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Towards a Reconstruction of the Mu‘tazili Tradition of Qur’anic Exegesis: Reading the Introduction to the Tahdhīb of al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī (d. 494/1101) and Its Application

SULEIMAN A. MOURAD

The Tahdhīb fi tafsīr al-Qur‘ān (The Refinement in the Interpretation of the Qur‘ān), by the Mu‘tazili scholar and theologian al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī (d. 494/1101), represents, to date, our best source for understanding the Mu‘tazili tradition of Qur‘ānic exegesis. Yet, this massive work that comprises nine volumes is only available in manuscript form, and is therefore inaccessible to most scholars of Qur‘ānic Studies. The only published Mu‘tazili tafsīr is Tafsīr al-kashshāf by Jār Allāh Ma‘ṣūm b. ‘Umar al-Zamakhshāri (d. 538/1144), who does not furnish in his introduction the hermeneutical approach and methodology he adopts for interpreting the Qur‘ān, although in the main body of the Kashshāf the reader can identify some elements that belong to a hermeneutical approach and methodology. In contrast, Jishumī lays

out a clear hermeneutical system for the exegesis of the Qur'an in the introduction of the *Tahdhib* and, more importantly for this study, he methodically and meticulously follows it in the actual *tafsir*. This essay examines Jishumi’s introduction in order to determine his methodology and approach to scriptural hermeneutics as reflecting an advanced stage in the development of the Mu'tazili tradition of Qur'anic exegesis. It also looks into how Jishumi applies his methodology, approach and hermeneutical system in the main text of the *Tahdhib*, taking as a case study verses Q. 68:33-43.

I will first provide a translation of the introduction to the *Tahdhib*, then move on to analyse the hermeneutical approach laid out therein by Jishumi, followed by the examination of his section on Q. 68:33-43. Finally, critical editions of the Arabic texts are given in two appendices to the paper (see pages 125-37).

A. English Translation of the Introduction to the *Tahdhib*

In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate. Him we seek for help. May His blessings and peace be upon our lord Muhammad and his lineage.

Thanks to God who guided us to Islam and invited us to the abode of everlasting peace, granted us our Prophet Muhammad, peace on him, bestowed on us all types of benefactions, revealed the Qur'an and protected it from forgery, addition and omission, and by it abrogated all other religions. Furthermore, praise to the lord of messengers, seal of the prophets, and leader of the pious: Muhammad, and his entire lineage.

The most befitting occupation for the individual is to seek the religious sciences, through which he attains his escape and salvation, then to worship his Lord who is his ultimate recourse in life and death. The most noble of the religious sciences is the knowledge of the Book of God Almighty and the grasp of its meanings and decrees, for it is the axis of the religion, and it is the firm bond of God. The scholars have endeavoured, clarified and written on this, and the former ones are privileged for being the originators and laying down the foundations, whereas the later ones are privileged for their fine organisation, eloquent refinement, and enhanced value. If one were to say: 'The former [scholars] did not leave anything for the later [ones]', he is to be answered: '[Indeed,] the former [scholars] left [a lot] to the later [scholars].'

I have included in this book of mine focused and extensive discussions pertaining to the sciences of the Qur'an, without undue and boring excess, or disappointing concision. I hope it to be an enlightenment for the novice and a stimulant for the expert. I ask guidance from God and on Him I rely, for He is my reckoning and the best of helpers.

The Sciences of the Qur'an.

The sciences of the Qur'an are numerous, and their axes are eight:

1. The first is the Reading (*al-qira'a*) and its variations and ratios.
2. The second is Lexicology (*al-lugha*). All of the Qur'an is in Arabic, for God said so: *In eloquent Arabic speech.*
3. The third is Grammatical Syntax (*al-icrtib*). It (the Qur'an) does not include any case of grammatical error or mistakes, unlike what the heretics say.
4. The fourth is Compositional Structure (*al-na'zm*). The Qur'an and the way it is composed of suras and verses linked together was revealed as such, for there is a purpose and benefit for that.
5. The fifth is Meaning (*al-ma'na*). There is nothing in the Qur'an that cannot be understood, for the purpose of speech is to convey a
meaning. Each word can either have one meaning, so that the only way to interpret it would be by following that meaning, or have [multiple] meanings, all of which are plausible, in which case they can be followed in totality or selectively. But if there is compelling evidence that only certain meanings are intended but not others, then those meanings deduced by evidence are to be followed. Moreover, if [a word] has a lexical meaning and a legal meaning, then the legal meaning is heeded because it is overriding. Furthermore, there is the literal and the metaphorical. The literal has priority unless there is compelling evidence that it is more appropriate to follow the metaphor, in which case [the metaphor] is to be followed.

The sixth is [Occasion of] Revelation ([sabab] al-nuzūl). Some of the Qur'an was revealed on an occasion, which might indicate that it is limited to that occasion. But in some cases it might apply to other occasions. The imperative is to follow the wording, not the occasion.

The seventh is Evidences and Decrees (al-adilla wa'l-aḥkām). The Qur'an is the true speech and the proof. Parts of it are affirmative, as in the evidence of God's Oneness, and others are clear, as in the evidence of laws. Parts are to be understood according to the apparent [meaning], such as the evident and clear [verses]. Other parts, such as the obscure and ambiguous [verses], require, in order to understand them, a search elsewhere. Also there are abrogating [parts] that must be followed, and abrogated parts, which must not, hence the need to know the chronology of revelation and which [parts] were revealed in Mecca and which were revealed in Medina. There are also the general verses and the specific [verses] which cover parables, wisdom-sayings, admonitions, restrictions, commands, prohibitions, promises [of reward] and threats [of punishment].

The eighth is Messages and Narratives (al-akhirāt wa'l-qisas).

B. Analysis

Tafsir as Salvation

At the beginning of the introduction, Jishumi presents the study of the Qur'an as the most noble of the religious sciences. Not only does salvation depend on understanding the Qur'an, but the divine text itself is the firm bond (habl) that connects humanity to God. It must therefore be thoroughly understood in order that the principles and laws it advocates can be observed and followed. It is clear that Jishumi considers the composition of a tafsir work a personal duty, meant in the first place to fulfill his own search for understanding the divine text and, by extension, to help others find the true meanings of the text.

In Jishumi's view, Qur'anic exegesis assumes dynamism in the understanding of the text; hence his distinction between former and later exegetes. More importantly, the understanding of the Qur'an is an ongoing and never-achieved enterprise. The earlier scholars started the process and offered their opinions (in Jishumi's words, 'being the originators and laying down the foundations'), and the later ones must complement and complete that by perfecting the study of the Qur'an ('fine organisation, eloquent refinement, and enhanced value'). Jishumi's Tahdhib is therefore an effort that underlines the necessary dynamism of tafsir scholarship. Jishumi is essentially making the case for why he is writing a tafsir, and is therefore in full agreement with the conventional rationale given in medieval scholarship for authoring a book.

