

THE CONTIGUITY OF MUSA'S SHARIA IN THE QURAN: TORAH AND *ṢUHUF* TERMINOLOGY IN EXEGETICAL LITERATURES

Ali Thaufan Dwi Saputra & Miftach Ansari

Abstract: *This article attempts to trace the contiguity of the substance of the sharia revealed to Musa in the Quran by tracing the terminology of the Torah and *Ṣuhuf* on exegetical sources. The article will track the intersection of the classical and contemporary exegetical sources that use the jurisprudence approach as a lens in interpreting the Quran. This research is qualitative in nature, and the method used is descriptive-analytical. As a result, at least based on exegetical literature, there is a specific intersection between the sharia brought by Musa and the sharia brought by Muhammad in the Quran. The intersection lies, for example, in legal aspects such as *qiṣās*, *diyāt* and *rajam*. However, there are different views on addressing this contiguity. One view is that the contiguity does not mean anything because the previous sharia has been abolished by the revelation of the Quran. Another view states that the Quran is a conclusive-confirmative revelation and does not abolish previous sharia.*

Keywords: *The Quran; Torah; *Ṣuhuf*; Sharia of Musa; Interpretation.*

Abstrak: Artikel ini berusaha melacak persinggungan substansi syariat yang diturunkan kepada Musa di dalam al-Quran dengan menelusuri terminologi Taurat dan *Ṣuḥuf* pada sumber tafsir klasik dan kontemporer. Pelacakan akan dilakukan pada sumber-sumber tafsir yang menggunakan pendekatan *fiqhi* sebagai kacamata dalam menafsirkan ayat. Penelitian ini bersifat kualitatif, dan metode yang digunakan adalah deskriptif-analitis. Hasilnya, setidaknya berdasarkan sumber-sumber tafsir, terdapat persinggungan syariat secara spesifik antara syariat yang dibawa Musa, dan syariat yang dibawa Muhammad dalam al-Quran. Persinggungan tersebut terletak, misalnya, pada aspek-aspek hukum seperti *qiṣās*, *diyāt* dan *rajam*. Akan tetapi, terdapat perbedaan pandangan dalam menyikapi persinggungan ini. Satu pandangan menyebut bahwa persinggungan tersebut tidak berarti apa-apa karena syariat sebelumnya sudah dihapus dengan diturunkannya al-Quran. Pandangan lain menyebut bahwa al-Quran turun hanya sebagai wahyu yang bersifat konklusif-konfirmatif, dan tidak menghapus syariat sebelumnya.

Kata Kunci: al-Quran, Taurat, *Ṣuḥuf*, Syariat Musa, Tafsir.

Introduction

Fuqahā' (jurist) defines sharia as a guideline based on religious postulates, both the Quran and the Sunna of the Prophet. Sharia then imposes legal burdens on followers of the Islamic religion that must be implemented in life.¹ In the *fiqh* (Islamic jurisprudence) discourse, *shar'ū man qablanā* is one of the instruments that constructs the provisions of sharia law. This instrument forms sharia provisions by basing them on the provisions of religious sharia that existed before Islam. However, there are still differences of opinion regarding the use of this instrument as a basis for the formation of sharia.²

Al-Mu'jam al-Mufahras presents data that the Quran mentions the existence of religion before Islam and its holy books in many verses.³ Such mention indicates that there is a quite intense interaction between the Quran and other religions with their holy books. Scholars then discuss what kind of format is formed and what this mention means. The Quran intensely mentions one religion, along with its holy book, in many verses, namely the Jewish religion and its Torah. The Quran also mentions that Musa was the prophet who received the book of the Torah. Apart from the Torah, the Quran also mentions that Moses received revelation in another format, namely *ṣuḥuf*, as mentioned in QS. al-Najm [53]: 36, also in QS. al-A'lā [87]: 19.⁴ The Torah and *Ṣuḥuf* contain the substance of Musa's teachings to his people. That is why many studies have attempted to discuss this matter more inclusively from the perspective of the Quran or inter-religious dialogue.

Research conducted by Musrefah Mehfooz, Fatima Javaid, and Iffet Khalid, for instance, discussed philosophical similarities in aspects of

worship such as prayer, zakat, fasting, and hajj, which they explore directly from the verses of the Quran and the Torah in a *vis-a-vis* manner. So, we consider the Quran and the Torah as two revelations that are on a parallel line.⁵ In a more general format, research also discusses that the holy books of previous religions before Islam contained falsification and distortion, so the sharia was no longer authentic. This is like what Baeti Rohman did. By tracing the word *tahrif* and its derivations in exegetical literature, Rohman's research concludes that previous religious scriptures were no longer authentic.⁶ Md. Masum Billah and the team conclude a relevant thing in their research. They describe the methods used by Jews and Christians to distort their holy book based on the Quran.⁷

The general form of mention in the Quran certainly raises a subtle question that is important to find answers to: What is the actual substance of the Mosaic sharia that the Quran tries to discuss? From this question, this research attempts to trace the description of the substance of the sharia, and perceive it as an intersection. We will use the Torah and *Ṣuḥuf* terminology as key subjects in carrying out this tracking. More specifically, it will track based on contemporary exegetical literature that uses the *fiqhī* approach. This research is a type of library research that refers to various kinds of literature and written documents. The primary source used is *al-Tafsīr al-Munīr fī al-'Aqīdah wa al-Sharī'ah wa al-Manhaj*, written by Wahbah al-Zuhaylī.

Apart from identifying the contiguity between sharia, this research will also identify the definition of Torah and *Ṣuḥuf* and describe the forms of falsification and distortion as stated in Muslim sources.⁸ The discussion that will take place in this article will provide a specific overview of how *tafsīr* sources specifically discuss, describe and provide an overview of the dialogical format of the Mosaic sharia based on tracking Torah and *Ṣuḥuf* terminology in *fiqhī* approach exegetical literature.

Monotheistic Beliefs Dialectic

Before further discussing the scriptures revealed to Musa, at this point, we will first describe how the existence of religion and belief is formed through understanding the revelations contained in the scriptures. Primarily, this discussion will focus on the religions mentioned in the Quran. The presentation at this point will present the intersection between monotheistic religions in the most fundamental doctrinal aspects. So this can be an illustration of why then tracing the format of the revelation revealed to Musa is very relevant, especially when viewed from sources of interpretation, both classical and contemporary sources.

According to several Muslim theologians, there are at least two classifications of types of religion based on the source of their teachings, namely divine religion (*samawī*) and *ardī* religion. In its sense, divine religion is based on *risālah ilāhiyyah* (revelation) sent down by Allah and His messengers or prophets delivered to their people. Meanwhile, *ardī* religion is based on a consensual understanding of a community that agrees on a belief and does not depart from an understanding of revelation.⁹ In Islam, divine religions are specifically defined as ‘previous’ religions before Islam, which are also mentioned in many verses of the Quran, and the Quran has an intense dialogue with adherents of these religions. There are at least three religions identified as divine religions, namely Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.¹⁰ Kamal Muhammad Isya offers another view. Although he agrees with the definition of *samawī* and *ardī* religions, Isya view that divine religion is not limited to these three religions but the religion that existed from the beginning of Adam’s descent to the last sharia brought by Muhammad.¹¹

In addition, Muhammad Arkoun believes that divine religion is defined as a religion that has divine characteristics and bases its beliefs on revelation. Furthermore, based on his understanding of the term “revelation”, Arkoun views that divine religion is not only limited to the three religions mentioned in the Quran. Arkoun included all religious communities in general, which base their understanding on revelation and possess divine characteristics, into the classification of heavenly religions. This conclusion then has implications for Arkoun’s interpretation of the term *ahl al-kitāb* in the Quran. In general understanding, *ahl al-kitāb* only identified as Jewish and Christian monotheists. When using Arkoun’s glasses to interpret this word, *our experts mean* all religious communities that develop from a dynamic understanding of the scriptures as something transcendent, including religious communities that emerged later. Furthermore, this view concludes that divine religions are not limited to the references set by the theologians above, which are only limited to three religions.¹²

This dichotomy between divine religion and *ardī* religion then gives rise to questionable implications; is there any possibility that the divine religions mentioned above come out from the same root? Several arguments, and perhaps the most common one, explain that the divine religion underlying their doctrinal understanding of divine treatises originates from the same root teaching, namely the teaching that Ibrahim first wrote down. The Quran refers to this as *millat Ibrāhīm*, which is also labelled as “*ḥanīf*”.¹³ This argument tries to explain that the teachings which Ibrahim brought

are the basic sharia that has the main mission to invite humans to the doctrine of the oneness of God (*tauḥīd*). Religions born after it established this great mission are known as Abrahamic religions or Abrahamic faiths. This argument later became the basis for the formation of divine religions.¹⁴ Because they base their doctrinal understanding on revelation, these divine religions are similar to holy books as a medium for conveying these revelations: Judaism with its Torah, Christianity with its Bible, and Islam with the Quran.

