قرآن و روشنگری دینی

سال ششم، شماره اول، پیاپی یازدهم، بهار و تابستان ۱۴۰۴ (۱۸۴-۱۶۷)
DOI: 10.30473/quran.2025.73422.1298

«مقاله پژوهشی»

تحلیل مقایسه‌ای آراءِ طبرسی و زمخشری در سیر آیات تحدی

علی غضنفری[1*]، مریم حسینی[2]

۱. دانشیارگروه علوم قرآن ومعارف اسلامی تهران، ایران.
۲. دانشجوی دکتری مرکز تخصصی علوم اسلامی کوثر، تهران، ایران

نویسنده مسئول:
علی غضنفری
رایانامه: ali@qazanfari.net

تاریخ دریافت: ۱۴۰۳/۱۱/۲۴
تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۴۰۴/۰۵/۰۴

استناد به این مقاله:
غضنفری، علی و حسینی، مریم (۱۴۰۴). تحلیل مقایسه‌ای آراءِ طبرسی و زمخشری در سیر آیات تحدی. فصلنامه قرآن و روشنگری دینی، ۶(۱)، ۱۸۴-۱۶۷.
(DOI: 10.30473/quran.2025.73422.1298)

چکیده

فضل بن حسن طبرسی امامی، معاصر جارالله زمخشری معتزلی است . آن‌دو از اندیشمندان در حوزه تفسیر و علوم قرآن کریم محسوب می‌شوند. هر دو در معجزه بودنِ ظواهر و الفاظِ قرآن با استناد به ادله مختلف و از جمله ساختار و نظام هماهنگ قرآن، بلاغت و فصاحت آیات آن با بهره گیری از تحدی، تشابه فکری دارند. این امر که از مجموعه دلائل اعجاز قرآن محسوب می‌شود، بر پنج آیه استوار است که ترتیب نزولش آنها محل تضارب آراءِ مفسران شده است. به نظر می‌رسد زمخشری و هم‌نظران وی ترتیب پیشنهادیِ نزولِ سوره‌ها را بدون توجه به مستندات تاریخی و با استناد به آراء شاذ مثل فهرست ابن ندیم، عدم تصریح به جایگاه سوره طور و همچنین نپرداختن به مفهوم کلید واژه‌ی مهمِ "بحدیثٍ مثله"،رعایت نکرده‌اند. بنابراین در نگاهی تحلیلی می‌توان دیدگاهی را که طبرسی در ترتیب آیات تحدی ابراز نموده همنواتر با مستندات موجود دانست وی به هدفِ اصلیِ آیاتِ تحدی که اثباتِ اعجاز قرآن و برتریِ آن نسبت به منظومه‌ی کلام عرب است، توجه نموده و خود را بمنظورِ دست‌یابی به سیری که منطقی و عقلایی به تکلّف نیفکنده و نظری تحمیلی ابراز ننموده است. طبرسی رازِ اختلاف در متعلقِ آیات تحدی را شرائط و اقتضائات زمانه در پاسخ به عنادِ مدعیان دانسته و حکمتِ نزولِ آیاتِ تحدی را ادعای غیر الهی بودنِ آیات از سویِ منکران معرفی نموده‌است.

واژه‌های کلیدی

اعجاز قرآن، تحدی، طبرسی، زمخشری.

Quran and Religious Enlightenment Open Access

Spring & Summer (2025) 6(1): 167-184
DOI: 10.30473/quran.2025.73422.1298

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

A Comparative Analysis of the Views of Ṭabrisī and Zamakhsharī on the Progression of the Verses of Taḥaddī

Ali Qazanfari [1*], Maryam Hoseini[2]

1.Associate Professor, Tehran University of Quranic Sciences and Islamic Studies, Tehran.Iran.
2. Ph.D Student of Kowsar Specialized Center for Islamic Sciences, Tehran, Iran

Correspondence
Ali Ghazanfari
Email: ali@qazanfari.net

Received: 13 Jan 2025
Accepted: 26 Jul 2025

How to cite
Ghazanfari, A.,Hoseini.M. (2025). A Comparative Analysis of the Views of Ṭabrisī and Zamakhsharī on the Progression of the Verses of Taḥaddī. Quran and Religious Enlightenment, 6(1), 167-184.
(DOI: 10.30473/quran.2025.73422.1298)

ABSTRACT

Faḍl ibn Ḥasan Ṭabrisī, an Imami scholar, and *Jārallah Zamakhsharī*, a Mu'tazili contemporary, are considered intellectuals in the field of Quranic exegesis and sciences. Both share similar intellectual viewpoints on the miraculous nature of the Quran's apparent meanings and words, based on various arguments, including the Quran's harmonious structure and system, and the eloquence and fluency of its verses, utilizing the concept of *Taḥaddī*. The verses of *Taḥaddī*, which are considered part of the evidence for the Quran's miraculous nature, are based on five verses, the order of their revelation being a point of contention among commentators. The gap resulting from the lack of thorough research in systematic comparisons of Shi'a and Mu'tazili schools of exegesis necessitates that, based on a descriptive-analytical method and reference to library sources, the views of *Ṭabrisī* and *Zamakhsharī* on the progression of the verses of *Taḥaddī* be explained by comparing and analyzing the perspectives of these two intellectual schools. Therefore, it seems that *Zamakhsharī* and his like-minded thinkers have disregarded historical evidence in their proposed order of the verses' revelation, relying on unusual opinions such as *Ibn Nadīm*'s list, the lack of explicit mention of the position of Surah *al-Ṭūr*, and the failure to address the key concept of "with a similar discourse (*Bi Ḥadīthin Mithlih*)." In an analytical view, it can be seen that *Ṭabrisī*'s view on the order of the verses of *Taḥaddī* is more consistent with the available evidence. He has paid attention to the main goal of the verses of *Taḥaddī*, which is to prove the miraculous nature of the Quran and its superiority over the Arabic poetic system, and he has not burdened himself to achieve a logical and rational progression, nor has he expressed an imposed opinion. *Ṭabrisī* considers the reason for the difference in the subject of the verses of *Taḥaddī* to be the circumstances and exigencies of the time in response to the obstinacy of the claimants, and introduces the wisdom of the revelation of the verses of *Taḥaddī* as the claim by the deniers that the verses are not divine.

KEYWORDS
Quranic *I'jāz*, *Taḥaddī*, *Ṭabrisī*, *Zamakhsharī*.

Introduction

Comparing and analyzing the views of commentators with different intellectual orientations leads the audience to a better understanding of the theological schools of the commentators. Undoubtedly, the influence of these schools on the understanding of the verses of *Taḥaddī* is inevitable. Analytical comparisons based on the qualitative content of the commentators' intellectual orientations are important and necessary for a correct understanding of the verses of *Taḥaddī*, and the mission of proving the miraculous nature through the verses of *Taḥaddī* is the achievement of comparisons and analyses of this kind.

On the one hand, although the *Taḥaddī* in its initial step focused on the wording of the Quran, it never meant words devoid of meaning. This is because in the miraculous nature of expression, full attention was paid to aspects of eloquence and fluency in the *Taḥaddī*. Rather, among the pillars of the *Taḥaddī* were fluency and eloquence in the meaning, intent, and purpose of the speaker, which were considered in the conditions of the *Taḥaddī*. This inevitable necessity was not hidden from the Arabs of the time of revelation.

