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Abstract

This article explores the origins and genealogy of kalam thought in the Commentary of al-Ibriz by Bisri Mustofa. The tradition of writing interpretations of the Qur’an is described as a cross-generational literary heritage. The written commentaries (Tafsir) will not be separated from the influence of previous works of interpretation, and the works of interpretation will likely influence future works of interpretation, including Tafsir al-Ibriz, a complete Tafsir al-Qur’an of 30 chapters written in Javanese using the Pegon Arabic script in the mid-20th century AD. This article examines the genealogy of kalam thought in al-Ibriz by tracing the sources of kalam interpretation from other interpretations to find the origins of the idea of kalam. Using qualitative research methods and library research techniques, this study tries to examine al-Ibriz’s relationship with past Commentary works and how the addition of the author’s kalām thoughts can be done by adding, omitting, or summarizing kalām’s interpretation of the verse under study. It was found that from the point of view of kalām thinking, al-Ibriz has many connections with earlier Commentary works such as Tafsir Jalālayn, Tafsir Khāzin, and Tafsir Baydāwi to the earliest works of exegesis such as Tafsir Māturīdī and Tafsir Tabarī.
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Introduction

Since its inception, the Qur’ān has been on the verge of being understood and used correctly so that its teachings can be appropriately applied in human life. From time to time, interpretation has occasionally seen notable advancements, similar to other fields of knowledge in the Islamic scientific heritage. It has always been a key area of study for scholars. This is evident from the numerous commentaries written by academics who aim to read the Qur’ān appropriately for human understanding of kalamullāh. It is possible to determine that each work of interpretation has a connection to the others, even though there are many works of Commentary from the time of the mutaqaddimīn academics to the present day, which is organized according to the madhhab of each author. This is because the tradition of composing the Qur’ān has been described as a literary tradition spanning centuries, or, as Walid Saleh put it, that an interpretational work is not just the labor of its creator but also the result of a long tradition of interpretation (Saleh, 2004, pp. 14–16).
The idea of Tafsīr bi al-ma’thūr, in which a work of interpretation references exegesis narrations from the Prophet, companions, as well as tābi‘ūn and tābi‘ū bi al-tābī‘īn, to determine the meaning of the verse being studied, is well-known in the tradition of interpreting the Qur’ān. Because the proper interpretation is based on the interpretation of the Prophet, the companions, and other individuals, this type of interpretation appears to be inextricably linked to the process of Qur’ānic interpretation. A commentator also has a tradition of citing the authority of earlier commentators who are thought to have the correct opinion or quoting in the context of criticism. It is customary to reference passages from the Qur’ān when analyzing them, whether to express ideas or criticism like this. This helps to establish a strong connection between one work and another.

Even across areas and languages, contemporary Commentary works follow this form of genealogical heritage. Finding the connection between one interpretation and another is urgently sought while tracing the history of Commentary works in this situation. The commentator’s stance about other commentators’ viewpoints on a verse is also crucial to note. In addition, we can learn more about the authors’ original interpretations, which diverge from the justifications provided in earlier remarks. The verses of kalām, as interpreted by Bisri Mustofa (d. 1977) in his interpretation of al-Ibrīz, are the main focus of this research. Due to the vast number of kalām verses in the Qur’an, every work of interpretation will undoubtedly tackle the subject of kalām in its interpretation, making it a universal object for research. This research intends to shed light on the history of kalām thinking, its connection to earlier interpretations such as al-Ibrīz, as well as the opinions of commentators on kalām thought.

Genealogical studies within the scope of hermeneutical research are a field of research that has received considerable attention from several academics. Waled Saleh, with his work entitled The Formation of the Classical Tafsīr Tradition: The Quran Commentary of al-Thalābī, examines the interpretation of Thallabī and elucidating its connection to previous interpretations, thus providing an overview of the term he refers to as the ‘genealogical tradition’ of Qur’ānic Commentary (Ali-de-Unzaga, 2006; Saleh, 2004). In his article titled ‘Letter by Letter: Tracing the Textual Genealogy of a Sufi Tafsīr,’ Martin Nguyen attempts to examine the relationship between Lata‘if al-Ishārāt
by Qushayri (d. 465/1072) and previous works of Commentary. He mentions that his research aims to address the textual forebears of the *Latā'if al-Ishārāt* (Bauer, 2013). Based on the previous research, this research aims to present a model of genealogical research in the field of Commentary, specifically focusing on theological thought with al-Ibriz as the object, which has not been explored in previous research. The expected outcome of this research is to complement existing studies and uncover new facts that can deepen and broaden insights into various previously conducted studies.

