

Qur'aanic Purdah (Hijaab)

**RESPONSE TO THE
KUFRA CONCOCTION
OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF
DEVIATE MODERNISM**

**BY
MUJLISUL ULAMA OF SOUTH AFRICA
P.O. BOX 3393, PORT ELIZABETH
SOUTH AFRICA 6056**

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

QUR'AANIC PURDAH

A pamphlet, titled IS PURDAH ISLAMIC?, authored by a modernist group (A. Kays & Associates), is replete with kufr and baatil in that the views expressed are in diametric conflict with the Qur'aan and Sunnah. The pamphlet seeks to impress unwary and ignorant people with its so-called 'research' approach. But, only like-thinking modernists and ignoramuses will perhaps be influenced by the drivel written in the pamphlet in the name of research.

The very first paragraph of the pamphlet demonstrates the shallowness of the 'research' of deviate modernists who lack in entirety in the Shar'i conception of Imaan. Displaying gross ignorance, the authors of the pamphlet allege:

“IN THE FIRST PLACE the word Purdah is not Arabic (the language of the Holy Qur'aan). The Arabic alphabet has no 'p'. Purdah is of Persian origin and it has many meanings:....”

This presentation is an attempt to befuddle the minds of people who are unable to think for themselves. If a term is not of Arabic origin, it does not follow that the concept or the teaching/practice which the term denotes is not Islamic – is not Qur'aanic. The conclusion which the modernist authors desire people to draw from their puerile observation is that the Islamic institution of Purdah/Hijaab is in actual fact not Islamic – not Qur'aanic – because the word Purdah is not Arabic. This conclusion is absurd.

NAMAAZ is not of Arabic origin. Nowhere in the Qur'aan does the word, NAMAAZ, appear. But it will be stupid and absurd to claim that the institution of Salaat is not Islamic – not Qur'aanic – because the term, NAMAAZ, is Persian. Only ignoramuses can venture such absurd conclusions.

Then the modernist authors seek to peddle the idea that the Fuqaha of Islam have designated the face-veil as PURDAH. In other words, it is their claim that Purdah as used by the authorities of Islam means the face-veil. This allegation is fallacious. Purdah does not refer to the face-covering. The face-veil is known as NIQAAB, not Purdah.

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

PURDAH is an Islamic concept. It is the Institution of modesty, anti-promiscuity, anti-nudity and anti-vulgarity. It is the Islamic Institution which brings within its purview all acts and teachings pertaining to hayaa (modesty, shame and respect). The face-veil is simply one item of Purdah, just as dress is an item of Purdah. In the context of the Shariah's order, PURDAH is applicable to both males and females.

The literal meanings (with which the modernists wish to impress) are of no significance and of no consequence. Of importance and significance are the Shar'i meanings and expositions attached to the term used to denote the Institution of Islam. Thus, the literal meaning of Namaaz is of no importance. The Shar'i meaning denoted by the Persian term, NAMAAZ, is of significance to the Ummah. Similarly, the literal meanings of the Persian term, PURDAH, are not our concern. Our concern is the Institution of Islam regardless of what word is used to denote it – whether a Persian, Chinese, English or Latin term. Different nations have different words to describe the Institutions of Islam. It never follows from the non-Arabic terms that the institutions these terms represent are not Qur'aanic or not Islamic. We should be concerned with meanings, not the words used to convey the meanings.

The Kays group says in its pamphlet:

*“THE TERM generally indicated a woman in a veil,
from head to toe, the face being covered.”*

This statement is false. People who understand the meaning of Purdah never refer to a woman in a veil as 'purdah'. While a woman in veil and cloak will be said to be observing purdah or hijaab, the term itself does not indicate a woman with a veil as claimed by Mr. Kays and company.

Purdah as understood by its proponents (i.e. the authorities of the Shariah) means the Islamic practice of separation of the sexes. Every act of such segregation comes within the scope of Purdah or Hijaab. Thus when a man lowers his gaze when a shameless woman without veil comes in his presence, it will be said that he is observing purdah. When a man comes to a home and the females withdraw into seclusion, it will be said that they are observing purdah whether they are the donning cloak and veil or seductive garments. Their act of segregating

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

themselves from the males is called purdah, i.e. this particular act is part of purdah or an item in the Islamic concept of Purdah.

The Kays group states:

“PURDAH-NASHEEN means a veiled woman or one who stays behind a curtain or does not come out of the house.”

The Urdu/Persian word ‘nasheen’ means sitting. Purdah Nasheen women means women who live in Purdah, i.e. secluded from males. A woman who observes all Islamic demands of modesty and decorum in both dress and conduct, living in separation from ghair mahrams, will be described as a purdah nasheen woman even if she does not wear the cloak and veil in her state of separation and even if she wears revealing and seductive garments in privacy for the sake of her husband. On the contrary, a woman who wears a face-veil, but wanders around the streets and drives about in cars (i.e. she herself drives), is not a purdah nasheen woman. In a town in Kenya, women in droves prowl the streets after Maghrib. All of them wear a face-veil. A stranger will wonder at these ‘purdah nasheen’ females roaming the streets immediately after the Maghrib Athaan. For the benefit of the Kays group, these so-called ‘purdah nasheen’ females are all prostitutes plying their vile trade. Such women can never be termed purdah nasheen solely on account of wearing a niqaab (face-veil). Again we shall emphasise that while the veil is an item of purdah, it is not PURDAH itself nor is a woman with a niqaab necessarily purdah nasheen. The Urdu dictionary, Firozul Lughaat defines purdah nasheen as follows: a female who conceals (herself); a female who sits in purdah; a chaste woman; a (morally) pure woman. It does not mean a woman with a veil. If a woman donning a niqaab does not subscribe to the Shar’i institution of Purdah/Hijaab, she will not be described as a purdah nasheen lady of Islam.

The modernist writers of the pamphlet further claim:

“PURDAH is often confused with HIJAAB which is an Arabic word used in the Holy Qur’aan in several places.”

The confusion lies in the thinking of Kays and his associates. His allegation is tantamount to the claim:

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

“Namaaz/Prayer is often confused with Salaat which is an Arabic word used in the Holy Qur'aan in several places.”

If by Namaaz we refer to the Islamic Institution of Salaat – i.e. Salaat as taught by the Qur'aan and Sunnah – it will be absurd to claim that there exists confusion in using these words for Salaat. Similarly, if by the word PURDAH we mean the Islamic Institution of Hijaab, no confusion whatever is implied. Crooked thinking and oblique mental vision conjecture the idea of confusion.

In an attempt to impress ignorant people with their so-called ‘research’, the group presents a definition of Raaghib. Thus is it said by this group:

“The great Arab linguist, Raaghib, says it means a kind of obstruction/impediment which prevents the reaching of one thing to another, concurred by lexicologist Ibn Faras (Ref. Taaaj and Muheet).”

The attempt to deny the Shar'i validity of the Niquaab (face-veil) by trying to sound academic, is futile and stupid. Instead of Raaghib's definition of ‘al-hijaab’ being any substantiation for the baseless claim of the Kays group, it on the contrary provides proof for the Shar'i command of Niquaab. Raaghib's definition applies aptly to the Niquaab because the Niquaab is in fact an *“obstruction/impediment which prevents”* the lustful gazes of men “reaching” the face of the woman donning the Niquaab. The Shariah imposes the Niquaab precisely to create the obstruction or the impediment so necessary for the maintenance of moral purity of both man and woman.

