A DISCUSSION OF THE

ERRORS OF YUSUF ALI

BY

MUJLISUL-ULAMA
OF SOUTH AFRICA
(Port Elizabeth)

Published by
YOUNG MEN'S MUSLIM ASSOCIATION
P.O. Box 18594, Actonville 1506
(Benoni, South Africa)

A DISCUSSION OF THE

ERRORS

OF

YUSUF ALI



by

MUJLISUL-ULAMA OF SOUTH AFRICA

(PORT ELIZABETH)

Published by

YOUNG MEN'S MUSLIM ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 18594, Actonville 1506

(Benoni, South Africa)

CONTENTS

Introduction i

The violaters of the Sabbath 1

Riba 12

Azwaajum Muṭahharah — Wives purified 16

Islamic meaning of the Zakaat category of Fi-Sabeelillah 27

Shooting stars 31

Risaalat — Is it a requisite of Imaan? 35

Damsels of Jannat 44

Resurrecting the dead 50

Absurd research of Yusuf Ali and the Researchers 57

Denying the Islamic Jannat 63

Islamic belief of Jannat and Jahannum 67

Nabi Isaa (Alaihis Salaam) 72

Yusuf Ali propagates the death of Isaa (Alaihis Salaam) 74

Jinn — What are they? 75

A Musaafir in the Shariah 82

Apologetic confusion 88



بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

الحمد لله رب العالمين والصلوة على حبيبه الكريم

INTRODUCTION

Verily, Allah has been kind to the Mu'mineen by sending to them a Rasool from among them. He (the Rasool) recites to them the aayaat of Allah; he purifies them and he teaches them the Book (Qur'an) and Wisdom (Hikmat). Verily, before (this) they were in clear error.

(Surah Aal-e-Imraan)

And, We (Allah) have revealed to you (Muhammad) the Thikr (Qur'an) so that you may explain to mankind that which was revealed to them."
(Surah Nahl)

The Qur'an Majeed is the Wahi of Allah. It is the Wahi — the Law — which progressed from Allah Ta'ala to the Rasool, Muhammad Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, the highest and the final repository of Wahi. The Qur'an -e-Hakeem is very explicit in declaring that the office of Nubuwwah was not confined to mere recital of the Words of Wahi. Along with recital, it was the fundamental duty of the Nabi to present the Divine Exposition of the Verses of the Qur'an. Thus, the Qur'an declares:

He (Muhammad) does not speak of desire (his own opinion).
It is nothing but revealed Wahi.

It is clear from the Qur'an Majeed that the Tafseer (the exposition) of the Qur'an which has reached the Ummah is from Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam.

It is not that the recital of the Qur'an was the duty of the Nabi while the exposition and interpretation of the recited words were the privilege of others after the Rasool. The Rasool of Allah, Muhammad Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam did not come to mankind in the mere capacity of a

postman just to deliver the Wahi. His office of Nubuwwah required the exposition and the detailed explanation of the verses of Wahi which are vital for the earthly and spiritual life of the Mu'mineen.

Exposition or explanation was a necessary corollary of the revealed verses. Such exposition was always given by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. Such exposition as given by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam has been reliably and authoritatively transmitted through the various epochs of the Ummah, from generation to generation in an unbroken Chain of authentic narration. The Tafseer of the Qur'an in the possession of the Ummah is thus, not the product of individual opinion and the interpretation of unqualified men who have hoisted themselves as authorities of the Deen in their minds, but who in actual fact come within the purview of the following severe warning sounded by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam:

"He who speaks about the Qur'an with his opinion, let him prepare his abode in the Fire."

The Qur'an was not left to the wildly fluctuating vagaries of individual understanding, opinion, inferences and interpretations. Such individual interpretation has absolutely no origin and no sanction in Islam. Allah Ta'ala is the Interpreter of the Qur'an. The Divine Interpretation has been transmitted to the Ummah by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. Any departure from the Divine Exposition of the Qur'an is baatil and mardood (false and rejected).

In Islam there is no scope for entertaining the views and opinions of an individual who seeks to interwove such personal whim and fancy into the fabric of the Shariah. Such unauthorized opinion stands condemned by the Ahadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. The Qur'an declares:

This is a Revelation from Rahmaan, Raheem. It is a Kitaab, the Aayats of which have been explained...

(Surah Haameem Sajdah)

When the Aayaat have already been divinely explained, the Ummah does not require the unauthorized expositions of unqualified men who present their personal opinions as Shar'i matter. One such unauthorized exposition is the commentary of Yusuf Ali.

This booklet deals with some of the errors of Yusuf Ali who has rendered Islam a great disservice by projecting his personal opinions and theories as Qur'anic Tafseer. The few errors discussed herein are by no means comprehensive. These errors have been taken at random. Insha'Allah, we may yet prepare a more exhaustive account of the errors contained in the translation and commentary of Yusuf Ali. Many Muslims unacquainted with Yusuf Ali and not versed in Shar'i knowledge, have been deceived into believing that Yusuf Ali is a mufassir (Commentator) of the Qur'an. He is nothing of the sort. Some of his errors are of exceptional gravity, being clear teachings of kufr.

We have prepared this booklet to warn Muslims of the errors of kufr committed by Yusuf Ali in his translation and commentary. We have prepared this exposition of Yusuf Ali's errors so that unwary Muslims may be saved from the abyss of kufr, the end of which is perpetual damnation in the Aakhirah. There is no greater calamity than the curse of kufr. Since Yusuf Ali has lost himself in his opinions, desires and fancies, he has strayed from the Path of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah. He has thus presented exposition which are in total conflict with the Tafseer presented by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, the Sahaabah and the recognized authorities of Islam.

In view of the serious defects contained in the commentary of Yusuf Ali, it is not permissible for laymen to read such a book which constitutes a danger to Imaan. Imaan is the Mu'min's greatest and most delicate treasure. It is not lawful for a Believer to expose the Treasure of his Imaan to the onslought of kufr.

The Qur'an is the Book of Guidance. Its guidance can be obtained only by accepting and following the avenues of its Guidances indicated by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. Such avenues cannot be chalked out on the basis of an individual's understanding. In short, there is no

exposition to accept and follow other than the Tafseer of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam.

MUJLISUL ULAMA OF SOUTH AFRICA

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

الحمد لله رب العالمين والصلوة على حبيبه الكريم

THE VIOLATORS OF THE SABBATH

"And, verily, you are aware of those among you who transgressed regarding the Sabbath. We then said to them: 'Become apes, despised!' "
(Surah Baqarah, Ayat 64)

Commenting on this Qur'anic ayat, Yusuf Ali states in his 'commentary':

"There must have been a Jewish tradition about a whole fishing community in a seaside town, which persisted in breaking the Sabbath and were turned into apes: cf. vii. 163-166. Or should we translate in both these passages, "Be as apes," instead of "Be apes"? This is the suggestion of Maulvi Muhammad Ali on this passage, on the authority of Mujahid and Ibn Jarir Tabari."

"They were despised among their own people, and became like apes, without law and without order or decency."

While presenting his personal opinion on the Qur'anic Ayat pertaining to the particular episode referred to, Yusuf Ali totally ignores the Tafseer and unanimous opinion of the Mufassireen of the Ahle Sunnah. He is, moreover, guilty of chicanery by passing over the relevant ayat most superficially and concluding:

"There must have been a Jewish tradition about a whole fishing community in a seaside town, which persisted in breaking the Sabbath and were turned into apes."

Yusuf Ali has been grossly dishonest in his attempt to attribute the literal connotation of the Qur'anic verses in question to some Jewish tradition. In so doing he dismissed the literal meaning of the ayat and asserts a figurative interpretation, viz,

"Be as apes."

"...and became like apes, without law and without order or decency."

The existence of "a Jewish tradition about a whole fishing community..." to this effect and the literal meaning - the actual occurrence of the incident — are in fact adequately corroborated by the Qur'an Sharief. There is, therefore, no need for tendering any ambiguous explanation about the relevant ayat. The Qur'an Shareef, itself, most unambiguously speaks about the "fishing community in a seaside town, which persisted in breaking the Sabbath and were turned into apes. In Surah A'raf, the Qur'an Shareef states:

وَسْئَلْهُمْ عَنِ الْقَرْيَةِ ...

Yusuf Ali, himself translated these verses as follows:
"Ask them concerning the town standing close by the sea.

Behold! they transgressed
In the matters of the Sabbath.
For on the day of their Sabbath
Their fish did come to them,
Openly holding up their heads,
But on the day they had
No Sabbath, they came not:
Thus did We make a trial
of them, for they were
Given to transgression."
(Surah A'raf, Verse 163)

It will be seen from this ayat that the Qur'an Shareef is narrating an actual event which occurred to Bani Isra-il, hence, Allah Ta'ala commands (in the ayat), Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam:

وَسْئَلْهُمْ

"And ask them (the Jews)!"

The question of there having been a "fishing community" according to "some Jewish tradition" is confirmed by the Qur'an. The existence of such a community is upheld by

— the town by the sea.

The transgressing community being turned into actual apes — literally — is forcefully asserted by the Qur'an Shareef:

فَقُلْنَا لَهُمْ كُوْنُوْا قِرَدَةً خَاسِئِيْنَ

"Then We said to them — Become apes, despised."
(Surah Baqarah, ayat 65)

Also:

فَلَمَّا عَتَوْا عَنْ مَّانُهُوْا عَنْهُ قُلْنَا لَهُمْ كُوْنُوْا قِرَدَةً خَاسِئِيْنَ

"When they transgressed that which they were prohibited (i.e. fishing on the Sabbath), We said to them: Become apes, despised."
(Surah A'raf, ayat 166)

The clear text of the relevant ayat is emphatic and unambiguous in its literal meaning. Any figurative connotation attributed to the occurrence of transformation of the transgressors into apes will render the ayat meaningless, for Allah Ta'ala says,

فَجَعَلْنٰهَا نَكَالًا لِّمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهَا وَمَا خَلْفَهَا وَمَوْعِظَةً لِّلْمُتَّقِيْنَ

"Thus, We made it (the transformation into apes) an example for those of its time and an admonition for posterity."

immediately after: كُوْنُوْا قِرَدَةً خَاسِئِيْنَ — *"Become apes!"*

This ayat says that something was made an example and an admonition for people. Yusuf Ali says that "Become apes!" has a figurative meaning which means that they became lawless like apes without any decency. But

such lawlessness of men is no "example" and "admonition" for people of the time and for posterity. According to the Qur'an they were in fact punished for their lawlessness, but according to Yusuf Ali's figurative interpretation the punishment for their transgression was lawlessness. But this conclusion is absurd since lawlessness and indecency themselves are transgression. The compensation or punishment of transgression is not further transgression. Transgression is the act of the transgressor, and further transgression is likewise the act of the transgressor. The latter act of transgression in no way represents the punishment for the former act of transgression nor does the combination of the two acts of transgression (in this case (1) the transgression of the Sabbath and, (2) the lawlessness and indecency) constitute either punishment for the first act of transgression, viz. transgression of the Sabbath, or an example and an admonition for mankind. The whole figurative interpretation of these verses presented by Yusuf Ali thus results in an absurdity.

The history of Bani Isra-il abounds with lawlessness and transgression. The Qur'an repeatedly draws attention to the transgression and rebellion of Bani Isra-il. Because of such wanton and flagrant violation perpertrated, their hearts were transformed. But about such transformation - figuratively - the Qur'an Shareef leaves no ambiguity. Where the transformation had a figurative implication, there the Qu'ran speaks clearly of such figuration. In this regard the Qur'an states:

ثُمَّ قَسَتْ قُلُوْبُكُمْ مِّنْ بَعْدِ ذٰلِكَ فَهِيَ كَالْحِجَارَةِ اَوْ اَشَدُّ قَسْوَةً

"Then your hearts became hard thereafter - thus they (became) like stone or harder than stone."
(Surah Baqarah, ayat 74)

In this ayat the figurative connotation is stated clearly by the words كالحجارة - like stone. Here the Qur'an explicitly negates the literal meaning of "stone" by prefixing the term ك (like). Another example of figurative meaning in the Qur'an Shareef, is the verse:

كَمَثَلِ الْحِمَارِ يَحْمِلُ اَسْفَارًا

"...like an ass loading books." The literal meaning of الحمار (ass) is

negated by the Qur'an itself in stating: كمثل (like the similitude). The Qur'an Shareef, thus, leaves no ambiguity in regard to its literal and figurative meanings.

In the Qur'an Shareef where the literal meaning is not negated by ك (a kaf used for purposes of similitudes) or مثل (example, simile), there will definitely be a strong indication (قرينه) directing towards a figurative connotation e.g.

صُمٌّ بُكْمٌ عُمْىٌ فَهُمْ لَايَعْقِلُوْنَ (البقرة ١٧١)

"They are deaf, dumb and blind. Thus they do not understand."
(Surah Baqarah, Ayat 171)

This is the ending part of ayat 171 in which the Qur'an Shareef likens the kuffar to an animal who does not understand any call or clamour directed to it. Such intransigence and refusal to understand the truth are described in this ayat as deafness, dumbness and blindness (صم بكم عمى). But the negation of literal deafness, dumbness and blindness is made manifest by the opening words of the ayat, viz,

وَمَثَلُ الَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوْا كَمَثَلِ الَّذِيْ يَنْعِقُ ...

"The similitude of the kuffar is like the similitude of one who calls..."

And, the figurative meaning is further asserted by لايعقلون (thus they do not understand), which immediately follows on the words, صم بكم عمى (deaf, dumb, blind). Hence, there remains absolutely no ambiguity in regard to the type of connotation - whether the words have a literal or a figurative meaning. On the contrary, as regards

كُوْنُوْا قِرَدَةً خَاسِئِيْنَ

"Become apes, despised!"

neither مثل nor ك characterizes it. Nor is there the slightest indication - leave alone a strong indication - negating the literal meaning and asser-

ting a figurative connotation. The episode of the curse of disfiguration of the community which transgressed the Sabbath is mentioned in four different Surahs of the Qur'an Shareef, viz. Baqarah, Nisa, Ma-idah and A'raf. In these Surahs, the incident is described with the greatest clarity, leaving no scope for the unauthorised figurative meanings attributed to these aayaat.

Furthermore, this disastrous and bizarre episode was to serve as a lesson and admonition to people, both of the time and of posterity, hence, the Qur'an states this purpose with great clarity:

فَجَعَلْنٰهَا نَكَالًا لِّمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهَا وَمَا خَلْفَهَا وَمَوْعِظَةً لِلْمُتَّقِيْنَ
(البقرة ٦٦)

"Thus We made it (the incident of disfiguration) a lesson for those of the time and for posterity; and an admonition (naseehat) for the pious."
(Surah Baqarah, ayat 66)

The purpose intended by the disfiguration — i.e. a lesson and an admonition - would be defeated if the verses in question are interpreted figuratively, because transformation of the heart, which will be a figurative disfiguration bringing in its wake greater disobedience, lawlessness and indecency, is an internal (batini) condition which cannot serve the purpose of lesson and admonition for others. Hence internal disfiguration - i.e. of the heart - the figurative dimension far from serving the purpose of acting as lesson and admonition, will only obfuscate the issue although it will be conceded that figurative transformation (i.e. corruption of the heart also is a punishment for the transgressors in that their hearts become sealed and repel hidayat. But, the requirements of نكال (lesson) and موعظة (admonition) are not fulfilled by such figurative action. It is, therefore, conclusively clear that the zahir nass (the clear text) of the ayat pertaining to this issue are literal in meaning and refers to a definite and particular incident which occurred in the history of Bani Isra-il.

The Opinion of Mujahid

In opposition to the unanimous teaching of all the authorities of Islam

on this issue, Yusuf Ali cites the opinion of Mujahid in substantiation of his figurative interpretation. But, he, conveniently adopts total silence about the unanimous tafseer of all authorities of Islam. In his "commentary" on these aayaat, Yusuf Ali overtly ignores and covertly rejects the tafseer preferred by the illustrious Sahabah and all the other Mufassireen. He has indeed acted recklessly and trifled with Iman in dismissing the large body of authoritative and unanimous tafseer - tafseer given by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam - in favour of the solitary and erroneous opinion of Hadhrat Mujahid (Rahmatullah Alayhi). In clinging to this solitary and erroneous opinion, Yusuf Ali is guilty of an act of kufr.

Let us now see what the authorities of Islam say in regard to the opinion of Mujahid.

Tafseer Ibn Kathir states:

قَالَ مُجَاهِدٌ مَسَخَتْ قُلُوبُهُمْ

"Mujahid said that their hearts were disfigured..."

Commenting on this view, Allamah Ibn Kathir says:

قَوْلٌ غَرِيْبٌ خِلَافُ الظَّاهِرْ مِنَ السِّيَاقِ فِى هٰذَا الْمَقَامِ وَفِى غَيْرِهِ

"A Ghareeb (very weak) statement which conflicts with the clear text and tenor of (the verses) in this place and (with the verses) elsewhere."

Allamah Ibn Kathir (Rahmatullah Alayh), after recording the unanimous tafseer of the great authorities such as Hadhrat Abdullah Bin Abbas (Radiallahu anhu), Qatadah, Rabee' Bin Anas, Abul Aliyah, Dhuh-hak and the Jamhur Ulama, states:

(قلت) والغرض من هذا السياق عن هٰؤلآء الائمّة بيان خلاف مذهب اليه مجاهد رحمه الله من ان مسحهم انما كان معنويا لاصوريا بل الصحيح انه معنوى صورى (والله اعلم)

"I say: The purpose of mentioning the narration of these authorities is that (they all) are opposed to the view of Mujahid (Rahmatullah Alayh) who opined that their disfiguration was figurative and not literal. But, the actual reality is that the disflguration was (both) figurative and literal. And, Allah knows best' Yusuf Ali, in presenting his figurative interpretation says in his "commentary":

"Be as apes"... This is the suggestion of Maulvi Muhammad Ali on this passage, on the authority of Mujahid and Ibn Jarir Tabari.

It is not certain to whom the reference, "Maulvi Muhammad Ali" is. If it refers to the Qadiani translator of the Qur'an then there is no need to probe his "suggestion" since he (i.e. the Qadiani) is a kafir whose "tafseer" is not worth any consideration.

In the afore-quoted statement, Yusuf Ali mentions the name of Ibn Jarir (Rahmatullah Alayh) in a way which leaves the impression that he (Ibn Jarir) also shares the opinion of Mujahid (Rahmatullah Alayh). On the contrary Ibn Jarir has negated the view which Mujahid offered. Says Ibn Jarir in his Tafseer:

عن مجاهد مسخت قلوبهم لاابدانهم قال (ابن جرير) انه مخالِفٌ لظاهر القران والاحاديث والاثار واجماع المفسرين

"According to Mujahid their hearts and not their bodies were disfigured. Ibn Jarir said: Verily, it (Mujahid's view) is in conflict with the clear text of the Qur'an, with the Ahadith, with the narrations and with the Ijma' (consensus) of the Mufassireen."

It will now be manifest that Ibn Jarir did not uphold Mujahid's opinion, but merely narrated it. And, after narrating it, he dismisses it as baseless.

Mujahid's opinion on this issue is not Islamically tenable as tafseer of the relevant Qur'anic aayaat because it is in opposition to the tafseer given by the great Sahabah and it conflicts with the Ijma' (consensus) of the Mufassireen.

We shall now present the official Islamic tafseer of the aayaat in question.

1. صيروا قردة صاغرين (فجعلناها) قردة (نكالا) عقوبة

(تنوير المقباص من تفسير ابن عباس)

"Turn into apes disgraced. Thus We made it, i.e. the apes, a naqal, i.e. a punishment (Tanweerul Miqbas - Tafseer Ibn Abbas).

2. فَقُلْنَا لَهُمْ كُوْنُوْا قِرَدَةً خَاسِئِيْنَ (مبعدين فكانو بها ويهلكو بعد ثلثت ايام)

"Then We said: Become apes, despised! i.e. far (from the Mercy of Allah and Guidance). Thus they became apes and died after three days."

فَكَانُوْ بِهَا سُوْرَةٌ وَمَعْنًى

"Thus they became apes literally and figuratively."

فقلنا لهم كونوا قردة خاسئِيْنَ (جامعين بين صورة القردة

"Then We said to them- "Become apes, despised!, i.e. resembling the forms of apes.

Baidhawi.

