

In this topic, we will review a suspicion that has been talked about a lot by Christians recently . Rather , the uproar has increased in those days , and all Christians only talk about it now , which is the verse on the jizya. They say, how can a religion inspired by God impose a tax on others who do not believe in it , or else they will be killed ? Rather, one of them said on one of the Christian channels, “ We will not pay the jizya even if you kill us, and we will not submit to this bullying even if it saves us from death.” In this topic, we will not talk in trivial terms or repeat what was said before about the jizya. Rather, we will shock Christians like this person who is not good at and knows nothing but a loud voice with Christian information about the jizya in general and the jizya in Islam in particular , and from Christian references , articles , and testimonies . In order to give the subject of the jizya in Islam its full right , in this topic , we will present it through several points that cover the issue of the jizya in general , the jizya in Islam in particular , and the jizya from the Christian point of view , through a summary of Islamic research and explanations .

In addition to presenting the most famous Islamic interpretations of the verse of Jizya, and presenting Christian interpretations , articles and testimonies about Jizya , we will summarize the topic in six points , which are : First : What is the definition of Jizya ? Second : Is Jizya something that Islam introduced ? Third : What is Jizya in Islam? Fourth : Does Jizya diminish the dignity of non - Muslims? Fifth : What is the punishment for someone who refuses to pay Jizya if he is ordered to do so? Sixth : Is Jizya a shameful act and does paying it diminish the dignity of a Christian from a Christian perspective ? Let us begin with God’s blessing .

#### **First : Definition of Jizya????**

**1- Definition of Jizya in the Arabic language : Jizya is derived from the root (j -z -y ) meaning to reward him for what he did; Arabs say : Jaza yajzi, if he rewarded for what was done to him, and Jizya is derived from Mujazat on the weight of Fi’lah; meaning : they gave it as a reward for what they were granted of security.**

#### **2- Definition of Jizya in Islamic jurisprudence :**

**Jizya is a financial tax taken from non -Muslims if they enter into the protection and covenant of Muslims while remaining on their religion, they pay it to the Islamic state in exchange for the protection of Muslims from their enemy and to spare their blood so that no Muslim transgresses against them , as well as in exchange for their benefit from the facilities of the Islamic state .**

#### **3- Definition of Jizya in the Christian Biblical Encyclopedia :**

Jizya is money , goods or services provided by a nation or an individual to a nation or king as a sign of submission and to provide for the expenses. This indicates that the word jizya is equivalent to tax , because the word tax did not exist at that time, but rather it is a new word in the centuries that came after Islam.

### Second: Is jizya something that Islam introduced ?

Islam was not an innovation among religions, just as Muslims were not among nations when they took jizya from the nations that came under their rule. The fact that the victorious nations take jizya from the vanquished nations is more famous than science, as human history is the greatest witness to that. The New Testament conveyed the prevalence of this image when Christ said to Simon: "

What do you think, Simon? From whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute, from their own children, or from foreigners?" Peter said to him, "From foreigners." Jesus said to him, "Then the children are free " (Matthew 17-25).

And the prophets, peace be upon them, when they conquered some kingdoms by the command and support of God, took tribute from the conquered nations, and even enslaved the conquered nations, as the prophet Joshua did with the Canaanites when he conquered them : " But they did not drive out the Canaanites who lived in Gezer. But the Canaanites live among the Ephraimites to this day and are subject to tribute " (Joshua 16:10) . So he combined for them slavery and tribute.

Christianity did not abrogate any of the laws of Judaism, for Christ came to fulfill the law, not to abrogate it (see Matthew 5:17) . Christ even commanded his followers to pay tribute to the Romans,

" So they sent their disciples to him with the Herodians, saying, 'Teacher, we know that you are true and teach the way of God in truth, and do not care about anyone, for you do not regard the person of men. Tell us, then, what do you think? Is it lawful to pay tribute to Caesar, or not?'" Jesus knew their wickedness and said, "Why do you test me, you hypocrites? Show me the tax receipt." So they presented him a denarius. And he said to them, "Whose image and inscription is this?" They said to him, "Caesar's." And he said to them, "Render to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's. " (Matthew 16:21-22 )

Therefore, the tax is not an Islamic innovation, but rather something that people have known and been accustomed to since the dawn of history. This is something that is approved by the book that Christians sanctify, so why object to it????

### Third: What is the Jizya in Islam????

#### 1- Definition of Jizya in Islamic jurisprudence:

Jizya is a financial tax taken from non -Muslims if they enter into the covenant and protection of Muslims while remaining on their religion. They pay it to the Islamic state in exchange for the protection of Muslims from their enemy and to spare their blood so that no Muslim may transgress against them , as well as in exchange for their benefit from the facilities of the Islamic state

#### . 2- Purpose of Jizya:

Islam, as usual, does not stop at the practices of humans before it. Islam has raised Jizya to make it not a tribute paid by the vanquished to their victors, but rather to be a binding contract between the Muslim nation and the peoples who have entered into its care.

Al-Tabari says in his interpretation: "Jizya" is the action of: "So-and-so rewarded so-and-so for what he owed," if he paid it, "repays him," and "Jizya" is like "sitting" and "session," and the meaning of the words: until they give the tax from their necks, which they give to the Muslims to protect them. Al -

Qurtubi says in his interpretation: If the people of the jizyah pay the jizyah , nothing of their fruits, trade, or crops will be taken from them. The imam must fight their enemy on their behalf and seek their help in fighting them. They have no share in the spoils of war. The jizyah has a weight of fa'lah, from jaza yajzi if he rewards for what was given to him. It is as if they gave it as a reward for what they were granted of security. Al

**-Mawardi says in his book Al-Ahkam Al-Sultaniyyah: Two rights are required of them by giving it - that is, the jizyah - one of them is to refrain from them, and the second is to protect them so that they are safe by refraining and protected by protection.**

**It was stated in the book " Islam and Christianity »by Professor Imam Muhammad Abduhas follows: Islam was satisfied with the conquest by bringing conquered land under its authority, then it leaves the people and their religion. Then it charges with a tribute they pay to help maintain them and preserve their security in their homes, and they are free in their beliefs, temples and customs after that no harassed in work, nor wronged in treatment.**

