

Beyond Words: Classifying Critiques of Linguistic Exegesis in Classical Tafsir

Roni Sahroni

Institut Ilmu Al-Qur'an (IIQ) Jakarta, Indonesia
abuumarroni@gmail.com

Muhamad Nasehudin

Institut Ilmu Al-Qur'an (IIQ) Jakarta, Indonesia
muhamadnasehudin.pb@gmail.com

Muhammad Ulinnuha

Institut Ilmu Al-Qur'an (IIQ) Jakarta, Indonesia
maznuha@iiq.ac.id

Suggested Citation:

Sahroni, Roni; Nasehudin, Muhamad; Ulinnuha, Muhammad. (2026). Beyond Words: Classifying Critiques of Linguistic Exegesis in Classical Tafsir. *Jurnal Iman dan Spiritualitas*, Volume 6, Number 2: 715–728. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jis.v6i2.54206>.

Article's History:

Received March 2026; Revised April 2026; Accepted May 2026.
2026. journal.uinsgd.ac.id ©. All rights reserved.

Abstract:

This article examines a critical study of linguistic exegesis. Linguistic interpretation constitutes one of the principal approaches in Qur'anic exegesis. However, in practice, this approach has at times produced interpretations that deviate from the rules of the Arabic language, the contextual meaning of the verses, and established methodologies of Qur'anic interpretation. In modern Qur'anic studies, such deviations are often classified as part of *al-dakhīl fī al-tafsīr*. Therefore, criticism of linguistic exegesis should not be viewed as a rejection of language itself, but rather as an effort to preserve the objectivity of interpreting divine revelation. This article aims to classify the forms of criticism directed at linguistic interpretation and to present their examples in classical exegetical works. This study employs a qualitative method with a library research approach, examining works of Qur'anic exegesis and Qur'anic sciences. The findings indicate that criticism of linguistic exegesis can be categorized into three main forms: first, criticism of lexical interpretation; second, criticism of the application of grammatical rules; and third, criticism of the use of Qur'anic readings (*qira'at*) within the linguistic approach to Qur'anic interpretation.

Keywords: *al-dakhīl fī al-tafsīr*; linguistic Interpretation; tafsir criticism

INTRODUCTION

The dynamics of interpreting the Qur'an reveal a text constantly in motion, undergoing renewal from its initial revelation to the present context. This fact confirms that understanding of the sacred text is never frozen or stopped at a particular form of interpretation. The Qur'an exists as a text that continues to interact with human reason, so that the process of its interpretation continues along with the development of space and time. Al-Khuli (1961) emphasized that the openness of the Qur'an's meaning allows for a lively dialogue between the text and social reality. Thus, interpretation is not merely an activity of reproducing old understandings, but rather an intellectual process that reflects human responses to the challenges of the times. Interpretation grows in an atmosphere of change, influenced by the historical, social, and intellectual conditions that surround it. This

situation makes interpretation a dynamic field of science, always open to rereading, and not bound by one final, absolute meaning (Al-Khuli, 1961).

The diversity of interpretations of the Qur'an is reflected in the emergence of various approaches and styles of interpretation developed by commentators, both classical and contemporary. Each historical period gives rise to interpretive models with distinctive characteristics suited to the intellectual and social needs of their communities. Classical commentators tend to emphasize aspects of narration, language, and the initial context in which the verses were revealed, while contemporary commentators focus more on linking the meanings of the verses to modern problems. These differences in approach do not indicate an essential conflict, but rather illustrate the breadth of the interpretation of the Qur'an. The same text can be read from diverse perspectives without losing its scholarly legitimacy. This variation demonstrates that interpretation is not a single, uniform product, but rather the result of a complex interaction between the text, the interpreter, and the reality encountered. Thus, the development of interpretive styles serves as an indicator of the vibrancy of the Islamic scholarly tradition in responding to changing times.

The activity of interpreting the Qur'an is essentially an intellectual process with no end in sight. As long as humans possess the power of thought and reflective capacity, efforts to understand the revealed text will continue. Interpretation does not stop with one generation, as each generation brings with it different issues, experiences, and perspectives. Musyarrafah (2023) emphasized that the drive to continue interpreting the Qur'an arises from intellectual unease with the methods, principles, and conclusions of pre-existing interpretations. This dissatisfaction is not a form of total rejection, but rather an expression of a critical spirit that encourages deeper reading. In this context, interpretation functions as a space for dialogue between ideas, where continuous refinement of understanding occurs. This process demonstrates that interpretation is a living, adaptive scientific activity that is constantly open to methodological renewal (Musyarrafah, 2023).

Throughout the intellectual history of Islam, various scholars and intellectuals from diverse academic backgrounds have produced works of interpretation. The diversity of their disciplines has influenced their interpretation and explanation of the verses of the Quran. A commentary written by a historian, for example, would pay close attention to the context of the events and the historical background in which the verses were revealed. This approach places the Quran within a concrete social-historical framework, allowing its meaning to be understood through its relationship to past realities. This scholarly tendency does not stand alone but is part of a comprehensive effort to explore the Quran's message more comprehensively. Thus, historical interpretation demonstrates how the discipline of history contributes to enriching the treasury of Quranic interpretation.

In addition to the historical approach, the style of interpretation is also influenced by the interpreter's philosophical background. Philosophers tend to place Quranic verses within a rational and reflective framework, with an emphasis on universal and conceptual meanings. Philosophical interpretation seeks to connect the revealed text to fundamental questions about existence, truth, and the nature of reality. This approach demonstrates how the Quran can be read as a source of inspiration for profound and systematic thought. The emphasis on the rational dimension does not diminish the sacredness of the text, but rather presents the Quran as a revelation in dialogue with human reason. This philosophical style is evidence that Quranic interpretation can reach the realm of abstract thought without losing its footing in the text.

The interpretation of the Qur'an is also evident in the works of jurists, Sufis, theologians, and Arabic linguists. A jurist emphasizes the legal dimensions and normative implications of Qur'anic verses, thus orienting his interpretation toward exploring the provisions of sharia. Meanwhile, Sufis emphasize the inner aspects and spiritual experience, presenting contemplative symbolic meanings. Theologians focus on issues of faith and the conceptualization of doctrine, while Arabic linguists focus on the grammatical structure, semantics, and linguistic beauty of the text. These differences demonstrate that the Qur'an has a broad range of meanings that can be explored across various disciplines. This diversity does not negate each other, but rather complements each other in building a more comprehensive understanding of the Qur'an.

Overall, the variety of approaches and scholarly tendencies in Qur'anic interpretation demonstrates that the interpretive activity reflects the intellectual dynamics of the Muslim community. Interpretation evolves alongside the development of science and the changing social contexts faced by humanity. The diversity of interpreters' backgrounds makes interpretation a meeting place for various academically valid scientific perspectives. Within this framework, interpretation cannot be understood as a single, homogeneous product, but rather as the result of a dialectic between the revealed text and human intellectual capacity. Awareness of this diversity enriches the treasury of Qur'anic studies and opens up space for more inclusive readings. This dynamic confirms that Qur'anic

interpretation will continue to thrive as long as humanity continues to think, reflect, and respond to the message of revelation within the ever-changing trajectory of history.

