense, according to a report that would support the Sunnī claims, the Messenger of

⁹³ Şehristānī, *el-Milel ve'n-Nihal*, 34.

⁹⁴ For narrative see Ibn Sa'd, *Kitābü't-Tabakāti'l-Kebîr*, 2/246-248; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241/855), *Musnad*, ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Şākir (Cairo: Dār al-Hadīth, 1416/1995), 2/456, 3/349, 416; Bukhārī, "İlm", 39 (No. 114), "Jihād", 56 (No. 3053); "İtişām", 96 (No. 7366); "al-Marḍā", 75 (No. 5669), "Jizyah", 58 (No. 3168), "Maghāzī", 64 (No. 4431-4432); Muslim, "Wasiyyah", 25 (No. 1637 a/b/c).

⁹⁵ Gölpınarlı, *Tarih Boyunca İslâm Mezhepleri ve Şiilik*, 51-52.

⁹⁶ Ibn Hishām, *al-Sirah al-nabawiyyah*, 4/305; Ibn Sa'd, *Kitābü't-Tabakāti'l-kebir*, 2/249-250.

⁹⁷ Bukhārī, "İlm", 39 (No. 114), "Maghāzī", 64 (No. 4432); "al-Marḍā", 75 (No. 5669), "İtişām", 96 (No. 7366); Muslim, "Wasiyyah", 25 (No. 1637).

⁹⁸ Shaykh Şadūq, *Man lā yahḍuruh al-faqīh*, 3/142.

Allāh personally summoned Aisha and thought of her to write something so that ummah would not disagree about Abū Bakr, but he saw this as something impossible and then gave up this request.⁹⁹

Another rumor about Kirtās wants to end the discussions over preventing of the Messenger of Allāh from writing. In the said narration, the Messenger of Allāh bequeathed the following three things: 1- The removal of the polytheists from the Arabian Peninsula. 2- The rewarding of the delegations from the neighborhood as he did. Third, either the Messenger of Allāh did not say it or forgot it or the narrator does not remember it.¹⁰⁰ As will be appreciated, this narration seems to have been constructed in response to Shi'ite allegations that the testament did not come true. Thus, a very important claim about the political events of the next period is wanted to be voided.

It should also be remembered that, in terms of the Shī'a imagination, the defense of the Qirtās tradition has its own inconsistencies. Because, an acceptance in the form of writing the guardianship of 'Alī on the deathbed of the Messenger of Allāh overshadows all the previous narrations, especially the Ghadīr Khumm incident, which refers to the completion of the religion. However, both accepting that this work is divinely appointed and expressing that it was prevented at the time of death is no different than shooting one's own foot.

CONCLUSION

Shi'ism is a charismatic leader-oriented religious/political movement. For this reason, Shi'ism accepts the imāmate as one of the basic belief principles of the religion. The Shi'ites, who are determined to maintain charismatic authority, have aimed to prove that 'Alī is the imām/caliph after the Prophet with rational and transmitted evidence.

In this study, it is emphasized whether the imāmate of 'Alī is indicated within the framework of the five narrations in Sier, which is accepted as one of the two important elements of the transport/nass. Contrary to the claims of Shi'ism, which does not hesitate to exploit the past within the framework of its own political/religious interests, our work has shown us that this is not the case at all. It can be said that the following points stand out here:

1- It can be said that some narrations that are transmitted independently from each other in the form of "Your position next to me ..." are generally used in different plots to support each other. This may well be due to a lack of memory of the narrators. Or, by repeating the same word in different historical contexts, it may be desired to create a common opinion. In any case, it would be a more correct approach to evaluate the situation of the people who are the subject of these narratives within the framework of the holistic view of religion and to interpret the related narrations together with the reasons for their utterance.

⁹⁹ Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-ashraf*, 2/210.

