

# “AŞ-ŞADAQA” (CHARITY) DESERVERS BETWEEN LANGUAGE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**HAITHM ZINHOM**

Muhammed bin Zayed University, United Arab Emirates.

## Abstract

Arabic language is accurate in its words and rich in its structure with flexible expressions and huge effects. The researcher has chosen one of the rubies from the Quran where he found the necessity for what societies pass through from dilemmas and language clearly shared in fixing priorities. It accurately highlights the societies differences and the targeted classes in a way that suits all times and places to make societies with all its economic and social development, this ruby is “*Al-Sadaqat are just for the poor and the needy, ...*” (Al-Tawba 9/60). The determination of each class mentioned in the verse, fixing priorities, deletion of application space that is believed to be wide between the verse and our contemporary societies that's by studying the linguistic differences that is believed to be similar in effect and is there only for repetition. This study aims to show the linguistic role in defining the meaning of the noble verse and determining the boundaries of each of the societal classes intended by it, and the line of charity priorities that guarantee the fair social and economic solidarity of the whole society, and applying that to our contemporary societies. The study followed the deductive method to determine the verse meaning and put the borders of each social class mentioned in it according to linguistic for granted facts.

**Keywords:** limitation, determination, aş-şadaqa " (Charity), inamā (just), sustainable development, linguistics, science

## INTRODUCTION

Arabic language is accurate in its words and rich in its structure with flexible expressions and huge effects. No wonder, it's becoming the language of the eternal miracle that invested all its ways and different characteristics to an extent that other Semitic and non-Semitic languages failed in expressing the Quranic meaning, the best example for this is the translations of different Quran meanings that hides the Quranic miracle determined “*And if you are in doubt about what We have sent down to Our servant, then produce a chapter like it, and call upon your witnesses besides God, if you are truthful.*” (Al-Baqara 2/23). The Quranic miracle is not specified for some human beings at a certain time but it is for all ages and all generations through an eternal language, to be preserved forever.

Arabic and Western societies are passing through an astonishing economic era that all researchers in all fields must review all that is related to building societies economically and socially focusing on the obligation of social and economic symbiosis between members of the society as one unit to achieve sustainable development. The researcher has chosen one of the rubies from the Quran where he found the necessity for what societies pass through from dilemmas and language clearly shared in fixing priorities.

It accurately highlights the societies differences and the targeted classes in a way that suits all times and places to make societies with all its economic and social development, this ruby is “*Al-Sadaqat are just for the poor and the needy, and those who collect them,*

*and those whose hearts are to be reconciled, and for the freeing of debtors, and for those in debt, and for the cause of God, and for the wayfarer, ordained by God, and God is Knowing, Wise.” (Al-Tawba 9/60).*

The determination of each class mentioned in the verse, fixing priorities, deletion of application space that is believed to be wide between the verse and our contemporary societies that's by studying the linguistic differences that is believed to be similar in effect and is there only for repetition.

## QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY

The objective of this study is to answer some questions in the researcher's mind:

- Why Quran used *إنما* 'inamā (eng. just) at the beginning of the verse?
- What is the difference between *aş-şadaqa* (eng. Charity) and *zakat* (eng.)?
- Why *aş-şadaqa* (eng. Charity) came plural and what is its effect?
- What is the difference between the poor and the needy?
- What is meant by "working on it"?
- What is meant by "those whose hearts have been reconciled to truth", are they still there in our contemporary societies?
- What is meant by "in bondage", "in debt", "in the cause of Allāh", "for the wayfarer"?
- Can there be another class deserving *aş-şadaqa* (eng. Charity) and not mentioned in the verse?
- Are any of the mentioned classes absent from our contemporary society?
- Why did the letter *ل* lām mention before the first 4 classes, while the preposition *في* fi (eng. in) before the last 4?
- What is the reason for repeating the prepositions *في* fi (eng. in) in the verse?

This study aims to show the linguistic role in defining the meaning of the noble verse and determining the boundaries of each of the societal classes intended by it, and the line of charity priorities that guarantee the fair social and economic solidarity of the whole society, and applying that to our contemporary societies.

## METHOD OF RESEARCH

The study followed the deductive method to determine the verse meaning and put the borders of each social class mentioned in it according to linguistic for granted facts.

The verse study required an introduction and six prerequisites followed by results of the study, the introduction included the problem of the study, its questions and objectives, its importance and model,

The prerequisites were entitled as follows:

- First:** limitation and specification in إنما 'inamā (eng. Just).
- Second:** the linguistic use of the word "aṣ-ṣadaqa" (Charity) in Quran
- Third:** the linguistic difference between the two words poor and needy
- Fourth:** different Quranic use of "workers on it"
- Fifth:** the linguistic Quranic use of "whose hearts reconciled to truth"
- Sixth:** Linguistic miracle in Quran in using "in bondage. In debt and in the cause of Allah"

### 1. Limitation and Specification in إنما 'inamā:

Limitation in language: imprisonment- as, the milk of the horse is for it, not for any other. In the expression, specifying something to something and putting borders to it. The first is called limited and the second limited in. The real limitation is specifying something by something according to reality. Limitation has a lot of linguistic forms but the study s concern is limitation by إنما inamā as "it shows possible effect on what follow it and negates any other thing, if you say إنما inamā Zayd came, means that no one else came".<sup>1</sup>

Al-Gergany (471 h) differentiated between it and other ways of limitation, he says, it is similar to saying, (Zayd came not Omar) but it has an advantage as it has a positive and negative effect at the same time which is not the case in (Zayd came not Omar) and another advantage which is showing Zayd clearly and that doesn't happen with "not".<sup>2</sup>

We can deduce the following results:

- 1) Using إنما 'inamā means limitation, affirming the action to something and negating it from others.
- 2) Affirming the action to something and negating it from others as a whole at the same time .
- 3) Making the order ما mā shown clearly

This linguistic background shares a lot in interpreting the Quranic verse - the study target and determining deservers of aṣ-ṣadaqa. The beginning of the verse with إنما 'inamā means limitation of aṣ-ṣadaqa and specifying it to those who are mentioned, are the aṣ-ṣadaqa deservers only of these classes, no more?