Undoubtedly, Purdah and Hijaab is one and the same thing. In the same way that Namaaz and Salaat is the same thing, Purdah and Hijaab is the same thing. It matters not that the terms Namaaz and Purdah are not Arabic. The teachings and demands of Purdah are identical with the teachings and demands of Hijaab. Insha'Allah, this will be substantiated with conclusive Shar'i evidence.

Since Kays and his associates are labouring under a gross misconception regarding the meaning of Purdah, they can ignorantly mock:

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

“They somehow misinterpret the Qur’aanic term to mean a Ninja-style veil, though the Holy Qur’aan does not say this, nor implies it even indirectly!”

(An implication is an indirect reference. Therefore to say: “*nor implies it even indirectly!*” is both superfluous and inaccurate.)

The reference of the above statement is to “Indo-Pak preachers”. By claiming that ‘Indo-Pak preachers’ propagate the incumbency of the Niqaab, Kays and his associates have displayed stark ignorance of the reality. The Niqaab is not restricted to India and Pakistan. The entire Arab World, Egypt, Syria, Morocco, Turkey and most Muslim countries have adopted the Niqaab since the very inception of Islam in their lands. To this day innumerable Muslim ladies of almost every nation on earth don the Niqaab. It is only the modernist, immoral pseudo-Muslim women aping every style of the kuffaar West, who have renounced the veil. It is indeed a great travesty of the truth to aver that the veil is the invention of the ‘Indo-Pak preachers’. The Niqaab is the introduction and command of Islam – the command of the Qur’aan and the Sunnah of which Kays and his associates are wholly ignorant notwithstanding their childish research.

In a smattering outline of the ‘history of the veil’, the pamphlet claims that the following communities also had adopted the Veil of Virtue and Modesty:

- *The elites and priests of the Assyrians.*
- *The Greeks.*
- *The Zoroastrians of Persia.*
- *The Jews.*
- *The pre-Islam Arabs.*
- *Some castes in India among the Hindus.*
- *Christians.*
- *Some Christian sects to this day wear the veil.*

The modernists, in their ignorance, have failed to understand that the VEIL which formed part of the culture of all these and other communities was in fact a remnant of the Islamic Culture which they had inherited from their respective Ambiyaa (alayhimus salaam).

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

Allah Ta'ala has sent a Nabi or Rasool to every community. Man was not created and left like the beasts of the jungle to be nourishment for some other species of creation. Man was despatched to earth to prepare himself for the Aakhirah. Hence, a Rasool was sent to guide every nation to the Path of Jannat. In this regard the Qur'aan Majeed says:

“For every nation was a Rasool.”

(Aayat 47, Surah Yunus)

Whatever goodness and virtue are observed in non-Muslim communities, even in pagans, were inherited from the Shariahs of the Ambiyaa which were sent to the various nations of the world. Highly civilized nations such as the Greeks, Egyptians, Indians, etc., were not left to shaitaan and the vagaries of the nafs. A Nabi came to every nation. The rites of Hajj practised by the pre-Islamic Arabs were not the products of their paganism. They had inherited the rituals of Hajj from their ancestor, Hadhrat Ibraaheem (alayhis salaam). In the course of time, they drifted from the Path of Islam and corrupted all the acts of Ibaadat and the Beliefs which they had initially acquired from Hadhrat Ibraaheem and Hadhrat Ismaaeel (alayhimas salaam).

That all civilized communities had the veil for their womenfolk, is indicative of this practice being a unanimous demand of civilized culture – culture which was brought and taught by the Ambiyaa (alayhimus salaam). On the contrary, nudity, semi-nudity, immodesty, female exhibition and the like are acts of shaitaan. Such acts of immodesty are the hallmark of uncivilized communities of savages and barbarians.

In Surah Ahzaab, Aayat 59, Allah Ta'ala announces the command of Hijaab/Purdah pertaining to the covering of the entire body, including the head and face. Thus, Allah Ta'ala says:

“O Nabi! Tell your wives, your daughters and the women of the Mu'mineen that they draw over themselves their jalaabeeb (outer-cloaks or shawls)....”

Kays and company defines the jilbaab as follows:

“The jilbaab was a fairly large piece of cloth draped around the neck and over the shoulders, hanging on the back as a showpiece, or to wrap around the whole body.”

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

This description of the jilbaab is misleading and erroneous. Tafseer Mazhari describes the jilbaab as follows:

“It is a sheet (or shawl) which a woman wraps around her, ontop of her dress and head-scarf (khimaar)... Ibn Abbaas and Abu Ubaidah (radhiyallahu anhum) said: ‘The women of the Mu’mineen were commanded to conceal their heads and their faces with the jalaabeeb, except one eye.’”

Tafseer Ibn Katheer states in its description of the jilbaab:

“Jilbaab is the shawl over the head-scarf (khimaar). This has been stated by Ibn Mas’oud, Ubaidah, Qataadah, Hasan Basri, Saeed Bin Jubair, Ibraaheem Nakh’i, Ataa Khuraasani and others.

Ali Bin Ali Talhah narrates that Ibn Abbaas said: *Allah ordered the women of the Mu’mineen that when they emerge from their home for a need, they should cover their faces from ontop of their heads with the jalaabeeb and leave exposed one eye.*

Muhammad Bin Sireen said: *I asked Ubaidah Salmaani about Allah’s statement (viz. they should hang over themselves their jalaabeeb). He then (practically demonstrated) by concealing his face and head, and exposing his left eye.”*

Tafseer Abi Sa-ood defines the jilbaab as follows:

“Al-jilbaab: Is a cloth bigger than the khimaar (head-scarf) smaller than the ridaa’ (shawl). A woman covers her with it from ontop of the head.

It is said that it is the shawl. It is every garment with which women conceal their faces and their bodies when they emerge (from their homes) for needs.

Sadi said that it conceals her one eye, and her face.”

Commenting on the Aayat 59 of Surah Ahzaab, Abu Bakr Jassaas says:

“In this verse is the indication that young women have been commanded to conceal their faces from strange males when they emerge.”

Imaam Qurtubi states in his Al-Jami li Akhaamil Qur’aan:

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

“Since it was the practice of the Arab women to leave their faces open like slave-girls, and this would invite the gazes of men, Allah and His Rasool ordered them (women) to hang down (irkhaa’) the jalaabeeb over them when they intend to emerge for their needs.

Ibn Abbaas and Ubaidah Salmaani said that it covers a woman so much that only her one eye remains exposed to enable her to see.”

All other authoritative books of Tafseer describe the jilbaab and the method of donning it in the same way as mentioned above, i.e. the jilbaab was worn from ontop of the head and covered the face as well.

None of the great and illustrious Mufasssireen whose references we have cited was among the ‘Indo-Pak preachers’. The authorities from whose works we present our proofs are all Sahaabah, Taabieen and other great authorities of the Shariah.

