

Muhammad Yasir Ali*

Challenging the Tradition: Reformation Design of Muhammad Hussain Najafi

Abstract

This article conducts a descriptive analysis of the contribution of Muhammad Hussain Najafi in reformation discourse in Pakistan. Najafi bears a distinct position by arguing for so-called reformation in belief structure, pattern of practices and approaching the 'history' in the religious discourse. His urge and efforts in this regard have brought him to fore as a dissident. This articles finds that he challenges the tradition with 'tradition' by adopting analytical and critical tools of inquiry. He does not invent something new. His distinction lies in his methodology.

Key Words: Shi'a, Islam, Mujtahid, Pakistan, Najafi

Introduction:

Muhammad Hussain Najafi is a renowned Shi'a religious scholar in Pakistan. At present, he is the only claimant in Pakistan to be a Mujtahid. He has earned name by adopting a so-called 'puritan' position in the recent Shi'ite discourse in Pakistan. He is one the most controversial Shi'ite scholars in the country. His puritan approach regarding definition of beliefs and practices not only enabled him to address the objective situation in Pakistani context but it also had some consequences in the Shi'ite discourse beyond our society. The number of his followers increased day by day besides a rigorous opposition from his own sect fellows. Although he had distinguished himself as a dissident earlier in sixties and seventies of the last century yet his opposition came to prominence in the last decade of previous century.¹ In the recent times, religious discourse in Pakistan has become diverse and exhibiting a variety of excommunications. Excommunication has become both inter- and intra-sectarian phenomenon in recent times.² Sects are not only divided in political matters but also have range of ideological differences among themselves.³ These ideological differences are translating themselves into new waves of excommunications and Shi'as are not exception in this regard. The first wave of excommunication in the sect was focused on Muhammad Hussain Najafi by declaring him as *Muqashir*.⁴ *Muqashir* (Deserter), in Shi'ite discourse is the antonym of Ghali (exaggerator).⁵ As pointed above that this phenomenon has been complexed during the last three decades and introduction and involvement of some new personalities and trends have grossed the issue. Avoiding the complexity of the discourse, this article focusses on the role and place of Muhammad Hussain Najafi in the Shi'ite development in Pakistan. His selection is justified on various grounds. He is only indigenous Mujtahid, the foremost dissident and carrying a remarkable following of the people (*muqalidin*). An academic understanding of his personality, role and contribution in the Shi'ite development will help the researcher to peep further into the issue and will also help the reader to understand some aspects of Shi'ite discourse in Pakistan. This article is divided into three parts which respectively deal with his conceptions regarding belief, practices and history. Before going to three main parts, it also contains his brief biography and a conclusion in the end.

Biography:

Muhammad Hussain Najafi born in 1932 in Jahaniyan Shah, a town situated in District Sargodha. His father's name is Rana Taj al-Din Dhakkū (d.1944). Najafi got early education from the government schools of the area. After

* *Muhammad Yasir Ali, Lecturer Department of History and Civilization Studies, BZU, Multan

¹ Andreas Rieck, *Shias in Pakistan: An assertive and beleaguered minority*, (New York: Oxford Press, 2015), 124-29

² Ibid, 96

³ Ahmed Vaezi, *Shia Political Thought*, (London: Islamic Centre of England, 2004), 25

⁴ Rieck, *Shias in Pakistan: An assertive and beleaguered minority*, 129

⁵ *Muqashir* is termed for reductionists who deliberately hide the attributes of Family of Prophet (P.B.U.H). *Ghali* refers to individuals who exaggerate the attributes of Family of Prophet (P.B.U.H)

