

## Was the legacy of Imam "Hasan Askari" [AS] divided amongst his brother and mother?

### Description:

One of doubts that Wahhabis keep repeating and using it to prove that Imam "Mahdi" [AS] wasn't born, is the matter of dividing the inheritance of Imam "Hasan Askari" [AS] between his brother "Ja'far" {known as Ja'far liar} and Imam "Askari" [AS]'s mother and they say if Imam "Askari" [AS] had a child why didn't he get inheritance and it was divided between Imam "Askari" [AS]'s mother and brother?

They also claim that Shia scholars such as "Sa'd bin Abdullah" {died in 300 AH} and "Hasan bin Musa Nubakhti" {died in 310 AH} have quoted that Imam "Hasan Askari" died while no one had seen and known his child.

"Nasir al-Din Qaffari" writes in this regard:

إذ بعد وفاة الحسن - إمامهم الحادي عشر - سنة (٢٦٠هـ) لم ير له خلف، ولم يُعرف له ولد ظاهر، فاقْتَسَم ما ظهر من ميراثه أخوه جعفر وأمه، كما تعترف بذلك كتب الشيعة نفسها، وبسبب ذلك اضطرب أمر الشيعة وتفرق جمعهم؛ لأنهم أصبحوا بلا إمام، ولا دين عندهم بدون إمام، لأنّه هو الحجّة علي أهل الأرض... .

After the demise of {Imam} Hasan, the eleventh Imam of Shia in 260 AH, successor wasn't seen for him and people didn't know his child, so his legacy was divided between his brother "Ja'far" and his mother; as this matter has been confessed in Shia books, that's why Shias were in perplexity; because they didn't have Imam and in their perspective, religion without Imam is pointless, because Imam is god's proof on the earth.

"Nasir al-Din Qaffari"- the principles of Shia sect- v 2, p 1004

And "Ehsan Elahi Zaheer" says in this regard:

مات الحسن العسكري بدون خلف ولا عقب، كما نص علي ذلك النوبختي حيث قال: «توفي ولم ير له أثر، ولم يعرف له ولد ظاهر، فاقْتَسَم ميراثه أخوه جعفر وأمه».

{Imam} Hasan Askari" [AS] died without successor and child; as "Nubakhti" has restated on this matter; he says: he passed away while no successor was seen for him; and people didn't know seen child for him, so his brother "Ja'far" and his mother divided his legacy .

"Ehsan Elahi Zaheer", al-Shia and al-Tashayyu'- p 261

### **Reviewing and studying:**

Contents of this doubt:

١: Imam "Hasan Askari" [AS] passed away while no child was seen and known for him

2: Shias, faced perplexity and dissension after Imam "Hasan Askari" [AS]'s demise

٢: after Imam "Hasan" [AS]'s demise, his legacy was divided between his brother "Ja'far" and mother.

### **Clear contradiction in Qaffari's sayings:**

"Qaffari" claims explicitly that people didn't know any child for him, but what interesting is that he explains Shia opinion in another page of his book as follow:

أما الاثنا عشرية فقد ذهبت إلي الزعم بأن للحسن العسكري ولداً كان قد أخفي (أي الحسن) مولده، وستر أمره؛ لصعوبة الوقت وشدة طلب السلطان له، فلم يظهر ولده في حياته، ولا عرفه الجمهور بعد وفاته.

Shias who believe in twelve Imams say that }Imams "Hasan Askari" has a child that { he has concealed his birth, because ruler was looking for him, so he didn't reveal the birth of his child {Mahdi} as long as he was alive; and most of Shias didn't know him after Imam "Hasan Askari" [AS]'s demise.

The principles of Shia sect, p 2, p 1006

By saying this sentence he confesses explicitly that Shias who believe in twelve Imams believe that Imam "Hasan Askari" [AS] had a child but he concealed him from the enemies; but in another page he says: Shias say that Imam "Hasan Askari" didn't have child and Shias remained without Imam...

This clear contradiction in quoting Shias' belief shows that they're not looking for the reality and use anything to question Shia sect.

### **This saying that Shia scholars have such belief is a lie:**

It's obvious that the topic of the book "Al-Shia sects" from "Nubakhti" and the book "al-maqalat wa-al-firaq" from "Sa'd bin Abd Allah Ash'ari" is quoting the beliefs of deviated

sects and then quoting the correct belief of Shias who believe in twelve Imams. So quoting this part of the text of these two books and ascribing it to all Shia sects and even Shias who believe in twelve Imams, is an unfair act and away of reality.

That's true that this issue is written in these books, but it has been quoted from deviated sects and then the belief of Shia who believe in twelve Imams has been said and its correctness has been proved.

