



REVEALING THE TRUTH

Who believes the Quran has been a victim of Tahreef?

Work file: tahreef_alquran.pdf
Project: Answering-Ansar.org Articles

Revisions:

No.	Date	Author	Description	Review Info
1.0.0	11.03.2009	Answering-Ansar.org	Created	

Contents

Table of Contents

<u>1.CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>2.CHAPTER TWO: PREFACE.....</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>3.CHAPTER THREE : SHIA EVIDENCES AGAINST THE POSSIBILITY OF DISTORTION IN QURAN.....</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>4.CHAPTER FOUR: SHIA SCHOLARS ABOUT THE COMPLETENESS OF QURAN</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>5.CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYZING SOME OF THE SHIA REPORTS ABOUT TAHREEF.....</u>	<u>40</u>
<u>6.CHAPTER SIX: ANSWERING SOME OF NASIBI OBJECTIONS.....</u>	<u>48</u>
<u>7.CHAPTER SEVEN: SUNNI REPORTS ABOUT ADDITIONS IN QURAN.....</u>	<u>53</u>
<u>8.CHAPTER EIGHT: SUNNI REPORTS ABOUT DELETIONS FROM THE QURAN.</u>	<u>62</u>
<u>9.CHAPTER NINE: SUNNI REPORTS ABOUT MISTAKES & CHANGES IN QURAN</u>	<u>99</u>
<u>10.CHAPTER TEN: CONCLUSION.....</u>	<u>127</u>
<u>11.COPYRIGHT.....</u>	<u>131</u>

1. Chapter One: Introduction

Whilst we find hadiths in both Shia and Sunni text implying that there might be some corruption of the Quran such traditions are rejected as unreliable and there remains a consensus among Shia and Ahle Sunnah about the completeness, purity and authority of the Holy Quran. Whilst this should not therefore be a topic of debate, we have still chosen to publish an article on this topic for two reasons:

1. To clarify the naïve minds who read such traditions and fall into confusion.
2. Nasibi attacks on the Shia belief in the completeness of Quran due to some weak traditions recorded in our text (Just as there in the authentic Sunni text).

We wish to make it clear from the outset that we had on numerous occasions shelved plans to publish this, since we feared the material being used as propaganda fodder for Jews and Christians. Unfortunately since such a fear didn't hinder them in the slightest, they shamelessly continued producing materials on the Shia 'belief' in tahreef we were forced to refute them by highlighting tahreef traditions from the pen of the Sahaba and scholars they venerate.

Nawasib have for centuries focused on suggesting the Shia of Ali [as] ascribe to tahreef of the Quran. This mantle has been inherited by the post modern day Nawasib such as Sipah-e-Sahaba and Salafies/Wahabies who have dedicated their resources, time and efforts on issuing takfeer against Shias on the basis of traditions implying changes to the Quran. We shall inshallah provide a detailed refutation of such Nasibi propaganda, and will present the actual Shia view from our prestigious scholars and the Imams of Ahlulbayt [as]. Thereafter we will also expose the Nasibi hypocrisy by citing authentic Nasibi texts which that evidence that their revered Sahaba and Scholars that they extol, narrated, recorded or endorsed a plethora of traditions to demonstrate their beliefs in the incompleteness of Quran. Once we have brought these traditions to the attention of our readers, we allow the Nawasib to issue an appropriate edict on the Imaan of such blessed individuals.

Important Note: Wherever we write 'Deobandies' they do not include learned Deobandies rather only those anti-shia fanatics who have abandoned all aspects of morality and decency in their extremism and are unaware of the actual teachings of the Deobandi school on account of their being infected by a noxious virus called Wahabism/Salafism.

2. Chapter Two: Preface

1. How to approach traditions on Tahreef?

Sayed Sharaf-al-din Amali (d 1377 H) writes:

“The books of Hadiths written by Shia and Sunni Ulema contain hadiths that demonstrate that alteration has been committed in the Quran. That hence means that the present Quran is smaller [in size] from the original Quran. But these hadiths are unreliable in the eyes of Sunni and Shia Ulema because such hadiths are weak from the aspect of sanad and moreover such hadiths can be refuted by a plethora of hadiths that enjoy authentic sanads that are clear from the perspective of number and proof. One cannot therefore rely on such weak hadiths in comparison to the presence of these countless, clear hadiths that reject the notion of distortion of the Quran,

Moreover the hadiths that evidence distortion with the Quran are single-chained narrations, and if the statement of a single-chained hadith is not useful at the place where it is to be practiced then it is not an authority. On the one side we have unequivocal proof that the present Quran is exempt from distortion in comparison to the assumption that the Quran has been distorted on the basis of some weak hadiths. It is clear that absolute, confirmed facts can never be rejected due to the existence of single chains and assumption. In conclusion, the hadiths that attribute distortion to the Quran should be thrown away”

Ajubat-al-Masail Jaar Allah

2. Three points to ponder

Before mentioning the views of the Shia ulema about those traditions that are recorded in the Shia hadith books attributing distortion to the Quran and analyzing such Shia traditions we deem it necessary to draw the attention of our readers to the following three important points.

3. First Point: No one amongst the Shia ulema claimed his hadith book as 100 % correct

Those people who after reading some traditions in the hadith books written by Shia Ulema criticize Shia of Ali [as] are fact fanatics that have abandoned all aspects of justice since no Shia author ever claimed that all of the hadiths compiled in his book were correct and Sahih. Similarly none amongst the Shia Muhaditheen and jurists testified to any specific Shia book containing hadiths that were all acceptable and Sahih. Likewise Sheikh Muhammad Jawwad Ma`tiya states the hadith books of our school like Al Kafi, Istibsar, Al Tahdib, Man La Yuhizar al Faiqh contain both Sahih and weak hadiths. Similarly, the books on Fiqa written by our scholars contain material that have mistakes. It would therefore be correct to assert that according to the Shia of Ali [as] there is no book besides that Holy Quran which is flawless from its beginning till its end.

One cannot therefore cite the tradition from the Shia hadith book against the Shia of Ali [as] as when the Shia reject the authenticity of such a hadith.

In order to corroborate our stance, it would suffice to say that Shiekh Muhammad Yaqub Kuleini (d 329 H) recorded 16200 hadiths in his book 'Al Kafi'. The scholars have categorized these hadiths in respect of Rijal under five different categories i.e Sahih, Mawthiq, Qawi, Hasan, Daef [weak].

It is therefore evident that since scholars applied this division to our principle book Al Kafi, that is deemed as reliable and a source of Islamic instructions, the authority and authenticity of other books is self clarified.

4. Second Point: One cannot accuse an author of ascribing to Tahreef because he recorded such traditions in his book

If there are some hadiths in a book by a author that show distortion to the Quran then merely depending on this fact and accusing the author of believing that the Quran is distorted is in bias, unjust and ignorant. If we were to determine the belief of every author with this methodology then the matter would become more complex as there are also some hadiths in the hadith books that are contradictory (the meaning of a hadith conflicts with the meaning of another hadith). The presence of such hadiths in the hadith books of the Ulema makes it incorrect to call the hadith recorded in a book as the belief of that author.

5. Third Point: It is unjust to attribute the belief of an individual to that of an entire same sect

If a person of a particular school adopts a specific view then it is incorrect to attribute his belief to the entire sect he adheres to. When the vast bulk of the reliable scholars of his sect oppose his personal view, to still attribute his belief to that sect is stubborn fanaticism. One can find a plethora of books in the world of knowledge wherein views are confined as the personal beliefs of an author that have no nexus to the whole school of thought he adheres to.

Similarly if Sheikh Noori Tabarsi (d 1320 H) did advance views of distortion with the Quran then they should be deemed his personal views one cannot attribute his views to every adherent of the Shia Sect.

Who is unaware of the absurdities that are found in the books of Ibn Taimiyah? His position has been vigorously refuted by the scholars and researchers of Ahle Sunnah. Would it therefore be fair for us to ignore all these rebuttals and continue to attribute the views of Ibn Taimiyah to the entire Ahle Sunnah? Clearly not, that would a baseless, unjust approach to follow.

Now if someone despite reading these facts and detailed proofs remains adamant that the personal views of an individual can be attributed to an entire sect then it is nothing short of stubborn blind bigotry, wherein the objective is merely incite violence and hatred against the Shia.

6. The views of the Shia Ulema in relation to those traditions that infer Tahreef

Prominent Shia researchers and scholars have rejected accepting those Hadiths that infer distortion to the Quran and are adamant that the Quran is uncorrupted.

7. The two types of Hadiths recorded in the Shia books regarding Tahreef

1. Most of these hadiths are Dhaef [weak], Mursal and Maqtu' and therefore cannot be deemed authority.
2. Some hadiths contain the chains with reliable narrators, whilst one cannot therefore reject such chains of transmission it is necessary to make interpretations [taweel] and reasonings to such hadiths as the scholars have said that some of these hadiths refer to the commentary [Tafseer] and interpretation of the Quran, others are about recitation

[qirat] and reasons of their revelation with some discussing the meanings. If the same kind of interpretation and reasonings are given about those Daeef (weak), Mursal and Maqtu hadiths then reliability about them may take place. But there is no need to provide reasonings for weak hadiths due to the fact that their being weak automatically makes them unreliable.

Amongst the hadith that are correct in respect of their chain of narration there are some wherein the view of distortion with the Quran are so clear, that interpretation and reasoning cannot be applied to them. When it comes to these types of hadith the scholars have adopted a very clear view that such hadiths have been falsely attributed (to individuals) and are fabricated and should be abandoned. The scholars have mentioned the following arguments in order to support their stance:

1. It is proved from authentic and Mutawatir sources that Quran had already been compiled during the time of Holy Prophet [s] and hadiths which shows distortion in Quran are in opposition to this fact. Such hadiths being in contradiction to the cited fact is itself a proof that such hadiths have been fabricated.
2. Such hadiths are in contradiction to the following verse of Holy Quran: **"Certainly We revealed the Reminder and certainly We shall preserve it." (The Holy Qur'an 15: 9)** and the hadith which is in contradiction to Quran is to be thrown away.
3. These hadiths which show distortion in Quran are very less in number while the hadiths which shows Quran being protected from distortion are Mutawatur and prominent, moreover these hadiths are strong in respect of arguments and proof as compared to the former.
4. Hadiths which shows distortion in Quran are very scarce, whereas the verses of Quran being actually Quranic can be proved from authentic and confirmed hadiths. Therefore the verses which such hadiths claimed to be Quranic or being part of Quran in fact do not prove so. How can Shia Ulema rely on these doubtful hadiths while some of the Shia Ulema have advanced the view that reports narrated from single source do not have the capability of being proof and even if we uphold the their authority then singularly narrated report can be a proof in only such a situation where it is useful to be practiced at the required place/time specially we cannot rely on singularly narrated reports in respect of 'beliefs' due to the fact the belief are maintained on the basis of knowledge and certainty.

8. Shia belief about Holy Quran

We Shia openly say that negating the faith of lovers of Ali [as] and calling them kaafir by the Sahaba worshippers is the extreme injustice on their part. We testify in the name of Allah [swt] that we believe in the present Quran being perfect; with neither anything missing from it nor any thing added to it. Right from "Bismillah" till "Walnaas", we Shia also believe in the same Quran which Ahle Sunnah do and accusing us for having faith on the deletion or addition in Quran by the Sahaba worshippers is totally wrong and an out and out lie.

The beliefs of a mazhab can be known from the sources deemed authentic in its principle books and it is not written in any authentic sources of Shias that present Quran is imperfect or we Shias have any other Quran. Any one who still accuses Shias for having the belief of Tehrif e Quran and denies our testimony is indeed misguided and a mushrik himself while no one knows what one has in his heart except Allah.

9. Those accusing Shias of practicing Taqiyyah while they actually testify to the authenticity of Quran are Mushriks for two reasons

Some Nasibi mullahs just feed their followers to use the card of Taqiyyah against Shias on their

testimony about the authenticity of Holy Quran. What they do not tell their adherents is the actual meaning of Taqiyyah. Taqiyyah is to hide one's belief when there is genuine fear of life like someone is physically and literally forcing you or putting sword on your neck to utter what you do not really believe else he could put your life to an end. The Nawasib who on the internet or in their books reject the testimony of Shias about the authenticity of Holy Quran by accusing them for practicing Taqiyyah and hiding their actual belief are in fact Mushriks (polytheist) because of the following two reasons:

1. They possess some self-proclaimed supernatural ability to enter computer or book from one side and come in and exit in a manner that enables them to literally force the Shia to bear testimony about the authenticity of Quran (whilst practicing Taqiyyah).
2. They are indirectly claiming to possess knowledge of unseen like Allah [swt], despite the distance of millions of miles through their x-ray vision that enables them to ascertain actual Shia beliefs by examining their hearts through from which they can confidently conclude that the Shias are practicing Taqiyyah and don't actually believe in the completeness of the Quran.

Had this been the era of the Imams of the Nawasib Muawyah or Yazeed wherein Shias were under oppression and aggression then methodology might have worked, fortunately we are living in an entirely new world today. We would suggest that in future the Nawasib ponder over the above two points before regurgitating the vomit of the Mullahs on this issue..

We shall now discuss the issue of distortion [Tahreef] in the Quran that will (inshallah) turn out to be an amazing piece of research that will burn the arrogance of Nawasib once and for all.

10. Nasibi submission that Shias provided written notification that their Ulema are cursed Kaafirs to enable unity

One of the most renowned scholars of the Yazeedi sect namely Habib ur-Rehman Kandhalvi's writes in his book "Kia humara Quran aik hai" [do we have same Quran?] page 64 that Sabais i.e Shias should call all of their Mujtahdeen who have attested to distortions in the Holy Quran as Kaafirs, and should publicly burn their books curse such ulema in Muharram processions for some years, only then there can be unity between both Sects. Similar arguments are frequently heard from the Nasibi adherents of such scholars like the apes of Sipah e Sahaba.

11. Invitation to Nawasib that Umar and Ayesha also believed in the distortion of Quran

Had this alleged Maulana read the major Tafseers of Ahle Sunnah like Tafseer al Itqan, Tafseer Dur Manthoor, Tafseer Tabari without the shackles of Nasbism & Yazeedism he would have known that amongst the claimants of distortion in Quran are Umar, Usman, their sons, Ayesha, other Sahaba, Tabayen and many Sunni ulema. If cursing and declaring those people who believed in the distortion of Quran as kaffirs makes one's faith more strong and pure then Nawasib should initiate this noble cause, by issuing takfeer, cursing and publicly dissociating themselves from the above mentioned culprits.

12. Nasibi Ahsaan Ilahi Zaheer made an abortive effort to rest the soul of Yazeed in peace by writing book "Ashia wal Quran"

This slain maulana had always shown an eagerness to propagate hatred towards Shias from his Ahle Hadeeth followers and relied on "Fasl Khitab" to enable this. But the Shia ulema have always made it crystal clear that the texts in "Fasl Khitab" regarding the distortion of the Quran are unauthentic and rejected by the Shias since we don't believe that there is any addition or

alteration of any kind to the present Quran and that those traditions cited in Fasl Khitaab are similar to those found in Sunni books like Tafseer Dur al-Manthur and Tafseer Itqan. If having such traditions in a book proves disbelief in the Quran then the Sunnis likewise don't believe in the completeness of the existing Quran.

Nasibi mullah Ahsaan Ilahi Zaheer has rejected the sayings of Shia ulema regarding their affirmation in the Quran by suggesting that such statements have been made under Taqiyyah. We the Shia clearly testify in the absence of Taqiyyah that we believe in the same Quran that the Ahle Sunnah do.

Some Nasibi Ulema are living examples of Kufr and Shirk and have raised this subject matter for the sole objective of facilitating hatred and violence against Shias. They have sought to prove that the Shias are kaafir because traditions in Shia books which point to alterations or distortions in the Quran, their ex-communication from Islam can only be retracted when they curse those ulema that narrated such texts.

We demand justice from these Sahaba worshippers and would like to ask them about the reports of alteration and distortion in the Quran as recorded by their ulema like Bukhari, Suyuti through to Allamah Anwar Shah Kashmiri who have relied on the testimonies of the Sahaba such as Umar, Ibn Umar, Ayesha, Hafsa and others. If the very existence of such reports makes one a kaafir that requires the hadeeth recorder and narrator to be cursed then Nasibi ulema like Ahsaan Ilahi and Habib ur Rehman should initiate the practice of cursing their ancestors, and evidence that they are truthful Muslims by cursing Umar, Ibn Umar, Ayesha, Hafsa and their ulema from Imam Bukhari through to Allamah Kashmiri.

3. Chapter Three : Shia evidences against the possibility of distortion in Quran

In the previous chapter we presented the views of some of the prominent ulema of Shia Athna Ashari Ulema who submitted various arguments and evidences to refute the notion of that the Quran has been distorted. When we have the testimonies of these grand Ulema then any traditions that infer distortion lose their value, irrespective of their number and authenticity. The evidences presented by the Shia Ulema debunk any statement about distortion in the Quran thus making it false. We shall seek to summarize all those arguments and evidences in this chapter.

13. Evidence one: Verses of the Holy Quran reject any possibility of distortion in it

As a Muslim we all believe that every vital thing is present in the Holy Quran. Since it talks about everything then it also talks about itself as well. There exist many verses in the Holy Quran which clearly reject any possibility of distortion in the Quran and and refute any suggestion of external interference in it. These verses prove that nothing until the day of judgment shall alter its authority or honor and become the reason of failure in its reverence. Those verses are as follows:

. . . And if it had been from any other than Allah, they would surely have found in it much discrepancy. (Quran, 4 :82)

Surely We have revealed the Reminder and We will most surely be its guardian. (Quran, 15:9)

According to Sahih reports the "**Reminder**" in the cited verse means the Quran which Allah [swt] revealed to his beloved Apostle and took the responsibility of its protection from its first revelation until Qiyamah.

Do not move your tongue with it to make haste with it, Surely on Us (devolves) the collecting of it and the reciting of it. Therefore when We have recited it, follow its recitation. Again on Us (devolves) the explaining of it. [Shakir 75: 16-19]

According to Ibn Abbas [ra]:

"Surely on Us (devolves) the collecting of it" means: "its collection is incumbent on us while reading it is incumbent on you so that it should remain protected so that its recitation becomes possible. Thus do not be doubtful in it and do not think that any of its words have been dead or lost"

Majma al Bayan, Volume 5 page 297 by Tabarsi

14. Evidence two: Hadiths from the Holy Prophet [s] and Imams [as]

After the Quran, the Sunnah is the second source of guidance for Muslims that form the basis for our beliefs and instructions that have reached us from different Sahih sources. It is therefore incumbent on Muslims to find those things in the Sunnah that cannot be found clearly in the Quran and should get the tafseer of all those verses from Sunnah that may seem to be difficult to understand with doubts over their actual meanings. We should accordingly adhere to the path of the Sunnah, whilst the Quran also instructs us to do likewise. We read in the Glorious Quran:

..and whatever the Messenger gives you, accept it, and from whatever he forbids you, keep back..., [Shakir 59:7]

"Obey Allah and Obey his Prophet and worry, and be warned that the Prophet's duty is only to deliver the message clearly" [Surah al Maidah verse 92]

Following the instructions of these verses when turn to the Sunnah, we find a plethora of hadiths that evidence that the present Quran without any additions and deletions is the same that was revealed by Allah [swt] to his Prophet Muhammad [s]. Such Hadiths fall under seven categories.

Type One: Hadiths that require the Quran to judge the Hadith itself

There are numerous Hadiths that tell us when we find two contradictory Hadiths the correct method should be to measure such Hadith against the Quran and determine whether they either contradict or conform with the Quran. Those Hadith that contradict the Quran should be rejected; the Hadith that conform it should be accepted. Had any distortion taken place in the verses or Surahs of the Quran, the Imams [as] would have never narrated this method from their forefather the Holy Prophet [s]. We would like to present such hadith.

"Imam Raza [as] stated: When you find two contradictory reports about same matter then present both of them before the Quran since it contains instruction of every Halal and Haram [matter]. Therefore whichever is in accordance to the Quran adhere to it while present the one before Sunnah of Prophet [s] which is not present in Quran"

Ayoon Akhbar Raza, Volume 2 page 20 by Sheikh Saduq

Imam Jafar [as] narrates from his father who from narrates from his father who narrates from Ameer al Momineen [as]: Verily every Haq is a reality and every Thawab is Noor. Thus take whatever is in accordance to the Quran and leave whatever is against it"

Amali, page 368 by Sheikh Saduq

"Imam Muhammad Taqi [as] states: Whenever Haqaiq are mentioned, their evidences should be sought from the Quran. Thus, if there are arguments about those evidences then it is incumbent to adhere to them and no one save people of arrogance would disagree about them"

Tauhfā al Aqool, page 343 by Behrani

Imam Jafar Sadiq [as] stated: When two different hadiths reach you then present both of them before book of Allah, if it is in accordance then take it, if it contradict it, then abandon it"

Arasail, page 446 by Sheikh al Ansari

These and similar traditions prove that there is no distortion to the Book of Allah [swt] and it is in same manner as it was revealed to our Holy Prophet [a] due to the fact that had any distortion taken place it would not have acted as the sole / final authority to check every hadith, including those inferring distortions to the Quran and to accept those that are in accordance to the Book of Allah and reject those that conflict with it.

Type Two: Hadith Thaqlain

As we all know that Holy Prophet [s] clearly instructed us to follow the book of Allah and his Ahlulbayt [as].

Prophet said: Verily, I am leaving behind two precious things (thaqalayn) among you: the Book of God and my kindred (`itrah), my household (Ahl alBayt), for indeed, the two will never separate until they come back to me by the Pond (of alKawthar on the Judgement's Day).

This hadith demonstrates that all the Quranic verses had already been compiled during the era of the Holy Prophet [s] since this enables us to understand the usage of "kitab" [book] here. This is because the word "Kitab" has been used in many Quranic verses. Moreover and most importantly this hadith also demands that until Qayamah, the Quran would remain in the same manner as it was during the time of our Holy Prophet [s] so that all Muslims, nay all mankind attain guidance from these two combined elements i.e. the Quran and Ahlulbayt [as] since the words and authenticity of this hadith prove such an aim. If the Quran did not remain in its actual form then this would mean that the Holy Prophet [s] (God forbid) did not know what would happen to his Ummah after him or that the Quran would be incapable of providing correct guidance to the entire Ummah. Verily no Muslim could even think let alone entertain either of these notions.

Type Three: Traditions about earning rewards for reciting the complete Surah in prayers

There are some traditions that evidence rewards for reciting particular complete Surahs during prayers or the complete Quran during the Holy month of Ramadan. Had any distortion taken place in the Quran such hadith would carry no value and be meaningless, afterall what be the sense in memorizing Surah that were distorted? Hereunder are some of the hadiths on the topic.

Imam Baqar[as] narrates from his father who from his father who narrates from the Holy Prophet [s]: Whoever recites ten verses in a night shall not be counted amongst the heedless ones and whoever recites fifty verse shall be counted among Daakireen [speakers]. Whoever recites a hundred verses shall be counted amongst the grateful ones. Whoever recites two hundred verses shall be counted amongst those who fear Allah. Whoever recites three hundred shall be counted amongst the successful ones. Whoever recited five hundred verses shall be counted amongst the Mujtahideen. Whoever recites one thousand verses shall receive many rewards"

1. *Al Kafi, Volume 2 page 448*
2. *Amali, page 59-60 by Sheikh Saduq*

Imam Muhammad Baqar [as] states: When someone performs Witr and recites Mauzatain and Surah Ikhlas, it is said to him: O man of Allah ! Your Witr has been accepted by Allah".

1. *Amali, page 60 by Sheikh Saduq*
2. *Thawab al A'maal, page 157 by Sheikh Saduq*

Note: Mauzatain refers to two Surahs of the Quran i.e. Surah Falaq & Surah Naas.

Imam Jafar Sadiq [as] states: The recitation of the Quran is incumbent on you because the ranks of Paradise will be based on the number of verses of Quran. Thus on the day of Qayamah it will be said to the Qari of the Quran: Keep reciting and keep ascending". The number of ranks that he is granted shall correspond to the number of verses he recites"

1. *Amali, page 359 by Sheikh Saduq*
2. *Thawab al A'maal, page 157 by Sheikh Saduq*

Imam Jafar Sadiq [as] states: It is incumbent for those from our Shia that the believer [Momin] recite on the preceding Friday night Surah Jum`a and Surah (Smai Isma Rabakal A`ala..). Verily this was the act of the Prophet [s] it is what he

used to, its reward is with Allah, whether He grants him paradise"

Thawab al A'maal, page 146

Imam Muhammad Baqar [as] states: Whoever in Makkah completes the Quran during two Fridays or around this period of time or mainly completes it on a Friday then Allah will give him reward, so that all of his time during the two Fridays will be counted in recitation. If he completes it on any other day than Friday even then his entire time shall be counted as if he was reciting all the time".

Thawab al A'maal, page 125

There are also several other traditions recorded by to Fuqha as to which Surah is Mustahib to recite in prayers. See Jawahir al Kalam, Volume 9 pages 400-419.

Sheikh Saduq has recorded traditions from the Imams [as] regarding the reward of particular Surahs. [see Thawab al A`maal, from page 130 to 158] and Sheikh Saduq has argued about the completeness of Quran on the basis of similar Hadiths. [see Al Eiteqad, page 93].

Type Four: Hadith instructing us to refer to the Quran

There are many Hadith that concur with the above. For the sake of brevity we shall cite the sermons and letters of Imam Ali bin Abi Talib [as].

"The Prophet came with (a Book containing) testifying to the previous (books) which were already there and also with a light to be followed. It is the Qur'an. If you ask it to speak it won't do so; but I will tell you about it. Know that it contains knowledge of what is to come about, stories of the past, cure for your ills and regulation for whatever faces you."

Nahjul balagha Sermon 158

And in a detailed sermon he said:

"And know that this Qur'an is an adviser who never deceives, a leader who never misleads and a narrator who never speaks a lie. No one will sit beside this Qur'an but that when he rises he will achieve one addition or one diminution - addition in his guidance or elimination in his (spiritual) blindness. You should also know that no one will need anything after (guidance from) the Qur'an and no one will be free from want before (guidance from) the Qur'an. Therefore, seek cure from it for your ailments and seek its assistance in your distresses. It contains a cure for the biggest diseases, namely unbelief, hypocrisy, revolt and misguidance. Pray to Allah through it and turn to Allah with its love. Do not ask the people through it. There is nothing like it through which the people should turn to Allah, the Sublime.

Know that it is an interceder and its intercession will be accepted. It is a speaker who is testified. For whoever the Qur'an intercedes on the Day of Judgment, its intercession for him would be accepted. He about whom the Qur'an speaks ill on the Day of Judgement shall testify to it. On the Day of Judgement an announcer will announce, "Beware. every sower of a crop is in distress except the sowers of the Qur'an." Therefore, you should be among the sowers of the Qur'an and its followers. Make it your guide towards Allah.

Seek its advice for yourselves, do not trust your views against it. and regard your desires in the matter of the Qur'an as deceitful."

Nahjul balagha sermon 176

Ameer al Momineen in his letter to Harith Hamdani [ra] wrote:

"Never forsake the orders, instructions and advice given by the Holy Qur'an. So far as presumptions of actions and things, lawful, legitimate and allowable or unlawful,

forbidden and prohibited are concerned, accept the rulings of the Holy Book."

Nahjul Balagha

At another place he said:

"The Book of Allah is among you. It speaks and its tongue does not falter. It is a house whose pillars do not fall down, and a power whose supporters are never routed."

Nahjul balagha Sermon 133

"Rayan bin Salat narrates that he asked Imam Raza [as] : "O descendant of Prophet (S), what are your views on the Qur'an? He replied: This is book of Allah, do not leave it behind and do not attain guidance from non-Quran for you will go astray"

1. *Aiwan Akhbar al Raza, Volume 2 page 57 by Sheikh Saduq*

2. *Amali, page 546 by Sheikh Saduq*

"Then, Allah sent to him the Book as a light whose flames cannot be extinguished, a lamp whose gleam does not die, a sea whose depth cannot be sounded, a way whose direction does not mislead, a ray whose light does not darken, a separator (of good from evil) whose arguments do not weaken, a clarifier whose foundations cannot be dismantled, a cure which leaves no apprehension for disease, an honour whose supporters are not defeated, and a truth whose helpers are not abandoned. Therefore, it is the mine of belief and its centre, the source of knowledge and its oceans, the plantation of justice and its pools, the foundation stone of Islam and its construction, the valleys of truth and its plains, an ocean which those who draw water cannot empty, springs which those who draw water cannot dry up, a watering place which those who come to take water cannot exhaust, a staging place in moving towards which travellers do not get lost, signs which no treader fails to see and a highland which those who approach it cannot surpass it.

Allah has made it a quencher of the thirst of the learned, a bloom for the hearts of religious jurists, a highway for the ways of the righteous, a cure after which there is no ailment, an effulgence with which there is no darkness, a rope whose grip is strong, a stronghold whose top is invulnerable, an honour for him who loves it, a peace for him who enters it, a guidance for him who follows it, an excuse for him who adopts it, an argument for him who argues with it, a witness for him who quarrels with it, a success for him who argues with it, a carrier of burden for him who seeks the way, a shield for him who arms himself (against misguidance), a knowledge for him who listens carefully, worthy story for him who relates it and a final verdict of him who passes judgements."

Nahjul balagha Sermon 198

"The Qur'an orders as well as refrains, remains silent and also speaks. It is the proof of Allah before His creation. He has taken from them a pledge (to act) upon it. He has perfected its effulgence, and completed through it His religion. He let the Prophet leave this world when he had conveyed to the people all His commands of guidance through the Qur'an. You should therefore regard Allah great as he has held Himself great, because He has not concealed anything of His religion from you, nor has He left out anything which He likes or which He dislikes, but He made for it a clear emblem (of guidance) and a definite sign which either refrains from it or calls towards it..."

Nahjul balagha Sermon 183

Type Five: Referring to different verses of the Holy Quran

Different Shia Muhaddaitheen have recorded hadiths wherein we read that the Imams of Ahlulbait [as] would refer and recite different verses of the Holy Quran during debates and

discussions whether debates and discussions were about beliefs or Holy instructions and whether they contained wisdom or examples etc. The Imams [as] would cite the Quranic verses that are present in the Quran today, and would cite Quranic verses to negate single chain narrations (Ahaad) about distortions in the Quran. This is evidence in chief proving that those traditions that have been narrated from the Imams [as] about Tahreef are actually tafseers according the revelation and not the additions or deletions. [See Al Mizan fi Tafseer al Quran, Volume 12 page 111].

Type Six: Hadiths that conform that the present Quran is correct

There are various traditions narrated from our Imams [as] that affirm their belief that the present Quran was the same as that which was revealed to the Holy Prophet [s]. Here are some of them:

"But the Prophet left amongst you the same which other Prophets left amongst their peoples, because Prophets do not leave them untended (in dark) without a clear path and a standing ensign, namely the Book of your Creator clarifying its permission and prohibitions, its obligations and discretion, its repealing injunctions and the repealed ones, its permissible matters and compulsory ones, its particulars and the general ones, its lessons and illustrations, its long and short ones, its clear and obscure ones, detailing its abbreviations and clarifying its obscurities. In it there are some verses whose knowledge is obligatory and others whose ignorance by the people is permissible. It also contains what appears to be obligatory according to the Book but its repeal is signified by the Prophet's action (sunnah) or that which appears compulsory according to the Prophet's action but the Book allows not following it. Or there are those which are obligatory in a given time but not so after that time. Its prohibitions also differ. Some are major regarding which there exists the threat of fire (Hell), and others are minor for which there are prospects of forgiveness. There are also those of which a small portion is also acceptable (to Allah) but they are capable of being expanded."

Nahjul Balagha, Sermon 1

At another place Ameer al Momineen [as] says:

**"..The fact is that Allah the Glorified says:
 . . . We have not neglected anything in the Book . . . [Qur'an, 6:38]
 And says that one part of the Qur'an verifies another part and that there is no divergence in it as He says:
 . . . And if it had been from any other than Allah, they would surely have found in it much discrepancy. [Qur'an, 4 :82]**

Certainly the outside of the Qur'an is wonderful and its inside is deep (in meaning). Its wonders will never disappear, its amazements will never pass away and its intricacies cannot be cleared except through itself."

Nahjul Balagha, Sermon 18

We also read the statement of Imam Jafar Sadiq [as]:

"Ali bin Salam narrates from his father who asked Imam Jafer Sadiq (as) "O descendant of the Prophet (S). What are your views on the Qur'an? Imam Jafer (as) replied 'the Qur'an is Allah's book and his revelation. This is a Book which Baatil hasn't even gone close to, neither will there be anyone who would call it Baatil nor has this happened before and this has been revealed by the Hakeem and Majeed God"

Amali by Shaykh Saduq, Page 545

Type Seven: Hadiths demonstrating that the Quran was compiled during lifetime of the Prophet [s]

There exist those hadiths that suggest that the Quran had already been collected during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet [s] and the version that Imam Mahdi [as] possesses will be the same as we have today except that its sequence differs. According to the traditions found in the texts of the Shia Imamia, the Quran had already been compiled during the time of the Holy Prophet [s] who tasked Imam Ali bin Abi Talib with its compilation. We read in our texts that the Quran possessed by Imam Mahdi [as] will be the same as that of Imam Ali [as] and will only differ from the present version in terms of the sequence of Surahs. We also read in such texts that there has been no *tehrif* in the Quran and that even if there was any possibility of *tehrif* it would be '*Tahreef bil Maini*' i.e. the words of the Quran are in same manner as they were revealed however there might be changes in the meanings (if its really the case) or it is only the sequence that has been changed.

The report which says that Quran had already been compiled during the time of Holy Prophet [s] is narrated by Ali ibn Ibrahim Qummi in his *tafseer* whilst those reports point to changes in the sequence of Surahs are reported by Qataal Nishapuri.

Type Eight: Tradition "the Book of Allah is sufficient for us"

Arguably the most tragic, painful incident that occurred during the last days of the of Holy Prophet [s] that divided the Muslims and deprived the majority from attaining the clear instructions of the Prophet [s] of Islam relates to the orders he issued on his last Thursday on this earth. We read in different texts as follows:

When the time of the death of the Prophet approached while there were some men in the house, and among them was 'Umar Ibn al-Khattab, the Prophet said: "Come near let me write for you a writing after which you will never go astray." 'Umar said: "The Prophet is seriously ill, and you have the Qur'an, so Allah's Book is sufficient for us." The people in the house differed and disputed. Some of them said, "Come near so that Allah's Apostle may write for you a writing after which you will not go astray," while the others said what 'Umar said. When they made much noise and quarreled greatly in front of the Prophet, he said to them, "Go away and leave me." Ibn 'Abbas used to say, "It was a great disaster that their quarrel and noise prevented Allah's Apostle from writing a statement for them.

Sahih Bukhari Arabic-English Volume 9 hadith number 468 and Volume 7 hadith 573

For the purpose of this article we are submitting the statement of Umar & Co. as evidence that the Quran was held by the people in a tangible book form. No one neither those who were in favor of obeying the instruction of the Prophet [s] not those opposed to it, advanced the notion that the surahs and verses of the Quran were scattered.

We have until now presented all those evidences from the Quran and Sunnah which demonstrate that there has been no distortion with Quran. Now shall now present further evidence.

15. Evidence Three: Ijma

Evidence which clarifies that the Quran is unchanged can be gauged from the Ijma of all the scholars of Islam. [see *Kashaf al Ghata* etc]. Everyone is aware that Ijma commands authority over all Muslims.

16. Evidence Four: The Salat (Prayer) of the Shia Ithna Ashari

The prayer of the Shia Ithna Ashari is itself the biggest proof that there has been no change to the Quran because it is Wajib to recite any surah from the Quran after reciting Surah Al Hamd during the first two Rakat. In the light of this rule the Shia prayer is based on their firm belief that all the verses present in the Quran we have in our possession are the same as those revealed to the Holy Prophet [s], had this not been the case, then the rule of reciting a complete Surah after Surah Al Hamd would be completely useless.

17. Evidence Five: The special treatment afforded to the Quran by the Prophet [s] and his companions

Is it possible for any Muslim to reject the special treatment afforded to the Holy Quran by our Holy Prophet [s]? Whenever a verse of the Quran was revealed, he [s] quickly cascade it amongst the Muslims and would instruct them to teach it to others, encouraging rewards associated with such dissemination in this world and hereafter. Therefore no one except an ignorant can deny the fact the Prophet [s] would make the people learn the verses and encourage them to protect the verses in their hearts or on parchment.

At that time there existed many reasons to memorize the Quran by heart, as the companions had a higher status due to this quality. In such conditions how is it possible that a large or say any part of Quran was lost or changed?

4. Chapter Four: Shia scholars about the completeness of Quran

Shia Ulema have always attested to the present Quran being perfect and free from any addition or subtraction. In this chapter, we shall cite the opinions of some of the Shia Ulema:

18. Sheikh Saduq (d. 381 AH)

One of the greatest Shia scholars Sheikh Saduq (rah) says:

"Regarding the Quran our belief is that it is the word of Allah, His revelation which has descended from Him, it is His words and His book, Baatil can neither enter it from the front, nor from the back. It has been revealed by the All Knowing and All Wise Allah, its tales are true and its sayings are firm. It is not a collection of forged useless incidents. Allah is its Creator, its Revealer, its Protector, and he speaks from it too."

E'tiqadaat by Sheikh-e-Saduq, page 92

Sheikh-e-Saduq (rah) further says:

"Our belief is that the Qur'an which Allah revealed to His Prophet Muhammad is (the same as) the one between the two covers (daffatayn). It is the one which is in the hands of the people, and is not greater in extent than that. The number of Surahs as generally accepted is one hundred and fourteen ...whoever asserts that we claim that it is greater in length than that, is a liar."

E'tiqadaat Sheikh-e-Saduq 93, Published Iran

Sheikh Saduq (rah) then presents the following arguments to prove his claim:

"The narrations that have been revealed about the blessings (Thawab) for the recitation of the entire Quran, the narrations about the permissibility of reciting two Surahs in a single Rakah of non-obligatory (Nafli) Prayers, and the ones about the impermissibility of reciting two Surahs in a single Rakah of Obligatory prayers certify our claim that the Quran is the same that the people have in their hands at present, and the narrations that the whole of the Quran shouldn't be recited in a single night, and narrations about not reciting the whole of the Quran in less than three days verify our claim."

1. *E'tidaqaat Sheikh-e-Saduq, page 93*

2. *Tafseer-e-Safi, page 13*

19. The Belief of Muhammad bin Muhammad ibn Numan Baghdadi; Sheikh Al-Mufid (d. 413 AH)

The teacher of Syed Murtadha Ilm-ul-Huda, and the great Shia Aalim, Sheikh Mufid (rah) says:

"There are no flaws of words, verses or Surahs in the present Quran."

Tafseer A'la al-Rehman, page 17

Perhaps the Nawasib were seeking the opportunity to bark at the Shia, but after this statement from this authentic and great Shia Scholar, their mouths will be shut.

Sheikh al Mufid (rah) further says:

أن الذي بين الدفتين من القرآن جميعه كلام الله و تنزله، و ليس فيه شيء من كلام البشر و هو جمهور المنزل

“Verily what is between the two covers of the Quran its whole content is Allah's words and revelation, there is nothing from the words of mankind in it and its entirety is the revelation of Allah”

1. *Mirat ul-Uqool, Volume 1, page 171.*
2. *al-Mesael al-Surweya, by Sheikh al Mufid, page 78*

20. Belief of Syed Murtada Ali bin al Hussain al Musawi known as Ilm ul-Huda (d. 436 H)

Syed Murtadha Ilm-ul-Huda (rah) says:

“We have a firm belief that the Qur'an is complete in the same way that we believe in the existence of famous cities, or the great events that occurred through history. The reason for this firm belief is (firstly) due to the deep affection Muslims have towards the Qur'an, the other reason being it keeps this book of Almighty Allah, safe from any alteration. Also the Qur'an is (a sign of) the miracle of Prophet Muhammad's Apostleship. It is the source and foundation via which we locate our religious edicts and regulations. It is for this reason that Muslim scholars throughout history have taken great care in its compilation to the extent that if they were unsure about the minutest of matters, they would to examine it (the Qur'an) rigorously. Our belief about the compilation being the exact copy (as the original) is as strong as our belief that the Qur'an is the Book of Allah (swt). The present Qur'an is exactly the same Qur'an that was compiled during the life of Prophet Muhammad (S).”

1. *Tafseer Majma-ul-Bayan, Edition 1, Page 15, Published Iran*
2. *Tafseer-e-Safi, Volume 1, page 34*

Here Syed Murtadha Ilm ul-Huda has comprehensively replied to the queries of Sunnis, and asked how can the Quran be altered in such a situation?

Below Syed Murtadha (rah) further explains the issue, and declares the Quran being perfect, and has termed those who believe in the alteration of the Quran as Akhbaris, that have accepted weak narrations.

“The Holy Quran was collected during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet [s], and it was in the same way in which it exists now, and the evidence for it is that proper classes of the Holy Quran were held and taught during the life of the Holy Prophet [s]. A group was assigned the duty of memorizing the Quran, and progress was presented to the Holy Prophet [s], wherein they would recite the Quran before the Prophet [s]. Hadhrat Abdullah ibne-Mas'ud and Hadhrat Ubay Ibne-Ka'b even recited the Quran several times in front of the Prophet [s] after memorizing it. The simplest of thoughts prove the fact that the Quran was compiled in the lifetime of the Prophet [s], and those who have termed the Imamia and Hashwia against it are wrong. In reality, the people who believe in the alteration of the Quran, are Akhbaris, who narrated weak narrations themselves, and then believed in them being reliable, though weak narrations cannot be made the basis of changing correct and certain facts.”

