

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Qur'ānic Exegesis and the Reshaping of Early Islamic History: A Case Study of Sura Q 107

[Yassine Yahyaoui](#) *

Posted Date: 20 September 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202409.1511.v1

Keywords: Qur'ānic Exegesis; Qur'ānic Exegetical Practices; The Historical Context of the Qur'ān; Discontinuity; The Early Meccan Sūras



Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Article

Qur'ānic Exegesis and the Reshaping of Early Islamic History: A Case Study of Sura Q 107

Yassine Yahyaoui

Centre for Islamic Theology, The University of Münster, 48149 Münster, Germany;
yassine.yahyaoui@uni-muenster.de

Abstract: This study examines the historiography of early Islam by assessing the reliability of Qur'ānic exegeses as sources documenting the early history of Islam and the biography of the Prophet Muḥammad in Mecca. Focusing on Qur'ānic exegetical practices from late antiquity to the medieval period, this article argues that there is a significant discontinuity in how Qur'ānic exegeses align with the historical context of the Qur'an, especially in relation to Meccan *sūras* such as Q 107. Significantly, this challenges the continuity of tradition, the fundamental concept upon which the "Islamic sciences" are based. This discontinuity is herein revealed through a historical-critical analysis of the exegesis of Q 107:4 that demonstrates how Qur'ānic exegetical practices have reinterpreted and reshaped early Islamic history in response to the pressures of new identity formation and made Qur'ānic exegeses more reflective of the social and political contexts of the exegetes than of the historical milieu of the Qur'an itself. This analysis contributes to the ongoing discussion of the role exegesis played in reshaping the history of Islam. Indeed, it emphasises the importance of critically evaluating these sources in order to uncover a more nuanced historical narrative of early Islam.

Keywords: Qur'ānic exegesis; Qur'ānic exegetical practices; the historical context of the Qur'an; discontinuity; the early Meccan *Sūras*

1. Introduction

The study of Qur'ānic exegesis has evolved significantly over recent decades, revealing diverse approaches and interpretations that reflect the changing socio-political contexts of Islamic societies. While some scholars, such as John Wansbrough (1977), have critically examined the historical authenticity of early Islamic sources, others, like Andrew Rippin (1988) and Walid Saleh (2004), have focused on understanding how exegetical practices developed over time. This scholarly conversation highlights a key issue in Islamic historiography, that is, the extent to which later Qur'ānic exegesis may have diverged from the original context of the Qur'an. This study contributes to this ongoing debate by examining the concept of discontinuity in Qur'ānic exegesis, particularly in the interpretation of Meccan *sūras* such as *sūra al-Mā'ūn* Q 107.

Accordingly, this study argues that Qur'ānic exegeses from late antiquity to the medieval period reveals significant discontinuity with the beginning of Muḥammad's call and the Qur'ānic discourse, in particular, in the exegesis of the Meccan *sūras*. Instead of preserving the historical milieu of the Qur'an, the exegeses were reshaped to reflect the evolving theological, legal and socio-political needs of the contemporary Muslim community. Therefore, this thesis challenges the assumption that early Qur'ānic exegeses were primarily concerned with faithfully preserving tradition, the fundamental concept upon which the Islamic sciences are based. Instead, it suggests that the tradition has been dynamically shaped by the changing needs and circumstances of the Muslim community.

The hypothesis of this study is that the Qur'ānic exegetical practices were not merely a medium for transmitting tradition but actively reshaped the historical narrative of early Islam. This led to the discontinuity that can be observed between the historical context of the Qur'an and the exegeses that have emerged since late antiquity. This hypothesis is put to the test herein through an analysis of the

different layers of the commentaries on Q 107:4 and by exploring how these layers reveal a gradual shift away from engagement with the historical context of the Qur'ān.

Verse 107:4, from the first Meccan period, is of pivotal importance as a case study. From one perspective, it illuminates the beginnings of the Prophet Muḥammad's preaching in Mecca, as well as the opposition he faced from several prominent Meccan figures (Nöldeke 1860, p. 74; Neuwirth 2011, pp. 138-40). In addition, it demonstrates how subsequent exegeses have frequently removed this verse from its original context and placed it within an entirely new milieu. This dual focus not only highlights the historical significance of the verse as a text that helps us better understand the biography of Muḥammad, but it also offers insight into how exegeses interact with tradition which, in turn, helps us identify the discontinuities that have arisen because of Qur'ānic exegetical practices.

Lena Salaymeh's work provides a crucial foundation for this study by highlighting the discontinuity in the exegetical treatment of jurisprudential matters by medieval exegetes and jurists *fuqahā'* (Salaymeh 2016, p. 43-83). Her analysis, of Q 47:4 in particular, demonstrates a shift initiated by medieval scholars who, she argues, deviated from tradition and the authority of the *salaf*. This study builds on Salaymeh's thesis by acknowledging the discontinuity she identifies in medieval exegetical practices. However, I argue that this discontinuity originated much earlier and reflects a deeper historical rupture that began with the exegetes of late antiquity.

Furthermore, several other scholars have examined the impact the exegetes' contemporary context had on their commentaries, concluding that it was a more fundamental determinant of exegesis than the context of the Qur'ān itself (Gilliot, 1985, p. 183; Walid Saleh 2004, p. 2; Jemal 2005, p. 230). Nevertheless, the question of how Qur'ānic exegetical practices reshape the historical context of the Qur'ān remains open. In his analysis of Q 107, Harris Birkeland made a significant contribution to answering this question when he, primarily based on medieval exegeses, argued that Islamic interpretations had largely failed to understand Q 107 as a coherent whole (Birkeland 1958). Birkeland observed that up to the 4th/10th century, exegetes struggled to provide a consistent interpretation that was able to harmonize the first verse with the fourth, noting that it was not until the medieval period that a consensus emerged according to which Q 107 should be divided into Meccan and Medinan parts. While Birkeland's study focused on exploring the concepts of religion *dīn* in Q 107:1 and prayer *ṣalāt* in Q 107:4, in order to examine the evolution of the concept of prophethood in the earliest stages of Muḥammad's call, this study diverges from his approach. Instead, I trace Qur'ānic exegesis from late antiquity to the medieval period, not in order to reconstruct the historical context of Q 107 but to underscore the discontinuity between the Qur'ānic context and Qur'ānic exegetical practices. Moreover, this study highlights how these practices contributed to creating a new Qur'ānic context and reshaping early Islamic history.

Analysing this case study, Q 107, sheds light on the core concerns of Qur'ānic exegetes during late antiquity and the medieval period, thereby engaging with Salayma's thesis by arguing that the discontinuity took place between two historical moments, the formation of the community of believers and the establishment of the Islamic Empire. Such a standpoint suggests that the foundations for this discontinuity were laid by the late antique exegetes.¹

The validity of both theses is here highlighted by a demonstration that the discontinuity began with the late antique exegetes and then spread to other religious and jurisprudential topics. This spread depended on the context of the exegete and the need to go beyond the narratives to develop an exegesis of the Qur'ān that reflected, even if unconsciously, the social and political context of their later society. The results of the analyses of these two distinct cases, Q 47:4 and Q 107:4, produced harmonious conclusions: the tradition/*salaf* authority did not serve as the foundational starting point for exegetes, neither in late antiquity nor the medieval period.

