Sir Syed's Religious Thought:
A Critical Analysis

Dr. Noor Muhammad Danish Bettani [*]
Irfan Ali Shah[**]

ABSTRACT

Sir Syed (1817-1897) is considered to be a social, educational, religious, and political reformer of Muslims of British India. During his times, the War of Mutiny (1857) changed the whole fabric of Muslim socio-political structure in India. The British held the Muslims, the sole agitators of rebellion. The Muslims were made deprived of their basic rights, and the Hindus were preferred over them. This manufactured a vast gap between the British and the Muslims, which Sir Syed observed. The emergence of science at the time was equally shattering down the religious foundations. Sir Syed thought science and its modernization affecting Islam and the Muslims. According to him, the conservative and false beliefs and values, engendered by the Mullahs, throughout the course of Muslim history, led astray a common man in understanding Islam. Sir Syed felt the need to interpret Islam, which was considered antagonistic among the Muslim societies. This paper examines Sir Syed's contentious religious thoughts.

[*] Dr. Noor Muhammad Danish Bettani is currently working as Assistant Professor at Pashto Academy, University of Peshawar
[**] Irfan Ali Shah is a PhD Research Scholar studying at Area Study Centre, University of Peshawar

MODERNISM

Modernism, in broad sense, is modern thought, character or practice. Specifically, modernism denotes both a set of cultural tendencies and an array of associated cultural movements, originally arising from wide-scale and far-reaching changes to western society in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.[1]Modernism takes into its jurisdiction, the activities and output of those who felt the 'traditional' forms of art, architecture, literature, religious faith, social organization and daily life as outdated in the new surge of economic, political and social conditions of an emerging industrialized world.[2]Modernism originated in the late 19[th]century (1890s) Europe, following a strand of thinking to assert that it was necessary to push aside previous norms entirely, instead of only revising past knowledge in the light of current techniques. The growing movement in art paralleled such developments as the *Theory of Relativity* in Physics, the *Industrial Revolution*, and the increased role of *Social Sciences* in public policy. The more influential was the theories of *Sigmund Freud* and *Ernst Mach*, who argued beginning in the 1880s that the mind had a fundamental structure and that subjective experience was based on the interplay of the parts of the mind.[3]

REFORMATION

According to the Oxford dictionary, reformation is the act of improving or changing something. More precisely, reformation is new ideas in religion in the 16[th]century Europe, attempting to reform the Roman Catholic church and the forming of the Protestant churches; the period of time when these changes were taking place.[4]The approach which attempts to bring changes in religion and society may be called reformist.[5] There are three strands in the Islamic society that are active; the *Modernists,* the *Revivalists* and the *Orthodox*. The *Modernists* emphasis on *Ijtihad,* the *Revivialists* propound the ideals for the early Islam, and the *Orthodox* are the blind followers of the values and acts that developed throughout the course of Islamic history. A contention exists between the *Reformists* and the *Orthodox*, which is considered the cause for lagging behind Muslim societies from the advanced West. Need has been felt by the Muslim Modernists in their own societies, advocating freedom of will and thought, considering no mediation(*mulla*) between *God* and man.[6]

RATIONALISM

Rationalism, a movement of free thought, appeared in the early stages of Islam, got intellectual activism between 9th and 13th centuries with followers in many parts of the world. The first statement in favor of rationalism was stated by Al-Kindi(801-66), according to him, we should not be ashamed to acknowledge truth from whatever source, even if it is brought to us by former generations and foreign powers. For him there is nothing of higher value than truth itself. The Muslim philosophers assumed their general assumption on *Rationalism* that though *reason* may be presented by acquiring certain and reliable knowledge but belief on revelation is also necessary. *Rationalism* could not consolidate itself when the movement passed on to Imam Ghazali (d-1111), according to him, revelation is superior to *reason*. He established the lasting hold of scholasticism over Muslim intellectual activity. Resultantly, *dogmatism* became permanently diffused in Muslim intellectual discourses, and it is therefore not surprising that the syllabi of the contemporary Islamic *madrassas* are based on scholasticism and dogmatism. Their implications were that the *Fuquha* (jurists) and *Ulema* (religious scholars) seemed to have covertly reached the conclusion that all matters deserving to be explained or regulated in law had been covered by *Fiqah*rulings. They thought that the world had reached its ultimate development which would last till such time that decline sets in and the whole universe declines into chaos, as predicted in the sacred sources, culminating in the Day of Reckoning or Qayamat. This persuaded the medieval Muslim scholars of Islam that in future all specific matters should be consulted in the light of *Fiqah*, thus closed the door of *Ijtihad*. The rise of 18th century saw the new development when the doctrine of *Ijtihad* was questioned. Now the reformer were the *Wahabis* of Arabian peninsula. They sought to employ *Ijtihad* to purify contemporary Islam of unIslamic accretions. During colonial time, Muslims sought encounters with *science* and modernity. After Napoleon landing at Alexandria in 1798, Muslim modernism began to take shape. Though the influence of Jamaluddin Afghani had reaffirmed the supremacy of revelation over *reason*, but *Sir Syed*Ahman Khan took the sophisticated position on reform, asserting that Islam is based on *reason* and *nature*. AllamaIqbalcame reverted to the scholastic position of Ghazzali and Afghani, asserting

