

ومن كلام له (عليه السلام) في معنى طلحة بن عبيد الله وقد قاله حين بلغه خروج طلحة والزبير إلى البصرة لقتاله

About Ṭalḥah ibn ‘Ubaydillāh. Delivered when he received the news that Ṭalḥah and az-Zubayr had already left for Baṣrah to fight against him.

قَدْ كُنْتُ وَمَا أَهْدُ بِالْجَرْبِ، وَلَا أَرْهَبُ بِالضَّرْبِ، وَأَنَا عَلَى مَا قَدْ وَعَدَنِي رَبِّي مِنَ النَّصْرِ. وَاللَّهُ مَا اسْتَعْجَلَ مُتَجَرِّدًا لِلطَّلَبِ بِدَمِ عِثْمَانَ إِلَّا خَوْفًا مِنْ أَنْ يَطَالِبَ بِدَمِهِ، لِأَنَّهُ مَظْنُونُهُ، وَلَمْ يَكُنْ فِي الْقَوْمِ أَحْرَصَ عَلَيْهِ مِنْهُ، فَأَرَادَ أَنْ يَغَالِطَ بِمَا أَجْلَبَ فِيهِ لِيَتَبَسَّ الْأَمْرُ وَيَقَعَ الشُّكُّ.

As for me, I would never be frightened of fighting or be made to fear striking because I am satisfied with Allāh's promise of support to me. By Allāh, Ṭalḥah has hastened with drawn sworn to avenge ‘Uthmān's blood for fear lest the demand for ‘Uthmān's blood be made against himself, because the people's idea in this matter is about him, and, in fact, he was the most anxious among them for his killing. Therefore, he has tried to create misunderstanding by collecting forces in order to confuse the matter and to create doubt.

وَوَاللَّهِ مَا صَنَعَ فِي أَمْرِ عِثْمَانَ وَاحِدَةً مِنْ ثَلَاثٍ: لَيْتَنِي كَانَ ابْنُ عَفَّانٍ ظَالِمًا - كَمَا كَانَ يَزْعُمُ - لَقَدْ كَانَ يَنْبَغِي لَهُ أَنْ يُوَازِرَ قَاتِلِيهِ وَأَنْ يَنْبِذَ نَاصِرِيهِ، وَلَيْتَنِي كَانَ مَظْلُومًا لَقَدْ كَانَ يَنْبَغِي لَهُ أَنْ يَكُونَ مِنَ الْمُنْهَنِّهِينَ عَنْهُ وَالْمَعْذِرِينَ فِيهِ، وَلَيْتَنِي كَانَ فِي شَكٍّ مِنَ الْخَصْلَتَيْنِ: لَقَدْ كَانَ يَنْبَغِي لَهُ أَنْ يَعْتَرِزَ وَيُرْكَدَ جَانِبًا وَيَدْعِ النَّاسَ مَعَهُ، فَمَا فَعَلَ وَاحِدَةً مِنَ الثَّلَاثِ، وَجَاءَ بِأَمْرٍ لَمْ يَعْرِفْ بَابَهُ، وَلَمْ تَسْلَمْ مَعَا ذِيرَهُ.

By Allāh, he did not act in either of three ways about ‘Uthmān. If the son of ‘Affān (‘Uthmān) was in the wrong, as Ṭalḥah believed, it is necessary for him to support those who killed [1] him or to keep away from his supporters. If ‘Uthmān was the victim of oppression, then Ṭalḥah should have been among those who were keeping (the assaulters) away from him or were advancing pleas on his behalf. If he was in doubt about these two alternatives, then it was incumbent upon him to leave him (‘Uthmān) and retire aside and leave the men with him (to deal with him as they wished). But he adopted none of these three ways, and came out with a thing in which there is no good, and his excuses are not acceptable.

Footnote :

[1] It means that if Ṭalḥah considered ‘Uthmān an oppressor, then after his assassination, instead of getting ready to avenge his blood, he should have supported his killers and justified their action. It is not the intention that in the case of ‘Uthmān being in the wrong Ṭalḥah should have supported the attackers because he was already supporting and encouraging them.