**Theoretical Review**

The original definition of genealogy was a study that looked at the documentation of a person’s, family’s, or group’s lineage back to an ancestor or an earlier form. The research of justifications for the historical beginnings and progression of things also gives rise to the name genealogy research aimed to determine the beginnings and progression of kalām thinking in *Tafsir al-Ibriz*’s utilizing this understanding. Waled Saleeh’s explanation of the history of classical Qur’anic interpretation is one of the general theories relating to studying ancestry in interpretation. The classical Quran commentary follows a genealogical tradition, meaning any new interpretation work has a dialectical connection with every preceding commentary work. Each commentator demonstrates the tradition of continuity in sharing interpretational concepts as the fundamental interpretation approach (Saleh, 2004, p. 14).

Regarding *kalām*, it is a branch of knowledge in the Islamic faith that studies *aqīdah*, or in-depth, the nature and deeds of Allah about concerns of this world and the afterlife (Najjār, 2003, pp. 4–7). One opinion claims that this science originated during Muawiyah’s period with the establishment of the Mu’tazilite school. This science of *kalām* appeared at the same time as the beginning of disputes between Muslims in terms of philosophy and politics (Jazirī, 1992, pp. 8–9; Najjār, 2003, p. 26). As it continued to advance, the science of *kalām* significantly impacted how the Qur’an was interpreted, helping to validate their viewpoints. The path of *kalām* in the interpretation of the Qur’an has historically varied depending on the *kalām mazhab* which are currently in existence, such as Mu’tazilah, Ashariyah, and Shia (Riḍā’i al-İşfahānî, 2011, p. 355–369).

---
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Method

This research integrates library research methods with a qualitative methodology. The research topic is evaluated in a descriptive-analytical manner by outlining the issue and then evaluating it by developing a specific theory. The research shall focus on five topics, including the presence of God, the purported shirk of Adam, the deception of Ibrahim, the Two Great Sins, and the Name of al-Hāqqah. The research centers on verses containing kalam themes, such as concerning Allah, prophecy, and the afterlife. After describing the explanations in al-Ibrīz, it is then discussed how the explanations in other interpretations differ, starting with the earlier interpretations and working backward from the main sources of al-Ibrīz, such as the tafsir Baydawi, the tafsir Khāzin, and the tafsir Jalālayn. This allows one to discover the genesis of the kalām thought. After that, the numerous interpretations of the interpretation books were examined by comparison to Tafsīr al-Ibrīz.

Result

Context of al-Ibrīz

Bisri Mustofa, ulama from Rembang, who studied for several years in Mecca with eminent scholars, wrote al-Ibrīz. He got a substantial amount of his Islamic education in Islamic boarding schools in Indonesia. Between the Dutch and Japanese colonial periods and Indonesia’s independence, Bisri lived through intense political turbulence in his native country. He also plays a significant role in the Nahdlatul Ulama organization, significantly contributing to community outreach and education. Bisri constructed a madrasa to advance da’wah and general education, and it has since grown to become one of Rembang’s most significant educational institutions. One of the experts who create books is Bisri, who has produced about 54 books on subjects like morality, aqidah, and a variety of religious sciences (Muaz et al., 'Alallah, M., Rosyidi, J., Alkatib, 2020, p. 26–42).

Al-Ibriz, a commentary that explains all 30 jūz of the Qur’an in the sequence of the manuscripts, is one of the most significant works that has been extensively examined up to this point. This work successfully made Bisri one of the most well-known
Indonesian exegetes. With a brief explanation of the meaning, al-Ibrīz is written in Javanese using the Pegon Arabic character. This interpretation may be written in Javanese because of the language’s popularity among Indonesians, where there are an estimated 40% of speakers of Javanese. When al-Ibrīz was published, the Pegon script was also a style frequently used in literary works.

Bisri freely acknowledges that parts of commentaries by Tafsīr Jalālāyn, Tafsīr Bayḍāwī, Tafsīr Khāzin, and others served as the inspiration for his writing. This interpretation tries to make it possible for Muslims to understand the meaning of the Qur’an straightforwardly. Particularly, the interpretation of al-Ibrīz lacks a predisposition toward any particular style. The al-Ibrīz style frequently combines social, kalām, tasawuf, and fiqh styles (Rohkmad, 2011). Al-Ibrīz, so that one of the dominating patterns does not emerge, explains with a balanced number of verses that fall into the categories of fiqh, tasawuf, kalām, and social society. Numerous research has attempted to shed light on various characteristics of al-Ibrīz to provide a more detailed understanding of the interpretation of those characteristics. Numerous studies have attempted to shed light on some of al-Ibrīz’s traits, including his social, cultural, and kalam aspects as well as his Sufi practice (Andriawan, 2022; Fahmi, 2019; Ikhsan, 2022; Mu’jizat, 2019; Rohkmad, 2011; Sholikhah, 2017).

