

Rules of M. Quraish Shihab's Interpretation in *Tafsir Al-mishbah*

Mazlan Ibrahim and Abur Hamdi Usman

Department of Theology and Philosophy, Faculty of Islamic Studies,
National University of Malaysia, 43600, Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia

Abstract: As one of Malay Archipelago commentator, M. Quraish Shihab has his own rules of interpretation the Qur'an. Like other commentators, this is to ensure they are in line with the requirements of the interpretation and not deviant. However, his highly significant attention in interpreting the verse based on the linguistic meaning has led him to a different interpretation with other authentic commentators. One of the causes of this difference is due to the rules of interpretation used. Thus, is the rules of interpretation used in the *Tafsir Al-Mishbah* is following the rules of interpretation that has been compiled by scholars? Or is there any other rules pursued to guide his interpretation? To what extent was the accuracy of the rules pursued? To answer these questions, the authors outlined two examples of the Qur'anic verses to identify the rules pursued in his interpretation via the document analysis approach. Based on these two examples of Qur'anic verses, this preliminary study found that he had been following the rules of interpretation that has been formulated by the scholars. In addition, this study also found that even when using the same or different rules or interpretations, there were times when his interpretation was more powerful when compared with other commentators, however, sometimes his interpretation is weaker.

Key words: Rules of interpretation • Malay Archipelago • M. Quraish Shihab • *Tafsir Al-Mishbah* • Qur'anic commentator

INTRODUCTION

Qur'an According to M. Quraish [1], although the Qur'an uses the vocabulary used by the Arabs during the revelation, the meaning is not necessarily same with the popular meaning among them. On the other hand, the development of the Arabic language lately has provided new definitions of the vocabulary used in the Qur'an. A commentator should emphasize on the linguistic method and the context of the verse and observe how the Qur'an uses the vocabulary against each preceding vocabulary from the known at the time before Islam, but are not allowed to use the new definitions that

develop later. However, if the specific definitions for a vocabulary or an indication that the meaning of the Qur'an is not intended by the verse, one has the freedom to choose the most appropriate meaning according to his thinking.

One of the phenomenal works of M. Quraish is *Tafsir Al-Mishbah*.¹ In addition to the elucidation of the effects produced, message and compatibility of verses of the Qur'an, the commentator tends to use a linguistic method in interpretation, as claimed in his statement which states that in order to understand the content of the Qur'an, in-depth knowledge of the Arabic language is needed. Similarly, is the need to clarify the meaning of a particular

¹*Tafsir Al-Mishbah* is a Book of complete interpretation consists of 30 parts and fifteen volumes produced by an Indonesian commentator namely M. Quraish Shihab. This is one of his greatest scholarly works, as well as dozens of other books. This book is written when he was Ambassador of the Republic of Indonesia in Egypt and is completed after four years. It started in Cairo on Friday 4 Rabiulawwal 1420 H. or June 18, 1999. The book is completed in Jakarta on Friday, 8 Rejab 1423 H or 5 September 2003 after spending approximately seven hours per day. It is printed for the first time in November 2000 by Percetakan Lentera Hati in Jakarta from part 1 to 10.

Corresponding Author: Mazlan Ibrahim, Department of Theology and Philosophy, Faculty of Islamic Studies,
National University of Malaysia, 43600, Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia.

statement in more detail. To understand the meaning of each word in verse editorial network, one shall first review any sense that contained in the word and then set the most appropriate meaning after analyzing all aspects relating to the verse.

Interpretation method with description of linguistic meaning is used consistently in each verse in surah which he analyzed. He was very attentive to the meaning of the Qur'an's vocabulary or expressions with reference to language expert opinion. In addition, his critical attitude always questioned how the vocabulary is used in The Qur'an. By doing so, he sought to understand why the vocabulary is used by the Qur'an. Such interpretation rule according Islah Gusmian [2] is important, because the Qur'an was frequently changed the assumed meaning of the words used by the Arabs and then giving a different meaning of the word.

