

# The Meaning of the Word

## Lexicology and Qur'anic Exegesis

EDITED BY

**S.R. Burge**

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

*in association with*

**THE INSTITUTE OF ISMAILI STUDIES**  
LONDON

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP  
Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York  
Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi  
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi  
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece  
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore  
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press  
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States  
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Islamic Publications Ltd 2015

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted  
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,  
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,  
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate  
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction  
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,  
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover  
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data  
Data available

**Cover illustration:**

Untitled by Khaled al-Saai. Reproduced courtesy of Khaled al-Saai.

**Cover design:** Russell Harris

Index by Philip Hillyer, Advanced Professional Member, Society of Indexers

Typeset by RefineCatch Ltd, Bungay, Suffolk

Printed in Great Britain on acid-free paper by

TJ International Ltd., Padstow, Cornwall

ISBN 978-0-19-872413-1

---

## The *Fātiḥa* of Salmān al-Fārisī and the Modern Controversy over Translating the Qur'an

---

TRAVIS ZADEH

ON 28 MARCH 1936 (5 Muḥarram 1355), the front page of *al-Ahrām*, Egypt's leading newspaper, featured an article by the editor-in-chief of the monthly journal published by al-Azhar University, Muḥammad Farīd Wajdī (d. 1954), arguing for the legitimacy of translating the Qur'an. This is a position that Wajdī, a reformist, had been advancing in the Egyptian press for several years.<sup>1</sup> In this particular article, Wajdī offered as his foremost justification the example of Salmān al-Fārisī, the first Persian convert to Islam. According to Wajdī, the Prophet Muhammad approved a translation of the *Fātiḥa*, the opening sura of the Qur'an; Salmān had composed the translation at the request of recent Persian converts who had written to him seeking something of the Qur'an in Persian, which they could recite during ritual prayer. In Wajdī's view, this historical fact offered prophetic sanction for the production and use of Qur'anic translations.<sup>2</sup>

Needless to say, the authenticity of Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḥa*, and the question of whether or not it received the approval of the Prophet, were matters of serious contention in the controversies over the translation of the Qur'an that raged at the turn of the twentieth century. Wajdī was not the first to draw on the example of Salmān's *Fātiḥa* with this specific juridical end in mind; the appearance of this issue on the front page of a daily newspaper, however, serves as a reminder of how both the medium of debating

the matter of translation and of how the audience engaged with this question had radically transformed since the account was first circulated in classical Arabic sources.

I have written elsewhere about the debates over the translatability of the Qur'an, primarily with respect to the early constitution of vernacular piety and the history of Qur'anic hermeneutics.<sup>3</sup> Admittedly, it would be rather cavalier not to address, in some fashion, the ways in which the classical discourses concerning translation, and the concomitant matter of accessing Qur'anic meaning in vehicles other than Arabic, came to inform ideas about and practices of scriptural translation in the modern period. At the heart of this problem are the tensions between meaning and form and their relationship to syntactical and rhetorical structures, categories that generally are expressed in the classical material as *ma'nā*, *lafz* and *naẓm*, respectively. Throughout the modern debates, the question of what constitutes a legitimate translation is a matter of primary concern. The extent to which the classical sources of juridical and exegetical authority feature in the early twentieth-century controversies offers insight into a modern process of redefining the purpose and meaning of Qur'anic translation.

One aim of the present article is to develop a fuller genealogy of the issue of Qur'anic translation, as expressed particularly in the controversies in modern Egypt. For, while others have studied this topic,<sup>4</sup> there is much that remains to be done in terms of understanding how these debates relate to earlier juridical and exegetical traditions. Furthermore, I hope to shed light on the discontinuity that at times characterises the modern reception of the classical material on the topic. These moments of rupture illuminate how, often despite contrary appearances, historical and cultural contexts inevitably shape interpretive practices, animating both their production and reception. While there are notable distinctions that separate the diachronic history of Qur'anic translation, the apparent continuity of discursive strategies justifying the translation of the Qur'an also deserves further consideration.

### **Modern Trajectories**

In Cairo, Muḥarram 1355 (March–April 1936) marked not only the coming of the new year but also a renewal of the translation controversy that had cycled in and out of Egyptian public life during the course of the century. The question of translating the Qur'an featured in a series of rather vitriolic debates, reflecting a range of political and religious concerns that extended well beyond the question of scriptural hermeneutics. This particular controversy intersected with the highest echelons of the Egyptian political elite and was a matter that directly related to the king, the prime minister, parliament, the Ministry of Education (Wizārat al-Ma'ārif), the religious courts (*al-mahākim al-shar'iyya*), the Dār al-Iftā' (the state agency for issuing legal decrees) and al-Azhar University. The Egyptian press, in the form of newspapers, journals and pamphlets, offered the print medium for staging these debates, which were often quite acrimonious in tenor.

An important element to the controversy in Egypt were the concomitant developments in Turkey, which was itself in a process of radical political and social transformation. In 1922, the Ottoman sultanate was abolished and by 1924 the caliphate had been dissolved, the symbolism of which had reverberations for Muslims the world over. The publication of a Turkish translation of the Qur'an in 1924 was followed a year later by a state-sponsored translation project, funded by the secular nationalist parliament, to produce an official Turkish translation and commentary of the Qur'an, along with a translation of Bukhārī's canonical hadith collection.<sup>5</sup> Through a programme of modernisation, the government of Kemal Atatürk began to officially promote the use of Turkish in liturgical spheres once reserved for Arabic, such as for the call to prayer, Ramadan recitations and the performance of ritual prayer itself. Writing a year after the legislation of 1932 discouraging the use of Arabic in mosques, Lyman MacCallum, a Canadian missionary and director of the Bible Society in Istanbul, commented that Western law had 'substituted the *Sheriat*',<sup>6</sup> and that the Turks were 'tearing their religious life free from the senseless clutch of the withered hand

of Arabia', now they were free from their oppressors to worship in their own language.<sup>7</sup>

Needless to say, many Muslim religious authorities were much less sanguine. Most notably, the Salafī reformist Rashīd Riḍā (d. 1935) stood out as a vocal critic of Qur'anic translation. A student of the Egyptian modernist and reformist Muḥammad 'Abduh (d. 1905), Riḍā was a stalwart leader of the Salafī movement, who advocated a pan-Islamic reform with Arabic at its centre. Among the sundry topics with which he engaged, Riḍā used his monthly journal *al-Manār*, published in Cairo, as a platform to advance Arabic as the authentic language of Islam and to criticise efforts to translate the Qur'an.<sup>8</sup> Riḍā linked such translations to broader secular and nationalist currents that, in his mind, would result in the further fragmentation and political emaciation of the global community of Muslims.<sup>9</sup>

In 1925, the arrival in Cairo of an English translation of the Qur'an by Mawlānā Muḥammad 'Alī (d. 1951) of the Lahore Aḥmadiyya also gave occasion for heated debate over the lawfulness of translating the Qur'an. Upon reviewing it, the leadership of al-Azhar issued an order banning the distribution and circulation of the work. Outrage over the sectarian nature of the translation led to the seizure and public burning of copies in the courtyard of al-Azhar mosque.<sup>10</sup> In 1931, this climate of suspicion toward Qur'anic translation greeted the British Muslim convert Marmaduke Pickthall (d. 1936) during his travels in Egypt. Pickthall attributed the resistance he met in Egypt to his translation of the Qur'an to a cultural distinction between Arab and non-Arab Muslims, as he had encountered no such opposition while working on the project in India.<sup>11</sup>

To be sure, opposition even in Egypt was by no means uniform. Arriving from India, Pickthall set out with the aim of working with Shaykh Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Marāghī (d. 1945) to improve his English translation.<sup>12</sup> Like Riḍā, Marāghī was also a student of 'Abduh. In contrast to Riḍā, however, Marāghī was a proponent of establishing an official translation of the Qur'an for the purposes of proselytisation and for Muslims who could not access the meaning of the original Arabic. This translation project fit into his

larger efforts toward institutional and curricular reform of al-Azhar. Marāghī's first stint as rector of al-Azhar began in 1928; he immediately proposed the formation of a committee within the university to help revise and review the translation on which Pickthall had been working. However, Marāghī met opposition from King Fu'ād I himself (r. 1917–36), who viewed translating the Qur'an as illicit.<sup>13</sup>

The king had also resisted Marāghī's promotion to the position of Shaykh al-Azhar, preferring instead the Shāfi'ī jurist and royalist Muḥammad al-Aḥmadī al-Ẓawāhirī (d. 1944) for the post. Nominated by the nationalist Prime Minister Muṣṭafā al-Naḥḥās Pashā (d. 1965), Marāghī was only promoted to the position after a ten-month struggle for succession, which pitted the parliament against the king.<sup>14</sup> By the time Pickthall arrived with a letter of introduction to Marāghī, in the middle of November of 1929, the political situation had significantly changed. Just a few weeks earlier, Marāghī had been forced to step down as rector in the face of obstruction from the royalist camp, while his own support had eroded due to a change of leadership in parliament. The king's original choice, Ẓawāhirī, was immediately appointed to head al-Azhar. While Ẓawāhirī ultimately adopted many of the reforms that Marāghī had originally proposed,<sup>15</sup> he stood in opposition to the translation of the Qur'an.<sup>16</sup>

In 1935, Marāghī was reinstated as Shaykh al-Azhar, following a turbulent period for the university, which saw the growing politicisation of the institution. Marāghī returned with a mandate for further reforms. There is much to suggest that attitudes toward the translation of the Qur'an were not entirely static during this period.<sup>17</sup> At the end of the year, Marāghī sent a bill (*mashrū'*) to parliament, co-sponsored by 'Alī 'Allūba Pāshā (d. 1956), the minister of education, seeking governmental approval of and financial support for a project which would see al-Azhar University collaborate with the ministry of education in forming a commission to translate the 'meanings' (*ma'ānī*) of the Qur'an. According to the memoir of 'Alī 'Allūba Pāshā, King Fu'ād I originally resisted Marāghī's proposal; however, after 'Allūba's intervention, the king reversed his position on the matter, a shift apparently occasioned by the proliferation of foreign language

translations said to contain errors, often with intentional distortions (*taḥrīf*) aimed at defaming Islam.<sup>18</sup> On 7 April 1936, a *fatwā* in support of the project was signed by the grand mufti, ‘Abd al-Majīd Salīm (d. 1954), head of the Dār al-Iftā’; he was joined by several other prominent Egyptian ‘*ulamā*’, including authorities from al-Azhar and the judiciary.<sup>19</sup> Muḥammad ‘Alī Tawfiq (d. 1955), a prominent member of the royal family, spoke out publicly as a supporter of the bill, defending it as a measure that would benefit Muslims and Islam the world over.<sup>20</sup> On 16 April, the prime minister, ‘Alī Māhir Pāshā (d. 1960), approved the measure with the endorsement of parliament and promised governmental funds for the translation project.<sup>21</sup>

When Marāghī addressed parliament advocating the passage of the measure, he opened his speech by claiming that, ‘in both ancient and modern times people have sought to translate the meanings of the Noble Qur’an.’<sup>22</sup> This established tradition of translating the Qur’an served as one of the major justifications for the legitimacy of the entire project. Marāghī argued that these translations, however, were carried out either by those who did not have a full mastery of Arabic, or others who did not have complete command of the target language. The joint commission led by the ministry of education and al-Azhar University sought to make available to the world an accurate and official translation that agreed with the orthodox principles of Islam.<sup>23</sup> In many ways Marāghī’s proposal built on earlier translation efforts within al-Azhar. It is also during this period that Wajdī, serving as the editor of the university journal, then titled *Nūr al-Islām*, increased the publication of English language material. This is notably reflected in the serial translation of Bukhārī’s hadith collection that the journal began to publish in 1935 during Wajdī’s tenure as editor-in-chief.<sup>24</sup>

Despite gaining widespread political backing, Marāghī’s proposal met with vocal opposition in the press, both before and after the run-up to the vote in parliament. His opponent, the ousted Zawāhirī, was just one of many who challenged the entire measure as an illicit enterprise that ran afoul of convention and religious law.<sup>25</sup> Many of Marāghī’s critics were religious lawyers, such as Muḥammad Sulaymān (d. 1936), a judge of the Supreme Court of Religious Law

in Cairo, and Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Shāṭir, a provincial judge in the religious court of Shibīn al-Kūm, in the Nile Delta, both of whom published denouncements of the translation project as the case made its way through parliament.<sup>26</sup> On 12 June, a faction of lawyers from the religious courts (*al-maḥākīm al-shar'īyya*) issued an opinion claiming that it was unlawful to translate either the Qur'an or its meanings, as it would cause harm to religion, language and nation (*al-dīn wa'l-luḡha wa'l-waṭan*) – a turn of phrase that at once highlights the intersection between Arabic, nationalism and religious identity.<sup>27</sup>

Despite these vocal objections, parliament continued its commitment to the project and funds were allocated in the autumn for a commission to oversee the translation. This commission included such members as the grand mufti 'Abd al-Majīd Salīm and Maḥmūd Shaltūt, a lecturer in the faculty of religious law, who would ultimately become rector of al-Azhar after Marāghī's death in 1945.<sup>28</sup> The commission was charged with first concisely paraphrasing in Arabic the *ma'ānī* (meanings) of the Qur'anic text; this was then to serve as the basis for further foreign language translation.<sup>29</sup> However, evidently due to a parliamentary budget crisis which soon followed, funding was ultimately cut, putting an end to the entire project.<sup>30</sup> While the translation never materialised, Marāghī's success before parliament and within al-Azhar played a role in changing public opinion over the nature and form of Qur'anic translation.<sup>31</sup> The entire episode gave public expression to translation as an exegetical enterprise that sought to communicate the meaning of the Qur'an but not to actually replace the Arabic text itself.<sup>32</sup>

### **The Shibboleth of Salmān's Persian Translation of the *Fātiḥa***

Throughout this controversy, Salmān's Persian translation of the *Fātiḥa* served as a site of contestation. For the proponents of Marāghī's project, the account offered a *sunna* of the early community that had the sanction of the Prophet.<sup>33</sup> Newspapers presented one of the most prominent staging grounds for this issue.

At stake in the back and forth of the arguments was not only a political struggle. As the competing sides of the controversy made repeatedly clear, at the heart of this debate was the contested relationship between Arabic and vernacular languages in the fields of religious knowledge for Muslims the world over.

In March 1936, at the height of the controversy, Wajdī published his article in *al-Ahrām*, opening with the account of Salmān's *Fātiḥa*, as a rebuttal to the judge Sulaymān, who had earlier attacked Marāghī's proposal to the parliament in the same newspaper, calling it a repugnant innovation.<sup>34</sup> Quoting the Khwārazmī polymath Abū'l-Rayḥān al-Bīrūnī (d. 440/1048), Sulaymān had argued that the religion (*dīn*) and the state (*dawla*) of Islam are by their very nature Arabic, 'one is lifted up by divine power, the other by a heavenly hand';<sup>35</sup> Sulaymān further claimed that for over twelve centuries no Muslim has ever thought of translating the Qur'an.<sup>36</sup> As far as the historical record is concerned, the notion that Muslims never translated the sacred text is rather dubious, as the copious written record preserved in a wide range of vernaculars demonstrates. Needless to say, whether or not such texts should be considered translations forms part of the debate.

