



xkcp

Ayatullah Sayyid Abul Qasim Al Khui

The Collection & Preservation of the
Holy Qur'an

The Collection and Preservation of the Qur'an

Ayatullah Sayyid Abul Qasim Al Khui - XKP

Published: 2013

Tag(s): islam "tharif quran" "tahref quran" khui khoie "Ayatullah Sayyid Abul Qasim al Khui" "Collection Preservation Quran" khoei xkp "islamic ebooks" "ayatullah khui" "collection koran" "preservation of ve

Chapter 1

Foreword

"In the name of Allah, Most Gracious, Most Merciful. Praise be to Allah Who has sent to His servant The Book and has allowed no deviation therein. And the best of Allah's blessings and His most complete peace upon His Apostle whom he sent with His Guidance. And upon his chosen, virtuous progeny who believed in him, honoured him, helped him and followed the Light Which was sent down to him".

Amid all the diversity of thoughts, leanings and interpretations, Muslims are united by a single cohesive force, an eternal and abiding miracle of Muhammad ('s); Holy Qur'an. A prince among the revealed Books, Qur'an has remained pristine and unsullied by the profane hands.

The external forces working restlessly to wreck the Muslim unity and consensus have now resorted to a new ploy. From among the Muslims themselves, they have succeeded to instigate sectarian differences based on Qur'an. We now see scholars of one sect accusing the followers of another sect of disbelieving in Qur'an, or believing in a Book which has disappeared or been interpolated.

From Saudi Arabia, South Africa and particularly Pakistan, recent publications against the *Shiah* sect harp on one and the same note. They go to wearisome and tedious lengths, just to prove that the Shiahs are not Muslims because they do not believe in the existing Qur'an. It is surprising to find a man of Abul Hasan Nadawis' calibre joining the notorious band and entering inextricably into the quagmire. The forces of *kufir* have thus successfully created a wider chasm between the two main sects of Islam, the Shiah and the Sunni; and some scholars have played into their hands.

The fact is neither Sunni nor Shiah Muslims believe in any Qur'an other than the existing one, nor do they subscribe to the views supporting interpolations, distortions, omissions, additions or any sort of tampering in the Holy Book.

In our selection of two chapters from Ayatullah Sayyid Abul Qasim al-Khui's famous work *al Bayan fi Tafsiril Qur'anwe* have deliberately given a prime choice to the subjects of *Tahrif* and collection of the Qur'an. Later, we hope to translate and publish further chapters so that, eventually, whole book is placed in the hands of the Muslim as well as non-Muslim readers.

Ayatullah al-Khui completed this work decades ago. He is one of the great Shiah *mujtahids* of this era, internationally known for his erudition. The book was acclaimed as a masterpiece by Shiah as well as Sunni scholars, leaving no doubt in the minds of its readers that Qur'an as a great force binding all the Muslims together has come to stay for ever.

The line of argument pursued by Ayatullah al-Khui is unique. While he enumerates and discusses

all the reports from Shiah as well as Sunni sources, he very ably concludes that according to the reliable and authentic traditions, Qur'an has remained pure, pristine and unprofaned. His arguments proving that the belief in *Tahrif* goes against *al-Kitab* (i.e. Qur'an), *as-Sunnah*, *al-Aql* and *al-Ijma'*, are compelling and persuasive. His analysis of all those reports which indicate desultory, unmethodical and haphazard later day collection of Qur'an leaves no shred of doubt that they are false and fabricated.

In his preface to the first edition of *al-Bayan fi Tafsir il Qur'an*, al Khui writes:-

"I was enamoured by Qur'an from the childhood, always keen to unravel its secrets and to discover its meaning. It behoves every true Muslim, and even non-Muslim thinkers to ponder over Qur'an, to unfold its hidden meaning and to benefit from its light. For it is a Book which has a message for human welfare and guides it to success and salvation. Qur'an is a reference for the linguist, a guide to the grammarian, an authority for the jurist, an example for the refined, a lost treasure for the wise. It even guides those who admonish and shows the goal in life. It is a source of social as well as political sciences, and upon it rest the sciences of Islam. It will reveal to you the fascinating secrets. of Nature, and introduce you to the laws of creation. Qur'an is the abiding miracle of this ever lasting religion, and a code of conduct based on the high and esteemed Shariah".

It is our earnest hope that this publication will serve to bridge the gap between Muslims, created by the subtle forces of *kufr*. Further, it will Inshallah enable them, both Shiah and Sunni, to realize that Qur'an is their only hope of deliverance from the unscrupulous manipulations of un-Islamic and anti-Islamic propagandists. Let no Muslim be deceived into believing that he or his brother, despite the sectarian differences, believes in any authority other than that of the existing Qur'an. It is complete, pure, pristine and unaltered.

Secretariat
The World Federation of K.S.I. Muslim Communities
London

Chapter 2

Introduction

*To things immortal, time can do no wrong,
And that which never is to die, for ever must be young.*

With the passage of time, many great messages have been lost, and those which have survived must be subjected to close scrutiny. How often do we hear and learn a corrupt version of a statement or an event, even if the lapse of time in between was short? It was perhaps for this reason that even Emerson, the famous and comparatively cheerful sage, declared: "*The surest poison is time.*". History has always been haunted by this ravaging and devouring aspect of time.

Ever since man was created, the principle message to him has been that of absolute unity of God, and that all men and women are his slaves. Today, the defaced form of this message is visible in the form of numerous deities, some openly polytheistic, others under the guise of monotheism. The great books revealed to the early Prophets have been victims of profane hands which succeeded even to convert some parts of the sacred texts into the most tasteless and immoral anecdotes and parables. The substance of the original message was deliberately allowed to disappear with a growing number of interpolations.

Humanity today would have had no chance whatsoever to know about the message in its pristine form, had it not been redeemed by the great Prophet of Islam, Muhammad (peace be upon him and his progeny). Among the hostile people of various shades of faith, some engaged in polytheism while others in dualism and trinity of godhead, his famous simple dictum was: "*Say: There is no God but Allah, and you will be saved*". All gods, made of metal wood or other materials, and those comprising of pious prophets and virtuous men and women, were asked to succumb before one God, Allah, and His Will. He told humanity then, and continues to do so even today, that the eternal message from Allah is that of His absolute unity, and that none be worshipped; not even human desire which lies like a venomous viper in the bosoms.

This great message is enshrined in the Qur'an, the only book of God, which has remained unsullied, untainted, pure and unprofaned. The sure greedy hands of *time could* not destroy the sacrosanct quality of Qur'an, not because it was not tried, - but because Qur'an is inherently incorruptible. It has a style and form which is inimitable, rendering any change or alteration creeping stealthily into it easily detectible. The transmission of every verse of this great Book has been continuous ever since it left the lips of the Prophet as a revelation from Allah. And then there is the content of the Book, destined to remain an illuminating, ever shining light for those who grope in darkness. Qur'an is irreplaceable.

Our sixth Imam, Ja'far as-Sadiq ('a) has said:

"Qur'an is living, its message never died. It turns like the turn of day and night, it is in motion like the sun and the moon. It will embrace the last of us, the way it embraced the first of us"[1]

Sadly enough, Muslims have recently initiated a mud slinging match amongst themselves, accusing each other of disbelief in the Qur'an or interpolation. Such an attack from non-Muslims is understandable, because Qur'an stands in a sharp contrast to the corrupted divine texts they hold in their hands. *But why the Muslims?*

Ayatullah Sayyid Abul Qasim al Khui, the great Mujtahid of our era, examines here the subject with an insight singularly his own.

Notes:

[1]Al-Ayyashi

Chapter 3

The Holy Qur'an, Pure, Pristine and Unprofaned

Before we dwell upon this subject at length, we feel it is necessary to discuss certain connected issues which cannot be overlooked, that are the following:

- à The Meaning of *Tahrif* (interpolation or tampering);
- à Muslim view on *Tahrif*;
- à Abrogation of Recitation a Fact or a Myth;
- à *Tahrif* and the Book Itself;
- à *Tahrif* and *Sunnah*;
- à Permission to Recite the Surah in the Prayers;
- à The Claim that *Tahrif* was caused by the Caliphs;
- à Some Doubts by those who believe in *Tahrif*;
- à The Traditions about *Tahrif*;
- à True Meaning of the Traditions.

Chapter 4

The Meaning of Tahrif

The Meaning of *Tahrif* (interpolation or tampering)

This word is used with common denotations, some of which are acceptably applicable to the Qur'an; and the others are either inapplicable or disputed. The details are as below.

First, the meaning is to transfer an object from its place to another. Allah says:

Muslims are agreed upon the fact that such an interference has occurred in the Qur'an, because whenever someone interprets the Qur'an without understanding its true meaning and transforms its real meaning to something irrelevant, he tampers with it.

Many have introduced innovations and unfounded beliefs into Islam by basing their arguments on interpretation of the Qur'an according to their own whims and opinions.

There are several traditions which forbid this type of interpretations, and condemn its perpetrators. In *al-Kafi*, a tradition by Imam Muhammad al-Baqir ('a) says that he wrote to Sa'ad al-Khayr:

"One of the examples of their repudiation of the Book has been that they stood by its letters and distorted its injunctions; they narrate it, but do not have deference to its teachings. The ignorant are impressed by their narrations and recitations, while the learned are grieved to see their disregard for its protection..."[2]

Secondly, the meaning of *Tahrif* is an omission or an addition of a letter or a change in grammatical inflections, without effecting any change in the content of the Qur'an. This change may sometimes not be discernible from the rest of the Qur'an.

This type of change has definitely occurred in the Qur'an. We have already pointed out earlier that the so called various readings of the Qur'an were not based on *tawattur*, which means that the Qur'an was really based on only one authentic system of reading, and the rest were either additions or omissions.

The third meaning of *Tahrif* is an omission or an addition of a word or two, at the same time leaving the essence of the Qur'an untouched.

It is the type of interpolation which surely occurred in the first century of Islam, and in the days of the companions of the Prophet ('s). The fact that Uthman burnt up all other copies of the Qur'an, and ordered his emissaries to do away with all the copies other than the codex prepared by himself, is an

ample proof that there existed some difference between his copy and the others, else he would not have asked for their destruction.

In fact, some of the scholars have recorded those differences, like Abdullah b. Abi Dawud as-Sajistani who wrote a book titled: *Kitabul Masahif*. It could be inferred that some interpolation had occurred, either on the part of Uthman or on the part of the scribes who prepared their copies. But we will soon establish that the copy of Uthman was actually the one already known to the Muslims. It was the one which was handed over from the Prophet ('s) and widely used. The *Tahrif* by way of addition or omission had occurred in those copies which ceased to exist after the era of Uthman. As for the existing Qur'an, it is totally free from any omission or addition.

In short, those who rightly believe that those extra codices of the Qur'an were not authenticated by *tawattur*, that is to say that their authenticity was not established by wide currency and acceptance among Muslims, for them it is also right to believe that this sort of tampering had occurred in the beginning, but it ceased to exist after the time of Uthman. This leads us to believe that only that Qur'an remained authentic which was supported by a continuous chain joined with the Prophet ('s).

Those who hold that all the codices, despite their variations, were based on *tawattur*, will have to subscribe to the disputed view that *Tahrif* has occurred in the Qur'an, and that some parts of it is lost. Tabari has classified, as you have noticed earlier, that Uthman dismissed the six variations of reading, and allowed only one to sustain.

The fourth meaning of *Tahrif* is addition or suppression of an *ayah* or a *Surah*, at the same time preserving the revealed Qur'an intact, and accepting the fact that the Prophet ('s) recited it as a part of the Qur'an.

And this has definitely occurred in the Qur'an. The "*basmalah*" for example, is an *ayah* for which Muslims unanimously hold that the Prophet ('s) recited it before every *Surah* except the *Surah* of *al-Tawbah*. Yet, among the *Ulama'* of *Ahlu Sunnah*, it is a subject of dispute. Some of them suggest that it is not a part of the Qur'an, and the Malikites have gone to the extent as to consider it *Makruh* to recite it before the *Surah* of *Fatihah* in the daily prayers, except when one intends to thereby digress from another *Surah*. And then there is a group among them who say that it is a part of the Qur'an.

The Shiahs are unanimous that *basmalah* is a part of every *Surah* except *al-Tawbah*, and this has been accepted by some Sunni scholars as well. When we start our commentary of the *Surah al-Fatihah*, we will enlarge upon this subject. So we see that *Tahrif* in the form of exclusion or suppression has certainly taken place.

The fifth meaning of *Tahrif* is that an addition of such a nature has taken place which rendered certain parts unauthentic. This indeed is totally inapplicable to the Holy Qur'an. Such a change has not occurred in the Qur'an, and this must be believed in as cardinal part of the faith.

The sixth meaning is *Tahrif* by omission. This would imply that the Qur'an we have today is incomplete and that people are deprived of some parts of Qur'an.

It is over this implication that the dispute arose, with certain people rejecting it altogether, and

certain group conceding it.

