Edinost in dialog *Unity and Dialogue*
80 (2025) 2: 251–284

Izvirni znanstveni članek Original scientific paper (1.01)
Besedilo prejeto Received: 1. 5. 2025; Sprejeto Accepted: 11. 9. 2025
UDK UDC: 27-277.2:28
DOI: 10.34291/Edinost/80/02/Halil

Hüseyin Halil

Negotiating Scriptural Intertextuality: Al-Biqāʿī's Engagement with Biblical Sources in Qurʾānic Exegesis

Obravnavanje svetopisemskih medbesedilnih povezav: Al-Biqāʿījevo vključevanje svetopisemskih virov v koransko eksegezo

Abstract: The interpretive tradition of Qurʾānic exegesis (*tafsīr*) has historically engaged with Biblical literature as well as Talmudic and Midrashic sources in varied ways. While scholarly attitudes toward these texts have differed, their influence on Islamic commentary is discernible across multiple generations of exegetes. Some scholars incorporated Biblical narratives after adapting them to Islamic frameworks, whereas others, like the 15th-century commentator al-Biqāʿī, engaged more directly with Biblical material, at times quoting extended passages verbatim. This study examines al-Biqāʿī's distinctive methodological approach to Biblical intertextuality, analyzing how his explicit citations function within his Qurʾānic commentary. By comparing al-Biqāʿī's exegetical strategies with broader trends in tafsīr literature, the paper explores the dynamic interplay between Islamic and Judeo-Christian textual traditions. Rather than focusing solely on theological divergences, it highlights how scriptural interpretation often occurred through nuanced textual dialogue across religious boundaries. The analysis pays particular attention to how al-Biqāʿī's commentary negotiates between maintaining Islamic theological positions while actively engaging Biblical sources. Central to this investigation is understanding how al-Biqāʿī's direct use of Biblical texts influenced his interpretive framework, and what his methodology reveals about the broader reception of Biblical material in Islamic exegesis. The study suggests that examining such cross-textual engagements can enrich our understanding of how Qurʾānic interpretation developed in conversation with earlier scriptural traditions. Ultimately, it invites reconsideration of the complex ways Islamic exegetical tradition has historically interacted with, and drawn upon, the broader landscape of monotheistic scripture.

Keywords: The Bible, the Qurʾān, Islamic exegesis, al-Biqāʿī, Midrash

Izvleček: *Razlagalna tradicija koranske eksegeze (*tafsīr*) se je skozi zgodovino na različne načine ukvarjala s svetopisemsko literaturo ter s talmudsko in midraško dediščino. Čeprav so bila stališča učenjakov do teh besedil različna, je njihov vpliv na islamske komentarje razviden skozi več generacij eksegetov. Nekateri učenjaki so svetopisemske pripovedi vključili tako, da so jih predhodno prilagodili islamskemu okvirju, medtem ko so se drugi – kot*

komentator al-Biqāʿī iz 15. stoletja – s svetopisemskim gradivom ukvarjali veliko bolj neposredno in občasno navajali tudi daljše odlomke dobesedno. Ta študija preučuje al-Biqāʿījev značilni metodološki pristop k svetopisemski medbesedilnosti ter analizira, kako delujejo njegove eksplicitne svetopisemske navedbe v okviru njegove koranske razlage. S primerjavo al-Biqāʿījevih eksegetskih pristopov s širšimi tokovi v tafsirski literaturi članek raziskuje dinamično prepletanje islamske ter judovsko-krščanske besedilne tradicije. Namesto da bi se osredotočala izključno na teološke razlike, študija poudarja, da se je razlaga svetih spisov pogosto odvijala v obliki subtilnega besedilnega dialoga prek verskih meja. Analiza se posebej posveča temu, kako al-Biqāʿī v svojem komentiranju vzpostavlja ravnotežje med ohranjanjem islamskih teoloških izhodišč in hkratnim aktivnim vključevanjem svetopisemskih virov. Osrednji del raziskave predstavlja vprašanje, kako je neposredna raba svetopisemskih besedil oblikovala njegov interpretativni okvir ter kaj njegova metoda razkriva o širšem sprejemanju svetopisemske snovi v islamski eksegezi. Študija nakazuje, da lahko preučevanje takšnih medbesedilnih povezav pomembno obogati naše razumevanje razvoja koranske interpretacije v dialogu s starejšimi svetopisemskimi tradicijami. Nazadnje nas spodbuja k ponovnemu razmisleku o kompleksnih načinih, na katere se je islamska eksegetska tradicija skozi zgodovino soočala s širšo krajino monoteističnih svetih besedil in črpala iz nje.

Ključne besede: *Sveto pismo, Koran, islamska eksegeza, al-Biqāʿī, midraš*

Introduction: The reception of Biblical material in Islamic literature

The Qurʾānic text demonstrates a meaningful engagement with Biblical tradition through various forms of textual interaction. These range from direct parallels – such as Q 5:45's resonance with Exodus 21:23, Q 21:105 with Psalms 37:9, and Q 7:40 with Matthew 19:24 – to more adapted references that recontextualize Biblical material within the Qurʾān's distinctive theological framework.[1] Many prophetic narratives appear in this reinterpreted form, reflecting what scholars have termed a »Qurʾānic reframing« of earlier scriptural traditions (Rippin 2019, 23; Saleh 2016, 415).[2]

1 Biblical material takes a new shape within the Qurʾānic sense, obtaining new content with a fresh vision. It rephrases the stories with its own metaphorical and moral language, and at times summarizes them to directly convey its message, e.g. the stories of Solomon, David, Adam, Jesus, Joseph etc. Qurʾānic versions of these stories are broadly compliant with that of Bible, though they are distinguished from it with their peculiar phraseology.

2 The stories about Adam, Moses, Solomon, David, Joseph, and etc. were reshaped and retold in the Qurʾānic sense (see Q 38:30-40; 38:21-30; 12:1-30; 26:32; Gen 39:1-23; Exod 32:5-22; 4:3), e.g. the Sūrah al-Yūsuf which relates the story about a Biblical character, Joseph, in the Qurʾānic guise. Some passages of the story were transmitted directly from the Biblical version, some from Talmud, Mishnah and Midrash, and others were reformed and rephrased in a way that they are compatible with Qurʾānic sense. Although the stories were retold with some redactions / modifications in the Qurʾān, its plotline still remained unchanged.

This intertextual relationship suggests that the Qurʾān positions itself in conscious dialogue with Biblical tradition, as noted in Q 48:29. Andrew Rippin emphasizes the importance of reading Qurʾānic narratives alongside their Biblical counterparts to fully appreciate their historical and literary dimensions. As he observes:

> To grasp these passages within a coherent narrative structure, it is often essential to situate Qurʾānic accounts within the broader framework of Biblical tradition. This necessity highlights the importance of considering a geographic and cultural context extending well beyond Central Arabia when reflecting on Islam's formative milieu.

Walid Saleh similarly highlights the Qurʾān's narrative connections to earlier scriptures, noting that »The Qurʾān at no point hides or belittles the connection to its Jewish paradigm. Ultimately, the Qurʾān saw itself as the continuation of the history of Judaism and Christianity« (Saleh 2016, 410). This perspective is further developed by Soomro (2023), who approaches such textual relationships through the lens of intertextual theory. For instance, Qurʾān 10:98's reference to the »people of Jonah« gains deeper significance when read alongside the Biblical Book of Jonah.

Rather than diminishing the Qurʾān's theological independence, this intertextual dynamic may be understood as reflecting the complex ways in which religious traditions develop through engagement with their textual environments. Such analysis requires careful attention to both the continuities and transformations that occur when material crosses interpretative traditions. The present study explores these dynamics through the particular lens of how Islamic exegesis has historically negotiated its relationship to Biblical sources, focusing especially on the methodological approaches developed within the tafsīr tradition.

Beyond direct textual correspondences, the Qurʾān shares significant thematic and structural similarities with Biblical tradition across several dimensions. These include core theological concepts – such as strict monotheism, eschatological belief in resurrection and divine judgment – as well as ritual practices like animal sacrifice, pilgrimage observances, and fasting periods. Such parallels suggest a shared religious milieu rather

than simple borrowing, reflecting what Rippin (2019, 107) characterizes as »contextual connections« between the scriptural traditions.

The Qurʾān engages with Biblical narratives through a distinctive interpretive process, often reformulating stories with its own linguistic and theological emphases. While maintaining the essential narrative framework, it frequently employs metaphorical language, condensed retellings, and moral focal points that align with its revelatory perspective.[3] Such variations in narrative presentation are not unique to Qurʾānic-Biblical relationships, but rather reflect common patterns across scriptural traditions. Islamic ḥadīth collections, for instance, preserve multiple versions of the same events with differing details (Buḫārī 2002, 5:65, no. 4485; Abū Dāwūd 2009, 24:2, no. 3644).[4] Similarly, Jewish textual tradition shows narrative flexibility between the Tanakh, Midrashic literature, and Talmudic discussions. The Christian Gospels likewise present complementary yet distinct accounts of shared events.[5] These cross-traditional parallels suggest that narrative variation, while affecting stylistic and thematic emphasis, typically preserves core story elements across different religious texts.

