

QUESTION: "I have several important questions. However, I beg you to abstain from vitriolic so that the issue remains in perspective. So much has been said on the issue of women and the Masjid that it has become easy for the modernists to draw a smokescreen to conceal their glaring errors. Please, I beg you to answer the query without the invective so that it becomes easy for others to see the glaring error of the lady who propagates that Eid Salaah is waajib for women. Jazaakallaah. My first query is as follows:

In a discussion the lady Quraysha Sooliman, the one who is promoting the idea that Eid Salaat is Waajib for women, was asked about her misquoting from Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi's kitaab, I'laaus Sunan. The author of the book, 'The Dumb Lady', had drawn attention to her fabrication and incorrect attribution to Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi. In her defence she responded as follows: "As for the quotes from the text of Thaanvi, Brother Mohammed Wadee translated the Arabic text exactly as it is, so if there is a difference in interpretation, then the next best thing is to go to the source of any dispute, and the source is Quraan and Sunnah." Please comment on her answer. Jazaakallaah.

ANSWER

Our 'vitriolic' is an integral constituent of the sacred mission of Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar. Allah Ta'ala states in the Qur'aan Majeed: "We have created iron. In it is powerful warfare and benefits for mankind." (Al-Hadeed, aayat 25) In the tafseer of this aayat, Hadhrat Mufti Shafi (rahmatullah alayh) states in his Ma-aariful Qur'aan: "In iron there is great awe (which strikes fear) for maintaining a systematic order in the world. With iron (i.e. with the weapons made therefrom) the rebellious could be compelled to submit to the just Laws of Allah."

Brother, to appease you, we shall temporarily set aside the vitriolic whip. However, you should understand well that those who are on baatil and who set themselves up as Mujtahids and labour to change the 14th century Divine Shariah, will not accept the Haqq. They have a sinister agenda. So it matters not how glaring in error and deviation they are. They will ignore all logic and every rational Shar'i argument to intransigently peddle their view. Only those who fear Allah Ta'ala and who are in the quest for the Haqq will readily understand and accept the truth when they see it. Let us now proceed with what the lady said about her glaring error regarding her citation from I'laaus Sunan.

The author of the book, A Dumb Woman's View, had pointed out the glaring error which this lady and her guide, Mr.Wadee of the Saudi embassy, had perpetrated in the translation. Her claim that Wadee had "translated the Arabic text exactly as it is", is grossly false. She has now compounded the mistranslation with even a blatant lie. Without conceding the reality of the mistranslation, she seeks to deflect the focus from her and Wadee's humiliation by saying: "If there is a difference in interpretation..." This is a desperate ploy to deflect focus from the glaring error in the translation presented by her, and which she now acknowledges emanated from the Saudi embassy via Mr.Wadee. The issue is not one pertaining to "difference in interpretation" The charge is simply that she/Wadee has wrongly translated what is stated in I'laaus Sunan. She attributed a fabrication to the illustrious author of I'laaus Sunah, Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh). He never said in his kitaab what this lady and Wadee fabricated in his name.

We are not speaking of difference of opinion. We are saying that her translation is glaringly

erroneous. Now when she and Wadee lack the expertise to even correctly translate, what should be said of their whimsical opinions? When a person is unable to even correctly translate the Arabic, then by what stretch of imagination can such a person be a 'mujtahid' who embarks on a mission of abrogating laws of the Shariah?