On the other hand, what was considered the basis of the Quran's *I'jāz* during the time of revelation was its expressive miracle. Therefore, the eloquent and rhetorically skilled Arabs considered the Quran's *Taḥaddī* to be limited to words, appearances, and linguistic subtleties. However, the Quran, apart from details, is absolutely a complete miracle in its entirety, and in this being a miracle, it is self-sustaining and does not accept accidental miracles. Nevertheless, according to its comprehensiveness and inclusion, the Quran accommodates various dimensions of miracles at the level of its parts; for example, the Quran reports various epistemological sciences in scientific dimensions, which human thought has gradually touched upon after many years; or the *I'jāz* of the Quran from the perspective that its bringer was an unlettered person who had no teacher. Or the legislative *I'jāz* of the Quran, which is the origin of a novel innovation and contains comprehensive and evolved rulings and laws, or the *I'jāz* of the Quran in explaining propositions of news and unseen events. All these aspects of miracles are undeniable truths that have become more apparent to audiences over time than at the beginning of the revelation. The reason why the Arabs contemporaneous with the revelation overlooked these aspects of the *I'jāz* and only chose the expressive aspect may lie in the rhythm and balance of the Quran's verses, because the melodic rhythm of the Meccan verses captivated the Arabs from the very beginning of the revelation. So, the Arab who was fascinated by the coherence and balance in the ups and downs of the Quran's speech inevitably sought the magic of the Quran in a place other than the legislation of laws, unseen propositions, and its guiding and epistemological dimensions. Perhaps later, the initial seed of *Ṣarfa* sprouted under this cover of harmonious arrangement and the Quranic connections and subtleties that manifested in beautiful expressions and captivated the audience, and thus the technical beauty of the Quran emerged to humanity as an independent element in proving the Quran's miraculous nature.

1. Background

The discussion of the *I'jāz* of the Quran and its various aspects officially began during the debates between Christians and Jews against the authenticity of the Prophet Muhammad

(PBUH). This paved the way for numerous writings by Muslims defending the Prophet (PBUH). Consequently, a vast collection of books emerged with titles such as "Establishing the Prophethood of the Prophet," "Evidences of Prophethood," and others. This style of defense continued until the mid-3rd century AH, resulting in well-founded works focusing on the order and structure of the Quran, theories of *Ṣarfa* (divine preclusion), and accounts of the unseen (cf. Barqī, 1951 AD/1371 AH: 1, 277). In the early 4th century AH, many Muslim scholars and theologians, such as *Abū Alī Jubā'ī*, *Baḥr Iṣfahānī*, and *Rummānī*, addressed the *I'jāz* of the Quran and its aspects in the form of refutations responding to the doubts raised by opponents, adding them to their commentaries (cf. Mufīd, 1979 AD/1400 AH: 65). In the beginning of the 5th century, the expansion of various aspects of *I'jāz* became more significant. The views and works of *Shaykh Mufīd* (d. 413 AH) and *Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār* (d. 415 AH) are all considered products of the flourishing era of Quranic *I'jāz* discussions (cf. Khorramshahi, 2001 AD/1380 SH: 1, 490).

In a more precise approach, *Abū 'Ubaydah Ma'mar ibn al-Muthannā* (d. 209 AH) is considered the oldest pioneer with a written work in two volumes on *I'jāz*. Some others attribute the pioneering writing in this regard to *Abū 'Ubayd Qāsim ibn Sallām* (d. 224 AH). However, in any case, the oldest work that has reached us today in written form, according to *Ibn Nadīm*'s report, is by *Muḥammad ibn Zayd Wāsiṭī* (d. 307 AH), which includes "*al-Imama*" and " *I'jāz al-Qurān fī Naẓmihī wa Ta'līfihī*" (cf. Ibn Nadīm, 987 AD/377 AH: 63; Kaḥāla, Mu'jam al-Mu'allifīn: 12, 160). An old treatise attributed to *Abū Sulaymān Ḥamad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Khaṭṭābī Bustī* (d. 388 AH) has also been published (cf. Ma'rifat, 1969 AD/1389 AH: 1, 8). Another work on *I'jāz*, which *Shaykh Ṭūsī* praised in his commentary "*al-Tibyān*," is attributed to *Abū al-Ḥasan Rummānī* (d. 386 AH) (cf. Bāqillānī, 2000 AD/1421 AH: 95).

In the modern era, numerous treatises have also been written in the field of *I'jāz*, among the most famous of which are "*al-Mu'jizah al-Khālidah*" by *Hibat al-Dīn al-Shahristānī*, "*I'jāz al-Quran*" by *Muṣṭafā Ṣādiq Rāfi'ī*, and the treatise "*al-Naba' al-'Aẓīm*" by *'Abdullāh Darrāz* (cf. Seyyedi, 2008 AD/1387 SH: 86).

Furthermore, numerous theses and articles have been written on the miracle of the Quran and the verses of *Taḥaddī*. Among them is "A Comparative Study of the Verses of *Taḥaddī* in the Two Books *al-Tamhīd* and *al-Burhān* by *Zarkashī*" by *Ali 'Abd 'Awzī Ḥamza al-Shabānī* in 1981 AD/1402 AH, which, as the title suggests, the author discusses and compares the verses of *Taḥaddī* from the perspective of Ayatollah *Ma'rifat* and *Zarkashī*, and ultimately arrives at aspects of differences and similarities in this regard. Articles can also be listed as follows: "An article by Kazem Qazizadeh in 1995 AD/1374 SH entitled "Investigating the Descending Trend of *Taḥaddī* in the Verses of the Quran," which, while explaining the generalities about *Taḥaddī*, criticizes the opinions of commentators such as *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī* and *Rashīd Riḍā* regarding the stages of *Taḥaddī*, and ultimately considers the stages of *Taḥaddī* in five stages: "To the entire Quran, ten unspecified Surahs, *Taḥaddī* to several Surahs, *Taḥaddī* to a speech, and *Taḥaddī* to an unspecified Surah, meaning he believes in the descending trend of the verses of *Taḥaddī*." The next article is an article by "Sayyid Reza Moaddab" in 2003 AD/1382 SH entitled "A

Reflection on the Horizons of the *I'jāz* of the Quran," in which the author, considering the topic of *Taḥaddī*, emphasizes the miraculous nature of the Quran and then considers the aspects of the miracle of the Quran together. Also, an article by "Sayyid Mohammad Hassan Javaheri" in 2013 AD/1393 SH entitled "Investigating *Khaṭṭābī*'s Theory on the Impactful Miracle of the Holy Quran" can be mentioned; in this article, the theory of "*Khaṭṭābī*," who considers the attractions of the Quran to be of a superhuman nature, has been criticized and examined. In addition to these articles that deal with one aspect of *I'jāz* and *Taḥaddī*, articles can be found that, in addition to paying attention to both aspects, examine a specific theory; such as the article by "Mohsen Rafat" and "Ensieh Asgari" in 2016 AD/1396 SH entitled "Critical Analysis of *Muḥammad Shaḥrūr*'s View on the *I'jāz* and *Taḥaddī* of the Quran," which criticizes and examines this theory.

Relying on historical evidence, the present article examines the events and questions that led to the revelation of the verses of *Taḥaddī* in order to comparatively analyze the views of *Ṭabrisī* and *Zamakhsharī*. This analysis requires understanding the historical and interpretative context of the revelation of these verses and can be achieved through the differences in these two commentators' approaches to the context of their revelation. This is because, in many cases, differences in commentators' opinions stem from their different understandings of the atmosphere of revelation or the type of initial audience. Furthermore, many studies, such as "Scholarly Debate on the *Taḥaddī*," have sufficed with purely philosophical or theological analyses of the *Taḥaddī* and have not examined the influence of the occasions of revelation on the interpretations of *Ṭabrisī* and *Zamakhsharī*. Additionally, most articles and books have a single-sectarian focus on Shi'a or Mu'tazili interpretations, and a systematic comparison between these two schools in an analytical-comparative manner has rarely been conducted. For example, studies like "Examining the Interpretative Views of *Zamakhsharī* from the Perspective of *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*" or "A Comparative Study of Quranic Vocabulary in *Majma' al-Bayān* and *Kashshāf*" only focus on a specific aspect and do not address the overall interpretative approaches. Moreover, sources such as "The Course of the Quranic *Taḥaddī*" only examine the historical or literary aspects of the *Taḥaddī*, neglecting the role of interpretative schools in shaping different interpretations of the verses of *Taḥaddī*. Therefore, the present research attempts to address the weaknesses of previous studies, which stem from a single-sectarian focus, a general approach to the *Taḥaddī*, a lack of attention to the occasions of revelation, and a neglect of the methodological differences between schools, and to enrich the existing gaps by clarifying the sectarian differences between Shi'a and Mu'tazila.

