USING THE NUMBER 786 AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR "BISMILLAAHIR RAHMAANIR RAHEEM"

BY
MUJLISUL ULAMA OF SOUTH AFRICA
PO BOX 3393
PORT ELIZABETH
6056 SOUTH AFRICA

THE USE OF 786

Q. Someone claims that using the number 786 as a symbol for Bismillaah is bid'ah. Is it permissible to write 786 instead of Bismillaah?

A. It is not bid'ah to use the number 786 as a substitute for *Bismillaahir Rahmaanir Raheem.* Although there is no Sunnah significance in using 786, it is permissible to use it as a substitute for the Arabic text of the Bismillaah aayat.

Q. Please explain the meaning of the number 786 which people generally write in their letters.

A. Each *harf* (letter) of the Arabic alphabet has a numerical value. e.g. Alif's value is 1, Ba's value 2, Taa is 400, Thaa is 500 and so on. The sum of the numbers of the letters in the aayat Bismillah is 786. This number is therefore used as a symbol for the Aayat *Bismillaahir Rahmaanir Raheem.* Although this is not a Sunnah practice, it is simply permissible.

Q. What is the significance of the number 786 which is used to symbolize *Bismillaahir Rahmaanir Raheem*? I have read in an article that this number is *shirk* because it also symbolizes the Hindu god Hari Krishna. Is it permissible to use this number?

A. Yes, it is permissible to use 786 as a written substitute for the *Tasmiah*. The Hari Krishna talk is bunkum. All our great and illustrious Ulama and Auliya have used this number as well as many other number combinations for Ta'weez. There is no Islamic significance in the number 786. Its use is merely permissible. If this number does also symbolize Hari Krishna, it is simply a coincidence. Muslims did not borrow it from the followers of some Hindu cult.

Hari Krishna is furthest from the minds of Muslims who use this number. No Muslim who uses 786 has the faintest idea of any association with Hari Krishna. Something does not become haraam or shirk by mere coincidence. There is no evidence in the Shariah for the claim that 786 is shirk.

The author has merely presented his opinion without substantiating it with Shar'i proofs. The

Qur'aanic Aayat he presents has no bearing on his claim. While it is conceded that there is no origin in the Sunnah for the use of 786 as a substitute to be used for Bismillah, it cannot be said that it is not permissible or that it is a sinful innovation. Many things have no origin in the Sunnah , but are permissible. Using a typewriter, implements and modes of transport, etc., for example, have no origin in the Sunnah, but it is permissible. Writing Tafseer in the English language in which we have to start the holy words from the left side has no origin in the Sunnah, but it is not unlawful to do so. Everything which is not in conflict with any teaching or principle of the Shariah will be *Mubah (Permissible)* even if there is no origin for it in the Sunnah.

Yes, when a Mubah is accorded a status higher than its Mubah status, then it will be transformed into a bid'ah. But, this is not the case of 786. No one believes it to be waajib. Its writing is not advocated as a Sunnah teaching. People have adopted it on account of their whimsical fancy, hence it remains permissible.

Should its Wujoob or it being a Sunnat be propagated then undoubtedly, it will be bid'ah

because such emphasis will indicate an erroneous belief.

It is undeniable that the Arabic *huroof* have numerical values. Great Ulama utilize this numerical value system to write Ta'weez, and in their Ta'weez they write 786 to represent **Bismillaah.** None of the many Akaabireen who had adopted the numerical value of writing Ta'weez in which appears 786 ever thought that this number is bidah.

The argument that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) wrote the full *Bismillah* in his letters to the kings is no substantiation for the claim that writing 786 is bid'ah because the question of writing the full *Bismillah* in the Arabic form is an entirely a different issue. The question we are discussing is the permissibility or not of 786 as a substitute for *Bismillah*. At most the author can claim that Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) letter contained *Bismillah*, not 786. But this claim will merely be a statement of a fact. It will not render 786 Bid'ah. Even the style of Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) letter, the way in which he addresses the kings, etc., differ from the style we have adopted in our letters in general. Since our style of address in

our letters differs from the style of Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) letters, it cannot be argued that our style is bid'ah.

