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Introduction: Qur’ān and Rhetoric, Balāgha

Every prophet is given a sign that testifies to his rank as a messenger. Moses, who was sent to the Egyptians, had to convince addressees with magic. To eclipse them he had to perform a miracle, changing a rod into a snake and changing the snake back into the rod. Jesus made his appearance in an age when the most prestigious discipline was medicine; he therefore had to work a medical miracle: resurrecting the dead. Coming still later, Muḥammad was sent to a people who would no longer be won by physical miracles, but—being particularly committed to rhetoric, balāgha—demanded a more sublime prophetic sign. Muḥammad, therefore, had to present a linguistic and stylistic miracle to convince them. He presented a scripture, the Qur’ān.

This review of the prophetic missions, often evoked since the time of its first transmitter, the eighth- and ninth-century polymath al-Jāḥiẓ, seems to hit an important point in the perception of the kind of scripture the Qur’ān constitutes. Although one might object to the classification of the two great messengers preceding Muḥammad as professionals in magic and medicine, the classification of Muhammad and the Qur’ān as closely related to linguistics and rhetoric is certainly pertinent. His communication of the message is in fact the central part of his mission, unlike Moses and Jesus whose significance relies on both deeds and words. Not only by virtue of Muḥammad’s addressing a linguistically demanding audience should the Qur’ān be acknowledged as particularly closely related to balāgha, but also for another reason about which the authors of the above-quoted classification were arguably less conscious. I am referring to the peculiar junctim of speech and meta-speech in the Qur’ān. Unframed by any narrative scenario, the entire Qur’ān is speech as such. Qur’ānic speech, moreover, is not limited to the oral communication of a message to listeners, but is often a metadiscourse, a speech about speech, a comment on the Qur’ānic message itself or on the speech of others. The Qur’ān—so one might summarize the classifications of prophets related above—was sent down not in an age where amazement could be aroused by extraordinary deeds, but where a speaker successfully confronted and vanquished another, eclipsing the argument of the other in what in Islamic theology would later term i’jāz, meaning to “render the other rhetorically impotent.” That age was neither an age of magic, nor of science, but an age of exegesis. The Qur’ān accordingly
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1 Paraphrase of Al-Jāḥiẓ 1979. See also the summary in Pellat 1967:80.
presents itself as a highly rhetorical and often metatextual document that reflects an ongoing debate.

In light of these considerations, the problem underlying the present crisis in Western Qur’anic scholarship—the seemingly unbridgeable divide between a traditional position that regards the Qur’an as the literary outcome of a prophetic mission in Mecca and Medina during the first half of the seventh century CE, and a skeptical position that ascribes its compilation to a later syncretistic Mesopotamian community—appears to reflect a mistaken premise, very much like the problem that tormented the customs inspector in the famous Tijuana anecdote (Boyarin 2004:1):

Every day for thirty years a man drove a wheelbarrow full of sand over the Tijuana border crossing. The customs inspector dug through the sand each morning but could not discover any contraband. He remained, of course, convinced that he was dealing with a smuggler. On the day of his retirement from the service, he asked the smuggler to reveal what it was that he was smuggling and how he had been doing so. “Wheelbarrows; I’ve been smuggling wheelbarrows, of course.”

I mention this humorous anecdote to argue that what Qur’anic scholars should be looking for is not the whereabouts of a literary compilation called “Qur’an,” let alone asking “What the Qur’an really says,” but should instead be looking at the Qur’anic text as a “medium of transport,” triggering and reflecting a communication. The Qur’an in its emergent phase is not a pre-mediated, fixed compilation, a reified literary artifact, but a still-mobile text reflecting an oral theological-philosophical debate between diverse interlocutors of various late antique denominations. It is a text that first of all demands to be read as a drama involving multiple protagonists. What is demanded is a change in focus from the exclusive perception of a reified codex to a still-fluid pre-canonical text that can provide a solution to the historical problems that Qur’anic scholarship addresses.