Discussion

Genealogy of Thought kalām al-Ibrīz

Al-Ibrīz prefers to adhere to the Ahl Sunnah school of kalām, where he is also quite active in translating and narrating (explaining) several publications on the subject of kalām science that are considered to be part of the school, including Rawihāh al-Aqwām Nazm ‘Aqidah al-Awwām, Sullam al-Afhām tarjama ‘Aqidah al-Awwām, and ad-Durar al-Bayān fi tarjama Shu‘ab al-iḥān. As far as the author can tell, there have been no studies that have concentrated on kalām thought’s ancestry studies, which look at the thought’s genesis and connections to other current interpretations, despite studies that have attempted to study the side of kalām in al-Ibrīz. The research discussion is described as follows:
1. The Existence of Allah

The controversy over Allah’s existence is one of the topics that has given rise to a protracted discussion in the discipline of kalām. Several verses are employed as study subjects for this discussion in the field of commentary studies, including “Do you feel secure that He Who is in heaven...?” (QS. al-Mulk: 16). Upon first inspection, this verse makes it clear where God is—in the sky. The verse’s literal interpretation is at odds with the belief that Allah should not exist since it is incompatible with creation, which is the Ahl Sunnah and Mu'tazila's view. This is when the verse's kalām controversy concerning its meaning occurs (Jushami, 1435, p. 7011; Thallabi, 1422, p. 382). Other groups, like Jahmiyyah, asserted that the phrase should be interpreted literally and claimed that Allah is present above the throne and throughout all of creation (Ibn Kasir, 1999, p. 240). According to the Salaf scholars, if the verse’s editorial were stated without any explanation, it would suggest Allah is a jism (Shafi’i, 1426, p. 1063).

About the explanation of Qur'an sūrah al-Mulk verse 16, in al-Ibriz, Bisri explains the sentence "أَمِنتُ مَن فِى ٱلسَّمَاءِ" in the translation of the word as follows: “Are you safe on the figure who is in the sky?” This demonstrates that he precisely translated the words he placed beneath each word in the verse by the verse’s tone. As for the definition of the phrase, it is written in al-Ibriz. “Are you safe (not frightened) on the One who has power in the sky?” (Mustofa, n.d., p. 2110). It is clear from this justification that Bisri understood "the figure in the sky" to refer to the might of God rather than the Divine Essence. This suggests that Bisri supports the view that the expression in verse is not textually understood but incorporates the meaning of ta’wil.

In this view, Bisri appears to be quoting Jalālayn’s Commentary, but in reality, he has changed the editorial language of the source and translated the opinion into Javanese. In Jalālayn, it is mentioned that the meaning of the sentence "سُلطَانه وَقُدْرَته" is "His sultanate and power" (Maḥalli, A. ‘Abd A. M. ibn S. al-Dīn al-, & Suyūṭī, n.d., p. 756), “God is sovereign in the skies,” Bisri said in his explanation. If Jalālayn is the primary source of information he cites, Bisri is referring to both revising the editorial and quoting Jalālayn’s viewpoint. Because this opinion is not included in other
important texts, such as *Lubāb al-Ta’wil* by Khāzīn (d. 741/1341) and *Anwār al-Tanzil* by Baydāwī (d. 719/1319). The opinion cited by Bisri is, in reality, comparable to the account of the opinion voiced in *Jalālayn* by Rāzī (d. 606/1210) in *Maṣāḥīḥ al-Ghayb*. According to Rāzī, the phrase “God’s strength is in the sky” means that God exercises his power in the sky (Rāzī, 1420, p. 30, 592). This viewpoint is comparable to Bisri’s assertion in *al-Ibrīz* that Allah’s sovereignty over the sky is implied by the phrase “the figure in the sky.”

Let us look up other earlier interpretations of *al-Ibrīz*, including the interpretation of *al-Ibrīz*’s reference, especially *Lubāb al-Ta’wil* and *Anwār al-Tanzil*. We find many different perspectives on the phrase “the figure in the sky” in Qur’an surah al-Mulk verse 16. These beliefs include God’s authority (as stated by *al-Ibrīz*), angels, matters and decisions, and God is in the sky as the Arabs believe, God’s punishment, Allah is above the throne but does not resemble a creature, and The One who created and is the owner of the heavens (Abū al-Sa‘ūd, n.d., p. 10,389; Baydāwī, 1418, p. 5,230; Jushami, 1435, p. 10,7010; Khāzīn, n.d., p. 3,320; Qurṭubī, 1384, p. 18,215; Rāzī, 1420, p. 30,590). The author has not discovered the justifications or motivations that Bisri has for deciding and selecting one of the opinions above, namely the opinion that explains that the meaning of the verse expression is “the power of God,” out of the various opinions that exist regarding the expression of the verse in Qur’an surah al-Mulk verse 16. Nevertheless, he appears to simplify and suffice by citing the viewpoint in *Jalālayn*, which he probably takes as a reliable source.

