

**WOMEN AND EID SALAAT**

**A DUMB WOMAN'S  
VIEW  
AND  
ITS  
REFUTATION**

**By  
THE INTERNATIONAL THAANVI ACADEMY  
OF ISLAMIC RESEARCH  
P.O.BOX 673  
RANDFONTEIN 1760  
SOUTH AFRICA**

## INTRODUCTION

Some dumb woman whose brains have become convoluted as a consequence of her adoption of the immoral cult of western liberalism is currently on a campaign to promote the idea that its is compulsory -Waajib and even Fardh – for women to attend the Eidgah for the Eid Salaat. The article and silly arguments which she has presented to bolster her corrupt opinion are indeed mind boggling from the Shar’i perspective.

She has committed wholesale debauchery to Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi’s discussion on this issue in his monumental kitaab. Her chicanery and fraud are shockingly disgusting. She attributes falsehood to Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) and Allaamah Zafar Ahmad (rahmatullah alayh) by ascribing notions and views which they never affirmed or even propounded. She speaks typical womanish lies by claiming that according to Allaamah Zafar Ahmad and Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayhima), Eid Salaat is Waajib, nay Fardh, on women.

This stupid aunt whose natural intellectual deficiency is compounded with her penchant for lies has with her gross inability to even understand the Arabic text of *I’laaus Sunan*, submitted the text of this wonderful Kitaab to the vilest kind of intellectual abortion which is the effect of her intellectual deficiency (*nuqs fil aql*), love for liberalism and her inability to even read correctly the Arabic text of the kutub.

Her stupidity and the inability to understand and even read correctly the texts have adequately exposed her *jahaalat*. By parading her ignorance publicly in writing, she has adequately debunked her own contention and corrupt opinion of the compulsion of Eid Salaat on women.

This dumb woman is a prime specimen of the type of *fitnah* which is mentioned by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in the following Hadith:

*“I have not left after me a greater fitnah for men than women.”*

And, on the occasion when Allah Ta’ala expelled Iblees from the Heavens, he (Iblees) supplicated for *traps and snares* to ply his trade of vice and corruption on earth. Granting his request, Allah Ta’ala said to Iblees: *“Your traps will be women.”*

Shaitaan has perfectly ensnared this dumb *apa* whom he is utilizing to entrap men into vice and immorality by promoting female attendance in the Musaaajid and Eidgahs.

Alhamdulillah! By Allah’s fadhil, in this *Refutation*, we have thoroughly demolished the stupid arguments of the dumb woman whose intellectual debauchery leaves one aghast.

INTERNATIONAL THAANVI ACADEMY OF ISLAMIC RESEARCH

P.O.Box 673

RANDFONTEIN

1760  
SOUTH AFRICA

27 Ramadhaan 1431  
7 September 2010

**QUESTION**

**IS IT PERMISSIBLE FOR WOMEN TO GO TO THE EIDGAH OR TO THE MUSJID FOR EID SALAAT?**

**ANSWER**

**IT IS NOT PERMISSIBLE. EID SALAAT IS NOT WAAJIB NOR SUNNAH FOR WOMEN. THE COMMAND OF THE SHARIAH SINCE THE AGE OF THE SAHAABAH HAS BEEN PROHIBITION.**

**Ooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooo**

Refuting this fourteen century Command of the Shariah, which Mufti Abdul Kadir Hoosen confirmed, a woman raised a number of puerile and baseless objections. On the basis of unfounded conjecture she interprets and misinterprets the Qur'aan and Hadith to subject the Shariah to her personal opinion. We present here a refutation of her 'response' to the Mufti's answer, and our comments.

(1) She says: *“Mufti said that when you have a dispute regarding any matter, you should refer to the Qur'aan and Sunnah for a solution. We absolutely agree. Hence all the statements made showing that Muslim women must not be prevented from attending the mosque have been substantiated by Hadith. Mufti in return did not give a single hadith to prove his argument – that muslim women cannot attend or that the prophet SAW said they cannot attend.”*

The woman has failed to understand the meaning of 'refer to the Qur'aan and Sunnah', hence her mental imbroglio and the resultant conundrum fabricated by her. Reference to the Qur'aan and Sunnah NEVER means entitlement to grab a Hadith book and the Qur'aan, least of all translations, then submit the aayaat and ahaadith to one's personal opinion and gorge out a corrupt 'fatwa'. Such misinterpretation is termed

*zanaadaqah* which transforms a Muslim into a *Zindeeq*. *Zindeeq* is one of the classes of *kuffaar*. Whoever submits the Qur'aan and Hadith to his/her opinion has been described by Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) as an '*Enemy of the Sunnah*'.

The entire edifice of the Shariah is structured on the Qur'aan and Sunnah. The Sahaabah, Taabi-een and Tab-e-Taabieen are the authorities of the Qur'aan and Sunnah. But this lady of corrupt opinion implies that she has better understanding of the Qur'aan and Sunnah than the illustrious Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and Fuqaha of the *Khairul Quroon* (the first three noblest eras of Islam). With regard to the Fuqaha of these three Ages, Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*"Honour my Sahaabah for verily they are your noblest, then those after them, then those after them. Thereafter, kizb (lies and falsehood) will become prevalent."*

In another Hadith, Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *"Thereafter (i.e. after Khairul Quroon) will arise people who will love obesity (fatness produced by luxury and opulence)."*

Thus, any interpretation of the Qur'aan and Sunnah which conflicts with the understanding of the authorities of the Khairul Quroon epoch is NOT the Qur'aan and Sunnah notwithstanding the presentation of the Qur'aanic or Hadith text. What the lady of *baatil* opinion has done, was to rudely and brutally tear the Hadith narrations from the context created by Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and to present it in isolation of this context.

The sacred context is the FATWA of the Khairul Quroon. Any interpretation or understanding which conflicts with this FATWA is baseless – *mardood and mal'oon* – rejected and accursed, qualifying the holder of such opinion for immediate entry into the bowels of Jahannum.

(2)

The one who maintains on the basis of Saheeh Hadith that salvation in the Aakhirah and admission to Jannat are reliant on *only 'Laailaha il lalaah*, without the addition of *Muhammadur Rasulallah*, is among the progeny of Shaitaan. Such a proponent of kufr is a *murtadd*. The Hadith states explicitly: *"He who proclaims 'Lailaha illallaah' will enter Jannat."* There is no mention in the Hadith of adding *Muhammadur Rasulallah*. This Hadith, just as all other Ahaadith, may not be torn crudely from their context for subjugation to the corrupt personal opinion of wayward miscreants and deviates such as the modernist dumb lady of opinion.

There is a procedure for the Rulings of Allah's Shariah. Any Tom, Dick, Harry, Jane and Mary have no entitlement to extract a Hadith from the books of Hadith and issue a ruling on the basis of their opinion utilizing merely the text of the Hadith. The Shariah is not the domain of Toms and Janes.

The Saheeh Hadith instructs wudhu after eating cooked food. But, no one, not even lady Jane who has ventured her corrupt and stupid opinion on the Hadith, believes that wudhu is Waajib or Sunnat after eating cooked food. There is authoritative and sacred opinion and interpretation on all the Ahaadith and Qur'aanic aayaat.