To understand this perspective, we need to remember that the Qur’anic age roughly coincides with the epoch when the great exegetical corpora of monotheist tradition were edited and published, such as the two Talmudim in Judaism and the patristic writings in Christianity. These writings, not the Bible, as is often held, are the literary counterparts of the Qur’an. Daniel Boyarin (2004) repeatedly stresses that the Talmud is—no less than the writings of the Church fathers—imbued with Hellenistic rhetoric. Indeed, the Qur’an should be understood first and foremost as exegetical, that is, polemical-apologetical, and thus highly rhetorical. The Qur’an is communicated to listeners whose education already comprises biblical and post-biblical lore, whose nascent scripture therefore should provide answers to the questions raised in biblical exegesis—a scripture providing commentary on a vast amount of earlier theological legacies.

This thesis contradicts the dominant views in present Qur’anic scholarship. More often than not, the Qur’an is considered as a text pre-conceived, so to speak, by an author, identified in Western scholarship with Muhammad, or anonymous compilers, a text that was fixed and canonized somewhat later to constitute a liturgical manual and a religious guide for the Muslim community. This view reflects Islamic tradition, which equally regards the Qur’an as an
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2 For the state of Qur’anic studies, see Neuwirth, Marx, et al. 2008.
auctorial text. Islamic tradition, however, does distinguish between the (divinely) “authored Book,” labeled al-
muṣḥaf, as the canonical codex, and the Qurʾānic communication process, labeled al-qurʾān. Yet the hermeneutical predominance of the Qurʾān’s perception as muṣḥaf in Islamic tradition is hard to deny. The shift from the “original,” that is, intra-Qurʾānic concept of qurʾān, to the post-Muhammadan concept of muṣḥaf is, of course, due to the event of canonization, which reconfigured the text from a historical document into a timeless symbol. Aziz al-Azmeh (1994) has shown that texts become detemporalized through canonization, their single units being considered indiscriminate in terms of chronology;3 instead—so we have to add—they become amalgamated with myth, turning into testimonies of the foundational myth of their communities.

The core of this paper will focus on the Qurʾān not as the fixed corpus it became after the death of the Prophet, al-
uṣḥaf, but as a chain of oral communications conveyed to the Meccan and the Medinan community, whose expectations and religious background are reflected in the Qurʾānic texts. Following Daniel Madigan (2001), I claim that the oral character of the communication during the Prophet’s lifetime was never substituted by a written text—not because the ongoing revelation process stood in the way of codification but rather because the emerging conviction that the Word of God is not accessible to humans except through oral communication. To highlight the notion of qurʾān in the sense of “oral communication,” I first will briefly survey the hermeneutical implications of a Qurʾānic reading as either muṣḥaf or qurʾān. Then I will vindicate the claim that orality in the Qurʾān is not limited to its function as a mediality but successively acquires the dimension of a theologumenon (that is, a conviction shared by the speaker and his audience). This will be demonstrated by tracing the strategies that the Qurʾān applies to justify its essentially oral character as a legitimate scriptural manifestation and to challenge the rival concept of codified scripture. The third part focuses on literary devices that serve as markers of Qurʾānic orality. Finally, I will analyze an example of the Qurʾānic “re-
reading” of earlier monotheistic traditions as an oral and public procedure.

**Qurʾān Versus Muṣḥaf**

The study of the Qurʾān as a post-canonical, closed text (that is, the text established after the death of the prophet, which was codified a few decades later and acknowledged as unchangeable), accessible only through the lens of traditional Islamic exegesis, is a legitimate task for elucidating the community’s understanding of the Qurʾān. It is an anachronistic approach, however, when it is applied—as it tacitly often is—to investigate the formation of the Qurʾānic message, that is, the dynamics of its textual growth and diverse changes in orientation during the oral communication phase of the Qurʾān. To evaluate the Qurʾān historically one has to be aware of the reconfiguration that the prophetic communication underwent in its redaction and canonization: whereas the single units (sūras) collected in the muṣḥaf are juxtaposed,

