

Critical Analysis of Fakhr-e Razi's Paraphrase, in Capacity Verses: Theological Explanation

تحلیل انتقادی تأویل گروهی فخر رازی در آیات وسع: تبیین کلامی

Received: 05/12/2018

Accepted: 03/02/2020

Ahad Faramarz Gharamolki¹

Fahimeh Sajedi Mehr²

احد فرامرز قراملکی^۱

فهیمة ساجدی مهر^۲

Abstract

Razi is not one of those commentators who often go beyond the text and the apparent meaning of the verses of the Qur'an and tend to paraphrase the verses. However, he is forced to paraphrase the five verses of the Qur'an, which explicitly indicate that the duties are limited to the extent of the Qur'an. This rare approach has its causes and reasons. He mentions five reasons in this regard and considers them as a definite verdict on the fulfillment of the task, to an extent beyond the scope of individuals. The subject of current research is to investigate the reason for his tendency to interpret these verses of the Qur'an. The research hypothesis of Razi's theological basis in paraphrasing is the attribution of individuals' actions. According to this interpretation, any internal origin of the action in man is denied and only the act of "acquisition" is sufficient. There are reasons for this mysterious epistemological basis. One of these factors is the interpretation of divine power.

Keywords: Verses of Capacity, Acquisition, The task in scope, Strength, Power, Endurance.

چکیده

رازی را نمی‌توان از مفسرانی دانست که اغلب از نص و معنای ظاهری آیات قرآنی فرا می‌گذرند و متمایل به تاویل هستند. او در خصوص آیات پنج‌گانه وسع که به محدود بودن تکالیف در حد وسع دلالت صریح دارند خود را ناگزیر از تاویل می‌بیند. موضع نادر وی عوامل و دلایلی دارد. وی پنج دلیل می‌آورد و آن‌ها را حکم قطعی بر تحقق تکلیف فراتر از وسع می‌داند. بررسی عامل گرایش وی به تاویل در این آیات، مساله تحقیق حاضر است. فرضیه تحقیق مبنای کلامی رازی در تفسیر انتساب فعل انسان است. تفسیری که بر اساس آن هرگونه مبدء درونی فعل در انسان انکار می‌شود و تنها به حالتی نزد شخص به هنگام فعل «کسب» بسنده می‌شود. این مبنای معرفتی رازی خود دارای عوامل است. یکی از این عوامل تفسیر قدرت الهی است.

کلمات کلیدی: آیات وسع، کسب، تکلیف در حد وسع، قدرت، توان، طاقت.

1. Professor of Islamic Philosophy, University of Tehran, Iran. (the Corresponding Author)

2. Quran and hadith sciences Ph.D, Olum and Tahghighat University, Tehran, Iran.

۱. استاد فلسفه اسلامی دانشگاه تهران، ایران. (نویسنده مسئول)
ghmaleki@ut.ac.ir

۲. دانش آموخته دکتری علوم قرآن و حدیث دانشگاه علوم و تحقیقات، تهران، ایران. f.sajedimehr@yahoo.com

Introduction

Fakhreddin Razi (603-543) is one of the commentators who try to be moderate in paraphrasing Quranic verses. In expressing the meaning of the Qur'an from paraphrase in different verses, he considers it to mean interpretation (see: 3/557; 3/469; 12/502; 8/268).

But what is meant by interpretation here is not the meaning of the first interpretation in the use of the Qur'an means interpretation. Rather, it refers to the latter meaning in the science of interpretation, which is the point of contention between anti-interpretation and hermeneutics. According to this meaning, Ibn Jawzi considers paraphrasing as distancing oneself from the apparent meanings of the word based on reason and symmetry and does not consider the apparent meaning acceptable (Nozha al-A'in al-Nawazir fi Alam al-Wujuh wa al-Nazair: 216-217).

Razi's analysis of the necessity of interpretation in some verses of the Qur'an is, in fact, his interpretation of interpretation as a later meaning, which he considers as distancing himself from the apparent meaning of suspicion in the opposite sense, which is the result of a definite and certain reason (Razi, 1420: 7/146).

One of the verses that he believes should be paraphrased, is an example of verses that must be paraphrased by necessity, is: "Allah does not task any soul beyond its capacity (286-2)". In his view, and for conclusive reasons, there is a task beyond capacity. For this reason, it is said that what God means in this verse is not what the appearance of the verse implies. Therefore, the word must be returned to some lexical metaphors (ibid.).

In interpreting the verses of capacity, Razi, unlike most commentators, tries to offer interpretation beyond the appearance of the verse by paraphrasing.

In examining his point of view, there are two research issues:

one, verifying and measuring his point of view according to interpretive arguments, and second, explaining his point of view and discovering the basis that led him to take such a point of view. In the present study, the second problem is analyzed. This analysis is preceded by a brief account of the interpretive heritage in the capacity verses of the Qur'an, as well as a critical account of Razi's arguments for taking the position of hermeneutics. The hypothesis of the research is as follows:

The theological view of denying the power, as the origin of the issuance of action from man and believing in the theological theory of "acquisition" (Razi, 1411: 1/455) has caused him to have to paraphrase verses broadly.

The theological view of denying power and capacity and replacing the concept of acquisition with it (Abolhassan Ash'ari view) is derived from the basic image of the mystery of God. This image is not imaginable. Nor is a definition. Rather, it is a strong and powerful mental idea that when it is inconsistent with the verses of the Qur'an, Razi paraphrases it instead of doubting its idea. Here, the idea is a mental image of something that sits in its place and affects a person's beliefs (see: Faramarz Gharamaleki, Ahad, the power of the idea).

Although numerous researches have been done on verses of capacity and related interpretive views, but in analyzing the paraphrasing view of Razi and examining its theological basis, no systematic research has been published.

The interpretive challenges of capacity verses, Background

In five verses of the Qur'an, the task is limited to the capacity of man: "No soul

is to be tasked except according to its capacity (233-2)", "Allah does not task any soul beyond its capacity (286-2)", "We task no soul except according to its capacity (152-6)", "We task no soul except according to its capacity (42-7)" and "We task no soul except according to its capacity (62-23)".

These verses are called "capacity verses". Following these verses, various issues have been raised by commentators. Some of them are: analysis of the concept of capacity, the relationship between capacity and endurance, the rationality or legality of the proportionality of the task with capacity, the validity or invalidity of the task beyond the scope, the occurrence or annulment of the task beyond the scope, the ratio of "task within the scope" with purpose from the task, and linking capacity verses with verses indicating the elimination of hardship. Among the commentators, there are differences in the understanding of the capacity verses.

But none of the commentators has considered these verses to be corresponding. All commentators agree that these verses explicitly indicate the limited scope of the task. Of course, there is disagreement about the meaning of these verses.

Among the commentators, there are differences in the understanding of the capacity verses. But none of the commentators has considered these verses to be similar. All commentators agree that these verses explicitly indicate the limited scope of the task. Of course, there is disagreement about the examples of these verses. For this reason, paraphrasing those verses is a very rare issue and contrary to the consensus of commentators. The emergence of such a view needs to be explained.

Regarding those issues, two major interpretive currents have criticized each other's positions:

One: All Shiite commentators, as well as the Mu'tazilites, consider the task beyond the scope (in the nowadays explained as the task beyond one's strength) to be intellectually useless and oppressive. Therefore, they consider it wrong and bad. On this basis, God has never set a task beyond the reach of individuals (See: Ibn Shahr Ashob, 1369: 146; Tabatabai, 1390: 2/444; Sadeghi Tehrani 1406: 4/386; Alwan, 1999: 1/80; Abolsoud 1983: 2/276; Siddiq Hassan Khan 1420: 4/527; Novvi, 1417: 2/90).

Second: all Ash'arite commentators deny the intellectual and inherent ugliness of the overworked task. Therefore, they do not consider it wrong. They generally believe that in the divine view, the overworked task could be a command (Matridi, 1426: 4/317; Panipenti, 1412: 1/446).

Razi, in the form of a nonsense theorem, says: The task has been ordered out of scope (7/146). He attributes this view to the Ash'arite school (7/122). But some of his arguments require that all tasks be beyond the scope. He considers the fact that the duties are beyond the scope of the servant as a reason for paraphrasing the verses.

Razi's reasons regarding fulfilling the task beyond the scope

One of the issues of the capacity verses, in the analysis of which Razi criticizes the Mu'tazilites' point of view, is the issue of the occurrence or cancellation of the task beyond the scope. He says that the Mu'tazilites use those verses to prove that God does not impose on His servants beyond their power. According to the Mu'tazilites, God has declared that He does not oblige anyone except to the extent of His scope. Expansion is beyond endurance. When God does not

assign a servant outside of expansion, then he certainly does not assign a task outside of power and endurance (6/458). Like this verse, other verses say:

“He has chosen you and has not placed for you any obstacle in the religion (78-22)”, “Allah desires to lighten your burden (28-4)”, “Allah desires ease for you, and He does not desire hardship for you (185-2)”. These verses explicitly deny the task beyond the power and capacity of individuals. Therefore, by proving those two principles, two other principles could be concluded:

Reason 1: The servant creates his deeds. If God is the creator of the servant's actions, then the servant's duties will be beyond his power. Because deeds are done by the power of God, and what has been created and done will not be re-created. Moreover, it will not be possible to leave the verb. For the power of the servant is weaker than the power of God; So how can he repel the power of God with his power? When God does not create the present, the servant can't acquire the present with his power.

Reason 2: Affordability is given to individuals before doing work. If this is not the case, then the disbeliever is obliged to believe while he is unable to believe, and this duty is beyond his ability (116/7). He does not refer to a specific source of Mu'tazilites.

According to Razi, rational reasons can prove the occurrence of a task beyond expansion: The first reason is the task of believing in an infidel who dies in a state of disbelief. God is aware from eternity and knows that this person remains an infidel and certainly does not believe. God's awareness of his unbelief and at the same time obliging him to believe are contradictory (7/117). This reason has been widely criticized in the

history of commentary. Assuming logical validity, the occurrence of a task beyond capacity means being beyond power and in the form of an existential theorem (or, in the words of traditional logicians: a partial theorem).

The second reason is that the work is done by the servant according to his motivation. This motive is God's creation. If the performance or omission of action is without any preference, the occurrence of a possible thing without the necessary preference occurs, and this causes the negation of the existence of the Creator.

The reason that motivation is from God is that if it is from the servant, then the person himself will need another motivation to motivate, and this requires sequencing. When a motive causes a task, it indicates that the task was preferable and the other party had less preference. A task with less preference is unlikely to happen. When it is less preferred, the preferred one will inevitably happen. And this requires coercion. In this case, a disbeliever can't believe. While he has been tasked with the impossible, so this task is beyond his power (7/118).

The result of this reason, assuming logical validity, is beyond the power of all duties, and forcing the infidel to believe, at the end of Fakhr al-Razi's statement, is an example. This reason has been widely criticized in theological debates.

Reason 3: There are two ways in assigning a servant:

1. He has the same motivation to do or not to do that task.
2. His motivation is superior to doing or not doing that task.

In the first case, the task is beyond endurance. Because the same motivation to do or not to do something contradicts the preference of one party. In this case,

(equal motivation to do or leave) if one is assigned to one side, the person is assigned to two contradictory things. In the second case (one-sided preference), what is superior is obligatory and what is not superior is impossible and forbidden.

If it is assigned to superiority, it means that it has been assigned to the obligatory. If it is given to a non-superior thing, it is assigned, that is, it is assigned to the impossible (7/118). This reason, is another interpretation of the second reason.

Reason 4: God commanded Abu Lahab to believe. Faith means acknowledging God in all that He has revealed. One of the news that God informed people about, was that Abu Lahab will not believe. Therefore, Abu Lahab has been tasked with something that is not going to be done, so this task is beyond his power (7/118). This reason has been widely criticized in interpretive and theological heritage. The above reason, assuming a logical validity, indicates the fulfillment of a task beyond the power, in the form of a personal theorem.

Reason 5: The servant is not aware of the details of his actions. For example, a person does not know the number of moments he shakes his finger. From the theologians' point of view, movement is movement and stillness. One does not know that when he moves his hand, it involves several movements and stillness. This shows that he is not the creator, because he did not intend to move a specific number. If he does a certain number of moves, without more or less, he prefers the possible and not the preferred, and this is impossible.

Therefore, the individual is not the creator of his actions. So the tasks are beyond strength (7/118). This reason, assuming logical validity, implies the occurrence of tasks beyond the power of

the general cause. Three other reasons, which are presented in the form of two-sided comparisons, result in a general cause: any duty on the servant that is beyond his reach. Razi's arguments have a long history, and he knows very well that the Mu'tazilites have criticized all his arguments.

The Mu'tazilites are not criticized here to avoid prolonging the speech. The Mu'tazilites as well as the philosophers have stated many opposing arguments. There is no doubt that the conflict of conflicting arguments destroys Fakhr Razi's alleged certainty.

Razi's arguments are related to the concept of expansion. Examining and criticizing his views on the use and meaning of the word "capacity" is effective in more accurate analysis of his arguments. In the following five verses, he brings three meanings of capacity: One, capacity as power, in the sense that it is within the realm of human power and does not include all power. Because if he acquires all power, power is limited and man becomes helpless. He continues: On such basis, it has been said that expansion is higher than endurance.

According to this view, expansion means power; The same general concept that does not have ease and difficulty. If the man is given a task that encompasses all his power, he will reach impotence the difference between capacity and endurance is that capacity is general and includes the ability of man to perform easy and difficult tasks. But endurance is the ability of man to perform tasks easily so that man does not fall hard. Second: Expansion means the ability of human beings to do something easily and not in tightness and intensity (24/142). Expansion in this sense is lower than endurance (23/284). Fakhr al-Razi considers the reason for this meaning, according to Mu'adh ibn

Jabal, in the following verse, as said: "Is not his pleasure, not his hardship" (14/242).

He also quotes some unnamed sayings: expansion is lower than effort with hardship (7/116). He goes on to say that the ultimate and highest level of endurance is "Jahd" and not expansion. It is a mistake to think that expanding means making every effort. (14/242). It is noteworthy that he also brought this meaning of expansion from the words of Mu'tazilites, Muqatil, Zahak, and Kalbi. According to them, he gives their reason and argument for this meaning as follows: Indeed, expansion is called expansion because it includes human action and he does not fall hardship(23/284).

Expansion means endurance. He quotes this meaning from Mofazal and does not explain it. According to a study conducted in Farahidi and Mostafavi dictionary books, most lexicologists interpret the word broad according to its meaning. They have linked expansion to God, man (livelihood, psyche, and power), time, and space-based on its uses. The subject of our discussion is human power. Most of the linguists have interpreted expansion to mean strength, as opposed to narrowness. They have portrayed the power of man as a vessel whose object is his activities (Farahidi, 1409: 2/203; Jawhari, 1404: 3/1298; Ibn Faris, 1404: 6/109; Ragheb, 1413: 870; Ibn Athir, 1367: 5/184; Ibn Manzoor, 1410: 8/392, Fayumi, 1414: 659; Turayhi, 1375: 4/403; Mustafavi, 1368: 13/112).

Unlike most lexicographers who equate breadth and strength, some have pointed to the semantic difference between breadth and strength. Among them is Ragheb Esfahani, who said: "Endurance is a name for the strength and ability with which man can hardly

do something" (532). In other words, endurance is the ability to do hard work. Mostafavi has considered endurance as a limitation (7/173).

According to what has been said, the second meaning that Razi has expressed in detail is consistent with the opinion of most lexicologists. However, Razi's approach to vocabulary does not correspond to his interpretive approach everywhere. In cases where Fakhr-e-Razi has had a theological discussion, all his examples and arguments are based on the first meaning he has given in detail. The examples he has given in all his arguments to prove that the task is beyond scope show man's helplessness and not his hardship.

Another point that exists in the cases related to Razi is that he, in expressing the meaning of expansion, analyzes it from the Mu'tazilites' point of view, without endurance, so that man does not fall into the hardship (284/23). But he explains the Mu'tazilites' point of view: "They believe in the annulment and non-occurrence of duty to that which does not exist." Because it is said that God does not burden anyone except what is within His power and scope, is beyond strength (6/458).

Razi's reason for paraphrasing capacity verses

Razi, by mentioning the five reasons, wants to show the conflict between what he considers to be definite rational reasons, and the auditory reason that is, the appearances of the verses. He says: Recognition of both sides is a combination of two contradictions and impossible. It is also impossible to deny both. Denial of rational reason and preference of audio reason is a mockery of rational reasons and irrationality.

The result is the annulment of monotheism, prophecy, and the Qur'an.

The preference of the auditory reason, over the rational reason, causes the loss of both reasons. So there is no other way but to consider the rational reason as correct and paraphrasing the auditory reasons (7/117). Razi, in his controversy with the Mu'tazilites, says that they also interpret in repelling the appearances used by the similes.

According to Razi, interpretation is inevitable, although it does not have a paraphrasing meaning. Of course, he also suggests several interpretive meanings. He does not accept these interpretive meanings (117/7). The prerequisite for this secret statement is to abandon the apparent meaning of opposing rational arguments. Even if an acceptable true meaning is not obtained. This requires critical analysis and explanation.

Critique of Razi's point of view

Razi states two reasons for the tendency for paraphrasing in capacity verses. The first is that the appearance of capacity verses is the negation of any task beyond expansion. On the other hand, rational arguments, reveal the existence of out-of-scope tasks.

Criticism of Razi's opinion

Razi states two reasons for the tendency to interpret in broad verses. First, the appearance of the verses of capacity is the negation of any task beyond expansion. Rational arguments, on the other hand, reveal the existence of out-of-scope tasks. Razi acts in three ways in stating the reasons for assignments beyond scope: personal, partial, and general. In the first two cases, the evidence violates the appearance of the capacity verses. In the third case, the reasons are the opposite of the appearance of the verses.

The first method of Fakhr Razi is criticized based on the distinction between the apparent rule of reason and the definite rule of reason. Certainly, his basis is not that whenever the apparent rule of reason conflicts with the appearance of revelation, the way of paraphrasing revelation should be taken. Paraphrasing conflicts with the explicit rule of reason. Can the arguments of Fakhr-e-Razi show the clear and definite rule of reason?.

Razi is well aware of the arguments that contradict his arguments in theological and interpretive heritage. Conflict in competing arguments (positive and negative of fulfilling an out-of-scope task) raises doubts about their certainty. It is a certainty that contrasts with the appearance of Quranic verses and leave no choice but to interpret. Of course, Razi does not see this conflict as a reason to doubt the conclusiveness of his arguments. One may ask why? The purpose of asking why here is not to seek evidence. Because the evidence has come to this question. Rather, the purpose of this question is to search for the definitive factors of the arguments of non-doubt in them, despite the knowledge of the existence of opposing arguments.

Secondly, according to Razi, these arguments do not prove a certain meaning beyond the apparent and explicit meaning of the verses. Rather, they oblige to suppress the apparent meaning of the verses, even if the true meaning cannot be found. Such a method is not in line with his strict style in violating the paraphrasing of other commentators. Therefore, it encourages the researcher to look for the factors that lead him to paraphrase the verses.

Razi's second method to express paraphrasing tendency is to present an example of paraphrasing to competitors.

The Mu'tazilites, for example, have been forced to paraphrase verses that seem to signify incarnation.

Razi's second method of expressing a tendency to interpret is to present an example of interpretation to competitors. The Mu'tazilites, for example, have been forced to interpret verses that seem to signify incarnation. Based on the distinction between similar and strong verses, the Mu'tazilites may consider this comparison to be inaccurate and analogous to the difference. Although the difference in the fulfillment and reversal of the task beyond the scope is high, there is a lot of controversies, but no one has stated that the capacity verses are similar.

Razi does not consider the paraphrase able appearance to be any meaning of the verse, which includes explicit meaning and text. The capacity verses, explicitly indicate that the task is limited to capacity. Their paraphrasing, cannot be justified based on secret evidence alone. Does Razi's hermeneutics have a cause before it has a reason, and does it give a reason for believing in that cause?

The reason for Razi's hermeneutics in capacity verses

The interpretation of "hermeneutics" refers to the type of Fakhr-e-Razi's tendency in the verses. The appearance is that he proposes a point of view and gives a reason for it. Paraphrases a tendency to cause rather than a view of reason. The question is why Razi, instead of doubting, criticizing, and measuring the logical validity of what he considers to be conclusive rational arguments, is persuaded to abandon the explicit meaning of the verse? Are his five arguments unquestionable? Or are the fundamental beliefs and hidden

ideas of his mind, which have brought the evidence together, unquestionable?

Care in this question leads the researcher from a critique of his arguments to an analysis of his theological foundations. Razi's theological principles force him to paraphrase. Is the inevitability of a mystery of paraphrasing a logical requirement of theological foundations based on rational arguments, or is it a cognitive bias arising from hidden mental ideas?

Razi, in some of his philosophical works, such as *Al-Mubahis Al-Mashreqiya*, considers power to mean the internal origin of a verb. According to this analysis, intentional actions in animals are issued from an internal origin and mean power and power (Razi, 1411: 1/379-381).

But in theological and interpretive works, such as the interpretation of broad verses, he rejects power in the sense of the inner origin of the verb. Razi's theological position in attributing human action to him is under an interpretation from the point of view of Abolhassan Ash'ari. But in theological and interpretive works, such as the interpretation of capacity verses, he rejects power in the sense of the inner origin of the verb. Razi's theological position in attributing human action to him is under Abolhassan Ash'ari.

He considers the power in issuing an action to belong to God alone. Therefore, he considers the acceptance of absolute power incompatible with the acceptance of the issuance of human actions from the inner origin of action (strength/power). But at the same time, and contrary to the determinists' view, he does not deny the attribution of human action to him.

Therefore, it can be said that conclusive rational arguments do not

contradict the appearance of capacity verses. Rather, the Ash'arite view, just like a Criticizable view, conflicts with the appearance of the verses. The implication of such a statement is not the invalidity of the Ash'arite view, but its critique. Why does Razi, who is one of the leading critics in Islamic civilization, not consider this Ash'ari view to be critical and consider himself forced to paraphrase the verses? Therefore, it can be said that Razi considers the Ash'arite view to have conclusive rational arguments.

In this case, there is another objection to Razi's approach: reasoning is different from being rational. The Ash'arism view is reasoned according to Razi, and he considers reasoning to be rational. While considering the types of reasoning, this inclination is challenging. There are different types of reasoning: Reason based on certainty (argument), reason based on language, reason based on words, reason based on imagination, and Reason based on an idea.

A reason based on certainty is a reason that all its premises are certain and mean the argument of logic. According to logicians, a reasoned view in this sense is a rational view. Abolhassan Ash'arism theory of acquisition is a theological attempt to resolve the conflict between divine power and human power. The Mu'tazilites and the Shiites consider this conflict to be an illusion of conflict.

Accordingly, the Ash'arite argument for the denial of human power is theological. This argument can be explained based on the following words: What is the reason for Abul Hassan Ash'ari's attempt to resolve the conflict between divine power and human power through the theory of acquisition? Is his conception and definition of divine power a factor in seeing it in opposition

to human power? Or has his idea of God caused such a conflict?

Assuming the second case, Razi's argument is reasonably based on an idea. On the first premise, his reasoning is based on words. By examining the reason for this, it is possible to base his view on the idea of God. In either case, there is no definitive rationale. A few points confirm the above explanation:

1. Failure to reach Razi in the true acceptable sense of the word from the verses;
2. Unjustifiability beyond knowing the scope of all tasks;
3. The inaccuracy of Razi's analysis of the concept of capacity in those verses, with the arguments that he considers definitive and rational.

Razi takes a picture of God. The image is the cause of every phenomenon, including in the human actions of God. In Eastern issues, he raises an argument that confirms this image (1/379). The origin of the verb, or has all the qualities of being the beginning, is or is not. If not, it is not the origin. If so, it is the perfect cause. He does not refer to his theological basis in Oriental discourses. At the same time, he does not say that the only cause in the universe is God alone. This theological belief has led to the opposition of the appearance of the capacity verses to what he calls definite rational arguments.

As long as that fundamental image exists and solidifies Razi's theological scheme, Razi's arguments and those of his rivals will remain in opposition.

According to Rumi: Every insider who became imaginative, If you give him a reason, he will be more worried (Masnavi, second book, verse 2).

Fakhr Razi's image of God is not a reason, but a cause that considers all tasks unrelated to human power and scope. In

interpreting the attribution of the verb to the person, he substitutes the view of acquisition. This image is so entrenched and entrenched that when beliefs based on it conflict with capacity verses, he turns to paraphrase.

Conclusion

Razi's tendency to paraphrase capacity verses is strange in his method of interpretation. This needs to be explained. He gives reasons for paraphrasing these verses.

Research in the factors of his paraphrasing tendency shows that Razi, based on a fundamental image of God, tends to take an Ash'arite position in paraphrasing the issuance of action from human beings.

He substitutes acquisition for the philosophical concept of power. His basic image of God is not imaginary. Rather, it is a powerful idea that does not disappear when confronted with the capacity verses. Therefore, Fakhr Razi is forced to paraphrase the verses.

References

- The Holy Quran.
- Ibn Athir, Mubarak Ibn Muhammad (1367). *The end is in the oddity of the hadith and the impact*. Research: Mahmoud Mohammad. Tanahi, Qom: Ismailian Institute.
- Ibn Shahr Ashob, Muhammad Ibn Ali (1369). *The Qur'anic is similarities and differences*. 2 vols. Qom: Awake.
- Ibn Farris, Ahmad Ibn Farris(1404). *Dictionary of Language Standards*. Research: Abdul Salam Muhammad Harun. Qom: Islamic Media School.
- Ibn Manzoor, Muhammad ibn Makram (1410). *Language of the Arabs*. Beirut: Dar Sader.
- Ibn Jozi(1984). *A walk in the eyes of the beholders, in the science of facets and analogues*. research by Muhammad Abdul Karim Razi. Beirut.
- Abu al-Saud, Muhammad ibn Muhammad(1983). *Tafsir Abi al-Saud (Guidance of the sound intellect to the benefits of the Holy Qur'an)*. vol. 9. 9c. Beirut: House of Revival of Arab Heritage.
- Panipenti, Sana'a Allah(1412). *Tafsir al-Mazarin*. 10 vol.. Pakistan: Rushdie School.
- Johari, Ismail Ibn Hammad(1404). *Al-Sahah*. research by Ahmad Abdul Ghafoor Attar. Beirut: Dar al-Alam for the scholars.
- Razi, Muhammad ibn Umar(1420). *Tafsir al-Kabir (Mafatih al-Ghayb)*. 32 vols. Lebanon - Beirut: House of the Revival of Arab Heritage. 3rd edition.
- Razi, Muhammad ibn Umar(1411). *The Eastern Investigations in Theology and Natures*. Qom: Bidar publication
- Razi, Muhammad ibn Umar(1411). *the conductor*. Cairo: Dar Al Turath Library.
- Ragheb Isfahani, Hussein Ibn Muhammad(1413). *Vocabulary of Quranic words*. correction by Safwan Adnan Davoodi. Beirut: Dar al-Shamiya.
- Sadeghi Tehrani, Mohammad(1406). *Al-Furqan in the Interpretation of the Qur'an through the Qur'an and the Sunnah*. Volume 30. Iran-Qom: Islamic Culture. 2nd edition.
- Siddiq Hassan Khan, Mohammad Siddiq (1420). *The Conquest of the Statement in the Purposes of the Qur'an*. Volume 7. Footnote: Ibrahim Shams al-Din, Lebanon - Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-Alamiyya, Muhammad Ali Bayzun Publications.
- Tabatabai, Mohammad Hussein(1390). *Almizan fi Tafsir al-Qur'an*. Volume 20. Lebanon - Beirut: Scientific Foundation for Publications. 2nd edition.
- Tarihi, Fakhreddin Ibn Muhammad(1375). *Majmaol- Bahrain*, Research: Ahmad Hosseini Eshkevari. Tehran: Al-Mortazaviyah School.
- Alwan, Sheikh Naima Allah ibn Mahmoud(1999). *Divine Luminaries and Unseen Keys: The Clarifying of Qur'anic Speech and Qur'anic Judgment*. vol. 2. Egypt - Cairo: Rikabi Publishing House.
- Faramarz Gharamaleki, Ahad(1400). *The Power of Imagination*. Qom: Majnoon. Fourth Edition. Second Edition.
- Farahidi, Ahmad Ibn Khalil(1409). *Al-Ain*. research by Mehdi Makhzumi. Qom: Dar al-Hijra Institute.

Fayumi, Ahmad Ibn Muhammad(1414). *Al-Misbah Al-Munir*. Qom: Dar Al-Hijra Institute.

Matridi, Muhammad ibn Muhammad (1426). *paraphrasing of the Sunnis (Tafsir al-Matridi)*. vol.10. Research: Majdi Baslom. Lebanon - Beirut: Dar Al-Kitab Al-Alamiya. Publications of Muhammad Ali Bayzun.

Mustafavi, Hassan(1368). *Research in the words of the Qur'an*. Tehran: Ministry

of Culture and Islamic Guidance.

Rumi, Jalaluddin Mohammad(2001).

Masnavi Manavi. by Barzegar Khaleghi. Tehran, Zavar.

Novvi, Muhammad(1417). *Lapid to reveal the meaning of the glorious Qur'an*. Corrected by Muhammad Amin Dnawy. Lebanon - Beirut: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya. Muhammad Ali Baydoun Publications.