getting initial formal education, he was admitted in the religious seminaries to learn Arabic. His first destination was the seminary in Jalālpur Nangiyāna.⁶ He was taught by Hussain Baksh Jarra (1920-1990). After getting basic education he moved to Badh Rajbāna, District Jhang. In Badh Rajbāna he got the tutelage of a famous religious scholar of his time, Bāqir Hindī (d.1966) and studied Dars-i-Nizāmī.⁷ The list of his teachers also includes Sayyid Muhammad Yār Shah who was a prominent religious scholar and disciple of Sayyid Muhammad Bāqir.⁸ After getting this basic education he appeared in and passed the examination of Maulwī Fāḍil in 1953 from University of Punjab. In 1954, before going to Najaf for higher religious education, he was married to his maternal cousin. His teacher 'Allāma Yār Shah had links with 'ulama of Najaf, and he wanted Muhammad Hussain to be married in a scholarly family of Najaf, but Muhammad Hussain declined this proposal due to cultural differences. In 1954, his only son Muhammad Sibṭain was born. At the age of five, he got seriously ill and died, as Muhammad Hussain had not possessed enough money for his treatment. He married to the daughter of Hājī Muhammad Shafī' Faisalabad in 1970, and was blessed with three daughters from this marriage. His first wife died in 1996.

He moved to Najaf for higher education. In six years, he after getting expertise in three disciplines of religious education, *Kafāya*, *Makāsib* and *Rasāil*, he passed *Dars-i-Khārij*.⁹ The list of his teachers includes the names of Sayyid Maḥmūd, Mirzā Muhammad Bāqir Zanjanī, Abu al-Qāsim Ashtī, Sayyid Jawād Tabraizī, and Āyatullāh Muḥsin al-Hakīm. He also acknowledges the contribution of Sayyid Muhammad Bāqir, 'Alī Naqī Naqqan and Muftī Ja'far Hussain in the development of his religious thought.¹⁰ He translated and wrote many books during his career. His publications include, *Faiḍān al-Raḥmān fī Tafṣīr al-Quran*, *Masā'il al-Sharī'a*, *Kawākib-i-Muzayya*, *Aḥsan al-Fawa'id fī Sharah al-'Aqa'id*, *Uṣūl al-Sharī'a fī 'Aqa'id al-Shī'a*, *A'itaqādāt-i-Imāmiyya*, *Aqsām-i-Tauḥīd*, *Mukhtasir Aqaid ush-Shī'a*, *Qawānīn al-Sharī'a fī Fiqh-i-Ja'fariyya (Tawḍīḥ al-Masā'il)*, *Khulāṣa al-Aḥkām*, *Ḥurmat-i-Ghina Aur Islam*, *Ḥurmat-i-Rishtarāshī*, *Namaz-i-Jum'a Aur Islam*, *Zād-al-'Ibad li-yaum al-Mi'ād*, *Sa'adat al-Dārāin fī Maqṭal al-Hussain*, *Shuhada-i-Khamsa kay Hālāt-i-Zindagī*, *Ithbāt al-Imāmat*, *Tahqīqāt al-Farīqain fī Hadīth al-Thaqalain*, *Tajalliyāt-i-Ṣadāqat fī Jawāb Āftāb-i-Hidāyat*, *Tanzih al-Imāmiyya amma fī Risāla Mazhab al-Shī'a*, *Khatam-i-Nabūwwat bar Khatmī Martabat*, *Ādāb al-Mufīd wa al-Mustafīd*, *Iṣlāḥ al-Majālis wa al-Maḥāfil*, *Iṣlāḥ al-Rasūm al-Zāhira bā Kalām al-'Itrat al-Ṭāhira*.

The list of his publication, as mentioned above, includes not only large number of books but at the same time it shows the diversity of his scholarship as well. Owing to the needs of this article only a few sources which deal directly with his conceptions regarding belief, religious practices and history are consulted in this work. The discussion in this article is focused on the distinctive issues regarding his concepts and interpretation regarding the above mentioned three heads.

