

# REACTIONS AND RESPONSES TO MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT THE QUR'ÁN: A CASE STUDY OF THE NARRATION OF ×AFÎ DOWN TO ÑÓÏM

<sup>1</sup>Mohamed Ibrahim Hassan Othman, <sup>2</sup>Abdul Ghani Bin Md Din, <sup>3</sup>Ebrahim Muhammad Ahmad Eldesoky, <sup>4</sup>Mohd AzizulRahman Bin Zabidin, <sup>5</sup>Ibrahim Babikir Al Haj Abdul Kadir, <sup>6</sup>Omar bin Md Din

<sup>1,2,3,4,5</sup>Faculty of Arabic Language, Sultan Abdul HalimMu'adzam Shah International Islamic University (UniSHAMS).

<sup>6</sup>Faculty of Language, Al- Madinah International University Malaysia.

## ABSTRACT:

The tourism sector has considerably increased in Nan province in last few years, and has made major contribution to the Nan province due it natural beauty and beautiful landscape. Agricultural tourism has emerged as new tourism attraction in this region. Thai government has initiated many agricultural tourism projects for increasing revenue of Thai people in rural and agricultural areas and give tourists insight and experience of rural life. This paper is designed to examine the agricultural tourism development in ChaloePhrakiat District. This paper tests the relationship between digital public relation, sense of community and agricultural tourism development in case of ChaloePhrakiat District. The data was collected from 351 respondents which was analyzed on structural equation modeling on SPSS to check hypothetical relationship among proposed research frame. The findings advocated that personal relationship, community relationship, professional relationship and agricultural tourism development are significantly correlated. Sense of community also intervenes the connection between these variables. The paper advances literature on Digital public relations and agricultural tourism in Thailand. This paper will benefit public relation experts and government of community building in ChaloePhrakiat District.

## Keywords:

Digital public relations development, Personal relationship, Community relationship, Professional relationship, Sense of community, Agricultural tourism, Nan Province, Thailand.

Article Received: 18 October 2020, Revised: 3 November 2020, Accepted: 24 December 2020

## INTRODUCTION

Many detractors of Islam—namely Sami ÑIwaìDhÊb, the author of *al-'AkhîÊ' al-LughawiyahÊ al-Qur'Ên al-KarÊm* (Linguistic Mistakes in The Noble Quran) published by Markaz al-QÊnÊn al-ÑArabÊ al-'IslÊmÊ, and the author of *al-ÛaÑnfÊal-Qur'Ên al-KarÊm*—have stated that there are errors in the language and syntax of the Quran. However, this statement has been responded by many scholars in the past as well as in recent times. Furthermore, these detractors have made several attempts to call into question and challenge as false the verses that apparently look misguiding and confusing. The problem lies in that some sentence structures in the Quran apparently seem to have broken all grammatical rules. This has misled the detractors into believing that the Quran contains grammatical errors.

This is an attempt to explain these problematic verses that look apparently to have broken grammatical rules, however, sound in reality. This is a subtle problem and therefore requires careful deliberation and in-depth knowledge about the opinions of linguists and scholars in Islamic exegesis.

We aim to explain what is meant by syntax problems, thus, *al-Mushkil*—which literally means problem in English—denotes something that is difficult, confusing, and ambiguous. In *al-MuÑjam al-WasÊÏ* dictionary, *al-Mushkil* denotes something or a concept that is vague. According to scholars in the realm of the Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence, *al-Mushkil* is something or a concept that is not independently explicit unless it is supported by another indicator or context. *Mushkil*, a singular of *mushkilÊt* both have been found in some classical writings by scholars who

were concerned with the confusing and ambiguous verses in the Quran, namely *Mushkil ĪrĒb al-Qur'Ēn* by MakkĒIbnAbĒUĒlib (437 H), *Mushkil al-×adhwa BayĒnuhĒ* by Abu Bakr al-'AĒfahĒnĒ (406 H), *BĒhir al-BurhĒn FĒ MaĒĒnĒMushkilĒt al-Qur'Ēn* by BayĒn al-×aqq (553 H), *ShawĒhid al-TawĒĒwa al-TaĒĒĒLimushkilĒt al-JĒmiĒ al-ŒalĒĒ* by IbnMĒlik (672 H), *al-MujtabĒ Min MushkilĪrĒb al-Qur'Ēn* by Dr. ĀĒmadIbnMuĒammad al-KharrĒĒ, and *Radd al-BuhtĒnĒAnĒrĒb 'ŒyĒt Min al-Qur'Ēn* by Dr. YĒsuf al-ĒŒsĒwĒ, which contains only nine verses.

*ĪrĒb* (Syntax or the science of sentence structure) has a key role to play in revealing such ambiguity. MakkĒIbnAbĒUĒlib points out that “knowing the roots of sentence structures helps understand mostly what statements entail. In fact, it helps unveil the ambiguity, yield benefits, make any discourse intelligible and hence disclose the true nature of meaning. I have observed that most of those who wrote on *ĪrĒb* disregarded much what is needed to grasp the apparently ambiguous verses of the Quran. Therefore, in this book I aim to explain *mushkil al-Qur'Ēn* (the verses of the Quran that seem to be ambiguous) with mention of its rational justifications, its complexity and subtlety in order to make it (the book) light to carry, easy to access and convenient to understand for those who willingly want to commit it to their memory and content themselves with it only; for there is no *mushkil* in a sentence structure in the Book of Allah unless it is explicitly or implicitly stated. Makki (1405h).

Nonetheless, none of these scholars was able to gather in one compilation all these seemingly misleading and ambiguous statements of the Quran. In fact, some of them even mix the unambiguous with ambiguous statements all together.

## MUSHKILĒT OR AMBIGUITIES CAUSED BY OMISSION AND ADDITION

### 2.1. Omission

×*adhf* or omission is common in the speeches of the Arab. IbnJinnĒ points out in the context of

‘omission’: the Arab can omit a full sentence, a single word, a letter, or short vowels. All these have been noticeably proven (IbnJinnĒ. t.th:2/362). For instance, in this divine statement: {شَهِدَ اللَّهُ أَنَّهُ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ وَأُولُو الْأَلْبَابِ} GOD [Himself] proffers evidence – and [so do] the angels and all who are endowed with knowledge – that there is no deity save Him}[3:18], there must be an omission of a verb, which is *shahida* (witnessed in past tense). Therefore, the statement means: God witnessed or proffered evidence and so did the angels and those endowed with knowledge. The meaning would not have been absurd had not been for the omission. It would have entailed that the angels and the scholars are all gods alongside God—they are all associates in divinity, which is a total absurdity.

×*adhf* or omission is an instrumental key to semantics. ĒAbd al-Qāhir (471 H) states in the context of ×*adhf* saying: “it is subtle and intricate like magic. Not stating is more eloquent than stating; and silence is more informative than informing itself. Not speaking is more effective than speaking; and not explaining is more explanatory than explaining (Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjāni, 1992).

