A CASE STUDY IN QURAN REJECTION

An Analytical Breakdown of the Interpretive Method Behind the “Marvelous Quran” Channel

YUSUF MULLAN

Introduction: Why This Document Exists

Salaam.

Over the past little while I reviewed several long-form videos, transcripts, and presentations from Dr. Hani Atchan's "marvelous Qur'an" project. I did not plan on responding at first. My channel has never been about personalities or online back-and-forth. Its entire focus is helping people understand the Qur'an through the Arabic language, the classical interpretive tradition, and a clear, structured approach that gives them independence when they read.

But after analysing his material — and especially after seeing how many sincere Muslims feel "liberated," "shocked," or "finally given clarity" by his claims — it became clear that remaining silent would do more harm than good. Many of the people drawn to his methodology are not fluent in Arabic, are already confused by the tradition, or have lost trust in scholarship. They're vulnerable to any explanation that sounds confident, especially when it promises to "fix" 1,400 years of history at once.

And that is the only reason this document exists.

This is not a reaction to a single lecture.
It is a systematic examination of an entire interpretive method — a closed system — built on recurring claims such as:

- that every mufassir for fourteen centuries misunderstood key vocabulary,
- that the early Arabs did not grasp the Qur'an's meanings,
- that the Sahabah's understanding is unreliable or irrelevant,
- that Qur'anic Arabic does not follow its own grammar or lexicon,
- that foundational terms (*lissān, millah, khalideen, ṣalāh, nabī*) have hidden meanings the Ummah never noticed,
- that the tafsīr tradition is "corrupted" or "borrowed from the Bible,"
- and that only his personal methodology — with no precedent anywhere in Islamic history — can recover the "true" message of the Qur'an.

Once someone accepts those premises, the Qur'an no longer means what its words, grammar, and structure indicate. It means whatever his system requires it to mean.

So this document has one purpose:

1. To present his teachings exactly as he presents them.

For this document, the primary source is his long presentation titled *"YT93 Muhammad vs. Mecca's Quraysh. Did Arabs understand the Qur'an? Millat Ibrahim? Who was Shuʿayb?"*

It's a key segment in which he lays out the core pillars of his method. Everything is summarized faithfully, in order, and without distortion.

2. To then show, step by step, why each pillar collapses.

- Where definitions contradict Arabic,

- where grammar is overridden without reason,
- where Qur'anic usage is ignored,
- where internal contradictions appear,
- and where conclusions openly conflict with the Qur'an's core message.

The goal is not to attack him personally.
The goal is to protect people from a methodology that disconnects them from the Qur'an's own language and the scholarship that has preserved that language for more than a millennium.

If this analysis helps you, read it carefully.
If not, you are free to leave it aside.

My only concern is that sincere Muslims — especially those struggling with Arabic or navigating doubts — are not left unprotected when someone redefines the language of the Qur'an in a way that puts its meanings out of reach.

Warmest salams,
Yusuf Mullan

P.S.
If this document reached you through someone else and you'd like to learn Arabic properly — with structure, clarity, and a connection to the classical tradition — you can find all my free lessons and detailed walkthroughs on the channel:
https://www.youtube.com/@shariahprogram

Structured Summary – Part 1 of 3 (First ~Third of the Presentation)

1. Introductory Framing

- The speaker presents the segment as a long, comprehensive academic presentation.
- He says critics attack his channel regardless of format (long vs short videos).
- He stresses viewers must watch entirely before criticizing.
- Claims the material may cause “existential crisis” for some.
- Emphasizes:
    - This is “academic, scholarly work”
    - Viewers must have “intellectual wherewithal”
    - Critics lack the tools to understand him

2. Stated Objectives of the Segment

He lists 6 major goals:

1. Explain “the roots of disagreement” between Quraysh and Muhammad.

2. Show that the Qur’an “scandalizes Quraysh” and reveals the real disagreement.

3. Review and expand his theory of the **Abrahamic Locution**.

4. Discuss **Millat Ibrahim** and claim its meaning is misunderstood and corrupted.

5. Discuss the story of Shuʿayb and “who Shuʿayb really was.”

6. Present “evidence why the Arabs did not understand the Qur’an.”

He also says he will conclude with why the Qur’an appears “enigmatic” and whether “serious deliberate mistakes” occurred early in Islamic history.

3. Foundational Principles He Says His Method Depends On

He reiterates three pillars:

1. **Abrahamic Locution** — the Qur’an’s real linguistic framework.

2. **Organic Qur’anic Methodology** — a methodology “extracted from the Qur’an itself.”

3. **Evidence-based knowledge** sourced only from his reading of the Qur’an.

He states:

- Any disagreement between Qur’an and external sources → external sources are wrong.

- Critics must watch the entire segment or else they “embarrass themselves.”

---

4. The First Major Claim: Arabs Did Not Have One Language

Core assertions:

- It is “a misconception” that all Arabs spoke one language.
- Historical Arab tribes had drastically different linguistic systems.
- Arabic is a label applied to many related speech varieties, not one unified tongue.

Sources he cites:

- **Mustafa Sādiq al-Rāfiʿī** (“Tārīkh Ādāb al-ʿArab”)
- **Shawqī Ḍayf** (“al-Madāris al-Naḥwiyya”)

His conclusions:

- Pre-Qur’anic and post-Qur’anic Arabs differed greatly in speech.
- There was no single “language of the Arabs.”
- Therefore, statements like “the Qur’an was revealed in the language of Quraysh” are misleading.

---

5. The Concept of “Lissān”: Locution, Not Language

His definition:

- **Lissān** does not mean “language.”
- Lissān = **parole / locution**, using Saussurean terminology.
- Langue (language) = full abstract system.
- Parole / Lissān = subset of language spoken by a specific group.

Key points he makes:

- A person’s locution differs from the total language.
- Different communities have different locutions within the same language.
- Arabic dialects → proof of locutional diversity.
- Qur’an’s use of “Lissān” refers to special inherited locutions (e.g., Abrahamic).

Accusation against critics:

- Critics “lie” by saying he denies the Qur’an is in Arabic.
- He claims he never said locution ≠ Arabic.

---

6. Diagram-Based Explanation of Locution

He provides diagrams (verbally described) illustrating:

- Language = large container
- Locution = small subset tied to community, context, family, profession
- Communication happens at the intersection of two people's locutions

He applies this to:

- **Ibrāhīm**
- **Mūsā & Hārūn**
- **Different communities in Egypt, Canaan, etc.**
- Claims prophets had unique locutions that were later "cast into Arabic" in the Qur'an.

---

7. The Qur'an Uses Abrahamic Locution

His key thesis:

- Qur'anic stories of earlier prophets preserve **their** locution, not Arabic locution.
- These locutions were "Arabized" into Arabic words.
- Therefore, parts of the Qur'an are Arabic in form but not in origin.

Examples he gives:

- Terms used by Ibrāhīm, then by Isḥāq, Yaʿqūb, Yūsuf, the woman of Madyan, etc.

- The repeated use of **“yā abati”** is presented as:

    - A non-Arabic Abrahamic locution

    - Not understood by Arabs

    - A “marker” showing inheritance of locutional identity

He argues:

- Tafsīr scholars could not explain the etymology of *yā abati*

- Therefore, it wasn’t Arabic; it was Abrahamic speech Arabized in the Qur’an.

