Ṭāhir ibn ʿĀshūr: The Career and Thought of a Modern Reformist ʿālim, with Special Reference to His Work of tafsīr

Basheer M. Nafi

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir ibn ʿĀshūr was an eminent figure in both the Islamic reform movement and the institution of the Tunisian ʿulamāʾ for over half a century. While his intellectual output covered a wide range of Islamic scholarship and Arabic literature, he is perhaps best remembered for his Qurʾanic exegesis, *al-Taḥrīr waʾl-tanwīr*. Highly overlooked in studies of modern Qurʾanic exegesis, *al-Taḥrīr waʾl-tanwīr* is a major contribution to the ongoing attempt by Muslims to define the place that the Islamic founding text occupies in their lives. If the *Tafsīr al-manār* of Muḥammad ʿAbduh and Rashīd Riḍā, published early in the twentieth century, was the first significant work of *tafsīr* to reflect the impact of modernity on Muslim comprehension of the Qurʾan, *al-Taḥrīr waʾl-tanwīr* represents the persistence of classicism, but is at the same time both an internalisation of, and response to, modernity.

Unfortunately, no single work in English has been dedicated to the study of Ibn ʿĀshūr; neither to his biography nor his contribution to modern Islamic thought. The only reference to him in the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* is very brief, embedded in a short article covering several generations of his family.[1] It is time, perhaps, for this distinguished scholar of Islamic thought to occupy his place alongside other influential figures of modern Islamic reformism, with many of whom he was associated. The aim of this article, therefore, is manifold. Primarily, it seeks to study the life and making of Ṭāhir ibn ʿĀshūr as a modern Tunisian ʿālim, and to highlight the major themes of his intellectual contribution to Islamic thought. Special attention will be given to his work of *tafsīr*. This article will also attempt to reconstruct the overlapping contexts in which *al-Taḥrīr waʾl-tanwīr* and other of Ibn ʿĀshūr's major works were written and to identify the socio-political and cultural elements that contributed to their formation. It is hoped that this article will show that the influence of the Arab-Islamic reform movement reached far beyond Egypt and Syria (the leading reformists within these arenas being those with which students of modern Islamic thought are most familiar); that each figure within this movement was a distinctive figure; and that a major twentieth-century work of

Qur'anic exegesis has yet to take its place next to ᶜAbduh and Riḍā's *Tafsīr al-manār* and the *Fī ẓilāl al-Qurʾān* of Sayyid Quṭb.

The Transformation of the Tunisian ᶜUlamatic Environment

Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir ibn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir ibn ᶜĀshūr (known simply as Ṭāhir ibn ᶜĀshūr, 1296–1394/1879–1973) was born to one of the most notable families of the city of Tunis.[2] Originally Moroccan of Idrīsid decent, the ᶜĀshūrs settled in Muslim Spain until religious persecution forced them to emigrate to Morocco towards the end of Islamic rule in Andalusia. Muḥammad ibn ᶜĀshūr, with whom the family's importance in Tunisian history would begin, was born in the Moroccan city of Sale in 1030/1621. A Ṣūfī of some stature, Muḥammad settled in Tunis on his way back from a pilgrimage journey to the Ḥijāz, emerging as leader of a branch of the Shādhilī *ṭarīqa*.[3] The family's contribution to religious life in Tunis continued to be limited to Ṣūfī circles until three brothers of the fifth generation, Aḥmad (d. 1255/1839), Muḥammad (known also as Ḥamāda; d. 1265/1849) and particularly Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir (d. 1284/1868) were sent to the Zaytūna mosque, the great Tunisian centre of Islamic learning, to study as *ᶜulamāʾ*. It was the latter, the grandfather of the twentieth-century scholar, who would become the most renowned of the three brothers, rising to the post of chief Mālikī judge. In 1861, he was appointed muftī, and later combined this position with the prestigious one of *naqīb al-ashraf*.[4] In a turbulent period of the history of nineteenth-century Tunisia, Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir seems to have sided with the anti-reformist camp of the government of Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq Bey (*reg.* 1859–82).[5]

When the young Ṭāhir ibn ᶜĀshūr joined Zaytūna in 1892 to begin his ᶜulamatic education, his family was already an established part of the aristocracy of Tunis. While his parental grandfather had been a leading *ᶜālim* and government official, his maternal grandfather, Muḥammad al-ᶜAzīz Bū ᶜAttūr (1825–1907)[6] was the then first minister of ᶜAlī Bey III (*reg.* 1882–1902). Ibn ᶜĀshūr's career, however, would not only be shaped by the power and influence of his family, but also by the cultural and political currents of his time, engendered by government-led structural and cultural changes and the fall of Tunisia to French occupation.

Early attempts at restructuring in Tunisia were initiated during the reign of Aḥmad Bey (*reg.* 1837–55),[7] inspired in large part by Egyptian and Ottoman programmes of modernisation. Underlining Aḥmad Bey's policy was the French conquest of Algeria in 1830 and the failure of the Ottoman state to come to the defence of the Algerians. Unable to see the limits of Tunisian resources and the fundamental changes in the world economic situation, Aḥmad Bey opted for a policy of self-reliance, hoping to spare his country the fate that Algeria had faced. He undertook an ambitious plan to

set up a modern army and navy, employing French military experts and naval officers. Bardo Military College for Junior Officers, which he founded in 1840, was also run by French instructors. Aḥmad Bey moreover established a national bank to take control of Tunisian monetary affairs and increased the acquisition of mamlūks to meet the requirements of the modern military and expanding administration, in both of which senior positions were still being occupied by mamlūk elements. The abolition of slavery in 1846 and the adoption of an open door policy precipitated a steady increase in the number of European residents from between 1,000–2,000 persons in 1800 to around 8,000 in 1856,[8] offering foreign consuls new opportunities to intervene in Tunisian internal affairs. Inevitably, the sharp rise in government expenditure led to a sharp increase in agricultural taxation; this was not accompanied by any serious effort on the part of the government to invest in improving methods of farming and agricultural production.

The brief rule of Muḥammad Bey (*reg.* 1855–9) witnessed a short period of re-entrenchment; yet, under European pressure, reformist policies were soon resumed with the issuing of *ʿahd al-amān* and the Fundamental Law (*al-qānūn al-asāsī*) of September 1857. Modelled on similar Ottoman Sultanic declarations (firmans) of 1839 and 1856, the Fundamental Law introduced the concepts of citizenship and political equality between various groups of the population.[9] Again following in Ottoman footsteps, a town council was set up in Tunis in 1858 and an official gazette, *al-Rāʾid al-Tūnisī*, was launched two years later. The reform project reached a new level with the 1860 constitution, promulgated by Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq Bey (*reg.* 1859–82),[10] which established the separation of powers, put limits on the Bey's prerogatives, introduced a new court system, and created a high council to act both as parliament and supreme court. Khayr al-Dīn (known also as Khayr al-Dīn al-Tūnisī, 1822–89), the renowned reformist of nineteenth-century Tunisia, was the first president of the High Council. His attempt to make the council play the role it was granted by the constitution was faced by strong resistance from the reluctant Bey and his coterie, leading to Khayr al-Dīn's resignation and withdrawal from public life in 1862. Khayr al-Dīn spent the next seven years travelling between Tunisia, Europe and Istanbul, in the course of which he published his book *Aqwām al-masālik fī maʿrifat aḥwāl al-mamālīk*, in 1867.[11] The book, which was most likely the outcome of a collective effort rather than the work of Khayr al-Dīn alone, dominated Tunisian political and intellectual debate for over a century, and drew the lines of division within Tunisian political and intellectual circles, including that of the *ʿulamāʾ*.

In *Aqwām al-masālik*, Khayr al-Dīn sought to present Muslim statesmen and influential figures with a response to the pervading feeling of self-decline and to the crisis that they were facing in terms of their relationship with the European powers.

Khayr al-Dīn stated the aims of his book as being 'first, to urge those who are zealous and resolute among statesmen and men of religion to adopt, as far as they can, whatever is conducive to the welfare of the Islamic community and the development of its civilisation, such as the expansion of the bounds of science and learning and the preparation of the paths which lead to wealth' and 'secondly, to warn the heedless among the generality of Muslims against their persistence in closing their eyes to elements that are praiseworthy and in conformity with our own religious law in the practice of adherents of other religions, simply because they have the idea engraved on their minds that all the acts and institutions of those who are not Muslims should be avoided'.[12] Influenced by his observations of modern Europe, Khayr al-Dīn's project focused on defining the underlying reasons for the strength of European states and societies, and showing that borrowing ideas and institutions from Europe was not contrary to the Sharīᶜa. In other words, *Aqwām al-masālik* is a book about what Khayr al-Dīn and his associates saw as being common and universal to the human political and social experience; what made the European powers powerful and, if incorporated by Muslim states and society, could equally bring power and vitality to them. Identifying several aspects of modern European systems with the Islamic golden age, Khayr al-Dīn argued for the limitation of the ruler's powers by law and *shūrā* (consultation), and asserted the importance of the values of justice and freedom in rejuvenating Islamic societies. The *shūrā* he envisioned was the *shūrā* of notables and ᶜ*ulamā*ʾ, reflecting perhaps the interest of those ᶜ*ulamā*ʾ who stood by him, as well as an attempt to emphasise the Islamic framework of his project. According to Khayr al-Dīn, it was only in an atmosphere of justice and freedom that new knowledge, learning and ideas could flourish and bring about a new Islamic revival.

As European intervention in Tunisian affairs intensified, Khayr al-Dīn returned to government to chair the International Finance Commission in 1869. Four years later, Prime Minister Khazandār, a strong opponent of reform, lost his job, on the insistence of the European members of the commission, and Khayr al-Dīn replaced him.[13] From 1873 until 1877, Khayr al-Dīn tried to implement the ideas he had advocated in *Aqwām al-masālik*, with the aim of restoring confidence in the government and preventing further European encroachment. It was during this period that the lines dividing the Tunisian ruling élite, notables and ᶜ*ulamā*ʾ became apparent. When he first published his treatise, Khayr al-Dīn made sure that favourable reviews (*taqārīẓ*), written by a group of ᶜ*ulamā*ʾ, were appended to the text, indicating his deep awareness of the power of the ᶜ*ulamā*ʾ class and the influence of religion.[14] After becoming prime minister, he likewise tried to give the new institutions of his government religious trappings, to involve the ᶜ*ulamā*ʾ in the administration of these institutions and to present his reforms as a return to pristine Islamic principles: the management of the new public library was entrusted

to two senior ʿulamāʾ, Muḥammad Bayram V and Maḥmūd ibn al-Khūja, while the newly established government gazette, *al-Rāʾid al-Tūnisī*, was entrusted to another group of ʿulamāʾ. ʿUlamāʾ were included in the staff of the modern Ṣādiqiyya College and in the administration of the reorganised religious endowments (*awqāf*) sector that was increasingly coming under state control. Although a non-ʿālim was chosen to run the Ministry of Education, which, it was envisioned, would extend government authority over schooling and curricula, considering that the university mosque was a stronghold of the ʿulamāʾ class, only small modifications were introduced into Zaytūna's educational structure.[15] Khayr al-Dīn's skilful manipulation of the ʿulamāʾ class and his attempt to chart a middle line between established tradition and the requirement for change won him the support of many leading Tunisian ʿulamāʾ. *Al-Rāʾid al-Tūnisī* became a mouthpiece for the pro-reform camp, carrying many articles in support of Khayr al-Dīn's policies written by eminent ʿulamāʾ such as Sālim Bū Ḥājib, Muḥammad al-Sanūsī and Muḥammad Bayram V. In 1875, with the death of Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad Muʿāwiya, Muḥammad Bayram V, backed by Khayr al-Dīn, was granted the post of Shaykh al-Islām, regarded as the most senior position in the official ʿulamāʾ institution.[16] Most of those ʿulamāʾ that identified with Khayr al-Dīn's reforms came from provincial backgrounds and had thus no interest in perpetuating the status quo. Those among the reformists who belonged to entrenched ʿulamāʾ families from the capital city were by and large of the minority Ḥanafī *madhhab*, or were influenced by modern European culture, directly or indirectly. Sālim Bū Ḥājib (1828–1924),[17] for example, spent six years in Italy on an official mission (returning with an Italian daughter-in-law), made another visit to Paris, and accompanied Khayr al-Dīn to Istanbul in 1871.

