**Abstract:** This paper discusses Ibn ‘Ashūr’s interpretation of the verses which serve as the basis of the Tawḥīd ḥākimiyyah concept. Despite being an expert in Islamic law, Ibn ‘Ashūr did not perceive the Tawḥīd ḥākimiyyah verses as a basis for the necessity to apply Shari’a law at the level of government. Perhaps the thought of “ḥākimīyatullāh” had not developed in the time of Ibn ‘Ashūr. Another reason, Ibn ‘Ashūr used a linguistic-sociological contextual approach when interpreting the verses claimed to be the basis of the Tawḥīd ḥākimiyyah concept. With this approach, Ibn ‘Ashūr did not use the Tawḥīd ḥākimiyyah verse to judge the behavior of the Muslims because in fact these verses were revealed to explain the behavior of the polytheists who opposed Islamic da’wah.
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**Introduction**

The extremist groups often voice the discourse of God’s sovereignty in social, political and legal sphere. According to them, only God has the right to make law. Making, implementing, and following the laws set by man is a form of polytheism. Based on the concept of the sovereignty of God, they judge in general Muslims in Muslim-majority countries have committed shirk. They also stated that Muslims have opposed the tawḥīd ḥākimiyyah principle, namely the theological conception which recognizes there is only single authority entitled to make the rule or law, that is God.

Based on this belief, they regard Muslims who not apply the law of God as being infidels. Their political wings strive to realize the formal implementation of Sharia law in the state constitutional dictum and the legislation system. Failure in democratic struggle has encouraged them to use violent means such as terror attacks. This is where terrorist groups base their political ideology. Here, the Ḥākimiyyah theology serves as the seed for radicalism among Muslims.¹

The concept of God’s sovereignty (ḥākimīyatullāh) first appeared in the historical stage of the modern Islamic world in the thought of Abū al-A’lā al-Maudūdi, a Muslim thinker of Pakistan. In the book al-Khilafah wa Al-Mulk,
al-Maudūdī formulated the basics of the Islamic political system based on the concept which he called the government of God (al-ḥakimiyah al-ilāhiyyah). Al-Maudūdī used a thematic approach, compiling Qur’anic verses of the infinite power of God. There are two forms of God’s power described in the Qur’an. First, the power to regulate the universe through strong natural laws. Second, power that governs man’s life through the laws that He has revealed through the oracles of His prophets. These laws of revelation -- as reflected in the Qur’an and Sunnah which underlie the system of Islamic governance -- embody the power of God. The Qur’an and Sunnah are two texts of the constitution of the Islamic State according to al-Maudūdī. Al-Maudūdī succeeded in formulating an interesting concept of an Islamic State, so that it was influential not only in the country of birth, but also in Arab countries such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia. This is mainly due to the assistance of its assisted organization, Jamā’ah Islāmiyyah.

In Egypt, al-Maudūdī’s thoughts on God’s sovereignty were adopted by the Ikhwān al-Muslimūn (IM) figure, Sayyid Qūṭb. His book, entitled Ma’ālim fi al-Ṭarīq (guidance for the path of struggle) and Tafsir fi Zilāl al-Qur’ān (under the shadow of the Qur’an), serves as guidelines for the movement of IM followers. Repressive government makes IM more radical, coupled with the idea of Modern Jahiliyah, which has been interpreted textually by some IM followers. The extreme group in the IM body then formed the Takfīr wa al-Hijrah wing under the command of Syukrī Muṣṭafā and his friends. This wing then turned into Jamā’ah Islāmiyyah, under control of one of them, Nājiḥ Ibrāhīm. Both IM and its splinter groups maintain the idea of an Islamic State, the ideology of God’s sovereignty and its supporting instruments. When IM was suppressed in Egypt, many activists fled to Saudi Arabia. This is where IM encountered the theology of Wahhabism. The encounter between IM political ideas and Wahhabism theology gave birth to a hybrid generation that has a puritanical theological view and a critical attitude toward the regime. This hybrid generation is represented by the group al-Saḥwah al-Islāmiyyah. In the case of the Soviet-Afghanistan war, young boys of IM-Wahhabism joined the local fighters. And after the end of the war, they consolidated themselves into an international mujahideen network, al-Qaeda, under the control of Osama bin Laden. Al-Qaeda is a faction in the body of political Islam that is critical of the rulers of the Arab countries and does not hesitate to use violence. The idea of God’s sovereignty is not lost in the spirit of this jihadist movement, even when the movement is divided into many factions. Their struggle is always
accompanied by claims of upholding the Islamic State, applying Sharia law and carrying out jihad.

In studies of jihadism in Indonesia, Aman Abdurrahman--the ideologist of the ISIS-backed terrorist group in Indonesia--is a figure who instilled the *tawḥīd ḥākimīyyah* doctrine in his supporters through a work entitled "*Review of Shirk Law in Tafseer Adlwaul Bayaan.*" The work is a translation of the work by Abdurrahman ibn 'Abd Al-'Azīz Al-Sudays entitled *al-Ḥākimīyyah fī Tafsīr Adhwā’ al-Bayān.* As stated in the title, this paper was inspired by the discussion of *Tafsīr Adhwā’ al-Bayān* by Syekh Amīn al-Shinqīṭ (1907-1973 M.). Amīn al-Shinqīṭ is a Mauritanian-born Saudi textual interpreter. The textual tendency is seen in the interpretation work which tries to interpret the Qur’an with strict Qur’anic texts. Its textuality can also be seen in his work entitled *Man’ Jawāz al-Majāz* (Argument of the Majaz Concept Rejection).