Scholars have compiled a few rules for the Qur'an interpretation, aimed at guiding commentators so that they do not lose direction and always be on the right track of generation the treasures for the scientific, moral values and guidance (*Maqasid*) of the Qur'an in the interpretation. Previous studies that specifically study the rules of interpretation of the Qur'an has been done by several researchers. Among them is al-Tayyar who wrote the book *Fusul fi usul al-tafsir*. While the rules used in general interpretation in any books of *tafsir* was written by al-Sa'di entitled *al-Qawa'id al-hisan Fi Tafsir al-Quran*, al-Suyuti entitled *al-Itqan Fi 'Ulum al-Quran*, al-Harabi entitled *Qawa'id al-Tarjih Inda al-Mufasssin*, al-Rumi entitled *Buhuth Fi Usul al-Tafsir wa Manahijuhu* and al-Sabt entitled *Qawa'id al-Tafsir Jam'an wa Dirasah*. Each of the rule mentioned by them is explained and examples from the Qur'an or Hadith are given to strengthen the rule highlighted.

Farid [3] states that the production of interpretation rules is derived from interpretations of the texts and when the differences of interpretation occur, then a different rule will be constructed and available. The question related to this study is did M. Quraish interpretation rules follows the rules that has been compiled by scholars? Or is there any other rules pursued to guide the interpretation? How accurate is the rules pursued? This paper seeks to resolve all questions.

Rules of Interpretation In Tafsir Al-Mishbah: *Qa'idah*/rule according to the language as stated in *al-Mu'jam al-wasit* by Mustafa [4] is defined as base or cord if it is related to a building, or means something that

are far reaching every part of it. According to the terms, some explanation was found. al-Jurjani [5] in his book *al-Ta'rifat* indicates that the rule is formulation of a general nature which accounts every part of it. al-Sabt [6] defines the rule as general provisions with known conditions associated with the details. As for the rule of interpretation according to M. Quraish [7] is the fate of a *Kulli* (most part only and not the whole part) that helps commentator to understand the meaning or messages of the Qur'an.

His consistency on vocabulary description in *Tafsir Al-Mishbah* in order to know the meaning of a verse, has sometimes led M. Quraish to a different interpretations compared to other authentic commentator. Among the causes of the difference is due to either rule used in his interpretation is same and were used by other authentic commentator as well or arising from the use of different rules of interpretation. The same rule of construction in question but produce different interpretations can be seen, for example, through his interpretation of Surah al-Mu'minun verse 31 following, in which Allah SWT said:

- *Then We raised after them another generation.*

M. Quraish when interpreting the verse has expressed different opinion related to tribe and messenger who are meant by the verse compared to other scholars. He said: "Some thought they were 'Ad, which its messenger is the Prophet Hud AS, as the Qur'an states the generation after the Prophet Nuh AS is the Prophet Hud AS (see surah al-A'raf, Hud and al-Shu'ara'). In addition, Allah SWT also spoke about the generation of Hud:

- *Do but remember how He made you heirs to Nuh's people and endowed you abundantly with power (al-A'raf 7: 69).*

As for the second opinion, he said that "it is meant to the Prophet Salih AS and his tribe, Thamud. Supporters of this view argued with the form of torture mentioned which is scream (*al-saihah*), in which they were the one who be destroyed by the scream. It is different from 'Ad who is decimated by storms for seven nights and eight days (*al-Haqqah* 69: 6-7)". After noting both differences of opinion with supporting reasonings, then he made *tarjih* by saying "However, the first opinion is stronger, because the word *al-saihah* can only mean harsh voice caused by the wind" [8].

Based on the interpretation and *tarjih* by M. Quraish stated above, the authors found the fact that he has used the same rule of interpretation with other commentator and even increase the impact very seriously as it really influence the meaning of the verse. However, his interpretation is more powerful when compared with al-Tabari due to several factors:

- M. Quraish is keener to the first opinion, because it is supported by other the Qur'anic verses such as Surah al-A'raf verse 69 to prove that the messenger after the Prophet Nuh AS is the Prophet Hud AS. If carefully observed, the discussion on Surah al-Mu'minun, verse 25 to verse 31 is still deliberating on the Prophet Nuh AS and straight-forwardly shows that the tribe meant is 'Ad and its messenger is Prophet Hud AS. This means that he has been using the rule of interpretation based on the context of the verse (*siyaq al-ayah*).