The encyclopaedic LISAANUL ARAB of Ibn Manthur Jamaluddin Muhammad al-Ansaari defines Jilbaab as follows: *“Jilbaab is bigger than the khimaar (the long head-scarf) smaller than the ridaa’ (the outer shawl). The woman conceals with it her head and breast.”*

These definitions presented by the authorities of the Shariah are adequate for understanding that the jilbaab is not a garment worn from the neck downwards. Even if it was worn in this fashion prior to the command issued for the observance of PURDAH/HIJAAB (i.e. to conceal the head and face), Aayat 59 of Surah Ahzaab ordered women to conceal their heads and faces with their jalaabeeb henceforth. Their style of wearing the jilbaab beyond the home precincts was changed by this Aayat of Surah Ahzaab. There is unanimity of the Shar’i authorities on this issue.

It should be further understood that the Arab Muslim ladies (i.e. the Sahaabiyah or female Sahaabah) were accustomed to don a khimaar

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

and a ridaa'. Khimaar is a big, long head scarf. Ridaa' is the big sheet which is wrapped around the body. When they ventured out of their homes (i.e. even prior to the revelation of the PURDAH Aayat of Surah Ahzaab), their hair, head, breasts and body were well covered. The command to 'hang over them' their jalaabeeb will be meaningless, if the purpose was merely to cover the hair. The order would have been redundant since the khimaar already took care of the hair and head. The ridaa' took care of the body. But for greater and complete PURDAH with a view to thwart the evil and lustful gazes of the fussaag and munaafiqeen, the command was issued to conceal the face with the jilbaab. And on this score there is copious evidence and the authoritative ruling of the Sahaabah and Fuqaha in general.

In Saheeh Muslim, the jilbaab is described as such a big garment which could be wrapped around two women.

The garment which normally covered the bosoms of the women was the large head-scarf (ornhi) which extended from over the head, down over the bosoms until the waist and even lower down. The Qur'aan Majeed mentions the khimaar distinct from the jilbaab. Thus, in Aayat 31 of Surah Noor, the Qur'aan declares:

*"They should put their khumur (plural of khimaar)
over their bosoms...."*

With regard to the jilbaab, Aayat 59 of Surah Ahzaab commands that they 'hang their jilbaabs OVER them'. The head is part of 'them' and it is the point from which 'hanging' of the jilbaab is instructed. Its function is apart from the function of the khimaar. Its primary function is to conceal the FACE while the primary function of the khimaar is to conceal the head and the bosom. After the command was received, ladies would cover their faces in varying degrees depending on circumstances. Some covered their faces completely exposing only one eye to enable them to see. This was the standard way in which the jilbaab was donned. At times both eyes were exposed while some say that the greater part of the face was covered. But there is unanimity among the authorities of the Shariah that the purpose of the jilbaab was to conceal the FACE from the lustful and shaitaani gazes of the fusaag and munaafiqeen and to distinguish the chaste females of Islam from slave-girls and prostitutes.

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

The following extract from our book, ISLAMIC HIJAAB (PURDAH), further explains the JILBAAB:

She must be properly and thoroughly covered in a loose outer-cloak which totally conceals her entire body including her face. In the following Aayat, the Qur'aan Shareef commands this Hijaab:

“O Nabi! Say to your wives, your daughters and the women of the Believers that they draw over them their jilbaabs (outer-cloaks). That (covering with the jilbaabs) is the least (requirement) so that they be recognized (as respectable and honourable ladies) and not be molested (by evil men)”.
(Surah Ahzaab, aayat 59)

A jilbaab is an outer sheet or cloak which during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was large enough to conceal two women. The way in which the ladies during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah wore the jilbaab covered them from head to feet including the face. The term (yudneena – they should lower or draw down) appearing in the above Aayat orders that the cloak be drawn over from above and lowered in such a way as to conceal the face as well. Covering the face outside the home precincts was the standard and normal practice of the womenfolk during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In this regard Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) narrates:

“During the occasion of Hajjatul Wida when people passed near to us, we (the ladies) would draw the jilbaab over the head and the face. When they (the people) departed from us, we would open our faces”.
(Abu Dawood)

Imam Ghazaali (rahmatullah alayh) mentions in Ihyaaul Uloom:

“Women emerged (during the time of Nabi Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with niqaabs on their faces”.

Niqaab is a cloth which conceals the face and not a transparent veil. In a Hadith in Abu Dawood an incident is described in which a young man

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

was martyred. His mother, wearing a jilbaab fully covering her face came into the battlefield to enquire about her son. With face fully covered she appeared in the presence of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Some people were surprised to observe that the lady donned face-covering even during an emergency and on such a grave occasion. When she learnt of their surprise, the mother of the slain Sahaabi said:
“My son is lost, but my shame and modesty are not lost”.

In Durrul Mukhtaar, the authoritative Islamic Law Book, the following verdict of the Shariah is recorded:

“Young women are compulsorily prohibited from revealing their faces in the presence of men”.

These narrations are sufficient to indicate that it is an Islamic demand of compulsion for women to conceal their faces when circumstances compel them to leave the home boundaries. This practice of concealing the face was not a later introduction, but existed from the very time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Certain narrations which indicate that women appeared in the presence of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) should not be misconstrued and understood to have been the normal practice. Such narrations pertain to either incidents prior to the revelation of the Law of Hijaab or to special circumstances which were exceptional cases and not the normal rule.

From the foregoing discussion it should be abundantly clear that Purdah or Hijaab does not mean ‘niqaab’ or the face-veil. The Niqaab is rather an item of Hijaab/Purdah.

Regarding the Niqaab, Kays and company state:

“Niqaab or Burqa means the same, but the Holy Qur’aan does not use these words.”

It is surprising for so-called ‘research scholars’ to speak such drivel in a bid to refute the fourteen century practice of the Ummah. Of what significance is the non-appearance of these terms in the Holy Qur’aan? Does it mean that a practice is invalid and unsubstantiated simply because direct reference to it is not made in the Qur’aan Majeed? Any such conclusion is obviously not only Islamically absurd, but it is

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

downright stupid. The number of Salaat raka'ts is not mentioned anywhere in the Qur'aan and so is a myriad of other Shar'i laws. Will it be sensible for anyone to conclude that the laws of Islam which are not mentioned in the Qur'aan have no validity simply because they do not appear in the Qur'aan Majeed? We need not dwell further on this self-evident absurdity and fallacy which the modernists are attempting to propagate.

Secondly it is erroneous to claim that niqaab and burqa mean the same thing. The "Indo-Pak preachers" never made this claim. Niqaab refers to only the veil which conceals the face while burqa is the outer-garment or the jilbaab. The niqaab forms part of the burqa. In the early days, i.e. during the age of the Sahaabah, the jilbaab or the loose sheet served the purpose of covering the entire body as well as the face. The present day burqa is a more convenient form of jilbaab. The face-covering (niqaab) is a separate item attached to the outer-garb or sometimes it is apart. Thus, the niqaab is part of the burqa, but it is never the burqa.

Although the words, niqaab and burqa are not in the Qur'aan Majeed, both these terms are Arabic and are mentioned in numerous Kitaabs of the Ulama of Islam many centuries before the era of the "Indo-Pak preachers". The ladies of Arabia referred to their outer-garment (i.e. their Purdah dress – their jilbaab) as 'BURQA'. Thus, LISAANUL ARAB states:

"Al-Burqa: It is well-known to the women of Arabia."

