

# PITFALLS IN HERMENEUTICS

## SESSION #2

### ZAAHIRI (LETTERISM)

This has to do with taking texts that are speaking of the mutashaabihaat and forcing them to be haqiqah, which means as we know and understand them in this life. The most severe of these has to do with the Attributes of Allah.

Look at these passages,

**And He is istiwaaw<sup>1</sup> over the Throne**

[Surat ul-A`raaf (7), ayah 54; Surah Yunus (10), ayah 3, Surat ur-Ra`d (13), ayah 2; Surah Taa Haa (20), ayah 5; Surat us-Sajdah (32), ayah 4; Surat ul-Hadid (57), ayah 4]

**On the contrary! His Two Hands are outspread. He spends as He wills.**

[Surat ul-Maa`idah (5), ayah 64]

Based on these passages, as well as others, some have believed that the Lord Almighty, upon describing Himself in the Qur`an, is somehow akin to a human being or like His Creation.

Mr. `Abdul-`Aziz Ibn Baaz stated the following thing about Allah,

To say that Allah does **not** have a body, pupils, ear drums and ear lobes, tongue, and larynx is not the position of Muslim Orthodoxy.

[At-Tanbihaat (Warnings), p. 22]

Another leader of the Salafi movement, Mr. Muhammad ibn Saalih al-`Uthaimin,

He is sitting in person on His Throne in a way that befits His Majesty and Greatness. Nobody except He knows exactly how He is sitting.

[The Muslim Belief, p. 8]

---

<sup>1</sup> This term can refer to settling, establishment, power, loftiness, conquest, sitting and even be used to refer to food when it is complete. It can refer to one or all of these meanings. With regard to Allah, we do not know the reality of what is intended by this word. Many times it is left untranslated. When it is, it is usually given as, 'Established' or 'In a manner that suits His Majesty.' For the sake of translation, these terms are employed, but it should be known to the reader that we should not imply or insinuate any human meaning to them.

Another Salafi master, Mr. Muhammad Khalil al-Harraas said,

These two passages are a proof of the affirmation of two hands to Him in a literal sense...And moreover the use of the wording hands in the dual sense is not known and considered except in the literal sense...How is it that someone could use the word hand (yad) to mean power or bounty in spite of what has been related of the affirmation of the palm, fingers, right and left (hand), grasping and opening and other than that when these things could not mean except the literal hand?!

[Sharh ul-`Aqidat ul-Waasitiyyah, pp. 66-67]

But what has Allah said about this issue? How could someone accuse Him of human attributes? Has He not already proclaimed the truth?

**There is no thing like Him. And He is the All-Hearing, the All Knowing.**

[Surat ush-Shuraa (41), ayah 11]

**And they thought of Allah other than the truth, the thought of the Days of Ignorance.**

[Surah Aali `Imraan (3), ayah 154]

The main problem with those who would espouse the doctrine of letterism is that they have not cross-referenced and examined all of the sources on the particular subject that the Orthodox Muslim Community have agreed upon.

If someone should hold beliefs about Allah in a sense of how they are held with a human being, what should we do? Let us examine the argument.

With regard to holding the hands of Allah to be literal hands, this comes from a belief that hands can only be a literal hand as we know them. However, this is not the case, as we can see,

**And mention our slaves, Ibrahim, Ishaq and Ya`qub. They are men of aydin and absaar.**

[Surah Saad (38), ayah 45]

Imaams Ibn `Abbas, Mujaahid (d. 104 AH/722 AD), Qataadah ibn Da`mah (d. 118 AH/736 AD), Mansur ath-Thaqafi (d. 131 AH/749 AD), Sufyaan ath-Thawri (d. 161 AH/778 AD) and many others,<sup>2</sup> state that the passage should be understood to mean, *'They are men of power and insight.'* They explain that this is because the Arabic language at times uses the Arabic word yad or aydin, meaning literal hand or hands respectively, to refer to power, and absaar to mean insight or inner light, while in literal terms it would mean eyes.

Now in looking at this, if we were to translate aydin literally, it would be hands, and absaar, it would be eyes. Therefore, the ayah would be read, *'They are men of hands and eyes.'* Does this mean that the prophets before did not have hand and eyes or that these

---

<sup>2</sup> Jaami` ul-Bayaan, V. 27, pp. 7-9

prophets had more eyes and more hands than them? Not at all. Rather, the word hands can sometimes mean power and the word eyes can sometimes mean insight in the Qur'an as well as the Arabic language.