Notes:

[2] *al-Wafi*, p.274

Chapter 5

Muslim view on Tahrif

The accepted view of Muslims about the Qur'an is that it is free from all profanities and tampering. They firmly believe that the Book existing among them has the complete text of what was revealed to the great Prophet ('s). Many scholars of repute have supported this view, among them is Muhammad ibn Babawayh, popularly known as Sheikh Saduq, who has included this view in the principle tenets of Shia Ithna-Asheri sect. Sheikh al Taifah Abu Ja'far Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-Tusi has dwelt on this subject in his commentary *al Tibyan* and in support of this view, has quoted his master Alamul Huda Sayyid Murtadha, relating his extensive arguments. The great commentator, al Tabrasi, has lent credence to this view in the preface to his famous work *Majma-ul-Bayan*, and so has Shaikh Ja'far in his chapter on the Qur'an, from his book *Kashful Ghita*; wherein he claims a consensus on this view. Allamah Shahshahani in his book *Al Urwatul Wuthqa* says that the majority of mujtahids concur that there has been no Interpolation in the Qur'an; and Mulla Muhsin Kashani in his two worlds, *al-Wafi* and *Ilm-ul-Yaqin* reiterates the same view. We find this repeated by the great scholar Sheikh Muhammad Jawad al-Balaghi in the foreword to his *Tafsir Ala-ur-Rahman*.

Besides, many great scholars like Sheikh Mufid, Shaikh Bahai and Muhaqqiq Qadhi Nurullah are known to have been partisans of the view that there has been no tampering in the Qur'an. Even those great Shiah scholars who wrote on the subject of Imamatus, criticizing the factions which arose to usurp the rights of *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a), have not ascribed *Tahrif* to them. This is a very pertinent point, because had they subscribed to the view that the Qur'an had been profaned, they would have mentioned it with more candour than merely grieving about the burning up of the copies of the Qur'an or other similar matters.

To sum up, the general belief of Shiah *Ulama'* has been that the Qur'an is intact and pristine. Of course, there has been a small group of traditionalists, both among Shiahs and Sunnis, who held that the Qur'an has been tampered with. al-Rafai says: "A group of theologians used to hypothetical presumptions have subscribed to the view of *Tahrif*; those who have a habit of resorting to various methods of disputations in every word and in every law, have found it probable that something from the Qur'an may have been lost because of the way its collection has been described"[3]. In *Majma ul Bayan*, Tabrasi has ascribed this view to the group of *Hashawiyah* among Sunnis.

It will soon be evident from what follows that to confirm that the recitation of certain parts of the Qur'an had been abrogated is tantamount to believing in *Tahrif*. Those *Ulama'* of Ahlu-s*Sunnah* who declare such an abrogation are in reality declaring that some tampering has occurred in the Qur'an.

Notes:

Chapter 6

Abrogation of Recitation a Fact or a Myth

Most of the Sunni *Ulama'* have mentioned that the recitation of some parts of the Qur'an was abrogated, confirming at the same time, through the reports, that those abrogated parts were in the Qur'an during the days of the Prophet ('s). We will quote some of those reports here to prove that such a belief makes it necessary to also believe that an interpolation took place.

Tradition n. 1

(a) Ibn Abbas reports that Umar said while on the pulpit:

"God sent Muhammad ('s) with Truth, and sent down unto him the Book. And among that which was revealed was an ayah about rajm which we read, understood and heeded. And based on that, the Prophet ('s) stoned, and after him, we stoned. I fear that with the lapse of time, people may say: `we do not find the ayah of rajm in the book of God', and thus go astray by abandoning that which God has ordained. The ordinance of stoning was indeed prescribed for the adulterers in the book of GodAnd then, among verses we read, there was a verse which said[4]

or it was

And Suyuti has mentioned: Ibn Ashtah has reported from Layth b. Sa'ad, who said:

"The first person to collect the Qur'an was Abu Bakr and Zaid wrote it down ... And Umar came up with the ayah of rajm, but he did not record it because Umar was the sole reporter".[5]

This verse of *rajm* which Umar claimed to have been in the Qur'an, and was rejected, has been reported in several forms; among them are:

(i)

and (ii)

and (iii)

Whatever be the case, there is nothing in the Qur'an today which indicates the law of stoning the adulterers. And if the reports are to be considered true, then it follows that an *ayah* has definitely disappeared from the Qur'an.

Tradition n. 2

(b) Tabrani has reported with reliable chain of narration from Umar b. al-Khattab:

"The Qur'an had one million and twenty seven thousand letters".[6]

While the existing Qur'an does not have even one third of the number. So, one is led to believe that more than two-third of the Qur'an has been lost.

Tradition n. 3

(c) Ibn Abbas reports from Umar:

"God sent Muhammad ('s) with Truth and sent down unto him the Book. And among things revealed was an ayah of rajm. So the Prophet ('s) stoned and after him we stoned too". Then Umar added: "We used to recite[7]

or

Tradition n. 4

(d) Nafe' reports that Ibn Umar said:

"One of you might claim that he has taken the complete Qur'an, but what does he know of the Complete Qur'an? Much from the Qur'an has disappeared, so he should say: I have taken what has been traced"[8].

Tradition n. 5

(e) Urwah b. Zubair reports from Aisha:

"The Surah of al-Ahzab as read during the times of the Prophet ('s) comprised of two hundred verses. When Uthman prepared the codex, we did not get except what it has remained to be"[9].

Tradition n. 6

(f) Hamidah binti Anas says:

It was read before my father who was 80, from the codex of Aisha:

She says: `This was before Uthman changed the texts'.

Tradition n. 7

(g) Abu Harb b. Abil Aswad reports from his father:

"Abu Musa Al-Asha'ri sent for the Qura' (the reciters of Basrah), and three hundred men called upon him, who had all read the Qur'an. Then he said : `You are the best of the people of Basrah, and their reciters. Read the Qur'an constantly, otherwise, before too long, your heart may harden the way the hearts of your predecessors had hardened. We used to read a Surah which we compared, in length and severity, with the Surah of Bara'ah, but I have now forgotten it, except a verse which says:

And we used to read a Surah which we compared with one of the musabbihat (Surahs which begin with sabbaha or yusabbihu) but I have forgotten it except a verse I remember[10]:

Tradition n. 8

(h) Zarr says: Ubayy b. Ka'b told me, O Zarr: "How much of Surah of al Ahzab do you read?" I said: "Seventy three verses". He said: "though it was equal to the Surah of al Baqarah, or it was longer than that". [11]

Tradition n. 9

(i) Ibn Abi Dawud and Ibn Ambari report from Ibn Shihabi: "*We have been informed that much more of the Qur'an had been revealed - but those who knew it were killed at Yamamah. They had preserved it, and it was never known or written after them...*"[12]

Tradition n. 10

(j) Umrah reports from Aisha:

"Among that which was revealed in the Qur'an, is the following verse:

then it was abrogated to read

and they remained in the Qur'an till the Prophet ('s) died.[13]

Tradition n. 11

(k) Miswar b. Makhrumah reports: "*Umar inquired from Abdul Rahman b. Awf if he had found the following ayah in the Qur'an:*

Abdul Rahman answered that the ayah had disappeared along with the lost parts of the Qur'an.[14]

Tradition n. 12

(1) Abu Sufyan al-Kala'i says that Muslimah b. Mukhallad al-Ansari told them one day: "*Inform me about those two verses of the Qur'an which were never recorded*". None would answer, not even Abul Kanood, Sa'ad b. Malik who was there. Then Ibn Muslimah recited[15]:

And it has been narrated in various ways that the copies of Ibn Abbas and Ubayy b. Ka'ab contained two extra *Surahs*: Al-Khala' and Al-Hafd. It reads[16]:

It is now evident that to say that certain parts of the Qur'an have been excluded from recitation means to confirm interpolation and omission in the Qur'an.

This can be further explained this way. The abrogation of those recitations was either recommended by the Prophet ('s) himself, or it was done by those who came to power after the Prophet's death. If one says that the Prophet ('s) himself recommended it, then it is a claim which calls for substantiation.

All *Ulama'* are agreed upon the principle that the Qur'an cannot be superseded or abrogated by an isolate report - i.e. a tradition which has been reported singly. The jurists have made this abundantly clear in their works on the principles of jurisprudence. In fact, Shafi'i and many other scholars go further to say that the Book of God, (i.e. the Qur'an) cannot be superseded or abrogated by even those traditions which have reached continuity and acquired wide spread currency. This has been confirmed by Ahmed b. Hanbal in one of the two traditions reported by him. Even those who proposed that a continuous and widespread *Sunnah* may potentially supersede the Qur'an, have confirmed that such a situation has in reality never occurred. In view of the foregoing, it is incorrect to ascribe the abrogation to the Prophet ('s). Even those reports which mention the omissions clearly say that it occurred after the Prophet ('s).

But if it is proposed that the abrogation was perpetrated by those who assumed leadership after the Prophet ('s), then that indeed is tampering with the Qur'an. It can safely be asserted that the occurrence of *Tahrif* in the Qur'an is supported by the majority of Sunni *Ulama'*, because they believe that certain *ayahs* of the Qur'an were abrogated, in as far as their recitation was concerned, irrespective of whether the law contained in that *ayah* remained in force or not. Interestingly enough, we find certain scholars among them disputing whether a person in the state of *janabah* can recite those verses whose reading have been reportedly abrogated, or whether a person without *wudhu* would be permitted to touch the script of such a verse. Some of them have adopted a view that this would not be permissible. Yes, among the Mutazilites, there is a group which believes that an abrogation of recitation never occurred[17].

Is it not surprising to find Sunni *Ulama'* disputing the fact that some of them are supporters of *Tahrif*. Alusi has censured Al-Tabrasi of having falsely accused *Hashawiyah*. He wrote: "Not a single scholar among the Sunnis has ever supported that view". Then he proceeds to presume that Al-Tabrasi has been insisting on the absence of *Tahrif* to alleviate the harm done by some Shia scholars who believed to the contrary. All this makes a pathetic reading especially when it is well known that the Shiah scholars do not subscribe to *Tahrif* in the Qur'an, while Al-Tabrasi himself has extensively

quoted Sayyid Murtadha, enumerating all his arguments in support of the Qur'an's purity.

Notes:

[4]Sahih, Bukhariv8, p.26.; Sahih, Muslimv5, p.116, without the last sentence "And then, among verses"

[5]Al-Itqan, v1, p.101

[6]Al-Itqan, v1, p.121

[7]Musnad, Ahmed Hanbal, v1, p.48

[8]Al-Itqan, V. 2, p. 40-41

[9]Al-Itqan, V. 2, p. 40-41

[10]Sahih, Muslim v3, p.100

[11]Muntakhab Kanzul Ummal, on the margin of Musnad, Ahmad Hanbal v2, p.43

[12]Muntakhab Kanzul Ummal, on the margin of Musnad, Ahmad Hanbal v2, p.50

[13]Muslim, Sahih, v4, p.168

[14]al Itqan, v2, p.42

[15]al Itqan, v2, p.42

[16]al-Itqan, v1, p.122, 213

[17]Al-Ahkam fi Usul il Ahkam, Amedi v3 p.217

Chapter 7

Tahrif and the Book Itself

Considering the foregoing, the fact is that *Tahrif*, in the sense which has been a subject of disputation and contradictory opinions, has never occurred in the Qur'an. Here we give proofs from the Qur'an itself:

First, Allah says in the Qur'an:

"Surely, We have sent down the reminder, and We will most surely be its guardian". (Qur'an, 15:9)

This *ayah* adequately proves that the Qur'an has been guarded from all tampering, and that the profane hands shall have no wily access to it.

Some have tried to interpret this *ayah* differently, stating that (reminder) represents the Prophet ('s) as mentioned in the following verse:

"Allah has indeed revealed to you a reminder: An Apostle who recites to you the clear communications." (Qur'an, 65:10-11)

But this interpretation has many faults. The word "ذِكْرًا" has been used in the context of ((تنزيل-)) "sending down", and therefore, it befittingly applies to the Qur'an. Had it been for the Prophet, the appropriate word would have been ((الارسال)) (sending our or sending away) or something synonymous. And if we were to accept that represents the Prophet ('s) in the second *ayah*, it certainly does not in the first *ayah* wherein Allah guarantees the protection, because it preceded by the following *ayah*:

"And they say: O you to whom the reminder has been sent down! You are most surely insane". (Qur'an, 15:6)

This *ayah* undoubtedly refers to the Qur'an as **الذکر** and it becomes easy to deduce that **الذکر** occurring in the subsequent *ayah* has the same meaning.

