

WHAT ARE THE REASONS OF DISBELIEF
IN HADITH (TRADITION)?
(REPLIES TO THE DISBELIEVERS IN HADITH)

THE MISCHIEF OF REJECTION OF HADITH (TRADITION)

By

(Late) Allama Hafiz Mohammad Ayub
Dehlavi

Presented by

SIDDIQI TRUST (Regd.)

NASIM PLAZA, LASELA CHOWK
NISHTER ROAD, KARACHI.

MAKTABA-I-RAZI

Shahab Mansion, Mohammad Bin Qasim Road,
Karachi (Pakistan) Phone No. 213989

Printed at FAZLESONS, Urdu Bazar, Karachi.

7-13

85

✓
297.13

M85

191431

DATA ENTERED

INTRODUCTION

The rejection of Hadith (tradition) of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) is one of the major evils of the present age, not because it is supported by any learned and irrefutable arguments, but because its motive is, in a way, similar to that of Atheism and Communism, its chief object being the destruction of religion. Atheism substitutes for religion, misguided human reason, and Communism man's physical needs. The rejectors of Hadith (tradition), are not bold enough to declare openly their disbelief in the Book of God, so they are partly engaged in trying to deprive the Holy Book of the explanation and interpretation (by word and action) of its Creator (peace be upon him) and thus to destroy the comprehensive arrangement made by God for the guidance of man, at best to render it ineffectual.

God did not merely send down the Book, He also endowed the Prophet (peace be upon him) with laudable qualities for the purpose set forth in the following verse of the Holy Quran :—

هُوَ الَّذِي بَعَثَ فِي الْأُمِّيِّينَ رَسُولًا مِنْهُمْ يَتْلُو عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتِهِ
وَيُزَكِّيهِمْ وَيُعَلِّمُهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ

“ HE IT IS WHO HATH SENT AMONG THE UN-LETTERED AN APOSTLE FROM AMONG THEMSELVES TO REHEARSE TO THEM HIS SIGNS. TO SANCTIFY THEM AND TO INSTRUCT THEM IN SCRIPTURE AND WISDOM”.

(62 : 2)

So that the Prophet (peace be upon him) according to the needs of the community, clarify interpret explain, by words and deeds, every verse of the Holy Quran, arrange them in their proper order and expound in detail such matters

as have been mentioned in the Holy Book, only in general terms without dealing with them comprehensively. The rejectors of Hadith (tradition) (whose mouthpiece is "Tul Islam", Lahore) are bent upon misguiding others by saying "The revelation of God is the only thing which a man is duty-bound to believe in and act upon, and that revelation is confined to the Book of God". "Obedience to the Prophet" they say, "was only limited to his life-time, and when the leader of the community is not among us, obedience to him is not necessary". According to them: "Obedience is only due to God and not to man", and even the Prophet cannot compel any-one to obey him". Further, they declare "the Quran too does not give the right to the Prophet of declaring anything Haram (prohibited) of his own accord".

All this is far from the truth. The fact is that the Quran frequently enjoins **أَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ** "OBEY THE PROPHET" along with **أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ** "OBEY GOD". At one place also said :

مَنْ يُطِيعِ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدْ أَطَاعَ اللَّهَ

"WHOSOEVER OBEYS THE PROPHET OBEYS GOD"

The misconception of the rejectors of Hadith has led to the gravest errors and deviation from the right path, especially when the verses of the Quran are being (wrongly) quoted in support of their erroneous views. The correct view is that which has been pithily described by Iqbal in the following lines.

بمصطفیٰ برساں خویش را کہ دین ہمہ اوست

اگر بہ او نہ رسیدی تمام بولہبی است

"TAKE YOURSELF NEAR UNTO THE PROPHET (peace be upon him) FOR HE IS THE DEEP (RELIGION) PERSONIFIED. IF YOU FAIL TO REACH HIM, YOU GO ASTRAY".

It is necessary to bring the truth to the notice of the intelligentsia and the general public among the Muslims so that they may guard themselves against this mischief. In order to understand the correct position, it is necessary to put the matter into the form of a few fundamental questions, and to answer these purely by means of rational discussions. These questions may be as under :-

- 1) What are the different kinds of WAHI (revelations) ?
Can there be any revelations besides the Holy Book ?
- 2) Is Hadith (tradition) of the Prophet (peace be upon him) in itself a HUIJAT (conclusive proof) in religion or not ?
- 3) Is the received collection of HADITH (tradition of the Prophet, peace be upon him) which we possess, positive and authentic, or is it conjectural ?
- 4) Is ZAN (conjecture) HUIJAT (conclusive proof) from the view-point of the Shariat ?
- 5) Is it obligatory to act upon the unanimously accepted Ahadith (traditions) or not ?
- 6) Replies to the rejectors of Hadith.
- 7) Errors of rejectors of Hadith in the translation of Quran verses.
- 8) Replies to the points raised in the Letters in the June 1957 issue of the periodical "Tulu-e-Islam".
- 9) The disbeliever in Hadith (tradition) and the sacrifice.

These questions have been answered by the Allama Mohammad Ayub Sahib with the support of the Holy Quran. It is hoped that those in search of the truth will be fully satisfied with the replies given by the Maulana, and that their doubts, perplexities and vacillations will be removed.

The Maulana has, with the help of rational and traditional arguments proved that ZAN (conjecture) is Hujjat (conclusive proof) both from point of view of intellect as well as of religion, and is a motive for action though not of IMAN

(belief) as such. Because, the thing from which ILM (belief) arises is only YAQEEN (unswerving faith), the determining principle is that action will be based on ZAN (conjecture), whereas IMAN (belief) will depend on YAQEEN (unswerving faith). Innumerable mistakes have been committed in the matter of ZAN (Conjecture) on account of lack of proper understanding of the technical terms used in religion and logic. The Maulana has, therefore, explained in detail the terms like ZAN (conjecture), YAQEEN (unswerving faith) and other terms connected therewith, so that the exact meaning of these terms may be well understood. For this reason, he has explained that there are two kinds of ZAN (conjectures). One is that which is the opposite of YAQEEN (Unswerving faith) and is a kind of knowledge, for example ZANNI ILM, which is the opposite of YAQEENI ILM. The other is a kind of action, and there are two types of this, One is SU-E-ZAN (unjust suspicion), and the other is HUSN-E-ZAN (good favourable opinion). God has enjoined us to refrain from SU-E-ZAN and act upon HUSN-E-ZAN. The ZAN (conjecture) which Maulana Ayub Saheb has termed HUIJAT (conclusive proof) is the one which is the opposite of YAQEEN (unswerving faith), and is a kind of knowledge. There is no need for discussion on HUSN-E-ZAN and SU-E-ZAN.

The mode of discussion of the Maulana is purely logical and scholarly and is free from the modern literary embellishments, but therein the seekers after truth will certainly find the light of guidance.

May God bestow upon all of us, right understanding and protect us from the evil of the 'SNEAKING WHISPERER.'

IDARAH.

REVIEW ON "FITNA-E-INKAR - E - HADITH" BY MAULANA ABDUL MAJID DARYABADI, WHICH APPEARED IN "SIDQ-E-JADID" LAKHNAU OF 12th MAY, 1958 (16th SHAWWAL, 1377)

Quite a number of convincing replies have been given to the disbelievers in Hadith by various Ulema, and Scholars possessing deep insight. However, the replies of Maulana Ayub are quite unique and surpass them all in logical perfection.

The Maulana has a marvellously deep understanding of the Quran and Hadith (traditions). Besides, he is a master of logic and philosophy, he has, taken the arguments of the disbelievers in Hadith, one by one, and after subjecting them to deep and thorough examination, has torn them to pieces without bringing in personalities.

He has discussed in a masterly way such topics as conclusiveness (HUJJAT) of Hadith the significance of single reporter of Hadith, the importance of different kinds of ZAN (conjecture) and various kinds of WAHI (revelation). He has, in short, given conclusive and satisfactory replies to all questions big and small.

Hazrat Allama Hafiz Mohammed Ayub Saheb Dehlavi has left since this transitory abode. The readers are requested to pray for him.

CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter I	
(1) What are the different kinds of WAHI (revelation) ?	1
(2) Can there be any revelation besides the Book of God?	
Chapter II	
(1) Is Hadith (tradition) of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) in itself HUUJJAT (conclusive proof) or not ?	18
(2) Is the reliable collection of Ahadith (traditions) which we possess positive and authentic or is it conjectural ?	
Chapter III	
(1) Is conjecture (ZAN) HUUJJAT (conclusive proof) from the viewpoint of the Hadith ?	41
(2) Is it obligatory to act upon unanimously accepted Ahadith (traditions) of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) or not ?	
Chapter IV	
(1) Replies to disbelievers in Hadith (tradition).	67
(2) Errors of the disbelievers in Hadith in translating the Quranic verses .	
Chapter V	
(1) Replies to the points raised in the "Letters" in the June 1957 issue of the periodical Tulu-e-Islam, Lahore.	87
Chapter VI	
(1) The injunction of Sacrifice and the disbelievers in Hadith .	123

أَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنَ الشَّيْطَانِ الرَّجِيمِ
بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

CHAPTER I

WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF WAHIREVELATIONS)
CAN THERE BE REVELATIONS BESIDES THE BOOK OF GOD

Question Did the Prophet Mohammad (Peace be upon him) receive WAHI (revelations besides the Quran) or was revelation confined to the Quran itself? Did other Prophets who received revelations in the form of the Scriptures receive other revelations besides those?

Answer Every Prophet received revelation and every Prophet who received a scripture also received revelations besides the scripture: especially our Prophet Mohammad (peace be upon him) frequently received revelations besides the Quran.

Proof : The proof of the fact that revelation is not confined to the book of God, and that revelations over and above the scriptures were received by Prophets possessing Scriptures is that every Prophet is not the possessor of a Scripture, but every Prophet is a possessor of revelation ('WAHI'), that is, a person cannot be a Prophet without receiving a revelation but he can be a Prophet without a Book. Now, if revelation was confined to the Book, every Prophet would have been possessor of a book, whereas there is consensus of religious opinion on the point that every Prophet is not the possessor of a Book, but is a receiver of revelation.

In the following verses, the Holy Quran lays down the essential of Prophethood :

Every Prophet received Revelations

The proof of the fact that revelation is not confined to the Book by Prophets possessing Scripture is that every possessor is not 'Wahi', that a person cannot be a prophet without receiving a

Qur'an says regarding ^{essential of Prophethood} **قُلْ إِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ مِّثْلُكُمْ يُوحَىٰ إِلَيَّ**
SAY : I AM ONLY A MORTAL LIKE YOU. MY LORD INSPIRETH IN ME THAT YOUR GOD IS ONLY ONE GOD"
(18 : 110)

It is evident from this that a Prophet is different from an ordinary man in as much as he receives revelations from God. Unless he receives revelation, a man cannot be a Prophet.

Now, what is a revelation? A revelation is the communication of God with man. God reveals to man or communicates with him in the following three ways :

مَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ أَنْ يُكَلِّمَهُ اللَّهُ إِلَّا وَحْيًا أَوْ مِنْ وَرَائِ حِجَابٍ أَوْ يُرْسِلَ رَسُولًا فَيُوحِيَ بِإِذْنِهِ مَا يَشَاءُ

"AND IT WAS NOT (VOUCHSAFED) TO ANY MORTAL THAT ALLAH SHOULD SPEAK TO HIM UNLESS (IT BE) BY REVELATION OR FROM BEHIND A VEIL, OR (THAT) HE SENDETH A MESSENGER TO REVEAL WITH HIS PERMISSION WHAT HE WILLS, LO! HE IS EXALTED, MOSTWISE".
(42 : 51)

These are the three ways of communication of Divine Message and all three are modes of revelation. In (1) revelation is "by inspiration and is clear. In (2) "from behind a veil", the communication is like the one adopted in the case of Moses.

وَأَنَا اخْتَرْتُكَ فَاسْتَمِعْ لِمَا يُوحَىٰ

"AND I HAVE CHOSEN THEE, SO HEARKEN UNTO THAT WHICH IS INSPIRED"
(20 : 13)

Here what was spoken to Moses has been termed by God as revelation. In (3) the mode of revelation is "by the sending of a Messenger". Here, too, revelation is clear. In short, the communication of God with man is a revelation and the

✓ *Next. Now if a revelation is confined to a book, every prophet's religious opinion on the point that every prophet is not*

of God, & that revelations over & above the Scriptures were received
 the possessor of Scripture, but every 3 Prophet is a possessor of
 revelation but he can be a prophet without a Book. ↓
 man who receives the revelation is a Prophet of God, since
 the difference between a Prophet and an ordinary man is
 only in the receipt of revelation.

The Quran was revealed to the Prophet through
 Messenger viz the Angel Gabriel, as God says in the Quran

نَزَّلَ بِهِ الرُّوحُ الْأَمِينُ

"THE TRUST WORTHY SPIRIT (GABRIEL) HATH
 BROUGHT DOWN WITH IT" (26 : 1)

فِيَّاهُ نَزَّلَهُ عَلَى قَلْبِكَ

"AND HE (GABRIEL) INSPIRED IT (SCRIPTURE)
 TO YOUR HEART" (26 : 2)

Thus the Quran falls in the third category of revelation

i. e.

أَوْ يُرْسِلَ رَسُولًا

"REVELATION THROUGH A MESSENGER" (42 : 1)

The revelations referred to "by inspiration" and "by
 behind the veil" therefore obviously are revelations before
 the Quran. In other words it is quite clear that revelations
 not confined to the Quran but that revelations besides the
 Quran were also sent by the other two modes as stated above.

We are now going to prove that the previous prophets
 had received revelations which were not part of Scripture.
 God said to Adam :

وَقُلْنَا يَا آدَمُ اسْكُنْ أَنْتَ وَزَوْجُكَ الْجَنَّةَ

"AND WE SAID : O ADAM ! DWELL THOU AND
 THY WIFE IN THE GARDEN" (2 : 35)

يَا آدَمُ أَنْبِئْهُمْ بِأَسْمَائِهِمْ

And Again :

"O ADAM : INFORM THEM OF THEIR NAMES
 (NATURE)" (2 : 36)

would have been possessor of Book, whereas there is consensus of
 the possessor of Book, but is a receiver of Revelation

ther :

وَقَالَ لَهُمَا رَبُّمَا الْحَرَامُ نَهَيْتُمَا

“THEIR LORD CALLED UNTO THEM (SAYING) :
DID I NOT FORBID YOU THAT TREE”.

(7 : 22)

In fact, God spoke to Adam frequently, but this was not of a Book. Reference is made in the following verses of the Quran to the revelations made to the Prophet Noah.

وَأُوحِيَ إِلَى نُوحٍ أَنَّهُ لَنْ يُؤْمِنَ مِنْ قَوْمِكَ إِلَّا مَنْ قَدْ آمَنَ

“AND IT WAS REVEALED TO NOAH : NO ONE OF THY FOLK WILL BELIEVE SAVE HIM WHO HATH BELIEVED ALREADY”.

(11 : 36)

فَإِذَا اسْتَوَيْتَ أَنْتَ وَمَنْ مَعَكَ عَلَى الْفُلِكِ

“AND WHEN THOU HAST EMBARKED ON THE ARK - THOU AND THOSE WITH THEE SAY : PRAISE BE TO ALLAH WHO HAS SAVED US FROM THE PEOPLE WHO DO WRONG”.

(23 : 28)

يُنُوحُ إِنَّهُ لَيْسَ مِنْ أَهْلِكَ

“O NOAH ! LO ! HE IS NOT OF THY FAMILY”

(11 : 46)

short, frequent, addresses were made to Noah but no scripture, although they were revelations, since at a time of despair, of submersion in the flood waters and urgent salvation a Book was not needed. A book is sent only by good tidings, for giving warning, and for removing doubts and disputes which did not prevail at that time.

was revealed to the Prophet Abraham :

يَا بَرَاهِيمُ أَعْرِضْ عَنْ هَذَا

“O ABRAHAM, SEEK NOT THIS”.

(11 : 76)

This was a revelation but not part of a Book.

تِلْكَ حُجَّتُنَا آتَيْنَاهَا إِبْرَاهِيمَ عَلَىٰ قَوْمِهِ

“THAT WAS THE REASONING ABOUT US WHICH WE GAVE TO ABRAHAM (TO USE) AGAINST HIS PEOPLE” (6 : 83)

The Prophet Abraham proved the transitory nature of the stars, the Moon and the Sun from their setting and vanishing, which was confirmed by God by saying that He had given this line of reasoning to Abraham. It was clearly a revelation and the fact remains that it was not in the shape of a Book.

The Prophet Jacob said :

إِنِّي لَأَجِدُ رِيحَ يُوسُفَ

“I DO INDEED SCENT THE PRESENCE OF JOSEPH” (12 : 94)

Those present said :

قَالُوا تَأْتِيهِ إِتْنَاكَ لَفِي ضَلَالِكَ الْقَدِيمِ

“BY GOD ! TRULY THOU ART IN THINE OLD WANDERING MIND” (12 : 95)

إِنِّي أَعْلَمُ مِنَ اللَّهِ مَا لَا تَعْلَمُونَ

“DID I NOT SAY TO YOU, I KNOW FROM ALLAH THAT WHICH YE KNOW NOT” (12 : 96)

again this was a revelation but not a Book.

again :

وَأَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْهِ لَتُنَبِّئَنَّهُمْ بِأَمْرِهِمْ هَذَا

“WE INSPIRED IN HIM : THOU WILT TELL THEM OF THIS DEED OF THEIRS WHEN THEY KNOW (THEE) NOT” (12 : 15)

and consequently informed them :

هَلْ عَلِمْتُمْ مَا فَعَلْتُمْ بِيُوسُفَ وَأَخِيهِ

“KNOW YE HOW YE DEALT WITH JOSEPH AND HIS BROTHER NOT KNOWING (WHAT YE WERE DOING)” (12 : 89)

This revelation was made at the time of JOSEPH'S being thrown into the well, and was not in the form of a Book. The Prophet Moses received the revelation in the valley of Tuwa:

أَنْ يُمُوسَىٰ إِلَىٰ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ

“O MOSES LO’ I AM ALLAH, THE LORD OF THE WORLDS” (28 : 30)

This was a revelation because God said :

فَاسْتَمِعْ لِمَا يُوحَىٰ

“LISTEN THEN TO WHAT IS BEING REVEALED TO YOU” (20 : 13)

This address in the valley of Tuwa was a revelation and not a book, Further :-

وَأَوْحَيْنَا إِلَىٰ مُوسَىٰ أَنْ ألقِ عَصَاكَ

“AND WE INSPIRED MOSES (SAYING) : THROW THY STAFF ! ” (7 : 117)

This also was a revelation but not a book, because the Torah was revealed long after these revelations. And again :

وَأَوْحَيْنَا إِلَىٰ مُوسَىٰ أَنْ أَسْرِ بِعِبَادِنَا

“WE REVEALED TO MOSES TO TAKE AWAY OUR SERVANTS THAT VERY NIGHT” (26 : 52)

This is merely a revelation other than a scripture. The angels said to the Prophet Lot :

قَالُوا يَا لوطُ إِنَّا رُسُلُ رَبِّكَ

“O LOT ! WE ARE MESSENGERS FROM THY LORD” (11 : 81)

This was a revelation and not a book, since a book is of no use when the moment of punishment has arrived. The Prophet of Bani Israil said :

وَقَالَ لَهُمْ نَبِيُّهُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ قَدْ بَعَثَ لَكُمْ طَالُوتَ مَلِكًا

"GOD HAS APPOINTED TALOOT (SAUL) AS
YOUR KING" (2 : 247)

This was a revelation but not written in a book, for if it were, then DAVID would have known about the affair.

Again :

فَفَهَّمْنَاهَا سُلَيْمَانَ

"AND WE MADE SOLOMON UNDERSTAND (THE
CASE)" (21 : 79)

was only a revelation and no book.

The Prophet Zachariah received the revelation :

يٰۤاٰتٰنٰبِسْرٰكٍ يُعْلِمُ

"O ZACHARIAH ! WE GIVE YE THE GOOD NEWS
OF SON" (19 : 7)

Again :

فَنَادَتْهُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ وَهُوَ قَائِمٌ يُصَلِّي فِي الْمِحْرَابِ أَنَّ اللَّهَ يُبَشِّرُكَ بِيَحْيٰى

"AND THE ANGELS CALLED TO HIM AS HE STOOD
PRAYING IN THE SANCTURY : ALLAH GIVETH
THEE GLAD TIDINGS OF (A SON WHOSE NAME
IS) YAHYA (JOHN)" (3 : 39)

This was also only a revelation and not a book. If these revelations had been contained in a book, he would neither have made supplications nor would he have been surprised.

The Prophet Jesus received the following revelation :

قَالَ اللَّهُ اِنِّىۤ اُنزِلْتُهَا عَلَيْكُمْ

"ALLAH SAID : LO ! I SEND IT DOWN UNTO
YOU" (5 : 115)

Which was not a book. If this were a book, the disciples of Jesus would neither have demanded such a thing nor would

there have been any dispute about it. In other words, had there been such a thing said in the book, namely that God could send down a tray from heaven and that He would do so, there would have been no need to ask for it, since the Torah and the Evangel had already been completely sent down before this incident.

In short, to those Prophets who were not the Possessor of scriptures, revelations were continuously sent and those who were the possessors of scriptures frequently received revelations before and after the scriptures. Numerous examples of such revelations are mentioned in the Holy Quran. We have shown that revelation will sometimes be a book, and at other times an address from behind a veil", at other times it will be a direct revelation.

We shall now show that Prophet Mohammad (peace be upon him) also received revelations besides the Quran. In this connection we quote the following verses of the Quran :

Proof No. 1

وَإِذْ أَسْرَأَ النَّبِيُّ إِلَىٰ بَعْضِ أَزْوَاجِهِ حَدِيثًا فَلَمَّا نَبَّأَتْ بِهِ
وَأَظْهَرَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ عَرَّفَتْ بَعْضَهُ وَأَعْرَضَ عَنْ بَعْضٍ فَلَمَّا
نَبَّأَهَا بِهِ قَالَتْ مَنْ أَنْبَأَكَ هَذَا قَالَ نَبَّأَنِيَ الْعَلِيمُ الْخَبِيرُ

WHEN THE PROPHET CONFIDED A FACT UNTO ONE OF HIS WIVES AND WHEN SHE AFTERWARDS DIVULGED IT AND ALLAH APPRISED HIM THEREOF, HE MADE KNOWN (TO HER) PART THEREOF AND PASSED OVER PART, AND WHEN HE TOLD HER, SHE SAID: WHO HATH TOLD THEE? HE SAID, THE KNOWER, THE WELL ACQUAINTED HATH TOLD ME". (66:3)

The words "أَظْهَرَ اللَّهُ" "ALLAH APPRISED HIM THEREOF" and "نَبَّأَنِيَ الْعَلِيمُ الْخَبِيرُ" "THE KNOWER, THE WELL

"ACQUAINTED HATH TOLD ME" are a proof of the fact that the knowledge that God unfolded to the Prophet was a revelation. These two parts of the verse are an instance of revelation besides the Quran, for whatever God informed the Prophet (peace be upon him), in this connection, is to be found nowhere in the Quran.

Proof No. 2

مَا قَطَعْتُمْ مِنْ لَيْنِهِ أَوْ تَرَكَتُمْوهَا قَائِمَةً عَلَىٰ أَسْوَابِهَا فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ

"WHATSOEVER PALM-TREES WHETHER YOU CUT DOWN OR LEFT STANDING ON THEIR ROOTS, IT WAS BY ALLAH'S LEAVE" (59:5)

The instructions (from God) under which the trees were cut down are not found in the Quran. It is evident that this instruction was received through some other revelation besides the Quran.

Proof No. 3

The Surahs (Chapters) Al-Baqara, Al-e-Imran, etc. were revealed in Medina about ten years after some of the earlier Surahs. The question is why have they not been arranged in the Holy Quran chronologically? The Surahs which were received later should have been arranged after those received earlier, but such is not the case; some of the Surahs revealed earlier have been arranged after those sent down at a later date and vice versa, God say in the Quran:

قَالَ الَّذِينَ لَا يَرْجُونَ لِقَاءَنَا أَتَىٰ بِقُرْآنٍ غَيْرِ هَذَا أَوْ بَدَّلَهُ قُلْ مَا يَكُونُ لِي أَنْ أُبَدِّلَهُ مِنْ تَلْقَائِي نَفْسِي ۚ إِنْ أَتَيْتُمُ الْإِنَّمَاءَ يَوْمَئِذٍ إِلَىٰ

"THEY WHO REST NOT THEIR HOPE ON THEIR MEETING WITH US, SAY: BRING US A QURAN OTHER THAN THIS, OR CHANGE IT. SAY (O MOHAMMAD): IT IS NOT FOR ME TO CHANGE IT OF MY OWN ACCORD"

(10:15)

It is evident from this that no change can be made without a revelation. Whatever changes the Prophet (peace be upon

done through some revelation in the Quran? Since the Quran is silent on the matter, it must obviously have been done in accordance with a revelation besides the Quran.

Proof No. 6

God has said :

فَانكِحُوا مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ مِمَّنِّي وَثَلَاثَ وَرُبْعًا

“MARRY OF THE WOMEN, WHO SEEM GOOD TO YOU, TWO OR THREE OR FOUR :” (4 : 3)

the question arises which Wahi (revelation) was it that the Prophet (peace be upon him) followed when he married more than four wives? The Quranic revelation allows only upto four women. The act of the Prophet (peace be upon him) must necessarily have been in accordance with some non-Quranic revelation.

Proof No. 7

Further God says in Quran :

فَاِذَا قَرَأْتَهُ فَاتَّبِعْ قُرْآنَهُ ثُمَّ إِنَّ عَلَيْنَا بَيَانَهُ

“AND WHEN WE READ IT FOLLOW THOU THE READING: THEN LO! UPON US (RESTS) THE EXPLANATION THEREOF”. (75:18)

This means that after the revelation of the Quran, the explanation thereof is left to God. Now we ask, is this explanation a part of the Quran, or some-thing besides it? If it is a part of the Quran, then for this part too an explanation is likewise required. If it is besides the Quran, it follows that there is something besides it by way of revelation from God. The conclusion is that God says: “It is for us to explain it” and hence, this explanation is by means of revelation besides the Quran.

Proof No. 8

For nearly seventeen months the Prophet (peace be upon him) kept Jerusalem (Baitul Maqdis) as the Qibla (the

place to-wards which Muslims turn their face for prayers). By what revelation did he do this? The Quran is silent on the point. Nowhere in the Quran is the Prophet (peace be upon him) instructed to make Jerusalem the Qibla. But since all acts of the Prophet (peace be upon him) were based purely on revelation, therefore, the revelation through which the Prophet (peace be upon him) made Jerusalem the Qibla must have been a revelation besides the Quran.

