

is to make and to ask the Prophet to recite (repeat) the verse of the Qur'an when those are revealed to Him.

42. 'Leg' is not the appropriate translation for the Arabic word 'sāq' as done in 79:29. Its proper equivalent in English is 'shank.' In 68:42 Yusuf ^cAli himself has translated this word with 'shin'. However 'shank' is more appropriate as both in 68:42 and here in 75:29 an Arabic phrase has been used. The agony overtaking a person when about to die has been described in this verse. Hence the first sentence of footnote 5825 (when the soul has departed... rites preliminary to the burial) is wholly superfluous and irrelevant.

43. 'Will not the unbelievers have been paid back for what they did' is a very clumsy translation of 83:36; incorrect in fact. It should be 'Have not the unbelievers been paid back for what they did' or 'Lo and behold! the unbelievers are being paid back for what they did.'

44. The translation of 93:11 is 'but the Bounty of thy Lord-- Rehearse and proclaim.' The words 'but' and 'rehearse' here are wholly superfluous.

45. 101:10 has been incorrectly translated as 'And what will explain to these what this is?' Its simple translation is 'knowest thou what it is?' (Letter 'T' in the word 'Thee' is unnecessarily a capital one).

46. 'Companions of the Elephants' in 105:1 is incorrect. It should be 'people of the elephants' or 'masters of the elephants.'

1. Publisher's note to the first revised edition, January 1989.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Ibid.*

be observed if a female is to travel extensively. Therefore 'Who travel (for faith)' should necessarily be dropped.

36. The word '*sujūd*' in 68:42 and 43 has been translated as 'bow in adoration', whereas 'prostration' is the right translation for '*sajdah*' which is distinctly different from bowing. Then the word '*sālīmūn*' in 68:43 has been translated with "whole" ('while they were whole') which makes little sense. What is meant here is 'while they were hale and healthy' or 'while they were in good shape.'

37. The opening words in 72:23 have been translated as 'Unless I proclaim what I receive from Allah.' This is incorrect. It should be 'Mine is only to convey what I receive from Allah...'

38. 'With ordinary duties' as translation for '*sabhan ṭawīla*' in 73:7 is inappropriate. It should be 'manifold engagements.' Accordingly, at two places in the footnote no.5759, 'ordinary' is to be replaced with 'manifold.'

39. The word 'magnify' ('And thy Lord thou magnify') in 74:3 is very inappropriate. It is absurd to say that Allah can be magnified. It should be replaced with 'glorify,' or it should be translated as 'and proclaim the greatness of thy Lord.'

40. 75:40-41 has been translated as '(They will be) in Garden (of Delight) they will question each other, and ask of the sinners.' The latter part 'they will question each other,' is quite erroneous. This is not at all what the Arabic text means. the correct translation would be 'They will be in the Garden (of Delight) and will ask the sinners.'

41. The Arabic word '*Qur'ānahu*' has been translated with 'promulgate' in 75:17 & 18. The translation is quite wrong and does in no way conform with the context. What is meant here

in it for which 'imprudence' (or even indiscretion in any degree) can be attributed to 'Ā'isha.

Another gross error in this footnote is that the Prophet is stated to have 'renounced the society of his wives' because of the incident referred to in 24:11. This is totally incorrect. The incident of the Prophet deciding to withdraw from the society of his consorts (temporarily for a month) is covered in 62:4-5 and has nothing to do with 24:11 as stated here by 'Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali. It is highly surprising that the learned reviewers have allowed this disrespectful expression about 'Ā'isha and the incorrect reference to 24:11 to stand.

34. The later part of the translation to 66:3 i.e. '...he confirmed part thereof and repudiated a part...' is quite erroneous. The correct translation would be 'and he confronted her with part thereof and held back a part...' Earlier in the verse in place of 'a matter of confidence,' 'a matter in confidence' would be appropriate.

35. In 66:5 '*sā'ihār*' has been translated as 'Who travel (for faith) and fast.' Here 'Who travel (for faith)' is sense-fluous. The Arabic word '*sā'ihār*' does, of course, also mean 'who travel,' just as it means 'who fast,' but in the context of this verse, which lays down some attributes of the Prophet's (would be) wives, 'who travel' is not at all intended because none of the wives of the Prophet was given to travelling (for faith). Correct translation would be 'Who are given to fasting.'