Tafseer-e-Safi, page 34

This belief of Syed al Murtada became so popular that some prestigious scholars of Ahle Sunnah also recorded it in their works. Ibn Hajar Asqalani narrates from Ibn Hazm that Syed al Murtada was amongst the scholars of the Imamia and he used to deem infidels whoever

maintained the belief in the distortion of the Quran and same was the belief of his fellow scholars like Abul Qasim Razi and Abu Y`ali Tusi. [see Lisan al Mizan, Volume 4 page 224]

21. Belief of Sheikh Muhammad bin Hasan Abu Jafar Tusi known as Shiekh al Taifa (d. 460 AH)

"Sheikh al Tusi (rah) in his book al-Tibyaan says that raising questions about the tahrif of the Quran is inappropriate, because as far as the question of anything being added to the Quran is concerned, there is a complete consensus that no such thing has happened, and about anything being subtracted from it, apparently the belief of all the Muslims is also that this hasn't occurred. The same is the "Sahih" statement especially in our religion, and it has been backed by Allamah Syed Murtadha [rah] and the same is proven from the Ahadith. No doubt both Shias and Sunnis have some single chain narrations that appear which can neither suffice for knowledge, nor can they be acted upon, therefore it is better to discard those.

1. *Tafseer-e-Safi*, page 36.
2. *Tafseer al-A'la al-Rehman*, page 17
3. *Al Bayan fi Tafsir al Quran*, Volume 1 page 3
4. *al-Tibyaan*, by Sheikh Tusi, volume 1 page 3

Following this statement from someone of the caliber of Sheikh-e-Tusi (rah) the Nawasib should now remove their bigoted spectacles, since we have demonstrated that the Shia believe in the perfection of the present Quran, and those handful of narrations that have appeared against it are single chained, and they should know that Ahaad narrations are not followed.

22. The belief of Fazl bin Hassan known as Shaykh Tabrisi (d. 548)

The author of *Tafseer-e-Majma' ul-Bayan*, Allamah Ali bin Ahmed Tabrisi says:

"Anything about the alleged additions made to the Quran are wrong and void anyway. With regards to the reduction from the Quran, some people from the Hashwia sect have narrated that changes and lapses have occurred in the Holy Quran, but we the Shia are opposed to this belief, that is we believe that no reduction has been made to the Holy Quran, 'Ilm ul-Huda Syed Murtadha has said the same too, and this is a simple and clear statement, hopefully you people have come to know that the Shia belief is against any reduction or addition to the Holy Quran."

1. *Tafseer Majma' ul-Bayan*, page 5.
2. *Tafseer-e-Safi*, page 13.

23. The Belief Allamah Ibn Shehr Ashob (d. 588)

"The Prophet [s] received a book that is guarded, neither is it changed, nor is it distorted."

Manaqib-e-Aal-e-Abi Talib, Volume 1, page 187.

24. The belief of Syed al-Radhi (rah) (d. 406 H)

Allamah Syed Razi, the compiler of *Nehj ul Balagha*, says:

"It is such a great book that Baatil can neither enter it, from the front or behind, and it has been revealed by Allah {swt}."

Haqiq al-Taweel, page 102.

25. The belief of Allamah ibn al-Mutahar al-Heli (d. 726 H)

We read in *Masa'el al-Mehana'wiyah* by Allamah ibn al-Mutahar al-Heli, page 121:

الحق أنه لا تبديل ولا تأخير ولا تقديم فيه وأنه لم يزد ولم ينقص ونعوذ بالله تعالى من أن يعتقد مثل ذلك

"The truth is that there are no changes in it and there is neither addition nor loss in it and we seek refuge from Allah about such beliefs".

26. The belief of Shiekh Fath-Ullah Kashani (d 988 H)

"The Holy Quran is safe from any sort of addition or deletion, and that's the belief of our sect."

Tafseer Minhaj ul-Sadiqeen, page 5, published in Iran.

27. The Belief of Shaheed-e-Thalis; Qazi Noor Ullah Shostari (d. 1019 H)

"The Quran is of the same length as it is now, if anyone says that the Quran was lengthier, he is a liar. The Quran was completed and compiled during Prophet's lifetime, and thousands of the companions used to scribe and memorize it. The Imamia sect believes in the perfection of the Quran, and the narrations about distortion have been narrated by some unreliable people, because several Ahadith instruct us to compare the narrations with the Holy Quran, and if they are not in conformance with the Quran, then they should be discarded. When such narrations are judged against the Holy Quran, they are found to be contradicting the Holy Quran's verse:

"we will preserve it"

And the Shia commentators of the Holy Quran have explained this verse saying that Allah [swt] is the Protector of the Holy Quran from all sorts of distortions and alterations. If the Quran is accepted as being distorted and changed, then it means that it has the words of human beings, then if such is the case, then why are they unable to form a single similar verse like that revealed by Allah [swt]?

1. *Masaib al-Nawaib, page 105.*

2. *Muqadimma Tafseer Haqqani, Volume 1, page 23.*

Then he moves on to further say:

"The accusation leveled at the Shia (namely) that they believe in the distortion and alteration of the Holy Quran is wrong. No one from amongst the Shia believe this, and if there are exceptions, how can they be relied upon?"

Masaib al-Nawaib, page 105.

28. The belief of Shiekh Muhammad bin Hasan known as Bahauddin al Amali (d. 1031)

"The true belief is that Quran is free from Tahrif, and that Tahrif might be about addition or deletion, and the statement of Allah [sw] i.e 'We will most surely be its guardian' also proves so. Moreover statements like the name of Ali [as] was mentioned in the verses like 'O Messenger! Deliver what has been revealed to you from your Lord' but were subsequently deleted later, are unreliable statements in the eyes of the Ulema"

Ala Rehman, page 26

29. The Belief of Allamah Sadruddin Shirazi (d. 1050 AH)

Shaykh Sadr-uddin Sheerazi better known as "Mulla Sadra" wrote a commentary on Usul-ul-Kafi. We read about his belief about the supposed Tahreef in the Quran:

"Research proves that the present Quran has neither been changed, nor has it been distorted, and no error has entered into its ranks."

Tafseer of Ayat ul-Kursi, page 332.

30. The belief of Allamah Tuni (d. 1071 H)

In his book "Al Wafia fil Usool" page 148 states:

"It is popular that the Quran is still protected as it was revealed and is still recited in the same manner. No changes have taken place to it. Allah [swt] protected it and revealed:

"Surely We have revealed the Reminder and We will most surely be its guardian"

31. The belief and arguments of Allamah Mohsin Faiz Kashani (d. 1091 AH)

Allamah Mohsin Faiz Kashani who according to the Akhbari scholar Yusuf Al-Bahrani was an Akhbari (Lu'lu'at-ul-Bahrain page 121). Our readers should be reminded that amongst the practices of the Akhbariyah is the duty to accept all hadiths which have been attributed to the Holy Prophet [s] and the Imams [s] irrespective of their credibility. Returning to the discussion Shaikh Faiz Kashani is the author of Tafseer al-Safi and al Waafi and recorded traditions about tahrif in his works from Muhaditheen like Shaykh Kauleni, Ayashi etc and wrote a paragraph which Nawasib happily quote:

Nawasib quote:

And as for the belief of our scholars in this matter, the apparent regarding Al-Kulayni is that he believed in tahreef and deletion of the Quran, as he has related narrations to this effect in his book Al-Kafi and did not disagree with such narrations, as he said at the beginning of his book that he believes in what he narrates therein.

What Nawasib cunningly do not quote is the very next and important sentence of Shaykh Faiz Kashani:

والصحيح من مذهب أصحابنا خلافه وهو الذي نصره المرتضى رضي الله عنه واستوفى الكلام فيه غابة الاستيفاء في جواب المسائل الطرابلسيات

"The correct view of the people of our sect is against that and that is what Al-Murtadha (R.A) confirmed explicitly in its explanation in his answers to 'Al-Mesael Al-Tarabulseat'."

Shaykh Faiz Kashani then goes on to argue that the Quran has been preserved and advance the arguments of various scholars as well as providing rational proofs for it. He says:

"If the alteration in the Quran is accepted, then certain problems occur, and one of those is that if the Quran is considered altered, then nothing in the Quran remains reliable."

Tafseer-e-Safi, volume 1 page 23

He further says:

"If the present Quran isn't as much as it was when revealed, then nothing from the Quran remains Hujjah."

Tafseer-e-Safi, volume 1 page 33.

He goes on to further elaborate:

"If the Quran is incomplete or has additions, then the order of obedience to the Quran, and the instruction to attach oneself to it becomes redundant."

He then affirmed his belief about the completeness of Quran by citing the Quran:

In additional Allah (swt) said: 'Most surely it is a Mighty Book Falsehood shall not come to it from before it nor from behind it and said Surely We have revealed the Reminder and We will most surely be its guardian.' So how can it be corrupted and changed?

He further says:

"When numerous Ahadith have been narrated from the Prophet [s] whereby the reliability of the narrations may be assessed against their conformance with the Quran, and their non-reliability can be ascertained from their opposition to the Quran. If the Quran is considered altered, then what would be the use in forwarding such narrations?"

He adds by saying:

"The narrations about Tahrif are against the Book of Allah, and they degrade the Holy Quran, therefore it is obligatory to reject such narrations."

He further says:

"What Hadhrat Ali [as] said to Talha also verifies our belief, namely O Talha! You will be safe from the Hell Fire and shall enter paradise if you follow everything that is written in the Quran."

Tafseer-e-Safi, volume 1 page 34.

As for Kashani's statement about Shaykh Kulayni, he was not giving an out and out conclusion about Kulayni rather he used the word 'apparent'.

32. The belief of Shaykh Muhammad Baqar Majlisi (d. 1111 H)

Shaykh Baqar Majlisi is also a prominent Shia scholar who Nawasib allege believe in Tahreef of the Quran and they base their proof on the statement of Shaykh Baqar Majlisi wherein he said that some of (Shia) traditions on Tahreef are Mutawatur (Mir'atul-Uqool, Vol 12 page 525). What these people deliberately avoid citing is the similar statement of Shaykh Majlisi written in Mir'atul-Uqool, Vol 3 page 31 wherein he says such traditions from both Shia and Sunni texts are Mutawatur .

If the Ahle Sunnah and Nasibi elements amongst them want to base their proof on the basis of this text, then by the same token they should likewise deem all the Sunni ulema the Kaafirs for they graded many Sunni traditions evidencing Tahreef or mistakes in the Quran to be 'Sahih'. For example Imam Ibn Hajar Asqlani called a tradition 'Sahh' according to which the word '**YAY-ASI**' in verse 13:31 has been written in Quran 'by mistake' while it should have actually

been 'YATBAIN' (Fatah al Bari, Volume 8 page 373).

In order to know the actual belief of Shaykh Baqar Majlisi about the Quran, we read following his citation of a tradition that implies Tahrif in Quran as follows:

"If someone advance his doubts over present Quran being the actual book of Allah [swt] when there exist many traditions according to which the Imams [as] recited verses of the Quran in a manner that are different from the existing Quran for example "Ye are the best of Imams, evolved for mankind", "Thus We have appointed you a middle Imams" and "They ask you the windfalls" - reply of such notion will be the same as already cited i.e these traditions that are counted amongst the 'Akhbar Ahad' and when they are (measured) against Quran then their authenticity is unsure therefore we do not rely on such traditions and haven't abandoned whatever is found in the present Quran because we have been ordered to act upon it ..."

Bihar al Anwar, Volume 89 page 75

The three verses mentioned in the text are 003.110 , 002.143 and 008.001.

At another place whilst explaining the verse 15:9, Shaykh Baqair Majlisi advanced his unequivocal belief in the authenticity of the Quran in the following manner:

إنا نحن نزلنا الذكر " أي القرآن " وإنا له لحافظون " عن الزيادة والنقصان والتغيير والتحريف "

"We have revealed the Reminder" means the Quran "and We will most surely be its guardian" from addition, loss, change and Tahreef.

Bihar al-Anwar, Volume 9 page 113

In his another book Mirat al-Uqool, Volume 2 page 273, Shaykh Baqar Majlisi stated:

ليعلم أن للقرآن حملة يحفظونه عن التحريف في كل زمان

"It must be known that in every era, there are people who protect Quran from Tahreef"

33. The belief of Shiekh Muhammad bin al-Hasan bin al-Hurr al-'Aamili (d. 1104)

The author of Al-Wasa'il, Shiekh Muhammad bin al-Hasan bin al-Hurr al-'Aamili believed:

"One who ponders into the traditions and chapters of history will certainly know that the Quran is present at the highest stage of being Tawatur and there were plenty of Sahaba who were Hafid and Qaris of the Quran..."

Al Fasul al Muhimmah fi Talif al Ummah, page 166

34. The belief of Ibn Abi Jamhoo Ehsai (d. 9th century)

"The other point is that (amongst) the miracles that the Prophet Muhammad [s] brought with him, a permanent miracle is the Holy Quran. Research proves that the Holy Quran has neither changed, nor will it vanish like other miracles."

Al-Mujalla, page 302.

35. The belief of Allamah Abdullah Bashirni Khurasani

"People have disagreed on the issue of the distortion of the Holy Quran, a few have

said that additions have been made to it, and some have said that deletions have been committed to it. There are some narrations in this regard that have been collected by Kulaini and also Qummi in his Tafseer. But the accepted belief is that the Holy Quran is as protected and sound as it was revealed by Allah [swt], it has not been distorted, and He Himself protected it."

Shrah Wafia, page 52, published in Lucknow.

36. The Belief of Shaykh Abu Ja'far Musawi (d. 1157)

"The main reason behind the compiling of this book is to teach us about the meanings of the words contained in the Qur'an. As far as the question of there being any addition or deletion in the Qur'an, there is no need to debate on this matter as everyone agrees that there has been no change made to it the comments of Sayyid Murtaza Alam ul-Huda have been discussed and proved. I have seen many commentaries in the books of the Shi'a and Ahl'ul Sunnah suggesting that the Qur'an is incomplete or that a verse has been transferred from its original place to another but these are secluded cases and cannot be relied upon. Is it not best to abandon such texts and let them become extinct? We are sure of the Qur'an being true. The Ummah has never objected or rejected Qur'an."

Al Bayan Fil Tafseer-ul-Qur'an, 1st volume, Page 3, Published Najaf

37. Shiekh Ibrahim Kalbasi Asbahani (d. 1261)

"The belief of the Quran being lessened is from amongst those beliefs that carry no evidence"

Isharaat al Usool

38. The belief of Allamah Muhammad Hassan Ashtiani (d. 1319)

"The famous Mujtahideen and Usooleen widely believe that the Holy Quran has not been distorted, in fact many people have even claimed a consensus of opinion (ijma') on this. There is in particular a complete consensus of opinion (ijma') that no additions have been made to the Quran, and the narrations that point to deletions being made to the Quran contain weak chains, with very few exceptions."

Behr ul-Fawaid, page 99, published in Iran.

39. The belief of Allamah Abul-Qasim al-Qumi (d. 1231 H)

"Syed Murtadha, Sheikh Saduq, Allamah Tabrisi and the entire sect and the Mujtahideen believe that the Quran has not been distorted."

Qawaneen al-Usool, page 315.

40. The belief of Sheikh Jaffar Kashif ul-Ghita (d. 1228 AH); the author of Kashf ul Ghita

"There is no doubt that the Holy Quran is free of defects; The Qur'an is free from any change or harm due to the hidden protection of Allah [swt], and some verses in the Qur'an confirm this point, the scholars of all the eras (and languages) have likewise testified to this fact. There are a very few opinions that the Qur'an is incomplete, but such views are incorrect and they should not be adhered to, as the religion prohibits us from accepting them."

1. Kashf-ul-Ghita, Page 315, Published Iran.

2. Tafseer Aala al-Rehman, page 17.

41. The belief of Allamah Muhammad Rida Muzaffar (d. 1381 H)

"We believe that the Holy Qur'an was revealed by Allah through the Holy Prophet of Islam dealing with every thing which is necessary for the guidance of mankind. It is an everlasting miracle of the Holy Prophet the like of which cannot be produced by the human mind. It excels in its eloquence, clarity, truth and knowledge. This Divine Book has not been tampered with by any one. This Holy Book that we recite today is the same Holy Qur'an which was revealed to the Holy Prophet. Any one who claims it to be otherwise is either an evil-doer, a mere sophist, or is sadly mistaken. All of those who have this line of thinking have gone astray as Allah in Qur'an said:

"Falsehood can not reach the Qur'an from any direction (41:42)"

1. *The Beliefs of Shiite School, by Muhammad Ridha Mudhaffar, English version, p50-51*
2. *Maktab-e-Tashaiyo', by Muhammad Ridha Mudaffar, Urdu version, page 82, published in Karachi.*

42. The belief of Mullah Sadiq

"Mullah Sadiq in Sharah e Kulaini writes that this Quran would remain as it is until the arrival of Imam Mehdi [as]."

Tafseer-e-Haqqani, Volume 1 page 63.

43. The Belief of Allamah Hasan Amoli

"Whosoever looks at the narrations with a bit of thought, would understand that deletions or additions to the Holy Quran are impossible. Even if (for arguments sake) someone develops this belief, we would convince him through two arguments.

That if the Quran was changed, then why didn't the Aima-e-Ahl-e-Bayt [as], especially Ali [as] and Fatima [sa] keep their Musahif safe, so that the Shia could implement and use that Quran? Had there been any addition or subtraction made to the Holy Quran; the requirement and the true spirit of Islam would have been to openly declaring that and expose such culprits. They would have certainly been supported by a few people as there are always a few people of the kind, if others would have left them at least Banu Hashim would have supported them, or at least Allah [swt] would have supported them for sure, just as he supported an Orphan, and weak child (Hadhrat Muhammad [s]) against the Quraish, and spread his religions across the entire world....."

Tafseer e Haqqani, Volume 1 page 63

44. The belief of Sheikh Muhammad Sadiq Tehrani (d. 1330 H)

"The Tawatur of the Quran has always negated the concept of Tahrif, right from the revelation of the Quran till now; it has always been safe in the form of scriptures as well as the hearts of Muslims."

Anees ul-A'laam, page 28

He further says:

"The Book of Allah is perfect and free from distortion and errors in the view of all the Athna-Ashari Shia, and if anyone believes in Tahrif of the Quran, his views are void, and unaccepted."

Anees ul-A'laam, page 28

45. The belief of Allamah Shaykh Muhammad Hussein Kashif al Ghita (d. 1375)

"The Qur'an that we possess is the same text that Allah (swt) sent as a miracle, to bring fear to the people, to let them know about the commandments and the difference between good and bad. It has never been changed nor has any addition or subtraction ever occurred to it, all the scholars agree to this fact. Moreover these scholars agree to the fact that whoever alleges that Qur'an has been changed is wrong & there is a text in the great Quran that answers them '(Surely We have revealed the Reminder and We will most surely be its guardian)'. Additionally, all the claims of the Qur'an being incomplete, whether made by Shi'as or Ahl'ul Sunnah, are very weak. These claims are not beneficial in any regard whether that be to attain knowledge or perform a good deed. These claims should be disregarded."
Asal Shi'a wa Asoo-laha, Page 101-102, Published Najaf

46. The belief of Syed Abdul Hussain Sharaf-al-ddin al Amali (d. 1377 AH)

**"Fourth Question: Tahrif took place in the Quran due to some lost letters and verses. This statement is attributed to Shias.
 Answer: We ask protection from Allah [swt] from this statement, we ask protection from Allah [swt] from this ignorance and whoever attributes this belief to our madhab is either ignorant of our madhab or lies about it...."**
Ajubat al Masail Jar Allah, pages 28 -37 by Sayed Abdul Hussain Sharaf al-ddin.

47. The belief of Syed Abdul Hussein Tayyab

"The Holy Quran from the first letter of the first word [Ba of Bism Illah] until the last letter of the last word (Seen of al-Naas) is the Word of Allah that has been revealed to the Prophet [s], and no alteration or distortion has occurred in it."
Kalm-ul-Tayyab, page 391

He goes on to further say:

"All of the Scholars of the Imamia, and even the Ahl-e-Sunnah scholars unanimously believe that no addition or deletion has been made to the Holy Quran."
Kalm-ul-Tayyab, page 291

He further says:

"Sheikh Bahai (rah) has said that the Holy Quran is protected from all forms of addition or deletion, and that this is proven from the words of Allah [swt] himself."
Kalm ul-Tayyab, page 295

He then adds to it by saying:

"All those narrations that have come in respect of Tahrif of Quran, are all weak and unreliable due to one reason or the other. Below are a few evidences for it:
(a). All these narrations contradict each other, and in such a case the authenticity of the narrations are always affected
(b). The narrations negating Tahrif of the Quran are very authentic and reliable, therefore the weak narrations of Tahrif cannot withstand them.
(c). The narrations of Tahrif that are quoted hinder worship, and also attack the perfection and eloquence of the Quran.
(d). Even if the extra words and verses sited, are accepted as true, they constitute an explanation of Quranic verses and are not the actual words of the Quran.

(e). The narrations that suggest Tahrif in the Quran are against the ijma' of the Shia as well as the Sunni Ulema."

Kalm ul-Tayyab, page 293

He further testifies by saying:

"It is even reported about Muhaqqia-e-Thani that he had written a permanent article against the distortion of the Quran."

Kalm ul-Tayyab, page 295

He further says:

"Our great teachers like Allamah Syed Mohammad Baqir and Grand Sheikh Allamah Jawad Balaghi were very persistent against Tahrif of the Quran."

Kalm ul-Tayyab, page 295

He adds to it by further saying:

"In the presence of the testimonies of the Scholars, Teachers and experienced researchers, and the consensus on the perfection of the Quran, there remains no worth in the narrations about Tahrif in the Quran, and cannot in any way be relied upon."

Kalm ul-Tayyab, page 295

48. The belief of Muhammad Jawad Mughnyia (d. 1400 H)

We read in Tafseer Al-Mubin by Muhammad Jawad Mughnyia, page 338:

أن هذا القرآن الموجود فعلاً بين الدفتين المؤلف المعروف لدى كل الناس هو بالذات الذي نزل على محمد (ص) بلا تقليص و تطعيم

"The Quran which exists between the two covers, which is known by all the people is exactly the same as that which was revealed upon the Prophet Muhammad (pbuh) without any addition or loss."

49. The belief of Allamah Syed Mohammad Hussein Tabatabai, the author of al-Mizan (d. 1412)

Below are a few of his statements in respect of perfection of Quran, and against Tahrif :

"The verse INNA NAHNU NAZALNAZIKR is testifying to the protection of Quran from all sorts of Tahrif , because it is the Zikr of Allah [s], that has to remain prevalent for ever."

Tafseer-ul-Meezan, volume 12, page 104, Published Iran

He further says:

"The Qur'an, which Almighty Allah descended on the Prophet Muhammad (S), is protected from any change."

Tafseer-ul-Meezan, volume 12, page 109, Published Iran

He adds to it by saying:

"The Hadith al-Thaqlayn that is Mutawatir from both the sides, orders the obedience to Thaqlayn, now if the Book of Allah is distorted, then what is the reason for the order of sticking to it? The Holy Prophet [s] has said that the person remaining with

the Quran will not be astray.”

Tafseer-ul-Meezan, volume 12, page 110, Published Iran

He further says:

“The Masoomeen [as] have declared the Quran to be the criteria for analyzing the Ahadith. If the Quran is itself distorted then how can the merit of any narration be checked according to it? Therefore the Quran is not altered or distorted.”

Tafseer-ul-Meezan, Volume 12, page 110, Published Iran

He further adds to it:

“All the narrations about Tahrif are Ahaad (single chained)”

Tafseer-ul-Meezan, Volume 12, page 111, Published Iran

50. The belief of Shareef Hussain bin Ali Alavi

In the court of King of Iraq, Malik Shah Saljooqi in the era of before 485 A.H., whilst debating with the representative of the Sunnis, Allamah Hussein bin Ali Alavi, the representative of Shia, stated:

“We don’t say such statements (tahrif), but this is a Sunnis statement, therefore the Quran is reliable according to us.”

Moreover we read:

“Our reliable scholars don’t believe in Tahrif”

Mo`tamir Ulema-e-Baghdad, by Maqatil bin Atia, page 91.

51. The Belief of Ayatullah al Udhma Syed Abul Qasim al-Khoei (d. 1413)

Ayatullah Syed Abul Qasim al-Khoei’s detailed work ‘Al-Bayan fi Tafsir al-Quran’ is not hidden from the masses wherein he rejected any notion of tahreef in the Holy Quran. Despite this, some Nawasib try to attribute the belief of Tahreef to al-Khoei through the partial quoting of his words. For example, the following passage is quoted by some Nawasib on the internet with an emphasis on the underlined sentences:

“There is no indication in these narrations pointing to the fact of tahreef as in the disputed meaning of the word. To explain that: a great number of these narrations, though they are of weak isnad, a good number of them were copied from the book of Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Sayyari, whom the scientists of Rijal have a consensus on the invalidity of his mazhab, and the fact he believes in the incarnation, as well as from Ali b. Muhammad al-Kufi who has been charged by the scientists of Rijal to be a liar and pointed to his invalid mazhab. However, the multitude of these narrations forces us to believe that some of them have definitely been issued by the infallibles [as], that is the least we can be sure of, and some of them have been narrated with a considerable Isnad, and therefore there is no need to examine each and every Isnad of them.”

Al-Bayaan fi Tafseer al-Quran, published by Al-'Alami Foundation, Beirut, Lebanon, 3rd ed. 1974, p. 226

If Nawasib had actually taken the time and effort to read Al-Khoei’s work, they would have seen that he has classified tahrif according to a number of levels, the verse being tampered in the sense of alteration of the meaning, and the last being in the sense of addition of verses to the Quran, with various other types in between. This is based on the Ahadith and the Quran itself.

He then goes on to say that tahrif has indeed occurred, but not the tahrif of adding or deleting verses rather tahreef in the meanings and two pages following the above passage, under the topic of **'Actual Significance of the Traditions'** Sayyid al-Khoei explains that these traditions are not in the sense of additions or deletions of verses from the Quran, but they actually point to other dimensions of tahrif i.e. the Tahrif of the meaning:

"As for the remaining traditions, their apparent meaning points to tahrif in the sense of explaining the verses at variance with their actual meanings, which, in turn goes hand in hand with denying the excellence of the Family of the Prophet (ahl al-bayt) (peace be upon them)..."

Al-Bayaan fi Tafseer al-Quran, published by Al-'Alami Foundation, Beirut, Lebanon, 3rd ed. 1974, p. 228

As for the perfection of the Holy Quran, Al-Khoei has made it very clear throughout his book that:

"A large group of the great scholars have denied any chances of Tahrif in the Holy Quran, Sheikh al-Mufid, Sheikh al-Bhai, and researcher Qadhi Noor-Ullah and a few others are the leading ones to be mentioned. Every Shia Scholar who has authored a book on Imamate and has mentioned the "Mata'in" in it believes in the perfection of the Quran, because had they believed in Tahrif of Quran, they would have mentioned the burning of the Holy Quran."

Al-Bayaan, page 201

"Whoever claims Tahrif , opposes the mind and rationality."

Al-Bayaan, page 220

"Numerous groups have claimed an Ijma' (consensus of opinion) on the perfection of the Holy Quran, and those who have claimed an Ijma' includes Sheikh al-Mufid, Sheikh al-Bhai, Sheikh al-Tusi and many other great scholars."

Al-Bayaan, page 233

"Research shows that most of the narrations about tahrif of Quran are daeef, and some do not prove any probability of Tahrif ."

Al-Bayaan, page 233

"Allamah Tabarsi has quoted a lengthy saying of Syed Murtadha ilm-ul-Huda and has denied the statements of Tahrif through logical arguments, and sound facts."

Al-Bayaan, page 207

"This permissibility by the Imams is a proof that corruption didn't take place in the Quran"

Al-Bayaan, page 215

"The narrations that hint towards Tahrif are Ahaad (Single narrations) which cannot be sufficient for the Ulema to act upon them."

Al-Bayaan, page 221

"Allamah Kalyasi says that the narrations pointing to a distortion of the Quran are against the Ijma'-e-Ummat (Consensus of the Ummah's opinion)"

Al-Bayaan, page 234

52. The belief of Allamah Ali Hairi

"The present Quran is free from all sorts of additions or deletions."

1. *Lawame' al-Tanzeel, part 14, page 23*
2. *Tahreef-e-Quran (speech of Allamah Hairi at Mochi Darwaza Lahore), page 80.*

53. The belief of Sayed Muhammad Shirazi (d. 1422 H)

Sayed Muhammad Shirazi states in Tafsir Taqrib al-Quran, volume 3 page 157:

أن هذا القرآن الذي هو بأيدينا اليوم بين الدفتين هو عين ما أنزل بلا أي تغيير أو تعديل

"Surely the Quran which is in our hands today is exactly the same as that which was revealed without any changes or alteration"

54. The belief of Mukaram Shirazi

Modern day scholar Mukaram Shirazi records in Tafsir al-Amthal, volume 8, page 20:

"The Quran has never been altered and what exists in our hands is the same as that which was revealed upon the bosom of the beloved prophet Muhammad (pbuh), surely neither is there any addition to it nor loss of even one word or even less than a letter."

Here is the website of Allamah Mukaram Shirazi:

<http://www.makaremshirazi.org/english/>

55. The belief of Sayed Muhammad Saeed al-Hakim

Another modern day Shia scholar Sayed Muhammad Saeed al-Hakim records in Fi Rehab al-Aqida, volume 1 page 143:

"What is between the two boards of Quran is the complete Quran."

Here is the website of Sayed Muhammad Saeed al-Hakim

<http://english.alhakeem.com/>

56. The belief of Sayed Sistani

Syed sistani stated in Ahdath al-Istiftaat al-Aqedia, page 454:

"The Quran that exists in our hands is the same as that which was revealed upon Allah's messenger (pbuh) without addition or loss"

57. The belief of Allamah Shaykh Muhammad Jawad Balaghi Najafi (d. 1352 AH)

Here the descriptive statement of Allamah Jawad al-Balaghi from his Tafseer al-Aala al-Rehman (with Tafseer of Syed Abdullah Shabbar) page 17, second edition, (published in Iran is being presented) so that our unbiased and rational readers may get fully acquainted with the truth, that will in turn lead to them throwing the baseless materials of the Nawasib in the gutter.

This statement has also been recorded by the famed Allamah Syed Ali Naqi Naqvi (Lucknawi) in the introduction of his 'Tafseer Fasl Khitab' on page 175 (published by Idara Tarweej e Uloom e Islamiya, Karachi).

Translation of Muqadimah, Tafseer-e Fasl Khitab, page 175-181 Under "**The Imamia sect believes that no subtraction has occurred in the Quran**":

"The teacher of all the Muhaditheen and one of the most known traditionists, Sheikh al-Sadooq (rah) states in his book, al-Ei'teqadat: "We believe that the holy Quran that Allah [swt] revealed to the Prophet [s] is the same that lies with us between the two covers and nothing more than this, and whosoever accuses us of believing in a Quran lengthier than this, he is a blatant liar. He has taken those narrations which have come about the reduction of the verses of Quran in a different meaning."

In the last part of Fasl-ul-Khitaab a statement of Sheikh al-Mufid [rah] has been recorded from his book al-Maqalaat, wherein he says that most of the followers of the Imamia sect believe that no subtraction has been done to the Holy Quran, not even that of a single sentence, single verse or a single word. No doubt, the explanations, the meanings and the details of revelations of the holy Quran compiled by Hadhrat Ali [as] had been reduced.

Syed Murtadha ilm-ul-Huda [rah] likewise affirmed the same belief, he states that nothing has been reduced from the Holy Quran, only a few from the Imamia sect and Hashwia opposed this view and they do not deserve any attention. The statements against this view they are from some people from the Akhbariyyah who have taken some daeef narrations as Sahih and have adopted this view.

In the beginning of Sheikh al-Tusi's book al-Tibyaan it is stated that raising questions about the Tahrif of the Quran is inappropriate, because as far as the question of anything being added to the Quran is concerned, there is a complete consensus that no such thing has happened, and about anything being subtracted from it, apparently the belief of all the Muslims is that this has likewise not occurred, and the same is the "Sahih" statement especially in our religion, and it has been backed by Allamah Syed Murtadha [rah] and same is proven from the Ahadith. No doubt in both Shias and Sunnis some single chain narrations have certainly come which can neither suffice for knowledge, nor can they be acted upon, therefore it is better to discard them.

Exactly the same belief is described in Tafseer al-Majma' al-Bayaan.

It is stated in Kashf-ul-Ghita Kitab al-Quran that the eighth discussion concerns mistakes in the Quran. Certainly the Holy Quran is protected from the mistakes and errors with the protection of Allah [swt] which is explicitly declared by the verse of the Holy Quran itself, and the Ulema of all the eras have had the same belief, except for the very few people who have gone against this and deserve no attention, and the narrations that point to errors in the Quran cannot be acted upon and neither should they be explained for this matter.

Sheikh Bahai says that there is a difference of opinion about Tahrif in the Quran, but the correct view is that it is protected from all sorts of subtractions or additions, and Allah [swt] says that He Himself is the Protector of the Quran, and the proof for it is that it is said that the term "Ameer ul-Mo'mineen" had been subtracted from numerous places, like: "Ya Aiyohal lazeena balagh ma unzila Ilaik fi Ali" etc which is completely unauthentic.

Syed Mohsin Baghdadi in Shrah Wafia says that the accepted belief amongst our Ulema is that we have an Ijma' that no subtraction has occurred with the Holy Quran.

Allamah Ali Bin Abdul `Aali Kirki has authored a complete book about the perfection

of the Holy Quran, wherein he has quoted the statement of Sheikh al-Sadooq [rah] and then whilst discussing the narrations which point to Tahrif of the Quran, he has said that when any hadith is against the Quran or the Mutawatir ahadith, and any other possible explanation cannot be done, then that narration should be discarded.

Going against all these Ulema, a scholar of the present era Allamah Noori in Fasl-ul-Khitaab has sought to collect all those narrations that can be used in the matter of Tahrif of the Quran, and then has tried to give arguments from them. He has increased the number of narrations. If any person has a rational outlook and research oriented attitude and looks into the matter, he would understand that these narrations that are recorded in Tafseer al-'ayaashi, firaat, ibn-e-Ibrahim etc are all adapted from a very few narrations, and then the narrations which are quoted in this case cannot be correct in any case, and some of them contradict each other so much that they all become very doubtful and objectionable.

Most of the mentioned primary source narrations (from which the others are adapted) also go back to a few people who are themselves unreliable when scrutinized through Rijal. One of them has been termed as la-Madhab (Without any religion) whose narrations are weak and discarded, whilst one of the other narrators is known for narrating from weak narrators and having doubtful narrations. The Ulema of Rijal call the third a liar and unreliable, and have not taken any narration from his Tafseer, or the person had an excessive hatred for Imam Ali ul-Redha [as], was a Ghaali and a Liar, and not even worth considering. Now if narrations from such narrators are taken then even the abundance of such narrations cannot justify a belief and neither can they prove the point of a person, because when the narrators are termed as liars, unreliable, la-Madhab and abandoned then their narrations cannot be used as authority. Even if the narrations are accepted for one reason or another, one should interpret the narrations as pointing towards the explanations, or interpretations [that the narrations deem as subtracted] and not the verses, or that the details about the person or the occasion on which the verse was revealed has been reduced, and Tahrif in the sense of meaning, not in the sense of words has occurred.

Like those narrations which are said to be revealed and have been brought by Jibrael [as], their accumulation indeed proves their meaningfulness. And by distortion it is meant the "Distortion of meaning" which is verified by the note written to Saa'd by Imam Mohammad Baqir [as] and which has been mentioned in Rawdha tul-Kafi that 'those people had disregarded the Book of Allah by bringing alterations in its restricted limitations though their literal words were retained.'

Likewise the traditions which state that in Mushaf-e-Imam Ali [as] and Mushaf-e-Ibn Mas'ud, it has been narrated correspondingly, it in fact denotes the explanation and interpretation. To confirm its validity there is a narration of Hadhrat Ali [as] to a Zindeeq (non-muslim) that states that he had provided them with the complete book which included both the revelation and elucidation (Imam Ali's compiled Quran). The traditions that we pointed out earlier are the four traditions narrated by Allamah Noori which say that the phrase "Bil-Wilayatal Ali" was mentioned in Mushaf-e-Fatima [sa], and some of them state that it is mentioned in Mushaf-e-Fatima [sa] just like that. It should be kept in mind that Mushaf-e-Fatima [sa] was not the Qur'an but it was a book that contained literary understanding. Just as it is proven from several traditions of Usul-al-Kafi that are mentioned in the chapters of Sahifa, Mushaf and Jamia, they include a quotation from Imam Jaffer Sadiq [as] that: "it does not contain anything from your Quran" and at some places it is said that: "I do not say that it contains the Quran" as it has come in Sahih and Hasan traditions.

Other than that, in the same chapter of Al-Kafi it is stated that the Ma'sumeen [as]

are 'the witnesses over the people'. In a Sahih tradition of Burayd it has been reported from Imam Mohammad Baqir [as] and in another tradition, which has been narrated from Imam Sadiq [as] that both of the Imams have said about "ja'alna kum ummata wasta", that they (Aima) are the Ummat-e-Wast.

Amir-ul-Momineen [as] has clarified it under its tafseer that: "We are the ones about whom Allah said: 'We declared you as the Ummat-e-Wast.'"

Now in Tafseer-e-Nu'mani and Tafseer Saa'd, it has been mentioned that the verse contains "Aima Wast".

It should be understood as Tafseer only and it was that the meaning of 'Ummat e Wast' was "Aima wast' which was altered by the people. Moreover, in the chapter of al-Kafi whee Ma'sumeen have been declared as the guides and leaders there are traditions from Fazal that he had asked the meaning of this verse from Imam Jafer Sadiq [as] i.e "Lakum Qoum Haad" (to each nation there is a guide), Imam said: "Each Imam is a guide to the nation and time in which he belongs." In the tafseer of the same verse, Imam Baqir [as] said: the Holy Prophet is a warner and in every period there is a guide from us who guides towards the teachings of the Holy Prophet and the guide after the Holy Prophet is Ali--- and after him there are his successors that are like them" .

Abu Baseer reports from Imam Al-Sadiq [as] and Abd al Rahim Qaseer reports from Imam Mohammad Baqir [as], all of the narrations state the same that Hazrat Mohammad [as] is a Warner, Ali bin Abi Talib [as] is the guide. Such narrations are also found in the text of Ahl-al-Sunnah. Such narrations have come from Abu Hurairah, Abu Barzah, Ibne-Abbas and also had Hadhrat Ali [as], Hakim has termed these narrations Sahih in his Mustadrak. [1]

Even after reading all these narrations can anybody give importance to the efforts in Fasl-ul-Khitaab that have been made after taking some narrations from some tafseer of Mataikhreen and Hashiya-e-Qibsaat of Meer Baqir Daamaad, and then it has been stated that there are numerous Shia and Sunni narrations that say that the verse in its correct form was: "Innama anta Manzara ne'ibad Ali likule Qaumun Haad" (You are just a warner and Ali is a guide for every nation)?

This is just a couplet of poetry that was recited by some poets, now a mere couplet of poetry cannot be taken as authority and then one cannot say that Shia and Sunni narrations both testify to the above mentioned statement, because the Shia and Sunni narrations are the ones that we have already cited above, and state what the Prophet [s] said was actually the words of Quran. Muhadith Noori has gone against this.

The narration in al-Kafi says that Imam Muhammad Baqir [as] said to Abu Hamza that the pagans used to say: "Rabbana Makkunna Mushrikeen" and this refers to the denial of the Wilayat of Ali [as]. These words clearly shows that these words were a part of the tafseer and not a part of the verse. This also justifies the two weak narrations of Abu Baseer which say that the term "Bewilayate Ali" was included in the Quran was subsequently struck out.

"Umar bin Hinzala narrates that about this verse of Surah al-Baqarah "Mata' ilal howil ghayr akhiraj" Imam Jafar al-Sadiq [as] said "Mukhrajaat". By looking at the word MUKHRAJAAT one cannot even doubt that this has been used as nothing but a tafseer (explanation). This means that neither the word "Ikhraaj" nor meaning MUKHRAJAAT nor that this word was present and then it was removed. But in Fasl-ul-Khitaab, it has been recorded as an error and (concluded via) deduction.

In these narrations the narration of Mohammad bin Muslim from Imam Jafar al-Sadiq [as] with a Sahih Chain is present in the beginning of al-Kafi's chapter "Mana'

al-Zakaat"; it states that Hazrat Imam Jafar al-Sadiq [as] said that these people will be chained and that the things regarding which they were avaricious was from Zakat. It clearly shows that the word 'Mina al Zakat' is used as an explanation, not that it is the part of Quran. The same will be used as the commentary of the Mursal tradition of Ibn Abi Umair wherein he reported from Imam Jafar al-Sadiq [as] that Allah (swt) said: "Sayootufuna ma Bukhalu Bihi Mina al Zakat Yum al Qyamah"

This tradition will also mean the same that "Ma Bukhalu" means "Mina' al-Zakaat was not a part of the Qur'an which was subsequently expunged. Hence a Sahih narration from Abu Baseer that has been narrated from Imam Jafar al-Sadiq [as] as recorded in al-Kafi chapter "Nas al-Aima [as]" which says that Abu Baseer asked that people ask why the names of Ali [as] and his descendants are not in the Holy Qur'an, to which the Imam [as] replied: "Tell those people that in the Holy Quran it was revealed on the Prophet [s] that prayers (salat) are obligatory, but Allah has not said that there are three rakahs for Maghrib and four rakahs for 'Isha, unless the Prophet [s] told the people about it, likewise the Quran provides an introduction about Zakat and Hajj, and the Prophet [s] provided details about them." This narration proves that the Imam [as] deemed the view of those people as correct and that the name of Ameer ul-Mo'mineen [as] was not present in the Quran

The proof of this narration also comes a bit later in Saheeha-e-Fuzla in al-Kafi, in Abu-Lajarud's narration from Imam Muhammad Baqir [as] and Abul Delem's narration from Imam Jafar-e-Sadiq [as] wherein both of the Imams [as] without any reason for Taqqiyah recited the verse: '*Messenger! proclaim the (message) which hath been sent to thee from thy Lord.*' They didn't add the words "Fi-Ali" to it, that proves that some narrations which have the additional words of "Fi-Ali" are a commentary, whilst they were brought by Jibrael [as] as revelation they were not a part of the Holy Quran. This form of revelation used existed in the form of the words of Holy Prophet [s] because it is mentioned in the Quran that "*Nor does he (Muhammad) speak out of his desire. Whatever he says is nothing but a revelation that is revealed*" - which is always the revelation brought from Allah.