قوله جامعين: فيه اشارة الى انه حولى صورتهم الى صورة القردة مع بقاءِ اثر الانسانيه فيهم من العقل والفهم . حاشيه على البيضاوى)

"His statement, جامعين : In this is the indication that while their forms were transformed into the form of apes, there remained in them the human faculties of intelligence and understanding."

فاذا بهم قردة فلميعرفوا انباءهم لكن القردة تعرفهم فجعلت تاتى انباءهم وتشم ثيابهم وتدور حولهم باكية ثم ماتوا بعد ثلثة

"Thus, suddenly they became apes. Their relatives did not recognize them, but the apes recognized them (these relatives who were not transformed). The apes came to their relatives, sniffing their clothing and circled them crying. Then they died after three days."

(Baidhawi)

4. ظاهر القران ... انهم مسخوا قردة على الحقيقة وعلى ذلك جمهور المفسرين و هو الصحيح (روح المعنى)

"According to the clear text of the Qur'an they were disfigured into apes literally. And that is the view of the Jamhur Mufassireen. That is the correct view."

(Tafseer Ruhul Ma'ani)

د. فَاِذَا قِرَدَةً .... فيقولون (اى انباءهم) الم نهكم فنقول القردة براسها نعم فمكثوا ثلثة ايام ينظر بعضهم الى بعض وينظر اليهم الناس ثم ماتوا

(تفسير المظهرى)

"Then suddenly they were apes...Their (the apes') relatives said: 'What, did we not forbid you (from violating the Sabbath)? Then the apes would say by nodding their heads, 'yes'. Thus they remained for three days staring at one another, and people beholding them. Thereafter they died."

(Mazhari)

فلما فعلوا ذلك مسخهم الله الى صورة القردة (ابن كثير)

"When they did so (violated the Sabbath), Allah transformed them into the forms of apes."

(Ibn Kathir)

The above are merely a few of the authoritative and authentic Tafseer of the Mufassireen. The numerous other authoritative and authentic Tafseer books all state the same view, viz. the literal and actual transformation of the transgressors into apes.

Regarding the fate of the disfigured community, the eminent Sahabi. Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ud (Radiallahu Anhu) said:

"We asked Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam about the apes and pigs - whether they are the progeny of the (disfigured) Yahud. He said: 'No! Whenever Allah cursed a community and disfigured them, they did not reproduce. But these (animals) are a (separate) creation (of Allah). When Allah's Wrath decended upon the Yahud, He transformed them to resemble these animals (apes and pigs)."

(Musnad Ahmad, Abu Dawud, Muslim)

Hadhrat Ibn Abbas (Radiallahu Anhu) - the Sahabi who is the leader of the Mufassireen, narrates:

"The disfigured people did not remain alive for more than three days, neither eating, drinking nor reproducing."
(Musnad Ahmad, Abu Dawud, Muslim).

The fallacy of Yusuf Ali's opinion should now be clear.

RIBA

Aayat No. 275 of Surah Baqarah reads: "Those who devour riba do not stand except like one who has been driven to madness by the (evil) touch of shaitaan. That is because they say:
"Surely trade is like riba. But Allah has made lawful trade and forbidden riba."

Commenting on this aayat, Yusuf Ali says:

"When we come to the definition of usury there is room for difference of opinion. Hadhrat Umar, according to Ibn Kathir, felt some difficulty in the matter, as the Apostle left this world before the details of the question were settled...Our Ulama, ancient and modern, have worked out a great body of literature on Usury, based mainly on economic conditions as they existed at the rise of Islam. I agree with them on the main principles, but respectfully differ with them on the definition of Usury...The definition I would accept would be: undue profit made, not in the way of legitimate trade, out of loans of gold and silver, and necessary articles of food, such as wheat, barley, dates and salt (according to the list mentioned by the Holy Prophet Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam himself). My definition would include profiteering of all kinds, but exclude economic credit, the creature of modern banking and finance."

In the aforementioned comment, Yusuf Ali tenders the following claims which are entirely baseless and in conflict with the Shariah:

1. There is room for difference of opinion regarding the Islamic definition of riba.
2. Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam departed from this world while the details of riba were not fully explained.
3. The Fuqaha of Islam based their opinions on the economic conditions as they existed at the rise of Islam.
4. Bank interest is not riba.

THE SHARI'I DEFINITION OF RIBA

Yusuf Ali makes his claim in this regard without having any Shar'i proof. It is false to allege that there exists ambiguity and thus room for dif-

ference of opinion in the Islamic definition of riba. It is most significant that the Qur'an Shareef declares war against the devourers of riba. To those who refuse to desist from riba, the Qur'an says:

"Thus, if you do not (refrain from riba) then take notice of war from Allah and His Rasool."

For no sin other than riba has Allah Ta'ala sounded the ultimatum of war in the Qur'an. The villainy and immorality of riba are of such a grave nature that Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam described it as an evil worse than a conglomeration of seventy major sins, the lightest of these seventy being worse than committing fornication with one's own mother. A sin of such gravity would not have been left in a state of ambiguity.

Yusuf Ali, inspite of asserting that there exists scope for difference of opinion regarding the definition of riba, fails to produce a single authentic difference. A difference tendered by a modernist like Yusuf Ali is not a valid Shar'i difference of opinion. Differences tendered by non-entities, and that too, without any Shar'i backing, are deviations from the Haqq. The claim of difference of opinion regarding the Islamic definition of riba is false in entirety. There exists unanimity in the Islamic definition of riba. The Shariah did not leave this important question ambiguous and unsettled as Yusuf Ali alleges.

Yusuf Ali says: "The definition I would accept ... "but Islam is neither interested in the personal deviated definition of Yusuf Ali nor does it permit its followers to subscribe to his new-fangled idea. Islam is the product of Divine Wahi. Personal opinion has no share in the formulation of the teachings and concepts of Islam. Suffice here to say that the claim of Yusuf Ali is baatil.

THE CLAIM THAT RIBA IS AN AMBIGUOUS CONCEPT IN ISLAM

In the assertion that Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam departed from the world leaving the question of Riba unsettled, Yusuf Ali attempts to convey the impression that Riba is an ambiguous concept. In

support of his contention, Yusuf Ali cites Hadhrat Umar (Radiallahu Anhu) and says: "Hadhrat Umar, according to Ibn Kathir, felt some difficulty in the matter..."

Indeed, Yusuf Ali is guilty of a great act of chicanery in endeavouring to present Hadhrat Umar's statement as support for the attempt to legalize bank interest which is in fact the clearest example of riba. The "difficulty" which Hadhrat Umar (Radiallahu Anhu) experienced in certain matters of Riba did not constrain him to legalize riba, but on the contrary even lawful transactions were given up by Hadhrat Umar (Radiallahu Anhu) for the fear of indulging in riba. If a transaction was not clearly riba and there remained ambiguity in its nature - whether it is riba or not - Hadhrat Umar (Radiallahu Anhu) shunned it. Thus he observed:

"We (the Sahaabah) refrained from nine tenths of lawful transaction in fear of riba."

He further said:

"Shun riba and whatever resembles riba."

It should thus be clear that, far from being in doubt regarding the definition and reality of Riba, Hadhrat Umar (Radiallahu Anhu) ordered abstention from transactions which even resembled Riba. The "difficulty" which he experienced related to transactions which resembled Riba, not to transactions which were clear-cut dealings of riba.

In view of the fact that Yusuf Ali cited Hadhrat Umar (Radiallahu Anhu) in substantiation of his personal baseless opinion, it would have been more appropriate to have adopted Hadhrat Umar's attitude in matters of Riba. This attitude of caution and piety is amply reflected in Hadhrat Umar's statements:

"Abstain from Riba and rabeebah (transactions resembling riba-dealings in which there is the doubt of riba)."

"We refrained from nine tenths of lawful transactions in fear of (committing) riba."

In contrast to this attitude of caution and piety, Yusuf Ali adopts a reckless attitude in such a grave matter as the prohibition of Riba, and excludes bank interest from the Islamic definition of Riba. A study of the Ahadith and the relative statements of Hadhrat Umar (Radiallahu Anhu) shows positively that Hadhrat Umar (Radiallahu Anhu) had no doubt in the definition of Riba and that his desire for a greater clarification pertains to dealings which resemble Riba. Furthermore, the degree of ambiguity in certain dealings - whether they are riba or not - is by Divine Design. Allah Ta'ala desired a degree of ambiguity in certain matters so that valid difference of opinion be generated among the Fuqaha, since such authoritative and academic difference of opinion, according to Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, constitutes a Rahmat (mercy or blessing) for the Ummah.

In short, it must be well understood that there exists no difference of opinion regarding the reality and nature of Riba according to Islam. Riba is a well-defined and detailed concept in which there exists no ambiguity and no doubt. It is therefore, a travesty of the truth to introduce doubt and confusion in the Islamic definition of Riba. Such attempts of the modernists are designed to legalize interest in Islam. The opinion of Yusuf Ali has therefore to be rejected as baatil - blatantly false.

It should also be well understood that the Islamic prohibition of Riba is not an opinion of the Fuqaha. This is not a question based on Ijtihad as Yusuf Ali wishes us to believe. It is inconceivable that the Qur'an declares war on people who perpetrate an act, but leaves the act ambiguous and unexplained. It is inconceivable that Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam brands Riba to be worse than committing zina with one's mother, but leaves the crime ambiguous - not fully explained.

The Deen of Islam is perfect. It's teachings have been fully explained and stand in no need of modernist interpretations, for all such interpretations which clash with the exposition of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, the Sahaabah and Fuqaha are baatil and rejected by the Qur'an ∎

AZWAAJUM MUTAHHARAH
— Wives Purified —

"And, for them therein (in Jannat) are wives who are pure."
(Surah Baqarah, Ayat 25)

Commenting on the word مطهرة (mutah-haratun) appearing in this ayat, Yusuf Ali states in his commentary:

"Then there is companionship. If sex is suggested, its physical associations are at once negatived by the addition of the word Mutahharatun "pure and holy". The Arabic is in the intensive form, and must be translated by two adjectives denoting purity in the highest degree. The Companionship is that of souls and applies to both sexes in the physical world of men and women."

The conception of purity and holiness formulated by Yusuf Ali excludes sex. According to him, sex is the negation of purity and holiness, hence he claims:
"...its (sex's) physical properties are at once negatived by the addition of the word Mutahharatun "pure and holy".

Yusuf Ali has propounded a theory of a purely spiritual heaven - a conception in which the Islamic physical Jannat finds no room - hence he speaks about the negation of "physical properties" which the words ازواج مطهرة clearly convey. The question of the form of Jannat — whether it is an abstract spiritual state or a physical existence — is discussed in another article of this booklet. Here we shall deal with Yusuf Ali's contention that the word mutahharatun in the aayat negates sex or the "physical associations" conveyed by ازواج مطهرة (az-wajum mutah-haratun) - pure wives.

Yusuf Ali claims that sinee the word مطهرة (mutahharatun) is in the "intensive form" it must be translated by two adjectives denoting purity in the highest degree. He thus presents "pure and holiness" as the two adjectives - such purity and holiness - i.e. in the highest degree in Yusuf Ali's opinion cannot include sex or "physical associations" within it's

scope. But this is a purely arbitrary claim for which Yusuf Ali has no Islamic evidence. Other than his own opinion and the theories of the misguided and deviated Hellenic philosophers, Yusuf Ali has no support for his claim. Let us see what the Shariat says about the ازواج مطهرة the pure and holy wives, which Allah Ta'ala has promised the Mu'mineen.

1. Hadhrat Ibn Abbas (Radiallahu Anhu) whom our Nabi Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam described as the "Head of the Mufassireen", comments on this particular word of this particular (No. 25) ayat as follows:

(مُطهَرَةٌ) مهذبة من الحيض والاذناس (تنوير المقباس)

("Mutahharatun) - Purified from haidh (menstruation) and (other) impurities."

(Tanweerul Miqbas)

2. زُوجٌ: نساء من حور العين

"Azwaj: Women, i.e. Hurul Een."

مطهرة: من الغائط والبول والحيض والبصاق والمخاط والمنى وكل قذر و من ساوى الاخلاق

"Mutahharatun: Purified from faeces, urine, menstruation, saliva, mucous, semen and every impurity. And (as well) of evil character."

والمطهرة ابلغ من طاهرة ومتطهرة للاشعار بان الله طهر هن

(تفسير المظهرى)

"Al-Mutahharatu is more emphasised (intensive) than tahiratin and mutatahiratin. This (intensive form of the word) is to show that, verily, Allah has purified them (the women of Jannat)."

(Tafseerul Mazhari)

3. Allamah Alusi Baghdadi, says in his famous Tafseer, Ruhul Ma'ani: (page 204, Vol. 1)

والازواج .....

"Al-azwaj: The meaning here of al-azwaj is such women who are exclusively for a man, none besides he (a particular man) will associate with them (the women of Jannat)."

(page 205, Vol. 1)

مطهّرة .....

"Mutahharatun: Verily, Allah Subhanahu Wa Ta'ala has purified them (women of Jannat) of all things which bring about defect in them. Thus, if they (i.e. the women referred to in this ayat) are of the Hur-as has been narrated from Abdullah - then the meaning of purified is: 'Allah has created them with the highest degree of purity. Neither natural or external impurity associates with them.' And, if they (the azwaj mentioned in the Ayat) refers (to the women) of Bani Adam - as has been narrated by Hasan, i.e. that your old and ailing women will become young, then the meaning will be: 'the elimination of every, natural and external, and internal defect from them.'

(Tafseer Ruhul Ma'ani)

4. The author of Baidhawi states in his Tafseer:

Page 500 (Baidhawi)

مطهّرة .....

"Mutahharatun: Purified of all things regarded as the impurities of women, and from all disgusting conditions of women, e.g. menstruation, other physical impurities, bad temperament and evil character, for tatheer (from which mutahharatun is derived) applies to physical bodies,character and actions."

(Tafseer Baidhawi)

5. The following appears in Tafseer Jala-lain:

مطهّرة من الحيض وكل قذر

"Mutahharatun: Purified of menstruation and all impurity."

6. Khulasatut Tafaseer states in regard to the purified women of Jannat: "The meaning of purity is:
There will be no menstruation; inspite of sexual relations, there will be no janabat; they will be totally pure from all forms of excretions."

The above are a few references cited from the large body of authoritative and authentic tafseer work of the Shariah. The many other books of authentic tafseer likewise, ALL agree with the explanation of مطهّرة (mutahharatun) given by the books of Tafseer quoted above. Not a single authority of the Ahle Sunnah Wal Jama' holds a view which differs with this view of the Shariat, viz; مطهّرة means purified from all forms of impurities and defects. Not a single authority - right from Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam - ever propounded the theory of sex-negation in Jannat. Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam,the Sahaba and all the great Ulama of Islam unanimously assert purification from physical and moral impurities as the meaning of mutahharatun, but Yusuf Ali claims its meaning as the negation of "physical association," yet he fails to support his theory with any Islamic evidence. He fails to produce the statements of even a single Islamic authority to support his contention.

What is the basis for claiming that the Qur'anic description of مطهّرة(purified,) negates sex or "physical association"? Lawful sex is in no way negatory of the "highest degree" of purity. This is indeed a personal and a baseless view which should not be confused with the tafseer of the Qur'an given by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. This is the opinion of a deviated man who has no Islamic qualification and is an unauthorised commentator of the Qur'an. Granted that the word (مطهّرة) is used in the "intensive" form, but the utilization of a word in its "intensive" form does not imply a negation of "physical association" -

neither gramatically nor from the Shar'i point of view. The books of the Shariat very clearly state that the word describes purification from all forms of impurities.

(Baidhawi, etc)

فان التطهير .....

"For, verily, tatheer (in its scope) applies (or is used) for physical bodies, character and action."

(Tafseer Baidhawi and others)

Negation of sex nowhere, in no way and by no authority constitutes a facade of the meaning of mutahharatun nor is it (i.e. negation of sex) a requisite for the "highest degree" of purity. On the contrary, Islam teaches that lawful sex facilitates the attainment of the "highest degree" of purity. Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam said:

من اراد ان يلقى الله طاهرا مطهرا فليتزوج الحراعص (مشكوٰة)

"He who intends to meet Allah pure (tahiran) and purified (mutahharan) should marry free women."

(Mishkat)

In this Hadith, the attainment of Allah's Pleasure is conditioned with the development of the highest degree of purity (mutahharan) and according to Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam one of the ways of achieving this "highest degree" of purity is through the agency of lawful sex, viz. Nikah.

In this Hadith, our Nabi Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam used the very same word, viz. mutahhar (purified), to describe the purified state in which one should yearn to meet Allah Ta'ala. It is quite obvious that Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, in using the word mutahharan in no way negates sex, but on the contrary says that the "highest degree" of a purified state will be attained by marrying free women.

Again Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam said:

اذا تزوّج العبد فقد استكمل نصف الدين (مشكوٰة)

"When the servant marries, then verily, half the Deen is perfected." Half the perfection of the Deen - half the perfection of one's Iman-half of all Ruhani (spiritual) development is obtainable via the agency of Nikah -lawful sex. It should therefore be abundantly clear that "physical association" is in no way an impediment in the path of achieving the "highest degree" of purity. Sex and all forms of physical associations and relations will be impediments in the attainment of spiritual perfection and the "highest degree" of purity only if such relationships are unlawful in terms of the Shariat.

Man is not a purely spiritual and celestial being like the Angel. It is therefore unreasonable to posit for him a purely spiritual existence which of a necessity, by virtue of its inherent pure celestial and non-physical substratum, will annihilate his personality as a human being whose nature is fundamentally animal and intelligence. Man being an intelligent animal will remain so in his category of creation as long as his fundamental constituent parts are retained. Elimination of his physical - i.e. natural physical-properties which render him a species apart fom other forms of creation, will rob him of his natural physical personality without which he will no longer be man, but will be transformed into a different species of creation.

Let it now be understood that the field or scope of Thawab (reward in the Akhirat) is not transformation or bringing into existence a new species of creation. If Allah Ta'ala desires to bring into existence a new species of creation, He merely says:

(Be!) كُنْ

He does not have to transform us into a new species to realise His Will. Reward is to compensate the Believers for their obedience here on earth. Allah Ta'ala desires that His righteous and pious servants derive pleasure in the fullest measure from the reward which He will bestow. Such perfect experience of pleasure will be possible only if man retains - no, not only retains, but acquires intensification and greater development -his physical properties and potentials which are integral parts of his

natural constitution. In order to allow man to derive the fullest measure of physical satisfaction from ni'mat (favours and blessings) of Jannat, Allah Ta'ala will enhance his physical capacity, potential and prowess to a degree which our earthly minds cannot encompass.

Since we are essentially physical in constitution, Allah Ta'ala will grant us physical rewards and pleasures in the highest degree. And, as for spiritual rewards, the highest (summum bonum) will be the Divine Vision. Hence, the reward of this man - this partly spiritual and partly physical being - will be both physical and spiritual. It should be understood that the Ruh (soul) of man in the substratum of the human body too derives pleasure from physical and animal exploits and experiences. The body minus the soul is a mere lifeless entity incapable of experiencing the sensual pleasures which in Yusuf Ali's baseless theory are of no substance and no reality to the soul. Hence, "physical association", physical tangible and corporeal rewards will be an ample reward for the Ruh in the human body - the body which it will occupy in Jannat.

Yusuf Ali and the Hellenic philosophers from which he takes his cue suffer from a state of mental confusion. In consequence they conceived that the "highest degree" of purity excludes all forms of physical associations. But they committed a fundamental error in their understanding of the meaning of the "highest degree" of purity. They thought of the Angels who are purely celestial creations and realised that these beings are in a state of close proximity to Allah Ta'ala (although there is a vast difference in the Islamic conception of Allah and the Hellenic conception of the First Cause). They then concluded that such proximity is possible to only beings devoid of physical properties, hence being devoid of physical form and nature will be a requisite for occupying the lofty realms of the Angels. But they failed to discern that the lofty ranks and celestial realm occupied by the Mala-ikah (Angels) are not due to their "non-physical" state. They occupy the celestial realm of Divine Proximity not because they are "denude" of physical form, but because they have been created by Allah Ta'ala to solely occupy that realm of Divine Proximity.

The realm of Divine Proximity, furthermore, does not preclude physical constitution. Islam teaches that the Angels are a species of creation having been created from Nur (a celestial substance -or celestial light). Such beings are visible to man with the naked eye. Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam and all the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) saw Jibra-eel (alayhis salam), the Arch-Angel, on several occasions in his original form. Such seeing was effected by the naked, physical eye. Thus it will be correct to claim that the Angels too have physical form, although the elements in their physical form are of a different kind - unlike the physical elements of the human body. The Qur'an speaks of the specific number of wings of the Angels and the Hadith of Nabi Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam gives a detail description of the physical form of the Angels.