The Eight Categories of Qur'anic Hermeneutics

Jishumi also identifies in the introduction a hermeneutical system that, in his opinion, forms the indispensable basis for understanding the Qur'an. This hermeneutical system involves eight categories:

1. Reading (al-qirā'a);
2. Lexicology (al-lughā);
3. Grammatical Syntax (al-i'rāb);
4. Compositional Structure (al-nāzīm);
5. Meaning (al-ma'na);
6. [Occasion of] Revelation ([sabab] al-nuzūl);
7. Evidences and Decrees (al-adilla wa'l-aḥkām);
According to Jishumi, *tafsir* entails a complete and comprehensive study of the Qur'an as it relates to a hermeneutical system comprised of eight categories. This hermeneutical system, which Jishumi identifies in the introduction to the *Tahdhib* and methodically follows in the main body of his exegesis, is not unique to him. Several exegetes before him had identified in their introductions a hermeneutical approach to, and methodology for, the study of the Qur'an. Although they did not call it a hermeneutical system as such, their emphasis that understanding the Qur'an involves the mastery of *'ulûm al-Qurân* (sciences of the Qur'an) suggests an awareness that the meaning(s) of the Qur'anic verses can be properly unlocked only by the application of a set of tools; hence a hermeneutical system of sort. A case in point is the Sunni exegete Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Tha'labī (d. 427/1035) who, as Walid Saleh has shown, divides his theoretical hermeneutical approach into fourteen aspects, some of which overlap with what Jishumi presents. But invariably Tha'labī's is a more theoretical hermeneutical approach and methodology; for in his actual *tafsir*, Tha'labī does not fully follow the theoretical hermeneutical approach he articulated in the introduction. Another example involves the fragmentary *tafsir* work by the Karrāmī scholar Ḥāmid ibn Bīšāmī (fl. 425/1034), which was studied by Josef van Ess, and in which a theoretical hermeneutical system of seven categories is adopted.

A third example is the Twelver-Shi'i exegete and theologian Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067), whose hermeneutical system consists of five categories: *al-qirā'a* (reading), *al-lughā* (lexicology), *al-i'rab* (grammatical syntax), *al-ma'nā* (meaning), and *[sabab]* al-nuzūl (*occasion of* revelation). But Ṭūsī does not fully define this system in the introduction. He follows it to some extent when interpreting the Qur'anic verses. Given the fact that Ṭūsī openly acknowledges his indebtedness to Mu'tazili exegetes before him, it might be that such a hermeneutical system was devised earlier by a Mu'tazili author. Indeed, we have an example of a Mu'tazili exegete who adopts a similar system. 'Alī b. Isā al-Rummānī (d. 384/994) identifies a theoretical hermeneutical system made out of five categories: *al-fahm* (meaning), *al-i'rab* (grammatical syntax), *wujūh* al-qirā'āt (proper readings), *al-dalālāt* (evidences), and *al-aḥkām* (decrees). Given that Rummānī precedes all of the exegetes named above, this makes the possibility that a Mu'tazili introduced this hermeneutical system appear likely. Yet, any attempt to establish influence remains speculative, especially in light of the fact that we lack several *tafsirs* from the fourth/tenth century, including those of some major Mu'tazilis, which could definitely settle this issue. Indeed, the system could have been originally devised by a non-Mu'tazili exegete and then adopted by more than one group, including the Mu'tazils, Sunnis, Karrāmīs and Twelver-Shi'is. Still, the conclusion that can be drawn here is that the idea of Qur'anic exegesis involving a hermeneutical system appears in late fourth/tenth- and early fifth/eleventh-century *tafsirs* with a number of groups, and the evidence we have points to these groups being active in Iraq and Khurāsān.

Having said this, one should also acknowledge that the hermeneutical approach and methodology laid out by Jishumi reflects an advanced stage – for sure, an advanced stage of the Mu'tazili tradition of Qur'anic exegesis that could have been partially identified by his predecessors, like Rummānī. Jishumi's originality is therefore in further developing this system and, more significantly, restructuring *tafsir* in a very methodical and meticulous way around the eight categories of his hermeneutical system: each *tafsir* section is preceded by the Qur'anic verse or verses in question and then divided in a very systematic and orderly fashion according to the precise categories of his system.

**Understanding Jishumi’s Hermeneutical System**

Jishumi's system is best understood by arranging the eight categories into three groups: verification of the text of the Qur'an (categories 1–4 and 6), meaning of the text (category 5), and implication of the text (categories 7–8). The verification of the text is the first step; it requires the establishment of how the Qur'an appears and the chronology of its verses, thus involving the five categories: reading, lexicology, grammatical syntax, compositional structure and occasion of revelation. These fundamental steps determine the options that the exegete will have for establishing the meaning of the Qur'an and by extension the evidences and decrees that are communicated by its verses.
Under the rubric of reading, the verification of the Qur'an is done on the basis of 'widespread and authoritative transmission'. The variation in the readings is not a reflection of divisions among early exegetes, but rather a testimony to the Qur'an's divine origin: the different readings were revealed 'as such'. This position by Jishumī is in full agreement with exegetes before and after him, on the basis of a hadith, that the Qur'an was revealed in seven readings (unzīla al-qur'ānū 'alā sab'ata ahrufin). Hence, the anomalous is to be rejected because there is no way to verify that it was actually revealed. The discussion here echoes the position of earlier grammarians in that they insisted on the reading being compatible with rasm (the way a word appears written in the mushaf) and supported by a trustworthy isnād (chain of transmitters).

With respect to lexicology, the Qur'an is in Arabic and includes no foreign word, in Jishumī's view. That a word is also encountered in another language is not indicative of any influence on the Qur'an, and by extension does not require knowledge of that language. Moreover, the lexicology of the Qur'an is the proof of its miraculousness (i'jāz). With respect to grammatical syntax, according to Jishumī, every expression in the Qur'an has at least one meaning, and when more than one is found, it is incumbent upon the exegete to determine whether all or only some are acceptable. This is why the fifth category, Meaning, is so important. The idea that the exegete must verify 'compelling evidence' in order to accept or dismiss a particular meaning entails a direct responsibility on his part that cannot be evaded by imitating earlier exegetes. He must follow the literal (ḥaqīqa) and stick to the legal meaning (al-ma'na al-sharī) because they supersede the metaphor (majāz) and lexical meaning (al-ma'na al-lughawi), unless there is an irrefutable proof to the contrary. Moreover, for Jishumī the meaning of a verse is not restricted to the occasion of its revelation unless there is a specific Qur'anic stipulation to that effect; hence the necessary expertise in the chronology and occasion of revelation of each verse (category 6).

The last group, implications of the text (categories 7–8), seems to be the most central; indeed, they may be seen as the culmination of all the other categories. Categories 7 and 8 address respectively how one is to live in accordance with God's word, and the past stories that the Qur'an recounts to illustrate the implications of observing or ignoring God's word. Jishumī tells us that the evidences and decrees determine what to believe and how to act (which involve among other things, the doctrine of monotheism, as well as commands and prohibitions); thus, it is no surprise that he reopens the issue of the proper understanding of the text (category 5), which in turn depends on the verification of the text (categories 1–4 and 6). But he does that with a specificity that goes somewhat beyond what he discusses under
category 5. There are the evident and clear verses that must be understood according to their apparent meaning. There are also the obscure and ambiguous verses, which require investigation involving not only other Qur'anic verses but, as we will see below with the case of Q. 3:7, extra-Qur'anic material (such as poetry and grammar) as well. Categories 7–8 also require knowledge of the chronology and occasion of revelation in order to determine and follow the abrogating verses and dismiss the abrogated ones. Thus these two final categories show why all the other categories are so important for Jishumi.