In his statement, ĒAbd al-Qāhir points out that ×*adhf* is magic. Therefore, there are some morphologically weak verbs in the present tense (*afĒĒlmuĒtallahmuĒĒraĒnah*) in the Quran whose *wĒw* has been omitted even though it is not preceded by any *jussive* article. A thorough deliberation on in the reason why it is omitted, you find that the omission is more informative than the statement. There are four cases in the Quran in which *Īarf al-Ēillah* (i.e. weak letter) is omitted: (Al-Quran 42:24), (Al-Quran 17:11), (Al-Qamar 54:6) and (Al-Quran 96:18). The omission here denotes immediacy and easiness of the action. Allah says {سَنَدْعُ الزَّبَانِيَةَ} which means {We will call on the angels of punishment}. In this statement, you can feel the spontaneous immediacy of the action as well as the promptness of reaction by the angels of punishment. The statement denotes majestic magnificence and potency. In addition, it also entails an unpleasant

menace whose beginning is stated but ending omitted. This is true if we take into consideration the statement by Allah: { وما أَمْرُنَا إِلَّا وَاحدةٌ كَلَمْحٍ بِالْبَصَرِ } which means {And Our Command is but a single (Act),- like the twinkling of an eye} (Al-Quran 54:50).

In His statement { وَيَمْحُ اللَّهُ الْبَاطِلَ } (Al-Quran 54:50), which means {God blots out all falsehood} there is an omission of  $wÉw$  that gives the impression of promptness in blotting out all falsehood. Similarly, it shows how promptly all falsehood has responded to that state of eliminating. This is demonstrated by another statement in which Allah says { إِنَّ الْبَاطِلَ كَانَ زَهُوقًا } (Al-Quran 17:81). The verb { يَمْحُ } is not in conjunction with the verb { يَخْتِمُ } that precedes it in the following statement: { فَإِنْ يَشَاءِ اللَّهُ يَخْتِمْ عَلَى قَلْبِكَ وَيَمْحُ اللَّهُ الْبَاطِلَ وَيُحِقُّ الْحَقَّ } which means {had God so willed, He could have sealed thy heart [forever]: for God blots out all falsehood and by His words proves the truth to be true}. { يَمْحُ }, rather comes with present participle and then relates to the verb { يَحِقُّ الْحَقَّ } that comes after it. It equally connotes an unpleasant menace which beginning is stated yet ending omitted. This is all proven by statement: { وما أَمْرُنَا إِلَّا وَاحدةٌ كَلَمْحٍ بِالْبَصَرِ } which means {And Our Command is but a single (Act), - like the twinkling of an eye}.

In His statement { وَيَدْعُ الْإِنْسَانَ بِالْشَّرِّ دُعَاءَهُ بِالْخَيْرِ } (Al-Quran 17:11), which reads (As it is man [often] prays for things that are bad as if he were praying for something that is good: for man is prone to be hasty [in his judgments]), the omission of  $wÉw$  entails that man commonly and hurriedly prays for things that are bad as he does for things that are good. Hence, man finds it more common to pray for things that are bad than those that are good. Likewise, there is an omission of  $wÉw$  in { يَوْمَ يَدْعُ } which means {The Day that the Caller will call} to show promptness in calling upon Allah by man and immediacy in answering that call by Allah.

AbÈ al-BaqÈ' al-KafawÈ {1094 H} says: “the secret that lies in the omission of  $wÉw$  in { يَدْعُ } and { وَيَوْمَ يَدْعُ الدَّاعِ } and { سَنَدْعُ } and { الْإِنْسَانَ } and { يَمْحُ اللَّهُ } and { الرَّبَّانِيَّةِ } is an expression of promptness of doing an action, of the easiness of that action, and of the

effectiveness of the response that results from it.” (al-KafawÈ: t.th: p389).

**A. The omission of the main clause that comes after (لَمَّا)**

{ فَلَمَّا ذَهَبُوا بِهِ وَأَجْمَعُوا أَنْ يَجْعَلُوهُ فِي غِيَابَةِ الْجُبِّ وَ أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْهِ } { لَتُنَبِّئَنَّهُمْ بِأَمْرِهِمْ هَذَا وَهُمْ لَا يَشْعُرُونَ } (Al-Quran 12:15). Which means {And so, when they went away with him, they decided to cast him into the dark depths of the well. And We revealed [this] unto him: "Thou wilt yet remind them of this their deed at a time when they shall not perceive [who thou art]!"}. The scholars of syntax point out that the main clause that comes after (لَمَّا) is all omitted. The main clause that has been omitted is ‘they maltreated him a lot’. Dārwish (1415H). There are various opinions about the verse at hand. Some scholars claim that “أوحينا” is the main clause and that the  $wÉw$  that comes right before it is supplementary. AbÈ ×ayyÈn has mentioned this myriad of views in his magnum opus—in his book of exegesis. He says: “scholars had different views on the main clause that comes after (لَمَّا): is it stated or omitted? Those who claim that it is stated say that the main clause that is omitted is { قَالُوا يَا أَبَانَا إِنَّا ذَهَبْنَا نَسْتَبِقُ } which means {O our father! We went racing with one another}. That is, when they did such and such, they said... this is a good view. Other scholars claim that the omitted clause is ‘أوحينا’ and the  $wÉw$  that stands before it is subsidiary. This view belongs to the KufÈ Language School of Thought. According to them  $wÉw$  is supplementary when it comes after (لَمَّا) and (حَتَّى إِذَا). This is how they have interpreted the following statement: { فَلَمَّا أَسْلَمًا وَتَلَّهُ لِلْجَبِينِ وَنَادَيْنَاهُ } which reads {But as soon as the two had surrendered themselves to [what they thought to be] the will of God, and [Abraham] had laid him down on his face, and we called out to him }, that is, we call out to him with immediately no interval of  $wÉw$ . The same thing applies to { حتى إذا جاؤوها } and { وَفُتِحَتْ } which reads {when they reach it, and they shall find its gates wide-open}, that is, they shall find its gates wide-open with no interlude of  $wÉw$ . This style is also common in the statements of 'ImrulQays (al-Qurashi: t.th: p126). He states out: “فلما أجزنا ساحة الحَيِّ وَاثْتَحَى” which means “when we

passed through the courtyard of the neighbourhood, and he sat to a corner”, that is, he sat to a corner without *wÉw*. As for those who claim that the main clause is omitted and not stated, which is in fact the opinion of the BaʿrÊ Language School of Thought headed by al-ZamakhsharÊ, they say that the main clause in the verse is “they did all kinds of harm to him”. al-ZamakhsharÊ narrated a long story about what they did to him and the discussion and argument that occurred among them. Some scholars state out that the omitted main clause is “عَظُمَتْ فِئْتَنُهُمْ”, “i.e. their deceiving character has become worst.” Some views see that the main clause is “جَعَلُوهُ فِيهَا”, that is, they cast him into it [the dark depths of the well]. This is the most likely because the statement that is right before it and which reads {وَأَجْمَعُوا أَنْ يَجْعَلُوهُ}, that is, {they all decided to cast him into the dark depths of the well}. al-Andalusiyy and Abū (1420H). The view that suggests the omission of the main clause of (لَمَّا) is the most likely to me because it complies with the context of the verses.

