

REVISITING A FRAGMENT OF THE EARLY HISTORY OF ISLAM: THE MYTH OF THE ORDER TO ASSASSINATE ENEMIES BY THE PROPHET

Javad Fakhkhar Toosi

University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Email: j.fakhar.t@gmail.com

Abstract

This article studies a part of early Islam's history that seems ambiguous due to some reports. According to these reports, Prophet Muhammad issued decrees ordering of his opponents and enemies' assassination. The qualitative method has been used in the article. The article shows that there are only 4 cases that appear to have been terrorist operations. Another achievement of the article is that among these 4 cases, only one seems to be valid, and the other three are all rejected because of their chain of narrators. Also, these 4 cases, have all occurred on the battlefield and warzone, and none are indicative of terrorist operations. The article also argues that in the life-history studies of the Prophet, the basic principles and general teachings of the Prophet must be our foundations. The article refers to a general principle in the teachings of the Prophet, according to which He proclaimed that a Muslim must never assassinate. In conclusion, neither the authenticity of the reports, nor their texts are acceptable; they are contrary to the general policy of Islam in the fight against terrorism. The article suggests that the general principles and central teachings of the Prophet should be of interest to researchers in the study of early Islam history, which sometimes contain inconsistent and ambiguous reports.

Keywords: *Early history; Islamic history; revisiting; the prophet; assassination*

MENINJAU KEMBALI FRAGMENT SEJARAH AWAL ISLAM: MITOS PERINTAH UNTUK MEMBUNUH MUSUH OLEH NABI

Abstrak

Artikel ini mencoba mempelajari kembali bagian dari sejarah awal mula Islam yang tampaknya ambigu karena beberapa laporan. Menurut laporan-laporan ini, Nabi Muhammad mengeluarkan dekrit yang memerintahkan pembunuhan lawan dan musuhnya. Artikel ini menggunakan metode kualitatif dan menunjukkan bahwa hanya ada 4 kasus yang tampaknya merupakan bagian dari operasi teroris. Temuan lain dari artikel ini adalah bahwa di antara 4 kasus ini, hanya satu yang tampaknya valid, dan tiga lainnya semuanya tertolak disebabkan oleh rantai periwayatan mereka. Selain itu, 4 kasus ini, semuanya terjadi di medan perang dan tidak ada indikasi sebagai operasi teroris. Artikel ini juga berpendapat bahwa dalam studi sejarah hidup Nabi, asas dasar dan ajaran umum Nabi mesti menjadi landasan kita. Artikel ini mengacu pada prinsip umum dalam ajaran Nabi yang menyatakan bahwa seorang Muslim tidak boleh membunuh. Kesimpulannya, baik keaslian laporan maupun teks mereka tidak dapat diterima; laporan-laporan tersebut bertentangan dengan kebijakan umum Islam dalam perang melawan terorisme. Artikel ini menyarankan bahwa prinsip-prinsip umum dan ajaran utama Nabi harus menjadi perhatian para

peneliti dalam studi sejarah Islam awal, yang terkadang berisi laporan yang tidak konsisten dan ambigu.

Kata Kunci: *Sejarah awal; sejarah Islam; peninjauan kembali; nabi; pembunuhan*

Introduction

Part of the study of Islamic history is of great importance because it deals with the history of the life of the Prophet (peace be upon him). The truth is that there are still challenging questions in this part of Islamic history that sometimes provide a pretext for Western scholars to criticize this religion. One of the challenging parts is the charge of conducting terrorist operations and its permission by Prophet Mohammed, which some opponents have put forward.

There are reports in historical and Islamic sources that involve the murder of some people by the prophet's ordering. According to some narrations in Islamic sources, the prophet (pbuh) had ordered for the assassination of his enemies; *Abī 'afak* (Al-Balāziri 2007. 1, 374), *'ṣmā'* Daughter of *Ma rwān* (Al- Wāqidī 2004. 1 , 173), *K'ab Ibn Al-ashrāf* (Al-Tabarī 2002. 2, 487), *abū RĀfi'* (Ibn sa^c d 2009. 2,

28). These narrations can be found in the books about prophet's lifestyle (*Sīreh*) and also in historical sources. While these reports have led to numerous attacks on the personality of Prophet Muhammad, they have provided an opportunity for extremists to attribute their behaviour to the prophetic tradition.

We are not going to discuss all of them, but only the ones that involve assassination. There are only four cases that indicate assassination which. They are: *Abī 'afak*, *'ṣmā'* Daughter of *Ma rwān*, *K'ab Ibn Al-ashrāf*, and *abū RĀfi'*. Other cases were some criminals have killed by public performance of punishment, for committing some types of crimes. For example we can refer to *'abdullah āl -Akḥṭal* and *Moqīs Ibn ṣababah* , that were not assassinated but were publicly executed (al-Bayhaqi, 2003 9, 120; Al-Bukhārī, 1981 4 ,28; al-

Niyshābūrī, 2003 4, 111; Al-Sajestani, 2008 1, 607).