In explaining the *ḥākimīyyah* doctrine, al-Shinqīṭ used a number of Qur’anic verses which textually show that only Allāh has the right to make laws or rules. The limitation of authority to make law in al-Shinqīṭ’s point of view is based on the concept of monotheism. The concept of al-Shinqīṭ then used the "new" nomenclature, *tawḥīd ḥākimīyyah.* In the concept of al-Maudūdī and Sayyid Qūṭb, the nomenclature of *tawḥīd ḥākimīyyah* is almost unknown. Since it is based on the concept of monotheism, those who are considered to oppose this concept are regarded as polytheists, e.g., those who believe in the existence of more than one God.

In the interpretation of al-Shinqīṭ, there are at least eight verses used as the basis for the *tawḥīd ḥākimīyyah* concept: Qs. 12:40, Qs. 12:67, Qs. 42:10, Qs. 40:12, Qs. 28:88, Qs. 28:70, Qs. 5:50, Qs. 6: 114. The position of al-Shinqīṭ as an influential clerical figure in Saudi Arabia made his work an important reference for the Salafs. The doctrine of Tawhid Uluhiyyah, which is usually used by Salafi groups to legitimate authority that comes from agreement, gets a reinforcing argument with what is called *Tawḥīd ḥākimīyyah.* This doctrine is very popular with extremist groups such as Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz and Aman Abdurrahman.

Al-Shinqīṭ and his interpretation represent a new situation in the world of the Quranic Exegesis. He was born in the context of the modern world that knows the concept of the nation state, the constitution and the legislative system. From his point of view, the legal system in the context of modern statehood must be based on the law of God to affirm the sovereignty of God in the world of law (*ḥākimīyyatullah*). The concept of God’s Sovereignty is emerging in the modern Muslim world. In this era, besides al-Shinqīṭ in Saudi
Arabia, there was Abu al-A’lā al-Maudūdī (1903-1979 AD) in Pakistan and Sayyid Qūṭb (1906-1966 AD) in Egypt. While Sayyid Qūṭb uses God’s Sovereignty to criticize the social situation, Abu al-A’lā al-Maudūdī translates it in the context of state administration, al-Shinqīṭi translates in the context of the world of law / justice. All three offer the concept of God’s Sovereignty in response to the modern world of Muslims. The Discourse of God’s Sovereignty is only one of the many proposals of theo-social concepts present in the Islamic world. This is evidenced by the diversity of interpretations of the verses that are claimed to be the basis of the tawḥīd ḥākimiyyah which arise together with the birth of the discourse of God’s Sovereignty. Among the scholarly interpretations of the Qur’an in the modern Muslim world which has a traditional-compromise-progressive style is tafsir al-Tahrīr wa al-Tanwīr by al-Ṭahir Ibn ‘Ashūr (1879-1973 AD).

Ibn ‘Ashūr was a scholar, interpreter, academick who represented traditional currents because he was known to the school of Malik. He became Chief Justice of the Malik School, in Tunisia. A compromising scholar because he accepts modern ideas such as citizenship (jinsiyyah), democracy, etc. His progressive thought was shown by his attention to the development of the Maqasid al-Shari’ah concept to cover the lack of knowledge of ushul fiqh in finding Sharia law. In the book Niẓām al-Ijtīmā’ ʿal-Islāmī, Ibn ‘Ashūr praised the United States model of democracy. This view was surprising because Ibn ‘Ashūr also criticized ‘Alī ‘Abd al-Razziq who stated that Islam did not carry the state system. In the book Naqd Uṣūl al-Ḥukm, Ibn ‘Ashūr criticized ‘Alī ‘Abd al-Razziq who criticized the caliphate system. However, as mentioned earlier, Ibn ‘Ashūr precisely idealized a democratic country he thought to be in accordance with Islamic values.

Democracy, in the current of conservative Salafi thought, is considered to contain elements of disbelief such as the placement of humans as the center of authority that is contrary to the sovereignty of God (ḥākimiyyatullah). However, democracy in the thought of Ibn ‘Ashūr serves a means of cultivating Islamic values. The question arises, how did Ibn ‘Ashūr interpret the verses that explained tawḥīd ḥākimiyyah?

This article will examine Ibn ‘Ashūr’s views and interpretations of the verses that are made the postulate of the tawḥīd ḥākimiyyah by the Salafi group. The object of this research is the interpretation of Ibn ‘Ashūr on the eight tawḥīd ḥākimiyyah verses in the interpretation of al-Tahrīr wa al-Tanwīr namely: Qs. 12:40, Qs. 12:67, Qs. 42:10, Qs. 40:12, Qs. 28:88, Qs. 28:70, Qs. 5:50, Qs. 6: 114.
Brief Biography of Ibn ‘Āshūr

Ibn ‘Āshūr’s full name was Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir Ibn ‘Āshūr. ‘Āshūris a family name that refers to the name of his great-grandfather, a cleric who migrated from Andalusia to Tunisia after the fall of the Islamic empire there. ‘Āshūr later became an important cleric figure in Tunisia. Many of his descendants became great scholars. Among them is Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir.

Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir was born in 1879 in the city of Mursi, Tunisia. He began his education at the Sayyidi Abi Ḥadīd Mosque. He studied the Qur’an, Arabic grammar, and the basic fiqh of the Maliki School. In 1893, al-Ṭāhir Ibn ‘Āshūr registered at al-Zaytunah College when he was fourteen. Here, he studied Arabic grammar, Arabic literature, logic, Islamic law, the philosophy of Islamic law, hadith, the history of the Prophet, and history in general. Ibn ‘Āshūr completed his education by obtaining a formal diploma from the campus and a scholarly certificate from his teachers.