Muslim scholars, particularly Qurʾānic commentators, frequently engaged with Midrashic literature – Jewish interpretive expansions of Biblical narratives – incorporating them into Islamic exegetical works. This cross-textual interaction allowed Biblical stories to be reinterpreted within an Islamic theological framework, enriching the tradition's narrative and hermeneutical dimensions. A notable example is the story of Solomon and his ring, which appears in Midrashic sources (Ginzberg 1968, 4:168–169) and was

3 See e.g. Q 12:7.

4 E.g. the *ḥadīth* that occurs in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Buḫārī* »The people of the Scripture (Jews) used to recite the Torah in Hebrew and they used to explain it in Arabic to the Muslims. On that Allah's Messenger said: Do not believe the people of the Scripture or disbelieve them, but say: We believe in Allah and what is revealed to us.« (Buḫārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Buḫārī*, 5:65:11, no: 4485) Abū Dāwūd transmitted the same *ḥadīth* with a different context and slight variation of wording »When a Jew was with Muḥammad, a funeral passed by him. He (the Jew) asked (Him): Muhammad, does this funeral speak? The Prophet said: Allah has more knowledge. The Jew said: It speaks. The Messenger of Allah said: Whatever the people of the Book tell you, do not verify them, nor falsify them, but say: We believe in Allah and His Apostle. If it is false, do not confirm it, and if it is right, do not falsify it.« (Abū Dāwūd, *al-Sunan*, 24:2, no: 3644) As is seen, despite the variation of the context and wording with transmission of the narrative, main features of the narrative is invariable.

5 The Gospel of John differs from other three Gospels to some extent in the way that it relates the accounts; nonetheless, it coincides with the others with its relating outlines of the stories. See e.g. John 27:45-66, and Matthew 19:28-42.

later adapted by Muslim exegetes such as Ibn Kathīr (1999, 5:67–69) and al-Qurṭubī (2006, 17:199–200) to explain Qurʾānic passages (Q 38:34-35). Similarly, accounts of Solomon's encounters with animals – such as the ant's warning to its colony in Q 27:18 – reflect narrative elements drawn from Jewish interpretive traditions (Ginzberg 1968, 4:163; Ibn Kathīr 1999, 6:182–183).

As Saleh (2016, 415) observes, this represents more than simple borrowing; it constitutes a process of narrative integration where Jewish textual traditions were substantially incorporated into Islamic exegesis. The adaptation of these materials was not merely selective, but rather involved a comprehensive adoption that made them an inseparable part of Islamic interpretive tradition. This phenomenon illustrates how early Muslim scholars engaged with existing scriptural knowledge, transforming it to serve within an Islamic theological framework while maintaining continuity with the broader Abrahamic narrative tradition.

Rather than viewing this as mere borrowing, it may be more accurate to consider it part of a broader intertextual exchange, in which early Muslim scholars engaged with existing scriptural lore while reshaping it to align with Islamic teachings. This process reflects a dynamic interaction between religious traditions rather than a unilateral adoption. The incorporation of such narratives into tafsīr literature demonstrates how Islamic exegesis developed through dialogue with earlier textual traditions, integrating and recontextualizing them in ways that reinforced Qurʾānic themes while maintaining theological coherence.

It is important to recognize that once the substantial body of Biblical and Midrashic material had been transmitted to Muslim scholars and subsequently integrated into Islamic literature by early Muslim thinkers, attempts to later dismiss these elements as fabrications became untenable. As Walid Saleh has observed (Saleh 2016, 415):

> This material, as might be expected, has had a checkered history of reception, oscillating on the one hand between complete acceptance and attempts on the other at purging it from the tradition. Yet, because of its intimate connection to a central genre in Islam, it has proved impossible to uproot *isrāʿiliyyāt* from the tradition.

The Qurʾān reflects not only canonical Biblical texts (the Torah, Gospels, and Psalms) but also Midrashic, Talmudic, and Mishnaic literature, along with living Jewish and Christian traditions, as Andrew Rippin has demonstrated (Rippin 2019, 23):

> Elements in the Qurʾānic versions of these stories are sometimes found in works such as the Jewish Talmud or Midrash, for example. Thus, the context within which the Qurʾān must be read is far more than the framework provided by the text of the Bible alone; rather, the living traditions of Judaism and Christianity, and all the other faiths and folk-lore of the area, are reflected in the Qurʾān and provide the necessary background for its comprehension.

Another evidence regarding the influence of Jewish lore like Midrash on the Quranic exegesis is the statement of R. Michael McCoy's:

> In the *Story of Adam and Eve*, for example, the description of Iblīs (Satan) maraud-ing in the garden appears in al-Ṭabarī's treatment of the subject in his tafsīr; but this found its way into his interpretation through the previous traditions in Jewish midrash rather than directly from the Bible. Thus the general contours of canonical stories are present in *qiṣaṣ* narratives of the Qurʾān, but the contexts and substance of the dialogues have been reshaped for particular Muslim interests, and, more importantly, they rely heavily upon the »processed version« of the Biblical story, as transmitted through other Islamic genres. (2021, 37)

Claude Gilliot likewise recognized the influence of Biblical traditions on Qurʾānic exegesis, drawing attention to Muqātil's engagement with Jewish source material: »he extensively employed Biblical narratives. The *qiṣaṣ* and Jewish traditions likewise form fundamental components of his exegesis.« (Gilliot 1990, 132) This suggests that Midrashic, Talmudic, and Mishnaic literature – alongside Biblical texts such as the Torah, Gospels, and Psalms – contributed meaningfully to the intellectual and religious environment in which the Qurʾān emerged and Islamic religious thought developed. In this context, exploring Biblical and Midrashic sources may offer valuable insights for deepening our understanding of both Qurʾānic revelation and Islamic traditions (*ḥadīth*). During the medieval period,

it appears that Christian elements were present within *ḥadīth* literature. Scholarly analysis has identified numerous Biblical quotations and ascetic maxims embedded in *ḥadīth* collections, which may have been transmitted orally by Syrian-Palestinian monks (Cook 2006, 203). These materials were often edited and paraphrased to align more closely with the stylistic and thematic character of *ḥadīth* literature, and in some cases, additional non-Biblical elements were incorporated through these adaptations (Cook 2006, 201–204).

In this context, Gobillot illustrates the depth of intertextuality between the Bible and the Qurʾān, stating: »For a long time, the historical precedence of the Bible vis-à-vis the Qurʾān polarized discussions of their relationship, reducing it to mere questions of influence and borrowing – or, in extreme polemics, to accusations of plagiarism and parody.« (Gobillot 2014, 611)

The incorporation of Biblical and midrashic materials into Islamic scholarship reflects a complex and longstanding process of hermeneutical adaptation. From the earliest period of Qurʾānic exegesis, a wide range of Muslim scholars engaged with this body of lore. The Prophet's disciples – such as Ibn ʿAbbās, Abū Hurayra, and ʿAbdullah b. Salām – and their successors, including figures like Kaʿb al-Aḥbār, Wahb b. Munabbih, and Mukātil b. Sulaymān, frequently utilised biblical and post-biblical knowledge to elucidate scriptural narratives. Rather than direct quotation, Muslim exegetes typically recontextualized these narratives – such as the midrashic accounts of Solomon's ring (Ibn Kathīr 1999, 5:67–69) – within distinct Islamic theological frameworks. This interpretive approach, while often preserving the core moral and spiritual significance of the narratives, rendered their explicit connections to Jewish textual sources less immediately recognizable, seamlessly integrating them into the Islamic exegetical corpus.

This tradition of engagement was not confined to Sunni scholarship but was also a significant feature in other Islamic sects, such as the Ibāḍī school, where exegetes like al-Huwārī and al-Itfayyish liberally incorporated *Isrāʾīliyyāt* (al-Huwārī 1990, 225–226; Q 10:40, 24; 38:24). As noted by Claude Gilliot, for commentators like Muqātil, Biblical narratives and Jewish traditions formed fundamental components of his tafsīr (Gilliot 1990, 132). Prominent classical exegetes, including Ibn

Kathīr, al-Ṭabarī, al-Ālūsī and al-Qurṭubī, continued this practice, often drawing on these sources to expand upon concise Qurʾānic accounts (Qurṭubī 2006, 2:118; Ṭabarī 1955, 2:101; Q 2:57; 7:160). A common method was to attribute explanatory details derived ultimately from the Bible to early Muslim authorities like the Companions (*al-Ṣaḥāba*) or their Successors (al-*Tābiʿūn*), thereby Islamizing the material and obscuring its direct textual lineage.

However, the Islamic exegetical tradition never exhibited a uniform approach to *Isrāʾīliyyāt*. Alongside this pervasive incorporation, a strong counter-tradition of methodological caution and theological resistance emerged. Figures such as al-Māturīdī, al-Māwardī, Ibn ʿAṭiyya, and Ibn Taymiyya advocated for a critical sifting of these narratives, insisting they be evaluated in light of the Qurʾān and authentic *ḥadīth* (Ibn Taymiyya 1995, 18:376; al-Māturīdī 2005, 8:107–108; Q 27:20). Yet, a sophisticated analysis reveals that even these critics often engaged with *Isrāʾīliyyāt*, albeit with a distinct hermeneutic of recontextualization. Their approach was not one of outright rejection but of critical adaptation, whereby Biblically-derived narratives were reinterpreted to align with Islamic theological and ethical sensibilities. A prime example is al-Māturīdī's handling of the David and Bathsheba narrative in his commentary on Q 38:24. While he transmits the core story known from the Bible – involving David, Uriah, and Bathsheba – he meticulously reframes it to safeguard prophetic impeccability. He suggests that David's initial glance at the woman was not intentional but accidental, occurring as he was distracted by birds flying to a high window. Furthermore, al-Māturīdī justifies David's growing affection for her by drawing an analogy to the inclination of the Prophet Muhammad's heart towards Zayd's wife, Zaynab bint Jaḥsh. Most significantly, he argues that David sent Uriah to battle not with the intent to have him killed, but to fulfill the obligatory duty of fighting God's enemies, thus attributing David's action to a noble, rather than a personal, motive (al-Māturīdī 2005, 8:616). This case demonstrates that the practice among cautious scholars was not merely to use or reject *Isrāʾīliyyāt*, but to actively recontextulize, reinterpret and Islamize it, softening its ethically challenging edges and presenting the prophets in a manner deemed appropriate within an Islamic framework.

