

this is a pre-publication version; for the published version, please check here: in: Alessandro Cancian (ed.): *Approaches to the Qur'an in Contemporary Iran*, Oxford (Oxford University Press in Association with The Institute of Ismaili Studies) 2019, 225-42

**DO NOT QUOTE THIS PRE-PUBLICATION VERSION WITHOUT THE
AUTHOR'S PRIOR CONSENT**

Chapter 8

Abrogation and Falsification of Scripture According to Twelver Shi'i Authors between Iraq and Iran (19th–20th Centuries)

Rainer Brunner

Falsification (*tahrīf*)

Whoever opens any Shi'i book about the Qur'an, its textual history and its interpretation, will inevitably find a more or less lengthy chapter containing solemn declarations about the integrity of the scripture and its preservation from any kind of falsification. Usually, the authors will continue by stressing that this had always been the broad consensus of the Shi'i religious scholars, except for a few eccentrics, and except for some traditions in the early collections which, however, were to be regarded as unreliable.¹ Occasionally, some writers would even go so far as to state that there are several cases in point to be found in Sunni sources as well, in which textual alterations of the Qur'anic text were affirmed.² These affirmations, however, would normally not be called by the usual name, *tahrīf* (i.e. 'falsification'), but by a different term, a misnomer indeed, and they would accordingly be classified in a different category. If, on the other hand, one opens any modern Sunni diatribe against Shi'ism, one will also inevitably find the accusation that the Shi'is believe in the falsification of the text of the Qur'an, and that they, as a matter of fact, have always done so. Reality, as is usually the case, is more complicated.³

The conviction seems to have been widespread among the early Shi'i exegetes that the present text of the Muslim holy scripture is incomplete and that a substantial number of

references to the Shi‘i imams and the family of the Prophet (*ahl al-bayt*) in general had been deliberately removed by the (Sunni) collectors of the bits and pieces of the revelation. In the pre-*ghayba* period (i.e. until the first half of the fourth/tenth century), many traditions going back to the Shi‘i imams report this accusation, and several treatises on this subject were composed, the majority of which has regrettably been lost or was preserved in later sources only in a fragmentary way.⁴ Also in several classical Hadith collections, especially in Ja‘far b. Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī’s (d. 328-9/939-41) *al-Kāfī*, one finds more or less open *tahrīf* allegations, even though in a somewhat remote ‘chapter on rare things’ (or anecdotes: *bāb al-nawādir*).⁵ One of the most common of these is the statement that the words "on (behalf of) ‘Alī" (*fī ‘Alī*) had been deleted in many verses which accordingly were said to have been revealed with special reference to the first imam. It was only after the occultation of the twelfth imam and the beginning of a Shi‘i theology proper that this attitude began to change. Starting with Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad Ibn Bābūya (d. 381/991) in the second half of the fourth/tenth century and continuing with luminaries such as al-Shaykh al-Mufīd (d. 413/1022–3), Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067) or al-Faḍl b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭabrisī (d. 548/1153–4), most significant Shi‘i jurists and exegetes now confirmed that these traditions were not to be taken at face value.⁶ Rather, they were either unreliable because they were transmitted only by a single authority (so-called *akhbār āḥād*), or the passages they deemed omitted were only part of Qur’anic exegesis (*tafsīr*), but did not belong to the actual text of the Qur’an.

This, however, was not the end of the story. Starting in the seventeenth century, in the context of the revival of the Akhbārī school of thought in Shi‘ism,⁷ the topic of *tahrīf* witnessed a remarkable renaissance. This was so because the rather unconditional belief in the authority of the traditions of the imams which was not allowed to be filtered by the individual reasoning (*ijtihād*) of the Uṣūlīs was the hallmark of the Akhbārīs. And as basically all relevant traditions were attributed to the imams, they were willy-nilly prisoners

of their own allegiance to the hadiths. In a great number of Akhbārī *tafsīr* works, the issue of *tahrīf* was dealt with in a rather offensive way, and names such as Muḥsin Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (d. 1090/1679), Hāshim al-Baḥrānī (d. c. 1107/1695), Ni‘matullāh al-Jazā‘irī (d. 1112/1701), Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Sharīf al-‘Āmilī (d. c. 1139/1727), or Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī (d. 1185/1772–3) bear witness to the relevance of *tahrīf* in the Akhbārī doctrine.⁸ The fact that it even managed to survive the final defeat of the Akhbārīs at the beginning of the nineteenth century proves that the importance of the topic transcended the actual dividing line between the two groups. On the contrary, in the writings of Uṣūlī figurehead jurists such as Ja‘far Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ (d. 1812), Murtaḍā al-Anṣārī (d. 1864) and Muḥammad Kāẓim al-Khurāsānī (d. 1911) one finds – albeit somewhat between the lines – covert confirmation of the *tahrīf* suspicion.⁹ Characteristically, it was thus no longer in Qur’anic commentaries or Hadith compilations – both the key to Akhbārī scholarship – that the issue of *tahrīf* was dealt with, but rather in theoretic legal works, that is, the hallmark genre of the Uṣūlīs. These brief remarks make it clear that the Shi‘i attitude towards the text of the Qur’an has remained a thorny issue in modern times. In what follows, four rather characteristic voices will be presented: one scholar (in fact the only one, as far as I can judge) who composed a staunch defence of the classical *tahrīf* theory, and three prominent critics who tried to undo the effect caused by their colleague, especially with regard to the wider inner-Islamic debate between Sunnis and Shi‘is. As we shall see, these critics even went so far as to question a commonly accepted method of exegesis in order to ward off the suspicion of the falsification of the Qur’an.

Ḥusayn Taqī al-Nūrī al-Ṭabrisī (d. 1902)

It was only at the end of the nineteenth century that Ḥusayn Taqī al-Nūrī al-Ṭabrisī – presumably against his own intention – contributed most to a thorough and lasting change of attitude within Shi‘ism concerning the text of the Qur’an. Nūrī, who was of Iranian origin,

was a student of Mīrzā Ḥasan al-Shīrāzī (d. 1895) and became later the teacher of Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭihranī (d. 1970) and Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' (d. 1954). He largely divided his time between the Iraqi Shrine cities ('atabāt), Sāmarrā' and Najaf, and Iran; only towards the end of his life, in 1896/7, did he finally settle in Najaf, where he died in 1902.¹⁰ His renown is above all based on his monumental hadith collection *Mustadrak al-wasā'il*, which is the continuation of the equally famous collection *Tafṣīl wasā'il al-shī'a* by Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥurr al-Āmilī (d. 1104/1693),¹¹ and he may justifiably be called the last great Akhbārī scholar of Shi'ism (his peers at the *ḥawza* in Najaf today do point-blank consider him to be an Akhbārī).¹² What is of greater interest in our context is a different compilation of his, namely his book *Faṣl al-khiṭāb fī taḥrīf kitāb rabb al-arbāb*, which was finished in 1876 and published in a lithograph edition in 1881; it is rather characteristic that this has remained the only available edition until today and that it was not published in Najaf but in Tehran, far away from the 'atabāt.¹³ Nūrī's book is considerably more than a mere collection of traditions about the *taḥrīf* allegations, and even as such it would have been of great significance, since he managed to unearth relevant references from the remotest sources, many of which had never before been accessible in print. But Nūrī went a step further and classified these traditions in twelve chapters, with the explicit purpose to prove once and for good that the existent text of the Qur'an had been tampered with and that the 'true' version of God's revelation was in the custody of the hidden twelfth Imam who would bring it back on the occasion of his return at the end of days. Of particular interest is certainly the last chapter of his book, in which he gathered more than one thousand traditions, arranged according to the suras and verses of the Qur'an, reporting the seemingly 'correct' reading of the relevant passages. As a sort of preventive measure, he ended his book with a short but substantial critique of possible objections to the *taḥrīf* suspicion, such as was produced by many a classical scholar, above all by al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (d. 436/1044) and al-Faḍl b. al-

Ḥasan al-Ṭabrisī, both of whom he severely criticised.