Yet, opposition to Khayr al-Dīn was no less pronounced. Leading ʿulamāʾ families of the dominant Mālikī *madhhab* saw in the reformist policies a threat to their vested and entrenched interests in the educational and *awqāf* sectors. On the other hand, the merchant class, which was the first group to feel the brunt of foreign encroachment into the Tunisian economy, associated the Western orientation of the new reforms with the rising European threat to their livelihood. While Khayr al-Dīn's main goal was to forestall foreign incursions, he never succeeded in presenting the reformist programme as indigenous. Eventually, Khayr al-Dīn found himself struggling against a powerful coalition of foreign and local enemies, alienated due to public perception of his policies, his attempts to curb the powers of the Bey and his inability to satisfy the competing demands of the British, the French and the Italians. Dismissed in 1877, Khayr al-Dīn left for Constantinople where he was appointed grand vizier by Sultan ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd II in December 1878, a position he held for less than a year. Tunisia's disparate efforts to maintain independence, which began after the fall of Algeria to the French, reached an abrupt end in 1881 as French military and naval forces turned the country into a French protectorate. This drastic

development in the history of Tunisia, combined with the previous few decades of modernisation and change, left a profound impact on the making of the *ʿulamāʾ* institution, in which Ibn ʿĀshūr came to emerge as a major figure.

The mosque/university of Zaytūna was the principal institution of Tunisian Islamic learning, in which a large number of *ʿulamāʾ* resided and from which the vast majority of Tunisian *ʿulamāʾ* graduated. Originally free from state intervention, Zaytūna became an object of official reform in 1842 when Aḥmad Bey decreed a charter aimed at reforming its instruction and recruitment practices.[18] Marking the beginning of Zaytūna's subjugation by the state, the charter provided for the creation of an administrative board (*niẓāra ʿilmiyya*) and an official faculty of thirty professors. The *niẓāra* consisted of the Ḥanafī Shaykh al-Islām, the Mālikī Bāsh Muftī, and the Ḥanafī and Mālikī qāḍīs, while the faculty was evenly divided between the Mālikī and the Ḥanafī *madhāhib*. A Zaytūna graduate who wished to pursue a career at the mosque itself would first be appointed as an auxiliary, unpaid teacher (*mutaṭāwiʿ*). In 1849 a group of twelve second-class teachers was added to the original faculty of thirty, first-class professors.[19] Zaytūna graduates were also eligible to enter the Islamic judiciary, first as notaries and then as qāḍīs. The city of Tunis had two judges, one belonging to the dominant Mālikī *madhhab* and the other to the Ḥanafī *madhhab*.[20] Official muftīs were also appointed from amongst Zaytūna's senior *ʿulamāʾ*, both Mālikī and Ḥanafī. Although the *ʿulamāʾ* of both *madhāhib* were treated equally by the state, the supremacy of the Ḥanafī *madhhab* can be seen in Aḥmad Bey's decision to give the title of Shaykh al-Islām to the most senior Ḥanafī muftī,[21] while the senior Mālikī muftī continued to be called Bāsh Muftī. Only in 1932 was it decided to also grant the title of Shaykh al-Islām to the Mālikī muftī, a decision which led to the resignation of the Ḥanafī Shaykh al-Islām, Aḥmad Bayram, in protest.[22] Until the foundation of the Ṣādiqiyya College, traditional Islamic education had been the only education available to the Tunisian populace, making the *ʿulamāʾ* the most influential group in society. They controlled the judiciary, education and the *waqf* sector, and occupied vital positions in the state machinery; and as muftīs, qāḍīs, teachers and mosque preachers, shaped societal discourse. This situation was severely and irreversibly disrupted by the French occupation.

With the exception of a few co-opted Ṣūfī shaykhs, the majority of Tunisian *ʿulamāʾ* received the occupying power with a sense of ambivalence or active opposition. While many amongst the provincial *ʿulamāʾ* encouraged armed resistance to the French, other *ʿulamāʾ* chose to emigrate to Istanbul or other parts of the Ottoman realm. At the beginning of the occupation some *ʿulamāʾ* resigned their teaching jobs at the Ṣādiqiyya College, but the majority maintained their administrative and judicial posts that brought them into contact with the French authorities. Since

the French did not abolish the old structure of government, these official *ulamāʾ* convinced themselves that they were serving the Tunisian government of the Bey and not the French authorities. Gradually, however, the French began to encroach upon the sphere of the *ulamāʾ*. In May 1883, Louis Machuel, an official in Algeria's French school system, was appointed director of public education in Tunisia. One of Machuel's first acts was to place the Ṣādiqiyya College under his own authority, and to subject it to a fundamental rearrangement in structure and curriculum.[23] Although he preferred to follow a non-confrontational policy of cooperation with traditional Islamic institutions of education, Machuel's aim was that of the French Republic, that is, the secularisation of education and the extension of the state's control over its centres, methods and outlook. Machuel's policy involved the establishment of Franco-Arab primary schools as a supplement to traditional Islamic primary schools (*katātīb*), and the transformation of the old Madrasa ʿAlawiyya into a school producing modern teachers for the Franco-Arab schools. Machuel then sought to bring all Qurʾanic schools under the jurisdiction of the director of public education with the view of turning them into public schools. His attempt to control Zaytūna was faced with strong opposition from the *ulamāʾ*. However, by manipulating existing powers in the hands of the state, Machuel had succeeded by 1892 in gaining control of the religious schools (*madāris*) associated with Zaytūna and now exercised considerable influence in the choice of the deputy supervisors of education at Zaytūna and the selection of professors for administrative jobs.[24] Machuel's largely non-provocative approach guaranteed the implementation of his policy with as little resistance as possible.

Similar steps were taken to bring the Islamic judiciary under the control of the protectorate authorities. In July 1884 a decree specified that, except in land cases, litigation between Europeans and Tunisians would be decided in French courts. Another major step in the erosion of the sharīʿa courts was the reorganisation and enlargement of Tunisian commercial and penal courts in February 1885. By 1896, instead of Islamic courts, a number of regional courts of the first instance were created in provincial centres, while a policy of non-replacement secured the gradual abolition of key positions in the Islamic judiciary. The French authorities avoided making specific intrusions into the sensitive Islamic law of personal status, but since Islamic laws were widely interpreted by Tunisian judges against the desires of the French colonists, the French authorities decided to draft a real-estate law. Based on the British Torrens Act of Australia, the new law was drafted with the help of cooperative Muslim scholars. Considered a victory for the European colonists, the new law led to the establishment of the Mixed Property Court in 1888.[25]

Ibn ᶜĀshūr's Rise to Prominence

Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir ibn ᶜĀshūr received his primary education of Arabic, Qur'an and some French in a traditional Tunisian *kuttāb*. He was admitted to Zaytūna in 1310/1892, where he studied with some of the most eminent *ᶜulamā'* of the time, including Muḥammad al-ᶜAzīz Bū ᶜAttūr, Ṣāliḥ al-Sharīf (1869–1920), Sālim Bū Ḥājib, ᶜUmar ibn al-Shaykh (1822–1911), Muḥammad al-Nakhlī (1860–1924), Maḥmūd ibn al-Khūja (1854–1911), Ibrāhīm al-Mirghanī (1863–1930) and Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf (1863–1939).[26] With the exception of Maḥmūd ibn al-Khūja, the Ḥanafī Shaykh al-Islām between 1900 and 1911,[27] all of Ibn ᶜĀshūr's teachers were Mālikī scholars. As Ibn ᶜĀshūr joined Zaytūna ten years after the French occupation, active Tunisian resistance to the French was dying out; in the city of Tunis itself armed resistance was non-existent. Both the *ᶜulamā'* and the nascent intelligentsia were engaged in a soul-searching exercise that reflected many features of the Tunisian debate prior to the occupation. The reformist camp was again regrouping, calling for a fundamental restructuring of education and pointing out social ills. The appearance of *al-Ḥāḍira* newspaper in 1887, launched by a group of French-educated Tunisians and supported by reformist *ᶜulamā'* like Sālim Bū Ḥājib and Muḥammad al-Sanūsī, was the first sign of the revival of the reform debate. In 1896, al-Jamᶜiyya al-Khaldūniyya was founded by almost the same group that was running *al-Ḥāḍira*, including Bashīr Ṣafar, Muḥammad ibn al-Khūja and Muḥammad al-Aṣram, and supported by like-minded *ᶜulamā'* such as Muḥammad al-Nakhlī, ᶜAlī al-Shanūfī and Sālim Bū Ḥājib.[28] Al-Jamᶜiyya al-Khaldūniyya's major goal was to supplement the Zaytūnī education with what Maḥmūd Qābādū (1812–71),[29] the godfather of all nineteenth-century Tunisian reformists, used to call 'the universal sciences'. *Al-Ḥāḍira* and al-Jamᶜiyya al-Khaldūniyya were both supported by liberal elements in the French colonial administration. As in other parts of the Muslim world, reformist *ᶜulamā'* and intellectuals saw in the 'enlightened' colonial administrator an ally for speeding up and achieving the aims of reform.[30] In addition to the large segment of *ᶜulamā'* involved with *al-Ḥāḍira*, al-Khaldūniyya and the Ṣādiqiyya College, Shaykh Muḥammad al-ᶜAzīz Bū ᶜAttūr (Ibn ᶜĀshūr's maternal grandfather) was a cooperative prime minister during the 1890s.

Yet, other of Ibn ᶜĀshūr's teachers were opposed to reformist ideas. Shaykh Maḥmūd ibn al-Khūja, an early associate of Khayr al-Dīn, grew more conservative in his attitudes,[31] while Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Sharīf al-Tūnisī's objection to change and cooperation with the French led to his emigration to Ottoman lands where he would play a noticeable role in the heated debate about reform and change in Istanbul and Syria.[32] Ibn ᶜĀshūr himself seemed to have made his choice early in life. In 1896, he completed his basic studies at Zaytūna and was soon appointed as an auxiliary

professor. His rise in rank was faster than usual, even for a gifted young ᶜālim, and was certainly helped by the power and influence of his family. He became a lecturer at Ṣādiqiyya College in 1900, and three years later, at the young age of 24, passed the oral exam to become a first-class professor at Zaytūna. The next year, he was nominated a state deputy at the niẓāra of the mosque/university, a position in which he would take the first steps in his life-long project to reform Zaytūnī education.

