

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

Dr. Anna Afreen

Lecturer of Islamic Studies

RLAK, Home Economics Govt. Girls College, Karachi.

Abstract:

Fazlur Rahman is certain that a fundamental and methodical redirection of modern Muslim thought is necessary if Islam is to be revived and Muslim society is to become a dynamic, prolific strength competent of determining its own future again. He desired to enlighten philosophy, and was keen that Muslims should realize how the modern nation-state comprehends law, and conflicting ethics; his vision as the sharia was a combination of ethics and law together. He was critical of historical Muslim theologians and philosophers for leading to deterioration and failing to generate a moral and ethical worldview founded on the principles resulting from the Quran: 'moral values', contrasting socioeconomic values, 'are not worn out at any time in history' but needed continual interpretation.

.....

Fazlur Rahman was a Muslim thinker who considered philosophy on his own stipulations. He plainly articulated his religious belief in his study of the philosophical institution of Islam. Rahman's philosophy, nevertheless, comprises belief dedication; thus there is no obvious division among his philosophical analysis and his religious convictions. At this point rests the most important part of his insight of the temperament of Islamic philosophy. Hence, Rahman's definition of Islamic philosophy is typified by a method which is not purely rational, but more significantly, is based on realistic evidence. In short, Rahman's philosophy is a moral and realistic philosophy developed upon from his comprehension of the Quran.

Rahman was deported by force from his native soil, Pakistan, where he was part of a working group which wanted to interpret Islam for the young modern state. However, Pakistan was carved in the name of Islam, thus Pakistan was supposed to be an Islamic State where people could live lives truly guided by and representing Quranic values and where the traditional social complex as a whole would be modernized. This objective could not

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

be achieved until the idea of modernization was comprehended and acknowledged by the orthodox Ulama or some influential intelligent human resources and through them reached to the laymen.

The situation we have envisaged requires an enlightened class of religious leaders. We must repeat that our present religious leadership is unable to fulfil this function by any stretch of imagination. The intolerable insufficiency and out-modedness of their curriculum must necessarily condemn them to this position.(1)

Like Sir Sayyed, Fazlur Rahman condemns the backward attitude of Ulama towards modern civilization. Moreover, he criticizes competently the double standards of Ulama towards the acknowledgment of modern machineries simultaneously with denial of modernity in its other aspects.

So far as the learning of scientific techniques and importation of technological progress were concerned, not much opposition was experienced and, although voices were raised from various traditionalists' quarters even against these, these were silenced without much difficulty. Although a stray Imam of a mosque in an outlying district may still today be found objecting to the use of microphones in prayers, yet nobody takes this kind of opposition either as formidable or even as serious. To the amenities of life which modern science brings, even the most reactionary person today not only does not object but in most cases even uses them without any question. When, however, it comes to questioning the traditional social complex as a whole and the norms upon which it was constructed, the result is very different, indeed. It is here that modernism has made the least impact on Muslim society and, in so far as it is difficult to imagine how technological progress can be sustained without changing traditional habits of thought and certain set social norms, one must exercise due caution in categorically affirming that modern developments have taken root in the Muslim society.(2)

Professor Fazlur Rahman was born on September 21, 1919 in Hazara district, in the North West Frontier Province (now Pakhtun Khwa). He was the Harold H. Swift Distinguished Service Professor of Islamic Thought in 1986 at the University of Chicago till the time of his death in July 1988. He belonged to a traditional Deobandi family, He was the son of a learned 'Alim, Mawlana Shahab al-Din, who was a graduate from Dar al-Ulum,

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

Deoband, where he studied with Mawlana Rashid Ahmed Gangohi and Shykh al-Hind Mawlana Mahmud al-Hasan. Deoband's dedication to Islam, freedom and reform were infused by Mawlana Shahab al-din in his son Fazlur Rahman. He commenced his early education in customary Islamic sciences at a very young age. However, Mawlana Shahabuddin also gave him access to modern system of education. After School he continued his Dars-i Nizami learning at home together with following his University Studies and received B.A. (Hons.) in Arabic in 1940 from the Punjab University. He received an M.A. in Arabic from the University of Punjab, Lahore with first class first position in 1942 and then he went to Oxford, where he wrote a dissertation on Ibn Sina's (980-1037) Kitab al-Najat, and acquired his doctorate in Islamic Philosophy from Oxford in 1949. He started his teaching profession in Durham, England He joined Durham University in 1950 and taught Persian and Islamic philosophy (1950-58) before moving to Canada where he taught Islamic Studies at McGill University, Montreal (1958-1961).

Fazlur Rahman first achieved international renown with the publication of *Avicenna's Psychology* (1952), in which he demonstrated the influence of the Muslim philosopher physician Ibn Sina (d.1037) on the medieval Christian theologian St. Thomas Aquinas (d.1275). An expert in medieval philosophy, Rahman wrote two more books on Ibn Sina (*Prophecy in Islam*, 1958, and *Avicenna's De Anima*, 1959), but he was best known for his pioneering work in Islamic hermeneutics (*Islamic Methodology in History*, 1965) and educational reform (*Islam and Modernity: Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*, 1984).⁽³⁾

Fazlur Rahman came back to Pakistan in 1961 and became the Director General of the newly established Central Institute of Islamic Research which was given permission for reviving Pakistan's general temperament through political and legal change by implementing an Islamic vision. It was a remarkably demanding job which brought him in direct conflict with diverse groups and organizations. Unfortunately he had to left Pakistan, as a consequence of a politically- provoked movement by some dominant Ulama in opposition to his modernist interpretations of various long-established Islamic values and rituals.

Eventually, he resigned from his position and left Pakistan for the United States where he was appointed a visiting professor at UCLA and, afterwards, professor of Islamic thought at University of Chicago (1969-1988). It was in Chicago that Fazlur Rahman became the most forthright

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

voice for an elemental reform in the Islamic polity. He also worked as adviser to the US State Department on issues concerning Muslim countries and was awarded the Harold H. Swift Distinguished Service Professor at Chicago (1986), a title he held until his death in July 26, 1988.

Acceptance of Modern Approach

Fazlur Rahman completely acknowledged Western historical critique and is ready to apply it for the interpretation of Quran and for an assessment of the history of Islamic thought. He also recognize that it is vital not to disregard 'the wide and profound currents of a people's psychology' thus having specified an outstanding position to a new study of the Quran. Rahman's status is consequently pragmatic, aspiring to change society. Rahman was bold as his predecessors, so he did not hesitate to deliberately think upon the substance and the outcome of the ideas which were rooted in conventional attitude towards Islamic thought.

He firmly believes that the Modernist and the orthodox in reality call to the same origins of Islam. The only difference is that the Modernists seek to implement the real spirit behind the literal basis and the orthodox wants to implement the literal words of Quran and Hadith.

It is also something of an irony to pit the so-called Muslim fundamentalists against the Muslim modernists, since, so far as their acclaimed procedure goes, the Muslim modernists say exactly the same thing as the so-called Muslim fundamentalists say: that Muslims must go back to the original and definitive sources of Islam and perform Ijtihad on that basis.(4)

When analyzing the orthodox Muslims' explanation of the Quran, he believed that

Muslim Scholarship, on the other hand, has two problems: (1) lack of a genuine feel for the relevance of the Quran today, which prevents presentation in terms adequate to the needs of contemporary man; but even more (2) a fear that such a presentation might deviate on some points from traditionally received opinions. This last risk is inevitable; I think it must be undertaken, though with both sincerity and perception.(5)

So, Fazlur Rahman is in the forefront confronting antagonism from traditionalists and fundamentalists. He defends and advocates Islamic reform, criticizes outdated restrained traditions. He demonstrates a new

Dr. Fazhur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

dimension from the historical facts of Islamic legislation which cannot be denied.

This fact is historically so clear and firm that it is this kind of unambiguous pronouncement or behaviour that later legists term muhkam or mansus. The truth, however is that this hard and fast distinction between muhkam and mutashabih, between nass and non-nass does not exist for the very early generations of Muslims.(6)

The Assessment of Hadith Literature

Likewise as Sir Sayyed opposed the Ahl-e-Haithds, he also precisely disapproves of the Wahabbi ideology which originated afterwards in Islamic activist's ideology and justified reasons to reject the mainstream opinion, but provided misleading and unsound theological reasons for their ideas.

Rahman claims that due to the lack of a comprehensive understanding or "whole-text" learning, especially on topics of political authority, many political, fundamentalist, movements (e.g., Wahabbi movement in Saudi Arabia) have dangerously misrepresented certain philosophers' thinking by "piecemealing" the philosopher's argument to their own political agenda. For instance even though, there are strong irja (deterministic) elements within the thought of Ibn Taymiyya, (1263-1328), there are also counterparts to these elements, such as his extensive thought on free will. In his argument against the religious leaders of his day, Ibn Taymiyya pointed out how scholars tended "to affirm the divine will but [did] not affirm wisdom and affirmed] only [God's] all-compelling will (mashi'a) without affirming mercy(rahma), love (mahabba) and no gratitude[contentment] (rida).(7)

However, Fazhur Rahman is against the idea of the total rejection of Hadith literature.

Among the Modernists, Sayyed Ahmad Khan and some of his school went to extreme lengths in rejecting all Hadith... The Modernists, in fact, rejected all authoritativeness in traditional Islam. The pre-Modernists Revivalists, although they had rejected the authority of the medieval schools, had not only owned Hadith in the traditional manner as being authoritative almost on a par with the Quran, but had also assigned almost absolute authority to

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

the 'consensus with the early generations' (ijma as-salaf) of Muslims.(8)

He believes in the execution of organized study of the whole Islamic corpus is indispensable through the development of a methodology for establishing Islamic validity in agreement with cautiously coherent Islamic principles. Thus, Fazlur Rahman has a pragmatic reasoning for Hadith as well. While acknowledging the 'corrupting hand of history' he brings out a more acceptable approach in this regard.

The greatest sensitivity surrounds the Hadith, although it is generally accepted that, except the Quran, all else is liable to the corrupting hand of history. Indeed, a critique of Hadith should not only remove a big mental block but should promote fresh thinking about Islam. Further, if a certain Hadith is shown to be historically unsound, it need not be discarded, for it may contain a good principle, and a good principle, no matter where it comes from, should be adopted.(9)

He perceives the desired political, ethical, and spiritual reformulation while reliant upon a reassessment of Hadith. Hence, he has balanced and logical judgments on this issue.