Other interpreters have said that the preservation and protection promised by Allah refers to guarding the Qur'an against vilifications and protecting it from any repudiation of its teachings. This interpretation is also far-fetched, because if it was meant to be protected from vilification by the disbelievers, then the Qur'an has had enough of it from the enemies of Islam. And if it is held to mean that the teachings of the Qur'an are above any vilifications because of their majesty, sublimity and the inherent strength in the arguments, then this is true, but this kind of protection does not become necessary *after* the revelation. The inspiring quality of the Qur'an is self-protecting, needing no

further protection. The *ayah*, as you will observe, tells about protection **after** the revelation.

There is a third interpretation advanced by some which maintains that the guardianship promised in the *ayah* is related to the whole of the Qur'an as an entity, and does not apply to its individual verses and chapters. According to them, the Qur'an in its complete form is safe with the Twelfth Imam ('a) who is in concealment, and thus the promise has been fulfilled.

This interpretation is the most defective, because the Qur'an has to remain guarded for the benefit of the people, for whom it was revealed. To say that it is safe in the possession of the twelfth Imam ('a), the way it was fully entrenched in *lawhe mahfuz* or in the possession of an angel, is just like someone saying: "I am sending you a gift and I shall keep it in safe custody, or in the custody of my chosen one".

The suggestion that the guardianship is related to the Qur'an as a whole emanates from the presumption that the Qur'an is what exists among us in a book form, or what is on our tongues as a spoken word. This is not so, because a book or a word may not exist for ever. Actually, the Qur'an, or **الذکر** mentioned in the *ayah*, is that which was revealed to the Prophet ('s), and guarding it means warding off all possibilities of distortions, interpolations and tampering, and protecting it from being lost so as to ensure that people have access to it in full. When we say that a particular eulogy or poem is guarded, we mean the original has been preserved, and protected from being lost.

Yes, there is another doubt which could creep into the minds of those who insist on *Tahrif*. They would say that it is unfair to base an argument against *Tahrif* on this *ayah* because it is quite possible that the *ayah* itself might have been tampered with. So, in order to be able to rely on this *ayah* as a basis of our argument, we have to revert to proving that there has been no *Tahrif* in the Qur'an. Thus a vicious circle is formed.

This doubt is the result of alienating the *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a) from divine authority. Those who do not consider them an authority should find this argument irrefutable. As for those who believe that they are the authority divinely appointed, and that they are the rightful companions of the Book with whom we must acquiesce, for them there is no room for such a doubt. The fact that *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a) based all their deductions and conclusions on the Qur'an, and instructed their companions implicitly as well as explicitly to accept it, amply demonstrates that this Qur'an is an authority, even if it is claimed that *Tahrif* had occurred. Ultimately, the evidence from the Qur'an, against any interpolation having occurred, is based on their attestation.

The second proof from the Qur'an is:

"... and most surely, it is a mighty book. Falsehood shall not come to it from before it nor from behind it; a revelation from the Wise, the praised One". (Qur'an, 41:41-42)

This verse clearly indicates that the Book is free from all sorts of falsehood, and when this type of general negation occurs, it denotes totality. No doubt, *Tahrif* is a kind of falsehood and therefore it cannot find its way to the holy Book.

This submission has been opposed by some who maintain that the prevention of falsehood means the absence of any contradiction in its laws, and that its message is far from being untrue. They seek

support from Ali b. Ibrahim al-Qummi who has quoted this tradition in his *Tafsir* from Imam Muhammad al-Baqir ('a):

"No falsehood can be imputed to it from Torah, nor from injil or zabur; and nor from behind it, which means no book will ever come to render it false".

And they also quote another tradition from both Imam Muhammad al-Baqir and Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq ('a), recorded in *Majma ul Bayan*, which says:

"There is no falsehood in what it has reported of the past, nor in what it has conveyed of the future".

In reply I submit that these traditions do not in anyway confine the meaning of the word `falsehood' to any single interpretation, nor do they forbid us from accepting its general connotation. In the foregoing chapter on "The excellence of the Qur'an", I have cited many reports which indicate that the meanings of the Qur'an are not restricted. This *ayah* exempts the Qur'an from all falsehood at all times, and since interpolations and tampering are a type of falsehood, they are also precluded. A further evidence is provided by the *ayah* itself when it describes the Qur'an as a Mighty Book. The `might' is contained in its ability to fortify itself against all loss or changes. To restrict the meaning of falsehood to contradictions or falsehood within the book would not fully justify the use of the word **al-'izza**.

Chapter 8

Tahrif and Sunnah

The third proof is from the traditions of *thaqalayn*, two invaluable things left behind by the Prophet ('s), wherein he said that they would hold together till they arrive near him at the *Hawdh* (the pool of *Kawthar*) and he asked his followers to remain adhered and attached to them. These two things are the Qur'an and the *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a) (his true progeny). These traditions have been overwhelmingly reported by the accepted chains of narration from both the sects of Islam[18].

This tradition helps us establish the purity of the Qur'an from *Tahrif* in two ways. First, the adherence would not be practical nor conceivable if parts of the Qur'an were lost by way of interpolation or change. But as the tradition clearly sets out, the adherence is required of the ummah for ever, till the Day of Judgement. Therefore, *Tahrif* cannot be accepted to have occurred.

Further, these traditions show that the *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a) and the Qur'an will remain together, present among men till the Day of Judgement. It is therefore absolutely imperative that a person should exist whom Qur'an accompanies, and also, the Qur'an must exist to be in company with the *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a), till they reach the Prophet together at the *Hawdh*. And as the Prophet ('s) has said in this tradition, adherence to both of them would guard the Ummah from going astray.

Obviously, the adherence to *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a) is brought about by affinity to them, by following what they enjoin and refraining from what they forbid, and by walking on their guided path. It does not at all need a direct contact with the Imam or talking to him personally. In fact, such a contact is not possible for all Muslims even when an Imam is visibly present, to say nothing of the days of concealment. Those who insist on a contact of this nature do so without any reasonable argument. The Shiahs, for example, are adherents of their Imam in concealment ('a) by way of love for him, and by following his behests, which include following the *Ulama'* who carry their traditions, to guide in matters which are contingent or incidental.

As for adherence to the Qur'an, it is not possible without direct access to it, and therefore it is absolutely essential for it to be present among the Ummah for guidance and prevention from going astray. This explains why it is unnecessary to discuss about the guarded Qur'an being in possession of the Imam ('a) in concealment, because mere existence of the Qur'an is not enough for Ummah to be able to follow; it has got to be available.

It may be argued that the traditions of *Thaqalayn* indicate that only those verses of the Qur'an have remained unaltered which deal with the divine rules and laws, for they are the ones to be followed. They do not necessarily cover other parts which do not enunciate any laws.

They forget that the Qur'an is a book of guidance to men, as a whole, with all its verses, conducive

to perfection in all aspects of life. Thus there is no difference between the parts which contain the laws and the others. In the foregoing chapter on excellence of the Qur'an, we have explained how even those verses which apparently deal with the past history have morale and admonition in them. The basic issue of controversy has been the claim by some who say that the verse of *wilayah* and related subjects have been omitted. The answer is that if those had been proved to be parts of the Qur'an, then it would have been obligatory upon the Ummah to adhere to them as well.

The benefit of this tradition is that if interpolation, distortions, deformations, alteration or omissions are allowed in the Qur'an, then its authority lapses, and it would not be incumbent to follow the outward or literal texts of the Qur'an. In such circumstances, the believers *Tahrif* have no choice but to refer to *Ahl ul-Bayt ('a)* for getting the Qur'an certified as an authentic book, worthy of reference by the people, in spite of the tampering having occurred.

This means that the authority of the Qur'an primarily depends upon the sanction by *Ahl ul-Bayt ('a)*, or upon any one having two authorities for which the Prophet ('s) ordered adherence. But of these two, the Qur'an is greater and therefore its authority cannot be subservient to the ratification of a lesser authority, i.e. *Ahl ul-Bayt ('a)*. The reason why we say that the authority of the Qur'an would lapse if *Tahrif* is allowed is that because of such changes, there is every possibility that the postulations of the Qur'an had some contextual link with other qualifying parts which are lost.

An argument running counter to this maintains that it is not rational to anticipate a contradictory or qualifying part if it does not readily exist. One has to rely upon the literal text which is manifest and existing. We have ourselves explained in our discussions of the principles of jurisprudence that it is not rational to anticipate any context which is not syntactic or which does not appear immediately in the construction of a sentence. In fact, even those contexts, which are in the syntax, can be ignored if they have been caused by the carelessness of the speaker or negligence of the listeners.

But in this case, we maintain that this principle does not apply. Here, there are the believers in *Tahrif*, who say that something is lost, and therefore, reason will guide us to restrain from relying solely upon the existing literal text of the Qur'an. Let us say, for example, a scripture is found which instructs its followers to buy a house. Now if a follower found out that certain parts of the scripture have been ruined or missing, suspecting that those missing parts may have further specifications with regard to the size of a house to be bought, or its value or location, it would be quite rational for him to refrain from purchasing a house. He cannot take the existing text as complete, and if he bought a house he would not be sure that he has carried out the intended instruction of his Lord.

The reader may think that with this analogy, the whole foundation of *fiqh*, together with the system of deductions and inferences of the divine laws would collapse; because they depend chiefly on the traditions reported from *themasumin ('a)* (the Prophet ('s) and his pure progeny). And in these, there is a possibility that their saying may not have been reported with the qualifying contexts. But with little extra effort, this doubt can be allayed. In the case of the traditions, what is to be followed is the report of a narrator in its complete form. If there was any contextual evidence, he would include it in the narration. The absence of any contextual qualifications or contradictions in the tradition would simply mean that they did not exist.

It is now an established fact that belief in *Tahrif* necessarily means that the text of the Qur'an cannot be taken as an authority. Some people say that, before accepting this conclusion, one must at least

have a comprehensive knowledge about those *ayahs* in which any deficiency may have occurred. I maintain that this does not apply in the case of *Tahrif*, because comprehensive knowledge becomes credible only when its effect is seen in practice. Most of the verses of the Qur'an in which *Tahrif* is believed to have occurred do not deal with any laws, and therefore they would not be requiring this consideration.

There might be a claim that since the Imams of *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a) have based their guidance on the text of the Qur'an, and since their followers and companions have acquiesced to their directive, therefore the authority of the text of the Qur'an has been reinstated, even though it may have lapsed before due to *Tahrif*. This claim has no substance because the Imams of *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a) did not initiate the authority of the Qur'an. What they did was to confirm the authority of the Qur'an by instructing their followers to adhere to the scriptural text, giving full recognition to the Qur'an as an independent, autonomous authority.

Notes:

[18] *Musnad*, Hanbal, v3, p14,17,26,59 reported from Abu Saeed al-Khudri;v4, p.366,371 from Zaid b. Arqam.; v5, p.182, 189from Zaid b. Thabit.) Jalal-ud-din Suyuti in his *Jama'us Saghira* reported from Tabrani by Zaid b. Thabit, declaring it as authentic. Allamah al-Manawi in his commentary: v3, p15 wherein he reports al-Haythami having said: '**All the narrators are trustworthy**'. Abu Ya'la reported it with an unblemished chain of reporters, and Hafiz Abdul Aziz b. al-Akhdhar quoted this with an addition: This was said by the Prophet ('s) at the time of the last Hajj. He also castigated those like Ibn Jawzi who have classified this tradition as false. As-Samhudi says: *This is among those chapters wherein more than twenty companions of the Prophet ('s) have reported.* al-Hakim has reported in *al-Mustadrak* v3, p.109 from Zaid b. Arqam and has authenticated it. al-Dhahabi has not criticized it. The words in the actual traditions vary, but the meaning conveyed is constant.

Chapter 9

Permission to Recite the Surah in the Prayers

The fourth proof is contained in the directive of the Imams of *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a) to read a complete Surah in the first *two rak'ats* of every obligatory prayer, after the Surah of al Fatihah. And they allowed to divide a Surah or more in the case of *Salat ul ayat* (prayers which become incumbent due to natural phenomena like eclipses or earthquakes etc.), the details of which can be found in its place in *Fiqh*.

Obviously, these laws are established parts of Sheriah ever since the prayers became obligatory, and they were not prompted by *taqiyyah* or dissimulation. For those who hold that *Tahrif* or interpolation has taken place in the Qur'an, it is important that they do not recite those Surahs which they consider to have been tampered with, because restraint is the only sure alternative in the case of doubt. Their excuse that since a complete, unvaried Surah is not available, therefore they have to accept whatever is available, cannot be accepted because that would apply only if they believe that all the Surahs have been interpolated. Since there is a Surah, like Surah of *Ikhlas*, which has remained intact, they would have to resort to its recitation excluding the others.

The directive by the Imams of *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a) would not be of any help to them as any authority, because the very fact that the Imams have permitted and directed to read a complete Surah from the existing Qur'an indicates satisfactorily that there has been no *Tahrif* whatsoever. Otherwise, a Muslim unable to fulfil the, required condition of reciting a complete Surah after *al-Fatihah* would have to be exempted from the obligatory prayers. We find that the Imams have directed us to read the Surahs of *Ikhlas* and *Qadr*, recommended for every prayer. Since the question of *taqiyyah* was never relevant here, the recommendation and directive to read these two complete Surahs extends to all other Surahs of the Qur'an.

