

**MODERN RESEARCH ON HAKIM TIRMIDHI'S WORK
"TAHSIL NAZAIR AL-QUR'AN"****Zafar FAKHRIDDINOV**

International Islamic Academy Of Uzbekistan, Basic doctoral student of the Department of Islamic Studies and the Study of Islamic Civilization "ICESCO"; senior researcher of the Imam Maturidi International Scientific Research Center Uzbekistan
z.fahriddinov@iiau.uz

ABSTARCT

This article illuminates the study of the work "Tahsil Nazair al-Qur'an" by Hakim Tirmidhi by contemporary Arab scholars and critically analyzes their conclusions. The objectivity of the results was investigated based on primary sources. It is argued that Hakim Tirmidhi wrote his work in a different style from his predecessors. The advantages and disadvantages of Tirmidhi's work are shown. The article also provides information about the science of wujuh and nazair, its peculiarities, and works written in this direction.

Key words: *Qur'an, al-Wujuh wan Nazair fil-Qur'an (the meanings of the Qur'an), verses of the Qur'an, Hakim Tirmidhi, manuscript, scribe, collection.*

"Tahsil Nazair al-Qur'an" is a vocabulary of religious texts by Hakim Tirmidhi, more precisely, a work related to the vocabulary of the Qur'an ("Study of the meaningful words of the Qur'an"). This work was prepared by Hosni Zeidan and published in 1969 on the basis of a single manuscript number 3585 ج/II, copied in 503/1110 AD, kept in the Library of Alexandria Baladiyya. According to H. Zaidan, the manuscript is in the same volume as the author's other works, including "al-Masail al-maknuna" (Hidden Issues) and "Kitab ar-radd alal-Muattila" (Rejection of the Muattila sect). There is also a photocopy of it and a new manuscript copied from it in the Darul-kutub al-Misriyya library, which is kept under the number 19516ب. H. Zaidan testified that this copy was full of errors due to the fact that the copyist did not understand the text. However, the new manuscript pays special attention to the correct spelling of the verses of the Qur'an, which have some shortcomings in the original. Therefore, H. Zaidan writes that he decided to use only the old copy in preparing the work for publication [3: 15-16].

H. Zaidan also gives the following descriptive information about the manuscript. This copy consists of 32 sheets of large size, which are located in the middle of the collection on pages 48 to 79. The work is written in fluent naskh script, but it has many erroneous changes. There are also errors in the writing of some verses of the Qur'an. Nevertheless, the work is almost devoid of words and flaws. Its scribe was Ibn al-Adim, written in 503 AH [3:16].

After this information, H. Zaidan gives a detailed explanation of the method of preparation of the modern edition of the work. In particular, he said that he divided the chapters into sections for ease of use and comprehension, explained some difficult passages, clarified some personalities, clarified verses and hadiths, and provided catalogs at the end of the text [3: 16-17].

No research has been done to identify the source on which the "Tahsil Nazair al-Qur'an" is based. Some scholars have speculated that this unknown work may be the work of Muqatil ibn Sulaiman, who wrote the first complete work on wujuh and nazair, entitled "al-Wujuh wan-Nazair fil-Qur'an-al-Azim. For example, the Egyptian scholar Muhammad Ibrahim Juyushi, who fundamentally studied the legacy of Hakim Tirmidhi, makes this point in his study, "al-Hakim at-Tirmidhi - dirasatun li-asarihi wa afkarihi" (The Study of the Works and Thoughts of Hakim Tirmidhi). However, in M.Juyushi's data there are some peculiarities. In particular, Juyushi quotes the number of the collection of Hakim Tirmidhi's works in the Alexandrian Baladiyya Library as

145, and in addition to “Tahsil”, “al-Masailul-maknuna” and “Kitab ar-radd alal-Muattala”, he counted “al-Furuq”. He also mentions the name of the scribe as Haybatullah ibn Abu Jirad. [7:55] The number of commented words in “Tahsil Nazair al-Qur’an” is not eighty-one (81), but eighty (80), and they are listed in a slightly different order than that of H. Zaidan. For example, the words “al-I’tida” and “al-Farz” in numbers 28 and 29 in the edition of H. Zaidan as well as the words “as-Sawi” and “al-Asbab” in numbers 72 and 75 have been dropped; The word “al-Ahass” in number 46 is given in the form “al-Ihsas”, the word “ash-Shahid” in number 55 is given as “Shahid”; The phrase “La yarjuuna liqa’ana”, which does not exist in H. Zaidan’s edition, is also listed. There are also differences in the spelling of some words. At the same time, M. Juyushi also says that there is only one copy of the work [7:87]. However, a clear difference can be seen when comparing his list with the publication of H. Zaidan. Spontaneously, the question “Is it about one copy or another?” arises. Also, in the fourth chapter of his research, M. Juyushi again speaks about the word “Tahsil” and numbers the list of words, and repeats the ideas expressed in the previous chapter in a slightly different form [7: 162]. Uncertainties in the conclusions of M. Juyushi are reflected in the following:

