



## And Yazīd is Not Cursed After His Death

Mawlānā ‘Alī al-Qārī<sup>1</sup>  
*Translated by Sidi Abu Hasan*

Released by [www.marifah.net](http://www.marifah.net) 1429 H

*and Yazīd is not cursed after his death (by)  
except one who is excessively prejudiced, fanatical<sup>2</sup>*

In another copy it is ‘*wa lan yal’an*’ meaning ‘he shall not be cursed’; *mikthār*: with the kasrah of *mīm*: extremism, excessiveness and immoderation; *al-ighrā’a*: with kasrah of hamzah: mischief, transgression or incitement towards it [*al-fasād wa al-taḥrīd ‘alayh*]; *ghālī*: active participle of *ghulūw*, which means excessively prejudiced, bigoted, fanatical which is used here as an appositive of *mikthār*.<sup>3</sup>

It means:

None among our predecessors [*salaf*] cursed Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah. Except some who said excessive things urging people to send curses and were extremely biased in this matter and transgressed the limits, like the Rafiḍīs, Khawārij and some among the Mu’tazilis.<sup>4</sup> And they said:

---

<sup>1</sup> Excerpted from: *Daw al-Ma‘ālī* by ‘Alī al-Qārī an explanation of the poem *Bad’ al-‘Amālī* by ‘Alī al-Ūshī

<sup>2</sup> *wa lam yal’an yazīdan ba’ada mawtin*

*siwa al-mikthāri fī’l ighrāyi ghālī*

[*Bad’ al-‘Amālī* by ‘Alī al-Ūshī]

<sup>3</sup> Al-Qārī clarifies that it is *ghālī* with *ghayn* [with a dot, *al-mu’jama*]; the reason is because if it is read without the dot it becomes ‘ālī with ‘ayn meaning lofty; which can make it the opposite of the intended meaning or render the couplet incoherent.

<sup>4</sup> These are groups that have dissented from the Ahl al-Sunnah and gone astray.

This is because he was pleased with the murder of Ḥusayn and showed happiness at the deed, and he humiliated the blessed household of the Prophet ﷺ – the meaning of which has been massively reported.

This is an opinion Taftāzāni chose to follow.<sup>5</sup> But he was refuted that when even the lone-reports [*āḥād*] of these events are not proven, how can one claim them to be massively reported [*tawātur*]? Even though it has been reported in *al-Tamhīd* that:

Yazīd did not order the murder of Ḥusayn; he ordered them to obtain his *bay'a*<sup>6</sup>; or to sieze him and bring him. But they [his army] killed him without his [Yazīd's] permission.

Even then, according to the principles of Ahl al-Sunnah the murder of Ḥusayn does not necessitate damnation because a person who commits an enormity [*al-kabīra*] is not to be ruled a *Kāfir*. Therefore it is not permissible to curse or damn a transgressor, an oppressor, a tyrant as mentioned by Ibn Jamā'ah<sup>7</sup>; that is cursing such a person individually.

Otherwise, there is no doubt in saying: 'Damnation of Allāh be upon the tyrant, the transgressor' on account of the saying of Allāh Ta'ālā: ***'Hearken! Allāh's damnation is upon the oppressors'***<sup>8</sup> and the saying of RasūlAllāh ﷺ: 'May Allāh damn the person who takes usury and the one who facilitates it.'<sup>9</sup>

It is reported from a scholar that he said: 'such a damnation is allowed individually and to his face'. What he probably meant was that this act would serve as a reprimand [*zajr*] to the doer and thus prevent him from committing it [further]. This can be imagined in the lifetime of such a person [usury taker, oppressor, tyrant, transgressor] – compared to what can be said after his death when it is not permissible to send damnation individually, even on a disbeliever, except in those cases where we know by absolute documentary evidence that a person has died as a disbeliever<sup>10</sup>.

It is probably because of this reason, that the author [of the above couplet] described this restriction [*taqayyud*] 'after death'. Because there is a possibility that his death might have been good. In *Khulāsah [al-Fatāwa]* it is said: 'One should not damn him [Yazīd]' because RasūlAllāh ﷺ forbade us from damning those who pray [*muṣallīn*] and *Ahl al-Qibla*.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Sa 'duddīn Taftāzānī said so in his *Sharḥ al-'Aqā'id*

<sup>6</sup> Swearing allegiance; in other words acknowledging the Caliphate of Yazīd.

<sup>7</sup> Ḥāfiẓ Imām Qāḍī 'Izzuddīn Abū 'Amr Abdul 'Azīz Ibn Jamā'ah al-Kanānī, originally from Ḥamā, he was born in Damascus in the year 694 AH; he migrated to Egypt and was its judge. He passed away in Mecca in the year 767 AH. [*Tabaqāt al-Ḥuffāz*, Suyūṭī]

<sup>8</sup> Sūrah Hūd, v.18

<sup>9</sup> Musnad Imām Aḥmad, 1/402

<sup>10</sup> Like the case of Abū Lahab or Abū Jahl.

<sup>11</sup> People who turn towards Mecca to pray

A scholar from the Iraqis has permitted to curse him and he said: ‘It is because he committed *kufr* by making permissible [*istahalla*] things forbidden by Allāh Ta‘ālā by his deeds concerning the household of the Prophet ﷺ.’

It is obvious that ‘considering a thing *ḥalāl* [*al-istiḥlāl*] is something related to the heart and a hypothetical matter which is not apparent from the outside. [*amrun qalbiyyun ḡanniyyun ghāyibun ‘an ḡāhīr al-ḡā*]. Even if it is assumed that he did so in the first place, the possibility of his repentance in a later stage cannot be ruled out; hence it is not permissible to curse him openly or inwardly; this is the answer to reports like the following – if such an allegation is proved to be authentic<sup>12</sup> – that Yazīd said:

*were it that my forefathers<sup>13</sup> in Badr witnessed this  
the wails of Khazraj on our getting even with them<sup>14</sup>*

The author of the book *al-Tamhīd* said:

‘The most accurate position is that you can say: If Yazīd ordered the murder of Ḥusayn or was pleased with its occurrence, then it is permissible to curse him; and if not, then it is not permissible. Similarly, the murderer is not ruled as an infidel unless he considered that act [of killing a Muslim] as a permissible one [*min ghayri istiḥlāl*].’

The weakness of the argument above is obvious, because he allowed cursing based on merely ordering a murder or being pleased with it – even though for the murderer himself, he restricted it to be provisional only if he considered it permissible. Whereas committing the deed of murder itself is worse than ordering it. Along with the fact that, according to Ahl al-Sunnah the murder of anybody other than Prophets is not disbelief [*kufr*] contrary to the belief of the Khawārij, the Mu‘tazila and other heretics.

Therefore there is no doubt that remaining silent on this issue is the safest path. Allāh Ta‘ālā knows best.

Concerning what the Exegete said: ‘the repentance of a person who murdered a Prophet is not acceptable, nor is his faith [if he renews after the murder] veritable’ : his reasoning is not evident because, according to consensus [*al-ijmā*] sincere repentance and professing faith [*al-īmān wa al-tawba*] clears everything else [from sins and transgressions] prior to them.

---

<sup>12</sup> It is not proven that he said these things and even if he did...

<sup>13</sup> Infidels who perished

<sup>14</sup> *layta ashyākhī bi badrin shahidū  
jaz’a al-khazraji min waq’ay al-asal*

The Quraysh chieftains who were infidels were slain in Badr by the people of Medina who were mainly the tribes of Aws and Khazraj. So Ḥusayn, the chief of the people of Medina in our time, has been martyred, and now we are even.