



ISSN: 2146-4901
e-ISSN: 2667-6575

A Comparison of the Linguistic Categories of Muştarak and Muşkil of the Hanafî Islamic Jurisprudence

Hanefî Usûl-ı Fıkhî'nın Müşterek ve Müşkil Dil Kategorilerinin Bir Mukayesesi

Ahmet TOPAL

ORCID: 0000-0003-3127-1674 - E-Posta ahmet.topal@aya.yale.edu

Assist. Prof. Dr. Hitit University Faculty of Theology, Department of Basic Islamic Sciences,
Arabic Language And Rhetoric

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Hitit Üniversitesi, İlahiyat Fakültesi, Temel İslam Bilimleri,

Çorum, Türkiye

ROR: 01x8m3269

Article Information / Makale Bilgisi

Citation / Atıf: Topal, Ahmet. "A Comparison of the Linguistic Categories of Muştarak and Muşkil of the Hanafî Islamic Jurisprudence". *Şırnak Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 31 (Haziran 2023), 122-151. <https://doi.org/10.35415/sirnakifd.1258792>

Date of Submission (<i>Geliş Tarihi</i>)	01. 03. 2023
Date of Acceptance (<i>Kabul Tarihi</i>)	08. 06. 2023
Date of Publication (<i>Yayın Tarihi</i>)	15. 06. 2023
Article Type (<i>Makale Türü</i>)	Research Article (<i>Araştırma Makalesi</i>)
Peer-Review (<i>Değerlendirme</i>)	Double anonymized - Two External (<i>İki Dış Hakem / Çift Taraflı Körleme</i>).
Ethical Statement (<i>Etik Beyan</i>)	It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited. (<i>Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.</i>)
Plagiarism Checks (<i>Benzerlik Taraması</i>)	Yes (<i>Evet</i>) – Turnitin / Ithenticate.
Conflicts of Interest (<i>Çıkar Çatışması</i>)	The author(s) has no conflict of interest to declare (<i>Çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir.</i>)
Complaints (<i>Etik Beyan Adresi</i>)	suifdergi@gmail.com
Grant Support (<i>Finansman</i>)	The author(s) acknowledge that they received no external funding in support of this research. (<i>Bu araştırmayı desteklemek için dış fon kullanılmamıştır.</i>)
Copyright & License (<i>Telif Hakkı ve Lisans</i>)	Authors publishing with the journal retain the copyright to their work licensed under the CC BY-NC 4.0. (<i>Yazarlar dergide yayımlanan çalışmalarının telif hakkına sahiptirler ve çalışmalarını CC BY-NC 4.0 lisansı altında yayımlanmaktadır.</i>)

Abstract

The linguistic categories (*aqsām al-lafz*) of Islamic Jurisprudence (*Uṣūl al-Fiqh*) have recently become a source of interest to both Arabic linguists as well as scholars of Islamic Law. There seems to be a widespread tendency, however, among contemporary scholars to approach to them without any concern to highlight aspects where they are similar to, or different from, each other, unless such a comparison was already made in classical manuals of Islamic Jurisprudence, even where the occasion demands the otherwise. One such occasion concerns *muštarak* and *muškil*, the two linguistic categories that fall under the first and the second linguistic categorizations respectively. While *uṣūlīs* compare *muštarak* with its co-subcategories (e.g. *khāṣṣ*) and *muškil* with its co-subcategories (e.g. *khafī*), they do not compare *muštarak* and *muškil* with each other despite the striking similarities between them. These similarities might compromise the integrity of the linguistic categorization due to the seeming existence of two separate categories for what appears to be the same concept. Therefore, there is a need to analyze the two categories in a comparative way to establish the nature of the relationship between the two, which is an issue, to the best of my knowledge, that has never been addressed in the previous literature, thus constituting an important gap that needs to be filled. The need to fill this gap becomes more urgent as the contemporary works that discuss *muštarak* and *muškil* define these two categories almost identical, sometimes even providing the same examples for each one of them, without noting the nature of the difference between them, which epitomizes the degree of misunderstanding which this gap in the classical literature can lead to today. In an attempt to fill this gap, this paper provides, for the first time, a comparative analysis of *muštarak* and *muškil*. Falling back upon classical manuals of Islamic Jurisprudences within the Ḥanaḫī school, the present work argues that the difference between *muštarak* and *muškil* is that in the case of *muškil*, the assigned meanings of a given ambiguous expression has not yet thought through and requires two types of inquiries, namely *ṭalab*, which is to list the assigned meanings in use, and *ta`ammul*, which is to determine which one of the assigned meanings of the ambiguous expression is meant on a given speech/writing occasion. However, in the case of *muštarak*, the assigned meanings of a given ambiguous expression have already been worked out and therefore are already known by the addressee(s) on a given speech/writing occasion, thus requiring only the inquiry of *ta`ammul*. Therefore, this paper further argues that after its meanings in use are determined through *ta`ammul*, *muškil* turns into *muštarak*. In this regard, *muškil* expression can be said to be an earlier version of *muštarak*, just as *muštarak* can be referred to be an earlier version of *mu`awwal* after one of its assigned meanings are preponderated upon through *ta`wil*.

Kew Words: Islamic Law (*Fiqh*), Arabic Linguistics, Linguistic categories of Islamic Jurisprudence (*uṣūl al-fiqh*), *Muškil*, *Muštarak*.

Özet

İslam hukuk metodolojisi (*usûl-ı fıkhın*) dil kategorilerinin (*elfâz* bahislerinin), son zamanlarda hem Arap dilcileri hem de İslam hukuku üzerine çalışma yapan ilim adamları için bir ilgi kaynağı haline geldiği görülmektedir. Ancak, konuyu çalışan modern dönemdeki ilim adamları arasında, klasik eserlerde zaten mukayesesi yapılmış olanların dışında dil kategorilerinin benzerliklerine ya da farklılıklarına, durumun bir mukayeseyi gerektirdiği zamanlarda bile, değinme endişesi taşımayan yaygın bir yaklaşım söz konusudur. Böyle bir durum, sırasıyla birinci ve ikinci lafız tasnifi içerisinde yer alan *müşterek* ve *müşkil* lafızları için de görülmektedir. Klasik usûl âlimleri bu her iki dil kategorisini, kendi dil tasnifleri içerisinde yer alan diğer dil alt-kategorileri ile mukayeseye tabi tutmaktadır. Sözelimi, klasik usûl âlimleri, *müşterek* lafız onunla aynı dil tasnifi içerisinde (yani birinci dil tasnifinde) yer alan *hâss* ile; *müşkil* lafız ise onunla aynı dil tasnifinde (yani ikinci dil tasnifinde) yer alan *hafî* ile mukayese etmektedirler. Bununla beraber, bu alimlerin *müşterek* ve *müşkil* lafızları, aralarındaki çarpıcı benzerliklere rağmen mukayese etmediği görünmektedir. Bu benzerlikler, dil tasnifinin sağlamlığını sarsabilir çünkü aynı kavram için iki terimin var olduğu zannedilebilir. Daha önceki literatürde işaret edilmemiş olan bir problemi teşkil eden ve bu sebeple de alanda önemli bir boşluğu temsil eden *müşterek* ve *müşkil* lafızların arasındaki ilişkinin nasıl olduğu sorusuna yanıt bulabilmek amacıyla, bu iki kategorinin, mukayeseli bir analizine ihtiyaç duyulmaktadır. *Müşterek* ve *müşkil* lafızları inceleyen modern eserler, bu iki dil kategorisini neredeyse aynı şekilde tanımlamakta ve onları açıklamak için aynı örnekleri kullanmaktadırlar. Bu durum ise, bu konuda bahsi geçen boşluğun sebep olabileceği yanlış anlaşılmanın boyutunu gözler önüne sermektedir. İlk kez burada tespit ettiğimiz bu boşluğu doldurmak için, bu makale, literatürde tespit edebildiğimiz kadarıyla ilk defa *müşterek* ve *müşkil* lafızların mukayeseli bir analizini gerçekleştirmektedir. Hanefi mezhebi klasik eserlerine dayanarak, *müşterek* ve *müşkil* arasındaki farkı şu şekilde izah etmektedir: *Müşkil* lafızda, manasında kapalılık bulunan lafızın dilde kullanılan manaları üzerinde alimler henüz kafa yormamış ve dolayısıyla onlar için bunları listeleme ihtiyacı doğmamıştır. Bu durum, *müşkil* lafızda iki tür bilgiye ulaşma yöntemi gerektirmektedir: *taleb* (kullanımdaki konulmuş manaların tespiti) ve *teemmül* (belirli kullanım sırasında bu konulmuş manalarından hangisinin kastedildiğinin tespiti). *Müşterek* lafızda ise, manasında kapalılık bulunan lafızın konulmuş (*vad'î*) manaları üzerinde âlimler zaten düşünmüş ve bunları tespit etmiştir. Bundan dolayı bu lafız türü sadece *teemmül* gerektirir. Bu sebeple, bu makale, dilde kullanılan manaları henüz âlimler tarafından tespit edilmemiş *müşkil* lafızın, *müşterek* lafızın bir önceki versiyonunu temsil ettiğini iddia etmektedir. Ayrıca, bu manalarının neler olduğu tespit edildikten ve listelendikten sonra (ki bu durum, bu manaların sözlüklerde yer almasına da sebebiyet verebilir), daha önceden *müşkil* kategorisi altına düşen lafızın, artık doğal olarak *müşterek* lafza tebdîl olacağı yine bu makalede savunulmaktadır. Bu durumun bir benzeri, herhangi bir konuşma sırasında manalarından birinin, muhatap tarafından maksûd (kastedilen anlam) olarak tercih olunması sebebiyle *müşterek* lafızın, *müevvel* lafza dönüşmesinde de görülmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: İslam Hukuku, Arap Dil Bilimi, *Usûl-ı Fıkh'ın* Dil kategorileri (*Elfâz* Bahisleri), *Müşterek*, *Müşkil*.