Lady Jane – the lady of corrupt opinion – has claimed that not a single Hadith has been given to substantiate the prohibition of females attending the Musjid/Eidgah. Her audacity is the effect of her *jahaalat*. Since she does not know even the meaning of

‘Hadith’, she courageously flaunts her *jahaalat* by denying the existence of Ahaadith to confirm the prohibition. For her edification and for the dissipation of the unholy mist which veils her sensorium, the definition of Hadith brings within its scope the statements and actions of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah.

The Ahaadith and Rulings of the Sahaabah conclusively emphasize the prohibition. Only a daughter of Shaitaan would venture that the Sahaabah, especially the illustrious senior Sahaabah, and more especially, Hadhrat Aishah Siddiqah (radhiyallahu anhum), did not understand the statements and instructions of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and that these statements and instructions were left for interpretation by Lady Jane of this belated 21<sup>st</sup> century of the Christian era.

The Ummah has long ago selected to follow even the ‘errors’ of the Sahaabah rather than destroy their Imaan with the kufr stupidities of deviated modernists whose misinterpretations are impregnated with nifaaq and kufr. There are many Ahaadith which categorically declare the prohibition of women going to the Masjid or Eidgah. We have published two books on this issue. Those interested in these books, may write for copies. The relevant Ahaadith are explained correctly in these books. Here it will suffice to reject as baseless Lady Jane’s contention and denial of Ahaadith of prohibition.

(2) The lady of opinion states: *“Mufti said that the Quraan says that the women must stay in their homes. This is true, and we go further to add that the Prophet SAW is the one who taught this verse to the Ummah. But in spite of this verse, the prophet SAW still said: ‘Do not prevent your women from attending the mosque if they seek your permission to do so’ .....*

*Additionally, if this verse is to be understood in general terms as Mufti himself suggested, then women should be prevented from leaving their homes altogether – they cannot attend any bayaans, masturah Jamaat. Halaqa, khatams, etc. as all of this entails leaving home.”*

The lady of corrupt opinion is here implying that she has understood this Qur’aanic verse while the illustrious Sahaabah and Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha), in particular, have failed to understand it. Despite being aware of this aayat, the Sahaabah enacted the prohibition. Did they then not understand the Qur’aan and the specific Hadith which Lady Jane has cited as her basis for her stupid view? Are we to accept that this miserable lady of corrupt opinion has understood the aayat better than Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) and the other Sahaabah?

(3)

Lady Jane is ignorant of the Law that the Qur’aan overrides Hadith. If a Hadith appears to be in conflict with the Qur’aan, there will be an appropriate and authoritative interpretation to reconcile the Hadith with the Qur’aan. The Sahaabah understood this fact. Lady Jane may not attempt to impart a lesson in Islamic Jurisprudence to Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) and the Sahaabah in general who prohibited women from the Masjid despite being fully aware of the Hadith which the lady of corrupt opinion is displaying as her trump card.

The Hadith which the lady of corrupt opinion cites as her basis, was not hidden from Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) and the Sahaabah. Fully aware of the Hadith, Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) unequivocally declared that if Rasulullah was present 'today', he would have banned women from the Masjid. This view of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) was upheld by the Sahaabah, the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen, the Fuqaha and the Ummah for fourteen centuries. Now in this belated era there mushrooms up deviates and miscreants such as the lady of corrupt opinion, who endeavour laboriously to refute the verdict of the Ummah – the verdict of prohibition which was enacted by the Sahaabah.

The other acts of female emergence – masturah Jamaat, etc. – mentioned by the lady of corrupt opinion, undoubtedly are in conflict with the Qur'aanic prohibition. The prohibition applies to these acts also. We say with emphasis that women should NOT emerge from their homes for any of these acts in the manner they are perpetrating nowadays. None of these acts of emergence is occasioned by dire need. They are permitted to leave the home precincts only when there is a real and valid need condoned by the Shariah.

One haraam act does not legalize another haraam act. The imagined permissibility of women attending the Masjid may not be reasoned on the basis of masturah jamaat, halqa, etc. because these acts of emergence are also not permissible. The analogy is therefore palpably false and baseless. The employment of valid Shar'i *qiyaas* requires a valid first premises, as well as a competent and qualified Aalim. Furthermore, *qiyaas* may not be employed to formulate a ruling for an act for which there already exists the ruling of the Shariah. Such an act may not become the subject of *qiyaas* – valid *qiyaas*. Since the Shariah's decree on prohibition of females attending the Masjid is authoritatively confirmed and has been in this Ummah since the age of the Sahaabah, it may not be made the subject of analogy for seeking abrogation of the Shariah's decree. Lady Jane's argument is therefore to be dismissed for the stupidity that it is.

(3) Then the lady of opinion, once again flaunting her *jahaalat* says: *"We agree with Mufti that Taraweeh and Jumma salaah (the lady can't even pronounce Jumma) is not wajib (A wajib act, according to the Hanafis, is an act in which there is a specific and clear instruction for the act in the Hadith. A fard act has an instruction for that act in Quraan). As stated above, the Prophet has given a specific instruction – Do not prevent your women from attending the mosque – hence, if women want to attend they can do so and there should be facilities for them."*

The dumb lady of corrupt opinion has made some preposterous claims in this averment. That wajib is an act for which there is a 'clear instruction in the Hadith' is an act which the lady of corrupt opinion has sucked stupidly from her thumb. There are numerous acts for which there is clear instruction in the Hadith, but which are NOT Wajib according to the Hanafi Math-hab. There is clear instruction in the Hadith for all the Masnoon - Sunnat and Mustahab – acts., but they have not been assigned to the Wajib category. The lady of opinion does not understand that 'a clear instruction' (*Amr*) is not always for Wujoo. Its effect is also *Istihbaab* (Being Mustahab).

There is clear instruction in the Hadith to break the fast with either *only* dates or water. But it is not Wajib in the Hanafi Math-hab to do so. There is clear instruction in the Hadith to perform Tahajjud Salaah, Awwaabeen, Ishraq, the four Sunnats of Zuhur, the

two Sunnats of Fajr, the two Sunnats of Maghrib, the two Sunnats of Isha; there is clear instruction in the Hadith to slaughter a goat for the walimah. There is clear instruction in the Hadith to use the

(4)

Miswaak and to start washing from the right side. But these acts are not Waajib in the Hanafi Math-hab. In short, there are clear instructions in the Hadith to perform thousands of acts which are not Waajib in terms of the Hanafi Math-hab. The dumb lady of corrupt opinion has merely demonstrated her stupidity with the definition of waajib sucked from her thumb.

The poor, dumb lady sinks deeper into her quagmire of confusion and delusion with her averment that *'a fard act has an instruction for that act in the Quraan'*. Innumerable Shar'i acts debunk this stupid notion presented by Lady Moron. There is absolutely no instruction in the Qur'aan for the following FARDH acts:

The two raka'ts Fardh of Fajr, 4 raka'ts of Zuhr, 4 raka'ts of Asr, 3 raka'ts of Maghrib, 4 raka'ts of Isha', Qa'dah Akheerah, the five Fardh Salaat, payment of Zakaat every year, the specified Zakaat percentages payable, satr-e-aurah in Salaat, Salaat, Saum, etc. become Fardh on attainment of puberty, etc. Despite there being no Qur'aanic instruction, these acts are Fardh. The lady of corrupt opinion has only made a fool of herself by trespassing in a sphere for which she is not qualified.