A pretext that the obligation to recite a complete *Surah* has been abrogated in the favour of reading whatever is currently available in the present Qur'an is unacceptable, and I do not think the believers in interpolation would seek refuge under it. The fact is that no abrogation of this type could have occurred after the Prophet ('s). Some scholars have hypothetically discussed the possibility or otherwise of such an abrogation, but we are not concerned with those hypotheses here.

In short, there is no doubt that the Imams of *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a) have directed to recite the Surahs from the Qur'an we have among us in the prayers. This ordinance has no room for *taqiyyah* either. One has to believe that this was also the established directive given by the Prophet ('s) himself. It could not be a later development because that would imply an abrogation - and no abrogation ever occurred after the Prophet ('s), in spite of the hypothetical possibility. When it is established beyond doubt that the ordinance of reciting complete Surahs existed in the days of the Prophet ('s), it follows that there has been no *Tahrif*. This is evidenced in every law of Shariah, and it has been successfully applied by

the *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('*a*) to their directive to recite a complete Surah or a complete *ayah*.

The Claim that Tahrif was caused by the Caliphs

Some hold that the interpolation, alteration, omission may have occurred after the death of the Prophet (‘s), perpetrated by the first two Caliphs or by Uthman when he came to power, or by someone of the later period. All these claims are invalid. If abu Bakr or Umar did it, then there can be two assumptions. They either did it unintentionally, because, as it is believed, the Qur’an was not available in its entirety as it had not yet been compiled. Or they did it intentionally. In any case, the verses in which they interfered by way of *Tahrif* would be those concerning their leadership or even others. In all, there are three considerations:

First, to say that they had no access to the whole of the Qur’an is totally out of question. The Prophet (‘s) had taken great pains to see that it was committed to memory, and was constantly recited, slowly and elegantly, and the companions had compiled during the Prophet's time and after his passing away. This makes us certain that the Qur’an was with them, well guarded, all in one place or at various places, in the hearts of people or noted down on the papers. They were the people who had proudly preserved the poems and speeches of the pre-Islamic era. How could they be expected to ignore the great Book whose laws they proclaimed, for which they had staked their lives, left their homes, spent their wealth, abandoned their families and children, and had taken a firm stand in the brilliant history of Islam. Can a reasonable person believe that they would be so indifferent so as to cause any loss of the Qur’an? A loss which could not be retrieved without the evidence of two witnesses? Is it not tantamount to believing that there has been an addition or an omission in the Qur’an which was revealed to the Prophet (‘s)?

Then there is the famous and widely acknowledged tradition of *thaqalayn* which invalidates all presumption, about *Tahrif*. The Prophet (‘s) said:

'I leave behind me two invaluable things: the Book of Allah and my Ahl ul-Bayt'.

This statement becomes meaningless if it is believed that the Qur’an had been lost during his time, because that which was lost would definitely be parts of the Book. In fact, this tradition points to the collection of the Qur’an during the Prophet's era; because scattered or memorised literature cannot be termed a book. We will deal with the subject of the collection of the Qur’an later. The question is that if the Muslims did not care to collect the Qur’an while the Prophet (‘s) lived, why did the Prophet (‘s) himself neglect it, in spite of his vehement emphasis on its importance? Did he not foresee the result of such carelessness? Or was it impossible for him to do so? Obviously, these are all invalid excuses.

If we were to propose that the first two Caliphs effected *Tahrif* in those verses which did not deal with their leadership, and the leadership of their friends, then this seems to be unlikely because it

serves no purpose. Definitely, this did not occur. The Caliphate was a political matter, ostensibly based on their concern for the religion, and as such there was no need for touching the Qur'an. Even those like Sa'ad b. Ubadah and his companions who objected to the rule of Abu Bakr, and those who refused to swear oath of allegiance to both of them, never accused the Caliphs of having tampered with the Qur'an. Did Ali b. Abi Talib ('a), in his famous discourse of *Shaqshaqiyyah* or elsewhere where he objected to Abu Bakr taking precedence over him, mention anything about the Caliphs effecting any changes in the Qur'an? It is not conceivable that the Muslims cited any such instance without us knowing about it. Therefore, this proposition cannot be true.

Finally, it is an indisputable fact that the two Caliphs did not cause any purposeful interpolation or omission of those verses which may have dealt adversely with their leadership. Ali b. Abi Talib ('a) along with his wife Fatimah Zahra ('a) and certain friends from the companions of the Prophet ('s) protested against the two Caliphs on matter of Caliphate, basing their objection on what they had heard from the Prophet ('s), presenting witnesses from among the Muhajirin and Ansar, and also on the famous tradition of *Al Ghadir* and others. In the book of *Al-Ihtijaj*, it is reported that twelve men protested against the Caliphate of Abu Bakr, quoting the text of what they said. Allamah Majlisi has set out a complete chapter on the subject of the objections by Ali b. Abi Talib in the matter of Caliphate[19].

Had there been anything in the Qur'an disparaging their leadership, they would have definitely quoted them in their protests, and so would all the Muslims. The Caliphate is a matter which came to transpire well before the so-called collection of the Qur'an. The silence of the companions on this subject, from the beginning till the end when Ali b. Abi Talib ('a) became the Caliph, is an indisputable evidence that such an interpolation or omission never occurred.

It is all the more difficult to accept that *Tahrif* was caused by Uthman, for the following reasons:

(a) Islam had gained a strong foothold by the time of Uthman, and was widely spread. It was not possible for Uthman to tamper with the Qur'an, nor for anyone else more influential and higher in status than him.

(b) If it were presumed that he tampered with the verses which had no bearing on the question of *wilayah* or the Caliphate of his predecessors, then it would be a futile exercise. And if he tampered with those verses which had such connections, then the Caliphate, in the first instance, would not have come to him, because the Qur'an would have guided the Muslims against him.

(c) His tampering with the Qur'an would have become a major and prominent reason for his assassination. There would have been no need to ascribe to Uthman other reasons like squandering the Baitul Mal of the Muslims unlike his predecessors, or other such reasons.

(d) It would have become incumbent upon Ali ('a) to restore to the Qur'an what had been interpolated or omitted, and to bring it up to date with the original as it existed during the time of the Prophet ('s) and the first two Caliphs. In so doing he could not have been censured. In fact, Ali ('a) could have advanced a convincing reason against those who accused him of having condoned the killing of Uthman, and sought revenge from him.

It is known that Ali ('a) returned all the lands to their rightful owners which had been wrongfully

granted to others by Uthman. In his sermon, he said:

"By God, if I were to find that some women were married by that wealth or some maidservants were owned by it, I would return it to their rightful owners. Whoever finds justice stifling, must find injustice and tyranny all the more so".[20]

This is what Ali ('a) said in respect of the wealth. One can easily imagine what his stand would be if he found out that the Qur'an was interpolated or tampered with. The fact that he accepted the Qur'an as it existed in his time is a convincing proof against any *Tahrif*.

No attempt at the interpolation of the Qur'an are known to have occurred after the era of the four Caliphs, except a report that Hajjaj omitted many verses from the Qur'an, which dealt disparagingly with the rule of the Umayyids, and also added to it some which were not there originally. Then he is alleged to have prepared a new codex for distribution in Egypt, Syria, Mecca, Medina, Basrah and Kufah. Thus, it is presumed that the present Qur'an is the one prepared by Hajjaj, who methodically destroyed all the previous copies, allowing not a single one to remain[21].

Obviously, this is a claim based on conjecture and it smacks of delirium. For Hajjaj was merely one of the generals in the Umayyid regime, with little influence and almost no ability to do the Qur'an any harm. In fact, he was incapable of effecting any change in the most elementary laws of Islam, not to speak of the Qur'an which is the foundation of our faith, and pillar of Islamic Laws. One wonders how he could influence any change in the Qur'an after it had gained currency in so many Muslim countries. Not a single historian or commentator has chronicled this change which because of its importance should not have escaped their notice. No contemporary Muslim ever objected to this, and even after his rule, the Muslims seem to have condoned this abominable act.

If at all it is believed that he managed to withdraw all the previous copies of the Qur'an, replacing it with his new codex, how could he eradicate it from the hearts of the Muslims who had committed it to memory, and whose great number is known by none but Allah? Had there been anything in the Qur'an which was uncomplimentary to the Umayyids, Muawiyah would have been the first to see it omitted because, compared to *Hajjaj*, he was more influential and powerful. Of course, if Muawiyah had done this, the companions of Ali ('a) would have argued with him, the way they did on many occasions, as recorded in the books of History, Hadith and Theology. As we said earlier, the pretence that the Qur'an has been tampered with has no substance whatsoever.

Notes:

[19]Bihar al anwar, Majlisi,v8, p.79

[20]Nahj al balaghah

[21]Manahilul Irfan p257

Some Doubts by those who believe in Tahrif

There are certain doubts which seem to lend some strength to those who believe in *Tahrif*. We must study them, and allay them one by one.

First Doubt

It is a fact that interpolation and omissions have occurred in Torah and Injil. According to the continuous traditions recorded by both, Shiah and Sunni, all that which occurred in the preceding era must recur in this Muslim Ummah as well. as-Saduq, for example, has recorded the following in his *al Ikmal* from Ghiyas b. Ibrahim who reports from Imam as-Sadiq ('a) through his forefathers:

"The Prophet ('s) said: *`All that was in the preceding peoples, must happen in this Ummah, in the wake of their footsteps, exactly identical'*"[22]

So, it follows that *Tahrif* must occur in the Qur'an also, otherwise this tradition would have no meaning.

This can be answered in many ways.

First, the tradition is not continuous or widely acknowledged one, as alleged. In fact, it is from amongst isolate reports. They have not been recorded in the four great books of Hadith, and as such there can be no comparison between the Qur'an and the Testaments on this point.

Secondly, if this argument is to be considered fully, then one has to accept that together with the omission, some addition has also occurred, just as in the Testaments. This, as we know, is evidently untrue.

Thirdly, many events which occurred among the foregoing peoples never occurred among the Muslims. For example, the worshipping of the calf, the stray wandering of Banu Israel for forty years, the drowning of Pharaoh and his people, the kingdom of Sulaiman over men and jinn, the rising of Jesus alive to the heaven, the death of Harun before Musa, though he was the Wasiy, the' great nine signs of Musa, the birth of Isa without father, the curse of transmutation from men to apes and pigs, and many such occurrences which we cannot all enumerate, have not occurred in this Ummah. The meaning of the tradition, therefore, has got to be construed differently from what it apparently conveys. What it actually means is that certain incidents occurring in this Ummah will have its corresponding counterpart in the ancient history. It does not mean that all of them must recur.

In the case of Qur'an, suffice it to say that the Muslims failed to adhere to the behests of the Qur'an, the same way as the preceding people failed to follow their scriptures, although the text of the Qur'an was preserved. We have already mentioned this sort of *Tahrif* earlier when we quoted a report. It is further stressed by a report by Abu-Waqid Al-Laysi who says: "When the Prophet ('s) advanced towards *Khaybar*, he passed by a tree which was revered by the idolaters. It was called *Dhatu Anwat*, upon which they suspended their weapons.

The companions urged the Prophet ('s): *`O Messenger of Allah, let us have a tree like the one they have'*. The Prophet ('s) said:

"Glory be to Allah! This is like what they had asked Musa when they said: `Let us have a god like the one they have'. By God, you are going to follow in the wake of the people before you". [23]

This tradition clarifies that certain events in this Ummah will bear resemblance of what transpired in the preceding Ummah, in some way.

Lastly, if we were to accept that the tradition is authentic and also continuous, it does not in any way prove that *Tahrif* would occur in the past, or in the early days of Islam. There is nothing to indicate that the occurrence is confined to those days. The Qur'an is for ever, and as evidenced by al-Bukhari, it will remain till the Day of Judgement. So they should expect *Tahrif* to occur at any time, even in the future. Why should they speak of *Tahrif* in the prime of Islam or at the time of the Caliphs only?