In support of her opinion, she had cited Allamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi (rahmatullah). We quote here her rendition verbatim. She presented the following translation of a ceritan text of l'laaus Sunnan in support of her view of women and the Musjid. She alleged: "In l'laaus Sunan (Hanafi scholar) Thufr Ahmed Thanvi from the Indo-Pak sub-continent, makes two distinctions regarding Eid Salaat. Firstly, he affirms that Eid Salaat is Fard Ain from the Qur'anic verse 2:18 "

Now this is the translation which the lady has presented of what she thought is stated by Allaamah Zafar Ahmed Thaanvi. But this translation is glaringly incorrect. Allaamah Zafar does not 'affirm' Eid Salaat to be Fardh-e-Ain. On the contrary, he dismisses the Fardh-e-Ain claim. In this regard, he states in l'laaus Sunan from which the lady had mistranslated:

"Allaamah Shaukaani said: 'Haadi, Qaasim and Abu Hanifah have deducted from Rasulullah's command for all people to come out (and go) to the Musalla (Eid Gah) for the Eid Salaat that Eid Salaat is from among the Fardh-e-Ain (injunctions).'" This is what Allaamah Shaukaani reported. Refuting the attribution of Fardh-e-Ain to Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh), Allaamah Zafar says:

"In this claim is an error because, Abu Hanifah did not say anything other than Wujooab (i.e. Eid Salaat is Waajib)."

Pursuing the argument of Eid Salaat being Waajib, Allaamah Zafar says in l'laaus Sunan: "Allaamah Aini.....(page 26- Dumb Woman)

Now when Allaamah Zafar categorically refutes the Fardh-e-Ain contention and explicitly affirms that Eid Salaat is Waajib, is it then not a calumny for the lady to so brazenly aver: "Firstly, he (Allaamah Zafar) affirms that Eid Salaat is Fard Ain from the Quranic verse 2:18"? We emphasize that this is not an issue of interpretation. It is a simple matter of translation. She has fabricated, albeit in ignorance, a falsehood which she attributed to Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh).

Her suggestion to "go to the source of any dispute", is preposterous. What is the source of the dispute in this context? She says that the "source is the Quran and Sunnah". She is thoroughly confused. The Qur'aan and the Sunnah are not the 'source of the dispute'. The source of the dispute is her erroneous translation of what is said in l'laaus Sunan. To resolve this dispute, we should refer to l'laaus Sunan to discover what exactly does Allaamah Zafar say in his kitaab. Surely, Wadee can obtain the services of some Arab sheikh at the Saudi embassy to assist him to correctly translate what is written in l'laaus Sunan.

At this juncture we are not talking of interpretation nor are we concerned with the mas'alah of permissibility or prohibition in the issue of females flocking to the Musjid/Eidgah. The immediate concern is the lady's and her handler's (Wadee's) humiliating blunder in having erroneously translated the relevant Arabic passages in l'laaus Sunan. This glaring mistranslation has resulted in the attribution of falsehood to Hadhrat Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh), for he never made the statements which the lady has fabricated and attempted to pass off as his views. If an author writes in his book that coal is a black mineral substance, and Mr. A translating it states that the author mentions that coal is a white mineral substance, will it then not be correct to say that either the translator committed wilful fraud or he is a colossal ignoramus or a moron?

Now before we proceed to discuss the other blunders in her translation, it devolves on her and

on Wadee as incumbent an obligation to acquire the services of a Saudi Sheikh to assist them to present the correct translation of what is said in I'laaus Sunan. Beating about the bush in desperate attempts to slip out of an impossible corner will not do the lady any good. She has to admit that her translation is wrong – totally inaccurate and the attribution to Allaamah Zafar is false. Although this is a far-fetched expectation, we still hope that the lady will not make a greater fool of herself by refraining from acknowledging her conspicuous blunder. There are numerous Madrasah kids who can refer to the relevant texts in I'laaus Sunan, and confirm the translation blunders of the lady and her handler, Mr. Wadee of the Saudi embassy who has commissioned him to give effect to the New Saudi policy of 'emancipation' of women which America is foisting on the authorities in all Muslim lands.

Our next pamphlet in this series will, Insha'Allah, point out the other glaring mistranslations of the lady. Brother, the questions in your list shall be answered one at a time in this series of pamphlets to enable readers to digest each point and to understand the degree of deviation of those who claim that it is permissible for women to attend the Musjid or the Eidgah.