Niqaab too is defined as *"the cloth concealing the face of the woman"*. These meanings could be ascertained from any Arabic dictionary. Both these terms are Arabic and not 'fabrications' of the "Indo-Pak preachers" as Kays & Co. would like Muslims to believe.

Undoubtedly, the "Indo-Pak preachers" borrowed the same Arabic terms to describe the outer-garb and the face-cloth which Muslim ladies had adopted. Any Urdu dictionary will describe burqa as:

"a kind of mantle or veil covering the whole body from head to foot."

On the other hand, niqaab is defined as only a veil. Since its function is to veil only the face.

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

Regardless of the non-appearance of these terms in the Qur'aan or whether niqaab and burqa mean the same thing, it cannot be cited in negation of the concealment of the female's face in public because Aayat 59 of Surah Ahzaab, the Ahaadith and the permanent practice of the Sahaabi ladies and of the Ummah down the long corridor of Islam's fourteen century history bear evidence with the greatest clarity that it is Waajib for the female to conceal her face in public. The exercise to refute the validity of face-concealment by attempting to sidetrack the minds of unwary and ignorant people by the employment of fallacious arguments centring around words, is stupid and futile.

The pamphlet of the modernists asks:

"If the face was to be covered why the command not to look at it?"

Firstly, modernist logic cannot be employed to refute and negate the commands of Allah Ta'ala. Regardless of how logical an argument may appear, it cannot be cited to negate any teaching of the Shariah. The Qur'aan, the Sunnah and the Tawaaruth of the Ummah very clearly uphold the practice of concealing the face. This irrefutable practice of the Ummah cannot be negated and proclaimed invalid simply because some deviates in this belated century present their logical understanding. The clear-cut Ahkaam of the Shariah cannot be abrogated by an implied conclusion extracted by modernists who have absolutely no footing, no grounding and no standing in the firmament of Shar'i Uloom.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his Sahaabah had greater and the proper understanding of the Aayat in which Allah Ta'ala commands men to cast down their gaze. Despite their knowledge and understanding of the Aayat, their womenfolk concealed their faces in public. And, they did not come up with the stupid doubts of kufr emanating from the modernists of our day.

Secondly, the instruction to 'cast down the gaze' is not restricted to viewing the faces of females. The Mufasssireen, commenting on this Aayat state that the prohibition to stare applies to all things which are unlawful to look at. Thus, a man should cast down his gaze even for young lads on account of the fitnah of being attracted to unnatural acts.

OUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

Looking at any part of the satr of either man or woman is haraam. The thighs of males so much exposed in these immoral times also come within the scope of this prohibition to stare.

Thirdly, it is quite possible that inspite of having their faces concealed with a jilbaab to which a niqaab has not been fitted, the woman's face may become momentarily exposed due to her movements. On such occasion, the man should lower his gaze.

Fourthly, when a man passes by a woman, he should lower his gaze even if her face is concealed. It is an act of misconduct and despicable to stare at a woman even if she is completely covered in her burqa. It is still necessary to cast down the gaze. It is indeed rude to stare at females even if they are covered in their jilbaabs with their faces concealed.

There is, therefore, absolutely no valid argument for the denouncers of Islamic Purdah in the verse instructing men to cast down their gaze. There is no conflict between this Aayat and the Niqaab.

The Aayat ordering down-casting of the gaze is not restricted to only Muslim women. Non-Muslim women do not wear the jilbaab. Muslim men will always have to cross paths with them in all times and in all lands. There is thus an imperative and a great need to cast down the gaze.

In a futile attempt to deny the Shar'i command for the woman to conceal her face in public, Kays & Associates say in their pamphlet of baatil:

“When the Hadith says, look properly at the prospective bride before proposing as it develops affection, but how does one see if the Command was to cover the face.”

“Research scholars” should display at least rudimentary understanding of the subject matter they desire to dilate. The Shariah allows a woman to expose any part of her aurah or satr for a valid need. If any part of her body requires medical treatment, then it is permissible for her to reveal that part. There are exceptions to all the rules of the Shariah. Opening up the face for the valid reason of marriage is lawful. This is a specific ruling of the Shariah in which there is no dispute. A specific situation or

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

concession cannot be cited as a basis for the negation of the law itself. A woman is allowed to reveal her face, not only for allowing a prospective groom to see her, but also when she has to appear in front of the Qaadhi. But these concessions do not cancel the general prohibition. The Qur'aanic Aayat commanding concealment of the face (i.e. verse 59 of Surah Ahzaab) remains intact notwithstanding the concessions applicable to certain cases and situations. It is, therefore, childish to wonder: 'how does one see....'

Kays & Associates display stark ignorance of the Shariah in the following statements appearing in their baatil pamphlet:

"The Holy Prophet (S) asked some women on Pilgrimage NOT to cover their faces and hands, even then they covered it when strange men passed by. It seems that the Commands on modesty had inspired a fashion, thinking that it was far better to incline towards more modesty than less."

For their baseless conclusions which they raise on the grounds of Ahaadith which they have not quoted, they tender the following Kitaabs: Muatta-e-Imaam Maalik, Abu Dawood and Tirmizi. Let us now refer to Muatta-e-Imaam Maalik to ascertain the worth of the conclusions of the modernist group. The following Hadith narration appears in Muatta-e-Imaam Maalik:

"Naafi' narrates that Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) said: The woman in ihraam should not place a niqaab on her face nor wear gloves."

The instruction stated by Hadhrat Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) is for women in the state of ihraam. It does not apply for those who are not in ihraam. It is quite evident from this instruction that it was the practice of the Sahaabiyyah (ladies) to conceal their faces under normal and daily circumstances, hence the need to issue an express directive prohibiting wearing of the Niqaab during ihraam. One of the compulsory conditions of ihraam for ladies is that the cloth should not touch their faces. The usual niqaab cannot be donned without it touching the face, hence the prohibition. In the same way as it is forbidden for men in ihraam to cover their heads, so is it prohibited for women to cover their faces in ihraam in such a way which allows the niqaab cloth to touch their faces.

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

Another Hadith also in Muatta-e-Maalik:

“Faatimah Bint Munthir said: We would cover our faces in the state of ihraam when we accompanied Asmaa Bint Abi Bakr (radhiyallahu anhuma) and she would not object.”

They would don a face-veil in such a way which prevented the cloth from touching the face. The cloth would overhang on a protuberance placed on the head. This narration too substantiates that it was the normal practice of the ladies during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah to conceal their faces in public from the lustful gazes of men. Faatimah Bint Munthir mentioned that they did this in the company of the Sahaabiyah, Hadhrat Asmaa (radhiyallahu anha), in substantiation of their practice of concealing their faces even during the state of ihraam. This is how strongly the ladies of Islam felt about the imperative need to conceal their faces in public.

Let us now study the Hadith in Abu Dawood. Mujaahid narrates:

“Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) said: Travellers (on mounts) would pass by us whilst we were in the state of ihraam together with Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). When they came near to us, we would hang our jilbaab over our face. When they would pass (and be at a distance) we would open (our faces).”

Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) states the Islamic practice on donning the niqaab with great clarity. It is abundantly clear from the attitude displayed by Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) and the other ladies with her that it was the practice for women to conceal their face, hence they considered it incumbent to do so even during the state of ihraam when it is not permissible to allow the niqaab cloth to touch the face. Thus, if the niqaab is worn in such a way by the muhrimah that it does not touch her face, there is no penalty since the Ihraam Prohibitions have not been violated.

