



النقي الناصح

**MAM ĀLI BIN
MUHAMMAD
AL-HADI (PBUH)**

The **Pure Advisor**

FAWZI AL-SAIF

2024

IMAM ALI BIN MUHAMMAD AL-HADI (AS) The **Pure Advisor**

By: Fawzi al-saif

Translated by: Adnan Alsaffar



بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

Contents

Preface..... 9

Introductory Lines11

1. His blessed birth and noble age: 12

2. His upbringing: 12

3. Imam al-Hadi’s Leadership of the Imamate 13

4. The Imamate of al-Hadi, peace be upon him, in his youth did not cause a problem: 15

5. The reaction of al-Mu’tasim al-Abbasi to the Imamate of al-Hadi:..... 17

6. The Imam in the era after al-Mu’tasim al-Abbasi:.. . 21

7. Imam Ali al-Hadi, peace be upon him,
during the era of al-Mutawakkil al-Abbasi:25

8. Bringing Imam al-Hadi to Samarra and
imposing residence on him there:30

9. The roles of the Imam and his duties:35

10. The Lean Years in Samarra39

11. The conditions of Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him,
after the death of Al-Mutawakkil. 41

12. The Imam’s martyrdom (or his death)?43

Endnotes 49

Preface

1. The book in your hands, dear reader, is an abridgement of the biography of one of the fourteen infallibles in Shia Islam. Its pages constitute about 25% of the original book, which also bears the same title. With Allah's Grace and Will, the original book will be translated at a later date.
2. This book, and the other books in the same series, are aimed at the young generation of Shia Muslims who do not have a good command of the Arabic language, in which the original book was written. It therefore assumes a basic knowledge of the concepts related to the Infallible and their life, and seeks to analyze and expand on them.

We note that there are very few translated books in English on the lives of the Imams, especially for young English speakers. This is despite the importance of the topic, and it is one of the reasons that prompted this translation project.

3. Since this book and the rest of the series have been translated by multiple individuals and in different ways, it is natural that they will not all be in a consistent style. We would therefore be grateful if the reader would help us by pointing out any errors or observations they may have, so that they can be corrected in future editions.

I ask Allah Almighty to reward the reader, the author of these pages, and the translators with His recompense and blessings, and the intercession of the Infallibles, may peace and blessing be upon them.

Fawzi Muhammad Taqi Al Saif
Tarut - Qatif
20/09/1445 H

Introductory Lines

His name: Ali bin Muhammad bin Ali bin Musa bin Ja'far bin Muhammad bin Ali bin Al-Hussein bin Ali bin Abi Talib, peace be upon them

His title: The tenth Imam of the Muslims from the infallible Imams of the Ahlulbayt

- His honorific: Abu al-Hassan
- His Titles: Al-Hadi, An-Naqi, An-Nasih
- His noble age: 42 years
- His birth: In Medina
- His martyrdom: In Samarra, Iraq

1. His blessed birth and noble age:

Like his father, Muhammad al-Jawad, peace be upon them, his birth was in the month of Rajab, which is the closest approximation^[1]. This was in the year 212 AH^[2] in Medina, in the agricultural village of Sarya, established by his great-grandfather, Imam Musa bin Ja'far al-Kadhim. Since he was martyred in the year 254 AH, his noble age would thus be 42 years.

His honoured mother is: Samana al-Maghribiya^[3], and it suffices in her regard and her virtue what was narrated about him, peace be upon him, from his saying: "My mother recognizes my right, and she is among the people of Paradise. No rebellious devil comes near her, nor is she reached by the cunning of a stubborn tyrant. She is protected by the eye of Allah that does not sleep, and she does not fall short of the mothers of the truthful and the righteous"^[4].

2. His upbringing:

Imam al-Jawad, peace be upon him, began to indicate the distinction of his son Ali al-Hadi and his inheritance of the knowledge of his fathers, and his selection for the Imamate, explicitly and implicitly, as to accommodate what the listener could bear. The last of these was Ismail bin Mihran's narration around the year 218 AH, when Imam al-Jawad, peace be upon him, was brought by force to Baghdad by the order of al-Mu'tasim, where the Imam, peace be upon him, informed Ismail that he feared for him from this journey and that "the matter after me is to my son Ali"^[5].

Among these narrations was what Al-Saqr bin Abi Dulaf reported, saying: I heard Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Ali bin Musa al-Ridha, peace be upon them, saying: "The Imam after me is my son Ali, his command is my command, his word is my word, and obedience to him is obedience to me, and the Imam after him is his son Hasan, his command is his father's command, his word is his father's word, and obedience to him is obedience to his father"^[6].

During the first six years of his noble life, he was under the direct care of his father, al-Jawad, peace be upon him. Despite having brothers like Musa al-Mubarraqa and sisters alongside him, since he was the chosen one for the Imamate, he was an extension of his father and the bearer of his knowledge, and the proof upon his nation.

It is plausible that, to protect him from the danger of al-Mu'tasim al-Abbasi, who assumed power in the year 218 AH and was known for his fierceness and his dislike for knowledge, as we previously explained in our book about Imam al-Jawad, peace be upon him, Imam al-Jawad kept his son Ali al-Hadi, peace be upon them, in Medina and did not take him with him to Baghdad on his last journey, which lasted two years and ended with his assassination by al-Mu'tasim in the year 220 AH.

3. Imam al-Hadi's leadership of the Imamate

With the martyrdom of his father, Muhammad al-Jawad, peace be upon them, Abu al-Hasan Ali al-Hadi assumed the divine Imamate at about the age of eight, since his birth was

in the year 212 AH and the martyrdom of his father occurred in the year 220 AH, as we have mentioned in the previous lines.

Here, it is necessary to establish and confirm some dates to avoid confusion, as has occurred with some writers and authors, for they:

A/ They disagreed on the duration of his stay, peace be upon him, with his father, where some said it was six years and five months or that it was six years and months. The correct view that we adopt is that it was eight years in the manner we have presented. This is also what al-Tabarsi said^[7].

B/ They also differed in the duration of his Imamate from its beginning to his martyrdom, peace be upon him, between the statement that it was thirty years as mentioned by al-Tustari^[8], or that it was thirty-three. The correct view that we adopt is that it was thirty-four years, as he was poisoned in the year 254 AH, and his noble age was 42 years as we have presented. He assumed the Imamate at the age of eight years, of course, this disregards the number of months and days in each. This basis is what we will rely on for both points.

Despite the martyrdom of Imam al-Jawad, peace be upon him, in Baghdad, his son Ali al-Hadi informed about it on the same day while he was in Medina and shared this with some of his companions. He went to his father's house and his aunts and informed them about the news. Since it might not have been appropriate for him to tell them that this was from the special knowledge that Allah had bestowed upon him, especially at such a young age, he approached it in another

way, which was that he felt a serenity and submission to Allah that he had not experienced before.

This was mentioned by Harun bin al-Fadl who said: "I saw Abu al-Hasan (al-Hadi), peace be upon him, on the day Abu Ja'far (al-Jawad) passed away, saying: 'To Allah we belong and to Him we shall return.. Abu Ja'far, may Allah bless him (meaning his father), has passed away.'

When asked, 'How did you know that?' He said, 'I felt a humility and submission that I had not experienced before.'

Similarly, he returned to his family home as Hasan bin Ali al-Washsha narrated: 'Um Muhammad, the servant of Abu al-Hasan al-Rida (peace be upon him), told me: Abu al-Hasan (peace be upon him) came, looking alarmed, until he sat in the lap of his grandmother, the daughter of Musa al-Kadhim, his father's aunt, and she said to him: 'What is wrong?'

He said to her: 'My father has died - by Allah - just now.'

She said: 'Do not say that!'

He said: 'It is - by Allah - as I tell you.'

So, we noted the time and the day, and his passing, peace be upon him, occurred, and it was as he, peace be upon him, had said.^[9]

4. The Imamate of al-Hadi, peace be upon him, in his youth did not cause a problem:

Unlike the Imamate of his father al-Jawad, peace be upon him, his Imamate did not raise any problems or questions among the Shia, nor was there hesitation about it. Instead, acceptance of it was smooth; we did not witness objections like those faced by his father, peace be upon him, or the emergence of opposing factions. Perhaps this was because the period of Imamate during which his father al-Jawad, peace be upon him, remained, completely removed any question on both theoretical and practical levels as we mentioned in our book (The Greatest Blessing; Imam al-Jawad). This was summarised by the jurist al-Hashimi, Ali bin Imam Ja'far al-Sadiq, who said: "What should I do if Allah did not see this old man fit for Imamate but saw this boy suitable for it?"

Thus, the matter among the Shia was conclusive, and they knew that divine Imamate is not about height, bodily bulk, or old age, but rather a divine selection that transcends human criteria that qualify - in their view - this person and disqualify that one.

16

Indeed, Imam al-Jawad, peace be upon him, definitively clarified to remove any doubt that the matter of Imamate would go to him, even though he was seven years old at that time. Muhammad bin Ismail bin Bazi said: Abu Ja'far (al-Jawad), peace be upon him, said to me: "This matter will lead to Abu al-Hasan while he is seven years old." Then he said: Yes! And even younger than seven years, as was the case with Jesus, peace be upon him.^[10]

Ali bin Mahziyar, who was among the trustworthy associates and agents of Imam al-Jawad, peace be upon him, made this clear, saying: "I said to Abu al-Hasan (al-Hadi), peace be upon

him: 'Indeed, I had asked your father about the Imam after him, and he explicitly named you.'⁽¹¹⁾

5. The reaction of al-Mu'tasim al-Abbasi to the Imamate of al-Hadi:

We notice in the biographies of the Infallibles, peace be upon them, that rulers (especially the Abbasids) had varying reactions towards the Imams' assumption of the Imamate in reality. While al-Mansur al-Abbasi ordered his governor in Medina to kill anyone who became the successor(wasi) for Imam Ja'far al-Sadiq, peace be upon him, and the Imam after him, it was only a well-prepared plan by Imam al-Sadiq, peace be upon him, that ensured –with God's protection– the safety of Imam Musa bin Ja'far, peace be upon him. Similarly, Harun al-Abbasi had plans for Imam Ali bin Musa al-Rida, but the approach of al-Ma'mun al-Abbasi was different as he tried to "contain" the Imam, purportedly, and "isolate" him from his Shia in Medina by bringing him to Baghdad for some time, attempting to make him a part of the caliph's entourage and showing his interest in him!