One can see, when looking in the Salafi translations of the Qur'an, that they do not literalise this passage. But for some reason, when referring to the Lord Almighty, they would have us envisage a big man sitting on a giant chair. But how did the first generations view holding Allah to be a human being or His Attributes to be literal as we understand them? Let us look to the first communities and examine their position,

Imaam Maalik RH stated,

Whoever recites the 'Hand of Allah,' and indicates his hand or recites 'the Eye of Allah,' and indicates that organ or his, let it be cut off to discipline him concerning the Transcendence beyond what he has compared Him to, and above his own comparison to Him. Both his life and limb he compared to Allah are cut off.

[Ahkaam ul-Qur'an, V. 4, p. 1740]

Imaam Ahmad ibn Hanbal RH has informed us in the strongest possible terms,

The names of things are taken from the Shari`a and the Arabic language. The language's possessors have used this word (body) for something that has height, breadth, thickness, construction, form and composition, while Allah Most High is beyond all of that and may not be termed a body, because of being beyond being embodied. This has not been conveyed by the Shari`a, and so it is refuted.

[Al-Baraahin as-Sati`a, p. 164]

Imaam `Abdul-Qaahir al-Baghdaadi RH [429 AH (1037 AD)] warns us,

As for those who liken Allah to His creation in Khurasaan, the Karamiyyah, it is obligatory to consider them kuffar (unbelievers) because they affirm that Allah has a physical limit and boundary from underneath, from where He is in contact with His Throne.

[Taken from Usul ud-Din, p. 337]

Imaam `Abdul Ghaani an-Naabulsi RH gives warning,

Whoever believes that Allah fills the skies and the Earth or that He possesses a body, sitting above His Throne, then he is a kaafir, even though he claims that he is a Muslim.

[Al-Fath ur-Rabbaani, p. 124]

Imaam Ibn Hajar al-Haitami RH has mentioned an important ijmaa` ,

You should know that Quraafi and others have related from ash-Shaafi`ii, Maalik, Ahmad and Abu Hanifa (RAA) the statement in which they proclaimed the kufr of those speaking of direction and having a body (for Allah) and on this statement they are agreed in that.

[Al-Hadramiyyah, p. 224]

Imaam Muwaffaq ud-Din RH tells us the method of the first generations,

So their words, 'We believe in it,' are proof on a type of tafwid (consignment) and submission to something that they were not able to know its' meaning.

Rawdat un-Naadhir wa Junnat ul-Munaazir, V. 1, pp. 215-216

Imaam Muwaffaq ud-Din RH said,

And whatever of that appears ambiguous to us, it is compulsory on us to establish the text and leave seeking its' meaning and returning knowledge of it to the speaker and we make the responsibility of its' meaning go to the one that related it.

[Lum`at ul-I`tiqaad, p. 5]

Shaikh ul-Islam Muwaffaq ud-Din RH says in another place,

And we believe in Him without boundary and without limit.

[Lum`at ul-I`tiqaad, p. 6]

From all of this, it is easy to summarise what has been stated into categories,

- a. Whatever Allah has said of His Attributes, we accept them. When we read the texts, we affirm the Attributes.
- b. When we read them, we pass the texts by, as they are mutashaabihaat.
- c. We attribute the meaning of those Attributes to Allah, not knowing the reality or what Allah has intended by them for Himself.
- d. One thing we do know is that they are not literal as we understand them, as Allah is not human, nor are humans Allah. Therefore, we do not fall into the evil of letterism.

## **GHALAT FI TASALSULI TAWAARIKH IL-HAWAADITH (HISTORICAL ANACHRONISM)**

This is where someone takes something that exists in his own time period and when quoting past events inserts that into a time when that thing did not exist. Here are some examples:

Imaam Ahmad ibn Hanbal RH enjoyed the taste of Kentucky Fried Chicken over that of Imaam's Fried Chicken in some three different taste tests done with him.

When Imaam Abu Hanifa RH used to sit with his Qaadis on an issue, he would have an assistant type up the minutes of the meeting.

When King Herod, the ruler of Judaea in the 1<sup>st</sup> century, was diagnosed with variant CJD at Whittington Hospital in London, he was devastated.