In principle, any approach and method used by an interpreter in interpreting the Qur'an is acceptable as long as the interpretation has a strong scientific basis and does not contradict the naqli or aqli arguments. As a result of human intellectual construction, interpretation cannot be separated from limitations and the potential for error. Therefore, in the process of interpreting the Qur'an, deviations are often encountered (Ulinnuha, 2017). 'Abd al-Wahhab Fayid explained that the practice of infiltration in Qur'anic interpretation is not a new phenomenon that emerged in the contemporary era, but has been going on since the classical period, along with the spread of Islam to various regions and diverse cultural backgrounds (Fayed, 1978).

Fayid classifies linguistic interpretation (*lugawi*) as a form of interpretation that contains an *al-dakhil* (infiltrative) element, so this approach needs to receive critical attention so as not to give rise to deviations in meaning in the interpretation of the Qur'an (Ulinnuha, 2019). These deviations are usually caused by ignorance of Arabic grammar or by ideological encouragement, whether in the form of sectarian fanaticism or the desire to advance interpretive innovations that are not in accordance with religious principles.

According to Al-Maghazi, deviations in interpretation related to errors in the use of these language rules are usually inseparable from violations of the word structure contained in a verse (*مخالفة للفظ الآية*), inconsistency with the position (*i'rab*) of a word contained in the wording of the verse (*منافية للفظ لإعرابها*), inaccuracy in the context of the discussion (*منافرة لسياق الكلام*), there is no correlation with the reasons for the revelation of the verse (*غير متلاقية*) مع سبب النزول, or contradicts other postulates (Ulinnuha, 2017).

Some scholars argue that errors in the interpretation of Qur'anic verses are often caused by neglecting linguistic elements, such as the rejection of *i'rab*, inconsistency with the context of the sentence (*siyaq al-kalam*), lack of integration with the reasons for the revelation of the verse (*asbab al-nuzul*), and neglect of Arabic language rules. These deviations are generally divided into three main categories, namely those related to Arabic grammar (*qawa'id nahwu*), the meaning contained in a word (*madlul al-lafazh*), and differences in the reading of the Qur'an (*al-Qira'at*) (Musyarrafah, 2023). A similar point was also conveyed by Fayid, who divided criticism of linguistic interpretation into three main categories, namely criticism of the interpretation of the meaning of vocabulary, criticism of the application of grammatical rules, and criticism of the use of *qirā'āt* Al-Qur'an in the linguistic interpretation approach (Ulinnuha, 2019). This phenomenon of deviant linguistic interpretation has received serious attention from scholars of tafsir, both classical and contemporary. In modern tafsir studies, this form of deviation is often categorized as part of *al-dakhil fi al-tafsir*. Therefore, criticism of linguistic interpretation cannot be seen as a rejection of language, but rather as an effort to maintain the objectivity of interpreting revelation.

METHOD

This research is placed within a qualitative approach framework with a literature study orientation as the primary basis for data collection. The qualitative approach was chosen because the object of study is classical exegetical texts that require in-depth, reflective, and contextual reading. Literature study allows researchers to trace the construction of meaning, methodological tendencies, and argumentation patterns of the exegetes in interpreting the verses of the Qur'an, especially those related to the phenomenon of linguistic *al-dakhil*. Classical exegetical works are used as primary sources because of their fundamental position in the history of interpretation and their influence on subsequent exegetical traditions. This approach facilitates exploration of the internal dynamics of exegetical texts without being tied to empirical field data, so that analysis can focus on the relationship between language, interpretative methods, and the scientific legitimacy that underlies them (Al-Khuli, 1961).

The research data sources are classified into two main categories: primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include classical tafsir books that explicitly or implicitly demonstrate the use of a linguistic approach in interpreting Qur'anic verses. These works were selected based on the author's scholarly authority, the book's position within the tafsir tradition, and the intensity of the use of Arabic language analysis. Meanwhile, secondary sources include Arabic linguistics books, works on scholars of the Qur'an, and scientific journal articles discussing the concept of *al-dakhil* and tafsir methodology. The use of secondary sources serves to strengthen the analytical framework and provide a theoretical basis for assessing the interpretation's conformity to established Arabic language rules. The source selection process was conducted purposively, considering the relevance and academic credibility of the sources (Abdullah & Samsudin, 2022).

The data collection technique was carried out through intensive reading and systematic recording of sections of the exegetical text that showed indications of linguistic *dakhil*. The reading was not conducted solely in a linear manner, but rather through a thematic reading strategy that focused on specific linguistic units, such as sentence structure, lexical choice, and linguistic argumentation patterns. Each finding was recorded and classified based on relevant linguistic categories. This process enabled the identification of forms of linguistic deviation that emerged in the interpretation. Furthermore, the researcher conducted cross-references with classical and modern Arabic literature to ensure the accuracy of the rules used as benchmarks for the analysis. This technique maintained data consistency while preventing the analysis from being subjected to subjective or ahistorical judgments (Bowen, 2009).

The data analysis in this study employed a descriptive-critical method with an emphasis on mapping and evaluation. Descriptive analysis was used to describe in detail the linguistic forms of *al-dakhil* found in the exegetical text, without simplifying the meaning. Each form of deviation was explained based on the context in which it appeared in the exegetical text. Meanwhile, critical analysis aimed to assess the implications of using this linguistic approach for the interpretation of Quranic verses. The assessment was conducted by considering the internal consistency of the exegete's argumentation and its conformity to linguistic principles recognized in the Arabic linguistic tradition. This approach enabled the research to go beyond data inventory and provide argumentative and measurable academic evaluation (Flick, 2022).

The linguistic approach used in the analysis encompasses four main aspects: grammar, *sharaf*, *balaghah*, and semantics. The grammar aspect is used to assess the accuracy of syntactic structure and the relationships between sentence elements in the interpretation. *Sharaf* functions to examine word forms, derivations, and the implications of their meaning. *Balaghah* is used to assess the rhetorical and aesthetic dimensions of language that influence the interpretation of a verse's meaning. Meanwhile, semantic analysis is directed at examining the relationship between word meaning and the context in which it is used. These four aspects are treated as a complementary analytical unit. This linguistic approach allows for a comprehensive evaluation of the interpretation without separating language from the meaning it produces (Versteegh, 2014).

Thematic classification is used as a further analytical strategy to group data based on specific linguistic themes. Each *al-dakhil* finding is placed into a thematic category according to its type of deviation, such as syntactic, morphological, or semantic deviation. This classification makes it easier for researchers to see general patterns and methodological tendencies that emerge in the exegetical texts. The thematic approach also allows for comparisons between interpretations in similar contexts. In this way, the analysis avoids getting bogged down in fragmented case-by-case readings, but rather builds a systematic picture of the character of linguistic *al-dakhil* in classical exegesis. The thematic approach serves as a conceptual tool to maintain the coherence of the overall analysis. (Braun & Clarke, 2006)

Cross-verification is conducted by comparing the analyzed interpretations with authoritative sources in Arabic linguistics. This step aims to ensure that the assessment of linguistic interpretation is not based on personal assumptions, but rather on scientifically recognized rules. Cross-verification is conducted by referring to classical texts on grammar, grammar, and rhetoric, as well as relevant works on modern Arabic linguistics. This process also helps identify the extent to which the interpreter adheres to or deviates from linguistic consensus. Thus, the resulting analysis has a strong methodological basis and is academically sound. Cross-verification serves as a quality control mechanism throughout the research process.