3 Although in exegesis a rough grid ascribing the texts to particular “situations of revelation” (asbāb al-
nuzūl) has been laid over the text whose single units are more generally divided into Meccan and Medinan, this does not prevent readers from applying a purely synchronic approach when explaining texts through others.
constituting a sort of anthology, the oral communications build dynamically on each other, later ones often rethinking earlier ones, sometimes even inscribing themselves into earlier texts. Thus there is ample intertextuality to be observed between sūras absent from the mushaf, where the chronological order of the sūras is no longer evident and the tension produced by dialectic interactions between texts is extinguished (Neuwirth 2002). But Qur’anic texts viewed as communications also refer to extratextual evidence, to unspoken intertexts, so to speak, drawing on the discourses that were debated in the listeners’ circles. These fell silent once the text was turned from a dramatic polyphonic communication into a monolithic divine account. The oral Qur’ān (to use a loose expression) may be compared to a telephone conversation where the speech of only one party is audible, yet the unheard speech of the other is roughly deducible from the audible one. Indeed, the social concerns and theological questions of the listeners are widely reflected in the Qur’ān text pronounced by the Prophet’s voice. To approach the text as a historical document thus would demand the researcher to investigate Muḥammad’s growing and changing public, listeners who belonged to a late antique urban milieu, many of whom must have been aware of and perhaps involved in the theological debates among Jews, Christians, and others in the seventh century.

When studying the Qur’ān from a literary perspective, it is even more perilous to use the two manifestations of the text indistinctly. In view of their generic differences, both would require different methodologies: the communication process comes closest to a drama, whereas the mushaf presents itself as a divine monologue, in generic terms, a kind of a hagiographic account. The theory of drama that distinguishes between an exterior and an interior “level of communication” (Pfister 1994) best illustrates the relation between canonized text and the communication process. On the exterior level, which in literary texts is occupied by the author of the printed dramatic text and his readers, the mushaf authored by God addresses the readers of the written Qur’ān. Against that, on the interior level—in literary texts occupied by the performers of the drama who are observed acting—the speaker, Muḥammad, and his listeners are interacting. This scenario demands that a number of extra-semantic signs, such as rhetoric and structure, be taken into consideration (Neuwirth 1980). The divine voice here acts as a further protagonist speaking continuously to the Prophet, seldom directly to the listeners, but the voice permanently stages the various scenarios of the prophet-listeners-interaction through speaking about the listeners, thus acting as a kind of invisible stage director or as a sort of reporter. Looking back once again to the exterior level, the mushaf, the divine voice has merged with that of the Prophet to become the narrator, whereas the interacting audience has disappeared from the stage completely, to become mere objects of the sole speaker’s speech. These two scenarios of the Qur’ān—as a communication process and as a scriptural codex—are thus essentially different and consequently demand methodologies of their own.

**Strategies of Vindicating Scriptural Orality**

Returning to the thesis that the orality of the Qur’ānic message, rather than being a pragmatic medial option, amounts to no less than a basic theologumenon, let us look at the Qur’ānic strategies of vindicating scriptural orality as an appropriate manifestation of the divine
word. The Qur’ān, not unlike the other Scriptures, originated from a vast body of heterogeneous traditions current in its geographical context, a selection of which, answering to the needs of an emerging community, crystallized into a Scripture in its own right. What is characteristic of the Qur’ān, however, is its emergence from a milieu in which the phenomenon of Scripture, materialized in written codices, was already familiar. As Nicolai Sinai (2006) has lucidly demonstrated, it is in confrontation with the Judeo-Christian notions of scripturality that the developing Qur’ān had to stake its own claim to authority. What is striking here is that the Qur’ān did not subscribe to the concept of a written manifestation of scripture but established a new image, that of an “oral scripture”; in William Graham’s words, “The Qur’ān has always been pre-eminently an oral, not a written text” (2003:584). Daniel Madigan justly claims that “nothing about the Qur’ān suggests that it conceives of itself as identical with the kitāb (the celestial book)” (cited in Sinai 2006:115), that is to say the Qur’ān in no phase of its development strove to become a closed scriptural corpus. This claim to “an ontological difference between the recitations and their transcendent source” (ibid.:109), however, presupposes that two conditions be fulfilled, and these can only be traced through diachronic investigations that Madigan has avoided. First, it requires an awareness of the essentially oral character of the emerging Qur’ān as its entelechy, irrespective of the occasional employment of writing for its memorization. Second, it requires a set of arguments to justify the striking absence from the Qur’ān of the conventional paraphernalia surrounding the revealed Word of God in the neighboring religions.