2. The Interpretative Status of *Ṭabrisī* and *Zamakhsharī* as Two Contemporary Commentators

Abū Ali Faḍl ibn Ḥasan Ṭabrisī was born in 468 AH in Tafresh, a district of Qom province. He acquired knowledge in his birthplace and progressed through various stages before moving to Khorasan and settling there. During his life, he resided in Sabzevar and also spent some time in Mashhad. He was known by the title Amin al-Islam (Trustee of Islam) and eventually passed away in 548 AH, being buried in an area near the Razavi shrine.

Although *Ṭabrisī* was considered one of the jurists and *Uṣūlīs* (experts in the principles of

jurisprudence) due to his mastery of Islamic jurisprudence, and presented the valuable work "*al-Mu'talif min al-Mukhtalif*" to the community of jurists, his writings in his commentary books shone so brightly that gradually the interpretive face of this Muslim thinker surpassed his other scientific aspects, and his name remained as a capable commentator who was aware of technical and luxurious literature (cf. Ḥurr ʻĀmilī, 1965 AD/1385 AH: 2, 190).

Among the commentators contemporary with *Ṭabrisī* is *Maḥmūd ibn ʻUmar Zamakhsharī*. He was born in the village of Zamakhshar in the year 528 AH and completed his studies in the city of Khwarazm. In order to pursue academic degrees, he traveled to Baghdad and spent two years of his life in Mecca during his scientific activities; hence, he was named "*Jārallāh*" (Neighbor of God) (cf. Samʻānī, 1987 AD/1408 AH: 3, 375). *Zamakhsharī*'s unique views on the Mu'tazila school were pleasing to many Mu'tazilites, so much so that his achievements in this field led to the expansion of the Mu'tazila school in the cities of Transoxiana (Yāqūt Ḥamawī, 1993: 6, 2680). *Zamakhsharī*'s interpretive comments with a Mu'tazila approach opened a new chapter in understanding the verses of the Quran for his fellow thinkers, to the point that not only were his views recognized as the pinnacle of Mu'tazili opinions, but his commentary was also considered as one of the rich sources in recognizing the Mu'tazila school (cf. Khansari, 1970 AD/1390 AH: 8, 125). *Zamakhsharī*'s mastery of literary arts, rhetoric, and figures of speech turned him into the first person who strived to explain the Quranic subtleties by distinguishing between the art of metaphor and reality, and on this basis, he presented the Quranic subtleties to the audience with a more eloquent expression and clearer arguments (cf. Ibn Shahr Āshūb, 1989 AD/1410 AH: 2, 236). *Zamakhsharī*'s *Kashshāf* commentary attracted the attention of scholars from various sects, such as the *Shāfiʻī* commentator and jurist *Bayḍāwī* (685 AH), who created *Anwār al-Tanzīl* based on a summary of *Kashshāf*.

Also, authors of works such as *Kanz al-Daqā'iq*, *Irshād al-ʻAql al-Salīm*, and Tafsir *al-Ṣāfī* benefited greatly from the literary and rhetorical points of this commentary. In the same vein, *Shaykh Ṭabrisī*, inspired by the commentary of *Kashshāf*, after writing his first commentary, *Majmaʻ al-Bayān*, as a major commentary in ten volumes, turned to compiling *Tafsīr al-Kāfī al-Shāfī* as a concise commentary, and in his last commentary work, he devoted himself to organizing and compiling Tafsir al-Wasīṭ of *Jawāmiʻ al-Jāmiʻ* (cf. Jazarī, n.d.: 3, 239)

Zamakhsharī follows the path of the Hanafi School in jurisprudence and its principles; therefore, his commentaries on the verses of *Aḥkām* (commandments) support the fatwas of *Abū Ḥanīfa* and in many cases, the proximity of their fatwas is evident. Of course, there are also a few cases where he does not express an agreeing opinion and sometimes, if he goes to great lengths to extract a concurring fatwa, he opposes it.

Shaykh Ṭabrisī, however, with a clear and explicit approach that he has in jurisprudence and its principles, directly seeks to realize the school of Ahl al-Bayt, and in proving the opinions of Shiʻa jurisprudence, he argues and relies on the narrations of the infallible Imams (cf. Gazār, 1961 AD/1381 AH: 26; Ḥaskānī Nīshābūrī. 1990 AD/ 1411 AH: 1, 249-257).

Since each of the commentators has insisted on his theological view and has remained

committed to it throughout his commentary, differences can be clearly found in the interpretation of various doctrinal verses and their expressions. *Zamakhsharī*, as one of the pioneers of the Mu'tazila, has sought to defend the principles of this school. However, *Ṭabrisī* has fulfilled his mission in commentary by paying attention to proving the Imamiyya theology. Meanwhile, some superficial observers, based on the overlap of some common principles that exist between the Imamiyya and Mu'tazila theology, have been tempted and have tried to portray the Imamiyya theology as being influenced by the Mu'tazila theology, unaware that the framework of the Imamiyya principles is stronger than such false claims can shake its foundations. In proving this claim, one can refer to the interpretation of the verse of *Tablīgh* (al-Mā'idah: 67).

The content of this verse, while reassuring the Prophet, firmly asks him to complete the communication of his mission without worrying about the opposition, because the ultimate outcome of affairs is in God's hand, and of course, He will not guide the disbelievers to the path of success.

In the interpretation of the verse of propagation, *Ṭabrisī* explicitly refers to the event of *Ghadīr*, emphasizing the phrases "Convey" as well as "If you do not," in the verse, explaining that God commands His Prophet not to fear the obstruction of the disobedient group; therefore, He obliges the Prophet to choose Ali (AS) as his successor and guardian and introduce him to everyone in order to complete the mission (Ṭabrisī, 1959 AD/1338 AH: 10, 480).

On the other hand, although the foundation of *Kashshāf*'s interpretation is to explain the miracles of the Quran based on rhetorical tools and literary techniques, his special approach in dissecting Quranic words in order to explain the meaning and purpose of the verses inevitably leads his interpretation to explaining semantic developments over time, using the poems of the past, as well as turning to historical evidence and explaining the reasons for revelation; therefore, in some cases, his interpretation is a valuable source of some reasons and occasions of revelation, which he generously provides to the audience (cf. Zamakhsharī, 1969 AD/1389 AH: 3, 126; Ibn Hishām Anṣārī. 1984 AD/ 1405 AH: 2, 680).

