Galadari, Abdulla. "Notes." *Qur#anic Hermeneutics: Between Science, History, and the Bible*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. 153–214. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350070059.0007>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 14:16 UTC.

Copyright © by Abdulla Galadari. This Work is Licensed under the Creative Commons License. 2018. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Notes

Chapter 1: The Science Behind Revelation

- 1 Macdonald, Duncan B., *Aspects of Islam* (New York: Macmillan, 1911), 63–64.
- 2 Rodinson, Maxime, *Muhammad: Prophet of Islam* (London: Tauris Parke Paperbacks, 2002), 54–60.
- 3 To assess methods for understanding personality traits and psychological assessments from psychobiography, see Runyan, William M., ed. *Life Histories and Psychobiography: Explorations in Theory and Method* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982); Alexander, Irving A., “Personality, Psychological Assessment, and Psychobiography,” *Journal of Personality* 56, no.1 (1988): 265–294.
- 4 These are the same reasons why Bas van Os also considers limitations to perform a sound psychobiography of Jesus. See van Os, Bas, “The Problem of Writing a Psychobiography of Jesus,” in *Psychological Hermeneutics for Biblical Themes and Texts: A Festschrift in Honor of Wayne G. Rollins*, ed. J. Harold Ellens (London: T&T Clark, 2012), 84–96.
- 5 Examples include Sina, Ali, *Understanding Muhammad: A Psychobiography of Allah’s Prophet* (n.p.: FaithFreedom Publishing, 2008); and Das, Sujit, *Islam Dismantled: The Mental Illness of Prophet Muhammad* (n.p.: Felibri Publications, 2012).
- 6 See also Szaluta, Jacques, *Psychohistory: Theory and Practice* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 1999).
- 7 See Rollins, Wayne G., *Soul and Psyche: The Bible in Psychological Perspective* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999); Kille, D. Andrew, *Psychological Biblical Criticism* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2000); Ellens, J. Harold, and Rollins, Wayne G. *Psychology and the Bible: A New Way to Read the Scriptures* (Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood, 2004); Rollins, Wayne G., and Kille, D. Andrew, *Psychological Insight into the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2007); Daschke, Derek, and Kille, D. Andrew, eds., *A Cry Instead of Justice: The Bible and Cultures of Violence in Psychological Perspective* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010); Ellens, J. Harold ed., *Psychological Hermeneutics for Biblical Themes and Texts* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2012). For more on Psychological Biblical Criticism and hermeneutics, see Edinger, Edward F. *The Bible and the Psyche: Individuation Symbolism in the Old Testament* (Toronto: Inner City Books, 1986); Halperin, David J. *Seeking Ezekiel: Text and Psychology* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 1993); Drewermann, Eugen, *Discovering the God Child Within: A Spiritual Psychology of the Infancy of Jesus*, trans. Peter Heinegg (New York, NY: Crossroad, 1994); Miller, John W. *Jesus at Thirty: A Psychological and Historical Portrait* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1997); Meissner, William W. *The Cultic Origins of Christianity: The Dynamic of Religious Development* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000); Berger, Klaus, *Identity and Experience in the New Testament* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2003); Efthimiadis-Keith, Helen, *The Enemy Is Within: A Jungian Psychoanalytic Approach to the Book of Judith* (Leiden: Brill, 2004); Kamp, Albert H. *Inner Worlds: A Cognitive*

- Linguistic Approach to the Book of Jonah* (Leiden: Brill, 2004); Newheart, Michael W. *My Name Is Legion: The Story and Soul of the Gerasene Demoniac* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2004); Capps, Donald, *Jesus the Village Psychiatrist* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2008); Capps, Donald *Jesus: A Psychological Biography* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2010); van Os, Bas, *Psychological Analyses and the Historical Jesus: New Ways to Explore Christian Origins* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010).
- 8 El-Badawi, Emran, *The Qur'an and the Aramaic Gospel Traditions* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013).
 - 9 Kille, *Psychological Biblical Criticism*, 28.
 - 10 Galadari, Abdulla, "The Qibla: An Allusion to the Shema'," *Comparative Islamic Studies* 9, no. 2 (2013): 165–193.
 - 11 Qur'an 43:23.
 - 12 Ibid., 4:82.
 - 13 Qur'an 47:24.
 - 14 This is not only a modern view of interpretation, but it also started with classical exegetes who tried to take into consideration the circumstances of revelations (*asbāb al-nuzūl*) in Qur'anic exegesis.
 - 15 Gibbs Jr. Raymond W., "Authorial Intentions in Text Understanding," *Discourse Processes* 32, no. 1 (2001): 73–80.
 - 16 Gibbs Jr., Raymond W., Kushner, Julia M., and Mills III, W. Rob, "Authorial Intentions and Metaphor Comprehension," *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 20, no. 1 (1991): 11–30.
 - 17 Katz, Albert N. and Lee, Christopher J., "The Role of Authorial Intent in Determining Verbal Irony and Metaphor," *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 8, no. 4 (1993): 257–279.
 - 18 Understanding authorial intent can be filled with bias. For further details, see VanSledright, Bruce A., "What Does It Mean to Think Historically . . . and How Do You Teach It?" *Social Education* 68, no. 3 (2004): 230–233.
 - 19 See Wansbrough, John, E., *Qur'anic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977); Crone, Patricia and Cook, Michael, *Hagarism: The Making of the Islamic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977); Wansbrough, John, E., *The Sectarial Milieu: Content and Composition of Islamic Salvation History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978); Crone, Patricia, *Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980). See also Rippin, Andrew, ed., *Approaches to the History of the Interpretation of the Qur'an* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988); Reynolds, Gabriel S., *The Qur'an and Its Biblical Subtext* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010).
 - 20 Donner, Fred, *Muhammad and the Believers: At the Origins of Islam* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010).
 - 21 Donner, *Muhammad and the Believers*, 204.
 - 22 For neuropsychology of creative individuals, see Camfield, David, "Neurobiology of Creativity," in *Neurobiology of Exceptionality*, ed. Con Stough (New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum, 2005), 53–72; Richards, Ruth, "A Creative Alchemy," in *The Ethics of Creativity*, eds. Seana Moran, David Cropley, and James C. Kaufman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 119–136.
 - 23 Räisänen, Heikki, "The Portrait of Jesus in the Qur'an: Reflections of a Biblical Scholar," *The Muslim World* 70, no. 2 (1980): 122–133.
 - 24 Ibid., 124.

- 25 For an overview, you may refer to Almond, Philip C., *Mystical Experience and Religious Doctrine: An Investigation of the Study of Mysticism in World Religions* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1982).
- 26 One of the earliest studies in modern psychology about religious experiences is James, William, *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (New York, NY: Longmans, Green & Co, 1902); Freud, Sigmund, "A Religious Experience," *The Psychoanalytic Review*, 20 (1933): 352; Proudfoot, Wayne, *Religious Experience* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985). Carl Jung has devoted his life and work to understanding the psychology of mystical experiences; examples of his works include *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1933) and *Psychology and Religion* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1938).
- 27 For an overview of the relationship between psychology, cognition, and neuroscience in religious experiences, see Paloutzian, Raymond F. and Park, Crystal L. eds., *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* (New York, NY: The Guilford Press, 2013); Beit-Hallahmi, Benjamin and Argyle, Michael, *The Psychology of Religious Behaviour, Belief and Experience* (London: Routledge, 1997).
- 28 For an overview of neurotheology, see Newberg, Andrew B., *Principles of Neurotheology* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).
- 29 Brandt, P.Y., Clément, F., and Manning, R.R., "Neurotheology: Challenges and Opportunities," *Schweizer Archiv für Neurologie und Psychiatrie* 161, no. 8 (2010): 305–309.
- 30 Ashbrook, James B., "Neurotheology: The Working Brain and the Work of Theology," *Zygon* 19, no. 3 (1984): 331–350.
- 31 Joseph, Rhawn, "The Limbic System and the Soul: Evolution and the Neuroanatomy of Religious Experience," *Zygon* 36, no. 1 (2001): 105–136.
- 32 Ibid., 105–106.
- 33 Ibid., 107.
- 34 For examples, see Schwarcz, H. P., Grün, R., Vandermeersch, B., Bar-Yosef, O., Valladas, H., and Tchernov, E., "ESR Dates for the Hominid Burial Site of Qafzeh in Israel," *Journal of Human Evolution* 17, no. 8 (1988): 733–737; Stringer, C. B., Grün, R., Schwarcz, H. P., and Goldberg, P., "ESR Dates for the Hominid Burial Site of Es Skhul in Israel," *Nature* 338 (1989): 756–758.
- 35 Zilhão, João, "Lower and Middle Palaeolithic Mortuary Behaviours and the Origins of Ritual Burial," in *Death Rituals, Social Order and the Archaeology of Immortality in the Ancient World: Death Shall Have No Dominion*, eds. Colin Renfrew, Michael J. Boyd, and Iain Morley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 27–44.
- 36 This is suggested by Zilhão, "Lower and Middle Palaeolithic," 43.
- 37 Examples may be seen in Belfer-Cohen, Anna and Hovers, Erella, "In the Eye of the Beholder: Mousterian and Natufian Burials in the Levant," *Current Anthropology* 33, no. 4 (1992): 463–471.
- 38 Robert Gargett provides two possible theories in that Neanderthals either believed an afterlife or had an emotional capacity like ours. See Gargett, Robert H., "Grave Shortcomings: The Evidence for Neanderthal Burial," *Current Anthropology* 30, no. 2 (1989): 157–190.
- 39 Piel, Alexander K. and Stewart, Fiona A., "Non-Human Animal Responses Towards the Dead and Death: A Comparative Approach to Understanding the Evolution of Human Mortuary Practice," in *Death Rituals, Social Order and the Archaeology of Immortality in the Ancient World: Death Shall Have No Dominion*, eds. Colin Renfrew, Michael J. Boyd, and Iain Morley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 15–26.
- 40 Ibid., 23.

- 41 For more on the association between dreaming and religious experience see Kahn, David, "From Chaos to Self-Organization: The Brain, Dreaming, and Religious Experience," in *Soul, Psyche, Brain: New Directions in the Study of Religion and Brain-Mind Science*, ed. Kelly Bulkeley (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 138–158.
- 42 Between 1913 and 1916, Jung developed a meditation technique called "active imagination" for inducing visions. During hypnagogic states, he introduced visualization techniques to induce autonomous waking imaginations that were not consciously directed. For details of this technique, see Jung, Carl G. *Active Imagination* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997). For more on the mystical visions across religions refer to Merkur, Dan, *Gnosis: An Esoteric Tradition of Mystical Visions and Unions* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1993).
- 43 You may refer to Yu, Calvin K. C., "Toward 100% Dream Retrieval by Rapid-Eye-Movement Sleep Awakening: A High-Density Electroencephalographic Study," *Dreaming* 24, no. 1 (2014): 1–17.
- 44 Louie, Kenway and Wilson, Matthew A., "Temporally Structured Replay of Awake Hippocampal Ensemble Activity during Rapid Eye Movement Sleep," *Neuron*, 29, no. 1 (2001): 1454–156.
- 45 See Hurovitz, Craig S., Dunn, Sarah, Domhoff, G. William, and Fiss, Harry, "The Dreams of Blind Men and Women: A Replication and Extension of Previous Findings," *Dreaming* 9, no. 2/3 (1999): 183–193; Kerr, Nancy H. and Domhoff, G. William, "Do the Blind Literally 'See' in Their Dreams? A Critique of a Recent Claim that They Do," *Dreaming*, 14, no. 4 (2004): 230–233. The difference between perception and visual imagery has to be noted. Congenitally blind individuals can construct visual forms and perceive spatial relationships having spatial mental imagery, but do not visually see; see Kaski, Diego, "Revision: Is Visual Perception a Requisite for Visual Imagery?" *Perception* 31, no. 6 (2002): 717–731; Aleman, Andre, van Lee, Laura, Mantione, Mariska H. M., and de Haan, Edward, "Visual Imagery Without Visual Experience: Evidence from Congenitally Totally Blind People," *Neuroreport* 12, no. 11 (2001): 2601–2604; D'Agostino, Armando, Castelnovo, Anna, and Scarone, Silvio, "Non-pathological Associations: Sleep and Dreams, Deprivation and Bereavement," in *The Neuroscience of Visual Hallucinations*, eds. Daniel Collerton, Urs P. Mosimann, and Elaine Perry (Chichester: Wiley, 2015), 59–89.
- 46 Krill, A., Alpert, H. J., and Ostfeld, A. M., "Effects of a Hallucinogenic Agent in Totally Blind Subjects," *Archives of Ophthalmology* 62, no. 2 (1963): 180–185.
- 47 Aleman et al., "Visual Imagery Without Visual Experience," 2601–2604.
- 48 Voss, Ursula, Tuin, Inka, Schermelleh-Engel, Karin, and Hobson, Allan, "Waking and Dreaming: Related but Structurally Independent—Dream Reports of Congenitally Paraplegic and Deaf-Mute Persons," *Consciousness and Cognition* 20, no. 3 (2011): 673–687.
- 49 Ibid.
- 50 McCreery, Charles, *Dreams and Psychosis: A New Look at an Old Hypothesis* (n.p.: Oxford Forum, 2008).
- 51 Nielsen, Tore A., and Stenstrom, Philippe, "What Are the Memory Sources of Dreaming?" *Nature* 437 (2005): 1286–1289.
- 52 Fingelkurts, Alexander A. and Fingelkurts, Andrew A., "Is Our Brain Hardwired to Produce God, or is Our Brain Hardwired to Perceive God? A Systematic Review on the Role of the Brain in Mediating Religious Experience," *Cognitive Processing* 10, no. 4 (2009): 293–326. The last statement refers to Newberg, Andrew B. and Lee, B. Y., "The Neuroscientific Study of Religious and Spiritual Phenomena: Or Why God Doesn't Use Biostatistics," *Zygon* 40, no. 2 (2005): 469–489.

- 53 Joseph, "The Limbic System."
- 54 See Catani, Marco, Dell'Acqua, Flavio, Thiebaut de Schotten, Michel, "A Revised Limbic System Model for Memory, Emotion, and Behaviour," *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 37, no. 8 (2013): 1724–1737. Also, for recent studies on the limbic systems (not just a single one), see Rolls, Edmund T., "Limbic Systems for Emotion and for Memory, but No Single Limbic System," *Cortex* 62 (2015): 119–157.
- 55 Joseph, "The Limbic System," 132; Saver, Jeffrey L. and Rabin, John, "The Neural Substrates of Religious Experience," in *The Neuropsychiatry of Limbic and Subcortical Disorders*, eds. Stephen Salloway, Paul Malloy, and Jeffrey L. Cummings (Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press, 1997), 195–215.
- 56 Joseph, "The Limbic System," 132–133.
- 57 See Kéri, Szabolcs, "Genes for Psychosis and Creativity: A Promoter Polymorphism of the Neuregulin 1 Gene Is Related to Creativity in People with High Intellectual Achievement," *Psychological Science* 20, no. 9 (2009): 1070–1073; O'Reilly, Thomas, Dunbar, Robin, and Bentall, Richard, "Schizotypy and Creativity: An Evolutionary Connection?" *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31, no. 7 (2001): 1067–1078.
- 58 Lodge, Daniel J. and Grace, Anthony A., "Developmental Pathology, Dopamine, Stress, and Schizophrenia," *International Journal of Developmental Neuroscience* 29, no. 3 (2011): 207–213.
- 59 Kozbelt, Aaron, Kaufman, Scott Barry, Walder, Deborah J., Ospina, Luz H., and Kim, Joseph U., "The Evolutionary Genetics of the Creativity–Psychosis Connection," in *Creativity and Mental Illness*, ed. James C. Kaufman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 102–132.
- 60 Lecture by Andani, Khalil {2017} "The Speaking Qur'an: Revelation in Sunni & Shia Islam," Austin, TX: University of Texas, 7 April 2017
- 61 Qur'an 26:193–194.
- 62 Al-Zarkashī (d. 794/1392), *al-Burhān fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān* (Beirut: Dār Ihyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabiyyah, 1957), 1: 229–230.
- 63 Abu Zayd, Nasr Hamid, *Maḥmūd al-naṣṣ: Dirāsah fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān* (Rabat: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfi al-'Arabī, orig. 1998/2014), 42–52, 55–57.
- 64 Ibid.
- 65 Soroush, Abdulkarim, *The Expansion of Prophetic Experience: Essays on Historicity, Contingency and Plurality in Religion*, trans. Nilou Mobasser (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 209–211, 272.
- 66 Ibid., 336.
- 67 Ibid., 332–333.
- 68 Al-Zarkashī, *al-Burhān fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*.
- 69 Sayadmansour, Alireza, "Neurotheology: The Relationship Between Brain and Religion," *Iranian Journal of Neurology* 13, no. 1 (2014): 52–55.
- 70 See Ibn Ishāq (d. 151/768), *Sīrah* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1978), 120–121; Ibn Hishām (d. 213/833) *Sīrah* (Cairo: Maktabat wa Maṭba'at Muṣṭafa al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī wa Awlādih, 1955), 1: 239–240.
- 71 We do not have conclusive evidence of Muḥammad eating less in the cave, but his seclusion might make it likely. This is also the opinion of Ibn 'Āshūr (d. 1973). See Ibn 'Āshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wal-tanwīr* (Tunis: al-Dār al-Tūnisiyyah lil-Nashr, 1984), 2: 172 on Qur'an 2:185.
- 72 Yung, Alison R. and McGorry, Patrick D., "The Prodromal Phase of First-Episode Psychosis: Past and Current Conceptualizations," *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 22, no. 2 (1996): 353–370.

- 73 Al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923), *Jāmi' al-bayān fī ta'wīl al-Qur'ān*, ed. Aḥmad Shākīr (Damascus: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 2000), Q 74:1, 23:7–9.
- 74 Yung, and McGorry, "The Prodromal Phase of First-Episode Psychosis."
- 75 Ibn Ishāq, *Sīrah*, 121.
- 76 Ibid., 121.
- 77 Auditory and visual hallucinations are also found in the writings of Ezekiel (a prophet from the Hebrew Bible). As Muḥammad also shows that God commands him to do things according to the Qur'an, so is Ezekiel commanded to do things. The modern diagnosis of Ezekiel's state of mind is a case of schizophrenia. See Stein, George, "The Voices that Ezekiel Hears: Psychiatry in the Old Testament," *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 196, no. 2 (2010): 101.
- 78 Similarly, Ezekiel also interprets his hallucinations with grandiose delusions as stated by Edwin Broome, Jr. See Broome Jr., Edwin C., "Ezekiel's Abnormal Personality," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 65, no. 3 (1946): 277–292.
- 79 The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders version 4 (DSM-IV) published by the American Psychiatric Association (APA) states that for a schizophrenia diagnosis two or more of the following symptoms must exist, each present for a significant portion of time during a one-month period, (a) delusions, (b) hallucinations, (c) disorganized speech, (d) grossly disorganized or catatonic behavior, (e) negative symptoms. Muḥammad apparently had delusions and hallucinations. However, Muḥammad did not experience other symptoms such as social/occupational dysfunction or negative symptoms. Hence, he might not have been considered schizophrenic but what is considered not-otherwise-specified (NOS) psychotic disorder, since his symptoms are not specific to any type, according to DSM-IV. Frank Freemon also excludes a schizophrenia diagnosis due to Muḥammad's leadership ability. See Freemon, Frank R., "A Differential Diagnosis of the Inspirational Spells of Muḥammad the Prophet of Islam," *Epilepsia*, 17 (1976): 423–427. Although Freemon considers epileptic seizures as the likely diagnosis of Muḥammad, I find low latent inhibition coupled with high intelligence as the most likely diagnosis, where Muḥammad entered a psychotic state. But his intelligence protected him from delving into psychosis or mental illness, and instead made him very creative. Similarly, in the case of Ezekiel, Eric Altschuler also suggested that since schizophrenia causes diminished social functioning, then he also excludes schizophrenia as a possible diagnosis for Ezekiel, and considers temporal lobe epilepsy as a possible alternative. See Altschuler, Eric, "Did Ezekiel Have Temporal Lobe Epilepsy?" *Archives of General Psychiatry* 59, no. 6 (2002): 561–562. However, I consider Ezekiel also to have been a case of low latent inhibition coupled with high intelligence, who might have suffered from a psychotic state of mind without truly delving into psychosis or mental illness.
- 80 Joseph, "The Limbic System," 129; d'Aquili, Eugene and Newberg, Andrew, "Religious and Mystical States: A Neuropsychological Model," *Zygon* 28, no. 2 (1993): 177–200; de Ropp, R. S., "Psychedelic Drugs and Religious Experience," in *Magic, Witchcraft, and Religion*, eds. A. C. Lehmann and J. E. Myers (Mountain View, CA: Mayfield, 1993); Frazier, J. G. *The Golden Bough* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1950); James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*; Lehmann, A. C. and Myers, J. E. eds., *Magic, Witchcraft, and Religion* (Mountain View, CA: Mayfield, 1993); Malinowski, Bronislaw, *Magic, Science and Religion* (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1954); Neihardt, J. G. and Black Elk, *Black Elk Speaks* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1979); Smart, N. *The Religious Experience of Mankind* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1969). For the last statement,

- see Joseph, Rhawn, "Traumatic Amnesia, Repression, and Hippocampus Injury Due to Emotional Stress, Corticosteroids and Enkephalins," *Child Psychiatry and Human Development* 29, no. 2 (1998): 169–185; Joseph, Rhawn "Early Environmental Influences on Neural Plasticity, the Limbic System, and Social Emotional Development and Attachment," *Child Psychiatry and Human Development* 29, no. 3 (1999): 189–208; Joseph, Rhawn, "The Neurology of Traumatic 'Dissociative' Amnesia: Commentary and Literature Review," *Child Abuse and Neglect* 23, no. 8 (1999): 715–727; Joseph, Rhawn, *The Transmitter to God: The Limbic System, the Soul, and Spirituality* (San Jose, CA: University Press California, 2000).
- 81 Consider Michel Cuypers' works on the rhetoric style of the Qur'an. See Cuypers, Michel, *The Composition of the Qur'an: Rhetorical Analysis* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015).
 - 82 Krippner, Stanley, Richards, Ruth, and Abraham, Frederick D., "Creativity and Chaos While Waking and Dreaming," *Lumina* 21, no. 2 (2010): 7.
 - 83 Muḥammad's mental state may be comparable to that of Abraham, Moses, Ezekiel, Jesus, and Paul who some modern psychiatrists studied and suspect to have had psychotic disorders. See Murray, Evan D., Cunningham, Miles G. and Price, Bruce, "The Role of Psychotic Disorders in Religious History Considered," *The Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences* 24, no. 4 (2012): 410–426; van Nuys, Kelvin, "Evaluating the Pathological in Prophetic Experience (Particularly in Ezekiel)," *Journal of Bible and Religion* 21, no. 4 (1953): 244–251.
 - 84 Barrantes-Vidal, Neus, "Creativity & Madness Revisited from Current Psychological Perspectives," *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 1, no. 3/4 (2004): 58–78.
 - 85 See Eysenck, Hans J., "Creativity as a Product of Intelligence and Personality," in *International Handbook of Personality and Intelligence* eds. Donald H. Saklofske and Moshe Zeidner (Berlin: Springer, 1995), 231–247; Prentky, R. A., "Mental Illness and Roots of Genius," *Creativity Research Journal* 13, no. 1 (2010): 95–104; Fink, Andreas, Slamar-Halbedl, Mirjam, Unterrainer, Human F., and Weiss, Elisabeth M., "Creativity: Genius, Madness, or a Combination of Both?" *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts* 6, no. 1 (2012): 11–18.
 - 86 Thalbourne, Michael A. and Delin, Peter S., "A Common Thread Underlying Belief in the Paranormal, Creative Personality, Mystical Experience and Psychopathology," *The Journal of Parapsychology* 58 (1994): 3–38.
 - 87 It is inconclusive to state if Muḥammad had high working memory. He had scribes writing the Qur'an. This could mean that he may not necessarily have had high working memory, although it is more likely that he did, since scribes were perhaps used for preservation of the Qur'an for the community after Muḥammad's demise.
 - 88 See Benedek, Mathias, Franz, Fabiola, Heene, Moritz, and Neubauer, Aljoscha C., "Differential Effects of Cognitive Inhibition and Intelligence on Creativity," *Personality and Individual Differences* 53, no. 4 (2012): 480–485; Carson, Shelley H., Petersen, Jordan B., and Higgins, Daniel M., "Decreased Latent Inhibition Is Associated with Increased Creative Achievement in High-Functioning Individuals," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85 (2003): 499–506; Drus, Marina, Kozbelt, Aaron, and Hughes, Robert R., "Creativity, Psychopathology, and Emotion Processing: A Liberal Response Bias for Remembering Negative Information Is Associated with Higher Creativity," *Creativity Research Journal* 26, no. 3 (2014): 251–262.
 - 89 Braff, David L., "Information Processing and Attention Dysfunctions in Schizophrenia," *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 19 (1993): 233–259.