What would be wrong with these three statements? If you guessed that the items mentioned being utilised with these people did not exist, you are correct. Although the examples are ridiculous, there are plenty of examples of Historical Anachronism that are more subtle. This is why we have to be aware. Examine this passage,

**By the one witnessing and the one witnessed to...**

[Surat ul-Buruj, ayah 4]

Please look carefully at how Mirza Tahir Ahmad interprets it,

...But here, as the text shows, the shaahid is the Promised Messiah and the Mash-hud is the Holy Prophet, and the verse signifies that the Promised Messiah will bear witness to the truth of the Holy Prophets by his speeches, discourses and writings and by the Signs that God will show at his hands. He will also bear witness in the sense that in his person the prophecy of the Holy Prophet about the appearance of the Promised Messiah and Mahdi in the 14<sup>th</sup> century A.H. will be fulfilled. The Promised Messiah is also Mash-hud in the sense that the Holy Prophet himself has borne witness to his truth. Thus the Holy Prophet and the Promised Messiah are both Shaahids (bearers of witness) and Mash-huds (to whom witness is borne)...

[The Holy Qur'an: Arabic Text with English Translation and Short Commentary, p. 1248]

This would be one of the best examples of historical anachronism as it is putting something, namely Ghulam Ahmad, back into history, as if he had been referred to as the Messenger of Allah by the Prophet Muhammad SAW.

Again, falling short of understanding history is fatal. In examining this error, the following points should be kept in mind,

1. The Messenger of Allah SAW has made no mention of Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian either in name or deed. None of his characteristics have even been mentioned. Especially significant is the fact that he is not from the Children of Ibrahim AS, when Allah made it clear in the Qur'an that the prophetic lineage was to carry through.
2. Ghulam Ahmad claimed to be the Promised Messiah, which is impossible, for he was not Semitic and racially he was not a Hebrew.
3. Ghulam Ahmad claimed to be the Mahdi, which is not tenable, for he was not Semitic and racially he was not an Arab.
4. The Promised Messiah and the Mahdi are two different people, as has been evidenced numerous times in the ahaadith. One example would be sufficient.

**How will you be when the son of Maryam descends and your Imaam is from you.**

[Collected by al-Bukhaari, Muslim, as-Suyuti, hadith #4591 and an-Nabahaani, hadith #1579 and classified by them as sahih]

There are other examples that would also facilitate this point, but perhaps this hadith is evidence enough.

## **GHALAT FI TASALSULI TAWAARIKH IL-KALAAM (SEMANTIC ANACHRONISM)**

This would be where someone takes the meaning of a word in modern times and attempts to force that meaning onto its' meaning in ancient times. This would be wrong, as language does indeed change. It is for this very reason that dictionaries were written down, to catalogue and observe the change in languages and to protect ourselves from losing the language. It is most dangerous indeed when we take language, especially in such a crucial area as creed, and with our current understanding make the assumption that the revelation must share that same conclusion. By becoming aware of this terrible mistake, we can preserve ourselves. Consider the following example,

**Muhammad was not the father of any of your men, but he is the Messenger of Allah and the Khaatam (Seal) of the Prophets.**

[Surat ul-Ahzaab (33), ayah 40]

For all intents and purposes, this ayah would appear to proclaim the Messenger of Allah SAW as the final prophet and that there will be no other prophet or messenger after him.

But please read the understanding that Mirza Tahir Ahmad has taken from this passage,

The Holy Prophet was the last of the prophets only in the sense that all of the qualities and attributes of prophethood found their most perfect and complete consummation and expression in him; Khaatam in the sense of being the last word in excellence and perfection is of common use.

[The Holy Qur'an: Arabic Text with English Translation and Short Commentary, p. 858]

This understanding has been based on some of the principles that Mr. Ahmad has taken from the Urdu language and Arabic language of modern times, not from the original meanings of the revelation and the language and its' meanings at the time of revelation. Based on his modern understanding of a word, he has placed the meaning into a text that was revealed more than 1,000 years ago. He has then made the conclusion that the Prophet Muhammad SAW is not the last of the prophets in the sense of being the final one, but rather he was the best in his time or the most perfect of them.

You should feign to humour the person that says such blasphemous statements. The best thing you can do after is take them to Surat ul-Baqarah, ayah 7.