Furthermore, the issue of writing *Bismillaah* in the Arabic text to non-Muslims is an *Ikhtilaafi* mas'alah. According to some Fuqaha it is not permissible because it is necessary to be pure from *hadth* when touching any Qur'aanic Aayat. With regard to the Aayat which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had written, there are different interpretations. One such interpretation is that in those days the Ahl-e-Kitaab were religious people. They adhered too much of the ritual practices of the Taurah and Injeel. Ghusl-e-Janaabat and abstention from haraam meat were among their salient features. It was for this very reason that the Sahaabah would without hesitation eat the meat of the Ahl-e-Kitaab although they would not enter the homes of the Ahl-e-Kitaab in a hurry because the Ahl-e-Kitaab were strict with regard to halaal meat, but since they hung pictures of animate objects in their homes, the Sahaabah would not enter .

The argument of 786 representing Hari Krishna is a pure coincidence. Such coincidences are not worthy of consideration. It does not follow from

any conception of the Unity of Allah which any other religion holds that we have to shun our conception of Tauhid because people of baatil too hold such views. If by coincidence the Shiahs and ourselves agree on any specific aspect, it does not follow that we should discard our view and brand it bid'ah or an aspect in emulation of the Shiah. The Yahood and Nasaara also believe in the Aakhirah. It does not follow that we have to abandon our belief in the Aakhirah.

Further, Hari Krishna is not an Arabic term. The form given to it in Arabic by the author of the article is its nearest transliteration. Also, there is no obligation to accept the transliteration of the author as being the correct or only correct transliteration. There is no compulsion to transliterate Hari Krishna in the way the author has done. Hari Krishna could also be transliterated into Arabic by omitting the *Yaa*. In this form, the total will be 776. We can also omit the *Alif* at the end as no one pronounces it. Why did the author have to add an *Alif* at the end when this is not an Arabic term.

Also, if the author's advice of adding the number of the *Alif* after the *Meem* of *Ar-Rahmaan* is accepted, then the number of *Bismillah* will

change and become 787. If someone adopts this number, no one will say that he is wrong. In this way he can escape the authors charge of shirk on the assumption that 786 represents Hari Krishna. Hence, by mentioning the fact of the additional *Alif*, the author has also defeated his own argument as it is not supportive of his view.

Anyhow these are only coincidences, conjecture and arguments which are not Shar'i *dalaa-il.*

The aayat pertaining to shirk cited by the Author has absolutely no relationship with the issue of 786. It has never occurred to the mind of any person , laymen or Aalim that Hari Krishna or any other element of shirk is intended here. Those who write 786 do so only in respect of *Bismillaah*. Since they feel reasonably certain that the holy Aayat will be desecrated, they write 786. The charge of shirk brought by the author is absolutely ridiculous. To believe or claim that those who write 786 are doomed to everlasting Hell-fire is indeed an audacious and reckless claim. Many great Auliya and Ulama write Qur'aanic aayat in numerical form in their Ta'weez.

While we do not say that 786 is Sunnah nor do we say that it is an act of thawaab (perhaps there will be thawaab on account of the good niyyat), we must at the same time say that it is not bid'ah and never shirk.

The following is a reproduction of our letter written in 2007 on the same question.

ASSALAMU ALAIKUM

23 Zil Hajj 1427 (13-01-2007)

Muhtaram Mufti Sahib,

We are in receipt of your e-mail dated 12-01-2007 together with the 786 article. You had sent us the same article during 1992. A copy of our response dated 27th Rabiul Awwal 1413 (25th September 1992) is attached hereto. Our further comments are as follows:

(1) The anonymous writer of the article claims: *"Having borrowed the Qabalist science of Gematria, the Muslim theological adventurers, who had nothing else to do, got down to reducing the Qur'aanic verses, and even the Soorahs, to numbers*."

Origin in antiquity is not a factor of prohibition. The writer concedes: "The ancient art of numerology went hand in hand with the development of mathematics, geometry and

trigonometry." If the numerology of the letters of the Arabic alphabet was, supposedly, borrowed from the science of Gematria, this is never a factor of *hurmat*. Mantiq (Logic) was taken directly from the kuffaar Greek philosophers and so was Falsafah (philosophy). Despite astronomy having been heavily associated with magic and fortune-telling, Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) instructed the Sahaabah to learn from *Ilm-e-Nujoom* whatever is necessary for their material and practical life such as direction.

Despite mathematics, geometry and trigonometry being associated with ancient kuffaar, this relationship does not render these branches of science haraam. In fact, these branches of sciences are imperative for thousands of activities and operations. Everything associated with the ancients is not shirk.