In several theories of the emergence of early Islam, a Western scholar, Fred Donner, put forward a quite controversial view. He wrote this view in an article published in 2003 entitled "From Believers to Muslims: Confessional Self-Identity in the Early Islamic Community". Donner argues that when Islam first emerged in the 6th century, Islam did not necessarily exist as a religion in the distinctive form it has today. He believes that at its inception, Islam was a community system that accommodated other monotheistic beliefs. Donner draws this conclusion based on his search for the words "*mu'min*" and "*muslim*" which are mentioned in verses in the Quran, also supported by several other indications.¹⁵

According to him, in the context of the early emergence of Islam, the use of the word believer in the verses of the Quran refers to adherents of monotheism who are not limited to just one group. At that time, the teachings that Muhammad brought also accommodated some Judeo-Christian groups under the same umbrella of teachings, which was then called the community of believers. This is because Muhammad and his followers did not identify themselves as *muslim*, but as *mu'min* (believers). And it must be underlined that the use of the word *mu'min*, with all its derivations in the Quran, can be found in almost a thousand places. Meanwhile, the word *muslim* only appears about seventy-five times in the Quran.¹⁶

Sirry then elaborated on Donner's views further. Donner's argument, as reviewed by Sirry, is based on the theory of inclusivism and ecumenism of the believer community. For Donner, the inclusivity of the believers at the beginning of the emergence of Islam was based on the same estuary of teachings, such as believing in and worshipping the one God, having faith in the last day, and doing good deeds. Donner bases his arguments on several propositions, among which are the verses of the Quran, historical documents such as the Medina Charter, and other documents found in non-Muslim sources. For example, Donner uses QS. al-Baqarah [2]: 62 as well as QS. al-Mā'idah [5]: 69 in describing the inclusiveness of the early Islamic format in accommodating monotheistic religions (community of

believers).¹⁷

Another argument used to strengthen Donner's argument is the redaction used in the Medina Charter. In this document, the Jews are mentioned as part of the "*ummatan wāḥidah*". "The Jews from Bani 'Awf are one community (*ummatan wāḥidah*) with the believers." However, based on Donner's tracking, Muslim sources in historical books do not describe the harmonious impression that occurred between the Prophet and the Judeo-Christian community. Instead, these sources emphasized the conflict between the Prophet and the three Jewish tribes in Medina, namely the Bani Qaynuqā', Naẓīr and Qurayzah.¹⁸ It should be noted that the involvement of Bani Auf from Jews, as evidenced by the redaction in the Medina Charter, can be interpreted by their involvement only in social-community aspects, not in theological or faith issues. This may be missed from Donner's analysis.

Donner's explanation is very different from most of the narratives presented by Muslim sources, be that as it may, classical and contemporary literature. Because these sources describe Islam as a distinctive conventional religion (separate from other monotheistic beliefs), it has been formed and crystallized from the very beginning when it was present amid the ignorant Arab society. Then, the next question, based on Donner's theory, is when and how Islam can crystallize and form a separate religion. According to Donner, as cited by Sirry, the transformation from a community of believers to Muslims who are distinctive or separate occurs through a process that is quite complex and takes a relatively long time. Several attempts by Muslim leaders at that time also played a role in shaping this format of separation. For example, the efforts of 'Abd al-Mālik bin Marwān who promoted the importance of the Quran and the figure of the Prophet Muhammad. Al-Ḥajjāj bin Yūsuf, to print the complete the Quran with diacritics and vowels so that it can be read widely. Furthermore, from several other indications, Donner saw that the split in the community of believers at that time was also influenced by doctrines that could no longer be reconciled with one another.¹⁹

The use of the terminology *ahl al-kitāb* in the Quran is also one of the variables studied by Donner in tracing indications that support his conclusions. Donner cites the view of Albrecht Noth, who explains that the terminology of *ahl al-kitāb* in the Quran is generally used in a positive context. In the context of negative verses, it is usually addressed only to "some" *ahl al-kitāb*. This, according to Donner, shows that the ambivalence of the Quran can be traced not to *ahl al-kitāb* as a whole but to partial *ahl al-kitāb* who had made sins and mistakes. From this view,

he concluded that *ahl al-kitāb* can be said to be part of the community of believers.²⁰ In his book, Sirry criticizes the views put forward by Donner. According to Sirry, at least two weaknesses of Donner's arguments exist. First, not all verses of the Quran, especially those that talk about other religions, are inclusive. Some verses even expressly criticize their beliefs and contain orders to fight, as in the QS. al-Mā'idah [5]: 17, 51 and 72. Second, Donner's view of the shift in meaning from *mu'min* to *muslim* does not have solid and relevant supporting evidence. That is, Donner departs from the speculative-assumptive lens installed when analyzing the verses of the Quran to detect early Islamic formats. Donner himself admits there are weaknesses in this argument.²¹

Furthermore, Jarot Wahyudi wrote an article titled "Exegetical Analysis of the *Ahl al-Kitāb* Verses of the Quran". Wahyudi uses various sources of interpretation to analyze the interpretation of the word *ahl al-kitāb* and makes QS. Āli 'Imrān verses 64, 113, 114 and 115 as its main subject.²² In verse 64, for example, based on Wahyudi's tracking, al-Ṭabarī explicitly describe what is meant *ahl al-kitāb* in this verse, referring directly to *Ahl al-Tawrāh* and *Ahl al-Injīl* (those who hold to the Torah and the Gospel). Likewise, the classical interpreters who lived after al-Ṭabarī, like al-Zamakhsharī and al-Ṭūsī. Despite differing in theological sect backgrounds, like al-Ṭabarī, they also interpret the term of *ahl al-kitāb* by referring to the meaning of the Jews and Christians, who are ordered to stick to one sentence (*tawḥīd*).²³

Differs from the interpretation in classical sources. When Wahyudi traces the interpretation of the term *ahl al-kitāb* to contemporary exegetical sources, most of these sources use an inter-religious studies approach that emphasizes the aspect of dialogue between religions. Muhammad Abduh, for example, in interpreting surah Āli 'Imrān [3]: 64, tends to discuss the concept of monotheism rather than the term *ahl al-kitāb*. More specifically, he elaborated on the concept of monotheism, which he included into two classifications, namely *waḥdāniyyah al-ulūhiyyah* and also *waḥdāniyyah al-rubūbiyyah*. Then, Abduh explained that Musa, Jesus, and Muhammad carried out the same mandate, namely calling on people to worship one God.²⁴

Zabur, Torah, and Gospel in the Quran

At this point, several questions will arise in response to the presentation on the points above. Why does the Quran mention these religions so often in its many verses? Is this mention simply a consequence of the possibility that the Quran appeared in a monotheistic climate, which also underlies

belief in the holy book? Then, what is the pattern of interaction between the Quran and the holy books of other religions? It is important to ask these questions at the outset to find out how the format of the Quran talks about other religions, along with their holy books as the main doctrines in their teachings. So, the arguments of several scholars who discuss this matter will be presented at this point.

As mentioned in the previous point, other religions before Islam and their holy books are very intensely mentioned in many verses of the Quran. Judaism and Christianity are the most dominating from the mention of these other religions. Sirry explained that there are also mentions in these verses that are a criticism of the Quran against other religions, which in this context are Judaism and Christianity. Such criticism can be found in formats, for example, advice not to make friends or leaders from their group,²⁵ criticism of doctrinal issues and the authenticity of his scriptures,²⁶ to the call to fight and impose *jizyah*.²⁷ If interpreted textually, these verses could be used as a basis for legitimizing immoral acts such as violence and calls for hatred against other religions, which are massively made into doctrines by radical Muslims. Apart from these groups, some polemical Western groups use these verses as a lens to see an intolerant and exclusive image of Islam, which is also strengthened by the concrete actions of the radical Muslims earlier. In his article, Sirry uses these verses as one of the tools to identify the history of the emergence of early Islam; from these verses, it can be seen that Islam is described as having very intense dialogue with other religions, especially Judaism and Christianity.²⁸

The verses of the Quran also explicitly mention these holy books. At least four holy books are listed in the Qur'an, namely Zabur, Torah, Gospel, and *Ṣuḥuf*. In several sources of interpretation, a history of hadith is presented, explaining the number of holy books that Allah sent down to his prophets and messengers. One of the most quoted hadiths is a hadith narrated by a companion (*sahābah*) Abū Dhar, with some of its narration as follows:²⁹

