The Concept Of Abrogation (Naskh) In The Holy Qur'an
The Concept Of Abrogation (Naskh) In The Holy Qur’an

Abbas Ali Shameli, Shahnaz Yousofi

Al-Islam.org
This text analyses the controversial concept of abrogation (Naskh) in the Holy Qur’an and its possible meaning taking into consideration verses of the Holy Qur’an itself and their interpretation.

**The Concept Of Abrogation (Naskh) In The Holy Qur'an**

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful

**Introduction**

One of the controversial discussions in Qur’anology is agreement on having the real meaning and understanding the role of (abrogation) Naskh in the holy Qur’an. In this paper I have tried to study different aspects of this subject as monitored in the Qur’an & discussed by Qur’an researcher. I have also attempted to re-read this subject as discussed by some Western scholars like John Burton, and A. Rippin. My concern has been also to concentrate on searching three verses of the Qur’an:

1. "Whatsoever verse we abrogate, or consign to oblivion, we will bring one better than it, or similar to it." (2:106)

2. "We will reveal to you, so you shall not forget, except what Allah wills, verily He knows whatever which is apparent and all which is hidden." (87:6–7)
3. "And We have not sent before you any Apostle nor any Prophet, but that when he longed, Satan cast suggestions into his longing. But God shall cancel that which Satan suggests. Then shall God establish His revelations." (22:52)

Importance Of Nasikh (Abrogating) And Mansukh (Abrogated) In The Qur’an

It is reported that one day Imam Ali (as) entered the mosque of Kufa and saw a man surrounded by a group of people who were asking him about Qur’anic knowledge. Attempting to answer the questions, he was mixing different parts of the Qur’an into one another. Imam Ali (as) asked him, "Are you really able to distinguish between Nasikh and Mansukh? He replied, "No". Addressing him, Imam told, "Therefore, you yourself are misled and misleading other people, too." According to this report it is clear that one of the most important conditions of understanding the Qur’an and consulting with its verses is having a correct and complete knowledge about Nasikh and of course the nature of Naskh in the Qur’an.

What Does Naskh Mean In The Qur’an?

Trying to understand the meaning of Naskh, we can go through two different ways and have two types of approaches: linguistic and technical approaches. In linguistic sources, Naskh has different meanings like copying (Istinsakh), nullification (Ibtal), and replacement (Ibdal). I will deal with the technical meaning of Naskh later when I discuss the interpretation of verses which were mentioned above. Abrogation in its general Qur’anic meaning stays for the deadline of a ruling. If any ruling seizes to be effective any more, we say it is abrogated. No one but Allah knows when a ruling comes to an end. Muslim scholars believe that Islam is the seal of all religions. Therefore, all previous religions must come to an end at a particular time when Islam is effective. This abrogation is because they will be expired at a specific time.

Occourance Of Naskh In The Qur’an

al-Razi, one of the Muslim interpreters says that almost all Muslim scholars believe that Naskh has occurred in the Qur’an; however, Abu Muslim Bahrana rejected it because of the verse 42 from chapter 41 which says the Qur’an is never imposed to any kind of nullification. He thinks that Naskh is really a kind of nullification and according to this verse the Qur’an is not opposed to any kind of wrongness. But as we will see, Naskh is a kind of change through which a ruling will be replaced by another according to
new conditions.

**Jews' Idea Against Naskh**

Jews have strongly refused the doctrine of abrogation because of its unacceptable implications & consequences. They believe that it leads to refuting the knowledge of God in the case of abrogated verses. Moreover, it leads to rejection of previous religions after the appearance of Islam. They also asserted that occurrence of abrogation in the Qur'an was a reason that Muhammad was not stable in expressing the revelation.

However, one may reply that *Naskh* is, in fact, removing a temporary rule which before God was clear that it would be removed, but for us it seems to be permanent. So, removing a temporary rule does not imply any ignorance for God. In addition, we know that in Torah (Tawrat) also some rules became abrogated, as well as four Tablets which were removed when Muses (as) threw thirteen Tablets which he had brought from Miqat (the special place near the mountain of Tur where Prophet Muses was worshiping Allah for a recommended period of time).