On the occasion when Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) and other ladies of Rasulullah's (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) House were on Hajj, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had accompanied them. They would cover their faces inspite of being in ihraam when men would

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

approach, but Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) never reprimanded them or even requested them to refrain from the act of concealing their faces as Mr. Kays would like us to believe.

Let us now study a little the Hadith on this subject in Tirmizi:

In a Hadith narrated by Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) enumerating the prohibitions of Ihraam, he states that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“The woman in ihraam should not wear a niqaab nor gloves.”

In this narration it is clearly stated that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) forbade the donning of the niqaab during the state of ihraam. The prohibition is directed by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) exclusively to women in ihraam. This is categorically stated in the Arabic text of the Hadith. This prohibition further substantiates that it was the practice of the females in the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to wear a niqaab. It is therefore, silly, to say the least, to ascribe the practice of the Sahaabi ladies concealing their faces to some ‘fashion’ inspired by the Qur’aanic command to adopt Modesty and Purdah. If we accept for a brief moment that the ladies derived the inspiration for greater modesty from the Qur’aanic command, then no one has the right to denounce such holy inspiration, least of all modernists who are extremely ill-equipped in matters pertaining to Shar’i Uloom. When Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not prohibit women from wearing the niqaab when they were not in ihraam, when he did not prohibit them from concealing their faces in a particular manner even during the state of ihraam and when he did not forbid them from concealing their faces with their jalaabeeb, how can the modernists of Kays & Associate’s ilk arrogate such a right to themselves?

In a Hadith appearing in Bukhaari Shareef, Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) enumerating the prohibitions of ihraam, said:

“Women should not wear the burqa (i.e. during ihraam).”

The burqa (or the jilbaab) entailed concealment of the face. In the context of the Hadith, her statement means that the burqa should not be worn in such a manner which allows the cloth of the niqaab to touch the

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

face. In fact, in a narration mentioned earlier in this article, Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) explicitly says that they would hang their jalaabeeb from over their heads to conceal their faces when male travellers would approach. And, this was during ihraam.

From all the aforegoing Ahaadith it will be seen that the view expressed by Kays is a figment of his imagination. His claim that the practice of concealing the face in vogue during the time of the Sahaabah was simply a 'fashion' of "some women", is ridiculous. It is false to claim that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had asked "some women NOT to cover their faces and hands...." This was specially meant for the state of ihraam, and even then they were not prohibited from concealing their faces in a way which prevented the cloth from touching the face. The Ahaadith of Hadhrat Aishah and Hadhrat Asmaa and of others bear ample testimony to this fact.

The attempt to induce people to swallow the falsehood that the niqaab, burqa and jilbaab are the creations of the 'Indo-Pak preachers', viz. The ULAMA-E-HAQQ of the last two centuries, is despicable. This fallacious supposition completely ignores that the institution of Purdah along with its items such as the burqa and niqaab, were in force during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and were the direct product of the Qur'aanic Commands.

Kays and his associates claim:

"The word HIJAAB has been used as a misnomer for a garment."

He then goes on to present a meaningless discussion totally unrelated to the topic. In the first instance, the word Hijaab is not used for a garment. Hijaab is used to signify an institution, viz., the Islamic institution of separation between men and women. There are various dimensions of Hijaab applicable to both males and females. Just as women have to adopt hijab so too do men have to.

Words are immaterial. The meanings are of importance. Whether Qur'aanic or Islamic Salaat is called Namaaz, Prayer, or Dua, etc., is of no significance. If by these non-Arabic terms the proper Shar'i meaning of Salaat (i.e. Qiyaam, Qira't, Ruku, Sujood, etc.) is conveyed, there is

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

absolutely no Shar'i proscription in the utilization of such terms. Similarly, it is of no significance if alien terms are used to denote the Qur'aanic or Shar'i concept of male-female seclusion/separation. Whether the term is *hijaab*, *pardah*, *nikaab*, *veil*, *face-cloth* or *pyjamas*, it is of no significance as long as these terms convey the Qur'aanic meaning of the Hijaab verses and the Sunnah way of women observing modesty, viz., concealing their faces in public, remaining indoors, etc., etc. Mr. Kays is simply attempting to bamboozle the minds of unwary people by putting up an 'academic' front and discussing words. This is a plain attempt to sidetrack the issue and to pull wool over the eyes of unsuspecting people.

The claim of the 'INDO-PAK PREACHERS', i.e. of the Ulama-e-Haqq of India and Pakistan in this age is that the system of Hijaab they are advocating is the precise code of Modesty and purity of conduct which the Qur'aan and Sunnah command. This lofty code of Hijaab – Qur'aanic and Sunnah HIJAAB or PURDAH commands that:

- Women conceal their faces in public whether with a burqa, nikaab, jilbaab, outer-cloak or a blanket made of jute-sackcloth.
- Women remain within the precincts of the home and emerge only when necessary.

These are the main constituents of Hijaab which brings within its purview a host of acts and rules pertaining to Haya (shame and modesty) and moral purity.

All four Math-habs unanimously rule that during ihraam it becomes incumbent on women to conceal their faces from males. However, there is some difference of opinion regarding the manner of concealment.

This difference is explained as follows in BAZLUL MAJHOOD:

“....Verily, they (the Fuqaha) differ as to when it becomes necessary (to conceal the face) because of Hijaab for strangers (i.e. *ghair mahrams*). According to the Hanafiyyah and Shafi'iyyah it is obligatory to ensure that nothing of the (*nikaab*) cloth touches the face. It (the *nikaab*) should be kept at a distance from the face by means of some protuberance. The Hanaabilah and Maalikiyyah say that it does not matter even if the cloth

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

of the ghita (i.e. niqaab) touches the face because of need.”

The entire world of Islam – all the authorities, right from the time of the Sahaabah, speak of Hijaab and Niqaab, but the modernist deviates lacking in Shar'i Uloom very audaciously put forward their untenable baatil and fallacies.

Mr. Kays, in his pamphlet of baatil and confusion, embarks on a little discussion regarding the principles of Hadith. It is clear from his claims that the smattering of information he has gleaned about this branch of Islamic Knowledge amply displays his ignorance of Usool-e-Hadith. Infants should not attempt to swim in the deep waters of oceans. The comments of Kays on the categories of Ahaadith have illustrated his lack of understanding of the subject of Usoolul Hadith. He has seen somewhere that a certain Hadith is described by the authorities as 'Mursal' for example. He then concludes that such a Hadith is literally speaking 'defective', 'weak', hence 'rejected'. He fails to understand that the terms given to Ahaadith narrations by the Muhadditheen are technical in import. It does not follow that Mursal narrations or Dhaeef narrations or Ahaadith categorized as AAHAAD are rejected, and the 'rational' law cannot be based on such a 'Hadith' as he claims.

He very ignorantly says: *“This so-called Hadith is recorded by Abu Dawood (Sunan) who himself says it is Mursal.”* This statement demonstrates that Kays does not understand even the definition of Hadith, hence he stupidly labels the narration, 'so-called Hadith'. One qualified in the science of Usoolul Hadith, will not commit such a childish blunder which leaves us aghast in view of its emanation from one who professes to be a 'research scholar'.