It should be of interest here to know that some 'modernists' rely on this translation to claim that Islam does not enjoin *hijāb* nor is there the condition of *maḥram* to accompany a female while she travels because travelling (for faith) has been mentioned in the Qur'an as an appreciable quality in a Muslim woman and these conditions (*hijāb* and *maḥram*) cannot easily

32. The Words '*fa-law la tuṣaddiqūn*' in 56:57 have been translated as 'why will ye not witness the Truth.' The translation is wholly wrong (and there is no occasion for the use of capital 'T' in 'Truth'). Allah, here, by first asserting 'It is We Who have created you' is not calling upon people to 'witness' a truth but to 'stand witness to a truth.' The proper translation would be 'then why do ye not testify to this truth.'

33. The translation of the first part of 66:2 is 'Allah has already ordained for you, (O men) the dissolution of your oaths in some cases.' This is quite clumsy. The word 'already' should be within brackets as there is no word for it in the text although it is a good addition because the reference here is to a procedure already laid down in 5:89. Then the use of the word 'ordained' is not quite proper. Allah has not 'ordained' but has laid down or prescribed the method (in 5:89) of absolution from oaths wrongfully taken. 'O men' (within brackets) is also improper. It should be 'O Muslims' because the address is to Muslim men and women both and not to men alone. 'Dissolution of oath' is not a proper expression. It should be 'absolution from oaths.' Then 'in some cases' is wholly superfluous. The method prescribed in 5:89 is for all cases and not for 'some cases' only. The proper translation would be 'Allah has (already) prescribed for you (O Muslims) method for absolution from your oaths.'

I must add that footnote No.5529 (under 66:1) which has been revised by the learned reviewers contains a highly objectionable expression relating to Sayyidah ʿĀ'isha. The footnote reads 'The imprudence of ʿA'isha [see no.2962 to 24:11] once caused serious difficulties... and he [the Prophet] renounced the society of his wives for some time. This renunciation seems to be referred to here.' The expression 'imprudence' is *per se* highly disrespectful to Sayyidah ʿĀ'isha. Moreover the incident (the *Ifk* incident as it is commonly known) referred to in 24:11 does not have anything

26. The first word in line 4 of 27:66 is printed as 'thereanent' in place of 'Thereat'. It is so in the old edition also.
27. The translation in the first three lines of verse 30:39 is confusing. In fact it makes little sense. More particularly it does not fit in with the revised footnote No. 3552 which says: 'according to commentators the verse specially applies to those who give to others, whether gifts or services in order to receive from them greater benefits in return...' The translation 'that which ye increase through the property of (other) people...' is contradictory to the footnote. The translation refers to 'the property of *other* people' whereas according to the footnote it refers to one's own property given to others whether as 'gifts or services.'
28. 'And those who stir up sedition in the city' in 33:60 is not an appropriate translation of '*wa'l-murjifūna fi'l-Madīna*'. The correct translation would be 'and those who spread false (or 'slandorous') rumours in the city.' Sedition is a technical term related exclusively to acts directed against a government, to rise against or disobey the authority of a government. This is not what is meant in this verse. Arabic word '*murjifūna*' simply and plainly means 'those who spread false rumours' while 'sedition.' is distinctly different from it.
29. Translating '*inda Rabbihim*' with 'before their Lord' in 42:22 (line 10) is incorrect. It should be 'from their Lord.'
30. 'Provoked Us' as translation for '*āsafūna*' in 43:55 is improper because 'provoked' has an element of 'loss of control' in it whereas here Allah is speaking about Himself. To attribute loss of control to Allah is quite improper. 'Angered Us' will be appropriate here.
31. The Arabic word '*nufā*' in 53:46 has been translated with 'seed.' It should better be 'sperm drop.'

22. In 17:32 the word '*al-zina*' has been translated with 'adultery.' This is not satisfactory. In the English language there are two separate words for unlawful sex. The word 'adultery' is for illegal sex by a married person. For illegal sex by an unmarried person the word is 'fornication.' But in Arabic language the word '*zina*' covers both adultery and fornication and while rendering it into English the context in which the word appears will have to be taken into consideration. Hence the correct translation here would either be 'nor come nigh to adultery and fornication' (as properly done in 24:3) or 'nor come nigh to unlawful sex.'

