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Introduction

Of all the various Ideological controversies in the history of Islamic thought, one of the most highly contentious areas are those surrounding the ontological nature of the divine attributes (ِّسَٰفِئُتَ الْحَلَّال). Such questions, surrounding the attributes of God, and what delineation, if any, is to be made between the nature of God in his divine attributes (ِّسَٰفِئُتَ الْحَلَّال), and in his Being (ِّذَٰلِكَ الْحَلَّال)
preoccupied some of the greatest disputants in the ‘ilm al-kalām systematic theological disputation tradition.\(^1\)

The concept of *theosis* and theomorphism have received much attention from scholars engaged in the study of Patristic theology.\(^2\) However, and most regrettably, the idea of humanity’s divine nature, whether by the process, or ontology, as a specific field of inquiry within the Islamic tradition, has not been as energetically pursued by the academy. Even more problematic is the tendency for some voices within the academy to see mystical ideas of Sufi thinkers as anachronistic. Many have seen the articulations of mystical exegetes as derived from non-Qur’ānic importations into the exegetical framework of this later *muḥaffāẓ*. Interestingly, one of the few examples of scholarly attention on this subject has seen parallels to theosis’s patristic modality, and we argue rightly so.\(^3\)

There was a robust discussion on whether the deity attributes were a separate ontological category from his Being in classical Islamic theological discourse. Both the words *dhāt* and *wujūd* have been widely used as technical terms to denote God’s Being, as a distinct ontological category from the *Essence* of God, when such delineations were asserted. Ibn ‘Arabī (1165 C.E./560 A.H.-1240 C.E. 637), for example, is well known for his use of the ideological concept of *Wahdat al-Wujūd*, to describe God’s ultimate reality as a manifest, non-delimited unicity.\(^4\)

---


2. The work cited below is an excellent introduction to just how normative *theosis* was in historical patristic theology.


4. While many would posit, he actually never used the term itself; the matter is far from settled. While largely outside the scope of this paper, Part of this hinges on what the ‘canon’ of Ibn al-‘Arabī’s writings is accepted to consist of; there is inarguably manuscript attestation to various treatises’ utilizing the term *Wahdat al-Wujūd* in works attributed by the scribe of these said works to Ibn ‘Arabī. However, they are generally regarded to be the works of later authors; pseudonymous or
Specifically, this idea, that all things are pure of other than God, is inarguably and unavoidably replete in his work. While amenable to a number of interpretive exegetical frameworks from which to view this discourse, including what may be clumsily termed pantheistic (rather, if anything it is panentheistic) his metaphysical theosophy is one if immanence. The names and attributes (al-asma’ wa al-ṣifāt) or dhāt (being, in the sense of essential essence verses attributes) or wujūd (being, used by the aforementioned Ibn ‘Arabī in the sense of ultimate ontological nature of one from the category of existent things, in this case God) regularly made appearances in the classical ‘aqīdah and ‘ilm al-kalām literature. The noted prolific Shi‘ī philosopher and Qur’ānic mystical exegete Mulla Sadrā for example presents a highly nuanced presentation on the ontological interrelationship of the dhāt and al-asma’ wa al-ṣifāt.

The present study argues that the Qur’ānic paradigm of anthropology is one that presents, in no uncertain terms, humanity as being granted a ‘divine’ status.

**Qur’ānic Theosis: Adamic Viceregency and Paradigms of Divinization**

*Theosis*, or the process of humanity ascending to divine status, either by gaining access to what one is intrinsically by nature; or by manifesting by knowledge, faith, and deeds, ontologically divine status is a scriptural anthropological reality described at multiple points in the Qur’ānic narrative. Perhaps the ayāt with the highest centrality to this idea is the Qur’ānic depiction of the ensoulment of banī Adam, which is met with in multiple instances, such as is the described in the 15th ayah of Sūrah al- Ḥijr:

فِي اذَّ سَوَّيْنَهُوَ وَنفَخَتْ فِيهِ مِن رُوحِي فَقَعَوْا لِهِ سَاجِدِين

In another place, The Holy Qur’ān informs us in the 72nd verse of Surah Ṣād the exact same nature of the divinization of banī Adam by means of ensoulment (Q.38:72). This event, also described at length at Q. 2:34 Q. 7:11 and Q. 15:30. In all this, there is the command for angelic prostration. Further, it is the special divine act of blowing into what has been formed by God a *Soul from Himself* that

---

misattributed. Likewise, we find the concept, if not the direct technical vocabulary, soaking his works. For a discussion of this, see Abdul Haq Ansari, *Ibn ‘Arabi: the Doctrine of Wahdat al Wujūd*, Islamic Studies, Vol. 38, No. 2 (1999), 149-192.
now consubstantially indwells this special exalted creation that necessitates the divine bowing of the divine council of angelic hosts. In the contexts of these verses, it is diabolic resistance that among the entirety of the divine assembly is the only resistance to this command that we meet within the text. It is exactly this \textit{rebellion to acquiesce} to The God’s command to prostrate to \textit{Mankind} as the divine being that is the genesis of the shaytan project of rebellion against God and Man.