Regarding al-Mu'tasim al-Abbasi (Muhammad bin Harun), he thought –with his flawed opinion– that since Ali al-Hadi was young (8 years old), entrusting one of the scholars from the caliphs' school to educate and cultivate him would divert him from the knowledge of his fathers to another realm, and separating him from his Shia and his father's companions would scatter the Shia since they would have no central figure to rally around, especially since his brother (Musa al-Mubarraqa)

was not trusted by his father's Shia and did not possess the necessary knowledge, being younger in age!

This was a critical strike in al-Mu'tasim's opinion, aiming to destroy Shi'ism as a community and school, and to end the line of Imamate by having the son of al-Jawad educated with a culture and knowledge in line with the caliphate's current, which did not recognize the merits of his fathers.

We say, regarding his flawed opinion, –that is if we regard him as worthy of having an opinion– , .^[12]

to be described as flawed! Because we have seen the rest of the Abbasid caliphs –despite their enmity– towards the Imams of guidance, peace be upon them, yet they recognized their distinction and their superior knowledge over others, and that they were “fed knowledge profoundly.”^[13]

Based on this, al-Mu'tasim al-Abbasi ordered his governor over Medina, Omar bin al-Faraj al-Rukhkhaji, to execute this plan, which al-Mas'udi referred to in “Ithbat al-Wasiyya”^[14].

18

He said: “.

Omar bin al-Faraj al-Rukhkhaji^[15] arrived in Medina as a pilgrim after the passing of Abu Ja'far (al-Jawad), peace be upon him. He summoned a group of people from Medina who opposed and were hostile to the Ahlulbait of the Prophet of Allah (may Allah bless him and his family). He said to them: “Find me a man of literature, Qur'an, and knowledge who does not ally with this house, so I may assign him to this boy and entrust him with his education, and I will make it clear to him to prevent the Rafidah (Shi'a) who seek and reach out to him.”

They named for him a man of literature, known as Abu Abdullah and referred to as al-Junaydi, who was prominent among the people of Medina for his literature and understanding, and openly hostile. Omar bin al-Faraj presented him and granted him funds from the sultan's wealth, communicated to him what he wanted, and informed him that the sultan ordered him to choose someone like him and entrust him with this boy.

Al-Junaydi would keep Abu al-Hasan in Seria, and when night fell, he would lock the door, take the keys with him.

This situation continued for a while, and the Shi'a were cut off from him and from listening or reading to him. Then, I met him on a Friday, greeted him, and said to him: "What happened to this Hashemite boy whom you are educating?"

He replied, denying my wording: "You say the boy! And not say the Hashemite sheikh?! I ask you by Allah, do you know anyone in Medina more knowledgeable than me?"

I said: "No."

He said: "By Allah, when I recite to him a section of literature thinking I have mastered it, he dictates to me a chapter in which I benefit from him. People think I am teaching him, but by Allah, I am learning from him."^[16]

The result of the (miserable plan) devised by al-Mu'tasim al-Abbasi was that al-Junaydi acknowledged the Imamate of Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, instead of changing the Imam's thoughts and culture! And he became one of his advocates.

Amazed by this man who “his father died in Iraq while he was a child in Medina, and grew up among these black slaves, so where did he learn this from?” And that al-Junaydi would mention to him “from the long chapters (of the Quran) what he had not reached in its recitation, a reading I have never heard cleaner from anyone, with a voice sweeter than the Psalms of Prophet David, peace be upon him, to which his reading is likened.”^[17]

History does not specify the duration that Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, spent in what resembled detention and house arrest imposed by al-Mu'tasim al-Abbasi through his governor al-Rukhkhaji. However, we do not believe it was lengthy, as it was not long before the teacher al-Junaydi showed signs of admiration for the Imam's personality and faith in his exceptional knowledge. Naturally, in such a case, it was expected that the government would end this mission!!

However, after this period, he lived in Medina in normal circumstances. We believe this was because al-Mu'tasim al-Abbasi became preoccupied with other matters in Baghdad and other parts of the state; on one hand, following the escalating anger of the people towards the excesses of the Turkish militia he formed to protect himself and his government. This Turkish militia grew increasingly powerful day by day from the first days of his caliphate in 218 AH until it became unbearable in its interference in people's lives^[18].

Thus, the decision was made to relocate it and move with it to Samarra (130 km from Baghdad). Then planning and construction of Samarra began in the year 221 AH. It was natural for him to be preoccupied with this significant project over

others. Some authors suggest^[19], that the move to it occurred in the year 222 AH.

Additionally, his preoccupation with fighting those who rose against him in internal movements, as occurred with Babak Khorramdin in 222 AH and Mazyar in Tabaristan in 224 AH, and what was said about the battle of Amorium with the Byzantines between them, distracted him from targeting Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him^[20]. In the year 223 AH, and by the time the year 227 AH arrived, al-Mu'tasim al-Abbasi had died in the manner described by Du'bil al-Khuza'i about him and his successor:

"A Caliph died, and no one mourned him, and another came, and no one rejoiced for him."

6. The Imam in the era after al-Mu'tasim al-Abbasi:

Al-Mu'tasim had three sons who assumed the caliphate: Harun, known as al-Wathiq; Ja'far, known as al-Mutawakkil; and Ahmad, known as al-Musta'in. Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, lived through the reigns of all these rulers and was martyred by al-Mu'tazz al-Abbasi, the son of al-Mutawakkil, who was deposed by the Turks and died in the year 255 AH.

After the death of al-Mu'tasim al-Abbasi, the caliphate went to his son, al-Wathiq. History does not record any adverse actions by al-Wathiq towards Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him. Moreover, al-Wathiq's caliphate did not last long; he assumed power in 227 AH and it ended in 232 AH, lasting

no more than five years! This phenomenon will be observed during this phase of the Abbasid caliphate's history. Except for al-Mutawakkil al-Abbasi, whose caliphate lasted 15 years, we will notice that the reigns of the rest of the caliphs were short (ranging from five years for some to six months for others). This indicates several points; among them is the intense conflict among the candidates for the caliphate, as long as the only requirement was being a son of the family, and from the lineage of so-and-so. It also includes the frequent interventions by the Turkish militia, which they brought for their protection from the people, but then needed the people to protect themselves from it! Too late for regret! It also shows how weakness spread throughout this caliphate.

This might indicate, as we mentioned, the lack of finding of any negative, severe positions from al-Wathiq towards the Imam and his Shia. It appears that he was the one who – outwardly– performed the funeral prayer for Imam al-Jawad, as reported by Ibn al-Athir^[21].

Indeed, it might be conveyed through his approach that it was different from his father al-Mu'tasim's, to the extent that al-Wathiq was likened to his uncle al-Ma'mun, even being called "al-Ma'mun the younger" in reference to his love for knowledge and learning. It is reported about him that when he assumed power, "he treated people well, included the Alawites, went to great lengths in honouring them, doing good to them, and entrusted them with wealth^[22]." We do not wish to accept everything stated in this text that Ibn al-Athir relied upon and was subsequently transmitted by others. However, we point

out that the general impression of al-Wathiq al-Abbasi was not negative towards the Ahlulbayt, peace be upon them.

Indeed, it may appear from what al-Khatib al-Baghdadi transmitted that he, like his uncle al-Ma'mun, believed in the exceptional knowledge of the Ahlulbayt. Specifically regarding Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, who was 15 years old when al-Wathiq assumed the caliphate. Al-Khatib al-Baghdadi relayed a story in which Yahya bin Aktham, the judge, asked in the presence of al-Wathiq - and scholars in his presence - "Who shaved Adam's head when he performed Hajj?" The people hesitated to answer, so al-Wathiq said: "I will bring someone who can inform you of the matter," and he sent for Ali bin Muhammad bin Ali bin Musa bin Ja'far bin Muhammad bin Ali bin al-Hussein bin Ali bin Abi Talib, who was brought in, and asked: "O Abu al-Hasan, who shaved Adam's head?" He said: "I ask you by Allah, O Commander of the Faithful, to excuse me from answering." Al-Wathiq said: "I swear you must say." He replied: "If you insist, then my father told me from his grandfather from his father from his grandfather, who said: The Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace be upon him) said: Gabriel was commanded to descend with a ruby from Paradise," So he descended with it, and he rubbed it over Adam's head (peace be upon him), and his hair scattered from it, and wherever its light reached, it became a sanctuary^[23]."

Indeed, if the narration was accurate, his statement "I will bring someone who can inform you of the matter!" points to what we mentioned about his awareness of the knowledge of the Family of Muhammad, which others are incapable of possessing. Of course, we do not mean to say that he was a

believer in them! For his situation would not be better than that of his uncle al-Ma'mun al-Abbasi, who was well-informed about the detailed knowledge of Imam al-Rida and al-Jawad, peace be upon them, yet he committed against Imam al-Rida what he did!

Perhaps the avoidance by the Imams, peace be upon them, and their Shia of engaging in the issue of "the creation of the Quran" and the controversy that followed it^[24], and perhaps the words of the Imams on this matter, such as their saying "Everything other than Allah is created," which al-Wathiq and his government might understand as not opposing them, contributed to calming the stance of the Abbasid rule at the time against the Imams and their Shia. Otherwise, al-Wathiq's rigid and harsh stances towards his opponents on this issue, which reached the point of execution, just as his brother al-Mutawakkil al-Abbasi did on the opposite side, would not be approved by the Ahlulbayt, peace be upon them, nor does it align with their approach!

24

Yes, the narrative transmitted by al-Khatib al-Baghdadi raises a question: Where was that assembly held? Was it in Samarra after al-Mu'tasim established it and moved there in the year 222 AH, transferring the capital? This possibility is weakened by the fact that Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, was in Medina until al-Mutawakkil al-Abbasi summoned him to Samarra in the year 243 AH (after al-Wathiq's caliphate) following a slander by Rayhan (Ibn Atraj) al-Abbasi, which will be discussed later.

Or was it in Baghdad during the times when al-Wathiq was there, and during his father al-Mu'tasim's caliphate, since

he used to delegate authority to him when he left the city, as indicated by Ibn al-Athir in the context of al-Mu'tasim's campaign against Amorium^[25]?

Before he began the construction of Samarra? This is also a possibility. The question remains: was Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, in Baghdad at that time, or was he summoned to come from Medina?