- 90 For a salutogenic sense of coherence concept on how people may establish a support system both internally and externally, see Antonovsky, Aaron, *Unraveling the Mystery of Health: How People Manage Stress and Stay Well* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1987).
- 91 See Benedek et al., "Differential Effects." Also see Carson et al., "Decreased Latent Inhibition." Also see Carson, Shelley H., "Creativity and Psychopathology: A Shared Vulnerability Model," *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 56 (2011): 144–153; Maçkali, Zeynep, Gülöksüz, Sinan, and Oral, Timuçin, "Creativity and Bipolar Disorder," *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry* 25, no. 1 (2014): 50–59.
- 92 Flaherty, Alice W., "Frontotemporal and Dopaminergic Control of Idea Generation and Creative Drive," *Journal of Comparative Neurology* 493, no. 1 (2005): 147–153.
- 93 Chiappe, Dan L. and Chiappe, Penny, "The Role of Working Memory in Metaphor Production and Comprehension," *Journal of Memory and Language* 56 (2007): 172–188.
- 94 Flaherty, "Frontotemporal and Dopaminergic Control."
- 95 Carson et al., "Decreased Latent Inhibition."
- 96 As attested in the traditional account from some Qur'anic passages (e.g., Qur'an 15:6, 34:46, 37:36).
- 97 Schuldberg, David, "Six Subclinical Spectrum Traits in Normal Creativity," *Creativity Research Journal* 13, no. 1 (2000): 5–16.
- 98 See Nunn, J. and Peters, E., "Schizotypy and Patterns of Lateral Asymmetry on Hemisphere-Specific Language Tasks," *Psychiatry Research* 103 (2001): 179–192; Langdon, R. and Coltheart, M., "Recognition of Metaphor and Irony in Young Adults: The Impact of Schizotypal Personality Traits," *Psychiatry Research* 125 (2004): 9–20.
- 99 Mitchell, R. L. C. and Crow, T. J., "Right Hemisphere Language Functions and Schizophrenia: The Forgotten Hemisphere?" *Brain: A Journal of Neurology* 128 (2005): 963–978.
- 100 See Mohr, C., Graves, R. E., Gianotti, L. R. R., Pizzagalli, D., and Brugger, P., "Loose but Normal: A Semantic Association Study," *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 30 (2001): 475–483; Pizzagalli, D., Lehmann, D., and Brugger, P., "Lateralized Direct and Indirect Semantic Priming Effects in Subjects with Paranormal Experiences and Beliefs," *Psychopathology* 34 (2001): 75–80; Kiang, M. and Kutas, M., "Abnormal Typicality of Responses on a Category Fluency Task in Schizotypy," *Psychiatry Research* 145 (2006): 119–126; Grimshaw, G. M., Bryson, F. M., Atchley, R. A., and Humphrey, M., "Semantic Ambiguity Resolution in Positive Schizotypy: A Right Hemisphere Interpretation," *Neuropsychology* 24 (2010): 130–138.
- 101 Mohr et al., "Loose but Normal."
- 102 Gianotti, L. R. R., Mohr, C., Pizzagalli, D., Lehmann, D., and Brugger, P., "Associative Processing and Paranormal Belief," *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences* 55 (2001): 595–603.
- 103 Grimshaw et al., "Semantic Ambiguity Resolution."
- 104 For an overview of related research, see Hinzen, Wolfram and Rosselló, Joana, "The Linguistics of Schizophrenia: Thought Disturbance as Language Pathology Across Positive Symptoms," *Frontiers in Psychology* 6 (2015): art. 971. <http://dro.dur.ac.uk/15916/>.
- 105 Andreasen, N. C. and Glick, I. D., "Creativity and Mental Illness: Prevalence Rates in Writers and Their First-degree Relatives," *American Journal of Psychology* 144 (1987): 1288–1292.

- 106 Kaufman, James C., "Dissecting the Golden Goose: Components of Studying Creative Writers," *Creativity Research Journal* 14, no. 1 (2002): 27–40.
- 107 The term "normal" individuals is as found in psychiatric and psychological literature. Personally, I think "normal" is not well defined. Every person is unique, and so it is common and normal to be unique, whichever, whatever, and however such uniqueness may exhibit.
- 108 See Baruch, Ilan, Hemsley, David R., and Gray, Jeffrey A., "Latent Inhibition and 'Psychotic Proneness' in Normal Subjects," *Personality and Individual Differences* 9, no. 4 (1988): 777–783; Lubow, R. E., Ingberg-Sachs, Y., Zalstein-Orda, N., and Gewirtz, J. C., "Latent Inhibition in Low and High 'Psychotic-Prone' Normal Subjects," *Personality and Individual Differences* 13, no. 5 (1992): 563–572; Lubow, R. E. and Gewirtz, J. C., "Latent Inhibition in Humans: Data, Theory, and Implications for Schizophrenia," *Psychological Bulletin* 117, no. 1 (1995): 87–103.
- 109 See Leonhard, Dirk M. A., and Brugger, Peter, "Creative, Paranormal, and Delusional Thought: A Consequence of Right Hemisphere Semantic Activation?" *Neuropsychiatry, Neuropsychology, & Behavioral Neurology* 11, no. 4 (1998): 177–183; Rominger, Christian, Weiss, Elisabeth M., Fink, Andreas, Schuler, Günter, and Papousek, Ilona, "Allusive Thinking (Cognitive Looseness) and the Propensity to Perceive 'Meaningful' Coincidences," *Personality and Individual Differences* 51, no. 8 (2011): 1002–1006; Benedek, Mathias, Könen, Tanja, and Neubauer, Aljoscha C., "Associative Abilities Underlying Creativity," *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts* 6, no. 3 (2012): 273–281; Kenett, Yoed, N., Anaki, David, and Faust, Miriam, "Investigating the Structure of Semantic Networks in Low and High Creative Persons," *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 8 (2014): art. 407; Radel, Rémi, Davranche, Karen, Fournier, Marion, and Dietrich, Arne, "The Role of (Dis)inhibition in Creativity: Decreased Inhibition Improves Idea Generation," *Cognition* 134 (2015): 110–120.
- 110 Rominger et al., "Allusive Thinking."
- 111 Goss, James, "Poetics in Schizophrenic Language: Speech, Gesture and Biosemiotics," *Biosemiotics* 4, no. 3 (2011): 291–307.
- 112 Chaika, E., *Understanding Psychotic Speech: Beyond Freud and Chomsky* (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1990).
- 113 Forrest, D. V., "Poiesis and the Language of Schizophrenia," *Psychiatry* 28 (1965): 1–18.
- 114 Goss, James, "The Poetics of Bipolar Disorder," *Pragmatics & Cognition* 14, no. 1 (2006): 83–110; Goss, "Poetics in Schizophrenic Language."
- 115 Goss, "Poetics in Schizophrenic Language."
- 116 Chaika, E., "A Linguist Looks at 'Schizophrenic' Language," *Brain and Language* 1 (1974): 257–276, 270.
- 117 Goss, "Poetics in Schizophrenic Language," 293.
- 118 Lorenz, M., "Problems Posed by Schizophrenic Language," *Archives of General Psychiatry* 4 (1961): 603–610, 604.
- 119 Goss, "Poetics in Schizophrenic Language," 293.
- 120 Wrobel, J., *Language and Schizophrenia* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1989), 106.
- 121 Goss, "Poetics in Schizophrenic Language," 293–294.
- 122 Kischka, U. Kammer, T. H., Maier, S., Weisbrod, M. Thimm, M., and Spitzer, M., "Dopaminergic Modulation of Semantic Network Activation," *Neuropsychologia* 34, no. 11 (1996): 1107–1113.
- 123 See Isen, A. Johnson, M., Mertz, E., and Robinson, G., "The Influence of Positive Affect on the Unusualness of Word Associations," *Journal of Personality and Social*

- Psychology* 48, no. 6 (1985): 1413–1426; Docherty, N. M. Hall, M. J., and Gordinier, S. W., “Affective Reactivity of Speech in Schizophrenia Patients and Their Nonschizophrenic Relatives,” *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 107 (1998): 461–467; Goss, “The Poetics of Bipolar Disorder.”
- 124 For a comparison on the linguistic nature between individuals with bipolar disorder and schizophrenia, see Sanfilippo, L. C., and Hoffman, R. E., “Language Disorders in the Psychoses,” in *Concise Encyclopedia of Language Pathology*, ed. F. Fabbro (Oxford: Elsevier Science, 1999), 400–407.
- 125 Goss, “The Poetics of Bipolar Disorder.”
- 126 Hoffman, R. E., “Computer Simulations of Neural Information Processing and the Schizophrenia–Mania Dichotomy,” *Archives of General Psychology* 44 (1987): 178–188, 187.
- 127 Qur’an 56:77–80.
- 128 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ* (Q. 56:78), 23: 149–150.
- 129 Qur’an 6:25.
- 130 Ibid., 17:45–46.
- 131 Ibid., 18:57.
- 132 Ibid., 41:5.
- 133 Bergen, Robert D., “Text as a Guide to Authorial Intention: An Introduction to Discourse Criticism,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 30, no. 3 (1987): 327–336, 335.
- 134 For an overview of the various schools of Qur’anic exegesis, see Abdul-Raof, Hussein, *Schools of Qur’anic Exegesis: Genesis and Development* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010).
- 135 See Reynolds, *The Qur’ān and Its Biblical Subtext*, 3–22.
- 136 Nanji, A., “Ismaʿilism,” in *Islamic Spirituality: Foundations*, ed. Seyyed Hossein Nasr (London: Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1987), 179–198.
- 137 For more information on Ismāʿīlī exegesis, refer to Steigerwald, Diana, “Ismaʿīlī Taʾwīl,” in *The Blackwell Companion to the Qur’an*, ed. Andrew Rippin (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 386–400.
- 138 Al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111), *Iḥyāʾ ʿulūm al-dīn* (Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifah), 2004.
- 139 Druze call themselves unitarians (*muwahhidīn*), not to be confused with Unitarianism.
- 140 Firro, K. M., “The Druze Faith: Origin, Development and Interpretation,” *Arabica*, 58, nos. 1/2 (2011): 76–99.
- 141 Al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870), *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, ed. M. Z. N. Al-Nāṣir (Beirut: Dār Ṭawq al-Najāh, 2002), 4: 188 (#3244), 6: 115 (#4779), 6: 116 (#4780), 9: 144 (#7498).
- 142 Qur’an 2:256.
- 143 ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī (d. 329/942), *Tafsīr al-qummī* (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-ʿAlamī lil-Maṭbūʿāt, 1991) on Q. 2:256.
- 144 Al-Ṭabarsī (d. 548/1153), *Majmaʿ al-bayān fī tafsīr, al-Qurʾān* (Beirut: al-ʿAlamī, 1995), on Q. 2:256.
- 145 See Ebstein, Michael, *Mysticism and Philosophy in al-Andalus: Ibn Masarra, Ibn al-ʿArabī and the Ismāʿīlī Tradition* (Leiden: Brill, 2014); Corbin, Henry, *History of Islamic Philosophy*, trans. Phillip Sherrad (London: Kegan Paul International in association with Islamic Publications, 1993), 97–98.
- 146 Such as the Apology of al-Kindī. See Muir, William, trans., *The Apology of al-Kindy: Written at the Court of al-Māmūn (Circa A.H. 215; A.D. 830), in Defence of Christianity Against Islam* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1887).

- 147 *Ijtihād* is the endeavor of a Muslim scholar to derive rules, theology, exegesis, etc.
- 148 In Biblical hermeneutics, there is a concept of double authorship of scriptures: the divine author and the human author. See Virkler, H. A. and Ayayo, K. G., *Hermeneutics: Principles and Processes of Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 24–25. The divine author inspires and works with the human author in writing scriptures. Hence, even in Biblical hermeneutics, understanding the historical and social contexts of scriptures is usually important, but because of the double authorship of scriptures, it may not necessarily be enough. It is argued that the human author might have had a specific intention in certain scriptural passages, but the divine author might have had a greater intention that the human author might have not been aware of or had been incapable of fully perceiving. This theory in Biblical hermeneutics has become known as *sensus plenior* (fuller sense), which suggests that since the divine author of scriptures is one and the same, the divine author might have had a fuller sense of scriptures that go beyond the historicity and social contexts that the human author was bound by. For more on *sensus plenior* refer to Brown, Raymond E. “*Sensus Plenior* of Sacred Scripture” (Ph.D. dissertation, St. Mary’s University, 1955). If we suggest that the divine author of scriptures, both the Bible and the Qur’an, could also be one and the same, then just as using the Bible to interpret itself or the Qur’an to interpret itself, perhaps each can also interpret the other. This does suggest that the divine author is the same.

If the divine author of scriptures, both the Bible and the Qur’an, is the same, then I will explore in my third argument whether intertextuality between the Bible and the Qur’an can hold some ground. The assumption is that if the divine author of the Bible and the Qur’an could be the same, then it would still seem to be the words of God interpreting themselves without contradicting the Qur’anic notion that God teaches the Qur’an. Even if we do not accept the notion of a divine author in either the Bible or the Qur’an, then it is best to understand the Qur’anic discourse in the context of pre-Qur’anic literature, such as the Bible, as a probable source of information. To the very least, it is apparent that the Qur’an is an active reader and fully engaging with the Bible. As such, it may be necessary to understand the Bible to further relate Qur’anic interpretations thereof.

- 149 Mutahhari, M., “Understanding the Uniqueness of the Qur’an,” *al-Tawhīd* 1 (1987): 9–23.
- 150 Heath, P., “Creative Hermeneutics: A Comparative Analysis of Three Islamic Approaches,” *Arabica* 36, no. 2 (1989): 173–210.
- 151 See Rippin, Andrew, “The Function of *Asbāb al-Nuzūl* in Qur’anic Exegesis,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 51, no. 1 (1988): 1–20; Jaffer, A. and Jaffer, M., *Quranic Sciences* (London: ICAS Press, 2009), 67–71.
- 152 Calder, N., “*Tafsīr* from Ṭabarī to Ibn Kathīr: Problems in the Description of a Genre, Illustrated with Reference to the Story of Abraham,” in *Approaches to the Qur’an*, ed. G. R. Hawting and Abdul-Kader A. Shareef (London: Routledge, 1993), 101–140, 105.
- 153 Abu Zayd, N., “The ‘Others’ in the Qur’an: A Hermeneutical Approach,” *Philosophy Social Criticism* 36, nos. 3/4 (2010): 281–294.
- 154 For more on the fine line between creativity and madness, see Koh, Caroline, “Reviewing the Link Between Creativity and Madness: A Postmodern Perspective,” *Educational Research Reviews* 1, no. 7 (2006): 213–221.
- 155 Qur’an 41:5.
- 156 Abrams, Meyer H., *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature* (New York, NY: W. W. Norton, 1973), 68.

- 157 Timmerman, John H., *Do We Still Need the Ten Commandments? A Fresh Look at God's Laws of Love* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1997), 53.
- 158 See Forrest, Peter, *God Without the Supernatural: A Defense of Scientific Theism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996).
- 159 Abu Zayd, *Maḥmūd al-naṣṣ*, 222–223.
- 160 Reynolds, *The Qurʾān and Its Biblical Subtext*.
- 161 Fishbane, Michael, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).
- 162 Eslinger, Lyle, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category,” *Vetus Testamentum* 42, no. 1 (1992): 47–58.
- 163 Beale, G. K., “Questions of Authorial Intent, Epistemology, and Presuppositions and Their Bearing on the Study of the Old Testament in the New: A Rejoinder to Steve Moyise,” *Irish Biblical Studies*, 21 (1999): 152–180.
- 164 Moyise, Steve, “Authorial Intention and the Book of Revelation,” *Andreas University Seminary Studies* 39, no. 1 (2001): 35–40.
- 165 Plummer, Robert L., “Righteousness and Peace Kiss: The Reconciliation of Authorial Intent and Biblical Typology,” *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 14, no. 2 (2010): 54–61.

Chapter 2: Interpretation According to the Qurʾān

- 1 For more information on various schools of Qurʾānic exegesis, see Abdul-Raof, *Schools of Qurʾānic Exegesis*; Abdul-Raof, Hussein, *Theological Approaches to Qurʾānic Exegesis* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012).
- 2 From Derrida, J., “Linguistics and Grammatology,” trans. G. C. Spivak, *SubStance* 4, no. 10 (1974): 127–181, 130.
- 3 Aristotle (d. 322 BCE), *De Interpretatione*, trans. E. M. Edghill (Adelaide: University of Adelaide, 2015).
- 4 Weber, Samuel, “Saussure and the Apparition of Language: The Critical Perspective,” *Modern Language Notes* 91, no. 5 (1976): 913–938, 919.
- 5 Stubbs, M., *Words and Phrases: Corpus Studies of Lexical Semantics* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 10.
- 6 Al-ʿUthaymīn, Muḥammad Ṣ., *al-Uṣūl min ʿilm al-uṣūl* (Cairo: al-Maktabah al-Islāmiyyah, 2001), 97–104.
- 7 Galadari, Abdulla, “The *Taqīd al-Ijtihād* Paradox: Challenges to Qurʾānic Hermeneutics,” *Al-Bayān: Journal of Qurʾānic and Ḥadīth Studies* 13, no. 2 (2015): 145–167.
- 8 Qurʾān 12:2. This verse and the meaning of “*taʿqīlūn*” will be critically studied later to show the meaning, “connect.” It is an adaptation from Galadari, Abdulla, “The Role of Intertextual Polysemy in Qurʾānic Exegesis,” *International Journal on Quranic Research* 3, no. 4 (2013): 35–56.
- 9 Examples include al-Ṭabarī, al-Rāzī (d. 606/1210), Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373), and others.
- 10 See al-Wāḥidī (d. 468/1075), *Asbāb Nuzūl al-Qurʾān*, ed. Iṣām al-ḥumaydān (Dammam: Dār al-Iṣlāḥ, 1992).
- 11 Abu Zahrah (d. 1394/1974), *Zahrat al-tafāsīr* (Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-ʿArabī, n.d.), 8: 4105–4106, 9: 4491, 9: 4877; al-ḥijāzī, M. M., *al-Tafsīr al-wāḍiḥ* (Beirut: Dār al-Jil al-Jadīd, 1993), 2: 168, 355, 814.

- 12 Al-Sha'rawī, M. M. (d. 1419/1998), *al-Khawātir: tafsīr al-Sha'rawī* (Cairo: Maṭābi' Akhbār al-Yawm, 1997) 12: 7688; Al-Khālidi, Ṣalāḥ. A., *al-Qur'ān wa naqḍ maṭā'in al-ruhbān* (Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 2007), 166; al-Rūmī, F., *Ittijāhāt al-tafsīr fil-qarn al-rābi' 'ashr* (Riyadh: Idārāt al-Buḥūth al-'Ilmiyyah wal-Iftā' wal-Da'wah wal-Irshād, 3, 1986): 971.
- 13 Wansbrough, *Qur'anic Studies*.
- 14 See Andrew Rippin's article on John Wansbrough's *Qur'anic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*: Rippin, "The Function of Asbāb."
- 15 See Ibn Sulaymān, Muqātil (d. 150/767), *Tafsīr Muqātil ibn Sulaymān*, ed. A. M. Shaḥāteh (Beirut: Dār Ihya' al-Turāth, 2003).
- 16 See al-Wāḥidi, *Asbāb Nuzūl*.
- 17 See al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), *al-Itqān fi 'ulūm al-Qur'an*, ed. M. A. Ibrāhīm (Cairo: Al-Hay'ah al-Miṣriyyah al-Āmmah lil-Kitāb, 1974).
- 18 Rippin, Andrew, "The Qur'an as Literature: Perils, Pitfalls and Prospects," *British Society for Middle Eastern Studies Bulletin* 10, no. 1 (1983): 38–47, 44.
- 19 Abdul-Raof, *Theological Approaches*, 10–27.
- 20 To argue against a traditional audience, further notes must be stated:
Although the Ash'arī and Mu'tazilī theological schools of thought argued whether the Qur'an is created or eternal, they both agree that the Qur'an, in its entirety, existed in heaven in the Preserved Tablet (*al-Lawḥ al-Mahfūz*) before its revelation piecemeal to Muḥammad. Refer to al-Shahrastānī (d. 548/1153), *al-Milal wal-niḥal* (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-ḥalabī, n.d.), 1: 70, 1: 107. Also refer to the footnotes of Al-Shāfi'ī, Yahya ibn Abī al-Khayr (d. 558/1163), *al-Intiṣār fil-radd 'ala al-mu'tazilah al-qadariyyah al-ashrār*, ed. S. Al-Khalaf (Riyadh: Aḍwā' al-Salaf, 1999), 1: 160, 2: 544, and 2: 571. Also refer to a citation from Muqātil ibn Sulaymān in Al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277), *Juz' fih dhikr i'tiqād al-salaf fil-hurūf wal-aṣwāt*, ed. A. Al-Dimyāṭī (Cairo: Maktabat al-Anṣār, n.d.), 36. Also refer to Shams al-Dīn Al-Safārīnī al-ḥanbalī (d. 1188/1774), *Lawāmi' al-anwār al-bahiyyah wa-sawāṭi' al-asrār al-athariyyah li-sharḥ al-durrah al-muḍiyyah fi 'aqd al-firqah al-maraḍiyyah* (Damascus: Mu'assasat al-Khāfiqīn wa Maktabat-ha, 1982), 1: 136, 1: 164, 1:167–168, and 2: 288. If that is the case, it brings into question whether the circumstances of revelation (*asbāb al-nuzūl*) are even an integral part of the Qur'an. However, it can always be argued by Muslim theologians that God in Its omniscient knowledge of the future already knew the circumstances of which the Qur'an would be revealed and integrated them as part of the Qur'an. However, it is equally possible that the circumstances of revelation are not an integral part of the Qur'an and therefore not absolutely necessary for its interpretation. From an academic point of view, the reliability of the sources that narrate the circumstances of revelation (*asbāb al-nuzūl*) can always be brought into question, whether or not it should be taken into account.
One of the tenets of Muslim belief regarding the Qur'an is that it is for all times and places (*likulli zamān wa makān*) Al-Saḥīm, M. *al-Islām: Uṣūluhu wa-mabādī'uhu* (Riyadh: Ministry of Islamic Affairs, 2001) 136, even though such a tenet has no Qur'anic basis. If it is for all times, then it cannot be confined within a specific temporal context, and if it is for all places, then it cannot be confined within a specific social context.
- 21 The Qur'an many times uses the terms "*ta'qilūn*," "*yafqahūn*," "*yatadabbarūn*," etc. as a way to ask people to use reason and contemplate in an attempt to understand the meanings of Godly signs and/or the Qur'an.
- 22 Al-Bāqillānī (d. 403/1013), *Tamhīd al-awā'il fi takhlīṣ al-dalā'il* (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Kutub al-Thaqāfiyyah, 1987), 515–516.

- 23 The infallibility doctrine appears to have developed in the eighth century by both Shī'ī and Sunnī scholars. The Shī'ī doctrine encompasses the infallibility of prophets and imams, while the Sunnī doctrine only attributes the infallibility of prophets. See Muḥammad Zakī-al-Dīn Ibrāhīm, *ʿIṣmat al-anbiyāʾ* (Cairo: Dār al-Naṣr, 1989).
- 24 The Qurʾān shows various example of sins and mistakes made by prophets, including disobedience to God's commandments, such as the story of Jonah (i.e., Qurʾān 21:87). Other examples include the killing of a man by Moses (i.e., Qurʾān 28:15), Abraham declaring lords besides God (though some exegetes consider this to be part of Abraham teaching his people) (i.e., Qurʾān 6:76–78), Abraham lying about not breaking the idols (though some exegetes consider this also for the purpose of teaching his people) (i.e., Qurʾān 21:62–67), and in a prophetic tradition, Abraham lying about Sarah calling her his sister instead of wife, similar to the story in the Torah (though Shī'ī tradition would consider this as evidence for “*taqiyya*” or lying for the purpose of avoiding harm). Nonetheless, even the Qurʾān shows examples of mistakes made by the prophet, such as ignoring a blind man (i.e., Qurʾān 80:1) or attempting to trick his wives (i.e., Qurʾān 66:1). In my opinion, if the doctrine of infallibility has any legal standing, then perhaps it needs to be redefined—possibly, prophets do err and commit sin, but that they are forgiven. In that sense, they could be considered “infallible,” not that they never sin or make mistakes. There were debates among Muslim Sunnī scholars that addressed when the infallibility starts, whether at birth or after the call to prophethood. The debate also consisted on whether the infallibility encompasses all kinds of sin or particular ones, such as major sins (*kabāʾir*), minor sins (*ṣaghāʾir*), inadvertent error (*sahw*), forgetfulness (*nisyān*), and lapses (*zallāt*). The common denominator is usually the infallibility of prophets in their transmission of divine revelation. See Ahmed, Shahab, “Ibn Taymiyyah and the Satanic Verses,” *Studia Islamica* 87 (1998): 67–124.
- 25 See Burton, J., “Notes Towards a Fresh Perspective on the Islamic Sunna,” *Bulletin of the British Society for Middle Eastern Studies* 11, no. 1 (1984): 3–17.
- 26 Robson, James, “Tradition: Investigation and Classification,” *The Muslim World* 41, no. 2 (1951): 98–112.
- 27 Robson, James, “Tradition, the Second Foundation of Islam,” *The Muslim World* 41, no. 1 (1951): 22–33.
- 28 Robson, James, “The Material of Tradition I,” *The Muslim World* 41, no. 3 (1951): 166–180.
- 29 Abdul-Raof, *Theological Approaches*, 28–29.
- 30 Ceccarelli, Leah, “Polysemy: Multiple Meanings in Rhetorical Criticism,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84, no. 4 (1998): 395–415.
- 31 Refer to Kaye, A. S., “Arabic Morphology,” in *Morphologies of Asia and Africa*, ed. A. S. Kaye (Warsaw, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 211–247. Also refer to Prunet, J.-F. “External Evidence and the Semitic Root,” *Morphology* 16, no. 1 (2006): 41–67.
- 32 Kaye, “Arabic Morphology,” 239. Also refer to a citation in Al-Khirāṭ, A. M., *ʿInāyat al-muslimīn bil-lughah al-ʿarabiyyah khidmah lil-Qurʾān al-karīm* (Riyadh: Mujaṃmaʿ al-Malik Fahad li-Ṭibāʿat al-Muṣḥaf al-Sharīf, n.d.), 8.
- 33 On the definition of “*k t b*,” refer to Al-Zabīdī (d. 1205/1790), *Tāj al-ʿarūs* (Alexandria: Dār al-Hidāyah, n.d.), 4: 100–107.
- 34 Makram, ʿAbdul ʿal Sālim, *al-Mushtarak al-lafẓī fī al-ḥaqḥ al-Qurʾānī* (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risālah, 1997), 44.
- 35 Al-ʿIzz ibn ʿAbdulsalām (d. 660/1262), *Al-Imām fī bayān adillat al-aḥkām* ed. Riḍwān Mukhtār ibn Gharbiyyah (Beirut: Dār al-Bashāʾir al-Islāmiyyah, 1987), 159.
- 36 Al-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, 2: 144–165.