Late "Nubakhti" has quoted the opinion of Shias who believe in twelve Imams in the book "Shia sects" and then he says that this opinion is correct:

وقالت الفرقة الثانية عشرة وهم الأمامية ليس القول كما قال هؤلاء كلهم بل لله عز وجل في الأرض حجة من ولد الحسن بن علي وأمر الله بالغ وهو وصي لأبيه علي المنهاج الأول والسنن الماضية ولا تكون الإمامة في أخوين بعد الحسن والحسين عليهما السلام ولا يجوز ذلك ولا تكون إلا في غيبة الحسن بن علي إلي أن ينقضي الخلق متصلا ذلك ما اتصلت أمور الله تعالى ولو كان في الأرض رجلان لكان أحدهما الحجة ولو مات أحدهما لكان الآخر الحجة ما دام أمر الله ونهيه قائمين في خلقه...

ولا يجوز أن تخلو الأرض من حجة ولو خلت ساعة لساخت الأرض ومن عليها ولا يجوز شيء من مقالات هذه الفرق كلها فنحن مستسلمون بالماضي وإمامته مقرون بوفاء معترفون بأن له خلفا قائما من صلبه وأن خلفه هو الإمام من بعده حتي يظهر ويعلن أمره كما ظهر وعلن أمر من مضى قبله من آباءه ويأذن الله في ذلك إذ الأمر لله يفعل ما يشاء ويأمر بما يريد من ظهوره وخفائه كما قال أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام «اللهم إنك لا تخلي الأرض من حجة لك علي خلقك ظاهرا معروفا أو خائفا مغمودا كيلا تبطل حجتك وبيناتك»

وبذلك أمرنا وبه جاءت الأخبار الصحيحة عن الأئمة الماضين... وقد رويت أخبار كثيرة أن القائم تخفي علي الناس ولادته ويخمل ذكره ولا يعرف إلا أنه لا يقوم حتي يظهر ويعرف أنه إمام ابن امام ووصي ابن وصي يوتم به قبل أن يقوم ومع ذلك فإنه لا بد من أن يعلم أمره ثقاته وثقات أبيه وإن قلوا ولا ينقطع من عقب الحسن بن علي عليه السلام ما اتصلت أمور الله عز وجل ولا ترجع إلي الأخوة ولا يجوز ذلك وأن الإشارة والوصية لا تصحان من الإمام ولا من غيره إلا بشهود أقل ذلك شاهدان فما فوقهما.

فهذا سبيل الإمامة والمنهاج الواضح اللاحظ الذي لم تزل الشيعة الإمامية الصحيحة التشيع عليه.

Twelfth group which is "Imamiyyah", believes that the matter of Imamate is different than what other sects believe, but there is proof for god on the earth from the generation of Imam "Hasan bin Ali" [AS], god's order is definitive in this regard, and he is the successor of his father like previous Imams.

After Imam "Hasan" and Imam "Husayn" [AS], Imamate is not transferred from one brother to another brother. So, Imamate can't be for any guy other than Imam "Askari" [AS]'s child, this is divine will by the end of the creation, even if two guys are left on the earth one them is definitely god's proof and if one of them die, the one that is alive will be god's proof as long as divine's orders and prohibitions are amongst people.

Divine proof must be on the earth otherwise earth will be destroyed with anything on it. No word of these {deviated} sects is true .

Imam "Askari" [AS] has left the world and has a successor who is his son. So he'll appear and announce the responsibility of his Imamate; as previous Imams did so. God has willed it and god's will will definitely happen, because he's the only absolute ruler. Anything that god wills, it will happen, and anything that he wants about appearance and occultation {of Imam Mahdi} it'll happen, as commander of the faithful [AS] has said:

"earth won't be without god's proof; whether it's known and seen or hidden and protected so that god's proof and verses aren't annulled" .

This is what we've been ordered and we have authentic narrative from previous Imams in this regard. Many narratives have been quoted that the birth of Imam "Mahdi" [AS] is concealed from people and his fame will be a little, he will remain unknown and he won't arise before appearing and announcing his Imamate. Before his appearance, no one will be like him, any way his Imamate must be said to his father and his reliable guys, though the number of them is short, this Imamate will remain with the son of Imam "Askari" [AS] as long as god wants, the matter of Imamate won't return to brotherhood {from one brother to another one}, this matter isn't permissible. Mentioning and will on Imam behalf are incorrect and invalid; unless two {or more than two} just witnesses confirm it.

So this is the way of Imamate and bright method that Shias who believe in twelve Imams believe it and continuing this way is correct.