Second Doubt

Imam Ali ('a) had a codex of his own, other than the existing one. He brought it to the people, but they did not accept it from him. His codex contained certain sections which are not to be found in the Qur'an we have, and so it proves that the present Qur'an is lesser than the one Imam Ali ('a) had collected. This then is the *Tahrif* which is said to have occurred. It is supported by many traditions, like a tradition where Ali ('a) is reported to have argued with a group of Muhajirin and Ansar:

"O Talha, every ayah that was revealed to the Prophet ('s) by Allah is with me, dictated by the Prophet ('s) and in my handwriting. And an explanation to every ayah in respect of that which is permissible, forbidden, penal code, laws or things of which this ummah may stand in need till the dawn of qiyamah. They are with me dictated by the Prophet ('s) and written in my own hand, even the blood money required to compensate a scratch".[24]

Again, there is another tradition in which Ali ('a) is reported to have told an atheist while arguing with him that his codex

"..... was a complete Book containing all the revelation and all the interpretations, all clear, canonical verses and those requiring elucidations, the abrogants and those abrogated. In short, every letter from Alif to Lam was there. But they did not accept it".[25]

Another tradition is in *al-Kafi* where the author narrates it with the chain of reporters ending up with Jabir who reports from Imam Mohammad Baqir ('a):

"No one can claim that he has a complete Qur'an with him, its exterior and its interior, except the successors of the Prophet ('s) (i.e. al-awsiya)."[26]

And further, a report from Jabir says:

"I heard Abu-Ja'far ('a) (i.e. Imam Mohammad Baqir ('a), say that whoever claims to have collected the total Qur'an as it was revealed is indeed a liar. None has collected and preserved it in the way it was revealed by Allah except Ali b. Abi Talib ('a) and the Imams ('a) after him".[27]

The answer to all this is very simple. The codex prepared by Ali ('a) differed from the existing Qur'an in the arrangement and order of the *Surahs*. This is beyond any doubt, and has been accepted by the great scholars to an extent that we do not have to go to any length to prove it. Similarly, if we were to accept that the contents of his copy were more than the contents of this Qur'an, there is no evidence to prove that the addition found in his copy belonged to the text of the Qur'an. The truth is that those additions were by way of interpretation, explaining the original intention of the revelation. Or, even if they formed a part of what was revealed by Allah, they came as interpretation, indicating the true meaning.

In fact, this doubt originates from the meaning given to the two words: *tanzil* and *tawil* by the later scholars, in that they construe *tanzil* as that which was sent down as the Qur'an, and '*tawil*' as that which is supposed to be the true meaning or interpretation of the word, a meaning which may differ from the immediate sense of the word. But these interpretations. have been fabricated, because they

are not in any way supported by the language nor are they in any way indicated by the authentic traditions of *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a).

In Grammar, *tawil* is an infinitive deriving from *al-awl* which means "to refer to" or "to return to". It is also used to mean "the end result" or "the consequence" and also "that to which the matter eventually resorts". Based on these, we find them used in the following *ayahs*.

"And teach you the interpretation of the stories". (Qur'an, 12:6)

"Tell us the meaning thereof". (Qur'an, 12:36)

"This is the meaning of my vision". (Qur'an, 12:100)

"That is the meaning of things over which you were unable to hold patience". (Qur'an, 18:72)

And it has been similarly used at several other places in the Qur'an, where *tawil* means an event or a fact to which the speech is related, or its consequence, regardless of whether it is clearly understood by those who know Arabic, or whether it has a hidden meaning not known by anyone except those endowed with profound knowledge.

Similarly, *tanzil* is an infinitive deriving from *an-nuzul*, meaning that which was sent down. In the Qur'an, we find this use in many verses:

"This is indeed A Qur'an, most honourable, In a Book well-guarded, which none shall touch but those who are clean, Sent down from the Lord of the Worlds". (Qur'an, 56:77-80)

As stated earlier, it is not correct to presume that every revelation was a part of the Qur'an. The tradition which states that Ali's ('a) codex had some additions of *tanzil* and *tawil*, does not have any indication that those additions were parts of the Qur'an. This is why we find in certain reports that his codex had clear mention of the names of the hypocrites. This evidently was in the form of elucidation; because we have proved beyond doubt that no omission or addition ever took place in the Qur'an. Moreover the Prophet ('s) in his bid to win over the hearts of the hypocrites, always treated his knowledge about their hypocrisy secretly. It is known to every student of history that the Prophet ('s) displayed utmost patience when dealing with them; therefore it is inconceivable that their names would appear in the Qur'an. If it did, it would mean that the Prophet ('s) was indirectly forcing the hypocrites to curse themselves through the Qur'an openly, and also the Muslims to do the same against the named hypocrites. Could this be possibly accepted without looking into the credibility of the report, or by simply accepting those traditions which mention that the names were there in the codex prepared by Ali ('a)? Of course, there can be no comparison with Abu Lahab who was openly cursed in the Qur'an because of his defiance and because the Prophet ('s) knew that he would die an unbeliever. It is quite possible though, that the Prophet ('s) revealed the names of the hypocrites to his confidante like Ali ('a) in the exclusive sittings.

To summarise, even if it were accepted as true that Ali's ('a) codex contained those additions, they were not the part of the text of the Qur'an, nor were they intended for the Prophet ('s) to reveal to his people. The argument of those who conclude otherwise is incompatible with all the aforementioned proofs advanced against *Tahrif*:

Third Doubt

It is said that there are some widely reported and continuous reports from the *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a) which indicate the tampering having occurred.

The fact is that there is no indication in those reports to prove *Tahrif* in the sense which has been a subject of debate. Again, most of them are weak, reported from the book by Ahmed b. Muhammad As-Sayari who has been acknowledged by all scholars of *rijal* as one of corrupt beliefs, like that he believed in reincarnation. Some of them are taken from Ali b. Ahmed al-Kufi who has been described by the scholars of *rijal* as "*kadhab*" a liar; and that his beliefs were corrupt. Of course, the abundance of certain reports from Masumin (peace be upon them) gives us enough reason to presume that they have been correctly attributed. Among them are traditions which have been reliably reported, and therefore we do not see any need to go into the details of their authenticity.

Notes:

[22]Bihar al anwar, v8, p.4, and there are other sunni sources also.

[23]Sunan, Tirmidhi, v9, p.26

[24]Muqaddimah, Tafsir al burhan, p.28. This tradition also clarifies that the present Qur'an has no addition.

[25]6th Muqaddimah, Tafsir as Safi, p.2

[26]al Wafi, v2, kitab al hujjah, chapter 76, p.130[27]al Wafi, v2, kitab al hujjah, chapter 76, p.130

The Traditions about Tahrif

It is imperative to investigate the correct interpretations of these reports and to clarify that they have different applications. The reports are of various types, and we must explain and comment on each type specifically.

The first type: These are traditions which speak of *Tahrif* in its literal meaning. They are twenty in all but we would confine ourselves to some, leaving out those which are repetitive.

Tradition n. 1

1. Reported by Ali b. Ibrahim al-Qummi, with his own chain of narrators from Abu Dharr: "When this *ayah* was revealed:

the Prophet ('s) said:

"My people will come to me on the Day of Judgment under five banners". Then it mentions that the Prophet ('s) will ask them about their dealings with *thaqalayn* (i.e. the Qur'an and Ahl ul-Bayt). The people of the first banner will say: "As for the greater one (i.e. the Qur'an), we tampered with it, and discarded it. And the smaller one, (i.e. Ahl ul-Bayt) we offended it, hated it and dealt with it unjustly". The second group will say: "As for the greater one, we tampered with it, tore it into pieces, and turned hostile to it. And the smaller one, we offended it and fought against it"

Tradition n. 2

2. Reported by Ibn Ta'us and Sayyid al-Muhaddith al Jaza'ari with their chains of narrators from Hasan bin al-Hasan As Samarri, a lengthy tradition in which the Prophet ('s) spoke to Hudhaifa about one who would desecrate the *haram*,

"He will lead people astray from the path of Allah, tamper with His Book and change my Sunnah".

Tradition n. 3

3. Reported by Sa'ad b. Abdillah al-Qummi with his chain of narrators from Jabir al Jufi' who reported from Abu Ja'far (Imam Muhammad Baqir ('a)).

"The Prophet ('s) called people to assemble at Mina and announced: "O people! I leave behind two invaluable things; you will not go astray as long as you adhere to them: the Book of Allah, and my Ahl ul-Bayt - and Ka'ba, the sacred House of God". Then Abu Ja'far ('a) said: "As for the Book of Allah, they tampered with it, and Ka'ba, they demolished, and the Ahl ul-Bayt they massacred. They discarded every trust of God deposited with them, and dissociated themselves from it".

Tradition n. 4

4. Reported by as Saduq in "*al-Khisaal*" with his chain of narrators from Jabir who reported from the Prophet (‘s):

"On the Day of Judgement, three shall rise to complain: the Qur’an, the Mosque and the Ahl ul-Bayt. The Qur’an will say: "O Allah, they tampered with me, and they tore me apart. The Mosque will say: "O Allah, they left me idle, and they ruined me. And the Ahl ul-Bayt will say: "O Allah, they killed us, they discarded us and they drove us away."

Tradition n. 5

5. Reported in *al-Kafi* and by as-Saduq with their chains of narrators from Ali b. Suwaid:

"I wrote a letter to Abul Hasan Musa ('a) (i.e. Imam Musa b. Ja'far al-Kadhim) - when he was in prison". Then he proceeds to quote fully his reply in which he said: "They were entrusted with the Book of Allah, but they tampered with it and changed it"

Tradition n. 6

6. Reported by Ibn Shahr Ashub with his chain of reporters from Abdullah who quoted the sermon of Imam Husayn ('a) on the day of *Ashura*. In it, it is mentioned:

"Surely, you are the despots of the Ummah, a strange lot, insubordinate to the Book, inspired by Satan, league of sinners and corrupters of the Book".

Tradition n. 7

7. Reported in *Kamiluz Ziyarat* by its chain of narrators from Hasan b. Atiyyah who reports from Abu Abdillah (Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq ('a)):

"When you enter al-Haer (in the shrine of Imam Husayn ('a)) say: "O Allah, curse those who disbelieved in your prophets, desecrated your Ka'bah, and tampered with your Book ."

Tradition n. 8

8. Reported from al Hajjal who reports from Qatbah b. Maimun who reports from Abdul A'ala:

"Abu Abdillah ('a) said: The scholars of Arabic language displace the words of Allah, Most High, from their rightful places".

True Meaning of the Traditions

It is abundantly clear from the last report quoted above that the word *Tahrif* (displacing the words of Allah from their rightful places) denotes the variations brought about by the *qaris* who most of the time based their mode of recitations on their own opinions. We have made it plain from the very outset that such a tampering has definitely occurred, where a particular *Qari* has read a particular word differently though without effecting any change in the original text or its essence. Whether we subscribe to the so called, seven modes of recitations or not, there is no doubt that such a tampering took place. In fact, there are many renderings, each based on the reader's guess and conjecture, which have changed the pronunciations and the recitations. In any case, this report does not support the view of *Tahrif* as the alteration, addition, omission or interpolation in the Qur'an.

The remaining traditions clearly point out that the word *Tahrif* used in them mean the misinterpretation of the verses. One of the results was that the excellence of *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a) was denied, and hostility towards them encouraged. This is further supported by the sermon of Imam Husayn ('a) quoted above when those who were gathered to kill him are described as perpetrators of *Tahrif*.

In the tradition reported from *al-Kafi*, Imam Muhammad al Baqir ('a) says:

"And one of the examples of their repudiation of the Book is that while they upheld the words they distorted its injunctions".

Well, we have repeatedly said that *Tahrif* in this fashion has indisputably occurred in relation to the Qur'an. Had it not been so, the rights of *Ahl ul-Bayt* ('a) would have remained protected, and the reverence for them by the Prophet ('s) would have been honoured. The events would not have taken the tragic turn the way they did, resulting in the usurpation of their rights and in the Prophet's inconsolable grief.

The second type of traditions are those which state that the names of aimma (Imams) had originally appeared in certain verses of the Qur'an. These are quite a few. Among them is a report in *al-Kafi* by its own chain of narrators from Muhammad b. Fudhail that Abul Hasan (Imam Ali b. Musa Ridha ('a))said:

"The wilayah of Ali b. Abi Talib found mention in every book of the Prophets. No Prophet was sent without a covenant of Muhammad's ('s) prophethood and his rightful successor's wilayah, peace be upon them and their progeny"

And there is a report by al-Ayyashi with his chain of reporters from as-Sadiq ('a);

"If the Qur'an were to be read the way it was revealed, we would be found therein by our names".

Further reports of this nature are in *al-Kafi*, tafsir of Al-Ayyashi, reporting from Abu Ja'far ('a) and again in *Kanzul Fawaid* with its several chains of reporters from Ibn Abbas, and also in tafsir of Furat b. Ibrahim al Kafi with its own chain of narrators. It reports from Asbagh b. Nubatah having heard from Amirul Mu'mineen (Ali b. Abi Talib ('a))

"The Qur'an was revealed in four quarters: a quarter about us, a quarter about our adversaries, a quarter about traditions and parables, a quarter about the obligations and the laws. Ours was the most vital part of the Qur'an".

And *al-Kafi* has also reported with its own chain of reporters from Abu Ja'far (Imam Muhammad al-Baqir ('a))

"Jibra'ill came with this *ayah* to Muhammad in this way:

In reply to all these, we have clarified earlier that some parts of the revelations to the Prophet did not constitute the Qur'an; they were elucidatory. The reports which say that certain verses contained the names of Aemma ('a) could be such elucidatory additions. But if this interpretation does not seem plausible or probable, then the reports must be totally rejected as false and fabricated, because they would be deemed to be against the Qur'an, the traditions, and the aforementioned evidence which disprove *Tahrif*. There are acknowledged and continuous authentic reports which direct us to discard and reject all those reports which contradict the Qur'an.