Nūrī's book caused quite a stir at the *'atabāt*, and he apparently became an outcast, particularly after the death of his teacher al-Shīrāzī in 1895.¹⁴ It seems also that several polemical treatises and refutations were composed by other Shi'ī scholars as Nūrī tried in vain to defend himself against their criticism; none of these treatises has been published so far, however. Beyond these immediate reactions, the long-term effect of his book proved to be of two kinds with respect to the Shi'ī religious literature, on the one hand, and the Sunni, on the other. Within Shi'ism it managed to produce a nearly unanimous closing of the ranks. The only distinguished scholar who was ready to protect Nūrī (without necessarily following his point of view) was his student Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭīhrānī, but his fellow student Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' prohibited Āghā Buzurg from publishing his apologia, for fear of scoring points from the wrong side.¹⁵ Apart from this solitary voice, I know of no prominent Shi'ī scholar who, in the course of the 130 years which have passed since the publication of Nūrī's book, has publicly endorsed the latter's main thesis that the Qur'an suffered from deliberate falsification.

Things look totally different, however, if one delves into the Sunni religious literature of the twentieth century, especially into the literature of a more polemical tinge. It took their authors a little while to discover what precious treasure that Nūrī's collection constituted for their own purpose. Early authors such as Yūsuf b. Aḥmad al-Dijwī (d. 1946) or the indefatigable Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā (d. 1935) mentioned the book,¹⁶ but it was quite apparent that they knew little about it beyond its title, as they went hardly beyond quoting the usual suspects from bygone times, such as al-Kulaynī and Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328). It was as late as the 1960s when, in the slipstream of cautious ecumenical activities between Sunni and Shi'ī institutions, the journalist and Wahhabi henchman Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb (d. 1969) published a short but snide pamphlet outlining the foundations on

which Twelver Shi‘ism is based.¹⁷ There, he not only placed the question of *tahrīf* and the person of Nūrī at the centre of his argumentation but also had the ingenious idea to combine *tahrīf* and *taqiyya* in such a way that he called any Shi‘i denial of *tahrīf* allegations nothing but dissimulation. As short and superficial as Khaṭīb’s diatribe may have been, it proved to have a lasting effect on the debate and became one of the most influential polemics against Shi‘ism in modern times.¹⁸

Reading these polemics – and their counterparts on the Shi‘i side – is usually not very entertaining. More often than not, the tone is ugly, the arguments are foreseeable and the degree of innovative thinking is rather modest. There are, however, occasional exceptions to this rule. One of the topics where the mode of arguing is – at least sometimes – more sophisticated (although not always free of polemics) concerns the question of abrogation (*naskh*), that is, the problem of whether some verses of the Qur’an had been cancelled by others.¹⁹ Addressed by the Qur’an itself (especially in verse 2:106: *And for whatever verse We abrogate or cast into oblivion, We bring a better or the like of it*),²⁰ it is not only a crucial problem for Islamic law but also a highly sensitive issue of Qur’an interpretation. As such, it could take three distinct forms: the content of a verse was abrogated by a later revelation but its wording remained part of the existing text²¹ (the so-called *naskh al-ḥukm dūn al-tilāwa*); the wording of a verse disappeared but its meaning remained to be effective (*naskh al-tilāwa dūn al-ḥukm*); both the wording and the meaning were considered to have been abrogated (*naskh al-tilāwa wa’l-ḥukm*). Of these three cases, the second and third ones (abrogation of the text but not of the content, as well as abrogation of both) are all the more tricky, as they presuppose a change of, possibly an encroachment on, the existing text of the scripture. What is more, reports to this effect are quoted in many classical Sunni sources as well. The best-known example of this kind is the so-called ‘stoning verse’ (*āyat al-rajm*) whose Qur’anic origin was allegedly confirmed by ‘Umar and which stipulates that adulterers should be

punished by stoning, contrary to the existing verse Q. 24:2 in which ‘only’ one hundred lashes are prescribed.²² It comes as no surprise therefore that the issue of *naskh* formed part of the wider *tahrīf* debate, the ‘stoning verse’ being, throughout the twentieth century, one of the central proof texts that Shi‘i authors in particular used to claim the existence of *tahrīf* in Sunni works.²³

Nūrī devotes some fifteen pages of his treatise to the question of abrogation,²⁴ and characteristically enough, he completely neglects the first form of *naskh* (inner-Qur’anic abrogation), which he accepts in passing elsewhere in the book.²⁵ Instead, he concentrates on those cases in which a disappearance of the Qur’anic wording is reported, and his judgement is as outspoken as it is simplistic: as neither ‘Alī nor any other imam certified such a category, it simply cannot have existed. On the contrary: ‘Alī explicitly stated that not a single word of the revelation had been dropped from his collection, and the imams who enumerated some sixty forms of verses knew of no genre called ‘the abrogating and the abrogated’ (*al-nāsikh wa’l-mansūkh*).²⁶ Rather, any form of *naskh al-tilāwa* is nothing but the invention of ‘the evil imams’ (*a’immat al-jawr*) who tried to camouflage their tampering with the Qur’anic text, especially by dropping all references to ‘Alī’s claims to leadership and to their own disgrace. If, Nūrī concludes, some verses had been eliminated by *naskh al-tilāwa*, how could the remaining Qur’an then possibly tally with the one preserved by God on the ‘guarded tablet’ (*al-lawḥ al-maḥfūz*)?²⁷ Apparently, it suits him well in this context that there is one particular tradition – circulating also among Sunni exegetes such as Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūfī (d. 911/1505) or Abū ‘l-Qāsim al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1144), whom he quotes extensively – according to which *Sūrat al-Aḥzāb* (Q. 33) had originally been much longer and even surpassed *Sūrat al-Baqara* (Q. 2). For Nūrī, this is the final proof of his thesis, and without giving further evidence, he identifies this as the spot where all the atrocities of the Sunni evildoers is located.²⁸

Hibat al-Dīn al-Shahrastānī (d. 1967) and Abū'l-Qāsim al-Khū'ī (d. 1992)

Nūrī's analytical shortcut – *naskh* equals *tahrīf* – may be simplistic, but it is also slippery ground for all Shi'i exegetes after him who affirm the completeness of the Qur'anic text. It is precisely for this reason that the topic is usually dealt with at more or less great length in all Shi'i books and treatises on *tahrīf*, and some of the conclusions the respective authors come up with are quite far-reaching, going as far as a complete rejection of any form of inner-Qur'anic abrogation. Several passages taken from the works of Shi'i scholars of the twentieth century may well serve to illustrate this point. The first example is a long essay by the Iraqi Qur'anic scholar (*'ālim*) and, for some time, minister of education, Hibat al-Dīn al-Shahrastānī (d. 1967).²⁹ As is already made clear by the title ('The noble Qur'an is beyond abrogation, faultiness and falsification'),³⁰ Shahrastānī considers abrogation to be a sign of falsification, but contrary to Nūrī, he does not take it as proof of the existence of *tahrīf*, but rather as proof of the inexistence of both *tahrīf* and *naskh*. Further, he extends the discussion of abrogation to include also the inner-Qur'anic mode of one verse cancelling the prescriptions of other verses. For him, it is not acceptable that there is any verse in the Qur'an whose instruction (*ḥukm*) could have been abrogated. First of all, he asserts, *naskh* does not refer to replacing one verse with another, but to replacing the pre-Islamic religions of Judaism and Christianity with Islam, and it is in this way that the usual Qur'anic proof text in favour of abrogation, the above-mentioned Q. 2:106, has to be understood, for in the preceding verse, the *ahl al-kitāb* are explicitly addressed.³¹ Moreover, he enumerates a number of other verses which he deems incompatible with the theory of abrogation, for example Q. 5:3 ('Today I have perfected your religion for you' – how could a religion be perfect if there were verses which were suspended or overruled?) or Q. 2:2 ('That is the Book, wherein is no doubt' – and any kind of *naskh* would be tantamount to sowing doubt).³² In

addition to that, he links the problem of abrogation with another hermeneutic challenge within the Qur'an: that those traditions which seem to affirm the existence of abrogated verses actually bear a different meaning. In reality, he repeats several times, they refer to 'clear' (*muḥkam*, i.e. in the sense of abrogating) verses and 'ambiguous' (*mutashābih*, i.e. abrogated) ones, a concept which is alluded to in Q. 3:7 ('*It is He who sent down upon thee the Book, wherein are verses clear that are the Essence of the Book, and others ambiguous*'). This idea as such is not new, as the combination of the problem of abrogation and the ambiguous verses played a substantial role in classical commentaries. According to Shahrastānī, the purpose of this form of 'abrogation' is not to rescind some divine injunctions with others, but rather to extinguish all traces of imaginary exegesis: the whole Qur'an is *muḥkam*, only human beings with their narrow horizons render the message *mutashābih*.³³ And finally, he concludes, if there had been any necessity, strictly during the lifetime of the Prophet, to cancel any *ḥukm* of the revelation for the sake of humanity, surely the *tilāwa* would also have disappeared.³⁴