**Development Of Technical Meaning Of Naskh**

Muqatil, one of the Muslim interpreters, in his book (Khams mi'a 'aya/five hundred verses) considered *Naskh* as a technical term in the science of the Qur’an exegesis. Burton also in his article "High-Flying Cranes" states that we do not know clearly when the developed ideas about *Naskh* were first propounded and adhered within Islam, but the elaboration of the theories is dateable with certainty to at least the latter half of the second century after Prophet Muhammad (S), when Shafi'i in his "Risala/essay" and somewhat later in "Ikhtilaf al-Hadith/ the discrepancies of narrations" was applying his considerable talent to resolving the serious problem of the apparent discrepancies between certain hadiths/narrations and others, and most serious of all, between certain Qur’anic verses and certain hadiths/narrations.

**The Meaning Of Naskh In The Qur'an**

We have two verses in the Qur’an contain the word *Naskh*, namely Q., 2:106 and Q., 22:52. Burton states that Muslims interpreters generally assign that in the Qur’an *Naskh* means replacement, but this meaning is not applicable in the case of Q., 2:106. Translating *Naskh* into replacement would involve the meaningless tautology because it means whatsoever verse God replaces, He would replace! Q., 22:52 shows that the meaning of *Naskh* should be nullification (*Ibtal*), for replacement only is reasonable if God replaces one aya (verse) with another as we can see in Q., 2:106 and Q., 16:101. Yet we have another important point in respect whit comparing these two verses, for in Q., 2:106 the abrogated matter is God’s revelation, while in Q., 22:52 is Satanic obsessions.

So we should emphasize that one could never adduce that Q., 22:52 is a Qur’anic proof for the technical
meaning of Naskh. However, it may be used to support the concept of suppression and removal. Accordingly some scholars like Nishapuri pointed out that Naskh in Q., 2:106 is technical but in Q., 22:52 is linguistic.15

Comparing Q., 2:106 with Q., 16:101, we may conclude that the Qur'anic meaning of Naskh is substitution or replacement. But this meaning is derived from the whole context not from the word Naskh specifically. It is also interesting to know that even in the case of Naskh itself there is no real nullification because as Q., 13:39 states both removal and establishment are existed in preserved Tablet (Umm al-Kitab). Therefore, abrogation is a replacement or change for us yet for Allah everything is permanent.

The Theological Problems Of Naskh

Some scholars have argued that, since the Qur'an is the word of God, and thus is eternal, it cannot be abrogated in anyway.16 Tabari neutralized this problem by saying that if Naskh in the Qur'an means real change and alternation; it implies that the Qur'an would be created.17 So if the Qur'an were eternal, it should not be abrogated; however, we see verses in the Qur'an indicate the occurrence of abrogation by God himself. Moreover, at the end of Q., 2:106, Naskh is related to God's attribute of power, so it would be created because the subject of power is action and action cannot be eternal.18

The Scope & The Domain Of Naskh

Allamah Tabataba'i in his tafsir al-Qur'an argues that Naskh may belong to both rules and realities. He brings Q., 13:39 as a proof and says that this verse refers to Bada' (divine alternation) which is, in fact, a kind of Naskh. ‘Ayyashi, also accepted this theory in his tafsir (Qur'an interpretation) by quoting a saying from Imam Baqir (as) who says that Bada’ (Transmission Of The Divine Willing From One Thing To Another) is a kind of Naskh because of Q., 13:39.19 Accordingly abrogation could cover theological subjects such as Bada’.

Tabarsi,20 Tabari,21 and other exegetes, on the contrary, restricted Naskh to the rulings only. One more remaining question in this case is that what kind of ruling could be abrogated in the Qur'an? Considering Q., 2:106 and also Q., 16:101, we can discover that both the substitute (Naskh) and the replaced (Mansukh) should be a divine 'aya. Therefore, replacement of a ruling from pre-Islamic Arabic (the Jahiliyya) and also removing a Satanic obsession as mentioned in Q., 22:52 cannot be considered as technical Naskh. This consideration may also exclude Q., 13:39 because it has wider field and covers pre-destinations. Therefore, scholars called it Bada’ instead of Naskh.22

Although Rippin in his researching al-Zuhari’s book accepts that specification (takhsis) is a kind of Naskh,23 but as we mentioned before, according to Q., 2:106 and Q., 16:101 Naskh includes both removal and replacement, while specification is, in fact, narrowing the expansion of a rule which even after specification is effective. Therefore, we cannot consider specification as a kind of Naskh. Watt and Muir assumed that in Q., 22:52, the abrogated matter is not God's revelations, but it is Satanic verses
which were recited by Prophet Muhammad (S) as a part of the Qur'an and then removed. 

