

# Abū Bakr Siddīq-8

(Raḍee-Allāhu ‘Anhu)

الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ وَالصَّلَاةُ وَالسَّلَامُ عَلَى سَيِّدِنَا مُحَمَّدٍ وَعَلَى آلِهِ وَاصْحَابِهِ وَسَلَّمَ

With regard to the governorship of the Muslim State <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ رَضِيَ</sup> followed the <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> policy of not changing any governor or general that was appointed by

Or any of the <sup>أُمَرَاءُ الْجُنُودِ</sup> (Commanders of the army) and <sup>أُمَرَاءُ الْبُلْدَانِ</sup> (Governors of the regions/countries) was either appointed into a better position or given the choice between two different positions. For example, <sup>عَمْرُو بْنُ الْعَاصِ رَضِيَ</sup> was appointed

by <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> in Amman. <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ رَضِيَ</sup> sent him an errand: “I was thinking about you to appoint over the army and send you to Palestine. So it is your choice whether you want to stay where you are or lead the army. <sup>عَمْرُو بْنُ الْعَاصِ رَضِيَ</sup> gave a

positive response to the recommendation of <sup>أَمِيرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ</sup>; he left Amman and took charge of the army that was going to Palestine. Similarly <sup>مُهَاجِرُ بْنُ أُمَيَّةَ</sup> who had

already been appointed by <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> in Yemen received message of <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ رَضِيَ</sup> whether he would like to be Amīr of Sana or the Amīr of Hazarmoot.

<sup>مُهَاجِرُ بْنُ أُمَيَّةَ</sup> chose the post in Sana. So he never thought of firing anyone who was appointed by <sup>مُحَمَّدٌ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup>.

What were the responsibilities of these <sup>أُمَرَاءُ</sup>? These were:

1. Leading the daily prayers and **صَلَاةُ الْجُمُعَةِ**. He was essentially to be the Imam of prayer (**صَلَاة**) five times a day. It was manifestation of leadership in religion as well. Then it would only make sense that he would lead them on the issues that were less important, i.e., worldly affairs. Unfortunately it has become upside down. Now we see the post of Imam (**إِمَام**) less important than political or military designation. When the **صَحَابَةُ رَضِيَ** witnessed **أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ رَضِيَ** as **إِمَام** of the **صَلَاة** they expected him to be the Head of the state after **رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ**. The **أُمَرَاءُ** used to lead the **صَلَاة** of **جُمُعَةٍ** in the *masjid* and deliver **خُطْبَةُ الْجُمُعَةِ**. The *Khalīfa* would deliver the **خُطْبَةُ الْجُمُعَةِ** in the Muslim capital and the Amīr of every location would give the **خُطْبَةَ** in **مَسْجِدُ الْجَامِعَةِ**, the major mosque in the town or area. For example in Sana' there was **الْجَامِعَةُ الْكَبِيرُ** (the grand mosque) where the **خُطْبَةَ** was delivered by the Amīr. In Damascus they had *al-Jamia Amuwi* (the central grand mosque) of Damascus. In Andalusia they had **جَامِعَةُ الْقُرْطُبَةِ**.

**خُطْبَةُ الْجُمُعَةِ** was a weekly address instructing them the important issues (**مَسَائِل**) and there was also a chance for the Amīr to speak about the current affairs of the ummah to his followers. Thus the **خُطْبَةَ** entailed the comprehensive role of teaching the people **فَقْه** (jurisprudence), their religion and also updating them on the affairs of the ummah.

2. The second responsibility of the **أُمَرَاءُ** was everything related to Jihad, for example, recruitment. When **أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ رَضِيَ** soldiers required to be sent to Persia and Rome he sent a directive to his **أُمَرَاءُ** in Yemen to recruit and send the soldiers to Medina. They were also responsible for financial concurrence, booties of war, rationing of the soldiers, payment of salaries in addition to the negotiations made with the enemy and/or any peace agreement or truce on behalf of the **خَلِيفَتِهِ** and usually there would be two-way

communication between the two but <sup>رض</sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ gave the <sup>أُمَرَاءُ</sup> a lot of jurisdiction to make decisions. However, for major issues they had to consult the <sup>خَلِيفَتِهِ</sup> and seek his advice.

3. The appointment of judges, *zakat* collectors and collectors of <sup>جَزْيَتِهِ</sup> was also concern of the <sup>أَمِيرٍ</sup>.

4. <sup>أُمَرَاءُ</sup> were duty-bound to take <sup>بَيْعَتٍ</sup> for the <sup>خَلِيفَتِهِ</sup> as in those days the means of communications were too slow. They couldn't take <sup>بَيْعَتٍ</sup> from everyone simultaneously.

In Medina <sup>عُمَرَ بْنِ خَطَّابٍ</sup> proposed <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ</sup> and he was the one who initiated the proposal in his *khutaba* as we mentioned in our last session.

As <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ</sup> was present, he stood on the <sup>مَنْبَرٍ</sup> and the people came to give him <sup>بَيْعَتٍ</sup>. But how will the people of other areas give <sup>بَيْعَتٍ</sup> to the <sup>خَلِيفَتِهِ</sup>? This was done by the Amīr of the <sup>خَلِيفَتِهِ</sup> and then communicated to the <sup>أَمِيرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ</sup> or the <sup>خَلِيفَتِهِ</sup>.

5. They had to enforce the law, establish the <sup>حُدُودَ</sup> and decide the cases accordingly. For example, al-Muhājir who was at that time the Amīr of Hazarmoot had to give his verdict about two singer women. One of them used to sing against

<sup>رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> while the other made songs against the Muslims. Al-Muhājir made

ijtihād in this issue as there was no clear-cut *hukm* (<sup>حُكْمٍ</sup>) or <sup>حَدٍّ</sup> he knew. He ordered to break the front teeth of both the singers. When it was conveyed to <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ</sup>,

he told him that the woman who sang against <sup>رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> should have been executed while the other woman who sang against the Muslims might have been given light punishment in stead of being deprived of her teeth because the fist case was

كُفْر while the second case a sin. It was rectification of the judgment but al-Muhājir had already sentenced the women according to his *ijtihād* (اجْتِهَاد).