However, in some verses, *Zamakhsharī* deviates from his own style and method as a skilled linguist in explaining the splitting of words and referring to the historical backgrounds of words in the verses; for example, in explaining the noble verse of propagation, he not only does not make the slightest reference to the story of *Ghadīr* and the reason for the revelation of the verse, but also believes that God's purpose of the phrase "Convey what has been revealed to you" does not refer to a specific matter or a special event; rather, the phrase "What has been revealed" implies generality, and its purpose is the set of duties that the Prophet, as a mentor and guide of humanity, was obliged to perform (ibid: 1, 658)

Another difference in distinguishing *Ṭabrisī*'s interpretative method from *Zamakhsharī*'s can be examined in the verse of ablution (al-Mā'idah: 6). *Zamakhsharī*, regarding the verse of ablution, uses the phrase "*'Alā Wujūb al-Iqtiṣād fī Ṣabb al-Mā'*" (ibid: 611) and explains that the phrase intended by God regarding the washing of "Feet" is the same imperative verb "*Ighsilū*" (wash) that is used for "Face" and "Hands;" however, the wisdom of using the word "*Masḥ*" (to wipe) instead of "*Ghusl*" (to wash) is to avoid pouring extra water and prevent wastefulness, because wastefulness is a reprehensible matter in the eyes of God. *Ṭabrisī*, in *Jawāmi' al-Jāmi'*,

criticizes this type of interpretation by *Zamakhsharī* and emphasizes the use of two words with two different forms by the Lawgiver, saying that the divine will intended the words to indicate independent meanings, and therefore differentiated between the members that must be washed and those that must be wiped, and it is not appropriate for the interpreter to ignore the semantic difference of words in the divine word and consider it similarity (Ṭabrisī, 1959 AD/1338 AH: 1, 105)

In the interpretation of the third verse of Surah al-Tawbah (That Allah is disassociated from the disbelievers and [so is] His Messenger...) (al-Tawbah: 3), *Zamakhsharī* admits that one of the Bedouin Arabs saw a man who, in reading the verse of disavowal, said: "Indeed, God has disavowed His Messenger, so we also disavow him." So he took him to *'Umar*, and *'Umar* ordered the man to learn the Arabic language (Zamakhsharī, 1969 AD/1389 AH: 2, 345; Ibn Athīr. 1988 AD/ 1409 AH: 4, 25).

However, *Ṭabrisī*, in the interpretation of the above verse, relies on a narration from *Abul Aswad Du'alī* that: One day, *Abul Aswad* heard a man reciting the verse of disavowal incorrectly and presented the type of recitation to Ali (AS), and in response, that Imam explained the types of words and established the foundations of grammar for the first time and obliged *Abul Aswad* to continue teaching this knowledge (Marʿashī, 1896 AD/1326 AH: 8, 146; Ṣadr, 61; Hujjati, 1990 AD/1369 SH: 140).

Another distinction can be observed in the verse of *Taḥrīm* (Prohibition). *Zamakhsharī*, in his interpretation of this verse (al-Taḥrīm: 1), openly attributes the error of forbidding the consumption of honey to the Prophet (PBUH), and in explaining the last part of the verse (And Allah is forgiving, merciful) he implores forgiveness for the Prophet's slip in a taunting sentence (Zamakhsharī 1969 AD/1389 AH: 4, 564). However, *Ṭabrisī*, in his interpretation of the verse of *Taḥrīm*, while criticizing *Zamakhsharī*'s incorrect expression, emphasizes the Prophet's infallibility and declares his sacred being free from any error (Ṭabrisī, 1997 AD/1418 AH: 499).

3. A Comparison of the Difference in Viewpoints of *Ṭabrisī* and *Zamakhsharī* in the Verses of *Taḥaddī*

"Say, if mankind and jinn gathered..." (al-Isrā': 88) *Ṭabrisī*, relying on the legislative and theological aspects of the verse and citing the traditions of the Ahl al-Bayt, emphasizes that the Quran is the "Firm Cord of Allah" and explains the system of Islamic legislation; he believes that the *Taḥaddī* is proof that the Quran is not the word of man, but has been revealed from the Wise, the Praiseworthy, and its miracle includes aspects of legislation and guidance; that is, the Quran is unique not only in rhetoric, but also in divine lawmaking and the enactment of rulings (cf. Ṭabrisī, n.d.: 6, 456); but *Zamakhsharī*, by analyzing the structure of the verse, points to literary devices such as rhyme, brevity, and novel similes in the verse, and says: "If this Quran had been revealed in the most eloquent Arabic, they still could not have opposed it, because such a miracle is hidden in the order and eloquence of the Quran that it renders the eloquent helpless. In fact, *Zamakhsharī* considers the *Taḥaddī* of the Quran to be in the eloquence and unique order of the Quran." (cf. Zamakhsharī, n.d.: 2, 783)

Therefore, *Ṭabrisī*, with a theological-legislative view, considers the *Taḥaddī* of the Quran as a tool to prove the necessity of following Islamic law, while *Zamakhsharī*, with a literary-rhetorical approach, considers it

as evidence of the invincibility of the Quran in the field of eloquence. This difference reflects the difference between the Shiite school, with its focus on the guidance of the Quran, and the Mu'tazili school, with its focus on rationalism and rhetoric.

4. Pillars of *I'jāz*

Shi'a scholars, and of course *Ṭabrisī*, deem several conditions necessary for something to be considered a miracle and do not consider something lacking the following conditions to be a miracle. *Ṭabrisī* believes that a miracle is something that is contrary to custom (Ṭabrisī, 1959 AD/1338 AH: 1, 317). *Zarkashī* also considers an event to be a miracle that humans are unable to replicate (Zarkashī, 1989 AD/1410 AH: 2, 10). *Rāfi'ī* considers a miracle to be an indication of the truthfulness of a prophetic claim (Rāfi'ī, 2000 AD/1421 AH: 196). *Shaykh Ṭūsī* in *al-Tibyān* considers the "Miracle" to be based on two pillars: "Being impossible to *Taḥaddī* and confirming prophethood." He has interpreted the word "Āyah" in the same meaning (al-A'rāf: 132).

Ayatollah *Khu'ī* in "*al-Bayān*" considers the conditions for the realization of a miracle to be the truthfulness of the claim of the position of prophet and says that the claim of the Prophet must have a complete correspondence with definitive transmission as well as reason and logic. He considers the two conditions of being extraordinary and challenging to be distinctive (ibid: 134).

In explaining the pillars of *I'jāz*, *Ṭabrisī* has an integrated (literary-theological) approach; on the one hand, with mastery of Arabic literature, he analyzes the linguistic aspects of the Qur'an. On the other hand, with a Shiite theological view, he presents the *I'jāz* of the Qur'an in order to prove prophethood and Imamate. In his commentary, he introduces *I'jāz* not merely as a theoretical topic, but as part of the guidance of the Qur'an.

The distinctions of *Ṭabrisī*'s view in comparison with others lie in the integration of Shi'a tradition and Arabic literature; that is, while relying on the narrations of the Ahl al-Bayt in rhetorical and literary interpretation, he also benefits from the defensible principles of the Mu'tazilites in proportion to the subjects. This integrated method of his later paved the way for commentators such as *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī* to use the integrated method or the comprehensive method.

In explaining the pillars of *I'jāz*, *Zamakhsharī* believes that "A miracle is exclusive to someone who is truthful in his claim; because a miracle is a confirmation from God for the claimant of prophethood." (Zamakhsharī, 1969 AD/1389 AH: 3, 309) "If bringing the Qur'an was unprecedented among the Arabs from the Prophet, then such a work is considered a miracle because an act contrary to custom has been done." (ibid: 4, 128) In the above definition, *Zamakhsharī* refers to the invincibility and unchangeable nature of the Qur'an, and in this regard, he mentions an example from the Qur'an (Ṣād: 35): (And grant me a kingdom such as shall not belong to any after me).

Other earlier Sunni views are not significantly different from *Zamakhsharī*'s viewpoints because *Jaṣṣāṣ*, before *Zamakhsharī*, had already pointed out aspects such as bearing witness to truthfulness and the irreproachable nature of the miracle (Jaṣṣāṣ, 1984 AD/1405 AH: 3, 268).