Most researchers and the researcher agree that إنما 'inamā in the verse means a whole limitation and limiting aṣ-ṣadaqa for the eight types that don't have a ninth, confirms this by a linguistic share as the following figure



The question remains actually: aren't al-ṣadaqat given to any other classes than the eight mentioned in the verse, in other words, can there be other deservers not mentioned in this list?

Ar-razi (604 h) answered by confirming the limitation from إنما 'inamā and that the deservers are eight only giving the prophet saying to a man as an illustration: "if you are one of the eight categories, you have a right to it, otherwise it is a headache and a stomach ailment."

To sum up, we can say that Ar-razi (604 h) confirmed that إنما 'inamā is for limitation by many ways, first, that إنما 'inamā is a mixture of إنما 'inamā and if any of them is violated, it wouldn't have been mixed originally. Second, his illustration by the prophet saying: "But usury is in the bad." 4. and it is an argumentative saying, some say, it is copied and others say, it is from Aḥaad, regardless of this case, how can إنما 'inamā be for limitation and there are other types of forbidden usury which made As-Shaf'i (204 h) say that the saying of the prophet was an answer to a question about usury in two different types, gold for silver and dates for wheat „But usury is in the bad". Here the language shares the meaning when it is cut from the whole text.

The researcher supports more that there is no complete usury except in النسيئة an-nasi'ā, but that was at the beginning, so the prophet meant by إنما 'inamā limitation then when things were broader, Allāh informed him by the other forbidden types, so he added other types. Third, illustration by poetry in Al-'ashry lines and fourth, his illustration of the prophet's response to the man asking for aṣ-ṣadaqa as evidence of limiting the deservers to the eight classes.

Here language plays an essential role by one word in making a religious rule of sharia: who deserves aṣ-ṣadaqa, their 8 categories, using إنما 'inamā.

## 2. The Quranic use of the word aṣ-ṣadaqa

Ibn Faris (395 h) mentioned that the word aṣ-ṣadaqa originally is strength in something, it is opposite to lying, and an honest thing is strong. Aṣ-ṣadaqa is what a man gives from his money and himself. (17) While Ibn Manzūr (711 h) determines aṣ-ṣadaqa in "what you give to poor and what you give for God's Sake to poor". (18) Here comes a Linguistic question, is there a linguistic difference between aṣ-ṣadaqa and zakāt?

Alzebeidy (1205 h) says in "Tagouh" "that aṣ-ṣadaqa is what you give for God's Sake to poor and in "Alsahah" what you give to the poor, in the vocabulary, aṣ-ṣadaqa is what comes out of one's money as zakāt but it is voluntary while zakāt is obligatory". (19)

So, there is a new linguistic share in differentiating between aṣ-ṣadaqa and zakāt as the following table:

zakāt	ṣadaqa	Comparison issues
obligatory	Voluntary not obligatory	Obligation
development an increase	God bless	Objective
doesn't include ṣadaqa	Includes zakāt as it is more general	Generalisation

Ṣadaqa is not obligatory but we do it for God's sake however, zakāt is for development, increase and refinement. So, we can say that each zakāt is ṣadaqa but not all ṣadaqa zakāt, ṣadaqa is a wider and more general concept.

The theory of the linguistic origin of ṣadaqa as Ibn Fares (395 h) showed as strength and stubbornness are completely different from the linguistic origin of zakāt which Ibn Fares showed as " growth and increase, it is said that zakāt is money refinement, zakāt a money and increases it. "الم يعلموا أن الله هو يقبل التوبة عن عباده ويأخذ الصدقات وأن الله هو التواب الرحيم. 'alam ya'lamu 'anna allāha huwa yaqbalu at-tawabata 'an 'ibadihi wayḥuḍu aṣ-ṣadakāt wa 'anna allāha tawābun rahīm (eng. The base of all of that is the two messages, development and refinement. <sup>5</sup> In ṣadaqa, there is strength and stubbornness, in zakāt, strength and stubbornness by increase and development.

Comparing the places where ṣadaqa and zakāt are mentioned in Quran shows a lot of clear linguistic sharing, the following table shows that. <sup>6</sup>

pronunciation	Mentioning times	Percentage
zakāt	30	69.76
ṣadaqa	13	30.23

After revising Quran, we notice the following:

- 1) The word zakāt didn't come except singular, while ṣadaqa came singular and plural.
- 2) Zakāt didn't come in the Quran except with give.
- 3) Zakāt is mentioned double ṣadaqa in Quran.

The researcher observes that these notes show how language shared in effect clearly. The singular mentioning of zakāt goes to its legit position, can a person give zakāt twice? While ṣadaqa has an endless number of repetitions that's why it came plural. In addition, zakāt came accompanied by "give" or what is related to it, as it is obligatory, no choice in it. In contrast, ṣadaqa is optional that's why the insistence came on zakāt in Quran twice ṣadaqa. The research finds that the plurality of ṣadaqa in this verse for variety, the faithful person must give various types of ṣadaqa without sticking to one type of the eight mentioned.