In short, the achievement of the "highest degree" of purity is neither dependent upon the denudation of physical form nor are physical form and association impediments in the realization of this goal. Physical form is the creation of Allah Ta'ala. If this form is manipulated and governed in strict accordance with His command then the "highest degree" of purity will be attained. On the contrary, "spiritual" beings ostensibly denude of physical form occupy the lowest and vilest of ranks due to their disobedience, and this is inspite of them having no concrete "physical form - i.e. in relation to human beings. Consider the example of Iblis Shaitan. He is, in relation to us (since he is invisible to us) devoid of physical form. He at one time occupied the lofty realm of the Angels. In fact he was known by the title of Mu-allimul Mala-ikah (Educator of the Angels). But what rank does he occupy now? His accursed rank is not dependant upon the possession of a physical-physical as we understand-form just like the lofty rank of "highest purity" of the Ambiya and the Auliya is not dependant upon them being devoid of physical body.

Thus when reference is made to the "highest degree" of purity it should be understood as being in relation to man and not in relation to the Angels. Man is a species entirely apart and different from the Angels. What is requisite to them is not essential for us. Consumption of food, sexual relations and all other physical properties concomitant to the

human body are negatory to the constitution of the Angels because they are an entirely different species of creation. But in so far as man is concerned, he is an embodiment of physical attributes which if channelled in strict obedience to Divine Command will obtain for man the "highest degree" of purity.

Who - or which Muslim - can deny that Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam was in the "highest degree" of purity? Who can deny the fact that Rasulullah's Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam rank was loftier than that of even Jibra-eel (alayhis salaam)? But, Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam was physical body with physical powers and physical attributes!

In his conception of the "highest degree" of purity, Yusuf Ali seeks to equate man with angel in the attainment of the ultimate "highest degree" of purity. The Angels are in a state of constant and perpetual "purity". The Qur'an teaches us so. There is no need for progress in their state of "purity". Progress and development in the state of "purity" are confined to man. In order to achieve the "highest degree" of purity his body and soul will have to jointly progress by offering supreme and total obedience to the Divine Laws restricting the operation of man. Man's attainment of the "highest degree" of purity is not by transformation into a different species in which his physical constitution is annihilated, but is achieved by obedience for which he has been created.

There exists absolutely no incompatibility between "highest degree" of purity and physical body, neither logically nor according to the Shariat. He who postulates any such incompatibility should provide his basis - and such basis should be Islamic evidence since the matter under discussion is pure Islamic belief based on the Qur'an. But not a shred of Islamic evidence could be adduced in corroboration of this hypothesis to warrant the assertion that the Qur'anic word, مطهرة (mutahharatun), negates physical associations.

The use of the term in its "intensive" form (meaning intensively purified) is because the purifying agent here is Allah Ta'ala Himself. In this regard Allamah Alusi says:

ان لها مطهّرا وليس سوى الله تعالى (روح المعانى)

"Verily, they (women of Jannat) have a purifier Who is none besides Allah Ta'ala."
(Tafseer Ruhul Ma'ani)

The Divine agency of Tatheer (to purify intensively) is not restricted to women of Jannat. Allah Ta'ala says in the Qur'an Shareef:

اِنَّمَا يُرِيْدُ اللهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنْكُمُ الرِّجْسَ اَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ وَيُطَهِّرَكُمْ تَطْهِيْرًا

"Verily, Allah intends to remove from you impurity, O People of the House (of the Nabi)! And, He (intends) to intensely purify you." (Surah Ahzab).

In this ayat, Allah Ta'ala addresses the noble wives of the Nabi Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. In the ayat before, the Qur'an specifically addresses them:

يَانِسَاءَ النَّبِى

"O wives of the Nabi!"

Allah Ta'ala thus affirms the "highest degree" of purity for the noble wives of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam by way of stating His intention of effecting their "intensive" purification (tat-heer from which is derived mutahharatun). Allah Ta'ala postulates this "intensive" purification for the noble wives who were physical beings with "physical associations."

The "highest degree" of purity according to the Qur'an Shareef is attained by purification of man by Allah Ta'ala, Himself. Realization of such supreme purity is not dependant upon denudation of the physical body with its physical attributes resulting in the de-personification and transformation of man into some non-human species.

Whatever claims Yusuf Ali has made in regard to the term, مطهّرة, are therefore, fallacious, having not the slightest Islamic or grammatical evidence as substantiation. In postulating his theory of the annihilation of the physical body with its physical properties, Yusuf Ali comes into violent conflict with the belief of the Shariat pertaining to Aakhirat, Jannat and Jahannum. In tendering his personal opinion in the exposition of the Qur'an, he has ushered himself within the purview of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam's warning:

من قال فى القرآن برأيه

"He who speaks about the Qur'an according to his opinion, should prepare his place in the fire."

Yusuf Ali, in this fallacious "commentary" of his, rejects the vast body of authoritative, authentic and unanimous opinion of Islam which has been authoritatively transmitted down the past fourteen centuries. May Allah Ta'ala save Muslims from such blasphemy which the deviates are propagating.

THE ISLAMIC MEANING OF THE ZAKAAT CATEGORY OF "FI-SABEELILLAAH"

Some people in order to channel Zakaat funds into causes not sanctioned by the Shariah, are attempting to seek justification for their un-Islamic act by resorting to interpreting the Quranic verses by distortion. In substantiation for their claim that Zakaat monies should be utilized for all Muslim charitable purposes, they adduce the Quranic phrase: "Fi-Sabeelillaah" which appears in the verse of the Quran fixing the recipients of Zakaat. Because, literally, "Fi-Sabeelillaah" means "in the Path of Allah", they argue that all Muslim charitable causes and institutions are in the Path of Allah, hence utilization of Zakaat monies in these "in the Path of Allah" activities is fully justified. Insha'Allah, the fallacy of this argument will be exposed in this article.

The phrase: "Fi-Sabeelillaah" appears in the Quranic verse dealing with Zakaat as one of the eight Masaarifuz-Zakaat (i.e.the categories of Zakaat-recipients). In the context of the Zakaat-verse, the phrase: "Fi-Sabeelillah" does not have a literal application. Besides the authoritative interpretation of this term advanced by the Sahaba and the Fuqahaa even superficial reasoning requires that the literal meaning could not be applied here since the very stipulation of eight categories of Zakaat-recipients would be defeated and rendered meaningless. The Holy Qur'an restricts the spending of Zakaat to EIGHT categories of persons. This is unanimously accepted by all, even the modernists. The restriction will have no meaning if the literal meaning of "Fi-Sabeelillaah" is construed to apply, for then, the classes of Zakaat-recipients will cease to be EIGHT, but will multiply into numerous classes because charities in the Path of Allah exceed eight by far. Such a contradiction is not conceivable in the Qur'an, and no Muslim would even tolerate to hear of such a suggestion. The very fact that Zakaat-recipients have been classified into eight groups, is clear proof that "Fi-Sabeelillah" must be a class on its own and must have a meaning other than its literal meaning. For this other meaning it is imperative that we turn towards the great Authorities of the Shariah.

Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam used the term: "Fi-Sabeelillaah" synonymously with JIHAAD in the Path of Allah. Basing their claim on the interpretation of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam the Fuqahaa (Jurists of Islam) state:

"...and, "Fi-Sabeelillah" means the `masraf in Jihaad (or the soldier who requires aid in Jihaad). And, Imam Abu Hanifah Rahmatullah Alayh stipulated that the soldier (in Jihad) must be a needy one (so as to qualify as a Zakaat-recipient). Imam Ahmad Rahmatullah Alayh says that Hajj also is "Fi-Sabeelillaah".

(QUSTULAANI)

Imam Aini Rahmatullah Alayh said:
"Fi-Sabeelillaah" refers to soldiers (of Jihaad) stranded, according to Imam Abu Yusuf Rahmatullah Alayh, and according to Imam Muhammad Rahmatullah Alayh stranded Huj-jaaj."

In the great authoritative work on Islamic Jurisprudence known as Mabsoot it is stated:

"And, "Fi-Sabeelillaah" means the poor soldiers according to Imam Abu Yusuf Rahmatullah Alayh and according to Imam Muhammad Rahmatullah Alayh, the poor Huj-jaaj (i.e. those who went on Hajj and for some reason became destitute)."

"Imam Shafi Rahmatullah Alayh, Imam Abu Yusuf Rahmatullah Alayh and the overwhelming majority of Ulema say that the meaning of "Fi-Sabeelilaah" is "MUNQATA-UL-GHUZAAT" (or soldiers stranded or prevented by lack of means to join up with the Muslim army)."

(TAFSEERUL MAZHARI)

"Fi-Sabeelillaah means stranded soldiers according to Imaam Abu Yusuf Rahmatullah Alayh, and stranded Huj-jaaj, according to Imaam Muhammed Rahmatullah Alayh."

(HIDAAYAH)

In Wabri it is recorded:
"They (i.e. the "Fi-Sabeelillaah" recipients) are those Hujjajj and soldiers who have been cut off from their wealth." In Isbahaani it is stated:
"Allah intended by it (i.e. the phrase: "Fi-Sabeelillaah") the soldiers of Jihaad."

Kaaki Rahmatullah Alayh said:
"Stranded soldiers is the meaning of Allah Ta'ala's statement: "Fi-Sabeelillaah" according to Imam Abu Hanifah Rahmatullah Alayh, Imam Abu Yusuf Rahmatullah Alayh, Imam Shafi Rahmatullah Alayh and Imaam Maalik Rahmatullah Alayh. And, according to Imam Ahmad Rahmatullah Alayh and Imam Muhammad Rahmatullah Alayh, stranded Hujjaaj.

Ibn Munzir Rahmatullah Alayh said:
"The view of Imam Abu Hanifah Rahmatullah Alayh, Abu Yusuf Rahmatullah Alayh and Muhammad Rahmatullah Alayh regarding "Fi-Sabeelillaah" is the soldier who is not wealthy."

Abu Thaur Rahmatullah Alayh narrates:
"According to Imam Abu Hanifah Rahmatullah Alayh, verily, it ("Fi-Sabeelillaah") means the soldier, not the Hajjee."
Imam Surooji Rahmatullah Alayh says:
"These people narrate on the authority of Abu Hanifah. I then observed in KHAZAANATUL AKMAL that which corresponds with what this Jamaat narrates (i.e. the view that "Fi-Sabeelillaah" refers to soldiers)."

"And, "Fi-Sabeelillaah" means stranded soldiers, i.e. those soldiers who have become destitute and stranded according to Imam Abu Yusuf Rahmatullah Alayh, and according to Imam Muhammad Rahmatullah Alayh, the stranded Hajjee."

(SHARHUN NIQAAYAH)

"Verily, one of the Classes (of Zakaat recipients) is "Fi-Sabeelillaah", and they are the Mujaahidoon (soldiers fighting in the Path of Allah)."

(LAAMIUD DURARI)

"And, "Fi-Sabeelillaah" according to Imam Abu Yusuf Rahmatullah Alayh refer to stranded soldiers, and according to Imam Muhammad Rahmatullah Alayh, to stranded Hujjaaj."

(SHARHUL WIQAYAH)

"Fi-Sabeelillaah" refers to stranded soldiers, i.e. those who are unable to join up with the Muslim army by virtue of their poverty brought about by the depletion of their money, means of transport, etc., and even though they may be having wealth at home."

(UMDATUR RIAAYAH)

The above quotations from the authentic Law Books of Islam will be more than sufficient to convince the unbiased Muslim that the Quranic phrase: "Fi-Sabeelillaah" does not have a general application in the context of Zakaat. The Ruling of the Shariah - right from the time of the Sahaaba - has been that "Fi-Sabeelillah signifies a specific class of Zakaat recipients, viz. "Munqata-ul Ghuzaat" and/or "Munqata-ul Hujjaaj."

The reader will also note from the many references cited above that the difference of opinion among the Authorities of Islam on the meaning of "Fi-Sabeelillaah" is restricted to "stranded soldiers" and "stranded Hujjaaj". The four Aimmah (Imaams of the Four Mazhabs) are unanimous on this score. Hence any third meaning, any "modern" interpretation assigned to this Quranic category must of a necessity be rejected as baseless. This is what the Holy Quran commands:

"Verily, those who dispute in the (Laws) of Allah after these have been accepted (by the Authorities of Islam and the Ummah), their disputation is baseless by their Creator. Upon them is the Wrath (of Allah), and for them is a dreadful chastisement."

The question of "Fi-Sabeelillaah" has been explained and authoritative verdicts issued on its meaning from the times of the Sahaba Radhiallaahu Anhum. Therefore, in terms of the above Declaration of the Quran the innovators of interpretation -modernistic interpretation- of the Quran should realise and concede the baselessness of their case.

The Qur'an Shareef categorizes the avenues of Zakaat expenditure into eight classes. In aayat 60 of Surah Baraa'at, one of the classes of persons allowed to accept Zakaat is described as "Fi-Sabeelillaah" (in the Path of Allah). Commenting on this avenue of Zakaat expenditure, Yusuf Ali says:
"...those who are struggling and striving in God's cause, by teaching or fighting or in duties assigned to them by the righteous Imaam, who are thus unable to earn their ordinary living;"

This view expounded by Yusuf Ali is erroneous. The term, "Fi-Sabeelillaah", in the context of Zakaat has a specific and confined meaning. It is not of general application.

SHOOTING STARS

VERSE 17 and 18 of Surah Hijr read:

"And, We have guarded them (the Heavens) from every accursed shaitaan. But he (a shaitaan) who gains a stealthy hearing, a bright and clear fire pursues him."

In these ayats of the Holy Qur'an Allah Ta'ala explains the phenomenon of shooting stars. Shooting stars according to the Quran and Hadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam are guards let loose in hot pursuit of a shaitaan who managed to overhear some of the talks which take place in the Heavenly Realms. But, according to Yusuf Ali these verses as well as other verses of the Quran regarding the occurrence of shooting stars are a mere allegorical description of evil and good. In terms of Yusuf Ali's interpretations these aayaats represent a mere figurative explanation of the forces of evil and good. Yusuf Ali totally discards the literal - the real and the true cause of the incidence of shooting stars. His commentary reads:

"Spiritually speaking, order, beauty, harmony, light and truth are repugnant to evil. It deliberately rejects them when offered freely as God's gifts. But its crooked nature loves to gain access by fraud or stealth. Its malevolent curiosity impels it to gain by stealth a sound of that harmony of which it is itself a negation. And its punishment is a flashing light, in itself most uncongenial to the powers of darkness, which are a negation of light. Notice that in the allegory the objective of Evil was to steal a hearing of Music; its punishment is therefore different - a flaming light which it did not seek."

For the benefit of our readers we tender the definition of the term, "allegory" so that the un-Islamic interpretation of Yusuf Ali could be better understood.

"Allegory: Narrative description of subject under guise of another suggestively similar; figurative story."

The verses of the Holy Quran mentioning the phenomenon of shooting stars are unambiguous and leave no scope for individual interpretation. The Quran says very clearly:

"We have protected the Heavens from every accursed shaitaan."

Verse 5 of Surah Mulk explains further:

"And, We have adorned the Sama'ad dunya (the lowest heaven) with lamps (i.e. the stars):

"And, We have made these (stars) missiles for the devils;

And, We have prepared for them (the devils) a blazing Fire."

This verse explains that the shooting stars are in fact missiles guarding the Heavens and pursuing the evil ones who attempt to gain access to overhear the discussions of the Heavenly Realms. But, to Yusuf Ali these verses do not mean what Allah Ta'ala, Himself conveys to us. Yusuf Ali interprets the verses as "symbolism", thus he describes the narrative in these verses as:

"The symbolic imagery of the shooting stars."

In Surah Saaf-faat, Allah Ta'ala explains the occurrence of shootin, stars in greater detail.

"Verily, We have decorated the lowest Heaven with the beauty of Stars and We (have made these stars) a guard against every rebellious shaitaan so that they cannot direct their hearing to the Assembly on High.

And, they (the shayateen) are attacked from every side so that they are repulsed. For them there is an everlasting punishment.

Except such as snatch away something by stealth (overhear stealthily) and who is pursued, then, by a flaming fire."

Yusuf Ali's attempts to explain away the literal meaning of these verses are all in vain because he has not been able to adduce a single Ayat, Hadith or statement of authority in substantiation of his view. The only thing which he has done was to advance his personal opinion which is contrary to the accepted official version of Islam as expounded by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. Yusuf Ali regards these verses merely as symbolical and allegorical. Let us now see what is the view of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. The following Hadith is narrated in Bukhari Shareef:

"Hazrat Aishah Radiallahu Anha relates: I heard Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam say: Verily, the Angels descend to the clouds and discuss events which have been decreed in the Heavens. The shayaateen overhear something of their discussion and convey it to fortune-tellers. To every correct information furnished by the shayaateen to the fortune-teller they add a hundred lies."

In Muslim Shareef the following Hadith is recorded:

"Hazrat Ibn Abbaas Rahmatullah Alayh narrates: When Allah, Most High, decrees something, the Bearers of the Throne recite His Glory. The Angels in the adjoining Heaven take up this recitation of Tasbeeh in-

itiated by the Bearers of the Throne. This Tasbeeh is relayed from Heaven to Heaven until it reaches the Angels of Sama'ad dunya (the lowest Heaven). Then the Angels closest to the Bearers of the Throne enquire: What has your Creator decreed? The Bearers of the Throne inform them. This information is then relayed from Heaven to Heaven until it reaches the Angels of Sama'ad dunya. The Jinn who travel towards the Sama'ad dunya overhear some'hing of their (the Angels') talks, and immediately transmit it to their friends (other Jinns close by). They are then pursued by shooting stars..."

In another Hadith, also in Bukhari Shareef, Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam said that sometimes the jinn manages to transmit what he had overheard to the fortune-teller before the shooting star overtakes him, and sometimes the shooting star catches up with him before he (the jinn) is able to transmit the overheard talk. Another Hadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam narrated by Qatadah Rahmatullah Alayh and cited in Bukhari states:

"Allah Ta'ala has created these stars for three purposes -for the beauty of the Heavens; as missiles for hitting the shayaateen; and, as signs for people to plot directions. Whosoever interprets other than this has blundered and destroyed his share (of the Aakhirat) and has assumed what he knows not."

This Hadith most appropriately fits the un-Islamic interpretation of Yusuf Ali.

The explanation of these verses in question given by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam and transmitted to us by the Sahaba Radhiallahu Anhum is the only authoritative and accepted version in Islam. It is not lawful for Yusuf Ali to have deviated from the exposition tendered by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam himself. Yusuf Ali's explanation has no relation to the teachings of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam on the subject. All the authoritative and great Mufassireen of the Qur'an have given the very same explanation of these verses as appears in the Ahadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. May Allah Ta'ala save all Muslims from the error of misguided intelligence, Aameen.

RISAALAT - IS IT A REQUISITE OF IMAAN?

WESTERN LIBERALISM

Some people among Muslims believe that Najaat (salvation in the Hereafter) is not dependent upon belief in the Risaalat (Prophethood) of Muhammadur Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This is indeed a grave misconception which is a belief of open kufr. The holder of the belief which discards the Risaalat as well as the Finality of Risaalat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is a kafir in the unanimous opinion of the Ummah. There are no two opinions on this vital issue in the Shariah.

Those associated with this kufr belief are men who have been schooled in modernism. They lack Islamic knowledge and are gripped by servile and inferior reasoning anchored to the attitude of western liberalism. Since their capacity to reason on the basis of Imaan has become crippled, they attempt to substantiate this belief of kufr on the following Qur'anic verse:

"Verily, those who have accepted Imaan, and those who have become Jews, the Sabians and the Christians who have accepted Imaan in Allah and the Last Day and practise righteousness, for them is their reward by their Rabb. No fear will be upon them nor will they grieve."