Eventually, Fazlur Rahman believed, it became apparent that the proliferation of Hadith—regarding every aspect of life, from birth to death, and including hundreds of conflicting, even directly contradictory reports—had gotten out of control. But again, instead of developing a methodology for determining Islamic authenticity in accordance with carefully articulated Islamic principles, the orthodoxy further limited the range of individual Muslims' initiative, determining that Hadith literature was systematized into six collections, classified according to degree of verifiability, and they were to be the source of legislation from then on.(10)

On the other hand he was denounced, because of having neutral point of view on the opinion of reassessment of Hadith literature which could not be acknowledged by the conservative orthodox Ulama. He supports oriental attempts in this regard pursuing Sir Sayyed who was the one who initiated this thought and later on the Western orientalist like Schacht carried it out.

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

Professor Schacht is the first scholar to have undertaken an extensive and systematic comparison of legal traditions in their historical sequence is unassailably scientific and sound in method and one only wishes that it were practiced thoroughly in all fields of the Hadith.(11)

Fazlur Rahman figured out that the main body of commonly acknowledged Hadith has historical uncertainties in linking to the Prophet, except to the initial Muslims, perceived as a guide to the Prophetic Sunnah. The Hadith literature should be studied within the backdrop of primary advancements of Islamic history. While reviewing the notion of resurgence attitude which demands a return to the literals of Quran and Sunnah, he argues that it means the return to its meaning and message instead of literal grounds.

The only sense, therefore, that the dictum can yield is that Muslims must perform and enact in the twentieth century that whose moral and spiritual dimensions match those of the Muslims' performance in the seventh and eighth centuries. But this means not just a simple "return" to the Quran and the *Sunnah* as they were acted in the past but a true *understanding* of them that would give us guidance *today*. A simple return to the past is, of course, a return to the graves. And when we go back to the early Muslim generations, this process of a living understanding of the Quran and the Sunnah is exactly what we find there.(12)

This bold and striking blow towards the logical weak point of the orthodoxy could not be spared by the so called Islamists. Since his sound line of reasoning is unanswerable for them and is a real threat for their fake adoration of ancestors and deceptive leadership in the hearts of Muslims generally. Hence, he was treated offensively. Unfortunately he experienced a lot of adversities due to his reformed ideas and the distinctiveness of his two fold conception of Quranic interpretation; while he was an energetic advocate of reforming traditional comprehension of fundamental religious resources as being a scholar and leading an influential national institution (Central Institute of Islamic Research) at the same time.

He was, however, criticized by those he considered fundamentalists as being overly liberal in his interpretation of the Quran, the Sunnah, and classical Islamic law. In Pakistan his detractors referred to him as "the destroyer of hadiths" because of

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

his insistence on judging the weight of hadith reports in light of the overall spirit of the Quran. However, he believed his reformist views would eventually be vindicated; he felt that contemporary Islamic fundamentalism was a defensive and temporary posture taken in response to the political and economic setbacks experienced by the Muslim world.(13)

Revelation in Historical Perspective

Dr. Fazlur Rahman delved into the depths of Islamic intellectual history and had a profound knowledge of Islam. The orthodoxy had blamed Sir Sayyid and Iqbal for not having the 'required' knowledge of Arabic and Islamic jurisprudence, but Rahman not only had an orthodox background through his father, yet he also had ample knowledge of Arabic and Dars-i-Nizami. Thus, he was one of the most erudite intellectuals of the foremost Muslim thinkers in the second-half of the twentieth century, in classical Islam as well as Western philosophical and theological discourse. Rahman on the whole tried to base his works through his perceived Quranic insight. Basically his complete framework of ideas is rooted in Quranic philosophy. Hence, the origin of Rahman's historical considerations can evidently be traced in his elucidations of Quranic methodology.

Pakistani philosopher and educator Fazlur Rahman (1919-1988) rejected literal and traditional interpretations of the Quran, arguing that they limited the applicability of the message to the time and place in which the revelation occurred. By understanding the spirit of the Quran, Rahman argued, Muslims can apply the text to modern circumstances. He believed that Muslims should study the historical context of each verse in order to find its true essence. Equipped with an understanding of their contemporary circumstances, they could apply the principles derived from the text to their own time. Rahman was convinced that an adequate understanding of Quranic teachings would enable believers to overcome the problems of the modern Muslim world.(14)

The past endeavours cannot be denied and will obviously be helpful to reach the true understanding of revelation. However he criticized the attitude of Ulama, as treating them in a manner exclusive of its historical background. As a matter of fact the relation of revelation is integrated with the Prophet's every day deeds.

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

For modern thinkers such as Fazlur Rahman it was vital to make sense of revelation in historical terms. If history was to make any impact in understanding a transcendent revelation, then it was necessary to explore the interface of revelation with the world. An insistence on the complete "otherness" of the Quran, as orthodox required in order to minimize the Prophet's involvement in the revelatory process, was not only historically inaccurate in his view, but also contrary to the Quran itself. Historically, it was difficult to ignore the fact that revelation itself commented on matters that affected the Prophet's personal behavior and travails.(15)

Rahman maintains that every assessment of Quran's meaning is required to utilize a historical method. He suggests a new approach that struggles to illustrate an unambiguous difference among "historical Islam and normative Islam". Thus, he intended the methods of synthetic and logical amalgamation and used analytical philosophy and systematic theology in inferring the fundamentals of religion. This difference of traditional and historical evaluation has to be drawn equally concerning Islamic ideals and Islamic institutions. He asserts that the huge number of Quranic revelations occurred "in thought not only for, a given historical context". Muslims have to identify the fundamental characteristic in the revelation which is intended not only for that precise context in which it was revealed but is planned by the Creator for beyond that given context of history. This can be completed by an inclusive study of the Quran to resolutely find universal values and define their needed purposes which should be clarified. The reason for this inclusive study would be to define the spirited self assurance of the Quran.

Subsequently, the asbab-e-nuzul (the historical conditions enclosing a particular revelation) ought to be employed to inspect particular assertion, to make certain that the assertion is in accordance with the assurance of the Quran. This will authorize the resurgence of the initial momentum of Islamic thought, liberated from the hoarded remains of tradition, pattern, and civilization of the precedent millennium. What is more, he believes that although the orthodoxy considers historical causes of the verses and called it asbab-e-nuzul or shan-e-nuzul, but at the same time, their results are at variance and confused.

The second all-important feature of the legislation of the Quran is that it (like the decisions of the Prophet) always had a background or a historical context, which the Muslim commentators of the

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

Quran call "occasions of revelation." But the literature on the "occasions of revelation" is often highly contradictory and chaotic. The basic reason for this state of affairs seems to be that, although most Quranic commentators were aware of the importance of these "situational contexts," either because of their historical significance or for their aid in understanding the point of certain injunctions, they never realized their full import, particularly from the second point of view. Instead, they enunciated the principle that "although an injunction might have been occasioned by a certain situation, it is nevertheless universal in its general application." This principle is sound enough provided it means by an "injunction" the value underlying that injunction and not merely its literal wording. But the value can be yielded only by understanding well not only the language, but above all the situational context of a given injunction.(16)

At the outset, Rahman's critique of the chronological method of the Quran appears to oppose his stress on the significance of the historical milieu for the comprehension of the Quran itself. Yet, inclusive analysis reveals that Rahman does not decline the study of the historical milieu of Quran; in contrast, he expresses dissatisfaction with the seemingly chronological method to comprehend Quran, which directs the comprehension of the verses in an "atomistic" way. This deals only with the superficial understanding of the words of verses in remoteness, and reduces its comprehensive perception.

There was a general failure to understand the underlying unity of the Quran, coupled with a practical insistence upon fixing on the words of various verses in isolation. The result of this "atomistic" approach was that laws were often derived from verses that were not at all legal in intent.(17)

Rahman deduces that the relevance of a suitable approach of inferring Quran depends on distinguishing the aim or "moral ideal" which is ordained by the Quran from the legal details of the verse. It is this moral ideal which is worldwide and guidance to Muslims for eternity. And in this way we can escape from our narrow minded approach and the spiritual feature of religion will be heightened. As per Rahman's description, the Prophet's identity in his 'Quranic Moments' was expanded to such an extent that it is impossible to recognize his identity as something which could be differentiated from the Divine Moral Law.

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

Moreover, Rahman daringly expresses disapproval of the prevailing basis of fiqh. For him they are one of the main reasons for the limited approach to revelation. Thus the traditional tools for inferring and deducing new laws for current problems in the context of the modern society, in reality does not have the capability of doing so.

Rahman advocates a renewal of Islamic intellectualism as it relates to the moral improvement of mankind. In his historical investigation, which utilizes a *longue duree* approach, Rahman points out that traditional Islamic models of juristic reasoning, such as *qiyas* (analogical reasoning), greatly restricted the ability of Muslim intellectuals to apply Islamic values. These models were very atomistic in their hermeneutical approach (giving priority to injunctions without context, and without an integrated philosophical sense of underlying principles), preventing comprehensive analysis of the whole text of the Quran and resulting in the equation of Islamic values with specific historical practices. In other words, Muslims have long lacked a well-developed "Quranic Weltanschauung" that might help them differentiate that which is essential and relevant to the demands of a situation from that which is not.(18)

Fazlur Rahman became the existing world's most passionate advocate of shaping the "Islamic worldview." In conflicting with Islamic conservatives, he did not consider that the endeavour for the comprehension of Islam had been, mainly, accomplished. He, with good reason discarded the thought that the evils of the Islamic world could be treated by the option of long-established Islamic authorities. In addition Rahman criticized the intellectual history and points out the misfortunes in the formation of laws. He believes that while in general Islamic legal system randomly related with the fundamentals of Islam, it was not established on a methodical scholarly assessment of the Quran's ethical principles, which are consistent to the norms of society. However this attempt certainly requires creativity, but for Rahman it cannot be illustrated as law because it mainly dealt with ethics.

The non-pragmatic approach was established even in Muslims' most advanced period in history. Moreover, the involvement of successive emperors also made fiqh more hypothetical. He believed the development of the Islamic worldview to be achievable only by reassessing Islamic tradition taking into consideration the general essence of the Quran. For him the basic need was in fact the continuous restructuring and

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

development of Islamic law that would have safeguard its reliability and worth.

