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Objection of not Participating in Jihād

A few people level the accusation against Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ʿUmar ʿUmar that during the era of Nubuwwah they were not appointed leaders of the army, nor did they participate in any combat, nor were they injured during jihād; thereby deserving any reward. Thus, it is proof of their inability and unworthiness.

Answer

Those who have levelled this objection have done so only on the basis of stubbornness and enmity, and is also contrary to reality. The reality is that during the blessed era of Rasūlullāh, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr was appointed the leader of the Muslim army, he waged jihād and was also injured and hurt. In this light, the following narrations are presented wherein all doubts will be clarified.

Participation of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq

Sayyidunā Salamah ibn Akwaʿ — a well-known Ṣaḥābī of Rasūlullāh — states:

قال (سلمة بن اكوع) بعث رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أبا بكر إلى فزارة وخرجت معه حتى دنونا من الماء عرس أبو بكر حتى إذاصلينا الصبح أمرنا فشنا الغارة . فوردنا الماء فقتل أبو بكر من قتل ونحن معه ... الخ

We waged jihād in the direction of Banū Fazārah. Rasūlullāh appointed Abū Bakr as the leader. When we came to a well, Abū Bakr told us to spend the night and we stayed there for the night. The next morning we attacked this tribe from different sides and killed the people that were close to the well and imprisoned some.¹

Sayyidunā Salamah ibn Akwaʿ states: “In this incident, we were with Abū Bakr and we waged jihād under his command.”

¹ Musnad Imām Aḥmad vol.4 p.51 and Muslim vol. 2 p. 89, Nūr Muḥammadī, Delhi
From this narration, the following is made clear:

1. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr  was appointed the leader of the Muslim army.

2. It is also clear that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr  also killed the disbelievers and a number of disbelievers were killed and imprisoned upon his command.

The scholars of ḥadīth have transmitted another narration of Sayyidunā Salamah ibn Akwa’:

يقول (سلمة بن اكوع) غزوت مع رسول اللّٰه صلى اللّٰه عليه وسلم سبع غزوات ، وخرجت فيما يبعث من البعثات سبع غزوات مرة عليّنا أبو بكر ومرة عليّنا أسامة بن زيد

In the company of Rasūlullāh , I waged seven battles. Besides this, I participated in nine battalions that were sent out. In some of the expeditions, Abū Bakr was made the leader over us, whilst Usāmah Ibn Zayd was made the leader in others.

Both Imām Bukhārī  and Imām Muslim  have reported this narration.¹

The famous historian, Ḥāfiż ibn Kathīr  has mentioned that in the battle of Dowmat al-Jandal:

ان أبا بكر الصديق كان على المهاجرين في غزوة دومة الجندل وخالد بن وليد على الأعراب في غزوة دومة الجندل

Sayyidunā Abū Bakr  was the commander over the Muhājirīn and Sayyidunā Khālid ibn Walīd  was commander over the Bedouins that participated in the battle.²

Corroboration from the Shīʿah

Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, a Shīʿī scholar, writes in his commentary of Nahj al-Balāghah:

---

¹ Bukhārī vol.2 p.112, Muslim vol. 2 p. 118
² Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah vol .5 p. 18
During Shaʿbān in the seventh year after hijrah, Rasūlullāh sent Abū Bakr as a leader of a battalion towards Najd. They went to the people of the tribe of Ḥawāzin and attacked them at night. Bayās ibn Salamah narrates from his father: “I was present in the army. I killed seven disbelievers and we made our sign at the time, the words, ‘kill, kill’. On this occasion, a group of the companions of Rasūlullāh (sw) were martyred and Abū Bakr was injured in this fight. He rested for a few days and after his condition became better, he returned to Madīnah.”

Moreover, from amongst the Shīʿī historians, al-Masʿūdī writes in al-Tanbih wa al-Ashrāf about some of the skirmishes that took place. He mentions that during Shaʿbān 7 A.H, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr (ra) took the Muslim army towards Banū Kilāb ibn Rabīʾah. This battalion was called Sariyyah Abū Bakr.

Then the battalion of Abū Bakr in this month (Shaʿbān 7 A.H) towards Banū Kilāb ibn Rabīʾah ibn ʿĀmir.

From the references of the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah quoted above, the following is proven:

1. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr (ra) waged jihād in the path of Allah a number of times.