There is also a possibility that this assembly took place in Mecca or Medina, during al-Wathiq's pilgrimage to Hajj or his visit to the Prophet. This is the view inclined to by Sheikh al-Korani.^[26] Where he supported this statement with the fact that al-Wathiq had performed Hajj^[27] once,^[28] and it was in the year 231 AH, which means that the Imam, peace be upon him, was under the age of twenty.

7. Imam Ali al-Hadi, peace be upon him, during the era of al-Mutawakkil al-Abbasi:

The observer's astonishment does not cease when looking into the life of Ja'far al-Mutawakkil bin al-Mu'tasim al-Abbasi, who assumed the caliphate after his brother al-Wathiq. This came after the state's pillars did not accept the allegiance to Muhammad (the son of al-Wathiq), who was still a minor when his father passed away. They brought in Ja'far al-Mutawakkil, his uncle, who was disfavored by his brother al-Wathiq, and placed in a situation resembling isolation and house arrest, with his powers significantly reduced to the lowest levels.^[29]

This is not of great importance to us, as it is not the first time “a flask has been broken” in Islam! The caliphate, which was diverted from Amir al-Mu'minin Ali, peace be upon him, and his household, was naturally destined to end this way!

What is important to us is to take a closer look at this (al-Mutawakkil), who was a collection of contradictions, given that our Imam Ali al-Hadi, peace be upon him, lived through the longest period of his Imamate during his time, may Allah send his prayers and blessings upon him. Al-Mutawakkil was the one who brought him to Samarra and kept him there until al-Mutawakkil died (232 AH - 247 AH), and the Imam was still in Samarra.

Historians report that al-Mutawakkil was described as a youthful and effeminate man with long hair at the back, and he used to wear the attire of effeminate men, which was one of the reasons for his brother al-Wathiq's anger towards him. So much so that when Ja'far (al-Mutawakkil) asked one of the ministers to mediate with al-Wathiq to appease him, al-Wathiq ordered (al-Mutawakkil) to be brought in and commanded that his hair be shaved off completely, as they say, took his hair and struck his face with it as an insult. Moreover, he possibly assigned people to monitor him to prevent him from veering into that deviant direction.^[30]

This very person would become, overnight, a reviver of the Sunnah and a suppressor of innovation!

And while you see him choosing man called, Ubada (who was known to be an effeminate)^[31] to be his close companion, to the point where he became the official companion in the court

of the caliphate, you see him exhausting Ahmad bin Abi Nasr al-Jahdami as a punishment for transmitting a hadith about the virtues of Amir al-Mu'minin Ali, peace be upon him!

And regarding the matter of drinking wine^[32] - Like his predecessors - having a daily routine of drinking wine, you see him being sensitive about believers visiting the grave of Abu Abdullah al-Hussein bin Ali, peace be upon him! Because that is against the Sunnah, as journeys should not be undertaken for such purposes!! And at the same time, you see him drawing closer to the people of Hadith, anthropomorphists, and those who liken Allah to the creation!!

In any case, this effeminate young man who would later become (al-Mutawakkil ala Allah, Abu al-Fadl, Amir al-Mu'minin) assumed the caliphate at the age of twenty-six, without any religious or worldly qualifications. It suffices to take a quick glance at the list of his "achievements"(!!) to see how he became a reviver of the Sunnah!

- From the beginning of his reign in the year 232 AH, he wrote to the regions, declaring a change from what was the practice during the times of al-Wathiq, al-Mu'tasim, and al-Ma'mun regarding the belief in the creation of the Quran and that those who adhered to this belief should be punished.
- He summoned the hadith scholars to Samarra, generously rewarded them, and commanded them to narrate hadiths concerning attributes (anthropomorphism) (those who ascribe physical features to Allah) and seeing (incarnation), leading

these scholars to the mosques and schools, and their hadiths spread. This is what we see today in some hadith books.

Conversely, this same al-Mutawakkil would punish those who transmitted a hadith containing references to the Ahlulbayt, peace be upon them. Among those who suffered his punishment in this regard was Ali bin Nasr al-Jahdami,^[33] He had transmitted that the Messenger of Allah said: "Whoever loves me, and loves these two - meaning Al-Hasan and Al-Husayn - and loves their father and mother, will be with me at my level in Paradise." When al-Mutawakkil became aware of this, he ordered that he be lashed a thousand lashes!!

When they informed al-Mutawakkil and interceded for al-Jahdami by explaining that this man was not among the (Rafidha) and that he was unaware that the (reviver of the Sunnah) would disapprove of mentioning the virtues of the Ahlulbayt! And after attempts, the punishment was reduced to five hundred lashes.^[34]

So, this too is among his virtues and achievements!!

- And in the year 236 AH, he ordered the demolition of the grave of al-Husayn, peace be upon him, and the destruction of the surrounding buildings, and proceeded to prohibit the visitation of the noble grave under the threat of punishment.^[35]
- And in his "love" (!) for knowledge and the Prophet's progeny, in the year 244 AH, he killed Abu Ishaq Ya'qub bin al-Sikkit, the most knowledgeable person of his time in Arabic, who had authored eleven books,

the most important of which is “Islah al-Mantiq” (The Correction of Logic). It was said about it that there was no book on the bridge of Baghdad greater in the field of language than it. In addition to being “prominent in the presence of, (respected by), Abu Ja’far the Second (Imam Muhammad al-Jawad) and Abu al-Hasan (Imam Ali al-Hadi), peace be upon them, in narration and issues, al-Mutawakkil killed him due to his Shia belief, and his matter is well-known, reliable, and confirmed beyond doubt.”^[36]

The reason was that he (al-Mutawakkil) had appointed him to educate his sons, and one day, looking at his sons al-Mu’tazz and al-Mu’ayyad, he asked Ibn al-Sikkit, “Who is dearer to you, these two or al-Hasan and al-Husayn?” When he mentioned al-Hasanain (al-Hasan and al-Husayn) with the respect they deserve, al-Mutawakkil ordered the Turks, who then trampled on his stomach until he died!.^[37]

- For some, it was sufficient to disparage the family of the Prophet’s House to qualify them for governance and leadership, as happened with Abu al-Simt Marwan bin Abi al-Janub.^[38]
- And he completed his sins - with neither perfection in him nor in them - by imprisoning Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him. However, the duration of his imprisonment was not long because al-Mutawakkil died shortly thereafter at the hands of his son Muhammad al-Muntasir, with the assistance of the Turkish military officers.

Do you see these “achievements” that qualified him to be considered a reviver of the Sunnah? And led some to count him among the three most important caliphs in the history of Islam?

8. Bringing Imam al-Hadi to Samarra and imposing residence on him there:

One of the greatest misdeeds of al-Mutawakkil al-Abbasi, whose actions were entirely reprehensible and significant, was bringing Imam Ali al-Hadi, peace be upon him, from the city of his grandfather al-Mustafa to Samarra, in the year 243 AH^[39], against his will and contrary to what he desired

We have pointed out in several instances that the Imams, peace be upon them, despite being aware of the rulers’ intentions and policies, knew that someone like al-Mutawakkil’s aim in bringing the Imam was nothing but to isolate him from his Shia in Medina, Kufa, and elsewhere, and to place him in another city where he would be a stranger, in a sort of house arrest, and under surveillance. Nonetheless, they did not see it wise to overtly confront in a manner that might provide a superficial justification for their killing or engage in a battle with those rulers that would give them the opportunity to annihilate their Shia. This contrasts with the actions of the (Hasannite and Husaynite revolutionaries), who often ended up directly clashing with the military machinery of the caliphate, resulting in their deaths and the deaths of their supporters.

Al-Mas’udi mentioned in “Ithbat al-Wasiyya” that “Rayhan al-Abbasi, the one responsible for the prayers in the Haramain (Mecca and Medina), wrote to al-Mutawakkil: If you have any

need in the Haramain, then remove Ali bin Muhammad from them because he has called people to himself and many have followed him. Rayhan continued to send letters in this regard, so al-Mutawakkil dispatched Yahya bin Harthama...^[40] to carry Imam al-Hadi from Medina to Samarra.

And we did not find - as al-Khazali said^[41] - a biography for this Rayhan, and the correct thing is that there is a mistake or a scribal error in the name, for other sources refer to Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Dawood bin Isa bin Musa al-Abbasi^[42]. And the governor of Medina during that period, appointed by al-Mutawakkil, was the one who had campaigned against the Imam, peace be upon him, and sent letters to al-Mutawakkil inciting him by saying that he (the Imam) was calling people to himself and that if al-Mutawakkil had any hope for staying as a Caliph, then he should remove Ali al-Hadi from there.

This was mentioned by Sheikh al-Mufid, may Allah have mercy on him, in "Al-Irshad," and was explicitly stated by Ibn al-Sabbagh al-Maliki, who said: "It is narrated that the reason for the transfer of Abu al-Hasan Ali bin Muhammad from Medina to Surra Man Ra'a (city of Samarra) was that Abdullah bin Muhammad acted on behalf of the Caliph al-Mutawakkil in matters of war and prayer in the noble Medina. He campaigned against Abu al-Hasan to al-Mutawakkil and intended to harm him..."^[43]

And that campaign matched a desire within al-Mutawakkil, who "detested Ali and his progeny. So, when he learned of Ali's (al-Hadi) status in Medina and the people's inclination towards him, he feared him."^[44]

And the Imam, peace be upon him, was aware of the false letters filled with slander and malice that the governor of Medina, Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Dawood (Ibn Atraj), was sending to al-Mutawakkil. In response, he wrote to al-Mutawakkil, indicating his innocence from the accusations of the governor of Medina.

The letter from Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, to al-Mutawakkil al-Abbasi bore fruit in spoiling the plan of the governor of Medina to incite al-Mutawakkil. Indeed, it led al-Mutawakkil to remove him from his governorship of Medina (which, for those in power, is tantamount to ending his political and worldly future). However, al-Mutawakkil seized the opportunity to request the Imam to come to Samarra and wrote him a letter to that effect^[45]. It resembles a snake; soft to the touch, deadly is its venom.

Given this, it was natural for the Imam to depart from his grandfather's city, as we mentioned earlier, that the Imams, peace be upon them, were not advocates of blatant confrontation. They managed affairs gently as much as possible and did not give those tyrants any means to harm them and their followers.

When was the Imam brought to Samarra?

Al-Mufid in his book "Al-Irshad" and Al-Kulayni in "Al-Kafi" indicated that it was in the year 243 AH. This means he remained with al-Mutawakkil al-Abbasid for about four years until al-Mutawakkil was killed in 247 AH by his son al-Muntasir and his supporters among the Turkish leaders. This is the correct account, as we believe.