6. The أمراء had to hold study circles in the *masājid*. The *Amīr* as a political leader or an army general would sit in the *masjid* and hold the حلقه teaching the people Quran and hadīth. It was considered as part of their responsibilities. So al-Muhājir or Ma'āz bin Jabal as *Amīr* would sit in the *masjid* to teach and guide the people. Abu Dardā and the other صحابه who had political and military acumen would also sit in the *masjid* and teach the people about Islamic problems (مسائل).

There is a story that علي بن طالب and زبير were late in giving بيعت. What actually happened is that as earlier mentioned Alī bin Tālib (*Raḍee-Allāhu 'Anhu*) was not present in the meeting of Saqīfa of Banu Sa'da because he was busy with the funeral proceedings of رسول الله ﷺ. However, the next day when the بيعت العامة took place and أبو بكر صدیق was taking بيعت in the *masjid* from the general public he looked around and did not see Zubair ibn al-Awwam (*Raḍee-Allāhu 'Anhu*). So he called him.

When he came أبو بكر صدیق said to him: أتريد أن تشق المسلمين Do you intend to disunite the Muslims? Zubair said:

لا تثريب عليك يا خليفة الرسول الله ﷺ I have nothing against you, O' خليفة of

رسول الله ﷺ. Then he gave his بيعت to أبو بكر and said: I am not reluctant to

give you بيعت and I have nothing against you. Then أبو بكر صدیق looked around but didn't see Alī bin Tālib (*Raḍee-Allāhu 'Anhu*). Meanwhile he was seen rushing in the

*masjid*. أبو بكر صدیق put him the same question أتريد أن تشق المسلمين Do

you want to disunite the Muslims for you didn't give بيعت and you were unavailable in

the assembly of the Muslims? <sup>رض</sup> عَلِيُّ بْنُ طَالِبٍ submitted the same answer as given  
 by <sup>رض</sup> زُبَيْرٍ: لَا تَتْرِيْبَ عَلَيْكَ يَا خَلِيْفَةُ الرَّسُوْلِ اللّٰهُ I have nothing against you,  
 O' <sup>رض</sup> خَلِيْفَةُ of <sup>رض</sup> رَسُوْلِ اللّٰهُ ﷺ and then he gave his <sup>رض</sup> اَبُوْبَكْرٍ صِدِيْقٍ to <sup>رض</sup> بِيْعَتْ .

Ibn-i-Katheer mentions that Imam Muslim went to his Sheikh Ibn-ul-Khuzaima to teach him this hadīth. For him Imam Muslim wrote it down and then he said that this hadīth was equal to a camel meaning it was highly valuable. Ibn-ul-Khuzaima gave his comments: this is not only equal to a camel but equal to a huge pile of gold coins. This *hadīth* is, of course, highly valuable because it tells us the whole truth of the real

situation. <sup>رض</sup> عَلِيُّ بْنُ طَالِبٍ was at home when the Muslims were gathering in the *masjid*.

Somebody came and told him that <sup>رض</sup> اَبُوْبَكْرٍ صِدِيْقٍ was taking <sup>رض</sup> بِيْعَتْ in the *masjid*. <sup>رض</sup> عَلِيُّ بْنُ طَالِبٍ went out rushing; he didn't want to be late even for a single

moment. That is why he forgot to wear his <sup>رض</sup> قَمِيْصٍ (shirt). He went running into the *masjid* and then someone came to deliver him his <sup>رض</sup> قَمِيْصٍ while he was in the *masjid*.

How can anybody claim that <sup>رض</sup> زُبَيْرٍ and <sup>رض</sup> عَلِيُّ بْنُ طَالِبٍ didn't want to

give <sup>رض</sup> اَبُوْبَكْرٍ صِدِيْقٍ to <sup>رض</sup> بِيْعَتْ when both of them realized that <sup>رض</sup> اَبُوْبَكْرٍ was the best of

all. It was <sup>رض</sup> عَلِيُّ بْنُ طَالِبٍ who once proclaimed about <sup>رض</sup> اَبُوْبَكْرٍ صِدِيْقٍ in plain

words <sup>رض</sup> هُوَ سَبَّاقٌ (he was always ahead of us) and that 'We never tried to compete with

him in any good for we knew that he would always surpass us'. How <sup>رض</sup> اَبُوْبَكْرٍ صِدِيْقٍ

was loved by <sup>رض</sup> عَلِيُّ بْنُ طَالِبٍ can be ascertained by the fact that when <sup>رض</sup> اَبُوْبَكْرٍ

passed away it was <sup>رض</sup> عَلِيُّ بْنُ طَالِبٍ who asked his son Muhammad bin <sup>رض</sup> اَبُوْبَكْرٍ to be

brought up at his home. <sup>رض</sup> عَلِيُّ بْنُ طَالِبٍ himself took the child Muhammad bin Abu Bakr and brought him up. He appreciated his talents and appointed him as Governor in

Egypt when he himself became <sup>رض</sup> أَمِيرُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ . Zubair ibn al-Awwam (*Raḍee-Allāhu*

'Anhu) was married to a daughter of <sup>رض</sup> أَبُو بَكْرٍ whose name was Asma (*Raḍee-Allāhu*

'Anha). So with such close family relationship and love bond with <sup>رض</sup> أَبُو بَكْرٍ that there is no truth whatsoever in the false claims of the *Shi'as*. The scholars

of <sup>رض</sup> عَلِيُّ بْنُ طَالِبٍ <sup>رض</sup> أَيْمَنُ السُّنَّةِ وَالْجَمَاعَةِ have <sup>رض</sup> اِجْمَاعُ that <sup>رض</sup> عَلِيُّ بْنُ طَالِبٍ did give <sup>رض</sup> بَيْعَتُ to

<sup>رض</sup> أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ without any hesitation or reservation. The fact of the matter is that none

of the <sup>رض</sup> صَحَابَةُ , was isolated from the agreement. One of them Saeed bin Zaid (*Raḍee-*

*Allāhu* 'Anhu) who was one of those ten most fortunate <sup>رض</sup> صَحَابَةُ given the glad tidings

of Janna was asked: <sup>رض</sup> أَشْهَدْتُ وَقَاتِ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ ﷺ Did you witness the departure

of <sup>رض</sup> رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ ? He said: Yes. They asked him: When was the <sup>رض</sup> بَيْعَتُ given

to <sup>رض</sup> أَبُو بَكْرٍ ? He replied: The <sup>رض</sup> بَيْعَتُ was given to <sup>رض</sup> أَبُو بَكْرٍ the same

day <sup>رض</sup> رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ departed because the Muslims did not want to stay even for one

day without *jama'at*. He was enquired: Was there anybody against <sup>رض</sup> أَبُو بَكْرٍ <sup>رض</sup> بَيْعَتُ ?