This theme is likewise asserted at Q. 17:16 Q. 18:50, and the heavy repetition of this narrative is indicative of its theological importance to the Qur'ānic anthropology and merits serious attention. Such consideration is especially warranted, on account of another Qur'ānic injunction, that nothing makes Sajida, except to Allah (Q. 41:37). The Qur'ān presents an anthropology wherein the sun and moon, and even the angelic hosts of the ‘divine council’ have no felicity whose merits even approach those given the Adamic \textit{“Universal Soul”}.

We are presented with this essential component of both Qur’ānic onto-theology and anthropology, fairly early within the ordering of the Qur’ānic narrative as a whole within Q.2:29-34. The establishment of this scriptural precedent for man’s idea as \textit{khalīfa} directly informs the \textit{irfānī} paradigm of the \textit{tajalli al-Nafs} as \textit{tajalli Allah}. Specifically, this can be read as a form of \textit{name theophany}, and it is rather striking-sg that it is within the context of God setting his viceregent upon the earth where the Adam pedagogical didactic with the angelic hosts in regards to ‘\textit{the names}’ is mentioned.

Turning again directly towards the text, we are called to remember when God informed the angels that he will create a viceregent in the earth. When the angelic objection is raised that perhaps this creature might cause \textit{fasād} in the earth. However, the answer to this objection is that God knows something that the angelic hosts do not collectively yet known. In Q. 2:31, we learn Adam teaches the angels \textit{the names all of them}, and then \textit{displays them or manifests them} to the angles. This point in the text and the semantic domain of the words \textit{ism} and \textit{‘aradabum ‘alā al-malāikā} and what is intended by their usage is of great importance to this central thesis. Indeed, how we parse this piece of text has direct implications for a host of claims appertaining to claims about both theological and anthropological Qur’ānic paradigms.
For instance, one could rightly ask, who is being taught? Is it Adam as a student, for example, *a priori* to the angels? Structurally, the most ‘natural’ reading would be ‘Allah [teacher] instructs Adam [student] then after he taught Adam, then Adam [teacher] instructs what he has learned from Allah to the angels [students]. However, when we read the text in its larger narrative context, both at this point and with all the intra-textual relationships to parallel Qur’ānic narrations, there are at multiple, equally coherent ways of reading the text. In short, the standard way of reading the text, (with some slight digressions at different theology relevant points depending on the exegete) is as follows:

We can see the narrative as being God teaching to Adam all the names. Then he displays them to the angels. After this display, he (God) requires the angels to inform Him about the names if they are from the truthful and righteous. The angels, in light of the default angelic position towards *taslim* and sensing the rhetorical nature of this inquiry, and because there was perhaps something rather revelatory in the display, of course, respond with deference to that request and courteously abstain.

God then instructs Adam to inform the angels by means of their names, and when he does so, God, on the basis of the Adamic felicity just demonstrated by the informational imparting upon them by means of the names, rhetorically asks the assembly of the divine council “Did I not say I know what you all know not?” Then God asks the angels to make *sujud* directly to Adam, or, as is often repeated in commentarial works, to God by means of prostration to Adam. All do so, save the one diabolic among them.

In general, this is the standard way of reading the text both among Muslim and non-confessional secular academics. This is *not*, however, the reading that I propose. There as some grammatical as well as exegetical issues inherent with that line of argumentation that is a highlight. Thereafter, different exegetical reading of the text is presented, an understanding of the text which I argue enjoys the most thematic coherence and explanatory power.

**Encountering Man as Divine Being: Modalities of Adamic Name Theophany**

At the outset, we must insist that the word ‘names’ (*ism*) is actually *not* the primary semantic domain intended by *ism* at this point
in the Qur’ānic text. Rather, it is the pan-Semitic connotation of the idea of the presence of a thing, especially a deity that is meant here. On this point, Julien Véronèse observes, “…Using one or more of God’s names embody the Verb par excellence, the creative and efficient language fragments…revealed to a certain people in order to cement a special place between them and divinity…”5

That should be kept in mind as forming a central exegetical presupposition before engaging with the narrative.

