

Volume LXVI – 2015-2016



MÉLANGES

de l'Université Saint-Joseph

UNIVERSITÉ SAINT-JOSEPH – DAR EL-MACHREQ
Beyrouth – Liban

MÉLANGES

de l'Université Saint-Joseph

Volume LXVI – 2015-2016

Résumés/Abstracts 9

Définition du substantif et catégorisation des choses
qui sont dans l'univers chez Bar Zo'bī
Georges BOHAS 21

LANGUAGE AND INTERPRETATION IN ARABIC AND ISLAMIC SCIENCES

*Proceedings of the Islamic Studies Lecture Series
Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies
Georgetown University, Sept. 2014 – April 2015*

Presentation
Emma GANNAGÉ and Felicitas OPWIS 43

The Unknown Known:
Some Groundwork for Interpreting the Medinan Qur'an
Nicolai SINAI 47

Exculpatory Language in the Qur'an:
A Survey of Terms, Themes, and Theologies
Joseph E. LOWRY 97

Why Do We Need *Tafsīr*? The Mu'tazila Perspective
Suleiman A. MOURAD 121

Imitation – Ambiguity – Discourse
Some Remarks on al-Fārābī's Philosophy of Language
Nadja GERMANN 135

Why Music Matters for Language and Interpretation: Al-Fārābī
Thérèse-Anne DRUART 167

* * *

Why Do We Need *Tafsīr*? The Mu‘tazila Perspective

Suleiman A. MOURAD

The Mu‘tazila tradition of Qur’anic exegesis is starting to receive scholarly attention,¹ yet our knowledge of it is still in need of further research especially in terms of editing the few extant Mu‘tazila *tafsīrs* and making them accessible for scholars in the field. This paper offers some remarks regarding why, according to the Mu‘tazila, *tafsīr* is needed. By looking at Mu‘tazila works, some of which are still in manuscripts, it provides some reflections on the approach, methodology, and hermeneutical principles employed by Mu‘tazila exegetes. The paper also delves into the criteria that allow scholars to determine whether or not a *tafsīr* is a Mu‘tazila *tafsīr* and if *kalām*/theology is the key factor, which will further help us assess the challenges later Sunnī and Shī‘ī scholars faced when they incorporated Mu‘tazila exegetical glosses into their own works.

¹ For some recent studies that examine Mu‘tazila *tafsīr*, see KULINICH Alena (2015), “Beyond Theology: Mu‘tazilite Scholars and their Authority in al-Rummānī’s *Tafsīr*,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 78.1, p. 135-148; ULLAH Kifayat (2013), “*Al-Kashshāf*: Al-Zamakhsharī’s (d. 538/1144) Mu‘tazilite Exegesis of the Qur’ān,” Ph.D. Dissertation, Georgetown University; FUDGE Bruce G. (2011), *Qur’anic Hermeneutics: al-Ṭabrisī and the Craft of Commentary*, Routledge, London, p. 114-42; MOURAD Suleiman A. (2008), “Ibn al-Khallāl al-Baṣrī (d. after 377/988) and his Œuvre on the Problematic Verses of the Qur’ān, *Kitāb al-Radd ‘alā al-jabriyya al-qadariyya* (Refutation of the Predestinarian Compulsionists),” in ADANG Camilla, SCHMIDTKE Sabine and SKLARE David (eds.), *A Common Rationality: Mu‘tazilism in Islam and Judaism*, Ergon Verlag, Würzburg, p. 81-99; *id.* (2013), “The Mu‘tazila & their *Tafsīr* Tradition: A Comparative Study of Five Exegetical Glosses on Qur’an. 3.178,” in SHAH Mustafa (ed.), *Tafsīr: Interpreting the Qur’an*, 4 vol., Routledge, London, vol. III, p. 267-282; *id.* (2013), “Towards a Reconstruction of the Mu‘tazilī Tradition of Qur’anic Exegesis: Reading the Introduction of the *Tahdhīb* of al-Hākim al-Jishumī (d. 494/1101) and its Application,” in BAUER Karen (ed.), *Aims, Methods and Contexts of Qur’anic Exegesis (2nd/8th - 9th/15th C.)*, Oxford University Press in association with The Institute of Ismaili Studies, Oxford/London, p. 101-137; and *id.* (2012), “The Revealed Text and the Intended Subtext: Notes on the Hermeneutics of the Qur’ān in Mu‘tazila Discourse as Reflected in the *Tahdhīb* of al-Hākim al-Jishumī (d. 494/1101),” in OPWIS Felicitas and REISMAN David (eds.), *Islamic Philosophy, Science, Culture, and Religion: Studies in Honor of Dimitri Gutas*, Brill, Leiden, p. 367-395.