Fakhr Rāzī extracts the elements of a miracle from the noble verses. For example, he refers to the verse about the fire becoming cool and safe for Abraham (al-'Ankabūt: 24), and thus brings a Quranic argument for the extraordinary nature of the miracle, saying: "It

is fitting that the miracle be extraordinary." (Fakhr Rāzī, 1999 AD/1420 AH: 45, 225)

Or elsewhere, based on the verse about the destruction of the rebellious, he argues: (So when Our command came, We made the uppermost part of it the nethermost, and rained down on it stones of layered hard clay) (Hūd: 82). And based on the overturning of the land of the evildoers, he brings a Quranic clue to another element of the conditions of miracle, saying: "Know that this act of the Lord is a dominant miracle from two perspectives: "One is uprooting the earth and raising it close to the sky, an act that is amazing and extraordinary..." (ibid: 18, 383)

"Be aware that the act of the Lord is a dominant miracle from two perspectives: "One is uprooting the earth and raising it close to the sky, an act that is amazing and extraordinary..." which, from a literary point of view, refers to the art of antithesis.

Also, *Fakhr Rāzī* considers the miracle as an indication of the correctness of prophecy (ibid: 3, 595). *Bayḍāwī*, in "*Anwār al-Tanzīl*," believes that the true form of miracle is a kind of knowledge or a type of action that is exclusively given to the claimant of divine office in such a way that it is outside of ordinary affairs (Bayḍāwī, 1997 AD/1418 AH: 4, 43). *Suyūṭī* in *al-Itqān* considers the realization of a miracle to be dependent on three things: breaking the norm, challenging, and being invincible (Suyūṭī, 1960 AD/1380 AH: 2, 1001)

5. Comparing the Views of *Ṭabrisī* and *Zamakhsharī* in Explaining the Elements of *I'jāz*

In the discussion of miracle, in comparing the views of *Ṭabrisī* and *Zamakhsharī* as two prominent commentators from the Imamiyyah and Mu'tazilah schools, several common and different outcomes can be achieved, the most important of which will be discussed below (cf. Martin McDermott, 1984 AD/1363 SH: 116).

5.1. Similarities

The common ground between the Mu'tazili and Imami schools of thought regarding the miracle of the Quran is considerable. In brief, the most significant points of agreement are as follows:

1) The first alignment is the intellectual similarity in considering the apparent meanings and words of the Quran as miraculous. They believe that the very Quran available in all ages and generations possesses aspects of *I'jāz*, and only a few of these aspects have been revealed to humanity so far. Therefore, they do not attribute the miraculous nature of the Quran to an ancient word;

2) Belief in common elements in the definition of miracles, such as: "violation of habit, Taḥaddī, and being evidence of truth." (Khu'ī, 1990 AD/1369 AH: 89) They also believe that the miracle must be subsequent to or accompany the claim of prophethood (Ṭūsī, 1889 AD/1309 AH: 4, 520);

3) Agreement on aspects of the *I'jāz* of the Quran, such as the structure and system of the Quran, the miraculous nature of historical events of peoples and prophets, the eloquence and fluency of the verses, and reporting of events and unseen matters, are other commonalities (Ḥillī, 1984 AD/1363 AH: 184).

5.2. Differences

Among the differing opinions, several important inconsistencies can be pointed out:

1) In Shi'a view, miracles do not contradict the causal laws governing the universe but are consistent with the laws of physics present in nature that are yet unknown

to mankind. However, the Mu'tazilites consider the dominance of miracles to be outside the causal system in nature, believing that not only is the miraculous act devoid of material causes and effects, but also material forms prevent the realization of the miraculous act;

2) The Mu'tazilites believe that miracles are exclusively limited to prophets, but the Shi'a accept the attribution of miracles to the position of Imamate as the successor of the Prophet, as well as the manifestation of miracles upon the saints of God;

3) Contradictory statements and notions can be found among the great scholars of the schools in various aspects, such as the issue of "*Ṣarfa*" (prevention), different readings, the quality of the rhythmic system of speech and its balance, and the context and network connection existing in the verses and surahs;

4) The Mu'tazilites do not consider the realization of miracles other than the Quran to be dependent on the matter of *Taḥaddī*; for example, in the occurrence of the miracles of the prophets, they do not consider the *Taḥaddī* necessary, but consider it specific and exclusive to the miracle of the Quran.

6. Analysis and Review of Different Perspectives on the Expression of the Verses of *Taḥaddī*

A group of commentators, including *Jaṣṣāṣ* in *Aḥkām al-Qur'an* (cf. Jaṣṣāṣ, 1405: 1, 34), as well as *al-Zarkashī* in *al-Burhān* (cf. Zarkashī, 1989 AD/1410 AH: 2, 110), and indeed some contemporary scholars, including *Rāfi'ī* in *I'jāz al-Qur'an* (cf. Rāfi'ī, 2000 AD/1421 AH: 196), believe that in the sequence of the verses of *Taḥaddī*, God initially began the *Taḥaddī* with respect to bringing a discourse like the Qur'an; that is, the *Taḥaddī* began with the entire Qur'an (al-Isrā': 88), then *Taḥaddī* with ten surahs (Hūd: 13), and finally concluded the progression of the *Taḥaddī* with one surah (al-Baqarah: 23-24). Among the commentators who believe that the progression of the *Taḥaddī* has occurred based on the amount from more to less is *Qurṭubī*. He considers the order that he considers for the revelation of the surahs to include, in order: "Surahs *al-Isrā', al-Ṭūr, Hūd*, and *al-Baqarah*, and believes that God initially *Taḥaddī* with the entire Qur'an, then said to bring a discourse like the Qur'an, and then obligated the deniers to bring ten surahs, and finally obligated them to bring one surah." (cf. Qurṭubī, 1999 AD/1420 AH: 1, 77) A fundamental problem is raised against the descending order that *Qurṭubī* has presented in this way, and that is the disregard for Surah *Yūnus*, which as the fifty-first surah of the Qur'an was revealed before Surah *Hūd*. The same problem is raised against the theories of earlier scholars such as *Jaṣṣāṣ* and later scholars such as *Rāfi'ī*, because their theory does not correspond to the descending order that has been recorded in history for the surahs. Numerous and reliable sources testify to the precedence of Surah *Yūnus* over *Hūd*, including *Suyūṭī* in "*al-Itqān*" in chapter *al-Nuzūl*, quoting *Ibn 'Abbās, Jābir ibn Zayd, 'Uthmān ibn 'Aṭā*, and *'Umar ibn Hārūn*, explicitly stating this by bringing the chain of transmission of the narration, and considers such an order reliable due to the multiple and extensive narrations in the interpretive sources and its harmony with historical events. He explains the precedence of Surah *Yūnus* over *Hūd*, narrations from early and late commentators, including *Zarkashī* and *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī* (Suyūṭī, 2000 AD/1421 AH: 1, 170). Also, Theodor Nöldeke, as one of the orientalist Qur'an scholars, explains in detail the order of the revelation of Surahs *Yūnus* and *Hūd* in "*Tārīkh al-Qur'an*" based on historical evidence. Among others who have presented an order inconsistent with the historical order, one

can point to martyr Sayyid Mustafa Khomeini (cf. Khomeini, 1997 AD/1376 SH: 67).

In his interpretation, he acknowledges that the descending order of the *Taḥaddī* includes the *Taḥaddī* to the entire Quran, ten surahs, a new discourse, and finally one surah. Therefore, he considers the order of the surahs to be *al-Isrā'*, *Hūd*, *al-Ṭūr, Yūnus*, and *al-Baqarah*. However, this order is also based solely on observing the step-by-step *Taḥaddī* from the lesser to the greater amount, and it still does not correspond to the historical evidence of the revelation of the surahs.