Al-Tabari also used the rule of interpretation with respect to the context of the verse, but rather understand that the Prophet and the tribe who is meant are the Prophet Salih AS and Thamud [9]. The verse that he relate with in the context of the verse/surah is Surah al-Mu'minun verse 38 as follows:

- *He is only a man who invents a lie against Allah, but we are not the ones to believe in him!*

According to al-Tabari [10], the word *huwa* (he) in the verse is the reasoning that the Messenger and those who are referred to are the Prophet Salih AS and Thamud. The same rule of interpretation is used in interpreting Surah al-Haqqah verse 6 and 7, that serve as a proof for supporters of the second opinion above. al-Tabari said: "However, the most accurate opinion is the one that stating that they (the Thamud) are destroyed by the scream (*al-saihah al-taghiyah*). This is because Allah SWT himself has explained that the punishment which destroyed the Thamud is the same as that experienced by 'Ad, as the verse is still in relation with the previous verse".

Based on the above explanation, both commentators are using the rule of *siyaq al-ayah*, namely *idkhal al-kalam fi ma'ani ma qablahu wa ma ba'dahu awla min al-khuruj bihi 'anhuma illa bi dalil yajib taslim lahu*. This rule of interpretation means that in the event of disagreement between the commentator, in which the first commentator is interpreting based on the context of the

verse, while the second commentator is interpreting but is excluded from the meaning of the text either before or after the event and cause a conflict in the context of the verse, the first commentator interpretation is the most powerful, unless there is a provision that denies the interpretation or there is a provision that validate the second commentator interpretation [11].

However, when interpreting surah al-A'raf, verse 69 as his first reasoning, al-Tabari is mentioning the Prophet Hud AS and 'Ad, rather than the Prophet Salih AS and Thamud [12]. This proves that there is no consistency in his interpretation. Thus the authors conclude that the interpretation by M. Quraish is more powerful than al-Tabari unless there is other reasoning that permit it (*illa bi dalil yajib al-taslim lahu*) factor.

- M. Quraish tends to understand that the Messenger and those who referred in Surah al-Mu'minun, verse 31 are the Prophet Hud and 'Ad, due to his *tarjih* on the two opinion differences (as described above) using linguistic meaning, which is "the word *al-saihah* could also means the loud noise caused by the wind storm". The authors found that the meaning of the word was indeed used in Arabic such as *sayyahathu al-rih* [13] and *ijtima' alaihim saihatan ma'a al-rih al-sarsari al-asif al-qawi al-baridah* [14]. Thus, his interpretation of the above verse with meaning refers to the meaning of the language is *mashur*, known and not *al-shadh*. Therefore, the authors conclude that the rule used in his interpretation is *fi tafsir al-Quran bi muqtada al-lughah yura'i ma'na al-aghlab wa al-ashhar wa al-afsaq duna al-shadh aw al-qalil*. This rule means to interpret the Qur'an on Arabic based on the most popular and well known meaning, so the odd and isolated meanings must be abandoned [15]. In addition, his interpretation was accompanied with *tarjih*, making it easier for the reader to judge.

Al-Tabari also used the linguistic meaning rule as cited by authors in the first factor. However, he did not perform any *tarjih* on his interpretation of this verse (al-Mu'minun verse 31) as what was done by M. Quraish, making the assessment of the accuracy of the interpretation quite difficult. However, it does not mean that he did not perform any *tarjih* on the supporting reasoning that he chose. As a proof, he has performed *tarjih* on the differences of opinion when interpreting Surah al-Haqqah verse 6 and 7 which serve as supporting reasoning for the second opinion.

- M. Quraish interpretation of Surah al-Mu'minun verse 31, is included in the majority interpretation commentators, while al-Tabari's is in the category of minority interpretation. The authors referred to 18 Books of Interpretation and found out that the majority of them (nine commentators) interpret Surah al-Mu'minun, verse 31 as referred to the prophet Hud AS and cAd, seven commentators who *tawaqquf*, while only two commentators who decode the prophet and the people as the Prophet Salih AS and Thamud.²

The reasoning held by the majority of the commentators is Surah al-A'raf verse 69 and the story of the Phophet Hud AS and his tribe in surah Hud and al-Shu'ara', while the minority held on Surah al-Mu'minun verse 41, Hud verse 67, al-Hijr verse 73 and 83 and al-Haqqah verses 6 and 7. There are commentators who *tawaqquf*, due to their caution on the verse, after all, both two opinions pledging their reasonings to the reasonings from the Qur'an. No wonder their number is closest to the majority opinion of the commentator.

Based on the explanation above, the authors concluded that M. Quraish were using some rule of interpretation that has been compiled by scholars. Although his interpretations are different, but there are times when his interpretation of The Qur'anic verses are stronger compared to other commentator, as it is supported by the other *qarinahs*.