**Sheikh Al-Shaarawy says in his interpretation: The reward is the jizya. It is from the root "jaza" and "yajzi". So it is as if the jizya is an action from "jaza" "yajzi"; because Islam presented them with a good deed by preserving their lives and keeping them on their religion without coercion, so it was necessary that they be given a reward for this blessing that God Almighty bestowed upon them with Islam. Also, they will live in a community of faith; The guardianship in it is for Islam, and Muslims are responsible for protecting them and ensuring their safety in themselves, their families, their money, and everything else. If a Muslim pays zakat to the treasury to serve the interests of the poor and Muslims, then the People of the Book who are present in the Islamic society also benefit from the services that Islam provides for them, and they must pay something from their money in return for those services. Islam, for example, does not require the People of the Book to enter as soldiers in a war against any enemy of the Muslims unless they volunteer to do so. Therefore, the jizya is not an obligation of coercion, but rather it is in return for a benefit that Islam provided for them.**

**Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi says in his book Non -Muslims in Islamic Society : "Some people look at things superficially, and consider Islam to be arbitrary in imposing the jizya on non-Muslims. If they were fair and contemplated the truth of the matter, they would know that Islam was completely fair in imposing this trivial jizya . Islam has obligated its sons to perform military service as a (community obligation) or an (individual obligation) and has entrusted them with the duty of defending the state. It has exempted non-Muslims from this, even if they live under its state, because the Islamic state is an (ideological) state, or in contemporary terms, an (ideological) state, meaning that it is a state based on a principle and an idea, and only those who believe in the soundness of its principle and the soundness of its idea fight to defend such a state." It is not reasonable that a person should be taken to put his head on his palm, and his blood should be shed for the sake of an idea that he believes is false, and for the sake of a religion that he does not believe in, and most likely the religion of the opponents itself does not allow them to defend another religion, and fight for it. The jizya is also dropped if the People of the Covenant participate with the Muslims in fighting and defending the House of Islam against the enemies of Islam. This was explicitly stated in some of the covenants and agreements that were concluded between the Muslims and the People of the Covenant during the reign of Omar, may God be pleased with him. The representative of Abu Ubaidah also reconciled with the Christian group (al-Jarajima) to be helpers of the Muslims and eyes on their enemy, otherwise they would be taken to pay the jizya, as stated in Fatwa No. 912548 of al-Azhar regarding the jizya , as follows: The purpose of imposing this tax on the Christians was not as a form of punishment for their refusal to accept Islam , but rather they were paying it with the rest of the people of the covenant, who are non-Muslim subjects of the state whose religion prevented them from serving in the army in exchange for the protection guaranteed to them by the swords of the Muslims. In the biography, when the people of al-Hirah presented the money for the agreed-upon jizya , they explicitly stated that they only paid this jizya on the condition that (they prevent us and their unjust emir from Muslims and others). Likewise, it happened that Khalid recorded in the treaty he concluded with some of the people of the cities neighboring al-Hirah his saying (if we prevent you, then we have the jizya , otherwise not). The Muslims returned the jizya to the people of the covenant when security was not achieved for them, as happened during the reign of Caliph Umar, may God be pleased with him, when Heraclius mobilized a huge army to repel the forces of the Muslims. As a result of what had happened, the Muslims were obliged to focus all their efforts on the battle that had besieged them. When Abu Ubaidah, may God be pleased with him - who was the leader of the Muslims - learned of this, he wrote to the workers of the conquered cities in the Levant to return to them the tribute that had been collected .**

From these cities, he wrote to the people saying (We have returned your money to you because we have been informed of what has been gathered for us from the crowds and that you have stipulated that we protect you and we are not able to do that and we have returned to you what we took from you and we are for you on the condition and what we wrote between us and you if God grants us victory over you) and thus huge sums of state money were returned so the Christians prayed for blessings for the leaders of the Muslims and said (May God return you to us and grant you victory over them - meaning over the Romans - if it was them they would not have returned anything to us and taken everything that remained for us) and the same ruling if they participated in the army as mentioned above.

### 3- The difference between Jizya, Zakat and modern taxes:

Dr. Ragheb Al-Sarjani says in his book *Jizya in Islam* : Let everyone who challenges the matter of Jizya and says : It is a form of injustice, oppression and humiliation of peoples take note. Especially when he knows that it is paid in exchange for the Zakat that Muslims pay. He should also know that the value of this Jizya is much less than the value of what Muslims pay in Zakat?! At the time when Muslims entered Andalusia, the value of what an individual who meets the previous conditions pays from Jizya to Muslims was one dinar per year. While a Muslim used to pay 2.5% of his total wealth if it reached the minimum amount and a year had passed, and in the case of a dhimmi converting to Islam, the jizya was dropped from him, and if he participated with the Muslims in fighting, they paid him his wages, so the amounts that Muslims paid in zakat were many times what the People of the Book and others paid in jizya - that zakat which itself is less than any tax in the world - there are those who pay 10 and 20% in taxes, and there are those who pay 50 and sometimes 70% in taxes on their wealth; while in Islam, zakat does not exceed 2.5%; so the jizya was less than the zakat imposed on Muslims; and thus it is considered the lowest tax in the world, and it was much less than what the rulers themselves imposed on their people and their own people. Moreover, the Messenger ordered that the People of the Book not be burdened beyond their capacity, and he even threatened those who wronged or harmed them; He said: "Whoever wrongs a covenantor, or diminishes his rights, or burdens him with more than he can bear, or takes something from him against his will, then I will be his opponent on the Day of Resurrection." That is, I am the one who will argue with him and dispute with him on the Day of Resurrection.

This means that the jizya is much less than the zakat imposed on Muslims, and both are equivalent to the concept of taxes in the current concept, with the difference between the value of the jizya and the value of zakat and the value of current taxes and their diversity. Dr. Attia Saqr, head of the Fatwa Committee at Al-Azhar

says:It cannot be said that taking the jizya from the People of the Covenant is an injustice to them or makes them second-class citizens, as it corresponds to the zakat imposed on Muslims.