Exegetes who liberally utilized such material, like Ibn Kathīr, simultaneously inherited and systematized the tradition of methodological caution. While he vehemently criticized *Isrāʾīliyyāt*, labeling some of it as »fabrications by their heretics to confuse people in their religion« and rejecting claims of the Bible's complete preservation, a position notably associated with Wahb b. Munabbih (Ibn Kathīr 1998, 2:56; 7:368; Q 3:78; 50:1-5; Ibn Kathīr 1939, 1:78), he nonetheless conceded its utility for specific, limited purposes. He explicitly stated that he would cite those Isrāʾīliyyāt *»for illustration rather than for substantiation« (li al-istishhād lā li al-iʿtiḍād)* – not as legal proof, nor as a relied-upon source, nor as evidence from which a binding argument could be derived (*lā ʿalā sabīl al-iḥtijāj wa li iʿtimād, wa li al-ʿitiḍād*) – but merely to elucidate narratives that were mentioned succinctly or ambiguously in the Islamic scripture, thereby »adorning« the commentary (Ibn Kathīr 1939, 1:6; 1998, 1:4). This practice is crystallized in his famous tripartite classification of *Isrāʾīliyyāt* into acceptable, rejectable, and indeterminate categories (Ibn Kathīr 1998, 1:10). This very classification exemplifies the inherent and persistent tension within Islamic scholarship. This tension reflects a continuous balancing act between engaging with the intertextual environment of revelation and maintaining theological purity, a dynamic that forms the essential backdrop for understanding the audacity of al-Biqāʿī's project.

It appears that Ibn Kathīr established a three-fold classification for *Isrāʿīliyyāt*. The first category consists of »acceptable« reports – those not contradicted by the Qurʾān and Sunnah. The second encompasses narratives that can be neither verified nor falsified, while the third comprises rejectable ones. From his commentary on Q 6:103, which deals with the theme that God cannot be seen with human eyes in this world, we observe that he utilizes reports from the first category in his exegesis, even making reference to the Bible in this context (Ibn Kathīr 1998, 3:277–279).[6] He also employs narratives from the second category, but accompanies them with a disclaimer such as, »these are from the Israelites, and God knows best concerning their authenticity« (Ibn Kathīr 1998, 3:359; Q 7:24-25). As for the third category, he cites them as well, yet he appends a stronger note:

6 Ibn Kathīr references the Bible without any criticism, stating »And in the earlier scriptures: Indeed, Allah the Exalted said to Moses when he asked for vision: O Moses, no living being sees Me except that it dies, and no solid [thing] sees Me except that it crumbles to dust.«

»this is from the fables (hurāfāt) of the Israelites, we cannot ascertain their authenticity.« (Ibn Kathīr 1998, 7:368; 8:386; Q 50:1-5; 89:7).

A distinctive and audacious figure within this complex exegetical landscape is the Mamluk-era scholar Ibrāhīm b. ʿUmar al-Biqāʿī (d. 885/1480) (Brockelmann 1943, 2:142; Goudie 2020, 203; Guo 2001, 28). His commentary, *Naẓm al-durar*, is remarkable for its extensive and direct quotation of Biblical texts to illuminate Qurʾānic passages, a methodology that drew criticism from his contemporaries. In response, al-Biqāʿī composed an apologetic treatise, *al-Aqwāl al-qawīmah fī ḥukm al-naql min al-kutub al-qadīmah*, to justify his approach. As elucidated in Walid Saleh's 2008 critical edition of this work, al-Biqāʿī navigated the contentious issue of *taḥrīf* (textual corruption) by proposing a four-fold categorization of scholarly opinion (Saleh, 2008). He positioned himself close to the view that the Bible's corruption was minimal, arguing that its core text remained largely reliable (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:16). This theological foundation allowed him to treat the Bible as a hermeneutically valuable source, whose *muḥkam* (clear) verses could be used to interpret *mutashābih* (ambiguous) Qurʾānic passages (Sonn 2006, 14; Heath 2003, 386),[7] thereby seeking to harmonize Biblical and Qurʾānic material while respecting their distinct canonical statuses (Eickelman 2003, 5:73).

Al-Biqāʿī's application of this methodology was systematic and direct, setting him apart from exegetes who paraphrased Biblical material or hid it behind the generic label of *Isrāʿīliyyāt*. He employed the Bible in three primary ways: to supplement concise Qurʾānic narratives with detailed Biblical accounts (e.g., the Exodus story), to clarify obscure Qurʾānic terms and concepts (such as the »burdens and shackles« in Q 7:157 by referencing Levitical law), and to apply a Qurʾānic hermeneutic – specifically the *muḥkam/mutashābih* framework – to interpret the Bible itself, using it to challenge Christian doctrines like Jesus's divinity. This approach, particularly his lengthy verbatim quotations from the Gospels, demonstrates his conviction that the Bible he cited was authentic. Therefore, al-Biqāʿī's project represents more than a mere intertextual exercise; it is a bold intervention

7 It means 'accurate', 'solid', 'reinforced' or 'well-planned'. The *muḥkam* verses are perceived of as clear, accurate and decisive.

in ongoing Islamic debates about revelation and interpretive authority, championing a direct and declared dialogue with the earlier scriptures that was both remarkable and controversial within the tradition.

The Authenticity of the Bible

Al-Biqāʿī developed a refined approach to Biblical texts, recognizing their revelatory status when their content harmonized with Qurʾānic teachings (Guo 2005, 101–121; al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:477). He distinguished between Biblical passages that remained uncorrupted – which he designated as »the truth« (*al-ḥaqq*) (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 1:116) – and those he believed had undergone alteration. This careful discernment allowed him to incorporate Biblically-derived material into his exegesis while maintaining Islamic theological parameters. His commentary frequently referenced Biblical sources directly to elucidate Qurʾānic narratives (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:603),[8] demonstrating both his scholarly methodology and his respect for what he considered authentic elements of earlier revelation.

As Walid Saleh conclusively states: »To him, it is a divine book, scripture worthy of respect, and a reliable source for Israelite history.« (Saleh 2012, 85) This balanced approach reflects al-Biqāʿī's attempt to navigate the complex relationship between Islamic and Biblical textual traditions while upholding core Islamic theological principles.

When examining differences between Qurʾānic and Biblical narratives, al-Biqāʿī suggests two possible explanations for such variations: either the Biblical account has been *mansūkh* (abrogated) as part of the Qurʾān's role as the final revelation in the Abrahamic tradition (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:477), or it reflects *tahrīf* (textual alteration) where the original meaning was distorted (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 1:213–216).

8 Moreover, quoting Islamic-Biblical material – elements transmitted from the Tanakh, Midrash, and Talmud to Islamic literature in a new shape, quise and reframed manner – contrasts with Biblical lore, al-Biqāʿī advocates for the Bible. For example, after citing the names of twelve disciples of Jesus, quoting from Ibn Hishām and Ibn Isḥāq, he found the Biblical version regarding their names more authentic, saying »That I composed from the Gospels are different from it (the narrative about the names Ibn Hishām mentioned), and truer than it«.

A notable example is the differing accounts of Abraham's sacrifice. The Torah states: »Take your son, your only son Isaac, whom you love...« (Genesis 22:2), while the Qurʾān indicates Ishmael as the intended son: »So We gave him tidings of a gentle son (Ishmael)...« (Q 37:102) Al-Biqāʿī, along with many classical (*mutaqaddimūn*) and later (*mutaʾakhkhirūn*) scholars, maintains that this represents a case where the Biblical narrative was altered over time, with the Qurʾān restoring the original account (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 6:331–332).

Thus, rather than dismissing Biblical material entirely, al-Biqāʿī's approach deals with specific scriptural divergences (such as determining the identity of the sacrificed son in the Abrahamic narrative) through nuanced textual analysis. His methodology seeks to reconcile such differences by applying established Islamic hermeneutical principles (*naskh* and *tahrīf*) while acknowledging the complex transmission history of Biblical revelations. This interpretive framework allowed him to critically engage with Biblical texts – particularly in cases like the Isaac/Ishmael discrepancy – while consistently upholding the theological integrity of Qurʾānic narratives, thereby exemplifying his distinctive approach within Islamic exegetical tradition.

Al-Biqāʿī's examination of Biblical narratives extended beyond apparent divergences with the Qurʾān to include careful scrutiny of internal textual coherence within the Torah. His approach sought to identify what he viewed as potential transmission anomalies through detailed comparative analysis.

A central focus was the Abrahamic sacrifice narrative. Regarding Genesis 22:2 »Take your son, your only son, whom you love – Isaac«, al-Biqāʿī noted the theological difficulty of describing Isaac as the »only son« given the clear Biblical account of Ishmael's prior birth (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 6:332). He further examined the covenantal promise in Genesis 22:17-18 that »through your offspring all nations on earth will be blessed«, suggesting this better aligned with Ishmael's lineage, which expanded across numerous nations, compared to Isaac's descendants who remained more geographically concentrated (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 6:332).