Saeed bin Zaid (*Raḍee-Allāhu* 'Anhu) said: No. There was none to go

against <sup>رض</sup> أَبُو بَكْرٍ and refuse to give him <sup>رض</sup> بَيْعَتُ except a <sup>رض</sup> مُرْتَدٌ or somebody who was

likely to be a <sup>رض</sup> مُرْتَدٌ . <sup>رض</sup> اللَّهُ مُبِحَانُهُ وَتَعَالَى . <sup>رض</sup> مُرْتَدٌ gracefully saved the Ansār ( <sup>رض</sup> أَنْصَارٌ ); all

of them gave <sup>رض</sup> بَيْعَتُ to <sup>رض</sup> أَبُو بَكْرٍ as we have earlier mentioned it in detail. Then he was

questioned: Was there anybody from among the *Muhajireen* ( <sup>رض</sup> مُهَاجِرِينَ ) who didn't

give him <sup>بِيعَتْ</sup>? He responded by saying: <sup>لَا</sup> (No); all of them came and willfully gave him <sup>بِيعَتْ</sup>. So hopefully it is a clear-cut issue.

A second issue that is controversial is the issue of inheritance. Fatima (*Raḍee-Allāhu*

'*Anha*) and Al-Abbas (*Raḍee-Allāhu 'Anhu*), uncle of <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> went to <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> asking for their inheritance from <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup>.

<sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> said: I heard <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> say that the <sup>أَنْبِيَاءُ</sup> of Allāh are excluded from the laws of inheritance and what they leave is <sup>صَدَقَهُ</sup>. The <sup>أَنْبِيَاءُ</sup> of Allāh are the fathers of the ummah. What do we call the wives of <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup>?

We call them <sup>أُمَّهَاتُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ</sup> (the mothers of the believers). And what was <sup>أَبِرَاهِيمَ</sup> called? 'He is our father' <sup>أَبِرَاهِيمَ</sup> and he is the one who gave us the name of Muslims.

When <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> and <sup>عَبَّاسُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْمُطَّلِبِ</sup> came to <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> they were unaware of this *hadīth* but when <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> told them about this *hadīth* they believed and did not ask further for any

inheritance. <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> said: I am not going to disobey any order of <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> and I have to follow his ways because if I don't do so I will go

astray. Qazi al-Ayaz says: When <sup>فَاطِمَةُ</sup> heard the *hadīth* from <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> she had no sad feelings at all and did accept it heartily and when <sup>عَلِيُّ بْنُ طَالِبٍ</sup> became <sup>خَلِيفَتَهُ</sup> later

on, even he did not change the verdict of <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> regarding the inheritance of <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup>.

We move on to the next topic and that is the army of <sup>رض</sup>أسامة. After departure of <sup>رض</sup>رسول الله ﷺ when three days passed <sup>رض</sup>أبو بكر صدیق said: The army of <sup>رض</sup>أسامة will have to march out and none of the army should stay in Medina but to

leave for the camp at <sup>رض</sup>الجُبَر. A little bit background. In the 8<sup>th</sup> year of Hijra <sup>رض</sup>رسول الله ﷺ prepared an army to go for the first time to face the Romans. He

appointed <sup>رض</sup>زید بن حارثه to lead that army. The second in command was <sup>رض</sup>جعفر بن ابی طالب and the third one was <sup>رض</sup>عبد الله بن رواحه from Ansār

(<sup>رض</sup>انصار). The army comprised 3,000 soldiers who were to proceed to Syria for the first time ever to meet the Romans. To their utter surprise they faced an enemy that was filling the horizons as far as they could see with soldiers. It was not less than 200,000.

The <sup>رض</sup>صحابه never ever saw such a titanic army before in their life. In Arabia they didn't see even such a population as this area was scarcely populated with small tribes. They didn't face such huge numbers. They were only 3,000 and did not know how to

fight a colossal army of 200,000. So they held <sup>رض</sup>شورى to arrive at a decision. Some of them said that the army of the enemy was so huge in numbers that they should be excused to go back and they knew that in Quran it is said 'if you are strong you are sufficient to face ten and if you weak then you can face two. They had the right to go

back but <sup>رض</sup>عبد الله بن رواحه said: We have come here for <sup>رض</sup>شهادة (martyrdom). So

why should we retreat? If we are seeking <sup>رض</sup>شهادة why should we go back? So they decided to go ahead. They kept on fighting bravely for three days. On the third day

when <sup>رض</sup>زید بن حارثه was killed <sup>رض</sup>جعفر بن ابی طالب took over the charge. When

he was also killed <sup>رض</sup>عبد الله بن رواحه took over the command but he was also killed.