Other than his consistency of using vocabulary explanation in *Tafsir Al-Mishbah* to know the real interpretation of any one verse, the authors found that M. Quraish is keener to the meaning of language than the *asbab al-nuzul* of the verse when there are clashes between the two. As a result, there are times when this led him to a different interpretation with other authentic commentators. Among the causes of the differences is due to the different rule of interpretation used. Different rule of interpretation in question can be seen for example through his interpretation of Surah al-Anfal verse 1 below:

- *They ask you (O Muhammad SAW) about the spoils of war. Say: "The spoils are for Allah and the Messenger." So fear Allah and adjust all matters of difference among you and obey Allah and His Messenger (Muhammad SAW), if you are believers*

M. Quraish says: "Some scholars understand that the word *yasalunaka* in the sense of they ask 'gains in excess of their rights'. This view is, even though consistent with many content of history regarding the cause of revelation of this verse, the essence of which is the difference of opinion among the companions on the spoils connection and a desire to acquire more than the others. However, this kind of understanding is inconsistent with the linguistic rule, in which the word, *yasalu* is accompanied by an idiom *'an*. Thus, it means asking, whereas when there is no *'an* then it means requesting. The verse above, clearly using the *'an* after *yasalunaka*. Moreover, the verse shows that indeed the disagreement happened between them, because if it does not, then the order to improve the relationship becomes less relevant" [16].

Based on the interpretation of the verse, M. Quraish used an interpretation rule associated with *f'l al-mutaaddi* which understands the meaning of the verb based on the objects followed (*tufhamu ma'ani al-af'al 'ala daw' ma tataadda bih*). Therefore, he understands that the word *yasalunaka* as 'to ask' because there is idiom *'an* after the word. According to him, when *yasalunaka* is not followed by idioms *'an*, then it means 'to request'. The question is to what extent is the truth of M. Quraish language interpretation against other commentators interpretation which is supported by the *asbab al-nuzul* of the verse? Furthermore, there are assertions as stated by al-Harabi [17] that when there are differences of opinion among the related scholars on the meaning of the verse, then the main interpretation is the one which is interpreted with *asbab al-nuzul*.

Al-Tabari [18], for example, has expressed a difference of opinion about the *asbab al-nuzul* of Surah al-Anfal, verse 1 as follows:

- Some scholars say that it was revealed during the Battle of Badr when there is a conflict between young and old companions on the spoils. As mentioned in the following narration:

From Ibn Abbas RA said: During the battle of Badr, the Prophet said: Whoever did so and so, then he will get such and such spoils. So the young man moved forward, while the other friend (the elder) looks behind. After they won, the old saying: Do not ignore us, because we are protecting you when you stepped forward. If your line

² The commentators interpret Surah al-Mu'minun verse 31 as referred to the prophet Hud AS and cAd are al-Zamakhshari, Ismail Haqqi, M. Quraish, Muqatil Sulaiman, al-Razi, al-Nasafi, al-Maraghi, al-Shacrawi and HAMKA. The commentators who *tawaqquf* are al-Alusi, al-Baydawi, al-Shawkani, Abu Hayyan, al-Qurtubi, Ibn Kathir and Ibn cAtiyah. The commentators who decode the prophet and the people as the Prophet Salih AS and Thamud are al-Tabari and cAshur.

broke, there would have to us you shall take refuge again. Then the young men feel reluctant and said: It is provided to us by the Prophet. Thus Allah SWT revealed the verse of *yasalunaka* ‘*an al-anfal qul al-anfal lillahi wa al-rasul*’ to verse *kama akhrajaka rabbuka* until *lakarihun*. Prophet SAW said: “This verse was also an indicator for the betterment of their differences. Therefore, obey whatever decision I made, because I know more about the matter [19].

- Other scholars of the opinion that this verse was revealed because some companions is asking for part of the spoils before the distribution. Because it is shared in common by all troops, Allah SWT made it entirely Phophet’s. As narrated as follows:

From Sa’ad ibn Malik (Abu Waqqas RA) said: “O Messenger of Allah, today Allah heals my heart from the polytheists, so give this sword to me”. Prophet SAW replied: “The sword is not for you and me, then put it!. Then I put the sword. After that I went back. In my heart, I said, “Maybe the sword will later be given to people who struggle not like me”. As I think that, a voice calling my name came from behind. I said, “Maybe Allah SWT has revealed His Word on the matter”. He said: “You told me just now to give you this sword, it is not mine, but now it has been given to me. Therefore, now I give it to you”. It was then this verse is revealed *yasalunaka* ‘*an al-anfal qul al-anfal lillahi wa al-rasul*’ [20].