Introduction

The growing interest in *aqsām al-lafz* (the linguistic categories) of *Uşûl al-Fiqh* (Islamic Jurisprudence) and the nature of the existing approaches to these categories adopted in contemporary scholarship as well as the issues associated with these approaches have been explored in detail elsewhere.¹

The contemporary scholars often repeated, with various degrees of success, what is already mentioned in classical manuals of Islamic Jurisprudence with regard to the linguistic categories, without any interest into exploring the overarching theory that led to the production of these categories.² This brings up a morass of issues concerning our understanding of the nature of the linguistic categories in particular and of *Uşûl al-Fiqh* in general.³

This paper deals with one of the characteristics of the prevailing approaches to categories that results from their lack of interest in the framework behind the linguistic categories that steered the scholars of Islamic Jurisprudence (hereafter, *uşûlīs*) when producing the categories. In fact, its main argument is that the prevailing approaches to the categories are characterized by their tendency to compare and contrast the categories which had already been compared and contrasted with each other in classical manuals of Islamic Jurisprudence while avoiding from

¹ See Ahmet Topal, "The Role of the Arabic Language in *istinbât al-ḥukm* within the Context of Criminal law: A General Framework for Inquiry into the Linguistic Categories of *uşûl al-fiqh* of the Ḥanafī school of law" (PhD diss., Leeds University, 2020).

² See, in this regard, Fahrettin Atar, *Fıkh Usûlü* (Istanbul: IFAV, 2018), Zekiyüddin Şâban, *İslâm Hukuk İlminin Esasları (Usûlü'l-Fıkh)* [in Arabic] (Ankara: TDV Yayınları, 2018), Bernard G. Weiss, *The Search for God's Law: Islamic Jurisprudence in the Writings of Sayf al-Dīn al-Āmidī* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2010), Mohammad Hashim Kamali, *Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence* (Cambridge: The Islamic Texts Society, 1991), Wael B. Hallaq, *A History of Islamic Legal Theories: An Introduction to Sunnī uşûl al-fiqh* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), Aron Zysow, *The Economy of Certainty: An Introduction to the Typology of Islamic Legal Theory*, Resources (Atlanta, Georgia : Lockwood Press, 2013), Muhammed M. Yunis Ali, *Medieval Islamic Pragmatics: Sunni Legal Theorists' Models of Textual Communication* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), David R. Vishanoff, "Early Islamic Hermeneutics: Language, Speech, and Meaning in Preclassical Legal Theory" (PhD diss., Emory University, 2004), and Behnam Sadeghi, *The Logic of Law Making in Islam* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

³ Topal, "The Role of the Arabic Language in *istinbât al-ḥukm*," 51.

making any comparisons between categories which have not so far been subject to any comparison in classical manuals, even where the occasion demands the otherwise. One such occasion concerns *muštarak* and *muškil*, and this paper will compare these two categories with each other as a case study to support its main argument.

1. A Literature Review on the Difference between *Muštarak* and *Muškil*

Despite the striking similarities between the two, which might well underpin the existence of two separate categories for what appears to be the same concept, *muštarak* and *muškil* have been compared and contrasted with each other in neither the contemporary nor the classical manuals, which I will next review below.

1.1. Contemporary Literature

The majority of contemporary works on Islamic legal studies tend to avoid from discussing the linguistic aspects of *Uşūl al-Fiqh*, and so it does not come as a surprise that we do not find any separate modern work that is dedicated to a comparison of *muštarak* and *muškil*.

Nevertheless, there are several contemporary works that deal with the linguistic categories in general, and while doing so, they discuss or touch upon, with various lengths, the two linguistic categories as well. We also find others whose subject matter is more specific, such as covering only the ambiguous categories, and while doing so they also discuss or touch upon *muštarak* and/or *muškil*.

Yalınkılıç and Abay, for instance, specifically attempt to compare with *muškil* the linguistic categories that have ambiguity in them such as *khafī*. Yet, they are silent when it comes to comparing it with *muštarak* in any way whatsoever in spite of the fact that *muštarak* is also a linguistic category with ambiguity and therefore falls under the subject matter that their paper aims to cover.⁴

⁴ Mehmet Yalınkılıç and Ahmet Abay, "Meryem suresi 71. Ayet Bağlamında İşkâli Giderme Yöntemleri", in *Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 5 / 9 (December 2018): 463-482, p. 467-9.

Another example in this regard is Karaahmetoğlu, who discusses the type of *işkâl* and the ways of resolving them within the scope of Ibn Āšūr,⁵ while providing no conceptual basis for *qur'* that would justify the fact that *tuhr* (the state of pureness from menstrual discharge) is the intended meaning of the expression *qur'*.⁶ Instead, she contends herself to say that despite the fact that the expression *qur'* could potentially come to mean both *tuhr* and *hayđ* (menstruation), the exegetes require that the most suitable and the most correct of them to be chosen in terms of its meaning and use. As a result, she notes, it is necessary to choose the former as the intended meaning of the word *qur'*, albeit without really exposing the logic behind choosing the former and not the latter meaning of the word *qur'*.⁷

Being more of a general treatment of the categories, Kamali's *Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence* is widely used work that discusses, among other categories, *muşkil* and *muştarak*. He notes, "*Mushkil* denotes a word which is inherently ambiguous, and whose ambiguity can only be removed by means of research and *ijtihad*." He next goes on to compare it with *muşkil*'s co-subcategory under the second categorization. He then notes something worth discussing here: "There are, for example, words which have more than one meaning, and when they occur in a text, the text is unclear with regard to one or the other of those meanings." This is in fact quite similar to how he defines *muştarak*, where he notes, "A homonym [*muştarak*] is a word which has more than one meaning."⁸

What is even more interesting to show the degree of misunderstanding among contemporary scholars when it comes to the nature of the difference between the categories of *muştarak* and *muşkil* is the fact that Kamali gives the same example for *muştarak* and *muşkil*,

⁵ See, for instance, Reyhan Karaahmetoğlu, "İbn Āšūr'a Göre İşkâl Sebepleri ve Çözüm Yolları," in *Mutalaa* 1 / 2 (December 2021): 222-239, p. 228.

⁶ For more information on the term *qur'* being a *muştarak* expression, see Şams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ḥamza b. Muḥammad al-Fanārī al-Rūmī, ed. Muḥammad Ḥasan Muḥammad Ḥasan Ismā'īl, *Fuṣūl al-Badā'i' fi Uşūl al-Sharā'i'* (Beirut: Dār Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1971), I, 105-106.

⁷ See Karaahmetoğlu, "İbn Āšūr'a Göre İşkâl Sebepleri ve Çözüm Yolları," 228.

⁸ Kamali, *Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence*, 116.

namely the word *qur'*.⁹ And yet, he makes no effort to investigate the nature of the difference between the two categories.

For the convenience of my readers, I will provide with Kamali's remarks here on the expression *qur'*. When giving *qur'* as an example for *muštarak*, he notes: "Similarly the word '*qur'*' has two meanings, namely menstruation, and the clean period between two menstruations. The Hanafis, the Hanbalis and the Zaydis have upheld the first, while the Shafi'is, Malikis and Ja'faris have upheld the second meaning of *qur'*."¹⁰ Interestingly enough, he provides the same example, namely *qur'*, for *muškil* and makes almost the same remarks: "There are, for example, words which have more than one meaning, and when they occur in a text, the text is unclear with regard to one or the other of those meanings. Thus, the word '*qur'*' which occurs in sura al-Baqarah (2:228) is *Mushkil* as it has two distinct meanings: menstruation (*hayd*) and the clean period between two menstruations (*tuhr*). Whichever of these is taken, the ruling of the text will differ accordingly. Imam Shafi'i and a number of other jurists have adopted the latter, whereas the Hanafis and others have adopted the former as the correct meaning of *qur'*."¹¹

These are representative examples from the contemporary scholarship, and more examples could have been cited.¹² Similar examples are also explored elsewhere from works of Weiss, Kamali, Ali, Vishanoff, and Sadeghi within the scope of linguistic categories other than *muštarak* and *muškil*. They also demonstrate the lack of interest among contemporary scholars to approach to the linguistic categories in a comparative way even when this causes misunderstandings with regard to one's understanding of each relevant linguistic category and

⁹ See Kamali, *Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence*, 98 and 116.