Shahrastānī's severe rejection of the concept of abrogation in general is basically also the line of argument of our second example, written by Abū'l-Qāsim al-Khū'ī, who was commonly regarded as the most revered model for emulation (*marja' al-taqlīd*) in Shi'ism during the 1970s and 1980s, following the death of Ayatollah Muḥsin al-Ḥakīm in 1970, and notwithstanding the rising star of Rūhollāh Khomeini. Like Nūrī, Khū'ī was of Iranian origin (he was born in Iranian Azerbaijan in 1899), but came to Najaf at the age of thirteen. He spent all his life in that city, and died there in 1992.³⁵ In his book *al-Bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, which he finished in the mid-1950s,³⁶ he deals with this question in two places. First, he includes it in his lengthy chapter on the *tahrīf* suspicion, where he explicitly talks on *naskh al-tilāwa dūn al-ḥukm*, that is, abrogation of the wording but not of the content.³⁷ Like Nūrī before him, he readily identifies this as a view which was held by the majority of classical

Sunni exegetes, and like Nūrī, he quotes a representative sample of Sunni traditions about, among other things, the ‘stoning verse’ and the alleged size of *Sūrat al-Aḥzāb*. From these, he draws two conclusions, namely, (a) that ‘the belief in the abrogation of recitals (i.e. *naskh al-tilāwa*) is similar to the belief in alteration and omission’, and (b) that ‘it is possible to claim that the view that the Qur’an was altered is the doctrine of the majority of Sunni scholars, because they maintain the permissibility of abrogating the recitation of a verse regardless of whether the ordinance contained in it is abrogated or not’.³⁸ Contrary to Nūrī, however, and very much in line with Shahrastānī’s deductions, Khū’ī does not take the fact that Sunni sources testify to alterations of the text of the Qur’an as positive evidence for the existence of *tahrīf*. Rather, he proceeds by rejecting the reliability of all relevant traditions (both Sunni and Shi‘i), and by adducing other Qur’anic verses as well as the sayings of the Shi‘i imams to the effect that the existing text of the Qur’an is complete, unaltered and obligatory.³⁹

Like Shahrastānī before him, he now goes one step further. In addition to his proclamation in the chapter on *tahrīf*, he elaborates on the issue in a separate chapter, and the fact that this is the longest one in the book shows the importance he attached to the problem.⁴⁰ Having once more rejected the abrogation of the wording as synonymous with *tahrīf*,⁴¹ he now proceeds to categorically deny the possibility of *any* kind of abrogation within the text of the Qur’an, including that kind of *naskh* which is generally accepted in Islamic law: the abrogation of earlier verses by later ones (i.e. *naskh al-ḥukm dūn al-tilāwa*). He even goes so far as to deny those cases that are usually taken for granted in *tafsīr*, such as the aforementioned prohibition of wine.⁴² Not that Khū’ī is tempted to allow drinking, but he stresses that Q. 4:43 which admonishes the believer not to show up at prayer drunk does not constitute any permissibility to drink wine in the first place, and that therefore it could not have been abrogated by Q. 5:90, which prohibits wine in general.⁴³ In such a way, he singles out thirty-six verses (the alleged permission of temporary marriage in Q. 4:24 receiving the

most detailed investigation) in order to ‘prove’ that basically the whole category of *al-nāsikh wa’l-mansūkh* is utterly wrong.⁴⁴ In the end, there remains only a single instance of *naskh* which Khū’ī, again like Shahrastānī, is ready to accept: the abrogation by Islam of all preceding religions, which is, in his eyes, confirmed by the fact that the New Testament ‘abrogates’ several injunctions of the Old Testament.⁴⁵ This last point takes us back to Nūrī, because he, too, uses Judaism and Christianity as a foil for his main thesis: in his very long first chapter, he takes pains to show that everything that happened to these two communities by necessity also happened to the Islamic community (*umma*) – and as their scriptures had been falsified (which is of course a well-known commonplace in Muslim theology), it surely is proof that the Qur’an also underwent *tahrīf*.⁴⁶

Both Shahrastānī and Khū’ī were ready to throw out the baby with the bathwater when they came to the conclusion that all forms of abrogation within the Qur’an have to be rejected. As far as modern Shi’ism is concerned, this radical stance seems to be somewhat exceptional, although some scholars – such as Hossein Modarressi – come quite close to it.⁴⁷ However, their categorical rejection of the possibility of *naskh al-tilāwa* by claiming that it would be tantamount to *tahrīf* is more or less the standard line of argumentation in modern Shi’i *tafsīr* and beyond.⁴⁸ Especially in a great number of books and treatises that were published in Iran during the 1980s and 1990s, this assertion is defended with great vigour.⁴⁹ The background of these activities was provided by the initiative of the Iranian government to pose as the herald of Islamic unity and rapprochement with Sunni Islam by founding and sponsoring an ecumenical society, called *Majma‘ al-Taqrīb bayn al-Madhāhib al-Islāmiyya*, in 1990 and organising a series of international conferences on this issue.⁵⁰ This seemed all the more necessary because the Iranian revolution was (and still is) widely perceived as an attempt to proselytise Sunni Muslims and undermine the neighbouring states and societies. What is more, Ayatollah Khomeini himself had included in his book *Kashf al-asrār*, which

appeared in the 1940s (but was re-edited after 1979), a passage which could easily be read as an affirmation of the *tahrīf* thesis, all the more so because he put great emphasis on the alleged violations of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar against the Qur’an. It goes without saying that these sentences were met with the utmost interest by Sunni polemicists, and the aforementioned publications were clearly intended to counter this devastating impression.⁵¹

Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā’ī (d. 1981)

The last Shi‘i scholar to be mentioned here who combined the rejection of *tahrīf* allegations with a denial of the concept of *naskh* is the Iranian philosopher and exegete Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā’ī (d. 1981).⁵² The expression *mansūkh al-tilāwa*, he states in his disquisition about Q. 15:9: ‘*It is We who have sent down the Remembrance, and We watch over it*’ (which is universally regarded by Shi‘i writers as the scriptural guarantee against *tahrīf*), is used by Sunni commentators in order to safeguard what is narrated by their traditions, for example, the injunction of stoning as punishment for adultery. There is no doubt, he continues, that this form of omitting the wording of the Qur’an is tantamount to nullification (*ibtāl*), but how could that possibly go together with Q. 41:41–2, which explicitly declares ‘*surely it is a Book Sublime; falsehood (al-bāṭil) comes not to it from before it nor from behind it*’? It would run counter to all those honourable designations of the scripture as *al-lawḥ al-maḥfūz*, *dhikr*, *furqān*, and so on. Thus, according to him, both the *tahrīf* traditions of the two sides and the narrations on *naskh al-tilāwa* decidedly run counter to the Qur’an itself. In general, it is completely unimaginable to him that anything in the Qur’an could have been ‘cast into oblivion’, as the generally accepted reading of Q. 2:106 (‘*And for whatever verse We abrogate or cast into oblivion [nunsīhā], We bring a better or the like of it*’) implies. Ṭabāṭabā’ī argues that instead of reading *nunsīhā*, it ought to be *nansa’ahā*, in the sense of ‘postponing (its appearance)’, since Muhammad was immune to

forgetting.⁵³ The verse, according to Ṭabāṭabā'ī, means that God cancelled both the wording and the content of a verse, yet at the same time kept them intact in *al-lawḥ al-mahfūz*.⁵⁴ By this, however, it becomes clear that Ṭabāṭabā'ī, in comparison to Shahrastānī or Khū'ī, is considerably less radical as far as his judgement of the possibility of the ordinary form of abrogation, *naskh al-ḥukm dūn al-tilāwa*, is concerned. Indeed, in his exegesis of Q. 2:106, he readily admits the existence of abrogating and abrogated verses without further ado (and also refers to the reading *nansa'ahā* only in passing and without claiming it to be authoritative), as the last part of this very verse also gives an irrefutable explanation: '*knowest thou not that God is powerful over everything?*' Ṭabāṭabā'ī's only purely Shi'ī reasoning in this regard is his rather casual remark that according to some Shi'ī traditions (that go without concrete reference here) the death of an imam and the succession of another one also count as abrogation.⁵⁵ Ṭabāṭabā'ī could easily afford such a relaxed approach to the question of abrogation, as he had elsewhere refuted the whole idea of *tahrīf* in the Qur'an as self-contradictory. According to him, the *akhbār āḥād*, on which the falsification theory usually rests, are dependent on the words of the imams, which, in turn, are dependent on the words of the Prophet (who appointed the imams) and on the conclusiveness of the Qur'an (upon which Muhammad's prophecy is based); thus, if one deprived the Qur'an of its conclusiveness by assuming any form of *tahrīf*, this would mean that neither the Prophet's words nor those of the imams could be trusted – including the very traditions in which *tahrīf* was stated. Corroborating the falsification of the Qur'an by adducing Prophetic or imamic traditions therefore automatically, and by necessity, amounts to the refutation of precisely these traditions.⁵⁶