- Some scholars are of the opinion that this verse was revealed because the companions asked the distribution of the spoils between them at Badr. Then he told them that they belong to Allah SWT and His Messenger and they have no right on them. As narrated as follows:

From Ibn Abbas RA said that in respect of Surah al-Anfal, Allah SWT says: revealed *yasalunaka* ‘*an al-anfal qul al-anfal lillahi wa al-rasul*’, al-Anfal is spoils entirely belongs to the Messenger of Allah and there is no others’ rights on it. Any troop who found it will hand them over to him and those who hide them have been unfaithful. Then the companions asked the Prophet S.A.W to give the spoils to them. Allah SWT says revealed *yasalunaka* ‘*an al-anfal qul al-anfal lillahi*, I have handed them over to my Messenger and you have no right on them. Allah SWT says *fattaqullaha wa aslihu dhata baynikum* to the verse of *in kuntum mu’minin*.

Then Allah SWT revealed the verse of *wa’lamu annama ghanintum min shay’ fa inna lillahi khumusahu wa li al-rasul*. Then one-fifth of the spoils distributed to the Prophet [21].

That are the three narration-based opinions on the *asbab al-nuzul* of Surah al-Anfal verse 1 above. The word *yasalunaka* in the first opinion means ‘asking’, which is the question of the companions (young and old) to the Prophet about how the distribution of spoils will be done. Narration in second opinion shows that Sa’ad ibn Abi Waqqas RA personally asked for the Prophet’s sword which he had obtained from his battle with the polytheists. As for the third, the word *yasalunaka* also means asking, which is the demand of the Prophet’s companions to be given the spoils. Thus, it can be combined with a second opinion. But the authors should emphasize some differences between both opinions that the third is the demand of the majority of companions rather than personally as stated in the second story.

Al-Tabari [22] chose an opinion that Allah SWT tell the companions about their request to be handed the spoils of war from the Prophet. Indeed, the property belongs to Allah SWT and handed over to him. If this is what it meant, then that could also be revealed due to the companions’ difference of opinion, may also be due to Sa’ad’s request to be given the sword and could also due to the request of distributing the spoils among the troops.

Based on the above explanation, the authors found that M. Quraish uses different rule of interpretation with al-Tabari. Methodology used by M. Quraish is associated to the linguistic meaning, whereas al-Tabari uses *asbab al-nuzul* interpretation rule. Before analyzing both commentators’ interpretations, it is the best to first observe an outlook from al-Sabt [23] which states that in the event of a difference of opinion based on narration, we must choose an authentic narration and leave the invalid. When the authenticity is apparent, the terminology used shall be observed too. If term used is not *sarih* like *wa nazalat hadhihi al-ayah fi kadha* (this verse was revealed associated with this matter) then it is rejected because it is interpretation and not *asbab al-nuzul*. When the narration is *sahih* and *sarih*, then the time of occurrence is referred.

Al-Sabt emphasized on three aspects, the value of a narration, signs of authenticity and time of event. With regard to these three aspects, the fact is the differences of interpretation between M. Quraish with al-Tabari can be adjusted due to several factors:

- The narrations referred to are both *sahih*, based on *takhrij* method that has been made. Details as mentioned below:

- *Ayasalunaka* means ‘asking’

This narration is narrated by Abu Dawud [24] in his *Sunan* as hadith no. 2737, al-Bayhaqi [25] in his *Sunan al-Kubra*, hadith no. 12492. al-Hakim [26] narrated this hadith in his *al-Mustadrak*, hadith no. 2594. He said “This hadith is *sahih*, al-Bukhari made it a reasoning based on *sanad* from ‘Ikrimah. Muslim did so as well, based on *sanad* from Dawud ibn Hind and did not perform *takhrij*”. al-Albani [27] in his book *Sahih wa Daif Sunan Abi Dawud* rating this narration as *sahih*.