Ontological manifestation and interpretation of belief:

Muhammad Hussain Najafi focused on the ontological purification of belief structures of Shī'as in Pakistan. His argument finds fault with the popular belief system of a particular section of his community.¹¹ He points out the major fault lines in the existing *Ghālīs* beliefs regarding *Tauḥīd* and Imamate.¹² While defining *Tauḥīd* and Imamate he also gives his view on sufism as an erroneous epistemology which has affected the Shi'ite beliefs during the course of history.¹³ He views that present day Shi'ite belief are facing ontological problems and this situation needs an overhauling. His ontological position regarding beliefs has made him very much controversial not only among the masses but also has attracted many antagonists in the scholars as well. He accuses Sufism as an ontological offender and intruder in the Shi'ite faith system. He laments on the adoption of Sufi ideas by the Shī'a community which in his view is repugnant to basic Shi'ite faith and institution of Imamate.¹⁴ His discussions on *Tauḥīd* and Imamate are woven together. He tries to clarify the doubts that confuse the above mentioned beliefs. Briefly, he explains two terms whose explanation helps to identify the distinctive boundaries of the beliefs regarding *Tauḥīd* and Imamate. These terms are '*tafwīd*' and *takwīn*. *tafwīd* is translated as to devolve or to assign. In terms of fiqh it

⁶ Rieck, *Shias in Pakistan: An assertive and beleaguered minority*, 78

⁷ Ibid

⁸ Ibid

⁹ Safi Hasan, *Essence of Shia Faith*, (Sargodha: Maktaba Sibṭain, 2012), 2-5

¹⁰ S. Hussain Doger, *Al-Qā'im*, (Lahore: Idara al-Qaim, 1986), 9

¹¹ Hasan, *Essence of Shia Faith*, 116-18

¹² Ibid

¹³ Muhammad Hussain Najafi, *Iqamat al-Burhān 'alā Baṭlān-i-Taṣawwuf wa al-'Irfān*, (Sargodha: Maktaba Sibṭain, 2010), 13

¹⁴ Ibid, 52-63

means that Creator has assigned his duties to others or has devolved his powers among the selected people.¹⁵ It also establishes that the person who have been assigned divine duties and empowered with divine authority. Muhammad Hussain Najafi equates the ontological position of *tafwīd* with *Shirk*. He maintains that God is omnipotent and does not need to devolve his powers even among the Prophets. By doing so he antagonizes a considerable portion of Shi'a community which believes in *tafwīd* of divine powers and duties in the institution of Imamate. He further explains this issue by clarifying his position on *Takwīn*. *Takwīn* means creative governance.¹⁶ *Takwīn* is a major ontological concept. It creates one of the major divisions in Shi'a community. It derives its meaning from the roots of the belief in *tafwīd*. According to this concept Creator has not only bestowed the office of Imamate with the duties of protection and interpretation of Shari'a but at the same time Imams are also empowered to use the delegated divine powers in the 'creative governance of universe as well. He maintains that Imams do not possess the powers of creative governance but they act as mediators between creator and creation being the most elevated and blessed creation of God.¹⁷ He explains further that they are the most superior creation of God and God has elected them to represents him before the rest of creation as mediators and not as creative governors. While explaining the ontological position of *tafwīd* and *takwīn*, he also challenges the divine essence of Imams.¹⁸ He stresses on the human attributes of Imams by rejecting any divine claims of essence. He views that they are human being but are the most superior in ranks. He distinguishes their stature as elevated by God rather on the basis of their divine origin. He views that the belief of divine origin or *Nūr* being of Imams is derived from *Waḥdat al-wajūd* which is a Sufi idea and is repugnant to Islam.¹⁹ He rejects the idea of omnipresence of Imams and says that although they are *present* yet the omnipresence is a divine prerogative which is inseparable and is not assigned and devolved to anybody.