According to Ismā’il Ḥassānī, Ibn ‘Āshūr’s thought was influenced by three important social movements in his time. First, the reform of al-Zaytunah’s education system. Al-Zaytunah in Ibn ‘Āshūr’s time was not only a university that developed traditional Islamic scholarship, but it also developed ideas of reform. The al-Hadira magazine and scientific journals became the main characteristics of reform-oriented scientific development. The university was supported by Muslim activists who were reform-oriented and were compromised toward the colonial government. Second, reform of Tunisian nationalists, Khair al-Dīn al-Tūnisī. He was a politician who encouraged progress in Tunisia. Among his important contributions is the development of printing techniques. Third, reform of Jamāl al-Din Afghānī and Muḥammad ’Abduh. Ibn ‘Āshūr was very enthusiastic about the reform campaign of the two modernist figures. Thanks to ’Abduh, Ibn ‘Āshūr knew the book al-Muwāfaqāt by Al-Ṣāṭibī which contained the study of Maqāṣid al-Sāārī’ah.

Ibn ‘Āshūr built his career starting with al-Zaytunah, then became the Supreme Judge of the Maliki School in Tunisia. In the competition between Islamic schools of thought in the era of reform, this prestigious position placed him in the position of traditionalist groups that were still loyal to the Islamic school system in religious practice. In this context, Ibn ‘Āshūr practiced the Maliki school accompanied by the theology that followed the Ash’ari. As the Supreme Judge of the Maliki School, it is important to know his views on the verses understood by some as the basis for God’s sovereignty (ḥākimiyyatullāh). Ibn ‘Āshūr had controversial attitudes while serving as Chief Justice of the Maliki School. Among other things, his acceptance of naturalization policy by
the French Protectorate government. When most scholars forbade and believed that it might cause disbelief, Ibn ‘Ashūr declared it is allowed to follow the policy. When the Barguiba regime enacted a law on the prohibition of polygamy, Ibn ‘Ashūr seemed to be unmoving, without protesting despite his position as the Supreme Judge whose opinion was awaited. It’s a little different if we look at Ibn ‘Ashūr’s attitude in the matter of interfaith relations that tend to be conservative. For example, in the interpretation of Qs. Al-Maidah: 51, Ibn ‘Ashūr tended to view that forbids the election of non-Muslims as leaders. In fact, Ibn ‘Ashūr stated that Muslims should not be leaders for non-Muslims. Muslims who violate this law will be sentenced to apostasy.\(^\text{12}\)

This Ibn ‘Ashūr controversy gave birth to a different assessment from scholars. Ghālī Shukrī saw Ibn ‘Ashūr as a reformist Muslim figure.\(^\text{13}\) Whereas according to al-Ajhūrī, Ibn ‘Ashūr is actually a conservative scholar.\(^\text{14}\)

Judging from the problematic position of Ibn ‘Ashūr, on the one hand there is an impression of himself as an open-minded reformer, but on the other hand a conservative cleric that is completely closed-minded, however the one agreed upon is his position as Supreme Judge of the Maliki school. What was Ibn ‘Ashūr’s view of verses that speak of the sovereignty of God’s law if Ibn ‘Ashūr issued a fatwa that is contradictory to the law of God as the majority of scholars of his time understood, as in the matter of naturalization (of citizenship), and what was Ibn ‘Ashūr’s view of the verses of the ḥākimiyyah? Did he not feel that it is against God’s law?

**Tawḥīd Ḥākimiyyah**

In a linguistic perspective, tawḥīd ḥākimiyyah is taken from two words; "tawḥīd" and "ḥākimiyyah". Linguistically, tawḥīd means to believe in something singular (al-ḥukm bi anna al-shai’wahḥīd). In a popular use among scholars of theology, tawḥīd means believing in the divine nature of God, recognizing its oneness, and denying a competitor to God in general (ma’rifatullāh ta’ālā bi al-rubūbiyyah, wa al-iqrār bi al-wahdāntiyah wa nafy al-andalād ‘anhu jumlah).\(^\text{15}\) Whereas according to mystic-Sufis, tawḥīd means purifying the Essence of God from all perspectives of thought and all forms of emotional imagination (tajrid al-adzāt al-ilāhiyyah ‘an kulli mā yataṣawwaw fi al-afhām wa yatakhayyal fi al-aubām wa al-adzhān).\(^\text{16}\)

In the context of the doctrine of Salafism, tawḥīd has a specific definition. In their perspective, tawḥīd means believing in three basic concepts of Islam: rubūbiyyah, ulūhiyyah and asmā ‘waṣfīt. Rubūbiyyah is believing that Allāh is the only creator and ruler of the universe. Ulūhiyyah is purifying worship only
to Allâh. Whereas *tawhîd asmâ 'wa ṣîfât* means setting the name and nature of Allâh as Allâh calls and attributes Himself without doing *takwil* on strange definition. From the concept of *rububiyyah* and *ulubiyyah*, there appeared the concept of derivation called *tawhîd ḥâkimiyyah*. That is the belief that only Allâh has the right to make rules and Whose rules should be followed.\textsuperscript{17}

Believing in the existence of a ruler other than Allâh is a form of polytheism that is contrary to tauhîd. This definition is extended to those who follow and apply the rules formulated by human beings such as positive law (*al-qawânîn al-wadhîyyah*). Based on this concept, a country that does not apply the law of God is a polytheist state (*dawlah al-syîrk*) such as a democratic country which is considered to be contrary to the Tauhîd ḥâkimiyyah doctrine.\textsuperscript{18} The state apparatus who carry out the mandate of the law are polytheists and so is the civil society that supports democracy and all its products.\textsuperscript{19}

Historically, the concept of ḥâkimiyyah appeared in the modern era, or it could be regarded as a new concept (*muwallad*). It emerged at the same time as the emergence of an Islamist movement that wanted a constitutional system based on Islamic law. *Tawhîd ḥâkimiyyah* tried to combine the theological approach of "*tawhîd*" and "*ḥâkimiyyah*" government in a formulation of the political system of power. Among the figures who came up with the ḥâkimiyyah idea was Abû al-A’lā al-Maudūdî (1903-1979 M.) in Pakistan dan Sayyid Ḥusayn (1906-1966 M.) in Egypt\textsuperscript{20} and al-Shinqîṭ (1907-1973 M.) in Saudi Arabia.\textsuperscript{21}

While Sayyid Ḥusayn used the Sovereignty of God to criticize the social situation, Abû al-A’lā al-Maudūdî interpreted it in the context of state administration, and al-Shinqîṭ interpreted in the context of the sphere of law / justice. The three of them offered the concept of God’s Sovereignty as a response to the development of the national state in the modern world of Muslims. Social, political and legal affairs became the dimensions of life that should be under the authority of God.