1) M. Juyushi: “From the first lines of the book, it is clear to the reader that there is another book of the same name, which was read by al-Hakim and entered by the scribe himself, or there may be another book of the same name. As far as I know, Muqatil ibn Sulaiman wrote a similar book and al-Hakim must have read it”. [7:55]

2) M. Juyushi: “What is clear from the first lines of the preface of the book is that there is another book written in the same direction and al-Hakim read it and then copied it. Studies have shown that this was a book written by Muqatil ibn Sulaiman and named “al-Wujuh wan-Nazair”, following the path taken by al-Hakim in writing it. He even began with the word “al-Huda” which al-Hakim began to define”. [7:162]

The confusion in M. Juyushi’s first conclusion is that in the introduction to “Tahsil” Hakim Tirmidhi mentioned that he was looking at a book on the same subject and not on the same title, and this book cannot be a comment made by the scribe. This is because this information is given after the traditional phrase “Abu Abdullah said,” which means that these words clearly belong to Hakim Tirmidhi. In his initial conclusion, M. Juyushi speculated that the book read by Hakim Tirmidhi may belong to Muqatil ibn Sulaiman.

M. Juyushi’s second conclusion is a bit strict. He said that Hakim al-Tirmidhi wrote a book of imitation after reading a book in the same direction, and that the result of his research was Muqatil ibn Sulaiman’s “al-Wujuh wan-Nazair. In fact, from the first lines of “Tahsil” it is clear that Hakim Tirmidhi criticized the work, not imitated. There is no serious reason to conclude that this work belongs to Muqatil ibn Sulaiman. Moreover, Muqatil ibn Sulaiman was not the only scholar who wrote in this field. There are not many classical authors in the Islamic world who wrote on the subject of wujuh and nazair. If we count periodically, the following list of works created before Hakim Tirmidhi appears:

1. Muqatil ibn Sulaiman (d. 150/767 m.) – “al-Wujuh wan-Nazair fil-Qur’an al-Azim”;
2. Harun ibn Musa (d. 170/787 m.) – “al-Wujuh wan-Nazair fil-Qur’an al-Karim”;
3. Yahya ibn Salam (d. 200/816 m.) – “at-Tasarif”;
4. Hakim Tirmidhi (d. 255/932 m.) – “Tahsil Nazair al-Qur’an”;

The first four of the authors on this list were among the first to enter the field, and their works followed the same path in terms of style. To put it more simply, Muqatil ibn Sulaiman, who wrote the first complete work on wujuh and nazair, began with the word “al-huda”, then “al-kufr”, “ash-shirk”, “sawa”, “al-maradh”, “al-fasad” and so on.. Nowhere is it explained why the list went in that particular order. Closer to the truth, this

order is probably based on the fact that these words begin to appear one after the other from the first page of the Qur'an.

For example, "al-huda" occurs in the 1st verse of Surah al-Baqara, "al-kufr", "sawa" comes in the 6th verse of the same surah, "al-maradh" and "al-fasad" in the 10th and 11th verses and does not occur before. However, the same order is not regular, because the word "ash-shirk", which is the third in the list, does not occur among them. Harun ibn Musa, Yahya ibn Salam, and Hakim al-Tirmidhi, who were followers of Muqatil ibn Sulaiman, followed the same order. However, after the first three "nazair", it is noticeable that each author began to make minor differences in the number, choice and sequence of words.