The second aspect of his ontological expressions of beliefs deals with Sufism. He rejects Sufism on account of latter's historical development and its ideological position.²⁰ Historically, he is of the view that Sufism owes its existence from the efforts of Umayyad's who supported and strengthened the Sufi ideas to contain the resisting element of Imamate. *Taşawwuf*, according to him was constructed to detach Imams of their popular base of followers.²¹ He also presents the traditions from Shi'ite Imams against the existence and ideology of Sufism. At second he criticizes Sufism on the basis of their so-called un-Islamic beliefs. He identifies Sufism as *Ḥalūl*, *waḥdat al-wajūd* and *waḥdat al-shahūd*.²² All of these manifestations of Sufism are repugnant to Islam and have caused irreparable losses to the basic Islamic belief structure, he argues. These concepts, according to him are borrowed from Judaism, Christianity and Hinduism. He further elaborates that Sufism, as an ontological paradigm, has created different episteme of human action which exhibits itself in shape of human prostration, *chillas* and *ghina* (music). These practices detach human beings from the overall plan of human development according to divine will. Concluding, he rejects each and every aspect of Sufism and establishment of any Sufi office or institution i.e. *wilāya* (spiritual governance), *murshid* (spiritual elder) and *murīd* (spiritual follower) etc. So, he not only distinguishes sufism from Shi'ism but also establishes that they are poles apart just like the difference among Shi'ism and *wahhābiyya*.²³ The discussion in the next part further elaborates not only his position regarding certain beliefs but also extends the ontological aspects of belief to the epistemological position of religious practices.

Epistemological orientation of belief and its expression in religious practices:

The basic argument behind the rigorous opposition of critic of Najafi against the so-called false belief is that these beliefs extend their influence in the shape of un-Islamic and disastrous practices.²⁴ His criticism of the practices follows the similar gradual steps as have been followed in the above part regarding his explanation of beliefs. He identifies the practices that confuse the worship of Creator with the remembrance of Imams. He extends his criticism to the second part which deals with the practices emerging out of the different understanding of office of Imamate.²⁵

¹⁵ Muhammad Hussain Najafi, *Aṣūl al-Sharī'a fī 'Aqā'id al-Shia*, (Sargodha: Maktaba Sibṭāin, 2000)

¹⁶ Hasan, *Essence of Shia Faith*, 123-30

¹⁷ Muhammad Hussain Najafi, *A'īqādāt-i-Imāmiyya fī Tarjuma-i-Risāla al-Lailiyya*, (Sargodha: Maktaba Sibṭāin, 2006), 57-59

¹⁸ Muhammad Hussain Najafi, *Ithbāt al-Imāmat*, (Sargodha: Maktaba Sibṭāin, 2006), 25-30

¹⁹ Najafi, *Iqamat al-Burhān 'alā Baṭlān-i-Taşawwuf wa al-'Irfān*, 61

²⁰ *Ibid*, 63-73

²¹ *Ibid*

²² *Ibid*

²³ M.I. Hussain A'wān, *Sarkar Āyatullah Najafi kī 'ahad Sāz Shakhshiyat aur Tārīkh Sāz Kārnamay*, (Sargodha: Maktaba Sibṭāin), 123

²⁴ Hasan, *Essence of Shia Faith*, 125

²⁵ Muhammad Hussain Najafi, *Işlāḥ-i-Rasūm al-Zāhirā wa al-'Itrat a-Tāhira*, (Sargodha: Maktaba Sibṭāin, 1996), 74-78

The third category of his criticism includes the Sufi practices. Following the first category, for example, he distinguishes *nazar* from *nayyaz* and stresses the divine prerogative on *nazar*.²⁶ On the other hand he allows the *nayyaz* in the name of Imams. He also criticizes the way in which *nazar* and *nayyaz* are offered by his Shī‘a fellows. Besides *nazar* and *nayyaz* he also criticizes the prostration offered to any spiritual personality of religious symbols. Shirk according to him has four main kinds and he advises Shī‘as to refrain from such acts which can be labelled as shirk.²⁷ These kinds of practices like *nazar* and *sajda* reflect the beliefs of *tafwīd* and *takwīn* which are against the spirit of Sharī‘a and Islam. Besides Shirk he also reflects to the recent discourse by taking his particular stand. The foremost example of this kind of criticism is the issue of *Shahādat-i-Thālitha*. He is of the view that *Shahādat-i-Thālitha* became the part of Āzān in fourth century and was later accepted by religious scholars for the sake of identification and distinctiveness of Shi‘ite Āzān (Call to Prayers).²⁸ On the other hand inclusion of *Shahādat-i-Thālitha* in Namāz is maintained as unlawful by him.²⁹