In his retort, Wajdī questioned why, if Qur'anic translation were as repugnant an affair as Sulaymān claimed, would the Prophet have sanctioned Salmān's *Fātiḥa*. Furthermore, according to Wajdī, such translation continued throughout the early centuries of Islam. For support, he turned to the Ḥanafī juridical position that those who had yet to master the original Arabic could perform the daily ritual prayers reciting a translation in Persian. This was an argument advanced by the Ḥanafī jurists Abū Yūsuf (d. 182/798) and Muḥammad al-Shaybānī (d. 189/805), who modified the position of their master, Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nu'mān (d. 150/767), which permitted the unrestricted liturgical use of Persian regardless of one's capacity in Arabic.<sup>37</sup> As a legacy of Ottoman rule, the legal institutions in Cairo upheld Ḥanafī jurisprudence as the normative basis for positive law, and thus arguments based on the history of Ḥanafī praxis carried with them further juridical weight.<sup>38</sup> Wajdī also claimed that the practice of performing ritual prayer in translation could be traced back to the pious forefathers (*salaf*), particularly to

the figure of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110/728), who was said to have had difficulty with the original Arabic and so recited the Qur'an in Persian during prayer.<sup>39</sup>

Sulaymān responded in *al-Ahrām* with a detailed counterattack. As for Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḥa*, Sulaymān retorted, 'I am immensely sorry that I must say to my friend Professor Muḥammad Farīd Wajdī that this account is not authentic (*ghayr ṣaḥīḥ*); were his Honour to uncover its chain of transmission, this would put us at ease and would help remove the dispute between us.'<sup>40</sup> Likewise, Sulaymān impugned the authenticity of the anecdote ascribed to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, arguing that the famed *muḥaddith* was known throughout the classical biographical accounts for his eloquent command of Arabic.<sup>41</sup>

This line of argumentation was followed by the judge Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Shāṭir, who directly attacked Wajdī's accounts of Salmān and Ḥasan al-Baṣrī in a short pamphlet refuting the lawfulness of Marāghī's project.<sup>42</sup> On the question of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Shāṭir concluded that the account was taken from a commentary on the *Musallam al-thubūt*,<sup>43</sup> a work of *uṣūl al-fiqh* by the Ḥanafī Indian Muḥibb Allāh al-Bihārī (d. 1707), where it is Ḥabīb al-'Ajamī (d. ca. 140/757), a companion of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, who was said to recite the Qur'an in Persian as he could not properly pronounce the Arabic original.<sup>44</sup>

Turning to Salmān's *Fātiḥa*, Shāṭir set out to dispute the authenticity of the story. The arguments over the report primarily build upon and engage with earlier sources, drawn largely from classical law. Shāṭir argues that there is no historical basis to Wajdī's claim that the Prophet sanctioned Salmān's translation and that the account itself strains all reason:

I have not found in any of the books of hadith, nor the books of history any basis for [this account]. I have, however, come upon the original report (*al-riwāya al-aṣliyya*) in *al-Mabsūṭ* and there is nothing here to indicate that the Prophet ordered Salmān to do this. Could the Honourable Professor tell us his reference, and if he does not, which will more likely be the case, then he has produced a proof which would go against him . . . O Professor,

were it established that the Prophet ordered what you have mentioned in your article, then Abū Ḥanīfa would have used it as a proof for his position and the other imams would have been compelled to follow him.<sup>45</sup>

The reference in question is to the Ḥanafī juridical work *al-Mabsūṭ* by the Central Asian jurist Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Sarakhsī (d. ca. 483/1090). Sarakhsī relates that Abū Ḥanīfa drew authority for his ruling from an account that Salmān had composed the translation of the *Fātiḥa* at the request of Persians who recited it until they grew accustomed to the original Arabic.<sup>46</sup> Shāṭir also turns to the Shāfi'ī encyclopaedia of positive law, the *Sharḥ al-Muhadhḥab* by Abū Zakariyyā' al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277), which lists the report as one of the proof texts for the Ḥanafī position.<sup>47</sup> For his part, Nawawī claims that a translation can never equal the Qur'an, and while he does not directly impugn the authenticity of Salmān's account, he argues that what Salmān produced was merely a commentary (*tafsīr*) of the *Fātiḥa*.<sup>48</sup>

While a prophetic context may well be implied in the account, Shāṭir notes that neither Sarakhsī nor Nawawī clarify whether Salmān's translation was made during the lifetime of the Prophet, nor do they explicitly state that the Prophet condoned Salmān's translation. Likewise, Shāṭir draws the entire historical context into question, as he doubts that there were a significant number of Persian converts at this early period. Even if the account were authentic, Shāṭir argues that the action of a Companion cannot serve as the basis of a juridical proof (*ḥujja*). Furthermore, the isolated reports (*āḥād*) of the story (*qiṣṣa*) are themselves overruled by the established textual authority (*naṣṣ*) of the Qur'an, which on multiple occasions refers to itself as fundamentally an Arabic revelation.<sup>49</sup>

Coming to Wajdi's defence, the Egyptian religious scholar 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Jazīrī (d. 1941) argued that Shāṭir's criticism was entirely unfounded as the accounts of Salmān and Ḥasan al-Baṣrī both form part of the juridical corpus of Ḥanafī law.<sup>50</sup> Best known for the *Kitāb al-Fiqh 'alā'l-madhāhib al-arba'a*, a work of comparative jurisprudence, Jazīrī published a direct rebuttal to

Shāṭir, and promoted the Azhar translation project as a normative continuation of Qur'anic hermeneutics. Jazīrī claimed that the Azhar position reflected the majority view, while the number of opponents, such as Shāṭir and Sulaymān, could be counted on a single hand.<sup>51</sup> This characterisation may well reflect public sentiment, though it is difficult to assess the accuracy of such a claim, considering that all sides vied for the mantle of consensus.<sup>52</sup>

While Wajdī was by no means the only one to advance Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḥa* as a juridical proof text during the course of the controversy, he vocally upheld this position even in the face of withering criticism.<sup>53</sup> After parliament passed the measure, Wajdī edited an issue of the *Majallat al-Azhar* that focused on the legitimacy of the project; in it he republished a tract by Marāghī written four years earlier on the lawfulness of translation.<sup>54</sup> While Marāghī did not trace the account back to the authority of the Prophet, he did advance the argument that Abū Ḥanīfa drew support for the translation of ritual prayer from the authority of Salmān's Persian *Fātiḥa*.<sup>55</sup>

While Marāghī's plan was criticised by the likes of Sulaymān and Shāṭir, it appears that Wajdī faced more in the way of personal attacks. Yet Wajdī did not let these affronts go unchallenged. His most detailed defence of the matter came with the publication of his own treatise, *al-Adilla al-'ilmiyya 'alā jawāz tarjamat ma'āni'l-Qur'ān*, issued as a supplement to the spring volume of *al-Azhar*.<sup>56</sup> Here Wajdī responds point by point to the accusations levelled by Sulaymān and Shāṭir, replying with a similar spiteful tone of public rebuke. One of the centrepieces to the treatise is his affirmation that Salmān indeed produced a Persian translation of the *Fātiḥa*, which the Prophet approved of, and he advances various arguments to support his case.

To the question posed by Sulaymān in *al-Ahrām* concerning the source of the account, Wajdī cites a juridical text by the name of *al-Nihāya wa'l-dirāya*;<sup>57</sup> he adds that the grand mufti, Muḥammad Bakhīr al-Muṭī'ī (d. 1935), drew on the same text when he issued a *fatwā* in 1903, giving licence to Muslims in South Africa to translate the Qur'an.<sup>58</sup> These citations are designed to locate the Prophet's acceptance of the Persian translation of the *Fātiḥa* within the

Ḥanafī juridical tradition and to demonstrate that the account was used as a basis of positive law in modern Egypt. The recourse to Bakhīt served a further purpose, as the grand mufti had published a treatise in 1932 on the juridical question of Qur'anic translation. This treatise was used by both proponents and opponents of Marāghī's translation project.<sup>59</sup> By turning to Bakhīt as an authority on the matter, Wajdī positions the deceased shaykh as an advocate for Qur'anic translation.

In the opening of his treatise, Wajdī argues that the juridical position permitting the translation of the Qur'an and its use in ritual prayer for those who did not know Arabic dates back to the lifetime of the Prophet, 'since Salmān translated the *Fātiḥa* of the Qur'an into Persian and there were Persian converts who would pray using it'. He continues, stating that during the second/eighth century the permissibility of translation became a juridical principle (*aṣlan madhhabiyyan*) in Ḥanafī law, the largest of the juridical schools.<sup>60</sup> He notes that this permissibility was not just theoretical, but put into practice, citing once again the account of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī as authentic and noting that Bakhīt had also turned to the same report in his *fatwā* on the matter.<sup>61</sup> Repeated throughout his treatise is the weight of juridical precedence, as Wajdī advances in his defence the 'numerous Ḥanafī juridical works published in Egypt' which 'all stipulate the permissibility of translating the Qur'an and using it in prayer for those who do not know Arabic'.<sup>62</sup>

Wajdī also turns to Shāṭir's claim that had the Prophet indeed sanctioned the translation, then Abū Ḥanīfa would have used it as a proof for his position and that the other founders of juridical schools would have had to follow him in his ruling. In response, Wajdī argues that there is nothing here which strains reason, for according to Ḥanafī juridical tradition Abū Ḥanīfa indeed used Salmān's translation as the basis for his position. Furthermore, he notes that one of the greatest causes for divergence (*ikhtilāf*) between the juridical schools derives from the founders drawing upon different prophetic sayings and actions to support their own rulings.<sup>63</sup> As to the argument that there were no Persian converts in the region, Wajdī turns to the Persians (*abnā'*) of Yemen who converted during the lifetime of the Prophet and also notes that

there could very well have been Persian converts in the Arabian Peninsula, not to mention Mesopotamia, and these converts could have been in contact with Salmān during this period.<sup>64</sup>

To be sure, this tit for tat verges on tautology, with a set of *a priori* assumptions underwriting the entire debate, one claiming that the Prophet would have indeed permitted such a translation and the other arguing the exact opposite. Although Salmān's *Fātiḥa* offers merely one node in a broader constellation of disputes in the larger controversy, it reveals a running tension over the legitimacy of Qur'anic translation and its historical significance. Those debating the issue knew that, if authentic, the account would not only situate the practice of translating the Qur'an in the earliest history of conversion, but it would also position translation in the realm of ritual praxis as a symbolically legitimate replacement of the sacred text for those unable to recite the original. This was not the aim of Marāghī's proposal, which insisted that a translation of the meanings of the Qur'an could never be a substitute for the original text. Yet both Sulaymān and Shāṭir believed that regardless of the real purpose of the project, the result would be the same: a translation which people would use to replace the Qur'an itself.<sup>65</sup>

### A Juridical Legacy

While several works of jurisprudence feature as authorities in these debates, arguably the most important is a treatise dedicated to the subject, *al-Nafḥa al-quḍsiyya*, composed by the Ḥanafī scholar and leading professor of al-Azhar, Abū'l-Ikhlāṣ al-Shurunbulālī (d. 1658). Although this short tract appears as a source in the writings on the topic prior to Marāghī's parliamentary measure, it was only published in April 1936. The publisher, Farāj al-Sayyid 'Abd al-'Āl, a religious lawyer, states in his preface that the publication was aimed at specifically addressing the recent crisis (*fitna*) and to make more generally known proofs which demonstrate that the translation of the Qur'an is impermissible in any form.<sup>66</sup> The publisher also points out that more than three hundred years have passed since Shurunbulālī collected the positions of the religious

authorities on the matter, highlighting, as it were, both the antiquity and authority of the text. Needless to say, Shurunbulālī's treatise is not nearly as programmatic as the preface would suggest, for it gathers a range of early juridical opinions and statements that are at times contradictory and not easily harmonised. To this end, both proponents and opponents of the translation project mined Shurunbulālī's digest to advance their own argumentation.

As mentioned above, Wajdī cites the juridical work *al-Nihāya wa'l-dirāya* as his source for the Prophet's approval of Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḥa*. This source is also referenced within Shurunbulālī's *al-Nafḥa al-qudsiyya* and it is clear from Wajdī's use of the treatise elsewhere that he derived the account from Shurunbulālī. This point is not lost on Shāṭir, who turns his attention to the account as redacted by Shurunbulālī. Shāṭir reworked Shurunbulālī's account in his rebuttal to Marāghī, entitled *al-Qawl al-sadīd fī ḥukm tarjamat al-Qur'ān al-majīd*. He published this in 1936, after Wajdī's *Adilla* and the April (Muḥarram) issue of the *Majallat al-Azhar*, which contained a further defence of the translation project. Here Shāṭir argues:

[Wajdī] claims in the supplement to the *Majallat al-Azhar* that a translation took place in the time of the Prophet; he relies on what is in *al-Nafḥa al-qudsiyya*, on the authority of *al-Nihāya wa'l-dirāya*. Well, we have never heard of this claim until today. There was no translation of the Qur'an in the time of the Prophet, nor in the time of the Companions. The proof upon which they base their claim is an error in every respect, and thus their conclusion is also an error.<sup>67</sup>

At this point Shāṭir turns to the passage in Shurunbulālī's treatise that describes how the people of Persia wrote to Salmān requesting that he translate the *Fātiḥa* for them. The text explains that Salmān translated the *basmala*, the inchoative benediction to the *Fātiḥa*, *In the name of God, full of compassion, ever compassionate (bismi'llāh al-raḥmān al-raḥīm)*, in Persian as *ba-nām-i yazdān bakhshāyand bakhshānīd* ('In the name of God, merciful, forgiving').<sup>68</sup> Shurunbulālī relates that Persian converts would recite Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḥa* in prayer until their tongues became

accustomed to the original and that the Prophet had approved of Salmān's translation. Shurunbulālī concludes that the account is related in the *Nihāya* on the authority of Sarakhsī's *Mabsūṭ*. Again, Shāṭir observes that Sarakhsī's report contains neither a translation of the *Fātiḥa* nor an explicit account of the Prophet's approval, and draws into question the authority of the *Nihāya* from which the account is taken. Likewise, Shāṭir notes that the Persian translation does not replicate the *Fātiḥa*, but only the *basmala* and that, furthermore, one could not become accustomed to the original Arabic by reciting a Persian text. From these apparent inconsistencies, Shāṭir concludes that 'it is not possible for a Muslim to draw on the example of this account, for it is invalid in all respects as a basis for arguing that translating the Qur'an took place in various languages during the lifetime of the Prophet'.<sup>69</sup>

Neither Shurunbulālī nor the later authorities who copy from him identify the author of the *Nihāya*, which makes reference to Salmān's translation. However, there is every reason to believe that the juridical collection in question is the *Nihāyat al-kifāya fī dirāyat al-Hidāya* by the Central Asian Ḥanafī jurist Tāj al-Sharī'a Abū 'Abd Allāh 'Umar al-Bukhārī (d. 672/1273–4). This work is, in turn, a commentary on the famed handbook of Ḥanafī law, *al-Hidāya*, by Shaykh al-Islām Burhān al-Dīn Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Marghīnānī (d. 593/1196).<sup>70</sup> While a lithograph edition was printed as a marginal commentary alongside the *Hidāya* in Delhi at the turn of the twentieth century, the *Nihāya* remains unedited and appears to have been entirely unknown in the modern Egyptian disputes, as its author is never directly cited, nor is the full title of the work given. Rather, as mentioned above, all the references to the work are clearly copied from Shurunbulālī's text.

The *Nihāya* of Tāj al-Sharī'a does indeed report the Persian translation of the *basmala*, and also affirms that Salmān gained the Prophet's approval, ascribing the entire account to Sarakhsī (i.e. *kadhā fī'l-Mabsūṭ*).<sup>71</sup> These details, however, are not found in the two printed editions of Sarakhsī's encyclopaedic juridical compendium.<sup>72</sup> While the manuscript record may indeed prove differently,<sup>73</sup> the point is largely otiose, for, as we shall see, the details of both Salmān's translation and the prophetic approval were in

circulation well before Sarakhsī transmitted an abridged version of the account. Sarakhsī's early readers may well have understood the abridged account as alluding to a prophetic sanction given to the translation.