But it is true that, already in medieval Islam, certain trends in the field of law were highly detrimental to the integrity of Islamic law itself. While taking the advantage of an appealing to the principles of "social necessity" and "public interest" that the Muslim jurists themselves had enunciated for the convenience of administration—so that they would not remain hidebound by the provisions of the Sharia law even when circumstances demanded otherwise—Muslim rulers at the same time freely resorted to promulgating state-made law that was neither Islamic nor yet secular. There was nothing inherently wrong with these two principles themselves, provided their actual application had been reasoned on Sharia bases. But when rulers began to feel free to promulgate their own laws, based on the principles of social necessity and public interest in the absence of any reformulation or rethinking of Islamic law, the results were disastrous for Islamic law itself. What was required but never achieved was a constant reformulation and expansion of Islamic law that would have preserved its integrity and efficacy.(19)

Islam was intended to provide the true and unadulterated divine guidance to all mankind, generating a universal society in which the true revelation would be the daily standard for all nations. If Muslims had correctly executed Islamic principles, the existing mostly unprincipled worldwide society would have been in a better condition. You are indeed the best community that has ever been brought forth for (the good of) mankind. You enjoined what is good, and forbid what is evil, and you believe in God. (3:110).

Muslim society was expected to have been a motivation for other human races in the world; unfortunately their political structure developed into the dynastic establishment which further illustrated the far-reaching feature of any such system i.e. the need for self preservation.

However, for numerous formative and post formative's legal developments Fazlur Rahman considered an analysis of Muslim civilization with the aim of investigating the roots of law. According to him this endeavour cannot remain uninfluenced by a particular type of arbitrariness in that precise time span. Rahman claims that it is the responsibility of intellectuals to strive strenuously to comprehend

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

seemingly inconsistent facts, notions and basis within Islam. An approach of submissiveness, as noticeable in historical master-student relations, had no support in the search of knowledge and the progress of the Islamic intellectual tradition. Hence, Rahman rationalizes that Islam in the twentieth-century, needs a renewal of fundamental principles and customs within Muslim traditions so as to counter the challenges of modern Islamic societies.

Drawing on the early intellectual heritage of Islam, Fazlur Rahman attempted to provide a complex theory of revelation that linked philosophical and psychological arguments with a sociology and anthropology of history. This most critical task must surely remain one of his most ambitious intellectual attempts. His arguments were at times characteristically brief, defensive, and polemical. Indian scholars such as Sirhindi and Shah Wali Allah provided him with some insights on which he could build a case for a theory of revelation that went beyond the standard dogmatic account. (20)

He criticizes the leading movements in the intellectual history of Islam with his logical arguments. The Ulama have neglected the fundamentals of religion as the source of law and have engrossed themselves with the branches of law and sectarianism. Therefore their attempts principally lack the harmonization with the philosophy of Quran.

Rahman traces the moral indifference of which he accuses the dominant trends in Muslim intellectual history, Ash'arism and Sufism, back to the irja' doctrine. In the realm of politics irja' led, according to him, to a lenient attitude towards despotism. In this book Rahman takes a more balanced stance on al-Ghazali. Nevertheless, he judges al-Ghazali's attempts to reform Islamic theology and law as deficient because he puts individual ethics at the center, not the improvement of society according to the Qur'anic kerygma. (21)

...on Wali Allah's political theory, which Rahman unmasks as authoritarian, undemocratic and un-Qur'anic, with reference to a translation of central passages from his "Hujjat al-Islām al-baligha." His criticism is well founded and counters widespread prejudice. (22)

Fazlur Rahman sought to curb the idle and confined restrained state of Intellectual thought of Islam. He deduces the perpetuity of legal specifics

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

of the Qur'an is in its ethical principles, in the philosophy which lay beneath the text itself or indeed the primary subject, or the idea around which Quran is organized. For Rahman, a real comprehension of Quranic weltanschauung was misinterpreted. When Medieval Muslim philosophy endeavoured to relate an Islamic appearance onto its evidently hellenized rational interpretation of religion, Islamic Orthodoxy flattened it 'by its sheer weight'. Consequently the historically curtailed hikmat is found only in Sufi and Shi'ite schools. Paradoxically, the orthodoxy did not have a grip on the Quranic weltanschauung also, as orthodox scholars cultivated Islamic jurisprudence and theological doctrine their minute concentration on particular suras beyond the situational milieu essential for appropriate inference, they failed to spot the point, thus eradicating the formerly abundant intellectual tradition's future of natural and original thought. However, even scholars who advocate modernity also lack in-depth understanding of the fundamentals of religion. According to Rahman,

Muslims, and particularly modernist Muslims have often contended that the Quran gives us "the principles" while the Sunna or our reasoning embodies these fundamentals in concrete solutions. This is considerably less than a half-truth and is dangerously misleading. If we look at the Quran, it does not in fact give many general principles: for the most part it gives solutions to and rulings upon specific and concrete historical issues; ... it provides, either explicitly or implicitly, the rationales behind these solutions and rulings, from which one *can deduce general principles*. In fact, this is the only sure way to obtain the real truth about the Quranic teaching. He finally comes to the logical conclusion:

One must generalize on the basis of Quranic treatment of actual cases—taking into due consideration the socio historical situation then obtaining—since, although one can find some general statements or principles there, these for the most part are embedded in concrete treatments of actual issues, whence they must be disengaged.(23)

Fazlur Rahman repudiated literal and conventional interpretations of the Quran, maintaining that they restricted the relevancy of the message to the time and place in which the revelation came about. Rahman maintained, that through comprehending the essence of Quran, Muslims can relate the text to their contemporary situations. He alleged that Muslims should look into the historical milieu of every verse in an attempt to get its real spirit. So that they will be capable for the comprehension of their existing situation, they could utilize the ideology originated from the text to their

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

particular period. Moreover, Rahman was certain that a sufficient comprehension of Quranic ideas would facilitate believers to engulf the problems of the modern Muslim world.

In contrast to orthodoxy's tendency of romantically or legislatively moving back to the past, he searches to reinterpret the original scriptures, to reassess past tradition, and to rebuild Islamic religious thought and law to approach more precisely and efficiently the present and future of Islam. This regeneration is not an amendment of the origins but a change of the intellect that comprehend them, which are of course obviously affected by their contemporary social, political and scientific surroundings. The modern interpretation according to the existing circumstances or events in the environment transforms the limits of knowledge and experience of the text, revives it, and at times provides it a novel assertion, offering outcomes that were never before imagined.

Such quasi-laws as do occur in the Quran are not meant to be literally applied in all times and climes; the principles on which these legal or quasi-legal pronouncements rest have to be given fresh embodiments in legislative terms. In this process of legislation the twin principles of Ijtihad and Ijma play the most crucial role. They bestow upon law whatever necessary permanence it requires and also the necessary elements of change and dynamism that it always needs in order to realize the ideals of a changing, progressing and developing society.(24)

Fazlur Rahman not only sought to assuage the idle, confined and shrouded state of intellectual thought of Islam, but remarkably he also delves into the intellectual history and discovers the crucial grounds behind the shackles of taqlid.

The doctrine held by many of our religious doctors that the Ijma of bye-gone times cannot be repealed or replaced is a mere dogma without any foundation. Neither the Quran nor the Sunnah has anything at all to this effect. Indeed, the "closing of the door of Ijtihad" and the irreparability of earlier Ijma were the twin doctrines whereby Islamic progress committed suicide.(25)

Likewise, he rejected the existing orthodox agreed method of performing Ijtihad, for the issue of the eligibility of interpreting the Islamic fundamentals, and their accepted criteria for Mujtahid, which in truth made impossible any attempt of Ijtihad without restraints, a true

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

obstruction in the progression and one of the fundamental reasons of stagnation in Muslim thought. Besides Rahman stands extraordinary among modernist scholars, who generally only highlight the shortcomings and do not provide remedies, he also presents the criteria for performing Ijtihad.

It is sometimes asserted by those who called themselves "ulama" that a particular unknown kind of capacity is required for exercising Ijtihad, including, so it is said, the study of a certain prescribed course of books and materials. This assertion is not only historically groundless but patently false. What is required is a good acquaintance with Islam—the closer the acquaintance, of course, the better—and a power of thinking. There is no definite point at which some mysterious "Ijtihad-capacity" arises; indeed, skill in the Islamic field is just like skill in any other field. This quality can be recognized by the community at large and requires no occult or obscurantist tests on the part of self styled 'ulama' to judge the qualities of a *Mujtahid*. It follows that Ijtihad of people will vary on different subjects according to their thoughts, points of view, educational equipment and natural endowments. This fact has always been recognized by the classical *Mujtahid* themselves. (26)

They regarded their own originated sciences as substantially divine. Thus the lack of freedom of thinking, and Muslims' failure to discover the way to exercise intellectual scrutiny, instead of progression they had renounced those methods of reinterpretation that had been discovered in the past. The logical and methodical analysis of previous work is immensely lacking thus the result is, objectivity of study and discussion of well-known religious interpretations that comprises the traditional science of jurisprudence or the science of the traditions and scriptural exegesis is nowhere to be found. Likewise the foundation of Islamic organizations on such demonstration and its practice is deficient.

According to Rahman:

There has not been a lack of men of deep insight, but there has been no systematic and coherent body of metaphysical thought fully informed by the Quranic weltanschauung, which is itself remarkably coherent. (27)

So, Rahman considers that the basic deficiency is the lack of impartial study of these intellectual endeavours that could afterwards be formulated

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

into a system. Consequently, this intellectual recognition would facilitate Muslims to unburden themselves from the nuisance of intellectual void. The amalgamation of the principle thoughts of the Quran and universal human rationale will restate the classical principles of Islam. Through this integration the desire of God will be revealed coherently.

The "*living Sunnah*" of our early forefathers, therefore, while it has lessons for us as a genuine and successful interpretation of the Quran and the Prophet activity for the early days of the Community, is, in its flesh and blood, absolutely irrepeatable, for history never repeats itself so far as societies and their structures are concerned. There is only one sense in which our early history is repeatable—and, indeed, in that sense it must be repeated if we are to live as progressive Muslims at all, *w.c.*, just as those generations met their own situation adequately by freely interpreting the Quran and *Sunnah* of the Prophet—by emphasizing the ideal and the principles and re-embodiment them in a fresh texture of their own contemporary history—we must perform the same feat for ourselves, with our own effort, for our own contemporary history.(28)

For legislation of Islamic laws here again he is in complete agreement with Iqbal that the authority of Ijtihad should be given to the Muslim legislative assembly and as far as the issue of different sects' conflicts is concerned, they can perform Ijma for the agreement in getting resolutions. This will also prevent the ignorant laymen's involvement in these analytical issues. Fazlur Rahman rather defined Iqbal's idea more comprehensively.