Sinai has observed that in the earliest sūras the divine origins, let alone the scriptural source of the Qur’ānic recitations, are not indicated. Obviously it took some time before the claim to revelation that is implicit in the use of the prophetic address “you” was translated into a consistent rhetoric of divine address, so as to raise the problem of its relationship to written models (Sinai 2006:109). In view of the Qur’ānic beginnings this is no surprise. The early sūras on closer examination reveal themselves as rereadings of the Psalms (Neuwirth 2008). They clearly reflect the language of the Psalms not only in terms of the poetical form (short poetic verses), but equally in terms of their imagery and the liturgical attitude of their speaker. This thesis is unaffected by the absence of early translations of the Psalms into Arabic, since the Psalm corpus, contrary to the other biblical books, was used primarily in liturgy, being recited by heart so that complete or at least partial texts rendered in a more or less verbal form thus may have been current through oral transmission. Though the early sūras cannot be considered faithful paraphrases of individual Psalms, early sūras and Psalms alike are unique in expressing the mood of their speaker articulated in close communication with the divine Other.

The step toward establishing an agency of authority in the texts was taken only at a later stage, although still in early Mecca, arguably in response to a challenge from outside. This is evident from verses like Q 69:41-42 (trans. by Arberry 1964:ii, 298):

\[
\text{Wa-mā huwa bi-qawli shā'irin—qālīlan mā tu 'minān}
\]
\[
\text{wa-lā bi-qawli kāhinin qālīlan mā tadhakkarān}
\]

4 See further the discussion in Sinai 2006:111.
It is the speech of a noble messenger, it is not the speech of a poet—little do you believe.
Nor the speech of a soothsayer—little do you remember.

A perceived misinterpretation of the recitations’ literary genre involving a particular mode of inspiration is corrected through appeal to their divine origin (Q 69:43; trans. by Arberry 1964:ii, 298):

*tanztlun min rabbi l-ʻalamtn*

A sending down from the Lord of all being

Sinai in his attempt to explain the Qurʿan’s contrasting of poetry/soothsaying with “revelation” focuses on the issue of literary genre (2006:111):

The recitations’ literary novelty . . . engendered different attempts at categorization among their audience not so much out of sheer curiosity, but rather because assigning them to a textual genre was a pre-condition for grasping their communicative intent. Muhammad’s recitations in defining themselves as *tadhkira*—“reminder”—or *dhikr*—“warning”—or as *tanzl*—“revelation”—take up a discussion which had initially been conducted outside the Qurʿan. The meta-level debate is thus interiorized, as it were.

Although the salient point in my view here is the need to reject a particular—inferior—source of inspiration rather than a non-pertinent literary genre, it is certainly true that “Qurʿanic self-referentiality must accordingly be understood as gradually emerging from a process of discussion with an audience, the expectations and convictions of which had to be convincingly addressed” (idem). The recitations’ engagement with their audience is of course evident from the strikingly dialectical structure of many early *sūras*, as noted by Jane McAuliffe (1999:163):

The often argumentative or polemical tone of the Qurʿan strikes even the most casual readers. . . . The operative voice in any given pericope, whether it be that of God or Muhammad or of another protagonist, regularly addresses actual or implicit antagonists.

The importance of such interactions as a formative factor in the emergence of the Qurʿan’s form and content is evident.