Similarly in the translation of 24:2 'the woman and the man guilty of adultery or fornication--flog each one of them...' the addition of the word 'adultery' is quite wrong because the punishment of flogging with one hundred stripes in this verse is only for fornication and not for adultery. In case one of the parties to illegal sex is married and the other an unmarried one, the married one will be put to death and the unmarried one will receive one hundred lashes. This is the definitive position in the Islamic law. Although the learned gentlemen who have revised the edition have somewhat modified the relevant footnote No. 2954 (which I find quite unsatisfactory) they have not deleted the word 'adultery' in the translation which should necessarily have been done being quite misplaced here as the verse does not at all relate to adultery.

23. 'Did not Allah check' in the translation of 22:40 is wrong. It should be 'Had not Allah checked.'

24. 'To and fro' in the translation of 23:75 (last line) is wrong. The correct idiom here will be 'hither and thither.'

25. The word 'Misbelievers' in the last line of 25:26 and in line 4 of 25:55 (is perhaps misprinted. At both places it should be 'Disbelievers' or 'Unbelievers.'

word '*Zakat*' was retained and its special meaning elucidated in the footnote.

17. The Arabic word '*li-yuzhirahu*' in 9:33 and 48:28 has been translated with 'to proclaim' ('to proclaim it over all religions.') This makes little sense. It should be 'to prevail over all religions.'

18. It is 'when the unbelievers drove him out...' in 9:40. To translate '*akhrajahu*' with 'drove him out' is not wrong literally but it is disrespectful to the Prophet to whom it relates here. It could well have been 'made him leave' or 'forced him to leave.'

19. In 10:3, instead of 'Receive admonition,' it should be 'Then be of the warned.'

20. In 11:72 '*inna hadha la shay'un 'ajīb*' has been translated as 'that would indeed be a wonderful thing.' The use of the word 'wonderful' is incorrect. According to the narration in the Qur'an these words were spoken by Sarah, the wife of prophet Abraham, when two angels gave her the tiding that God was going to bless her with a son, Isaac. She was surprised to hear this as she was too old (*'ajūz*) then and long past the age of conceiving. It was her feeling of great surprise that she then gave vent to through these words. Had it been an expression of great happiness over the tiding the translation would have been correct but she was expressing not her happiness but her surprise as is evident by the remark of angels contained in the next following verse. The correct translation would be 'That would indeed be very strange.'

21. The translation 'nor would We visit with Our wrath' in 17:15 is very poor; clumsy in fact. It should be 'nor would We make Our wrath visit.'

13. Verse 4:34 has been translated as 'Men are protectors and maintainers of women.' This is not wholly proper because this and the next verse (4:35) specifically deal with the relationship between husbands and wives and not with men and women generally. The position of '*qawwām*' as mentioned in this verse is not enjoyed by men over women in general, for example a father is not the '*qawwām*' over his daughter but a guardian, or so a brother to his sister. It is only a husband who is conferred with the status of '*qawwām*' over the wife. The Arabic word '*rajul* and '*nisā'* mean man and woman as well as husband and wife. While translating, the context in which these words appear must be kept in mind. The next following verse (4:35) speaks of refusing 'to share their bed' which manifestly refers to husbands and to none else.

14. '*Wa in tuṣliḥū*' in 4:129 has been translated as 'if you come to a friendly understanding.' This is incorrect. It should be 'if you mend your ways' or 'if you make amends.'

15. The words 'and took the aggressive' in verse 9:13 in the revised as well as in the original edition are obviously misprinted in place of 'and took to aggression.'

16. At all places (2:43-110-177-277; 4:162, 5:55; 22:78; 24:56 etc) the word *Zakat* has been translated with 'charity', appended with the word 'regular' at most places, which is not incorrect as in all these places the word '*Zakat*' is used for charity only. Similarly the word '*ṣadaqa*' in 2:263-264-271-276; 9:103; 57:18 etc has also been translated as 'charity' But the same word '*ṣadaqa*' in 9:60 has been translated as 'alms' whereas in 9:60 the word unquestionably refers to '*Zakat*' which is commonly understood as compulsory 'poor due' at a specified rate to be spent on one or more specified heads as given in 9:60. The distinction should have been made clear in the footnote. Surprisingly, although footnote no.1320 has been revised, this distinction has not been brought out. This is an important omission. It would have been proper in 9:60 the

The Arabic word *yamḥaq* in 2:276 has been translated with, 'deprive of all blessings'. It is incorrect. It should be 'deprive of all growth.'