¹⁰ Kamali, *Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence*, 116.

¹¹ Kamali, *Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence*, 98.

¹² Another example is Kavalcıođlu, A. "Debûsî ve Semerkandî'nin Fıkıh Usulünde "Kapalı Lafızlar" in *Konusuna Yaklaşımları ve Görüşlerinin Mukayesesi*". *Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi (KTUİFD)* 5 (2018): 61-85.

of the whole science of *Uşûl al-Fiqh* (Islamic Jurisprudence) as well as the role of these linguistic categories on the formation of Islamic Law (*Fiqh*) as we know it today.¹³

1.2. Classical Literature

The classical manuals of Islamic Jurisprudence within the Ḥanafī school of law, as far as I am aware of, do not make any comparison between the categories of *muştarak* and *muşkil* on a theoretical basis.¹⁴ There could be a number of reasons behind the lack of classical manuals of any comparison between *muştarak* and *muşkil*. To mention but one possibility, this might be due to the fact that the difference between the two categories might well be too obvious to their authors.¹⁵

Thus, I do not claim that the classical scholars did not know the difference between the two categories. Rather, the classical scholars, at least the earlier ones, appear to be well aware of the difference between *muştarak* and *muşkil*, as they are the ones who produced the categories in

¹³ Vishanoff, Sadeghi and several others consider the role of *Uşûl al-Fiqh* with its linguistic categories in the formation of the Ḥanafī school of law to be negligible. For details on the nature of their approaches to the linguistic categories and issues associated with their approaches, see Topal, "The Role of the Arabic Language in *istinbâṭ al-ḥukm*," 45-86. There are other works that repeat similar mistakes due to their approaches to the categories. See for instance, Tariq, Jaffer, "Mu'tazilite Aspects of Faḥr Al-Dīn al-Rāzī's Thought," *Arabica* 59, no. 5 (2012): 510-35, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41727686>.

¹⁴ See, for instance, Molla Jiwan, *Kitāb Nūr al-Anwār 'alā al-Manār* (Istanbul: al-Maktaba al-Ḥanāfiyya, n.d.), I, 150. See also, al-Pazdawī, Fakhr al-Islām 'Alī b. Muḥammad, *Kanz al-Wuṣūl ilā Ma'rifat al-Uşūl* (N.p., Mīr Muḥammad Kutub-khānah Markaz 'Ilm wa Adab, n.d.), 9. Noting on whether or not the expression *annā* falls under *muşkil* or *muştarak*, Ibn Ḥalabī notes, in his glossary on Ibn Malak's *Şarḥ al-Manār*, that the relevant verse can be regarded both as *muştarak* and *muşkil* simultaneously, though without really exposing the logic behind this or exploring the theoretical difference between *muşkil* and *muştarak* (see Ibn Ḥalabī, Raḍī al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, *Anwār al-Ḥalāk 'alā Şarḥ al-Manār li-Ibn Malak* (Istanbul: Āsitāna, n.d.), I, 365.

¹⁵ It could also be the case that *uşūlīs* may have not felt the need to cover the difference between the two categories simply because there might be no disagreement (*khilāf*) among scholars or schools of law on it that would make it worth to be included in classical works. For a discussion of the influence of disagreements, though not on manuals of Islamic Jurisprudence, but on Islamic legal manuals, (see Abdurrahim Bilik, "Hilâf Mesailinin Hanefî Muhtasarların Metin Kurgusuna Etkisi ve Temel Şerhlerde Ele Alınışı (Kitabu's-Salât Örneği)" in *Universal Journal of Theology* 5 / 2 (Aralık 2020): 109-134.) For other reasons behind the absence of such comparisons in classical manuals, albeit discussed within the scope of another matter, see Topal, "The Role of Arabic in *istinbâṭ al-ḥukm*," 86-89.

the first place and their works on Islamic Jurisprudence do provide valuable insights into the matter in hand, which will be illustrated below.

A close reading of the classical works on Islamic Jurisprudence can actually help one gain insights into the nature of the similarities and the differences between the two categories. In this regard, when commenting on al-Nasafī's influential work on *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*, namely, *al-Manār*, Molla Jīwan points out, perhaps unwittingly, to the similarities between *muštarak* and *muškil*. He classifies them both under the class of *izdiḥām al-ma'ānī* along with other two categories, namely *khafī* and *mujmal*.¹⁶

He holds that what all these four linguistic categories have in common is the fact that they all have multiple potential intended meanings. That is why he classifies them under the class of *izdiḥām al-ma'ānī*,¹⁷ which I might translate as 'merging of meanings in a single expression.' As to the difference between the two linguistic categories, i.e. *muštarak* and *muškil*, however, the same passage does not provide any insights. In fact, he notes the following:¹⁸

"فإن الخفي يدرك بمجرد الطلب والمشارك والمشكل بالتأمل بعد الطلب بخلاف المجمل فإنه قد يحتاج إلى ثلاثة طلبات الأولى الاستفسار عن المجمل ثم الطب للوصاف بعده ثم التأمل للتعيين."

As seen in the excerpt, Molla Jīwan discusses the question of how *mujmal* differs from the rest of the sub-classes of *izdiḥām al-ma'ānī*, namely, *khafī*, *muškil*, and *muštarak*, which he explains by appealing to the fact that *mujmal* is the only one among them that requires three inquiries, namely, *istifsār* (asking for clarification), *ṭalab* (pondering), and *ta'ammul* (deliberation).¹⁹ Similarly, he notes that *khafī* differs from the rest of the co-subclasses of *izdiḥām al-ma'ānī* in that it is the only linguistic category the ambiguity of which is resolved through *ṭalab* alone.²⁰ Instead

¹⁶ Molla Jīwan, *Kitāb Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 150. See also, Ibn Malak, *Šarḥ al-Manār*, I, 366.

¹⁷ Molla Jīwan, *Kitāb Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 150. See also, Ibn Malak, *Šarḥ al-Manār*, I, 365.

¹⁸ Molla Jīwan, *Kitāb Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 150. See also, al-Pazdawī, *Kanz al-Wuṣūl*, 9.

¹⁹ Molla Jīwan, *Kitāb Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 150.

²⁰ The term *ṭalab* refers to an inquiry into the meanings in which a given expression can be used, which is expressed by Molla Jīwan as an inquiry into whichever meaning it is used in (لأي معنى يستعمل هذا اللفظ) (Molla Jīwan, *Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 149). *Ṭalab* is to be followed by another process of inquiry in the case of *muškil*,

of noting the difference between the two, he mentions how both *muştarak* and *muşkil* require *ṭalab* and *ta'ammul* while *khafī* only requires the former.²¹

Moreover, he is not the only *uşulī* who does so. In fact, discussing how *izdiḥām al-ma'ānī* is a genius/class for *mujmal*, *muştarak*, *muşkil*, and *khafī*, Ibn Malak makes similar remarks when he says:

"لأن المراد يدرك في الخفي بمجرد الطلب وفي المشترك والمشكل بالتأمل بعد الطلب."²²

This translates as the following:

This is because the intended meaning in *khafī* is known merely through *ṭalab*, and in *muştarak* as well as *muşkil* via *ta'ammul* following *ṭalab*.

Likewise, Şadr al-Şarī'a compares the ambiguous expressions to each other from a different perspective. He notes the following:

"وإذا خفي أي المراد من اللفظ فخفاؤه إما لنفس اللفظ أو لعارض. والثاني يسمى خفياً. والأول إما أن يدرك المراد بالعقل أو لا. الأول يسمى مشكلاً. والثاني إما أن يدرك المراد بالنقل أو لا يدرك أصلاً. الأول يسمى مجملاً والثاني متشابهاً. وهذه الأقسام متباينة بلا خلاف."²³

This translates as follows:

When an expression becomes ambiguous, that is to say, its intended meaning of it, its ambiguity is either [1] due to the expression itself or [2] to an accident. The latter [2] is named "*khafī*". The former's [1] intended meaning can either [1.1.] be understood through intellect or [1.2.] it cannot. The former [1.1.] is called *muşkil*. The latter's [1.2.] intended meaning can either [1.2.1.] be understood through *naql* [report, containing, *tafsīr*, an explanation, provided by the addresser] or [1.2.2.] it can never be. The former [1.2.1.] is called *mujmal* and the latter [1.2.2.] is *mutaşābih*. And these categories are obvious without any argument [over them].

namely *ta'ammul*, which refers to an inquiry to determine which sense among the potential senses of the expression is meant on a particular speech/writing occasion (see, Molla Jīwan, *Kitāb Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 149).

²¹ Molla Jīwan, *Kitāb Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 150.

²² Ibn Malak, *Şarḥ al-Manār*, I, 366.

²³ Şadr al-Şarī'a, *al-Tawḍīḥ*, 197.

However, Şadr al-Şarī'a, too, does not compare *muşkil* with *muştarak* and thus does not provide insights into the nature of the difference between the two either.

Thus, *uşūlīs* seem to be either irrelevant to the difference between *muştarak* and *muşkil*, as is the case with, for instance, Şadr al-Şarī'a or even worse, put them into the same basket in that both require *ṭalab* and *ta'ammul* for their ambiguity to be resolved, and instead of noting the difference between the two, they rather go on to explain how these two differ from *khafī*, as is the case, for example, with Ibn Malak and Molla Jīwan.

This brings to the mind the question of how and in what ways *muştarak* and *muşkil* might be different from each other. Or do *uşūlīs* consider *muştarak* and *muşkil* the same?

As will be illustrated using classical sources, the *ṭalab* that is required in *muştarak* by some scholars for its ambiguity to be resolved seems to be different from the *ṭalab* that is required in *muşkil*'s ambiguity's resolution. Therefore, the similarity between *muşkil* and *muştarak* as far as both seemingly requiring *ṭalab* is more apparent than real.

2. *Muştarak* and *Muşkil* as Described in Classical Works

There is not much that the Ḥanafī primary sources of Islamic Jurisprudence directly or explicitly offer when it comes to the nature of the difference between *muştarak* and *muşkil* on a theoretical level.²⁴ Nevertheless, one could find pieces of information that can help lay a foundation for a comparative analysis of the linguistic categories between *muştarak* and *muşkil* and subsequently reveal the nature of the difference between the two. In this section (section 2) therefore, I will describe, starting with *muşkil*, both of these categories as they are presented in classical works.

²⁴ See, for instance, 'Alā al-Dīn Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Samarqandī, *Mizān al-Uşūl fī Natā'ij al-Uqūl*, ed. Muḥammad Zakī 'Abd al-Barr (N.p.: Maṭba'a Dūḥa al-Ḥadītha, 1984), 340 and 354, Şadr al-Şarī'a, *al-Tawḍīḥ*, 197, and al-Shāshī, Niẓām al-Dīn Abū 'Alī Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ishāq, *Uşūl al-Shāshī*, ed. 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Khalīlī (Beirut: Dar al-Kotob al-Ilmiyah, 2003), 24-25.

2.1. Muşkil

The category of *muşkil* falls under the second categorization within the Hanafi Jurisprudence and *uşûlīs* define it as the following:

"وهو عند الاصوليين عبارة عن كلام يحتمل المعاني المختلفة ويكون المراد واحدا منها لكنه قد دخل في اشكاله وهي تلك المعاني المختلفة فاختلفت بسبب هذا الدخول".

This translates as the following:

According to *uşûlīs*, it [*muşkil*] is an expression that has multiple potential meanings. Yet, the intended meaning [of *muşkil* expression] is [only] one of them. However, it mixed with its likes, which are these various [i.e. multiple] meanings. As a result of this mix, it [i.e. the *muşkil* expression] became ambiguous.²⁵

The two examples often given for *muşkil* expression are (i) *qawārīr min fiḍḍa* (decanters made of silver), mentioned in Qur'ān 76:16,²⁶ which translates as "Decanters made of silver: they will determine the measure thereof (according to their wishes)²⁷ and (ii) *annā*, as in *annā la-ki hādā* (O Mary! Whence (comes) this to you?),²⁸ mentioned in the Qur'ān 3:37,²⁹ which translates as

²⁵ Other *uşûlīs* defined *muşkil* similarly. Al-Shāshī, for instance, notes: "وأما المُشكَل... دخل في أشكاله وأمثاله حتى لا يقال المراد إلا بالطلب ثم بالتأمل حتى يمتيز عن أمثاله ونظيره في الأحكام", which can be translated as "As to *muşkil*,... [it is that which] enters upon its likes and its equals so much so that its intended meaning cannot be known only through pondering and then deliberating with the purpose of differentiating it from its likes and compeers in legal ruling (al-Shāshī, Niẓām al-Dīn Abū 'Alī Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ishāq, *Uşūl al-Shāshī* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Arabī, 1982), 81.) For similar remarks, see also a-Laknawī, *Qamar al-Aqmār*, I, 148; al-Nasafī, *al-Manār*, I, 148; and Molla Jīwan, *Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 148. For the lexical meaning of the term *muşkil*, which is "things or affairs, that are confused or dubious [by reason of their resembling one another or from any other cause]," see Edward William, Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon Derived from the Best and Most Copious Eastern Sources* (Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1968), 1500.

²⁶ قَوَارِيرٍ مِنْ فِضَّةٍ قَدَرُوا مِنْهَا تَقْدِيرًا

²⁷ See, Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. Ḥajjāj al-Signāqī, *al-Kāfi Šarḥ al-Pazdawī*, ed. Fakhr al-Dīn Sayyid Muḥammad Qānat (al-Riyāḍ: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2001), 234, where al-Signāqī notes: "فالقارورة من الزجاج تكون لا من الفضة، فتأملنا فقلنا: إن تلك الأواني لا تكون من الزجاج، ولا بد من الفضة، بل لتلك الأواني حظ منهما، فإن للزجاج صفاء ليس هو للفضة وهو أن يجلي عما في باطنه، والفضة لها بياض ليس هو للزجاج، فكان لتلك الأواني صفاء الزجاج وبياض الفضة، وهما الصفتان الحميدتان لهما، فانتهت عنها الصفات الذميمة التي لهما."

²⁸ See, for instance, Molla Jīwan, *Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 149.

²⁹ فَتَقَبَّلَهَا رَبُّهَا بِقَبُولٍ حَسَنٍ وَأَنْبَتَهَا نَبَاتًا حَسَنًا وَكَفَّلَهَا زَكَرِيَّا كُلَّمَا دَخَلَ عَلَيْهَا زَكَرِيَّا الْمِحْرَابَ وَجَدَ عِنْدَهَا رِزْقًا قَالَ لِمَزِيْمٍ أَنَّى لَكَ هَذَا إِذْ ظَنَنْتَ أَنَّكَ وَرَثٌ مِنَ اللَّهِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُرْزُقُ مَنْ يَشَاءُ بِغَيْرِ حِسَابٍ

“And her Lord accepted her with full acceptance and vouchsafed to her a goodly growth; and made Zachariah her guardian. Whenever Zachariah went into the sanctuary (*miḥrāb*) where she was, he found that she had food. He said: O Mary! Whence (comes) this to you? She answered: It is from Allah. Allah gives without limit to whom He wills.”

I will next deal with these two examples of *muškil* with an eye to providing insights into nature of the linguistic category of *muškil* with its both types and how exactly both differ from the category of *muštarak*. I will start with *qawārīr min fiḍḍa* and proceed to *annā*, which represent multiple-worded *muškil* and one-worded *muškil* respectively.

2.1.1. Multiple-worded *muškil*

The issue with *qawārīr min fiḍḍa* that made it fall under the ambiguous category of *muškil* is that when the word *qārūra* (pl. *qawārīr*), which means a cup made of glass, is described with the adjectival of being made of silver, this particular type of cup then happens to be described with two opposing features, namely, the feature of being made of silver and the feature of being made of glass. In fact, as far as our understanding of the world in which we live in is concerned, there exists no item that is being described by the expression *qārūra min fiḍḍa*.

It is true that we do know of cups made of glass and those made of silver. But we have not experienced any cup which combines the feature of being made of silver and that of being made of glass. In other words, this expression mixes with each other what we know of in this world in terms of two ordinary features of ordinary cups in order for this mix/combination (*mudkhal* or *madkhūl*)³⁰ to denote, perhaps on the strength of this combination, a meaning of an extraordinary type of cup used in paradise to serve drink to those who go to paradise, as it is understood from the context of the expression where it is mentioned in the Qur’ān 76:16.³¹

³⁰ *Mudkhal* is the passive participle noun of *adkhala-hū* (Lane, 861). I am using it here to allude to how *uṣūlīs* define *muškil*, which, as they note, mixes with, or enters upon, its likes, when they say “وهو الداخل في أشكاله” (It is that which mixes with, or enters upon, its likes (see al-Nasafī, *al-Manār*, I, 148.)

³¹ قَوَارِيرَ مِنْ فِضَّةٍ قَدَّرُوا هَا تَقْدِيرًا

Thus, the meaning which the addresser, in this case, God the Almighty, seems to convey to his creation is expressed not with the name of the particular cup used in paradise, but through this combination, namely *qārūra min fiḍḍa*. The addressee(s) could then come up with their best understandings of the expression following pondering (*ṭalab*) and deliberation (*ta'ammul*).

This is in line with the definition of *muşkil*, which states that “it [*muşkil*] is that which enters upon, or mixes with, its likes (*amṭālihi*).”³² In fact, *qārūra min fiḍḍa* mixes the two features of cups that we know of, namely, the feature of being made of glass and the feature of being made of silver. Once we move to the process of *ṭalab* to find out what this combination/mix of features might denote in terms of the intended meaning of this mysterious cup that is noted in the Quran, we go further down to the sub-features of the feature of being made of glass and those of the feature of being made of silver.

This then leads us to arrive at the conclusion that *glass* has two sub-features that stand out among the materials that one would know of during the time when Qur'ān 76:16 was revealed: transparency and opaqueness. While the former sub-feature is desired, the latter is not so when it comes to glass material. The other conclusion which one arrives at here is that *silver* has two sub-features: brightness and the lack of purity. While the former is something appreciated when it comes to silver, the latter is not desired, as noted by *uşūlī* scholars.³³

As a result, when the feature of being made of glass and that of being made of silver were combined with each other in the *muşkil* expression *qārūra min fiḍḍa*, the outcome of this combination is a type of cup that might possess the features of transparency and/or opaqueness in addition to the features of brightness and/or the lack of purity. Some of the potential intended meanings of the expression *qārūra min fiḍḍa* that one could then derive from this are as the following:

1. Cup that is opaque and impure.

³² Al-Nasafī, *al-Manār*, I, 148. See also, al-Samarqandī, *Mīzān al-Uşūl*, 354 and al-Pazdawī, *Kanz al-Wuşūl*, 9.

³³ Molla Jīwan, *Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 150. See also Şadr al-Şarī'a, *al-Tawḍīh*, 196.

2. Cup that is opaque and bright.
3. Cup that is transparent and bright.
4. Cup that is transparent and impure.

The intended meaning of any given *muškil*, though could potentially be more than one, must be one of these potential senses in a given speech or writing occasion and it cannot denote multiple meanings at the same time.³⁴ Then, in our case which one of the combination of features mentioned above could express the intended meaning of the *muškil* expression of *qārūra min fiḍḍa*?

It seems that the only plausible answer to this question is the third option because it is the one that contains only the positive sub-features. In fact, these two features, namely, transparency and brightness, would be the expected features among the potentials for a type of cup to be used in the paradise.³⁵ This process of choosing the most likely option among the potential intended meanings of a *muškil* phrase is what *uṣūlīs* refer to as the process of *ta'ammul* (deliberation).³⁶

2.1.2. One-worded *muškil*

The issue which *uṣūlīs* found with one-worded *muškil* expressions such as the expression of *annā* mentioned in Qur'ān 2:223³⁷ is similar to the issue with multiple-worded *muškil* expressions as in *qārūra min fiḍḍa*, which I have explored in the previous section. The issue with the one-worded *muškil* expressions involves a somewhat easier thought process in its resolution in comparison to the previous type of *muškil* expression, which consists of multiple words.

³⁴ Al-Nasafī, *al-Manār*, I, 148

³⁵ Şadr al-Şarī'a, *al-Tawḍīḥ*, 196.

³⁶ Molla Jīwan, *Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 150, al-Pazdawī, *Kanz al-Wuṣūl*, 9, al-Samarqandī, *Mizān al-Uṣūl*, 354, and Şadr al-Şarī'a, *al-Tawḍīḥ*, 196.

³⁷ نِسَاؤُكُمْ حَرْثٌ لَّكُمْ فَاتُوا حَرْثَكُمْ أَنَّى شِئْتُمْ وَقَدِّمُوا لِنَفْسِكُمْ ؕ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَعَلِمُوا أَنَّكُمْ مُلَاقُوهُ ؕ وَبَشِّرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ (Your wives are a place of sowing of seed for you, so approach them how you please. And send forth something good for yourselves. Be mindful of Allah, and know that you will meet Him. And give good news to the believers.)

The relative easiness in the resolution of this type of *muşkil* expression, which I refer to as 'one-worded *muşkil*,' seems to come from the fact that each one of the *muşkil* expression's potential meanings is already known to the linguistic community.

The problem here originates from the fact that scholars had not found themselves in a situation where they would consider all its potential meanings that were in circulation at that time and then make a list of all these potential meanings, a list to be used for feature reference.³⁸

Thus, as is the case with the multiple-worded *muşkil*, here one needs to first ponder upon (go through the process of *ṭalab*) to determine the potential meanings of one-worded *muşkil* expression. Given that the process of *ṭalab* (pondering) is performed by someone who knows the Arabic language well, it would help them reach to the meanings of the *muşkil* expression that were in circulation in the Arabic language then.³⁹

This is the process which *uşûlīs* have followed with the word *annā*, too. In fact, undertaking the inquiry of *ṭalab*, *uşûlīs* noted that the potential meanings of *annā* are as the following:

1. *ayy kayfiyya* (how) as in “*annā yakūnu lī ġulamun*,” (How shall I have a son!), which is mentioned in Qur'ān 19:08.⁴⁰
2. *min ayy makān* (whence) as in “*annā laki hādā*,” (O Mary! Whence (comes) this to you?), which is mentioned in Qur'ān 3:37.⁴¹

³⁸ Note, however, that listing here does not necessarily entail a written one. A given scholar's lack of knowledge of a given expressions' potential meanings that were in use at the time of his/her consideration of it constitutes for this particular scholar the type of ambiguity that *uşûlīs* refer to as the *işkāl* and would thus render such word as *muşkil*. Him/her considering this particular expressions' potential meanings that were in use then, i.e. the process of *ta'ammul*, might lead him/her arrive at realizing all the senses of the expression. Once this happens, the *işkāl* of the expression is removed, apparently without requiring these meanings to be written.

³⁹ Molla Jīwan, *Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 150.

⁴⁰ قَالَ رَبِّ أَنَّى يَكُونُ لِي غُلَامٌ وَكَانَتِ أَمْرَأَتِي عَاقِرًا وَقَدْ بَلَغْتُ مِنَ الْكِبَرِ عِتِيًّا
⁴¹ فَتَقَبَّلَهَا رَبُّهَا بِقَبُولٍ حَسَنٍ وَأَنْبَتَهَا نَبَاتًا حَسْبًا وَكَفَّلَهَا زَكَرِيَّا كُلَّمَا دَخَلَ عَلَيْهَا زَكَرِيَّا الْمِحْرَابَ وَجَدَ عِنْدَهَا رِزْقًا قَالَ يَمْرِئُمُ أَنَّى لَكَ هَذَا إِذْ قَالَ هُوَ مِنْ عِنْدِ اللَّهِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَرْزُقُ مَنْ يَشَاءُ بِغَيْرِ حِسَابٍ

As such, following the inquiry of *ṭalab*, comes the process of choosing the most likely option of the *muškil* expression through the process of *ta'ammul* (deliberation). Upon completion of this process also, scholars seem to have realized that what is meant by the *muškil* expression in Qur'ān 2:223 is the first option here. This is primarily because of the context in which the expression is mentioned. In fact, the verse notes that “*Nisā'ukum ḥarṭun la-kum*” (Your wives are a place of sowing of seed for you.) Scholars understood that the only plausible potential intended meaning of *annā* here would therefore be the first one, i.e. *ayy kayfiyya* (how) rather than *min ayy makān* (whence). In effect, *annā* in Qur'ān 2:223 is interpreted (made *ta'wīl*) in its first sense. Thus, a husband could have intercourse with his wife in various positions but not through ways other than the birth canal, as explained by scholars.⁴²

The resolution of the issues with the two types of *muškil* expressions, such as *qārūra min fiḍḍa* and *annā*, therefore involves first deciding the potential intended meanings of a *muškil* expression through *ṭalab* and then choosing one of them as the intended meaning thereof on a given occasion of speech or writing through *ta'ammul*.

2.2. *Muštarak*

Having thus explained what *muškil* is on the basis of an analysis of classical manuals of Islamic Jurisprudence, I would like to discuss next *muštarak* as it is described by *uṣūlīs* in an effort to compare and contrast *muškil* with *muštarak*. In fact, al-Nasafī defines *muštarak* as the following:

"ما يتناول افرادا مختلفة الحدود على سبيل البديل"⁴³

This translates as:

⁴² See, for instance, Molla Jīwan, I, 149; al-Nasafī, *Kašf al-Asrār*, (Istanbul: al-Maktaba al-Ḥanīfiyya, n.d.), I, 149.

⁴³ Al-Nasafī, *al-Manār*, I, 137. See also al-Dabūsī, Imām Abū Zayd. *Taqwīm al-Adilla*, ed. Khalīl Muḥy al-Dīn Ḥusayn (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘ilmiyya, 2001), 104, al-Pazdawī, *Kanz al-Wuṣūl*, 7, and Ṣadr al-Šarī‘a, *al-Tawḍīḥ*, 45, 100-101.

That which includes by way of interchange individuals the definitions of which are different.

This means that *muštarak* could refer to more than one kind of entity at a time. This is due to the fact that *muštarak*, as noted by Molla Khusraw, is an expression which was assigned to multiple meanings through multiple occasions of assignment (*waḍ'*).⁴⁴

The example *uṣūlīs* often provide for *muštarak* is the word *qur'*, which is assigned both to *ḥayḍ* (menstruation⁴⁵) and *ṭuhr* (the state of pureness from menstrual discharge⁴⁶).⁴⁷ Though opposite, each one of these meanings could be the intended meaning of *qur'*. In this regard, Ibn Malak notes the following:

تأمل علماءنا في لفظ القرء فوجدوه دالا على الجمع كما يقال قرأت الشيء أي جمعته وعلى الإنتقال أيضا كما يقال قرأ النجم إذا إنتقل. وكلاهما موجودان في الحيض لأنه هو الدم المجتمع في الرحم ومنتقل من الطهر إلى الحيض لأنه هو الأصل والحيض عارض كذا قاله الشراح.⁴⁸

This translates as the following:

Our scholars have deliberated upon the word *qur'*, and they found that it signifies [i] 'gathering' as in "*qara' tu šay'an*," that is, "I have gathered something" and also [ii] 'moving' as in "*qara' al-najmu*," [the star moved] when it moves.⁴⁹ Both [meanings] are present in menstruation because it is the blood that is gathered in the womb and transforms from pureness to menstruation. This is because it is the original [state of a woman] while menstruation is accidental/ephemeral, as stated by commentators.

⁴⁴ Molla Khusraw, *al-Mir'āt*, 185.

⁴⁵ Wehr and Cowan, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, 517 and Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, 259.

⁴⁶ Lane, Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, 1887.

⁴⁷ Molla Jīwan, *Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 138.

⁴⁸ Ibn Malak, 'Izz al-Dīn 'Abd al-Laṭīf, *Šarḥ al-Manār* (Istanbul: Āsitāna, n.d.), 342.

⁴⁹ He is referring to "shooting star."

The ambiguity of *muštarak* may be resolved through *ta'wīl*, which involves *ta'ammul* among other ways of inquiry.⁵⁰ In that case, it turns into *mu'awwal*. If it cannot be resolved through *ta'ammul*, then it turns into *mujmal* and requires *tafsīr* for its intended meaning to be understood by the addressee(s).⁵¹

Having thus provided detailed information on both *muškil* and *muštarak*, I will next analyze the two categories in a comparative way.

3. The Nature of the Difference between the Categories of *Muškil* and *Muštarak*

I have thus covered *muškil* and *muštarak* in detail on the basis of some of the major classical manuals of Islamic Jurisprudence in the Ḥanafī school of law in the previous section, and now I would like to discuss the nature of the difference between the two in this section through a comparative analysis between the two.

From the ongoing discussion on *muškil* and *muštarak* in the previous two sections, it is clear that a *muštarak* expression, like *qur'*, and a *muškil* one, like *annā*, are quite similar to each other in some respects.

First, both types of expressions could potentially come to refer to more than one meaning on any given speech/writing occasion. In this regard, the *muštarak* expression *qur'* could come to mean *ṭuhr* or *ḥayd* on one hand, and the *muškil* expression *annā* could come to mean *ayy kayfiyya* or *ayy makān* on the other, as explained above.

Second, the same examples, such as *qur'* and *annā*, are given for both *muškil* and *muštarak*. For someone reading about these two categories, one may well find that neither their definitions nor the examples given in classical manuals help explain the difference between the two.

⁵⁰ On this, Ibn Malak notes that preponderance of one of a given *muštarak*'s meanings could be done through *ta'ammul* as in the word *qur'*, or it could be done through a consideration of its, in our example, the word *qur'*s, *sibāq*, which is *thalātha* (three), or it could also be done by taking its *siyāq* into consideration (for more information, see Ibn Malak, *Šarḥ al-Manār*, 347.)

⁵¹ Molla Jīwan, *Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 150.

Last, but not least, both *muştarak* and *muşkil* are said to require *ṭalab* in addition to *ta'ammul* for their ambiguities to be resolved.

All of these similarities lead to confusion as to the nature of the difference between *muşkil* and *muştarak*. Among these three aspects where *muştarak* and *muşkil* seem to have in common, I think the most significant is the last one in that it plays a key role in differentiating *muştarak* and *muşkil* from each other.

In fact, as mentioned above, while discussing *izdiḥām al-ma'ānī* being a genius/class for *mujmal*, *muştarak*, *muşkil*, and *khafī*, Ibn Malak and Molla Jīwan note that intended meaning of a *muştarak* as well as of *muşkil* is known through *ta'ammul* in addition to *ṭalab*.⁵²

I believe that the type of *ṭalab* that these two scholars seem to require for the ambiguity of *muştarak* to be resolved is not the same *ṭalab* that all the *uşūlīs* require for *muşkil* to go through for its ambiguity to be resolved. I further argue that the use of *ṭalab* in this specific sense is not common among, at least, the earlier *uşūlīs*. In fact, the idea of *muştarak* requiring *ṭalab* in addition to *ta'ammul* contradicts to the view of al-Pazdawī, earlier eminent scholar on *Uşūl al-Fiqh*. He makes the following remarks when comparing *muştarak* with *mujmal*:

“ لأن المشترك يحتمل الإدراك بالتأمل في معنى الكلام لغة برجحان بعض الوجوه على البعض فقبل ظهور الرجحان سمي مشتركا. ”

This translates as follows:

This is because certainly [the intended meaning of a given] *muştarak* could potentially be understood through *ta'ammul* (deliberation) on the [intended] meaning of the utterance by prepondering one of its [potential] meanings over the others. Prior to the completion of the preponderance, it is referred to as *muştarak*.

Furthermore, Pazdawī is not the only scholar who does not mention *ṭalab* as a type of inquiry that needs to be present during the resolution of a given *muştarak*'s ambiguity. In fact,

⁵² Ibn Malak, *Şarḥ al-Manār*, I, 366 and Molla Jīwan, *Kitāb Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 150.

Molla Jīwan himself speaks of *muštarak* requiring *ta'ammul*, where he makes no reference to its requirement of *ṭalab* when he notes:

"ألترجح من المشترك قد يكون بالتأمل في الصيغة وقد يكون بالتأمل في السباق كما قلنا في القرء بالنظر إلى نفسه وبالنظر إلى

ثلاثة...⁵³

This translates as the following:

Preponderance from [among the potential senses of] the *muštarak* may be carried out through *ta'ammul* upon the expression, and it may be done through *ta'ammul* on the co-textual context (*sibāq*), as we mentioned on the matter of *qur'*, by taking into consideration [the expression] itself as well as [the expression] *thalātha*.⁵⁴

Here, Molla Jīwan himself makes no reference to *muštarak* requiring *ta'ammul* for its ambiguity to be resolved, which implies that *ṭalab* in the case of *muštarak* is not seen as a prerequisite for its ambiguity to be resolved.

Likewise, al-Nasafī himself does not refer to *ṭalab* as a type of inquiry that needs to be undertaken for *muštarak*'s intended meaning to be resolved. When discussing *muštarak*, al-Nasafī makes the following remarks in his *al-Manār*:

"حكمه التوقف فيه بشرط التأمل ليترجح بعض وجوهه للعمل به."⁵⁵

This translates as:

Its [referring to *muštarak*] legal ruling is that one needs to suspend judgement on it with the condition of making deliberation (*ta'ammul*) so that one of its meanings is preponderated upon for it to become acted upon.

Furthermore, in his own commentary on *al-Manār*, he discusses in some length the way in which the ambiguity of *muštarak* can be resolved, appealing to *ta'ammul* on the expression,

⁵³ Molla Jīwan, *Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 141.

⁵⁴ For more information, see below.

⁵⁵ Al-Nasafī, *Manār al-Anwār*, I, 138.

looking at the *sibāq*, and finally by looking at another report.⁵⁶ He does not make any reference to *muştarak*'s needing *ṭalab* for its ambiguity to be resolved. Similar remarks are also made by Molla Jīwan, as noted above.⁵⁷

Then, the reason behind some scholars' mentioning of *ṭalab* in addition to *ta'ammul* in the resolution of a given *muştarak* expression may not be to indicate that *ṭalab* is required and that they may have referred not to a given scholar's lack of knowledge of a particular ambiguous expression's assigned senses that are in use. As a matter of fact, even if one studied a given *muştarak*'s assigned senses previously, as soon as they encounter with the expression in given speech occasion, they will still need to recall the assigned senses of the *muştarak* expression. Therefore, they will need to recall the assigned senses, though not from what they know of the general raw linguistic corpus, but from what they know of in terms of processed information with regard to the language.

This type of inquiry also involves one's intellectual effort to determine the potential assigned senses of a given ambiguous expression in that they recall these senses on the speech occasion. As a result, this type of inquiry may also be referred to as *ṭalab* in that sense. And this could be what scholars like Molla Jīwan refers to when they speak of *muştarak* needing *ṭalab*.

This kind of *ṭalab* differs from the one seen in *muşkil*, though. In the case of *muşkil*, a person comes across an ambiguous expression which he/she has not previously considered with an eye to listing its potential meanings that are in use in the language.⁵⁸ Therefore, here the person's intellectual effort of gathering the assigned senses of the ambiguous expression involves a search from the raw linguistic corpus whereas in the case of *muştarak* it is quite the opposite, as I noted above.

⁵⁶ Al-Nasafī, *Kaşf al-Asrār*, I, 138.

⁵⁷ Molla Jīwan, *Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 141.

⁵⁸ Remember that through *ṭalab*, its potential meanings are sought after, something expressed by Molla Jīwan as "لأي معنى يستعمل هذا اللفظ", that is, an inquiry into whichever meaning it is used in (see *Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 149).

I think the ongoing discussion on whether or not *muštarak* requires *ṭalab* for its resolution to be resolved has no bearing on *muštarak*'s relation to *muškil*. In other words, the similarity between *muškil* and *muštarak* with regard to both requiring *ṭalab* in their ambiguities to be resolved is more apparent than real, as each category requires a different type of *ṭalab*.