¹⁰⁰ Ibn Sa'd, *Kitābū't-Tabakāti'l-Kebīr*, 2/246-248; Bukhārī, "Meğāzī", 64 (No. 4432); "Jizyah", 58 (No. 3168), "Jihād", 56 (No. 3053); Muslim, "Wasiyyah", 25 (No. 1637 a); Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, 3/192-193. In another narration in Abū Dāwūd's *Sunan*, although there is no reference to the event, only three testaments from Ibn 'Abbās are included. See Abū Dāwūd, Sulaymān b. al-Ash'as b. Ishāq al-Sijistānī (d. 275/889), *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, ed. M. Muḥyiddīn 'Abd al-Hamid (Beirut: al-Maktabah al-'Aşriyyah, n.d.), "Kharāj", 20 (No. 3029).

2- Historical events take place in a certain space. However, the rumors that Shi'ism uses as evidence for itself are often transferred out of context. This caused ideological implications. Therefore, it can be said that when considered independently, there is no obstacle to different agreements. Some Shī'a authors are mistaken that this is a one-sided operation. This is because efforts to understand, not accompanied by a scientific method, have opened the door to new discourses for the opponents. As a matter of fact, Sunnī sources had no difficulty in finding historical material to highlight the other three caliphs. Thus, an objective historiography seems essential and more beneficial for all political/religious groups. Contextless approaches increases the separation between groups stemming from religion, and consequently damage the integrity of the religious community.

3- One of the weakest points of the Shī'a is that the imāmate claims are not holistic and contains anachronistic elements. Shī'a groups could not unite on the conditions of being an imām. In this sense, historical knowledge has been reconstructed. Apart from the differences between the claims of Zaydiyyah, Ismāiliyyah or Imāmiyyah among themselves, Imāmi scholars also advocated different things from time to time. Therefore, the claims defended are not accepted by all the Shī'a authors as a whole. Because they are also aware that their claims are based on forced interpretations after all.

4- Multiple incidents used by the Shī'a to defend the imāmate actually undermine their claim. For, if each narration that Shi'ism takes as evidence for itself belongs to different times chronologically, which is so, defending the next narration itself means admitting that it doubts the previous one.