- 37 Ibid., 2: 144. *Faqīh* means a scholar or a jurist. This tradition is also quoted by Ibn ‘Asākir (d. 571/1175).
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 Ibid., 2: 145.
- 40 The *khawārij* is the group who opposed ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib for accepting the mediation with Mu‘āwiyah.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 For a survey of classical books on Qur’anic polysemy, refer to Makram, *al-Mushtarak al-lafẓī*.
- 43 Ricoeur, P., *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, trans. J. Thompson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 108.
- 44 Al-Ma‘tūq, Aḥmad M., “Al-Alfāz al-Mushtarakah al-Ma‘ānī fil-Lughah al-‘Arabiyyah: Ṭabī‘atuhā, Ahammiyatuhā, Maṣādiruhā,” *Majallah jāmi‘ah umm al-qurā li-‘ulūm al-sharī‘ah wal-dirāsāt al-islāmiyyah* 7 (21): 81–138.
- 45 Ceccarelli, “Polysemy.”
- 46 Fraade, S. D., “Rabbinic Polysemy and Pluralism Revisited: Between Praxis and Thematisation,” *Association for Jewish Studies Review* 3, no. 11 (2007): 1–40.
- 47 For more on the role of polysemy in the midrash see Stern, D., *Midrash and Theory: Ancient Jewish Exegesis and Contemporary Literary Studies* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1996).
- 48 Stern, D., “Midrash and Indeterminacy,” *Critical Inquiry* 15, no. 1 (1988): 132–161.
- 49 Ibid., 155–156.
- 50 Ibid., 161.
- 51 Ibid., 143–144.
- 52 Caplan, H., “The Four Senses of Scriptural Interpretation and the Mediaeval Theory of Preaching,” *Speculum* 4, no. 3 (1929): 282–290.
- 53 Bloomfield, M. W., “Symbolism in Medieval Literature,” *Modern Philology* 56, no. 2 (1958): 73–81.
- 54 Coulter, J. A., *The Literary Microcosm: Theories of Interpretation of the Later Neoplatonists* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 87–89.
- 55 Ricoeur, P., *The Rule of Metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language* (London: Routledge, 2004), 143.
- 56 Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, 44.
- 57 Condit, C. M., Bates, B. R., Galloway, R., Givens, S. B., Haynie, C. K., Jordan, J. W., Stables, G., and West, H. M., “Recipes or Blueprints for Our Genes? How Contexts Selectively Activate the Multiple Meanings of Metaphors,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 3 (2002): 303–325.
- 58 Ibid.
- 59 Qur’an 12:2.
- 60 Ibid., 43:3.
- 61 Refer to Al-Zabidī, *Tāj al-‘arūs*, on the definition of “‘a q l,” 30: 18–40.
- 62 Refer to Brown, F., Driver, S. R., and Briggs, C., *Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, 2000), 786, henceforth BDB; Koehler, L. and Baumgartner, W., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 878–879.
- 63 Qur’an 12:2.
- 64 Ibid., 43:3.
- 65 Abu Zayd, Nasr H., “The Dilemma of the Literary Approach to the Qur’an,” *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics* 23 (2003): 8–47.

- 66 Ibid., 36–37.
- 67 For an overview of different understandings of God's speech in Islamic history, see Tritton, A. S., "The Speech of God," *Studia Islamica* 36 (1972): 5–22.
- 68 For more on the Mu'tazili understanding of the Qur'an, refer to Peters, J. R. T. M., *God's Created Speech: A Study in the Speculative Theology of the Mu'tazili Qāḍī l-Quḍāt Abu l-Ḥasan 'Abd al-Jabbār ibn Aḥmad al-Ḥamadānī* (Leiden: Brill, 1976).
- 69 Abu Zayd, "The Dilemma of the Literary Approach to the Qur'an."
- 70 For more on the Mu'tazilah and Ash'ari view of language, refer to Abu Zayd, Nasr Hamid, *al-Ittijāh al-'aqlī fil-tafsīr: Dirāsah fī qaḍīyyat al-majāz fil-Qur'ān 'ind al-mu'tazilah* (Casablanca: AL-Markaz al-Thaqāfi al-'Arabī, 1996), 70–82.
- 71 Abu Zayd, "The Dilemma of the Literary Approach to the Qur'an."
- 72 Genesis 2:19–20.
- 73 Allen, William Sidney, "Ancient Ideas on the Origin and Development of Language," *Transactions of the Philological Society* 47, no. 1 (1948): 35–60.
- 74 Ibid., 45.
- 75 Ibid., 41.
- 76 Kieffer, B., "Herder's Treatment of Süssmilch's Theory of the Origin of Language in the *Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache*: A Re-evaluation," *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory* 53, no. 3 (1978): 96–105.
- 77 Allen, W. S., "Ancient Ideas on the Origin and Development of Language," 44.
- 78 For a survey of literacy in the classical world see Harris, W. V., *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991). Also refer to Bowman, A. K. and Woolf, G., *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- 79 See Avis, P., *God and the Creative Imagination: Metaphor, Symbol and Myth in Religion and Theology* (Abingdon: Routledge, 1999).
- 80 For few examples of Joseph Campbell's books on religious symbology, see *Myths to Live By* (New York, NY: Viking Press, 1972); and *The Inner Reaches of Outer Space: Metaphor as Myth: Metaphor as Myth and as Religion* (New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1986). For Mircea Eliade, see *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (Orlando, FL: Harcourt Books, 1959).
- 81 Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane*, 183.
- 82 Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 2: 149 (#1597).
- 83 Campbell, J., *Thou Art That: Transforming Religious Metaphor* (Novato, CA: New World Library, 1996), 48.
- 84 Ibid.
- 85 See Campbell, *Thou Art That*, and Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane*.
- 86 Dupré, L., *Symbols of the Sacred* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Company, 2000).
- 87 Ricoeur, P., *The Rule of Metaphor*, 200.
- 88 Saussure, F., *Course in General Linguistics*, trans. W. Baskin, eds. P. Meisel and H. Saussy (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2011), 16.
- 89 Ibid., 113.
- 90 Bergen, "Text as a Guide."
- 91 Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 6: 182 (#4984).
- 92 See Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728/1328), *Al-Īman* ed. M. al-Albānī (Amman: Al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1996), 74; Al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), *al-Wasā'il fī musāmārat al-awā'il* (Baghdad: Maṭba'at al-Najāh, 1950), 127.
- 93 Abū 'Ubaydah Mu'ammār ibn al-Muthannā (d. 209/824), *Majāz al-Qur'ān* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 1961).

- 94 For an overview comparison between the approaches of Abū 'Ubaydah and al-Jurjānī (d. 471/1078), see Wansbrough, John E., "Majāz al-Qur'ān: Periphrastic Exegesis," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 33, no. 2 (1970): 246–266.
- 95 Almagor, E., "The Early Meaning of Majāz and the Nature of Abū 'Ubaydah's Exegesis," in *Studia Orientalia Memoriae D. H. Baneth Dedicata* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1979). For more overview on Abū 'Ubaydah's usage of the term, also see Madelung, W., "Abū 'Ubayda Ma'mar b. al-Muthannā as a Historian," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 3, no. 1 (1992): 47–56.
- 96 Almagor, "The Early Meaning of Majāz."
- 97 For further overview of Abū 'Ubaydah's use of "majāz" and its relation to the *majāz-ḥaqīqah* dichotomy, see Heinrichs, W., "On the Genesis of the *ḥaqīqa-majāz* Dichotomy," *Studia Islamica* 59 (1984): 111–140.
- 98 Ibid.
- 99 Narrator.
- 100 Abu-Deeb, K., "Studies in the Majāz and Metaphorical Language of the Qur'ān: Abū 'Ubayda and al-Sharīf al-Raḍī," in *Literary Structures of Religious Meaning in the Qur'ān*, ed. I. J. Boullata (Abingdon: Curzon, 2009), 310–353, 316.
- 101 Ibid., 310–353.
- 102 Ibn Taymiyyah, *Al-Īman*, 74.
- 103 Al-Jurjānī, Abdul-Qāhir (d. 471/1078), *Asrār al-balāghah* (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Madanī, n.d.), 386.
- 104 Cited in Whittingham, Martin, *Al-Ghazālī and the Qur'ān: One Book, Many Meanings* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), 34.
- 105 Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1002), *al-Khaṣā'is* (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Miṣriyyah al-Āmmah lil-Kitāb, n.d.).
- 106 Al-Tha'ālbi (d. 429/1038), *Fiqh al-lughah wa sirr al-'arabiyyah*, ed. 'A. al-Mahdi (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 2002).
- 107 Al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1143), *al-Mufaṣṣal fi 'ilm al-lughah* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-'Ulūm, 1990).
- 108 Al-Yāzījī (d. 1324/1906), *Naj'at al-rā'id wa shir'at al-wārid fil-mutarādif wal-mutawārid* (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Ma'ārif 1905). Al-Yāzījī was a Christian scholar of the Arabic language.
- 109 Baljon, J. M. S., "Qur'anic Anthropomorphism," *Islamic Studies* 27, no. 2 (1988): 119–127.
- 110 This is based on the ḥanbalī stance of "without how" questioning.
- 111 See Al-Maḥmūd, 'A., *Mawqif Ibn Taymiyyah min al-ashā'irah* (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 1995), 3: 1170–1176; al-Qāsimī, M. J. (d. 1332/1914), *Maḥāsin al-ta'wīl*, ed. M. B. 'Uyūn al-Sūd (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1998), 5: 80–84.
- 112 Abu Naṣr al-Sijzī (d. 444/1052), *Risālat al-Sijzī ila Ahl Zubayd fil-radd 'ala man ankar al-ḥarf wal-ṣawt*, ed. M. ba-'Abdullah (Medinah: 'Imādāt al-Baḥth al-'Ilmī bil-Jām'ah al-Islāmiyyah), 178–179.
- 113 Keddie, N. R., "Symbol and Sincerity in Islam," *Studia Islamica* 19 (1963): 27–63.
- 114 For more on Avicenna's use of allegory in Qur'anic interpretation refer to Heath, P., *Allegory and Philosophy in Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā): With a Translation of the Book of the Prophet Muhammad's Ascent to Heaven* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992).
- 115 Cited in Wohlman, A., *Al-Ghazālī, Averroës and the Interpretation of the Qur'an: Common Sense and Philosophy in Islam* trans. D. Burrell (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010), 42.

- 116 Keddie, "Symbol and Sincerity in Islam," 45.
- 117 Burckhardt, T., *Introduction to Sufi Doctrine* (Bloomington, IN: World Wisdom, 2008), 3; Arberry, A. J., *Revelation and Reason in Islam* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), 16; Amir-Moezzi, M. A., *The Divine Guide in Early Shi'ism: The Sources of Esotericism in Islam*, trans. D. Streight (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994).
- 118 Averroës (d. 595/1198), *The Decisive Treatise*, trans. C. E. Butterworth (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 2001), 10, 11.
- 119 The other imams of the Sunni tradition, Abū ḥanīfah (d. 150/767), Mālik ibn Anas (d. 179/795), and al-Shāfi'ī (d. 204/820) did not discuss the literal and allegorical senses of the Qur'an. Ibn Taymiyyah, *Al-Īman*, 74–75.
- 120 Qur'an 26:15.
- 121 Ibn ḥanbal (d. 241/855), *al-Radd 'ala al-jahmiyyah wal-zanādiqah*, ed. Ṣ. Shahīn (Riyadh: al-Thabāt, 2002), 92.
- 122 Ibid. The Jahmiyya is named after Jahm ibn Ṣafwān (d. 128/746) who considered the Qur'an created. Anti-Mu'tazilah polemics sometimes called the Mu'tazilah "Jahmiyya," since Jahm ibn Ṣafwān was the first known theologian who argues that the Qur'an is created.
- 123 Ibid., 74.
- 124 If it is a message from God to Muḥammad, then it assumes that Muḥammad knew their meanings, but for some reason kept them secret from the general public. Otherwise, if Muḥammad indeed passively received his revelation, then there is also a possibility that Muḥammad might have not even understood the full meaning, which again brings into question the meaning of language and the role of the audience in making such meanings.
- 125 If this is the case, then one cannot consider the Qur'anic audience to be for all times and places, which has no Qur'anic basis anyway. However, there is also a possibility that it is God's message to humanity, but even Muḥammad was unaware of the meanings of the disjointed letters, making the language of the Qur'an not necessarily hold any specific meaning to the community it was presented to. Instead, the meaning is univocal and set independent of the community receiving it. Hence, there is always a possibility of *sensus plenior* in Qur'anic text, in which the human author is not always aware of the message intended by the divine author.
- 126 Asad, M., "Symbolism and Allegory in the Qur'an," in *The Message of the Qur'an* (appendix), Gibraltar: Dār al-Andalus, dist. (London: E. J. Brill, 1980).
- 127 There have been theories that the disjointed letters may be related to the Hebrew/ Aramaic alphabets, which have meaning on its own. Other theories are that since Arabic letters have numerical values, that it is possibly part of some numerical code, as promulgated by Rashad Khalifa. For more on the traditional Muslim stance of the disjointed letters, see Kenawy, Salah, "A Linguistic Reading in the Disjointed Letters," *Islamic Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (1998): 243–255.
- 128 Al-Saqqāf, 'Alawī 'A., *Mawsū'ah al-firaq al-muntasabah lil-islām* (dorar.net, n.d.), 2: 405.
- 129 Haqqī, Ismā'īl (d. 1127/1715), *Rūḥ al-bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1994), 6: 238.
- 130 Abu al-'Abbās (d. 1224/1809), *al-Baḥr al-madīd fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-majīd*, ed. A. Raslān (Cairo: Dr. Ḥassan 'Abbās Zakī, 1999), 2: 195.
- 131 This brings us to the crossroads of the Mu'tazilī and Ash'arī schools of theology. If we take the Mu'tazilī perspective that the Qur'an is created, because language is a human

invention, but that the Qur'an contains allegorical meanings on the anthropomorphic descriptions of God, then we can conclude there is symbology in the Qur'an that may only be interpreted allegorically. If we take the Ash'ari perspective that the Qur'an is uncreated, then it would mean that the language of the Qur'an was done independently of the receiving community, and therefore, we can still conclude that the language of the Qur'an may be understood beyond the social and historical context of Quraysh. Either perspective leads us to the conclusion that the social and historical contexts of the Qur'an may not be the only method or even the correct method in Qur'anic interpretation.

- 132 Mohammed, K., "Assessing English Translations of the Qur'an," *Middle East Quarterly* 12, no. 2 (2005): 58–71.
- 133 Al-Tha'labi (d. 427/1035), *al-Ashbāh wal-naẓā'ir*, ed. Muḥammad al-Maṣrī (Damascus: Sa'd al-Dīn Press, 1984).
- 134 Ibn al-'Imād, *Kashf al-sarā'ir fī ma'na al-wujūh wal-ashbāh wal-naẓā'ir*, ed. Fu'ād Abdulmon'im (Alexandria: al-Maktabah al-Miṣriyyah, 2004).
- 135 Al-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, 2: 144–145.
- 136 Shameli, N. A., "Mulla Sadr and Interpreting the Quranic Keywords in a Polysemous Method," *Tahqiqat-e Ulum-e Quran wa Hadith* 3, no. 1 (2007): 5–32.
- 137 Using <http://www.altafsir.org/> as a comprehensive reference of the most prominent books of *tafsir* of various Islamic schools, including Sunni, Shī'a, Ibadi, Sufi, etc.
- 138 Wafī, 'Alī 'Abdulwāḥid, *ʿIlm al-lughah* (Cairo: Nahḍat Miṣr lil-Ṭibā'ah wal-Nashr, n.d.), 314–315. For examples of evolution of polysemous meanings, see Makram, *al-Mushtarak al-lafẓī*, 9–11.
- 139 Allen, W. S., "Ancient Ideas," 35–36.
- 140 Ibid.
- 141 Ibid.
- 142 Ibid., 41.
- 143 However, Plato did suggest that some names were given by a superhuman power. Allen, W. S. "Ancient Ideas," 38. If we adopt a Platonic definition of language, then this may suggest that even if the Qur'an may mostly contain conventional form of language, some words, such as the disjoined letters, could have a divine origin.
- 144 Allen, W. S., "Ancient Ideas," 53.
- 145 Ibid., 54.
- 146 O'Leary, De Lacey, *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2000), 175–176.
- 147 Allen, W. S., "Ancient Ideas," 56.
- 148 Amsler, M., *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1989), 31.
- 149 Al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), *al-Mizhir fī 'ulūm al-lughah wa anwā'ihā*, ed. Fu'ād 'Alī Maṣṣūr (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1998), 1: 303–304.
- 150 Ibid.
- 151 Makram, *al-Mushtarak al-lafẓī*, 15–16.
- 152 Cited in al-Ṣāliḥ, Ṣ. I. (d. 1407/1987), *Dirāsāt fī fiqh al-lughah* (Beirut: Dār al-'Ilm lil-Malāyīn, 1960), 303–304.
- 153 Al-Suyūṭī, *al-Mizhir*, 292–304.
- 154 Ibid., 293.
- 155 Ibid.
- 156 Barr, James, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961).

- 157 Zaborski, Andrzej, "Etymology, Etymological Fallacy and the Pitfalls of Literal Translation of Some Arabic and Islamic Terms," in *Words, Texts and Concepts Cruising the Mediterranean Sea: Studies on the Sources, Contents and Influences of Islamic Civilization and Arabic Philosophy and Science*, eds. R. Arnzen and J. Thielmann (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 143–148.
- 158 Saleh, Walid A., "The Etymological Fallacy and Qur'anic Studies: Muhammad, Paradise, and Late Antiquity," in *The Qur'ān in Context: Historical and Literary Investigations into the Qur'ānic Milieu*, eds. A. Neuwirth, N. Sinai, and M. Marx (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 649–698.
- 159 Ibid., 659–660.
- 160 Rippin, Andrew, "RĤMNN and the ḤANĪFS," in *Islamic Studies Presented to Charles J. Adams*, eds. W. B. Hallaq and P. D. Little (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 153–168.
- 161 Beeston, A. F. L., "Himyarite Monotheism," in *Studies in the History of Arabia II: Pre-Islamic Arabia*, executive eds. Abdelgadir M. Abdalla, Sami Al-Sakkar, and Richard Mortel (Riyadh: King Saud University, 1984), 149–154.
- 162 Refer to Al-Zabīdī, *Tāj al-'arūs*, on the definition of "ḥ n f," 23: 168–173.
- 163 On the meaning of "ḥ n f," refer to Ibn Manẓūr (d. 711/1311), *Lisān al-'arab* (Beirut: Ṣaḍīr, 1994), 9: 56–58.
- 164 Muslim (d. 261/875), *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, ed. M. F. Abdul-Bāqī (Beirut: Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, n.d.), 1: 130–131 (1.65, #232).
- 165 Zaborski, "Etymology, Etymological Fallacy."
- 166 Saleh, "The Etymological Fallacy and Qur'anic Studies."
- 167 Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 35.
- 168 Ibid., 39–43.
- 169 Ibid., 100–106.
- 170 Ibid., 102.
- 171 The Syriac term "loḥem" means to unite. Refer to BDB, 535–536; Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 526. The Hebrew term "milḥama" is also used to mean "joined," as that the battle was joined in 1 Kings 20:29. On the root meaning of "l ḥ m" as join, refer to the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project of the Jewish Institute of Religion at the Hebrew Union College (<http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/>); on "l ḥ m," see Botterweck, G. J. and Ringgren, H., eds., J. T. Willis trans., *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, revised edn (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1977), 7: 521 (henceforth TDOT).
- 172 Refer to Al-Zabīdī, *Tāj al-'arūs* on the definition of "l ḥ m," 33: 403–411.
- 173 Ibid.
- 174 It is also suggested that "l ḥ m" means the core of something and when referring to plants "alḥim" means it has wheat (see Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 12: 535 on "l ḥ m"). If that is the case, the bread would take its meaning from that.
- 175 I do not want to delve into all the examples provided by Barr, but I need to respond to some to show that his argument and those he is refuting are all dependent on interpretation. He cannot assert that such methods are often misused, although I must admit that they sometimes are. In one example, he shows that the term for "man" in the Hebrew Bible is sometimes used as "geber," which is rooted in strength, but that it does not always denote man as strong (Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 144–147). He brings forth few examples from scriptures showing that the term is being used to show the weakness of "man" and not his strength (e.g., Psalms 88:4–5, 89:48–49). He assumes that these examples prove that we cannot understand the etymological root meaning to have any significance to the word's semantics.

However, that is not necessarily the case. For example, Psalm 88:4 states, "I am as a man (*geber*) who has no strength (*ayil*).¹⁷⁶ It is possible that the rhetoric style of this statement is an intentional oxymoron, using the term "*geber*" to starkly contrast "strength" with "no strength." Psalm 89:48 asks, "What man (*geber*) shall live and not see death?" Again, in here it could easily be interpreted that every mighty one (*geber*) will still see death. This would be an example of the rich rhetorical style of scriptures. Hence, Barr's claim that these methods are dangerous and absurd is not always valid. It is dependent on the interpretation. Barr is aware that using such methods would open doors to interpretations, in which the exegete would be subjective in his interpretation making anything at all to mean anything. However, this statement can be said to any sort of interpretation and not only due to etymology. It does not, however, suffice as evidence that an etymological approach would necessarily lead us astray. Perhaps the etymological approach would simply provide us with a different perspective.

176 Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 107–160.

177 Qur'an 41:2–5.

178 A theologian might argue that if scriptures are believed to have a divine author, then could we also fairly assume that a divine author is not aware of or cares less about the etymological meanings of words?

179 Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*.

180 If scriptures, both the Bible and the Qur'an, are assumed to be divine and infallible in their nature, then one must assume that the divine author is fully aware of the meanings of the words, their polysemous nature, its morphological permutations, and its root-based etymology. Barr actually states that; "Words can only be intelligibly interpreted by what they meant at the time of their use, within the language system used by the speaker or writer" (*The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 139–140). He uses this statement as a way to refute certain linguistic methods of Biblical theology. However, he seems to have been unaware that such a statement creates a self-defeating theological loop that Biblical theologians would find sufficient to use his own words against him. If the speaker or author of scriptures is believed to be God, then what is the "time" or "place" in which the Biblical language would need to be understood as? Is God confined to a specific time frame in history or a specific social context, on which Its words would depend for their definition? If the author of scriptures is believed to be beyond time and space, then why would we need to assume that Its words can only be understood to be a meaning restricted to a specific time and space? If scriptures are the Word of God, which can therefore be inferred as the Logos, in which Jesus Christ has become the embodiment and the Incarnation of scriptures, then according to the Gospel of John, the Word of God is eternal and is God Itself. According to the Ash'ari school of thought, the Qur'an is also eternal. See al-Maḥmūd, *Mawqif Ibn Taymiyyah*, 448. Henceforth, if it is in God's attributes to be beyond space and time, then so would be Its words in scriptures. It would have to be assumed that the divine author has selectively used certain terms for specific reasons, and these reasons could also be beyond time and place, and not completely arbitrary. This does bring into question whether language itself is an arbitrary symbol or sign as Saussure understood it.

181 Isma'il, M. B., *Dirāsāt fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān* (Cairo: Dār al-Manār, 1999), 238–241.

182 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 1: 586–588, on "arb."

183 BDB, 787; Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 878, on "arb."

- 184 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 1: 588, on “*arb*.”
- 185 ʿUthmān is quoted to say to Qurʾanic copyists, “If you disagree you and Zayb ibn Thābit in anything in the Qurʾan, write it in the language of Quraysh, as it was revealed in their language.” See al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 4: 180 (#3506), 6: 183 (#4987). In another narration of the same saying of ʿUthmān, it is reported that he told the copyists, “If you disagree you and Zayd ibn Thābit in an Arabic of the Arabic Qurʾan, write it in the language of Quraysh, as the Qurʾan was revealed in their language.” See al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 6: 182 (#4984).
- 186 Further reading on Crone’s argument that Islam did not rise in Makkah, see Crone, Patricia, *Meccan Trade and the Rise of Islam* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987).
- 187 That prophetic saying states, “Gabriel recited on a *ḥarf* so I returned to him and I continued to add him and he adds me until he ended to seven *aḥruf*.” In al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 6: 184 (#4991). I hesitate to translate the term “*ḥarf*” in this prophetic tradition, as it may have various meanings. Another tradition also states that various companions have heard the Qurʾan from Muḥammad in different ways and that all were acceptable to Muḥammad adding, “This is how it was revealed. This Qurʾan was revealed on seven *aḥruf*, so read what is simple from it.” See al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 6: 184 (#4992).
- 188 Jepsen, A., “*arb*,” in Botterweck and Ringgren, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, 11: 331.
- 189 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 1: 592 on “*arb*.”
- 190 Ibid.
- 191 BDB, 786; Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 876–877 on “*arb*.”
- 192 TDOT, “*arb*,” 11: 327.
- 193 Ibid., “*arb*,” 11: 331–334.
- 194 Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 878–879, on “*arb*.”
- 195 Compare with Q. 16:103 and 41:44. See Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 12: 385–386.
- 196 BDB, 785.
- 197 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 12: 386–387 on “*a j m*.”
- 198 Ibid., 12: 386 on “*a j m*.”
- 199 BDB, 786; Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 878–879 on “*arb*.” Also see TDOT, “*arb*,” 11: 331.
- 200 TDOT, “*arb*,” 11: 333.
- 201 Al-Azharī, Abu Manẓūr (d. 370/981), *Tahdhīb al-lughah*, ed. M. ʿU. Marʿib (Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 2001), 2: 221.
- 202 Rofé, A., *The Book of Balaam: A Study in Method of Criticism and the History of Biblical Literature and Religion* (Warsaw, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1979).
- 203 Crone and Cook, *Hagarism*.
- 204 Beyer, K., *The Aramaic Language: Its Distribution and Subdivisions*, trans. J. F. Healey (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 27.
- 205 Healey, J. F., “Lexical Loans in Early Syriac: A Comparison with Nabataean Aramaic,” *Studi Epigrafici Linguistici* 12 (1995): 75–84.
- 206 Ibid., 76.
- 207 Ibid., 78.
- 208 O’Connor, M., “The Arabic Loanwords in Nabatean Aramaic,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 45, no. 3 (1986): 213–229.

- 209 On Thamudic being a dialect of Arabic, see Milik, J. T., "Inscriptions grecques et nabatéennes de Rawwafah," *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology* 10 (1971): 54–59.
- 210 Graf, D. F. and Zwettler, M. J., "The North Arabian 'Thamudic E' Inscription from Uraynibah West," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 335 (2004): 53–89.
- 211 For more on the Arabic influence onto the Nabataean Aramaic, especially in the area of Madā'in Šālīḥ, see Healey, J. F., ed., *The Nabataean Tomb Inscriptions of Madā'in Šālīḥ, Journal of Semitic Studies, Supplement 1* trans. S. Al-Theeb (Arabic section) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
- 212 Healey, "Lexical Loans in Early Syriac," 79.
- 213 Watson, J., "South Arabian and Yemeni Dialects," *Salford Working Papers in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics* 1 (2011): 27–40.
- 214 Potts, Daniel P., "Trans-Arabian Routes of the Pre-Islamic Period," *Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient* 16, no. 1 (1988): 127–162.
- 215 For more on the topic, see Versteegh, C. H. M., *Arabic Grammar and Qur'ānic Exegesis in Early Islam* (Leiden: Brill, 1993).
- 216 Cited in Kopf, L., "Religious Influences on Medieval Arabic Philology," *Studia Islamica* 5 (1956): 33–59, 40–41.
- 217 *Ibid.*, 47.
- 218 This might also be a possible reason why according to tradition, Muḥammad might have allowed various recitations of the Qur'an.
- 219 Allen, Roger, *Arabic Literary Heritage: The Development of Its Genres and Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- 220 Al-Sha'rāwī, *Tafsīr*, 15: 9166.
- 221 Luxenberg, Christoph, *Die syro-aramäische Lesart des Koran: Ein Beitrag zur Entschlüsselung der Koransprache* (Berlin: Verlag Hans Schiller, 2000).
- 222 Lüling, Günter, *Über den Ur-Qur'an: Ansätze zur Rekonstruktion vorislamischer christlicher Strophenedien im Qur'an* (Erlangen: Verlagsbuchhdlg, 1974).
- 223 Wansbrough, *Qur'anic Studies*; Wansbrough, *The Sectarian Milieu*.
- 224 Galadari, "The Qibla."
- 225 Reynolds, *The Qur'an and Its Biblical Subtext*.
- 226 Hawting, Gerald, "Review of Lüling," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 27 (1982): 111.
- 227 Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*.
- 228 Galadari, "The Qibla."