---

8. Qur’anic Evidence He Claims Supports “Lissān ≠ Language”

Example 1: Mūsā & Hārūn

Qur’an 28:34 — “He is more eloquent in Lissān than me.”

- He argues they shared the same language but different locution → proves Lissān ≠ language.

Example 2: Dāwūd & ʿĪsā

Qur’an 5:78 — cursed “in the Lissān of Dāwūd and ʿĪsā”

- He claims they lived centuries apart → so cannot mean “same language”

- Therefore “one Lissān” means “shared Abrahamic locution.”

---

9. His Reinterpretation of Qur’an 14:4

Traditional translation:
“We did not send any messenger except with the language of his people so he could clarify to them.”

He rejects this interpretation as “trite and illogical.”
He lists “problems” with the traditional view:

1. It states something obvious (messenger speaks people’s language).

2. It would imply the Arabs should have understood the Qur’an easily — yet many didn’t.

3. It would imply the Qur’an only clarifies to Arabs.

4. It creates problems with jinn understanding the Qur’an.

His alternative translation:

“Never have We sent *in this Qur’an about* a messenger except **in the locution of his people** so that **Allah** exposes to them…”

Additional claims:

- The verb *yubayyina* refers to Allah revealing meaning, not the messenger.

- The “min” means “about,”
- The subject of *yubayyin* is a delayed pronoun referring to Allah, not the messenger.

This is the foundation of his linguistic system.

---

10. Argument Involving the Jinn

He presents a chain of reasoning:

- Jinn “heard” the Qur’an in Arabic.
- If Arabic = “language of the Arabs,” then Jinn must be Arabs.
- If Jinn are not Arabs, then “Lissān” cannot equal “language.”
- Thus Qur’an 14:4 must refer to locution, not language.

He uses this to claim:

- Traditional interpretation collapses logically.
- His locution-based interpretation is the only viable one.

---

11. Extensions of His Reinterpretation

Claims:

- A *Rasūl* does not speak in his own language, but only through the scripture's locution.
- "Bi-lisān qawmihi" refers to the locution of the *recipients*, not the prophet.
- The Qur'an must be understood through inherited Abrahamic locution embedded in its stories.
- "Clarity" (li-yubayyina) occurs through the Qur'an itself, not the messenger's speech.
- Understanding Qur'an requires decoding locutional markers in prophetic stories.

---

12. Qur'anic Style: Pronoun First, Referent Later

To justify delayed referents in 14:4, he brings:

- 4 examples from Qur'an where pronouns appear before their nouns.
- Claims this validates his reading of *yubayyina lahum* as referring to Allah, not the messenger.

---

13. Qur'ān vs. Arabic vs. "Language of the Arabs"

He asserts:

- Qur'anic Arabic ≠ full Arabic language

- Qur’anic Arabic ≠ the Arabs’ Arabic

- Qur’an contains many non-Arabic or Arabized words

- Qur’an violates Arabic grammar because Qur’anic grammar is superior to poets’ grammar

List of words he claims are not Arabic:

- *hayta-lak*, *wayka’anna*, *lanasfaʿan*, *layakūnan*, *as-samāwāt*, *um-niyyatihi*, *yabna-umma*, *salsabīl*, *allahumma*, *jahannam*

- Plus “thousands” of expressions he says Arabs never used before Qur’an.

His conclusion:

- Qur’anic Arabic is a subset produced by Arabizing Abrahamic locution.

- Arabs could recognize its *form* but not understand its *meaning*.

End of Part 1 Summary

1. The Entire Framework Is Reverse-Engineered to Justify One Goal

Everything in this first third has one underlying purpose:

To break the connection between:

- Qur’an
- Arabic language
- Tafsir
- Early Arabs
- Usul al-tafsir
- Classical scholarship
- Linguistic consensus

He needs all of these to collapse so that **his own system is the only interpretive authority left standing**.

This is textbook ideological reconstruction disguised as “philology.”

Nothing he builds afterward can survive if the Arabic language and tafsir tradition remain intact.
So he spends the entire first third dismantling them.

This is not a misunderstanding. It's tactical.

2. His Foundational Move Is Dishonest

His central trick is redefining لِسَان.

But he doesn't do it through:

- lexicons
- pre-Islamic poetry
- classical tafsir
- historical linguistics
- comparative Semitic philology
- Quranic usage
- or context

Instead he imports **modern European linguistic terminology (Saussure)** and pastes it onto Qur'anic Arabic — as if the Qur'an intended 20th-century Swiss structuralist distinctions.

This is blatant methodological fraud.

It's like claiming:

> "The Qur'an must be read using Newtonian physics terms."

He knows the audience doesn't know Saussure, so he uses it as a smokescreen.

3. He Reverses the Relationship Between Language and Scripture

He repeatedly says:

> "Language doesn't define the Qur'an; the Qur'an defines the language."

This is absurd.

The Qur'an **uses** the Arabic language.
It does not invent it ex nihilo.

Every classical scholar — from Sībawayh to Ibn Malik to Ibn Jinnī — makes the exact opposite argument.

He acts like the Arabic language was ambiguous, unstable, or tribal chaos until the Qur'an came — which is historically and linguistically false.

This is not ignorance. It is **intentional narrative revision**.

---

4. His Lissān Argument Is Flat-Out False

He claims:

> "Lissān never means language."

This is a lie.

Every classical dictionary (creating a list would fill pages):

- Lisān al-ʿArab
- Tāj al-ʿArūs

- Muʿjam Maqāyīs al-Lughah
- al-Ṣiḥāḥ
- al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ
- al-Aṣmaʿī
- Khalīl ibn Aḥmad
- Ibn Jinnī

…and every mufassir of every era…

…agrees that لِسَان absolutely *does* mean “language.”

Not a single scholar in 1400 years held his view.

This isn’t a fringe opinion. It is a **manufactured definition**.

---

5. His “Non-Arabic Words” List Is Fabricated

He claims:

- hayta laka
- wayka’anna
- lanasfaʿan
- salsabeel

- allahumma
- jahannam
- as-samāwātu
  …are “not Arabic.”

This is complete nonsense.

Some are:

- attested in pre-Islamic poetry
- well-documented in early lexicons
- explained in classical tafsir
- historically known in Semitic philology

Every one of these words has:

- a known root,
- or established morphological analysis,
- or documented usage,
- or a classical linguistic discussion explaining its form.

He simply hopes the audience cannot verify any of this.

---

6. His *yā abati* Story Is False and Intentionally Misleading

He claims:

> "Tafsir scholars struggled with its etymology."

Completely false.

Sībawayh explained it.
al-Farrāʾ explained it.
Ibn al-Anbārī explained it.
al-Zajjāj explained it.
al-Akhfash explained it.
Ibn Jinnī explained it.
al-Ṭabarī documented the grammar.
al-Qurṭubī quoted multiple analyses.
Even modern Arab linguists teach it to first-year students.

It is fully transparent Arabic grammar:

- the tāʾ in "yā abati" is the well-known *tāʾ al-ʿiwaḍ* — a compensatory tāʾ used in vocatives for softness and endearment. It appears throughout early Arabic speech and in Qur'anic usage.