Opinions that mention sentences من في أنفاس as different works of interpretation contain opinions about “the power of God.” Several interpretations reference this opinion, and if we go back to the previous remarks since Jalālayn’s Commentary, we will discover quite a few. Qurṭubī’s (d. 671/1273) interpretation of al-Jāmī’ is the Commentary that was closest to Jalālayn’s period and expressed the same viewpoint. The opinion is expressed by quoting without a clear source using the expression فلٌ , فل فلّة وسنّة وغرفة وملكة, the last two words are two words that are not found in Jalālayn (Qurṭubī, 1384, p. 18, 215). The opinion Qurṭubī cited is the same as that found in Thalabi’s interpretation of *al-Kashf wa al-Bayān*, according to a
search, suggesting that Qurṭubī may have taken his words directly from Tha’labī (Tha’labī, 1422, p. 9,359).

This viewpoint is expressed with the words سلطانه وقُدرته after Qurṭubī, then back again, in Rāzī’s Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb, it’s just that the word سلطانه not available in Jalālayn (Rāzī, 1420, p. 30, 592). Because Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb is one of Jalālayn’s sources, it is most likely that Suyūṭī quoted verbatim from Rāzī but without giving him credit (Akpınar, n.d.). Additionally, a similar view is expressed in Mahmud Naysābūrī’s (d. 550/1155) I’jāz al-Bayān with the words عرشه أو سلطانه “His Arsy or His power” (Naysābūrī, 1415, p. 2, 826). Following that, the viewpoint was also discovered in Wāḥīdī’s work al-Wajīz with the expression قدرته وسلطانه وعرشه “His Dominion, His Sultanate and His Arsh” (Wāḥīdī, 1415, p. 1118). The earliest source of this opinion is Māturīdī’s Ta’wilāt Ahl al-Sunnah with the expression ملكه وسلطانه (Māturīdī, 1426, p. 10, 117). It may be the case that Māturīdī himself came up with this opinion based on his editorial submission to his interpretation and explanation without using any quotation marks. No similar or comparable opinions were discovered despite the author’s investigation of prior works and the history of interpretations. The verse is often interpreted literally in the earlier Māturīdī readings, i.e., that Allah is in the sky, but with the knowledge that Allah is not like a creature (Muqātil ibn Sulaymān, 1423, p. 4, 391-392; Shāfiʿī, 1426, p. 10, 1063,1397). As a result, it may be claimed that Bisrī’s viewpoint on Qur’an sūrah al-Mulk verse 16 is where it originated in Māturīdī. It is quite likely that the scholars later propagated this Māturīdī opinion by quoting it, making it available in later Ahl Sunnah commentary, leading to the interpretational effort that formed the basis for al-Ibrīz.

2. Alleged Shirk Adam

According to Islamic tradition, a prophet follows Allah’s directives and steers clear of all forms of polytheism. A prophet is not worthy of engaging in shirk before being chosen as a prophet, even for some tribes. However, the Qur’an has a statement that initially appears to suggest that a prophet, in this case, Adam, engaged in shirk, as stated in the following verse: “They ascribe to others a share in the gift they have received” (QS. al-Aʾrāf: 190). This also sparks the kalām controversy and leads
to several poem readings. The following are some of the verse's interpretations by scholars: (1) the subject of ﺟَعَلَا in verse above are the children of Adam, not Adam and Eve, so the perpetrators of shirk are the children of Adam and Eve. (2) The word ﻣُشرِكَاءَ is used to refer to participants or partners, not to associate partners with Allah. The obedient child joined Adam and Eve in eating and drinking. (3) By giving their offspring names that followed the devil’s advice, Adam and Eve committed shirk. (4) The Quraysh are the subject of the verse above, not Adam and Eve. (5) The subject of ﺟَعَلَا is Jews and Christians in the verse above. (6) The word ﺟَعَلَا means “Do the two of them then make partners for him?” because it is an istifhām (question) (Al-‘Izz ibn ‘Abd is-Salām, 1416, p. 1, 518; Ibn Kasir, 1999, p. 3, 525; Jushamī, 1435, p. 4, 2810; Khāzin, n.d., p. 2, 281; Maḥalli, A. ‘Abd A. M. ibn S. al-Dīn al-, & Suyūṭī, n.d., p. 223; Nasaʿī, 1419, p. 1, 624; Samin et al., p. 5, 535-536). In the word-for-word translation of the passage, Bisri mentions that the subject of the word ﺟَعَلَا is Adam and Eve so that they both engage in acts of shirk or partner association. As stated in the Commentary on al-Ibrīz by Bisri:

Adam and Eve called their kid Abdul Haris, and the name was given by Satan when God gave them a virtuous child. Above everything else that has companions with Him is Allah, the Exalted (Mustofa, N.y., 482-483).