عَنْ أَبِي إِدْرِيسَ الْخَوْلَانِيِّ عَنْ أَبِي ذَرٍّ: قُلْتُ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ كَمْ كِتَابًا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ قَالَ مِائَةٌ كِتَابٍ وَأَرْبَعَةٌ كُتِبَ أَنْزَلَ عَلَى شِيثٍ حَمْسُونَ صَحِيفَةً وَأَنْزَلَ عَلَى أَخْنُوخَ ثَلَاثُونَ صَحِيفَةً وَأَنْزَلَ عَلَى إِبْرَاهِيمَ عَشْرَ صَحَائِفَ وَأَنْزَلَ عَلَى مُوسَى قَبْلَ التَّوْرَةِ عَشْرَ صَحَائِفَ، وَأَنْزَلَ التَّوْرَةَ وَالْإِنْجِيلَ وَالزَّبُورَ وَالْفُرْقَانَ^{٣٠}

This hadith explains that there are a total of one hundred and four holy books revealed by Allah to his prophets and messengers with details; Shith (or in the editorial in another interpretation using Adam) received

fifty *ṣuḥuf*, Akhnuh or Idris thirty *ṣuḥuf*, Ibrahim ten *ṣuḥuf*, Musa (before receiving the Torah) ten *ṣuḥuf*, after that Allah sent down the Torah to Musa, the Gospel to Isa, Zabur to Daud and finally *al-Furqān* (the Quran) to Muhammad. Although this hadith is not found in the famous Hadith book (*al-kutub al-tis'ah*), this hadith is found in the *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Hibbān*, which is still the main book of hadiths, because it has its own transmission path.³¹

Although in terms of validity, this hadith is weak, from this hadith, it can be seen that the Quran is the holy book of the divine religion, which was most recently revealed. Several scholars state that the revelation of the Quran is the closing, abolishing, and rectifying of the sharia that was revealed in the previous holy books. The term erasure of the Quran against previous teachings is then known as the concept of supersessionism or abrogation. The concept of supersessionism is comprehensively elaborated by a British Muslim scholar named Tim Winter or Abdul Hakim Murad in his article entitled "The Last Trump Card: Islam and the Supersession of Other Faiths." Winter argued that Islamic sharia, with the revelation of the Quran, had erased the previous teachings of sharia religion.³²

Winter's argument is strengthened by the belief that the holy books that came down before the Quran were not authentic and have also experienced distortion or falsification (*tahrīf*). This is supported by the existence of verses of the Quran, which strengthen the argument for the occurrence of *tahrīf* against these holy books.³³ Scholars have different opinions regarding the existence of this *tahrīf* phenomenon. Some think that *tahrīf* applies to texts (*tahrīf al-naṣ*). Another opinion states that the *tahrīf* occurs in understanding and interpretation (*tahrīf al-mā'nā*). There is also an opinion that states that the *tahrīf* of the holy book occurs in two aspects at once, namely text and meaning.³⁴

However, it should be noted that there are also verses in the Quran that previously affirmed the truth of the previous holy books. Among them are as in QS. Āli 'Imrān [3]: 3, 50 and 93, or in QS. al-Mā'idah [5]: 46. In these verses, it is stated that the Quran came to justify the teachings of the previous holy book (*muṣaddiqan limā bayna yadaiyya*).³⁵ There are also other forms of affirmation, for example, when the prophet was ordered to read or deliver the Torah to the Jews as found in QS. Āli 'Imrān [3]: 93. Then, why is there a shift in the pattern of interaction of the Quran with the previous scriptures? From what initially stated justification, then the Quran stated that the holy books experienced distortion or falsification.

Several Western scholars then responded to this question. They put forward views that are considered quite radical. As described by Sirry, they

argue that the shift in the interaction format of the Quran, from initially affirming, then shifting to accusations that these books had changed and experienced distortions, was caused by the response of the Jews and Christians whom the Prophet preached. They considered that the Judeo-Christian response was not under the Prophet's expectations because the Prophet suspected that they would accept the teachings he brought when the Prophet affirmed their holy books at the beginning. Because of this rejection, there is no other way but to accuse the Judeo-Christians of having changed the substance of their holy book, also stating that their holy book has been falsified. Arguments such as these can be found in the work of Western scholars such as AJ. Wensick.³⁶

On the other hand, Abdulaziz Sachedina, a professor at the University of Virginia, presents a view that significantly contrasts with Winter's regarding the supersessionism of the Quran against previous scriptures. He challenges the supersessionist view in his article "Political Implication of the Islamic Notion of 'Supersession' as Reflected in Islamic Jurisprudence." Sachedina argues that no verses in the Quran explicitly explain and support the Muslim belief that the Quran has erased the teachings of previous holy books.³⁷

Sachedina views that Islamic jurists (*fuqahā'*) have contributed to creating a vision, in the socio-political context of society, that Islam is the only true religion. Furthermore, he explains that the Quran acts as a confirmation of previous teachings rather than as an altering of the teachings of the Abrahamic-monotheistic religions that existed before. The revelation of the Quran, as explained by Sachedina, is more appropriately seen as a conclusive revelation of God's teachings, starting from the sending of Prophet Adam to earth and ending with Muhammad's apostolate. This means that the revelation of the Quran does not act as an elimination of these teachings but as something that is confirmative-conclusive.³⁸

Sirry, in an article entitled *Memahami Kritik Al-Quran Terhadap Agama Lain* commented on two major views regarding this supersessionism of the Quran. He argues that applying the dichotomous lens of whether the Quran is supersessionist or non-supersessionist to the teachings of other religions eliminates the essence of the complexity of the appearance of the Quran in the format of early Islamic emergence. The application of this dichotomy does not take into account the consequences that the Quran descends in a climate of polemic, in which the format of criticism as a form of interaction with the teachings of other religions is unsophisticated.³⁹

The Contiguity of Sharia of Musa in the Quran

In the Quran, the word Torah appears seventeen times, the word Bible eleven times, the word *ṣuḥuf* eight times and the word Zabur appears only three times.⁴⁰ The intensity of the appearance of the word Torah in the verses of the Quran indicates that the Quran discusses the Torah quite frequently compared to other scriptures. Based on these verses, at this point, it will be explained specifically how the exegetical sources describe the Torah and *Ṣuḥuf* as revelations revealed to Musa. At least, the researcher will explore two sources of exegetical literature in tracing the terminology of the Torah and *Ṣuḥuf*. These two sources respectively represent classical interpretations and contemporary exegetical sources, both of which use *fiqhī* complexion to interpret the verses of the Quran. The first exegetical literature used is *al-Jāmi' li-Aḥkām al-Qur'ān*, a magnum opus from a commentator named al-Qurṭubī (d. 671 H). The second literature is *Tafsīr al-Munīr* written by Wahbah al-Zuhaylī (d. 1436 H) as a source of reference for contemporary interpretation. These two exegetical sources are selected to see the contiguity of the Musa's sharia in the Quran. Furthermore, the use of different interpretations on a periodical basis serves to see whether there is a transformation of interpretation or approach in viewing the Torah and *Ṣuḥuf* on the Quran.

1. Tracing the Substance of the Torah in Exegetical Literatures

From the fourteen Quranic verses about the Torah, there is not a single verse that discusses explicitly the substance of what is contained in the Torah in a detailed manner. Some verses only allude to it in general and explain that in the Torah, there is guidance and light, as alluded to in QS. al-Mā'idah [5]: 44. Or in other verses, it is stated that in the Torah, there is God's law *fiḥā ḥukmullāh*, as in QS. al-Mā'idah [5]: 43. Likewise other verses, only allude to the Torah as a holy book, and are often referred to together with other scriptures such as the Bible or the Zabur without elaborating on its substance. There are Torah recitations that are juxtaposed with other scriptures, including QS. Āli 'Imrān [3]: 3, 48, 65; QS. al-Mā'idah [5]: 46, 66, 68, 110; QS. al-A'rāf [7]: 157; QS. al-Taubah [9]: 111; also in QS. al-Faṭḥ [48]: 2.