As mentioned, the fundamental problem with the descending order that this group of early and late scholars have stated lies in its inconsistency with historical evidence and documentation. This is because credible documents consider the revelation of Surah *Yūnus* to be before Surah *Hūd*. Although both surahs are Meccan, Surah *Yūnus* is the fifty-first and Surah *Hūd* is the fifty-second surah in the order of revelation. With the exception of *Ibn Nadīm*'s list, which places the revelation of Surah *Hūd* before *Yūnus*, such a view is not seen in other reliable sources and narrations. Therefore, sound reason dictates that *Ibn Nadīm*'s view should not be accepted due to its being anomalous. Consequently, the view of those commentators who have explained the stages of *Taḥaddī* in accordance with the order of revelation found in *Ibn Nadīm*'s list can be rejected.

Some commentators, who have insisted on the necessity of an order among the series of *Taḥaddī* verses, have doubted the order that history mentions for the revelation of the surahs; therefore, they have chosen a different order. Among these is *Fakhr Rāzī*. He believes that God called the deniers in Surahs *Yūnus* and *al-Baqarah* to bring a surah, and since Surah *Hūd* is Meccan and Surah *al-Baqarah* is Medinan, the precedence of Surah *Hūd* over *al-Baqarah* is inevitable. Up to this point, *Fakhr Rāzī*'s view is acceptable, but he goes on to say that if Surah *Hūd* is also considered to precede Surah *Yūnus,* there is no problem because both are Meccan, and to preserve the order in the series of *Taḥaddī* and the precedence of ten surahs over one surah, the precedence of Surah *Hūd* over *Yūnus* can be concluded (cf. Fakhr Rāzī, 1999 AD/1420 AH: 17, 157). Although *Fakhr Rāzī*'s theory provides a rational progression in the *Taḥaddī* verses, it is not only not based on historical evidence, but it also contradicts the view of Quranic scholars who believe that God did not follow a specific progression in the *Taḥaddī* verses.

Some other commentators, in order to preserve the descending harmony in the surahs and avoid disrupting the historical order, believe that although the earlier revelation of Surah *Yūnus* compared to *Hūd* is definite, the verses of *Taḥaddī* in these surahs may not have been revealed simultaneously with the surahs themselves. In other words, the verse attributed to *Taḥaddī* in Surah *Hūd* may have been revealed before its counterpart in Surah *Yūnus*. Specifically, it is possible that the thirteenth verse of Surah *Hūd* (which invites opponents to produce ten surahs) was revealed before the thirty-eighth verse of Surah *Yūnus* (which invites disbelievers to produce one surah). Thus, while maintaining the order of revelation in the surahs, the logical sequence and rational progression in the verses of *Taḥaddī* are also observed (cf. Sadr al-Dini, 1995 AD/1374 SH: 138). The suggestion of delaying the revelation of the verse of *Taḥaddī* in Surah *Yūnus* (which calls for one surah) and advancing the revelation of the verse of *Taḥaddī* in Surah Hūd (which calls for ten surahs) is not mentioned in

any reliable historical sources and is presented solely to preserve the logical sequence in the verses of *Taḥaddī*; therefore, it is an unsubstantiated theory.

Sayyid Quṭb, in his commentary *Fī Ẓilāl al-Qur'an*, rejects the commentators' unsubstantiated discretionary and obligatory arrangements imposed on the series of *Taḥaddī* verses. He argues that the order of the *Taḥaddī* verses cannot be considered contrary to the descending order recorded in history; rather, the focus should be on the essence of the *Taḥaddī*, not the order or precedence; therefore, according to the *Taḥaddī* verses, God *Taḥaddī* the deniers of the divine origin of the Quran to encourage those with intellect to reflect. He considers the primary audience of the *Taḥaddī* verses to be those deniers who perceive the Quran as human speech. Therefore, he believes that God *Taḥaddī* the disbelievers regarding the nature of the Quran, not the quantity or number of verses and surahs. Thus, in this *Taḥaddī*, God asks the opponents to bring a discourse equal to the Quran, similar in kind and nature, regardless of whether it is a part, one surah, or ten surahs (cf. Sayyid Quṭb, 1988 AD/1408 AH: 6, 225).

7. *Zamakhsharī*'s Perspective on the Progression of the Verses of *Taḥaddī*

Although *Zamakhsharī* considers historical background and transmitted documents in many cases of interpretation, he does not accept the order of revelation in explaining the verses of *Taḥaddī*, which is agreed upon by the majority of opinions. In explaining and interpreting the verses of *Taḥaddī*, he refers to *Jaṣṣāṣ*'s opinion and prefers the order of revelation that *Ibn Nadīm* mentioned in his *al-Fihrist*, even though it is an opinion contrary to the majority. He believes that God, after inviting humanity to bring an absolute word like the Quran, reduced the amount of *Taḥaddī* to ten surahs in the next stage, and finally proposed the call to bring one surah (cf. Zamakhsharī, 1969 AD/1389 AH: 2, 347) According to what *Zamakhsharī* discusses in *al-Kashshāf*, the order of the verses of *Taḥaddī* is *al-Isrā'*, *Hūd*, *Yūnus*, and *al-Baqarah*. The biggest problem with this order, as we mentioned in the critique of *Zamakhsharī*'s peers, is the disregard for the precedence of Surah *Yūnus* over *Hūd*, while according to what historians have recorded from the beginning of Islam in the order of revelation of the surahs, the precedence of Surah *Yūnus* over Surah *Hūd* is agreed upon by the majority of scholars (cf. Suyūṭī, 2000 AD/1421 AH: 1, 170). *Zamakhsharī* does not specify in his interpretation on what basis he abandoned the well-known opinion that has a historical basis and relies on a rare opinion. The second problem is the failure to address Surah *al-Ṭūr* and the phrase "with a discourse like it." *Zamakhsharī* does not offer an opinion on this matter and believes that the word "hadith" only indicates a general meaning. Of course, such problems have not been hidden from the view of commentators such as *Suyūṭī*, because he has criticized those commentators who have ignored some verses in the order of the *Taḥaddī* progression (cf. Suyūṭī, 1960 AD/1380 AH: 3, 542)

Based on the order he has chosen, *Zamakhsharī* believes that a rational progression has been observed in the *Taḥaddī*, because God, in a logical progression, initially considered an absolute word, then ten surahs, and finally one surah, and as a result, the divine purpose, which was to prove the inability and helplessness of mankind, has been achieved.

8. Ṭabrisī's Perspective on the Progression of the *Taḥaddī* Verses

In explaining the *Taḥaddī* verses, *Ṭabrisī* refers to all five categories of verses on this topic. In interpreting verse 13 of Surah *Hūd*, he writes:

"In response to the denial of the opponents, God Almighty *Taḥaddī* them to produce ten surahs." He continues, "The reason why God issued the Taḥaddī in varying amounts at different times, and the wisdom behind sometimes challenging the audience to produce one surah, at other times ten surahs, and at yet another stage with the phrase "A discourse like it," must be sought in the miraculous nature of the Quran in relation to the metered speech of the Arabs." (cf. Ṭabrisī, 1968 AD/1388 AH: 10, 405) The secret to these fluctuations in the *Taḥaddī* lies in proving the superiority of the Divine word; the superiority of the Quran and its elevation in terms of rhythmic harmony and proportion, and its freedom from any affectation, are all proven in the background of the *Taḥaddī* verses. *Ṭabrisī*, through the *Taḥaddī* verses, explores the miraculous nature of the Quran and considers the wisdom of the *Taḥaddī* verses to be the proof of the superiority of the Divine word over the word of the Arabs, and the admission of the Arabic speakers to their inability to compete. Therefore, he does not seek a logical progression among the *Taḥaddī* verses; rather, he accepts the order of revelation of the *Taḥaddī* verses based on historical evidence. Thus, the order of the *Taḥaddī* verses in *Ṭabrisī*'s view is consistent with the well-known view agreed upon by scholars such as *Suyūṭī*, *Sayyid Quṭb*, *Allamah*, and many commentators. According to this view, the *Taḥaddī* to the Quran began with the phrase "Like this Quran," meaning verse 88 of Surah *al-Isrā'*, which is the 50th surah of the Quran. In the second stage, the *Taḥaddī* was to produce one surah, according to verse 38 of Surah *Yūnus* with the phrase "A surah like it," and then it increased to ten surahs in the third stage, as evidenced in verse 13 of Surah *Hūd* with the content "With ten surahs like it." Then, in the fourth stage, in verse 34 of Surah Tur with the phrase "with a discourse like it," this *Taḥaddī* continues until, finally, in the last stage, God says in Surah *al-Baqarah*, "Then bring a surah like it." According to this view, the order of revelation includes the surahs: "*al-Isrā', Yūnus, Hūd, Ṭūr*, and *al-Baqarah*, respectively."