Returning to our direct analyses, the verses start with the assertion that God will be placing a khalīfāh “a successor” on the earth. Now, the semantic domain of khalīfāh is from amongst the most important theological and narrative points in establishing a meaningful exegesis of the narrative. What is meant by a khalīfāh here is not peoples or tribes having children who, as the next generation, will be “succeeding” their parents, and therefore creating a people who will be successors to one another on the earth. This is admittedly one of the understandings found in the commentarial tradition, classical and modern, but it lacks on many substantive grounds. Those deficiencies are likewise noted by other voices in the classical and modern commentarial tradition. We will suffice to say that first, the word here is a singular noun, and the text does not say I will place Khūlafāh on the earth. This would be the case if parents and their children in ‘endless’ successive generations was meant.

Clearly, the singular use of the word (khalīfāh) here is an excellent example of when a grammatically singular noun is standing for a plural concept. If someone were to say, for example, “A ruler shall not depart from Judah” or “Qom will never be bereft of a scholar or a marja‘ taqlīd” or “Japan shall never be empty of the cherry blossom,” a singular ruler, or an individual scholar, or a specific cherry blossom tree is obviously not intended.

Likewise, if the idea of generations procreating successive generations is not intended, what is especially, and we insist emphatically not a possible contender is the styming suggestion that what is meant by khalīfāh is a person or persons who, by military campaigning, will shed blood. To posit that nation rising against one another to then be “successors” of each other, is essential to offer as an interpretive hermeneutic the recapitulation of the initial angelic objection. This objection is one that is soundly refuted by the deity later on in the narrative.

Now, irrespective of the potential for bani Adam to be those engaged in bloodshed, that cannot coherently be what is intended by khalīfāh. This stands true on multiple grounds, most strongly, as previously mentioned, the internal logical grounds. The angelic objections to the introduction of another order of creation to fit the status of khalīfāh are inclusive of the idea that there is something inherently special or noble about being a khalīfah. The angelic prognostication that this Adam may be unworthy of this title is in part because of their fear he will have this propensity, whereas then they are in constant submission to deity.

Hence there is something of inherent worth in the status of being a khalīfāh already hinted at in the status of being a khalīfāh that being prone to unwarranted violence would generally preclude one from being worthy to obtain. Further, why would Allah have to say that he knows something the angelic hosts are ignorant of if the definition of khalīfāh is by nature what they put forth an inquiry about. In other words, if that was the case, could not have the answer from God to the angels have simply been yes, your correct, full stop?

The deficiency in adopting the above vantage point is highlighted in the commentary of al-Maturidī; the imām relates a tradition that when it is said, “will you create a person on the earth who will cause corruption and wrongdoing” the speaker voicing this ‘angelic’ objection is actually Iblis.6

Al-Maturidī presents some of the most explicit assertions of Adam’s nature as he viceregent representative of God on the earth: saying he was to establish God’s Judgement over creation, to judge between them, and to establish his religion

---

Khaliṣāh is then most correctly then understood in the meaning of being a ‘viceregent’ or a divine agent on earth “representing” in duty, role, and characteristics, the absolutely transcendent God. Such a reality can be seen within the narrative of the 79th verse of Sūrah Āl ʿImrān, which contains direct divine injunctions that call toward theosis, commanding the people to ‘Be Lords’ in a fiʿil amar of grammatical construction (kūnū rabbānīyīn).

Further, by ʿaradabum what is meant is literally manifesting, not simply showing, and that the harf jabr “alā” at this point in the text literally means ‘upon’. In other words, what we have is a theophanic condescension. The divine answer to the angelic objection is a tajallī of the totality of the divine names within Adam. This manifestation of a name theophany exemplified to the angels furnishes a proof that impresses fully upon the angels the full meaning of God’s saying, “I know what you do not know” vis a vis the Adamic creation event. When turning to the classical commentarial tradition, we find that this is a very well-represented interpretive option within the discourse.

This was what was noted by Ibn ʿArabī, who observed in the Fusūṣ al-Hikam “All of the Names, which are divine forms, are manifested in this makeup of man and the function of encompassment and synthesis is achieved through his existence. God’s arguments against the angels stand on this”.7

In classical commentarial works, many opinions are related. Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, records that “the names, all of them”, for example, meant that God taught Adam the names of all the most magisterial pillars of creation, the sky, the land, the mountain the earth, the sea, etc.8 and it was Adam who named these things by these names. Another of the opinions transmitted from ʿUmār (which likewise corresponds to many similar rabbinical midrashim) is that the ‘names’ in question are the names of the angels9 (an intriguing facet of this idea will be highlighted later on). Al-Ṭustarī records it was from an admixture of clay and the logos of the nur of Muhammadan reality

---

9 Ibid., 253.
that formed Adam, endowing him with divine attributes with which to fight the lower self.\(^{10}\)

Likewise, the classical commentarial tradition is perhaps the strongest attestation to the understanding of the *khalīfāh* as being a divine status. Turning to the *Kitab al-Tafsīr* in *Ṣaḥīh al-Bukhrā*, we find that the Prophet directly states the meaning of *Khalīfāh* is *Khalīfāh* *Allah*.