The Quran also refers to the legal aspects contained in the Torah. This can be seen, for example, in surah al-Mā'idah [5]: 45. In that verse, the Quran explicitly explains that the punishment is *qiṣās*, which is to sentence someone to a punishment such as a soul for a soul, is found in the Torah. This aspect of *qiṣās* law is also applied in Islam as a consequence of someone having committed a crime (*jināyah*) of murder or something similar. Sirry,

in his book titled *Kemunculan Islam dalam Kekerjanaan Revisionis*, explains that there are several arguments in response to biblical narration in the Quran, including this aspect. The first view sees that in several aspects, the Quran indeed borrows or adopts legal substance from previous holy books, including the Torah. The second view emphasizes the argument that the existence of these narrations is seen as a dialogical-interactive aspect between the Quran and other holy books and religions at that time. The view or theory of “borrowing” in the first argument has been widely refuted and rejected in modern scholarship.⁴¹

Al-Qurṭubī, in his commentary, elaborates on how the Torah is defined. When interpreting QS. Āli ‘Imrān [3]: 3-4, he defines that, in general, Torah means light (*al-diyā’ wa-al-nūr*). Al-Qurṭubī then discusses in detail the origin of the word Torah. There are several opinions quoted by al-Qurṭubī regarding the root of the word Torah in Arabic. One opinion says that this word comes from the word *tawriyatun* which follows *wazn taf’ilatun*. The letter *ra’* in the word *tawriyatun*, which originally had the vowel *kasrah*, changed to *fathah* due to the change in the letter *ya* to *alif* in the word. This is the same as the transformation on the word *jāriyatun* become *jāratun*, or in the word *nāsiyatun* become *nasatun*. When the word *al-tawrah* is taken from this word (*al-tawriyatun*) it means: *al-ta’riḍ ‘an shai’ wa al-kitmān li ghairih* (the generalization on something and limitation on something else). According to al-Qurṭubī, this definition was taken because the substance of the majority of the Torah is global and general disclosure, without explaining specifically and elaboratively.⁴²

The description of al-Qurṭubī in interpreting the verse regarding the substance of the Torah, can be seen when he interprets QS. al-Mā’idah [5]: 43-45. The verse alludes to what the Torah contains in brief with the phrase of “*fiḥā ḥukmullāh*” and in the next verse with the phrase of “*fiḥā hudan wa-nūr*.” Al-Qurṭubī cites the opinions of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and Qatādah in interpreting the phrase *fiḥā ḥukmullāh*. Ḥasan al-Baṣrī views that the law alluded to in the verse is interpreted as *rajam*. Qatādah views that the legal substance alluded to in this verse is *qiṣāṣ*. This means that, from al-Qurṭubī’s perspective, the context of the topic discussed in this verse does not explain the substance of the Torah as a whole but only partially discusses the law contained in it, namely the law of *qiṣāṣ* or *rajam*. This interpretation is also based on the context of the discussion mentioned in the previous verse, QS. al-Mā’idah [5]: 42, where the Prophet was ordered to judge the Jews fairly. Furthermore, when interpreting the verse “*fiḥā hudan wa-nūr*,” al-Qurṭubī interprets that in the Torah, there is an explanation and notification regarding the justification for sending the

Prophet Muhammad as a last prophet.⁴³

When discussing aspects of Torah's law in the form of *qisās* in QS. al-Mā'idah: 45, al-Qurṭubī discussed them in sufficient detail and itemized. The complexion of *fiqhī*, which colours his interpretation, is also very visible when he elaborates on it. Not only discussing the *fiqhī* aspect, al-Qurṭubī also describes how the recitation of the *qirā'at* of various priests is contained in the verse. Based on the interpretation of al-Qurṭubī, this verse was revealed to rectify the actions of the Jews, who, at that time, imposed their tribes with a hierarchical system. This means that there is one tribe that is superior to the other tribes, which has implications for applying the Torah law, which is discriminatory and one-sided. Al-Qurṭubī stated that the Jews had violated the law contained in the Torah, for example, regarding *diyyat* and *qisās*. The *diyyat* imposed on the Bani Naẓīr was more than that of other tribes. However, on the other hand, the Nazir received special treatment.⁴⁴ They were not implicated by *qisās* when, for example, they killed Bani Quraizah, but Bani Quraizah would be implicated by *qisās* when they killed Bani Naẓīr. Then, when the Prophet Muhammad came with "Islamic teachings", Bani Quraizah complained about this to the Prophet, and the Prophet then treated them equally. However, the Prophet then received a negative response from the Bani Naẓīr. According to the presentation of al-Qurṭubī, this incident became the reason for the revelation of the 45th verse (*sabab al-nuzūl*) in al-Mā'idah.⁴⁵

In contrast to al-Qurṭubī, Wahbah al-Zuhailī adopted the view of *naḥw* Basrah scholars in tracing the roots of the word Torah when interpreting QS. Āli 'Imrān (3): 3-4. The word *al-tawrah*, as quoted by al-Zuhailī, follows the *wazn fau'alatun*, which comes from the root word *wauriyatun*. The first *wawu* letter in the word *wauriyatun* is replaced by the letter *ta*, while the letter *ya* is replaced by the letter *alif* because it is pronounced alive, and the previous letter is read *fathḥah*. Furthermore, in defining the Torah, he explained that the Torah, comes from the Hebrew language which means "sharia". Al-Zuhailī then describes the "contents" of the Torah, in his interpretation, he explains that the Torah contains five *ṣifr* (parts of the book), namely; *ṣifr al-takwīn* (book of events), *ṣifr al-khurūj* (book of output), *ṣifr al-lawīyyīn* (book of Levi), *ṣifr al-'adad* (book of numbers) and *ṣifr tasniyah al-ishtirā'* (deuteronomy). According to the Jews, this book, which is composed of several *ṣifr*, was written by Musa. Meanwhile, Christians consider this book to be the Old Testament (*al-'ahd al-qadīm*) or in other terms, namely *al-'atīq*. According to them, the substance of the Old Testament is in the form of the history of Israel and the story of the previous Prophet before the arrival of al-Masih.⁴⁶

Furthermore, when interpreting the substance of the Torah, which is alluded to in the verses of the Quran with the clause “*fiḥā ḥukmullāh*” and also “*fiḥā hudan wa-nūr*”, al-Zuhailī interprets it differently from al-Qurṭubī. When interpreting the clause *fiḥā ḥukmullāh*, for example, al-Zuhailī interprets singly that the legal aspect alluded to here is the law of stoning (*rajam*), without mentioning the law of *qiṣās* as interpreted by al-Qurṭubī. This was concluded by al-Zuhailī because, in the previous verse, he interpreted by discussing how the Prophet judged the stoning case that occurred within the scope of Jewish people. Then, in interpreting the clause *fiḥā hudan wa-nūr*, al-Zuhailī interprets it separately. The word “*hudā*” means in the Torah, there are instructions that guide humans to get out of digression. The substance is in the form of laws and burdens (*taklīf*) for the people of Musa. While the word *nūr* is interpreted as the essence of the teachings of monotheism, prophetic news, and the last day. Quoting the views of al-Naisabūri in his work *Asbāb al-Nuzūl*, al-Zuhailī explained the al-Mā'idah [5]: 44) was revealed due to the incident in which the Prophet stoned two Jews who committed adultery. This event is also recorded in the hadith of the Prophet, which was narrated by Muslim and reported by al-Barrā' bin 'Azib as a companion (*ṣaḥābah*) in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* book. The Apostle punished them because, at that time, the Jews replaced or violated the *rajam* punishment that should have been imposed on adulterers.⁴⁷

Furthermore, in interpreting QS. al-Mā'idah [5]: 44-47, al-Zuhailī discusses elaboratively various examples of distorted acts committed by the Jews against their holy book, the Torah. The discussion regarding the *tahrīf* that is alluded to by al-Zuhailī here, in the form of *tahrīf al-ma'nā*, in which the Jews violated and interpreted the substance of the Torah haphazardly so that the enactment of the law they applied was not following what was in the Torah. For example, when the Jews applied *diyāt* laws that were unequal between one tribe and their other tribes. Another example presented by al-Zuhailī is when they also replaced the punishment of stoning with the punishment of *tashīm*, withheld or replaced information about Muhammad's sending by alleging that Muhammad was not meant,⁴⁸ as well as not imposing *qiṣās* punishment. According to al-Zuhailī, these actions were the deviations of the Jews from their holy book. It should be underlined that the application of the existing law in the Torah, according to al-Zuhailī, was also applied by the prophets before Muhammad, including Prophet Daud, Sulaiman, and even Isa.⁴⁹ This means that, based on al-Zuhailī's interpretation, there is a continuity of legal relevance in monotheistic religions that existed before the Quran and the Torah became a holy book used as a “reference” for the basic rules

of law even though the law is still abstract and general in nature, just like the definition of the Torah which al-Qurṭubī explained at the beginning.