So, even if the numerology of the Arabic alphabet was procured from Pythagoras or from ancients before him, this is not a factor of prohibition.

The head movements in Thikr *Nafi-Ithbaat* as well as some of the methodology which the Auliya have adopted in their *Athkaar* and *Ashghaal* have been borrowed from the Yogis. But this does not render these *Athkaar* and *Ashghaal* haraam. As long as the Shar'i limits are observed, the issues of bid'ah and shirk do not arise.

Therefore, even if "some Muslim theological adventurers" had borrowed *Abjad* from the science of Gematria, it is not grounds for labelling it haraam in the same way as borrowing any beneficial knowledge from the present day kuffaar atheist scientists is not haraam.

(2) The claim that the Ulama had nothing to do, hence they became involved in the *Abjad* science is the stupidity of a jaahil. The jaahil should substantiate his stupid claim with facts and figures. The true and illustrious Ulama and Fuqaha throughout Islamic history were always overwhelmed with Ilmi and Islaahi services. Their copious works on Islam bear loud and conspicuous testimony to this fact. If an Aalim

had engaged in the Abjad science, only a jaahil like the anonymous writer of the stupid article will claim that such an Aalim had nothing else to do. There was so much barkat in the time of the great Ulama and Auliya that whilst engrossed 24 hours of the day in Ilmi and ibaadat services, they found time for even beneficial material and worldly pursuits for the sake and benefit of Allah's Makhlooq. It devolves on the jaahil writer to specify who exactly the "Muslim theological adventurers who had nothing else to do", were. If he would name them, we could pursue this slanderous dimension of his argument with greater elaboration.

(3) The jaahil writer of the article states: "It is my contention that 786 does NOT mean BISMILAAHIR RAHMMAANIR RAHEEM, for it has no meaning other than seven hundred and eighty-six units of anything."

The jaahil has merely advertised his compound ignorance. If this is his contention, our contention is the contrary. His contention is not substantiated by Wahi nor by any other Shar'i

daleel. No one is under any obligation to accept and digest the opinion of the writer.

We can formulate a numerical code to correspond with letters of the alphabet for purposes of secret discussion. In such a secret code there is nothing to debar us from giving every letter of the alphabet a number, then utilize that number to represent the letter to which it (the number) has been accorded. Thus, while an ignoramus such as the anonymous writer will not understand 513, for example, to mean anything other than five hundred and thirteen units, those versified in the coded language will understand the message. Similarly, the *Huroof-e-Muqat-ta-aat* at the beginning of some *Suwar* have hidden and mysterious meanings. But to a jaahil, '*Swaad* ' will mean nothing but the *harf swaad*, while to the intelligent it does have a meaning but Allah knows best its meaning.

In the same way, if great and illustrious Ulama have substituted the Tasmiah with 786, there is absolutely no conflict with the Shariah. Every intelligent person who sees 786 will understand

that it is a substitute for *Bismillaahir Rahmaanir Raheem*. No one will commence any activity, any recitation, etc. by reciting 786 or 'seven hundred and eighty six'. No one will begin reciting the Qur'aan or writing a letter verbally say 786. Everyone who writes 786 will recite the Tasmiah fully. No one ever had accepted 786 as a substitute for verbal recitation of the Tasmiah.

Those who substitute *Tasmiah* with 786 are exactly in the same category as those who write the *Tasmiah* in the transliterated form, namely, *Bismillaahir Rahmaanir Raheem*. Just as this transliteration is NOT the actual *Tasmiah*, so too is 786 not the actual *Tasmiah*. Just as a person recites the transliteration in Arabic in its full form, so too does the one who writes or reads 786. He never reads "786 – Alhamdulillaahi Rabbil Aalameen", for example. The *Tasmiah* is always recited in full. There is therefore no substance in the stupid contention of the jaahil writer of the 786 article.

Furthermore, for (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the jaahil writes 'pbuh'. From whence did this

lazy jaahil acquire the abbreviation as an adequate substitute for the full Durood?

While numerous Ulama say that writing such abbreviation for the full Durood is not permissible, no Aalim of worth has claimed that it is not permissible to write 786 as a substitute for 786. When we say 'Aalim of worth', we refer to the illustrious Akaabireen, not to the puny non-entities such as ourselves.