(Surah Baqarah, verse 62)

This verse has been grossly misinterpreted by the holders of the kufr belief. This verse is not a negation of the belief in Risaalat. Risaalat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is one of the fundamentals of Imaan. Minus Risaalat there is no Imaan. Without Risaalat there is no Najat in the Aakhirah. Rejection of the Risaalat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is tantamount to the rejection of the Qur'an. Acceptance and belief of the Qur'anic truths are based upon belief in the Prophethood of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). If there is no belief in Muhammadur Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). If there is no belief in Muhammadur Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), there can be no belief in the Qur'an. Islam, the Truth, Belief in Tauhid, Belief in the Aakhirah, in Resurrection, etc. are inextricably interwoven with the Risaalat and Finality of Muhammad Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Qur'an categorically again and again emphasises the Risaalat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

AXIOMATIC TO BELIEF

The above-cited Qur'anic verse upon which the kufr belief is lamely based, merely states two fundamentals of Imaan, viz., belief in Allah and belief in the Aakhirah. The verse briefly mentions Imaan. A brief description of Imaan cannot be interpreted as the negation of the detailed definition of Imaan. This verse further briefly mentions Allah and the Last Day. It cannot be claimed on the basis of this concise mention that Allah Ta'ala is devoid of the Attributes of Power and Splendour nor could it be said that the belief in the eternity of Allah Ta'ala is not a requisite of Imaan because in this verse no such mention of Allah's Eternity is made -only mention of Allah is made. The verse in question merely states: "those who have believed in Allah." A sensible Believer will not claim on the basis of this concise mention of `belief in Allah' that all the other beliefs, which are axiomatic to belief in Allah, do not constitute an integral part of Imaan. Any person who ventures to deny the Eternity of Allah, etc. and tenders as his proof this verse, is branded as an open kaafir.

Similarly, belief in the Aakhirah (the Last Day) is a fundamental of Imaan which entails belief in all the other beliefs attendant and axiomatic to the belief in the Last Day. Belief in the Last Day, necessarily implies belief in the resurrection, Jannat, Jahannum, Sirat, Kauthar and the numerous other teachings of Islam pertaining to Aakhirah. One who claims that belief in the Last Day means belief in a future existence without having to believe in Jannat, Jahannum and the rest of the Aakhirah beliefs stated by the Qur'an and Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and then, as his bases of deduction, cites the aforementioned verse containing a concise reference to the Last Day, will undoubtedly be beyond the pale of Islam and will be labelled a kaafir.

SALAAT AND ZAKAAT

In a like manner, Imaan has been referred to in this verse briefly, not in detail.Two fundamentals of Imaan, viz, belief in Allah and belief in Aakhirah are here mentioned. The other fundamental articles of Imaan, viz.,belief in the Mala'ikah,the Divine Revelations,the Ambiyaa,Qadr, etc are not mentioned in this verse. But, the silence of this particular verse on these details is no negation of the fact that these are all integral constituents of Imaan.Minus any one of them, Imaan is negated and the negator becomes a kaafir.Numerous verses refer briefly to Salaat-in fact

all the verses speaking of Salaat and Zakaat, refer to these Ibadat in brief. No details of Salaat and Zakaat are furnished by the Qur'anic verses. It will be clear kufr if any person rejects the present form of Islamic Salaat and Islamic Zakaat, saying that any manner of worship is Salaat and any form of charity is Zakaat, and in substantiation for this misconception cites some Qur'anic verse which makes mere mention of Salaat and Zakaat minus the detailed description of these Ibaadaat.

The definition - the full definition - of Imaan as defined by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is obtained from the various Qur'anic verses and Ahadith pertaining to Imaan. This particular verse cannot, therefore, be divorced from the rest of the Qur'anic verses dealing with Imaan. On the contrary it has compulsorily to be read in conjunction with all other Islamic matter defining the meaning of Imaan.

THE GREEK PHILOSOPHERS

All the kuffaar - whether Hindu, Christian, Jew or Sabian -believe in Allah. But, their belief in Allah is not the conception of Tauhid as believed in by the adherents of Islam. i.e. the Islam brought by Muhammadur Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Hence, if they believe in God, we cannot claim that they have fulfilled the Qur'anic command of belief in Allah and cite as proof the verse containing a mere reference to belief in Allah. Belief in Allah does not mean mere belief in a divine being. Belief in Allah is the specific and particular concept of Tauhid as taught in its minutest detail by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Rejection of the detailed definition of Tauhid is nothing but a negation of belief in Allah. The Greek philosophers, as well as the later philosophers such as Farabi, Ibn Sina, etc., all claimed to believe in Allah. But, their belief in Allah was not the Islamic concept of Belief in Allah, for they, while professing belief in one 'first cause' which they even referred to as "Allah" to beguile the masses, stripped Allah Ta'ala of all His Attributes. They rejected, for example, that Allah Ta'ala had knowledge of all the particulars, etc Imaan cannot be claimed for these philosophers merely because some deviated persons claim that mere belief in Allah minus the details, is sufficient, and as evidence cite the verse briefly referring to belief in Allah.

Let us now refer to the Qur'an Majeed for the Ruling of the Shariah on the question of the Risaalat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The Qur'an declares the purpose of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) being despatched by Allah Ta'ala:

"Verily, We have sent you (O Muhammad) as a witness and a warner so that they believe in Allah and in His Rasul (viz, Muhammad - sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

In this verse, the Qur'an refers to Imaan as 'belief in Allah and His Rasul'. On the basis of this verse, non-acceptance of the Rasul will be tantamount to non-acceptance and rejection of Allah, since Allah Ta'ala Himself states the He has sent Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) so that mankind believes in Allah and in His Messenger.

This verse, like the verse cited by the negators of Risaalat as being a requisite of najaat, refers briefly to the Islamic concept of Imaan. It does not outline Imaan in detail. If the logic of the negators of Risaalat is to be entertained, it could be claimed likewise that belief in the Last Day is not requisite to Imaan, since this verse speaks of only belief in Allah and belief in His Rasul. If someone had to argue that belief in the Ambiyaa besides Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is not a requisite of Imaan and cites as proof this verse wherein Imaan is spoken of as only belief in Allah and belief in Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), then the error of such logic will be manifest. The kufr too, of the propounder will be manifest

THE KAAFIREEN

Another verse of the Qur'an reads:

"Verily, the Mu'min (those who have accepted Imaan) are ONLY those who believe in Allah and His Rasul (Muhammad), and then they entertain no doubt..."

(Surah Hujurat)

Belief in the Risaalat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is explicitly mentioned here.

The Qur'an states:
"And whoever does not have Imaan in Allah and His Rasul (Muhammad)' verily, we have prepared for the kaafireen (the rejectors of Imaan) a blazing fire."

The Blazing Jahannum awaits those who reject the Risaalat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This verse clearly states that those who do not believe in either Allah or Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are the "Kaafireen".
Again the Qur'an declares:
"Say (O Muhammad!), Obey Allah and the Rasul (Muhammad). And, if you turn away (from this belief), then verily, Allah does not love the kaafireen."

Those who refuse acceptance of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam's) Risaalat are the "Kaafireen" according to this verse as well.
The following Qur'anic verse presents the detailed definition of Imaan:
"O people of Imaan, Believe in Allah, His Rasul and in the Book which Allah has revealed to His Rasul (Muhammad) and in the Books which He has revealed before. Whoever commits kufr (rejects) against Allah, His Mala-ikah, His Books, His Messengers and the Last Day, verily, he has gone far astray."

Risaalat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as well as belief in all the previous Ambiyaa (alayhimus salaam) are stipulated in this verse as requirements of Imaan. Whoever rejects any one of these ingredients of Imaan, is labelled by this verse as having committed kufr, and as a consequence has drifted far from the Hidayah of Islam.
The verse No. 62 of Surah Baqarah which the negators of Risaalat cite in their support cannot be utilized to negate the above verse in which the details of Imaan are enumerated. In verse, No. 62 of Surah Baqarah, only two requirements of Imaan were referred to. However, this verse mentions a number of essential requirements of Imaan. Rejection of any one of these essentials will render one a kaafir.

The Qur'an says:
"Verily, those who commit kufr with Allah and His Rasul (Muhammad) and desire to differentiate between Allah and His Messenger, saying: We believe in some (Messengers) and we reject some...Indeed, they are truly the kaafirun."

The Qur'an in this verse explicitly states that differentiating between belief in Allah and belief in the Ambiyaa is kufr. Those who subscribe to any such incomplete 'Imaan' are "the kaafirun" according to this verse. Those who believe in some of the Ambiyaa and disbelieve in others, are "the kaafirun" according to this verse. Hence, in terms of this verse negators of the Risaalat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are "the kaafirun."
Again the Qur'an states:
The Rasul (Muhammad) and the Mu'minun (Believers) believe in what has been revealed to him (Muhammad) from his Rabb. Everyone (of the Mu'minun) has Imaan in Allah, His Mala-ikah and His Messengers. We (Believers) do not differentiate (regarding believing in them) among any of His Messengers."

(Surah Baqarah)

The Mu'minun are those who do not reject the Risaalat of any among the Ambiyaa. They believe in everything revealed to Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This verse states that the Mu'minun as well as the Rasul believe in all the ingredients and details of Imaan as contained in the Revelation of Allah.
The Qur'an commands in very clear terms belief in Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Those who deny belief in Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are not on the Guidance of the Qur'an and are beyond the pale of Islam. The Qur'an says in this regard:
"Say (O Muhammad!) O people! Verily, I am the Rasul of Allah to all of you...Therefore, have Imaan in Allah and His Rasul (Muhammad), the Nabi who is the Ummi...And, follow him (Muhammad) so that you may attain guidance."

(Surah Hujurat)

What could be clearer than this command to have Imaan in the Risaalat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)?
The Qur'an emphatically describes the Mu'min (Believer) as the one who believes in all the essentials of Imaan, such as Allah, Ambiyaa, Malaikah, Aakhirah, Kutb, etc. "A'mal Salihat" (righteous deeds) without Imaan are of no significance in so far as Najaat (salvation) in the Aakhirah is concerned. Righteous deeds on the pivot of Imaan are acceptable by Allah Ta'ala. Without Imaan, righteous deeds are not acceptable for reward in the Aakhirah. Hence, the Qur'an states:
"Whoever practices righteousness, be it man or woman, while he (or she) is a MU'MIN, will enter Jannat."

(Surah Nisa)

Entry into Jannat (Salvation in the Aakhirah) - Najaat - is dependent, therefore on being a MU'MIN. And, what is a Mu'min? The Qur'an is explicit that a Mu'min is one who believes in all the essentials of Imaan. Describing the Believers, Allah Ta'ala states in Surah Muhammad:
"And, those who have accepted Imaan and practised righteousness, and have accepted Imaan in that which has been revealed to MUHAMMAD -and indeed it is the Haqq from their Rabb - Allah has forgiven their sins and rectified their condition."

The requisite of Imaan is belief in Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as this verse categorically declares. Allah Ta'ala states that the revelation to Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is "the Haqq from their Rabb - he who then chooses to deny the Haqq - to deny Muhammad - to deny the Risaalat of Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), has rejected Imaan and has rendered himself a kaafir.

The Islamic conception of Imaan is declared incumbent upon followers of all religions by the Qur'an. The Qur'an hinges the Success of the Hereafter, viz., Najaat, onto belief in Nabi Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), hence, it appears in Surah A'raf:
"(Those who will obtain the Reward of Allah) are those who have Imaan in Our Laws; those who follow the Rasul (Muhammad), the Nabi, the Ummi, he whom they (Jews and Christians) find written by them in the

Taurah and Injeel...Therefore, those who have Imaan in him (Muhammad who has been prophesied in the Taurah and Injeel)...they, indeed, are the ones to attain Success."
This verse is clear that it is imperative for obtaining Najaat, that the Yahud and Nasara will have to accept Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Practising righteous deeds will not avail them in the Aakhirah if they had rejected the Risaalat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).
Who among the People of the Book (Yahud and Nasara) will obtain Najaat? The Qur'an answers:
"And, verily, among the People of the Book (Ahle Kitaab) those who have Imaan in Allah and in that which has been revealed to you (Muslims) and in that which was revealed to them, fearing Allah - they do not trade the Verses of Allah for a miserable price - they, indeed are the ones who will obtain their Reward by their Rabb."
Hence, for the Reward by Allah - the Najaat in the Aakhirah - it is essential that the Ahle Kitaab subscribe to the Risaalat of Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Verse No. 62. of Surah Baqarah should be read in conjunction with this verse so that the definition of Qur'anic Imaan is not distorted.

If every brief reference to a teaching of Imaan or practice had to be interpreted as a final and comprehensive definition of Imaan or a teaching, there would then not remain a single belief or practice of Islam intact. Every belief and practice of Islam would then be subjected to an individual's understanding and fancy. It is, therefore, highly erroneous and dangerous to read a particular verse or hadith out of the context of its proper meaning and divorced from all other Islamic material pertaining to the belief or teaching being dealt with.

Verse 62 of Surah Baqarah mentions three things essential for Najaat, viz., belief in Allah, belief in Aakhirah and practising of righteous deeds. The negators of Risaalat attempt to substantiate their distorted conception of Imaan by restricting the fundamentals of Imaan to these three factors contained in this verse. If this strain of reasoning be accepted, then a further restriction and shirinking of the fundamentals of Imaan will have to be accepted on the basis of other verses which also refer to Imaan. Verse II of Surah At-Talaq states:

"And whoever has Imaan in Allah and practices righteousness, He (Allah) will enter him (the believer in Allah and practiser of righteousness) into Jannat beneath which flow rivers. Forever will they dwell therein..."

This verse mentions only two things as essential for Najaat, viz., belief in Allah and practising of righteousness. Can any sensible believer now argue that for Najaat in the Aakhirah, only belief in Allah and practising righteousness are necessary, belief in the Aakhirah, in the Ambiyaa, etc. not being requisites of Imaan? The fallacy and absurdity of such an argument are evident. This verse, by mentioning only belief in Allah as a requisite of Najaat, does not negate the other fundamental requirements of Imaan. It does not mean that because only belief in Allah is mentioned in this verse, there is no need for believing in the other fundamentals of Imaan. This verse, like the verse 62 of Surah Baqarah, have to be understood in the light of the Qur'an and Tafseer of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasllam). In fact, the Qur'an is explicit that belief in Allah necessarily means belief in the Ambiyaa, in Aakhirah, in the Malaikah, etc. Without attesting to the truth of all the articles of Imaan, belief in Allah is not possible.

Besides these verses cited at random from the Qur'an Majeed, there are numerous other verses and Ahadith of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) which unambiguously define the Imaan demanded by the Qur'an Shareef for the obtainal of Najaat in the Aakhirah. This Imaan propagated by the Qur'an stipulates unequivocally that the Risaalat of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is a fundamental constituent part of Imaan. Anyone rejecting this Risaalat or claiming that this Risaalat is not essential for salvation in the Hereafter is himself a Kaafir. May Allah Ta'ala save us all from this calamity.

One who professes to be a Muslim - a believer and follower of the Qur'an which is the Divine Message delivered via the agency of the Risaalat of Muhammadur Rasulullah - (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) - but at the same time denies the need to subscribe to the Risaalat and the Finality of the Risaalat of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), cannot be a Muslim. He, if he was a Muslim previously, will now be branded a Murtad - a

renegade - one who has turned his back on Islam. Allah preserve all Muslims from the disaster of kufr and irtidaad.

Commenting on verse 62 of Surah Baqarah, Yusuf Ali states:

"The point of the verse is that Islam does not teach an exclusive doctrine and is not meant exclusively for one people."

This view presented by Yusuf Ali is highly erroneous. The aforementioned Qur'anic aayat illustrates the exclusiveness of Islamic doctrines. In relation to Najaat in the Aakhirah, Islam emphasises that such salvation is attainable only by subscribing to the particular doctrines of Islam. Islam excludes salvation for all those who reject the beliefs of Islam as expounded by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. No religion or concept other than the particular Islam of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam can bring about Najaat in the Aakhirah. The doctrines of Islam are thus exclusive.

DAMSELS OF JANNAT

COMMENTING on the Hur of Jannat or the Maidens in Jannat, Yusuf Ali asserts:

"The word Hur, in such passages as xiiv. 54, and iii, 20, has been misunderstood and misrepresented. Grammatically it is not feminine in form, and the companionship of Hurs will be for all in Heaven - men and women (as they were in this life)."

Because of his belief in a spiritual heaven and his rejection of the high and lofty material heaven preached by the Quran and expounded by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, Yusuf Ali is at pains to explain away the reality of the Hur of Jannat. According to Yusuf Ali, there is no such reality as Hur. His conception of Hur is stated in his footnote No. 4729 of his commentary as follows:

"Hur implies the following ideas: (1) purity:... (2) beauty, especially of the eyes,...and (3) truth and good-will."

In short, Hur, according to Yusuf Ali signifies an abstract conception implying the ideas of purity, beauty and truth.

This notion of Yusuf Ali is an extremely vague and negative description of such a clear and concrete reality as the Hur of Jannat which the Holy Quran and the Ahadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam thoroughly explain. No authentic grounds exist for the distortion and misappropriation of the word Hur. No Islamic evidence could be adduced in vindication of the theory propounded by Yusuf Ali. The Holy Quran, the Hadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, the opinions of the Sahaba Radiallahu Anhum, the Mufassireen, the Muhadditheen and all the Ulama of Islam through the centuries of Islam's history unanimously proclaimed that Hur is a reality - a tangible reality of a very elevated form as described by our Nabi Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. The Hur are fair damsels of Jannat. Nowhere in the Shariah has a figurative meaning been attributed to the term Hur.

Yusuf Ali, in vindication of his spiritual-abstract heaven, subtly attempts to explain away the Islamic or Shar'ee definition of Hur by asserting:

"Grammatically it is not feminine in form..."

Since no Quranic or other Shar'ee proof could be produced to substantiate his view, Yusuf Ali seeks refuge in the grammatical gender of the word. Because the gender of the word Hur is not feminine, Yusuf Ali attempts to trade the idea that the Hur of Jannat is not a female as described by the Quran and Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. If a word's gender is not feminine, it does not automatically follow that the object denoted by that word is not feminine. There are words in the Arabic language which are grammatically masculine in gender but refer strictly and only to females. For example: A pregnant woman in Arabic is called "HAAMIL". The grammatical gender of the term HAAMIL is only masculine, but despite this it refers only to females. A woman in her monthly periods is called in Arabic "HAA-IDH". The gender of the term is masculine although it refers to only females.

If we have to follow Yusuf Ali's line of "grammatical" reasoning we shall have to conclude that HAA-IDH because its gender is masculine is a male. Thus Haa-idh will mean "a man in his monthly period", and HAAMIL will mean "a pregnant man". This absurdity is the result of Yusuf Ali's confused reasoning.

Let us now see what Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam said about the Hur of Jannat.

Hazrat Anas (Radiallahu Anhu) said that Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam said:

"Verily, if a woman of the females of Jannat should appear on earth, the space between heaven and earth would be lit up; and the space between heaven and earth would be permeated with fragrance. The scarf on her head is more valuable than its possessions."

Ibn Mubarak (Radiallahu Anhu) narrates on the authority of Zaid Bin Aslam (Radiallahu Anhu) that Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam said:

"Verily, Allah Ta'ala did not create the Hur with lustrous eyes from sand (as is the case with human beings). Verily, Allah, created them (Hinna) out of musk, kaafur and za'fraan."

It should be noted here that in this Hadith Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam used the strictly feminine pronoun, "HINNA" for Hur, clearly denoting the female.

Ibn Abu Dunya reported on the auhority of Hazrat Anas (Radiallahu Anhu) that Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam said:

"Verily, should a Hur spit into the ocean, the ocean, would be transformed into sweetness by virtue of her saliva."

In this Hadith as well, Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam uses a feminine verb (BAZAKAT) and a female pronoun (LA-HAA) to refer to

the Hur, and this, Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam does despite the fact that the term Hur is not feminine in gender.

Hanaad (Radiallahu Anhu) narrates on the authority of Ibn Aheelah (Radiallahu Anhu) that Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam said:

"Verily, the women of the world, when they enter Jannat will have ranks higher than the Hur with lustrous eyes by virtue of their good deeds on earth."

In this Hadith, Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam compares the worldly women to the women of Jannat (i.e. the Hur). If Hur were not females the comparison would be illogical. If Hur were not females the comparison should have applied to both men and women of this world and not only to women.

In another Ahadith, Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam uses such words as "IMR'AT", "NISAA" and pronouns "LA-HAA" and "HUNNA" to refer to the Hur of Jannat. The gender of the term "Imra't" is feminine and it means nothing but "a woman." "Nisaa" is feminine in gender and it means "women". The pronoun, "HUNNA" is feminine and is used to refer to only females and not males. Now, despite the grammatical gender of the word Hur not being feminine, Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam uses a feminine pronoun to refer to the Hur of Jannat. The normal practice of the Quran is to use masculine terms where ever reference is both to men and women, never feminine terms to refer to a group consisting of both male and female. For example: The verse of the Quran:

"It (i.e. the Quran) is a guide for the MUTTAQEEN (the pious)."

The word Muttaqeen is masculine in gender, but in the context of this verse it refers to both male and female pious believers. The term, Mu'mineen, although masculine covers both men and women believers. Thus, Quranic usage is to use masculine terms where the need arises to refer to both male and female, and not vice versa. Therefore, if the Hur of Jannat are not female, Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam would not have used feminine terms to refer to them.

We shall now quote some references from the authentic Tafseers of the Holy Quran. Tafseerul Mazhari states:

"Hur: Pure and Fair ladies with the white of the eyes being intense."

Tafseer Jalaalain states:
"Hurun Een: Fair women with big lustrous eyes." Tafseer Ibn Katheer states:

"Hurun Een: Fair beautiful maidens with lustrous eyes."

All the authentic and accepted Tafseers of the Holy Quran give the very same explanation of the term Hur, i.e. females of Jannat.

In his commentary, Yusuf Ali is constrained to say:

"Maidens or Virgins of Equal Age..."

However, despite this admission in his commentary, he commits a serious error in his translation of the ayat.

"Wa-kawaa-ibaa Atraabaa", in Surah Nabaa. He translates the word "KAWAA-IBAA" as "COMPANIONS". But Kawaa-ibaa does not mean "companions". Kawaa-ibaa is the plural of Kaa-ib which means:

"A female with prominent breasts."

This could be verified from any Arabic dictionary.

The word Kaa-ib refers strictly to woman, and in the context of the ayat quoted above it refers to the Hur of Jannat.

The strictly feminine terms,meanings and qualities attributed to the Hur of Jannat by the Quran and Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam plunge Yusuf Ali in a dilemma,and in order to extricate himself from his confusion and to salvage his interpretation of the word Hur, he lapses in-

to a greater confusion by abortively attempting to explain away the femininity which the Qur'an ascribes to the Hur of Jannat. Thus in the Appendix on the description of Heaven he asserts:

"In lxxviii.33 are mentioned Maidens or Virgins of Equal Age, in a highly symbolical passage, where the notes may be consulted. But the masculine virtues of handsome and manly strength and the youthful enthusiasm for service are also mentioned in association with Heaven (see lii. 24, and note 5058)."

The abovementioned paragraph from Yusuf Ali's commentary is a piece of pure deception because his statements here convey the impression that while the Quran attributes female qualities to the Hur of Jannat, it also ascribes masculine qualities to them (the Hur) thus cancelling out the strict femininity of the Hur. In support of his contention he cites verse lii, 24 (verse 24 of Surah Tur). But this verse does not speak of the Hur. In fact there is no reference whatsoever in this verse of the Hur of Jannat. The ayat is clear and unambiguous. It says "YOUTHS...", and the word used in this verse is "GHILMAAN" and not HUR. Ghilmaan is the plural of ghulaam which means a male servant. Yusuf Ali, himself translates the word GHILMAAN as "YOUTHS". Ghilmaan in grammatical gender is masculine and in reality refers to males. There exists no difference of opinion on this score. Not a single authority of Islam - right from the time of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam - has ever said that "Ghilmaan" referred to in verse 24 of Surah Tur means the Hur of Jannat.

The Ghilmaan mentioned in the Quran and the Hur of Jannat are two different entities or two different creations of Allah Ta'ala, which inhabit Jannat. The Ghilmaan are male and the Hur are female.

Another factor which establishes the masculinity of the Ghilmaan is the pronoun, "HUM" which the Quran uses to refer to them (Ghilmaan). The pronoun "HUM" is masculine. Not in even a single case does the Quran or the Hadith use a masculine term or pronoun for the Hur, but it does so in the case of the Ghilmaan.

In his commentary, Yusuf Ali states:

"The word Hur has been misunderstood and misrepresented."

Indeed this is a most audacious claim. How is it possible for Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam to misunderstand and misrepresent the word Hur? How is it possible for the Sahaba to misunderstand and misrepresent the word Hur? And, how is it possible for all the great Authorities of Islam to misunderstand and misrepresent a word and cling to such a misrepresentation for fourteen centuries? After all, what Yusuf Ali states in his commentary is merely his own theory. It is not Islamic belief and Islamic interpretation.

RESURRECTING THE DEAD

"And remember, when Ibrahim said: O My Creator! Show me how You give life to the dead...

He (Allah) said: Take four birds and let them become inclined towards you. Then place on every hill a portion of them. And, call to them; they will come to you with speed.
Know that Allah is Majestic and Wise."

(Quran-Surah Baqarah)

The above verses of the Holy Quran mention the incident when Nabi Ibrahim Alayhis Salaam requested Allah Ta'ala to reveal to him the mystery of resurrection - how Allah will bring to life the dead. The manner by means of which Allah Ta'ala showed Ibrahim Alayhis Salaam how He resurrects the dead is briefly referred to in these verses. The full explanation of the episode was given by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam.

Yusuf Ali in his commentary of the Quran states his views as follows:

"A portion of them: Juz-an. The received Commentators understand this to mean that the birds were to be cut up and pieces of them were to be put on the hills. The cutting up or killing is not mentioned, but they say that it is implied by an ellipsis, as the question is how God gives life to the dead. Of the modern Muslim Commentators, M.P. is non-commital, but H.G.S. and M.M.A. understand that the birds were not killed, but that a "portion" here means a unit, single birds were placed on hills and they flew to the one who tamed them. This last view commends itself to me, as the cutting up of birds to pieces is nowhere mentioned, unless we understand the word for "taming" in an unusual and almost impossible sense."

It is clear from the above that Yusuf Ali accepts the view expounded by Mohammed Ali who is (upon Yusuf Ali's own admission) one of the "modern Commentators." Besides being one of the "modern" so-called commentators, Mohammed Ali was a Qadiani as well. Now according to Yusuf Ali and the Qadiani Mohammed Ali, the birds were not killed and cut up as is reported by the great Authorities of Tafseer (the Mufassireen of Islam), but a live bird was placed on each hill, and these live birds flew to Ibrahim Alayhis Salaam when he called to them. The Tafseer of these verses of the Quran given by the great Mufassireen — right from the Sahabas — is rejected by Yusuf Ali in the words:

"The cutting up or killing is not mentioned, but they say that it is implied by an ellipsis, as the question is how God gives life to the dead."

Every Muslim will accept that the greatest Mufassir or Commentator of the Holy Quran was our Nabi Muhammad Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, and after him comes the rank of the great Companions of our Nabi Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. And among the Companions of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, Hazrat Ibn Abbas (Radiallahu Anhu) is known as Ra-eesul Mufassireen or the leader of the Commentators. The Sahaba's (Radiallahu Anhum) acquired their knowledge of the Quran sitting at the feet of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alavhi Wasallam.

Hence, no person's view, opinion or interpretation could be acceptable if these contradict the opinion and interpretation given by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam and his illustrious Companions (Radiallahu Anhum).

The interpretation of the verses offered by Yusuf Ali, the Qadiani Mohammed Ali as well as their brand of "modern" commentators is in conflict with the interpretation expounded by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. Therefore, every Muslim will automatically reject the baseless interpretations of Yusuf Ali and the "modern commentators". In order to give credibility to his personal interpretation of these verses of the Quran, Yusuf Ali very subtley attempts to discount the Tafseer of the great Mufassireen of Islam by claiming that they have based their interpretation on an "ellipsis". Ellipsis means:

"The omission from a sentence of word(s) needed to complete the grammatical construction or fully express sense."

In other words; The verses of the Quran pertaining to this particular incident do not explain the episode fully and in order to present a complete and meaningful picture, the Mufassireen deduced and inferred that the birds were killed, cut to pieces and put on various hills. We must say that, on the contrary, it is Yusuf Ali who arrived at the opinion by means of deduction and inference, and not the Mufassireen. The Mufassireen did not interpret these verses in accordance with their fancy. They merely reported in their great Works the explanation given by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. But Yusuf Ali discounts the authoritative interpretation of the Mufassireen and accepts an "opinion" which sounds more "rational" to the "modern mind". In fact, Yusuf Ali commits a travesty of the truth by brazenly claiming that the "received Commentators." (the noble Mufassireen, among whom are great Sahabas) based their Tafseer merely on an "ellipsis." He alleges: "..they (the Mufassireen) say that it (the killing of the birds) is implied by an ellipsis.."

How Yusuf Ali could believe that the view as expounded by the Mufassireen is on the basis of an implication, defies one's comprehension. It is very difficult to accept that Yusuf Ali was ignorant of the

source, of the basis upon which the Mufassireen offered their explanation of the verses in question, because in his Introduction to his commentary he states:

"Let me set out the most important Tafseers, especially those to which I have from time to time referred."

He then proceeds to enumerate these "most important" Tafseers, and his list includes:

Tabari, Mufradat, Kash-shaaf, Tafseer Kabir, Baidhawee, Ibn Kathir, Itqan fi Ulumil Quran, Jalalain and Haqqani.

Yusuf Ali claims to have referred to all these important Books of Tafseer, yet he alleges that the authors of these great Books of Tafseer arrived at their explanation on the basis of only an "ellipsis". Indeed, Yusuf Ali is guilty of a grave injustice rendered to these great Mufassireen from whose Works he benefited so much. He simply brushes aside the divine interpretation of these verses by stating:

"The received Commentators understand this to mean."

Every unbiased Muslim who has direct access to the original Books of these great Mufassireen will know that the Mufassireen did not "understand" the verses to mean what they stated, but that they merely reported what the Sahabas (Radiallahu Anhufn) heard from Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam.

Even if we had to assume that the Mufassireen did in fact base their interpretation on the basis of only an "ellipsis", then too, their view, would be more convincing and in accord with reason, logic, coherence and the general context, flow and trend of the verses under discussion, for Ibrahim Alayhis Salaam requested Allah Ta'ala to demonstrate how the dead is raised up again, hence he says:

"Rabbi arini kayfa tuhyil MAUTA."
("O My Creator! Show me how You give life to the dead).

The mere answering of trained birds to the call of their master is no demonstration of the raising of the dead. Ibrahim Alayhis Salaam did not doubt in the least Allah Ta'ala's power to give life to the dead. What he desired was to witness the mystery of giving life to the dead. Killing the birds, rendering them to pieces, mixing up the various pieces, putting portions of the "mixture" on various hill-tops, commanding the dead birds to come to life by the Permission of Allah, and their immediate coming to life is a real and apt demonstration of Allah's power to give life to the dead. However, as stated earlier the explanation of the verses given by the Mufassireen of Islam is not based on any "ellipsis" or any assumption.

The Quran is the Revealed Word of Allah. The opinions expressed by individuals cannot be accepted if these are in opposition to the opinions of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam and his Sahaba (Radiallahu Anhu). Rasulullah's interpretation of the verses must be and is regarded as Divine by all authorities of Islaam. Allah Ta'ala states in the Quran:

"And, he (Muhammad) does not speak of desire. It (what he says) is such Wahi which is revealed."

Let us now see what the authoritative Mufassireen have to say about these verses of the Holy Quran.

TAFSEER IBN KATHIR

"Hazrat Ibn Abbaas (Radiallahu Anhu) narrates a Hadith that Allah Ta'ala instructed Ibrahim Alayhis Salaam to take four birds - a pigeon, fowl, peacock and a crow -, slaughter them and cut them into pieces."

"In another Hadith it is stated that Ibrahim Alayhis Salaam was commanded to keep the birds with him for a while (and train them). Thereafter he had to slaughter the birds and render them into pieces which had to be mixed together. The "mixture" had to be divided into portions and one portion had to be placed on each hill (four or seven hills). The heads of the birds Ibrahim Alayhis Salaam kept with him. Then, with the permission of Allah, Ibrahim Alayhis Salaam commanded the birds to life. Whichever bird he called, its dismembered and scattered parts and organs would re-assemble into the original bird and come

to Ibrahim Alayhis Salaam. Ibrahim Alayhis Salaam then offered the head of another bird to this body, but the body would reject the head. When its own head was offered it was accepted. In a similar manner the other birds were called to life."

TAFSEER BAIDHAWEE
Tafseer Baidhawee offers the very same explanation.

TAFSEER JALALAIN
Offers the same interpretation as outlined above.

MADAARIK
Same interpretation as above.

TAFSEER MAZHARI
Same as above. It is also stated:

"Ibn Juraij and Sadi reported this interpretation."

"And, Ibn Jareer narrated that Ibn Ishaaq reported from Ibn Abbas (Radiallahu Anhu) and Qatadah (Radiallahu Anhu) that every bird was divided into four parts and on each hill one fourth of each bird was placed."

KHULASATUT TAFSEER
The same interpretation given above. The basis of this interpretation is also attributed to Ibn Abbas (Radiallahu Anhu) in this Tafseer.

TAFSEER HAQQANI
Same explanation as above. This is the Tafseer about which Yusuf Ali says:

"I have derived much instruction from it and have used it constantly."

Commenting on the interpretations of these verses, the Author of Tafseere Haqqani observes:

"The materialistic commentators have rejected both incidents (i.e. the cutting up of the birds into pieces and the story of Uzair Alayhis Salaam sleeping 100 years. They are faithful to their old habit of disgracefully attacking the Mufassireen and they have offered baseless interpretation of these verses..."

"In rejecting the (reality of these) stories these materialist commentators are merely imitating the athiests. They are unable to advance any narration (Hadith, etc.) or any reasonable argument in substantiation of their claim."

TAFSEER RUHUL MA'ANI
This Tafseer also gives the very same view outlined above, and adds that Ibn Munzir narrated it from Hasan (Radhiallahu Anhu), Mujahid and Zuhhaaq as well narrated this interpretation according to Tafseer Ruhul Ma'ani. Rejecting all other interpretations as baseless, the Mufassir states:

"Verily, this (the other views which are not backed by Rasulullah or the Sahaba) contradicts the Ijma (Consensus of Opinion) of the Ummah. These other views are nonsensical. The learned and pious men of the Deen do not incline towards it....

The proper thing to do is to follow the Jamaat, for the Protection of Allah is with the Jamaat (the Ahle Sunnah Wal Jamaat)."

To sum up:

The interpretation of these verses advanced by the authoritative Mufassireen, right from the time of the Sahaba (Radiallahu Anhu), is not based on an "ellipsis", nor is it the deduction or inference of the Mufassireen. The interpretation recorded by the Mufassireen in their Books were narrations of the Sahaba which were transmitted most authentically, and the Sahaba did not offer their own versions or deductions, but reported what they heard from Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. On the other hand, the intrepretation given by Yusuf Ali is not based on any narration or Hadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam or of the Sahaba (Radhiallahu Anhu). The views expounded by

Yusuf Ali is based on conjecture and cannot be substantiated on the basis of the Shariah. There does not exist a single Authority in Islam who agrees with the opinion expressed by Yusuf Ali. And, the "modern commentators" are no authoritative exponents of the Shariah, hence they have to be dismissed as a danger to one's Imaan.

ABSURD RESEARCH OF YUSUF ALI AND THE "RESEARCHERS"

A new organization calling itself "The Institute for Arabic and Islamic Research" (apparently a Cape body - it gives a Cape address), has published a frame containing the following Qur'anic verse:

"IN-NAL LAAHA LAA YUGHAY-YIRU MAA BIQOUMIN HAT-TAA YUGHAY-YIROO MAA BI-AN FUSIHIM."

This is a verse from Surah Ra'd, viz. verse ii. The organization responsible for the poster containing this verse translates the aayat as follows:

"Verily Allah will never change the condition of a people until they change it themselves."

The translation is erroneous. It seems that this "Arabic and Islamic Research" organization has taken the wrong translation of Yusuf Ali. Yusuf Ali presents the exact erroneous translation. Yusuf Ali translates the verse as follows:

"Verily never will God change the condition of a people until they change it themselves."

It is indeed a poor reflection on the worth of the "research" conducted by the "research" organization. The people responsible have accorded themselves the grandiose title of "Arabic and Islamic Research." but

they have exhibited their inability to even render the translation of the aayat accurately. The error made by Yusuf Ali, from which the "Research" organization borrowed its translation, is of a serious nature. It is at least expected of an organization which calls itself "The Institute for Arabic and Islamic Research" not to borrow inaccurate translated versions of the Qur'anic verses. A modern "Research" organization should be in a position to at least understand the meaning of the word, "research". If the organization does not possess even the ability to translate the verses correctly, what hope is there for conducting so-called research in "Arabic" and "Islamic" studies? We have all along maintained that those lacking the qualifications of Islamic Knowledge should restrict themselves to 'tilaawat' of the Qur'an Shareef and not dabble in a domain which is beyond the scope of their ability and knowledge. Trifling with the Deen is a serious matter, since it involves Imaan, the pivot of Najaat in the Aakhirah.

It seems that the furthest limits of reference of modernist "Research" organizations is the incorrect commentary and translation of Yusuf Ali. Yusuf Ali who is a non-entity in so far as the Deen and Ilm are concerned is the "Imaam" of those who, despite not possessing the proper Islamic qualifications, are desirous of setting themselves up as Islamic authorities. Yusuf Ali was astray and so are those who follow his incorrect work. Let us now examine the translation of the aayat in question.

1. Gramatically the translation is erroneous because the "Research" organization as well as Yusuf Ali have confused the phrase: MAA BI QOUMIN with the phrase: MAA BIANFUSIHIM. Our Research Professors have translated both these phrases to refer to the same thing, hence they say:

"Verily Allah will never change **the condition of a people** until they change it themselves."

The Research Professors of "The Institute for Arabic and Islamic Research" have translated the words: MAA BI QOUMIN as "the condition of a people." and MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM as "it". It is clear from the translation posited by the Research Professors that the pronoun "it" (appearing in the translation) refers to "the condition of the people."

Leaving aside the Tafseer of the phrases in question, anyone who understands Arabic will immediately discern the incorrectness of the translation. One who possesses even a fair knowledge of the Arabic language will know that the two phrases, viz. MAA BI QOUMIN and MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM, refer to different things and not to the same object as the "Research" organization and Yusuf Ali have translated.

The Research Professors are guilty of gross distortion in translating the phrase of the sentence: MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM. as "it". MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM does not mean "it". The literal translation of MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM is:

"THAT WHICH IS WITH THEMSELVES."

The translation: "the condition of a people" for MAA BI QOUMIN is correct, but "MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM ("That which is with themselves.") does not refer to MAA BI QOUMIN ("the condition of a people") as the pronoun "it" in the translation of Yusuf Ali and the Research Professors indicates. MAA BI QOUMIN refers to one thing and MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM refers to another thing.

2. Let us now refer to the authentic and authoritative Tafseers of the Quraan for the explanation of the two phrases. The Tafseer of the eminent Sahaabi, Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas (Radiallahu Anhu) explains MAA BI QOUMIN as follows:

"Verily Allah will not change that which is with a community (i.e. of the peace and prosperity)." (Tanweerul Miqbaas)

--NB Words in brackets, the words of Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas. MAA BI QOUMIN has thus been explained as the peace and prosperous condition of a community. It does not refer to mere "condition of people." The condition of a people may be adverse or prosperous. The "condition" referred to in MAA BI QOUMIN is specific, viz. the peaceful and prosperous state of favour and bounty which Allah Ta'ala has bestowed upon a nation.

In his Tafseer, Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas (Radiallahu Anhu) explains MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM as follows :

"...until they change that which is with themselves (by neglecting shukr)." (Tanweerul Miqbaas).

Hence, the meaning of MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM ("that which is with themselves") is their virtuous condition of morality. The correct meaning of the verse is therefore:

"Verily Allah will not change the peaceful and prosperous condition of a community as long as they do not change their state of goodness, gratitude and obedience. Once a community destroys its good integrity by exhibiting ingratitude and disobedience, Allah Ta'ala annihilates the prosperity which He has bestowed upon them. In other words, man's moral degeneration results in the elimination of the bounties of Allah Ta'ala."

This verse mentions two specific things, viz. (1) man's external condition: and (2) man's internal condition. The external condition (MAA BI-QOUMIN) is a reference to his peaceful and prosperous condition. The internal condition (MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM) refers to man's moral condition -the good spiritual condition of his soul. The former condition is the consequence or effect of the latter condition. But, the Research Professors confuse the two conditions and portray both as being the same thing, hence they translate MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM as "it" referring to MAA BI QOUMIN. But, this is manifestly and Islamically erroneous..