that reality was spiritual, and *science*, dealing with material data, was inadequate for gauging true reality.[7]

SIR SYED AHMAD KHAN

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan (1817-1898), born in New Delhi (India) in 1817, belonged to a Syed family. Known as the *Mohammadan* educationist and reformer in India, he reformed the fields of politics, society, education and religion. However, his religious philosophy is often considered controvercial in Muslim societies, particularly by the *Orthodox Mullahs*in the Indian Sub-Continent. Sir Syed's active career is marked by three clear-cut phases; The pre-Revolution Period (1837-57), the efforts for educational and social reforms(1858-85), and the full-fledged leadership of the Muslim community(1886-98).[8]The first phase shows his conservative ideas and thoughts which, resulting from the conservative atmosphere of the Mughals of India. He was, however, inclined towards *Wahabism* at that time. He wrote a historical book on the monuments and leading personalities of Delhi, the *AsarusSanadid* published in 1847, and *Aain-e-Akbari* in 1856. Both were received well in literary circles. A change in his thought, in the second phase, was brought. He published his well known treatise *Asbab-e-Baghawat-e-Hind* in 1859, in which he criticized the un commendable activities of the Christian missionaries and told the government that these were the main causes of disaffection among the people.His other contributions are; the creation of *Scientific Society*(1864), the publication of bi-Weekly '*Aligarh Institute'* (1866), *Khutbate-Ahmadiya* in response to*Willium Muir*'s *Life of Muhammad* and the famous magazine, *TahzeebulAkhlaq*.[9] It was the experience of the Indian Revolt(1857) that made *Sir Syed* Ahmad Khan what he is considered today. He realized the dangers that were overcoming the Muslim community of India at that time and declared to take the challenge boldly. He wrote *The Causes of Indian Revolt* (1859) and *The Loyal Mohammadans of India*, to counteract, the growing anti-Muslim attitude of*The British* rulers and hostile propaganda of the Hindus.[10]The impact of the new learning and the spread of scientific knowledge created many problems for religious thought not only in Europe but also in India. The Christian missionaries, who fought with the modern thought of the West, now began to approach and study the religious thought of Muslims. The traditional *Ulamas* who were unaware of the modern trends of thought and the new outlook of *science*, proved

incapable of meeting the challenge. *Sir Syed* was, thus forced to take up this challenge. He had to rethink the whole cultural heritage of Islam and interpret it in the light of modern developments.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF *SIR SYED*'S RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

The program of *Sir Syed*'s reformation was based on two fundamental concepts; *educational and social* reforms, and reconstruction of Islamic religious thought in the context of modern trends in civilization.[11]*Sir Syed* took a minimalist view of religion and of the demands , religion made on the believer, and he did so in the name, first, of *reason*, and second, of *Nature*----but also in the name of *science,* because a new scientific view of *nature* is explicitly or implicitly endorsed by him.[12]*Sir Syed* regarded *Nature* as the 13th century scientists interpreted as a closed system which obeyed certain laws of mechanics and physics, characterized by a uniformity of behavior to which, there could not be any exception. All inorganic, organic behavior is subject to these mechanical laws. In one of his articles, Sir Syed propounded, *"In the beginning, this knowledge of nature was limited. But with the increase in knowledge, the sphere of nature has correspondingly increased and thus seems to have become co-extensive with what we find in the universe. What we see or feel, and that the actions and thoughts of man and even his beliefs are all different chains in the unstoppable laws of nature."* But his mechanical conception of *nature*, as James Ward put it, is totally antagonistic to the spiritual interpretation of life and so, cannot be upheld by a person who is advocating the truth of any theistic religion.