Let us now turn to the Qurʿanic engagement with the problem of its non-written form and, moreover, the missing scriptural paraphernalia. As Madigan observes, the basic challenge for any interpretation of the term *kitāb* consists in the fact that the Qurʿan claims to be “of a piece with carefully guarded, lavishly appointed, and scrupulously copied sacred codices and scrolls, while itself remaining open-ended, unwritten, and at the mercy of frail human memory” (2001:45; cited in Sinai 2006:113). This tension, according to Sinai, can be explained as resulting “from a need to balance the obvious situatedness of Muhammad’s recitation with a strategic interest in imparting to them the glow of scripturality that was felt, by his audience, to be an indispensable concomitant of genuine revelation” (114). Equally the appeal to an
archetypal celestial book—an issue that I will turn to presently—may have been propelled by polemics.

As often quoted, the most explicit reproach made by Muḥammad’s opponents is the question posed in Q 25:32: “Why was the Qurʾān not sent down to him as a single complete pronouncement—*jumlatan wāḥidatan*?” The incompleteness and situatedness of the communications obviously were viewed by the audience as a deficiency that set them apart from conventional manifestations of the Word of God and thus needed to be compensated by additional credentials more in line with the familiar models. These of course had to be related to writing, since revelation in Jewish and Christian contexts was bound to the concept of a written scripture.

Should the fact that some early *sūras* of the Qurʾānic revelations are credited with an indirect participation in literacy be related to this expectation of the listeners? There is a cluster of early *sūras* that establish a relation to the celestial book. Thus in Q 80:11-16 the Qurʾānic communications are presented as being emanations, or excerpts, from the celestial ur-text:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{kullā inna hu tadhkirah} \\
&\text{fa-man shāʾa dhakarah} \\
&\text{ft ʿāshifin mukarramah} \\
&\text{marrūʿat in muṭṭahrah} \\
&\text{bi-aydī safarах} \\
&\text{kirāmin bararalī }
\end{align*}
\]

No indeed; it is a reminder
—And who so wills, shall remember it—
Upon pages high-honored,
Uplifted, purified,
By the hands of scribes, noble, pious.

The heavenly source of the Qurʾānic communication is elsewhere labeled “tablet” (Q 85:22)—a reference to the Book of Jubilees—and somewhat later, in Middle Mecca, even “mother of the book,” *umm al-kitāb* (Q 43:4). Sinai justly claims that these verses “posit a transcendent source document, participation in which is supposed to invest Muḥammad’s recitations with a mediated kind of scripturality” (2006:114). He comments (*idem*):

The manoeuvre clearly serves to accommodate both the Qurʾān’s orality and situatedness, which could not very well be denied, and the prevailing assumption that when God addresses man, writing somehow has to come into play. Yet contrary to audience expectations, the *kitāb* is placed out of human reach, and is said to be accessible only in the shape of the oral recitations delivered to Muḥammad. To a certain extent then pre-
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5 Unless otherwise noted, all translations are by the author.

6 Cf. Q 85:21-22: *bal huwa qurʾānun majīd ft lawhīn mahfūz* and Q 56:77-80: *inna hu la-qurʾānun kartīn ft kitābin mākinūn lā yamassuhu illā l-muṭṭahharūn tanztulun min rabi l-ʾālamīn*.
existing assumptions of the audience are embraced, yet at the same time are subjected to
a profound reconfiguration.

Although I share his conviction regarding the continuous impact of the audience on the
configuration of the emerging Qur’ān, I would like to attribute some of the driving force behind
the foregrounding of the transcendent Scripture to the important role played by the Book of
Jubilees in the thinking of the community. That apocryphal text (cf. Najman 1999) had retained a
strong influence on Judeo-Christianity and was in no way absent from the scenario of late
antique theological debate. It is reflected in several early sūras and can plausibly be considered a
source of inspiration in the Qur’ānic relocation of the written Word of God exclusively in the
transcendent sphere. Still, the ongoing debate with opponents cannot be overestimated. And it is
this debate that should have propelled the promotion of the factual orality of the Qur’ānic
communications to become a Qur’ānic theologumenon.

