

Analysis of the Qur'anic Exegesis on the Names and Attributes of Allah (a Comparative Study of Al-Zamakhshari's Interpretation in Tafsîr Al-Kashshâf and Ibn Taymiyyah's In Al-Tafsîr Al-Kabîr)

Bambang Deny Suatpandy

Program Studi Magister Ilmu Al-Qur'an dan Tafsir. Konsentrasi Ilmu Tafsir Pascasarjana. Universitas PTIQ
Jakarta. Jl. Lebak Bulus Raya No. 2, Lebak Bulus, Cilandak, Jakarta Selatan 12440

Article Info

Keywords:

Asmâ' wa Şifât,
al-Zamakhshari,
Ibn Taymiyyah,
Qur'anic Interpretation,
Theological Methodology

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the methodological divergence in interpreting the Qur'anic names and attributes of God (*asmâ' wa şifât*) between al-Zamakhshari's al-Kashshâf and Ibn Taymiyyah's tafsîr corpus, with special reference to the verse of *istiwa'* (Q 20:5) and its implications for Islamic monotheism (*tawhîd*). Using a qualitative, descriptive-analytical design, it conducts close textual readings of primary works, a targeted comparison of the *istiwa'* verse, source triangulation with authoritative tafsîr, and an examination of the linguistic, theological, and historical contexts that shape each method. Findings reveal a clear polarity: al-Zamakhshari privileges metaphorical-linguistic *ta'wîl*, construing *istiwa'* as a metaphor for divine sovereignty to safeguard *tanzîh* (transcendence) and avoid anthropomorphism; Ibn Taymiyyah adheres to the apparent (*zâhir*) sense while affirming *bilâ kayf* (without inquiring "how"), rejecting figurative *ta'wîl* on the grounds that it risks *ta'tîl* (nullification of meaning). Both emphatically repudiate *tashbîh* (likening God to creation), yet their criteria diverge, yielding distinct theological trajectories: for al-Zamakhshari, *tawhîd* is secured by deconstructing literalism; for Ibn Taymiyyah, it is secured by unwavering submission to transmitted reports (*naql*) and by treating the dismissal of the apparent meaning as deviation. These approaches have shaped subsequent currents: al-Zamakhshari's method informs modern ethical-transcendental readings (e.g., Fazlur Rahman, Asma Barlas, Nurcholish Madjid), whereas Ibn Taymiyyah's stance undergirds Salafi exegesis (e.g., al-Qâsimî, al-Jazâ'iri, Abdul Hakim Abdat) as a guardrail against interpretive relativism. The study concludes that Ibn Taymiyyah's method better preserves the integrity of revelation while maintaining divine transcendence. More broadly, this divergence crystallizes a durable split within tafsîr epistemology, between linguistic rationalism and textual purity, with lasting consequences for articulating *tawhîd* in Islamic thought.

This is an open access article
under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license



Corresponding Author:

Bambang Deny Suatpandy
Program Studi Magister Ilmu Al-Qur'an dan Tafsir. Konsentrasi Ilmu
Tafsir Pascasarjana. Universitas PTIQ Jakarta. Jl. Lebak Bulus Raya No.
2, Lebak Bulus, Cilandak, Jakarta Selatan 12440
Sespdic@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Scholars of Islam have employed diverse methods to interpret the Qur'an, drawing on various approaches to grasp its message and content. Some privilege linguistic analysis; others rely primarily on transmitted reports. Among the most discussed are Maḥmūd ibn 'Umar—better known as al-Zamakhsharī—and Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥalīm ibn 'Abd al-Salām—widely known as Ibn Taymiyyah. Both combined linguistic and riwāyah-based approaches, yet their interpretations often diverge. Their readings later became foundations for competing arguments among those aligned with their respective methods. This raises a key question: how can two exegetes, drawing on overlapping approaches, reach different conclusions? Setting their exegesis alongside that of other mufasssīrūn reveals each one's characteristic method, points of convergence, and lines of separation. The comparison is compelling, for both men are authoritative figures representing two influential theological currents within Islam—Mu'tazilism and Salafī-Atharī thought—whose tafsīr has since been used to argue across that divide.

Al-Zamakhsharī epitomizes the rational-linguistic strand in classical tafsīr. His *Tafsīr al-Kashshāf* showcases deep philological analysis and a rational propensity to interpret, especially on verses about the divine attributes, destiny, and the unseen. His significance, however, is not merely sectarian: the scholarly quality of *al-Kashshāf* transcended boundaries, as many Sunnī scholars—including Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī and al-Bayḍāwī—quoted and relied on it for its linguistic precision.