### B. The omission of *muîÉf*

Almighty God says { لَيْسَ الْبِرُّ أَنْ تُوَلُّوا وُجُوهَكُمْ قِبَلَ الْمَشْرِقِ وَالْمَغْرِبِ وَلَكِنَّ الْبِرَّ مَنْ آمَنَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَالْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالْكِتَابِ وَالنَّبِيِّينَ وَآتَى الْمَالَ عَلَى حُبِّهِ ذَوِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسَاكِينَ وَابْنَ السَّبِيلِ وَالسَّائِلِينَ وَآتَى الزَّكَاةَ وَالْمُؤَفَّرَ بِعَهْدِهِمْ إِذَا عَاهَدُوا وَالصَّابِرِينَ فِي الْبَأْسَاءِ وَالضَّرَّاءِ وَوَجِينَ النَّاسِ أُولَٰئِكَ الَّذِينَ صَدَقُوا وَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُتَّقُونَ } (Al-Quran 2:177), which means {True piety does not consist in turning your faces towards the east or the west – but truly pious is he who believes in God, and the Last Day, and the angels, and revelation, and the prophets; and spends his substance – however much he himself may cherish it – upon his near of kin, and the orphans, and the needy, and the wayfarer, and the beggars}.

what seems to be problematic and confusing here is that the relative pronoun ‘مَنْ’ (i.e. who) in the second proposition is compared to the phrasal infinitive ‘أَنْ تُوَلُّوا’ (i.e. to turn) in the first proposition. However, there no any problem in fact because the full statement reads “ولكن البر بر مَنْ”، that is, the *muîÉf*, which is ‘بر’ (i.e. piety) has been omitted. Hence, it is linguistically permissible to omit one of a two-word compound noun—*muîÉf* or *muîÉfIlayhi* if it is perceivable.

Ibn, Abdullah, Abdullah, Abū, and Jamāl (1985m).

### C. The omission of verb, subject with the statement of object

In the same verse { لَيْسَ الْبِرُّ أَنْ تُوَلُّوا وُجُوهَكُمْ قِبَلَ الْمَشْرِقِ وَالْمَغْرِبِ وَلَكِنَّ الْبِرَّ مَنْ آمَنَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَالْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالْكِتَابِ وَالنَّبِيِّينَ وَآتَى الْمَالَ عَلَى حُبِّهِ ذَوِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسَاكِينَ وَابْنَ السَّبِيلِ وَالسَّائِلِينَ وَفِي الرِّقَابِ وَأَقَامَ الصَّلَاةَ وَآتَى الزَّكَاةَ وَالْمُؤَفَّرَ بِعَهْدِهِمْ إِذَا عَاهَدُوا وَالصَّابِرِينَ فِي الْبَأْسَاءِ وَالضَّرَّاءِ وَوَجِينَ النَّاسِ أُولَٰئِكَ الَّذِينَ صَدَقُوا وَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُتَّقُونَ }, which reads {True piety does not consist in turning your faces towards the east or the west – but truly pious is he who believes in God, and the Last Day, and the angels, and revelation, and the prophets; and spends his substance – however much he himself may cherish it – upon his near of kin, and the orphans, and the needy, and the wayfarer, and the beggars, and for the freeing of human beings from bondage; and is constant in prayer, and renders the purifying dues; and [truly pious are] they who keep their promises whenever they promise, and are patient in misfortune and hardship and in time of peril: it is they that have proved themselves true, and it is they, they who are conscious of God}. Here both verb and subject have been omitted and object stated. In the statement ‘الصَّابِرِينَ’ which is an object has the verb and the subject omitted together. The full statement is, therefore, “أَمْدَحُ الصَّابِرِينَ”, which means “I praise those who are patient”.

According al-ZajjĒj: the phrase ‘الصَّابِرِينَ’ has two cases: the most common of all is that it is an object of the phrase “أَمْدَحُ” (I praise), which contains the verb and the subject together. This is so when there a sentence contains multiple epithets and adjectives. Therefore, the object ‘الصَّابِرِينَ’ denotes an omission of a verb and subject, which is “أعني الصابرين”, i.e. I especially single out those who are patient from all this series of epithets and adjectives with praise (al-zajjā, 1988m). The sudden change of style—from a nominative state to an accusative one with the presence of coordinative conjunction is meant to draw the attention of the listener. Hence, both verb and subject have been omitted and object stated in the state of accusative—“أقصد الصابرين”

or “أمدح الصابرين”, that is, “I exclusively praise those who are patient” or “I praise those who are patient”. This style is attractive to both readers and listeners.

#### D. The omission of *jÉzim* and the statement of *majzÈm*

Almighty God says {قُلْ لِعِبَادِيَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا يُقِيمُوا الصَّلَاةَ} (Al-Quran 14:31), which is {[And] tell [those of] My servants who have attained to faith that they should be constant in prayer}. AbÈ al-BaqÈ' al-ÑUkburÈ (616 H) states that “يُقِيمُوا” is an accusative or *majzÈm* verb that has been made so by an omitted ‘لام’ or *jÉzim*, which is “يُقِيمُوا”, which suggests a new imperative sentence. Similarly, the ‘لام’ can be also omitted because of “قُلْ”, which entails imperative and command (al-ÑUkburÈ, AbÈ al-BaqÈ' t.th:2L770). There are many other opinions and interpretations about the verse above, but I personally think that this analysis is probably the most likely to the truth.

#### 2.2.problems and confusion caused by *ziyÉdah* or addition

A. Almighty God says {وَسِيقَ الَّذِينَ اتَّقَوْا رَبَّهُمْ إِلَى الْجَنَّةِ زُمَرًا حَتَّىٰ إِذَا جَاءُوهَا وَفُتِحَتْ أَبْوَابُهَا وَقَالَ لَهُمْ خَزَنَتُهَا سَلَامٌ عَلَيْكُمْ} (Al-Quran 39:73), which means { But those who were conscious of their Sustainer will be urged on in throngs towards paradise till, when they reach it, they shall find its gates wide-open; and its keepers will say unto them “Peace be upon you!”}. The scholars had different opinions about the result of the conditional sentence in this verse—is it omitted or stated through “فُتِحَتْ أَبْوَابُهَا” (i.e. gates wide-open), which is preceded by a ‘when’ clause {حَتَّىٰ إِذَا جَاءُوهَا وَفُتِحَتْ أَبْوَابُهَا} (i.e. when they reach it, they shall find its gates wide-open)? The controversy results from whether the ‘واو’ right before the result of the conditional sentence is supplementary or not. For me, I think that “فُتِحَتْ أَبْوَابُهَا” is the result of the ‘when’ clause that precedes it. This view is evidenced by the verse that comes before it and which reads {الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا إِلَىٰ جَهَنَّمَ زُمَرًا حَتَّىٰ إِذَا جَاءُوهَا فَتِحَتْ أَبْوَابُهَا} (Al-Quran 39:71), that is, {And those who were bent on denying the truth will be urged on in throngs towards hell till, when they reach it, its gates will be opened}. The rationale behind the statement of

the ‘واو’— though it is supposed not to be stated especially when the sentence is a result of a conditional sentence—is a statement that Almighty God has exclusively singled out the righteous who will be hosted in paradise with cordial reception and earnest dignity where the gates of paradise are wide-open upon their arrival as though paradise had previously set an appointment with them and had been waiting since. There is no temporal interval between the occurrence of the conditional sentence and the result that comes out of it, rather, the conditional sentence and the result occurred simultaneously. This is contrary to what is common in conditional sentences and their subsequent results—in a conditional sentence, the first clause happens followed by the consequence or result.