A comparison of these works shows that the work that best corresponds to the list of "Nazairs" cited by al-Hakim al-Tirmidhi is not Muqatil ibn Sulaiman's, but Harun ibn Musa's "al-Wujuh wan-Nazair fil-Qur'an al-Karim" in which seventy-eight (78) words corresponded to the Tirmidhi list. The least appropriate is Yahya ibn Salam's "at-Tasarif", in which thirty-two (32) words are repeated. Fifty-seven (57) words correspond to Muqatil ibn Sulaiman. However, the words "al-hawf", "as-salat", and "an-nas" are not found in Harun ibn Musa. They are found in Muqatil ibn Sulaiman and Yahya ibn Salam. The word "ar-rada" is found only in Hakim Tirmidhi.

The French scholar P. Nwyia also pointed out that the work on which Hakim al-Tirmidhi was based must have belonged to Muqatil ibn Sulaiman or was very similar to his own [8:118]. However, these conclusions do not have a deep scientific basis and are based only on superficial formal similarities. On the contrary, in terms of style, Hakim Tirmidhi's approach is completely different, and this style is radically different from all the works written in this field. Both Muqatil ibn Sulaiman, Harun ibn Musa, and Yahya ibn Salam begin their work by enumerating the "wajh" of the word, which is interpreted as "nazair" and do not make excessive comments, quoting verses that reflect the meaning of "wajh". Hakim Tirmidhi first comments on the core of the word, then enumerates the "wajh". He does not always quote verses that reflect "wajh", but begins to explain why a particular word is given meaning in this "wajh". This is radically different from the approach of the previous three authors.

That is, Hakim al-Tirmidhi did not specify in which verse the word "al-Huda" means "al-Bayan". It is clear from the context of the sentence that it begins with a reference to the fact that this "wajh" is mentioned in the book to which he refers. Hakim Tirmidhi, on the other hand, explains the reason for this and justifies its return to the core. This style is not found at all in previous authors. It is clear that Hakim Tirmidhi began to write an independent work, citing another source as a basis. The critical approach here is that an unknown author enumerated various words in his book without explaining how they meant a single word. This has led to a demand for interpretation on his work.

In this regard, M. Juyushi's conclusion that Hakim Tirmidhi read the work of Muqatil ibn Sulaiman and wrote work similar to it is incorrect. This is although this conclusion was presented as a result of research. P. Nwyia's opinion that the unknown work is Muqatil ibn Sulaiman's work or another work very similar to his work is based only on formal similarity. This is because all three authors before Hakim al-Tirmidhi started their vocabulary with the word "al-Huda" and the reason for this has been explained in part above. To clarify the extent to which the "wajh" quoted by al-Tirmidhi to "al-Huda" correspond to the "wajh" quoted by Muqatil ibn Sulaiman or his followers, it is necessary to pay attention to the following table:

Nazair №1: Wajhs of al-Huda				
№	Hakim Tirmidhi	Muqatil bin Sulaiman	Harun ibn Musa	Yahya ibn Salam

1	<i>al-Bayan</i>	<i>al-Bayan</i>	<i>al-Bayan</i>	<i>Bayan^{an}</i>
2	<i>al-Islam</i>	<i>Dinul-Islam</i>	<i>Dinullislam</i>	<i>Dinul-Islam</i>
3	<i>at-Tawhid</i>	<i>al-Iyman</i>	<i>al-Iyman</i>	<i>al-Iyman</i>
4	<i>ad-Diin</i>	<i>Da'iy^{an}</i>	<i>ad-Da'i</i>	<i>ad-Du'a</i>
5	<i>ad-Du'a</i>	<i>al-Ma'rifa</i>	<i>Ma' rifa</i>	<i>Ma' rifa</i>
6	<i>Basira</i>	<i>Rusul^{an} wa kutub^{an}</i>	<i>Rusul wa kutub</i>	<i>Amr^{an}</i>
7	<i>al-Ma' rifa</i>	<i>ar-Rushd</i>	<i>al-Irshad</i>	<i>Rushd^{an}</i>
8	<i>al-Qur'an</i>	<i>Amru Muhammad</i>	<i>Amru Muhammad</i>	<i>Rusulan wa kutuban</i>
9	<i>ar-Rasul</i>	<i>al-Qur'an</i>	<i>al-Qur'an</i>	<i>al-Qur'an</i>
10	<i>ar-Rushd</i>	<i>at-Tawrat</i>	<i>at-Tawrat</i> (?)	<i>at-Tawrat</i>
11	<i>as-Sawab</i>	<i>al-Istirja'</i>	<i>al-Istirja'</i>	<i>at-Tawfiq</i>
12	<i>at-Taqwa</i>	<i>al-Hujja</i>	<i>Lā yahdi ila al-hujja</i>	<i>La yahdi ila al-hujja</i>
13	<i>at-Tawfiq</i>	<i>at-Tawhid</i>	<i>at-Tawhid</i>	<i>at-Tawhid</i>
14	<i>at-Tawba</i>	<i>Sunna</i>	<i>Sunna</i>	<i>Sunna</i>
15	<i>al-Mamarr</i>	<i>La yahdi - la yuslih</i>	<i>La yahdi - la yuslih</i>	<i>at-Tawba</i>
16		<i>al-Ilham</i>	<i>al-Ilham</i>	<i>Yahdi - yuslih</i>
17		<i>Tubna</i>	<i>Tubna</i>	<i>al-Ilham</i>