Such objections over the authenticity of Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḥa* were by no means new. Prior to Marāghī's parliamentary proposal, various authorities had challenged the account. There is much to suggest that Wajdī was well aware of these objections. His use of the anecdote as a proof of the legacy of Qur'anic translation speaks to a broader process of contesting the shape and significance of Qur'anic hermeneutics in the course of Islamic history. Before Wajdī took on the post of chief editor of *al-Azhar*, the journal had published in 1932 an article by Shaykh Maḥmūd Abū Daqīqa (d. 1940), a professor in the faculty of Islamic theology (i.e. the Kulliyyat Uṣūl al-Dīn) at the university, taking a rather saturnine view of the lawfulness of Qur'anic translation. As for Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḥa*, Abū Daqīqa argued that the variants separating the material found in the *Nihāya*, the *Mabsūṭ* and in Nawawī's commentary demonstrated how weak the account was and that the very story went against the juridical consensus (*ijmā'*), which had agreed that it was unlawful to translate the Qur'an.<sup>74</sup>

In the same year, Muṣṭafā Ṣabrī (d. 1954) the former Shaykh al-Islām in the Ottoman Empire, who was living in exile in Cairo, published a detailed Arabic treatise refuting the modern attempts to translate the Qur'an. A virulent opponent of secular nationalism, Ṣabrī directed much of his ire at the Kemalist support of Turkish translations of the Qur'an and the use of such translations in mosques and for the performance of ritual prayer.<sup>75</sup> However, the treatise was also written in response to both Wajdī and Marāghī, who had published various articles in leading Egyptian newspapers, advocating the translation of the Qur'an.<sup>76</sup> While Ṣabrī acknowledges that the majority of the Muslims throughout the world indeed do not know Arabic, this, he concludes, is no justification for Qur'anic translations; rather, trained religious scholars should explain to these Muslims the meaning of the sacred text.<sup>77</sup> Regarding Salmān's translation, Ṣabrī dismisses the account out of hand, quoting the famed Indian Ḥanafī reformist, Abū'l-Ḥasanāt

'Abd al-Ḥayy al-Laknawī (d. 1886), who wrote an entire study, the *Ākām al-naḡā'is*, on the juridical question of the use of the vernacular within the spheres of ritual performance.<sup>78</sup> While material from Shurunbulālī's treatise appears much more frequently, references to Laknawī's *Ākām al-naḡā'is* also feature in the Egyptian debates.<sup>79</sup> As for Salmān's *Fātiḡa*, Laknawī notes, 'I have looked into this account, but up until now I have not found it to be reliably transmitted in the books of tradition.'<sup>80</sup>

This is more or less the same position taken by Riḡā on the matter. In 1903, he published a response in his monthly journal *al-Manār* to the *fatwā* issued by Bakhīt. In this *fatwā* Bakhīt cites Shurunbulālī's *al-Naḡa al-quḡsiyya* to argue that one may issue a translation of the Qur'an, but it is only lawful to do so in a manner that maintains the original Arabic side-by-side with the translated text.<sup>81</sup> As noted earlier, Bakhīt also references the report of Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḡa* from *al-Nihāya wa'l-dirāya*, which he clearly derived from Shurunbulālī. In his response, Riḡā questions how Salmān's translation would have offered a means to adapt the Arabic text, as suggested in the account, which states that Persian converts would recite the translation 'until their tongues grew accustomed' (*hattā lānat al-alsinatuhum*) to the original. Riḡā concludes that, in any case, this particular tradition is not authentic (*ghayr ṣaḡīḡ*) and thus cannot serve as the basis for law.<sup>82</sup>

It is worth noting that Bakhīt later appears to have reformulated his stance on this particular issue. He still maintained the Ḥanafī position that those who did not know Arabic could use translations for the performance of ritual prayer, citing the Ḥanafī sources redacted by Shurunbulālī in support of this ruling.<sup>83</sup> However, as for the essential Arabic form of the Qur'an, Bakhīt argues that the individual reports (*akḡbār āḡād*) concerning the story (*qiṣṣa*) of Salmān al-Fārisī, as mentioned in various books of law, including Sarakhsī's *Mabsūṡ*, do not take precedence over verses of the Qur'an that affirm the Arabic character of the revelation; for, in contrast to this account, the Qur'an has the status of *tawātur*, in other words, it is authenticated by multiple lines of transmission.<sup>84</sup>

For Sulaymān there is no doubt about the matter. In the expanded second edition of his *Ḥadath al-aḡdāth*, he responds directly to

Wajdi's *Adilla* and focuses the brunt of his accusations on the inauthenticity of Salmān's *Fātiḥa*, charging that 'Wajdi lies about the Prophet, about the Companions, about the Successors; with injurious intent he strikes at the revealed law (*sharī'a*) and without any basis in religious knowledge, he issues rulings to the people.'<sup>85</sup> Sulaymān concludes that the entire account is itself a lie, as it cannot be found in any book of hadith and thus it cannot be relied upon: 'How can al-Azhar permit this mendacious ascription [to the Prophet] and rather than reject it, issue a *fatwā* based upon it?'<sup>86</sup>

Doubt concerning the authenticity of the story continued beyond these heated debates. Such is the case with 'Abd al-'Azīm al-Zarqānī (d. 1948), a professor of Qur'anic Studies at al-Azhar.<sup>87</sup> In his influential introduction to the study of the Qur'an, the *Manāhil al-'irfān*, first published in 1943, Zarqānī contends that there is no historical basis for Salmān's translation. He does this in an extended chapter exploring the lawfulness and linguistic possibility of translating the Qur'an; here he argues that a literal translation that seeks to replace the Qur'an is both impossible linguistically and unlawful juridically, a line of argument most generally agreed upon in the various sides of the debate. However, Zarqānī also advances the position that a translation which does not seek to replace the Qur'an but exegetically explains its meanings is both licit and meritorious, a position that largely conforms to Marāghī's argumentation and al-Azhar's translation project.<sup>88</sup>

With regard to Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḥa*, Zarqānī quotes Shurunbulālī's treatise, and argues that as the transmission of the report is unknown (*lā yur'afu lahu sanad*), it cannot serve as the basis of law (*fa-lā yajūzu'l-'amal bihi*). Like Shāṭir before him, Zarqānī criticises the account, which he asserts is not a translation of the *Fātiḥa*, but only of the *basmala*; furthermore, he argues that the translation of the *basmala* was itself not complete. Zarqānī's transmission of the anecdote is both apocopated and jumbled; here Salmān only offers the community of early converts the following, '*Ba-nām-i yazdān yaḥshayand*', which is a shortened misreading of Shurunbulālī's original account. Nonetheless, Zarqānī contends that the translation lacks a word corresponding to *raḥmān*, which he faults as a deficiency of the Persian language itself.<sup>89</sup>

The historian Abdul Latif Tibawi (d. 1981) echoes many of Zarqānī's points in his English article 'Is the Qur'an Translatable? Early Muslim Opinion', published in 1962. This article has had an enduring influence on the modern western reception of the topic.<sup>90</sup> Though he does not acknowledge it, the 'early Muslim opinion' that Tibawi sets out to unearth is largely a reformulation of what modern Egyptian scholars had collected in their own arguments over the matter. As for Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḥa*, Tibawi asserts: 'A historian will be quick to detect technical reasons, based both on internal as well as external evidence, to reject it altogether. Some jurists will not be far behind the historian in their protests.'<sup>91</sup> Tibawi concludes that there is 'no reliable evidence' that the Prophet had approved of reciting the *Fātiḥa* in Persian during prayer.

Tibawi makes no effort to trace the contexts where Salmān's *Fātiḥa* travelled or the motivations that animated its transmission, though he admits that translations of the Qur'an were indeed produced. While he finds it difficult to establish when these were first attempted, Tibawi claims that the manuscripts of these translations are themselves not particularly old.<sup>92</sup> Such a view can only be obtained by reading solely legal works on the topic, an accusation which Tibawi levels at the authorities themselves.<sup>93</sup> Contrary to his suggestion, the first full translations and commentaries of the Qur'an appear at exactly the same time as the emergence of Early New Persian in the course of the fourth/tenth century, a fact already apparent with the publication of Charles Storey's sweeping treatment of the topic in the first volume of his bio-bibliographical survey of Persian literature, published in 1927.<sup>94</sup> Furthermore, there is much to indicate that this written tradition builds upon even older practices of Qur'anic translation and that the history of Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḥa* is itself tied to this very process of vernacularisation.

### Language Politics

While texts like Shurunbulālī's digest feature throughout the controversy, modern religious authorities evince a good deal of resourcefulness in their use of material, often drawing on an array

of sources from different genres to marshal their arguments in new and creative ways. Although much of this material is taken from classical sources, the tensions animating the debates were very much part of the unique historical context of the period. As Sulaymān argues, Arabic is the formal language of Islam (*lisān al-Islām al-rasmī*). He continues that Muslims must resist the secularising forces of colonialism, which used the education systems across North Africa, the Levant and India to force French or English upon the local inhabitants.<sup>95</sup>

The writings of the famed Ḥanbalī jurist Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) are particularly influential in this reformist vision of Arabic as a sacred language that could unite the Muslim community. Perhaps most important is Ibn Taymiyya's polemical treatise *Iqtidā' al-ṣirāṭ al-mustaqīm*, which warns Muslims against imitating the practices of infidels, drawing on the prophetic hadith 'whoever resembles a group, belongs to [that group] (*man tashabbaha bi-qawmin fa-huwa minhum*)'.<sup>96</sup> As with other displays of cultural difference, language represents for Ibn Taymiyya one of the many locations of religious identity. Sulaymān cites a famous passage from this treatise in which Ibn Taymiyya argues that speaking languages other than Arabic is juridically detested (*makrūh*), for Arabic is the defining sign or mark (*shi'ār*) of Islam and the Qur'an:

When the first Muslims settled in the Levant and Egypt, the language of these regions was Greek, and in the region of Iraq and Khurasan it was Persian, and for the people of the Maghrib their language was Berber, and all of the peoples of these regions grew accustomed to Arabic, such that it gained ascendancy amongst both the Muslims and the infidels (*ghalabat 'alā'l-muslimīn wa'l-kuffār*) of these regions. This used to be the case in Khurasan as well. However, they became careless in the matter of language and they grew accustomed to speaking in Persian, so that Persian predominated amongst them and Arabic became unknown to many of them. There is no doubt that this is detested. Rather, the better course is to become accustomed to Arabic, so that it is taught to the young in schools and used in the home, and so that it manifests as the mark of Islam and its people. Then it would

become easy for the people of Islam to understand the meanings of the Book and the Sunna and the speech of the pious forefathers (*salaf*), as opposed to those who grew accustomed to another language and then wish to translate [all this].<sup>97</sup>

Here, vernacular exegetical activity is presented as a flawed means of transmitting scripture and religion. Sulaymān builds upon Ibn Taymiyya's views to argue that Arabic has always been the language of true religion and that the translation of the Qur'an, even if it were possible, violates the Arabic essence of Islam. However, it is of note that elsewhere Ibn Taymiyya argues that while it is prohibited to use translations for ritual prayer, translating the Qur'an for the purpose of comprehension, just like commenting upon it, is indeed permitted.<sup>98</sup> Sulaymān, in contrast, refuses to accept the analogy between the two.

While Sulaymān admits that of course non-Arabs did study the Qur'an in their own languages, he is quick to distinguish such interpretive activity from translation. To this end, he turns to the now well-known example of the Basran scholar Mūsā b. Sayyār al-Aswārī (fl. 120/738), who features in a list of prominent eloquent preachers drawn up by the Abbasid intellectual and man of letters, Abū 'Uthmān al-Jāhīz (d. 255/868–9).<sup>99</sup> A descendant of the Sāsānian cavalry (*asbārān asāwira*) that joined forces with the Arabs during the conquest of Iran, Mūsā b. Sayyār is remembered for his prodigious command of both Persian and Arabic.<sup>100</sup> At his renowned assemblies before the mosque of the Asāwira, Mūsā would read a verse from the Qur'an, comment upon it (*yufassiruhā*) in Arabic for the Arabs seated to his right and then turn to the Persians to his left and comment upon it in Persian. Jāhīz concludes that no one could tell in which language he was more eloquent.<sup>101</sup> For Sulaymān, the important point here is not that early Muslims used the vernacular to interpret the Qur'an, but that such acts were done purely for the purposes of explanation (*tafḥīm*) and interpretation (*tafsīr*) and not translation (*tarjama*).<sup>102</sup>

Repeated in these debates is an argument over the semantic distinction between translation and interpretation. For instance, Muḥammad Shākīr (d. 1939), judge and a vice-rector (*wakīl*) of

al-Azhar, also saw the two activities as fundamentally distinct. Shākīr famously spoke out against the first Aḥmadī translation, which reached Cairo in 1925, just as he stood in opposition to the Turkish translations of the Qur'an.<sup>103</sup> One of his sources for separating interpretation from translation is the compendium of Shāfi'ī jurisprudence *al-Baḥr al-muḥīṭ*, by the Egyptian religious scholar Abū 'Abd Allāh Badr al-Dīn al-Zarkashī (d. 794/1392).<sup>104</sup> Zarkashī relates an anecdote from the Shāfi'ī jurist of Transoxiana, Abū Bakr al-Qaffāl al-Marwazī (d. 427/1036), that it was impossible to produce the Qur'an in Persian. To the retort that the same would be true then for any interpretation of the Qur'an, Qaffāl replied that one could determine part of God's intention, but not all of it.<sup>105</sup>

In contrast, the move to issue a translation of the 'meanings' of the Qur'an, as proposed by Marāghī and Wajdī, was designed to keep the activity of translation within the realm of interpretation, an endeavour long considered legitimate in the broader sphere of Qur'anic hermeneutics. Thus, while a literal translation, referred to generally as *tarjama ḥarfīyya* or *lafẓīyya*, is repeatedly ruled out as impossible, an exegetical translation, a *tarjama tafsīriyya* or *ma'n-awiyya*, is advanced as entirely licit. Such a hermeneutical division is designed to preserve the sanctity of the divine and inimitable Arabic text, while also opening it up to various vernacular modes of interpretation.<sup>106</sup>

During the run-up to the parliamentary proposal, Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasanayn Makhlūf al-'Adawī (d. 1936), former vice-rector of al-Azhar and head of the religious court in the provincial city of Qena in Upper Egypt, argued in *al-Ahrām* that a *tarjama tafsīriyya* 'without a doubt has been permitted by all the ulama and there is no proof in the Sunna or elsewhere to indicate that it is forbidden'.<sup>107</sup> Makhlūf also concluded that, through the course of history, leading religious scholars have produced commentaries of the Qur'an in Persian and in Hindi, just as they have composed translations of hadith and commented upon them, and in doing so, he said, 'their method has been to understand the original and to express that which they understand in another language and then write that out. No one would say they were translating the Qur'an,

rather they have interpreted the Qur'an and then translated their interpretation.' Makhlūf contends, in contrast to those such as Sulaymān and Shākir, that it is a figurative expression (*ḍarb min al-majāz*) to speak of a translation of the Qur'an, for what is meant by translation is really just interpretation.<sup>108</sup> Years earlier, Makhlūf had advanced a similar argument in a treatise he published on the topic, in which he explained that in common usage translation is the interpretation of speech from one language to another.<sup>109</sup> This definition of *tarjama* is entirely in keeping with the classical lexicons.<sup>110</sup>

