

## Is it true that the Prophet had ever had a Will before the Dying?: Historical Analysis and Analysis of Hadith Science on the Hadiths about Will

Muhamad Ridwan Nurrohman<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>STAI Persatuan Islam, Garut, Indonesia.

Email: [rnurrohman@gmail.com](mailto:rnurrohman@gmail.com)

### Abstract:

*The purpose of this paper was to perform verification regarding the will of the Prophet. This study used the approach of hadith science as well as historical analysis to read the available data related to the will of the Prophet. After the research was performed, it was found a conclusion that the Prophet never delegated leadership in a *ṣāriḥ* way (decisively) to anyone. As for the thing, he firmly bequeathed at the end of his life were (1) to expel Jews, Christians, and polytheists from the Arabian Peninsula and 2) to treat delegates as best as they can. As for the third point, there were those who conclude: a) bequeathing the Quran; b) to send Osama troops; c) to keep the prayers and slaves they had; d) not to make his grave as a place of prayer.*

**Keywords:** Hadith, Muhammad, Omar, the Prophet's Death, Will.

### A. INTRODUCTION

Every aspect of the life of Muhammad can always cause controversy both in scientific studies and in the emotional aspect alone. The life of Muhammad, including the one concerning his will that he gave at the end of his life, always attracts the attention of various people (Sinaulan, 2016). The will, at least, have caused controversy between Sunni and Shiite thinkers. It could even have the implication in the appointment of the first caliph, Abu Bakr aṣ-Ṣiddīq (Athoillah, 2006).

Therefore, the review on the facts regarding the Prophet's will is important enough to be studied, at least, to find out the root of the problem that caused the controversy among the Sunni-Shiite related to the Prophet's will (Cf., Moore, 2015). Furthermore, it is certainly important to verify the event.

After a search, it was found at least two "poles of thought" concerning the hadiths about will. The first hadith was about "Thursday's tragedy", telling about the dispute of the Companions involving the side of Omar ibn Al-Khaṭṭāb and the side of the *Ahl al-Bayt* of prophet. At that time, Muhammad's condition was in critical times. At that time, Muhammad insisted on requesting a record in order that he wrote a will, which would protect his *ummah*, so that they would not get lost. Unfortunately, the content of the will failed to be discovered because of the dispute of the Companions at that time. There are at least 56 narrations, scattered in 28 books of hadith, with various variations of the *matn* (content of hadith).

The second hadith explains the events before Thursday's tragedy. The core story is still about "writing a will". However, what is interesting in this tradition is that there was "transparency" about what the Prophet wanted to record there, namely the appointment of Abu Bakr aṣ-Ṣiddīq, which the Prophet predicted that it would cause political friction among the Companions. Even the Prophet clearly stated the motive of his rejection, namely, "considering more deserved and better". There are at least 22 narrations, scattered in 17 books of hadith, also with various variations of the *matn*.

## B. METHODS

Methodologically, the author would discuss the two hadiths from the point of view of the science of hadith, by conducting a verification of *sanad* to find out whether in the aspect of *sanad* the hadiths can be made as *hujjah* (argument). The next step was elaborating the aspect of *matn*. Afterward, then the author crosschecked the data in the book of *sī rah* about the incident in question. Anything understood by the writers of *sī rah* related to the incident would certainly be another interesting thing related to this issue. It is not to "impose" which one is true, of course. It was merely the author's attempt to examine these two hadiths more fairly, as well as to reopen such studies, of course.

## C. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

### 1. General View: What did the Prophet ever bequeath?

This incident started from *Hujjatul-Wada'* (the Last Hajj) of the Prophet. At that time, Muhammad, as told by Jabir ibn Abdullah, delivered an important will in *Khuṭbat al-Wada'* (the Last Sermon). Later, especially in Thursday's tragedy, it began to surface. In the sermon, what the Prophet conveyed includes:

وَقَدْ تَرَكْتُ فِيكُمْ مَا لَمْ تَضِلُّوا بَعْدَهُ إِنْ اعْتَصَمْتُمْ بِهِ: كِتَابُ اللَّهِ، وَأَنْتُمْ تُسْأَلُونَ عَنِّي، فَمَا أَنْتُمْ قَائِلُونَ؟ قَالُوا: نَشْهَدُ أَنْكَ قَدْ أَدَيْتَ، وَبَلَّغْتَ، وَنَصَحْتَ. فَقَالَ بِإِصْبَعِهِ السَّبَابَةَ يَرْفَعُهَا إِلَى السَّمَاءِ، وَيَنْكُتُهَا إِلَى النَّاسِ: اللَّهُمَّ اشْهَدْ. ثَلَاثَ مَرَّاتٍ.