Although it emerged from the thoughts of the three figures above, by nomenclature, the term *tawhîd ḥâkimiyyah* only appeared in the hands of a Saudi Arabian scholar, ‘Abd al-Raḥmân bin Abd al-Azîz al-Sudais. His dissertation on the view of Amîn al-Shinqîṭ in the Tafsîr of Adhwâ ‘al-Bâyan emphasized the need for the application of the *tawhîd ḥâkimiyyah* in the world of justice. The dissertation resume, entitled *tawhîd ḥâkimiyyah*, seems more famous than the full version of his dissertation. Al-Sudais was a radical figure in Saudi Arabia. He was arrested and imprisoned because of his harsh attitude. His dissertation was highly appreciated by jihadist groups. It was translated into
Indonesian by the Indonesian Salafi-Jihadi figure, Aman Abdurrahman, founder of the Tauhid Wal Jihad group.\textsuperscript{22}

The *tawḥīd ḥākimīyyah* concept is widely used by political Islamic groups, both violent and non-violent. The Muslim Brotherhood reflects non-violent political Islamist groups while Salafi-Jihadi represents violent groups. For this group, a violation of the *tawḥīd ḥākimīyyah* concept implies the denial of the faith of a Muslim. Offenders are considered apostates and polytheists. It is no longer a form of disobedience.

**Ibn ‘Āshūr’s Interpretation**

Ibn ‘Āshūr had an interpretive method characterized by a strong language approach. Despite the background of Ash’ari theology and Maliki fiqh, Ibn ‘Āshūr also supported the rationalist ideas of modern Islamic reform. But the bond to the Maliki School was very strong compared to support for reform without its school. Ibn ‘Āshūr was very strongly influenced by Arabic literary theories (stylistics), inter-verse cohesion (munāṣabah baina al-āyāt) and the socio-historical context of a verse. Ibn ‘Āshūr rarely used a thematic approach by removing a text from the context of the sentence or its socio-historical context. Here are Ibn ‘Āshūr’s interpretation of the eight verses that are often used as the basis for *tawḥīd ḥākimīyyah*.

1. **Judgment rests with Allāh alone, worshipping Allāh (Qs. 12: 40)**

In interpreting Qs. 12: 40, *in al-ḥukm illā lillāh amara an lā ta’budu illā iyyāh* (legislation is not but for Allāh. He has commanded that you worship not except Him), Ibn ‘Āshūr said the word *al-ḥukm* means *tasarruf* (the power of creating). Taking into account the context of the previous verse, Ibn ‘Āshūr related it to the previous verse about the belief of the polytheists who believe in the idols of their offerings to be of benefit to themselves. Ibn ‘Āshūr said Qs. 12: 40 is a form of negation of the beliefs of the polytheists (*ibtāl li jamī’ al-tasarrufat al-maz’ūmah li ālihatihim bi annahā lā ḥukma lahā fīmā za’amu annabū min ḥukmihā wa tasarrufihā).*\textsuperscript{23} This statement shows that Ibn ‘Āshūr understood the law more theologically, namely the power of creating (*tasarruf*). The diction of "*ḥukm*" in Qs. 12:40, in Ibn ‘Āshūr’s perspective, does not mean legislation (*al-Qānūn al-Wadl’iyyah*).

2. **Judgment rests with Allāh alone, Surrender to Allāh (Qs. 12: 64)**

Similar interpretation patterns are found in Qs. 12: 64, *in al-ḥukm illā lillāh alaihi tawakkaltu* (legislation is not but for Allāh, only to Him I surrender). Ibn ‘Āshūr said *"wa al-ḥukm buna bi ma’na al-tasarruf wa al-taṣādir"* (legislation...
in this verse means the power to create and determine). The meaning of legislation is not but for Allāh is that only with Allāh's will is what will happen. In essence, a human being cannot oppose Allāh's will. Humans are only obliged to make things that are the cause of the case they want. Allāh commands it. Here, legislation is not a statutory law applicable within a country but the power and destiny of Allāh which applies to all of His creatures.

3. Ruling is to be referred to Allāh (Qs. 42: 10)

In Qs. 42: 10, *wa mā ikhtalaftum fīhi min shai‘in fā ḥukmuhū ila allāh* (And in anything over which you disagree - its ruling is [to be referred] to Allāh), Ibn 'Āshūr interpreted this verse in the context of disputes between Muslims and polytheists. The ruling in this verse means Allāh’s decision on the Day of Judgment that the faithful who are in the truth will get a reward, and the polytheists who are in evil will get punishment. Clearly, Qs. 42:10 speaks of a delay in legal decisions until the end of the world; when God gives all decisions (*ta’khīr al-ḥukm ila ḥulūl al-waqt al-mu‘ayyan lahū ‘inda allāh*). Here, Ibn 'Āshūr stated that the reference of the ruling to Allāh occurs only in the Hereafter, not in this world. Thus, according to Ibn 'Āshūr, Qs. 42: 10 does not talk about the application of Sharia law as positive law (*al-qānūn al-wadh‘i*).