His textual analysis extended to other narrative elements, including the incomplete account of Hagar's story in Genesis 16:6-9, which mentions her flight but omits her eventual return. Similarly, he questioned the historical plausibility of Genesis 21:12's declaration that »through Isaac your offspring will be reckoned«, given Abraham's stronger ancestral connections to Arab lineages (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 6:333).

These observations led al-Biqāʿī to cautiously suggest certain Torah passages may have undergone modification during transmission (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 6:333). His methodology reflects a nuanced engagement with scripture--raising thoughtful questions about specific passages while maintaining respect for the Biblical text's overall status as containing elements of preserved revelation. This balanced approach allowed him to uphold Qurʾānic theological positions while seriously engaging Biblical material through careful textual and historical analysis.

Al-Biqāʿī suggested that some Jewish interpreters may have modified specific Torah passages, particularly those addressing moral prohibitions like bribery, usury, and adultery (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 4:545). He viewed as particularly significant the potential omission of references to Muhammad's prophethood, despite Biblical anticipation of future messengers (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:464). Regarding these textual considerations, he carefully noted (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:461–464):

> According to a report transmitted from ʿAbdullāh b. ʿUmar, a group of Jews approached the Prophet of Islam and informed him that a man and a woman from among them had committed unlawful sexual intercourse. The Prophet asked what ruling the Torah prescribed in such a case. They replied that they typically announced the offense publicly and administered lashes. At this point, ʿAbdullāh b. Salām intervened, stating that the Torah in fact contained a command for stoning (*al-rajm*). When they brought the Torah, one of them covered the relevant verse with his hand and read the surrounding verses. Upon being asked to move his hand, the verse of stoning became visible. The Prophet then ordered the prescribed punishment to be carried out.

The exegete noted that some Jewish interpreters appear to have substituted the Biblical penalty of stoning with alternative punishments like public exposure and flogging (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 1:213–214; 2:461–464). This led him to cautiously suggest possible adjustments to certain divine ordinances within their textual tradition.

Al-Biqāʿī expressed concerns about the preservation of earlier scriptures, suggesting that some religious scholars may not have fully maintained their custodial responsibilities (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:477). In his commentary on Q 2:79,[9] he proposed that certain textual passages might reflect a blending of divine revelation with human interpretation, potentially involving modifications over time (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 1:177). His analysis of Q 2:42[10] distinguished between preserved elements (*al-ḥaqq*) and potentially altered sections (*al-bāṭil*) of earlier revelations (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 1:116). He further observed that some scholars might have been selective in their scriptural citations, particularly regarding passages he believed contained references to Muḥammad's prophethood (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 1:116). This nuanced approach reflects his careful engagement with textual transmission issues while maintaining respect for the concept of divine revelation.

In his commentary on Q 4:46,[11] al-Biqāʿī cautiously suggested that some interpreters may have modified certain scriptural references to Muḥammad and Islam, potentially affecting both textual meanings and pronunciations (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:263). He proposed that such changes could have been influenced by various factors, including social pressures or material considerations (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:262).

Despite these criticisms, al-Biqāʿī continued to consult Biblical material to support his Qurʾānic exegesis, especially concerning the authenticity of Muḥammad's prophethood and the divine origin of the Qurʾān. He argued that certain verses in the Bible (e.g., Genesis 18:19; 22:1-10;

9 »Woe to those who write (*yaktubūna*) revelation (*al-kitāb*) with their hands and then say, 'This is from God'.« (See Q 2:79)

10 »Do not cover up (*talbisū*; Q 3:71) the truth with falsehood and conceal (*taktumū*; cf. Q 2:140, 146, 159, 174; 3:71, 187) the truth, while you know it.«

11 »Among the Jews are those who shift (*yuḥarrifūna al-kalima 'an mawāḍiʿihī*; cf. Q 2:75; 5:13, 41) words out of their contexts.«

Exodus 6:3) alluded to Muḥammad's advent and had not been subject to distortion (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:125).[12] Additionally, he cited Genesis 18:20, Deuteronomy 2:2-4, 18:15,[13] and 33:1–3 in relation to Q 7:157,[14] viewing them as prophetic indicators. In his commentary on Deuteronomy 18:15, he elaborated further:

> If one construed the phrase »raising up a prophet from among your brothers« to refer to Israelite prophets, he would have understood it metaphorically, since Israelites were not biologically brothers – they were not coming from the same parents – rather were in-directly brothers, because they came from the same ancestor, Abraham. However, if one understood the phrase to refer to Ishamel's offspring, he would have understood it literally, since Ishamel was real brother of Isaac. (1995, 3:124–125)[15]

So the prophet to be raised up must be Muḥammad, since he is from Ishmael's offspring, brother of Isaac.

Accordingly, he concluded that the prophet mentioned in the verse must be Muḥammad, as a descendant of Ishmael, the brother of Isaac.

This dialectical approach – critically examining Biblical texts while simultaneously relying on them as authoritative sources – powerfully demonstrates al-Biqāʿī's intertextual methodology. His willingness to engage deeply with Biblical literature, despite his reservations about certain passages, ultimately affirms the interconnected nature of Abrahamic revelations and underscores his commitment to textual analysis across religious traditions.

---

12 He explicitly mentioned not Genesis 18:19, 22:1-10, and Exodus 6:3, rather alluded to them citing the Qur'ānic verses Q 2:124; 3:33. To see his exegetical trajectory, see al-Biqāʿī, *Naẓm al-durar,* 3:125.

13 »The LORD your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your brothers. You must listen to him.«

14 »Those who follow the Messenger, the unlettered prophet, whom they find written in what they have of the Torah and the Gospel.«

15 Additionally, there is a rule, al-Biqāʿī mentioned, that metaphorical phrases should be attribute to the closest reality. In this sense, the closest reality that the metaphorical phrase could be attributed is Ishmael and his lineage; since only Isaac and Ishmael were brothers in real sense. If the prophets coming after Moses were meant, metaphorical phrase would have been attributed to the farthest reality.

In his exegesis, al-Biqāʿī focused on the term »like« in Deuteronomy 18:15, suggesting it denotes similarity to Moses in establishing an independent legal system (*sharīʿa*). He observed that while Jesus reaffirmed Mosaic law, Muḥammad introduced a new legislative framework, making him, in al-Biqāʿī's view, the more fitting fulfillment of this prophecy. This interpretation was supported by his reference to Rabbi Samuel b. Yaḥyā's account (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:125), which he understood as corroborating this reading.

According to this narrative, certain Jewish scholars associated the prophesied figure in Deuteronomy 18:15 with Samuel, a post-Mosaic prophet from the Levite lineage. Al-Biqāʿī references an account attributed to Rabbi Samuel b. Yaḥyā, wherein the rabbi describes a visionary encounter with the prophet Samuel. In this dream, Samuel presents a book containing messianic prophecies, prompting the rabbi's exclamation: »Congratulations, O prophet of God! What a great message you were given!« Samuel, however, responds with apparent dissatisfaction: »God did not mean me, O discerning one!« When pressed for clarification, Samuel cryptically references »the coasts of Mount Paran« (חופי מהר פארן) – a phrase al-Biqāʿī interprets as pointing toward Mecca and, by extension, Muḥammad's prophethood (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:125).

The dream narrative continues with Samuel distinguishing his own mission – »God did not send me to abrogate any part of the Torah but to revive and purify it among the people of Palestine« – from that of the ultimate foretold prophet. This distinction leads al-Biqāʿī to argue that the Deuteronomy prophecy must concern a law-giving prophet unlike previous messengers, including Samuel, Daniel, Jeremiah, or Hezekiel, who operated within the existing Mosaic framework. His analysis suggests that Jewish interpretive traditions themselves preserved clues indicating a prophet who would transcend the Torah's legal structure – a role he identifies with Muḥammad and the Qurʾānic revelation.

Al-Biqāʿī proposed that the Biblical command to heed the coming prophet (Deuteronomy 18:15) specifically addressed the Israelites' anticipated resistance, as this prophet would introduce a new legal framework distinct from Mosaic law (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:124). He observed that earlier prophets like Samuel and Jeremiah – who operated within the Torah's existing structure – did not require such emphasis, as their communities accepted

them without comparable divine injunction. This led him to conclude that the prophesied figure must bring a novel legislative revelation, distinguishing him from previous messengers. Within this interpretive framework, al-Biqāʿī identified Muḥammad as the logical fulfillment, given the Qurʾān's independent legal system and the early Muslim community's historical experiences with Jewish interlocutors.

Another piece of evidence al-Biqāʿī drew from the Torah to support the claim that the foretold prophet is Muḥammad is Genesis 17:2, 20, which states, »I will multiply you exceedingly« (בִּמְאֹד). He argued that by applying the gematria method to count the numerical value of the word בִּמְאֹד (*bimʿod*), the result is 290, which corresponds to the numerical value of the name Muḥammad. In his view, this verse serves as a hidden reference to Muḥammad, suggesting that God concealed his name within the Torah, making him an enigmatic figure in order to prevent tampering by the Jews (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:125–126).

The final evidence he found in the Torah to affirm the prophecy regarding Muḥammad is found in Deuteronomy 18:15:

> The LORD came from Sinai and dawned over them from Seir; he shone forth from Mount Paran. He came with myriads of holy ones from the south, from his mountain slopes. Surely it is you who love the people; all the holy ones are in your hand. At your feet they all bow down, and from you receive instruction/word.