“From the Prophet (S) who said, “the believers will be gathered of the Day of Resurrection…to Adam it will be said you are the father of humanity, the Successor of God (*Khalīfāh* *Allah*) formed by means of his hand, and to you, the angels were commanded to make *sujūd*”.\(^{11}\)

Further, we likewise therein have the most compelling attestation to the idea that the names that were imparted to Adam were the Divine Names proper. This also intersects directly with the previously mentioned opinion that the names were angelic names earlier mentioned. We find *Kitab al-Tafsīr* in *Ṣaḥīh al-Bukhrā*, an extensive number of traditions reported that the names of angels such as *Mika'īl* or *Jibra'īl* contain the Divine Name and the explicit assertion that the names are from the Hebrew language, with the name of God that forms part of the angelic naming conventions. In hadith no. 448, for example, we find the Prophetic statement.

كل اسم فه إيل فهو اسم الله...إيل الله بالعبرانية

This is not simply an exegetical point. It is likewise a lexical one. Although as many lexical authorities consider\(^{13}\) Adam as *mafi'il bih* of ‘he taught’ making it and he (Allah as the hidden *damir*) Adam the names, all of them; one likewise read Q. 2:31 as “And Adam taught them the names, all of them”. The text is amenable to a variegated number of interpretive readings. Here we do not have to believe that God taught Adam the names here, although that is inherently implied, for the creator is the one who illumined all men’s minds; rather although when read with the *taskhiil* in ‘*allama Ādam* we can read “and

---


\(^{12}\) “Every name that contains in it the ‘el’ suffix contains within in the name of God... El/Eloah is the name of God in the Hebrew Language.” Ibid., 141.

He (God) taught...”. However, the consonantal orthography itself does not necessitate “taught Adam” For example, similarly can say “Adam Taught” just as we can say that “God created” (khalaga Allah).” The ‘Uthmanic rasm could easily accommodate either reading.  

What God knew that the angels were unaware, the theomorphic qualities inherent in Adam’s ensoulment is not only asserted but demonstrated by Adam’s display of the divine names and attributes. On this demonstration of inherent theomorphic display to the angelic hosts by the Adamic reality as a name theophany, Mullā Sadra observers “With respect to the point of view that man contains all that is in the microcosm (al-‘ālam al-Kabīr) it is because his perfect configuration (nash’atubu al-Kāmilab) is the locus of all the divine names and attributes…”  

**The Qur’ānic Paradigm of Theosis as Divinization via Self-actualization**

Further, what I contend is this a-temporal theomorphic ontatheology cum anthropology is described in Q. 30:30. Therein, the reader is presented with a description of the fitrāb of banī Adam that is a direct divinization presentation. This is concomitant with the Qur’ānic and Irfāni paradigm of theosis, which has been highlighted, theomorphism is humanity’s inherent nature; it is who he is and what he does.

Within Q. 30:30 the reader is presented with an exhortation and a reminder.

فأقم وجهكم لِلدين حنيفا ُ لله الذي فترت الناس عليها لا تبدل خلق الله ذلك الدين القائم ولكن أكثر الناس لا تعلمون

The Qur’ān here exhorts its audience to turn to be established firmly with their whole essence with the way of those who have

---

14 Although somewhat outside the scope of this paper; many exegetes have noted that the rasm may lend itself to very plausible and reasonable alternative readings. The great Qur’ānic mufassir and theologian ‘Allama al-Tabātabā’ī proffers an extensive discussion in his famous work al-Mizān on the merits of understanding rabb al-‘ālamin as rabb al-‘ālimin with specific connotations of Allah as the nourisher of the sentient beings/minds, not rabb al-‘ālimin. He grounded this argumentation on the merits of the ubiquity of the plural ‘awālim used for worlds. Readings being proposed that are amenable to the Qur’ānic rasm but not part of the more common taskbīl transmitted in more common riwāyat such as Ḥafs is by no means idiosyncratic within the history of Qur’ānic exegesis.

turned towards God. The concept of mankind as inherently divine is perhaps nowhere as strongly asserted. Although often this can be glossed over due to the differing ways that we can understand this text, there is language herein strongly suggestive of Qur’ânic theomorphic anthropo-ontology.

Suppose we encounter the text from this perspective. In that case, faaqim has, I contend a possesses a rhetorical simultaneity of meaning, both firmly established and raised up upon the hanafi dîn, (possessing it in fact by nature) and likewise of qâwîm, a nation whose essence (wajdbc); the full weight of the bifurcated resonances of meaning here met within the phrase li khalq Allah dhalika al-dîn al-qayyim.

It was serving as indexicality of the exhortation to the cultivation of divine status. Establishing oneself upon the hanafi dîn is to cognize the nature of who one is by nature of the inherent ontological status simply by being banî Adam. This is the religion of people because it is the very nature by which the fitrah of humanity was formed and molded upon, and they can never be alteration in the creation of Allah. Here I take this as a statement of fact, not simply a warning against violating normative God-ordained socio-religious practices, but a direct statement of anthropology Mankind was formed upon the hanafi fitrah and there is no altering Allah’s creation. Mankind is literally formed and molded upon this fitrah. Here the lexical-semantic domain of hanaî, fitrah, dîn, wajdbc, and the grammatical possibilities of this verse are tremendously exegetically significant.

The Qur’ân says, “Firmly establish (or raise and exaltation) your entire essence with the hanafi dîn”. While hanaif possesses several meanings in this context, its semantic domain of turning towards is not lost. Certainly, when taken in this regard, we meet with a specific portrait is painted regarding the status of being hanaif as comprising a universal religion, or rather, a divine culture imparted to humanity via a-temporal ensoulment

This is an exhortation to become firmly established upon the fitrah Allah and this construct, with the intra-Qur’anic exegesis that the fitrah of God “…that is the fitrah of mankind upon which he was formed, there is no altering Gods creation.” Man’s nature (his fitrah) is God’s Nature, his fitrah, banî Adam being formed upon that mold collectively, and there is no alteration in what God has formed; man is by nature a divine being. Further, although this is the religion of Qiyyamah of the
station of mankind before God, the majority of humanity is ignorant of this divine status before Allah as his theophany.

This kind of theomorphism is at once inherently preservative of unitarian monotheism, and yet arguably an even stronger assertion of the image bearer pan-Semitic religious theologeme whereby in Biblical and extra-biblical literature, as well as a vast plurality of ‘ahādīth literature, the themes of Adam as ‘image-bearer’ or ‘image and likeness’ of God is met with. Here hoverer the Qur’ānic theme of mankind’s theomorphic status is his very nature, his fitrah itself, which is the tajalli al-Nafs as a modality of tajalli Allah.

The ‘Arsh Allah and the Qur’ānic Semiotics of Theomorphic Anthropology

Verses 19-22 of Sūrah al-Anbiyā’ present a significant series of cosmological assertions highly relevant to contextualizing both the theological conception of the throne of God, and the idea of the immanence of the deity in a Qur’ānic framework. Verse 19 asserts that “And with him belongs whoever is in the heavens and from the earth. And those with him (‘inda) are not too arrogant to be kept from ‘ibādā nor are they those who desist.” We are informed further on the subject in verse 20, that they glorify him day and night, and never cease in doing so (lā yaftarūn). This establishes several important exegetical elements. First, there are three important categories of being established, the heavens, the earth, and those with, or in possession of, or special relationship to, proximity with God. The rhetorical significance of the phrase ‘inda in the context of the totality of the narrative in which it is situated is great, and it should not be glossed over. Although the phrase ‘inda, as Lane notes “signifies at, near, nigh, by, near,” the words primary signification was that of “denoting presence… i.e., perceptible presence, and also ideal presence …the place of presence…and utmost nearness”.

Of these beings, the question is asked, “Or have they taken gods from the earth who give life? If there were in them gods besides Allah, they would have both been in disorder. So glory be to Allāh, the Lord of the Throne, being above what they describe!”

17 Ibid.
The throne of God (‘Arsh) here functions as theologeme in a highly significant way in the passage’s rhetorical and theological context. However, since this significance lies in what the verse is affirming the ontological nature of what nature ‘Arsh is, it is part of the broader cosmological and theological messaging of the verse, not simply an oath that God is the ‘Lord of the Throne’. The verse’s context makes the ‘Arsh language part of a complex intra-textual discourse on the concept of hulūl or the divine presence’s indwelling. The Qur’ānic narrative in verse is here addressing all categories of creation (verse 19, wa lahu man fī al-samāwāt wa al-ard) explicitly and directing attention to those directly in communion with the Divine presence who especially are not too haughty to serve and worship.\(^\text{19}\) The polytheists and unbelievers are addressed, and the rhetorical question is posed in verse 21, “Have they taken gods from the earth other than Allah?” Such a course of action would be not only the height of ignorance but also an impossibility, we are told, the text continues, because there are simply no ontologically real deities in them (fībimā)\(^\text{20}\) any of them (the heavens, the earth, or the ones enveloped in the Divine presence) other than The God. And rather, the one God is indwelling them all, heavens, earth, and the created beings; some in a special way (‘indahu).