A. APPROACH

Mu‘tazila exegetes consider *tafsīr* as first among all sciences and writing a *tafsīr* as a religious obligation. According to al-Ḥākīm al-Jishumī (d. 494/1101), the study of the Qur’an is the most noble of the religious sciences because the revealed text is the firm bond that connects humanity to God (*ḥabl Allāh al-matīn*). Moreover, religion revolves around the Qur’an (*huwa madār al-dīn*). Proper understanding of the Qur’an is, therefore, needed in order for the principles and laws it advocates to be observed and followed. That is why, in al-Jishumī’s opinion, exegetes are important. More so, exegetes are under *taḳlīf* or binding religious obligation to master the necessary sciences in order to explain the Qur’an.²

Al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1144) agrees with al-Jishumī on this point. He does not specifically invoke the notion of *taḳlīf*, but we see in his introduction to *al-Kashshāf* that when he was initially asked to write a *tafsīr*, he declined even though he knew well it is a mandatory task (*wājib*) on the same par as a *farḍ ‘ayn* or binding religious duty that no other person can fulfill on one’s behalf.³

Furthermore, al-Zamakhsharī’s gloss on Qur’an 3.187 —﴿Remember when God covenanted with those formerly entrusted with the Book: ‘That you should proclaim your Revelation to mankind and not conceal it.’ But they cast it behind their backs and bartered it for a paltry sum —wretched indeed is what they bought!﴾— reveals the seriousness of this religious duty:

The verse is a sufficient proof that scholars are under obligation to reveal (*ma’khūdhun ‘alā al-‘ulamā’i an yubayyinū*) to people the Truth and what they have learned. They must not withhold anything from that for corrupt purposes, such as to smooth things for tyrants, be supportive of them and seek their approval, or to pursue a benefit or worldly means.⁴

It is obvious, therefore, that despite the seeming early reluctance of al-Zamakhsharī in his introduction, his enthusiasm to author a *tafsīr* was as unwavering as that of al-Jishumī. They both saw the compiling of a *tafsīr* as a task that the scholar cannot evade.

The binding religious duty on scholars to engage in *tafsīr* is therefore set because without *tafsīr* the Qur’an cannot be interpreted, and by extension, the average Muslim

² For al-Jishumī’s opinions on these matters, see MOURAD, “The Revealed Text,” p. 378; and *id.*, “Towards a Reconstruction,” p. 104-105.

³ AL-ZAMAKHSHARĪ Abū al-Qāsim Maḥmūd (1995), *Tafsīr al-Kashshāf*, 4 vol., ed. SHĀHĪN Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Salām, Dār al-Kutub al-‘ilmiyya, Beirut, vol. I, p. 8.

⁴ AL-ZAMAKHSHARĪ, *al-Kashshāf*, vol. I, p. 440. See also #2 in the Appendix below.

cannot follow it and obey its teachings. Such an understanding is not restricted to the Mu‘tazila, and is shared by other Muslim groups.⁵

B. METHODOLOGY AND HERMENEUTICAL SYSTEM

Some Mu‘tazila exegetes devised a methodology for Qur’anic exegesis that is based on a hermeneutical system. According to al-Jishumī, *tafsīr* entails a complete and comprehensive study of the Qur’an as it relates to a hermeneutical system made of eight categories, which he calls the sciences of the Qur’an (*‘ulūm al-qur’ān*). They are: Reading (*al-qirā’a*), Lexicology (*al-lughā*), Grammatical Syntax (*al-i’rāb*), Compositional Structure (*al-naẓm*), Meaning (*al-ma’nā*), Occasions of Revelation (*asbāb al-nuzūl*), Evidences and Decrees (*al-adilla wa-al-aḥkām*), and Messages and Narratives (*al-akhbār wa-al-qīṣaṣ*).

This hermeneutical system is best understood by arranging the eight categories into three groups: 1) Verification (categories: Reading, Lexicology, Grammatical Syntax, Compositional Structure, and Occasions of Revelation), 2) Meaning, and 3) Implication (which includes Evidences and Decrees as well as Messages and Narratives).⁶ Verification determines the options that the exegete has for establishing the Meaning of the Qur’an and by extension its Implications, especially the theological and legal lessons.

Al-Jishumī maintains that the verification of the text is done on the basis of widespread and authoritative transmission. The variant readings do not reflect division, but are rather a testimony to the Qur’an’s divine origin: the verses were revealed as such. Hence, the anomalous is to be rejected because there is no way to verify that it was revealed. The lexicology of the Qur’an is the proof of the text’s miraculous nature (*i’jāz*): it is all in Arabic and includes no foreign words. Its grammatical syntax is impeccable, and its compositional structure was revealed in the sequence of verses and suras that we have in the codex of caliph ‘Uthmān (r. 23-35/644-656); al-Jishumī indeed raises several times in *al-Tahdhīb* the need to abide by the codex of ‘Uthmān.⁷

⁵ For instance, al-Tha‘labī, who represents a more traditional Sunnī voice, argues that the average believer would stray away from God if left alone with the Qur’an: see SALEH Walid A. (2004), *The Formation of Classical Tafsīr Tradition: The Qur’ān Commentary of al-Tha‘labī* (d. 427/1035), Brill, Leiden, p. 79.

⁶ For a broader discussion of al-Jishumī’s hermeneutical system, see MOURAD, “The Revealed Text,” p. 378-382; and *id.*, “Towards a Reconstruction,” p. 105-110.

⁷ As in his discussion of *Q.* 12:31: see al-Jishumī Abū al-Sa‘d, *al-Tahdhīb fī tafsīr al-qur’ān*, Ms. Qom, al-Mar‘ashī Library 1719, fol. 178-179; see also #4 in the Appendix below. This issue does not relate to the variant readings.

It is evident that al-Jishumī does not tolerate any innovation or originality on the part of the exegete in this aspect of the study of the Qur'an. The Verification of the Qur'anic text is beyond the exegete in the sense that he is bound to adopt what has already been verified and established, and is not at liberty to modify any part of the text.

This hermeneutical system is not unique to al-Jishumī. It is shared by other Mu'tazila. Al-Rummānī (d. 384/994), for instance, uses a hermeneutical system of five categories: Meaning (*al-fahm*), Reading (*wujūh al-qirā'at*), Grammatical Syntax (*al-i'rāb*), Evidences (*al-dalālāt*), and Decrees (*al-aḥkām*).⁸ Al-Zamakhsharī does not follow a defined hermeneutical system, but we come across many of these categories, without specification, in *al-Kashshāf*. For example, al-Zamakhsharī declares regarding the expression *annamā* (that which) in *Q.* 3:178:

According to the rules of orthography, *mā* ought to have been written as separate from *anna*. But since it is connected in *al-imām* [i.e. the Codex of caliph 'Uthmān], it cannot be contested, for the custom of the Codex must be observed when writing the *maṣāḥif*.⁹

Clearly here, al-Zamakhsharī believes that as far as the proper rules of Arabic language are concerned, the two particles of *anna* and *mā* should not be connected orthographically. Still, he argues that one must connect them because they appear as such in the 'Uthmanic Codex. This suggests that there is a higher operating factor that determines how words in the Qur'an appear, and this factor is assumed *a priori*, before the exegete even starts any work on the text of the Qur'an. As the Speech of God, the Qur'an conforms to the primordial archetype (*al-lawḥ al-mahfūz*), and the Codex of 'Uthmān matches that archetype.

The other categories of the Mu'tazila hermeneutical system —Meaning and Implications— do not require the exegete to abide by the “established” tradition. According to al-Jishumī, every word in the Qur'an has a meaning, and when more than one is found, it is incumbent upon the exegete to determine whether all or only some are acceptable. The idea that the exegete must verify compelling evidence in order to accept or dismiss a particular meaning entails, according to al-Jishumī, a direct responsibility on the part of the exegete that cannot be dodged by imitating earlier exegetes. He must determine the literal and legal meanings, which supersede allegorical and lexical meanings. Moreover, 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 importance of the expertise in the chronology and occasion of

⁸ See AL-RUMMĀNĪ 'Alī b. 'Īsā, *al-Jāmi' al-kabīr*, Ms. London, British Library, Or. 9408, fol. 5a.

⁹ AL-ZAMAKHSHARĪ, *al-Kashshāf*, vol. I, p. 434. See also #3 in the Appendix below.

revelation of each verse. As such, the proper hermeneutic of the Qur’an mandates that the exegete masters these categories of the hermeneutical system and adheres to the conditions that govern their application.¹⁰

The categories of *al-adilla wa-al-aḥkām* (Evidences and Decrees) and *al-akhbār wa-al-qīṣaṣ* (Messages and Narratives) seem to be the most central in Mu‘tazila *tafsīrs*. They address how one is to live in accordance with God’s word, and if one were to doubt that, they are reminded in the categories of Messages and Narratives of the implications of ignoring God’s commands and warnings (some Mu‘tazila *tafsīrs* do not specifically use a category called *al-adilla wa-al-aḥkām*, but they all clearly operate with an understanding of it, as they invariably invoke it by the use of such expressions as *tadull al-āya* or *ḥukm al-āya*). Al-Jishumī tells us that the theological and legal implications determine what to believe and how to act (which involve among other things, the doctrine of monotheism, as well as commands and prohibitions).¹¹ There is no way this can be achieved without the proper understanding of the meaning of the Qur’anic verses, which in turn depend on the correct verification of the text of the Qur’an.

Again, the fact that we find this hermeneutical system either specified or loosely followed in other Mu‘tazila *tafsīrs* allows us to identify it as defining the methodological outline of the Mu‘tazila *tafsīr* tradition (although al-Jishumī stands out as the one who follows this hermeneutical system methodically). But this is not sufficient to distinguish Mu‘tazila *tafsīr* from other *tafsīrs* precisely because non-Mu‘tazila exegetes follow it as well (such as traditionalist Sunnīs, Karrāmīs, and Twelver-Shī‘īs).¹²

There is another essential hermeneutical principle that guides the Mu‘tazila methodology in *tafsīr*. It is their understanding of the relationship between the *muḥkam* (evident) and the *mutashābih* (ambiguous). For instance, al-Zamakhsharī states that God revealed the Qur’ān in two categories: *mutashābih* and *muḥkam*. “The *muḥkam* verses are protected from speculation and ambiguity,” for they are the basis upon which the *mutashābih* verses are to be interpreted. The latter are “a test to distinguish the steadfast in the way of Truth from he who slips away.”¹³

Al-Jishumī agrees completely with this. He argues that the *mutashābih* verses need the *muḥkam* verses to help unlock their meaning, for they together determine the fundamental principles of religion. According to al-Jishumī, if the *mutashābih*

¹⁰ See MOURAD, “The Revealed Text,” p. 381-382; and *id.*, “Towards a Reconstruction,” p. 108-109.

¹¹ See MOURAD, “The Revealed Text,” p. 381-382; and *id.*, “Towards a Reconstruction,” p. 109-110.

¹² See MOURAD, “Towards a Reconstruction,” p. 106-107.

¹³ AL-ZAMAKHSHARĪ, *al-Kashshāf*, vol. I, p. 332-333. See also #5 in the Appendix below. See also ULLAH, “*Al-Kashshāf*,” p. 125-130.

were not relevant to the fundamental principles of religion, then any meaning that the exegete offers for them would be acceptable, because issues determined by independent individual reasoning (*ijtihād*) do not earn punishment or blame. Blame and punishment are only assigned in the case of the erroneous application of independent reasoning to the fundamental principles of religion. In this respect, the Mu‘tazila do not tolerate *ijtihād* when it comes to the fundamental principles of religion (*uṣūl al-dīn*).¹⁴

Indeed, the dynamic relationship between *muḥkam* and *mutashābih* is one of the major tenets of the Mu‘tazila methodology in *tafsīr*. What this relationship reveals is that it too presupposes the *a priori* notion that certain theological tenets must be assumed before the exegete starts with the *tafsīr*. For instance, al-Rummānī pens the following:

One might ask: “Why is it not possible to explain ﴿to increase in sin﴾ (Q. 3.178) on the basis of the apparent meaning of the particle *lām* (to), to indicate the will to increase in sins?” The answer is that if God willed it from them, they would be obedient to Him by doing it, but willing the disgraceful is futile. God, His praise sublime, refuted that by saying: ﴿Do you imagine that We created you in vain﴾ (Q. 23.115), and also the verse has to be referred to the evident (*al-muḥkam*), namely His saying: ﴿I created the *Jinn* and humans but to worship Me﴾ (Q. 51.56).¹⁵

One might be tempted to call this *tafsīr al-qur’ān bi-al-qur’ān*. But it is clearly not as simple as that. It is an approach to *tafsīr* that assumes a hermeneutical principle informed by the Mu‘tazila creed. This is why the Mu‘tazila, more than any other group, were attracted to the genre of *mutashābih al-qur’ān*. 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 validate the tenets of their theological system.

C. CRITERIA TO DETERMINE MU‘TAZILA *TAFSĪR*

The approach, methodology and hermeneutical system, and theological principles allow us to determine whether or not a *tafsīr* is a Mu‘tazilī *tafsīr*. If the purpose of *tafsīr* is to determine the fundamental principles of religion that Muslims need to follow, then it becomes significant to study the essential sciences that enable the

¹⁴ AL-JISHUMĪ, *al-Tahdhīb fī tafsīr al-qur’ān*, Ms. Ṣa’dā (Yemen), Āl Hāshīmī Library, fol. 6a-6b. See also #1 in the Appendix below. See also MOURAD, “The Revealed Text,” p. 382-384; and *id.*, “Towards a Reconstruction,” p. 110-112.

¹⁵ AL-RUMMĀNĪ, *al-Jāmi‘ al-kabīr*, Ms. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, ar. 6523, fol. 148b-149a. See also #6 in the Appendix below.

exegete to take on the task. But the fundamental principles of religion are already determined by the Mu‘tazila: their Five Principles (*al-uṣūl al-khamsa*). Thus *tafsīr* effectively becomes a medium for legitimizing their system of belief and delegitimizing those of their opponents; I call it a battlefield where the Mu‘tazila exegete fights his opponents over their misinterpretation of the Qur’an. *Tafsīr* as such is not a passive process where the exegete simply proposes the meanings of the Qur’anic verses. It is an opportunity to validate his position and point out the fallacies of his adversaries. It is for this reason that the Mu‘tazila advocated an approach, methodology and hermeneutical system, and principles that assume the exegete’s reasoning and expertise in a wide range of topics relating to the study of the Qur’an. Yet one gathers that this comprehensive and encyclopedic knowledge is not meant to tolerate an open diversity of opinions. Rather, it is a deliberate strategy intended to supply the exegete with a wide range of options in order to facilitate imposing on the text particular meanings in line with the Mu‘tazila creed. The reason for this complexity is that the Mu‘tazila go to the Qur’an loaded with theological biases, often having already decided what the text should or should not say; as if the exegete needs a set of tools to help him tame the text, and determine what the Qur’an “truly” says. It seems, thus, that the categories about the Verification of the text of the Qur’an are not really the purpose of *tafsīr* but more likely the tools that the exegete brings to the craft of *tafsīr*. In this respect, if there is any rationalism in Mu‘tazila *tafsīr*, it must take the validation of their theological system (*al-uṣūl al-khamsā*) as its point of departure and ultimate goal.¹⁶ *Tafsīr*, to put it in the words of al-Rummānī, demonstrates:

The validity of the arguments of the people of Truth against those who disagree with them, and exposes the ambiguities that the deviants from the Truth adhere to and how to refute them.¹⁷

A more specific example about this strategy comes from the comment of al-Jishumī on *Q. 7.23*:

The verse shows that they (Adam and Eve) admitted their guilt and asked for forgiveness. It also shows that the eating was their own action, thus the argument of the Compulsionists (*al-mujbira*) regarding people’s actions is invalid. It also shows that the minor sin is an offense against one’s self; we have explained what was said

¹⁶ This point does not imply that the Mu‘tazila exegetes do not tolerate diversity of opinions, or disagree among each other. My argument is that the tolerated opinions must comply with the tenets of Mu‘tazila theology. In this respect, I agree with the main point raised by KULINICH, “Beyond Theology.”

¹⁷ AL-RUMMĀNĪ, *al-Jāmi‘ al-kabīr*, Ms. London, British Library, Or. 9408, fol. 5a. See also #7 in the Appendix below.

about this. It also shows that Paradise and its food are forbidden to transgressors, thus the argument of the Postponers (*al-murji'a*) is invalid.¹⁸

In these comments, al-Jishumī aims not only to inform his readers about the proper interpretation of *Q.* 7.23, and validate two of the Mu'tazila principles: God's Justice (*al-'adl*) and Reward and Punishment (*al-wa'd wa-al-wa'id*). He equally wants to point out the error in the belief of the Compulsionists (*al-mujbira*) who uphold that God predestines the actions of humans, and to contend that sinners are forbidden the food of Paradise, contrary to the allegation of the Postponers (*al-murji'a*).

Comparable examples from other Mu'tazila exegetes show the same pattern. For instance, Ibn al-Khallāl al-Baṣrī (d. after 377/988) contends that there are only two possible interpretations for *Q.* 7.179 ﴿We have consigned to hell many Jinn and humans ...﴾:

One ... is that it foretells the outcome of their affair: they will end up in Hell by committing the actions that make them earn it. The other is that God expressed this in the past tense but intended the future, similar to His saying: ﴿The People of Paradise called out to the People of Hell﴾ (*Q.* 7:44) and clearly meant *they will call*. ... For God creates them in order to let them reach their recompense or their punishment. These two possible interpretations of this verse, whose validity we have demonstrated, disprove the contention of the contrarian and correct his argument.¹⁹

Similarly, al-Zamakhsharī's comments on *Q.* 3:182, *Q.* 5:64 and *Q.* 2:26 demonstrate not only his adherence to the tenets of Mu'tazilism, but also his profound sense of duty to defend them in *al-Kashshāf*:

The meaning of Him being not unjust to humans (in *Q.* 3:182) is that He is just towards them, and justice mandates that He punishes those who commit bad acts and rewards those who do good acts.²⁰

To withhold the hand and extend it (in *Q.* 5:64) are allegorical in the sense of stinginess and magnanimity. ... One who expresses that does not intend to prove the existence of a hand. ... He who does not consult the science of rhetoric (*'ilm al-bayān*) is blinded from attaining the evident accuracy about the interpretation of verses like this one.²¹

¹⁸ AL-JISHUMĪ, *al-Tahdhīb fī tafsīr al-qur'ān*, Ms. Vatican, AR 1026, fol. 7a. See also #8 in the Appendix below.

¹⁹ See IBN AL-KHALLĀL, *Kitāb al-Radd 'alā al-jabriyya al-qadariyya fīmā ta'allaqū bihi min mutashābih āy al-qur'ān al-karīm*, Ms. Rome, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Caetani, 332 fol. 87b-88b. See also #9 in the Appendix below.

²⁰ AL-ZAMAKHSHARĪ, *al-Kashshāf*, vol. I, p. 438. See also #10 in the Appendix below.

²¹ AL-ZAMAKHSHARĪ, *al-Kashshāf*, vol. I, p. 641-642. See also #11 in the Appendix below.

Fāsiq (in *Q.* 2:26), according to the legal definition, means the one who rebels against the command of God by committing a grave sin. His situation is in the intermediate position (*al-nāzil bayna al-manzilatayn*); that is between the position of a believer and unbeliever.²²

Al-Zamakhsharī argues in the first case that because God is Just, He is obligated to enact Reward and Punishment (both of which are tenets of Mu‘tazilism: *al-‘adl* and *al-wa‘d wa-al-wa‘īd*). In the second example, al-Zamakhsharī is clearly making a case against anthropomorphism — *yad* is purely allegorical and does not in any way mean a physical hand— which falls under the first tenet of Mu‘tazilism: *al-tawhīd*. In the third example, he asserts the Mu‘tazila tenet of *al-manzila bayna al-manzilatayn* that the sinner is a member of the Muslim community but is neither a believer nor an unbeliever.