9. Translation of verse 3:46 is 'he shall speak to the people in childhood and maturity...' (also in 5:110). There is no reason to translate *fi'l-mahd* with 'childhood' and avoid 'cradle' which is the exact equivalent of *mahd*. All the more so when the verse contains a *bishāra* (advance tiding) of one of the miracles to emanate from Prophet Christ in the future and which came true as mentioned in 19:29 where the same word *mahd* has been rightly translated with 'cradle.'

Even if *mahd* is to be taken figuratively, 'childhood' is improper. The proper word would be 'infancy.'

10. In the translation of the verses 3:49 and 5:110, the words 'as it were' are wholly superfluous because these words would mean that whatever is stated is just figuratively speaking; 'so to say' in other words, whereas what is stated therein relates to a definite miracle performed by Christ under special powers conferred on him by God. Moreover, from *و إذ تخلق* onwards upto *نخرج الموتى بإذنى* in 5:110, the translation is in the present tense ('makest,' 'breasthest,' 'healest,' 'bringest forth,') which makes it quite contrary to the text and context. In fact, the whole of 5:110 is in the past tense. Therefore it should be 'didst make,' 'didst breathe,' 'didst heal,' 'didst bring forth.'

11. The word 'Him' at two places in 3:143 is wrong. At both places it should be 'it.'

12. 'You are members, one of another' in 3:195 is improper. It should either be 'you are from one another' or 'you all are offsprings of one another.'

them from marrying persons of their choice'. The word 'persons' here will include 'former husbands'.

7. Verse 2:241 has been translated as 'for divorced woman maintenance (should be provided) on a reasonable scale...' Translating *matāʿ* (متاع) as 'maintenance' is improper because the English word 'maintenance' has well-understood connotations of a regular amount to be paid at fixed intervals. This is not meant by *matāʿ*. It may be stated that relying on this erroneous translation by Yusuf Ali the Supreme Court of India gave the verdict (in the famous Shah Bano case on 23 April 1985) that the Qur'an enjoins upon the divorcing Muslim husband to continue to pay some amount regularly to the divorced wife for the remainder of her life or till she remarries. It is also to be noted that at many other places e.g. in 2:234, 3:197, 4:77, 9:38, 10:70, 16:117 and 80:32 Yusuf Ali has translated this (word and its variants) variously i.e., gift, possession, enjoyment etc. and it is only in 2:240 and 2:241 that he has translated it as 'maintenance.' It may be acceptable in 2:240 but not in 2:241 where it should be translated as 'for divorced women [a one-time] provision (should be paid) on a reasonable scale.'

8. In verses 2:275, 2:276, 2:278, 3:310 and 4:161 the word *riba* has been translated as 'usury.' In English language 'usury' relates to lending money on high and exorbitant rate of interest. Adopting 'usury' to translate 'riba' would mean that what is forbidden in Islam is charging high rate of interest and not a reasonable or moderate rate of interest whereas Islam prohibits interest *per se* irrespective of its rate being high or low. Hence in all the relevant verses and in footnotes 324 and 450 the word 'usury' has to be replaced with 'interest.' Surprisingly the footnote 324 has been revised but the word 'usury' has been retained.

5. The first part of verse 2:231 has been translated as 'when ye divorce women and they fulfil the term (of their *'iddat*), either take them back on equitable terms or set them free on equitable terms, but do not take them back to injure them (or) to take undue advantage....' This translation is quite erroneous. Once divorced women fulfill the term (of *'iddat*) they go out of wedlock and there remains no scope for their former husbands, to 'take them back' as stated. This verse, in fact, relates to the situation when the term of *'iddat* has not yet been completed and the divorce is still revocable (رجعی). Therefore the correct translation would be 'when you divorce women and they are about to fulfil the term of their *'iddat* either retain them (فامساک)... or let them go... but do not retain them to injure them.'

Arabic words *fabalaghna ajalahunna* can be translated as completion of the (appointed) term also as rightly done by Yusuf Ali in 2:232 and 2:234. But in 2:231 according to the context, it means 'about to fulfil.' The context cannot be ignored while translating words which are capable of giving more than one meaning. (The same mistake has been committed in translating the verse 65:2). 'Take them back' would be an appropriate translation of *raddihinna* as done in 2:228, but not here in 2:231.