Then <sup>رض</sup>خالد بن ولید took over and made a successful retreat along with the army. The



next year <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> wanted to go himself. For this purpose, he prepared an army

for <sup>غَزْوَهُ تَبُوكَ</sup> and reached to face the Romans but they didn't dare face the Muslim

army led by <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup>. As no fighting occurred he returned without being

harmed. The third year <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> wanted to send out <sup>أَسَامَةَ بْنِ زَيْدٍ رَضِيَ</sup> to lead an army and he told him: I want you to step over with your horses at the same place where

your father was killed. But <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> passed away after a few days. Thus he had been arranging a campaign for three years for conquering the Roman Empire; Mauta,

Tabuk and then the third year the army led by <sup>أَسَامَةَ بْنِ زَيْدٍ رَضِيَ</sup> was being prepared. As they didn't have uniformed soldiers and there wasn't any professional troops the way

they used to mobilize the army was just to inform the <sup>صَحَابَهُ رَضِيَ</sup> as every one of them

was expected to participate in <sup>جِهَادٍ</sup>. They would have camp grounds outside Medina and then the soldiers would flood into that camp ground until the army was ready to

leave. This camp ground was called <sup>الْجُبَرِ</sup> and it was always outside Medina. Some people would get ready in hours while some of them in days. In the army the Amīr of the army would know how many soldiers were there. The moment

<sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> breathed his last all of them who were camped at <sup>الْجُبَرِ</sup> came back to

Medina. Three days later <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقِ رَضِيَ</sup> told them to go back to <sup>الْجُبَرِ</sup>.

<sup>أَسَامَةَ بْنِ زَيْدٍ رَضِيَ</sup> obeyed the orders and all the soldiers moved with him. The <sup>صَحَابَهُ رَضِيَ</sup>

came to <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ رَضِيَ</sup> and try to imagine the situation. It was only three days

after <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> passed away and they were still preoccupied with the suffering

and agony caused by the departure of <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> but <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقِ رَضِيَ</sup> was directing the soldiers to finalize their preparations for proceeding to fight the Romans.

According to Ibn-i-Katheer the <sup>أبو بكر</sup> صحابه came to <sup>أبو بكر</sup> and told him: This army comprises the majority of our Muslim brothers and the Arabs are going to cut their ties with you. So we don't think that it is appropriate for you to disperse the <sup>جماعة</sup> of the Muslims while all the Arabs around are thinking about of attacking us. With these deliberations they tried to convince the <sup>خليفة</sup> and the most outspoken person among them was <sup>عمر بن خطاب</sup>. Even <sup>أسامة بن زيد</sup> prompted <sup>عمر بن خطاب</sup> to convey his message to <sup>أبو بكر</sup>: I have with me the majority of men and I fear the <sup>خليفة</sup> and the family of <sup>رسول الله ﷺ</sup> is not safe from the *Mushrikeen* and *munafiqeen*. The <sup>صحابه</sup> on the whole were seriously thinking of protecting the wives/families of <sup>رسول الله ﷺ</sup>. Both <sup>أسامة بن زيد</sup> and the <sup>صحابه</sup> thought that their priority ought to be protection of the family of <sup>رسول الله ﷺ</sup> and safety of the central town of the Muslims. Since the base of the Muslims was Medina they considered it was better for the army to stay at Medina. Apparently they looked sensible and made a solid point when they said: Why should our priority now be to fight the Roman Empire who poses no danger to us especially at this moment? Why should it leave Medina that could be ambush at any moment of the night or day? After hearing all of the different views and having been reasonably pressurized by <sup>صحابه</sup> especially <sup>عمر بن خطاب</sup> and <sup>أسامة بن زيد</sup>, leader of the army who also thought it better not to leave Medina at a critical juncture <sup>أبو بكر صديق</sup> gathered all the Muslims in the *masjid* and made a brief speech. He said: By Him in whose hands is my soul even if the beasts of prey and snatch me away and no one remains in the villages I would carry out the orders of <sup>رسول الله ﷺ</sup> and send the army under the command of <sup>أسامة بن زيد</sup>. With these words he put an end to all of the arguments. He was not talking about the strategy or what was most beneficial. He only stressed the need to

follow the *Sunnah* (سنة) and carry out the orders of رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ. He plainly said:

I am a follower of the *Sunnah* of رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ & I am not an innovator. He was making it clear that policy of his government would be to follow the footsteps

of رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ no matter even if the whole community was annihilated. He was bound to follow the way of his beloved Prophet even if he was the only person to be left behind. No doubt this was an extremely difficult position to take.

We need to think about the mindset of the صحابه رض at that critical juncture

when رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ had just departed and look at the description of عائشة رض. She

says: When رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ departed us all of the Arabs turned to apostasy and the bulk of the *munafiqeen* started sticking-up. In the name of Allāh my father was carrying such a stupendous burden if it was placed over a mountain it would have shattered it into

pieces while the صحابه رض of رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ were like scattered goats. It looked like

a stormy cold night in the land overcrowded with wolves. The صحابه رض were like scattered goats simply because they had been forlorn without their shepherd (caretaker). This description beautifully explains how dismal, dire and desperate the situation was.

All of them were encircled by enemies from every direction. But أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ stood unflinching like a rock. Ibn-i-Hajar Asqalani says that the stand of

أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ amid those bleakest moments shows that not always the opinion of the majority is right. Sometimes a lone person could have a right opinion.

أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ was going against the vast majority of the صحابه رض but later on he

proved to be hundred percent right. Al-Qurtubi says: أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ had the best judgment

among the صحابه رض of رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ because of his intelligence and understanding that he had gained by spending his lifelong friendship with him and drinking from the

fountain of the Prophethood. This may also be termed as the peak of belief (يَقِينٌ) and faith (إِيمَانٌ). You can't take that position or that stand unless you have يَقِينٌ. This is not something that develops from intelligence but is based on إِيمَانٌ.