B. Almighty God says {إِنَّ رَحْمَةَ اللَّهِ قَرِيبٌ مِّنَ الْمُحْسِنِينَ} (Al-Quran 7:56), which is {verily, God’s grace is ever near unto the doers of good}. Some scholars claim that ‘رَحْمَةٌ’ (i.e. grace) is a supplementary word and that the statement should have been “إِنَّ اللَّهَ قَرِيبٌ مِّنَ الْمُحْسِنِينَ” (i.e. God is ever near unto the doers of good), not his grace. In fact, there are many opinions about this verse which have been quoted by Ibn al-Qayyim:

1. ‘قريب’ (i.e. ever near) in the verse is in the form of ‘فَعِيل’ which means ‘فَاعِل’, that is to say, it is a present participle. In this case, it must take ‘التاء’, however, it has been treated as ‘فَعِيل’ that means ‘مفعول’, a past participle, therefore, did not take ‘التاء’ as in the following examples: “امرأة قتيل”, “وكفت خضيب” and “عين كحيل”. These are instances in which the ‘فَعِيل’ does not require any ‘التاء’. ‘قريب’, hence, has been treated as such instances though it should have taken ‘التاء’. This is one of the most common method used by the scholars of Arabic syntax.

2- ‘رَحْمَةٌ’ (i.e. grace) is a divine attribute, and an attribute is incorporate in the one that the attribute is ascribed to, it never disassociates from it since the attribute never parts ways with the person qualified. Furthermore, if ‘رَحْمَةٌ’ (i.e. grace) is close to those who do good deeds, then, the one who is qualified with that attribute, ‘رَحْمَةٌ’ is closer to that grace than anyone else. The

closeness of his 'رَحْمَةً' is subordinate to His closeness to those who do good deeds.

The omission of the 'النَّاء' here yields a great benefit—that Almighty God is close and near to those bent on doing good deeds. This necessitates two types of closeness—his closeness and closeness of his grace. However, had the verse used 'النَّاء' as in 'إن رحمة الله قريبة من المحسنين', it would not have entailed the closeness of the Almighty to the doers of good because his own closeness is more especial and rewarding than the closeness of the grace—an open and general statement does not necessarily express something that is especial and exceptional. However, the closeness of the Almighty even though it is exceptional, yet, is general—the closeness of His grace. Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (1992m).

### AMBIGUITIES RESULTING FROM AL- ×AMLÑALÉ AL-MAÑNÉ OR AL-TAÏMÊN (SEMANTIC SUBSTITUTES)

#### 3.1. *al-×amlÑAlÉ al-MaÑnÉ* (semantic substitutes)

*Al-×amlÑAlÉ al-MaÑnÉ* “is to judge something based on something else that resembles it in its meaning, pronunciation, or both” (Ibn et al., 1985m). We can conclude from this definition that *al-×amlÑAlÉ al-MaÑnÉ* or semantic substitutes occurs when two words have likeness. In this case, we give the first word the meaning of the second provided there is a contextual relation; because things are treated the same way if they have similarities.

#### A. Making plural the pronoun that refers to singular

Almighty God says { مَثَلُهُمْ كَمَثَلِ الَّذِي اسْتَوْقَدَ نَارًا فَلَمَّا أَضَاءَتْ مَا حَوْلَهُ ذَهَبَ اللَّهُ بِنُورِهِمْ وَتَرَكَهُمْ فِي ظُلُمَاتٍ لَّا يُبْصِرُونَ } (Al-Quran 2:17), which means {Their similitude is that of a man who kindled a fire; when it lighted all around him, God took away their light and left them in utter darkness. So, they could not see}. Al-BÉqËLÉ says: this style has occurred in the Quran with words like “مَنْ، وَمَا،” “وَالَّذِي، وَكُلُّ، وَأَحَدٍ” etc. that are used at times for singular and at other times for plural—both styles, as

SÉbawayhi and other scholars point out, are common, therefore, eloquent.

For instance, Almighty God in { كَمَثَلِ الَّذِي اسْتَوْقَدَ نَارًا } { فَلَمَّا أَضَاءَتْ مَا حَوْلَهُ } which means { Their similitude is that of a man who kindled a fire } uses singular instead of plural, then uses plural instead of singular in the subsequent statement { ذَهَبَ اللَّهُ } { بِنُورِهِمْ }, {i.e. God took away their light}. al-Bāqūliyy and Ali bin al-Hussain (1420H).

Al-QurġubĒ (671 H) states that: { مَثَلُهُمْ كَمَثَلِ الَّذِي } {i.e. Their similitude is that of a man who} could mean “كَمَثَلِ الَّذِينَ اسْتَوْقَدُوا” “i.e. is like those who kindle”, thus, the Almighty says: “God took away their light”, He, almighty God substitutes plural with singular at the beginning and substitutes singular with plural at the end. As for this statement by almighty God { وَخُضْنُمْ كَالَّذِي خَاضُوا } (Al-Quran 9:69), which means {and you have been indulging in scurrilous talk – just as they indulged in it}, the word ‘الَّذِي’, (i.e. the one who) is a description of an omitted infinitive that reads: ‘وَخُضْنُمْ كَالْخَوْضِ الَّذِي خَاضُوا’, which means ‘you have been indulging in scandalous talk just like the scandalous talk that they indulged in’. It could also mean that almighty God may have used ‘الَّذِي’ and ‘اسْتَوْقَدَ’ in singular because the one who kindled the fire was one person from a group who assumed that responsibility. However, when the light went off, they were all in darkness, therefore, almighty God uses ‘بِنُورِهِمْ’ to convey that meaning. al-Qurġubi (1384H).

#### B. The plural pronoun that refers to dual or *al-MuthannÉ*

Almighty God says { هَذَانِ خَصْمَانِ اخْتَصَمُوا فِي رَبِّهِمْ } (Al-Quran 22:19) i.e. {These two antagonists dispute with each other about their Lord}. Al-AġfahĒnĒ (535 H) points out that meaning of ‘خَصْمَانِ’ (i.e. two antagonists) two groups—believers and disbelievers who fought on the day of Badr. This statement is ascribed to AbĒDharr. However, IbnĒAbbas says: the two antagonists or خَصْمَانِ are the People of the Book and the People of Quran. Al-×asan, MujĒhid, and ĒĒĒĒ state that خَصْمَانِ are believers and disbelievers. This is somehow the statement made by AbĒDharr earlier, but they did not make any mention of Badr

day. Almighty God used 'اِخْتَصَمُوا' the plural pronoun not to refer to 'خَصْمَانِ' which is dual expressing two explicit antagonists, but rather, to two groups. This explains why He used 'خَصْمَانِ'. al-Aṣṣfahānī (1995).