Ibn ᶜĀshūr's allegiance to the reformist wing of the Tunisian ᶜulamāʾ became apparent during Muḥammad ᶜAbduh's visit to Tunis in September 1903. ᶜAbduh first came to Tunisia in 1884 from Paris, a visit that was meant to raise financial support for al-ᶜUrwa al-wuthqā, the journal that he helped publish with Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī.[33] Fairly well acquainted with the Tunisian ᶜulamatic scene, and now highly regarded as the grand master of Islamic reformism, ᶜAbduh was received warmly on his second visit.[34] During his many encounters with the ᶜulamāʾ and notables of Tunis, some of which were attended by Ibn ᶜĀshūr, ᶜAbduh advocated educational reforms, criticised old Islamic pedagogical methods and traditional manuals, and defended the legacy of the great fourteenth-century Salafī scholar Taqī al-Dīn ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328).[35] It was, of course, the principle of ijtihād and the assertion of the role of the Qur'an and the Sunna in the reconstruction of religious thought that ᶜAbduh was trying to highlight in Ibn Taymiyya's legacy. But ᶜAbduh's defence of Ibn Taymiyya, combined with his reformist message, incurred the wrath of conservative Tunisian ᶜulamāʾ, some of whom accused ᶜAbduh of Wahhābism.[36] The controversy over ᶜAbduh's ideas intensified even further after news reached Tunisia of his famous Transvaal fatwa, as well as another fatwa permitting Shāfiᶜī Muslims to pray behind an imam of another school of fiqh.[37] Writing anonymously in al-Manār (founded and edited by ᶜAbduh's disciple, Rashīd Riḍā), Ibn ᶜĀshūr published a powerful defence of the great Egyptian reformist.[38]

That Ibn ᶜĀshūr chose to express his views in al-Manār anonymously may have been, as the modern scholar Arnold Green suggests, an indication of the strength of the conservative circles;[39] it may have also been a reflection of his own non-confrontational nature. Time and again throughout his career, Ibn ᶜĀshūr proved to be a non-activist reformist, a somewhat detached intellectual. His aristocratic background, and the complex networks of interests and privileges that connected his social milieu with the centres of power, be they French or Tunisian, contributed to defining his outlook and limiting his choices. A contemporary of the politically active Rashīd Riḍā, and ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bādīs (1889–1940) of the Algerian Jamᶜiyyat al-ᶜUlamāʾ,[40] Ibn ᶜĀshūr was politically cautious and socially ambivalent. During the early phase of the Young Tunisians movement (1905–9), from whose womb the Tunisian nationalist movement of the twentieth century would be born,

Ibn ʿĀshūr, as well as other likeminded ʿulamāʾ, cooperated with the mainly French-educated activists of the movement.[41] Later, however, as the nationalist attitudes of the Young Tunisians, and then the Destour Party, became more evident, Ibn ʿĀshūr maintained a distance from the political arena. Even with respect to the question of reform in Zaytūna, Ibn ʿĀshūr was not prepared to entertain what he saw as disruptive methods. In 1907, Zaytūna students organised themselves to form the Society of the Students of the Zaytūna Mosque (known later as al-Jamʿiyya al-Zaytūniyya), demanding urgent restructuring in the process and curriculum of education at the mosque.[42] Although Ibn ʿĀshūr assumed the presidency of the society, he kept a low profile when the prime minister, Maḥmūd Jallūlī, decided to suppress it on the grounds that its creation had never been sanctioned by the government. The question of reforming Zaytūna flared up again in April 1910 when angry students encircled the mosque to prevent the entry of professors, encouraged apparently by Young Tunisian elements. Ibn ʿĀshūr, who arrived at the scene along with his fellow Zaytūnī Muḥammad al-Asghar ibn al-Khūja and the mayor of Tunis, reproved the students and made no effort to protect those who were arrested.

Ibn ʿĀshūr's ascendance through the ʿulamatic hierarchy continued unabated until Tunisian independence in 1956. Between 1908 and 1912, he participated in the official commission entrusted with reforming all levels of education and was instrumental in the compromise that underlined its recommendations.[43] A year later, he was named the Jamāʿa Mālikī judge (the most senior Mālikī judge), and subsequently appointed ex officio as a member of the Academic Supervisory Bureau of Zaytūna, which functioned as the mosque's administrative committee. He left the judiciary in 1923 to return to teaching at Zaytūna and the Ṣādiqiyya College, while holding the position of deputy Bāsh Muftī. In 1932, he was declared the Mālikī Shaykh al-Islām, becoming the first Mālikī ʿālim to be given such a title. Although Ibn ʿĀshūr also occupied the influential position of shaykh of the Zaytūna mosque in the early 1930s, he soon resigned from this while maintaining his position as the Mālikī grand muftī. In November 1944, however, he was granted the shaykhdom of Zaytūna again, a position he continued to hold until 1951.

In 1920, amid widespread expectations of self-rule among colonial peoples, the Tunisian Destour Party was born, led by ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Thaʿālibī (1875–1944), an Arab-Islamic reformist and controversial ex-Zaytūnī.[44] The Destour was not yet a revolutionary anti-colonialist party, but rather a constitutionalist one that advocated the reforming of government and emphasised the Arab-Islamic identity of the Tunisian people. Although many of the Destour leaders were graduates of Zaytūna, Thaʿālibī was too controversial a figure to draw support from the leading Tunisian ʿulamāʾ. Ibn ʿĀshūr maintained his distance from the political activism of the nationalist movement after Ḥabīb Bourguiba split from the Destour Party and

founded, with a group consisting mainly of Ṣādiqiyya graduates, the New Destour Party in March 1934.[45] In fact, Ibn ᶜĀshūr's nationalist reputation would receive a severe blow immediately after his rise to the Mālikī muftī-ship of the country in 1932. In 1929, hard-line French colonialists held a Catholic missionary congress in Tunis which was intended as a challenge to the Arab-Islamic identity of Tunisia and portrayed the French occupation as an act of historical correction, reconnecting Tunisia with its Christian-Roman roots. Received with a strong sense of indignation by the Tunisian people, the congress aroused widespread opposition, led by the Ḥanafī Shaykh al-Islām Aḥmad Bayram.[46] It seems that granting Ibn ᶜĀshūr the title of Shaykh al-Islām when he became the Mālikī grand muftī was a gesture of displeasure against Aḥmad Bayram. Protesting the abrupt disruption of an established ᶜulamatic system of authority, Aḥmad Bayram resigned the muftī-ship.

Ibn ᶜĀshūr's position vis-à-vis the French authorities was put to the test immediately after he assumed the position of grand muftī. One of the simmering issues in the relationship between the French colonial administration and the Tunisian people was the French Law of Naturalisation of October 1910, which offered French nationality to any Tunisian who wished to acquire it. This law was activated in December 1920 when the French authorities attempted to induce Tunisians to become French citizens by offering financial advantages to those who would do so. Most Tunisians, however, saw the naturalisation law as a French scheme to liquidate the Islamo-Arabness of their country. The issue resurfaced again in December 1932 when the muftī of Bizerte issued a fatwa stating that 'naturalised Tunisians, by ceasing to be under the governance of Islamic law, had lapsed from the faith'.[47] The implication of the fatwa was that, among other things, a naturalised Tunisian was not entitled to be buried in an Islamic cemetery. Seeking to avoid an open confrontation with the protectorate authorities, Ḥanafī ᶜulamāʾ in the city of Tunis declined to endorse the fatwa. Ibn ᶜĀshūr, whose opinion as the Mālikī grand muftī was more crucial for the Tunisian public, expressed a middle-of-the-road opinion. Rather than dissenting, Ibn ᶜĀshūr opined that a naturalised Tunisian could be buried in an Islamic cemetery if he repented his lapse from the faith before his death.[48] Although Ibn ᶜĀshūr's fatwa was not published at the time, the public commotion that surrounded the issue of naturalisation branded Ibn ᶜĀshūr and other ᶜulamāʾ of Tunis as pro-French clerics.

The Tunisian anti-naturalisation movement was so powerful that on occasions the graves of naturalised Tunisians were dug up and their remains were removed from Islamic cemeteries, and, in early 1933, the French authorities relented and assigned separate cemeteries to the naturalised. Opposition to the French and to the Tunis ᶜulamāʾ was led by L'Action Tunisien, the newspaper of the group that came to break away from the Destour Party and establish the New Destour. His nationalist

credentials dented, the naturalisation issue continued to haunt Ibn ʿĀshūr for long afterwards. Between 1944 and 1955, Ibn ʿĀshūr served his second, long, tenure as shaykh of Zaytūna, during which he attempted to implement his reformist vision. Treading carefully, he introduced modern sciences into the core curriculum at the mosque and reduced the teaching load of aspects of traditional materials that he considered irrelevant to modern Islamic learning. His move incurred wrath from conservative quarters at the mosque and led to an open revolt against him prior to the 1951 examinations. In challenging his authority over the mosque's affairs, Ibn ʿĀshūr's detractors invoked his opinion with regard to the apostasy of the naturalised Tunisian.

Yet, despite the naturalisation controversy, Ibn ʿĀshūr's stature as a leading Mālikī scholar continued to grow. Bourguiba, who never allowed the Tunisian people to forget how the ʿulamāʾ had betrayed them in 1932,[49] tried to establish a special relationship with Ibn ʿĀshūr. In the wake of independence, Ibn ʿĀshūr accepted Bourguiba's invitation to become the dean of Zaytūna, thus lending his authority to Bourguiba's attempt to placate the mistrust that divided the Zaytūnīs and his government. When Bourguiba signed the controversial Law of Personal Status the next year he made sure that Ibn ʿĀshūr appeared by his side.[50] As in other Islamic countries, Islamic reformist ʿulamāʾ in Tunisia were prepared to ally themselves with the modernising élite of the post-colonial nation state. But by 1961, as Bourguiba moved to implement one of the most radical educational reforms in any Islamic country (except perhaps the Turkish Republic), Ibn ʿĀshūr was reaching the end of the road in his search to reconcile Islamic reformism with the modern world.[51] In fact, the whole reformist project in Tunisia was becoming meaningless since Bourguiba, ever suspicious of Zaytūna, had turned the ancient Islamic school into a mere college of Sharīʿa attached to the Tunisian University. At the height of his campaign against Islamic culture in 1961, Bourguiba described fasting in the Islamic month of Ramaḍān as being the cause of a drop in productivity, and called upon the Tunisian people to abandon the religious rite of fasting. When asked by Tunisian radio about his opinion on the president's view, Ibn ʿĀshūr refused to endorse Bourguiba's call, stating the Islamic legal position that fasting in the month of Ramaḍān is obligatory and that one can be permitted to not fast only on legally recognised grounds. Islamic reformism, it seemed, had its limits. Now at an advanced age, Ibn ʿĀshūr would henceforth avoid all forms of public involvement and focus instead on writing and responding to the enquiries that he continued to receive from both within and outside Tunisia.

Education and Social Order

By the early 1950s, Ibn ʿĀshūr's erudition and contribution to Islamic learning and Arabic literature had come to be widely recognised by Tunisian and non-Tunisian ʿulamāʾ. In 1951, he was selected as an associate member of the Arab Academy of Cairo, and in 1955 the Arab Academy of Damascus bestowed on him the same honour. Ibn ʿĀshūr was perhaps one of the most active writers of his generation of ʿulamāʾ, producing more than forty books and treatises and countless short essays and fatwas, covering various fields of Arabic and Islamic knowledge.[52] Beside his formidable grasp of *fiqh*, Islamic legal theory and Qur'anic exegesis, he was a poet and a keen student of Arabic language and literature. Yet Ibn ʿĀshūr's view of the world, so to speak, can be seen to be outlined in four major works that deal with his vision of educational reform, his contribution to Islamic legal theory, his understanding of the nature of modern Islamic society, and his exegesis of the Qur'an.

Ibn ʿĀshūr's association with the question of educational reform can be traced back to the early stage of his ʿulamatic career. Among his teachers there were many who had identified with Khayr al-Dīn al-Tūnisī's attempts to reform Zaytūna and introduce new educational institutions to the country. He was also influenced by the Egyptian Islamic reformist emphasis on education, expressed by ʿAbduh and *al-Manār*,[53] as a principal route for reforming and reviving Islamic societies. Like other Arab-Islamic reformists, Ibn ʿĀshūr was a product of the nineteenth-century Euro-Ottoman culture of modernisation which sought in centralisation and control the surest answer to what appeared to have been a lack of dynamism and innovation in traditional social organisations. Hence, for Ibn ʿĀshūr, the first step towards educational reform is the formulation of a defined plan by ʿulamāʾ who are aware of the requirements of the time and the purposes of knowledge. This plan should be implemented rigorously through a deliberate system of inspection and surveillance. The model that Ibn ʿĀshūr seemed to have in mind was the French Academy, founded by Cardinal Richelieu in 1634.[54] The freedom that characterised traditional Islamic education was harmful, and teachers should not be freely permitted to select the books they use. Not surprisingly, Ibn ʿĀshūr saw education as a function and responsibility of the state and called for it to be universally available.[55] He was equally interested in educational method and in substantive knowledge. With respect to method, he advocated memorisation in the primary stages of education, while he called for the development of analytical and critical approaches in higher stages.[56] With respect to substance, he presented a careful and systematic critique of the major fields of traditional Islamic knowledge. Linking the decline of Islamic learning to the general decline of the Muslim *umma*, Ibn ʿĀshūr listed the major reasons behind the crisis in Islamic culture as follows: a) the inner conflicts that led to the disintegration

of the ᶜAbbāsid state and that drastically affected Islamic centres of learning; b) the loss of direction in Islamic culture that resulted in the neglect of essential learning while wasting disproportionate effort in the expansion of superfluous areas of knowledge; c) the absence of specialisation; d) the prevalence of *taqlīd* and decline of *ijtihād*; and e) the conflict and disjunction between various schools of Islamic learning.[57] This, of course, is a highly anachronistic view of Islamic intellectual history, largely influenced by the dominant discourse of the early twentieth-century Arab-Islamic reformists, and lacks a proper understanding of Islamic history. It is, however, a coherent premise for the more specific critique of Islamic sciences.