And since *Shaykh Ṭabrisī* considers the mission of the *Taḥaddī* verses to be the proof of the superiority of the Quran's structure over Arabic speech, he states that it makes no difference whether the proof of this superiority is based on a *Taḥaddī* to the entire Quran, one Surah, or ten Surahs. *Ṭabrisī* believes that what caused the disagreement in the object of the *Taḥaddī* was the conditions and exigencies of the time; because the Quran and the Prophet (PBUH) were always confronted by opponents with various types of taunts, slanders, and numerous contentions; therefore, the Quran, in accordance with the unreasonable demands and claims of the opponents, each time *Taḥaddī* them to bring a part of the Quran, for example, one or ten Surahs, or a new word, or speech like the Quran, without any special order being considered in terms of time. Rather, the Quran's intention was to prove the absurdity of the claim that the opposing claimants had made before the revelation of the *Taḥaddī* verses, through the type and extent of the *Taḥaddī* (cf. Ṭabrisī, 1968 AD/1388 AH: 6, 147).

9. An Analysis of the Comparison of *Zamakhsharī*'s and *Ṭabrisī*'s Views on the Progression of the *Taḥaddī* Verses

The view that *Zamakhsharī* has chosen regarding the order of revelation of the *Taḥaddī* verses can be criticized for four reasons:

1) The order of the Surahs' revelation in *Zamakhsharī*'s and his like-minded individuals'

proposed order has not been observed and does not match the evidence that history testifies to;

2) Relying on an opinion that has not been observed in any other source except *Ibn Nadīm*'s list is not acceptable due to being uncommon;

3) Disregarding the precedence of Surah *Yūnus* over Surah *Hūd* in the order presented by *Zamakhsharī* is questionable. According to him, the order of the *Taḥaddī* verses includes: *al-Isrā'*, *Hūd*, *Yūnus*, and *al-Baqarah*. However, in no reliable source recorded in history has Surah *Hūd* been mentioned before Surah *Yūnus*;

4) *Zamakhsharī* does not clearly specify the position of Surah Tur in the order he mentions and does not express a specific opinion regarding the important keyword "*Bi Ḥadīthin Mithlih*" (with a speech like it), but merely concludes that it is general.

In an analytical comparison between the viewpoints of *Zamakhsharī* and *Ṭabrisī*, the perspective that *Ṭabrisī* expressed regarding the arrangement of the verses of *Taḥaddī* can be chosen. What follows elaborates on the reasons for the preference of *Ṭabrisī*'s view over that of *Zamakhsharī*:

1) The order favored by *Ṭabrisī* aligns with the documented historical evidence transmitted generation after generation from the dawn of Islam until now. Therefore, it is a well-known arrangement mentioned in various historical sources, and the majority of Quranic scholars and commentators adhere to it; 2) *Ṭabrisī* considered all five categories of verses in the order he presented, and he did not, for the sake of expediency, overlook some verses and their key words;

2) The fundamental problem of not observing the precedence of Surah *Yūnus* over *Hūd*, which is observed in the arrangement of some early and later scholars, does not exist in the order that *Ṭabrisī* has stated;

3) *Ṭabrisī* has paid attention to the keywords of each of the five categories of verses of *Taḥaddī* in his commentary, and he has interpreted and explained each in its proper place;

4) He has paid attention to the main goal of the verses of *Taḥaddī*, which is to prove the miraculous nature of the Quran and its superiority over the Arabic poetic system, and in his commentary, he has taken care to address the aspects of the Quran's superiority in terms of eloquence, rhetoric, and style of speech;

5) *Shaykh Ṭabrisī*, in order to achieve a sequence that appears logical and rational, has not resorted to affectation and does not attribute an arbitrary arrangement to the verses of the Quran;

6) He considers the secret of the difference in the object of the verses of *Taḥaddī* to be the conditions and exigencies of the time in response to the obstinacy of the claimants, and he introduces the wisdom of the revelation of the verses of *Taḥaddī* as the deniers' claim that the verses are not divine; because some deniers, assuming that they were faced with human speech, claimed the ability to bring speech like the Quran, and the Quran each time, in proportion to that claim, revealed a harmonious and worthy response.

Conclusion

The topic of *Taḥaddī* in the Quran is multifaceted, and the differing opinions of commentators demonstrate the interpretive richness of the Quran in accepting various approaches. In the discussion of "*I'jāz*," comparing the views of *Ṭabrisī* and *Zamakhsharī* as two prominent commentators from the Imamiyyah and Mu'tazilah schools of thought,

several shared and divergent outcomes were obtained:

The common ground shared by the Mu'tazili and Imami perspectives briefly includes intellectual similarity in the miraculous nature of the apparent meanings and words of the Quran and its non-attribution to the ancient word (of God). They also agree on common elements such as: "Breaking of habit (*Kharq al-ʻĀdat*), *Taḥaddī* , being a testimony to truth, *Iʻjāz* in the structure and system of the Quran, the miraculous nature of the historical events of peoples and prophets, the eloquence and fluency of the verses, and reporting of events and unseen matters."

In parallel with the similarities, their differing opinions were also examined, including that: in the Shi'a view, the miracle is consistent with the causal laws governing the system of existence, but the Mu'tazilah consider the matter of miracle devoid of material causes and effects, rather considering the form of matter as preventing the realization of supernatural affairs. The Mu'tazilah exclusively confines miracles to prophets, but the Shi'a accepts its attribution to the successor of the Prophet and the position of Imamate, sometimes with the same name and sometimes with the title "Karāmat" (miracles of saints). The Mu'tazilah insist that *Taḥaddī* is exclusively necessary in proving the miraculous nature of the Quran, and do not consider the realization of other miracles dependent on the matter of *Taḥaddī*. Also, the great scholars of the schools have expressed contradictory opinions on various issues regarding the matter of *Iʻjāz*, including: the issue of *Ṣarfa* (divine intervention preventing imitation), variant readings, the quality of the harmonious system of speech and its balance, the context and network connections existing among the verses and surahs.

In the discussion of the "Progression of the verses of *Taḥaddī*," in an analytical comparison between the views of *Zamakhsharī* and *Ṭabrisī*, the achievements obtained indicate that: "The order of revelation of the surahs in the proposed order of *Zamakhsharī* and his like-minded scholars is not observed and does not match the documents that history testifies to." Also, from his opinions, results such as relying on a rare opinion such as the list of *Ibn Nadīm*, not considering the precedence of Surah *Yūnus* over Surah *Hūd*, and not having well-reasoned historical evidence, the lack of explicit mention by *Zamakhsharī* of the position of Surah Tur, and also not addressing the concept of the important keyword "*Bi Ḥadīthin Mithlih*" ("with a similar discourse"), are obtained.