This is similar to the situation that مُوسَى underwent. When the sea was in front of him and فِرْعَوْنُ (Pharaoh) along with his army was chasing him. مُوسَى had told Bani Israel that Allāh would give them victory but then the real state of affairs was something else. His eyes witnessed that the army was behind him and directly in front of him was the sea. His ears were hearing nothing but the complaints and groans of Bani Israel. They were saying: You promised us that we would be saved but now you see the army of فِرْعَوْنُ is right behind us. We are surely affected by the opinions of the people especially when we are hearing the same thing again and again just like the Information Minister of Hitler who said 'we keep on lying until the people would believe it - we keep on repeating our lie and in the end the people will buy it.' But مُوسَى due to

his يَقِينٌ said: كَلَّا إِنَّمَا رَبِّي سَيِّدُهُ. Not at all. Allāh is with me and He will guide me. I don't believe my eyes. I don't believe my ears. I only believe in Allāh. What Allāh has promised with me will surely happen. It was a test from Allāh Azzawajal. Allah commanded him: Split the sea with your stick. And then Allāh Azzawajal saved them. Or

like رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ when somebody came to him complaining: My brother is

sick. رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ told him: Give him honey. He later on came and stated that he

wasn't cured. رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ said: Give him honey. Again he came back and said: My brother isn't cured. He again advised him: Give him honey. The fourth time he came

and said: My brother isn't cured. رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ said: Allāh has told the truth but the

stomach of your brother is lying. Allāh has described honey as شِفَاءٌ (remedy). So it is

absolutely and unquestionably شِفَاءٌ but the stomach of your brother is lying. Ibn-i-Qayyam explains this *hadīth*: The problem was that he didn't give his brother the

sufficient dose of honey. So you must have <sup>يَقِين</sup> and believe in what Allāh Azzawajal has promised with you. <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ رَضِيَ</sup> categorically said: I am going to follow the way of <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup>. Keep in mind here that <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ رَضِيَ</sup> is setting the ground rule of <sup>خِلَافَتِهِ</sup>. The <sup>خَلِيفَتِهِ</sup> must follow the footsteps of <sup>نَبِيِّ</sup>. <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ رَضِيَ</sup> stated: I am a follower and not innovator. Thereupon the <sup>عُمَرَ رَضِيَ</sup> told <sup>أَنْصَارَ رَضِيَ</sup> to go back and tell the <sup>خَلِيفَتِهِ</sup> 'if he doesn't agree to keep the army then at least appoint somebody who is older and more competent than <sup>أَسَامَةَ رَضِيَ</sup> who is only 18 years old. We want somebody who has more matured and talented.' There was already some talk going on about the appointment of <sup>أَسَامَةَ رَضِيَ</sup> before that and then <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> had said: If you have objection about the leadership of <sup>أَسَامَةَ رَضِيَ</sup> you had already said such things about his father but you saw his father was absolutely befitting for that position. I loved his father and so I love his son. <sup>عُمَرَ بْنِ خَطَّابٍ رَضِيَ</sup> went to <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ رَضِيَ</sup> and said: Would you consider somebody who is older in age? <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ رَضِيَ</sup> sprang up in anger and said: May your mother be bereft of you <sup>عُمَرَ بْنِ خَطَّابٍ رَضِيَ</sup> ! It was the Messenger of Allāh appointed him and you suggest to me to dismiss him. Why do you want me to change him? I cannot change <sup>أَسَامَةَ رَضِيَ</sup> and I refuse to change any of the <sup>أُمَرَاءَ رَضِيَ</sup> appointed by <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup>.

After the whole army was camped at <sup>الْجُرِّ رَضِيَ</sup> and ready to set out <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ رَضِيَ</sup> rode on his camel led by Abdur Rahman bin Auf went to what is called escorting the army. Previously <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> would walk with the army for some paces and then he

would bid them farewell. <sup>أبو بكر رضي</sup> was following the same *Sunnah*. He was walking and

<sup>أسامه بن زيد رضي</sup> just 18 years old was riding over his camel. Out of respect a younger person comes down from his camel if he sees an older person walking and would want him to ride the camel. Islam teaches us that the one who does not pay respect to the elderly among us does not belong to us and the one does not have mercy on her children

has no concern with us. So <sup>أسامه بن زيد رضي</sup> wanted to come down from his camel and he

told <sup>أبو بكر رضي</sup> : I am going to come down and you ride the camel. <sup>أبو بكر رضي</sup> said: No. I want my feet to get soiled walking in the path of Allāh because

<sup>رسول الله ﷺ</sup> says: A person whose feet are soiled walking in the path of Allāh

( <sup>جهاد في سبيل الله</sup> ) will be saved from Hellfire. Therefore,

<sup>أبو بكر رضي</sup> wished to walk on the sand and have a few steps in the path of Allāh. If he could not go with the army then at least he wanted to walk a few steps. Then he

delivered a <sup>خطبه</sup> to the army. He said: O' Army! Stop and I order you ten things. Learn them by heart. i. You shall not engage in treachery. ii. You shall not steal from the booty. iii. You shall not act unfaithfully. iv. You shall not engage in deception. v. You shall not indulge in mutilation. vi. You will kill neither a young child, nor an old man or women. vii. You shall not fell palm trees and burn them. You shall not cut down any fruit bearing tree. viii. You shall not slaughter a sheep or a cow or a camel except for food. ix. You will pass by people who occupy themselves in monasteries. Leave them alone with what they are busy. x. People may come to you and bring vessels with varieties of food. If you eat anything from their dishes mention the name of Allāh over them.

These were the words of advice that <sup>أبو بكر رضي</sup> gave to the army. There are a few points

that are noteworthy. <sup>أبو بكر رضي</sup> advised: You shall not engage in treachery or

deception while we know <sup>رسول الله ﷺ</sup> said in a *hadīth*: <sup>الحرب خدع</sup> (War is

deception). I want to bring the contradictions and then comment on them. <sup>أبو بكر رضي</sup> says:

You should not engage in deception while <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> says: War is deception.

<sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ رَضِيَ</sup> says: Do not kill young child nor any old man or woman but somebody can

come up and say: two cases at least are mentionable when <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> had

ordered the execution of a woman. And we know that <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> sent out a

<sup>مَسْرِيًّا</sup> that attacked an enemy at night and caused collateral damage when some innocent

women, children and old men die and here <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ رَضِيَ</sup> was saying: You shall not fell palm

trees or burn them. And we certainly know that <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> in a *ghazwa* of *Bani Nazeer*

did cut down palm trees and burned them. So how can you bring these statements which seem to be contradictory altogether as ‘you shall not engage in deception’ and the *hadith* is ‘war is deception’? It is pinpointed that during war the army is allowed to take deceptive measures in order to trick the enemy. But it should not at all engage in deception when you makes or comes to an agreement. If you have truce or negotiate with the enemy or agree on ceasefire there should be not any kind of deception. However, while the battle is raging you can engage in deception. But when you come on terms with the enemy and you are expected to stick to your words then you should never be

deceptive. The next issue when <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ رَضِيَ</sup> says: Do not kill a young child or an old man

or woman <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> applied that standard and never killed women or old men or children because they were non-combatants. But in a case when a woman did engage

somehow or other in fighting the Muslims <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> approved her execution. So

the reason why old men or women are spared is that they are non-combatants but the moment they turn into combaters the rules of combat will apply to them as well. Likewise, if there is any precarious situation where a Muslim community could be harmed then it is a priority to protect the Muslims. The protection of the Muslims is of paramount importance in any case. So in a situation where there is need for tabeet or like the siege in Taif where catapult was used; you don’t know where the missiles would land but the general rule is that non-combatants should not be harmed. You shall not fell palm trees or burn them. In *ghazwa Bani Nazeer* the Jews had decided to hide in fortresses. They had powerful forts and castles, possessed abundance of ammunition and so much food in those forts that they could survive a long siege. Their farmland was outside the

forts. They would have always forts and farmlands outside the forts. They couldn't have farmlands inside because in that case the forts would be so huge and extremely expensive. So the forts enclose within them the abodes of the people while their farms are situated outside. So the Jews were determined to hide in the forts after they had betrayed

مُحَمَّدٌ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

and since they knew his disposition they were sure he would not touch their

farms. But they couldn't believe their eyes when they saw that مُحَمَّدٌ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had cut down their palm trees and was burning them. Then they knew that without their farms they could hardly survive for a long siege. The very fact broke their resistance. Their

forces fell down and went out saying مُحَمَّدٌ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ claimed that he did not cause فَسَادٌ (corruption) in the land and here he was cutting down our palm trees. But we question: Is it not corruption? Allāh Azzawajal revealed the *āyāh* to clarify the situation:

مَا قَطَعْتُمْ مِّن لِّيْنَةٍ أَوْ نَرْتُمْوهَا قَائِمَةً عَلَىٰ  
أُصُولِهَا فَبِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ وَلِيُخْزِيَ الْفٰسِقِينَ ﴿٥٩﴾

Whether you cut down (O ye Muslims!) the tender palm-trees, or left them standing on their roots, it was by leave of God, and in order that He might cover with shame the

rebellious transgresses. (59:5). This it was not fasād (فساد) or corruption in the land. What the enemy thought that they could take advantage of the kindness of

مُحَمَّدٌ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

and tolerance of the Muslims. Hence

مُحَمَّدٌ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

made it clear: You are

not going to deceive me again. I don't like cutting down trees and destroying the farmlands but if you venture to take advantage of my mercy and meekness I will not allow you to do that. So here is the setting of the rule that the Muslims are tolerant and lenient in terms of the security of the people. However, their tolerance and leniency must not be used against them. So the general rule is that the Muslims would not harm any farm land or cut down trees but if the enemies decide to utilize the kindness of the Muslims against their own community then they will be stripped off that opportunity.

And the same thing with رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ (Do not mutilate). never mutilated the dead bodies of his enemies nor did he torment them but there is an exceptional and outstanding situation which is mentioned in *Sahih Bokhari*, Such an

رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

event occurred neither before nor after. When caught some vicious shepherds he had their eyes plucked out and their arms and legs amputated and then he



left them to die out of bleeding and thirst. They were seen rolling and licking the rocks and sand for thirst and no body was there to give them water. The fact is that this thing happened neither before nor after but he did it because of the cruelties that these shepherds were involved in. These men were not shepherds but some persons from

Urana. They killed the shepherds of <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> after plucking their eyes and then left them in the deserts to die out of thirst. These men had come to Medina and become

Muslims' after giving *shahadah* (شَهَادَة):

أَشْهَدُ أَنْ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَ أَشْهَدُ أَنَّ مُحَمَّدًا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ

But then they suffered from some mysterious disease in Medina. They

asked <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> for medical treatment. <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> told them to go out and drink from the milk and urine of camels. They had a special case and for them it was

a medicine. They went out to the camels which were <sup>صَدَقَهُ</sup> but they

betrayed <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> as they killed their shepherds atrociously, seized the camels

and took to their heels. <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> immediately sent a troop to bring them back.

Because of the betrayal and the ruthlessness they perpetrated <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> wanted to teach the Bedouins a lesson and this was to act as deterrent telling them not to take advantage of the Muslims. They were not supposed to come and lie before him that they were Muslims and then kill the innocent shepherds and run away with the camels. It was,

indeed, severe punishment that <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ</sup> imposed on them but it acted as a deterrent to the rest of the tribes so that no one could dare to involve in such kind of betrayal and atrocity again.

So Amīr of the Muslims needs to make judgment on when to imply the general rule and when to apply the exceptional rule. These were the general rules

which <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٍ رَضِيَ</sup> meant when he addressed to the army being led by <sup>أَسَامَةَ بْنِ زَيْدٍ رَضِيَ</sup> proceeding to fight the Romans.