However, some researchers, including Sheikh Rasoul Ja'farian, followed by Sheikh Ja'far Al-Muhajir^[46], indicating the former's statement and his evidence, believe that the Imam was summoned and brought to Samarra in the year 233 AH. This means that he remained in Samarra for about twenty years until his martyrdom. Al-Mufid made a mistake in the timeline he specified by saying that this date was "a reference to the year in which one of the Shia reproduced the message of al-Mutawakkil to the Imam, and that in that year, 233 AH, Abdullah bin Muhammad Al-Hashimi wrote a letter to al-Mutawakkil, in which he said: 'If you have a need in the Haramain, then bring out Ali bin Muhammad from them, as he calls to himself and many people follow him.' After this, al-Mutawakkil instructed Yahya bin Harthama to bring the Imam al-Hadi to Samarra."

We believe that what Al-Mufid mentioned and what the letter referred to is correct for several reasons:

- A.** Firstly, we exclude the possibility that al-Mutawakkil, who assumed the caliphate on 24/12/232 AH, at the end of the year, would initiate the process of summoning and bringing the Imam within a few months!
- B.** Since Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Dawud al-Hashimi was overseeing the Haramain after this date (233 AH) by several years, Ibn Habib al-Baghdadi mentioned in ("Al-Mahbir" p.43) that he was performing Hajj in the year 239 AH^[47]. Despite what was mentioned in the letter from al-Mutawakkil to Imam al-Hadi, stating that he had dismissed Abdullah (whether Ibn Atrajah or Birriha, as mentioned in some books) from war and prayer duties, this implies that the governor of Medina

had schemed with the Imam and instigated al-Mutawakkil, and that the Imam had sent a letter to al-Mutawakkil refuting what the governor Abdullah had stated, and that al-Mutawakkil had sent a letter to the Imam reassuring him that he believed him and that he criticised of the governor of Medina, who did not respect the sanctity of the Imam, and al-Mutawakkil subsequently punished him with dismissal, seems inconsistent with the claim that he was performing Hajj and leading prayers in 239 AH and that he was dismissed in 233 AH. However, according to the assertion that he was indeed overseeing the Haramain and their affairs (including prayer and Hajj) in 239 AH, and during this period, people showed increasing support for the Imam, prompting the governor to send a letter of instigation to al-Mutawakkil, and the Imam responded with a clarifying letter to al-Mutawakkil. Consequently, al-Mutawakkil dismissed this governor and summoned the Imam thereafter in 243 AH, which corresponds to the date of al-Mutawakkil's letter. Furthermore, there is another piece of evidence supporting this, as Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Dawud bin Isa (al-Hashimi) remained the governor of Mecca and Medina until 241 AH, as mentioned by al-Azraqi when discussing the renovation of the Mas'a in the Haram Mosque, where he stated: "Abu al-Abbas Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Dawud bin Isa renewed it, and he was the governor of Mecca in the year forty-one and two hundred." Additionally, al-Tabari stated that he was the governor of Mecca in the year 239 AH.

9. The roles of the Imam and his duties:

The role of the Imams, peace be upon them, is summarized in that Allah, the Exalted, has made them “repositories of His wisdom, translators of His revelation, pillars of His oneness, witnesses over His creation, beacons for His servants, lighthouses in His lands, and guides upon His path.” While others are concerned with the earth and building palaces^[46] or gathering wealth, concubines, the Imams were accumulating virtues and merits, and collecting the scattered and branched rulings of the Sharia and the path to a good life leading to the pleasure of Allah the Almighty. This is what preserved the Sharia of Allah, the Exalted, and the religion of the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him and his family. This is what Imam Ali al-Hadi, peace be upon him, was preoccupied with, whether during his days in Medina or after moving to Samarra, despite the different political and general atmospheres in the latter compared to the former, with the former being easier and the latter more challenging.

In the coming pages, it will be shown that the Imam, peace be upon him, worked in multiple directions in this matter:

- From one perspective, the oneness of Allah in the nation was threatened by the activities of anthropomorphism (those who ascribe physical features to Allah) and those who ascribe to Him features of His creation, who became active during the time of the Abbasid Caliph Al-Mutawakkil. After having been relatively restrained during the reigns of Al-Ma'mun, Al-Mu'tasim, and Al-Wathiq, they returned with significant vigour under the protection

of Al-Mutawakkil. He officially invited them to promote narratives on seeing and describing Allah, a broad topic that opens up discussions on anthropomorphism (those who ascribe physical features to Allah) and the infiltration of distorted Jewish beliefs into the Muslim hadith tradition.

In response, Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, rose to promote the concept of transcendence in opposition to anthropomorphism, and he disseminated interpretations of the definitive verses of the Quran that refute the idea of physical embodiment and false beliefs. This was crucial because if the understanding of the oneness of Allah is corrupted and people are ignorant of His true nature, they end up worshipping a God who is different from Allah, the Exalted. In the upcoming pages, with the help of Allah, detailed accounts of his efforts through discussions, debates, and protests will be presented.

- During the reign of the Abbasid Caliph Al-Mutawakkil, and often directly due to his initiatives and support in all cases, there was a widespread sentiment of animosity and hostility towards Amir al-Mu'minin Ali ibn Abi Talib, peace be upon him. The extent of this hostility was such that anyone who spoke well of Imam Ali, peace be upon him, was subject to punishment, as was the case with Al-Jahidhmi. Conversely, those who reviled him (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), cursed him, and mocked him were favoured and sometimes even rewarded with governorship over regions!

If hostility towards Imam Ali, peace be upon him, was the general official stance in the Abbasid state, with only a few short exceptions, the extent of this hatred and the manner of its

public expression through various means at an official level were unprecedented in the history of the Muslims. Al-Mutawakkil, the Abbasid caliph, was explicitly described by many historians as a "Nasibi" (a term used to denote someone who shows enmity towards Imam Ali), a designation not commonly assigned to others despite their similar expressions of hostility towards the Imam. This unique degree of animosity directed at Imam Ali by official state policy under Al-Mutawakkil is notable for its intensity and the formal support it received.

In this regard, the Imam actively worked to revive and spread the virtues of Imam Ali, peace be upon him, and he encouraged people to visit him, especially on the occasion of Ghadir Day. This day is a pivotal moment that affirms his authority and leadership over the community. Further discussion on this topic will follow, God willing.

- While the caliphs were engaged in creating false battles, as though they were fighting windmills, they neglected the real issues that mattered to the nation, which expected from its rulers; justice, fairness, and equity. One such prolonged distraction was the Mihna (Inquisition) regarding the creation of the Qur'an, which lasted about three decades. The Abbasid rulers played with this issue like a ball, lifting it up or pressing it down according to the whims of the ruling caliph. The real victims were the people, both the general populace and the scholars, who were distracted and punished according to the caliph's stance. At times, severe punishments were meted out to those who believed in the uncreated nature of the Qur'an, and rewards were given to those who supported the

idea that the Qur'an was created and had a beginning. However, whenever the ruler changed, the situation reversed: those who had previously been rewarded for advocating the created nature of the Qur'an might then be whipped and killed for holding that view if it contradicted the new ruler's beliefs.

Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, strongly discouraged engagement in this futile controversy, clarifying that the issue was a pointless distraction that yielded no fruitful results, either from a scientific theoretical perspective or from a practical faith-based standpoint. He advised that people should not delve into this matter. (When the full book will be translated), God willing, there will be a detailed discussion on this topic, including an explanation of the Imam's stance and that of his followers regarding this matter.

Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, lived during a time when there were various misguided movements, including the extremist trend of "Ghuluw" (exaggeration), which was based on worldly interests and ignorance. On one hand, there were some adventurers greedy for leadership, prominence, and wealth who managed to deceive a portion of the ignorant who did not understand that:

"It is not unthinkable for Allah to gather the universe in one entity,"

As well as that Allah's grace upon His chosen ones is complete, elevating them to the highest status achievable by humans while they remain human. They are servants created

and sustained by Allah, indeed, the most devout and humble of Allah's creation in their servitude.

Just as likening Allah to His creation and anthropomorphizing Him is a grave sin against the Creator, so too is the exaggeration in the veneration of His servants (even if they are infallible Imams), a major transgression against them and against their Creator. Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, therefore, focused on combating this trend of Ghuluw on multiple fronts. Further details on this aspect and its implications will also be discussed, God willing.

10. The Lean Years in Samarra

From his arrival in Samarra in the year 243 AH as previously mentioned, until his martyrdom in the year 254 AH, Imam al-Hadi spent eleven years^[49]. From his arrival in Samarra in the year 243 AH until his martyrdom in 254 AH, Imam al-Hadi spent eleven difficult and lean years. Approximately four of these years were under the rule of Al-Mutawakkil al-Abbasi, who was assassinated in the year 247 AH by the Turks in collaboration with his son Al-Muntasir.

These years witnessed various forms of harassment and hardship for Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him. The first of these was his forced residence in Samarra, preventing his return to his homeland and place of origin, Medina. This form of harassment is known to be particularly severe as it forces a person to live as a stranger, dealing with an unfamiliar environment that may not be easily adaptable, unlike living in one's homeland.

Moreover, another form of harassment was the violation of the sanctity of his home. Intrusions sometimes occurred by climbing over the walls and rooftops in the manner of thieves and robbers. These repeated actions meant that his house was frequently breached, leaving the occupant feeling unsafe even within his own home, unable to relax or feel at peace in his daily life.

Additionally, Imam al-Hadi was subjected to abrupt summonses to the caliph's palace at any time without prior notice, sometimes in a manner reminiscent of repressive intelligence operations. He was brought in whatever state he was in, without any regard for his religious status or his position as, at the very least, a leader of a community within the nation. This disregard for his dignity and the disrespectful treatment highlight the extent of the challenges and disrespect he faced during his years in Samarra.

Another form of harassment against Imam al-Hadi included demands that he participates in their prohibited activities, such as drinking alcohol^[50], or to participate in frivolous gatherings and similar activities. The intent behind these demands was to tarnish the sacred image of the Imam held by the general public and especially his followers. However, the outcome was not as Al-Mutawakkil had intended. Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, firmly refused to join the frivolous caliph and his drunken companions in their revelry. Instead, he turned the situation around completely^[51].