### 3. Difference between poor and needy

A great controversy happened between linguists about the different effects of poor and needy. Ibn Manzūr (711 h) collected all of this in " the poor is the one who affords living, Arabey said in praise of Abdel-malik Ibn Marwan: أما الفقير الذي كانت حلوبته 'amā al-faqīrul-lazī kānat ḥalūbatuhu... (But the poor who has an animal that milks)

He said, the needy doesn't have anything, Yūnis said that the poor is better than a needy, he said, I told an Arab, are you poor? He said, no but needy, the needy is worse than a poor, Ibn Al'arabi said: the poor doesn't have anything and the needy like him. Abo Amr Ibn Al'ala' said as Yūnis said the poor can find his food, the needy doesn't have anything.

"أما السفينة فكانت لمساكين يعملون في البحر فأردت أن أعيبها..."  
'amma as-safinatu fakanat li masakīna yamaluna fil-baḥri fa'aradtu 'an 'aībahā"<sup>7</sup> (eng. but as for the ship, it belonged to poor people working in the sea, so I wanted to make it defective." Ibn 'arafa said, the poor at the Arabs is in need God says "you are poor to God" you need him, while the needy is the one who is broken by poverty.<sup>8</sup>

So, there are three views for the difference between poor and needy:

**First:** the poor are as the needy, the researcher doesn't support that at all, because he doesn't support that it is synonymous except if it is for different accents. If they are synonymous, what is its reason in the verse that we are studying!

**Second:** the poor is better than the needy because:

1. أما الفقير الذي كانت حلوبته .. (But the poor who has an animal that milks).
2. What the Arab said when he was asked are you poor? No but needy, worse than the poor.

The researcher is with Ibn Manzūr (711 h) the line was in the past and the time of the ṣadaqa is present, is that enough to show the poor better than the needy? The Arabic words don't have evidence also, may be the opposite is meant, that the needy is better than the poor.

**Third:** the needy is better than a poor; as God says said "أما السفينة فكانت لمساكين يعملون في البحر فأردت أن أعيبها..."  
'amma as-safinatu fakanat li masakīna yamaluna fil-baḥri fa'aradtu 'an 'aībahā"<sup>9</sup> (eng. but as for the ship, it belonged to poor people working in the sea, so I wanted to make it defective." may be going to linguistic roots makes this view stronger, Ibn Fares (395 h) said that poverty expresses openness.

Comparing the two origins support the third meaning which the researcher supports, that the needy is better than the poor, the following table illustrates this:

	Linguistic origin	Effect
poor	Problem in the back bone	He owns, but the interest in the present is not realized,
needy	Disturbance in movement and accommodation	He owns, and the interest is achieved, but it is not enough for him, so the disturbance is achieved that is not related to what he has, it may be illness, insufficient money.

The researcher believes that beginning with poor then needy in the verse - the field of study- confirms what the researcher supports, the eight types are arranged ascendingly, the more in need is mentioned first then the second then the third. It may be said here that addition doesn't make that a must, if it was meant then ف fa' would be used not و waw for addition, the answer is that ف fa' must show completion, the one who gives ṣadaqa won't be accepted except if he gives all types according to order which the verse doesn't mean, that's why adding with و was more accurate and metaphorical ,the order from the lower to the higher is done and the choice is available, the giver can choose the

first and the third but the ف fa' doesn't do this which what Ar-razī asserts in the following points:

- 1) The eight types deserve ṣadaqa, the one mentioned first is in more need, as the beginning is always for the most important as we say Abu Bakr and Omar.
- 2) The poor are called like that for their deep need.
- 3) The prophet prayed to be needy, not poor in life and death<sup>10</sup> can he ask for the worse?
- 4) Being needy doesn't negate his ownership as Quran says "أما السفينة فكانت لمساكين يعملون في البحر فأردت أن أعيبها..."  
"amma as-safīnatu fakanat li masakīna yamaluna fil-baḥri fa'aradtu 'an 'aībahā"<sup>11</sup> (eng. but as for the ship, it belonged to poor people working in the sea, so I wanted to make it defective."<sup>12</sup> at the same time nothing in Quran shows that the poor owns.
- 5) The needy are levels and this is clear in "أو مسكيناً ذا متربة." 'aw miskīnan ḍa matrabah<sup>13</sup> (eng. or poor and dusty) but no levels for the poor.
- 6) The contrasting relationship between poverty and richness which can't be between the needy and the rich.
- 7) The prophet words to Mo'āz about zakāt take it from the rich and return it to the poor"<sup>14</sup> if the needy were poorer, he would have better mentioned them.

To sum up, it can be said that the poor are more in need than the needy. The poor don't own or lost what they own in contrast to the needy who own what's not enough for their needs, in addition, the needy ask a lot and stop only when people shout at them or give them. (37) But the poor don't ask from their deep need, our prophet clarified the difference that the researcher supports by saying, "the needy are not the asking for bite or two, the date or two dates but who doesn't find richness".

The extreme importance of the difference between poor and needy appears not only in ṣadaqat but also in wills which ar-razī (604 h) clarified in his saying the words of a man " I recommended 200 for the poor and 50 for the needy, it is a must for Aš- šaf'ī to pay 200 to who is in more need, for Abu ḥanifa to who is in less need." <sup>15</sup>

#### 4. The Quranic use of **العاملين عليها** al- 'amilīna 'alayhā (eng. workers on it)

We have two groups analyzing this expression, why the word is workers, not collecting it.