Tabari also narrated some narrations on the alleged "strange episode" in the life of the Prophet (S). So we have a very hot argument around interpretation of Q., 22:52.

Some interpreters say that if the Prophet himself said any Satanic matter, it must be weaken for future his claims to be a genuine Prophet and reduce people's confidence in the divine origin of his subsequent utterances.

Other scholars tried to justify or modify narrations about Satanic verses as follow:
1. Prophet Muhammad (S) himself was unaware of these words so he recited them without any attention.
2. The Satan, impersonating Gabriel had revealed these verses.
3. Satan as an invisible existent uttered the verses.
4. Some human Satan (enemies of Muhammad) imitating his voice, stated the verses.

Some scholars like Hassan al-Basri regarded these verses as true, divine verses which refer to the angels in the Heaven. But as I have mentioned before, Naskh in Q., 22:52, is a linguistic term and is really different from technical one. Although "tamanni" in this verse means also "qira'a" or "tilawah", but the Prophet has never recited any Satanic verses, for he had a deep and supported knowledge about the content of revelation, and was under control of special immunity by the angels.

Moreover, al-Razi in his series of Qur'an interpretation strongly rejects the story of the Satanic verses by offering some other verses which reveal that Prophet Muhammad (S) recited only what he was commanded to say. These verses are: Q., 69:44; Q., 10:15; Q., 53:4; Q., 17:74; Q., 87:6–7.

**Types Of Naskh (Abrogation)**

The other interesting aspect in discussing Naskh is numerating different types of abrogation which occurred in the Qur'an. Some interpreters believe that we have three types of Naskh (abrogation):

1. Naskh al-hukm dun al-tilawa (removing rulings without words),
2. Naskh al-hukm wa al-tilawa (removing both ruling and words), and

Considering Q., 2:106; Q., 16:101 and Q., 22:52, we can presume that in each case of Naskh we have a removal and a substitution, but removal may occur only on ruling or both ruling and word. Tabari has quoted al–Hassan who says that Q., 2:106 refers to two types of Naskh, because it includes two different
terms: *Naskh* (abrogation) and *insa’* (making forgotten), but others assume that they are synonymous.

The majority of the Muslim scholars, both Sunni and Shī‘ī alike, accept at least one type of *Naskh* in common: *Naskh al–hukm dun al–tilawa* (the abrogation of the rulings of the earlier verse, without; however, the removal of its wordings. But there is a hot debate about the third mode of abrogation; *Naskh al–tilawa dun al–hukm* (the non–survival in our text of an original Qur’an wording, with, however, the containing validity of the legislative force of its revealed contents). This kind of abrogation will lead to the acceptance of a new theory which implies that the Qur’an could be abrogated with Sunna (Tradition).

Shafī‘ī and Tabataba‘ī emphasized that Sunna can never abrogate the Qur’an, for if it were any inconsistency between the Qur’an and Sunna the latter would easily be rejected. Therefore, Sunna is always subordinate to the Qur’an in its validity and legitimacy. There is an interesting question about the verse that its ruling was abrogated. What is the purpose of leaving its words if it is contently abrogated? Suyuti replies that in these cases we may consider two reasonable points. The abrogated verse is left either to provide a constant reminder of the compassion and mercy of God who had lightened the burden of some of His previous requirements or to be another divine word by the recitation of that we will be rewarded.

**The Meaning Of "Insa'"**

There is a stormy debate among scholars about the interpretation of the term *nunsi* in Q., 2:102. Comparing this verse with Q., 87:6–7, we have a wider and more precise perspective. Exegetes offered different variants for the term "*nunsi*" both about its grammatical forms and its linguistic roots. Each variation will lead to some new questions and theories. Some scholars bring it back to the root "*nasiya*" and then considered it "*nunsi*". According to this version, the main question is that why God causes his Prophet to forget some parts of the revelation? Is it an instrument for God to abrogate a verse? Here we have to switch to Q., 87:6–7 to deal with the same term but in other form (*fala tansa*).

Is "*fala tansa*" a simple negative which denies the future forgetting, or is it a prohibition? Moreover, we have some questions about the position and the meaning of exceptive phrase "*illa masha’ Allah*". Is it really an effective form of exception, or does it have another role? Understanding the meaning of "*nunsi*" and the relationship between these two verses, we have to have some knowledge about chronological order of Q., 2:106 and Q., 87:6–7.

All Qur’an exegetes mentioned that Q., 87:6–7 is Meccan and refers to the early period of the Prophet’s life. On the other hand, Q., 2:106 is Medinan. Accordingly, Allamah Tabataba‘ī in his Tafsir concludes that, since Q., 87:6–7 is Meccan and revealed as a miracle to deny every future forgetting, we cannot interpret "*nunsi*" in Q., 2:106 as a term refers to the root "*nasiya*" (forgetting).

Consequently, the exceptive phrase in Q., 87:6–7 is not effective. It is revealed to indicate God is able to
remove what he has revealed even after Prophet Muhammad was ensured of forgetting. It is, in fact, like Q., 17:86 which says: 
"If We wanted, we would remove all We revealed to you" (17:86). 36 Similar to this kind of exception are exceptive phrases in Q., 11:107 and Q., 18:23. For example, Q., 11:107 says: "They are in the fire whenever heavens and earth continue to exist, unless your Lord wants otherwise..." (11:107)

If permanently they are placed there, then exceptive phrase is not effective and indicates only the maintenance of God’s power to release them if He wants. Allamah Tabataba’i also mentions that if exception in Q., 87:6–7 were effective, and meant occasional forgetting, then it would not be a special privilege for the Prophet, and he like other people would have forgetting. Moreover, according to the historical documents Prophet Muhammad was dramatically afraid of forgetting the revelation and recited it over and over again.

Consequently, God revealed Q., 87:6–7 ensuring him not to be afraid of revelation, for he will not forget any of the Qur’an. 37 Interpreting the term "nunsi", Tabari has a wavering position. At first he says "nunsi" in Q., 2:106 does not mean that God make His Prophet forget any of the Qur’an because of Q., 17:86 which says, "If We wanted, We would remove what We had revealed" (17:86); however, God never removed any of the Qur’an. Then he comes back and states that this verse, in fact, rejects removal of the Qur’an completely; nevertheless, God may remove some verses as He has himself mentioned in Q., 87:6–7 in exceptive phrase. 38

**Is Forgetting A Type Of Abrogation?**

Therefore, Tabari accepts the theory of forgetting concerned with the term "nunsi". But the main point is that we cannot consider removal in Q., 17:86 as technical Naskh, for the context of this verse does not include any replacement after removal, while the meaning of Naskh according to Q., 2:106 and Q., 16:101 emphatically includes replacement. Discussing the term "nunsi" in Q., 2:106, and its relation with exceptive phrase in Q., 87:6–7, Burton quotes that Qutada and Hassan who take "nunsi" as a term refers to "nasiya". They believe that causing to forget is, in fact, an instrument for abrogation. Accordingly "Naskh" can occur through a controlled forgetting. Yet we need to know, this kind of forgetting is not usual; it is a controlled way for a type of Naskh (abrogation of both ruling and wording). 39

Depending on this idea, Burton concludes that Q., 2:106 in comparison with Q., 87:6–7 is dominant. Therefore, we are able to go through a process starting from exegesis of Q., 2:106 and then turn to the interpretation of Q., 87:6–7 and eventually deal with narrations which could be considered as historical cases of either forgetting or withdrawal. 40 Burton may have some supports from Suyuti who states that if two verses are concerned with a single subject and their contents are opposite but if one of them is Meccan and the other is Medinan, the latter which is revealed later, is normally abrogating.