He further claims that it is the rule of the Muhadditheen and Fuqaha that if a Hadith does not belong to the Mutawaatir category, it can be discounted. This is utterly baseless.

Let it be understood that in the first instance, the science of the Principles of Hadith, unlike Usoolul Fiqh and Fiqh, is not binding on the Aimmah Mujtahideen and the Fuqaha who acquired their Ilm from the Sahaabah and the Students of the Sahaabah.

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

The conditions and principles of Hadith formulated by Imaam Bukhaari (rahmatullah alayh), for example, 200 years after the Sahaabah cannot be cited as a basis for the rejection of a fatwa issued by the Students of the Sahaabah or by the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen such as Imaam Abu Hanifah and Imaam Maalik (rahmatullah alayhima) who appeared long before the dawn of the age of the Muhadditheen. When a Mujtahid cites a Hadith in substantiation of his Fatwa, it automatically implies that the Hadith which is his basis, is an authentic Hadith in which there is no vestige of doubt irrespective of the category to which a Muhaddith had assigned to it a century or two later.

In the presence of Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen such as Hammaad, Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Maalik and numerous others of the Taabieen age, Imaam Bukhaari and the many Muhadditheen of his age and thereafter are all infants.

Coming back to the question of the acceptability or rejection of a Mursal Hadith, let it be known that according to the Ahnaaf (Hanafis) and Maaliki, a Mursal Hadith is acceptable for Hujjat (for a firm basis on which to base Shar'i Law) without reservation. In fact, they assert that the 'irsaal' in the Hadith indicates the perfection of the authenticity. They have their proofs for their claim. This is not the occasion to elaborate. According to Imaam Shaafi (rahmatullah alayh) if the Mursal narration is bolstered in some other way, it will be accepted even if it has been categorized as Dhaeef.

For the benefit of Mr. Kays and his associates, he should be informed that regardless of the classification of the narrations, all the Ahaadith in the following Kitaabs are SAHEEH: Mutta Imaam Maalik, Saheeh Bukhaari, Saheeh Muslim, Saheeh Ibn Hibbaan, Saheeh Haakim, Saheeh Ibn Khuzaimah and many others.

For his further information the Muhadditheen assert that all the Ahaadith in the undermentioned books are worthy of Ihtijaaj (i.e. to cite as a basis for a ruling) inspite of the fact that some of the narrations in these Kitaabs are classified as Hasan and Dhaeef. These Books of Hadith are: Sunan Abi Dawood, Jaami', Tirmizi, Sunan Nisaai, Musnad Ahmad, etc.

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

The above have been mentioned by way of sample. Only deviates and those plodding the Path to Jahannum will venture to pick up a few scattered pebbles from the multi-faceted science of Hadith Principles and throw them at the illustrious Aimmah Mujtahideen and Fuqaha who were in entirety independent of the presentations of Imaam Bukhaari and other Muhadditheen two centuries later.

Lest the thrust of our rebuttal of the baatil pamphlet be forgotten, we should at this juncture repeat that:

- The incumbency of the NIQAAB (face-cloth for concealing the female's face in public) is the product of Aayat 59 of Surah Ahzaab.
- This incumbency is supported by the general practice of the ladies of the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), of the ladies of the Taabieen age, of the ladies of the Tab-e-Taabieen age and of the ladies of the Ummah down Islam's long passage of 14 centuries.

A Shar'i Practice which is upheld and supported by such a mass of solid proof can never be discounted by the oblique logic of the liberals and modernists of this age – liberals who hold no pedestal in the firmament of Shar'i Uloom.

Kays claims in his pamphlet that “*rational law cannot be based on Mursal and Aahaad narrations which are to be discounted and rejected*”. This he claims to be “*the Rule of Law of the Muhaddith and Jurist*”. He later cites a narration in which it is mentioned that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) stated that the male thigh is part of the aurah (i.e. part of the body which has to be compulsorily concealed). This particular Hadith has been variously classified by the Muhadditheen. Some say that it is Maudhoo', some say Dhaeef, some say it is Hasan, etc. The Hadith appears in Abu Dawood, Bukhaari, Tirmizi and other Kitaabs. In spite of its classification, the great Fuqaha, long before Imaam Bukhaari and the classification of the Hadith by the later Muhadditheen, utilized it as the basis for formulating the Waajib law of the male's Satr. It is thus haraam to expose the thigh. This severe ruling has been issued on the basis of this Hadith which Kays asks Muslims to discount and reject.

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

The above is but one example of the formulation of LAW on the basis of Ahaadith which have been classified in the 'weak' category by the later Muhadditheen. It is indeed silly and irrational to seek to negate the Shariah formulated by the Sahaabah and Taabieen by bringing the Hadith classification of the later Muhadditheen in conflict with the system of the Fuqaha who had no need for the Hadith classification of the later Muhadditheen.

While these modernists have no respect for the Muhadditheen and do not accept the science of Hadith classification of the Muhadditheen, they only seek to extract support for their baatil views from whichever principle the Muhadditheen had formulated. If a principle of the later Muhadditheen seemingly conflicts with the verdicts of the Fuqaha, they will quickly and gleefully cite it in an attempt to reject the Faqih's fatwa. It is for this reason that their statements and arguments are replete with contradictions.

Kays and his associates say that the Hadith pertaining to the 'aurah' is an Ahaad Hadith. In his definition of Aahaad Hadith, Kays says:

"....that if an Hadith is Ahaad (a single report) and not Mutawaatir (not repeated by other reliable recorders) then it is not an undisputed statement and can therefore be discounted."

Far from discounting the 'aurah' Hadith, the Jurists have made it their strongest basis for declaring the thigh to be part of the aurah.

Kays has also failed to understand the meaning of Khabr-e-Waahid or Hadith known as Aahaad. He has defined it wrongly. Aahaad Ahaadith are classified into different categories. One category pertains to a number of narrators in each epoch. With regard to this factor, this type of Hadith is divided into three kinds: Mash'hoor, Azeez and Ghareeb. This is not the occasion to go into detailed definitions of each kind of classification. It suffices to say that:

- All Aahaad narrations are not the effects of single reporters.
- It is not a principle that Aahaad cannot constitute a basis for the formulation of Ahkaam (the 'rational' law stated by Kays).

This brief explanation on Hadith categories has been presented merely to show that Kays & Associates have no proper understanding of the

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

branch of knowledge known as Usoolul Hadith. They are therefore not competent to speak on this subject.

OUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

As far as the Laws of the Shariah are concerned, the criterion is the verdict promulgated by the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen, not the classification of Hadith by the later Muhadditheen. When a Hadith is authentic by the Fuqaha, it becomes irrefutable evidence for the Law. The task of setting out the Shariah in a systematic form was entrusted to the Fuqaha whose age commenced with the age of the Sahaabah. The Students of the Sahaabah were the Fuqaha and the Mujtahideen of the first epoch. The Ahkaam which have been transmitted on the authority of the Fuqaha, long before the age of the Muhadditheen, constitute the Shariah.