Al-FarrĒ', however, claim that Almighty God said { هَذَانِ خَصْمَانِ اِخْتَصَمُوا فِي رَبِّهِمْ } and did not say { اِخْتَصَمَا }, and He said { فَرِيقًا هَدَى وَفَرِيقًا حَقَّ عَلَيْهِمُ { الصَّلَاةُ } } and my father read "عَلَيْهِ الصَّلَاةُ". In all these instances, you will find that all the nouns are masculine collective ones. In these cases, it is linguistically permissible to either use a plural or a singular verb such as { وَإِنَّا لَجَمِيعٌ حَازِرُونَ } and { أَمْ يَقُولُونَ نَحْنُ جَمِيعٌ مُنْتَصِرُونَ }. (al-FarrĒ'. t.th: 1/258).

The Almighty says { هَذَانِ خَصْمَانِ اِخْتَصَمُوا فِي رَبِّهِمْ } فَالَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا قُطِعَتْ لَهُمْ ثِيَابٌ مِنْ نَارٍ يُصَبُّ مِنْ فَوْقِ رُءُوسِهِمْ { الْحَمِيمِ (19) يُصْهِرُ بِهِ مَا فِي بُطُونِهِمْ وَالْجُلُودُ :19-20), which means { These two antagonists dispute with each other about their Lord: But those who deny (their Lord),- for them will be cut out a garment of Fire: over their heads will be poured out boiling water (19) With it will be scalded what is within their bodies, as well as (their) skins. }

Al-ŌukburĒ says: Almighty's statement 'اِخْتَصَمُوا' is an infinitive that has been used as adjective. In this case, it is commonly used as singular. However, those who use it as dual and plural regard it as adjectives and nouns. The plural verb 'اِخْتَصَمُوا' is therefore used here because of what it entails as meaning. Moreover, every opponent is a group that consists of people. (al-ŌukburĒ, Abū al-Baqa: t.th: 2/ 937). There is also a semantic implication to this—a subtle significance. That is, even if a fight or dispute occurs often between two sides, nonetheless, it normally spreads out to include everyone around. Every team or group tries to win as many people as possible around. This person belongs to the first group and that to second group. Here tensions, hostilities and enmities arise and evil dominates over all.

### C. The singular relative pronoun that refers to plural

Almighty God says: { وَخُضُّنْتُمْ كَالَّذِي خَاضُوا } (Al-Quran 9:69), that is, {and you have been indulging in scurrilous talk – just as they indulged

in it}. "كَالَّذِي خَاضُوا" means "كَالْخَوْضِ الَّذِي خَاضُوا" i.e. just like the same insulting talk which they had been indulging before—this is concluded by al-FarrĒ'. It was also quoted that it means "كَالْخَوْضِ الَّذِي خَاضُوا" i.e. like the same insulting who have been indulging. It could be that the 'الَّذِي' is omitted and therefore, it reads "كَالَّذِينَ خَاضُوا" i.e. "كَخَوْضِ الَّذِينَ" that is, like the scandalous talk of those who..., it could be also that 'الَّذِي' and the relative clause that comes after it is transformed into infinitive which reads 'كَخَوْضِهِمْ' i.e. like their insulting talking. al-Andalusiyy and Abū (1420H). Al-ŌukburĒ says: 'الَّذِي' has two connotations—first: it is generic and means "خَوْضًا كَخَوْضِ الَّذِينَ" i.e. ill talking like the ill talking of those who had previously been indulged in it. This generic connotation of the relative pronoun 'الَّذِي' has equivalence in the following verse where Almighty God says: { مَثَلُهُمْ كَمَثَلِ الَّذِي اسْتَوْقَدَ } (Al-Quran 2:17), i.e. {Their similitude is that of a man who kindled}; second: it is an infinitive, therefore, the meaning becomes 'كَخَوْضِهِمْ' i.e. like their scandalous talking—this is however a rare case. (al-ŌukburĒ, Abū al-Baqa: t.th: 650).

IbnHishĒm has defined a relative particle as: every particle that has been transformed along with the relative clause into infinitive, and he demonstrated his claim by { وَخُضُّنْتُمْ كَالَّذِي خَاضُوا } i.e. you indulged in ill talking like they did. (IbnHishĒm. t.th: 1/143).

### D. Using macro plural instead of micro plural

Almighty God says: { وَالْمُطَلَّقَاتُ يَتَرَبَّصْنَ بِأَنْفُسِهِنَّ ثَلَاثَةَ قُرُوءٍ } (Al-Quran 2:228), that is, {Divorced women shall wait concerning themselves for three monthly periods}.

This verse has been criticized because the noun—the determiner that comes after number three is a macro plural "ثَلَاثَةَ قُرُوءٍ" (i.e. three periods) while it is supposed to be a micro plural. Furthermore, in Arabic numbers from three to ten should have a micro plural noun—determiner, not a macro one. The critics claim, therefore, that there is a grammatical error in this verse of the Quran. The author of TadhīĒlMaqĒlah FĒ al-IslĒm says: "stating macro plural where micro plural is

imperative...in His speech in chapter Baqarah: {وَالْمُطَلَّقَاتُ يَتَرَبَّصْنَ بِأَنْفُسِهِنَّ ثَلَاثَةَ قُرُوءٍ} ... the grammatically correct expression should have been 'أَقْرُوءٍ' or 'أَقْرَاءٍ'—micro plural, not 'قُرُوءٍ', macro plural.

This is a sheer misgiving because earlier scholars had previously raised the same problem but were able to find a well-thought-out answer to it. However, these critics or detractors have ill intention, therefore, felt victorious when they brought this grammatical ambiguity again to the forefront with a defamatory intent to confuse Muslims about the language of the book they see as sacred and divine.

Therefore, when Almighty God said: "وَالْمُطَلَّقَاتُ" i.e. divorced women in plural, He used macro plural because every divorced woman waits for "ثلاثة أقراء" three monthly periods. This view was preferred by al-HamdĒnĒ. (al-ŌsĒwĒ, YĒsuf, 2010m: p 65).

### 3.2. Problems that result from *al-TaĒmĒn*

IbnHishĒm defines *al-TaĒmĒn* as: it is to give a word the meaning and ruling of another word in order to cast two denotations on it. Ibn et al. (1985m). Al-SuyĒĒĒ says: *al-TaĒmĒn* aims to cast two denotations on a range of vocabulary, which is more effective than giving only one meaning. (al-SuyĒĒĒ: 1990m: 1/13).