There is no *ikhtilaaf* whatsoever regarding the permissibility of touching an Arabic Durood without Wudhu, but there is such an *ikhtilaaf* regarding the *Bismillaah* aayat.

Yet we find this writer adopting the symbol 'pbuh' for the Durood while he baselessly objects to 786 for the *Tasmiah*. From whence did he borrow pbuh? From some ancient mushrik or from some modernist atheist or from some zindeeq? If 786 is shirk, pbuh is also shirk.

Even today in places such as Kazakhstan a Muslim teaches the Qur'aanic recitation at the peril of his life. Just a couple of months ago. A

Chinese Aalim (he had qualified at Madrasah Zakariyya) was clandestinely teaching people to recite the Qur'aan Shareef in Kazakhstan. He was wanted by the Chinese government. When the kuffaar authorities of Kazakhstan leant that the Maulana was teaching the Qur'aan Shareef, they kidnapped him and promptly handed him over to the Chinese government for detention and torture. Do make dua for the Maulana Saheb. We have written for Amnesty, but have received no response. Only Allah Ta'ala can help us in such situations.

Now if in a situation such as this where one's life is at stake, if the Qur'aan is secretly taught utilizing numerology to save detection, there will be nothing but praise and thawaab for it. Anyhow, this is just by the way.

(4) The jaahil stating an obvious fact, avers: "The Qur'aan is not a book of mathematics or a book of symbolic numbers." Never was such a preposterous claim made by anyone, not even by the "Muslim theological adventurers".

(5) The jaahil also claims: “The absurdity of Abjad numbers becomes clear if you reflect upon the following numbers 66, 92, 352, 296 and 62. What do these numbers stand for? What do they mean? They are the numerical values of Allah, Muhammad (pbuh), Qur’aan, Rasool, and Nabi respectively... ..but can we dare to allocate similar (prison) numbers to Allah and His Messenger? The users of 786 have the arrogance to do so, but a God conscious Muslim (a Muslim with Taqwa) will not even dream of using such numbers. ”

The ignoramus uses the word ‘god’ as a substitute for Allah even while addressing Muslims. Is he now not guilty of emulating the kuffaar? Is he not insulting Allah Ta’ala? The word ‘god’ is used for even idols, and if you spell it backwards it means ‘dog’ – Nauthubillaah! How can the jaahil who speaks of Taqwa use such a derogatory word for Allah Ta’ala? Then while addressing Muslims, instead of saying Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the jaahil says “the Prophet (pbuh).” This word is used for any kaafir and mushrik. What inhibits him from

saying Allah Ta'ala and Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? He has no qualms about using such derogatory terms for Allah Ta'ala and Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), but he crows much about the use of a number as a written substitute for the *Tasmiah*, not as a verbal substitute. But he uses 'god' and 'prophet' and pbuh as verbal substitutes for the sacred terms, Allah, Rasulullah and Sallallahu alayhi wasallam!

Firstly, the jaahil should prove that Muslims have been using and are using the numbers 66, 92, 352, 296 and 62 as he contends. Besides the profuse and customary use of 786, can the jaahil substantiate his contention? Is there a practice among Muslims to use the number 66 as a substitute for Allah? Besides 786 which other number has gained prominence in the Muslim community?

Secondly, such numbers are used by great Ulama and Auliya in the preparation of Ta'weez. The arrogant jaahil claims that only people without Taqwa will use the aforementioned numbers as

substitutes for ‘Allah, Muhammad, etc.’. Yet we all are aware that those who lack Taqwa and Ilm have absolutely no awareness of the fact that 66 is the numerical substitute for ‘Allah’, and 92 for Muhammad, and 352 for Qur’aan, and so on. But what we are aware of is that only men whose Taqwa is unquestionable and of an exceptionally high calibre did and do use these numerical substitutes in the preparation of Ta’weez. Thus, men such as Hakimul Ummat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi and innumerable such great Ulama and even greater Ulama and Auliya before him all had utilized this numerology to represent Qur’aanic aayaat in the preparation of Ta’weez. They have written treatises on Ta’weez and amaliyaat using numerology. These were men of the Shariah who championed the Cause of the Deen and who dedicated their lives to the elimination of bid’ah and shirk. Besides being paragons of virtue and Taqwa, they were glittering Stars of Uloom. If the jaahil denies the Taqwa of these illustrious Men of Islam, our answer would be: “And, when the jaahiloon address them, they say: ‘Salaam! ”