Thus, I argue that the difference between the two lies in the fact that unlike the case in *muštarak*, the potential meanings of *muškil* expression are not thought through by linguists or jurists.⁵⁹ This is probably because in the case of *muškil* scholars have not previously had any occasion where they would feel the need look into the matter so closely so far as to list the potential meanings of *muškil* expression such as *annā*. This also explains why *ṭalab*, which is to list the potential meanings of a given expression, is a requirement of *muškil*, while it is not for *muštarak*, according to such scholars as al-Nasafī and al-Pazdawī, as noted above.

To illustrate, when considering the Qur'ān 2:223⁶⁰ with an eye to trying to understand for the first-time the intended meaning of the word *annā* that is mentioned in it, scholars must have felt the need to investigate the potential meanings that *annā* denoted in the Arabic language of the time.⁶¹ Scholars' lack of knowledge during their first encounter with the word *annā* of the potential meanings which the word denoted when it was revealed made it difficult for them reach to the intended meaning of the word. Therefore, they needed to first go through the process of *ṭalab*.

In the case of *muštarak*, on the other hand, scholars had already studied and listed the *wad'ī* (assigned) senses of *muštarak* and thus by the time they encountered a *muštarak* expression such as *qur'*, granted that its assigned meanings were discovered already before the relevant revelation

⁵⁹ Note that this lack of complete knowledge of a given expression's potential meanings used in language can well be in relation to a given scholar and not something common among the linguists or jurists or even the members of the same linguistic category. For someone who does not know Arabic at all, all the expressions mentioned in the sources of Islamic Law (e.g. *annā*) would be *muḥmal* and not *muškil*, as indicated by *uṣūlīs* (see, *Laknawī, Qamar al-Aqmār*, I, 149-150.)

⁶⁰ نَسَاؤُكُمْ حَزْتُ لَكُمْ فَأْتُوا حَزُّكُمْ أَلَىٰ نِسْتُمْ وَقَدِمُوا لِأَنْفُسِكُمْ وَأَتَقُوا اللَّهَ وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّكُمْ مُلَاقُوهُ وَبَشِّرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

⁶¹ This is the process which *uṣūlīs* refer to as *ṭalab* (see Molla Jīwan, *Kitāb Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 150).

that included the word *qur'*, they were already aware of the potential senses the *muştarak* word could denote in a given speech or writing occasion. That is why *uşûlîs* highlight the fact that the potential senses of *muştarak* are assigned (*wad'î*) senses,⁶² i.e. senses that became part of the linguistic corpus as assigned (*wad'î*) senses, as opposed to *muşkil*'s potential senses which have not yet become part of the language as assigned (*wad'î*) senses.

As such, unlike the case with *muşkil*, where its potential meanings are to be discovered through *ṭalab* (pondering), the list of potential senses that a *muştarak* expression can denote have already made their way into the recorded lexical body of the language,⁶³ and therefore require no *ṭalab*. To illustrate, when one looks at lexicons, one realizes that there are multiple meanings for the entry of *annā*.⁶⁴ This makes it a *muştarak* expression today, as its potential meanings later on probably made their way into the lexical body of language. Therefore, the ambiguity seen in a *muşkil* expression is an ambiguity with regard to its potential intended meanings which have not yet listed in the lexical body of the language at the time of that inquiry.

I thus further argue that once the potential meanings of a given *muşkil* expression such as *annā* become part of the knowledge of a given scholar who is looking at the matter for the first time, the *muşkil* expression turns into a *muştarak* expression for that scholar. Later on, the knowledge of the potential meanings of *annā* might become part of the linguistic corpus of other

⁶² Even if we accepted that the word *qur'* was not already explored in terms of its assigned meanings by the time of the relevant revelation, this would only made the example of *qur'* a bad example for *muştarak*, and it would have still held as a good hypothetical example.

⁶³ I should note here that these meanings do not actually have to be written down or made their way into lexicons. Rather, at minimum, they have to become part of the linguistic corpus of the particular scholar looking into the matter or a group of them. This information might well make its way into lexicons, as that is how it commonly occurs with languages whose body of language come to be written down.

⁶⁴ Ibn Manẓūr, Muḥammad b. Mukarram, *Lisān al-'Arab*, (Būlaq: n.p., AH 1300-8; another edn, Beirut: n.p. 1955-6), 160. See also Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, 119. This has been pointed out by *uşûlîs* as well. In discussing *muştarak*, for instance, al-Shāshī notes the following: “أجمع العلماء رَجَمَهُمُ اللهُ تَعَالَى عَلَى أَنْ لَفْظَ الْقُرْءِ “ (al-Shāshī, *Uşûl al-Shāshī* (1982), 36-39), which indicates that scholars consider it to have turned into *muştarak* expression.

scholars as well and also be part of the written language once it is recorded in any piece of literature such as lexicons.

This whole process can be seen not only in one-worded *muškil* expressions such as *annā* but also in multiple-worded *muškil* expressions. They, too, can potentially make their way into lexicons in the form of phrases. The potential meanings of the expression *qārūra min fiḍḍa* also made their way into the lexicons, rendering them *muštarak* as well.⁶⁵

As such, the difference between *muštarak* and *muškil* is that in the case of *muškil* the potential meanings of a given *muškil* expression have not yet been thought through. Whereas, in the case of *muštarak*, the potential meanings of a given *muštarak* expression have already been worked out, which might have made their way into lexicons later on. Therefore, a *muškil* with its potential meanings that have not yet been worked out by scholars represents an expression that would later on evolve into *muštarak*⁶⁶ if the inquiry of *ṭalab* is successfully completed, resulting in the identification of all the potential meanings of the *muškil* expression that are in use in the language of the time.

I believe that nuances such as these that we see between *muškil* and *muštarak* represents such a remarkable sensitivity on the part of *uṣūlīs* when it comes to the nature of language. This is because their analysis of language for the purpose of deriving laws from the sources of Islamic law takes into consideration, in a consistent theoretical manner, differences even between one's lack of readily available knowledge of potential meanings of a given expression that are in use in

⁶⁵ See, for instance, Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, 2464.

⁶⁶ It would be wrong to say that *muškil* is a type of *muštarak*, as it would be wrong to say that *mu'awwal* is a type of *muštarak*, simply because *muškil*'s definition does not match with *muštarak*'s nor does *muštarak*'s with *mu'awwal*. Rather, they represent concepts which are, though evolve from one another, are different at the end. This is also similar to the case with *khafī* and *zāhir* in that once a *khafī* expression's *khafā'* (ambiguity) is removed through *ṭalab*, it turns into *zāhir*, and this does not mean that one is the sub-category of the other, but rather, the expression ceases to qualify to be categorized under the former and falls under the latter upon the resolution of the ambiguity in it (for the notion of *khafī* turning to *zāhir*, see Molla Jīwan, *Nūr al-Anwār*, I, 141 and al-Nasafī, *al-Manār*, I, 147.)

the language, as is the case with *muşkil*, and one's readily available knowledge of this information as is the case with *muştarak*.

Nuances such as these that we see between *muşkil* and *muştarak* seem to perfectly serve to refine the process of law-making in Islamic Law. It also illustrates the high degree of scrutiny that *uşûlîs* studied the language of the sources of Islamic Law, the primary one's of which are the Qur'ân and the Sunna.

4. Conclusion

This paper pinpoints the fact that the difference between the linguistic categories of *muşkil* and *muştarak* of the Hanafî school of law is not well-established in either classical or contemporary sources. It argues that the difference between the two has much to do with whether or not the potential meanings of these expressions have been previously worked out by scholars and thus became readily available to them for future reference.

The potential intended meanings of a *muşkil* expression need to be listed through *ṭalab* before they can be used. In the case of a *muştarak* expression, on the other hand, its potential intended meanings have already been worked out by scholars, thus requiring no process of *ṭalab*. These meanings might then make their way into the lexical body of the language of other members of the linguistic community, which would likely be resulted in being listed as assigned (*waḍ'î*) senses of the expression in lexicons.

This explains why the same example such as *qur'* sometimes could be given for both *muştarak* and *muşkil* expressions in the literature. In fact, in the case of *muşkil*, the potential meanings of the word *qur'* were not thought through and thus were not listed prior to scholars' consideration of it. On the other hand, once the meanings of the word *qur'* that were used in the language were thought through and listed by scholars, which resulted in them discovering that it was used either to signify *jam'* (gathering) and *intiḳāl* (move). This discovery then turned this *muşkil* expression into a *muştarak* for these scholars.

In short, *qur*' whose potential meanings were to be worked out by scholars had fallen under the category of *muškil*, while *qur*' whose potential meanings were already been worked out by scholars fell under *muštarak*.

The present work thus argued that a *muškil* expression, and especially one that consists of one word, constitutes an earlier version of *muštarak* expression in that the latter evolves from the former and not that one is the sub-category of the other. For instance, despite the fact that *annā* is given as an example of *muškil* phrase in classical as well as modern *uṣūl* works, it seems to have made its way into lexicons with two of its potential meanings,⁶⁷ and thus have turned into *muštarak* after it was considered a *muškil* expression.