By contrast, Ibn Taymiyyah, a central Salafī figure, explicitly rejects speculative *kalām*, including Mu'tazilī reasoning. His *Muqaddimah fī Uṣūl al-Tafsīr* critiques overly rationalized methods or those mingled with foreign philosophies. Although he did not produce a single, independent tafsīr like al-Zamakhsharī, his dispersed exegetical discussions were later compiled, making his interpretation accessible to academic analysis. Across his works he insists that tafsīr must rest on sound reports from the Prophet, Companions, and early generations, and he sharply criticizes free rationalization in verses of the attributes, which he deems liable to *taḥrīf* (distorting meaning).

The comparison matters because their epistemic premises differ: al-Zamakhsharī prioritizes linguistic reasoning; Ibn Taymiyyah centers transmitted evidence. *Al-Kashshāf* exhibits bold *ta'wīl* of verses on the attributes in line with Mu'tazilī *tanzīh*, whereas Ibn Taymiyyah defends the Salaf's path: accepting the verses "as they are," without *ta'wīl*, while avoiding both assimilation (*tashbīh*) and negation (*ta'tīl*) of God's names and attributes.

Comparing them therefore reveals not only divergent conclusions but also how theology and method shape the understanding of revelation. Ibn Abī al-'Izz, for example, explains God's statement "Is your Lord not sufficient that He is Witness over all things?" as divine testimony to the truth of His Messenger and as proof grounded in God's name *al-Shahīd*—nothing escapes His knowledge—an argument from the divine names and attributes.

Likewise, Ibn al-Qayyim notes in *al-Tibyān* that genuine affirmation of *lā ilāha illā Allāh* entails all its doctrinal branches: belief in God, His angels, books, messengers, and the

meeting with Him, and affirmation of His attributes of majesty and perfection. Denying such attributes to avoid resemblance to creation, he argues, undermines the very meaning of *tawḥīd*.

Thus, the interpretive gap between al-Zamakhsharī—rationalist and linguistic—and Ibn Taymiyyah—literal-textual—becomes decisive in verses of the attributes. Careless exegesis risks conclusions contrary to revelation; hence a comparative study clarifies how methodological choices shape theological outcomes, especially regarding *tawḥīd* and the divine attributes. Al-Zamakhsharī, consistent with Muʿtazilism, elevates reason and practices *taʿwīl*—for instance, reading *yad Allāh* as God’s power or favor, not a literal “hand.” Ibn Taymiyyah counters that such moves overstep proper *istidlāl* on the sacred texts; he upholds the Salaf’s manhaj of affirming the apparent meaning without *taḥrīf*, *taʿtīl*, *takyīf*, or *tashbīh*. Reason is not rejected, but subordinated to authentic revelation: if a conflict appears, either the reasoning is flawed or the evidence is unsound.

Interestingly, both condemn anthropomorphism and both caution against following the *mutashābihāt*, though they define that category differently. For the Muʿtazilah, *tawḥīd* involves excluding any possibility of resemblance—whether in essential attributes (e.g., face, hand) or acts (e.g., *istiwāʿ*, coming). For Ibn Taymiyyah, denying such attributes nullifies what God has affirmed about Himself and jeopardizes *tawḥīd al-ulūhiyyah* and *tawḥīd al-asmāʾ wa al-ṣifāt*.

METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative descriptive-analytical approach, which is appropriate for exploring theological and exegetical methodologies. The qualitative orientation allows the researcher to examine textual interpretations in their natural context without reducing them to numerical measurements, ensuring a nuanced understanding of exegetical traditions. The research relies primarily on textual analysis of classical sources, with Tafsīr al-Kashshāf by al-Zamakhsharī and the exegetical writings of Ibn Taymiyyah, including Muqaddimah fī Uṣūl al-Tafsīr and other collected interpretations. These works were chosen because they represent two contrasting theological paradigms, Muʿtazilite rationalism and Salafi textualism, both of which remain influential in Islamic scholarship.

A comparative method was employed to juxtapose the interpretations of both scholars regarding the verse of *istiwāʿ* (Qurʾan, Sūrah Ṭāhā: 5). This comparative lens highlights similarities and differences in their hermeneutical principles, epistemological assumptions, and theological commitments, thereby exposing the broader implications for Islamic theology. The study also implements triangulation of sources to enhance validity. Apart from the primary works of the two exegetes, authoritative commentaries from scholars such as Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, al-Bayḍāwī, and later Salafī commentators including al-Qasimi and al-Jazaʾiri were consulted. This triangulation ensures that the findings are not limited to isolated textual readings but situated within a broader exegetical tradition.

