

commentary of the Holy *Quran*. On other points there is a striking similarity in their methodology of the Quranic exegesis.

- Dr. Kabir Ahmad Jaisi in his article *Bakhshe az Tafsir-i Kuhan* introduces an anonymous but one of the oldest known Persian commentaries of the Holy *Quran*. The Manuscript of this commentary was discovered by late Prof. Mujtaba Minavi in Istanbul and later on it was published by Muhammad Roshan. Keeping in view the paper, orthographical peculiarities and the script of the Manuscript, Professor Minavi has come to the conclusion that this *Tafsir* was compiled before the famous *Tarjuma-i Tafsir-i Tabari* and hence it was the earliest specimen of exegesis-writing in the Persian language. Dr. Jaisi, however, does not agree with this view. After discussing the characteristic features of this *Tafsir* in some detail, he arrives at the conclusion that it is more likely to have been compiled after the *Tarjuma-i Tafsir-i Tabari* which was rendered from Arabic into Persian during the reign of the Samanid Sultan Mansur bin Nuḥ (348-364 A.H.). According to him its diction and style is vastly different from the *Tarjuma-i Tafsir-i Tabari*. Copious quotations have been given to enable the reader to understand the nature of its contents.

- A lot of confusion exists about the age in which Imam Raghīb Isfahani, the noted scholar of the Quranic Studies, flourished. There is a gap of about a hundred years in the accounts given by different sources. While some maintain that he lived at the beginning of the 5th Century A.H., others say that he died sometime between 502 and 565 A.H. Dr. Abdur Rahman Sarisi, however, has proved in the light of the fresh evidence gleaned from the works of Imam Raghīb that he most probably died in the early years of the 5th Century A.H. Dr. Ehsan Abbas and Adnan Jauharji have come up with more evidence in support of Dr. Sarisi's view. Dr. Ajmal Ayyub Islahi summarizes these new evidences on the subject.

- The article *Istikbar and its Consequences in the Light of the Quran* by Maulana Akhtar Ahsan Islahi explains the meaning of *istikbar* (arrogance) and highlights its ruinous effects on human life. Quoting extensively from the Holy *Quran*, he comes to the conclusion that this malady is virtually incurable as the afflicted person is not likely even to realise the gravity of his affliction.

ABSTRACTS

• Some scholars maintain that Adam was not the first man and that this word denotes the entire human race. Consequently, they hold that the story of the creation of Adam as narrated in the *Quran* is an allegory rather than a fact. Maulana Shahabuddin Nadvi in his article *The Story of Adam—Allegory or Fact: A Study of the Quranic Evidence* strongly refutes this contention and conclusively proves that the Quranic genesis of Adam is a fact not an allegory.

• Many Western scholars including the contributors of the *Encyclopedia of Islam* have laboured to prove that the word *Ummah* has its roots in the Hebrew or Aramaic languages. This is a part of their endeavour to prove that the origin of the most of the Islamic institutions, practices and concepts are to be found in the Christianity and Judaism. Dr. Ahmad Hasan Farhat explodes this myth in his scholarly work *The Word Ummah and its Connotation in Arabic Language, Quran and Hadis*. He conclusively proves its origin to be firmly rooted in the Arabic language, and shows that there is a basic unity in its different usages, shades and nuances. Then he discusses the different connotations in which this word has been used in the *Quran* and *Hadis*. At the end, he delineates the characteristic features of the Muslim Ummah as it emerges from the *Quran* and *Hadis*. Contrasting the concept of Ummah with that of the Arab Nationalism, he maintains that the latter is totally untenable in the light of the teachings of Islam. Mr. Raziul Islam Nadvi's article is an abridged form of Dr. Farhat's findings.

• Mr. Ashhad Rafiq Nadvi in his article *A Comparative Study of the Exegetical Methods of Allama Ibn Taimiya and Maulana Farahi* makes a comparative study of the basic principles adopted by both the scholars in relation to the Quranic exegesis. In the light of the evidence gleaned from their exegetical works as well as their books on the principles of the exegesis (*Usul-i Tafsir*), he has tried to identify the main areas of their agreement and difference. The writer is of the view that the major area of difference in their respective methods of exegesis relates to their approach to the traditions and their place in the