To ensure the validity and reliability of the data, this research adheres to the principles of analytical consistency and methodological openness. All stages of analysis are described in detail and systematically so that the research process can be academically retraceable by other researchers. The description of procedures is not merely a methodological formality, but rather a form of scientific responsibility for the knowledge production process. The clarity of the analytical steps allows for a critical reading of how the data is treated and interpreted. Research validity is established through the integration of the analyzed data, the theoretical framework used, and the consistently applied analytical techniques. The alignment of these three elements demonstrates that the research results emerge from a controlled, structured, and academically accountable process (Creswell, 2014).

Research reliability is maintained by applying the same linguistic references to analyze linguistic cases with similar characteristics. Consistent use of reference sources serves as a buffer to prevent bias in data assessments due to differences in analytical standards or preferences. This way, each finding can be proportionally compared within a uniform analytical framework. This approach prevents the research from drawing subjective or situational conclusions. The results of the analysis are positioned as the product of a repeated and tested intellectual process, rather than a spontaneous response to specific data. This practice

strengthens the research's credibility and affirms its place within the scientific methodological tradition, which emphasizes rigor, repeatability, and measurability as the primary foundations of scientific study.

Methodologically, this research aims to develop a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon of linguistic *dakhil* in the tradition of Qur'anic interpretation. The focus of this research lies not in normative assessments of classical commentators, but rather in rereading their works through a structured linguistic analysis tool. This approach positions the exegetical text as an object of scientific study open to critical scrutiny. The use of linguistic analysis is intended to uncover the dynamics of meaning that occur in the interpretation process, without ignoring the scientific context that underlies it. Thus, this research seeks to provide a balanced understanding between respect for the authority of the exegetical tradition and the need to develop systematic academic analysis.

The placement of language as the primary instrument in interpretive evaluation is a prominent methodological characteristic of this research. Language is understood not merely as a medium for conveying meaning, but as a structure that shapes and limits that meaning itself. Through this approach, interpretive analysis is directed at testing the conformity between interpretation and the linguistic rules recognized in the Arabic linguistic tradition. This research method is expected to contribute to strengthening the methodology of interpretive studies, particularly in the realm of critical and academically responsible linguistic evaluation. With a clear and measurable methodological foundation, this research opens up space for the development of interpretive studies that are more reflective, disciplinary, and relevant to the needs of contemporary scientific research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Background of the Emergence of the Term *Al-Dakhil fi Al-Tafsir*

According to the explanation in the *Lisan al-'Arab* dictionary, the term *al-dakhil* etymologically refers to the entry of a foreign element into an entity, the presence of which can cause damage to both the physical and intellectual well-being of humans. This definition aligns with al-Zamakhsyari's view as outlined in his work, *Asas al-Balaghah*, which also confirms a similar understanding of the concept (Subhan, 2023). Al-Ragib al-Iṣfahani in his work *Mufradat fi Garib Al-Qur'an* explains that the term *al-dakhil* refers to the meaning of damage or something that has the potential to cause conflict. This interpretation is in line with the view of 'Abd al-Qadir al-Razi in *Mukhtar al-Ṣiḥah* (Al-Asfahani, 1961). The term *al-Dakhil* is also interpreted as deception, treason, cheating, and treason. Thus, based on the various definitions that have been put forward, it can be concluded that the concept of *al-dakhil* has a similar meaning that leads to elements of damage and infiltration, namely something that does not originate from its original source, comes from outside, and has the potential to cause damage, both in material form and in the realm of thought (Prayudi, 2023).

The term *al-dakhil*, which is considered to have a close meaning to *al-dakhil*, can be equated with the word *outsider*, namely something that comes from outside and then enters. In addition, this term is also in line with the concept of infiltration, which means infiltration, seepage, or absorption, namely something that successfully enters even though it does not originate from the original element (Echols, 1988).

Furthermore, the use of the term *al-dakhil fi al-tafsir* can be considered the most comprehensive and consistent terminological choice among the terms proposed by scholars in similar fields. For example, 'Abdullah Ṣiddiq al-Gumari (1910-1993 CE) used the term *bida' al-tafsir* to refer to this category of study, which loosely translates as a new form of interpretation that deviates from the principles of the Qur'an and Sunnah.

In the field of tafsir studies, the term *al-ittijāh al-munḥarifah fi al-tafsir*, commonly translated as a deviant view in interpretation, is also known. This term was introduced by Ḥusain al-Ḍahabī (1915–1977 CE) to refer to a type of tafsir study considered to have undergone disproportionate mixing of sources. This mixing is understood as the introduction of foreign elements into the interpretive process without an adequate scientific selection mechanism. Within this framework, deviation does not always manifest as explicit errors, but can arise from the use of unverified references or a perspective that blurs the line between authoritative and non-authoritative sources. Al-Ḍahabī positioned the term as a conceptual tool to interpret the tendency of tafsir to lose methodological clarity due to weak control over the sources and approaches used (Al-Dhahabi, 1976).

Although the term *al-ittijāh al-munḥarifah fi al-tafsir* is often cited as the primary reference, the concept of *al-dakhil* was first discussed by Ḥusain al-Ḍahabī in his monumental work *al-Tafsir wa al-Mufasssirūn*. In this context, al-Ḍahabī used the term *al-dakhil* to explain the phenomenon of *ḥaẓf al-isnād*, namely the omission of the chain of narration in the delivery of tafsir. The emphasis of the criticism is on the practice of interpretation that

deliberately abandons the sanad, thereby leading to confusion in distinguishing between authentic and invalid narrations. However, al-Žahabī's discussion of *al-dakhīl* remains limited and has not yet developed into a comprehensive methodological concept. The focus of his criticism is more on the aspect of narration than on expanding the meaning of *al-dakhīl* in the epistemological dimension of tafsir as a whole.

As a form of conceptual affirmation, the use of the term *al-Dakhīl fī al-Tafsīr* by its initiators is structured around the views of linguistic experts, both from classical and contemporary traditions. This reference shows that the concept of *al-dakhīl* does not stand apart from linguistics but is rooted in established linguistic rules. In the practice of tafsir studies, the *al-dakhīl* approach is not the sole method of criticism. There are also other approaches that have a similar goal, namely testing the objectivity of interpreters in producing meaning. One approach that is often compared is literary criticism introduced by Amīn al-Khūlī. This approach emphasizes critical reading of texts with attention to structure and style (Al-Khuli, 1961).

However, the literary criticism approach is considered unable to match the reach of the *al-dakhīl* method. This assessment is based on a relatively limited scope of analysis, focusing on the text as a literary object without addressing the issue of sources or the epistemological legitimacy of interpretation. This approach focuses on internal criticism of the text, while the *al-dakhīl* method goes further, examining the origins of ideas, references, and the consistency of interpretation with Islamic principles. With this characteristic, *al-dakhīl* is seen as having a broader methodological reach, as it not only tests the accuracy of reading the text but also examines the scientific foundations that support the interpretation process. This difference in orientation is what makes *al-dakhīl* strategically positioned in the discourse of contemporary exegetical criticism.