In addition, the research engages with secondary literature in the form of modern scholarship, including the works of Fazlur Rahman, Asma Barlas, and Nurcholish Madjid.

These contemporary perspectives demonstrate how classical exegetical methods continue to shape modern Islamic thought and provide a framework to interpret the theological implications of the study's findings. The epistemological context was carefully considered, incorporating linguistic, theological, and historical dimensions. Linguistic analysis was applied to explore the semantic and rhetorical features employed by al-Zamakhsharī, while theological inquiry examined how both scholars articulated concepts of tawhīd and divine attributes. Historical contextualization provided an understanding of the intellectual climates that shaped their approaches.

Data collection involved a critical reading and content analysis of the selected texts. Passages concerning divine attributes were coded, categorized, and analyzed thematically to uncover recurring patterns in interpretation. This systematic approach enabled the researcher to identify points of convergence and divergence between the two exegetical traditions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Exegesis of Qur'anic Commentators and Theologians

As the primary foundation of Islam, the Qur'an is continuously discussed and examined for its values and meanings—not only by exegetes (*mufassirūn*) but also by scholars from other branches of the Islamic sciences. In this study I focus on theologians and ḥadīth specialists, because sound ḥadīth play a constitutive role in explaining the Qur'an. This follows the counsel attributed to 'Umar, cited earlier: "A people will come who argue with you using ambiguities from the Qur'an; confront them with ḥadīth, for the people of the Sunnah know best the Book of God."

Ibn Wahb, for example, described Sufyān ibn 'Uyaynah as the person most knowledgeable about Qur'anic exegesis. This shows that the early *salaf* did not confine the term "exegete" to those who authored complete tafsīr works from beginning to end. Hence I distinguish two categories: (1) *Ahli tafsir mutlaq*—those whose authorship is explicitly in tafsīr, ideally a complete commentary; they rightly deserve the designation because they devoted their lives to interpreting the Qur'an. (2) *Ahli tafsir muqayyad*—scholars who have reached the rank of *mujtahid* in Islam and who are therefore entitled to interpret the Qur'an on the basis of the disciplines in which they are experts. Whether an interpretation from either category is accepted or rejected is a separate question. To deny the latter category would entail opposing the consensus practice of leading exegetes. Ibn Kathīr—an authoritative mufassir—cites, for instance, Nu'aym ibn Ḥammād, who left no independent tafsīr. This indicates that authoritative exegetes may transmit the statements of competent scholars whose remarks qualify as tafsīr, even without a standalone commentary.

Before proceeding, I note a foundational principle agreed upon by Muslim scholars in the discourse on the divine names and attributes: it is impermissible to liken God to His creation. Among the proofs is: "There is nothing like unto Him, and He is the All-Hearing, All-Seeing" (Q 42:11). This verse grounds discussions of the names and attributes by absolutely negating resemblance; sameness exists only at the level of nomenclature, not reality. As a comparative baseline between al-Zamakhsharī and Ibn Taymiyyah—as well as other

scholars—I begin with reports from the Companions. It is narrated that ‘Adī ibn ‘Āmirah, after migrating to the Prophet, observed them prostrating with their faces and declaring that their Lord is above the heavens; he then embraced Islam. Individually, al-Bazzār relates that Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq said: “If Muḥammad is your deity, then your deity has died; but if your deity is God who is above the heaven, then your deity is Ever-Living and does not die”—plainly affirming God’s transcendence “above the heaven.”

‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak—reported by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad—stated that they know their Lord is above the seven heavens, established over the Throne, distinct from His creation, rejecting the Jahmī interpretation. Al-Awzā‘ī, as cited by Ibn al-Qayyim, said that the many *tābi‘īn* of his time held that God is above His Throne and that they believe in what is reported in the Sunnah regarding this. Ibn Baṭṭah narrates from Ḥammād ibn Zayd that the Jahmīs merely aim to say “there is nothing in the heaven,” which he refuted by affirming what the verses indicate. Al-Lālikā‘ī reports that Sufyān al-Thawrī explained “God is with you wherever you are” (Q 57:4) as “by His knowledge,” thereby rejecting the Jahmī idea of God’s omnipresence by essence.