When discussing the *qiṣās* punishment alluded to in QS. al-Mā'idah: 45, al-Zuhailī interprets it in line with the interpretation carried out by al-Qurṭubī. It's just that he explained in more detail the law of *qiṣās* by quoting the views of scholars across different schools of *fiqh*, along with the differences of opinion that colour the law. For example, this verse, as commented on by al-Zuhailī, according to the Ḥanafīyyah, is a stipulation that a Muslim is sentenced to *qiṣās* when he kills an infidel. Conversely, Shāfi'īyyah scholars are of the view that Muslims who kill *dhimmī* cannot be sentenced to *qiṣās*. The Shāfi'ī scholar argues that this verse is sharia for people before Islam (*shar' man qablanā*).⁵⁰

At the point of concluding the interpretation of the verse, al-Zuhailī alludes to the abolition of sharia, or in another term, namely Quranic supersessionism, as discussed in the previous point. He explained that the mention of the Torah and the Bible with an atmosphere of praise and flattery in these verses aims to anticipate the distortions committed by the Judeo-Christians against their scriptures. In addition, this verse also explains the substantive intersection between the Quran, the Torah and the Bible in fundamental aspects such as laws and other essential teachings. Because of this contact, according to al-Zuhailī, the Quran came to transcribe the teachings of the previous sharia and present the sharia in a more perfect format in the Quran.⁵¹

2. The Substance of *Ṣuḥuf*

Ṣuḥuf, as in many explicit explanations in the verses of the Quran, is a form of revelation that was revealed to Musa and Ibrahim. However, apart from Musa and Ibrahim, it turns out that there are many other *ṣuḥuf* who were passed down to the prophets before them. This can be concluded from the explanation of the Prophet's Hadith, as reviewed in the previous discussion. Uniquely, from this explanation, Musa was the only prophet who received revelation in two formats at once, namely *Ṣuḥuf* and Torah. So, the question that needs to be asked is, why did Musa get two forms of revelation? Is there any difference between *Ṣuḥuf* and Torah or holy books in general? Tracking the terminology of *ṣuḥuf* in the exegetical sources, especially those relating specifically to Musa, aims to answer these matters.

In the Quran, the intensity of the mention of *ṣuḥuf* is less than that of the Torah. *Ṣuḥuf* is only mentioned in eight verses in seven *sūrah*, namely QS. Ṭāhā [20]: 133, QS. al-Najm [52]: 36, QS. al-Mudaththir [74]: 52, QS. 'Abasa [80]: 13, QS. al-Takwīr [81]: 10, Qs. al-A'lā [87]: 18-19, and

QS. al-Bayyinah [98]: 2. From several say there are verses contained in these verses, there are verses that do not talk about *ṣuḥuf* in the context a form of revelation received by the prophets. For example, in QS. al-Mudaththir [74]: 52 and QS. al-Takwīr [81]: 10. In these two verses, the term *ṣuḥuf* refers to the meaning of a servant's charity sheet or record, not regarding transcendent matters in the form of revelation. So cumulatively, the number of specific surahs that talk about *ṣuḥuf* in the context of the revelation received by the prophet is only six verses.

Furthermore, from those six verses, the Quran sometimes uses *ṣuḥuf* as something general and can be interpreted as previous holy books, not specifically discussing *ṣuḥuf* in a revelation format different from holy books such as the Torah or the Bible. For example, in QS. Ṭāhā [20]: 133. In this verse, the word *ṣuḥuf* is paired with *al-ūlā* and shows generality. Say with the meaning of "earlier books".⁵² Say the same is also found in QS. al-A' lā [87]: 18. However, in this surah, *ṣuḥuf* is then specified in clause 19, indicating that *ṣuḥuf* here is not general, but refers to the *Ṣuḥuf* that Ibrahim and Musa owned.

Another verse that specifically mentions *ṣuḥuf* is QS. al-Najm [52]: 36-37. In this verse, the word *ṣuḥuf* also specifically refers to the *ṣuḥuf* revealed for Musa and Ibrahim and characterizes their *ṣuḥuf* with the word *waffā* (promise completion). Al-Qurṭubī, in his commentary, interprets the word *waffā* with various meanings. One of the most identical meanings mentioned by al-Qurṭubī regarding the word *waffā* is explained in the verse 38. Al-Qurṭubī then explains that there is a reminder in Musa and Ibrahim's surah. In verse 38, it is explained that a person will not bear the sins or burdens of others. He then elaborates on this meaning that one's soul is not taken in exchange for another (*lā tu'khaḥ nafsun badlan 'an ukhrā*). This is because, during the prophetic period between Noah and Ibrahim, someone was held accountable (killed) for crimes committed by their siblings, children, or even their fathers. However, in interpreting the verses, al-Qurṭubī discusses more about Ibrahim.⁵³ In addition, in this verse and also other verses such as in QS. 'Abasa [80]: 13, al-Qurṭubī makes QS. al-A' lā [87]: 18-19 as the "main reference" in interpreting the word *ṣuḥuf*.⁵⁴

In QS. al-A' lā [87]: 18-19, al-Qurṭubī elaborates on the interpretation of the *Ṣuḥuf* of Ibrahim and Musa with the hadith of the prophet narrated by Abū Dhar's friend. This hadith is a continuation of the hadith, which discusses the number of holy books revealed to the prophets. The editorial of the hadith also explains the substance of the Prophet of Ibrahim and Musa. In Ibrahim's *Ṣuḥuf*, it is stated that it contains examples or proverbs

(*amthāl*), and in Musa's *Ṣuḥuf*, there is advice (*'ibrah*). Mentioned in the hadith:

مِنْ حَدِيثِ أَبِي ذَرٍّ قَالَ قُلْتُ فَمَا كَانَتْ صُحُفُ مُوسَى قَالَ كَانَتْ عِبْرًا كُلُّهَا وَعَجِبْتُ لِمَنْ
أَيَّقَنَ بِالْمَوْتِ كَيْفَ يَفْرَحُ وَعَجِبْتُ لِمَنْ أَيَّقَنَ بِالْقَدَرِ كَيْفَ يَنْصَبُ وَعَجِبْتُ لِمَنْ رَأَى
الدُّنْيَا وَتَقَلَّبَهَا بِأَهْلِهَا كَيْفَ يَطْمَئِنُّ إِلَيْهَا وَعَجِبْتُ لِمَنْ أَيَّقَنَ بِالْحِسَابِ عَدَا ثُمَّ هُوَ لَا
يَعْمَلُ

In this hadith, it is stated that Abū Dhar asked what substance was contained in the *Ṣuḥuf* that Musa received. The Prophet replied that the entire *muṣḥaf* contains advice (*'ibrah*). Then, the Prophet explained some of the lessons in the surah. Among others, the Prophet was surprised by someone who believed in death but still had fun. Also feel surprised by people who believe in *qadar* but do deception. In addition, the Prophet was surprised by people who saw the world with all its trimmings but were still very calm and comfortable with it. The Prophet was also surprised by someone who believed in the day of reckoning but did nothing and did nothing.⁵⁵ With the hadith quoted in the interpretation of al-Qurṭubī, it can be concluded that the *Ṣuḥuf* passed down to Musa does not have the essence of the sharia in the form of legal provisions because it is only in the form of lessons intended to be learned from.

If we study the interpretation al-Zuhailī regarding the terminology of *ṣuḥuf* in QS. al-Najm [53]: 36, he interprets the word *ṣuḥuf* in this verse with the Torah as a holy book. He also explained that the mention of Musa's *Ṣuḥuf* in this verse takes precedence because it is closer in period, more famous and more numerous in terms of number than Ibrahim's *Ṣuḥuf*. Uniquely different from al-Qurṭubī, al-Zuhailī interprets that Ibrahim's *Ṣuḥuf* contains a sharia, not just an example or proverb (*amthāl*). Then, al-Zuhailī interprets the word *waffā* in this verse with the perfect execution of the order from God, which Ibrahim carries out on the order that his God gave, referring to the information contained in QS. al-Baqarah (2): 124. Furthermore, al-Zuhailī describes the substance within *Ṣuḥuf* of Ibrahim and Musa based on the following verse in this verse. There are at least fifteen substantive points in the surah based on verses 38 to 54 in QS. al-Najm. In contrast to al-Qurṭubī, in interpreting the 38th verse, al-Zuhailī does not comprehensively mention a specific law or community practice. If al-Qurṭubī discusses the custom of the former people who killed someone to account for the actions of their brother, then here al-Zuhailī only interpret it in terms of charity and sin, in the context of recompense

in the hereafter.⁵⁶

When interpreting QS. al-A‘lā [87]: 18-19, al-Zuhailī explicitly mentions the number of *ṣuḥuf* sheets that Ibrahim and Musa received. Based on al-Zuhailī’s interpretation, Ibrahim and Musa each received ten *ṣuḥuf* in addition to the Torah received by Musa. Al-Zuhailī tends to be equivocal in his interpretation of the definition and number of *ṣuḥuf*. In interpreting the word “*ṣuḥuf*” in QS. al-Najm, he interprets the *Ṣuḥuf* that Musa received similarly to the Torah. Likewise, regarding the number, he explained in the surah that the number of Musa’s *Ṣuḥuf* was more than that of Ibrahim. The same as the interpretation of al-Qurṭubī, al-Zuhailī explains that the substance of Ibrahim’s *Ṣuḥuf* is in the form of proverbs (*amthāl*), and the substance of Musa’s *Ṣuḥuf* is in the form of advice (*‘ibrah*).