In the writings of *Sir Syed*, we come across both types of naturalism, mechanistic and ant theistic, on the one hand, and teleological and theistic, on the other, and he often passes from the former to the latter, without any thought to consistency or logic.[13]

Sir Syed regarded religion as a discipline, essentially for the establishment of ethical criteria; its essence is truth rather than faith, which distinguishes a true creed from a false one. Faith is one of the ingredients of this essence. Truth is cognizable by human *reason*, which determines the organizational causality of all material and non-material phenomenon. These natural laws also possess moral criteria, which constitute the basis of human social ethics. And the logic of the

natural laws pointed necessarily to a Final Cause, a Prime Mover, *God*.[14]

In one of his articles, *Islam is nature and nature is Islam*, *Sir Syed* urged that, "*Islam is such a simple and useful religion that even irreligiousness is included in it… what minimum beliefs an irreligious person may hold, must be the basic creed of Islam…… he, who does not believe in any prophet, avatar, revealed scripture, or the ritualistic formalities but believes in one God, is a Muslim in the true sense of the word.*"[15]

By *reason*, *Sir Syed* meant the empirical *reason*, to which the *Quran* appeals. He called it human *reason* or *aql-i-kulli*. It is that inherent capacity in man by which he draws conclusions on the basis of the observation of objective phenomena or mental thinking processes, which proceeds from particulars to generalizations and vice versa…..It is this capacity of man which has enabled him to invent new things, led him on to understand and control the forces of *nature*; it is by this that man is able to know things which are a source of his happiness and then tries to get as much profit out of them as possible; it is this which makes a man ask the *whys* and *where* forces of different events around him.[16]

In *Thoughts of Man*, *Sir Syed* discussed the problems of *reason* that man was distinguished from animals on account of rationality, which imposed on him duties and responsibilities far in excess of those on animals. He pressed that the basic function of *reason* is to acquire knowledge about the *nature* and reality of things. But this knowledge is closely related to conviction (*Yaqin*). He further pressed that without *Yaqin,* knowledge is not possible in religion and the sphere of the world. He concluded that *reason* alone is the instrument which can decide the matter and bring about the necessary conviction. But he asked that, Is*reason* not fallible? He replied that it did so and we could not help it**.** As *reason* is used universally so the *reason* of one man and one age can be corrected by another man and age respectively.[17]

The fallacy in the above argument is obvious: all individuals could not claim to possess the capacity of judging the truth by their own *aqal*. *Sir Syed* admitted that the *aql-i-insani* of every individual was of the same caliber, but referring to Shah Waliullah's view that the

intelligent persons (*mufahimun*) received inspiration from *God* in their respective environments. He developed the argument that the most advanced among them possessed *malakah-i-nubuwwat* (prophetic intuition). To the prophets, inspiration came as a flash and in theology, it is termed as Gabriel.[18]

Sir Syed coincided *reason* and *Wahi*. He did not admit the distinction between *natural* and *revealed* religions. He looked at the problem of their relationship biological and made inspiration a natural development of man's instinctive and rational capacities. *Sir Syed* articulated that some people are endowed with *reason* to the highest degree; they are the guides and leaders of the people. He urged that these people appeared in all spheres of human life, secular or religious, and they all, without any distinction, receive divine illumination or *Wahi*. An inventor of a new mechanical device, a discoverer of unknown or unexplored regions of the world, or a composer of beautiful symphony, all are recipients of spiritual revelation in their different spheres. *Sir Syed* propounded that the difference between the prophets and other geniuses is due to the difference of the spheres in which they worked. Prophets are spiritual healers and their primary function was to reorient the spiritual, and moral life of the people.[19] He compared the prophet and his people with the shepherd and his sheep, in respect of *reason* and rationality. Thus, according to *Sir Syed*, prophet hood was a special natural faculty like other human faculties and capacities, which blossomed forth at the proper time as flowers and fruit ripen on a tree at a particular time. There is nothing strange about it. He urged therefore, that the prophetic quality is present in every man without distinction though with a difference of degree.[20]He further stated that prophet hood was a natural faculty, not a gift of the *God*, as the orthodox Muslims believe, and revelation was not something external, brought to a prophet by an *Angel*, but a natural phenomenon, like all other human faculties. Question was put on him that if this aptitude was to be found in every human being, then what would Muhammad's finality of prophet hood mean? He responded that it was not in respect of time or counting that Muhammad was to be considered as the last of the prophets, but it was because of the perfection of his message, which in that sense, was final.[21] In this regard, *Sir Syed* gives an example that there is a fragrant rose ina box. People come across that box and ask each other that there is sweet smelling of rose inside