From a terminological perspective, the concept of *al-dakhīl* has received varying responses and explanations from Muslim scholars. Ibrahim Khalifah, for example, defined *al-dakhīl* as a form of interpretation of the Qur'an that lacks a valid source. In his view, even if an interpretation includes a specific reference, the source is still considered problematic if it does not meet the criteria for acceptable interpretation. This type of interpretation can also stem from erroneous and epistemologically unsound thought structures.

Another view was put forward by 'Abd al-Wahhāb Fāyid, who understood *al-dakhīl* as an interpretation that lacks a basis and reference that aligns with the Qur'an. The emphasis of this definition lies in the internal harmony between the results of the interpretation and the principles contained in the Qur'anic text itself. Interpretations that are considered deviant are not solely due to weak sanads or sources, but also because the resulting meaning does not conform to the framework of Qur'anic values. This definition broadens the scope of *al-dakhīl* from the technical issues of narration to the realm of coherence of meaning and the substance of teachings, so that criticism of interpretation does not stop at the formal aspect, but also touches on the normative dimension (Khalifah, 2012).

Meanwhile, Jamāl 'Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Najjār defines *al-dakhīl* as a form of falsification or falsehood attributed to the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), his Companions, and his Companions. This interpretation fails to meet the criteria for the validity of narrations and is therefore unsuitable as a basis for understanding the Qur'an. Contrary to this definition, 'Abd al-Raḥīm Fāris Abū 'Albah places *al-dakhīl* in a more contemporary context, namely all views, ideas, understandings, or legal provisions that entered the Muslim community through the interpretation of the Qur'an, but are indicated to conflict with the values of the Qur'an and Sunnah. Through these various definitions, *al-dakhīl* can be understood as a product of interpretation that originates from non-credible references and contains inconsistencies with the basic principles of Islamic teachings.

Classification of criticism of linguistic interpretation

1. Criticism of Interpretation Related to the Meaning of Words

Criticism of linguistic interpretations relating to the meaning of vocabulary is divided into several categories;

a. Changing the Wording or Vocabulary of the Qur'an

An example is what some Sufis do in interpreting QS. al-Baqarah [2]: 255:

مَنْ ذَا الَّذِي يَشْفَعُ عِنْدَهُ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِهِ

"No one can intercede with Allah without His permission."

Some Sufi circles interpret the verse by breaking it down into several parts or syllables, adjusted to the Sufi doctrine they adhere to, without regard for Arabic grammar. In this interpretation, they argue that: (Man) is a conditional isim, (*dhalla*) comes from the word *al-dhull*, which means submission, (dhi) is a sign to lust, (*Yashfa*) comes from the word *al-shifa*, it is an answer to the condition meaning healing, ('U) is the verb amar

from the word *al-wa'y*, which means awareness. Based on this word-by-word breakdown, some Sufis understand the above verse as stating that "anyone who is able to subdue their desires is entitled to receive intercession from Allah SWT, or to receive healing and inner awareness." However, this interpretation is considered inconsistent with the verse's context and the applicable Arabic language rules. Fayid believes that the emergence of this interpretation is due to their lack of understanding of the rules of the Arabic language and literature (Ulinnuha, 2019).

Similarly, the interpretation of the word *salsabil* in QS. al-Insan [76]: 18:

عَيْنًا فِيهَا تُسَمَّى سَلْسَبِيلًا

"(which comes from) a spring (in Paradise) called *Salsabil*."

Some Sufis break the word "*salsabil*" into two syllables: "*sal*" (ask) and "*sabil*" (path), interpreting it as a command to the Prophet and his followers to seek guidance to reach the spring (Ulinnuha, 2019). This interpretation is also considered inconsistent with the context of the verse and the prevailing Arabic language rules. This interpretation stems from their ignorance of Arabic language and literary rules.

b. Interpreting Words with Meanings That Are Not Contained in Them

For example, the interpretation of the word *imamihim* (their leaders) in QS. al-Isra' [17]: 71, which is interpreted as *ummahatihim* (their mothers).

يَوْمَ نَدْعُوا كُلَّ أُنَاسٍ بِإِمَامِهِمْ

"(Remember) the Day (when) We will call every nation to its leader."

Based on this interpretation, this verse is understood as stating that on the Day of Judgment, humans will be called by their mothers' names. However, this interpretation was criticized by al-Zamakhsyari, because the word "imam" is not the plural form of "umm" (mother). A similar view was expressed by al-Alusi, who emphasized that the Arabic tradition does not recognize the use of the word "imam" as the plural form of "umm." The common and recognized plural form for "umm" is "ummahat," not "imam." Therefore, this interpretation is considered to have no acceptable linguistic basis (Subhan, 2023).

c. Interpreting Verses with Strange and Strange Meanings

For example, the interpretation of the word *akbarnahu* in QS. Yusuf [12]: 31:

فَلَمَّا رَأَيْنَهُ أَكْبَرْنَهُ

"When the women saw him, they were very impressed (with his good looks)"

The word *akbarnahu* (they [women] admired Yusuf) was interpreted as *hidna* (they menstruated). This interpretation was criticized by Abu Ubaidah and al-Alusi, who considered that such an interpretation was unknown in Arabic tradition and had no basis in Arabic rules and literature (Subhan, 2023).

d. Interpreting Verses with Disgusting and Embarrassing Meanings

For example, the interpretation of the word *wahjuruhunna* in QS. al-Nisa' [4]: 34:

وَالَّتِي تَخَافُونَ نُشُوزَهُنَّ فَعِظُوهُنَّ وَاهْجُرُوهُنَّ فِي الْمَضَاجِعِ وَاضْرِبُوهُنَّ

"Women from whom you fear *nushuz*, advise them, leave them in bed (separate beds), and (if necessary), beat them (in a way that is not painful)."

The word *wahjuruhunna* (and leave them) in this verse is interpreted as *warbutuhunna wa akrihuhunna 'ala al-jima'* (bind and force them [the wives] to have intercourse). This kind of interpretation is clearly inconsistent with the verse's context and is deviant.

e. Interpreting Verses with Meanings that Contradict Logic and Religious Teachings

For example, the interpretation of the sentence *innahu laisa min ahlika* in QS. Hud [11]: 46:

قَالَ يُنُوحُ إِنَّهُ لَيْسَ مِنْ أَهْلِكَ

"He (Allah) said, "O Noah, indeed he is not of your family."

The phrase "*innahu laisa min ahlika*" (he [Kan'an] is not of your family) in this verse is interpreted as "*ibn al-zina*" (son of adultery). This interpretation clearly contradicts religious teachings, which emphasize that prophets are God's chosen servants, protected from reprehensible acts. Therefore, it is impossible for the Prophet Noah to have committed adultery; Kan'an is considered a child born of adultery. This understanding is considered to have no strong basis, both in terms of data and historical facts (Ulinnuha, 2019).

f. Interpreting a Sentence with a Meaning That Doesn't Fit Its Context

For example, the interpretation of the word *al-furqan* in QS. al-Baqarah [2]: 53:

وَإِذْ آتَيْنَا مُوسَى الْكِتَابَ وَالْفُرْقَانَ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَهْتَدُونَ

"(Remember) when We gave Moses the Book (Torah) and the Criterion that you might be guided."