From the evidence provided above, it may be inferred that Adam and Eve intended to become partners to give their kid the name ‘Abd al-Ḥārith, which Satan prescribed. Let us examine the source texts of al-Ibrīz. We will discover that this explanation is comparable to the explanation in Jalālayn, and it is clear that Bisri concisely quotes this opinion from Jalālayn. It is further clarified in Jalālayn that Adam’s act of shirk involved naming his kid ‘Abd al-Ḥārith, even though there is no such thing as a servant other than that which belongs to Allah. In the instance of Ubdīyyah, this is not a type of shirk because Adam was prevented from doing so (Maḥalli, A. ‘Abd A. M. ibn S. al-Dīn al-, & Suyūṭī, n.d., p. 223).

Numerous commentators have cited this opinion in his work, as seen in the preceding Commentary. Although some works disputed this opinion, this opinion was documented in the bulk of Tafsīr from the Middle Ages to the Early Times. In addition to Jalālayn, several texts from the al-Ibrīz commentary also refer to this viewpoint. These sources include Lubāb al-Ta’wil by Khāzin and Anwār al-Tanzīl by Bayḍawī. It
has been suggested by a few narratives that Adam’s shirk named his son ʿAbd al-Ḥārith. The names of academics and narrations from the Prophet are among them, Iblu Abbas, Said b. Jubair, Samrah B. Jandab, Ikrimah, Qatadah, and Mujahid (Mujāhid, 1410, p. 348; Ṭabarî, 1420, p. 13). We can infer from this knowledge that, about Adam’s shirk in Qur’an surah al-Aʾrāf verse 190, al-Ibriz quoted the consensus of academics by summarizing and sufficing that Adam’s shirk was giving his son the name ʿAbd al-Ḥārith. We can infer from this evidence that Jalālayn is the source of the kalām in al-Ibriz about Qur’an surah al-Aʾrāf verse 190 as the two viewpoints are practically identical textually. It is also possible that Bisri also compared his interpretations to those of other authors he cited as references, such as Lubāb al-Taʾwil and Anwār al-Tanzil. This opinion was founded on the Prophet’s narration and Salaf scholars. Through Jalālayn, Lubāb al-Taʾwil, and Anwār al-Tanzil, who afterward cite the background of early commentators, the connection between al-interpretation al-Ibriz’s and the interpretation of the early generations may be explained. Even though Lubāb al-Taʾwil and Anwār al-Tanzil cited direct narrations of the opinions of the first commentators, it is obvious that they acquired this information through earlier commentaries, which they did not acknowledge because the background of that opinion was already well-known. Jāmiʿ al-Bayān is probably the primary interpretation that develops into a standard for history and then spreads to other interpretations because Ṭabarî’s Jāmiʿ al-Bayān contains an exhaustive account of the history (Ṭabarî, 1420, p. 13, 307-313).

3. Ibrahim’s Lies

The Qur’anic issue of the purported falsehood by Ibrahim has generated a lot of scholarly discussions and is one of the kalām themes. This is as contained in the following sentence: "And he said, ‘I am indeed sick!’ (QS. al-Ṣaffāt: 89). One group of scholars claims the phrase is a fabrication of Ibrahim, as reported in a hadith attributed to the Prophet. They acknowledge that Ibrahim lied, but it was forgiven, and a prophet was still exempt from committing a serious sin (Zajjāj, 1408, p. 4,92-93). While it is proven that the hadith narration is authentic on the one hand, other groups, such as the Muʿtazilah, deny not only that the prophets lied, including the Prophet Ibrahim, in the context of the verse above, but they also deny all hadith narrations that are oriented to information about the prophets' lies (Jushamī, 1435, p. 7,4846). Other scholars
attempt to interpret the verse to refute the notion that Ibrahim lied. Ibrahim’s expression can be interpreted in the following ways: (1) harm resulting from idolatry, (2) Every human being will pass away; this is what is meant by محمد "sick man," (3) Based on the knowledge he gathers from observing the stars, Ibrahim will be ill; (4) All humans must be ill, even only a little; (5) Ibrahim fakes being ill or tells lies to mislead his people; and (6) Ibrahim will feel agony since all humans must be ill. Will feel discomfort, and (7) Ibrahim was suffering from a true illness (Ibn Furak, 1430, p. 2,233,234; Jushamı, 1435, p. 8, 5935; Māturıdı, 1426, p. 8573; Muqātīl ibn Sulaymān, 1423, p. 3,612; Samarqandī, n.d., p. 2, 558; Ṭabarı, 1420, p. 22, 63, 64).