There is, therefore, need for a body of experts to which recourse should be had on technical and Islamic questions of legislation in the narrow sense of the term. But even after the experts' advice, the final decision remains with the Community and its representatives in the Legislature.(29)

Thus the democratic legislative council is the one who would have the ultimate verdict as they are the representatives of the public opinion. And the Islamic laws would be interpreting within the needs and demands of contemporary time.

Rahman thinks that his method has purely satisfactory interpretive style that could satisfy requirements of intellectual and ethical honesty, and this

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

is the only manner through which the message of the Quran becomes pertinent to modern circumstances. Rahman commenced by critiquing the "atomistic" attitude of numerous interpreters who were unsuccessful in comprehending the fundamental accord of the Quran, together with the functional perseverance on inserting the words of numerous verses in isolation. The requirement to analyze Quran in harmony, as a formation, directed Rahman to develop the procedure in two stages: the first originated from the historical actuality of the Quran, the common generally authentic principles, from a theological and ethical standpoint for humanity, the second based on the application of the succeeding principles on the level of the practical aspect and application of message of Quran, as opposed to its conventional theory.

In building any genuine and viable Islamic set of laws and institutions, there has to be a twofold movement. First one must move from the concrete case treatments of the Quran—taking the necessary and relevant social conditions of that time into account—to the general principles upon which the entire teaching converges. Second, from this general level there must be a movement back to specific legislation, taking into account the necessary and relevant social conditions now obtaining. (30)

His emphasis to study any verse of the Quran in the light of its situation is notable since each verse is related to the specific situation, thus for true understanding of Quran these situations and conditions are highly important as behind them the Quran was revealed. Rahman's two-fold movements are in fact his suggestive attempt to acquire the gist of Quran and its implication in today's world, the first movement is extracting and organizing its universal ideology and its vast aim to a large extent. The subsequent step is to develop new directives according to the first step for the modern needs. Thus the central philosophy of the Quran will appear in material form, for the current existing society.

The Quran and the genesis of the Islamic community occurred in the light of history and against a social-historical background. The Quran is a response to that situation. [. . .] The first of the two movements mentioned above consists of two steps . . . The first step of the first movement consists of understanding the meaning of the Quran as a whole as well as in terms of the specific tenets that constitute responses to specific situations. The second step is to generalize those specific answers and enunciate them as statements of general moral-social objectives that can be 'distilled'

Dr. Fazhur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

from specific texts in the light of socio-historical background and the often-stated rationales legis. (the reason behind the stated law)Throughout this process due regard must be paid to the tenor of the teaching of the Quran as a whole so that each given meaning understood, each law enunciated, and each objective formulated will cohere with the rest.(31) This complex, albeit embryonic, notion of revelation becomes the backdrop of this theory of Quran interpretation, called the "double movement" theory.(32)

Hence Rahman presents a new outline regarding fresh exegesis of Quran by which he intends to have the advantage to the extent that is possible so that the Muslims could be benefited from divine guidance in every aspect of their modern life. And for that Muslim intellectuals who have to move ahead from their over- respecting manner of the past.

He has admiration for the various sects in the intellectual history of Islam, for having the courage to differ from prevailed orthodoxy, moreover their constructive efforts in the progression of Islam are worthwhile. He wanted to have a new appraisal of the 'reasons' for discarding as heretical, such opinions as those of the Mutazilites. His notions could possibly be best explained as the judgment of intellectual history of Islam in finding out the relevance of its in-depth philosophy for the contemporary issues and for intellectual progression. He has the lucid comprehension of the significant temperament of new world-view for the implementation of Islamic ideology, and has recommended as well, ways of accomplishing it thoroughly.

While his views are regarded as controversial by the orthodox Ulamas on specific matters- the fundamental nature of revelation, the difference among Hadith and Sunnah, the methodology of Quranic interpretation, and the difference between riba and bank interest. Rahman's criticism of the historical formulations of Islamic theology and jurisprudence continued brilliantly in his profound and exceptional regards for Islamic norms. It was these exceptional thoughts that set the religious thinking to end its deficiently required progression which will extend the frontiers of religious thinking that was limited by the orthodoxies' thoughts. In addition they single out Fazhur Rahman from several other Islamic modernists. He takes example of riba for their superficial treatment of Quranic injunctions.

So far as the 'Ulama' are concerned, although they accept the technological benefits of modern life, they are not willing to accept

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

the consequences of modern education but are even by and large quite unaware of these consequences and think that both the traditional beliefs of Islam, as they were formulated by medieval theologians, and the traditional law can be kept completely intact and immune from modern influences. They would, for instance, while welcoming modern industry, still think that the giving and taking of interest can be strictly forbidden.(33)

Thus on the issue of modern banking system and usury he gives us a clear picture, his logical arguments provides full explicit explanation of the differences in modern banking and usury.

وَمَا تَنْتَهِم مِّن رِّبَا يَزِيدُوا فِي أَمْوَالِهِمْ فَلَا يَزِيدُوا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ
وَمَا تَنْتَهِم مِّن زَكَاةٍ يُرِيدُونَ وَجْهَ اللَّهِ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُضِلُّونَ

“And whatever you invest by way of riba so that may increase upon peoples wealth, increases not with God; but what you give by way of zakah seeking the pleasure of god, those – they receive recompense manifold” (XXX: 39).

...according to the Qur'an the opposite of riba is not bay (trade) but sadaqah (charity). The prevailing confusion about the problem, we submit, was due to riba and bay being considered opposed to each other. The result was that juristic hair-splitting was substituted for the moral importance attaching to the prohibition of riba. In the Qur'an the very first revelation condemning riba speaks of “what you give by way of zakah” in juxtaposition with and contrast to “whatever you invest by way of riba”. In the same way, the last revelation on this topic speaks of Allah as “destroying riba”, but this is immediately followed by the remark “but He makes alms (sadaqat) prosper”. How are these verses of Surah al-Baqarah concerning riba get a place immediately after the Qur'an had spoken at length in the same Surah on organization of sadaqat, the manner of their disposal, the various injunctions concerning them and finally of their important place in the social welfare structure.(34)

The ethical teaching of the Quran behind the prohibition of riba is the intention of banning abundant profit for the sake of self centered benefit which causes the destruction of society. But first the base for the prohibition of usury was set in the Quran:

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

Whatever you lend out in usury to gain in value through other people's wealth you invest in usury so that it should grow at the expense of other people's wealth will not increase in God's eyes, but whatever you give in alms in your desire for God's pleasure will be multiplied. (30:39)

It ought to be noticed that the recurring expression regarding social costs that it "cultivates several-fold" has evidently carried out usury, because usurious transactions turned out to be multiplied the invested amount "many many-fold [ad 'afan muda 'fa]" (3:130). It was then forbidden (2:275-78) with a severe caution that God and his Messenger would conduct warfare in opposition to violators; the assumed link relating usury and "lawful commerce" was discarded; and the direct opposite as to usury and welfare spending was once more emphasized. Creditors were asked to regain merely their principal amount, but "if you forgo even that it would be better for you—if you only knew." These harsh warnings were given to lessening the self centered benefit attitude and to promote kindness and welfare in society. Rahman stresses that this sincere philosophy for the welfare of society should be focused rather than taking the literal interpretations and superficial arguments for the rejection of the modern banking system.

...in accordance with well-recognized juristic principle of *masalih mursalah* (measures based on public weal) we should find out which forms of human dealings in modern times are morally more destructive, nearer to the spirit of *riba* and, therefore, worthy of greater attention in so far as they fall within the category of things which lead to forbidden acts. Landlordism, feudalism, profiteering and hoarding are surely much nearer to the manifest-*riba* than the bank-interest.(35)

He points out that the main intention of the Quran was the prohibition of the outrageous kind of monetary abuse and cruelty, which afterward manipulated by the orthodoxy into the prohibition on every kind of profit more than the principal amount.

To illustrate the inadequacy of the modernist approach in Pakistan, this controversy over the question of Islamicity or otherwise of the banking institutions is illuminating. The Institute's research showed that the actual system of *riba* or usury prevalent in Arabia was a crass form of economic exploitation and was, therefore, banned by the Quran after a series of warnings; that the Muslim *Fuqaha* in the succeeding generation extended this ban to all sorts

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

of financial transactions in which any increment over capital was involved.(36)

However, Fazlur Rahman does not mention the evidences of showing these attempts of directing it to their explanations of broadening the prohibition of Quran. Regrettably this is indeed the tendency of Ulama of taking superficially the issues which needed profound considerations.

The prohibition of usury was essential for the public welfare the medieval lawyers of Islam, however, draws the conclusion from this that all forms of interest are banned, a stand to which even today the vast majority of Muslim still cling, despite the fundamental change in the role of modern banking in the context of a "development economy." It is some measure of the current confusion in thought that numerous educated Muslims use Keynesian or Marxist arguments to support their position.(37)

Fazlur Rahman charges the Ulama for the credence of secularism in Muslim societies. He argues that it is the result of following literal interpretation and attitude of ignoring the philosophy behind them that the gap and vacuum between Islam and today's world has developed. Thus the orthodoxy's rigidity and adherence to the glorified past and their single-minded stress on the literal application of Quran and Hadith, compelled modern educated middle class Muslims towards secularism. Hence, it is the approach of Ulama that is justly liable for the pervasiveness of secularity in Muslims. To demonstrate the soundness of his argument he illustrates the case of zakah:

From the uses, enumerated by the Quran, of the expenditure of this tax, it is evident that it was a social welfare tax in the widest possible meaning of "welfare". Further, this was the only tax levied by the Quran. Now, the Prophet had fixed a certain rate, which leads one to believe that, for the normal needs of that society, he must have judged this rate adequate. The needs of a modern society, however, have expanded immensely. Education, communications and other developmental schemes are now considered to be among the necessities of modern social welfare. This would, therefore, argue for a readjustment of the rate of *zakah* tax to modern needs. The Ulama, however, forbid any change in the rate of *zakah* and assert that if *zakah* is inadequate to meet the larger welfare needs of the Muslim society, then Governments can levy other taxes. It is at this critical juncture that the administrator

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

tells the 'Ulama', "You say that there is only one Islamic tax which is *zakah*. When this proves inadequate, you forbid any change in the *zakah*-rate but you say that I can levy other taxes. You are, thereby, introducing a dualism which I find unworkable. If I can levy other taxes, I shall levy them and fulfill the needs of my society and your *zakah* is superfluous. This is the essence of secularism. Indeed, all along the line of confrontation of modernity with traditional Islam, the majority of the 'Ulama' exhibits an attitude which is directly conducive to secularism.(38)

The rigid attitude of Ulama is one of the decisive factors of prevailing secularity and increasing the gulf between Religion and everyday life. On top of it their disastrous unawareness of the nature of current needs, so consequently the Quranic ideology becomes outmoded.