#### A. Using numbers feminine and their determiners plural

Almighty God says: {وَقَطَعْنَاهُمْ اثْنَتَيْ عَشْرَةَ أَسْبَاطًا أُمَمًا} (Al-Quran 7:160), that is, {And We divided them into twelve tribes, [or] communities}. The number 'اثنتي عشرة' i.e. twelve is an adverb of manner that refers to the object of 'قَطَعْنَاهُمْ', that is, we divided them counting this number. Al-ZamakhsharĒ and AbĒ al-BaqĒĒ claim that 'قَطَعْنَاهُمْ' (i.e. we divided them) could mean 'صَيَّرْنَاهُمْ' (i.e. we turned them). In this case, 'اثنتي عشرة' (i.e. twelve) is a second object and 'أَسْبَاطًا' (i.e. tribes) is a substitute for 'اثنتي عشرة', that is, 'فرقة' (i.e. a team or group). AbĒIsĒĒq al-ZajjĒjĒ points out that it cannot be a determiner because if it was so, it would have been singular. More elaboration on this is upcoming in section of benefits. 'أُمَمًا' (i.e. nations or communities), however, is a substitute for

'أَسْبَاطًا' (i.e. tribes)—it is a substitute of another substitute, which is 'أَسْبَاطًا'. Dār wīsh (1415H). 'اثنتي عشرة' is determined by an plural noun despite the fact it is an singular number. It is determined in order to indicate that the word 'سببط' is encompassing and includes several tribes. The word 'سببط' means a grandson in general but it also entails a Jewish tribe. The root word suggests proliferation and propagation into nations or communities—'أُمَمًا'. It also entails how so extended and influential those Jewish communities were that other people joined them for protection and for their religion. It can also suggest that every nation from these tribes lead different people. (al-BiqāNĒ: t.th: 8/132).

### PROBLEMS THAT RESULT FROM SEMANTICS

A. Almighty God says: {وَمَنْ أَوْفَىٰ بِمَا عَاهَدَ عَلَيْهِ اللَّهُ { فَمَنْ أَوْفَىٰ بِمَا عَاهَدَ عَلَيْهِ اللَّهُ } (Al-Quran 48:10), that is, {whereas he who remains true to what he has pledged unto God, on him will He bestow a reward supreme}. The 'هاء' has *Īammah* on it even though it is supposed to be *kasrah* especially after 'الياء' because of the *sukĒn* that came after it in the word 'الله'. In this case it can have either *Īammah* or *kasrah*. Dār wīsh (1415H).

Semantically speaking, the choice of *Īammah* in the verse mentioned above has a powerful implication. *Öammah* is sign of majestic attitude and that well suites the context of fulfilling a pledge to Allah. Therefore, whoever fulfils the pledge they take in sight of Allah, is honored and dignified. Hence, the *Īammah* is a sign of dignity and honor for those who fulfil their pledge with Allah. The *kasrah*, however, is sign of humility and self-denial as pointed in the verse where Almighty God says: {وَيَخْلُدُ فِيهِ مُهَانًا} (Al-Quran 25:69), that is, {He will dwell therein in ignominy}. There is a long sound of *kasrah* on 'فيه', known as '*ishbĒN*', which gives the impression of humility, disgrace and ignominy—a situation in which disbelievers will find themselves on the day of judgment.

B. Almighty God says: {وَالَّذِينَ تَبَوَّءُوا الدَّارَ وَالْإِيمَانَ} (Al-Quran 59:9), that is, {And those who, before them, had their abode in this realm and in



faith}. In this divine statement there is an omission of a verb before the word 'الإيمان' (i.e. faith). AbĒ al-BaqĒ' comments on it saying: the verb has been used for two objects even though, in fact, it should have been only to one. That is to say, the remaining object has a verb that is hidden and not made apparent. Therefore, the full statement in {وَالَّذِينَ تَبَوَّءُوا الدَّارَ وَالْإِيمَانَ} is 'واعتقدوا' (i.e. and have faith). (al-KafawĒ, Abū al-Baqā'. t.th: 386).

We realize that omitting a verb in this context is more eloquent and in-depth since implies that they lodged and stayed in 'الإيمان' (i.e. faith) as though 'faith' has their abode that surrounds them from all directions. Thus, wherever they go, they are surrounded by the house. This a clear indication that they have attained the highest state of divine love, which is 'الإيثار' (i.e. altruism or selflessness)—Almighty God says: { وَيُؤْتِرُونَ عَلَىٰ { أَنفُسِهِمْ وَلَوْ كَانَ بِهِمْ خَصَاصَةٌ (Al-Quran 59:9), that is, {but rather give them preference over themselves, even though poverty be their own lot}.

### 5. Problems that result from understanding the context (*al-TarakhuĒfĒ al-QarĒ'in*) or using different form of word

5.1. Understanding the context or *al-TarakhuĒfĒ al-QarĒ'in*. First, we must explain what is meant by Understanding the context or *al-TarakhuĒfĒ al-QarĒ'in* and what its categories are.

#### Grammatical context or indices known as *QarĒ'in al-TaĒlĒq*

A text is meant to be understood, yet, to understand a text and context is imperative. The context or the indices can be either a situation or a case; it can also be semantic or lexical. Semantic context, for instance, is like *al-IsnĒd*, *al-TakhĒĒĒ*, *al-Nisbah*, *al-TabaĒniyyah*, and *al-MukhĒlafah*. Lexical context has to with *al-ĒAlĒmah al-INrĒbiyyah*, *al-Rutbah*, *al-ØĒghah*, *al-MuĒĒbaqah*, *al-RabĒĒ*, *al-TaĒĒm*, *al-'AdĒt*, and *al-TangĒm*. Hāssan. Tamām (n.d). Contexts are interchangeable, that is, they can replace one another providing that it does not lead to misunderstanding. Arabic is a language that tries to do away with any possible misrepresentation of a text—it is something that is of a primary

concern of Arabic. Therefore, if an intent or meaning can be convey with neither any misrepresentation, nor lexical contexts or indices, the Arabs permit the absence of indices. An example of this is allowing the context of index of *al-Rutbah* with no mention of it in the following poem: al-Ĥamawī (2004m).

ألا يَا نَخْلَةَ من ذات عرق. عَلَيْكَ وَرَحْمَةَ الله السَّلَام

Which means: O you, palm tree with a respectful family background peace be upon you.

Conjunction connectives are not used in this poem to bring these two simple sentences together. This is only allowed in the case of *al-TaĒĒm* where another sentence can meddle between a connective and the subsequent sentence—between an advanced subject (*al-khabar*) and late predicate (*al-Mubtada'*). This situation, *al-TaĒĒm*, is that makes it still a sentence. When indices multiply, they become interchangeable, which makes the meaning accessible. Tamām Hāssan (n.d).

#### A. The reference of a pronoun to something that is not stated in text

Pronouns normally refer to something that is stated previously in a sentence or text. Almighty God says: { وَعَلَّمَ آدَمَ الْأَسْمَاءَ كُلَّهَا ثُمَّ عَرَضَهُمْ عَلَى الْمَلَائِكَةِ { فَقَالَ أَنْبِئُونِي بِأَسْمَاءِ هَؤُلَاءِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ (Al-Quran 2:31), which is, {And He imparted unto Adam the names of all things; then He brought them within the ken of the angels and said: "Declare unto Me the names of these [things], if what you say is true."}. The pronoun in 'عَرَضَهُمْ' refers to the things that have been named not to the names themselves as it may appear. We know this because of the context 'فَقَالَ أَنْبِئُونِي بِأَسْمَاءِ هَؤُلَاءِ' even though the things that have been named are not explicitly mentioned. This meaning is also made possible because there is any confusion or misgiving whatsoever. Hāssan Tamām (1993m).