Al-Zuhaili elaborates on the proverbs contained in Ibrahim’s *Ṣuḥuf*. For example, a proverb says, “*A wise person should watch his tongue, know the time and focus on the things he is facing.*” He also explained that the commandments regarding goodness, such as cleaning the soul, remembering Allah, and prioritizing the interests of others, have existed in previous scriptures and have become essential even though they are not mentioned in the same exact narration.⁵⁷ In substance, the surah and previous scriptures have similarities in the commandment regarding goodness, which is conveyed consistently even though it is different in narration. However, in contrast to the holy book, in the *Ṣuḥuf*, no specific legal or sharia provisions become a *taklif* for the Prophet’s people.

Conclusion

The discussion that took place earlier concludes that monotheistic religions, which base their doctrinal understanding on revelation (*wahy*), have very strong contact in several aspects. When tracing the intersection using the words Torah and *Ṣuḥuf* as the main variables, this research shows that the substance of the sharia in the Torah and the Quran has congeniality in several aspects. Some scholars, however, state that the substance of the sharia in the Torah has experienced distortions or *tahrīf*, as Wahbah al-Zuhailī explained in his commentary. In addition to experiencing *tahrīf*, according to several scholars, this intersection has no meaning because the Quran has abrogated the substance contained in the Mosaic law. Another conclusion from tracking this terminology is that there are differences in substance in the holy book. Holy Scriptures, such as the Torah, Bible, Zabur and the Quran, have the essence of sharia. While the revelation in the surah format does not have the essence of the sharia in a specific form,

it only contains proverbs (*amthāl*) and advice (*'ibrah*).

Endnotes

1. Muṣṭafā Aḥmad al-Zarqā, *al-Madkhal al-Fiqh al-'Āmm* (Damaskus: Maṭba' Alif-Ba, 1968), 591.
2. Abdul Helim, "Memposisikan Kembali Shar'u man Qablanā sebagai Istinbat Hukum Islam," *Himmah* VIII, no. 20 (2006): 35-50.
3. *Al-Mu'jam al-Mufahras li Alfāz al-Qur'an*, an index based on words contained in verses of the Qur'an, shows data that mentions of religion and holy books occur very intensely. In calling the Bible, the book of Christians, for example, the Quran repeats it 18 times. Likewise with the Torah, Zabur and *Ṣuḥuf* which were also the holy books of previous religions.
4. Wahbah al-Zuhailī, *al-Tafsīr al-Munīr fī al-'Aqīdah wa al-Sharī'ah wa al-Manhaj* (Damaskus: Dār al-Fikr, 2009), vol. 30, 578. Wahbah acknowledged this opinion, quoted from: Maḥmūd Shukrī al-Alūsī al-Baghdādī, *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī Tafsīr al-Qurān al-'Azīm wa Sab'u al-Mathānī* (Beirut: Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, n.d.), vol. 30, 111.
5. Musrefah Mehfooz dkk, "Similarity in the Philosophy of Worship in Torah and Quran," *Journal of Islamic Studies and Culture* 2, no. 2 (2014).
6. Baeti Rohman, "Otentisitas Kitab Suci Agama Samawi dalam Al-Qur'an: Studi Pemikiran al-Qasimi dalam Tafsir al-Qasimy al-Musamma Mahasin al-Ta'wil," *Al-Amin: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Budaya Islam* 3, no. 2 (2020): 112-125.
7. Md. Maksum Billah dkk, "Revelation of the Quran Concerning Methods of Distortion in the Torah and the Bible: An Analytical and Critical Study," *Eximia Journal* 2 (2021).
8. Several Muslim sources, especially from the Sunni, state that previous holy books have experienced falsification or distortion, or in other terms it is called *taḥrīf*. This resulted in the sharia brought by the previous prophet no longer being relevant to the facts of Islam and the Quran. There will be a lot of discussion about this in the next points of this research.
9. Agus Hakim, *Perbandingan Agama Pandangan Islam Mengenai Kepercayaan: Majusi, Shabiab, Kristen, Hindu dan Budha* (Bandung: Diponegoro, 1982), 13.
10. Rahmat Hidayat, "Agama Dalam Perspektif Al-Qur'an," *Jurnal Ulunnuha* 8, no. 1 (2019): 127-41.
11. Kamāl Muhammad Isha, *al-'Aqīdah al-Islāmiyyah Safīnah al-Najāh* (Egyptian: Dār al-Shurūq, n.d.), 76.
12. Mohammed Arkoun, *The Notion of Revelation: From Ahl-Kitab to Society of the Book In Die Welt of Islams* (English: Brill, 1988), 85. Also see Lutfi Maulida and Siti Nurmajah, "Relasi Wahyu Dalam Tiga Agama Samawi (Kajian Terhadap Pemikiran Muhammad Arkoun)," *Al-Fikra: Jurnal Ilmiah Keislaman* 18, no. 1 (2019): 1-11.
13. Mun'im Sirry, "The Early Development of The Qur'anic Hanif," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 57, no. 2 (2011): 345-66. Also see Sirry, *Kemunculan Islam Dalam Keserjanaan Revisionis*, 77.
14. Waryono Abdul Ghafur, *Persaudaraan Agama-Agama: Millah Ibrahim Dalam Tafsir al-Mizan* (Bandung: Mizan, 2016), 37.
15. Fred M. Donner, "From Believers to Muslims: Confessional Self-Identity in the Early Islamic Community," *Al-Abhath: Journal of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences American University of Beirut* 50 (2003): 9-53.
16. Fred M. Donner, "From Believers to Muslims", 9-53. Also see Sirry, *Kemunculan Islam Dalam Keserjanaan Revisionis*, 112.
17. In QS. al-Baqarah [2]: 69, it is stated "Indeed, those who believe, Jews, Christians and Sabi'in people, whoever (among them) believes in Allah and the last day, and do good,

