

## STATUS OF LIBRARY AUTOMATION IN PAKISTAN

Khalid Mahmood Malik

Due to its excellent efficiency, marvelous performance and sure-fire ability to handle a bulk of documents, computer is getting popularity in the field of librarianship and information services. Many of the library and information routines are efficaciously being performed by computers. Computer has proved its success in the fields of library acquisition, cataloging, classification, circulation, serials control, and information storage and retrieval activities. Many new services like SDI and current content service have been initiated with the help of computer.

Now the library automation has become a burning issue, with pros and cons, among the librarians throughout the world. We can not mention the present library literature or any conference without the reference of library automation.

The history of library automation in the world is not an old one. It dates back to 1950s and 1960s in America and Europe. In Pakistan, library automation was introduced in 1980s and a number of libraries have been computerized in or after 1987. The library literature in Pakistan does not provide much information about the current status of library automation in the country. A few articles have been published. In this regard, our alumni scholars Dr. Mumtaz Ali Anwer, Dr. Sajjad-ur-Rehman and Dr. Abdus Sattar Ch. have presented some introduction and basic guidelines for librarians to automate their libraries with special reference to Pakistan.<sup>1,2,3</sup> Mrs. Bushra Riaz, in her article, has beautifully discussed the problems faced by the library automation in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Lecturer, Dept. of Library Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

relating to the unnatural longevity and death of Miriam which apart from being contrary to the express relevant statement in the Book of Numbers runs counter to the basic Quranic teachings. One wonders how critics of both religious groups imputed that Prophet Muhammad had heard this tradition from some unnamed Jewish informant and believed it with the result that he confused the two Marys though in reality their own minds befogged with prejudice had created the confusion.

Harun) but not his sister (Ar. أخت). This is another sure proof of the fact that the Harun mentioned in the phrase بِأُخْتِ هَارُونَ was a contemporary of Maryam and Jesus but was not the prophet brother of Moses of the distant past.

### **NOTE No. 3**

In para 1 at p. 2 ante we have stated that it was the wife of the Pharaoh who rescued the baby Moses. But according to verses 5 and 6 of chapter III of Exodus, the rescuer was the daughter of the Pharaoh in question. Considering the latter as a gospel truth, the Orientalists have been charging the *Quran* for a misstatement. But a perusal of page 517 of 'Egyptian Antiquities in the Nile Valley' by father James Baikie shows that Ramses II who is now a days believed to have been the Pharaoh of Oppression and Exodus of the Israelites, had inter alia married three of his own daughters named BANT ANAT, MERITAMUN AND NEBTTUI thereby establishing veracity of the *Quranic* statement and defeating the charge of the Orientalists. It was the custom of some Pharaohs of ancient Egypt inter alia to marry their own daughters and sisters besides other women as mentioned at p. 88 of Sir Wallis Budge's *Dwellers In The Nile Valley*.

### **Note No. 4:**

It will not be out of place to mention that Prof. Lammens ruefully admitted that the editors of the qirava mashhura, or textus receptus worked under the domination of a servile scrupulousness for tradition and resisted the temptation to improve the text (of the *Quran*) or to cut out (from it) the most glaring anachronisms: e.g. the confusion between the two Marys..... The *Quranic* Vulgate has respected all this, and left everything exactly as the editors found it.' This is proof positive inter alia of the *Quranic* text having remained in its pristine purity.

### **Note No. 5**

The critical remarks of the Jewish and Christian critics have been mutually contradictory in minor details e.g. in respect of the Jewish tradition

- (17a) Richard Bell, Introduction To The *Quran*, 1953, p. 164.
- (18) Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. IX, Edinburgh, 1908, p. 146.
- (19) Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. III, Edited by Dr. Hastings Edinburgh, 1905, p. 480.
- (19a) Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol. III, London, 1903, Col. 2968.
- (20) Dictionary Of & Biblical Theology, London and Dublin, 1973, p. 60.
- (21) Sir Hall Caine, Life of Jesus, p. 1235, London, 1938.
- (22) Karl Rahner Mary Mother of the Lord published in West Germany, 1963, p. 16.
- (23) Dictionary of the Bible, John L. Mckenzie, London, 1966, pp. 551- 552.

#### Note No.1

Sir William Muir obviously blows hot and cold with the same breath. He has already agreed with Prof. Gerock that Muhammad was well aware of the time interval between Moses and Jesus and has emphasised that 'Mahmet could never imagine that mary, the mother of Juses was the sister of Moses and Aaron. Obviously there is then no question of confusion or anachronism about which this knight and scholar seeks refuge behind some other Christian authority of any description.