Jishumi’s Methodology and Approach to Tafsīr

To argue that Jishumi’s introduction holds all the answers to his methodology and approach to tafsīr would be misleading. It is in the actual body of the Tahdhib that Jishumi applies his hermeneutical system in a way that completely unfolds his methodology and approach. What is meant here is not only the application of these, but also instances where Jishumi offers additional reflections on tafsīr. The example from his interpretation of Q. 3:7 is a case in point. It allows the reader to have a closer understanding of the additional theory regarding hermeneutical exegesis that Jishumi dispenses all over his Tahdhib. Jishumi states that Q. 3:7:

[... ] shows that the Qur’an comprises evident and ambiguous verses. The most plausible opinion is what we have already stated, which was preferred by al-Qādī [‘Abd al-Jabbar], namely that the evident exhibits the intended meaning in itself, whereas the ambiguous obscures its intended meaning. It also shows that the ambiguous must be referred to the evident, and its meaning is only deciphered by recourse to the evident. It also shows that the evident and ambiguous verses involve the fundamental principles of religion, such as the doctrines of God’s Oneness and Justice, because what is deduced by independent inquiry is not found blameworthy if followed. Hence only our argument is the plausible one. [ ... ] The verse also shows that truth is attained by rational inquiry; for that reason He said: Yet none remembers save those possessed of minds. He specifically intended them because they are under obligation.

It is clear that here Jishumi is addressing issues that he did not directly address in his introduction. To be sure, he mentions there the evident verses (al-muḥkam) and ambiguous verses (al-mutashabbih), as we saw earlier, but he does not clarify that both types involve the fundamental principles of religion (al-usta‘ul). It is in this gloss on Q. 3:7 that Jishumi discloses such a significant argument. The evident verses are important in order to determine the fundamental principles of religion, but not to the exclusion of the ambiguous verses, which also determine those principles. Yet by its very nature, the ambiguous needs the evident to help decipher its meaning. Jishumi then clarifies that if the ambiguous verses were not relevant to the fundamental principles of religion, then any meaning that an exegete offered for them would be acceptable. His rationale for this is that issues determined by independent inquiry (ijtihādiyya) do not earn punishment or blame. Blame and punishment are only assigned to the erroneous application of independent inquiry to the fundamental principles of religion. Since Q. 3:7 clearly identifies those who misinterpret the ambiguous verses of the Qur’an as deserving God’s condemnation, the ambiguous verses must therefore deal with the fundamental principles of religion; it is clear that what Jishumi intends by the ‘fundamental principles of religion’ is the theological system of Mu’tazilism, the five principles (al-usta‘ul al-khamsa).

This dynamic relationship between evident and ambiguous reflects a major aspect of the Mu’tazili approach to Qur’anic hermeneutics. One might be tempted to call it tafsīr al-Qur’an bi’l-Qur’an (using verses of the Qur’an to explain other verses). But this would not be entirely accurate, in the sense that, as seen in countless cases in the Tahdhib as well as in examples from other Mu’tazili exegeses, evidence beyond the Qur’an, such as Arabic poetry, language syntax and rhetoric, is often brought in by exegetes to help identify and explain the ambiguous verses. Even so, to link the ambiguous verses to the fundamental principles of religion has enormous implications. It is as if the soundness of the fundamental principles of religion requires constant inquiry into the meaning of a set of Qur’anic verses without which the Qur’an is not fully understood and one’s belief is defective. This is why the Mu’tazila, more than any other group, were attracted to the genre of mutashabbih al-Qur’an (books and treatises on the ambiguous verses of the Qur’an), and that was precisely because it
allowed them to identify the ambiguous verses, but more importantly to offer the ‘true’ interpretation of these verses in a way that helps them determine and validate the tenets of their theological system.27

Another important point about Jishumi’s methodology and approach to taṣfīr with respect to categories 5, 7 and 8, is that, unlike categories 1–4 and 6, the exegete is not restricted by the range of opinions reached by earlier scholars. If that were the case, God would have revealed the Qur’an in evident verses only. That God chose to reveal the Qur’an in evident and ambiguous verses mandates that one steer clear of the imitation of early traditions and opinions. After all, scholars are under obligation (taklīf) to labour to understand the Qur’an. Surely, Jishumi recognises that later exegetes might reach the same conclusions as earlier ones, but that is not the result of imitation. It is rather the result of the application of the individual exegete’s rational inquiry and the range of talents and skills he possesses. This is also why Jishumi raises the point about the enormous value of scholars and that they are under an obligation, because their rational inquiry enables them to determine the proper meaning of the ambiguous verses, and once they have they are bound to believe and follow it, as well as disseminate it to others.28

A final point regarding Jishumi’s methodology and approach to taṣfīr is that he understood Qur’anic exegesis as a battlefield, where the exegete fights his opponents over their misinterpretation of scripture. It is not a passive process in which the exegete simply proposes the meanings of the Qur’anic verses. Rather, it is an opportunity to reinforce and embolden one’s position and point to the opponents’ fallacies. There is no doubt that this is reflective of a major feature of the Mu’tazili tradition of Qur’anic exegesis that we also encounter in other Mu’tazili taṣfīrs. We come across it in the earlier al-Jāmi’ al-kabīr by Rummānī, who stipulates in the introduction that scriptural exegesis mandates that the exegete demonstrates the invalidity of the views of those who misinterpret the Qur’an (i.e. the opponents of the Mu’tazila),29 and repeatedly points these out in the actual taṣfīr sections.30 We also come across it in Tafsīr al-kashāf by Zamakhshari, who does not miss an opportunity to boast about the solid beliefs of the Mu’tazila as anchored in the proper interpretation of revelation as opposed to the unfounded ‘misinterpretation’ of the adversaries.31

Jishumi first discusses the category of reading (al-qirā’ā), where he indicates that there is a disagreement over the pronunciation of the verb y-k-sh-j (reveal) in Q. 68:42. The majority of scholars read it as yuḵshaʃu, that is waʃma yuḵshaʃu ‘an sāğiin (a day when sāq is revealed), where the agent is unknown. But ‘Abd Allāh Ibn ‘Abbās (d. 68/687) read the verb as takʃiʃu, to mean takʃiʃu‘an qiyiʃat ‘an sāği (the Day of Resurrection shall reveal its sāq). al-Hasan [al-Baṣrī] read it similarly, except that he rendered the verb as tukʃiʃu.