- they will be rewarded by their God, there is no fear of them, and they do not grieve.” In this verse, the description of inclusiveness that refers to beliefs other than “Islam” is stated very explicitly. Three main factors; belief in Allah, worshiping the last day, and doing good deeds, are pre-requisites for receiving rewards, regardless of any form of religious affiliation. Sirry, *Kemunculan Islam Dalam Kesenjanaan Revisionis*, 113.
18. Sirry, *Kemunculan Islam*, 114.
 19. Sirry, *Kemunculan Islam*, 116.
 20. M. Donner, “From Believers to Muslims: Confessional Self-Identity in the Early Islamic Community,” 9–53.
 21. Sirry, *Kemunculan Islam*, 118–20.
 22. The sources of exegesis used by Wahyudi represent classical and contemporary sources, which also represent theological schools of thought in Islam. There are at least 6 references to interpretation that are used as key research subjects for Wahyudi, namely; first, the interpretation written by al-Ṭabarī namely *Jāmi’ al-Bayān ‘an Ta’wīl Āy al-Qur’ān*, which represents the Sunni group. Second, is the commentary written by Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī Abū Ja’far al-Ṭūsī with the title *al-Tibyān fī Tafsīr al-Qur’ān* which representing the Shi’ah perspective. Third, the commentary written by al-Zamakhsharī with the title *al-Kashshāf ‘an Haqā’iq Gawāmiḍ al-Tanzīl wa ‘Uyūn al-Aqāwīl fī Wujūh al-Ta’wīl* who adopted the Mu’tazilah perspective. Fourth is the interpretation of *al-Manār* written by Rashīd Riḍā and Muḥammad Abduh which represents a Sunni perspective in the contemporary century. Fifth, is the interpretation of *al-Mizān fī Tafsīr al-Qur’ān* written by Ḥusain al-Ṭabaṭāba’ī which represents contemporary Shi’ah views. Lastly, Wahyudi uses Muhammad Arkoun’s views as a contemporary Muslim thinker. The three early sources used by Wahyudi represent classic exegetical sources, while the last three are contemporary sources.
 23. This view comes from the interpretation of surah Āli ‘Imrān (3): 64: “Say (Muhammad), “O People of the Book! Let (us) come to the same sentence (holding) between us and you, that we do not worship other than Allah and we do not associate anything with Him, and that we do not make each other gods besides Allah. If they turn away then say (to them), “Bear witness that we are Muslims.” See Jarot Wahyudi MH, “Exegetical Analysis of the ‘Ahl Kitab’ Verses of the Qur’an,” *Islamic Studies* 37, no. 4 (1998): 425–43.
 24. Wahyudi MH, “Exegetical Analysis of the ‘Ahl Kitab’ Verses of the Qur’an.”
 25. The verse that explains this is in QS. al-Mā’idah: 51.
 26. There are at least four verses in the three surah which say that the books containing the teachings of earlier religions (namely Judaism and Christianity) are no longer authentic and the Quran alludes to the fact that the contents of these books have been changed. The verse is in QS al-Baqarah [2]; 75, QS. al-Nisā’ [4]; 46 and also in QS. al-Mā’idah [5]; 41
 27. Verses that textually contain orders to fight and determine *jizyah* for them are found in QS. al-Taubah [9]; 29.
 28. Mun’im Sirry, “Memahami Kritik Al-Qur’an Terhadap Agama Lain,” *Journal of Qur’an and Hadith Studies* 3, no. 1 (2014): 1–15.
 29. These hadith narrations are mostly used to interpret the meaning of Ibrahim and Musa’s *ṣuḥuf*. See for example; al-Sakhāwī, *Tafsīr al-Qur’ān al-‘Azīm* (Kairo: Dar al-Nashr al-Jamī’at, 2009), vol. 2, 596. Al-Zamakhsharī, *al-Kashshāf ‘an Haqā’iq Gawāmiḍ al-Tanzīl*, Cet. III (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1986), vol. 4, 741. Al-Qurṭubī also quotes the same hadith, but uses the the different hadith narration that is at the end of the hadith, namely when Abū Dhar asked the Prophet about the substance of the *ṣuḥuf*. See Al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi’ li Ahkām al-Qur’ān*, Cet. II (Kairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyyah, 1964), vol. 20, 25.
 30. Ibn Hibbān, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Hibbān* (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2012), vol. 1, 534.
 31. This hadith does not have shawāhid or other paths transmission of companions than what was narrated from Abū Dhar. In addition, in this transmission, there is a reporter who

- has several problems in terms of their credibility, and received bad comments (*jarḥ*) from some *jarḥ-ta'dīl* scholars. The reporter is Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām ibn Yahyā al-Gasānī. Abū Ḥātim, for example, gave the label *kadhbḥāb* to Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām and considered that Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām was not worthy of taking transmission from him (*lā yuḥaddith 'anhu*). In addition, al-Dhahabī also commented that this narrator is *matrūk*. This hadith is also considered by some scholars not to be used as evidence. In the discourse on the science of *jarḥ wa ta'dīl* on the science of hadith, the labels *kadhbḥāb* and *matrūk*, which is imposed on Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām, is at the fifth level of the six levels of *jarḥ*. That is, his credibility as a reporter of hadith is very bad. See Ibn Ḥajar al-'Athqalānī, *Lisān al-Mizān* (Beirut: Mu'asasah al-'Ālamī, 1971), vol. 1, 123. See also Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl li Ibn Abī Ḥātim* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 1952), vol. 2, 143. To find out the level of *jarḥ* and its pronunciations, see Mahmūd Tahhān, *Taysīr Muṣṭalah al-Hadīth*, cet. VII (Riyād: Maktabah al-Ma'ārif, 1985), 152-154.
32. In this paper, Winter also tries to challenge the concept of pluralism, especially those who carry this idea using the perspective of the Qur'an, he says "The argument over the compatibility of such laws with the Quranic understanding of a just God must be developed elsewhere; but in these pages, I argue that Muslim supersessionist theologies may be disconnected from such purported legal entailments, and may be read in such a way as to reinforce rather than obstruct dialogue and mutual esteem. If this can be demonstrated, the moral case for the new theological 'pluralism' must lose a good deal of its force." Tim Winter, "The Last Trump Card: Islam and The Supersession of Other Faiths," *Studies in Interreligious Dialogue* 9, no. 2 (1999): 133-155.
 33. For example, the verse which explains that the holy books were written by their own hands (Jewish-Christians), as in QS. al-Baqarah [2]: 79: "So woe to those who write books with their (own) hands, then say, "This is from Allah," (with the intention) to sell them at a low price. So woe to them because of their handwriting, and woe to them because of what they have done." Another verse that explains the same thing is also found in QS. Āli 'Imrān [3]: 78: "And indeed, among them there must be a group who twist their tongues to read the Book, so that you think (what they read) is part of the Book, but it is not from the Book and they say, "It is from Allah," but it's not from God. They say lying things against Allah, while they know."
 34. Sirry, "Memahami Kritik Al-Qur'an Terhadap Agama Lain," 1-15.
 35. In some classic commentary literature it is stated that the form of justification in the Quran, to affirm the previous scriptures, is the justification of Allah's promise regarding the sending of a Messenger (Muhammad) and the revelation of the Quran. Such narratives can be found, for example, in the commentary of Ibn Kathīr. See Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-'Azīm*, Cet. II (Saudi: Dār Ṭayyibah, 1999), vol. 2, 5. In the interpretation of al-Qurṭubī it is also explained that the meaning of the word *muṣaddiqān* (to justify) means *muwaffiqān* (to agree). Furthermore, Al-Qurṭubī interprets the word *muṣaddiqān* by explaining that the Quran justifies itself and also justifies other holy books that were revealed before (*muṣaddiqān li nafsih wa muṣaddiqān li ḡayrih*). This interpretation can be said to be taken from another verse, where in QS. al-Ṣaff [61]: 6 it is stated that Jesus brought justification news regarding the sending of a Prophet after whose name is Ahmad (Muhammad), See al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi' li Ahkām al-Qur'ān*, vol. 4, 5.
 36. Sirry, "Memahami Kritik Al-Qur'an Terhadap Agama Lain," 1-15.
 37. In her writing, Sachedina explains; "it is remarkable that in the absence of any explicit or implicit statements of the Quran in support of the subsequent Muslim belief that the Islamic revelations have superseded the previous revelations, and hence that only Islam should prevail as the true religion, Islamic jurisprudence has extrapolated a number of 'exclusivist' and 'communalistic' rulings based on the otherwise tolerant Quranic and hadithic traditions. Abdulaziz Sachedina, "Political Implication of the Islamic Notion