- *Byasalunaka* means ‘requesting’

This hadith is narrated by Ahmad [28] in his *Musnad*, chap. *Musnad* Abi Ishaq Sa‘ad ibn Abu Waqqas RA, hadith no. 1528. The hadith is *sahih* according to Abu Dawud [29], hadith no. 2740 and *hasan sahih* according to al-Tirmidhi [30] in his *Sunan* with hadith no. 3079. It is also being narrated by al-Nasai [31] in his *Sunan*, hadith no. 11196 and al-Tayalisi [32] in his *Musnad* with hadith no. 208 and Muslim [33] in his *al-Jami‘ al-Sahih, kitab al-jihad wa al-sayr, bab al-Anfal*. al-Albani [34] in his book *Irwa‘ al-Ghalil fi Takhrij Ahadith Manar al-Sabil* rating this hadith as *sahih*.

- The specified narration by both commentators use a clear *asbab al-nuzul (lafaz al-sarih)* authenticity and not as a result of the interpretation of the narrator. Narration of first opinion (asking) is using *fa anzala Allah* (Allah revealed this verse later), while the second and third opinion (requesting) use *wa unzilal hadhihi al-ayah* (Then this verse is revealed) and *thumma anzala Allahu‘ Azza wa Jalla* (then Allah revealed this verse).
- Time of occurrence as indicated by the three narrations is in the battle of Badr. This also proves the authenticity of the narration.

Based on the explanation, the authors concluded that although M. Quraish and al-Tabari use a different rule of interpretation, both difference in interpretation could, in fact, be reconciled. However, it is important to indicate three important things to prove weakness in M. Quraish’s interpretation namely:

- Does the word *yasalunaka* combined with idioms ‘*an* in the Qur’an simply means asking only? Or is there any other purpose?

Al-Asfahani [35] states that the word *saala* has two meanings, either inquiring a matter or requesting something. When intended to be a question, then the answer is either by writing or gestures. If it is intended as a request, then the answer is either by appointment or rejection. Based on the statements of al-Asfahani and the narration that has been mentioned above, it is clear that *saala* mean requesting, due to the Prophet’s rejection on Sa‘ad’s request. Abu Hayyan [36] also concurred, stating that commentators who understand the word *yasalunaka* in al-Anfal verse 1 as request are acceptable.

Supporters of the third opinion as mentioned by al-Tabari [37] define the word as ‘asking’, because according to them, the idioms ‘*an* in the text means *min* (from), which caused the meaning of the text to be *yasalunaka min al-anfal* (they are requesting from you the spoils of war). This proves that *yasalunaka* combined with the ‘*an* in the Qur’an also means requesting. That is why Ibn Mas‘ud read the first verse of Surah al-Anfal with be *yasalunaka al-anfal*, because he understands the meaning as requesting. However, it must be noted that the *qiraat* is *shadh* as it is breaching *Mushaf rasm* method. So it be used as reasoning. The word ‘*an* mean *min* in other verses according to supporters of this opinion and can be seen in Surah al-Shura verse 25 and al-A‘raf verse 16. However, ‘Ashur [38] states that the inquiries *yasalunaka* means request (*al-talab*) and when connected to ‘*an* then it means demand to know something (*talab ma‘rifah*) and if without ‘*an* it means a request to give something (*talab i‘tau al-shay’*).

Based on the explanation above, the authors could conclude that the word *yasalunaka* combined with the ‘*an* in the Qur’an (Surah al-Anfal, verse 1) does not only mean to ask, but it can also mean to request.

- Al-Tabari’s *tarjih* of the verse is very comprehensive, as he states the scholars’ dissent with their supporting reasoning and detailed analysis, while M. Quraish not.
- Al-Harabi states that when there are differences of opinion among scholars on the meaning of the verse, then the most major interpretation is the one that interpreting using *asbab al-nuzul* [39]. Thus, the weakness of interpretation by M. Quraish is due to his tendency to linguistic meaning rather than *asbab al-nuzul*.

CONCLUSION

His consistency in describing the Qur'anic vocabulary in *Tafsir Al-Mishbah* to find out the true meaning of one verse has led M. Quraish to different interpretations with other authentic commentator. Among the causes of the difference is due to either rules used in his interpretation is also being used by other authentic commentator or arising from the use of different rules of interpretation.