Allaamah Aalusi Baghdaadi Rahmatullah Alayh states in Tafseer Ruhul Ma-aani:

MAA BI QOUMIN: Ni'mah (Bounty) and Aafiyah (prosperity and happiness).

MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM: The beautiful states (of morality) attributed to their selves. The meaning of changing it (i.e. their beautiful moral state) is to substitute it with its opposite (i.e. with immorality).

This authoritative Tafseer as well bears out the difference between MAA BI QOUMIN and MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM.

Tafseerul Mazhari likewise explains the two phrases as referring to different things, and gives the same tafseer as appearing in Tafseer Ruhul Ma-aani. Tafseer Baidhaawi states in the tafseer of the verse in question:

"MAA BI QOUMIN: of Aafiyah (prosperity) and Ni'mah (Bounty).

MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM: (changing) the beautiful conditions with evil conditions.

Tafseer Bayaanul Qur'an explains these terms:

"MAA BI QOUMIN: the prosperous (or good) condition of a community.

MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM: their virtuous condition."
It will be clear from all the authoritative Tafaaseer of the Qur'an Shareef that the verse, No. ii of Surah Ra'd, speaks of two separate entities, viz., (a) the prosperous condition which Allah Ta'ala bestowed to a community, and (b) the virtuous state of morality of the people concerned. The meaning of the verse as given by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, the noble Sahaabah and the Authorities of Tafseer is clear. It means:

Allah will not change or eliminate the goodness, favours and prosperity which He has granted a virtuous community as long as they themselves do not annihilate their virtuous moral condition and substitute it with disobedience, sin and immorality.

This explanation of the aayat concerned is corroborated by verse 53 of Surah Anfaal. Explaining the principle upon which the elimination of bounty and prosperity granted by Allah Ta'ala is based, the Qur'an states:

"That is because, verily Allah does not change the prosperity which He has bestowed upon a community until they change their own personal condition (MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM)..."

The Quraan, itself, explains that the MAA BI QOUMIN which appears in the verse in Surah Ra'd refers to NI'MATAN AN'AMA HAA ALAA QOUMIN (the prosperity which Allah Ta'ala has bestowed upon a community). This explanation of the Qur'an is in line with the tafseer of the aayat appearing in all the authentic Tafseer Books. And, why should it not be? It is the tafseer given by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam himself. It is not the figment of the imaginations of Yusuf Ali and the Research Professors of the so-called "Institute for Arabic and Islamic Research."

Furthermore, slight reflection in the translation of the verse given by Yusuf Ali and the Research Professors of "The Institute for Arabic and Islamic Research" will show the logical absurdity of the translation. Yusuf Ali & Co. translate the verse:

"Verily Allah will never change the condition of a people until they change it themselves."

The pronoun, "it" in this translation makes it abundantly clear that the reference is to "the condition of a people". According to the translation the conclusion is that once a people has changed its condition, Allah will change it. But if they (the people) have already changed it, then what will Allah change? And, conversely, if Allah changes the condition of a people, then how will the people change it? What is there for them then to change. If the "change of condition" is effected by Allah, then to claim that the same is the effect of the people is absurd. On the other hand, if the "change of condition" is the effect of the people themselves, then it will be absurd to say that it is the effect of Allah, for in terms of the erroneous translation the effect has already come into being by the act of the people. According to the translation of the Research Professors, MAA BI QOUMIN and MAA BI-ANFUSIHIM refer to the SAME thing, viz. "the condition of the people." The absurdity of a "change in the condition of the people" being the effect of two different causes

when the translation of the Research Professors posits one cause (viz., Allah's action) as being itself the effect of the second cause (viz., the act of a people), is self-evident.

The aforementioned absurdity is the consequence of translating incorrectly the verse. If the verse was translated and interpreted correctly - i.e. according to the translation and the interpretation of the Sahaabah -then this absurd conclusion would not have resulted. The verse simply means that the "external" condition of man (i.e. his prosperous material state) will not be eliminated by Allah Ta'ala if he (man) does not destroy his "internal" (i.e. his moral and spiritual) condition. Hence, in terms of the correct translation, the absurdity of two causes for the same effect does not arise.

According to the import of the verse in question, the "changing of man's prosperity into misery and adversity" is the effect of Allah Ta'ala whereas the "changing of man's virtuous condition of morality into moral degeneration" is the effect of man. This is what the aayat is about, and not the absurdity presented by the Research Professors of the "Institute for Arabic and Islamic Research" and Yusuf Ali.

DENYING THE ISLAMIC JANNAT

In Appendix XII of his Translation and commentary of the Holy Quran, Yusuf Ali asserts:

"Our heaven is independent of Time, or Place or fleeting circumstance.

"...But we must necessarily use terms that imply all these three conditions. Therefore they can only be expressed by allegory or imagery.

"...Such allegory or imagery is supplied in abundance in the Quran. The simple and yet the most far-reaching allegory that we can employ is that of the Garden - the Garden of Bliss (Jannat or Jannatun-Na-im, V.68).

"The symbolism of Springs or Fountains and Cups of Drink or Wine is also worked in a beautiful way in S.IXXVI (Dahr)."

The above quotations as well as many other statements and views expressed throughout Yusuf Ali's commentary expound Jannat as a purely spiritual state devoid of any material constituents or attributes. Because of this spiritual concept of Jannat, Yusuf Ali was constrained to infer:

"Our Heaven is independent of Time, or Place or fleeting circumstance."

It has to be pointed out that the ONLY ENTITY or BEING independent of Time and Place is Allah Ta'ala. Everything else besides Allah is the creation of Allah Ta'ala. And, creation signifies origin in time. Therefore, everything which came into existence is NOT independent of Time. The very fact that a created object originated in Time proves that it is not independent of Time. If it was independent of Time its relationship would not have been associated with Time. A created object is a temporal object and as such it cannot be divorced from the circumstance of Time. Even the Angels who are purely celestial beings are not independent of Time since their origin was temporal, i.e. they originated in Time - their state of existence being preceded by a state of pure non-existence.

Now, Heaven or Jannat is an Abode or a Place in a realm known to us as Aakhirat or the Hereafter. Aakhirat or the Hereafter is a place which has already been created by Allah Ta'ala. Its description as "Aakhirat" or "Hereafter" is a relative issue, it being described as the "hereafter" in relation to the reward or punishment which mortals will attain in that realm after death. Jannat is not a spiritual state which will come into existence at some future date as is the belief of Yusuf Ali. We may as well say that Yusuf Ali's belief is not original. This very belief is shared by the Mu'tazilah sect as well as the Greek philosophers of ancient times.

The true and correct belief of Jannat is the belief of the Ahle Sunnah Wal Jamah (comprising the four Schools of Thought) which base all their beliefs and teachings on the Quran and the Ahadith of our Nabi-Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. This correct Islamic belief is given in the following extract:

"Jannat and Naar (heaven and Hell) are true realities which have already been created. Both exist at present. The majority of the Mu'tazilah think that Heaven and Hell will be created on the Day of Qiyamah. Our (i.e. the Ahle Sunnah Wal Jamah's) proof that Jannat and Naar have already been created is:

i. The story of Aadam and Hawwaa. They lived in Jannat according to the Quran.
ii. The (many) clear verses of the Quran mentioning that both (Heaven and Hell) have already been prepared, e.g. "Heaven has been prepared for the pious.." (Quran), and "Hell has been prepared for the unbelievers." (Quran).

(SHARHUL AQAA-ID)

Besides the above-mentioned proofs as to the present existence of Heaven and Hell, there are numerous Ahadith of our Nabi Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam categorically establishing that Jannat and Jahannam are places - material abodes - which have already been created. Jannat, since it originated in Time and because the Power and the Will of Allah can destroy it and relegate it into non-existence (although Allah Ta'ala will not do so as He has already promised Believers an everlasting Jannat), is not independent of Time. Only eternal beings or entities are independent of Time. But besides Allah, nothing is eternal. Jannat is a temporal abode which will be everlasting, its perpetuity being assured by Allah Ta'ala.

Yusuf Ali, because of his opinion that Jannat is not an actual material place, says that Jannat is independent of place as well. This too is a claim unsubstantiated by Islamic facts. It is a claim which cannot be proved on the basis of the Shariah of Islam. The Quran and the Ahadith are replete with references speaking of the material attributes and qualities of Jannat. Mankind is not a purely spiritual creation and there exists no law which states that the spiritual progress and elevation of man hinge on the

separation of the material from the spiritual or celestial. On the contrary man's spiritual progress is dependent upon his material body. Man attains the higher planes of spiritual progress by denying the dictates of his material body - his desires of the flesh - and not by separating his spiritual self (soul) from his material self (body). Whoever claims that material states do not exist in realms where virtue will reign must produce Islamic proof to substantiate his claim. Matters of the Aakhirat cannot be expounded on the basis of the imperfect intelligence and opinions of individuals. If the Quran says that Jannat is a material state, no man has the right to opine to the contrary on the basis of his opinion.

In this world of gross materialism subjugated by lowly desire the spiritual self (soul) is controlled by the material (self). It is only by means of constant self-denial that the process is reversed here on this material world. But, in the Hereafter the world of "gross" spiritualism will hold sway over the material self. The material will be divorced from the lowly beastly or animal qualities which dominated it here in this lowly world. If the spirit (soul) can co-exist with the material in this material world, why can't the material exist with the spiritual in the Hereafter dominated by spirituality? It must be clearly understood that material is not the antithesis of spiritual. The one does not negate the other. Rather the one dominates the other. If they were self-negating then the co-existence of body and soul (material and spiritual) would not have been a possibility. But we do concede that on earth body and soul occupy a material realm, so there is no reason to believe that this is not possible in the Hereafter.

Yusuf Ali alleges that the material description of Jannat given by the Quran and by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam is merely allegorical and symbolical. He claims that the Jannat described and promised to us by Allah Ta'ala is not a real concrete Jannat as taught to us by the Quran and by our Nabi Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam and as has been accepted by the Sahaba and the great Fuqaha and Muhadditheen throughout the history of Islam. Any view or opinion which clashes with the accepted view of Islam is rejected by Allah Ta'ala, hence He says in the Holy Quran:

"Verily, those who dispute in the Laws of Allah, after these have been accepted, their disputation is rejected by Allah. And, for them is a dreadful chastisement."

The material concept of Heaven is a belief which has already been accepted by the Sahaba and the Ummah of our Nabi Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. Therefore, whosoever disputes this authoritative belief of Islam stands rejected by Allah Ta'ala in terms of the verse of the Quran quoted above.

Yusuf Ali's conception of Heaven is in direct contradiction to the accepted belief of Islam. Hence, it is of absolute importance to present his claim on a powerful basis. Yet, in defence of his views, Yusuf Ali has nothing but his own opinion to support him. He has not and he could not produce a single aayat or Hadith to substantiate his view of a spiritual Heaven which will come into existence in the future.

ISLAMIC BELIEF OF JANNAT AND JAHANNAM

Among the essential Beliefs of Islam is the Belief in Paradise and Hell. According to Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam Jannat (Paradise) and Jahannam (Hell) are two existing physical or material abodes. These abodes of Jannat and Jahannam have been created by Allah Ta'ala prior to the advent of man.

The Shariah teaches that these two abodes are physical, material realities, and not abstract conceptions as propounded by the Greek philosophers. This view of 'kufr' held by the Greek philosophers, Aristotle, Socrates, etc., has been taken up over the centuries by many Muslims. Thus we find men like Ibn Sina (Avicenna), Farabi, Raazhes, etc. expounding the same doctrine of kufr viz., that Paradise and Hell

are not material realities as propounded by the Ambiyaa, but are "spiritual" states. This abstract theory of Kufr with regard to the belief in Jannat and Jahannam is even today being enunciated by some so called Muslim intelligentsia. Muslim lecturers at universities in our midst are utilizing their entrenched positions to indoctrinate very subtly the Muslim youth with such theories of kufr. Muslim students studying at universities should be careful and wary of the Neo-platonic theories of kufr which are being disseminated by some university-lecturers under the guise of "Islamic studies."

Avicenna's (Ibne Sina) conception of paradise and hell.

Ibne Sina whilst conveying the impression th..t he is a man believing in the Islamic Belief of Jannat and Jahannam in a manner accepted and believed by the general body of Muslims, argues the superiority of the philosopher's conception of heaven and hell. Whilst admitting the validity of physical pleasure and pain of the Life Hereafter, he lays greater stress on the abstract theory of heaven and hell -the conception of the Greek philosophers that Jannat and Jahannam are mere spiritual states or "experiences". According to this theory of kufr expounded by Avicenna, the souls of men at the time of death could be classified into four categories.

1. Those souls who have become aware while still in the material body, of that spiritual perfection which is the object of its love, but have not attained it, though still yearning after it. This soul then is affected by pain at the loss of its cherished object. This then is the misery and the torment far exceeding the bodily pain and physical anguish of burning and freezing.
2. If, however, the intellectual faculty has achieved a high degree of perfection in the soul, then the latter is able to realise that full "spiritual" perfection which lies within the purview of its power. But the pleasure enjoyed by this soul at that moment is not of the sensual kind. This then, according to Avicenna, is the destiny of the soul which has become conscious in the physical body of the nature of intellectual perfection.
3. "The Foolish Souls" which have not acquired a yearning for perfection, yet leave the physical body without having acquired any vicious or evil bodily disposition. These "Foolish Souls" pass to the wide Mercy of God and attain a kind of ease.

4. If, however, these souls have acquired some evil disposition, and have no other condition but this vicious propensity, then they (the souls) will continue to yearn for the physical body which is regarded by them (the vicious souls) as an absolute necessity. The souls in this category are acutely tormented by the loss of the physical body and its requirements without being able to attain the object of their desire (which is subsistence in the physical body).

Avicenna interprets the Islamic concept of Jahannam and Jannat propounded by the Ambiyaa as a "possibility." In other words he holds the view that the Shariah-view of Jannat and Jahannam (i.e. the material existence of these two abodes) may also be true to a certain extent regarding physical pleasure and pain. However, while conceding this possibility he interprets away the Islamic Jannat and Jahannam as "states" (not real physical places) of "physical" pleasure and pain engineered by the imagination of man, which in turn is effected by some celestial body. Thus he says that pure souls whilst still in the physical body having fixed their gaze firmly on such beliefs (physical Paradise and Hell), after leaving the body may actually experience those "states" of physical pain and pleasure. This is so, he argues, since these souls (i.e. the Ambiyaa and the general body of Muslims) lack the force to draw them upwards to complete perfection which in turn brings about supreme spiritual happiness. The baser souls (those who subscribe to the Islaamic Doctrines of Reality) experience such low and baser sorts of celestial happiness while the "blessed" souls (of the Greek philosophers and those "Muslim" philosophers who subscribe to these theories of kufr), being perfect, are united to the ESSENCE of Allah. This is Avicenna's theory - Na-uzubillah min thaalik.

In his treatise, *"Ar-Risaalatul Azhaawiya fi amril Ma'aad."* Avicenna argues that it would have been an excercise in futility if the Ambiyaa preached the doctrine of a spiritual resurrection to the masses since they are able to conceive only of physical pleasure and pain. He opposes the Islam ic Doctrine of the physical resurrection of the body and the soul. After death it is only the soul which will experience either everlasting pain or everlasting pleasure. The sum total of this Neo-Platonic doctrine of the Hereafter is that happiness in the world to come, when the soul has

been stripped of the physical body and of physical impressions, is the intellectual contemplation of the Essence of God, and misery in the Hereafter is the opposite of that.

This doctrine of Avicenna is essentially a theory of disbelief in the Truth preached by all the Ambiyaa (alayhimus salaam). Islam rejects this theory as baseless and false. There is no sanction in the Qur'an or the Hadith for this abstract theory which is nothing but a figment of the imagination of men who suffered from oblique "knowledge", men who have been misled by shaitaan, men who laboured under the satanic notion that the Deen was revealed for the ignorant masses, they themselves by virtue of their "special intelligence" being exempted from the ambit of the Shariah.

IMAAM AL-GHAZALI'S REFUTATION OF AVICENNA'S CONCEPTION OF KUFR.

Imaam Al-Ghazaali (Rahmatullah Alayhi) categorically refutes the view propounded by Ibn Sina as being in direct conflict with the Beliefs of Islam. He rejects the philosopher's denial of the physical resurrection of the body and the soul; their denial of the existence of a physical Paradise and Hell as well as their assertion that the Islamic description of these entities are mere parables coined for the common people and designed to actually connote a spiritual reward and retribution. Imaam Ghazaali (Rahmatullah Alayhi) takes his stand on the basis of Wahi (Revelation) and rejects Avicenna's reliance on reason. He asks :

"Why should the two sorts of happiness and misery not be combined - the spiritual and the bodily?"

In answer to the philosophers view that the description of the Life Hereafter occurring in the Holy Qur'an is to be taken as parables for the rank and file of mankind, in the same way as the anthropomorphic passages relating to Allah Ta'ala, Imaam Ghazaali (Rahmatullah Alayhi) claims that this argument is fallacious. It fails for the elementary reason that the parallel drawn is not a true parallel. In accordance with Arab usage of the metaphor the anthropomorphic passages in the Holy Qur'an can be interpreted metaphorically and esoterically whereas the descriptions of Paradise and Hell transcend the limit of legitimate

allegorisation. To regard them (Paradise and Hell) as mere symbols is to suggest that Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) and all the Ambiyaa (alayhimus salaam) deliberately falsified the Truth for the benefit of mankind. The lofty office of Nubuwwat (Prophethood) is far too sacred to resort to such falsification of the Truth. The clinching proof in this matter is the irrefutable fact that Allah Azza wa Jal is Almighty and All-Powerful, hence it lies clearly within His Power to effect a physical resurrection wherein there will be the reunification of the body and the soul to receive retribution - pleasure and pain - in physical abodes.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), the Sahaabah and the entire body of the Ahle Sunnah wal Jamaa' throughout the history of Islam has held the firm belief that Jannat and Jahannam are physical abodes which have already been created. It is therefore, a belief of kufr to entertain the Neo-Platonic theory of Avicenna. Even today some modernist Muslims operating from a variety of platforms - universities, the media, discussion groups, etc. - are disseminating this belief of kufr among the Muslim youth. Yet, these so-called "intelligentsia" lack the courage to declare their beliefs. Since the majority of these modernist kufr - propounders are men deficient in faith, morals and good actions, they operate under cover of dishonesty and very cunningly attempt to ensnare unwary Muslims - especially among the youth - into their beliefs of eternal perdition. Muslim students who study under such "professors" have to be doubly on their guard and not permit any contamination of their Imaan by acceptance of theories of kufr cunningly expounded by their lecturers.

Those who propagate theories of kufr among Muslims must know that Allah Ta'ala will most certainly expose them. They will be disgraced here on earth in the community of Muslims - as well as in the Aakhirah.

NABI ISAA (ALAYHIS SALAAM)

COMMENTING on the Quranic verses which clearly state that Nabi Isaa alayhis salaam was raised unto Allah Ta'ala, Yusuf Ali says:

"The end of the life of Jesus on earth is as much involved in mystery as his birth...

There is a difference of opinion as to the exact interpretation of this verse (i.e. the verse in which Allah Ta'ala says that Isaa alayhis salaam was not killed, but raised up)...

One school holds that Jesus did not die the usual human death, but still lives in the body in heaven; another holds that he did die but not when he was supposed to be crucified, and that his being "raised up" unto God means that instead of being disgraced as a malefactor, as the Jews intended, he was on the contrary honoured by God as His Apostle."

The two schools of thought Yusuf Ali speaks of with regard to Isaa alayhis salaam are in fact non-existent in Islam. regarding the physical ascension and present life of Isaa alayhis salaam there is no difference whatsoever in Islam. The teachings of Islam are categoric and unambiguous in this regard. The Holy Quran is explicit in the fact that Isaa alayhis salaam was not crucified nor was he killed, but was raised up unto Allah Ta'ala. The Holy Quran and the statements and explanations of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam leave no doubt whatsoever that Isaa alayhis salaam is living in the body in the heaven.

The other school mentioned by Yusuf Ali represents the beliefs of the Qadianis who are not Muslims. Yusuf Ali thus confuses the unwary in introducing Qadiani beliefs into his "commentary" of the Holy Quran. The Islamic beliefs regarding Isaa alayhis salaam as preached by the Quran and Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam are:

1. Isaa alayhis salaam was born without the agency of a human father.
2. Isaa alayhis salaam was not crucified nor did he die later.
3. Isaa alayhis salaam was raised up bodily to heaven by Allah Ta'ala.