One of Ibn ᶜĀshūr's principal targets was Islamic theology, or *kalām*. His treatment of *kalām* did not follow the classical approach of comparing issues and doctrines of various Islamic theological schools, but rather adopted a holistic approach. He saw that *kalām* had failed to establish a unified system of terminology and had thus sunk into an essentially trivial rhetorical conflict. For Ibn ᶜĀshūr, scholars of *kalām* went to extremes, describing God in ways that He did not describe Himself and attaching to the Islamic system of belief some incomprehensible articles of faith.[58] While advocating a simpler and more meaningful reconstruction of Islamic theology, Ibn ᶜĀshūr did not refrain from criticising the tradition of Ashᶜarī theology, so dominant . in Mālikī circles. At the same time, he was equally critical of what he called Islamic tendencies for 'exaggerated transcendentalisation'.[59] Yet in his exegesis of the Qur'an, as we shall see later, he could hardly free himself from Ashᶜarī theological positions. Following in the footsteps of Muslim modernists, he approved of philosophy and logic but was critical of the way the Islamic tradition of learning treated both. He believed that while bad translations of Greek philosophical works contributed to the trivialisation of the study of philosophy, the more fundamental problem was the inability of the ᶜulamā' to see the relevance of philosophy and logic to the study of proper Islamic sciences.[60] This utilitarian perspective on philosophy characterised his approach to the study of history as well. Defining history as a fully-fledged science, with general rules and specific methods, Ibn ᶜĀshūr called for a re-examination of the Islamic historical legacy in order to salvage the real from the mythological.[61] In essence, nonetheless, he understood history as political history and saw its value in the contribution it could make to the understanding and progression of the Islamic political outlook.

Ibn ᶜĀshūr's *Uṣūl al-niẓām al-ijtimāᶜī fi'l-Islām*, first published in 1977, is another illustration of his continuous struggle to combine *fiqhī*, moral and spiritual Islamic traditions with modern ideas and social systems. It is not quite clear what would have motivated a scholar with a patrician background such as Ibn ᶜĀshūr to write such a book; what is clear, however, is that Tunisia, like the rest of the Arab world, was by then witnessing an Islamic revival in which the debate about the nature of

Islamic society featured very prominently.[62] His emphasis on the concept of the *umma* was perhaps a disguised challenge to Bourguiba's attempt to weaken Tunisia's attachment to the Arab and the Muslim worlds. In the first pages, Ibn ʿĀshūr states his purpose as being to discuss the relationship between religion and civil life in order to clarify to young generations of Muslims that Islam goes beyond issues of beliefs and *fiqhī* rulings.[63] *Uṣūl al-niẓām* is divided into three sections: the first deals with the nature of Islam as a religious system; the second discusses the Islamic approach towards reforming the individual; and the third, which makes up more than half the book, presents Ibn ʿĀshūr's vision of Islamic social reform. All in all, this is a book written in calm, deliberate language; its message, nonetheless, is unmistakable: modern state and society cannot be constructed in isolation from Islamic values. For Ibn ʿĀshūr, the permanent relevance of Islam lies in its congruity with the essence of human nature (*fitra*).[64] Thus, Islam is the religion of moderation and tolerance, aimed at achieving what is good for both the individual and society. Ibn ʿĀshūr affirms that the Prophetic Islamic experience was divided into two seminal stages, the Meccan and Medinan periods,[65] an understanding that was earlier advanced by the Egyptian Sayyid Quṭb.[66] During the Meccan period, the Prophet's aim was to reform and prepare the individual Muslim, while the construction of Islamic society would only begin in the Medinan period as a critical mass of Muslim individuals gathered in one place. This does not necessarily mean that Ibn ʿĀshūr subscribes fully to Quṭb's political vision, according to which the process of Islamisation, even fourteen centuries after the Prophetic era, was seen as the function of a dedicated organised body of Muslim activists. Rather, Ibn ʿĀshūr seems to argue that individual and social transformation are two intertwined and simultaneous processes.

On the level of the individual, he says, Islam seeks to reform man's system of belief and mode of work, as well as to correlate man's choices in life to an internal system of moral standards and motivations.[67] On the societal level, Islam's first task is to replace blood ties and primordial forms of association with the Islamic League (*al-jāmiʿa al-islāmiyya*);[68] only then can an Islamic political system emerge. The socio-political systems may be subsumed into two principal categories: the first is related to the laws that control social transactions, the most important purposes of which are to establish a moral society, social justice, and cooperation between the people. The second category is related to the laws that safeguard the well-being of the nation and defend it against decline and deviation by establishing equality and freedom, and protecting the Islamic domain through *jihād*, trade, international treaties, and the dissemination of Islam.[69] While the first category (the political art, as Ibn ʿĀshūr calls it) is linked to the inner motivations and values of the individual, the second is the function of the state and its instruments. It is clear that Ibn ʿĀshūr's vision of Islamic society is derived from his understanding of the Prophetic

experience. This vision, however, is highly idealistic, and almost nowhere does it try to delve into the complex interaction between the canonical text and historical reality: although he differentiates between the Meccan and the Medinan periods, Ibn ᶜĀshūr sees the purposes, features and characteristics of each period not as processes but as givens. But one of the most problematic dimensions of Ibn ᶜĀshūr's vision is his implied attempt to equate the traditional state and society with its modern counterpart. In fact, one might feel that it was perhaps Ibn ᶜĀshūr's consciousness of the fundamental differences between the socio-political systems of the Prophetic era and the modern state and society which made him lay more emphasis on the moral aspects of Islamic society than on elaborating the substantive nature of this society's institutions.

Where Ibn ᶜĀshūr's intellectual vigour is best illustrated is in his seminal work on *Maqāṣid al-sharīᶜa al-islāmiyya* (roughly 'The Ultimate Purposes of the Sharīᶜa'), first published in 1946.[70] Muslim jurists' search for organising themes, or a theoretical framework, to which the process of deriving *fiqhī* opinions from the sources of *fiqh* can be referred, has a long history. It was, however, the Andalusian jurist, Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq al-Shāṭibī (d. 790/1388) who presented the most developed work on the *maqāṣid*.[71] In the late nineteenth century, Muslim interest in *maqāṣid al-sharīᶜa* was renewed, especially in Arab-Islamic reformist circles. According to ᶜAbd Allāh Drāz (1894–1959), it was Muḥammad ᶜAbduh who encouraged him to edit and publish Shāṭibī's *Muwāfaqāt*, which became a major source for the modern Islamic debate on the *maqāṣid*.[72] For the early generations of Arab-Islamic reformists, the *maqāṣid* theory provided a new route for developing an Islamic legal outlook that is more responsive to modern developments in Islamic societies. The assumption that legal opinions should be linked to general purposes allows for a bigger role for reason in the *fiqhī* process and gives the modern jurist the freedom to revise and dissent from traditional *fiqhī* opinions.

Ibn ᶜĀshūr's entry into the debate about the *maqāṣid* illustrates how sharp and radical the reformists' arguments had grown by the mid-twentieth century. Describing *uṣūl al-fiqh* as inadequate and concerned largely with the technicalities of the *fiqhī* process, Ibn ᶜĀshūr argued that the *uṣūlī* rules failed to ascertain or serve the wisdom of the Sharīᶜa. Although it would be wrong to conclude that he wanted to dispense with *uṣūl al-fiqh*, Ibn ᶜĀshūr rejected the claim that the *uṣūlī* rules were certain (*qaṭᶜī*) and expressed his frustration over the wide diversity and contradictory nature of the *fiqhī* opinions.[73] By advocating the *maqāṣid* theory, he seems to look for greater certainty and conformity in the Islamic legal field, or, in other words, to define the certain purposes of the Sharīᶜa against which the validity of *fiqhī* opinions can be weighed.

Ibn ᶜĀshūr's work on *maqāṣid* is divided into three sections: the first attempts to establish the main premise behind the *maqāṣid* theory, that the Sharīᶜa is meant to accomplish specific purposes, and discusses why it is necessary for the jurist to recognise these purposes; the second looks into the purposes of the Sharīᶜa and their categories; and the third investigates the way the *maqāṣid* operate in the realm of transactions (*muᶜāmalāt*). This is a complex work that goes much further in elaborating the *maqāṣid* theory than Shāṭibī's *Muwāfaqāt* ever meant to go. What is important in terms of understanding Ibn ᶜĀshūr's outlook is, perhaps, three major points. First, in deriving the purposes of the Sharīᶜa from the primary sources of Islam, Ibn ᶜĀshūr holds that almost all rulings in the Qur'an or the Prophetic Sunna are reasoned. Only a limited number of rulings, related to individual acts of worship (*aḥkām taᶜabbudiyya*), are stated in the Qur'an without an elaborate reasoning.[74] Implied in this position, which represents an extreme opposition to the Ẓāhirī view of the Sharīᶜa, is the bestowal of ultimate responsibility for defining the law upon human reason. Second, by tending to search for the most common purposes of the Sharīᶜa, such as moderation, the maintenance of order, equality, freedom and the securing of the strength of the *umma* and its peace of mind, Ibn ᶜĀshūr seems to reflect the influence of modern world culture as well as a rational approach to sources of Sharīᶜa. Neither equality nor freedom, for example, are indicated specifically in the Qur'an as principal purposes of the Sharīᶜa;[75] but both are significant themes of the twentieth-century dominant culture. Third, while Ibn ᶜĀshūr's principal goal in seeking the *maqāṣid* is to bring a sense of certainty and conformity to the *fiqhī* process, the *maqāṣid* he proposes are still arrived at through human observation and deduction, making *maqāṣid* no more certain than other principles of *uṣūl al-fiqh*. Certainty and standardisation are, of course, major features of the twentieth-century human endeavour, and Ibn ᶜĀshūr, like the earlier generation of Arab-Islamic reformists, tended to view Islam through the prism of modern values. What he seemed to overlook is that *fiqh* is in essence about diversity and plurality.

Ibn ᶜĀshūr's Exegesis of the Qur'an

Ibn ᶜĀshūr's most formidable contribution to modern Islamic culture, his opus magnum so to speak, is his 30 volume exegesis of the Qur'an; it is also his last major work. The first volume of this daunting project, including a detailed introductory section and commentary on *Sūrat al-Fātiḥa* and the first *juz'* of the Qur'an, appeared in 1956;[76] however, the full work would only be published in 1970, indicating the length of time it took to be completed.[77] Known by its short title, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr* ('The Verification and Enlightenment')[78] is the culmination of a long life of Islamic learning and involvement in Islamic education and public life, the judiciary and the muftī-dom. Ibn ᶜĀshūr never explained why he decided to embark on the

task of writing an exegesis of the Qur'an at an advanced age; it seems, however, that by the mid-1950s he was hearing the call of history, and thought that only through engagement with the Qur'an itself could he put his reformist vision of Islam in a full and coherent manner. Whether designated by its long or short title, the very words *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr* suggest an attempt to enlighten the modern Muslim mind by constructing a new approach to the Islamic founding text. Although in writing his commentary on the Qur'an Ibn ᶜĀshūr made use of a large number of *tafsīr* books,[79] he is critical of the way in which many Qur'anic exegetes became captive to preceding works of *tafsīr*. The question of the extent to which Ibn ᶜĀshūr's work fulfils the promises of its title is an important one to answer.