### 4- Individuals who are entitled to the jizya:

God has commanded taking the jizya from the fighters and not others, as stated in the verse {Fight those who do not believe in God or the Last Day and do not consider unlawful what God and His Messenger have forbidden and do not adopt the religion of truth from among those who were given the Scripture - until they pay the jizyah with willing submission while they are subdued.} Al-Qurtubi said in his interpretation:

Our scholars, may God have mercy on them, said: What the Qur'an indicates is that the jizya is taken from the fighting men; because God Almighty said: Fight those until His saying: until they pay the jizyah This necessitates that it is obligatory for the one who fights. It indicates that it is not obligatory for the slave, even if he is a fighter, because he has no money, and because Allah the Almighty said: "until they give." And it is not said of one who does not own until they give. This is a consensus of the scholars that the jizyah is only imposed on the skulls of free adult men, who are the ones who fight, excluding women, children, slaves, the insane who are unable to control their minds, and the elderly. There is a difference of opinion regarding monks. Ibn Wahb narrated from Malik that

it is not taken from them. Mutraf and Ibn al-Majishun said : This is if he did not become a monk after it was imposed. If it was imposed and then he became a monk, his timidity does not cancel it. Umar wrote to the commanders of the armies: "Do not impose the jizyah on women and children, and do not impose it except on those who have reached puberty."

This means that the jizya is imposed on free, sane, adult men who are able to fight and own money, but not on the elderly or the sick who are unable to fight, or monks unless they become monks after the jizya is imposed on them, or women, boys, slaves who have been killed, or non-combatant slaves, even if they all own money.

#### 5- When is the jizya imposed and when is it dropped?

The scholars agreed that the jizya in two cases

- 1- On non-Muslims residing in the Islamic state, and it is taken from them in exchange for the state's guarantee of their defense and security and their enjoyment of the state's services and facilities.
- 2- On non-Muslims who fought the Muslims, broke the covenant, incited or helped the enemies of the Muslims in the war against the Muslims, so the army of the Islamic state invades them as punishment for them, and the jizya on them in exchange for entering their lands and entering with them within the scope and borders of the Islamic state. Some scholars said that the origin of imposing the jizya is this case only, but this opinion did not receive the consensus of the scholars of the nation.

The scholars agreed that it is dropped in three cases

- 1- If the ruler agrees with non-Muslims to be helpers of the Muslims and eyes on Their enemy, otherwise they will be taken to pay the jizya, as the representative of Abu Ubaidah agreed with the Christian group (al-Jarajima) on that.
- 2- The jizya if the People of the Covenant participate with the Muslims in fighting and defending the House of Islam against the enemies of Islam. This was explicitly stated in some of the covenants and agreements concluded between the Muslims and the People of the Covenant during the reign of Omar, may Allah be pleased with him.
- 3- The jizya if the Muslims are unable to protect the non-Muslims present within the Islamic state, as happened during the reign of Caliph Omar, may Allah be pleased with him, when Heraclius mobilized a huge army to repel the forces of the Muslims. As a result of what happened, the Muslims were obliged to focus all their activity on the battle that surrounded them. When Abu Ubaidah, may Allah be pleased with him - who was the leader of the Muslims - learned of that, he wrote to the workers of the conquered cities in the Levant to return to them what was collected from the jizya from these cities.

#### 6- The amount of the jizya:

The amount paid for the jizya was not large enough for men to be unable to pay, but it was affordable. It did not exceed one dinar per year during the time of the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, while it did not exceed four dinars per year during the Umayyad state.

In Sunan al-Tirmidhi, when the Prophet sent Muadh to Yemen, he took a dinar from each adult among them. Muadh says: "The Prophet, may God bless him and grant him peace, sent me to Yemen and ordered me to take a young cow or a young sheep from every thirty, and a zakat from every forty (this is zakat on the Muslims among them), and from every adult a dinar, or its equivalent in ma'afir (for the jizya)." Ma'afir means clothing.

Al-Baghawi says in his interpretation: "As for the amount of the jizya : its minimum is a dinar, and it is not permissible to reduce it. The Prophet, may God bless him and grant him peace, ordered him to take a dinar from every adult, i.e., an adult, and he did not differentiate between the rich, the poor, and the middle class. This is evidence that it is not obligatory on children, nor is it obligatory on women. Rather, it is taken from free, sane,

adult men. Some people went to the view that it is on every wealthy person four dinars, on every middle class person two dinars, and on every poor person one dinar, and this is the view of the people of opinion.”

#### 7- Who has the authority to collect the jizya:

Al-Qurtubi said in his interpretation: If the imam made a covenant with the people of a town or fortress, then they broke their covenant and refused to pay what is required of them of jizya and other things and refused the rule of Islam without being wronged and the imam was not unjust to them, then it is obligatory on the Muslims to invade them and fight them with their imam.

This means that the ruler is responsible for imposing and collecting the jizya, and he is the one who fights them with his army, not any person.

#### 8- Examples of the situation of the People of the Book in light of the Jizya:

The Prophet, may God bless him and grant him peace, wrote a covenant and pledge to the people of Najran. Christians, Ibn Saad transmits it to us in his *Tabaqat*, saying: “And the Messenger of God, may God bless him and grant him peace, wrote to the bishop of Banu al-Harith ibn Ka’b and the bishops of Najran and their priests and those who followed them and their monks that they have whatever is in their hands, little or much, of their trade, prayers, monks, and the protection of God and His Messenger. No bishop shall be changed from his bishopric, nor a monk from his monkhood, nor a priest from his priesthood, nor shall any of their rights be changed, nor their authority, nor anything of what they were upon, as long as they advise and reform what is upon them, not burdened with injustice or oppressors. And al-Mughira wrote.”

And Ubadah ibn al-Samit records these civilized features of the jizya in Islam, as he presents the clear Islamic position to al-Muqawqis, the great Copt, saying: Either you respond to Islam... If you and your companions accept that, then you will be happy in this world and the hereafter, and we will return from fighting you, and we will not permit harming you or exposing you. But if you refuse except the jizya, then pay us the jizya willingly and you are humiliated, and we will treat you according to something that pleases us. We and you, every year, as long as we and you remain, will fight on your behalf whoever opposes you or attacks you in any of your land, blood, or money. We will do that on your behalf if you are under our protection and you have a covenant with us, like the covenant of Umar that Umar wrote for the people of Jerusalem, in which it says: “In the name of God, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful; This is what Abdullah Omar, the Commander of the Faithful, gave to the people of Ilya in terms of security. He gave them security for their lives and their money, their churches and crosses, their sick and healthy, and all their religion. Their churches shall not be inhabited, nor demolished, nor diminished, nor their area, nor their crosses, nor any of their money. They shall not be forced to change their religion, nor shall any of them be harmed, nor shall any of the Jews be settled in Ilya with them. The people of Ilya must pay the jizya. .