the box. Some would believe and some would not. At last a man comes and opens the lock of the box and all see the rose with their own eyes and cry out 'this is the end. Does this mean that no other person could open the box? No this is absurd as it only meant that the question of proving that the box contained a rose, had now come to an end; this was the finality of the prophet.[22]The revelations of *God* are open to all men, according to *Sir Syed*. The deeper recesses of the human heart are always susceptible to the spiritual call; therefore man is able to penetrate through the world of *nature* to *God*. He articulated that prophet hood had ceased to exist. The immature and uneducated people needed the guidance of prophets in the past but now, with the passage of time and development of human *reason*, this guidance ceased, and as the last favour of *God*, the moral and spiritual values enunciated by Islam, were fully spread. Therefore, he (Muhammad) was the last of the distributors of these divine gifts.[23]

Religion is an aspect of *nature*, according to *Sir Syed*. He looked upon *God* as the Author of *nature* and as the First Cause. The relation of *God* is analogous to the relation of the watchmaker to the watch. As the craftsman is responsible for the peculiar make-up of the machine, the correlation of its parts and its overall function, so is *God*, the creator of the universe. It was He who gave it the laws according to which it continued to work. As *God* is unchangeable, so are the laws of *nature* which operate in the universe. As the *Quran* (x/viii.23) preached, "No change shall you find in the habit of *God***"**. As the world follows its natural laws so is in the moral sphere an absolute law of right and wrong which knows no exception. Pains and pleasure follow logically the kind of acts performed by men and there is no need for divine interference in the physical and moral sphere. It was by this deistic view of *God*'s *nature* and His relation to the universe that *Sir Syed* denied the possibility of *Miracles* and efficacy of prayer.[24]He could not accept *Miracles* as violations of the laws of *nature* for the law of *nature* is a practical promise of *God* that something will happen so, and if we say it can happen otherwise, we are accusing Him of going against His promise and this is inconceivable. He further propounded that " I do not deny the possibility of *Miracles* because they are against *reason*, but because the *Quran* does not support the happenings of events or occurrences that are against the laws of *nature* or those that violate the usual course of things".[25]

Sir Syed explained the complex *nature* of man, by giving his own interpretation of the legend of *Adam'sfall*. He thought that its presentation in a dramatic form is only a literary way of placing before us certain basic truths about man. He considered it wrong to take it as a literary account of a dialogue between *Angels*, the *Satan* on one hand and *God* on the other. The word, *Angel* signified limitless power of *God* and potentialities of things. Besides, the solidity of mountains, the liquidation of water and the power of growth in vegetation and the power of attraction and repulsion signified the word *Angel*. *Satan*was not a being existed outside us. It stood for the evil forces of the Universe. Man was *Angel* and *Satan* combined. *God*'s command to *Angels* to bow before Man signified that all good forces of the Universe will be obedient to man and ever willing to help him. Man had the power to control *Satan*'s evil forces in him but the refusal of *Satan* in obeying the order of *God* symbolized that the baser passions of man are not easily controllable, so man should strive to have check on them. The forbidden tree symbolized*reason* and self-consciousness, enabling man to distinguish between good and evil. Man's disobedience to *God*'s order signified that man was able to make full use of his powers independently of what anybody may order him to do, even though he might be led astray thereby.[26]

Sir Syed pronounced that Salvation did not depend on virtuous deeds but on the honest efforts. There was no sin over which man had no power.[27]   He articulated that soul is immortal, it did not die with the death of the body. He derived this support from the scientific doctrine that nothing perishes in the world, the quantity of matter remains unchanged and only its form changes. To the Resurrection, he referred to many theories but accepted one that both body and soul will emerge. He argued that wherever the *Quran* referred to the reality of the Resurrection, its real purpose was to refute the belief of those who deny the existence of the soul. He stated further that paradise and hell described in sensuous terms in the *Quran*, were mere symbolical representations of the psychological states of individuals in the life after death. The *Quran* declared," *No soul knowth what joy of the eyes is reserved for the good, in recompense of their work*".[28]

Furthermore, *Sir Syed* emphasized that the door of *Ijtihad* should be open and every one; those qualified may go for *Ijtihad* in problems of life and religion in accordance with the circumstances of

his age.[29] Regarding role of the prophet, *Sir Syed* made distinction between Din, *Sharia* and Wordly affairs. He included the belief in *God*, His attributes as well as acts of worship in the first category. In the second, he included the matters relating to moral and spiritual purification of mankind.