The grand mufti Bakhīt viewed the matter in similar terms. He maintained that the translation of the Qur'an for the purposes of instruction and comprehension, to warn humanity and to spread Islam is permitted according to all the legal schools without distinction. However, such translations should only be distributed after they have been verified to contain no distortion or falsification of theological meaning (i.e. *tahrīf*).<sup>111</sup> Bakhīt further argues that just as spreading Islam is a communal obligation (*farḍ kifāya*), so too is translating and explaining the Qur'an, 'for lexically the meaning of translation (*tarjama*) is interpretation (*tafsīr*), and there is no doubt that the interpretation of the Qur'an in Arabic is an expression of it through a translation of its meanings ('*ibāratun 'an tarjamatin li-ma'nāhu*').<sup>112</sup> Just as opponents often stated that translation was forbidden by consensus, those in support of the project repeatedly claimed that translation, as an exegetical activity, was not only lawful, but was a religious obligation for the entire community (*farḍ kifāya*).<sup>113</sup> Indeed, the belief that translating the Qur'an was a meritorious duty can be traced throughout the early exegetical and juridical literature on the topic.<sup>114</sup>

Even with this insistence on the probity of Qur'anic translation, advocates generally stressed that such translation can never replace the original Arabic text. The wedding together of meaning and form as the basis of Qur'anic inimitability lies at the heart of the problem. Thus, many modern advocates insisted on the necessity of keeping the Arabic Qur'an alongside the translated text. This line of argumentation is often supported by juridical source texts from Ḥanafī law which state that translations of the Qur'an should always accompany the original text. Such a strategy for managing the

vernacular within the sacred space of scripture is entirely congruent with the early emergence of Persian translations of the Qur'an. Rather than reflecting a particularly modern development, the move to subordinate translation to the field of hermeneutics, focusing on the meanings of the Qur'an rather than replacing the inimitable text itself, builds upon established exegetical practices. Yet Shāṭir, who, like Sulaymān and Shākir, also insisted that interpretation and translation were fundamentally distinct, even objected to interlinear translations and vernacular commentaries as contrary to the precepts of Islam.<sup>115</sup>

Such an argument ignores the long tradition of vernacular exegesis in Islamic history and views it instead as unlawful and heretical. It also hinges on a vision of translation as fundamentally replacing the original text. The complete effacement of the source text is not the only manner in which translation as a hermeneutical enterprise operates. The interlinear form of the early Persian translations of the Qur'an very much moves translation into the realm of commentary and interpretation, supplementing, expanding and opening up the Arabic text, but not replacing it. In many senses, the controversy over the authenticity of Salmān's Persian *Fātiḥa* was not only a debate over translation as such. Rather, it was also a dispute over the place and significance of the vernacular in the various fields of religious learning.

### Whence Salmān's *Fātiḥa*?

To be sure, Shāṭir was not the first juridical authority to raise objections to the use of vernacular commentaries or interlinear translations. The Ḥanafī jurist of Damascus 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Ḥaṣkafī (d. 1088/1677) contends in his law book *al-Durr al-mukhtār* that while one may write a verse or two in Persian, writing an explanation (*tafsīr*) underneath each verse is to be discouraged (*yukrahu*).<sup>116</sup> This position reflects the concern that people would grow overly dependent upon interlinear translations, which by this period were widely available in Turkish and Persian.<sup>117</sup> Ḥaṣkafī's ruling, in turn, forms the basis for a *fatwā* issued in 1908 by the grand mufti of Egypt, Shaykh Bakrī al-Ṣadafī (d. 1919), in which he discourages

the use of such translations.<sup>118</sup> This line of argumentation is designed as a response to an earlier ruling advocated in several early Ḥanafī juridical works from Central Asia. This particular ruling gives licence to interlinear translations, but does not assign their use a degree of approval or disapproval, by which actions are categorised in juridical terms. Thus, for instance, Ḥāfiẓ al-Dīn Abū'l-Barakāt al-Nasafī (d. 710/1310) comments in *al-Kāfi* that while it is forbidden to grow accustomed to reciting the Qur'an in Persian or to write an entire codex (*muṣḥaf*) of the Qur'an in Persian alone, he sees no problem with writing a verse or two of the Qur'an in Persian without the Arabic text and he concludes that 'it is permitted to write underneath each word its explanation (*tafsīr*) and its translation (*tarjama*)'.<sup>119</sup>

More than two centuries earlier, Sarakhsī had made the exact same claim in his commentary on Shaybānī's *al-Jāmi' al-ṣaghīr*. Here Sarakhsī similarly forbids the habitualisation of Persian during ritual prayer and the substitution of the entire Qur'an with a Persian translation. However, he also concludes that it is licit to write a Persian explanation and translation underneath each verse of the Qur'an. Sarakhsī substantiates the practice of interlinear translations with a quote from the leading Ḥanafī jurist of Balkh, al-Faqīh Abū Ja'far al-Hinduwānī (d. 362/973), who had argued that 'there is no issue with this in our region (*fī diyārinā*), for the masses only grasp its meanings and their inner dimensions in this manner'. Hinduwānī also explains that the Arabs, in their own region, dislike the practice, as they argue, 'the Qur'an was revealed in our language'.<sup>120</sup>

These comments historically align with the emergence of a written corpus of Persian exegetical literature in Khurasan and Transoxiana. A very similar regional justification for the use of Persian is expressed in the opening to the so-called *Tafsīr-i Ṭabarī*, one of the earliest Persian commentaries and translations of the Qur'an. According to its preface, the translation was commissioned in Bukhara by the Sāmānid emir Abū Ṣāliḥ Manṣūr b. Nūḥ (r. 350–65/961–76).<sup>121</sup> One of the rationales given for the project is the argument that while the Qur'an was revealed in the language of the Arabs, 'here in this region (*injā ba-dhīn nāhiyat*), the Persian

language [is used] and the kings of this side (*jānib*) are Persian (*‘ajam*).<sup>122</sup> Hinduwānī, who makes a similar discursive move, appears to have been one of the members of the juridical body assembled by the emir to issue a *fatwā* in support of the state-sponsored translation project.<sup>123</sup> While the historical and cultural motivations are quite different, Marāghī’s translation project centuries later was also intimately connected with spheres of state power and religious authority.

From the beginning, vernacular exegetical writing followed patterns laid out in the Arabic field of Qur’anic Studies. Furthermore, the interlinear model, which characterises the earliest surviving translations, highlights in its very form a theological recognition of the supremacy and irreplaceability of the original Arabic. This point is borne out in the juridical opposition to replacing the original Arabic text with a Persian translation. As Abū’l-Ḥasan al-Marghīnānī explained in a work on positive law, *al-Tajnīs*, replacing the Qur’an with a translation is forbidden, ‘for it would lead to a devaluation (*tahāwun*) of the importance of the Qur’an’.<sup>124</sup>

While Marghīnānī reaffirms the Ḥanafī argument allowing those who have not yet mastered the Qur’an to use translations in ritual prayer, the position was increasingly discordant with the juridical view that the Qur’an was fundamentally untranslatable and inimitable both in meaning and form. Already in the fourth/tenth century, it is not difficult to trace a discomfort among certain Ḥanafī jurists even with the curtailment of Abū Ḥanīfa’s ruling by his two chief disciples, Abū Yūsuf and Muḥammad al-Shaybānī, who permitted the use of Persian in the sphere of ritual performance only for those with no mastery of the original Arabic.<sup>125</sup> The early collections recording Shaybānī’s dialogues with his master frame the matter in terms of personal opinion (*ra’y*). In contrast, the accounts of Salmān’s translation of the *Fātiḥa* serve to locate the practice historically during the lifetime of the Prophet. As such, the story may well reflect an attempt to grant further legitimacy to this particular juridical position in historical and intellectual contexts where the actions of the early community held greater authority than the individual interpretation of later jurists.

In the surviving material from the early *sīra* literature, the hadith corpus and the exegetical tradition, Salmān often serves as a paradigm for Persian conversion.<sup>126</sup> He also features prominently in the formative currents of Shi'ī esotericism as a Persian inheritor of sacred wisdom who was directly initiated into the family of the Prophet (*ahl al-bayt*).<sup>127</sup> Yet this diverse material makes no direct reference to Salmān's Persian translation. As several of the modern Egyptian authorities surmised, Sarakhsī is one of the first Ḥanafī jurists to mention the account. Yet, there is much to suggest that Salmān's translation had been in circulation as an established proof text in even earlier Ḥanafī circles. Furthermore, the account was not isolated to Ḥanafīs alone. While later Shāfi'ī authorities, such as Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209) and al-Nawawī, called the story into question,<sup>128</sup> the Shāfi'ī exegete 'Imād al-Dīn Shāhfūr al-Isfarā'īnī (d. 471/1079) used the report as a way of justifying the translation of the Qur'an with the direct approval of the Prophet.<sup>129</sup>

Here it would be useful to delineate when and where the story of Salmān's translation first circulated, something that the modern material surveyed here has done only in a very limited way, often with a polemic or apologetic purpose in mind. Admittedly, given the fragmentary state of the archive, such historicisation is rather difficult. If we accept Sarakhsī's statement that Abū Ḥanīfa used Salmān's translation as a basis for his ruling, then the account must have been already a feature of the juridical debates of the time. Yet other than Sarakhsī's claim in the *Mabsūṭ*, we have very little positive evidence to this effect. For the generations of jurists after Abū Ḥanīfa, however, the situation is different. As I have explored in greater depth elsewhere, we have good reason to believe that already in the third/ninth century there circulated amongst certain juridical authorities not only a story of Salmān's translation, but also an actual translation of the *Fātiha*.<sup>130</sup>

The Ḥanafī jurist and traditionist of Transoxiana Abū'l-'Abbās al-Mustaghfirī (d. 432/1041) preserves a record of the translation in his collection, the *Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān*. Mustaghfirī quotes Salmān's Persian translation with an *isnād* that stops with a transmitter from the middle of the third/ninth century, a certain Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Yūsuf, also known as Abū Ḥanīfa the Lesser. His

report states, 'It has reached us that the people of Iran requested Salmān to write something of the Qur'an for them in their language'. In response Salmān translated the *Fātiḥa* as follows:

[1] [ba]-nām-i īzad bakhshāwand bakhshāyishgar [2] ushnuhl khīsh [?] khudāy-i hama jihān [3] bakhshāwand bakhshāyishgar [4] khudāy-i rūz-i dādīstān [5] ka tu-rā parastīm u tu-rā ba-yārī khwāhīm [6-7] mā rā rāh-i ān na-dahī ka na-bakhashmī tu bā ishān u na bī-rāhand.

[1] In the Name of the Lord, the Forgiving, the Merciful [2] gratitude to the Lord of all the world [3] the Forgiving, the Merciful, [4] the Lord of the Day of Judgement, [5] it is You whom we worship and from whom we seek succour; [6-7] do not set us on the path of those with whom You have enmity nor those who have gone astray.<sup>131</sup>

Other than collapsing together the sixth and seventh verses, the translation closely follows the original Arabic. The prayer entirely lacks Arabic vocabulary. This feature would have strengthened the credibility of the document, as it is congruous with what is said to have been its original target audience, namely Persians who, at that point, presumably had not been in linguistic contact with Arabic.

As with Shurunbulālī's account taken from the *Nihāya* by Tāj al-Sharī'a, the opening expression, *ba-nām-i īzad*, follows the Middle Persian, *pad nām ī yazdān* [PWN ŠM Y yzđtn]. This has clear echoes of Zoroastrian liturgical material, as do the terms *bakhshāwand* and *bakhshāyishgar*, both etymologically related to the Middle Persian verb *abaxšāyīdan* ('to forgive').<sup>132</sup> The words are thus evocative of a pre-Islamic religious vocabulary, suggesting in their own right the challenge of using Persian for ritual prayer, as it could very well evoke a set of non-Islamic religious practices and beliefs.

The memory of Salmān's translation circulated in the Ḥanafī juridical milieu of Transoxiana and Khurasan during the course of the fourth/tenth century, while the transmission of the account most likely dates back to preceding generations in Iran and Iraq.<sup>133</sup> However, the historicity of the document, as a reflection of an actual

translation made by Salmān al-Fārisī, is rather questionable, particularly as it supports a specific juridical argument. Yet, unlike Sarakhsi's *Mabsūt*, no juridical context is explicitly suggested in Mustaghfirī's presentation, which rather pauses on the antiquity of the language. Nonetheless, as many of the transmitters of the account were clearly juridical authorities in their own right, it is not difficult to see the legal implications behind the translation. It is of note that Mustaghfirī's *isnād* does not stretch back to the life of the Prophet or the subsequent generation of Companions and Followers. However, the presentation of the account, with the formula 'it has reached us', would indicate that the story existed in some form prior to its first recorded transmitter.

In addition, the names of the transmitters listed by Mustaghfirī are not particularly well known, save for a reference to Yaḥyā b. Mu'ādh al-Rāzī (d. 258/872), who is drawn into the material only after the translation has been presented. The penultimate transmitter, identified as Muḥammad b. Ja'far al-Faqīh, was a jurist from the Iranian city of Rayy who asked Yaḥyā about the significance of *ushnuhl khīsh*.<sup>134</sup> While it is not clear what *khīsh* means here, other than perhaps indicating some kind of preposition marker, *ushnuhl* is a perfectly reasonable rendering of *išnōhr* or *šnōhr* [*šnwhl*], a Middle Persian word for propitiation, gratitude, or thanks, which is a religious term used in Zoroastrian literature. Yaḥyā explains that the expression is from *fahlawiyya qadīma* (ancient Pahlavi), and he offers the Persian word *sipās* ('praise' or 'gratitude') as an explanation; this is an interpretation that is entirely in keeping with the original sense of the term.

Why Yaḥyā in particular would have been drawn into the exchange deserves further consideration. He was a popular preacher and renunciant who travelled widely across Iran and Iraq and ultimately settled in Nishapur. Yaḥyā was a contemporary of Ibn Karrām (d. 255/869), the founder of the renunciatory Karrāmī movement. Furthermore, he is said to have praised Ibn Karrām and several modern scholars have suggested that Yaḥyā held Karrāmī sympathies.<sup>135</sup> The Karrāmīyya were particularly instrumental in the process of converting the local population of Khurasan and Central Asia.

The connection between Yaḥyā and Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḥa* points to a broader network of ascetic Persian preachers who were involved in missionary activities along the frontiers and who were associated with vernacular expressions of piety. If we are to accept that the *isnād* accompanying Mustaghfirī's account reflects a historical process of transmission, then it points to the circulation of Qur'anic liturgical material in Persian during the middle of the third/ninth century. Furthermore, by this period, Ḥanafī jurists in the nascent stages of the development of their legal traditions had already circumscribed a space for Persian within the sphere of ritual activity. The same appears to have been the case for the short-lived school of Karrāmī jurisprudence, which, as with many other legal issues, followed the Ḥanafīs on the question of liturgical translation. Like Abū Ḥanīfa, Ibn Karrām is said to have permitted the unrestricted ritual use of translations, regardless of one's capacity in Arabic.<sup>136</sup> Furthermore, both the Ḥanafīs and the Karrāmīs advanced a framework informed by Murji'ī theology that privileged faith over acts in the process of conversion.<sup>137</sup>

The earliest Ḥanafī treatment of the topic, as preserved by Muḥammad al-Shaybānī and others, makes no reference to Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḥa*. From its presence in Mustaghfirī's hadith collection, we have evidence that a written record of Salmān's *Fātiḥa* had been in circulation for some time. Mustaghfirī's *isnād* stops with the generation of Yaḥyā b. Mu'adh al-Rāzī, and this likely offers a *terminus ante quem* for the use of Salmān's translation as a juridical proof text. The fact that the story appears not to have circulated widely prior to this may indicate its weak historical basis in the eyes of tradition-minded jurists; it may also point to a relatively late date for the emergence of the account. Yet, by the time Sarakhsī composed the *Mabsūṭ*, Salmān's *Fātiḥa* had clearly taken on a measure of authority in Ḥanafī circles as a justification for ritual prayer in translation, rooted in the authority of the Sunna of the early community.