In opposition to the orthodoxies he echoed Iqbal's logic, 'The Qur'an is a book which emphasizes 'deed' rather than 'idea'(39). It is obvious that when the literal interpretations are not appropriate, the application of the words of Quran as it is becomes far more unrealistic.

The Quran is not a law book, Fazlur Rahman often said. It offers very few specific rules, but it is full of moral principles ensconced in specific circumstances. The core of Islamic faith is that the Prophet was divinely inspired to put Islamic values into practice. His behavior was no doubt authoritative. But he lived in specific historical circumstances which required specific approaches. The principles he applied must therefore be abstracted from the specific circumstances surrounding them, so that they may again be put into practice in other specific circumstances.(40)

In structuring his Islamic methodology Rahman uses assorted principles from the abundant custom of Islamic epistemology and scholarship, and Ijtihad as the vital spark in these principles. He describes Ijtihad to be:

..... the effort to understand the meaning of a relevant text or precedent in the past, containing a rule, and to alter that rule by extending or restricting or otherwise modifying it in such a manner that a new situation can be subsumed under it by a new solution.(41)

Fazlur Rahman maintained that Ijtihad can accomplish the task of harmonizing the perpetual Quranic principles by "freshly derived

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

inspiration from revelations". Subsequently the knowledge and insightfulness acquired from this method are to be utilized to undertake issues and problems confronting modern Muslim society. Regardless of the fact that for almost a millennium authorized orthodoxy' advocated that Ijtihad was no longer required; however, there is no Quranic sanction or Prophetic tradition which provide evidence for this notion. An intense argument possibly and will certainly be made that closing the gates of Ijtihad, through anybody at any stage in time, is not in favor of the essence of Islamic teachings.

Fazlur Rahman locates the hostile attitude of Ulama towards liberal research is indeed their denial of the Mutazilite which ended in them the attitude of repudiating reason.

Since the orthodoxy first rejected the position of the Mutazila on the role of reason, this anti-rational theological position affected their attitude to legal thought also and their standard works formally deny any role to reason in law-making. (42)

If religious scholars had efficiently accomplished the process of *Ijtihad*, the principles of interpretation would have soundly recognized the requirement for modern interpretation and its implementation. Nevertheless, in pursuing his predecessor Iqbal, Fazlur Rahman asserts as well that the so called gates of Ijtihad were never closed, to refer to his words:

Although the "gate of Ijtihad" was never formally closed...Voices against this have been arising, particularly since the appearance of Ibn Taymiyah, and 'Taqlid' and closing of the door of Ijtihad have been imputed to the immediately earlier generations ever since. Proportionately the emphasis on the necessity of Ijtihad has increased particularly since the Islamic reform movements of the eighteenth century. The Muslim Modernist has espoused Ijtihad all the more and with all the greater sense of urgency since the impact on Islamic society of the new forces in all its forms. (43)

He continues to indicate the inconsistencies of orthodoxy that the majority of theologians even to this day hold that, in matters of belief, particularly in the case of existence of God and Mohamunad's prophet hood (and allied matters), authority alone is not sufficient and that these beliefs must be grounded by all Muslims in reason. But in the field of law they teach Taqlid (i.e.

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

unquestioning acceptance of authority) at least to the majority of Muslims and in practice to all Muslims.(44)

However, the truth is that a judgment might have been appropriate at a specific time and place, indeed has no assurance that it possibly will be appropriate in another time and place as well. Hence, Ijtihad is not only permanently achievable but also necessary for the implementation of Islam in every era, the divergences of the classical jurists in the history of Islam also supports the existence of adaptability in the nature of its legislative aspect. At this point Fazlur Rahman appears in accord with Iqbal as well. He states:

When, therefore, Iqbal, says, "the theoretical possibility of this degree of Ijtihad (i.e., Ijtihad Mutlaq) is admitted by the Sunnis, but in practice it has always been denied ever since the establishment of the schools, inasmuch as the idea of complete Ijtihad is hedged round by conditions which are well-nigh impossible of realization in a single individual.(45)

Fazlur Rahman further defines the underlying severe outcome associated with the orthodox ulama's act of discontinuing Ijtihad for the stability of legal structure.

The reasons subsequently enumerated by Iqbal for the actual stoppage of Ijtihad are undoubtedly correct. The denial of Ijtihad in practice has been the result not of externally over-strenuous qualifications but because of a deep desire to give permanence to the legal structure, once it was formulated and elaborated, in order to bring about and ensure unity and cohesiveness of the Muslim Ummah.(46)

Moreover, he broadens Iqbal's view and his findings by illuminating that the worth of their limited alliance and permanence of Muslim Ummah through law and other institutions, is in fact the beginning of the end of their internal development.

Such unity has, no doubt, reigned in the Muslim World but at the cost of inner growth as the Muslim world suddenly discovered under the impact of the foreign powers during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. But at the theoretical level the door of Ijtihad has always remained open and no jurist has ever closed it. To the cause enumerated by Iqbal must also be added the gradual

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

deterioration of intellectual standards and the impoverishment of the intelligentsia of Islam over the years through a gradual narrowing down of the educational system.(47)

Outstandingly to other modernists he presents the method to counter their stagnant intellectuality and consider in-depth study of the Modernists movement of Islam. At the same time he considers that the orthodox should develop progressive traditionalism through differentiating between principal and chronological basics.

...all situations of social growth, conservatism must seek not to conserve merely the past but what in it is valuable and essential...Muslims must decide what exactly is to be conserved, what is essential and relevant for the erection of an Islamic future, what is fundamentally Islamic and what is purely 'historical'. In other words, they must develop an enlightened conservatism. ...much of history had been eternalized by a kind of religio-historic fiction....

Indeed social progression and civilization develops naturally with time. So if tradition does not progress with it, it denounces tradition and adopts the more pragmatic approach to prevail. Furthermore, he also analyzes the shortcomings in the methodology taken by both traditionalists and secularists.

Rahman believed that contemporary Muslim conservatives, in trying to maintain the status quo in religious tradition, and fundamentalists, in interpreting the Quran literally, are as misguided as secularists who deny Islam's relevance to the political and economic spheres.(48)

We can determine that Fazlur Rahman's main interest was to make a way for the implementation of Islamic wisdom and its understanding in Modern times. That is essential not only for (Dawah) propagation of Islam but highly important for the intensity of every Muslim's conviction in Modern world. Rahman moreover endeavours to find a middle-of-the-road way out for the integration of change in Muslim society.

When new forces of massive magnitude—socio-economic, cultural-moral or political—occur in or to a society, the fate of that society naturally depends on how far it is able to meet the new challenges creatively. If it can avoid the two extremes of panicking

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

and recoiling upon itself and seeking delusive shelters in the past on the one hand, and sacrificing or compromising its very ideals on the other, and can react to the new forces with self-confidence by necessary assimilation, absorption, rejection and other forms of positive creativity, it will develop a new dimension for its inner aspirations, a new meaning and scope for its ideals... Should a society begin to live in the past—however sweet its memories—and fail to face the realities of the present squarely—however unpleasant they be, it must become a fossil; and it is an unalterable law of God that fossils do not survive for long: “We did them no injustice; it is they who did injustice to themselves” (XI: 102; XVI: 33 etc.)(49)

In fact he recognized the requirement for Islamic religious thought to progress further than its present literal pattern therefore Muslim thoughts and the Muslim societies should not remain idle in the face of universal development of human history, life and thinking. Or else, he believed that they would not know how to counter vigorously the assorted intellectual and social challenges encountered by Islam in the modern period.

The world-view of the modern man, despite all the differences that it may exhibit, is essentially different from the medieval outlook and traditional habits of thought. Belief in authority and credulity are two sides of the same coin, a coin which has necessarily lost currency in the modern world. Belief in authority, in fact, both leads to and assumes credulity. And credulity is the father of all types of occultisms, miracle-mongering and crass forms of spiritual exploitation.(50)

In fact orthodox Ulama maintain a kind of religious radicalism which is the result of arrogance and intellectual shallowness, in addition ignorance of existing circumstances, the lack of knowledge and religious insight. Thus they not only romanticize the past, but also want to legalize it. Whereas, the Quranic ideology essentially deals with the in-depth restructuring towards the moral development of society, and for that it develops directives according to the need of time. So the main objective is not the Quranic laws themselves rather, the result of their implementations that is ethical maturity and if that could be achieved through making other laws according to the current needs and in accordance with the divine standards, indeed this is the genuine philosophy behind the sunnah of the Prophet.

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

...the implementation of the Quran cannot be carried out literally in the context of today because this may result in thwarting the very purposes of the Quran and that, although the findings of the Fuqaha or Ulama of Islam during the past thirteen centuries or so should be seriously studied and given due weight, it may well be found that in many cases their findings were either mistaken or sufficed for the needs of that society but not for today...

He further elucidates the expected result of this kind of analysis in detail and ensures its importance and requirements; more importantly he also makes certain that without this methodology, religion will be reduced to emotional fascination only.

...This approach is so revolutionary and so radically different from the approaches generally adopted so far in that it seeks to bring under strictly historical study not only Fiqh and Sunnah of the Prophet but the Quran as well, that not only the traditionalists but even most of the modernists seriously hesitated to accept it. But this would seem to be the only honest method of appraising the historic performance of the Muslims and of genuinely implementing the purposes of the Quran and the Prophet. There would be naturally bitter opposition to this kind of approach and particularly the results reached through it. But there is reason to believe that, in a span of a decade or so the larger part of the liberals will come round to some such view. Failing this, this writer does not see any other alternative for Islam except, in course of time, to be reduced to a set of rites which will claim emotional attachment for some time to come. (51)

Pluralism and Freedom of Thought

Fazlur Rahman supports the modern concept of equality as in the Quran, God summons all men and women to respect the unity and equality of the human race: O people! Behold, We have created you all out of a male and a female, and have made you into nations and tribes so that you might come to know one another (49:13). Equality on the basis that the Quran acknowledged both Jews and Christians as "People of the Book," those who have exceptional position since God revealed his will through his prophets, comprising Abraham, Moses, and Jesus. Classical Islamic law categorized Jews and Christians as "protected" (dhimmi) that is people who could live and execute their faith if they disbursed the head tax (jizya), which might have been a necessity for its time. In contemporary

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

world of modern nation-states, its utilization is destined to assigning non-Muslims as second-class citizens. This is against the Islamic philosophy of peace and tranquillity, which inclined to create a society where people of all beliefs can live together in harmony and reciprocal esteem. The truth is Islam is nature's religion and religious diversity is a natural phenomenon of every civilized community. So it is irrational to believe there is room for prejudiced thinking in Islam as Islamic classical law depicts. The fact is Modernity condemns the orthodox belief that disregards multi-religious, multicultural, and multinational living, noting that the Quran declares persistently, "And among His Signs, are the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the difference of your languages and colours. Verily, in that are indeed signs for men of sound knowledge, 30:22. Thus God illuminates here that spirituality exists in a pluralistic attitude. Indeed respect of other person's belief instigates more patience and therefore results in further increase in intensity of tolerance and peace in the community.