- and it appears throughout pre-Islamic speech patterns in variant forms

His claim that "Arabs never used this" is simply a lie.

---

7. His Use of 5:78 to Redefine "Lissān" Is a Category Error

One of his arguments rests on the claim that:

> "Dāwūd and ʿĪsā lived centuries apart, yet the Qur'an says they shared one *lissān*.
> Therefore *lissān* cannot mean language."

The problem is simple: **the verse he's citing isn't even talking about language.**

The āyah states that the disbelievers among Banī Isrā'īl were cursed:

> **ʿalā lisāni Dāwūd wa ʿĪsā ibn Maryam**
> *"through the tongue of Dāwūd and ʿĪsā ibn Maryam."*

This is a well-known Arabic idiom meaning:

"They were cursed through the words of these prophets."

It refers to those prophets *invoking* Allah's curse —
not to their spoken languages, dialects, or "locutions."

There is no linguistic discussion here at all.

Using this verse to argue about the meaning of *lissān* is like reading:

> "He rules with an iron fist"

and concluding:

> "See? His hand must literally be made of iron."

It tells you nothing about the meaning of *lissān* in 14:4.
It is simply the wrong verse for the point he's trying to make.

And the fact that he builds an entire argument on a verse that has nothing to do with language tells you everything you need to know about the quality of his method.

---

8. His Argument on 14:4 (Sūrah Ibrāhīm) — Summary and Rebuttal

This section presents:

1. **A neutral, accurate summary** of his entire argument on 14:4

2. **A point-by-point rebuttal** showing why the argument collapses linguistically and logically

---

8.1. Summary of His Interpretation of 14:4

He begins by insisting that the traditional meaning of 14:4 —
"We did not send any messenger except in the language of his people, so that he may clarify for them" —
is "trite," "hackneyed," "obvious," and therefore "must mean something else."

He then dismantles every classical element of the verse to force a reinterpretation aligned with his "Abrahamic locution" theory.

(a) He claims "lissān" does not mean language

He argues:

- *lissān* literally means "tongue,"

- it cannot refer to language,

- and linguists like Saussure distinguish between "langue" (full language) and "parole" (individual speech / locution).

He asserts that the Qur'an uses *lissān* to mean *parole* or "locution," not language.

(b) He claims "min" in *min rasūl* means "about"

He reads the verse as:

> "We did not send **about a messenger** [in this Qur'an] except in the locution of his people…"

He inserts "in this Qur'an" even though it is not in the text.

(c) He claims "yubayyina lahum" refers to Allah, not the messenger

He argues that:

- the subject of *yubayyina* is not mentioned
- the later "fa-yuḍillu-llāhu… wa yahdī…" reveals that Allah is the one clarifying
- therefore the messenger is not clarifying anything in his own language

(d) He argues the traditional reading is meaningless

He repeatedly says:

- "This adds no new information."
- "Of course a messenger speaks the language of his people."
- "Why would Allah state something so obvious?"

He uses "triviality" as proof that the classical reading must be rejected.

(e) He introduces the jinn argument

He claims:

- The Qur'an reports jinn listening to the Prophet and understanding Arabic on the spot
- Therefore, jinn must be part of the Prophet's *qawm*
- If *lissān qawmihi* means human ethnic language, this creates a theological crisis
- Therefore *lissān* cannot mean language
- Therefore the traditional reading is wrong

(f) His final reinterpretation

He concludes that 14:4 actually means:

- The Qur'an narrates stories *about* earlier messengers
- These stories are retold using the *locution* of the original prophet's community
- The Qur'an "casts" that locution into Arabic while preserving its structure
- Allah (not the Prophet) clarifies the meanings directly through those locutions

In short:

> **The verse is not about messengers speaking their people's language.**
> **It is about the Qur'an importing earlier locutions into Arabic.**

This reinterpretation is the backbone of his entire system.

8.2. Rebuttal: Why His Interpretation Collapses Completely

(1) His argument depends on redefining "lissān" — but the redefinition is false

In the Qur'an and in classical Arabic:

- *lissān* **does** mean language
- and it **does** mean speech/tongue depending on context

There is no forced technical distinction like Saussure's "langue vs. parole." Arabic already has:

- **luġah** (language)
- **lisān** (language / tongue / speech)
- **kalām** (speech)
- **qawl** (statement)

His redefinition is imported and artificial.

(2) His reading of "min" as "about" is grammatically unnatural

The verse does **not** say:

> "We did not send *about* a messenger…"

It says:

وما أرسلنا من رسول

"We did not send *any* messenger…"

"Min" here is the standard **partitive min** after a negation (مِن الزائدة بعد النفي):

- universally recognized
- uncontroversial
- basic Arabic grammar

His interpretation requires rewriting the grammar.

(3) His "this is trivial" objection is false

He argues that the verse must mean something deeper because, in his words, "of course a messenger speaks the language of his people." He treats it as if Allah is stating a useless obvious fact.

But the point of the verse is not random, and it is not trivial.

The people he was dealing with had a very specific misconception: they assumed that "heavenly books" come in some special, foreign language (like Hebrew or Syriac), and then get translated for ordinary people. They had seen parts of the Torah and Gospel in Arabic, so in their minds the "real" version had to be in another tongue. On that assumption, an Arabic Qur'an looked suspicious to them — too close to the Prophet's own speech — so they actually said: why wasn't it revealed in a foreign language?

This is the mindset the verse is correcting.

When Allah says:

> "We did not send any messenger except in the language of his people so that he may make things clear to them,"

He is doing two things:

- rejecting their idea of a special “sacred language” for revelation, and
- affirming the real principle: every messenger is sent in the language of the people he is addressing first, so that the message is clear from day one.

Once you understand that, the verse is anything but pointless.
It has a very specific job. Calling it “trivial” just shows he has not understood what problem the verse is actually solving.

(4) His jinn argument is a category mistake

This is the core error.

He claims that if the jinn understood the Qur’an,
they must be part of the Prophet’s *qawm*.

But:

- The verse does **not** say revelation must be in the language of everyone who will ever hear it.
- It only describes the **initial audience of the messenger**.
- Jinn understanding Arabic does **not** turn them into ethnic Arabs.
- Understanding ≠ ethnicity.
- Ethnicity ≠ language.

The argument collapses.

(5) His reading requires inserting words not in the verse

He repeatedly adds:

- “in this Qur’an”
- “about the messengers”
- “cast into Arabic”

None of these phrases are in the āyah.

The text itself does not support his reading.

(6) His reassignment of *yubayyina* is unnecessary and linguistically weak

The default, natural reading is:

- the messenger clarifies to his people
- through the revelation sent to him

This is repeated all across the Qur’an:

- *li-tubayyina li-n-nās…*
- *yallimukumu-l-kitāba wa-l-ḥikma*
- *yutlu ʿalayhim āyātihi…*
- *wa yuʿallimuhumu-l-kitāb…*

He tries to force *yubayyina* onto Allah only because his system depends on removing the Prophet ﷺ from the act of clarification.

(7) His argument that “the classical reading creates a crisis” is manufactured

He creates the crisis, then solves it.
This is rhetorical manipulation, not tafsīr.