"Al-Nubakhti- al-Hasan bin Musa"- Al-Shia sects, v 1, p 96

"Sa'd bin Abd Allah Ash'ari" quotes the opinion of twelver Shias as follow:

ففرقة منها وهي المعروفة بالإمامية قالت:... فنحن متمسكون بإمامة الحسن بن علي،  
مقرّون بوفاته موقنون مؤمنون بأن له خلفاً من صلبه، متدينون بذلك وأنه الإمام من بعد  
أبيه الحسن بن علي، وأنه في هذه الحالة مستتر خائف مأمور بذلك حتى يأذن الله عز  
وجل له فيظهر ويعلن أمره.

And another sect that is known as "Imamiyyah", says: we believe in Imam "Hasan bin Askari" [AS], we've accepted his demise and we're sure and believe that he has a successor from his generation and we believe that he's Imam after his father "Hasan bin Ali" [AS]. He's hidden himself from people following god's order, he'll appear when god lets him and will announce his Imamate openly.

"Al-Ash'ari Al-Qumi"- al-Maqqalat wa al-Firaq- p 102 – 103

Dr."Qaffari" and "Ehsan Elahi Zaheer" quote from late "Nubakhti" and "Sa'd bin Abd Allah Ash'ari" that Imam "Askari" [AS] left the world while people didn't see and know any child from him and then they ascribe this belief to all Shias, but what we can get from these two guys' sayings is that Shias who believe in twelve Imams have never doubted the birth of Imam "Mahdi" [AS] and all of them have consensus on this issue that when Imam "Askari" died, his son had five years old.

But sad to say Dr."Qaffari" and "Ehsan Elahi zaheer" have not quoted this saying of late "Nubakhti" and "Sa'd bin Abd Allah", and have tried to ascribed this belief to these two Shia scholars and then to all Shias.

This issue shows that Wahhabi scholars have no reason by which they can question the right belief of Shia and only tools that they could use are lying, deceiving and hypocrisy.

If deviated sects of divine direct path have null beliefs, what's that got to do with right Shias who believe in twelve Imams}?

**Lack of finding doesn't show that it doesn't exist:**

This saying of "Sa'd bin Abd Allah" and late "Nubakhti" "his successor wasn't seen and people didn't know his son" doesn't show that Imam "Hasan Askari" [AS] didn't really have child.

Lack of finding or that people didn't see doesn't show that Hadrat "Mahdi" [AS] wasn't born.

Yes, if "Sa'd bin Abd Allah" and "Nubakhti" said: "he has never had any child, this saying of these to Wahhabis would be acceptable but there is clear difference between these two sentences: "his successor wasn't seen and people didn't know seen child for him" and "he's didn't have any child at all."

### **Serious dissension between Sunni sects:**

Dr."Qaffari" finds fault with Shia sect that there is dissension amongst Shia while there has always been dissension amongst all divine religions during the history and even at the time of prophets [PBUTH] their companions would sometimes have serious dissention and form different and quite opposite sects. So this matter can never question the legitimacy of a sect, because there have always been capricious guys in each nation who tried to make the religion of god going to stray to keep their own interests.

Especially "Bani Umayyad" and "Bani al-Abbas" rulers, who left no stone unturned to disperse the population of Shias and make division amongst them. In many cases, deviated sects were formed by the money and effort of tyrant rulers in order to standing against Shia right sect; that's why the existence of deviated sects that many of them didn't last more than several months or years, can't cause that we find fault with right sect.

Furthermore, if judgment criteria in ascribing an opinion to Shias is the view of some deviated sects of direct path, such dissention amongst Sunnis is more than Shia, and even some Sunni sects excommunicate other sect explicitly and have had serious conflicts with other, we mention to some of their dissentions:

### **Anyone who is not "Hanbali" {one of Sunni sects} is infidel**

"Shams al-Din Dhahabi" and "Ibn Rajab Hanbali" write:

أحمد بن الحسين بن محمد. المحدث الأمام أبو حاتم بن خاموش الرازي البزاز. من علماء السنة... وحكاية شيخ الإسلام الأنصاري معه مشهورة. وقوله: مَنْ لم يكن حنبلياً فليس بمسلم.

The story between "Shaykh al-Islam Ansari" with "Ahmad bin Hasayn bin Muhammad" is well-known who said: anyone who is not "Hanbali" is infidel.