One of the most convincing proofs that the name of Amir al Mu'minin ('a) was never openly mentioned in the Qur'an is the tradition of al-Ghadir. On that occasion, the Prophet ('s), as commanded by Allah appointed Ali after a revelation which placed great emphasis on it, and promised the Prophet ('s) that he would be guarded from evil men. If Ali's name had been openly there in the Qur'an, there would have been no need to declare an appointment, nor would it be necessary to make an elaborate arrangement for Muslims to assemble, or for Allah to assuage his fear that the declaration could cause him any harm.

The authenticity of *Ghadir* is enough to prove that these reports about the names of Aemma ('a) in the Qur'an are untrue; especially so because the event of *Ghadir* occurred in the farewell Hajj of the Prophet ('s) during his last days. By that time, most of the Qur'an had been revealed and had gained currency among the Muslim populace.

Moreover, the last report from *al-Kafi* seems to be highly improbable by its very contents. The abrupt mention of Ali where Allah wishes to prove the truth about Muhammad ('s) by presenting the challenge of Qur'as an inimitable Book, seems quite irrelevant.

All these reports are rendered useless and invalid by one authentic tradition from Abu Abdillah, Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq ('a) reported by *al-Kafi* from Abu Basir. He says: "I asked Abu Abdillah ('a) about the *ayah*:

He said the verse was revealed for Ali b. Abi Talib, Hasan and Husayn (peace be upon them)".

I said: "People ask why the names of Ali and his family are not mentioned in the Book of Allah". He answered:

"Tell them that the Prophet ('s) received the revelation for Salat, but Allah never specified the number of raka'ats as three or four. It was the Prophet ('s) who made its meaning manifest for them"

This authentic tradition decides the merit of all those reports and clarifies their possible meaning: the name of Amir al Muminin ('a) in those revelations could be just an elucidation, not to be imparted as a part of the Qur'an. Besides, those who refused to swear oath of allegiance for Abu Bakr never substantiated their argument by saying that Ali had been mentioned in the Qur'an. No doubt, had it been so, this would have been their strongest stand. And let us not forget that the collection of the Qur'an, as believed by those who argue against us, saw its completion soon after the question of khilafah was decided. All these are pointers to the fact that the names were never included in the verses.

The third type of reports are those which mention that there have been some additions or omissions in the Qur'an, and that, after the Prophet's death, people replaced some words in the Qur'an with the others.

Ali b. Ibrahim al-Qummi has reported with his chain of narrators from Hurayz who says: "Abu Abdillah ('a) read this *ayah* as:

Al-Ayyashi reports from Hisham b. Salim:

"I asked Abu Abdillah ('a) about this *ayah*:

He said: "It is آل عمران . They have changed one name for the other. They have substituted آل محمد for آل ابراهيم ."

Besides the weakness and unreliability of the reporters, these reports are all unacceptable and false because they are against the Qur'an, the *Sunnah* and the consensus of Muslims who hold that there has not been an addition of even one letter in the Qur'an. Even those who advocate *Tahrif* do **not** believe that there has been any addition. A group of *Ulama'* have claimed a consensus on the fact that there has been no addition to the Qur'an and that which exists between the two covers is nothing but the Qur'an. Among them are Sheikh Mufid, Sheikh Tusi, Sheikh Bahai and other great *Ulama'*, may He bless them. And we have quoted earlier from *al-Ihtijaj* which also reiterates that there has been no addition.

The fourth type of reports claim that there has occurred *Tahrif* in the Qur'an by way of omission only. To them we say that they have to interpret such reports the same way as those concerning the elucidatory additions in the codex prepared by Amir al Mominin ('a). And if that sounds improbable, then the reports must be rejected as false because they are against the Qur'an and the *Sunnah*. Most of the reports in this vein are weak, while falsehood of some of them is evident from their content. The *Ulama'* have therefore guided us to either subject them to interpretations or reject them altogether.

Muhaqqiq Al-Kalbasi has said: "All those reports which speak of *Tahrif* are against the consensus of Ummah and therefore unreliable - except for those who do not rely upon the consensus". And then he proceeds to say: "The belief in any omission having occurred in the Qur'an is baseless. Had it been true, it would have become popular and acknowledged, because such an important occurrence could not pass unnoticed".

The commentator of *al-Wafiyah*, Muhaqqiq al-Baghdadi, has further clarified this by quoting from Muhaqqiq al-Karaki who had written a complete tract on the subject. He says:

"The reports which speak of omissions must either be interpreted or rejected. Any tradition which is contradictory to the Qur'an, the acknowledged sunnah and the consensus, must be discarded if it has no room for interpretation or other justifications.

I say: Muhaqqiq al-Karaki has pointed towards what we have said earlier, about the clear directive from authentic traditions regarding the rejection of all those reports which are in disagreement with the Qur'an."

Among those traditions is the one reported by Sheikh as Saduq Muhammad b. Ali b. Husayn with his reliable chain of narrators from as-Sadiq ('a):

"To exercise restraint when in doubt is better than rushing into a jeopardy. Upon every truth there is divine light. Accept that which conforms with the Book of Allah, and leave aside that which goes against it[28]

And Sheikh Saeed b. Hibatullah, al Qutb ar-Rawandi, has reported with his authentic chain of narrators from as-Sadiq ('a),

"when you come across two opposing reports, expose them before the Book of Allah. Accept that which conforms with the Book of Allah and reject that which goes against it." [29]

The Fourth Doubt

This emanates from the way the collection of the Qur'an is described, making it possible for one to assume that Tahrif was inevitable. We now proceed to another chapter on this, so that this doubt is also allayed.

Notes:

[28]Al- Wasail Vol 3.

[29]Al- Wasail Vol 3.

A Reflection on the Collection of the Holy Qur'an

The question how the Qur'an was collected into a book form is among those topics which has led some to believe in interpolation or tampering having occurred in the Qur'an. The process, as generally described, makes such changes appear inevitable.

It was therefore necessary to attend to this discussion with a view to establishing that no interpolation, alterations or omissions have occurred in the Qur'an.

Actually, the pristine quality of the Qur'an became doubtful because it was believed that Abu Bakr ordered its compilation after 70 reciters of the Qur'an were killed in the battle of Bir Maunah, and four hundred in the battle of Yamamah. Fearing that the Qur'an would be lost and forgotten by the believers, Umar and Zaid b. Thabit undertook the task of collection from scripts found on palm branches, pieces of cloth and covers, and also from the memory of the Muslims, provided that two witnesses gave testimony that it was from the Qur'an. There are several reports which indicate that such an exercise was indeed carried out. When a compiler is not infallible, one can safely expect an element of error to creep in. Those who compile the widely scattered poems of one single poet could give you various versions of the couplets. These variations are usual, leading finally to the belief that some tampering has occurred. It is quite possible that someone, in spite of having actually heard the Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) recite verses from the Qur'an, did not venture to present them because he could not provide two witnesses. Thus, an omission becomes quite probable.

The answer to this is that the doubt becomes valid only if the reports about compilation of Qur'an are deemed credible. So, it is imperative that we mention those reports and analyse them critically.

Part 1
**The Traditions about the Compilation of the
Qur'an**

Report n. 1

1. Zaid b. Thabit says:

"Abu Bakr sent for me after the battle of Yamamah, and I found Umar also present. Abu Bakr said: `Umar has come to tell me that the day of Yamamah has been hard for the reciters of the Qur'an, and he fears that other such occasions may be harder still, resulting in the loss of greater part of the Qur'an. He says I must give orders for compilation of the Qur'an. I told Umar that how could he do a thing which the Messenger of Allah did not do? Umar said: "But this, by God, is desirable". And Umar has been referring this matter to me persistently, till at last Allah opened up my chest for that undertaking, and I began to hold the same view as Umar's.

Zaid says:

"Abu Bakr said: `You are a young intelligent man, and we find no fault in you. You were also a scribe, writing down the revelations for the Messenger of Allah. So attend to the Qur'an, and compile it'. By God, if they had entrusted me with removing a mountain from among the mountains, the task would not have been heavier for me than that of collecting and compiling the Qur'an. I asked: `Why do you undertake something the Prophet himself never did?' He answered: `By God, this is desirable'. And then Abu Bakr never left me without reminders, till Allah opened up my chest, the way He did for Abu Bakr and Umar, and I attended to the work, compiling the Qur'an from palm-branches, pieces of cloth, and from the memory of the people, till I found the last part of Surah al-Tawbah with Abu Khuzaimah Al Ansari, which no one else had.

till the end of Bara'ah. These compiled pages were with Abu Bakr till he died, then with Umar in his lifetime, and then with Hafsa, daughter of Umar".[30]

Report n. 2

2. Ibn Shihab reports from Anas b. Malik:

“When Huzaifah b. al-Yaman, with the Iraqis, was fighting the people of Syria, in the conquest of Armenia and Azerbaijan, he once came to Uthman and expressed his fears about variations in the recitations of Qur'an. Huzaifa told Uthman: `O master of the faithfuls! Come to the rescue of this ummah, before it is entangled into disagreements about the Book, the same way as Christians and Jews have been.

`Uthman sent a message to Hafsa asking her to submit the notes of Qur'an she held so that they could be copied into books, promising that they would be returned to her care and trust. Hafsa submitted the notes to Uthman who ordered Zaid b. Thabit, Abdullah b. az-Zubair, Saeed b. al-Aas, Abdur Rahman b. al-Harth b. Hisham, to transcribe. And Uthman told the group of three Qureishites: `If you differ with Zaid b. Thabit on any parts of the Qur'an, write down according to the dialect of Qureish, because it has come down in their dialect'.

`So they did the work, and when they had transcribed the notes into the books, Uthman returned the notes to Hafsa. Then he sent a copy to every place, ordering that all other versions of the Qur'an, found in pages or books must be set on fire'.

Ibn Shihab says:

"Kharijah b. Zaid b. Thabit informed me that he heard Zaid b. Thabit report the following: `When we were copying the notes, I found that an ayah from the Surah Al-Ahzab was missing. It was an ayah I had been hearing the Messenger of Allah himself recite. So we went in search of it, and found it with Khuzaimah b. Thabit al-Ansari:

and we added it to its Surah in the book.[31]

Report n. 3

3. Ibn Abi Shaybah, on his own chain , of authorities, reports from Ali:

"Abu Bakr deserves the best reward for the copies of Qur'an, for he was the first one to compile what exists between the two covers".

Report n. 4

4. Ibn Shihab reports from Salim b. Abdillah and Kharijah:

"Abu Bakr had compiled the Qur'an in some papers, and then asked Zaid b. Thabit to go through them. Zaid refused, till Abu Bakr asked Umar to intervene. So Zaid agreed. These books were with Abu Bakr till he died, then with Umar till he died, and thereafter with Hafsa, the Prophet's wife. When Uthman sent for them, she refused to part with them, till he pledged that they would be returned to her. Then she gave them. Uthman transcribed them into the books, and returned the original to Hafsa with whom they remained."

Report n. 5

5. Hisham b. Urwah reports from his father, who said:

"When the participants of Yamamah were killed, Abu Bakr ordered Umar b. al-Khattab and Zaid b. Thabit: `Sit at the door of the Mosque, and when anyone brings something from the Qur'an which you suspect, write it down if it is witnessed by two men'. This is because those companions of the Prophet ('s) who had compiled the Qur'an had been killed at Yamamah".

Report n. 6

6. Muhammad b. Sheen says:

"Umar got killed, without having compiled the Qur'an".

Report n. 7

7. Al-Hasan says:

"Once Umar b. al-Khattab inquired about a verse in the Qur'an. Someone said: "It was with so and so, but he was killed on the day of Yamamah".

Umar replied: "To Allah we belong!" Then he ordered the compilation of the Qur'an. So he was the first to compile it into a book form".

Report n. 8

8. Yahya b. Abdir Rehman b. Hatib says:

"Umar wished to compile the Qur'an, so he stood among the people and said: Anyone from you who had heard part of the Qur'an from the Messenger of Allah, should come to us with it'. They had written down parts of the Qur'an on pages, boards and palm-branches. Umar did not accept anything unless it was supported by two witnesses. He was killed while the compilation continued.

Then Uthman took over. He said: `Anyone who has something of the Qur'an with him should bring to us'. And he never accepted anything without having two witnesses. Then Khuzaimah b. Thabit came to him and said: "I find that you have left out two verses which you have not recorded". They asked: "Which are they"? He said: "I have received from the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him and his progeny):

till the end of the Surah. So Uthman said: "And I bear witness that these two verses are from Allah. Now, tell us where do you want us to place them?" Khuzaimah said: "Place them at the end of what was last revealed of the Qur'an". So Baraah was ended with them".