With regard to the question of abrogation, Ṭabāṭabā'ī seems to confirm his image as a maverick theologian.⁵⁷ This may be due to the fact that his approach to the Qur'an was a more philosophical one compared to that of Shahrastānī or Khū'ī who wrote from a more

polemical angle, both with regard to Sunni authors and to Shi‘i dissidents like Nūrī. As to the question of abrogation, the basic difference in the approach of the latter and his Shi‘i critics may be summed up as follows: Nūrī denies the possibility of *naskh* because he believes in *tahrīf*, Shahrastānī and Khū‘ī deny it because ultimately it would mean that *tahrīf* had happened – and this is an idea that is simply anathema to them.

Conclusion

Sunni critics normally do have a lot to say about Shi‘ism in general and of Nūrī and his *tahrīf* book in particular. With regard to abrogation and its relation to *tahrīf*, they seem much more taciturn. Occasionally, there is severe criticism, especially of Khū‘ī’s thorough inquiry, and he is blamed for mixing up *naskh* (which, as a Qur’anic concept, is taken to be of divine origin) and *tahrīf* (which is considered to be an entirely human device); one Wahhābī polemicist exclaims that the Shi‘is had better declare those verses they claim to be missing as abrogated.⁵⁸ It is not up to a non-Muslim outsider to decide which side is right and which one is wrong. But it does go without saying that the entire debate about these points has always been and continues to be revealing with regard to the highly enigmatic character of the text of the Qur’an. Its own assertion that it is a ‘book wherein is no doubt’ notwithstanding, Islamic intellectual history time and again testifies to the contrary.

Bibliography

- Adang, Camilla. *Muslim Writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible: From Ibn Rabban to Ibn Hazm*. Leiden, Brill, 1996.
- Algar, Hamid. ‘‘Allāma Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā‘ī: Philosopher, Exegete, and Gnostic’, *Journal of Islamic Studies* 17 (2006), pp. 326–51.

- ‘Alī, ‘Abd al-Raḥīm Muḥammad. *Shaykh al-bāḥithīn Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭīhrānī: Ḥayātuhu wa-āthāruhu (1875–1970)*. Najaf, Maṭba‘at al-Nu‘mān, 1970.
- al-‘Āmilī, Ja‘far Murtaḍā. *Ḥaqā’iq hāmma ḥawl al-qur‘ān al-karīm*, 2nd edn. Beirut, Dār al-Ṣafwa 1413/1992.
- al-‘Āmilī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥurr. *Tafṣīl wasā’il al-shī‘a*. See al-Nūrī al-Ṭabrisī, Mīrzā Ḥusain b. Taqī, *Mustadrak al-wasā’il*.
- al-Amīn, Muḥsin. *Naqḍ al-washī‘a aw al-shī‘a bayn al-ḥaqā’iq wa’l-awḥām*. Beirut, Maṭba‘at al-Inṣāf, 2001 (1st edn 1951).
- Amir-Moezzi, Mohammad Ali and Hassan Ansari. ‘Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī (m. 328 ou 329/939–40 ou 940–41) et son *Kitāb al-Kāfī*: Une introduction’, *Studia Iranica* 38 (2009), pp. 191–247.
- _____. ‘Al-Šayḥ al-Mufīd (m. 413/1022) et la question de la falsification du Coran’, in Daniel De Smet and Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, eds, *Controverses sur les écritures canoniques de l’Islam*. Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 2014, pp. 199–229.
- Arjomand, Saïd Amir. ‘The Consolation of Theology: Absence of the Imam and Tradition from Chiasm to Law in Shi‘ism’, *Journal of Religion* 76 (1996), pp. 548–71.
- al-Awsī, ‘Alī. *al-Ṭabāṭabā’ī wa-manhajuhu fī tafsīrihi al-Mīzān*. Tehran, Mu‘āwiniyya al-Ri’āsa li’l-‘Alqāt al-Dawliyya fī Munazzamat al-A‘lām al-Islāmī, 1405/1985.
- al-Balāghī al-Najafī, Muḥammad Jawād. *Ālā’ al-raḥmān fī tafsīr al-Qur‘ān*. Saïda, 2 vols., Maṭba‘at al-‘Irfān, 1933.
- Brown, Daniel. ‘The Triumph of Scripturalism: The Doctrine of Naskh and its Modern Critics’, in Earle H. Waugh and Frederick M. Denny, eds, *The Shaping of an American Islamic Discourse: A Memorial to Fazlur Rahman*. Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1998, pp. 49–66.
- Brunner, Rainer. *Die Schia und die Koranfälschung*. Würzburg, Ergon, 2001.

- _____. *Islamic Ecumenism in the 20th Century: The Azhar and Shiism between Rapprochement and Restraint*. Leiden, Brill, 2004.
- Burton, John. *The Collection of the Qur'ān*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- _____. *The Sources of Islamic Law: Islamic Theories of Abrogation*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1990.
- Corboz, Elvire. *Guardians of Shi'ism. Sacred Authority and Transnational Networks*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2015
- Dabashi, Hamid. *Theology of Discontent: The Ideological Foundations of the Islamic Revolution in Iran*. New York, New York University Press, 1993.
- al-Dijwī, Yūsuf b. Aḥmad. *Al-Jawāb al-munīf fī'l-radd 'alā mudda 'ī 'l-taḥrīf fī'l-kitāb al-sharīf*. Cairo, Maṭba'at al-Nahḍa al-Adabiyya, 1913.
- Elmi, Mohammad Jafar. 'The Views of Ṭabāṭabā'ī on Traditions (*Aḥādīth*) and Occasions of Revelation (*Asbāb al-Nuzūl*) in Interpreting the Qur'an', *Journal of Shi'a Islamic Studies* 1 (2008), pp. 57–84.
- Eltantawi, Sarah. 'Ṭūsī Did Not 'Opt Out': Shiite Jurisprudence and the Solidification of the Stoning Punishment in the Islamic Legal Tradition', in Alireza Korangy, Wheeler M. Thackston, Roy P. Mottahedeh and William Granara, eds, *Essays in Islamic Philology, History, and Philosophy*. Berlin, de Gruyter, 2016, pp. 312–32.
- Ende, Werner. 'Der amtsmüde Ayatollah', in Gebhard J. Selz, ed., *Festschrift für Burkhardt Kienast: Zu seinem 70. Geburtstage dargebracht von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen*. Münster, Ugarit-Verlag, 2003, pp. 51–63.
- van Ess, Josef. *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra: Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam*, 6 vols., Berlin, de Gruyter, 1991–7.
- Faḍlallāh, Muḥammad Ḥusayn. *Min waḥy al-Qur'ān*, 24 vols. Beirut, Dār al-Malāk, 1998.

