



The Quranic Discourse: Between the Authority of the Text and the Limits of Interpretation - Central Structure or Semantic Imperialism?

Tebtoub sadjia

Tabtoub.sadjia@yahoo.fr

Laboratory of Pragmatic Approaches, Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University- Setif2

Khettou zohra

khettou2023@gmail.com

Abu El Kassim Saadallah University, Bouzaréah – Algeria

Abstract:

This research paper aims to uncover the functional mechanisms used in strategies for reading and receiving Quranic discourse by comparing the reading and reception of both discourses: the exegetical discourse, representing the traditional discourse, and the contemporary interpretative discourse. It represents a modern reader's experience with Quranic discourse to elucidate the ideological backgrounds and references that guide the reader in the process of understanding, which can either lead to construction or deconstruction. This exploration is based on the duality of the fixed and the variable and highlights the nature of the relationship between the reader and the discourse: is it a relationship of desire and connection or rebellion and separation?

Keywords: Quranic discourse, act of reading, interpretation, text authority, semantic openness.

DOI Number: 10.48047/nq.2023.21.7.nq23024

NeuroQuantology2023;21(7):238-248

238

1. Introduction: The Quranic discourse constitutes a tightly structured and governing linguistic framework through which the human intellect shapes its vision, thoughts, beliefs, and moral behavior. It is a monotheistic religious framework that calls for the humanization of humanity, placing the human intellect as a balanced and guiding entity. The methods of the Quranic framework revolve around contemplation and the elevation of reason, as well as the call for monotheism and the pursuit of valid questions, rather than their deception, as some readings and interpretations seek to do. These interpretations load the Quranic discourse with erroneous concepts and promote the humanization of the discourse itself instead of the humanization of humanity, leading to the deception of questions and their corruption.

Reading and interpreting Quranic discourse have been the central focus of both traditional and modern Arab studies because it constitutes the primary element in shaping the Arab intellect and awareness. It serves as a dominant and influential authority over all human discourses, forming an interactive and communicative process. Through Quranic discourse, the universe is conceived, and its reality is continuously renewed through a proper understanding of the world and its predominant interpretation. The process of interpretation is a mean to guide Quranic discourse with the intention of understanding it and achieving the purposes of Allah Almighty. However, it can also be a tool for distorting it and loading it with concepts that do not serve its message or humanity. This is the aim of modern hermeneutics, where it seeks to empower the interpreting self to approach this sacred discourse, deconstruct it, and humanize it as a closed linguistic structure.



Since the words of the Quran are carefully chosen and suggestive, characterized by a high degree of coherence and regularity, they embody the Quran's ability to open up to interpretation and free it from the constraints of its linguistic and literal structure. Its dominant power is evident through conscious reading, which appreciates its miraculous nature and delves into the secret of its organization. This interactive reading engages fully with its language without deviating from it. Thus, its interpretations and expressive meanings, representing shades of its meanings, remain subordinate to the authority of Quranic discourse because its authority stems from its Creator, the Almighty.

The traditional interpretative reading (as found in exegesis texts) seeks to address the following questions:

1. What does the discourse precisely say? What is its specific meaning? When does the transition from the apparent meaning to the intended deeper meaning occur?
2. How does the Quranic discourse simultaneously maintain a closed structure while remaining open to interpretations? What are the effective guidelines for approaching this sacred discourse without overstepping its authority and without violating or dismantling its linguistic structure?

However, the problem with modern hermeneutical interpretation lies in the divergence of meaning from the fixed and unified linguistic structure of Quranic discourse by the reader, as well as its openness to the imperialism of interpretation, evidence, and humanization.

2. The interpretative process forms the foundation of the relationship between the reader and the text: Since the Quranic discourse is a unique and non-repetitive form of communication, unlike any other discourse, as it was revealed once and will not be repeated, it possesses the qualities of inimitability, sanctity, and dominance over all forms of discourse. Consequently, reading and interpreting it necessitate taking into account the act of interpretation as a linguistic phenomenon in which the Quranic discourse reconciles what the text requires, i.e., what the apparent linguistic structure entails, and what is demanded by the evolving events of life. This is achieved through the reader's exploration of the hidden meanings embedded within the text's context.

From the outset of its revelation, the Quran has been associated with the idea of embodying concepts and simplifying and elucidating closed meanings by transforming abstract mental concepts into practical scientific applications that manifest in the behavioral reality of the recipient. This involves simplifying the meanings of verses and clarifying what may be implicit in them through two main processes: exegesis and interpretation, based on the nature of the discourse/text itself (Mufleih bin Abdullah, 2011, pp. 31/32).