Report n. 9

9. Ubaid b. Umair said:

"Umar never recorded any verse in the compilation till it was witnessed by two men. Then a man from Ansar brought to him these two verses:

till its end. Umar said: I shall never ask you to substantiate these. The Messenger of Allah was indeed like that'[32]

Report n. 10

10. Sulaiman b. Arqam reports from Al-Hasan and Ibn Sirin and Ibn Shihab Az-Zuhri. They said:

"In the battle of Yamamah, massacre spread among reciters of the Qur'an, killing four hundred men. Then Zaid b. Thabit met Umar b. al-Khattab and told him: `This Qur'an binds us to our faith. If Qur'an vanishes, our faith vanishes also. I have decided to compile the Qur'an in a book form'. Umar asked him to withhold till he had consulted Abu Bakr. They went to Abu Bakr and informed him about the intention. He said: `Do not make haste. Wait till I have consulted the Muslims'. Then he stood to address the people and informed them about the intention. They said: "You have made the right decision". So they compiled the Qur'an. Then Abu Bakr ordered a herald to announce among people: "Whoever has any part of the Qur'an with him should come up with it".

Report n. 11

11. Khuzaimah b. Thabit reports:

"I brought the following ayah to Umar b. al-Khattab and Zaid b. Thabit:

Zaid asked: "Who bears witness with you?" I said: "No. I do not know anyone". So Umar said: "I bear witness with him for the ayah".

Report n. 12

12. Abu Ishaq reports from some of his friends. They said:

"When Umar had completed the collection of the Qur'an, he inquired: "Who is most well versed in Arabic?" They said: "Saeed b. al-Aas". Then he asked: "Who is most proficient writer?" They said: "Zaid b. Thabit". He said: "Then Saeed should dictate and Zaid should write down". So they transcribed four copies of the Qur'an. A copy each was sent to Kufah, Basrah, Syria and Hijaz".

Report n. 13

13. Abdullah b. Fadhalah says:

"When Umar decided to write down the master copy of the Qur'an, he appointed a group of his companions for it and they said: "When you have any disagreement over the language, write it down in the dialect of Mudhar. Because Qur'an came down to a man from the family of Mudhar".

Report n. 14

14. And Abu Qalabah said:

"In the days of Uthman's caliphate, a tutor would teach recitation according to a particular person, while another would teach recitation according to another person; so when the boys (students) met, they disagreed about each other's recitations. This finally came to the attention of the tutors who labelled each other's recitations as profane.

When Uthman learnt about this, he stood up to address the people and said:

"If you who are near me have so much of disagreements and confusion, then those who are farther away must have worse differences and errors. So, O Companions of Muhammad, join hands to write down a master copy of the Qur'an".

Abu Qalabah says:

Malik b. Anas told me: (According to Abu Bakr b. abi Dawud this Malik b. Anas is the grandfather of the known Malik b. Anas) "I was among those to whom the copy was dictated. So whenever there was any disagreement about an ayah, they would try to remember somebody who had heard it from the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him and his progeny). And if he was away, or lived in the deserts, they would write the preceding and the following words, leaving the disputed part till the person they wanted to refer to appeared, or was sent for. When the copy was finally ready, Uthman wrote to all the towns saying: "I have done this way, and have struck off what I had, so you strike off what you have"

Report n. 15

15. Masa'b b. Sa'ad reported:

"Uthman stood to address the people and said: 'O people, you are only thirteen years away from the era of the Prophet ('s) and have already begun to dispute about the Qur'an. Some of you talk of the recitation by Ubayy, while others quote the recitation by Abdullah. And one tells the other that his recitation has no value. So I command everyone who has any part of the Qur'an with him to come up with it'. Then people started coming with the Qur'an written on pieces of papers and patches of skin, till most of it was compiled. Then Uthman called them individually, imploring each of them to confirm that he had heard the Prophet ('s) recite for him, and each confirmed. When it was over, Uthman said: "Who is the best scribe?" They said: "The scribe of the Prophet ('s), Zaid b. Thabit". He said: "Who is most proficient in Arabic?" They said; "Saeed b. al-Aas". Uthman said: "Then Saeed should dictate and Zaid should write". So Zaid started writing and made out several copies which were distributed among men. Then I heard a companion of Muhammad say: "He has done well".

Report n. 16

16. Abul Malih says:

"When Uthman decided to have the Qur'an copied, he said: "People of Huzail would dictate and people of Thaqif would write".

Report n. 17

17. Abdul A'la b. Abdillah b. Abdillah b. Amir al Qarshi says:

"When he had completed the work of compilation, Uthman came up with it, and looking in it said: `I see some minor errors which Arabs will mend on their tongues'".

Report n. 18

18. Ikramah said:

"When the transcribed Qur'an was brought before Uthman, he saw some minor error. So he said: "Had it been dictated by someone from Huzail and written by one from Thaqif, this error would not have occurred.

Report n. 19

19. Ata says:

"When Uthman compiled the Qur'an, he sent for Ubayy b. Ka'ab who dictated it to Zaid b. Thabit, Saeed b. al-Aas gave grammatical inflections. So this copy is according to the recitation by Ubayy and Zaid".

Report n. 20

20. Mujahid reported:

Uthman ordered Ubayy b. Ka'ab to dictate, Zaid b. Thabit to write down and Saeed b. al-Aas and Abdur-Rahman b. al-Harth to give grammatical inflections".

Report n. 21

21. Zaid b. Thabit said:

"When we transcribed the Qur'an, I found that an ayah which I had been hearing from the Prophet ('s) was missing, I found it with Khuzaima b. Thabit

up to

And two witnesses. Khuzaima was known as one equal to Prophet ('s) had accepted his testimony as equal to two".

Report n. 22

22. Laith b. Sa'd said:

"The first person who collected Qur'an was Abu Bakr, and Zaid wrote it down. And people came to Zaid b. Thabit, but he would not write down any ayah except when supported by two witnesses. The ending part of Bara'ah was not found except with Abu Khuzaimah b. Thabit. He said: "Write it down, because the Messenger of Allah ('s) had accepted his witness as equal to two witnesses". So it was written. And when Umar came up with the ayah of Rajm (i.e. stoning the adulterer or adulteress to death) it was not recorded because he was alone".[33]

These are the important traditions reported on the subject of compilation of the Qur'an. Apart from being isolated reports which give no benefit of certitude, they have various deficiencies.

Notes:

[30]Sahih, Bukhari, bab jamul Qur'an, v6, p.98

[31]Sahih, Bukhari, bab jamul Qur'an, v6, p.99, note, these two reports, and the following ones till No. 11 are mentioned in Muntakhab of Kanz al Ummal, on the margin of Ahmad Hanbal's Musnad, v2, p. 43-52.

[32]This tradition in Muntakhab of Kanzul Ummal has been reported by Yahya b. Ju'dah.

[33]al Itqan, v1, p.101

The Contradictions

These reports are self-contradictory on many points, making them totally unreliable. Here, in the form of questions and answers, we examine the contradictions.

When was the Qur'an compiled as a book?

The second report says it was compiled during the rule of Uthman. The first, third, fourth and some of the later reports explain that it was in the era of Abu Bakr. And the seventh and twelfth report indicate that it was during Umar's caliphate.

Who undertook to compile the Qur'an during the era of Abu Bakr?

The first two traditions and the twenty second say that it was Zaid b. Thabit, but the fourth report says it was Abu Bakr himself; and that he only asked Zaid to go through what he himself had collected. And the fifth report together with the others indicate that the task was undertaken by Umar and Zaid.

Was Zaid given sole authority to compile the Qur'an?

The first tradition clearly states that Abu Bakr gave him sole authority. He told Zaid: "*You are a young, intelligent man, and we find no fault in you. You were also a scribe, writing down the revelations for the Messenger of Allah ('s). So attend to the Qur'an and compile it*". These words are explicit. But the fifth and other traditions reveal that the writing was substantiated by two witnesses, so much so that when Umar came with the verse of *rajm*, it was rejected.

Were there some verses which remained unrecorded till the time of Uthman?

Most of the traditions say that no verses remained unrecorded, but the second report says that some of the verses remained unwritten.

Did Uthman omit any thing from what was compiled before him?

Most of the traditions quoted above say that he did not exclude or omit anything. But the fourteenth report tells us that he struck off some parts from the previous compilation, and ordered the Muslim to do the same.

From what sources did Uthman prepare a book copy of the Qur'an?

The second and fourth report say: he relied upon the notes and pages collected by Abu Bakr. Then the eighth, fourteenth and fifteenth traditions reveal that he relied upon two witnesses, and upon those who claimed to have heard *theyyah* from the Prophet ('s).

Who asked Abu Bakr to compile the Qur'an?

The first report says that Umar did it, and that Abu Bakr conceded after having first refused. Then he sent for Zaid who also conceded after having declined. But the tenth report tells us that Zaid and Umar jointly asked Abu Bakr to undertake the work, and he conceded after having consulted the Muslims.

Who prepared the master copy and sent its editions to various cities?

The second report says it was Uthman, while the twelfth tells us it was Umar.

When were the two verses added to the Surah of Bara'ah?

The first, eleventh and twenty second reports reveal that this happened during the time of Abu Bakr, and the eighth report together with others say that it happened in the era of Umar.

Who came up with those two verses?

The first and twenty second reports say they were brought in by Abu Khuzaimah, while the eighth and eleventh reports say it was Khuzaimah. These are two gentlemen who had no relationship with each other at all, as reported by Ibn Abd al Barr.[34]

How were they accepted as being parts of the Qur'an?

By a sole witness, as mentioned in the first, ninth and twenty second report. By the accompanying witness by Uthman, as shown in the eighth; and by the supporting witness by Umar as shown in the eleventh.

Who did Uthman appoint for dictating and writing of the Qur'an?

(i) Uthman appointed Zaid, Ibn az Zubair, Saeed and Abdu Rahman as writers (see Report n. 2)

(ii) He appointed Zaid for writing, and Saeed for dictating, (see Report n. 15)

(iii) He appointed a person from *Thaqif* to write down, and a person from *Huzad* to dictate; (see Report n. 16)

(iv) The writer was not from *Thaqif* and the one who dictated was not from *Huzad*. (see Report n. 18)

(v) The dictation was by Ubay b. Kaab, and Saeed gave grammatical inflections to what Zaid wrote down (see Report n. 19)

(vi) The twenty second report adds the name of Abd ar Rahman together with Saeed.

Notes:

[34]*Tafsir*, al Qurtubi, v1, p.56

Their Conflict with Other Traditions Related to the Compilation of the Qur'an

These traditions are in conflict with all those tradition which stress that the Qur'an was recorded and compiled during the time of the Prophet ('s) himself. It has been reported by a group which include: Ibn Abi Shaybah, Ahmed b. Hanbal, Tirmidhi, Nas'ai, Ibn Haban, al-Hakim, al-Bayhaqi, Ziya al Maqdasi, who report from Ibn Abbas as following:

"I asked Uthman b. Affan: 'Why have you joined al-Anfal with Baraah, excluding the line of Bismillah from between them, while the former is shorter than 100 verses, and the later exceeds a hundred, and then you placed them among the seven long Surahs? What made you do that?'"

Uthman said:

"At times, the Prophet ('s) used to come up with the revelation of Surahs containing numerous verses, then when revelation came in small parts, he used to call his scribe and say: "Place this part among the Surah which says so and so": and when verses were revealed, he instructed: "Place these among the Surah which mentions such and such thing". Al-Anfal was from among the early revelations at Madina, and Bara'ah was from what was revealed last.-Their contents were similar, so I presumed that they belonged to each other. The Prophet ('s) never clarified this in his lifetime, so I joined them, without Basmalah in between and placed them among the seven long Surahs".[35]

Tabrani reports, and so does Ibn Asakir from Asha'bi.

"The Qur'an was compiled in the days of the Prophet ('s) by six men from the Ansar. They were Ubay b. Ka'ab, Zaid b. Thabit, Muadh b. Jabal, Abu al-Darda', Sa'd b. Ubaid, and Abu Zaid. And Ibn Jariyah had taken it except two or three Surah".[36]

And Qataadah says:

"I asked Anas b. Malik: 'Who collected the Qur'an at the time of the Prophet ('s)?' He said: 'Four of them, all from Ansar. They were Ubay b. Ka'b, Muadh b. Jabal, Zaid b. Thabit and Abu Zaid'.[37]

Masruq, when recalling Abdullah b. Umar and Abdullah b. Masud said:

"I have always loved him. I heard the Prophet ('s) say: Take the Qur'an from four: from Abdullah b. Masood, Salim, Muadh and Ubay b. Ka'b".[38]

Nasai has a report based on authentic chain from Abdullah b. Umar who said:

"I gathered the Qur'an, and read it every night. The Prophet heard about it, so he said: "Read it in a month ... "[39]

We will mention the compilation of the Qur'an by Umm Waraqah later.