Accepting this theory, we will face with some problematic consequences. For example, if we suppose that Prophet Muhammad (S) has forgotten some verses, is it reasonable that all of his companions
forget those verses, too?! Moreover, this theory may lead to a kind of distrust about all his utterances, for people are not sure whether he has also forgotten some real parts of the Qur’an or no.

Considering all problems mentioned above, Burton states that some exegetes prefer to bring the term "nunsi" back to the root means abandoning.41 This idea has some Qur’anic bases like: "They (The hypocrites) gave up Allah, He subsequently abandoned them."(9:67)42 Finally, we may have one more question about the last part of the Q., 2:106 which says we will replace abrogated verse with similar or better one.

The Possible Superiority Of Some Qur’anic Verses

Being entirely the word of God, no verse in the Qur'an could be "better" than the other. Dependently, how could the superiority of some verses be? Tabari suggests that superiority in fact refers to the new ruling arises out of the substitute verse. It may be a new easier obligation or include more reward in the other world if it is the same or even harder.43

Allamah Tabataba'i, on the other hand, believes that superiority refers to the new criteria of the substitute ruling (milak al-hukm) which appear according to the new circumstances. In addition, each new ruling includes both the advantages of the abrogated one and its own reasonable criteria.44 I prefer to side with Tabataba'i in seeking the very criterion of any abrogated verse whether in terms of its divine or earthy aspect. This will reveal the philosophy of each superior verse.

Eventually it is interesting to know that the first example offered as a similar substitute is Q., 2:144 which took the place of Q., 2:115.45 Through this type of abrogation Muslim's Qibla changed from Bait al-Maqdas into Ka'ba.46 As we may apparently assume, there is no clear superiority for any of these two places to stay as qilah for the Muslims.

Concluding Remarks

Abrogation is one of the controversial discussions in the Qur’anic studies. In this paper, I have attempted to compare the ideas of some Muslim interpreters with those of some Orientalists who have studied Qur’an about the concept of abrogation and its role in the Qur’an. I have reviewed three verses which contained abrogation in its technical meaning in different aspects.

In my study, I came across a report which stated that Imam Ali (as) emphatically warned those who do not afford the necessary requirements of Qur’an interpretation. He particularly mentioned that having a clear understanding about abrogation is one of the crucial requirements to consult the holy Qur’an and sit for interpretation. I have also emphasized that according to Muslim interpreters abrogation has linguistically or technically occurred in the Qur’an. Therefore, different arguments have been raised to situate abrogation within the Qur’an beside the opinion among Muslim scholars that nothing could violate the trueness and continuity of the Qur’anic verses both in word and in content.
According to some of the Islamic references, almost from the latter part of the second century of the Islamic era the technical concept of abrogation was developed by Shafe‘i, a Muslim interpreter. This idea, of course, does not reject a Shi‘i perspective which takes back this beginning to the early years of the first century in Islam when Imam Ali (as) was correcting some misunderstandings in Qur‘anology through the teachings he got from the Prophet Muhammad (S).

Discovering the meaning of abrogation in the Qur‘an, we need to keep in mind that before Allah and in the Mother of the Book (Umm al-Kitab/preserved tablet) every thing is permanent and unchangeable.

The scope and the extent of abrogation which links Qur‘an interpretation into theological hot discussions about the divine attributions is another aspect in researching abrogation in the Qur‘an. The inclusion of Bada’ (divine alternation), human pre–determination, and the story of Satanic verses are examples of this aspects. The majority of Muslim interpreters replied that the key point in this debate is to be able to distinguish between technical & linguistic meaning of abrogation.

The typology of abrogation was another important aspect in Qur‘an interpretation. I have been convinced that the occurrence of abrogation both in word and in ruling accepted by all Muslim scholars. Yet they believe that other two types of abrogation needed more precise explanation. The remained question was that is it possible for a verse to be abrogated only in word. In the last part of this paper, I tried to study the possible linkage between abrogation and forgetting one verse in word or in content. Some interpreters preferred to assume that the term nunsi could only have the meaning of abandonment. They argued that taking this term back to its original meaning (forgetting) would create a total mistrust with regard to the whole Qur‘an!
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