The dumb lady's contention that there 'should be facilities' in the Musjids for women is another effect of her thumb sucking which fabricates corrupt opinions. Where in the Qur'aan or in the Sunnah has such a command been issued? Were there separate facilities during the era to which the Hadith of permissibility is related? Were there separate facilities for women in Musjid-e-Nabawi during the era of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? The miscreant lady simply does not know what she blurts out.

Lady Moron sallying into the field of kufr, avers audaciously: *"We say that no-one can stop the women from praying in the mosque if they wish. This again by direct instruction from the Prophet SAW."*

In her *'no-one'* averment this deviated woman has included Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) and all the illustrious Sahaabah who had vehemently prohibited women from the Musjid. What the miserable lady of corrupt opinion says here is that she has the entitlement to interpret the Hadith, to review the fatwa of all the Sahaabah, to set aside the fatwa of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) and the Sahaabah, and then to issue her own 'fatwa' which will be the final word on par with Wahi. Her audacity and ignorance are mind boggling. Just look at the haraam, corrupt nerve of this *shaitaanah*. In her corrupt opinion Hadhrat Umar is wrong, Hadhrat Aishah is wrong and all the illustrious Ulama among the Sahaabah, and all the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and all the Fuqaha of the *Khairul Quroon* epoch were wrong – that they had failed to understand the Hadith whereas she (i.e. this modernist moron – lady of corrupt opinion) fourteen centuries down the line has ultimately unearthed the truth and has purified Islam of an interpolation which Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) and the Sahaabah in general had fabricated – *Nauthubillaah!* The dumb lady appears to be a shiah, for it is only shiahs

who possess the audacity of damning the Sahaabah in general, and Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) in particular.

Just who does this miserable entity think she is? From whence does she derive her satanic 'authority' to accuse the Sahaabah of having misunderstood and misinterpreted the Hadith of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Her whole stupid article is a veiled attack on the Sahaabah, and in particular against Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anhu), for it was Ummul Mu'mineen, the Lady of the Ummah, the Lady of Jannat who was the strongest proponent of the ban on females attending the Musjid.

The suggestion that Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) was ignorant of the specific Hadith which the stupid lady of corrupt opinion has made the fulcrum for her view of kufr, or that Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) did not understand the Hadith, or that she had misinterpreted it, or that she had acted in violation of Rasulullah's command, is the effect of brains polluted with coprophilic matter, hence the shaitaanah is capable of stercoracious utterances which not only contaminate her Imaan, but which eliminate Imaan.

(5)

The Hadith on which the dumb lady relies for her haraam opinion was well known to the Sahaabah. All the Ahaadith on the subject were in front of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha). Rasulullah's life, his words, actions and even thoughts were in front of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) when she declared: *"If Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasalam) knew what the women are perpetrating today, he would have banned them from the Musjid."*

Who does the Ummah follow? Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) who was the living and vibrant authority of Rasulullah's Ahaadith and Sunnah, or does the Ummah follow the rubbish opinion of a dumb *shaitaanah* of this belated age whom we are sure is a *jaahilah* in even the basic masaa-il of the Deen? A *shaitaanah* must necessarily be a *jaahilah*.

(4) The dumb lady further exposing her *jahaalat*, avers: *"Mufti quoted the hadith which said that if women go out to the mosques, they must go out 'Tafilaat' – go out with shabby clothing. This clearly proves again, that women are allowed to go out and pray in the mosques, but that there are conditions."*

Emerging from the home in the condition of '*tafilaat*' (looking dirty and shabby, like old hags) was not restricted to the occasions of proceeding to the Musjid. It applies in general. At all times - whenever women are constrained by need to emerge from their homes. This Hadith was in front of the Sahaabah when they banned women from the Musjid. Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) was aware of the Hadith. She understood the meaning, purport and the applicability of the Hadith. These are issues of which the dumb shaitaanah is ignorant.

No authority among the Sahaabah, Taabi-een and Tab-e-Taabieen read into the '*Tafilaat*' Hadith the meaning which the dumb lady proffers. This Hadith does not prove permissibility for women to attend the Musjid. It only says that when women are constrained to emerge they must transform themselves into old, ugly-looking hags. It

only says that when women have to leave their homes, they should not display themselves in the manner prostitutes do.

There are and will always be occasions when women have to leave the sacred precincts of their homes. One such occasion was during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) when it was permissible for them to attend the Musjid. But today! Look at the droves of women, all adorned in their finery, perfumed and painted with the fragrances and hues of zina. Women in such states of zina are frequenting the Musajid, the halqah thikr sessions, the tabligh activities, the bayaans, etc. Even the Ulama fail to understand the dangers and are oblivious of the mischief (fitnah) of these embellished females deceiving themselves and the public with their deceptive abayas and so-called burqahs, sitting in the driving seat of cars, pulling up in parking lots of the Musajid in full view of evil male eyes, and effectively putting themselves within the scope of Rasulullah's stricture:

*“A woman who perfumes herself and passes by a gathering is like an adulteress.”*

The stupidity of the dumb lady of corrupt opinion does not permit her to understand the simple fact that in the absence of a condition, the act dependent on that condition has no existence. Thus, without wudhu, there is no Salaat. Without Ramadhaan there is no Fardh fasting. Without puberty there is no incumbency. If this dumb woman contends that today in this age of *fitnah* the women who emerge into the streets in droves are submitting or will submit to the state of *Tafilaat*, then she will simply be confirming her state of mental derangement which has constrained her to blurt out so much drivel and unadulterated rubbish in her article in response to the Mufti's proclamation of Allah's Law, viz., the prohibition of women attending the Musjid.

Despite the pious Sahaabi Ladies observing the condition of *'tafilaat'*, Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) and the Sahaabah prohibited the women from the Musjid. And so vehement was their prohibition that some Sahaabah would pelt the women with pebbles to prevent them from the Musjid. This severe measure was necessary because it was difficult to eliminate an existing practice. That women were permitted to go to the Musjid during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has never been denied. That Rasulullah (sallallahu

(6)

alayhi wasallam) had ordered that camel's urine be consumed by certain people for their sickness is an accepted fact. That Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had allowed a man to comfortably complete his act of urinating right inside the Musjid is accepted as a truth. But these issues have their related contexts and circumstances, and all such Ahaadith are evaluated on the sacred Principles of the Shariah which are all products of the Qur'aan and Sunnah, but which morons of the dumb lady's kind fail to understand due to their crass *jahaalat* compounded with their immoral western education and upbringing.

Permissibility or Prohibition of an act is a Shar'i determination, and for these determinations we have no option but to submit to the authorities of the Shariah, the foremost among whom were the Sahaabah, the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and the Fuqaha of the *Khairul Quroon era*. It is the heights of Satanism to abandon the Shariah which has

reached us by way of authoritative transmission down the long corridor of 14 centuries of Islam's history, and to accept the opinions and stupid ideas of morons and dumb women whom shaitaan has deceived and tricked into rejecting the Sahaabah (radhiyallahu anhum).