For the English translation of *sūra al-Mā'ūn* Q 107, I primarily relied on the translation provided by Seyyed Hossein Nasr, with some modifications (Nasr et al. 2015, p. 1565-7). However, for the last

¹ On the entry of Arabs into the world of late antiquity through their adherence to a new religion and the establishment of an empire whose ideology was based on religion, I refer to the historical analysis of Aziz al-Azmeh (2014), which provides valuable insight into the formation of Islamic beliefs and practices within their socio-political contexts.

verse, Q 107:7, I preserved the original Arabic word “*al-mā‘ūn*” in order to maintain its nuanced meaning. It is also important to note that there are some differences between this translation and that of Richard Bell (1939, vol. 2, p. 680), as certain words can have significant implications if interpreted out of context. For instance, “*al-dīn*” in Q 107:1 is translated by Nasr as “religion,” while Bell translates it as “Judgment,” rendering it in such a way that preserves the possibility of understanding it as religion as well. The distinction between these two translations of “*al-dīn*” was a central focus of Birkeland’s study (1958). Similarly, the word “*al-mā‘ūn*” in Q 107:7, which is also the name of the *sūra*, is translated by Nasr as “small kindnesses” and by Bell as “succour.” However, this article will not delve further into the differences between the translations and their impact on our understanding of the context in which the Qur’ān was written as the translations of verse 4, the primary focus of this study, are quite consistent: Nasr’s translation reads, “So woe unto the praying,” while Bell’s translation is “So, woe to those who pray.”

Thus, in Nasr’s revised translation, Q 107 is rendered as follows:

- “(1) Hast thou seen the one who denies religion?
- (2) That is the one who drives away the orphan,
- (3) and does not urge feeding the indigent.
- (4) So woe unto the praying
- (5) who are heedless of their prayers,
- (6) those who strive to be seen,
- (7) yet refuse *al-mā‘ūn*.” (Nasr et al. 2015, p. 1566)

2. The Occasion of Revelation *Asbāb al-Nuzūl* of Q 107

This section examines the Islamic accounts that consider whether Q 107 should be classified as Meccan or Medinan. It is mainly focused on the exegetes’ consensus regarding the classification of the second part of Q 107:4-7, which is usually identified as Medinan because of its condemnation of hypocrites through the declaration “woe unto the praying.” Conversely, the initial section (107:1-3) is usually identified as belonging to the Meccan period. The analysis concentrates on the accounts attributed to ‘Abd Allāh Ibn ‘Abbās (d. 68/687), a key figure in early Islamic exegesis. By examining the transmission of Ibn ‘Abbās’s accounts among exegetes from late antiquity to the medieval period, this section emphasises the crucial influence he had on exegetical discourse (Berg 2004, 133-39). Furthermore, tracing the evolution of these accounts reveals how exegetical practices shaped new accounts, thereby rewriting early Islamic history. This part of the analysis deliberately excludes a detailed examination of the exegetes’ commentaries regarding the meanings of “prayer” in verse 107:4 and “*al-mā‘ūn*” in verse 107:7. These aspects will be explored in the third section.

In *Tafsīr Muqātil Ibn Sulaymān*, one of the earliest available exegetical works (Sezgin 1967, p. 21), Ibn Sulaymān (d. 150/767) identified seven verses from Q 107 as Meccan. He identified the occasion of revelation of Q 107 as follows: “It was revealed in al-‘Ās Ibn Wāil al-Sahmi and Hubayra Ibn Abī Wahb al-Makhzūmī, the spouse of Umm Hāni bint ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, the Prophet Muḥammad’s aunt” (ibn Sulaymān 2002, vol. 4, p. 869). However, in his commentary on verse 4, he indicates that the verse is addressed to the hypocrites, thereby suggesting a Medinan context for this verse. This is because the category of hypocrites is associated with the Medinan period rather than the Meccan. Therefore, in implying a dual-phase revelation, this account suggests a complex origin for Q 107 that encompasses both periods. However, it is noteworthy that Muqātil does not mention which sources his classification of Q 107 and association of verse 4 with the hypocrites are based.

In later exegesis, accounts of the occasions of Q 107 were not recorded until the 4th/10th century, and Muḥammad Ibn Aḥmad Ibn Ḥazm (d. 320/932) was among the first to transmit this tradition (ibn Ḥazm 1986, p. 67-68). He was followed by ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-Kāfi (d. 400/1009) (‘Abd al-Kāfi 2010, p. 533) and then by Hibatullah Ibn Salāma al-Muqrī (d. 410/1019) (al-Muqrī 1984, p. 205). It remains uncertain whether Ibn Ḥazm’s account was a source for Ibn ‘Abd al-Kāfi and al-Muqrī or whether all these exegetes accessed another common source. Nevertheless, the time between the 2nd/8th-century exegetes and their 4th/10th- and 5th/11th-century successors is ample enough that the latter exegetes could have drawn upon a diverse range of traditions. Indeed, this is mentioned specifically in al-

Muqri's own account, in which he indicated that he based his work on several exegetes and listed the authority of hearing them from the exegetes (al-Muqri 1984, p. 212-213).

Concerning Q 107, Ibn Ḥazm provided the following commentary: "Half of it [Q 107] originated in Mecca, commencing with the initial verses and concluding at 'and does not urge feeding the indigent' which was revealed in Mecca in al-ʿĀs Ibn Wāil al-Sahmī. The last part was revealed in Medina in ʿAbdullah Ibn Ubayy Ibn Salūl, identified as the chief of the hypocrites" (ibn Ḥazm, 1986, p. 67-68)². The account by Ibn Ḥazm and the later account by Ibn ʿAbd al-Kāfi and al-Muqri are significant as they are the first accounts according to which the first verses of Q 107:1-3 were revealed in Mecca and the last verses of Q 107:4-7 were revealed in Medina.³ Notably, these exegetes did not cite their sources or attribute any account detailing the various occasions on which Q 107 was revealed to Ibn ʿAbbās.

Although Birkeland attributed the first accounts of this division to Ibn ʿAbd al-Kāfi and al-Muqri and stated that such a division did not appear before approximately 1000 AD (Birkeland 1958, p. 15), my research suggests otherwise. Ibn Ḥazm, who preceded both Ibn ʿAbd al-Kāfi and al-Muqri, also mentioned a division in Q 107. Thus, not only is it possible that Ibn ʿAbd al-Kāfi and al-Muqri may have used Ibn Ḥazm's work, it contradicts Birkeland's claim that the division is not evident in older authorities and challenges his proposed timeline. However, it is also essential to note that both Birkeland's conclusion and this finding agree on the 4th/10th century gap. Indeed, the beginning of the 4th/10th century marks the appearance of accounts that divide Q 107 into two parts.