- Ghaemmaghami, Omid. 'Arresting the Eschaton: Mirza Husayn Tabarsi Nuri (d. 1902) and the Babi and Baha'i Religions', *Journal of Religious History* 36, no. 4 (2012), pp. 486–98.
- Gleave, Robert. 'Modern Šī'ī Discussions of *Ḥabar al-wāḥid*: Šādr, Ḥumaynī and Ḥū'ī', *Oriente Moderno* New Series 21 (82), no. 1 (2002), pp. 179–94.
- _____. 'Political Aspects of Modern Shi'i Legal Discussions: Khumayni and Khu'i on *ijtihād* and *qada*', *Mediterranean Politics* 7 (2002), pp. 96–116.
- _____. *Scripturalist Islam: The History and Doctrines of the Akhbārī Shī'ī School*. Leiden, Brill, 2007.
- al-Ḥakīm, Muḥammad Taqī. *al-Uṣūl al-‘amma li'l-fiqh al-muqāran*, 2nd edn. Beirut, Dār al-Andalus, 1979 (1st edn 1963).
- al-Ḥasanī, Hāshim Ma'rūf. *Dirāsāt fī'l-kāfī li'l-Kulaynī wa'l-ṣaḥīḥ li'l-Bukhārī*. Šūr, Maṭba'at Šūr al-Ḥadītha, 1388/1968.
- Ḥusaynī Nasab, Ridā. *Dar ṭarīq-i waḥdat-i islāmī: Pāsukh ba 35 pursish ka pīrāmūn-i īn hadaf maṭraḥ mīkardand*. Qum, Dabīr-khāne-ye Dā'emī-ye kongre-ye Jahānī-ye Bar-rasī-ye Qadāsāt wa Amniyyat-e Ḥaram, 1366 Sh/1988.
- Ibrāhīm, 'Izz al-Dīn. *Mawqif 'ulamā' al-muslimīn min al-shī'a wa'l-thawra al-islāmiyya*. Tehran (publisher unknown), 1406/1986.
- Ja'fariyān, Rasūl. *Ukdhūbat taḥrīf al-Qur'ān bayn al-shī'a wa'l-sunna*. N.p., 1413/1992–3.
- _____. 'A Study of Sunnī and Shī'ī Traditions Concerning Taḥrīf', *al-Tawḥīd* 6, no. 4 (Rajab-Ramaḍān, 1409/1988], pp. 34–42.
- Jeffery, Arthur. *Materials for the History of the Text of the Qur'ān: The Old Codices [...]*. Leiden, Brill, 1937.
- Keddie, Nikki R. *Religion and Rebellion in Iran: The Iranian Tobacco Protest of 1891–1892*. London, Cass, 1966.

- al-Khaṭīb, Muḥibb al-Dīn. *al-Khuṭūṭ al-‘arīḍa li’l-usus allatī qāma ‘alaihā dīn al-shī‘a al-imāmiyya al-ithnā ‘ashariyya*, 10th edn. Cairo, Maṭba‘at al-Salafiyya, 1982 (1st edn, Jeddah, [publisher unknown], 1961).
- al-Khoei, Yūsuf. ‘Abū’l-Qāsim al-Ḥū’ī’, *Oriente Moderno* New Series, 18 (79), no. 2 (1999), pp. 491–500.
- al-Kho’i, Yousif. ‘Grand Ayatollah Abu al-Qassim al-Kho’i: Political Thought and Positions’, in Faleh Abdul-Jabar, ed., *Ayatollahs, Sufis and Ideologues: State, Religion and Social Movements in Iraq*. London, Saqi Books, 2002, pp. 223–30.
- al-Khū’ī, Abū’l-Qāsim. *al-Bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur’ān*. Najaf, al-Maṭba‘a al-‘Ilmiyya fī’l-Najaf, 1375/1955–6. Translated and introduced by Abdulaziz A. Sachedina as *The Prolegomena to the Qur’an*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Kinberg, Leah. ‘*Muḥkamāt* and *Mutashābihāt* (Koran 3/7): Implication of a Koranic Pair of Terms in Medieval Exegesis’, *Studia Islamica* 35 (1988), pp. 143–72.
- Khomeini, Ruhollah. *See* Khumaynī, Rūḥullāh.
- Khumaynī, Rūḥullāh [Ruhollah Khomeini]. *Kashf al-asrār*. Qum, Enteshārāt-e Āzādī, c. 1980.
- Khurramshāhī, Bahā’ al-Dīn. *Qur’ān-pazhūhī: Haftād baḥth wa taḥqīq-i qur’ānī*. Tehran, Markaz-i Nashr-i Farhangī-yi Mashriq, 1372 Sh./1994.
- Kohlberg, Etan. ‘Some Notes on the Imāmite Attitude to the Qur’ān’, in Samuel M. Stern, Albert H. Hourani and Vivian Brown, eds, *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition: Essays Presented by His Friends and Pupils to Richard Walzer on His Seventieth Birthday*. Oxford, Cassirer, 1972, pp. 209–24.
- al-Kulaynī, Ja‘far b. Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb. *Uṣūl al-kāfī*, 2 vols, ed. Muḥammad Jawād al-Faqīh and Yūsuf al-Biqā‘ī. Beirut, Dār al-Aḍwā’, 1413/1992.

- Litvak, Meir. *Shi'i Scholars of Nineteenth-Century Iraq: The 'ulama' of Najaf and Karbala'*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Luizard, Pierre-Jean. *La formation de l'Irak contemporain: Le rôle politique des ulémas chiïtes à la fin de la domination ottomane et au moment de la construction de l'état irakien*. Paris, Editions du CNRS, 1991.
- Mīlānī, 'Alī al-Ḥusainī. *al-Taḥqīq fī nafy al-taḥrīf 'an al-Qur'ān al-sharīf*. Qum, Dār al-Qur'ān al-Karīm, 1410/1990.
- Modarressi, Hossein. 'Early Debates on the Integrity of the Qur'ān: A Brief Survey', *Studia Islamica* 77 (1993), pp. 5–39.
- Mu'arrafa, Muḥammad Hādī. *Ṣiyānat al-Qur'ān min al-taḥrīf*. Qum, Dār al-Qur'ān al-Karīm, 1410/1990.
- Mughniyya, Muḥammad Jawād. *al-Tafsīr al-kāshif*, 7 vols. Beirut, Dār al-Anwār, 1978.
- Āl Muḥsin, 'Alī. *Kashf al-ḥaqā'iq: Radd 'alā 'Hādhihi naṣīḥatī ilā kull shī'ī'*. Beirut, Dār al-Ṣafwa, 1416/1995.
- al-Nūrī al-Ṭabrisī, Mīrzā Ḥusain b. Taqī. *Faṣl al-khiṭāb fī taḥrīf kitāb rabb al-arbāb*, lithograph. Tehran, 1298/1881; Cairo, Dār Nūn, 2010 [partial edn]; Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāḥib, ed., *al-Shī'a wa'l-Qur'ān*, 3rd edn (Lahore, Idārat Tarjumān as-Sunna, 1983), pp. 136–344 [partial edn].
- _____. *Mustadrak al-wasā'il*. Tehran, [publisher unknown], 1311–21/1893–1903. [A continuation of 'Āmilī's *Tafṣīl wasā'il al-shī'a*.]
- Powers, David S. 'The Exegetical Genre *nāsikh al-Qur'ān wa mansūkhuhu*', in Andrew Rippin, ed., *Approaches to the History of the Interpretation of the Qur'ān*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1988, pp. 117–38.