In the chapter al-Qissah, which describes Namrud and the people in his nation, Bisri in al-Ibrız clarifies Ibrahim’s expression. Namrud and his people have an annual custom of celebration in the shape of a fun party that is highly vivacious. If the celebration occurs, the city will be quiet since everyone in the community will attend it outside the city limits. People would return to the city and the place of worship-temptation to-worship statues after the festivity. Ibrahim received an invitation from the community to attend the event once, just before it was to begin. Ibrahim, however, preferred to smash statues instead of doing so (Mustofa, n.d., p. 1584). The following explanation of the meaning of Ibrahim’s phrase, together with the verses before and after it, was then given as a continuation of the explanation:

Ibrahim pretended to see the stars when he was invited (astrology was popular at the time), then he stated, “If I stare at the stars, I will get sick.” Prophet Ibrahim was left behind when they headed off on their own after the Prophet Ibrahim had come to believe it.

If the terms “pretend to see the stars” and “shall be sick” are entered in a search, Bisri’s explanation above appears to directly quote Jalālayn’s argument (Mahallı, A. ʿAbd A. M. ibn S. al-Din al-, & Suyūtī, n.d., hal. 593). Although not literal, such an explanation is cited numerous times in the commentaries written before Jalālayn, which is most likely the source from which Jalālayn borrowed this viewpoint. Ibn Juzay’s al-Tashil, Baydawı’s Anwar al-Tanzil (Baydawı, 1418, p. 5, 13), Qurṭubı’s al-Jāmi (Qurṭubı, 1384, p. 15, 92), Rāzı’s Mafāṭib al-Ghayb (Rāzı, 1420, p. 26, 341), Ibn al-Jawzı’s Zād al-Masır (Ibn al-Jawzı, 1422, p. 3, 545), Zamakhsharı’s al-Kashshāf (Zamakhsharı, n.d., p. 4, 49), Sam‘āni’s Tafsir al-Qur‘ān (Sam‘āni, n.d., p. 4, 404), Wāḥidī’s al-Wajīz (Wāḥidī,
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1415, p. 912), Tha’labī’s al-Kashf wa al-Bayān (Tha’labī, 1422, hal. 8, 148) and Māturīdī’s Ta’wilat ahī al-Sunnah (Māturīdī, 1426, p. 8,573) are one of the commentary pieces written before Jalālayn that expresses a similar viewpoint (Ibn Juzayy, 1416, p. 2,194). If we look at the numerous works of Commentary, each includes a view that Ibrahim saw the stars by pretending to be unwell to fool his followers into thinking he was or would be sick. As a result, the people who wished to invite Ibrahim to the celebration abandoned him. Then, according to some readings, Ibrahim demolished the idols in the city when the people went to celebrate outside the city. In diverse ways, the many works of interpretation mentioned above express the belief that Ibrahim duped his people rather than deceived them. This means that none of the discussion seems to quote literal or textual opinions. Among the works of interpretation are those that make use of the word “Ibrahim deceived them,” “Ibrahim got them to think.” أراهم وهم. “Ibrahim demonstrated,” and فعاملهم من حيث كانوا نذكاراً عليه “Ibrahim acted in such a way that they could not refute it.”

According to our search, Māturīdī’s interpretation is among the early Commentary works that include this opinion. However, this is not Māturīdī’s own opinion, as it can be observed in his interpretation that he is paraphrasing other people’s opinions with his expressions. “and the ta’wil expert says.” Unfortunately, it is unclear whom he meant by the phrase "Ahlu Ta’wil"; it is possible that he felt there was no need to provide the name or attribution to a specific scholar because this was one of the mainstream ideas of his time. Māturīdī also failed to highlight that Ibrahim had lied or fooled his people. It is only that the sentence he cited could have the sense of deceiving, but it is not clear, possibly because he does not want to give the appearance that Ibrahim is telling the truth. Māturīdī underlined that it was wrong to assign lying to the Prophet, even though he did not appear adamant in rejecting the narration that revealed Ibrahim’s deceit. It only appears to disregard the claims of those who claim Ibrahim lied three times. including speech إبن سفيهم in Qur’an surah as-Saffāt verse 89 (Māturīdī, 1426, p. 8,65,573). The first source that expressly asserts the belief that Ibrahim fooled his people is Tabārī’s Jāmiʿ al-Bayān, which quotes the opinion of Bishr bin Muaz al-Aqdi (d. 245), where Bishr says: كأيد به عن دينه (Tabārī, 1420, p. 21, 63). It is
also possible that this is Bishr’s interpretation of the Prophet’s hadith, which reveals that the word Ibrahim in verse is one of Ibrahim’s three falsehoods.