From amongst those narrations, is the narration by Fazeel from Imam Ali ul-Rida [as] in al-Kafi, Chapter 1 "Maini tanzeel filWilayah" in which the narrator recited the verse: "HAZAL LAZI KUNTUM BEH TAKZIBOON", The Imam [as] said: "It means Ameer ul-Mo'mineen [as]", then the narrator asked: "Is it Tanzeel", the Imam [as] replied in the affirmative. In this tradition the Imam [as] used the word "Ameer al Momineen" along with the word "means" which clearly shows that this was not a part of the Quran. Now the narrators inquiry that if it was Tanzeel, and Imam [as]'s confirmation that it was doesn't mean that it was a part of the Quran, because Tanzeel doesn't always mean a part of the Quran, in fact it is also used by them to provide an explanation or explain the purpose of a verse. All these types of narrations make the arguments used to populate the pages of Fasl-ul-Khitaab makes null and void.

[1]

1. *Mustadrak al-Hakim, Volume 3, page 129, by Hakim Neeshapuri, published in Hyderabad.*
2. *Tafseer Ibn Jareer, Volume 13, page 63, by Ibne-Jareer Tabri*
3. *Dur al-Manthur, Volume 4, page 45, by Suyuti, published in Beirut.*

Beside these revered scholars of the Shia school, the following scholars also maintained a belief in the authenticity and completeness of the Holy Quran.

1. A paragraph by Shaikh Hassan Yusuf (d. 726) also known as Allamah Hilli in his book "Nihayaht al Usool" tells us that he was not a believer in Tahreef.

2. Shaikh Zainuddin al-Bayazi Amili (d. 877) whilst providing a commentary of the verse 15:9 states that it is about the protection of Quran from any kind of Tahreef. See "Mubahith fi Uloom e Quran" by Allamah Urduabadi.
3. Shaikh Ali bin Abdul A'ali al Kurki al Amili (d. 940) known as "Muhhaqiq Thani" wrote a complete book about the Quran being protected from Tahreef and Syed Muhsin Arji Baghdadi (d. 1228) in his book "Shrah Wafia fi Ilm al Usool" has cited it.
4. Syed Ali bin Masoom alMadani Shirazi (d. 1118) in his book "Riad al Salikeen fi Shrah Sahifah Syed AlAbadeen" also states the same.
5. Syed Muhammad Tabatabai (d. 1242) also held the same views. See "Mafatih al Usool".
6. Syed Muhammad Shahshahani (d. 1289) whilst discussing the topic of the Quran in his book "Urwatal Thiqa" clearly stated that there has been no Tahreef in the Quran and he also attributed same view to the Jamhur Mujtahideen. See 'Al Bayan fi Tafsir al Quran', page 200.
7. Syed Mahdi (d. 1300) the author of "Minhaj Sharyah fi Rad e Ala Ibn Tamiyah".
8. Syed Husain Kohkumri Najafi (d. 1299) clearly stated that there has been no Tahreef in the Quran. See 'Bashr alwsool Ila Ism`a Ilm al Usool'.
9. Shaikh Musa Tabraizi (d. 1307) in his book "Shrah Rasail fi Ilm al Usool" also upholds same view.
10. Shaikh Muhammad Hussain Shahrastanial Hairi (d. 1315) in his book "Risalat fi Hifz al Kitab al Ashraf An Shubhaat al Qol fi Tahreef" proves it from various arguments that there has been no Tahreef in Holy Quran. See 'Al Marif al Jalilah' Vol 1 Page 21.
11. Shaikh Muhammad bin Hasan bin Abdullah al Najafi (d. 1323) in his book "Bashr alwasool Ila Israr Ilm al Usool" also maintained the same view about Quran.
12. Shaikh Abdullah bin Shaikh Muhammad Hassan (d. 1351) while commenting on the view of Muhadith Nuri about Rabi` bin Kathim he also commented on his views of Tahreef. See Tanqeh al Maqal.
13. Shaikh AbilHasan al Khanizi (d. 1343) the author of Datwat al Islamiyah.
14. Shaikh Muhammad Nihawandi (d. 1371) the author of a Tafseer.
15. Shaikh Aqa Buzurg Tehrani (d. 1389), book "Nafi al Tahreef an alQuran al Shareef".

Note: We have obviously left out the Akhbari scholars from the list and haven't commented on their remarks and they include Al-Jazairi, Abu al-Hassan al-Amili, Syed Adnan al-Bahraini, Yusuf al-Bahraini etc.

We have mentioned more than a few dozen Shia scholars spanning over 1200 years of Shia scholarship. Anyone who still accuse Shias of ascribing to Tahrif e Quran and denies our testimony and claims all such statements have been made in Taqqiyah is indeed a misguided mushrik for no one knows what one has in his heart except Allah [swt].

58. What about those who believed in Tahreef?

Amongst the different objections that come from Nawasib and some contemporary Sunnies are two connected questions:

1. Why have the Shia Ulema never issued takfeer against that small number of scholars that ascribed to Tahreef
2. Why have later Ulema not only praised them but quoted their works.

For such an objection we would like to ask a question:

"Why do you not examine the contents in your own garden in the first instance? Who on earth has given you the right to point out fingers at others for a matter that grows abundantly in your own garden?"

It is well known that Sahabah and Tabeeen used to deny and change some verses of the Quran (Majum' Fatawa Vol 12 page 492-493), Ayesha used to recite some words in verse 2:238 which

we can't locate today and not only that, she insisted that the Prophet [s] used to recite it with those particular words (Sahih Muslim Book 004, Number 1316), Abi bin Kaab got furious at Umar who would recite verse 100 of Surah Taubah differently (Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Vol 3 page 269) etc. We have dedicated three chapters in this article for such Sunni references where you will find plenty of Sahabah that believed in the version of verses of Quran that differ from the present form.

In accordance with the question thrown at us, have such inquisitors abandoned their relationship with all those Sahabah and issued takfeer against them? If they haven't done it so to date, they should steer clear from posing such questions until they implement it in their own house.

59. Refuting the ignorance shown by Ibn al-Hashimi al-Nasibi regarding Allama Abdul Kareem Mushtaq Shaheed

It seems that Ibn al-Hashimi has not been having a good time once he came to know of the plethora of texts recorded by some of his grand Pandits about Tahreef in the Quran, he decided to criticize the following remarks of Allamah Abdul Kareem Mushtaq in a state of panic:

Ibn al Hashimi stated:

Answer 874 (by Allamah Abdul Kareem Mushtaq):

No doubt the Quran that is with Imam Mehdi is complete. It has in it all Mansukh verses as well as the present verses in the same order they were revealed and all explanatory notes and explanations are present in it. It has the complete interpretation of the Prophet. It has in it all the issues of past, present and future. And in that complete book everything wet or dry is mentioned in it. And you people (Sunnis) don't believe in that properly ordered Quran and only believe in this present Quran which according to you has lost a large part of it. That means that your (Sunni) belief is weak, whereas we (Shias) believe in that complete Quran which was never separated from the Ahlel Bayt.

That is why in the Times of Justice (i.e. the End of Times) this Quran would appear and will defeat falsehood, and it will prove Allah's Promise that this Quran has explanations of everything dry and wet in it and then not even any impure person can corrupt it. But only the pure can touch it. When Imam (Mehdi) will reveal this Quran to the world, falsehood will vanish from this world and Truth will rule.

The Holy Quran we have now with us (i.e. the present Quran) contains verses of that same Quran (that is with Imam Mehdi) but its order of verses is not the same, and it also does not contain the explanations given by the Prophet. When we accept the present Quran as the Word of Allah, then how can you doubt our belief? **The weakness of belief is present in your (Sunni) religion who only believe the present Quran to be enough, and don't**

believe in that part which is invisible.

However, they admit that a large part of the Quran went wasted but they don't believe this lost part as the Word of Allah, **but rather by denying it, they (the Sunnis) believe in a weak Quran.**

Our belief is on both the visible (verses) and invisible (verses). So we (Shias) are complete in beliefs, whereas you (Sunnis) believe in the visible (verses), and deny the invisible (verses). That is why you (Sunnis) are incomplete in faith when you proclaim that you believe in the total Quran which is the present Quran.

Even the claim of Quran is that it has everything dry or wet mentioned in it, whereas in the total Quran in which you (Sunnis) believe in (i.e the present Quran), you cannot find the mention of the existence of Pakistan in it, but the total Quran in which we believe in, it has everything of the past and the future mentioned in it. And that complete Quran is present under the protection of a guardian in this world (i.e. Imam Mehdi) which impure people cannot corrupt.

The situation of your Quran's protection is such that every pure or impure person in whatever condition can touch it. There exists the possibility of mistakes and errors in its manuscript. You cannot even show the name of the republic of Pakistan in it, whereas our claim is that the manuscript of the Holy Quran is safe under the guardianship of our Imam (Mehdi). It has all those things which have happened (in the past) or will happen (in the future). Hence, our belief is complete and your belief is faulty because you believe in the partial Word of Allah and deny the rest of it, whereas we are the believers of both the partial and total Word of Allah.

("Hazaar Tumhari Dus Hamari", by Allamah Abdul Kareem Mushtaq, p.553-554)

60. Reply

First of all it should be noted that the meaning and the context used is never clear if we:

- [1] pick up something from the middle of the book
- [2] seek to understand a different language.

If the Nasibi had pointed out something in particular then we could have provided a precise reply. From the outset until the end, Abdul Kareem Mushtaq Shaheed has actually explained the 'mushaf' (copy) of the Imams [as], that was transferred from one Imam [as] to the next one which currently is with the Imam e Zaman [as]. At the same time he has compared that copy of Quran with the Sunni belief about the copy of the Quran which we all Muslims have, i.e.

Sunnies believe that this is not the complete one as Ibn Umar testified that most of its part has been lost. It is therefore the Sunnies who should respond to the comments of Abdul Kareem Mushtaq Shaheed not us. As for his list of qualities about the copy which Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] possessed, this is not something new, we all know from Shia traditions as well as some Sunni traditions that the first Imam, Ali bin Abi Talib [as] had collected the Quran according to its revelation, i.e. in the order in which it had been sent down. This is the reason that Sunni Imam, Muhammad Ibn Sireen (33/653 - 110/729), the famous scholar and Tabayee regretted that this transcript had not passed into the hands of the Muslims, and said:

قال محمد ابن سيرين لو أصبت ذلك الكتاب كان فيه العلم

If we could get that transcript, we would found a great knowledge in it'

1. *Al-Sawaiq al-Muhriqa*, v2, p375
2. *Tarikh Dimashq*, v42, p399

Abdul kareem Mushtaq has referred to the very 'knowledge' contained in the compilation of the Imam [as] which the Sunni Imam Ibn Sireen had pointed out.

We Shias of Ahlulbayt [as] believe that Allah [swt] has chosen twelve members of Ahlulbayt [as] as Imams and has equipped them with all sorts of necessary knowledge and the method of transferring that knowledge through the Imams is either directly or through a copy of the Quran that has been given to them and which transferred to each Imam. It is that copy of the Quran which Allamah Abdul Kareem Mushtaq was discussing; it is that copy of Quran which contain all sorts of past and future events and knowledge of anything that a divinely appointed guide would need, in short, this extent is referred to as the knowledge of every 'wet and dry' thing. Of course this vast knowledge of 'wet and dry' contains information on different states, in his case, Allamah Abdul Kareem Mushtaq gave the example of a country he lived in. So which part of it is not getting into the thick minds of Nawasib?

If this is still not clear to our opponents then allow us to cite the words of the great Sahabi Ibn Abbas [ra] which we read in Al-Itqan, Volume 2 page 332:

وابن عباس حتى قال لو ضاع لي عقال بعير لوجدته في كتاب الله تعالى

"If the bond of the camel was lost, I would find it in Allah's book"

Can the thick headed Nawasib of ahlebayt.com show us any verse which helps one find the lost strap of his camel? Obviously there isn't any such verse, rather it was a certain level of spirituality possessed by a pious person which would help him to understand some of the internal meanings of the Holy Quran which would enable him to find the lost strap. Similarly, the name of any country, names of its residents, their personal information cannot be literally found in Quran but those that have attained a high rank of spirituality through the blessings of Allah [swt], can come to know all such information on the basis of the knowledge that has been given to them about the internal meanings of Quran, and we all know that anyone who has this kind of knowledge can perform those acts which a normal and sinful Muslim would be unable to perform and its prime example comes from Quran itself wherein we read that a person Asif who possessed a partial knowledge of the Book had brought the throne of Queen Bilqis from another place of the world within the twinkling of an eye.

Therefore, when Abdul Kareem Mushtaq stated that we believed in both of the Qurans whilst Sunnies believe in only one, he was actually referring to the Shia's belief in Imamate according to which Imams are given a certain copy of the Quran which we discussed above, whilst Sunnies don't believe in it, hence our faith is greater than that of Sunnies. It was just Allamah Abdul Kareem Mushtaq's rhetoric which didn't find an entrance into the thick head of this Nasibi. It is just like any Sunni stating that he believed in the present Quran as well as in the Quran possessed by Ibn Abbas through which he could find the lost bond of his camel, it means that he believed in the present Quran as well as the far superior level of 'spirituality' possessed by Ibn Abbas which enabled him to find the lost strap of his camel through Quranic verses.

5. Chapter Five: Analyzing some of the Shia reports about Tahreef

In this chapter we shall examine those Shia traditions that infer tahreef. After citing such hadiths we will present the views of Shia scholars about them and shall evidence that they are insufficient to prove distortion of Quran. Having cited the interpretations, reasonings and rejections presented by Shia Ulema about some of the hadiths on the topic it will be very easy for a person to decide about other such traditions. There are different groups of hadiths which suggest a distortion in the Quran.

61. First Group of hadith about Tahreef

The first group of hadiths are those that contain the word "Tahreef" in them. Here we see first one from Al Kafi:

"It has been narrated from Ali Ibn Suweed that Imam Musa Kazim [as] was in prison when I wrote a letter to him. The Imam [as] replied to it and amidst his reply he wrote this sentence: "They were declared Ameen over the book of Allah but they have committed Tahreef and made changes to it"

We see another hadith of this group which has been recorded by Ibn Shehr Ashob in 'Manaqib'. The sermon of Imam Hussain [as] that he delivered on the day of Ashura has been recorded in the following manner.

"No doubt you are counted amongst those people from the ummah of my grandfather who are disobedient and rebellious, who have left the bounds determined by Allah, who have thrown away the Book of Allah, and talk with the satanic intuition. Verily you are amongst the same people whose faces are black on account of your sins and have committed the dangerous crime of making Tahreef with the Book of Allah".

62. Reply

The word 'Tahreef' used in these traditions does not mean that a certain part of Quran has been lessened rather the meaning of word 'Tahreef' used in these traditions refers to:

- the practice of changing and twisting the meaning of verses so that they differ from their original meanings
- willfully abandoning the actual meanings of the verses
- ignoring the circumstances that caused the verse to descend
- concocting absurd reasonings without any evidence to corroborate their stance.

Our position can be evidenced from the letter of Imam Baqir [as] to Sa'ad wherein he wrote:

"Those people about whom my ancestor Imam Hussain [as] said had committed Tahreef to the Quran meant that whilst these people had kept the words of the Quran they present absurd interpretations and reasoning's in them".

Al Kafi, Volume 8 page 53

Regarding the first tradition, Al-Khoie stated in his book Al-Bayan, page 229:

www.allaahuakbar.net

Allah says in Surah Taha (115): "And We had given Adam an order before, but he forgot and We did not find any resolve in him (to disobey the order)."

Imam Ja'far is reported to have said that Allah had revealed this verse with the following words: "We had ordered Adam before with some words about Muhammad, Ali, Fatima, Hassan, Hussain and the Imams from their offspring but he (Adam) forgot." Ja'far said: 'By Allah, these were the words which were revealed to Muhammad.' (Usul Kafi: 1:416 and the footnotes of Maqbool's translation: 637)

64. Reply

Shaykh Bahboodi in his book Sahih al-Kafi have declared all these traditions as weak. Similarly Muhaddith Kashani in Al-Waafi, Volume 2 page 273 has also graded such hadiths as unauthentic [not Sahih]. There is therefore no need to examine the chain of each and every tradition that falls under this category. Sheikh Bahai states:

"A matter that is common amongst people, [namely] that the name of Ali has been deleted from Quran is unreliable in the eyes of Shia Ulema"

Aala e Rehman, Volume 1 page 26

Even if such hadiths were for arguments sake accepted as Sahih they would still be subject to interpretation. Those traditions that state that Gebrail had also brought the name of Ali in a specific verse or it was revealed in that manner on Holy Prophet [s] does not mean that Ali was meant in the meaning of the verse nor do such traditions imply that his name was mentioned in the verse and subsequently deleted. Renowned Shia researcher Al-Khoie [rh] states:

"Allah has also revealed the tafseer of some of the parts of Quran on the Holy Prophet [s] but such tafseer are not the part of Quran. Therefore the traditions which suggest that the names of the Imams [as] were present in the verses , should be considered on the basis of the meaning of tafseer. If the words and sentences of such traditions do not allow such consideration/interpretation then there is no other way than to abandon such traditions because these traditions contradict the Quran and Sunah whilst in these two entities it has been proved that Quran is exempt from Tahreef"

Al-Bayan fi Tafseer al Quran, page 230

Even if such traditions are not considered and interpreted in terms of their tafseer they remain unreliable as they contradict the Sahih tradition of Abu Baseer. In Al Kafi, Abu Baseer has narrated from Imam Jaffar Sadiq [as]:

"I asked Imam Jaffar [as] about the verse 4:59. The Imam [as] replied that this verse was revealed in the honor of Ali and Hasnayn. I asked him: People want to know why the names of Ali and other Ahlebayt are not mentioned in the Quran? The Imam [as] replied: "Respond to such people's objections by pointing out that Allah revealed five prayer times to the Prophet [s] but why did He not stipulate whether the prayers are four Rakats or three? When the Quran remains silent in this regard, then the Holy Prophet [s] set out the tafseer and explained the numbers of Rakats in prayers".

Al Kafi, Volume 1 page 286 Hadith 1

This tradition explains all those traditions that imply that the names of the Imams of Ahlulayt [as] were mentioned in the Quran. It is clear from this tradition that the names of the Imams [as] being in Quran should be understood in the same way that the Holy Prophet [s] mentioned the number of units of prayers, in the form of tafseer.

Another proof to negate the authenticity of such traditions can be evidenced by the fact that those famed personalities that refused to give bayah to Abu Bakar never advanced the notion that the name of Ali [as] was ever mentioned in the Quran to disprove the reign of Abu Bakar and advance the right of Ali [as]. Had the name of Ali [as] was mentioned in the Quran, those who refused to give oath to Abu Bakar would have never missed the opportunity to cite such a solid concrete evidence in favour of Ali [as].

Two more traditions about the second group of hadiths

It has been narrated on the authority of Asbagh bin Nabata that Ameer al Momineen [as] said: One part of the Quran is about us Ahlebayt and our friends, and another part is about incidents and traditions while one part is about obligations and instructions”

Al-Kafi.

We also read in Tafseer al Ayashi that Imam Jaffar Sadiq [as] said:

“If the Quran were recited in the manner in which it was revealed then our name(s) would have appeared in it.

Tafseer Al Ayashi, Volume page 17 Hadith 4

65. Reply

Regarding the first hadith Allamah Majlisi has termed it as 'Majhul' due to the fact that the truthfulness and authenticity of some of the narrators in the chain are not known while Shaykh Bahboodi in his book Sahih al-Kafi has declared it weak. As for the second tradition, it has been recorded by Ayashi as Mursal that means there is no mention of all the narrators leading up to Imam Jaffar [as].

As the first tradition is weak and the second tradition Mursal they cannot be submitted by our opponents as proof of tahreef. We should also point out that even if the tradition recorded by Ayashi was deemed reliable Taweel could be applied because the traditions demonstrate that the names of the Imams [as] existed in the Tafseer of certain, these names did not form a part of the Quran. Another Taweel of the cited tradition is that Imam Jaffar [as] was stating had the people applied the tafseer of the Quran in the manner that Allah (swt) revealed, it would have been free from the contamination of imbeciles, that had mixed incorrect beliefs the correct tafseer would have prevented the creation of doubts and suspicions since the names of the Imams would have present in the tafseer of Quran.

66. The third group of hadith about Tahreef

This group contain hadiths that demonstrate Tahreef in Quran in respect of additions or deletions.

First Hadith

"Narrated from Mesar that Imam Baqar [as] said: Had additions and deletions not been made in then Quran then our right would not have been hidden from those who possess minds. When the Qaim [as] rises, the Quran shall endorse every sentence uttered from his tongue"

Tafseer Al Ayashi, page 13 Hadith 6

Second Hadith

www.allaahuakbar.net

Jabir reported that he heard Imam Baqir saying: 'No one can claim that he has compiled the Quran as Allah revealed except a liar. The only person to compile it and memorise it according to its revelation was Ali ibn Abi Talib and the Imams who succeeded him. (Usole kafi 1:228)

 http://www.allaahuakbar.net/shiites/shiite_belief_that_the_present_quran_is_fabricated.htm

hcy.com

Kulyani, narrates the following statement which he attributes to Imam Baqir: "None among mankind but a great liar claims that he has compiled the whole Qur'an as it was revealed. No one compiled it nor memorized it as Allah revealed it, but Ali Bin Abi Talib and the Imams after him

 <http://www.kr-hcy.com/shia/books/majlisulama/part2.shtml>

Third Hadith

Imam Baqar [as] said: 'Other than the actual successors of the Holy Prophet [s] no one can claim that he possesses the Quran with its internal and external meanings'

Al-Kafi, Volume 1 page 13 Hadith 4

Basair al Darjaat, page 213 Hadith 1

67. Reply

This group of Hadith do not prove that Tahreef has been done to the Quran. The first hadith is Mursal and therefore it cannot be advanced as proof. It also contradicts the Quran, Sunnah and the consensus of the Muslim that attests that no addition or deletion has taken place in this Quran whilst this tradition suggest that it has. There is an consensus among the prominent Shia scholars headed by and Sayed Razi [rh] and Sheikh Tusi [rh] that there has been no addition to the Quran. The lacking or deletion that has been suggested in this hadith actually means that there has been a lack of understanding in relation to the meanings, Taweel and internal aspects of the Quran. It does not mean that there has been a reduction in verses.

The words "Law Qad Qaam Qaimna..." mentioned in this tradition means that Imam Mahdi [as]

will elaborate on the actual meanings of the Quran and tafseer in a manner that shall remove all doubts, so that all will be enlightened from it and will accept that the Quran itself endorses the words of Imam Mahdi [as]. Even if (for arguments sake) we deem this tradition as Sahih it would still mean that the people have altered the actual meanings of the Quran have and have produced tafseers that have no correlation with the actual meaning verses that explains why the Ahlebait [as] were deprived of their rights.

The words "Law Qad Qaam." also mean that the affirmation of Qaim e Aal e Muhammad i.e Imam Mahdi [as] shall be provided by the Quran that in our hands, had there been any Tahreef in the present Quran then it would not concur with the words uttered by Imam of time [as]. It is therefore clear that no Tahreef has been done with the present Quran.

The second tradition of the third group has been declared weak by Shaykh Bahboodi and cannot be submitted as proof since one of the narrators on the chain Umer Ibn Abi Maqdam has been graded as weak. See

1. *Majma Rijal, Volume 4 page 257*
2. *Rijal Ibn Daud, page 281- 516*

The third tradition has been narrated from Sheikh Kuleni and Sheikh Saffar and has been declared weak by Shaykh Bahboodi. It is at the highest degree of being weak due to the fact that its chain of narration contains Makhil bin Jameel Asadi who has been termed by the scholars of Rijal as a person who is weak and a Ghali (extremist) who narrated baseless things and yet named them 'Hadith' and there exist a plethora of hadiths that he has attributed to Imams that are based on Ghulu. See

1. *Majma Rijal, Volume 4 page 257 & Volume 7 page 139*
2. *Rijal Ibn Daud, page 281*
3. *Tanqeh al Maqal, Volume 2 page 247*

Even if we deem this tradition reliable we could still interpret it in a manner that negates any hint of Tahreef in the Quran. Sayed Tabatabai [rh] for example offered the following comments about the words in this hadith:

"Although these words create a suspicion that there has been Tahreef in Quran, if we analyze the words "Zahira wa Batina" in a context, then it is clear that this hadith means that no one except the successors of the Holy Prophet [s] know the internal and external meanings of Quran and no one except the successors of the Holy Prophet [s] can claim that he is a scholar of the entire Quran".

1. *Al Tehqeeq fi Nafi e Tahreef, page 620*
2. *Hashiya Kafi, Volume 1 page 228*

These two traditions of which Sayed Tabatabai [rh] has provides a sound reasoning, if one deems the traditions to Sahih and this can be supported by the fact that Syed Ali Ibn Masoom Madani has recorded both traditions alongside those traditions that prove that Ali [as] and Imams after him had a knowledge of the Quran and he has then claimed that Shia and Sunni hadiths on this topic have reached to the status of Tawatur (please see Sharh Saheefia Sajjadia, page 401.

A further explanation to both traditions is that the reference to addition means an addition to the tafseer that was revealed from Allah [swt] to elaborate on the meaning of the Quran whilst it was not a part of the Quran which is why it was deem an "additional" matter. Ultimately, both traditions evidence that no one except the successor of the Holy Prophet [s] has a complete knowledge with which to provided a correct tafseer of the Quran.

68. The fourth Group of Hadith about Tahreef

This group comprises of those traditions that suggest that the names of some men and women

were mentioned in the Quran but were deleted later on.

First Hadith

Imam Jaffar Sadiq [as] said: "The Quran contains the incidents of the past and future and it contained the names of some men which were deleted from it and one name was mentioned in many Surahs which one knows except the actual successors of Holy Prophet [s]."

Tafseer al Ayashi, Volume 1 page 12 Hadith 10

Second Hadith

Baznati narrates that Imam Raza [as] gave me a Quran and asked me not to see it, but I opened it and recited the first verse of Surah Baina. I found the names of 70 people from the Quraish along with their father's names. The Imam [as] asked me to return the Quran to him.

Al Kafi, Volume 2 page 613 Hadith 16

Third Hadith

Abdullah bin Sanan narrated from Imam Jaffar [as] that said: Surah Ahzab contained the blemishes of men and women from the Quraish and non Quraish. O son of Sanaan this Surah alone used to expose the wrong deeds of the women of Quraish and it was lengthier than Surah Baqra but Tahreef and deletion was made to it"

Thawaab al A`maal, page 100

Bihar al Anwar, Volume 92 page 50

69. Reply

First of all we should point out that the reports according to which the names of some hypocrites had revealed in Quran is not exclusive to Shia books but Sunni sources too confirm the same. For example, Allamah Baghwi records in his Tafseer, Volume 4 page 68:

قال عبد الله بن عباس رضي الله عنهما: أنزل الله تعالى ذكر سبعين رجلا من المنافقين بأسمائهم وأسماء آبائهم ثم نسخ ذكر الأسماء رحمة للمؤمنين، لئلا يعير بعضهم بعضا، لأن أولادهم كانوا مؤمنين.

Abdullah bin Abbas [ra] said: 'Allah almighty revealed the name of seventy hypocrite men but then the names were abrogated as a mercy upon the believers so that they don't mock each others because their (hypocrites') progeny were believers.'

And since it is believed that Ali bin Abi Talib [as] in the copy of Quran compiled by him had included the abrogated verses as well, therefore there shouldn't be any surprise if we see reports from Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] possessed some names of hypocrites.

Now if we talk about the authenticity of traditions suggesting that the names of men and women were present in Quran (which are not present today), then such traditions have been graded weak, Mursal and Marfu hence are unacceptable. The first hadith is Mursal. It has been taken from the traditions of Sheikh Saffar Qummi and Sheikh Ayashi and is narrated from Ibrahim bin Umer and there is a difference of opinion about him that whether he was weak or

Mothiq [see Tanqeh al Maqal, Volume 1 page 27].

The second tradition which Sheikh Kuleni narrated from Baznati has been graded as Mursal by Allamah Majlisi and weak by Shaykh Bahboodi in his book Sahih al-Kaf. Moreover Muhaddith Kashani states about this tradition:

“The names which were found in that Mushaf might have been written as the topic of the tafseer of the Kuffar and Mushrikeen and were known through revelation rather than there being a part of the Quran moreover this meaning applies to this and similar traditions narrated from the Imams [as].”

Al Waafi, Volume 1 page 273

In relation to the third tradition it contradicts the proven fact that Surah Ahzab had already been compiled during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet [s] [see Majmal Bayan and Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 5 page 179]. We would also like to ask those that deem such traditions as reliable how is it all those verses have been lost? How is it plausible that so many verses were not written in the Quran or were deliberately expunged without the Muslims of the time noticing? Did the Prophet [s] not teach every verse to the Sahaba at the time of descent so that it could be disseminated amongst all Muslims? How can it be believed that the Muslims collectively forgot to write those verses during the compilation of Quran?

Even if we deem such traditions as correct we could say that the names of men and women existed in the tafseer, but that specific tafseer cannot be located today. Such traditions do not imply that those names formed parts of the Quranic verses but not available now.

The prominent Shia ulema have rejected such hadiths as can be evidenced from the statements of Sayed Al Khoie and Faiz Khashani. Our leading scholar Muhadith Sheikh Saduq [rh] recorded this type of hadith in his book “Thawaab al A` maal” and in his book “Al Eiteqaad” explicitly stated there had been no Tahreef in the Quran. The recording of this kind of hadith by Sheikh Saduq [rh] is no proof of authenticity at all as some Nawasib would argue. Many Shi’a ulema recorded such traditions in their books and did not deem them Sahih or reliable.

70. The fifth Group of Hadith about Tahreef

This group of hadiths contains those hadiths relating to a certain form of recitations [Qirat] that have been attributed to Imams [as].

One such tradition is where a man recited the verse 33 of Surah An`am before Ameer al Momineen [as] in this manner:

33. QAD NAAALAMU INNAHU LAYAHZUNUKA ALLATHEE YAQOOLONA FA-INNAHUM LA YUKATHTHIBOONAKA WALAKINNA ALTHTHALIMEENA BI-AYATI ALLAHI YAJHADOONA

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/006.html>

Umran bin Maytham narrated that Abu Abdullah said: 'A man recited to Ameer al Momineen (as) '{but surely they do not call you a liar but the unjust deny the communications of Allah}'. He (Imam Ali) said: 'By Allah they called him liar, but the verse (Yukaththiboonaka) is not to be pronounced emphatically means that they cannot bring falsehood to reject your truthfulness'.

Al-Kafi, Volume 8 pages 200 – 241

Muhammad bin Suleman narrates from some Sahaba who from Imam Abul Hassan [as]:

We hear some verses that have never been heard before from the Quran. Moreover we cannot recite [do qirat] in such a beautiful manner as you do, so are we sinners? The Imam replied: No you are not sinners but you recite the Quran in the manner in

which you have been taught and soon there will come a person to teach you”

Usool al-Kafi, Volume 2 page 453

71. Reply

The first Hadith has been graded weak by Shaykh Bahboodi in his book Sahih al-Kafi while the second tradition has been graded weak by both Shaykh Bahboodi and Shaykh Majlisi [rh] in his book Marat al-Aqool, Volume 12 page 523, moreover Muhhaddith Kashani whilst making Taweel of this tradition in his book Waafi stated that those verses were revealed not as a part of Quran but as a Tafseer and hence does not constitute tahreef.

6. Chapter Six: Answering some of Nasibi objections

In this chapter we shall refute Nasibi objections wherein they have tirelessly sought to prove that the Shia believe that the Quran has been a victim of tahreef. Just in case Nawasib (as is their habit copy and past what we say in this chapter to prove that AA believe in tahreef) we wish to make it clear that the italicized paragraph under each objection are the common objections raised by our opponents, and we have paraphrased what they typically accuse us of.

72. Objection one: The Quran of Imam Ali [as] differed from the present version

Some hadiths demonstrate that Maula Ali [k] had a Quran that differed from the present day manuscript and whilst he tried to get his manuscript endorsed, the public rejected it. The different Quran means that the present Quran is corrupted, hence tahreef has occurred

73. Reply

Whilst such hadiths do exist, they are not in the exclusive domain of the Shia. Similar traditions can also be located in authentic Sunni sources that inform us that following the demise of the Prophet (s) Ali bin Abi Talib [as] separated himself from others and started compiling the Holy Quran.

According to some hadiths like the one mentioned in Tafseer Ayashi, it seems that Imam Ali bin Abi Talib [as] was acting on the instructions of the Holy Prophet [s] and other than participation on prayer gathering, he would remain aloof from the people until this task was completed.

Such traditions do not demonstrate that there has been Tahreef in the Quran. The Shia Ulema have commented on such hadiths making it clear that when Ali [as] compiled the Quran the only difference between the version of Imam Ali [as] and the present version, was that his version was compiled in accordance with the sequence of revelation with the abrogated verses were written first followed by the abrogating verses with some of the verses their tafseer that included details of the relevant people such as the bad deeds of the Muhajir and Ansar. Although those tafseer, meanings, abrogation were penned by Ali bin Abi Talib [as] they were according to the instructions of the Holy Prophet [s]. It is clear that this difference in compilation a change in the original words or parts of the Quran.

The only difference between the Quran compiled by Ali bin Abi Talib [as] and the present version was that there were some matters written in the version of Ali [as] under their tafseer that are not present in the present version and the additional texts in tafseer were not additions to the original Quran rather they were Hadith e Qudsi and it is a fact that Hadith e Qudsi is not a Quran as has been elaborated by Sheikh Saduq [rh] in his esteemed work "Al-I'tiqad ul-Imamiyyah page 93". Also Sheikh Mufid [rh] whilst elaborating on this stated that:

The tafseer, meanings and taweel present in the Quran compiled by Ali [as] whilst through divine words but were not a part of the Quran and that Tafseer and Taweel has been referred to the Quran and if somebody objects that if that was Tafseer and Taweel then how can it then be called the Quran as the Taweel of the Quran is not a part of the Quran. We will cite the following verse of Holy Quran in reply of such a person.

[20:114] *Supremely exalted is therefore Allah, the King, the Truth, and do not make haste with the Quran before its revelation is made complete to you and say: O my Lord ! increase me in knowledge.*

Awail al Maqalaat by Shaykh al Mufid, page 55

Sayed Khoie [rh] states

“Although it is true that the version of Ali’s Quran had some texts that are not in the present Quran this does not mean that Ameer al Momineen [as] had an additional Quran that is not in the present Quran rather that addition means that this version contained divinely revealed Tafseer and Taweel in it that is not present in the existing Quran”

Al Bayan fi Tafseer al Quran, page 223

Allamah Taba Tabayee stated:

“The Quranic compilation by Ali [as] and his presenting it before the people does not prove that there were any differences in respect of Furu and Usool between the present Quran and the Quran compiled by Ali [as]. Yes there might be differences in the sequence of verses and Surahs. But a difference in the true principle of the Deen does not appear.

Had there been any difference in principles then he would have proved it with arguments at the time he offered his version and would have defended his stance. He would have not remained silent at this point over its rejection by the people. Moreover when he protested about the Wilayah and other matters and recited verses and Surahs, there was no such report recorded of there being any difference between his Quran and the present one. Additionally he didn’t make reference to any verse or Surah being lost or distorted”

Al Mizan, Volume 12 page 116

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Sharastani has written in the Muqqaddamah [initial arguments] of his tafseer that there was a consensus amongst all the Sahaba that the Ahlebait were specialists in the field of Quranic knowledge. That is why they would ask Ali whether he was specialist in any other thing besides the Quran, such questioning evidences an ijma of the Sahaba that the knowledge of the Quran, its Taweel and Tanzeel lay with the Ahlebait. [Tareekh e Quran, page 25-26]. Some scholars of Ahle Sunnah have also stated that the Quran compiled by Ali (as) incorporated various disciplines of knowledge. [At Tasheel al Uloom al Tanzeel, Volume 1 Page 3].

Imam Ali [as] had in fact told a Zindeeq:

“I have written a complete book (Quran) that comprises of Tanzeel, Taweel, Muhakkim , Mtashaba, abrogated, abrogating and not a single letter has been lost from it”

Asafi, Volume 1 page 42

By bringing these materials together we can safely conclude that any Nasabi claim that the Quran compiled by Imam Ali (as) differed in length and text from the present Quran is a shameless liar.

74. Second Objection

Some of the hadiths demonstrate that the Quran during the era of Imam Mahdi [as] shall differ from the existing Quran and such traditions cast doubts on the perfection of the existing Quran. Such Hadiths are as follows:

www.allaahuakbar.net

A man said that someone was reciting the Quran in the company of Imam Ja'far. The narrator said that he heard certain verses in the recitation

which were not according to the recitation of the people. Imam Ja'far told the person reciting: 'Do not recite like this. Recite as the people recite until the (promised) Mahdi arrives. When the Mahdi arrives, he will recite the Quran according to its original revelation and the Quran compiled by Ali will be brought forward. (Ibid: 2.622)

hcy.com

"When the Qa-im (i.e. Imam Mahdi) appears, he will recite the book of Allah Azza Wa Jal its correct form and he will bring out that Mushaf (Qur'an) which Ali- alayhis salam wrote." (Al-Kafi)

 <http://www.kr-hcy.com/shia/books/majlisulama/part2.shtml>

Also proud of Nasbism Meher Mianwali

hcy.com

A person read a portion of the Qur-aan in the presence of Imaam Ja'far. The imaam said to him: " Do not read this Qur-aan. Read in the manner that the people read (i.e., the present day Qur-aan) till the Mahdii appears. When the Mahdi appears, he will read the original Qur-aan. He will bring forward that Qur-aan which 'Alii, 'Alayhis Salaam, wrote."--Ussul Kaafi, page 632, vol.

 <http://www.kr-hcy.com/statichtml/files/104285993825971.shtml>

75. Reply One

Our opponents should know that all of these traditions are weak and unreliable and hence have no value in the Shia madhab. The narrator of this hadith is Salim bin Samat or Salim bin Abi Salma and just one inspection of a Shia book of Rijal will enable you to recognize his unreliability. He has been termed weak by the prominent Ulemah of Shia such as Ibn Ghazairi, Najashi and Allamah Hilli [rh]. See Tanqeh al Maqal, Volume 2 page 4.

76. Reply Two

Even if were (for arguments sake) to accept these traditions they do not prove that the Quran during the time of Imam Mahdi [as] shall differ from the existing Quran rather it means that the sequence and compilation of the version of Imam Mahdi [as] will be different the present Quran. This version shall contain the original tafseer in relation to its meaning and shall contain all those virtues that were present in the version compiled by Imam Ali [as] which is a fact mentioned in all the cited traditions.

In conclusion this objection does not differ much to the first objection raised by the Nawasib against Shia of Ali [as] wherein they claim Imam Ali (as) had a different Quran, an objection that we have already refuted. The replies we have there can be applied here also. The version of the Quran that shall be brought by Imam Mahdi [as] will not differ in size / words / addition / deletion to the present Quran. It shall be same the only difference between the two will be in their tafseer and sequence of revelation.

77. Objection Three: This Ummah shall replicate the incidents of past nations

When the Taurah and Anjeel have been corrupted, you have admit likewise with the Quran since Prophet [s] had said that the incidents which took place in Bani Israil will also take place in his ummah. In light of this Hadith we have to accept tahreef has existed, otherwise this hadith becomes meaningless.

78. Reply

The renowned Shia research scholar Sayed al Khoie submitted several replies to such an allegation.

1. All of the hadiths on this topic are not practicable in the field of knowledge as they are dubious.
2. Even if such hadiths were considered Sahih it would mean that Tehref of the meanings has been done in the Quran because as this was the type of Tahreef that took place in Taurah and Anjeel whilst all Muslims unanimously believe that this type of Tahreef did not happen with the Quran.
3. There are numerous historical texts wherein Bani Israil and other past nations committed acts that were not replicated with the nation of the Holy Prophet [s] like the worshipping of the golden calf, Bani Israil being exiled for forty years, the punishment of Firown and his comrades, the rulership of Suleman over Jins and humans, the death of Harun the vizier of Musa during his life. There are thousands of other incidents that took place in previous nations but were not mimicked in the ummah of our Prophet [s]. This proves that the cited hadith should not be understood literally. Therefore from all hadiths on this topic the meaning which will be derived is whilst some incidents of past nations might have take place in this nation it does not apply to each and every incident.

Al Bayan fi Tafseer al Quran, page 221

Allamah Sayed Taba Tabayee [rh] has also explained the meaning of this hadith in the same manner. See Tafseer al Mizan, Volume 12 page 120.

79. Objection Four: Hadith about Tahreef in the Quran are Matawatir

When some Shia muhaddathin saw that there were some hadiths in the prominent Shia books implying Tahreef in the Quran some scholars were of the view that such traditions were muttawatir especially the Akhbari ulema who accept every tradition attributed to the Imams. Amongst them were the scholar Al Jazairi who said that there may be Tahreef in punctuations.

80. Reply

A group of our prominent scholars that includes some Akhbaris have rejected such a notion and have said that hadiths about Tahreef are Ahad therefore it is impossible to rely on them in respect of belief [eitaqaad].

Sheikh al Taifa i.e Tusi [rh] states that are many traditions demonstrating that Tahreef has been done with some Quranic verses and depicting changes. All of these reports are Wahid that are neither applicable in the field of knowledge nor in deeds. Therefore it is better to abandon them and to avoid occupying one's time with them.

Sheikh Majlisi [rh] states that the reports about Tahreef are Ahaad and one cannot believe in the authenticity of them in comparison to Allah [swt].

In addition to the above two, other prominent scholars of the Shia Athna Ashari school have echoed similar sentiments.