6. In 2:232 the translation 'do not prevent them from marrying their (former) husbands...' is not quite proper. The verse does not relate only to 'former husband'. It is true that according to some Traditions this verse was revealed to bail out a lady Companion of the Prophet from a particular situation but the directive given in this verse to the people of a divorced wife's family members not to oppose her taking a second husband of her choice is a general one and does not limit itself to former husbands only. The law concerning marriage with a former husband after an irrevocable divorce is contained in verse 2:230. Proper translation of 2:232 would be 'do not prevent

adopt some one's colour', 'to show one's true colours', 'stick to one's colour' etc.

3. Translation of *Manāfi*^c and *naḥ'ahuma* as 'profit' in 2:219 is improper. 'Profit' is commonly related to monetary and business transactions. In place of 'profit' it should be 'benefit.'

4. Words '*fa imsāk ... bi iḥsān*' in 2:229 have been translated as 'then the parties should either hold together on equitable terms or separate in kindness.' This is a wholly incorrect translation. The verse is addressed specifically to divorcing husbands as is abundantly clear by the first word '*at-ṭalāq*'. According to Islamic law it is the husband only who can give divorce while separation at the instance of wife is known as *khul'*.

This verse contains a directive for the divorcing husbands only and not to both the spouses as the word 'parties' suggests. This becomes further clear when we look at the next immediate part of the verse which says (in Yusuf Ali's own words) : "It is not lawful for you (men) to take back any of your gifts (from your wives)." It is thus quite clear that the verse is addressed to a husband who has divorced his wife for the second time and the divorce is still revocable.

Further, the words *fa-imsāk* and *tasrīḥ* have been quite incorrectly translated as 'hold together' and 'separate'. The correct translation would be 'retain' and 'let go' respectively.

The opening words of this verse (2:229) '*At-ṭalāqu marraṭān*' have been translated as 'A divorce is only permissible twice.' The translation is clumsy. The first word 'A' is quite superfluous and the word 'only' is not at the proper place. It should come after 'permissible' and not precede it as has been done.

Thānwi and Mawlāna Abul A'la Maudūdi, all of whom enjoyed a high degree of proficiency in Arabic language and could go to the original sources of the relevant classical literature, something which cannot be said with equal degree of certainty about those who have translated the Qur'an into English. (Mawlana 'Abdul Mājid Daryābādi being the lone exception to some extent).

EXAMPLES:

1. In verses 2:136, 2:140 and 4:163 the word *asbāṭ* has been translated as 'the Tribes.' The letter 'T' in Tribe is capital as also in footnote No. 135 to this verse. 'Tribes' has been mentioned as a separate group besides the four prophets i.e., Abraham, Ismail, Isaac and Jacob named preceding it. But the footnote is silent as to what is meant by 'Tribes' which appears to refer to a particular group because while translating the word *Shu'ūb* in verse 49:13 with the word 'tribe' capital 'T' has not been employed. In any event the word 'asbat' means descendents, as has been translated by all the scholars who have translated the Qur'an into Urdu. Moreover, all of them have related the word to Prophet Jacob to say 'Jacob and his descendants' (or 'children.' as done by Sher Ali). But Yusuf Ali has translated it as a separate and independent group without relating it to Prophet Jacob.

2. Verse 2:138 has been translated as '(our religion is) the Baptism of Allah; and who can baptise better than Allah...' The Arabic word *ṣibgha* appearing (twice) in the verse has been translated as 'Baptism' with a capital 'B.' As is well known, the English word 'baptism' has a definite connotation, that of ceremoniously admitting a person to the membership of the Christian Church. By usage, figuratively, it has also come to mean first experience of a new kind of life. Taken in either sense the translation appears to be improper. There is no reason why the straight translation with the word 'colour' be avoided, all the more so as the English word 'colour' is used in idioms also in the same sense as covered by the verse, e.g. 'to

Another admission that I have to make is that I have not gone through the translation of the text word to word to check its correctness or suitability. It was, in fact, when at different times I had to, for one purpose the other, look into the English translation of a particular *aya* (verse) that I turned to Abdullah Yusuf Ali's work (side by side with Pickthall, Arberry and Sher Ali, the last named being a Qāḍiāni) and marked the places that struck to me as rather odd and made a study of those places at different times later. All these notes had been taken from the original edition. Later when the revised edition came out I obtained a copy of it and checked it with the original to find it identical with the original edition at all such places. Later as I occasionally looked into the revised edition I again came across some places which struck me as odd and on checking with the original edition found that the translation in both editions at those places is the same. That is why I have stated that the learned scholars who have revised the work appear to have paid little attention to the translation of the text. The word 'God' in the original edition has, however, in all places been replaced with 'Allah' in the revised edition.