As a document, Salmān's *Fātiḥa* moves the justification for ritual performance in the vernacular beyond merely a hypothetical abstraction of jurisprudence, for it supplies the very textual basis for ritual performance in translation. Indeed, this written record

may well substantiate the use of such translations, however limited, in the space of ritual praxis. This is very much the suggestion in the regional history of Bukhara by Abū Bakr al-Narshakhī (d. 348/959), which describes how the first converts of the city in the early second/eighth century performed ritual prayer in translation, as they were unable to master the original Arabic.<sup>138</sup> In this sense, the account of Salmān's Persian translation reduces the complex history of conversion and ritual performance along linguistic frontiers into a discrete and manageable narrative form. Considering the juridical implications, there is good reason to believe that such narrativisation follows after the very ritual practices it seeks to justify.

It is perhaps not entirely inconsequential that we find in the earliest numismatic history of Arab-Sāsānian coins and weights from the first and second centuries of the Islamic era, not only the translation of the testament of faith (*shahāda*) into Middle Persian with 'Prophet of God' (*rasūl Allāh*) rendered *paygāmbār ī yazd* [pgt'mbl Y yzdt],<sup>139</sup> but also the actual translation of Qur'anic material.<sup>140</sup> As the conversion of non-Arabs necessarily would have been preceded by acts of translation, one may further ponder the extent to which the Ḥanafī and Karrāmī rulings permitting liturgical translation were following rather than establishing a set of normative practices along the frontiers.

The story of Salmān's translation also fits into a discursive process of legitimating vernacular religious learning, which extended beyond Ḥanafī and Karrāmī juridical circles. This is apparent in the introduction to the Persian commentary and interlinear translation of the Qur'an, the *Tāj al-tarājim*, produced by Isfarā'īnī, a Shāfi'ī scholar from Khurasan, in the middle of the fifth/eleventh century. Isfarā'īnī, who was appointed by the powerful Saljuk vizier Niẓām al-Mulk (d. 485/1092) to the Madrasa Niẓāmiyya in Tūs, opens his work with a robust defence of translating the Qur'an into any given language where there may be need.<sup>141</sup>

Among the various justifications he offers, the account of Salmān's translation stands out. Isfarā'īnī not only claims that Salmān translated the *Fātiḥa*, but also that, with the Prophet's approval, he produced an entire Persian translation of the Qur'an that preserved the original Arabic with the Persian written

underneath. We read that Salmān's translation concluded with a certification in both Arabic and Persian that affirmed 'this is the Qur'an which was revealed to Muhammad'. Unlike the majority of Shāfi'i scholars, Isfarā'īnī also suggests that converts who have no mastery of the original Arabic may indeed use translations of the Qur'an for purposes of ritual performance.<sup>142</sup>

As often accompanies the process of vernacularisation, the emergence of Persian in spheres once reserved exclusively for Arabic was a source of profound concern. Many of these tensions build upon even older anxieties that followed the waves of early converts in the course of the second/eighth century. For instance, the famed jurist Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/795) detested the use of foreign languages during ritual prayer. Mālik justified this juridical opinion with a report from the second caliph 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (r. 13–23/634–44), who is said to have forbidden the wicked whispering prayer (*raṭāna*) used by the Persians.<sup>143</sup> In this formulation, *raṭāna* alludes to the Zoroastrian liturgical practices of chanting,<sup>144</sup> related to the Syriac *reṭnā*, which signifies liturgical chanting, particularly the *reṭnā de-magūšūtā*, the whispered prayers of the Magi. The *muṣannaḥ* collections of 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan'ānī (d. 211/827) and Ibn Abī Shayba (d. 235/849) transmit similar accounts concerning the whispering (*raṭāna*) of Persians.<sup>145</sup> Ibn Abī Shayba notes that 'Umar singled out Persian as teaching only wickedness and claimed 'wickedness decreases manliness'.<sup>146</sup> The hadith corpus contains several similar accounts on the deleterious effects of Persian ascribed directly to the Prophet.<sup>147</sup>

Needless to say, Salmān's translation of the *Fātiḥa* could offer an antidote to these sentiments, which Kevin Reinhart associates with 'Arab chauvinism'.<sup>148</sup> We should also recall, nonetheless, that attitudes promoting the superiority of Arabic were by no means limited to Arabs. The early non-Arab clients (*mawālī*), were instrumental in the configuration of Arabic as a cosmopolitan language of learning and salvation, in which language and religious identity were intimately connected in diverse spheres of authority. Many of the staunchest proponents of the soteriological supremacy of the Arabic language were non-Arabs. As a hegemonic language, Arabic could extend beyond ethnicity and even religion. This is a topic

treated by those such as Ibn Taymiyya, who supports the universalist reach of Arabic with a saying ascribed to the Prophet, 'whoever speaks Arabic is an Arab'.<sup>149</sup>

In the first half of the twentieth century, the debate over Salmān's translation of the *Fātiha* came to reflect larger questions concerning the nature of religious authority and the place of Arabic within the contexts of religious reform. The controversy over Qur'anic translation intersected with the contested role of Arabic as a linguistic force to unite the entire Muslim community. While there are certainly parallels with classical sources on the matter, such mythologies of language were profoundly shaped by the specific histories of modernity and with them the legacy of European colonialism. There are many reasons why the modern debates over the translation of the Qur'an that took place in Egypt did not find direct corollaries in the Persian ecumene or in South Asia, where, like Turkey, vernaculars had long been privileged forms of religious expression.<sup>150</sup> For certain religious officials, the superiority of Arabic as a vehicle for religious authority, and with it the 'transparency' of the Arabic Qur'an, plays an important role in shaping the contours of the controversy.<sup>151</sup> Yet, in Islamic juridical and exegetical material, recourse to Salmān's translation was also an acknowledgment of a universalist current of adaptation, as it has long represented a discursive means of accommodating the vernacular within the spheres of piety and religious learning.

#### NOTES

- 1 See Muṣṭafā Šabīrī, *Mas'alat tarjamat al-Qur'ān* (Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Salafiyya, 1351/1932–3), p. 4.
- 2 Muḥammad Farīd Wajdī, 'Ḥadath al-aḥdāth fī'l-islām', *al-Ahrām*, issue 18424 (28 March 1936), pp. 1–2.
- 3 Travis Zadeh, *The Vernacular Qur'an: Translation and the Rise of Persian Exegesis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press in association with the Institute of Ismaili Studies, 2012), pp. 71, 95, 113–14, 260–63, 369, 374–5 and 478–83.
- 4 For an illuminating treatment of the topic as it relates to the broader historical context, see M. Brett Wilson, *Translating the Qur'an in an Age of Nationalism: Print Culture and Modern Islam in Turkey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press in association with the Institute of Ismaili Studies, 2014), pp. 184–220. See also in the present volume, Stefan Wild, Chapter 13, pp. 428–31. Further overviews are given in Aḥmad Ibrāhīm Muḥannā, *Dirāsāt ḥawl tarjamat al-Qur'ān al-karīm* (Cairo: Maṭbū'āt al-Sha'b, 1978); Abdelhamid Muhammad Ahmad,

- Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Al-Azhar und der modernistischen Bewegung in Ägypten von Muhammad 'Abduh bis zur Gegenwart* (Hamburg: University of Hamburg, 1963), pp. 32–44; Mohammad Ayoub, 'Translating the Meanings of the Qur'an: Traditional Opinions and Modern Debates', *Inquiry/Afkar* 3, no. 5 (1986), pp. 34–9.
- 5 See M. Brett Wilson, 'The First Translations of the Qur'an in Modern Turkey (1924–38)', *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 41, no. 1 (2009), pp. 419–35, at p. 428. See Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā, 'Tarjamat al-Qur'an wa tahrif tarjama lahu wa'l-tashkik fihi', *al-Manār* 25, no. 10 (1925), pp. 794–7. See also, Richard Hattemer, 'Atatürk and the Reforms in Turkey as Reflected in the Egyptian Press', *Journal of Islamic Studies* 11, no. 1 (2000), pp. 21–42.
- 6 F. Lyman MacCallum, 'Turkey Discovers the Koran', *Moslem World* 23 (1933), pp. 24–8, at p. 24.
- 7 *Ibid.*, p. 28.
- 8 See, for instance, Rashīd Riḍā, 'Bāb al-as'ila wa'l-ajwiba: Tarjamat al-Qur'an', *al-Manār* 6, no. 6 (1321/1903), pp. 268–70; *idem*, 'Kitābat al-Qur'an bi'l-ḥurūf al-inklīziyya', *al-Manār* 6, no. 6 (1321/1903), pp. 274–7; *idem*, 'Fatāwā'l-Manār: Tarjamat al-Qur'an', *al-Manār* 11, no. 4 (1326/1908), pp. 268–74. See also, Khwāja Kamāl al-Dīn and Rashīd Riḍā, 'Tarjamat al-Qur'an wa istiḥālat muṭābiqatihā'l-aṣl', *al-Manār* 17, no. 10 (1914), pp. 793–5. Riḍā reprinted much of this material in an extended article in his lengthy expansion of Muḥammad 'Abduh, *Tafsīr al-Manār*, 2nd edn (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Manār, 1366/1947), vol. 9, pp. 310–63; this is examined by J. Jomier, *Le commentaire coranique du Manār* (Paris: G.-P. Maisonneuve, 1954), pp. 338–47.
- 9 See, for instance, Rashīd Riḍā, 'Tarjamat al-Qur'an wa tahrif tarjama lahu'; *idem*, 'Mansha' fikrat tarjamat al-Qur'an wa sababuhā', *al-Manār* 26, no. 7 (1344/1926), pp. 481–96; and *idem*, 'Tarjamat al-Qur'an wa kawm al-'arabiyya lughat al-islām', *al-Manār* 32, no. 7 (1351/1932), pp. 535–44.
- 10 See Muḥammad Shākīr, *al-Qawl al-faṣl fī tarjamat al-Qur'an al-karīm ilā'l-lughāt al-a'jamiyya* (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Nahḍa, 1925), pp. 23–5. See also, Marmaduke Pickthall, 'Arabs and Non-Arabs and the Question of Translating the Qur'an', *Islamic Culture* 5, no. 3 (1931), pp. 422–33, at p. 424; Muhannā, *Dirāsa*, p. 13; Moch Nur Ichwan, 'Differing Responses to an Ahmadi Translation and Exegesis: The Holy Qur'an in Egypt and Indonesia', *Archipel* 62 (2001), pp. 143–61, at p. 145. For a summary of the debates over translating the Qur'an as they appeared within the Egyptian press during 1925, see Martino Mario Moreno, 'È lecito ai Musulmani tradurre il Corano?' *Oriente Moderno* 5, no. 10 (1925), pp. 532–43.
- 11 Pickthall, 'Arabs and Non-Arabs', p. 427.
- 12 *Ibid.*, pp. 423–4. On Marāghī, see 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Khafāji, *al-Azhar fī alf 'ām*, 2nd edn (Beirut: 'Ālam al-Kutub, 1987), vol. 1, pp. 264–79; Khayr al-Dīn al-Ziriklī, *al-A'lām: Qāmūs tarājīm li-ashhar al-rijāl wa'l-nisā'* (Beirut: Dār al-'Ilm li'l-Malāyīn, 1979), vol. 7, p. 103; and the monograph, Francine Costet-Tardieu, *Un réformiste à l'université al-Azhar: Œuvre et pensée de Mustafā al-Marāghī (1881–1945)* (Cairo and Paris: CEDEJ and Karthala, 2005).
- 13 See Pickthall, 'Arabs and Non-Arabs', p. 425.

- 14 For a detailed study of the political competition for leadership within al-Azhar, see Rainer Brunner, 'Education, Politics, and the Struggle for Intellectual Leadership: al-Azhar between 1927 and 1945' in Dale Eickelman, ed., *Guardians of Faith in Modern Times: 'Ulamā' in the Middle East* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 109–40. For a timeline of stages of reform within al-Azhar, see Pierre-Jean Luizard, 'Al-Azhar, Institution sunnite réformée' in Alain Roussillon, ed., *Entre réforme sociale et mouvement national: identité et modernisation en Egypte, 1882–1962* (Cairo: CEDEJ, 1995), pp. 519–48, at pp. 541–7.
- 15 For the nature of opposition and yet surprising continuity between Zāwāhirī and Marāghī, see Brunner, 'Education', pp. 121–2. On Zāwāhirī, see Khafājī, *al-Azhar*, vol. 1, pp. 259–63; and Ziriklī, *al-A'lām*, vol. 6, p. 26.
- 16 Pickthall, 'Arabs and Non-Arabs', pp. 432–3; on the matter of translation, see Costet-Tardieu, *Un réformiste*, pp. 238–46. See Zāwāhirī's letter to the prime minister, 'Alī Māhir Pāshā, dated 13 Muḥarram 1355 (5 April 1936), outlining his reasons for not signing the *fatwā* in support of Marāghī's proposal, reprinted in Fakhr al-Dīn al-Aḥmad al-Zāwāhirī, *al-Siyāsa wa'l-Azhar* (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-I'timād, 1945), pp. 349–50.
- 17 See Pickthall, 'Arabs and Non-Arabs', pp. 432–3.
- 18 Muḥammad 'Alī 'Allūba Pāshā, *Dhikrayāt ijtimā'īyya wa siyāsiyya*, ed. Aḥmad Najīb Aḥmad Ḥamadī, Jamāl al-Dīn Amin Muhannā and Nāhid Muṣṭafā Marzūq (Cairo: Markaz Wathā'iq wa Tāriḫ Miṣr al-Mu'āṣir, 1988), p. 286; cited in Costet-Tardieu, *Un réformiste*, pp. 242–3.
- 19 See Jakob Skovgaard-Petersen, *Defining Islam for the Egyptian State: Muftis and Fatwas of the Dār al-Iftā* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 163–4; Virginia Vacca, 'Lettera del Ministro dell'Istruzione circa il modo di eseguire la traduzione del Corano', *Oriente Moderno* 16, no. 5 (1936), pp. 292–3; Khafājī, *al-Azhar*, vol. 4, pp. 503–7. The *fatwā* is also reproduced in 'Ḥawl Tarjamat al-Qur'ān al-Karīm', *al-Ahrām*, issue 18442 (17 April 1936), p. 2; also in Muḥammad Sulaymān, *Kitāb Ḥadath al-aḥdāth fi'l-islām: al-iqdām 'alā tarjamat al-Qur'ān*, 2nd edn (Cairo: Maṭba'at Jarīdat Miṣr al-Ḥurra, 1355/1936), pp. 46–8; see also Muhannā, *Dirāsa*, pp. 51–3. On 'Abd al-Majīd Salīm, see Ziriklī, *al-A'lām*, vol. 4, p. 149.
- 20 Muḥammad 'Alī's speech is reproduced in 'Ḥawl Tarjamat al-Qur'ān al-Karīm', *al-Ahrām*, issue 18441 (16 April 1936), p. 1.
- 21 'Ḥawl Tarjamat al-Qur'ān al-Karīm' (17 April 1936), pp. 1–2. For more on the political progression of events leading up to and beyond the passage of the bill, see the contemporary Italian digests of the Egyptian press by Virginia Vacca, 'Gili "ulama" di el-Azhar tradurranno il Corano nelle principali lingue straniere?' *Oriente Moderno* 16, no. 4 (1936), pp. 236–7; idem, 'Lettera del Ministro dell'Istruzione'; Carlo Alfonso Nallino, 'Deliberazione della Camera egiziana sul progetto di traduzione del Corano', *Oriente Moderno* 16, no. 10, pp. 560–61; Laura Vecchia Vaglieri, 'Nomina della Commissione incaricata della "traduzione dei concetti del Corano"', *Oriente Moderno* 16, no. 12 (1936), p. 710.
- 22 'Ḥawl Tarjamat al-Qur'ān al-Karīm' (17 April 1936), p. 2; reprinted in Sulaymān, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*, pp. 43–4; and in Muhannā, *Dirāsa*, pp. 47–8.
- 23 Ibid.