7. Chapter Seven: Sunni reports about additions in Quran

We shall now cite authentic Sunni sources that suggest that additions have been made to the current Quran. We, the Shia of Ahlulbait [as] just like the true Ahle Sunnah do not believe that the Quran has been distorted. Our intention behind presenting this chapter was to make the Nawasib realize that they have a wealth of traditions about tahreef in their books.

81. Ibn Abbas [ra] testified to fifty verses being added to the Quran of Uthman

Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti has recorded a tradition from Ibn Abbas [ra] wherein he says:

"The number of verses in the Quran are 6616"

Tafseer Al Itqan fi Uloom al Quran, Volume 1 page 84

Just see how the Nawasib toy with Quran. They are uncertain about the number of verses in the Quran as can be evidenced by the testimony of Ibn Abbas. This was followed by the contribution of Nasibi Ibn Kathir. The Quran Muslims have in their hands contains 6666 verses that means the above cited Sunni tradition makes Ibn Abbas the refuter of 50 Quranic verses.

82. Disagreement amongst Sunni scholars over the number of Quranic verses

Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti whilst citing Sunni scholarly opinion from Sunni scholar Uthman bin Saeed bin Uthman Abu Amro al-Daani (d. 444 H) wrote:

Al-Daani said: 'They agreed that the number of verses of Quran are six thousand but they disagreed in what has been added further (to the Quran), some of them didn't add more whilst others said it was two hundred and four. Some said two hundred and fourteen, others said two hundred and nineteen. Some said two hundred and twenty five, others said two hundred and thirty six.'

Al Itqan fi Uloom al Quran, Volume 1 page 84

83. According to Imam of Nawasib Ibn Kathir 6000 verses are authentic the remainder are doubtful

To evidence this we have relied on the following esteemed books of Ahle Sunnah.

1. Tafseer Ibn Kathir, Volume 1 page 7, number of verses
2. Tafseer Qurtubi, Volume 1 page 65, number of verses

We read in Tafseer Ibn Kathir:

"The total number of verses Quranic verses are 6000. Disagreement remains about the remainder verses. There are various views and statements about them. One statement is that there are 6204 verses"

Those that deem it their religious duty to abuse Shias need to explain the texts of their own books first. We see some sources saying that "Mauzatain" and "Bismillah" are not a part of the Quran that means those Sunni Muslims who have these two verses in their Quran today have additions to the Holy Book. Some assert that an entire Surah equal in length to Surah Barqah has been lost. Some attest that 6000 verses are authentic, whilst others are doubtful. If having traditions about distortion in the Quran makes one Kaafir then what about these Sunni ulema and Caliphs who openly testified to distortions in the Quran?

If all the Sahaba are just and truthful then were their beliefs about additions to the Quran not also truthful? And what of the Ulema that followed their footsteps?

Did the Nawasib receive divine instruction that these so-called respected personalities are Aadil (just) like their Sahaba? Or did they commit an error in ijthad for which they will get one reward, and their mistaken view of tahreef be forgiven?

84. The Hanafi and Maliki belief that “Bismillah al-Rehman al-Rahim” is not a part of the Quran

Before we proceed any further, let us first cite an unequivocal edict of Holy Prophet [s] regarding “**Bismillah al-Rehman al-Rahim**” being one of the verses of Holy Quran:

Abu Huraira narrated that the prophet said: 'If anyone recited (Surah) al-Hamd, he shall recite 'Bismillah al-Rahman al-Rahim' because it is the head of Quran, the head of the book and the Sab'e al-Mathani (seven verses) and 'Bismillah al-Rahman al-Rahim' is part of its verses'

 [Kanz al-Ummal, Volume 7 page 437 Tradition 19665](#)

Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani declared it 'Sahih' in Talkhis al-Habir, Volume 1 page 233

Let us also see the testimony of Ameer al-Momineen Ali bin Abi Talib [as] as recorded by Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti in Al-Itqan, Volume 1 page 136:

Someone asked Ali: 'What is Sab'e al-Mathani (Seven Verses)?' He replied: 'It is Sura Al-Hamd'. The man said: 'Sura Al-Hamd consists of six verses'. He replied: "Bismillah Al-Rehman -Al-Rahim' is also one verse'.

About the famed Hanafi and Maliki belief regarding 'Bismillah' we have relied on the following valued books of Ahle Sunnah.

1. Tafseer Mazhari, Volume 1 page 3 by Qazi Sanaullah Paani Patti
2. Tafseer Qurtubi, Volume 1 page 92, Muqqadmah Tafseer
3. Tafseer Fatah al Qadeer, Volume 1 page 7 by Qazi Shokani
4. Tafseer Khazin, Volume 1 page 12, Muqqadmah
5. Tafseer Ibn Kathir, Volume 1 page 20, Farid Book Depot, Dehli
6. Tafseer Ahkaam al Quran al Jasaas
7. Noor al Anwar , page 9
8. Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 1 page 151
9. Tafseer Madarik , Volume 1 page 13
10. Tafseer Kashaf, Volume 1 page 1 by Allamah Zamakhshari
11. Umdatul Qari Shrah Sahih Bukhari, Volume 1 page 12

We read in Tafseer Ibn Kathir:

“On the other hand, Malik, Abu Hanifah and their followers said that Bismillah is not an Ayah in Al-Fatihah or any other Surah.”

 <http://tafsir.com/default.asp?sid=1&tid=208>

We read in Tafseer Khazin:

“Imam Abu Hanifa, Imam Malik and Imam Auzai attested that neither is “Bismillah” a part of surah Fatihah, nor of any other surah of the Quran”

If according to Imam Abu Hanifa “**Bismillah al-Rehman al-Rahim**” (In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful) is not a part of any Quranic Surah then the Sunni ulema have

committed an addition to the Quran when writing "Bismillah" at 114 places. If making an addition or deletion from the Quran is kufr then either Abu Hanifa is kafir or the present day Sunnis are kafir. The Nawasib of Sipah e Sahaba need to declare Abu Hanifa and abandon his taqleed forthwith.

We read in Tafseer Kabeer:

وأما أبو حنيفة رحمه الله تعالى فإنه قال : بسم الله ليس بآية منها

While Abu Hanifa may Allah's mercy be upon him said: 'Bismillah is not a verse of it'

According to Imam Shaffiyee "**Bismillah Al Rehman Al-Rahim**" is a part and a verse of Holy Quran and since whoever rejects even a single letter of the Quran is Kaafir then doesn't this mean that Imam Abu Hanifa was Kaafir according to Shafiyee teachings? Does it not mean that all Hanafis are infidels in the eyes of Shafiyees?

We read in Noor al Anwar:

"One who rejects that "Bismillah" is a part of the Quran should not be deemed a Kaafir when that rejection is on account of doubt. There is disagreement on this issue in the view of Imam Malik as he didn't deem it to be a part of the Quran"

85. Other than the month of Ramadhan, "Bismillah" shouldn't be recited in any prayer neither on ones heart nor loudly

Imam Fakhruddin Razi writes in Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 1 page 151:

وقال مالك والأوزاعي رضي الله تعالى عنهما : إنه ليس من القرآن إلا في سورة النمل ، ولا يقرأ لا سراً ، ولا جهرًا إلا في قيام شهر رمضان

"Imam Malik and Auzai may Allah be pleased with both of them said: 'It (Bismillah) isn't a part of the Quran except Surah Naml and that other than in Ramadhan, it should not be recited, neither in ones heart nor aloud"

Whoever rejects a single letter or verse of the Quran is Kaafir. "Bismillah" being a part of the Quran and of every surah has been proven by Imam Shafiyee. In consequence Imam Abu Hanifa and Imam Malik have rejected 114 Quranic verses and are Kaafir under Shafiyee jurisprudence.

86. The Ulema of Ahle Sunnah believed that the sole reason that "Bismillah" was written in the Quran was to make a distance between the texts and to earn a blessing

We read in Tafseer Kashaf:

"The jurists and the Qura of Madina, Basrah and Sham believed that "Bismillah Al-Rahman Al-Raheem " was not a part of Surah al-Fatiha nor from the Quran . It was written in the Quran so as to keep a distance between the suras (chapters) and to earn blessings by commencing with it, as is the case when one commences any action. [The stance] deeming it not to be a part of Quran was the madhab of Imam Abu Hanifa and his followers and for that it is not recited loudly by them during prayers."

[Tafseer Kashaf, Volume 1 page 1](#)

Our readers should again remind themselves that according to another Sunni Imam Shafi "Bismillah" is a part of Quran that in consequence makes Imam Abu Hanifa a kaafir.

We also read in Tafseer Kashaf:

“And the Quran readers of Makka and Kufa believed that it [bismillah] is a verse from [Surah] Fatihah and every Surat and this was maintained by Imam Shafiyye and his followers and due to that, they read it loudly.”

[Tafseer Kashaf](#)

Imam Abu Hanifa and his adherents reject **“Bismillah Al-Rahman Al-Raheem”** as being a part of the Quran, whilst it is a part of Quran according to Imam Shafiyye that demonstrates that Imam Shafiyye believed that 114 verses had been added to the Quran whilst Abu Hanifa had deleted 114 verses from his copy of Quran. Now will the dumbstruck Nawasib clarify that who was right and who was wrong, since only shall remain a Muslim?

87. Those who add or delete something from Quran are Kaafir

We are quoting from authentic book of Ahle Sunnah Jami Al-Sagheer, Volume 2 page 32 by Suyuti.

“According to the Holy Prophet [s] there are six types of men who are cursed by him [s], other Prophets and Allah [swt].

1. One who adds something to the Quran
2. One who rejects taqdeer until the end

Dear readers! There is disagreement between two Imams of Sipah e Sahaba over whether **“Bismillah Ar Rehman ar Rahim”** is a part of the Quran and one of them must be an accursed Kaafir. It is either:

Imam Shafiyye who become an accused Kaafir and by adding 114 verses to the Quran

Or:

Imams Abu Hanifa and Malik that became accused kaafirs for rejecting 114 Quranic verses.

Note: 114 because 'Bimillah' is at two places in Surah Naml therefore Bismillah is commonly counted as 114 times in Quran.

88. Uthman's own confession about his ignorance on the issue of Bismillah being a part of Surah Bar'a't

We are quoting from the following Sunni books.

1. Tafseer Gharab al Quran, Volume 2 page 57
2. Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 4 page 294
3. Tafseer Ibn Kathir, Volume 3 page 331
4. Tafseer Mazhari, Volume 4 page 32
5. Tafseer Mualam al Tanzeel, Volume 3 page 410
6. Tafseer Khazin, Volume 3 page 46
7. Tafseer Ruh al Mani, Volume 9 page 41
8. Sahih Tirmidhi, Volume 2 page 368

We read in Tirmidhi:

فقبض رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ولم يبين لنا أنها منها

“The Holy Prophet [s] died without informing us whether this (Surah Bar'a't) was a

part of that (Surah Anfaal) or not”

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Imam Malik said that “Bismillah” is not written at the beginning of Surah Bara't because when the first part of Surah Bar'at was lost the “Bismillah” was also lost along with it whilst Uthman stated that the Prophet [s] didn't tell them whether or not Sura Bar'at was a part of Surah Anfaal. Uthman has indirectly admitted that he adopted Qiyas when he was unsure. Here we see a major contradiction between two great figures of Ahle Sunnah.

89. According to the Sahabi Abdullah Ibn Masud Surah Fatiha is not a part of Quran

Dear readers, Surah Fatiha or Surah Al-Hamd is the first Surah we read in the Quran. Whilst every Muslim from childhood recognizes its importance in Islam yet we see that one of the beloved companions of our opponents staunchly rejected that Surah Fatiha is a part of the Quran. We have relied on the following esteemed work of Ahle Sunnah to evidence this:

1. Tafseer Qurtubi, Volume 1 page 15 & Volume 19 page 151
2. Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 1 page 2
3. Tafseer Kabeer page 176
4. Tafseer Al Itqan, Volume 1 page 80
5. Tafseer Fatah al-Qadeer, Volume 1 page 15

We read in Tafseer Fatah al-Qadeer:

كان عبد الله بن مسعود لا يكتب فاتحة الكتاب في المصحف ، وقال لو كتبها لكتبت في اول كل شئ

Abdullah bin Masud would not write Fateha as part of the Quran, he said: 'If I wrote it then I would have to write it at the beginning of every thing.'

Imam Ibn Hajr Asqalani writes in Fatah al Bari, Volume 8 page 571:

أجمع المسلمون على أن المعوذتين والفاتحة من القرآن وأن من جحد منهما شيئاً كفر

“There is an ijma amongst Muslims over Fatihah and Mauzatain being a part of the Quran and whoever rejects them is a Kaafir”

90. Further evidence of Ibn Masud rejecting Surah Fatihah as being a part of the Quran

We are quoting from the following Sunni books.

1. Al Itqan fi Uloom al Quran, Volume 1 page 99
2. Tafseer Ibn Kathir, Volume 1 page 9
3. Tafseer Fatah al Qadeer, Volume 1 page 6 by Allamah Shokani
4. Tafseer al-Kabeer, Volume 1 page 218

We read in Tafseer al-Kabeer:

نقل في الكتب القديمة أن ابن مسعود كان ينكر كون سورة الفاتحة من القرآن وكان ينكر كون المعوذتين من القرآن

“In some of the previous books it is written that Ibn Masud would reject Surah Fatihah and Mu'awwidh-at [Mauzatain] as being a part of the Quran”

We appeal to justice amongst our readers, after reading the above cited references that clearly state that the Sunni Imams like Imam Abu Hanifa and Imam Malik and the Sahabi Ibn Masud clearly opposed Surah Fatihah and Mauzatain being a part of the Holy Quran. The Nawasib

should therefore openly issue takfeer against these individuals against these individuals as these Imams and Sahaba didn't deem Surah Fatihah and Mauzatain to be a part of the Holy Quran. It is tragic that those who doubted the beginning and end of the Quran have become the leading lights of Islam.

This is precisely why our Prophet [s] ordered the Muslims to be with the Quran and Ahle Bayt, and not to leave them, since doing so would lead to misguidance. Nawasib having left the path of Allah, and clung to the errors of the three stooges and Sufyani ideology have got themselves derailed, and are heading towards eternal doom.

91. Ibn Masud rejected Mu'awwidh-at / Mauzatain [Surah Naas & Surah Falaq] as a being part of the Quran

We are quoting from the following esteemed work of Ahle Sunnah:

1. Sahih Bukhari Volume 6 Hadith 501
2. Fatah al Bari, Volume 8 page 743, kitab al tafseer
3. Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 6 page 416
4. Tafseer Ibn Kathir, Volume 4 page 571
5. Tafseer Qurtubi, Volume 2 page 251
6. Tafseer Ruh al Mani, Volume1 page 279
7. Sharah Mawafiq, page 679

We read in Sahih Bukhari:

Narrated Zirr bin Hubaish:

I asked Ubai bin Ka'b, "O Abu AlMundhir! Your brother, Ibn Mas'ud said so-and-so (i.e., the two Mu'awwidh-at do not belong to the Quran)." Ubai said, "I asked Allah's Apostle about them, and he said, 'They have been revealed to me, and I have recited them (as a part of the Quran),' So Ubai added, "So we say as Allah's Apostle has said."

[Sahih Bukhari Volume 6 Hadith 501](#)

We read in Fatah al Bari:

Al-Masnad, Al-Tabarani and Ibn Mardawayh from the way of Al-A'mash from Abi Ishaq from Abd al Rahman bin Yazid Al-Nakhe'i, who said: "Abdullah Ibn Masud used to erase Al Ma'uzatayn from his Mushafs and say that they (Ma'uzatain) aren't from Quran."

[Online Fath al Bari, Kitab Tafseer al Quran](#)

Please note that "Bismillah" and Fatihah are the at beginning of Quran whilst Mu'awwidh-at [Surah 113 & 114 combined are called Mu'awwidh-at or Mauzatain] appear at the end of Quran. We can see from this episode that Nasibi belief (as evidenced in their books) about the beginning and end of the Quran remains doubtful to the extent that their respected scholars opposed it.

We read in the esteemed Sunni work Tafseer Qurtubi, Volume 1 page 53 that:

قال يزيد بن هارونه المعوذتان بمنزلة البقرة وآل عمران ، من زعم انهما ليستا من القرآن فهو كافر

"The status of Mauzatain is the same as the status of Baqra and Aal-Imran, whoever claims that it is not part of Quran is a kafir"

Dear reader, the disclaimer of Ibn Masud about Mu'awwidh-is a throne that shall harm the Sunnis until Qayamah. Some Sunni ulema often seek to explain it away by offering some form

of pathetic excuse, but this throne has imbedded itself so deep into their throats, the further they push the more deep it pierces into the body.

92. Ibn Masud did not record Surah Fatihah (Al-Hamd) and Mu'awwidh- in his Mushaf


Allamah Jalauddin Suyuti whilst citing Ibn Ashtah records in his esteemed book Al Itqan:

"The sequence of Suras in Ibn Masud's mushaf was in this manner:

Al Itwaal, Al Baqrah, Al Nisa, Aal e Imran...Al Kauthar, Qul Ya Ahu hal Kafirun, Tubat, Qul ho Allah ho Ahad and Alig wow Ra, Alif Laam Meem Nashrah and Al-Hamd and Mazuatain were not there in it"

 [Tafseer Al Itqan \(Urdu\), Volume 1 page 173](#)

93. The rejection of Mu'awwidh-at by Ibn Masud is proven from Sahih texts

1. Fatah al Bari, Volume 8 page 74
2. Tafseer Al Itqan (Urdu), Volume 1 page 212
3. Al Bidayah wal Nihayah , Volume 8 page 357
4.  [Majma al-Zawaid, Volume 7 page 311 Tradition 11562](#)

All these books evidence beyond reasonable doubt Ibn Masud's rejections of two Quranic Surahs. We shall now cite the view of Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti from Al Itqan (published by Idaara Islamiyah, Lahore):

"Abdullah bin Ahmed in a book 'Ziaraat al Musnad' and Tabarani and Ibn Marjah following A'mash through Abi Ishaq, Abdul Rehman Bin Yazid Nukh'ei narrated: "Abdullah Ibn Masud used to erase Mauzatain from his mushaf and would attest that both of these verses are not a part of the Quran". And Bazar and Tabarani at another place have narrated from the same narrator that: "Abdullah Ibn Masud would write and erase Mauztain from his copies of the Quran and would state that the Holy Prophet [s] had only instructed him to use these Surahs as Taweez and Abdullah Ibn Masud did not recite these Surahs". All the chains of this narration are Sahih".

Similarly Imam Abi Bakar al-Haythami records in Majma al-Zawaid:

Abdulrahman bin Yazid al-Nakhaei said: Abdullah (Ibn Masud) used to erase Muwaztain from his Mushaf and say: 'It is not a part of Allah's book'. It is narrated by Abdullah bin Ahmad and Tabarani, the narrators of Abdullah are the narrators of the Sahih and Tabarani's narrators are authentic (Thuqat)"

So according to the belief of a Sahabi Ibn Masud about whom we are instructed to learn the Quran from (according to Sahih Bukhari), the Quran compiled by Uthman & Co. contained three additional Surahs that form no part of the Quran that descended on the Prophet (s). Now either Uthman & Co. are Kafirs, or Ibn Masud is out of the fold of Islam. Who will the Nawasib choose?

94. Nasibi defences presented to protect Ibn Masud from their own takfeer stance

In order to protect Ibn Masud from the fatwas of Kufr that they have utilized against the Shias,

some Nawasib submit the excuse that the Quran was Mutawatir and the statement of Ibn Masud has been falsely attributed to him.

95. Our Reply

We read in Tafseer Al Itqan, Volume 1 page 73:

"Ibn Ashtah has narrated in his book "al Musahif" from Lais and Sa'ad that Abu Bakar was the first who collected the Quran. The people would bring the Quran to Zaid bin Thabit and Zaid didn't write any verse unless there were two witnesses for it and the last part of Surah Bara't was only possessed by Khazimah bin Thabit. Abu Bakar asked him to write it down because the Prophet [s] had deemed his testimony to be on par with the testimony of two people, it was therefore included in the Quran. Umar brought the verses of stoning [Rajam] but Ziad bin Thabit didn't include it as Umar was the only witness to it"

We also read in Al-Musahif page 14 by Abu Bakar Sajastani:

"Umar bin Khattab decided to collect the Quran and didn't accept any Quranic verses unless there were two witnesses testified to them. When Umar was assassinated and Uthman attained power he declared that whoever has any Quranic verse should bring it to them, he likewise didn't accept any verse without [the presence of] two witnesses"

Dear readers, from the above two references it is quite clear that Abu Bakar, Umar and Uthman were not Hafiz of the Quran i.e. they didn't know entire Quran by heart and the Quran was not Mutawatir during that time. Had the Shaikhain been Hafiz of the Quran and had it been Mutawatir at that time, the Shaikhain would have not asked for witnesses to confirm verses formed part of the glorious revelation. From our analysis of Sunni books we can conclude that had the Quran been Mutawatir at that time:

- the last part of Khazimah Ansari would not have been the sole person to have possession of Surah Bar'at, rather other scribes would have also had it.
- Uthman would not have placed Surah Bar'at after Surah Infaal by exercising Qiyas.
- Ibn Masud would have recorded Surah Fatihah and Mu'awwidh-at rather than rejecting them
- There would have been no disagreement over verses amongst the Sahaba.

96. The companions believed that words have been added in Surah Lail and its endorsement by Imam Bukhari

We read in Sahih Bukhari, Volume 6, Book 60, Number 468 [English]

Narrated Ibrahim:

The companions of 'Abdullah (bin Mas'ud) came to Abu Darda', (and before they arrived at his home), he looked for them and found them. Then he asked them: 'Who among you can recite (Qur'an) as 'Abdullah recites it?' They replied, "All of us." He asked, "Who among you knows it by heart?" They pointed at 'Alqama. Then he asked Alqama. "How did you hear 'Abdullah bin Mas'ud reciting Surat Al-Lail (The Night)?" Alqama recited:

'By the male and the female.' Abu Ad-Darda said, "I testify that I heard the Prophet reciting it likewise, but these people want me to recite it:--

'And by Him Who created male and female.' but by Allah, I will not follow them."

Unlike the followers of Abdullah Ibn Masud, Alqama and Abu Ad-Darda all Muslims today read in Surat Al-Lail (The Night) verse No. 3:

وَمَا خَلَقَ الذَّكَرَ وَالْأُنثَى

[Pickthal 92:3] And Him Who hath created male and female.

Compare this recital to that offered by Ibn Masud's followers, Alqama and the testimony of Abu Ad-Darda whose recital included these words '**By the male and the female**' (والذكر والأنثى).

The tradition recorded by Imam Bukhari in his 'Sahih' indirectly persuades his adherents to erase the extra words '**Him Who created**' from this verse since the companions heard the Holy Prophet [s] recite it with the words '**By the male and the female**'. This tradition clearly highlights Nawasib belief in the distortion of the Quran.

Nawasib issue kufr edicts against Shias because their books have traditions suggesting that some texts are additions to the original Quran whilst we assert that the authentic books of Ahle Sunnah like Sahih Bukhari prove that Ahle Sunnah likewise uphold the same belief that likewise places them within the very same Fatwa issued by Sipaa-e-Sahaba.

97. The Mushaf of Sahabi Ubai bin Ka'b did not have a word that the present Quran contains

We read in Surah Nisa verse 101:

[Shakir 4:101] And when you journey in the earth, there is no blame on you if you shorten the prayer, if you fear that those who disbelieve will cause you distress, surely the unbelievers are your open enemy.

101. WA-ITHA DARABTUM FEE AL-ARDI FALAYSA AAALAYKUM JUNAHUN AN TAQSUROO MINA ALSSALATI IN KHIFTUM AN YAFTINAKUMU ALLATHEENA KAFAROO INNA ALKAFIREENA KANOO LAKUM AAADUWWAN MUBEENAN

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/004.html>

We read in Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 2 page 210:

Ibn Jarir and ibn al-Munder recorded that Ubai used to recite the verse '{if you shorten the prayer, if you fear that those who disbelieve will cause you distress}' without reciting '{if you fear}' while in Uthman's Mushaf its '{if you fear that those who disbelieve will cause you distress}'

[Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Surah Nisa, Verse 101](#)

This Sunni tradition clearly demonstrates that additions have been made to the Quran by Uthman while according to the belief of Sahabi Ubai bin Kaab the words '**if you fear**' (**IN KHIFTUM**) are not the part of this verse. How can Nawasib attack Shia for having traditions in their books implying distortion when their own texts are replete with such material? Nawasib need to look their own house first before attacking others. Before pointing their filthy fingers at our Madhab they need to issue their takfeer fatwas against the Sahaba, Taba'een, Fuqaha and scholars who narrated or recorded such tahreef narrations in their books.

Alhamdulillah, Shias and Ahle Sunnah believe in same Quran and its just the Yazidi cult who raise up the topic of Tahreef in the Quran to divide the Muslims.

8. Chapter Eight: Sunni reports about deletions from the Quran

98. The abrogation excuse offered by Nawasib will not work in this topic for the following reasons

As we know, the Nawasib often try to hide behind the curtain of 'abrogation' when it comes to authentic Sunni traditions proving Tahreef in Quran. This chapter is especially for them and you will recognize that such excuses are unacceptable because:

99. One: Imam Shafi'ee and Imam Ahmed did not believe that abrogation has taken place in the Quran

Let us have a glimpse on a rule formulated by two of the four prominent Imams of Ahle Sunnah namely Imam Shafi'ee and Imam Ahmad regarding those traditions demonstrating abrogation to Quranic verses. We present the following references recorded by Saif al-Deen al-Amedi in his authority work 'Al- Ahkam fi Usool al-Ahkam' as for a food four thought:

قطع الشافعي وأكثر أصحابه وأكثر أهل الظاهر بامتناع نسخ الكتاب بالسنة المتواترة وإليه ذهب أحمد بن حنبل في إحدى الروايتين عنه

"Al-Shaf'ee and most of his companions and most of ahl al-Dhaher attested that the book (Quranic text) cannot be abrogated by Mutwatir Sunnah (hadith), that is what Ahmad ibn Hanbal affirmed according to one of the two narrations from him"

<http://www.almeshkat.net/books/open.php?cat=36&book=1636>

Imam Fakhruddin al-Razi in his book Al-Mahsool, Volume 3 page 348 also confirms that Imam Shafi'ee did not believe in the abrogation of verses:

نسخ الكتاب بالسنة المتواترة جائز وواقع ، وقال الشافعي رضي الله عنه لم يقع

"Abrogating the Quran by Mutwatir is possible and has already taken place whilst Shafi'ee may Allah be pleased with him said that it never took place"

In light of these opinions, from this point forward every verse we cite that our opponents explain away as abrogation, should be considered against the opinion of their esteemed Imams that rejected the notion of abrogation.

100. Two: Abrogation can only be evidenced through the Mutawatir testimonies of the Sahaba

Let us now present the conditions laid down in the Sunni school in order to declare any verse to have been abrogated so that whenever our opponents submit the abrogation excuse, they shall need to adhere to the following rule of their sect as endorsed by Imam Jalaluddin Suyti:

Ibn al-Hasaar says: "For abrogation it is important to refer to such an explicit narration that is proven to be from the Prophet [s] or from some companion that such and such verse abrogated such and such verse, and when there is a contradiction between two traditions we can use it to know which is produced first and which is produced last, but about abrogation, the statements of common commentators and even of the Mujtahideen shall not suffice unless the abrogation is proven from some Sahih narration with no disputing argument against it, because abrogation either nullifies an order or strengthens it, and that was enforced during

the lifetime of the Holy Prophet [s] and in this matter, narrations and history are to be relied upon, not views or Ijtehad.

And the people are divided into two groups that are on contradiction, the first doesn't accept the sole authentic narration about abrogation while the other is very tolerant as the statements of commentators or scholars are suffice to them, while the truth is other way around"

 [Al Itqan fi Uloom al Quran \(Urdu\), Volume 2 Nau: 47 page 63](#)

 [Online Al-Itqan fi Uloom al-Quran](#)

Let us shed further light on the actual concept of abrogation from a Sunni perspective by relying on the great Salafi/Wahabi scholar Allamah Sidiq Hassan Khan Bhopali who explained certain conditions, without fulfillment of these, one cannot claim that such and such verse has been abrogated:

The first condition for abrogation is that the abrogation decree should be doctrinal (share'i) not logical (aqli), that the abrogating verse shall be separate from the abrogated verse and should have been revealed later, because when a verse applies with condition and exception, it cannot be called abrogation, but it is called discrimination (takhsees). Thus abrogation shall be accompanied by explanation. An order doesn't dissolve with death, but it is called the end of agony. The abrogation of a verse isn't related to time, therefore the passage of a certain time doesn't abrogate a verse. Abrogating verse should be on par with the abrogated verse in strength, in fact the abrogating verse should be stronger, because the weak can never nullify the strong. This is the edict of reasoning and consensus (ijma) also supports it because the Sahaba never abrogated the Quranic verses relying on Khabar-e-Wahid. Sixth is that the purpose of abrogating should be different to the purpose of abrogated otherwise the issue of Bada' will be involved and this is a condition that word to word the abrogating should apply on what abrogated applied. Abrogation is not possible in Tauhid. Allah [swt] is present with his names and attributes from ever and shall be forever. Similarly, issues whose existence forever, or for a fixed time period are proven from 'Nass' cannot be abrogated. From this we know that all the verses that have been revealed as 'akhbaar' cannot be abrogated and any such abrogation without the knowledge of the truthful messenger [Holy Prophet [saww]] is unimaginable.

Ifadatul Shayookh, page 5, line 9, published in Lahore

Similarly we read in Qwate al-Aela fi al-Uool by Sam'ani Volume 1 page 471:

ولا يجوز نسخ المتواتر بالأحاد لضعف الناسخ وقوة المنسوخ

"It is not permissible to abrogate the Mutwatir by Ahaad due to the weakness of the abrogating and the strength of the abrogated"

We read in Al-Mustasfa by Ghazali, page 98:

لا يجوز نسخ المتواتر بخبر الواحد

"It is not permissible to abrogate the Mutwatir by Ahaad"

101.The Shia view on the abrogation of verses

Sunni scholars (not Sahaba) have evolved various kinds of abrogation and the kind used by them the most is a type where the recitation of a verse is abrogated yet its ruling remains intact, thus we deem it appropriate to present the Shia stance about such kinds of abrogation.

Most of the Shia scholars reject such types of abrogation as we read in Uloom al-Quran by Muhammad Baqir al-Hakim, page 204:

أن لا يكاد يعترينا الشك ببطلانه وعدم ثبوته في القرآن الكريم

“There is no doubt about its falsehood and it has not been proved in the Quran”

We read in Usool al-Fiqh by Sheikh Muzafar, Volume 3 page 56:

لعدم ثبوت نسخ التلاوة بالدليل القطعي

“The recitation’s abrogation is not proven by absolute evidence”

We read in Al-Sahih Min Sirat al-Nabi by Jaffar Murtada, Volume 7 page 295:

إن نسخ التلاوة المدعى مرفوض

“The claims of recitation’s abrogation are rejected”

We read in Mafahim al-Quran by Jaffar al-Subhani, Volume 10 page 364:

بيِّن الفساد

“It is absolutely false”

We read in Min Wahi al-Quran by Fadlullah, Volume 2 page 156:

ونحن لا نوافق على نسخ التلاوة

“We disagree with recitation’s abrogation”

We should also point out that in order to prove that Shaykh Tusi believed in abrogation, some Nawasib use the following words recorded by Shaykh Tusi in his book Tubiyan fi Tafseer al-Quran:

Nawasib quote:

The abrogation in Quran is of three kinds, the first is about abrogating about the law without the recitation, such as the verse of Iddah for who her husband died.....

The second, abrogating the recitation without the law such as the verse of Rajam, surly the punishment of stoning ,there is no doubt about it, the verse which contained (rajm) is abrogated without any doubt which is His statement { the old man and woman if they performed adultery stone them because they had fulfilled lust and it is their punishment from Allah and Allah is }

The third abrogation is the recitation and law, such as what the opponents narrated from Ayesha i.e. ‘There was among what Allah revealed, ten suckling forbidding (marriage) then it was abrogated with fifteen, hence the recitation and the law were abrogated.

Tragically what our deviant opponents failed to disclose to their flock was that here Shaykh Tusi was recording the general view that prevailed about the abrogation. The words written

immediately follow the above paragraph explains Tusi's own views:

"About the conditions of abrogation and what is true and what is false and what can abrogate the verses of Quran and what cannot, we have mentioned it in the book Al-'Idaa."

Now what Shaykh Tusi has written in Al-'Idaa is no different to the Sunni view on abrogation i.e.:

النسخ بخير الواحد وهذا لا يقول به أحد

"No one believes in abrogation by an Ahaad tradition"

Al-'Idaa, Volume 2 page 137

Shaykh Tusi in this book mentioned the examples of recitation abrogation including the verse of Rajam (stoning) etc but explicitly stated later on:

وانما ذكرنا هذه المواضع على جهة المثال ولو لم يقع شئ منها

"We mentioned these verses as examples though nothing from these happened."

Al-'Idaa, Volume 2 page 514

Similarly we read in Maarij al-Wusool by Najmuddin al-Heli, page 159:

من شرط النسخ أن يكون في قوة المنسوخ ، فلا ينسخ المتواتر بالأحد

"It is the condition for abrogation that the abrogating is as strong as the abrogated, the Mutwatir cannot be abrogated by Ahad."

102.Introducing the Sunni Quran with 40 Juz/Parts

We have relied on the following authentic books of Ahle Sunnah

1. Fatah al Bari, Volume 9 page 95 by Ibn Hajar Asqalani
2. Umdatul Qari, Volume 9 page 345 by Badruddin Aini
3. Irshad al Saari, Volume 7 page 482 by Shahabuddin Qastalani

We read in Fatah al Bari that:

قال أقل ما يجزئ من القراءة في كل يوم وليلة جزء من أربعين جزءا من القرآن

"The least that is enough of reading Quran is to read every day and night one Juz amongst the 40 Juza of Quran"

[📖 Online Fatah al Bari, Kitab Fadail al Quran](#)

We know that the Quran is divided into 30 parts (Juz) but here we come to know that the Sunni Quran is incomplete as ten parts are missing from it. In order to hide such beliefs, Nasibi ulema have busied themselves issuing propaganda fuelled fatwas against Shias by suggesting they believe in the alteration of the Quran. We wish to make it clear that this belief is wrongly attributed to us. We seek justice from our Sunni brothers who are proud of the above cited Sunni books and their authors that refer to the Quran containing 40 parts whilst the Quran that we muslims have in our hands consists of 30 parts, that proves that the belief in tahreef is present in Deobandi and Salafi books.

Are the above cited ulema Kaafir in the eyes of Deobandi ulema? If not, then why this double standard? Isn't it blatant injustice and biasness to attribute a false belief of distortion of the Quran to and an entire Sect to justify deeming them Kaafirs, but the same Fatwa is not issued against their Ulema that attested to 10 addition partsof the Quran?

103.Sunni belief that Quran had ninety Juz; 700369 letters are missing

We will quote from the following valued books of Ahle Sunnah.

1. Kanz al Umaal, Volume 1 page 135 Hadith 2308
2. Al Itqan, fi Uloom al Quran Volume 1 page 88 by Jalaluddin Suyuti
3. Jama' al-Sagheer, Volume 2 page 88, Chapter: alif laam

We read in Al Itqan fi Uloom al Quran:

Umar narrated that the Prophet [s] said: "The Qur'an has 1,027,000 letters and whoever reads them with the intention of earning reward [Thawab] shall attain a female Hour from paradise against each letter. All the narrators of this tradition are Thiqah".

According to Ibn Abbas, the present Quran contains 326631 letters, that means according to the tradition narrated by Umar, 700369 letters are missing from the present Quran which ultimately means that the number of letters in the present Quran have to be thrice its present total in order to comply with the statement that Umar attributed to Prophet [s], but in that case the number of Juz/Parahs would jet up to ninety.

If Nawasib advance the same notion about abrogation in Quran in this case, then we would like to say that there would no merits in reciting abrogated verses. If somebody argues that in this tradition Umar was including both abrogated and remaining verses when referring to 1,027,000 letters then such a hypothesis likewise fails to hold any water because Umar mentioned the merits of reciting these letters, it is illogical to believe that one could attain blessings and merits by reciting abrogated verses.

We should also point out that the narrators of Tabrani are reliable according to Ahle Sunnah. Dahabi in his Mizan without advancing any proof and logic has maligned Tabrani's teacher Muhammad bin Ubaid for citing such narrations that evidences blatant unprofessional conduct on his part.

104.Sunni scholars believed that letters have been lost from actual Quran

Let us commence by citing the proud statement that Al Hafid Jalaluddin Suyuti recorded in the preface of his esteemed book Dur al Manthur:

"Praise be to Allah.... who has given me the ability to conduct a commentary of his Great Book based on what I have received of the transmitted reports with high valued chains".

In the Muqaddamah of Surah Ahzab Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti records the belief of Imam Sufiyan al-Thawri (d. 161 H) narrated from his student Imam Abd al Razzak al Sanani (d. 211 A. H.):

"Abd al Razaq narrated from Al-Thawri that he said: 'I have come to know that people from the Sahaba of the Prophet [s] who used to recite the Quran were killed on the day of Musaylama and with their deaths letters from the Quran were lost.'"

[Online Tafsir Dur al Manthur, Muqaddamah Surah Ahzab](#)

The filthy children of Muawyaia such as (most of the) narrow minded Salafi/Wahabis around the world and the debris of the Sipah e Sahaba cult who always issue kufr edicts against Shias for having traditions in their text that imply tahrif should take a good long look at this statement. If after this analysis they have an ounce of shame in them then they should throw issue Kufr edicts against all of their revered scholars that recorded or narrated tahreef statements in their

prestigious texts. Should they choose not to apply such fatwas against their Ulema, they should stop spreading propaganda suggesting that the Shia believe the Quran is incomplete since this only benefits the enemies of Islam.

105. The Nasibi belief that Umar decided to compile Quran when he found that a verse had been lost with the death of a person who knew it

We read in Kanz ul Ummal, Volume 2 page 574:


عن الحسن ان عمر بن الخطاب سأل عن آية من كتاب الله فقيل كانت مع فلان وقتل يوم اليمامة ، فقال إنا لله ، وأمر بالقرآن فجمع ، فكان أول من جمعه في المصحف

Umar bin al-Khatab asked about a verse of Allah's book, they answered: 'It was with a man who got killed on day of Yamama (battle)'. He (Umar) said: 'We all shall return to Allah'. Then he ordered to collect the Quran, therefore he was the first one who collected it in one book.

The tradition is clear that the verse of Quran Umar was looking for was lost with the death of a person who knew it and in Sahih Bukhari we read that the very fear of losing Quran due to the deaths of Qur'a made Umar to compile it in book form!

106. The aqeedah the Jhangvi & Wahabi cult derived from Ibn Umar: most of the Quran has been lost

In order to quote the statement of Abdullah Ibn Umar we have sought reliance upon the following esteemed books of Ahle Sunnah:

1. Tafseer Dur e Manthur Volume 1 page 106
2.  [Tafseer Itqan \(Urdu\), Volume 2 page 64](#)
3. Tafseer Ruh al Mani, Volume 1 page 25
4. Fadhael al-Quran by Qasim bin Salam, Volume 2 page 135

One of the early Sunni scholars Qasim bin Salam (d. 222 H) records:

حدثنا إسماعيل بن إبراهيم ، عن أيوب ، عن نافع ، عن ابن عمر ، قال : « لا يقول أحدكم قد أخذت القرآن كله وما يدريه ما كله ؟ قد ذهب منه قرآن كثير ، ولكن ليقل : قد أخذت منه ما ظهر منه

Ismail bin Ibrahim narrated from Ayub from Naf'ee from Ibn Umar who said: 'Verily among you people one would say that he has found the Quran whilst he is unaware of what the total quantity of the Quran was, because most of the Quran has been lost rather one should say that verily he has found the Quran that has appeared.'

Ismail bin Ibrahim: Dahabi said: '*Hujja*' (Al-Kashif, v1 p242), Ibn Hajar said: '*Thiqah*' (Taqrīb al-Tahdīb, v1 p90). **Ayub al-Sekhtiani:** Dahabi said: '*The master of scholars*' (Siar alam alnubala, v6 p15), Ibn Hajar said: '*Thiqah Thabt Hujja*' (Taqrīb al-Tahdīb, v1 p116). **Naf'ee:** Dahabi said: '*The Imam of Tabayeen*' (Al-Kashif, v2 p315), Ibn Hajar said: '*Thiqah Thabt*' (Taqrīb al-Tahdīb, v2 p239).

Abdullah Ibn Umar is declaring his aqeedah about the Quran i.e no one can proclaim that he has found the complete Quran whilst our Sunni brothers claim that they have the complete Quran with them. On the basis of this statement need to either declare Ibn Umar a liar or sever links with the Sunni ulema.

We would like Nawasib such as Sipah e Sahaba to provide explain the aqeedah of Umar and Abdullah Ibn Umar about distortions in the Quran. We would like to ask them whether books

like Kanz al Ummal, Tafseer Dur Manthur, Tafseer Itqan and Jam'i Sagheer are Sunni books or not? Aren't these authors the prominent scholars of your sect? The 'prizes and gifts' that Sipah e Sahaba have bestowed on those ulema that mentioned traditions regarding tahreef in their works, should be given to their own authors and sahaba first who have proclaimed their aqeedah regarding distortion in the Quran. They should either leave their existing belief, or disassociate themselves from their scholars and abandon their books.

107. Some excuses submitted by Nawasib to defend their beloved ancestors

In order to offer some defence for their beloved ancestors, Nawasib have submitted defences for them as means of protecting them from the takfeer edicts they have issued against Shias.

First Excuse: The narration is unauthentic

The tradition in which Ibn Umar stated that most of the Quran has been lost is weak.

Reply

We have already provided the appraisal of all the narrators by two great Sunni scholars in order to refute such a defence. Moreover, Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti chose to record the narration in his books and we have already cited his statement:

"Praise be to Allah.... who has given me the ability to conduct a commentary of his Great Book based on what I have received of the transmitted reports with high valued chains".