Whoever of them leaves is safe for himself and his money until he reaches his place of safety, and whoever of them stays is safe, and he owes the same jizya as the people of Ilya. Whoever wishes to go with the Romans, and whoever wishes to return to his family, nothing will be taken from them until their harvest is harvested. When Khalid ibn al-Walid conquered Damascus, he wrote to its people likewise, saying: “In the name of God, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful. This is what Khalid ibn al-Walid gave to the people of Damascus when he entered it, a guarantee for their lives, their money, their churches, and the walls of their city that will not be demolished, and that none of their homes will be inhabited. They have the covenant of God and the protection of the Messenger of God, may God bless him and grant him peace, the caliphs, and the believers. They will not be exposed to anything but good if they pay the jizya.”

Imam al-Qarafi quotes Imam Ibn Hazm al-Andalusi as a consensus of the Muslims that you will not find a parallel for among any nation. He says: “Whoever is under the protection, and the people of war come to our country intending to attack him, it is obligatory upon us to go out to fight them with our mounts and weapons, and we die

in the process, in order to protect whoever is under the protection of God Almighty and the protection of His Messenger, may God bless him and grant him peace. For surrendering him without that is a neglect of the covenant of protection."The CoptictinkerDr. Nabil Luka Babawi in his book"The Jizya on Non-Muslims":The jizya is nothing but a tax to defend them in exchange for protecting them and defending them from any external aggression, to exempt them from participating in the Islamic army so that they do not enter a war in which they defend a religion in which they do not believe.

. However, if a non-Muslim chooses to join the Islamic army willingly, he is exempted from paying the jizya." Dr. Luka continues by saying: " The jizya was also paid in return for enjoying the public services provided by the state to citizens, Muslims and non-Muslims, which were funded from the zakat money paid by Muslims as a pillar of Islam. This jizya represents only a small and modest amount when compared to the exorbitant taxes imposed by the Roman state on Christians in Egypt, from which no one was exempted. More than 70% of Orthodox Copts were exempted from paying this jizya. The following were exempted from paying it: minors, women, the elderly, the disabled, the sick, and monks.

Will Durant says in his book *The Story of Civilization (12/131): The People of the Covenant, Christians, Zoroastrians, Jews and Sabians*, enjoyed during the Umayyad Caliphate a degree of tolerance that we do not find its equivalent in Christian countries today. They were free to practice the rituals of their religion, and they kept their churches and temples. They were not required to do more than wear a special color of clothing and pay a tax for each person according to his income, ranging between two and four dinars. This tax was only imposed on non-Muslims who were able to bear arms, and monks, women, males who had not reached puberty, slaves, the elderly, the disabled, the severely blind and the poor were exempted from it. In return, the People of the Covenant were exempted from military service ...and the zakat, which amounted to two and a half percent of the annual income, was not imposed on them, and the government had to protect them. The historian Adam Metz says in his book *Islamic Civilization : The people of the covenant paid the jizya, each according to his ability, and this jizya was similar to a national defense tax, so it was only paid by the man who was able to bear arms, so it was not paid by the disabled, nor by the monks, nor by the people of the monasteries.*

We will suffice with this amount of testimonies to avoid prolongation, and this is the greatest evidence that the jizya is not just a tribute or a thug as Christians spread , because when the thug imposes the tribute on a person , he does not care what happens to this person afterwards, and he does not defend him or protect him or be responsible for him. As for the jizya , as we have seen , it is like an agreement and contract between non -Muslims and Muslims, based on which Muslims protect non -Muslims and defend them . 9- The testimony of the Copts of Egypt about the jizya in Islam: And here I will not convey to you the testimony of a person who defends Islam and a non-Muslim who converted to Islam , but the surprise is that I will convey to you the testimony of the Anba Takla website, which is the official website of the Coptic Orthodox Church, about the jizya in Islam. It says in the section on the conditions of Egypt during the conquest: Arabs to Egypt under the title *Egypt at the dawn of Islam: The financial system in the government (the jizya and the zakat)* "the jizya" is the taxes imposed on heads, while " the kharaj " is the land tax, but we often find in the references confusion between these two taxes; so we see

The jizya means the poll tax and the land tax together. It is noted that the word "kharaj" refers to the real estate tax and also the poll tax, and sometimes it is used for other taxes that differ in nature from these two taxes. After the Arabs conquered Egypt - and here I mean after the first Babylonian Treaty - the Arabs imposed the jizya

on the people of Egypt, and here is the text of what the historians mentioned: "They gathered together in a covenant among themselves and agreed to impose on all the Copts in Egypt, both upper and lower, two dinars for every soul, noble and lowly, and those who have reached puberty, nothing on the elderly, nor on the young who has not reached puberty, nor on women. They counted the number of Copts that day, especially those who had reached the poll tax, and imposed the two dinars on them. Their leaders raised this with confirmed faith, so that all those counted that day in Egypt, both upper and lower, of all the Copts, according to what they counted, wrote, and raised, were more than six thousand souls, and their tax that day was twelve thousand dinars per year."

This testimony from the Coptic Church contains several points

: 1- The jizya in Islamic rule is a state tax and not a tribute or bullying. 2- The amount of jizya was two dinars per year for each person who was entitled to pay jizya. 3- The jizya was not taken from the elderly, the young, or women.