One might argue that the collection or compilation mentioned in these reports denote committing the Qur'an to memory, and not to the papers. This presumption cannot be corroborated. Besides, it is a known fact that there were numerous believers at the time of the Prophet ('s) who knew the Qur'an by heart, so how can the memorising of the Qur'an be confined to four or six names? Those who have studied carefully the lives of the companions of the Prophet ('s) would know it for certain that the Qur'an was ready compiled during the days of the Prophet ('s) and that the number of its compilers were too many to be ignored.

The report by al-Bukhari through Anas stating that when the Prophet ('s) died, the Qur'an had not been compiled by anyone except four: Abu al Darda, Muadh b. Jabal, Zaid b. Thabit and Abu Zaid, is a report which ought to be discarded and rejected because it contradicts not only the earlier reports, but also what al-Bukhari himself reported. Moreover, the report cannot be accepted because it is difficult to conceive that the reporter knew all the Muslims at the time of the death of the Prophet ('s), and that in spite of the great number of the Muslims, scattered all around, he was able to find only four who had collected the Qur'an. This is a mere conjecture.

To summarize the whole situation, one may ask:

(a) With all the foregoing reports, how can one believe that Abu Bakr was the first to compile the Qur'an, after he had become a Caliph?

(b) And if we accept the report, it is strange that Abu Bakr should ask Zaid and Umar to collect the Qur'an from leather parchments, pieces of papers and from the people's memory, while Abdullah, Muadh and Ubayy were present alive among the people, especially when the Prophet ('s) had himself recommended that the Qur'an be taken from them?

(c) Of course, they could not have anything from Salim because he was one of those killed at the battle of *Yamamah*. But Zaid, one of the compilers of the Qur'an, was there, and Abu Bakr had certified his character as young, intelligent and without blemish. So what was the need of resorting to others?

(d) Finally, the widely acknowledged and authentic tradition about *thaqalayn* leaves us with no doubt that the Qur'an existed in a complete book form. We shall point this out later.

Notes:

[35]Muntakhab Kanz al Ummal, v2, p.48

[36]Muntakhab Kanz al Ummal, v2, p.48

[37]Sahih, Bukhari, chapter: "Qura" from the Prophet's companions, v6, p.202

[38]Sahih, Bukhari, chapter: "Qura" from the Prophet's companions, v6, p.202

[39]al Itqan, v1, p.124

Their Conflict with the Qur'an itself

These reports contradict the Qur'an itself. Numerous verses of the Qur'an prove that complete Surahs existed, each distinguished from the other. They were in the hands of the people, even those who were idolaters or the people of the Books. The famous challenge by the Prophet ('s) to the disbelievers was to produce the like of the Qur'an, the like of ten Surahs or even one Surah. This means that the Surah were there in the public hands.

And in the Qur'an itself, the word "book" has been used in many verses. And also in the famous saying of the Prophet ('s): "**I leave among you two valuable things, the book of Allah and my progeny**", there is a clear proof that the Qur'an was then written and compiled, because the word `book' is not used for that which is retained in the memory, nor for scattered writings on the parchments, pieces of papers and bones, except metaphorically. It is not right to construe any word metaphorically unless there is an evidence in its context.

The word `book' denotes existence of a collection and not of scattered scribbles, nor of things which are in the memory but not written.

Their Conflict with Reason

The greatness of the Qur'an itself, and the painstaking effort by the Prophet ('s) to arrange for its memorization and reading, and the inclination of the Muslims to do the same with reverence and expectation of being rewarded by Allah, all point to the fact that the Qur'an could not have been compiled in the haphazard manner shown in the reports. The Qur'an itself has an inherent quality which would make it absolutely imperative for Muslims to preserve it and to make it known popularly by all, even the ladies and the children. These qualities are:

(a) The Eloquence and Rhetoric of the Qur'an

The Arabs had a tendency of preserving their glorious literature, like the famous poems and speeches of pre-Islamic era. The Qur'an should receive all the more attention because it challenged all the existing fine literature, surpassing them all in excellence. The result was that it captured the attention of all, believers and disbelievers alike. A Muslim committed it to memory driven by his faith, while the disbeliever tried to remember it so that it could be eventually opposed or refuted.

(b) The Prophet's inclination to preserve the Qur'an

As is known, he had an absolute control over his people, and when such a leader expresses a desire that a particular book be read or preserved, it becomes a popular handbook among the followers, especially if the book is meant to be for earning the pleasure of Allah, here and hereafter.

(c) Memorization

Those who committed the Qur'an to memory were held in high esteem by the people, and this is very well evidenced in the history of Islam. This was a strong impetus which motivated many to memorize the Qur'an fully or even partially.

(d) Rewards

The reward and the blessings from Allah upon those who recite or memorize the Qur'an was perhaps the greatest incentive for Muslims to preserve it. In fact, the Muslims revered the Qur'an, and valued it much more than their own souls, wealth and families. We have reports which indicate that even some of the ladies had compiled the whole Qur'an.

Ibn Sa'd says in al-Tabaqat:

"Al-Fadhl b. Dakin informed us through al-Walid b. Abdillah b. Jami', who reported from his grandmother that Ummu Waraqah bint Abdillah b. Harith was frequently visited by the Prophet ('s), and he called her a Shahidah. She had compiled the Qur'an. When the prophet ('s) advanced to the battle of Badr she asked him if she could go along with him for nursing the ill and tending the wounded so that Allah may bless her with martyrdom. And the Prophet answered: `Allah has prepared for you the martyrdom'[40]."

If the ladies had undertaken such a task, we can expect men to have done better. A large group of people was known to have known the Qur'an by heart in the era of the Prophet ('s). Al-Qurutbi says:

"Seventy of the reciters were killed in the battle of Yamamah, and in the days of the Prophet ('s) nearly the same number were killed at Bir Maunah".

And in the preceding tenth report, we find that four hundred reciters had been killed at Yamamah. The fact that the Prophet ('s) showed particular concern about compilation of the Qur'an, with several scribes at his disposal, and that the Qur'an was revealed to him piece by piece during twenty three years, gives us justifiable certitude that the Prophet asked for the Qur'an to be written down in full.

Zaid b. Thabit says:

"We used to organize the Qur'an from the parchments, in presence of the Prophet ('s)".

Al Hakim says: "This report is authentic, based on the conditions laid down by the two Sheikhs (Bukhari and Muslim) though they have not recorded it".

And in this there is a clear evidence that the Qur'an was collected during the era of the Prophet ('s). [41]

And as for committing certain Surahs or parts thereof to memory, we know that it was a common practice. There was hardly a Muslim male or female, who did not do that. Ubadah b. Samit says:

"The Prophet ('s) used to remain occupied. So when any Muhajir called upon him, he would entrust him to one of us for teaching him the Qur'an".[42]

And Kulaib reports:

"I was with Ali ('a) when he heard loud voices of people in the mosque, reciting the Qur'an. He said: "They are blessed..."[43]

And another report from Ubadah b. Samit says:

"Whenever someone migrated to Medina, the Prophet ('s) would send him to us for learning the Qur'an. And loud voices of recitation of the Qur'an could be usually heard from the mosque, till the Prophet ('s) asked them to lower the voices so as to avoid errors in confusion".[44]

Yes, the memorization of the Qur'an or its parts was current among the Muslims, so much so that a Muslim lady would ask for being taught one *Surah* or more from the Qur'an in lieu of her *Mahr* (Bukhari, Muslim, Abu Dawud, Tirmidhi, Nasai, al-Taj). With all these pointers, how could we accept the proposition that the collection of the Qur'an was delayed till the days of Abu Bakr, and that Abu Bakr had to depend upon two witnesses asserting that they had heard it from the Prophet ('s)?

Notes:

[40]al Itqan, v1, p.215

[41]Mustadrak, v1, p.611

[42]Musnad, Hanbal, v15, p.324

[43]Kanz al Ummal, 2nd Editionv2, p.185

[44]Manahiul Irfan, p.324

Their Conflict with Consensus

These reports contradict the unanimous belief of all the Muslims that the only way of establishing the authenticity of the Qur'an is *tawattur*, which means 'a continuous and wide spread acknowledgement'. If we believe these reports, then it would follow that the Qur'an is established as authentic by reliance on two witnesses at every stage of compilation, or one witness whose testimony was accepted as equal to two. This means that the authenticity is proved by an isolated report also, a concept unthinkable to a Muslim. I wonder how can we reconcile between the two; one telling us that the Qur'an depends upon evidence, and the other telling us that it had an unbroken, widespread currency among the people - *tawattur*, needing no further corroboration. If we accept the consensus that the Qur'an is evidenced by *tawattur*, then we have no alternative but to reject all the reports contradicting it.

Surprisingly enough, Ibn Hajar interprets two witnesses as "written evidence" and "evidence of memorization". I believe he had to take recourse to this interpretation so as to avoid a conflict with the fact that the Qur'an is based on *tawattur*. But even this interpretation has many faults:

(a) It is contrary to the evident meaning of all the reports you have so far seen.

(b) This would mean that no parts of the Qur'an, however explicitly based on *tawattur*, would be accepted if they were not written down by someone. It becomes quite probable that certain parts of the Qur'an which, though current and widespread, were omitted because there was no written evidence.

(c) When *tawattur* exists, the written or memorized evidence is superfluous and redundant. In fact, such evidences would not be acceptable as parts of the Qur'an, if they do not comply with *tawattur*.

In fact, there is no alternative but to reject all these reports, because they prove the authenticity of the Qur'an on things other than *tawattur*. And the consensus of the Muslims lends no support either.

Those Traditions and Interpolations

If these reports on the collection of the Qur'an were accepted as true, then an argument suggesting some possible omissions becomes plausible, and together with it, one has to concede that some additions also -nay have occurred. The way the process of compilation has been described justifies such a presumption.

It may be argued that the eloquence and style of the Qur'an prevented any addition without being traced. Perhaps a complete *Surah*, if fabricated, could be detected, but an addition of a word or two, or even a short verse, would certainly be very difficult to distinguish. Had this been the case, the preceding reports would not have mentioned the provision of testimony by two witnesses. In fact, whenever a person came with an *ayah*, the very act presented a possibility that it either was from the Qur'an, or it was not. Thus we are faced with an ever attending curse of interpolation, while the consensus of Muslims is that the Qur'an is intact from all tampering and profanities.

To summarize, we say that to attribute the collection of the Qur'an to the Caliphs is based on mere conjecture, and it contradicts the holy Book itself, the *Sunnah*, the consensus and the reason. And therefore, those who believe that the Qur'an has been tampered with or interpolated do not have any solid grounds if they rely on the reports. And if at all we accept that Abu Bakr compiled it during his caliphate, there is no doubt that the process of collection as described in these reports is untrue. The fact is that the collection of the Qur'an was entirely based on *tawattur* among the Muslims. At the most, what Abu Bakr might have done was to collate a codex or a volume (*mushaf*) contents of which had already been preserved by the way of *tawattur*.

Yes, there is no doubt that Uthman produced a copy of the Qur'an in his days, but this was not to say that he collected the verses and the chapters into a book form. Actually, he effected a consensus on recitation according to a single master copy, ordering Muslims to burn out all other copies which varied from his copy. He actually wrote to all towns and cities, forbidding Muslims from entertaining different recitations. This has been substantiated by many Sunni scholars.

Al-Harith al Muhtasibi says: "It is commonly held by the Muslims that Uthman was compiler of the Qur'an. This is not so. Actually, Uthman enjoined upon Muslims to unite on one recitation, acting on the advice of certain Muhajirin and Ansar who feared disunity resulting from some confusion among the people of Iraq and Syria in respect of recitations. Before that, there were various copies having recitations based on the "seven readings" upon which the Qur'an was revealed"[45]

I say that Uthman united the Muslims upon one mode of recitation, the recitation which was already current and known among the Muslims, the one which they had heard from the Prophet ('s). He forbade all other systems which had developed based on the so called report about the Qur'an having

been revealed according to "seven readings", and I have already proved that this report is untrue. Uthman was never censured for this, because the different recitations were bound to bring about disunity and discord among the Muslims. In fact, each group had begun to label the others as infidels. And the Prophet ('s) himself had forbidden any differences in respect of the Qur'an. However, Uthman was censured for having burnt up the rest of the copies of the Qur'an, and for having ordered the Muslims to do so. A group of Muslims became his severe critics, labelling him as "the burner of Qur'an".

Notes:

[45] *al Itqan*, v1, p.103

It is clear from what we have mentioned above that the question of interpolation or profanity occurring in the Qur'an is baseless, advocated by those who have poor judgement, or those who refuse to ponder, or those who are infatuated with the task of disproving the Qur'an - and indeed, infatuation makes a person blind and deaf. A person with intellect and sense of justice can have no doubt about groundlessness of this presumption.

ISLAMICMOBILITY.COM

IN THE AGE OF INFORMATION
IGNORANCE IS A CHOICE

www.islamicmobility.com

"Wisdom is the lost property of the Believer, let him claim it wherever he finds it" - Imam Ali (as)