#### Note No. 2

By way of digression we may add that verse No. 5 of chapter I of Luke's Gospel states that Elizabeth, the wife of Zachariah was "of the daughters of Aaron." Since Mary was the first cousin of Elizabeth, we may aver that the former too was "of the daughters of Aaron" (بنات هارون) i.e. a descendant of

- (7) Encyclopaedia Britannica Vol. XIII, 1929, p. 483.
- (8) Encyclopaedia Britannica Vol. XIII 1960, p. 479.
- (9) Jewish Encyclopaedia Vol VII, London 1903, p. 559.
- (10) Palmer, E.H., Translation of The *Quran*, London, 1930, p. 45.
- (11) Arnold John M., Islam: Its History, Character and Relation to Christianity, London, 1874, pp. 148- 149.
- (12) Lammens H., Islam; Beliefs and Institutions London, 1929, pp. 38- 39.  
The original was in French which was translated into English by Sir Denison Ross.
- (13) Patai, Raphael, The Arab Mind, New Yark, 1973, pp. 70- 71.
- (14) Prof. P. K. Hitti, History of the Arabs, London, 1964, p. 125.
- (15) Rabbi Geiger, Abraham, Judaism and Islam, Weisbaden, 1933, pp. 135- 136.

Its English version was also published in Madras in 1898 and financed by the wife of the then Bombay Governor.

- (16) Prof. Dr. Walter Kaufmann, Religions In Four Dimensions New Yark, p. 164,
- (16a) Sale, George and Rev. Wherry, EM., Translation Of And Commentary On The *Quran*, London, Vol. II, 1896, pp. 14- 15.
- (17) Richard Bell, The Origin of Islam in Christian Environment, Edinburgh, 1926, p. 132.

This is the hidden secret which We have revealed to you (Muhammad).

It is high time that scholars like Prof. Montgomery Watt shed their age old prejudices which resulted from the Crusade syndrome and face hard facts and stern historical realities and refrain from un-warrantable criticism. How truly has the *Quran* affirmed in Verses 41- 42 of Surah Ha Mim AS- Sajdah (XLI) "And surely it is an unassailable scripture. Falsehood cannot come at it from before it or behind it. It is a revelation from the All- Wise the All Praiseworthy".

لَا يَأْتِيهِ الْبَاطِلُ مِنْ بَيْنِ يَدَيْهِ وَلَا مِنْ خَلْفِهِ تَنْزِيلًا مِنْ حَكِيمٍ حَمِيدٍ \*

## REFERENCES AND NOTES

- (1) Marraccio, Ludovico, Latin Translation of The *Karan* with Arabic Text And Refutations Padua, Italy 1698, pp. 435- 436.
- (2) Tisdall W. St Clair, The Sources of Islam, Edinburgh, 1911, pp. 150- 152.
- (3) Gerock C.E. Christologie des Koran, Hamburgh and Gotha, 1878, pp. 281- 282.
- (4) Muir, Sir William, The Life of Mahomet, Vol. II, London, 1878, pp 281- 282.
- (5) Prof. Montgomery Watt (i) Companion To The *Quran*, London, 1967, pp 49, 143, (ii) Islam and Christianity, London, 1983, p 63; (iii) Islamic Fundamentalism and Modernity, London and New Yark, 1988, p. 15. andir (iv) Islamic Revelation, Edindmgh, 1969.
- (6) Prof. Dr. Torrey Cutler, Jewish Foundation of Islam, N.Y, 1933, pp. 58, 70.

traditions as is clear from their very introductory titles like, "The Gospel According To St. Matthew", or , "The Gospel According To Saint Mark" etc. Moreover, in many respects they are mutually contradictory relating to same events or topics.

We have regarded the remaining issues raised by Marraccio as irrelevant and of no consequence and have, therefore, not dealt with them.

Mary was, of course, a descendant of the prophet Aaron, the brother of Moses. It is not quite correct to state that she was a descendant of Juda. Being an Aaronite, she was of Levitical origin and so the explanations of Muslim commentators are also well- founded though we have differed from them and have given straightforward proofs to rebut the criticism of the Christians and Jews.