M. Quraish was using some rules of interpretation that has been compiled by scholars. Among the rules in question are *idkhal al-kalam fi ma'ani ma qablahu wa ma ba'dahu awla min al-khuruuj bihi anhumma illa bi dalil yajib taslim lahu* and *fi tafsir al-Quran bi muqtada al-lughah yura'i ma'na al-aghlab wa al-ashhar wa al-afsaḥ duna al-shadh aw al-qalil*. Even though the interpretation is different, but there are times when his interpretation of the Qur'anic verses is stronger compared to other commentators, as it is being supported by other *qarinahs*, one of the example is his interpretation of Surah al-Mu'minun verse 31. Whereas, his interpretation of Surah al-Anfal verse 1 is weaker compared to other commentators, as well as not expressing scholars' dissent and their supporting reasoning clearly, together with detailed analysis. Furthermore he is giving more priority on the language meaning rather than *asbab al-nuzul*. Unfortunately, the linguistic meaning stated is not necessarily means as he understood it, according to scholars.

REFERENCES

1. Quraish Shihab, M., 2006. *Membumikan al-Qur'an: Fungsi dan Peran Wahyu dalam Kehidupan Masyarakat*. Bandung: Mizan, pp: 81.
2. Islah Gusmian, 2003. *Khazanah Tafsir Indonesia dari hermeneutika hingga ideologi*. Jakarta: Teraju, pp: 234.
3. Farid Saenong, 2007. *Kaedah Tafsir: Teori atau Ideologi?*. Journal of JSQ, 2(1): 209-234.
4. Mustafa, Ibrahim. et.al, n.d. *al-Mu'jam al-wasit*, vol. 2, Beirut: Dar al-Da'wah, pp: 748.
5. Al-Jurjani, 'Ali ibn Muhammad, 1985. *al-Ta'rifat*, vol. 1, Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-Mu'asir, pp: 219.
6. Al-Sabt, Khalid ibn Uthman, 2001. *Qawa'id al-Tafsir Jam'an wa Dirasah*, vol. 1, n.p.: Dar ibn 'Affan, pp: 27.
7. Quraish Shihab, M., 2011. *Membumikan Al-Qur'an jilid 2: Memfungsikan wahyu dalam kehidupan*, Jakarta: Lentera Hati, pp: 637.
8. Quraish Shihab, M., 2005. *Tafsir Al-Mishbah: Pesan, Kesan dan Keserasian Al-Qur'an*, vol. 9, Jakarta: Lentera Hati, pp: 187-188.
9. Al-Tabari and Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Jarir, 2001. *Tafsir al-Tabari*, vol. 17, al-Qahirah: Markaz al-Buhuth wa al-Dirasah al-'Arabiyah wa al-Islamiyyah, pp: 39-45.
10. Al-Tabari and Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Jarir, 2001. *Tafsir al-Tabari*, vol. 23, al-Qahirah: Markaz al-Buhuth wa al-Dirasah al-'Arabiyah wa al-Islamiyyah, pp: 209.
11. Al-Harabi, Husain ibn 'Ali ibn Husain, 1996. *Qawa'id al-Tarjih 'inda al-Mufassirin*, vol. 1, al-Riyad: Maktabah al-Qasim, pp: 125.
12. Al-Tabari and Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Jarir, 2001. *Tafsir al-Tabari*, vol. 10, al-Qahirah: Markaz al-Buhuth wa al-Dirasah al-'Arabiyah wa al-Islamiyyah, pp: 267.
13. Ibn Manzur and Muhammad, n.d. *Lisan al-'Arab*, vol. 4, Beirut: Dar Sadir, pp: 2533.
14. Ibn Kathir, Abu al-Fida' Isma'il, 2000. *Tafsir al-Quran al-'Azim*, vol. 10, Ghiza: Muassasah Qurtubah, pp: 123.
15. Al-Sabt, Khalid ibn Uthman, 2001. *Qawa'id al-Tafsir Jam'an wa Dirasah*, vol. 1, n.p.: Dar ibn 'Affan, pp: 213.
16. Quraish Shihab, M., 2005. *Tafsir Al-Mishbah: Pesan, Kesan dan Keserasian Al-Qur'an*, vol. 5, Jakarta: Lentera Hati, pp: 359.
17. Al-Harabi, Husain ibn 'Ali ibn Husain, 1996. *Qawa'id al-Tarjih 'inda al-Mufassirin*, vol. 1, al-Riyad: Maktabah al-Qasim, pp: 241.
18. Al-Tabari and Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Jarir, 2001. *Tafsir al-Tabari*, vol. 11, al-Qahirah: Markaz al-Buhuth wa al-Dirasah al-'Arabiyah wa al-Islamiyyah, pp: 12-21.
19. Abu Dawud and Al-Ashath, n.d. *Sunan Abu Dawud, kitab al-Jihad (9)*, chap. *fi al-nafal (156)*, hadith no. 2737, al-Riyad: Maktabah al-Ma'arif, pp: 484.
20. Ahmad, Ibn Hanbal, 2001. *Musnad al-Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal*, chap. *Musnad Abi Ishaq Sa'ad ibn Abi Waqqas RA*, hadith no. 1528, vol. 3, Beirut: Muassasah al-Risalah, pp: 117.
21. Al-Bayhaqi, Abu Bakr Ahmad. 1924. *al-Sunan al-Kubra*, chap. *Bayan masrif al-ghanimah (2)*, vol. 6, al-Hindi: Majlis Dairah al-Ma'arif al-Nizamiah al-Kainah, pp: 291-293.
22. Al-Tabari and Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Jarir, 2001. *Tafsir al-Tabari*, vol. 11, al-Qahirah: Markaz al-Buhuth wa al-Dirasah al-'Arabiyah wa al-Islamiyyah, pp: 21.
23. Al-Sabt, Khalid ibn Uthman, 2001. *Qawa'id al-Tafsir Jam'an wa Dirasah*, vol. 1, n.p.: Dar ibn 'Affan, pp: 73.

24. Abu Dawud, al-Ashath, n.d. *Sunan Abu Dawud, kitab al-Jihad* (9), chap. *fi al-nafal* (156), hadith no. 2737, al-Riyad: Maktabah al-Ma'arif, pp: 484.
25. Al-Bayhaqi, Abu Bakr Ahmad. 1924. *al-Sunan al-Kubra*, chap. *Bayan masrif al-ghanimah* (2), vol. 6, al-Hindi: Majlis Dairah al-Ma'arif al-Nizamiah al-Kainah, pp: 291-293.
26. Al-Hakim, Muhammad, 1990. *al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihain*, vol. 2, Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-'Ilmiyyah, pp: 143.
27. Al-Albani, Muhammad Nasiruddin, n.d. *Sahih wa da'if Sunan Abi Dawud*, vol. 6, n.p.: s.i. pp: 237.
28. Ahmad and Ibn Hanbal, 2001. *Musnad al-Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal*, chap. *Musnad Abi Ishaq Sa'ad ibn Abi Waqqas RA*, hadith no. 1528, vol. 3, Beirut: Muassasah al-Risalah, pp: 117.
29. Abu Dawud and Al-Ashath, n.d. *Sunan Abu Dawud, kitab al-Jihad* (9), chap. *fi al-nafal* (156), hadith no. 2737, al-Riyad: Maktabah al-Ma'arif, pp: 484.
30. Al-Tirmidhi, Muhammad ibn 'Isa, n.d. *Sunan Al-Tirmidhi* and Al-Riyad: Maktabah Al-Ma'arif, pp: 689.
31. Al-Nasai and Abu 'Abdurrahman, n.d. *al-Sunan al-Kubra*, vol. 6, Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-'Ilmiyyah, pp: 348.
32. Al-Tayalisi, Sulayman ibn Dawud, n.d. *Musnad al-Tayalisi*, Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah, pp: 28.
33. Muslim, Abu al-Husayn ibn al-Hajjaj, n.d. *al-Jami' al-Sahih*, vol. 5. n.p.: s.i. pp: 146.
34. Al-Albani and Muhammad Nasiruddin, 1985. *Irwa' al-ghalil fi takhrij ahadith manar al-sabil*, vol. 5, Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islami, pp: 63.
35. Al-Asfahani, Raghīb, 1970. *al-Mufradat fi gharib al-Quran*, vol. 1, Misr: Maktabah al-Anjlu, pp: 250.
36. Abu Hayyan and Muhammad ibn Yusuf, 2001. *Tafsir al-Bahr al-Muhit*, vol. 4. Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-'Ilmiyyah, pp: 453.
37. Al-Tabari and Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Jarir, 2001. *Tafsir al-Tabari*, vol. 11, al-Qahirah: Markaz al-Buhuth wa al-Dirasah al-'Arabiyah wa al-Islamiyyah, pp: 19.
38. 'Ashur, Muhammad al-Tahir, 1997. *al-Tahrir wa al-Tanwir*, vol. 9, Tunis: Dar Sahnun, pp: 248.
39. Al-Harabi, Husain ibn 'Ali ibn Husain, 1996. *Qawa'id al-Tarjih 'inda al-Mufassirin*, vol. 1, al-Riyad: Maktabah al-Qasim, pp: 241.