The defence of an Islamic liberalism rests on two primary arguments. First, Muslim liberals find in the Quran a remarkably open attitude toward religious diversity. Fazlur Rahman,...., argued, for example, on the basis of Sura 5 verse 48, that religious diversity is not just a necessary evil, but also a positive value:

If God had so willed, he would have made all of you one community, but [He has not done so] that He may test you in what He has given you; so compete in goodness. To God shall you all return and He will tell you [the Truth] about what you have been disputing.

The value of different religions and communities, Rahman concluded "is that they may compete with each other in goodness" (Rahman 1980:167).(52)

Pluralism in the religious framework proposes various interpretations of the primary basis of that tradition and is relatively involved in such plurality of hermeneutics as well. Orthodoxy opposed the deduction of pluralistic discussion on religion. As maintained by them, there is an ingrained apprehension for secularly motivated relativism regarding religious fact that faith in pluralism could undermine the influence of revelation with the tradition that has fixed the validity of its fundamental basis.

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

Despite the fact that faith in pluralism is indeed in harmony with the natural differences of perceptions and in the acknowledgement of free will given by Allah to his creatures, so we ought to respect other person's choices and decisions. Furthermore, it is also significant to consider that this long-established discussion in opposition to pluralism does not come in conflict with the acknowledgment of peaceful interfaith interaction as the basis of current pluralistic political and social stability. He asserted that generally developed yet, modified concepts of religious pluralism existed previously in the Islamic tradition as well.

A second argument in support of Islamic liberalism extends beyond scripture to appeal to the broader intellectual tradition of Islam. Liberals contend that the Islamic intellectual tradition not only encompasses a wide diversity of views, but also encourages and fosters this diversity. "The disagreement of the scholars," according to a famous tradition, "is a mercy to the community."The Islamic legal tradition, for example, institutionalizes diversity, first by accepting the four schools of law as equally valid, and then by tolerating a broad range of disagreement even within those four schools... The broad tolerance of the Islamic community through history is thus taken as a normative model in what might be seen as a uniquely contemporary application of *ijma*. What the community agrees on cannot be wrong, and mostly what the community seems to agree on is that there is a good deal of room for disagreement under the broad umbrella of Islam. Thus Fazlur Rahman sees a broad acceptance of diversity—a "catholic" spirit—as the definitive characteristic of Sunni Islam.(53)

Moreover, in discussing the traditional commentaries of the verses (2:62; 5:69) Fazlur Rahman evidently vindicates the concept of religious plurality in Islam.

Those who believe [Muslims], the Jews, the Christians, and the Sabaeans—whosoever believe in God and the Last Day and do good deeds, they shall have their reward from their Lord, shall have nothing to fear, nor shall they come to grief.(2:62; cf.5:69)

...the vast majority of Muslim commentators exercise themselves fruitlessly to avoid having to admit the obvious meaning: that those—from any section of humankind—who believe in God and the Last Day and do good deeds are saved. They either say that by Jews, Christians, and Sabaeans here are meant those who have

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

actually become "Muslims"—which interpretation is clearly belied by the fact that "Muslims" constitute only the first of the four groups of "those who believe"—or they were those good Jews, Christians, and Sabaeans who lived before the advent of the Prophet Muhammad—which is an even worse tour de force. Even when replying to Jewish and Christian claims that the hereafter was theirs and theirs alone, the Quran says, "On the contrary, whosoever surrenders himself to God while he does good deeds as well, he shall find his reward with his Lord, shall have no fear, nor shall he come to grief" (2:112).(54)

Hence the focus is on the good actions or moral advancement which is the basic origin of every kind of development and certainly not on the prevalence and eternalness of superficial rituals or code of laws.

The positive value of different religions and communities, then, is that they may compete with each other in goodness (cf. 2:148; 2:177; where, after announcing the change in the qibla from Jerusalem to Mecca, it is emphasized that the qibla per se is of no importance, the real worth being in virtue and competing in goodness). The Muslim community itself, lauded as the "Median Community"(2:144) and "the best community produced for mankind" (3:110), is given no assurance whatever that it will be automatically God's darling unless, when it gets power on the earth, it establishes prayers, provides welfare for the poor, commands good, and prohibits evil(22:41, etc.). In 47:38, the Muslims are warned that "If you turn your backs [upon this teaching], God will substitute another people for you who will not be like you" (cf. 9:38).(55)

Fazlur Rahman's in depth analysis gives us additional validity towards freedom of will. Hence, he expands Iqbal's belief and subsequently we have more rational arguments in this regard.

...in the broad outlines of his ideas Iqbal represents widespread trends in Muslim thinking in the modern period. In particular, he shares in a general rebellion amongst lay Muslims against the deterministic cast of Asharite theology. At the popular level this rejection of determinism finds expression in the frequent citation of a Quranic verse that Iqbal finds several excuses to quote: "Verily God will not change the condition of men, till they change what is in themselves" (Quran 13:14). Iqbal is one participant, in

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

other words, in a general reassertion of human freedom and revolt against determinism. Another manifestation of this trend has been the rehabilitation of the Mutazilites. . . . A more subtle form of what has been called neo-Mutazilism pervades the work of the modernist Fazlur Rahman. Although Rahman resisted identifying himself with the Mutazila, his opponents have not hesitated to do so, for he consistently and repeatedly defend human freedom and responsibility and the efficacy of human reason at the modern level.(56)

In view of the fact that for the respect of Pluralism and its acceptance in society human freedom is absolutely essential. For Rahman freedom of thought and thought are synonyms. So when there is no freedom and there is restriction on thinking, therefore original thought cannot be produced. The same applies to human will. If there is no freedom then the concept of test of man falls short and the whole ideology of religion becomes ambiguous.

To hold that the Quran believes in an absolute determinism of human behavior, denying free choice on man's part, is not only to deny almost the entire content of the Quran, but to undercut its very basis: the Quran by its own claim is an invitation to man to come to the right path (hudan li' l-nas). This picture is quite complex, however, and needs to be clarified. The Quran, it is true, often speaks as though man consciously chooses for himself right or wrong ways and follows them, and God only passes judgment upon his actions(e.g., 53:39-40; 76:3; 90:11ff; 91:7-10). But the Quran states even more often that when man takes a direction, God entrenches him in it: "So, for him who gives [of his wealth], guards against evil, and confirms goodness, We make good easy for him, but for him who is niggardly, thinks he is self-sufficient, and gives the lie to goodness, We make evil easy for him" (92:5-10)... no man can say "I am going to be a good person" and automatically become one. He has to struggle, and in this struggle God is his willing partner. Yet, God may not be taken for granted as though His partnership were automatic; this has to do with both the quality and the quantity of the struggle and it can be described almost literally as God's mercy.(57)

His method for rationalistic interpretation of the wisdom of God's nature in Quran accentuates that the Creator is in an active connection with His creatures and not in a state of aloofness from them. Since Fazlur Rahman

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

has traits of Iqbal in the main, he somehow comes to the conclusions like him. As here he is in complete harmony with Iqbal for the immanence of God not transcendence as the orthodoxies believe. Fazlur Rahman further investigates the orthodox ulama's restricted approach to this idea in the intellectual history of Islam.

There is no doubt that in the later Medieval period, a strong pre-determinism was widespread in Muslim societies (although many Western accounts of it are confused about both its nature and consequently its strength); but this was due not to the Quranic teaching but to a host of other factors. Prominent among these were the overwhelming success of the Ash'arite school of theology (which reduced man to impotence in the interests of saving the omnipotence of God, but whose influence upon Muslims was more formal than real), the broad spread (particularly after the sixteenth century) of doctrines of pantheistic Sufism, and, above all, strong fatalistic doctrines in the world-views of certain highly sophisticated peoples, particularly the Iranians. Under the impact of these influences, the Quranic idea of qadar (or taqdir) was interpreted as divine predetermination of everything, including human actions. (58)

He expertly highlighted the requirement for the fresh prospect of revelation, and for pluralistic dialogue of opinions between intellectuals. He connected Western as well as Islamic sources in an enthusiastic and ground-breaking approach. Hence, his efforts gives a valuable remedial to the aspect well-liked in Orientalists' writings that keeps on depicting the God of Quran as being the aloof and unreliable; it fails to portray the complete image of Quran's abounding theology of God's disposition and attributes, and it deliberately overlook the multifaceted progress of Quran's declarations about the existence and nature of other details regarding Allah, to mention Fazlur Rahman words.

What shall we say about the frequent statements of so many Westerners, in some cases even made in the name of scholarship, that the God of the Quran is a loveless, remote, capricious, and even tyrannical power which arbitrarily causes some people to go astray and others to come to guidance, creates some people for hell and others for paradise, without any rhyme or reason? Even the blind fate of pre-Islamic Arabs was not quite like this, let alone the creative, sustaining, merciful, and purposeful God of the Quran. Further, the picture is utterly incompatible with the most

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

fundamental outline of the doctrine of God described above. If the Western allegations are correct, they must square with this outline; otherwise, our outline, based on numerous verses of the Quran, must be rejected as false. (59)

Therefore Fazlur Rahman's intelligent, unprejudiced and logical views are in complete harmony with modern neutral scientific approach towards religious knowledge which is something that Iqbal had wished for, that is to study religion with critical mind set. Whose method of inquisition is free from all kinds of presumptions and who, endeavors to analyze the basics of religion as they occur naturally without the backdrop of former scholarly works.