‘*Azdārī* is part and parcel of Shi‘ite community. It is a combination of different rituals performed by Shī‘as for the remembrance of the hardships of Family of Prophet (P.B.U.H). It is observed throughout the year, besides annual observance in Muḥarram and Šafar. He divides ‘*azadārī* in two major categories i.e. *majlis* and *rasūmāt*. *Majlis*, a remembrance congregation of martyrs of Karbala is highly revered in the eyes of Najafī.³⁰ He maintains a high note of respect and esteem for the observance of *Majlis*. He also believes that its observance is necessary and brings certain religious and spiritual favors.³¹ Besides his appraisal he also has a list of critical remarks for the current scenario of observance of *majlis*. He criticizes the recent commencement of *majlis* on the basis of its being commercialized. The person who recites *majlis*, *zākir* or ‘*ālim*, takes huge sum of money as return.³² On the other hand most of reciters do not follow history and make self-contributions in the description of events. Some of them also follow musical notes to recite *qašīdah* and *marthiyya*.³³ He distinguishes rituals attached with the *Ta‘ziyya*, ‘*Alam* and *shabīhāt* from *majlis* and stresses the need of reforms in their observance. He sanctifies the preparation of *Ta‘ziyya* and *Dhuljināh* but recommends a thorough reformation in this respect.³⁴ He is of the view that while performing these rituals a Shī‘a must have to maintain the simplicity. For example, he seeks a simple presentation of *Dhuljināh* which could resemble the real horse of Imam Ḥussain instead of an ornamented horse.³⁵ He is very careful regarding the status of *mātam* (beating). He allows it with some restriction.³⁶ The beatings with blades, knives and swords which can harm the human body are forbidden in his view. His focus is more on the peaceful observance of ‘*azādārī* which does not spread any harsh messages and is purposeful in its nature.³⁷ He also rejects the observance of *mihindī* of Amīr Qāsim and argues against the tradition which allows this ritual.³⁸

He does not limit his urge of reformation and purification within the boundaries of *majlis* and ‘*azādārī* but also tries to codify a script for the observance of other social practices and rituals. The major parts of these social practices include spiritual practices at shrines, the rituals attached with deaths and marriages.³⁹ As he rejects the claims of sufism and ‘*Irfān* so his notion regarding the celebration of different spiritual tradition needs no explanation. His attitude towards the expensive celebration of marriages and death rituals is very much critical. He does not allow even a simple musical instrument to celebrate the joy of marriage.⁴⁰ As mentioned above, he takes the practices as epistemological offshoots of the larger ontological systems of belief so he focuses on the both purification of belief and reformation of practices. After going through his ideas and concepts regarding beliefs and practices the discussion will be extended to his historical conceptions in the next part. The discussion in next part explains his position regarding the narration of Shi‘ite historical traditions.

²⁶ Ibid, 287

²⁷ Ibid, 57-66

²⁸ Ibid, 96

²⁹ Ibid

³⁰ Muhammad Ḥussain Najafī, *Išlāh-i-Majālis wa al-Maḥāfil*, (Sargodha: Maktaba Sibtain, 2010), 9-13

³¹ Ibid

³² Ibid, 32-38

³³ Ibid, 53-69

³⁴ Najafī, *Išlāh-i-Rasūm al-Zāhirā wa al-‘Itrat a-Ṭāhira*, 53

³⁵ Ibid,

³⁶ Ibid, 167

³⁷ Ibid, 171

³⁸ Ibid, 156

³⁹ Ibid, 173-219

⁴⁰ Muhammad Ḥussain Najafī, *Asli Islām aur Rasmi Islām*, (Sargodha, Maktaba Sibtain, 67-75

Approaching History:

Besides explaining *Fiqh* and *sharī'a*, Muhammad Ḥussain Najafī also gives his deep insight in history and historical development of shi'ism.⁴¹ This part deals with his conception of history, redefining Shi'ite history and historicity of certain religious texts and events. His historical work includes one book on the History of Imam Ḥussain and his martyrdom but his historical vision is extended to his whole contributions. He seems to be well connected with history and strictly follows historical method not only in the narration of history but also in the explanation of *Fiqh* and *Sharī'a*. It is evident from the fact that he rejects many beliefs and practices which cannot be supported on historical standards. This part is restricted only to the elaboration of few examples which will help the reader to understand his overall historical development. He takes history as a major source of attaining the truth of human past. He constructs sacrality on the basis of historical findings and does not go beyond the limits of history. According to him history is also necessary to remember the prestige of the past heroes. He stresses the needs of heroic and contributive representation of past in the present. His distinction also lies in the fact that unlike ordinary religious historian he constructs his own methodology. He conducts a critical analysis of the sources; he is utilizing in his work. A discursive understanding of primary and secondary sources makes him unpopular before many people who strictly believe in popular assumptions regarding religious history. Following are a few examples of his historical conceptions and methods. At first, he challenges the authenticity of some religious texts which are observed and revered by the common people with zeal and zest.⁴² He challenges the authority of these texts on the basis of their weak historicity instead of their contents. *Khuṭba al-Bayān* is one of the foremost examples.⁴³ *Khuṭba al-Bayān* contain the matter related to the creative Governance of Imamate. The second example is that of *Hadīth-i-Kisa*. In this case he does not reject the sanctity of *Hadīth-i-Kisa* but challenges the essentiality of text.⁴⁴ Secondly, he identifies the *sunni* intrusions in the Shī'a history.⁴⁵ He distinguishes and identifies certain events that belong to the *sunni* writers based on the validity of Sunnite *Rijal* but have been using by Shī'as. He challenges many popular Shi'ite narrations on the basis of their Sunnite origin. His historical methodology also includes his ontological and epistemological understandings of beliefs and practices. He standardizes the historical facts on the logic of Quran and Sunnah and similarly applies historical logic in defining and interpretation of beliefs and practices.

All the above mentioned example would not have come to fore if he could have maintained the popular version of history regarding some personalities. He does not change the entire facts about certain personalities but only talks about different notions regarding their age, place, time and way they got martyred. Apparently these things should not be reflected with much hatred and opposition but it happened in case of Najafī. His difference of opinion in history brought him a strong wave of opposition and he had to face a kind of extermination. He was banned from the popular sacred spaces. There are many examples of his difference of opinion regarding personalities and events but some of them can be put here to apprehend the situation. Muhammad Ḥussain Najafī, at first instance, argued about the age, marital status and the event of martyrdom of 'Alī Akbar son of Imam Ḥussain. Commonly it is believed that 'Alī Akbar was the second son of Imam Ḥussain and the elder was 'Alī Zain al-'Abidīn. It is said that 'Alī Akbar was eighteen years old at the time of tragedy of Karbala and also was unmarried. Najafī applies a hermeneutical and cultural criticism on the details mentioned around the personality of 'Alī Akbar and also brings some primary evidences to differentiate his stance from the popular version. He argues that being '*Akbar*' he was the elder son of Imam Ḥussain. Culturally, he argues that it was surprising if a young man of eighteen years of age was still unmarried. It was also against the spirit of *sharī'a*, he adds.⁴⁶ Similarly he questioned the stature of Amir Qasim son of Imam Hasan. He is told to be the elder son of Imam Hasan who was in the thirteen years of his age at the time of tragedy of Karbala. It is said that he was married a day before 'Ashūra and was martyred on the day of 'Ashūra. It is also believed that his body was torn into pieces after he got martyred. Najafī claims that, at first, he was not the eldest son and secondly there commenced no marriage during the whole event of Karbala. He also maintains that the body that was tormented to pieces was of 'Alī Akbar instead of Amir Qāsim. He mentions that the elder son of Imam Ḥasan was Ḥasan Muthana.⁴⁷ The third example can be placed about the historical position of Hind, wife of Yazīd. Popularly it is believed and narrated that Hind was a Shī'a but was married to Yazīd and when she came to know about the tragedy of Karbala, she could not resist herself to oppose Yazīd. She came to the court of her