The passage reads in this way,

**Allah has set a khatam (seal) on their hearts, their hearing and on their eyes is a covering. They will have a great torment.**

[Surat ul-Baqarah (2), ayah 7]

But before you show it to them and read it in its' correct form, render it the following way to them, keeping a straight face the entire time,

*Allah has put 'the best of their time' on their hearts, 'the best of their time' on their hearing and on their eyes is a covering. They will have a great torment.*

No! No! No! They would say. It does not say that. The ayah says, a seal, a seal was put on their hearts. You should then reply to them,

*But the same root word, khatama, where khaatam derives from in Surat ul-Ahzaab, is used and in the Surah previously mentioned about the Prophet Muhammad <sup>saw</sup>, you had no problem in holding it to mean the best in his time. But why in this context have you interpreted it differently than how you had in Surat ul-Ahzaab?' This is an effective way to combat this false interpretation of the finality of the mission of the primordial prophet.*

## **(ISTILAAH `ASRI) HISTORICAL DISMISSAL OR MODERNISM**

That was back then, but this is now. What was then is old, what is now is new.

This is unfortunately a common problem with some of the Orthodox Muslims, let alone the cults themselves. There are some who would say that it is not necessary to wear hijab, purdah, khimaar or any of the other titles that we know the Muslim woman's dress by. Based on the 'fact' that this is not specifically mentioned in the Qur'an, they reason, there is no evidence for me to do so. Even if I should put on a baseball cap and Levi jeans, as long as I mean to be modest, then what is the harm? This is actually composed of two errors, the first of which is historical anachronism, the second what we are dealing with at the moment. For they do not understand the revelation and the time that it was revealed in to the people that witnessed it. Examine the passages of hijab:

**...And let them draw their veils (khumur) over themselves.**

[Surat un-Nur, ayah 31]

**O Prophet! Tell your wives, your daughters and the women of the believers to let down a section of their jalaabib over themselves...**

[Surat ul-Ahzaab, ayah ]

These Arabic words, khumur (plural of khimaar) and jalaabib (plural of jilbaab) have a historical as well as theological and cultural meaning. Before any one could make such a sweeping conclusion on the issue of hijab in this time, we would first have to understand

what these Arabic terms used in the passage mean. But in spite of learning the meaning and significance of these words, some would still insist on the, ‘That was then, this is now,’ attitude. Very well, let us humour them. Based on this logic, let us examine these passages and update their understanding,

**Do not take a life that Allah has forbidden except with a right due to it.**

[Surat ul-Israa’ (17), ayah 33]

We can likewise reason that this passage was revealed back then, so why use it now? Tell you modernist companion that murder is now permissible, as laws against it back then must now give way to new laws now. Inform them that some law makers, in cooperation with a group of psychologists are thinking of abolishing murder as a crime as all of us have the murderer instinct. Thus to punish people for murder would be discrimination, as they were borne that way. Try another passage with a ‘modern’ Muslim,

**Forbidden to you are your mothers, daughters, sisters...**

[Surat un-Nisaa’ (4), ayah 23]

Someone could easily say that these rules were for back then. If someone wants to marry their own child, parent or close relative such as an uncle, and have a ‘healthy’ sexual relationship with them, who is to stop them? If the ‘modern’ Muslim objects, be sure to inform them that there is a group in the United States, NAMBLA, lobbying for parent/children marriage rights. What is the harm in updating this part of the Qur’an? But obviously, there will be excuses made, as those who do not have the most healthy relationship with Allah pick and choose what ‘feels right’ for them. But you should inform them of the dangers, using these examples and perhaps others, when we take a selective or modernist approach to revelation.

## **(IRTIDAAD) APOSTASY ACCUSATION**

Application of texts of kufr/shirk to Orthodox Muslims.

One of the main ideologues of the Salafi establishment, Mr. Muhammad Jamil Zeeno, when asked if shirk existed amongst Muslims, affirmed,

Yes! It is very sad that it does exist among some Muslims.

*Proof from the Qu’ran*

And most of them do not believe in Allah, except that they associate partners.

[Surah Yusuf (12), ayah 106]<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> What a Muslim Believes, p. 24, Question #14

It is indeed strange to use this passage as a proof against the vast majority of Muslims. There are some things that we have to notice when looking at this passage,

- a. The revelation of the ayah was with regard to the kuffar, who when they would make pilgrimage, would proclaim Allah was One in one sentence but in the second sentence that He had partners.
- b. The ayah is in Surah Yusuf, which would make its' judgement particular to that.
- c. The shirk mentioned in the ayah is in reference to the major form.
- d. Allah has promised to protect this Ummah and that out of all of the other nations, this one was the most blessed. Read the words of the Lord,

**You are the best Ummah ever brought out for mankind. You enjoin righteousness and you forbid evil.**

[Surah Aali `Imraan (3), ayah 110]

Could this be said of an Ummah where most of them or crowds of them are committing major shirk?