Perhaps the context here does not allow for delving into the linguistic differences and terminological definitions of the two terms due to the differing contexts in which each term is used. It suffices here to provide a definition for each that serves the nature of the research.

When speech focuses on the apparent meaning, the intention is exegesis. When it goes beyond the apparent meaning to the non-apparent meaning or from one meaning to multiple meanings, the aim is to convey a meaning that is not immediately apparent. This is considered interpretation, not in the terminology of later scholars, but it can also be included in the concept of exegesis according to the terminology of early scholars (Aft Al-Sharqawi, 1980, p. 136). This is because the process of interpretation is a mental process that seeks to grasp the hidden or ambiguous meaning or to direct the most suitable meaning for the context when the evidence has multiple interpretations and meanings (Mufleih bin Abdullah, 2011, p. 43).

Based on the above, the research has chosen the term "interpretation" because it highlights the nature of the relationship between the reader and the discourse through their conflict over centrality and authority, which is not the case with exegesis.

3. The Quran between the Boundaries of Text and the Horizons of Discourse:

Perhaps the most fundamental question that comes to mind is:

- Should we say "Quranic text" or "Quranic discourse"?

Arab-Islamic culture has been characterized by its oral tradition related to the novel, which distanced it from written texts for a considerable period before the Quranic text was specifically documented. The Quran's immense significance lies in its association, among people of different backgrounds and social statuses, with the auditory and oral aspects, linked to its recitation, intonation, and memorization, more than its connection to writing. This could make it closer to the concept of discourse, whose linguistic meanings align more clearly with its terminological meanings. These meanings evolved within the context of interaction between interlocutors, relying on strategies of persuasion and influence within the cultural and social context, unlike the linguistic meanings of the term "text" (Yahya Baitaish, 2005/2006, p. 312).

On the other hand, it appears that scholars of Islamic jurisprudence use the terms "text" and "discourse" interchangeably. An example of this can be found in Al-Amidi's (d. 631 AH) definition of legal rulings: "When the meaning of discourse is understood, it is more appropriate to say in Islamic jurisprudence that it is the discourse of the legislator with beneficial legal implications. Thus, when we say the legislator's discourse, it is a qualification specific to his discourse, and the second qualification is specific to his discourse by excluding what does not carry a legal benefit, such as reporting statements and sensory perceptions, and the like. This is a clear and uncontested distinction" (Al-Amidi, 1986, Vol. 1, p. 132).

It is noteworthy that the term "discourse" was more common among the scholars of Islamic jurisprudence (Usul al-Fiqh), as discourse was the cornerstone and solid ground on which their work was based. Therefore, "legal discourse" refers to the legal texts from the Quran and the Sunnah. In general, legal discourse can be divided into verbal and situational, as categorized by Az-Zarkashi in his work "Al-Bahr Al-Muhit" (1/102). Verbal discourse includes explicit statements like "establish the prayer," while situational discourse specifies the timing and conditions, such as "perform the Dhuhr prayer when the sun has passed its zenith." This distinction is important because it clarifies whether Quranic discourse refers to the meanings conveyed by the Quran in terms of concepts, content, presentation, and indication, in which case it goes beyond the Quranic text itself, or if it specifically means the Quranic text itself (Marhoof Abdul Jabbar Saqa, "MultaqatAhl al-Tafsir," 1, cited from the website: <http://www.tafsir.net/vb/tafsir14172>).

Based on the previous discussion, the research has favored the term "discourse" over the term "text." "Text," as noted by Said Yaktine, does not provide a definitive answer to reality but rather disperses in front of it, penetrating the realms of knowledge, ideology, and politics with no limits to its interpretations (Said Yaktine, 1989, p. 49). On the other hand, "discourse" remains open to endless possibilities, with no boundaries to its interpretations. "Discourse" is characterized by its self-contained and self-referential nature, as it is studied in and for itself, and what distinguishes it is the absence of any external reference. It refers only to itself, and itself is the transmitted reference at the same time (Said Yaktine, 1989, p. 58). Consequently, it conveys the meanings of continuity, communication, and movement, which is the case with the Quran, declaring itself as a living and ever-renewed discourse. The processes of understanding and interpretation related to it have not

been completed yet, and they will never be. It is a discourse whose generosity is constantly renewed, never freezing or running dry, but instead providing each era with what suits and befits it.

As for the position of the sentence within the Quranic discourse, ancient Arab thinkers did not treat linguistic expressions as isolated subjects of study disconnected from their context. Instead, they considered them a central component of the complete communication process. This process included the recognized elements of discourse, such as the roles of the speaker and the audience, in addition to the discourse itself. For these Arab thinkers, the discourse was not limited to the elements present and interacting during the act of communication but also encompassed the broader conditions of production. They identified two main positions within discourse: a direct position that conveys a narrow meaning and an indirect position that conveys a broader meaning.

For example, Al-Shatibi (d. 790 AH) in his book "Al-Muwafaqat" stressed the need to take into account the linguistic, social, and historical customs and characteristics of the era when interpreting the Quranic verses. Similarly, Al-Ghazali (d. 505 AH) in his book "Al-Mustasfa" highlighted the importance of paying attention to the customs and intentions of the speakers (Al-Mutawakil, 2006, p. 207).

It is evident that, according to the ancient Arab linguists, especially scholars of Usul and Tafsir, addressing the central and sacred text (the Quran) is not merely through individual words or sentences but through complete and unaltered texts. They viewed the text as a unified and integrated communicative unit, and they considered it necessary to specify, restrict, and detail some parts of it in relation to others (Al-Mutawakil, 2006, p. 208).

A more accurate understanding of the meanings and interpretations of the Quranic text is fundamentally based on the consideration of linguistic (structural and phonetic) and contextual (semantic and pragmatic) components in the processes of exegesis and interpretation. This understanding is not achieved through a single sentence, even if it is linked to its contextual dimensions and regarded as a partial discourse rather than a complete one.

4. The Quranic Discourse Between Traditional and Modern Readings:

The interpretation and exegesis of the Quranic discourse have been a central focus of research and study, both historically and in modern times. This is because the Quranic discourse plays a pivotal role in shaping Arab intellectual thought and awareness. Scholars of this discourse have diverged into two main groups: one advocating for traditional readings, and the other supporting the modern interpretation project, each with its own criteria and justifications.

4.1 The Heritage of Reading and Understanding the Quranic Discourse: The Arabic language serves as a common medium between the Quranic discourse, which is the founding entity, and the reader, who interprets it. The Quranic discourse is intricately tied to the Arabic language, and its linguistic miracle reinforces the central structure of this language. This linguistic authority declared itself as the dominion of understanding, possessing the reins of interpretation and exegesis, effectively extending its dominance through interpretation and exegesis.

This linguistic miracle and linguistic uniqueness have made the Quranic discourse an open linguistic structure for reading and interpretation, characterized by semantic richness, rebellious vitality, and central authority within discourse. It is a linguistic structure that remains open to reading and interpretation, defying categorization and serving as a linguistic miracle. "The speech of the Quran and the speech of all people are equal in their Arabic affiliation, pronunciation, and structure. However, the Quran differs from the speech of all people in its composition... It differs in all its compositions from all the compositions of all people, and therefore, comparing one to the other is an inaccurate comparison because they do not rely on the same standards of composition. Thus, the

Quran forms a third, unique pattern that is incomparable and non-reproducible alongside colloquial discourse and literary discourse". (Munther Ayashi, 2013, p. 140).

This uniqueness has made it a subject of significant attention and scholarly inquiry by Islamic scholars. It has received considerable theoretical and practical attention, with substantial efforts devoted to its interpretation. These efforts have yielded a blessed wealth of scientific knowledge and given rise to various methodological sciences that serve the Quranic discourse in all its aspects. These sciences include the principles of jurisprudence (Usul al-Fiqh), the science of Quranic exegesis (Tafsir), Quranic sciences (Ulum al-Quran), hadith studies (Ulum al-Hadith), and other fields that support understanding and guide the jurisprudence of the text/discourse while providing regulations for examining the rulings of the Quran.

Quranic scholars have established rules that adhere to the laws of language in communication, relying on the concept of address (takhattub). They have exerted strong authority over the reader of the text and anyone seeking to interpret it by solidifying the model's authority in interpretation and exegesis. This model was thoroughly practiced by Imam Shafi'i (d. 204 AH) on both the reader and the interpreter of the Quranic texts, making it a comprehensive model.

Imam Shafi'i emphasized the importance of knowledge of the Arabic language in deriving Islamic legal rulings. Therefore, he obligated both the interpreter and the interpreter's audience to have a precise understanding of the language, including its structure and derivations. Ignorance of the linguistic tools is considered the primary obstacle to extracting rulings and comprehending the purposes and objectives. Imam Shafi'i stated, "No one knows the clarity of the book's knowledge except one who is knowledgeable about the Arabic language, its many facets, the multitude of its expressions, and the distinction between its meanings, and one who knows it will be immune from doubts that may affect those who are ignorant of its language" (Imam Shafi'i, n.d., p. 50).

Similarly, al-Zarkashi (d. 794 AH) emphasizes the importance of linguistic sciences in the process of interpretation. He states, "The apparent meaning of interpretation follows the path of learning the language, which is necessary for understanding. There must also be extensive listening because the Quran was revealed in the Arabic language. Thus, referring to their language is necessary, and knowing it or knowing most of it is essential" (Al-Zarkashi, 1988, Vol. 2, p. 171).

These statements highlight the significance of linguistic rules in reading the Quranic discourse and the importance of the linguistic structure in the process of interpretation. Interpretation, in this context, means that the Quranic discourse can carry more than one meaning. Scholars of exegesis expressed this multiplicity of understanding through the duality of the apparent (dahir) and hidden (batin) meanings. The apparent meaning, according to them, can be understood with a good command of the Arabic language and the acquisition of linguistic knowledge. However, for the hidden meaning, mere knowledge of the Arabic language and the collection of narrations and their reconciliation is not sufficient. It requires thinking, contemplation, reflection, and derivation because understanding the apparent meaning alone is not enough to comprehend the implicit meanings and subtle underlying purposes (Muflih bin Abdullah, 2011, pp. 87/88). This acknowledgment implies that the authority of the reader, whether an interpreter or an audience, in relation to the Quranic discourse, as recognized by traditional scholars, is subject to the authority of the text. For the interpreter or reader to reach an understanding of the implied, indirect meaning of the uttered discourse, they must first establish a firm understanding of the apparent, direct meaning expressed through the linguistic content of the statement.

2.4 The Modern Interpretive Approach to the Quranic Discourse: Several interpretive approaches have emerged in contemporary Arab Islamic culture, seeking to interpret the Quranic discourse using

new and unconventional Western methodologies that differ from the approaches taken by ancient interpreters. These traditional scholars worked to bridge the gap between the Creator's discourse and the created, employing various sciences and logical and philosophical knowledge for this purpose.

In contrast, a modernist approach to Quranic interpretation has emerged, aiming to break free from scientific constraints, discard the governing rules of interpretation, and allow the meaning to reside within the text itself, not limited by the established boundaries of interpretation as found in the books of Islamic jurisprudence and Quranic sciences (See: Muhamed Benamur, 28/03/2016, 02:06, In: <file:///C:/Users/hp/Desktop>).

One of the significant interpretive trends utilized in contemporary Arab Quranic interpretation is hermeneutics. Hermeneutics provides space for individual identities to engage in the process of understanding without limitations or conditions, making preconceived judgments, prior conceptions, and the openness of the self to the subject the determinants of the understanding process (Mufleih bin Abdullah, 2011, p. 157).

The problematic aspect of the emergence of modernist/hermeneutic interpretation can be traced back to its philosophical and dialectical nature within the religious and theological framework. Most of its issues are established within the context of interpreting sacred texts and rebelling against the authority of the church concerning the freedom to read the sacred text. When contemplating the concept of discourse and its fields of practice, one can understand that contemporary interpretive lessons have been dynamic, striving to explore the nature of discourse to expand the horizons of its meaning. Hermeneutics, therefore, represents "a cognitive approach that seeks to reveal procedural ways that determine the hidden and apparent relationship simultaneously, linking the interpreting recipient with the text as a discourse waiting to be interpreted and with the absent author present in his text, which falls within the sovereignty of the reader" (Ameesh Abdelkader, 2003, pp. 120/121).

This modern reader-oriented approach to the Quranic discourse has successfully entered the realm of Quranic interpretation in recent decades. It has practiced its methodologies comfortably by using the term "interpretation" instead of "hermeneutics." This choice was made because the term "interpretation" is more familiar in Islamic culture. Notable figures in this approach include Muhammad Arkoun in his critique of Islamic thought, Hassan Hanafi in his stance on the Quranic text, Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd in his modernist reading of the Quranic text, and others (Mufleih bin Abdullah, 2011, p. 157).

Supporters of this approach view the Quranic discourse as a text with a linguistic structure and a closed system that embodies the energy of the text and the author, even though the author is absent. Conversely, there is another energy, the energy of the interpreting self, which, through the act of reading, absorbs the energy of the text and integrates it into its cognitive and cultural knowledge (Ameesh Abdelkader, 2003, p. 289).

Moreover, the modernist interpretive approach openly declares that the proper way to read the Quranic discourse, understand its meanings, and discern its purposes is through a reading that liberates itself from the weight of tradition, is devoid of strict principles, and moves beyond the constraints that ancient interpreters adhered to. The new methodological necessity requires bypassing all the cultural heritage produced by scholars, theologians, and journalists over an extended history (See: Muhamed Benamur, /03/2016, 02:06, In: <file:///C:/Users/hp/Desktop>).

Supporters of the hermeneutic approach argue that the Quran is a written text established outside the framework of traditional methods and the sanctity of the text. They argue that the Quran should be granted the freedom to open up to multiple meanings and surplus meanings, liberating it

from the centrality of its linguistic structure and its overwhelming authority. Consequently, this energy shifts to the interpreting self, stripping away the controls and links to the authority of its creator (Ameesh Abdelkader, 2012, p. 65).

In summary, proponents of this modernist approach rely on three main readings to support their interpretive project, as outlined below (Nour Abdel-Rashid, Volume 3, Number 1, 2015, p. 72):

Here are translations of the three approaches mentioned:

1. The Plan of Humanization: This approach aims to remove the barrier of sanctity by transferring Quranic verses from their divine setting, which is distinct from the norm, to a relative and limited human setting. It does this by equalizing the status of divine discourse and human discourse, transforming the Quran into an ordinary linguistic text. This leads to the Quran gaining independence from its source and becoming open to interpretation due to its perceived incompleteness.

2. The Plan of Archeologization: This approach primarily seeks to eliminate the barrier of authority. It does so by linking legislative Quranic verses, especially in their environmental, temporal, and contextual circumstances. This makes the Quranic discourse akin to other historical discourses, refuting the claim that the Quran encompasses all knowledge. It asserts that the Quran mainly addresses inner, emotional, and sensory morality.

Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd summarized these two plans by saying, "Religious texts, whether divine or human, are governed by fixed laws. The divine source of religious texts does not exempt them from these laws. These texts have evolved since their manifestation in history and language, directed towards humans in a specific historical context. They are subject to the dialectic of permanence and change, being fixed in expression yet evolving in meaning. Conversely, the act of reading is also governed by the dialectic of concealment and revelation." (Nacer Hamid, 1995; p. 08)

3. The Plan of Rationalization: This approach aims to remove the barrier of the unseen by engaging with Quranic verses using modern methodologies and theories. It grants authority to reason in analysis and criticism, resulting in a shift in the concept of revelation, recognition of inconsistencies within the Quranic text, and the overcoming of verses that conflict with contemporary rationality, especially the concept of miracles.

5. Boundaries and Regulations of Quranic Interpretation: Effective interpretative processes are only achieved through conscious reading that fully engages with the language and central authority of Quranic discourse. Regardless of the horizons a reader aspires to in interpretation, the multiplicity of meaning and the imperialism of signification remain subject to the authority of the Quranic discourse and the sacred linguistic structure (Amish Abdulqadir, 2012, 94). This is because the authority of Quranic discourse stems from its Creator, Allah, the Most High.

This can only be accomplished through a set of regulations governing the interpretative process. Scholars of Islamic jurisprudence and exegesis have established rules and regulations that they deemed capable of ensuring a serious interpretation of Quranic discourse while supporting the principles of Sharia and respecting reason (Mufleh bin Abdullah, 2011, 83). Even if these regulations may not always provide the best interpretations, they can at least identify deviant interpretations and incorrect understandings.

These regulations can be divided into linguistic and intellectual criteria. Linguistic criteria encompass various linguistic rules relied upon by linguists and interpreters in the interpretation of Quranic discourse. This is because the Quran has been understood and continues to be understood in accordance with Arabic linguistic norms and the methods employed by Arab speakers. Scholars have also emphasized the need to reconcile the Quranic wording with the principles of correct belief

so that the interpretative process does not deviate from linguistic requirements or conflict with beliefs (Mufleh bin Abdullah, 2011, 83/84).

The intellectual criteria consist of non-linguistic and conceptual conditions. These criteria were emphasized due to the understanding that relying solely on linguistic logic is insufficient for theological interpretation, which is related to the divine essence. Therefore, it was acknowledged that intellectual evidence must be added to linguistic analysis to interpret the meaning based on reasoning and evidence (Mufleh bin Abdullah, 2011, 85).

Scholars of Islamic jurisprudence made significant efforts to establish a set of conditions that interpreters must adhere to in order to safeguard their thinking from errors and pitfalls. Al-Amidi summarized the regulations of interpretation by stating: "The wording should be open to multiple interpretations, with the possibility of it being applicable to what it has been diverted from and the evidence that diverts the wording from its apparent meaning should be stronger in favor of the wording appearing in its intended meaning. Otherwise, it should be considered likely that the wording is dominant, not diverting, or consensually accepted.

If it is equivalent to the appearance of the wording in signification, it should fluctuate equally between the two possibilities, and this should not be considered as interpretation... Depending on the strength or weakness of its appearance and its balance, interpretation must be conducted accordingly" (Al-Amidi, 1986, Vol. 2, p. 199).

Al-Amidi was fully knowledgeable about the concept of interpretation, and his intellectual prowess is evident in his extensive knowledge. This underscores the reading competence of scholars of Islamic jurisprudence and exegesis by establishing boundaries and regulations for the interpretative process.

6. The Quranic Discourse and the Problem of Modern Interpretation: Understanding the Quranic discourse and interpreting it in the light of Western linguistic theories, as well as contemporary critical readings, such as deconstruction and hermeneutics, is a risky endeavor fraught with pitfalls and dangers. Misunderstanding could lead to the distortion of Quranic meanings. This is because the modern reading approach or the interpretative approach that delves into the Quranic discourse - whether as a text or a closed linguistic structure - calls for challenging its established authority, which dominates all forms of discourse. It also calls for breaching the immunity of the Quranic text by undermining the principle of its reference in Quranic texts, invalidating the authority of the exegesis books and undermining trust in them.

The danger of this problem lies in the fact that it is not an innocent reading practice. It is a modern reading that actively seeks to confront and deconstruct the Quranic discourse, treating it as a closed linguistic structure, detached from its creator and the context of its production. It treats it as if it were a mute and deaf structure isolated from its context. These readings also aim to dismantle this linguistic structure from within by humanizing the procedural interaction, surpassing the sanctity of the Quran, and viewing it on equal terms with human discourse (Abdulqader Amish, 2012, 94).

Researcher Abdulqader Amish believes that the concept of reader-based interpretation can only be realized through the liberation of the interpreted text and the reader, leading them to a state of spiritual and cultural coexistence. Reader-based interpretation is based on the principles of conjecture and semantic estimation. It seeks to uncover the meaning that the text or discourse refuses to explicitly reveal. In doing so, reader-based interpretation expands the horizons of meaning, extending the boundaries of the text.

Critical interpretation aims to strengthen the reader's position and empower them with regard to the Quranic text. It grants the reader legitimacy in possessing and realizing the Quran, but

this principle does not align with the nature and specificity of the Quranic discourse (Abdulqader Amish, 2012, 66). The Quranic discourse is characterized by its central reference; Allah is the sender, and the Quran is the word of Allah revealed to the Messenger of Allah, Muhammad (peace be upon him). It carries all His attributes and His infinite nature, unlike other types of discourse that impose some contemporary theories such as the death of the sender once the work is completed and it is revealed to the receivers (Mufleh bin Abdullah, 2011, 17).

The general conclusion reached regarding the failure of modern approaches in reading and interpreting the Quranic discourse is that these are incomplete projects. They seek to "move the Quran from its divine space into the human realm and immerse it in the open, relative reading spaces that taint texts with a state of semantic fragmentation, obscurity, and complexity" (Mufleh bin Abdullah, 2011, 176). This view is supported by the acknowledgments of two moderate Orientalists who emphasized the impossibility of studying the Quranic text using modern approaches. The first acknowledgment is by Maurice Bucaille, who said, "Through a careful study of the Arabic text, I realized that the Quran does not contain any statements that can be criticized from the perspective of modernity" (Maurice Bucaille, cited in Mufleh bin Abdullah, 2011, 175).

As for the second acknowledgment, it comes from the French Orientalist Roger Arnaldez. He pointed out that Muslim scholars were able, through their concepts, to animate and revitalize the Quranic texts with their interpretations to such an extent that it is difficult for us today, even in the name of the humanities, to find anything new in them other than what they have already found! Therefore, contemporary Muslims who borrow Western methodologies to study the Quran would be more appropriate if they adhered to the methodologies of their ancient predecessors. These methodologies lead them with precision to extract and deduce from the Quranic verses what these methodologies, belonging to the humanities, lead them to (Mufleh bin Abdullah, 2011, 175). The truth is that contemporary Arab secular discourse studies the Quranic text/discourse (both reading and interpretation) using the same mechanisms and concepts as those of Orientalist discourse. It treats faith as a sacred inspiration, and this is a form of evasion.

7. The Importance of Linguistic Tools and Context in Conscious Quranic Reading: Interpretations of Quranic discourse are primarily based on conscious free reading, which represents the highest form of evidence and inference. Interpretation relies not on pre-existing value judgments but on subjecting the text/discourse to predefined criteria for engaging with it. This conscious reading strives to understand the speech of the Divine in the Quran by immersing in its recitation and contemplating its meanings. The pinnacle of artistic enjoyment is not achieved through strict standards and methodologies but through a deep passion for this sacred discourse in its entirety and its comprehensive nature, as well as understanding the secrets of its structure and striking eloquence. The Quran was initially written to be recited, not just interpreted or criticized, as exemplified by the Quranic verse, "**Read in the name of your Allah who created**" (Al-Alaq: 1).

Recognizing that the essence of language lies in the sounds that every people use to express their purposes (Ibn Jinni, 1999, Vol. 1, p. 33) underscores the importance of pronunciation in the learning process and, consequently, in interpretation. Acknowledging that previous heavenly messages were conveyed through reception and reception relies fundamentally on pronunciation, as stated in the Quran: "**And Allah spoke to Moses with [direct] speech**" (An-Nisa: 164), we can extract a fundamental rule for teaching Arabic, as well as for reading, receiving, interpreting, and explaining Quranic discourse. This rule is based on the spoken word and then the written word, which means

listening and reading, and then writing. Listening is well-known as the cornerstone of linguistics (Ammar Sassi, 2009, pp. 91/92 - paraphrased).

From this perspective, it is understood that scholars of interpretation and Islamic jurisprudence began their approach to reading and interpreting the Quran by focusing on the spoken linguistic structure. In contrast, proponents of modernist interpretation started from the written text, attempting to remove the Quran from its divine realm and place it in the labyrinth of open relative reading, which taints texts with a state of semantic fragmentation.

Regarding the drawbacks of modernist interpretative readings, "Cutting a part of a text or discourse necessarily means demolishing the structure of this text or discourse. It is necessarily and consequentially a demolition of the architecture of understanding, which is based on this structure. Thus, it is safe to say that we cannot talk about understanding without discussing context or without constructing a linguistic fence and a linguistic environment" (Munther Ayashi, 2013, p. 258). This applies to Quranic discourse, which does not accept the practice of deconstruction and reconstruction through modernist interpretation, as the interpreting reader encounters significant challenges, both in terms of knowledge and belief, especially when dealing with hidden meanings or issues of abrogation and similarity in the wise verses.

Therefore, linguistic proficiency of the reader, their doctrinal reference, as well as the linguistic, textual, and contextual aspects of Quranic verses are all prerequisites that enable the interpreting self to grasp the essence of understanding and extract hidden meanings. The Quran can only be understood correctly and interpreted properly by considering its context and discerning its legislative purposes.

It has become clear that between the discourse and the context in which it is placed, there exists a mutual relationship, each presupposing the other's presence. Each Quranic discourse establishes its context and defines words, phrases, texts, or speeches within it. Reading a Quranic word isolated from the sentence in which it appears, reading a sentence isolated from the text in which it is found, and reading the text without considering the presupposed context within it are all practices that hinder understanding and dissipate the Quranic meaning. They render reception futile. Therefore, since the context constitutes the environment of the text, reception involves semantic navigation within this environment (Munther Ayashi, 2013, p. 259). This calls for imperialism, away from the centralization of linguistic structure imposed by the authority of the discourse.

8. Conclusion: The task of the interpretative process of the Quranic discourse lies in the ability to question the silence of the hidden meaning that exists beyond the apparent meaning. This involves a set of inferential processes that are necessitated by the reader's culture in the quest for the purpose of the discourse. It transforms the Quranic discourse from the realm of the written and fixed to the spoken, variable, and renewing.

In summary, the problematic issue does not lie in the Quranic discourse's susceptibility to interpretation but rather in the reader's personality, reality, and ideological reference that seeks to undermine the sacred linguistic system and make its authority subordinate to that of the interpreter. This contradicts the Quran itself. How can one justify stripping the Quranic discourse of its linguistic and non-linguistic context (the reasons for revelation) while the interpreter does not relinquish their reference and culture, even if their culture has Western philosophical roots and theological beliefs that conflict with the Quranic reference?

Another issue stemming from proponents of the modern hermeneutical approach is the avoidance of humility and insistence on maintaining their interpretation as the dominant authority. The intention behind these new interpretative approaches was not innocent; they aspired to elevate

themselves above the sanctity of the Quran, diminish its influence in time and space, and treat this divine discourse, which is a consistent and harmonious revelation, as similar and homogeneous with texts produced and created by humans. Such an approach is unacceptable and will not be accepted.

References:

- The Holy Quran.

- Works:

- Al-Amadi, Ali bin Muhammad. "Al-Ihkam fi Usul al-Ahkam." Edited by Sayyid al-Jamili. Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi, Beirut, Lebanon, 1986.
- Al-Mutawakkil, Ahmed. "Al-Manhoo al-Wadhihi fi al-Fikr al-Lughawi al-Arabi: al-Usulwa al-Imtidad." Dar al-Aman, Rabat, Morocco, 2006.
- Ibn Junayi, Abu al-Fath Othman. "Al-Khasais." Edited by Muhammad Ali al-Najjar. Egyptian General Authority for Books, Egypt, 1999.
- Al-Zarkashi, Badr al-Din Muhammad bin Abdullah. "Al-Burhan fi Ulum al-Quran." Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyah, Beirut, Lebanon, 1988.
- Al-Saeed, Yaqteen. "Tahlil al-KhitabwaInfitah al-Nass." Arab Cultural Center, Casablanca, Beirut, Lebanon, 1989.
- Al-Sharqawi, Aft al-Humania fi A'mal al-Mufassirin." Dar al-Nahda al-Arabiya, Beirut, Lebanon, 1980.
- Ammar, Sassi. "Al-Lisan al-ArabiwaQadaya al-Asr: Ru'yahIlmiyyah fi al-Fahm, al-Minhaj, al-Khasais, al-Talim, al-Tahlil." Alam al-Kutub al-Hadith, Irbid, Jordan, 2009.
- Amish, Abdelkader. "Al-AdabiyyaBaynTurathiyat al-FahmwaHadathat al-Ta'wil: Muqarabah Naqdiyya li Maqool al-Qawlinda Abi Hayyan al-Tawhidi." Dar al-Adib, Egypt, 2003.
- Amish, Abdelkader. "Al-KhitabBayn Fa' al-TathbitwaA'lamat al-Qiraa: Markaziyyat al-Bunyah wa Amberyaliyyat al-Dalalah." Dar al-Amal for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution, New City, Tizi Ouzou, 2012.
- Al-Shafi'i, Muhammad bin Idris. "Al-Risalah." Edited by Abdul Salam Harun. Dar al-Jeel, Beirut, Lebanon, latest edition.
- Miflah bin Abdullah. "Al-Khitab al-QuraniwaQadaya al-Ta'wil." Dar al-Khaldunia, Algeria, 2011.
- Munther Ayashi. "Al-Quran wa al-Talqi: Min al-I'jazwa al-MajazIla al-Ishtirakwa al-Kharafa." Alam al-Kutub al-Hadith, Irbid, Jordan, 2013.
- Nasr Hamed Abu Zaid. "Naqd al-Khitab al-Dini." Madbouly Library, Egypt, 3rd edition, 1995.

Articles:

- Noor Abdul Rashid. "Mqaarabah al-Tasawwarat al-Muassasahlil-Mafhoom al-Khitab al-Qurani." Halawiyat al-Adabwal-Lughat, Faculty of Literature and Languages, Mohammed Boudiaf University, M'sila, Volume 3, Number 1, 11/15/2015.

University Theses:

- Yahya Baitish. "Toward a Functional Theory of Arabic Grammar." Doctoral thesis in Modern Functional Linguistics, Mentouri University, Constantine, 2005/2006.

Internet Sources:

- Muhammad bin Amar bin Taher. (03/28/2016). "Al-Tawiliyat al-JadidahwaQira'at al-Nass al-Qurani." Ahl al-Tafsir Forum. Retrieved from: [Website](file:///C:/Users/hp/Desktop), accessed on (01/06/2021).
- Marhaf Abdul JabbarSuqa. (2014). "Naqul Nass Qurani Am KhitabQurani?" Ahl al-Tafsir Forum, p. 1. Retrieved from: [Website](http:// www. tafsir. net/ vb/ tafsir14172), accessed on (05/14/2014).