These are the ones who slacken not (lā yaftarūn) from their ‘ibādā nor do they tire doing so, day or night, for the reason that resultant from their station (‘indahu) they are a locus of divine manifestation (‘ārsh) and the people, or angels, or jinn, et al who have taken “gods” from the Earth in contraposition to the worship of the God, and the proper recognition of the indwelling of the Divine presence, are astray and resultantly have wrongly erred in subsequently deriving from this folly the worshiping of false deities. As the accomplished Alhmādī translator Muhammad Ali observes on the question of the throne to which we now direct our attention, “Note that here Allāh is spoken of as Rabb al- ‘Arsh, the nourisher unto perfection (“Lord”) of the ‘Arsh so that the ‘Arsh, or the Throne

\(^{19}\) The connection between ‘ibādah and khalīfah is highly significant.

\(^{20}\) While fībimā itself is morphologically dual, the context of the rhetorical questioning in verse is inclusive of the ‘Heavens’ the ‘Earth’ and those from the creator who would take gods from the heavens the earth, or themselves other than Allah.
itself is sustained by God, and it is not God who is sustained by the ‘Arsh’.

The verse then is a rhetorical insistence on the futility of the false category of worship amongst those who have “taken gods other than Allah” from the earth, falsely thinking they can give life, with the catena of the narrative declaring that there are no gods other than the God, who is to be found in the heavens, the earth, and in themselves. There cannot have been with them any “gods” other than the God, in whom the divine presence is both omnipresent and indwelling. The only one ontologically valid worship category, none can be thought of as encompassing mankind or the earth in such a way other than The One true God. These categories of being, the heavens, the earth, and their inhabitants are the throne in question. Gods imminence is presented in the text as omnipresent, and the narrative insists his throne is encompassing the heavens, the earth, and the friends of God. This is why the phrasing chosen by the Ahmadi translator Muhammad Ali was to opt for functional, or dynamic equivalence, and render verse 21 literally as “in them” (fīhimā) rather than “in the heavens and the earth” or “in them both” as other noted translators have done. Grammatically and contextually, this is the correct opinion, as, even though the use of the plural is used in classical Arabic for more than two categories of being, based on the rhetorical context, delimiting the reference to solely the heavens and the earth does not accurately reflect the grammatical and contextual considerations, let alone do justice to the nuanced dimensions of the theological messaging present in the narrative structure of the text. As the mystic and scholar al-Ghazalī writes in his seminal commentary on these verses Miskhāt al-Anwār (‘the Niche of the Lights’).

Perhaps you desire to know the manner in which God’s light is ascribed to the heavens and the earth—or, rather, the manner in which God is the light of the heavens and the earth in His own essence…know that God is light, that there is no light other than He, and that He is the totality of lights and the Universal Light…an expression for that through which things are unveiled; in a higher

22 Rather than strictly formal-equivalence.
sense it is through that which, for which, and by which things are unveiled.  

These verses (Q. 21:19-22) in the light of the linguistic framework and the context of the Qur’ānic rhetorical structure in which they are situated greatly inform our conception of the how the Qur’ān outlines the ‘al-asma’ wa al-sifāt of Allah as a harmonious simultaneity of the two polarities of tanzīh and tashbīh. This framework is one wherein God’s ultimate transcendent reality (tanzīh) necessitates, rather than precludes, his immanent presence and self-disclosure. This self-revelation then becomes the form or likeness (tashbīh) by which He becomes known to the knower. 

The Qur’ānic narrative presents the ‘Arsh, or the ‘throne’ of God as central to God’s idea in his sovereignty and dominion. The Qur’ānic narrative, when closely read, reveals it is likewise related to the tajallī Allah, God’s theophanic self-disclosure of God through the agency of mankind. Mankind in general, (as the unique creation of God), and those special men and women specifically, are ontologically related to the throne itself, and function as a ‘throne theophany’. 

The 79th verse of Sūrah Āl-‘Imrān (a verse which directly intersects the concept of mankind as throne theophany and the full implications of ‘Ibadā) reads: “It is not for the creation, who verily are granted the Book, and the Wisdom, and the Prophet-hood, to then say to the people, be in a state of ‘ibādā to me, from other than Allah, but instead, kūnū rabbaniyyin by means of that which you teach, and by means of that which you study”.