The purpose of this article is to revise these reports. The study shows that the reports are false and that Prophet has not issued any statements to the assassination of his opponents. The research aims to find the best solution for these narrates.

The importance of the article is that by presenting the reality in this passage of Islamic history, it solves a significant challenge in the path of prophetic studies. This article can open the way for further studies of this kind of topics in the history of Islam. These researches eliminate many of the criticisms and misunderstandings of the Prophet's personality as well as the history of Islam.

In this research, an analytical method is used to investigate the propositions related to the issue in question. We used a critical approach to criticize the evidence that has been argued by them to attributed the permission of assassination. As historical studies of the Prophet's life relate to

narratives quoted in the books of history and *Sīrah*. We examine the chain of narrators on the one hand and to review the text of the reports on the other one.

Assassination of Abī 'afak

According to the reports Abī 'afak was an old poet, who called people for uprising against prophet. *Sālim Ibn 'miyr* got the command from the prophet to kill him, and killed him on his way back from *Badr* when he was asleep in front of his tent (Al-Balāzirī, 2007 1, 374; ibnKathir, 1990 5, 220).

The main resources about Abī 'afak assassination is *Tabaqāt Ibn Sa'd* (IbnSa'd, 2009 2, 480). He narrated mostly from Wāqidī and Ibn Kalb. Later many scholars like Al-Balāzirī, Al-Tabarī, Al-Zahabī and Ibn Hajar followed Ibn Sa'd in the story of Abī 'afak. Some authors have explicitly stated that the main source of the story is the book *Tabaqāt* (sayyidAl-Nās, 2008 1, 382). In Ibn Sa'd's chain of transmission Waqidī quotes on the authority of Sa'd bin Muhammad Zarqī on the authority of 'ammarah bin ghazzīyyah and Abū Moṣab

Ismā'īl bin Moṣ'ab bin Ziyd bin thābit, on the authority of someone (withouth mentioning his neam). This is a Mursal hadith that chain of narrators is not completed. The one whom Ismā'īl bin Moṣ'ab calls him an unnamed. The schollars do not This type of tradition (Mursal) valid.

Another important source for this story is the book of *Sīrah Rasūl Allāh* by Ibn Hisham Al-Himyari (Al-Himyari, 2005 4, 1051). The book is in fact the treatises of Muhammad bin Ishāq Al-Madanī, gathered by Ibn Hisham. He notes that he did not change the content of the treatise except for a few parts that were not important (Al-Himyari, 2005 1, 12). Muhammad bin Ishāq Al-Madanī was born in 85 After Hijrah and passed away between 150-153 in Baghdad. His work did not reach us, but its content was passed to several narrators. One of these narrators was Yūnis bin Bukiyar which has narrated only 374 reports. Theanother one is Muhammad bin ASlamiah, which has only narrated 47 reports. These two collections of reports are published

in one volume as *Sirah Ibn Ishāq* by Professor Muhammad Hamidullah. There is the third person who had quoted reports from Ibn Ishāq that is Zīyād bin 'abd Allah Al-bukā'ī (186 AH). Zīyād bin 'abd Allah Al-bukā'ī succeeded to hear the reports not once but twice from Ibn Ishāq himself, and gathered what he had heard.

Most of the Authors of *Sirah* books and historians have quoted Abī 'afak's story from Ibn Hisham Al-Himyari such as Ibn Kathīr (ibnKathir, 1990 5, 239). In Professor Muhammad Hamidullah's collection there is no report about Abī 'afak's murder(IbnIshāq, 2010). Thus, Ibn Ishāq's narration about the story of Abī 'afak is available only based on what Ibn Hisham has quoted. Muhammad bin Ishāq reported about the life of the prophet from several people, like: 'āṣim Ibn 'umar Ibn qatadaa (119-129 AH.); Muhammad Ibn Muslim Ibn 'ubayd Ibn Shahāb Al-Zahrī (51-124 AH). Al-Zahrī is the source of many of Ibn Ishāq's reports. He quotes from four people: Sa'īd Ibn Mussayyib; Abān Ibn 'usmān Ibn

ʿaffān; ʿubiyd Allah Ibn ʿabd Allah Ibn ʿutbah and ʿurvah Ibn Al-Zubiyri.

These four people are from *Tābiʿīn* (those who did not see the prophet, but they only have seen his Companions.) For example, ʿubiyd Allah Ibn ʿabd Allah Ibn ʿutbah quotes directly from ʿāyishah; Abī Hurayrah; Fatimah Bint Qiys; Abī Waqid Al-Liythī; Ziyd Ibn Khālid Ajahnī; Ibn ʿabbās; Ibn ʿumar; Abī Sʿīd; Nuʿmān Ibn Bashīr: *Miyūna*; *umm Al-Salamah*: *ad umm Qiyeys Bint Mohsin*. Accordingly, a part of the report of *Ibn Ishāq* that have been quoted by *Ibn Hisham*, which are *Mursal* (without the chain of narrators) and it is not clear whom *Ibn Ishāq* quotes from, cannot be accepted and attributed to the prophet. The reports about *Abī ʿafak* Murder are *Murasl*. *Ibn Hisham* has quoted from *Ibn Ishāq* without mentioning the all narrators (Al-Himyari, 2005 4, 1051). The result is that, we cannot attribute the command of *Abī ʿafak*'s assassination to the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) because the narrative is *Mursal* and

unreliable. This is regarding the authenticity of the narrative.

On the other hand, considering the content of *Hadith* we find out that in this story, *Sālim Ibn ʿumiyr* (who killed *Abī ʿafak*) did not assassinate him, but his act was a night raid to the enemy and killing one of the talented people of the enemy's army. Historians have reported this story as "*Sariyyah Sālim Ibn ʿumiyr*". We already know that the wars during the prophet's time are divided into two categories: "*Ghazvah*" and "*Sariyyah*". The second was the wars which the prophet did not attend them. "*Ghazvah*" and "*Sariyyah*" were both military operations, with only one difference that is the prophet's presence in *Ghazvah*. So, *Sālim Ibn ʿumiyr* killed *Abī ʿafak* in a military attack not in an assassination *Al-Zubiydī* the famous lexicographer says: "*Sālim Ibn ʿumiyr* was a man who killed *Abī ʿafak* in a *Sariyyah* that prophet sent him to". (*Al-Zubiydī*, 2010 13, 616)

It should also be noted that *Abī ʿafak* was not murdered in his home, but he was killed in his camp

among his people. *Sālim Ibn ʿumiyr* had sneaked into the enemy's army, as *Al-Balazerī*, described the scene and says: "*Sariyyah* of *Sālim Ibn ʿumiyr* took place in *Shawwāl* of the second year after *Hijrah*. *Abī ʿafak* was an old man who persuaded people to start a war against the prophet and Islam. He was one of the great men of the *Banī ʿamr Ibn ʿūf* tribe. He participated in the war of *Badr* with his people, and resided with *Banī ʿamr Ibn ʿūf* in a place on the way back. During this time, *Sālim Ibn ʿumiyr* and his people, chased him, raided and killed *Abī ʿafak*, in front of his tent¹". (Al-Balāzirī, 2007 1, 374).

The point is that, the prophet only commanded to kill him, he did not confirm his assassination or terrorizing. Thus, even if we accept that *Sālim Ibn ʿumiyr* assassinated *Abī ʿafak*, we cannot say it was the prophet's command.

Assassination of ʿAṣamāʾ Bint Marwān

Al-Maghāzī is the main source of the story of this assassination.

Waqidī quotes on the authority of ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Hārith, who quotes on the authority of his father that: "5 nights were left of *Ramadhān* of the nineteenth month after *Hijrah*, ʿumiyr Ibn ʿudiy Ibn *Kharshah Al-Khatmī* went to kill ʿAṣamāʾ Bint *Marwān* who was from *Banī ʿumayyah Ibn Ziyd*. ʿAṣamāʾ was wife of *Yazīd Ibn Ziyd Ibn Heṣn Al-Khatmī*. She used to mock Islam and bother the prophet, encouraged people against him and wrote poems in mockery of Islam., ʿumiyr Ibn ʿudiy who was a night blind, went to ʿAṣamāʾs house in the dark of the night, and went by her bed. Some of her children were sleeping by her side, one of them who was an infant had her mother's breast in her mouth. ʿumiyr searched for her and put the child away from her mother's breast, then put his sword on ʿAṣamāʾs breast and came out from the other side of her body. Then ʿumiyr performed the Morning Prayer with the prophet in the mosque. The Prophet asked him: have you killed the daughter of

¹. āhmad ibn yahyā ibn Jaber āl Balāzerī. (2007). ānsab āl āshr āf. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar ālfekr. v1' p374.

Marvan? He answered: I have, and have I done wrong? “Even two goats won’t fight for what you did (it is not important)” said the prophet. This sentence became the famous saying after that” (Waqidi, 2004 1 , 173).

This story is mentioned in other important sources like *Tabaqāt Ibn Sa’d*. Ibn Sa’d has quoted from Al- Waqidi (IbnSa'd, 2009 2, 21). *Sīrah Rasūl Allāh* by Ibn Hisham Al-Himyari another source that has mentioned it as we quoted Al- Waqidi (Al-Himyari, 2005 2, 637). The rest of the other sources have quoted the story from Ibn Sa'ad, or in the form of Mursel, without mentioning the source they quoted from (Alī Ibn Al-Jūzī, 2007 3, 135; Al-Muqrizī, 2008 1, 120; Al-Tamīmī, 2002 1, 207; Ibnkathīr, 2009 4, 438).