CONCLUSION

The examples discussed above show that the Mu‘tazila exegetes place a tremendous significance on *tafsīr* as a science that unlocks the meanings of the Qur’an and make them accessible to the rest of the Muslims. They operate with the notion that proper understanding of the Qur’an requires the applications of a variety of hermeneutical tools, and it is their theological premises that determine how these tools are to be properly applied in order to reach the intended meanings and not meanings that lead to error and heresy. In this respect, *tafsīr* is needed to guard the Muslims from deceptive *tafsīrs* by opponents of the Mu‘tazila.

²² AL-ZAMAKHSHARĪ, *al-Kashshāf*, vol. I, p. 123-124. See also #12 in the Appendix below.

APPENDIX

1) Al-Jishumī, *al-Tahdhīb fī tafsīr al-qur'ān*, Ms. Ṣa'dā (Yemen), Āl Hāshīmī Library, fol. 6a-6b.

﴿هُوَ الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ، مِنْهُ آيَاتٌ مُحْكَمَاتٌ هُنَّ أُمُّ الْكِتَابِ، وَأُخَرٌ مُتَشَابِهَاتٌ﴾ (٧: ٣) ... وتدلّ على أنّ المتشابه يُردّ إلى المحكم ويطلب معناه منه. وتدلّ على أنّ المحكم والمتشابه إنما يدخل في الأصول كالتوحيد والعدل لأنّ ما يدخل من ذلك في الاجتهاديات لا يُذمّ على إتباعه فلم يبق إلا ما ذكرنا. وتدلّ على أنّ في جعل القرآن كذلك مصلحة لذلك أنزله محكماً ومتشابهاً. وقد قيل: الفائدة فيه الحثّ على النظر والمذاكرة، ولو كان جميعه محكماً لكان طريقاً للاتكال على التقليد والعدول عن النظر. وتدلّ على عظم محلّ العلماء لأن المراد بالرأسخين في العلم (٧: ٣) الذابون عن الدين، الرادون على الملحدّين والمبتدعين، ومن قام بنصرة الدين. ... وتدلّ على أنّ الحقّ يُعرف بالتفكير لذلك قال ﴿وَمَا يَذْكُرُ إِلَّا أُولُو الْأَلْبَابِ﴾ (٧: ٣). وخصّهم بالذكر لأنهم المكلفون.

2) Al-Zamakhsharī, *al-Kashshāf*, ed. Shāhīn, vol. I, p. 440.

﴿وَإِذْ أَخَذَ اللَّهُ مِيثَاقَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ لَتُبَيِّنُنَّهُ لِلنَّاسِ وَلَا تَكْتُمُونَهُ﴾ (١٨٧: ٣) ... وكفى به دليلاً على أنه مأخوذ على العلماء أن يبيّنوا الحقّ للناس وما علموه وأن لا يكتُموا منه شيئاً لغرض فاسد من تسهيل على الظلمة وتطبيب لنفوسهم واستجلاب لمسارهم، أو لجرّ منفعة وحطام دنيا.

3) Al-Zamakhsharī, *al-Kashshāf*, ed. Shāhīn, vol. I, p. 434.

﴿وَلَا يَحْسَبَنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا أَنَّمَا نُمَلِّي لَهُمْ خَيْرٌ لَأَنْفُسِهِمْ﴾ (١٧٨: ٣) ... وكان حقّها [أنما] في قياس علم الخطّ أن نكتب مفصولة، ولكنها وقعت في الإمام متصلة فلا يخالف وتتبع سنّة الإمام في خطّ المصاحف.

4) al-Jishumī, *al-Tahdhīb fī tafsīr al-qur'ān*, Ms. Qum, al-Mar'ashī Library 1719, fol. 178-179.

﴿وَقُلْنَ حَاشَ لِلَّهِ﴾ (٣١: ١٢) قرأ أبو عمرو ﴿حَاشَا﴾ بإثبات الألف على الوصل، وهي رواية الأصمعي عن نافع. قال الشاعر: حاشى أبي ثوبان إنّ به ضناً عن الملحاة والشتم. وهو الأصل لأنّه من المحاشاة، وهي التنحية والتبعيد. وقرأ الباقون بحذف الألف للتخفيف وكُره دوزها على الألسن واتباعاً للمصحف. وقال أبو عبيد: قرأتها في مصحف الإمام عثمان ﴿حَاشَ﴾ بغير ألف، قراءة العامّة.

5) Al-Zamakhsharī, *al-Kashshāf*, ed. Shāhīn, vol. I, p. 332-333.