He suggested that he who shone forth from Mount Paran is Muḥammad, because, as they acknowledged, the mount Paran is present in Mecca where Muḥammad was born (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:126–127).

When addressing the Gospel, al-Biqāʿī reaffirmed his stance, offering numerous analogies from it, as drawn by Jesus (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:127). While he did not explicitly define the analogies' connections, he left it to the reader to interpret them. He refrained from directly linking these analogies to a new religion (Islam), a new community (Muslims), or a new prophet (Muḥammad), preferring instead to guide the audience to make that connection themselves. The analogies he presented, however, seem

to centre on the chosen prophet (Muḥammad) and his revered community (Muslims).

The first analogy involves a landowner who hired workers for his vineyard (Matthew 20:1-16; al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:127). The key aspects of this analogy are that the last workers became first, and the landowner treated all workers equally by paying them one denarius, regardless of when they began their work. In his exegesis of the Biblical parable (Matthew 20:1-16), al-Biqāʿī interprets the »last workers« as symbolizing the Muslim community that emerged after the People of the Book (the »first workers«). His reading suggests that divine reward operates beyond temporal precedence where later-coming believers who perform righteous deeds may attain equal, if not greater, spiritual standing before God. This interpretation reflects his view of Islamic tradition as both continuing and perfecting earlier revelations.

The second analogy concerns a landowner who planted a vineyard and rented it out to tenants before going on a journey. The tenants, however, refused to give the landowner his share of the fruit at harvest time, leading to their destruction and the vineyard being leased to new tenants who would fulfill their duties (Matthew 21:33-46; al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:127–128). Al-Biqāʿī seems to compare the new tenants to the Muslim community. He suggests that only Muslims could be faithful to the covenant with God, which commands them to practice His law on Earth,[16] as mere servants to Him.[17]

The third analogy depicts a king who prepared a wedding banquet for his son, but those invited refused to attend. The king, enraged, destroyed the murderers and burned their cities, then invited both good and bad people to fill the banquet hall (Matthew 22:1-14; al-Biqāʿī, *Naẓm al-durar*, 3:128). Al-Biqāʿī seems to liken those chosen and gathered from the streets represent the Muslim community.

16 The vineyard in the analogy denotes the land God gave to the servants.

17 The tenants in the analogy denote the servants of God, watching his property on the earth temporally.

The fourth example concerns a man who instructed his two sons to work in the vineyard. The first son initially refused, saying, »I will not,« but later changed his mind and went. In contrast, the second son agreed, saying, »I will, sir,« yet failed to go (Matthew 21:28-32). Jesus used this parable to highlight the people's unjust attitude toward John – specifically, their refusal to believe in and follow him – despite having pledged to obey the prophets sent by God, much like the second son in the story (Matthew 21:32). In this context, it is as though al-Biqāʿī implicitly likens John, who came in righteousness, to Muḥammad, and likens the Jews' rejection of John to the rejection of Muḥammad's prophethood by other communities in his own time.

One of the most frequently cited Biblical passages in Islamic prophetic proofs is Jesus' reference to a future »Advocate« or »Comforter« in John 15:26: »When the Advocate comes, whom I will send to you from the Father – the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father – He will testify about Me.« Muslim scholars, including al-Biqāʿī, have long noted the linguistic parallels between the Greek *paráklētos* (παράκλητος), the Assyrian *manḥamanā*, and the Hebrew *mənaḥḥēm* (מְנַחֵם), interpreting these terms as references to Muḥammad. Early authorities like Ibn Isḥaq recorded traditions suggesting Jesus himself had inscribed Muḥammad's epithets – including »Comforter« and »Helper« – within the Gospel of John (Ibn Hishām 1990, 1:262).

Al-Biqāʿī's approach to such Biblical material reveals a nuanced hermeneutic. While he acknowledged potential textual alterations in the Bible's transmission, he nevertheless found value in its preserved revelations. His willingness to engage deeply with Biblical texts – particularly those he believed contained authentic prophecies of Muḥammad – demonstrates his intertextual methodology. Rather than dismissing the Bible entirely due to its perceived inconsistencies, he carefully sifted its contents, distinguishing between what he considered corrupted passages and those retaining elements of divine truth. This selective yet serious engagement underscores his view that the Bible, when properly interpreted, could substantiate Qurʾānic teachings and Muḥammad's prophetic mission.

Thus, al-Biqāʿī's exegetical practice reflects a sophisticated balance between critical scrutiny and constructive appropriation of Biblical material.

His simultaneous caution toward and reliance on the Bible highlights the complex relationship between Islamic and Biblical textual traditions in medieval scholarship.

Al-Biqāʿī's Integration of Biblical Texts in Qurʾānic Commentary

Al-Biqāʿī often turned to Biblical lore to clarify and expound upon Qurʾānic verses, positioning himself as a notable figure in the integration of earlier scriptures within Qurʾānic exegesis. While this approach was somewhat unique, it became apparent that al-Biqāʿī's extensive use of Biblical references was uncommon in the broader tradition of Qurʾānic interpretation. Many Muslim scholars have not considered earlier scriptures as reliable sources for understanding the Qurʾān, given the belief that these texts had been altered by human intervention – especially in terms of removing prophecies related to Muḥammad, as well as the precept of stoning and other significant matters. In contrast to this view, al-Biqāʿī seemed to regard such distortions as rare exceptions, confined to only a few passages. He, therefore, felt it appropriate to incorporate Biblical lore into his commentary, considering it as part of a religious discourse that could aid in understanding the Qurʾān. At times, he included long quotations from the Bible to provide in-depth explanations of the Qurʾānic verses, while at other times, he offered more concise summaries of the same scriptures to support his arguments.

Al-Biqāʿī frequently included long excerpts from the Bible to clarify Qurʾānic verses. On occasion, he merely summarized Biblical ideas, blending them with the Qurʾānic context. A notable example is found in Q 7:157, which refers to »the Messenger, the unlettered prophet« and mentions »the burden and the shackles« placed upon the followers. The terms »burden« and »shackles« are not explicitly explained in the Qurʾān, which led al-Biqāʿī to look to the Bible for clarification. He drew upon various Biblical verses that referenced the burdens placed on the Jewish community but refrained from directly specifying what those burdens were. Instead, he implied them through scriptural references, such as Leviticus 17:1-4 (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:131).

> Then the LORD said to Moses, speak to Aaron, his sons, and all the Israelites and tell them this is what the LORD has commanded: Anyone from the house of Israel who slaughters an ox, a lamb, or a goat in the camp or outside of it instead of bringing it to the entrance to the Tent of Meeting to present it as an offering to the LORD before His tabernacle – that man shall incur bloodguilt. He has shed blood and must be cut off from among his people.

He seems to draw attention, here, to the difficulty of the task, with the phrase »those who slaughtered an animal to offer it to God shall bring it to the entrance to the Tent of Meeting« and to the severity of the punishment, »man shall be cut off from among his people«. To al-Biqāʿī, this act of forcing the Israelite people to bring offerings before the tabernacle, and punishing those who did not fulfill this order, is a kind of burden imposed upon them. These elements, according to al-Biqāʿī, serve as the rationale for why Muḥammad called upon the people to follow the Qurʾānic law, which lifts such heavy burdens from them.

The second example he gave of burdens in the Bible is Leviticus 21:17-23 (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:131):

> Then the LORD said to Moses, say to Aaron, for the generations to come, none of your descendants who has a physical defect may approach to offer the food of his God. No man who has any defect may approach – no man who is blind, lame, disfigured, or de-formed; no man who has a broken foot or hand, or who is a hunchback or dwarf, or who has an eye defect, a festering rash, scabs, or a crushed testicle. No descendant of Aaron the priest who has a defect shall approach to present the offerings made by fire to the LORD. Since he has a defect, he is not to come near to offer the food of his God. He may eat the most holy food of his God as well as the holy food, but because he has a defect, he must not go near the veil or approach the altar, so as not to desecrate My sanctuaries. For I am the LORD who sanctifies them.

This verse clearly presents challenges for some believers who wish to offer sacrifices to the Lord, simply because of physical defects. Recognizing

these burdens in the Bible, al-Biqāʿī wrote, »Had they converted to Islam, these burdens would have been alleviated« (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:130).

Other commands imposing burdens and restrictions upon the people of the book include: Deuteronomy 25:5-9, which discusses the obligation of a widow to marry her husband's brother; Deuteronomy 23:10, which instructs men who have become ritually impure due to a nocturnal emission to stay outside the camp until evening; Deuteronomy 23:2, which prohibits those born of a forbidden union from entering the assembly of the Lord, even for ten generations; Deuteronomy 22:28-29, which mandates that a man who violates an unmarried virgin must marry her and remain with her for life; and so on. In light of these, al-Biqāʿī drew on many Biblical citations to clarify the meaning of the Qurʾānic verse, Q 7:157.