Abū Hanīfah, in *al-Fiqh al-Akbar*, declared: whoever says, “I do not know whether my Lord is in the heaven or the earth,” has disbelieved; likewise, whoever says, “God is above the Throne but I do not know whether the Throne is in the heaven or on the earth,” has disbelieved. God is invoked from above, not below. He also adduced the ḥadīth of the slave girl whom the Prophet asked, “Where is God?” She pointed to the heaven; he said, “Free her, for she is a believer.” Mālik ibn Anas, when asked about “the All-Merciful is established over the Throne” (Q 20:5), replied: “*Istiwa*’ is known, its modality is unknown; asking about it is an innovation,” and he ordered the questioner to be removed. The same rule, he implied, applies to all attributes: the meaning is affirmed, the ‘how’ is unknown, belief is obligatory, and probing its modality is blameworthy.

Ibn Qudāmah reports that al-Shāfi‘ī enumerated the Sunnī creed he received from ḥadīth scholars such as Sufyān and Mālik: affirming the shahāda and that God is above His Throne in His heaven, drawing near to His creation as He wills, and descending to the lowest heaven as He wills—among other beliefs.

Exegesis of al-Zamakhsharī and Ibn Taymiyyah

The difference between al-Zamakhsharī and Ibn Taymiyyah in verses of the attributes is rooted not in technique alone but in opposing epistemologies and theologies. Al-Zamakhsharī privileges reason and language, avoiding literal readings to uphold *tanzīh*, he holds that literalizing the attributes risks *tashbīh*. Ibn Taymiyyah, by contrast, prioritizes revelation and transmitted reports: he accepts the apparent meaning unless strong evidence from the *salaf* indicates a verse is *mutashābih*. Many verses of the attributes, he argues, are actually *muḥkam*—their meanings are intelligible to believers while their *kayfiyyah* remains with God.

Al-Zamakhsharī tends to treat divine acts such as *istiwa*’, coming, and descending as metaphor (*majāz*), not reality, so that “established over the Throne” signifies governance and dominion, not spatial location. He rejects attributing temporal *fi‘l* attributes to God, lest

change be ascribed to the Divine Essence, a Mu'tazilī impossibility. Ibn Taymiyyah holds that space and time are created; God pre-exists them. He rejects questions that assume a place for God “before creation,” because such questions presuppose what was itself created. Yet he affirms a real *istiwa*’ over the Throne—occurring after the Throne’s creation—as a true act befitting His majesty, without implying temporality over God. Creation is originated; God has eternally possessed the ability to create.

Thus Ibn Taymiyyah is more willing to affirm actual divine acts so long as they do not entail likeness to creation or imperfection, refusing *ta'wīl* that cancels the apparent sense. Al-Zamakhsharī, driven by rational *tanzīh*, consistently opts for figurative interpretation. Early authorities such as Sulaymān al-Taymī, Muqātil ibn Sulaymān, al-Ḍaḥḥāk, Mālik ibn Dīnār, Rabī'ah, ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak, and al-Awzā’ī generally affirmed the apparent meaning of *istiwa*’ while consigning its modality to God and denying *tashbīh*.

Ibn Taymiyyah further clarifies the terminology: he prefers “without *takyīf* and without *tamthīl*,” since the Qur’an explicitly negates *tamthīl* and the *salaf* routinely denied *takyīf*. He distinguishes the Qur’anic use of *ta'wīl*—the ultimate, God-only-known reality of meanings—from the later technical sense of figurative reinterpretation. He also notes that labeling God a *jism* (body) is an innovation absent from revelation. His approach situates itself as a middle path between Jahmī negation (*ta'tīl*) and anthropomorphic assimilation (*tamthīl*): affirming what revelation affirms, while neither likening God to creation nor inquiring into the how.

In sum, both scholars aim to preserve divine oneness and transcendence, yet they proceed by opposing routes—al-Zamakhsharī through rational-linguistic *ta'wīl*, Ibn Taymiyyah through *naql*-based affirmation upon the path of the *salaf*. Their legacies have left sharply contrasting marks on subsequent exegesis; the differences can be summarized in a comparative table.