5- As we can see in the narrations, the appointment of a guardian, independent of the final acceptance that the Prophet did not or could not fulfill his duty from time to time, is historically impossible. Shī'a actually attacks the main vein of the duty of prophethood with each narrative. This operation, which was undertaken solely to verify its ideological view to the Messenger of Allāh and to ensure its legitimacy, makes the prophethood, which is one of the important pillars of the religion, suspicious. However, in order to achieve political unity in essence, the "imām" belief, which means maintaining the Sassanid divine-charismatic authority, must be rationalized and civilized. Otherwise, the mistakes caused by the imāms being human will harm the religion as a whole.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abū Dāwūd, Sulaymān b. al-Ash‘aş b. Ishāq al-Sijistānī (d. 275/889). *Sunan Abī Dāvūd*. ed. M. Muhyiddīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd. 4 Vol. Beirut: al-Maktabah al-‘Aşriyyah, n.d.
- Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241/855). *Faḍāil al-şahābah*. ed. Waşıyyullāh Muḥammad ‘Abbās. Beirut: Muassasah al-Risālah, 1403/1983.
- Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241/855). *Musnad*. ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Şākır. 8 Vol. Cairo: Dār al-Ḥadīth, 1416/1995.
- Ahmet el-Katip. *Nedenleri Tarihte Kalmış Siyasi Ayrılık: Sünnilik-Şiilik*. trans. Muharrem Tan. İstanbul: Mana Pub., 2009.
- Antākī, Muḥammad al-Mar‘ī al-Amīn (d. 1383). *li-Mādhā akhtartu madhhab al-Şū‘a madhhab Ahl al-Bayt*. ed. ‘Abd al-Karīm al-‘Uqaylī. Qom: al-I‘lām al-Islāmī, 1417.
- Atay, Hüseyin. *Ehl-i Sünnet ve Şi‘a*. Ankara: AÜIF Pub., n.d.
- Ayətullah əl-Uzma Hacı Şeyx Huseyn Vəhid. *Usulid’dinlə Tanışlıq*. S.l.: Baqirul-Ulum Medresesi, n.d.
- Bağdādī, Abdulkāhir b. Tāhir b. Muhammed (d. 429/1037). *Mezhepler Arasındaki Farklar*. trans. Ethem Ruhi Fığlalı. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Pub., 5. ed. 2008.
- Balādhurī, Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Jābir (d. 279/892-3). *Anşāb al-ashraf*. ed. Suheyl Dhakkār and etc. 13 Vol. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1417/1996.
- Bukhārī, Abū ‘Abdillāh Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl (d. 256/870). *al-Jāmi‘ al-şahīḥ*. ed. Muḥammad Zuhayr b. Naşr. 8 Vol. S.l.: Dār Tavq al-Najāt, 2. ed, 1422/2001.
- Demircan, Adnan. *Gadīr-i Hum Olayı*. İstanbul: Beyan Pub., 2. Ed., 2014.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Göstergebilim ve Gramatoloji*. trans. Tülin Akşin. İstanbul: Afa Pub., 1994.
- Dırār b. Amr. *Kitābu’t-Tahrîş*. ed. Hüseyin Hansu. trans. Mehmet Keskin. İstanbul: Litera Pub., 2014.
- Dölek, Adem. “Sekaleyn Hadisi ve Değerlendirilmesi”. *Marife* 4/3 (2004), 149-173.
- Erul, Bünyamin. “Hz. Peygamber’in Bize Bıraktığı Miras”. *Dinbilimleri* 7/1 (2007), 9-33.
- Erul, Bünyamin. *Sahabenin Sünnet Anlayışı*. Ankara: TDV Pub., 3. ed., 1999.
- Eş‘ārī, Ebū’l-Hasen (d. 324/936). *İlk Dönem İslam Mezhepleri Makâlâtü’l-İslâmiyyîn ve İhtilafu’l-Musallîn*. trans. Mehmet Dalkılıç-Ömer Aydın. İstanbul: Kabcacı Pub., 2005.
- Fayyāz, ‘Abdullah. *Tārīkh al-Imāmiyyah ve aslāfuhum min al-Şū‘ah*. Baghdad: As‘ad Pub., 1970.
- Fığlalı, Ethem Ruhi. “Gadīr-i Hum”. *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Accessed 17 Nisan 2020. <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/gadir-i-hum>
- Firūzābādī, Murtaḍā el-Ḥuseynī el-Firūzābādī. *Faḍāil al-khamsah min al-şihāḥ al-sittah*. 3 Vol. Qom: Manshūrātu Firūzābādī, 2. Ed., 1424.