- al-Qafārī, Nāṣir b. ‘b. rī, N b. ‘Alī. *Uṣūl madhhab al-shī‘a al-imāmiyya al-ithnā ‘ashariyya: ‘Arḍ wa-naqd*, 3 vols. Riyadh, Jāmi‘at al-Imām Muḥammad Ibn Sa‘ūd al-Islāmiyya, 1414/1993.
- al-Raḍawī, Murtaḍā. *Al-Burhān ‘alā ‘adam taḥrīf al-Qur‘ān*. Beirut, al-Irshād li’l-Ṭibā‘a wa’l-Nashr, 1411/1991.
- Rashīd Riḍā, Muḥammad. *Al-Sunna wa’l-shī‘a aw al-wahhābiyya wa’l-rāfiḍa*. Cairo, Maṭba‘at al-Manār, 1928.
- Rippin, Andrew. ‘The Exegetical Literature of Abrogation: Form and Content’, in Gerald Richard Hawting, Jawid Ahmad Mojaddedi and Alexander Samely, eds, *Studies in Islamic and Middle Eastern Texts and Traditions in Memory of Norman Calder*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. 213–31.
- Sachedina, Abdulaziz A. ‘Al-Khū‘ī and the Twelver Shī‘ites’, in Abū al-Qāsim al-Mūsawī al-Khū‘ī, *The Prolegomena to the Qur‘an*, tr. and intro. Abdulaziz A. Sachedina. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1998, pp. 3–22. [RG]
- Sālūs, ‘Alī Aḥmad. *Bayn al-shī‘a wa’l-sunna: Dirāsa muqārina fī’l-tafsīr wa-uṣūlihi*. Cairo, Dār al-I‘tisām, 1989.
- _____. *Ma‘a al-shī‘a al-ithnā ‘ashariyya fī’l-uṣūl wa’l-furū‘: Mawsū‘a shāmila*, 4 vols. Al-Dawḥa, Dār al-Thaqāfa, 1417/1997.
- al-Sayyārī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad. *Revelation and Falsification: The Kitāb al-Qirā‘āt of Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Sayyārī*, Critical Edition with an Introduction and Notes by Etan Kohlberg and Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi. Leiden, Brill, 2009.
- al-Shahrastānī, Hibat al-Dīn. ‘Tanzīh-i muṣḥaf-i sharīf az naskh wa naqṣ wa taḥrīf’, in idem, *Kitāb Tanzīh al-tanzīl mushtamal bar sa bakhsh wa yak khātima*. Tehran, Chāpkhāna-yi Ḥaydarī, 1331Sh/1951–52, pp. 5–79.

Sobhani, Ja'far. *Doctrines of Shi'i Islam: A Compendium of Imami Beliefs and Practices*, tr. and ed. Reza Shah-Kazemi. London, I.B. Tauris, 2001.

Ṭabāṭabā'ī, Muḥammad Ḥusayn. *al-Mīzān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, 20 vols. Beirut, Mu'assasat al-A'lamīllī'l-Maṭbū'āt, 1411/1991.

al-Ṭabrisī, al-Faḍl b. al-Ḥasan. *Majma' al-bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, 10 vols. Beirut, Dār al-'Ulūm, 2005.

al-Ṭīhrānī, Āghā Buzurg. *Al-Dharī'a ilā taṣānīf al-shī'a*, 25 vols. Beirut, Dār al-Aḍwā', 1983.

Ẓahīr, Iḥsān Ilāhī. *Al-Shī'a wa'l-Qur'ān*, 3rd edn. See al-Nūrī al-Ṭabrisī, Mīrzā Ḥusayn b. Taqī. *Faṣl al-khiṭāb fī taḥrīf kitāb rabb al-arbāb*.

NOTES

¹ See, for example, Ja'far Sobhani, *Doctrines of Shi'i Islam: A Compendium of Imami Beliefs and Practices*, tr. and ed. Reza Shah-Kazemi (London, 2001), pp. 93 and 210–11.

² Ja'far Murtaḍā al-Āmilī, *Ḥaqā'iq hāmma ḥawl al-qur'ān al-karīm*, 2nd edn (Beirut, 1413/1992) pp. 32–3.

³ For a comprehensive treatment of the subject, see Rainer Brunner, *Die Schia und die Koranfälschung* (Würzburg, 2001).

⁴ The probably most important source that survived in a few manuscripts is the *Kitāb al-Qirā'āt* by Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Sayyārī (a contemporary of the eleventh imam, al-Ḥasan al-'Askarī), which was edited some years ago: *Revelation and Falsification: The Kitāb al-Qirā'āt of Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Sayyārī*, Critical Edition with an Introduction and Notes by Etan Kohlberg and Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi (Leiden, 2009).

⁵ See Ja'far b. Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb al-Kulaynī, *Uṣūl al-kāfī* (Beirut, 1413/1992), vol. II, p. 599 (no. 2), vol. II, p. 602 (no. 16), vol. II, p. 604 (no. 32), vol. II, p. 605 (no. 28). On Kulaynī and his collection in general, see Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi and Hassan Ansari, 'Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb al-Kulaynī (m. 328 ou 329/939–40 ou 940–41) et son *Kitāb al-Kāfī*: Une introduction', *Studia Iranica* 38 (2009), pp. 191–247.

⁶ For the classical background of the debate, see Etan Kohlberg, 'Some Notes on the Imāmite Attitude to the Qur'ān', in Samuel M. Stern, Albert H. Hourani and Vivian Brown, eds,

Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition: Essays Presented by His Friends and Pupils to Richard Walzer on His Seventieth Birthday (Oxford, 1972), pp. 209–24; for Ibn Bābūya, see Saïd Amir Arjomand, ‘The Consolation of Theology: Absence of the Imam and Tradition from Chiliasm to Law in Shi‘ism’, *Journal of Religion* 76 (1996), pp. 548–71 (esp. p. 554); for Mufīd, see Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, ‘Al-Šayḥ al-Mufīd (m. 413/1022) et la question de la falsification du Coran’, in Daniel De Smet and Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, eds, *Controverses sur les écritures canoniques de l’Islam* (Paris, 2014), pp. 199–229; for Ṭūsī, see Sarah Eltantawi, ‘Ṭūsī Did Not “Opt Out”: Shiite Jurisprudence and the Solidification of the Stoning Punishment in the Islamic Legal Tradition’, in Alireza Korangy, Wheeler M. Thackston, Roy P. Mottahedeh and William Granara, eds. *Essays in Islamic Philology, History, and Philosophy* (Berlin / Boston, 2016), pp. 312–32; for Ṭabrisī, see Etan Kohlberg, ‘al- Ṭabrisī (Ṭabarsī), *EI*², vol. X, pp. 40–41.

⁷ On the Akhbārīs, see in detail Robert Gleave, *Scripturalist Islam: The History and Doctrines of the Akhbārī Shī‘ī School* (Leiden, 2007).

⁸ For all these scholars and their respective arguments, see in detail Brunner, *Die Schia und die Koranfälschung*, pp. 12–27.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 28–32.

¹⁰ On Nūrī, see *ibid.*, pp. 39–42 and the literature given there; see also Omid Ghaemmaghami, ‘Arresting the Eschaton: Mirza Husayn Tabarsi Nuri (d. 1902) and the Babi and Baha‘i Religions’, *Journal of Religious History* 36, no. 4 (2012), pp. 486–98.

¹¹ On ‘Āmilī, see Gianroberto Scarcia, ‘al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī’, *EI*², vol. III, pp. 588–9 and Meir Bar-Asher, ‘Ḥorr-e ‘Āmeli’, *EIr*, vol. XII, pp. 478–9; on his hadith collection, see Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharī‘a ilā taṣānīf al-shī‘a* (Beirut, 1983), vol. IV, pp. 352–5; on Nūrī’s *Mustadrak* (which was published for the first time in Tehran 1311–21/1893–1903), see Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharī‘a ilā taṣānīf al-shī‘a*, vol. XXI, pp. 7–8.

¹² Personal communication, Najaf, July 2012.

¹³ On this book, see in detail Brunner, *Die Schia und die Koranfälschung*, pp. 42–69; a partial edition of the text (with no named editor) appeared in Cairo in 2010 (at a publishing house called Dār Nūn); another partial edition had been issued by the Pakistani Sunni polemicist Iḥsān Ilāhī Zāhīr, *al-Shī‘a wa’l-Qur‘ān*, 3rd edn (Lahore, 1983), pp. 136–344.

¹⁴ Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Shīrāzī is famous beyond Shi‘i theology and law for his role in the so-called tobacco protest in 1891/2; for this incident, see Nikki R. Keddie, *Religion and Rebellion in Iran: The Iranian Tobacco Protest of 1891–1892* (London, 1966); on his

religious leadership (*marja' iyya*), see Meir Litvak, *Shi'i Scholars of Nineteenth-Century Iraq: The 'ulama' of Najaf and Karbala'* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 83–90; on his biography, see Werner Ende, 'Der amtsmüde Ayatollah', in Gebhard J. Selz, ed., *Festschrift für Burkhardt Kienast: Zu seinem 70. Geburtstage dargebracht von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen* (Münster, 2003), pp. 51–63.