The first group believe that "the workers on it" are those who work in order to collect it

The second group believe that the term is general and includes all people, even those who get it, the condition of deserving it, is that the ruler can't dismiss them. (41)

The researcher supports more the second group. When we look at the Quranic word, we find **عمل** without any sign for specification then **ل** is added which means the doer of the action. This means that working on it includes all who are related to it, near or far, poor or rich as the working and distributing, the writer, the accountant, ..... all could go under

the general Quranic word. This proved true because ṣadaqa is given to those whose hearts reconciled to truth, one of them can be rich as we will see later, and so, it is better to give all who worked on it, near or far.

The verb followed by "on" shows the objective of work, if the work is for increasing ṣadaqa that's because he will take from it. In contrast to working in it that will mean taking from it regardless of its increase or decrease. So, "on" here means َ (eng. to), how then can the meaning be different from what the researcher referred to?

### **5. The Quranic Linguistic use of “whose hearts reconciled to truth”:**

Alṭabary (310 h) said that “whose hearts reconciled to truth” are “people who knew about Islam from people who should not be followed”<sup>16</sup>. He also referred to the prophet Muḥamad when he gave “whose hearts reconciled to truth, and they were noble people. He gave Aba-Sufiān ibn-ḥarb a camel and gave his son Mo‘awiyā hundred camel also ...”<sup>17</sup> this type is there everywhere and at any time<sup>18</sup>. It didn't end by the victory of Islam, they are categorised since the prophet time as Muslim and not-muslim.<sup>19</sup> If the second ended, the researcher believes that the first is there and a lot. Hearts get weak with problems and dilemmas; it may also change in all times.

### **6. The linguistic miracle in the Quranic use of “in bondage, in debt, in God's cause and wayfarer”:**

When we study these four categories in verse, we notice that God used َ lām in the first 4 categories (poor, needy, whose hearts reconciled to truth, working on it), this is a linguistic investment but before clarifying that we need to explain (in bondage) it means setting free those who are slaves. The researcher finds an effect in not using setting free, any person responsible from another one, is in bondage and deserve ṣadaqa that is like the orphan who is responsible from a poor or needy and the immature who is responsible from his poor parent's, God said in bondage not setting free to be broad and general for any place and time, in debt, is owing money without committing sin owing money without mistakes<sup>20</sup>. They are the debtors without corruption in no sin.<sup>21</sup> Otis said the one who loses his home by flood or fire and owes money to support his children.<sup>22</sup> The researcher supports taking the term in general, any debt without a sin is included in the verse. while saying in God's cause means fighting for God<sup>23</sup> this goes under narrowing of meaning, the effect changes from the general to the specific<sup>24</sup>, the word is narrower than before<sup>25</sup> which means all what carry following God then specified fighting for God- according to analysts- but the researcher finds that in our contemporary time the term for God's cause is more general, by broadening the circle to all what is obeying God in any field as<sup>26</sup> confining dead, building mosques, youth marriage. Some analysts support that any work for God's obedience is in cause of God<sup>27</sup> while the wayfarer is the traveler who needs, in no sin.<sup>28</sup>

This is meant by (in bondage, in debt, in God's cause and wayfarer) the question remains, why did (in) come in the second 4 while ل in the first four (poor, needy, working on it, whose hearts reconciled to truth) as the following figure

Whose hearts reconciled by truth	Working on it	Needy	Poor	ل -	إنما ṣadaqat
Wayfarer	In cause of God	On debt	On bondage	In	

Ibn Hishām (761 h) says: "'in" is a preposition with 10 meanings: for place and time, accompanying, analysis, higher, synonymous to ب bā', إلى ilā (eng. to) and من min (eng. from), measuring broadening, insistence a.o.<sup>29</sup> while ل had 22 meanings, the right, specification, property, ownership, analysis, agree with to, on ,in, at, after, with, from, informing, swearing, exclamation , greetings, insistence, clarification.<sup>30</sup>

From Ibn Hishām (761 h) words, we get two results as follows:

- 1) The preposition "in" doesn't come with the meaning of ل lām (eng. for).
- 2) The ل lām can come with the same meaning of "in", Ibn Hishām (761 h) gave an example in God's saying "ونضع الموازين القسط ليوم القيامة" wa naḍa' al-mawazīna al-qīṣṭ liyawmi el-qiyama (we will set the scales of justice for the day of Resurrection).<sup>31</sup> But the researcher doesn't support this in the verse - field of study- as there is no need here for repeating words.