"Al-Dhahabi", The Islam History, v 29, p 303 /// "Al-Dhahabi"- Syar al-A'lam al-Nubala', v 17, p 625 /// "Ibn Rajab Hanbali, al-Tabaqat al-Hanabah, v 1, 20

### **The adherents of "Ahmad bin Hanbal" are infidel:**

"Ibn Athir Jazari" writes:

#### **ذكر الفتنة ببغداد بين الشافعية والحنابلة**

ورد إلي بغداد هذه السنة الشريف أبو القاسم البكري المغربي الواعظ وكان أشعري المذهب وكان قد قصد نظام الملك فأحبه ومال إليه وسيره إلي بغداد وأجري عليه الجراية الوافرة فوعظ بالمدرسة النظامية وكان يذكر الحنابلة ويعيبهم ويقول ( وما كفر سليمان ولكن الشياطين كفروا ) والله ما كفر أحمد ولكن أصحابه كفروا

Riots and seditions between "Shafi'is" and "Hanbalis: in "Baghdad":

"Abu al-Qasim Bakri Maghribi" who was "Ash'ari" madhhab {sect} entered "Baghdad" and after meeting "Nizam al-Mulk", he tended to him and did him much favor, he held preaching ceremony in "Nizamiyya" school and said bad things about "Hanbalis" and would say their faults, and said: "Ahmad bin Hanbal" is not infidel, but his followers are infidel.

"Al-Jazari"- The complete History- v 8, p 428

And "Nuwayri" writes in this regard:

وفي سنة خمس وسبعين كانت الفتنة بين الطائفتين، وسببها أنه ورد إلي بغداد الشريف أبو القاسم البكري المقرئ الواعظ وكان أشعري المذهب، وكان قد قصد نظام الملك فأحبه ومال إليه وسيره إلي بغداد، وأجري عليه الجراية الوافرة. وكان يعظ بالمدرسة النظامية، ويذكر الحنابلة ويعيبهم ويقول «وما كفر سليمان ولكن الشياطين كفروا» وما كفر أحمد ولكن أصحابه كفروا ثم قصد يوماً دار قاضي القضاة أبي عبد الله الدامغاني فجرى بينه وبين قومٍ من الحنابلة مشاجرة أدت إلي الفتنة.

In the year 75 AH, there was riot between these two sects because of the presence of "Abu al-Qasim Bakri" who was "Ash'ari" madhhab who tended to "Nizam al-Mulk" after meeting him and did him much favor he held preaching and speech ceremony In "Nizamiyyah" school and said bad things about "Hanbalis" and would say their faults, he said: "Ahmad bin Hanbal" is not infidel but his followers are got infidel, then he went to chief justice "Abu Abd Allah Damghani" and there was fierce conversation between him and "Hnbalis" that ended up in riot and.

**Al-Nwayri, Nihayat al-arab fi funun al-adab- v 23, p 141**

"Ibn Khalkan" writes about the enmity and killing between "Asha'ira" and "Hanbalis":

**وكان ولده [أبو القاسم القشيري] أبو نصر عبد الرحيم إماما كبيرا أشبه أباه في علومه...  
وجري له مع الحنابلة خصام بسبب الاعتقاد لأنه تعصب للأشاعرة وانتهي الأمر إلي فتنة  
قتل فيها جماعة من الفريقين.**

"Abu Nasr Abd al-Rahim", the son of "Abu al-Qasim Qashri" who was big leader and was like his father in knowledge. There was enmity and between him who was "Ash'ari" madhhab and fanatic and "Hanbalis" due to their beliefs that resulted in death of many guys from both sides.

**"Ibn Khalkan"- Wafiyat al-A'ayan- v 3, p 208 /// "Al-Akri al-Hanbali" Shuzarat al-Zahab, v 3, p 322**

"Al-Akri Hanbali" writes:

**البكري أبو بكر المقرئ الواعظ من دعاة الأشعرية وفد علي نظام الملك بخراسان فنفق  
عليه وكتب له سجلا أن يجلس بجوامع بغداد فقدم وجلس ووعظ ونال من الحنابلة سبا  
وتكفيرا ونالوا منه.**

"Abu al-Qasim Bakri" who was "Ash'ari" missionary, met "Nizam al-Mulk" and received much money from him and he got a letter from him so that he can speechify in "Baghdad" universities, but he was insulted and excommunicated by "Hanbalis".

**"Al-Akri Hanbali"- Shuzarat al-Zahab- v 3, p 353**

"Al-Nuwayri" writes:

فأنه [مظفر الدين موسى ابن الملك العادل] كان قد عزر جماعة من أعيان الحنابلة المبتدعة تعزيراً بليغاً رادعاً وبدع بهم وأهانهم.

“Muzaffar al-Din Musa” whipped a group of “Hanbali” famous figures and insulted them.