Women, according to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are *naaqisaatul aql*. Their natural attribute is intellectual deficiency. When this natural trait is compounded with envy and jahaalat, then the admixture is absolutely dangerous and explosive. It explodes Imaan into smithereens. We suspect that the dumb lady of corrupt opinion, being a stupid woman suffering from the explosive admixture of corrupt tendencies, entertains a deep-seated envy for Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha), hence she has pitted herself against this glittering Star of Knowledge and Piety which emblazons the firmament of the Shariah.

Anyone who believes to be a Muslim cannot afford to even consider the dumb woman's interpretation and understanding of the Ahaadith in the face of Hadhrat Aishah's understanding, interpretation and fatwa.

(5) The stupid woman, further compounding her ignorance, says: *“Remember, the only responsibility of the messenger is to give the message – and in this instance the message is clear, women can go to the mosques but must satisfy certain conditions. Thereafter, if the women disobey, the sin is theirs, but the Mufti cannot prohibit them from attending, nor can he tell them that they must not go. If he does this, then he is guilty of violating a direct instruction of the prophet SAW.”*

Her mind boggling stupidity is astonishing. Even if it is assumed that Rasulullah's duty “was only to give the message” as the dumb woman contends, and that whipping the prostitutes, executing the murtads, and in general punishing criminals and deviates were beyond the parameters of his Office of Nubuwwat, then too the dumb lady has committed a grave blunder which violates her own stupid principle pertaining to her contended ‘duty of the messenger’, for Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did order the prohibition of women who come to the Musjid adorned and perfumed. Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) addressing the Sahaabah when an adorned and decorated woman from the clan of Muzainah strutted into the Musjid, said: *“O people! Prohibit your women from coming to the Musjid with adornment and coquetry.”*

This Hadith makes trash of the dumb lady's principle. The sin of women who emulate prostitutes and roam the streets and have the audacity to go to the Musjids is on their menfolk who allow them to parade like the women of immorality. The Shariah emphatically rules that the *la'nat* of Allah Ta'ala descends on the audacious woman who parades in the streets in the styles of *jaahiliyyah*, as well as on her husband who permits her to leave the house.

Commanding men to attend to the moral and spiritual welfare of their womenfolk, the Qur'aan Majeed says: *“O People of Imaan! Save yourselves and your families from the Fire...”*

The Sahaabah would physically prevent women from the Musjid, yet this stupid aunt – the dumb lady of corrupt opinion – contends that the Mufti has no right of prohibiting women

from their lewd acts nor even offer them naseehat advising them not to violate the law of Allah Ta'ala. This woman is truly dumb to the core of her brains. Every Muslim has the Shar'i right of preventing women from the Masjid. It is the Waajib obligation of the Imaams of the Musaaqid, of trustees and the Ulama in general to prevent women from the Musaaqid. Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar is a Waajib duty which may not be abandoned. The dumb aunt has no idea of the significance and importance of this obligation of Amr Bil Ma'roof, hence she blurted out her *ghutha* (rubbish).

The dumb apa (or ape), in response to the Mufti's contention that women would come to the Masjid all dressed up in haraam ways, says: *"Firstly, if the Imaam or any other man for that matter is looking at the woman, then he is directly disobeying the Quranic instruction which tells the men to lower their gaze. Hence the problem is with the men and not the women. Secondly, Mufti is implying deficient and defective morals and etiquette as a general rule on ALL MUSLIM WOMEN. How dare he? He is implying that ALL women are evil and without morality. How dare he?"*

The Mufti has all the right to dare. Undoubtedly, it is correct that the males are directly disobeying the Qur'aan with their lustful staring initiated by the lustful women who insist coming to the Masjid despite the Shariah's prohibition. The *fisq* and *fujoor* of men nowadays are added reasons for emphasizing the prohibition on women attending the Masjid. Most men today are just like most women –immoral and evil. It is *fitnah* multiplied with *fitnah*. It was precisely on account of such *fitnah* – *fitnah* ignited by women with their self-exhibition and men falling prey to the immoral wiles of women that Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) and the Sahaabah prohibited women from the Masjid.

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) invoked the curse of Allah on both the man and the woman – the one who stares and the one who caused the stare, i.e. the woman. She must bear the greater part of the blame for the moral turpitude in which she ensnares men. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) warning men against the traps of women said: *"After me I have not left a greater fitnah for men than women."*

On the occasion when Allah Ta'ala expelled Iblees from Jannat, he supplicated for traps to ensnare his prey. Allah Ta'ala said: *'Your traps will be women.'* The issue now is the initiation of zina as a consequence of transgressing the limits of Allah Ta'ala. The Qur'aan Majeed commands: *"And, do not approach even near to zina."* Men and women intermingling or being in proximity or staring at one another lustfully are all stepping stones of zina enacted in flagrant violation of the command to stay far from zina. Yet the stupid aunt advocates the initiation of the process of zina right inside the Masjid.

She is not supporting her stupid cause in any way by shifting blame to the menfolk. That the menfolk are in violation of the Qur'aanic prohibition is true. There is no dispute in this fact. They are immoral. But women's presence in the proximity of these disobedient *fussaaq* and *fujjaar* males only compounds the vice.

The implication that all Muslim women are of defective morals is logical. Only women who are morally deficient have a desire to parade themselves in public. Only women of defective morals are desirous of showing off their finery and adornment in the Masjid where they come to attract the gazes of the lustful ones. Women of *haya* conduct themselves with shame and respect. They heed Rasulullah's exhortation to perform Salaat

in the remotest corners of their homes. They desire the greater thawaab of performing Salaat in their homes. But these evil, modernist *faasiqahs* and *faajirahs* who are crude and abrasive in their behaviour and who rudely and shamelessly intrude into the Musjid defiling the sanctity of Allah's Houses with their evil motives, have absolutely no concern for the advice and admonition of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Hence we find the dumb lady of corrupt opinion citing narrations, the meanings and application of which she possesses not the haziest idea.

(8)

In Islam a woman by her mere unnecessary emergence from the home precincts becomes a woman of defective morals qualifying for the curse of Allah Azza Wa Jal. Insha'Allah, at the end of this discussion we shall explain why these outdoor women are called *faasiqahs* and *faajirahs* in terms of the Shariah.

The following Hadith narrated by Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhu) will serve as further edification for the dumb lady. Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhu) said: *"I heard my friend, Abul Qaasim (i.e. Rasulullah – sallallahu alayhi wasallam) saying: 'The Salaat of a woman who has perfumed herself to go to the Musjid is not accepted till she takes a ghusl as she would for janaabat.'" Thus, these faasiqahs and faajirahs who adorn and perfume themselves when they set foot out of the holy precincts of their homes should understand that ghusl-e-janaabat is incumbent on them. They emerge polluted and they pollute the very earth on which they trample. But the dumb apa (ape) contends that such polluted females should not be prevented from the Musjid.*

Further, in refutation of the contention of the dumb woman, Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) said: *"If Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had seen what the women have introduced (in their lifestyle), he would have most assuredly prevented them from going to the Musjid as the women of Bani Israaeel were prevented."*

Hadhrat Aishah Siddiqah (radhiyallahu anhu) was describing the women of her age – the most pious age of Islam . What conclusion should be drawn and what appellation should be coined for the *faasiqahs* and *faajirahs* of this immoral era in which Muslim women enslaved to the western liberal cult have abandoned every vestige of *haya* (shame and modesty)?