Additionally, Imam al-Hadi was compelled to appear at the Abbasid court multiple times a week, to such an extent that his frequent presence was well-known among the general

public, almost as if he was required to mark attendance. This frequent requirement to appear was perceived by some to the extent that one of the people in need approached Imam al-Hadi as he was leaving the palace of Al-Mutawakkil^[52]. In some of these instances, deliberate attempts were made to humiliate Imam al-Hadi by making him walk ahead of Al-Mutawakkil, especially on scorching days, solely to showcase the caliph's military power.

Moreover, there was a display of animosity towards Amir al-Mu'minin Ali ibn Abi Talib, peace be upon him, to the extent that it was well-known that Al-Mutawakkil was among the Nasibis (those who show enmity towards Imam Ali)^[53]. It is said that this was one of the reasons that led his son, Al-Muntasir, to consider assassinating his father.

11. The conditions of Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, after the death of Al-Mutawakkil.

In the year 247 AH, Al-Mutawakkil experienced the same fate he imposed on others; he intended to dine with his son Al-Muntasir and his Turkish supporters, Bugha and Wasif, but they killed him before he could dine with them. Thus, the blood of the caliph (who proclaimed himself the supporter of the Sunnah) mixed with the wine of his enjoyment and his forbidden drink!^[54]

Following him—despite his reluctance—came his son Muhammad Al-Muntasir, who was commendable in his general attitudes towards the people, especially concerning the family

of the Prophet, peace be upon them. Some scholars even speculated about his Shia inclinations, as love for the family of the Prophet existed within the Abbasid palace despite Al-Mutawakkil's known enmity and hatred towards them^[55].

Ibn al-Athir mentions some of Al-Muntasir's qualities by saying: "Al-Muntasir was greatly patient, sound-minded, well-known for his benefactions, inclined towards good, generous, very just, and pleasant in companionship. He ordered people to visit the graves of Ali and Hussein, peace be upon them, thereby providing security to the Alawites, who had been fearful during the days of his father. He released their endowments and ordered the return of Fadak to the descendants of Hussein and Hasan, the sons of Ali ibn Abi Talib, peace be upon them."

Ibn al-Athir also mentions that one of the first actions Al-Muntasir took upon assuming the caliphate was to remove Saleh from the governance of Medina and appoint Ali ibn al-Hussein ibn Isma'il ibn Abbas ibn Muhammad in his place. It is reported that Ali ibn al-Hussein said, "When I went to bid him farewell, he said to me: 'O Ali, I am assigning you to my flesh and blood'—and he extended the skin of his forearm—and said: 'To this, I have directed you, so consider how you will be towards the people, and how you will treat them!' He meant the family of Abu Talib. I said: 'I hope to fulfill the view of the Commander of the Faithful, may God support him, regarding them, God willing.' He replied: 'Then you will be fortunate in that with me.'^[56]

However, these peaceful days did not last long—only about six months—when Al-Muntasir was assassinated through internal conspiracies within the Abbasid palace^[57].

The situation in the Abbasid palace became such that eliminating rivals became the primary concern for its men. Consequently, within a short period, there was a significant turnover of caliphs, and “their privates were cut,” and “they were struck with poisoned arrows.”^[58]

Shortly after, Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Al-Mu'tasim, nicknamed Al-Musta'in, came to power and ruled for less than three years. He was succeeded by Zubair ibn Al-Mutawakkil, known as Al-Mu'tazz, who ruled for eight years and six months. Al-Mu'tazz, like his father Al-Mutawakkil, harbored deep hatred towards the family of the Prophet, Ahl al-Bayt.

Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, was martyred during the reign of Al-Mu'tazz in the year 254 AH. In Shia tradition, Al-Mu'tazz is held responsible for the Imam's martyrdom, believed to have poisoned him. It is important to note that after Al-Mutawakkil's death, the practice of assassination escalated within the Abbasid court, extending to include poisoning each other in addition to their enemies and dissenters. This pattern of assassination is supported by the probable poisoning of Al-Muntasir, as noted by several historians, as previously mentioned. In this context, it is believed that Imam al-Hadi was assassinated, particularly since they regarded him as an enemy.

12. The Imam's martyrdom (or his death)?

Sheikh Al-Muhajir dismissed the notion of Imam al-Hadi's martyrdom by poisoning and stated, “The chronologically intermediate and the later narratives suggest that he died from poisoning without providing any objective evidence for

this." He believed that "the Imam's early death occurred after a long illness (ailment), possibly due to the arduous lifestyle he endured and worked through from his early youth until his death."^[59]

He attributed this to: "the entrenched tendency among some authors and others to depict a tragic picture of the lives of the Imams in general, which evokes sadness and grief." He ruled out the possibility that Al-Mu'tazz Al-Abbasi, who was in an extremely weak position as a caliph compared to the Turkish military forces, could have carried this out.

He supported this argument with four narratives close in time to the death of Imam al-Hadi, peace be upon him, which indicate that his death was due to a long illness and disease, with no mention of poisoning:

The first: as mentioned by Al-Masudi about Ibn Al-Azhar, who said: Muhammad ibn Al-Faraj told me in the city of Jurjan in the district known as the Well of Abu Anan, who said: Abu Da'amah told me, "I visited Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Musa during the illness from which he died that year."

44

From the phrase ("I visited him during the illness from which he died that year"), it can be inferred that the illness was prolonged and thus his death was not due to poisoning.

The second narrative: as related by Abu Hashim al-Ja'fari, as transmitted by Ibn Qulawayh, who said: "Muhammad ibn Hamza and I entered to visit him while he was ill, and he said to us: 'Direct some people to the Ha'ir from my money.'^[60]

The third one: From the same narrator but in another form, "Abu al-Hasan (peace be upon him) sent for me during his illness." He saw this last one as a clear indication that his illness was prolonged and known to his followers!

He also benefited from the expression ("while he was ill") and in another ("during his illness").

The fourth one: Narrated by Al-Masudi: "Abu al-Hasan became ill with the illness from which he passed away," and he said: without any hint or reference to poison or poisoning. It is known that Al-Masudi is a skilled historian with extensive knowledge and was closely connected to Shia circles, greatly concerned with the biographies of the Imams, and he authored the very important book from which this text was taken. The absence of mention of poisoning from him is a compelling argument because it came from a knowledgeable and qualified source in the context of explanation.

And we have some points to discuss with Dr. Al-Muhajir regarding his statements:

The first point: Just as it is possible that those who claim his poisoning are driven by a desire to paint a tragic picture of the Imams, peace be upon them, including Imam al-Hadi, it is also possible that the motivation of those who deny this is to portray a heroic, revolutionary image of him. What should be followed between these two is what the historical evidence dictates.

The second point: Sheikh Al-Muhajir, who is a diligent researcher, mentioned that those claiming his poisoning have not provided any objective evidence other than intermediate and late narratives.. and this is surprising! For Al-Masudi himself,

whom he cited repeatedly and held in high esteem, mentioned at the end of the section in *Muruj al-Dhahab*, which he partially quoted under the title of the first narrative (“visited him during his illness from which he died”) and used as evidence for his conclusion, states himself at the end of it that it was said he died poisoned! Just a page away from the previous narrative! What more is required than this? And what could be clearer? Why rely on a phrase whose meaning is not clear—as will be explained—and ignore another explicit statement that there is an opinion that he died poisoned?

The third point: We do not see, nor do I suppose others see, that the phrase (“died in his illness”) or “we visited him in his illness in which he died,” negates the possibility that he was poisoned. Why couldn’t that illness have been due to the poison? Especially if it is known that some poisons kill instantly while others cause bodily problems that eventually lead to death?

The fourth point: Al-Masudi, in “*Muruj al-Dhahab*,” is careful not to fully express the Shia perspective he believes in, and we do not know the reasons for this—whether it is because he lived under the shadow of the Abbasid Caliphate during the years 283 AH to 346 AH, or because he wanted his book to be widely circulated and not be restricted, or for other reasons. This is a notable observation for those who study the book, to the extent that some scholars of hadith have doubted his Shia allegiance! Nonetheless, he mentioned in the lives of several Imams that they were poisoned, but he phrased it as (it was said)^[61], and among those he mentioned in this manner was Imam Ali al-Hadi.

As for affirming the wills, although he fully expressed his Shia identity, he rarely addressed the manner of death of the Imams, peace be upon them. He explicitly mentioned that Imam Hasan and Imam Kazim, peace be upon them, were poisoned, but he did not discuss the poisoning of the other Imams.

The fifth point: The poisoning of the Imam was reported by others besides Al-Masudi. Ibn Shahrashub also reported it^[62]; Ibn Babawayh reported that Imam al-Hadi was poisoned by Al-Mu'tamid. If Ibn Babawayh referred to here is the father of Sheikh al-Saduq, then he belongs to the same era as al-Masudi, having died in the year 329 AH. If it refers to Sheikh al-Saduq himself, although this would place him somewhat later, he is still not significantly later than al-Masudi. He explicitly stated the poisoning, indeed mentioning that it was Al-Mu'tamid al-Abbasi who administered the poison. While it is widely believed that the poisoning was actually carried out by Al-Mu'tazz, this is a separate matter and does not detract from the fact of his death by poisoning.

Similarly, the term used to describe his death is that he was martyred, and that this occurred through poisoning, as stated by Ibn Jarir al-Tabari al-Imami (who died in the fourth century). He said: "At the end of his reign - Al-Mu'tazz - the Wali of Allah was martyred, having completed forty years of age. This occurred on a Monday, three days before the end of Rajab in the year two hundred and fifty of the Hijra, poisoned."^[63]

Some researchers have added to the previous discussion the statement attributed to Imam Hasan, peace be upon him, "None of us but is murdered or poisoned." This idea is a subject of debate among scholars and is divided into two opinions. The

first is that all the infallibles departed from this world either by murder or poison, and the second accepts this generally, confirming it in some cases but not in others.

The sixth point: We do not see a clear reason for Sheikh Al-Muhajir's statement about "Al-Mu'tazz, the weak caliph at the height of weakness," because anyone reading about his reign, the various murders he committed against his rivals, the dismissal and banishment of his opponents, and his vengeance against his closest associates would not arrive at this conclusion except perhaps in his final days when he tried to retaliate against the controlling Turkish militia and was killed by them. Even if that were the case, it only suggests that he did not publicly demonstrate such actions, not that he did not commit them. Poisoning does not require extraordinary courage or a dominant personality; indeed, it requires intense animosity, recklessness in position, and the availability of means to carry it out—all of which were present in Al-Mu'tazz and those around him. Furthermore, some narratives (as in Ibn Shahrashub's *Manaqib*) mention that he wanted to assassinate Imam Hasan al-Askari, peace be upon him as well^[64].