Before we conclude we must state that though *Miriam*, the sister of Moses has not been mentioned directly by name in the *Quran*, even once (compare verses 4- 7 of Exodus II), she is reported in Verse No. 11 of Surah Al Qasas (XXVIII) as "his sister" أَخِيهِ and "Your sister" أُخْتِكَ in verse No. 40 of surah TA- Ha (XX), both revealed at Macca. These verses relate that at the instance of her mother she (*Miriam*) kept a watch on the ark of bulrushes as it floated down the river Nile to the palace of the Pharaoh and later she suggested to the queen (who had indeed been the Pharaoh's daughter) that she could procure a wet nurse to suckle the baby Moses. There can be no denying the fact that Moses was brought up in the Pharaoh's palace (Verses 18- 19 of Ash-Shura , XXVI) and the said Pharaoh who was a contemporary of Moses and also of *Miriam*, indubitably lived many centuries earlier than Maryam and her son Jesus Christ. There could thus be no question whatsoever of any confusion or mistake in the *Quran* with regard to: (i) chronology and (ii) identities of the two Marys i. e *Miriam* and Maryam. One wonders why Rabbi Geiger and others of his ilk turned a blind eye to these facts related in the *Quran* and rushed to make unwarranted and baseless allegations against the *Quran* and Muhammad (P. B U. H.), the Prophet of the Universal Religion Al- Islam to whom the Omniscient Allah revealed all that is recorded in the *Quran*. By way of illustration we quote here verse No. 44 of Surah Ale- Imran, III in this behalf:

ذَلِكَ مِنْ أَنْبَاءِ الْغَيْبِ نُوحِيهِ إِلَيْكَ \*

38) give the genealogies of Jesus Christ expressly through his so-called legal father, Joseph, which have been adjudged by Christian authorities as irreconcilable, mutually contradictory, incomplete etc. etc. Again the Gospels of Matthew (XIII, 55- 56) and Mark (VI, 3 and III, 31 - 32) speak of the brothers and sister of the lord Jesus, but none of the Christian scholars have to this day been able to establish for certain whether they were the real children of the Virgin Mary born after her first born, Jesus Christ, or were her step children. The Virgin is moreover, reported to have had a sister also named Mary but Christian scholars are divided as to her identity though some (e.g. St. John XIX, 25) have named her as Mary Cleophas. If Maryam had a sister from sterile parents why could not she have a brother named Harun as mentioned in the *Quran*. The worst is that even the genealogy of Mary is not known for certain. For instance, at p. 380, Westminster Dictionary of The Bible has suggested that Luke (III, 23 - 38) gives the genealogy of Jesus Christ through his Virgin mother Mary, his only earthly parent in which case Mary's father is supposed to have been Heli or Eli. All these facts about the Christian Canonical Gospels constitute standing dilemmas which could not be resolved even by a task force of four eminent scholars named Brown, Donfried, Fitzmyer, and Reumann in their book 'Mary In the New Testament' published in London in 1978.'

### 13. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of irrefutable corroborative evidence, we hope, we have proved that the criticism of our learned Jewish and Christian scholars on the subject is groundless on all counts. They mainly suggested unreliability of the *Quranic* statements in this behalf and some blandly suggested that the *Quran* is not a revealed book, but is the work of *Muhammad* who was tutored by an unnamed Jewish teacher. They have, of course, miserably failed in their designs and have only exposed the undefendable unreliability of their own gospels which unlike the *Quran* were the works of human authors, because they lost their respective original revealed books or altered some of the texts. In fact the Canonical Christian gospels are at best comparable only to the Muslim books of



and suppositions that Gospel traditions were delivered to him (Muhammad) by his Jewish teacher lack any basis. He has failed to name the supposed "Jewish teacher". Moreover, all Jews being notorious enemies and calumniators of Maryam and Jesus Christ would never teach Muhammad (P.B.U.H.) to shower high praises on them with which the *Quran* abounds. Such superlative eulogies of Maryam are not found in any of the Christian canonical gospels! The possibility of any Jewish or Christian informant or mentor of Muhammad is thus completely ruled out.

There was moreover, no indigenous pre-Islamic tradition in this behalf which could be drawn upon by Muhammad (P.B.U.H.) otherwise Prof. Montgomery Watt would no doubt have quoted it chapter and verse instead of making vague and unfounded sweeping remarks in this behalf suggesting the currency of errors relating to Imran and Harun being names of the father and brother of Maryam "which the *Quran* did not find it necessary to correct". If any of the canonical Christian Bibles had given their correct and historical names, the Christian world would then have a sure criterion to adjudge the accuracy of the *Quran* in this respect.

As for Dr. Torrey, his suppositions and conjectures are obviously unfounded. He does not seem to have cared even to know that Surah Maryam was revealed to the unlettered Prophet Muhammad (P.B.U.H.) at Mecca in the fifth year of his advent as Prophet when there is known to have been no Jewish teacher there to deliver to him the supposed "Gospel Tradition"! He has, moreover, not read in the *Quran* clear proofs of the long interval between the eras of Moses and Jesus!