(6) The dumb lady of corrupt opinion says: *"Then Mufti quoted the hadith in which the prophet SAW said that if a woman applied perfume she must not come to the masjid. We agree, no one has denied this – and it again proves our point, the prophet SAW allowed women to attend conditionally, so why is Mufti saying women can't go, when the prophet SAW said that women can go?"*

The Hadith does not only say that perfumed women 'should not come to the masjid'. The Hadith instructs the menfolk to prohibit and prevent their perfumed and embellished women from the Musjid. Yet a few lines prior to this statement, the dumb ape averred that even if women come to the Musjid perfumed and embellished like prostitutes they may not be prevented since the sin is on them. This contention of the dumb aunt is in diametric conflict with the command of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Yes, you did deny ‘this’, hence you said just a few lines before: “*Thereafter if the women disobey, the sin is theirs but Mufti cannot prohibit them from attending, nor can he tell them that they must not go.*” But Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) commanded the Mufti to prevent these *faasiqahs* and *faajirahs* from attending the Musjid.

Wandering in a circle of confusion, this wayward woman says that women are allowed to go to the Musjid ‘conditionally’. Her stupidity is appalling. She concedes that there were strict conditions for the initial permissibility during the age of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Despite her dumbness and stupidity, she can see and understand that the original conditions no longer exist. Today women do not emerge like old hags. In the absence of the conditions, the initial permissibility logically and Islamically falls away. Is this miscreant woman then so stupid and mentally deranged to fail to understand such a simple obvious fact?

The initial permissibility to which the dumb aunt refers, has been abrogated fourteen centuries ago by the Sahaabah, and the prohibition has been in force since all these centuries. A stupid woman of this age is making a satanic endeavour to cancel this Fatwa of the Ummah which initiated with the Sahaabah.

(9)

(7) With regard to the permissibility stated by Sheikh Bin Ba’z and Sheikh Uthaymeen of Saudi Arabia, the following facts are to be noted:

- \* They were government scholars who were subservient to the Saudi royal family.
- \* Their fatwa is restricted with the many conditions for permissibility stated by Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).
- \* The views of these liberal Saudi Sheikhs subservient to the corrupt Saudi regime are of no consideration. Their views do not cancel the rulings of the Sahaabah and of the Fuqaha in general.
- \* In this era of immorality when women have exceeded all Shar’i bounds and prohibitions and are publicly indulging in *fitnah*, the views of these Saudi Sheikhs are erroneous.

The dumb aunt’s claim that Eid Salaat is Waajib for women according to the Ahnaaf is a further exhibition of her stupidity. There is no Math-hab which propagates this baatil view. Every Muslim knows that Eid Salaat is not Waajib on women. According to the Hanafi Math-hab Eid Salaat is Waajib for only men. Throughout Islamic history in all lands of Islam only men performed Eid Salaat compulsorily. Even in places where women attended, it was not a case of every woman in the community participating in the Eid Salaat. No Math-hab has ever ruled that women who do not perform Eid Salaat are sinful.

According to the Four Math-habs, the following are the rulings for Eid Salaat:

**Hanafi Math-hab** - Waajib on only those men on whom Jumuah Salaat is Waajib

**Shaafi; Math-hab** - Sunnatul Muakkadah on both men and woman. Jamaat is not a condition for the validity of Eid Salaat. Hence, a woman can perform Eid Salaat at home.

**Maaliki Math-hab** - Sunnatul Muakkadah on all those on whom Jumuah is incumbent, hence the ruling applies to only men.

**Hambali Math-hab** - Fardh Kifaayah on those on whom Jumuah Salaat is incumbent, hence women are excluded from this decree.

The averment that according to Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) Eid Salaat is Waajib for women implies that all the illustrious Hanafi Fuqaha and Ulama from the age of Imaam Abu Hanifah down to the present time, have been in error and did not understand that according to their Math-hab, Eid Salaat is Waajib for women. The dumb aunt's mental derangement displays the effect of Divine Curse, for only an accursed brain would be so audacious as to shamelessly blurt out a coprophilic opinion which makes a clown of its proponent.

Imaam Abu Hanifa's assertion of the Wujooob of Eid Salaat on 'everyone' pertains to every male on whom Jumuah Salaat is Waajib. It does not related to even men on whom Jumuah is not Waajib. Due to her crass *jahaalat* the dumb apa has understood that it is 'waajib' on all women, even *faasiqahs* and *faajirahs*.

(8) The dumb lady says: *"Mufti then said that the fatwas issued by him and the Indo-Pak scholars are based on 'Fiqh il Waqi' – to look at the prevailing condition and based on this condition it is better to tell the women to stay at home and not attend the Eid salaah or any prayers in the mosque. If this is true, then why has Mufti given women permission to attend his lectures at the mosque? Why has Mufti and other like-minded scholars created facilities for women to listen to their bayaans and talks, but deny the women the facilities and the right to attend the Eid Salaat when the prophet SAW COMMANDED the women to attend?"*

Undoubtedly, here is a conundrum which the "Mufti and the like-minded scholars" will not be able to solve. Despite the *jahaalat* of the apa, we concur with her on this point. Her query is logical and valid. It does not devolve on us to defend the Mufti and the other like-minded scholars for their haraam acts of creating facilities for women to emerge to attend their personal talks, halqahs, etc.

The apa is correct in so far as pointing out this contradiction. However, it should be understood that the Shariah is not the product of the errors and wrongs of the muftis. We are

(10)

100% in agreement with the lady. On this score we shall refrain to invoke the 'dumb' title which has been conferred on her, for she has spoken the truth. It is not permissible for women to attend the lectures and talks of the 'Mufti and like-minded scholars'. In fact the prohibition applies to a greater degree to the lectures, talks, bayaans and halqas of the maulanas and sheikhs of the present time. At least there is a precedent in the Sunnah for women attending the Masjid, albeit abrogated by the Ruling of the Shariah since the age of the Sahaabah. But, there is no precedent in the Sunnah for public-lecturing to perfumed and embellished women who come to the lectures audaciously driving their cars

The Mufti will undoubtedly have a dilemma answering the apa on this specific interlocution. But as far as the Shariah is concerned, the apa gains no points for pointing

out the error and contradiction of the Mufti and like-minded scholars. The prohibition of females attending the Musjid remains unscathed.