Second Excuse: The word 'Zahab' means abrogation

Ibn Umar used the word 'Zahab' for 'lost' but it doesn't mean 'lost' rather it means 'abrogation' and his statement should be read in its entirety as follows: "No one can claim that he has found the complete Quran as most of the Quran has been abrogated"

Reply One: Our challenge to Nawasib to bring a dictionary that defines "Zahab" as "abrogation"

For the sake of justice we would like to ask Sipah e Sahaba and other Nawasib to produce a dictionary that defines 'Zahab' as 'abrogation'. The reality is there is no dictionary in the world that defines 'Zahab' as 'abrogation' except the dictionary that Nawasib use that likewise define 'Tabarra' as 'cursing, name calling' 'Taqqyah' as lies and hypocrisy, 'Mutah' as 'adultery, prostitution' and 'Shia' as 'apostate'. The dictionary of the Debandies is indeed that of imbeciles of the highest order.

Reply Two: Umar bin Al-Khattab refuted those who defined Zahab as abrogation

We read in Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 61, Number 509 [English version]:

Narrated Zaid bin Thabit:

Abu Bakr As-Siddiq sent for me when the people! of Yamama had been killed (i.e., a number of the Prophet's Companions who fought against Musailama). (I went to

him) and found 'Umar bin Al-Khattab sitting with him. Abu Bakr then said (to me), "Umar has come to me and said: "Casualties were heavy among the Qurra' of the Qur'an (i.e. those who knew the Quran by heart) on the day of the Battle of Yalmama, and I am afraid that more heavy casualties may take place among the Qurra' on other battlefields, whereby a large part of the Qur'an may be lost. Therefore I suggest, you..."

The Arabic word which Umar Ibn al Khatab has used above for "lost" is "Zahab". The Arabic text of above tradition can be located at

 <http://www.al-eman.com/hadeeth/viewchp.asp?BID=13&CID=143#s2> (Hadith 5037)

Readers are required to ponder over the issue and if Nawasib are still using their own dictionary meaning of 'Zahab' then the above statement of Umar Khatab should be understood as follows: **"I am afraid that more heavy casualties may take place among the Qurra' on other battlefields, whereby a large part of the Qur'an may be abrogated. ..."** which is certainly incorrect as the war of Yamama was fought during the rule of Abu Bakr while the abrogation of Quranic verses could have only occurred during the time of Holy Prophet [s]. Applying the Deobandi dictionary definition here therefore means that the Nawasib deem Abu Bakr as their next Prophet after Prophet Muhammad [s], who had the mandate to abrogate the Quran, that would either elevate his status to that of a God, or that of a Prophet, either stance places them in the category of apostates. In the first case they would deny the belief in the Unity of Allah, and in the second case they would deny the belief in the finality of the Prophethood of Muhammad [s].

108. The testimony of Imam Malik that most of Surah Bar'at has been lost along with 'Bismillah'

We have relied on the following esteemed books of Ahle Sunnah to prove this:

1. Tafseer Fath al Qadeer, Volume 2 page 317, Surah Bara` t
2. Tafseer Qurtubi, Volume 8 page 62, Surah Bara` t
3. Tafseer Itqan, Volume 1 page 81
4. Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 3 page 208, Surah Bara` t
5. Al Muhazraat, Volume 2 page 434

We read in Fath al Qadeer:

"When the first part of Surah Bar'at was lost, Imam Malik said that 'Bismillah' was also lost along with it"

We read in Tafseer Qurtubi:

"Malik said among what had been narrated by Ibn Wahb and Ibn Al Qasim and Ibn Abdul Hakam is that when the first part of Surat Bara'at was lost, 'Bismillah Al Rahman Al Raheem' was also lost along with it. It has also been narrated from Ibn Ajan that he heard that Surat Bara'at was equal to the length of Surat Al Baqarah or approximately equal to it, so the part was gone and because of that "Bismillah Al Rahman Al Raheem" wasn't written between them (between the lost and the remaining part) ."

 [Online Tafseer Qurtubi](#)

109. The testimony of Sahabi Hudaifah that only one fourth of Surah Bar'at remains

Allamah Jalaludin Suyuti whilst quoting scholars like Tabrani, Hakim and Ibn Shebah writes:

عن حذيفة رضي الله عنه قال : التي تسمون سورة التوبة هي سورة العذاب والله ما تركت أحداً إلا نالت منه ولا تقرأون منها مما كنا نقرأ إلا ربعها

“Huzaifah narrated that the Surah which you call Taubah is actually Surah ‘Azaab [wrath] and you just recite one fourth of what we used to recite.”

Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 3 page 208

Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti has very confidently recorded the traditions mentioning that Surah Bar`at was equal to Surah Baqarah in length. At present Surah Baqarah contains 286 verses whilst Surah Bar`at contains 129 verses. If Surah Bar`at was really equal to the length of Surah Baqarah that would mean approximately 157 verses have been lost from Surah Ba`rat. If believing in Quranic distortion is Kufr then many prominent scholars of mazhab e Uthmani are clear-cut infidels and Imam Malik and Allamah Suyuti would head that list. We Shias using Nawasib logic shall likewise demand that justice will only be enabled when Nawasib issue the same fatwas against their beloved prominent scholars that they have issued against Shias. It is tragic that we are demanding justice from those who don't even believe in Justice of Allah [swt]. It is indeed strange, whilst they don't believe in Allah or his Prophet being Aadil, they deem all the Sahaba to be Aadil, as if this religion belongs to unknown fathers of Sipah-e-Sahaba, and not to Allah, Prophet [s] and his Holy Progeny.

110. Some excuses that Uthman's defender offer

Advocates of Uthman try to provide some excuses to maintain and safeguard their fabricated aqeedah that stipulates all the Sahaba were just.

First Excuse

The 157 verses of Surah Bar`at were abrogated verses.

Reply One

In the statement of Imam Malik the word "saqat" has been used. We challenge Nawasib like Sipah e Sahaba to bring any Arabic dictionary that defines "saqat" as abrogation.

Reply Two

If the advocates of Muawiya and Yazeed have been suckled by decent mothers rather than weaned on dubious bottled milk, then we issue them with a challenge that is also a rule of their sect as cited by us in the beginning of this chapter, namely that they produce a mutawatir hadeeth of the Holy Prophet [s] wherein he[s] declared that 157 verses of Surah Bar`at have been abrogated.

Reply Three

The 106th verse of Surah Baqarah tells us that whenever Allah[s] abrogates any verse He reveals a similar kind of or better verse than the abrogated verse. If 157 verses of Surah Bar`at were indeed abrogated then Nawasib should direct us to those verses that have replaced the preceding 157 verses. One verse for each of the abrogated verses should be brought.

Second Excuse

The word "saqat" in the statement of Imam Malik means "Nisyaan" i.e. to forget.

Our Reply

One of the mistakes of this second advocate is that he has refuted the former advocate himself but in our eyes both of them are liars.

If "saqat" really means to forget and if the statement of Imam Malik means that Allah [swt] made his worshippers forget 157 verses of Surah Bar`at then should remind them a verse from Surah Baqra wherein Allah[swt] says:

None of Our revelations do We abrogate or cause to be forgotten, but We substitute something better or similar: Knowest thou not that God Hath power over all things? (Quran 2:106)

We challenge the defenders of Hadrat Uthman to cite all those verses that have substituted the 157 alleged abrogated or forgotten verses of Surah Bar`at.

If Allah [swt] didn't make His worshippers forget these 157 verses himself then it means that the sahaba due to their irresponsible attitude forgot all 157 verses that makes them accountable to Allah (swt), his Prophet [s] after all it is due to their amnesia that all future generations of Muslims were deprived of 157 Holy verses.

111.The companions did not believe in the completeness of the Quran as they attested to numerous verses being lost from Surah Ahzab

We have relied on the following authentic Sunni books to prove this:

1. Tafseer Ibn Kathir, Volume 4 page 465, Surah Ahzab
2. Tafseer Dur al-Manthur, Volume 5 page 180 , Surah Ahzab
3. Tafseer Itqan, Volume 2 page 30
4. Tafseer Qurtubi, Volume 7 page 113, Surah Ahzab
5. Tafseer Fath al Qadeer, Volume 4 page 251, Surah Ahzab
6. Tafseer Mazhari, Volume 7 page 302, Surah Ahzab
7. Tafseer Ruh al-Ma'ani, page 121 parah 21
8. Tafseer Kashaf, Volume 2 page 204, Surah Ahzab
9. Tafseer Gharaib al-Quran, Volume 7 page 75
10. Tafseer Madarik al-Tanzeel, Volume 3 page 48, Surah Ahzab
11. Al Muhazraat, Volume 4 page 434 by Raghیب al-Isfahani

The testimony of the companion Ubai bin Ka'b

We read in Tafseer Dur e Manthur:

"Ubai bin Ka'ab inquired of someone: 'How many verses were there in the chapter of al-Ahzab?' He replied, '72 or 73 verses.' Ubai bin Ka'b then said: 'I had seen this Surah more or equal to Surah Baqarah'"

[🌐 Online Tafseer Dur e Manthur](#)

The testimony of Umar

We also read in Tafseer Dur e Manthur:

"Ibn Mardawayh narrated from Huzaifah that Umar said that Surah Ahzab was equal to Surah Baqrah (in length)"

Ayesha clearly believed in the incompleteness of Quran

We read in Tafseer Ruh al Mani:

"Ayesha narrates: "During the life of the the Prophet (s), Surah Ahzab was read with 200 verses, when Uthman collected the verses, he could get along with more verses than this."

We also read in Tafseer Qurtubi:

"Ayesha narrates: 'Surah Ahzab contained 200 verses during the lifetime of Prophet [s] but when the Quran was collected we only found the amount that can be found in the present Quran'".

This tragedy happened due to Uthman but it seems that the author of this tafseer lacked sufficient courage to cite his name.

We also read in Dur al-Manthur:

"Ayesha narrated that during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet [s] 200 verses were recited in Surah Ahzab but when Uthman collected the Mushaf, he only succeeded in locating the present number of verses"

[🌐 Online Tafsir Dur al Manthoor, Surah Ahzab](#)

Ayesha's explicit statement suggests that Uthman was unsuccessful in locating a large number of verses that were present during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet [s]. It isn't a small statement. According to Ayesha, the Muslims of today have been deprived of a large number of verses that were in existence during the time of the Holy Prophet [s]. Ayesha was fully aware of the seriousness of this statement, and in it we do not find any evidence that the 'lost' verses were abrogated, the Nawasib should therefore refrain from putting words into her mouth. She stated that these verses were in existence during the era of the Holy Prophet [s] and then went missing during the era of Uthman. If Nawasib seek to suggest that those verses were abrogated then would mean they deem Abu Bakr and Umar as their next Prophets for they had abrogated these verses after the death of the Prophet [s].

Comment

Dear readers, at present there are 73 verses in Surah Ahzab, where are the missing 127 verses? Who is responsible for omitting these verses? If Uthman's lovers give him credit for collecting and compiling the Quran then they should likewise hold him responsible for the loss of 127 verses, and this is a clear distortion of the Quran that according to Nawasib is Kufr. Perhaps they are unable to accept that their beloved Caliph was guilty of doing what they declare as Kufr. At least this wasn't "Fadak" or the "Bayt ul-Maal" that the drunkard heroes of Nawasib would freely distribute amongst their relatives, nor was it the pulpit of caliphate that they would play musical chairs with! We are talking about the Holy Quran, Allah (swt) says that He is the Protector of the Quran, so where was Allah (swt) and His authority when these people lost, forgot and distributed the Holy Quran with such generosity?

112.Nasibi excuses protecting their Khalifa from their own self made takfeer fatwas

Unsurprisingly Nawasib offer some attempts to protect their Khalifa.

Excuse

This is not Tahreef as Allah [swt] abrogated those 127 verses. By mixing the concept of abrogation with tahreef the Shias have disgraced themselves.

Reply One

Dear readers; the 'abrogation excuse' is a veil to hide their faces from Tahreef, but they have been exposed. Just like their artificial caliphate, the Nawasib have advanced a lame excuse about abrogation to defend Uthman & Co. who (according to authentic Sunni sources) either deliberately or inadvertently didn't include these verses in the Quran when compiling it. If the Nawasib have some shame then they should produce a Mutawatir hadith in which the Holy Prophet [s] referred to the abrogation of 127 verses of Surah Ahzab.

Reply Two

If Nawasib are adamant that these 127 verses of Surah Ahzab were abrogated then we would like to ask them that where can we find the replacement of the 127 verses of Surah Ahzab, when the present Quran only contains 73 verses? When the Nawasib are aware of the abrogation of those verses, then they must be aware of the replacement verses as well, and we relish the opportunity to benefit from their knowledge of these replacement verses.

We have already cited verse 106 of Surah Baqarah in which Allah [swt] says that when He (swt) wants to abrogate any verse He substitutes something better or similar. If 127 verses of Surah Ahzab were really abrogated then can Nawasib cite a matawatur hadith wherein the Prophet [s] mentioned the 127 substituted verses that were better or similar to the 127 abrogated verses?

We can see that the Nawasib themselves believe in the loss of 127 verses, a belief that they deem to be Kufr.

113.Nasibi belief that a Surah equal to the length of Sura Bar'at has been lost as endorsed by Imam Muslim and Hakim

We have relied on the following esteemed books of Ahle Sunnah.

1. Sahih Muslim [English] Book 005, Number 2286
2. Jama' al Usool, Volume 3 page 53, chapter 2 part 3 Hadith 972
3. Mustadrak al Hakim, Volume 2 page 224, Kitab al Tafseer
4. Al Muhazhirat, Volume 3 page 433
5. Tafseer Ruh al Mani, Volume 2 page 25
6. Mu'jam al Zawaid, Volume 7 page 140
7. Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 1 page 105 , verse of abrogation

We read in Sahih Muslim [English] Book 005, Number 2286:

Abu Harb b. Abu al-Aswad reported on the authority of his father that Abu Musa al-Ash'ari sent for the reciters of Basra. They came to him and they were three

hundred in number. They recited the Qur'an and he said: You are the best among the inhabitants of Basra, for you are the reciters among them. So continue to recite it. (But bear in mind) that your reciting for a long time may not harden your hearts as were hardened the hearts of those before you. We used to recite a surah which resembled in length and severity to (Surah) Bara'at. I have, however, forgotten it with the exception of this which I remember out of it: "*If there were two valleys full of riches, for the son of Adam, he would long for a third valley, and nothing would fill the stomach of the son of Adam but dust.*" ...

In Jamai al Usool we read the testimony of a companion Abi Ka`ab who was the first Imam of Taraweeh prayers appointed by Umar:

"Ubai bin Ka'b narrates: "The Prophet[s] said that he had been ordered to recite the Quran amongst us and the Quran which He[s] had recited also contained the following verse :

"Should a son of Adam own two valleys full of wealth, he should seek a third valley and nothing would fill Ibn Adam's abdomen but the soil".

We read in Al Muhazraat:

"Abdullah Ibn Masud had this in his mushaf:

"Should a son of Adam own two valleys full of wealth, he should seek a third valley and nothing would fill Ibn Adam's abdomen but the soil".

Similarly al-Hakim in his book Al-Mustadrak in the section of commentary on the Quran, part two, page 224, reported that Ubai Ibn Kaab said that the Messenger of God said to him:

"Certainly the Almighty commanded me to read the Quran before you, and he read "The unbelievers from the people of the Book and Should Ibn Adam ask for a valley full of wealth and I grant it to him, he would ask for another valley. And if I grant him that, he would ask for a third valley. Nothing would fill the abdomen of Ibn Adam except the soil. God accepts the repentance of anyone who repents. The religion in the eyes of God is the Hanafiyah (Islam) rather than Yahudiyya (Judaism) or Nasraniya (Christianity). Whoever does good, his goodness will not be denied."

al-Mustadrak by al-Hakim, section of commentary on the Quran, Volume 2, page 224 Hadith 2889. Al-Hakim wrote: "This is an authentic Hadith." al-Dhahabi also considered it authentic in his commentary on al-Mustadrak

When:

- al-Hakim said this is authentic according to the standards of the two Sheikhs (Al-Bukhari and Muslim)
- al-Dhahabi also considered it authentic in his Commentary of al-Mustadrak, vol 2, pages 225-226,
- Muslim report similar to this from Abu Musa Ash'ari then what will be the conclusion?
- Anas bin Malik also testified to the lost verse of Ibn Adam as recorded in Al-Musanaf, by Abdulrazaq, v10, p436

Thus, it is up to Nawasib to rule on the fate of the above Sahaba before attacking Shias. Those who claim that anyone who has recorded a tradition which implies the incompleteness of the Quran is a Kafir, should first issue this Fatwa against beloved Gurus Imam Bukhari, Imam Muslim, al-Hakim & Co since they testified to such absurd traditions being authentic and named their books as "Sahih"!

Note: Abrogation excuse will not be accepted here until they bring Mutawatir narrations from their Sahabah about the abrogation of the aforesaid verses.

114. Two Surahs namely Surah Hafd and Surah Khul'a are missing from current Quran which were written in the Quran of Ubai bin Ka'b

According to Sunni sources there were two Surahs which were part of that Quran according to the testimonies of the Sahaba and Tabayeen, one of which was Surah Khula:

اللهم إنا نستعينك ونستغفرك ونثني عليك ولا نكفرك، ونخلع ونترك من يفجرك

God, we ask help from You and we ask repentance from You. And we praise You, and we will not be infidels, and we remove and we leave who are dissolute (Unrestrained by Your laws).

The other was Surah Hafd:

اللهم إياك نعبد ولك نصلّي ونسجد وإليك نسعى ونحفد، نرجو رحمتك ونخشى عذابك إن عذابك بالكفار

God its You Who we worship , and for You we pray and prostrate , and we curry favor with You and we rush for Your obedience , and we hope for Your mercy , and we are afraid from Your anger , Your suffer is purchasing the infidels ."

Both of these Surahs were part of a copy of the Quran possessed by the Sahabi Ubai bin Kaab, and were read in the following Sunni books:

1. Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 4 page 421
2. Tafseer al Itqan (Urdu), Volume 1 page 172-173
3. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani, Volume 1 page 25

We read in Al Itqan:

"The sequence of surahs in Ubai bin Ka'ab's mushaf was in this manner: [1]Al Hamd, [2]Al Baqrah, [3]Aal e Imran, [4]Al-An'am, [5]Al-Ar`af, [6]...[94] At-Takathur, [95]Al-Qadr, [96]Surat al Khul'a, [97] Surat al Haqd, [98]..."

 [Tafseer al Itqan \(Urdu\), Volume 1 page 172-173](#)

Like their beloved companions, do Nawasib such as Sipah e Sahaba have these two surahs in their Quran? This tradition clearly demonstrates that Uthman deleted two surahs from the Quran. What is the Nasibi fatwa here? Or will they by adopting their usual double standard approach, closing their eyes from this serious tradition and focusing their attention on Shia scholars?

Surah Khul'a and Surah Hafd were a part of Ibn Masud's Mushaf

We read in Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 8 page 696:

وزعم عبيد أنه بلغه أنهما سورتان من القرآن في مصحف ابن مسعود

"Ubaid narrates that he came to know that these two are the surahs from the Quran and are written in the mushaf of Ibn Masud"

 [Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 8 page 696](#)

Umar used to recite Surah Khula and Surah Hafd in his prayers

We read in Tafseer al Itqan (Urdu), Volume 1 page 175:

Umar Ibn al Khattab did Qunut after Ruku [bowing] and recited:

***In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful
God, we ask help from You and we ask repentance from You.
And we praise You, and we will not be infidels, and we remove and we leave who
are dissolute (Unrestrained by Your laws).***

***In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful
God its You Who we worship , and for You we pray and prostrate ,
and we curry favor with You and we rush for Your obedience , and we hope for Your
mercy , and we are afraid from Your anger ,
Your suffer is purchasing the infidels ."***

 [Itqan fi Uloom al-Quran, Volume 1 page 77](#)

Ibn Abbas had written Surah Khul'a and Surah Haqd in his Quran

We are quoting from the following Sunni books.

1. Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 6 page 421
2. Itqan fi Uloom al-Quran, Volume 1 page 77


We read in Al Itqan:

In the Mushaf (Quran) of Ibn Abbas the recital of Abi and Abi Musa was in this manner:

***i.e "God, we ask help from you and we ask repentance from You.
We praise You, We will not be infidels, and we remove and we leave who are
dissolute (Unrestrained by Your laws).***

And this:

***God its You Who we praise , and for You we pray and prostrate ,
and we curry favor with You and we rush for Your obedience ,
We are afraid from Your anger , and we hope for Your mercy
Your suffer is purchasing the infidels ."***

 [Itqan fi Uloom al-Quran \(Urdu\), Volume 1 page 175](#)

 [Itqan fi Uloom al-Quran, Volume 1 page 77](#)

Umayya bin Abdullah would recite both Surahs in his prayers

In Itqan, Volume 1 page 77 we read that a Tabayee namely Umayya bin Abdullah (d. 87 H) used to recite both of these Surahs in prayers:

Tabrani with Sahih chain has narrated from Ibn Ishaq that he said: "In Khurasan Umayya bin Abdullah bin Khalid bin Usaïd did imamate for us in prayers and recited both of these Surahs: 'INNA NASTA3INUKA WA NASTAGHFIRUKA'

 [Itqan fi Uloom al-Quran, Volume 1 page 77](#)

Comment

These prominent figures amongst Sunnis including their second caliph are clearly announcing that these two Surahs were a part of the Quran. If these companions are indeed true then why did Uthman delete these two Surahs from the Quran? If our opponents offer some excuses, could they enlighten us with answers to the following questions:

- Why did these three prominent companions had those two surahs written in their Mushafs if they were unimportant
- Why did Uthman not include them in the mushaf when according to Sunni tradition the Prophet (s) issued the instructions that people were to attain knowledge of the Quran from Ibn Masud & Ubai ?
- What is Nawasib stance on those Sahaba that believed that both Surahs were worthy enough to be written in their Quran (if according to Nawasib they aren't the part of the Quran) and the scholars who recorded such traditions in their books? Are they ready to declare them infidels?


The abrogation excuse will not be accepted here until they bring Mutawatur Hadith from their Sahabah about the abrogation of the aforesaid verses. Moreover how can they even try to offer the abrogation defence when we learn that their Khalifa Umar and Umayya bin Abdullah would recite both verses in their prayers? Are Nawasib going to suggest that their Khalifa was so ignorant that he was reciting abrogated verses in his Salat? And was no Sahaba present to correct him and point out this major error?

115.The Sahabi Ibn Masud's testimony that Ali [as]'s name was mentioned in Quran which was deleted out by Uthman

We read in Holy Quran:

[Shakir 5:67] O Messenger! Deliver what has been revealed to you from your Lord; and if you do it not, then you have not delivered His message, and Allah will protect you from the people; surely Allah will not guide the unbelieving people.

We have relied on the following esteemed Sunni Tafseers of the above mentioned verse.

1. Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 2 page 297, Surah Maidah verse 67
2. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani, Volume 9 page 193
3. Tafseer Fatah al Qadeer, Volume 2 page 57, Surah Maidah verse 67
4.  [Tafseer Mazhari, Volume 3 page 353 published by Daar ul Ishaat Karachi](#)

We read in Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani:

**"Hafiz Ahmed bin Musa bin Mardawayh has narrated with his isnad from Abdullah Ibn Masud that: "During the lifetime of the Holy Prophet (s) we used to recite this verse as:
"O Apostle! Deliver what has been sent down to you from your Lord; 'that 'Ali is the Maula of the Momineen', if you don't...."**

It is quite clear from this tradition that Sunnis believe that Ali[as]'s name was mentioned in the Quran but Uthman due to his resentment towards Maula Ali[as] didn't include his name when compiling the Quran. If Nawasib without any strong evidence refuse this tradition then we would like to ask them that what compulsion were the Sunni scholars under when they record this tradition in their merits of Ali ibn Abi Talib [as]?

Some Nawasib malign the Shia ulema because they have recorded traditions that shows that Ali [as]'s name was mentioned Quran. We have now provided the opportunity for all Nawasib to ponder over this issue, since according to them anyone who records such traditions in his works becomes believer of distortion in the Quran and is therefore a Kaafir, that automatically engulfs those prestigious Sunni scholars who narrated the testimony of a Sahabi referring to tahreef in the Quran. Isn't it sheer injustice on the part of the Nawasib that they quickly throw edict of Kufr when such traditions are mentioned by any Shia but when some Sunni scholar records

what beloved sahabi narrates, they don't find any problem with that? Why should they be treated differently to the Shia?

116.Ibn Masud's testimony that Ali [as]'s name was mentioned in Surah Ahzab as well

[Shakir 33:25] And Allah turned back the unbelievers in their rage; they did not obtain any advantage, and Allah sufficed the believers in fighting; and Allah is Strong, Mighty.

We have relied on the following esteemed Sunni Tafseers of above mentioned verse:

1. Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 5 page 192, Surah Ahzab verse 25
2. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani, page 157, chapter 21, verse 25
3. Ma'arij al Nabuwat by Moin Kashifi, Volume 1 page 163

Allamah Alusi writes in Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani:

Ibn Mardawayh narrated from Ibn Masud that: "We used to recite this verse as: "and enough was Allah for the believers in their fight 'via Ali ibn Abi Talib'."

Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti writes in Dur al Manthur:

"Ibn Abi Hatim, Ibn Mardawayh and Ibn Asakir have narrated from Abdullah Ibn Masud that: "We used to recite this verse in the following manner: "and enough was Allah for the believers in their fight 'via Ali ibn Abi Talib.'"

Dear readers, one of the reasons that the Nasibi ulema have issued takfeer against Shias is that some of the Shia ulema recorded traditions suggesting that Ali [as]'s name was mentioned in Surah Ahzab, from which they have deduced that the Shia ascribe to Tahreef and are therefore Kaafirs. We the Shia would like to return the same fatwa to the Nawasib by saying that the renowned Sunni ulema by recording similar kinds of traditions have also become Kaafirs. If Nawasib are going to refuse to apply takfeer against ibn Masud and the Ulema that narrated his views, then they have no right to issue such Fatwas against the Shias

117.Ibn Masud's testimony that the term "Aal e Muhammad" was also present in the Quran after the term "Aal e Imran"

We read in Quran:

[Shakir 3:33] Surely Allah chose Adam and Nuh and the descendants of Ibrahim and the descendants of Imran above the nations.

INNA ALLAHA ISTAFA ADAMA WANOOHAN WAALA IBRAHEEMA WAALA AAIMRANA AAALA ALAAALAMEENA

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/003.html>

Important Note: In one of the esteemed Sunni books Tafsir Thalabi by Imam Abu Ishaq Thalabi, it was recorded Abdullah Ibn Masud used to read this verse in a different manner i.e. by adding the words '**descendants of Muhamad**' but in order to save a great Sahabi from the edicts of Kufr for believing in Tahreef as well as to degrade the merits of Ahlulbayt [as], Nawasib have committed Tahreef in Tafsir Thalabi itself and now this tradition can no longer be found in the book. The tradition was:

Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abdullah al-Kaeni from Abu al-Hassan

bin Uthman bin al-Hassan al-Nusaibi from Abu Bakr Muhammad bin al-Hussain bin Saleh al-Subaei from Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Saeed from Ahmad bin Maytham bin Abi Naeem from Abu Janad al-Saloli from al-Amash from Abu Wael that he said: 'I read in Abdullah ibn Masud's Mushaf: { Surely Allah chose Adam and Nuh and the descendants of Ibrahim and the descendants of Imran and descendants of Muhammad above the nations.}'

For the najis Nawasib who may still deny that such reference ever existed in Tafsir Thalabi, let us slap their ugly faces with the help of the text recoded by the great Sunni Imam Bahaqi. Bahaqi in his book Lubab al-Ansab wa al-Alqab wa al-Aqab, Volume 1 page 10 quoted the very reference from Tafsir Thalabi:

وذكر الثعلبي في تفسيره عن الأعمش عن أبي وائل أنه قال: قرأت في مصحف عبد الله بن مسعود وآل إبراهيم وآل عمران وآل محمد على العالمين

Thalabi recorded in his Tafsir from al-Amash from Abi Wael that he said: 'I read in Abdullah ibn Masud's book: 'The family of Abraham, and the family of Imran and the family of Muhammad above all people'

Having proved the Tahreef committed by the noxious Nawasib in Tafsir Thalabi in order to hide the Tahreef belief of Abdullah Ibn Masud as well as to hide the merit of Ahlulbayt [as], let us now cite this reference from couple of other Sunni sources also. Hasakani al-Hanafi records in Shawahid al-Tanzil, Volume 1 page 152:

عن شقيق قال : قرأت في مصحف عبد الله وهو ابن مسعود { ان الله اصطفى آدم ونوحا وآل إبراهيم وآل عمران وآل محمد على العالمين

Shaqiq said: 'I read in Abdullah ibn Masud's Mushaf '{Surely Allah chose Adam and Nuh and the descendants of Ibrahim and the descendants of Imran and descendants of Muhammad above the nations.}'

Imam Abu Hayan Andlasi also records in Tafsir Bahar al-Muheet, Volume 2 page 203:

وقرأ عبد الله : وآل محمد على العالمين

Abdullah used to recite: 'The descendants of Muhammad above all people'

Dear readers, according to Sunni sources the Prophet [s] ordered the people to learn the Quran from four people that included Abdullah Ibn Masud [Sahih Bukhari Arabic - English Vol 6 hadith number 521] and in the Mushaf of Ibn Masud there was written such a word that enlightens the merits of Ahlulbait[as]. Verily the representative of Banu Umayyah Uthman had the fire of abhorrence burning in his heart (which has now been inherited by Nawasib) which didn't allow the committee which was collecting the Quran to include the mushaf of Ibn Masud, in fact they burnt the copy of Ibn Masud as well, so that they could burn the merits of Ahlulbait [as].

118.Imam Bukhari's & Imam Muslim's enforcement of a tradition pointing to the incompleteness of the Quran

We have relied on the most reliable work of Ahle Sunnah.

1. Sahih Bukhari, Book of Tafseer (Commentry on Quran)
2. Fatah al Bari, Volume 8 page 506, Hadith 3771
3. Sahih Muslim, Book 001, Number 0406 [English]
4. Sahih Ibn Haban, Volume 14 page 487
5. Al-Sunnan al-Kubra, by Bayhaqi, Volume 9 page 7

We read in Sahih al Bukhari [Arabic], Book of Tafseer, Hadith 5023:

عن ابن عباس - رضى الله عنهما - قال لما نزلت وأنذر عشيرتك الأقربين { ورهطك منهم المخلصين، خرج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم حتى صعد الصفا فهتف "يا صباحاه" فقالوا من هذا، فاجتمعوا إليه . فقال "أرايتم إن أخبرتكم أن خيلا تخرج من سفح هذا الجبل أكنتم مصدقي" ...

<http://www.al-eman.com/hadeeth/viewchp.asp?BID=13&CID=141>

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

When the Verse:--'And warn your tribe of near-kindred, and thy group of selected people among them' was revealed the Prophet ascended the Safe (mountain) and started calling "O Bani Fihri! O Bani 'Adi!" addressing various tribes of Quraish till they were assembled. Those who could not come themselves, sent their messengers to see what was there. Abu Lahab and other people from Quraish came and the Prophet then said, "Suppose I told you that there is an (enemy)..."

Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 293 [English]

Ibn Abbas has used the words "and thy group of selected people among them" along with the words "And warn your tribe of near-kindred" which haven't been mentioned in the English version of Sahih Bukhari. The translator has committed Tahreef in order to hide the belief in Tahreef of the Quran that would expose his Imam Bukhari or if we adopt the Nasibi definition of Taqqiyah we can safely say that the translator practiced Taqqiyah in this case.

The words "And warn your tribe of near-kindred" can be read in Holy Quran [verse 26:214] but the former i.e "and thy group of selected people among them" which (according to Sunni sources) had been revealed along with "And warn your tribe of near-kindred" cannot be found in this verse nor any where else in the Quran. Hence the statement of Ibn Abbas proves that those words were also a part of this verse and same view has been endorsed by Imam Bukhari and Imam Muslim who included these words from Ibn Abbas in their 'Sahih'.

Our challenge to Sipah e Sahabah and their fellow Nasibi brethren to show us these words from the Quran

It is an open challenge to Nawasib like Sipah e Sahaba and other who have dedicated their cursed lives only for Shia-abhorrence to locate these words mentioned by Ibn Abbas in the present Quran and if they fail, which is certain, then they should issue an edict of Kufr as Imam Bukhari (as he is guilty of believing in Tahrif) in the same that they do against Shia scholars. The abrogation excuse shall not be accepted here until they bring a Sahih or Mutawatur Hadith from their Sahabah about the abrogation of the aforesaid verses. After all it is not only our challenge but the rule set by their school of thought as cited by us in the beginning of this chapter from Al Itqan.

If Nawasib are going to advance their usual abrogation excuse here they should know that there are also traditions in Bukhari wherein the companions after reporting verses clearly stated that they had been abrogated, why that was not the case here?

119.Nasibi belief endorsed by Bukhari & Muslim: Some words which were recited by the Prophet [s] and Sahaba have been deleted from Surah Kahf

Presently we have got the following words in the verses 79 and 80 of Surah Kahf:

[Shakir 18:79] As for the boat, it belonged to (some) poor men who worked on the river and I wished that I should damage it, and there was behind them a king who seized every boat by force.

[Shakir 18:80] And as for the boy, his parents were believers and we feared lest he should make disobedience and ingratitude to come upon them

We are quoting from the following prestigious books of Ahle Sunnah.

1. Sahih Bukhari [Arabic], Book of Tafseer, Hadith Number 4772
2. Sahih Muslim [English], Book 030, Number 5865
3. Sunan Tirmidhi [Arabic], Volume 11 page 427 Hadith 3442
4. Tafseer Dur al-Manthur, Volume 4 page 227, Surah Kehf verse 79
5. Tafseer Tabari, Surah Kehf verse 79
6. Mustadrak al Hakim, Volume 2 page 244 Hadith 2959
7. Tafseer Fath al Qadeer, Volume 3 page 305
8. Al-Tamhid by Ibn Abdulbar, Volume 4 page 278
9. Tafseer al-Qurtubi, Volume 11 page 22

We read in Sahih Bukhari [Arabic], Book of Tafseer, Hadith Number 4772:

قال سعيد بن جبیر فكان ابن عباس يقرأ وكان أمامهم ملك يأخذ كل سفينة صالحة غصبا وكان يقرأ وأما الغلام فكان كافرا وكان أبواه مؤمنين . قال سعيد بن جبیر فكان ابن عباس يقرأ وكان أمامهم ملك يأخذ كل سفينة صالحة غصبا وكان يقرأ وأما الغلام فكان كافرا وكان أبواه مؤمنين .

"...Saeed bin Jubayr narrated that Ibn Abbas used to recite: 'And in front (ahead) of them there was a king who used to seize every serviceable boat by force. [18.79] and used to recite: "and as for the boy he was a disbeliever and his parents were believers" [18.80]

[Online Sahih Bukhari \[Arabic\], Book of Tafseer, Hadith Number 4772](#)

Imam Tirmidhi recorded same thing and has declared the tradition to be 'Hasan Sahih':

[Sunan Tirmidhi \[Arabic\], Volume 11 page 427 Hadith 3442](#)

Note: The English translator of Sahih Bukhari in Volume 6, Book 60, Number 251, had no other option than to put the word 'serviceable' within brackets so that he the naïve readers may not see this tradition as the one showing the belief of Ibn Abbas in Tahreef of Quran.

Regarding the belief of the Sahabi Ubai bin Kaab about these two verses, we read in Tafseer Dur al Manthur:

"Ubai bin Ka'b used to recite the cited verse as follows: 'for there was after them a certain king who seized on every serviceable boat by force' [YA/KHUTHU KULLA SAFEENATIN SALEHAT GHASBAN]."

[Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Surah Kehf verse 79](#)

We also read in Tafseer Tabari:

Al-Hasan bin Yahya said that Abdul Razzak told us that Muammar narrated from Qatadah that in Ibn Mas'ud's writings the verse was in this manner: 'for there was after them a certain king who seized on every serviceable boat by force'.

[Online Tafseer Tabari](#)

We read in Sahih Muslim:

Sa'id b. jubair used to recite (verses 79 and 80 of Sura Kahf) in this way: There was before them a king who used to seize every boat by force which was in order, the boy was an unbeliever.

Now the answer of the question as to why these esteem people used to recite these two verses in this manner is that the verses were revealed in the very manner from the Holy Prophet [s] as

Imam Hakim records into the following tradition which has been declared 'Sahih' by him:

Ibn Abbas stated: The Holy Prophet used to recite: 'for there was after them a certain king who seized on every serviceable boat by force'.

[🌐 Mustadrak al Hakim, Volume 7 page 85 Hadith 2913](#)

Note: The filthy Nawasib have deleted the word 'SALEHAT' from various online versions of Mustadrak al-Hakim.

Comment

It is quite clear from the traditions that the Sahaba used to believe that both verses of Surah Kahf had the words '**serviceable**' [SALEHAT] and '**he was a disbeliever and**' [FAKAN KAFIRA WA] which cannot be found in the present Quran. What is the Nasibi fatwa here against those scholars who have not only recorded such traditions in their texts but graded them as Sahih? Have the impurely born people of Sipah e Sahabah declared all those people the filthiest Kafirs on the planet? If not then why do they demand such things from Shias?

120.The belief of Sipah-e-Sahaba and other Nawasib: An alteration has taken place in Surah Talaq

We read in Surah Talaq:

يا أيها النبي إذا طلقتم النساء فطلقوهن لعدتهن

[Yusufali 65:1] O Prophet! When ye do divorce women, divorce them at their prescribed periods,...

But when we read authentic text of Nawasib we come to know that people whom they regard highly used to recite this verse with words that cannot be found in the present Quran.

يا أيها النبي إذا طلقتم النساء فطلقوهن في قبليعدتهن

"O Prophet! When ye do divorce women, divorce them in the beginning their prescribed periods"

Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti records this fact from the most authentic sources of Ahle Sunnah in his Tafseer of the cited verse.

Malik and Shafiyye, Abdurazzaq in Al-Musnaf, Ahmad, Abd bin Hamid, Bukhari, Muslim, Abu Dawud, Al Tirmidi, Al Nisa'i, Ibn Majah , Ibn Jurir, Ibn al Munzer, Abu Ya'la Ibn Mardawah and Al Bayhaqi in his Sunan narrated from Ibn Omar that he divorced his wife while she was in her period and Rasulollah [s] was informed about this and He[s] got angry and said : "Let him go to her and hold her until she ends her period, then if he wished he can divorce her a pure divorce before he touches her because this is the "Iddat" that God ordered how the women will be divorced and then prophet [s] recited: "O Prophet! When ye do divorce women, divorce them in the beginning their prescribed periods"

We also read:

"Ibn Mardawah narrated from Abi-l-Zubayr who from Ibn Umar that, during the time of the Prophet [s] he divorced his wife while she was in her period, so Omar went to the Prophet and mentioned the same to him [s] on which He [s] said: "Order him to go to her and hold her until she ends her period then he can divorce

her if he wished" Thus Allah revealed ***"O Prophet! When ye do divorce women, divorce them in the beginning their prescribed periods"***
Abi-I-Zubayr said: I heard Ibn Umar reciting it like this."

We further read:

Abdul Razzaq and Abd bin Hamid and Al Tabarani and Ibn Mardaweh narrated from Mujahid [ra] that he said: One day a man asked Ibn Abbas: O Aba Abbas! I divorced my wife 3 times" So Ibn Abbas said: "You didn't obey your God and made your woman haram on you and you haven't been pious so that God makes for you a vent, one of you will divorce . Then he said: "O Aba Abbas! God has said: *"O Prophet! When ye do divorce women, divorce them in the beginning their prescribed periods"*** , And like this Ibn Abbas used to recite this verse .**

[Online Tafseer Dur e Manthur](#)

In order to gauge the primary Sunni sources that contain the above stance of Ibn Abbas, once can consult:

1. al-Mujam al-Kabir, by Tabarani, Volume 11 page 73
2. Sharh Ma'ani al-Athaar, by Ibn Salamah, Volume 3 page 58
3. Al-Sunnan al-Kubra, by Nisai, Volume 6 page 493
4. Sunnan al-Darqutni, Volume 4 page 11

Whilst quoting this episode again we would like to present the online versions of this incident briefly remove any Nawasib confusion so that they can recognize how their Imams recorded traditions in their "Sahih" texts which clearly show that the verse [65:1] in the present Quran is not same as it that which was recited by the Holy Prophet [s] and his Sahaba.

We read in Sahih Muslim:

"... Ibn 'Umar (Allah be pleased with them) said that Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) then recited this verse: " O Apostle, when you divorce women, divorce them at the commencement of their prescribed period" (I xv 1).

[Online Sahih Muslim \[English\], Book of Divorce Hadith Number 3489](#)

We read in Sunan Abu Daud:

"...The Prophet (peace be upon him) recited the Qur'anic verse: *O Prophet, when you divorce women, divorce them in the beginning of their waiting period."*

[Online Sunan Abu Daud \[English\] Book of Divorce Hadith Number 2180](#)

The Arabic versions of both these traditions can be read at the following sites respectively so that the difference between two versions of verse may become clear.

[Online Sahih Muslim \[Arabic\] Hadith # 3743](#)

[Online Sunan Abu Daud \[Arabic\] Hadith 2187](#)

Comment

What about those words which used to be recited by the Holy Prophet [s] and Sahabah but are not written in the present Quran? We see that najis Nawasib such as Haq Nawaz Jhangvi & Azam Tariq dedicated their cursed lives to issuing takfeer against Shias for having traditions in their texts implying tahrif in their books, what prevented them from examining the contents of their own house? Were the young boys that sat in their laps, blocking their view of their hadith books and tafseers that were replete with traditions of tahreef?

121. Further proof from Bukhari about Tahrif in the Quran

We read in Holy Quran:

[Shakir 2:198] There is no blame on you in seeking bounty from your Lord, so when you hasten on from "Arafat",

We have relied on the following most prestigious work of Ahle Sunnah.