The word "al-furqan" in this verse is interpreted as meaning the Qur'an. However, the verse's context clearly does not discuss the Qur'an or the Prophet Muhammad, but rather the Prophet Moses. Therefore, as emphasized by al-Alusi, the interpretation that interprets al-furqan as the Qur'an in this verse is considered inappropriate and deviates from the intended context of the verse.

2. Critique of Linguistic Interpretation Relating to Grammatical Rules

For example, some groups interpret QS. al-A'raf [7]: 16 by positioning the letter *ma* in the verse as *ma istifhamiyyah* (question), not as *ma masdariyyah*.

قَالَ فِيمَا آغْوَيْتَنِي لَأَقْعُدَنَّ لَهُمْ صِرَاطَكَ الْمُسْتَقِيمَ

"The devil replied, "Because You have led me astray, I will surely continue to hinder them from Your straight path"." (QS. al-A'raf [7]: 16)

By making the letter *ma* in the verse as *istifhamiyyah*, the meaning of the verse seems to be understood as Iblis asking Allah, "with what will You punish me?" After that, Iblis continued his statement by asserting, "Indeed, I will hinder them from Your straight path."

In response to this interpretive model, Fayid offered a critique based on two main argumentative foundations. This critique aimed to assess the logical soundness and linguistic accuracy of interpretations that place Iblis's question to Allah as part of the construction of the verse's meaning. Fayid believed that such an approach needed careful review, particularly when the interpretation rested on assumptions inconsistent with established theological frameworks and linguistic rules. Within the framework of his critique, Fayid not only highlighted the substance of the resulting meaning but also considered how the interpretation was constructed from a linguistic perspective. Thus, the critique was not reactive, but rather structured as a methodological evaluation of the interpretive process itself, both in terms of the rationality of the meaning and in terms of adherence to applicable Arabic language rules (Fayed, 1980).

The first argument put forward by Fayid concerns the relevance of the question attributed to Satan. He argues that the question lacks an acceptable rational basis, as it does not fit into a coherent framework of thought, theologically, for Satan to question God's power and ability to inflict punishment. Fayid believes that this assumption places Satan in a position inconsistent with the nature of his knowledge of God. From this perspective, such questions are seen as lacking meaningful significance, as they lack a logically justifiable communicative function. This irrelevance indicates a conceptual problem in the interpretation in question, as the resulting meaning is not based on solid theological rationality. This critique emphasizes the importance of maintaining a balance between the meaning of the interpretation and the fundamental belief structure of Islamic teachings (Fayed, 1980).

Furthermore, Fayid emphasized that there was no urgency for Iblis to question God's power in the context of punishment. Such questions were seen as not contributing significantly to the meaning, given that God's position as the possessor of absolute authority has become indisputable knowledge. Interpretations that force such questions are considered to weaken the coherence of the verse's narrative. Within this framework, Fayid believes that this approach has the potential to obscure the verse's main message by presenting speculative meaning constructions. This critique demonstrates that interpretation requires not only linguistic accuracy but also consideration of the rationality of meaning within a broader theological context. Thus, the acceptability of an

interpretation is not solely determined by linguistic feasibility but also by the appropriateness of the resulting meaning within the framework of Islamic belief.

Fayid's second argument rests on the application of Arabic grammatical rules, particularly those related to the use of the *istifhamiyyah* (inflected pronoun). In general Arabic grammar, a *istifhamiyyah* preceded by the letter *jar* necessitates the omission of the letter *alif* from its word form. Fayid refers to established examples in the Qur'an, such as QS. al-Naba' [78]: 1 and QS. al-Nāzi'āt [79]: 42, which demonstrate the consistent application of these rules. The presence of an *alif* after the *istifhamiyyah* (inflected pronoun) in the verse under discussion is seen as inconsistent with the usual grammatical pattern. In Fayid's perspective, such deviations from general rules are unacceptable without a strong and tested linguistic basis in the Arabic language tradition.

Fayid also emphasized that the letter *alif* after the *istifhāmiyyah* is indeed known in Arabic, but its use is very limited and occurs within a minor scope. This linguistic phenomenon does not represent a generally accepted dominant rule. Interpretations that use minor forms as the primary basis for analysis are considered problematic from a methodological perspective. Fayid believes that general rules have a stronger position in interpreting the text of the Quran, especially when they are still relevant and possible to apply. The use of rare and limited rules without clear methodological need has the potential to cause distortion of meaning. This criticism emphasizes the importance of caution in choosing linguistic references so that interpretations do not deviate from established linguistic principles.

In line with this view, Ulinnuha believes that the application of minor linguistic rules in the context of Quranic interpretation requires strong justification. As long as general rules can still be used consistently and do not create problems of meaning, the use of exceptional rules is considered disproportionate. Ulinnuha emphasizes that general Arabic rules have broader legitimacy within linguistic and interpretive traditions. This approach helps maintain methodological stability in reading the Quranic text. By placing general rules as the primary reference, interpretation can avoid excessive speculative tendencies. This view reinforces Fayid's critique by emphasizing that consistency of linguistic rules is a crucial requirement for maintaining the integrity of interpretation (Ulinnuha, 2019).

Within the overall framework of this critique, it is understandable that Fayid combines rational and linguistic considerations in evaluating the interpretations in question. The critique focuses not only on technical errors but also touches on aspects of coherence of meaning and methodological accuracy. Quranic interpretation is positioned as a scientific activity that demands caution in the use of linguistic rules and precision in constructing theological meaning. Through this approach, Fayid asserts that the validity of an interpretation cannot be separated from adherence to dominant linguistic rules and the rationality of the resulting meaning. This view demonstrates the importance of balancing linguistic possibilities and academic responsibility within the Quranic exegetical tradition.

3. Criticism of Linguistic Interpretation Related to the *Qira'at* (Recitation) of the Qur'an

In this discussion, Fayid emphasizes the existence of certain patterns that are seen as contributing to the distortion of understanding the Qur'an through the medium of *qira'at*. He indicates that there are at least two main patterns that are often used in problematic interpretive practices. These patterns are not simply related to variations in readings, but are directly related to how those readings are utilized to support the construction of certain meanings. In this context, *qira'at* is no longer positioned as a treasure trove of readings tied to sanad transmission and scientific legitimacy, but rather becomes an instrument to strengthen the interpreter's ideological tendencies. Fayid's perspective shows that deviations do not always appear explicitly, but can be hidden through the use of linguistic devices that appear valid, even though they are methodologically not firmly grounded in the recognized *qira'at* tradition (Fayed, 1980).