﴿هُوَ الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ، مِنْهُ آيَاتٌ مُحْكَمَاتٌ هُنَّ أُمُّ الْكِتَابِ، وَأُخَرٌ مُتَشَابِهَاتٌ﴾ (٧: ٣). ﴿مُحْكَمَاتٌ﴾ أحكمت عبارتها بأن حُفظت من الاحتمال والاشتباه. ﴿مُتَشَابِهَاتٌ﴾ متشابهات محتملات. ﴿هُنَّ أُمُّ الْكِتَابِ﴾ أي أصل الكتاب تُحمل المتشابهات عليها وتردّ إليها. ... ولما في المتشابه من الابتلاء والتمييز بين الثابت على الحقّ والمتزلزل فيه.

6) Al-Rummānī, *al-Jāmi‘ al-kabīr*, Ms. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, ar. 6523, fol. 148b-149a.

ويقال: لما لا يجوز أن تُحمل ﴿لِيَزِدَاذُوا إِنَّمَا﴾ (٣: ١٧٨) على الأظهر من معنى اللام وهو الإرادة لزيادة الأثام؟ الجواب: لأنه لو أرادته منهم لكانوا مطيعين له بفعله ولأنَّ إرادة القبيح عَبَثٌ. وقد نفا الله جل ثناؤه ذلك بقوله: ﴿أَفَحَسِبْتُمْ أَنَّمَا خَلَقْنَاكُمْ عَبَثًا﴾ (٢٣: ١١٥) ولأنَّه يُرَدُّ إلى المحكم في قوله: ﴿وَمَا خَلَقْتُ الْجِنَّ وَالْإِنْسَ إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُونِ﴾ (٥١: ٥٦).

7) Al-Rummānī, *al-Jāmi‘ al-kabīr*, Ms. London, British Library, Or. 9408, fol. 5a.

وسنذكر بعون الله من الدلالات ما يكون فيه حجة لأهل الحق على من خالفهم والشبه التي يتعلّق بها أهل الزيغ والجواب لهم.

8) Al-Jishumī, *al-Tahdhīb fī tafsīr al-qur‘ān*, Ms. Vatican, AR 1026, fol. 7a.

قوله تعالى: ﴿وَنَادَاهُمَا رَبُّهُمَا أَلَمْ أَنهَكُمَا عَن تَلَکُمَا الشَّجَرَةَ وَأَقَلُّ لَكُمَا إِنَّ الشَّيْطَانَ لَكُمَا عَدُوٌّ مُّبِينٌ. قَالَ رَبَّنَا ظَلَمْنَا أَنفُسَنَا وَإِن لَّمْ تَغْفِرْ لَنَا وَتَرْحَمْنَا لَنَكُونَنَّ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِينَ. قَالَ اهْبِطُوا بَعْضُكُمْ لِبَعْضٍ عَدُوٌّ وَلَكُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ مُسْتَقَرٌّ وَمَتَاعٌ إِلَىٰ حِينٍ﴾ (٧: ٢٢-٢٣) ... وتدلّ على أنه تعالى أمره بالتحرّر من الشيطان فإذا أوجب عليه ذلك مع جلالته قدره فعلينا وجب وإذا أوجب التحرّر منه لأنه يدعو إلى الفساد فكلّ من هذا حاله وجب التحرّر منه، فلهذا قلنا يجب التحرّر أولاً من الكفّار ثمّ من المبتدعة ثمّ من الظلمة وأهل الفساد. وتدلّ على اعترافهما بالذنب وسؤالهما المغفرة فدلّ أنّ الأكل كان فعلهما، فبطل قول المجبرة في المخلوق. وتدلّ على أنّ الصغيرة ظلم للنفس وقد بيّنا ما قيل فيه. وتدلّ على أنّ الجنّة وطعامها حرامٌ على العصاة، فبطل قول المرجئة.

9) Ibn al-Khallāl al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-Radd ‘alā al-jabriyya al-qadariyya fīmā ta‘allaqū bihi min mutashābih āy al-qur‘ān al-karīm*, Ms. Rome, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Caetani 332., fol. 87b-88b.

وفي قوله: ﴿وَلَقَدْ ذَرَأْنَا لِجَهَنَّمَ كَثِيرًا مِّنَ الْجِنَّ وَالْإِنْسِ﴾ (٧: ١٧٩) ... وجهان من التأويل. أحدهما، قد تقدّم ذكره في تأويل قوله ﴿إِنَّمَا نُمَلِّي لَهُمْ لِيَزِدَاذُوا إِنَّمَا﴾ وهو أنه الإخبار عن عاقبة أمرهم وأنهم إلى النار يصيرون وبما يوجب دخولها يعملون ... والوجه الثاني، أنه أتى بهذا الخبر بصيغة الماضي وأراد المستقبل كقوله: ﴿وَنَادَىٰ أَصْحَابُ الْجَنَّةِ أَصْحَابَ النَّارِ﴾ (٧: ٤٤) وأراد أنهم سينادون ... وإنما يخلقهم ليوصلهم إلى استحقاقاتهم من آياته أو معاقبته. فالوجهان اللذان أرينا جوازهما في هذه الآية واطراد معناهما يسقطان ما ذهب إليه المخالف ويصحّ مذهبه.