As each new generation of exegetes emerged, the number of exegeses relating to Q 107 grew. Abū Ishāq al-Thaʿlabī (d. 427/1035) introduced further details and presented the occasion of revelation in a narrative form comparable to a story as per the approach taken in his commentary, which relieved him of the burden of using the isnāds (Walid Saleh 2004, p. 161-62, 224) and attempted to bring together the fragmentary accounts about Q 107 into one coherent story. It is noteworthy that in his exegesis (al-Thaʿlabī 2002, vol. 10, p. 304), al-Thaʿlabī appeared to be unaware of Ibn Ḥazm's idea that the verse was revealed in Abdullah Ibn Salūl. Instead, he transmitted Muqātil Ibn Sulaymān's account, which stated that the first part of Q 107 was revealed in al-ʿĀs Ibn Wāil al-Sahmī and, including further accounts from Ibn Ḥayyan and Ibn Kaysān (d. 200-1/815-6), that the verses were revealed in al-Walid Ibn al-Mughīra. Furthermore, he also conveyed the version of events provided by al-Dahhak (d. 102-6/723-5) according to which Q 107 was revealed in ʿAmru Ibn ʿĀid Ibn ʿImran Ibn Makhzūm or in Hubayra Ibn Abī Wahb al-Makhzūmi, and the version provided by ʿAbd al-Malik Ibn Jurayj (d. 150/768) according to which Q 107 was revealed in Abū Sufyān Ibn Ḥarb (al-Thaʿlabī 2002, vol. 10, p. 304). Al-Thaʿlabī provided further information about Ibn Ḥarb, stating that: "He used to slaughter two camels every week. When an orphan approached him and asked for help, he rebuffed him with his stick, and Allah said: 'Hast thou seen the one who denies religion?'" (al-Thaʿlabī 2002, vol. 10, p. 304). The central figures in al-Thaʿlabī's version are exclusively Meccan. Furthermore, his version has been attributed to prominent exegetes from the generation of tābiʿūn.

ʿAli Ibn Aḥmad al-Wāḥidī (d. 468/1075), a disciple of al-Thaʿlabī, articulated a similar perspective in his work on the occasions of revelation, though without citing his sources (al-Wāḥidī 1992, p. 465). In contrast, in his other work on the exegesis of the Qurʾān, al-Wāḥidī attributed a tradition to Ibn ʿAbbās, stating that: "Q 107 was revealed in a man among the hypocrites" (al-Wāḥidī 1994, vol. 4, p. 558). This account is of particular interest as it attributes the first account that supports the Medinan origin of part of Q 107 to Ibn ʿAbbās.

² Compare with what al-Muqri reported: "*Sūra al-Māʿūn* was revealed in two parts [...] half of it in Mecca and half in Medina. The part that was revealed in Makkah, 'Hast thou seen the one who denies religion? That is the one who drives away the orphan and does not urge feeding the indigent' was revealed in al-ʿĀs Ibn Wāil al-Sahmī. The rest of the verse 'woe unto the praying' was revealed in ʿAbdullah Ibn Ubayy Ibn Salūl, the hypocrite" (see: al-Muqri 1984, p. 205).

³ After tracing the history of this account, there is no reason to assume that Ibn Ḥazm was the first to mention it, and this opinion likely spread after his time as it was transmitted by several known exegetes, including al-Muqri and ʿAbd al-Kāfi, as mentioned above, as well as in later centuries by scholars such as Ibn al-Jawzī's (d. 597/1201) (2001, vol. 4, p. 495) and Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusī (d. 745/1344) (2010, vol. 10, p. 552).

A similar version of this account can be traced back to Ibn ‘Abbās, as reported by al-Fayrūzabādī (d. 817/1414) in his exegesis (1992, p. 660). This compilation collected the traditions and accounts attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās that were relevant to the exegesis of the Qur’ān. Nevertheless, the assertion that these traditions represent the earliest account depends on the assumption that al-Fayrūzabādī’s compilation is an authentic transmission of Ibn ‘Abbās’s traditions.⁴ However, this premise is challenged by the absence of any mention of this particular tradition among late antique exegetes and the later interest in it among medieval scholars. This suggests that the attribution to Ibn ‘Abbās was invented in the medieval period. Therefore, the earliest documented tradition of Ibn ‘Abbās identifying the revelation of the verse in relation to the presence of hypocrites can be found in the account provided by al-Wāḥidī.

The account provided by al-Muqṛī, which linked the occasion of revelation in the second part of Q 107 with the presence of a hypocrite, was mentioned once again in Ibn al-Jawzī’s (d. 597/1201) exegesis. The reason why Ibn al-Jawzī omitted Ibn Ḥazm’s account, which identified this hypocrite, remains unclear. It is possible that this source was not available in al-Jawzī’s time. Nevertheless, it was relatively straightforward for Ibn al-Jawzī to identify the hypocrite and associate him with ‘Abdullah Ibn Salūl, the head of the hypocrites (ibn al-Jawzī 2001, vol. 4, p. 495). Furthermore, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209), a contemporary of Ibn al-Jawzī, provided a critical analysis of the varying opinions regarding the person referred to in Q 107:4-7. This discussion represented the final and most significant development regarding the question of who the verses were revealed to, as it can be noted that all subsequent exegeses did not extend beyond the exegesis of the two occasions of revelation in Q 107 that were prevalent among exegetes of the 6th/12th century.⁵ al-Rāzī stated:

“The verse has two possible interpretations. One is that it is specific to a particular person and one in which different individuals were mentioned. Ibn Jurayj stated, ‘It was revealed in Abū Sufyān, who used to slaughter two camels each week, as when an orphan approached him requesting meat, he beat him with his stick’. Muqātil stated that the verse was revealed in al-‘Ās Ibn Wāil al-Sahmī, who was known for denying the resurrection and engaging in immoral actions. Al-Suddī stated that the verse was revealed in al-Walīd Ibn al-Mughīra. Al-Māwardī (d. 450/1058) reported that it was revealed in Abū Jahl [...]. The final account is attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās and states that it was revealed in a hypocrite who combined avarice and hypocrisy” (al-Rāzī 1938, vol. 32, pp. 111-12).

The conclusions of the exegetes on the occasion of revelation of Q 107, or the question of whether Q 107 is Medinan or Meccan, are not significantly different. While there is a connection between these two accounts, several exegetes addressed the issue of Q 107’s classification without delving into the accounts that deal with the occasion of revelation. The tracing of the accounts that refer to Ibn ‘Abbās is of particular interest in this regard.