¹⁵ For Ṭihirānī's unpublished work *al-Naqd al-laṭīf fī nafy al-taḥrīf 'an al-qur'ān al-sharīf*, see his *al-Dharī'a ilā taṣānīf al-shī'a*, vol. XXIV, p. 278 and vol. III, pp. 312–13; for the *fatwā* by Kāshif al-Ghiṭā', see 'Abd al-Raḥīm Muḥammad 'Alī, *Shaykh al-bāḥithīn Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭihirānī: Ḥayātuhu wa-āthāruhu (1875–1970)* (Najaf, 1970), pp. 45–6; see also Brunner, *Die Schia und die Koranfälschung*, pp. 80–81.

¹⁶ Yūsuf b. Aḥmad al-Dijwī, *al-Jawāb al-munīf fī'l-radd 'alā mudda'ī 'l-taḥrīf fī'l-kitāb al-sharīf* (Cairo, 1913), pp. 164–87; Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā, *al-Sunna wa'l-shī'a aw al-wahhābiyya wa'l-rāfiḍa* (Cairo, 1928), pp. 12–13, 43–4, 74–5.

¹⁷ Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, *al-Khuṭūṭ al-'arīḍa li'l-usus allatī qāma 'alayhā dīn al-shī'a al-imāmiyya al-ithnā 'ashariyya*, 10th edn (Cairo, 1982); on this book and its author, see in detail, Rainer Brunner, *Islamic Ecumenism in the 20th Century: The Azhar and Shiism between Rapprochement and Restraint* (Leiden, 2004), pp. 255–75 and 331–7.

¹⁸ Brunner, *Die Schia und die Koranfälschung*, pp. 95–9.

¹⁹ On abrogation in general, see John Burton, 'Abrogation', *EQ*, vol. I, pp. 11–19; idem, *The Sources of Islamic Law: Islamic Theories of Abrogation*, (Edinburgh, 1990); see also David S. Powers, 'The Exegetical Genre *nāsikh al-Qur'ān wa mansūkhuhu*', in Andrew Rippin, ed., *Approaches to the History of the Interpretation of the Qur'ān* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 117–38; Andrew Rippin, 'The Exegetical Literature of Abrogation: Form and Content', in Gerald Richard Hawting, Jawid Ahmad Mojaddedi and Alexander Samely, eds, *Studies in Islamic and Middle Eastern Texts and Traditions in Memory of Norman Calder* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 213–31.

²⁰ All Qur'anic translations are by Arthur J. Arberry.

²¹ One of the most obvious (and well-known) examples in this regard is the gradual Qur'anic prohibition of wine: Q. 16:67 praises wine as a divine gift; Q. 4:43 exhorts the believers not to drink and pray; and only Q. 5:90 outlaws wine as *an abomination, some of Satan's work*.

²² On the 'stoning verse' in general, see Burton, *The Sources of Islamic Law*, pp. 122–64; on the classical Shi'i attitude, see Sarah Eltantawi, 'Ṭūsī Did Not "Opt Out" '.

²³ See, for example, Muḥammad Jawād al-Balāghī al-Najafī, *Ālā' al-raḥmān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān* (Ṣaida, 1933), vol. I, pp. 21–3; Muḥsin al-Amīn, *Naqḍ al-washī'a aw al-shī'a bayn al-ḥaqā'iq wa'l-awḥām* (Beirut, 2001 [1st edn 1951]), pp. 203–6; Muḥammad Taqī al-Ḥakīm, *al-Uṣūl al-'amma li'l-fiqh al-muqāran*, 2nd edn (Beirut, 1979 [1st edn 1963]), pp. 107–8; Hāshim Ma'rūf al-Ḥasanī, *Dirāsāt fī'l-kāfī li'l-Kulaynī wa'l-ṣaḥīḥ li'l-Bukhārī* (Ṣūr, 1388/1968), p. 349; 'Alī Āl Muḥsin, *Kashf al-ḥaqā'iq: Radd 'alā 'Hādhihi naṣīḥatī ilā kull shī'ī'* (Beirut, 1416/1995), pp. 75–7; Murtaḍā al-Raḍawī, *al-Burhān 'alā 'adam taḥrīf al-Qur'ān* (Beirut, 1411/1991), pp. 199–212; see also below, n. 49.

²⁴ Mīrzā Ḥusain b. Taqī al-Nūrī al-Ṭabrisī, *Faṣl al-khiṭāb fī taḥrīf kitāb rabb al-arbāb*, lithograph (Tehran, 1298/1881), pp. 105–20.

²⁵ Ibid., pp. 5, 121 (in both places he writes that 'Alī's collection comprised the abrogating [*nāsikh*] and the abrogated [*mansūkh*] verses in their correct order, i.e. the abrogated ones first).

²⁶ Ibid., p. 107. Al-Nūrī does not elaborate on the apparent contradiction to those instances where he talks about 'Alī's collection having both categories (see previous note).

²⁷ Ibid., p. 109. The expression 'guarded tablet' (see Q: 85:22) denotes the location of the Qur'an in God's presence. See Daniel A. Madigan, 'Preserved Tablet', *EQ*, vol. IV, pp. 261–3 and Josef van Ess, *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra: Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam* (Berlin, 1991–7), vol. IV, pp. 625–6.

²⁸ Nūrī Ṭabrisī, *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*, pp. 109–15; on the reports about *Sūrat al-Aḥzāb*, see also John Burton, *The Collection of the Qur'ān* (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 80–82; idem, 'The Collection of the Qur'ān', *EQ*, vol. I, pp. 353 and 355.

²⁹ On him, see Werner Ende, 'al-Shahrastānī', *EF²*, vol. IX, pp. 216–17; Pierre-Jean Luizard, *La formation de l'Irak contemporain: Le rôle politique des ulémas chiïtes à la fin de la domination ottomane et au moment de la construction de l'état irakien* (Paris, 1991), index, s.v.

³⁰ 'Tanzīh-i muṣḥaf-i sharīf az naskh wa naqṣ wa taḥrīf', in Hibat al-Dīn al-Shahrastānī, *Kitāb Tanzīh al-tanzīl mushtamal bar sa bakhsh wa yak khātima* (Tehran, 1331Sh/1951-2), pp. 5–79; this booklet seems to be the Persian translation of a treatise which was originally composed in Arabic but never published: 'Tanzīh al-tanzīl fī ithbāt ṣiyānat al-muṣḥaf al-sharīf min an-naskh wa'l-naqṣ wa'l-taḥrīf'.

³¹ Shahrastānī, 'Tanzīh-i muṣḥaf-i sharīf', pp. 16–19.

³² Ibid., pp. 32–3.

³³ Ibid., pp. 28, 34–6; on ‘clear’ and ‘ambiguous’ verses, see Leah Kinberg, ‘*Muḥkamāt* and *Mutashābihāt* (Koran 3/7): Implication of a Koranic Pair of Terms in Medieval Exegesis’, *Studia Islamica* 35 (1988), pp. 143–72 (esp. pp. 149–50 on abrogation).

³⁴ Shahrastānī, ‘Tanzīh-i muṣḥaf-i sharīf’, p. 30.

³⁵ On Khū’ī, see Elvire Corboz, *Guardians of Shi’ism. Sacred Authority and Transnational Networks* (Edinburgh, 2015), pp. 48–57, 94–100, 166–72; Abdulaziz Sachedina, ‘Al-Khū’ī and the Twelver Shī’ites’, in Abū al-Qāsim al-Mūsawī al-Khū’ī, *The Prolegomena to the Qur’an*, tr. and intro. Abdulaziz A. Sachedina (Oxford, 1998), pp. 3–22; Robert Gleave, ‘Political Aspects of Modern Shi’i Legal Discussions: Khumayni and Khu’i on *ijtihād* and *qada*’, *Mediterranean Politics* 7 (2002), pp. 96–116; Yousif al-Kho’i, ‘Grand Ayatollah Abu al-Qassim al-Kho’i: Political Thought and Positions’, in Faleh Abdul-Jabar, ed., *Ayatollahs, Sufis and Ideologues: State, Religion and Social Movements in Iraq* (London, 2002), pp. 223–30; Yūsuf al-Khoei, ‘Abū’l-Qāsim al-Ḥū’ī’, *Oriente Moderno* New Series, 18 (79), no. 2 (1999), pp. 491–500.

³⁶ Abū’l-Qāsim al-Khū’ī, *al-Bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur’ān* (Najaf, 1375/1955–6); for the English translation see the previous note (*The Prolegomena to the Qur’an*). Contrary to what the title might indicate, the book is not a Qur’anic commentary per se, but rather a theoretical introduction to a *tafsīr*; Khū’ī never composed a fully fledged commentary.