(9) Women attending the Musjid in Senegal, Nigeria, Zanzibar, etc. as pointed out by the dumb *khala* is not a *daleel* of the Shariah. An abundance of haraam is perpetrated in those countries, in Arabia and in all Muslim countries. The haraam acts and conflicts with the Shariah may not be cited as basis and proofs for structuring a Shar'i rulings. What happens in countries is not of any interest. The Qur'aan and Sunnah as understood and interpreted by the Sahaabah and Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen, and our Fuqaha of the *Khairul Quroon era constitute the Divine Shariah* to which submission is commanded in the Qur'aan. Obedience to the Rasul (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is impossible without obedience to his Sahaabah who were the highest and the first authorities (*Ulul Amr*) for whom obedience is Waajib in the same way as obedience is Waajib for the Rasul (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

(10) The dumb lady of corrupt opinion says: *“Finally Mufti said that the prophet SAW, till the end of his life allowed women to attend – and according to Mufti, the women were not prohibited because they had to come to the mosque to learn from the prophet SAW because the revelation was still coming. So now that there is no longer any revelation, woman must stay at home. Our question to Mufti is this: If the place of learning was the musjid at the time of the prophet SAW, why is it not the place of learning today?”*

The Mufti's rationalizing is erroneous and the dumb lady's question is drivel. Even during the era of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Musjid was NEVER a place of learning for women. The Ahaadith explicitly state that after the Salaam of the Fardh Salaat, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah would remain seated, and the women would immediately get up and depart. Only after their departure would the men rise to perform their Sunnah or leave the Musjid. The women never remained in the Musjid to perform Sunnat Salaat or to listen to any bayaan.

The pious Sahaabi ladies who emerged from their homes like hags, thoroughly wrapped up in shabby outer-garments big enough to enclose two women, did not gain their Deeni ta'leem in the Musjid. The Mufti has erred in his understanding. The question of the dumb apa is therefore devoid of substance.

#### (11) **CONDITIONAL**

The ignorance of this dumb woman is glaring, for despite conceding that the initial permission of women attending the Musjid was 'conditional' – encumbered with several severe restrictions and prohibitions – she stupidly and intransigently maintains that even if the conditions are missing, the permission remains in force. Reasoning with such an irrational woman who has sunk below the normal degree of *female nuqs-e-aql (female intellectual deficiency as stated by Rasulullah – sallallahu alayhi wasallam)* is like trying to convince a stone or a donkey.

Today ALL the conditions on the basis of which women used to attend the Musjid during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are lacking. Women have become

immoral and audacious. They have jettisoned all their *haya* by having cast aside Hijaab. Hijaab is not what these miscreant aunts and apas understand. Hijaab is not restricted to the niqaab. The fashionable abayas and quarter so-called burqahs donned nowadays are inimical of Hijaab. They are items of self-deception with which women who prowl the streets and public places soothe their conscience. They hallucinate that they are in hijab when fitted out in such un-Islamic style.

Despite Rasulallah's explicit command to prohibit women from the Musjid in the absence of the Waajib conditions, the dumb woman stupidly asserts that women must be allowed to attend the Musjid regardless of their immoral sins of perfuming and adorning themselves.

### **SYNOPSIS**

The entire argument of the dumb lady is drivel. Her arguments are devoid of Shar'i substance. With her unprincipled arguments which is the effect of her crass *jahaalat*, her false attributions, and inability to read and understand the Arabic texts, she has endeavoured to divert the focus from the fourteen century prohibition. The outline of this issue is quite simple:

(1) During Rasulallah's time women were allowed to attend the Musjid for only the Eid and Fardh Salaat – not for Sunnat Salaat and not for listening to lectures.

(2) The initial permissibility was accompanied by several strict conditions. If the conditions are not fulfilled, then according to Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), women should be prohibited.

(3) The Sahaabah prohibited women from the Musjid although they were fully aware of the permission granted by Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). By virtue of Rasulallah's command to obey his Sahaabah, we have to accept that they understood Rasulallah's pronouncements in a way that no other person can understand in this belated era in close proximity to Qiyaamah. Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) based her fatwa of prohibition on the clear understanding that even Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would have enacted the prohibition for want of the conditions.

(4) There exists copious argument and views among the Fuqaha of all Four Math-habs on this issue. The authorities of the Shariah report two types of *Ijma'* (*Consensus of the Ummah*) on this mas'alah:

\* *Ijma'* of Permissibility      \* *Ijma'* of Prohibition.

The *Ijma'* of Permissibility applies to a situation such as the era of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), i.e. the time that he was alive. It does not apply to even the age of the Sahaabah. Since this situation was peculiar to only the age of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) it will be utopia to believe or imagine that the pure and holy age of Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) will return. And, it is downright Satanism to hallucinate that the women of the current immoral age can be expected to comply with

the incumbent requisites which occasioned the initial permissibility. When this lofty state of Taqwa did not exist during the time of even the Sahaabah after Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), it will be sheer insanity and shaitaanityat to believe that the ground is today spiritually and morally fertile to permit women to go to the Musjid.

Everyone accepts this *Ijma'*. There is no dispute in this domain. Today the *Ijma'* of Prohibition enacted by the Sahaabah is the Law of the Shariah. Applies. Since the age of the Sahaabah, the immorality of men and women has progressively degenerated. The prohibition thus has greater emphasis today than what it had during the age of the Sahaabah.

(12)

The moral condition of women had degenerated to such an evil level that some Shaafi' Fuqaha centuries ago had issued the fatwa to prohibit women from entering Musjidul Haraam for even the Fardh Tawaaf. Although this is not our view, we cite it to illustrate the emphasis of the ban on women attending the Musjid.

(5) According to all Four Math-habs it is no longer permissible for women to attend the Musjid or the Eidgah despite the different views. The official and authoritative view of the Four Math-habs is PROHIBITION. We have explained this issue in greater detail in our two books: \* *Women in Musajjid* \* *The Ghutha of a Ghabi* . Those who are interested, may write for copies.

(6) During the age of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasalam), Eid Salaat was Waajib for even women according to the Hanafi Math-hab. This Wujood was made *Mansookh* (abrogated) by the Sahaabah. Hence, it is not longer Waajib or Sunnat for women.

### **THE PETTIFOGGERY OF THE DUMB LADY**

Brazenly and most stupidly, the dumb aunt displays her chicanery with grossly false views which she attributes to Hadhrat Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaانvi (rahmatullah alayh). Supposedly citing from Allaamah Zafar's monumental, *I'laaus Sunan*, the stupid woman says: "*In I'laa al Sunnan (Hanafi scholar) Thufir Ahmed Thanvi from the Indo-Pak sub-continent, makes two distinctions regarding Eid salaah. Firstly, he affirms that the Eid salaah is Fard Ain from the Quranic verse 2:18.*" The dumb woman does not know even the plural of Sunnah which is *Sunan*. She says '*sunnan*'.