“Al-Nuwayri”- Nihayat al-arab fi funun al-Adab- v 30, p 41

### **Changing the sect is forbidden:**

“Muhammad bin Isma‘il San‘ani” writes quoted from “Mulla Ali Qari”:

اشتهر بين الحنفية أن الحنفي إذا انتقل إلي مذهب الشافعي يعزر وإذا كان بالعكس فإنه يخلع عليه.

It’s well-known amongst “Hanafis” that if a “Hanafi” tends to “Shafi‘i” Madhhab, “Ta‘zir” {In Islamic Law, Ta‘zir refers to punishment for offenses at the discretion of the judge (Qadi) or ruler of the state} is imposed on him, but it happens vice versa that guy is rewarded.

“Al-San‘ani”- Ershad al-Nuqad, v 1, p 147

### **“Hanbalis” would put curse on “Shafi‘is”:**

“Ibn Asakir Shafi‘i” writes:

إن جماعة من الحشوية والأوباش الرعاع المتوسمين بالحنبلية أظهروا ببغداد من البدع الفضيعة والمخازي الشنيعة ما لم يتسمح به ملحد فضلاً عن موحد... وتناهوا في قذف الأئمة الماضين وثلب أهل الحق وعصابة الدين، ولعنهم في الجوامع والمشاهد، والمحافل والمساجد، والأسواق والطرقات، والخلوة والجماعات، ثم غرهم الطمع والإهمال ومدهم في طغيانهم الغي والضلال، إلي الطعن فيمن يعتضد به أئمة الهدى وهو للشريعة العروة الوثقى، وجعلوا أفعاله الدينية معاصي دنية، وترقوا من ذلك إلي القدح في الشافعي رحمة الله عليه وأصحابه.

A group of slipshod “Hanbalis” did improper acts and made “bid‘ah” {creation in religious matters} in “Baghdad” city and no unbeliever does so, let alone godly guys.

They insulted and put curse on elders of religion in openly in alleys, mosques and gatherings, they even called the improper acts of elders of religion sin and disobedience and dispraised big figure like “Shafi‘i”.

“Ibn Asakir Damascene”- Tabyin Kadhib al-Muftari- p 310

Notice: "Jizyah" is a per capita yearly tax historically levied by Islamic states on certain non-Muslim subjects permanently residing in Muslim lands under Islamic law

### **Getting "Jizyah" from "Hanbalis":**

"Shams al-Din Dhahabi" writes:

وأبو حامد البروي الطوسي الفقيه الشافعي محمد بن محمد تلميذ محمد بن يحيى وصاحب التعليقة المشهورة في الخلاف كان إليه المنتهي في معرفة الكلام والنظر والبلاغة والجدل بارعا في معرفة مذهب الأشعري قدم بغداد وشغب علي الحنابلة أهدوا له مع امرأة صحن حلو مسمومة وقيل إن البروي قال لو كان لي أمر لوضعت علي الحنابلة الجزية.

"Abu Hamid Barwi Tusi", "Shafi'i" scholar, the one whom theology, debating and rhetoric knowledge would end up to him and was so Knowledgeable in "Ash'ari" sect, entered "Baghdad" and put up riot against "Hanbalis".

"Hanbalis" sent poisonous "Halwa" and a women to him, he's been quoted: if I had power I'd impose "Jizyah" on "Hanbalis".

"Al-Dhahabi- al-Ibar fi Khabar Man Abar- v 4, p 200

### **Getting "Jizyah" from "Shafi'i":**

"Abu al-Fada' al-Sudani" writes:

محمد بن موسى بن عبد الله البلاشاغوني التركي تفقه ببغداد وقدم دمشق وولي بها القضاء ومات في جمادي الآخرة سنة ست وخمسمائة وكان يقول لو كان لي أمر لأخذت الجزية من الشافعية.

"Muhammad bin Musa bin Abd Allah", learned "Fiqh" in "Baghdad" and went to Damascene and was appointed as judge, he said: I'd get "Jizyah" from "Shafi'is" if I had power.

"Abu al-Fada' Sudani"- Taj al-Tarajim- v 1,p 350

### **Separating "Shafi'is" and "Hanafis" mosque:**

"Muhammad bin Isma'il San'ani" writes:

لقد وصل الخلاف إلي أن منع بعض الفقهاء الأحناف تزوج الحنفي من المرأة الشافعية ثم صدرت فتوي من فقيه آخر ملقب بمفتي الثقلين فأجاز تزوج الحنفي بالشافعية وعلل ذلك

بقوله تنزيلاً لها منزلة أهل الكتاب وقال العلامة رشيد رضا وقد بلغ من إيذاء بعض المتعصبين لبعض في طرابلس الشام في آخر القرن الماضي أن ذهب بعض شيوخ الشافعية إلى المفتي وهو رئيس العلماء وقال له أقسم المساجد بيننا وبين الحنفية فإننا فلانا من فقهاءهم يعدنا كأهل الذمة بما أذاع في هذه الأيام من خلافهم في تزوج الرجل الحنفي بالمرأة الشافعية وقول بعضهم لا يصح لأنها تشك في إيمانها يعني أن الشافعية وغيرهم يجوزون أن يقول المسلم أنا مؤمن إن شاء الله وقول آخرين بل يصح نكاحها قياساً على الذمية.