Similar to the accounts regarding the occasion of Q 107 and its connection to the Medinan period, which reappeared with Ibn Ḥazm in the 4th/10th century, al-Māturīdī (d. 333/944), a contemporary of Ibn Ḥazm, also reported the disagreement among the exegetes about the place of revelation of Q 107, attributing the opinion that it was Medinan to Ibn ‘Abbās:

“The exegetes differed on the occasions of Q 107, Ibn ‘Abbās said: ‘It is Medinan’, and Muqātil, Mujāhid and other exegetes said: ‘It is Meccan’. It is possible that the first part was revealed in Mecca as the person in whom it was revealed was a Meccan, al-‘Ās Ibn Wāil al-Sahmī, although they are the ones who deny the day of resurrection, and the last part was revealed in Medina as it described the hypocrites” (al-Māturīdī 2005, vol. 10, p. 622).

This perspective on the divergence of accounts, whether Q 107 is Meccan or Medinan, later became a recurring theme in the medieval exegesis. It can be found in the works of al-Muqṛī 1984, p. 205), al-Māwardī, (1992, vol. 6, p. 350), al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1143) (1947, vol 4, p. 803), Ibn al-Jawzī (2001, vol. 4, p. 495) and al-Qurtubī (d. 671/1273) (1964, vol. 20, p. 210).

⁴ On the scholarly debate regarding the authenticity of al-Fayrūzabādī’s commentary attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās, see: Rippin, 1994, pp. 40-47.

⁵ For example, in his exegesis (1964, vol. 20, p. 210), al-Qurtubī (d. 671/1273) did not provide any additional information regarding the occasion of Q 107 when compared to al-Rāzī.

It is notable that the Muslim exegetes did not reference their sources when attributing this tradition to Ibn ‘Abbās. Nevertheless, an examination of the numerous accounts attributed to him, such as his interpretation of verse 4 as a description of hypocrites or verse 7, in which the term *mā‘ūn* is understood as *zakāt*, may have led the exegetes to conclude that Q 107 is Medinan or, at least, that verses 4-7 are. In the absence of further evidence, it is challenging to ascertain the historical accuracy of Ibn ‘Abbās’ tradition.

What can be concluded from comparing the exegeses from late antiquity to those from the medieval period is that it evolved over time, and with each new layer of exegesis, new accounts or additional details about Q 107 were added. By the 6th/12th century, the exegesis corpus included two traditions attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās, one that Q 107 was revealed in al-‘Ās Ibn Wāil al-Sahmi from Quraysh, which would be an indication that the first part of Q 107 is Meccan, and another that it was revealed in a hypocrites, ‘Abdullah Ibn Salūl, according to Ibn Ḥazm, which would make the end of Q 107 Medinan. However, the absence of a chain of transmission from Ibn ‘Abbās makes it challenging to determine the origin and date of this tradition, unless one relies only on the first mention of the tradition in the manuscripts that have been preserved.

3. The Historical Development of Q 107:4

The preceding section examined the historical development of the traditions attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās concerning the revelation of Q 107. This section is devoted to an analysis of the exegesis of Q 107:4 and verse 7 as presented by exegetes in late antiquity and the medieval period. This study posits that the concepts of prayer “*ṣalāt*” and charity “*zakāt*”, regarded by exegetes as the defining rituals of Islamic identity, emerged through a discontinuity with the historical milieu of the Qur’ān. Instead, they reflect a new context that was primarily related to the challenges faced by later communities, rather than those present during the life of Muḥammad.

3.1. Late Antique Exegeses

The earliest traditions concerning verses 4 and 7 of Q 107 are closely tied to the commentaries of Ibn ‘Abbās (d. 68/687), a key figure in early Islamic exegesis or, as Claude Gilliot described him, the “miroir de la communauté” (Gilliot, 1985, p. 178). Although Ibn ‘Abbās did not write an exegesis himself (Berg 2000, p. 135-37), his commentaries have been preserved in various works, including the Ṣahifa of ‘Alī Ibn Abī Talḥa (d. ~120/738) and the Tafsīr of ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan‘ānī (d. 211/827). In addition, the work of al-Fayrūzabādī (d. 817/1414)⁶ and other medieval exegeses played a significant role in preserving many of the interpretations attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās.

From the earliest accounts attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās, the prayer in verses 4 and 5, ‘So woe unto the praying who are heedless of their prayers’, and the *mā‘ūn* mentioned in verse 7, ‘yet refuse the *mā‘ūn*’, were identified as acts of Islamic prayer and charity. Accordingly, in the Ṣahifa of ‘Alī Ibn Abī Talḥa, which is a compilation of Ibn ‘Abbās’s exegetical opinions, it is written that:

“He [ibn ‘Abbās] said in the interpretation of verse 4: They are hypocrites who show off their prayer when in the presence of other people but abandon it when alone.” (ibn ‘Abbās 1991, p. 541)

In *Tanwīr al-Miqbās*, a work attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās, it is reported that:

“And by the authority of Ibn ‘Abbās [...] ‘So woe’ indicates severe punishment in Hell ‘to those who pray’ refers to the hypocrites who, he [ibn ‘Abbās] clarified, ‘are heedless of their prayers,’ meaning they are negligent and abandon them; [they are] ‘those who strive to be seen’ meaning they pray when when people are watching, but do not pray when they are not being watched; ‘yet [they] refuse the *mā‘ūn*,’ meaning they withhold charity, and it is said that this refers to *zakāt*” (al-Fayrūzabādī 1992, p. 660).

⁶ These exegetes who claim that their interpretations are based on the commentaries of Ibn ‘Abbās have been criticised with regard to the authenticity of the opinions they attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās. Consequently, although they are consulted for insight into the development of exegeses in late antiquity, the authenticity of their works remains a matter of dispute. See: Rippin, 1994, pp. 71-2.

Additionally, Muḥammad Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923) made a similar statement based on al-Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Muzāḥim (d. ~102/720), that verses Q 107:4-5 refer to such hypocrites (al-Ṭabarī 2001, vol. 24, p. 665). However, the Islamic exegesis that transmitted this account did not mention al-Ḍaḥḥāk's sources. However, given that al-Ḍaḥḥāk (ibn Sa'd 1968, vol. 6, p. 301) received his exegesis from Sa'īd Ibn Jubayr (d. 95/714), a disciple of Ibn 'Abbās, it can be assumed that the interpretation attributed to Ibn 'Abbās was widely accepted during al-Ḍaḥḥāk's lifetime. Similarly, Muqātil Ibn Sulaymān (d. 150/767), a disciple of al-Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Muzāḥim (ibn Sa'd 1968, vol. 7, p. 263) transmitted this interpretation as a prevailing opinion of his time, albeit also without indicating his sources or making any reference to Ibn 'Abbās (ibn Sulaymān 2002, vol. 7, p. 263).

al-Ṭabarī also transmitted several interpretations attributed to Ibn 'Abbās, according to which Ibn 'Abbās interpreted verses 4 and 7 as references to Islamic prayer and *zakāt*. In particular, al-Ṭabarī drew upon the accounts of Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Sammān (d. 101/720) and Mujāhid Ibn Jabr (d. 104/722). He transmitted the first account according to three different traditions: the first is attributed to 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib by Mu'āwiya Ibn Abī Sufyān, the second is attributed directly to 'Alī and the third is attributed to Ibn 'Abbās by Mu'āwiya via 'Alī (al-Ṭabarī 2001, vol. 24, p. 657). In the second, al-Ṭabarī transmitted Mujāhid's accounts either without mentioning Mujāhid's source (al-Ṭabarī 2001, vol. 24, pp. 664-665) or by attributing them to 'Alī (al-Ṭabarī 2001, vol. 24, p. 665). Given the additional accounts that convey a similar opinion that is attributed to Ibn 'Abbās by 'Alī (see: al-Ṭabarī 2001, vol. 24, p. 665), it is probable that Ibn 'Abbās is the source of the accounts given by both al-Sammān and Mujāhid.