First of all, we need to point out that the assassination has not reported in any valid narrative collection such as *Sahīh* and *Sunan*, and the reports we have come across from some sources have not attracted the attention of authors of authoritative collections such as

Bukharī and *Muslim*. As *Ibn Salāmah* has mentioned there are three chains of narrators for this report. First, *Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Isfahanī* quotes on the authority of *Hassan Ibn Alī Al-Tustarī* and *dhū Al-Nūn Ibn Muhammad* on the authority of *Hassan Ibn ‘Abd Allah Al-‘Askarī* on the authority of *Yahyá Bin Muhammad* on the authority of *Bakr Ibn ‘Abd Allah Wahhāb* on the authority of *Waqidī* on the authority of *‘Abd Allah Ibn Harith Ibn Fuḍiyl* on the authority of his Father (Al-Qaḍā’ī, 1985 1, 203). Many scholars have clarified that *Fuḍiyl*, the father of of *‘Abd Allah Ibn Harith* quotes from several people as: *Ja’far Ibn ‘Abd Allah Ibn Hakam Al-Anārī*; *Sufyān Ibn Abī Al- ‘ujā’*; *‘Abd Al-Ramām Ibn khayy Al-Asadī*; *‘Abd Al-Rahmān Ibn Abī qarād*; *Muhammad Ibn Muslim Ibn Shahāb Al-Zahrī*; *Mahmūd Ibn Lubiyd Al-Anṣarī* (Al-Mazī, 2007 5, 271). This chain of narrators shows that the report is Mursal (the chain is not completed) because we can’t understand Which one of these six people has narrated for Fozeil. So, the report is not acceptable. Because it has to be

clear who has been quoted from then we can speak about his credibility.

In addition authenticity of *Abd Allah Ibn Harith Ibn Fuḍayl* is not verified in none of the books have written about narrators. Not only he is not verified, but some have explicitly have asserted his mendacity (Alī Ibn Al-Jūzī, 2009 3, 35).

In the second chain of narrators that is mentioned by Ibn Salāmah Abū Tāhir Muhammad Ibn Al-husayn Ibn Muhammad Ibn Sa'dūn on the authority of Abū Al-Hasan 'Alī Ibn Muhammad Ibn Al-Hasan Al-Harbī on the authority of Abū Al-Faḍl Ja'far Ibn Ahmad Al-Jurjānī on the authority of Muhammad Ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn 'Alā Al-Shāmī on the authority of Muhammad Ibn Al-Hajāj; Abū Ibrāhīm Al-Wāsetī on the authority of Mujālid Ibn Sa'īd on the authority of Sh'abī on the authority of Ibn 'Abbās. Some of the narrators in this chain are strongly criticized by scholars. For example, Hiythamī declares about Muhammad Ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn 'Alā' Al-Shamī: " He is

seriously weak and unreliable" (Al-Hiythamī, 2010 5 , 299). Dār AL-qutanī says: " He is a liar" (Al-Bastī, 2003 2, 303). And Ibn 'udayy says: " All of his narratives are invalid and he is a thief" ('udayy, 2006 6, 286).

The Third chain of narrators includes Abū ' Abd Allah Husayn Ibn Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Al-Raqqī on the authority of Muhammad Ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn 'Alā on the authority of Muhammad Ibn Al-Hajāj Abū Ibrāhīm Ibn Al-Wasitī on the authority of Mujālid on the authority of Sh'bī on the authority of Ibn 'abbās (Al-Qaḍā'ī, 1985 2, 48). This chain is the same as last one and is not unacceptable.

In addition to the triples chain of narrators of *Ibn Salāmah*, another chain has mentioned for report in question by Ibn 'Asākir in which *Hasan Ibn Muḥaffar* and *Muhammad Ibn Al-Husayn* and *'Abd Allah Ibn Ahmad Ibn Barakah Al-Asimsār* have quoted from *Abū Al-Ghanā'im Ibn Al-Ma'mūn* from 'Alī Ibn 'umar Ibn Muhammad Al-Harbī from *Ja'far Ibn Ahmad Ibn Al-Jurjānī* from *Muhammad Ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn 'Alā Al-Shamī* from *Muhammad Ibn*

Al-Hajjāj Al-Lakhmī Abū ibrahīm Al-Wāsitī from *Mujālid Ibn Sa'īd* from *Sh'bī* from *Ibn Abbās* (Ibn'Asākir, 2001 51, 224). This chaine of narrators has the same problem which is mentioned in the second and third chain of *Ibn Salāmah*. *Muhammad Ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn 'Alā Al-Shamī* is among the narrators This chain is also invalid and unreliable.

However, among the sources that have contributed to report this story, we also find *Ibn Hajar*, who has narrated from *Wāqidī* (Al'Asqalānī, 2002 4, 599). We have already mentioned in the first chain of *Ibn Salāmah* that *Wāqidī* quoted from his father, *Abd Allah Bin Hārith Bin Faḍl* (or *Fuḍiyl*). So the report of *Ibn Hajar* has the same problem as we mentioned about *Ibn Salāmah's* chain of transmission. Therefore, *Ibn Hajar's* chain cannot be examined independently and unacceptable as is the case of *Ibn Salāmah*.

So far we discussed regarding the authenticity of the report, but the story of assassination of 'Aṣamā' *Bint Marwān* is doubtful from

another aspect. According to the report, the prophet did not command her murder. The day after her murdering, the incident came to the notice of Prophet Muhammad. For instance, *Ibn Salāmah* one of the eleventh century's historians reports her death as " 'Aṣamā' *Bint Marwān* was from *Banī 'umaiyyah Bin Zayid*, and her husband was *Yazīd Ibn Zayid Ibn Hiṣn Al-khatmī*. She had persuaded people against the prophet and Muslims and had written poems to ridicule the prophet. Therefore *'umiyr ibn 'udaiyy* avowed that if the prophet came back from battle of *Badr* safely, he will murder that woman. So he went to her at night and killed her in the dark. Then he came to the prophet, performed the morning prayer with him and then informed the prophet the situation (Al-Qaḍā'ī, 1985 2, 48). Scholars in various sources have emphasised the unawareness of the Prophet about the murder of 'Aṣamā' (Ibn Athīr, 2014 4, 140).

K'ab Ibn Al-ashrāf

The story of the killing of *K'ab Ibn Al-ashrāf* is told in Islamic

sources. *Al-Bukharī*, in his book (*ṣahīh*), cites a report on the *Ka'ab* assassination under the heading "Surprise killing of infidels (*Kuffār Al-Harbī*) ". This title perhaps suggests the permissibility of assassination in case of the infidels (Bukhari, 1981. 4, 25).

Al-Tabarī quotes the murder of *K'ab Ibn Al-ashrāf* as: "He was a Jewish from the *Banī Naḍīr* Jewish clan, and he was a well-spoken, a lecturer and a poet. *K'ab Ibn Al-ashrāf* made himself the head of the Castle of *Banī Naḍīr* and at the same time he had his own castle in front of the castle of *Banī Naḍīr*. *K'ab* had good relations with the prophet's enemies and helped them. Whenever he came to Medina told people to cry, to make people think the prophet has passed and the prophet had heard this. One day the prophet was among his Companions, and they were talking about *K'ab ibn Al-Ashrāf*. The prophet became upset and said: who is willing to give his life to God and kill this man? *Muhammad Ibn Salamah*, said: O! Prophet I will go and kill this man. The Prophet

praised him. Three days passed, and the prophet was waiting for him to go, but he did not. So the prophet asked him: why you did not go? He answered: O! prophet, I have not eaten, nor I drinking water for three days. The Prophet asked: why? He said: for there is no choice but to get him out of his bodyguards by lying to him for *K'ab* is an important man and has a guard around him, I need some friends to help me. Seven men of *Anṣār* accompanied him, and they all discussed the matter to find a way. They went at the guard of *K'ab*. There were palm groves, and *Banī Naḍīr's* were on guard. They went with their weapons, and *Muhammad Ibn Salamah* called *K'ab*, and said: I am here to ask for your counsel about something if you can come, and if you do not tell us, so we go. When *K'ab* came out, *Ibn Salamah* saluted and called his companions, and they gripped their swords and killed *K'ab* They were gone before the Cuban guards were informed" (Al-Tabarī, 1967 . 2, 487).

According to this report, *K'ab's* murder was commanded by the prophet, but he had commanded

for a battle. Hence, Islamic sources have mentioned the story of *K'ab* as a *Sariyyah* (a war that prophet did not participate in). Thus, an armed group was sent to kill *Ka'b ibn al-Ashraf*, and the prophet did not order to assassinate but directed a military attack on a fortress. It was a surprise operation and not a terrorist attack. The most significant Islamic sources have raised the story of the *Ka'b* under the heading of "The night attack to the enemy at war" (al-Shāfi'ī 1982. 4, 253); "Invasion at Night to the Depth of the Enemy's Camp at war" (Al-Tanūkhī, 2005. 2, 3); "Attack to the enemy's army without warning" (Al-ṣan'ānī, 1960. 4, 45); "The Surprising invasion to the enemy's army" (Al-Sajestānī, 2008. 1, 630); "Prohibition of deception except for the time of war" (al-Bayhaqī, 2003. 8, 40); "Deception at War" (Al-Bukhārī, 1981 . 4, 24). This title has used by *Al-Bukhārī* and many scholars have followed him and titled their report of the event as "Lying at War" such as *Shawkanī* (*Al-Shawkānī*, 1973. 8, 82), *Ibn Hajar* (*Al-'A'sqalani*, 1960. 6, 11),