Din is not subject to change but our needs and the way we satisfy them, depend on differences of time and place. If we included these things within the sphere of prophetic function, then with the change of time, we shall need another prophet, which is against the spirit of the finality of prophet hood. What Islam claimed to be perfected, is Din, not the *Sharia*. So, if *Sharia* is not final, then it is the duty of Muslims to deal with the problems in the light of basic tenets of Islam. [30]

Sir Syed rejected *Hadith* (Tradition) as a source of religious knowledge. He claimed that the collections of *Hadith* were compiled in the political and social conditions of 8th century that helped in the fabrication of innumerable traditions ascribing them to the Holy Prophet. He did critically appraisal of Traditions with regard to their content. He urged the Muslims to take up this responsibility, and quoted IbnTaimyyah that " *the truly traditional is truly rational*". *Sir Syed* argued if any tradition was found to be true, he would be willing to accept as a valid basis for religion. He made a distinction between matters relating to purely religious Traditions and non-religious Traditions. He considered, the latter , we are not bound to follow.[31]

He did not accept the interpretation and modification of *Quran* on the basis of constructed stories and accounts of alleged *Miracles*. He was not satisfied with the numerous available commentaries of *Quran*. He referred the commentaries to particular historical events in the context of which alone, their real meanings could be grasped. Thus, the universal and eternal significance of the Quranic verses was sacrificed at the altar of historical culture. According to him, it is not the text, but the understanding of *Quran*, which has been distorted. Besides, *Sir Syed* refused to accept *Ijma* as the source of Islamic Law, considering it the cause of all superstition and un-Islamic practices. He urged that *Ijma* of the Companions of Prophet, lost its support because these were matters relating to the past.

Modern time and thinking needed new interpretation. Though he said we can make full use of the decisions of by-gone days.[32]

   Sir Syed propounded that *God*'s Book is sufficient for Muslims, rejected all the mythical stories incorporated in Muslims by the vast store of commentaries on the *Quran*, and thus, taken for the scriptural text (word of *God*). He tried to emphasis that the altered conditions of modern life, the advancement of human knowledge and the position of Muslims,in which they were, all demanded an effort on their part to solve their problems in the light of their own experiences. He refused common views among Muslims such as, stoning to death, punishment for fornication, which could not be accepted according to him, because, first, the *Quran* did not mention it and secondly, it was a tradition prevalent, in that time among the Arabs.[33]

   The only criterion, *Sir Syed* considered valid in demonstrating the truth of Islam, was its conformity to 19th century naturalism. He argued that if religion is compatible with human *nature* or *nature* in general, then it must be true. However, in order to prove that Islam was the religion of *science* and *reason*, he felt compelled to deny not only the *Miracles*, *Angels*,*djinn* and the *virgin* birth of Jesus, explaining away the *Miraj* of Prophet as simply a *dream*, but also the bodily *resurrection*, the *day of Judgement*, *Heaven* and *Hell,* all of which he insisted, must not be accepted literally but only symbolically. He even, went, so far as to compare the phenomenon of revelation to the hallucination of the mental illness.[34]

   Sir Syed derived his conception of *God* from the *Deist* of the 18th century France. To him, *God* was only a remote abstraction. According to him, as the laws of *nature* are unalterable, so, not even *God* can change them. So there is no sense in praying to Him. [35]

   Sir Syed was determined that Islam could be transformed into true religion of humanity, civilization and progress, as soon as antiquated and traditional ideas and customs, contrary to the spirit of modern times, were abandoned. He made some apologistic inter preatations: polygamy is contrary to the spirit of Islam and should not be permitted except in rare cases. He articulated further that as slavery was prohibited absolutely in Islam, even the enslavement of war prisoners permitted by the *Sharia*. Riba in the modern world is not

contrary to the law of *Quran*. Punishment for amputation of the land for theft, stoning for a dulterary and hundred lashes for fornication were barbarous and suitable only for a primitive society lacking prisons. *Sir Syed* propounded that Jihad was banned except in the direst necessity of self-defence.[36]He denied *Miracles*. He denied the *Miracles* of Hazrat Ibrahim of 'Fire', of Musa's stick becoming snake as illusion. He also denied that Jesus was born with a father.[37]