The researcher believes that God used ل lām (eng. for) for poor, needy, working on it and whose hearts reconciled to truth while في fī (eng. in) for bondage, debt, cause of God and wayfarer for the following reasons:

- 1) The first group (poor, needy, working on it, whose hearts are reconciled to truth) owns, they are given ṣadaqa as their own belonging. So, preceded by ل lām (eng. for) that refers to possession.
- 2) The second group (bondage, debt, the cause of Allah, wayfarers) don't own and the giver must supervise the ṣadaqa, those who are in bondage don't own, those who are in debt may take the money for something else and don't pay the debt , while those in cause of Allah or wayfarers may be in sin that's why في fī (eng. in) was suitable- from the point of view of the researcher- the ṣadaqa is for the freeing of the slave not the slave and for paying the debt not the person in debt. Also, in the cause of Allah, for weapons of fighting not the fighters, for the coffin not the dead, for facilitating traveling not the traveler, this is what language shared in to clarify what God meant.
- 3) In the first group, they own the ṣadaqa and don't have a relationship with the giver and how they spend it. While in the second group, the ṣadaqa should be given to free a slave, pay a debt, in the cause of Allah, in travelling and helping the guest continue his journey.
- 4) في fī (eng. in) in the second group made deservation obligatory, they are more in need than the first group, they don't own anything at all in contrast to the first group

that's better than the second group, if it is like that, then why did God start with the first group not the second as long as it is worse? We can clarify that as follows:

- a) Şadaqa, for the first group is general, while for the second group is for a certain goal, freeing a slave, paying debt, a work done for Allah or helping a traveller. No doubt, the general is economically more important than a certain goal. The help is for life, not certain situations, the first group has the priority.
  - b) "and" doesn't obligate sequence but beginning with the second group may be unfair for the first group, the cost of the second group is higher than the first, the giver may set a slave free then doesn't find money to give the poor and needy.
- 5) The researcher sees that using  $\text{في}$   $\text{fi}$  (eng. in) with the second group shares in collective investment as more than one person can share in setting free a slave and paying a debt or other works for obeying God as helping a traveller, they all give şadaqa for a goal, in the first group, there is no place for collective work, all give regardless of a certain goal except possession.
  - 6) If  $\text{في}$   $\text{fi}$  (eng. in) was used in Quran for the first group, it would have been obligatory on the giver to make sure that the poor changed to rich which is very difficult and illogical in the economic society, to ask a person or a group about changing the state from poverty to richness. While in the second group, the giver of şadaqa is responsible for freeing a slave or paying a debt or working in God's obedience or helping a traveller.
  - 7) The use of  $\text{ل}$   $\text{lām}$  (eng. for) was a must in the first group for possession with no interference from the giver or any responsibility, while "in" obliged the giver of şadaqa to give what he can afford to change a state and share in that.
  - 8) The repetition of  $\text{في}$   $\text{fi}$  twice and  $\text{ل}$   $\text{lām}$  once stresses more need of the second group at that time than the first which encourages the giver on doing his best, in fact asking others to share him to achieve the goal, in contrast to the first group which Elzarkašy (794h) stressed "He changed  $\text{ل}$  to " in" in the last 4 to permit their severe need for şadaqa and " in" means inside and stable in its place, the human can't be owned"(59)
  - 9) The  $\text{ل}$  obliged the giver of şadaqa on a relation with the deserver and it requires repetition while\* in " with the second group doesn't require repetition, for the situation may not be repeated and there is no more relation with the giver, freeing a person happens once, the same is the debt, it may not be repeated and the same is the case with the traveller.

## RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The study reached some results, on top are the following:

1. إنما 'inamā is for limitation of the deservers of ṣadaqa in the eight types with no ninth.
2. No deserver is not mentioned in the classes in the verse.
3. ṣadaqa is not obligatory as zakāt that's obligatory, it is for God's obeying.
4. Each zakāt is a ṣadaqa but not the opposite, ṣadaqa is a wider and more general concept.
5. zakāt always comes singular in Quran because it is given once while ṣadaqa came plural as evidence of repetition and variety.
6. zakāt in Quran is connected to the term أتى 'atā (eng. came) or its derivatives stresses that it is obligatory and there is no choice in it.
7. The coming of ṣadaqa plural in the verse encourages the faithful on varying Sadakah and exerting effort in searching for it.
8. There is a great controversy between linguists and Quran interpreters in identifying the class difference between the poor and the needy. The researcher supports the opinion that the needy are better than the poor.
9. The deservers are mentioned in sequence according to their importance and need, the more in need is mentioned first.
10. The needy have levels while the poor don't
11. An argument happened about what is meant by "working on it" in the verse, the researcher believes that the term refers to anyone working for ṣadaqa as those who collect zakāt then give it to its deservers. The condition of their deservation is that the ruler can't substitute or dismiss them.
12. Adding "علي" on "work" means that the work on increasing ṣadaqa is because he will take from it, in contrast to في fi that gives the meaning of deservation obligation regardless of decrease or increase, here, "علي" means ل.
13. The presence of "whose hearts are reconciled to truth" anywhere and anytime, it didn't end. Weaknesses of hearts are there in every crisis or dilemma, this general term makes it contemporary.
14. His majesty saying "on bondage" is general and includes everyone connected to another (slave) responsible for him, if he said "freeing", it would have been specific for a class that is not there now in our time.
15. "In the cause of Allah" is called by linguists narrowing of meaning but the verse didn't support that as any work for obedience of Allah is "in the cause of Allah".

16. The coming of  $\text{ل}$  for the first 4 and " in " for the second 4 for the following effect:
- The first group (poor, needy, working on it, whose hearts are reconciled by truth) own, they are given to own that's why  $\text{ل}$  was suitable.
  - The second group (on bondage, in debt, in the cause of Allah, farawayers) don't own, the giver should supervise the  $\text{ṣadaqa}$ , those who are on bodega don't own, those who are in debt may take the  $\text{ṣadaqa}$  and don't pay the debt to pay something else, in the cause of Allah and farawayers may be in sin that's why " in " was suitable for this group, the giver - from the point of the researcher- should free the slave not give him the money, pay the debt not give the indebted, in the cause of Allah should bring weapons, the coffin for the dead, facilitating traveling. Language shared a lot in clarifying God's intention.
  - In the first group,  $\text{ṣadaqa}$  is owned by the giver and he doesn't have a relation with how it is spent while the second group the giver has to direct the  $\text{ṣadaqa}$  to freeing a slave or paying a debt or in the cause of Allah or helping a traveller to continue his journey.
  - In the second group "in" made deservation a must, they're in more need than the first group, they totally don't own unlike the first group that's better than the second group.
17. Mentioning the First group first, before the second group is for the following:
- $\text{Ṣadaqa}$  in the first group is general while in the second is for certain situation as freeing a slave or paying a debt or in the cause of Allah or helping a traveller. No doubt, the general is more important economically than the specified, the  $\text{ḡelis}$  lifelong not for a temporary reason, so the first had the priority.
  - "And" doesn't give sequence but putting the second group first may be unfair to the first group. The cost of the second group is higher than the first, if the giver frees a slave, he won't have enough money to give the poor or the needy.
18. Using  $\text{في}$   $\text{fi}$  in the second group shares in collective investment, freeing a slave may be shared by more than one person, the same is paying a debt or working for God's obedience or helping a traveller, a specific goal. In the first group, there is no place for collective work, all give for possession only not for any other reason.
- 19- Not using  $\text{في}$   $\text{fi}$  with the first group doesn't require ensuring the change of state from poverty to richness which is very difficult and illogical in societies economically, to ask a person or a group about the change from poverty to richness. While in the second group, the giver is responsible for freeing a slave or paying a debt or working in the cause of Allah or helping a traveller.
- 20- Using  $\text{ل}$   $\text{lām}$  with the first group obligated possession with no interference from the giver or any other responsibility while " in " obligated putting what the giver can pay as  $\text{ṣadaqa}$  to solve a situation and share for that.

- 21- The repetition of في fi twice and ل once stresses the deep need of the second group, more than the first group which encourages the giver to exert hard effort in şadaqa. In fact, he asks others to share in achieving the goal, unlike the first group.
- 22- Using ل in the first group obligated a relation of possession between the giver and the deserver, it requires repetition. While with "in" with the second group, repetition is not required and there is no future relation with the deserver. It is an investment to solve a situation, freeing a slave once, paying a debt also may not be repeated the same as helping a traveller and obedience works.

## References

- Aḥkām Al-Qurān, Al-ğaşāş, ed. by Muḥamid Alşawāl, Dar İḥyā' Alturaḥ Al'arabī, Beirut, 1405 h.  
أحكام القرآن، للجصاص، تحقيق: محمد الصاوي قمحاوي، دار إحياء التراث العربي، بيروت، سنة 1405 هـ.
- Aḥkām Al-Qurān, Ibn Al'arabī, ed. by Muḥamid 'abdelkadir. Aḡa, Daril-fikr, Libonan, No date  
أحكام القرآن، لابن العربي، تحقيق: محمد عبد القادر عطا، دار الفكر، لبنان، بلا تاريخ.
- iḥtilāfil-hadiṯ, Al-shaf'ī, ed. by 'amir Aḡmid ḡidar, Mo'asit Alkutub Altakafiyā, Beirut, First, 1405 h, 1985.  
اختلاف الحديث، للشافعي، تحقيق: عامر أحمد حيدر، مؤسسة الكتب الثقافية، بيروت، الأولى، سنة 1405 هـ=1985 م.
- Adāb Alkāteb, Ibn Kotaybā, ed Mohamid Mohyiel-din Abdel-hamid, Maktabit Elsa'ada, Egypt, Fourth, 1963.  
أدب الكاتب، لابن قتيبة، تحقيق: محمد محيي الدين عبد الحميد، مكتبة السعادة، مصر، الرابعة، سنة 1963 م.
- Eslāh Almantek, Ibn Sakit, ed Ahmed Mohamed Shāker and Abd Elsalām Haroun, Dar Alma'rafa, Cairo, Fourth, No date  
إصلاح المنطق، لابن السكيت، تحقيق: أحمد محمد شاكر وعبد السلام هارون، دار المعارف، القاهرة، الرابعة، بلا تاريخ.
- Al-Um, Aş-şaf'ī, Darel-Ima'rifa, Beirut, Second, 1393 h.  
الأم، للشافعي، دار المعرفة، بيروت، الثانية، سنة 1393 هـ.
- Barel-'ulum, As-samarqadī, ed. by Dr. maḡmud matragī, Darel-fikr, Beirut, No date.  
بحر العلوم، للسمرقندي، تحقيق: الدكتور محمود مطرجي، دار الفكر، بيروت، بلا تاريخ.
- Al-baḡrel-muḡīṯ, Ibn ḡayān, ed. by šīḡ 'adil aḡmid 'abdel-mawḡūd and šīḡ 'ali Muḡamid Moawad, Darel-kutub Al-'ilmiyā, Libonan, Beirut, First, 1422 h, 2001  
البحر المحيط، لأبي حيان، تحقيق: الشيخ عادل أحمد عبد الموجود والشيخ علي محمد معوض، دار الكتب العلمية، لبنان- بيروت، الأولى، سنة 1422 هـ=2001 م
- Tarīḡ Aṯ-ṡabarī, Darel-kutub Al-'ilmiyā, Beirut, No date  
تاريخ الطبري، دار الكتب العلمية، بيروت، بلا تاريخ.
- Tafsīr Aṯ-ṡawrī, Darel-kutub Al-'ilmiyā, Beirut, First, 1403 h.  
تفسير الثوري، دار الكتب العلمية، بيروت، الأولى، سنة 1403 هـ.
- Tafsīr Al-Quarān, Ibn Abi Hātim, ed. by Aḡmad Muḡamad Aṯ-ṡayib, Al-maktaba Al-masriyā, şaida, No date.  
تفسير القرآن، لابن أبي حاتم، تحقيق: أسعد محمد الطيب، المكتبة العصرية، صيدا، بلا تاريخ.

- Altafsīr Al-kabīr, Ar-razī, Darel-kutub Al-‘ilmiyā, Beirut, First, 1421 h, 2000.  
التفسير الكبير، للرازي، دار الكتب العلمية، بيروت، الأولى، سنة 1421هـ=2000م.
- Tafsīr Muqātil Ibn Sulaymān, ed. by Aḥmad Farīd, Darel-kutub Al-‘ilmiyā, Beirut, Libonan, First, 1424 h 2003.  
تفسير مقاتل بن سليمان، تحقيق: أحمد فريد، دار الكتب العلمية، بيروت- لبنان، الأولى، سنة 1424هـ=2003م.
- Tahḍīb Al-loġa, Azharī, ed. by Muḥamad ‘awaḍ Mur‘ab, Dar Iḥyā’ At-turaṭ al-‘arabī, Beirut, First, 2001.  
تهذيب اللغة، للأزهري، تحقيق: محمد عوض مرعب، دار إحياء التراث العربي، بيروت، الأولى، سنة 2001م.
- Gami’ Al-bayān ‘an Ta’wīl ‘ay al-Quarān, Aṭ-ṭabarī, Darel-fikr, Beirut, 1405 h.  
جامع البيان عن تأويل آي القرآن، للطبري، دار الفكر، بيروت، سنة 1405هـ.
- Al-gami’ Aṣ-ṣaḡīr wa ṣarḥuhu An-nafī’ Al-kabīr, Aṣ-ṣaibānī, ‘alam al-kutub, Beirut, First, 1406 h.  
الجامع الصغير وشرحه النافع الكبير، للشيباني، عالم الكتب، بيروت، الأولى، سنة 1406هـ.
- Al-gami’ li aḥkām Al-Quarān, Al-Qurtubī, Dar el-ša‘b, Cairo, No date.  
الجامع لأحكام القرآن، للقرطبي، دار الشعب، القاهرة، بلا تاريخ.
- ḥizānet Al-adab wa lub lubab lisān el-‘arab, Al-buġdādī, ed. by Muḥamid Nabīl ṭarīfī and Imīl Badī’, Darel-kutub Al-‘ilmiyā, Beirut, First, 1998.  
خزانة الأدب ولب لباب لسان العرب، للبغدادي، تحقيق: محمد نبيل طريفي وإيميل بديع، دار الكتب العلمية، بيروت، الأولى، سنة 1998م.
- Rūḥ Al-ma‘ānī fi tafsīr Al-Qurān Al-‘az īm was-sab‘ el-maṭānī, Al-Alūsī, Dar ‘iḥyā’ At-turaṭ el-‘arabī, Beirut, No date.  
روح المعاني في تفسير القرآن العظيم والسبع المثاني، للألوسي، دار إحياء التراث العربي، بيروت، بلا تاريخ.
- Zād el-masīr fi ‘ilm at-tafsīr, Ibn el-ġawzī, Al-maktab Al-islāmī, Beirut, Third, 1404 h.  
زاد المسير في علم التفسير، لابن الجوزي، المكتب الإسلامي، بيروت، الثالثة، سنة 1404هـ.
- Sunan At-termizī, ed. by Aḥmad Muḥamid šakir, Dar ‘iḥyā’ At-turaṭ el-‘arabī, Beirut, No date.  
سنن الترمذي، تحقيق: أحمد محمد شاكر، دار إحياء التراث العربي، بيروت، بلا تاريخ.
- Sunan Ibn-magah, ed. by Muḥamid Fu‘ād Abd-elbakī, Dar el-fikr, Bierut, No date.  
سنن ابن ماجه، تحقيق: محمد فؤاد عبد الباقي، دار الفكر، بيروت، بلا تاريخ.
- ṣarḥ ṣaḥīḥ el-buḥarī, Ibn-baṭ-ṭāl, ed. by Abī Tamīm Yasir Ibn Ibrāhīm, Maktabit Ar-roshd, Saudia, Second, 1423 h, 2003.  
شرح صحيح البخاري، لابن بطال، تحقيق: أبي تميم ياسر بن إبراهيم، مكتبة الرشد، السعودية، الثانية، سنة 1423هـ=2003م.
- ṣarḥ m‘anī el-‘aṭār, Abī Ga‘far Aṭ-ṭaḥāwī, ed. by Muḥamid Zahri Al-nagār, Darel-kutub Al-‘ilmiyā, Bierut, First, 1399 h.  
شرح معاني الآثار، لأبي جعفر الطحاوي، تحقيق: محمد زهري النجار، دار الكتب العلمية، بيروت، الأولى، سنة 1399هـ.
- Al‘uoqdu el-farīd, Ibn-‘abd-rabbū, Dar ‘iḥyā’ At-turaṭ el-‘arabī, Beirut, Libonan, Third, 1420 h, 1999.  
العقد الفريد، لابن عبد ربه، دار إحياء التراث العربي، بيروت- لبنان، الثالثة، سنة 1420هـ=1999م.
- ‘ilm ad-delalah, Dr. Aḥmad Muḥtār ‘umar, ‘alam el-kutub, Cairo, Sixth, 1427 h, 2006.  
علم الدلالة للدكتور أحمد مختار عمر، عالم الكتب، القاهرة، السادسة، سنة 1427هـ=2006م.

- Fath elbarī šarḥ šaḥīḥ el-buḥārī, Ibn-ḥagar Al-ʿasqalanī, ed. by Muḥib ed-dīn al-ḥatīb, ed. by Dār el-maʿrifah, Bierut, No date.  
فتح الباري شرح صحيح البخاري، لابن حجر العسقلاني، تحقيق: محب الدين الخطيب، دار المعرفة، بيروت، بلا تاريخ.
- Kitāb Dalāʾil Al-i-ʿgāz, Abdel-qāhir Al-girgani, commented from: Maḥmūd Muḥamid šākir, 1984.  
كتاب دلائل الإعجاز، لعبد القاهر الجرجاني، علق عليه: محمود محمد شاكر، سنة 1984م.
- Al-kaššāf ʿan ḥaqāʾiq At-tanzīl wa ʿuyūn el-ʿakawīl fī wuḡūh at-taʿwīl, Az-zamaḥšarī, ed. by ʿabdel-rāziq Al-mahdī, Dar ʾiḥyāʾ At-turaṭ el-ʿarabī, Bierut, No date.  
الكشاف عن حقائق التنزيل وعيون الأفاويل في وجوه التأويل، للزمخشري، تحقيق: عبد الرزاق المهدي، دار إحياء التراث العربي، بيروت، بلا تاريخ.
- Al-kalimah dirasa luḡawiyah muʿgameiyah, Dr. ḥelmī ḥalīl, Dar el-maʿrifah Al-gamiʿiyah, Alexandria, Second, 1992.  
الكلمة دراسة لغوية معجمية، للدكتور حلمي خليل، دار المعرفة الجامعية، الإسكندرية، الثانية، سنة 1992م.
- Lubāb at-taʿwīl fī maʿanī at-tanzīl, Alkhazen, Dar el-fikr, Bierut, Libonan, 1399 h, 1979.  
لباب التأويل في معاني التنزيل، للخازن، دار الفكر، بيروت، لبنان، سنة 1399هـ=1979م.
- Al-lubāb fī ʿulūm Al-kitāb, Ibn-ḥafṣ ʿumar Ibn-al Ibn ʿadil Aldemeškī Alhanbalī, ed. by ših ʿadil Ahmad ʿabdelmawḡūd wa ših ʿalī muḥamad muʿawaḡ, Darel-kutub Al-ʿilmīyā, Bierut, Libonan, First, 1419 h, 1998.  
اللباب في علوم الكتاب، لأبي حفص عمر بن علي بن عادل الدمشقي الحنبلي، تحقيق: الشيخ عادل أحمد عبد الموجود والشيخ علي محمد معوض، دار الكتب العلمية، بيروت-لبنان، الأولى، سنة 1419هـ=1998م.
- Lisān al-ʿarab, Ibn-manzūr, Dar ṣādir, Bierut, First, 1300 h.  
لسان العرب، لابن منظور، دار صادر، بيروت، الأولى، سنة 1300هـ.
- Al-muḥarir Al-waḡīz fī Tafsīr Al-kitāb el-ʿazīz, Ibn ʿatiyah, ed. by Abdes-salām Abdel-šafī Muḥamad, Darel-kutub Al-ʿilmīyā, Bierut, Libonan, First, 1413 h, 1993.  
المحرر الوجيز في تفسير الكتاب العزيز، لابن عطية، تحقيق: عبد السلام عبد الشافي محمد، دار الكتب العلمية، لبنان، الأولى، سنة 1413هـ=1993م.
- Musnad ʿabd Ibn-ḥamīd, ed. by Sobḥ el-badrī As-samarrāī wa Maḥmud Muḥamad ḥalīl Aṣ-ṣaʿīdī, Maktabit As-sunah, Cairo, First, 1408 h, 1988.  
مسند عبد بن حميد، تحقيق: صبحي البدري السامرائي ومحمود محمد خليل الصعيدي، مكتبة السنة، القاهرة، الأولى، سنة 1408هـ=1988م.
- Moʿgam Maqayīs Al-loḡa, Ibn Fāris, ed. by Abd-elsalām Harūn, Dar el-fikr, 1399 h, 1979.  
معجم مقاييس اللغة، لابن فارس، تحقيق: عبد السلام هارون، دار الفكر، سنة 1399هـ=1979م.
- Muḡni Al-labīb ʿan kutub Al-ʿaʿariyīn, Ibn hisham Al-ʿanšārī, ed. by Dr. Abd el-latīf Muḥamid Al-khatīb, Al-maḡlis Al-watanī lel-thaqaf wal-finūn wal-adab, Kuwait, No date.  
مغني اللبيب عن كتب الأعرابيين لابن هشام الأنصاري، تحقيق: الدكتور عبد اللطيف محمد الخطيب، المجلس الوطني للثقافة والفنون والآداب، الكويت، بلا تاريخ.
- Al-mufradāt fī ḡarīb el-Qurān, Al-ʿaṣfahānī, ed. by Mohamed Sayed Kilānī, Dar el-maʿrifā, Libonan, No date.  
المفردات في غريب القرآن، للأصفهاني، تحقيق: محمد سيد كيلاني، دار المعرفة، لبنان، بلا تاريخ.