The first pattern highlighted by Fayid relates to the practice of interpreting the Qur'an through the use of *qira'a'at* (translations of the Qur'an) that lacks a justifiable basis. In this practice, a particular reading is used, even fabricated, without reference to a valid sanad or the recognition of *qira'a'at* scholars. This approach opens up room for manipulation of the meaning of verses, as variations in reading are treated as a means of legitimizing predetermined interpretations. *Qira'a'at*, which should function as an explanation of meaning, is instead positioned as a means of justifying certain theological views. Fayid believes that this tendency blurs the line between the authoritative tradition of Quranic reading and interpretive constructions born of ideological interests, thus potentially undermining the integrity of Quranic interpretation.

As a concrete illustration, Fayid alludes to the interpretation of some Mu'tazilites regarding QS. al-Falaq [113]: 2. In this interpretation, the verse is read by adding a *tanwin* to the word *syarrin*, then the letter *ma* in the

phrase *ma khalaq* is interpreted as the letter nafy which functions to negate. With this construction of reading and interpretation, the verse is understood as a statement that the evil in question does not originate from God's creation. The evil is positioned as the result of the actions of the perpetrator himself. This way of reading and interpretation shows how small changes in aspects of qira'at and grammar can produce a significant shift in meaning, while also opening up space for the affirmation of certain theological doctrines that have been previously believed.

This interpretation, as Fayid notes, cannot be separated from the Mu'tazilite theological framework, which strictly emphasizes the principle of divine justice. In this view, God is understood as a Being obligated to do good and incapable of creating evil. All bad deeds are entirely attributed to humans as the perpetrators. This framework of thought then influences how Quranic verses are understood and interpreted, including through the selection of recitations that support this basic assumption. Thus, recitations no longer stand as an autonomous reading tradition but rather become integrated into an established ideological structure. Fayid believes that this close link between interpretation and ideology raises serious methodological problems.

On this basis, Fayid asserts that interpretations based on this kind of qira'at are unacceptable within the framework of a valid tafsir methodology. This assessment is based on two main considerations: the dominance of ideological tendencies and the lack of a basis for qira'at that is renowned and recognized in the Islamic scholarly tradition. Qira'at that lacks the legitimacy of transmission is deemed unsuitable as a basis for interpreting the Qur'an, especially when used to support certain theological constructs. In Fayid's view, this practice reflects the misuse of linguistic devices that directly implicates the distortion of the meaning of revelation. This critique emphasizes the importance of methodological discipline in maintaining the purity of Qur'anic interpretation from irresponsible ideological intervention.

Second, shifting the Qur'an from an interpretation that aligns with valid and recognized qira'at. Both practices are considered extremely dangerous to the continued authenticity of the Qur'an, making a critical attitude toward them an unavoidable necessity. For example, al-Zamakhsyari's interpretation of the following verse:

وَكَذَلِكَ زَيْنَ لِكَثِيرٍ مِّنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ قَتَلَ أَوْلَادِهِمْ شُرَكَائِهِمْ لِيُرْدُوهُمْ وَلِيَلْبِسُوا عَلَيْهِمْ دِينَهُمْ

"And thus their leaders have made it seem good to most of the polytheists to kill their children, to destroy them and to obscure for them their religion." (QS. al-An'am [6]: 137)

Al-Zamakhsyari criticized qira'ah sahihah Ibn 'Amir al-Syami al-Yahsubi (21-128 AH) who read the words قَتَلَ with rafa' (أَوْلَادِهِمْ) with nasab (أَوْلَادَهُمْ) and the word شُرَكَائِهِمْ with major (شُرَكَائِهِمْ). The position of this last word in the sentence structure according to Ibn 'Amir's qira'ah is the mudaf ilaih of the word قَتَلَ. Thus, Ibn 'Amir's reading is شُرَكَائِهِمْ قَتَلَ أَوْلَادَهُمْ. According to al-Zamakhsyari, this reading is grammatically unacceptable, because the composition of mudaf and mudaf ilaih cannot be separated by isim (noun). The separation between mudaf and mudaf ilaih can be justified if the separator is zaraf (adverb), even then in emergency conditions such as in the context of the sentence structure of poetry or prose. Even though this reading—continued al-Zamakhsyari—is supported by the mushaf which reads شُرَكَائِهِمْ, it cannot necessarily justify Ibn 'Amir's qira'ah, because it violates valid Arabic language rules (Ulinnuha, 2017).

According to Fayid, the view of al-Zamakhsyari and the grammatical experts who are in line with him is based on the assumption that the qurra' (experts in reciting the Qur'an) in determining the reading pattern is only based on personal ijihad. This kind of view is considered incorrect, because the recitation of the Qur'an is essentially tauqifiyyah al-qira'ah (the reading model must be based on the guidance and instructions of the Prophet Muhammad SAW), so that it does not open up space for the element of ijthadiyah in it. Therefore, the seven imams of qira'at—including Ibn 'Amir—certainly have studied and narrated the recitation of the Qur'an from their imams through a chain of sanads that is muttasil and connected (continuous) until it reaches the Prophet Muhammad SAW (Fayed, 1980).

Abu al-Qasim al-Qusyairi (370-465 HI), as in al-Qurtubi (d. 671 H), also affirmed the authenticity and secret of Ibn 'Amir's qira'ah, he stated:

"...in the Uthmani Mushaf, the inscription شُرَكَائِهِمْ is found with the letter Ya'. This is the basis for Ibn 'Amir's qira'ah. The word قَتَلَ is based on شُرَكَائِهِمْ because it is the leaders who consider it good and also encourage the killing of children. So it is correct if the fi'il (القتل) is based (idafah) on the fa'il (perpetrator) (الشركاء). However, this qira'ah still leaves the position of mudaf ilaih (شُرَكَائِهِمْ) is after maf'ul bih (أَوْلَادَهُمْ) because it is in accordance with the existing mushaf, although according to the rule, the position of mud'af

ilaih should be before maf'ul bih. Thus, the order of this sentence—based on the qira'ah of Ibn 'Amir—is *أَوْ لَادَهُمْ شَرَّ كَاتِبِهِمْ قَتْلَ* (Al-Qurtubi & Al-Ansari, 2006).

Based on this description, it can be understood that Ibn 'Amir's qira'ah is included in the category of valid qira'ah, because it has fulfilled three main criteria as a requirement for the validity of qira'ah (Fathoni, 2009). Therefore, the criticism and accusations put forward by some Arabic grammarians, including al-Zamakhshari, cannot be fully accepted.

4. Implications of Linguistic Criticism in Interpretation Studies

Criticism of linguistic interpretation plays a crucial role in maintaining the objectivity of Quranic exegesis. This critique is not intended to reject the role of language as an interpretive instrument, but rather to ensure that its use is measured and responsible. Arabic is indeed the primary medium of revelation, but its understanding demands methodological caution. Without critical scrutiny, linguistic analysis has the potential to exceed its scientific function and become a means of overly free-flowing reading. Under these conditions, interpretation is no longer grounded in a solid scientific framework but tends to be driven by the interpreter's subjective preferences. Criticism serves as a controlling mechanism to ensure interpretation remains within the methodological trajectory historically established by the Islamic scholarly tradition, preventing the meaning of revelation from being reduced to untested linguistic speculation.