Once more back to al-kitāb: what is the relation between the performed Qur’ān and the
celestial kitāb? Post-canonical thinking, of course, holds that both are identical. It is, however,
striking to observe that in some middle and late Meccan texts kitāb and Qur’ān are carefully kept
distinct. A few remarks concerning the background may be in place here. It is in middle and late
Mecca that the earlier undetermined sūra structures develop into a structurally distinct shape: the
tripartite sūra. This composition—analogous to the structure of ecclesiastical and synagogue
services—presents a biblical story as its core part, framing it by more dialogical initial and final
parts, entailing polemics/apologetics, or else hymns and affirmations of the rank of the
communication as a revelation (Neuwirth 1996). These sūras attest to a new Sitz im Leben, a new
social-liturgical function. It is here that the reference to al-kitāb is reserved for the biblical
accounts in particular, figuring in the center of the triad. Later the dichotomy between (biblical)
recollections from the kitāb and other kinds of Qur’ānic communications is loosened: al-kitāb
becomes the designation of a celestial mode of storage, whereas Qur’ān points to its earthly
performance. Yet in terms of form both are never deemed identical: the excerpts from the kitāb
are not received by the Prophet unaltered but have in the course of the transmission process been
adapted to the specific needs of the recipients. Sinai (2006:121) emphasizes the importance of
this difference that the Qur’ān itself recognizes as a peculiarity, conceiving it as a hermeneutical
code, so to speak; it even receives a technical designation: tafsīl. The locus classicus for this
perception is Q 41:2 f. (Trans. by Arberry 1964:ii, 185):

tanzılun min al-raḥmāni r-raḥīm
kitābun fuṣṣilat āyātuhu qur’ānān ‘arabīyyan li-qawmin ya’lamūn.

A sending down from the Merciful, the Compassionate
A book whose signs have been distinguished [or “adapted”] as an Arabic Koran, for a
people having knowledge.
The heavenly kitāb is coded as an Arabic recitation—not implying, however, that it was necessarily composed in Arabic from eternity on. This means that even biblical stories that are ascribed to al-kitāb do not involve the claim to verbal quotations from the celestial source, but de facto constitute a kind of paraphrase adapted to the listeners’ scope. This observation equally throws light on the fact—often considered irritating—that in the Qurʾān individual stories are told more than once and presented in different versions. In the light of the hermeneutics of tafsīl these are to be considered as subsequent renderings of a particular kitāb-pericope, repeatedly re-phrased and adapted to the changing communal situation. Sinai concludes (2006:126):

From the Qurʾānic perspective, therefore, the celestial scripture cannot be given to man in any other shape than mufaṣṣal Q 6:114. The kitāb is partially accessible, but never available, it can be tapped via divine revelation, but due to the need to tailor such revelations to a specific target audience, the kitāb as such is at no one’s disposal, not even in the form of literal excerpts.

At this stage, orality has acquired the dimension of a Qurʾānic theologumenon.

**Markers of Orality**

**Proportions**

Having discussed the development of orality as a Qurʾānic theologumenon, let us now turn to some of the textual characteristics that strikingly point to the oral composition of the text. The most technically evident of these are quantitative regularities between verse groups that often amount to clear and certainly intended proportions (Neuwirth 1981/2007).