1. Sahih Bukhari, Volume 6, Book 60, Number 44 [English]
2. Fatah al Bari, Volume 8 page 186 Chapter 34 Hadith 4519
3. Sunnan al-kubra, by Bayhaqi, Volume 4 page 333
4. Al-Mujam al-kabir, by Tabarani, Volume 11 page 93
5. Tafsir al-Tabari, Volume 2 page 389

We read in Sahih Bukhari:

Narrated Ibn 'Abbas:

'Ukaz, Mijanna and Dhul-Majaz were markets during the Pre-islamic Period. They (i.e. Muslims) considered it a sin to trade there during the Hajj time (i.e. season), so this Verse was revealed:-- *"There is no harm for you if you seek of the Bounty of your Lord during the Hajj season."* (2.198)

Comment

Dear readers as you can see the words "***during the Hajj season***" has been used in this hadith of Sahih Bukhari along with the words of verse 2:198 which we do not find the former in the present Quran. Imam Bukhari has recorded the testimony of Ibn Abbas [ra] that the cited verse was revealed in that precise manner.

Imam Bukhari has himself left such a weapon for Shias which they can use against Nawasib to show the actual face of the beliefs of their ancestors. As for the Jhangvi cult, if recording traditions about Tahreef is Kufr and it makes the whole sect Kaafirs then Nawasib should head that list, because such proofs can be found in the most authentic books of Sipah e Sahaba (Krhcy.com). If they are going to advance lame excuse namely these were not the words of traditions or words of verses rather these were "commentary footnotes" then they should also accept the same explanation advanced by us to explain Tahreef in traditions in our books.

122. Alteration in the verse of Mutah

The Quran we have in our hands have the verse in the following manner:

[Shakir 4:24] ... Then as to those whom you profit by, give them their dowries as appointed; and there is no blame on you about what you mutually agree after what is appointed; surely Allah is Knowing, Wise.

In order to prove that the Sahaba and Tabayeen believed in some words to be the a part of this verse, we have relied on the following valued books of Ahle Sunnah:

1. [Tafseer Durre Manthur, Volume 2 pages 140-141](#)
2. Tafseer Tabari, Volume 5 pages 14-15
3. Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 3 page 94
4. Fatah al Qadeer, Volume 1 page 14
5. Tafseer Ibn Katheer, Volume 1 page 84
6. Tafseer Ruh al Maani, Volume 5 page 5

7. Tafseer Kashaf, Volume 1 page 20
8. Tafseer Mazhari, Volume 2 page 4
9. [Tafseer Ahkam al Quran, Volume 2 page 47](#)
10. Tafseer Mu'alim al Tanzeel, page 414
11. Mustadrak Al Hakim, volume 2 page 47
12. Al Musahif by Abi Bakr Sijistani, page 3
13. Tafseer Mawahib al Rahman, page 4 part 5
14. Tafseer Haqqani, Vol 2 page 3 (published in 1956, Deoband UP. India)
15. Tafseer Jama Al Bayan, Volume 1 page 66
16. Neel al Autar, Volume 6 page 53 Chapter: The abrogation of Nikah al-Mutah
17. [Tafseer Qurtabi, Volume 5 page 30](#)
18. Sharh Muwatta by Zarqani, Volume 1 page 54
19. Kitab al Musahaf, page 342
20. Al Bahar al Maheet, Volume 3 page 218
21. Maini al-Quran, Volume 2 page 61
22. Tafseer Manar, Volume 5 page 5
23. Sharh Sahih Muslim of al-Nawawi, Volume 9 page 179
24. Umdat al-Qari Shrah Sahih Bukhari, Volume 18 page 208
25. Tafsir Thalabi, Volume 3 page 286
26. Tafsir Samarqandi v1 p320
27. Al-Ujab fi bayan al-asbab by Ibn Hajar, Volume 2 page 858

We read in Mustadrak:

"Narrated from Ibn Abbas that he would read this verse with the words: *"Then as to those whom you profit by, for a prescribed period."*

Imam Hakim declared the tradition to be Sahih as per the grading conditions set by Imam Bukhari and Imam Muslim whilst Imam Dhahabi in his margin of 'Mustadrak' deemed it Sahih on the conditions of Imam Muslim. Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti records:

Narrated Abed bin Hamid, ibn Jarir, al-Anbari in his book al-Musahif and al-Hakim and he declared the chain as Sahih from Abi Nadhra who said: 'I recited before Ibn Abbas 'ye derive benefit from them, give them their dowers'. Ibn Abbas said: 'ye derive benefit from them for a prescribed period'. I said: 'We don't recite it like this'. Ibn Abbas said: 'By Allah it was revealed like that.'

[Tafseer Durre Manthur, Volume 2 pages 140-141](#)

Beside Ibn Abbas, Ibn Masud, Ibn Jubayr and Ubai bin Ka'ab, many other prominent figures also recited the verse with the words '*for a prescribed period*' and that includes Al-Sedi (Tafseer Tabari v5 p18, Tafseer Ibn Kathir v1 p486), Talha bin Musraf (Tafsir Thalabi v3 p286) and Muqatil (Tafsir Samarqandi v1 p320, Al-Ujab fi bayan al-asbab by Ibn Hajar v2 p858).

Comments

The testimony of the Sahaba proves that the words "*for a prescribed period*" were also there in Quran in the verse of Mutah and if that was indeed the case then it proves that Uthman committed blatant transgression by deleting these words from the Quran which could only be to:

- suppress news of the open secret about the Caliph's daughter Asma Bin Abu Bakr who practiced Mutah
- veil Umar's opposition to Allah's words by prohibiting Mutah.

If Nawasib are going to play their usual 'abrogation game' then they need to prove the

abrogation of the words "**for a prescribed period**" through Mutawatir narrations and also show us the abrogating verse.

123. The mothers of the believers and other Sahaba did not believe in the present Quran, and suggested that verse 2:238 had been tampered with

We read in the Quran:

[Shakir 2:238] Attend constantly to prayers and to the middle prayer and stand up truly obedient to Allah.

238. HAFITHOO AAALA ALSSALAWATI WAALSSALATI ALWUSTA WAQOOMOO LILLAHI QANITEENA

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/002.html>

Regarding the testimony of Ayesha about Tahreef having taken place in the verse under discussion, we are using following prestigious books of Ahle Sunnah as proof:

1. Sahih Muslim Book 004, Number 1316 [English]
2. Al Musahif by Abi Bakr Sijistani page 94
3. Tafseer Dur al Manthur Volume 1, page 302, Surah Baqrah Verse 230
4. Tafseer al-Tabari, Volume 3 page 348
5. Fatah al Bari, Volume 8 page 197 Hadith 4522
6. Musnad Ahmad, Volume 6 page 73
7. Sunnan Abi Dawoud, Volume 1 page 102
8. Sunnan Termidi, Volume 4 page 285
9. Sunnan Nisai, Volume 1 page 236
10. Sunnan al-Kubra, by Bayhaqi, Volume 1 page 462
11. Sharh Ma'ani al-athaar, by ibn Salamah, Volume 1 page 172

Sahih Muslim:

Abu Yunus, the freed slave of 'A'isha said: 'A'isha ordered me to transcribe a copy of the Qur'an for her and said: When you reach this verse: "Guard the prayers and the middle prayer" (ii. 238), inform me; so when I reached it, I informed her and she gave me dictation (like this): *Guard the prayers and the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer, and stand up truly obedient to Allah.* 'A'isha said: This is what I have heard from the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him).

Note: The words "**and the afternoon prayer**" [WASALAT AL ASR] cannot be found in the verse 2:238 in the Quran compiled by Uthman.

The testimony of a lady from the 'Sidiq' family shall be enough for the Nawasib to deem Uthman guilty of deliberately altering the Quran by deleting the words "**and the afternoon prayer**" from it. The famous excuse by Nawasib about abrogation will certainly not work here, because abrogation could only have occurred during the life of the Holy Prophet [s], had this verse been abrogated during the life of the Prophet [s] why did Ayesha want it placed in the Quran? Our readers do not need reminding that making additions to the words of Allah [swt] is a grave sin.

If Nawasib are still not satisfied then allow us to advance the words of a star from the 'Faroq' family from the following esteemed Sunni books:

1. Sahih Ibn Haban, Volume 14 page 228
2. Sunnan al-Kubra, by Bayhaqi, Volume 1 page 462

3. Sharh Ma'ani al-Athaar, by ibn Salamah, Volume 1 page 172
vTafseer Tabari, Volume 2 page 764
4. Tafseer Dur al Manthur Volume 1 page 302

Let us quote from Tafseer Dur al Manthur wherein Suyuti has recorded the narration from various high ranking primary sources:

Abu Rafee the slave of Hafsa said: 'Hafsa ordered me to write a Mushaf for her and said: 'Come to me when you come across this verse so that I dictate it to you in the manner that I learnt it. Then when I came across the verse '{Guard the prayers}' she said: 'Write '{Guard the prayers and the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer }''

[Tafseer Dur al Manthur Volume 1, page 721](#)

We would also like to advance the words of Umme Salama [ra] recorded in "Al Musahif" authored by Sunni scholar Abi Bakr Sajjstani the son of the author of Sunan Abu Daud:

"Umro Bin Rafa` narrates: "Umme Salama asked me to write a Mushaf for her and she asked me to inform her when I arrived at the verse "HAFITHOO AAALA ALSSALAWATI WAALSSALATI ALWUSTA". Therefore when I reached this verse I informed her about it and she made me write this verse with the words "ASALAT AL ASR" after the words "WASALAT AL WAST".

Similar things have also been recorded from Ibn Abbas (Sunan al-Kubra, by Bayhaqi, v1 p463 & Tafseer Tabari, v2 p764) and from the Sahabi al-Bara bin Azeb (al-Mustadrak, v2 p281).

Comment

We have come to know that according to the wives of the Prophet the verse is supposed to be:

Guard the prayers and the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer, and stand up truly obedient to Allah.

If Nawasib are going to bring their abrogation excuse here again to explain the words '**and the afternoon prayer**' could they kindly tell us why the wives of the Holy Prophet [s] issued a special instruction to the writers to insert these 'abrogated' words in their respective Mushafs? We see that none of the said wives of the Holy Prophet [s] said anything to suggest that these additional words they used in this verse were abrogated, rather they all said: **This is what I have heard from the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him).**"

By inserting these words into their respective Mushafs; Ayesha, Hafsa and Ume Salma [ra] proved that Uthman erred by not including these words when compiling the Quran, or these ladies believed that tahreef had been made to the Quran. Now who was mistaken here? Whoever was mistaken had committed a mistake of such severity that it placed their faith in danger.

124. Ayesha believed that the Quran compiled by Uthman was a victim of tahreef

We shall rely on the following esteemed books of Ahle Sunnah to prove this:

1. Tafseer Itqan (Urdu), Volume 2 page 65
2. Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 5 page 220, verse of salutation
3. Al Musahif, page 95, Zikr Mushaf e Ayesha

Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti records in Tafseer Itqan:

"Hameedah Bint Yunus narrates: "My father [Abi] who was 80 years old recited for me the verse of salutation from the Mushaf of Ayesha with the following words: i.e Allah and His angels send blessings on the Prophet: O ye that believe! Send ye blessings on him, and salute him with all respect. And on those who came to the first lines of prayers"

This verse was in this very manner before Uthman had made changes to the Quran."

 [Tafseer Itqan \(Urdu\), Volume 2 page 65](#)

The verse in the present Quran is as follows:

[Yusufali 33:56] Allah and His angels send blessings on the Prophet: O ye that believe! Send ye blessings on him, and salute him with all respect.

We can see that according to the Mushaf of Ayesha **"And on those who came to the first lines of prayers"** was the part of the verse [33:56] whilst Hameedah bin Yunus leveled a serious charge against Uthman by asserting **'This verse was in this very manner before Uthman had made changes to the Quran'**.

Dear readers, we now understand why the dirty Nawasib of Sipah-e-Sahaba (Kr-Hcy.com) are always found yapping about the topic of "Mushaf-e-Fatima [as]" and making it an issue of tahreef. The reality is the Mushaf e Fatima had nothing to do with divine instructions for humans. The main tactic of Nawasib here is to divert the attention of their ignorant masses from the Mushaf-e-Ayesha and Co. that contained different versions of verses that cannot be located in the present Quran.

The words from the Mushaf of Ayesha are in front of you as is the act of Uthman who altered the words of the Quran (according to Sunni reports). Had somebody else made alterations to the Quran, he would have been declared the worst Kaafir by Nawasib but they suffer from blindness when they are confronted with 'Sunni' historical evidence documenting willful Uthman's distortion of the Quran.

125.Umar did not believe that the word 'and' was a part of Surah Taubah verse 100

We know that words like 'and' creates a huge difference in terms of meanings in general literature, the case is greater with the Holy Quran. Amazingly we read that that in verse 100 of Surah Taubah, Umar was believed that "WA" that means 'and' was not a part of this verse whilst it is in the present Quran. The verse in the present Quran is as follows:

100. WAALSSABIQOONA AL-AWWALOONA MINA ALMUHAJIREENA WAAL-ANSARI
WAALLATHEENA ITTABAAOOHUM BI-IHSANIN RADIYA ALLAHU AAANHUM WARADOO
AAANHU WAAAAADDA LAHUM JANNATIN TAJREE TAHTAHA AL-ANHARU KHALIDEENA FEEHA
ABADAN THALIKA ALFAWZU ALAAATHEEMU

 <http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/009.html>

Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti records:

Umar recited the verse 'WAALSSABIQOONA AL-AWWALOONA MINA ALMUHAJIREENA WAAL-ANSARI ALLATHEENA ATABAOUHEM BEAHSAN' and did not insert 'WA'[and] before 'ALLATHEENA'. Zaid bin Thabit told him that it was 'WAL WAALLATHEENA' whilst Umar said it was 'ALLATHEENA'. Zaid bin Thabit said: 'Umar knows better'. Umar then summoned Ubai Bin Kaab, who said:'Yes, its

WAALLATHEENA'. Then Umar said: 'All right then recite it in this way.'

 [Tafseer Dur e Manthur](#)

We also read that Umar was humiliated by another Sahabi Ubai when discussing the cited verse. Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti records in Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 3 page 269, Surah Taubah verse 100:

"Umar recited the verse "WAALSSABIQOONA AL-AWWALOONA MINA ALMUHAJIREENA WAAL-ANSARI WAALLATHEENA" and did not insert "WA" before "ALLATHEENA". Zaid bin Thabit told him that it was "WAL WAALLATHEENA" whilst Umar said it was "ALLATHEENA". Zaid bin Thabit said: "Umar knows better". Umar summoned Ubai bin Ka`b. Ubai told Umar: "Yes! I have taken this word in exactly the same way from the tongue of the Holy Prophet [s]". Umar asked: "Have you really taken this word exactly from the Prophet's tongue?" Abi got furious and replied: "By Allah! He [swt] revealed the Quran on Gebrial and Gebrail revealed it on the Prophet's heart and Allah [swt] hasn't taken suggestions from Khatab or from his son when revealing the Quran."

 [Online Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Surah Taubah verse 100](#)

The above cited incident not only proves Umar's ignorance on knowledge of Quran but it also proves that there was distortion in the Mushaf of Umar. He had for a long period continued reading and believing that this verse did not include the word 'and'.

126. Umar believed in a different version of Surah Fatihah

We have relied on the following esteemed works of Ahle Sunnah to prove this:

1. Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 1 page 15
2. Al Musahif, page 60 by Abi Bakr Sajistani

In the present Quran, Muslims read Surah Fatihah with the following words, five times a day during prayers:

SIRATA ALLATHEENA ANAAAMTA AAALAYHIM GHAYRI ALMAGHDOOBI AAALAYHIM WALA ALDDALLEENA

 <http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/001.html>

But Ibn Khatab had his own version of Surah Fatihah. We read in Tafseer Dur al Manthur:

Al-Musahif:

"Umar would recite this verse as: "SIRATA MIN ANAAAMTA AAALAYHIM GHAYRI ALMAGHDOOBI AAALAYHIM WA GHAYRI WALA ALDDALLEENA"

 [Al Musahif, page 60](#)

We deem it a good opportunity to mention the author of Book 'al Musahif' Abdullah bin Sulaiman bin Al-Ashath bin Ishaq Al-Sejestani the son of Abu Dawood the author of Sunnan Abu Dawood. According to Darqatni he is Thiqa [Tadkerat Al-Hufaz v2 p771, Tarikh Baghdad v9 p468]. While Abu Hamed bin Asad Al-Maktib said: **'I never saw some one in knowledge than Abdullah bin Al-Ashath'** [Tarikh Baghdad v9 p465]. Imam Dhahabi also declared him Thiqa [Al-Siar fi Al'am Al-Nubala, v14 p505].

Dear readers, the Tahreef issue that Sipah e Sahaba deem the prime reason for declaring others as Kaafir has trapped their Godfather in its machinery, since he was the grand champion in the field of Tahreef believing that Surah Fateha contained the words **'WA GHAYR'** that cannot be found in the present Quran and he did not recite the words **'ALLATHEENA'** which

we do have.

The cornerstone of faith lies in Surah Fateha. This verse in effect summaries the entire Deen. Its importance can be evidenced by the fact that every believer who prays five times a day makes this supplication at least 17 times. This is taught to Muslim children at a young age, since it is the first Surah that we teach our children, since it gets them ready to learn to pray. With this in mind how could Umar have been so ignorant? If he didn't even know the correct recital of Surah Fateha what credence should be given to anything he says? It is a amazingly that the Ahle Sunnah have traditions wherein Rasulullah (s) interpreted dreams pointed to the superior knowledge of Umar – how can this be the case when he was not even able to provide the correct recitation of Surah Fateha. How long did Umar continue to read this incorrect recital? As Khaleefa did no Sahaba ever challenge his recital – or were they likewise ignorant of the correct recitation of this verse? What sort of Khaleefa is this, one that couldn't even correctly recite Surah Fateha? This is like a Christian not knowing the correct recital of the Lords prayer. It beggars belief that despite this blatant ignorance, the Ahle Sunnah still assert that Umar was one of the shining lights of Islamic knowledge!

127.Nasibi belief in Tahrif: The words “WAL MUHAJIROON FI SABIL ILLAH” have been deleted from two places in the Quran

We read in Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 6 page 192, Surah Hashr:

"A'mash states that in respect of Halal and Haram, the difference between the copies [Mushaf] of Abdullah Ibn Masud and Zaid Bin Thabit is that in Surah Infaal words '*And know that whatever thing you gain, a fifth of it is for Allah and for the Messenger and for the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarer*' [Surah Infaal, verse 41] and in Surah Hashr words '*Whatever Allah has restored to His Messenger from the people of the towns, it is for Allah and for the Messenger, and for the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarer and those who have left their homes in Allah's cause*' [Surah Hashr, verse 7].

[Online Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Surah Hashr](#)

Nawasib like Sipah e Sahaba have created the 'abrogation excuse' but by doing so they have exposed their beloved sahaba as liars. Let us apply their defence to the facts:

- Ayesha said that there were verses that were recited from the Quran that were subsequently eaten by a goat,
- Umar stated that had it not been his fear of the people, he would have added the verse of stoning the Quran,
- Amash stated the words '***and those who have left their homes in Allah's cause*** [WAL MUHAJIROON FI SABIL ILLAH] have been deleted from two different places in the Quran

Despite these clear statement Nasibi Mullahs automatically suggest that the testimonies of all three individuals referred to aboragated verses! Can this really be gauged from these three opinions? No doubby some of their Mullaf will immediately argue that these are weak or fabricated traditions, if this is indeed the case the they are exposing their eminent scholars as liars and fabricators. If we accept that the explanations offered by Nawasib are true why are they not prepared to accept our exolanations of such traditions in our texts? If these excuses are acceptable to defend your beliefs then the same should go for us. You cant have one rule for yourselves and another rule for your opponents, that is not justice.

128. According to Ubai, the word 'FIL WAADI' is missing from the present Quran

We read in Surah Aal e Imran, verse 153:

"Behold! ye were climbing up the high ground"

153. ITH TUSAAIDOONA WALA TALWOONA AAALA AHADIN

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/003.html>

We read in Tafseer Dur e Manthur:

"Ibn Jarir said that Haroon stated that Abi Bin Kaab used to recite the cited verse as: "Behold! ye were climbing up the valley" [ITH TUSAAIDOONA FIL WAADI]".

[Online Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Surah Aal e Imran, verse 153](#)

We do not find the word "FIL WAADI" in the present Quran. What is the Nasibi fatwa here? The narrators are yours, the books are yours, the author is yours, the translator is yours, the publisher is yours, so why this mulish attitude?

129. A letter has been added to the Mushaf of Uthman that was not in the Mushaf of Ibn Masud

We read in Surah Yusuf :

وَفَوْقَ كُلِّ ذِي عِلْمٍ عَلِيمٌ ...

[Shakir 12:76] .. and above every one possessed of knowledge is the All-knowing one.

We read in Tafseer Ibn Kathir:

Abdullah bin Masud read the Ayah this way:

'And above every scholar, is the All-Knower (Allah).'"

<http://tafsir.com/default.asp?sid=12&tid=24999>

Do we need to comment any further here?

130. Nasibi proof about tahrif in the 6th verse of Surah Ahzab

We read in the Holy Quran:

[Yusufali 33:6] The Prophet is closer to the Believers than their own selves, and his wives are their mothers.

Ibn Jarir Tabari records in his esteemed commentary of Quran:

"Bushr from Yazid from Sai'd from Qatadah that he said: Some used to recite: "The Prophet is closer to the Believers than their own selves, and his wives are their mothers and he is their father " .

[Online Tafsir Tabari, Tradition 21597](#)

Nawasib cannot advance their usual abrogation or difference of recitation kinds of excuse here due to the fact that their caliph Umar initially did not deem these extra words to be a part of Quran but following discussions with Ubay bin Ka`b he suffered his customary humiliation at his

hands. We read in Tafsir Dur e Manthur:

"Abd ARazaq and Sa'eed Ibn Mansoor and Ishaq ibn Rahuwayh and Ibn Munzir and Al Bayhaqi have narrated from Bujalah that he said: Umar passed by a youth who was reading in a mushaf *"The Prophet is closer to the Believers than their own selves, and his wives are their mothers and he is their father* , so he (Umar) said: "Young boy talk about it". The youth then said: "This is the mushaf of Ubay (Ubay bin Ka`b)". So Umar went to Ubay and asked him about it (the addition) to which Ubay replied: "I used to be busy with the Quran whilst you were busy shopping in the markets. "

[Online Tafsir Dur e Manthur, commentary of verse 6 Surah Ahzab](#)

Accompanying Ahle Sunna's first Imam of Taraweeh prayers Ubai bin Ka'b we have another prominent companion Ibn Abbas [ra] that likewise recited these words. Allamah Jalaluddin Suuti records:

"Al Firyabi and Ibn Mardawayh and al Hakim and al Bayhaqi in his Sunan narrated from Ibn Abbas [ra] that he used to read this verse: *"The prophet has more authority over the believers than themselves and he is their father and his wives are their mothers "*

[Online Tafsir Dur e Manthur, commentary of verse 6 Surah Ahzab](#)

131.A verse recited by Ubay bin Ka'b is not written in the present Quran; Tahrif in Surah Fatah

We read in the Holy Quran:

***"When those who disbelieved harbored in their hearts (feelings of) disdain, the disdain of (the days of) ignorance, but Allah sent down His tranquillity on His Messenger and on the believers, and made them keep the word of guarding (against evil), and they were entitled to it and worthy of it; and Allah is Cognizant of all things."* 48:26**

We read in the following authentic sources of Ahle Sunnah that companion of the Holy Prophet [s] Ubay bin Ka'b would recite some additional words to this verse.

1. [Sunan Nisai Vol 6 page 463, No. 11505](#)
2. Al Mustadrak al Hakim, Vol 2 page 225
3. Kanz ul Ummal Vol 2, No. 4815
4. [Online Tafsir Dur al Manthur Vol 7, tafsir for surah fath](#)

Sunan Nisai:

Ibrahim Ibn Sa'eed narrated from Shebahah Ibn Suwar from Abdallah ibn Al'ala' from Basr ibn Abdallah from Abi Idrees from Ubay ibn Ka'ab, that he read:

'(48:26) When those who disbelieved harbored in their hearts (feelings of) disdain, the disdain of (the days of) ignorance, and if you had felt disdain like they felt, the masjid e haram would have been corrupted '

Haven't the Fitnah mongers of Sipah-e-Sahaba (Kr-Hcylcom) and the Salafi/Wahabi movement witnessed such traditions in their authentic texts that demonstrate that an entire verse was not written into the the current Quran, even though it was recited by a prominent Sahabi? What is their edict against Ubai bin Ka'ab who believed that the aforesaid words were a part of the Quran whilst other Sahaba digressed with him?

Sunan al Nasai Kubra can be downloaded from the following Wahabi website

[\(Vol 10. No. 11441\)](#)

132. According to Ibn Masud, Ibn Abbas & Ubai bin Kaab, a deletion of words has been committed in Surah Nisa verse 79

In order to prove that the Sahaba did not believe in the present form of this verse, we have relied on the following esteemed Sunni books:

1. Tafsir al-Sam'ani, Volume 1 page 451
2. Tafsir Qurtubi, Volume 5 page 286
3. Fateh al-Qadir, Volume 1 page 490
4. Ruh al-Ma'ani, Volume 5 page 90
5. [Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 2 page 597](#)

We read in Quran, 4:79:

Whatever benefit comes to you (O man!), it is from Allah, and whatever misfortune befalls you, it is from yourself .

But according to three great Sahaba namely Abdullah Ibn Masud, Ibn Abbas and Ubai bin Kaab the words '**and I have recorded for you**' have been deleted from the verse. We read:

عن مجاهد قال : هي في قراءة أبي بن كعب وعبد الله بن مسعود " ما أصابك من حسنة فمن الله وما أصابك من سيئة فمن نفسك وأنا كتبتها عليك "

Mujahid said: 'According to Ubai bin Kaab and Ibn Masud's recitation its: '*Whatever benefit comes to you (O man!), it is from Allah, and whatever misfortune befalls you, it is from yourself, and I have recorded that about you* '

[Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 2 page 597](#)

Similarly we read:

" من طريق مجاهد أن ابن عباس كان يقرأ " وما أصابك من سيئة فمن نفسك وأنا كتبتها عليك "

Mujahid narrates that ibn Abbas used to recite: '*Whatever benefit comes to you (O man!), it is from Allah, and whatever misfortune befalls you, it is from yourself, and I have recorded that about you* '

[Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 2 page 597](#)

So according to these three esteemed Sahaba, the words '**and I have recorded that about you**' have been deleted from the version of the Quran we today have in our hands and as usual, the present day Nawasib have to choose between these three esteemed Sahaba and Uthman & Co. in order to attribute responsibility of committing Tahreef in the Quran, it was either:

- the above cited Sahaba who sinned by believing that the verse contained additional words not present in the Quran, or:
- it was Uthman & Co. who deleted these words and were hence guilty of committing Tahreef to the Quran.

133. The goat of Ayesha ate the verses of suckling from the Quran

In order to back up our point, we have relied on the following esteemed books of Ahle Sunnah:

1. Sahih Muslim Book 008, Number 3421
2. Sunan Ibn Majah, page 141, Book of suckling
3. Sunan Darqutni, page 500, Book of suckling
4. Hayat al Haiwan, Volume 4 page 463, Lughat Rawajan
5. Al Muhazraat, Volume 4 page 433
6. Tafseer Ruh al Mani, Volume 4 page 254

We read Sahih Muslim Book 008, Number 3421:

'A'isha (Allah be pleased with, her) reported that it had been revealed in the Holy Qur'an that ten clear sucklings make the marriage unlawful, then it was abrogated (and substituted) by five sucklings and Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) died and it was before that time (found) in the Holy Qur'an (and recited by the Muslims).

Whilst there is not much different between the original Arabic words of the tradition and the official English translation, we would like to mention a more accurate English translation of the tradition:

عن عائشة انها قالت كان فيما انزل من القرآن عشر رضعات معلومات يحرم من ثم نسخن بخمس معلومات فتوفي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وهن فيما يقرأ من القرآن

"Ayesha said: It had been revealed in the Quran that ten clear sucklings make the marriage unlawful, then it was abrogated by five clear suckling, then Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) died and the verse was recited as part of Quran"

We read the following words of Ayesha in Sunan Ibn Majah which has been declared 'Hasan' by Imam Nasiruddin Albaani:

"When the verse of stoning and verse of suckling descended, they were written on a piece of paper and kept under my pillow. Following the demise of Prophet Muhammad (S) a goat ate the piece of paper whilst we were mourning."

[Online Sunan Ibn Majah \[Arabic\], Book of Suckling, Hadith No. 2020](#)

Dear readers, the blasphemy committed by Ayesha against the Quran namely her claim that the verses about stoning and suckling were eaten by a goat merits closer attention. Had this thing been said by someone else, the 'kufir' drum of Nasibi mullahs would have been continuously played, but since these words have been uttered from the tongue of one they venerate, their jaws have become locked. The words of Ayesha clearly shows that she didn't have belief in the completeness of the present Quran. It is therefore upto the Nawasib to decide on which category they want to place Ayesha. The excuse offered by Ayesha has put Nawasib in a fix.

134.Replies to the Nasibi excuse that the verse of suckling was abrogated

One: Ayesha did not claim any such thing

Some Nawasib in order to defend Ayesha from their own fatwas suggest that the verse of five sucklings was abrogated. We should point out that Ayesha referred to the abrogation of ten sucklings but didn't mention anything about the abrogation of five sucklings. How can Nawasib place words into Ayesha's mouth by claiming that the verse about five sucklings was also abrogated? Let us not forget that they must comply to the law of providing Mutawatir traditions evidencing the abrogation of those particular words, personal views and the conjecture albeit those of exalted jurists are not applicable in such a case. Crucially, how can they avoid this sentence of Ayesha i.e **"Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) died and it was**

before that time (found) in the Holy Qur'an (and recited by the Muslims)."

According to Ayesha the verse was written in the Quran and was recited by Muslims before the Prophet's death so how do these Nawasib want to suggest that the verse of five sucklings was abrogated following the death of the Prophet [s]? Do they regard Abu Bakr as a Prophet?

Two: Sunni jurists not believing in the prohibition of marriage due to five sucklings proves that they don't believe in its abrogation

According to Sunnies, initially it was ten sucklings that used to make the marriage prohibited but this rule was subsequently abrogated and was replaced with five sucklings but then again, this verse was abrogated in terms of recitation but this ruling remained intact in Sharia. Our reply is that Ayesha didn't claim any such thing moreover the Sunni jurists not having a consensus on the prohibition of marriage due to 'five' sucklings proves that the abrogation excuse in the case of the verse of suckling carries no weight. We shall rely on the following valued Sunni Books to evidence this.

1. Tubyeen al-Haqaiq Sharh Kanz al-Daqaiq, Volume 1 page 146
2. Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 2 page 135, Surah Nisa verse 28
3. Al-Fiqh ala al-Madahib al-Arba, Volume 4 page 142
4. Nail al-Awtar, Volume 7 page 70
5. Zaad al-Maad, Volume 5 page 507

Shaykh Jazari records in his famed work Al-Fiqh ala al-Madahib al-Arba:

أن الشافعية والحنابلة يقولون إن الرضاع لا يحرم إلا إذا كان خمس مرات ، والمالكية والحنفية يقولون إن الرضاع يحرم مطلقاً قليلاً كان أو كثيراً ولو قطرة

"The Shafiyees and Hanbalis say that suckling does not prohibit (marriage) unless if it was five times, while Malikis and Hanafis say that suckling prohibits (marriage) no matter if it was less or more and even if it was single drop."

Imam Shawkani records in Nail al-Awtar:

وذهب الجمهور إلى إن الرضاع الواصل إلى الجوف يقتضى التحريم وإن قل

"The majority believe that suckling prohibits (marriage) even if it was less (than five)."

Imam of Salafies and Wahabies Ibn Qayim records in Zaad al-Maad:

وقالت طائفة أخرى : لا يثبت التحريم بأقل من ثلاث رضعات وهذا قول أبي ثور وأبي عبيد وابن المنذر وداود بن علي

Another group said that prohibition is established from three times and that is the opinion of Abi Thawr, Abi Ubaid, Ibn al-Munder and Dawoud bin Ali.

Hanafi Imam Fakhruddin Uthman bin Muhhajjin Albarti Azeli writes in Tubyeen al-Haqaiq:

"Imam Shafiyee states that a woman doesn't get unlawful except when she suckles five times to completion, because Ayesha had said that the Holy Quran contained the order about suckling ten times, but then it was abrogated and changed to five. When the Prophet [s] passed away, this was still being recited in the Holy Quran. This has been narrated by Muslim."

In reply he writes:

"This statement doesn't prove that five time sucklings would establish the unlawfulness because Ayesha has said that it is the verse of the Holy Quran. She has said that it was the verse of a Quran that was placed below my bed, but after the demise of the Prophet [s] whilst we were busy in his funeral rites, a few goats entered and ate that Quran. Therefore it is proven that it was not a part of the Quran because it is not Mutwatir and it is not permissible to recite it nor to can it be added to the Quran and it is not permissible to comply with it "

The first and last underlined sentences of Imam Fakhruddin unequivocally reject the rule of the prohibition of marriage due to five sucklings and leaves Ayesha prone to the edict of believing in Tahreef of Quran since she believed the ruling to be a part of the Quran.

135. Ayesha and Umar believed in the lost verse of stoning and Umar's Taqiyya prevented him from adding it into the Quran

In this particular case, we are not going to dispute the abrogation of the verse of Rajam rather our sole concern will revolve around specifically to Ayesha's and Umar's belief regarding the said verse, according to whom this verse was 'lost' after the death of Prophet [s] and not abrogated and therefore Umar intended to write this verse into Quran with his own hands.

1. Sahih Bukhari, Volume 8 & Volume 9
2. Sahih Muslim, Volume 2 page 42
3. Sunan Ibn Majah, page 182, kitab al hudood
4. Sunan Abu Daud, page 148, kitab al hudood
5. Musnad Ahmed bin Hanbal, Volume 1 page 274, Hadeeth 273
6. Tafseer Ibn Kathir, Volume 3 page 261, Surah Noor
7. Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 5 page 880
8. Al Itqan fi Uloom al Quran, Volume 2 page 32
9. Al Muhazraat, Volume 4 page 423
10. Sunnan al-Kubra, by Bayhaqi, Volume 8 page 211
11. Musnad al-Shafiyye, page 164
12. Al-Musanaf, by Ibn Abi Shayba, Volume 6 page 553
13. Sunnan al-Kubra, by Nisai, Volume 4 page 273
14. Marifat al-Sunnan wa al-Athaar, by Bayhaqi, v6 p323
15. Tarikh Baghdad, Volume 3 page 190

We read in Sahih al-Bukhari Volume 8 Hadith 817

"... 'Umar sat on the pulpit and when the callmakers for the prayer had finished their call, 'Umar stood up, and having glorified and praised Allah as He deserved, he said:..... Allah sent Muhammad with the Truth and revealed the Holy Book to him, and among what Allah revealed, was the Verse of the Rajam (the stoning of married person (male & female) who commits illegal sexual intercourse, and we did recite this Verse and understood and memorized it. Allah's Apostle did carry out the punishment of stoning and so did we after him. I am afraid that after a long time has passed, somebody will say, 'By Allah, we do not find the Verse of the Rajam in Allah's Book,' and thus they will go astray by leaving an obligation which Allah has revealed"

In another Hadith which is narrated without any Hadith number in Bukhari, we read about the Taqiyyah practiced by Umar wherein he failed to add those verses in Quran due to his fear of the people. This tradition is in the title of one of the chapter of Bukhari. Fortunately, it was translated by the translator. Sahih al-Bukhari, Arabic-English version, Vol 9, p212 between Traditions 281 and 282 of Volume 9:

(21) CHAPTER. If a judge has to witness in favor of a litigant when he is a judge or he had it before he became a judge (can he pass a judgment in his favor accordingly or should he refer the case to another judge before whom he would bear witness?). And the judge Shuraih said to a person who sought his witness, "Go to the ruler so that I may bear witness (before him) for you." And 'Ikrima said, "Umar said to 'Abdur-Rahman bin 'Auf, 'If I saw a man committing illegal sexual intercourse or theft, and you were the ruler (what would you do)?'. 'Abdur-Rahman said, 'I would regard your witness as equal to the witness of any other man among the Muslims. 'Umar said, 'You have said the truth.' 'Umar added: **"If I were not afraid of the fact that people may say that 'Umar has added to the Qur'an extra (verses), I would have written the Verse al-Rajm (stoning to death of married adulterers) with my own hands..."**

 [Sahih Bukhari, Volume 9 page 212 & 213](#)

Let us cite an example:

"There is a person who claims in public that such and such sentence was revealed in the book of Allah which cannot be found in it today. It is only the fear of the terrorists of Sipah e Sahaba organization that prevents him from adding it in the Quran. In such a case Sipah Sahaba terrorists would have not wasted a single minute to come on to the streets chanting that the man is Kaafir due to the fact that he has a firm belief of Tahreef in the Quran and it is just his fear of the defunct organization that prevents him from adding a verse into the Quran. Whilst he physically exhibits his belief he cannot implement it, though he still maintains the same belief in his heart"

We should point out that according to the strange testimony of Imam Fakhrudin Razi which we read in his book Al-Mahsool, Volume 3 page 348, the verse Umar was wishing to add in the Quran was neither a part of the Quran nor was it an abrogated verse:

قلت إن ذلك لم يكن قرآنا ويدل عليه قول عمر رضي الله عنه قال لولا أن يقول الناس إن عمر زاد في كتاب الله شيئا لألحقت ذلك بالمصحف ولو كان ذلك قرآنا في الحال أو كان ثم نسخ لما قال ذلك

"I say that it wasn't part of Quran and Umar's statement refer to it, he said: 'If I were not afraid of the fact that people may say that Umar has added to the Qur'an extra (verses), I would have written the Verse al-Rajm (stoning to death of married adulterers) with my own hands'. If that was a Quran or was an abrogated (verse), he wouldn't have said such thing."

Anyhow, let us now read the unequivocal testimony of Umar that he believed the verse of stoning to have been 'lost' following the death of Prophet [s].

"Abd ul Razzak in Al Musannaf from Ibn Abbas said : Umar bin Al Khattab ordered a person to gather people for Salat of Jama'at, then he ascended on a pulpit, praised God and said: "O people! Do not get afraid about the verse of Al-Rajm because it is a verse that was revealed in the book of Allah and we recited it, but it was lost [Zahab] with much of the Quran gone with Muhammad and the proof of that is that the prophet [s] has stoned and Abu Bakr has stoned and I have stoned and there will come people from this nation who would deny the stoning"

 [Online Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Muqadmah of Surah Ahzab](#)

As for Ayesha's belief regarding verse of Rajam we have already yread that:

"When the verse of stoning and verse of suckling descended, they were written on a piece of paper and kept under my pillow. Following the demise of Prophet Muhammad (S) a goat ate the piece of paper whilst we were mourning."

 [Online Sunan Ibn Majah \[Arabic\], Book of Suckling, Hadith No. 2020](#)

Let us again make one point very clear that in this particular case, we are not arguing whether or not the verse of stoning has been abrogated rather our sole motive in this case is to point out the belief of Tahreef in the Quran held by Umar and Ayesha according to whom the verse of stoning is still a part of the Quran that went missing following the death of Prophet [s].

9. Chapter Nine: Sunni reports about mistakes & changes in Quran

This is the chapter that shall hurt Nawasib the most as it shall provide no opportunity for them to advance the excuse of abrogation because the pious Sahaba and Tabayeen had unequivocally marked 'mistakes' in different parts of the Holy Quran and submitted 'actual' words that are markedly different to what we read today in the Holy book.

136. According to Ibn Abbas [ra] there is a 'mistake' in Surah Ra'ad because of the sleepy scribe

We read in Quran:

[Shakir 13:31] And even if there were a Quran with which the mountains were made to pass away, or the earth were travelled over with it, or the dead were made to speak thereby; nay! the commandment is wholly Allah's, Have not yet those who believe known that if Allah please He would certainly guide all the people? And (as for) those who disbelieve, there will not cease to afflict them because of what they do a repelling calamity, or it will alight close by their abodes, until the promise of Allah comes about; surely Allah will not fail in (His) promise

31. WALAW ANNA QUR-ANAN SUYYIRAT BIHI ALJIBALU AW QUTTIAAAT BIHI AL-ARDU AW KULLIMA BIHI ALMAWTA BAL LILLAHI AL-AMRU JAMEEAAAAN **AFALAM YAY-ASI** ALLATHEENA AMANOO AN LAW YASHAO ALLAHU LAHADA ALNNASA JAMEEAAAAN WALA YAZALU ALLATHEENA KAFAROO TUSEEBUHUM BIMA SANAAAQO QARIAAATUN AW TAHULLU QAREEBAN MIN DARIHIM HATTA YA/TIYA WAAADU ALLAHI INNA ALLAHA LA YUKHLIFU ALMEEAAAADA

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/013.html>

We are quoting from the following esteemed books of Ahle Sunnah .

1. Al Itqan fi Uloom al Quran, Volume 1 page 238
2. Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 4 page 63, Surah R'ad verse 31
3. Fatah al Bari, Volume 8 page 373 by Ibn Hajar Asaqlani

We read in Tafseer Al Itqan:

"Ibn Abbas recited this verse as 'AFALAM YATBAIN ALLATHEENA'. He was told that it is 'AFALAM YAY-ASI ALLATHEENA' to which Ibn Abbas replied: "The writer has written YAY-ASI but I think that he may not have been wakeful at that time of writing this word."

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Ibn Hajar Asqalani writes in his commentary of Sahih Bukhari:

وروى الطبري وعبد بن حميد بإسناد صحيح كلهم من رجال البخاري عن ابن عباس أنه كان يقرؤها " أفلم يتبين ويقول : كتبها الكاتب وهو ناعس

"And Tabari and Abd bin Hamid narrated with a Sahih chain containing all the narrators from the rijal of Bukhari, from Ibn Abbas that he recited "AFALAM YATBAIN" and said that the writer had written it [YAY-ASI] when he was drowsy."