In a broader context, criticism of linguistic interpretation serves as a safeguard for the epistemological validity of Qur'anic interpretation. A linguistic approach holds fundamental importance because the Qur'an was revealed in Arabic, with its complex grammatical, semantic, and stylistic systems. Each linguistic element carries complex implications. However, scholars of exegesis, from the earliest times, have warned that language cannot stand alone as the sole basis for interpretation. Language must be situated in relation to the context of the verse, the historical setting, and established principles of exegetical methodology. Critique of linguistic interpretation serves to emphasize these boundaries. Through critique, language use does not become uncontrolled but remains bound by authoritative linguistic rules and a framework of meaning that aligns with the purpose of revelation (Hameed, 2015).

Classical exegetes consistently demonstrated a methodological awareness of the potential problems in linguistic interpretation. Figures such as al-Zamakhshari are widely recognized as linguists with a profound grasp of grammar and rhetoric. However, this mastery did not exempt their approaches from criticism. Other scholars, such as AbuḤAyyān al-Andalusī frequently criticized linguistic interpretations deemed to deviate from the rules of authentic Arabic. This criticism was often directed at commentators, who were known as language experts. This phenomenon demonstrates that in the tafsir tradition, linguistic authority is not absolute. Every linguistic analysis remains subject to scientific scrutiny. Errors in the structure of grammar or grammar are understood to have direct implications for the distortion of the theological and legal meaning (Aprilianti & Huda, 2024).

The critical awareness of classical commentators demonstrates that linguistic approaches are always treated as a means, not an end in itself. Language becomes a tool for uncovering meaning, not the sole determinant of meaning itself. When linguistic analysis produces a construction of meaning that contradicts Islamic principles, criticism is immediately implemented as a form of methodological correction. This tradition demonstrates the existence of strict scientific discipline in the world of exegesis. Interpretations born from linguistic analysis are not automatically accepted but are tested for their consistency with authentic Arabic language rules and their conformity to the Islamic theological framework. Thus, criticism serves as a selection mechanism that keeps interpretations within scientific boundaries and prevents them from slipping into problematic interpretations.

In the development of contemporary tafsir studies, criticism of linguistic interpretation is gaining increasing epistemological relevance. The complexity of modern intellectual challenges has encouraged the emergence of various new approaches to reading the Qur'an, including more experimental linguistic approaches. In this situation, the role of criticism becomes increasingly crucial. Scholars such as ḤUsain al-Ḍahabī highlighted that the uncontrolled use of linguistic analysis can open the way for elements of *al-dakhīl fī al-tafsīr* to enter. These elements can appear in the form of forced meaning, the use of unconventional grammatical rules, or readings that ignore linguistic consensus. Critique serves to identify these tendencies and restore interpretation to a more stable methodological foundation.

A similar view was expressed by 'Abd al-Wahhāb Fāyid, who emphasized the importance of controlling linguistic interpretation. He argued that Arabic possesses a rich structure that allows for a wide range of possible meanings. However, this richness cannot be used to justify interpretations that are independent of scientific

discipline. Fāyid cautioned that unsupervised linguistic interpretations can easily veer into speculative readings. Under such circumstances, interpretations risk straying from the intended meaning of revelation and the normative aims of the Qur'an. Criticism serves as an instrument for assessing the extent to which linguistic possibilities remain within the bounds of methodological reasonableness and the extent to which they have exceeded the framework of scientific accountability.

The absence of critical linguistic interpretation has the potential to transform interpretation into a projection of the interpreter's subjectivity. Linguistic analysis, which should help clarify meaning, can instead be used to justify ideological tendencies or particular interests. In this context, language no longer functions as a medium of revelation, but rather as a tool for legitimizing imposed meaning. The tradition of critical interpretation seeks to prevent this tendency by subjecting linguistic analysis to a rigorous system of testing. Every claim to meaning is required to be linguistically, theologically, and methodologically accountable. In this way, interpretation remains a scientific discipline oriented toward the search for the meaning of revelation, rather than justifying the interpreter's subjectivity.

Critique of linguistic interpretation also serves to maintain balance between various interpretive approaches. Quranic interpretation is not constructed from a single perspective, but rather from the interaction of *tafsir bi al-ma'tsūr*, linguistic analysis, historical context, and consideration of *maqā* (the meaning of the word). *yesid al-syarī'ah*. The unchecked dominance of a single approach has the potential to diminish the richness of revelation's meaning. Critique ensures that linguistic approaches do not exclude other equally important dimensions. Thus, interpretation can develop integratively and avoid becoming trapped in partial readings. Critique serves as a reminder that language, while important, remains part of the overall, multidimensional interpretation methodology.

Within the epistemological framework of interpretation, criticism of linguistic interpretation serves as a balancing mechanism between analytical freedom and scientific responsibility. Linguistic analysis opens up space for intellectual creativity, but this creativity needs to be constrained by methodological discipline. Critique does not stifle innovation, but rather guides it to remain productive and relevant. Through critique, linguistic interpretation can continue to develop without losing its scientific foundation. This process demonstrates that the tradition of interpretation is not static, but rather dynamic and reflective. Critique is part of this dynamic, serving as a means of evaluation that enables renewal without sacrificing the fundamental principles of interpretation.

Furthermore, criticism of linguistic interpretation helps maintain the authority of Qur'anic exegesis within modern academic discourse. In an academic environment that demands methodological accountability, Qur'anic exegesis must demonstrate that its approach is not arbitrary. Critique serves as evidence that the exegetical tradition possesses internal mechanisms for self-correction. Thus, exegesis survives not only as a scholarly heritage but also as a scientific discipline capable of engaging in dialogue with contemporary academic standards. Critique of linguistic interpretation demonstrates that Qur'anic exegesis possesses evaluative tools comparable to those of other disciplines in the humanities.

The function of criticism is also evident in efforts to prevent the reduction of the meaning of revelation due to partial linguistic readings. Quranic Arabic contains interconnected layers of meaning. Interpretations that focus solely on one linguistic aspect have the potential to overlook these interconnections. Criticism helps remind us that the meaning of a verse cannot be separated from the overall structure of Quranic discourse. With a critical approach, linguistic interpretation is directed to interact with the context of the verse and the Quran's global message. This approach prevents interpretation from becoming trapped in micro-analyses that lose their relevance within the broader framework of meaning.

Ultimately, criticism of linguistic interpretation can be understood as an epistemological instrument that safeguards the integrity of Qur'anic interpretation. Critique does not function as a rejection of language, but rather as a safeguard to ensure its proportional and responsible use. Through criticism, interpretation can remain objective, authoritative, and scientific. This tradition emphasizes that Qur'anic interpretation is not merely a linguistic activity, but an intellectual process that demands a balance between linguistic analysis, historical context, and the normative purpose of revelation. Within this framework, criticism of linguistic interpretation is not an obstacle, but rather a crucial requirement for the sustainability and credibility of Qur'anic exegesis studies.

CONCLUSION

Critical studies of linguistic interpretation occupy a central position in efforts to maintain the methodological integrity of Qur'anic interpretation. Arabic, as a medium of revelation, possesses grammatical, semantic, and stylistic complexities that demand high precision in the interpretative process. A linguistic approach, despite its

strong scientific legitimacy, cannot be separated from the broader methodological framework of interpretation. This article demonstrates that without adequate epistemological control, linguistic analysis has the potential to produce interpretations that deviate from the intent of revelation, both theologically and normatively.