Dissension between "hanafis" and "Shafi'is" was so much that some of "Hanafi" jurists said that marrying "Shafi'is" is prohibited and another jurist said that it's permissible considering them as "Jewish" or "Christian", "Rashid Reza" says: there was so much persecution that some of "Shafi'i" elders went to great "mufti" and asked him to divide mosques between "Shafi'is" and "Hanafis", because their jurists behave them like "Dhimmi" {meaning "protected person") refers to specific individuals living in Muslim lands, who were granted special status and safety in Islamic law in return for paying the capital tax}.

**"Al-San'ani", Ershad al-Nuqad- v 1, p 20**

"Tanukhi Basri" writes:

الحنابلة بينون مسجداً ضراراً. أخبرني جماعة من البغداديين: إن الحنابلة بنوا مسجداً ضراراً، وجعلوه سبباً للفتن والبلاء. فتظلم منه إلي علي بن عيسى، فوقع في ظهر القصة. أحق بناء بهدم، وتعفية رسم، بناء أسس علي غير تقوي من الله، فليلحق بقواعده، إن شاء الله تعالى.

A group of people of "Baghdad" has quoted that "Hanbalis" established a mosque that was called "Zirar" by "Shafi'is"; because it was the center of dissention and attacking "Shafi'is", those who were the opponents of establishing this mosque complained to "Ali bin Isa", he wrote on the paper: this building must be destroyed and its remains must be removed; because it founded on impiety, so it must be torn down.

**"Al-Tanoukhi Basri", Nashwar al-Muhazarah wa'i-Akhbar al-Muzakira – v 1, p 330**

But this saying of "Qaffari" and "Dr."Ehsan Elahi Nazeer" that the legacy of Imam "Askari" [AS] was divided between his brother and mother and it implies that he didn't have child otherwise he'd get inheritance.

We say in response: this matter never proves that Imam "Aaskari" [AS] didn't have child; because if Shias have quoted this issue, they haven't said that because Imam "Askari" [AS] didn't have child, his legacy was divided between his mother and brother, but they claim that "Ja'far", brother of Imam "Askari" [AS] who is known as liar, would falsely claim that he is Imam and got the legacy of Imam "Askari" [AS] by force, hypocrisy, deceiving and with the assistance of "Abbasid" caliph.

Shaykh "Saduq" writes:

حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ الْوَرَّاقُ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ هَارُونَ الصُّوفِيُّ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ مُوسَى عَنْ عَبْدِ الْعَظِيمِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ الْحَسَنِيِّ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ قَالَ حَدَّثَنِي صَفْوَانُ بْنُ يَحْيَى عَنْ إِبْرَاهِيمَ بْنِ أَبِي زَيْدٍ عَنْ أَبِي حَمْرَةَ الثَّمَالِيِّ عَنْ أَبِي خَالِدِ الْكَابُلِيِّ قَالَ: ... قَالَ: حَدَّثَنِي أَبِي عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ إِذَا وُلِدَ ابْنِي جَعْفَرُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ عَلِيِّ بْنِ الْحُسَيْنِ بْنِ عَلِيِّ بْنِ أَبِي طَالِبٍ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ فَسَمُّهُ الصَّادِقَ فَإِنَّ لِلْخَامِسِ مِنْ وُلْدِهِ وَلَدًا اسْمُهُ جَعْفَرٌ يَدَّعِي الْإِمَامَةَ اجْتِرَاءً عَلَيَّ اللَّهُ وَكَذِبًا عَلَيْهِ فَهُوَ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ جَعْفَرُ الْكَذَّابُ الْمُفْتَرِي عَلَيَّ اللَّهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ وَالْمُدَّعِي لِمَا لَيْسَ لَهُ بِأَهْلِ الْمُخَالِفِ عَلَيَّ أَبِيهِ وَالْخَاسِدُ لِأَخِيهِ ذَلِكَ الَّذِي يَرُومُ كَشْفَ سِتْرِ اللَّهِ عِنْدَ غَيْبَةِ وَلِيِّ اللَّهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ ثُمَّ بَكَى عَلِيُّ بْنُ الْحُسَيْنِ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ بُكَاءً شَدِيداً ثُمَّ قَالَ كَأَنِّي بِجَعْفَرِ الْكَذَّابِ وَقَدْ حَمَلَ طَاعِيَةَ زَمَانِهِ عَلَيَّ تَفْتِيشِ أَمْرِ وَلِيِّ اللَّهِ وَالْمُعْتَبِ فِي حِفْظِ اللَّهِ وَالتَّوَكُّلِ بِحَرَمِ أَبِيهِ جَهْلًا مِنْهُ بِوَلَادَتِهِ وَحِرْصًا مِنْهُ عَلَيَّ قَتْلِهِ إِنْ ظَفِرَ بِهِ وَطَمَعًا فِي مِيرَاثِهِ حَتَّى يَأْخُذَهُ بِغَيْرِ حَقِّهِ....