After that, Jishumi engages the aspects of lexicology (al-lugha),
where he explains the philological origins of certain terms: *akbar* (far more, Q. 68:33); *al-hukm* (restraining/banning corruption, Q. 68:39); *al-za'im* (guarantee, Q. 68:40); *al-sāq* (foot/stalk, Q. 68:42); *kashf al-sāq* (usher violently, Q. 68:42); *rahaqa*, overcome/reach adolescence, Q. 68:43). One issue seems to preoccupy Jishumī’s mind: his eagerness to explain the etymology of the expression *kashf al-sāq* (lit., ‘to reveal a leg’). He argues that it is an idiomatic expression that indicates the severity of a given situation that would be similar to a serious task requiring one to hitch up his robe in order to engage it, hence showing his leg. Jishumī then digresses into an interesting explanation regarding delivering a she-camel, quoting the Mu’tazili exegete Abū Muslim al-Isfahānī (d. 322/933):

The proper way to deliver the calf of a she-camel from its uterus is for the man to reach in his hand and pull it out – he who does that is called *mudhammir* [lit., he who inserts his hand in the she-camel]. They [the Arabs] considered it a good omen if the calf was female and the head came out before the leg. But if it was the other way, that is the leg (*sāq*) came out before the head and the calf was male, they considered it a bad omen and were disturbed by it.

Following that comes the section of grammatical syntax (*al-i‘rāb*), where Jishumī discusses the reasons why in Q. 68:34, 38 and 39 the particle *inna* (that) appears in this form and not in the usual *anna* form. Jishumī explains this on the basis of three grammatical conditions: 1) if it is at the beginning of the sentence, 2) if it directly follows the verb *qāla* (say), or 3) if it is governed by the particle *là* which comes after it, such as in *and God knows that you are His Messenger (innakā lara-sālūhu)* (Q. 63:1), and *We know you are grieved (innahu la-yazumu-hu) by what they say* (Q. 6:33).

Then comes the section of occasion of revelation (*sābab al-nuzūl*), where Jishumī says that the verse *Are We to treat Muslims as We treat villains?* (Q. 68:35) was revealed to answer *Utbā b. Rabi‘a,* who said: ‘If what Muhammad claims is true, we are surely better than him in the hereafter.’ Jishumī comments that ‘Utbā said this either out of a conviction that he was right or to entice his supporters. As for the verse: *They had once been summoned to bow down, when still carefree* (Q. 68:43), Jishumī quotes Ka‘b al-Aḥbār (d. c. 31/651), who converted to Islam and came to Medina after the death of Muhammad, that it was revealed against those who missed the Friday prayers.

The category of meaning (*al-ma‘nā*), Jishumī focuses on several issues. First he addresses the meaning of the expression *‘Such is Our torment’* (Q. 68:33), which, according to Abū ‘Ali al-Jubba‘ī, means ‘the torment in this world that God inflicts on transgressors’. But according to Isfahānī, the expression informs us that the group addressed in these verses will receive the same fate as those who in previous times were tormented for similar transgressions. Jishumī also states that Q. 68:33 is addressed to Muhammad to warn the rich members of his community not to withhold the rights of the poor; if they do, God will bring upon them torment. But then Jishumī acknowledges a paradox:

How can torment be stipulated for that [conduct] when God had said [in a few verses earlier]: *‘kamā balawān’* (lit., as We afflicted) [Q. 68:17]? We say that *We afflicted* indicates the obligation (*taklīf*) to show gratitude [to God for His graces] and give to the poor their rights. Since they had not done so, they were punished by wanton-ness (*al-hāja*). Hence punishment is for the action of the human-being and not Almighty God’s.

Here, Jishumī is clarifying the meaning of the phrase *‘We afflicted’*, acknowledging thus a seeming contradiction between Q. 68:33 and Q. 68:17; God enacting torment on a group of people for actions that He had already afflicted them with. But, as a Mu’tazili, he argues against such an understanding on the grounds that Q. 68:17 only sets up a commandment: ‘the affliction is actually the obligation (*al-taklīf*) to thank God [for one’s good fortunes] and give charity to the poor.’ Those who do not act on this obligation have violated God’s commandment and are therefore tormented.

Then he discusses the meanings of other terms and expressions. One interesting case is the expression *partners* (*shurākā*) in the verse *Or do they have partners? Let them produce their partners if they speak the truth* (Q. 68:41). According to Jishumī, *partners* could mean any of the following: leaders, witnesses, idols, or fellow unbelievers. *Let them produce their partners if they speak the truth* is therefore rhetorical and means that, on the Day of Resurrection, they will be incapable
of providing witnesses to testify on their behalf; this therefore invalidates all arguments that equate between the Muslim (al-muslim) and the villain (al-mujrim).

Jishumi also explains that the expression a sāq is revealed (yawma yuksiṣa′ an sāqīn) indicates the horror (ḥawīl) of that Day, in the sense that no human has ever experienced so horrific a day as the Day of Resurrection, which, according to Iṣḥāqī, 'is the last day of this world and the first day of Resurrection'. 35 If we recall Jishumi's point in the introduction that ‘the literal has a priority unless there is compelling evidence that it is more appropriate to follow the metaphor’, then it becomes clear that, according to him, the term sāq in this case cannot be accepted as indicating the meaning of the literal, namely ‘leg’. Jishumi already gave the word sāq a serious examination under the category of lexicology, where he acknowledges that, ‘sāq is a well-known limb of a being’s body; it is called sāq because the body stands on it’. So he is aware that the most common meaning of the word sāq is ‘leg’. But in Q. 68:42, it cannot mean ‘leg’ because the expression a sāq is revealed is used by the Arabs to indicate the gravity of a situation. For that end, Jishumi lists two lines of poetry which prove that the term sāq, when used in expressions such as the war revealed its sāq, indicates the terrors of war, as in She (war) revealed to them its terror (sāq) and evil became manifest. But Jishumi does not tell us yet why the metaphor and not the literal in the word sāq must be adopted (and what the implications or dangers are of choosing the literal). He keeps this for the section on evidences and decrees, as we will see below.

After that, Jishumi moves to the category of evidences and decrees (al-adilla wa′l-ahkām). Since he provides a very important discussion that unveils crucial aspects of the application and implication of his hermeneutical system and methodology, I am providing here the translation of the entire section:

His saying Such is Our torment (ka-dhālika′ l-′adhāb) indicates the offense of transgression. It also indicates that the misfortunes of this world might be a punishment, which is the opinion of Abū `Ali [al-Jubbā`ī]. As for Abū Hāshīm [al-Jubbā`ī], this can either be a hardship or benevolence, for God had said as We afflicted (kamā

The Introduction to the Tahdhib of al-Ḥākim al-Jishumi balawnā), which we have explained what was said about it [earlier]. His saying To the pious (li′l-muttaqīn) indicates several things, among them: that Paradise is reached by piety, contrary to the argument of the Postponers; that the Muslim and villain are legal nouns, the first is a praise and the second is a rebuke; that these two descriptions are contradictory, and are not equal, contrary to the argument of the Postponers (al-murji`a); 36 that the [deceptive] obedience of the villain leads him astray; that it is not proper to equate between them, for He said, What makes you judge in this manner? which contradicts the arguments of the Compulsionists (al-muqībīra) 37 that it is permissible to equate between them and that the villain can indeed be preferred over the Muslim on the grounds that if He created belief and unbelief, it would then follow that they are to be equated similarly to the white and black [as colours]; that punishment applies to the villain who is the sinner, contrary to the argument of some; that His punishment is eternal, for if it stops, it would be at one point as if it was not; that what they have done is misguidance [on their part] and not [the result of] God’s judgement, for that He said [What makes] you judge in this manner? [Q. 68:36]; that conviction must derive from proof, for that He asked them to provide a proof and a book.