The command that is given, kūnū rabbaniyyin, is both theologically and exegetically significant, especially in the context of the previous mention of ‘ibādā, in structural parallelism, as is discussed below. The command given here is plural, and there is no reason to suspect that it is delimited to any one individual or referencing any specific prophet. Rather, it is a general command, first to those from amongst the creation who are charged with the prophetic office (al-

---

24 This term in both Biblical and Qur’ānic studies relates to how both the ‘ārsh and the kūrsi, or the merkavah function as part of a theophany.
nubuwwah) and simultaneously to the people (al-nās) to be Lords or to be Lordly.

The specific verbal command construction kūnū rabbaniyyīn is rather rare as a construction in the Qurʾān, however, both the qiraʿāt of Imām Hafs and Imām Warsh26 give the reading as kūnū rabbaniyyīn,27 and there is no significant textual variant here. The word rabbann in Qurʾānic usage is comparable to the word rabb and can connote a Lord, a Scholar, and a Rabbi. It is highly unlikely that the Qurʾānic narrative is encouraging its audience to become rabbinical clergy, and the use of the plural form of the word rabbann here is best understood as a command to be functionally Lords.

While this is not at all in opposition to the warning against those given the kitāb (‘the book’) and the ḥikmah (‘the wisdom, the ruling, or the understanding’), from telling people to worship themselves (‘ibāda) in contraposition to the One God. Indeed, this exertion is explicitly directed to be inclusive of the people (al-nās), not just those in the prophetic office (al-nubuwwah). Rather, becoming ‘Lords’ on the basis of having taught and studied the Kitāb is the very fulfillment of ‘ibadah in the Qurʾānic narrative. It is part of the tripartite mandate given to Banī Adām to be worshippers (‘ībadah in the 56th Sūrah al-Dhāriyāt, agentival representatives (Khalīfāh) in the 30th verse of Sūrah al-Baqarah, and lords upon the earth (kūnū rabbaniyyīn). This Qurʾānic injunction is also enjoining on mankind. The command to fulfill far more than can be delimited to the cultivation of scholastic acumen. Rather, it is inclusive of mankind being nourishers, and sustainers as Lane and Ibn Manṣūr both recorded this is inclusive within the semantic domain of rabbann.

---

26 Two of the most well-received and widely distributed recitations are those of the two Imāms of Qurʾānic recitation (Qiraʿāt) Abū ‘Amr b. Sulaymān, al-Kaḍī (Hafs) Lived 90-180 Hijrī, and Abū Sāʿīd al-Qutbī (Warsh), 110-197 Hijrī. Warsh is particularly well-represented in the Maghreb, and Hafs is the most widely distributed Qurʾānic recitation everywhere from Iran to Saudi Arabia. The standardization of the Hafs Qiraʿāt by the 1924 Egyptian Edition (Cairo) is still the ‘textus receptus’ as it were for the printing of the Qurʾānic text. It currently enjoys wide distribution by virtue of the prolific printing project of the King Saud Printing center in Saudi, and many other printings of both Hafs and Warsh follow its pagination and verse divisions.

The Qur’ānic description of the ‘arsh form part of the narrative assertions of cosmology wherein there is synonymic parallelism between the ‘throne of God’ and the human being, especially the human beings who fulfill the 253rd verse of Sūrah al-Baqarah (Q. 2:253) regarding those of whom the Qur’ān describes as “those messengers to whom we gave bounty, some we gave abundance upon abundance. From them are those to whom Allāh spoke, those raised by Allah in exalted degrees of rank. And given unto Jesus, the son of Mary was the manifest clarity, we strengthened him by means of the Holy Spirit.” These exalted messengers function as the locus of divine manifestation of the ‘arsh in a temporal sense in the world, as ontological and agentival reflections of a temporal ‘arsh by virtue of being extensions of, and indwelt by, the divine presence.

The Qur’ānic narrative supports this exegetical conclusion, and itself connects the theologeme of the throne of God and the human being through the medium of water. The Qur’ān describes the ‘arsh Allāh as upon the waters in Q. 11:7 “And he was the creator of the heavens and the earth, and His throne (‘arsh) was upon the waters (Mā)”. The Qur’ānic discourse further employs that same diction in the context of mankind, asserting that “…And the Heavens and the earth were joined…and we formed from water all things” in Q. 21:30. We have then the parallelism of the usage of kull shay’ (all things) in the context of the throne (‘arsh) in Q. 11:7 in the context of being given to the Queen of Sabā’, the ‘arsh of God being upon the waters( Q. 11:7), and kull shay’ being made from water in Q. 21:30. The Qur’ānic narrative is employing this intertextual parallelism of the Nazm of ‘arsh, and Mā’, illustrative of the fact that the human being, (especially prophets or friends of God) being the locus of manifestation of the Divine presence. Hence the Qur’ān can rightly speak a Human ruler such as the Queen of Sabā’ being given (all things) as she is a typological representation on the microcosm with her ārsh azīm of the True ‘Throne of Power’ through which the Mā’ (really the human Being) is the conduit for it to flow.