In Ainul Hidaayah appears the following:

“The Ulama of the Taabieen era accepted a narration when its authenticity is established by them. Imaam Shaafi has stated this in his Risaalah. Ibn Abdul Birr said that this order (referring to a particular narration) is Mash’hoor according to the Ulama-e-Taareekh and Ma’roof according to the Aimmah among the Fuqaha. Thus it resembles Mutawaatir. Since it resembles the category of Mutawaatir, there is no need for a sanad.”

The following appears in Raddul Mukhtaar:

“When the Mujtahid deducts (a law) on the basis of a Hadith, it in fact is evidence for the authenticity of the Hadith.”

Among the abundant nonsense contained in the pamphlet, we shall quote one more claim of drivel:

“What the Holy Prophet of Islam had done for the emancipation of womankind was mercilessly undone when the Khilaafat (rule by consultation) was seized for the father-to-son kingship of the Umayyads, assisted by their sponsored scholars.”

Mr. Kays is unable to decide who had “re-enslaved” womankind – the Umayyads who were all Arabs and closely related to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or the “Indo-Pak preachers”? In this nonsensical slander we shall only discuss briefly at this juncture, Mr. Kays definition of khilaafat. He has defined khilaafat as “rule by consultation”. In the same way as he has sucked many of his contentions from his thumb, so too has he sucked this one.

Khilaafat does not mean rule by consultation. Khalifah means a representative or a successor. The Khalifah is the Representative of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) who in turn was the Khalifah of

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

Allah Ta'ala on earth. While shura (consultation) is Sunnah in all affairs, the rule of the Khalifah is distinctly autocratic – subject to Divinely imposed Laws. He governs according to the Shariah, hence he is the Representative of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Khalifah is not obligated to follow the decision of any consultative assembly as the juhhaal modernists enamoured by the kufr concepts of western democracy would like us to believe. The decision of the Khalifah is final and absolute whether it conforms or conflicts with the unanimous decision of all the citizens in the land.

Mr. Kays should make a bit deeper 'research' to ascertain the literal as well as Shar'i meanings of Khalifah and Khilaafat. If he does, he will feel ashamed of advertising the nonsense which clutters his so-called 'research' pamphlet. May Allah Ta'ala guide the Ummah and protect the Imaan of the unwary from the ravages of shaitaniyat.

Mr. Kays states in his pamphlet:

“Every thinking Muslim accepts the Holy Qur'aan as the only source of Divine Laws.”

Does the modernist wish the Ummah to accept that the countless millions of Muslims, the world over, from the inception of Islam down to this day, were not thinking Muslims on account of their allegiance to the views and verdicts of the illustrious Fuqaha, Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and Mufasssireen, the first group of whom acquired their Ilm of the Deen from the Sahaabah? Does the modernist think that Muslims can accept that the great authorities of Islam from the age of the Sahaabah were not 'thinking Muslims' because they never propagated the lewd and libertine opinions which the kufr-mongering modernists inherited from their kufr masters and tutors at kuffaar universities? Does the modernist think that only he and his ilk are 'thinking Muslims' and those who devoted their lives to the pursuit of Qur'aanic and Hadith Ilm were not 'thinking Muslims'?

Let the modernists understand that all thinking Muslims refute the contention that *“the Holy Qur'aan is the only source of the Divine Laws”*.

Mr. Kays and company, in their pamphlet of baatil, had attempted to disprove the rulings of the Fuqaha by presenting some Hadith classifications. They contend that a law cannot be formulated on the basis of a mursal narration. Then they presented the argument of Aahaad narrations, etc. Now, let them prove their contention from the Qur'aan, the

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

“*only source of Divine Laws*”. Where in the Qur’aan does it say that “rational law” cannot be based on a mursal Hadith?

While the Ulama-e-Haqq cite the Qur’aan, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah in support of the VEIL and Separation between men and women (i.e. HIJAAB/PURDAH), the modernist, in his pamphlet cites Lady Sukaynah, a great granddaughter of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Where in the Qur’aan does it say that the act or acts or views of a great granddaughter of the Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), many decades after Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), constitute Divine laws? How come the views of the Lady have suddenly become transformed into Divine Law? Those who claim that the Qur’aan is the only source of Divine Law should desist from hiding behind the skirts of historical ladies when they are in a tight corner lacking in ability to present proofs from the “*only source of Divine Laws*”. Those who claim that the Qur’aan is the only source of Divine Law, should confine themselves to only Qur’aanic verses. They have no right to cite Ahaadith. They have no right to cite any of the Fuqaha. Just as their citation of the bible or gita in substantiation of their arguments will be baseless and rejected, so too their arguments on the basis of Hadith, etc., are MARDOOD (accursed and rejected).

The Ummah believes in the Qur’aan, the Hadith and abide by the expositions of the Fuqaha who gained their knowledge from Rasulullah’s (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) Students. We are, therefore, entitled to bring into operation all Shar’i arguments in defence of the Haqq of Islam. On the other hand, the mulhideen and the zindeeqs – the modernists – donning external masks of Islam, have no right to cite any basis whatever other than what they have stupidly opined to be “*the only source of Divine Laws*”. May Allah Ta’ala protect Muslims from the villainy of Ilhaad.

Mr. Kays and his ilk should state unequivocally if they believe that Fajr has two raka’ts, Zuhr four, Asr four, Maghrib three and Isha four raka’ts. They must let the Muslim community know if they believe that 2½ % Zakaat is Fardh every year. And, what are their beliefs about:

- Burying the dead? Can we cremate?
- Is it required of Muslims to drape the body with Masnoon Kafan as everyone does this day?
- Does nocturnal emission of semen obligate ghusl-e-janaabat?
- Putting on Ihraam garb for Hajj?
- Observing the numerous rules of Hajj, Salaat and other acts of Ibaadat?

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

Yes, in short, what are your beliefs pertaining to the numerous beliefs and practices of Islam to which the Ummah subscribe?

If you accept the validity of the aforementioned enumerated acts of Islam, then on what basis? You believe that the Qur'aan is "*the only source of Divine Laws*". Where in the Qur'aan is the number of raka'ts mentioned? Where is it said in the Qur'aan that every raka't has one ruku' and two sajdah? Where is it said in the Qur'aan that Surah Faatihah should be recited in every raka't and Attahiyaat be recited in a sitting after every two raka'ts? Where do the myriad of other Shar'i rules exist in the Qur'aan – "*the only source of Divine Laws*" in the opinion of the modernist?

Nowhere in the Qur'aan will Mr. Kays and his associates find any reference for all the masaail of the Shariah, yet we are sure that even if he and his ilk reject the myriad of Islamic rules, they at least will ostensibly say that Five Salaat are fardh every day. If they do believe in this Pillar of Islam, let them show us where in the Qur'aan it appears that Fajr, Zuhr, Asr, Maghrib and Isha are fardh Salaat. And, where in the Qur'aan does it say that Salaat is the NAMAAZ which every Muslim accepts?

Truly, these modernists are trapped in the quagmire of their own baatil and dhalaal. They are unable to distinguish day and night and right from left, hence their 'research' is a concoction of confusion, contradictions, absurdities, kufr and baatil.

In an absurd attempt to reject the Shariah of the Qur'aan, Kays presents this drivel:

"What we find today in some Kitaabs is mainly the result of deep penetration by the Zanaadeeq (Persian convert hypocrites) and the king sponsored scholars."