In the table, the “wajhs” quoted in Hakim Tirmidhi and that the other three authors do not have them, and in turn, the “wajhs” that three authors have but do not have Tirmidhi are highlighted in bold. A comparison of these “wajhs” makes it clear that the first three authors followed each other and created their work in the same direction.

This is because there is only one exception in them in “al-Istirja” wajh which is not found in Yahya ibn Salam. If we compare them with Tirmidhi’s list, four of the “wajhs” he cites do not occur in the three authors, and the seven wajhs they cite do not occur in Tirmidhi. Unlike Tirmidhi, the order of the wajhs is almost the same in all three authors, but in Tirmidhi it is different. Moreover, Tirmidhi cited eighteen wajhs in the work he used and commented on fifteen of them, but in the works of Muqatil ibn Sulayman and his followers, the number of “wajhs” does not exceed seventeen.

All of the above shows that the work that served as the basis for “Tahsil Nazair al-Qur’an” cannot be Muqatil ibn Sulayman’s work or any other work very similar to his. Hakim Tirmidhi, on the other hand, did not follow the style of Muqatil ibn Sulayman in writing his work, nor did he imitate his work. Therefore, it is correct to say that neither the name nor the author of the book that led to the writing of “Tahsil” is unknown. The following conclusions can be drawn from the opinions and information provided by the scholars who studied the work:

- The work “Tahsil Nazair al-Qur’an” has not been fully studied on the scientific basis and there is no scientific edition of the book;

- The most objective and truthful of the opinions expressed about the work “Tahsil Nazair al-Qur’an” are the opinions of H. Zaidan, who prepared its modern edition, albeit briefly;

- The information, opinions and conclusions given by M. Juyushi are quite confusing and need to be reconsidered. If the copy of the manuscript he studied is a copy other than that of H. Zaidan, it is likely a “new manuscript” full of errors;

- Hakim Tirmidhi used a completely different style from his predecessors in writing “Tahsil Nazair al-Qur’an”. This method, as the researchers point out, is a lexical-analytical method. It substantiates the core of the word, its etymology, relation to other cognate words and the return of the original meaning to its core, even if it is used in other meanings. This reflects the lexicographic features of this source.

REFERENCES

1. at-Tirmidhi, al-Hakim. Buduwush-sha’n. Prepared by Osman Yahya. Beirut: 1965.
2. Muzayyan.R.M. al-Hakim at-Tirmidhi and manhajuhu al-hadith fi Nawadir al-usul. Cairo: 1998.
3. at-Tirmidhi, al-Hakim. Tahsil Nazair al-Qur’an. Prepared by Hosni Zaidan. Cairo: Matba’atus-sa’ada, 1969.
4. as-Suyuti, Jalaluddin. al-Itqan fi ulumil-Qur’an. Beirut: Muassasatur-Risala. 2008.
5. Ibn al-Manzur, Jamaluddin Muhammad ibn Mukarram al-Ifriki al-Misri. Lisan al-Arab. Beirut: Daru Sadir. 1300/1883 - T.5.
6. al-Qanuji, Siddiq ibn Hasan. Abjadul-ulum. Prepared by A.Zakkar. Damascus: Manshurat wizaratis-saqafa wal-irshadil qavmi, 1978.
7. al-Juyushi. al-Hakim at-Tirmidhi - dirasatun li-asarihi and afkarihi. Cairo: Darun-nahzatil-arabiyya, 1980.
8. Nwyia P. Exegese coranique et langage mystique. Beyrouth: Dar el machreq editeurs, catholique imprimerie, 1970.