Table 1. Comparison of Several Methodological Aspects

Aspect	al-Zamakhsharī	Ibn Taymiyyah
Exegetical Approach	<i>Tafsīr bi al-ra'y</i> with emphasis on safeguarding against anthropomorphism (<i>tashbīh</i>).	<i>Tafsīr bi al-ra'y</i> with emphasis on avoiding anthropomorphism, while still relying on Salaf traditions.
Epistemological Basis	Reason (<i>‘aql</i>) and rhetoric (<i>balāghah</i>) as primary instruments; rarely using transmitted reports.	Revelation (<i>naql</i>) and traditions of the Salaf as the main foundation; reason and rhetoric not used to negate the apparent meaning.
Interpretation of <i>istiwa</i> ’	Allegorical interpretation as “sovereignty” or “directing by will.”	Literal understanding as “established above the Throne,” without likening God to creation or negating the meaning.

Aspect	al-Zamakhsharī	Ibn Taymiyyah
Attitude toward <i>ta'wīl</i>	Permissible when aimed at preserving divine transcendence (<i>tanzīh</i>).	Prohibited if it becomes a form of distortion (<i>taḥrīf</i>).
Sources of Exegesis	Rarely cites reports from the Salaf, not mentioning figures such as Mālik or Umm Salamah.	Relies on Salaf traditions (<i>āthār</i>) and their consensus (<i>ijmā'</i>).

The table above highlights the fundamental methodological contrasts between al-Zamakhsharī and Ibn Taymiyyah in interpreting verses of divine attributes. Al-Zamakhsharī, rooted in Mu'tazilite rationalism, relied heavily on reason and rhetoric, often favoring allegorical interpretation (*ta'wīl*) to preserve divine transcendence and avoid anthropomorphism. In contrast, Ibn Taymiyyah grounded his approach in revelation and the transmitted reports of the Salaf, affirming the apparent meaning of texts while prohibiting interpretive distortions that would nullify their substance. Their differing stances toward *istiwā'* epitomize this divergence: for al-Zamakhsharī it symbolized sovereignty, while for Ibn Taymiyyah it denoted a real attribute affirmed without *takyīf* or *tamthīl*.

CONCLUSION

This study reveals the fundamental methodological divide between al-Zamakhsharī and Ibn Taymiyyah in interpreting the Qur'ānic verses of the divine names and attributes (*asmā' wa ṣifāt*). Rooted in a Mu'tazilī theology, al-Zamakhsharī employs a rational-linguistic approach and metaphorical *ta'wīl*—for example, reading *istiwā'* as “directing by will” and *yad Allāh* as “power”—with the aim of safeguarding *tanzīh* (God's incomparability). By contrast, Ibn Taymiyyah, working within the Salafī tradition, upholds a text-centered, *naqlī* method: he rejects figurative reinterpretation that nullifies the text and affirms the apparent meaning of *istiwā'* as a real divine attribute under the principle *bilā kayf wa bilā tashbīh* (without inquiring into “how” and without assimilation), referring consistently to the understanding of the early *salaf*. These methodological differences bear significant theological implications for *tawḥīd*. Al-Zamakhsharī's approach can risk obscuring the original purport of revelation in favor of rationalization, whereas Ibn Taymiyyah's method preserves textual authenticity yet may be alleged to verge on *tashbīh* if not guarded by the Salaf's interpretive parameters. A key finding is that both scholars explicitly reject *tashbīh*, but they diverge in defining the *mutashābihāt* and in delimiting the role of reason. The study recommends a calibrated balance between textual and rational approaches in contemporary exegesis, anchored in the Salafic maxim *al-istiwā' ma'lūm wa al-kayf majhūl* (“the fact of *istiwā'* is known; its modality is unknown”) to avoid both excessive *ta'wīl* and narrow literalism. The research also underscores the need for scholarly objectivity when assessing exegetical legacies so as to protect the integrity of creed in the face of modern intellectual challenges.