Proof No. 9

We invite your attention to the following verse of the Quran :

أَلَمْ يَكْفِيكُمْ أَنْ يُمِدَّكُمْ رَبُّكُمْ بِثَلَاثَةِ آلَافٍ مِنَ الْمَلَائِكَةِ

“REMEMBER THOU SAIDEST TO THE FAITHFUL: IS IT NOT ENOUGH FOR YOU THAT ALLAH SHOULD HELP YOU WITH THREE THOUSAND ANGELS (specially) SENT DOWN ? (3:124)

Here God has quoted the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him). However no mention thereof was made in the Quran. It is, therefore, evident that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had received a revelation to this effect besides the Quran.

Proof No. 10 : Further we find :

يُوصِي بِهَا أُولَئِكَ

“THE DISTRIBUTION IN ALL CASES IS AFTER THE PAYMENT OF LEGACIES OR DEBTS”.

(4:11)

In this verse, priority is given to legacy over debts, but the Prophet (peace be upon him) gave debts priority over legacy. Now, since the Prophet (peace be upon him) could not have acted in contravention of the injunction of the Quran, there must have been revelation besides the Quran

which prompted the Prophet (peace be upon him) to do this.

Proof No. 11 : The following verse of the Quran is quoted to the same effect :

وَلِيُكَبِّرُوا اللَّهَ عَلَىٰ مَا هَدَاكُمْ

“THAT YE MAY MAGNIFY (GLORIFY) ALLAH THAT HE HATH GUIDED YOU”.

(22:37)

Now. God has not given details in the Quran about the way in which He should be glorified. It was the Prophet (peace be upon him) who described how to do it. God has confirmed the method taught by the Prophet (peace be upon him) and has attributed it to Himself as “His Guidance”.

Proof No. 12

God has said :

وَإِذْ قُلْنَا لَكَ إِنَّ رَبَّكَ أَحَاطَ بِالنَّاسِ

“REMEMBER (THE TIME) WHEN WE TOLD THEE THAT THY LORD HAS VERILY SURROUNDED THE MEN.”

(17 : 60)

This verse proves that the Prophet (peace be upon him) received revelations other than the Quran also, since the words **وَإِنَّ رَبَّكَ أَحَاطَ بِالنَّاسِ** “THY LORD HAS VERILY SURROUNDED THE MEN” occur nowhere in the Quran, and here God says : WE HAD TOLD THEE THAT THY LORD HAS VERILY SURROUNDED THE MEN.” From this it is clear that God had told the Prophet (peace be upon him) through another revelation besides the Quran that **وَإِنَّ رَبَّكَ أَحَاطَ بِالنَّاسِ** “THY LORD HAS VERILY SURROUNDED THE MEN”; and is now only reminding him of this.

Proof No. 13 : The following verse throws further light on the subject :

فَأَوْخَىٰ إِلَىٰ عِبْدِي مَا أَوْخَىٰ

614
"AND HE REVEALED UNTO HIS SLAVE
WHICH HE REVEALED"

meaning that some revelation was sent which is not a part of the Quran, since every one knows about the revelations contained in Quran and no one knows about the particular revelation. Further, about each of the verses of the Quran it is known whether it belongs to the Meccan or Medinan period, but about this revelation, it is not known to which period it belongs. In short, there are innumerable proofs pointing to revelations besides the Quran.

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ

"NOR DOETH HE SPEAK OF (HIS OWN) DESIRE"

(53:3)

The words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are, in the light of this verse, nothing but revelation. Now, if it is said that the implication of this is confined only to the revelations of the Quran meaning thereby that he does not say the verse of the Quran from his own desire, then it is incorrect, because then the word "Quran" shall have to be considered as understood or implied in the verse.

Such an interpretation is not supported by the text for the noun for which the pronoun "It" stands in the second verse is not mentioned. Earlier the Quran says:

مَا ضَلَّ صَاحِبُكُمْ وَمَا غَوَىٰ

"YOUR COMRADE ERRETH NOT NOR IS
DECEIVED"

(53:2)

establishing that the actions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) were pure and righteous by the verse:

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ

"NOR DOETH HE SPEAK OF (HIS OWN)
DESIRE"

(53:3)

This implies that the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) were directed by God and not prompted by the Prophet's own desire, because otherwise, when he says that :

الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ
الْقُرْآنَ فِي لَيْلَةِ الْقَدْرِ

“ALIF LAAM MEEM, THIS IS THE SCRIPTURE”.

(2.1)

are the words of God. is prompted by his own desire then no word of God will ever be proved. Therefore, every word of his has to be accepted to be free from his desire, and so a revelation.

Now, the question is whether all the words and actions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are included in the Quran. In case these (the words and actions) are prompted by revelation, then it is proved that there are revelations besides the Quran. And if these are not prompted by revelation then we come to a position contrary to the following verse :

إِنِّ اتَّبِعُ إِلَّا مَا يُوحَىٰ إِلَيَّ

“I FOLLOW ONLY WHAT IS REVEALED UNTO ME”.

(6.50)

On the other hand, if it is said that every action and word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is based on revelation, and that the revelation is that of the Quran, and that some of his words and actions are purely according to the Quran and some are by way of deduction, then this is incorrect, for God has said:

لَتَعْلَمَ بَيْنَ النَّاسِ بِمَا أَرَاكَ اللَّهُ

“THAT THOU MAYST JUDGE AMONG MEN AS GUIDED BY ALLAH”.

(4 :105)

Whatever was the commandment of God, the Prophet (peace be upon him) commanded accordingly. He was not deducing his own conclusions from them. Besides that, deducing an inference a middle term in the premises is necessary. Where there is no such term there can be no inference. For example, in the following verses :

عَلَّمَهُ شَدِيدُ الْقُوَى ۝

- 1) "HE WAS TAUGHT BY ONE MIGHTY IN POWER".
(53 : 5)

نَزَلَ بِهِ الرُّوحُ الْأَمِينُ ۝

- 2) WITH IT CAME DOWN THE SPIRIT OF FAITH
AND TRUTH". (26 : 193)

فَأَرْسَلْنَا إِلَيْهَا رُوحَنَا

- 3) "THEN WE SENT UNTO HER OUR ANGEL AND
HE APPEARED BEFORE HER AS A MAN IN ALL
RESPECTS". (19 : 17)

إِنَّهُ لَقَوْلُ رَسُولٍ كَرِيمٍ ۝

- 4) "VERILY THIS IS THE WORD OF A MOST HONOU-
RABLE MESSENGER". (81 : 19)

In all these verses reference is made to Gabriel. However it is not possible for anyone in the world to deduce that Gabriel is meant in above verses unless the speaker interprets it to be so. But the fact is that it is nowhere mentioned in the Holy Quran that the meaning of those words should be taken to Gabriel; Similarly the Names "ZUN-NOON" and "SAHIB-I-HOOT" signify the Prophet Jonah. However it is not possible to deduce such a meaning from anywhere. In short, there are many rulings given by the Prophet (peace be upon him), in words and through his actions which are neither apparently to be found in the Holy Quran nor can they be

deduced clearly therefrom, either by way of induction. or expression or by way of reasoning.

Now, we have to consider whether these words and actions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are based on revelations or not. If they are based on revelations our contention is proved. If they are not based on revelation, they are opposed to the Quranic verse :

إِن أَتَّبِعُ إِلَّا مَا يُوحَىٰ إِلَيَّ

"I FOLLOW ONLY WHAT IS REVEALED UNTO ME". (6 : 50)

and it is heresy to say that the Prophet (peace be upon him) did not obey God's revelation (God forbid).

We have thus shown that every word and action of the Prophet (peace be upon him) was based on revelation.

CHAPTER II

HADITH (TRADITION) OF THE HOLY PROPHET (PEACE BE UPON HIM) IS A HUIJAT (DECISIVE AUTHORITY) IN RELIGIOUS LAW.

Question : Is tradition (word and deed) of the Prophet (peace be upon him) in itself HUIJAT (Decisive authority) in religion or not ?

Answer : Yes, the word a deed of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is a decisive authority (HUIJAT) in religion.

Proof : There are only three possibilities, viz.:

- 1) Every tradition of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) is a HUIJAT.
- 2) No tradition of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) is a HUIJAT.
- 3) Only some traditions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are HUIJAT.

We shall take the third proposition first.

This proposition is absolutely incorrect as it aims at proving the effect without cause and movement without the mover. It is absurd to hold the view that some of the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are HUIJAT whilst others are not, without assigning any reason therefor, and without distinguishing one set of words from the other. Both sets of words are attributed to the Prophet (peace be upon him): one that is supposed to be decisive authority and the other supposed to be otherwise, without assigning any

reason. Hence, this proposition is untenable and this assumption is entirely false. Therefore, the third proposition that some of the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are HUUJAT and others are not is disproved, for the simple reason that, both are words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and no line of demarcation has been established between the two and no reason has been assigned.

Let us further examine the question objectively. If it is contended that conformity of the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) with the words of the Quran should determine the truthfulness of the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) as being a decisive authority in religion, that is to say, those of the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) which conform with the words of the Quran are HUUJAT and those that do not, are not HUUJAT, the anomaly being thus removed, then the following is the reply :—

We say that conformity with the words of the Quran can be taken as a proof of the truthfulness of the words of the prophet (peace be upon him) only when it is ascertained and established that such and such words are (in fact) words of the Holy Quran, revealed by God, and they are none but the words of God. But it is impossible to ascertain and establish the revelation of God and the words of the Quran unless the same are asserted and conveyed by the Prophet (peace be upon him). Now, when the Prophet (peace be upon him) reveals and establishes that such and such words have been revealed to him by God, and they form part of the Quran, the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) conveying this fact will become simultaneously decisive for establishing the truthfulness of the Quran as embodied in his message. Hence, the entire argument is turned topsy-turvy, that is, effort was made to prove that the Quran is a proof of the truthfulness of the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him), whereas it is proved that the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is a HUUJAT for

the truthfulness of the words of the Quran: and, in fact, this is the only truth. Consequently, the third proposition that 'some words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are HUIJAT and the others are not' falls to the ground.

We now come to the second proposition that 'no word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is a HUIJAT'. To hold this view is to combine unbelief with insanity, and is contrary to the consensus of the entire (Muslim) community. We say that if no word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is deemed to be HUIJAT then the word of God likewise will not be a HUIJAT. For instance, when the Prophet says "today the Chapter of Al Ikhlas قُلْ هُوَ اللهُ أَحَدٌ QUL HO WALLAH HO AHAD" has been revealed to me "and since, it is assumed that no word of the Prophet is Hujjat, then this sentence (of the Quran) will likewise not form a HUIJAT. And since these words" today the Chapter Al Ikhlas قُلْ هُوَ اللهُ أَحَدٌ QUL HO WALLAH HO AHAD" has been revealed to me "no more remains HUIJAT and since these words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) include the words of God the Almighty قُلْ هُوَ اللهُ أَحَدٌ QUL HO WALLAH HO AHAD", His said words too do not remain HUIJAT, whereas, the fact is that, according to the consensus of religious opinion, the word of God is HUIJAT. Consequently, the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) becomes, necessarily, HUIJAT. It follows, therefore, that the second proposition that 'no word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is HUIJAT' is disproved. Now, since the last two propositions have been disproved, then, necessarily, the first proposition that 'every word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is HUIJAT' stands proved.

We will further prove with the help of the Quran that the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is HUIJAT (binding) in religion.

God said :

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ
فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ

O YE WHO BELIEVE OBEY ALLAH AND OBEY THE APOSTLE AND THOSE CHARGED WITH AUTHORITY AMONG YOU AND IF YOU DIFFER IN ANYTHING AMONG YOURSELVES REFER IT TO ALLAH AND HIS APOSTLE, IF YOU BELIEVE IN ALLAH AND THE LAST DAY" (4 : 59)

God said **أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ** "OBEY ALLAH". Now,

obedience to a rational being, with free will, means obedience to His command and His words. Hence, obedience to God means obedience to His words and obedience to Him consists in obedience to the Quran only. From this it is clear that the meaning of

أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ "OBEY ALLAH"

is "obey the Quran". Similarly **أَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ** "OBEY

THE MESSENGER" means "Obey the words of the Prophet

(peace be upon him). Now, if it is said that the words of the

Quran and the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are

one and the same, then this contention is entirely false. On

the contrary, if the words of the Prophet (peace be upon

him) are different from the words of the Quran, then under

the circumstance, in accordance with the above verse, the

words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) become HUIJAT

apart from the words of the Quran. If, however, it is held

that obedience to the Prophet (peace be upon him) is to

obey the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) said in

accordance with the injunction of the Quran, and in the light

thereof, and like-wise obey the words of those in authority

in conformity with the Quran, then WE SAY that in such a

case, all those instructions and directions given by the

Prophet (peace be upon him) and those in authority (ULUL

AMR) (which are not at all evident in the light of the

Quran), will be rendered absolutely unfit to be obeyed. This

can be elaborated and explained by means of an example
thus :

The Prophet (peace be upon him) said that there are two compulsory RAKAAT (sets of standing, genuflection and prostration) in the morning prayers, three in the evening (Maghrib) prayers and four in each of the other three prayers. This ruling of the Prophet (peace be upon him) about prayers is proved by TAWATUR (that is unbroken chain of reporters). However, these words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are neither to be found in the Quran nor deduced in the light of Quranic injunctions. Now, the question arises whether these words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are fit for compulsory obedience or not? If it is said that they are fit for compulsory obedience then this very reason constitutes the reason for the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) being decisive authority binding in religion (HUJJAT). On the contrary, if it is contended that they are not fit for compulsory obedience, then it amounts to combining unbelief with insanity. In other words, a person who does not believe that there are two compulsory RAKAAT in the morning prayer, three in the (Maghrib) and four each in the other three is both infidel and insane.

To sum up, the Quran is an unconditional proof, that is, it is HUJJAT (decisive authority, binding in religion), and needs no external proof to prove or establish its truthfulness. There is no condition therein that the words of the Quran should conform to reason or be against it. Exactly, in the same manner, the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are HUJJAT in religion, notwithstanding whether or not they are derived or deduced from the words of the Quran. Even if the words are exclusively those of the prophet (peace be upon him) (that is without reference to the Quran) they are HUJJAT in religion. Even as the words "أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ" "Obey God" are HUJJAT on (the truthfulness of) the Quran, so are "أَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ" (OBEY THE APOSTLE)

HUJJAT on (truthfulness of) the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him). Similarly, the words " **أُولِي الْأَمْرِ** " **THOSE** charged with **AUTHORITY** among you, prove the truthfulness of **IJMA** (Consensus of opinion in religion). Hence these three are unconditional HUJJATS. As opposed to this is obedience to the words of a leader, parents etc, for obedience to them is conditional. If they are in conformity with the Quran, Hadith or religion as such, they will be obeyed but not otherwise. In short, what is considered as religion (of Islam) unanimously, is not entirely proved by the Quran; but a part of it is proved by the Hadith of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and a part also by consensus of religious opinion. As an example, a disbeliever in the compulsory nature of the fasts of the month of Ramadhan is an infidel. This is a matter concerning religion, although no injunction to this effect is to be found either in the Quran or the Hadith. This is only proved by the consensus of religious opinion. Hence, all three are HUJJATS, binding in religion. What remains is **QIYAS** (deduction from Quran and Hadith), which is a conditional proof. There is a condition in the matter :

فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ

"IF YOU DIFFER IN ANY MATTER AMONG YOURSELVES REFER IT TO ALLAH AND THE APOSTLE." (4:59)

Hence, after the above three unconditional proofs, if there is a dispute in a religious matter then it is necessary to turn for light to Allah and the Prophet (peace be upon him).

This means that if you are confronted with a religious problem, the answer to which is not found (directly) in the Quran, Hadith or by IJMA, then you have to search for a problem, in the Quran and Hadith, which would be similar to the problem in hand, and apply the decision given in respect of that problem to the problem in hand. This

method of deduction is known as QIYAS. The meaning of the verse, nevertheless, is not that the Quran and Hadith should be referred to in case of dispute only; since the Quran and Hadith would have been referred to right in the beginning. But if no (direct) solution is found in them, a dispute will arise. Hence, now the Quran and Hadith will once again be referred to for a similar problem and the decision found in respect of that problem will be applied to the problem in hand. This is what is done by all the Jurists (MUJTEHEDIN). Hence, this verse of the Quran contains all four proofs : three are unconditional and the fourth is conditional. Consequently, the word of the prophet (peace be upon him) is HUUJJAT.

The fact should be clearly understood that the Quran is not at all the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) : it is the word of God which has been conveyed verbatim by the Prophet (peace be upon him). Whatever the Prophet (peace be upon him) says, besides the Quran, whether the same is derived from the Quran or not, is in toto the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him). We have called such words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) HUUJJAT, which is neither in the Quran nor derived therefrom. For, if even we say some-thing which is derived from the Quran, our word will also become HUUJJAT by virtue of being derived from the Quran but not because our word is independently HUUJJAT. But the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is an independent HUUJJAT.

An analogy to this effect is found in the chronicle of the Prophet Moses When Moses was preaching his doctrines to Pharaoh the Old Testament (Tawrait) had not been revealed to him. Now, if the words of Moses were not HUUJJAT at that time, Pharaoh would not have deserved punishment (for not obeying him). In fact, the word of a Prophet, before, during and after the revelation of the Book, at all times is HUUJJAT. Further, if the word of the Prophet, irrespective

of the word of God, were not HUUJAT, then the prophethood of a large number of prophets will be obliterated, as a large number of them have not received a Book (of God.) Now, if a Book (of God) only were HUUJAT, then a Prophet without a Book would not be possessor of HUUJAT and disbelief in him would not have amounted to infidelity deserving punishment. Hence, it is proved that the word of a Prophet is HUUJAT.

To sum up, there are two sets of words of God. One is accompanied by a miracle is called the Quran, and the one not accompanied by any miracle is said to be the word of the Prophet. Even as the set of words accompanied by some miracle is HUUJAT, so also is the set of words not accompanied by any miracle HUUJAT. As the words and Books of all the previous Prophets were devoid of miracles but nevertheless were HUUJAT, so also the words of the last of the Prophets (peace be upon him) are entirely HUUJAT.

When God communicates with a person through revelation, this address in itself is Prophethood. and when this Prophet conveys the message to the people, then it constitutes messengership. If the word of the Prophet is not a decisive authority for the people, then the messengership will not remain HUUJAT. Now, the question is what constitutes HUUJAT of the truthfulness of the message to the people? Since the message of God cannot reach the people directly, and it should come through the Prophet only the word of the Prophet which will include the message of God will necessarily be HUUJAT. In short, therefore, the miracle testifies to the truthfulness of the Prophet, that is to say, the miracle proves that the person who claims to be a Prophet is true in all respects. Hence whatever a Prophet will say will be truth and nothing else, whether he says "this is the Quran which has been revealed to me by God", or he says anything other than this. In the same way as we believe in the Quran on the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him), so also we will have to believe in anything he says

besides the Quran. And this other thing is called the word of the Prophet and his Hadith. The miracle has testified to the entire truthfulness of the Prophet (peace be upon him). The miracle has not proved that when he speaks only of the word that is revealed to him he is true, but has proved and testified to his truthfulness in the entirety. Hence, now, that it is proved that the Prophet (peace be upon him) is truthful in all respects, then we should know that he has said two things: one which is known as the Quran and the other the Hadith. It follows, therefore, that as his truthfulness is HUUJJAT of the truthfulness of the Quran, it is likewise HUUJJAT of the truthfulness of the Hadith.

In fact, we have believed in the Quran on the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him). Hence, the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and his saying has become proof of the truthfulness of the Quran, and to its being HUUJJAT. Consequently, the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is the basis for belief in the Quran as HUUJJAT. In the like manner, the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is the proof of the truthfulness of the Hadith and a reason for the acceptance of the Hadith as a HUUJJAT, binding in religion. To sum up, the miracle has proved the truthfulness of the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and has compelled the people to accept his word. Here, we pose a direct question: Tell us on whose word you have accepted the Quran as Quran? Certainly, on the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and because he said so. Then, necessarily the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him), became HUUJJAT on the truthfulness of the Quran. In the same way, the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) became HUUJJAT on the truthfulness of the Hadith. This means that the miracle confirmed the truthfulness of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and induced people to believe in him. We now give another proof from the Quran itself:

رُسُلًا مِّنْ قَبْلِكَ وَمَنْذِرِينَ لِّئَلَّا يَكُونَ لِلنَّاسِ عَلَى اللَّهِ حُجَّةٌ بَعْدَ الرُّسُلِ

“APOSTLES WHO GAVE GOOD NEWS AS WELL AS WARNING, THAT MANKIND AFTER (THE COMING OF APOSTLES) SHOULD HAVE NO PLEA AGAINST ALLAH”. (4:165)

From this it is quite clear that a Prophet is a HUUJJAT of God for the people. At another place God says :

وَمَا كُنَّا مُعَذِّبِينَ حَتَّىٰ نَبْعَثَ رَسُولًا ۝

“WE NEVER PUNISH UNTIL WE HAVE SENT AN APOSTLE (TO GIVE WARNING)” (17:15)

This means that on the arrival of the Prophet. a proof is established (as to what is truth and what is false-hood) and that proof comes in the form of the Prophet. In still another place, God says in respect of the Prophet (peace be upon him)

وَإِنَّكَ لَتَهْدِي إِلَىٰ صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ ۝

“AND LO ! THOU VERILY DOST GUIDE UNTO A RIGHT PATH”. (42:52)

If the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) were not HUUJJAT he would not have been able to lead people to the straight path. The Quran further mentions :

إِنَّكَ لَمِنَ الرُّسُلِينَ ۝ عَلَىٰ صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ ۝

“LO ! THOU ART OF THOSE SENT ON A STRAIGHT PATH” (36:3-4)

It is impossible to believe, therefore, that the word of person who is on the straight path himself and leads people to the straight path is not HUUJJAT. And further :

لَقَدْ كَانَ لَكُمْ فِي رَسُولِ اللَّهِ أُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ

“VERILY IN THE APOSTLE OF ALLAH YE HAVE A BEAUTIFUL PATTERN (OF CONDUCT)” (33:21)

AND ALSO : **كَلَّا وَرَبُّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّىٰ يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ**

“BUT NAY, BY THY LORD, THEY CAN HAVE NO (REAL) FAITH UNTIL THEY MAKE THEE JUDGE IN ALL DISPUTES BETWEEN THEM” (4:65)

God did not say, ‘until they make ME judge, but said UNTIL THEY MAKE THEE JUDGE.’ Now, if the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) were not HUIJAT, how is it that he is made the Judge? Hence, in the word of the Quran, the Prophet (peace be upon him) is a judge, and the word of the judge is HUIJAT. It should be clearly understood that the meaning of HUIJAT is that which induces (demands) belief and action. Some types of HUIJAT demand both belief and action, whereas others demand only belief or only action. That portion of the Holy Quran in respect of which God has said that it is **أَمْرٌ الْكِتَابِ** “SUBSTANCE OF THE BOOK” and **آيَاتٌ مُّفَصَّلَاتٌ** “CLEAR REVELATIONS”, demand both belief and action. On the contrary, that portion about which He has said that it is **مُتَشَابِهَاتٌ** “ALLEGORICAL”, demands only belief in it. It does not require to be acted upon and God has declared acting on it as distortion. On the other hand, the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) in their entirety demand both belief and action. There is no division or differentiation in the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him), as there is in the Words of God. However, those words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) which have reached us through ZAN (assumption), only demand action and do not demand belief. A discussion on this point will appear presently.

It is clear that the Quran is Huijat in all respects. What then is the reason which establishes the truthfulness of the Quran! If we say that the proof of the Quran lies in its being from God, then all those things that are from God will become HUIJAT; God said **قُلْ كُلٌّ مِّنْ عِندِ اللَّهِ** SAY,

ALL ARE FROM GOD", (4:78) that is virtue and evil are all from God. In such a case, evil, too, will become HUUJAT. Similarly, the allegorical portion of the Quran is also from God and that will likewise become HUUJAT. The fact is, that both, the evil and the allegorical part, are not HUUJAT for acting thereon. In truth, the reasons for being HUUJAT lies in AHKAM (clearness of revelation), about which God said :

أَيُّتُ فَحُكْمَتُ هُنَّ أُمُّ الْكِتَابِ

"IN IT ARE VERSES BASIC OR FUNDAMENTAL (OF ESTABLISHED MEANING)". (3:7)

Now who will differentiate between the Clear and the Allegorical revelations? The words of one who is able to differentiate between them will be HUUJAT. And since that difference between the two has been established by the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him), only his word is HUUJAT. Further, God said :

وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُمْ تَعَالَوْا إِلَى مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ ذِكْرًا إِلَى الرَّسُولِ

"AND WHEN IT IS SAID UNTO THEM: COME UNTO THAT WHICH ALLAH HATH REVEALED AND UNTO THE APOSTLE" (4:61)

From this it is clear that if the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) were not HUUJAT, it would be no use calling people towards him. God further said :

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا لِيُطَاعَ بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ

"WE SENT NOT AN APOSTLE BUT TO BE OBEYED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE WILL OF ALLAH". (4:64)

Following is a further clarification in this respect :

مَنْ يُطِيعِ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدْ أَطَاعَ اللَّهَ

"HE WHO OBEYS THE PROPHET OBEYS GOD". (4:80)

In short, there are innumerable verses of the Quran from which obedience to the Prophet is proved. Besides the Book, there is also something else which is HUUJAT. This is proved by the following verse ;

اَيُّوتِي بِكِتَابٍ مِّنْ قَبْلِ هَذَا اَوْ اَشْرَافٍ مِّنْ عِلْمِ اِن كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ ۝

“BRING ME A BOOK (REVEALED) BEFORE THIS (SCRIPTURE), OR ANY REMINANT OF KNOWLEDGE (YE MAY HAVE) IF YE ARE TELLING THE TRUTH” (46:4)

Here, God demands proof from the polytheists and asks them to produce evidence from any Scripture or vestige of knowledge to prove their claim of partnership of their idols with Allah. From the fact that God has asked for proof from either any Scripture or vestige of knowledge, it is clear that, in the eyes of God, evidence from vestige of knowledge is also HUUJAT. Now, this vestige of knowledge is something besides the book, which is reliable before God as HUUJAT. The Book means the Scriptures received by the previous Prophets and vestige of knowledge means the sayings and information which have been reproduced as a single narration, from the previous Prophets. This vestige of knowledge is identical with what we call the traditions and Hadith. God further said :

وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَنُ يُجَادِلُ فِي اللّٰهِ بِغَيْرِ عِلْمٍ وَلَا هُدًى وَلَا كِتَابٍ مُّنِيرٍ ۝

“YET THERE IS AMONG MEN, SUCH A ONE AS DISPUTES ABOUT ALLAH WITHOUT KNOWLEDGE, WITHOUT GUIDANCE AND WITHOUT A BOOK OF ENLIGHTENMENT” (22:8)

From this it is evident that knowledge and guidance are also HUUJAT besides the light—giving Scripture. Knowledge comprises self-evident propositions whereas guidance is a theory proved by those self-evident propositions. In short, there are quite a number of verses of the Quran which prove that Prophet (peace be upon him), that is, his word, is

HUJJAT. But the main argument is that the miracle is HUJJAT of the truthfulness of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and the truthfulness of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is HUJJAT on both the Quran and Hadith. And since a miracle is known and perceived through the senses, it needs no evidence to prove it. The Holy Quran, and all the injunctions emanating therefrom and all the words and sayings proceeding from the Prophet (peace be upon him) are absolutely HUJJAT and the proof of this is as has already been given.