This is a preposterous LIE. No where in *I'laaus Sunan* does Allaamah Zafar Ahmad 'affirm' that Eid Salaat is *Fardh-e-Ain*. Her stupid 'expertise' in Arabic has enmeshed her in confusion. With regard to the *Fardh-e-Ain* contention, Allaamah Zafar Ahmad states the following:

*"Allaamah Shaukaani said: "Haadi, Qaasim and Abu Hanifah have deducted from Rasulallah'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 Ain (injunctions). (Allaamah Zafar comments: In this (claim) there is an error because, verily, Abu Hanifah did not say anything other than Wujooob (i.e. Eid Salaat is Waajib)."*

Allaamah Zafar Ahmad dismissed the *Fardh Ain* claim attributed to Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh), and he clarifies that Allaamah Shaukaani had erred in making this attribution to Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh). 100% of the Fuqaha of the Hanafi Math-hab who are all the Students of Imaam Abu Hanifah or his Students or the Students of their Students, all negate the *Fardh Ain* averment and affirm the *Wujoob* classification for Eid Salaat. AFFIRMING that Eid Salaat is Waajib, Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi says in *I'laaus Sunan pages 102/103, Vol.8, under the caption, THE WUJOOB OF THE TWO EID SALAAT*: “Allaamah Aini says in *Al-Umdah*: On the basis of Allah’s statement: ‘And, you should recite the Takbeer of Allah according to the way He has guided you..’ Eid Salaat is Waajib. It has been said that the meaning (in the aayat) is *Salaatul Eid*, and the command is for *Wujoob*.....When this narration is added to the previous narrations, the effect is unanimously *Wujoob*.....The reason for the (view of) *Wujoob* is continuity (on Eid Salaat) of *Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)* without omission as is stated in *Hidaayah*.....and also because Eid Salaat is among the *Sha-aair* of Islam, hence it is *Waajib*.....*Salaatul Eid* being *Fardh Ain* is in conflict with *Ijma*”.

Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi presents several arguments to substantiate the Hanafi position of *Wujoob*. The dumb aunt has grievously blundered in her reading of *I'laaus Sunan* or her informer has committed the blunder which he passed on to her.

(13)

Displaying her compound ignorance and her total inability of reading and understanding the *kutub* of the Akaabireen, the dumb woman blurts out the following chicanery:

“He further adds regarding the hadith of *Umm Attiyah (the name is Atiyyah, not Attiyah)*: ‘*I (Thufar Thanvi) say that in this hadith there is clear evidence that it is compulsory for Eid Salaat on the ladies and so it indicates also the compulsion on men. There is some difference of opinion however amongst the scholars who say it is mustahab. Regarding the hadith of the Sister of Abdullah ibn Rawaha RA, she narrates that the prophet SAW said: ‘The coming out is compulsory on every sane women’ – (Ahmad) {and in some narrations} ‘I mean in the two salaats of Eid’ – Tabarani} {This hadith is problematic, because of an unknown tabi’i narrator, but according to the Usool of the Hanafi’s it is totally acceptable). ‘*

*From this , he says, it is the right of ladies to go out for Eid salaat, and this is the instruction also of Qadi Iyyad (the name is Iyaad, not Iyyad) who narrates from Abu Bakr, Ali & Abdullah ibn Umar (Radiallhu Anhum Ajmaien). And abi Shaiban, who also narrates from Abu Bakr and Ali that they said: ‘It is the right of every sane lady to go out for the two Eids.’ “ We have reproduced the stupid aunt’s statement verbatim together with all the grammatical errors which renders her translation atrocious.*

Even on assumption that what the silly aunt had attributed wrongly to Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi is correct, then too it will in no way enhance the stupid lady’s *baatil* postulate pertaining to permissibility of women attending the Musjid nor to the imagined *Fardh Ain* classification drivel. From the time of Imaam Abu Hanifah

(rahmatullah alayh) to the present time, all the Hanafi Fuqaha and Ulama without exception barring Allaamah Zafar, i.e. according to the stupid aunt, unanimously averred that Eid Salaat is Waajib on ONLY men. The question of it being Fardh Ain never was the view of any of the Fuqaha of all Four Math-habs. There is no Math-hab which teaches that Eid Salaat is Fardh Ain for men, leave alone the women.

Thus if we had to assume that Allaamah Zafar Thaanvi did propound the Fardh Ain view for women and he also did contend that women have the right to attend the Musjid and Eid Salaat, then too his views will be set aside as being an aberration and a grievous error. The view of a solitary Aalim after more than thirteen centuries, which conflicts with the unanimous ruling of the Shariah, will necessarily be discounted and relegated to the realm of error. Every great Aalim slips and errs.

But the reality is that the assumption we have just made is baseless. Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi (rahmatullah alahy) did not hold the view that Eid Salaat is Fardh Ain nor did he entertain the idea of women having a right to attend Eid Salaat in this age of corruption. The imbecile lady has miserably failed to understand what is written in *I'laaus Sunan*. Either her smattering knowledge of Arabic betrayed her or some other stupid luminary misinformed her. Another possibility is that despite her having understood the text in *I'laaus Sunan* she tried her luck with her deliberate attribution of falsehood to Allaamah Zafar in the hope that no one will detect the wholesale chicanery blunders she has perpetrated.

The correct translation of Allaamah Zafar Ahmad's statement is as follows:

*"I say: In it (i.e. the Hadith of Umm Atiyyah) there is the indication on the wujoob of women emerging for the two Eid Salaat. Thus, the indication on it being Waajib for men is to a greater degree."* Having read this statement, the stupid aunt piled accolades on herself in haste without reading further. Remember that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that women are *naaqisaatul aql*, i.e. they are intellectually deficient. Due to this mental deficiency compounded by her enslavement to western liberalism, and not forgetting her origin from a crooked rib, the poor, lost aunt failed to take note of the following statement of Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi:

*"Whilst the obvious application (of the command in the Hadith) is Wujoob, it has been abrogated (made Mansookh) in so far as women are concerned on the basis of the daleel of*

(14)

*the Hadith of Umm Humaid, Umm Salmah, the statement of Aishah, Ibn Mas'ood and others as has already been mentioned."*

In her glee and elation for having discovered the first part of Allaamah Zafar Ahmad's statement pertaining to women's right, she did not bother to read further on, i.e. if she had herself read the kitaab. If she had exercised a little patience and completed the relevant section of *I'laaus Sunan* dealing with this subject, she would have understood that the *right* which Allaamah Zafar Ahmad was discussing was the *right* which women had enjoyed during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and that *right* was abrogated by the Sahaabah. This is what Allaamah Zafar Ahmad states with clarity in *I'laaus Sunan*.

Further making a fool of herself, the stupid aunt attributing another falsehood to Allaamah Zafar Ahmad, says: “*There is some difference of opinion however amongst the scholars who say it is mustahab.*” This contention of the dumb lady is baseless and false, for Allaamah Zafar Ahmad did not make this statement. What he says in *I’laaus Sunan* which the aunt with dim and dense brains did not understand, is as follows:

“*Verily, the Aimmah have differed (on the issue of) the emergence of women for the two Eids (and this difference is encapsulated) in five views.*”

He does not say that “there is some difference of opinion among the scholars who say it is mustahab”. After mentioning that there is difference of opinion on this issue, Allaamah Zafar mentions five different views. One of these views is *Mustahab*. Since the stupid lady did not understand the five different views, she quickly blurted out the drivel of there being difference of opinion among the scholars who are of the *Mustahab* view. But this palpably baseless.

The five different views mentioned by Allaamah Zafar Ahmad are: *Mustahab, Tafreqah, Jaaz Ghair Mustahab, Makrooh (i.e. Makrooh Tahrimi), the right of women*. These are the five views mentioned by Allaamah Zafar, which the imbecile woman did not understand. As far as the last view is concerned, namely, the *right* of woman, it has already been mentioned that Allaamah Zafar Ahmad has expressly clarified that this right is *Mansookh (Abrogated)*.