4. Judgment rests with Allāh, the Most High (Qs. 40: 12)

In Qs. 40: 12, there is the word of God that reads, *dzālikum bi annahū idzā du‘iyya allāh wahdah kafartum wa in yusyrik bihi tu‘minu fa al-ḥukm lillāhi al-‘aliyyi al-kabīr* (That is because, when Allāh was called upon alone, you disbelieved; but if others were associated with Him, you believed. So the judgment is with Allāh, the Most High, the Grand). Ibn 'Āshūr interpreted the word "al-ḥukm" in Qs. 40: 12 above by saying that the "al" prefix in the word "al-ḥukm" serves as *li al-jins* (generalize to anything classified as law or decision). The purpose of decision generalization is the expansion of the object being punished. That is the decision for all creatures inhabiting the universe. All decisions about the inhabitants of the universe are in the power of Allāh. According to Ibn 'Āshūr, Allāh will only make decisions to the inhabitants of the universe on the Day of Resurrection (*lā ḥukma yaum al-qiyāmah li ghairi Allāh ta‘ālā*). Ibn 'Āshūr did not interpret the law as a decision in the world to solve social problems. This of course negates the assumption that the law in this verse means Qur’anic verses that must be positioned as a source of legal references.
5. Judgment rests with Allāh, and to Him you will be returned (Qs. 28: 88)

In Qs. 28: 88, there is a verse that reads, *wa lā tad’u ma’a allāh ilāhan ākhara lā ilāha illā huwakullu syai’in hālikun illā wajbah, lahu al-ḥukm wa ilaibi turja’ïn* (And do not invoke with Allāh another deity. There is no deity except Him. Everything will be destroyed except Allāh. His is the judgment, and to Him you will be returned). Ibn ‘Āshūr interpreted Qs. 28: 88 above in the context of criticism of polytheism and prove the guilt of the polytheists where they acknowledge the deity of Allāh and at the same time they recognize another god who is believed to be able to give help (*syurakā ’wa syufa’ā*). *Al-ḥukm* in Qs. 28: 88 means the most perfect decision in the sense that no one can reject it (*al-ḥukm al-atamm alladzī la yarudduhū radd*). Ibn ‘Āshūr did not speak of law as a rule in a system of government or law in the sense of the Qur’anic text. Ibn ‘Āshūr spoke of God’s most perfect and indisputable provision (*la yaruddubu radd*). Presumably, Allāh’s indisputable provisions are related to the truth of the concept of monotheism taught by the Qur’ān. Polytheism will perish and the wrongs will be apparent, while the belief of monotheism will survive (*illā wajbah*). However, the strongest decision belongs to Allāh as will be revealed when humanity is returned to Him. Probably, being returned in this context is in the afterlife as Ibn ‘Āshūr’s other interpretations that are related to Allāh’s absolute decision.

6. Final decision is with Allāh (Qs. 28: 70)

In Qs. 28: 70, there is a verse that reads, *labu al-ḥamd fi al-ūlā wa al-akhirah, wa labu al-ḥukm wa ilaibi turja’ïn* (To Him is due all praise in the first life and the Hereafter. And His is the final decision, and to Him you will be returned). Ibn ‘Āshūr argued that *al-ḥukm al-qadhā’ wa huwa ta’yin naf’ in au dhurrin li al-ghair* which means law is a decision that give benefits or put a danger on others. This notion aims to refute the claims of the polytheists who believe that their gods have the power to create (*al-taṣarruf*) and the belief that gods can provide help in the sight of Allāh. In Ibn ‘Āshūr’s view, Qs. 28: 70 is addressed to the polytheists who believe in a god other than Allāh. God is believed to have the power to create or have special privileges in the sight of Allāh. Qs. 28: 70 says that belief is wrong because only Allāh has the power to create and determine to give intercessions or not in the hereafter. Ibn ‘Āshūr, as in the other "*tawḥid ḥākimiyyah*" verses, did not interpret the verse in the context of the worldly positive law. But it refers more to the divine power to create and organize the universe (*al-taṣarruf*).
7. Is it the judgment of the ignorant you desire? (Qs. 5: 50)

In Qs. 5: 50, there is a verse that reads, *a fa ḥukm al-jāhiliyyah yabghun wa man ahsanu minallāhī ḥukman li qaumin yūqinun* (Then is it the judgment of [the time of] ignorance they desire? But who is better than Allāh in judgment for a people who are certain in faith). Ibn 'Āshūr stated that ‘the judgment of the ignorant’ was the punishment used among the Jewish tribes which originated from the punishment of Yathrib. Yastrib inhabitants belong to the ignorant people. Banu Nadhir, one of the Arab-Jewish tribes, did not accept being equated with the Quraizhah tribe and did not accept the provisions they made using the punishment from the Yastrib Arabs who did not have a holy book. The punishment of the Arabs of Yastrib against adulterers was not by stoning the perpetrators as stated in the Torah. The judgment of the ignorant in this context was "punishment" or a form of "sanction" that applies to pre-Islamic Arabs. Apparently, Ibn 'Āshūr interpreted "jāhiliyyah" as a condition of society without the guidance of scripture (*ahl al-kitāb*). The form of punishment that comes from the traditions of the pagan Arab nation is called "the judgment of the ignorant", while the form of punishment contained in the scriptures is called "the judgment of Allāh". Here, the judgment is a form of sanction not a holy book that is positioned as a legislation.