(8) The verse means exactly what every Arabic speaker naturally reads

> **“We did not send any messenger except in the language of his people, so that he may clarify to them.”**

- The grammar is clean
- The meaning is obvious
- The structure is consistent across Qur’anic usage
- And nothing in the verse requires the gymnastics he performs

There is no mystery here.

(9) The logic behind the classical reading is sound

A messenger sent to a specific people must speak the language of those people so:

- the message is understood
- arguments are clear
- moral responsibility is established

This is a universal prophetic pattern — not ethnic supremacy.

(10) His reinterpretation collapses under its own weight

To sustain his theory, he must:

- redefine “lissān”
- redefine “min”
- redefine “yubayyina”
- shift the subject of the verb
- insert new words into the text
- fabricate a jinn-based theological problem
- and then present his solution as the only escape

That is not interpretation.
It is **systematic distortion**.

8.3. Bottom Line

14:4 does not support his methodology.
It contradicts it outright.

The traditional meaning is:

- linguistically correct
- grammatically clean
- contextually consistent
- and fully aligned with Qur’anic usage everywhere else

His reading is:

- unnecessary
- grammatically forced
- logically inconsistent
- and built on rewriting portions of the verse

This single āyah is enough to demonstrate that his system does not emerge from the Qur’an at all — it is imposed onto it.

---

9. His Constant Accusations Against Scholars Are an Enormous Red Flag

His language is filled with:

- “they lied to you”
- “they hid this”
- “they corrupted the lexicon”
- “they changed the meanings deliberately”
- “they hijacked Islam”
- “they refuse to think”
- “they’re incompetent”

- “they were politically motivated”

This is cultic rhetoric.
It’s classic “everyone is lying to you except me.”

He creates a narrative where:

- the entire ummah
- every scholar
- every mufassir
- every grammarian
- every philologist
- every historian
- every linguist
- from 700 CE to 2022

…is part of the same mistake — except him.

---

10. Is the Majority of Everything so far Garbage?

Yes. Almost all of it.

Not “mistaken.”
Not “poorly argued.”
Not “eccentric.”

But **actively deceptive** in many places, and **constructed on false premises**.

His entire methodology depends on:

- redefining key Arabic words against the consensus of all scholarship
- inventing new linguistic categories
- denying the Arabic language existed in a stable form
- undermining the Sahābah
- undermining classical tafsīr
- dismissing historical linguistics
- turning every anomaly into a proof for his private theory
- claiming unique access to knowledge the ummah lost
- portraying disagreement as “ignorance” or “shirk”

This is not a mistake.
It is an intentional reframing designed to detach people from the Islamic scholarly tradition.

Structured Summary – Part 2 of 3 (Middle ~Third of the Presentation)

1. Did the 7th Century Arabs Understand the Qur'an?

He poses the question directly and claims the Qur'an itself answers that the Arabs around the Prophet ﷺ **barely understood** it.

Key verses he cites:

- **Qur'an 4:78**

  "What is the matter with these people that they hardly understand any ḥadīth?"
  He interprets "ḥadīth" here as **the Qur'an itself**, not prophetic narrations.
  He says this proves:

  - they "did not come close" to understanding the Qur'anic discourse
  - the 7th-century Arabs were struggling with the Qur'an's language and composition.

- **Qur'an 25:60**

  When told "Prostrate to al-Raḥmān", they reply "What is al-Raḥmān? Shall we prostrate to what you command us?"
  He argues:

    - their problem was not simply the word “al-Raḥmān”
    - their refusal shows resistance to accepting meaning from Muhammad ﷺ
    - this indicates deep aversion and repulsion, not just confusion.

He concludes that:

- the Qur’an states explicitly that these “qawm” did not really understand
- this becomes part of his larger thesis that **the Arabs were not actually the custodians of the Qur’an’s semantics**.

---

2. Qur’anic Words Not Part of the Arabs’ Lexicon

He presents a list of words which he claims are **Qur’an-specific** and **not originally Arabic**:

Examples he gives:

- **هَيْتَ لَكَ** (hayta-lak) – 12:23
- **وَيْكَأَنَّ** (wayka’anna) – 28:82
- **لَنَسْفَعًا** (lanasfaʿan) – 96:15
- **لَيَكُونًا** (layakūnan) – 12:32
- **السَّمَاوَات** pronounced as “as-samāwāt” with a long alif – he claims this form is not in Arabic lexicons and is a Qur’anic innovation meaning

“layers of understanding,” distinct from a purely Arabic “as-samawāt.”

- أُمْنِيَّتِهِ (um-niyyatihi) – he distinguishes between Arabic vs. a special Qur’anic concatentated form

- يَبْنَؤُمَّ (yabna-umma) – 20:94, which he says is a non-Arabic concatenation pointing to a deeper method of Qur’anic word-formation

- سَلْسَبِيلًا (salsabīlā) – 76:18

- اللَّهُمَّ (allāhumma) – 10:10, which he says has no Arabic etymology and is an imported term

- جَهَنَّمُ (jahannam) – 2:206, claimed to have no true Arabic root

He adds:

- These words show the Qur’an **introduces new vocabulary** not found in the Arabs’ speech.

- He also claims there are **dozens of verses** which “violate” classical Arabic grammar rules (agreement, gender, iltifāt, etc.) because:

    - the grammarians tried to force the Qur’an into the poets’ rules

    - the Qur’an actually has its own superior grammatical system.

He concludes that:

- Arabic grammarians struggled with the Qur’an

- they sometimes accused the Qur’an of “errors”

- therefore, Qur’anic Arabic is not fully reducible to “language of the Arabs” and includes **special, divinely introduced forms and usages**.

---

3. Do Languages Change Over Time?

He shifts to a general linguistic discussion.

English examples he gives:

- **“Nice”** – used to mean “stupid, foolish,” now “pleasant, kind.”
- **“Awful”** – used to mean “worthy of awe,” now “terrible.”
- **“Heartburn”** – once “jealousy, hatred,” now acid reflux.
- **“Clue” / “clew”** – originally “ball of yarn” used to navigate labyrinths, now “hint.”
- **“Doom”** – once “legal judgment,” now “ruin, destruction, death.”

He uses these to argue:

- Meanings slip and drift with time.
- Without a fixed reference, words become unstable.
- Therefore, if the Qur’an had left meanings to “the Arabs” and their poetry, semantics of key Qur’anic terms would have drifted beyond recognition.

His conclusion:

- Allah needed a way to **freeze** the semantic content of Qur'anic terms.

---

4. Relationship Between Locution and Qur'anic Stories

He introduces what he calls a "significant principle":

- The **Qur'anic stories** are the **repository of semantics** for the Qur'an's key vocabulary.

He claims:

- Allah protected the Qur'an's language by embedding the meanings of important words in the **context of stories**.
- These stories fix the meanings and prevent drift.
- Therefore, anyone doing tafsir **must**:
    1. Start with the stories,
    2. Extract the meanings of terms from those story-contexts,
    3. Then apply those meanings to legal, doctrinal and other passages.

He says:

- If someone gives legal opinions on divorce, fasting, prayer, etc., **without** first deriving definitions of key terms from the stories, their opinions should not be trusted.
- This is a central plank of his "organic Qur'anic methodology."