Another example of his use of the Bible to paraphrase Qurʾānic verses is Q 7:133, which states, »So We sent upon them the flood and locusts and lice and frogs and blood as distinct signs«. al-Biqāʿī explained this verse by referencing several passages from Exodus: Exodus 8:2, where God tells Moses, »Go to Pharaoh and say to him, 'If you refuse to let them go, I will send a plague of frogs on your whole country'«; Exodus 8:16, »Then the LORD said to Moses, 'Tell Aaron, *Stretch out your staff and strike the dust of the ground*,' and throughout the land of Egypt, the dust will become gnats«; Exodus 7:17, »Let my people go...with the staff that is in my hand I will strike the water of the Nile, and it will be changed into blood«; and Exodus 9:18, »Let my people go, so that they may worship me, or this time I will send the full force of my plagues against you... I will send the worst hailstorm that has ever fallen on Egypt, from the day it was founded till now.« (Al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:95)

It seems that al-Biqāʿī was influenced by the detailed accounts in the Bible, which clearly describe the plagues that God sent against Pharaoh's Egypt for his refusal to release the Israelites. As seen in Q 7:133, the Qurʾān mentions the plagues briefly, without providing the extensive historical context. This brevity makes it difficult for readers to fully grasp the meaning of the verse. For instance, the Qurʾān says, »We sent upon them the blood,« but it does not explain how this plague of blood affected them, leaving some aspects of the narrative unclear. In contrast, the Bible elaborates on these

events, offering a clearer understanding of how the plagues unfolded.[18] Acknowledging this ambiguity, al-Biqāʿī incorporated long Biblical passages to shed light on the more obscure elements of the Qurʾānic account of the plagues.

Similarly, al-Biqāʿī used the same approach to clarify Q 7:134[19] and 135.[20] He referenced Exodus 8:8[21] and 9:27 to explain Q 7:134 (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:97),[22] and for Q 7:135, he referred to Exodus 8:15[23] and 9:33 (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 3:95).[24]

The Qurʾān recounts the story of the Israelites fleeing from Pharaoh and the drowning of his army in the sea. It tells that God parted the sea to allow the Israelites to pass through, then drowned Pharaoh's army as they pursued in enmity and tyranny (Q 7:136; 2:50; 10:90; 8:54). However, the Qurʾān offers a more concise version of the story compared to the Bible. It omits several details, such as the exact location where the Israelites camped, why Pharaoh broke his word and pursued them, how he overtook them, the reaction of the Israelites upon seeing Pharaoh's army, and how Moses reassured the people. The Bible, in contrast, provides a detailed narrative that answers these questions. For instance, it specifies the location of the Israelites' camp: »Tell the Israelites to turn back and encamp near Pi Hahiroth, between Migdol and the sea. They are to encamp by the sea,

18 »This is what the LORD says: 'By this you will know that I am the LORD: With the staff that is in my hand I will strike the water of the Nile, and it will be changed into blood. The fish in the Nile will die, and the river will stink; the Egyptians will not be able to drink its water.' The LORD said to Moses, tell Aaron, 'Take your staff and stretch out your hand over the waters of Egypt – over the streams and canals, over the ponds and all the reservoirs – and they will turn to blood.' Blood will be everywhere in Egypt, even in vessels of wood and stone... He struck the water of the Nile, and all the water was changed into blood. The fish in the Nile died, and the river smelled so bad that the Egyptians could not drink its water. Blood was everywhere in Egypt.« (Exodus 7:17-22)

19 »O Moses, invoke for us your Lord by what He has promised you. If you (can) remove the punishment from us, we will surely believe you, and we will send with you the Children of Israel.«

20 »But when We removed the punishment from them, then at once they broke their word.«

21 »Pharaoh summoned Moses and Aaron and said, pray to the LORD to take the frogs away from me and my people, and I will let your people go to offer sacrifices to the LORD.«

22 »Then Pharaoh summoned Moses and Aaron. This time I have sinned, he said to them. The LORD is in the right, and I and my people are in the wrong. Pray to the LORD, for we have had enough thunder and hail. I will let you go; you don't have to stay any longer.«

23 »The frogs died in the houses... when Pharaoh saw that there was relief, he hardened his heart and would not listen to Moses and Aaron, just as the LORD had said.«

24 »When Pharaoh saw that the rain and hail and thunder had stopped, he sinned again: He and his officials hardened their hearts.«

directly opposite Baal Zephon.« (Exodus 14:2) It also explains why Pharaoh broke his promise: »When the king of Egypt was told that the people had fled, Pharaoh and his officials changed their minds about them and said, What have we done? We have let the Israelites go and have lost their services.« (Exodus 14:5) Furthermore, the Bible narrates how Pharaoh pursued them, »He took six hundred of the best chariots, along with all the other chariots of Egypt, with officers over all of them, and he pursued the people of Israel while they were going out defiantly« (Exodus 14:7-8). It also describes the Israelites' reaction: »As Pharaoh approached, the people of Israel looked up and panicked when they saw the Egyptians overtaking them. They cried out to the LORD, and they said to Moses, Why did you bring us out here to die in the wilderness? Leave us alone! Let us be slaves to the Egyptians. It's better to be a slave in Egypt than a corpse in the wilderness.« (Exodus 14:10) Finally, Moses' words of comfort are recorded: »Moses answered the people, do not be afraid, stand firm and you will see the deliverance the LORD will bring you today. The Egyptians you see today you will never see again.« (Exodus 14:13)

The Bible provides an abundance of detail about the Israelites' deliverance from Egyptian persecution, giving its readers a fuller understanding of the context. Acknowledging these extensive Biblical descriptions, some Qurʾānic exegetes, such as al-Biqāʿī, quoted these passages directly from the Bible, while others, like al-Qurṭubī and al-Ṭabarī, paraphrased some of these Biblical elements without explicitly referencing them. For example, in his commentary on »manna«, al-Qurṭubī writes (Qurṭubī 2006, 2:118):

> They reported that »al-manna«, resembling snow or dew in its appearance, fell like rain from dawn until sunrise. Each person would gather only as much as they needed for the day, and if anyone kept some for the following day, it would spoil. However, on Friday they were allowed to keep some for Saturday, the Sabbath day, and it would not spoil. On that day, no manna fell from the sky.

This explanatory narration of the Qurʾānic verse was clearly transmitted from the Bible (Exodus 16:20, 27), yet al-Qurṭubī made no explicit

reference to it, instead reporting it anonymously (Qurṭubī 2006, 2:118).[25] Similarly, in his commentary on the same verse, al-Ṭabarī conveyed a similar elucidatory narration through Ibn Jurayj, stating, »when anyone took more than they needed for the day, it went bad, except when they took it on Friday to save for Saturday (the Sabbath day), and it remained intact« (Ṭabarī 1955, 2:101). Here, al-Ṭabarī also refrains from referencing the Bible directly, opting instead to attribute the explanation to Ibn Jurayj, a follower of the Prophet's companions (*al-Tābiʿūn*), rather than an authoritative figure from the Biblical tradition.

This pattern indicates that Biblical lore played a notable role in shaping Islamic exegetical literature. Some scholars, such as al-Biqāʿī, openly recognized this influence, directly referencing the Bible in their works. Others, like al-Qurṭubī and al-Ṭabarī, approached it more cautiously, often attributing similar interpretations to early Muslim authorities – such as the Prophet's companions (*al-Ṣaḥāba*) and their successors (*al-Tābiʿūn*) – rather than explicitly acknowledging external sources.

Unlike al-Ṭabarī, many commentators – including al-Biqāʿī, Ibn Barrajān, and Ibn Kathīr – freely cited Biblical, Midrashic, and Talmudic material under the broader category of *Isrāʿīliyyāt*. For example, in his commentary on Q 38:34, Ibn Kathīr recounts the story of Solomon's seal falling into the hands of Asmodeus (Āṣaf) and observes, »This appears to me as part of the *Isrāʿīliyyāt*«. He then presents another version of the story traced back to Ibn ʿAbbās, noting, »While the chain of transmission to Ibn ʿAbbās is reliable, it is evident that he received this from the People of the Book... much of what the early scholars (*mutaqaddimūn/salaf*) narrated on this matter derives from the literature of the People of the Book.« (Ibn Kathīr 1999, 69) This suggests that Qurʾānic exegesis engaged thoughtfully with *Isrāʿīliyyāt* – including Talmudic and Midrashic sources – to provide context for certain Qurʾānic passages (Ross 2019, 150–200).

25 He used the verb *ruwiya* (»reported«).

Al-Biqāʿī's Use of Biblical Texts to Support His Theological Interpretations

In his exegesis, al-Biqāʿī frequently referenced Biblical passages to support his theological interpretations. He extensively quoted the Gospels to argue that descriptions of Jesus as »Lord« and »Son of God« should be understood metaphorically (*al-majāz* or *al-mutashābih*), not literally (Heath 2003, 3:385; Stowasser 2003, 3:294; Iṣlāḥī 2005, 39).[26] He maintained that such figurative expressions must be interpreted in light of the Gospel's clear and decisive verses (*al-muḥkam*), which provide a foundational understanding.

For instance, he cited Luke 1:30, where the angel tells Mary that she will bear a son, Jesus, who will inherit David's throne – a passage emphasizing Jesus' human lineage and prophetic role. Al-Biqāʿī viewed this as a *muḥkam* text, offering a straightforward framework for understanding more ambiguous phrases. By comparing such clear revelations with metaphorical ones, he sought to demonstrate that Jesus' divine titles reflect honorific or symbolic language rather than literal divinity. This approach allowed him to reconcile seemingly conflicting descriptions while upholding a coherent theological perspective.

Al-Biqāʿī presented several additional Biblical passages as examples of clear, decisive verses (*muḥkam*) that establish Jesus' human and prophetic nature. These texts, he argued, provide the necessary context for interpreting more ambiguous references to Jesus' divinity. Among the key examples he cited was Matthew 4:5-7, where Jesus resists Satan's temptation by affirming »Do not put the Lord your God to the test,« thereby distinguishing himself from the divine. Similarly, in Matthew 4:8-10, Jesus rejects

26 In fact, it is not certain whether *mutashābih* verses import metaphorical meaning (*majāz)* or not, even they are controversial among Muslim theologians (e.g. *Muʿtazila* and *Ḥanbalīs*). Hence, they may or may not be deemed as metaphorical, depending on the theological stance or persuasion of the commentator. Prominent examples of *mutashābih* verses on which there is no consensus that they import literal or metaphorical meaning, are Qurʾānic expressions attributing physical attributes or mental or emotional operations to God. The former group (*Muʿtazila*) argued that God transcended physical representation; hence, references in the Qurʾān to God's possession of physical attributes and human emotions were »metaphorical« – they should be interpreted – whereas the latter group (*Ḥanbalīs/ahl-hadīth*) held that the Qurʾānic verses of God's possession of physical and human attributes import literal meaning, and they should be upheld as true – they should not be interpreted. It seems that al-Biqāʿī takes the side of the first group by placing the verses about the deity and sonship of Jesus in the category of the Qurān's obscure (*mutashābih*) teachings which are deemed metaphorical and to be interpreted.

worship, commanding Satan to »Worship the Lord your God, and serve him only« – a passage that clearly subordinates Jesus to God's authority.

Further supporting his interpretation, al-Biqāʿī referenced Mark 7:8, where Jesus criticizes those who follow human traditions over divine commandments, emphasizing his role as a messenger rather than the object of worship. The passage from Luke 4:16-21 was particularly significant in his analysis, as it presents Jesus declaring: »The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to proclaim good news to the poor...« This statement, according to al-Biqāʿī, clearly frames Jesus' mission as one authorized by God rather than asserting divine status.

Additional important texts included Luke 10:16 (»whoever rejects me rejects Him who sent me«), John 3:34 (»for he is sent by God«), and John 12:44-50, where Jesus states: »whoever believes in me does not believe in me only, but in the one who sent me... For I did not speak on my own, but the Father who sent me commanded me to say all that I have spoken.« These passages collectively demonstrate, in al-Biqāʿī's reading, Jesus' consistent self-presentation as God's messenger rather than as divine in essence. By carefully analyzing these *muḥkam* texts, he sought to establish an interpretive framework that would clarify the metaphorical nature of other, more ambiguous Biblical statements about Jesus' nature and status.

These clear scriptural passages (*muḥkam*) collectively portray Jesus as one who consistently worshipped and served the God who sent him, fulfilling his divinely appointed mission to proclaim sacred messages. The texts depict him referring to himself as the »Son of Man« (Luke 12:8-10) – a term emphasizing his human nature – while directing prayer and devotion to God in heaven (Luke 11:2). Such accounts suggest Jesus understood himself as distinct from the divine essence, consistently emphasizing his subordinate role as God's messenger. The Biblical narrative presents him as speaking only what God commanded, while acknowledging God's supreme attributes of omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence. This perspective emerges particularly in passages where Jesus differentiates himself from the ultimate divine authority, consistently directing worship toward God rather than claiming it for himself. The cumulative testimony of these verses indicates Jesus' self-understanding as God's servant and

prophet, sent to deliver specific revelations while maintaining a clear distinction between his human nature and God's transcendent reality.

Al-Biqāʿī's methodological approach to Biblical interpretation maintained that these revelatory passages constitute carefully structured and unambiguous *muḥkam* verses that warrant a literal reading (Kinberg 2001, 1:73; Qāḍī 1969, 1:6–36; Māwardī 1992, 1:369; Baghawī 1989, 2:7; Wāḥidī 1994, 1:413–414). However, his exegetical framework recognized another category of Biblical verses containing metaphorical language concerning Jesus' divine attributes - including references to his sonship (»You say that I am« in Luke 22:70), lordship (»You call me Lord« in John 13:13), and the paternal characterization of God (»Our Father in heaven« in Matthew 6:9).

In his analytical process, al-Biqāʿī argued that such metaphorical expressions should not be understood literally but rather interpreted through the clarifying lens of the aforementioned *muḥkam* verses (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:18–19). This hermeneutical principle led him to systematically examine potentially ambiguous Christological statements in light of the more definitive scriptural passages. His interpretive strategy involved careful textual juxtaposition, whereby he would first establish the clear, literal meaning of *muḥkam* verses before addressing more figurative expressions.

When approaching verses concerning Jesus' lordship specifically, al--Biqāʿī's methodology becomes particularly evident in his commentary (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:17). Here he demonstrates how the unambiguous declarations of Jesus' servanthood and prophetic mission provide the necessary context for understanding honorific titles that might otherwise suggest divine status. This approach reflects his broader exegetical commitment to maintaining textual coherence while accounting for the Bible's varied linguistic registers – from direct commandments to symbolic representations of spiritual truths:

> The title »lord« attributed to Jesus does not denote divine equality with God, but rather reflects his elevated spiritual status as evidenced by his extraordinary miracles. This interpretation aligns with the term's broader semantic usage in scriptural texts, where it can refer to earthly authorities as well. The Qurʾānic example in 12:40 demonstrates this linguistic flexibility, as Joseph

> uses the same honorific (»lord«) when addressing the Egyptian Pharaoh's subordinate: »Joseph said to the one he knew would be saved, mention me before your lord.«

Ultimately, this interpretive framework underscores how Christological titles demand careful contextual examination – considering both their linguistic particularities and cultural embeddedness – rather than default attributions of divinity. Al-Biqāʿī's approach thus invites readers to discern between honorific language and ontological claims through rigorous textual engagement.

In the second stage of his analysis, al-Biqāʿī examines Biblical passages referring to Jesus as the »son of God«. He interprets this designation metaphorically, explaining that it signifies God's special care and favor toward Jesus, much like a father's affectionate treatment of his cherished son (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:17–18). This relational language, in his view, emphasizes divine benevolence rather than biological or ontological sonship.

Finally, al-Biqāʿī turns to Gospel verses describing God as »Father«, such as Matthew 5:16 (»your Father in heaven«) and Matthew 6:9 (»Our Father in heaven«). He argues that this paternal imagery serves to illustrate God's merciful and protective relationship with His servants – similar to how an earthly father cares for his children. This interpretation finds support in passages like Luke 6:35 and Matthew 5:45, where believers are called »children of God« to emphasize their call to emulate divine mercy.

The Qurʾānic perspective on this matter appears in Q 18, which acknowledges how some Jewish and Christian communities perceived their special relationship with God in familial terms. Al-Biqāʿī's analysis suggests that such metaphorical language – whether referring to Jesus as God's »son« or believers as God's »children« – primarily serves to communicate spiritual truths about God's compassionate nature and humanity's dependent relationship with the divine, rather than making literal claims about God's nature or human ontology.

Al-Biqāʿī's exegetical approach presents a nuanced reading of Biblical texts that seeks to reconcile their content with Islamic theological principles. His analysis suggests the metaphorical nature of certain Christological titles,

proposing that terms like »son of God« and divine »fatherhood« might be better understood as figurative expressions rather than literal descriptions. This perspective emerges from his careful examination of how similar terminology functions across scriptural traditions.

When considering passages where Jesus is called »son of God,« al-Biqāʿī offers an interpretation that emphasizes God's special favor and protection toward Jesus as His chosen messenger, rather than indicating any biological or ontological relationship. The instances where individuals prostrate before Jesus (Luke 8:47; Matthew 15:25) are viewed through the lens of cultural practices showing respect to spiritual figures, comparable to honorific gestures found in other religious traditions.

The exegete's methodology draws attention to the importance of contextual interpretation, particularly when dealing with potentially ambiguous passages. He notes that some Christian interpretations of these metaphorical titles eventually contributed to the development of Trinitarian theology (Saleh 2012, 87; al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:16–19). While respectfully acknowledging this theological trajectory, al-Biqāʿī expresses concerns about how such interpretations might intersect with strict monotheistic principles, particularly regarding concepts like homoousion (consubstantiality).

Al-Biqāʿī's approach mirrors classical Islamic methods of dealing with ambiguous Quranic passages (*mutashābih*) by interpreting them through clearer contextual verses (*muḥkam*). His commentary suggests that applying similar interpretive principles to Biblical texts could yield readings compatible with Islamic monotheism while maintaining respect for the textual integrity of Christian scriptures. As he observes, »They diverged from the path by asserting Jesus' divinity based on metaphorical titles, rather than interpreting these through decisive verses« (al-Biqāʿī 1995, 2:19–22).

This interpretive framework extends to discussions of divine attributes, where al-Biqāʿī advocates for understandings that preserve God's transcendence while accounting for anthropomorphic language in scripture. His analysis reflects a broader Islamic scholarly tradition that seeks to maintain theological consistency without dismissing the textual complexity of sacred writings.

Ultimately, Al-Biqāʿī's Biblical exegesis represents a significant attempt within Islamic scholarship to engage thoughtfully with Christian scriptures while upholding core Islamic theological principles. His methodology demonstrates how comparative textual analysis can be conducted with both academic rigor and interreligious sensitivity. By examining Christological titles through linguistic, cultural and theological lenses, he provides an alternative reading that maintains the possibility of scriptural harmony while respecting doctrinal differences. This approach not only contributes to Islamic exegetical tradition but also offers potential avenues for constructive interfaith dialogue regarding scriptural interpretation and theological concepts shared across Abrahamic traditions.