Regarding the *Makrooh Tahrimi* view, Allaamah Zafar Ahmad says: “*Verily, Tirmizi has narrated it from Thauri, Ibn Mubaarak, and it is (also) a statement of Imaam Maalik and Abu Yusuf. Ibn Qudaamah has narrated it from Nakh’i and Yahya Bin Saeed Ansaari. I (i.e. Allaamah Zafar Ahmad) say*” ‘*And it is this view which the Mutakh-khiroon Mashaaiikh of the Hanafiyyah have adopted because of the corruption of the times.*” This is precisely the view of Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi. He is in 100% agreement with the Fatwa of prohibition.

Elaborating the prohibition, Allaamah Zafar Ahmad states in *I’laaus Sunan*:

“At-Tahaawi said: ‘Verily, the emergence of women (from their homes) to go to the Eidgah was during the early epoch of Islam for the purpose of (displaying) the abundance of the (Muslim) population. Then afterwards it was abrogated. ... I (i.e. Allaamah Zafar Ahmad) say: ‘What Tahaawi has said is substantiated by the narration of Umm Humaid, the wife of Abi Humaid Sa’di and the *Marfoo’* (narration) of Umm Salmah: ‘The Salaat of a woman in her *bait* is better than her Salaat in her *hujrah*. Her Salaat in her *hujrah* is better than her Salaat in her house, and her Salaat in her house is better than her Salaat in the Musjid of her people.’. His (i.e. Imaam Tahaawi’s) view is also substantiated by what has been narrated from Aishah: ‘If Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had seen what the women had introduced after him, then most certainly he would have prevented them from the Musjid just as the women of Bani Israaeel were prevented.’ Narrated by Muslim.”

Continuing his summing up, Allaamah Zafar Ahmad says: “The combination of the Ahaadith indicates that initially women were ordered to attend Jamaat (Salaat) and Salaatul Eid. Then Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) exhorted them to perform Salaat in their small rooms (*buyout*). However, he did not categorically prohibit them from being present at Jamaat Salaat.. Then after Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) the Sahaabah prohibited them because of the *fasaad* (corruption) of the age as is indicated by the

statement of Aishah (radhiyallahu anha). Undoubtedly, she (Hadhrat Aishah) is greater than Umm Atiyyah. Ibn

(14)

Mas'ood used to expel women from the Musjid on Fridays. He would say (to the women): 'Get out, and go to your homes which are best for you.' He would take an oath with much emphasis that there is no better place of Salaat for a woman than her room..

Thus those who in general have adopted the view of it being Makrooh for women to emerge (and go to the Musjid) do not reject the Saheeh Ahaadith with corrupt opinion (as Shaukaani has erroneously asserted). On the contrary they have restricted the Ahaadith to the noblest age of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and with the statements of the illustrious Sahaabah (radhiyallahu anhum). It is not hidden that the prohibition applies to only women. Thus, the WujooB remains for men as usual. It is thus established that the Salaat of the two Eids and going to (perform) it is Waajib on men, and this is the objective."

This then is what Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh) says in *I'laaus Sunan*. The views which the dumb woman has attributed to Allaamah Zafar Ahmad are false and baseless. This dumb lady is unable to distinguish left from right.

The dumb woman says: "*Thanvi further states that there are many hadiths that clearly indicate that ladies were instructed to go out to witness the Eid....*" Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi and all the Hanafi Fuqaha and Ulama since the time of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) have been saying precisely this. No one was ever been in denial of the Ahaadith which instructed women to come out of their homes to be present at the venue of the Eid Salaat. The stupid, dumb aunt, either because of her natural intellectual deficiency or because of her exercise of pettifoggery, fails to understand that the relevant Ahaadith are not rejected or denied. What has been contended is the abrogation of the instruction contained in these Ahaadith, and the Fuqaha have adequately furnished the proofs for this ruling.

In another blatantly false attribution to Allaamah Zafar Ahmad, the dumb apa avers: "*Finally, Thaanvi says 'that whoever presents an opinion that it is Makrooh for the ladies to come out, such people have not been able to present a single authentic hadith or opinion of a great Sahabi to support their prohibition on the women from attending the Eid salaat. There is thus no doubt that it is very clear from this hadith and the hadith of Umm Attiyah that it is compulsory for women to attend the Eid salaat.'* (*I'laa al Sunnan: Baab Wujub Salaatul Eidan: Vol.8: 103-110*).

It is only a woman whose defective intelligence has been compounded with *kufir* who can be so audacious to inflict humiliation on herself by uttering the rubbish mentioned above. No where in *Baabu WujooBis Salaatil Eidain, from pages 103 – 110, Vol.8 of I'laaus Sunan*, is the *ghutha* (rubbish) which the dumb aunt attributes to Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi mentioned. Her ignorance as far as the Arabic language is concerned is disgracefully and disgustingly colossal. The entire abovementioned statement cited from the stupid woman's article is blatantly false. There is nothing further to comment on this

rubbish which the stupid *khala* has stated in her abortive bid to hoodwink and deceive, hoping that no one will detect her fraud and chicanery.

### **SHEIKH UTHAYMEEN'S ALLEGED INTERPRETATION**

With regard to an interpretation which the stupid apa attributes to Shaikh Uthaymeen of Saudi Arabia, she says: “*Finally we were told that our proofs regarding the Hanafi mazhab were not authentic, implying that Shk Uthaymeen’s interpretation of Imaam Abu Hanifa’s fatwa in Ash’Sharhul Munti al Zaadil Mustaqni was deficient. So we have now produced the evidence of the respected Indian Hanafi Scholar Thufir Thanvi who confirms that Eid salaah is compulsory (waajib) on both the males and females.*”

We do not have this particular kitaab which the dumb aunt has mentioned above, hence we have been unable to verify what exactly is written and attributed to Imaam Abu Hanifah

(15)

(rahmatullah alayh) by Sheikh Uthaymeen. On the assumption that the stupid apa has quoted Sheikh Uthaymeen correctly, we comment as follows:

\* Sheikh Uthaymeen was a Saudi government scholar. He is not an authority of the Hanafi Math-hab nor of the Hambali Math-hab whose Fiqh the Saudi government scholars generally follow. Uthaymeen, Bin Ba’z & Co, had fabricated their own ‘math-hab’.

\* If Uthaymeen had indeed claimed that according to Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) Eid Salaah is Waajib on woman *after its abrogation during the era of the Sahaabah*, then the Sheikh’s understanding was not only deficient, but downright stupid, just as stupid as this stupid aunt’s silly pronouncements.

\* Without any implication, we categorically reject Sheikh Uthaymeen’s palpably *baatil* interpretation and the attribution of a baseless contention to Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh).

\* No where in *I’laah Sunan* does Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Thaanvi ‘confirm that Eid salaah is compulsory (waajib) on both the males and females.’ This is a blatant LIE of which only a stupid woman with mangled brains and bereft of all vestiges of shame would venture to blurt out.

### **WHY ARE THEY FAASIQAAT AND FAAJIRAAT**

The word *faasiqah* (plural *faasiqaat*) in terms of the Shariah means a woman who flagrantly violates the Shariah. *Faajirah* (plural *faajiraat*) is an immoral woman. The concept of *immorality* differs widely according to Islam and the western cult of