5. Why He Calls It “Abrahamic Locution”

He returns to the label “Abrahamic Locution” and tries to ground it in the Qur’an.

Verses he cites:

- **26:84** – Ibrahim’s duʿā’:

  “Grant me a *lisān ṣidq* in the later generations.”
  He interprets *lisān ṣidq* as “a locution of truth” which will be established in later generations.

- **19:49–50** – Allah grants Ibrahim Isḥāq and Yaʿqūb and “made for them a prevailing truth” in their stories.
  He reads this as:
  - Allah confirming Ibrahim’s request,
  - Embedding Ibrahim’s locution into the stories of his descendants.
- **2:124** – Allah tests Ibrahim with “kalimāt” and then makes him “imām for mankind.”
  He interprets:
  - *kalimāt* = divine expressions and lexicon,
  - Ibrahim perfects or receives these perfected,

    - So Ibrahim becomes the **conduit** (through-way) for a perfected divine lexicon.

He concludes:

- The **Abrahamic Locution** is:
    - the specific **speech-pattern, vocabulary, labels, and compositional style** Allah taught Ibrahim,
    - preserved in the Qur'an through stories of Ibrahim, Isḥāq, Yaʿqūb, Yūsuf, Mūsā, etc.
- This locution, not "Arab poets," is the true basis of Qur'anic meaning.

---

6. What "Millat" Is NOT

He then begins to redefine **Millah**.

Verses and claims:

- **2:120** – "The Jews and Christians will not be pleased until you follow their Millah…"

He emphasizes:

- The verse uses **one** Millah (millatahum), not plural.
- Yet Jews and Christians clearly have many sects, creeds, and divergent religions.

- Therefore, he argues, Millah **cannot** mean:
    - Dīn
    - Religion
    - Faith
    - Creed
    - Nation
    - Community

He surveys:

- Modern translations that render Millah as “religion”, “faith” or “creed.”
- Classical tafsir:
    - al-Ṭabarī: says “Millah = Dīn” and gives no methodological derivation, just a statement.
    - al-Rāzī, Ibn Kathīr: follow similar lines.
    - Others: some say “Qiblah,” some say “ṭarīqah” (way).

He claims:

- These are arbitrary, opinion-based definitions with no Qur’anic proof.
- They differ from each other, which he presents as proof that they are guesswork.

- He calls them “brain farts” (his wording) and says they did not actually derive Millah from Qur’anic evidence.

He also notes:

- In Turkish, Urdu, Persian, etc., “Millat” is used for “nation” or “community,” which he says is also wrong according to the Qur’an.

---

7. What Is ‘Millat Ibrāhīm’? – Lexical Derivation

He turns to his own derivation.

Main text: 2:282 (the debt verse)

He focuses on:

- **فَلْيُمْلِلْ / يُمِلَّ / يُمْلِلْ** – verbs meaning “let him dictate / compose”
- The context is:
    - someone dictating terms of a contract,
    - composing the clauses,
    - a guardian dictating on behalf of someone who cannot.

He argues:

- From these verbs **amlala / mallā / yumill(u)**, we get the gerund **malal / mall / malala** indicating:
    - composition

- dictation
- weaving sentences and clauses.

He then asserts:

- **Millah** comes from the **fiʿlah** pattern (fiʿlah = result of an action),
- So **Millah** = "the composition / the result of dictation."

From this, he concludes:

> **Millat Ibrāhīm = the composition style instituted by Ibrāhīm; the narration style; the way his locution is structured.**

Not religion, not creed.

---

8. Who Is Required to Follow Millat Ibrāhīm?

He then argues that **everyone** is required to follow Millat Ibrāhīm as he defines it.

Verses:

- **16:123** – "Then We revealed to you (Muhammad) to follow Millat Ibrāhīm Ḥanīfan…"
  He says:
  - This is a direct order to the Prophet ﷺ to adopt Ibrahim's composition style.
- **3:95** – "So follow Millat Ibrāhīm Ḥanīfan…"
  He interprets this as a general command for all of us.

- **4:125** – “Who is better in Dīn than one who submits to Allah… and follows Millat Ibrāhīm Ḥanīfan…”
  He says:

    - This shows that correct commitment to Allah includes following Ibrāhīm’s composition style.

- **12:37–38** – Yūsuf in prison:

    - Yūsuf says he has left “Millat of a people who don’t believe in Allah…”

    - And followed “Millat of my fathers, Ibrāhīm, Isḥāq, Yaʿqūb…”
      He reads “Millat” here as:

    - the compositional style of those who misused scripture vs. that of Ibrāhīm and his descendants.

From all this, he concludes:

- Millat Ibrāhīm is a **technical term** meaning:

    - the compositional style,

    - the labeling system,

    - the narrative and lexical structure Allah taught Ibrāhīm.

- All believers, including Muhammad ﷺ, are commanded to follow that style when engaging the Qur’an.

---

9. Warning to Those Who Confuse or Corrupt the Divine Lexicon

He connects mis-defining Millah and other key words to **corrupting the divine lexicon** (taḥrīf of meanings).

He revisits:

- The story of the cow (Baqarah) and the word **huzūʾan** – which he previously reinterpreted as "perverting the divine lexicon" rather than just "mockery."

Then he cites:

- **2:231** – "Do not take the āyāt of Allah as huzūʾan…"
- **5:57** – People who take your dīn as a game and huzūʾan.
- **45:6–10** – Those who:
    - hear Allah's āyāt,
    - insist in arrogance,
    - and when they "know something from Our āyāt, they take it as huzūʾan."
      He interprets this as:
    - people who twist the meanings,
    - change the lexicon,
    - and mislead others.

He emphasizes:

- Altering key meanings (like Millah, Lissān, etc.) is a form of **shirk** in the realm of language.
- Those who do this leave “a trail leading to Jahannam” behind them.
- He links this to scholars who, in his view, replaced the Qur’an’s own definitions with their own.

---

10. Definition of Jāhilūn in the Qur’an

He redefines **jāhil / jāhilūn**.

Example:

- **11:46** – Allah to Nūḥ: “…I advise you lest you be among the jāhilīn.”

He says:

- Here Nūḥ used the word *ahl* incorrectly in his duʿā’ (for his son), and Allah corrected him.
- This shows that **jahl** here is not “ignorance” in the simplistic sense, but:
    - misusing the divine lexicon,
    - using words in ways that the Qur’an does not sanction.

So he concludes:

- **Jāhil** in Qur’anic terms = one who misapplies the Qur’an’s own lexical system and semantics.

- This becomes part of his broader linguistic framework.

---

11. What Does ‘Ḥanīf’ Mean?

He unpacks **Ḥanīf**.

He notes:

- Root **ḥanaf** = “to incline / to veer / to turn away from a main path.”

- He argues:

    - A ḥanīf is someone who veers away from the herd, from the crowd’s beaten path,

    - but does so **while remaining purely monotheist** and not falling into shirk.

He cites:

- **6:161** – The Prophet ﷺ is told to say he has been guided to:

    - “Ṣirāṭ mustaqīm,”

    - a “dīn qiyaman,”

    - “Millat Ibrāhīm Ḥanīfan.”