## 12. DILEMMAS RELATING TO MARY AND JESUS CHRIST

It is a great pity that Christian Gospels have been conspicuous by their complete silence about the parentage and other essential details about the life of Maryam and Jesus Christ. Not only that; Mathew (I, 1- 16) and Luke (III, 23-

some other as his correct name, that could provide a ground for some doubt. But Sir Hall Caine at page-1235 of his *Life of Jesus*<sup>21</sup> has asserted; "Of Mary we know little from Scripture. We do not know who she was, who her parents were, where she was born, or to what condition of life she belonged".

Again Karl Rahner has positively stated at page-16 of his *Mary, Mother of The Lord*,<sup>22</sup> " We do not know the names of Mary's father and mother". This is reaffirmed at pp.551-552 of the *Dictionary of the Bible* by John L. Mckenzie<sup>23</sup> who states:

"The names of her (Mary's) parents are not mentioned in the New Testament". He adds "The positive reticence of the primitive preaching not only about Mary, but also about the entire life of Jesus and their village connections seems to suggest a movement against any such attempt to make kinship the basis of special claim. A by-product of this reticence is our total lack of genuine information concerning the life and person of Mary". Sir William Muir has given Joachim and Anna as the traditional names of her parents but one is at a loss to understand why a scholar of his standing failed to mention that these names were drawn from an apocryphal gospel having no historical value in the Christian World. If the Christian World could prove what the correct name of Mary's father was and it happened to be different, then one could think that the name of her father as given in the *Quran* might be incorrect. This argument applies *mutatis mutandis* to her brother's name i.e., Harun as mentioned in the *Quran*. One would have expected a critic of the standing of Prof. Montgomery Watt to have given concrete and convincing evidence to support his contention regarding the possibility of confusion in the mind of the Arabs of Medina or of the chance of "a misconception current among the Arabs". Like George Sale he too has concluded that the explanation of Muslim commentators that Maryam was of levitical descent and as such an Aaronite is also valid. The Prof. naively but groundlessly by suggested that the Arabs of Mecca of the Islamic days for whom the message of the *Quran* was intended had erroneous notions about Biblical chronology as illustrated by the phrase "sister of Aaron". We have given adequate grounds to establish verity of the names of Mary's brother and father being "Harun" (Heb. Aaron) and "Imran" (Heb. Amram). Dr. Torrey's conjectures

But Verse No.28 of Surah Maryam read carefully would lead any impartial and fair-minded reader to the conclusion that in this Verse the Harun was a well-known contemporary of the Jews who obviously calumniated Maryam, the Virgin, having given birth to her child (Jesus) whom they regarded as an illegitimate child born as a result of illicit sexual relationship with a soldier named Pandera or Stada as indicated in Col.2968 of Encyclopaedia Biblica-III.<sup>19a</sup> This gross calumny relating to adultery is referred to as **بُهْتَانًا عَظِيمًا** in Verse No.156 of Surah An-Nisa (IV). Of course, no Jews would calumniate their own haloed *Miriam*, the prophetess who, of course, did not and could not give birth to Jesus. This is another proof that the Quran regarded the two Marys as separate famous ladies whose qualities of head and heart, of character and nature, and whose accomplishment were also quite different. The *Quran* has not described *Maryam* as prophetess while *Miriam* was a prophetess according to the Torah. Rev. Marraccio's statement that Mary was the only child of sterile parents who did not or could not have any more children is quite untenable in the face of the facts that :

(i) Abraham and Sarah were both sterile but initially Abraham was blessed not only with Ismail by Hagar (Hajra) and had later Isaac by Sarah, but also had children by Katurah as borne out by the Old Testament, and (ii) Zachariah and Elizabeth were similarly sterile but the prayer of the former for a successor was answered with the birth of John the Baptist. After all, Mary was also born of sterile parents. There is thus no ground to believe that they could not be blessed with a son who would be a real brother of Mary. Even if we suppose that there is some truth in the statement of the Rev. Father, one can assert that Mary had a male relative who would be covered by the broad definition of 'brother' and that being so, he would have been given the name of Harun in accordance with the prevailing custom. This Harun as we have already proved was, of course, not the Prophet Harun, the brother of *Miriam* and Moses and could under no circumstances be confused with the latter by the *Quran*.

As for the name of the father of Maryam (Mary), there is no reason to suppose that there was any confusion whatsoever in this behalf as has been suggested by Prof. Montgomery Watt. If any of the Christian Gospels had given