The first volume of *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr* begins with ten introductory parts, in which Ibn ᶜĀshūr lays out his vision of *tafsīr* as a field of Islamic learning, and expounds the premises behind his own approach to the Qur'anic text. *Tafsīr*, Ibn ᶜĀshūr states, is 'the science (ᶜ*ilm*) of searching for the meaning of utterances and what may be derived from them, briefly or in detail'.[80] He is aware, however, that in considering *tafsīr* as such one has to stretch the limits of science. The problem arises from the connotations of the Arabic word ᶜ*ilm*, which indicates a holistic perception (*taṣawwur kullī*) or knowledge with a high degree of certainty (*taṣdīq*),[81] while *tafsīr*, as practised by Muslim scholars, deals with words and their meanings, and with knowledge in its partial sense. What is interesting in Ibn ᶜĀshūr's understanding of the nature of *tafsīr* is the emphasis he puts on the linguistic relationship between the text and its receiver. The Qur'an is not seen as a holistic structure of meaning, as became fashionable among the 'modern' Muslim scholars of the second half of the twentieth century,[82] but rather, and in a strict, traditional manner, as words and statements. This approach to the Qur'an would shape the whole project, illustrating Ibn ᶜĀshūr's mastery of the Arabic language and the secrets of its inner workings. Ibn ᶜĀshūr's emphasis on the linguistic aspect of the Qur'an does not mean that he restricts the tools required of the Qur'anic exegete to those relating to the realm of the Arabic language. Since Qur'anic Arabic is of divine origin, our connection with which is the Prophet, *tafsīr* cannot be practised without a profound knowledge of the Prophetic traditions.[83] This, however, does not make Ibn ᶜĀshūr a traditionalist exegete in the strictest sense. His position on the occasions of revelation (*asbāb al-nuzūl*), the other important instrument of *tafsīr*, and on the use of independent opinion (*raʾy*), provide glimpses into the reality of his attitudes. Although Ibn ᶜĀshūr admits that in a few cases knowledge of the *asbāb al-nuzūl* is necessary to comprehend the Qur'anic statement and grasp its inferences, he is clearly dismissive of its free use by scholars of *tafsīr*.[84] On the relevance of the *asbāb al-nuzūl* to the understanding of the text, he subscribes to the well-established principle of Islamic legal theory: the indicant (*al-dālla*) is in the generality of the utterance, not in the specificity of the occasion. He even goes so far as to suggest

that most of the accounts of *asbāb al-nuzūl* recorded in *tafsīr* traditions were invented.

One of the questions that has haunted the Islamic debate about *tafsīr* for centuries is the issue of *raʾy*, that is, whether it is permissible for the interpreter to use *raʾy*, or whether all approaches to the Qurʾan are bound by the Prophetic *aḥādīth*.[85] Conscious of the centrality of the *aḥādīth/raʾy* debate to the field of Qurʾanic *tafsīr*, Ibn ʿĀshūr dedicates the third introduction of *al-Taḥrīr waʾl-tanwīr* to clarifying his position on the debate. Like Alūsī in *Rūḥ al-maʿānī*, to which he frequently refers, he accepts *raʾy* as a means of Qurʾanic exegesis,[86] but he also states a number of reservations about the use of *raʾy*, without taking which into consideration the validity of *raʾy* may be seriously questioned. According to Ibn ʿĀshūr, *tafsīr biʾl-raʾy* should not rely on mere human conjecture but on a careful understanding of the Arabic language and the Sharīʿa; it should involve a full consideration of the verse and its textual context; it should not be an instrument to justify a preconceived idea or ideological doctrine; and it should always be conscious that the Qurʾanic text might be understood in various ways.[87] It is the last point in particular that singles out Ibn ʿĀshūr's *tafsīr* from the common Salafī view of the Qurʾanic text. The Salafī approaches to the Qurʾan can largely be located between two major views: one is associated with the Ẓāhirī school, led by the Andalusian jurist Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064), and the other is expressed by Ibn Taymiyya. For Ibn Ḥazm and the Ẓāhirīs, the Qurʾanic statement is always one-dimensional, embodying a single meaning and sustaining a single indicant, the apparent indicant.[88] Ibn Taymiyya, on the other hand, accepts that a Qurʾanic term can evince a variety of meanings, but not within a single statement.[89] From Ibn Taymiyya's standpoint, although the Arabic language is susceptible to a multiplicity of meanings, this multiplicity is not absolute and is always determined by the textual context.

In contrast to Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn ʿĀshūr asserts that the Arabic language is inherently rich with an abundance of meanings; hence, the exegete should approach the Qurʾanic narrative with the assumption that it is conducive to multiple meanings, each of which is relatively true.[90] Moreover, by holding that the Qurʾanic narrative could embody more than one possible meaning, Ibn ʿĀshūr was more inclined to accept the validity of non-orthodox approaches to the Qurʾan. *Tafsīr biʾl-ishārāt* (signs), which is associated with Ṣūfī treatments of the Qurʾan, is usually seen by orthodox scholars as a stark example of how dangerous the espousal of *raʾy* can be to the sanctity of the Qurʾan.[91] Yet, despite his rationalist/reformist background, Ibn ʿĀshūr's discussion of Ṣūfī *tafsīr* seems quite apologetic. He holds that the Ṣūfīs did not claim that their approach to the Qurʾan was a *tafsīr* proper.[92] By describing their insights into the Qurʾan as signs, not meanings, the Ṣūfīs are

seeking in the Qur'an a sort of simulation (*tamthīl*), or parable, of the moral and spiritual aims of their intellectual journey. It must be pointed out, however, that Ibn ʿĀshūr's reconciliatory projection of the Ṣūfī *tafsīr* does not extend to the extremist (*bāṭinī*) interpretation, which he rejects outright.

This fascination with the power of the Arabic language and its secrets, this subtle belief in the relativity of truth, and this conciliatory evaluation of the Ṣūfī approach to the Qur'an, make *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr* one of the least ideologically constructed works of *tafsīr* in the twentieth century. Compared with other influential twentieth-century works of *tafsīr*, such as Muḥammad ʿAbduh and Rashīd Riḍā's *Tafsīr al-manār* and Sayyid Quṭb's *Fī ẓilāl al-Qurʾān*, Ibn ʿĀshūr's work stands as thoroughly informative, temperate, detached and non-committal. One of the most important features of *Tafsīr al-manār* was its intent to bring the Qur'an close to the life of the community and to restore Islamic self-confidence, shaken by the challenge of modernity.[93] Quṭb, on the other hand, was an ideologue of Islamic revivalism, an activist with a sharp, uncompromising and clear political agenda, who saw in the Qur'an the ultimate frame of reference for a radical socio-political and cultural change in the post-independence, Arab-Islamic political order.[94] Ibn ʿĀshūr was neither; his fascination with the Arabic language embedded his interpretive approach in a pristine, seminal language, while his political disengagement made him see knowledge as a worthy pursuit on its own. He was no doubt deeply touched by the currents of the modern times, but modernity for him, or whatever traces of it he absorbed, was no longer an externalised object from which he could choose to incorporate or reject (as it was for ʿAbduh, fifty years earlier), but rather an internalised influence submerged in his subconscious. Perhaps the best illustration of his position and what he believed to be his contribution to the Qur'anic *tafsīr* can be found in his discussion of the purposes of his exegesis.[95] Instead of highlighting one or two major aims he intends to achieve, Ibn ʿĀshūr lists at least eight goals of his work, which encompass almost all objectives of the *tafsīr* tradition since the field took shape in the third century AH. What Ibn ʿĀshūr hopes to realise includes reforming the Islamic educational system, elucidating correct beliefs, defining Qur'anic law, clarifying the policy of the *umma*, explicating the history of ancient, extinct peoples, educating the Muslims with sound Qur'anic methods of proof and deduction, moral admonishment and warning, and elaborating the miraculous attributes of the Qur'an.

Given that the *maqāṣid* theory formed an important part of Ibn ʿĀshūr's understanding of Sharīʿa and *fiqh*, it is perhaps necessary to explore the influence that it exercised on his exegesis of the Qur'an, especially the Qur'anic verses that carried legal inferences. One example can be found in Ibn ʿĀshūr's treatment of Q. 5:6,[96] from which Muslim jurists derived the permission for the traveller and the

sick to resort to *wuḍūʾ* (cleansing in preparation for performing the prayer), when water is not available or its use is medically restricted, by *taymūm* (wiping the face and hands on something dry).[97] *Taymūm*, Ibn ʿĀshūr points out, is the only ruling in the Sharīʿa that is essentially symbolic and imagined rather than physical and material,[98] for cleansing by *taymūm* is not a real act of cleansing. Hence, the significance of *taymūm*, its purpose, is both to underline the ritual of cleansing and to highlight the great position that *ṣalāt* occupies in the Islamic system of worship. It is obvious that in his treatment of Q. 5:6, Ibn ʿĀshūr had to deduce what he believed to be the purpose of the Qurʾanic injunction through an analysis of the context, internal relationships and the overall outlook of the Sharīʿa. In other instances, he could locate the *maqāṣid* from within the Qurʾanic text itself. For example, when discussing Q. 29:45 (*Recite what is sent of the Book by inspiration to thee, and establish regular prayer ...*), Ibn ʿĀshūr indicates that the purpose of the Qurʾanic injunction of *ṣalāt* is in the following Qurʾanic statement (*... for prayer restrains from shameful and evil deeds*).

The cases of cleansing by *taymūm* and *ṣalāt* provide what one might call the minor purposes of the Sharīʿa, or what other jurists usually describe as the *ʿilla* of the injunction. But the *maqāṣid* theory was principally sought by Ibn ʿĀshūr, and other *maqāṣid* scholars, to define the *major* purposes and directions of the Islamic legal system. Yet only in a few positions put forward in *al-Taḥrīr waʾl-tanwīr* can we find illustrations of a fully-fledged employment of the *maqāṣid* methodology. Commenting on Q. 5:97, where the Qurʾan says, *Allah made the Kaʿba the sacred house, a standard for mankind ...*, Ibn ʿĀshūr suggests that the divine purpose behind making the Kaʿba the centre of worship for all Muslims is to form out of Ishmael's descendants, the Arabs, a nation with the necessary attributes to receive the concluding Sharīʿa.[99] Displaying unmistakable Arabist sentiments,[100] Ibn ʿĀshūr lists these attributes as: a high level of intelligence; a capacity for memorisation; a simple legal system and an undemanding mode of life; and a distance from ethnic hybridisation. The Kaʿba, furthermore, is the symbol of Islamic unity, the historical embodiment of goodness, and the illustration of the Muslims' response to the divine call.

Ibn ʿĀshūr's preoccupation with the *maqāṣid* runs through most of his *tafsīr* work. He sees in the Qurʾanic permission for polygamy a means for increasing the Muslim population and the expansion of the *umma*, as well as a protection for the female section of the society.[101] The permission for divorce, on the other hand, is a resort to the lesser of two harms, since the continuance of a troubled marriage would undermine quality of life and lead to the demise of the family institution.[102] Ibn ʿĀshūr's social instincts are shown in his commentary on several Qurʾanic verses in which he suggests that the Qurʾan calls for a society in which wealth is in a

permanent state of circulation, monopoly is opposed and regarded as illegal, social solidarity is an essential part of the moral fabric and the *umma* is collectively responsible for preserving its collective wealth and prosperity.[103] To what extent one can see in all of these instances a fulfilment of the *maqāṣid* theory's promise is perhaps difficult to answer; what is clear, however, is that only a few other Sunnī scholars of *tafsīr* before, or even since, have employed human reason in understanding the legal implications of the Qur'anic text on the scale demonstrated in Ibn ʿĀshūr's *tafsīr*. *Al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr* is a work that is almost entirely underpinned by the notion of *taʿlīl*, or the ability of human reason to grasp the legal connotations of the Qur'anic text.[104] In fact, Ibn ʿĀshūr's embrace of, and trust in, human reason is so visible that his reservations about the use of *raʾy*, made in the introduction of his work, appear largely irrelevant.