His saying a sāq is revealed [Q. 68:42] indicates the horrors of the Day of Resurrection, and that they are asked to prostrate as a rebuke [for them] and not as [a request for] worship. It also indicates that they were physically capable of prostrating while in this world, seeing that otherwise the composition of speech (naẓm al-kašām) does not make sense, therefore annulling the argument of the Compulsionists regarding the created being and human capability (al-istiṣ̄a′a). As for what the [Sunni] traditionists (al-ḥashšíyya) relate – a long story whose central theme is that every faction goes to Hell with its deities, and only the monotheists remain. God Almighty will ask them: ‘Whom did you worship?’ They will reply: ‘We worshipped God.’ He will then appear to them in a form other than His form, but they will not recognise Him. He will ask them: ‘Is there between you and Him a sign?’ They will reply: ‘Yes.’ He will then reveal His leg (sāq), and they will fall down [on their knees] in
prostration - it is a scheme from the heretics (al-mulhida), because God has no form and it is impossible for Him to have body parts or assume forms. They [the hashwiyya] are so irrational that they contend that Satan assumes forms, and then describe their deity [God] as assuming forms too. For what does it mean to say 'leg' when there is neither foot nor thigh? And if they establish the existence of these body parts, then it is a body, and one wonders how this group deny anthropomorphism and then relate a story like this one without interpreting (ta'wil) it and also relate what contradicts it. May God be immensely exalted above that.

In this section on the evidences and decrees of Q. 68:33-43, it is clear that Jishumi is concerned with two major issues. The first issue is the offense committed against God's commandments and what that entails. He is clearly defending the Mu'tazili belief that humans are the creators of their own actions, and when God foretells their punishment, He is not indicating that He is preordaining their transgressions. Otherwise, it would be absurd that God would punish humans for what He compelled them to do. Incidentally, Jishumi acknowledges that the Mu'tazila consider punishments to be also in this world: 'the misfortunes of this world might be a punishment, which is the opinion of Abû 'Ali [al-Jubbâ'i].' These issues are raised by Jishumi in order to affirm the veracity of the Mu'tazili beliefs and to point out the absurdity of the views of the opponents. For instance, Muslims and villains are two categories that cannot be placed on the same level; the first is praise for those who follow God's commandments, and the second is a rebuke for those who violate them. So the Postponers (al-murji'a) are wrong when they say that those who transgress against God can still be admitted to Paradise: 'Paradise is reached by piety.' They are also wrong when they say that the Muslim sinner is still a Muslim: 'the two descriptions are contradictory.' Similarly, the argument of the Compulsionists (al-mujbira), that it is possible to equate those who violate God's commandments with those who abide by them or prefer the latter over the former on the grounds that God predestined their actions, is invalid. Tafsir in this case is the battlefield where the exegete not only reveals the evidences and decrees that are communicated in the Qur'an so that the beliefs

and commandments are known to the Muslims, but also points out the fallacies to which those who allegedly misinterpret the Qur'an are exposed.

The second major issue that preoccupies Jishumi is the challenging expression 'a saq is revealed'. One anticipates that he will definitely address it in this section given that the word saq literally means 'leg', and he twice before addresses it under the categories of lexicology and meaning, but does not go into the implications of accepting the literal meaning. For Jishumi, saq is revealed cannot mean that a physical leg will be revealed on the Day of Resurrection, rather, the expression denotes the terror of the Day of Resurrection. Since the understanding of the expression has a tremendous theological implication, Jishumi feels obliged to address his opponents' understanding of the phrase, in order to refute them. The hashwiyya, which is a blanket reference to several traditionalist Sunni groups from the time, say that it is actually God's leg which He will show to the believers on the Day of Resurrection as if God here is revealing Himself for the first time to those who have worshipped Him through the ages. So one is not surprised to see that Jishumi is enraged about the story they reportedly relate regarding the circumstances of God's revealing His leg on the Day of Resurrection. He argues that it was an idea that 'the heretics' (al-mulhida) have introduced to corrupt Islam. Obviously, Jishumi and the Mu'tazila utterly reject anthropomorphism: not only in that God has no form, but in that it is impossible for Him to reveal Himself in a form or assume a form. Hence, the literal meaning of saq is to be dismissed, and instead, the exegete must adopt its metaphor, namely, 'terror'.

Jishumi does not include sections for the categories of compositional structure (al-na'am) or messages and narratives (al-akhbâr wa'l-qiṣas), suggesting that there is nothing of substance that can be said about them with respect to Q. 68:33-43.

Conclusion

The introduction of the Tahdhib, despite its relative brevity, provides us with valuable information on the approach, methodology and hermeneutical system that Jishumi adopts for the interpretation of the
Jishumi’s insistence that exegesis is a legitimising and empowering method, and a key aspect of his hermeneutical system. This is not an explicit order according to his hermeneutical system. This recourse to rational inquiry to dislodge the meanings and implications of the text; hence Jishumi’s insistence that exegesis is a dynamic and ongoing process.

But the introduction does not hold all the answers to Jishumi’s approach and methodology. It is in the actual tafsîr that we encounter additional reflections regarding his methodology and hermeneutical principles and see them in actual application. We also come across instances where he offers valuable reflections about the function of Qur’anic exegesis as, on the one hand, legitimising and empowering certain beliefs and doctrines (in Jishumi’s view, they are the beliefs and doctrines of the Mu’tazila), and, on the other hand, exposing erroneous ones (those of the Mu’tazila’s many opponents).

NOTES

In another recursion, the Tadhhib exists in 18 volumes.

A comprehensive study to identify the hermeneutical system that Zamakhshari adopts in al-Kashshâyî is still lacking.

All translations of the Qur’an are based on The Qur’an, tr. Tarîf Khalidi (New York, 2008); if an expression needs clarification, I provide it between brackets.

Q. 26:195. All translations of the Qur’an are based on The Qur’an, tr. Tarîf Khalidi (New York, 2008); if an expression needs clarification, I provide it between brackets.

Q. 17:35 and Q. 26:182.


Jishumi does not include any text under the eighth section of his introduction.


The translation of any of these concepts is not an easy task. Here, for instance, reading (qura‘) is to be understood in the sense of correct pronunciation and orthography.

For an examination and analysis of Tha’lîbi’s theoretical hermeneutical approach, see Saleh, Formation, pp. 77–99.

One can even see an earlier unrefined system presented by Abû Jâ’far Muhammad b. Jarir al-Tabarî (d. 310/923), who raises some of the hermeneutical issues that are much more elaborate in the introductions of Tha’lîbi and Jishumi: see al-Thâ’lîbi, jami’ al-bayin fi ta‘wil al-Qur’ân (Beirut, 1999), vol. 1, pp. 28–66.