Since the sensational hypothesis presented by David Heinrich Müller (1896) claiming a strophic composition for the sūras was dismissed without further scrutiny by subsequent scholarship, the possibility that “a firm hand was in full control” of the composition and structure of individual sūras has been virtually excluded. Against this view, structures do become clearly discernible beneath the surface through micro-structural analysis (Neuwirth 1981/2007). These structures mirror a historical development. Particularly in the early short sūras, distinctive verse groups can be isolated that often form part of clear-cut patterns of proportions. Thus, Q 75 is built on the following balanced verse groups: 6 + 6 + 6 + 6 + 5 + 5 + 5; Q 70 is made up of 6 + 7 + 7 + 7 + 7 + 9; Q 79 entails two groups of nine verses, its proportions being strikingly balanced 5 + 9 / 6 + 6 + 6 / 9 + 5. Q 51 is made up of groups of 9 + 14 + 14 + 9 + 7 + 7 verses. Similar
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7 Sinai explains (2006:121), “Elsewhere, in Q 10.37 too, this Qurʾān is qualified as tafsīl al-kitāb, a sequence of excerpts or interpretative renderings from the celestial book. In a number of passages from Mecca II and III the kitāb and Qurʾān are clearly distinguished. The transformation process leading from one entity to the other being labeled as tafsīl.” Sinai stresses that “a tafsīl of something must always target a specific audience in a specific situation. Q 41.44 wa-law jaʿalnā hu Qurʾān aʿjamīyan la-qulā lā fuṣsilat āyatuhu provides additional evidence for this. If the recitations had not been in Arabic, they would not have been properly adapted to their intended audience” (idem).
cases are found in many of those early Meccan sūras that exceed some ten verses, proportions being obviously a mnemonic device required when memorization without written support was demanded from the listeners.

_Clausulas_ 8

At a certain stage of the Middle Meccan period, verses that have become longer, exceeding two-sentence structures, cease to be marked by expressive and frequently changing rhyme formulas. Verses now start to display a more simple rhyme, mostly following the stereotypical –ūn, –īn-pattern that would hardly suffice to fulfill the listeners’ anticipation of a resounding end to the verse. A new mnemonic-technical device is utilized to solve the problem. This device is the rhymed phrase, a syntactically stereotyped colon that is distinguished from its context insomuch as it does not partake in the main strain of the discourse but presents a kind of moral comment on it, such as in the case of Joseph’s brothers’ plea, “Give us full measure and be charitable with us,” which is commented on with the statement “Truly God will repay the charitable” (Fa-awfi lanā l-kayla wa-taṣaddaq ʾalaynā inna llāha yajzī l-mutasaddiğin. Q 12:88). Or else the clausula refers to divine omnipotence and providence, such as in the case of Muḥammad’s night journey: _Subḥāna lladhi ʾasrā bi-ʿabdihi laylan [...] li-nuriyahu min āyatinā, innahu huwa l-samīʿu l-baṣīr_. Q 17:1, “Glory be to Him who carried His servant by night . . . that we might show him some of our signs,” which is commented on with the clausula: “He is the All-hearing, the All-seeing.” An elaborate classification of the rhymed phrases has shown that the clausulas display a large number of divine predicates. Although it is true that not all multipartite verses bear such formulaic endings but occasionally contain ordinary short sentences in the position of the last colon, clausula verses still may be considered a characteristic developed in the late Meccan period and present in later verses. Clausulas serve to turn the often-narrative discourse of the extended sūras into paraenetic appeals, thus immediately supporting the communication of their theological message. In this manner they betray a novel narrative pact between the speaker and his audience, the consciousness that there is a basic consensus on human moral behavior as well as on the image of God as a powerful agent in human interaction, a consciousness that has of course been reached only after an extended process of the community’s education.

_The Exegetical Qurʾān: Sūrat al-ikhlāṣ as an Example_

Let us finally turn to an example of the Qurʾānic absorption of earlier traditions that were orally transmitted in its milieu and—appropriated by the Qurʾānic community—emerged in a new shape that however still re-sounds their pre-Qurʾānic acoustic and rhetorical shape. One of the core texts of the Qurʾān, the creed articulated in _sūrat al-ikhlāṣ_ (112), the “pure belief,” is celebrated in Islam as a textual, visual, and acoustic icon of unity (trans. by Arberry 1964):
Qul huwa llāhu ʾḥad / Allāhu ʾṣ-ṣamad / lam yalid wa-ʾlam yālād / wa-ʾlam yakun lahu kufūwan ʾḥad.

Say: He is God, one / God the absolute / He did not beget, nor is He begotten / And there is none like Him.

The short text unit, made up of succinct verses with a proper end-rhyme, would, on first sight, fit into the pattern of the neatly constructed poetical early Meccan sūras were it not for the introductory “qul,” “say,” that is characteristic of later—more discursive—texts. Indeed, upon closer examination, the text is not as monolithic as it appears. It is hard to ignore the way verse 1—“Say, God is One”; qul huwa llāhu ʾḥad—echoes the Jewish credo “Hear Israel, the Lord, our God, is One”; Shema’ Yisrāʾēl, adōnay ēlōhēnū adōnay ʾḥad. It is striking that the Jewish text remains audible in the Qurʾānic version, which—against grammatical norms—adopts the Hebrew-sounding noun ʾḥad instead of the more pertinent adjective wāḥid for the rhyme. This “ungrammaticality” should not go unnoticed. I refer here to Michael Riffaterre (1978), who coined the notion of the “ungrammaticality,” meaning the awkwardness of a textual moment that semiotically points to another text which provides a key to its decoding. The particular kind of ungrammaticality that is operating in our text can be identified with Riffaterre’s “dual sign.” To quote Riffaterre (92):

The dual sign works like a pun . . . It is first apprehended as a mere ungrammaticality, until the discovery is made that there is another text in which the word is grammatical; the moment the other text is identified, the dual sign becomes significant purely because of its shape, which alone alludes to that other code.

The Jewish text, as we saw, remains audible in the Qurʾānic version. Why? This striking translingual quotation is certainly not without function. It is part of a negotiation strategy: to appropriate the Jewish credo by making it universal and thus acceptable to a non-Jewish audience by underscoring that difference, addressing not Israel but any believer. This kind of exegetical correction is a modification that the Qurʾān applies to numerous earlier traditions. Yet the audible resonance of the earlier text seems to be a clear oral address to Jewish listeners in particular; the text might thus additionally entail a strategy to bridge the gap between the Qurʾānic and the Jewish communities.

But, as the following table shows, the sūra refers to more than one earlier credo:
Verse 3—”He did not beget nor is he begotten”; lam yalid wa-lam yūlad—is a reverse echo of the Nicene creed; it rejects the emphatic affirmation of Christ’s sonship—begotten, not made; gennethenta, ou poiethenta—by a no less emphatic double negation. A negative theology is established through the inversion of a locally familiar religious text. This negative theology is summed up in verse 4—“And there is none like Him”; wa-lam yakun lahu kufuwan aḥad. The verse that introduces a Qur’ānic hapax legomenon, kufuwun, “equal in rank,” to render the core concept of homoousios, not only inverts the Nicene formula of Christ’s being of one substance with God—homoousios to patri—but also forbids thinking of any being as equal in substance with God, let alone a son.⁹

Although these verses negate the essential statement of the Nicene creed, they nevertheless “translate” the Greek/Syriac intertext, adopting its rhetorical strategy of intensification. The Nicene wording first emphatically denies Christ’s being made, “begotten, not made,” and then goes on to top that verdict by proclaiming his equality in nature with the Father, homoousios to patri, “being of one substance with the Father.” In the Qur’ān, the no less emphatic exclusion of the idea of sonship and fatherhood alike—lam yalid wa-lam yūlad, “he did not beget, nor is he begotten”—is likewise “topped” by a universal negation stating that there is no way to think of a being equal with God: wa-lam yakun lahu kufuwan aḥad. Again the pre-text is audible in the final version.

Rhetorically, again, this text echoes the earlier Christian wording. Verses 3 and 4 are certainly not primarily a polemic address to Christians, but, raising more general claims, have become part of an integral new text, a universalist monotheistic creed. That text is a composite counter-text to two powerful earlier texts, the creeds of both the Jews and the Christians, that can both still be “heard” re-sounding through the new Arabic rhetorical shape. A cultural translation has taken place, brought about most immediately by oral communication and continuing to rely for its effectiveness on the still-audible rhetorical matrix of both the Jewish and the Christian tradition. What for Islamic tradition has become an icon of unity reveals itself in the pre-canonical Qur’ān as living speech—a suggestive example of the Qur’ān’s oral and at the same time exegetical nature.
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