[Fatah al Bari, Volume 8 page 373](#)

Comment

Notice big difference between the two spellings and hence in their respective pronunciations. So would Nawasib like to tell us whose version Muslims should adhere to? Uthman's one which as per Ibn Abbas is a result of a 'mistake' of the writer or the 'corrected' version told by Ibn Abbas?

Here we would like to ask the filthy Nawasib of Sipah e Sahaba and Salafi/Wahabi movement straight questions:

It is palpable that both Shias and Sunnis believe that Imam Mahdi [as] will come before Qiyamah and will rule according to the perfect divine laws. So will he rule with a book that is made up of incorrect words?

If yes then Nawasib are calling the book of Allah [swt] incorrect which will not be corrected by him or his caliph even before Qayamah, the Quran will thus remain incorrect.

If the answer is no, will Imam Mahdi [as] correct the words (in the manner in which they were revealed from Allah) so that the truth shall be made manifest known to the Muslims prior to the end of this world? If yes then why do these followers of Muawiya bark at Shias for believing that the correct form of the Quran is with Imam Mahdi [as] when we actually believe that the Quran shall be no different?

Which ever answer they provide, both will read to one path, namely proof that the Nasibi ascribe to Tahrif.

This serious matter has been claimed and recorded by the esteemed authorities of their sect not by us. It has been the 'impure' blood of unknown fathers flowing into the veins of Haq Nawaz Jhangvi, his Sipah-e-Sahaba followers and the 'Wahabi Movement' that has issued edicts against the followers of Ahlulbait [as] for having traditions that imply Tahrif in the Quran, tragically we are yet to find these hatred filled people issuing takfeer against their own Imams for recording similar traditions.

137. According to the belief of the pious Tabayeen and Sahaba, there is a 'mistake' in Surah Aal e Imran

We read in the Quran:

[Shakir 3:81] And when Allah made a covenant through the prophets: Certainly what I have given you of Book and wisdom-- then an messenger comes to you verifying that which is with you, you must believe in him, and you must aid him. He said: Do you affirm and accept My compact in this (matter)? They said: We do affirm. He said: Then bear witness, and I (too) am of the bearers of witness with you.

Now we are quoting from the following books of Ahle Sunnah

1. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani, Volume 3 page 205, Surah Aal e Imran, verse 81
2. Tafseer Qurtubi, Volume 3 page 124
3. Tafseer Tabari, Vol 6 page 554 Surah Aal e Imran, verse 81
4. Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 3 page 47
5. Tafseer Fatah al Qadeer, Volume 1 page 225, Surah Aal e Imran, verse 81

We read in Tafseer Tabari:

Al-Rabee used to read: 'and Allah made a covenant with the people who were given

the book'. He said: 'And that is how Ubai bin Kaab used to read it.'

So we have the beliefs of a Tabayee al-Rabee bin Anas and a Sahabi Ubai bin Kaab that the 'correct' form of this verse is the one they used to recite and not the one we have today in our copies of the Quran. If Nawasib are planning to bring any sort of excuse about the statement of the two aforesaid personalities, we would like to nip that in the bud by presenting the elaborated testimony of one of the pious and revered Tabayee namely Mujahid, who clearly stated that the present form of this verse is a 'mistake' by the scribe, as he likewise believed in the same form of this verse as testified by Al-Rabee and Ubai bin Kaab previously. We read in Tafseer Tabari:

حدثني محمد بن عمرو قال : ثنا أبو عاصم عن عيسى عن ابن أبي نجيح عن مجاهد في قوله { وَإِذْ أَخَذَ اللَّهُ مِيثَاقَ النَّبِيِّينَ لَمَا آتَيْتُكُمْ مِنْ كِتَابٍ وَحِكْمَةٍ { قال هي خطأ من الكاتب ، وهي في قراءة ابن مسعود } . وَإِذْ أَخَذَ اللَّهُ مِيثَاقَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ

Muhammad bin Amro narrated from Abu Asim from Isa from Ibn Abi Nujaih from Mujahid who said about the verse: "And when Allah made a covenant through the prophets: Certainly what I have given you of Book and wisdom". He said: 'It is a mistake of the scribes. In the recitation of Ibn Masud it was in this manner: "And Allah made a covenant with the people who were given the book"'.

According to Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani's Taqrib al-Tahdib, Muhammad bin Amro bin Abaad is 'Seduq'. Abu Asim al-Dhahak bin Mukhalad is 'Thiqah Thabt' while Isa bin Maymoon, Abdullah ibn Abi Nujaih and Mujahid bin Jabr are 'Thiqah'.

Dear readers, here we see another proof from Sunni texts regarding Tahreef in the Quran. Unsurprisingly Nasibi mullahs of modern age try their best to defend their beloved Sahaba who attested to alterations in the Holy text, and for this Nawasib advance their usual abrogation excuse. But they should know that there must be an authentic hadith to support their claim. And whenever they don't have any solid thing to say, then we see the Nawasib calling such traditions fabricated. If they are really going to advance the same opinion then we would like to thank the Almighty (swt) who has made our opponents admit that the narrators and scholars of their sect were liars and we should not forget that Allah [swt]'s curse is upon liars.

138.Nasibi belief that a word in Surah Bani Israil got changed due to rough use of ink by the scribe

Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti records in Al-Itqan, Volume 1 page 542:

وأخرجه من طريق أخرى عن الضحاك أنه قال كيف تقرأ هذا الحرف قال وقضى ربك قال ليس كذلك نقرؤها نحن ولا ابن عباس إنما هو ووصى ربك وكذلك كانت تقرأ وتكتب فاستمد كاتبكم فاحتلم القلم مدادا كثيرا فالتصقت الواو بالصاد

Al-Dahak was asked: 'How do you recite the verse 'Wa Qaza Rabuka'?'. He replied: 'Neither we nor Ibn Abbas used to recite this verse in this manner, actually its "Wa wasa Rabuka". This verse used to be read and written like this but your writer dipped his pen into ink pot, he got more ink than required and hence 'Waa' (و) got mixed up with 'Saad' (ص).'

Thus we learned from this narration that in Surah Bani Israil verse 23, the word 'Qaza' is incorrect while the 'actual' word before the 'mistake' of the scribe was 'Wasa'!

139. Umar and other Sahaba did not believe in the Quran we have today as we are reciting an abrogated word in Surah Juma while they knew the 'correct' word

We read in Surah Jum'a:

[Shakir 62:9] O you who believe! when the call is made for prayer on Friday, then hasten to the remembrance of Allah and leave off trading; that is better for you, if you know.

9: YA AYYUHA ALLATHEENA AMANOO ITHA NOODIYA LILSSALATI MIN YAWMI ALJUMUAAATI FAISAAW ILA THIKRI ALLAH WATHAROO ALBAYAAA THALIKUM KHAYRUN LAKUM IN KUNTUM TAAALAMOONA

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/062.html>

For the proof of Tahreef offered by Umar, we will rely on the following Sunni texts:

1. Fatah al Bari, Volume 8 page 496
2. Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 7 page 206
3. Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 6 page 219
4. al-Musanaf by Abdulrazaq, Volume 3 page 207

We read in Tafseer Dur e Manthur:

Abu Ubaid narrated in his (book) al-Fadhael and Saeed bin Mansur, Ibn Abi Shayba, Ibn al-Munder and Ibn al-Anbari in the Masahif (book) from Kharsha bin al-Hur that he said: 'Umar bin al-Khatib saw me carrying a tablet written in it '{when the call is made for prayer on Friday, then hasten to the remembrance of Allah}' (FAISAAW ILA THIKRI ALLAH)'. He (Umar) asked: 'Who dictated this to you?' I replied: 'Ubai bin Kaab'. He said: 'Ubai recited the abrogated (part), he (Umar) recited it 'FAMZO ILA THIKRI ALLAH'

[Online Tafsir Dur al Manthur, Surah Juma](#)

Regarding its chain of narration, Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani records:

وأخرجه سعيد بن منصور فيبين الوساطة بين إبراهيم وعمر وأنه خرشة بن الحر فصح الإسناد

"Narrated by Saad bin Mansur and he clarified the medium [narrator] between the [narrator] Ibrahim and Umar who is Kharsha ibn al Hurr therefore the chain is Sahih"

[Fatah al Bari, Book of Commentry of Quran, Surah Juma](#)

Imam AbdulRazaq Sanani records in his Musnaf:

Abdulrazaq narrated from Mu'amar and others from al-Zuhari from Salem from Ibn Umar who said: 'Umar used to recite the verse of Juma chapter in this manner: 'FAMZO ILA THIKRI ALLAH' until he passed away'

According to Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani's Taqrib al-Tahdib, Abdulrazaq al-San'ani is 'Thiqah' (v1 p599), M'amar bin Rashid is 'Thiqah Thabt' (v2 p202) and Salem bin Abdullah is 'Thabt' (v1 p335) and about Al-Zuhari he said: 'There is a consensus on his magnificence' (v2 p132).

If Nawasib argue that these two different words doesnt result in different meanings then we should point out that the word we Muslims recite today is '**FAISAAW**' which means '**to hasten**' but according to Umar was the what the 'correct' word and which we are supposed to write and recite is '**FAMZO**' which means '**to go**', that is why we read the following words of Sahabi Abdullah Ibn Masud:

عن ابن مسعود أنه كان يقرأ " فامضوا إلى ذكر الله " قال : ولو كانت فاسعوا لسعيت حتى يسقط ردائي

Ibn Masud used to recite 'FAMZO ILA THIKRI ALLAH'. He said: 'If it was 'FAISAAW', I would walk so quickly that my cloak would fall down'

[Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 8 page 161](#)

Ibn Abbas too believed that the actual word in this verse was 'FAMZO'.

We are eager to know the Nasibi fatwa here. These traditions not only show the belief of companions but they also confirm that the Sunni ulema too believed in the distortion of the Quran for they copiously recorded Sahih traditions from Sahaba who testified to a form of word which is absent in the present Quran and thus we are also deprived of the 'correct' meaning which the verse wanted us to know. Have the malicious Nawasib belonging to Salafi/Wahabi cult and Sipah Sahaba for that matter, never come across such traditions? Now the Nawasib are left in a difficult position. Their Mullah recite Surah during every Friday prayer. What recitation do they perform? The version from the Quran that Umar deemed incorrect or Umar's version? If they adopt the version from the existing Quran then is that not an insult to the memory of their second king who made it clear that the word '**FAISAAW**' is incorrect?

140. According to Sahabi Ibn Masud clear Tahreef has been committed in Surah Zukhraf

The 45th verse of Surah Zukhraf is in the following manner

واسأل من أرسلنا من قبلك من رسلنا أجعلنا من دون الرحمن آلهة يعبدون

[Shakir 43:45] And ask those of Our messengers whom We sent before you: Did We ever appoint gods to be worshipped besides the Beneficent Allah?

In order to show the different wordings of this verse recited by the famed companion Abdullah Ibn Masud, we shall rely on the following Sunni books.

1. Tafseer Qurtubi, Volume 16 page 95
2. Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume page 382, Surah Zukhruf verse 45
3. Tafseer Ibn Kathir (Urdu), Vol 5 page 35 Surah Zukhruf verse 45

We read in Tafseer Ibn Kathir:

قال مجاهد في قراءة عبد الله بن مسعود رضي الله عنه واسأل الذين أرسلنا إليهم قبلك رسلنا

Abdullah bin Masud recited it as:

"And ask those whom We sent before you of Our Messengers"

[Tafseer Ibn Kathir \[Arabic\]](#)

[Tafseer Ibn Kathir \(Urdu\), Vol 5 Parah 25 Page 35 \(Farid Book Depot Dehli\)](#)

Now apart from this version of the verse recited by Ibn Masud, Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti has recorded yet another version of this verse recited by Ibn Masud which again is not the one we read today.

في قراءة ابن مسعود "واسأل الذين يقرأون الكتاب من قبل"

In Ibn Masud's recitation: 'And ask those who read the book before you'

[Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 7 page 382](#)

Notice the big difference between the two versions of verses recited by Ibn Masud and the one we have today in our copies of the Quran. Both the versions of Ibn Masud are demanding the Prophet [s] **to ask the people** to whom Allah [swt] had sent prophets before, whilst the verse

we recite today is demanding the Holy Prophet [s] to **ask those prophets**. Moreover, the second version of Ibn Masud is considerably different than the others as it contains the words '**who read the book**'.

Interestingly, after recording the tradition, Ibn Kathir then says:

"Yet this appears to be an explanation rather than an alternate version of recitation. And Allah knows best."

There are numerous traditions according to which Ibn Masud and his companions had the Quranic verses in their Mushafs with words that differ from the manner in which Muslims recite verses today. Are all of those traditions going to be explained away as explanations rather than alternate verses? And why don't Nawasib deem such Shia traditions as 'explanation' as well? We are yet to find the primary source from where Ibn Kathir was informed about this.

The alleged belief in distortion in the Holy Quran that is used as a tool by Sipah e Sahaba to declare others as Kaafir has struck the necks of their own scholars and caliphs and they have unashamedly recorded those views and beliefs in their renowned and authentic books. Ibn Kathir says about the above mentioned tradition that his beloved may have read the verse in this manner to enable an "explanation" but has then he destroyed his own excuse by concluding with the words "And Allah knows best", which clearly shows that even he wasn't sure of the reality. And why don't these people accept the Shia reply about similar traditions found in their books?

141.Ibn Abbas [ra] and Saeed bin Jubayr marked a 'mistake' in Surah Nur verse 27 of Uthman's Mushaf

We read in Quran:

[Shakir 24:27] O you who believe! Do not enter houses other than your own houses until you have asked permission and saluted their inmates; this is better for you, that you may be mindful.

27. YA AYYUHA ALLATHEENA AMANOO LA TADKHULOO BUYOOTAN GHAYRA BUYOOTIKUM HATTA TASTA/NISOO/ WATUSALLIMOO AAALA AHLIHA THALIKUM KHAYRUN LAKUM LAAAALLAKUM TATHAKKAROONA

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/024.html>

We read in the following reliable books of Ahle Sunnah.

1. Tafseer Itqan, Volume 1 page 228
2. Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 5 page 38, Surah Nur verse 27
3. Mustadrak al Hakim, Volume 2, kitab al tafseer
4. Tafseer Tabari, Volume 18 page 146

We read the testimony of Sahabi Ibn Abbas in Tafseer Tabari:

حدثنا ابن بشار قال ثنا محمد بن جعفر قال ثنا شعبة عن أبي بشر عن سعيد بن جبير عن ابن عباس في هذه الآية { لَّا تَدْخُلُوا بُيُوتًا غَيْرَ بُيُوتِكُمْ حَتَّى تَسْتَأْذِنُوا وَتَسَلِّمُوا عَلَىٰ أَهْلِهَا } وقال إنما هي من خطأ الكاتب { حتى تستأذوا وتسلموا

Ibn Bashar narrated from Muhammad bin Jaffar from Shu'aba from Abi Bashir from Saeed bin Jubair from Ibn Abbas about this verse '*{O you who believe! Do not enter houses other than your own houses until you have asked permission (TASTA/NISOO) and saluted their inmates}*'. He said: 'It is a mistake by the scribe. '*{ until you have asked permission (TASTAZINO) and saluted their inmates}*'.

According to Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani's *Taqrib al-Tahdib*, Muhammad bin Bashar, Muhammad bin Jaffar al-Hadali and Shu'aba are '**Thiqah**' while Abu Bashr Bayan bin Bashr and Saeed bin Jubair are '**Thiqah Thabt**'.

Moreover we read a similar testimony by one of the revered Tabayeen namely Saeed bin Jubair:

حدثنا ابن المنني قال ثنا وهب بن جرير قال ثنا شعبة عن أبي بشير عن سعيد بن جبير بمثله غير أنه قال : إنما هي { حتى تستأذنوا } ولكنها سقطت من الكاتب

Ibn al-Muthana narrated from Wahab bin Jarir from Shu'aba from Abi Beshr from Saeed bin Jubair the same but he added: 'It is supposed to be '{until you have asked permission (TASTAZINO)}' but it was a mistake of the scribe'

According to Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani's *Taqrib al-Tahdib*, Wahab bin Jarir and Shu'aba are '**Thiqah**' while Muhammad bin al-Muthana, Abu Bashr Bayan bin Bashr and Saeed bin Jubair are '**Thiqah Thabt**'.

This time a straight question to Nawasib of Sipah-i-Sahaba:

"Do you really believe that the Quran which is today in the hands of Muslims is correct and complete? If yes then what does your brutal organization deem about the testimonies of Sahaba recorded by your esteemed Ulema which shows that there are mistakes in the present Quran? If abandoning Sahaba is Kufr and its perpetrator is to get curse of Allah (as taught by Nawasib) then are you people not likewise accursed ones as you have abandoned the 'correct' versions of Quranic verses taught by some renowned Sahaba?"

We would like Nawasib to make themselves clear from objection against them for not believing in the present Quran only then they have right to demand answers from us about traditions present in our text.

142.Ibn Abbas [ra] marked another 'mistake' in Surah Nur, verse 35 of Uthman's Mushaf

We read in Tafseer Ibn Abi Hatim, Volume 8 page 2595:

حدثنا علي بن الحسين ، ثنا نصر بن علي ، أخبرني أبي ، عن شبل بن عباد ، عن قيس بن سعد ، عن عطاء ، عن ابن عباس : (الله نور السموات والأرض مثل نوره) قال : هي خطأ من الكاتب ، هو أعظم من أن يكون نوره مثل نور المشكاة قال : مثل نور المؤمن كمشكاة

Ali bin al-Hussain narrated from Nasr bin Ali from his father from Shebl bin Abaad from Qays bin Saad from Atta from Ibn Abbas '{Allah is the light of the heavens and the earth; a likeness of His light is as a niche}'. He said: 'This is a mistake by the scribe, He (Allah) is greater than to be his light as a niche, He said (that its): '{a likeness of the believer's light is as a niche}'.

According to Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani's *Taqrib al-Tahdib* Ali bin al-Hussain bin Ibrahim al-Ameri is '**Seduq**' and Nasr bin Ali al-Jahdhami is '**Thiqah Thabt**' where as Ali bin Nasr, Shebl bin Abbad, Qays bin Saad al-Makki and Atta bin Rabah are '**Thiqah**'.

See the big difference between the two versions of this verse. According to Mushaf of Uthman, we believe the the verse is talking about **Allah [swt]** while Ibn Abbas [ra] not only unequivocally rejected this but advanced the 'correct' version of this words according to which this verse is talking about '**believers**'. So what is the fatwa of Nawasib against Ibn Abbas here? Are they going to declare him Kaafir since he openly challenged a word of Holy Quran and did it with reasoning?

143. Shocking Nasibi belief: There are four mistakes in Quran

Imam Abu Daud's son Allamah Abi Bakar Sajistani records this daring tradition in his esteemed book Al Musahif:


"Abdullah narrated from Al-Fadhal bin Hamad al-Khayri narrated from Khlad (he meant Ibn Khalid) from Zaid Ibn Hubab narrated from Ash'ath from Saeed bin Jubayr: "There are four mistakes in Quran: "ALSSABI-OON" [5:69] , "WAALMUQEEMEEN" [4:162] , "FAASSADDAQA WAAKUN MINA ALSSALIHEEN" [63:10], "IN HATHANI LASAHIRANI" [20:63]".

 [Al Musahif, page 42](#)

When the beloved personalities of the Nawasib have narrated clear traditions about mistakes in the Quran and their Imams had the audacity to endorse these traditions then what right do these Nawasib have to attack Shias? Why do these Nawasib not bat an eyelid when their texts contain such statements from their beloved ones, but are content on declaring the Shias Kaafir because their books contains traditions suggesting tahreef?

144. Ayesha rejected the authenticity of the Quran and marked 'mistakes' in the Quran compiled by Uthman

We read in the following texts of Ahle Sunnah:

1.  [Al Musahif, page 43](#)
2. Tafseer Tabari, Volume 2 page 18 , Surah Nisa verse 162
3. Tafseer Gharaib al Quran, Volume 2 page 17, Surah Nisa
4. Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 2 page 246, Surah Nisa
5. Tafseer Thalabi, Volume 6 page 250
6. Tafseer Itqan, Volume 1 page 210
7. Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 2 page 246 , Surah Al Maidah
8. Tafseer Mazhari, Volume 6 page 149
9. Tafseer Qurtubi, Volume 11 page 216
10. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani, Volume 1 page 31
11. Tafseer Ma'alim al Tanzeel, Volume 4 page 221
12. Al Muhazraat, Volume 3 page 435, Al Had

We read the following bold testimony of Ayesha in Tafseer Thalabi:

أخبرنا أبو بكر بن عبدوس وأبو عبدالله بن حامد قالا : حدثنا أبو العباس الأصم قال حدثنا : محمد بن الجهم السمرى قال حدثنا الفراء قال حدثني أبو معاوية عن هشام بن عروة عن أبيه عن عائشة أنها سئلت عن قوله سبحانه في النساء { لكن الراسخون } { والمقيمون } وعن قوله في المائدة { إن الذين آمنوا والذين هادوا والصابئون } وعن قوله { إن هذا لساحران } فقالت : يا بن أخي هذا خطأ من الكاتب

Abu Bakr bin Abdoos and Abu Abdullah bin Hamid narrated from Abu al-Abbas al-Asim from Muhammad bin al-Jahm al-Samri from al-Fara from Abu Mu'awiyah from Hisham bin Arwa from his father that Ayesha was asked about Allah's statements in Surah Nisa (verse 162) 'LAKINI ALRRASIKHOONA' and 'WAALMUQEEMEENA' and the Almighty's statement in Sura Maidah (verse 69) 'INNA ALLATHEENA AMANOO WAALLATHEENA HADOO WAALSSABI-OON' and His statement (Taha, 63) 'IN HATHANI LASAHIRANI'. Ayesha replied: 'O my nephew, this is due to mistakes committed by the scribe'.

Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Abdoos: Dahabi said: '*Imam*' (Siar alam alnubala, v17 p58). **Abu Abdullah bin Hamed al-Waraq:** Dahabi said: '*Sheikh and Mufti of Hanbalis*' (Siar alam alnubala, v17 p203). **Abu al-Abbas al-Asim:** Dahabi said: '*Thiqah*'

(Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v3 p860). **Muhammad bin Jahm al-Samri:** Dahabi said: '**Darqutni said that he was Thiqah**' (Siar alam alnubala, v13 p164). **Al-Fara bin Yahya:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (Siar alam alnubala, v10, p119). **Abu Mu'wiyah Muhammad bin Khazem:** Dahabi said: '**Thabt**' (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v1 p294). **Hisham bin Urwa:** Dahabi said: '**Hujja**' (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v1 144). **Urwa bin al-Zubair:** Dahabi said: '**Thabt**' (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v1 p62).

145. Some of the Nasibi justifications

Justification One

Shias attest that Uthman made mistakes whilst writing the Quran and have marked errors in the Quran compiled by Uthman.

Our Reply

It is not us; rather it was Ayesha who marked errors in the Quran compiled by Uthman. If marking errors of Uthman is a sin then Ayesha was the first person to do so.

Justification Two

The chain of narrators in the above cited tradition in which Ayesha marked mistakes in the Quran of Uthman is weak, and a weak tradition carries no importance.

Our Reply

The chain is strong, all of the narrators have been graded as reliable by the great Imam Dhahabi that nullifies this argument. Moreover Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti's statements are sufficient to refute any such attempt by Nawasib:

قال أبو عبيد في فضائل القرآن حدثنا أبو معاوية عن هشام بن عروة عن أبيه قال سألت عائشة عن لحن القرآن عن قوله تعالى إن هذان لساحران وعن قوله تعالى والمقيم الصلاة والمؤتون الزكاة وعن قوله تعالى إن الذين آمنوا والذين هادوا والصابئون فقالت يا بن أخي هذا عمل الكتاب أخطئوا في الكتاب هذا إسناد صحيح على شرط الشيخين

Abu Ubaid stated in Fadhail Quran that Abu Muawiyah narrated from Hisham bin Urwah from his father that Ayesha was asked about the following mistakes in the Quran 'IN HATHANI LASAHIRANI' and His [swt] statement 'WAALMUQEEMEENA ALSSALATA WAALMU/TOONA ALZZAKATA' and His [swt] statement 'INNA ALLATHEENA AMANOO WAALLATHEENA HADOO WAALSSABI-OON'. She replied: "O son of my nephew, this is due to the act of the scribes of the Quran who committed a mistake whilst transcribing them. The chain of this tradition is Sahih according to the conditions of the Shaikhain.

[Al Itqan fi Uloom al Quran, Volume 1 page 210](#)

Moreover he wrote in Volume 1 page 212:

وبعد فهذه الأجوبة لا يصلح منها شيء عن حديث عائشة أما الجواب بالتضعيف فلأن إسناده صحيح كما ترى

"There is no strength with the replies that are advanced against the above cited reply of Ayesha, namely that it contains a weak chain. The chain is Sahih."

Justification Three

Uthmani advocates say: "We can conduct interpretations (Taweel) of the words that have been marked as incorrect by Ayesha and they can be dealt with under the rules of grammar and syntax."

Our Reply

The excuse of 'interpretation' is indeed a very convenient and accommodating. Nasibi scholars utilized this excuse when they issued a fatwa permitting the writing of the Quran with urine. The Sahaba offered the same excuse after setting the Quran manuscripts on fire. Muawiyah who raised the Quran on spears in the Battle of Sifeen offered the same excuse. Since Ayesha's statement about errors in the Quran of Uthman casts serious aspersions on the faith of both personalities the interpretation excuse is offered yet again.

Justification Four

Ayesha's views about the above cited words are a mistake in Ijtehad similar to when she rebelled and fought the fourth khalifa.

Our Reply

Jalaluddin Suyuti has unequivocally accepted her statement [Tafseer Itqan]. In consequence, the authenticity of the hadith of Ayesha has spun the heads of Sunni scholars in a manner so severe that the spinning shall not cease until Qayamah. The mistakes in the Quran of Uthman marked by Ayesha cannot be refuted on the feeble basis of conjecture and the tricks of Sunni hardliners.

Justification Five

Sahaba were Huhfaz / Qurra i.e they knew the Quran by heart, how could they commit mistakes in the words of the Quran?

Our Reply

Abu Bakar, Umar and Uthman were not complete Hufaz of Quran.

Justification Six

The Sahaba had taken Quran from Prophet [s] in the manner in which it was revealed and likewise taught it in the same manner. How could they then make errors when compiling the Quran?

Our Reply

This is a baseless claim because we read in authentic Sunni literature that the companions weren't sure about the place or sequence of Surah Infaal and Surah Barat.

Justification Seven

It is strange to assume that all the companions were happy to with the inclusion of incorrect words in the Quran.

Our Reply

Not all companions agreed to it, after all Umro would not have asked Ayesha about those mistakes.

If Ayesha believed in the distortion of the Quran then it was a mere mistake, but when it comes to others it is kufr

Dear readers, Ayesha's tradition that states that writers had made errors whilst lettering some words in the Quran, has been narrated with a Sahih chain of narration according to Sunni sources. Whilst contemplating Ayesha's research, several questions appear,

1. Why did Uthman appoint scribes that were prone to committing mistakes when writing out the Holy book?
2. Almost ten Sunni caliphs succeeded the throne of Uthman and yet not one of them set about correcting the mistakes in the Uthman compiled Quran?
3. If Muslims have for over 1400 years been reciting words mistakenly recorded in the Uthman compiled Quran who is responsible for the incorrect recitation of such words?

Notice the double standards of the Nasibi ulema who cannot validate Ayesha's atrocious belief that the Quran contains incorrect words but if same words have been uttered by someone else (of the opposite sect) these mullahs instantly issue a fatwa of Kufr.

This approach proves how disingenuous the Nawasib are.

146. Uthman blackened the name of Islam by testifying that some Quranic words were incorrectly transcribed

This atrocious view of Uthman has been recorded in the the following esteemed books of Ahle Sunnah.

1. Tafseer Itqan (Urdu) Volume 1 page 492
2. Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani, Volume 1 page 30
3. Tafseer al-Kabeer, Volume 6 page 38
4. Tafseer Qurtubi, Volume 11 page 212, Surah Taha verse 63
5. Tafseer Fath al Qadeer, Volume 3 page 361
6. Tafseer Ma'alam al Tanzeel, Volume 3 page 361, Surah Nisa verse 161
7. Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 2 page 246, Surah Maidah
8. Al Muhazraat, Volume 2 page 434 by Raghil Isfahani
9. Tafseer Mazhari (Urdu), Volume 3 page 215 & 216
10. Al Fauz al Kabir al Usool al Tafseer by Shah Waliullah Dehalvi
11. al Kashf wal Byan fi Tafseer e Quran by Abu Ishaq Thalabi
12. Al Musahif by Ibn Ashtah

Allamah Baghwi writes in Tafseer Ma'alam al-Tanzeel:

"There is disagreement over 'ALMUQEEMEENA ALSSALAT'. Ayesha [ra] and Aban bin Uthman said that was written in the Quran due to a mistake on the part of the

transcriber. Its correction is essential and it should be written as 'ALMUQEEMOONA ALSSALAT'. Similarly in Surah Maidah 'AALSSABI-OONA' and in Surah Taha 'IN HATHANI LASAHIRANI' have also been written due to the mistake of scribes. Uthman stated that he had seen some mistakes in the Quran and Arabs would correct them through their language and they had asked him to change them but he said that these mistakes did not change Haram to Halal and vice versa"

We should also mention that Imam of Nawasib Ibn Taimiyah has written in his Minhaj, under the discussion of Tafseer Thalabi that:

"Baghwi's Tafseer is the abridged form of Thalabi's Tafseer and he (Baghwi) didn't include fabrications in his Tafseer"

We read in Tafseer Kabeer:

"When Uthman saw his [compiled] Quran he stated that he observed some mistakes that would be corrected by the Arabs through their language"

We read in al-Musahif:

"When the Quran was written it was brought to Uthman who saw mistakes in its scripture. He said that there was no need to correct them, as the Arabs would make the correction themselves"

One of the beloved scholars of Deobandies namely Qazi Thanauallah Uthmani Pani Patti in his commentary of verse 162 of Surah Nisa records in his esteemed work Tafseer Mahzari (Published by Daarul Isha't Karachi):

"Baghwi has written the statements of Ayesha [ra] and Aban Bin Uthman [ra] that 'ALMUQEEMOONA ALSSALAT' should have been written at this place. Similarly 'WAALSSABI-OON' in Surah Maidah's verse 'INNA ALLATHEENA AMANOO WAALLATHEENA HADOO WAALSSABI-OON' and 'HATHANI' in the verse 'IN HATHANI LASAHIRANI' are the mistakes of writer (It should have been SABI-EEN & HATHAIN respectively). Hadrat Uthman [ra] had also stated that there were some mistakes (of writing) in the Mushaf and Arabs whilst reciting them would make the corrections themselves, through their language. When asked why he did not make the amendments, Uthman asked that it remain the same as it does not alter Halal to Haram and Haram to Halal"

 [Tafseer Mazhari, Volume 3 page 215 & 216](#)

Nawasib claim that Uthman was a shy person and count it as one of his merits. We want to ask them where his shyness went when he described the book of Allah as 'incorrect'? Since he observed mistakes in the Quran compiled and written by him, why didn't he correct them? The very mistakes that he expected the Arabs to correct remain unaltered in the Quran and are similarly read both by Arabs and non Arabs. It is amazing that Sunnis extol Uthman for compiling the Quran, when he testified to his compilation containing mistakes!

We read in Al Itqan fi Uloom al Quran:

"Akramah states that when Mushafs were written, they were presented before Uthman and he found some incorrect words written in them and then said that they shouldn't be changed as Arabs would themselves make the corrections. Or he said that they would themselves correct the pronunciations (vowel points, diacritics). Had the narrator been from the tribe of Thaqeef and the writer been from the tribe of Hadheel, these mistakes wouldn't have been in the Mushaf."

 [Tafseer Al Itqan \(Urdu\) Volume 1 page 492](#)

Uthman's belief in the incorrectness of Quran has been testified by his own son Aban. We read in Tafseer Qurtubi:

"Aban bin Uthman recited the cited verse [IN HATHANI LASAHIRANI] before his father Uthman. Uthman said: "It is incorrect". Someone asked him: "Why don't you correct it?". Uthman replied: "Leave it there, it doesn't make any difference in respect of what is Halal and Haram".

[Online Tafseer Qurtubi, Surah Taha verse 63](#)

Dear readers, the Quran is a miracle due to its in-depth rhetoric and eloquence. If according to Uthman there are mistakes in the Quran then there remain no virtues of Quran. Had this testimony been that of anyone else, the Nasibis would have immediately issued fatwas of Kufr, but as such words have been spoken by an individual from their own ilk their voices automatically fall silent.

Qazi Shawkani also records Uthman's blasphemy against the Quran. We read in Fatah al Qadeer:

"There are traditions according to which Uthman said that certain Quranic words were wrong due to mistakes committed by writers"

147.Common Nasibi excuses to defend Uthman

Uthman's deeming certain Quranic words to have been incorrectly transcribed by his appointed scribes is a bone that remains lodged in the Nasibi throat and despite several operations by Nasibi surgeons the swelling has increased. Here are just some of the excuses offered by the defenders of Uthman in respect of the above-cited narrations.

Excuse one

Rasheed Khan the student of Shah Waliullah in his book "Ezah Litafat almaqal" claims that there exists no such tradition wherein Uthman called the Holy words as incorrect. Hence the allegation of Shias against Uthman is baseless.

Our Reply

It is not surprising that Uthman's adherents would be ashamed for the bold statement of Uthman and for all those people who would at once reject the statement, we have included scanned pages and direct links from some of the cited Sunni sources.

Excuse Two

The second excuse that is presented by the advocates of Uthman is that the recitation of Uthman was "**IN HATHAINI LASAHIRANI**" which is why he did not like the statement being recited as "**IN HATHANA LASAHIRANI**" and declared it as wrong.

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/020.html>

Reply One

There were Seven Qirah (with seven recitations), but none of them declared the recitation/pronunciation of the others as wrong, therefore Uthman's deeming other

pronunciations as wrong not only disrespects the Quran, but it is nothing short of Kufr (Ayesha knew Uthman better, which is why she issued takfeer against him).

Reply Two

If Uthman considered the correct pronunciation to be "**IN HATHAINI LASAHIRANI**" and not "**IN HATHANA LASAHIRANI**" why didn't he change the phrase, or burn the Quran (as was his forte)?

Reply Three

The compilation of the Holy Quran was done under Uthman's supervision. If mistakes had occurred in the compilation process, then his sub-ordinates weren't obeying the caliph, and his concerns fell on deaf ears. If the incorrect pronunciation was transcribed with Uthman's consent, why did the caliph instruct the scribes to records an incorrect phrase in the Quran? Why did he keep letting others know of the mistake, and not change it?

Sipah-e-Sahaba and defenders of Uthman, take note

If a book of any religion [other than the Sunnis] states that at a certain place the word "Aimata" should be replaced by "Aima", the religion, according to the advocates of Uthman falls out of the fold of Islam. Fifteen Sunni books have recorded that Uthman deemed the correct Quranic words to be "**IN HATHANA LASAHIRANI**", yet rather than deem him an apostate, he remains their third rightly guided caliph. Why is this biased approach adopted in this case?

Uthman's claim of having knowledge of the unknown fails

We have proven that Uthman confidently asserted that the [alleged] wrong words would be amended by the Arabs themselves. His confidence was unfounded despite the passage of 1400 years these 'incorrect' words remain and are recited in the same manner that Uthman criticized. The Arabs [along with the others] still read continue to recite the [alleged] incorrect words. The Qaris of the Quran from all over the world read the same incorrect words, yet they love Uthman and credit him for compiling the Quran.

148. According to Sunni Scholars a verse in Surah Dhariyat does not contain the same words as were taught by the Prophet [s] to his Sahabah

In surah Dhariyat (51) verse 51 we read the following verse:

ان الله هو الرزاق ذو القوة المتين

"Surely Allah is the Bestower of sustenance, the Lord of Power, the Strong"

According to Sunni scholars, this is not the form of verse that was taught by the Holy Prophet [s] to the Sahabi Abdullah Ibn Masud. We read in Sunan Tirmidi:

عن عبد الله بن مسعود قال قرأني رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إني أنا الرزاق ذو القوة المتين قال أبو عيسى هذا حديث حسن صحيح

The Messenger of Allah taught me to recite: "I am the Bestower of sustenance, the

Lord of Power, the Strong".

Abu Isa said that this hadith is Hasan Sahih.

[Online Sunan Tirmidi with Commentary, Hadith 2864](#)

[Online Sunan Abu Daud with commentary, Hadith 3479 \(with different chain\)](#)

What is the view of Ahle Sunnah regarding the words taught by the Prophet [s] to Ibn Masud? According to Sunni traditions the Prophet ordered his adherents to learn the Quran from Ibn Masud. The tradition is deemed Hassan Sahih by Imam Abu Isa Ibn Isa Tirmidi.

149.The proud belief of the ‘Hinda Haq Chaar Yaari’ cult: Verse 25 of Surah Noor used to be recited by the Sahaba and the Prophet [s] differs to the way we recite it today

We read in Surah Noor verse 25:

يومئذ يوفيهم الله دينهم الحق ويعلمون أن الله هو الحق المبين

"On that Day Allah will pay them the recompense of their deeds in full, and they will know that Allah, He is the Manifest Trut."

25. YAWMA-ITHIN YUWAFEEHIMU ALLAHU DEENAHUMU ALHAQQA WAYAAALAMOONA ANNA ALLAHA HUWA ALHAQQU ALMUBEENU

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/024.html>

Now we read in Tafser Tabari, Volume 18 page 141 that the Sahabi Ubai bin Kaab had this verse in his compilation in a shuffled manner:

قال جرير : وقرأتها في مصحف أبي بن كعب يوفيهم الله الحق دينهم

Jarir said: 'I read it in Ubai bin Kaab's Mushaf as 'Allah the just will pay back to them their reward in full (YUWAFEEHIMU ALLAHU ALHAQ DEENAHUM)'

Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti has recorded that the Prophet [s] recited the same verse in an even more different manner:

وأخرج الطبراني وابن مردويه عن بهز بن حكيم عن أبيه عن جده أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قرأ : (يومئذ يوفيه الله الحق دينهم) .

Tabarani and Ibn Mardweh narrated from Behz bin Hakim from his father from his grand father that the Prophet (pbuh) recited: '{Allah the just will pay back to them in full their reward}' (YUWAFEEHI ALLAHU ALHAQ DEENAHUM)'

[Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 5 page 36](#)

Dear readers, please ponder over the big difference between the verses recited by the Holy Prophet [s], Ubai bin Kaab and the version that is present in the mushaf of Uthman. It has the word "ALHAQ" after "ALLAH" and the word "DEENAHUM" after the "ALHAQ" whereas in the Quran compiled by Uthman the word "DEENAHUM" is present between the words "ALLAH" and "ALHAQ" which results in the emergence of a term '**Allah the just**' according to the Prophet and Ubai. Moreover, there is another difference in the version of the verse (24:25) the Prophet [s] believed in and what we have today and the difference is in the word "**YUWAFEEHIMU**" which is plural whilst the Prophet used to believe in a word "**AFEEHI**" that was singular.

150.The Sahabi Ibn Masud attested to a different word in Surah 93 verse 8

In the Holy Quran (93:8) we read:

ووجدك عائلا فأغنى

"Did He not find thee destitute and enrich (thee)?"

Imam Suyuti in Tafseer Dur al-Manthur and Ibn Attia al-Andalusi in al-Muharrar al-Wajiz, Volume 5 page 495 have recorded that a great Sahabi did not believe in the aforesaid words of the Quran, rather he believed in a different form of this verse:

"وأخرج ابن الأنباري في المصاحب عن الأعمش قال : قراءة ابن مسعود "ووجدك عديما فأغنى"

Narrated Ibn al-Anbari in al-Masahif from al-Amash that he said: 'Ibn Masud recited it like this: 'He found you lacking and enriched you'

[Tafseer Dur al-Manthur, Volume 8 page 544](#)

The Quran has used the word '**Aael**' which means that he had money but not enough, thus he was in need whereas the Sahabi Ibn Masud believed in the word '**Adeem**' which means he had nothing at all. Moreover, the grammars of the two forms of verse are entirely different from one another since the form of verse we have today is interrogative whilst Ibn Masud believed in an affirmative form of the verse.

151. Ibn Masud believed in a different word in Surah 4 verse 40

In the Holy Quran (4:40) we read:

إن الله لا يظلم مثقال ذرة

"Surely Allah does not do injustice to the weight of an atom"

Now Imam Suyuti in Tafseer Dur al-Manthur, Volume 2 page 539, Imam Abu Ishaq Thalabi in Tafseer Thalabi, Volume 3 page 308 and Ibn Attia al-Andalusi in al-Muharrar al-Wajiz, Volume 2 page 254 have recorded that Abdullah Ibn Masud did not believe in the aforesaid Quranic verse rather he believed in a different version of this verse:

"وأخرج ابن أبي داود في المصاحف من طريق عطاء عن عبد الله أنه قرأ "إن الله لا يظلم مثقال نملة"

Ibn Abi Dawood recorded in al-Masahif (book) from Atta from Abdullah (Ibn Masud) that he recited: 'Surely Allah does not do injustice to the weight of an ant'

[Tafseer Dur al-Manthur, Volume 2 page 539](#)

We can see the difference between the two versions of this verse, the version we have today of this verse assures us that Allah [swt] does not do injustice even to the weight of 'an atom' whilst Abdullah Ibn Masud believed that Allah [swt] does not do injustice even to the weight of 'an ant' that is a name that has been given to a particular creature.

152. Another daring belief of Nawasib: Word 'grapes' has been replaced with the word 'wine' in the current version of Surah Yusuf

In Surah Yusuf verse 36, we read:

"[Shakir 12:36] And two youths entered the prison with him. One of them said: I saw myself pressing wine...."

36. WADAKHALA MAAAHU ALSSIJNA FATAYANI QALA AHADUHUMA INNEE ARANEE AAASIRU KHAMRAN

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/012.html>

We read in Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 4 page 19:

عن ابن مسعود رضي الله عنه، أنه قرأ إني أراني أعصر عنبا وُقَالَ : والله لقد أخذتها من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم هكذا .