For an examination and analysis of Tha’lîbi’s theoretical hermeneutical approach, see Saleh, Formation, pp. 77–99.

For the identification of this tafsîr as the work of Ibn Bistâm, see Hasan Anşûr Qumî, ‘Mulâbâşât-i chand dar bâra-yi mîrâz-i bârâ-mânda-yi karrâmîyîa’, Kitâb-i moh-i Din 56–7 (1381 Sh./2002), pp. 80; and Claude Gilliot, ‘Les Histoires des Prophètes d’al-‘Tabîbî. Sources et Traductions’, Oriente Moderno 89, no. 2 (2009), p. 347, n. 108. Saleh has raised the possibility that Tha’lîbi’s hermeneutical system could have been borrowed from the one developed by the Karrâmî school of exegesis as cited in the Karrâmî tafsîr: see Saleh, Formation, pp. 88–9. However, since Ibn Bistâm is of the same generation as Tha’lîbi, the direction of influence is once again unclear.

For the identification of this tafsîr as the work of Ibn Bistâm, see Hasan Anşûr Qumî, ‘Mulâbâşât-i chand dar bâra-yi mîrâz-i bârâ-mânda-yi karrâmîyîa’, Kitâb-i moh-i Din 56–7 (1381 Sh./2002), pp. 80; and Claude Gilliot, ‘Les Histoires des Prophètes d’al-‘Tabîbî. Sources et Traductions’, Oriente Moderno 89, no. 2 (2009), p. 347, n. 108. Saleh has raised the possibility that Tha’lîbi’s hermeneutical system could have been borrowed from the one developed by the Karrâmî school of exegesis as cited in the Karrâmî tafsîr: see Saleh, Formation, pp. 88–9. However, since Ibn Bistâm is of the same generation as Tha’lîbi, the direction of influence is once again unclear.

For Muhammad b. Hasan al-ţâ‘î (Shaykh al-Tâ’î), al-Tâhirî fi tafsîr al-Qur’ân, ed. Ahmad Qâsir al-‘Amîlî (Beirut, n.d.), vol. 1, p. 2. On a few occasions, Tâhir adds a category that he calls al-ţułju, which essentially argues for the validity of a particular choice of a reading or grammatical point, and in some cases for a text’s inclusion in a...
sura or proper division of a verse. Abū 'Ali al-Fadl (d. 548/1154) also adopts this system in his Majma’ al-bayān ft tafsīr al-Qurʾān, ed. Hāshim al-Maḥallah (Beirut, 2005), in which it is clear that he was influenced by Tūsī and Jishum. On Tābrīzī’s tafsīr, see Fudge, Qur’ānic Hermeneutics. On Tābrīzī’s reliance on Jishum’s Tahdhib, see also Suleiman A. Mourad, The Survival of the Mu‘tazila Tradition of Qur’ānic Exegesis in Shī‘i and Sunnī Tafsīr, Journal of Qur’ānic Studies 12 (2010), pp. 83–108.

15 See, for example, Tūsī’s acknowledgment that the best two tafsīr works that he saw were those by the Mu‘tazili exegetes Abu‘l-Muṣa‘īd al-‘Iṣāḥānī (d. 322/933) and ‘Ali b. Ḥusayn al-Rummānī (d. 384/994): Tūsī, al-Tibyān, vol. 1, pp. 1–2. 16 ‘Ali b. Ḥusayn al-Rummānī, al-Jāmi‘ al-kafrīn (MS Or. 9408, British Library, London). Fol. 5a. I am thankful to Alena Kulinch of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, for bringing this to my attention and providing me with a transcription of Rummānī’s introduction.

17 Jishum hails from Khurāsān; precisely from the town of Jishum, near the city of Bayhaq, located to the southeast of Nishapur, at that time Khurāsān’s capital city.

18 Since Jishum also preserves and often documents the authorship of particular views regarding the interpretation of Qur’ānic verses by Mu‘tazili exegetes before him, such as Abū ‘Ali al-Jubbāri (d. 303/915), Abū'l-Qāsim al-Ka'bī al-Balkhī (d. 319/931), Abū Muslim al-Isfahānī (d. 322/933), ‘Ali b. Ḥusayn al-Rummānī (d. 384/994), and al-Qādī ‘Abd al-Jabbār (d. 415/1024), he could not have been simply copying from an earlier Mu‘tazili source. Jishum’s Tahdhib represents a valuable source that allows for the reconstruction, however partially, of their lost tafsīrs. It is worth noting here that Jishum seems to copy directly from Rummānī, invariably without acknowledgment, but he rearranges Rummānī’s material—which the latter presented in an argumentative question and answer style—to strictly fit the eight categories of his hermeneutical system.

19 For this hadith, see the extensive discussion in Tābrīzī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, vol. 1, pp. 35–52. Tābrīzī himself takes the opposite position that aḥruf means not readings but categories (ma‘amlāt); commands (aman), prohibitions (nahāf), promises of reward (wa‘īd), and threats of punishment (wa‘īd), arguments (jadāl), narratives (saghir), and parables (mathāl). See Tābrīzī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, vol. 1, pp. 46–58. See also Tūsī, al-Tibyān, vol. 1, pp. 7–9.


22 For Jishum’s comment on Q. 12.31 see al-Tahdhib, MS Hashimi (Sa‘da, Yemen, copied 782/1380), fol. 132b. (The volume covers from Q. 10:57 to Q. 14:47.)

23 See for example the discussion about allowing variant readings and the insertion of words into the text of the Qur‘ān by some early Twelver-Shī‘ī exegetes in Meir M. Bar Asher, Scripture and Exegesis in Early Imāmī Shi‘ism (Leiden, 1999), pp. 101–4.
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24 Q. 3:7 reads: It is He who sent down the Book upon you. In it are verses precise in meaning (muḥkamāt): these are the very heart of the Book. Others are ambiguous (mutashābihāt). Those in whose heart is waywardness pursue what is ambiguous therein, seeking discord and seeking to unravel its interpretation. But none knows its interpretation save God (optional stop) and those deeply rooted in knowledge say: ‘We believe in it. All is from our Lord.’ Yet none remembers save those possessed of minds. This verse has been the subject of debate not only regarding its meaning, but also the way it should be read, and the translation by Khalidi has been slightly modified here to reflect this. Notable among the problems is the issue of whether God and the deeply rooted in knowledge are meant as one group who understand the meaning of the ambiguous verses, or whether only God possesses this understanding and the deeply rooted in knowledge admit the limitations of their knowledge. The Mu‘tazili favoured the former interpretation, since they considered themselves the deeply rooted in knowledge. See Leah Kinberg, Muḥkamāt and Mutashābihāt (Koran 3:7): Implication of a Koranic Pair of Terms in Medieval Exegesis, Arabica 35 (1988), pp. 143–72; idem, ‘Ambiguous’, EQ, vol. 1, pp. 70–7; and Stefan Wild, ‘The Self-Referentiality of the Qur‘ān: Sura 3:7 as an Exegetical Challenge’, in Jane D. McAuliffe, Barry D. Walfish and Joseph W. Goering, eds., With Reverence for the Word: Medieval Scriptural Exegesis in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (Oxford and New York, 2003), pp. 422–36.