"Abi Khaid Kabuli" says:... Imam "Zayn al-Abedin" [AS] said: my father quoted for me from his father [AS] that messenger of god [PBUH] said: when my grandson "Ja'far bin Muhammad bin Ali bin Al-Husayn Ali bin abi Talib [AS] is born, call him "Sadiq" [AS]; because his fifth child named "Ja'far" will ascribe lie to god almighty and claim that he is Imam and with god, he is "Ja'far" liar and claim the position that he doesn't deserve it, he's the opponent of his father and is jealous on his brother, he wants to reveal god's secret at the time of the occultation of Imam appointed by god.

Then "Ali bin Husayn" [AS] cried and said: it's as if I'm seeing "Ja'far" liar who forces the caliph of his time to search the Imamate of Imam appointed by god who is occulted protected by god, {Ja'far does so} because he's ignorant towards his {Mahdi} birth and is greedy killing him in case of catching him to get his brother's inheritance unfairly.

"Al-Saduq"- Perfection of Faith and Completion of Divine Favor, p 319- 320

This narrative which has been quoted by prophet Muhammad [PBUH] clearly shows that "Ja'far" liar wanted to reveal god's secret for the tyrant ruler of his time because of his greed towards Imam "Askari" [AS]'s legacy at the time of the occultation of the Imam appointed by god, he took sultan's guards to Imam [AS]'s house to find and kill his child and get Imam "Askari" [AS]'s property.

So, dividing Imam "Askari" [AS]'s legacy between his brother and mother doesn't prove that he didn't have child.

Shaykh "Mufid" writes about this incident:

وَحَلَفَ ابْنُهُ الْمُنتَظَرُ لِدَوَلَةِ الْحَقِّ وَكَانَ قَدْ أَخْفَى مَوْلِدَهُ وَسَتَرَ أَمْرَهُ لِصُعُوبَةِ الْوَقْتِ وَشِدَّةِ  
طَلَبِ سُلْطَانِ الزَّمَانِ لَهُ وَاجْتِهَادِهِ فِي الْبَحْثِ عَنْ أَمْرِهِ وَلِمَا شَاعَ مِنْ مَذْهَبِ الشَّيْعَةِ  
الْإِمَامِيَّةِ فِيهِ وَعُرِفَ مِنْ انْتِظَارِهِمْ لَهُ فَلَمْ يُظْهِرْ وَلَدَهُ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامِ فِي حَيَاتِهِ وَلَا عَرَفَهُ  
الْجُمْهُورُ بَعْدَ وَفَاتِهِ. وَتَوَلَّى جَعْفَرُ بْنُ عَلِيٍّ أَخُو أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامِ أَخَذَ تَرْكِيَّتَهُ وَسَعَى  
فِي حَبْسِ جَوَارِي أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامِ وَاعْتِقَالَ حَلَائِلِهِ وَشَنَعَ عَلَيَّ أَصْحَابِهِ بِانْتِظَارِهِمْ  
وَلَدَهُ وَقَطَعَهُمْ بِوُجُودِهِ وَالْقَوْلِ بِإِمَامَتِهِ وَأَعْرَى بِالْقَوْمِ حَتَّى أَخَافَهُمْ وَشَرَّدَهُمْ وَجَرَى عَلَيَّ  
مُخَلَّفِي أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامِ بِسَبَبِ ذَلِكَ كُلِّ عَظِيمَةٍ مِنْ اعْتِقَالِ وَحَبْسِ وَتَهْدِيدِ وَتَصْغِيرِ  
وَاسْتِخْفَافِ وَدُلِّ وَلَمْ يَطْفُرِ السُّلْطَانُ مِنْهُمْ بِطَائِلٍ. وَحَازَ جَعْفَرُ ظَاهِرَ تَرْكَةِ أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ عَلَيْهِ  
السَّلَامِ وَاجْتَهَدَ فِي الْقِيَامِ عِنْدَ الشَّيْعَةِ مَقَامَهُ فَلَمْ يَقْبَلْ أَحَدٌ مِنْهُمْ ذَلِكَ وَلَا اعْتَقَدَهُ فِيهِ فَصَارَ  
إِلَى سُلْطَانِ الْوَقْتِ يَلْتَمِسُ مَرْتَبَةَ أَخِيهِ وَبَدَلَ مَالًا جَلِيلًا وَتَقَرَّبَ بِكُلِّ مَا ظَنَّ أَنَّهُ يَتَقَرَّبُ بِهِ  
فَلَمْ يَنْتَفِعْ بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ ذَلِكَ.