48

Additionally, the "deep state" was still present even if the head and caliph were weak.

From all of this, we do not see Sheikh Al-Muhajir's conclusion that the Imam was not poisoned as correct, nor are the pieces of evidence he presented sufficient. And Allah knows best.

Endnotes

-
- [1] And we have referred to this when discussing the birth of his father, in our book (The Greatest Blessing: Imam Muhammad al-Jawad), taking advantage of the famous supplication (“I ask You by those born in Rajab: Muhammad bin Ali the Second and his son Ali bin Muhammad al-Muntajab...”). Let the dear reader refer to it.
- [2] As mentioned by Sheikh al-Kulayni, al-Mufid, al-Tusi, and al-Tabarsi, and the sources for this were indicated by al-Attardi in the Musnad of Imam al-Hadi.
- [3] She was among the concubines, and in jurisprudence, she and others like her are referred to as “Umm Walad” (mother of a child). We have explained this phenomenon in the lives of the Imams from the time of Imam al-Kadhim to the time of Imam al-Mahdi regarding their mothers, peace be upon them, and what the purpose behind it was, in our book “Kadhim Al-Ghaiz: Imam Musa bin Ja’far, peace be upon him,” so refer to it.
- [4] Al-Mas’udi; Ali bin Al-Hussein: “Ithbat al-Wasiyya for Imam Ali bin Abi Talib” / 228, and Al-Tabari (the Shi’i); Muhammad bin Jarir: “Dalail al-Imamah” / 410.
- [5] Attardi; Sheikh Azizullah: “Musnad of Imam al-Hadi (AS)” / 18.

- [6] The same source / 21.
- [7] The Scientific Committee at the Foundation of the Guardian of the Age for Islamic Studies: Encyclopedia of Imam al-Hadi (AS) 1/77.
- [8] The Scientific Committee at the Foundation of the Guardian of the Age for Islamic Studies: Encyclopedia of Imam al-Hadi (AS) 1/77.
- [9] Al-Mas'udi: "Ithbat al-Wasiyya" / 230.
- [10] The same source / 228.
- [11] The Scientific Committee: Encyclopedia of Imam al-Hadi 1/132, citing Kifayah al-Athar by al-Khazzaz al-Qummi, who transmitted tens of hadiths regarding the designation of his Imamate, starting from the Messenger of Allah, peace and blessings be upon him and his family, and Amir al-Mu'minin, peace be upon him, then the Imams after them up to the time of his father, al-Jawad, peace be upon them.
- [12] We mentioned something about his personality, his hatred for knowledge, and his dullness in theoretical matters in our book: "The Greatest Blessing; Imam Muhammad al-Jawad."
- [13] Ibn Manzur: Lisan al-Arab: "The bird fed the chick by putting food into its beak and making a sound, deceiving and feeding it with its mouth." .
- [14] Al-Mas'udi: Ithbat al-Wasiyya, page 230.

The source and the indication that Al-Mas'udi alone reported it, which does not diminish its value given Al-Mas'udi's extensive knowledge (citing some words about his expertise), and that if he practiced taqiyya (dissimulation) in Muruj al-Dhahab, he did not practice it here. Moreover, the incident fits perfectly with the circumstances of that time.

- [15] Umar ibn al-Faraj al-Rukhji: One of the worst examples of serving the ruler. Some researchers described him as a man for dirty tasks, and it is enough to know that Al-Mutawakkil appointed him over Medina and Mecca. He prevented the family of Abu Talib from soliciting from people and forbade people from showing kindness to them. Whenever he learned that someone had shown kindness to any of them, even with a small amount, he would punish them severely and impose heavy fines on them. It reached the point where a single shirt would be shared among a group of Alawite women, each taking turns to pray in it, then patching it up and sitting in their corners, naked and bare-headed, as mentioned in

Maqatil al-Talibiyyin 479. More of his misdeeds will be mentioned in the coming pages.

- [16] Al-Mas'udi: *Ithbat al-Wasiyya*, page 231.
- [17] The same source.
- [18] Al-Tabari; Muhammad ibn Jarir: *Tarikh al-Rusul wa al-Muluk*, and the continuation of *Tarikh al-Tabari*, 9/18, mentions instances such as: "It was seen that Al-Mu'tasim was riding back from the prayer place on the day of Eid al-Adha or Eid al-Fitr. When he reached the Harsha Square, he saw an old man who approached him and said, 'O Abu Ishaq,' whereupon the soldiers rushed to beat him, but Al-Mu'tasim signaled them to refrain. He asked the old man, 'What is the matter with you?' The old man replied, 'May God hold you accountable for your lack of neighborly deeds! You moved next to us and brought these foreign men, settled them among us, orphaned our children, widowed our women, and killed our men!' Al-Mu'tasim listened to all of this and then entered his house and was not seen riding again until the following year, on a similar day, he went out and led the people in the Eid prayer, but he did not return to his home in Baghdad. Instead, he directed his mount towards the Qatool area, left Baghdad, and did not return there. What Ibn al-Athir mentioned in "Al-Kamil" does not differ from what Al-Tabari stated. Similarly, Al-Mas'udi says: "The Turks would harass the common people in the City of Peace by riding their horses through the markets, causing harm to the weak and the children. The people of Baghdad would sometimes revolt and kill a Turk when he collided with a woman, an elderly person, a child, or a blind person. Al-Mu'tasim then decided to move them away." He also says in the same context: "The reason for this was that the people disliked him and were troubled by his presence, especially when his Turkish slaves and other non-Arabs increased in number, causing them harm with their roughness. The people would sometimes rise against them and kill them when they collided with them while riding. Therefore, Al-Mu'tasim preferred to move away with them and isolate himself from the City of Peace." These texts and others were cited by Ahmad Abdul Baqi in his book "Samarra: The Capital of the Arab State."
- [19] Abdul Baqi, Ahmad: "Samarra: The Capital of the Arab State during the Abbasid Era" (Electronic Version).
- [20] We believe that the significance of that battle has been greatly exaggerated and that its true nature is different from what is recorded

in the official historical accounts! Investigating its true nature belongs to another context.

- [21] Ibn al-Athir: *Al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh*, 6/455: "Al-Wathiq prayed over him (al-Jawad), and he was twenty-five years old at the time of his death, which occurred in the month of Dhu al-Hijjah."
- [22] Ibn al-Athir, 7/31.
- [23] Al-Khatib al-Baghdadi: *Tarikh Baghdad*, ed. Bashir (13/518), and Sheikh al-Kulayni in *Al-Kafi*, 4/195, as will be mentioned shortly. Nasir al-Din al-Albani in *Silsilat al-Ahadith al-Da'ifa wa al-Mawdu'a* 6/488 said: "Fabricated." I say: This is one of his peculiarities, as he judged it to be fabricated without justification. The most he could have judged, based on the unsoundness of the chain of transmission, is that the narration is weak! Hence, we found that Al-Suyuti and others said about the narration, using it as evidence: "With a chain containing unknown individuals!" But to categorically declare it fabricated, we do not see a basis for this, except for the apparent content where it involves the inability of jurists from another school to answer, and Imam Ali al-Hadi providing the answer, which Al-Albani may not accept! In any case, based on his claim that it is fabricated, the question that baffled those scholars remains unanswered since it was posed to Maqatil ibn Sulayman (died 150 AH) when he tried to emulate Ali ibn Abi Talib's statement: "Ask me before you lose me!" Someone then asked him the same question, shattering his pride when he could not answer. And up to Al-Albani's time... Who shaved Adam's head?.

Sheikh al-Kulayni narrated in *Al-Kafi* from Imam al-Jawad, peace be upon him: Muhammad ibn Yahya, from Ahmad ibn Muhammad, from Ali ibn Muhammad al-Alawi, who said: I asked Abu Ja'far, peace be upon him, about how Adam shaved his head during his Hajj. He said: Gabriel descended upon him with a ruby from Paradise and passed it over his head, causing his hair to fall off.

- [24] In the full edition of the book, there will be an introduction to the origin of the issue, the reasons behind it, and the stance of the Infallibles on it.
- [25] Ibn al-Athir: *Al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh*, 6/452.
- [26] Imam Ali al-Hadi (a.s.), Sheikh Ali al-Kourani al-Amili, p. 15.
- [27] Official historical sources, especially those aligned with the Ash'arites, mention that Al-Wathiq did not perform Hajj due to the lack of water on the road to Mecca. It is possible that this was part of an effort to tarnish

the image of their adversaries, the caliphs who advocated for the created nature of the Quran, contrary to their belief in its eternity. We observe this in discussions about Al-Wathiq's killing of Ahmad ibn Abi Nasr al-Khuza'i (who followed the path of the Ahl al-Hadith and opposed Al-Wathiq, who was closer to the Mu'tazilites in many of his views). The image of Al-Khuza'i was glorified, with claims that the Prophet Muhammad and the caliphs attended his (martyrdom), and he was praised highly. In contrast, his killer, Al-Wathiq, was vilified. Refer to Ibn Kathir's "Al-Bidaya wa'l-Nihaya" to see more of this kind of portrayal.

- [28] Sheikh al-Kourani cites Ibn Taghri in "Mawrid al-Latafa," 1/153: "Al-Wathiq performed Hajj once and distributed significant amounts of money in the two holy cities, leaving no poor person in Mecca and Medina." Additionally, Al-Ya'qubi, 2/483, mentions: "Al-Wathiq intended to perform Hajj that year, and his intention was firm, but his Hajj was delayed, and he permitted his mother to go."

In "Tarikh al-Ya'qubi," what is present does not indicate that Al-Wathiq actually performed Hajj, but rather that he intended to, and his Hajj was not completed. The text is as follows: "Al-Wathiq intended to perform Hajj that year, and his intention was firm, but his Hajj was delayed, and he permitted his mother to go... etc." Yes, in another instance, Al-Ya'qubi mentions that he distributed money in the two holy cities, but this does not prove the claim, as the text also states that he distributed money in various other regions: "Tarikh al-Ya'qubi, vol. 2, Al-Ya'qubi, p. 483. Al-Wathiq distributed significant amounts of money in Mecca, Medina, and other regions to the Hashemites, other Quraysh, and all people. He also distributed large sums in Baghdad several times to the notable families and the general public."