- Furāt b. İbrāhīm al-Kūfī. *Tafsīr al-Furāt al-Kūfī*. ed. Muḥammad el-Kāzım. Tahran: Muassasah Wizārah al-Thaqāfah wa-l-Irshād al-Islāmī, 1410/1990.
- Gölpınarlı, Abdülbâki. *Tarih Boyunca İslâm Mezhepleri ve Şiilik*. İstanbul: Derin Pub., 2011.
- Ibn Hazm (d. 1064). *el-Fasl Dinler ve Mezhepler Tarihi*. trans. Halil İbrahim Bulut. 3 Vol. İstanbul: TYEK Pub., 2017.
- Ibn Hishām (d. 218/833). *al-Sīrah al-nabawīyyah*. ed. 'Umar 'Abd al-Salām Tadmurī. 4 Vol. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Arabī, 1410/1990.
- Ibn Ishāq, Muḥammad b. Ishāq al-Muttalibī (d. 151/768). *Kitāb al-siyar wa-l-maghāzī*. ed. Suhayl Dhakkār. S.l.: Dār al-Fikr, 1398/1978.
- Ibn Kathīr, Abū al-Fidā Ismā'il b. 'Umar (d. 774/1373). *al-Bidāyah wa-l-nihāyah*. ed. 'Abdullāh b. 'Abd al-Muhsin al-Turkī. 21 Vol. S.l.: Dār Hijr, 1418/1998.
- Ibn Mājah, Abū 'Abdullāh Muḥammad b. Yazīd al-Qazwīnī (d. 273/887). *Sunan İbn Mājah*. ed. Muḥammad Fuād 'Abd al-Bāqī. 2 Vol. S.l.: Dār İhyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabī-Faysal İsā al-Bāqī al-Ḥalabī, n.d.
- Ibn Manzūr, Abū al-Faḍl Muḥammad b. Mukarram b. 'Alī al-Ansārī (d. 711/1311). *Lisān al-'Arab*. 15 Vol. Beirut: Dār Sādir, 1414.
- Ibn Sa'd, Muhammed b. Sa'd b. Menī el-Hāşimī el-Basrī (d. 230/845). *Kitābü't-Tabakāti'l-Kebīr*. trans. ed. Adnan Demircan. trans. Musa Kazım Yılmaz. 11 Vol. İstanbul: Siyer Pub., n.d.
- Ibn Taymiyyah, Abū al-'Abbās Taqıyyuddīn Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Ḥalīm (728/1328). *Minhāj al-sunnah al-nabawīyyah*. ed. M. Rashād Sālim. 9 Vol. S.l.: s.n., 1406/1986.
- Kummī - Nevbahtī. *Şiî Fırkalar Kitābu'l-Makālāt ve'l-Fırak Fıraku'ş-Şia*. trans. Hasan Onat etc. Ankara: Ankara Okulu Pub., 2004.
- Kutluay, Yaşar. *Tarihte ve Günümüzde İslâm Mezhepleri*. İstanbul: Pınar Pub., 2003.
- Külekcı, Cahit. "Tarihin Araçsallaştırılmasında İmâmiyye Örneği". *Din Algısı İnşasında Tarihin Araçsallaştırılması*. ed. Adnan Demircan. 169-190. İstanbul: Mana Pub., 2019.
- Lindholm, Charles. *İslâm Toplumlarında Gelenek ve Değişim*. trans. Nihal Çelik etc. Ankara: Elips Pub., 2004.
- Majlisī, Muḥammad Bāqır al-Majlisī (d. 1110/1689). *Bihār al-anwār al-jāmi'ah li-durari aḥbār al-aimmah al-aṭkhār*. 110 Vol. Beirut: Dār İhyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 1983/1403.
- Mālik b. Anas, Mālik b. Anas b. Mālik b. 'Amir al-Aşbahī al-Madanī (d. 179/795). *al-Muwatta'*. ed. Muḥammad Muştafa al-A'zamī. 8 Vol. S.l.: Muassasah Zāyid b. Sulṭān al-'Imārāt, 1425/2004.
- Muḥammad Bāqır al-Şadr. *al-Ma'ālim al-jadīdah li-l-uşūl*. Beirut: Dār al-Ta'aruf li-l-Maṭbū'at, 1410/1989.
- Muslim, Abū al-Ḥusayn Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 261-875). *al-Jāmi' al-şahīḥ*. ed. Muḥammad Fuād 'Abd al-Bāqī. Cairo: s.n., 1374-75/1955-1956.