- **22:31** – “Ḥunafāʾ lillāh, ghayra mushrikīn bihi…”

He concludes:

- Being ḥanīf =
    - not following inherited ethnic or sectarian paths,
    - steering away from popular religious culture,
    - while being uncompromisingly strict about Tawḥīd.
- Applied to Ibrāhīm, it means he refused his community's shallow scriptural reading and followed the divine lexicon as taught by Allah.

---

12. "But the Qur'an Was in Muhammad's Tongue!"

He addresses the objection using:

- **19:97** and **44:58** – "We have made it easy in your *lissān*…"

He claims:

- These verses are **prescriptive, not descriptive**.
- That is:
    - Allah is telling the Prophet ﷺ to **adopt** this lissān (Abrahamic locution) so that it becomes "your lissān."
    - It's not saying the Qur'an came down in the pre-existing Qurayshi tongue.
- The goal is:

    - to make comprehension easy for disciplined people (muttaqīn),
    - to allow him to give glad tidings and warnings using the Abrahamic locution embedded in the Qur'an.

He also cites:

- **75:16** – "Do not move your tongue with it to hasten it…"
    - He reads this as:
        - not rushing to spell out everything,
        - allowing the locution and methodology to be preserved for the muttaqīn over time.

Thus he maintains:

- The Prophet's *lissān* is to become aligned with **Millat Ibrāhīm** and the Abrahamic locution, rather than vice versa.

---

13. Relationship Between Millat Ibrāhīm, Nesting, and Aṣ-Ṣarḥ

He connects several of his technical concepts:

- **Millat Ibrāhīm** = the overall composition style and locution.
- **Nested interpretation** = extracting abstract concepts and their interrelations by tracing them through multiple stories and markings.

- **Aṣ-Ṣarḥ** (the “monument”) = his term for:
    - the structure formed when all abstract concepts and their relationships are mapped and understood,
    - culminating in a coherent “weltanschauung” (worldview) aligned with the Qur’an.

He says:

- Qur’anic stories use locution and markings to:
    - identify families, lineages, geographies, affiliations,
    - and to tie together concepts across distant sūrahs.
- These markings and nests are all part of Millat Ibrāhīm’s structure.

His claim:

- Without Millat Ibrāhīm and Abrahamic locution, you cannot:
    - properly build this conceptual structure,
    - or understand how the stories are meant to anchor meanings.

---

14. Why is Ibrāhīm ‘Khaleel’ and ‘Imām’?

He reinterprets **Khaleel** and **Imām**.

Khaleel:

- Root **kh-l-l** – he says carries a sense of “passing through,” “throughway,” “gap, opening.”
- He argues:
    - *Khaleel* does not mean “friend” or “companion.”
    - It means Ibrāhīm was a **throughway** or conduit:
        - through whom the perfected divine lexicon and millah passed to mankind.

Imām:

- In **2:124**, after Ibrāhīm is tested with “kalimāt”:
    - Allah makes him “imām for mankind.”
- He interprets:
    - This recognizes Ibrāhīm as the central **exemplar** and reference point for:
        - the divine lexicon,
        - millah,
        - locution,
        - composition style.

So in his system:

- Ibrāhīm as **Ḥanīf**, **Khaleel**, and **Imām**
  all converge to mean:

    - he is the pivot through whom the true methodology and lexicon of engaging revelation is established,

    - and everyone, including the Prophet Muhammad ﷺ, is commanded to adopt that methodology.

Rebuttal – Part 2 (Middle Third of the Presentation)

---

1. “The Qur’an says the 7th-century Arabs barely understood it.”

This claim collapses immediately once you look closely at the verses he cites.

When Allah says in 4:78:

> “What is with these people that they hardly understand any ḥadīth?”

- *ḥadīth* here means **speech**, **statement**, **discourse**.
- It does not mean *the Qur’an itself*.
- No classical mufassir interpreted it that way.
- No linguistic authority has ever defined it that way.

The verse is simply describing their **attitude**, not their intelligence, and certainly not their grasp of their own language.
They rejected the message, not the grammar.

Likewise, when they react negatively in 25:60 (“What is al-Raḥmān?”), this is not evidence that they didn’t understand Arabic.
It is evidence that they **didn’t want to accept the One who revealed the message.**

There is a difference between **rejection** and **incomprehension**.
Conflating the two is not linguistic analysis — it is narrative construction.

---

2. The claim that the Qur’an uses non-Arabic words that were unknown to Arabs is incorrect

Every example he gives — from *hayta laka* to *salsabeel* — has been discussed in depth by classical linguists:

- Sībawayh
- al-Farrā’
- al-Aṣmaʿī
- Ibn al-Anbārī
- al-Zajjāj
- Ibn Jinnī
- al-Ṭabarī
- Ibn Kathīr
- al-Qurṭubī
  …and many others.

Some are native Arabic forms, some are foreign proper nouns that entered Arabic long before the Qur'an (a normal phenomenon in all languages).
None of this is new, surprising, or controversial.

His presentation gives the impression that:

- these words were unknown to the Arabs,
- the Qur'an introduced them for the first time,
- and classical scholars "struggled" with them.

This is false.
They explained them clearly, with full morphological and lexical grounding.
There is no mystery here.
The only reason these words feel "mysterious" in his presentation is because the audience does not know the linguistic literature.

---

3. His argument that the Qur'an "violates Arabic grammar" is unfounded

It is not the Qur'an that is measured against the grammar books.
It is the grammar books that were written based on the Qur'an and pre-Islamic Arabic speech.

The grammarians:

- collected pre-Islamic poetry,
- documented Bedouin speech,
- analyzed Qur'anic structures,

- and formulated rules **from** the language as it existed.

So when modern speakers encounter something they personally don't understand in the Qur'an, the issue is never with the Qur'an; it is with their own grasp of the language.

The idea that the Qur'an "breaks the rules" is not a linguistic argument.
It is simply unfamiliarity presented as revelation.

---

4. His discussion of semantic drift in English does not support his theory

He presents examples from English to argue that meanings change over time.
That much is true in a general sense.
But it has nothing to do with Qur'anic Arabic.

Classical Arabic is:

- root-based,
- morphologically transparent,
- semantically stable,
- and anchored by a vast corpus of preserved usage.

Semantic drift in Arabic does happen, but at a very different pace and with different rules than English — and most importantly, not in ways that erase the meanings of core Qur'anic vocabulary.

This entire section is meant to soften the audience so they accept the next step:
that Allah had to embed meanings inside stories because the Arabs could not be trusted with the language.

There is no evidence for this.
It is simply asserted.

---

5. His claim that Qur'anic stories are the "semantic storehouse" of key vocabulary is not supported by the tradition

It is true that Qur'anic stories clarify meanings.
Tafsīr scholars absolutely use stories to illuminate context.

But he takes this ordinary, uncontroversial idea and expands it into an entire linguistic system:

- that stories are the exclusive home of semantics,
- that definitions must be extracted only from stories,
- that legal or doctrinal passages cannot define their own terms,
- and that anyone who does not follow this method "cannot be trusted."

This is not found in any work of uṣūl al-tafsīr.
There is no textual basis for it.
There is no linguistic necessity for it.

It is a constructed methodology that exists only to justify the rest of his framework.

6. His derivation of “Millah” from 2:282 is linguistically invalid

This is the central move of this section.

He takes verbs related to:

- dictating a contract,
- composing clauses,
- writing agreements,

…and claims that from this, the word **Millah** must mean “composition style.”

But:

- The Qur’an uses *Millah* dozens of times.
- Classical lexicons (Ibn Fāris, Ibn Manẓūr, Fairūzabādī, al-Rāghib) define it consistently as:
    - religion,
    - creed,
    - way,
    - path,

- system of belief,
- the orientation of a prophet and his followers.

This is not a hard word.
It is one of the most transparent terms in the Qur'an.

He selectively ignores all of this and instead relies on a distant verbal resemblance in an unrelated context (a financial contract) to build an entirely new meaning of Millah, which conveniently becomes:

> Ibrahim's "composition style."

There is no linguistic evidence for this.
It is an imposed meaning.

---

7. His conclusions about "following Millat Ibrahim" depend entirely on his invented definition

Once he establishes (wrongly) that Millah means "composition," he then reads that meaning back into:

- 16:123
- 3:95
- 4:125
- 12:38

…and claims all of these are commanding us — and even commanding the Prophet ﷺ — to adopt Ibrahim's compositional method.

But this process depends entirely on circular reasoning:

1. Redefine Millah in an unprecedented way.
2. Insert that definition into the verses.
3. Claim the verses now support your new definition.

This is not methodology.
It is retrofitting.

---

8. His warnings about the "divine lexicon" create a false sense of danger

He repeatedly claims:

- that mis-defining the Qur'anic lexicon leads a person to error,
- that it is a form of corruption,
- that it is associated with shirk,
- and that previous scholars fell into this.

But his own definitions are:

- new,

- unanchored,
- linguistically unsupported,
- and invented for the sake of his system.

So the effect is:

- create fear around using classical meanings,
- then present his own meanings as the safe alternative.

This places ordinary people in a position where they feel they must abandon 1,400 years of scholarship in order to “avoid corrupting the lexicon.”

It is psychologically powerful, but entirely manufactured.

---

9. His redefinition of Jāhil/Jāhilūn has no basis in the Qur’anic semantic field

He claims:

> “Jahl” in the Qur’an means misusing the divine lexicon.

But the Qur’an uses:

- *jahlīyah*,
- *jahl*,

- *jāhil*,
- *jāhilūn*

…in contexts relating to:

- arrogance,
- impulsiveness,
- defiance,
- moral blindness,
- reckless behavior,
- lack of discipline,
- stubborn refusal of guidance.

He collapses all of this into:

> “Using the wrong meanings.”

This is not the Qur’anic usage.
It is not supported by any classical scholar.
It is another example of redefining familiar terms into components of his private framework.

---

10. His explanation of “Ḥanīf” extends the same pattern

Classically:

- *ḥanīf* = someone who rejects idolatry and inclines toward pure monotheism.
- It is a spiritual and theological term.

He retains part of this meaning but expands it to include:

- rejecting “the masses,”
- rejecting inherited knowledge,
- and “turning away from superficial readings.”

This redefinition sets up a contrast between:

- the “ḥunafā’ who follow the divine lexicon”
- and those who do not adopt his methodology, who become “jāhilūn.”

Again, the redefinitions serve a rhetorical purpose, not a linguistic one.

---

11. His treatment of “your tongue” in the Qur’an is a forced reinterpretation

Verses like:

- 19:97

- 44:58

have always been understood as describing the Qur’an being revealed in the Prophet’s clear, accessible Arabic.

He reverses this and claims:

> Allah was telling Muhammad ﷺ to adopt this new locution so it becomes “your lissān.”

There is no textual indication of this,
no classical tafsīr supports it,
and no linguistic necessity requires it.

It exists solely to preserve his earlier claims about lissān, locution, and semantics.

---

12. His explanations of “Khaleel” and “Imām” follow the same pattern

He needs Ibrahim to be:

- the conduit of the lexicon,
- the center of the methodology,
- the root of the interpretive system.

So:

- *Khaleel* cannot mean “friend”

- *Imām* cannot mean “leader” or “exemplar”

- Both must be redefined to support the structure he has already built.

But the Qur’anic usage of both terms is clear, consistent, and supported unanimously by the tradition.
His reinterpretation is not linguistic analysis — it is systematic reengineering for the sake of the theory.

---

13. His handling of *lisān ṣidqin ʿaliyyan* is another category mistake

When he reaches Ibrāhīm’s duʿā’ — *“wa-jʿal lī lisāna ṣidqin fī al-ākhirīn”* — he claims this proves that *lisān* cannot mean “language,” and therefore must support his invented “locution” category.

But this is another basic error in reading Arabic rhetoric.

What *lisān* means in this verse is entirely standard and well-known

This expression is a straightforward example of **majāz mursal** (metonymy):

- **the tongue is the instrument of mention**,

- so “lisān” is used to mean **dhikr** — remembrance, reputation, mention, legacy.

This is classical Arabic 101.

Every mufassir — from the earliest to the latest — explains it this way:

- *“Grant me a truthful, honorable mention in later generations.”*

And the Qur’an itself confirms the acceptance of this duʿā’:

- Every prophet mentioned alongside Ibrāhīm is mentioned with honor.
- His name is venerated across millennia exactly as he asked.

The إضافة (annexation) to “ṣidq” only strengthens the meaning

Calling it *“lisān ṣidq”* is:

- **an elevation of the quality of that remembrance**,
- as if *truthfulness itself owns that reputation.*

There is nothing mysterious or foreign about the construction.

His reinterpretation only exists because his theory needs it

He cannot allow *lisān* here to mean “mention,”
because:

- it destroys his claim that every Qur’anic use of *lisān* encodes a hidden “locution,”
- and it shows *lisān* is a normal Arabic word with normal semantic range.

So he discards the obvious rhetorical meaning and redefines the term yet again.

In reality, this verse does not support him — it refutes him

- It shows *lisān* is not a technical term.
- It shows *lisān* can mean “mention” (through majāz), just as everyone has always understood.
- It shows his “locution” framework cannot account for Qur’anic Arabic.
- It shows he is willing to override clear rhetorical usage whenever it threatens the theory.

This is the same pattern repeated throughout his methodology:
change the meaning first, then build the argument on the altered word.

Conclusion of Part 2 Rebuttal

This middle section of his presentation builds on the false foundations established in Part 1.
The pattern is consistent:

1. Redefine familiar Qur’anic terms in unprecedented ways.
2. Present those definitions as “evidence-based.”
3. Use them to criticize the tradition.
4. Build an alternative interpretive system on top of them.
5. Warn people that using classical meanings is dangerous.
6. Position his methodology as the only path to “the divine lexicon.”

There is no linguistic, historical, or methodological basis for any of these steps.

They are not discoveries.
They are not revelations.
They are not new insights.

They are a closed interpretive system constructed from the ground up, using redefined vocabulary to make the Qur’an dependent on that system.

The methodology collapses at every level:

- linguistically,
- textually,
- logically,
- historically,
- and methodologically.