Indeed, in "Mawrid al-Latafa" by Ibn Taghri, it is mentioned that he performed Hajj and distributed money in the two holy cities.

- [29] Al-Tabari: Tarikh al-Tabari, 7/343: "He appointed Umar ibn al-Faraj al-Rukhji and Muhammad ibn al-Ala' the servant to watch over him, and they would report his news at all times..."
- [30] Al-Tabari: Tarikh al-Tabari, 7/344: "Ja'far (Al-Mutawakkil) went to Muhammad ibn Abdul-Malik, asking him to speak to his brother Al-Wathiq on his behalf. When Ja'far left, Muhammad wrote to Al-Wathiq: 'O Commander of the Faithful, Ja'far ibn al-Mu'tasim came to me asking that I request the Commander of the Faithful's approval for him, as he is dressed like an effeminate person with hair at the back of his neck.' Al-Wathiq wrote back: 'Send for him, bring him in, and order someone to shave the

back of his neck, then have someone take the shorn hair and hit him with it on his face, then send him back to his home...”

- [31] It was mentioned about him that he would be treated like a woman and would give money to those who did this to him!! Refer to Al-Kourani: Imam Ali al-Hadi, p. 21.
- [32] He was even killed while he was at a table of wine!.
- [33] Al-Dhahabi; Shams al-Din: Siyar A'lam al-Nubala - Tahdhib edition (9/502): He said, “Abdullah ibn Ahmad ibn Hanbal: Naser ibn Ali told me, Ali ibn Ja’far ibn Muhammad told me, my brother Musa told me, from his father, from his father, from Ali ibn al-Husayn, from his father, from his grandfather that the Prophet (peace be upon him) took the hands of Hasan and Husayn and said: ‘Whoever loves me, and loves these two, and their father and mother will be with me in my rank on the Day of Judgment.’” I (Al-Dhahabi) said: This is a very strange hadith. Then Abdullah ibn Ahmad said: When Naser narrated this, Al-Mutawakkil ordered him to be beaten with a thousand lashes. Ja’far ibn Abdul Wahid interceded for him, saying, ‘The man is from Ahl al-Sunnah,’ and kept pleading until Al-Mutawakkil relented. He had stipends which Musa increased. Abu Bakr al-Khatib said afterwards: Al-Mutawakkil ordered him to be beaten because he thought he was a Rafidi (Shiite). I (Al-Dhahabi) said: Al-Mutawakkil was a Sunni, but he had enmity towards Ali. There is no unreliable narrator in this chain except Ali ibn Ja’far, who might not have accurately conveyed the wording of the hadith. The Prophet (peace be upon him), out of his love for and spreading the virtues of Hasan and Husayn, would not place everyone who loved them in his rank in paradise. He might have said: ‘He is with me in paradise.’ It is well-established that he said, ‘A person is with whom he loves.’ Naser ibn Ali was one of the steadfast Imams of Ahl al-Sunnah.”

Our Commentary:.

Firstly, Al-Dhahabi’s strong rejection of the hadith was due to its content. This is a typical method used by followers of the Umayyad line to discredit hadiths. In addition to concealing such hadiths as much as possible, they reject them by claiming that their chains of transmission are not authentic whenever they contradict their beliefs. They should change their views according to these hadiths, not reject them.

Secondly, Abu Bakr al-Khatib’s comment that Al-Mutawakkil ordered the beating because he thought the narrator was a Rafidi is worse than Al-Mutawakkil’s action! It implies that beating a Rafidi (who narrates a

virtue of Hasan and Husayn) is normal and acceptable, almost justifying Al-Mutawakkil's actions.

Thirdly, Al-Dhahabi's statement that Al-Mutawakkil was a Sunni but had enmity towards Ali, as if enmity and hatred towards Amir al-Mu'minin (peace be upon him) are part of Sunnism that can coexist with it! Notably, in another place, Al-Dhahabi excused Al-Mutawakkil, stating that there is no proof of his enmity and hatred towards the Imam. In a third part of his works, he mentioned that Allah forgave him for that because he supported the Sunnah! So, in Al-Dhahabi's view, at one time he is not a Nasibi, and assuming he is, as long as he is a Sunni, there is no problem with his enmity towards the Imam, even though (according to narrations) "whoever hates him has hated the Messenger of Allah and hated Allah." Finally, Al-Dhahabi and his like believe he is forgiven as long as he participated in the trivial debate about the creation of the Quran.

[34] Narrating a virtue of Hasan and Husayn is considered a grave sin! But his adultery with the daughter of one of his ministers is not an issue... Refer to Al-Kourani: Imam al-Hadi, 33, where he states that Al-Jahiz in "Al-Mahasin," 118, and Al-Tanukhi in "Nishwar al-Muhadara," 6/323, narrate a story that demonstrates Al-Mutawakkil's debauchery and tyranny, where he ordered his minister Al-Rukhji at night to bring him his daughter! They said: "Aisha, the daughter of Umar ibn al-Faraj al-Rukhji, was described to Al-Mutawakkil, so he sent for her in the middle of the night while it was raining heavily. He ordered Umar to bring Aisha to him, but Umar pleaded with him to spare her as she was responsible for managing his household, but he refused. Umar returned saying, 'O Allah, protect me from the evil of your servant Ja'far.' He then carried her to Al-Mutawakkil at night, who violated her and then returned her to her father's house..."

[35] Al-Tabari, 9/185, and the same text was later narrated by Ibn al-Athir in Al-Kamil: "In that year (235 AH), Al-Mutawakkil ordered the demolition of the grave of Husayn ibn Ali and the destruction of the surrounding houses and buildings. He commanded that the site be plowed, sown, and watered, and that people be prevented from visiting it. It was mentioned that the police chief called out in the area: "Whoever we find at his grave after three days, we will send them to the dungeon." So, the people fled and refrained from going there. The site was ploughed, and the surrounding area was sown.».

[36] Al-Khoei; Abu al-Qasim: Mu'jam Rijal al-Hadith, 21/139.

[37] Al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh, 6/166, by Ibn al-Athir: "In this year, Ya'qub ibn Ishaq al-Nahwi, known as Ibn al-Sikkil, passed away. The reason for his death was that he came into contact with Al-Mutawakkil, who asked him, 'Which of the two do you prefer, Al-Mu'tazz and Al-Mu'ayyad, or Hasan and Husayn?' Ibn al-Sikkil disparaged the former and praised Hasan and Husayn, peace be upon them, as they deserved. So, Al-Mutawakkil ordered the Turks to trample on his stomach. He was carried to his home, where he died."

It is surprising that some people cite this story as evidence for the saying: "A man dies from a slip of the tongue, not from a stumble of the foot!" As if Ibn al-Sikkil was supposed to prefer those two boys over the leaders of the youth of Paradise! It was not a slip of the tongue by Ibn al-Sikkil but rather a clear and intentional stance.

[38] Al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh (6/175):

"It was mentioned that Abu al-Simt Marwan ibn Abi al-Junub said: 'I recited a poem to Al-Mutawakkil in which I mentioned the Rafidah (a derogatory term for Shiites), so he appointed me as the governor of Bahrain and Yamama, bestowed upon me four robes of honor, and Al-Mutawakkil's son Al-Muntasir also bestowed upon me a robe. Al-Mutawakkil ordered three thousand dinars to be given to me, which were scattered over me, and he commanded his son Al-Muntasir and Sa'd al-Ittakhi to collect them for me, and they did so. The poem I recited was:

The caliph Ja'far's reign... brings peace to religion and the world.

The legacy of Muhammad is yours... and with your justice, darkness is dispelled.

The sons of daughters seek inheritance... but they have no share in it.

Sons-in-law are not heirs, and the daughter does not inherit the Imamate."

Dear reader, do you see how the affairs of the nation were managed? Look at the great administrative qualification for governing two large regions (Bahrain and Yamama): a poem in which he disparaged the Rafidah, and he was appointed over the mentioned regions!.

[39] This is evident from the date of Al-Mutawakkil's letter to him requesting his presence in Samarra. However, some researchers, including Rasul Ja'fariyan, argue that this occurred earlier, stating that the Imam stayed in Samarra for about twenty years (which implies that he was brought there

in the year 234 AH, since his martyrdom was in 254 AH). They respond to the explicit date on the letter, which is 243 AH, by suggesting that this date is actually the date of copying the letter!

- [40] Al-Mas'udi: *Ithbat al-Wasiyya*, page 233.
- [41] Al-Khuza'i; Sheikh Abu al-Qasim: *Encyclopedia of Imam al-Hadi*, 4/63: He said, "We did not find a biography of Bariḥah al-'Abbāsī in the biographical books; however, Al-Mas'ūdī mentioned that he was in charge of prayers in the two holy mosques, and he conspired against Ali ibn Muhammad al-Hadi, peace be upon them, with Al-Mutawakkil!"
- [42] I saw a note in "Makateeb al-A'imma" 6/295 by Sheikh al-Ahmadi al-Miyangi, verified by Muḥtaba Faraji, in the margin of a narration about Abdullah ibn Muhammad ibn Dawood. The note states (and I do not know if the margin note is by the author or the verifier): "It appears that the correct name is 'Ibn Atrujah,' who is Abdullah ibn Muhammad ibn Dawood al-Hashimi ibn Atrujah, one of Al-Mutawakkil's close companions, well-known for his enmity towards Ali ibn Abi Talib, peace be upon him. He was killed by Isa ibn Ja'far and Ali ibn Zaid al-Hasani in Kufa shortly before the death of Al-Mu'tazz." I say this is a solid argument, and the basis of the confusion lies in what was mentioned in "Ithbat al-Wasiyya." Those who relied entirely on this source fell into this error, treating the matter as if it pertained to Bariḥah al-'Abbāsī, who does not exist in the biographical and historical books. It was also noted that "Ibn Atrujah" is a nickname for Abdullah ibn Muhammad ibn Dawood, as mentioned by the verifier of the book "Maqātil al-Tālibiyyīn" Ahmed Saqr in the index of the book's figures.

Additionally, Abu Ja'far al-Baghdadi, the author of "Al-Muḥabbar" on page 43, mentioned that Al-Mutawakkil appointed him over the Hajj in the year 239 AH, saying: "He appointed Abdullah ibn Muhammad ibn Dawood ibn Isa ibn Musa for the Hajj in the year thirty-nine."