- 24 Ibrāhīm Ḥasan al-Mūjī, 'Al-Bukhari, A Collection of Muhammad's Authentic Traditions, translated into English', *Nūr al-Islām* 5, no. 1 (Muḥarram 1353/April 1934), pp. 1–20. The Arabic title also refers to this as a translation (*tarjama*). Wilfred Cantwell Smith, *Islam in Modern History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957), pp. 122–55, examines Wajdi's editorial influence on the journal and the increased use of English. However, contrary to Smith's claim, there is much to suggest that Wajdi intended the English language material not only for Europeans, but also for English-speaking Muslims.
- 25 Zawāhirī, *al-Siyāsa*, pp. 351–4.
- 26 See Sulaymān, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*; this second edition is an expansion of the first version published in May 1936 by al-Maṭba'a al-Salafiyya, see Muhannā, *Dirāsa*, p. 45. Sulaymān published sections of this treatise in various newspapers during the lead-up to the parliamentary vote; see, for instance, 'Ḥadath al-aḥdāth fi'l-islām: al-iqdām 'alā tarjamat al-Qur'an', *al-Ahrām*, issue 18420 (24 March 1936), pp. 1 and 3, and *al-Ahrām*, issue 18437 (10 April 1936), pp. 1–3. On Sulaymān, see Ziriklī, *al-A'lām*, vol. 6, p. 153. See also the treatise addressed to Marāghī by Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Shāṭir, finished on 10 April, *Tadhkira li-ūli'l-baṣā'ir wa'l-abṣār ilā mā fi tarjamat ma'āni'l-Qur'an min akhṭār* (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Naṣr, 1355/1936), and a repurposed and expanded version published as *al-Qawl al-sadīd fi ḥukm tarjamat al-Qur'an al-majīd* (Cairo: Maṭba'at Ḥijāzī, Rabī' II 1355/June 1936).
- 27 Sulaymān, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*, p. 176; Sulaymān also describes the project as a war on language and nation, *ibid.*, pp. 77–81; cf. Ṣubḥī Maḥmaṣānī, *Falsafat al-tashrī' fi'l-islām*, 2nd edn (Beirut: Dār al-Kāshif, 1952), p. 107, tr. Farhat J. Ziadeh as *The Philosophy of Jurisprudence in Islam* (Leiden: Brill, 1961), p. 69, n. 22.
- 28 See *Oriente Moderno* 16, nos 10, 12 (1936), pp. 560 (Nallino), and 710 (Veccia Vaglieri). On Salim's role, see Skovgaard-Petersen, *Defining Islam*, pp. 163–4; for Shaltūt, see Wolf-Dieter Lemke, *Maḥmūd Šaltūt (1893–1963) und die Reform der Azhar: Untersuchungen zu Erneuerungsbestrebungen im ägyptisch-islamischen Erziehungssystem* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1980), pp. 113–15.
- 29 See 'Ḥawl Tarjamat al-Qur'an al-Karīm' (17 April 1936), p. 2; reprinted in Sulaymān, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*, p. 45, and Muhannā, *Dirāsa*, p. 49; see also Vacca, 'Gili "ulama"' di el-Azhar, p. 237; *idem*, 'Lettera del Ministro dell'Istruzione', p. 292; Nallino, 'Deliberazione della Camera egiziana', p. 560; Veccia Vaglieri, 'Nomina della Commissione', p. 710. Wajdi followed a similar exegetical enterprise producing an Arabic paraphrase in his own commentary of the Qur'an, a project which he began in 1906; he titles his Arabic paraphrastic explanations as *tafsīr al-ma'āni*, see Muḥammad Farīd Wajdi, *al-Muṣḥaf al-mufassar* (Cairo: Maṭba'at Dā'irat Ma'ārif al-Qarn al-'Ishrīn, 1925); J.J.G. Jansen, *The Interpretation of the Koran in Modern Egypt* (Leiden: Brill, 1974), pp. 46–7.
- 30 See Lemke, *Maḥmūd Šaltūt*; Costet-Tardieu, *Un réformiste*, pp. 245–6; cf. Zawāhirī, *al-Siyāsa*, p. 354.
- 31 See Maḥmaṣānī, *Falsafat al-tashrī'*, pp. 108–9, tr. p. 70.
- 32 Even in Salafī circles, the translation of the meanings of the Qur'an became a normative position, upheld, for instance, by the grand mufti of Saudi Arabia, 'Abd al-'Aziz b. 'Abd Allāh Ibn Bāz (d. 1999), among others in the state agency

- for issuing legal rulings, see *Fatāwā'l-lajna al-dā'ima li'l-buḥūth al-'ilmiyya wa'l-iftā'*, ed. al-Shaykh Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Duwaysh (Riyadh: Dār al-Mu'ayyid, 2003), vol. 4, pp. 132–6; in the Egyptian context, see 'Abd al-'Azīm al-Zarqānī, *Manāhil al-'irfān fi 'ulūm al-Qur'an*, ed. Fawwāz Ahmad Zamarlī (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 1995), vol. 2, pp. 133–5; cf. the question of reciting a translation in prayer as treated by the grand mufti of Egypt, Faḍilat al-Shaykh Ahmad Muḥammad 'Abd al-'Āl Harīdī (d. 1984), 'Tarjamat al-Qur'an wa tafsīruhu fi'l-ṣalāt mufsidun laḥā' (25 April 1961), reprinted in *al-Fatāwā'l-islāmiyya min dār al-iftā' al-miṣriyya* (Cairo: Jumhūriyyat Miṣr al-'Arabīyya, 1980), vol. 5, pp. 1627–8, no. 712. See also Niloofer Haeri, *Sacred Language, Ordinary People: Dilemmas of Culture and Politics in Egypt* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 12–13.
- 33 See Maḥmaṣānī, *Falsafat al-tashrī'*, p. 107, tr. p. 69.
- 34 The very title of Muḥammad Sulaymān's article and subsequent treatise, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth fi'l-islām* is a play on *ḥadath* as both an innovation and a misfortune or a ritual impurity; Wajdī uses the same title for his rejoinder, flipping the meaning around, as it were, suggesting that it was Sulaymān's stance which was deviant; Wajdī, 'Ḥadath al-aḥdāth fi'l-islām'.
- 35 Sulaymān, 'Ḥadath al-aḥdāth' (24 March 1936), p. 1; see Abū'l-Rayḥān al-Bīrūnī, *Kitāb al-Ṣaydana fi'l-tibb*, ed. 'Abbās Zaryāb (Tehran: Markaz-i Nashr-i Dānishgāhī, 1991), p. 14. For a discussion of this famed passage by Bīrūnī, see Lutz Richter-Bernburg, 'Linguistic Shu'ūbiya and Early Neo-Persian Prose', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94 (1974), pp. 55–64, at p. 63.
- 36 Sulaymān, 'Ḥadath al-aḥdāth' (24 March 1936), p. 3; see Sulaymān, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*, p. 21.
- 37 See Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī, *Kitāb al-Aṣl*, ed. Abū'l-Wafā' al-Afghānī (Beirut: 'Ālam al-Kutub, 1990), vol. 1, pp. 38–9 and 236; idem, *al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḡhīr* (Karachi: Idārat al-Qur'an wa'l-'Ulūm al-Islāmiyya, 1987), pp. 95–6. For further on the early Ḥanafī treatment of the matter, see Zadeh, *Vernacular Qur'an*, pp. 53–72, and *passim*.
- 38 See Skovgaard-Petersen, *Defining Islam*, pp. 4, 37 and 50.
- 39 Wajdī, 'Ḥadath al-aḥdāth' (28 March 1936), p. 1; cf. idem, *al-Adilla al-'ilmiyya 'alā jawāz tarjamat ma'ānī'l-Qur'an*, 2nd edn (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Raghā'ib, 1355/1936), pp. 61–2.
- 40 Sulaymān, 'Ḥadath al-aḥdāth' (10 April 1936), p. 3.
- 41 See also Sulaymān's further retort in his printed treatise, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*, pp. 33 and 205–6.
- 42 Shāṭir, *Tadhkira*, pp. 32–3 and 35–7; idem, *al-Qawl al-sadiid*, pp. 42–4 and 67.
- 43 Sulaymān, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*, p. 205; Shāṭir, *Tadhkira*, pp. 32–3; see Wajdī, *Adilla*, p. 61.
- 44 The commentary in question is by Baḥr al-'Ulūm 'Abd al-'Alī al-'Ayyāsh al-Laknawī (d. 1819), which reads, '*al-Ḥabīb al-'Ajami ṣāhibu Tāj al-Muḥaddithin Imām al-Mujtahidin al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī . . . kāna yaqra'a'l-Qur'an fi'l-ṣalāti bi'l-fārisiyya . . .*' in *Fawātiḥ al-rahmūt*, ed. 'Abd Allāh Maḥmūd Muḥammad 'Umar (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 2002), vol. 2, p. 10. The story appears to draw from the account of Ḥabīb and Ḥasan as preserved in Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Hujwīrī (d. ca. 469/1077), *Kashf al-mahjūb*, ed. Maḥmūd 'Ābidī (Tehran: Surūsh, 1383 Sh./2004–5), pp. 135–6.

- 45 Shāṭir, *Tadhkira*, p. 35.
- 46 Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Sarakhsi, *Kitāb al-Mabsūt*, ed. Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad al-Shāfi'ī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 2001), vol. 1, p. 138.
- 47 Abū Zakariyyā' al-Nawawī, *Kitāb al-Majmū': Sharḥ al-Muhadhdhab*, ed. Muḥammad Najīb al-Muṭi'ī (Jeddah: Maktabat al-Irshād, 1992), vol. 3, p. 341. Ridā makes a similar move quoting from Nawawī to discredit the Ḥanafī use of the anecdote in 'Tarjamat al-Qur'ān wa kawn al-'arabiyya lughat al-islām', p. 538.
- 48 Nawawī, *Majmū'*, vol. 3, p. 342.
- 49 Shāṭir, *Tadhkira*, pp. 36–7.
- 50 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Jazīrī, *Aḥsan al-bayān fi'l-radd 'alā'l-Shaykh Muḥammad Shāṭir wa ghayrihi min māni'in li-jawāz tarjamat tafsīr al-Qur'ān* (Cairo: Maṭba'at wa-Majallat al-Irshād, 1936), pp. 54–5.
- 51 *Ibid.*, p. 5.
- 52 See Sulaymān's list of authorities opposing Marāghī in 'Ḥadath al-aḥdāth' (10 April 1936), p. 1.
- 53 See, for instance, 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ḥasan (president of the Cairo religious court), 'Tarjamat al-Qur'ān ilā'l-lughāt al-ajnabiyya', *al-Ahrām*, issue 18431 (4 April 1936), pp. 1–2.
- 54 Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Marāghī, 'Baḥṭh fi tarjamat al-Qur'ān al-Karīm wa aḥkāmiḥā', *Majallat al-Azhar* 7, no. 2 (1355/1936), pp. 77–112; republished two months later as a pamphlet with the same title (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Raghā'ib, 1355/1936).
- 55 Marāghī, 'Baḥṭh', p. 91, and in the reissued pamphlet, *Baḥṭh*, pp. 15–16.
- 56 Wajdī, *Adilla*, title page; it was first released in May and then again in June with further additions.
- 57 *Ibid.*, p. 58.
- 58 *Ibid.*, p. 63; quoted in Rashid Ridā, 'Kitābat al-Qur'ān', p. 275.
- 59 Muḥammad Bakhīt al-Muṭi'ī, *Kitāb Ḥujjat Allāh 'alā khaliqatihi fi bayān ḥaqīqat al-Qur'ān wa ḥukm kitābatihī wa tarjamatihi* (Cairo: al-Azhar al-'Ilmiyya, 1350/1932).
- 60 *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- 61 *Ibid.*, pp. 57 and 63.
- 62 *Ibid.*, p. 61.
- 63 *Ibid.*, pp. 63–4.
- 64 *Ibid.*, p. 65; on the conversion of the Persian *anbā'* of Yemen, see Mohsen Zakeri, *Sāsānid Soldiers in Early Muslim Society: The Origins of 'Ayyārān and Futuwwa* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995), p. 270, n. 81; on the historical presence of Persians in the Hijaz, see M.J. Kister, 'Al-Ḥīra: Some Notes on its Relations with Arabia', *Arabica* 15, no. 2 (1968), pp. 143–69, at pp. 144–5.
- 65 Sulaymān, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*, pp. 16–18; Shāṭir, *al-Qawl al-sadīd*, pp. 12–13.
- 66 Abū'l-Ikhlāṣ al-Shurunbulālī, *al-Nafḥa al-qudsiyya* (Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Raḥmāniyya, 1355/1936), pp. 3–4; on Shurunbulālī, see Muḥammad al-Amīn al-Muḥibbī (d. 1111/1699), *Khulāṣat al-athar fi 'ayān al-qarn al-ḥādī 'ashar* (Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Wahbiyya, 1284/1868), vol. 2, pp. 38–9.
- 67 Shāṭir, *al-Qawl al-sadīd*, p. 124. The reference to the supplement of the *Majallat al-Azhar* is to Wajdī's *Adilla*.
- 68 *Ibid.*, p. 125; Shurunbulālī, *al-Nafḥa al-qudsiyya*, p. 15; the Persian has been slightly garbled in transmission.