Verses Q 107:4 and Q 107:7, when understood as referring to Islamic prayer *ṣalāt* and almsgiving *zakāt*, were not only preserved within the exegetical tradition but also made their way into the foundational texts of Islamic jurisprudence. This integration into legal discourse is particularly evident in the works of Mālik Ibn 'Anas (d. 179/795) and Muḥammad Ibn Idris al-Shāfi'ī (d. 204/820), who are recognized as two of the most influential authorities in the development of Islamic law. Regarding Mālik's interpretation, I refer to the tafsir of 'Abū Bakr Ibn al-'Arabī (d. 543/1148), who compiled Mālik's understanding of and opinions on specific Qur'ānic verses related to religious law and jurisprudence. In his commentary, Ibn al-'Arabī transmitted Mālik's account of verses 4 and 7, thereby preserving the legal implications of these interpretations and ensuring their influence on subsequent juristic discussions. Mālik is quoted as saying, "They are the hypocrites who strive to be seen, pretending to obey out of fear of being accused. The *fāsiq* prays for appearance's sake, so that people may say that he is praying" (Ibn al-'Arabī 2003, vol. 4, p. 455). Regarding verse 7, Mālik stated, "It [*al-Mā'ūn*] refers to *zakāt*, and the hypocrite is the one who withholds it" (Ibn al-'Arabī 2003, vol. 4, p. 455). As for al-Shāfi'ī, the chapter on *zakāt* in his *al-Risāla* provides insight into his interpretation of verse 7, particularly when he wrote, "'yet refuse the *mā'ūn*': some scholars say it refers to the obligatory *zakāt*" (al-Shāfi'ī 1938, p. 187). Through the works of Mālik, al-Shāfi'ī, and others, these verses were further embedded into the jurisprudential tradition, shaping the legal thought of subsequent generations of jurists who built upon their interpretations. Consequently, the exegetical interpretations of verses 4 and 7 extended beyond their initial context and became an integral part of the Islamic legal discourse that guided the Muslim community.

3.2. Medieval Exegeses

Regarding the interpretation of Q 107, the position adopted by medieval exegetes did not differ significantly from that of their predecessors in late antiquity. Indeed, it can be stated that the accounts that emerged in late antiquity were a strong influence on the medieval exegeses. Indeed, we observe exegetes forming opinions during the medieval period that attempt to reconcile various late antique accounts, particularly those related to the jurisprudential issues related to prayer. In addition, this period also witnessed increased attention on the occasion of revelation of Q 107, as previously mentioned, along with the inclusion of new elements concerning certain aspects of the story.

This section presents an analysis of the exegeses of Sahl al-Tustarī (d. 283/896), Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923) and Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209). The focus on these three exegeses is intentional, as al-Tustarī can be considered the first significant attempt to connect Q 107 with the Abrahamic

traditions. This effort marked a mature stage in the Arab view of history and reflected an attempt to link the history of Islam with that of Judaism and Christianity. Al-Ṭabarī's significance can be attributed to his comprehensive presentation of various accounts related to Q 107 and his efforts to reconcile them, ultimately providing a coherent interpretation of the narrative. In contrast, al-Rāzī's commentary can be regarded as the culmination of Qur'ānic exegetical practices from late antiquity to the medieval period, reinterpreting early Islamic history and offering what can be seen as the ultimate compilation of accounts and discussions related to Q 107, a compilation that would continue to influence interpretations into the modern era.

3.2.1. Sahl al-Tustarī: Intertextuality within Biblical Traditions

Al-Tustarī's interpretation did not markedly diverge from those of earlier exegetes when he associated Q 107 with Islamic prayer and *zakāt*. Rather, his significance lies in his unique approach. This sets him apart from both preceding and subsequent Islamic exegetes. Notably, he incorporated a text from the Psalms of David to reinforce his interpretation of Q 107:4-5. He stated:

"The verse refers to the hypocrites, who are heedless of the times and rights of prayer. This is a severe warning, for not everyone who appears as an obedient worshipper is truly obedient or accepted in their deeds. In the Psalms of David, it is written, 'Say to those who attend churches - *kanā'is* - with their bodies, stand among the worshippers, but whose hearts are in the world - *dunyā* - : Do they mock Me, or think they deceive Me?'" (al-Tustarī p. 2004, p. 330-331).

It is not known exactly which Arabic translation of the Psalms al-Tustarī used, or whether he read the text in its original language. However, upon examining the Bible, especially the Book of Psalms, this specific text could not be found. Rather, the quotation seems to be a literary expression or part of a religious sermon that reflects the general theme of criticism present in the Psalms, but it is not an actual quote from the Bible. Nonetheless, the Psalms do address a similar theme, in particular, by critiquing formal religious practices and hypocrisy. For instance, Psalm 50:16-17 addresses those who speak of God's laws without sincerity in their hearts. Similarly, Psalm 78:36-37, which closely parallels al-Tustarī's quotation, criticised the hypocrisy of those who worship God with their mouths while their hearts remain distant from Him. It is also plausible that al-Tustarī was familiar with Matthew 15:7-8, which quotes the prophecy of Isaiah 29:13.

Despite the historical ambiguities surrounding al-Tustarī's commentary on Q 107:4-5 and his reference to the Psalms of David, whether inspired by his source or the use of the Christian term "churches" in a Jewish context, this reference to a biblical narrative can be seen as an effort to reinforce the meaning embedded in Q 107's address to the hypocrites. This search for intertextuality suggests that by the end of late antiquity, there was distance between exegetes' interpretation of Q 107 and the original context in which Q 107 was revealed was already growing, even though al-Tustarī, as a Sufi mystic, did not incorporate jurisprudential considerations into his writings. In light of this omission, this conscious forgetting, the insertion of the quasi-biblical passage served as a historical marker, confirming the new medieval understanding of Q 107.