⁴¹Muhammad Ḥussain Najafī, *Sa'adat al-Dārāin fī Maqatal-i-Ḥussain* (5th ed.), (Sargodha: Maktaba Sibtain, 2004), 15,50

⁴² Ibid, 26-27

⁴³ Najafī, *Iṣlāḥ-i-Majālis wa al-Maḥāfil*,

⁴⁴ Najafī, *Iṣlāḥ-i-Rasūm al-Zāhirā wa al-'Itrat a-Ṭāhira*,55

⁴⁵ Ibid, 56

⁴⁶ Najafī, *Sa'adat al-Dārāin fī Maqatal-i-Ḥussain*, 414

⁴⁷ Ibid, 441

husband and cursed him for the atrocities he had inflicted at the family of Prophet. Najafī differs by claiming that her Shi'ite faith is questionable but she had remained in the '*ḥarrām*' of Imam Ḥussain before marrying Yazīd.⁴⁸ These are some examples of his, apparently, slight difference about the historical stature of some personalities. This happens, as mentioned above, because his historical methodology includes hermeneutics and cultural examination and criticism besides utilizing the other tools of inquiring Islamic history. This methodological distinction brought him to fore and he was cursed by a considerable segment of public, *zākirs* and religious scholars. It was a very difficult situation for him since the last few decades. His methodological and theoretical reconstructions were not only bringing certain reorientations of belief, practices and history but he had also to invite and encourage the scholars to join his hands for the reformation of Shi'a community.

Conclusion:

By going through the discussion in the three parts of the article, writer can establish that Muhammad Ḥussain Najafī do not invent some new beliefs and similarly has not constructed some new rituals. He, even, does not change the overall path of Shi'ite history. He only put some new orientation of defining belief, organizing practices and consulting history. By doing so he not only attracted a considerable number of followers but also invite antagonism and furry of many opponents. The description of Shi'ite development and discourse in Pakistan cannot be completed without mentioning his name and contributions. This discussion is an initiative to start an academic perusal of religious development in Pakistan. It is like picking up the pieces. One cannot establish that it presented a wholesome picture of personality and stature of Najafī but it only explained a part of it. Even by going that much brief in description certain trends emerge which will contribute in the future understanding of religious scholarship. Shi'ite religious interpretations have mostly been done in Iran and Iraq. Although the religious seminaries of Qum and Najaf created a number of Mujtahids for different parts of the world but Indo-Pak subcontinent received a tiny share of that. 'Alī Naqī Naqqan from Lucknow and then Āyatullah Bashīr Najafī maintained the pace of Iranian and Arabian Shi'ite discourse. Muhammad Ḥussain Najafī brings the Shi'ite discourse on Pakistani soil. He was daring enough to apply hermeneutical and cultural criticism on the already existing structures of beliefs and practices. At second, he tries to enhance and encourage discursivity in religious discourse. His differences and deviation from certain established things manifest the level of his dis-satisfaction from the existing understandings. He is courageous to announce that still a revisit and rethinking is required. He not only mentions the spaces for reconstruction but also gives a set of methodology for that reorganization. His contributions also guide that to what extent our society is recipient of new understandings and orientations. The increasing numbers of his followers show that there exist a number of people who are uncomfortable with the existing religious understandings. On the other hand, his opponents define the spaces where one can get possible waves of resistance and criticism. It can help the reader as well as researchers to understand a part of religious discourse in Pakistan which deals with the Shi'ite development.

⁴⁸ Ibid, 560