- 69 Shāṭir, *al-Qawl al-sadīd*, p. 126.
- 70 See Hājji Khalifa (d. 1067/1657), *Kashf al-zunūn 'an asāmi'l-kutub wa'l-funūn*, ed. Muḥammad Sharaf al-Dīn Yaltaqāyā and Rif'at Bilka al-Kilisī (Istanbul: Maṭba'ī Wikālat al-Ma'arif al-Jalila, 1941), vol. 2, p. 2033. However, on the question of the identity of the author, Tāj al-Sharī'a, see Ibn Abī'l-Wafā' al-Qurashī (d. 775/1373), *al-Jawāhīr al-muḍīyya*, ed. 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥulw (Giza: Hajr li'l-Ṭibā'a wa'l-Nashr, 1993), vol. 4, p. 369, no. 2068, n. 1; along with the detailed comments by Abū'l-Ḥasanāt 'Abd al-Ḥayy al-Laknawī, *al-Fawā'id al-bahīyya fi tarājim al-ḥanafīyya*, ed. Aḥmad al-Zu'bī (Beirut: Dār al-Aqram, 1998), pp. 48, 185–9 and 338 (nos 31, 232 and 442).
- 71 Printed as a marginal commentary in Burhān al-Dīn Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Marghīnānī, *al-Hidāya*, ed. Mawlānā Muḥammad 'Abd al-Aḥad (Delhi: Maṭba' al-Mujtabā'i, 1332–4/1914–16), vol. 1, p. 86.
- 72 See Sarakhsī, *Mabsūf*, vol. 1, p. 138; idem (Cairo: n.p., 1324–31/1906–13), vol. 1, p. 37.
- 73 With regard to this passage, the printed editions correspond to Sarakhsī, *Mabsūf*, MS Feyzullah Efendi Koleksiyonu 983, Millet Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, fol. 9a; MS 191 Konya Karatay Yusufaga Kütüphanesi, Konya, fol. 22b; cf. Burhān al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Aḥmad al-Marghīnānī al-Bukhārī (d. 616/1219–20), who, without citing Sarakhsī, appears to be directly copying the passage, *al-Muḥīṭ al-burhānī*, ed. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Jundī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 2004), vol. 1, p. 307; my earlier assessment reflects the reception history of the *Mabsūf* and not how it is treated in the published text, see Zadeh, *Vernacular Qur'an*, p. 114.
- 74 Maḥmūd Abū Daqīqa, 'Kalima fi tarjamat al-Qur'an al-Karīm', *Nūr al-Islām* 3, no. 1 (1351/1932), pp. 29–35, at pp. 33–4. On Abū Daqīqa, see Zirikli, *al-A'lām*, vol. 7, p. 169; cf. Muḥammad Aḥmad, *Die Auseinandersetzung Zwischen al-Azhar*, p. 36.
- 75 See Wilson, 'First Translations', p. 431.
- 76 Ṣabrī, *Mas'ala*, p. 4; Ibrāhīm al-Jabbālī, 'Kalām fi tarjamat al-Qur'an', *Nūr al-Islām* 3, no. 1 (1351/1932), p. 59.
- 77 Ibid., p. 14.
- 78 Abū'l-Ḥasanāt 'Abd al-Ḥayy al-Laknawī, 'Ākām al-nafā'is fi adā' al-adhkār bi-lisān al-fāris' in *Majmū'at rasā'il al-Laknawī*, ed. Nā'im Ashraf Nūr Aḥmad (Karachi: Idārat al-Qur'an wa'l-'Ulūm al-Islāmiyya, 1419/1998–9), vol. 4, pp. 333–92. On Abū'l-Ḥasanāt, see Renate Würsch, 'Abd al-Ḥayy al-Laknawī, Abū'l-Ḥasanāt', *EI THREE* (Brill Online).
- 79 In addition to Ṣabrī, see also, for instance, Sulaymān, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*, pp. 83 and 184–7.
- 80 Laknawī, 'Ākām al-nafā'is', p. 363; Ṣabrī, *Mas'ala*, p. 61.
- 81 Quoted in Riḍā, 'Kitābat al-Qur'an', p. 275.
- 82 Ibid., p. 277. Riḍā goes on to argue that if what is meant here is that Salmān transliterated the account into Persian as a means for converts to pronounce the original Arabic, this would also make little sense, as the Persian and Arabic scripts are themselves nearly the same. Admittedly, Riḍā appears not to be aware that the Arabic script was adapted for the use of Persian much later. See also, Riḍā, 'Tarjamat al-Qur'an wa kawn al-'arabiyya lughat al-islām', p. 538.
- 83 Bakhīt, *Kitāb Hujjat Allāh*, p. 45.
- 84 Ibid.

- 85 Sulaymān, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*, p. 203.
- 86 Ibid., p. 204; cf. Wajdi, *Adilla*, p. 75.
- 87 On Zarqānī, see Zirikli, *al-A'lām*, vol. 6, p. 210.
- 88 Zarqānī, *Manāhil al-'irfān*, vol. 2, pp. 133–5.
- 89 Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 125–6.
- 90 A.L. Tibawi, 'Is the Qur'an Translatable? Early Muslim Opinion', *Muslim World* 52, no. 1 (1962), pp. 4–16; see for instance, Anna Gade, *The Qur'an: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2010), pp. 101–2.
- 91 Tibawi, 'Early Muslim Opinion', p. 5.
- 92 Ibid., p. 15.
- 93 Ibid., p. 16.
- 94 Charles A. Storey, 'Qur'anic Literature', in idem, *Persian Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey* (London: Luzac, 1927), vol. 1, part 1, pp. 1–58, vol. 1, part 2, pp. 1189–228. For further overviews in English of the Persian exegetical traditions, see Frank Lewis, 'Persian Literature and the Qur'an', *EQ*, vol. 4, pp. 55–66; Annabel Keeler, 'Exegesis III. In Persian', *Elr*, vol. 9, pp. 119–23; Mohammad Jafar Yahaghi, 'The Development of Koranic Commentaries in Early New Persian' in Fereyduṅ Vahman and Claus V. Pedersen, eds, *Religious Texts in Iranian Languages* (Copenhagen: Det Kongelige Danske Videnskaberne Selskab, 2007), pp. 247–61. The modern Persian scholarship on the topic is extensive; for general introductions, see, for instance, Ḥasan Sādāt Nāṣiri and Manūchihr Dānishpazhūh, *Hazār sāl-i tafsīr-i Fārsī* (Tehran: Nashr-i Alburz, 1990); Ādhartāsh Adharnūsh, *Tārikh-i tarjuma az 'Arabī ba Fārsī, az āghāz tā 'aṣr-i ṣafawī*. Volume 1: *Tarjumahā-i Qur'an* (Tehran: Surūsh, 1375 Sh./1996–7).
- 95 Sulaymān, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*, pp. 77–8.
- 96 Ibn Taymiyya, *Kitāb Iqtidā' al-sīrat al-mustaqīm li-mukhālafat aṣḥāb al-jaḥīm*, ed. Nāṣir b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-'Aql (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 1994), vol. 1, pp. 239–42; for this hadith, see Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī (d. 275/889), *Sunan*, Kitāb 33, 'Kitāb al-Libās', Bāb 5, 'Fī lubs al-shuhra', part 2, p. 675, no. 4033, in *Mawsū'at al-ḥadīth al-sharif, jam' jawāmi' al-aḥādīth* (Vaduz: Jam'iyyat al-Maknaz al-Islāmī, 2000–1); Abū Bakr Aḥmad al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066), *al-Jāmi' li-shu'ab al-imān*, ed. 'Abd al-'Alī 'Abd al-Ḥamid Ḥamid (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2003), vol. 2, p. 418; cf. 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan'ānī (d. 211/827), *al-Muṣannaf*, ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-A'zamī (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1970–72), vol. 11, pp. 453–4, no. 20986. More broadly, see M.J. Kister, "Do Not Assimilate Yourselves . . ." *Lā tashabbahū*, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 12 (1989), pp. 322–70.
- 97 Ibn Taymiyya, *Iqtidā'*, pp. 468–9; cf. Sulaymān, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*, pp. 39–40. See also Kevin Reinhart, 'Fundamentalism and the Transparency of the Arabic Qur'an' in Carl Ernst and Richard Martin, eds, *Rethinking Islamic Studies: From Orientalism to Cosmopolitanism* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), pp. 97–113, pp. 101–2. For a rather clever inversion of this passage for the purposes of advancing Urdu as the mark of Islam and an inheritor of Arabic, see the Deobandī Ḥanafī scholar Ṣafar Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (d. 1974), *I'lā' al-sunan* (Karachi: Idārat al-Qur'an wa'l-'Ulūm al-Islāmiyya, 1401/1980–81), vol. 12, pp. 702–3; discussed in Muhammad Qasim Zaman, *The Ulama in Contemporary Islam: Custodians of Change* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), pp. 41–5.

- 98 Ibn Taymiyya, 'Kitāb fi'l-radd 'alā'l-ṭawā'if al-mulḥida' in *al-Fatāwā'l-kubrā*, ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Qādir 'Aṭā' and Muṣṭafā 'Abd al-Qādir 'Aṭā' (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1987), vol. 6, pp. 323–664, at pp. 572–3.
- 99 Abū 'Uthmān al-Jāhiz, *al-Bayān wa'l-tabyin*, ed. 'Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn (Cairo: Maṭba'at Lajnat al-Ta'lif wa'l-Tarjama wa'l-Nashr, 1948), vol. 1, pp. 368.
- 100 C. Edmund Bosworth, 'Asāwera', *Elr*; and particularly on Mūsā b. Sayyār, see Zakeri, *Sāsānid Soldiers*, pp. 335–6.
- 101 For a theoretical reading of the translation process described here, see 'Abd al-Fattāh Kiliṭū, *Lan tatakallama lughatī* (Beirut: Dār al-Talī'a li'l-Tibā'a wa'l-Nashr, 2002), pp. 27–46, tr. Wail S. Hassan as *Thou Shalt not Speak my Language* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2008), pp. 21–37.
- 102 Sulaymān, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*, p. 196.
- 103 See Pickthall, 'Arabs and Non-Arabs', pp. 426–8; Muhanna, *Dirāsa*, pp. 14–19; Shākīr's treatise, *al-Qawl al-faṣl*, consists of four articles which he published in the Egyptian newspaper *al-Muqaṭṭam* between April and May 1925. The first of these articles, published 15 April (*al-Qawl al-faṣl*, pp. 6–13), was translated by Thomas Arnold as 'On the Translation of the Koran into Foreign Languages', *The Muslim World* 16, no. 2 (1926), pp. 161–5. See also, Moreno, 'È lectio ai Musulamni tradurre il Corano?'
- 104 Shākīr, *al-Qawl al-faṣl*, pp. 33–4. On Muḥammad Shākīr, see Ziriklī, *A'lām*, vol. 6, pp. 156–7.
- 105 Abū 'Abd Allāh Badr al-Dīn al-Zarkashī, *al-Baḥr al-muḥīṭ fi uṣūl al-fiqh*, ed. 'Abd al-Qādir 'Abd Allāh al-'Ānī *et al.* (Kuwait: Wizārat al-Awqāf wa'l-Shu'ūn al-Islāmiyya, 1992), vol. 1, p. 447, repeated in *idem*, *al-Burhān fi 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo: Dār Iḥyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabiyya, 1957), vol. 1, p. 465; the editor of the *Burhān* identifies the Qaffāl referenced here with the famed al-Qaffāl al-Shāshī Abū Bakr Muḥammad Ismā'īl (d. 365/976), also known as al-Qaffāl al-Kabīr; I followed this in *The Vernacular Qur'an*, p. 420, n. 23. However, in *al-Baḥr al-muḥīṭ*, Zarkashī explicitly cites the *fatāwā* of Qaffāl; this most likely refers to the collection of Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh al-Qaffāl al-Marwazī (d. 427/1036), who records a nearly identical ruling in his *Fatāwā*, ed. Muṣṭafā Maḥmūd al-Azharī (Riyadh: Dār Ibn al-Qayyim, 2011), p. 53; Zarkashī's citation of Qaffāl is copied by Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), *al-Itqān fi 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo: Maktabat al-Mashhad al-Ḥusaynī, 1967), vol. 1, p. 307; this is cited by Shākīr, who affirms the legitimacy of commenting on the Qur'an in foreign languages, *al-Qawl al-faṣl*, pp. 25 and 33; see also Ibrāhīm al-Jabbālī, 'Kalām fi tarjamat al-Qur'ān', pp. 58–9; Shāṭir, *Tadhkira*, pp. 60–72; Sulaymān, *Ḥadath al-aḥdāth*, pp. 114–20; Zarqānī, *Manāhil*, vol. 2, p. 135; the account is loosely translated by Tibawi, 'Is the Qur'an Translatable?' p. 15.
- 106 The ideal of 'literal' translation is, in practice, largely a myth, see David Bellos, *Is That a Fish in Your Ear? Translation and the Meaning of Everything* (New York: Faber and Faber, 2011), pp. 102–16.
- 107 Muḥammad Ḥasanayn Makhlūf, 'Tarjamat al-Qur'ān al-Karīm', *al-Ahrām*, issue 18424 (28 March 1936), p. 2. On Makhlūf, see Skovgaard-Petersen, *Defining Islam*, pp. 170–71.

- 108 Makhlūf, 'Tarjamat al-Qur'an al-Karīm', p. 2.
- 109 Muḥammad Ḥasanayn Makhlūf, *Risālat ḥukm tarjamat al-Qur'an al-karīm bi-ghayr al-lughā al-'arabiyya* (Cairo: Maṭba'at Maṭar, 1343/1925), pp. 3 and 28; cf. Muhannā, *Dirāsa*, pp. 19–24.
- 110 The Egyptian lexicographer Muḥammad b. Mukarram Ibn Manẓūr (d. 711/1311–12), for instance, explains the verb *tarjama* as 'one's speech has been translated when it is explained in another language' (*qad turjima kalāmuhu idhā fussirahu bi-lisān ākhar*). See Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'Arab* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1955–6), vol. 12, p. 229.
- 111 Shaltūt quotes Bakhīt's position as articulated in 1925, 'Tarjamat al-Qur'an', *Majallat al-Azhar* 7, no. 2 (1936), pp. 123–34 and 130.
- 112 Bakhīt, *Kitāb ḥujjat Allāh*, pp. 55–6; quoted in Shaltūt, 'Tarjamat al-Qur'an', p. 130.
- 113 See 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ḥasan, 'Tarjamat al-Qur'an' (4 April 1936), p. 2; and the Moroccan statesman, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥajawī al-Tha'libī, 'Tarjamat al-Qur'an al-Karīm', *Majallat al-Azhar* 7, no. 3 (1355/1936), pp. 190–98, at p. 190. See also Ayoub, 'Translating the Meanings of the Qur'an', pp. 37–9. Jazīrī offers a critique of Shāṭir's claim to be representing normative consensus, *Aḥsan*, pp. 35 and 42–3.
- 114 See Shāhfur al-Isfarā'īnī, *Tāj al-tarājim fī tafsīr al-Qur'an li'l-a'ajim*, ed. Najīb Māyl Harawī and 'Alī Akbar Ilāhī Khurāsānī (Tehran: Shirkat-i Intishārāt-i 'Ilmī wa Farhangī, 1996), vol. 1, pp. 8–9; see also Abū'l-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. 'Umar al-Zamaksharī (d. 538/1144), *al-Kashshāf 'an ḥaqā'iq ghawāmiḍ al-tanzīl wa 'uyūn al-aqāwīl fī wujūh al-ta'wīl* (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 1947), vol. 2, pp. 538–9 (on Q. 14:4); Ibrāhīm b. Mūsā al-Shāṭibī (d. 790/1388), *Muwāfaqāt fī uṣūl al-sharī'a*, ed. 'Abd Allāh Darāz (Cairo: al-Maktaba al-Tijāriyya al-Kubrā, n.d.), vol. 2, p. 68.
- 115 Shāṭir, *Tadhkira*, pp. 69–70; cf. Jazīrī, *Aḥsan al-bayān*, pp. 23–4.
- 116 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Ḥaṣkafī, *al-Durr al-mukhtār*, ed. 'Abd al-Mun'im Khalīl Ibrāhīm (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 2002), p. 67. On Ḥaṣkafī, see Muḥibbī, *Khulāṣa*, vol. 4, pp. 63–4.
- 117 As quoted in Ibn al-'Ābidīn (d. 1252/1836), *Radd al-muhtār 'alā'l-durr al-mukhtār*, ed. 'Ādil Aḥmad 'Abd al-Mawjūd and 'Alī Muḥammad Mu'awwad (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1994), vol. 2, p. 187. According to Ibn al-'Ābidīn, Ḥaṣkafī wrote in the margins to his *Khazā'in* that this position was taken from *al-Mujtabā*, i.e. a commentary by Abū'l-Ḥusayn al-Qudūrī (d. 428/1037), *Mukhtaṣar*, by the Ḥanafī jurist of Khwārazm, Najm al-Dīn Mukhtār al-Zāhidī (d. 658/1259–60); cf. Ḥajjī Khalīfa, *Kashf*, vol. 2, pp. 1592 and 1631. For the broader historical and geographical contexts of post-classical Ḥanafī *furū'* literature, see Robert D. McChesney, 'Central Asia's Place in the Middle East: Some Historical Considerations' in David Menashri, ed., *Central Asia Meets the Middle East* (London: Frank Cass, 1998), pp. 25–51, at p. 40.
- 118 Shaykh Bakrī al-Ṣadafī's *fatwā* is recorded in Haridī, *al-Fatāwā'l-islāmiyya*, vol. 1, pp. 44–5, no. 3.
- 119 Abū'l-Barakāt al-Nasafī (d. 710/1310), *al-Kāfī fī sharḥ al-Wāfī*, MS Hk 3502, Il Halk Kütüphanesi, Manisa, fol. 34a (unnumbered); a position repeated in Kamāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wāhid Ibn Humām (d. 861/1457), *Faṭḥ al-qadīr*, ed.