4. Two Sins

The Qur’an explains that a person will pay for their misdeeds in the hereafter, and of course, they will pay the price (QS. Fātir: 18). But the Qur’an contains a verse that appears to expressly indicate that a person can bear the sins of others. It is the verse that reads as follows: “Indeed I want you to obtain my sin and your sin” (QS. al-Mā’idah: 29). The context of the verse refers to Qābīl and Hābīl, who both perform qurban; nevertheless, Hābīl’s qurban is accepted, while Qābīl’s qurban is not. This is clarified in the preceding verses. When Qābīl learned of this, he refused to accept it and vowed to kill Hābīl. Hābīl then gave Qābīl advice in numerous statements that included the words mentioned above. The verse above contains a statement that has various readings from experts who have quite different perspectives on what it means “my sin” and “your sin” in that verse, among them are as follows: (1) According to Tha’labī, this is the consensus among most scholars: “my sin” refers to the sin I committed when I was killed (Hābīl), while “your sin” refers to a sin you (Qābīl) have previously committed (Tha’labī, 1422, p. 4) (2) “my sin” means the sin for killing me (Hābīl) and “your sin” means the sin that causes the sacrifice that Qābīl did is not accepted, (3) “my sin” means the sin for killing me (Hābīl) and “your sin” means the sin of kufr which Qābīl did, (4) “my sin” refers to Hābīl’s own sin, which was to kill me (Hābīl), whereas “your sin” refers to Qābīl’s sin of envy and enmity, (5) “my sin” refers to Hābīl’s own sin, which was to kill Qābīl (Abū Ḥayyān, 1420, p. 4, 231; Ibn ’Atiyyah, 1422, p. 2, 179; Qurtubī, 1384, p. 6, 137), (6) If Hābīl likewise wishes to kill Qābīl, then “my sin” refers to sin motivated by the desire to kill, and “your sin” refers to the sin that Qābīl committed (Abdurrazzāq, 1419, p. 2, 14; Ibn ’Atiyyah, 1422, p. 2, 179; Māturīdī, 1426, p. 3, 499; Mujāhīd, 1410, p. 306; Muqṭātil ibn Sulaymān, 1423, p. 1,470; Sam’ānī, n.d., p. 2, 30; Samarqandī, n.d., p. 1, 384; Ṭabārī, 1420, p. 10,215-217; Tha’labī, 1422, p. 4, 50; Zajjāj, 1408, p. 2, 167). Regarding the statement in verse, Bisri in al-Ibrīz discusses the word’s meaning as the verse is zahir in the word-for-word translation part. Namely Bisri explains the word بِإِثْمِي وَإِثْمِكَ with “your sins and mine”. However, Bisri seems to
combine the two transgressions into one sin in his explanation of his understanding. The whole meaning of Qur’an surah al-Mā’idah verse 29 is as follows:

*I hope you will end in hell if you carry your sin. That is taking revenge on bad people* (Mustoфа, n.d., p. 285).

It is clear from Bisri’s answer that he only listed the two sins mentioned in verse as sins without elaborating on their particular forms or types. No scholars summarize the phrase “two sins” in the verse above as a straightforward explanation, as Bisri did when contrasted to the scholars’ interpretation of the verse as indicated above. Even when we look at al-Ibrīz sources like Jalālayn, Baḍāwī, and Khāzin, we fail to discover a summary that is identical to what Bisri provided in al-Ibrīz. Some interpretations still express two sins, comparable to al-Ibrīz’s text. One could argue that Bisri’s interpretation is original in this case. By using the key terms “bearing sin” or “carrying sin,” Īji and Ṭabarī describe a meaning that is essentially identical to that given by Bisri, yet both still refer to the two sins without summarizing as Bisri did (Īji, 1424, hal. 1, 458; Sanaullah et al., 1, 458; Ṭabarī, 1420, hal. 2, 138). When explaining the word, Nu’mānī’s explanation may be the one that most closely resembles Bisri’s understanding in Qur’an surah al-Baqarah verse 60. Nu’mānī explains the term using the idea from Qur’an surah al-Mā’idah verse 29 and said that the word استحقوا ṣabawtu means as a verse ṣabawtu ويوم يلتمي واسبك “Right to every sin.” An interpretation that claims the two sins in Qur’an surah al-Mā’idah verse 29 are combined into one sin that encompasses all sins can be found in this context. Since there is a very slim chance that Bisri is quoting from Nu’mānī in this distinct context, it can be assumed that the summary he provides is one of his ideas.