- [43] Ibn al-Sabbagh al-Maliki; Ali ibn Muhammad: *Al-Fusul al-Muḥimma fi Ma'rifat al-A'imma*, 2/388.
- [44] Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzi: *Tadhkirat al-Khawass*, page 322.
- [45] Al-Kulayni: *Al-Kafi*, 1/549, which included: "The Commander of the Faithful has decided to remove Abdullah ibn Muhammad from his position overseeing the military and prayer in the city of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and his family, due to his ignorance of your right, his disrespect towards you, and the accusations he has made against you. The Commander of the Faithful is aware of your innocence in this matter

and your sincere intention to avoid it. He has appointed Muhammad ibn al-Fadl in his place and instructed him to honor and respect you, to follow your directives and opinions, and to seek closeness to Allah and the Commander of the Faithful through this. The Commander of the Faithful is eager to see you and renew his relationship with you. If you are inclined to visit him and stay as long as you see fit, you may come with whomever you choose from your family, servants, and attendants, at your convenience and leisure. Travel when you wish, settle when you wish, and move as you wish. If you prefer, Yahya ibn Harthama, the Commander of the Faithful's servant, and his soldiers can accompany you, traveling with your departure and moving at your pace; the decision is yours..."

[46] It was previously mentioned in earlier pages the source of this information.

[47] It was previously mentioned in earlier pages the source of this information.

[48] Al-Nuwairi; Ahmad ibn Abdul Wahab: *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 1/406: "As for the palaces of Al-Mutawakkil, they are: Al-Kamil, Al-Ja'fari, Barakwara, Al-Arus, Al-Birka, Al-Jawsuq, Al-Mukhtar, Al-Gharib, Al-Badi', Al-Sabih, Al-Malih, Al-Qasr, Al-Burj, Al-Mutawakkiliyyah, and Al-Qallayah."

[49] Al-Khuza'i; Abu al-Qasim: *Encyclopedia of Imam al-Hadi*, 1/81: Al-Irbili, may Allah have mercy on him: "He resided in Samarra until his death for ten years and some months." Sheikh al-Kourani mentioned in his book "Imam al-Hadi" that he, peace be upon him, was brought to Samarra three times: once in 232 AH at the beginning of Al-Mutawakkil's caliphate, once in 243 AH, and a third time in between. We did not find in the evidence he referred to, including Al-Tabari's specification of the first journey without mentioning the others, enough to reach this conclusion. What we see immediately is that there was only one journey in 243 AH, which continued until his martyrdom, peace be upon him.

Based on what Al-Tabari mentioned, later scholars who relied on him stated that his period of stay in Samarra was twenty years or more, such as Al-Tabarsi in *Ilam al-Wara*, Ibn Khallikan in *Wafayat al-A'yan*, and Ibn Shahrashub in *Manaqib*.

On the other hand, those who relied on his arrival in Samarra in 243 AH, such as Al-Irbili in *Kashf al-Ghumma*, Al-Qunduzi al-Hanafi in *Yanabi' al-Mawaddah*, and similarly Ibn Hajar in *Al-Sawa'iq al-Muhriqah*, mentioned that his stay there was about eleven years or ten years and some months.

[50] Al-Kulayni: *Al-Kafi*, 1/502: "Abu al-Tayyib al-Muthanna Ya'qub ibn Yasar narrated to me: Al-Mutawakkil used to say, 'Woe unto you, the matter of

Ibn al-Ridha has exhausted me! He refuses to drink with me, to keep me company, or to give me any opportunity in this regard! They said to him, 'If you cannot find any fault with him, then his brother Musa is a jester, a drinker, a lover. Send for him and bring him here so we can deceive the people and say he is Ibn al-Ridha!' So, he wrote to him and had him brought with honors. All the Banu Hashim, commanders, and people welcomed him on the pretense that upon his arrival he would be granted a property, where a house would be built for him, and transferred the wine sellers and singers to him. He gave him gifts and favors and provided him with a private residence so he could visit him there!'

- [51] Al-Masudi: *Muruj al-Dhahab wa Ma'adin al-Jawhar*, 4/11: "There were reports brought against Abu al-Hasan Ali ibn Muhammad to Al-Mutawakkil, claiming that there were weapons, books, and other items in his house from his followers. Al-Mutawakkil sent Turkish soldiers and others to raid his house at night, surprising those in his household. They found him alone in a room with a woolen robe, no carpet except for sand and pebbles, and a woolen blanket over his head. He was facing his Lord, reciting verses from the Quran about promises and warnings. He was taken as he was found and brought to Al-Mutawakkil in the middle of the night. When he was brought before Al-Mutawakkil, who was drinking with a cup in his hand, he was greatly respected and seated beside him. There was nothing in his house as reported, and no situation that could be used against him. Al-Mutawakkil offered him the cup he was holding, and he said, 'O Commander of the Faithful, it has never touched my flesh and blood, so excuse me from it.' He excused him and said, 'Recite some poetry for me that I may enjoy.' He said, 'I am not much of a reciter of poetry,' but Al-Mutawakkil insisted, so he recited:.

'They spent the night on the mountain peaks, guarded by strong men, but the peaks did not benefit them.

They were brought down from their strongholds after their might and deposited in pits—what a terrible descent!.

He continued: "Everyone present felt pity for Ali and thought that a rash act might come from Al-Mutawakkil towards him. But, by Allah, Al-Mutawakkil cried for a long time until his tears soaked his beard, and those who were present also wept. Then he ordered the removal of the wine..."

- [52] Al-Tusi; Ibn Hamza: *Al-Thaqib fi al-Manaqib*, 559: In the story of the person who wanted to ask the Imam to pray for his healing from leprosy that had

afflicted him... he sat for him one day on the road as he was leaving the house of Al-Mutawakkil.

- [53] Ibn al-Athir: *Al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh*, 6/130: "Al-Mutawakkil had a strong hatred for Ali ibn Abi Talib, peace be upon him, and for his family. He would target anyone reported to be loyal to Ali and his family by seizing their wealth and shedding their blood. Among his close companions was 'Ubada the effeminate, who would tie a pillow under his clothes over his stomach, uncover his bald head, and dance in front of Al-Mutawakkil while the singers sang, 'Here comes the bald, fat man, the Caliph of the Muslims,' mocking Ali, peace be upon him, while Al-Mutawakkil drank and laughed. One day he did this while Al-Muntasir was present, and Al-Muntasir signaled to 'Ubada, threatening him, so he fell silent out of fear. Al-Mutawakkil asked, 'What is the matter with you?' 'Ubada got up and told him. Al-Muntasir said, 'O Commander of the Faithful, this man whom this fool mocks and makes people laugh at is your cousin, the elder of your household, and the source of your pride. You may consume his flesh if you wish, but do not feed this dog and his likes from it!' Al-Mutawakkil then told the singers to all sing together:.

'The young man is jealous for his cousin.

The young man's head is in his mother's heat'

This was one of the reasons Al-Muntasir justified killing Al-Mutawakkil!... And among his close companions were those well-known for their animosity and hatred towards Ali, including: Ali ibn al-Jahm, the Syrian poet; from the Banu Shamam, Ibn Lu'ay; Umar ibn Faraj al-Rukhji; Abu al-Simt, a descendant of Marwan ibn Abi Hafsa from the mawali of Banu Umayya; and Abdullah ibn Muhammad ibn Dawud al-Hashimi, known as Ibn Atrajah.

- [54] Al-Safadi; Salah al-Din: *Al-Wafi bil-Wafayat*, 5/204: Ahmad ibn Ibrahim al-Asadi eulogized him, saying: "Thus should the noble die ... Between a flute, a lute, and wine, Between two cups, they both aimed ... A cup of pleasure and a cup of death."
- [55] Al-Kafi 1/547: "From Ibrahim ibn Muhammad al-Tahiri who said: Al-Mutawakkil fell ill with an abscess and was close to death because of it. No one dared to touch him with a metal instrument, so his mother vowed that if he recovered, she would bring a large sum of money to Abu al-Hasan Ali ibn Muhammad from her own wealth."
- [56] Al-Tabari: *Tarikh al-Tabari*, 9/254.

[57] Ibn al-Athir: Al-Kamil, 6/187: "It is said that he felt a fever, so he called one of his doctors, who then bled him with a poisoned lancet, and he died from it. The doctor returned home and felt a fever, so he called a student to bleed him. He placed his lancets in front of him to choose the best one, and he chose the poisoned lancet, having forgotten about it. He bled him with it, and when he was done, he looked at it and recognized it, realizing he was doomed. He immediately made his will.

It is also said that he had a condition in his head, so Ibn al-Tayfuri dripped oil into his ear, causing his head to swell, and he died.

And it is said that Ibn al-Tayfuri poisoned him through his cupping glasses, and he died."

[58] Castration was one of their methods of execution, as well as the use of a poisoned lancet for bloodletting. In Ibn Miskawayh's book "The Experiences of Nations and the Successive Efforts" 4/307, he talks about the conspiracy among Al-Mutawakkil's ministers against each other, and what happened between Najah ibn Salama and Ubayd Allah ibn Yahya, where each tried to incriminate the other. The result was the downfall of Najah: "They ordered that his cap be taken, and they arrested his scribes, extracting from them on that day one hundred and forty thousand dinars, which his son admitted to, not including the value of his estates, palaces, furniture, and belongings. All of this was seized, and he was repeatedly beaten with whips, tortured, then strangled, or his testicles were crushed, leaving him dead by morning."

[59] Al-Muhajir: Imam al-Hadi: from pages 88 to 90.

[60] Ibn Qulawayh; Ja'far ibn Muhammad: Kamil al-Ziyarat, page 459.

[61] He mentioned regarding Imam al-Sadiq, he said (3/285): "Abu Abdullah Ja'far passed away, and it was said that he was poisoned." Regarding Imam al-Rida, he said (3/441): "Ali ibn Musa passed away after eating grapes and consuming a lot of them, and it was said that he was poisoned." Regarding Imam al-Jawad, peace be upon him, he said (3/464): "In the year 219, Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Musa passed away, and it was said that Umm al-Fadl poisoned him." In the same manner, he said about Imam al-Hadi: "And it was said that he died poisoned."

[62] In Manaqib, vol. 4, by Ibn Shahrashub, page 401, he said: "Ibn Babawayh stated that Al-Mu'tamid poisoned him."

[63] Al-Tabari (the Shia): Dala'il al-Imamah, page 409.

[64] (Ibn Shahrashub: *Manaqib*, 4/432).