Imam "Askari" [AS] left a child who is alive now and is waiting for divine right government.

Hadrat "Askari" [AS] would hide the birth of his child and didn't let anyone to know about it; because caliph was looking for him and left no stone unturned to find him, and at that time it was in the mouth of public that Shias who believe in twelve Imams are waiting for a hidden Imam who is the son of "Abu Muhammad", that why Imam "Askari" [AS] didn't show his son to public and after his demise no one knew about him other than some of his relatives.

Since Imam "Askari" [AS] didn't have seen heir, "Ja'far bin Ali" {known as liar} Imam's brother got his legacy and imprisoned his maids and wives and would swear at the companions of Imam "Askari" [AS] who were waiting for the appearance of Imam "Askari" [AS]'s child and believed that such child exists and he's Imam of the time, and "Ja'fa"

would try to mislead them to scare and disperse them and Imam "Askari" [AS]'s remains suffered a lot due to imprisonment, threatening and humiliation.

Despite all this persecution, caliph couldn't get to his target getting Imam "Askari" [AS]'s child.

And as we said "Ja'far" gained the legacy of Imam "Askari" [AS] and would try to have the same position of Imam "Askari" [AS] amongst Shia; but no one paid attention to his claim and didn't confess to his Imamate, he eventually went to caliph and asked him give him the same dignity as his brother and to get to his target he spent much money and left no stone unturned reaching his goal but he failed getting what he wants.

"Al-Shaykh Mufid"- Al-Irshad- v 2, p 336

### **Shias' opinion about "Ja'far" liar:**

The summary of Shias' view about "Ja'far" liar especially in this matter are as follow:

1: he claimed Imamate while he didn't deserve this position that's why he asked tyrant ruler to prepare the arrangement of his Imamate but his got nothing.

What's interesting is that when "Ja'far" went to minister "Ubayd Allah bin Yahya bin Khaqan" and asked him helping him so that king gives Imamate to him, he said in his response:

يَا أَحْمَقُ السُّلْطَانُ جَرَدَ سَيْفَهُ فِي الَّذِينَ رَعَمُوا أَنَّ أَبَاكَ وَأَخَاكَ أَيْمَّةً لِيَرُدَّهُمْ عَنْ ذَلِكَ فَلَمْ يَتَهَيَّأَ لَهُ ذَلِكَ فَإِنْ كُنْتَ عِنْدَ شِيعَةِ أَبِيكَ أَوْ أَخِيكَ إِمَامًا فَلَا حَاجَةَ بِكَ إِلَى السُّلْطَانِ أَنْ يُرْتَبِكَ مَرَاتِبَهُمَا وَلَا غَيْرِ السُّلْطَانِ وَإِنْ لَمْ تَكُنْ عِنْدَهُمْ بِهَذِهِ الْمَنْزِلَةِ لَمْ تَنْلَهَا بِنَا.

O fool! Sultan drew his sword out to stop people knowing your father and brother as Imam; but he couldn't. now you want him to give you the position of Imamate, if you're Imam with your father and brother's Shias, you won't need the order of sultan or others, and if you're not Imam, you won't get this position by our order.

"Al-Kulayni al-Razi"- al-Uṣūl al-kāfī - v 1, p 505

2: "Ja'far" would falsely claim that he's the owner of the properties and legacy of his brother, he couldn't get the position of Imamate, but after much effort he got the ownership of Imam "Askari" [AS]'s properties with the assistance of Sultan.

3: revealing the secrets of his brother's house was one the improper acts of "Ja'far", he went to ruler and notified them about the birth of Imam "Mahdi" [AS], that's why they put pressure on Imam's family to find born child. Sultan put much effort finding Imam "Askari" [AS], but it was divine will to protect the last proof from the enemies.

When Shias know "Ja'far" as liar, how can dividing the legacy of Imam "Askari" [AS] and getting his properties by such guy, imply that Imam "Mahdi" [AS] wasn't born?

**Good luck.**