#### Fourth: Does jizya deprive non-Muslims of their dignity

Christians always rely in their attempts to prove that jizya deprives them of their dignity on the phrase "by hand" which came at the end of the verse. In response, we say regarding the phrase "by hand,"

Al-Qurtubi says in his interpretation: Ibn Abbas said: He pays it himself without appointing anyone to do so his interpretation: As for his saying: "by hand," it means: from his hand to the hand of the one to whom he pays it. Sheikh Al-Shaarawy says in his interpretation: "by hand" means ability, so whoever has ability, the jizya is taken from the one who is able and we do not take it from the one who is unable. Therefore, we do not see that the word "by hand" contains any offense. As for the phrase "and they are humiliated" we will present it in terms of its definition, image, and wisdom. First, what is the definition of "the small ones"? Ibn Kathir, Al-Tabari, and Al-Baghawi indicated in their interpretation that its meaning is humiliation and subjugation of the non-Muslim for their polytheism and blasphemy against God, and for the Muslim monotheism. Al-Qurtubi said in his interpretation that the word "the small ones" is from "the small ones," that which is small

#### His status Abdullah ibn Omar

said about the meaning of "and they are subdued" as Al-Qurtubi indicated in his interpretation, saying: The Imams narrated on the authority of Abdullah ibn Omar that the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, said: The upper hand is better than the lower hand. The upper hand is the one that spends, and the lower is the one that asks. It was narrated: "The upper hand is the one that gives." So he made the hand of the giver in charity upper, and he made the hand of the giver in jizya lower. And the hand of the taker is upper, because he is the one who raises and lowers, he raises whomever he wills and lowers whomever he wills, there is no god but Him. And its meaning is that the hand that takes the jizyah is higher than the hand that gives the jizyah, the opposite of charity, meaning that he means the lowliness of his position and the status of the giver in front of the taker. This is to show that the giver of the jizyah does not do it a favor to the one who takes it, because as we have shown, it gives the giver rights, and consequently it is not a

favor , the opposite of charity , in which the giver does it a favor to the one who takes it.

Sheikh Al-Shaarawy said in his interpretation : (Until they give the jizyah with willing submission while they are humbled) and saghrān is from the root sad, ghayn, and ra', and it indicates two meanings; if you mean it about age,

It is said " saghr " and " yasghru " like when we say : someone is big, he is big . If you mean it in size and position , we say " saghr " and " yasghr " , meaning : he is small in position or size, and it means that they pay it with humiliation , not with superiority, so that the one who gives does not think that he is giving with superiority, and we say to him : No, the hand that takes here is the upper hand .

Therefore , we see that scholars have agreed on the definition and content of the meaning of saghr, which is humiliation , oppression , low status, and lack of honor , and that the giving of the jizya by a non -Muslim is not the giving of a noble person to a lowly person or the giving of a rich person to a poor person , or that by giving the jizya to a Muslim, the Muslim is subject to him as the taker is subject to the giver, but rather the opposite , because the Muslim gives him security and defends him against the enemies, and thus he is the one who needs the Muslim , not the Muslim who needs him.

Here, an important question must be asked : Is the humiliation and lack of honor for the non-Muslim due to the phrase " and they are humiliated " or only when paying the jizya ? Sheikh Muhammad Salih Al-Munajjid

says in his fatwa about the permissibility of honoring and respecting non -Muslims in general as follows :

It is not permissible to do to them an act that requires venerating or respecting them, just as it is not permissible to befriend them , because Allah the Almighty says : { O you who believe! Take not the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are [in fact] allies of one another .} But showing this basic creed does not prevent treating them kindly, as befits their likes, and treating them with justice, as long as they are peaceful, because Allah the Almighty says: {Allah does not forbid you from those who do not fight you because of religion and do not expel you from your homes - from being righteous toward them and acting justly toward them. Indeed, Allah loves those who are just.} (Al-Muqsiteen) However, kindness to them should not include anything that suggests that they are being glorified or venerated, or that they are being looked down upon, or that they are superior to Muslims. Omar (may Allah be pleased with him) said: "I do not honor them when Allah has humiliated them, nor do I honor them when Allah has humiliated them, nor do I bring them near when Allah has cast them away." End quote.

This means that it is not permissible to honor a non-Muslim in general, whether when paying the jizyah or not , because of his disbelief and blasphemy against Allah . Allah the Most High said : " O you who have believed, whoever of you should revert from his religion - Allah will bring forth [in place of them] a people He will love and who will love Him - humble toward the believers, mighty against the disbelievers." However, this does not prevent us from loving them because of their kinship or kindness. The Fatwa Center says in Fatwa No.

219466 :

Love is of two types: natural love and legitimate love. As for legitimate love, such as loving the disbelievers for their disbelief and the immoral for their immorality, this is not permissible. As for natural love, this is an instinct in the soul that a person cannot control. Sheikh Ibn Uthaymeen (may Allah have mercy on him) said in his interpretation of Surat Al-Baqarah: And Allah the Most High said: "Indeed, you do not guide whom you love" [Al-Qasas: 56] meaning you do not... May you be guided to the guidance of the one you love, or the one you love to guide.

There is no blame on a Muslim for loving his parents or his infidel relatives with a natural, instinctive love, or loving an infidel for the sake of his continued kindness to him . In conclusion : From the above , we can conclude with five main points , which are : 1- It is not permissible to honor a non -Muslim and raise him above Muslims in general because of his disbelief and polytheism . 2- It is not permissible to honor a

non- Muslim.

Because he pays the jizya

3- Paying the jizya does not mean that the non -Muslim is doing a favor to the Muslim or feeling that he is superior to the Muslim by giving him the jizya, but rather the opposite, because the Muslim provides him with protection and security.

4- The humiliation and subjugation of the non- Muslim that the scholars referred to is not because of the phrase “ they are submissive” or when paying the jizya only , but rather it is generally permanent because of their disbelief in God, their polytheism, and their blasphemy against Him .

5- Humiliation and subjugation do not conflict with our being dutiful to them, doing good to them, and loving them. Of course, the Christian

will say that he rejects this humiliation , this subjugation, and this description. In response to him, we say : 1- Subjugation is coercion, as they are forced to pay the jizya like citizens who are forced to pay state taxes, and thus there is no defect in describing them as subjugated, i.e. forced. 2- Describing any person with the word “humiliation” in itself is not an insult or an insult, because humiliation has many meanings, including submission, acquiescence, compassion, hope, sympathy, low status, or the loss of dignity, or Insult: Paul the Apostle described himself with this word, which means submission or acquiescence, in his second letter to the Corinthians 1:10: “

I myself, Paul, who in presence am lowly among you, but being absent am bold toward you.” 3- Describing the non-Muslim as humiliated and of low status is a result of his adherence to disbelief. Disbelief does not honor its owner, but rather humiliates him and diminishes his status, as God Almighty says

: “ O you who have believed, whoever of you should revert from his religion - Allah will bring forth [in place of them] a people He will love and who will love Him [who will be] humble toward the believers, powerful against the disbelievers.”