Ibn ʿĀshūr's theological views, however, show how uncertain he was about where to stand with respect to the Islamic debate about the role of reason. And it is here, in the perceptions of God, man and predestination, that we find some of the most startling contradictions of Ibn ʿĀshūr's ideational world. If Salafī and rationalist influences made considerable contributions to the shaping of Ibn ʿĀshūr's view of the Sharīʿa and law, his theological views represent a largely unexplained synthesis of Ashʿarī and Muʿtazilī doctrines. To be sure, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr* presents Ibn ʿĀshūr as a mild Ashʿarī, especially when his views are compared with the late Ashʿarī dogma as formulated by the influential Mālikīs Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥasan al-Laqqānī (d. 1041/1631) and Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Sanūsī (d. 895/1489).[105] Only rarely does Ibn ʿĀshūr display Muʿtazilī leanings, and even here he tries to shroud his opinion in Ashʿarī garb. In Ibn ʿĀshūr's theological vision, God is One, He is the Master of the universe, and His power is all embracing;[106] He is the First and the Last of all existence. But while the Salafī school usually avoids delving into the connotations of the ambiguous verses (*al-mutashābihāt*), Ibn ʿĀshūr does not refrain from proposing allegorical interpretations for such verses. For example, he describes *al-ẓāhir wa'l-bāṭin* ('the Evident and the Hidden') in Q. 57:3 as indicating the comprehensibility of the evidence for God's attributes while, at the same time, the impossibility of comprehending His essence and the detailed nature of His acts.[107] Like the majority of Ashʿarīs and Salafīs, Ibn ʿĀshūr affirms the divine attributes of being (such as existence and knowledge), the attributes of action (such as creating and providing), the attributes of meaning (such as hearing and seeing); but unlike the Salafīs, he refrains from affirming the corporeal attributes (*al-ṣifāt al-khabariyya*), such as the ear and hand of God. Commenting on Q. 51:47 (*We have built the firmament with hands, and We indeed have vast power*), Ibn ʿĀshūr allegorically explains the hands as might.[108] He similarly suggests that the Light in Q. 24:35 (*Allah is the Light of the heaven and earth*), is indicative of a corporeal and bounded substance, and should thus be understood in its allegorical sense, meaning that God

created everything that could be expressed as light, such as righteous knowledge and good deeds.[109]

The question of divine speech (*kalām*), which was perhaps the first to precipitate Islamic theological divisions and thus lends its name to the whole tradition of Islamic theology, is the subject of a lengthy discussion,[110] the occasion of which is Ibn ʿĀshūr's treatment of Q. 42:51, where the Qur'an says, *It is not fitting for a man that Allah should speak to him except by inspiration (waḥy) or from behind a veil (ḥijāb), or by the sending of a messenger to reveal, with Allah's permission, what Allah wills: for He is Most High, Most Wise.* This verse, Ibn ʿĀshūr states, elaborates the three ways by which God reaches out to His messengers: the first is by inspiration; the second is by speaking from behind a veil, that is, 'the creation of speech in an object that is veiled from the hearer'; and the third is by sending an angel to inform the prophet of revealed speech, which was the most common form of connection between God and His prophets. Throughout this discussion, Ibn ʿĀshūr's main goal seems to be to deny that *kalām* is an attribute of God. Neither the Qur'an nor the Sunna, he asserts, ever mentioned God as the speaker (*mutakallim*), or affirmed of Him an attribute that is *kalām*. He accepts, like all Ashʿarīs, that the Qur'an is the *kalām* of God; this *kalām*, however, is not of the essence of God but is rather created (*ḥādith*). Ibn ʿĀshūr's opposition to the Ḥanbalī/Salafī position on *kalām*, which he believes to be subversive of the concepts of divine unity and transcendentalisation, is inconspicuously clear; but his attempt to identify his own opinion with that of Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī,[111] and disassociate himself from the Muʿtazilī view, is obviously untenable.

Where Ibn ʿĀshūr uncompromisingly adheres to the Ashʿarī theology is in his discussion of divine will and predestination. Where the Qur'an speaks of the will of man and the will of God (*But ye will not except as Allah wills, for Allah is full of Knowledge and Wisdom*, Q. 76:30), he sees that whatever man wills, in any situation and at any time, is entirely contingent upon the will of God.[112] To avoid appearing as a predestinationist, he underlines the fact that the verse speaks of two separate wills, the will of man and that of God. But his real escape from a predestinationist position is in his embrace of the Ashʿarī concept of *kasb*, or acquisition, which has been the object of sharp Salafī refutations and accusations of being a disguised predestinationism (*jabriyya*).[113] To be sure, Ibn ʿĀshūr's view of man's responsibility and the divine will seems to be as confused and critically thin as that of Ashʿari *kasb* has been judged to be by its critics. Ibn ʿĀshūr never explains what exactly he understands from the concept of *kasb*, and for a while seems to hover between late Ashʿarī fideism, the Muʿtazilī belief in man's freedom and responsibility for his acts, and the middle-of-the-road Salafī proposition that man's

responsibility stems from the power instilled in him, by God, to decide his own fate and choose his act.

In the end, however, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr* is neither a work of *fiqh* nor one of theology; it is simply a work of *tafsīr*. Reflecting a profound awareness of the Qur'an as the founding text of almost all branches of Islamic culture, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr* does not refrain from dealing with theological and *fiqhī* issues, but it does so in a brief and transparent manner. Its focus is essentially the exposition (the *bayān*)[114] of the text itself, not the exegete's a priori agenda. And it is here, in Ibn ʿĀshūr's overall approach to the Qur'anic text (the *naṣṣ*), that we find the influence of the Salafī methodology. While in great Muʿtazilī and Ashʿarī works of *tafsīr*, such as Zamakhsharī's *al-Kashshāf* and the *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb* of Rāzī,[115] the exegete seems to employ his commentary on the Qur'an as a vehicle to expound his own philosophical and theological views, Ibn ʿĀshūr's concern is the text and its *bayān*, and the construction of an accessible bridge between the reader and the *naṣṣ*. As a matter of rule, Ibn ʿĀshūr goes directly to the *naṣṣ*, and only rarely does he lose sight of it. *Fiqhī* and theological discussions are encountered throughout the pages of *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, and they cannot always be attributed to a single *madhhab* or a school of thought, but they are there as a natural and logical outcome of the *bayān*, a *bayān* for which a formidable arsenal of linguistic erudition is utilised. Ibn ʿĀshūr, nonetheless, does not accept the whole Salafī methodology, at least as it was advanced by Ibn Taymiyya and his disciple, and renowned exegete of the Qur'an, Ibn Kathīr.[116] By defending the role of *raʾy* in understanding the Qur'an, Ibn ʿĀshūr made it clear that he would not restrict the tools of the exegete to reports attributed to the Prophet and his companions (as the early Salafīs called for). To this position he adhered throughout his work.

Conclusion

As an *ʿālim*, Ibn ʿĀshūr was the product of three circles of influences: his aristocratic family background, the institution of the Tunisian *ʿulamāʾ* with which he was associated to the last days of his working life, and the turbulent times of imperialism, modernisation and national independence. These circles, although separate and distinctive in their origins, would soon overlap and act interactively upon the life of Ibn ʿĀshūr. The institution of the Tunisian *ʿulamāʾ* in which he was trained had been going through a period of change even before he joined Zaytūna, and as the process of change accelerated Ibn ʿĀshūr became a key element in this process. His criticism of the old methods and of the substance of Islamic education was, in the manner of ʿAbduh and Riḍā, aimed at responding to the challenge of modernisation brought about by the rise of the European powers and the colonial administration, as well as maintaining the relevance of Islam and the *ʿulamāʾ* to

changing Islamic societies. But unlike ᶜAbduh and Riḍā, Ibn ᶜĀshūr belonged to a highly privileged family whose social status and ties to the ᶜulamāʾ class were intertwined.

For several generations, the ᶜĀshūrs had been producing some of the most prominent ᶜulamāʾ of the city of Tunis and becoming a leading, influential and well-connected family. Ibn ᶜĀshūr had, therefore, to tread carefully between expressing his reformist attitudes and maintaining the family's position and privilege. Ironically, while the reformist impetus was engendered by the Western challenge, the family's interests could not be safeguarded without cooperating with the governing authorities in the country: Ottoman, French or post-independence nationalist. His balancing act marked his outlook with a sense of ambivalence and intellectual uncertainty. It has already been noted that the Arab Salafī-reformists found a natural ally in the reformist colonialist. The truth, however, is a bit more complex, for the Arab-Islamic reform movement manifested itself in the early part of the twentieth century in different forms and choices. Muḥammad ibn ᶜAbd al-Karīm al-Khattabī (d. 1964)[117] in the Moroccan Rīf and ᶜIzz al-Dīn al-Qassām (1883–1935)[118] in Palestine were both students of the Salafī-reformist movement and radical anti-imperialists at the same time. Even Rashīd Riḍā became a bitter enemy of the Anglo-French occupation during the interwar period. What seems to have determined Ibn ᶜĀshūr's relations with the French and the Bourguiba regimes was perhaps the social rather than the intellectual.

In fact, Ibn ᶜĀshūr's socio-political choices seem to have undercut his own belief in the righteousness and legitimacy of his intellectual choices, concluding in a feeling of failure and disappointment at the direction towards which Bourguiba was taking the country. Ibn ᶜĀshūr's attempt at reforming Zaytūna was neither bold enough nor was it prepared to tolerate the disruptive consequences of the reforming process, his belief in a just social system was never expressed clearly enough, his critique of traditional Islamic theology left no impact on his own approach to the questions of theology, and he seems to have been unsure about what to do with his revolutionary revival of the *maqāṣid* theory. When he wrote his final and major work of Qur'anic exegesis, he was so overburdened by the contradictions of his career that he could only find solace in the idea of pure knowledge. No other work of *tafsīr* produced in the twentieth century was more refined in its linguistic style than *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, yet, in a time of grand ideologies and colliding visions of change and reform, no other work of *tafsīr* was less committed to a socio-political or intellectual message. *Al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr* was in a sense a reflection of the ᶜālim's withdrawal from a repudiated and disagreeable world to the origin of all things, the founding text, where he could find his ultimate solace.

One, however, should not underestimate the power of tradition in Ibn ʿĀshūr's environment and within his own self. Compared to Cairo, Damascus and Baghdad, where *madhhabī* diversity and Salafī currents always existed, the Tunisian Islamic cultural environment was quite dominated by Mālikī *fiqh* and Ashʿarī theology; even the officially recognised Ḥanafī presence was largely marginal. Ibn ʿĀshūr was not only a product of a highly conservative institution, but was also supposed to be one of its faithful guardians. Furthermore, in the face of sweeping winds of change such as those experienced by Tunisia during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, conservative attitudes could paradoxically become more conservative, and calls for reform could unreservedly be seen as betrayal. Still, no one can easily dismiss the impact of Ibn ʿĀshūr's work on the Islamic intellectual scene in Tunisia, and on modern Islamic thought in general. The growing interest in him is self-evident. For many Tunisians, he has come to embody the possibility of achieving Islamic reform from within, and producing a version of Islam that corresponds to the demands of modern times. For modern Muslims in general, he is seen to have succeeded, single handedly, in reviving the juristic debate about *maqāṣid*, which had long been sidelined.

NOTES

1 M. Talbi, art. 'Ibn ʿĀshūr' in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 3, p. 720.

2 For short biographies of Ibn ʿĀshūr, see Muḥammad Maḥfūẓ, *Tarājim al-muʾallifīn al-Tūnisiyyīn* (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1985), vol. 3, pp. 304–9; al-Ṣādiq al-Zammarlī, *Aʿlām Tūnisiyyūn*, tr. Ḥamadī al-Sāhilī (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1986), pp. 361–7.

3 Ḥusayn Khūja, *al-Dhayl li-kitāb bashāʾir al-īmān*, ed. al-Ṭāhir al-Maʿmūrī (Tunis: al-Dār al-ʿArabiyya li'l-Kitāb, n.d.), pp. 281–5.

4 Maḥfūẓ, *Tarājim*, vol. 3, pp. 300–4.

5 Muḥammad ibn Abī Ḍiyāf, *Itḥāf ahl al-zamān bi-akhbār mulūk Tūnis wa-ʿahd al-zamān* (Tunis: al-Dār al-ʿArabiyya li'l-Kitāb, 2001), vol. 8, pp. 165–7.

6 Maḥfūẓ, *Tarājim*, vol. 3, pp. 355–8.

7 On Aḥmad Bey and his reformist policy, see Leon Carl Brown, *The Tunisia of Ahmad Bey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974).

8 Magali Morsy, *North Africa 1800–1900* (London: Longman, 1984), p. 185.

9 Ibn Abī Ḍiyāf, *Itḥāf ahl al-zamān*, vol. 3, pp. 240–4.

10 Jamil M. Abu-Nasr, *A History of the Maghrib in the Islamic Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 278.

11 On Khayr al-Dīn al-Tūnisī's career and his book, see Albert Hourani, *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age, 1798–1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 84–95.

12 Khayr al-Dīn al-Tūnisī, *Aqwām al-masālik fī maʿrifat aḥwāl al-mamālik* (Tunis: Official Press, 1867), p. 5.

13 Abu-Nasr, *A History of the Maghrib*, pp. 285–9; Hourani, *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age*, pp. 85–7.

14 Tūnisī, *Aqwām al-masālik*, Appendix.

15 Arnold H. Green, *The Tunisian Ulama: 1873–1915* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), pp. 111–17.

16 Green, *The Tunisian Ulama*, p. 121.

17 Maḥfūẓ, *Tarājim*, vol. 2, pp. 77–81.

18 Ibn Abī Ḍiyāf, *Ithāf ahl al-zamān*, vol. 4, pp. 65–74.

19 Muḥammad ibn al-Khūja, *Taʾrīkh maʿālim al-tawḥīd fī'l-qadīm wa-fī'l-jadīd* (Tunis: al-Matbaʿa al-Tūnisiyya, 1934), p. 40.

20 Green, *The Tunisian Ulama*, pp. 33–4.

21 Originally, the Shaykh al-Islām was the highest-ranking muftī-ʿālim of the Ottoman Sultanate; Aḥmad Bey's introduction of the title to the hierarchy of the Tunisian ʿulamāʾ is indicative of his intention to assert Tunisia's independence. On the Tunisian Shaykh al-Islām, see Mohamed Bel Khodja, 'Le Cheik el Islam a Tunis' in *Congrès de l'Afrique du Nord tenu à Paris du 6 au 10 Octobre, compte rendu travaux* (Paris: Depince, 1909), vol. 2, pp. 405–12.

22 The Mālikī *madhhab* was the dominant *madhhab* in Tunisia; leading families in the capital city of Tunis and the coastal region, however, followed the Ḥanafī *madhhab*, the spread of which was associated with Ottoman rule. For the history and diffusion of the Mālikī *madhhab* in Tunisia and North Africa in general, see Christopher Melchert, *The Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law, 9th–10th Centuries C.E.* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 156–63; and David S. Powers, *Law, Society and Culture in the Maghrib, 1300–1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 11–12.

23 Green, *The Tunisian Ulama*, pp. 129–35.

24 Green, *The Tunisian Ulama*, p. 142.

25 Green, *The Tunisian Ulama*, pp. 143–6.

26 Maḥfūẓ, *Tarājim*, vol. 3, p. 304; Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir ibn ʿĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb* (Tunis: al-Dār al-Tūnisiyya li'l-Nashr, 1967), pp. 9ff.

27 Muḥammad al-Nayfar, *ʿUnwān al-arīb ʿammā nashaʾa bi'l-mamālīk al-Tūnisiyya min ʿālim adīb* (Tunis: al-Matbaʿa al-Tūnisiyya, 1932), vol. 2, pp. 187–91.

28 On the Khaldūniyya and its role in the Tunisian cultural and nationalist movements, see Green, *The Tunisian Ulama*, pp. 165–8; Ibn ʿĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb*, pp. 101–13; al-Ṭāhir ʿAbd Allāh, *al-Ḥaraka al-waṭaniyya al-Tūnisiyya: ruʾya shaʿbiyya qawmiyya, 1830–1956* (Sussa: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1990), pp. 32–3.

29 Zammarlī, *Aʿlām Tūnisiyyūn*, pp. 63–70; Maḥfūẓ, *Tarājim*, vol. 4, pp. 41–4.

30 Lord Cromer, *Modern Egypt* (London: Macmillan, 1908), vol. 2, pp. 179–80.

31 Ibn ʿĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb*, p. 247.

32 Makhlūf, *Shajarat al-nūr*, p. 1687. See, also, David D. Commins, *Islamic Reform: Politics and Social Change in Late Ottoman Syria* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

33 Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā, *Taʾrīkh al-ustādh al-imām al-shaykh Muḥammad ʿAbduh* (Cairo: Matbaʿat al-Manār, 1931), vol. 1, pp. 380–1.

34 On ʿAbduh's second visit to Tunisia, see Green, *The Tunisian Ulama*, pp. 183–5; Muḥammad al-Fāḍil ibn ʿĀshur, *al-Ḥaraka al-adabiyya wa'l-fikriyya fī Tūnis* (Tunis: al-Dār al-Tūnisiyya li'l-Nashr, 1970), pp. 74–6.

35 On Ibn Taymiyya, see Henri Laoust, *Essai sur le doctrines socials et politiques de Taki-d-Dīn ibn Taimiya* (Cairo: Institut Français d'Archeologie, 1939); Muḥammad Abū Zahra, *Ibn Taymiyya: ḥayātuhu wa-ʿaṣruhu wa-fiqhuhu* (Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-ʿArabī, 1991).

36 Ibn ʿĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb*, p. 249.

37 On the controversy that erupted over ᶜAbduh's fatwas, see Malcolm Kerr, *Islamic Reform: The Political and Legal Theories of Muhammad Abduh and Rashid Rida* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), p. 145.

38 See *al-Manār* 6 (1904), pp. 927–38; Riḍā, *Ta'rīkh al-ustādh al-imām*, vol. 1, p. 717.

39 Green, *The Tunisian Ulama*, p. 185.

40 On Ibn Bādīs and the Algerian Jamᶜiyyat al-ᶜUlamā', see Ali Merad, *Le Reformisme Musulman en Algérie de 1925 à 1940* (Paris: Martan, 1967), p. 338; Turkī Rabīḥ, *al-Shaykh ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd bin Bādīs* (Algiers: al-Sharika al-Waṭaniyya li'l-Tawzīᶜ, 1970); Turkī Rabīḥ, *al-Taᶜlīm al-qawmī wa'l-shakhṣiyya al-waṭaniyya* (Algiers: al-Sharika al-Waṭaniyya li'l-Tawzīᶜ, 1975).

41 On the Young Tunisians, see Leon Carl Brown, 'Stages in the Process of Change', in Charles A. Macaud, L.C. Brown and C.H. Moore, *Tunisia: The Politics of Modernization* (London: Pall Mall Press, 1963), pp. 22–37; Nicola Ziadeh, *Origins of Nationalism in Tunisia* (Beirut: American University of Beirut, 1962), pp. 73–83; Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *al-Ḥaraka al-adabiyya*, pp. 88–90.

42 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb*, pp. 249–53; Green, *The Tunisian Ulama*, pp. 211–12 and pp. 214–17.

43 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *al-Ḥaraka al-adabiyya*, p. 98; Ziadeh, *Origins of Nationalism in Tunisia*, p. 78; Green, *The Tunisian Ulama*, pp. 217–18.

44 On the founding of the Destour Party, see Abu-Nasr, *A History of the Maghrib*, pp. 355–6; Brown, 'Stages in the Process of Change', pp. 38–45. On Thaᶜālibī, see ibid. and Khayr al-Dīn al-Ziriklī, *al-Aᶜlām* (Beirut: Dār al-ᶜIlm li'l-Malāyīn, 1989), vol. 4, pp. 12–13.

45 Norma Salem, *Habib Bourguiba, Islam and the Creation of Tunisia* (London: Croom Helm, 1984), pp. 93–7.

46 ᶜAbd Allāh, *al-Ḥaraka al-waṭaniyya*, pp. 57–8.

47 Abu-Nasr, *A History of the Maghrib*, p. 361; Salem, *Habib Bourguiba*, pp. 81–93.

48 Mukhtār al-ᶜAyyāshī, *al-Bī'a al-Zaytūniyya* (Tunis: Dār Turkī, 1990), pp. 270–3.

49 Habib Bourguiba, *Ḥayāti, ārā'i, jihādi* (Tunis: Ministry of Information, 1978), p. 72.

50 On the Law of Personal Status, see Charles A. Micaud, 'Social and Economic Change' in C.H. Micaud, L.C. Brown and C.H. Moore, *Tunisia: The Politics of Change*, pp. 145–9; ᶜAbd al-Razzāq al-Hamāmī, '*Jadaliyyāt al-taqlīdiyyīn wa'l-taḥdīthiyyīn ḥawla majālat al-aḥwāl al-shakhṣiyya*' in ᶜAbd al-Jalīl al-Tamīmī (ed.), *al-Ḥabīb Bourguiba wa-inshā' al-dawla al-waṭaniyya: qirā'a ᶜilmiyya li'l-Bourguibiyya* (Zaghwan: Mu'assasat al-Tamīmī li'l-Baḥth al-ᶜIlmī, 2000), pp. 75–86, esp. p. 77.

51 Micaud, 'Social and Economic Change', pp. 149–59, esp. p. 156; ᶜAlī al-Zaydī, '*Iṣlāḥ al-taᶜlīm al-Tūnisī ᶜām 1958: min al-taᶜrīb ilā nāqidihi*' in ᶜAbd al-Jalīl al-Tamīmī (ed.), *al-Ḥabīb Bourguiba wa-inshā' al-dawla al-waṭaniyya*, pp. 101–22, esp. p. 119.

52 For a list of his works, see Maḥfūẓ, *Tarājim*, pp. 307–9; Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *al-Ḥaraka al-adabiyya*, pp. 202–3.

53 See, for example, Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā, *al-Manār wa'l-Azhar* (Cairo: Matbaᶜat al-Manār, 1353 AH).

54 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb*, p. 117.

55 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb*, p. 121.

56 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb*, p. 127.

57 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb*, pp. 177ff.

58 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb*, pp. 205ff.

59 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb*, p. 209.

60 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb*, pp. 225–6.

61 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb*, p. 227.

62 For an earlier attempt to present an Islamic view of social justice, see Sayyid Quṭb, *al-ᶜAdāla al-ijtimāᶜiyya fī'l-Islām* (Cairo: Lajnat al-Nashr li'l-Jāmiᶜiyyīn, 1949).

63 Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir ibn ᶜĀshūr, *Uṣūl al-niẓām al-ijtimāᶜī fī'l-Islām*, 2ⁿᵈ edn (Tunis: al-Sharika al-Tūnisiyya li'l-Tawzīᶜ, 1985), pp. 1–2.

64 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *Uṣūl al-niẓām al-ijtimāᶜī*, p. 22.

65 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *Uṣūl al-niẓām al-ijtimāᶜī*, p. 103.