About the monks <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٍ</sup> said: You will find the monks (<sup>رُهْبَانٌ</sup>) who would

devout themselves to a life of <sup>زُهْدٌ</sup> and <sup>عِبَادَةٌ</sup>. With austere life style they lived in monasteries – they would not get married and lived in a condition of celibacy and engaged themselves in extreme measures. There was in Andalusia a nun who was proud of what she had done. She said: I have never, ever in my life bathed at all with the exception of the tips of my fingers when I would perform mass. <sup>اللَّهُ سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى</sup>

did not command them to involve themselves in strict <sup>رَهْبَانِيَّةٍ</sup>. It was their own

choice. <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٍ</sup> said about them: Leave them alone. Do not kill them and do not harm them for they will not fight with you; they are non-combatants. Do not harm them

even though they are involved in wrong type of <sup>زُهْدٌ</sup> and <sup>عِبَادَةٌ</sup>. Should that rule hold on with the templers? The templers were priests but they were issuing orders on the behalf of the Catholic Church to fight the Muslims; they were the worst among the crusading armies and the most brutal templers. How could this rule be applied on those who had issued the most fanatic orders for fighting the Muslim in the land of Palestine? So there must be judgment where to apply and where not to apply the rule and that is something

that the <sup>خَلِيفَةُ</sup> renders as <sup>مُجْتَهِدٌ</sup>. Notice by the way that a lot of <sup>اجْتِهَادٌ</sup> was done

by <sup>خُلَفَاءُ</sup> and <sup>أُمَرَاءُ</sup> for their position demanded it. <sup>عُمَرَ بْنِ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيزِ</sup> is also

considered as <sup>مُجْتَهِدٌ</sup> and one of the scholars of the *ummah* because there is a lot of

<sup>اجْتِهَادٌ</sup> that he observed appreciably. A <sup>مُجْتَهِدٌ</sup> is more than a mufti or a scholar and

especially as a <sup>خَلِيفَةُ</sup> or as an <sup>أَمِيرٌ</sup> he is the one who has to cope with the different

situations in the real world. So one of the compulsory conditions of <sup>خِلَافَةٍ</sup>

is <sup>عِلْمٌ</sup> (knowledge). The <sup>خَلِيفَةُ</sup> must be knowledgeable so that he can do <sup>اجْتِهَادٌ</sup> in the various situations he is faced with.

Now let us examine what was the outcome of sending out the army? Was Medina

ambushed or destroyed or were the Muslims killed? <sup>سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ</sup> Nothing of the sort happened. Look at what actually happened! The army marched out. It was traveling all

the way from Medina to شام (Syria). So it was cutting through the Northern Arabia. It was a grand show of force before all of the tribes who had been planning an assault on Medina as that's the law of the desert. If you are weak you can be attacked at any time. So all of the tribes which were trying to take advantage of the departure of

رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ

and wishfully sought to put an end to the Islamic state were really

amazed. They said to one another: مُحَمَّدٌ ﷺ passed away just a few days ago and these people are sending an army to none else but the Super Power of the world, the Roman Empire. Fighting the Romans among the Arab tribes was something that was rather incredible, rather formidable for them. They were so much afraid of the Roman Empire that they won't even think of facing them – just like when we talked about when

رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ

was seeking support from *Banu Shaibān* for bordering the Persians they frankly stated: We can protect you from the Arabs but cannot promise you protecting you from the Persian armies. This is something we cannot do. Thus the Arabs held the Romans and the Persians in awe and respect and wouldn't dare waging war

against them. When these Arab tribes saw that أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ ﷺ had mobilized an army that he was sending to fight the Romans they were nonplussed; they thought the Muslims must be very strong. Thereupon they changed their minds and forgot about attacking Medina.

The Arabian area remained very safe area even during the time of حُرُوبِ رِدِّي . That

area was no more problematic for the Muslim خِلاَفَةُ even though there were so many tribes just because they had entirely dismantled their plans of attacking Medina. The Heracles, the Roman Emperor was so worried about the new phenomenon of Islam that he left his capital and set his base in Antakya (in Syria) because he wanted to see closely the events that were occurring in the forgotten land of Arabia where before there was nothing to be worried about. Armies would cross the Arabian border and they wouldn't even take a glimpse at the desert as they found no resources there. Scarcely had they seen people there. That was a totally waste land for them. So both the Persian and the Roman Empires at the height of their power never invaded Arabia as they thought they would get nothing from deserts which seemed to be desolate and waste land.

What a great phenomenon! The Roman Emperor leaves his capital and goes to Antakya

just to monitor events in Medina. The <sup>قَدْر</sup> of Allāh is that he received the news of the

Muslim army marching towards Rome and the death of <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup> on the same day. Heracles said: What's going on? Their Prophet, their leader just passed away and they are sending out an army to fight against me. Surprisingly he changed his mind and allowed the Muslim army an easy access into the Roman Empire and to take booty.

<sup>أَسْمَاءُ بِنُ زَيْدٍ</sup> marched with his horses over the land where his father was killed as

desired by <sup>رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ</sup>. Heracles is right there and did not send an army to meet

him. On his return <sup>أَسْمَاءُ بِنُ زَيْدٍ</sup> made negotiations and deals with the Arab tribes and

signed agreements and truces with them. After taking <sup>جِزْيَهُ</sup> and booties of war from

here and there he goes back. This was the fruit of <sup>يَقِينٍ</sup> and <sup>أَيْمَانٍ</sup> of <sup>أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقِ</sup>.

The mother of Musa if she would not have <sup>يَقِينٍ</sup> in <sup>اللَّهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ</sup> she would not have

thrown her child in the river which seemed to be definite death of <sup>مُوسَى</sup>. Allāh Azzawajal told her 'if you wish safety of your child throw him in the river/. Tell me any mother who would throw her child in the river. Look at the solution. If you are afraid

of <sup>فِرْعَوْنَ</sup>, then throw him in the river. Apparently it seems to be worse than the problem. But Allāh told her in plain words:

وَلَا تَخَافِي وَلَا تَحْزَنِي إِنَّا رَادُّوهُ إِلَيْكِ وَجَاعِلُوهُ مِنَ الْمُرْسَلِينَ

-- But fear not nor grieve: for We shall restore him to thee, and We shall make him one of

Our apostles (28:7). Do what I tell you and that will happen. She did have <sup>يَقِينٍ</sup> in Allāh.