And God Almighty says : “ To Allah belongs honor *and to His Messenger* and to the believers.”

And Al-Farouq Omar Ibn Al-Khattab, may God be pleased with him, said: “ We were humiliated, then Allah honored us with Islam. If we seek honor in anything other than Islam, Allah will humiliate us .”

So describing the non-Muslim as humiliated and of low status because of his disbelief is because God does not honor those who disbelieve in Him or make them superior to the believers, so that he does not think that his disbelief has honored him or made him superior to the believers and so he clings to it, but rather he knows that his disbelief has humiliated him and made his status inferior before the Muslims, so he examines himself.

Islam is not unique in describing non-believers with some negative characteristics such as humiliation, lowliness, and disbelief. Rather, the Holy Book, especially the New Testament, describes non-believers with characteristics that are more negative than the characteristics that Islam described for the non-believer. The non-believer in Christianity has Satan in him and his mind is blind. In fact, his mind and conscience are impure ( 2 Corinthians 4:4) , in whom the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers ( Titus 1:15) . But to the impure and unbelieving, nothing is pure. Rather, their minds and consciences have also become defiled. Therefore, we see that describing a non-believer with some negative characteristics in religions does not

blemish religions, so that the believer is distinguished from the non-believer in every religion. However, what no human being would accept is the squandering of the dignity of a non-believer simply because he is a non-believer in the other religion.

Here, an important question appears to us: Does describing a non-Muslim as humiliated squander his dignity, as the non-Muslim believes, or does it make his dignity permissible?

We say to him that humiliation as a description came about the believers in the saying of Allah the Almighty ( O you who believe ! Whoever of you should revert from his religion - Allah will bring forth in place of them a people He will love and who will love Him [who will be] humble toward the believers, mighty against the disbelievers]) and here the word humiliation came about about the believers but in the sense of mercy , i.e. its image and form . Allah the Almighty also said ( And lower to them the wing of humiliation out of mercy and say , " My Lord, have mercy upon them as they brought me up [when I was] small") and here the word humiliation came about about any person in front of his parents but in the sense of affection and mercy, i.e. its image and form.

Thus, it becomes clear to us that humiliation as a word is used to describe the believer and the non-believer, but the difference is in its image and meaning, i.e. the crux of the matter is knowing the form and image of humiliation and smallness described as a non-Muslim in the verse of the jizya , which the scholars have agreed upon, so that we know whether this description diminishes his dignity and makes it permissible or not.

Secondly, what is it an image of smallness, humiliation and low status for non-Muslims???

We present here all the images and methods of smallness that scholars have said and presented in their books and interpretations :

1- An opinion says that it means submission and obedience to the rulings of Islam and the application of the rulings of Islam to them .

This is the opinion of Al- Shafi'i and Al-Baghawi referred to it in his interpretation by saying : Al-Shafi'i, may Allah have mercy on him, said : Smallness is the application of the rulings of Islam to them . Ibn Al- Qayyim

agrees with him in his book Ahkam Ahl Al -Dhimmah by saying : Smallness is their commitment to the application of the rulings of Allah Almighty to them.

Ibn Hazm in his book Al-Muhalla by saying : Smallness is the application of Our rulings to them .

Ibn Taymiyyah in the book Al-Sarim Al-Maslul by saying : That they are humiliated and the rulings of the religion apply to them . Al-Jalalayn's

interpretation by saying: Humiliated and obedient to the rule of Islam .

Sheikh Abu Bakr Al-Jaza'iri in the book Aysar Al-Tafasir by saying : And they are humiliated , meaning humiliated and obedient to this rule of Islam .

And before him, the majority of jurists and hadith imams, and it is common in the books of interpretations. 2- An opinion says that its meaning is that he pays it while standing and the taker is sitting. This is the opinion of Ikrimah, and Al-Qurtubi referred to it in his interpretation, and Al-Baghawi in his interpretation, and Al-Tabari in his interpretation.

There are other images that Al-Baghawi presented uniquely , and they are: 1- An opinion that says that its meaning is that he is taken by his beard and struck in his two sides, and its source is unknown, and Al-Baghawi referred to it by saying: It was said. 2- An opinion that says that its meaning is that he is pulled and dragged to the place of giving violently, and its source is unknown, and Al-Baghawi referred to it by saying: It was said. 3- An opinion that says that its meaning is that if he is pushed, he is slapped on the back of his head, and this is Al-Kalbi's opinion, and Al-Baghawi referred to it. 4- An opinion that says that its meaning is that he is pushed and his neck is trampled on, and this is Ibn Abbas' opinion, and Al-Baghawi referred to it.

Thus, the vision is now clear to us that the image that the jurists and imams agreed upon is submission and obedience to the rulings of Islam and the Islamic state.

What Al - Qurtubi , Al-Tabari and Al-Baghawi agreed upon in their interpretations is Ikrimah's explanation that the person pays it standing while the one who takes it is sitting. This was the case of collecting taxes in the past. The one who represented the authorities would sit while the line of those who came to him to pay taxes stood. This does not detract from the payer, but on the contrary. We see now that someone who wants to obtain a tax return, for example, we find the person standing while the employee is sitting. Despite the absence of any embarrassment in this image, the majority of jurists rejected it because Ikrimah alone had this explanation and no scholar from the early scholars agreed with him on this explanation.

As for the explanation of Ibn Abbas and Al-Kalbi, both of them are weak because Al-Qurtubi, Al-Tabari and even Ibn Kathir did not indicate in their interpretation any of these two opinions. The majority of jurists weakened it because there is no evidence from Islamic history of such an occurrence during the collection of the jizya , knowing that if this had actually happened, we would have found it written on the Anba Takla website in the section on jizya, especially since they are always quick to show any behavior that offends Islam and shows the extent of their persecution even And if it was from people who have weight in history,

as for the rest of the opinions, they are of unknown source, as we always find Al-Baghawi saying, "It was said... It was said..." meaning that it is not known who is the speaker from whom he takes it.

Imam Al-Shafi'i said in his book Al-Umm (5/208): "If he takes the jizya from them, he takes it in loads, and he does not harm any of them or say anything ugly to them ." This means that it is not permissible to humiliate them when they pay the jizya,

knowing that humiliating and oppressing the People of the Book in the ways that Christians spread contradicts many verses and hadiths that command us to be good to the People of the Book and to be fair to them and not to harm them without right.

God Almighty said: "God does not forbid you from those who do not fight you because of religion and do not expel you from your homes - from being righteous toward them and acting justly toward them. Indeed , (Allah loves the just)

and on the authority of Safwan bin Salim , on the authority of several of the sons of the Companions of the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, on the authority of their fathers, on the authority of

the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, who said: ( Whoever wrongs a covenantor, or diminishes his rights, or burdens him beyond his capacity , or takes something from him without his consent, then I will be his opponent on the Day of Resurrection ). Narrated by Abu Dawud .

Thus, we see that the image of humiliation and degradation that scholars have agreed upon is submission to the rule of Islam and the Islamic state. This image does not detract from the dignity of the Christian. Rather, Paul orders every Christian to submit to the authority because every authority came with the permission of God. Whoever resists the orders of the authority resists God and God will judge them for that. He advises him to do what is good and the authority will praise him. This is in his letter to the Romans, chapter 13 , where he said :

- 1 Let every soul be subject to the higher authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and the authorities that exist have been ordained by God.
- 2 So that whoever resists the authority resists the ordinance of God. And those who resist will receive judgment for themselves.
- 3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil. Do you want to not fear the authorities? Do good deeds, and you will receive praise from Him.

In conclusion: 1- Describing the non-Muslim as humiliated and of low status is due to his disbelief, because Allah does not honor those who disbelieve in Him or make them superior to the believers.

2- Humiliation is a word used to describe the believer and the non-believer, but the difference is in its form and meaning.

The humiliation used to describe the believer is in its form and meaning of kindness and mercy , while the humiliation used to describe the non-believer is submission and obedience to the rulings of Islam and the Islamic state. Paul ordered them to submit to the rulers .

Third, what is the wisdom behind the Almighty's saying , “ and they were humbled”?

The wisdom here is clearly evident in the non-Muslim's lack of superiority when paying the jizya. This is for several reasons

- : 1- This is a right upon him in return for his enjoyment of protection, security and the defense of Muslims , so he should not think that he is doing Muslims a favor or showing kindness to Muslims .
- 2- Not giving the jizya arrogantly or haughtily or in a humiliating manner such as throwing the jizya in the face of its recipient ... etc. Therefore, it was necessary to codify the form of giving the jizya .
- 3- Clarifying that the jizya is not a tribute or bullying , because if it were , the Qur'an would not have cared about the form of giving it. The bully who imposes the tribute does not care about the form of giving, even if the giver threw the amount of the tribute in the face of its recipient. As for the Qur'an, it cared about the form of giving in order to clarify that it is not a tribute imposed on non-Muslims . 4- We should not honor or respect the giver of the jizya just because he gave it to us, rather he is humiliated before Islam and Muslims in general for his association with God and is subject to the rulings of Islam and the Islamic state

. Fifth: What is the punishment for someone who refuses to pay the jizya if he is ordered to do so? And it is required here that he be able. Al-Qurtubi said: Our scholars said: As for their punishment if they refuse to

pay it while being able, then it is permissible. However, if it is clear that they are unable, then their punishment is not permissible, because whoever is unable to pay the jizyah is exempted from it.

Some may believe that the punishment is killing a person while he is unarmed, like what some gangs do in the name of religion, but in reality the fighting mentioned in the verse does not mean killing a person while he is unarmed.

The scholars said that fighting has many forms, not just war, because the word "fight" is not the same as the word "kill."

Imam Ibn Hajar said in Fath al-Bari in his explanation of Sahih al-Bukhari: He was amazed by the difference between fighting for something and killing for it, as fighting is a reciprocal action that requires both sides to obtain it, so it is not necessary that the permissibility of fighting also permits the killing of the one who refuses to do it if he does not fight. The difference between fighting for something and killing for it is clear.

Sheikh Ibn Uthaymeen said:

\* Fighting: is to strive in jihad against the enemies so that the word of Allah is supreme.

\* Killing: is to kill a specific person, and for this reason we say: not everything that fighting is permissible is permissible to kill, as killing is narrower and is not permissible except under known conditions, while fighting is broader.

Consequently, we conclude from this that the word kill has only one meaning, which is killing regardless of its method. As for fighting, it has many forms, as the scholars said.

Al-Qurtubi said in his interpretation of the one who refuses to pay the jizyah : If the imam made a covenant with the people of a town or fortress, then they broke their covenant and refused to pay what is required of them of jizyah and other things, and refused the rule of Islam without being wronged, and the imam was not unjust to them, then it is obligatory for the Muslims to invade them and fight them with their imam. If they fight and are victorious, the ruling on them is the same as the ruling in the land of war.

From the words of Al-Qurtubi, we find that the punishment is fighting, i.e. war, and not killing a person while he is unarmed

. Another question arises for us: Who are those we fight, as Al-Qurtubi says???

Imam Al-Qurtubi said: Our scholars, may God have mercy on them, said: What the Quran indicates is that the jizya is taken from the fighting men, because God Almighty said: "Fight those" until His saying: "until they give the jizya ." This necessitates that it is obligatory on the one who fights. It indicates that it is not on the slave, even if he is a fighter, because he has no money, and because God Almighty said: "until they give." And it is not said to someone who does not own until he gives. This is a consensus among scholars that the jizya is only imposed on the skulls of free adult men, who are the ones who fight, not women, children, slaves, insane people whose minds are overcome, and the elderly.

That is, when we fight, we fight the fighters and do not fight those who do not have the ability to pay the jizya, even if they are fighters.

Al-Mawardi says in his book Al-Ahkam Al-Sultaniyya, quoting Imam Abu Hanifa, the following: If the People of the Covenant break their covenant, it is not permissible to kill them, nor to seize their wealth, nor to take their children captive, as long as they do not fight. It is obligatory to expel them from the lands of the Muslims in safety until they reach their destination. Their safety is in the nearest land of polytheism. If they do not leave willingly, they are expelled against their will

. That is, if they refuse to pay the jizya , it is not necessary to fight them unless they start fighting. Rather, they are expelled in this case while they are safe.

In the book of Sharia Policy, issued by the International University of Madinah for Islamic Studies: If the People of the Covenant refuse to pay the jizya, some jurists consider that this is a breach of their covenant, and the jizya is taken from them by force, like debts. We say that among the means that can lead to preventing evasion of

paying the jizya: Imprisoning the evader until he pays it. In this sense, Imam Abu Yusuf, may God have mercy on him, says in the Book of Al-Kharaj: "And the People of the Covenant are imprisoned until they pay what they owe, and they are not released from prison until the jizya is collected from them."

Accordingly, the word "fight" mentioned in the Qur'an has many forms, including war, or expelling them from Muslim lands in safety, or it is taken from them by force, or imprisonment, as all of these are forms of fighting.

Sixth: Is the jizya a shameful act, and does paying it diminish the dignity of the Christian from the Christian perspective?

Of course, any Christian will answer yes, because the tax is an inhuman act that God does not approve of, but the shocking surprise for him is that he is ordered to pay the tax, and whoever does not pay the tax is resisting God, and God will condemn him for not paying the tax, according to the text of the Holy Bible and Christian interpretations.

It came in the Epistle to the Romans 13

1 Let every soul be subject to the higher authorities, for there is no authority except from God, and the authorities that exist have been established by God,

2 so that whoever resists the authority resists the ordinance of God, and those who resist will receive judgment upon themselves.

3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil. Do you not want to be afraid of the ruler? Do what is good, and you will have praise from him.

4 For he is God's minister for what is good. But if you do what is evil, fear, for he does not bear the sword in vain; for he is God's minister, an avenger to execute wrath on him who does evil .

5 Therefore it is necessary to be subject to him, not only because of wrath, but also because of conscience.

6 For this is why you also pay taxes , since they are God's ministers, giving regularly to this very thing.

7 Therefore give to all what is due them: to whom taxes belong taxes; to whom revenue belongs custom; to whom revenue belongs fear. Honor to whom honor is due.

8 Owe no one anything, except to love one another, for he who loves another has fulfilled the law.

Here are the Christian interpretations so that no one accuses me of interpreting the texts according to my whims or the whims of Muslims.

Father Tadros Yacoub Malaty says in his interpretation that

the Apostle Paul wrote: "Let every soul be subject to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except from God, and the authorities that exist are ordained by God. " This was at the time when Nero was violently persecuting the church. Since he believed that Nero, despite his evil, was established by divine permission for the good of the Church, and that the Church's job was not to resist him either outwardly or in the heart, but to respond to his resistance with love and submission in temporal matters as long as it did not affect her faith in God. St. John Chrysostom explains this phrase

to us , explaining that we are committed to submission. For the leaders and rulers , because this arrangement is from God, not in the sense of every king or official appointed by God, but rather the arrangement itself is from God , Saint John Chrysostom

completes by showing that submission here is not for a temporal benefit, but for the sake of God Himself. Submission here does not mean weakness but "obedience in the Lord," so it is appropriate for the believer in his submission to fear not people but evil : Saint John Chrysostom sees that the Apostle has transformed what many see as a burden into comfort, so if a person is obligated to pay the tax , this is to his advantage , because the rulers "are God's servants who persevere in this very same thing," staying awake, struggling for the peace of the country from enemies and for resisting evildoers such as thieves and murderers. Their lives are full of toil and vigilance. While you pay the tax to live in peace that the rulers themselves are deprived of. St. Ambrose says : It is necessary to submit to him as to the Lord , and the sign of submission is paying the tribute . He also says: The Apostle focuses on us returning to him not only money, but also honor and awe

. The word "give" here in the original Greek means "return." What we offer as tribute or honor to the rulers is not

a gift from us, but rather it is the fulfillment of a debt owed to us . They stay up and struggle so that everyone may rest in peace.

Here, the tribute means what the ruler takes on souls and real estate, while the tax he takes on trade.

Father Anthony Fikry says in his interpretation

: Thus, we do not covet global political positions because our church is a heavenly institution, and we also do not care about the persecution that befalls us, and we do not revolt against those who persecute us. We submit to the ruler or king in everything except for one thing, which is that he orders us to leave Christ.

The Christian feels that his life is not in the hand of the king, but in the hand of God, the Ruler of all, who appointed the king. Authority is ordained by God, so we must submit to the king no matter how evil he is , and not to the king alone, but to the entire ruling body with him .

God is the one who appointed the king, through him kings reign . Whoever resists the king resists God . Whoever does good works does not fear the ruler. Whoever does evil fears him . The ruler is the servant of God. God has placed the sword (punishment) in his hand to suppress all evil so that chaos does not prevail. We must submit to the ruler not only out of fear but for the sake of conscience, because God appointed him. That is, we must understand that we are not dealing with a great man, so we fear him because of his greatness, but we are dealing with God who commanded us to submit to the one he appointed . This is like giving to Caesar what is Caesar's. We must give those who have authority their rights, and this is our duty.

We note the following in the text and interpretations:

1- The Christian must pay tribute to the king because the king was established with God's permission. 2- The Christian who resists the king even if he is evil as long as the king has not ordered him to abandon Christ, especially in the matter of tribute.

And taxes, he resists God

3- The Christian is ordered to pay the tax so as not to anger the king and bring evil upon him because God put the sword in his hand 4- Christians who resist the king, God will judge them as Paul said .

Rather, the surprise lies when the Christian learns that Christ, peace be upon him, paid the tax for himself, as he said to Simon: " Go to the sea and cast in a hook, and take the fish that comes up first, and when you open its mouth you will find a she-fish; take that and give it to them for me and you " (Matthew 17-27)

. Did Christ submit to bullying when he paid the tax??? Did Christ allow himself to pay a tax if the tax is a tax as you imagine and not a tax from the state taxes as you reject this meaning? Is the Christian greater than Christ, peace be upon him, and he is their god, and the dignity of the Christian is greater than the dignity of Christ so that they reject what Christ accepted??

After all this, does the Christian still believe that the tax is an Islamic innovation?? Does he still believe that the jizya is a tribute and bullying even though his book orders him to pay it and Christ paid it???? Does he still believe that the jizya is a large sum of money even though the official website of the Coptic Church admits that its amount is two dinars???? Does he still resist God????