10) Al-Zamakhsharī, *al-Kashshāf*, ed. Shāhīn, vol. I, p. 438.

معنى كونه غير ظلامٍ للعبيد (٣: ١٨٢) أنه عادل عليهم، ومن العدل أن يعاقب المسيء منهم ويثيب المحسن.

11) Al-Zamakhsharī, *al-Kashshāf*, ed. Shāhīn, vol. I, p. 641-642.

﴿وَقَالَتِ الْيَهُودُ يَدُ اللَّهِ مَغْلُوبَةٌ﴾ (٥: ٦٤) غلّ اليد وبسطها مجاز عن البخل والجود ... ولا يقصد من يتكلم به إثبات يد ... ومن لم ينظر في علم البيان عمى عن تبصّر محجة الصواب في تأويل أمثال هذه الآية.

12) Al-Zamakhsharī, *al-Kashshāf*, ed. Shāhīn, vol. I, p. 123-124.

﴿وَمَا يُضِلُّ بِهِ إِلَّا الْفَاسِقِينَ﴾ (٢: ٢٦) ... والفاسيق في الشريعة الخارج عن أمر الله بارتكاب الكبيرة وهو النازل بين المنزلتين، أي بين منزلة المؤمن والكافر.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts

IBN AL-KHALLĀL al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-Radd ‘alā al-jabriyya al-qadariyya fīmā ta‘allaqū bihi min mutashābih āy al-qur’ān al-karīm*

Ms. Rome, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Caetani, 332.

AL-JISHUMĪ Abū Sa‘d, *al-Tahdhīb fī tafsīr al-qur’ān*

– Ms. Qum, al-Mar‘ashī Library 1719.

– Ms. Ṣa‘dā (Yemen), Āl Hāshīmī Library.

– Ms. Vatican, AR 1026.

AL-RUMMĀNĪ ‘Alī b. ‘Īsā, *al-Jāmi‘ al-kabīr*

– Ms. London, British Library, Or. 9408.

– Ms. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, ar. 6523.

Sources

AL-ZAMAKHSHARĪ Abū al-Qāsim Maḥmūd (1995), *Tafsīr al-Kashshāf*, 4 vol., ed. SHĀHĪN Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Salām, Dār al-Kutub al-‘ilmiyya, Beirut.

Studies

FUDGE Bruce G. (2011), *Qur’ānic Hermeneutics: al-Ṭabrisī and the Craft of Commentary*, Routledge, London.

KULINICH Alena (2015), “Beyond Theology: Mu‘tazilite Scholars and their Authority in al-Rummānī’s *Tafsīr*,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 78.1, p. 135-148.

MOURAD Suleiman A. (2008), “Ibn al-Khallāl al-Baṣrī (d. after 377/988) and his Œuvre on the Problematic Verses of the Qur’ān, *Kitāb al-Radd ‘alā al-jabriyya al-qadariyya* (Refutation of the Predestinarian Compulsionists),” in ADANG Camilla, SCHMIDTKE Sabine and SKLARE David (eds.), *A Common Rationality: Mu‘tazilism in Islam and Judaism*, Ergon Verlag, Würzburg, p. 81-99.

Id. (2013), “The Mu‘tazila & their *Tafsīr* Tradition: A Comparative Study of Five Exegetical Glosses on Qur’an. 3.178,” in SHAH Mustafa (ed.), *Tafsīr: Interpreting the Qur’an*, 4 vol., Routledge, London, vol. III, p. 267-282.

Id. (2013), “Towards a Reconstruction of the Mu‘tazilī Tradition of Qur’anic Exegesis: Reading the Introduction of the *Tahdhīb* of al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī (d. 494/1101) and its Application,” in BAUER Karen (ed.), *Aims, Methods and Contexts of Qur’anic Exegesis (2nd/8th – 9th/15th C.)*, Oxford University Press in association with The Institute of Ismaili Studies, Oxford/London, p. 101-137.

- Id.* (2012), “The Revealed Text and the Intended Subtext: Notes on the Hermeneutics of the Qur’ān in Mu‘tazila Discourse as Reflected in the Tahdhīb of al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī (d. 494/1101),” in OPWIS Felicitas and REISMAN David (eds.), *Islamic Philosophy, Science, Culture, and Religion: Studies in Honor of Dimitri Gutas*, Brill, Leiden, p. 367-395.
- SALEH Walid A. (2004), *The Formation of Classical Tafsīr Tradition: The Qur’ān Commentary of al-Tha‘labī (d. 427/1035)*, Brill, Leiden.
- ULLAH Kifayat (2013), “*Al-Kashshāf*: Al-Zamakhsharī’s (d. 538/1144) Mu‘tazilite Exegesis of the Qur’ān,” Ph.D. Dissertation, Georgetown University.