Almighty God says: { مَا يَفْتَحُ اللهُ لِلنَّاسِ مِنْ رَحْمَةٍ فَلَا مُمْسِكَ (لَهَا وَمَا يُمْسِكُ فَلَا مُرْسِلَ لَهُ مِنْ بَعْدِهِ وَهُوَ الْعَزِيزُ الْحَكِيمُ (Al-Quran 35:2), which means {Whatever grace God opens up to man, none can withhold it; and whatever He withholds, none can henceforth release: for He alone is almighty, truly wise}. In this verse, the pronoun is masculine 'لها', then it turns into feminine again. What seems to be

confusing is that both refer to one thing, however, some scholars in Islamic exegesis claim that the feminine pronoun refers to 'رَحْمَةً' (i.e. grace) while the masculine pronoun refers to 'مَا' (i.e. whatever) in the beginning of the sentence. 'مَا' is a relative pronoun that means 'الذي' (i.e. what/that/which). It is also so understood because nothing is stated after 'ممسك' that can explain it; nonetheless, it could also be interpreted as 'غضب' (i.e. the wrath of God and His grace), hence, the pronoun is made masculine because of that. Al-ZamakhsharĒ says: if you hypothetically ask why the pronoun came feminine first, then masculine knowing that it refers in the two cases to the noun that implies a condition, my answer is that both cases are authentic languages—one case refers to the meaning and the other to the word itself. The interlocutor, in both cases, is confused, thus, making the pronoun at times feminine based on its meaning and at times masculine according to the word itself. Moreover, because the first pronoun entails 'رحمة', it has been made feminine and since the second pronoun has not been explained, it is left in its natural case—masculine. If you insist that the second pronoun needs to be explained, my answer is that explaining it may either give the same meaning as the first pronoun but was left out because it is implied; and because it encompasses all what God withholds including His wrath and grace. The first pronoun is explained because it implies that the grace of God predominates His wrath. al-Zamakhshariyy Abū Qāsim Jarullah (1470H).

### B. A case in which there is no agreement between a number and a noun

Almighty God says: { إِنَّ نَسْأَ نُنَزِّلَ عَلَيْهِمْ مِنَ السَّمَاءِ آيَةً { فَظَلَّتْ أَعْنَاقُهُمْ لَهَا خَاضِعِينَ (Al-Quran 26:4), that is, {Had We so willed, We could have sent down unto them a message from the skies, so that their necks would [be forced to] bow down before it in humility}. How can 'خَاضِعِينَ' (i.e. in humility) be a predicate of 'الأعناق' (i.e. necks)? My answer is that the sentence is originally 'فظلوا لها خاضعين' (i.e. they remained humiliated) then 'الأعناق' (i.e. necks) was appropriated into it in order to show which part of the organ is subjugated and

humiliated. Therefore, the original statement stays as it is. It could be also that those described as being in humiliy are rational beings, therefore, 'خَاضِعِينَ' is used for that purpose. al-Zamakhshariyy Abū Qāsim Jarullah (1470H).

### C. A case in which there is no agreement between the number and glorification

a. Almighty God says: { يَخْلِفُونَ بِاللَّهِ لَكُمْ لِيُرْضُوكُمْ { وَاللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَحَقُّ أَنْ يُرْضُوهُ إِنْ كَانُوا مُؤْمِنِينَ (Al-Quran 9:62), that is, {[The hypocrites] swear to you by God [that they are acting in good faith], with a view to pleasing you [O believers] – the while it is God and His Apostle whose pleasure they should seek above all else, if indeed they are believers!}. The verse does not say 'أَنْ يَرْضُوهُمَا' (i.e. to please both) it rather says 'أَنْ يُرْضُوهُ' (i.e. to please him). The reason behind it is the clarity of context and the absence of any confusion. Here there is a significant semantic implication—the veneration and glorification of God. It was narrated that ṢAdiyyIbn ×Ētim said: Two men recited a *Tashahhud* before the Prophet and one of them said: 'Whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger has been guided aright and whoever disobeys them has gone astray.' The Messenger of Allah said: What a bad speaker you are! (al-Nasāiyy, 1986). In this Ādith the prophet has dispraised and reprimanded the man because he did not mention neither Allah nor his messenger.

b. Almighty God says: { إِنَّا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ شَاهِدًا وَمُبَشِّرًا وَنَذِيرًا لِتُؤْمِنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ وَتُعَزِّرُوهُ وَتُوَقِّرُوهُ وَتُسَبِّحُوهُ بُكْرَةً وَأَصِيلًا (Al-Quran 48:8-9), which means, {VERILY, [O Muhammad,] We have sent thee as a witness [to the truth], and as a herald of glad tidings and a warner (8) o that you [O men] might believe in God and His Apostle, and might honour Him, and revere Him, and extol His limitless glory from morn to evening}. As for "وتسبحوه بكرة وأصيلا" (i.e. and extol His limitless glory from morn to evening) it is exclusively for Almighty God and strictly forbidden for other than Him; because its meaning is either, as pointed out by Juwaybir, "وتصلوا له" (i.e. you might perform prayer for Him) or "وتعظموه وتنزهوه" (i.e. you might extol and glorify Him). (al-Nahhā:t.th: 6/500), the context that prevents any confusion here in this

verse is therefore rational. Glorification is only for God and cannot be for His messenger. His messenger (PBUH) deserves only esteem and reverence (al-Aṣḥānī, 1995).

### PROBLEMS THAT RESULT FROM A CHANGE IN THE FORM OF A WORD

What is meant by a ‘change’ here is when we replace a morphological form with another in order to comply with the context in which both convey the same general meaning, nonetheless, one of them is preferred to the other because of the context in which it is mentioned such as using infinitive instead of present participle.

Almighty God says: { وَالْوَالِدَاتُ يُرْضِعْنَ أَوْلَادَهُنَّ حَوْلَيْنِ كَامِلَيْنِ لِمَنْ أَرَادَ أَنْ يُنْتَظَرَ الرِّضَاعَةَ وَعَلَى الْمَوْلُودِ لَهُ رِزْقُهُنَّ كَامِلِينَ وَكَسُوَّتُهُنَّ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ لَا تَكْلَفُ نَفْسٌ إِلَّا مَا وَسَعَهَا } (Al-Quran 2:233), that is, {And the [divorced] mothers may nurse their children for two whole years, if they wish to complete the period of nursing; and it is incumbent upon him who has begotten the child to provide in a fair manner for their sustenance and clothing. No human being shall be burdened with more than he is well able to bear}.

The verb is a predicate that entails imperative, that is, “ليرضعن أولادهن” (i.e. nurse your children). This a predicate or non-instructional statement that suggests imperative and a must to carry something out. Moreover, the statement { فَسْتَرْضِعْ لَهُ أُخْرَى } (Al-Quran 65:6), that is, {let another woman nurse it on behalf of him} is predicate but has instructional and imperative tone, that is, “فليرضع” (i.e. let him nurse). This also applies to { وَالْوَالِدَاتُ يُرْضِعْنَ أَوْلَادَهُنَّ حَوْلَيْنِ كَامِلَيْنِ }, that is, {And the [divorced] mothers may nurse their children for two whole years, if they wish to complete the period of nursing} in which explicit word is non-instructional or predicate while the implicit meaning is instructional and imperative—the meaning is “وليرضعن أولادهن حولين كاملين” (i.e. you must nurse your children two full years). al-zajjāj (1988m), therefore, the sentence is a predicate that entails imperative; using a predicate form to entail imperative is more effective than a pure and natural instructional form as though using a predicate form suggests something that is normal

which people must do even they are instructed to do so.

The change here from a predicate to imperative suggests a semantic and aesthetic value.

“يُرْضِعْنَ أَوْلَادَهُنَّ” is a declarative sentence in terms of explicit denotation of the word, however, connotes instruction and imperative. That is, it is incumbent upon them [mothers] to nurse their own children. Using a declarative form in this context suggests that nursing is natural thing and common sense that a mother must do—it rather appeals to the motherhood and maternity of a mother. Ṭantāwī (1995).

### CONCLUSION

This research deals with problems related to Arabic syntax raised by critics vis-à-vis the Sacred Book of God due their ignorance and lack of in-depth knowledge about the nature of Arabic Language. It deals with the problems in perspectives that are completely different from previous studies on the same topic, that is, it treats it in four main different dimensions—the roots of the problem.

#### 7.1. Findings

Here are general findings:

1. The science of specification or *al-’Inr’Eb* is a key tool to understanding the meanings and secrets of al-Qur’Ēn.
2. The critics or detractors of the Book of God are ill-informed about Arabic Language, its stylistics, and its secrets. They lack knowledge of the methods and approaches of Arabs in speaking. Moreover, they are unaware of the distinctive styles found in the discourse of the Arabs—in stating, omitting, advancing, delaying and so on and so forth.
3. The Noble Qur’Ēn is an authoritative source of Arabic and contains the highest level of fluency, eloquence, and rhetoric.
4. Arabic has laid down objectives, aims, goals, rules, laws, explicit and semantic contexts, contextuality. Hence, to have a grasp of Arabic, the language of the Qur’Ēn, one must know all these. Lack of knowledge, however, about these basics can lead a researcher in the field of Arabic

Language, especially classics, to designate it as erroneous and incorrect.

5. Semantic dimension has great impact in interpreting many phenomena that are usually interpreted through rules. There are two cases to support this claim: first, when there are two statements or more about a grammatical issue, semantic cause can be of great help to determine the cause of choosing one statement over the others. Second, when a sentence violates grammatical rules with no clear reason, the semantic cause gives an answer to that.

Here are definite findings:

It is found, through this research, that the key reasons of the problems are as follows:

- Problems that result from omission or addition, omission of a letter, a verb, noun, an addition of a letter, a verb or noun.
- Problems that result from semantic alternatives as demonstrated in some verses where the pronoun is singular at the beginning and plural at the end.
- Problems related to semantics since the semantic aspect plays a key role in the interpretation of the Qur'ān such the omission of 'الواو' from the verb 'يَمْحُ' in the following statement by Almighty God: {وَيَمْحُ اللَّهُ الْبَاطِلَ} (Al-Quran 42:24), that is, {for God blots out all falsehood} in which the 'الواو' is omitted from the verb to show promptness in execution.
- Problems that result from context. This has many forms: the reference of the pronoun to something that is explicitly mentioned or to a number that does cohere with glorification of God.
- Problems related to interchangeability of morphological forms.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjāni. (1992). *Dalāil al-'ijāz fi' ilm al-ma'āni*. Cetakan 3. ed. Muḥammad shakir abū fahr. Kaherah: Maṭba'ah al-Madani.
- [2] al-Andalusiyy, & Abū, Ḥ. (1420H). *al-Baḥr al-Muḥiṭ fi al-Tafsir*. Ed. . Ṣadqī Muhammad Jamīl: Beirut: Dār a-Fikr.
- [3] al-Aṣfahānī, I. ī. b. M. (1995). *Irāb al-Qurān*. Cetakan. Riyāḍ: Maktabah al-Malik Fahd al-Waṭaniyyah.
- [4] al-Bāqūliyy, & Ali bin al-Hussain. (1420H). *Irāb al-Qurān*. Cetakan 4. Ed. Ibrāhīm al-Ībyāriyy. Kaherah: Dār al-Kutub al-Lubnāniyyah.
- [5] al-Ḥamawī. (2004m). *Khazānah al-Adab wa Ghāyah al-Arab*. Cetakan 4. Beirut: Maktabah al-Ḥilāl.
- [6] al-Nasāiyy. (1986). *al-Mujtaba min al-Sunan*. Cetakan 2. Ed. 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Gaddah. Ḥalib: Maktabah al-Maṭbu'āt al-Islāmiyyah.
- [7] al-Qurṭubi. (1384H). *Al-Jāmi' li Aḥkām al-Qurān*. Cetakan 2. Ed. Aḥmad al-Bardūniyy wa Ibrāhīm Aṭfish. Kaherah: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyyah.
- [8] al-zajjāj, A. I. (1988m). *Ma'āni al-Qurān wa I'rābuhu*. Ed. 'Abd al-Jalīl 'Abduḥ Syalbī. Beirut: Ālam al-kutub.
- [9] al-Zamakhshariyy Abū Qāsim Jarullah. (1470H). *Al-Kashshaf 'An Haqāiq Gawāmiḍ al-Tanzil*. Cetakan 3. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabiyy.
- [10] Dārwish, M. (1415H). *I'rab al-Qurān wa Bayānuhu*. Cetakan 4. Dimashq: Dār Ibn Kathir.
- [11] Ibn, H., Abdullah, b. Y. b. A. b., Abdullah, b. Y., Abū, M., & Jamāl, a.-D., Ibn Hishām. (1985m). *Mugnī al-Labīb 'an Kutub al-a'arīb*. Cetakan 6. Ed. Māzin al-Mubārak & Muhammad 'Ali Ḥamdallah. Dimashq: Dār al-Fikr.
- [12] Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya. (1992m). *Badāi' al-Fawāid*. Cetakan 3. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabiyy.
- [13] Makki, I. A. Ṭ. (1405h). *Mushkil I'rab al-Qurān*. Cetakan 2. Ed. Hātim Ṣoleh al-Ḍamin. Beirut: Muassasah al-Risālah.
- [14] Tamām, H. (1993m). *al-Bayān fi Rawā'i al-Qurān*. t.tp.: Ālam al-Kutub.
- [15] Tamām, H. (n.d). *Al-Lughah al-'Arabiyyah Ma'nāha wa Mabnāha*. t.th. Magribi: Dār al-Thaqāfah.

- [16] Tamām Hāssan. (n.d). al-Lughah al-‘Arabiyyah Ma’nāha wa Mabnāha. Magribi: Dār al-Thaqāfah.
- [17] Ṭanṭāwī, M. S. (1995). T.th. Al-Tafsir al-Wasīṭ li al-Qurān al-Karīm. Cetakan 1. Kaherah: Dār Nahḍah Misr li al-Ṭibā’ah wa al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī’.