His object is to apply methods of scientific research to religion, with a view to discover how the various elements in a given structure fit in with one another, how each factor functions individually, and how their relation with one another determines the functional value of the whole. (60)

Fazlur Rahman has the same scientific spirit through which he studies and scrutinizes the doctrines generally. He utilizes this neutral approach for analyzing both the traditional orthodoxy's and Orientalists' considerations. Such as, for the Orientalists accusation that the Prophet had epileptic fits, Fazlur Rahman brilliantly not only rectify it but also put it to end without being biased and gives logical reasons which cannot be denied. He states:

... some modern historians have conjectured that he suffered from epileptic fits. On a closer examination, however, the epilepsy theory faces objections which seem to us fatal. To begin with, this condition begins only when Muhammad's Prophetic career starts at about the age of forty, there being no trace of it in his earlier life. Secondly, tradition makes it clear that this condition recurred only with a revelatory experience and never occurred independently. This is, indeed, a strange form of epilepsy which is *invariably* associated with the deliverance of guiding principles for such a powerful and creative movement as the Prophet's and never occurs by itself. We are not, of course, denying the possibility of someone suffering from epilepsy and *also* being endowed with spiritual experiences, but the point is that *at least sometimes* the former should be capable of occurring independently of the latter even if the latter may not occur without the former. Lastly, it is incredible that a distinct malady such as epilepsy should not have been

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

identifiable clearly and definitely in a sophisticated society like the Meccan or Medinese. (61)

While maintaining that revelation is not exterior to the Prophet, he states that the real idea of its exterior temperament is a fundamental delusion of orthodoxy. Unlike Sir Sayyed, Fazlur Rahman does not unambiguously nullify the existence of angel; neither does he contradict the oral nature of revelation, as generally held. For him, there was certain 'channel' to convey the Moral Law from its Source to Prophet's heart but he does not wonder about this channel and discards all the opinions of it that are "quasi-mechanical"; likewise as he discards the 'locomotive' character of Prophet's ascension to heavens. However, he evaluates the underlying meaning of ascension. In this state of 'self ascension' the Prophet's articulation of the Moral Law is Quran.

This was supposed to guarantee the externality of the Angel or the Voice in the interests of safeguarding the 'objectivity' of the Revelation. The attempt may seem to us intellectually immature, but at the time when the dogma was in the making, there were compelling reasons for taking this step, particularly the controversies against the rationalists. A great deal of Hadith, commonly accepted later, came into existence portraying the Prophet talking to the Angel in public and graphically describing the appearance of the latter. Despite the fact that it is contradicted by the Quran which says '... We sent him (the Angel) down upon your *heart* that you may be a warner' (XXVI, 194, cf. II, 97) this idea of the externality of the Angel and the Revelation has become so ingrained in the general Muslim mind that the real picture is anathema to it... But the spiritual experiences of the prophet were later woven by tradition, especially when an 'orthodoxy' began to take shape, into the doctrine of a single, physical, locomotive experience of the 'Ascension' of Muhammad to Heaven, and still later were supplied all the graphic details about the animal which was ridden by the Prophet during his ascension, about his sojourn in each of the seven heavens, and his parleys with the Prophets of bygone ages from Adam up to Jesus....

Consequently, he proclaims boldly inconsistently with orthodox ulama: ...yet in either case the doctrine of a locomotive *miraj* or 'Ascension' developed by the orthodox (chiefly on the pattern of the Ascension of Jesus) and backed by Hadith is no more than a historical fiction whose materials come from various sources. (62)

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

And so another outstanding rational denial of him is the dogma of intercession. Fazlur Rahman is not in favour of the Prophet's intercession for Muslims as the traditional orthodoxy's belief. In the same way, he considers that the hypothesis presented by the orthodoxy, for the events which took place in the Prophet's journey Muslims generally accepts it as a fact. Even though these sorts of concepts exists in Islamic theology, but not in the ideas of Quran, on the contrary, indeed whose opposites could be found, and the dogma of intercession and miraj is one of them.

The story of the Prophet's Ascension (miraj) is an example of such superstitionism which finds little support in the Quran... the Quran not only does not speak of a physical ascension of the Prophet but even describes it as an "act of the heart"; and in two places, far from speaking of the Prophet as ascending; it speaks of God as descending to him. It seems, however, that when the Muslims confronted the Christians outside the Arabian Peninsula and particularly in Iraq they were forced to interpret this experience as that of ascension in answer to the Christian dogma of the Assumption of Jesus. Similarly, the doctrine of intercession (shafaah) was the Muslim counterpart to the Christian redemption even though intercession has been explicitly and recurrently rejected by the Quran.(63)

Therefore in confronting with Christians' doctrine the stress on such suppositions was given to strengthen Islamic theology, since they were in contrast of the fundamental nature of Islamic basics. Fazlur Rahman brilliantly traces these acts which actually ruined Muslims' progress of moral values on the whole.

According to the orthodox Muslim belief, as it crystallized in the second and third centuries of Islam (the eighth and ninth centuries of the Christian era), intercession is not possible with regard to infidels or non-Muslims in general (on the fate of Jews and Christians some Muslim theologians like Ibn Taimiya have advocated a non-committal attitude), but it will be effective on behalf of sinful Muslims. This belief was originally opposed by the Mu'tazila (who subsequently, however, fell in line with the orthodox view on the point—so strong is the psychological factor involved in the ideas of intercession and redemption) yet here is a clear -cut verse of the Quran negating, beyond doubt, any intercession even on behalf of Muslims: "O you who believe! Spend [for the welfare of the poor] from what We have provided you before the arrival of a Day on which neither

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

trade shall benefit, nor any friendship, nor any intercession" (2:254; cf. also 2:48, 123; 6:5; 51:70; 39:44,23).

However, the Quran also says that no one shall intercede with God "except whom He permits" (2:255; 10:3; 20:109; 34:23; 53:26) and it is to these words the orthodoxy attached the idea that intercession is permissible on the assumption that God would permit Muhammad to intercede on his community's behalf. (64)

A further major thought of Fazlur Rahman which sets him apart is that the Quranic injunctions are not eternal in their literal meaning that succeeding scholars had determined. Such as, for the problem of slavery, the essence of the Quranic legislation demonstrates a clear tendency to the liberty of slaves but Slavery was not eliminated in time as it should be in the early history. Muslims did not in fact eliminate slavery absolutely until the near contemporary period. One theological cause is that scholars started interpreting Quran as a legalistic document, forsaking the real spirit behind the freeing of slaves and describing the grant of slavery as eternally employed injunctions. A superior method would have been to consider the Quran as a moral text rather than a legal one. A scheme of morals could then be advanced from the literals of Quran and then the legal problems could be figured out subsequently.

In understanding the Quran's social reforms, however, we will go fundamentally wrong unless we distinguish between legal enactments and moral injunctions. Only by so distinguishing can we not only understand the true orientation of the Quranic teaching but also solve certain knotty problems with regard, for example, to women's reform. This is where the Muslim legal tradition, which essentially regarded the Quran as a law book and not *the religious source* of the law, went so palpably wrong. (65)

He then takes the case of polygamy and refers the Quranic verses regarding polygamy (i.e. 3:3; 4:127; 4:129). And after explaining them he asserts that it is seemingly a conflict in the authorization for polygamy to four behind the condition of the obligation of fairness and the obvious assertion that such justice is, in the temperament of things is unfeasible.

The traditionalist interpretation was that the permission clause has legal force while the demand for justice is, though important, is left to the conscience of the husband(although traditional Islamic law gave women the right to seek remedy or divorce in case of gross injustice or cruelty).

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

The weakness of this position from the viewpoint of normative religion is that something should be left to the good conscience of the husband, even though in the nature of things it is certain to be violated. Muslim modernists, on the other hand, tend to give primacy to the demand for justice plus the declaration of the impossibility of justice, and say that permission for polygamy was meant to be only temporary and for a restricted purpose.

After evaluating traditionalists' and modernists' point of views, he elucidates his rationales i.e.

The truth seems to be that permission for polygamy was at a legal plane while the sanctions put on it were in the nature of a moral ideal towards which the society was expected to move, since it was not possible to remove polygamy legally at one stroke. We encounter a similar phenomenon with regard to slavery: the Quran legally accepted the institution of slavery, since it was impossible to legislate it away at one stroke, but strongly recommended and encouraged emancipation of slaves (90:13; 889; 58:3), and, in fact, asked Muslims to allow slaves to purchase their freedom by paying an agreed sum in installments (24:33); the classical Muslim lawyers, however, interpreted this as a "recommendation," not a command. (66)

He alleges that in the case of polygamy it is profusely obvious that although the essence of Quranic legislation reveals a clear tendency towards the gradual process of constructing new legislation by which the essential human principles of liberty and accountability becomes tangible and noticeable. However the intention of Quran as established at that time, presented the need of a certain change in societal milieu.

It is also true that the Quran says that men should not marry more than one wife if they fear they cannot do justice among them, adding categorically that no matter how much men may try, they will not be able to do justice among several wives. However, it remains equally true that the Quran had given permission to marry up to four wives. The only way to understand the Quranic pronouncements as a whole is to say that, whereas the Quran desired to promote the maximal happiness of the family life and, for this purpose stated that a monogamous marriage would, normally, be ideal, this declared moral purpose had nevertheless to be compromised with the actual seventh century Arabian society

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

into which polygamy was deeply structured and hence could not be *legally* rooted out except on pain of utterly defeating the *moral* purpose itself. The Quran therefore, accepted polygamy at the *legal* level, restricted it and put as many safeguards against it as possible, but at the same time the *moral* ideal was enunciated as that of a monogamous society towards which the Prophet may have hoped the Muslims would move. (67)

This evidently makes certain that the authentic method of legislation from Quran could not intend to be literally everlasting. There are facts to validate that in the initial era of Muslims' history, they were in the habit of interpreting the Quran pretty liberally. However later in the era of juristic progress, the outstanding aspects of which is the emergence of the Traditions and the progress of technical, analogical reasoning, the lawyers tidily fixed themselves and the society to the 'text' of Quran until the subject matter of Muslim law and theology obscured beneath the burden of literalism. Therefore, Fazlur Rahman suggests that there could possibly be one adequate way of carrying out justice for the requirement of rational and ethical honesty is the kind of interpretation that could cope with all the possibilities of historical critique.

Conclusion

Fazlur Rahman tended to emphasize the need for an interpretation of revelation in a modern perspective, and from a pluralistic point of view among intellectuals. He linked Western and Islamic sources in a genuine and innovative method. Fazlur Rahman's intellectual, objective and sound analysis are in absolute agreement of modern neutral scientific method towards religious knowledge as Iqbal desired, that is to study religion with neutral and analytical approach.