Conclusion

The relationship between Islamic exegesis and Biblical sources has long been characterized by complex scholarly attitudes. Traditional perspectives often approached earlier scriptures with caution, influenced by theological concerns about textual preservation. Yet historical examination reveals that many Islamic scholars, including prominent exegetes, engaged extensively with Biblical narratives, adapting them within Islamic interpretive frameworks. Among these scholars, al-Biqāʿī stands out for his distinctive methodology – one that neither rejected Biblical sources outright nor accepted them uncritically, but rather approached them as potentially valuable resources when carefully contextualized.

Al-Biqāʿī's exegetical work demonstrates how Biblical material, when approached discerningly, could enrich Qurʾānic interpretation without compromising Islamic theological principles. His willingness to incorporate explicit Biblical citations, while maintaining critical awareness of textual considerations, represents a noteworthy middle path between complete rejection and uncritical acceptance. This approach allowed him to utilize Biblical and midrashic materials to illuminate Qurʾānic passages while articulating his theological perspectives.

The substantial influence of Judeo-Christian textual traditions on Islamic exegesis is evident throughout classical commentaries, suggesting these sources played a more integral role in shaping Qurʾānic interpretation

than sometimes acknowledged. This historical reality invites reflection on contemporary exegetical practices, where such cross-textual engagement has become less common. The gradual distancing from these sources in modern times may reflect evolving methodological preferences rather than inherent textual incompatibilities.

This study highlights the potential benefits of re-examining the intertextual relationships between Islamic and Biblical traditions. Rather than viewing these textual worlds as fundamentally opposed, future scholarship might explore them as complementary interpretive resources – each offering valuable insights when approached with appropriate methodological awareness. Such an approach could yield richer historical understanding while respecting theological distinctions. Al-Biqāʿī's example suggests possibilities for contemporary scholars to engage Biblical and midrashic materials as contextual references for understanding the Qurʾān's historical milieu, without necessarily compromising Islamic theological positions. This balanced approach could open new dimensions in Qurʾānic studies, particularly in exploring the scripture's dynamic interaction with its religious environment.

Ultimately, this investigation points toward promising directions for future research in Islamic studies. By carefully examining historical intertextual relationships while maintaining methodological rigor, scholars may develop more sophisticated frameworks for understanding the Qurʾān's engagement with preceding traditions. Such approaches could foster more comprehensive interpretations while contributing to constructive interfaith scholarly dialogue about shared textual heritage and distinct theological developments.

|

No new data were created or analysed in support of this research.
Za podporo tej raziskavi niso bili ustvarjeni ali analizirani nobeni novi podatki.

References

Abū Dāwūd, Sulaymān b. al-Ashʿas b. Ishāq al-Sijistānī el-'Azdī. 2009. *Al-Sunan*. Damascus: Dār al-Risāla al-ʿĀlamiyya.

Baghawī, Ḥusayn b. Masʿūd. 1989. *Maʿālim al-Tanzīl*. Edited by Muḥammad ʿAbdullah al-Namr. 4 vols. Riyāḍ: Dār Ṭayyiba.

al-Biqāʿī, Ibrāhim b. ʿUmar. 1995. *Naẓm al--Durar fī tanāsub al-āyāt wa-l-suwar*. Beirut: Dār Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya.

Buḫārī, Abū ʿAbdillāh Muḥammad b. İsmāʿīl. 2002. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Buḫār*. Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr.

Brockelmann, Carl. 1943. *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*. 2 vols. 3 supplements. Leiden: Brill.

Cook, David. 2006. New Testament Citations in the Ḥadith Literature and the Question of Early Gospel Translations into Arabic. In: Mark N. S., Grypeou E., and & David T., eds. *The Encounter of Eastern Christianity with Early Islam,* 185–223. Leiden: Brill.

Gobillot, Geneviève. 2013. Qur'an and Torah: The Foundations of Intertextuality. In: *A History of Jewish-Muslim Relations*, 611–627. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gilliot, Claude. 1990. *Exégèse, langue et théologie en Islam: L'exégèse coranique de Tabari*. Paris: J. Vrin.

Guo, Li. 2001. Al-Biqāʿī's Chronicle: A Fifteenth-Century Learned Man's Reflections on His Time and World. In: Hugh Kennedy, ed. *The Historiography of Islamic Egypt (c. 950–1800)*, 121–148. Leiden: Brill.

Guo, Li. 2005. Tales of a Medieval Cairene Harem: Domestic Life in al-Biqāʿī's Autobiographical Chronicle. *MSR* 9/1: 101–121.

Goudie, Kenneth. 2020. How to Make it in Cairo: The Early Career of Burhān al--Dīn al-Biqāʿī. *Mamlūk Studies Review* 9/1: 203–230.

Eickelman, Dale F. 2003. Social Sciences. In: Jane Dammen McAuliffe, ed. *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*, 65–76. Leiden: Brill.

Ginzberg, Louis. 1968. *The Legends of the Jews.* Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America.

Heath, Peter. 2003. Metaphor. In: Jane Dammen McAuliffe, ed. *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*, 384–388. Leiden: Brill.

Ibn ʿAṭiyya, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al- Ḥaqq b. Ghālib. 2001. *Muḥarrar al-Wajīz*. Edited by ʿAbd al-Salām ʿAbd al-Shāfī Muḥammad. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub ʿIlmiyya.

Ibn Hishām, Abū Muḥammad Jamāl al-Dīn Abdulmalīq. 1990. *al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya.* Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī.

Ibn Kathīr, ʿImād al-Dīn Abī Fidāʾ Ismāʿīl al-Qurayshī al-Dimashqī. 1999. *Tafsīr al--Qurʾān al-ʿĀzīm.* Riyadh: Dār Ṭayyiba.

– – –. 1998. *Tafsīr al-Qurʾān al-ʿĀzīm*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya.

– – –. 1939. *Al-Bidāya wa-l-Nihāya*. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Saʿāda.

Ibn Taymiyya, Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Ḥalīm. 1995. *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*. al--Madīna: Majmaʿ al-Malik Fahd.

Işlāḥī, Muḥammad Ajmal Ayyūb. 2005. *Fihrist muṣannafāt al-Biqāʿī an nusḫah manqūlah min ḫaṭṭih*. Riyadh: Maktabat al-Malik Fahd al-Waṭaniyyah.

Jaṣṣāṣ, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. ʿAbdallāh. 1992. *Aḥkām al- Qurʾān*. Beirut: Dār Iḥyā Turāth al-ʿArabī.

Kinberg, Leah. 2001. Ambiguous. In: Jane Dammen McAuliffe, ed. *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*. Leiden: Brill.

al-Māturīdī, Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad. 2005. *Taʾwīlāt al-Qurʾān.* Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya

Māwardī, Alī b. Muḥammad. 1992. *al-Nukat wa-l-ʿUyūn fī al-Tafāsīr*. Edited by al--Sayyid b. ʿAbd al-Maqṣūd. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub ʿIlmiyya.

McCoy, Roy Michael. 2021. *Interpreting the Qurʾān with the Bible (Tafsīr Al-Qurʾān bi al-Kitāb): Reading the Arabic Bible in the Tafsīrs of Ibn Barraǧān and al-Biqāʿī*. Leiden: Brill.

ʿ**Abd al-Jabbār, Qāḍī**. 1969. *Mutashābih al-Qurʾān*. Edited by ʿAdnān M. Zarzūr. Cairo: Dār al-Turāth.

Qurṭubī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Anṣārī. 2006. *Al-Jāmiʿ li- Aḥkām al-Qurʾān*. Beirut: Muʾassasa al-Risāla.

Rippin, Andrew. 2019. *Muslims: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices.* London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Ross, Samuel. 2023. *Qurʾan Commentary and the Biblical Turn: A History of Muslim Exegetical Engagement with the Biblical Text*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Saleh, Walid. 2016. The Hebrew Bible in İslam. In: Stephen Chapman and Marvin Sweeney, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to The Hebrew Bible / The Old Testament*, 407–423. New York: Cambridge University Press).

– – –. 2012. An Islamic Diatessaron: Al-Biqāʿī's Harmony of the Four Gospels. In: Sara Binay, ed. *Translating the Bible into Arabic: historical, text-critical and literary aspects*, 85–117. Beirut: Orient-Institut Beirut.

– – –. 2008. *In Defense of the Bible: A Critical Edition and an Introduction to al-Biqāʿī's Bible Treatise*. Leiden: Brill.

Sonn, Tamara. 2006. Introducing. In: Andrew Rippin, ed. *The Blackwell Companion to the Qurʾān.* Andrew Rippin. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Soomro, Taha. 2023. The Qur'an's Engagement with Christian and Jewish Literature. Yaqeen Institute. Https://yaqeeninstitute.org (accessed 12. 5. 2024).

Stowasser, Barbara Freyer. 2003. Mary. In: Jane Dammen McAuliffe, ed. *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*, 288–295. Leiden: Brill.

Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn. 1967. *al-Itqān fī ʿUlūm al-Qurʾān*. Edited by Muḥammad Abū l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm. Cairo: Vizārat al-Shuʾūn al-Islāmiyya.

Ṭabarī, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Jarīr. 1955. *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān ʿan taʾwīl al-Qurʾān.* Cairo: Maktaba Ibn Taymiyyah.

Wāḥidī, Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Aḥma. 1994. *Al-Wasīṭ fī Tafsīr al-Qurʾān*. Edited by ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd et al. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub ʿIlmiyya.

Zebiri, Kate. 2006. Argumentation. In: Andrew Rippin, ed. *The Blackwell Companion to the Qurʾān*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

»No new data were created or analysed in support of this research.«
»Za podporo tej raziskavi niso bili ustvarjeni ali analizirani nobeni novi podatki.«