CONCLUSION

*Sir Syed*viewed Islamfrom a modernist perspective. The orthodox Muslims entertain detestation for him, due to his interpretation of Islam. He evaluated Islam based on scientific reason, and the laws of nature. According to him, the nature followed certain laws of mechanics, characterized by uniform behaviour, for which there could be no exception, while all inorganic and organic behaviours are subject to these mechanical laws .For him ,as God is unchangeable, so are the laws of nature. Religion is an aspect of laws of nature, and bound to follow them.In that context, he reinterpreted Islam.
Hedenied *Miracles* of Hazrat Ibrahim (Fire), ofHazrat Musa (stick), and the virgin birth of *Jesus*. He rejected the *Angels,djinn*,and the events of *Miraj* of prophet *Muhammad ,*according to him, the *Quran* did not support happenings of events against the laws of nature.The event of *Miraj* was considered as a dream. He rejected *ijma* as source of Islamic law, basing the reason that these matters related to the past; modern times needed new interpretations. He urged that the bodily resurrections, the Day of Judgment, concepts of Heaven, Hell, must not be accepted literally but symbolically. He rejected interpretations and modification (commentaries) of *Quran* based on the constructed stories and accounts of *Miracles*. According to him, it is not the text, but the understanding of *Quran*, which has been distorted. He regarded *Quran* as a sufficient source for the Muslims.He rejected punishments such as, stoning to death, fornication, due to the fact that these were Arab's traditions at that times. For him,*ijtihad* is open to those qualified for it, and the prophetic quality, revelation is present in every man, though with a difference of degree. He rejected *Hadith* too, placing reason of fabrication in the 8th Century. However, *Sir Syed* argued that Islam could be transformed into a true religion of humanity, civilization, and progress, when the antiquated and traditional ideas and customs, contrary to the spirit of modern times, were abandoned. Thus,

Sir Syed reinterpreted Islam on the basis of reason, and scientific outlook. But religion or Islam is a belief system. It is not mathematics, law, or art, where you follow certain rules based on reason, and logic. Role of reason exists in religion (Islam), but the role of belief cannot be dismissed. Sir Syed has dismissed belief from Islam. This is a humble attempt, the window of research is open for the prospective scholars to probe further on the topic.

Endnotes:

[1] http//en.wikipedia.org/wiki.modernism

[2] ibid.

[3] Ibid

[4] The *Oxford University Dictionary*, Second Edition, Volume-XIII, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1989.

[5] Sarfraz Khan, '*Muslim reformist Political Thought'*, published by Routledge Curzon,2003.

[6] Ibid.

[7] http://www.ntpi.org/html/reform.html

[8] S.MoinulHaq, '*Islamic Thought and Movements in the sub-Continent(711-1947)'',* published by Historical Society,Edition-69, Karachi, 1979. (hereafter cited as Haq, 1979)

[9] Ibid

[10] M.M.Sharif, Edited, '*A History of Muslim Philosophy'*, Volume-Two, published by Pakistan Philosophical Congress 1966, Reprinted in 1983, Karachi, p-1598.(Hereafter cited as Sharif, 1983)

[11] Haq, 1979, p-1597

[12] ZafarIshaq Ansari and John.L.Esposito, Edited; '*Muslims and the West: Encounter and Dialogue*', published by International Research Institute,2001, p-184.(hereafter cited as Ansari& Esposito, 2001)

[13] Sharif, 1983, p-1599.

[14] Ansari & Esposito,2001, p-185.

[15] Ibid, p-186

[16] Sharif, 1983, p-1600.

[17]Ibid, p-1600.

[18]Haq, 1979, p-463-64.

[19]Sharif, 1983, p-1602.

[20]Ibid, p-1602.

[21]Haq, 1979, p-464.

[22]Ibid, p-465.

[23]Sharif, 1983, p-1603-04.

[24]Ibid, p-1604-05.

[25]Ibid, p-1605.

[26]Ibid, p-1606.

[27] Ibid, p-1607.

[28] Ibid, p-1608.

[29]Haq, 1979, p-465.

[30]Sharif, 1983, p-1610

[31] Ibid, p-1610.

[32] Ibid, p-1613

[33]Ibid, p-1612-13.

[34]Jamila, Maryam, *'Islam and Modernization'*, published by Mohammad Yousaf Khan, Fourth edition, Sant Nagar, Lahore, 1977.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid.

[37]http:www.learndeen.com