2. He was appointed as the leader of the army on a number of occasions.

3. He was injured during battle and therefore deserves reward.

---

1 Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah vol. 4 p. 250, Old Edition, Beirut
2 Al-Tanbih wa al-Ashrāf p. 4227, New Edition, Egypt
Participation of Sayyidunā ʿUmar

The scholars of history and biographies have written in detail regarding Sayyidunā ʿUmar, that he participated in jihād in the path of Allah Taʿālā a number of times and his exploits in the decisive battles of Islam are clearly proven. Presenting the details of this will unnecessarily lengthen the discussion. Despite this, a few references are presented to prove the matter, ponder over them.

The scholars of biographies state that ʿUmar participated in the Battles of Badr, Uḥud and Khandaq. Aside from these, he was with Rasūlullāh (saw) in other battles as well and was appointed as the leader of a number of battalions.¹

The biographers have written:

Buraydah al-Aslamī says that when Rasūlullāh dismounted at Khaybar, then he gave the flag to ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb.²

Ibn Kathīr mentions in al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah, with reference from Bayhaqī that on one occasion, Rasūlullāh sent Sayyidunā ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb with a battalion of thirty to fight the Ḥawāzin, and a guide from the Banū Hilāl went along with them. They would travel at night and remain hidden during the day. When they reached close to the city of the enemy, those people fled.

---
¹ Ṭabaqāt Ibn Saʿd vol.3 p.195
² Ṭabaqāt Ibn Saʿd vol.3 p.195
After this, Sayyidunā ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb returned to Madīnah Munawwarah. Some gave the counsel that Banū Khathʿam should be fought, so he said that Rasūlullāh (saw) had sent him to fight only the Banū Ḥawāzin (and Rasūlullāh did not instruct him to fight any other tribe).\(^1\)

In Ṭabaqāt Ibn Saʿd, this incident is said to have occurred in Shaʿbān 7 A.H:

ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بعث عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه في ثلاثين راكبا ومعه دليل من بني هلال وكانوا يسبرون الليل ويكتمون النهار فلما انتهوا إلى بلادهم هربوا منهم وكر عمر راجعا إلى المدينة فقيل له هل لك في قتل خثعم؟ فقال ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لم يأمرني الا بقتال هوازن في أرضهم.

Corroboration from the Shīʿah

The famous Shīʿī historian, al-Masʿūdī, writes in al-Tanbīḥ wa al-Ashrāf regarding this battalion of Sayyidunā ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, which was sent out in 7 A.H. The incident is mentioned in the following text:

ثم سرية عمر بن الخطاب في شعبان (الى الموضع المعروف بتربة وتربة ناجيه العبلاء على اربع ليال من مكة وقبل خمس طريق ثعا ونجمان اليمن).

From the above references (of the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah), it is clear that:

1. Sayyidunā ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb participated in the famous battles of Islam.

2. Sayyidunā ʿUmar was appointed the leader of the battalions in a number of expeditions.

Therefore, this accusation of the opposition — that Shaykhayn did not participate in any Islamic jihad nor were they appointed as leaders of any army — is totally baseless.

\(^1\) Al Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah vol.4 p. 221, Ṭabaqāt Ibn Saʿd vol. 3 p. 195
Objection of Fleeing from the Frontlines of Battle

Battle of Uḥud:

Those who lay false accusations against the Ṣaḥābah claim that the senior Ṣaḥābah were not firm in the Battle of Uḥud and they fled from the battle.

Answer

In reply to this, a number of points are presented below, from which this objection will be dismissed totally.

1. Whoever slipped in the Battle of Uḥud, it was on account of a misunderstanding with regards to implementing a command of Rasūlullāh. However, Allah Taʿālā forgave this slip of the Ṣaḥābah and revealing the following verse in the Qur’ān:


een al-dīn tawlō manaqūm yowm al-nilqi jammān inna ʿustūlūhum shīṭān bughū mā kasībū wāldū ʿamīlullāh

Indeed, those of you who turned back on the day the two armies met (at Uḥud) — it was Satan who caused them to slip because of some (blame) they had earned. But Allah has already forgiven them. Indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Forbearing.1

2. Moreover, at this point the scholars of tafsīr and ḥadīth have explained that there were approximately fourteen people who remained steadfast with Rasūlullāh: seven from the Muhājirīn and seven from the Anṣār. The names of the Muhājirīn who remained steadfast are clearly mentioned: Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, Sayyidunā ʿUmar, Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Sayyidunā Ṭalḥah, Sayyidunā ʿUbayd Allāh, Sayyidunā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAwf, Sayyidunā Zubayr and Sayyidunā Saʿd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ. Subsequently, Tafsīr al-Khāzin states:

1 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 155

11
Only thirteen or fourteen remained with Rasūlullāh from among the Muhājirīn and seven from the Anṣār. From the Muhājirīn: Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿAlī, Ṭalḥah ibn ʿUbayd Allāh, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAwf, Zubayr, Saʿd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ.¹

The same subject matter has been mentioned by Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar in the famous commentary of Bukhārī, Fath al-Bārī.²

In short, the biographers and historians have clarified that in the Battle of Uḥud, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ʿUmar, along with other senior Şaḥābah were of those who stood their ground and were not amongst those who slipped in fleeing.