25 For the Arabic text, see Mourad, The Revealed Text’, p. 393.

26 These are: 1) God’s Oneness (al-tawḥīd), 2) God’s justice (al-adl), 3) commanding right and forbidding wrong (al-amr bi-l-ma‘ruf wa-l-nahi ‘an al-munkar), 4) the intermediate position (al-manṣila bayn al-manṣilatayn) and 5) reward and punishment (al-wa‘d wa-l-wa‘id).

27 Of the many Mu‘tazili works on this genre, two books have survived: Ibn al-Khallāl al-Brāṣīl (d. after 777/1088) and al-Qādī ‘Abd al-Jabbār. On Ibn al-Khallāl’s Mutashābih, see Mourad, ‘Ibn al-Khallal al-Brāṣīl’. We also have a number of short epistles that address this topic, such as the Risāla ft l-hidāya wa-l-dalāla by al-Sāḥib b. ‘Abbad (d. 385/995), in which Sāḥib lists the names of six Mu‘tazili theologians who also wrote on the ambiguous verses of the Qur‘ān. See also al-Sāḥib b. ‘Abbad, Risāla ft l-hidāya wa-l-dalāla, ed. Husayn Mahfūz (Tehran, 1955). The Epistle to Caliph ‘Abd al-Malik’, with its pseudepigraphal attribution to al-Ḥasan al-Brāṣīl (d. 110/728), also fits into this genre. See Suleiman A. Mourad, Early Islam between Myth and History: al-Ḥasan al-Brāṣīl (d. 110/728CE) and the Formation of His Legacy in Classical Islamic Scholarship (Leiden, 2005), pp. 176–239.


30 For example, his comment on Q. 3:57, in which he says that the verse proves the invalidity of the views of the Predestinarian Compulsivists (al-Muḫīṣirūn): Rummānī, al-Jāmi‘ al-kafrīn (MS 6523, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris), fol. 6b.

31 See for example the discussion on Q. 5:64 in Muḥammad b. ‘Umar Zamakhshāri’s, Tafsīr al-kashshāf, ed. Muḥammad Shāhīn (Beirut, 1995), vol. 1, pp. 641–2.

32 For the Arabic text of Jishum’s section on Q. 6:33–43, see Appendix II.
APPENDIX I: The Arabic Text of Jishumi’s Introduction to the Tahdhib (starting on p. 137)

The edition of Jishumi’s introduction to the Tahdhib fi tafsir al-Qur’ān is prepared on the basis of three manuscripts. The base text derives from MS OR 2583 from Leiden University Library (referred to in the edition with the letter lām (لا)). The manuscript is identified as the first volume of the work and dates to 650/1252. The introduction is found on folios 1b-2a. MS OR 2583 is the only manuscript in my possession that contains the entire text of the introduction of the Tahdhib; the other manuscripts have all or part of the introduction missing due to damage or loss of some folios. The other two manuscripts were used to verify the text and differences are noted in the footnotes, where their extant endpoint is also given. They are the manuscript of the first volume from Ayatollah Kalbāyikāni Library in Qumm (fols. 1b-3a), referred to in this edition with the letter kāf (ك), which dates to 651/1254, and manuscript MS Arabo 1064 from the Vatican Library (ف), which dates to possibly the second half of the sixth/twelfth century (fols. 1a-2a).

APPENDIX II: Section on Sūrat al-Qalam, Verses 33-43, from Jishumi’s Tahdhib (starting on p. 133)

This edition of the section on Q. 68:33-43 from Jishami’s al-Tahdhib fi tafsir al-Qur’ān has been made using two manuscripts:

a) The edition is based on an unidentified manuscript from a private collection in Yemen. The section edited here falls on folios 38b–40b. (The volume covers from Q. 62:4 to Q. 113:5.) I want to thank Ahmad S. Achtar from Heythrop College, University of London, for providing me with a copy of this manuscript.

b) Variants have been annotated using MS 3746, Mar’ashi Library, Qummm, dated 678/1279 (designated as the letter mim, ﻣ). The text of Q. 68:33-43 occupies folios 37b–39b in volume IX (which covers from Sūrat al-Jumu’a [Q. 62] to Sūrat al-Nās [Q. 114]).
سليمان موراد

وعدل قوله: "كان نبض عينه كأنه على شدة أهل القيادة وأنهم يدعون إلى السجود توبخًا لا تهدأ. وعدل أنهم كانوا يكرؤون على السجود في الدنيا، وإلا لما ضح نظم الكلام، فيطل قول المجزعة في المخلوق والاستغاثة. فلما نزدح الحشوقة، في حدث طويل عمده أنه تنهب كل طائفة مع أهلهم إلى النار، وبيقي الموحودون فيقول اللهم تعالى لهم: من عبديكم؟ يقولون: عبدي الله. فيبدو لهم في صورة غير ضوحته فيكرونهم. يقول: هل بينكم وعبدي آباؤكم؟ قالوا: نعم، ويكشف عن ساقه فخورون سجداً. فمن دسائس المهود لأنه ليس بذي صورة ولا يجوز عليه الأعضاء ولا أن ينصب بصور، ومن عجيب أنهم يردون أن النجوم ينصب بصور، ثم وصفوا معمودهم بذل ذلك، وأي يعني في ساق بلا قدم وفخذ! ولو أنواعا جميع الأعضاء فهو جسم والعمل من قوم يكرون الشفهية وبرورون هذا الحديث من غير تأويل لها ثم بروون ما يناقشها، تعالى اللهم عن قرائهم "علياً كبيرًا.

الأحكام


المرجئة: السجدة، م. 11

قوائم: ذلك، م. 12
Suleiman A. Mourad
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ثم ذكر الوعد للمؤمنين فقال سبحانه: "إِنَّا لِلَّهِ وَإِنَّهُ لَرَبِّنَا فَلَوْ تُحْكَمُونَ جَنَّاتَ الْيَمِينَ" يعني في الآخرة. "يَجْعَلُ الْمُتَّقِينَ كَالْمُجَرَّمِينَ" وهذا سامح وعميد النفي، أي لا يستوعبن ولا يستوعبن بعده لأنه ليس بفعل حكم. "وَإِنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَّارَتُوٍّ" يعني من انتظر هذا الحكمة

فكيف تحكمون بل على الله فنعمل مع أنه حكيم لا يفعل القبيح. "إِنَّا لِلَّهِ وَإِنَّهُ لَرَبِّنَا فَلَوْ تُحْكَمُونَ أي لكم كتاب تدرسون ذلك فيه، وقد قامت الحكمة بذلك ففسcken به. "إِنَّا لِلَّهِ وَإِنَّهُ لَرَبِّنَا فَلَوْ تُحْكَمُونَ أي لكم ما تحكمن في ذلك الكتاب، فليزور الله لا يبت إلا بدليل، وإنما احتج عليهم بعفي الكتاب لأن وعد الله ومن يغفر له ومن لا يغفر يعلم بالسمع. "إِنَّا لِلَّهِ وَإِنَّهُ لَرَبِّنَا فَلَوْ تُحْكَمُونَ" يدعي الكتاب على بعض النواة بين المسلمين.