3.2.2. Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī: Omitting the Occasions of Revelation

Al-Ṭabarī's approach to Q 107 was consistent with his general method of exegesis. After presenting a range of accounts, attributed to either the Companions or the *Tabi'ūn*, he provided his own opinion. Al-Ṭabarī stated,

"In my opinion, the most accurate interpretation of the term 'heedless' *sāhūn* is that it refers to those who are negligent and careless about their prayers [...] and regarding 'those who strive to be seen,' it refers to those who show off their prayers to people when they pray [...] they are the hypocrites who, during the time of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, concealed disbelief and were outwardly Islam" (al-Ṭabarī 2001, vol. 24, p. 663-663).

Al-Ṭabarī was widely recognized for the approach he took in his *tafsir*, in which he attempted to transmit every available account that he had access to, regardless of the varying levels of authenticity. This characteristic of his work made it a crucial resource for understanding the breadth of early Islamic traditions. However, when examining his interpretation of Q 107, it is noteworthy

that all the accounts associate Q 107:4-7 with a Medinan context, without any consideration of the possibility that all of Q 107 could have been revealed in Mecca and been addressed to a Meccan audience. Despite the differing accounts on whether the first part of Q 107 referred to a non-Muslim in Mecca and the second part to a hypocrite in Medina, al-Ṭabarī did not go so far as to identify a specific individual who might have been the subject of these verses. Nevertheless, the opinion he presented, after thoroughly examining the various accounts, suggested that he understood Q 107:4-7 to be a critique of the hypocrites in Medina.

This interpretation aligns with the broader trend within the Qur'ānic exegetical practices of the time. Namely, the transition from late antiquity to medieval exegesis, which increasingly sought to associate Q 107 with the hypocrites. Al-Ṭabarī's final judgment on the matter, therefore, reflects a broader exegetical consensus that was taking shape during his time, one that considered rituals a sign of a new Islamic identity.

3.2.3. Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī: An Attempt to Resolve the Contradiction

In al-Rāzī's exegesis, as per his standard method of addressing multiple perspectives in interpretation, he presented a series of issues that appeared to be based on the assumption that Q 107 was addressed to the hypocrites. One of the initial issues al-Rāzī raised was the connection between verses 1-3 and verses 4-7. In response, al-Rāzī proposed that the first section pertained to negligence in interactions with other people, while the subsequent section concerned negligence in dealings with the Creator. Thus, God's warning was a consequence of the conjunction of both forms of negligence, which al-Rāzī used to justify the imposition of "woe" in verse 4, a punishment he viewed as inconsistent with the actions indicated in verses 5-7. Al-Rāzī's inquiry can, therefore, be considered the first real questioning of the verse's historical decontextualization. He stated,

"The verse indicates the occurrence of a severe warning against committing three acts: the first is neglecting prayer, the second is striving to be seen, and the third is preventing charity. All of these [actions] are sins, but they do not make a person a hypocrite. So why did God decree such a severe warning for the one who commits these acts?" (al-Rāzī 1938, vol. 32, p. 114).

However, al-Rāzī did not present this issue as a challenge to the reliability of earlier interpretations. Instead, he sought to substantiate the early accounts and, in so doing, defend a particular standpoint in Islamic law. Despite the contradiction it represented, he argued that non-Muslims are held accountable for the observance of the practical rulings of Islamic law, as he explained:

"The verse, 'So woe to those who pray,' means woe to the hypocritical worshippers who commit these acts. In this sense, the verse indicates that non-Muslims receive additional punishment for engaging in prohibited acts of Islamic law and neglecting its obligations, which supports al-Shāfi'ī's opinion that non-Muslims are held accountable for the branches of Sharī'a. This answer is the one to be relied upon" (al-Rāzī 1938, vol. 32, p. 304).

Thus, al-Rāzī argued that the punishment implied by the woe is only consistent if verses 4-7 are interpreted according to the accounts of the early exegetes, which means that these acts were performed by the hypocrites.

Although al-Rāzī's exegesis is known for exploring all possible interpretations and presenting various issues, some of which are merely assumptions made by al-Rāzī himself —thus, he was criticised in a statement attributed to Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) in which it was claimed that al-Rāzī's exegesis contains everything except exegesis (al-Ṣafadī 2000, vol. 4, p. 179)— he did not mention the possibility that all of Q 107 was Meccan and that the audience was not initially the hypocrites but the Qurayshis, who were considered the addressees before prayer and charity were established as Islamic rituals. As a result, in the same exaggerated manner in which al-Rāzī was criticized, it can be said that al-Rāzī's exegesis, like those from late antiquity and the medieval period, does everything except consider placing Q 107 in its historical context. This omission contributed to a significant rupture and discontinuity in the narrative of early Islamic history, a matter that will be addressed in the next section.

4. Contextual Influences on Qur'ānic Exegesis: Historical Consciousness and Q 107:4

Islamic exegetes engaged with the historicity of the Qur'ān, in particular by attempting to distinguish between the Meccan and Medinan revelations. They also addressed the question of precedence for specific verses from within the same period. There were various motives behind the exegetes' interest in the circumstances surrounding the revelation of the Qur'ān. However, it appears that this interest did not arise from an understanding of the historical context of the Qur'ān itself, but from the historical context in which the exegete was living and the social, political and jurisprudence needs of the time.

As Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) noted, "One of the benefits of knowing [the Meccan and the Medinan] is understanding what came later, which may be abrogating nāsikh or specifying mukhaṣṣiṣ." (al-Suyūṭī 2008, p. 31). Similarly, in a more explicit reflection of the exegetes' stance on studying the Qur'ān within its historical context, Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Zarkashī (d. 794/1392) wrote:

"The exegetes have taken care of this [the occasions of revelation] and have devoted numerous books to it [...] Those who claimed that it is useless because it is just a history⁷ are wrong. Rather, it has benefits, such as understanding the wisdom behind the legislation of ruling (ḥukm)" (al-Zarkashī 1957, vol. 1, p. 22).

The criticism levelled against the exegetes, that "it is useless because it is just a history", rested on two primary arguments. First, many of the narratives concerning occasions of revelation were considered unauthentic. Second, there were only a few accounts that could be reliably traced back to the Prophet Muḥammad (Jemal 2005, pp. 61-62). However, to respond to this critique, which could be perceived as a threat to the identity and integrity of the exegetes' community, they developed the principle that accounts of the occasions of revelation do not necessarily require scrutiny for authenticity. Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Bāqillānī (d. 403/1013), for example, articulated this view, asserting that it was permissible for exegetes to offer their opinions on what should be considered Meccan or Medinan. He wrote, "It is permissible for exegetes to differ regarding whether certain parts of the Qur'ān were revealed in Mecca or Medina, and to use their own opinion and ijtihād in forming these opinions" (al-Bāqillānī, vol. 1, p. 248). Al-Suyūṭī later supported al-Bāqillānī's stance on whether it is acceptable to use opinion and ijtihād to determine which verses of the Qur'ān are Meccan and which are Medinan (al-Suyūṭī 2008, p. 32).