8. Is it other than Allāh I should seek as judge? (Qs. 6: 114)

In another verse, i.e. Qs. 6: 114, there is a sentence that reads, *a faghaira allāh abtaghī hakaman wa huwa alladzi anzala ilaikum al-kitāb mufaṣṣalā* (Then is it other than Allāh I should seek as judge while it is He who has revealed to you the Book explained in detail?). Ibn ‘Āshūr put this verse in reference to the previous verse which describes the opposition, lies, and the attempts of the polytheists to ask for proof of the truth of the Holy Prophet’s teachings. Allāh commanded Prophet Muhammad to answer their doubt and refusal by stating that we make Allāh the decision-maker (*ḥakam*) of the truth of the teachings he preaches. Everyone will die and will get a judgment in the afterlife before Allāh. Allāh’s decision in the hereafter will not be able to be refuted. Al-Hakam means party who gives irrefutable decisions. The word al-Ḥakam is deeper in its meaning than al-Hākim. Allāh is called Al-Hakam but not Al-Hākim. Ibn ‘Āshūr stated that the meaning of Qs. 6: 114 is that Prophet Muhammad would not seek a judge for his dispute with the idolaters who rejected his preaching except to Allāh, the God whose decision is irrefutable. Allāh will surely decide that they are the enemies and the sinners (*a’da’*
Qs. 6: 114 in Ibn ‘Āshūr's perspective, is understood as Allâh's decision in the hereafter, not in this world.

Of the eight verses that form the basis of tawhid ḥākimiyyah, Ibn ‘Āshūr did not interpret them as Qur’anic texts used as references in legal decision making like positive laws (al-qānun al-wadh’i). Nor did he interpret them bearing the concept of tawhid ḥākimiyyah which presupposes the Qur’an as the corpus of the "law of God" which humanity must apply. Ibn ‘Āshūr also did not view the eight verses as the law of God which if anyone rejects them, can have consequences of disbelief or polytheism. The word judgment in Ibn ‘Āshūr's interpretation of Ḥākimiyyah verses is often interpreted as Allâh's decision in the afterlife, the power of creation (al-taṣarruf), and the form of punishment contained in the scriptures.

Conclusion

Tawhid ḥākimiyyah is a theological-political-ideological concept formulated by Muslim political thinkers. This concept leads to the revitalization of God's position in the Muslimsocio-political life. The thinkers based it on a number of Qur’anic verses which textually mean the affirmation of the power of God in the socio-political system. The 'dissidents' before this theological-political concept, were categorized as polytheists equivalent to those who believe in the doctrine of polytheism. Among the proponents of the tawhid ḥākimiyyah were Abû al-A’lā al-Maudūdî, Sayyid Quṭb and Amîn al-Shinqîṭ. In particular, the nomenclature of tawhid ḥākimiyyah is derived from the formulation of al-Shinqîṭ.

Ibn ‘Āshūr who lived before the tawhid ḥākimiyyah thinkers above, despite being an important figure in Islamic law, had a more flexible view of the tawhid ḥākimiyyah verses. He used a contextual-linguistic approach and the social context of the verses. He always related the verses prior to "the tawhid ḥākimiyyah verses", and often, it was generally found that the verses before the tawhid ḥākimiyyah spoke of the behavior of the polytheists who were condemned by the Qur'an. This is different from the method of interpretation of tawhid ḥākimiyyah proponents who often take out a verse, then with a thematic approach combine it with similar verses. Ibn ‘Āshūr did not use the descending verses to explain the polytheists to judge the behavior of Muslims in contrast to al-Shinqîṭ who interpreted these verses to assess the socio-political conditions of Muslims, especially those applying positive laws.

Then, Ibn ‘Āshūr viewed the socio-political context when the ḥākimiyyah verses were revealed. The context is the polytheists who opposed the preaching
of Prophet Muhammad. This is in contrast to the pattern developed by the tawḥīd hākimīyyah proponents who presumably put forward more rigorous attitudes. They ignored the difference in context between the time when the verse was revealed and the context when the verse was interpreted. This neglect was allegedly because they made an analogy between the behavior of polytheists and that of Muslims who do not apply sharia law at the level of legislation.

Texts of the Tafsir Al-Tahrīr wa al-Tanwīr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Qs.</th>
<th>Qur'anic text</th>
<th>Tafsir Ibn ‘Āshūr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>12: 40</td>
<td>إِنِ الحَكْمُ إِلَّا بِاللهِ أَمَرَ أَلَّا تَعَمَّمُوا إِلَّا إِبْطَالٌ لِِمِيعَ التَّاصَرُّفَاتِ الْمَزْعُومَةِ لِِلَّهِمْ بَِِن اهَا حُكْمَ لََِا فِيمَا زَعَمُوا أَناوُ مِنْ حُكْمِهَا وَتَصَرُّفِهَا</td>
<td>التحرير والتنوير (12/277)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>12: 67</td>
<td>إِنِ الحَكْمُ إِلَّا بِاللهِ عَلَىٰ تَوَلُّقَتْ</td>
<td>التحرير والتنوير (13/23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>42: 10</td>
<td>وَمَا اخْتُلِفَ فِيهِ مِنْ شَيْءٍ مَّـفْتَحَةٌ إِلَى اللَّهِ</td>
<td>التحرير والتنوير (25/41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
بِلِيرِْ اللاااِرِ إِاَ أَحَدٍ ي َنْزِلُ عِنْدَهُ .
وَلََّ عَلََ َةَ لَِِذِهِ الِْيَةِ باِخْتِلََفِ عُلَمَا ِ الُْْماةِ فِِ أُصُولِ الدِّينِ وَف ُرُوعِوِ
لَِْنا ذَلِكَ الَِّخْتِلََفَ حُكْمُوُ مَنُوطٌ باِلناظَرِ فِِ الَْْاِلاةِ وَالَْْ ْيِلَةِ صِحاةً
وَفَلَااًا فَإِصْدَا ُ الُْْكْمِ ب َ َْ الْمُصِيبِ وَالْمُخْطِئِ فِيهَا يَلِيرٌ إِنْ  َا َ
النااسُ التادَاوُلَ وَااِْنْصَافَ .
وَبِذَلِكَ ت َوَصالَ أَىْلُ الَْْقِّ إِاَ التامْيِ به ذِهِ الِْيَةِ ن ُفَاةُ الْقِيَاسِ، وَىُوَ احْتِ َااٌ لََّ ي َرْتَضِيوِ نَطااسٌ
التحرير والتنوير (24/101)
وَجِ  َ فِِ الشارْطِ الثاانِِ بَِِرْفِ إِنْ الاتِِ أَصْلُهَا عَدَمُ الَِْزْمِ بِوُ ُوعِ  َرْطِهَا،
أَوْ أَنا  َرْطَهَا أَمْرٌ مَفْرُواٌ، مَعَ أَنا ااِْ ْرَاكَ مَُُقاقٌ ت َنْزِيلًَ لِلْمُحَقاقِ مُنْزِلَةَ
الْمَشْكُوكِ الْمَفْرُواِ لِلت انْبِيوِ عَلَى أَنا اَلََّاِلَ بُطْلََنِ الشِّرْكِ وَاضِحَةٌ
بَِِاْنََ تَََمُّلٍ وَتَدَبُّرٍ ف َن َزالَ إِ ْرَا َهُمُ الْمُحَقاقَ مَنْزِلَةَ الْمَفْرُواِ لَِْنا الْمَقَامَ
مُشْتَمِلٌ عَلَى مَا يقْلَعُ مَضْمُونَ الشارْطِ مِنْ أَصْلِوِ فَلََ يَصْلُحُ إِلَّا لِفَرْضِوِ
عَلَى نََْوِ مَا يفْرا الْمَعْدُوم مَوْجُواًا أَوِ الْمُحَالُ مُُْكِنًا .
وَاللَامُ فِِ لِلِّاِ لِلْمِلْكِ أَيْ جِنْسُ
واللَامُ فِِ لِلِّاِ لِلْمِلْكِ أَيْ جِنْسُ
وَاللَامُ فِِ لِلِّاِ لِلْمِلْكِ أَيْ جِنْسُ
وَىُوَ  َصْرٌ حَقِيقِ ٌّ إِذْ لََّ حُكْمَ
ي َوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ لِ َيرِْ الِلّاِ ت َعَااَ
وَبَِِذِهِ الِْيَةِ تَََلاكَ الَْْرُو ِياةُ ي َوْمَ حَرُو َا َ حِ َ تَدَاعَى جَيْشُ الْكُوفَةِ
وَجَيْشُ الشاامِ إِاَ التاحْكِيمِ ف َثَا َتِ الَْْرُو ِياةُ عَلَى عَلِ ٌّ بْنِ أَبِِ طَالِبٍ
وَ َالُوا
لََّ حُكْمَ إِلَّا لِلِّاِ (جَعَلُوا الت اعْرِي َ لِلْ ِنْسِ وَالصِّي َةَ لِلْقَصْرِ)
وَحَدا ُوا إِاَ ىَذِه الِْيَة وأغضوا عَنْ آيََّاتٍ جَُاةٍ، ف َقَالَ عَلِ ٌّ لَماا سََِعَهَا:
"َلِمَةُ حَقٍّ أُ ِيدَ بَِِا باَطِلٌ
اضْطَرَبَ النااسُ وَ َْ يَتِما التاحْكِيمُ
ذَلِكُمْ بَِِناوُ إِذَا اُعِ َ الِلّاُ
وَحْدَهُ  َفَرْتُُْ وَإِنْ يُشْرَك
بِوِ ت ُؤْمِنُوا فَالُْْكْمُ لِلِّاِ
الْعَلِ ِّ الْكَبِيرِ
40:12
التحرير والتنوير (20/196)
وَجْهَوُ لَوُ الُْْكْمُ وَإِلَيْوِ
ت ُرْجَعُونَ
28: 88
وهذا النص هو الذي طالب الله عليه وسلم بفضله في الطاهر، والمقصود
به إيطال القرآن وإظهاره خلال أهله إذ يرغمون أنهم مغفلون بإبراهيم
الله تعالى وأنتهم إذ أنتمو له شركاء، فثبت أن الله لا إنه
عُزْزٍ، وأن المفاضلة بالإلهية في نفس الأمر يفضلك ببطولcción الإشراف في
الاعتقاد والوأصطفى إطرازك، فجمالاً لا إله إلا هو في معنى العبادة للشجاع
الذي في الجملة فعلها.
وَجُلَّةُ لِلُّكَمُ وَإِلَيْهِ تُرْجَعُونَ تَذْيِيلٌ فَلِذَلِكَ َانَتْ مَفْصُولَةً عَلَى مَا لَهَا.

أَيِ الاذِي لَّ يُرَاُهُ أَيْضًا لِلْمِلْكِ

وَالت اقْدِيمُ لِلَِخْتِصَاصِ أَيْضًا.

وَحُذِفَ الْمُت َعَلِّقُ باِلُْْكْمِ لِدَلََّلَةِ   َوْلِوِ فِِ الُْْوا وَالِْخِرَةِ عَلَيْوِ، أَيْ لَوُ الُْْكْمُ فِِ الدَايْنِ

وَالَِّخْتِصَاصُ مُلْت َعْمَلٌ فِِ حَقِيقَتِ وَمَََازِهِ لَِْنا الُْْكْمَ فِِ الدُّنْيَا يَثْبُتُ

وَفِِ   ىَذَا إِبْطَالٌ لِتَصَرُّفِ آلَِِةِ الْمُشْرِ ِ َ فِيمَا يُزْعُمُونَ وَمِنْ تَصَرُّفَاتِهَا إِبْطَالٌ لِشَفَاعَتِهَا الاتِِ يُزْعُمُونَهَا فِِ   َوْلِِِمْ ىؤُلَّ ِ ُفَعاؤُنا عِنْدَ الِلّاَ.

أَيْ فِِ الِْخِرَةِ إِنْ مَا زَعَمْتُمْ مِنَ الْبَعْ ِ.

لَوُ الَْْمْدُ فِِ الُْْواَ وَالِْخِرَةِ وَلَوُ الُْْكْمُ وَإِلَيْوِ تُرْجَعُونَ

فَإِنْ تَوَلاوْا فَاعْلَمْ 

الْمَااِدَةَ: 49 إِلََِ اسْتِفْهَامًا عَنْ مُرَااِىِمْ مِنْ ذَلِكَ الت اوَلِّّ، وَالَِّسْتِفْهَامُ إِنْكَا ِيٌّ، لَِْن اهُمْ طَلَبُوا حُكْمَ الَِْاىِلِياةِ

وَحُكْمُ الَِْاىِلِياةِ ىُوَ مَا تَقَرَّبَ بَََ َ ِرَيْظَةَ مَا تَقَدَمَ وَمَا بَصااِرُ مِنْ ُسُلِوِ

أَيْ يُقُولُونَ.

وَوْلُوُ الْمُت َقَدِّمُ آنِفًا َدْ جا َ ُمْ

بَصااِرُ مِنْ ُسُلِوِ

أَيْ يُقُولُونَ.

وَ َوْلُوُ الْمُت َقَدِّمُ آنِفًا َدْ جا َ ُمْ

بَصااِرُ مِنْ ُسُلِوِ

وَضَعُوهُ مِنَ الَْْحُكْامِ بَََ َ َْ أَىْلِ الَِْاىِلِياةِ، وَىُوَ الْعُدُولُ عَنِ الرَّجْمِ الاذِي

وَحُكْمُ الت اوْ َاةِ

أَفَحُكْمَ الَِْاىِلِياةِ يُب ْ ُونَ وَمَنْ أَحْلَنُ مِنَ الِلّاِ حُكْمًا لِقَوْمٍ يُو ِنُونَ

5: 50

أخفَى الْجِهَادِيَّةُ يَبْعَونَ

6: 114

عَفَّ اللهُ الْأَنْفُغُ حُكْمًا

أَفَ حُكْمَ الَِْاىِلِياةِ يُب ْ ُونَ وَمَنْ أَحْلَنُ مِنَ الِلّاِ حُكْمًا لِقَوْمٍ يُو ِنُونَ

6: 50

أخفَى الْجِهَادِيَّةُ يَبْعَونَ

5: 50

أَفَحُكْمَ الَِْاىِلِياةِ يُب ْ ُونَ وَمَنْ أَحْلَنُ مِنَ الِلّاِ حُكْمًا لِقَوْمٍ يُو ِنُونَ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aman Abdurrahman, Kupasan Syirik Hukum Dalam Tafsir Adlwaul Bayaan, published by the Community of Tawhid and Jihad, without year. Aman Abdurrahman was a preacher involved in a number of terrorism cases. Inside the terror group, Aman and his group were dubbed takfiri because they were known to be hard in applying the principles of labeling others as disbelievers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Abdurrahman ibn ‘Abd Al—'Azīz Al-Sudays, Al-Hakimiyah Fi Tafsir Adhwa’ Al-Bayān, published in on the site minbar al-taubid wal al-jihad. An imam at Masjid Al-Furqan, Mecca, and a lecturer at Ummul Qura University, Mecca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A Saudi cleric from Mauritania who had a career as a lecturer at the Islamic University of Madinah. Among his famous books are Tafsir Adhwā’ al-Bayān fī Tafsir al-Qur’ān bi al-Qur’ān. An intertextual pattern of interpretation that interprets the Qur’an with the Qur’an. Another famous book is Man 'Jawāz Al-Majāz. Like Ibn Taymiyah, this book presents an argument why Muslims need to reject the concept of majaz as is known in classical Arabic literature studies. At first, he was a follower of the Maliki school. When he moved to Saudi Arabia, he became acquainted with the Hanbali school and manhaj salaf. Since then, his manhaj salaf tendency became stronger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Al-Zirkli, Al-A’lām.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


18. Abū Muḥammad al-Ma‘qūdisī, al-Dimūqrāṭīyyah Din.


25. Ibn ‘Āshūr rejection the differences of opinion among Muslims regarding this verse. According to him, the differences of opinion among the Muslims in the matter of theology (uṣūl al-dīn) and Islamic law (furū‘ al-dīn), will be settled on the Day of Judgment later. According to Ibn ‘Āshūr, there are three reasons why Qs. 42: 10 cannot be applied to assess differences of opinion among Muslims. First, all Muslims agree to use shar‘i propositions. It’s just that there is a difference in the choice of argument and the method of interpretation. All ikhtila‘f can still be tolerated. Second, the context of the verses before and after Qs. 42: 10 which speak of the differences between believers and polytheists. Third, Qs. 42: 10 is a Makkiyyah verse that has not spoken of the law. According to Ibn ‘Āshūr, Qs. 42: 10 is not appropriate to use the Qiyas method. Ibn ‘Āshūr, *Al-Tahrīr wa al-Tanwīr*, vol. 25, p. 41-42.

26. In interpreting this verse, Ibn ‘Āshūr revealed that the Ḥarārīyyah-Khawārij used Qs. 40: 12 to judge the army of Kufah ‘Ali and Shām-Mu‘awiyah who were making an agreement to conduct arbitration (mediation). The Khawārij invited ‘Ali bin Abī Tālīb only used the law of Allah in the meaning of the Qur’ān. They interpreted sharply, but ignored many other verses that differ from the definition they understood. Because their interpretation, ‘Ali bin Abī Tālīb then said, ”kalimat al-haqq urida biha al-bāṭil“ (right words, misguided meaning). The protest of
the Kharijrij disturbed the mediation process. Here, Ibn ‘Ashur did not seem to approve the application of Qs. 40: 12 to judge disputes among fellow Muslims in the world. Ibn ‘Ashur, Al-Tahrir wa al-Tanwir, vol 24, p. 101.

27Ibn ‘Ashur, Al-Tahrir wa al-Tanwir, Vol 20, p 196
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