He considered that the orthodox Islam mistakenly laid emphasis on taqlid over Ijtihad. Rahman believes that the traditional madhabs inflict the observance of obsolete laws which were not methodically originated from the revealed text and so are not able to assimilate the true significance of the Quran. He thinks this also directed the religious authorities to rely unnecessarily on Hadith, and thus Rahman, regarded the sway of the Hadith arguable. Indeed, he wanted to reconstruct Islamic morals and jurisprudence by re-examining the historical context from which they developed. The Hadith literature ought to be studied within the background of foremost developments of Islamic history. While analyzing the idea of renaissance approach which insists on going back to the literals

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

of Quran and Sunnah, he argues that it should be meant to the return to its meaning and message behind the words instead on literal grounds.

For the legislation of Islamic laws here again he is in absolute accord with Iqbal. Fazlur Rahman rather defined Iqbal's idea comprehensively that the authority of Ijtihad should be given to the Muslim legislative assembly.

Fazlur Rahman upholds the modern idea of open-mindedness for other religions on the basis that Quran approved an exceptionally open approach for religious diversity. Furthermore, on the whole advanced and modified concepts of religious pluralism also existed formerly in the Islamic tradition.

Considering the fact that for the admiration of Pluralism and its acknowledgment in society human freedom is certainly crucial. If there is no freedom then the belief of test of man goes wrong and the entire thought of religion becomes uncertain.

As Quran stresses that the Creator has an effective bond with His creature and do not have a state of detachment from them. Rahman believes in the immanence of God not transcendence in contrast to the orthodoxies, since he has traits of Iqbal generally, here as well Fazlur Rahman is in absolute agreement with him.

Fazlur Rahman does not acknowledge the Prophet's intercession for Muslims as the traditional orthodox believes. For the proceedings which occurred in the Prophet's expedition, which Muslims by and large believe as factual, he regards it as the hypothesis suggested by them. The doctrines of intercession or of miraj are the important examples of the prevailing notions among Muslims; such false notions have little validation in the Quran and Sunnah. While in answering Christians' dogma the emphasis on such assumptions was given to intensify Islamic theology, in view of the fact that they were contradictory to the essence of the basics of Islam. Fazlur Rahman accomplishedly locates these actions which actually ruined the evolution of moral values overall in Muslims.

Fazlur Rahman alleges the Ulama for the trend of secularism in Muslim societies. He maintains that it is the result of pursuing literal interpretation and disregarding the philosophy behind them that the chasm and space between Islam and today's world has developed. Thus their inflexibility and observance to the glorified past and their single-minded accentuation of the literal application of Quran and Hadith, compelled Muslims towards

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

secularism. Hence, it is the approach of Ulama that is justly liable for the pervasiveness of disregarded attitude and deficiency of conviction in religion among educated Muslims.

References:

- 1) Fazlur Rahman, Implementation of the Islamic Concept of State in the Pakistani Milieu, *Islamic Studies*, Vol.VI, No.2, September 1967, No.3, p.217
- 2) Fazlur Rahman, The Impact of Modernity on Islam, *Islamic Studies*, 5:2, p.115; Islamic Research Institute, Islamabad, June 1966.
- 3) John L. Esposito, *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World*. Edited by John L. Esposito, Vol. 3, 1995, New York, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 408.
- 4) Fazlur Rahman, *Islam and Modernity, Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*, The University of Chicago Press 1990, USA, p.142.
- 5) Fazlur Rahman, *Major Themes of the Quran*, Minneapolis, Bibliotheca Islamica, Chicago, 1980 p. xii.
- 6) Fazlur Rahman, Social Change and Early Sunnah, *Islamic Studies*, Vol.II:No.2, June 1963, p.209.
- 7) Fazlur Rahman, *Revival and Reform in Islam, A Study of Islamic Fundamentalism*, Oxford Oneworld Publications, 2000, p.149. As Referred by Meena Sharify-Funk, *From Dichotomies to Dialogues in Contemporary Islam*, Edited by Abdul Aziz Said, Mohammad Abu-Nimer, Meena Sharify-Funk, Routledge, London and New York, 2006, p. 69.
- 8) Fazlur Rahman, *Islam: Challenges and Opportunities*, in *Islam: Past Influence and Present Challenge*, Edited by Alford T. Welch and Pierre Cachia, Edinburgh University Press, 1979, p.322.
- 9) Dr. Fazlur Rahman, *Islam and Modernity, Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*, op.cit., p.147.
- 10) Quoted by Muhammad Yusuf Musa, *Imn Taymiyya* (Cairo: Al-Mu'assa al-Misriyya al-'Amma li'l-Ta'lif wa'l-Tiba'awa'l-Nashr, 1962), pp.46-47. As referred by Tamara Sonn, *Fazlur Rahman's Islamic Methodology*, *The Muslim World*, Vol. LXXXI, Nos. 3-4, The Duncan Black Macdonald Center at Hartford Seminary, 1991, p.218.
- 11) Fazlur Rahman, *Islam*, University of Chicago press, Chicago and London, 1979, pp.47-48
- 12) Fazlur Rahman, *Islamic Methodology in History*, Central Institute of Islamic Research, Karachi, 1965, p.143.
- 13) Tamara A. Sonn, *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Islamic World*, John L. Esposito editor in chief, Vol. 4, Oxford University Press, New York, 2009, p.502.
- 14) *The Islamic World Past and Present*, vol.3, Editor in chief John L. Esposito, Associate Editors Abdulaziz Sachedina, Tamara Sonn, John O. Voll, Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 29.
- 15) Ibrahim Moosa, *Introduction in Revival and Reform in Islam*, Fazlur Rahman, op.cit., p.13.
- 16) Fazlur Rahman, *Islam and Modernity, Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*, op.cit., p. 17.
- 17) *Ibid*, p. 2-3.

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

- 18) Meena Sharify-Funk, *From Dichotomies to Dialogues in Contemporary Islam*, Edited by Abdul Aziz Said, Mohammad Abu-Nimer, Meena Sharify-Funk, op.cit., p. 70.
- 19) Fazlur Rahman, *Islam and Modernity, Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*, op.cit., pp.29-30.
- 20) Ebrahim Moosa, *Introduction in Revival and Reform in Islam*, Fazlur Rahman, op.cit., p.14
- 21) Martin Riexinger, *Middle East Studies Association Bulletin*, Cambridge University Press, New York, Volume 35 Number 1 Summer 2001, p.103.
- 22) Ibid, p.104.
- 23) Fazlur Rahman, *Islam and Modernity, Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*, op.cit., p. 20. Emphasis is in the reference.
- 24) Fazlur Rahman, *Implementation of the Islamic Concept of State in the Pakistani Milieu*, *Islamic Studies*, Vol.VI, September 1967, No 3, p.216.
- 25) Fazlur Rahman, *Implementation of the Islamic Concept of State in the Pakistani Milieu*, *Islamic Studies*, op.cit., p.218.
- 26) Ibid, p.216.
- 27) Fazlur Rahman, *Islam and Modernity, Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*, op.cit., p.132.
- 28) Fazlur Rahman, *Social Change and Early Sunnah*, *Islamic Studies*, op.cit., p.207.
- 29) Fazlur Rahman, *Implementation of the Islamic Concept of State in the Pakistani Milieu*, *Islamic Studies*, op.cit., p.217.
- 30) Fazlur Rahman, *Islam and Modernity, Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*, op.cit. p.20.
- 31) Ibid, p.5-7.
- 32) Fazlur Rahman, *Islam and Modernity*, pp.5-7, as referred by Ebrahim Moosa, *Introduction in Revival and Reform in Islam*, Fazlur Rahman, op.cit., p.15.
- 33) Fazlur Rahman, *The Impact of Modernity on Islam*, *Islamic Studies*, op.cit., p.119.
- 34) Fazlur Rahman, *RIBA AND INTEREST*, *Islamic Studies (Karachi)* 3(1), Mar. 1964 p.31.
- 35) Ibid, p.36-37.
- 36) Fazlur Rahman, *The Impact of Modernity on Islam*, *Islamic Studies*, op.cit., p.127.
- 37) Ibid., p.127.
- 38) Fazlur Rahman, *The Impact of Modernity on Islam*, *Islamic Studies*, op.cit., p.119.
- 39) Allama Muhammad Iqbal, *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, edited and annotated by M.Saeed Sheikh, Institute of Islamic Culture, Lahore, 2006, p. xci
- 40) Fazlur Rahman, *Islam and Modernity, Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1990, p.10-11. As referred by Tamara Sonn, *Fazlur Rahman's Islamic Methodology*, *The Muslim World*, Vol. LXXXI, Nos. 3-4, The Duncan Black Macdonald Center at Hartford Seminary, 1991, p.220.
- 41) Fazlur Rahman, *Islam and Modernity, Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*, op.cit., p.8.
- 42) Fazlur Rahman, *Islamic Methodology in History*, op.cit. p. 151.
- 43) Ibid, p. 173.

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's Distinctive Religious Ideas

- 44) Ibid, p. 152
- 45) Iqbal, Muhammad, Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, Lahore, 1960, p.149. As referred by Ibid, p. 171.
- 46) Ibid, p. 172.
- 47) Ibid, p. 172.
- 48) Tamara A. Sonn, The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Islamic World, John L. Esposito editor in chief, Vol. 4, op.cit., p.502.
- 49) Fazlur Rahman, Social Change and Early Sunnah, Islamic Studies, Vol.II:No.2 (June 1963),p.205
- 50) Fazlur Rahman, The Impact of Modernity on Islam, Islamic Studies, op.cit., p. 128.
- 51) Fazlur Rahman, The Impact of Modernity on Islam, Islamic Studies, op.cit., p. 127.
- 52) Daniel Brown, A new Introduction to Islam, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004, p.231.
- 53) Ibid, pp.232-233.
- 54) Fazlur Rahman, Major Themes of the Quran, op.cit., p.166.
- 55) Ibid, p.167
- 56) Daniel Brown, A new Introduction to Islam, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004, p.223-224.
- 57) Fazlur Rahman, Major Themes of the Quran, op.cit., p.20-21.
- 58) Ibid., p.23.
- 59) Fazlur Rahman, Major Themes of the Quran, op.cit., p.15.
- 60) Muhammad Iqbal, Islam as a Moral and Political Ideal, in Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal, edited with notes by Syed Abdul Wahid, op.cit., p.29
- 61) Fazlur Rahman, Islam, op.cit., p.13.
- 62) Ibid, p.14.
- 63) Fazlur Rahman, The Impact of Modernity on Islam, Islamic Studies, op.cit., p.122;
- 64) Fazlur Rahman, Major Themes of the Quran, op.cit., p.31-32.
- 65) Ibid, p.47.
- 66) Ibid, p.47-49.
- 67) Fazlur Rahman, The Impact of Modernity on Islam, Islamic Studies, op.cit., pp.121-122.