She threw her new-born infant <sup>مُوسَى</sup> in the river. If she had kept <sup>مُوسَى</sup> in her arms

and not believed in the promise of Allāh the soldiers of <sup>فِرْعَوْنَ</sup> or his intelligence services would have discovered him and put him to death because he was male boy born among Bani Israel and none of the male infants was being spared by the security men of

<sup>فِرْعَوْنَ</sup>. But the mother of <sup>مُوسَى</sup> believed in the promise of Allāh and soon she got the

reward. <sup>موسى</sup> was safely picked up by the soldier of Allāh. Who was the soldier of Allāh? It was the wife of <sup>فِرْعَوْنَ</sup>. She loved him and cherished to adopt him as her son and since <sup>موسى</sup> was to be breast-fed from no one but his own mother <sup>موسى</sup> was to be carried to the house of his mother surrounded by Royal Guards and the Royal Palace was obliged to pay salary for breast-feeding. Allāh Azzawajal says:

فَالْتَقَطَهُ آلُ فِرْعَوْنَ لِيَكُونَ لَهُمْ عَدُوًّا وَحَزَنًا

Then the people of Pharaoh picked him up (from the river): (It was intended) that (Moses) should be to them an adversary and a cause of sorrow (28:8). They didn't know that this new-born child would be the one to eliminate them.

The army of <sup>أسامة</sup> came back and was welcomed with a huge celebration. He was received in Medina for he was victorious. Thus the policy of <sup>أبو بكر</sup> did pay a lot. That's why all of the <sup>صحابه</sup> thereafter realized what <sup>أبو بكر</sup> says must be followed because he had <sup>تأييد</sup> (support) of Allāh Azzawajal.

Next segment is <sup>حُرْبُ رِدْئِي</sup> (The wars of Apostates). What is the definition of <sup>رِدْئِي</sup>? An-Nawavi says: The definition of <sup>رِدْئِي</sup> is discontinuation of Islam. A person who has <sup>نية</sup> *niyyāh* ( ) of leaving Islam or makes statement or acts that is liable to make a person apostate whether that action or statement is done even out of mocking. If some person makes fun of <sup>رسول الله</sup> or mocks or ridicules any pillar of Islam out of stubbornness it is <sup>رِدْئِي</sup>. If one makes *halal* as *haram* or *haram* as *halal* that is also <sup>رِدْئِي</sup>. Or even if he has intention of becoming *murtad* ( <sup>مُرْتَد</sup> ) or is debating whether to do it or not for example he says 'I am not sure whether I should say my prayer or not it is <sup>رِدْئِي</sup>. It comes in different forms, for example not applying the *hukm* of Allāh Azzawajal because He says:

وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ

Those who do not apply the law of Allāh by (the light of) what God hath revealed, they are (no better than) Unbelievers. (5:44). Another common form of رَدَى is retreat:

يَتَأْتِيهَا الَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا إِن تَطِيعُوا الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا يَرُدُّوكُمْ

عَلَىٰ أَعْقَابِكُمْ فَتَنْقَلِبُوا خَاسِرِينَ ﴿١٤٩﴾

O' believers! If you obey the Unbelievers, they will drive you back on your heels, and ye will turn back (from Faith) to your own loss (3:149). So رَدَى also implies

retreat. يَرُدُّوكُمْ عَلَىٰ أَعْقَابِكُمْ They will make you retreat you

وَمَنْ يَتَوَلَّهُمْ مِنكُمْ فَإِنَّهُ مِنَّهُمْ will become the losers. The Holy Prophet says: Whoever follows their ways becomes one of them. And this is an āyāh that

رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ repeats in the hadīth. The categories of رَدَى in the time of

أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ were of three types. Al-Qazi Ayāz says: The first type of the مُرْتَدِّينَ was they went back to worshipping idols or to what they were doing before

Islam. The second type of مُرْتَدِّينَ was the ones who followed Musalima al-Kazzāb and Aswad-ul-Ansī who claimed to be Prophets. The third type comprised those who remained Muslims but they refused to pay zakāt and claimed that zakāt had to be paid

only to رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ. They were also considered to be مُرْتَدِّينَ even though they used to pray and continued to stick to the other pillars of Islam.

أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٌ considered them as مُرْتَدِّينَ and we will talk about them in the next session.

When did رَدَى start? It actually started in the time of رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ. In the tenth year of *Hijrah* when his reign was spreading all over Arabia the weak-hearted people who joined the Muslims just because they were afraid of them or Islam had become

strong and prevalent. They were مُنَافِقِينَ (hypocrites). They didn't really believe it from their hearts. They were just taking the Muslims for a ride. Prophethood was not something known among the Arabs before. But when some people observed with their

naked eyes the success of the mission of مُحَمَّدٌ ﷺ they suggested to some clever

persons: Why don't you also claim to be Prophets? No body before مُحَمَّدٌ ﷺ in

Arabia had ever claimed to be a Prophet. But when they saw that مُحَمَّدٌ ﷺ had become the undisputed leader of Arabia they said: Lo! Give it a shot. So Musailma Kazzāb, Aswad-ul-Ansi and Tulaiha Azdi and Sajjah, all of them claimed to be Prophets. They were three men and one woman. The most dangerous of the four were, however, Musailma and Aswad-ul-Ansi. Musailma was from al-Yamama and Ansi from Yemen. These two were so dangerous as they had amassed huge armies that were posing a real

threat to the Muslim خَلَافَةَ. Both Musailma and Aswad al-Ansi claimed to be Prophets

during the time of رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ in the tenth year of Hijrah.

But رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ saw a dream before he breathed his last. He said: I saw as if I was wearing two bracelets of gold which I disliked. So I blew at them and they flew away in the air. His interpretation was that the two bracelets were the Liars of Yamama and Yemen. He would call them as the great Liars. The two bracelets symbolized dangers for

the Muslim community. There was Tulaiha, the third Prophet but رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ saw only two bracelets that meant to be the most dangerous and he said about

them: فَكَّرَهُتْمُوهُمَا. These were bracelets of gold which stand for the *zeenat* (زِينَةٌ) and love of this *dunya*. The two sham Prophets were claiming their Prophethood not for *Akhira* but for this *dunya* and in general gold carries a negative connotation in dreams.

The blowing of رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ means that even though they were dangerous their elimination was imminent as it was seen in the dream just by blowing at them. Thus

Musalima and Aswad both vanished and disappeared. And that blowing happened in the  
time of **أَبُو بَكْرٍ صَدِيقٍ** .

%%%%%%%%%