Same with regard to the footnotes also. I have looked into very few, in fact mostly into those which were connected with the translation of the text which I had marked for scrutiny.

What I have found is that at some places the translation is manifestly erroneous, heavily distorting the real intent of the verse of the Qur'an; at some places it is quite confusing and involved, not carrying the true import of the text, at some places it lacks clarity; inelegant at some places and at places, very surprisingly, even English idioms have been incorrectly used. I am detailing below some of the eighty odd such instances with brief comments where necessary.

The checking done by me is primarily with the Urdu translation of the Qur'an by Shāh 'Abdul Qādir, Shāh Rafī'uddīn, Mawlāna Maḥmūdul Ḥasan, Mawlāna Aḥraf 'Alī

In the Preface to the 'new revised edition' it is said that 'there nevertheless has long been a need for a revised new edition... Revisions have been made in both the contents and form of the original work... In the translation, the *Sūrah* introductions, and the commentaries, such changes are relatively few and infrequent... The explanatory footnotes and the appendices, however, were subjected to more frequent and occasionally more substantial changes than those in the translation and the commentaries.'

However, while admitting that I have not made a word to word comparison of the translation of the text with the original and the revised version, I have noted that in all those about 80 places where I feel that the translation is erroneous or lacks clarity or is inelegant --- a few of those I am going to detail below --- there is no difference between the original and the revised edition. It appears, and I say this with all due respect to the learned members of the committees who worked on the job and to late Ismail Faruqi of revered memory, that due attention has not been paid to the translation of the text and the learned reviewers appear to have mainly concentrated on explanatory footnotes. (Interestingly, however, while the IIIT is continuing its programme of wide free distribution of the revised version of Abdullah Yusuf Ali's English translation of the Qur'an, in its own other publications the IIIT is using the same translation with modifications. For example, in its series of 'Occasional Papers' the preface to Paper No.3 'The Qur'an and the Sunnah: The Time-space Factor' says, 'the translation of the Qur'an used in this series is that of Yusuf Ali (Amana Corporation, revised ed. 1989). However, we made changes in it whenever we deemed it necessary for the sake of elucidation and precision of meaning.' Accordingly in verse 25:32, for example, the words 'Thus (it is revealed) that' in the revised edition have been replaced with 'it is revealed in this manner that' and 'Had it been Our will' in verse 50:52 have been changed to 'If We so wished' and the word 'serve' in 51:56 has been changed to 'worship').

Qur'an / translations

Some errors in Abdullah Yusuf Ali's English translation of the Holy Qur'an

By Sayyid Ameenul Hasan Rizvi

In 1934 came out from Lahore the first edition of late Abdullah Yusuf Ali's English translation of the Holy Qur'an with the title *Holy Qur'an - Text, Translation and Commentary*. It was an instant success. Earlier it had been appearing in parts, one part every three months.

About twenty years ago, after the government of Saudi Arabia gave clearance to it, a few institutions in Saudi Arabia took to the free distribution of Abdullah Yusuf Ali's translation of the Qur'an in a big way which made it reach far and wide in thousands upon thousands of copies to now make it, perhaps, the most widely-read English translation of the Qur'an.

For several years, this translation of the Qur'an continued to be printed and distributed exactly as it had been originally printed in 1934. It was in 1980 that the Amana Corporation (Brentwood, Maryland, USA) decided to adopt an English translation of the Qur'an for wide distribution. The Corporation set up a committee of 'highly reputable Muslim Scholars'¹ to make a selection out of the existing 'most recognised and authentic available English translation of the meaning of the Qur'an'². The Committee decided on the work of Abdullah Yusuf Ali. Later more than one committees 'examined the text meticulously, updated the material and refined the commentaries.'³ The last complete review was undertaken by late Ismail Raji al-Faruqi who was then the president of the International Institute of Islamic Thought (IIIT), USA. It is in cooperation with the IIIT that the Amana Corporation has published the revised edition.