Therefore, the accusation levelled against Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ʿUmar can never be correct. Furthermore, Allah Taʿālā has forgiven all those who slipped on that day, thus criticism cannot be levelled against any of them.

Battle of Ḥunayn

After this, the accusation is levelled against the Şaḥābah regarding the Battle of Ḥunayn. A few points are mentioned below, through which this accusation will be dismissed.

1. In reality, the Şaḥābah did not flee from the Battle of Ḥunayn, but there was a shortcoming in strategy. The disbelievers were laying in ambush on the right and left, with the path in the valley being narrow. When the Islamic army passed through, the disbelievers of the Ḥawāzin

---

¹ Tafsīr al-Khāzin vol.1 p.437
² Fath al-Bārī vol.7 p.289
began firing arrows with great ferocity, thereafter launching a full scale assault on the Muslims. When arrows were being fired from all directions, it became difficult for the Muslims to remain firm-footed and due to this great confusion, the ranks of the Muslims were broken. Allah Ta‘ālā then sent His special help and tranquillity upon His Rasūl and upon the Mu‘minīn, and sent upon them unseen assistance by means of the angels. In this manner, after their momentary disarray, they were granted victory, as the Qur’ān explains:

\[
	ext{ثُمَّ أَنَزلَ اللّٰهُ سَكِينَتَهُ عَلَى رَسُولِهِ وَعَلَى الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَأَنزَلَ جُنُودًا لَّمْ تَرَوْهَا وَعذَّبَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُواْ}
\]

Then Allah sent down His tranquillity upon His Messenger and upon the believers and sent down soldiers (i.e. angels) whom you did not see and punished those who disbelieved. And that is the recompense of the disbelievers.¹

We learn from this:

I. During the sudden attack, they were thrown into disarray, but Allah then sent His special help and the battlefront changed. His assistance descended and victory was attained.

II. At this point, the senior scholars have written that Rasūlullāh did not rebuke anyone that turned away on this occasion nor did he take them to task because he was aware of their excuse and forced circumstances. So, it will not be permissible for others to criticise them either. Subsequently, Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz says:

Rasūlullāh did not reprimand them, because he knew of their excuse, so no one else can criticise or accuse them.²

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 26
2 Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashāriyyah p. 338
At the end of this response, it is beneficial to note that the names of those who remained firm with Rasūlullāh in the Battle of Ḥunayn have also been recorded.

عن جابر قال ثبت معه ابو بكر و عمر و علي و العباس …الخ

It has been reported from Jābir that amongst those who remained firm with Rasūlullāh were Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿAlī, ʿAbbās…

In summary, in light of the above quotations it is proven that those who turned away in the Battle of Ḥunayn, did so on account of the severe circumstances that befell them, but Allah later changed their condition to one of assistance and victory.

Moreover, the scholars have clearly written that in the Battle of Ḥunayn, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ʿUmar were not of those who turned back. Therefore, it can never be correct to accuse them of fleeing from battle.
Accusation of Him not Being the Khalīfah of Rasūlullāh

One of the objections raised by the critics of the Ṣaḥābah against Sayyidunā Abū Bakr is that a Bedouin came to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and asked: “Are you the khalīfah of Rasūlullāh?” Sayyidunā Abū Bakr replied: “No.” He then asked: “Then what are you?” Sayyidunā Abū Bakr replied:

أنا الخالفة بعده

I am the one that comes after him.

According to the objection, the word “خالفة” refers to the person ‘upon whom one does not suffice and he has neither goodness nor blessings, and in fact one whom the majority oppose’, in other words, “خالفة” refers to someone that has no good and ability in him.

The critic who has raised this objection seems has understood this to mean that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr denied being the khalīfah of Rasūlullāh and instead regarded himself to be the khālifah. Therefore, it is not correct to refer to such a person as the khalīfah of the Rasūl.

Answer

1. What is the status of this narration of the Bedouin, quoted by the critic, according to the ḥadīth scholars:

It is unclear. It is not a narration of Bukhārī or Muslim, which we can accept without question or reservation. The books of ḥadīth diction, in which this narration is mentioned, mention regarding its meaning and purport:

فانما قال ذالك تواضعا وهضما من نفسه حين قال أنت خليفة رسول الله

He said this out of humility and modesty, when he was asked “You are the khalīfah of Rasūlullāh”
In other words, even if this narration were to be accepted then the scholars of ḥadīth have explained it to be an expression of humility on the part of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and not denial of being the khalīfah of the Rasūl.\(^1\)

The explanation above mentioned by the author al-Jazrī himself, immediately following this narration.

2. Aside from this narration, the scholars have reported another narration wherein Sayyidunā Abū Bakr acknowledges being the khalīfah of Rasūlullāh:


\[
\text{ عن أبي مليكة قال قال رجل لابي بكر يا خليفة الله قال لست بخليفته ولكني خليفة رسول الله، أنا راض بذالك}
\]

Ibn Abī Mulaykah said that a person said to Abū Bakr: “O khalīfah of Allah!” to which Sayyidunā Abū Bakr responded: “I am not the khalīfah of Allah, but I am the khalīfah of Rasūlullāh, and I am pleased with this.”\(^2\)

We learn from this narration that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr was pleased with being the khalīfah of Rasūlullāh. Therefore, he did not deny being the khalīfah of Rasūlullāh. Assuming he did deny being the khalīfah of Rasūlullāh at some point, then it was out of humility and subdue his own ego, as the scholars of ḥadīth diction have explained.

3. Moreover Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah has the following narration:


\[
\text{ عن حذيفة قال كنا جلوسا عند النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال لا أدري ما قدر بقائي فيكم فاقتدوا بالذين من بعدي وأشار الى أبي بكر وعمر واهتدوا بهدي عمار وما حدثكم ابن مسعود من شيء فصدقوه}
\]

Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah narrates: “Once we were sitting in the company of Rasūlullāh, and Rasūlullāh said: ‘I do not know for how

---

1 Ibn Athīr al-Jazrī: Al-Nihāyah, vol. 1 p. 315, Majmaʿ al-Bihār

2 Majmāʿ al-Zawā'id vol. 5 p. 184
long I will live amongst you. So, follow these two after me.’ He said this while gesturing towards Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ʿUmar). He also said: “Hold firm to the path of ʿAmmār and attest to whatever Ibn Masʿūd tells you.”

This narration makes it abundantly clear that after Rasūlullāh, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ʿUmar are worthy of being followed, and there is guidance and virtue in following them.

Moreover, it has also been clarified that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr is worthy of being the khalīfah of Rasūlullāh. He is most worthy of this position and Rasūlullāh subtly indicated towards him being the khalīfah.

Counter reply

To answer this allegation candidly, assuming that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr did negate being the khalīfah at any time, then Sayyidunā ʿAlī declined the khilāfah and desisted from taking the pledge of khilāfah. He refused it, whereas he was worthy for the position of khilāfah at that time.

It is stated in Nahj al-Balāghah that after the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ʿUthmān, people went to Sayyidunā ʿAlī with the intention of pledging allegiance, and he said:

معني فانتموا غيري...وأنا لكم وزيرا خير لكم مني أميرا

Leave me alone with regards to the matter of the khilāfah and look for someone other than I. It is better for me to remain a minister for you, rather than become a leader (khalīfah) over you.¹

Therefore, just as we cannot negate the position of khilāfah from Sayyidunā ʿAlī based on his refusal to become the khalīfah, in exactly the same way, we

¹ Nahj al-Balāghah p. 181
cannot deny the position of khilāfah from Sayyidunā Abū Bakr  ✈️ based on his modest statements. The actual purport and context under which he negates being the khalīfah is what we have previously explained.
Accusation of the Pledge at the Hands of Abū Bakr Being Sudden

The enemies of the Ṣaḥābah — the Shī‘ah — raise an objection regarding the pledge of khilāfah at the hands of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr that the pledge was taken suddenly, without thinking and no consultation took place. He was also made the khalīfah without any proof.

Therefore, the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr was not based on the truth and this leader is not upon the truth.

Answer

The sect that opposes the Ṣaḥābah has made the following statement of Sayyidunā ʿUmar the basis of their objection:

كانت بيعة أبي بكر فلتة وقي الله شرها

The pledge at the hands of Abū Bakr was sudden, Allah Ta‘ālā saved us from the evil of its suddenness.

The purport of this statement of Sayyidunā ʿUmar has been explained by Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim ibn Salām (d. 224 A.H) in his work Gharīb al-Ḥadīth, in the following text:

انما معناها البغتة وانما عوجل بها مبادروه لإنتشار الامر والشقاق حتى لا يطمع فيها من ليس لها بموضع

وكانت الفلتة هي التي وقي الله بها الشر المخوف

It means; suddenly. There was haste in it because the matter could have led to disunity and disagreement, so that no-one who was unworthy could desire and the haste is what Allah Ta‘ālā used to save the evil that was feared.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) Gharīb al-Ḥadīth vol. 2 p. 231
This subject is discussed in another place:

The meaning of the word ‘فلتة’ is sudden. And that is how it happened because the general masses were not waited upon but the senior Ṣaḥābah from the Muhājirīn and Anṣār went forward. They all then placed their hands in his hand because they knew that there is no rival for Abū Bakr and no-one shared his virtue and there was no need to discuss the matter or consult about it. Therefore, it was sudden and through it Allah Ta’ālā saved Islam and the Muslims from its evil.¹

Similarly, Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz has given a detailed response to this objection in his work *Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah*:

The purport of “Allah Ta’ālā saved from its evil” is that the pledge of khilāfah at the hands of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr took place in Saqīfah Banī Sāʿidah quickly; bearing in mind the difference of opinion or disagreement that could have arisen. There was no opportunity for lengthy deliberation and discussion. However, the fear that existed for hastening in this matter was that if the pledge was not found in its place, then someone unworthy person would have been appointed to the post. Through the grace of Allah Ta’ālā, it did not occur and the matter of truth found its standing.²

It is apparent that in this statement, Sayyidunā ʿUmar did not imply that the pledge at the hands of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr was not correct. The reason for this is:

---

¹ Gharīb al-Ḥadīth vol. 3 p. 352, 357, Minhāj al- Sunnah vol. 3 p. 118, al-Muntaqā p. 338
² Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah p. 271
1. In Saqīfah Banī Sāʿidah, the first two people to pledge allegiance at the hands of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr (رضي الله عنه) were Sayyidunā ʿUmar (رضي الله عنه) and the second was Sayyidunā Abū ʿUbaydah ibn al-Jarrāḥ (رضي الله عنه). After this, the rest of the people pledged allegiance.

2. On this occasion, both of them (Sayyidunā ʿUmar and Sayyidunā Abū ʿUbaydah ibn al-Jarrāḥ) used the following words in favour of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr:

أنت خيرنا وأفضلنا

You are the best among us and the most virtuous among us.

The Muhājirīn and Anṣār that were present there, they did not refute these words, but they accepted it. So, in this case, it was accepted that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr (رضي الله عنه) was the best and most virtuous amongst the Ṣaḥābah and they were convinced of this.

Note: -

The above quoted words which Sayyidunā ʿUmar (رضي الله عنه) used in favour of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr (رضي الله عنه) are mentioned in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (vol. 1 p. 518) in the following manner:

بل نبايعك فانت سيدنا وخيرنا واحبا الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

In fact, we pledged allegiance to you because you are our leader and the best amongst us and the most beloved to Rasūlullāh.¹

Summary

Those who have levelled this criticism against Sayyidunā Abū Bakr (رضي الله عنه) have done so in vain. This is because the intent of Sayyidunā ʿUmar (رضي الله عنه) was not to

---

¹ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī vol. 1 p. 518
imply that the pledge was done out of place or without thinking, that despite his ineligibility for the post he was still elected as the khalīfah, and is not the true khalīfah. However, Sayyidunā ʿUmar ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz mentioned this statement knowing the reality of the situation that there was haste in the matter of pledging allegiance so that there will be no confusion in the case where different opinions are raised.

Allah Taʿālā saved Islam and the Muslims from the evil of differences of opinion and the correct khalīfah was chosen quickly and the chosen khalīfah was worthy of this position. Based on this, most of the Muslims accepted happily and there was no disagreement. This proves that the selection was correct.

It is beneficial to mention at this point, in order to remove any doubt, that some of the narrations of this incident where it is stated that the Ṣaḥābah argued with each other, drew swords etc. are totally incorrect. Such narrations are nothing but exaggerations of history and according to the scholars of the field; they are highly debated and criticised and can never be relied upon.
The Accusation of Waging War Against Those who Stopped Paying Zakāh

The opposition accuse Sayyidunā Abū Bakr of acting contrary to the guidelines of Rasūlullāh, who left those who stopped giving zakāh (like the tribes of Tha’labah and Thaqīf etc.) and he did not wage war against those who stopped from giving zakāh, whereas Sayyidunā Abū Bakr waged war against them. Thus, this was against the directions and deeds of Rasūlullāh.

They present the following narration on which the objection is based:

عن وهب سالت جابرا عن شان ثقيف از بايعت قال اشترط على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ان لا صدقة عليها ولا جهاد

It is narrated from Wahb, I asked Jābir about Thaqīf, when they pledged allegiance. He said: “They placed the condition on Rasūlullāh that there will be no zakāh and no jihād upon them.”

Answer

If this question is accepted, then study the following in reply to it. The objection will be dismissed:

1. The above mentioned condition was made during the initial discussion with Thaqīf. However, this was not accepted as a permanent condition. The reason for this is that the very same narration states:

سمع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول بعد فالك سيتصدقون ويجاهدون انا اسلموا

He heard Rasūlullāh saying later on that they will give zakāh and wage jihād, when they become Muslims.

1 Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah vol. 5 p. 30
Which means that temporarily, they put down the condition of not giving zakāh and waging jihād. After Islam became firm, they will give zakāh and they will participate in jihād.

2. When the tribes turned apostate after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, while some tribes refused to pay zakāh — but said that they will perform ṣalāh — Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﺑ高潮 was resolute and said:

منعوني عقالا لجاهتهم

If they refuse to give me a rope (for tying the camel) I shall wage jihād against them.¹

Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﺑ高潮 was the khalīfah and ruler of the time. It was compulsory upon the Muslims to obey his orders. Fighting those who refused to give zakāh was indeed the correct course of action, while some felt at first called for, they too also agreed with the view of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﺑ高潮 in the end.² They classified the fight against the rejecters of zakāh as correct. This is clearly mentioned in its place.

Amongst the senior Ṣaḥābah م高潮, Sayyidunā ʿAlī ﻢ高潮 also agreed to the view of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﺑ高潮 and he was ready for this fight. On this occasion, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﺑ高潮 was very passionate, he asked for his conveyance to be brought and he set out to lead the charge but Sayyidunā ʿAlī ﻢ高潮 took the reins of his conveyance and advised him not to go, but send others to lead this expedition.

عن عائشة قالت خرج أبي شاهرا سيفه راكبا على راحلته إلى وادي القصة فجاء علي بن أبي طالب وأخذ بزمام راحلته فقال إلى أين؟ يا خليفة رسول الله أقول لك ما قال رسول الله يوم أحد لم سيفك ولا تفجن بنفسك فوالله لان أصبتني لك لا يكون للإسلام بعلك نظام ابدا فرجع وامضى الجيش

¹ Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah vol. 6 p. 312, Mishkāt p. 157
² Mirqāṭ vol. 4 p. 136, 137
ʿĀʾishah narrates: My father went out with his sword drawn, mounted on his steed, towards Wadi al-Qissah, ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib came and took the reins of his mount and said: “Where are you going, O khalīfah of the Rasūl of Allah? I say to you what Rasūlullāh said to you on the day of Uḥud: “You will not stop, and you will not leave us in loss with regards to yourself, by Allah, if something has to afflict us regarding you, there will be no administrative support for Islam ever.” So he returned and let the army carry on.¹

In short, Sayyidunā ʿAlī agreed with the rest of the senior Ṣaḥābah that war should be waged against those that refuse to pay Zakāh, so the step taken by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr was correct.

It was not against, and did not contradict the Sunnah of Rasūlullāh. Therefore, the objection is baseless. There is a statement mentioned in Jawāmiʿ al-Sīrah of Ibn Ḥazm Ṣāhirī, it is presented here:

وقد قال قوم ان ثعلبة بن حاطب منع الزكوة فنزلت فيه (ومنهم من عاهد الله لئن آتنا من فضله لنصقن (الآيات) وهذا باطل لأن شهوده بدرا يبطل ناك بلا شك

Some have said that when Thaʿlabah ibn Ḥātib refused to give zakāh, then the verse was revealed regarding him, “and among them are those who made a pact with Allah that if He grants us from His grace, then we shall definitely give zakāh”, this is baseless; being amongst the Ṣaḥābah of Badr renders it baseless.²

---

¹ Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah vol. 6 p. 315
² Jawāmiʿ al-Sīrah p. 127
Accusation Regarding the Army of Sayyidunā Usāmah ibn Zayd

Those who criticise the Ṣaḥābah state that in Safar 11 A.H, Rasūlullāh prepared an army to face the Romans, appointing as their leader Sayyidunā Usāmah ibn Zayd. The Shīʿī scholar Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī reports that Rasūlullāh said:

انفذوا جيش اسامة لعن الله المتخلف عن جيش اسامة وكانت الثلاثة معه ومنع أبو بكر عمر من ذالك

Send the army of Usāmah. May the curse of Allah be upon the one who does not join the army of Usāmah. The three (Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān) were with him, then Abū Bakr prevented ʿUmar from going with the army.

The objection is that after Rasūlullāh passed away, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr fell short in sending off this army; himself not joining and also preventing Sayyidunā ʿUmar from joining them. This was clear opposition to the emphatic command of Rasūlullāh.

Answer:

A number of points will be presented in reply to this objection, through which the objection will have no basis.

Scholars have commented on the words in this narration, “May the curse of Allah be upon the one who does not join the army of Usāmah”, that these words are not correct and they have been added to the narration.

If this narration is taken to be correct, then there are a number of negative implications. For example, Sayyidunā ʿAlī did not join the army of Sayyidunā Usāmah; how will the above mentioned words be correct for him?

Moreover, this point is worthy of note, that during his final moments, Rasūlullāh instructed Sayyidunā Abū Bakr to lead the ṣalāh, which he did, in
accordance with the command of Rasūlullāh. Thereafter, after the demise of Rasūlullāh, he was chosen by the Ṣaḥābah for the position of khalīfah. In these conditions, how could he join the army of Usāmah?

In light of this, the scholars have explained that the words of cursing are not correct. Moreover, it is incorrect that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr went against the command of Rasūlullāh in sending out the army of Sayyidunā Usāmah. This is because the reality is that after the demise of Rasūlullāh, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr did indeed send the army of Sayyidunā Usāmah out, which is transmitted in a number of narrations. One of these narrations is presented below:

When Abū Bakr made a firm resolution to prepare the army of Usāmah, then some of the Anṣār said to ʿUmar: “Tell Abū Bakr that he should appoint someone besides Usāmah as the leader over us,” and ʿUmar mentioned this to Abū Bakr. Abū Bakr said: “I shall not appoint a leader other than the leader who Rasūlullāh appointed.” Sayyidunā Abū Bakr then personally went to Jurf and walked at the head of the army of Usāmah, and commanded them to depart. He walked along with them whilst Usāmah was mounted. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAwf was pulling the reins of the conveyance of Abū Bakr. Usāmah said: “O Khalīfah of the Rasūl of Allah, either mount the conveyance or shall I dismount.” Abū Bakr said: “Neither will you dismount, nor will I mount.

After this, Abū Bakr asked Usāmah for ʿUmar to be returned from the
army, whereas ʿUmar was part of the army. So, Usāmah permitted ʿUmar to return.

This is why whenever Sayyidunā ʿUmar used to meet Sayyidunā Usāmah, he would say: “Peace be upon you, O Amīr.”

Note:-

Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ has also mentioned this narration in his history work (vol. 1 p. 65) that Amīr al-Muʿminīn Abū Bakr took permission from the leader of the army, Usāmah ibn Zayd for ʿUmar to return.

It is clear from the above narration that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr did not go against the command of Rasūlullāh, and despite the opinion of some to delay this expedition, he order them to march. He did not suspend the departure of the army of Sayyidunā Usāmah at all. Moreover, it is also clear that Sayyidunā ʿUmar was not opposed to the army of Sayyidunā Usāmah, but Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ʿUmar took permission from Sayyidunā Usāmah for him to be left behind. Therefore, the objection that they have raised regarding the army of Sayyidunā Usāmah not being sent out is wrong and contrary to reality.

1 Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah vol. 6 p. 305
Accusation of Confessing to Error and Sin

The enemies of the Ṣaḥābah raise the objection against Sayyidunā Abū Bakr that he was not worthy of the khilāfah on account of what he stated in his sermons and other speeches, namely:

ان لي شيطانا يعتريني

I have a devil that troubles me

اني لست بخيركم

I am not the best among you

Therefore, from this type of speech we learn that in accordance to his confession, he was not worthy of the khilāfah.

Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī discusses this criticism in Minhāj al-Kirāmah in the following text:

منها ما ردوه عن ابي بكر انه قال على المنبر ان النبي صلى الله عليه وآله كان يعتصم بالحوى وان لي شيطانا

يعتريني فان استقمت فاعينوني وان زغت فقوموني ...الخ

وكيف يجوز امامه من يستعين بالرعية على تقويم مع ان الرعية تحتاج اليه

... Amongst them it is narrated from Abū Bakr that he sat on the pulpit and said: “Rasūlullāh would hold on firmly to revelation and there is a devil that troubles me. If I remain firm in religion, then help me and if I stray, then straighten me.”
How can the Imāmah of such a person who is in need of his subjects to straighten him be permissible, whereas the subjects are in need of him?

Answer

If this speech came from Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and it is proven with an authentic chain of narration, then the interpretation of it will be:

Sayyidunā Abū Bakr was making it apparent that he is not infallible and he is not safe from error.

فقال ان استقمت على الطاعة فاعينوني عليها وان زغت عنها فقوموني

You should help me in that which is best and in taqwā. If I remain firm upon obedience (the Qur'ān and the Sunnah), then help me and if I stray from obedience, then correct me.¹

The senior scholars often mentioned statements like this at times. The best answer is that on account of being overwhelmed by the fear of Allah Ta’ālā, they mentioned this type of speech. Moreover, this type of speech is found in the books of the Shī’ah as well from their A’immah. So, whatever answer they provide there, the same will be the answer for the speech of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr.

In the book of al-Kulaynī, there is an authentic narration from Imām Ja’far al-Ṣādiq: “There is a devil with every believer that turns him away from the straight path.”²

Moreover, the same type of speech uttered by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr is narrated from Sayyidunā ‘Alī in Nahj al-Balāghah:

1 Al-Muntaqā p. 336
2 Tuhfah Ithnā ’Ashariyyah p. 270
لا تكفوا عن مقاله بحق او مشورة بعدل فاني لست في نفسي يقوق ان اخطى ولا آمن ذالك من فعلي

Do not stay away from me in saying the truth or in giving me counsel of the truth. I am not beyond error and I am not safe from error in my deed.¹

Sayyidunā ʿAlī used to supplicate:

اللهم اغفرلي ما تقربت به اليك بلساني ثم خالفه قلبي اللهم اغفرلي رمزات الألحاظ وسقطات الألفاظ وشهوات الجنان وهفوات اللسان

O Allah, forgive me for that speech through which I acquired closeness to You, then my heart went against it. O Allah, forgive me for the indications of my eye and my useless words and desires of my heart and the errors of my tongue.²

Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn (ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn) used to supplicate:

ها انا ذا يا رب مطروح بين يديك انا الذي اوقرت الخطايا ظهره وانا الذي افنت الذنوب عمره وانا الذي بجهله عصاك ولم تكن اهلا منه لناك...الخ

Here I am, O Rabb, thrown before You, I am the one that attests to my sin that has burdened by back and I spent my life in sin and I am the one that disobeyed You out of ignorance...³

In another place, he says:

واغفرلي ما تعلم من ذنوبي ان تعذب فانا الظالم المفرط المضيع الثامس المضجر المغفل...الخ

And forgive me for those of my sins that You are aware of, if You punish, then I am the oppressor, the one who has been extreme in my life, the extravagant in sin, the one who falls short, one asleep, one who is negligent...⁴

¹ Nahj al-Balāghah vol. 1 p. 436, Furūʿal-Kāfī vol. 3 p. 165
² Nahj al-Balāghah vol. 1 p. 127
³ Al-Ṣaḥīfah Kāmilah Sajjādiyyah p. 83
⁴ Ibid p.301
Moreover, Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn supplicates elsewhere:

O Allah, whatever Shayṭān has placed in my heart of hopes and jealousy, make it into mention of Your greatness and into pondering over Your power and whatever lewd talk Shayṭān has placed in my tongue: futile talk, dishonouring someone, baseless testimony, backbiting of a Muslim and speaking ill of a person in his presence; turn it into praise for You, exaggeration in Your glory, gratitude for Your bounty, confession of Your favour, counting Your bounty...¹

In summary

From the speech of the A’immah quoted above, whatever words have been narrated, there is confession of sin, Shayṭān affecting the heart etc., just as it is found within the infallible A’immah, and it did not negatively affect their Imāmah in any way, so too these things are found in the speech of the senior Șaḥābah like Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, and cannot form the basis of any objection or criticism.

In short, whatever your reply is, that will be our reply.'

¹ Ibid p.106