³⁷ Khū’ī, *al-Bayān*, pp. 136–81, esp. pp. 139–44 (English tr.: *The Prolegomena*, pp. 138–42); for his arguments against *tahrīf*, see in detail Brunner, *Die Schia und die Koranfälschung*, pp. 88–92.

³⁸ Khū’ī, *al-Bayān*, p. 143 (English tr.: *The Prolegomena*, p. 141).

³⁹ Khū’ī, *al-Bayān*, pp. 175–81 (English tr.: *The Prolegomena*, pp. 156–61).

⁴⁰ Khū’ī, *al-Bayān*, pp. 189–269 (English tr.: *The Prolegomena*, pp. 186–253).

⁴¹ Khū’ī, *al-Bayān*, pp. 195–6 (English tr.: *The Prolegomena*, pp. 191–2).

⁴² See above, n. 21.

⁴³ Khū’ī, *al-Bayān*, pp. 233–5 (English tr.: *The Prolegomena*, pp. 221–3).

⁴⁴ Khū’ī, *al-Bayān*, pp. 199–269 (English tr.: *The Prolegomena*, pp. 193–248); for classical Sunni lists of allegedly abrogated verses, see Powers, ‘The Exegetical Genre’, pp. 137–8.

⁴⁵ Khū’ī, *al-Bayān*, pp. 190–95 (English tr.: *The Prolegomena*, pp. 188–91).

⁴⁶ Nūrī Ṭabrisī, *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*, pp. 35–96, esp. pp. 92–6; see Brunner, *Die Schia und die Koranfälschung*, pp. 43–6; on the traditional Muslim view on the Jewish and Christian falsification of the scriptures, see Camilla Adang, *Muslim Writers on Judaism and the*

Hebrew Bible: From Ibn Rabban to Ibn Hazm (Leiden, 1996); Hava Lazarus-Yafeh, 'Taḥrīf', *EI²*, vol. X, pp. 111–12.

⁴⁷ Hossein Modarressi, 'Early Debates on the Integrity of the Qur'ān: A Brief Survey', *Studia Islamica* 77 (1993), pp. 5–39, esp. the following quote on pp. 7–8 referring to Khū'ī: 'With a single possible exception, however, it is highly doubtful that the Qur'ān includes any abrogated verse.'

⁴⁸ See, for example, al-Balāghī al-Najafī, *Ālā' al-rahmān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, vol. I, p. 115; Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyya, *al-Tafsīr al-kāshif* (Beirut, 1978), vol. I, pp. 169–70; Muḥammad Ḥusayn Faḍlallāh, *Min wahy al-Qur'ān* (Beirut, 1998), vol. II, pp. 156–7; the latter avoids discussing the thorny issue in detail, but refers the reader to Khū'ī's *al-Bayān* instead.

⁴⁹ See, for example, Rasūl Ja'fariyān, *Ukdhūbat taḥrīf al-Qur'ān bayn al-shī'a wa'l-sunna* (N.p., 1413/1992–3;), pp. 46–59; Ja'fariyān, 'A Study of Sunnī and Shī'ī Traditions Concerning Taḥrīf', *al-Tawḥīd* 6, no. 4 (Rajab-Ramaḍān 1409/1988), pp. 34–42; Bahā' al-Dīn Khurramshāhī, *Qur'ān-pazhūhī: Haftād baḥth wa taḥqīq-i qur'ānī* (Tehran 1372 Sh./1994), pp. 106–7; 'Alī al-Ḥusainī Mīlānī, *al-Taḥqīq fī nafy al-taḥrīf 'an al-Qur'ān al-sharīf* (Qum, 1410/1990), pp. 272–92; Muḥammad Hādī Mu'arrāfa, *Ṣiyānat al-Qur'ān min al-taḥrīf* (Qum, 1410/1990), pp. 17–24; 'Izz al-Dīn Ibrāhīm, *Mawqif 'ulamā' al-muslimīn min al-shī'a wa'l-thawra al-islāmiyya* (Tehran 1406/1986), pp. 36–9; Riḍā Ḥusaynī Nasab, *Dar taḥqīq-i waḥdat-i islāmī: Pāsukh ba 35 pursish ka pīrāmūn-i īn hadaf maṭraḥ mīkardand* (Qum, 1366 Sh./1988), pp. 52–60.

⁵⁰ Brunner, *Islamic Ecumenism in the 20th Century*, pp. 382–3 and the references given there; the organisation was renamed *al-Majma' al-'Ālamī li'l-Taqrīb bayn al-Madhāhib al-Islāmiyya* in 2004; see also its website <http://www.taghrib.org>.

⁵¹ Rūḥullāh Khumaynī [Ruhollah Khomeini], *Kashf al-asrār* (Qum, c. 1980), pp. 114–20; see in detail Brunner, *Die Schia und die Koranfälschung*, pp. 103–4.

⁵² On Ṭabāṭabā'ī, see Hamid Algar, 'Allāma Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī: Philosopher, Exegete, and Gnostic', *Journal of Islamic Studies* 17 (2006), pp. 326–51 (which is of a heavily apologetic tendency); on some of his exegetical principles, see Mohammad Jafar Elmi, 'The Views of Ṭabāṭabā'ī on Traditions (*Aḥādīth*) and Occasions of Revelation (*Asbāb al-Nuzūl*) in Interpreting the Qur'an', *Journal of Shi'a Islamic Studies* 1 (2008), pp. 57–84; 'Alī al-Awsī, *al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī wa-manhajuhu fī tafsīrihi al-Mīzān* (Tehran, 1405/1985).

⁵³ This reading was already discussed by al-Faḍl b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭabrisī (d. 548/1153–4), who remains one of the most important Shi‘i commentators today; see his *Majma‘ al-bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur‘ān* (Beirut, 2005), vol. I, p. 250; for references to the old codices, see Arthur Jeffery, *Materials for the History of the Text of the Qur‘ān: The Old Codices [...]* (Leiden, 1937), pp. 119, 195, 220, 246, 277, 285.

⁵⁴ Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā‘ī, *al-Mīzān fī tafsīr al-Qur‘ān* (Beirut, 1411/1991), vol. XII, pp. 115–16 and 130–31; see also Brunner, *Die Schia und die Koranfälschung*, pp. 99–102.

⁵⁵ Ṭabāṭabā‘ī, *al-Mīzān*, vol. I, pp. 246–52 (esp. p. 252).

⁵⁶ Quoted by Khurramshāhī, *Qur‘ān-pazhūhī*, p. 112; see also Ṭabāṭabā‘ī, *al-Mīzān*, vol. XII, p. 109; on the problem of *akhbār āḥād* in modern Shi‘ism, see Robert Gleave, ‘Modern Šī‘ī Discussions of *Ḥabar al-wāḥid*: Šādr, Ḥumaynī and Hū‘ī’, *Oriente Moderno* New Series, 21 (82), no. 1 (2002), pp. 179–94.

⁵⁷ See Hamid Dabashi, *Theology of Discontent: The Ideological Foundations of the Islamic Revolution in Iran* (New York, 1993), pp. 273–323.

⁵⁸ Nāṣir b. ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Alī al-Qafārī, *Uṣūl madhhab al-shī‘a al-imāmiyya al-ithnā ‘ashariyya: ‘Arḍ wa-naqd* (Riyadh, 1414/1993), vol. I, pp. 247–8; see also al-‘Alī Aḥmad Sālūs, *Bayn al-shī‘a wa’l-sunna: Dirāsa muqārina fī’l-tafsīr wa-uṣūlihi* (Cairo, 1989), pp. 160–61; idem, *Ma‘a al-shī‘a al-ithnā ‘ashariyya fī’l-uṣūl wa’l-furū‘: Mawsū‘a shāmila* (Al-Dawḥa 1417/1997), vol. II, pp. 158–519; for modern Sunni authors and their scepticism of the idea of abrogation, see Daniel Brown, ‘The Triumph of Scripturalism: The Doctrine of Naskh and its Modern Critics’, in Earle H. Waugh and Frederick M. Denny, eds, *The Shaping of an American Islamic Discourse: A Memorial to Fazlur Rahman* (Atlanta, 1998), pp. 49–66.