The disbelievers in the Hadith have said that in the following verse :

مَنْ يُطِيعِ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدْ أَطَاعَ اللَّهَ

“WHOSO OBEYETH THE MESSENGER OBEYETH ALLAH” (4:80)

obedience, to which reference is here made, is not obedience to the person of the Prophet (peace be upon him); and they argue that God has said in clear words that it does not behove any prophet to make people obedient to himself, and, according to them, God has also said to our Prophet (peace be upon him) that in matters of dispute, he should decide in conformity with the injunctions of the Quran.

فَاَحْكُمْ بَيْنَهُمْ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ

“SO JUDGE BETWEEN THEM BY THAT WHICH ALLAH HATH REVEALED” (5:48)

The disbelievers in Hadith have likewise turned and twisted the meaning of the following verse of the Quran to explain their contention.

مَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ أَنْ يُؤْتِيَهُ اللَّهُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحُكْمَ وَالنُّبُوَّةَ ثُمَّ يَقُولَ
يَلَيَّاسَ كُنتُ أَعْبَادًا لِلَّهِ مِن دُونِ اللَّهِ وَلَكِنْ كُنتُوا شَرِيكِينَ

"IT IS NOT (POSSIBLE) FOR ANY HUMAN BEING UNTO WHOM ALLAH HAD GIVEN THE SCRIPTURE AND WISDOM AND THE PROPHETHOOD THAT HE SHOULD AFTERWARD HAVE SAID UNTO MANKIND : BE SLAVES OF ME INSTEAD OF ALLAH : BUT (WHAT HE SAID WAS) : BE YE FAITHFUL SERVANTS OF THE LORD."

(3:79)

According to their translation the above verse is made to appear as under :

'It does not behove anyone, that having been bestowed by God, the Book, sovereignty and Prophethood, he should ask the people to give up God and accept his kingship, whereas in fact he should ask them to become people of God'.

We affirm that the above translation is entirely incorrect. The words of the Quranic verse are **كُونُوا عِبَادًا لِّي** which when faithfully rendered mean that a prophet has no right to say to the people to leave God and become his **WORSHIPPERS**. Nowhere in the lexicon the words **كُونُوا عِبَادًا لِّي**

are found to mean 'accept my kingship'. The meaning of 'IBAD' is devotees and creatures (of God) and not subject or governed, or obedient. The word 'IBAD' is applicable to all, that is believers, infidels, and living and even lifeless objects. To elucidate the meaning of IBAD, we further quote the following verses of the Quran :

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ عِبَادٌ أَمْثَلُكُمْ

"VERILY THOSE WHOM YE CALL UPON BESIDES ALLAH ARE SLAVES LIKE UNTO YOU"

(7:194)

And further ;

قُلْ يَاعِبَادِيَ الَّذِينَ اسْرَفُوا عَلَىٰ أَنفُسِهِمْ

"O MY SLAVES WHO HAVE TRANSGRESSED AGAINST THEIR SOULS:"

(39:53)

Likewise :

فَوَجَدَا عَبْدًا مِّنْ عِبَادِنَا

“SO THEY FOUND ONE OF OUR SLAVES” (18:65)

The long and short of it is that, in whatever sense the words ABD and IBAD are used in the Quran, they are used to mean slave (of God) and creatures of God, and never to mean ‘the governed’. Hence, the meaning of :

ثُمَّ يَقُولُ لِلنَّاسِ كُونُوا عِبَادًا لِّيْ

“HE WOULD THEN SAY TO THE PEOPLE
‘LEAVE GOD AND BECOME MY DEVOTEES’”

i.e., he cannot say that he is their creator and they are his creatures”, or ‘I am your God and you become my devotees’. The translation can never be ‘then he would say you become my subjects or accept my sovereignty’. In short, God has called good and the bad alike ‘ABD’ (devotees, creature). In being His devotees and creatures all are alike, but in being obedient (and intelligent follower) is confined to rational being only. This means that the decision and verdict ‘in accordance with what has been revealed to you’ مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ which the Prophet (peace be upon him) has been ordered to give, is only in respect of rational beings, whereas ‘ABD’ is common to both a rational being and one devoid of reason. Now if meaning of كُونُوا عِبَادًا لِّيْ is taken to be كُونُوا مَخْلُوقِينَ لِيْ then the recipient of the address contained in مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ would include even all the animals and plants (lifeless objects) whereas the fact is that they have not been addressed in مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ. They have not been given the commands that have been addressed to mankind. From this, it is absolutely clear that the meaning of ‘IBAD is slaves and creatures (of God) and not subject or governed.

Now, let us put you a direct question : Do you believe in the above verse of the Quran which was conveyed by the Prophet (peace be upon him) or not? If you say you do not,

then you become an infidel and if you say you believe in it and without the instruction contained in **مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ** ('what has been revealed'), and without the Book of God, then the Holy Prophet Mohammad (peace be upon him) becomes without doubt, an independent and absolute MUTA' (one who is obeyed). Where is it mentioned in the Book of God, that verses of the Quran should be believed just on the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him)? And even if you produce such a verse (to the effect that the verse of the Quran should be accepted on the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him)), then the question arises: on the strength of which verse of the Quran have you accepted this verse, which you produce in support of your contention? To sum up, since you say "obedience to Mohammad (peace be upon him) is obedience to the Book of God: as obedience to the Prophet (peace be upon him) is obedience to God, and obedience to God means obedience to the Book of God, hence, obedience of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is in fact obedience to the Book of God, but this obedience is not to the person of the Prophet (peace be upon him)". Now, WE ask you when obedience to the prophet is in fact obedience to the Book of God, whose obedience is the obedience to the Book of God? Is it obedience to God or the Prophet (peace be upon him)? If you say that obedience to the Book of God constitutes obedience to God it is against what you have just said, namely that obedience to the Prophet (peace be upon him) is obedience to the Book of God. Hence your argument goes topsyturvy. And since you also say that obedience to the Book is through the Prophet (peace be upon him), it follows that obedience to the Prophet (peace be upon him) becomes prior to the obedience to the Book of God, but this constitutes obedience to the person of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and not to the Book. In short, you say that this is no obedience to the person of the Prophet (peace be upon him) but it is obedience to God, that is Book of God, we now put to you another question: Whom are

you obeying in accepting the Book of God as Book of God? Is it in obedience to the Book of God, or the Prophet of God? If you say it is in obedience to God, that is the word of God. the Book was accepted as the Book of God, then this amounts to absolute madness. On the contrary, if you say that you have accepted the Book on the strength of the Book of God, then it is (nothing but) stupidity, whereas, if you say that you have accepted the Book of God on the word of the Prophet of God, then this very thing is the truth. Consequently, obedience to the Prophet (peace be upon him) has become prior to the Book of God, and this, in fact, is the meaning of obedience to the person of the Prophet (peace be upon him). Hence, obedience to the Prophet of God is absolute, in the same manner as obedience to the Book of God is absolute. In fact, the obedience to the Book of God is an off-shoot of the obedience of the Prophet (peace be upon him). Hence, obedience to the Prophet of God becomes (is proved to be) HUIJAT on the Book of God.

In the translation of the verse of the Quran quoted above, the disbelievers in the Hadith have given the meaning of HUKM **حُكْمٌ** as 'government', which is absolutely incorrect. The meaning of HUKM. **حُكْمٌ** by the consensus of opinion of the writers of Quranic exegesis is 'wisdom'. The meaning is clear when we read the following Verse of the Quran In respect of the prophet JOHN.

وَاتَيْنَاهُ الْحُكْمَ صَبِيًّا

“WE GAVE HIM WISDOM WHEN A CHILD”.

(19:12)

If the meaning of the word HUKM were 'government' then the translation of the verse would be 'we gave him kingdom (government) in his very childhood', whereas it is a well-known fact that no kingdom (government) was bestowed on the prophet JOHN.

There is here a subtle point which should be well understood.

stood, It is this, that when God says 'Obey Me (worship Me)', then after His so saying, He becomes THE ONE WORSHIPPED. This means that the person of God and His entity (ZAT) of itself does not demand to be worshipped, because His person and entity (ZAT) is AZALI (that is belonging to eternity without beginning), and the demand of the entity (ZAT) cannot be separated from itself. Now, if the demand to be worshipped were of His entity (ZAT), the act of His being worshipped will also become AZALI (would belong to eternity without beginning). But ascertaining of THE WORSHIPPED is not possible without the existence of the worshipper. Hence, the worshipper will also become AZALI **آزَلِي** (eternal without beginning), whereas the fact is that the entire world and the worshippers are all created and not AZALI (eternal, without beginning). From this it is amply clear that God will be worshipped as and when He orders. Hence, it is proved that God has become THE ONE WORSHIPPED on account of His command and not on account of His entity (ZAT). When God commanded **أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ** "OBEY ALLAH" (4:59) it is only on this command that He became the One obeyed. Then He ordered **أَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ** "OBEY THE PROPHET" (4:59) then only on this command, the Prophet (peace be upon him) became to be obeyed (and followed). Hence, on this very order, on which the obedience to God has become compulsory, obedience to the Prophet (peace be upon him) has also become compulsory. This means, that if the order **أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ** "OBEY ALLAH" had not been given, obedience to God would not have been compulsory and binding. In the same way if the command **أَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ** "OBEY THE PROPHET" were not given, obedience to the Prophet (peace be upon him) would not have been compulsory and binding.

It should be well understood that God is not the FAEL **فَاعِل** (Performer) by virtue of His ZAT (**ذَات**) (entity or essence) but by virtue of His intention (and desire). The view (that He is Performer by virtue of His ZAT or essence)

is held by the infidel philosophers. It is for the same reason, that, if His worship were the demand of His ZAT (essence), He would have been worshipped all the time, but this is not the case. Hence, during certain times (disapproved by religion) SAJDAH سجد (prostration to God) is disallowed and even HARAM حرام (prohibited). Now, if it is contended that the fact that the Prophet (peace be upon him) is obeyed and followed is proved and depends on the above quoted verse of the Book of God, and that we have mentioned before, that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) is HUUJJAT on the truthfulness of the Book, and that the Book is not HUUJJAT on the Prophet (peace be upon him), and here we have mentioned that the command of God **وَاطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ**

"AND OBEY THE PROPHET" is HUUJJAT on the Prophet (peace be upon him) being obeyed. Our reply to this is that, in fact, the command of God is HUUJJAT. At times, the command of God is embodied in His words such as **وَاطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ** "AND OBEY THE PROPHET", at other times, it is in the form of His action, and that action or performance of God is the miracle which has made the Prophet (peace be upon him) **مُطَاعٌ** obeyed and followed.

Solely on this command constituted in the acts or performance (of miracle) that the Prophet (peace be upon him) has been obeyed and followed. And this command of God **وَاطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ** "OBEY THE PROPHET" is in the confirmation of the acts, the miracle.

The long and short of it is that the Miracle, that is the command of Performance, is HUUJJAT on the Prophet (peace be upon him) whereas on the determination of the Quran, the Prophet (peace be upon him) is HUUJJAT and the Quran has further confirmed that the Prophet (peace be upon him) is an absolute **مُطَاعٌ** MUTA (one who is obeyed). Hence, the truthfulness of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is not dependent on the Quran. On the contrary, the determination of the Quran and the very fact that Quran is considered to be the Quran is dependent on the truthfulness of the Prophet

(peace be upon him). Like-wise, the Prophet's truthfulness and his being obeyed and followed, and his being HUUJAT dependent on the Miracle, that is, they are proved by the Miracle. The command of God which consists in performance of Miracle, has declared and proved that this claimer to Prophethood, that is, Mohammad (peace be upon him) is truthful. The matter needs sincere deliberation to understand that in the same way as the performance of God is HUUJAT, so the words and acts of the Prophet (peace be upon him), one and all, are HUUJAT. Even as there is no condition in the word of God being HUUJAT that it should conform to reason, exactly in the same way, there is no condition for the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) being HUUJAT that it should be in conformity with the Quran. This is so because, the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is also the word of God, and the Quran is likewise the word of God. Hence, both are words of God: both the Quran and Hadith of the Prophet (peace be upon him). It is not necessary for the words of God to be free from diversity in the same way as it is not necessary for any of His acts to be identical with any other.

We see that, on the one hand, the peak of the mountain reaches the sky, whereas on the other hand, the depth of the ditch reaches the lowest point. Exactly as any of His acts is not required to be like any of his other acts, in the same way, His one word, that is the Hadith of the Prophet (peace be upon him), is not required to be like His other words, that is the Quran. A misconception has arisen in this respect that since the Prophet (peace be upon him) is a human being, his word must be in conformity with the word of God, (for being HUUJAT), but this is not true. The word of the Prophet (peace be upon him), in reality, is the word of God. The Quran is a revelation, as is the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) a revelation, as has already been proved earlier in the discourse.

In support, we quote the following verse of the Quran:

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ ۗ إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ ۗ

“NOR DOETH HE SPEAK OF (HIS OWN) DESIRE
IT IS NAUGHT SAVE AN INSPIRATION THAT IS
INSPIRED” (53:3)

Now, if anyone asks what is the meaning of :

فَأَحْكُمُوا بَيْنَهُمْ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ

“SO JUDGE BETWEEN THEM BY THAT WHICH
ALLAH HATH REVEALED” (5:48)

That is, according to the Book of God, our answer is that the meaning of **مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ** (what has been revealed by God), is not only the Book of God. It is both the Book of God and the Hadith of the Prophet (peace be upon him). On deliberating a little, it will be clear that it was the Prophet (peace be upon him) who ordered that there will be two compulsory RAKAAT (prayers) in the morning (SUBH) prayer, four in the after noon (ZOHR), four in the evening (ASR) three at sun-set (MAGHRIB) and four in the night (ISHA) prayers. This has all been shown by the Prophet (peace be upon him). There are no such details or numbers to be found in the Book of God. You may now say that there is no such an order for five compulsory prayers at the appointed times, since the Book of God does not contain clear instructions to this effect. In such a case, not only infidelity but also insanity would be involved. On the other hand, if you say that this is absolutely the command of God, then necessarily, it is through a revelation received by the Prophet (peace be upon him) which is besides the Quran, and the Prophet (peace be upon him) which is besides the Quran, and the Prophet's command is in accordance with what has been revealed (**مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ**)

The disbeliever in Hadith in the periodical, 'ITA-ATE-RASUL' has said that the meaning of the following verse of the Quran.

أَمَرَ أَنْ لَا تَعْبُدُوا إِلَّا اللَّهَ

“WHO HATH COMMANDED THAT YE WORSHIP NONE BUT HIM (ALLAH)”. (12:40)

is that He, God, has commanded not to accept anyone's government (kingship) except His'. He further says 'according to the Quran, God's worship and God's government are one and the same thing, that is, obedience to the laws of God'. To this, our reply is as follows :-

According to his rendering, 'IBADAT' (worship) and 'ITA'AT' (obedience) are identical in meaning, and to him, the meaning of ' لَا تَعْبُدُوا ' and ' لَا تُطِيعُوا ' are one and the same. This means that worship and obedience are identical in meaning. WE affirm that, it is absolutely incorrect to treat worship and obedience as identical. There is worship of idols, Jinns,

يَعْبُدُونَ الْجِنَّةَ

("THEY WERE WORSHIPPING JINN"), (34:41)

of the angels and even of the prophet Jesus and of the sun. In short, various (God's creations (things) are being worshipped. But this does not constitute obedience: that is, no one is obedient to the idols. Likewise no one is obedient to angels and to Jesus, but there are worshippers of them. Hence, it is evident that a person that is obedient is different from the worshipper (that is they are not necessarily same). Further, obedience to the Prophet (peace be upon him) is obedience to God, but worship of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is not worship of God. It is, therefore, crystal clear that obedience is different from worship. The above is a huge fallacy in which people are entangled.

CHAPTER III

IS THE EXTANT COLLECTION OF GENUINE AHADITH (TRADITIONS) RELIABLE OR NOT ?

Question : Is the extant collection of Traditions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) certain or conjectural ?

Answer : It is conjectural—the Ahadith (Traditions) contained in Bukhari, Muslim and others are all conjectural.

IS CONJECTURE HUJJAT (CONCLUSIVE PROOF FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF RELIGION) OR NOT ?

Question : Is Zan (conjecture) Hujjat (conclusive proof from the point of view of religion) or not ?

Answer : Conjecture (Zan) is Hujjat from the point of view of both reason and religion.

MEANING OF ZAN (ظن) (CONJECTURE) :—

It is necessary to understand at the out-set the meaning of (ظن) Zan (conjecture). When the subject matter of a narration comes to mind, then two mental conditions are possible, either the mind is inclined towards the truth of the narration or its falsehood. If the mind is neither inclined towards its truth nor its falsehood, then this is called (تخيل) TAKHAYYUL—thought. If the mind is at all inclined, then we have to see: is it inclined towards any one side, that is, either only towards its being true or only towards its being false, or is it inclined towards both? If it is

inclined towards one side only then this one sided inclination is called (**جزم**) JAZM (determination) or (**قطع**) QATA (severence). And this has the following three aspects. Is this one-sided inclination in accordance with the fact of the matter or not? That is to say the narration was in fact perfectly correct but the mind considered it to be entirely false : or that in fact it was entirely false but the mind considered it to be entirely true. Hence, if the one-sided inclination is opposed to the fact of the matter, then such a stand is called JEHL-E-MURAKKAB (**جهل مرکب**) (compound ignorance). If, on the other hand, it is in accordance with the fact of the matter then to decline this inclination and belief is either possible or not possible. If it is capable of being declined, then this inclination which is in accordance with the fact and yet capable of being declined is known as (**تقليد**) TAQLEED (emulation, imitation), if it is not capable of being declined (being broken), then this inclination which is in accordance with the fact of the matter and not capable of being broken is called (**يقين**) YAQEEN (unswerving faith). In short, there are three aspects of one-sided inclination (1) JEHL-E-MURAKKAB (compound ignorance), (2) TAQLEED (emulation or imitation), (3) YAQEEN (unswerving faith).

Likewise, there are three categories of a two-sided inclination. If this two-sided inclination is equal on both the sides, then it is called (**شك**) SHAK (partial or unconfirmed belief). However, if it is more on one side than the other, then on the side on which it is less, it is called (**دوم**) WAHM (doubt) and on the side on which it is more, it is called (**ظن**) ZAN (conjecture) or (**گمان**) GUMAN (supposition). For instance, if we say that such and such narration is (**ظن الصدق**) ZANNI AL SIDQ, then the meaning of this is that it is more inclined towards truth, and less inclined towards falsehood. On the otherhand if we say that such and such narration is (**ظن الكذب**) ZANNI AL

KIZB then it is meant that it is more inclined towards falsehood and less inclined towards truth.

When the meaning of ZAN (conjecture) has been understood, it is necessary to ascertain whether ZAN (conjecture) necessitates action or not. It should be well understood that in YAQEEN (unswerving faith) the extent of inclination is so great to one side that there is not the slightest deviation to the other side; whereas in ZAN (conjecture) the extent of inclination is so great on one side that there is only a slight deviation to the other side. However, both are equal in as far as the extent of inclination is concerned, but that which makes action compulsory is the excess (of inclination) and not its deficiency. Hence, in the same way as YAQEEN (unswerving faith) demands action by virtue of its predominant inclination to one side so also ZAN (conjecture) demands action on account of its excessive inclination. In other words, why is YAQEEN (unswerving faith) a cause for action? It is so only because of its predominant, excessive inclination. In it such excess is so great that there is no possibility of deficiency. Hence, in YAQEEN (unswerving faith), the cause for action is the quality of predominance and not because there is no possibility of deficiency. Therefore, HUJJAT (conclusive proof) lies in predominance (of inclination), and this is present in ZAN (conjecture). Hence, on the same grounds on which YAQEEN (unswerving faith) is HUJJAT (conclusive proof), conjecture is also HUJJAT (conclusive proof). In short, in order to do a thing (action), the goodness of the thing (action) should be present before the mind, and this conception (of goodness) is as much present in ZAN (conjecture) as it is in YAQEEN (unswerving faith). As there is present in ZAN (conjecture) this inclination (in excess), it is sufficient to induce action. Hence, ZAN (conjecture) and YAQEEN (unswerving faith) are HUJJAT (conclusive proof) on the same grounds.

We declare that if YAQEEN (unswerving faith) only were

HUJJAT (conclusive proof) and the ZAN (conjecture) were not, then there would be no failures in the world, they would simply not occur. Since, when a person would definitely know (that is, he would have Yaqeen) that such and such an action is beneficial (profitable), then benefit or profit or success will definitely result therefrom, and failures and disappointments will not. But, on the contrary, we find that in the world there are present, side by side, success and failure and profit and loss. Hence, it is clear that action does not depend only on YAQEEN (unswerving faith), and ZAN (conjecture) is sufficient to induce action, 'This is the reason why in certain things failure takes place.

COMMON SENSE REASON TO PROVE THAT ZAN (CONJECTURE) IS A HUJJAT (CONCLUSIVE PROOF) :-

All the transactions in the world, and especially business matters are based on ZAN (conjecture). There is no profit in every business. If YAQEEN (unswerving faith) were the impetus for doing business, none would suffer a loss. But the conjectural profit is the cause which induces action in business, that is, a person imagines that there would be profit in a certain transaction, and he undertakes it.

Similar is the case in the matter of labour. If the labourer had the YAQEEN (unswerving faith) that on going to the market he would get an appropriate job, no labourer would remain jobless. Only the ZAN (conjecture) of getting a job brings him to the market. In the majority of cases he gets a job but sometimes he does not.

Much the same is the condition of an employee in his service, or a doctor. The doctor has no absolute YAQEEN (unswerving faith) that administration of his medicine will result in cure. If this were the case, (that is, if the doctor would have absolute faith in the cure with his medicine), then no patient would go uncured. The doctor has only ZAN (conjecture) in the curative action of his medicine and he administers it on his ZAN. At times cure takes place, at

other times it does not. Hence the action of both the doctor and the medicine are ZANNI (depending on conjecture).

Now, if ZAN (conjecture) were not the cause of action, then the treatment of diseases would come to an end and no one would undertake treatment and no one would go for treatment. Similarly, in the case of a journey, whether it be on foot, or in a (carriage, by car, rail, aeroplane, ship or on horse back, or by any other means, we observe that the person who undertakes the journey, does not have absolute certainty that he will reach his destination safe and sound and he only acts on ZAN (conjecture). Now, if ZAN (conjecture) were not the motivating force for action, there would be an end to all travelling. Similarly, in the floating of airways and railway companies, it is not known for certain that there would be only profit resulting from them, and there will be no loss, but there is strong conjecture (ZANN-E-GHALIB) that it would be a profitable enterprise, and that there would be loss at times. Now, if ZAN (conjecture) ceases to be an incentive for action, then all the industries will disappear. In fact, there is no action in the world which does not depend on ZAN (conjecture). Every action is motivated by ZAN (conjecture); In conclusion if ZAN (conjecture) were not beneficial for promoting action or inducing activity or being a conclusive proof (HUJJAT) for action, the entire arrangement and stability of the world would be destroyed. This is because, no one has absolute certainty (YAQEEN) of the goodness of the result of any of his actions, but only conjectures that it would be so. God has said in the Holy Quran as follows :

وَلَوْ اتَّبَعَ الْحَقُّ أَهْوَاءَهُمْ لَفَسَدَتِ
السَّمَاوَاتُ وَالْأَرْضُ وَمَنْ فِيهِنَّ

“AND IF THE TRUTH HAD FOLLOWED THEIR DESIRES, VERILY THE HEAVENS AND THE EARTH AND WHOSOEVER IS THEREIN HAD BEEN CORRUPTED (DESTROYED)” (23:71)

It is proved by the above verse that destruction of the world is equivalent to the Truth being subordinated to the desire of the people and it is proved by observation that the destruction of the world is due to ZAN (conjecture) not being considered HUIJAT (conclusive proof). Hence, it can be deduced that ZAN S (conjecture's) not being HUIJAT would mean that the Truth follows their desire. Hence, it is absolutely clear that ZAN is truth, and contributes to the stability of the world; and being subordinated to the desire, that is, by ZAN (conjecture) not being considered HUIJAT, it becomes the cause of mischief in the world. This matter demands profound deliberation.

Let us see, which of the actions in the world is motivated by YAQEEN (unswerving faith). The entire transaction is based on ZAN (conjecture). We are now going to show that all the actions pertaining to religion are based only on ZAN (conjecture). Nevertheless, faith is based on YAQEEN (certainty): in fact, it is nothing but YAQEEN (unswerving faith). It is worth observing that every one who does a virtuous deed, is motivated by the desire to be free from punishment, to gain paradise and reward. Now, let us see whether there is any one who has YAQEEN (perfect confidence) that he would certainly be free from the punishment of Hell and would go to Heaven. All act on ZAN (conjecture) and on the supposition that perhaps they would acquire freedom from punishment and obtain reward. Excepting the Prophets, all are motivated for their actions by ZAN. Now, we give examples from actions pertaining to religion:

EXAMPLES FROM ACTIONS PERTAINING TO RELIGION

Marriage depends entirely on the testimony of two witnesses, and the testimony of the two persons is ZANNI, that is depending on conjecture. Religion has declared this ZAN (conjecture) as HUIJAT (conclusive proof). Similarly,

the punishment for adultery is decided on the testimony of four persons, and the testimony of these four persons is only ZANNI, depending on conjecture. Nevertheless, the religious law has declared such a severe punishment on the ground of ZAN (conjecture), as being HUIJAT (conclusive proof). Further, even a father's position as a father depends on ZAN (conjecture), but the religious law has declared it as HUIJAT (conclusive proof). This means the relation is based on ZAN, and the decree of legacy is (also) based on this very ZAN. Likewise, whereas the fact is that prostration in prayers should be directed exactly towards the KAABA, but the line which can be drawn from the place of prostration to the KAABA depends on ZAN (conjecture), and is not definite. Likewise, the time of early morning meals (Sehri) in fasting and the breaking of fast (Iftar) in the evening (at sun-set) are both dependent on ZAN (conjecture). We do not know exactly whether the Sehri (early morning meal) and the Iftar (breaking of fast) have been performed at the proper time or not. God said in the Quran :

وَأَسْتَشْهِدُوا شَهِيدَيْنِ مِنْ رِجَالِكُمْ

“AND CALL TO WITNESS, FROM AMONG YOUR MEN, TWO WITNESSES”, (2:282)

But the testimony of two witnesses is only ZANNI, that is, depending on conjecture. Nevertheless, God has declared it as HUIJAT. God further said :

وَالَّذِينَ يَرْمُونَ الْمُحْصَنَاتِ ثُمَّ لَمْ يَأْتُوا بِأَرْبَعَةِ شُهَدَاءِ

“AND THOSE WHO ACCUSE HONOURABLE WOMEN BUT BRING NOT FOUR WITNESSES”

(24:4)

and

لَوْلَا جَاءُوا عَلَيْهِمْ بِأَرْبَعَةِ شُهَدَاءِ

“WHY DID THEY NOT PRODUCE FOUR WITNESSES”

(24:13)

In the above verses testimony of four witnesses, has been considered sufficient for inflicting punishment (that is, convicting the accused), as being HUIJAT, whereas the testimony of the four witnesses is not definite. In short, the Holy Quran has declared the performance of by far the majority of the virtuous deeds based on ZAN (conjecture) as HUIJAT. God has said :

لَتَعْلَمُوا عَدَدَ السِّنِينَ وَالْحِسَابِ

"THAT YE MIGHT KNOW NUMBER OF THE YEARS AND THE RECKONING". (10:5)

مَا خَلَقَ اللَّهُ ذِيكَ إِلَّا بِالْحَقِّ

"ALLAH CREATED NOT (ALL) THAT SAVE IN TRUTH". (10:5)

وَأَخْضَى كُلَّ شَيْءٍ عِدًّا

"AND HE KEEPETH ACCOUNT OF ALL THINGS". (72:28)

Now, Mathematics is true, and since Mathematics is true, the main factor on which mathematics depends is also true, and that factor is the following Theorem :

WHEN FOUR QUANTITIES ARE PROPORTIONAL THE PRODUCT OF THE EXTREMES IS EQUAL TO THE PRODUCT OF THE MEANS.

This can be expressed by a simple proportion as under :

$$12:3 :: 8:2$$

This means that 2 is related to 8 in the same manner as 3 is related to 12. Hence, the product of 2 and 12 is equal to the product of 8 and 3 and all the laws of Mathematics, except addition and subtraction, are entirely the off shoots of this fact. At another place, we have proved that the knowledge of Mathematics is the result of principle of Geometry. Now since Mathematics depends on the principles of Geometry, then necessarily in the same way as Mathematics

is true, Geometry, on which Mathematics depends, is also true. It follows that since Geometry is true the factor on which Geometry depends is also true, and that factor constitutes the following fundamental principles :

- 1) That a line can be drawn by joining two points.
- 2) That a line can be extended indefinitely.
- 3) That from a given point as the centre, a circle of any radius can be drawn.

The above are the three fundamental principles on which all the Theorems of Geometry depend. All these these are not self evident truths. If they were, they would have been included in the category of exact sciences, which are evidently sound and positive. On the other hand, if they were theoretical formulas, then like other theoretical subjects, they would have been included in the theorems and they would have been proved like other theorems. But nothing of the sort has been done. They have neither been included in the category of the twelve positive sciences nor is there any mention of them in any of the discourses on theoretical formulas. They have been accepted on the authority of gracious presumption of the Teacher of Geometry, and this is conjectural. Hence, if ZAN were not HUIJAT, then all the things depending on this ZAN (conjecture) would not have been HUIJAT, neither the Geometrical formulas nor Mathematics. But God has termed Mathematics as True. Hence, necessarily, Geometry also becomes true and as Geometry depends on these three fundamental principles, hence they also are true. Now, these three fundamental principles are based on ZAN (conjecture), hence ZAN, becomes HUIJAT, in the light of the Quran. In conclusion, (we say that) if ZAN. were not HUIJAT, the entire arrangement of the world and religion would be shattered. Hence, ZAN is HUIJAT.

Now, if it is argued that there are verses of the Quran against the use of ZAN such as :

اجْتَنِبُوا كَثِيرًا مِّنَ الظَّنِّ إِنَّ بَعْضَ الظَّنِّ إِثْمٌ

“SHUN MUCH SUSPICION ; FOR LO ! SOME SUSPICION IS A CRIME”. (49:12)

إِن يَتَّبِعُونَ إِلَّا الظَّنَّ وَمَا تَهْوَى الْأَنْفُسُ

“THEY FOLLOW BUT A GUESS AND THAT WHICH (THEY) THEMSELVES DESIRE”. (53:23)

And further God has Said :

إِن هُمْ إِلَّا يَظُنُّونَ

“THEY BUT GUESS”. (2:78)

Again :

إِنَّ الظَّنَّ لَا يُغْنِي مِنَ الْحَقِّ شَيْئًا

“ASSUREDLY CONJECTURE CAN BY NO MEANS TAKE THE PLACE OF TRUTH”. (10:36)

Besides the above, there are quite a number of verses censuring ZAN. What then is the reply to this? The reply is that there has been a mistake in comprehending the exact meaning of ZAN (conjecture). One ZAN is that which is the opposite of YAQEEN (unswerving faith): As, when we say, “this is ZANNI”. this is YAQEENI knowledge “when we mean that this is an “exact science” or that this is “true knowledge”. Hence, one ZAN is a kind of knowledge, whereas the other ZAN (conjecture) denotes a kind of action. Now, there are two types of ZAN meaning action :

One is SU-E-ZAN (unjustified opinion), and the other is HUSN-E-ZAN (good opinion). Following is the example of HUSN-E-ZAN (good opinion) :

لَوْلَا إِذْ سَمِعْتُمُوهُ ظَنَّ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ وَالْمُؤْمِنَاتُ بِأَنْفُسِهِمْ خَيْرًا

“WHY DID NOT THE BELIEVERS, MEN AND WOMEN, WHEN YE HEARD IT, THINK GOOD OF THEIR OWN FOLK ?

(that is why did they not have HUSN-E-ZAN — good opinion).

(24:12)

The following is, an example of SU-E-ZAN (unjustified opinion).

اجْتَنِبُوا كَثِيرًا مِّنَ الظَّنِّ

“SHUN MUCH SUSPICION”.

(49:12)

Shun much suspicion means shun SU-E-ZAN (unjustified opinion. That means that there are two types of ZAN : one is ZAN, meaning ZAN-E-KHAIR, (good opinion) which we are ordered to adopt and the other is ZAN, meaning SU-E-ZAN (unjustified opinion) which we are ordered to shun.

The ZAN (conjecture) which we have termed HUIJAT (conclusive proof), is neither HUSN-E-ZAN (gracious presumption, good opinion) nor SU-E-ZAN (unjustified suspicion) but it is ZAN (conjecture) which is opposite of YAQEEN (unswerving faith), and falls in the category of knowledge. The proof of its being HUIJAT (conclusive proof) is also contained in the following verse of the Quran :

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اجْتَنِبُوا كَثِيرًا مِّنَ الظَّنِّ إِنَّ بَعْضَ الظَّنِّ إِثْمٌ

“O YE WHO BELIEVE ! SHUN MUCH SUSPICION FOR LO ! SOME SUSPICION IS A CRIME”.

(49:12)

In the above verse, some ZAN (conjecture) has been called sin and we are ordered to shun much ZAN (conjecture), whereas, since only some are sin, God should have ordered us to shun some. But He has ordered to shun majority of ZAN, since we do not know, out of the grades of the majority, which is the grade of that particular ZAN (conjec-

ture) which is sin. Hence, the order to shun much ZAN since the aim is to shun and avoid that which is sin. It is possible, that, that ZAN may be this or that or any other, since that ZAN which is sin is among the majority of ZAN. Therefore, if ZAN (conjecture) were not HUJJAT (conclusive proof), and only YAQEEN (unswerving faith) were HUJJAT (conclusive proof), God would have ordered us to shun only some ZAN (conjecture) which is sin.

This will be evident from an example. For instance, the number of ZANS is 100 and out of these some are regarded as sins, for instance 10. We are told to shun or refrain from 70, whereas it was necessary only to shun 10. The order to shun 70 is because this 10 which is required to be avoided is among the 7 tenths of the 70, and it is not known to us which tenth is that. It may be the first tenth or second, or third or fourth or fifth or sixth or the seventh tenth; in fact any of tenth is possible. Now since every tenth is possible, then there is ZAN in every. Hence, ZAN is certainly proved to be HUJJAT, on the ground that instead of shunning some, it is required to shun much, whereas the demand of YAQEEN was that only that should be shunned which is sin. But there is YAQEEN about only some being sin, whereas ZAN (conjecture) is in respect of much. That is, in fact there is ZAN about sin being in much (majority). And since ZAN is considered by God as HUJJAT (conclusive proof), on this very ground God has prohibited to the extent that ZAN could reach, that is, much ZAN. In short, the meaning of the verse can now be rendered to this, that, some ZAN (conjecture) is certainly sin and vice, but much ZAN, that is, the entire lot of it is sin by way of conjecture, and since ZAN is a HUJJAT (conclusive proof) for acting thereon, hence we are required to refrain from the entire ZAN and not only from that which is certainly a sin. Hence ZAN is proved to be HUJJAT (conclusive proof). However, the censure of ZAN in belief and faith is true. The foundation of (religious) belief is laid on YAQEEN. ZAN does not produce

YAQEFN. Hence, ZAN has been censured. In short, ZAN (conjecture) is a cause for (that is, demands) action, and is not a cause for faith or belief. Hence, ZAN (conjecture) will not be HUIJAT in questions where faith is concerned, but in questions concerning action it will be HUIJAT (conclusive proof).

It should be clearly understood that if ZAN (conjecture) were not HUIJAT, it will not be possible to act on most of the verses of the Holy Quran. For instance :

قُلْ لَا أَسْأَلُكُمْ عَلَيْهِ جُزْءًا إِلَّا الْوَدْعَةَ فِي الْقُرْبَىٰ

“SAY (O MOHAMMAD, UNTO MANKIND): I ASK OF YOU NO FEE THEREFOR, SAVE LOVING KINDNESS AMONG KINSFOLK”.

(42:23)

Now, this “loving kindness among kinsfolk” may mean that you should love your neighbours (kinsfolk), it may also mean that you should love my kinsfolk. Again, it may mean that love me and I am your kinsman. Hence, the verse can be interpreted in three different ways, and it is not known which exactly is the meaning intended by God. Nevertheless, all the meanings are conjectural. Hence, if ZAN were not HUIJAT, it would not be possible to act on the instructions of the Book. Likewise, the following verse is a good example :

وَالْمُطَلَّاتُ يَتَوَصَّيْنَ بِأَنْفُسِهِنَّ ثَلَاثَةَ قُرُوءٍ

“WOMEN WHO ARE DIVORCED SHALL WAIT, KEEPING THEMSELVES APART, THREE (MONTHLY) COURSES”.

(2:228)

In the above verse, it is said that the period for waiting for divorced women is three courses. Now, “course” may mean menstruation. Likewise, it may mean purification after the menstrual period. Hence, both the meanings menstruation and purification after the menstrual period are conjectural.

It is not certain whether the menses or the purification after menses is meant by God. Similarly, in the following verse of the Holy Quran :

وَيَحْمِلُ عَرْشَ رَبِّكَ فَوْقَهُمْ يَوْمَئِذٍ ثَمَنِيَّةٌ

“AND EIGHT WILL UPHOLD THE THRONE OF THEIR LORD, THAT DAY, ABOVE THEM”.

(69:17)

Here, the number given is eight, but the person or thing for which the number stands is conjectural it is not known to whom the number eight refers. What is exactly the intention of God? Is it eight angels that are meant or any other eight persons or things are meant? Or does it mean the seven heavens and the earth?

The idea is that the interpretation of most of the verses, based on their literal meaning is conjectural. If ZAN were not HUIJAT it would not be possible to act on the instructions embodied in most of the verses of the Holy Quran.

ARE THE UNIVERSALLY ACCEPTED AHADITH (TRADITIONS) OF THE PROPHET (PEACE BE UPON HIM) WORTH FOLLOWING OR NOT ?

Question :

Is the report of a single person (that is tradition received through the report of a single narrator) a HUIJAT (conclusive proof) ? That is, is it worth following or not ? In other words, are the present collections of Ahadith, such as found in the works of Bukhari, Muslim etc., HUIJAT (conclusive proof) or not ?

Answer :

YES, the report of a single person that is, Hadith received through a single روى (Rawi) is worth following.

Proof : If the report of a single person is not a HUIJAT (conclusive proof), then the entire system and order of the world will be destroyed. But the arrangement of the world is existing and firm. Hence, the Hadith or tradition of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is HUIJAT (conclusive proof) and is worth following, and it is obligatory to act on the Hadith.

First Proof : We give the following reasons to substantiate our contention that if the report of a single narrator were not HUIJAT (conclusive proof), the entire arrangement of the world would be destroyed.

Man is by nature a social being, that is, he is dependent on others for his survival. To obtain his needs, he has to rely on the fact that he should convey to others his needs and requirements, and the method of conveying this, that is expressing what is in his mind is only by means of report and narration. This means that the entire life of man depends on report and narration only.

KHABAR-E-MUTAWATIR
(Continuous Report).

Khabar-E-Mutawatir : (Or, continuous report): There

are two kinds of KHABAR (report). One is KHABAR-E-MUTAWATIR (KHABAR-E-MUTAWATIR), which is a continuous report. For instance, we say that Egypt, Damascus, Mecca, and other cities. Now, those people who have not seen these cities have the same firm belief in their being cities, on account of the continuous report received from various people, as those who have seen the cities.

KHABAR-E-WAHID: The other type of report is which is not received as KHABAR-E-MUTAWATIR. This is known as KHABAR-E-WAHID. When we say KHABAR-E-WAHID we mean that report which is not KHABAR-E-MUTAWATIR. To act on KHABAR-E-MUTAWATIR is difficult, nay, practically impossible, since KHABAR-E-MUTAWATIR is that report which is conveyed to people by a very large majority of persons who have actually felt the happening or seen the event, that there may not be any chance of such a majority going wrong in such a way that the number of reporters is not decreased at any time. To prove such a KHABAR (report) in the action (life) of a man is practically impossible. Hence, necessarily, the only thing left for man to act upon is that report which is not continuous that is, KHABAR-E-WAHID. Therefore, if KHABAR-E-WAHID were not to induce action, there will be an end to the action of man, and the entire arrangement of the world will be shattered. In short, man depends on report (KHABAR) for his action, and the existence or availability of the KHABAR-E-MUTAWATIR which is certain and definite is difficult, or nearly impossible. Hence, KHABAR-E-WAHID, which though is uncertain and conjectural is the only thing which can induce action. For instance, a person tells another not to go any further, as the wall is about to fall. Now, the person says to himself that the information given by the other person is only of a single person, KHABAR-E-WAHID, is conjectural, and that he would only act on YAQEEN, (that is KHABAR-E-MUTAWATIR which is certain); and YAQEEN (certainty) is not possible, unless the wall falls and this is seen by such a

large majority of persons, that it cannot possibly be believed by reason to go wrong. It is not possible to obtain such a large number of persons at this time (who would bear witness to the falling of the wall). Hence, it is not possible to obtain **YAQEEN** (certainty), and the man does not act according to the information of the person who wanted to stop him from proceeding further. Naturally, he goes ahead and dies through getting buried under the wall. Consequently, not acting on the report of a single person results in destruction.

Second Proof : Higher priority is always given to avoiding loss than obtaining gains. If the **KHABAR-E-WAHID** is in fact the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him), then to act on it is to save one-self from action that is, not following the Hadith of the Prophet (peace be upon him). On the other hand, if it is not the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him), then there is no gain in acting upon it. Nevertheless, there is prevention of loss on acting upon **KHABAR-E-WAHID**.

Third Proof : When, after deliberation and pondering, a man comes to the conclusion that **KHABAR-E-WAHID** is not a conclusive proof, and does not demand action, he resolves in favour of abstaining from action thereon. Hence, now the resolve is for refraining from action. But the intention to desist from action is also a kind of action. That is, the action on **KHABAR-E-WAHID** would have been acting on **ZAN** (conjecture) and based on natural inclination, and the latter action that is, refraining from action is opposed to conjecture and natural inclination, that is, it is based on suspicion. Now, if action on suspicion (**WAHM**) which is weaker than conjecture (**ZAN**) is permissible, then action should be preferred more on **ZAN** (conjecture) which is far better than **WAHM** (suspicion).

Proof No. 4 : On the evidence of the word of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) being certain, makes action thereon obligatory, and when the action becomes certainly

obligatory, it is clear that if it is known through ZAN that the command of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is absolute, that is, depending on ZAN, and the command of God is present therein but only through conjecture. But the command of God, even if it is known through conjecture, takes action thereon obligatorily. The word of Prophet (peace be upon him) which is known through ZAN absolutely demands action thereon. Hence, the meaning of the argument is that, the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) about which it is certainly known that it is the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) certainly demands action. And the fact that it absolutely demands action means that it is absolutely the command of God. Hence, the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is necessarily the command of God. Therefore, the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and the command of God are inseparable from each other. Similarly, when the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is conceived through conjecture, it is still the command of God but only conceived through ZAN or conjecture. But even if the command of God is conceived through ZAN, action thereon is absolutely obligatory. In other words, if it is known through conjecture that this is the command of God, then on this command of God, even though it is conceived through conjecture, action is absolutely necessary.

Proof No. 5 : The absolute word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is the absolute command of God, and action thereon is absolutely necessary. Similarly, the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is, nevertheless, the command of God though conceived only through ZAN. But, the command of God conceived through conjecture, like the command of God received on absolutely clear evidence, compulsorily demands action thereon. The sum and substance of the argument is that, what makes action obligatory is the command of God; whether the command is absolute or conceived on ZAN. As for example, action of the external

Meaning of the Quran is obligatory, and interpretation of most of the verses, as far as their meaning is concerned, is conjectural. Nevertheless action thereon is compulsory. Hence, it is proved that what makes action compulsory is the command of God. This is so, whether the command of God is known on sound evidence or through conjecture. In any case, action on the verse of the Quran is absolutely obligatory. The meaning of the verses of the Quran being conjectural is that it is possible that the sense and connotation which the jurists or the learned persons have understood (and given to the verses in their interpretation) may not be exactly what is intended by God. Although the evidence of the verse is certain (that is, it is certain that those verses are the words of God), but their evidence on the meaning of the verses is conjectural. Now exactly in the same way as the command of God, with certain evidence but conjectural proof (in so far as the meaning is concerned), demands compulsory action on it, so does the KHABAR-E-WAHID and the Hadith of the Prophet (peace be upon him) demands action, and there is no discrimination left.

Proof No. 6 : The concensus of opinion of all the companions of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) is that KHABAR-E-WAHID is HUJJAT (conclusive proof). If report of a single person were not HUJJAT, the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) would not have acted upon it. Hazrat Abu Bakr Siddiq (R) narrated the following Hadith :

الْأئِمَّةُ مِنَ الْقُرَيْشِ

- 1) "THE LEADER SHALL BE FROM THE QUREISH"

نَحْنُ مَعَاشِرُ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ لَا نُوْرَثُ وَلَا نُورِثُ

- 2) "OURS IS A COMMUNITY OF THE PROPHETS: IT DOES NOT INHERIT ANY ONE, NOR IS IT INHERITED BY ANY ONE".

3) "PROPHETS ARE BORN TO DIE".

All the above Ahadith were narrated by Imam Bakr (R) and all the companions unanimously and this consensus of opinion of theirs has been passed down to us by an unbroken and continuous chain of narrators.

Proof No. 7: It is proved by TAWATUR (continuous chain of narrators) that the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) sent individuals for the propagation of the religious tenets. If the KHABAR-E-WAHID were not REJECT, the benefit of propagation would not have reached people; instead, they would have gone astray.

Proof No. 8: Following is the command of God:

فَمَا كَانَ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ لِيَنفِرُوا كَافَّةً فَلَوْلَا نَفَرَ مِن
كُلِّ فِرْقَةٍ مِّنْهُمْ طَائِفَةٌ لِّيَتَفَقَّهُوا فِي الدِّينِ وَ
لِيُنذِرُوا قَوْمَهُمْ إِذَا رَجَعُوا إِلَيْهِمْ لَعَلَّهُمْ يَحْذَرُونَ

"AND THE BELIEVERS SHOULD NOT ALL GO OUT TO FIGHT. OF EVERY TROOP OF THEM, A PARTY ONLY SHOULD GO FORTH, THAT THEY (WHO ARE LEFT BEHIND) MAY GAIN SOUND KNOWLEDGE IN RELIGION, AND THEY MAY WARN THEIR-FOLK WHEN THEY RETURN TO THEM, SO THAT THEY MAY BEWARE"

(9:122)

Now the word FIRQA (group) is used to indicate a minimum number of three, that is, there should be at least three (persons or things). Hence God has made it obligatory in the above verse that a party (number of men out of every FIRQA (group), that is, out of every three) should go forth

that they may gain sound knowledge in religion". Now, the number which will be sent forth out of the FIRQA (that is, three), will be either two or one. Nevertheless, it has been made obligatory to follow the information (KHABAR) conveyed by this batch (of two or one). When this batch of persons returns to their native place and conveys to people the information and reports, requiring people to fear God, it is made obligatory for the people to follow what is conveyed by it. The inference from the above verse is that the batch should go out for the acquisition of religious knowledge, and after having acquired religious knowledge, on returning to their native place, they should warn their community by conveying to them (the message) warning, saying : "O, people I be afraid of disobedience and opposition to the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). Now, it is incumbent upon the people to be afraid of the thing warned by the party concerned, and act upon their report. The fact is that FIRQA (group) may consist of two or even a single person, as is clear from the following verse of the QURAN :

وَإِنْ طَائِفَتَانِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ اقْتَتَلُوا فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا

"IF TWO PARTIES OF BELIEVERS FALL TO FIGHTING, THEN MAKE PEACE BETWEEN THEM".

(49:9)

In the same way as making peace between two large parties is necessary, so also it is necessary to bring about conciliation and peace between two fighting individuals. From the above verse, it can be deduced that the word TAEFA (batch) can also be used for an individual. Hence, the application of the word TAEFA (batch) to one or two persons is correct. And since God has made it compulsory to act on the information and advice of the TAEFA. (that is, the informant), who warns and cautions them, it is evident that for a community, KHABAR-E-WAHID is HUJJAT, according to religion. This means that God has made the

Proof No. 9 : Action, conceived in the form of all periods of rest and the period of movement, that is, they are never ending. In other words, it forms numberless actions. Further, actions are according to changing conditions, and action in different conditions demands different directions (instructions). Hence, the directions required become innumerable and the verses of the Quran with clear-cut instructions are limited in number. Therefore, acting only on the verses of the Quran with clear-cut instructions would leave much of the actions unauthorised (that is, having no direction for their performance). Hence there will be many actions for which justification for prohibition or sanction thereof will not be found in the Quran, and at that time the life of man will become useless and absurd in view of those actions. Further God has said in the Holy Quran :

أَفَحَسِبْتُمْ أَنَّمَا خَلَقْنَاكُمْ عَبَثًا

“DEEMED YE THEN THAT WE HAD CREATED YOU FOR NAUGHT”?

(23:115)

Now, if there is no action on Hadith, and KHABAR-E-WAHID, a majority of God's creation will be reduced to naught. Hence, it is obligatory and necessary to act on Hadith.

Proof No. 10 : The coining of false Ahadith is in itself a testimony that Hadith is HUUJAT. A counterfeit coin will only be made when it is known that the original coin is in circulation as officially recognised coin. If the original coin is not in circulation, it would be useless to make a counterfeit coin.

As the Hadith was being considered HUUJAT (conclusive proof) throughout, the false (counterfeit) Ahadith were coined. In case the original Ahadith were not current among all the Muslims as HUUJAT, the persons coining false

counterfeit Ahadith would not have benefited in the least
doing so.

Proof No. 11 : The following are the words of God in
the Holy Quran :

فَجَاءَ رَجُلٌ مِّنْ أَقْصَا الْمَدِينَةِ يَسْعَىٰ قَالَ
يٰمُوسَىٰ إِنَّ الْمَلَأَ يَأْتِ بِكَ بِقَتْلٍ لَّكَ
فَاخْرُجْ إِنِّي لَمِنَ النَّاصِحِينَ

“AND A MAN CAME FROM THE UTTERMOST
PART OF THE CITY, RUNNING. HE SAID : O
MOSES ! LO ! THE CHIEFS TAKE COUNSEL
AGAINST THEE TO SLAY THEE ; THEREFORE
ESCAPE LO ! I AM OF THOSE WHO GIVE
THEE GOOD ADVICE”.

(28:20)

Now, if the information of a single person were not fit
to be acted upon, the prophet Moses would not have left
(the city) on the report of the person.

Similarly, when the woman came to call him and said
(as reported in the Holy Quran) :

إِنَّ أَبِي يَدْعُوكَ لِيَجْزِيَكَ أَجْرًا سَقَيْتَ لَنَا

LO ! MY FATHER BIDDETH THEE, THAT HE
MAY REWARD THEE WITH A PAYMENT FOR
THAT THOU DIDST WATER (THE FLOCK) FOR
US”.

(28:25)

If the information of a single person (that is, that woman)
were not fit to be accepted, Moses would not have gone
with her, and similarly, when he reached her father and
narrated to him the entire story the woman's father would
not have said :—

قَالَ لَا تَخَفْ نَجَوْتَ مِنَ الْقَوْمِ الظَّالِمِينَ

...DON'T WORRY ABOUT
THE CLUTCHED BROTHERS...

In other words, Moses narrated the story of the prophet Shoeb and he, after hearing him, believed in him and consoled him and called the people of Pharaoh to him. Hence, if the report of a single person were not acceptable, Shoeb would not have accepted the story of Moses, who was not yet a prophet. Likewise, a believer from among the people of Pharaoh, who was making secret of his belief, said as contained in the following verse of the Quran:

وَقَالَ الَّذِي آمَنَ يَا قَوْمِ اتَّبِعُونِ أَهْدِيكُمْ سَبِيلَ الرَّشَادِ ۝

"AND HE WHO BELIEVED SAID: O MY PEOPLE! FOLLOW ME, I WILL SHOW YOU THE WAY OF RIGHT CONDUCT".

(40:38)

following that single man means being on the right path. Now, if his word and following him were not acceptable then how would he lead to right path? Then the man said:

فَسَتَذْكُرُونَ مَا أَقُولُ لَكُمْ ۝

"AND YE WILL REMEMBER WHAT I SAY UNTO YOU".

(40:44)

If his word was not HÜJJAT, how would he be remembered? Further, if his words were not HÜJJAT, not believing in it would not have brought about calamity and punishment to Pharaoh. Hence, it is evident that, in the light of the Holy Quran, KHABAR-E-WAHID is HÜJJAT.

Proof No. 12: God said:

فَجَاءَ مِنْ أَقْصَى الْمَدِينَةِ رَجُلٌ يَسْعَى

يَكْفُرُ بِمَا تَعْبُوهُمْ سَلِيمٌ ۝

"AND THERE CAME FROM THE UTTERMOST PART OF THE CITY A MAN RUNNING. HE CRIED: O MY PEOPLE! FOLLOW THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN SENT"

(36:20)

If the word of the man was not HÜJJAT for his people, then disobeying him would not have rendered the people liable to punishment, and it would not have reduced them to ashes by a single spark of punishment. It is amply clear from this, that, in the light of the Holy Quran, KHABAR-E-WAHID is HÜJJAT.

Proof No, 13 : Following is the command of God :

إِنْ جَاءَكُمْ فَاسِقٌ بِنَبَأٍ فَتَبَيَّنُوا

"IF AN EVIL - LIVER BRINGS YOU NEWS, VERIFY IT"

(49:6)

It is evident from this that the information conveyed by an evil-liver is liable to verification but not rejection (without verification). This means that if a truthful and just man brings some news you should accept it but if an evil-liver does so, you should not accept without verification. Hence, even the information of an evil-liver is not fit to be rejected outright; it should be subjected to verification. Therefore, according to the Holy Quran the report of a just man is fit to be accepted without even verification.

Proof No. 14 : That KHABAR-E-WAHID is not HÜJJAT is not proved in the light of the Holy Quran. On the other hand, the fact that KHABAR-E-WAHID is HÜJJAT is proved in the light of the Holy Quran, Hadith, reason, Ijma (consensus of religious opinion), and from the opinion of entire community of scholars of Tradition, jurists of Islam and leaders among research scholars. Now, the question is whether a thing which is not proved through any source is fit to be accepted or that which has been proved from every source? God has said in the Holy Quran :

“(O MAN), FOLLOW NOT THE FOOTSTEPS OF
THOU HAST NO KNOWLEDGE”

Hence, to say that KHABAR-E-WAHID is not true is like a thing about which there is no evidence from any source. Therefore, there is no point in following it.

CHAPTER IV

REPLIES TO THE DISBELIEVERS IN HADITH :

Now, since it has been proved that the word of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) is HUIJAT, the question arises that if the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) happens to be opposed to the word of the Quran, in other words, if in the light of the Quran a certain act or thing is lawful but in the light of the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) it is otherwise, or the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is in excess of the word of the Quran, that is, if there is a sanction in the Quran and in the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) there are details thereof, or if a thing is not mentioned in the Quran and is only mentioned in the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him), then under such circumstances, is the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) HUIJAT, or not.

ANSWER : The word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is HUIJAT under all circumstances. The word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is HUIJAT absolutely and independently. It is unconditionally HUIJAT.

It is not necessary for the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) that it should be HUIJAT only if it is in conformity with the Quran and not otherwise. This condition is valid for a person other than a Prophet, namely that if the word of a person other than a Prophet is in conformity with the Quran then, under the circumstances, the word of that person who is not a Prophet will be HUIJAT. On the other hand, if it is not in conformity with the word of the Quran, then the word of no such person (who is other than a

Prophet) shall be HUUJAT. It is not necessary for the word of the Quran that it would be HUUJAT, only if it is in conformity with reason. Otherwise, it is not necessary for the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) that it would be HUUJAT only if it conforms with the word of the Quran and not otherwise.

The proof for this is that the Quran is HUUJAT on the ground that it is from God. In the same way the Prophet (peace be upon him) is from God, since this is confirmed by miracles, and miracles are from God. Hence, the Prophet (peace be upon him) and his words are proved to be from God. And since being from God in itself is HUUJAT, therefore, the Prophet (peace be upon him) and his words are both absolute and independent HUUJAT.

The summary of the above argument is that the Prophet (peace be upon him) and the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are from God, and whatever is from God is fit to be accepted and is HUUJAT to be acted upon. Hence, the Prophet (peace be upon him) and his words are HUUJAT and demand action thereon. The word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is the word of God, and is from God. This fact is also evident from the following verse of the Holy Quran :

قُلْ مَا يَكُونُ لِي أَنْ أُبَدِّلَهُ مِنْ تَلْقَائِي
نَفْسِي إِنْ أَتَّبِعُ إِلَّا مَا يُوحَىٰ إِلَيَّ

"SAY (O MOHAMMAD) : IT IS NOT FOR ME TO CHANGE OF MY OWN ACCORD. I ONLY FOLLOW THAT WHICH IS INSPIRED IN ME".

(10:15)

It is clear from the above that the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is based on inspiration ; it is the word of God and from God. The proof of the fact that the Quran is HUUJAT, on account of its being from God and not because it is Quran and THE BOOK, is that the allegorical part of

The Quran is Quran but is not HUUJAT. Following the allegorical meaning has been termed "Crookedness" (induced by doubts) : It is further confirmed in the following verse of the Holy Quran :

فَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ زَيْغٌ
فَيَتَّبِعُونَ مَا تَشَابَهَ مِنْهُ

"BUT THOSE IN WHOSE HEARTS IS DOUBT PURSUE, FORSOOTH, THAT WHICH IS ALLEGORICAL". (3:7)

In short, the part of the Quran which is allegorical, is not HUUJAT for action thereon, in spite of the fact that it is also Quran. Hence, Quran is HUUJAT only on account of its being from God. Therefore, reason for being HUUJAT depends on being from God. In this connection the following verse of the Holy Quran is quoted :

وَلَا تَجْعَلْ بِالْقُرْآنِ مِنْ قَبْلِ
أَنْ يُقْضَىٰ إِلَيْكَ وَحْيُهُ

"AND HASTEN NOT (O MOHAMMAD) WITH THE QURAN ERE ITS REVELATION HATH BEEN PERFECTED UNTO THEE".

(20 : 114)

This means, do not convey the Quran immediately it is revealed ; but wait till the entire inspiration regarding it is completed. - This revelation is the same which is besides the Quran. The details of the Quran and points relevant to the Quran are revealed through this revelation. By it is also shown that such and such portion of the Quran is "clear revelation" and HUUJAT and the other is "allegorical," and is not HUUJAT. It is clear from the above discussion that the Prophet is from God and his word is likewise from God.

HENCE, both these are absolute and independent HUUJAT. Now, if it is argued that the allegorical portion of the Quran is also from God, and, according to us, what is from God is

fit to be accepted, and HAJJAT. The fact that the allegorical part should be non-binding is not HAJJAT as HAJJAT for acting thereon. The fact that the allegorical portion of the Quran is not binding on accepting and is likewise acceptable for belief. Nevertheless, it is not fit to be acted upon. Another verse of Quran has explicitly prohibited acting on the allegorical part of the Quran :

لَا مَا الْكُذِبِينَ فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ زَيْغٌ
فَيَتَّبِعُونَ مَا تَشَابَهَ مِنْهُ

"BUT THOSE IN WHOSE HEARTS IS DOUBT DO NOT PURSUE, FORSOOTH, THAT WHICH IS ALLEGORICAL".

In the light of the above, allegorical portion is not deemed fit to be acted upon.

NOW, WHAT REMAINS to be proved is that even if the word of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) is opposed to the Quran: it is still HAJJAT. The proof of this is that the Quran says :

كُتِبَ عَلَيْكُمْ إِذَا حَضَرَ أَحَدَكُمُ الْمَوْتُ
إِنْ تَرَكَ خَيْرًا الْوَصِيَّةَ لِلْوَالِدَيْنِ

"IT IS PRESCRIBED FOR YOU, WHEN ONE OF YOU APPROACHETH DEATH, IF HE LEAVES WEALTH, THAT HE BEQUEATHE UNTO PARENTS". (2:180)

As opposed to this, the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) said لَا وَصِيَّةَ لِلْوَارِثِ "THERE IS NO BEQUEATHING FOR THE HEIR", and it has been proved by a continuous chain of narrators that this Hadith of the Prophet (peace be upon him) has been acted upon, that is, bequeathing by will has been made unlawful. Hence, Hadith has abrogated the verse of the Quran, and the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him), notwithstanding that

opposed to Quran, has been acted upon, and the fact of this Hadith being acted upon and (treated as) HUUJAT has been proved by a continuous chain of narrators.

Likewise, a large number of religious problems are proved with the help of and based on Hadith and not the Quran. Hence the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is absolute, independent and unconditional HUUJAT.

Besides this, IJMA is also an unconditional HUUJAT. For this very reason the words :

أُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ

“THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE IN AUTHORITY” (4:59)

are not connected with the word : Prophet (peace be upon him) :—

وَاطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ

“AND OBEY THE MESSENGER AND THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE IN AUTHORITY”.

(4:59)

Now, if it is said that it is not understood how the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) could be opposed to the word of Quran and could abrogate the Quran, then at the outset it should be understood that the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is not his own word. It is in fact the word of God. Similarly as the Quran is the word of God, the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is also the word of God. And in the same way as one verse of the Quran abrogated another verse of the Quran, so also does one word of God that is, the word of Prophet (peace be upon him) abrogate the other word of God, that is the Quran. Surprise and ambiguity have arisen because the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is considered as the word of a human being. It should be well understood that the word of the

Prophet (peace be upon him) is only the word of God

مَا يَنْطَلِقُ مِنَ الْهَوَىٰ إِن هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوسَىٰ

"NOR DOTH HE SPEAK OF HIS OWN
(DESIRE.)"

or IT IS NAUGHT SAVE AN INSPIRATION THAT
IS INSPIRED."

(53:3)

It is clear from the above verse that every word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is inspired. This fact can further be elucidated as under :

There are only three alternatives possible; that is either (1) that every word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is inspired, or (2) that no word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is inspired (3) or some words are inspired and others are not. If it is said that no word of the prophet (peace be upon him) is inspired, then we would like to point out that, at the very outset, we have refuted this concept and have proved that there have been revelations bestowed on the Prophet (peace by upon him) besides the Quran.

Hence, to say that no word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is inspired, is absolutely false. Now, let us consider the second alternative that some of the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are inspired whereas others are not. Even this is untrue. This is so because, saying that some of the words are inspired and others are not, involves differentiating one set of words from an other without any reason. This is both impossible and false. After all, by which word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is it known that such and such words are not inspired? If it is known from those words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) which are inspired, then these words which are supposed to be uninspired are included in those words (which are inspired). If on the other hand, you say that they are known through the words that are not inspired, then the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) which are supposed to be

uninspired become Hujjat on those that are inspired. And since you do not consider uninspired words to be HUIJAT, hence, this proposition is also refuted. As both the propositions that no word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are inspired and some words are inspired whereas others are not, are proved to be false, then necessarily the third alternative that is, every word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is inspired, stands proved. Now, since every word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is inspired, every word of his is HUIJAT and deserves to be accepted.

The question is, that when the Prophet (peace be upon him) said "I am the Prophet of God; follow what I say" at a time when the Book was not sent or only a few verses were inspired to him in which there was no mention about following the Prophet (peace be upon him), was his word fit to be accepted at that time or not? If a person says that it was not fit to be accepted (at that time), he becomes an absolute infidel. On the other hand, if it is said that it was fit to be accepted, then the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) certainly becomes absolutely HUIJAT, notwithstanding the absence from THE BOOK. If the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) were not HUIJAT then it would mean that Pharaoh was punished without HUIJAT, although the command of God is as follows :

وَمَا كُنَّا مُعَذِّبِينَ حَتَّى نَبْعَثَ رَسُولًا

"WE NEVER PUNISH UNTIL WE HAVE SENT A MESSENGER".

(17:15)

He did not say 'We do not punish until We have sent a Book'. From this it is evident that the word of Prophet is HUIJAT notwithstanding its absence from the BOOK.

Question : Should the Ahadith which attribute indecency, lie, unreasonableness and lack of information to the Prophet (peace be upon him) be rejected that is, removed from the

Ahadith of the Prophet (peace of upon him) on account of these defects or not? For instance, it is narrated in some of the Ahadith that Hazrat Aisha, the wife of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and the Prophet (peace be upon him) bathed together in one tub. In some of the Ahadith it is given that prophet ABRAHAM told lies three times. In some other Ahadith it is said that prophet Moses slapped the Angel of death. Further, it is narrated in connection with a date tree, the Prophet (peace be upon him) said that it would bear much fruit but it did not. In all these Ahadith, indecency, lie unreasonableness and lack of information are attributed to the Prophets (peace be upon them) respectively.

Answer : The Ahadith cannot be dubbed as unacceptable merely on account of those defects. The indecency that has been attributed is only on account of the personal opinion of the person who attributed indecency to the act. For instance, if nudity between husband and wife were termed as indecency, then the process of legitimate lineage would come to an end. In fact, indecency is that which the Prophet (peace be upon him) calls indecency, and the Prophet (peace be upon him) has never termed the bathing of husband and wife together as indecency. Likewise, the Quran as well, has not called this act as indecency. Further, if such acts were to be called indecent, then the word of KAWAIB كَوَائِب which God has used in praise of women would also become indecent. KAWAIB is the plural of KAIB كَائِب which means a woman with prominent breasts. If the praise of the breasts of women is indecency then the word should be removed from the Quran. On the other hand, if it is not indecency, then the bathing of husband and wife together too is not indecency.

The lie which has been attributed to the prophet ABRAHAM is not something for which the Hadith should be rejected. If on this account the Hadith is rejected, the verse of the Quran will also have to be rejected which said :

يَجْعَلُ السَّقَايَةَ فِي رَحْلِ أَخِيهِ

"HE PUT THE DRINKING CUP IN HIS BROTHER'S SADDLE—BAG". (12:70)

After putting the cup in his brother's bag the prophet Joseph made his men call a thief. It is evident that this act of Joseph is worse than a lie. And then God said :

كَذَلِكَ كُنَّا لِيُوسُفَٰ

"THUS DID WE CONTRIVE FOR JOSEPH". (12:76)

Hence, we find that this supposed defect (attributed to the Prophet peace be upon him) is also found in the verse of the Quran. Accordingly, it follows that the particular verse should be removed from the Quran as well.

Again, the information about Moses slapping the Angel of Death is related in the Hadith. This too is not unreasonable for the simple reason, that, when we have accepted the meeting and conversation of man with Angel, which apparently is infeasible, then the fight between them cannot be unreasonable. Both of them are on the same level of plausibility. In short, a person who can talk with another can also slap him :

FURTHER God has said :

وَلَا تَقُولُوا لِمَنْ يُقْتَلُ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ
أَمْوَاتٌ بَلْ أَحْيَاءُ وَلَٰكِن لَّا تَشْعُرُونَ

"AND CALL NOT THOSE WHO ARE SLAIN IN THE WAY OF ALLAH, "DEAD" NAY, THEY ARE LIVING, ONLY YE PERCEIVE NOT". (2:154)

Apparently to call persons slain in the way of God as alive is not only against reason but is also against sense. But God has called them alive and has further asserted that 'you' are not able to perceive ; you do not know. The

life of Shaheed شهيد (one slain in the way of God) such that it cannot be comprehended by reason. Now, the unreasonableness of Hadith should lead to rejection of Hadith, unreasonableness of the verse of the Quran should also lead to rejection of it from the Quran. In short, the objection which is being raised against the Hadith can also be raised against the Quran. Therefore, as the objection against the verse of the Quran cannot lead to its removal from the Quran so also objection against the Hadith cannot lead to its removal from the collection of AHADITH. That Hadith will not be believed in which the conditions required to make the KHABAR-E-WAHID acceptable are not fulfilled. Quran will not be believed in when the conditions for continuity of narration of the report are not fulfilled.

It is not necessary that information should be in itself commendable and appealing to be correct. For an information to be correct, it is only necessary that the information should be proved to have come from the person to whom it is attributed. The responsibility for the correctness of information rests with the person whose words they are, and the person who repeats the message is responsible only for the verbatim conveyance of the message. The IJMA اجماع of twelve hundred years on the correctness of narration by the Rawis (narrators) is more than sufficient and conclusive.

We would like to invite the attention of the reader to the fact that the message may be appealing, commendable, corresponding to the event and true in all respects, but in fact, it may not be the word of the person to whom the message is attributed. Likewise it is possible that a message may be appealing to our reason as sensible, but may not be the word of the person to whom it is ascribed. In the same way, it is possible that a message may not appeal to our reason, nevertheless, it can be the word of

the person from whom it is supposed to come. Hence, it is incorrect to say that we should believe only in the Hadith which is in conformity with the Quran, and not that which is not. It is possible that the message which conforms with (the word of) the Quran may not be the Hadith of the Prophet (peace be upon him), and it is possible that the Hadith which does not conform with the Quran may be the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him).

Regarding the objection about date tree that what was said did not materialise, the matter was quite in keeping with the verse of the Quran (which says) :

وَلَا تَقُولُوا لِمَا يُرَاوَىٰ فَاَعْلَىٰ ذَٰلِكَ عَذَابٌ ۗ

“AND SAY NOT OF ANYTHING ! LO ! !
SHALL DO THAT TOMORROW”.

(18:23)

Even as the Prophet (peace be upon him) had said, in connection with the questions put to him about RUH رُوح (the soul), ZULQARNAIN (Alexander) and ASHAB-E-KAHF (comrades of the cave), that he would give the reply on the following day and he (peace be upon him) did not do so. Identical situation is observed in this verse and the Hadith regarding the date tree. Now, as the thing mentioned in the verse of the Quran is not prohibitive to prophethood, so what is mentioned in the Hadith, likewise, is not prohibitive to Prophethood. The sum total of the above discussion is that the objections raised against the Hadith are such as could be raised against the Quran also. Therefore, in the same way as the verses of the Quran against which objections are raised cannot be removed from the Quran, so also, the Ahadith against which objections are raised cannot be removed on that account from the collection of Ahadith. You say that you do not believe in the Hadith on account of those objections. To this we

reply that the same objections can be raised against the verses of the Quran, and in keeping with your contention, you should not believe, likewise, in the Quran too. The above argument has destroyed, root and branch, all the objections against the Hadith.

QUESTION : When it has been proved that the word of the prophet (peace be upon him) is HUUJJAT and the Hadith of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is also HUUJJAT from religious point of view, the Prophet (peace be upon him) should have made the Ahadith reduced to writing and presented to the community, as he did with the Quran. Why did he not get the Ahadith written down ?

ANSWER : The collection of Ahadith was not committed to writing as Ahadith constitute inspiration besides the Book, and no Prophet at any time had committed to writing the inspiration, besides the Book. God sent an inspiration to the Prophet Noah as under :

وَأَوْحَىٰ إِلَىٰ نُوحٍ

“AND IT WAS INSPIRED IN NOAH” (11:36)

And after describing all the events connected with this inspiration He said :

مَا كُنْتَ تَعْلَمُهَا أَنْتَ وَلَا قَوْمُكَ مِنْ قَبْلِ هَذَا

“THOU THYSELF KNEWETH IT NOT, NOR DID THY FOLK (KNOW IT) BEFORE THIS”.

(11:49)

The community (folk) of the Prophet is the entire world. And since the entire world is unaware of the inspirations of Prophet Noah then necessarily, without doubt, those inspirations which are besides the Book were not written down. If they were written, the Jews or the Christians at least any one of them, would have known the written inspiration. Besides this, we say that in the Ahadith

(conditions) there is mostly a mention about actions (practices). Now, actions are not much concerned with knowledge acquired by reading and teaching. Actions demand acting upon. Hence, actions were not taught but shown by acting upon what was required to be practised. It was never intended to teach by heart, or by lectures or through written matter, the actions, but the real intention was to make people practice (what is contained in the Ahadith), which was done. Hence, people were made to practice upon the Ahadith by their actions. The Prophet (peace be upon him) said :

صَلُّوا كَمَا رَأَيْتُمُونِي أُصَلِّي

“PRAY (EXACTLY) AS YOU SEE ME PRAYING”.

This means that he, the Prophet (peace be upon him), made them practice what was to be practised. He did not tell them to learn by heart and write down the Hadith but he ordered them to practice what was preached in the Hadith. But their came a time when evildoing was on the increase and those who remembered the words of AHADITH wrote them down so that the admonitions contained in the Ahadith may not be lost.

As the Quran contains the narrations of the ancestors and all the doctrines and articles of faith, which could not be remembered by every one, so it was ordered to be written. Besides this, we say that the Prophet (peace be upon him) ordered the Quran to be written, but no such order from God is to be found anywhere in the Quran to this effect. It only contains ;

أَنْتَلُ مَا أَوْحَى

“(O MOHAMMAD) RECITE WHAT HAS BEEN
INSPIRED TO YOU”.

(29:45)

and

وَأَوْفِرُوا لَهُ الْقُرْآنَ كَمَا سَبَّحُوا لَهُ

"AND WHEN THE QURAN IS BEING RECITED,
LISTEN TO IT"

(7:204)

No where is it mentioned "write down the Quran". Now, since the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) got the Quran written, and conveyed it so, the question arises on what basis (that is, under whose orders) he got the Quran written down? He should have been ordered through an inspiration from God to get Quran written down. If this is the case, then the inspiration besides the Quran stands proved. On the other hand, if he did it without any inspiration from God that is, of his own accord, then his opinion (judgement) becomes HUUJJAT. Hence, under his own instruction and discretion, the Quran was written down and similarly in accordance with his opinion Hadith was not committed to writing. Both of them are governed by one and the same thing (that is, his own opinion or inspiration of God).

The meaning of the above is that in the same way as he received an inspiration from God to get the Quran written, so also he received an inspiration not to get the Hadith written. On the other hand, if he got the Quran written down of his own accord and judgement, he likewise on his own judgement did not get the Ahadith (traditions) written down.

QUESTION : God said :

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

"LO ! WE EVEN WE, REVEAL THE REMINDER
(ZIKR) AND LO ! WE VERILY ARE ITS
GUARDIAN"

(15:9)

Hence, it is said that the Quran is guarded and the Hadith is not. As God has promised to guard the Quran from

destruction. The Quran only, therefore, is the religion, and is guarded. And since Hadith is not guarded, its guardian is not God, and it is neither a thing of admonition nor DIN (religion in reality).

ANSWER : God has promised to guard the ZIKR, that is, advice and admonition, and His promise is true. He is the guardian of ZIKR. In fact, ZIKR are to be found in both the Quran and Hadith, hence both are guarded and safe. On the contrary, hardly one percent of the people are HAFIZ (knowers by heart) of the Quran, and the guardians of the meaning of Hadith constitute the entire community. Everyone knows that Miswak (cleaning of teeth) is a SUNNAT (tradition), that on the day of Eid fasting is prohibited, that the punishment for adultery is stoning to death, that there are two Sunnat prayers in the morning prayers, and six in afternoon prayers, that there will be questions and answers between the dead and the angels and that there will be punishment and reward in grave, is true. In short, all the ways and modes of dealing with others and of prayers and rituals which are shown in the Hadith are well contained and guarded in the minds of all ignorant and the learned people. The promise of God is true. He has guarded the religion of Islam. Every one is the HAFIZ (guardian) of the Traditions. Hence, it is incorrect to say that the Hadith is not guarded. Hadith is guarded on account of action (practice on it), whereas the Quran is guarded on account of its repeated recitation.

**"ERRORS OF THE DISBELIEVER IN HADITH
IN TRANSLATING VERSES OF THE QURAN"**

The disbeliever in the Hadith is given his own meaning to the following words of God :

مَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ أَنْ يُؤْتِيَهُ اللَّهُ الْكِتَابَ
وَالْحِكْمَ وَالنَّبُوءَ ثُمَّ يَقُولَ لِلنَّاسِ كُونُوا عِبَادًا
لِي مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ وَلَكِنْ كُونُوا رَبَّكُمْ
مُسْلِمِينَ

"IT IS NOT (POSSIBLE) FOR ANY HUMAN BEING UNTO WHOM ALLAH HAD GIVEN THE SCRIPTURE AND WISDOM AND THE PROPHETHOOD THAT HE SHOULD AFTERWARDS HAVE SAID UNTO MANKIND; BE SLAVES OF ME INSTEAD OF ALLAH ; BUT WHAT HE SAID WAS; BE YE FAITHFUL SERVANTS OF THE LORD".

(3:79)

His translation of the above verse is as under --

It does not behove anyone that after God has bestowed on him the Book, Government (Kingdom) and Prophethood, he should say to the people to leave God and accept his authority (government) (whereas) he should ask them to become people of God'.

QUESTION : Is the above translation (of the disbeliever in Hadith) correct or not ?

ANSWER : The translation is incorrect. In fact the meaning of 'government' given to HUKM **حُكْمٌ** and that of "accept my authority (government) "given to" **كُونُوا عِبَادًا لِي**

"BE MY SLAVES (WORSHIPPERS OR DEVOTEES)" is absolutely incorrect.

There is a consensus of opinion of the writers on the exegesis of the Quran that the meaning of HUKM, here is 'wisdom'. Again in the following verse I

وَأَتَيْنَاهُ الْحُكْمَ صَبِيحًا

(9143)

“WE GAVE HIM WISDOM WHEN A CHILD”
(19:12)

If the meaning of HUKM is taken to be ‘kingdom, (or government)’ then it would mean that God had bestowed kingdom to the Prophet (Yahya) John in his childhood, which is really false. Further, a majority of those who were bestowed with wisdom and prophethood were not given kingdom or government. If the meaning of HUKM were kingdom, then every person who was given wisdom and prophethood would possess a kingdom. But the fact is that every prophet is not the possessor of a kingdom (or a government). This is because most of the prophets were subjected to various kinds of privations and calamities, and some of them were even murdered. If they were masters of kingdom and government, they would neither have been in trouble nor murdered. Hence, the meaning of HUKM is not kingdom or government.

The second mistake is that the translation of as given (by the disbeliever in Hadith) that ‘be my subjects’, is incorrect. The correct meaning is “BE MY WORSHIPPERS OR DEVOTEES”. The meaning of **عِبَاد** IBAD is devotee (or worshipper) and not subject, because, the word IBAD is used in the Quran both for human beings and other than human beings, for instance :

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ عِبَادٌ أَمْثَلُكُمْ

“LO ! THOSE ON WHOM YE CALL BESIDES ALLAH ARE SLAVES LIKE UNTO YOU”.

(7:194)

Here, God has called the idols IBAD. In connection with the angels He said ;

بَلْ عِبَادٌ مُكْرَمُونَ

“NAY, BUT (THOSE WHOM THEY CALL SONS) ARE HONOURED SLAVES”.

(21:26)

Another Quranic verse reads :

أَلَمْ يَسْئَلُوا اللَّهَ أَنْ يَجْعَلَهُمْ
عِبَادِي مِنْ دُونِي أَوْلِيَاءَ

"DO THE DISBELIEVERS RECKON THAT THEY
CAN CHOOSE MY BONDS MEN (CREATURES)
AS PROTECTING FRIENDS BESIDES ME?"

(18:102)

The disbelievers had made the idols, the sun, the stars, the angels and even prophet Jesus their protectors, notwithstanding that they are all created by God and are His IBAD (creatures). In short, the word IBAD is used for creatures of God, and the word IBAD has been used in the Quran at various places for creatures of God only, and never in the sense of subject of a government or of a king. It is evident, that the disbelievers and polytheists have worshipped those creatures of God but have never been their subjects or obedient to their orders. This is because, neither of them, that is, the idols, the sun, the stars, the jinns, the angels or Jesus had asked them to worship them. Hence, they are worshipping them without their authority and in doing so the disbelievers and the Polytheists are their worshippers but not their subjects or obedient to their orders. It is clear from this discourse that worship is different from obedience. Hence, these false deities are worshipped but are not obeyed and are no rulers,

In brief, these idols and jinns etc. are worshipped but not obeyed (by their worshippers). Consequently, one who is worshipped and the one who is obeyed are not one and the same. It follows, therefore, that since MABUD (one worshipped) and MUTA (one obeyed) are not identical; IBADAT (worship) and ITAAT (obedience) are also not identical. Likewise, since IBADAT (worship) and ITAAT (obedience) are not one and the same thing, IBAD (devotee and creature of God) cannot be termed as MUTI (obedient) and humble subject (of a king).

Therefore to render **كُونُوا عِبَادًا لِي** as 'become my subjects and obedient to me' is entirely wrong, and this is what we wanted to prove. The real meaning of the verse is that a prophet cannot say "I am your creator and you are my creatures, I am your Lord and you are my worshippers, so worship me; but he will say 'become the worshippers of God'. We Say, the meaning of ITAAT is compliance with orders, that is, being obedient to the orders and acting according to the orders. Hence, it is necessary, in order to obey, that there should be some one who gives orders but those false deities did not give any orders. They did not issue any commands that would result in their orders being obeyed or that the people should do according to their orders. Hence, here, the word ITAAT (obedience) is not at all applicable and the word IBADAT (worship) is applicable. It is, therefore, evident that worship is not obedience. Worship does not constitute an order which would result in the IBAD (worshippers) being called obedient to or subject of a government or king.

Question : The disbeliever in Hadith has, in his periodical entitled, **اطاعت رسول ITAAT-E-RASUL**, said that **اطاعت ITAAT** (obedience) is only due to God. Is this correct or not ?

Answer : It is not correct. The truth is that **عبادت IBADAT** (worship) is due only to God. On the contrary, even **ايمان IMAN** (belief) in respect of certain persons and things besides God such as in the Prophets, messengers of God and angels is compulsory. But worship of prophets, messengers of God, and angels is **حرام HARAM** (forbidden). Worship is exclusively confined to God and obedience is not exclusively confined to God, in the same way as IMAN (belief) is not exclusively confined to God.

اٰمَنُوْا بِيْ وَبِرَّسُوْلِيْ

BELIEVE IN ME AND IN MY MESSENGER".

(5:111)

and further:

وَأَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَالرَّسُولَ

"AND OBEY ALLAH AND THE MESSENGER"

(3:1)

It is proved beyond doubt that concord both, in obedience (ITAAT) and belief (IMAN) is compulsory. Whereas partnership in worship (IBADAT) is forbidden (HARAM). حَرَامٌ

From the above, it is clear that IMAN (belief) is different from IBADAT (worship) as also ITAAT (obedience) different from IBADAT (Worship).

CHAPTER V

REPLIES TO
THE PERIODICAL "TULU-E-ISLAM" OF JUNE 1957
UNDER THE CAPTION OF "LETTERS".

Question : In "TULU-E-ISLAM" of June 1957, it is published that every Prophet was possessor of a Book (of God). Is this correct or not ?

Answer : This is entirely incorrect. If every prophet were the possessor of a Book (of God), the prophets Moses and Aaron would have received two Books, whereas only one Book was received between the two. That Book was **تَوْرَاة** TORAH (Old Testament). In this connection God said :

وَآتَيْنَهُمَا الْكِتَابَ الْمُسْتَقِيمَ

"AND WE GAVE THEM THE CLEAR
SCRIPTURE".

(37:117)

He further said :

إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَا التَّوْرَةَ فِيهَا هُدًى وَنُورٌ يُحْكَمُ
بِهَا النَّبِيُّونَ الَّذِينَ أَسْلَمُوا لِلَّذِينَ هَادُوا

"LO! WE DID REVEAL THE TORAH, WHEREIN
IS GUIDANCE AND LIGHT. BY WHICH THE
PROPHETS WHO SURRENDERED (UNTO ALLAH)
JUDGED THE JEWS".

(5:44)

From this it is clear that various prophets used to give their decisions based on a single Book (of God). Similarly, they

used to issue their commandments according to it. Now, if every Prophet were the possessor of a Book, each of the prophets would have given orders to the Jews according to his own Book, but the fact is that these prophets used to issue orders according to the OLD TESTAMENT (TORAH), which was not at all revealed to them. The intention behind this discussion is (to show) that the Prophet Moses received revelations besides the Torah (Old Testament). Prophet Jesus received revelations besides the Injil (Gospels), and Prophet Mohammad (peace be upon him) likewise received revelations besides the QURAN. We invite your attention to the following verses of the Quran where God has said :

وَإِذْ قَالَ مُوسَىٰ لِقَوْمِهِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَأْمُرُكُمْ أَنْ تَذْبَحُوا بَقَرَةً

“AND WHEN MOSES SAID UNTO HIS PEOPLE LO! ALLAH COMMANDETH YOU THAT YE SACRIFICE A COW”.

(2:67)

From the above verse to the following :

فَقُلْنَا اضْرِبُوهُ بِبَعْضِهَا

“AND WE SAID: SMITE HIM WITH SOME OF IT”.

(2:73)

There are five commandments of God. If these words and commandments of God were mentioned in the Torah (Old Testament), there would not have been any need for these questions and answers (between Prophet Moses and his people). The people would have seen the commandments in the Torah and would not have asked so many questions and wanted answers.

The following verse of the Quran is also indicative, where God said :

قَالَ اللَّهُ إِنِّي مُنَزِّلُهَا عَلَيْكُمْ فَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ فَأِنَّي أُعَذِّبُهُ
عَذَابًا لَّا يُعَذِّبُهُ أَحَدًا مِنَ الْعَالَمِينَ

“ALLAH SAID : LO! I SEND IT DOWN FOR YOU AND WHOSO DISBELIEVETH OF YOU AFTERWARDS, HIM SURELY WILL I PUNISH WITH A PUNISHMENT WHEREWITH I HAVE NOT PUNISHED ANY OF (MY) CREATURES”.

(5:115)

Now, if these words of God were mentioned in the Injil (Gospels) the disciples would not have questioned prophet Jesus as to whether his God could send from the heavens for them a tablespread with food.

هَلْ يَسْتَطِيعُ رَبُّكَ أَنْ يُنَزِّلَ عَلَيْنَا مَائِدَةً مِنَ السَّمَاءِ

“IS THY LORD ABLE TO SEND DOWN FOR US A TABLE SPREAD WITH FOOD”

(5:112)

and prophet Jesus would not have admonished them to fear God :

قَالَ اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ

“HE SAID : OBSERVE YOUR DUTY TO ALLAH”.

(5:112)

Exactly in the same manner the Quran was revealed to our Prophet (peace be upon him) and he received revelations besides the Quran as well.

As long as the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) was in Mecca, he used to pray with his face towards the KABA. However, there is no mention in the Quran that there was an order from God at that time to pray with the face towards the KABA, whereas the fact is that, the sending down of the Quran, change in the arrangement, and the fixation of number of Prophet's (peace be upon him) wives (permitted to be married) are all impossible without revelation. Details have already been given before this.

Question : When it has been proved that every prophet is not the possessor of a Book, what is the explanation for the following verse :

فَبَعَثَ اللَّهُ النَّبِيِّنَ مُبَشِّرِينَ وَمُنذِرِينَ
وَأَنْزَلَ مَعَهُمُ الْكِتَابَ

“AND ALLAH SENT (UNTO THEM) PROPHETS—
AS BEARERS OF GOOD TIDINGS AND AS
WARNERS AND REVEALED THEREWITH THE
SCRIPTURE”.

(2:213)

Answer : The complete verse is as follows :

كَانَ النَّاسُ أُمَّةً وَاحِدَةً فَبَعَثَ اللَّهُ النَّبِيِّنَ
مُبَشِّرِينَ وَمُنذِرِينَ وَأَنْزَلَ مَعَهُمُ الْكِتَابَ

“MANKIND WERE ONE COMMUNITY AND
ALLAH SENT (UNTO THEM) PROPHETS AS
BEARERS OF GOOD TIDINGS AND AS
WARNERS, AND REVEALED THEREWITH THE
SCRIPTURE”.

(2:213)

Here, the word is Book (in singular), and not Books. The meaning of ‘AND REVEALED THEREWITH THE SCRIPTURE’ is not that He revealed (sent) Book with each of them. That is, the meaning of **مَعَهُمُ** is “WITH THEM” and not **مَعَ كُلِّ** “with each of them”. We quote below an analogy to this :

وَلَقَدْ كَرَّمْنَا بَنِي آدَمَ وَحَمَلْنَاهُمْ فِي الْبَرِّ وَالْبَحْرِ وَرَفَعْنَاهُمْ
مِّنَ الطَّيِّبَاتِ وَفَضَّلْنَاهُمْ عَلَى كَثِيرٍ مِّمَّنْ خَلَقْنَا تَفْضِيلًا

“VERILY WE HAVE HONoured THE CHILDREN
OF ADAM. WE CARRY THEM ON THE LAND
AND THE SEA, AND HAVE MADE PROVISION
OF GOOD THINGS FOR THEM AND HAVE
PREFERRED THEM ABOVE MANY OF THOSE
WHOM WE CREATED WITH A MARKED
PREFERMENT”

(17:70)

The meaning of “WE CARRY THEM ON THE LAND AND THE SEA” is not at all that God gave each and every one of

them means of conveyance (carriage). Likewise, good things were not given to each and every one of them. Similarly, excellence over a large majority of the creatures was not given to each and every one of them, since God has said about the infidels as under :

أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الشَّرَّاءُ الْبَرِيَّةُ

“THEY ARE THE WORST OF CREATED BEINGS”

(98:6)

They are not superior to any of the creatures. Exactly in the same way, the meaning of “AND REVEALED THEREWITH THE SCRIPTURE” is not that He revealed (sent) a Book with each and every one of them, otherwise, there would have been as many Books as there were prophets. We have, before this, explained that prophet Moses and prophet Aaron received only one Book (of God) between them. On the contrary, the meaning is that the Book was sent to a group or a single person from amongst them. This method of speech is common to all the languages. For instance, “artillery was sent with the army”, “dowry was sent with the marriage procession” and “food was sent with so and so party”. This does not mean that artillery was sent with every man in the army, dowry with every man in the marriage procession, and food with every man in the party. In exactly the same manner, the meaning of sending the Book with the prophets is that the Book was sent with a group of prophets or with one of them. The proof of this is that ‘Book’ is used (in the verse of the Quran) in the singular number (and not plural). If instead of Book, the word Books were mentioned then there would have been a possibility of interpreting that a Book was sent with every one of the Prophets.

Question : The disbeliever in Hadith has said on page 58 that it was Ghulam Ahmed Qadiani who had propagated the view that there can be a prophet without a Book.

Answer : It is the consensus of opinion and unanimous belief of the entire Muslim community that a prophet can be with a Book or without a Book. As this view universally prevailed, the Qadiani (Ghulam Ahmed), taking advantage of it, put up his claim to prophethood. If this were not the universally accepted opinion, immediately on the claim, (to prophethood) being made, the same would have been contradicted and refuted by the people, and the people would not have paid any attention to him. Hence, the Qadiani has not popularized this view, but even before this there was a firm belief among the Muslims that prophets were also sent who did not possess Book (of God).

Question : Why were the revelations other than the Book not protected like the revelations of the Book (page 58)?

Answer : There are two ways of protecting: one is by getting them written and the other is by making people practise what is revealed. As the revelations other than the Book contained details of act and practies, they were not written down but people were made to practise them. This was because the object in view was not to commit, to writting what is to be practised but it was to make the people practise what was intended to be practised. Hence the Prophet (peace be upon him) said "Pray as you see me praying". If he had only got this written down it would not have been possible to practise the ritual of NAMAZ as required. Every one received the practical rules about prayers, fasting and other necessary rituals. Hence, the revelations besides the Book are protected in practice. The promise of God contained in the following verse of the Quran is true :

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ ۝

"LO ! WE EVEN WE, REVEAL
THE REMINDER, AND LO ! WE VERILY ARE
ITS GUARDIAN".

(15:9)

Exactly in the same manner as the Quran is protected on account of its oft recitation, the revelation besides the Quran that is, the Hadith of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is protected through constant practice. Every one knows that before the FAJR (morning) compulsory prayers there are two SUNNAT prayers, after the evening prayers (MAGHRIB) there are two, before and after the ZOHR (afternoon) prayers there are six, and after the ISHA (night) prayers there are two SUNNATS and three WITR prayers; cleaning the teeth is a SUNNAT (practice of the Prophet (peace be upon him)); and the questions and answers with the two Angels (in the grave) is a fact etc. etc. In short, the subject matter of the revelations other than the Quran is still safe and protected on account of its being in practice. You will not find even one per cent of the people who have committed to memory the whole of the Quran, whereas, those who have protected the Ahadith (traditions of the Prophet (peace be upon him)) through practice are in far larger numbers than the HUFFAZ (that is those who have committed to memory the whole of the Quran).

Besides this, there is another reason why the revelations other than the Book, were not made to be written down and that is that revelations of the previous prophets too were not written down. The proof of this is as follows :

وَأَوْحَىٰ إِلَىٰ نُوحٍ أَنَّهُ لَنْ يُؤْمِنَ مِنْ قَوْمِكَ إِلَّا مَن قَدْ آمَنَ

“AND IT WAS INSPIRED IN NOAH, (SAYING) :
NO ONE OF THY FOLK WILL BELIEVE SAVE
HIM WHO HATH BELIEVED ALREADY”.

(11:36)

This is a revelation besides the Book, as the Book is meant for the reformation of the community and this was not the time for reformation ; it was time for disappointment. When it was said that no one would now believe, then it was useless at that time to send the Book for teaching people

to believe and to do good deeds. Hence, it is evident that this revelation is besides the Book. After this verse, another revelation was made and at the end it was said:

مَا كُنْتَ تَعْلَمُهَا أَنْتَ وَلَا قَوْمُكَ مِنْ قَبْلِ هَذَا

“THOU THYSELF KNEWEST IT NOT, NOR DID THY FOLK (KNOW IT) BEFORE THIS”

(17:49)

And since the Prophet (peace be upon him) was sent to the whole world, it means that at that time the Prophet (peace be upon him) and the entire world was unaware of the revelations, and even before this, all the people were unaware. Now, if this revelation was written down, then before this, some nation or other would have known it. It is, therefore, clear that it was not the practice with the previous prophets to have the revelations, besides the Book, written down. Besides this, we ask you why did the Prophet (peace be upon him) have the Quran written down? Did the Prophet (peace be upon him) receive a revelation to the effect that he should get the Quran written down, or did he do it of his own account? There are only two alternatives possible. Either he got it written in response to an inspiration (revelation) or he did so on his own initiative. There is nowhere to be found in the Quran an order to the effect that the Quran should be committed to writing. Whenever the reference is found, it is 'read', 'listen' (to the Quran). Nowhere is it mentioned 'Write down'. Hence, if the Prophet (peace be upon him) got the Quran written in response to an inspiration, this inspiration (revelation) was outside the Quran. This means that there was an inspiration for committing the Quran to writing, and he acted upon accordingly, but there was no inspiration to get the Hadith written down so he did not have it committed to writing. On the other hand, if he got the Quran written down on his own initiative, he likewise did not get the Ahadith written down on his own initiative. In both the instances opinion and judgement (initiative) are at the bottom of the matter (detail in this regard have

appeared before). It may also be possible that the Quran was committed to writing because miracle is associated with the words of the Quran; and since the promise is a permanent one, the proof and miracle should also be permanent. Miracle is not associated with the words of Hadith and so it was not committed to writing.

QUESTION : The disbeliever in Hadith says on page 58 that the meaning of مَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ is not that whatever the Prophet (peace be upon him) said was all as a result of inspiration. But (according to him) some words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) were inspired whereas others were not. The disbeliever in Hadith has tried to prove his contention by means of the following verse of the Quran :
Translation that he suggests is :-

قُلْ إِنْ ضَلَلْتُ فَإِنَّمَا أَضِلُّ عَلَىٰ نَفْسِي
وَإِنِ اهْتَدَيْتُ فَبِمَا يُوحَىٰ إِلَيَّ رَبِّي

'SAY : IF I ERR, I ERR ONLY DUE TO MY OWN ACCOUNT (OR ITS BAD EFFECTS ARE ON ME) AND IF I AM RIGHTLY GUIDED IT IS BECAUSE OF THAT WHICH MY LORD HATH REVEALED UNTO ME'.

(34:50)

The Question is whether it is right to say that some words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) are inspired and others are not and whether it is correct to base the argument on the above verse.

ANSWER : This argument is entirely false. The translation is also incorrect. The correct translation is :

"SAY UNTO THEM, IF I ERR AND REMAIN ASTRAY, THEN DUE TO MY ERROR AND REMAINING AWAY FROM STRAIGHT PATH, (THAT IS UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES) THE LOSS WILL BE SUSTAINED BY ME ONLY."

(34:50)

This is being said in case it is destined that he should err or go astray, not that the Prophet (peace be upon him) was

erring or had gone astray. In case it is destined, then 'suppose I go astray, then, under the circumstances, the loss will be sustained on that account by me only.' The word used is IN " **إِنْ** " which is used for destiny and for supposition, it does not mean "verily". Going astray, is only supposed that if he goes astray, and if he is destined to go astray, it is not a statement of fact. For example :

فَإِنْ كُنْتَ فِي شَكٍّ

"AND IF THOU (MOHAMMAD) ART IN DOUBT"

(10:94)

does not mean that you are in fact suspicious. Exactly in the same manner :-

إِنْ ضَلَلْتَ

"SAY UNTO THEM IF I EVER, AND REMAIN ASTRAY,"

(34:50)

does not mean that he has actually gone astray. On the contrary it means "supposing that I go astray, then in such a case, the loss will be sustained by me only". Hence, to take the verse to mean that (God forbid) any part of the action (and life) of the Prophet (peace be upon him) amounted to going astray, is clear unbelief. An example of this is found in the Chapter of the Quran entitled Al-Momin.

إِنْ يَكُ كَاذِبًا فَعَلَيْهِ كَذِبُهُ

"IF PROPHET MOSES IS A LIER, THEN THE CALAMITY FOR HIS LIE WILL FALL ON HIM"

(40:28)

وَإِنْ يَكُ صَادِقًا يُصِيبْكُمْ بَعْضُ الَّذِي وَعَدْتُمْ

"AND IF HE IS TRUE, THEN A PORTION OF THE PUNISHMENT WHICH HE HAS PROMISED WILL SURELY FALL ON YOU"

(40:28)

The meaning of this is not (God forbid) that the prophet Moses was to any extent a liar. The same is the case

with:-

قُلْ إِنْ ضَلَلْتُ فَإِنَّمَا أَضِلُّ عَلَىٰ نَفْسِي
وَإِنِ اهْتَدَيْتُ فَبِمَا يُوحَىٰ إِلَيَّ رَبِّي

“SAY UNTO THEM, IF I ERR, AND REMAIN
ASTRAY,” (34:50)

Similarly, as in the above reference there is no division between truth and falsehood, there is no division between guidance and error (that is going astray) here. Hence, it is absolutely wrong to translate the verse as ‘if he is making a mistake then this mistake is on his own account and if he follows the straight path, then it is on account of the revelation (inspiration)’. In fact, it amounts to unbelief (Kufr) and ignorance.

What we are going to say in the following lines is the only truth.” If it is from my side (of my own doing), then the loss (on account of it) is my own. And if this is not from my side (and it certainly is not from my side), then undoubtedly it is on account of the inspiration from my Lord”. This is the real meaning of the verse. It is not that “something is from me and something is inspired”.

Now, we put to you a straight question. According to you (as it appears), is it that the Prophet (peace be upon him) commits a mistake of his own accord and of his own doing or not? If he does it then according to this verse of the Quran, the calamity of the doing is on the Prophet (peace be upon him) himself. But to say this is absolute unbelief (KUFR). On the other hand, if the Prophet (peace be upon him) does not err of himself and of his own accord, then entire words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) become a result of inspiration and revelation from God. This is the very thing we wanted to prove. Besides this, we say that God has said under the Chapter of AN NAJM :

مَا ضَلَّ صَاحِبُكُمْ وَمَا غَوَىٰ

“YOUR COMRADE ERRETH NOT, NOR IS HE
DECEIVED”

(53:2)

In view of this clear verdict of the Quran, "that your Comrade does not err", what is the meaning of:-

إِنْ ضَلَّكَ فَإِنَّمَا أَضِلُّ

"IF I ERR, I ERR TO MY LOSS" (34:50)

How can the Prophet (peace be upon him) then commit any error of his own accord? If the Prophet (peace be upon him) were to err (God forbid), then the entire structure of religion would be demolished. How can a Muslim pronounce that the Prophet (peace be upon him) has erred (God forbid)? The fact is that God has said about the Prophet (peace be upon him) that he is on the right path.

عَلَى صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ

"YOU ARE ON THE RIGHT PATH." (36:4)

The meaning is as we describe; "If this is of my accord, then undoubtedly the calamity resulting therefrom will be 'on my own self'. This means that "the loss (calamity) will affect me as I say". To take an analogy, a man says. "If Zaid is a stone, he will be lifeless", but it is of course impossible that Zaid is a stone (since he is a human being). So the conclusion depends on this impossible assumption. In the same way, we can understand that "if I am erring" means "my erring is impossible, since erring is connected with the calamity to myself, but I am free from calamity, hence my erring is impossible". This type of mistake is committed by those who are ignorant even of the rudimentary laws of knowledge. Hence the meaning of the verse (34:50) is as we give hereafter: "If this is from my own self and I have wrongly attributed it to God, then undoubtedly the calamity accruing therefrom will fall on myself: but if whatever I say is not from my own self, then this is absolutely the result of the revelation received from God".

Question : (page 59). Here, the disbeliever in Hadith has said that in elucidating 'this fact', the Quran contains a number of instances where God has asked the Prophet

(peace be upon him) as to why he said such and such a thing. The example given by him in this connection is the following verse of Sura TAUBA.

عَفَا اللَّهُ عَنْكَ لِمَ أَذِنَتْ لَهُمْ

“ALLAH FORGIVE THEE (O MOHAMMAD) !
WHEREFOR DIDST THOU GRANT THEM
LEAVE ?”

(9:43)

Now, the Question is why was this chastisement meted out when whatever the Prophet (peace be upon him) said was on account of the inspiration received from God ? This means, that God first sent inspiration to the Prophet (peace be upon him) and then He asks “Why did you do this”?

Answer : God has every right, at all times to say and do whatever He wishes. God well knew that the prophet Jesus had not propagated the doctrine of trinity, nevertheless, God asked him :

مَا أَنْتَ قُلْتَ لِلنَّاسِ اتَّخَذُوا مِنِّي وَآرِئِي الْهَيْبَةَ مِنَ دُونِ اللَّهِ

“IF HE HAD DIRECTED THE PEOPLE TO
CONSIDER HIS MOTHER AND HIMSELF AS
GODS, BESIDES ALLAH”.

(5:116)

God knew very well that he had never said such a thing, yet God questioned him. In respect of our Prophet (peace be upon him) God said :

إِنَّكَ لَمِنَ الْمُرْسَلِينَ عَلَى صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ

“LO ! THOU ART OF THOSE SENT ON A
STRAIGHT PATH”.

(36:3,4)

He further announced ;

مَا ضَلَّ صَاحِبُكُمْ وَمَا غَوَىٰ

“YOUR COMRADE ERRETH NOT, NOR IS HE
DECEIVED”.

(53:2)

From the above two verses, it is evident that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had not erred in the least. In spite of this God said :

لِيَغْفِرَ لَكَ اللَّهُ مَا تَقَدَّمَ مِن ذَنْبِكَ وَمَا تَأَخَّرَ

"THAT ALLAH MAY FORGIVE THEE OF THY SINS THAT WHICH IS PAST AND THAT WHICH IS TO COME",

(48:2)

God has the right to tell to the Prophet (peace be upon him) that He has forgiven his sins although He Himself has announced sinlessness of the Prophet (peace be upon him).