(6) The jaahil writes: “Imagine if the beautiful names like Muhammad, Mahmood, Mustapha... ....and Aishah are transformed into numbers, 92, 98, 199, ... respectively! ” In Islamic history was there a time that the imagination of the jaahil had been a reality? Does anyone call his brother Muhammad, ‘92’? Anything could be imagined. But when the imagination is baseless, it has no reality and is not grounds for intelligent argument. Besides 786 as a written substitute for *Tasmiah*, not as a verbal pronouncement of Tasmiah, the Ummah has never utilized numerology in accordance with the wild and stupid imagination of the jaahil. Only great Ulama and Auliya of impeccable character and of the highest calibre of Taqwa and Divine Proximity have used these numbers in their Ta’weez. The objection of the jaahil writer is therefore silly and spurious.

(7) He rants: “786 is not exclusive for BISIMILLAAH. The example above should be more than sufficient for this purpose. ” He shoots arrows wildly in the dark. No one had claimed that 786 is exclusive with the *Tasmiah*. His

argument would have had validity only if it was claimed that 786 represents only the *Tasmiah* and nothing else. What Shar'i defect is there if 786 does not refer exclusively to the *Tasmiah*? This argument is both stupid and superfluous.

(8) The jaahil states: "It is a matter of FACT that Allah has revealed the Qur'an in Arabic... ..Why was the Qur'an NOT revealed in mathematical figures? Why are we then converting it into numbers?" The stupidity of the jaahil is stark. The Qur'aan was revealed in Arabic. Why does the jaahil write the *Tasmiah* in the transliterated form using the English alphabet? Why does he use English letters as a substitute for Allah, Muhammad, etc.? If letters of the English and Sanskrit alphabets may be used for transliteration of Qur'aanic verses, why can 786 not be used to represent the Tasmiah?

Why was the Qur'aan NOT revealed in English or Sanskrit? Why then are we converting it into English transliteration as the jaahil does? The jaahil considers transliteration convenient in some cases. In the same way we consider 786

convenient as a written substitute or symbol for Tasmiah. Besides the stupid opinion of the writer, there is no Shar'i basis for objection. That the Qur'aan was revealed in Arabic is not a valid argument in negation of symbolizing the *Tasmiah* with 786 in the written form. There is no relationship in the jaahil's stupid analogy.

Furthermore, besides *Tasmiah,* the Qur'aan Majeed is not recited in numerical form. The moron's claim is a portrayal of his jahaalat.

(9) The ignoramus states: "We are instructed to recite the Qur'an Majeed, as can be seen from the following verses... Now would one recite the Qur'aan if it is reduced to numbers? ... Does this mean that merely reading 101189 we have read the whole of Soorah al-Fatihah? "

The jaahil has stretched his imagination to ridiculous and absurd limits. Did anyone ever make such a preposterous claim? Did any Muslim ever read this number and claimed or believed that he has recited Surah Faatihah? He speaks utter drivel. Despite the extensive and

intensive usage of the number 786 as a written substitute for the *Tasmiah*, no one ever reads the number 786 when he begins Qira't or any other activity. This argument will apply to a greater degree to number symbols of other Surahs which are totally unknown to the masses and to the vast majority of the Ulama, and who never ever utilize such numerical symbols for the Surahs. Such numerology is used only for Ta'weez by men of great taqwa and Ilm – by great Ulama and Auliya such as Hakimul Ummat, Hadhrat Shaikhul Hind, Hadhrat Gangohi, Shah Waliullah and countless other outstanding Luminaries of Islam. There never was a time when any segment of the Ummah ever attempted to substitute actual Qiraa't of the Qur'aan Majeed with pronouncements of numbers.

(10) Mufti Ebrahim Desai's opinion in support of the anonymous jaahil's 786 views, is rather surprising and lamentable. It is clear to us that Mufti Ebrahim Saheb has not applied his mind to the issue. He is unaware of the facts of this issue. He is blissfully unaware that our greatest Akaabireen had used these numerical symbols in

the preparation of their Ta'weez. He seems unaware that these great Akaabireen had used the number 786 as a written substitute for the *Tasmiah*. It is lamentable when a Mufti does not apply his mind fully to a question and speaks purely on the basis of personal *raai* and not taking into account the views and practices of the great Auliya and Ulama-e-Muhaqqiqeen. In fact it is apparent that his *raai* is the influence of the stupid article which the anonymous jaahil has written. The Mufti Saheb simply echoes what the jaahil writes.