REFERENCE

- Abū Hanīfah. (2007). *al-Fiqh al-Akbar*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah.
- Ahmad, A. (2022). *Contemporary Islamic Discourse and the Interpretation of Divine Attributes*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Islam.
- Al-Baihaqi, Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn al-Husain. (2005). *Al-Asmâ’ wa al-Shifât*. Kairo: Dar al-Hadits.
- Al-Bazzâr, Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn ‘Amr Ibn ‘Abdul Khaliq Ibn Khallâd Ibn ‘Ubaidillah al-‘Ataki. (2009). *Musnad al-Bazzâr al-Mansyhûr bi Ism al-Bahr az-Zakhkhâr*. al-Madinah al-Munawwarah: Maktabat al-‘Ulum wa al-Hikam.
- Al-Harrani, Ahmad Ibn ‘Abd al-Halîm Ibn Taimiyyah Taqiyuddîn. (1998). *Majmû’ al-Fatâwâ*. Riyadh: Maktabah al-‘Ubaykân.
- Al-Izz, Ali Ibn Ali Ibn Muhammad. (2014). *Syarah al-‘Aqîdah al-Thahâwiyyah*. Beirut: Muassasah al-Risalah.
- Al-Jawziyyah, Muhammad Abu Bakar Ibn Ayyub Ibn al-Qayyim. (1438 H). *Ijtimâ’ al-Juyûsh al-Islâmiyyah ‘alâ Harb al-Mu‘atthilah wa al-Jahmiyyah*. Riyadh: Dar ‘Alam al-Fawa’id.
- Al-Jawziyyah, Muhammad Abu Bakar Ibn Ayyub Ibn al-Qayyim. (2019). *Al-Tibyân fî al-Aymân al-Qurân*. Riyadh: Dar ‘Alam al-Fawa’id.
- Al-Jazâ’irî, A. b. J. (2001). *‘Aqîdah al-Mu’min*. Riyadh: Dār al-Salâm.
- Al-Lalaka’i, Hibatullah Ibn al-Hasan Ibn Manshûr. (2004). *Syarah Ushûl I’tiqâd Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamâ’ah*. Kairo: Dar al-Hadits.
- Al-Maqdisi, Muwaffiq al-Dîn ‘Abdullah Ibn Ahmad Ibn Muhammad al-Syahir bi Ibn Qudamah. (1988). *Itsbat Shifat al-‘Uluw*. al-Madinah al-Munawwarah: Maktabah al-‘Ulûm wa al-Hikam.
- Al-Nu’mân, Abû Hanīfah. (1999). *Al-Fiqh al-Akbar*. al-Imârât al-‘Arabiyyah: Maktabah al-Furqân.
- Al-Qâsimî, J. (1996). *Maḥāsîn al-Ta’wîl*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Qurthubi, Yusuf Ibn ‘Abdullah Ibn Muhammad Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr al-Numairi. (2002). *Al-Tamhîd limâ fî al-Muwaththa’ min al-Ma’ânî wa al-Asânîd*. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr.
- Al-Syâfi’î. (2003). *al-Umm*. Beirut: Dār al-Ma’rifah.
- Barlas, A. (2002). *“Believing Women” in Islam: Unreading Patriarchal Interpretations of the Qur’an*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Batthah, ‘Ubaidullah Ibn Muhammad. (2006). *Al-Ibânah ‘an Syarî’ah al-Firqah al-Najiyah wa Mujânah al-Firaq al-Madzmûmah*. Kairo: Dar al-Hadits.
- Hanbal, ‘Abdullah Ibn Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Hanbal. (2014). *Kitâb al-Sunnah wa al-Radd ‘alâ al-Jahmiyyah*. al-Madinah al-Munawwarah: Dar al-Nashihah.
- Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr. (2000). *al-Tamhîd*. Riyadh: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah.
- Ibn Abî al-‘Izz. (2001). *Sharḥ al-‘Aqîdah al-Ṭaḥâwiyyah*. Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma’ârif.
- Ibn al-Qayyim, M. (1999). *al-Tibyân fî Aqsâm al-Qur’ân*. Cairo: Dār al-Hadîth.
- Ibn Qudâmah. (1997). *Lum’at al-I’tiqâd*. Riyadh: Dār al-Ṣumay’î.
- Ibn Taymiyyah. (2000). *Muqaddimah fî Uṣûl al-Tafsîr*. Riyadh: Dār ‘Ālam al-Kutub.

- Ibrahim, I. (2017). *Theological Methodologies in Qur'anic Exegesis: A Study of Classical and Salafi Approaches*. Cairo: Dār al-Salām.
- Madjid, N. (1992). *Islam: Doctrine and Civilization*. Jakarta: Paramadina.
- Mustofa, A. (2020). *Rationalism in Qur'anic Exegesis: The Case of al-Zamakhsharī's al-Kashshāf*. Yogyakarta: UII Press.
- Nasir, M. (2019). *Reason and Revelation in Ibn Taymiyyah's Hermeneutics*. Kuala Lumpur: IIUM Press.
- Rahman, F. (1980). *Major Themes of the Qur'an*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Yahya, M. (2021). *Ibn Taymiyyah and the Critique of Rationalist Exegesis*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah.
- Zamakhsharī, M. b. ʿUmar. (1998). *al-Kashshāf ʿan Ḥaqāʾiq al-Tanzīl*. Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifah.