

**Lessons From The Biography Of The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)**  
**Taught by: Abū ‘Ammār ‘Alī Ḥudhayfah (حفظه الله)**

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

الحمد لله والصلاة والسلام على رسول الله وعلى آهله وصحبه أجمعين

Class 03

20<sup>th</sup> Dhū Al-Ḥijjah 1444

8<sup>th</sup> July 2023

**Class 03: Some Muṣṭalahāt – The Specific Terms That Are Particular To The Sīrah.**

**Ghazwah** – A battle that the prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was present in and fought in, like the battles of Badr and Uḥud.

**Sariyah** – A battle that the prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not attend, nor fought but rather sent some of his companions to go and engage in a distant territory.

**A Ba‘th** - the sending of troops.

Some historians use the terms interchangeably referring to a **ghazwah** as something the prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not attend. Or if there was an encounter where no fighting took place, then some historians might also call this a **ghazwah**, particularly if there was a large number of soldiers who had marched out or if it was a very important incident like that of Mu’tah. The prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not attend the battle of Mu’tah but because of its importance in the sīrah, some historians refer to Mu’tah as a ghazwah.

Al-Suyūṭī (رحمه الله) has a book Al-Khaṣā'is where he refers to the battle of Al-Rajī' as a **ghazwah** even though the prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not attend this incident or fight in it.

At times even if there was not an entire army sent out, even if there was one man or a couple of men, the historians would also refer to this as a **sariyah**. Even if it was not for the purpose of fighting with the enemy. The men may have been on a different mission. Some historians may refer to this as a **sariyah** or it might be referred to as a **ba'th** which is sending troops. Imām Al-Bukhārī (رحمه الله) refers to the incident of Al-Rajī' as a **ba'th** in his ṣaḥīḥ.

### **The difference Between A Ba'th And A Sariyah.**

Ibn Ḥajr Al-'Asqalānī (رحمه الله) in his book Fath Al-Bārī said that there is a difference between a sariyah and a ba'th. One is if there was a group of people sent from one location to another, and the other is if they were not sent, rather they were travelling. [9:32 – 11:00 audio not clear]

Mujāhid (رحمه الله) said the prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) sent a number of his companions off to Ḥunayn and it was called a sariyah, when a letter was sent off. The prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) also sent Diḥya as one man by himself on a mission that was called a sariyah.

**Al-Ḥalabī** (رحمه الله) said **perhaps there is no real difference between a sariyah and a ba'th** and that these terms could be used interchangeably. Whether the purpose of the individuals that were sent was for fighting or for sending a message to another nation, even potentially an enemy nation, but if the purpose was only to deliver a message, or if they were sent as spies, or if it could be called a reconnaissance, which is kind of like spying, and just checking out the situation and seeing what the enemy is up to. Sometimes soldiers would be sent out not to actually engage with the enemy, but just to check out their numbers and the likes.

### **Spies**

There are two different words for the word spy in the Arabic language,

- 1) (جاسوس) **Jāsūs – Spy**, but we rarely find this word in the terminology used by the scholars of Islāmic history.
- 2) (عَيْن) **'Ayn – Eye**. This is more commonly used and it refers to people sent out as eyes.

On other occasions, the prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) would send out some of the companions to some of the tribes that had just accepted Islām to teach them about Islām and this was also considered a **ba'th**.

### The Arabs Before Islām.

Before Islām, the Arabs fell into three main categories,

- 1) **Al-Arab Al-Bā'idah – The Arabs that became extinct** and have no remaining ancestors, like 'ād and thamūd. None of their lineage carried on until the time of the prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Historians have very little information about this category of Arabs.
- 2) **Al-Arab Al-Āribah – Arabs from the lineage of Yashjub bin Ya'rub bin Qaḥṭān**. They were originally from Yemen. Yemen was originally everything that was to the right (يمين) of the ka'bah, or to the south of Makkah. Essentially these were Arabs of the southern part of the Arabian Peninsula. They were descendents of Saba' ibn Yashjub and they were divided into two main categories – the tribes of **ḥimyar** and **kahlān** who were two of the sons of Saba'. They said that Saba' had fourteen children but the main tribes that descended after him were **ḥimyar** and **kahlān**. The word on the street is that the origin of the Arabs is Yemen. This is not from the educated historians and there is no definite proof of this, so people should not get into arguments about it, since it cannot be proven or disproven.
- 3) **Al-Arab Al-Musta'ribah – They were not Arab in their lineage or mother tongue, but lived amongst the Arabs and intermarried them, acquired the Arab language and were considered Arabs**. Like prophet Ismā'īl (عليه السلام), he was not from Arab lineage but he grew up amongst Arabs in Makkah and married from them. Everyone from his lineage is considered Arab but not an original Arab, rather someone that was intermingled with the Arabs and became

Arab. These Arabs are from the northern most part of the Arabian peninsula including Makkah. The prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was from this category. **Shaykh ‘Uthaymīn (رحمه الله) said in his commentary on the book Nūr Al-Yaqīn, that this category of the Arabs is the best of the three categories because Allāh (سبحانه و تعالی) chose the prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) from this category.**

There is a difference of opinion about the three categories but if we were to accept these three categories then it is up for debate. However there is not a lot of fruit in debating about this because it is something historical that cannot be proven since it is too old.

It is said that Adnān and Qaḥṭān (one of the original Arabs) was said to be living at the same time as prophet Mūsá (عليه السلام). After Adnān, his son Ma‘ad came, and then his son Nizār, then his son Rabīah. There were a lot of tribes that branched off from this.

### **The Blameworthy Tribal Pride Of Musaylimah Al-Kadhāb And His Supporters.**

Rabīah was one of the original Arab tribes. Musaylimah Al-Kadhāb who appeared and claimed to be a prophet was from the tribe of Rabīah. Even though Musaylimah was known to be a liar, part of the way he got his following was that people were just racist because they belonged to his tribe and were proud of their lineage. They clung to him knowing that he was a liar. The people from the tribe of Rabīah said, **‘we prefer the liar of Rabīah over the truthful man of wuda‘, meaning the prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) because he is not from our tribe.**

Majority of the khawārij came from the tribe of Rabīah, one of the reasons they had so much ‘beef’ with the Muslims was simply based on tribalism and racism. **They did not want to be under the authority of people from Quraysh, they wanted their own tribes to be the leaders of everything.**

### **The Arabs Can Be Traced Back To The Tribes Of Adnān and Qaḥṭān.**

We can generally trace back the Arabs to two tribes, Adnān and Qaḥṭān and that besides the Arabs that were extinct, the rest of the Arabs fall into two branches, **Al-Arab Al-‘Āribah** (originally Arab) and **Al-Arab Al-Musta‘ribah** (became Arab because they adopted the language and customs, everyone from the lineage of Ismā‘īl (عليه السلام)).

Some historians say there is no difference between them and we cannot really draw this line.

**Astonishing Statements Regarding The Existence Of Ismā'īl and Ibrāhīm (عَلَيْهِمَا الصَّلَاةُ وَالسَّلَامُ) From Some Liberal Muslims.**

The liberals and intellectuals who do not follow history and do not like to bind themselves to the teachings of the religion like Ṭāhā Ḥussein have said that we cannot even prove that Ismā'īl and Ibrāhīm (عَلَيْهِمَا الصَّلَاةُ وَالسَّلَامُ) even existed, even though they are mentioned in the Torah and the Qur'ān. This statement is kufr and it is very dangerous to make. **People like this go back and try to revise history according to their own desires.** It is not worth paying attention to what they say.

وصلى الله على نبينا محمد وعلى آله وصحبه وسلم