Chapter 3: Examples of Intertextual Polysemy from Qur'anic and Arabic Perspectives

- 1 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, 24: 519–522 on Q. 96:1.
- 2 I translate "*khalaq*" as divided, based on my discussion in Galadari, Abdulla, "*Creatio ex Nihilo* and the Literal Qur'an," *Intellectual Discourse* 25 (2017): 381–408.
- 3 I translate "*alaq*" as clinging, instead of "blood clot" used by TSQ, as it appears to be perhaps more loyal to the original Arabic root meaning.
- 4 Unlike the TSQ, which translates "*al-insān*" as "man," I translate it as "the human."
- 5 Qur'an 96:1–5.
- 6 The root of the term "*khlaq*" means division, and it is mainly used in that definition by the Hebrew Bible.

- 7 For example, al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 24: 519–522 on Q. 96:2; al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī (d. 1402/1981) *al-Mizān fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān* (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Aʿlami lil-Maṭbūʿāt, 1997), 20: 181 on Q. 96:2.
- 8 The method of intertextual polysemy is described in Galadari, “The Role of Intertextual Polysemy.”
- 9 Qurʾan 55:1–4. There is a likelihood that “*bayān*” is not specifically speech, but clarity, which is the root meaning of the term.
- 10 It is also noteworthy to state that in Qurʾan 1:1, and traditionally, the recitation of the Qurʾan starts with the name of God, the Most Compassionate (*al-Raḥmān*), the Most Merciful (*al-Raḥīm*).
- 11 Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*.
- 12 The prophetic tradition (*ḥadīth*) states, “Everything has a bride, and the bride of the Qurʾan is al-Raḥmān.” This tradition is narrated by ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib as found in al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066), *Shuʿab al-īmān* (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2003) 4: 116 (#2265). Exegetes such as al-Biqāʾī (885/1480) narrates it in his interpretation of the surah. See al-Biqāʾī (d. 855/1480) *Nizām al-durar fī tanāsib al-āyat wal-suwar* (Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Islāmī), 19: 139.
- 13 Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 4: 2169 (#2816), with a variant in 4: 2170 (#2816).
- 14 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab* on “*srr*.”
- 15 Ibid., on “*bṭn*.”
- 16 John 3:3–12.
- 17 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, on Q. 18:65.
- 18 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 10: 227–231.
- 19 Ibid., 10: 225–226.
- 20 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 4:538–600 on Q. 2:229–230.
- 21 This section is based on an example found in Galadari, “*Creatio ex Nihilo*.”
- 22 Qurʾan 19:2.

Chapter 4: The Relationship Between the Qurʾan and the Bible

- 1 The Qurʾan usually talks of the Gospel in singular form, “*al-injil*.” As such, I am trying to show that the Qurʾan is speaking of the Gospels most probably, but is calling the collection in its singular form as Gospel. Perhaps there needs to be more study as to what Arab Christians used to call the Gospels in the time of Muḥammad. There might be a possibility they called them “*injil*” as the collective works of the Gospels. This is perhaps coming from the Syriac Tatian’s *Diatessaron*.
- 2 The concept of abrogation is a heated topic of debate between Muslim scholars. Many classical Muslim scholars, such as Abu ʿUbayd (d. 224/839), Abu Jaʿfar al-Naḥḥās (d. 377/949), Hibbat Allāh ibn Salamah (d. 410/1019), Makkī ibn Abū Ṭālib (d. 437/1045), Abu Bakr Ibn al-ʿArabī (d. 543/1148) (not to be confused with the Sufi mystic Muḥammad ibn ʿArabī), Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1201), al-Zarkashī, and al-Suyūṭī have argued that some Qurʾanic verses have been abrogated. For a brief overview on the concept of abrogation from the point of view of classical Muslim scholars see Ushama, Thameem, “The Phenomenon of al-Naskh: A Brief Overview of the Key Issues,” *Jurnal Fiqh* 3 (2006): 101–132.
- 3 Ali, Moch. “Rethinking the Semitic Texts: A Study of Intertextuality,” *Studia Philosophica et Theologica* 8, no. 1 (2008): 72–89.

- 4 Reynolds, *The Qur'ān and Its Biblical Subtext*.
- 5 Firestone, Reuven, "The Qur'ān and the Bible: Some Modern Studies of Their Relationship," in *Bible and Qur'an: Essays in Scriptural Intertextuality*, ed. J. C. Reeves (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 2–3.
- 6 Wansbrough, *Qur'anic Studies*.
- 7 Wansbrough, *The Sectarian Milieu*.
- 8 Ibid. and also Reynolds, *The Qur'ān and Its Biblical Subtext*.
- 9 Qur'an 4:157.
- 10 As an example, consider the narrations mostly based on Wahb ibn Munabbih in al-Ṭabarī's *tafsīr* that perhaps one or more of Jesus' disciples was made in the likeness of Jesus. See Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, 9: 367–377 on Q. 4:157.
- 11 Medieval Christianity has viewed Islam with hostility, possibly due to Muslim political and military threats against Christian territories. Islam had threatened Europe in both the west, in Spain and France, as well in the east, by the Ottomans. As such, many polemical works against Islam in medieval times have portrayed Muḥammad as a charlatan and an imposter, whose aim was to deceive the people. Medieval Judaism, on the other hand, did not feel especially threatened, since they did not have political autonomy anyway under Christian rule. The Jewish predisposition toward Islam might have influenced Abraham Geiger (d. 1874). Geiger did not view Muḥammad as an imposter like many of his predecessors and contemporaries, but viewed him as a sincere and a devout religious enthusiast, whose aims are characteristically noble. Geiger, Abraham, *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen?* (Bonn: F. Baaden, 1833).
- 12 Pregill, M., "The Hebrew Bible and the Quran: The Problem of the Jewish 'Influence' on Islam," *Religion Compass* 1, no. 6 (2007): 643–659.
- 13 Sasson, J. M., "Circumcision in the Ancient Near East," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85, no. 4 (1966): 473–476.
- 14 Hecker, H. M., "A Zooarchaeological Inquiry into Pork Consumption in Egypt from Prehistoric to New Kingdom Times," *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 19 (1982): 59–71; Lobban, R. A., "Pigs and Their Prohibition," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 26, no. 1 (1994): 57–75.
- 15 Wasserstrom, Steven M., *Between Muslim and Jew: The Problem of Symbiosis Under Early Islam* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014).
- 16 Ibid., 103.
- 17 Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845), *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubra* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah, 1990), 2: 273–274; al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 6: 182 (#4984).
- 18 I am indebted to Ulrika Mårtensson who pointed this out to me.
- 19 Torrey, Charles C. *The Jewish Foundation of Islam* (New York, NY: Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1933).
- 20 Jeffery, Arthur, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ān* (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1938).
- 21 Pennacchio, Catherine "Lexical Borrowing in the Qur'an: The Problematic Aspects of Arthur Jeffery's List," *Bulletin du Centre de recherche français à Jérusalem* 22 (2011), <https://bcrfj.revues.org/6643>.
- 22 Newby, Gordon "Observations About an Early Judaeo-Arabic," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 61, no. 3 (1971): 212–221.
- 23 Bell, Richard, *The Origin of Islam in Its Christian Environment* (London: Frank Cass, 1968).
- 24 Pregill, M., "The Hebrew Bible and the Quran," 648.

- 25 See, for example, King, Leonard W., *Legends of Babylon and Egypt in Relation to Hebrew Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1916); Melvin, David, "The Gilgamesh Traditions and the Pre-history of Genesis 6:1–4," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 8, no. 1 (2011): 23–32.
- 26 Barr, James, "The Question of Religious Influence: The Case of Zoroastrianism, Judaism, and Christianity," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 53, no. 2 (1985): 201–235.
- 27 Halliday, W. R., *The Pagan Background of Early Christianity* (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2010).
- 28 Refer to *Tafsīr Muqātil ibn Sulaymān*.
- 29 Refer to Al-Tha'labī (d. 427/1035), *al-Kashf wal-bayān 'an tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, eds. Abī Muḥammad ibn 'Āshūr and Naẓīr al-Sā'idī (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 2002).
- 30 Albayrak, I., "Isrā'īliyyāt and Classical Exegetes' Comments on the Calf with a Hollow Sound Q.20: 83–98 / 7: 147–155 with Special Reference to Ibn 'Aṭīyya," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 47, no. 1 (2002): 39–65. Also refer to Al-Madinah International University, *al-Dakhil fil-tafsīr* (n.d.), 23. For an historical summary of the notion of "isrā'īliyyāt" refer to Albayrak, I., "Re-Evaluating the Notion of Isrā'īliyyat," *D. E. Ü. İlahiyyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 14 (2001): 69–88.
- 31 Not only are there critics of "isrā'īliyyāt" among Sunnī, but also among Shī'ī scholars. Refer to al-Muḥammadī, F. A., *Salāmat al-Qur'ān min al-tahrīf* (Markaz al-Abḥāth al-'Aqā'idīyyah, n.d.), 449–451.
- 32 For more on Biblical scholarship in early Islam, refer to Adang, Camilla, *Muslim Writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible from Ibn Rabban to Ibn Hazm* (Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- 33 For more information on the Israelite tradition (*isrā'īliyyāt*) see Muḥammad Ḥussain al-Dhahabī, *al-Isrā'īliyyāt fil-tafsīr wal-ḥadīth* (Cairo: Maktabat Wahbah, 1990).
- 34 Albayrak, "Isrā'īliyyāt and Classical Exegetes' Comments."
- 35 See Abu Shuhbah, Muḥammad, *al-Isrā'īliyyāt wal-mawḍū'āt fī kutub al-tafsīr* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Sunnah, 1983), 95; al-Rūmī, *Ittijāhāt*, 2: 757–758.
- 36 Al-Rūmī, *Ittijāhāt*, 2: 757–758.
- 37 As an example, see Abu Shuhbah, *al-Isrā'īliyyāt*, 128.
- 38 Na'nā'ah, R., *al-isrā'īliyyāt wa atharuhā fī kutub al-tafsīr* (Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 1970).
- 39 Al-Dhahabī, *al-Isrā'īliyyāt*.
- 40 Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 4: 170 (#3461).
- 41 Kister, Meir J., "Ḥaddithū 'an Banī Isrā'īla wa la Ḥarajā: A Study of an Early Tradition," *Israel Oriental Studies* 2 (1972): 215–239.
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 Al-Qāsimī criticizes the use of stories that do not even correspond to Jewish scriptures and have very ambiguous sources. See al-Qāsimī, *Maḥāsīn*, 35.
- 44 Twakkal, Abd Alfatah, "Ka'b al-Aḥbār and the Isrā'īliyyāt in the Tafsīr Literature" (M.A. diss., Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, 2007), 20.
- 45 See al-Qāsimī, *Maḥāsīn*, 30–35.
- 46 Twakkal, "Ka'b al-Aḥbār," 29.
- 47 His main logical argument is the prophetic tradition where Muḥammad states, "I am the child of the two sacrificed ones (*ana ibn al-dhabīhayn*)," where this is assumed to be a reference of Ishmael, as one of the sacrificed ones. See Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373), *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-'aẓīm*, ed. Sāmī Salāmeḥ (Riyadh: Dār Ṭaybah, n.d.), 7: 28–31 on Q. 37:99–113.

- 48 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, 21: 72–90 on Q. 37:101–111.
- 49 E.g., Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr*, 7: 28–31 on Q. 37:99–113; al-Samarqandī (d. 373/983), *Baḥr al-'ulūm* (unknown publisher, n.d.), 3: 146–150 on Q. 37:99–113; al-Rāzī (d. 606/1210), *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb* (Beirut: Ihyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 2000), 26: 345–351 on Q. 37:102–113; al-Qurṭubī (d. 671/1273), *al-Jāmi' li-aḥkām al-Qur'ān*, ed. A. Aṭfīsh (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyyah, 1964), 15:98–114 on Q. 37:102–113.
- 50 al-Samarqandī, *Baḥr*, 3: 147 on Q. 37:99–113.
- 51 al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ*, 26: 346 on Q. 37:102–113.
- 52 Al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi'*, 15:100 on Q. 37:102–113.
- 53 Al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/970), *al-Tafsīr al-kabīr* (Amman: Dār al-Kitāb al-Thaqāfī, 2008), on Q. 37:101–113.
- 54 Firestone, Rueven, “Abraham’s Son as the Intended Sacrifice (*Al-Dhabīḥ*, Qur’an 37:99–113): Issues in Qur’ānic Exegesis,” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34, no. 1 (1989): 95–131.
- 55 Twakkal, “Ka’b al-Aḥbār,” 32.
- 56 Ibid., 35–37, 88.
- 57 Although the Book of Enoch is not canonical to the majority of Jewish traditions and Christian Churches, it is canonical to the Ethiopian and Eritrean Orthodox Churches. The New Testament, however, does cite and quote from the Book of Enoch (i.e., Jude 1:14–15), which might support the authenticity of the Book of Enoch as a Jewish religious work. Augustine did consider 1 Enoch as having something of divine inspiration in it, and as such repeated and cited in Jude’s Epistle. See Williams, A., “Milton and the Book of Enoch: An Alternative Hypothesis,” *The Harvard Theological Review* 33, no. 4 (1940): 291–299. Andreas Rivetus (d. 1651), a Calvinist theologian, considered the citation in Jude not as a proof of the authenticity of the Book of Enoch or even its existence. To him, Jude states that Enoch prophesied something, but that Jude says nothing of the Book of Enoch. Also see Williams, “Milton and the Book of Enoch.” To him, Jude received inspiration on Enoch’s prophecy. However, one might also argue that the Holy Spirit may cite other books that contain truths even if it does not consider the whole other text as truth. The Qur’an also directly quotes (or alludes to) Biblical scriptures (e.g., Qur’an 5:32, 45, 21:105). Muslim scholars may adopt a similar viewpoint where the Qur’an might cite parts of the Bible confirming that the text contains truth, but not necessarily confirming the full text as true, although this is highly debatable, in which I will need to discuss the issue of corruption of scriptures known as “*taḥrīj*,” according to the Qur’an.
- 58 As examples from medieval polemics against Jews and Christians; see Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064), *al-Faṣl fil-milal wal-ahwā’ wal-niḥal* (Cairo: al-Khānjī, n.d.); Shihāb al-Dīn al-Qarāfī (d. 684/1285), *al-Ajwiba al-fākhiraḥ ‘an al-as’ ilāḥ al-fājiraḥ fil-radd ‘ala al-millāḥ al-kāfiraḥ*, ed. Bīkr Zakī ‘Awaḍ (Cairo: Sa’id Ra’fat, 1987); Ibn Qayyim (d. 751/1350), *Hidāyah al-ḥayāra fī ajwibah al-yahūd wal-naṣāra*, ed. M. Al-Ḥāj (Jeddah: Dār al-Qalam, 1996); Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728/1328), *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ liman baddal dīn al-masīḥ*, ed. ‘Alī ibn Ḥasan, ‘Abdul-Azīz ibn Ibrāhīm, and Ḥamdān ibn Muḥammad (Riyadh: Dār al-‘Āsimah, 1984).
- 59 See Ibn Qayyim (d. 751/1350), *Ighāthat al-lahfān min maṣā’id al-shayṭān*, ed. M. al-Faqī (Riyadh: al-Ma’ārif, n.d.), 2: 351–354; Ibn Qayyim, *Hidāyah al-ḥayāra*, 312; al-Salmān, ‘Abdul ‘Azīz, *Mukhtaṣar al-as’ ilāḥ wal-ajwibah al-uṣūliyyah ‘ala al-‘aqidah al-wāsiṭiyyah* (unknown publisher, 1997), 23–24; al-Qaḥṭānī, S. *Kayfiyyat da’wat ahl al-kitāb ila Allah ta’āla fi daw’ al-kitāb wal-sunnah* (Riyadh: Mu’assasat al-Juraisi lil-Tawzī’ wal-I’lān, n.d.), 23.

- 60 Āl-Mu‘ammar, ‘Abdul ‘Azīz (d. 1244/1828) *Minḥat al-qarīb al-mujīb fil-radd ‘ala ‘ibād al-ṣalīb* (unknown publisher, n.d.), 1: 250.
- 61 Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 9: 160.
- 62 Ibn Qayyim, *Ighāthah*, 2: 353.
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 Both the Qur’anic and Talmudic contexts are referring to Cain slaying Abel, which highly suggest the Qur’anic engagement with the Talmud. This is found in both the Bavli and Yerushalmi Talmuds. Refer to Neusner, Jacob, trans., *The Babylonian Talmud: A Translation and Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2011), Sanhedrin 37a, 4:5; also refer to Neusner, Jacob, trans. *The Jerusalem Talmud: A Translation and Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008), Sanhedrin 4:5.
- 65 Although there is no scholarly consensus on the Jews referred to by the Qur’an (we do not even know if the Qur’an is referring to Jews in Medina), but there is a highly likelihood they have been precursors of Rabbinic Judaism due to the Qur’an’s engagement specifically with the Talmud, as is also seen in Galadari, “The Qibla.” Refer to Mazuz, Haggai, *The Religious and Spiritual Life of the Jews of Medina* (Leiden: Brill, 2014). Also refer to Newby, Gordon, *A History of the Jews of Arabia: From Ancient Times to Their Eclipse under Islam* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, 1988), 57–59. Also refer to Lapin, Hayim, *Rabbis as Romans: The Rabbinic Movement in Palestine, 100–400 CE* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 158. Also refer to Berkey, Jonathan, P. *The Formation of Islam: Religion and Society in the Near East, 600–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 46.
- 66 Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 4: 170 (#3461).
- 67 Qur’an 16:43, 21:7.
- 68 See Abu al-Muẓaffar (d. 471/1079), *al-Tabṣīr fil-dīn wa-tamyīz al-firqah al-nājiyyah ‘an al-firaq al-hālikin*, ed. K. Y. al-Ḥūt (Beirut: ‘Ālam al-Kutub, 1983), 181–182; Ibn Qudāmah al-Maqdisī (d. 620/1223), *Taḥrīm al-naẓar fī kutub al-kalām*, ed. A. M. S. Dimashqiyyah (Riyadh: ‘Ālam al-Kutub, 1990), 49.
- 69 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi‘*, 17: 208 on Q. 16:43.
- 70 Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr*, 4: 573 on Q. 16:43.
- 71 Al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi‘*, 10: 108 on Q. 16:43.
- 72 Al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ*, 20: 211 on Q. 16:43.
- 73 Al-Ṭabarsī, *Majma‘*, 6: 159 on Q. 16:43.
- 74 See Al-Biqā‘ī (d. 885/1480), *al-Aqwāl al-qawīmah fī ḥukm al-naql min al-kutub al-qadīmah* (Cairo: Maktabat Jazīrat al-Ward, 2010). Al-Qāsimī mentions him as someone who has extensively used the Bible in his Qur’anic exegesis. See al-Qāsimī, *Maḥāsīn*, 30–38.
- 75 Saleh, Walid A., “A Fifteenth-Century Muslim Hebraist: Al-Biqā‘ī and His Defense of Using the Bible to Interpret the Qur’ān,” *Speculum* 83 (2008): 629–654.
- 76 Ibid., 630–631.
- 77 Ibid., 633–634.
- 78 Ibid.
- 79 Al-Biqā‘ī at times quotes from the Bible verbatim, and states, for example, this is “*naṣṣ al-tawrāh*” (the passage of the Torah) or “*qawluhu fil-tawrāh*” (His [God’s] saying in the Torah). As an example, on the age of Adam, he quotes directly from Genesis 5:5; see al-Biqā‘ī, *Niẓām*, 1: 271 on Q. 1:31–35. On the creation of Adam in God’s image, he also quotes directly from Genesis 1:27 or 5:1–2; see al-Biqā‘ī, *Niẓām*, 1: 280 on Q. 1:31–35. As an example, while quoting from the Gospel of Matthew, he states

“Matthew says” when quoting Matthew 9:35. He continues by quoting Matthew 11:2–3; see al-Biqā’ī, *Niẓam*, 6: 343 on Q. 5:109–111.

80 A mufti is a religious authority who is an expert in Islamic legal matters.

81 Saleh, “A Fifteenth-Century Muslim Hebraist,” 634.

82 Ibid., 636–637.

83 Al-Qāsimī, *Maḥāsini*, 35. Al-Qāsimī brings up the prophetic tradition (*ḥadīth*) that states:

The People of the Book used to read the Torah in Hebrew and used to interpret it to Muslims in Arabic, and so the prophet said, “Neither believe nor falsify the People of the Book, and say, ‘We believe what has been revealed to us and what has been revealed to you.’”

(My translation from al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 6: 20 (#4485), 9: 111 (#7362), and 9: 157 (#7542), which is narrated in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* as a reference to Qur’an 3:93)

This prophetic tradition also provides evidence in using scriptures, where Muḥammad is asserting to the believers the need to believe earlier scriptures. The context to which this tradition is being related by Abū Hurayra provides some insight that perhaps the reason why Muḥammad cautioned the Muslims is not because of doubting the Torah, but because the Muslims are not reading it as a primary source in its original language (Hebrew), but as a secondary source from Arabic commentaries thereof that are being told to them by the Jews. Thus Muslims did not have the opportunity to read it directly and as such were cautioned about how the Jews would interpret it for them. Therefore, this prophetic tradition cannot be used as evidence that Muḥammad had cautioned the usage of earlier scriptures, but cautioned on how they are being interpreted. On the other hand, it is not Muḥammad, but Ibn ‘Abbās who had cautioned the Muslims from asking the People of the Book, when the Qur’an is a newer revelation. Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 9: 111 (#7363). Nonetheless, Ibn Kathīr had argued that some narrations of Ibn ‘Abbās could be from “*isrā’īliyyāt*,” as reported in al-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, 4: 299. Such a statement, however, would contradict the Qur’an, which requires Muslims to ask the People of the Book (i.e., Qur’an 16:43, 21:7).

84 Although the TSQ, and generally the term “*ṭa’ām*” in this passage is understood as food, I argue that its meaning is closer to “commandments” or “judgments,” which shares the same root and is used in this sense in Akkadian, Hebrew, and Aramaic languages, based on its root meaning “wise” see Oppenheim, A. Leo, Reiner, Erica, and Roth, Martha T., eds., *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago, IL: The Oriental Institute, 1956–2011), 19:46, 19:84–97; TDOT, 5:345–347; BDB, 380–381, similar to the Arabic “*ḥukm*” for commandment from the root meaning of wisdom, as well. The Qur’anic context both before and after this verse has no mention of food, and therefore, the closest possible meaning given the context of this passage is “commandments.”

85 Qur’an 3:93.

86 Saleh, “A Fifteenth-Century Muslim Hebraist,” 638. This argument is weak in that polemics usually quote the Bible to refute Jews and Christians, while al-Biqā’ī uses it to interpret the Qur’an. There is a philosophical argument as to whether it is logical to quote a text, in which the polemic does not believe, to refute it. Polemic arguments that use texts believed to be false cannot be used to conclude truths, philosophically. As such, there is reason to consider al-Biqā’ī’s quotes a more rational approach than that of polemics.

- 87 Saleh "A Fifteenth-Century Muslim Hebraist," 639–640. In part of his defense, he states that the majority of other scholars who oppose his method are of the Shāfiʿī school of thought, the same school to which he belongs. He argues that it is perhaps jealousy on their part, since scholars and jurists from other schools did not oppose him. As such, he concludes that he has the support of the Shāfiʿī *muftī* in Makkah, who praises his work and was eager to obtain a copy of his Qurʾanic commentary. Saleh, "A Fifteenth-Century Muslim Hebraist," 641.
- 88 Ibid., 643.
- 89 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 10: 336–337 on Q. 5:43.
- 90 Qurʾan 5:43.
- 91 Saleh, "A Fifteenth-Century Muslim Hebraist," 644–645.
- 92 Ibid., 646.
- 93 Ibid., 649.
- 94 Ibid.
- 95 Ibid.
- 96 Ibid.
- 97 Ibid.
- 98 Ibid., 650.
- 99 Ibid.
- 100 Ibid., 651.
- 101 Ibid., 652.
- 102 Ibid., 635.
- 103 Guo, L., "Al-Biqāʿī's Chronicle: A Fifteenth Century Learned Man's Reflection on His Time and World," in *The Historiography of Islamic Egypt, c. 950–1800*, ed. Hugh Kennedy (Leiden: Brill NV, 2000), 121–148.
- 104 Chodkiewicz, M., *An Ocean Without Shore: Ibn Arabi, the Book, and the Law* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1993), 19.
- 105 For more details on the Qurʾanic passages that appear to be exclusivist in nature and how they are being interpreted in modern contexts, see Sirry, Munʾim, *Scriptural Polemics: The Qurʾan and Other Religions* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2014).
- 106 Qurʾan 3:83–85.
- 107 For a comprehensive review of the term "islām" in the Qurʾan, see Smith, Jane I. *An Historical and Semantic Study of the Term "Islām" as Seen in a Sequence of Qurʾan Commentaries* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975).
- 108 Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl*, 3: 109.
- 109 Ibid.
- 110 There is a long debate on the difference between the term "islām" and "imān" among classical scholars, which is beyond the scope of this book.
- 111 Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl*, 3: 109.
- 112 Robson, James, "Islām' as a Term," *The Muslim World* 44, no. 2 (1954): 101–109.
- 113 Izutsu, T. *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qurʾan* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002), 189–193.
- 114 Ibn ʿAbdulwahhāb (d. 1206/1792), *al-Rasāʾil al-shakḥīyyah*, eds. S. Al-Fawzān and M. al-ʿAilaqi (Riyadh: Al-Imam Muhammad ibn Saud Islamic University), 170.
- 115 Ibn ʿAbdulwahhāb (d. 1206/1792), *Kashf al-shubuhāt* (Riyadh: Ministry of Islamic Affairs, 1998), 24.
- 116 Sirriyeh, E., "Wahhabis, Unbelievers and the Problems of Exclusivism," *Bulletin of the British Society for Middle Eastern Studies* 16 (1989): 123–132, 125.

- 117 For the Semitic etymology of the root “*s l m*,” see *TDOT*, 15: 14–20, on “*s h l m*.”
- 118 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 12: 289–301 on “*s l m*.”
- 119 Ibid.
- 120 Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Īmān*, 204–205.
- 121 Ibid., 205.
- 122 Ibid.
- 123 Ibid., 282–283, 296–297, 320–321.
- 124 Ibn Abī al-‘Izz (d. 792/1390), *Sharḥ al-‘aqidah al-ṭahāwīyyah* (Riyadh: Ministry of Islamic Affairs, 1998), 534.
- 125 Ibid. Ibn Abī al-‘Izz states that this *ḥadīth* is in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* and narrated by Abū Hurayra. The text of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* is as follows, “Prophets are brothers in faith; their mothers are different and their religion is one.” See al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 4: 167 (#3443).
- 126 Ibid.
- 127 Ibid.
- 128 Shams al-Dīn al-Safārīnī, *Lawāmi‘*, 2: 383.
- 129 Donner, *Muhammad and the Believers*, 71–73.
- 130 Ibn Abī al-‘Izz, *Sharḥ*, 534.
- 131 Donner, *Muhammad and the Believers*, 71–73.
- 132 I translate “*al-nās*” as humankind as it seems more loyal to the Arabic, than the TSQ’s translation of “mankind.”
- 133 I translate “*khalaq*” as divided, based on my discussion in Galadari, “*Creatio ex Nihilo*.”
- 134 Qur’an 49:13.
- 135 Asani, Ali S., “So That You May Know One Another: A Muslim American Reflects on Pluralism in Islam,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 588 (2003): 40–51, 43.
- 136 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi‘*, 22: 309–312 on Q. 49:13.
- 137 I would call it a discussion instead of a debate.
- 138 Qur’an 29:46.
- 139 As before, I translate “*al-nās*” as humankind as it seems more loyal to the Arabic, than the TSQ’s translation of “mankind.”
- 140 Qur’an 3:110.
- 141 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi‘*, 7: 107–108 on Q. 3:110.
- 142 Qur’an 3:112–115.
- 143 Qur’an 2:61–62.
- 144 Qur’an 5:68–70.
- 145 There are other points of intertextuality, but I will stop it there, as it would go beyond the scope of this book.
- 146 Qur’an 2:111–113.
- 147 In explaining this verse, al-Ṭabarī mentions that the term “*aslam*,” which shares the same root as “*islām*” and “*muslim*,” means to surrender. See al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi‘*, 2: 510–511 on Q. 2:112.
- 148 Qur’an 2:121.
- 149 Qur’an 5:66.
- 150 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 9: 43 on “*ḥ r f*.”
- 151 Ibid., 12: 496 on “*q w m*.” Also see *TDOT*, 12: 589–612, on “*q w m*.”
- 152 Tarakci, M. and Sayar, S., “The Qur’anic View of the Corruption of the Torah and the Gospels,” *The Islamic Quarterly* 49, no. 3 (2005): 227–245.

- 153 Al-Hāshimī (d. 668/1269) *Takhjīl man ḥarraf al-tawrāt wal-injīl*, ed. M. A. Qadh (Riyadh: Maktabat al-'Obaikān, 1998).
- 154 Mingana, A., "The Apology of Timothy the Patriarch Before the Caliph Mahdi," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 12, no. 1 (1928): 137–298, 171, 191.
- 155 Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 3: 181 (#2685).
- 156 It sometimes bewilders me why some Muslims would sometimes take a *ḥadīth*, and in this case not even attributed to Muḥammad, as a rule, even when it contradicts the Qur'an.
- 157 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, 17: 207–208 on Q. 16:43.
- 158 Tarakci and Sayar, "The Qur'anic View," 228.
- 159 Ibid., 230.
- 160 Whether it is al-Ghazālī's work is highly debatable.
- 161 Whittingham, Martin, "The Value of *tahrīf ma'nawī* (corrupt interpretation) as a Category for Analysing Muslim Views of the Bible: Evidence from *al-radd al-jamīl* and Ibn Khaldūn," *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 22, no. 2 (2011): 209–222.
- 162 See Bowman, J., "The Debt of Islam to Monophysite Syrian Christianity," in *Essays in Honor of Griffiths Wheeler Thatcher*, ed. E. C. B. MacLaurin (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1967), 200; Resnick, I., "The Falsification of Scripture and Medieval Christian and Jewish Polemics," *Medieval Encounters* 2, no. 3 (1996): 344–380.
- 163 Reynolds, Gabriel S., "On the Qur'anic Accusation of Scriptural Falsification (*tahrīf*) and Christian Anti-Jewish Polemic," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 130, no. 2 (2010): 189–202, 197. See also Reynolds' reference on Syriac Fathers using a spiritual interpretation of the Hebrew Bible for typological purposes in Brock, Sebastian P., *The Bible in Syriac Tradition* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006), 59.
- 164 Reynolds, "On the Qur'anic Accusation," 197–200.
- 165 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, 2: 248–249 on Q. 2:75.
- 166 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 9: 43 on "ḥ r f"
- 167 The term "*inḥirāf*" meaning crooked perhaps goes back to the time of the Qur'an. There is a saying by Abū Hurayra stating, "*Āmantu bi-muḥarraf al-qulūb*," (I believe in the bender of the hearts). See Ibn Baṭṭah (d. 387/997), *al-Ibānah al-kubra* (Riyadh: Dār al-Rāyah wal-Tawzī', 1995), 4: 171 (#1658).
- 168 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, 2: 248–249 on Q. 2:75.
- 169 See *ibid.*, 15: 40–41 on Q. 10:15, and 17: 296–297 on Q. 16:101.
- 170 Ibid., 17: 68 on Q. 15:9.
- 171 Medieval Muslim polemics, such as Najm al-Dīn al-Ṭūfī (d. 716/1316), argue against the understanding of "*al-dhikr*" to mean the Torah and the Gospel using consensus of Qur'anic commentators as evidence. However, as argued here, classical Qur'anic commentaries may be plagued with opinions and assumptions based on presuppositions rather than facts. Hence, such evidence would have no Qur'anic basis. See Najm al-Dīn al-Ṭūfī (d. 716/1316), *al-Intiṣārāt al-iṣlāmīyyah fī kashf shubah al-naṣrāniyah*, ed. S. M. al-Qarnī (Riyadh: Maktabat al-'Obaikān, 1999), 1: 289–300.
- 172 Qur'an 6:34.
- 173 Ibid., 6:115.
- 174 Ibid., 10:64.
- 175 Ibid., 18:27.
- 176 Ibid., 48:15.
- 177 Ibid., 2:75.
- 178 Ibid., 4:46.
- 179 Ibid., 5:13.

- 180 Ibid., 5:41.
- 181 Mazuz, *The Religious and Spiritual Life*, 19–21.
- 182 Ibid., 19–20. Mazuz gives the following examples from the Babylonian Talmud: Ro'sh ha-Shana, 3a, 11a, 13b; Yômā, 39a, 75b; Sukka, 31a, 52a, 55 a–b, 114a, 118b, 119b; Shabbat, 30b, 32b, 33a, 88b, 89a; Ḥaggiga, 27a; Mo'ed Qaṭan, 5a, 9b; Pesahim, 49b, 117a; Meggila, 13a, 14a, 15b, 25b, 28a–b; Ta'anit, 4a, 7b, 9a; Berakhöt, 5a, 7b, 10a–b, 14a, 15b, 20a, 30b, 31b, 48b, 64a; Söṭa, 5a–b, 9a, 11b, 12a, 13a, 35a, 37a; Nidda, 13a, 73a; Ketüböt, 5a, 67a, 111a–b; Qiddushin, 30a–b; Hulin, 27a, 60a; Qodashim, 29b; Zevaḥim, 116b; Keritöt, 28a; 'Avöda Zara, 3b, 4a, 11a; Sanhedrin, 63b, 99b, 110b; Bavā Qammā, 10b, 81b; Bavā Meši'ā, 84a; Bavā Batrā, 74b, 75b, 118b; 'Eirüvin, 21b, 54a–b.
- 183 Ibid., 19–20. Referring to the Babylonian Talmud, Shabbat 33a.
- 184 Ibid., 20. Referring to the Babylonian Talmud, Shabbat 89a.
- 185 Ibid., 20. Referring to the Babylonian Talmud, Shabbat 88b.
- 186 Ibid., 20–21.
- 187 Ibn Manzür, *Lisān al-'arab*, 9: 41–42 on “ḥ r f.”
- 188 Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 4: 113 (#3219). Also variants in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 6: 184 (#4991), 3: 122 (#2419), 6: 184 (#4992); Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 1: 560 (#270/818), 1: 561 (#272/819), 1: 561 (#273/820), 1: 562 (#274/562).
- 189 Perhaps the term “*yuharrifūn*” is an Arabic equivalent to “*yutarjimūn*” at the time of the Qur'an. The term “*t r g m*” appears to be Aramaic. Rarely are Semitic roots quadrilateral, and this term appears to be one of them. We will need to find out when the term “*t r j m*” was adopted by the Arabs, as there is evidence perhaps it did exist in the time of the Qur'an. This might be of interest as literal translation is called in Arabic “*tarjamah ḥarfiyyah*,” in which the root of the term “*ḥ r f*” is used to mean literal. The term “*tarjumān*” from the root “*t r j m*” appears in a prophetic tradition (*ḥadīth*), which states, “then one of you will stand up between God's hands without between him and Him a veil nor a translator (*tarjumān*) to translate (*yutarjim*) for him;” al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 2: 108 (#1413). Also variants in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 4: 197 (#3595), 8: 112 (#6539), 9: 132 (#7443), 9: 148 (#7512). Also in Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 2: 703 (#1016). The term “*t r j m*” also appears in a tradition when Muḥammad asked Zayd ibn Thābit to learn the book of the Jews and that Ibn 'Abbās had a translator as well; *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 9: 76 (#7195); *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 9: 76 (#7196).
- 190 For more on Jewish targums and its role in interpretation of the Hebrew Bible, see Bowker, J. W. *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretation of Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969); McNamara, Martin, *Targum and New Testament: Collected Essays* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011); McNamara, Martin, *Targum and Testament Revisited: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2010).
- 191 McNamara, *Targum and Testament Revisited*, 131; McNamara, *Targum and New Testament*, 239.
- 192 There is no consensus on the dating of the targums. Some scholars suggest that some targums were written during the Islamic period, while others suggest that at least some targums were perhaps written as early as the first century CE. See Flesher, Paul V. M. and Chilton, Bruce D. *The Targums: A Critical Introduction* (Leiden: Brill, 2011); Hayward, C. T. Robert *Targums and the Transmission of Scripture into Judaism and Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2010); Houtman, Alberdina and Sysling, Harry, *Alternative Targum Traditions: The Use of Variant Readings for the Study in Origin and History of*

- Targum Jonathan* (Leiden: Brill, 2009); McNamara, *Targum and Testament Revisited*. Nonetheless, this does not dismiss the existence of perhaps oral targum during the time of the Qur'an, which the Qur'an may be rejecting.
- 193 McNamara, *Targum and Testament Revisited*, 60.
- 194 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 9: 42–43 on “ḥ r f.”
- 195 See Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 9: 43–44 on “ḥ r f.” Also see *TDOT*, 5: 209–211, on “ḥ r p.” Though there might seem to be a relationship between “*ḥirfah*” and “craft,” the English term could trace its root to “*kraf*” in Proto-Germanic meaning strength.
- 196 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 9: 43–44 on “ḥ r f.”
- 197 *TDOT*, 5: 209–215, on “ḥ r p.”
- 198 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 9: 43 on “*ḥrf*.”
- 199 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, 10: 301–318 on Q. 5:41.
- 200 Ibid., 10: 301–302 on Q. 5:41.
- 201 Ibid., 10: 303–306 on Q. 5:41.
- 202 Ibid., 10: 303–306 on Q. 5:41.
- 203 Qur'an 5:43.
- 204 Tarakci and Sayar, “The Qur'anic View.”
- 205 Reynolds, “On the Qur'anic Accusation.”
- 206 Tarakci and Sayar, “The Qur'anic View.”
- 207 In the view of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints and as stated by Joseph Smith in the Doctrine and Covenants 91:1–2, “Verily, thus saith the Lord unto you concerning the Apocrypha. There are many things contained therein that are true, and it is mostly translated correctly. There are many things contained therein that are not true, which are interpolations by the hands of men.”
- 208 Reynolds, “On the Qur'anic Accusation,” 193.
- 209 Also compare with Q. 5:48.
- 210 Donner, *Muhammad and the Believers*, 87.
- 211 Ibn Qayyim, *Hidāyah al-ḥayāra*, 312–315, 416, 432; Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Jawāb*, 2: 367.
- 212 Al-Juwaynī (d. 478/1085), *Shifā' al-ghalīl fī bayān mā waqa'a fil-tawrāt wal-injīl min al-tabdīl*, ed. A. H. al-Saqqā (Cairo: Maktabat al-Azhariyyah lil-Turāth, 1978), 29.
- 213 For more on Aḥmad or Muḥammad see Jones, L. B., “The Paraclete or Mohammed: The Verdict of an Ancient Manuscript,” *The Muslim World* 10, no. 2 (1920): 112–125; Smith, P., “Did Jesus Foretell Ahmed? Origin of the so-called Prophecy of Jesus concerning the Coming of Mohammed,” *The Muslim World* 12, no. 1 (1922): 71–74; Guthrie, A. and Bishop, E. F. F., “The Paraclete, Almunhamanna and Aḥmad,” *The Muslim World* 41, no. 4 (1951): 251–256; Watt, William Montgomery, “His Name is Ahmad,” *The Muslim World* 43, no. 2 (1953): 110–117.
- 214 Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Jawāb*, 3: 142–144.
- 215 Examples of medieval polemics against Jews and Christians; see Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣḥ*; al-Qarāfī, *al-Ajwiba al-fākhira*; Ibn Qayyim, *Hidāyah al-ḥayāra*.
- 216 Qur'an 2:113.
- 217 Classical Qur'anic commentators, such as al-Ṭabarī, make a note of this definition for the term “*yuḥarrifūn*.” See al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, 2: 248–249 on Q. 2:75.
- 218 Qur'an 5:68–69.
- 219 Qur'an 5:43–44.
- 220 Qur'an 5:47–48.
- 221 Tarakci and Sayar, “The Qur'anic View.”
- 222 I will not delve in arguing the debate of infallibility of prophets in Islam, as it is an argument on its own, and will restrict my argument in this book in that it is not

based on the Qur'an. The Qur'an actually shows that prophets are as fallible as anyone else, such as Abraham lying (i.e., Qur'an 21:63), Jacob's sons leaving their brother Joseph in a well and then lying about it to their father (e.g., Qur'an 12:9–18), David mishandling judgments (e.g., Qur'an 38:21–25), Moses killing (e.g., Qur'an 28:15), Jonah specifically disobeying a divine command (e.g., Qur'an 21:87), and perhaps Muḥammad trying to refuse what God has made lawful (e.g., Qur'an 66:1).

223 Averroës, *The Decisive Treatise*, 10.

224 See Reynolds, *The Qur'an and Its Biblical Subtext*; El-Badawi, *The Qur'an and the Aramaic Gospel Traditions*.

Chapter 5: In the Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit

- 1 Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt al-kubra*, 2: 273–274; al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 6: 182 (#4984). I am indebted to Ulrika Mårtensson for pointing this out to me.
- 2 See Gardner-Smith, P., *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938); Smith, Dwight Moody, *The Theology of the Gospel of John* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Dvorak, James D., “The Relationship Between John and the Synoptic Gospels,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 41, no. 2 (1998): 201–213; Bauckham, Richard and Mosser, Carl, eds. *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2008).
- 3 Wolfe, Michael W. “The World Could not Contain the Pages: A Sufi Reading of the Gospel of John based on the Writings of Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn al-ʿArabī (1165–1240 CE),” PhD diss., Columbia University, 2016.
- 4 Eusebius (d. 340 CE), *Eccl. Hist.*, VI.14, as translated from Valesius, *Life of Eusebius Pamphilus*, in Parker S. E. trans. *An Ecclesiastical History to the 20th Year of the Reign of Constantine* (London: Samuel Bagster, 1847), 247–248.
- 5 For examples, refer to Quddus, Munir, Bailey III, Henri, and White, Larry R., “Business Ethics: Perspectives from Judaic, Christian, and Islamic Scriptures,” *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion* 6, no. 4 (2009): 323–334; and also refer to Wilson, Rodney, *Economics, Ethics and Religion: Jewish, Christian and Muslim Economic Thought* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 1997).
- 6 Beit-Hallahmi, Benjamin, “Morality and Immorality Among the Irreligious,” in *Atheism and Secularity*, ed. Phil Zuckerman (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2010), 113–141.
- 7 Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter, *Morality Without God?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Cirrone, Steve *Secular Morality: Rhetoric and Reader* (n.p.: SFC Publishing, 2015).
- 8 For examples, refer to Bremmer, Robert H., *Giving: Charity and Philanthropy in History* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2000): for specifically an example of a humanist approach to charity, see pp. 28–29.
- 9 As examples, refer to Wilson, Andrew, ed. *World Scripture: A Comparative Anthology of Sacred Texts* (St. Paul, MN: Paragon House, 1998); also refer to Hooper, Richard, ed. *Jesus, Buddha, Krishna, Lao Tzu: The Parallel Sayings—The Common Teachings of Four Religions* (Sedona, AZ: Sanctuary Books, 2007).
- 10 Refer to Gyatso, Tenzin (Dalai Lama XIV), *Beyond Religion: Ethics for a Whole World* (New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2011). For a critique of secular ethics, see

- Mitchell, Basil, *Morality: Religious and Secular—The Dilemma of the Traditional Conscience* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).
- 11 For an overview of the different Christological and theological debates in Christian history, see McGrath, Alister E., *Historical Theology: An Introduction to the History of Christian Thought* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013).
 - 12 For an overview of Church history, see Cairns, Earle E. *Christianity through the Centuries: A History of the Christian Church* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996).
 - 13 For an overview of the history of the development of Muslim theology, see Wensinck, Arent J. *The Muslim Creed: Its Genesis and Historical Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932).
 - 14 Jane Smith states, “Some advocates of Muslim-Christian dialogue, therefore, are adamant that the most appropriate arena for discussion is not theology, but ethics,” Smith, Jane I., *Muslims, Christians, and the Challenge of Interfaith Dialogue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 75.
 - 15 Ayoub, Mahmoud, “Christian–Muslim Dialogue: Goals and Obstacles,” *The Muslim World* 94, no. 3 (2004): 313–319.
 - 16 Qur’an 9:30–32.
 - 17 Casanova, Paul, “Idris et ‘Ouzair,” *Journal asiatique*, 205 (1924): 356–360. For reference to the haggadic literature mentioning ‘Aza’el see Neusner, *Babylonian Talmud*, Yoma 6:4.
 - 18 Ibid.
 - 19 Stuckenbruck, L. T., *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and the Christology of the Apocalypse of John* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995).
 - 20 Ginzberg, Louis, *Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 2003), 135–136.
 - 21 Ibid., 136.
 - 22 Ibid.
 - 23 Ibid. It may be interesting to note that Azael taking the sins of Israel may be seen with similarity as Jesus’ crucifixion for the forgiveness of sins, according to John and Paul (e.g., John 1:29, Romans 4:25, 1 Corinthians 15:3).
 - 24 Neusner, *Babylonian Talmud*, Rosh Hashanah 4:5.
 - 25 The Sanhedrin is the council of experts initially founded through the seventy elders appointed by Moses to assist in governing the Jewish people.
 - 26 Leviticus Rabbah 2:11.
 - 27 The term “*arbāban*” is cognate of the Hebrew “*rabbi*.”
 - 28 Casanova, “Idris et ‘Ouzair,” 356–360; Torrey, *The Jewish Foundation*, 72.
 - 29 Bell, R., *Introduction to the Qur’an* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1953), 163.
 - 30 Watt, William Montgomery, *Bell’s Introduction to the Qur’an* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1970), 28, 191.
 - 31 Bellamy, James A., “Textual Criticism of the Koran,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 121, no. 1 (2001): 1–6.
 - 32 Erder, Yoram, “The Origin of the Name Idris in the Qur’an: A Study of the Influence of Qumran Literature on Early Islam,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 49, no. 4 (1990): 339–350.
 - 33 Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary*, 214–215.
 - 34 For a summary on ‘Uzair in the Muslim tradition, see Ayoub, Mahmoud, “‘Uzayr in the Qur’an and Muslim Tradition,” in *Studies in Islamic and Judaic Traditions*, eds. W. M. Brinner and S. D. Ricks (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986), 3–18.

- 35 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, 14: 202–203 on Q. 9:30.
- 36 Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāyah wal-nihāyah* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 1988), 2: 53–54.
- 37 Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl*, 1: 147–148, 156.
- 38 Walker, John, "Who is 'Uzair?" *The Muslim World* 19, no. 3 (1929): 303–306, 303.
- 39 Bellamy, "Textual Criticism."
- 40 2 Esdras 14:9.
- 41 2 Esdras 2:47.
- 42 Bellamy, "Textual Criticism," 5.
- 43 Mazuz, *The Religious and Spiritual Life*.
- 44 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, 14: 201 on Q. 9:30.
- 45 Ibid., 14: 202–203 on Q. 9:30. Also, Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr*, 4:118 on Q. 9:30.
- 46 Walker, "Who is 'Uzair?"
- 47 Al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ*, 16: 28 on Q. 9:30.
- 48 Ibid.; al-Ṭabarsī, *Majma'*, 5: 42–43 on Q. 9:30.
- 49 Ibn Hazm, *al-Faṣl*, 1: 82.
- 50 Al-Maqdisī (d. 355/966) *al-Bad' wal-tarīkh* (Port Sa'īd: Maktabat al-Thaqāfah al-Dīniyyah, n.d.), 3: 116.
- 51 Ibid., 4: 35.
- 52 Al-Hāshimī, *Takhjīl*, 2: 527–528.
- 53 Matthew 26:64–66, Mark 14:62–64, John 10:33–36.
- 54 Bellamy, "Textual Criticism."
- 55 Ezra 1:1–3.
- 56 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 14: 89 on "b n y." Also see *TDOT*, 2: 145–159, on "bn."
- 57 Ibid., 14: 89 on "b n y." *BDB*, 119–120. The *TDOT* states that some Hebrew scholars contend that the Hebrew term "bn" is rooted in "b n h," which is to build, and that the Aramaic term for son, "br," comes from "bara," meaning to create. See *TDOT*, 2: 149, on "bn." Also see *TDOT*, 2: 167, on "b n h." It is important to note that "b n y" or "b n h" also means to create in Akkadian and Ugaritic. See *TDOT*, 2: 166–167, on "b n h."
- 58 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 14: 93 on "b n y." *BDB*, 6.
- 59 Neusner, *Babylonian Talmud*, Berakhot 9:1, 64a.
- 60 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 14: 89 on "b n y."
- 61 *BDB*, 119–120.
- 62 Ibid., 124. The *TDOT* states that some Hebrew scholars contend that the Hebrew term "bn" is rooted in "b n h," which is to build, and that the Aramaic term for son, "br," comes from "bara," meaning to create. See *TDOT*, 2: 149, on "bn." Also see *TDOT*, 2: 167, on "b n h." It is important to note that "bny" or "bnh" also means to create in Akkadian and Ugaritic. See *TDOT*, 2: 166–167, on "b n h."
- 63 *BDB*, 6; *TDOT*, 1: 48–49, on "a b n."
- 64 Although not typically used in the form of "abn," the Arabic language uses the term "lbn" to also mean stone. Nonetheless, *Lisān al-'arab* gives an example of a man saying "banāt masājid Allah" to mean stones of mosques, which is from the root "bny." See Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 14: 93 on "bny."
- 65 1 Samuel 7:12.
- 66 Ezra 5:8.
- 67 Qur'an 9:30.
- 68 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 4: 562 on "a z r." *BDB*, 740–741; *TDOT*, 11: 12–18, on "a z r."
- 69 *BDB*, 741.

- 70 Temple court as a reference to the Temple in Jerusalem (*beit ha-miqdash*).
- 71 John 2:19–22. Utey states, “Christianity replaces the physical temple of the Jews with the spiritual temple of Christ’s physical body as His corporate body, the church” in Utey, B. *Paul’s Letters to a Troubled Church: I and II Corinthians* (Marshall, TX: Bible Lessons International, 2002), 76.
- 72 Qur’an 3:118.
- 73 Qur’an 3:167.
- 74 Qur’an 5:41.
- 75 Galadari, “The *Qibla*.”
- 76 Qur’an 9:8.
- 77 Qur’an 9:32.
- 78 Qur’an 61:1–8.
- 79 Bassler, Jouette M., “Mixed Signals: Nicodemus in the Fourth Gospel,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108, no. 4 (1989): 635–646, 637, original emphasis.
- 80 Canales, Arthur D., “A Rebirth of Being ‘Born Again’: Theological, Sacramental and Pastoral Reflections from a Roman Catholic Perspective,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 11, no. 1 (2002): 98–119.
- 81 Ibid., 101.
- 82 The history of Christianity also recounts Nicodemus the Christian such as in the Apocrypha, Gospel of Nicodemus. See Schneemelcher, W. ed. *New Testament Apocrypha* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1991), 1: 502–536.
- 83 Fazlur Rahman, “Some Key Ethical Concepts of the Qur’ān,” *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 11, no. 2 (1983): 170–185.
- 84 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi’*, 14: 213–214 on Q. 9:32; Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr*, 4: 119–120 on Q. 9:32.
- 85 Ibid.
- 86 Commenting on this passage of Paul’s epistle, Staton says, “Our body is just not ‘our’ body, but the temple of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit lives inside us. Our bodies become the house of God’s Spirit. God’s temple is no longer a stationary building in one city in the Mideast, but a temple that walks around and lives in the community,” in Staton, K., *Unlocking the Scriptures for You: First Corinthians* (Cincinnati, OH: Standard Publishing, 1987), 129.
- 87 1 Corinthians 6:19–20.
- 88 Qur’an 9:111.
- 89 Gupta, Nijay K., “Which ‘Body’ Is a Temple (1 Corinthians 6:19)? Paul Beyond the Individual/Communal Divide,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72, no. 3 (2010): 518–536.
- 90 Jamieson, R., Fausset, A. R., and Brown, D., 1871, *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible* (Hartford, CT: S. S. Scranton, 1997), on 1 Corinthians 6:19–20.
- 91 Pirke Abot, 3.2.
- 92 Marshall, Howard, “Church and Temple in the New Testament,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 40, no. 2 (1989): 203–222, 218.
- 93 Pratt, Richard L. *Holman New Testament Commentary: I & II Corinthians*, ed. M. Anders (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2000), 101.
- 94 Patai, R., “The Shekhina,” *The Journal of Religion* 44, no. 4 (1964): 275–288. Also refer to *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 2: 1943; *The New Bible Dictionary* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1996), 1090–1091; *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (Nashville, TN: Holman Bible Publishers, 2003), 1480.