- 'Abd al-Razzāq Ghālib al-Mahdī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1415/1995), vol. 1, p. 291; Shurunbulālī, *al-Nafḥa*, p. 12; cf. Shaltūt, 'Tarjamat al-Qur'an', p. 129; Shāṭir, *al-Qawl al-sadīd*, pp. 112–13; Makhlūf, *Risāla*, p. 42.
- 120 As quoted in Bukhārī, *al-Muḥiṭ al-burhānī*, vol. 1, p. 308, cf. Zadeh, *Vernacular Qur'an*, p. 139, n. 92; Ashirbek Muminov, 'Disputes in Bukhara on the Persian Translation of the Qur'an', *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* 59 (2006), pp. 301–8. On Hinduwānī, see Ibn Abī'l-Wafā', *al-Jawāhir al-muḍiyya*, vol. 3, pp. 192–4, no. 1345.
- 121 See Daniel Elton, 'The Sāmānid "Translations" of al-Ṭabarī' in Hugh Kennedy, ed., *al-Ṭabarī: A Medieval Muslim Historian and His Work* (Princeton, NJ: Darwin Press, 2008), pp. 263–98; Shahrokh Mohammad Baygi, 'The First Available Persian Interpretation of the Qur'an Known as the *Tarjumah Tafsi-r-i-Ṭabarī*', *Hamdard Islamicus* 19, no. 4 (1996), pp. 31–44.
- 122 *Tafsīr-i Ṭabarī*, MS Supplément persan 1610, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris, fol. 3a; *Tarjuma-i Tafsīr-i Ṭabarī*, ed. Ḥabīb Yaghmā'i (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Tūs, 1367 Sh./1988), vol. 1, p. 13.
- 123 He is listed in MS Supplément persan 1610, fol. 3a as Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. 'Alī from Bāb al-Hind in Balkh. This appears to be an error of the copyist, as the name given in the biographical authorities is Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh; on Bāb al-Hinduwānī of Balkh, see 'Abd al-Karīm al-Sam'ānī (d. 562/1166), *al-Ansāb*, ed. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Yamānī et al. (Hyderabad: Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-'Uthmāniyya, 1962–82), vol. 12, p. 350; see also Elton, 'Sāmānid "Translations"', p. 288, n. 74.
- 124 Burhān al-Dīn Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Marghīnānī, *Kitāb al-Tajnis wa'l-mazīd*, ed. Muḥammad Amīn Makkī (Karachi: Idrārat al-Qur'ān wa'l-'Ulūm al-Islāmiyya, 2004), vol. 1, pp. 477–8, no. 512, cf. vol. 1, p. 478, no. 517. Quoted in Shurunbulālī, *al-Nafḥa*, p. 11; Shākir, *al-Qawl al-faṣl*, p. 26.
- 125 See, for instance, the position ascribed to Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Bukhārī (d. 381/991), that only heretics (*zandīq*, dualists?) or the insane (*majnūn*) would pray in Persian, cited in Bukhārī, *Kashf al-asrār*, ed. 'Abd Allāh Maḥmūd Muḥammad 'Umar (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1997), vol. 1, p. 42; also cited in Ṣabrī, *Mas'ala*, p. 61; Abū Daqīqa, 'Kalima', p. 32; cf. Muhammad Ahmad, *Die Auseinandersetzung Zwischen al-Azhar*, p. 35.
- 126 Sarah Savant gives an excellent account of the figure of Salmān in this process of historiographical modelling, in "Persians" in Early Islam', *Annales islamologiques* 42 (2008), pp. 73–91, pp. 80–82, and most recently in *ibid.*, *The New Muslims of Post-Conquest Iran: Tradition, Memory, and Conversion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 61–89.
- 127 See Louis Massignon, *Salmān Pāk et les prémices spirituelles de l'Islam iranien* (Tours: Arrault, 1934); see also Matti Moosa, *Extremist Shiites: The Ghulat Sects* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1988), pp. 342–51; Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, *The Spirituality of Shi'i Islam: Beliefs and Practices* (London, I.B. Tauris in association with the Institute of Ismaili Studies, 2011), pp. 97–8, 209–10, 294–5 and 471.
- 128 Nawawī, *Majmū'*, vol. 3, pp. 341; Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *Mafātiḥ al-ghayb* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1981), vol. 1, p. 217; cited in Shāṭir, *Tadhkira*, pp. 46–7.
- 129 Isfarā'īnī, *Tāj al-tarājim*, vol. 1, p. 8.

- 130 The following draws on material examined within the broader context of early Persian exegesis, Zadeh, *Vernacular Qur'an*, pp. 478–83.
- 131 Abū'l-'Abbās Ja'far al-Mustaghfirī, *Faḍā'il al-Qur'an*, ed. Aḥmad b. Fāris al-Sallūm (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2006), vol. 1, pp. 493, no. 685. Sallūm's transcription leaves much to be desired. My reading is based upon the unicum, MS Esad Efendi 181, Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul, fol. 96b. The last two lines are admittedly a bit jumbled and may well have been collapsed together in the course of transmission; I have dropped out the '*ka-tu*' which begins line six of the manuscript for the sake of semantic clarity, for it appears here to be pleonastic. The third and tenth lines of the manuscript clearly have *ushtuhl*, which is an error for *ushnuhl* > *shnuhl*, Middle Persian *šnwhl*. The folio is reproduced as figure 9 in Zadeh, *Vernacular Qur'an*.
- 132 It is common for Zoroastrian manuscripts to begin with the Persian phrase *ba-nām-i khudāy-i bakhshāyanda-i bakhāyishgar*, which functions as a kind of Zoroastrian *basmala*. See also, Philippe Gignoux, 'Pour une origine iranienne du bi'smillah' in Philippe Gignoux *et al.*, eds, *Pad nām i Yazdān: études d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'histoire de l'Iran ancien* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1979), pp. 159–63.
- 133 The first two transmitters to Mustaghfirī were from the region: 1) Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bukhārī, and 2) Abū'l-Ḥasan Naṣr b. Aḥmad al-Sharghī; Shargh (or Jargh), is a village located outside Bukhara, see Sam'ānī, *Ansāb*, vol. 7, p. 311. The next transmitter is 3) Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Yazdād al-Rāzī (fl. 352/963), a baker, who also took up residence in Bukhara; see Sam'ānī, *Ansāb*, vol. 8, p. 204 and vol. 9, p. 308. It appears that through him the account circulated in Transoxiana; while in Rayy, he studied with 4) Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ja'far al-Faqīh al-Ushnānī al-Rāzī; see 'Abd al-Karīm al-Rāfi'ī (d. 623/1226), *al-Tadwīn fī akhbār Qazwīn*, ed. 'Azīz Allāh al-'Uṭārīdī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1987), vol. 1, pp. 240–41. The final transmitter, 5) Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Yūsuf, was a Ḥanafī jurist, as noted by his honorific, Abū'l-Ḥanīfa al-Ṣaghīr (the lesser); this title was used to refer to other scholars who had mastered Ḥanafī law, most notably Hinduwānī; see Ibn Abī'l-Wafā', *al-Jawāhir al-muḍīyya*, vol. 3, pp. 192–4, no. 1345. The appearance of Yaḥyā b. Mu'adh al-Rāzī in the following *isnād*, on the authority of Muḥammad b. Ja'far al-Faqīh, dates the transmission of the report; see Mustaghfirī, *Faḍā'il*, vol. 1, p. 494, no. 686.
- 134 It may well be the case that the jurist Muḥammad b. Ja'far had a written version of the account, for he is credited with composing works on both *fiqh* and hadith, see Rāfi'ī, *Tadwīn*, vol. 1, pp. 240–41.
- 135 For further details, see Zadeh, *Vernacular Qur'an*, pp. 481–2.
- 136 See 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn al-Sughdī (attrib.), *al-Nuṭaf fī'l-fatāwā*, ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Nāhī (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1984), vol. 1, pp. 49–50; on the Karrāmī provenance of this juridical collection, see Aron Zysow, 'Two Unrecognized Karrāmī Texts', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 108, no. 4 (1988), pp. 577–87.
- 137 See Wilferd Madelung, 'The Early Murji'a in Khurāsān and Transoxania and the Spread of Ḥanafism', *Der Islam* 59 (1982), pp. 32–9. On the Karrāmī association with the Murji'a, see Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmiyyīn*, ed. Helmut Ritter (Leipzig: Brockhaus in Komm, 1929–33), vol. 1, p. 141. See

- also Josef van Ess, *Der Eine und das Andere: Beobachtungen an islamischen häresiographischen Texten* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), vol. 1, p. 664.
- 138 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ja'far al-Narshakhī, *Tārikh-i Bukhārā*, ed. Muḥammad b. Zufar b. 'Umar (Tehran: Sanā'ī, 1320 Sh./1940–41), p. 67. See Mohammad Jafar Yahaghi, who views this account, along with Salmān's translation, as shedding light on the early historical tradition of Persian translations, 'An Introduction to Early Persian Qur'anic Translations', *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 4, no. 2 (2002), pp. 105–9, at p. 105.
- 139 See Melick Iradj Mochiri, 'A Pahlavi Forerunner of the Umayyad Reform Coinage', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 2 (1981), pp. 168–72, pp. 170–71; idem, *Arab-Sasanian Civil War Coinage: Manichaeans, Yazidiya and other Khawārij*, tr. Jean Louis Avril and Françoise Graves (Paris: n.p., 1986), p. 57, no. 112; Stuart Sears, 'A Monetary History of Iraq and Iran, ca CE 500 to 750' (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1997), vol. 1, pp. 37–8. On the sociopolitical context of the coinage, see Stefan Heidemann, 'The Evolving Representation of the Early Islamic Empire and its Religion on Coin Imagery' in Angelika Neuwirth, Nicolai Sinai and Michael Marx, eds, *The Qur'an in Context: Historical and Literary Investigations into the Qur'anic Milieu* (Brill: Leiden, 2010), pp. 149–95, at pp. 168–9.
- 140 For the bilingual Arab-Sāsānian weight in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (1974.25) with its Middle Persian translation of Q. 5:8, see Raoul Curriel and Philippe Gignoux, who offer a tentative reading of the Middle Persian, 'Un poids arabo-sasanide', *Studia Iranica* 5, no. 2 (1976), pp. 165–9; Ḥasan Riḍā'ī Bāghbīdī attempts to fill in more detail, though with questionable readings, 'Darbāra-i tarjama-i 'ibārātī az Qur'an ba Pahlawī', *Nāma-yi Īrān-i Bāstān* 1 (1380 Sh./2001), pp. 11–14; Shaul Shaked's explanation is more compelling, 'Mihr the Judge', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 2 (1980), pp. 1–30, at p. 10, n. 38b.
- 141 Isfarā'nī, *Tāj al-tarājim*, vol. 1, pp. 7–9.
- 142 Ibid., vol. 1, p. 9; see also Yahaghi, 'Introduction', p. 105.
- 143 'Abd al-Salām b. Sa'īd Saḥnūn (d. 240/855), *al-Mudawwana al-kubrā*, ed. 'Alī b. al-Sayyid 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Hāshim (Abu Dhabi: n.p., 2000), vol. 1, pp. 193–4.
- 144 On *raḥāna*, related to the Syriac *reṭnā*, as liturgical chanting, see J.C. Greenfield, 'Rṭyn mgwš (The Sorcerer Whispers)' in Benjamin Sidney and Leon D. Stitskin, eds, *Joshua Finkel Festschrift* (New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1974), pp. 63–9; see Ignaz Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, tr. S.M. Stern (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1967), vol. 1, p. 158, n. 4.
- 145 'Abd al-Razzāq, *al-Muṣannaf*, 'Kitāb al-Manāsik', vol. 5, pp. 496–7, no. 9793; Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaf*, 'Kitāb al-Adab', ed. Ḥamad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Jum'a and Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Luḥayḍān (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2004), vol. 8, p. 548, nos 26684–6, cf. vol. 8, p. 549, nos 26687–90; see Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 1, p. 157, n. 3; Suliman Bashear, *Arabs and Others in Early Islam* (Princeton, NJ: Darwin Press, 1997), p. 31.
- 146 Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. 8, p. 548, no. 26684.
- 147 See al-Ḥākīm al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014), *al-Mustadrak 'alā'l-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, ed. Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Wāḍi'ī (Cairo: Dār al-Ḥaramayn, 1997), vol. 4, p. 184, nos 7080–81.

- 148 Reinhart, 'Fundamentalism', p. 108.
- 149 This hadith, which forms part of a larger speech, is notably directed to Ṣuhayb the Greek, Bilāl the Ethiopian and Salmān the Persian, among others. See Ibn Taymiyya, '*fa-man takallama bi'l-'arabiyyati fa-huwa 'arabiyyun*' in *Iqtidā'*, vol. 1, p. 410. While Ibn Taymiyya doubts the authenticity of this hadith, he argues that its meaning is authentic. See also Ibn 'Asākir (d. 571/1176), *Ta'rikh madīnat Dimashq*, ed. Muḥibb al-Dīn al-'Amrawī and 'Alī Shīrī (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995–2001), vol. 24, pp. 224–5, nos 5227–8; Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, *al-Khaṣā'ish al-kubrā*, ed. Muḥammad Khalil Harrās (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Ḥadītha, n.d.), vol. 3, pp. 10–11; also Roy Mottahedeh, 'The Shu'ūbiyah Controversy and the Social History of Early Islamic Iran', *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 7 (1976), pp. 161–82, at p. 179; Bashear, *Arabs and Others*, p. 56.
- 150 For an overview of modern Persian commentaries and translations, see my chapter, 'Persian Qur'anic Networks, Modernity and the Writings of "an Iranian Lady", Nusrat Amin Khanum (d. 1983)' in Suha Taji-Farouki, ed., *The Qur'an and Its Readers Worldwide: Contemporary Commentaries and Translations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press in association with the Institute of Ismaili Studies, forthcoming). Within the context of South Asia, see, for instance, Shāh Walī Allāh (d. 1762), *Faṭḥ al-Raḥmān fī tarjamat al-Qur'ān* (Meerut: Lithograph, 1867), p. 1. See also the discussion by Abū 'Alā' al-Mawḍūdī (d. 1979) of his Urdu translation and commentary in the preface to *Tafhīm al-Qur'ān* (Lahore: Ta'mīr-i Insāniyyat, 1954–65), vol. 1, pp. 1–10; similarly, see 'Uthmānī's robust defence of the early Ḥanafī position on translation during ritual prayer, *I'lā' al-sunan*, vol. 4, pp. 148–57.
- 151 See Reinhart, 'Fundamentalism', p. 109. More broadly, see Haeri, *Sacred Language*, pp. 25–51, particularly pp. 44–5 and 149.