البرول
قيل: نزل قوله: «أَنْتِ أَجْمَالُ الْمُسْلِمِينَ كَالمُجَرَّمِينَ» جواباً لعنيدة بن ربيع، قال: إن كأنما يقوله محمد حقاً فنحن أفضل منه في الآخرة. وهذا إنما قاله إما لاعتذاد أنه على الحق، أو إيهاما لأنبياء العلوم. وقيل في قوله: «وَقَدْ كَانَوا يَقْعُونَ إِلَى السَّجْرَةِ» نزل في الذين تخلفوا عن الجماعات، عن كعب.

المعنى
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لرأس في الرجل، فإذا كان على خلافه بأن تخرج الرجل قبل الرأس وكان ذكرًا تشاعموا به وكرهونه.
قال الكميت:
وقال السامع للناكحين متي ذكرت قبل الأرجل.
وقال آخر:
قد طرقت بيكراً أم طبق فذروها ذكرًا ضخم العنق، موت الإمام قفصة من الفلق، أي داهية من الدواهي.
«كَفَتُوهُمْ»: تفصاح. رهقه يبرقه رهفاً، فهو راهق إذا غشيء.
ورهقه الفارس، إذا أدركه، راهق الغلام، أدرك.

الإعراب
كسرت إن في قوله: «إِنَّ لَكُمْ فِي الْيَوْمِ لَا تَتَّخِذُونَ»، «إِنَّ لَكُمْ لَا تَتَّخِذُونَ»، لأجل دخول اللات في الخبر، ولولا لفتح. وألف إن يكسر في ثلاثة موضع، إذا كانت في ابتداء الكلام، نحو قولهم: إن زيما لفظهم؛ إذا جاء بعد الفعل، كقولهم: قال إن زيماً قائم، وأنفسها إذا تلفظهم اللفظ المفتوح، كقولهم: علمنا إن زيماً قائم. قال الله تعالى:
«إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَعْلَمُ إِذْ أَخَذَ أَنْتُمْ إِنَّ الْحَيَاةَ الْأَخِيرَةَ ۛ حَيْثُ لَا تَكُونُونَ ۛ وَكَذَلِكَ لَا تَهْكَوْنَ» (5: 104)
وما سواها فيما مفتوحة. «إِنَّا تَتَّخِذُونَ» أي الذي تحكمون، «تَتَّخِذُونَ» نصب على الظرف.
الحكم: فصل الأمر على جهة الفهَر والمنع، وأصل الباب المنع، ومنه الحكم لانها تمنع من الفساد، ومنه حكمة الدابة. والزعيم والكفيل والضمنين نظائر. والسلاق: عضو معروف للحيوان سمي ساقاً لقيم الساق عليه، ومنه ساق الشجرة، وكل نبت له ساق وبقيه صفاً وشاطاء فهَر شجرة.
قال الشاعر:
لفني عقل يعيش به حيث يهدى ساقه قدمه.
والكشف: إزالة الساق، ثم يستعمل كشف الساق في الأمور الشديدة.
فقال: قامت الحرب على ساق، وكشف الأمر عن ساق، وليس للحرب ساق وإنما يريدون شدتها.
قال الشاعر بصف حريباً:
كشفت لهم عن ساقها وبدا عمر الشجر.
وقال آخر:
قد شرمت عن ساقها فشادوا وجدت الحرب بكم فصداً.
واختلفوا في تصغير ذلك بكشف الساق. فأكبر على أن معناه أنه يشتد الأمر كما يشتد ما يحتاج إلى كشف الساق، ثم كسر في كلذمهم حتى صار كالملجع. وذكر أبو مسلم: أن أصل استخراج لعدن تفاعلا عن خيامه عند الولادة فيدخل الرجل بده وبخرجه، والذي يفعل ذلك يقال له: المقدر. ويعبر بالآثري من أولادها، وكذلك إذا خرج

[التهذيب في تفسير القرآن للحاكم الجشمي]
[تفسير سورة القلم، آيات 43-45]


 القراءة
قراءة العامة (كتَفَّى) بالباء وضمها على ما لم نَّمَّ فاعله. وعن ابن عباس (كتَفَّى) يفتح الاء وكسر الشيخ. أي تكتَفيف القيامة عن ساقها. وعن الحسن بالاء مضمومة.

اللغة
بالقول في المذكر الكبير والمؤنث كبير، وهو أن يزيد مقداره على مقدار غيره ثم يستعمل في كل شئ. يقال: أكبر شيئاً وأكبر شخصاً.

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الآية</th>
<th>الفصل: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الآية</td>
<td>الفصل: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الآية</td>
<td>الفصل: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
حقيقة ومجاز في الحقيقة أو لا، أن يدل الدليل على أن حمله على المجاز أو لا فيحمل عليه.

وقد يعدّ إلى غيره، والواجب اعتبر الفظ دون السبب.

واسبابها الأدلة والأحكام، فإنّه كلام صادق وهو حجّة، ثمّ منه ما ورد مؤكّداً كأدلة التوحيد، ومنه ما ورد مبيناً كأدلة الشرع، ومنه ما يُعرف المراد بظهاه كالمحكم والمبين، ومنه ما يُرتج في معرفة المراد به إلى غيره كالمجمل والمتشابه، ومنه ناسخ يوجب العمل به ومنسوخ لا يوجب وذلك يوجب معرفة تاريخ النزول وما نزل منها بسكتة وما نزل بالمدينة، ومنه العموم والخصوص وتدخل فيه الأشخاص والحكم والمواعظ والرواج والأثر والنواهي والوعيد والوعيد.

وثامنها الأخبار والقصص.
وقد جمعت في كتابي هذا جملة وجوامع في علم القرآن من غير تطويل مanol وإيجاز مخلأ أرجو أن يكون تبصرة للسنيدي وتذكرة للمحتوى ومن الله استمدد التفتيق وعليه أتوك وأحسى ونعم المعين.

علم القرآن
وعلم القرآن كثيرة ومداراً على ثمانية.

أوثرها القراءة ووجهها وعلوها. وإنما تجوز القراءة بالمستقبل
على المتواتر دون الشاذ والنادر وكما لا يجوز إثبات القرآن إلا بقل
مستفيض كذلك القراءات وما توفر نقله فلا يجوز رد شيء منها
لأن كلها مولة ثابتة.

وتألقها اللغة. والقرآن كله بلغة العرب هكذا قال الله تعالى:
"بليغًا وجريفًا. وسورة أنباؤها رومية أو فارسية ك"النبسطامي" [136:26] و"السجّيل" [182:26:27] و"السجّيل".

---

1. ونعم المعين: ونعم الركيل, ك.
2. ومرادها: مداراً, ك.
3. القراءات: القراءة, ك.
4. وما توفر نقله: وما توفر نقلها, ك.
5. كله: كلهمزه, ك.