All these come down to illustrating the fact that reading the linguistic categories, and in particular those which have similar features as is the case with *muškil* and *muštarak*, without any consideration as to how they are different from each other, one might end up with incorrect understandings of, at least, some of these linguistic categories. This then seems to have led them to avoid going beyond the classical manuals even if the occasion demands otherwise, as I explored within the context of *muškil* and *muštarak*. Contemporary treatments of the subject matter thus seem to be eclectic in nature and are characterized by their unease with exploring beyond the picture of what *uṣūlīs* sufficed to reveal of this unparalleled linguistic theory that was behind the process of law-making in Islamic Law.

This uneasiness with going beyond what *uṣūlīs* revealed of their linguistic theory is also represented with their avoidance to explain any given linguistic category using examples other than those mentioned in classical texts, even if this would mean using the same examples to explain two different categories, as was the case with their treatment of *muškil* and *muštarak*. They

⁶⁷ Obviously, it is worth mentioning here that *muškil* expressions that consist of more than one word, such as *qārūra min fiḍḍa*, would hardly make their way into lexicons as separate entries, albeit could well be found in entries for each word that such expressions contain, as is the case with *qārūra min fiḍḍa*, as noted above.

define the two almost identical and yet provided the same example, namely *qur'*, simply because this is the example often given in the classical manuals.

As the ongoing discussion suggests, I believe that no one embarking on a study of Islamic Law and Islamic Jurisprudence can feel at ease with their subject without scrutinizing the linguistic categories and the linguistic theory that steered the classical scholars when producing these categories.⁶⁸

Finally, as illustrated in the case of *muşkil* and *muştarak* in the present work, each linguistic category gains its proper meaning not independently but in consideration of its relations to other categories. As such, approaching to the linguistic categories in a holistic way that allows one to appreciate the fine details between the categories and their implications for the process of law-making in Islamic Law, which includes drawing new comparisons, is the way forward in the contemporary study of *Uşûl al-Fiqh* (Islamic Jurisprudence) and *Fiqh* (Islamic Law).

⁶⁸ *Uşûl al-Fiqh*'s linguistic categories are still used for the process of law-making in Islamic Law even in Türkiye, Malaysia, Pakistan, USA, UK, and elsewhere, so these categories are still relevant for the study and practice of Islamic Law (see Hüseyin İçen, "Çağdaş Dönemde Fetva Faaliyeti: İslam Hukuku ve Toplum Bağlamında Dinî Kurumlardan Örnekler" in *İslam Tetkikleri Dergisi* 13 (2023): 479-486.)

References / Kaynakça

- Ali, A. Yusuf., trans. *The Meaning of the Holy Qur'ān*. Brentwood, Maryland: Amana Corporation, 1991.
- Atar, Fahrettin. *Fıkıh Usûlü*. Istanbul: IFAV, 2018.
- Bilik, Abdurrahim. "Hilâf Mesailinin Hanefî Muhtasarların Metin Kurgusuna Etkisi ve Temel Şerhlerde Ele Alınışı (Kitabu's-Salât Örneği)". In *Universal Journal of Theology* 5 / 2 (Aralık 2020): 109-134.
- Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- Al-Dabûsî, İmâm Abû Zayd. *Taqwîm al-Adilla*. Edited by Khalîl Muhyî al-Dîn Hısayn. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-İlmiyya, 2001.
- Hallaq, Wael B. *A History of Islamic Legal Theories: An Introduction to Sunnî Uşûl Al-Fiğh*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Ibn Hâlabî, Rađî al-Dîn Muğammad b. İbrâhîm. *Anwâr al-Halak 'alâ Şarh al-Manâr li-Ibn Malak*. Istanbul: Āsitāna, n.d.
- İçen, Hüseyin. "Çağdaş Dönemde Fetva Faaliyeti: İslam Hukuku ve Toplum Bağlamında Dinî Kurumlardan Örnekler". In *İslam Tetkikleri Dergisi* 13 (2023): 479-486.
- Kamali, Mohammad Hashim. *Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence*. Rev. ed. Cambridge: Islamic Texts Society, 1991.
- Karahmetoğlu, Reyhan. "İbn Âşûr'a Göre İşkâl Sebepleri ve Çözüm Yolları" In *Mutalaa* 1 / 2 (December 2021): 222-239.
- Kavalcioğlu, A. "Debûsî ve Semerkandî'nin Fıkıh Usulünde "Kapalı Lafızlar" Konusuna Yaklaşımları ve Görüşlerinin Mukayesesi". In *Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* (KTUİFD) 5 (2018): 61-85.
- Ibn Malak, 'Izz al-Dîn 'Abd al-Laţîf. *Şarh al-Manâr*. Istanbul: Āsitāna, n.d.
- Lane, E. W. *An Arabic-English Lexicon Derived from the Best and Most Copious Eastern Sources*. Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1968.
- Jiwan, Molla. *Nūr al-Anwār*. Istanbul: al-Maktaba al-Ĥanîfiyya, n.d.
- Ibn Manzûr, Muğammad b. Mukarram. *Lisān al-'Arab*. Būlaq: AH 1300-8; another edn, Beirut: 1955-6.
- Jaffer, Tariq. "Mu'tazilite Aspects of Fağr Al-Dîn al-Rāzî's Thought." *Arabica* 59, no. 5 (2012): 510–35. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41727686>.
- Molla Khusraw, Muğammad b. Faramûz. *al-Mir'ât fî Sharh Mirqât al-Uşûl*. Istanbul: Fazilet, 2016.
- Şadr al-Şarî'a, 'Ubayd Allāh b. Mas'ūd Taj al-Şarî'a. *al-Tawđîh fî Halli Ġawāmiz al-Tanqîh*. N.p., N.d.

- Šams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ḥamza b. Muḥammad al-Fanārī al-Rūmī. Edited by Muḥammad Ḥasan Muḥammad Ḥasan Ismā'īl. *Fuṣūl al-Badā'i' fī Uṣūl al-Sharā'i'*. Beirut: Dār Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1971.
- Al-Nasafī, Abū al-Barakāt. *Kaṣf al-Asrār*. Istanbul: al-Maktaba al-Ḥanīfiyya, n.d.
- Al-Nasafī, Abū al-Barakāt. *Al-Manār*. Istanbul: al-Maktaba al-Ḥanīfiyya, n.d.
- Nasūhîzâde, Büyük Haydar Efendi. *Usul-i Fıkh Dersleri*. 2nd ed. Istanbul: Üçdal, 1966.
- Pickthall, Marmaduke William, *The Meaning of the Glorious Qur'an Revised New modern English edition* (Birmingham: Islamic Dawah Centre International, 2011).
- Al-Samarqandī, ʿAlā al-Dīn Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *Mizān al-Uṣūl fī Natā'ij al-Uqūl*. Edited by Muḥammad Zakī ʿAbd al-Barr. N.p.: Maṭbaʿa Dūḥa al-Ḥadītha, 1984.
- Samar, Mahmut. "İslam Hukuk Usulünde Müşterek Lafzın Manaya Delaletine Dair Tartışmalar." In *Eskiyeşi / 42* (September 2020): 961-984, <https://doi.org/10.37697/eskiyeşi.764230>.
- Sezgin, Fuat. *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- Al-Siġnāqī, Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī b. Ḥajjāj. *al-Kāfi Šarḥ al-Pazdawī*. Edited by Fakhr al-Dīn Sayyid Muḥammad Qānat. al-Riyāḍ: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2001.
- Al-Pazdawī, Fakhr al-Islām ʿAlī b. Muḥammad. *Kanz al-Wuṣūl ilā Maʿrifat al-Uṣūl*. N.p.: Mīr Muḥammad Kutub-khānah Markaz ʿIlm wa Adab, n.d.
- Al-Shāshī, Niẓām al-Dīn Abū ʿAlī Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ishāq. *Uṣūl al-Shāshī*. Edited by ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Khalīlī. Beirut: Dar al-Kotob al-Ilmiyah, 2003.
- Topal, Ahmet. "The Role of the Arabic Language in *istinbāt al-ḥukm* within the Context of Criminal law: A General Framework for Inquiry into the Linguistic Categories of *uṣūl al-fiqh* of the Ḥanafī school of law." PhD dissertation, Leeds University, 2020.
- Vishanoff, David R. "Early Islamic Hermeneutics: Language, Speech, and Meaning in Preclassical Legal Theory." PhD diss., Emory University, 2004. <http://david.vishanoff.com/wp-content/uploads/Dissertation.pdf>
- Yalınkılıç, Mehmet and Abay, Ahmet. "Meryem suresi 71. Ayet Bağlamında İşkâli Giderme Yöntemleri." In *Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 5 / 9 (December 2018): 463-482.
- Yazır, Elmalı'lı Muhammed Hamdi, *Hak Dîni Kur'ân Dili*. N.p.: Eser, 1979.
- Zysow, Aron. *The Economy of Certainty: An Introduction to the Typology of Islamic Legal Theory*. Atlanta, Georgia: Lockwood Press, 2013.