5. The name of al-Ḥāqqah

al-Ḥāqqah, the name of one of the surahs in the Qur’an, is one of the references in the Qur’an to the name of the Day of Judgment. Qur’an surah al-Ḥāqqah verse 1 contains the word “al-Ḥāqqah” itself, which appears three times in that surah. The meaning of al-Ḥāqqah, which is also the opening verse of this surah al-Ḥāqqah, has been the subject of numerous interpretations by scholars. Some of the explanations include the following: (1) al-Ḥāqqah is the Day of Judgment, the moment when events like the
Resurrection, Reckoning, and Jaz become a reality, (2) The right of a person to receive compensation for their actions, (3) The transparency of everything, (4) The veracity of promises and threats, (5) There is no question about a few things, (6) The time when one group deserves heaven and another is deserving of damnation, (7) Something triumphs, (8) A discussion in which everyone will assert their rights, and (9) Something that every sensible person should fear (Al-‘Izz ibn Ṭabd is-Salām, 1416, p. 3, 354; Ibn Juzayy, 1416, p. 2, 404; Ibn Kasīr, 1999, p. 8, 208; Ibn Ṭādīl, 1419, p. 19, 312; Khāzin, n.d., p. 4, 333; Mahalli, A. Ṭabd A. M. ibn S. al-Dīn al-, & Suyūṭī, n.d., p. 761; Tha‘ālibi, 1418, p. 5, 473). Regarding the meaning of the word, in al-Ibrīz, it is stated:

_Reality is al-Ḥāqqah. Because what the unbelievers deny, like reckoning and jaza, becomes real, apparent, and obvious on that day, the Day of Judgment is also known as the Day of Reality_ (Mustofa et al., p. 2125).

We employ three essential phrases or expressions, including the _day of reality, what the disbelievers reject becomes plain, reckoning, and jaza_ to identify the source of the interpretation in al-Ibrīz above. The search results reveal that this interpretation is a translation from Jalālayn that is taken literally (Mahalli, A. Ṭabd A. M. ibn S. al-Dīn al-, & Suyūṭī, n.d., p. 761) Just that Bisri added the second explanation of al-Ḥāqqah’s word’s meaning in language _البعث “resurrection” which he did not mention._

When tracing the origins of the interpretations, we find nearly identical interpretations in earlier Commentary works if we employ the same sentences and terms. Anwār al-Tanzīl by Bayḍāwī is the work that most closely resembles Jalālayn and explains a nearly identical opinion (Bayḍāwī, 1418, p. 5, 239). The interpretation, however, does not clarify the statement _مَا أُنْكِر_ “what is denied,” and uses the phrases jaza and reckoning. Al-Kashshāf, which also mentions reckoning, _thawāb_, and _iqāb_, expresses essentially the same viewpoint (Zamakhshari et al., 4, 598). Zamakhshari’s al-Kashshāf is arguably the first source of opinion on the word “al-Ḥāqqah” that Bisri quotes from Jalālayn. Based on this information, we can conclude that al-Ibrīz, Jalālayn, Anwār al-Tanzīl, and al-Kashshāf share a relationship in kalām thought, with al-Kashshāf providing the opinion concerning _al-Ḥāqqah_ that is passed down to and quoted by al-Ibrīz. This supports the argument put forth that Jalālayn used Anwār al-Tanzīl and al-Kashshāf as sources for his comments (Akpinar, n.d.). However, we can
see that Jalālayn added the word, so 
what is denied,” which one might describe as a unique Jalālayn addition. According to Jalālayn, Bisri introduced the phrase “unbeliever” as a subject, making it possible to claim that al-Ibrīz now contains an original addition.

**Conclusion**

Based on the elements that have been explored, the interpretation of kalām in al-Ibrīz reveals a connection between al-Ibrīz and earlier interpretations, including the primary sources for early interpretations. Through this research, it is also possible to conclude that Jalālayn, which contains opinions that can be found in several earlier Commentary works to reach the earliest sources of commentary works, such as Māturīdī and Ṭabārī’s interpretation, is the work that served as al-Ibrīz’s primary source. Al-Ibrīz’s relationship to introductory remarks on kālam can also be interpreted as evidence that he belongs to the genealogical tradition.

In addition to citing and translating the commenting opinions from the works of earlier scholars, Bisri also adds amendments, additions, and editorial summaries. The phrase “the might of Allah is in the sky” was changed to “the One who rules in the sky” by Bisri regarding Qur’an sūrah al-Mulk verse 16. Regarding the subject of the supposed shirk committed by the Prophet Adam, Bisri cited Jalālayn’s viewpoint by summing and adequately elucidating that the shirk was committed when Adam named his son ʿAbd al-Hārith. Regarding Ibrahim’s alleged lies, Bisri was spotted paraphrasing Jalālayn’s viewpoint while revising the editorial to fit his sentence. By condensing the word "two sins" into "sin," Bisri seems to be expressing an original viewpoint on the subject of the two sins in the tale of Qābil and Hābil. It can be claimed that this summation is Bisri’s original idea because it is not typical in prior works of Commentary. Concerning the definition of the word "al-Hāqqah," Bisri is found to have quoted Jalālayn’s viewpoint. He also offers additional editorials, which may be interpreted as switching from passive to active sentence construction.
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