At another place God said :

وَأَعْلَمُوا أَنَّ اللَّهَ يَحُولُ بَيْنَ الْمَرْءِ وَقَلْبِهِ

"AND KNOW THAT ALLAH COMETH IN BETWEEN THE MAN AND HIS OWN HEART," (8:24)

God intervenes between a man and his heart, that is, He does not allow the IMAN (belief) to reach the heart. God Himself then says :

فَأَيْنَ تَذْهَبُونَ

"WHERE ARE YOU GOING" ? (81:26)

كَيْفَ تَكْفُرُونَ

"WHY DO YOU (THEN) DISBELIEVE" (2:28)

He himself prevents the belief from reaching their hearts and He Himself says :

وَمَا ذَا عَلَيْهِمُ لَوْ آمَنُوا

"AND WHAT SHOULD HAVE THEY LOST IF THEY HAD BELIEVED ?" (4:39)

إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُضِلُّ مَنْ يَشَاءُ

"SAY ! GOD LEADS ASTRAY WHOMSOEVER HE WISHES" (13:27)

Then He says :

فَأَيْنَ تَضُرُّونَ

"WHERE ARE YOU ASTRAYING ON THE WRONG PATH" ? (10:32)

فَأَنى تَوَلَّوْنَ ه

“WHERE ARE YOU GOING (ASTRAY)?” (10:34)

Further, He Himself said :

خَتَمَ اللّٰهُ عَلَى قُلُوْبِهِمْ

“ALLAH HATH SEALED THEIR HEARTS” (2:7)

Then He says :

فَمَا لَهُمْ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ ؕ

“WHAT’S THE MATTER WITH THEM, WHY DO THEY NOT BELIEVE” ? (84:20)

Again He himself says :

وَجَعَلْنَا مِنْ بَيْنِ أَيْدِيهِمْ سَدًّا وَمِنْ خَلْفِهِمْ سَدًّا

“AND WE HAVE SET A BAR BEFORE THEM AND A BAR BEHIND THEM” (36:9)

He then says :

مَا مَنَعَ النَّاسَ أَنْ يُؤْمِنُوا

“AND WHO PREVENTED THE PEOPLE FROM BELIEVING” ? (17:94)

And again He says :

فَإِنَّا قَدْ فَتَنَّا قَوْمَكَ مِنْ بَعْدِكَ

“AFTER YOU, WE LED ASTRAY THE PEOPLE” (20:85)

that is, the people of prophet Moses. Yet again He said :

ثُمَّ أَخَذْتُمُ الْعِجْلَ

“THEN YOU MADE THE CALF AS (YOUR) G/D” (2:51)

He said

فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّىٰ يُحْكُمُونَكَ

“BY YOUR LORD. THEY WILL NOT BE (CONSIDERED) BELIEVERS UNLESS THEY TAKE YOU TO BE THEIR JUDGE” (4:65)

Here He has made the Prophet (peace be upon him) a judge.
On the other hand He says :

لِمَ آذِنْتَ لَهُمْ

“WHEREFOR DIDST THOU GRANT THEM
LEAVE”? (9:43)

It has now been proved with solid logical arguments that
God is the originator of all the actions. This is also evident
from categorical Quranic injunctions :

وَاللَّهُ خَلَقَكُمْ وَمَا تَعْمَلُونَ

“GOD IS YOUR CREATOR AND THAT OF YOUR
ACTIONS” (37:96)

Inspite of this He rebukes His creatures saying “why have you
done this?” In fact there are innumerable verses of the
Quran from which it is clear that God is the creator of each
and every action of the creature. On the other hand, there
are many verses of Quran where He asks his creature ‘why
have you done this?’

The following verses are typical :

سَنَفْرُغُ لَكُمْ أَيُّهَ الثَّقَلَيْنِ

“WE SHALL DISPOSE OF YOU, O YE TWO
DEPENDENTS (MAN AND JINNI)” (55:31)

In this verse there is extreme type of chastisement. Further
He says :

فِي أَيِّ آيَاتِ رَبِّكُمَا تَكْذِبِينَ

“WHICH IS IT, OF THE FAVOURS OF THY
LORD, THAT YE DENY”? (55:32)

Then He says :

يُرْسَلُ عَلَيْكُمَا شُوَاظٌ مِّنْ نَّارٍ وَنُحَاسٌ فَلَا تَنْصِرَانِ

“THERE WILL BE SENT, AGAINST YOU BOTH
HEAT OF FIRE AND FLASH OF BRASS, AND
YE WILL NOT ESCAPE”. (55:35)

فِي أَيِّ آيَاتِ رَبِّكُمَا تَكْذِبِينَ

“WHICH IS IT, OF THE FAVOURS OF THY LORD, THAT YE DENY”? (55:36)

Also :

يَطُوفُونَ بَيْنَهَا وَبَيْنَ حَمِيرٍ ؕ

“THEY GO CIRCLING ROUND BETWEEN IT, FIERCE, BOILING WATER”. (55:44)

And He questions :

فِي أَيِّ الْأَعْمَارِ بِكُمْ تُكذِّبُونَ

“WHICH IS IT, OF THE FAVOURS OF THY LORD, THAT YE DENY”? (55:45)

It is clear that all these things are not favours but (an enumeration of) punishments. However, God has included these in the list of favours. The long and short of it is that God has the right to say and do whatever He wishes. His actions cannot be subjected to questions :

لَا يُسْأَلُ عَمَّا يَفْعَلُ

“HE WILL NOT BE QUESTIONED”. (21:23)

You should deliberate and try to find out the underlying truth. If those people who were granted leave by the Prophet (peace be upon him), had not acted upon the permission and leave granted to them, they all would have committed sin. Now that they acted upon the leave granted to them, they have obeyed the Prophet (peace be upon him) and obedience to the Prophet (peace be upon him) is obedience to God.

مَنْ يُطِيعِ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدْ أَطَاعَ اللَّهَ

“WHOSOEVER OBEYS THE PROPHET (PEACE BE UPON HIM) OBEYS GOD”. (4:80)

This means that the Prophet (peace be upon him) by granting them leave raised them to the position of becoming obedient to God. This amounts to God saying ‘why did you make them obedient to Me?’ From this it is evident that He

can say and do whatever He pleases. His right is absolute and unconditional.

There is a very subtle point, here, which should be well understood and borne in mind. It is that, when misguidance and leading astray are attributed to God and the Prophet (peace be upon him). If misguidance is attributed to God, no harm is done to one's faith and IMAN. However, to attribute such a thing to the Prophet (peace be upon him) is unbelief (KUFR). This is because, God has attributed the act of misguiding to Himself. On the other hand, He has not attributed the act of misguiding to the Prophet (peace be upon him) at any place. On the contrary, He has attributed guidance to the Prophet (peace be upon him).

وَإِنَّكَ لَتَهْدِي إِلَى صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ

“VERILY YOU GUIDE TO THE RIGHT PATH”.

(42:52)

And further :—

إِنَّكَ لَمِنَ الْمُرْسَلِينَ عَلَى صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ

“LO ! THOU ART OF THOSE SENT ON A STRAIGHT PATH”.

(36:3-4)

He (peace be upon him) is himself on the right path. God's dignity is such that He leads astray or guides right whomsoever He pleases. Hence, attributing the act of leading astray to God is not wrong but attributing the same act to the Prophet (peace be upon him) is wrong, nay, unbelief (KUFR).

Question :

أَمْسِكَ عَلَىكَ زَوْجَكَ

“LET YOUR WIFE REMAIN WITH YOU”.

(33:37)

If this was a revelation (inspiration from God), why did Zaid not act on it ?

Answer : It was a revelation, but as the imperative mood is used for command, so is it also used for other purposes, and has different meanings. In this case, it is not a

Command. Analogy of this is found elsewhere, such in :

وَإِذَا حَلَلْتُمْ فَاصْطَادُوا

“WHEN YOU COME OUT OF YOUR IHRAM (Cloth), THEN GO HUNTING” (5:2)

This is an imperative mood but does not make the act of hunting compulsory. In the same way :

وَمَنْ شَاءَ فَلْيُكْفُرْ

“WHOSOEVER WISHES MAY DISBELIEVE” (18:29)

Here too the verb (fal yakfur) is in the imperative mood. This does not mean that KUFR (unbelief) is compulsory. On the contrary, it is a threat :

اعْمَلُوا مَا شِئْتُمْ

“DO WHATEVER YOU PLEASE” (41:40)

All these are in the imperative moods but do not mean compulsion. In the same way :

أَمْسِكْ عَلَيْكَ زَوْجَكَ

“LET YOUR WIFE REMAIN WITH YOU” (33:37)

though in the imperative mood does not mean compulsion of the type that non-compliance with it would result in disobedience.

Question : On page 59, the disbeliever in Hadith has asked, what is the meaning of :

مَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ

“NOR DOETH HE SPEAK OF (HIS OWN) DESIRE. IT IS NAUGHT SAVE AN INSPIRATION THAT IS INSPIRED.” (53 : 3, 4)

Answer : The meaning is that your comrade does not speak of his own wish (desire). Whatever he says, that is, every word that he pronounces, is nothing but revelation (inspira-

tion) from God, which is directed towards him. This does not mean that he does not repeat or convey the Quran of his own desire. This is because in :-

إِنَّ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ

“IT IS NAUGHT SAVE AN INSPIRATION THAT IS INSPIRED.” (53:4)

the antecedent (or the noun) to which the pronoun HUWA refers is not expressed. Nevertheless, only three words appear above namely AN NAJM (the star), SAHEB (comrade) and HAWA هَوَى (desire) and all these are not qualifying HUWA (it) هَوَى or WAHI وَحْيٌ (revelations). Hence, the antecedent of HUWA (it), logically, is NUTQ نَطَق (Spoken word) which is included in YANTIQUO يَنْطِقُ (he speaks). Hence, the meaning of the verse is that

إِنَّ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ

“THE WORD OF YOUR COMRADE IS NOTHING BUT WAHI (inspiration)” (53:4)

Here the word of Prophet (peace be upon him) has been termed as WAHI (inspiration from God). But the Quran is not the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and a person who calls the Quran word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is an infidel (KAFIR) since the Quran is the word of God. In the verse under consideration, WAHI (inspiration) is undoubtedly used for the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him). Besides this we say that God has further said under in this connection :

فَأَوْحَىٰ إِلَىٰ عَبْدِهِ مَا أَوْحَىٰ

“AND HE REVEALED UNTO HIS SLAVE THAT WHICH HE REVEALED” (53:10)

To this day it is not known to which verse of the Quran the word revealed to His slave (53:10) refers. Now, if it is confirmed that inspiration is only confined to the Quran, then it would be necessary to point out where exactly is the W

inspiration) referred to in it **فَأَوْحَى** since the verse "AND HE REVEALED UNTO HIS SLAVE THAT WHICH HE REVEALED." (3:10) is a description of the inspiration which is interpreted in "WHICH HE REVEALED". We put you a simple question. Tell us whether this WAHI (inspiration) is in the Quran? If so, let us know which verse or verses does it comprise? Upto this day, no exegetist of the Quran and no learned man has been able to or can locate which verse or verses contain the WAHI (inspiration) under discussion. This is because the Quran is explicit and this WAHI (inspiration) is ambiguous. Hence, it is clear that this WAHI (inspiration) is outside the Quran, and it is besides the Quran. Our only question to you is, is the word of the Prophet (peace be upon him) inspiration or not? If you say that it is a WAHI (inspiration), then well and good. This is exactly our contention. On the other hand, if you say that it is not so, then in that case, another question arises, and that is, when the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: "This Book, or this verse or this Chapter has been revealed to me", are those words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) worth accepting or not? If you say they are worth accepting, then you are right and this is the very thing which constitutes the word of the Hadith of the Prophet (peace be upon him) being HUIJAT (conclusive proof). Hence it is proved that the Hadith of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is HUIJAT (conclusive proof). If you say that they are not worth accepting, then along with the Hadith the Quran also goes. Neither the Hadith remains nor the Quran, nor the religion of Islam. Such a belief results in unbelief (KUFUR) plus insanity. One should be afraid of the wrath of God and refrain from indulging in destroying religion.

Question : The disbeliever in Hadith has quoted the following verses of the Quran :

وَإِذْ أَسْرَأَ النَّبِيُّ إِلَىٰ بَعْضِ أَزْوَاجِهِ حَدِيثًا فَلَمَّا نَبَّأَتْ بِهِ وَأَظْهَرَهُ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ عَرَفَ بَعْضَهُ وَأَعْرَضَ عَنْ بَعْضٍ فَلَمَّا نَبَّأَهَا بِهَا قَالَتْ مَن آتَاكَ هَذَا قَالَ نَبَّأَنِي الْعَلِيمُ الْخَبِيرُ

“WHEN THE PROPHET CONFIDED A FACT UNTO ONE OF HIS WIVES AND WHEN SHE AFTERWARDS DIVULGED IT AND ALLAH APPRISED HIM THEREOF HE MADE KNOWN (TO HER) PART THEREOF AND PASSED OVER PART, AND WHEN HE TOLD IT HER SHE SAID : WHO HATH TOLD THEE ? HE SAID : THE KNOWER, THE AWARE HATH TOLD ME”.

(66:3)

The two parts of the above verse namely **وَأَظْهَرَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ** “ALLAH APPRISED HIM THEREOF” and **بِنَبَأِي الْعَلِيمِ الْخَيْرِ** “THE KNOWER, THE AWARE HATH TOLD ME.” afford proof of the fact that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had received revelations besides the Quran.

The question is that the disbeliever in Hadith contends that **وَأَظْهَرَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ** “ALLAH APPRISED HIM THEREOF” and **بِنَبَأِي الْعَلِيمِ الْخَيْرِ** “THE KNOWER, THE AWARE HATH TOLD ME” do not prove that this exposition and information were through WAHL (revelation). According to him this exposition and information is of the type that God has given you the knowledge of improving (the habits of) a dog. In the same way as this giving of knowledge to you for improving the dog is not through an inspiration (WAHL), so too the giving of information to the Prophet (peace be upon him) is not by WAHL (inspiration). As another example, that it is similar to God saying :

عَلَّمَ الْإِنْسَانَ مَا لَمْ يَعْلَمُهُ

“WE TAUGHT MANKIND THAT WHICH THEY DID NOT KNOW”.

(96:5)

In the same way as this teaching of mankind (by God) is not through WAHL (inspiration), so too the informing by “THE KNOWER, THE AWARE” of the event to the Prophet (peace be upon him) is not a WAHL (revelation). The Question is, is this true or false ?

Answer : It is entirely false. To man are bestowed two things : one is spontaneity **فَعْلِيَّتْ** (FAALIAT) in the acquisition of knowledge and the other is the ability to

acquire knowledge. The meaning of FAALIAT (spontaneity) is that when a man directs his senses to the things capable of being known by senses, he spontaneously acquires the knowledge thereof. This is known as self-evident knowledge. The other thing is the ability, capability or competency. In this the things are not known only by directing the senses towards them. This means that the knowledge of which a man is granted the capability to acquire is not gathered through the senses only but to acquire it (the knowledge), one has to exert, make efforts and endeavours, and apply deliberation and thinking. This knowledge is called theoretical knowledge. Every man is endowed by God, in his very nature, with ability to acquire theoretical knowledge and spontaneity (FAALIAT) for the acquisition of self-evident knowledge. The knowledge which is bestowed upon the prophets is far superior to those two, and this knowledge is called WAHI (inspiration from God). Hence, the knowledge of a prophet as a prophet is not like the knowledge of an ordinary man. The knowledge of a prophet consists in listening to the word of God, His message and His orders, and the message of God to man is in itself the WAHI (revelation). God has said in this connection :

وَمَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ أَنْ يُكَلِّمَهُ اللَّهُ إِلَّا وَحْيًا أَوْ مِنْ
وَرَاءِ حِجَابٍ أَوْ يُرْسِلَ رَسُولًا فَيُوحِيَ بآذُنِهِ فَالْيَسَاءُ

“AND IT WAS NOT (VOUCHSAFED) TO ANY MORTAL THAT ALLAH SHOULD SPEAK TO HIM UNLESS (IT BE) BY REVELATION OR FROM BEHIND A VEIL, OR (THAT) HE SENDETH A MESSENGER TO REVEAL WHAT HE WILL BY HIS LEAVE”.

(42:51)

The message communicated by all the three methods is WAHI (revelation). The first that is, **وَحْيٌ** “BY REVELATION” is the clear WAHI (revelation). The second that is, **مِنْ وَرَاءِ حِجَابٍ** “FROM BEHIND A VEIL”, such as God had spoken to the prophet Moses from behind a veil, is also WAHI (revelation)

فَأَسْمِعْ يَسْمِعُ ۝

"O MOSES I LISTEN TO WHAT IS BEING REVEALED".

(20:13)

For the third mode, that is, through a messenger, the same word **يُوحَى** "TO REVEAL" is used.

In short, the knowledge of a prophet consists in the message of God (His speaking to the prophet), and speaking of God to the prophet itself is WAHI (revelation). Hence, a prophet's knowledge is (nothing but) WAHI (inspiration). This means that whenever God will inform some thing to the prophet it would be WAHI (revelation) and will be through WAHI (revelation), it will not be through spontaneous and theoretical knowledge, as these are granted to even ordinary men. The reason is if God had taught the prophet through these two (common) methods, the prophet would not be any superior to ordinary man. God has thus described the point which differentiates a prophet from an ordinary man :

قُلْ إِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ مِّثْلُكُمْ يُوحَىٰ إِلَيَّ

"SAY, O MOHAMMAD ! I AM ONLY A MORTAL LIKE YOU (THE DIFFERENCE IS ONLY THAT) I AM BEING INSPIRED (BY GOD)".

(18:110)

Hence, WAHI (inspiration) is something superior to the knowledge acquired by senses and theoretical methods. Hence, whenever God will inform the prophet, about any thing it will be through WAHI (revelation). Likewise whenever God will caution the prophet, it will be through WAHI (revelation). Otherwise the prophet will not be superior to ordinary men, and there will be no need left for prophethood. Besides this, we say that God had declared :

بَلَدِكَ مِنَ أَنْبَاءِ الْغَيْبِ نُوحِيهَا إِلَيْكَ مَا كُنْتَ
تَعْلَمُهَا أَنْتَ وَلَا قَوْمُكَ مِنْ قَبْلِ هَذَا

“THIS IS OF THE TIDINGS OF THE UNSEEN WHICH WE INSPIRE IN THEE (MOHAMMAD). THOU THYSELF KNEWEST IT NOT, NOR DID THY FOLK (KNOW IT) BEFORE THIS”.

(11:49)

It is clear from the above that the information about **غيب** (Ghaib) the hidden things is not obtainable without WAHI (revelation). Now, the information given by the Prophet (peace be upon him) to his wife, that she had revealed the secret, was giving an information about a hidden thing (GHAIB), and information about hidden thing (GHAIB) is not possible without WAHI (revelation). Hence, the informing of the Prophet (peace be upon him) to his wife was on the basis of WAHI (revelation). To recall the event, the Prophet (peace be upon him) said something to his wife, and she revealed it to another; this is the condition and its consequence **عَرَفَ بَعْضَهُ** that is, “HE MADE KNOWN TO HER PART THEREOF”, and between this condition and consequence is placed **وَأَظْهَرَ اللَّهُ** “AND ALLAH APPRISED HIM THEREOF”, (66:3) that is, God informed the Prophet (peace be upon him). No sooner did the wife reveal the secret, the Prophet (peace be upon him) informed her of the act having received the information from God. Now, God says **فَلَمَّا نَبَّأَهَا بِهِ** “AND WHEN HE TOLD HER,” the wife was astonished at this information given by the Prophet (peace be upon him). She could not understand how the Prophet (peace be upon him) came to know about the incident as hardly any time had passed since her divulging the secret, and so she asked him who had informed him. To this the Prophet (peace be upon him) replied “THE KNOWER, THE AWARE” had informed him. When you join the first and last pieces of the verse, you will appreciate that no sooner the secret was revealed by the wife, the Prophet (peace be upon him) with the information from God through WAHI (revelation), informed her about what had happened. Hence, to give the information to the wife about the secret that was revealed by her amounts to giving information

about GHAIB (a hidden thing). And since it is impossible to give information about GHAIB without a WAHI (revelation), the exposition and the information by God was WAHI (revelation).

Question : (the second part of Q. No. 3 Page 61) Can THE KNOWER AND AWARE be besides God (as the disbeliever in Hadith has said)?

Answer : Not at all. The reason is that there is only one incident. For the same event, **أَظْهَرَ** and **نَبَأَ** are used. Hence, the person who apprised and the one who informed are one and the same. And since the one who apprised is ALLAH (according to the verse), one who informed is also Allah. In the verse, the informer is "THE KNOWER AND THE AWARE", therefore, it is evident that "THE KNOWER AND THE AWARE" is Allah, and no one else.

Question : The disbeliever in Hadith, has said in his periodical "Tulu-e-Islam" (June 1957) at the beginning of page 62, that the revelation THAT WERE RECEIVED BY THE PROPHETS were meant only for guidance of mankind. Is this true or false ?

Answer : It is false. For example, God said !

وَأَوْحَىٰ إِلَىٰ نُوحٍ أَنَّهُ لَنْ يُؤْمِنَ مِنْ قَوْمِكَ إِلَّا مَن قَدْ آمَنَ

..AND IT WAS INSPIRED IN NOAH, (SAYING) : NO ONE OF THY FOLK WILL BELIEVE SAVE HIM WHO HATH BELIEVED ALREADY..

(11:36)

This is a WAHI (inspiration), but it has nothing to do with guidance on the occasion of this WAHI (revelation), despair and disappointment existed. Hence, it is wrong to say that the WAHI (revelation) is meant only for guidance. On the contrary, it sometimes even speaks of despair and disappointment in stead of guidance. Reading a little further you will find :

وَأَصْبَحَ الْفُؤَادُ بِأَعْيُنِنَا وَوَحَيْنَا

"BUILD THE SHIP UNDER OUR EYES AND UNDER OUR INSPIRATION."

(11:37)

This WAHI (revelation) was not for the guidance of people but was in connection with building of the ship. And to call this WAHI (revelation) a "book" is pure ignorance.

Question: The disbeliever in Hadith has said on page 62 'since there is no instructions in the Quran for making BAITUL MAQDIS the Qibla (place to which to turn while praying), it appears that BAITUL MAQDIS had been made Qibla through some WAHI (inspiration) besides the Quran'. To this the disbeliever in Hadith has given a reply "after investigation and inquiry", that BAITUL MAQDIS had been made the Qibla in accordance with the instruction contained in the following verse of the Quran:

أُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ هَدَى اللَّهُ فَبِهِدَاهُمُ اقْتَدُوا

"THESE PROPHETS HAVE BEEN GUIDED BY ALLAH. O (Prophet) FOLLOW THEIR GUIDANCE" (6:90)

and since BAITUL MAQDIS had been the Qibla of those prophets, the Prophet (peace be upon him), in response to this verse, made it the Qibla.

The Question is, is this answer (of the disbeliever in Hadith) right or wrong.

Answer: This answer is entirely wrong. The reason is that this verse and the chapter are Meccan (revealed in Mecca). Hence, if this verse was the reason for making Baitul Maqdis the Qibla then the Prophet (peace be upon him) would have turned his face towards Baitul Maqdis in Mecca. On the contrary as long as the Prophet (peace be upon him) remained in Mecca, he made Kaba his Qibla. We quote the following verse of the Quran:

أَدْعَيْتَ الَّذِي يَنْهَىٰ عَبْدًا إِذَا صَلَّىٰ

"DID YOU SEE THE MAN WHO PREVENTS (OUR) SLAVE (THAT IS, YOU) FROM SAYING PRAYERS" ? (96: 9:10,)

This refers to the incident in which Abu-Jehl used to stop the Prophet (peace be upon him) when he prayed with his face towards the KABA. From this it is evident that the Prophet (peace be upon him) used to pray with his face towards the KABA in Mecca, and the verse :

“FOLLOW THEIR GUIDANCE” (6:90) is a Meccan one. If this verse were instrumental in making Baitul Maqdis the Qibla, it would have been made the Qibla in Mecca itself. Hence, it is clear that for making Baitul Maqdis the Qibla, another inspiration was received in Medina, on account of which it was made the Qibla. But that inspiration (revelation) is nowhere mentioned in the Quran.

Here, another point also should be well understood. That is, the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) remained for a considerable time in Mecca and he made the Kaba his Qibla right from the beginning. Now, the question arises, on account of which verse of the Quran did he make Kaba his Qibla from the beginning? Was it due to some revelation in the Quran or one besides the Quran? The fact is that there is no instruction to be found in the Quran for making Ka'ba the Qibla in the beginning. Hence, it was made through a revelation besides the Quran. It should be remembered that in the beginning the Ka'ba was made the Qibla through a revelation besides the Quran and then again Baitul Maqdis was made the Qibla through a revelation besides the Quran. Then on the third occasion Ka'ba was made the Qibla through a revelation of the Quran. Therefore, the answer of the disbeliever in Hadith is entirely wrong irrespective of the “investigation and inquiry” claimed by him

Further, there is one thing which you should understand perfectly well and that is, the instruction given to the Prophet (peace be upon him) in: **فَيُؤْتِيهِمْ مِنْهَا صَبْرًا** “FOLLOW THEIR GUIDANCE” (6:90) to follow other prophets, is not in connection with religion, as our Prophet (peace be upon him) had done away with all other religions. The following of

(these prophets) is confined to beliefs and conduct.

Question No. 4. The disbeliever in Hadith has on page 62 quoted the following "It occurs in Sura Al Hashr 'WHATEVER PALM-TREES YE CUT DOWN OR LEFT STANDING ON THEIR ROOTS, IT WAS BY ALLAH'S LEAVE'. And this leave to which reference is made is not to be found anywhere in the Quran. Hence, this leave was given (through a revelation) besides the Quran." Then the disbeliever in Hadith has said that the leave is present in the Quran and in support he has quoted the following verse of the Quran :

أُذِنَ لِلَّذِينَ يُقْتَلُونَ بِأَنَّهُمْ ظَلَمُوا

"THOSE PERSONS WHO ARE OPPRESSED ARE PERMITTED TO FIGHT". (22:39)

The question is whether this reply is right or wrong.

Answer : This reply is entirely wrong, since permission to fight is the only thing that can be proved from the verse. Permission to destroy crops and cut down trees cannot be proved therefrom. Further, for arguments sake, if permission to cut down trees was proved to be contained in the verse then all trees would have been cut down, whereas such thing was not the case: some trees were cut down and others were allowed to stand. Besides this, God has condemned the destroying of crops.

وَيُهْلِكُ الْحَرْثَ وَالنَّسْلَ

"THEY ARE DESTROYING THE CROPS". (2:20)

This is condemnation of the act of destroying the crops. No if trees are destroyed, that was done in accordance with fresh revelation. The permission to fight can never be taken as a permission to cut down trees.

Question : (Third part of Q. No 3, Page 61). The disbeliever in Hadith has after all admitted in this issue of periodical that such revelations as had connection with person of the Prophet (peace be upon him) were revealed

the Prophet (peace be upon him) besides the Quran, but not those relating to the guidance of the people. Further according to him, such revelation was in the form of revelation made to the honey bee. Now, the question is, is it true that the revelations besides the Quran which the Prophet (peace be upon him) received was of the type of the revelation made to the honey bee?

Answer : It is not true that the revelations received by the Prophet (peace be upon him) besides the Quran were of the type received by the honey bee. The reason is that God has said as under :

مَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ أَنْ يُكَلِّمَهُ اللَّهُ إِلَّا وَحْيًا أَوْ مِنْ وَرَائِ

حِجَابٍ أَوْ يُرْسِلَ رَسُولًا فَيُوحِيَ بآذَانِهِ مَا يَشَاءُ

"AND IT WAS NOT (VOUCHSAFED) TO ANY MORTAL THAT ALLAH SHOULD SPEAK TO HIM UNLESS (IT BE) BY REVELATION OR FROM BEHIND A VEIL, OR (THAT) HE SENDETH A MESSENGER TO REVEAL WHAT HE WILL BY HIS LEAVE."

(42:51)

God speaks to a person only in three ways (1) through a WAHI (inspiration). "Through inspiration" means that God puts meaning (substance communicated) in the heart of a prophet and the prophet transmits the same in his own words. (2) through a WAHI (revelation) from behind a veil: in this the prophet hears the words but God is not visible to him (3) The third method consists in **يُرْسِلَ رَسُولًا** "THROUGH A MESSENGER". In this, a messenger of God brings the message of God and reads it before the prophet. After a WAHI (revelation) of the messenger is received by the prophet it is interpreted and explained by the prophet. The proof of this is contained in

فَإِذَا قَرَأْتَهُ فَاتَّبِعْ قُرْآنَهُ ثُمَّ إِنَّ عَلَيْنَا بَيَانَهُ

"WHEN WE RECITE FOLLOW IT (THAT IS LISTEN TO IT). THEN IT IS FOR US TO INTERPRET IT AND EXPLAIN IT".

(75 : 18, 19).

This explanation of the Quran is from God. But this explanation is nowhere to be found in the Quran. However, if this explanation of the Quran were in the Quran itself, then another explanation would be necessary for this Quran (that is explanation of the Quran which would form part of the Quran). Hence, the chain (of Quran and its explanation) would go on indefinitely, which is impossible. Therefore, the explanation referred to is besides the Quran in respect of which God has said, "It is His responsibility", that is, He will explain the Quran by a WAHI (revelation) which would be besides the Quran. We have discussed this in detail on previous pages. Hence, the Prophets (peace be upon them) received inspiration (revelation) in those three ways only. It is not of the type of inspiration to the honey bee. The nature of the honey bee has been moulded in such a way that it naturally does all the works. It does not receive inspiration in a conscious way that it may use its wisdom and intelligence to perform those things. In fact, it makes such excellent and intricate solid geometrical designs which baffle even the highest qualified mathematicians and engineers. Now, if this work of the honey bee were the result of its conscious and intelligent performance, the honey bee would excel mankind. Therefore, the inspiration received by it is not in conscious way. On the contrary, the inspiration received by our Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) is through the channel of conscience. It is, therefore, proved that the Prophet (peace be upon him) did not receive any inspiration of the type received by the honey bee. To explain this, we quote the following verse of the Quran :

قُلْ مَا يَكُونُ لِي أَنْ أُبَدِّلَهُ مِنْ تَلْقَائِي نَفْسِي إِنْ أَسِعُوا إِلَّا وَجْهِيَ إِلَىٰ

"SAY (O MOHAMMAD) HOW CAN I CHANGE THIS OF MY OWN ACCORD ? I ONLY FOLLOW THE INSPIRATION WHICH IS INSPIRED IN ME (REVEALED TO ME)".

(10:15)

Further, the Prophet (peace be upon him) arranged the Chapters of the Quran in such a way that he placed at the end the chapters which were revealed earlier and in Mecca and those chapters which were revealed later on and in Medina, such as Chapter-Al-Baqara etc., he got them written in the beginning. Now, since the Prophet (peace be upon him) does not make the change of his own wish, being a strict follower of WAHI (inspiration) from God, and there is no mention of this change (in sequence of the chapters) in the revelations of the Quran, hence, it is absolutely clear that the WAHI (inspiration) through which the change in sequence of the chapters was brought about was certainly besides the Quran. Since the Quran which has reached us has these changes in the arrangement of chapters, and this is a guidance for the people. It is, therefore, evident that the WAHI (inspiration), besides the Quran is also meant for the guidance of people. We have explained this in detail in the previous pages. Now, we put to you a simple question.

Has the Prophet (peace be upon him) fixed or not, the numbers of compulsory prayers, namely, two in the morning (Fajr), four in the after noon (Zuhr), four in the evening (Asr), three after the sun-set (Maghrib,) and four in the night (Isha)—which the Muslims are faithfully observing? One who says that the Prophet (peace be upon him) has not fixed them, he is not only an unbeliever but also insane. If it is said that the Prophet (peace be upon him) has fixed them, then the question is whether the Prophet (peace be upon him) has fixed them, through his own judgement and opinion or in consequence of a WAHI (inspiration from God)? If you say that the Prophet (peace be upon him) has fixed the numbers out of his own judgement and opinion, then, the Muslims of the entire world and of every age and epoch know (and bear witness) that the prayers have been made compulsory by God. Under this circumstance (God forbid) the Prophet (peace be upon him)

would be included in the following threat :

وَلَوْ تَقَوَّلَ عَلَيْنَا بَعْضَ الْأَقَاوِيلِ ۚ لَأَخَذْنَا
مِنْهُ بِالْيَمِينِ ۚ ثُمَّ نَقَطَعُنَا مِنْهُ الْوَتِينَ ۚ

“AND IF HE HAD INVENTED FALSE SAYINGS,
CONCERNING US, WE ASSUREDLY HAD TAKEN
HIM BY THE RIGHT HAND AND THEN
SEVERED HIS LIFE-ARTERY”.

(69:44-46)

The fact is that, the Muslim of the entire world are unanimous on the point that the Prophet (peace be upon him) has never attributed to God anything which was not conveyed to him by God (through inspiration). On the other hand, if it is admitted that it was through an inspiration (WAHI) from God, then this is the same WAHI (inspiration) which we have proved. This WAHI (inspiration) is besides the Quran and termed as AHADITH (traditions of the Prophet peace be upon him). In short, the Prophet (peace be upon him) did not fix the numbers of prayers without a WAHI (inspiration). But these numbers are not to be found in the Quran, hence, necessarily, there was a WAHI (inspiration) besides the Quran in correspondence with which these numbers (of prayers) were fixed.

Question : 6 The disbeliever in Hadith, on page 63, has said that the Book and wisdom are one and the same thing. Is this correct or not ?

Answer : This is entirely incorrect. The Book and Wisdom are not one and the same thing. The reason is that the Book is absolutely and exclusively given to a prophet. This means that to whomsoever God bestowed the Book is certainly a prophet, and it is not necessary that the one on whom Wisdom is bestowed should be necessarily a prophet. There is a concensus of opinion of the entire Muslim world that the prophet-hood of Hazrat Luqman is not one that has been absolutely established. In other words, the prophethood of Hazrat Luqman is not positive and definite. On the other hand, Wisdom of Luqman is positive and definite.

وَلَقَدْ آتَيْنَا لُقْمَانَ الْحِكْمَةَ

“AND VERILY WE GAVE LUQMAN WISDOM”

(31:12)

From this it is evident that if the Book and Wisdom were one and the same thing ; it would mean that one who received wisdom certainly received the Book and one who has received the Book (from God) is absolutely a prophet and messenger of God. Now, since Luqman received Wisdom, it would mean that he received the Book and one who receives a Book is positively a prophet, hence Luqman should have been, without doubt a prophet; whereas the consensus of opinion of the Muslim community is that he is not definitely a prophet. Besides this, We say, that the Book (of God) is a guidance and light and is absolute good, that is, it is good and nothing else. Hence, the Book of God is nothing else but good : it is good personified, whereas Wisdom is not absolute good, but is ‘much good’

وَمَنْ يُؤْتَ الْحِكْمَةَ فَقَدْ أُوتِيَ خَيْرًا كَثِيرًا

“AND ONE WHO HAS BEEN GIVEN WISDOM HAS BEEN GIVEN MUCH GOOD”

(2:269)

From this it is clear that Wisdom is ‘much good’ and that a Book is nothing but good-it is totally good. Now absolute good is opposed to ‘much good’. Hence, Book and Wisdom are totally different and not at all the same thing.

Question : (Part second of Question 6). The disbeliever in Hadith has quoted the following verse and tried to prove oneness of the Book and Wisdom (that is, he has tried to prove that both are identical).

ذَلِكَ مِمَّا أَوْحَىٰ إِلَيْكَ رَبُّكَ مِنَ الْحِكْمَةِ

“THIS IS (PART) OF THAT WISDOM WHEREWITH THY LORD HATH INSPIRED THEE (O MOHAMMAD)”

(17:39)

The question is, is it proved by this verse that Book and Wisdom are identical ?

Answer : No, because the MIN **مِنْ** which is present in **مِمَّا أَوْحَى** is descriptive and the description of **مِمَّا أَوْحَى** in **مِنَ الْحِكْمَةِ**. This means that it is from Wisdom, and is a part of Wisdom. Hence, it is clear that Wisdom also lies in the WAHI (inspiration) outside the Quran and in the one that is besides the Quran. This is because, **ذَلِكَ مِنَ الْحِكْمَةِ** is something different from **ذَلِكَ الْحِكْمَةِ**. Further, in this verse too there is a pointer towards the WAHI (inspiration) besides the Quran. In other words 'this, that is the WAHI (revelation) of the Quran is a part of the WAHI (inspiration) which has been sent to you, besides the Quran'. The reason for this is that **ذَلِكَ** is a pointer to the WAHI (revelation) of the Quran mentioned above.

Question : The disbeliever in Hadith, on page 64, has quoted the following verse of the Quran in support of his contention that the Book and Wisdom are identical ;

وَمَا أَنْزَلْنَا عَلَيْكَ مِنَ الْكِتَابِ وَالْحِكْمَةَ يَعِظُكُمْ بِهِ

"HE HATH REVEALED UNTO YOU OF THE SCRIPTURE AND OF WISDOM"

(2:231)

he has said that if the Book and Wisdom were two different things, then in the above verse, instead of (BIHI) **بِهِ** (BEHEMA) **بِهِمَا** would have been used. He concludes that from this it is proved that the Book and Wisdom are one and the same thing. The question is whether this reasoning is correct or not ?

Answer : The reasoning is wrong. The pronoun BIHI stands for each one of them as we see in the following verse of the Quran :-

وَاللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَحَقُّ أَنْ يُرْضَوْا

"BUT ALLAH, WITH HIS MESSENGER HATH MORE RIGHT THAT THEY SHOULD PLEASE HIM"

(9:62)

Here, the singular pronoun stands for every one of the two meaning thereby that we should please God and the Prophet each one of them. Now, from the use of singular pronoun, if it is argued that both are one and the same, then God and the Prophet (peace be upon him) would become one. Hence, the meaning of **يَعْظُمُ بِكُلِّ وَاحِدٍ مِنَ الْكِتَابِ وَالْحِكْمَةِ** is **يَعْظُمُ بِهِ** (2:231). Exact analogy of this is found in the following verse:

اسْتَجِيبُوا لِلَّهِ وَلِلرَّسُولِ إِذَا دَعَاكُمْ

"OBEY ALLAH, AND THE MESSENGER WHEN HE CALLETH YOU". (8:24)

Here too, a pronoun in singular has been used. But the meaning is that whosoever from God and the Prophet (peace be upon him) should call, since God is also the one who calls.

وَاللَّهُ يَدْعُو إِلَى دَارِ السَّلَامِ

"AND ALLAH SUMMONETH TO THE ABODE OF PEACE". (10:25)

CHAPTER VI

THE INJUNCTION OF SACRIFICE AND THE
DISBELIEVERS IN HADITH

Question : The central office of "IDARA-E-TULU-E-ISLAM LAHORE" has published a book which has been given the title "قرآنی فیصلے" "VERDICTS OF THE QURAN". On page 57 of this book occurs what is mentioned below :

"In compliance with which of the edicts of the Quran are we sacrificing these goats and cows in every city, every village, every lane and bylane on the occasion of the Eid of Sacrifice? There is no command in the Quran in this connection. This practice, (ritual) has been passed down to us as a heritage from our ancestors".

On page 63 of this book, the disbeliever in Hadith has said : "In the entire Quran it is not written anywhere that sacrifice should be done at any place other than Mecca".

On the same page, it has been said in a 'scholarly strain' : "All this has been in vogue for about one thousand years and no creature of God is giving any thought to all that is going on".

After this, on page 65 following disclosure has been

made: "Even the Prophet himself did not perform sacrifice in Medina".

Lastly,

he has crowned his efforts at misleading people in the following manner:

'To perform sacrifice at any and every place is neither the command of God nor was the practice of the prophet Abraham nor was it even the practice of Prophet Mohammad (peace be upon him)''.

The question is, what is the status of the above elucidations of the disbeliever in Hadith?

Answer: The statements of the disbeliever in Hadith are totally false. His assertion that there is no command in the Quran for performing sacrifice and that it is nowhere written (in the Quran) that a sacrifice could be performed anywhere besides Mecca is false top to bottom and is calculated to misguide people. The Quran is an all comprehensive Book and it is clearly mentioned in it, but how can one help him, if due to lack of vision and sight the disbeliever in Hadith could not see that God The Almighty has said:

وَلِكُلِّ أُمَّةٍ جَعَلْنَا مَنْسَكًا لِيَذْكُرُوا اسْمَ
اللَّهِ عَلَىٰ مَا رَزَقَهُم مِّنْ بَهِيمَةِ الْأَنْعَامِ

"AND FOR EVERY NATION HAVE WE APPOINTED A RITUAL THAT THEY MAY MENTION THE NAME OF ALLAH OVER THE BEAST OF CATTLE THAT HE HATH GIVEN THEM FOR FOOD".

(22:34)

It is evident from this verse that the practice of sacrifice existed in every nation. To elucidate, it is an established fact that every nation had a prophet as may be seen from the following verse of the Quran:

وَلِكُلِّ أُمَّةٍ رَسُولٌ

“AND FOR EVERY NATION THERE IS A MESSENGER”

(10:47)

Hence, there are as many Ummahs (nations) as there are RUSUL (prophets). In other words wherever in the world the prophets were sent there were nations. It follows, therefore, that wherever there were nations the practice of sacrifice of animals existed.

In brief, nations existed not only in Mecca but in the entire world and sacrifice (as it is clear from the above quoted verse) was ordained for every nation. Hence, it is evident that sacrifice was performed on the entire surface of the earth. Therefore, the statement of the disbeliever in Hadith that there is no commandment in the Quran about performance of sacrifices and that in the entire Quran it is nowhere mentioned that sacrifice can be performed any-where besides Mecca, is a clear proof not only of misguidedness but also a glaring proof of his lack of knowledge. Besides it, it is not correct to consider sacrifice as specifically connected with Hajj or Pilgrimage of Kaba or Mecca as even before the construction of Kaba, there existed nations on the earth and wherever nations existed there existed also the practice of sacrifice. (This is evident from the verse quoted above). Hence, it is wrong to consider sacrifice as belonging to Hajj or Hujjaj or Kaba and Mecca.

Here, there is a point worth considering, and that is, that God has ordained nations only through the prophets to perform sacrifice. Hence the prophets in accordance with the commands of God, taught their UMMA (nations) to sacrifice animals, and guided them according to the commands of God. Hence, (according to the verse) sacrifice becomes the SUNNAH (practice) of all the prophets. Therefore, the contention of the disbeliever in Hadith that it is neither the SUNNAH of prophet ABRAHAM nor even of the prophet Mohammad (peace be upon him) is absolutely false. We would now like to show you what is mentioned

in the Quran in this respect. After speaking about the prophets from **وَوَهَبْنَا لَهُ إِسْحَاقَ** (.6:84) to **فَمُذَمِّمُهُمْ أَقْتَدَا** (6:90) **إِلَى صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ** (6:87) God said: **أُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ هَدَى اللَّهُ فَبِهِدَاهُمْ أَقْتَدَا** that is

أُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ هَدَى اللَّهُ فَبِهِدَاهُمْ أَقْتَدَا

"ALL THESE PROPHETS HAVE RECEIVED GUIDANCE FROM GOD, O PROPHET YOU FOLLOW THEM"

(6:90)

Now, since the guidance is inclusive of performance of sacrifice, hence, it is proved that sacrifice is included in the act of following the prophets. Therefore, sacrifice of animals is by the command of God and is the **SUNNAH** (practice) of the prophets and also of the Prophet Mohammad (peace be upon him). It follows therefore, that the claim of the disbeliever in Hadith that sacrifice is neither the command of God nor the **SUNNAH** of the prophet **ABRAHAM** nor of our Propnet Mohammad (peace be upon him) is totally wrong, and is calculated only to misguide people as already proved.

Further, the disbeliever in Hadith has said that the sacrifice of animals is a mere custom in practice for the last one thousand years. In this connection, it is necessary to keep in mind that this and such other ill-conceived talk is indulged into just to lead the Muslim masses astray by instilling poison into their ears against religion so that they would gradually become non-believers and atheists. As far as the issue in hand is concerned, it is a simple matter, which can be understood easily. In case sacrifice was only a custom or an innovation (in religion, as is the opinion of the disbeliever in Hadith), and was not a part of religion, there would have been a dispute right at the outset of the practice, as happened in case of problems like creation of the actions of man, **IMAMAT** (leadership) etc. On the contrary, it is established by continuou schain of evidence that in case of sacrifice no dispute whatsoever arose at any time. What type of sacrifice

was this and what kind of innovation (in religion), which the entire community of Muslims accepted without any dispute and given it place in religion ?

In short, no sooner a new custom or an innovation in religion is introduced, it creates a dispute and difference of opinion. It has never happened that a custom or an innovation in religion was introduced and the Muslims of the entire world accepted it unanimously and without any dispute. Now, since sacrifice is such an issue on which all the Muslims have remained unanimous, it follows that it is not a new custom or innovation in religion but it is an item of religion itself. This is the very reason for its being performed and practised in every city, in every village and in every house. Hence, the contention of the disbeliever in Hadith that it is only a custom, is entirely wrong and devoid of reason.

Now, we turn to the contention of the disbeliever in Hadith that sacrifice is merely a custom in practice for last one thousand years only. The mischief underlying this contention is evident. The matter is pretty simple. If sacrifice were mere custom or an innovation in religion stretching for last one thousand years only, then prior to these thousand years, during the period of three hundred and seventy years there should be no reference to it, (that is, from the date of advent of Islam). On the contrary, the subject of sacrifice is mentioned in the earliest writings. Sahibe Bukhari and Muwatta of Imam Malik are books which belong to a period prior to this period of one thousand years. Nevertheless they are full of discourses on sacrifice.

Now, if it is argued that this argument is based on the books of Ahadith (traditions), and the disbeliever in Hadith has nothing to do there with, then our reply is as follows: It is immaterial whether the disbeliever in Hadith believes or not in the Ahadith (traditions) contained in these books. The point at issue is that these Books belong to the second and the third centuries, and description of the subject of sacrifice in them is ample proof of the fact that before and at the

time these books were written the practice of sacrifice was prevalent and was therefore discussed. Hence, to say that sacrifice is a mere custom in vogue during the last one thousand years only is absolutely false and baseless. Whether the subject matter of the Hadith contained in Bukhari is factual or not, is a different matter, but the fact remains that book was written prior to one thousand years and the AHADITH concerning sacrifice existed in it. This proves that it was in existence more than a thousand years ago. In case there was any dispute, in this connection it would have been handed down through a continuous chain (of narrators). On the contrary there is a continuous evidence that there was no dispute in respect of sacrifice. This very fact confirms that sacrifice is a SUNNAH and part and parcel of religion.

For example, the prayer of Idd-uz-Zoha is established by a continuous evidence and is (a part of) Deen (religion). Exactly in the same manner, performance of sacrifice after the Idd-uz-Zoha prayer is established by a continuous chain of evidence of the narrators. Hence it is also a part of religion. Sacrifice is a part of religion through the same source through which the prayer of Idd-uz-Zoha is a part of religion.

Eid-ul-Azha X

To sum up, the claim of the disbeliever in Hadith that sacrifice is a mere custom or innovation in vogue since only a thousand years is false and baseless. The reason for this is that all the movements and innovations which are the product of twelve hundred years, such as Shiism, and the sects of Kharejites, Motazila, Murjia etc, all belong to a period prior to one thousand years. Every one knows that these are innovations that is, their being innovations is proved by a continuous evidence (of narrators).

Similarly, if sacrifice were a custom, innovation or a newly created practice, then undoubtedly there would have been a dispute on this issue and the same would have been reported by a continuous evidence of narrators. But such is not the

case. Hence it is evident that sacrifice is not a mere custom, innovation or a newly introduced practice. On the contrary, it is a part of religion, and its being a part of religion is reported by a unanimous evidence of continuous narrators, like the fact of Idd-uz-Zoha.

Now, it may be argued that the continuous and unanimous evidence in favour of sacrifice does not prove that sacrifice is a part of religion, and that it is possible that the entire world of Islam may have become unanimous about some thing that is un-Islamic, but thereby the un-Islamic thing cannot become Islamic. The reply to this is as follows. The fact that sacrifice has been accepted and declared as such by a continuous evidence is in itself a proof of its being a part of religion, as otherwise even the Holy Quran (which has been accepted on the same basis) will also not remain reliable and its position will become dubious.

This may be explained in greater detail. The disbeliever in Hadith says that sacrifice is a mere custom which has been in vogue for only one thousand years. It was not in existence prior to this, hence it is not a part of religion. This contention of the disbeliever in tradition (as has already been stated on previous pages) is absolutely wrong, and misleading, because, firstly, it is wrong to consider sacrifice a product of one thousand years only, when the proof of its existence is available in earlier books. Secondly, if sacrifice happens to be the product of one thousand years and is a mere custom or innovation, as claimed by the disbeliever in Hadith then, it would mean that the entire world of Islam became unanimous in acceptance of a thing which is un-Islamic. Under these circumstances, the position of the Holy Quran will also become dubious. Hence, the verdict of this community that "this Quran is THE QURAN" will not remain fit to be accepted. The identity of the Quran also becomes unreliable and false, since the Quran too has been accepted on the evidence of this world of Islam. But all parties concerned are unanimous that the Holy Quran is

reliable. Hence, it is clear that the body (congregation), which has by continuous chain conveyed the Quran, is reliable. Now where is the harm in accepting sacrifice as part of religion on the evidence of the body on whose evidence the Quran has been accepted as THE QURAN (Book of God) ?

Now we turn to the contention of the disbeliever in Hadith that the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) had not performed the sacrifice in Medina. In this connection, we wish to point out that the Prophet's (peace be upon him) performance of the Idd-uz-Zoha, and sacrifice thereafter, is proved by a continuous chain of narrators. In other words, exactly as the performance of Idd-uz-Zoha prayers by the Prophet (peace be upon him) is established through continuous evidence, as is the performance by him of the sacrifice established by a continuous evidence, and the nonsense concealed behind these words (of the disbelievers in Hadith) cannot remain concealed from the eyes of men of knowledge and thinking.

Further, in this connection, my question is : Did the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) perform Idd-uz-Zoha prayers in Medina or not ? There are only two alternatives, that is, either he performed it or he did not. If it is said that he did not perform it, then from where has this Idd-uz-Zoha prayers come into practice ? After the Hajj Idd-uz-Zoha prayers are not performed in Mecca. Then wherefrom has this practice of performing Idd-uz-Zoha prayers come ? If, on the other hand, it is said that he performed (the Idd-uz-Zoha prayers), then exactly in the same manner in which and through the same source of evidence that the performance of Idd-uz-Zoha prayer is established and is part of religion, the performance of sacrifice after the prayer is likewise established and is part of religion. Hence, there is no need to prove sacrifice through Hadith (tradition).

From the foregoing discussions it is absolutely clear that

sacrifice is not a mere custom or an innovation but it is a religious matter and is proved through the Quran, which says

وَلِكُلِّ أُمَّةٍ جَعَلْنَا مَنْسَكًا لِيَذْكُرُوا اسْمَ
اللَّهِ عَلَىٰ مَا رَزَقَهُم مِّن بَيْمَاتِهِ الْأَنْعَامِ

"AND FOR EVERY NATION HAVE WE APPOINTED A RITUAL THAT THEY MAY MENTION THE NAME OF ALLAH OVER THE BEAST OF CATTLE THAT HE HATH GIVEN THEM FOR FOOD".

(22:34)

Further, it is also established and proved through IJMA (consensus of religious opinion). The reason is that if there was no IJMA on this point (that is, if the entire community of Muslims was not unanimous on the issue) of sacrifice, then undoubtedly there would have been a dispute, and that dispute would have either been total or partial, (total means that no one would have considered sacrifice as a part of religion and the meaning of partial is that some would have considered it as a part of religion and others not), in any case, the dispute would have been noted and conveyed through a continuous chain of evidence. In fact, there is nothing of this sort. In this long period of thirteen hundred years, not a single soul has disputed the sacrifice after Idd-uz-Zoha prayers. Whereas even the minutest differences have been conveyed regularly, there is no difference of opinion reported regarding the sacrifice after the Idd-uz-Zoha prayers. Hence, it is clear that the sacrifice is as unanimously accepted part of religion as the Idd-uz-Zoha prayers are and there is the same kind of IJMA on this issue as on the Idd-uz-Zoha prayers.

Therefore, sacrifice is not a mere custom or innovation, but is a part of religion. This was performed alike by the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him), their successors and those pious people who came after them, and thereafter, to this day the practice

is in existence like a legacy. There was no difference of opinion on this issue at any period, and it was never branded as an un-Islamic practice. This (performance of sacrifice) is neither a mere custom nor an innovation. Like-wise it is neither extravagance, nor useless expenditures. Those who consider it such (that is, extravagance etc.) are hypocrites.

وَاللّٰهُ يَشْهَدُ اِنَّ الْمُنٰفِقِيْنَ كٰذِبُوْنَ ۝

"AND ALLAH BEARETH WITNESS THAT THE HYPOCRITES ARE SPEAKING FALSELY."

(63:1)

APPEAL TO THE READERS

It will be no overstatement to say that this unique brochure has been written with the life-blood of the author. In the writing of this book both logical skill and workmanship have been displayed par excellence through fine blending of deductive logic, able argumentation and genuine appeal to reason. The late Allama Hafiz Mohammad Ayub Dehlavi worked at it most assiduously in order that the traducers and shameless maligners of the good name of Holy Prophet of Islam (may peace be upon him) would meet their Waterloo once and for all. It is my profound conviction that to date no book - either by contemporary authors or by those scholars who are now no more amongst us - have dealt so convincingly with the subject matter under discussion as the present work of the Allama. Copious references have been made to the verses of the Holy Quran, the Ahadith of Holy Prophet and his Seerat (detailed life-study) to substantiate the contentions of the learned author.

The book carries no copyright, so any one desiring to reprint or translate and publish it in any language is most welcome to do so, since that will help achieve the purpose of the book, namely to put an end to the long standing mischief.

SYED SHAUKAT ALI DEHLAVI
Maktaba-i-Razi