66 Ibrahim M. Abu-Rabiᶜ, *Intellectual Origins of Islamic Resurgence in the Modern Arab World* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996), pp. 172–9.

67 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *Uṣūl al-niẓām al-ijtimāᶜī*, pp. 45–90.

68 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *Uṣūl al-niẓām al-ijtimāᶜī*, pp. 104–15.

69 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *Uṣūl al-niẓām al-ijtimāᶜī*, p. 122.

70 Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir ibn ᶜĀshūr, *Maqāṣid al-sharīᶜa al-islāmiyya*, 3ʳᵈ edn (Tunis: al-Sharika al-Tūnisiyya li'l-Tawzīᶜ, 1988).

71 On Shāṭibī and the *maqāṣid*, see Muhammad Khalid Masud, *Shāṭibī's Philosophy of Islamic Law* (Islamabad: Islamic Research Institute, 1995); Wael ibn Hallaq, *A History of Islamic Legal Theories* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 162–206. For a partial comparison between Ibn ᶜĀshūr's and Shāṭibī's methodology, focusing on their approaches to the discovery of the purposes of the Sharīᶜa, see ᶜAbd al-Majīd ᶜUmar al-Najjār, *Fuṣūl fī'l-fikr al-islāmī bi'l-Maghrib* (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1992), pp. 139–62.

72 See Drāz's introduction to Muḥammad Ishaq al-Shāṭibī, *al-Muwāfaqāt*, ed. ᶜAbd Allāh Drāz (Beirut: Dār al-Maᶜrifa, 1996), vol. 1, p. 16.

73 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *Maqāṣid*, pp. 5–8. Ibn ᶜĀshūr's *Maqāṣid* has recently become a focus of growing intellectual interest. The book itself has been republished with a long introduction by Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir Misāwī as *al-Shaykh Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir ibn ᶜĀshūr wa-kitābuhu Maqāṣid al-sharīᶜa al-islāmiyya* (al-Baṣāʾir: n.p., 1998). The most scholarly study of Ibn ᶜĀshūr's theory of *maqāṣid*, however, is Ismāᶜīl al-Ḥasanī, *Naẓariyyāt al-maqāṣid ᶜinda'l-imām Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir ibn ᶜĀshūr* (Herendon, Virginia: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 1995).

74 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *Maqāṣid*, pp. 44–8.

75 Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *Maqāṣid*, pp. 95–100 and pp. 130–5.

76 Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr: al-muqaddima wa-Sūrat al-Fātiḥa wa-juzʾ ᶜamma* (Tunis: Dār al-Kutub al-Sharqiyya, 1956).

77 Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir ibn ᶜĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr* (30 vols. Tunis: al-Sharika al-Tūnisiyya li'l-Tawzīᶜ, 1970). The reference here is to a later, undated edition, published by al-Dār al-Tūnisiyya li'l-Nashr (Tunis) and al-Dār al-Jamāhīriyya li'l-Nashr wa'l-Tawzīᶜ wa'l-Iᶜlān (Tripoli, Libya).

78 The short title was chosen by Ibn ᶜĀshūr himself. The original, longer title was *Tahrir al-maᶜnā al-sadīd wa-tanwīr al-ᶜaql al-jadīd min tafsīr al-kitāb al-majīd* ('Verification of the Sound Meaning and Enlightenment of the New Mind in the Exegesis of the Glorious Book'). See Ibn ᶜĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 1, pp. 8–9.

79   Including Zamakhsharī's *al-Kashshāf*, Ibn ʿAṭiyya's *al-Muḥarrar al-wajīz*, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*, Bayḍāwī's *Tafsīr*, and Shihāb al-Dīn al-Alūsī's *Rūḥ al-maʿānī* (Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 1, p. 7).

80   Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 1, p. 11.

81   According to ʿAlī Muḥammad ibn al-Sharīf al-Jirjānī, *Kitāb al-Taʿrīfāt*, ed. ʿAbd al-Munʿim al-Ḥifnī (Cairo: Dār al-Rashad, 1991), p. 177, *ʿilm* is the 'certain knowledge reflecting the reality'.

82   Mustansir Mir, 'The *Sura* as a Unity: A Twentieth Century Development in Qur'an Exegesis', in G.R. Hawting and Abdul-Kader A. Shareef (eds), *Approaches to the Qur'an* (London: Routledge, 1993), pp. 211–24.

83   Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 1, pp. 18–27.

84   Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 1, pp. 46–50.

85   On the early Islamic debate about the employment of independent opinion in the exegesis of the Qur'an, see Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Dhahabī, *al-Tafsīr wa'l-mufassirūn* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, n.d.), vol. 1, pp. 255–87.

86   Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-Alūsī, *Rūḥ al-maʿānī* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1985), vol. 1, p. 39. On Alūsī and his exegesis of the Qur'an, see Basheer M. Nafi, 'ʿAbu al-Thanaʾ al-Alusi: An Alim, Ottoman Mufti, and Exegete of the Qur'an', *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 34 (2002), pp. 465–94.

87   Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 1, pp. 29–30.

88   On Ibn Hazm and the Ẓāhirī school, see I. Goldziher, *The Zahiris: Their Doctrine and Their History*, trans. Wolfgang Behn (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971); Anwār Khālid al-Zuʿbī, *Ẓāhiriyyat Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalūsī* (Amman: al-Maʿhad al-ʿAlamī li'l-Fikr al-Islāmī and Dār al-Bashīr, 1996).

89   On Ibn Taymiyya's understanding of language and the text, see Ibrāhīm ʿUqaylī, *Takāmul al-manhaj al-maʿrifī ʿinda Ibn Taymiyya* (Herendon, Virginia: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 1994), pp. 127–74. See, also, M.A.S. Abdel Haleem, 'Context and Internal Relationships: Keys to Qur'anic Exegesis', in G.R. Hawting and Abdul-Kader A. Shareef (eds), *Approaches to the Qur'an* (London: Routledge, 1993), pp. 71–98.

90   Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 1, pp. 93–100.

91   On the Ṣūfī methodology of *tafsīr*, see al-Shaḥḥāṭa al-Sayyid Zaghlūl, *al-Itijāhāt al-fikriyya fī'l-tafsīr* (Alexandria: al-Hayʾa al-Miṣriyya al-ʿĀmma li'l-Kitāb, 1975), pp. 230–6; Dhahabī, *al-Tafsīr wa'l-mufassirūn*, vol. 2, pp. 237–78.

92   Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 1, p. 34.

93   ʿAbd Allāh Maḥmūd Shahāda, *Manhaj al-imām Muḥammad ʿAbduh fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān al-karīm* (Cairo: Cairo University Press, 1984), pp. 173–6; M.W. Watt, *Introduction to the Qur'an* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997), p. 73.

94   On Quṭb and his approach to the Qur'an, see Abu-Rabiʿ, *Intellectual Origins*, pp. 92–219.

95   Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 1, pp. 38–45.

96   *O ye who believe! When ye prepare for prayer, wash your faces, and your hands (and arms) to the elbows; rub your heads (with water); and (wash) your feet to the ankles. If you are in a state of ceremonial impurity, bathe your whole body. But if ye are ill, or on a journey, or one of you cometh from privy, or ye have been in contact with women, and ye find no water, then take for yourselves clean sand or earth and rub therewith your faces and hands. Allah doth not wish to place you in difficulty, but to make you clean, and to complete His favour to you, that ye may be grateful.*

97 Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 5, p. 65.

98 Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 6, p. 132.

99 Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 7, p. 57.

100 For other strong Arabist sentiments, where he expresses resentment over the rise of Persian influence on Islamic culture during the early ʿAbbāsid period, see Ibn ʿĀshūr, *A-laysa al-ṣubḥ bi-qarīb*, pp. 29–30.

101 Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 4, p. 227.

102 Ḥasanī, *Naẓariyyāt al-maqāṣid*, p. 166.

103 See, for example, Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 3, pp. 46–7; vol. 4, p. 235; vol. 15, p. 78; vol. 28, p. 85.

104 Cf. Alūsī, *Rūḥ al-maʿānī*, vol. 26, pp. 89–90, where Alūsī identifies the principle of *taʿlīl* with the Salafī outlook.

105 See, for example, Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Sanūsī, *Sharḥ Umm al-barāhīn fī ʿilm al-kalām*, ed. Muṣṭafā al-Jamarī (Algiers: al-Muʾassasa al-Waṭaniyya li'l-Kitāb, 1989); Ibrāhīm al-Bājūrī, *Sharḥ jawharat al-tawḥīd*, ed. Muḥammad al-Kilānī and ʿAbd al-Karīm Taṭṭān (Damascus: n.p., 1971).

106 Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 30, pp. 609–21.

107 Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 27, pp. 359–63. On the different Islamic conceptualisations of the deity, see L. Gardet, art. 'Allāh' in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 1, pp. 406–17.

108 Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 27, pp. 15–16. See, also, vol. 1, pp. 682–3; vol. 26, pp. 157–60.

109 Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 18, pp. 230–3.

110 Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 25, pp. 140–50. On the early Islamic debate about *kalām* as an attribute of God, see W. Montgomery Watt, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oneworld, 1998), pp. 242–5 and pp. 280–5.

111 At least on the question of divine speech, the Ashʿarī position, even in its late formulation, is closer to the Salafī/Ḥanbalī views. See, for example, Sanūsī, *Sharḥ Umm al-barāhīn*, pp. 37–8. For Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī's declaration of his adoption of Ibn Ḥanbal's position, see Abū'l-Ḥasan ʿAlī al-Ashʿarī, *al-Ibāna ʿan ʿuṣūl al-diyāna*, ed. F.H. Maḥmūd (Cairo: Dār al-Anṣār, 1977), vol. 2, pp. 20–1.

112 Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Taḥrīr wa'l-tanwīr*, vol. 29, pp. 412–5. See, also, vol. 25, pp. 38–9.

113 On the late Ashʿarī concept of *kasb*, see ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Jurjānī, *Sharḥ al-mawāqif li-ʿAḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī*, ed. M. Badr (Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Saʿāda, 1907), vol. 8, p. 48; Sanūsī, *Sharḥ Umm al-barāhīn*, pp. 53–4 and pp. 76–8. See also George Makdisi, 'Ashʿarī and Ashʿarites in Islamic Religious History', *Studia Islamica* 17 (1962), pp. 37–80, and 18 (1963), pp. 19–39. For a major Salafī critique of the concept of *kasb*, see Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Shifāʾ al-ʿalīl* (Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, n.d.).

114 On *bayān*, see Jurjānī, *Kitāb al-Taʿrifa*, pp. 56–7.

115 On Zamakhsharī and Rāzī and their methods of interpretation, see Zaghlūl, *al-Itijāhāt al-fikriyya*, pp. 144–216; Dhahabī, *al-Tafsīr wa'l-mufassirūn*, vol. 1, pp. 290–5, pp. 429–76; Muḥammad al-Fāḍil Ibn ʿĀshūr, *al-Tafsīr wa-rijāluhu* (Cairo: Majmaʿ al-Buḥūth al-Islāmiyya, 1970), pp. 46–88.

116 See, on Ibn Taymiyya's vision of Qur'anic exegesis, Taqī al-Dīn ibn Taymiyya, *Muqaddima fī uṣūl al-tafsīr* (Damascus: Maṭbaʿat al-Taraqī, 1939). On Ibn Kathīr's approach to the Qur'an, see Dhahabī, *al-Tafsīr wa'l-mufassirūn*, vol. 1, pp. 45–53, pp. 242–7.

117 See Mohamed El Mansour, 'Salafis and Modernists in the Moroccan Nationalist Movement' in John Ruedy (ed.), *Islamism and Secularism in North Africa* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994), pp. 53–71; C.R. Pennell, *A Country with a Government and Flag: The Rif War in Morocco, 1921–1926* (Cambridgeshire, England: MENAS Press, 1986).

118 See Basheer M. Nafi, 'Shaykh ʿIzz al-Dīn al-Qassām: A Reformist and Rebel Leader', *Journal of Islamic Studies* 8:2 (1997), pp. 185–215.