In several cases, this opinion and ijtihad reflected an awareness of early Islamic history, making the Sīra, or biography of the Prophet, a crucial source for such critiques. One example of the exegetes rejecting certain accounts based on their historical awareness is their disagreement about whether Q 13:43 was Meccan or Medinan (al-Tha'labī 2002, vol. 5, p. 267). Al-Ṭabarī reported that several second-generation exegetes from late antiquity relied on an account by 'Abdullāh Ibn Salām (d. 43/663) to determine the occasion of revelation for this verse. Ibn Salām, a Jewish rabbi who converted to Islam after the Prophet arrived in Yathrib, claimed that he was the person mentioned in the verse (al-Ṭabarī 2001, vol. 13, pp. 582-84). However, Sa'īd Ibn Jubayr (d. 95/714) rejected this claim arguing, based on historical awareness that Q 13 is entirely Meccan and Ibn Salām's conversion to Islam occurred during the Medinan period (ibid., vol. 13, p. 586).

This raises the question of why such historical awareness seemed to be lacking in the case of Q 107. No early exegete is known to have objected to the claim that verse 4 was revealed in Ibn Salūl or to the association of verses 4-7 with the hypocrites in Medina. The selectivity of the exegetes in

⁷ Al-Zarkashī emphasised the importance of history in Qur'ānic exegetical practices, viewing it as a crucial tool for preserving the role of exegetes as intermediaries between the Qur'ān and the Sharī'a. This attitude towards history, which reflects the stance of the community of exegetes during the medieval period is consistent with that of many scholarly communities within the Islamic tradition. For example, Shams al-Dīn al-Sakhāwī (d. 902/1497), a representative of the hadith scholars, defends the use of history as a means to maintain a sense of belonging within the community. To illustrate the hadith scholars' perspective, Al-Sakhāwī writes, "In terminology, history is defined as the study of the time period in which the circumstances of narrators and scholars are recorded, including their date of birth, date of death, state of mental health, physical condition, journeys, pilgrimages [...]" (al-Sakhāwī 1986, p. 18).

dealing with the occasion of revelation can be justified by the fact that Q 107:4 was more intricately linked to defining the identity of the emerging Islamic community than Q 13:43. Consequently, this pressure likely compelled the exegetes to reinterpret and rewrite history. Thus, it can be argued that the accounts provided by exegetes regarding the occasions of 107:4 did not help describe the circumstances of the addressees at the time of prophet Muḥammad. Moreover, they provide no insight into the chronological order of Q 107, which is essential for understanding the historical context of the Qur'ān.

The focus of exegetes on the occasions of revelation is a significant source for researchers in Qur'ānic studies based on which they can propose a historical timeline for the Qur'ān. However, it is important to recognise that relying exclusively on these accounts may not provide a comprehensive understanding of the historical context of the Qur'ān. In fact, such an approach may prove unproductive, particularly when the historical event in question is of limited significance. In such cases, the perspective of the exegete may unduly influence the interpretation of the meaning conveyed in the Qur'ānic texts, as is the case with Q 107.

Indeed, Nöldeke has highlighted this issue, noting that the principal sources for the order he proposed were historical and exegetical accounts (Nöldeke 1860, p. 45). However, he also limited the extent to which Qur'ānic exegesis could contribute to this purpose by associating it with historically significant events, particularly those that took place in Medina, such as the association of Q 8 with the Battle of Badr and Q 33 with the Battle of the Khandaq (Nöldeke 1860, p. 45). Focusing on such events as historical markers reflects a continuation of pre-Islamic Arab traditions of historical consciousness in which the recording of the past was tied to significant events such as the "Days of the Arabs" before Islam and the "Maghāzi" during the rise of Islam (Sezgin 1967, p. 257).

As the Meccan period did not witness significant historical events that could serve as such markers, the collection and precise dating of events during this period was not a priority for early historians. As a result, our overall understanding of the history of the Meccan period remains constrained to a vague overview, with considerable uncertainty surrounding the finer details. This uncertainty is reflected in the multitude of conflicting accounts which, at times, may affirm both a statement and its contradictory version, indeed in some cases, both versions are attributed sometimes to the same person. The accounts concerning the occasion of revelation of Q 107: 4 are an example of this, as they reflected the political and jurisprudential debates that concerned Muslims in the decade following the life of Muḥammad. Consequently, Qur'ānic exegetical practices created a disconnect with the historical context of the Qur'ān, effectively rewriting historical facts in a manner that obscures significant parts of Muḥammad's life. These practices not only affect our understanding of the *sīra* but also extend to much of the Meccan Qur'ān (Nöldeke 1860, p. 52), about which we know almost nothing regarding its historical context if we rely solely on Islamic tradition.

5. Conclusions

This study has evaluated the hypothesis that Qur'ānic exegetical practices represent a discontinuity with the historical context of the Qur'ān. The case of Q 107:4 has confirmed this hypothesis, demonstrating that Qur'ānic exegesis did not merely transmit tradition. Instead, it played a significant role in rewriting the early history of Islam under the pressure of establishing a religious identity. This process reflected the context of the exegetes and led to a kind of discontinuity with the original milieu of the Qur'ān. While previous scholarship has highlighted the discontinuity between late antique and medieval exegetes, this study has shown that this discontinuity was already present among late antique exegetes themselves. This observation provides deeper insight into the dynamics of Qur'ānic exegetical practices and their complex relationship with tradition and early Islamic history.

The discontinuity identified in this study cannot be attributed simply to a lack of knowledge. Rather, it should be understood as a form of conscious forgetting. This forgetting was not a result of ignorance but a deliberate act of shaping memory, replacing an undesired past with a narrative that better served the exegetes' contemporary socio-political and theological needs. Exploring this deliberate forgetting and discontinuity is essential for analysing the complex relationships between

the Qur'ān, its historical context and the tradition of exegesis. Rather than seeing these elements as obstacles, they should be considered critical points of inquiry that allow for a more nuanced reconstruction of the historical milieu from which the Qur'ān emerged. In addition, this approach challenges traditional narratives and provides a deeper understanding of the development of Qur'ānic exegetical practices.

The value of this approach extends beyond providing an alternative narrative of early Islamic history. It also opens up avenues for exploring the moral and humanistic dimensions of the Qur'ān, which are best understood within the linguistic and conceptual framework familiar to its original audience. For instance, the prayer mentioned in Q 107:4 was not originally intended as an Islamic ritual, nor was the verse primarily addressed to hypocrites. By examining the layers of later exegesis, this study aims to uncover the original intentions of the Qur'ānic revelation as expressed in the context of late antiquity.

References

1. Abū Ḥayyān, Muḥammad al-Andalusī. 2010. *Al-Baḥr al-muḥīṭ fī al-tafsīr*. Beirut: Dār al-fikr.
2. Al-Azmeh, Aziz. 2014. *The Emergence of Islam in Late Antiquity : Allāh and His People*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Al-Bāqillānī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad. 2001. *Al- 'intisār li-al-Qur'ān*. Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm.
4. al-Fayrūzabādī, Majd al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb. 1992. *Tanwīr al-miqbās min tafsīr ibn 'Abbās*. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya.
5. Al-Māturidī, Muḥammad Abū Manṣūr. 2005. *Ta'wīlāt 'ahl al-sunna: Tafsīr al-Māturidī*. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya.
6. Al-Māwardī, Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī. 1992. *Al-Nukat wa-al-'uyūn: Tafsīr al- Māwardī*. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya.
7. al-Muqrī, Hibat Allāh ibn Salāma. 1984. *Al-nāsikh wa-al-mansūkh min kitāb Allāh 'azza wa-jalla*. Beirut: Al-maktab al-'islāmī.
8. Al-Qurtubī, Muḥammad ibn 'Aḥmad. 1964. *Al-Jāmi' li-'aḥkām al-Qur'ān*. Cairo: Dār al-kutub al-miṣriyya.
9. Al-Rāzī, Muḥammad Fakhr al-Dīn. 1938. *Al-Tafsīr al-kabīr*. Cairo: Al-maṭba'a al-bahiyya al-maṣriyya.
10. Al-Ṣafadī, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl. 2000. *Al-Wāfī bi-al-Wafayāt*. Beirut: Dār 'ihyā' al-turāth.
11. Al-Sakhāwī, Shams al-Dīn. 1986. *Al- 'lān bi-al-tawbīkh liman dhamma al-tārikh*. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-risāla.
12. Al-Shāfi'ī, Muḥammad Ibn Idris. 1938. *Al-Risāla*. Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-bābī al-ḥalabī wa-'awlādūh.
13. Al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn and Jalāl al-Dīn al-Maḥalī. [n.d.]. *Tafsīr al-Jalālayn*. Cairo: Dār al-ḥadīth.
14. Al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn. 2008. *Al- 'Itqān fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-risāla.
15. Al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad ibn Jarīr. 2001. *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī: Jāmi' al-bayān 'an ta'wīl 'āy al-Qur'ān*. Cairo: Markaz al-buḥūth wa-al-dirāsāt al-'arabiyya wa-al-'islāmiyya.
16. Al-Tha'labī, Abū Ishāq. 2002. *Al-Kashf wa-al-bayān 'an tafsīr al-Qur'ān*. Beirut: Dār 'ihyā' al-turāth al-'arabī.
17. Al-Tustarī, Sahl ibn 'Abd Allāh. 2004. *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-'azīm*. Beirut: Dār al-Ḥaram li-al-turāth.
18. Al-Wāḥidī, 'Alī Ibn Aḥmad. 1992. *'Asbāb al-nuzūl*. Dammam: Dār al-'iṣlāh.
19. Al-Wāḥidī, 'Alī Ibn Aḥmad. 1994. *Al-Wajīz fī tafsīr al-kitāb al-'azīz*. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya.
20. Al-Zamakhsharī, Maḥmūd ibn 'Umar. 1947. *Al-kashaf 'an ḥaqā'iq ghawāmiḍ al-tanzīl wa-'uyūn al-'aḳāwīl fī wujūh al-ta'wīl*. Cairo: Dār al-rayān li-al-turāth.
21. Al-Zarkashī, Muḥammad Badr al-Dīn. 1957. *Al-Burhān fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*. Beirut: Dār 'ihyā' al-turāth al-'arabī.
22. Bell, Richard. 1939. *The Qur'ān: Translated, with a critical re-arrangement of the Surahs*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
23. Berg, Herbert. 2004. Ibn 'Abbās in 'Abbasid-era Tafsīr. In *Abbasid Studies: Occasional Papers of the School of 'Abbasid Studies*, Cambridge, 6-10 July 2002. Edited by James E. Montgomery. Leuven: Peeters.
24. Berg, Herbert. 2000. *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam: The Authenticity of Muslim Literature from the Formative Period*. London: Routledge.
25. Birkeland, Harris. 1958. *The Interpretation of Surah 107*. *Studia Islamica* 9: 13-29.
26. Gilliot, Claude. 1985. *Portrait "mythique" d'Ibn 'Abbās*. *Arabica* 32: 127-184.
27. Ibn al-Jawzī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān. 2001. *Zād al-masīr fī 'ilm al-tafsīr*. Beirut: Dār al-kitāb al-'arabī.
28. Ibn al-'Arabī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad. 2003. *'Aḥkām al-Qur'ān*. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmīya.
29. Ibn Ḥazm, Muḥammad Al-'Andalusī. 1986. *Al-Nāsikh wa-al-mansūkh fī al-Qur'ān al-karīm*. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmīyya.
30. Ibn Salmañ, Muqāṭil. 2002. *Tafsīr Muqāṭil ibn Salmañ*. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Tārikh al-'Arabī.
31. Ibn Sa'd, Muḥammad ibn Manī'. 1968. *Al-Ṭabaqat al-kubrā*. Beirut: Dar Ṣādir.
32. Ibn 'Abās, 'Abd Allāh. 1991. *Tafsīr ibn 'Abās al-musamā' ṣaḥīfat 'Alī ibn 'Abī Ṭalha 'an ibn 'abās fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-karīm*. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-kutub al-thaqāfiyya.

33. Ibn 'Abd al-Kāfī, 'Amr ibn muḥammad. 2010. 'Adad suwar al- Qur'ān wa-'āyātuh wa-kalimātuh wa-hurūfuh wa-talkhīṣ makkiyyih min madaniyyih. Cairo: Maktabat al-'imām al-Bukhārī.
34. Jemal Bassem. 2005. 'Asbāb al-nuzūl. Casablanca: Al-markaz al-thaqāfī al-'arabī.
35. Nasr, Seyyed Hossein et al. 2015. *Study Quran: A New Translation and Commentary*. New York: HarperOne.
36. Neuwirth, Angelika. 2011. Der Koran. Band 1. Frühmekkanische Suren: Poetische Prophetie. Handkommentar mit Übersetzung von Angelika Neuwirth. Berlin: Verlag der Welreligionen.
37. Rippin, Andrew. 1988. *The function of asbāb al-nuzūl in Qur'ānic exegesis*. Bulletin of School of Oriental and African Studies 51:1-20.
38. Rippin, Andrew. 1994. *Tafsīr ibn 'Abbās and criteria for dating early tafsīr texts*. Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam. 19: 38-83.
39. Salaymeh, Lena. 2016. The beginnings of Islamic law: Late antique Islamic legal traditions. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
40. Saleh, Walid. 2004. The formation of the classical Tafsīr tradition: The Qur'ān commentary of al-Tha'labī (d. 427/1035). Leiden: Brill.
41. Sezgin, Fuat. 1967. Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums. Band I: Qur'ānwissenschaften - Hadīt Geschichte - Fiqh - Dogmatik - Mystik. Bis ca. 430 H. Leiden: Brill.
42. Theodor, Nöldeke. 1860. *Geschichte Des Qorāns*. Göttingen: Verlag der Dieterichsehen Buchhandlung.
- Wansbrough, John. 1977. *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*. Oxford: University Press.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.