While even a great Aalim and Wali can err, such error should be countered with Dalaa-il, not with personal opinion unbacked by Shar'i daleel.

The Mufti Saheb avers: *"Apart from the common folk, the scholars also heed no attention towards it... "* He should understand that among the 'scholars' whom he is castigating for having used 786 are Hadhrat Thaanvi, and Ulama of his calibre and of Ulama greater than even Hadhrat Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh). I suppose that only this Mufti Saheb is a 'scholar' and all our

illustrious Akaabireen were 'juhhaal' – Nauthubillaah! If the Akaabireen had erred, present the dalaa-il to bolster the claim.

The Mufti Saheb in his 'Hari Krishna' analogy is simply gorging out the very same vomit of the jaahil writer, which he has lapped up. We have responded to this nonsense in my letter of 1992.

He says in regard to the 786 argument: *"If we associate anyone with Allah's exalted names orally or practically, we would be committing infidelity that is an unpardonable sin."* A Mufti is supposed to hold his tongue and pen and not blurt out such nonsense which he will rue even in his grave. We suppose that the Mufti Sahib is the only muwahhid, and Hakimul Ummat and the Galaxy of Akaabireen who all had used 786 and the other numeral equivalents of the Surahs, were all 'mushriks' committing infidelity that is an unpardonable sin.

The Mufti Saheb has also degenerated to *nafsaani* ranting in his support for the jaahil's article. Unthinkingly and horrendously failing to

apply his mind, he states: *"The Qur'aan warns us, one who finds a rival against Allah, Allah will never allow him to enter paradise, and his abode is hell."* He has prejudged Hadhrat Thaanvi & Co. to be mushrikeen, destined for Jahannum. May Allah Ta'ala save us from such 'ilm' which leads to Jahannum.

The Mufti Saheb poses the silly question: *"Can number 786 replace the Holy Name of God?"* He too demeans his ilm and Imaan by substituting the word 'god' for Allah Ta'ala. No one has ever claimed that 786 is a replacement for the holy Name of Allah Azza Wa Jal. The only claim is that it is permissible to use the number as a written substitute for the *Tasmiah*. There is not an iota further to read into this claim or practice.

They are raising stupid and spurious arguments presented by imaginations which play havoc with their intelligence.

Despite his silly objections against 786, he speaks about 'Prophet Solomon (pbuh)". From whence did he obtain this 'nameology'? What

Shar'i justification does he have when speaking to Muslims to substitute the holy name and title of Hadhrat Nabi Sulaimaan (alayhis salaam) with the kuffaar concocted corruption of 'Prophet Solomon (pbuh)'?

In justification of his view, the Mufti Sahib cites Hadhrat Nabi Sulaimaan's letter to Bilqees in which the *Tasmiah* was written. While he is allowed to present this argument to substantiate the view that it is permissible to write the Arabic text of the *Tasmiah* in a letter to even a kaafir, he may not cite this argument in refutation of the permissibility of using 786 as a written substitute for the Tasmiah. He may use the Bilqees argument against those Ulama who claim that it is not permissible to write the Arabic text of the *Tasmiah* in a letter to the kuffaar. But there is no validity in the argument tendered against the use of 786. His analogy is *qiyaas ma-al faariq*. These are two different issues which require different *dalaail* for and against.

I must say that the Mufti Saheb has degenerated to a very low level of stupidity in his following

comment: *"Was the verse, 'Today I completed your religion for you ', revealed to the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or to the so-called scholars of our age who are all bent to amend the Divine principles."* He labours in pure self-deception if he believes that this comment is a *daleel* in refutation of the permissibility of 786.

The 'scholars of our age' who make use of 786 are merely following their Akaabireen who in turn followed their Akaabireen. I suppose all the illustrious Akaabireen from whom we had gained our ilm were in the business of amending the Divine Principles. Statements such as this convince one that the Mufti Saheb has not applied his mind, and that he had said whatever came to his mind from his nafs to support the moron expounder of the 786 stupidity. There is a need for the Mufti to present solid Shar'i daleel to substantiate his charge against the Akaabireen.

His penultimate paragraph is pure ranting and raving. There is no ilmi talk in it, hence it needs no intelligent comment. Was-salaam