What a disgusting conclusion for a 'research scholar' professing to be a Muslim? Which Kitaabs are you referring to, Mr. Kays? Enumerate the Kitaabs. Which Persian hypocrites are you speaking of? Let the Muslim community know of your inner thoughts concealed in ambiguity. Mention the 'hypocrites' you have in mind and state the names of their kitaabs so that the community can judge them and their kitaabs in the mirror of the Qur'aan and Sunnah.

Is Kays & Associates perhaps referring to Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) and his companions? Or to Imaam Maalik, Imaam Shaafi, Imaam Ibn

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

Hambal (rahmatullah alayhim) and to the other countless Fuqaha of Islam whose thousands of Kitaabs are extant today? There are not only “*some Kitaabs*” as mentioned by Kays. There are thousands of Kitaabs authored by the greatest Fuqaha and Ulama of Islam. Kays should mention the “*some Kitaabs*” to which he has made reference.

Does Kays perhaps know and understand the sources from whence the vast treasure of Islamic knowledge has been acquired? Does he realise who were the fountainheads of this Knowledge which is today to be found in thousands of Kitaabs? Does he know who the Shuyookh (Ustaadhs) of Imaam Abu Hanifah were? Most certainly not the “*Persian convert hypocrites*” whom he has imagined. To enlighten him and others we shall outline the Avenues of Imaam Abu Hanifah’s Uloom. Once Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) speaking about the authorities from whom he obtained his Ilm said:

“I acquired the Knowledge of Ibn Umar (who was a senior Sahaabi) from the Ashaab of Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu). I acquired the Ilm of Ibn Mas’oud (radhiyallahu anhu) from the Ashaab of Ibn Mas’oud (among the most senior Sahaabah). I acquired the Ilm of Hadhrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu) from the Ashaab of Hadhrat Ali (a very senior Sahaabi). I acquired the Ilm of Hadhrat Anas (radhiyallahu anhu) from the Ashaab of Hadhrat Anas. I acquired the Ilm of Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhu) from the Ashaab of Abu Hurairah (a very senior Sahaabi).”

These five top-ranking Sahaabah, viz. Hadhrat Ibn Umar, Hadhrat Ali, Hadhrat Ibn Mas’oud, Hadhrat Anas and Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhum) were the Fountainheads of the Qur’aanic and Hadith Knowledge of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh). At this juncture there is no need for us to enumerate the very lengthy list of the names of the illustrious Muhadditheen, Mufasssireen and Fuqaha (not *Persian convert hypocrites*) among the Taabieen who had acquired their knowledge from the aforementioned five senior Sahaabah. The numerous Fuqaha, Muhadditheen and Mufasssireen among the Taabieen were the Ustaadhs of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh).

The same holds good for Imaam Malik (rahmatullah alayh). The golden chain of his Ilm is closely linked to the Sahaabah. Thus, the knowledge which today exists in the innumerable Kitaabs of the four Math-habs of Islam is the authentic Ilm of the Sahaabah. The concoction of the “*Persian*

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

convert hypocrites” is a fabricated figment in the minds of Kay and his associates.

Kays & associates should understand that they cannot befuddle and misguide the community by making stupid and sweeping claims which they can never hope to substantiate with sound evidence. To say that what exists of Islam today is only the supposedly few kitaabs supposedly authored by imaginary “*Persian convert hypocrites*” is tantamount to claiming that Islam had died with the rise of the Ummayyad Empire and for the past thirteen and a half centuries this Deen was hidden, mutilated and battered beyond recognition like Christianity, and that today in this age of kufr and evil some modernists who cannot even perform Salaat properly or who lack the correct knowledge of the rules of Tahaarat, have suddenly stumbled on the true Islam and gained the qualifications for correctly elaborating the Qur’aanic meanings. Alas! These modernists cannot make even proper tilaawat of the Qur’aan. What do they understand of its meanings! May Allah Ta’ala save Muslims from the calamity of shaitaani modernism.

DUMFOUNDING STUPIDITY

The ludicrousness of the modernist argument is dumbfounding. They seek to deny the validity of the Shariah by citing and distorting practices of individuals who have no rank in the firmament of Islamic Knowledge. On the specific issue of PURDAH, the modernists in their attempt to scuttle the Qur’aan and Sunnah, cite the attitude and manner of Lady Sukaynah, the granddaughter of Hadhrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu). In the first instance, the mulhideen have slandered this Lady by alleging that she did not observe PURDAH. Secondly, assuming that she was not in favour of PURDAH, her practice and view are of no significance as far as the Shariah is concerned. According to Mr. Kays she was 9 years old on the occasion of the episode of Karbala. It is clear that she is not a Sahaabiyyah. Even if the modernists can present any of her statements (which they did not) to conflict with Qur’aanic PURDAH, it will be summarily rejected since the views of individuals carry no Shar’i weight if in conflict with the Qur’aan, Sunnah and the Ijmaa’ of the Ummah regardless of their noble birth and regardless of their family ties to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

QUR'AANIC PURDAH (HIJAAB)

Now let Mr. Kays and his group cite Lady Sukaynah's statements and inform us of the category her words occupy in the classification of the Muhadditheen. Kays was quick to embark on a puerile explanation of Hadith classification of the Muhadditheen. Now let him state Lady Sukaynah's narration and its classification. Let him present the sanad of her riwaayaat and the class thereof, whether Saheeh, Dhaeef, Maudhoo', etc., etc.

How can Mr. Kays expect the Ummah to be so stupid as to swallow unknown historical data of dubious origin and distortion in a bid to abrogate the Qur'aan, Sunnah and the authoritative rulings of the Fuqaha – the Students of the Sahaabah? Lady Sukaynah and other ladies of history have no ranking in Shar'i Uloom. Their words and actions cannot be cited in abrogation of the Shariah. While the Ulama cite the Qur'aan, the Sunnah, the Sahaabah, the Fuqaha among the Taabieen and the unanimous practices of the Ummah, modernist deviates come up with the feeble, ambiguous and misinterpreted statements and actions of ladies who are unknown in Ilmi circles of the Shariah despite their noble lineage.

Men who lack understanding in the application of Shar'i Law, in its Sources and operation should stick to their worldly occupations of monetary pursuit and not dabble in things beyond their mental capabilities.

The pamphlet of Kays & Associates is in entirety bereft of any Shar'i proof for their contentions of baatil. The modernist group has tendered only their personal opinion and a distorted version of the actions of an historical lady whose statements and acts do not constitute the Law of the Shariah. For people of such baseless opinion, Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) said:

“Verily, the people of opinion are the enemies of the Sunnah.”

**Subscribe to:
The Majlis
“Voice of Islam”**

**Presenting the Knowledge of Islam, the
Qur’aan and the
Sunnah in Pristine Purity.
Presenting the Deen of Islam as
propounded and practised by
Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi
wasallam) and his illustrious Sahaabah
(radhiyallahu anhum).**

Rates R30.00 (South Africa)

US\$20 (Rest of the world)

*Note: Please send no cheques (checks)/ money orders for subscriptions.
The banks here do not cash foreign cheques (checks) of small currency.
Send currency notes. If you are unable to afford the subscription, provide
only your name and postal address.*

**Send your subscriptions to:
The Majlis, Subscription Dept.**

**P.O. Box 3393, Port Elizabeth, 6056,
South Africa**

mujlisul.ulama@gmail.com