Ibn Masud read it as "AAASIRU ANBAH" (pressing grapes) and he (Ibn Masud) said: 'By Allah, I heard it from Allah's Messenger likewise'

[Online Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Surah Yusuf verse 36](#)

So here we learnt that in the Quran compiled by Uthman we read "AAASIRU KHAMRAN" (pressing wine) instead of "ASR ANBAH" (pressing grapes) which according to great Sahabi Ibn Masud was not only the word he believed in but that was the (correct) word the Holy Prophet [s] had taught him. So what is the Nasibi fatwa now? Who should they indict for believing in Tahreef of the Quran? Was it Abdullah Ibn Masud or Uthman? One of them is wrong, now if they jump on Uthman's side then it means that they are going against their own belief that deems Abdullah Ibn Masud as one of the most knowledgeable Sahaba on the Quran. Should they side with Ibn Masud's, then they have by implication deemed their Ummayyad Caliph a Kaffir.

153. According to Nawasib, Ayesha and Ibn Abbas did not believe in the current version of verse 117 of Surah Nisa

We read in the Quran:

[Shakir 4:117] They do not call besides Him on anything but idols, and they do not call on anything but a rebellious Shaitan.

17. IN YADAAOONA MIN DOONIHI ILLA INATHAN WA-IN YADAAOONA ILLA SHAYTANAN MAREEDAN

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/004.html>

Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti in his commentary of the above cited verse in his esteemed work Tafseer Dur e Manthur, Volume 2 page 223 records:

عن عائشة قالت : قرأ رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم إن يدعون من دونه إلا أنتى

"Ayesha narrates that the Holy Prophet [s] recited "IN YADAAOONA MIN DOONIHI ILLA AUNTHA"

We also read:

أن ابن عباس كان يقرأ هذا الحرف "إن يدعون من دونه إلا أنتى"

Ibn Abbas used to recite "IN YADAAOONA MIN DOONIHI ILLA AUNTHA"

154. Nasibi belief in Tahreef continues; word 'JAHILEEN' has been replaced with 'DALLEEN'

We have relied on the following esteemed Sunni sources:

1. Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 6 page 291
2. Tafseer Tabari, Volume 19 p84
3. Tafseer Ibn Abi Hatim, Volume 8 page 2755
4. Tafseer al-Thalabi, Volume 7 page 161
5. al-Muharar al-Wajiz by Ibn Attia al-Andalusi, Volume4 page 228
6. Tafseer al-Bahr al-Muhit by Ibn Hayan al-Andalusi, Volume7 page 11

7. al-Burhan by Zarkashi, Volume 4 page 189

We read in Holy Quran (26:20):

قال فعلتها إذا وأنا من الضالين

He said: I did it then, when I was of those who are astray.

20. QALA FAAAALTUHA ITHAN WAANA MINA ALDDALLEENA

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/026.html>

But our opponents believe that one of their beloved Sahaba namely Abdullah Ibn Masud did not believe 'DALLEEN' (astray) to be the actual word that was revealed in this verse but it was 'JAHILEEN' (ignorant):

عن ابن جريج قال في قراءة ابن مسعود فعلتها اذن وأنا من الجاهلين

Ibn Juraij said: 'According to Ibn Masud's recitation its: 'I did it then, when I was of those who are ignorant (JAHILEEN)'

[Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 6 page 291](#)

155. Deobandi Imam Muhammad Anwar Shah Kashmiri has polished the name of Uthman and Deobandism by admitting that the Holy Quran contains distortions

Prominent Deobandi Imam Sheikh Muhammad Anwar Shah Kashmiri (d. 1352 H) in his esteemed book Faiz al Bari the commentary of Sahih Bukhari writes:

فإن التحريفَ المعنويَّ غيرُ قليلٍ فيه أيضاً، والذي تحقَّقَ عندي أن التحريفَ فيه لفظيٌّ أيضاً، أما إنه عن عمدٍ منهم، لمغلطة. فا تعالی اعلم به

"The tahreef of meanings has not taken place in a lesser amount. In my eyes, this is proved by research that the tahreef of words has taken place in this Quran. This tahreef was done either intentionally or by mistake"

[Faiz al Bari Shrah Sahih Bukhari, Volume 3 page 395, Kitab al Shahadaat \(Khizrah Book Depo, Deoband. India\)](#)

The book can also be downloaded from the following Salafi online library

<http://www.almeshkat.com/books/open.php?cat=22&book=2361> (volume 2, MS Word, page No. 491).

This person has been given the title of "Imam al Asr " [Imam of the present time]. We should point out the revered value this scholar enjoys amongst Deobandies. Another grand scholar of Deobandis Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi praised Anwar Shah Kashmiri in the following words:

"Once Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi sat in a lecture of Allama Kashmiri. After hearing this lecture, Hadhrat Thanvi said: "Every sentence of Shah Saheb can be turned in to a book" (Anwarul Bari, v.2, p.235). Hadhrat Thanvi also said: "I have benefited so much from Hadhrat Shah Saheb that his respect that I have in my heart is on par with the respect that my other teachers occupy, even though I was never his student" (Anwarul Bari, v.2, p.235)."

Another Deobandi scholar Mawlana Abdul Qadir Raipuri wrote about him:

"Indeed Hadrat Shah Sahib is a sign from the signs of Allah" (Akabir-e-Ulama-e-Deoband, p. 98)".

<http://alashrafia.com/english/anwar.html>

Deobandis like that of Sipah e Sahaba Pakistan, and Mufti Ebrahim Desai have always taught their adherents that Shias are kafir due to the presence of some traditions in their texts implying that the Quran has been altered. They should likewise inform their adherents about the above statement issued by their Imam! Why does this Mullah remain a sign of Allah, despite his belief in tahreef? What rule excludes him from any form of criticism? Was this sin absolved because he bathed in Ganges River prior to his death?

Do any of these Deobandis have the courage to stand up and ask their sodomy addicted Mullahs from Sipah-e-Sahaba about such idiotic and unislamic statements from their Imam? Islam is a complete code of life that provides thorough guidance till the Doomsday, Islam is not confined to any madressa of Sipah-e-Sahaba where every sodomite may thrust his lustful wishes upon religion, and may start attacking the beliefs of Islam as they attack their students in the madressas. Next time Nawasib should keep the esteemed research of their Imam in mind before attacking Shias.

We have already discussed the tradition of Sahih Bukhari which implies Tahreef i.e **Narrated Ibn Abbas: When the Verse:--'And warn your tribe of near-kindred, and thy group of selected people among them' was revealed...."** a Sunni author Syed Ateeq ur Rehman Gilani writes about this tradition in his special edition of a religious Urdu magazine published in June 2005 in Karachi:

"This tradition of Sahih Bukhari collides with the protection of Quran. Therefore this and other traditions like this should be declared as unreliable and fabricated. Imam Bukhari [rh] had laid down the toughest conditions for the authenticity of a hadith. Wasn't he able to understand such solid thing that a tradition which affects the protection of Quran is incorrect? Certainly he used to understand but someone might have done this act in Sahih Bukhari because no matter how much authentic Sahih Bukhari be after Quran but it is not equal to Quran and also it is not worthy enough that like Quran it can also be claimed that Baatil cannot come near to it and if this tradition has really been recorded by Imam Bukhari and he deemed it Sahih then the personal opinion of Imam Bukhari is not an authority that traditions recorded by him be deemed correct in a situation where it begets the belief of Tahreef in Quran. Mulana Anwar Shah Kahsmiri while relying upon these traditions of Imam Bukhari wrote in his Faiz al Baari the commentary of Sahih Bukhari: "The distortion of meaning in Quran has not been taken place in a lesser amount. In my eyes, this is proved by research that the distortion of words has taken place (by Sahaba) in Quran and either this distortion was done intentionally or by mistake" This will be an injustice to deem the traditions of Sahih Bukhari which implies distortion of words in Quran to be true and on the other side the explanation of Mulana Anwar Shah Kahsmiri to be condemnable. The explanation by Mulana Anwar Shah Kahsmiri is the result of accepting those traditions of Sahih Bukhari. But a question arise that except Mulana Anwar Shah Kahsmiri why did his teachers and students and other scholars not draw this conclusion from the traditions of Sahih Bukhari? The answer is that unlike Mulana Anwar Shah Kahsmiri other scholars did not ponder into the traditions of Bukhari. Mulana Anwar Shah Kahsmiri while writing Faiz al Baari Shrah Sahih Bukhari advanced his personal view for the reason that no one before had ever admitted about Tahreef of Quran openly".

[Aatish Fishan, \[Volcano\] page 31 by Syed Ateeq ur Rehman Gilani \(Madressa Mehmoodia, Jain Road, Gazdarabad, Ranchod Line Karachi\)](#)

Why do Nasibi close their eyes and ears when Shia advance the same notion for their scholars and traditions recorded by them that are deemed authentic and imply Tahreef ?

156. Renowned Sunni scholar Dr. Israr Ahmed's testimony: The current Quran is not the real one; it has mistakes in it

There are very few Sunni Muslims who are unfamiliar with Dr. Israr Ahmed particularly those from the Indian sub continent. Details about him can be ascertained from his website <http://www.tanzeem.org/>. A few months ago he stated clearly that the present Quran is corrupted and is not the same as the one guaranteed protection by Allah [swt]. This statement created outrage amongst the Deobandi mullahs that resulted in Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam (JUI) one of the largest Deobandi organizations attacking him in their monthly magazine through the following interesting comments:

[Main Heading]

THE CURRENT QURAN CONTAINS MISTAKES AND IS NOT THE REAL ONE: DR. ISRAR


[Sub-Headings]

Like Qadianis those that do not believe in the protection of Quran should likewise be declared infidels under the constitution of Pakistan. No scholar, not even Christians or Jews have never had the gall to suggest such about the Quran, Commentary by Abdul Quddus Baloch

[News]

Karachi (representative of Zarb-e-Haq): Internationally famed, renowned scholar Dr. Israr Ahmed; the founder of organizations like Khudam al Quran, Tanzeem-e-Islami and Tehreek-e-Khilafat has preached to the public in public gatherings, writings and video cassettes that the Quran we have in our possession is not the real one rather it is a copy. The real Quran is written on Loh-e-Mehfooz which is free from all mistakes whilst the Quran possessed by the Ummah has mistakes in it. Whilst providing a commentary of the verses dealing with the protection of the Quran Dr. Israr asserted that the promise is not about the Quran possessed by the Ummah, rather it is about the Quran of Loh-e-Mehfooz. "Surely We have revealed the Reminder and We will most surely be its guardian" do not refer to the copy of Allah's book that is in our hands rather these verses were revealed for the verses written on Loh-e-Mehfooz. Allah also says "None touches save the purified ones" this verse likewise does not refer to the copy of the Quran we possess, that is the Usmani scripture that is unprotected and can be touched by impure and pure people.

Zarb-e-Haq's Commentary: the intellectual commentaries of the Ulema exist in their academic and non academic books. Whilst one can also deem such commentaries as incorrect, it remains an unequivocal fact that none of these scholars of commentary ever had doubts over the authenticity of the Quran. This Quranic verses are deemed sufficient enough about the protection of the present Quran. Qazi Abdul Kareem Kalachi kept striking his head on account of the statement of Maulana Anwar Shah Kashmiri about Tahreef of words in the Quran in his 'Faiz al Baari'. Had Maulana Anwar Shah Kashmiri like Dr. Israr spoken these words in public gatherings or common gatherings of scholars then he would have been excommunicated from Islam and would have been forced for repent..."

 [Monthly Zarb-e-Haq, for the month of May 2005 \(Madressa Mehmoodia, Jain Road, Gazdarabad, Ranchod Line Karachi\)](#)

We would like to ask the mullahs why they are merely targeting Dr. Israr Ahmed? It is not like he woke up in the morning and inexplicably uttered those words. His theory is based on the various Sunni traditions that imply that mistakes are present in the present Quran. If Deobandi logic suggests that Dr. Israr should be deemed an infidel then what about those scholars that he relied upon to shape his theory?

As for the excuse Nawasib advanced about their Imam Anwar Shah Kashmiri namely that he would have been declared Kafir had he spoken such words in public gathering, if the doctrine of excommunication only applies to one that espouses a belief in tahreef of the Quran in public gatherings and not those who merely wrote such things in their prestigious books then why are they attacking the Shia scholars that recorded such traditions implying Tahreef? Should they not be afforded the same level of protect as Kashmiri as they had never affirmed belief in tahreef in public gatherings?

We should also point out that the Deobandi writer acknowledged the existence of statements made by their scholars on Tahreef, but suggested that Quranic verses wherein Allah (swt) takes personal responsibility with protecting his Holy Book by Allah [swt] shall suffice prove its authenticity. This mirrors the Shia stance about the Quran, why is it okay if the Deobandis believe this but unacceptable of the Shia say the same?

157. The Scholar Uthman bin Abi Sheybah (d. 287) committed Tahreef to the Quran

Let us first introduce this personality from the pen of Imam Dhahabi who said '**He is an Imam, a major Hafiz and Mufasir**' (Siar alam alnubala, v11 p151). Imam ibn Haban mentioned him in his book of Thiqaah narrators i.e. al-Thuqaat, Volume 8 page 454. Imam al-Ejli declared him '**Thiqaah**' (Marifat al-Thuqaat, v2, p130) as did Imam Ibn Moin (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v2 p444) whilst Imam Abu Hatim Al-Razi graded him '**Seduq**' (Al-Jarh wa al-Tadil, v6, p167).

Tahreef in Surah Fil

Imam Dahabi in his esteemed book Siyar Alam al Nubla, Volume 11 page 153 records:

"Darqutni said: Ahmed ibn kamil has narrated that Al Hasan ibn Alhabab said that Uthman ibn Abi Sheybah recited for them in the tafsir 'Have you not considered how your Lord dealt with the possessors of the elephant?' that he recited it as: 'Alif-lam-meem'".

Dear readers, as you know, there are some words/letters in the Quran known as Al-Muqattaat i.e. the abbreviated letters that Muslims believe are words whose true meaning is known only to Allah [swt]. One of those words/letters is الم i.e this term is recited making its letters separate in this manner "**Alif-lam-meem**". Examples wherein this term exist are in the opening verses of Surah Baqrah and Surah Aal e Imran:

Baqrah:1. Alif-lam-meem

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/002.html>

Aal e Imean:1. Alif-lam-meem

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/003.html>

On the other hand we read in the first verse of Surah Fil (which was recited by Uthman bin Abi Sheybah):

ألم تر كيف فعل ربك بأصحاب الغيل

Alam tara kayfa faAAala rabbuka bi-as-habi alfeeli

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/transliteration/105.html>

[Shakir 105:1] Have you not considered how your Lord dealt with the possessors of

the elephant?

This word ألم may sound the same like that special letters of Allah [swt] but it differs and is a complete word that is recited as "Alam" which means 'Have you not?'

Now, instead of reciting this actual word in the verse, Uthman bin Abi Sheybah believed that it was the former and kept committing open Tahreef with the Holy Quran.

Tahreef in Surah Yusuf

Another example Tahreef of the Quran committed by Uthman bin Abi Sheybah was with regards to the verse:

[Shakir 12:70] So when he furnished them with their provisions...

Imam Dhahabi has recorded:

Ali ibn Muhammad Ibn Kas said that Ibrahim al-Khisas said: Uthman ibn Abi Sheybah read: 'And when he provided them with their ship', on that they told Uthman that it should be 'And when he provided them with their provisions'. He replied: 'I and my brother do not recite on the recitation of Asim''

NB: People were taught the Quran by Asim.

Those that utter takfeer against the Shia scholars with every breath for recording traditions or statements that imply Tahrif in the Quran should in the first instance examine the contents of their own house. Their scholar Uthman bin abi Sheybah committed a clear distortion in the words of the Holy Book yet we do not find any filthy Nasibi of the Sipah e Sahaba or Salafi/Wahabi movement issuing takfeer against him nor against those that recorded his comments in their esteemed works. If such tahreef is pardoned in the Nasibi school of thought then why do they always show have their swords unsheathed against the Shia?

158.Imam Ibn Hazm's doubts over the authenticity of the Quran compiled by Uthman

The prestigious pioneer Imam of Ahle Sunnah Abu Muhammad Ali bin Ahmed Ibn Hazm Andalusi (994-1064) records this bold statement in his esteemed book Al-Ahkam fe usul Al-Ahkam:

قال أبو محمد : فهذه صفة عمل عثمان رضي الله عنه ، بحضرة الصحابة رضي الله عنهم في نسخ المصاحف، و حرق ما أحرق منها مما غير عمداً و خطأ

"Abu Muhammad said: This is the description of Uthman's work that (was compiled) in the presence of the companions. Whilst copying the Mushafs he burnt what he burnt from them from what he had changed intentionally or by mistake"

Al-Ahkam fe usul Al-Ahkam, Volume 1 page 528

The book can be downloaded from the following salafi website

 <http://www.almeshkat.net/books/archive/books/alehkam.zip>

This glorious scholar of Ahle Sunnah needs no introduction but still allow us to cite some scholarly Sunni opinions of Ibn Hazm. Ibn Khalkan records in Wafiat Al-Ay'an, Volume 3 page 13:

"Al-Hamidi said: We never witnessed anyone as smart or quick in memory, generous

or religious as him”

Ibn Hajar Asqlani records in Lisan Al-Mizan, Volume 4 page 198:

S'aeed bin Ahmad Al-Rubay said: 'In Andlus (Spain) Ibn Hazm was the most knowledgeable amongst the people in Islamic knowledge and the most acquired in knowledge, in addition to this, he is expanded in statements, rhetoric, biography and origins/breed'

While Imam Dhahabi in his authority work Siar alam alnubala, Volume 18 page 18 stated about Ibn Hazm:

"He was a unique Imam"

What medication do the Nawasib take that protects their minds from thinking negatively of the great Ulema who cast doubts over the authenticity of the Quran? If such a protective taken can be applied to curtail having bad thoughts of these grand Ulema why is it not likewise taken to understand Shia traditions on tahreef?

159.A dose for the Salafi/Wahabi Movement: Ibn Taimiyah testified that the Salaf used to deny & change Quranic verses

The beloved Imam of the Nawasib Ibn Taymiyyah after acknowledging that the Sahaba used to curse asserted:

"And likewise some of the Salaf denied words form of the Quran such as the denial of some of them of the verse, 'Have not yet those who believe known' (13:31) and them saying that its 'Has it not been made clear to those who believe' and the denial of reading of the verse by others (of the Salaf) 'And your Lord has ordained (quthiyah) that you worship none but He' and they said that its 'And you Lord has advised (wassa)' and some of them used to delete Al-Mu'waithatayn from their copies of the Quran (mushaf) and others used to write a surah called Suratul Qunut (!) and this is a known mistake that is known by consensus (Ijma), and via multiple successive transmission (matawatur). And even with this the tawatur had not been established for them and so they are not kuffar. It is only after showing one the mutawatir proof (that if he rejects it) then he is kafir"


 [Majmua al-Fatawa Volume 12 page 492](#)

Ibn Tamiyah after accepting a fact sought to defend the indefensible. How did he know that the tawatur was not established for Salaf ? The Sahaba benefited from the company of the Holy Prophet [s] and yet we see evidences of them not reciting or rejecting parts of Quran we have currently have in our possession. Is this not shameful?

The menace of Salafism/Wahabism has always focused on attacking the unity of the Islamic Ummah through their atrocious and abhorrent teachings. These enemies of Ahlulbait [as] have from every corner of the earth dedicated their time and efforts on attacking Shias – and the topic of Tahreef is the specialist favorite topic. Have these malicious offspring of Ibn Tamiyah and Abdul Wahab ever dared to issue takfeer against their father for testifying that the Salaf Sahaba used to make Tahrif with the Quran ? Or have these people (whose minds resemble the people of Jahilyah) ever issued takfeer against those Salaf who clearly rejected or changed the verses revealed by Allah [swt]? If Shias can be excommunicated due to the presence of texts implying tahreef why should the Nawasib not do the same with their beloved Shaykh ul Islam? Why is it one rule for the Nawasib Imams, and another rule for Shia scholars?

160. Nawasib are unsure over the the authenticity of the Quran and suggest that the Prophet [s] committed Tahrif of the Quran by coming under the influence of Shaitan (godforbid)

We are quoting the famous incident of Gharaniq from the following esteemed Sunni sources:

1. Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Vol 4 page 367 Surah Hajj verse 52
2. Tafseer Gharaib al Quran, Vol 17 page 109 by Nizamuddin Nishapuri
3. Tafseer Qurtubi, Vol 12 page 80 by Muhammad Ibn Ahmed Qurtubi
4. Tafseer Mazhari (Urdu), Vol 8 page 94 By Qadhi Thanauallah Pani Patti
5. Ghanyatul Talibeen, by Shaykh Abdul Qadir Gilani, Page 172
6. Tafseer al-Kashaf, Vol. 3, Page 164
7. Ahkam al Qur'an, Vol. 3, Page 246
8. Tafseer al-Tabari, Vol. 17, Page 186
9. Irshad al Sari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari by Qastalani, Vol. 7 page 194
10. Fatah ul Bari Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari, Vol. 8 page 349
11.  [Tafseer al-Jalalayn, page 338](#)
12. Minhaj as Sunnah, Volume 2 page 409 by Ibn Tamiyah
13. Majma al-Zawadi, Volume 7 page 248 Tradition 11376

Some Nawasib embarrassed by such blatant blasphemy of the Prophet (s) and the Holy Book in their esteemed works have sought to question the authenticity of this reference. The very fact that their esteemed scholars like Suyuti recorded this tradition from authentic sources makes such excuses null and void. We read in Tafseer Dur Manthoor that:

Al-Bazaar and Al-Tabarani and Ibn Mardaweh and al-Ziya' have narrated through a chain of all trustworthy (Thiqa) narrators by the way of Saeed Ibn Jubayr, from Ibn Abbas that Prophet [s] recited the words of Surah Najm in the following manner:

"Have you then considered the Lat and the Uzza And Manat, the third, the last? These are the lofty (idols), verily their intercession is sought after."

Mushrakeen became delighted on hearing this from Holy Prophet [s] and said that their idols have also been mentioned in Quran. Then Gebrail came and said to Prophet [s]: "Recite same revelation and Quran which I have brought." Prophet [s] again recited the words:

"Have you then considered the Lat and the Uzza And Manat, the third, the last? These are the lofty (idols), verily their intercession is sought after."

Gebrail said: "I had not brought these words, these are from Satan". Then the following verse was revealed:

[22:52] "And We did not send before you any messenger or prophet, but when he desired, the Shaitan made a suggestion respecting his desire; but Allah annuls that which the Shaitan casts, then does Allah establish His communications, and Allah is Knowing, Wise".

 [Tafsir Dur al Manthur, Surh Hajj, verse 52](#)

Besides this, Allamah Jalauddin Suyuti records similar versions of this incident from several other Sahih chains, for example:

"Ibn Jarir and Ibn al-Munder and Ibn Abi Hatim and Ibn Mardaweh have narrated through a Sahih chain by the way of Saeed Ibn Jubayr who said...."

"Ibn Jarir, Ibn Al Munzir and Ibn Abi Hatim narrated with a Sahih chain from Abi Al

'Aliyah..."

"Abd bin Hamid and Ibn Jarir by the way of Yunis, from Ibn Shahab narrated:... with Mursal Sahih chain"

Qadhi Thanauallah Pani Patti Uthmani in his commentary of the above mentioned verse adopted the questions based on casting doubts over the authenticity of the episode like his Imams but had no choice than to quote their statements as they deemed the episode to be true:

"..However the tradition we previously mentioned from Saeed bin Jubayr by Bazar, Ibn Mardwaeh and Tabarani is indeed successive [Mutawatur] and strong [Qawi]. Ibn Hajar Asqalani has stated that from the abundance of traditions reported, it is deemed that there is some truth in it..."

The actual statement of Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani which Qadhi Thanauallah referred to is:

لكن كثرة الطرق تدل على أن للقصة أصلاً

[Fatah al Bari, Volume 8 page 439](#)

Not only these but Imam Ibn Abi Bakar al-Haythami is also among those Sunni scholars who deemed the incident to be authentic [Sahih] as he stated after recording the tradition:

رواه البزار والطبراني وزاد إلى قوله : { عذاب يوم عقيم } يوم بدر ورجالهما رجال الصحيح

"Al-Bazar and Tabarani narrated it and they added '{the penalty of a Mighty Day}' in the day of Badr, the narrators are the narrators of Sahih"

Majma al-Zawadi, Volume 7 page 248 Tradition 11376

Imam of the Nawasib Ibn Tamiyah also believed that Holy Prophet [s] recited Satanic verses and in this regard he cites the testimony of his beloved Salaf. He writes:

"What occurred with suratul Najm and its recitation 'These are the lofty (idols), verily their intercession is sought after' is well known amongst the Salaf; that this was recited by Rasulullah and then Allah abrogated it."

[Minhaj Sunnah, Volume 2 page 409](#)

The dirty Jhangvi cult and Salafies/Wahabies who love attacking the Shia have clearly questioned the authenticity of the Prophethood of Muhammad [s] and hence the Holy Quran we have in our hands. When they believe that the Holy Prophet [s] had on one occasion come under the influence of Iblis and recited a verse that was dictated to him from Iblis rather than that revealed by his Lord one can easily ascertain their true view over the authenticity of the Quran and blessed Messenger (s) who delivered it.

We now know that those that attack the Shia who 'disgrace' the Sahaba have themselves committed blasphemy against the Holy Prophet [s] and the Holy Quran. These people who demand the imposition of stern penalties against those that speak ill of the Sahaba need to take a good look at their ulema that recorded this tradition. The Shiekhayn and Muhaddatheen of Sipah e Sahaba like Bazar, Tabrani and Ibn Jarir have left behind them such a well developed text of blasphemy against Quran that if Sunnis were to read these books, they would be committing blasphemy against Quran till Qiyamah.

161.The Shia view on the Satanic verses

Alhamdulillah we, the Shia of Ahlulbayt [as] reject the notion that our Holy Prophet [s] could ever come under the influence of Iblis but condemn such a blasphemous belief espoused by our

opponents. About the actual reason for the revelation of verse 22:52, we read in Mukhtasar Tafsir al-Mizan by Tabatabai, page 399:

{إلا إذا تمنى} وقدر بعض ما يتمناه من توافق الأسباب على تقدم دينه وإقبال الناس عليه وإيمانهم به {ألقى الشيطان في أمنيته} وداخلها بوسوسة الناس وتهيج الظالمين

'{but when he desired}' he desire success for the religion and the people drew near to it and believed in it '{Satan threw some (vanity) into his desire}' by whispering men and instigating the unjust.

Regarding the views of Shia scholars on the incident of Gharaniq, we read in Tafsir al-Mizan by Tabatabai, Volume 14 page 399:

الأدلة القطعية على عصمته صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم تكذب متنها

"The conclusive proofs related to His (pbuh) infallibility are sufficient to evidence the falsehood of this tradition"

We read in Tafsir Min Wahi al-Quran by Fadhlullah, Volume 16 page 99:

هذه الرواية من الروايات الموضوعة على لسان كثير من الصحابة يريد بها المنحرفون الإساءة إلى النبي وإلى الإسلام

"This tradition is one of those fabricated traditions that has been attributed to the companions by the errant who want to offend the Prophet and Islam."

In the footnote of Bihar al-Anwar, Volume 17 page 56 by Rabani Shirazi, we read:

حديث الغرانيق من الخرافات التي روتها العامة وهو موضوع

"The incident of Gharaniq is a myth narrated by Amma (Sunnis) and it is verily a fabrication."

We read in Tafsir al-Amthal by Makarem Shirazi, Volume 10 page 379:

أن أسطورة الغرانيق من وضع أعداء سذج

"The myth of Gharaniq is fabricated by stupid enemies".

162. The testimony of Shaykh Sherani that his fear of investigating individuals prevented him from citing all the verses that were destroyed to enable the usage of the Uthmani manuscript

We read in 'Kabreyat Ahmer' page 143 (published in Egypt) the following statement of [Allamah Abdul Wahab Sherani](#):

"Had there been no fear of weak hearts going astray and knowledge reaching those that were ineligible, I would have cited all those verses that were lost from the Mushaf of Uthman, nobody disagrees with the contents of the Uthmani Quran"

Dear readers, to believe that the Quran is the victim of distortion is deemed Kufr by the Ahle Sunnah. Tragically, this was a belief espoused by their own clergy, Sahaba including their Heads of State. Amongst the Ulema Anwar Shah Kashmiri and Abdul Wahab Sherani were lead advocates of this stance.

It is interesting that rather than present the harsh truth, this Imam of the Nawasib seeks to hide the truth so as to prevent hearts from deviating. Why should presenting the truth lead to people becoming deviants?

163. According to Ahle Sunnah there are some mistakes in Quran which Prophet [s] and companions were unaware, but the Sunni Imam Hamzah bin Ziyat saw Allah [swt] in his dream who [swt] directed him to make the amendments

Renowned scholar of Ahle Sunnah Shiekh Abdul Wahab bin Ahmed bin Ali Sherani writes in his esteemed book *Al-Yawaqet wa al-Jawahir*:

"Hamzah Bin Ziyat said : 'When I saw Allah [swt], I recited the words of Surah Yaseen "Tanzeel ul Aziz" and recited the letter "Laam" with "Zahhah" in it. Allah [swt] admonished me and ordered to recite Tanzeel with the "Fakhah" of Laam as He [swt] had revealed it like that. Moreover when I recited the verse "WAANA IKHTARTUKA" of Surah Taha before the Almighty Allah [swt], He [swt] again rebuked me and ordered me to recite it "WAANA IKHTARTAKA" .

Al-Yawaqet wa al-Jawahir

The initial words uttered by the Sunni Imam exist in the present Quran, and differ to those that Allah [swt] directed him to recite. From this narration it is evident that Hafiz Hamzah Bin Ziyat was superior to Abu Bakar, Umar and Uthman since despite their being Caliphs, Allah [swt] did not deem them worthy enough to appear in their dreams, and instruct them of the correct recitals.

Moreover we read in the same book:

"Ulema have narrated that many Salaf had the privilege of viewing Allah [swt] in their dreams and amongst them Imam Ahmed, Hamzah bin Ziyat and Abu Hanifah head the list. Hamzah bin Ziyat says that when he saw Allah [swt] and recited Surah Yaseen before Him, He [swt] rectified him at two points in its recitation"

Al-Yawaqet wa al-Jawahir, Volume 1 page 119

It is worthy to note that the author of 'Al-Yawaqiyat' counted Ibn Hamzah amongst the prestigious Salaf, Ibn Hajar Asqalani in *Taqreeb al Tehdeeb*, page 83 and in *Tahdib al-Tahdib*, Volume 3 page 28 graded him as authentic and truthful figures and showered him with epithets such as Rijlan, Salehan and Sidooqan. He was born in 80 H and died at the age of 56. Did the process involving abrogation of verses and recitation continue until that period? By that time the compilers of the Uthmani manuscript were in their graves. Abdul Wahab Sherani has been named as "Al Faqih al Hadith" in a book of Ahle Sunnah 'Kashf al Zanoon' Volume 5 page 641.

Points for the ulema of Sipah e Sahaba and their fellow Nawasib to mull over

People should take the ignorance of these Nawasib seriously. They believe that some words in the Quran were incorrect and that Archangel Jibrail revealed them in this wrong manner, and our Holy Prophet [s] kept reciting them in the same incorrect way and he transferred those taught these incorrect words to the Sahaba kept on making this incorrect recital. This unfortunate state of affairs continued until one Sunni scholar met Allah [swt] and presented his recitation before Allah (swt) who informed him of the correct recitation and he subsequently disseminated the original revelation of Allah [swt] to the Ummah.

If this is indeed the belief of Nawasib then we Shias keep aloof from those whose atrocious beliefs raise doubts over the authenticity and truthfulness of Jibrail and the Holy Prophet [s]. If Sipah e Sahaba are going to present justifications and explanations, then we would like to know who has given them the right to provide justifications when they do not afford the same write to their opponents?

10. Chapter Ten: Conclusion

Traditions that imply that the Quran has been a victim of Tahreef are present in both Shia and Ahle Sunnah texts. From our detailed discussion we have proved that the Shia of Ali [as] do not believe in the distortion of the Quran and our belief has been corroborated by the prestigious scholars of Ahle Sunnah. Imam of Ahle Sunnah Muhhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehalwi in his renowned anti-Shia book writes:

"It is proven from all the traditions of the Imamia that the Ahlulbayt used to recite this same Qur'an and based their decisions in accordance with it. The commentary of the Qur'an by Imam Hasan Askari is the commentary of this same Qur'an. All his children, relatives and servants studied 'this' Qur'an, and he used to order them to recite this Qur'an when praying. It is due to this fact that Shaykh Ibn Babuya in his book "Al Eitiqad" denied that the Qur'an had been altered."

 [Taufha Ithna Ashari \(Urdu\), Page 281, Published by Noor Muhammad Kutub khana Karachi](#)

Imam of the Deobandies Shaykh Abu Muhammad Abdul Haq Haqqani in his famed Tafsir of Holy Quran confirmed the fact that the Shia believe in the authenticity of the Quran. In the English translation of his tafsir we read:

"(3). An answer to the third objection is that, critics among the Shia sects are quite averse to such an idea and clearly show their disapproval of it. Sheikh Saduq Abu Jaafar Muhamed, the son of Ali Babaya, tells us in his Treatise upon Creeds that "Holy Qoran given by God to the Prophet is just the same which people have near themselves. It has neither deductions not additions in it". Sayyid Murtaza who had been acknowledged as one of the learned Shias, thus writes in his commentary called Majma-ul-Bayan, "the Qoran is exactly the same that was in the time of our Prophet, without a bit of change". Qazi Nurullah Shustari in his book Masaib-uin-Nawasib writes that it is quite wrong to ascribe it to the Shiah that they believe there are changes in Quran. The critics among us do not believe in it at all. It would bring no credit to some who might be led to do so. Mulla Sadiq in his book Shrah-e-Kulaini says that Holy Quran will remain quite free and safe upto the time of Imam Mahdi. Muhammad the son of Amili, has refuted this spurious idea with strong arguments"

 [An introduction to the commentary on the Holy Qoran by Maulwi Aboo Muhammad Abdul Haqq Haqqani \(published in Calcutta 1910\), page 306](#)

This can also be found in Tafseer-e-Haqani, 1st Edition, Page 63, published in Lahore.

Why do the Deobandies of Sipah e Sahabah still accuse the Shia of believing that the Quran has been distorted when their Imams accepted the testimonies offered by the Shia on the authenticity of the Holy Quran?

In addition to the above two, there exist numerous Sunni scholars who likewise endorsed that the Shia believe in the completeness of the Holy Quran. They include:

1. Imam Abu Zahra Misri in Al-Imam Al-Sadiq, page 206, Published Egypt.
2. Shaykh Ghazzali of Egypt in Difa an Al-Aqida wa Al-Shariah, page 265-266, Publishers Al kutub Al hadisia, Egypt, 1985
3. Allamah Shamas-ul-Haq Afghani as quoted in Ulum-ul-Qur'an, page 134-136, Published Lahore
4. Principal of the Shariah Department of Al Azhar University, Allamah Shaykh Muhammed-al-Madani in Risalah'thul-Islam, 11th Edition, pages 382-383, 4th Part

Alhamdulillah both Shia and Ahle Sunnah do not believe in the traditions recorded in their texts

referring to Tahreef of the Quran, they have solved and understood such traditions on this topic which are termed Sahih with Taweel and Tojeeh. But the Nawasib who reject the interpretation of such traditions as offered by the Shia Ulema want to impose their own understanding of such traditions on us. If they are going to continue to adhere to this stance then by the same token they also have no right to offer any excuses and interpretations for the authentic texts inferring tahreef that are recorded in their books.

If these minds that are polluted with the filthy disease called Nasbism are still adamant on their Shia hatred and want to attribute the belief of Tahreef of the Quran to us, deeming it Kufr whilst ignoring the narrations of their own beloved scholars and Sahaba we are likewise entitled to demand that the same edicts are issued against all of those notable figures who have either narrated, recorded or endorsed the traditions that imply that there has been Tahreef in the Quran.

164.The list of those Sahaba and Tab'een who testified about mistakes in the present day Quran

1. Ayesha
2. Hafsa
3. Umar
4. Ibn Umar
5. Uthman bin Affan
6. Aban bin Uthman
7. Ibn Abbas
8. Abu Musa al-Ash'ari
9. Ubai bin Ka`b
10. Abdullah Ibn Masud
11. Abu Muawyah
12. Urwah bin Zubair
13. Hasham bin Umro
14. Harun bin Musa
15. Zubair bin al Harees
16. Akramah
17. Abdullah
18. Yahyah bin Abu Bashir
19. Saeed bin Jubair
20. Ismail Makki
21. Qatadah
22. Hassan Basri
23. Ubaid bin Zuhaak
24. Mujahid

This is a list of 'some' of those sahaba which we have derived in the light of Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Tafseer Itqan and other sources. If all Sahaba are like stars and anyone amongst them can be taken as guide then by the same figures these figures who marked errors in the Quran of Uthman are also worthy of being followed.

165.The list of those Sunni Scholars who have stated, recorded or have endorsed the traditions which evidence distortion to the Quran

1. Jalaluddin Suyuti
2. Imam Bukhari
3. Imam Muslim
4. Abu Daud

5. Ibn Hazm
6. Imam Hakim
7. Imam Dhahabi
8. Imam Ahmed
9. Ibn Kathir
10. Ibn Hajar Asqalani
11. Imam Behaqi
12. Qurtubi
13. Abi Bakar Sajistani
14. Baghwi
15. Imam Fakhruddin Razi
16. Imam Ibn Jarir Tabari
17. Imam Shokani
18. Imam Badruddin Al-A'ini
19. Imam Anwar Shah Kashmiri
20. Shaykh Abdul Wahab Sherani
21. Raghیب Asfahani
22. Allamah Qazi Thanauallah Pani Patti
23. Imam Abu Hanifa
24. Imam Auzai
25. Imam Malik
26. Dr. Israr Ahmed

Interestingly a world renowned Nasibi figure Maulana Haafiz Maher Muhammad Mianwali writes in his book "THE JA'FARI FIQH AND MUSLIMS" which is also available online at the website of Muawiya bin "Hinda Haq Char Yaari" [the four friends of Hinda]:

Maulana Haafiz Maher Muhammad Mianwali
Khomeini, like many of the present-day shiihahs, does not hold the view that the Qur'an has been changed. On the other hand, he does not regard Nuurii Tabrasi as an apostate, but respectful refers to him and authoritatively quotes him in his book, 'Wukaayat Faqiih'. --Al-Hukuumatul Ilaahiyyah'.

 <http://www.kr-hcy.com/statichtml/files/104285993825971.shtml>

Do the Nasibi Meher Mianwali and present-day adherents of his school hold the view that the Quran has been changed? When they have a plethora of texts in their authentic sources that imply Tahrif, what point he is trying to make here? And have Meher Mianwali and his fellow Nasibi mullahs and adherents ever declared the above cited 24 Sahaba and Taba`in and 25 prominent scholars and Imams of Ahle Sunnah as apostates? Or should we apply the same Nasibi logic and automatically deem them as apostates? Rather than grade them as apostates why do these individuals still enjoy respect and an authoritative rank? Don't the Nawasib of Sipah-e-Sahaba continually bark on about respecting such individuals to the extent that they issue fatwas of Kufr on those who malign them ?

Why do they demand what they themselves do not initiate? Why the double standards? Those who claim that anyone who has recoded a tradition which implies the incompleteness of Quran is Kafir, should in the first instance pass this Fatwa against the scholars listed above.

The father of Sipah-e-Sahaba namely Haq Nawaz Jhangvi went a step further and after quoting a text from a Shia scholar and interpreting it according to his own thought yapped in one of his speeches:

Haq Nawaz Jhangvi stated:

No Shia has ever given edict of Kufr on him, no Shia has ever called him La'een (cursed one), then I reserve this right that Shia is worst Kafir on planet.....he is the biggest Kaafir on this earth, biggest Dajjal on this planet, biggest La'een on this earth, biggest Iblis on this earth, to cover the Kufr of this Kaafir is actually to make your hereafter destroyed"

 <http://kr-hcy.com/shia/quranindex.shtml>

Did Nasibi Jhangvi place his whore mothers veil over his filthy eyes when he read his 'Sahihs' and other authentic texts which contain a wealth of texts that imply Tahrif to the Quran? What prevented him from issuing the same Kufr Fatwa against the Salaf and their Ulema in his speech who recorded details on Tahreef? Why did he never declare the above cited 25 Imams as the worst Kaafir, Iblis, Dajjal, and the worst La'een creatures on planet? If he reserved the right to call Shia authors Kafir and La'een then he and his Nasibi followers should also have no objection if their opponents reserve the right to do likewise. If according to the logic of this follower of Hinda's madhab, to cover the text which implies Tahrif is actually to destroy one's hereafter then we have alhamdulillah preserved our hereafter by citing numerous traditions and statements from Sahaba and Imams recorded in their texts which clearly imply Tahrif to the Quran.

11. Copyright

All rights, including copyright, in the content of these Answering-Ansar.org web pages are owned or controlled for these purposes by the Answering-Ansar.org team.

You can distribute the download version of "Adobe® PDF" documents of the Answering-Ansar.org articles, as long as the documents remain in their original state and none of the contents are modified in any format.

The Answering-Ansar.org reserves the right over the contents of the articles if they are used in the original format. You can freely distribute the Islamic references and quotes that we use in our articles in any format.

When using our articles in your websites or if in distribution in print format, please include the source as Answering-Ansar.org.

Our web site contains links to third party sites. These links are used for the convenience of our users; however, they are not under the control of Answering-Ansar.org. We are not responsible for their contents, nor should they be considered endorsements of the individual linked sites.

However, it is possible that the site could contain typographical errors. If such a condition is brought to our attention, a reasonable effort will be made to fix or remove it.

If you wish to reproduce, print and distribute our articles in book format, then you will need a written permission of Answering-Ansar.org. If you wish to do so, then please contact us for further details.