4. Isaa alayhis salaam lives to this day in the Fourth Heaven.
5. Isaa alayhis salaam will appear on earth later, but during the time of İmam Mahdi. His task will be to slay Dajjaal.
6. Isaa alayhis salaam will die a physical death and be buried alongside Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam.

Copious evidence in the form of Quranic verses, Ahadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam teachings of the Sahaba (Radiallahu Anhu) and opinions of the great learned men of Islaam establish beyond the slightest shred of doubt that Isaa alayhis salaam is alive and will make a second appearance on earth to die a physical death.

The statement of Yusuf Ali, viz., "The end of the life of Jesus on earth is as much involved in mystery as his birth...", is highly inconsistent with the unambiguity of the teachings of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. According to Islam there is no mystery woven around Isaa alayhis salaam's birth or departure from earth. Islam has clearly explained that Isaa alayhis salaam's birth was without the agency of both human father and mother. Similarly, Isaa alayhis salaam's departure from earth has been clearly explained by Islam, hence there is no mystery. The mystery or supposed mystery exists for non-believers and those Muslims who have fallen victims to fanciful interpretation of Quranic verses to suit their own fancies. Allah Ta'ala says about those who dispute regarding Isaa alayhis salaam:

"Verily, those who differ about it (the question of Isaa alayhis salaam's crucifixion and death) are in doubt. They have no knowledge, but they follow only conjecture."

Islam has clarified all doubts and "mysteries" which the Christians had woven around Isaa alayhis salaam. Therefore, it does not behove Muslims to accept "commentaries" like that of Yusuf Ali and lapse into confusion and doubt as was the case with the Christians.

YUSUF ALI PROPAGATES THE DEATH OF ISAA (ALAYHIS SALAAM)

VERSE 33, Surah Maryam, pertaining to Isaa (alayhis salaam) reads:

"And, peace upon me the day I was born, the day I shall die, and the day I shall be raised up to life."

Yusuf Ali, commenting on this verse states in his commentary of the Quraan:

"Christ was not crucified. But those who believe that he never died should ponder over this verse."

In this comment, Yusuf Ali has clarified his personal belief regarding Isaa alayhis salaam i.e. Isaa alayhis salaam is not alive, but has died already. This then is Yusuf Ali's belief. The established belief of Islam - the belief of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam - the belief of the Sahaaba, the belief of the entire Ahle-Sunnah wal Jama'ah is that Nabi Isaa alayhis salaam never died. Islaam teaches that Nabi Isaa alayhis salaam was raised bodily, while alive, to heaven. He shall remain there until his second advent just before Qiyaamah when he will descend, live among the people, marry, have children, die and be buried alongside Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. Hadhrat Ibnul Jauzi Rahmatullah Alayh narrates in his Kitaab, Al-Wafaa:

"Abdullah Ibn Umar narrates that Rasulullah Sallalahu Alayhi Wasallam said: Isaa Ibn Maryam will descend to earth. He will marry, have children, and he will live (on earth) for forty five years. He will then die and be buried with me in my grave. Thus Isaa Ibn Maryam and I will rise up (on the Day of Qiyaamah) from one grave between Abu Bakr and Umar."

In another Hadith stated by Baghawi Rahmatullah Alayh it is narrated that Abu Hurairah Radiallahu Anhu said that Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam said:

"...He (Isaa alayhis salaam) will stay on earth for forty years, then die. Muslims will perform the prayer (Janaazah Salaat) on him (Isaa alayhis salaam)."

(Tafseerul Mazhari)

The belief entertained by Yusuf Ali is contrary to the belief taught by Rasulullah (sallallaahu alayhi wasallam).

JINN:
What are they?

Verse V of Surah An'aam reads:
"They (human beings) make unto Allah the Jinns as partners, yet Allah created them (the Jinns)."

Commenting on the term, "Jinn" in this verse, Yusuf Ali observes:-
"Jinn: who are they...? I do not wish to be dogmatic, but I think from a collation and study of the Quranic passages, that the meaning is simply a 'spirit' or an invisible hidden force."

Note Yusuf Ali's statement: "but I think..." It is clear that he is merely trading his personal opinion of the meaning of Jinn. His description or interpretation of Jinn is not the version of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, which has been authentically transmitted to the Ummah by the Companions of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, the Muhadditheen and the great Mufassireen of the Holy Quran. Yusuf Ali's 'collation and study of the Quranic passages' which has led him to propound his fanciful and un-Islamic view, amounts to a rejection of the authoritative and accepted Shar'ee (Islamic) version of the term, Jinn -of the meaning or the Islamic meaning of Jinn. And, about those who dispute and argue and formulate opinion contrary to the accepted Islamic opinions, the Quran declares:

"Verily, those who argue in the verses of Allah, after these (the verses) have been accepted, their argument is baseless. For them is a painful chastisement."

In verses 14 and 15 of Surah Ar-Rahmaan, the Quran states:

"He created man from brittle clay like pottery. And, He created jinn from fire free of smoke."

In these verses, Allah Ta'ala mentions the basic physical matter or material which constitutes the fundamental component parts in the physical bodies of the two species of creation, viz., man and Jinn. Despite the clarity of the verse, Yusuf Ali comments adversely on it so as to forge confirmation for his fanciful theory of Jinn. He says:

"They (the Jinn) are spirits, and therefore subtle like a flame of fire. Their being free from smoke implies that they are free from grossness, for smile is the grosser accompaniment of fire. If we take them to typifying the hidden forces and capacities in man, created by God, both their potency and their value would be acknowledged."

Yusuf Ali's "typification" of the real and physical species of jinn as "spirits, hidden forces and capacities in man" is pure conjecture. His interpretation is unfounded, having no Islaamic basis for substantiation. He has not been able to adduce or produce any Quranic or other Islamic evidence (Ahadith and opinions of Islamic authorities) in support of his view. There exists no plausible argument or justification for diverting from the authoritative explanation of the term, Jinn, tendered by the Shariah and indulging in opinions which are nothing but flights of fancy. The claim that Jinn typifies some "hidden force and capacities in man" is just as vulnerable to criticism and negation like to claim that the term, "Insaan" or man typifies some force and capacity in Jinn. Since, according to the Qur'an and Ahadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam Jinn is a particular species of material form of creation, the very same logic and trend of argument which applied to obtain an interpretation of Jinn will apply to the species of man as well. However, the

ludicrousness of such application of logic is self-evident, hence Yusuf Ali was compelled to restrict his fanciful form of reasoning to the obtainal of only an interpretation of Jinn.

The capability of invisibility which is attributive to Jinn is not grounds for the negation of the existence of the species of Jinn - the Jinn described by the Shariah - because visibility to the human eye is not a requisite for the existence of material or matter.

Verses 26 and 27 of Surah Al-Hijr read:
"And, verily We created man from brittle and decayed clay moulded in shape. And, We created Jinn before (creating Adam) from scorching wind (fire)."

In these verses as well as several other verses of the Holy Quran, Allah Ta'ala mentions in one breath the creation of both species, viz., man and Jinn, yet Yusuf Ali seeks to deny the existence of the physical Jinn - the species of Jinn composed of matter - by asserting that "Jinn" is a typification of "hidden forces", "invisible forces" and "capacities in man". In exposing the Quranic verses to the vagaries of wildly abstract interpretation, Yusuf Ali is in fact denying the Quranic claim that the Jinn is an intelligent species of creation which has been commanded by the Quran to submit to the Shariah of Islam - not any abstract concept of Shariah - but the concrete Shariah brought by Muhammad Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam to the material species of man and Jinn. The Quran states in Sura Thaariyaat:

"And, I (Allah) have not created Jinn and man, but that they worship (obey) Me."

The prime purpose of the creation of man and Jinn is stated with great clarity and emphasis in this verse. Denial of the physical presence of Jinn amounts to a denial of this verse as well. Both man and Jinn, according to Islam are intelligent species of creation consisting of physical matter, who have been created for submission to the Command of Allah Ta'ala. In Surah An'aam it is said that on the Day of Qiyamah Allah will address Jinn and man thus:

"O Assembly of Jinn and man! Did not Prophets from among you come explaining to you My Laws and warning you of the Meeting of this Day of yours?"

If "Jinn" was a mere typification of the "hidden forces and capacities in man", the verse insofar as its address to the Jinn is concerned, will be meaningless since man and Jinn in Yusuf Ali's opinion are not two different entities. Jinn is merely some abstract "capacity" in man, according to Yusuf Ali.

The many verses in Surah Jinn are explicit and unambiguous in upholding the view of Jinn advanced by all authorities of Islam since the very time of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. Even a cursory glance at the verses of Sura Jinn will establish that Jinn does not typify any "hidden capacity in man, but refers to a creation distinct and apart from man - a species governed by the restrictions, prohibitions, commands, exhortations, beliefs and practices of the Shariah of Islam as expounded to them by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. The relevant aayats are:

"Behold, We turned towards thee (O Muhammad!) a company of Jinns (quietly) listening to the Quran; when they stood in the presence thereof, they said: 'Listen in silence. When the (reading) was finished, they (the Jinns) returned to their people, to warn (them of their sins).' They said: 'O our people! We have heard a book revealed after Musaa, confirming what came before it: it guides men to the Truth and to a Straight Path.' "

(Surah Ahkaaf, Verses 29, 30, 31)

"Say: It has been revealed to me (Muhammad -Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) that a company of Jinns listened (to the Quran). They said: 'We have really heard a wonderful Recital.
...And, verily, we think that never should man or Jinn utter against Allah a lie.
...True, there were persons among mankind who took refuge with 'persons' among the Jinns. But they (Jinns) increased them (humans) in folly. And, verily, among us (Jinns) are pious ones and among us are wrongdoers (as well).' "

(Surah Jinn)

The abovementioned Quranic verses are a discussion which took place among the Jinns when first they heard the Holy Quran being recited. Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam did not know that a group of Jinn was listening in awe and reverence to the Quran. However, this information was revealed to Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam as it stated in the Quran.

Despite his confused conception of Jinn, Yusuf Ali is again constrained to concede the Islamic reality of Jinn, hence in his commentary of the verses of Surah Jinn he observes:

"The Jinns had evidently heard of previous revelations, that of Moses, and the error of Trinitarian Christianity. The people from whom they (the Jinns) come have all sorts of good and bad persons, but they (Jinns) are determined to preach the Good Message of Unity which they have heard and believed in."

In one place in his commentary, Yusuf Ali by the clarity of the Quranic text is forced to concede that the Jinn are an "Unfamiliar class of beings" and in another, while commenting on certain verses of Surah Jinn, he compounds his confusion and uncertainty by a further attempt to put across his un-Islamic notion and says:

"We may take these (i.e. Jinns) to be spirits ordinarily unseen, or people who were strangers in Arabia."
Yusuf Ali has propounded his baseless and confused opinion despite the incontrovertible fact that his abstract conception of Jinn is in diametric contradiction to the unadulterated version furnished by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam and his noble Sahaba (Radiallahu Anhum).

Elsewhere too, in his commentary, Yusuf Ali is compelled by the clear text of the Quran to acknowledge, albeit a muffled acknowledgement, the Quranic conception of Jinn. Says the Quran:

"And before Sulaiman were marshalled his hosts of Jinns and men and birds, and they were all kept in order and ranks.

Said Ifrit of the Jinns: 'I will bring it (the throne) to thee before thou rise from thy Council!"
(Surah Namal)
Commenting, Yusuf Ali states:
"Ifrit: a large powerful Jinn, reputed to be wicked and crafty."

Who can deny the existence of Iblees? And, who can deny that Iblees is not a mere "capacity in man"? And, who can deny the irrefutable fact that Iblees is a Jinn? Allah Ta'ala states in Surah Kahaf:

"And, when We said: Prostrate unto Adam, the Malaaikah prostrated, but Iblees. He (Iblees) was of the Jinns, hence he disobeyed the Command of his Creator."

In one of the greatest and highly authoritative Books of Tafseerul Quran, Tafseer Ibn Kathir, it is said in the tafseer of the verses:

"And, We created man from decayed mud.
And, We created Jinn before (creating man) of a scorching fire."

"Hazrat Ibn Abbaas (Radiallahu Anhu) said that the Fire from which Jinn has been created is of a very excellent quality (pure and unadulterated)' In the authentic Ahadith it is narrated that the Angels were created from Noor, Jinn from fire and Adam from the material just mentioned (in the verse, viz., decayed mud.)"

And, commenting on the verses of Surah Jinn, the authoritative author of Tafseer Ibn Kathir, Hazrat Allamah Ibn Kathir (Rahmatullah Alayh) observes:

"The Jinn describing the differences (of beliefs) prevailing among them said: Among us are good as well as bad. We followed various Paths. Hazrat A'mash R.A. narrated: 'One Jinn frequented us. Once I said to him: Which food do you prefer best? He replied: Rice, I presented some rice to him and observed the morsels of rice rising (from the plate), but the eater was not visible. I asked him: Do you (the Jinn) have similar emotions and desires like us (humans). He replied: Yes, we do have."

Hafiz Abul Hajjaaj Muzni R.A. adds that the Sanad (Chain of Narrators) of this hadith (of A'mash) is authentic.

The following description of Jinn is recorded in Tafseerul Mazhari in the tafseer of the verses of Surah Jinn:

"Jinn are beings with physical bodies and souls similar to animals; they are intelligent like human beings; they are hidden from the sight of man, hence have been named 'Jinn'; they have been created from fire like Adam was created from soil, for verily, Allah Ta'ala says:

"We have created Jinn before (creating man) from a blazing fire.'

The species of Jinn consists of male and female; they reproduce (like humans do). It is evident that the shayaateen are of the species Jinn. On the other hand the Malaaikah (angels) have no male and female. The existence of the Jinn and Malaaikah is proved by the Shariah, but the philosophers deny their existence.

...The Ahadith indicate that the deputations of the Jinn (visiting Rasulullah - Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) met the Holy Messenger of Allah six times. This fact further proves that Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam was sent as the Rasool to both Jinn and mankind."
(Tafseerul Mazhari)

Besides the aforementioned proofs there exists a large number of Quranic verses, Ahadith and authoritative opinions and explanations regarding the existence of the physical species of Jinn. We conclude this article with some Quranic verses pertaining to the species Jinn.

"And, verily, We have created numerous among Jinn and man to be fuel for Jahannam."
(Surah A'raaf)
(On the Day of Qiyamah, Allah Ta'ala will say:) "Enter into the Fire with those groups of Jinn and man who have already entered before you."
(Surah A'raaf)

"And, on the Day (of Resurrection) when We shall gather them and (We shall say):
O Assembly of Jinn! You have played a great role in leading astray mankind. The friends of Jinn among mankind will say: O our Creator! We derived mutual gain from one another, but now our appointed time which You had fixed has arrived..."
(Surah An'aam)

MUSAAFIR IN THE SHARIAH

O Believers: Fasting has been ordained for you like it was ordained for those before you so that you may attain piety. A fixed number of days (has been prescribed). Whoever is ill or on a journey (may omit fasting) and fast a like number of days (at another time)."

(Surah Baqarah)

In these verses of the Holy Quran Allah Ta'ala grants the Musaafir or the traveller the choice of fasting or not fasting during the month of Ramadhaan. If the Musaafir chooses to omit fasting, he is within his Islamic rights and no one can blame him or reprimand him for availing himself of the Divine Concession. Should he make use of the Quranic concession of "Not fasting while on the journey", he will have to make good the missed number of days by fasting at another time.

Commenting on this Quranic concession to the Musaafir, Yusuf Ali states in his 'commentary' of the Holy Quran:

"Illness and journey must not be interpreted in an elastic sense; they must be such as to cause real pain or suffering if the fast were observed. For journies, a minimum standard of three marches is prescribed by some Commentators; others make it more precise by naming a distance of 16 farsakhs equivalent to 48 miles. A journey of 8 or 9 miles on foot is more tiring than a similar one by bullock-cart. There are various degrees

of fatigue in riding a given distance on horseback or by camel in a comfortable train, or by motor car or by steamer, aeroplane or airship. In my opinion the standard must depend on the means of locomotion and on the relative resources of the traveller. It is better to determine it in each case according to circumstances."

Yusuf Ali brings into play his personal opinion to fetter the Quranic concession with self-thought factors. Thus according to him the Quranic concession granted to the traveller should be conditioned with the following factors:

1. The journey must be one which causes suffering and fatigue.
2. Means of locomotion.
3. Resources of the traveller.
4. Every individual to decide his/her case according to circumstances.

Attaching these factors to the Quranic concession, Yusuf Ali compounds the following conclusion.

"In my opinion the standard must depend on the means of locomotion and on the relative resources of the traveller. It is better to determine it in each case according to circumstances."

In battering out his standard for concession (to the Musaafir) - which upon his own admission is basically "my opinion" - Yusuf Ali clashes sharply with the Shariah in its (the Shariah's) definition of "Safar" (Journey) and "Musaafir" (Traveller) and in its unconditional concession granted to the Musaafir. In Yusuf Ali's opinion the "journey" which entitles one to the Quranic concessions relative to certain obligations has a wide meaning which is open to individual interpretation and subject to prevailing circumstances. However, the Authority of the Sunnah and the Shariah rejects this opinion of Yusuf Ali. The Shariah defines the journey which qualifies one for concessions granted by the Quran. The Shariah is very precise in its definition of the Musaafir - when one becomes a "Musaafir" in the technical language of Islam. The Shariah defines the "Musaafir" Thus:

"He who leaves his place of residence (hometown) intending to undertake a journey of three days and three nights is a Musaafir."

(DURRE MUKHTAAR)

"The journey which brings about a change in the Ahkaam (Laws) is one in which the intention is made to travel (a distance which is covered in) three days and three nights."

(HIDAAYAH)

"The distance by which the Ahkaam change is a journey of three days and three nights."

(TABYEEN)

"THIS IS THE AUTHENTIC AND CORRECT VIEW."

(Jawaaharul Akhlaati)

Now what is the meaning of "a journey of three days and three nights."

Again the Shariah is very precise in its definition and its determination. The Shariah rules:

"And, the accepted (means of locomotion) is normal walking."

(AS-SIRAAJIYAH)

"And, it (the standard of locomotion in determining the distance for the Musaafir) is the walk of the camel or walking by foot (i.e. walk of man)."

(TABYEEN)

"...the distance covered in three days and three nights (is determined) by the walk of the camel or the walk of man."

(HIDAAYAH)

From the above quotations it is clear that according to the Shariah the standard of locomotion for determining the distance (which in fact is the standard for determining if one qualifies as a Musaafir) journied in three days and three night is the normal stride of the camel or the normal walk by man. The argument that the standard of locomotion accepted by the

Shariah to calculate the distance travelled in seventy two hours was fixed by the Fuqahaa (Jurists of Islam) to be the walking of man or camel because these were the then prevalent means of transport and locomotion (modern means of transport being non-existent), carries no substance and has to be discounted as baseless because, besides the camel and the foot, other means of transport too existed during the time of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam. For example, the horse, the mule, the boat existed. However, despite the horse being a very popular means of transport and journeying, the Shariah did not take into consideration this animal as a standard for locomotion for determining the distance covered in three days and three nights. In the authoritative work on Islamic Jurisprudence, AL JAUHARATUN NIYARAH, it is stated:

"And, if the distance covered on foot or by camel in three days and three nights be accomplished in two days or less on horseback, Qasr Salaat shall yet have to be performed." (In other words the traveller remains a Shar-ee Musaafir even if the seventy two-hour journey is completed in less than that time).

This then proves conclusively that the standard for the Musaafir is not "means of locomotion" or "relative resources of the traveller" as is the opinion of Yusuf Ali, but the standard in terms of the Shariah is DISTANCE COVERED IN THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS BY NORMAL WALK OR NORMAL CAMEL STRIDE. The Directive of the Quran and the Sunnah as handed to the Ummat by the Fuqahaa is quite clear. No one has the authority to fetter the general Commands of the Shariah with conditions and factors which are the products of individual opinion.

This Quranic Directive is repeated very clearly in the Books of Fiqah and in the Ahadith Books. In Sharhun Niqaayah the traveller in terms of the Shariah is defined thus:

"The traveller according to the Shariah, upon whom it is incumbent to perform Qasr Salaat, and for whom it is lawful to make Fitr (i.e. not to fast)... is one who leaves the town (his place of residence) with the intention of undertaking a journey of three days and three nights."