"And verily I have left for you the thing, with which you shall not be lost forever, as long as you cling to him: *Kitābullāh*, and someday you will be asked about this, then what will you answer?" The Companions replied, "We will testify that you have delivered it, even advised us with it." So, the Prophet said, lifting his hand up towards the sky, speaking softly, "O Allah, witness!" three times ('Abd ibn Humaid, 2002: II, 63 & 195; Muslim, 1991, II: 890).

The only will he gave in *Khuṭbat al-Wada'* was *Kitābullāh*. Later, it will be very interesting when looking at the argument built by Omar ibn Al-Khaṭṭāb on Thursday's Tragedy discussed in this paper.

Then, after the Prophet left Mecca because he had finished the series of Hajj, when he just reached a valley later known as *Ghadī r Khum*, he delivered a sermon, still using the diction "will". Only on that occasion, the Prophet said very quietly:

فَإِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ يُؤْتِيهِ رَّبِّي رَسُولٌ لِّئَلَّا تَأْتِيَهُمُ الْغِيَابُ وَهُمْ يَكْفُرُونَ وَأَنَا تَارِكٌ فِيكُمْ تَعْلِينَ: أَوْهُمَا كِتَابُ اللَّهِ فِيهِ الْهُدَىٰ وَالتُّورُ فَخُذُوا بِكِتَابِ اللَّهِ، وَاسْتَمْسِكُوا بِهِ فَحَتَّىٰ عَلَىٰ كِتَابِ اللَّهِ وَرَعَبٍ فِيهِ، ثُمَّ قَالَ: «وَأَهْلُ بَيْتِي أُذَكِّرُكُمْ اللَّهُ فِي أَهْلِ بَيْتِي، أُذَكِّرُكُمْ اللَّهُ فِي أَهْلِ بَيْتِي، أُذَكِّرُكُمْ اللَّهُ فِي أَهْلِ بَيْتِي»

“Actually I'm just an ordinary human like you. Soon the messenger of my Lord, the angel of death, will come to me and I am ready to welcome him. Indeed, I will leave two things that are hard on you, namely: the first, the Quran, which contains instructions and light, so carry out the contents of the Quran and hold on to it (It seems that the Prophet strongly encouraged and urged the practice of the Quran), and the second, my family. I remind all of you to guard the law of God in treating my family.” (Muslim, 1991, II: 1130).

In other *matn* variations, it is even expressed in a more concise and succinct way, for example:

إِنِّي قَدْ تَرَكْتُ فِيكُمْ مَا إِنْ أَخَذْتُمْ بِهِ لَنْ تَضِلُّوا بَعْدِي، الثَّقَلَيْنِ، وَأَخَذَهُمَا أَكْبَرُ مِنَ الْآخِرِ: كِتَابُ اللَّهِ حَبْلٌ مَمْدُودٌ مِنَ السَّمَاءِ إِلَى الْأَرْضِ، وَعِزَّتِي أَهْلُ بَيْتِي، أَلَا وَإِنَّهُمَا لَنْ يَفْتَرَقَا، حَتَّىٰ يَرِدَا عَلَيَّ الْخَوْضَ

“Verily I have left among you (two things) which if you take (the teaching) from it, then you will not go astray. The two things are heavy, but the one is heavier than the others is, namely *Kitābullāh*, which is the rope that extends from the heaven to the earth, and my descendants (my relatives). Surely both will not separate until it returns to me in the Lake (Heaven).” (Ahmad, 2001, XVIII: 114).

إِنِّي تَرَكْتُ فِيكُمْ الْخَلِيفَتَيْنِ كَامِلَتَيْنِ: كِتَابَ اللَّهِ، وَعِزَّتِي، وَإِنَّهُمَا لَنْ يَتَفَرَّقَا حَتَّىٰ يَرِدَا عَلَيَّ الْخَوْضَ

“Verily I have left among you two perfect substitutes: *Kitābullāh*, and my descendants (my relatives). Surely both will not separate until it returns to me in the Lake (Heaven).” (Ibn Abi Shaybah, 1997, I: 108).