The subject of the ontological synonymy of Allah and the ‘arsh was mentioned in several narrations collected in the jāmi’a or Sabih of al-Bhukārī, highly relevant to further references to the ‘arsh al-‘Azīmi’ in another Qur’ānic verse from the same chapter, in which a discussion on the Amīra al-Saba’ is presented, Sūrah al-Naml (Q.

28 Translation mine.
27:26) “And he is the Lord of the Throne of Mighty Dominion (wa huwa rabb al-`arsh al-azîm).

Ibn Hajar presents a discussion of these `ahdîth of Bukhârî29 including a Mu`allaq30 narration stating “and there was Allah, and there was no other thing existing) before him), and His Throne was established upon the waters.” (kâna Allah wa lam yakun shay` qablab, wa kâna `arshubn `alâ al-mâ). He observes it was a common position among many philosophers in his day to hold to the ontological synonymy of the `arsh and God. Ibn Hajar was himself not sympathetic to that view himself, stating “that the Throne did not originate with Allah the Highest, this is a fallacious opinion, and it was from the suppositions of the people of Falâsafîb”31. The assertion in the narration that there was no other existing thing but God (while simultaneously affirming the existence of both ‘throne’ and ‘waters’) is strongly indicative of the hadith affirming the position that both the throne and the waters were latent potentialities of God, existing in His attributes and being as attributable concomitants not ontologically distinct from the deity.

However, adopting this position in no way necessitates compromising divine unicity; rather, it is an assertion of only one Iylâb’s ontological reality. This assertion forms part of the Qur`ânic rhetorical insistence on seeing the heavens and the earth as a function of, and consubstantial extension of the ‘Throne of Power’; locus for the divine presence, and conduit of the divine manifestation. Hence within the one verse of Q. 27:26 one can see an interrelationship with ten other theologominal discursive narratological elements that intersect with vital elements of the complex profundity of the Qur`ânic cosmological argument.32

---

30 ‘Suspended’ or given without a complete chain. A common way for imâm Bukhârî to provide a thematic introduction to a new chapter in his work.
31 Ibid., 345.
32 Heavens, Earth, Water, Throne, Nûr Khalîfah, and Rûh. The aforementioned content of Sûrah Ibrâhîm (Q. 14:5), with the Nûr Allah and the ‘ayât Allah being connected with the soteriological aspects of the Qiyyamât al-Kubrâ as connected with the Days of Allah are intertwined with this intra-Qur`ânic narrative on those theologies vis à vis the teleological element of the Days of God, for example in Q. 70:4 we find that “The angels and the Spirit (rûh) ascend to him in a day the measure of whereof is fifty thousand years. The poetic and metaphorical nature of this statement is self-evident and the literal the interconnectivity of, Nûr, ‘ayat, and Rûh as elements of the
Concluding Remarks

If within this exegesis we find the echoes of the mystics, Bayezid Baṣṭāmī, al-Ḥallāj, et al. it is not because these thinkers are merely proffering ‘ecstatic utterances’ to be explained away as the excesses of drunken ecstatic piety; nor are they non-Islamic importation from some hidden crypto-Manicheanism or other Qur’ānicly incompatible ‘heresy’ superimposed on Islamic frameworks. Rather, as Mohammad Rustom observes on the views articulated regarding the Prophetic pinnacle of those who have obtained the full theomorphic actualization of the Nūr-i-Muhammad in tafsir al-Fātiḥah of Mullā Sadra “…only the Perfect Man…can interpret the Fātiha, since, in reading it, he offers a reading of Himself”.33

This what Ibn ‘Arabī referred to when he discussed the self-actualization of the internal divinity of man “…his theomorphism is (ta’allub) is a fact since he is viceregent of God in the world”34. This concept (ta’allub), is the cultivation and manifestation of divine attributes, or quite literally the doing of God-Nature. Thereby, when reading the Qur’ānic text in this light, we see that there is inherent in the Qur’ānic narrative on the Adamic creation and ensoulment a divinization by imparting the divine attributes. This divinized status is thereby realized through action, or theosis of self-actualization in the performance of what the divine does, which is what he has charged mankind collectively to do by the very nature of his ontology. The God of the Qur’ān is most certainly not a man, but humanity in the Qur’ānic is essentially divine, enjoying theomorphic ontology as self-disclosure of the Deity.
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