What is this distance? The distance covered on foot or by camel in seventy two hours has been fixed by the Authorities of Islam - Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, the Sahabas and the Fuqahaa - to be between 45 and 48 miles. The official Hanafi view being 48 miles. These distances (viz. 45, 46 or 48 miles) are based on an authentic Hadith. Because there existed different versions as to the distance of a particular town from Madinah Munawwarah, we find the different distances stated by the Fuqahaa, some opining 45 miles, others 46 and others again 48 miles. Nevertheless they all are agreed on this score that the standard for the Musaafir is "the distance covered by foot or by camel in seventy two hours." The relative Hadith upon which this Islamic Standard is based is:

"Hazrat Mujaahid (Radiallahu Anhu) said: I asked Ibn Umar (Radiallahu Anhu) (who was a top-ranking Sahabi) regarding the minimum standard for a journey (i.e. whic' will qualify one to be a Musaafir).
Ibn Umar (Radiallahu Anhu) said: Do you know (the town of) Saweeda?
I (Mujaahid) said: Yes. I have heard of it.
Ibn Umar (Radiallahu Anhu) said: Whenever we went there (to Saweeda) we performed Qasr Salaat. And, it is a place which is situated forty six miles from Madinah."

(SHARHUN NIQAAYAH)

According to another version the town of Saweeda is situated at a distance of 48 miles from Madinah Munawwarah. This version is also reported in Sharhun Niqaayah.

According to Yusuf Ali, real suffering and fatigue are essential conditions for the qualification of Musaafir. If these conditions are absent then in his opinion the Musaafir cannot avail of the Quranic concession even though the Shariah describes him (the traveller) as a "Musaafir" in its technical sense: viz., one who sets out from home with the intention of journeying forty eight miles or more. The Sahaba (Radhiallahu Anhum) of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam and the great and eminent Fuqahaa of Islam state that the Standard in this regard is MILES. It is stated in Shurhun Niqaayah:

"The majority of the Mashaa-ikh (Authorities of Islam) determine the journey (i.e. the seventy two hour journey) in terms of MILES."

Nowhere does the Shariah consider fatigue or suffering as factors essential for one to be described as Shar-ee Musaafir (a traveller in terms of the Shariah). If fatigue was a consideration for concession then there are many arduous tasks and jobs which cause fatigue right at home and, in terms of Yusuf Ali's logic this fatigue effected by strenuous work or physical exercise would be sufficient cause to invoke the Quranic concession of omitting to fast during the month of Ramadhaan. If fatigue had to be a consideration for concession then a farmer working all day long in the sun ploughing his fields could justifiably claim concession of exemption from fasting on the grounds of fatigue. And, so could all those who indulge in hard, physical and strenuous work causing real fatigue. But the Shariah does not entertain the consideration of fatigue. Those who suffer fatigue at home are not permitted to invoke the Quranic concession of postponing the fasts for a later date, for the Holy Quran very precisely states that the concession is applicable to ONLY illness and journey.

The Holy Quran grants the concession on the grounds of SAFAR (journey), but Yusuf Ali says that the concession is on the grounds of FATIGUE. This opinion of Yusuf Ali can never be substantiated on the basis of the Shariah. If fatigue was the basis of concession then the Holy Quran would undoubtedly have stated so. But the Quran says SAFAR and the Arabic definition of Safar is:

"Safar (or journey) literally means 'to traverse distance' "

(Sharhun Niqaayah)

And, that is precisely what the Sahaba and the Fuqaha say. They claim that the standard for the Musaafir is "to traverse the distance of forty eight miles with the intention of travelling", the two additional factors of 48 miles and intention being stipulated by Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam - by the Shariah and not extracted from whimsical opinion un-associated with the Shariah. Yusuf Ali is guilty of tampering with the Divine Law of Allah by substituting one standard with another. Yusuf Ali in his blunder of substituting standards has been the victim of un-

bridled reasoning. Qiyaas or the Analogical Reasoning of the Authorities of Islam for its validity has several conditions. And, one of these conditions for the validity of Reasoning is that the Qiyaas in no way should be contradictory to any Command of Allah. If the Reasoning clashes with an injunction of the Shariah, such reasoning will stand condemned and rejected. Yusuf Ali's reasoning clashes with the Shariah in that it substitutes the Quranic standard of "Safar" with his own standard of "fatigue", hence his opinion stands condemned and rejected (MARDOOD) in the eyes of the Shariah. May Allah Ta'ala save us all from such unbridled reasoning which casts one off from Siraatul Mustaqeem - far, far off.

ACCORDING to Imam Abu Hanifa (Rahmatullah Alayh) the correct view (for one to qualify as a Shar-ee Musaafir) is the standard of distance covered in three days on land even though speed is increased and this standard distance (covered in three days and three nights on foot or by camel) is completed in two days or less.

(AL UYOON)

APOLOGETIC CONFUSION

THE following article appearing in the Delhi Paper, 'Radiance' is a reflection of the apologetic confusion prevailing in the minds of Westernized Muslims.

SCIENTIFIC RELIGION: AN EXAMPLE

Faezul Islam Fauzi Hashmi, Aligarh

ONE day a non-Muslim friend of mine raised an objection criticising the contents of the Surah of the Quran mentioned below and argued that they cannot be justified in the light of modern science. I tried to convince him and fortunately met with success. It may be useful for others also.

The Surah under discussion was Alfeel (The Elephant, 105) in which Almighty Allah warns the non-believers of the dreadful consequences of their baneful and sinister designs and establishes the fact that He had taken upon Himself the responsibility to protect Khana-e-Kaba.

BACKGROUND: Abraha, the Christian ruler of Yemen, marched with a large army along with a large number of elephants to demolish Khana-e-Kaba so that Christianity may easily be preached among the Arabs.

Quraish, the chief tribe of Mecca, were no match for the Christian invaders so they left the city in order to avoid confrontation. Before they fled Abdul Muttalib, the chief of Quraish, prayed inside Khana-e-Kaba. "No doubt we are leaving the city but as every one protects his home, in the same way, Lord, protect Thy home from Thy enemies."

When the king reached his destination, Allah sent an army of small birds which dropped small pieces of stones upon the army and as a result the whole army met its doom. The Surah says:
"Hast thou not seen how thy Lord dealt with the owners of the elephants?

Did He not bring their stratagem to naught.
And send against them swarms of flying creatures,
Which pelted them with stones of baked clay.
And made them like green crops devoured (by cattle)?"

SCIENTIFIC EXPLANATION:
The statement may appear a fable to a layman but in fact it has sound scientific footing. We all know that the earth on which we live attracts every object towards its surface with a certain force, called the force of gravity. This force produces a uniform acceleration i.e. a uniform increase in the speed of all bodies allowed to fall freely on earth and we term this as acceleration due to gravity.

The acceleration due to gravity is about 9.8 metres per sec. or 10 metres per sec. approximately which means that if a body is allowed to fall freely on the surface of the earth then its velocity or in layman's tongue the speed increases by ten metres per second after each second. In one second it becomes 10 metres per sec., in three seconds it becomes 20 metres per sec. and so on and so forth.

If the birds were flying at such a height that the stones took, say, about two minutes or 120 seconds to reach the earth's surface then our calculations by the

method described above show that the speed of the stones after 120sec. should be of the order of 1,200 metres per second which is as good as the speed of a bullet fired from an ordinary gun.

Thus we see that the small pieces of stones thrown from great heights perform the function of an ordinary bullet, and are sufficient for the destruction of life.

Negation of the 'Scientific' Explanation.
The aforementioned article is typical of the thinking of westernized Muslims. The obsession with modern science (as the author states) is such that the most ludicrous arguments are produced to substantiate Quranic teachings which seem to be in conflict with the creature, 'modern science'. No matter how absurd an argument may be, it will be cited in substantiation of Islamic injunctions as long as it (the argument) has a scientific tinge to titilate the minds of people awed by modern science.

SOUNDING "SCIENTIFIC"

In endeavouring to sound 'scientific' and in a futile attempt to attribute the hue of 'modern science' to Qur'anic verses, the author of the article alleges that the incident of the destruction of Abraha's army by way of the flocks of birds with little pebbles is in conformity with 'modern science'. He drags in the law of gravity to place the Qur'anic Surah 'Al-Feel', on a 'scientific footing'. The argument of the force of gravity in relation to the incident of the birds and Abraha is manifestly un-Islamic as well as 'unscientific', viz. in conflict with even 'modern science' which the author has cited in support of the incident described in the Quran Shareef.

WHY THE AUTHOR'S ARGUMENT IS UN-ISLAMIC

In his hypothesis the author claims that the pebbles released by the birds onto Abraha's army were released at such a height that due to the force of gravity the pebbles attained the speed of a bullet, viz. 1200 metres per second when they struck the army. The author postulated that the birds flew at such a height that the time taken for the pebbles to reach the army of Abraha was two minutes. It was necessary to suppose 'two minutes' since the pebble will only attain the speed of a bullet if dropped at a 'two-minute height' because the acceleration of a freely falling object towards the earth is approximately 10 metres per second after each second.

Hence, if it was supposed that the pebbles were released at a one-minute height, then in terms of 'modern science' they would not be able to kill a man since the speed of an object falling for one minute would be 600 metres per second in the final second when it strikes the earth. This speed will, therefore, not enjoy the force of a bullet. Hence, in order to assign some validity to the argument it is necessary that the two-minute height be postulated as a fact. In the absence of the 'two-minute' height postulate, the author's hypothesis will not be in conformity with 'modern science. It is now essential for the author to answer the following questions:

BIRDS

(a) What is the Shar'i justification for the claim that the birds did IN FACT fly at a two-minute height? The Quran Shareef as well as the Hadith do not confirm this claim. No authority of Islam has claimed that the birds were flying at such a height. Mr. Hashmi, the author, himself knows fully well that the supposition of 'two-minutes' is a mere figment of his imagination, hence he says: "If the birds were flying at such a height that the stones took, say, about two minutes or 120 seconds to reach the earth..."

He is constrained to say: 'If the birds...' for lack of Islamic proof. What if the birds were flying at one minute height or at half a minute-height? What Islamic proof is there to disclaim that the birds were in fact flying at a very low level? In fact according to Rasulullah's Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam tafseer of the Surah in question, the birds were flying at a very low level. The Tafseer Kitaabs clearly state that the birds settled low overhead the army of Abraha.

HEIGHT

The author's 'two-minutes' height assertion is, therefore, a baseless supposition. For the author's un-Islamic theory to have some credibility in terms of 'modern science' it is absolutely necessary to present the supposition that the birds were flying at such a height that it took the stones two minutes to reach the army of Abraha. The logical conclusion of this supposition is that the Command of Allah Ta'ala to the birds to destroy the army of Abraha was cir-

cumscribed by the force of gravity. In other words, Allah Ta'ala was compelled (Al-iyazu billah) by the force of gravity to order the birds to release their pebbles only at such height which will ensure that the speed of a bullet is attained when the pebbles strike their targets. This is the baneful result of attempting to submit the Divine Commands to the god of materialism, 'modern science.'

b. To bring about the destruction of the army of Abraha through the agency of the birds pelting pebbles did Allah Ta'ala have to submit to the force of gravity? In terms of the author's hypothesis of 'modern science', Allah Ta'ala had no alternative (Al-iyazu billah) but to obey the force of gravity, for the pebbles in terms of 'modern science' would not have served the destructive purpose if released by the birds at a distance below the 'two-minutes' height.

c. Does the author who claims to be a Muslim, believe the Quranic declaration, "Verily, Allah Ta'ala is powerful over all things?"

ABRAHA

If Allah Ta'ala is Qadir' over all things (as He most assuredly is), then what was the need for Him to obey the force of gravity which is His own creation, in order to bring about the destruction of Abraha's army? It must be remembered that the whole incident of destroying Abraha's army was a super-natural occurrence, an episode which defied all natural laws or which supersede the laws of 'modern science'. A cursory glance at the facts of the incident will establish that almost every move in the occurrence was contrary to 'modern science'. The Hadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam describes the birds as having 'heads of beasts'. The bodies were those of birds, but the heads were those of animals. Does 'modern science' justify this? Each bird, according to Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam had three pebbles - one in its beak and one in either leg. Which law of 'modern science' did these birds follow in this action. Which law of modern science instilled it into their minds to airlift three pebbles each? And, which law of 'modern science' did these birds submit to when they settled over the army of Abraha? Why did they not release their 'bullets' over the Meccans as well? Both Abraha and the Meccans were Kuffaar. In fact, the Meccans at that stage were greater kuffaar than Abraha since Abraha was a member of the

'People of the Book' whereas the Meccans were worshipping at that time hundreds of idols. Which law of 'modern science' put it in their minds to attack only the army of Abraha?

In certain Ahadith it appears that each pebble had the name of one of Abraha's soldiers inscribed on it. Hence, each pebble was destined for a particular person. Every man was killed with a pebble bearing his name. Which law of 'modern science' explains this phenomenon?

PEBBLES

Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam explained that the pebbles struck their victims with such tremendous force that a pebble striking a soldier's head would penetrate his body, find its exit through the anus and then penetrate to a depth into the earth. What law of 'modern science' explains this? If the author wishes to explain this tremendous force also in terms of the force of gravity, he will have to relinquish his 'two-minutes' height supposition and posit a far higher distance which will enable the pebbles to have such tremendous force at the point of striking. But, to do so would be not only Islamically wrong, but would be scientifically absurd just as the two-minute height theory is scientifically absurd. Insha'Allah, it will be shown later that 'modern science' too does not support the author's contention.

LEADER

According to the Ahadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam, the leader of the elephants in Abraha's army was a massive creature whose name was 'Mahmood'. Outside the precincts of Makkah Muazzamah an Arab chieftain whispered into the elephant's ear: This is the sacred land of Allah Ta'ala. Upon hearing this the elephant sat down and refused to budge. No amount of whipping, etc. would make the elephant proceed in the direction of the Ka'bah. The elephants were specially brought to demolish the Ka'bah. When the face of the elephant was turned into a different direction (away from the Ka'bah) it would immediately rise and quickly move away into that direction. Repeatedly attempts were made to divert it towards the Ka'bah, but to no avail. Every time it was turned to the direction of Makkah, it sat down. What law of 'modern science' explains this peculiar behaviour of the elephant?

DESTROY

Indeed, if Allah Ta'ala desired to destroy the army of Abraha through the agency of 'modern science' or through some such way which could be explained in terms of the laws of nature then so would He have done. A storm, and incidentally one did accompany the invasion of the birds, or a deadly pestilence or a torrential downpour could have sufficed. What was the need to despatch flocks of birds so supernaturally and destroy the army of Abraha in this supernatural manner? Even the author, in the deepest recess of his heart will be constrained to confess that the arrival of large flocks of birds with pebbles to destroy a particular army is indeed a supernatural act which defies the laws of 'modern science.'

This incident of the destruction of Abraha's army described briefly in Surah Al-Feel is a demonstration of one of the numerous supernatural and miraculous acts displaying the Power of Allah Ta'ala. These miraculous displays have no relationship to 'modern science'. They do not operate in submission to laws of nature or 'modern science.' They are clear revelation of the Power of Allah Ta'ala. He, Who is the Creator of all natural laws which our apologetic brethren term `modern science', is not bound by these laws. He acts solely by His Iraadah (Will), and none can encompass His Attributes.

MU'JIZAH

The futile and apologetic endeavours to strike a relationship between the Mu'jizah (Miracles of the Ambiyaah), Karamat (Miracles of the Auliyaa) and 'modern science' is fraught with serious consequences to one's Imaan. The puerile attempt to conform the Miraculous acts with the laws of 'modern science' culminates in the covert negation of the Power of Allah Ta'ala. Besides the incident of the birds and Abraha, there are many miraculous deeds and events which 'modern science' can never hope to explain. How will 'modern science' explain the shaq-qul qamr (splitting of the moon into two by the sign of the finger) act of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam? In conformity with which law of 'modern science' did Nabi Musa (alayhis salaam) enact the act of 'yade Baidha' (the glittering hand which stunned all)? What was the law of 'modern science' which enabled Musa (alayhis salaam) to transform with the touch of his hand his staff into a monstrous serpent capable of swallowing the whole palace of Firoun? And, which law of 'modern science' can

explain the opening of the Red Sea which enabled Bani-Isra-eel to traverse safely across, but engulfed Firoun and his troops? Which law of 'modern science' explains the creation in Jannat of Aadam (alayhis salaam)? In fact 'modern science' totally rejects the conception of man's origin in the being of Aadam (alayhis salaam). According to 'modern science' man's origin is the ape. Must the Muslim then ape 'modern science' in attempting to present an apologetic explanation to non-Muslims who cannot accept the eternal truths of the Quran? Which law of 'modern science' explains the creation of Hawwa (alayhas Salaam) from the rib of Aadam (alayhis salaam)? Which law of 'modern science' explains the Mi'raj of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam? Which law of 'modern science' explains Yunus's (alayhis salaam) three-day stay in the stomach of the fish? Does 'modern science' teach that a human being can remain alive three days inside the stomach of a fish? Which law of 'modern science' explains the Resurrection, Jannat, Jahannum, the Sirat and the innumerable other beliefs of Islam? These innumerable beliefs and practices of Islam have absolutely no truck with the laws of 'modern science'. Many of the laws and theories of the so-called 'modern science'are clear-cut beliefs of kufr. The beliefs of Islam are based on the footing of Imaan and not 'modern science'. Our belief owes no explanation to `modern' science'. On the contrary, our Muslim brethren who offer unbridled submission to the theories of `modern science' have much to explain -and they will have to offer their explanations to their Creator on that Day of Resurrection which defies the laws of `modern science'.

Why the Author's Argument is 'Unscientific'

The author has presented an argument supposedly in conformity with 'modern science' in a flabby and apologetic attempt to pamper the confusion in the mind of his non-Muslim friend. In resorting to his baatil method of substantiating the Quranic verses, he stumbles and commits blunders which even his 'modern science' fail to uphold. In his hypothesis, he postulated the supposition that the birds flew at such a height that the stones took two minutes to reach the earth's surface.

ACCEPTED

If this supposition is to be accepted, it will mean that the birds were flying at a height of 72 kilometres which is impossible ih terms of 'modern science'. This distance is obtained by employing the formula of 'modern

science', viz. S, — 1/2 G.T. The acceleration being approximately 10 metres per second. In terms of 'modern science' no birds can fly or even live at this great height. The highest mountain peak on earth is approximately 8 kilometres and only condors or vultures have been found to be flying at this height. According to the Hadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam the birds came from the direction of the sea and were flying so low that everyone could clearly see them and describe them. Assuming that these birds had to rise through the cloud region, the troposphere which is up to 16 kilometres and is the flight level for long distance aircraft, they would be lost to sight. The temperature in that zone falls to - 80°C, a temperature which will not permit birds to survive in terms of 'modern science'. But, according to the author's hypothesis the birds had to fly, not at 16 kilometres, but at 72 kilometres - nine times higher than the highest mountain peak on earth. Seventy two kilometres away from the earth's surface in that part of the hemisphere known as the mesophere where the temperature falls to the low value of -140°c This, of course, is in terms of 'modern science' which is the god of the slaves of materialism. No law of 'modern science' will condone the hypothesis that claims that flocks of birds with pebbles in their beaks and in their claws rose from the earth and traversed first the troposphere region, then immediately the stratosphere, then penetrated the mesophere region of the hemisphere and from the monosphere these birds unanimously made a decision to release in unison all their pebbles in such an accurate manner that the tiny pebbles dropped at this great height of 72 kilometres defied the other forces of nature, e.g. wind, on their downward journey to strike only the army of Abraha. 'Modern science' makes a mockery of this claim. It is therefore, futile and childish to resort to 'modern science' for proving Quranic truths.

If the birds had to rise higher in order to increase the striking force of the falling stones, it will mean that they penetrated the heterosphere where, 'modern science' tells us, temperatures rise to 2000°C. In terms of 'modern science' no bird can attain this height or survive in such scorching temperatures.

Conclusion

Modern science in no way offers any explanation to the incident described in Surah Feel. Believers accept the truth of the Quranic assertions only on the basis of their Imaan regardless of any conflict which may prevail between a Quranic claim and a theory of 'modern science'. The only explanation to the incident acceptable to people of Imaan is that Allah Ta'ala is the Creator of the universe and that He has power over all things. As the Quran states:

"And when He intends something. He merely says: BE, and it comes into existence.