On the other hand, The killing of *Ka'b* was a sequence of the suppression of a group of Jews who had violated covenants and taken action against Muslims. It was not, therefore, an arbitrary act, but rather a series of Muslim-led war operations against the group. As the credible sources report, the killing of *K'ab* has nothing to do with terror. According to sources, the expeditionary group encountered the fortress and the armed forces of the Kab. By turning to a deception pulled him out of the fortress. It is not an assassination to pull an enemy commander out of the military fort and kill him, even though they have been deceived militarily. It is prevalent in the wars resorting to such actions. For this reason, Muslim scholars have viewed the story as a military operation (Al-Sajestānī, 2008; al-Shāfi'ī 1982. 4, 253). *Al-Bukhārī* clarifies that *Ka'b* was residing in the military castle (Al-Bukhārī, 1981. 5, 26), and *Hākim Al-Nniyshābūrī* have listed him among those killed in the Jewish war against Muslims (Āl- HĀkim al-

Niyshābūrī', 1986. 3, 229). According to sources, when *Ka'b Ibn Ashraf* decided to step out and talk to *Mohammed ibn Salmah* and his men, *Ka'b's* wife said, "You are at war with these! and one who is at war does not go out at such an hour at night" (al-Bayhaqi, 2003. 2, 219). Biyhaqi narrates that after reporting the killing of *Ka'b* the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) stated the famous phrase "*Al-Harb Khudah*" That is: "A part of the war to deceive the enemy". This statement clearly proves that the *Ka'b's* killing was a part of a Muslim war effort, not a terrorist operation (al-Bayhaqi, 2003. 2, 219).

***Abū Rāfi'* the Jewish**

His name was *'Abd Allah Ibn Abī Al-Haqīq* or *Salām Ibn Abī Al-Haqīq*. And the fact that some writers have identified *Salām Ibn Abī Al-Haqīq* as another person and made his murder an independent case is due to a lack of precision and lack of reference to the original sources. According to the report of *Ibn Sa'd* in *Al-Tabqāt " Ibn Abī Al-Haqīq* gathered the disbelievers in *Ghatfān* to make them ready for

fighting the Prophet. The prophet sent *'Abd Allah Ibn 'Atīk* and *'Abd Allah Ibn Anīs* and *Abū qetadah* and some other people to kill him. They went to *Khiybar* and lurked, and when the village folk were all at home and in peace, they went to his house, went up the stairs and sent *'Abd Allah Ibn 'Atīk* forward for he knew Hebrew, he knocked and said: I have brought a gift for *Abū Rāfi'*. His wife opened the door and saw the weapon, wanted to scream, but they silenced her by threatening her with the sword. Then they recognized *Abū Rāfi'* by the fair skin he had and invaded him with swords. When they came down the stairs, his wife screamed. The Muslims hid in one of the canals of *Khiybar*. Three thousand men came for them all with their torches lit, but none found one" (*Ibn Sa'd*, 2009. 2, 28).

The chain of narrators for *Al-Bukhārī* is *Ishāq Ibn Naṣr* *Yahyá Ibn Ādam* from *Ibn Abī Zāiydah* from his father from *Abū Ishaq* from *Barā' Ibn 'Azib* (*Bukhari*, 1981. 5, 27). We cannot ignore *Al-Bukhārī's* chain of narrators, hence we

consider this report valid based on his quotation. But regarding the text, the story of killing of *Abū Rāfi'* took place in the castle of *Khiybar*, which there was a heavy battle between the Muslim army and the army of the *Banī quriyazah* Jewish. Most of the historians and authors of *Sīrah* except for *Tabarī* (*Al-Tabarī, 1967. 4, 493*), have mentioned the time of the story after the battle of *Khandaq* and during the battle of *Khiybar*. Therefore, this incident was not a terror, but a wartime Surprise invasion and an attack to heart of the enemy's army in the time of war, and killing one of the commanders of the enemy.

What proves this perception is that, according to this report; after killing of *Abū Rāfi'*, his wife screamed: "Sneak attack, Sneak attack!". Calling it Sneak attack by *Abū Rāfi'*'s wife indicates that it was an act of fighting in time of war between the Muslims and the Jewish.

What was said in the story of the killing of the four persons shows that the prophet Muhammad had

never assassinated and never had commanded that. The first three reports of these four, though they are very problematic in their chain of transmission and obviously are inaccurate, do not in any way imply that the Messenger of Allah has ordered terror. In the fourth report, which we believe in based on the quotation from Imam Bukhari, the text has nothing to do with Terror, it was the only a report on a Jewish commander being killed during a war operation.

Moreover, it should be borne in mind that the history of the prophet must be studied in accordance with the imperative and categorical principles. One of these points is to pay attention to the general fundamentals of the prophet's teaching in each case. The prophet has made clear and evident guidance on terrorism. The prophet said: "Islam forbids assassination!" This report is quoted by several scholars in some chains of narrators that we point to three of them.

1. *Abū Dāvūd* quotes on the authenticity of *Muhammad Ibn Hazabah* on the authenticity of

- Ibn Manṣūr Al-Hamidānī* on the authenticity of *Sudayy* on the authenticity of his father on the authenticity of *Abī Huriyrah* from the Prophet that: “Islam forbids assassination and Muslims never assassinate” (Al-Sajestānī, 2008. 1, 631).
2. Hākim Al-Niyshābūrī on the authenticity of ‘Alī Ibn Muhammad Ibn ‘Aqabah Al-Shiybānī on the authenticity of Ibrāhīm Ibn Ishāq Al-Zahrī on the authenticity of Asbāt Ibn Naṣr Al-Hamidānī on the authenticity of Ismā‘īl Ibn ‘Abd Al-Rahmān Sudayy on the authenticity of his father on the authenticity of Abī Huriyrah from the Prophet that: “A believer never assassinates for Islam has banned assassination” (Āl- HĀkim al-Niyshābūrī’, 1986. 4, 351).
 3. A-Hiythamī on the authenticity of Muhammad Ibn ‘Abd Allah Ibn ‘Itāb on the authenticity of Ahmad Ibn ‘Ubiyd Allah Narsī on the authenticity of ‘Amr Ibn ‘Āṣim AL-Kilābī on the authenticity of Hammād Ibn

Salamah on the authenticity of ‘Alī Ibn Zayd on the authenticity of ‘Saīd Ibn Musayyib on the authenticity of Marvān bin Hakam quotes that: “We went to ‘Aiyshah with Mu‘āwīyyah. ‘Aiyshah told Mu‘āwīyyah ‘you killed Hujr Ibn ‘udayy and his companions, didn’t you fear I had commanded someone to kill you surprisingly?’ Mu‘āwīyyah said ‘No, for I have heard the prophet saia Belief forbids assassination and a believer never assassinates. So, this house is safe” (Al-Haythamī, 1988. 1, 96).

Conclusion

In this article, a section of Islamic history dedicated to the life of the prophet is studied. In this section, there is some ambiguity about the prophet's point of view on the issue of terrorism. This ambiguity can only be resolved by studying the reports in this field.

This article discusses reports that appear to be the prophet's permission on terrorist operations. A careful examination showed that among the cases raised, there are

only four that appear to have the characteristics of a terrorist operation. In other cases, where the prophet ordered the killing of dissidents or enemies, in fact, the offenders were publicly punished, and their execution was, in fact, their punishment and by no means of terrorism. The four cases that are considered terrorist operations are murdering of *Abī 'afak* ; *'šmā' Bint Ma rwān* ; *K'ab Ibn Al-ashrāf* and , *abū RĀfi'*. These four cases were studied in two separate sections. The first is about the text of reports, and the second is on the chain of narrators.

In the context of the text, these four cases have a common point that is based on the evidence, none of these cases were terrorist operations. In the murder case *Abī 'afak*, *Sālim Ibn'umiyr* (who killed *Abī 'afak*) did not assassinate him, but his act was a night raid to the enemy; therefore, the Islamic sources have perceived this operation as "*Sarīyyah Sālim Ibn'umiyr*". We know that the *Sarīyyah* was a kind of war that took

place without the presence of the Prophet.

The murder of *'Aṣamā' Bint Marwān*, also took place without the knowledge of the prophets. The Prophet was informed of the matter at dawn on the next day. Therefore, this operation (regardless of its nature) cannot be attributed to the Prophet.

The murdering of *Ka'b bin al-Ashraf* that is the third one is also occurred during a battle between Muslims and armed Jewish soldiers in a war zone. In the course of this battle, the Muslims used military deceit to kill the *Ka'b* in the midst of the fort and the masses of its guards. Military operation is very different from assassination.

Also, the story of killing of *Abū RĀfi'* took place in the castle of *Khiybar*, which there was a heavy battle between the Muslim army and the army of the *Banī quriyazah* Jewish. Most of the historians and authors of *Sīrah*.

In studying the text of these reports, we have also pointed out the vital pillar that the accounts of the Prophet's life should be read in

the light of the definite teachings and principles of the Prophet. In an authentic narration, the Prophet (PBUH) said: "Islam forbids assassination and Muslims never assassinate". This narrative defines an Islamic policy and a general principle in the face of terrorism, so these reports should be studied on this basis.

In another section of this article, the chains of narrators of these reports is reviewed. The was very stunning. The study showed that the three reports on murder of *Abī 'afak; 'Aṣamā' Bint Marwān; Ka' b bin al-Ashraf*, are entirely unreliable and unacceptable even given the explicit text. *Imam Bukhari* cited the only credible report that was on the murder of *Abū Rāfi'*. This report did not indicate terrorism but was related to military operations.

References

- Ibn 'udayy, 'A. A. 2006. *Al- kāmīl fī ḍu'af Zua'fā Al-Rijāl*. Dar Ibn Kathīr.
- Al-'Asqalānī, A. 'A. 2002. *Al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz Al-ṣahābah*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-kutub Al-'ilmīyyah.
- Āl- HĀkim al-Niyshābūrī, M. 1986. *Al-Mustadrak 'alā al-Sahīhiyn*. Beirut. Lebanon: Dār al- ma'rifah.

- Al-'A'sqalani, A, 'A. 1960. *Fath al-Bari sharh s'ahih al bukhari*. . Lebanon. : Dar al ma'refah.
- Al-Balāzirī, A. y. 2007. *Ansāb Al-Ashraf*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Alfikr.
- Al-Bastī, M. I. H. 2003. *Al-Majrūhīn Min Al-Muhadithīn wa Al-ḍu'afā wa Al-Matrūkīn*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-fikr Al-Mu'āṣir.
- al-Bayhaqi, A. i. Ḥ. 2003. *Al-sunan Al-Kubrā*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dāe al-kutub al-'lmiyyah.
- Al-Bukhārī, M. i. I. ī. 1981. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Beirut. Lebanon: Dār al-fikr.
- Al-Haythamī, A. i. A. B. 1988. *Majma' al-Zawā'id wa Manba' al-Fawa'id*. Beirut. Lebanon: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmīyah.
- Al-Himyari, A. A.-M. I. H. 2005. *Sīrah Rasūl Allāh*.
- Al-Hiythamī, N. A.-D. 2010. *Majm' Al-Zawā'id*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-āfaq Al-Jadidah.
- Al-Jūzī, A. I. 2007. *Āl-Muntazam*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-kitab Al-^ḥarabī.
- Al-Jūzī, A. I. 2009. *Al-Mūḍūāt*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Ibn Kathīr.
- Al-Mazī, Y. I. A. A.-R. I. Y. 2007. *Tahzīb Al-kamāl*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-Risālah.
- Al-Muqrizī, A. I. A. 2008. *Imtā' Al-Asmā'*. Egypt:: Maktaba Al-khanjī.
- al-Niyshābūrī, M. i. a.-Ḥ. i. M. 2003. *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Beirut. Lebanon: Dār al-fikr
- Al-Qaḍā'ī, M. I. S. 1985. *Musnad Al-Shahāb*. Beirut, Lebanon: Al-Risālah Institut

- Al-Sajestani, S. i. a. a. 2008. *Sonan abī Davood*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-fikr.
- Al-ṣan'ānī, M. i. i. i. 1960) *Subul Al-salām*. Cairo, Egypt: Maktabah al-Halabi.
- al-Shāfi'ī, M. 1982. *Kitāb al-Umm*. Beirut. Lebanon.: Dra al fikr.
- Al-Shawkānī, M. i. A. 1973. *Niyl Al-awtār min ahādith siyyed al-mukhtār* Beirut, Lebanon: Dār Al-jalīl.
- Al-Tabarī, M. i. j. 1967. *Tārīkh al-rusul wa al-mulūk*. Cario, Egypt: Dār al-M'ārif.
- Al-Tamīmī, -. M. I. H. I. A. 2002. *Al-Thiqāt*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-[°]Alamī.
- Al-Tanūkhī, S. I. S. a. 2005. *Al-Mudawwnah Al-kubrā*. Jadaa: Saudi Arabia: Ministry of endowments.
- Al-Zubiydī, M. I. M. I. M. 2010. *Taj Al-[°]Arūs min Javāhir Al-Qāmūs* (Vol.). Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-fikr Al-Mu'āṣir.
- Bukhari, M. 1981. *Sahih al-Bukhari*. Lebanon. : Dar al fikr.
- Ibn'Asākir, A. I. A.-H. 2001. *Tārīkh Madinah dimashq*. Beirut, Lebanon :Dar ālresala.v 51' p 224.: Dar Al-Risālah.
- IbnAthīr, M. I. M. I. A. A.-k. 2014. *Usd Al-Ghabah*. Beirut, Lebanon Dar Al-kutub Al-[°]ilmīyyah.
- IbnIshāq, M. 2010. *Al-Sīrah Al-Nabawīyyeh* (P. H. āllah Ed.). Morocco: The center of study and research
- ibnKathir, I. A.-D. I. i. b. U. 1990. *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-Nihāyah*. Beirut, Lebanon: Maktabah al-M'ārif.
- Ibnkathīr, I. ī. I. u. 2009. *Al-Sīrah Al-Nnabwīyyah*. Beirut, Lebanon: Maktabah Al-Má arif.
- IbnSa'd, M. 2009. *Al Tabaqat Al-kubrā*. Cairo, Egypt: Maktabah Al-khanjī.
- sayyidAl-Nās, M. I. A. A. I. y. I. 2008.[°] *uūn Al-athar*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-qalam.
- Waqidi, M. I. U. A.-. 2004. *Al-Maghazī* (Vol. 'v1' p3.). Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-[°]alamī.