The discussion of the concept of *al-dakhīl fī al-tafsīr* shows that deviations in interpretation do not always appear in the form of false narrations or *isrā'iliyyat* alone, but can also appear through the manipulation of linguistic devices. In this context, the use of invalid *qirā'āt*, forced interpretation of meaning, and the disproportionate application of minor grammatical rules are important indicators of the inclusion of *al-dakhīl* elements. This article emphasizes that this problem is not merely a technical linguistic issue, but is closely related to the ideological tendencies of the interpreters that influence the direction of interpretation.

Fayid's critique of fabricated interpretations based on *qira'at* demonstrates how linguistic devices can be used to legitimize certain theological views. The example of the interpretation of QS. *al-Falaq* [113]: 2, which is linked to the construction of *Mu'tazilah* thought, shows that linguistic reading is never truly neutral. This article shows that such critique is not intended to deny the role of language, but rather to emphasize the need for caution in using linguistic instruments so as not to be separated from the famous *qira'at* and *sanad* recognized in the Islamic scientific tradition.

Within a broader framework, this article also positions the critique of linguistic interpretation as a balancing mechanism between various *tafsir* approaches. *Tafsir bi al-ma'thūr*, historical context, and consideration of *maqāyēs* The Islamic jurisprudence (*id al-syarī'ah*) exists as a methodological horizon that complements linguistic analysis. Thus, language is understood as the initial entry point for understanding a text, not as the sole determinant of meaning. This integrative approach emphasizes that the objectivity of interpretation does not arise from the dominance of a single method, but rather from a controlled and academically responsible methodological dialogue.

This article also demonstrates the continuity between the classical exegetical tradition and contemporary studies in viewing the urgency of linguistic criticism. Classical exegetes such as *al-Zamakhshari* and *Abū ḤAyyān al-Andalusī* demonstrated methodological sensitivity to grammatical errors that distort meaning. This critical attitude has found renewed relevance in modern studies through the thinking of figures such as *ḤUsain al-Ḍahabī* and 'Abd al-Wahhāb Fayid. This continuity confirms that linguistic criticism is not a recent academic product, but rather an inherent part of the *tafsir* tradition itself.

Ultimately, this article concludes that criticism of linguistic interpretation serves as an epistemological instrument that keeps Qur'anic interpretation within the bounds of sound scholarship. This critique ensures that linguistic analysis does not become entangled in subjective speculation, ideological bias, or a reduction of the meaning of revelation. By placing language within a comprehensive interpretive methodology, the study of interpretation can continue to develop scientifically without losing its normative orientation. This conclusion emphasizes that the sustainability and credibility of interpretation studies depend crucially on the balance between linguistic acumen and consistent methodological discipline.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, N., & Samsudin, S. (2022). Perbandingan penterjemahan *Majāz Mursal* al-Quran antara Yayasan Restu dengan al-Hidayah House of Quran [Comparison of Quranic synecdoche translation between Yayasan Restu and al-Hidayah House of Quran]. *Al-Irsyad: Journal of Islamic and Contemporary Issues*, 7(2), 949–961. [https://doi.org/\[in Indonesian\]](https://doi.org/[in Indonesian])
- Al-Asfahani, al-R. (1961). *al-Mufradat fi Gharib al-Qur'an*. *Karachi: Tijarat Kutub*.
- Al-Dhahabi, M. H. (1976). *al-Tafsir wa al-Mufasssirun*. Dar al-Fikr.
- Al-Khuli, A. (1961). *Manāhij al-Tajdīd fi al-Nahwi wa al-Balāghah wa al-Tafsīr wa al-Adab*. *Cairo: Dār Al-Ma'ārif*.
- Al-Qurtubi, M. bin A., & Al-Ansari, A. (2006). *al-Jami'li Ahkam al-Qur'an*. *Beirut: Muassasah Al-Risalah*, 1428, 267–284.
- Aprilianti, A. F., & Huda, M. M. (2024). *Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusī's Thoughts on Qirā'āt Shādhhdah in The Tafsīr of al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ*. *Progresiva: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Pendidikan Islam*, 13(02), 243–256.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2),

77–101.

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Echols, J. M. (1988). Hasan shadily, Kamus Inggris-Indonesia [Hasan Shadily, English-Indonesian Dictionary]. *An English–Indonesia Dictionary*. Jakarta: Gramedia. <https://doi.org/>[in Indonesian]
- Fathoni, A. (2009). Ragam Qiraat Al-Qur'an [Various Recitations of the Qur'an]. *Suhuf*, 2(1), 53–72. <https://doi.org/>[in Indonesian]
- Fayed, A. W. (1978). *al-Dakhil fi Tafsir al-Qur'an al-Karim*. Kairo: Matba'ah Al-Hadarah Al-Ârabiyyah.
- Fayed, A. W. (1980). *Ad-Dakhil fi Tafsir al-Quran al-Karim, Mathba'ah al-Hadlarah al-'Arabiyyah*.
- Flick, U. (2022). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research design*.
- Hameed, A. A. (2015). The Development of Approaches to the Classification of Qur'anic Sciences (Ulüm Al-Qur'an): A Case Study of Al-Suyūṭī and IbnAqīlāh. *Ma 'ālim Al-Qur'ān Wa Al-Sunnah*, 10(11).
- Khalīfah, I. A. (2012). *Dirāsāt fī Manāhij al-Mufasssīrīn*. Kairo: t. np, t. th.
- Musyarrofah, E. (2023). Al-Dakhil fi al-Tafsir : Refleksi Analitik terhadap Infiltrasi dalam Penafsiran Alquran [Al-Dakhil fi al-Tafsir: Analytical Reflections on Infiltration in the Interpretation of the Qur'an]. *Jakarta: Kencana*. <https://doi.org/>[in Indonesian]
- Prayudi, R. (2023). Penerapan Metode Al-Dakhil Dalam Tafsir Al-Qur'an: Kontroversi Epistemologi Kesarjanaan Timur Dan Barat [The Application of the Al-Dakhil Method in the Interpretation of the Qur'an: The Epistemological Controversy of Eastern and Western Scholars]. *Sukabumi: Haura Utama*. <https://doi.org/>[in Indonesian]
- Subhan, M. (2023). Al-Riwayah Wa Al-Dirayah Dalam Tafsir Al-Kasysyaf Karya Al-Zamakhsyari. *At-Tibyan*, 6(1), 1–20.
- Ulinuha, M. (2017). *Konsep Al-Ashil Dan Al-Dakhil Dalam Tafsir Al-Qur'an [The Concept of Al-Ashil and Al-Dakhil in Tafsir of the Qur'an]*. <https://doi.org/>[in Indonesian]
- Ulinuha, M. (2019). *Metode Kritik Ad-Dakhil fit Tafsir: Cara Mendeteksi Adanya Infiltrasi dan Kontaminasi dalam Penafsiran Alquran [The Ad-Dakhil Fit Tafsir Criticism Method: How to Detect Infiltration and Contamination in the Interpretation of the Qur'an]*. Qaf Media Kreativa.
- Versteegh, K. (2014). *Arabic language*. Edinburgh University Press.



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).