Unfortunately, however, these narrations of *thaqalayn* in such concise phrases (besides the narration on *Ghadī r Khum* in *Ṣaḥī ḥ Muslim*) are considered problematic. In essence, these narrations can only be elevated by the narration by Muslim, with such variations of *matn*. For a complete description of this issue can be seen in the description of Al-Arna'uth in his *taḥqīq* of *Musnad Aḥmad*, XVII: 170-175. Looking at the various data, it can be concluded that the true nature of the other variations of the *matn* is a form of *riwāyah bi al-ma'nā* (narration through meaning), which unfortunately describes the essence of difference from the base hadith.

While the diction of *kitāballāh wa sunnata nabīyyih* first emerged in *balagha* method in *Kitāb al-Muwaṭṭ a'* by Imam Malik. That is also in the context of the ban of speaking casually about fate (Malik ibn Anas, 2004, V: 1323). As in the other narrations, all were narrated with a troubled *sanad*, because it passes through Katsir ibn 'Abdullah ibn 'Amr ibn 'Auf (Ibn Hajar, 1995, III: 462-463), Salih ibn Musa (Ibn Hajar 1995, II: 201), and Ismā'il ibn Abī Uwais (Ibn 'Ādiy al-Jurjāni, 1997, I: 525-527).

At a glance, it can be understood the will that the prophet gave to his *ummah*, especially with the characteristics that he characterized, “... will never get lost forever as long as clinging to it.” It is only *kitāballāh* which according to *ijmā' ahlil-hadī th* is categorized safe, while the will of the other

elements can be said to be “problematic”. So, if asked what did the prophet ever bequeath before his death, the answer that can be proved certain is *kitā bullā h*. Whereas, the Prophet’s will in the narration by Muslim to pay attention to his family (*‘itrah/thaqalayn*) is clearly just a human attitude of a head of the family to his family members.

## 2. Thursday Tragedy: What would the Prophet Muhammad be saying?

Then what is the thing that the Prophet wanted to bequeath in the moments before his death? What problem that he considered so important that it could cause a quite diametric dispute among the Companions, and even involving *Ahl al-Bayt* of the Prophet. The hadiths that record the event include:

لَمَّا حَضَرَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَفِي الْبَيْتِ رِجَالٌ، فِيهِمْ عُمَرُ بْنُ الْخَطَّابِ، قَالَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ: (هَلُمَّ أَكْتُبْ لَكُمْ كِتَابًا لَا تَضِلُّوْا بَعْدَهُ) فَقَالَ عُمَرُ: إِنَّ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَدْ غَلَبَ عَلَيْهِ الْوَجَعُ، وَعِنْدَكُمْ الْقُرْآنُ، حَسْبُنَا كِتَابُ اللَّهِ. فَاخْتَلَفَ أَهْلُ الْبَيْتِ فَاحْتَصَمُوا، مِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَقُولُ: قَرُّوْا يَكْتُبْ لَكُمْ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ كِتَابًا لَنْ تَضِلُّوْا بَعْدَهُ، وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَقُولُ مَا قَالَ عُمَرُ، فَلَمَّا أَكْثَرُوا اللَّعْوَ وَالِاخْتِلَافَ عِنْدَ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ، قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ: «قُومُوا» قَالَ عُبَيْدُ اللَّهِ: فَكَانَ ابْنُ عَبَّاسٍ، يَقُولُ: «إِنَّ الرِّزِيَّةَ كُلَّ الرِّزِيَّةِ مَا حَالَ بَيْنَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَبَيْنَ أَنْ يَكْتُبَ لَهُمْ ذَلِكَ الْكِتَابَ، مِنْ اخْتِلَافِهِمْ وَلَعَطِهِمْ».

“By the time the Prophet was about to die, when there were several people in the Prophet’s house, including Omar ibn Khaṭ ṭ ab. The Prophet said, “Come here, I write to you a writing that indeed you will not be lost forever.” Omar said, “The Prophet was in pain, and on your side there is the Quran. It is sufficient for us *kitā bullā h*.” *Ahl al-bayt* came into a quarrel and dispute. Some of which said, “Please come closer so that the prophet can write you a writing for you, which indeed you will not be lost forever.” Among them, there was an opinion as Omar’s opinion. As their voices grew louder and the dispute grew louder on the side of the Prophet, the Prophet said, “Get rid of me!” Ubaidullah said, Ibn Abbas said, “The disaster of all disasters is what prevents the Messenger of Allah to write a record for them, because they are at dispute and make a noise”. (Al-Bukhārī, 1422 H, VII: 120)

Differences of opinion that occurred among these Companions actually did not have much different from their debate about the *Ashr* prayer in Banī Quraiz ah. There were some Companions who held on the *z ā hir* of the prophet’s command text “لا يصلين أحد العصر إلا في بني قريظة”, there were the others who held on the meaning (substance) of the text of the Prophet’s command to perform *Asr* prayer in Banī Quraiz ah (Al-Bukhārī, 1422 H, V: 112). So is the case. There were the companions who held on the *z ā hir* of the prophet’s request to bring a set of writing tools. Meanwhile, the others considered that the Prophet’s request at that time was only an affirmation that requires a lot of energy. In fact, they all understood that the condition of the Prophet at the time was seriously ill. It is supported by their understanding, in this case that of Omar ibn Al-Khaṭ ṭ ab, about the perfect Islamic message that he was about to affirm through his will (Surah al-An’am [6]: 38).

This is evidenced also by the fact that there was no “repeated requests” by the Prophet at that time and on other occasions. In fact, the Prophet only died the next four days, i.e. on Monday (Ibn Hisham,

1955, II: 652-653). There is also no firmness of the party of Ali (Ahmad, 2001, II: 105), as the person requested to bring writing tools or in other words commanded to write, in order to comply with the request of the Prophet (Ibn Hajar, 1379 H, XIII: 208-209). At a glance, this incident is quite similar to the story when the Prophet was about to inform (*ta'yīn*) the time of *laylat al-qadr*. However, due to the dispute of opinions that occurred at that time, it was deprived the goodness (blessing) of the explanation that the Prophet would convey on the two things in question; *ta'yīn* of *laylat al-qadr* time and the writing of the will of the Prophet in this hadith (Ibn Hajar, 1379 H, XIII: 209). The prophet finally preferred not to explain the two things until his death.

The above conclusion is supported by a narration from 'Ali ibn Abī Ṭālib, who was then questioned by Ibn 'Abbās. At that time, 'Ali ibn Abī Ṭālib came out after meeting the Prophet when he was in sick condition that brought to his death. People asked, "O Abū Hasan how is the Prophet?" He replied, "Alhamdulillah, he has healed." Ibn 'Abbās said, 'Abbas ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib took his hand and said, "In God's name, don't you see in three days? The Prophet is going to die of this illness. Indeed, I know the face of the sons of 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib when facing his death. Let us meet the Prophet then we ask to whom this matter (leadership) will be handed over. If to [our] people then we know it, and if in other than us then we will talk to him, so he can put it on us." Then 'Ali said, "In God's name, if we ask him to the Prophet then he refused, people will never give it to us forever. Therefore, by Allah, I will never question that to the Prophet." (Al-Bukhārī, 1422 H, VI: 12).

From these facts, finally it can be concluded that the two things are not the things that the Prophet was obliged to convey to the Muslims. Understandably, these two things were merely a reinforcement to what he had said before since the scholars agree that *tarkul-bayān fī waqtil-hājat* is forbidden (Ibn Uqail, 1999, V: 234). In addition, it is impossible for the Prophet not to convey the message and the truth just because there was opposition from other parties. Yet throughout his journey of *da'wa*, he always got a more powerful opposition, but he still delivered it. What's more, *kitmān* is an impossible trait for him.

### 3. Then what did he really want to say at the time?

Having known the fact that the Prophet did not write a will in Thursday's tragedy, there have arisen various speculations about what he really wanted to say at the time. One side said that there was a political effort in the banning of some companions to the writing of the will. There was an attempt to seize the right of leadership from 'Ali ibn Abī Ṭālib, based on the *mutashābih* information (Ibn Kathir, 1997, VIII: 36). A speculation, just maybe. Because on the other hand, they generated more *muḥkam* evidences related to what is meant. *Ahl al-Sunna* prefers to relate it to the *muḥkam* narrations related to this case, one of which is the narration of the Prophet's sermon, which he delivered after he "failed" to write the testament on Thursday's tragedy (Ibn Kathir, 1997, VIII: 38).

عَنْ أَبِي سَعِيدٍ الْخُدْرِيِّ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ، قَالَ: خَطَبَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ، النَّاسَ وَقَالَ: «إِنَّ اللَّهَ خَيْرَ عَبْدًا بَيْنَ الدُّنْيَا وَبَيْنَ مَا عِنْدَهُ، فَاخْتَارَ ذَلِكَ الْعَبْدُ مَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ»، قَالَ: فَبَكَى أَبُو بَكْرٍ، فَعَجَبْنَا لِئُكَايِهِ: أَنْ يُخْبِرَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ عَنْ عَبْدِ خَيْرٍ، فَكَانَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ هُوَ الْمَخْيِرُ، وَكَانَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ أَعْلَمَنَا، فَقَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ: «إِنَّ مِنْ أَمْرِ النَّاسِ عَلَيَّ فِي صُحْبَتِهِ وَمَالِهِ أَبَا

بَكْرٍ، وَلَوْ كُنْتُ مُتَّخِذًا خَلِيلًا غَيْرَ رَبِّي لَاتَّخَذْتُ أَبَا بَكْرٍ، وَلَكِنْ أُخُوَّةُ الْإِسْلَامِ وَمَوَدَّةُ، لَا يَبْقَى فِي الْمَسْجِدِ  
بَابٌ إِلَّا سُدَّ إِلَّا بَابَ أَبِي بَكْرٍ»

“Verily God has given a choice to a servant of Allah to choose between the world and what is with Him, and then the servant chooses what is with Allah.” Abū Sa’īd said, “Suddenly Abu Bakr cried which amazed us with his cry just because the Prophet preached that there was a servant who was asked to choose. Apparently, the Prophet is what is meant by the servant. Abu Bakr is the one who most understands the gesture. Then the Prophet said, “Truly the most trusted man before me in his friendship and his wealth is Abu Bakr. And if I could take the peak of a lover other than my *Rabb*, Abu Bakr would surely be the man. However, what is there is Islamic brotherhood and affection in Islam. Verily, there is not a single door in the mosque left but will be closed except for the door of Abu Bakr.” (Al-Bukhārī, 1422 H, I: 100 and V: 4).

As Ibn Kathir acknowledged, there is not a single *nash* and authentic proof and even the confession of the Companions related to the will of leadership to anyone, neither to Abu Bakr, as some Ahlus-Sunnites believe, nor to ‘Ali ibn Abī Ṭālib as the Shi’a think. This confession even came from ‘Ali ibn Abī Ṭālib, as recorded in the following description:

عَنْ عَمْرٍو بْنِ سُفْيَانَ قَالَ: لَمَّا ظَهَرَ عَلَيَّ عَلَى النَّاسِ يَوْمَ الْجَمَلِ قَالَ: أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ لَمْ يَعْهَدْ إِلَيْنَا فِي هَذِهِ الْإِمَارَةِ شَيْئًا، حَتَّى رَأَيْنَا مِنَ الرَّأْيِ أَنْ نَسْتَخْلِفَ أَبَا بَكْرٍ، فَأَقَامَ وَاسْتَقَامَ حَتَّى مَضَى لِسَبِيلِهِ، ثُمَّ إِنَّ أَبَا بَكْرٍ رَأَى مِنَ الرَّأْيِ أَنْ يَسْتَخْلِفَ عُمَرَ فَأَقَامَ وَاسْتَقَامَ حَتَّى مَضَى لِسَبِيلِهِ. أَوْ قَالَ: حَتَّى ضَرَبَ الدِّينُ بِجِرَانِهِ إِلَى آخِرِهِ.

“O mankind, the Messenger of Allah did not promise anything to us regarding this leadership, so we are of the opinion to appoint Abu Bakr. Then, he upheld the affair and went straight until his death. Then Abu Bakr took the throne to choose his successor, Omar bin Al-Khaṭ ṭ ab. Then, he upheld the affair and went straight until his death. Then came the people who were pursuing the world, whereas the Caliphate is a matter destined by Allah *subhānahu wata’ālā*.” (Al-Bayhāqī, 1988, VII: 223 and Ibn Kathir, 1997, VIII: 94).

With this information, it is clear that the alleged “omission of will” by the party of Aisha is an unfounded assumption. For even ‘Ali ibn Abī Ṭālib, as the party whose rights is “seized”, never expressed any objection about it. He even felt awkward just to ask it to the Prophet, as narrated in the hadith Al-Abbās. Abu Bakr's election as Caliph after the Prophet had died cannot be separated from the understanding of the companions about the superiority of Abu Bakr and strong cues delivered by the Prophet Muhammad as in his sermon. Not once, the Prophet even delivered a special request to Aisha, as recorded in the following narration:

عَنْ عَائِشَةَ، قَالَتْ: قَالَ لِي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فِي مَرَضِهِ: ادْعِي لِي أَبَا بَكْرٍ، أَبَاكَ، وَأَخَاكَ، حَتَّى أَكْتُبَ كِتَابًا، فَإِنِّي أَخَافُ أَنْ يَتَمَتَّى مُتَمَتِّ وَيَقُولَ قَائِلٌ: أَنَا أَوْلَى، وَيَأْتِي اللَّهَ وَالْمُؤْمِنُونَ إِلَّا أَبَا بَكْرٍ

“Call your father, Abu Bakr, and your brother here to make me a letter, because I'm afraid that someday someone will be ambitious and say, 'I am the one who has more right,' while Allah and the Muslims do not approve it other than Abu Bakr.” (Muslim, 1991, IV: 1857).

At a glance, this history is identical to the history of the Prophet's conversation with Aisha and Ḥaḥḥah about appointing Abu Bakr as a prayer imam replacing him, as follows:

قَالَ النَّبِيُّ - صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ - فِي مَرَضِهِ الَّذِي مَاتَ فِيهِ: ادْعُوا لِي أَبَا بَكْرٍ. فَقَالَتْ عَائِشَةُ: إِنَّ أَبَا بَكْرٍ يَغْلِبُهُ الْبُكَاءُ وَلَكِنْ إِنْ شِئْتَ دَعَوْنَا لَكَ ابْنَ الْخَطَّابِ. قَالَ: ادْعُوا أَبَا بَكْرٍ. قَالَتْ: إِنَّ أَبَا بَكْرٍ رَجُلٌ يَرِيءُ وَلَكِنْ إِنْ شِئْتَ دَعَوْنَا لَكَ ابْنَ الْخَطَّابِ. فَقَالَ: إِنَّكَ صَوَّاحِبٌ يُوسِفُ! ادْعُوا لِي أَبَا بَكْرٍ وَإِنَّهُ فَلْيَكْتُبْ أَنْ يَطْمَعَ فِي أَمْرِ أَبِي بَكْرٍ طَامِعٌ أَوْ يَتَمَنَّيَ مُتَمَنَّئًا. ثُمَّ قَالَ: يَا أَيُّ اللَّهِ ذَلِكَ وَالْمُؤْمِنُونَ. يَا أَيُّ اللَّهِ ذَلِكَ وَالْمُؤْمِنُونَ! قَالَتْ عَائِشَةُ: يَا أَيُّ اللَّهِ ذَلِكَ وَالْمُؤْمِنُونَ. فَأَبَى اللَّهُ ذَلِكَ وَالْمُؤْمِنُونَ.

The Prophet said when he was sick before his death, “Call Abu Bakr.” Then, Aisha said, “O Messenger of Allah, Abu Bakr is a man who cries easily, but if you want we will call for you Ibn Al-Khaḥḥab.” The Prophet reiterated, “Call Abu Bakr.” Aisha said, “O Messenger of Allah, Abu Bakr is a gentle man, but if you want we will call for you Ibn Al-Khaḥḥab.” Finally, he said, “You are like the wives of Yusuf! Call Abu Bakr and his son and write it down because there may be greedy people who want Abu Bakr's business. Yet God is reluctant, and the believers refuse.” Aisha said, “Allah refuses (other than him) and the believers are reluctant (for besides Abu Bakr).” (Ibn Sa'ad, 1990, II: 173).

Imam Al-Bukhāri even recorded a hadith that is in the same meaning with the above hadith in Al-Istikhlāf chapter, appointing a successor (Al-Bukhāri, 1422 H, IX: 80). This is what allegedly made the majority of the Muslims finally agreed to make Abu Bakr as the caliph after the death of the Prophet, even bind themselves by way of pledging allegiance (*bay'ah*) to him. Although the above narration by Muslim is a *riwāyah bi al-ma'nā* from the narration by Ibn Sa'ad. However, the proximity of the foresight of the Muslims had been quite able to translate the cues that the Prophet gave to make Abu Bakr as the leader for the Muslims.

To eliminate the unclear assumptions of hadith *yaum al-khāmis*, it is necessary to study further the meaning of the speech of Ibn 'Abbās. In Ibn 'Abbās' understanding, since the Prophet did not succeed in writing his will, it raised doubts among the human heart about the appointment of Abu Bakr (Ibn Taymiyya, 1986, VI: 317; 1995, IV: 400). It is in this context that the phrase “great disaster” was uttered. However, it turns out that about this *ar-raziyya* sentence in the future its meaning would be twisted by some followers of Khawarij and Shiite to doubt the leadership of Abu Bakr. What is the evidence to suggest that this is the correct interpretation? On another occasion, Ibn 'Abbās conveyed about the stages of taking a source of legal references in the following order: (1) what is recorded in the Qur'an, (2) what the Prophet decreed, (3) what Abu Bakr and Omar decided, if still not obtained (4) he would perform *ijtihād* (Ad-Dārimi, 2000, I: 265, Ibn Abi Shaybah, 1409 H, IV: 544, al-Hākim, 1990, I: 216, and Al-Bayhāqi, 2003, X: 197).

So, if it should be traced chronologically various versions of hadith narrations related to this incident, it will be found in this order: (1) Hadith of Aisha, “ادعو لي اباك”; (2) Hadith *yaum al-khāmis*; (3) the Prophet's farewell sermon; and (4) Hadith of 'Alī and al-'Abbās. In this chronological order, it

becomes clear how to put the matter properly on the “will of leadership” of the Prophet before his death. So anyone who argues with the *mutashābih* status of the hadith *yaum al-khāmis* as a leadership will for ‘Ali ibn Abī Ṭālib is an opinion that cannot be accounted for scientifically. Both from the point of view of hadith and history. Ibn Baṭ ṭ al even mentioned this to be false (Ibn Baṭ ṭ al, 2003, V: 215).

Then what is the third point in the will? There is no agreement among the scholars on this matter. Some argue that what is meant is to (a) to cling to the Quran; (b) the dispatch of Osama’s troops and their departure to conquer the country of Sham; (c) that Muslims to keep their prayers and keep the slaves they have; (d) not to make his grave as a place of prayer. However, if you look at the context of the other two points of the will of the Prophet, then the “dispatch of Osama’s troops” could be very appropriate in this case. This can be seen from the attitude of Abu Bakr who still insisted on sending the troops after the Prophet died, despite getting various objections from the Companions (Ibn Kathir, 1997, IX: 424).

#### **D. CONCLUSION**

After the study through the method of hadith and historical analysis had been performed, it was found a bright spot about the will of the Prophet at the end of his life. It is revealed that what was alleged about the disappearance of the will, especially by using the hadith *yaum al-khāmis* as the reason, cannot scientifically be accounted for. It was revealed also about the three points of will that the Prophet SAW conveyed at the time, namely: 1) to expel the Jews, Christians, and the polytheists from the Arabian Peninsula; 2) to treat the delegates as best they can; and 3) the dispatch of the troops of Osama and their departure to conquer the country of Sham. These three points are proven to be tested both through the method of testing of hadith and history.

With the disclosure of this case, the author hopes to build a good and proper scientific tradition, especially in the land of Indonesian archipelago. The author wants to change a debate that today is more dogmatic, Sunni-Shiite, to be an open scientific discussion. Anyone who has the data and thoughts is encouraged to write it in the form of scientific work, not just talking loosely and sometimes being not responsible. What for? Of course to revive the scientific tradition in Indonesian archipelago.



## References

- Abd bin Humaid, Abu Muhammad. (2002). *Al-Muntakhab min Musnad 'Abd bin Humaid*. Edited by Musthafa Adawi. Vol. II. Riyadh: Dar Bilinsiyah.
- Asqalani, Ibn Hajar. (1379 H). *Fath al-Bārī: Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Vol. XIII. Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah.
- Asqalani, Ibn Hajar. (1995). *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*. Vols. II, III. Beirut: Muassasah Risalah,
- Athoillah, M. Anton. (2006). *Perbedaan Ahl Al-Bait dan Al-Sunnah: Studi Hadits tentang Wasiat Nabi SAW*, Bandung, Gunung Djati Press.
- Bayhāqī, Abu Bakr. (1988). *Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah*. Vol. VII. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah.
- Bayhāqī, Abu Bakr. (2003). *Al-Sunan al-Kubrā*. Vol. X. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah.
- Bukhārī, Muhammad bin Ismail. (1422 H). *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Edited by Muhammad Zuhair bin Nashir an-Nashir. Vols. I, V, VI, VII, IX. Dar Thuq an-Najah.
- Dārimī, Abu Muhammad. (2000). *Sunan al-Dārimī*. Edited by Husain Salim Darani. Vol. I. KSA: Dar al-Mughni.
- Hākim, Abu 'Abdullah An-Naisabury. (1990). *Al-Mustadrak 'alā Ṣaḥīḥayn*. Vol. I. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah.
- Ibn Abi Shaybah, Abu Bakr. (1409 H). *Al-Muṣannaf*. Vol. IV. Riyadh: Maktabah ar-Rasyd.
- Ibn Abi Shaybah, Abu Bakr. (1997). *Musnad Ibn Abī Shaybah*. Vol. I. Riyadh: Dar al-Wathan.
- Ibn al-Hajjaj, Muslim. (1426 H). *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Edited by Muhammad Fuad Abdul Baqi. Vols. II, IV. Beirut: Dar Ihya at-Turats al-Arabi.
- Ibn Anas, Malik. *Al-Muwatta'*. (2004). Edited by Musthafa A'dzami. Vol. V. Muassasah Zaid bin Sulthon.
- Ibn Baṭṭal, Abu al-Hasan. (2003). *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Vol. V. Riyadh: Maktabah ar-Rasyd.
- Ibn Hanbal, Ahmad. (2001). *Al-Musnad*. Edited by Syu'aib al-Arna'uth. Vols. II, XVIII. Beirut: Muassasah Risalah.
- Ibn Hisham, Abdul Malik. (1955). *Sīrah al-Nabawiyyah*. Vol. II. Mesir: Musthafa Bab al-Halabi.
- Ibn Ishaq, Muhammad. (1978). *Sīrah Ibn Ishāq*. Edited by Suhail. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr.
- Ibn Kathir, Ismail. (1997). *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*. Vols. VIII, IX. Dar al-Hijr.
- Ibn Sa'ad, Abu Abdullah. (1990). *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*. Vol. II. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah.

Ibn Taymiyya, Taqiyuddin Ahmad. (1986). *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah*. Vol. VI. Jami'ah Muhammad bin Sa'ud.

Ibn Taymiyya, Taqiyuddin Ahmad. (1995). *Majmū' al-Fatawā*. Edited by Abdurrahman bin Muhammad bin Qasim. Vol. IV. Madinah: Majma' Malik Fahd.

Ibn Uqail, Ali. (1999). *Al-Wāḍiḥ fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh*. Vol. V. Beirut: Muassasah Risalah.

Jurjāni, Ibn 'Ādiy. (1997). *Al-Kāmil fī Ḍu'afā' al-Rijāl*. Vol. I. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah.

Moore, James, (2015). "The Sunni and Shia Schism: Religion, Islamic Politics, and Why Americans Need to Know the Differences". *The Social Studies*, 106:5, 226-235.

Sinaulan, Ramlani Lina. (2016). "Islamic Law and Terrorism in Indonesia". *International Journal of Nusantara Islam*, Vol .04 No .01 pp. 13-28, <https://dx.doi.org/10.15575/ijni.v4i1.1436>