- Najafî, ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad al-Amîni. *al-Ghadîr fi-l-kitâb wa-s-sunnah*. 11 Vol. Beirut: Muassasah al-A‘lemî li-l-Maṭbû‘ât, 1414/1994.
- Nisâbüri, Abû ‘Abdillâh al-Hâkim Muḥammad b. ‘Abdillâh b. Muḥammad b. Ḥamdawayh b. Ḥakem (d. 405/1014). *al-Mustadrak ‘ala’s-Şahîhayn*. ed. Muşafa ‘Abd al-Qâdir ‘Atâ. 4 Vol. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1411/1990.
- Öz, Mustafa. “Teberri”. *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Accessed 28 Temmuz 2020. <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/teberri>
- Öz, Şaban. *Mevzû Haberlerin Tarihî Değeri*. İstanbul: Neva Pub., 2016.
- Qummî, Abû al-Ḥasan ‘Alî b. Ḥusayn b. Bâbawayh (d. 329/941). *el-Imâmah wa’t-tabşirah al-hayrah*. Qom: Madrasah al-Imâm al-Mahdî, 1404/1363.
- Qummî, Abû al-Ḥasan ‘Alî b. Ḥusayn b. Bâbawayh (d. 329/941). *Tafsîr al-Qummî*. ed. Muassasah al-Imâm al-Mahdî. 3 Vol. Qom: s.n., 1435.
- Şan‘ânî, Abû Bakr ‘Abdurrazzâk b. Hammâm (d. 211/826-827). *al-Muşannaḥ*. ed. Ḥabîburrahmân al-A‘zamî. 11 Vol. Beirut: Maktabah al-Islâmî, 1403.
- Sarıkaya, Saffet. *İslâm Düşünce Tarihinde Mezhepler*. İstanbul: Rağbet Pub., 3. ed., 2011.
- Shaykh Mufid (d. 413/1022). *Awâil al-maqâlât*. ed. İbrâhîm al-Anşârî. Qom: Mihr Pub., 1413/1993.
- Shaykh Şadûk, Ebû Ja‘far Muḥammad b. ‘Alî b. al-Ḥusayn b. Mûsâ b. Bâbawayh al-Qummî (d. 381/991). *Man lâ yahḍuruh al-faqîh*. Profreader Ḥusayn al-A‘lamî. 4 Vol. Beirut: Muassasa al-A‘lamî, 1406/1986.
- Shehristânî, Ebu’l-Feth Muḥammad b. Abdulkerim (d. 548/1153). *el-Milel ve’n-Nihal*. trans. Mustafa Öz. İstanbul: Litera Pub., 2008.
- Şeriati, Ali - Şehidî, Cafer. *Sîret*. trans. Kerim Güney. İstanbul: Ayışığı Pub., 1991.
- Şeriati, Ali. *Ali Şiast Safevi Şiast*. trans. Feyzullah Artinli. İstanbul: Yöneliş Pub., 2nd ed., 1990.
- Ṭabarî, Muḥammad b. Jarîr (d. 310/923). *Târîkh al-rusul wa-l-mulûk*. ed. Muḥammad Abû al-Faḍl İbrâhîm. 11 Vol. Mısır: Dâr al-Ma‘ârif, 2nd ed., 1387/1967.
- Ṭabarsî, Abû ‘Alî Faḍl b. Ḥasan. *Majma‘ al-bayân fi tafsîr al-Qur‘ân*. 10 Vol. Beirut: Dâr al-‘Ulûm, 1426/2005.
- Ṭabaṭabâi, Muḥammad Ḥusayn. *al-Mîdhân fi tafsîr al-Qur‘ân*. Proofreader. Ḥusayn al-A‘lamî. 22 Vol. Beirut: Muassasah al-A‘lamî li-l-Maṭbûât, 1417/1997.
- Ṭabaṭabâi, Muḥammad Ḥusayn. *Tüm Boyutlarıyla İslâm’da Şia*. trans. Kadir Akaras - Abbas Akyüz. İstanbul: Kevser Pub., 4th ed., 2009.
- Tirmidhî, Muḥammad b. İsâ b. Thawrah b. Mûsâ b. Ḍahhâk (d. 279/892). *al-Jâmi‘ al-kabîr*. ed. Bashshâr ‘Awwâd Ma‘rûf. 6 Vol. Beirut: Dâr al-Gharbi al-Islâmî, 1998.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. *Geçmiş Süstürmek Tarihin Üretilmesi ve İktidar*. trans. Sezai Ozan Zeybek. İstanbul: İthaki Pub., 2015.

- Uyar, Mazlum. *İmamiyye Şîasında Düşünce Ekolleri: Ahbârîlik*. İstanbul: Ayışığı Kitapları Pub., 2000.
- Wāqıdī, Muḥammad b. Umer b. Wāqıd (d. 207/823). *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*. ed. Marsden Jones. Beirut: 'Ālem al-Kutub, 1996.
- Watt, Montgomery. *İslâm Düşüncesinin Teşekkül Devri*. trans. Ethem Ruhi Fığlalı. Ankara: Sarkaç Pub., 2010.
- Yavuz, Adil. "Ehl-i Sünnet'e Göre Ehl-i Beyt'in Konumu -Sekaleyn Hadisi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme". *Marife* 5/3 (2005), 333-360.