- 95 Lenski, Richard C. H. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1963), 269–270.
- 96 Barrett, Charles K. *Black's New Testament Commentary: The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000), 151–152.
- 97 Talbert, Charles H. *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians* (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2002), 51.
- 98 Hodge, Charles, *An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York, NY: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1857), 106.
- 99 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 10: 390 on the meaning of “*a f k*.”
- 100 *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project* at <http://cal.huc.edu/>, on the meaning of “*a p k*.” In Christian Palestinian Aramaic and Syriac, the term “*p k h*” means foolish. However, its relationship with the Arabic “*i f k*” is unknown. See *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project*, on the meaning of “*p k h*.”
- 101 Qurʾan 7:117–121.
- 102 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 1: 685 on the meaning of “*q l b*.”
- 103 Ibid., 1: 687 on the meaning of “*q l b*.”
- 104 Al-Kalbī (d. 204/819), *Kitāb al-aṣnām*, ed. A. Z. Pāsha (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyyah, 2000), 19. Also refer to al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 22: 522 on Q. 53:19–22. Also refer to Ibn Ṭāhir al-Baghdādī (d. 429/1037), *al-Farq bayn al-firaq wa bayān al-firqaq al-nājiyyah* (Beirut: Dār al-Āfāq al-Jadīdah, 1977), 345.
- 105 Qurʾan 4:171–172.
- 106 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 3: 270–272 on the meaning of “*ʿabd*.”
- 107 Ibid., 3: 273–274 on the meaning of “*ʿabd*.”
- 108 Ibid., 3: 273 on the meaning of “*ʿabd*.”
- 109 BDB, 712–713.
- 110 For more on the Semitic use of “*ʿabd*” and its use in the Hebrew Bible, see TDOT, 10:376–405, on “*ʿabd*.”
- 111 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 14: 95 on the meaning of “*b n y*.” Also in Abū al-Walid al-Bājī (d. 474/1082) in his *al-Muntaqa* states that Ibn al-Sikīt (d. 244/858) defined *al-baniyyah* as the Kaʿbah, and that ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb called it as such: Abū al-Walid al-Bājī (d. 474/1082), *al-Muntaqa sharḥ al-muwattaʿa* (Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Islāmī, 1914), 4: 8. Ibn Sidah (d. 458/1066) also mentions this definition of *al-baniyyah* from Ibn al-Sikīt: Ibn Sidah (d. 458/1066), *al-Mukhaṣṣaṣ*, ed. Khalīl Ibrāhīm Jifāl (Beirut: Dār Ihyaʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1996), 1: 505.
- 112 The Kaʿbah is also called “*baniyyat Ibrāhīm*,” because it is built by Abraham. See Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 14: 95 on the meaning of “*ʿabd*.” As such, Jesus may be considered “*bani Allah*,” meaning built or made by God, or more, so that he is the Temple of God.
- 113 TDOT, 1: 1–2, on “*ab*.”
- 114 BDB, 2–3.
- 115 TDOT, 1: 24–25, on “*a b h*.”
- 116 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 14: 3–5 on the meaning of “*a b y*.”
- 117 TDOT, 1: 131, on “*a w b*.”
- 118 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 1: 217–219 on the meaning of “*a w b*.” Also see BDB, 15 and 33.
- 119 Ibid., 1: 233 on the meaning of “*t w b*.”
- 120 Ibid., 1: 218–219 on the meaning of “*a w b*.”
- 121 TDOT, 1: 212–213, on “*a y b*.”

- 122 The Qur'anic passage uses “*udttum ‘udnā*.” This can either mean, if you return to us, we shall return, or if you come against us (enemy), we shall come against you (enemy). Which sense of the word is meant may be ambiguous, and possibly as part of the rhetoric, perhaps both meanings are intended.
- 123 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 6: 258 on Q. 3:14; Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr*, 2: 22 on Q. 3:14; al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ*, 7: 163 on Q. 3:14.
- 124 Besides its meaning of the “persecuted one” as well. See *BDB*, 33.
- 125 Qurʾan 9:30–32.
- 126 Qurʾan 20:56.
- 127 Exodus 10:27; *BDB*, 2.
- 128 John 3:3–18.
- 129 Richard, E., “Expressions of Double Meaning and their Function in the Gospel of John,” *New Testament Studies* 31, no. 1 (1985): 96–112.
- 130 Coloe, Mary L., *God Dwells With Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2001), 5.
- 131 Grese, William C., “‘Unless One Is Born Again’: The Use of a Heavenly Journey in John 3,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107, no. 4 (1988): 377–693, 689.
- 132 *Ibid.*, 691.
- 133 *Ibid.*
- 134 Bassler, “Mixed Signals,” 638.
- 135 Wiles, Maurice F., *The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), 24.
- 136 Augustine’s Homilies on the Gospel of John, Tractate XI. See Schaff, Phillip, ed., *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church* (New York, NY: The Christian Literature, 1888), 75.
- 137 Koester, Craig R., *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1995), 47; Renz, Gabi, “Nicodemus: An Ambiguous Disciple? A Narrative Sensitive Investigation,” in *Challenging Perspective on the Gospel of John*, ed. John Lierman (Heidelberg: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 261.
- 138 Ford, David F., “Meeting Nicodemus: A Case Study in Daring Theological Interpretation,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 66, no. 1 (2013): 1–17.
- 139 Neusner, *Babylonian Talmud*, Yebamot 6:6; also, Yebamot 11:2; also, Bekhorot 8:1.
- 140 Al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ*, on Q 8:38, 15: 482–483.
- 141 Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 2: 133 (#1521). Also Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 2: 983 (#438.1350).
- 142 See Carroll, John T., “Children in the Bible,” *Interpretation* 55, no. 2 (2001): 121–134, esp. n. 26.
- 143 Mark 10:13–16.
- 144 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 24: 519–522 on Q. 96:1.
- 145 *BDB*, 871. Used in various passages of the Hebrew Bible, including Micah 3:6, which talks about prophets.
- 146 Qurʾan 97:1–5.
- 147 The connection between being reborn, *laylah al-qadr*, and the Gospel of John is further discussed in Galadari, Abdulla, “*Layla al-Qadr*: Muḥammad Assuming Authority by Alluding to the Gospel of John,” in *New Trends in Qurʾanic Studies*, ed. Munʾim Sirry (London: Lockwood Press, forthcoming).
- 148 John 1:51.
- 149 Ambrose of Milan (d. 397 CE) suggested that John 1:51 is an allusion to Jacob’s ladder. See Ambrose (d. 397 CE), *Seven Exegetical Works*, trans. Michael P. McHugh,

The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation, vol. 65 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1972), 155–156; Neyrey, Jerome H., “The Jacob Allusions in John 1:51,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (1982): 586–605; Clarke, Ernest. G., “Jacob’s Dream at Bethel as Interpreted in the Targums and the New Testament,” *Studies in Religion* 4 (1975): 367–377; Rowland, Christopher, “John 1.51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition,” *New Testament Studies* 30, no. 4 (1984): 498–507.

150 Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-‘arab* on “s l m.”

Chapter 6: Begotten of God

- 1 Räisänen, “The Portrait of Jesus.”
- 2 See Bell, *The Origin of Islam*; Claassens, G. H. M., “Jacob van Maerlant on Muhammad and Islam,” in *Medieval Christian Perceptions of Islam*, ed. J. V. Tolan (New York, NY: Routledge, 1996), 211–232.
- 3 The term “kn” shares its possible proto-Semitic root in the meaning of establish. See Hecker, Bernice V. “The Biradical Origin of Semitic Roots,” PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2007, 107.
- 4 Donner, *Muhammad and the Believers*, 204; Firestone “Abraham’s Son.”
- 5 For a detailed textual analysis of the various terms for begotten and sonship in the Bible refer to Vellanickal, M., *The Divine Sonship of Christians in the Johannine Writings* (Rome: Typis Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae, 1976).
- 6 Bromiley, G. W., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964) 5: 738; Louw, J. P. and Nida, E., eds., *Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York, NY: United Bible Societies, 1989), 1: 590; Bauer, W., *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, ed. F. W. Danker (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), 658.
- 7 Moulton, J. H. and Milligan, G., *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1930), 416.
- 8 See the entry for “monogenēs” in Brannan, Rick, *The Lexham Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament* (Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, 2013).
- 9 Beekes, R., *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leiden: Brill NV, 2010), 1: 266, 1: 272–273.
- 10 TDOT, 1: 681; Schwyzler, E., *Griechische Grammatik: auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik. Bd. 2: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik, vervollständigt und hrsg. Von Albert Debrunner. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* (München: C. H. Beck, 1950), 215.
- 11 Moody, D., “God’s Only Son: The Translation of John 3:16 in the Revised Standard Version,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72, no. 4 (1953): 213–219.
- 12 Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, 1: 266.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 Menken, Maarten J. J., “‘Born of God’ or ‘Begotten by God’? A Translation Problem in the Johannine Writings,” *Novum Testamentum* 51 (2009): 352–368.
- 16 Either “akun” or “akūn” may be used.
- 17 The reader is reminded the distinction made in the beginning between the terms of Begotten of God and Son of God, where the latter may be seen in other Gospels.

- 18 Räisänen, "The Portrait of Jesus," 124.
- 19 Zaehner, Robert C. "The Qur'ān and Christ," in *At Sundry Times: An Essay in the Comparison of Religions* (London: Faber & Faber, 1958), 209, 216.
- 20 Haight, Roger, *Jesus, Symbol of God* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1999), 173.
- 21 Mahmoud Ayoub has attempted to show similarities of the image of Jesus in Shī'ī thought as points of convergence with Christianity. See Ayoub, Mahmoud M., "Towards an Islamic Christology: An Image of Jesus in Early Shī'ī Muslim Literature," *The Muslim World* 66, no. 3 (1976): 163–188.
- 22 Al-Majlisi (d. 1111/1698), *Biḥār al-anwār, al-jāmi'ah li-durar akhbār al-a'imma al-aṭ-ḥār* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 1983), 53: 46.
- 23 See Rochais, Gérard, "La formation du Prologue (Jn 1:1–18)," *Science et Esprit* 37, no. 1 (1985): 5–44, 161–187; Schnackenburg, Rudolf, *The Gospel According to St. John*, trans. Kevin Smith (New York, NY: Herder and Herder, 1968), 1: 221–281, 1: 481–505; Tobin, Thomas H., "Logos," in *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1992), 4: 348–356, 348; Dunn, James D. G., *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1996) 239–250; Schnackenburg, Rudolf, *Jesus in the Gospels: A Biblical Christology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 283–394; Moloney, Francis, *Belief in the Word: Reading John 1–4* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993).
- 24 Farrelly, M. John, *The Trinity: Rediscovering the Central Christian Mystery* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005), 50–51.
- 25 Ibid., 52.
- 26 Ibid., 53.
- 27 See Ronning, John L. *The Jewish Targums and John's Logos Theology* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 5; Tobin "Logos," 4: 354.
- 28 Farrelly, *The Trinity*, 51.
- 29 Bultmann, Rudolf, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1941). There are several scholars who argue that John's prologue is Gnostic; the following references are from: Evans, Craig A. *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993); see Deeks, David G., "The Prologue of St. John's Gospel," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 6, no. 1 (1976): 62–78. For further analyses of John's prologue and perhaps its Gnostic or Hellenic Jewish tendencies, also see Schlier, Heinrich, "Im Anfang war das Wort' im Prolog des Johannesevangeliums," *Wort und Wahrheit* 9 (1954): 169–180; Schnackenburg, Rudolf, "Logos-Hymnus und johanneischen Prolog," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 1 (1957): 69–109; Schnackenburg, Rudolf, "Und das Wort ist Fleisch geworden," *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift* 8 (1979): 1–9; Eltester, Walther, "Der Logos und sein Prophet: Fragen zur heutigen Erklärung des johanneischen Prologs," in *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen*, eds. Walter Eltester and Franz H. Kettler (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1964), 109–134; Langkammer, P. H., "Zur Herkunft des Logostitels im Johannesprolog," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 9 (1965): 91–94; Ridderbos, Herman N., "The Structure and Scope of the Prologue to the Gospel of John," *Novum Testamentum* 8, nos. 2/4 (1966): 180–201; Demke, Christoph, "Der sogenannte Logos-Hymnus im johanneischen Prolog," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 58, nos. 1/2 (1967): 45–68; Fascher, Erich, "Christologie und Gnosis im vierten Evangelium," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 93, no. 10 (1968): 721–730; O'Neill, J. C., "The Prologue to St John's Gospel," *Journal of Theological Studies* 20, no. 1 (1969): 41–52; Wengst, Klaus, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder im Urchristentums* (SNT, 7,

Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1972), 200–208; Zimmermann, Heinrich, “Christushymnus und johanneischer Prolog,” in *Neues Testament und Kirche*, ed. Joachim Gnilka (Freiburg: Herder, 1974), 249–265; de la Potterie, Ignace, “Structure du Prologue de Saint Jean,” *New Testament Studies* 30, no. 3 (1984): 354–381; Sevrin, Jean-Marie, “Le quatrième évangile et le gnosticisme: questions de méthode,” in *Communauté johannique et son histoire: La trajectoire de l’Évangile de Jean aux deux premiers siècles* (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1990), 249–268.

30 Evans, *Word and Glory*, 47–76.

31 *Ibid.*, 75–76.

32 There is a scholarly debate between the origins of Gnosticism and its relationship with Jewish mysticism. Gershom G. Scholem suggests that Kabbalah might have emerged from Gnostic influences into Rabbinic Judaism. Possibly, pre-Christian Jewish Gnosticism might have existed and perhaps caused early Christian heresies, since Christian Gnosticism may bear a resemblance to Merkabah Mysticism as found in Hebrew and Aramaic texts, known as *Hekhaloth Books* during the early Talmudic period. He suggests that Gnosticism might have emerged from a rabbinic culture; see Scholem, Gershom G. *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, NY: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1960). Moshe Idel challenged this notion suggesting that Kabbalah emerged from Rabbinic Judaism without any foreign influence; see Idel, Moshe *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988). Mystical traditions, generally, share much in common, e.g., see Katz, Steven T., ed. *Comparative Mysticism: An Anthology of Original Sources* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013). For looking into pre-Christian Gnosticism, the *Nag Hammadi Library* may shed some light to such an existence, which was then later Christianized. For debates for the existence of pre-Christian Gnosticism see Bultmann, Rudolf, “Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums,” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 24 (1925): 100–145; Reicke, Bo, “Traces of Gnosticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls?” *New Testament Studies* 1, no. 2 (1954): 137–141; Yamauchi, Edwin M. *Pre-Christian Gnosticism: A Survey of the Proposed Evidences* (London: Tyndale Press, 1973); Yamauchi, Edwin M., “Pre-Christian Gnosticism in the Nag Hammadi Texts?” *Church History* 48, no. 2 (1979): 129–141. For debates against the existence of pre-Christian Gnosticism, see King, Karen L. *What Is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 71–72, 83–84, 148, 181–190. Since Gnosticism and Kabbalah are both mystical traditions and may share similarities, this does not necessarily mean that one has influenced the other. Perhaps the neuroscience of the brain and the psychology of the mind, which humans share, provide similar insights for the simple reason that our genes are all related. If a person can distinguish the green color from the blue (assuming a person is neither blind nor color-blind and there is enough light for the eyes to perceive the different wavelengths) and another person can do the same, it does not at all mean that one has influenced the other. It is because our perception due to the common neural network is biologically the same. Those two persons may name the colors differently (like two different religious traditions with different semantics), but at least share the common concept that they are distinguished from one another. If mysticism is based on experiential insights that the mind may attempt to contextualize with its own understanding and presuppositions, then similarities between different mystical traditions should not be assumed as one necessarily influencing the other historically, but rather is best explained biologically; see d’Aquila, Eugene and Newberg, Andrew, *The Mystical Mind*:

- Probing the Biology of Religious Experience* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999); d'Aquili, Eugene and Newberg, Andrew, *Why God Won't Go Away: Brain Science and the Biology of Belief* (New York, NY: Ballantine Books, 2001).
- 33 Dodd, Charles H., *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 54–73.
- 34 Evans, *Word and Glory*, 83–94.
- 35 Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 241.
- 36 Philo, *Philo* eds. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962), “De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini,” 8; also a variant in “De Fuga et Inventionem,” 94–95.
- 37 *Ibid.*, 65; also a variant in Philo, *Philo*, “De Vita Mosiis,” 1.281.
- 38 A tradition attributed to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib portrays him stating, “*kn f-yakūn* is neither a sound that is rung nor a call that is listened to, but His words are an action that is made and performed. It was not before it existing, and if it were pre-existing, it would have been a second God,” ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, *Nahj al-balāghah*, ed. Fāris al-Ḥassūn (Qom: Markaz al-Abḥāth al-‘Aqā’idiyyah, 1999), Sermon 186, 427.
- 39 Miller, Ed L., “The Johannine Origins of the Johannine Logos,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112, no. 3 (1993): 445–457.
- 40 *Ibid.*
- 41 *Ibid.*
- 42 It is not a concern here on Johannine origin of the Logos, whether it is to be understood as the “Word of God” (*dabar Yahweh*) from the Hebrew Bible or the late Jewish Sophia (Wisdom), as found in the wisdom literature and argued by Rudolf Bultmann or through any Hellenistic, Gnostic, or other definitions. Ed L. Miller suggests that it may not be necessary to identify the origins of Johannine Logos beyond the writings of John. See Miller, “The Johannine Origins.” Here in this section, only how the Qur’an interprets John’s Logos is highlighted, without delving in its possible origins beyond the Bible.
- 43 John 1:1. This alternative rendition is from the Nestle-Aland (NA28) *Novum Testamentum Graece*, www.nestle-aland.com/en/read-na28-online/.
- 44 Moloney, *Belief in the Word*, 28.
- 45 Not only is it in the beginning of the sentence, but also in the beginning of the book. See León, D. Muñoz “El Pentateuco en San Juan,” in *Entrar en lo Antiguo: Acerca de la relación entre Antiguo y Nuevo Testamento*, eds. I. Carbajosa and L. Sánchez Navarro, Presencia y diálogo 16 (Madrid: Facultad de Teología “San Dámaso,” 2007), 107–166, esp. 153.
- 46 See Lenski, R. C. H., *The Interpretation of St. John’s Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1961), 27; Borgen, Peder J., “The Prologue of John—as Exposition of the Old Testament,” in *Philo, John and Paul: New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity*, Brown Judaic Studies, 131 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987), 75–102; Pagels, E. H., “Exegesis of Genesis 1 in the Gospels of Thomas and John,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118, no. 3 (1999): 477–496; Painter, J., “Rereading Genesis in the Prologue of John?” in *Neotestamentica et Philonica*, eds. D. E. Aune, T. Seland, and J. H. Ulrichsen (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 179–201; Lioy, Dan, *The Search for Ultimate Reality: Intertextuality Between the Genesis and Johannine Prologues* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2005); Menken, Maarten J. J., “Genesis in John’s Gospel,” in *Studies in John’s Gospel and Epistles: Collected Essays* (Leuven: Peeters, 2015), 131–145, esp. 137–139.
- 47 *Genesis Rabbah*, 2:4, 17. See Brown, Jeannine K., “Creation’s Renewal in the Gospel of John,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72, no. 2 (2010): 275–290.

- 48 John 1:3.
- 49 The Logos described as speech is found in writings by Tertullian (d. 225 CE), Cyprian (d. 258 CE), and Ambrose (d. 397 CE). However, Tertullian in *Adversus Praxean* 8 rejects the Gnostic notion that the Logos is simply God's spoken word and uttered speech, which is separate and ignorant of the Father. See Osborn, E. *Tertullian: First Theologian of the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 123–124; Lapse, C. *The Great Commentary*, trans. T. W. Mossman (Edinburgh: John Grant, 1908), 20.
- 50 Commenting on “I am who I am,” Philo suggests that there is no name for God, because it cannot be described; as such, it is only to be (*eimi*), Philo, *Philo*, “De Somniis,” 1.230.
- 51 See Brownlee, W. H., “The Ineffable Name of God,” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 226 (1977): 39–46; Janzen, J. Gerald, “What’s in a Name? ‘Yahweh’ in Exodus 3 and the Wider Biblical Context,” *Interpretation* 33, no. 3 (1979): 227–239; Buber, Martin, *Moses: The Revelation and the Covenant* (New York, NY: Harper and Brothers, 1958), 53. Also compare with the following: Parke-Taylor, Geoffrey H. *Yahweh: The Divine Name in the Bible* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975); de Moor, Johannes C. *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism*, revised edn. (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 108–136; Mettinger, Tryggve N. D., *Namnet och närvaron: Gudsnamn och gudsbild i Böckernas Bok* (Örebro: Bokforlaget Libris, 1987); Ahlstrom, Gosta W. *Who Were the Israelites?* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1986), 59–60; Reisel, Max, *The Mysterious Name of Y. H. W. H.: The Tetragrammaton in Connection with the Names of EHYEH ašer EHYEH-Hūhā-and Šem Hammephôrās* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957); Murtonen, Aimo E., *A Philological and Literary Treatise on the Old Testament Divine Names ‘l, ‘lwh, ‘lhym, and Yhwh* (Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1952). There have been suggestions that the root of “yhwh” is possibly “h w y,” which means to fall, Knauf, Ernst A., “Yahwe,” *Vetus Testamentum* 34, no. 4 (1984): 467–472, and perhaps in context could mean “tajallī” (immanence) as it is used in Qur’an 7:143 to denote when God reveals Himself to Moses.
- 52 See Abba, Raymond, “The Divine Name Yahweh,” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 80 no. 4 (1961): 320–328; Mowinkel, Sigmund, “The Name of the God of Moses,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 32 (1961): 121–133; Kosmala, Hans, “The Name of God (YHWH and HU),” *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 2 (1963): 103–120.
- 53 Nelson, W. D. trans., *Mekhilta De-Rabbi Shimon bar Yoḥai* (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 2006), Tractate Sanya, 2:2, 1B, p. 6.
- 54 Evans, *Word and Glory*, 79–83; Boismard, Marie-Émile, *St. John’s Prologue* (Westminster: Newman, 1957), 135–145; Hooker, Morna D., “The Johannine Prologue and the Messianic Secret,” *New Testament Studies* 21, no. 1 (1974): 40–58; Hanson, Anthony T., “John i. 14–18 and Exodus xxxiv,” *New Testament Studies* 23, no. 1 (1976): 90–101; Hanson, Anthony T., *The New Testament Interpretation of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1980), 97–109; Rissi, Mathias, “John 1:1–18 (The Eternal Word),” *Interpretation*, 31 no. 4 (1977): 395–401; Koester, Craig R., *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1989), 104.
- 55 Evans, *Word and Glory*, 80.
- 56 *Ibid.*, 80–81.
- 57 “Or the only One, who is God.” Some manuscripts: “the only Son.”
- 58 In al-Ṭabarī’s *tafsīr*, there is a debate on what “wāliḍ” means, with some suggesting perhaps Adam, and what “kba” means, with some suggesting perhaps uprightness, heaven, or hardship. See al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi’*, 24: 431–435 on Q. 90:3–4. In Hebrew it

- means heaviness, weighty, abundance, or riches, which might give the sense of someone's honor or glory. See BDB, 457–459. If it means abundance and wealth, then this may contextualize the term “*lbd*” in Qur'an 90:6, which also is used to mean abundance and wealth. The root “*k b d*” may be derived from the proto-Semitic “*kb*,” which means weighty: see Hecker, “The Biradical Origin,” 105. There is a Byzantine Greek translation of the Qur'an that translates “*kabad*” as “*se isku*” (in strength), which might suggest that it could have been understood as glory. Adel-Théodore Khoury and Christian Høgel report it, but do not understand the reason it is translated the opposite way of what Muslim exegetes later assumed: see Khoury, Adel-Théodore, *Les théologiens byzantins et l'islam: Textes et auteurs [VIIIe-XIIIe siècles]* (Leuven: Nauwelaerts, 1969), 120; and Høgel, Christian, “An Early Anonymous Greek Translation of the Qur'an: The Fragments from Niketas Byzantios' *Refutatio* and the Anonymous *Abjuratio*,” *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 7 (2010): 65–119, 110.
- 59 Since the first verse affirms the unity of God, then the “*šamad*” in the second is more likely to mean indivisible, inseparable, bound, or yoke: BDB, 855. This would be cognate to “*šamad*,” which means to join a wound or a pair of cattle: see Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 3: 264–266 on “*š m d*.” In traditional *tafsīr*, such as al-Ṭabarī, there are various opinions for the meaning of “*šamad*.” Among those conjectures are: (i) the one who is worshipped, (ii) the one who is not hollow, (iii) the one who neither eats nor drinks, and (iv) the one who nothing extracts: see al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, 24: 689–691 on Q. 112:2. Among its various meanings, it also means one's goal: Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 3: 258–259 on “*š m d*.” A Byzantine Greek translation of the Qur'an by Theodore Abū Qurra (c.750–825 CE) translates “*šamad*” as “*sphyropēktos*,” which means hammered together or closely united: van Ess, Josef, *The Youthful God: Anthropomorphism in Early Islam* (Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University, 1988), 5. Sometimes it is translated as beaten solid into a ball: Sahas, Daniel J., “‘Holosphyros’? A Byzantine Perception of ‘the God of Muhammad’,” in *Christian-Muslim Encounters*, eds. Yvonne Y. Haddad and Wadi Z. Haddad (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 1995), 111; Griffith, Sidney H., “Byzantium and the Christians in the World of Islam: Constantinople and the Church in the Holy Land in the Ninth Century,” *Medieval Encounters* 3, no. 3 (1997): 231–265, 262; or a hammered solid: Ṭāhādhūrus Abū Qurrah, *Schriften zum Islam*, eds. and trans. Reinhold Gleis and Adel T. Khoury (Würzburg: Echter, 1995), 99. Nicetas of Byzantium (842–912 CE) later translates “*šamad*” as “*holosphyros*,” meaning impenetrable: Förstel, Karl, ed. and trans. “Nicetas of Byzantium,” *Schriften zum Islam* (Würzburg: Echter, 2000), 117; or entirely chased in metal: van Ess, *The Youthful God*, 5; or solid hammered metal: Meyendorff, John, “Byzantine Views of Islam,” *Dumbarton Oaks Paper* 18 (1964): 113–132, 122; and Hanson, Craig L., “Manuel I Comnenus and the ‘God of Muhammad’: A Study in Byzantine Ecclesiastical Politics,” in *Medieval Christian Perceptions of Islam: A Book of Essays*, ed. John V. Tolan (New York, NY: Garland, 1996), 61 and 75; or solid metal made into a sphere: Sahas “‘Holosphyros’?” 109. Most scholars believe that it is a mistranslation, or perhaps biased for polemical reasons. Sidney Griffith suggests that perhaps the Byzantines thought Muslims believe in a material, corporeal God: Griffith, “Byzantium and the Christians,” 262. Christos Simelidis suggests that the Greek translations, which perhaps mean massive and solid, are accurate to the Arabic understanding of the term “*šamad*,” during the ninth century CE: Simelidis, Christos “The Byzantine Understanding of the Qur'anic Term *al-šamad* and the Greek Translation of the Qur'an,” *Speculum* 86, no. 4 (2011): 887–913. If this were perhaps true, it might suggest why later Muslim exegetes had some kind of confusion of the

term “*šamad*.” However, if we attempt to interpret Qur’an 112 as engaging with the *Shema* and perhaps the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds, as will be shown further, then it may more accurately be understood as God’s covenant (the yoke of God) or perhaps more precisely, indivisible.

- 60 See Hirschfeld, Hartwig, *New Researches into the Composition and Exegesis of the Qoran* (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1902), 35; Neuwirth, Angelika, “The Qur’an in the Field of Conflict Between the Interpretative Communities: An Attempt to Cope with the Crisis of Qur’anic Studies,” in *Fundamentalism and Gender: Scripture–Body–Community*, eds. Ulrike Auga, Christina von Braun, Claudia Bruns, and Jana Husmann (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2013), 123–124.
- 61 Deuteronomy 6:4.
- 62 Refer to Neusner, *Jerusalem Talmud*, Berakhot 2:1.
- 63 See the previous note on “*šamad*” and its possible connection to “*damad*.” BDB, 855. For few examples, compare its use in Numbers 25:3, 25:5, and Psalm 106:28. It has also been used to mean couple or pair (perhaps in the meaning of them being yoked together); for examples, compare in Judges 19:3, 19:10, and 1 Kings 19:19.
- 64 See Neusner, *Babylonian Talmud*, Berakhot 2:2. Also in Basri, Moshe, *Narratives of the Talmud: A Collection of Aggadot in the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds and the Tosefta*, trans. Edward Levin (Jerusalem: Haktab Institute, 1994), 1: 24; Soloveitchik, Joseph B. *Worship of the Heart: Essays on Jewish Prayer*, ed. Shalom Carmy (New York, NY: Toras HoRav Foundation, 2003), 108. Also refer to Neusner, *Jerusalem Talmud*, Berakhot 2:1.
- 65 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi’*, 24: 687–688 on Q. 112:1–4.
- 66 See Clark, Matityahu, *Etymological Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew: Based on the Commentaries of Samson Raphael Hirsch* (Jerusalem: Feldheim Publishers, 1999), 57. Compare with Klein, Ernst, *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language for Readers of English* (Jerusalem: Carta, 1987), see entry on “*hwa*.” Also see Fried, Isaac, *The Analytic and Synthetic Etymology of the Hebrew Language* (Boston, MA: The Hebrew Etymology Project, 2004), see entry on “*hwa*.” In my opinion, the terms “*hwa*” (masculine) and “*hya*” (feminine) might be derived from “*ha*,” which means to be or to exist. Because it is a third person pronoun, meaning the person is not necessarily present, it could be the reason why it uses the term to be or to exist to explicitly say, though not present, the person exists. Julian Morgenstern states:

For, as is well known, in Hebrew—and in fact in all Semitic languages to a greater or less degree—the personal pronouns discharge a unique function: “*hwa*,” for example, means not only “he,” but also “he is,” or perhaps somewhat more precisely, “the one who is” or “the one who exists.”

Morgenstern, Julian, “Deutero-Isaiah’s Terminology for ‘Universal God,’” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 62, no. 4 (1943): 273–274 (transliteration is mine)

- 67 The third person pronoun is sometimes substituted for or in conjunction with Yahweh in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Deuteronomy 32:39, 2 Kings 2:14, Psalm 102:27, Isaiah 41:4, 43:10–13, 46:4, 48:12, Jeremiah 3:12). Bernhard Duhm suggests that Yahweh is an extension of “*hw*” (He), as God is called by some Arabs, as cited in Abba, “The Divine Name,” 321–322. However, there are scholars that dismiss the connection between them: Abba, “The Divine Name,” 320–328. Nonetheless, Isaiah 41:4 states, “I, YHWH, the first, and with the last ones; I am He (*hwa*).” Julian Morgenstern discusses this verse and states:

But the question arises immediately, just what is the actual implication of “*hwa*.” “He” is only a literal translation of the pronoun, but as such is almost meaningless. It is impossible to escape the conviction that the prophet had in mind something more specific than this, when he employed the pronoun here. Obviously in this distich “*hwa*” is in absolute parallelism with “YHWH”; and this parallelism suggests that “*hwa*” itself is a term which Deutero-Isaiah employs as a designation of the Universal God in precisely the same manner and with precisely the same implication as “YHWH.”

Morgenstern, “Deutero-Isaiah’s Terminology,” 271 (transliteration is mine)

Morgenstern continues giving examples from Isaiah and stating:

Apparently “*hwa*” stands by itself, in syntactical isolation altogether out of keeping with its use as a pronoun. Seemingly “*hwa*” is here used as a noun, a name or designation of the Deity, as in fact a synonym of “YHWH” in the connotation, “the Universal God.”

Morgenstern, “Deutero-Isaiah’s Terminology,” 272 (transliteration is mine)

After giving many examples, Morgenstern concludes:

All these passages lend added confirmation to our interpretation of the terms, ‘YHWH’ and ‘*hwa*,’ as used by Deutero-Isaiah as a designation for God, with the specific implication of ‘the eternally existent One, the Eternal,’ and show the strong influence which this great prophetic writer exerted upon the thought, theology, and literary style of the immediately ensuing age.

Morgenstern, “Deutero-Isaiah’s Terminology,” 279 (transliteration is mine)

James Montgomery also suggests the connection between Yahweh and “Hū.” However, he dismisses the relationship between Yahweh and the verb to be (*hyh*) in favor of “*hwa*.” Montgomery, James A., “The Hebrew Divine Name and the Personal Pronoun Hū,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 63, no. 2 (1944): 161–163. As stated above in this note and the previous one, both Yahweh and “*hwa*” are probably related to the verb to be (*hyh*), and therefore dismissing Yahweh’s relationship with “*hyh*” is perhaps misleading; Mowinkel, “The Name of the God of Moses,” 121–133; Kosmala, “The Name of God,” 103–120.

68 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 7: 26–29 on “*khḷṣ*.”

69 BDB, 322–323. Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 321–322. Kaufmann, Stephen A., ed. *Targum Lexicon: Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project* (Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College, n.d.). From the meaning to withdraw may come the meanings to escape or to deliver, in which the meaning of salvation may be attributed to it. See TDOT, 4: 436–437, on “*ḥ l ṣ*.”

70 Deuteronomy 6:5.

71 See Neusner, *Babylonian Talmud*, Berakhot 9:5; Neusner, *Jerusalem Talmud*, Berakhot 9:5.

72 Ibid.

73 Ibid.

74 Neuwirth, Angelika “The Two Faces of the Qur’ān: Qur’ān and Muṣḥaf,” *Oral Tradition* 25, no. 1 (2010): 141–156, 153; Neuwirth, Angelika, *Der Koran als Text der Spätantike: Ein europäischer Zugang* (Frankfurt: Verlag der Weltreligionen im Insel Verlag, 2010).

75 The Nicene Creed, as adopted in 325 CE, did not originally explicitly give the Holy Spirit a status in the Godhead. The amendment to the Nicene Creed took place in the

First Council of Constantinople in 381 CE, which mentions the Holy Spirit as the Lord and Giver of life that proceeds from the Father. Just to note, the Holy Spirit in Judaism is not another person of the Godhead, but is an attribute of God's presence and power. Unlike the Nicene Creed, the pseudo-Athanasian Creed is not a product of an Ecumenical Council. It is attributed to Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 373 CE), but scholars believe it was written much after his death and that it is neither a creed nor written by Athanasius. Its origins are ambiguous. It appears to have originated in Europe in Latin. See Haring, Nicholas M., "Commentaries on the Pseudo-Athanasian Creed," *Medieval Studies* 34 (1972): 208–252; Krueger, Robert, "The Origin and Terminology of the Athanasian Creed," *Western Pastoral Conference of the Dakota-Montana District*, October 5–6 (1976). Philip Schaff states, "it appears first in its full form towards the close of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century," Schaff, Philip, *Creeds of Christendom* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1977), 36. This suggests that its relationship with the Qur'an is perhaps highly unlikely. However, the foundations that made this creed might have already existed and been debated among different Christian churches during the time of the Qur'an. For one of the early scholarly histories of the Athanasian Creed, see Waterland, Daniel, *A Critical History of the Athanasian Creed*, ed. John R. King (Oxford: James Parker, 1870).

- 76 Partly perhaps because the pseudo-Athanasian Creed may be seen as logically inconsistent allowing for contradictions to coexist. This does not mean that it is untrue, but that it allows for many ambiguities. See Cartwright, Richard, "On the Logical Problem of the Trinity," in *Philosophical Essays* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990), 187–200.
- 77 Walhout, Edwin, *Christianity Down to Earth: Where We Are and Where We Should Be Going* (n.p.: Lulu Press, 2015), 179–180.
- 78 For more on Tertullian (d. 225 CE) refer to his treatise "Adversus Praxeian." This was Tertullian's defense against Monarchianism, which emphasized God being one person. Tertullian, "Adversus Praxeian," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Buffalo, NY: The Christian Literature Company, 1885).
- 79 Ambrose, "On the Holy Spirit," #83, in Schaff, *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 10: 147.
- 80 On "Let there be" in Genesis 1:3 Sarna in his commentary states, "The directive *yehi*, found again in verses 6 and 14, is reserved for creation of celestial phenomena. Its usage here may be an allusion to the divine personal name YHVH." Found in Sarna, N. M., *The JPS Torah Commentary: Genesis* (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 7.
- 81 John 8:58.
- 82 1 Corinthians 7:31.
- 83 Acts 17:28.
- 84 2 Corinthians 1:19.
- 85 Exodus 3:14. Ambrose, "Letter 79," as translated in Beyenka, Mary M., trans., *Saint Ambrose Letters*, The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation, vol. 26 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1954), 437–447, 443.
- 86 The source extrapolates from Ambrose's "Letter 79" by stating, "The Word of God Is Yahweh, the One Who Is." In Elowsky, Joel C., ed., *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament IVa, John 1–10* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006), 1: 15.
- 87 The TSQ translates "*waladā*" as "taken a child." To conform with the thesis perpetuated in this chapter, I keep "has begotten" as the translation of this term.

- 88 Qur'an 2:116–117.
- 89 Qur'an 19:34–35.
- 90 Further discussion on the Incarnation of the Word and the creation of Jesus' physical body from the Qur'anic point of view appears in Chapter 7.
- 91 For more on the topic, see Martin, Richard C., "Createdness of the Qur'an," *Encyclopedia of the Qur'an*, ed. Jane D. McAuliffe (Leiden: Brill, 2005); Nawas, John A., "A Reexamination of Three Current Explanations for al-Ma'mun's Introduction of the Miḥna," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 26, no. 4 (1994): 615–629. There is some ambiguity on the Shī'ī view. The Qur'an is usually considered created, but sometimes is referred to as "*muḥdath*," which may be interpreted as something with a temporal existence: al-Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī (d. 676/1277), *al-Maslak fī uṣūl al-dīn wa talīh al-risālah al-māti'iyah*, ed. Riḍa al-Ustādī (Mashhad: Mujaḥma' al-Buḥūth al-Islāmiyyah, 1994). Ja'far al-Ṣādiq (d. 148/765) considered the Qur'an neither created nor coeternal, Ibn Bābawayh (d. 381/991), *al-Tawḥīd*, ed. Ḥāshim al-Ḥusaynī al-Ṭahrānī (Qom: Manshūrāt Jamā'ah al-Mudarrisīn fil-Ḥawzah al-'Ilmiyyah, 1978), 223–228; al-Shākri, Ḥusayn, *al-Ṣādiq Ja'far 'alayh al-salām, Mawsū'ah al-muṣṭafa wal-'itrah* (9) (Qom: Nashr al-Hādī, 1997), 490–493. If a person speaks, their speech is neither created nor has it existed with the person since his existence. Nonetheless, some view that Ja'far al-Ṣādiq simply did not want to enter into a debate that appeared to have political motivations.
- 92 Qur'an 3:59. TSQ translates "*fa-yakūn*" in this instance as "was," as an exegetical inference of Adam's creation in the past. However, the Arabic term is in the present tense.
- 93 The term "*fa*-" used is grammatically known to have two meanings, conjoining ('*atf*') and following ('*ittibā'*'). This means that the conjoining also implies sequence ('*tartīb*'). See al-Mūṣālī, *al-Khaṣā'is* (Cairo: Al-Hay'ah al-Miṣriyyah al-'Āmmah lil-Kitāb, n.d.), 2: 198. Looking at it from the grammatical understanding, if it says "*kun wa-yakūn*," it would mean "Be and (same time) it is." This would imply only conjunction without sequence. However, if it says "*kun thumma yakūn*," it would mean "Be, then (after a while) it is." This would imply sequence, but unlike "*fa*-" it does not assume necessarily an immediate consequence.
- 94 Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal states that the Qur'an differentiates creation (*khlq*) from command (*amr*) considering "Is it not His the division (creation) and the command (*alā lahu al-khalq wal-amr*)" (i.e., Qur'an 7:54) as a point showing that the terms are mutually exclusive. He states that the command (*amr*) is uncreated, since it is God's speech, Ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Radd*, 39–40, 106–107. Although he suggests that "*khlq*" requires "*amr*," basing it on Qur'an 16:40, Ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Radd*, 128, 164–165, the verse does not explicitly state that the "*amr*" is for creation and Qur'an 3:59, as discussed, shows, at least in that instance, creation (*khlq*) preceded being (*takwīn*). If, according to Ibn Ḥanbal, the "*amr*," which is "*kn*" is uncreated, then using the same logic the spirit (*al-rūḥ*) would also be uncreated, because it is from God's "*amr*" (i.e., Qur'an 17:85). However, this is not the stance of Ibn Ḥanbal, who states that the "*rūḥ*" is created and that Jesus is not the embodiment of the uncreated "*kn*," but is created by the uncreated "*kn*," Ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Radd*, 125–127. Ibn Qayyim states the different opinions on the spirit, according to Muslim thought, and concludes that it is created, although there is no explicit Qur'anic indication that it is. See Ibn Qayyim, *al-Rūḥ fil-kalām 'ala arwāḥ al-amwāt wal-aḥyā' bil-dalā'il min al-kitāb wal-sunnah* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, n.d.), 144–155.
- 95 Qur'an 3:45.

- 96 One of the reasons that Ibn Ḥanbal states that the Word of God, “*kn*,” and His command (*amr*) are uncreated, is because they are the agent of creation, Ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Radd*, 40–41. If they were created, then there needs to be another word, which also would be created, to create it, Ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Radd*, 164–165. Therefore, Ibn Ḥanbal sees this as an unending loop. Augustine also argues similarly:

Now some unbelieving Arian may come forth and say that “the Word of God was made.” How can it be that the Word of God was made, when God by the Word made all things? If the Word of God was itself also made, by what other Word was *it* made? But if thou sayest that there is a Word of the Word, I say, that by which *it* was made is itself the only Son of God. But if thou dost not say there is a Word of the Word, allow that that was not made by which all things were made. For that by which all things were made could not be made by itself. Believe the evangelist then. For he might have said, “In the beginning God made the Word:” even as Moses said, “In the beginning God made the heavens and the earth”; and enumerates all things thus: “God said, Let it be made, and it was made.” If “said,” who said? God. And what was made? Some creature. Between the speaking of God and the making of the creature, what was there by which it was made but the Word? For God said, “Let it be made, and it was made.” This Word is unchangeable; although changeable things are made by it, the Word itself is unchangeable.

(Augustine, *Tractates on John*, in Schaff, *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Tractate John 1.11, 7: 10)

For more on the Muslim debate regarding whether or not God’s speech is created, refer to Tritton, “The Speech of God.”

- 97 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘Arab*, 10: 503–508 on “*h l k*.”
- 98 *BDB*, 229–237. Also for earlier Semitic usage of “*hlk*” to mean going, see *TDOT*, 3: 388–403.
- 99 This is not solidly defined if the pre-Islamic Arabs did not believe in an afterlife. Otherwise, this may suggest that they do, though not specifically resurrection of the dead. Yet, another theory is that the meaning of death was used by Semitic communities that believed in an afterlife and that pre-Islamic Arabs might have adopted it to mean death.
- 100 This will be further explained later in this section.
- 101 Qur’an 3:55.
- 102 Qur’an 3:47.
- 103 Qur’an 19:33–35.
- 104 John 1:13.
- 105 John 3:3–8.
- 106 Qur’an 17:85.
- 107 Augustine, Sermon 90.2, as taken from *Augustine Sermons on Selected Lessons of the New Testament*, in P. Schaff, ed., *Saint Augustine: Sermon on the Mount, Harmony of the Gospels, Homilies on the Gospels*, trans. R. G. MacMullen (New York, NY: Christian Literature, 1888) 6: 529.
- 108 Seim, Turid K., “Descent and Divine Paternity in the Gospel of John: Does the Mother Matter?” *New Testament Studies* 51, no. 3 (2005): 361–375, 375.
- 109 May, Eric, “The Logos in the Old Testament,” *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 8, no. 4 (1946): 438–447; Hayward, C. T. Robert, “The Holy Name of the God of Moses and the Prologue of St John’s Gospel,” *New Testament Studies* 25, no. 1 (1978): 16–32;

- Reed, D. A., "How Semitic Was John? Rethinking the Hellenistic Background to John 1:1," *Anglican Theological Review* 85, no. 4 (2003): 709–726.
- 110 McNamara, Martin, "Logos of the Fourth Gospel and Memra of the Palestinian Targum (Ex 12⁴²)," *The Expository Times* 79, no. 4 (1968): 115–117.
- 111 Boyarin, Daniel, "The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John," *Harvard Theological Review* 94, no. 3 (2001): 243–284, 258.
- 112 Ibid.
- 113 Ibid., 259.
- 114 Ibid., 261.
- 115 Anderson, Gary, "The Interpretation of Genesis 1:1 in the Targums," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52, no. 1 (1990): 21–29, 28.
- 116 John 1:14.
- 117 Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Jawāb*, 3: 245.

Chapter 7: The Incarnation and the Water of Life

- 1 Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Jawāb*, 3: 245.
- 2 For a more basic overview of early Christian–Muslim dialogues with a strictly traditional Islamic thought, see Beaumont, M. I. *Christology in Dialogue with Muslims: A Critical Analysis of Christian Presentations of Christ for Muslims from the Ninth and Twentieth Centuries* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2005).
- 3 Wansbrough, *The Sectarian Milieu*.
- 4 Sachedina, Abdulaziz, "Islamic Theology of Christian–Muslim Relations," *Islam and Christian–Muslim Relations* 8, no. 1 (1997): 27–38.
- 5 Qur'an 15:29, 38:72.
- 6 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 14: 408–417 on "s w y."
- 7 BDB, 1000–1001.
- 8 Ibid.
- 9 TDOT, 14: 522–527, on "shwh."
- 10 Ibid., 14: 525, on "shwh." Also see Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 11: 610 on "mthl." Also consider Isaiah 46:5, which uses these terms as if they were somewhat synonymous.
- 11 Also see Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 11: 610 on "mthl."
- 12 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ* (Q. 15:29), 17: 100.
- 13 Al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ* (Q. 15:29) 19: 139.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Ibid. (Q. 2:34), 2: 427–428.
- 17 Al-Masʿūdī (d. 346/956), *Murūj al-dhahab wa maʿādin al-jawhar* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1966), 1: 33.
- 18 Ḥaqqī, *Rūḥ al-bayān*, 6: 28.
- 19 The honor of the Kaʿbah is related in prophetic traditions (*aḥādīth*). "Praying in my mosque is better than a thousand prayers in any other, except the Sacred Mosque," from al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 2: 60 (#1190); also from Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 2: 1012–1014 (#1394, #1395, #1396).
- 20 The prophet had said while circumambulating the Kaʿbah, "How good are you and good is your smell. How great are you and great is your sacredness. By the One whose Muḥammad's soul is in His hands, the sacredness of a believer is greater unto God than you, his money, his blood, and to think of him in goodness." Ibn Mājih

- (d. 273/887), *Sunan Ibn Mājih*, ed. M. F. Abdul-Bāqī (Cairo: Dār Iḥyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabiyyah, n.d.) 2: 1297 (#3932).
- 21 Al-Saqqāf, 'Alawī 'A., ed., *al-Mawsū'ah Al-'aqqdiyyah* (dorar.net 2013), 3: 266; Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd (d. 656/1258) *Sharḥ nahj al-balāghah* (unknown publisher, n.d.), 13: 4.
 - 22 Al-Sha'rāwī, *Tafsīr*, 1: 510.
 - 23 Al-Baghawī (d. 516/1122), *Ma'ālim al-tanzīl fī tafsīr al-Qur'an* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 2000), 1: 104.
 - 24 Al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ* (Q. 2:34), 2: 427.
 - 25 Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ nahj al-balāghah*, 13: 4.
 - 26 Imām Ḥassan al-'Askarī (d. 260/874) is the eleventh imam of the Twelver Shi'a school of thought.
 - 27 Al-'Askarī, *Tafsīr* (Qom: Madrasat al-Imām al-Mahdī, n.d.), 385. Also reported in Al-Shirāzī, M., *Nafāḥāt al-Qur'an* (unknown publisher, n.d.), 3: 275.
 - 28 Al-Majlisī (d. 1111/1698) *Bihār al-anwār* (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Wafā', 1984), 11: 140, 16: 402.
 - 29 Galadari, "The Qibla."
 - 30 Al-Ṭabarsī, *Majma'* (Q. 28:14), 7: 421.
 - 31 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, refer to meaning of (Q. 28:14), 19: 535.
 - 32 Al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ*, refer to meaning of (Q. 28:14), 24: 583.
 - 33 Qur'an 32:4–9.
 - 34 The term "*istawa 'ala al-'arsh*" is usually translated as "established on the throne." The term "*istawa*" is actually very ambiguous. It could mean sitting (*julūs*), but it is not quite sitting. Ibn Taymiyyah in his *Sharḥ* relates from Imām Mālik (d. 179/795) stating, "*Al-Istiwa'* (sitting) is known. The how is unknown. Believing in it is obligatory. Asking about it is an innovation" [suggesting that people should not ask about it]. Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728/1328), *Sharḥ ḥadīth al-nuzūl* (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1977), 32.
 - 35 Qur'an 7:11.
 - 36 For a further understanding of the term "*thumma*" see my discussion in Galadari, "*Creatio ex Nihilo*."
 - 37 The concept of the creation of human progeny is known in some Muslim thought to have occurred already. This concept can be seen in the exegesis of Qur'an 22:27, where Abraham calls the people for Ḥajj, and those who believed have already accepted the call. Refer to the interpretation of Qur'an 22:27 from several exegetes, such as al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, 18: 605–616, al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ*, 23: 218–221, and Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr*, 5: 363–364.
 - 38 Hebrews 1:6.
 - 39 Deuteronomy 32:43—Septuagint; Brenton, Lancelot Charles Lee, ed., *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, with an English Translation: and with Various Readings and Critical Notes* (London: Samuel Bagster, 1884), 277. There is a Hebrew version of this text found in Qumran, known as 4QDeut32; for more on this and its relation to Hebrews 1:6, see Cockerill, Gareth L., "Hebrews 1:6: Source and Significance," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 9 (1999): 51–64.
 - 40 Qur'an 3:59. TSQ translates "*fa-yakūn*" in this instance as "was," as an exegetical inference of Adam's creation in the past. However, the Arabic term is in the present tense.
 - 41 BDB, 9–10.
 - 42 This is further elaborated on in the Hebrew Bible; see Hess, Richard S., "Splitting the Adam: The Usage of 'Ādām in Genesis I–VI," *Studies in the Pentateuch* 41 (1990): 1–15. Also, this may be compared with the understanding of the "Son of Man (or Son

- of Adam)” title for Jesus using for himself in the Gospels; see Cortés, Juan B. and Gatti, Florence M., “The Son of Man or the Son of Adam,” *Biblica* 49, no. 4 (1968): 457–502.
- 43 *TDOT*, 1: 78, on “*a d m*.”
- 44 *Ibid.*, 1: 75–79, on “*a d m*.”
- 45 *Ibid.*
- 46 *Ibid.*, 3: 234–235, on “*dm*.”
- 47 *Ibid.*, 3: 236, on “*dm*.” In Arabic, the root of “*dm*” is “*d m y*.” See Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 14: 267–271, on “*d m y*.”
- 48 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 14: 267–271, on “*d m y*.”
- 49 *Ibid.*, 14: 271, on “*d m y*.”
- 50 Refer to Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab* and Al-Zabīdī, *Tāj al-‘arūs*; *BDB*, 9–10.
- 51 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 12: 8. Also in Al-Zabīdī, *Tāj al-‘arūs*, 31: 190.
- 52 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 12: 12. *Lisān al-‘arab* only refers due to Adam’s creation from clay, which is also called “*adamah*.” Also in Al-Zabīdī, *Tāj al-‘arūs*, 13: 197.
- 53 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 12: 9.
- 54 *Ibid.*, 12: 9–10. Also in Al-Zabīdī, *Tāj al-‘arūs*, 13: 192.
- 55 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 12: 10. Also in Al-Zabīdī, *Tāj al-‘arūs*, 13: 193. Both lexicons also portray the possibility of an opposite view, where the “*adamah*” is the epidermis and the “*bashrah*” is the dermis.
- 56 *Midrash Rabbah*, 1: 56–59.
- 57 *Ibid.*, 1: 60–61.
- 58 Chipman, L. N. B., “Adam and the Angels: An Examination of Mythic Elements in Islamic Sources,” *Arabica* 49, no. 4 (2002): 429–455.
- 59 John 2:19–22.
- 60 Patai, “The Shekhina.”
- 61 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi’*, refer to meaning of (Q. 9:26), 14: 189; Al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ*, refer to meaning of (Q. 9:26), 16: 19; Al-Ṭabarsī, *Majma’* (Q. 9:26), 5: 32.
- 62 *Ibid.*, Also see Zayd ibn ‘Alī (d. 122/740), *Tafsīr gharīb al-Qur’ān al-majīd*, ed. M. Y. Al-Dīn (Hyderabad: Taj Yusuf Foundation Trust, 2001), 107.
- 63 Al-Simnānī (d. 736/1336), *al-Ta’wīlāt al-najmīyyah fī al-tafsīr al-ishārī al-ṣūfī* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 2009), Q. 9:26.
- 64 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 13: 213. Also in Al-Zabīdī, *Tāj al-‘arūs*, 35: 198.
- 65 Al-Ṭabāṭabā’ī, *al-Mizān*, 2: 294–295.
- 66 Malachi 3:6. This is based on Ambrose, where the verse is “I am the Lord,” while Ambrose uses “I am, I am.” This assumes that Ambrose perhaps calls the name of God, Yahweh, as I am, “Ehiyeh,” as is also found in Exodus 3:14. This is compiled in Ambrose’s (d. 397 CE) “Exposition of the Christian Faith,” in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series, Ambrose: Select Works and Letters*, trans. and ed. Phillip Schaff and Henry Wallace (New York, NY: Cosimo Inc., 2007), 10: 222.
- 67 See Athanasius (d. 373 CE), *Four Discourses Against the Arians* (n.p.: Fig Books, 2012).
- 68 The purpose of Chapters 5 to 7 is not to discuss Christology, but only to analyze the Qur’anic description of creation of human flesh with the text of the Bible. In other words, I am not suggesting that the Qur’an conveys a message of Incarnation of God in accordance to any creeds within Christianity. These chapters only suggest that there are various ways to interpret the Qur’an. It could be interpreted in accordance to the Nicene Creed, Chalcedonian, non-Chalcedonian, Nestorian, Arian, etc. This means that one can argue a Chalcedonian creed through the Qur’an or even a non-Chalcedonian creed. The text allows for multiple meanings. The only thing that the Qur’an asserts is that Christ had a physical body and was human in every way, and,

hence, it argues against Docetism and some Gnostic beliefs that existed during early Christianity. However, the Qur'an can be interpreted in many other types of Christology that existed in the early Churches.

- 69 For more information on the early Christological controversies, see Norris Jr., Richard A. ed. *The Christological Controversy* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1980).
- 70 Al-Dārmī (d. 255/893), *Naqḍ al-Imām Abi Sa'īd 'Uthmān ibn Sa'īd 'Alī Al-Mrīsī al-Jahmī al-'anīd fima iftara 'ala Allāh 'azza wa jall mina al-tawhīd*, ed. R. Ḥ. Al-Alma'ī (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 1998), 2: 675.
- 71 Al-Kalābādhi, Abu Bakr (d. 380/990), *al-Ta'arruf li-madhab ahl al-taṣawwuf* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, n.d.), 68.
- 72 Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl*, 2: 130.
- 73 I use "Spirit" as God's own (perhaps the Holy Spirit). I use "spirit" as a general term of any kind of spirit, whether divine and holy or otherwise.
- 74 Ibn Ḥazm, 5: 58.
- 75 Ibn Qayyim, *al-Rūḥ fil-kalām*, 145.
- 76 Ibid.
- 77 Ibid.
- 78 Al-Shirāzī, M., *al-Amthal fī tafsīr kitāb Allāh al-munzal* (unknown publisher, n.d.), 9: 111. In Al-Shirāzī's *Tafsīr*, the use of the Spirit in the Qur'an has multiple meanings in different contexts. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit that helps prophets in their message, such as Jesus Christ. It is also used in the context of the angel of inspiration. It is also used in the context of the archangel. Also, it is used as the human spirit, which was used in Adam's creation; Al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, 4: 12, 58: 28, 58: 47, 71: 266; al-Māzandarānī (d. 1086/1699), *Sharḥ uṣūl al-kāfi*, eds. Abu al-Ḥasan al-Sha'rānī and 'Alī 'Āshūr (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 2000), 4: 122.
- 79 Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir (d. 114/733) is the fifth Imām of the Shī'a, including among those who trace their schools to both the Twelver and Ismā'īlī. He is also considered a respected Islamic scholar among Sunni Muslims.
- 80 Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq is the sixth Imām of the Shī'a, also among those who trace their schools to both the Twelver and Ismā'īlī. He is a respected Islamic scholar even among Sunni Muslims. It is reported that the Sunni Imām Abu Ḥanīfah (d. 150/767), founder of the Ḥanafī school of jurisprudence, and Imām Mālik (d. 179/795), founder of the Mālikī school of jurisprudence, studied under Imām al-Ṣādiq. See Ibn al-Jizrī, *Manāqib al-asad al-ghālib mumazziq al-katā'ib wa muḥḥir al-'ajā'ib Layth ibn Ghālib amīr al-mu'minīn Abī al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib*, ed. Ṭ. Al-Ṭanṭawī (Cairo: Maktabat al-Qur'ān, 1994), 83 (#95); Taymūr, Aḥmad (d. 1348/1930), *Naṣrah tārikhiyya fī ḥudūth al-madhāhib al-fiqhiyya al-arba'ah: al-Ḥanafī, al-Mālikī, al-Shāfi'ī, al-Ḥanbalī, wa intishārihā 'ind jumhūr al-muslimīn* (Beirut: Dār al-Qādirī, 1990), 26.
- 81 Al-Ḥawayzī (d. 1112/1700), *Tafsīr nūr al-thaqalayn* (unknown publisher, n.d.), 3: 11–13, 3: 215–219.
- 82 Al-Majlisī (d. 1111/1698), *Mir'āt al-'uqūl fī sharḥ akhbār āl al-rasūl*, ed. Ja'far al-Ḥusaynī (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyyah, n.d.), 4: 274.
- 83 O'Connor, K. M., "The Islamic Jesus: Messiah-hood and Human Divinity in African American Muslim Exegesis," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 66, no. 3 (1998): 493–532. In some Muslim thought, including orthodoxy, the Holy Spirit is considered a creature and not divine, although there is no Qur'anic basis to suggest that.
- 84 For more on the orthodox systematic theology, see Crisp, Oliver D., *God Incarnate: Explorations in Christology* (London: Continuum, 2009).

- 85 For history of the churches' theology and Christology, see Hall, S. G. *Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2003).
- 86 Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274 CE) *Summa Theologica* (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, n.d.), 3rd Part, Question II, 1st Article, Reply to Objection 3.
- 87 Zaehner, "The Qur'an and Christ," 206–207.
- 88 Ibid., 209.
- 89 Qur'an 5:17, 5:72.
- 90 Risse, Günther, *Gott ist Christus, der Sohn der Maria: Eine Studie zum Christusbild im Koran* (Bonn: Borengässer, 1989).
- 91 A Monophysite Christology suggests that Jesus Christ is of a single nature that is either divine or a synthesis between the divine and human natures. This is based on the Churches that rejected the Council of Chalcedon in 451 CE. In contrast, the Chalcedonian formula maintains that Jesus Christ had two natures, divine and human during the Incarnation, that are distinct. In other words, the Chalcedonian churches maintain that Jesus Christ has two natures in one person.
- 92 Beaumont, M. I., "Early Christian Interpretation of the Qur'an," *Transformation* 22, no. 4 (2005): 295–203, 200.
- 93 Ibid.
- 94 According to orthodox Islam, the Spirit is distinct from God. However, I suggest that the Qur'an does not truly define it as either distinct or otherwise, giving it flexibility for it to be understood as either.
- 95 Some Gnostics believed that Jesus Christ was a pure spirit with a phantom body, a doctrine known as Docetism. For more information on Gnostic origins and beliefs see King, *What Is Gnosticism?*
- 96 Qur'an 21:30–35.
- 97 BDB, 135; Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 53–154; Gesenius, William, *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament* (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, n.d.), 138–139.
- 98 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 1: 31 on "br'."
- 99 Qur'an 23:14 uses the term "*khalaqnā*" to be more appropriate to its root meaning of "we divided" instead of its meaning to create in general. For the meanings to portion, to measure, and to smoothen, see Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 10: 85–92 on "*khlq*," "*akhlāq*," "*khlīlqah*," "*khalqā*," and "*khalāq*." For these definitions and more specifically for the meaning of division and splitting, see BDB, 322–324.
- 100 TDOT, 2:245, on "br'."
- 101 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 10: 114 on "*r t q*." Also see Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr*, 5: 339 on Q. 21:30.
- 102 Ibid., 10: 114 on "*r t q*." Also see al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923), *Tarikh al-rusul wal-mulūk* (Beirut: Dār al-Turāth, 1967), 1: 61; Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr*, 5: 339 on Q. 21:30.
- 103 On the meanings of "*fajj*" as a path in a deep or distant valley, refer to Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 2: 338–340 on "*f j j*." On the meaning of "*amīq*" as deepness, depth, and distance, refer to Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 10: 270–271 on "*o m q*" and "*muta'ammīq*." In Hebrew and Aramaic, the term "*omq*" means deepness and valley (as a valley is a depth between mountains), and it is used as such in the Hebrew Bible. Refer to BDB, 770–771. In most Semitic languages, the meaning used for this term is in some way derived from depth. See TDOT, 11: 202–208, on "*a m q*."
- 104 *Genesis Rabbah*.
- 105 Also compare with Job 10:19–22. In Job 10:22, the deep is darkness and without any order, which may be compared with Genesis 1:2.

- 106 Proverbs 9:18.
 107 Genesis 1:14–18.
 108 *Genesis Rabbah*, 6:1, 42.
 109 *Ibid.*, 6:1, 41.
 110 Psalm 104:19.
 111 Qur'an 11:7.
 112 *Genesis Rabbah*, 2:4, 17.
 113 Rashi (d. 1105 CE), *Torah with Rashi's Commentary* (Brooklyn, NY: Mesorah, 1998), Genesis 1:2.
 114 *Genesis Rabbah*, 1:4, 6. The Qur'an typically states that God establishes on the Throne after the creation of the heavens and the earth (e.g., Qur'an 7:54, 10:3, 13:2, 25:59, 32:4, 57:4). Meanwhile, the midrash states that the Throne of Glory is among the first things created, although a chronology of when that occurred (before or after the creation of the heavens and the earth) is not shown.
 115 Qur'an 7:54.
 116 Some have suggested that “*al-‘ālamīn*” may refer to all creation and creatures. According to Ibn ‘Abbās, it is specifically to people and *jinn*. See al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi‘*, 1: 143–146 on Q. 1:2.
 117 This would be the Hebrew and Aramaic definition of the word's cognate “*olam*.” See *BDB*, 761. The root “*‘l m*” means secret, hidden, or concealed. Thus, the age to come, which is presumed to be eternal is hidden, and hence called “*olam*” and not that the root actually means eternity. See *BDB*, 761; *TDOT*, 11: 147–152, on “*alam*.” Hence, “*ilm*” also means knowledge, as it is knowing things that were unknown earlier. Similarly, the root for the term “*khuld*” in Qur'an 21:34 is presumed to mean eternity, but its root actually means to creep in and to penetrate, such as someone creeping into or penetrating through sleep (*khālid fil-nawm*). As such, when people leave this world and penetrate the world to come, it is called “*khuld*,” and not that the root actually means eternity. See Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 3: 164–165 on “*khld*.” Also see *BDB*, 317. Although the *TDOT* does not identify a relationship between the meanings of time and creeping in the term “*khld*” (see *TDOT*, 4: 397–399, on “*ḥ l d*”), it is suggested that the meaning for eternity comes from creeping or penetrating time. The definition of eternity for “*khuld*” and “*olam*” are presumed, but are not necessarily the literal root definitions of the word. This brings into question if either scriptures assert eternity and everlastingness in the world to come or if it is assumed by interpreters.
 118 Qur'an 10:3–6.
 119 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 4: 268–276 on “*d b r*.” The Hebrew Bible also sometimes uses it in that definition (e.g., Ecclesiastes 7:14). See Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 209–210.
 120 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 4: 275 on “*d b r*.” It is also used in the Hebrew Bible in that definition (e.g., Exodus 5:3). See *BDB*, 183.
 121 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 4: 273 on “*d b r*.”
 122 *Ibid.*, on “*d b r*.” Also see *BDB*, 180–184.
 123 *Ibid.*, on “*d b r*.” Also see *BDB*, 182–183.
 124 *BDB*, 180–184. It has been suggested that the etymological root of “*d b r*” meaning back is also used for words or speech is that talking means putting words in motion after another. However, such a connection is not generally accepted by scholars. See *TDOT*, 3: 94–95, on “*d b r*.”
 125 *BDB*, 184–185.
 126 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 4: 274–275 on “*d b r*.”

- 127 BDB, 184.
- 128 As it is being argued that the six days of creation in the Qur'an are allusions to Genesis 1 and have a relationship with the Gospel of John, some scholars have identified John's prologue with an implicit portrayal of a new creation; see Brown, J. K., "Creation's Renewal."
- 129 The *TDOT* shows a relationship between the terms "*dbr*" and "*amr*." See *TDOT*, 3: 98–100, on "*dbr*." It is suggested that "*dbr*" has a more comprehensive sense of to speak or to converse. As such, it is usually followed by a finite verb form of "*amr*" (e.g., Genesis 19:14, Deuteronomy 20:2–3, Ezekiel 14:4). However, they can also be synonymous sometimes (e.g., Isaiah 40:27).
- 130 *Genesis Rabbah*, 2:4, 17.
- 131 Köstenberger, Andreas J. *Encountering John: The Gospel in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002), 53–57. Nonetheless, Köstenberger compares John's prologue with Isaiah 55:9–11, which uses the term "*dbr*," but the Septuagint does not render it as "*logos*," but as "*rēma*."
- 132 See Ronning, *The Jewish Targums*. There is no consensus on the dating of the targums. Some scholars suggest they were written well post-Christianity, while others suggest that at least some targums were perhaps written as early as the first century. See Flesher and Chilton, *The Targums*; Hayward, *Targums*; Houtman and Sysling, *Alternative Targum Traditions*; McNamara, *Targum and Testament Revisited*. Nonetheless, this does not dismiss the relationship between Genesis' "*amr*" and Johannine Logos.
- 133 *TDOT*, 3: 116–125, on "*dbr*."
- 134 *Ibid.*, 1: 333, on "*amr*."
- 135 For further uses of "*dbr*" as Word of God, see *TDOT*, 3: 111–112, on "*dbr*."
- 136 *TDOT*, 1: 338–341, on "*amr*."
- 137 *Ibid.*, 1: 328, on "*amr*."
- 138 *Ibid.*
- 139 Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-'arab*, 4: 32–33 on "*amr*."
- 140 *TDOT*, 1: 328–329, on "*amr*."
- 141 See Lincoln, A. T. *Black's New Testament Commentary: The Gospel According to Saint John* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006), 94–95.
- 142 *Genesis Rabbah*, 3:2, 20.
- 143 Psalm 33:6.
- 144 *Genesis Rabbah*, 2:4, 17.
- 145 Exodus 3:14.
- 146 Exodus 6:2–3.
- 147 John 1:1–5.
- 148 *Genesis Rabbah*, 2:5, 19; also 3:6, 22.
- 149 The Babylonian Talmud makes a connection between the Messiah and the resurrection of the dead. According to a note, it states, "The Talmud treats as self-evident the link between the Messiah and the resurrection of the dead, but the Mishnah has not done so, indeed, has no [*sic*] introduced the Messiah-theme at all. The Talmud then wants to know how the Messiah's coming relates to the resurrection of the dead." In Neusner, *The Babylonian Talmud*, 16: 774.
- 150 Qur'an 2:116–117.
- 151 Qur'an 3:47.
- 152 *TSQ* uses past-tense "was" as a translation of "*yakūn*," but I keep it in the present tense to be consistent with the Arabic term.

- 153 Qur'an 3:59–60.
- 154 Qur'an 6:73.
- 155 There could be wordplay occurring in here with Qur'anic exposition of John's passage, as "*ḥaqq*" is a polysemous term that could mean both truth and law. See Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 10: 49–58 on "*ḥ q q*."
- 156 *Genesis Rabbah*, 1:7, 4.
- 157 Psalm 119:160.
- 158 Qur'an 19:34–35.
- 159 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 18: 193–194 on Q. 19:34. Al-Ṭabarī shows that "*al-ḥaqq*" is God; al-Ṭabarsī, *Majmaʿ*, on Q. 19:34. Ibn ʿArabī interprets "*qawl al-ḥaqq*" in this passage as that Jesus is the word of "*al-ḥaqq*," or in other words, the Word of God, as God is "*al-ḥaqq*." Ibn ʿArabī, *Tafsīr*, on Q. 19:34.
- 160 Unlike the TSQ which uses "mankind" as a translation for "*al-nās*," I prefer "humankind."
- 161 Qur'an 16:38–40.
- 162 Qur'an 40:68.

Chapter 8: Allegorical Interpretation

- 1 See Perrine, Laurence, "Four Forms of Metaphor," *College English* 33, no. 2 (1971): 125–138; Crisp, Peter "Between Extended Metaphor and Allegory: Is Blending Enough?" *Language and Literature* 17, no. 4 (2008): 291–308.
- 2 This section is revised from Galadari, Abdulla, "Inner Meanings of Islamic Finance: Understanding the Theory Behind All Theories," in *Islam, Accounting and Finance: Challenges and Opportunities in the New Decade*, eds. Norhayati M. Alwi and Sherliza P. Nelson (Kuala Lumpur: IIUM Press, 2011), 1–18.
- 3 Kahf, M., "Islamic Economics: Notes on Definition and Methodology," *Review of Islamic Economics* 13 (2003): 23–38.
- 4 For the history of interest rates see Homer, S., *A History of Interest Rates* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1996).
- 5 Iqbal, Z. and Mirakhor, A., "Progress and Challenges of Islamic Banking," *Thunderbird International Business Review* 41, nos. 4/5 (1999): 381–405.
- 6 See Lewison, M., "Conflict of Interest? The Ethics of Usury," *Journal of Business Ethics* 22, no. 4 (1999): 327–339; Rosly, S. A. and Abu Bakr, M. A., "Performance of Islamic and Mainstream Banks in Malaysia," *International Journal of Social Economics* 30, no. 12 (2003): 1249–1265.
- 7 See Rogers, R. A., "The Usury Debate, the Sustainability Debate, and the Call for a Moral Economy," *Ecological Economics* 35, no. 2 (2000): 157–171; Carrasco, I., "Ethics and Banking," *International Advances in Economic Research* 12 (2006): 43–50; Naughton, S. and Naughton, T., "Religion, Ethics, and Stock Trading: The Case of an Islamic Equities Market," *Journal of Business Ethics* 23, no. 2 (2000): 145–159; Sen, A., "Money and Value: On the Ethics and Economics of Finance," *Economics and Philosophy* 9 (1993): 203–227.
- 8 Al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ*, 7: 74 on Q. 2: 275; Al-Zuhaylī, *al-Fiqh al-islāmī wa adillatuhu* (Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, n.d.), 5: 3708.
- 9 Naqvi, S. N. H., *Islam, Economics, and Society* (London: Kegan Paul International, 1994).
- 10 Siddiqi, M. N., *What Went Wrong?* Keynote Address at the Roundtable on Islamic Economics: Current State of Knowledge and Development of Discipline held in

- Jeddah, Saudi Arabia on May 26–27, 2004, http://www.siddiqi.com/mns/Keynote_May2004_Jeddah.html (accessed August 14, 2010).
- 11 See Metawa, S. A. and Almossawi, M., “Banking Behavior of Islamic Bank Customers: Perspectives and Implications,” *International Journal of Bank Marketing* 16, no. 7 (1998): 299–313; Hamid, A. H. and Nordin, N. Z., “A Study on Islamic Banking Education and Strategy for the New Millennium: Malaysian Experience,” *International Journal of Islamic Financial Services* 2, no. 4 (2001).
 - 12 Zaher, T. S. and Hassan, M. K., “A Comparative Literature Survey of Islamic Finance and Banking,” *Financial Markets, Institutions & Instruments* 10, no. 4 (2001): 203–227.
 - 13 Diamond, D. W. and Rajan, R., “Liquidity Risk, Liquidity Creation, and Financial Fragility: A Theory of Banking,” *Journal of Political Economy* 109 (2002): 289–327.
 - 14 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 14: 304–307 on “*r b y*.” Also see *TDOT*, 13: 272–276, on “*rb*.”
 - 15 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 14: 304–306 on “*r b y*.”
 - 16 In the prophetic tradition (*ḥadīth*), “*al-Firdaws rabwat al-jannah*,” which means “Paradise is the great (raised) part of heaven.” See al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/970), *al-Muʿjam al-kabīr*, ed. Ḥamdī al-Salafī (Cairo: Maktabat Ibn Taymiyyah, 1994), 7: 213 (#6886).
 - 17 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 14: 306 on “*r b y*.”
 - 18 The bilateral root “*r b*” is expanded to “*r b b*” in West Semitic and “*r b y*” in East Semitic. See *TDOT*, 13: 273, on “*r b*.”
 - 19 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 14: 306 on “*r b y*.” *Lisān al-‘arab*, 1: 399–409 on “*r b b*.” *BDB*, 913–914.
 - 20 *Ibid.*, 1: 399–401 on “*r b b*.”
 - 21 *Ibid.*, 1: 442–443 on “*r y b*.” Also see *TDOT*, 13: 473–479, on “*r y b*.”
 - 22 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 12: 119–130 on “*ḥ r m*.” *BDB*, 355–356. *TDOT*, 5: 184, on “*ḥ r m*.”
 - 23 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 11: 166–171 on “*ḥ l l*.” *BDB*, 320–321. *TDOT*, 4: 409–417, on “*ḥ l l*.”
 - 24 Qur’an 2:265.
 - 25 I translate “*bay*” as “sale” and not “buying and selling,” as suggested by the *TSQ*, since it is more loyal to the Arabic term.
 - 26 Qur’an 2:274–279.
 - 27 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 9: 203–206 on “*ḍ a ʿ f*.” In Hebrew, the term means to double. See *BDB*, 858.
 - 28 Qur’an 30:39.
 - 29 “The early church fathers condemned usury. Tertullian, Basil, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Jerome used Luke 6:34–35 to support their arguments against the practice.” “Usury was considered oppressive to the poor and, thus, a forbidden practice for leadership and laypeople alike, even though it was legal in society.” In *Lexham Bible Dictionary* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press); Schaff, P. and Wace, H., eds., *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church* (New York, NY: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1900), 36–38.
 - 30 Luke 6:34–35.
 - 31 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, 8: 26 on “*b y*.”
 - 32 *Ibid.*, 8: 23 on “*b y*.”
 - 33 *Ibid.*, 4: 89 on “*t g r*.”
 - 34 Keeping loyal to the Arabic, unlike the *TSQ*, which translates “*bi-bay’ikum*” as bargain, I translate it as sale instead.
 - 35 Qur’an 9:111.
 - 36 Qur’an 71:4.

- 37 Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, 13: 166–171 on “*d y n*.” BDB, 192. TDOT, 3: 187–194, on “*d y n*.” The TDOT shows the synonymy between “*dyn*” (to judge) and “*ryb*” (to bring forth a lawsuit/quarrel) TDOT, 3: 188, on “*d y n*.” The TDOT also illustrates the term “*m d n*,” as in “*madīnah*” is rooted in “*dyn*” meaning a judicial district or province, TDOT, 3: 190, on “*d y n*.”
- 38 Qurʿan 82:17–19.
- 39 As before, unlike TSQ, I translate “*bay*” as sale to be more loyal to the Arabic term.
- 40 Qurʿan 2:282.
- 41 Qurʿan 42:13–15.
- 42 Qurʿan 45:17.
- 43 I translate “*al-nās*” as “humankind” instead of “mankind” used by TSQ.
- 44 Qurʿan 3:9.
- 45 I translate “*khalaq*” as divided, based on my discussion in Galadari, “*Creatio ex Nihilo*.”
- 46 I translate “*alaq*” as clinging, instead of “blood clot” used by TSQ, as it appears to be perhaps more loyal to the original Arabic root meaning.
- 47 Unlike the TSQ, which translates “*al-insān*” as “man,” I translate it as “the human.”
- 48 Qurʿan 96:1–5.
- 49 Qurʿan 3:19.
- 50 For more on the sayings of jurists on the verses of “*muḥkamāt*” and “*mutashābihāt*” please see Al-Karamī (d. 1033/1624), *Aqāwīl al-thiqāt fī taʾwīl al-asmāʾ wal-ṣifāt wal-āyāt al-muḥkamāt wal-mushtabihāt*, ed. Shuʾayb al-ʿArnaʿūṭī (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risālah, 1986).
- 51 I translate “*al-nās*” as “humankind” instead of “mankind” used by TSQ.
- 52 Qurʿan 3:7–9.

Chapter 9: Conclusion

- 1 Wasserstrom, *Between Muslim and Jew*, 103.
- 2 Ibn Saʿd, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubra*, 2: 273–274; al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 6: 182 (#4984). I wish to thank Ulrika Mårtensson for pointing this out to me.
- 3 I am indebted to Ulrika Mårtensson for pointing this out to me.
- 4 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ* [Q. 37:101–102], 21: 72–76.
- 5 Al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ* [Q. 37:102], 26: 346–349. Also, Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr* [Q. 37:101–102], 7: 26–31.
- 6 Firestone, Reuven, “Abraham’s Son,” 115–116.
- 7 Qurʿan 27:76.
- 8 Meditation and low latent inhibition may have some neuropsychological associations; see Horan, Roy, “The Neuropsychological Connection Between Creativity and Meditation,” *Creativity Research Journal* 21, nos. 2/3 (2009): 199–222. Since “*kashf*” may be understood as the power of intuition, individuals with low latent inhibition and high intelligence are usually very intuitive; see Sadler-Smith, Eugene, *Inside Intuition* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008). For more on Sufi “*kashf*,” see ʿAlī al-Hujwayrī (d. 465/1072), *Kashf al-maḥjūb* (Cairo: al-Majlis al-Aʿlā lil-Shuʾūn al-Islāmiyyah, 2004); Azadpur, Mohammed, “Unveiling the Hidden: On the Meditations of Descartes and Ghazzali,” in *The Passions of the Soul in the Metamorphosis of Becoming*, ed. Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka (Berlin: Springer, 2003), 219–240. Also, you may compare with Saniotis, Arthur, “Mystical Mastery: The Presentation of Kashf in Sufi Divination,” *Asian Anthropology* 6, no. 1 (2007): 29–51.