## **(TANQIH UT-TAARIKHI) HISTORICAL REVISION**

This is also known as historical redaction, which is the practice of taking ideas that exist in your own time and attempting to put them back into history to prove your doctrine.

The leader of the Ahmadiyyah World Faith Community, Mirza Tahir Ahmad states about the Prophet `Isa <sup>AS</sup>,

Thereafter he migrated in search of the lost sheep of the Children of Israel as he himself had promised. By following the probable route of the migration of Israeli tribes one can safely assume that he must have travelled through Afghanistan on his way to Kashmir and other parts of India where the presence of Israeli tribes was reported. There is strong historical evidence that the peoples of both Afghanistan and Kashmir have stemmed from migrant Jewish tribes. Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad revealed that Jesus ultimately died and was buried in Srinagar, Kashmir.

[Christianity: A Journey from Facts to Fiction, pp. 87-88]

There are a number of problems with this belief.

1. There is nothing in the Qur'an to support such a view.
2. The Prophet `Isa <sup>AS</sup> did ascension and has not died an earthly death yet, nor is there any report of him ever being near the Indian Subcontinent.

**Indeed Allah raised him to Himself**

[Surat un-Nisaa' (4), ayah 158]

3. By examining the genetic makeup of the Punjabis, Baluchis, Mirpuris, Afghanis of the Pathans, Hazara and other racial types, one finds that they are not closely related to the Mediterranean racial stock that the Hebrews would be, but that they are related to Dravidian and other racial classes common in the subcontinent.
4. The point of claiming this information was to bolster the reputation of Ghulam Ahmad ob Qadian, who claimed to be an Israelite and therefore befitting of the title of al-Masih. Therefore, it was rather necessary that he prove such a thing absolutely. By making such a claim, he was able to enlist gullible followers around himself. But modern genetic research has proven him to be nothing more than a charlatan.

### **GHULU FIT-TA`MIM (OVER-GENERALISING):**

This has two definitions within it.

1. Taking a general text that has restriction and forcing it to stay on its' general import for any given subject.
2. Taking a mujmal text that has a mubayyin and forcing it to remain on its' outward sense without recourse to clarification.

An example of the former is the following text,

**And I do not find in that which was revealed to me anything forbidden to eat for the one who desires to eat it...**

[Surat ul-An`aam (6), ayah 145]

There are some who take this general text on its' outward form and declare it to be the only way to be understood. When challenged, they then result to unqualified mujmal texts,

**The food of the People of the Book is lawful for you and yours for them.**

[Surat ul-Maa'idah (5), ayah 5]

By examining the first passage above in fullness, we can see that Allah has forbidden pork for us. Thus, *not all* food of the People of the Book is permissible for us. In addition to this, we find alcohol has also been forbidden,

**O you who believe! Khamr, gambling, stone alters, errors for divination or only an abomination of Shaitan. So avoid that so that you will successful.**

[Surat ul-Maa'idah, ayah 90]

This would again be another example that all of the food of the People of the Book is not permissible for us, for the Jews as well as Christians do make use of alcohol in their services.

An example of the latter form of generalisation would be the frequently misconstrued,

**So marry women of your choice, two and three and four.**

[Surat un-Nisaa' (4), ayah 3]

From looking at this passage, one may say that it is permissible to marry some 9 or more wives without problem, due to this ayah. But this is actually not correct. Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn al-Jawzi <sup>RH</sup> stated that the letter waw (and) in this ayah is referring to the choice to make, meaning that one may either choose two for wives, three for wives or four for wives. So the ayah should be understood as, '**So marry women of your choice, two and three or four.**'

This grammatical form was taken from the fact that the Prophet Muhammad <sup>SAW</sup> stated about this ayah,

**'Choose four of the women for marriage.'**

[Collected by Imaam Ahmad ibn Hanbal in the Musnad, hadith #4609]

The same was said by the Prophet Muhammad <sup>SAW</sup> when he found a man with 9 wives after the revelation of the ayah. He said to this maverick,

**'Choose four of them and release the rest.'**

[Tafsir ul-Baghawi, pp. 271-273]

The use of the word waw as 'or' was also used in other texts,

**Say, I preach to you one thing: that you stand up for the sake of Allah in pairs or singly...**

[Surah Saba' (34), ayah 46]

**...Who made the angels messengers with wings, two, three or four. He increases in creation what He wills.**

[Surah Faatir (35), ayah 1]

These ayaat then stand as a proof of the use of waw in the form of 'or' instead of its' other well know form, 'and.'

## **GHULU FIT-TAKHSIS (OVER-PARTICULARISING)**

This is taking a text that is general and forcing it to be particular on any given subject.

One of the most beautiful ayaat in the Qur'an is,

**Let there be among you an Ummah that commands righteousness, orders what is right and forbids what is wrong and these will be the successful ones.**

[Surah Aali `Imraan (3), ayah 104]

The Hizb ut-Tahrir (Liberation Party) organisation, in commenting on this ayah state the following,

Its' (Hizb ut-Tahrir's purpose) was to revive the Islamic Ummah from the severe decline that it had reached, and to liberate it from the thoughts, systems and laws of kufr, as well as the laws and domination of the kufr states...a number of attempts and movements, Islamic as well as un-Islamic, arose in order to revive the Muslims, but all of them failed. They could neither revive the Muslims, nor stop their severe decline...

[Hizb ut-Tahrir, pp. 2, 7-8]

This organisation states that the ayah was an order to bring about a political party and that all other parties and revivals failed. Pay careful attention to their next statement after explaining the ayah and that all other political groups failed,

Therefore, Hizb ut-Tahrir was established and its' formation was based on the Islamic `aqeedah. It adopted those concepts and rules of Islam that are required to implement its' aim. It has avoided the shortcomings and the causes that have led to the failure of movements that were established to revive Muslims by Islam...It therefore deserves that the Ummah embraces it and proceeds with it; infact the Ummah must embrace it because it is the only party that digests the idea...

[Hizb ut-Tahrir, pp. 11-12]

It would take no great examination to see that Hizb ut-Tahrir has applied this ayah to itself and made it compulsory for the Ummah to follow it. Thus an ayah that was general in addressing the Ummah has been taken by their organisation and held to apply to them in particular and that the entirety of Muslim Orthodoxy must follow them. But how should we respond?

One way to respond is by looking at the ayah in its' context. The ayah quoted is actually from a series of ayaat addressed to the Ummah, the last of which is,

**You are the best Ummah ever brought out for mankind. You enjoin righteousness and you forbid evil.**

[Surah Aali `Imraan (3), ayah 110]

Based on this passage and the others before it, we can observe and benefit from the points that the `ulama have brought in their cross-referencing and imitate their example. Imaams

al-Baghawi, Ibn `Atiyyah, Ibn al-Jawzi and al-`Izz ibn `Abdus-Salaam <sup>RHM</sup> <sup>4</sup> all state that the ayah quoted by the HT carries the meaning of,

- a. Addressing the whole Ummah to represent the call and preach to nations, as Allah was speaking to the Muslims amongst the kuffar, which are also an Ummah. Therefore, when Allah said, let there be an Ummah from you, the you intended was that of humanity.
- b. The `ulama were called to represent the Ummah and stand up and preach the truth in all affairs as their knowledge is vast and they are able to do so.
- c. The people that know enough about enjoining the right and forbidding the wrong in a given situation so they may effectively do so without causing further harm.

Here there is no mention of establishing the khilaafah or a group known as Hizb ut-Tahrir or that you must follow it. Indeed we have to beware of such traps, as anyone can fall into them, ourselves included. We must be vigilant in asking Allah to guide our lives.

At the end of this series, we hope that you have become equipped in your faith with how to contend with falsehood and the cults. Hopefully, this will encourage you to not just know what you believe but why you believe it and that it deserves to be stood up for and defended with vitality and passion. Faith is not just a recess in the darkest depths of the heart, but also a conviction that moves us, motivates us, pushes us into action and delivers visible results. The hope is that this series has inspired you to continue studying the revelation, acting on it, preaching it and prepared to give an answer to your faith. Be always ready to stand against Shaitan. Always stand up and be ready to obey when you are told,

**If you love Allah, then follow me. Allah will love you and He will forgive you of your sins. And He is the Forgiving and the Merciful.**

[Surah Aali `Imraan (3), ayah 31]

**Contact Details:**

SOCSS Organisation can be contacted at: Our Website: [www.htspub.com](http://www.htspub.com) or Our E-Mail: [htspub@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:htspub@yahoo.co.uk)

© SOCSS Publications 2004

---

<sup>4</sup> The references, in their respective order are, Ma`aalum at-Tanzil, pp. 233-34, al-Muharrir al-Wajiz, pp. 338-39, Zaad ul-Masir Fi `Ilm it-Tafsir, pp. 214-15 and Tafsir ul-Qur'an, pp. 85-86