Therefore, in an analytical and selective comparison between these two perspectives, one can choose the view that *Ṭabrisī* expressed regarding the order of the verses of *Taḥaddī*; because the order considered by *Ṭabrisī* is in accordance with the transmitted historical documents and evidence, and the well-known sequence. He has not ignored some verses and key words for certain expediencies. Also, the fundamental problem of not observing the order between Surahs *Yūnus* and *Hūd* is not observed in his arrangement. *Ṭabrisī* has paid attention to the key words of each of the five categories of verses of *Taḥaddī* in his interpretation and has not ignored any of them. In addition, he has paid attention to the main purpose of the verses of *Taḥaddī*, which is to prove the miraculous nature of the Quran and its superiority over the Arabic eloquent system, and in order to achieve a sequence that appears logical and rational, he has not forced himself into affectation and has not expressed an imposed opinion. He

considers the reason for the difference in the object of the verses of *Taḥaddī* to be the conditions and exigencies of the time in response to the obstinacy of the claimants, and introduces the wisdom of the revelation of the verses of *Taḥaddī* as the deniers' claim that the verses are not divine; just as the Holy Quran has revealed a coherent and worthy answer each time in proportion to that claim.

Sources

..... (1997 AD/1418 AH). *Jawāmi‘ al-Jāmi‘*. Qom: Islamic Publishing Institute.

Allamah Ḥillī, H. (1984 AD/1363 SH). *Anwār al-Malakūt fī Sharḥ al-Yāqūt*. Qom: Al-Radi Publications.

Anṣārī, I. (1984 AD/1405 AH). *Mughnī al-Labīb*. Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah.

Bāqillānī, M. (2000 AD/1421 AH). *I'jaz al-Qur'an*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya.

Barqī, A. (1951 AD/1371 AH). *al-Maḥāsin*. Qom: Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyya.

Bayḍāwī, A. (1997 AD/1418 AH). *Anwār al-Tanzīl*. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr.

Gazar, M. (2002 AD/1381 SH). "A Comparative Look at Jami al-Jami and Kashshāf." No. 29.

Ḥamawī, Y. (1993 AD). *Mu‘jam al-Udabā’ (Irshād al-Arīb ilā Ma‘rifat al-Adīb)*. Beirut: Dar al-Gharb al-Islami.

Ḥaskānī Nīshābūrī, U. (1990 AD/1411 AH). *Shawāhid al-Tanzīl li Qawā’id al-Tafḍīl*. Tehran: Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance.

Hojjati, M. (1990 AD/1369 SH). *Grammar and Morphology History*. Tehran: Quran Foundation.

Ḥurr ‘Āmilī, M. (1965 AD/1385 AH). *Amal al-Āmil fī ‘Ulamā’ Jabal ‘Āmil*. Baghdad: Maktabat al-Andalus.

Ibn Athīr, I. (1988 AD/1409 AH). *Usd al-Ghāba fī Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥāba*. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr.

Ibn Nadīm, M. (987 AD/377 AH). *al-Fihrist*. Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah.

Ibn Shahr Āshūb Mazandarani, M. (1989 AD/1410 AH). *Mutashābih al-Qur'an wa Mukhtalifuh*. Qom: Bidar.

Jaṣṣāṣ, A. (1984 AD/1405 AH). *Aḥkām al-Qur'an*. Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Ṭūrath al-Arabi.

Jazarī, I. (n.d.). *al-Lubāb fī Tahdhīb al-Ansāb*. Beirut: Dar Sader.

Kaḥāla, U. (n.d.). *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifīn*. Beirut: Maktabat al-Muthanna, Dar al-Ihya al-Ṭūrath al-Arabi.

Khansari, M. (1969 AD/1390 AH). *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt*. Tehran: Maktabat Esmaeilian.

Khomeini, M. (1997 AD/1376 SH). *Tafsir al-Quran al-‘Aẓīm*. Tehran: Institute for Compilation and Publication of Imam Khomeini's Works.

Khorramshahi, B. (2001 AD/1380 SH). *Encyclopedia of the Quran and Quranic Studies*. Tehran: Nahid.

Khu’ī, A. (1990 AD/1369 SH). *al-Bayān fī Tafsīr al-Quran*. Qom: Ihya Athar al-Imam al-Khu’i.

Majlisī, M. (1996 AD/1375 SH). *Biḥār al-Anwār*. Tehran: Islamic Publications.

Makarem Shirazi, N, et all. (2001 AD/1380 SH). *Tafsir Nemooneh*. Tehran: Dar al-Kotob al-Islamia.

Mar'ashi Najafi, Sh. (1896 AD/1326 AH). *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq wa Izhāq al-Bāṭil*. Qom: Ayatollah Mar'ashi Library.

Ma‘rifat, M. (2010 AD/1389 SH). *Quranic Sciences; A Summary of the Book al-Tamhid*. Qom: Tamhid Cultural Institute.

Martin, M. (1984 AD/1363 SH). *The Theological Ideas of Shaykh Mufīd*. Tehran: Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University.

Mo’addab, R. (1993 AD/1372 SH). *The I‘jāz of the Quran in the View of the Ahl al-Bayt*. Qom: Ahsan al-Hadith.

Mufīd, M. (1979 AD/1400 AH). *Awā’il al-Maqālāt fī al-Mukhtārāt*. Qom: The World Congress.

Qurṭubī Anṣārī, M. (1999 AD/1420 AH). *al-Jāmi‘ li Aḥkām al-Quran*. Beirut: Dar al-Ihya al-Ṭūrath al-Arabi.

Rāfi‘ī, M. (2000 AD/1421 AH). *I‘jāz al-Quran wa Iblāghihī al-Nabawīyyah*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.

Rāzī, F. (1999 AD/1420 AH). *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb; al-Tafsir al-Kabīr*. Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Ṭūrath al-Arabi.

Sadr al-Dini, A. (1995 AD/1374 SH). *A Critique and Introduction to the Evolution of the Quran, the Prophet and the Revolution*. Tehran: Majed.

Ṣadr, H. (2019 AD/1438 AH). *Ta'sīs al-Shi'a li 'Ulūm al-Islam*. Qom: Institute of Shi'a Heritage.

Sam'ānī, A. (1987 AD/1408 AH). *al-Ansāb, Investigation and Commentary*. Beirut: Dar al-Jinan for Printing and Publishing.

Sayyid Quṭb. (1987 AD/1408 AH). *Fī Ẓilāl al-Quran*. Beirut: Dar al-Shuruq.

Sayyidi, H. (2008 AD/1387 SH). Translator of the book by Mohammad Karim Kawaz. *Stylistics of the Miraculous Eloquence of the Quran*. Tehran: Sokhan.

Sirati Qazvini, M. (1958 AD/1338 SH). *Commentary on the Evidences of Majma' al-Bayān Ṭabrisī*. Tehran: Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyyah.

Suyūṭī, J. (2001 AD/1380 SH). *al-Itqān fī 'Ulūm al-Quran*. Tehran: Amir Kabir.

Ṭabāṭabā'ī, M. (1955 AD/1375 AH). *al-Mīzān fī Tafsir al-Quran*. Qom: Islamic Publications.

Ṭabrisī, F. (2009 AD/1388 SH). *Majma' al-Bayān fī Tafsir al-Quran*. Tehran: Maktaba al-Ilmiyya.

Ṭūsī, M. (1889 AD/1309 AH). *al-Tibyān fī Tafsir al-Quran*. Qom: Maktab al-Alam al-Islami.

Zamakhsharī, M. (1969 AD/1389 AH). *al-Kashshāf 'an Ḥaqā'iq Ghawāmiḍ al-Tanzīl*. Tehran: Quqnous.

Zarkashī, M. (1989 AD/1410 AH). *al-Burhān fī 'Ulūm al-Quran*. Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah.