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Abstract

Muḥammad ʻIzzat Darwazah, a contemporary exegete, dates the Ikmāl āya using new methods and analyses. Relying on the first āyas of the Sūrat al-Mā‘īda (The Food) and its order of revelation based on his reliable list, he puts emphasis on concomitant revelation of the first three āyas shortly after Ḥudaybiya peace treaty. In spite of the majority of exegetes, he considers that the Ikmāl āya has a general content without referring to a specific cause of revelation. His method of exegesis shows that his disagreement with Shi‘a on the date of revelation of the Ikmāl āya has its roots in his theological presumptions. Nevertheless, his viewpoint may be criticized based on many traditions of Fariqayn on the Sūrat al-Mā‘īda in its being ākhārū mā nazal and the causes of revelation of the Ikmāl āya, as well as the completely different context of the various parts of the third āya and some controversial arguments of Darwazah.
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Introduction
From the advent of Islam up to now, various methods of explanation of the divine words have been selected by Quran researchers. One of these methods is historical exegesis. The exegetes who adopted this method interpret every āya considering its place and time of revelation. They consider the possibility of dating the Quran as one of its unique features compared to other scriptures.

Accepting the possibility of dating the text of the Quran and revelation of its units based on the situation and requirements of the period of prophet’s mission makes clear the importance of its dating, since these requirements are considered circumstantial evidences of the Quran without which the divine word would not be understood properly and clearly. In contrast, paying attention to the order of revelation of the āyas and sūras can remove most of exegetical differences. A further advantage of ordering the āyas and sūras is to identify the correctness (i.e. reliability) of the various traditions on the order of revelation, causes of revelation, Meccan and Median sūras, and abrogating and abrogated verses. (Nekunam, 2001: 2-8). In addition, since most of the sūras of the Quran report the process of the prophet’s calling to Islam, with the aid of historical interpretation one can know the prophethical history and practice through the Quran. (Tabātabā’ī, 1996: 13/235).

Reviewing the literature it is considered that dating of the Quran returns back to early Islam; when the Companions and the Tabe‘ūn (successors to the prophet’s Companions) organized Meccan and Median āyas and sūras. (Ma‘rifat, 1994: 1/132) Orientalists such as Moyer, Springer, Will, Schwally, Noldeke, Rudol, Drenborg, Greim, Hershfield, Bell and Blasher were working in the process of the development of this knowledge since the mid-thirteenth century (lunar year). About one year later, Sayyed ’Abdul Qadir Mollah Huways al-Ghāzī and Muhammad ’Izzat Darwazah, among other Islamic scientists, presented the descending order in Bayān Al-Ma‘ānī and Tafsīr Al-Ḥadīth relying on the order of the sūras in an Egyptian Muṣḥaf. The only difference was that, Darwazah, in spite of ’Abdul Qadir, made some changes in the order of the list of the sūras (specifications of the Muṣḥaf will be discussed later). He also compiled two other books titled “Sīrat al-Rasūl, Suwaru muqtabisa min al-Quran Al-Karīm” and “Aṣrunnabī (s) wa biy, atuhū fi al-bi‘tha, Suwaru muqtabisa Min al-Quran Al-Karīm” and noted the order of revelation of the sūras in both of them. In Iran also, the book “The process of the development of the Quran” and the historical-critical exegesis book “step-by-step with revelation” have been written by Mehdi Bazagan around 1350-60th (solar year). After him, three other books “The prophet and revolution”, “The prophet and holy war”, and “The prophet and ruling”, have been written by Jalāledīn Fārsī in the subject of the practice of the Prophet (S) since 1982. (Dīyārī Bīdgułī, 2009: 4/103, 105) In the recent years, the exegesis books of ’Abdulkarīm Behjatpūr “Along with revelation” and Mohammad ’Ābed Jāberī “Al Wāziḥ” have also been written down in the order of revelation of the sūras.

Although the western scientists and the Muslims have been concerned with the subject of dating the Quran from the past years which had some effects; a few researches analyze specifically the method of exegetes and their arguments for specifying the order of revelation of an āya or a sūra. Studying the arguments of Darwazah for dating ikmāl āya the present text tries, as far as it is possible, to fill in the present gap. For this reason, first the general method of Darwazah is discussed briefly; next his view on specifying the date of revelation of this āya is extracted, explained and criticized. The unique characteristics of Tafsīr al-Ḥadīth from one hand, and the exegetical importance of the aforementioned āya, specifically in the area of
theological and historical matters, on the other hand are important effects in performing this research which will be discussed in the following section:

A review of Tafsīr al-Ḥadīth

Muḥammad ʿĪzzat Darwazah is a contemporary Ashʿarī exegete and among a few people who have written an exegesis on the Quran based on the order of revelation of the sūras. In his introduction to his book, he has explained the reason of choosing his exegetical plan and has considered the exegesis of the Quran in the order of revelation the best method for understanding the Quran and its serving. (Darwazah, 2008: 1/33-34).

His most important source for dating the sūras and exegesis of the āyas after the Quran was the book of Sheykh Maṇṣūr Nāṣīf’s “Al-ṭtāj al-jāmi` fī aḥādīth al-rasūl”. Since the book is a collection of hadiths in Sahīhayn of Bukhārī and Muslim, Sunan of Abū Dāwūd, Jāmi` of Tarmazī and Nasā`ī, the name “traditions of Sahāh Khamsa” has been applied instead in the book of Tafsīr al-Ḥadīth. He extracts most of the traditions on the order of revelation, Meccan and Median traditions, exegetical traditions, and traditions on the causes of revelation from this source, but he considers the context of verses as the best source for exegesis of the Quran. His disagreement with some of the historical documents, order of revelation traditions, and even his reliable list has roots in his different understanding of the verses of the Quran. Now that the motivation of Darwazah and the special importance of his book in dating the Quran have been made clear, his method and the reasons for dating the revelation of ikmāl āya will be analyzed and criticized.

Generalities on ikmāl āya

The content of the third āya of the Sūrat al-Ma`ida is about two essential jurisprudential and theological matters. The first and the last parts of the āya speak about Islamic rules and laws and the middle part which is consisted of the phrases Those who disbelieve have this day despaired of your religion. Do not fear them, but fear Me. and this day I have perfected your religion for you and completed My favor to you. I have approved Islam to be your religion are designated as ikmāl āya. According to the majority of exegetes, this part of āya has been revealed independent of the other parts and according to the Shi`a belief it is related to the event of Ghadir Khum. Since the early Islam the exegetes intended to remove doubts about this āya. One of the most important matters is its dating. The theological and historical importance of the āya adds to the need to know the requirements and the date of its revelation.


Darwazah who claims to have a new method of dating believes that the exegetes mistakeny specified the cause and the date of revelation of this āya, and have gone astray sometimes because of religious partiality or of ignorance about different matters. The following paragraphs will clearly explain his view.

1- Darwazah’s viewpoint on dating ikmāl āya

In Tafsīr al-Ḥadīth Darwazah rejects sometimes directly or indirectly the understanding of exegetes about the date of revelation of ikmāl āya. It roots from his different view about the traditions on the order of revelation of Sūrat al-Ma`ida, the context of the first āyas, and most
importantly from his presumptions. The idea of Darwazah can be explained from his brief analyses as the follows:

1-1- The reasons of Darwazah for specifying the date of revelation of Sūra al-Maʿida

One way to prove that ikmāl āya was revealed on the 18th Dhul Hijja in the event of Ghadīr Khum or at least in the last days of the life of the Prophet (S) is to prove that it was among the last Suras revealed to him. In contrast, Darwazah intends to prove that the Sūrat al-Maʿida was revealed many years before Ḥajjat al-widāʾ (the last pilgrimage of the Prophet Muhammad) to show that it is irrelevant to the aforementioned event. The most important instruments and their method of using are explained here.

1-1-1- The content of the Sūrat al-Maʿida

Darwazah considers several chapters for the Sūrat al-Maʿida. From the content of some of these chapters- which call for the Muslims to fulfill their pledges and forbid them from allowing pagan pilgrims to approach Mecca - he deduce that this sūra was revealed before sūrat al-Tawbah (“The Repentance” also known as al-Bara’ah “the Ultimatum”) - which orders the Muslims to kill polytheists and forbids them from allowing polytheists to approach Masjid al-Ḥarām (because they are considered unclean). (Darwazah, 2008: 9/9). Nevertheless, Darwazah agrees with the revelation of a few parts of this sūra after the sūrat al-Tawbah. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/10)

On the other hand, considering the revelation of sūrat al-Tawbah after Ḥudaybiya peace treaty he considers a different date around the seventh year of Ḥijrah for the revelation of some parts of the sūra in contrast with other exegetes. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/9). He even does not accept the tradition quoted by Tarmazī that the Sūrat al-Maʿida was the last sūra revealed to the Prophet. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/8). Therefore he rejects it as being ākharu mā nazal (Darwazah, 2008: 9/10) and is surprised by some traditions that refer to sūrat al-Tawbah as the abrogating of Sūrat al-Maʿida and at the same time consider it as the last sūra. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/22).

He also rejects the traditions on the revelation at once because he believes that the different verses of the sūra have been revealed in several years and according to the requirements of that time. To prove his words he seeks help from the content of āyas and gives some examples to put emphasis on the validity of this subject.

The first example is about the time of revelation of several āyas of Sūrat al-Maʿida which deals with the powerful Jews of Medina. They were in this situation in the early Median period. To Darwazah, if the time of revelation of this part of āya is irrelevant to the early Median period, it would be, at least, relevant to the previous āyas about the Jews’ exile from Medina in the Sūrat al-Aḥzāb (The Confederates) occurred many years before Ḥajjat al-widāʾ.

Another example is about the verses that condemn the Hypocrites for their friendly relation with the Jews. To him, this behavior with the Hypocrites and as a result the revelation of the related āyas is irrelevant to the time of Ḥijra, but the āyas revealed when some apparently Muslims abused their situation at the early or middle years of Ḥijra. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/9).

In his view, Sūrat al-Maʿida was revealed from the early Median period to its end and in different occasions. Therefore, he agrees with the subaltern revelation of some sūras at certain times and in portions and during long periods of time. (See Ahmadnezhad and Mohammadzadeh, 2014: 30-33).
1-1-2-The list of the sūras and the order of revelation traditions
The most common instrument for dating is the traditions which report on the order of revelation of the sūras. The lists of the sūras in the order of revelation are also formed based on the same traditions. In his introduction to his book, Darwazah, who interprets the Quran based on the dating of the sūras mentions the chains of transmitters he obtained as the follows:
The traditions ascribed to Jābir ibn-Zeyd, Hassan, ’Akrameh and Ibn-Abbās in the Suṣūṭī’s “Al-atqān”, two orders of revelation in the introduction to “Tafsīr al-Khāzin” and the introduction to the “Tafsīr al-Majma’ al-bayān” and a further order of revelation with an anonymous author.
But he finally notes that the order of revelation mentioned at the top of the sūras is related to a Mushaf written down by an orthographer known as Qadrūhulī Mustafā Nazīf under the supervision of Egyptian masters of recitation “qarāt al-Quran” on behalf of ʿAbdul Ḥamid ʿAmād ʿAḥnafī. (Darwazah, 2008: 1/12)

His reliable list of the sūras pertains to the same mushaf. Relying on this source, he ranks the order of revelation of the Sūrat al-Ma’īda after the sūrat al-Fath (The Victory) and before the sūrat-al-Tawba. Contemplating on the content of the sūrat al-Fath some of which āyas refer to the event of Ḥudaybiya peace treaty, as well as considering the content and the context of the first āyas of the Sūrat al-Ma’īda which speak about the interaction with the polytheists, he confidently endorse the order of revelation of these two sūras in the relevant list and some of the traditions on the order of revelations. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/10)

He is confident in the aforementioned list of the sūras and traditions since the first āyas of the sūra implies that it was revealed shortly after Ḥudaybiya peace treaty. Darwazah puts value to the lists or traditions to the extent that they are in accordance with the content and the context of the āyas. (See Ahmadnezhad and Mohammadzadeh, 2014: 42-44, 62-64)

1-2- The reasons of Darwazah for dating ikmāl āya
It was said that one of the principles of Darwazah’s dating is his belief in the subaltern revelation of sūras at certain times and in portions. In his perspective, some of the Meccan sūras like al-ʿAlaq, al-Qalām, al-Muzzammil, al-Muddathir and many Median sūras like al-Baqara, al-Ahzāb, al-Nestā, al-Ñūr, al-Mujādela, al-Maʿīda, al-Tawba are so characterized. The same principle is adopted by Darwazah for dating the different units of Sūrat al-Maʿīda like ikmāl āya and new results are obtained in the exegesis of the āyas and their chronological order of revelation. Relying on indications of the Quran, Darwazah identifies the date of revelation of the ikmāl āya in a period around the time of revelation of the Sūrat al-Maʿīda about seventh year of Hijra. Here are his major documents in this regard:

1-2-1- The context of the first āyas of the Sūrat al-Maʿīda
For specifying the date of revelation of the Sūrat al-Maʿīda and the ikmāl āya Darwazah, as usual, relies mostly on textual indications. Accordingly, he disagrees with the revelation of the ikmāl āya in the 18th Dhul Hijja in the event of Ghadīr khum or the 9th day of Dhul Hijja (known as ‘Arafah) in Hajjat al-Widā and does not follow the statements of many early and modern Sunni exegetes (Ṭabarī, 1991: 6/51-54; Zamakhsharī, 1986: 1/604; Rāzī, 2000, 11/286-287; Haqqī Burusawī, n.d: 3/342-343; ibn ʿAshūr, n.d. 29-35 ) in this regard.
He regards the content of the first three āyas of the Sūrat al-Maʿīda as the sign of their coherence and introduces the ikmāl āya as inseparable part of the previous āyas and from this he draws the conclusion that it must have been revealed concomitantly with other āyas. In
his belief, since the sentence “with the exceptions named…” in the third āya is an explanation and exegesis of the first āya, there is a clear semantic relation among the said āyas. In his view, considering that the first and the second āyas were revealed after Ḥudaybiya peace treaty, the date of revelation of the ikmāl āya along with its upper and lower parts (ṣadr wa Dhiyl) must have been at the same time; i.e. about four years before Ḥajjat al-Widā’. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/26-29)

To prove the semantic coherence of the first āyas of the sūra, Darwazah studies the context of the fourth and the fifth āyas and the usage of the word “al-Yawm (today)” in these āyas. Considering the similarity of structure and the context of the first to fifth āyas and their semantic relation, he relies on the context indication and thereby draws the conclusion that the ikmāl āya must have been revealed concomitantly with its previous and next āyas. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/28)

1-2-2-The generality of the āya
Darwazah, in spite of many exegetes, believes that the ikmāl āya has no specific cause of revelation. He states this point after studying the content of the āya and the viewpoints of a number of exegetes and puts emphasis on its revelation concurrent with other āyas. He mentions, among others, the tradition of Ṭabarī from Ibn-'Abbās that the word “al-yawm” does not refer to a specific day Zamakhsharī’s view that the word “al-yawm” means the time or part of life (Zamakhsharī, 1986) as his documents to prove this. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/28)

To Darwazah, there is no special application for the aforementioned word and the date of revelation of the third āya of the Sūrat al-Maʿida, like previous āyas, is shortly after Ḥudaybiya peace treaty. Accordingly, he has not confined the word “āya” to the ikmāl āya, but extends it to the whole part of the third āya. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/27-28)

To confirm his idea, he explains about the role of the following possibilities in the exegetes’ mistake:

The recitation of the āya by the messenger of Allah (S) in the day of ‘Arafa in the Hajjat al-Widā’ and the revelation of the first three āyas to the messenger during Hajj pilgrimage one year after Ḥudaybiya peace treaty

Therefore, Darwazah accepts the revelation of the ikmāl āya in a time or even a specific day during Umra one year after Ḥudaybiya peace treaty. In his view, the perfection of religion, completion of favor, and despairing of the polytheists begin with the same day. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/27)

2- Criticizing Darwazah’s viewpoint
In spite of Darwazah’s attempt to argument reasonably, his view is exposed to criticism. The major criticisms of his view are as the following:

2-1-The traditions on the Sūrat al-Maʿida being ākharu mā nazal (the last sūra revealed to the Prophet Mohammad)
It was said that Darwazah according to his reliable list and one tradition on the order of revelation ranks the Sūrat al-Maʿida before sūrat al-Tawbah and sūrat al-Nasr which in his belief are the last sūras revealed. Therefore, his view is contrary to many other traditions emphasizing that the Sūrat al-Maʿida was the last sūra revealed. Although he maintains that the traditions of Seḥāh Khamsa are highly valid, he disregards Tirmīzī’s tradition that the Sūrat al-Maʿida was the last sūra revealed. In addition, what is surprising is that although he
refers to the above-mentioned tradition, he notes that there are no such traditions in Sehah Khamsa. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/10)

Nevertheless, there are some hadiths from the Prophet (s) (Suyūṭī, 1983: 2/252; Kāshānī, 1957: 3/186) Imam 'Ali (A.S) (Bahraṇī, 1995: 2/213) and Imam Ṣādiq (A.S) (Kāshānī, 1957: 3/168) that the Sūra al-Ma‘īda was the last sūra revealed. A number of traditions have described how this sūra was revealed in Ḥajjat al-Wedā’ or a month or three before the prophet’s decease. (Suyūṭī, 1983: 2/252; Bahraṇī, 1995: 2/213-214) Of course, some other traditions, mentioning it under the title of “non-abrogated-abrogating verse” (nāsikhātu ghayra mansūkah), put emphasis on its being the last sūra revealed. (‘Āyyāshī, 2001: 1/288; Kāshānī, 1957: 3/167-168; Bahraṇī, 1995: 2/213-214; ‘Arūsī Huwiyzī, 1994: 1/582)

The existence of such traditions or emphasizing on their contents in a number general or specific, early or contemporary exegetes is an indication of the importance of this subject to the Fārīqayn (the two major sects in Islam). (‘Āyyāshī, 1380: 2001: 1/288; Ṭūsī, n.d., 3/413; Qurṭūbī, 1985: 6/30; Tabarsī, 1993: 3/231; Ibn Kathīr, 1998: 3/3; Suyūṭī, 1983: 2/252; ‘Ānī, 2004: 6/287; Ṭabātabā’ī, 1996: 2/204; Ṣādiqī Tehranī, 1986: 8/9). Another group of traditions indicates that the laws prescribed in the sūra are eternal ones. In a Ḥadīth from the Prophet (s), for example, with two chains of transmitters, Ṣumrūt ibn Ḥabīb and ‘Aftiyat ibn-Qeys, it has been quoted that the Prophet (S) has clearly introduced the Sūra al-Ma‘īda as the last sūra revealed to him and has called all the people to be obliged to the lawful or unlawful laws prescribed in the sūra. (Tha‘labī, 2001: 4/5; Qurṭūbī, 1985: 6/31; Baghdādī, 1994: 2/3; Suyūṭī, 1983: 2/252) Even Darwazah, himself, has referred to a ḥadīth implying such a meaning and has recalled the existence of such traditions in the interpretations of Ṭabarī, Baghwā, and Zamakhshārī. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/8)

According to the above-mentioned traditions, the Sūra al-Ma‘īda and as a result ikmāl āya were revealed in the last Meccan period. Now, if the traditions on the revelation of the Sūra al-Ma‘īda at once (Ibn Kathīr, 1998: 3/3; Kāshānī, 1994: 2/105; Huwiyzī, 1994: 1/582) quoted by Darwazah (Darwazah, 2008: 9/8) are also added to these traditions, then the revelation of ikmāl āya in the seventh year of Ḥijra may be rejected more confidently. But even if we believe in the revelation of the Sūra al-Ma‘īda at certain times and in portions, because of the existence of the causes of revelation of the ikmāl āya, there would be no reason that the sūra was revealed in the years before the Ḥajjat al-Wedā’.

On the other hand, Darwazah’s relying on his reliable list is not a reasonable argument to prove that the Sūra al-Ma‘īda was revealed in the seventh year; since Tafsīr al-Ḥadīth itself contains a number of contrary examples which indicate his relative confidence in the list. The different view of Darwazah on the aforesaid order of revelation may also be followed up by the question that whether the sūras al-Zīlāl, al-Insān, and al-Ra‘d are Meccan or Media. He has acknowledged that according to his reliable list, the four above-mentioned sūras are Media, but since their content and style are completely similar to the Meccan sūras, in addition to the traditions that consider them to be Meccan, he has interpreted them to be Meccan sūras. In several cases which he has preserved the original order, he has clearly stated, in the beginning of each case, his different view with the Mosḥaf. (Darwazah, 2008: 1/17-18)

In his view, the style and the content of these sūras are almost completely similar to the Meccan ones, but since he has not found any interpretation to identify them as Meccan, he brings them after the sūras he agrees to be Meccan. Finally, after his individual legal reasoning, he interprets the above-mentioned sūras in this order: al-Ra‘d, al-Rahmān, al-Insān, and al-Zīlāl. (Darwazah, 2008: 1/17-20)
2-2- The cause of revelation of ikmāl-āya

In contrast to Darwazah who maintains no cause of revelation for ikmāl-āya, a number of traditions in many general and specific sources and the statements of many exegetes who have explained the meaning of the word “al-yawm”, imply otherwise. (Ṭabarī, 1991: 6/51; Baghawī, 1999: 2/5; Ibn Jūzī, 2001: 1/513; Zamakhsharī, 1986: 1/604; Ṭabarsi, 1993: 3/246; Ibn Kathīr, 1998: 3/25; Suyūṭī, 1983: 2/258; Kāshānī, 1957: 3/108; Bahrānī, 1995: 2/223-247; Qāsimī, 1997: 4/4) His different view with the current Hadiths in the early interpretations like Tafsīr Ṭabarī, Bağhawī, Ibn-Kathīr, and Zamakhsharī which emphasize on the revelation of the sūra in the 9th day of Dhul Ḥijja in the tenth year of Hijra, as well as his disagreement with the later interpretations like Tafsīr Qāsimī mentioning that it was revealed in a place between Mecca and Medina in Hajjat al-Widā', deserve contemplation. (Darwazah, 2008: 9/8-9) So, contrary to his dominant method of relying on the aforesaid interpretations (Darwazah, 2008: 7/95, 159-162, 379-382; 8/81, 9/164-165), he does not follow them here. Therefore, in contrast to his disagreement with the date of revelation of ikmāl āya and the existence of two major views in this regard, one may, at least, gain confidence in the revelation of the āya in the late Median period and in Hajjat al-Widā’ and criticize his view on the revelation of the āya many years before that time. Moreover, it is proved from the contents close to the āya and the single purpose of its sentences that the word “al-yawm” refers to a specific day. (Ṭabatabā’T, 1996: 5/170) The Quran also describes this day with such phrases as “the day in which the religion of the Muslims is perfected, the favor of God to them is completed and the polytheists are despaired of their deviation”. The unique features of this day make it a turning-point in the history of Islam. (Najjārzādīgān, 2008: 132-133) Therefore, it is unlikely that the aforesaid āya has been revealed without any specific cause of revelation.

2-3- The limits of semantic relation among the āyas

Darwazah's view on the coherence among the first to fifth āyas of the Sūrat al-Ma'ida as well as their concomitant revelation is disputable from several aspects: Firstly, the verses of the Quran have not been compiled as a classic book, but they have been recorded in the same form they have been revealed (sometimes with some changes and displacements) by the prophet’s order. Therefore, it is possible that the Sadr of the āya has been revealed because of the questions raised about unlawful meats and after a while, according to the requirements of the time, the ikmāl āya has been revealed and recorded by the ascribe of revelation following the previous law. Then, according to another requirement a new law has been revealed and the Diyl of the āya has been brought after the middle part of the āya by ascribe of revelation. (Makārim, 2007: 61-63) Accepting this trend, there is no need for all parts of the third āya or the whole āya to be in a specific semantic harmony with their previous āyas.

The Next point is that if we contemplate more on the context, upper and the lower part (Sadr wa Dhīyil) of the āya, we will see that the first part is a semantically complete sentence and it does not need the ikmāl āya. Therefore this upper part of the āya, like the Quran: 2/173, 6/145, and 16/115 which imply the unlawful foods, is a complete and independent sentence, and the middle sentences are periodic sentences. (Ṭabatabā’T, 1996: 5/167)

The question that whether the ikmāl āya is a periodic sentence can be followed up by scientific discussions of the Quran. A number of traditions, both from the Shi’a and the Sunni, quote that if a more attractive āya was revealed, the messenger of Allah (S) ordered, by the
Divine order, to put it in a better place to attract attentions. This is why the ikmāl āya was placed in the middle of the Sūrat al-Maʿida which has been approved in many traditional commentary works like Al-Dur al-Manthūr. (Suyūtī, 1983: 2/258)

Moreover, according to Hadiths on the lack of contextual unity among a number of āyas (Barqī, 1992: 2/300), it is not necessary for the third āya of the Sūrat al-Maʿida. Therefore it is possible that the middle part of the āya, although separated from its upper and lower parts (Ṣadr wa Dhīyl), has a specific cause of revelation and all parts of it have not necessarily a single generality or cause of revelation.

In addition, the aforesaid laws have been also referred to in other sūras. Therefore, mentioning more extra cases in this āya than the previous ones is only intended to explain other instances and is not the sign of a new law. The only difference is that in the other parts of the Quran, the included sentence (al- mustathnā) “but whoever is driven to necessity...” is mentioned next to the included sentence (al-mustathnā minhu) “He has only forbidden...”, while in the Sūrat al-Maʿida they are separated by the sentences of the ikmāl āya. (Jawādī Āmulī, 1989: 21/606)

3- The result of Darwazah's prejudices on dating the ikmāl āya

The less strong arguments of Darwazah for dating the Sūrat al-Maʿida and the ikmāl āya indicate that this exegete has been driven against his famous opinions and even his exegetical method by his presumptions.

The apparently conflicts, for example, between a number of āyas of the Sūrat al-Maʿida and of the sūrat al-Tawbah make exegetes maintain that one of these two sūras is the abrogating and naturally has been revealed later. Among them are the āyas related to the interactions with the polytheists (the Quran: 5/2), as well as the āyas emphasizing on the lawfulness of the food of the People of the Book (the Quran: 5/5), which according to the belief of a number of researchers have been abrogated by the āyas of the sūrat al-barāʿ (al-Tawbah), like the āyat al-sayf (the Quran: 9/5). Darwazah also, believing that the sūrat al-Tawbah is a non-ambiguous sūra and the Sūrat al-Maʿida is an abrogated one, has inclined toward the earlier revelation of the sūra than the sūrat al-Tawbah. But he has gone to the extreme and has taken it back to the Conquest of Mecca in the eighth year of Hijra, while his view is not consistent with the context of the āyas, exegetical evidences, and the viewpoints of the other exegetes. Moreover, with more contemplation and getting into deeper discussions about relationship with the polytheists under the āyas of the sūrat al-Kāfirūn (Darwazah, 2008: 2/25-40), al-Baqara (Darwazah, 2008: 6/326-338), and al-Tawbah (Darwazah, 2008: 9/352), he could find a more subtle way to bring the āyas together, being not in conflict with the documents of the knowledge of exegesis.

Darwazah's exaggerating belief in the influence of the Shiʿa transmitters and commentators on the traditions and exegetical views of the Sunni commentators, on the other hand, made him skeptical of the causes of revelation of āyas on the virtues of the Ahl al- Bayt (A.S) (the household of the Prophet Mohammad). This is observed in many cases, including the exegesis of the āyat al-Mobāhila (Darwazah, 2008: 7/160-161), al-Wilāyat (Darwazah, 2008: 9/164), al-Barāʿat (Darwazah, 2008: 9/347), and al-Taḥrīr (Darwazah, 2008: 7/380-382) “Inna riwāyatuhu daʾwa al-nnabī li abi-Bakir wa ῥUmar wa ῥUthmān wa ... , hiya ayyan maṣnuʿatan li muqābilati riwāyiṭi wi twlāt al-Shiʿat al-moṭʾasifā”, “narjiḥ ‘an al-riwāyat al-latī ’awradiḥā al-Ṭabarī ’an al-Imām ’abi Jaʿfar maṣnūʿa”, and “wa nahu nakhsī bal narjiḥ ‘an yakūna al-hawa al-Shiʿī qaḍ laʿiba dūran fi baʿḍi hādhihi al-riwayāt” are some of the phrases
he use in this regard. Nevertheless, he is expected to draw a conclusion about the āya, without any prejudice and more scientific study of the traditions and exegetical statements.

Conclusion
The results of the present research are briefly discussed as follows:
1) In spite of Darwazah's view on the revelation of the Sūrat al-Ma'ida before the sūrat al-Barā'ī in the seventh year of Hijra, according to many traditions of Fāriqayn, it was among the last parts of revelations in the tenth year of Hijra. Although there are many causes of revelation of the ikmāl āya in the 9th Dhul Hijja or 18th Dhul Hijja following the event of Ghadīr Khum in Hijjat al-Widā, certainly it was revealed in the last year of the life of the Prophet Mohammad (S).
2) Darwazah's referring to his reliable list is not a reasonable argument to prove that the sūra was revealed in the year after Hudaybiya peace treaty; since there are many contrary examples in Tafṣīr al-Ḥadīth itself which indicate the relative confidence of the exegete to the list.
3) Although Darwazah takes the context as a means to prove the coherence among the first āyas of the Sūrat al-Ma'ida and draws the conclusion that it has no specific cause of revelation, it is understood from reviewing the same means in the third āya and the semantic relation among the middle sentences that there is no relation between theological discussions of the ikmāl āya and jurisprudential matters of its Ṣadr wa Dhīyl. The contents close to and the single purpose of these sentences also indicate that the word “al-yawm” refers only to a single day and that there is no generality in the āya. The description of the day with its unique characteristics in the Quran also strengthens the idea that there is a specific cause of revelation of the āya.
4) The contradictory words of Darwazah about the date of revelation of the Sūrat al-Ma'ida and ikmāl āya, his lack of adherence to some of his principles, and stressing on the weak and unreasonable arguments to reject the lawful dating indicate that the exegete attempts to show that there is no relation between the ikmāl āya and the event of Ghadīr Khum. His negative view about the Shi’a and the possibility of forgery of the traditions on the event of Ghadīr Khum by them root from his presumptions. Firstly, the traditions on the revelation of the ikmāl āya not only have been quoted by the Shi’a, but also by various Sunni chains of transmitters. Secondly, some of the methods of verification of this Ḥadīth have been, at least, reliable and acceptable according to the Sunni rules for identification of the chains of transmitters.
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