- of ‘Supersession’ as Reflected in Islamic Jurisprudence,” *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 7, no. 2 (1996): 159-168. The argument offered by Sachedina probably does not take into account the views offered by the classical interpreters as previously explained. Whereas, the aspect of justification that the Quran tries to confirm is the justification regarding the narration of the revelation of the Prophet and the Quran which is in the previous holy books.
38. Sachedina, “Political Implication of the Islamic Notion of ‘Supersession’ as Reflected in Islamic Jurisprudence.”
 39. Sirry, “Memahami Kritik Al-Qur’an Terhadap Agama Lain,” 1–15.
 40. Muḥammad Fu’ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī, *al-Mu’jam al-Mufahras li Alfāz al-Qur’ān al-Karīm* (Kairo: Dār al-Ḥadīth, 2007).
 41. Sirry, *Kemunculan Islam Dalam Keserjanaan Revisionis*, 150.
 42. Al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi’ li Ahkām al-Qur’ān*, vol. 4, 5.
 43. Al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi’ li Ahkām al-Qur’ān*, vol. 6, 188.
 44. Al-Qurṭubī also includes the hadith of the Prophet regarding this event when interpreting the previous verse. This hadith was narrated by al-Nasā’ī from the friend of Ibn ‘Abbās. The hadith explains that the Bani Naẓīr are more noble than the Bani Quraizah. In this hadith it is also explained that if a person from the Bani Quraizah kills someone from the Bani Naẓīr, then he will be punished by being killed (*qiṣās*). However, when a person from Bani Naẓīr kills someone from Bani Quraizah, he will only be fined 100 wasq dates. See Al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi’ li Ahkām al-Qur’ān*, vol. 6, 187. See also al-Nasā’ī, *Sunan al-Kubrā* (Beirut: Mu’asasah al-Risālah, 2001), vol. 6, 329.
 45. Al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi’ li Ahkām al-Qur’ān*, vol. 6, 191.
 46. Wahbah al-Zuhailī, *al-Taḥfīr al-Munīr fī al-‘Aqīdah wa al-Sharī‘ah wa al-Manhaj* (Damaskus: Dār al-Fikr, 2009), 155-156.
 47. Wahbah al-Zuhailī, *al-Taḥfīr al-Munīr*, 542-548. See also Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (Cairo: Maṭbū‘ah ‘Isā al-Bāb al-Ḥalabī, 1955), vol. 3, 1327.
 48. A number of *sirah* books mention that when the Prophet met Bahīrah, a Christian religious leader, Bahīrah saw signs of prophecy in Muhammad. This incident occurred when Muhammad was still a child and was accompanying Abi Ṭālib to trade in Syria with his trade caravan. Bahīrah gave a warning to Abu Ṭālib to continue to see after Muhammad. This is because Bahīrah knows the prophetic signs in Muhammad as mentioned in scriptures of the previous people. Bahīrah ordered Abi Ṭālib to see after him because the Jewish religious leaders at that time were suspected of killing him when they learned of these signs, which were the closing signs of prophethood. This was allegedly the reason why the Jews hid or changed information about Muhammad’s prophethood, and became one of their distorting actions against the teachings of his holy book. See Ibn Hishām, *Sirah al-Nabawiyah* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, 1995), 218–220.
 49. Al-Zuhailī, *al-Taḥfīr al-Munīr*, 558.
 50. Al-Zuhailī, *al-Taḥfīr al-Munīr*, 559.
 51. Al-Zuhailī, *al-Taḥfīr al-Munīr*, 563.
 52. When referring to al-Qurṭubī’s interpretation of this verse, at least there are several opinions in interpreting the pronunciation of *mā fī al-ṣuḥuf al-ūlā* in this verse. The first opinion states that the pronunciation is interpreted as previous holy books such as the Torah, Bible and Psalms. The next opinion considers that the *suḥuf* here means signs in the form of good news about the sending of a Prophet, and this is found in the previous books in general. Another opinion says that *ṣuḥuf* here is interpreted as a warning about the destruction of the previous people because they denied and did not acknowledge the signs of God’s greatness. See al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi’ li Ahkām al-Qur’ān*, vol. 11, 264.
 53. Al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi’ li Ahkām al-Qur’ān*, vol. 17, 113.
 54. Al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi’ li Ahkām al-Qur’ān*, vol. 19, 217.

55. Al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi' li Ahkām al-Qur'an*, vol. 20, 24.
56. Al-Zuhailī, *al-Taḥfīr al-Munīr*, 134-152.
57. Al-Zuhailī, *al-Taḥfīr al-Munīr*, 576-578.

Bibliography

- ʿAbd al-Bāqī, Muḥammad Fuʿād. *al-Muʿjam al-Mufabras li Alfāz al-Qurʿān*. Kairo: Dār al-Hadīth, 2007.
- Al-Nasāʾi. *Sunan al-Kubrā*. Beirut: Muʿassasah al-Risālah, 2001.
- Al-Qurṭubī. *al-Jāmi' li Ahkām al-Qurʿān*. Cet. II. Kairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyyah, 1964.
- Al-Sakhāwī. *Taḥfīr al-Qurʿān al-ʿAẓīm*. Kairo: Dār al-Nashr al-Jāmiʿah, 2009.
- Al-Zamakhsharī. *al-Kashshaf ʿan Haqāʾiq Gawāmiḍ al-Tanzīl*. Cet. III. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1986.
- Al-Zarqā, Muṣṭafā Aḥmad. *al-Madkhal al-Fiqh al-ʿĀmm*. Damaskus: Matbaʿ Alif-Ba, 1968.
- Arkoun, Mohammed. *The Notion of Revelation: From Ahl-Kitāb to Society of the Book in Die Welt of Islams*. Ingggris: Brill, 1988.
- Billah, Md Maksun, dkk, "Revelation of the Qur'an Concerning Methods of Distortion in the Torah and the Bible: An Analytical and Critical Study." *Eximia Journal* 2 (2021).
- Donner, Fred M. "From Believers to Muslims: Confessional Self-Identity in the Early Islamic Community." *Al-Abhath: Journal of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences American University of Beirut* 50 (2003).
- Ghafur, Waryono Abdul. *Persaudaraan Agama-Agama: Millah Ibrahim Dalam Taḥfīr al-Mizan*. Bandung: Mizan, 2016.
- Hakim, Agus. *Perbandingan Agama Pandangan Islam Mengenai Kepercayaan: Majusi, Shabiah, Kristen, Hindu Dan Budha*. Bandung: Diponegoro, 1982.
- Helim, Abdul. "Memposisikan Kembali *Shar'u man Qablanā'* sebagai Istinbat Hukum Islam." *Himmah* VIII, no. 20 (2006).
- Hidayat, Rahmat. "Agama Dalam Perspektif Al-Qur'an." *Jurnal Ulunnuha* 8, no. 1 (2019).
- Hidayatullah. "Karakter Kepemimpinan Nabi Musa as Dalam Perspektif Al-Quran: Analisa Pada Kisah Nabi Musa As." Disertasi, Institut PTIQ, 2019.
- Ibn Abī Ḥātim. *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl li Ibn Abī Ḥātim*. Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1952.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAthqalānī. *Lisān al-Mizān*. Beirut: Muʿassasah al-ʿAlamī, 1971.
- Ibn Ḥibbān. *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Hibbān*. Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2012.
- Ibn Hishām. *Sīrah al-Nabawīyyah*. Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1995.
- Ibn Kathīr. *Taḥfīr al-Qurʿān al-ʿAẓīm*. Cet. II. Saudi: Dār Ṭayyibah, 1999.
- Isha, Kamāl Muhammad. *al-ʿAqīdah al-Islāmiyyah Safīnah al-Najāh*. Mesir: Dār al-Shurūq, n.d.
- Lasmana, Nunung, and Ahmad Suhendra. "Al-Qur'an dan Tiga Kitab Suci Samawi Lainnya." *Jurnal Al-Syukriyah* 18 (2017).
- Maulida, Lutfi, and Siti Nurmajah. "Relasi Wahyu Dalam Tiga Agama Samawi (Kajian Terhadap Pemikiran Muhammad Arkoun)." *Al-Fikra: Jurnal Ilmiah*

- Keislaman* 18, no. 1 (2019).
- Mehfooz, Musrefah dkk. "Similarity in the Philosophy of Worship in Torah and Quran." *Journal of Islamic Studies and Culture* 2, no. 2 (2014).
- Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj. *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Kairo: Maṭbū'ah 'Isā al-Bāb al-Ḥalabī, 1955.
- Rohima, Umniyatur. "Kisah Nabi Musa Dalam Al-Qur'an Menurut Penafsiran Hamka dan M. Quraish Shihab." Skripsi, UIN Sunan Kalijaga, 2020.
- Rohman, Beti, "Otentisitas Kitab Suci Agama Samawi dalam Al-Qur'an: Studi Pemikiran al-Qasimi dalam Tafsir al-Qasimy al-Musamma Mahasin al-Ta'wil." *Al-Amin: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Budaya Islam* 3, no. 2, (2020).
- Sachedina, Abdulaziz. "Political Implication of the Islamic Notion of 'Supersession' as Reflected in Islamic Jurisprudence." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relation* 7, no. 2 (1996).
- Sirry, Mun'im. "Memahami Kritik Al-Qur'an Terhadap Agama Lain." *Journal of Qur'an and Hadith Studies* 3, no. 1 (2014).
- _____. "The Early Development of The Qur'anic Hanif." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 57, no. 2 (2011).
- _____. *Kemunculan Islam Dalam Kecerjanaan Revisionis*. Cet.III. Yogyakarta: Suka Press, 2021.
- Ṭaḥḥān, Mahmūd. *Taysīr Mustalah al-Hadīth*. Riyāḍ: Maktabah al-Ma'ārif, 1985.
- Wahyudi MH, Jarot. "Exegetical Analysis of the 'Ahl Kitāb' Verses of the Qur'an." *Islamic Studies* 37, no. 4 (1998).
- Winter, Tim. "The Last Trump Card: Islam and The Supersession of Other Faiths." *Studies in Interreligious Dialogue* 9, no. 2 (1999).
- Zuhaili, Wahbah al-. *al-Tafsīr al-Munīr fī al-'Aqīdah wa al-Sharī'ah wa al-Manhaj*. Damaskus: Dār al-Fikr, 2003.

Ali Taufhan D. S., UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta | ali.taufhan@uinjkt.ac.id

Miftach Ansari, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta | miftach.ansari@mhsuinjkt.ac.id