Structured Summary – Part 3 of 3 (Final ~Third of the Presentation)

---

1. Who Was Shuʿayb? — Reframing the Entire Story

He introduces this section by claiming that classical scholars misunderstood the story of Shuʿayb entirely.

Claims:

1. Shuʿayb was **not** from Madyan in the way the tradition describes.
2. Shuʿayb was **not** an obscure prophet with a small mission.
3. Shuʿayb was **a Rasūl**, not merely a Nabī.

He emphasizes:

- The Qur'an never gives geographic details for Shuʿayb.
- The story's "markings" mirror the story of Muhammad ﷺ.
- Therefore, the Shuʿayb narrative is about a much larger conflict than classical tafsir indicates.

He says classical tafsir:

- "made up details" from Biblical sources,

- “invented stories” to fill gaps,
- and “misled Muslims” into thinking Shuʿayb was minor.

He presents the Shuʿayb narrative as a **parallel** to the Prophet Muhammad’s own mission.

---

2. Evidence That Shuʿayb Was a Rasūl and Not Just a Nabī

He cites:

7:85–93

“Shuʿayb said to them…”
“Indeed I am a trustworthy messenger…”
He stresses the word **rasūl**.

26:176–189

He notes that the people of al-Aykah reject Shuʿayb despite his status.

He concludes:

- Shuʿayb had a scripture (as all rasūl do).
- Classical scholars “hid” or “ignored” this by labeling him as a minor prophet.

He says:

- The “main disagreement” between Shuʿayb and his people mirrors the disagreement between Muhammad ﷺ and Quraysh.

- Shuʿayb’s people rejected his compositional method and reinterpreted vocabulary — exactly what he claims happened to Muhammad ﷺ.

---

3. The Primary Disagreement Between Shuʿayb and His People

He argues the disagreement was **not** about weights and measures (the traditional reading).

Instead:

His claims:

- The real issue was **lexical corruption** of key divine terms.

- When Shuʿayb used certain words, his people used them incorrectly or changed their meanings.

- This mirrors what he claims happened in Mecca with Quraysh.

He highlights:

11:87

“They said: Does your **salāh** command you that we should leave what our fathers worship…?”

He claims:

- This does not refer to prayer.
- It refers to Shuʿayb's **interpretive method** or composition method.
- His people objected not to ritual but to the linguistic consequences of his methodology.

He frames this as:

- an early example of the same conflict Muhammad ﷺ faced with Quraysh over "Millat Ibrāhīm."

---

4. Parallels Between Shuʿayb and Muhammad ﷺ

He builds a structured comparison:

Both:

- brought a message that corrected the lexicon,
- faced communities attached to inherited interpretations,
- were accused of causing division,
- were confronted by elites who benefited from the old system,
- were rejected for "changing meanings,"
- and had deep conflicts over vocabulary and labeling.

He says:

- The Qur’an uses “markers” (special expressions that appear in both stories) to signal that Shuʿayb is “an earlier mirror” of Muhammad.

He claims this is irrefutable and part of the Qur’an’s own narrative structure.

---

5. Why the Descriptor “Shuʿayb?”

He argues that the name “Shuʿayb” is not the prophet’s literal name.

Instead, he says:

- It is a **label** chosen by Allah.
- The label encodes:
    - the role of someone who “reassembles,”
    - someone who “guides with clarity,”
    - someone who “restores markers.”
- He claims the root contains meanings related to:
    - branching,
    - separating,
    - distinguishing,
    - or sorting.

He claims:

- This labeled role is reflected in his mission.
- The Prophet Muhammad ﷺ shares the same functional descriptors through overlapping markers.

Thus, the labeling is part of the Abrahamic locution and the “divine lexicon.”

---

6. Did the Prophet ﷺ Predict and Warn About This?

He references:

6:112

> “We made for every prophet enemies: devils from mankind and jinn, inspiring each other with adorned speech…”

He argues:

- This is a prediction that future communities would corrupt meanings.
- He presents this as evidence that the Prophet ﷺ warned about what he calls “the hijacking of the divine lexicon.”

He also cites:

- **25:30** “And the Messenger said: O my Lord, my people have abandoned this Qur’an.”

    - He claims this refers to abandoning the divine lexicon and compositional method.

- **30:58** about debates and arguments.

- **41:25** about “decorated speech.”

He frames this as:

- the Prophet ﷺ foreseeing that future Muslims would rely on inherited stories, opinions, and corrupted vocabulary instead of the Qur’an’s direct methodology.

He presents his own methodology as the fulfillment of this Qur’anic warning.

---

7. Why Did They (Quraysh) Not Understand the Qur’an?

He returns to the earlier claim and expands it.

Reasons he gives:

1. **They did not share the Abrahamic locution.**

    - He reiterates that the Qur’an was not revealed in “Qurayshi Arabic.”

    - Instead, the Qur’an used the locution inherited from Ibrahim.

2. **They read the Qur’an with their own superficial lexicon.**

- He claims Quraysh overlapped meanings, conflated terms, and relied on oral traditions.

- Therefore they misunderstood key words.

3. **They rejected markers.**

    - He emphasizes again the concept of “markers” which tie stories together.

    - He says Quraysh did not accept these markers or their interpretive function.

4. **They were attached to Biblical and Judaic interpretive frameworks.**

    - He claims Quraysh followed a corrupted interpretive tradition passed down via Jews and Christians.

    - This prevented them from understanding “compositional style.”

5. **They had inherited political and theological interests.**

    - He says the elites had reasons to suppress the Qur’anic methodology.

    - Their misunderstanding was part resistance, part inability.

6. **They did not have the “organic Qur’anic methodology.”**

    - This becomes a repeated refrain.

    - He presents the Qur’an’s methodology as something the Arabs simply did not possess.

He concludes:

> “The Arabs did not understand the Qur’an then. And many do not understand it now.”

And he frames this as the core reason his project exists.

---

8. Final Recommendations and Closing Remarks

He ends with practical points for his followers.

He advises:

- Do not learn for curiosity — learn to apply the method.
- Empty your cup (i.e., remove inherited understandings).
- Follow only Qur’anic definitions, not tradition or tafsir.
- Use the “markers” as the primary tool to decipher narratives.
- Derive meanings of terms only from their usage in the stories.
- Avoid reliance on scholars who “corrupted the lexicon.”

He concludes:

- The Qur’an contains a self-sufficient methodology.
- This methodology was lost for 14 centuries.

- Allah is now “reopening” this methodology.
- Those who accept it will reconnect directly with Allah.
- Those who reject it are repeating the mistake of Quraysh.

He closes by reaffirming:

- Abrahamic Locution
- Divine Lexicon
- Nested Interpretation
- Organic Qur’anic Methodology
  …as the tools the viewer must use going forward.

And the segment ends with a final encouragement to continue studying through his playlist.

Rebuttal – Part 3 (Final Third of the Presentation)

---

1. His treatment of the story of Shuʿayb has no textual or methodological basis

Classical tafsīr works — from al-Ṭabarī to Ibn Kathīr to al-Qurṭubī, Fakhr al-Rāzī, al-Ālūsī and others — discuss Shuʿayb's location, lineage, and mission based on:

- Qur'anic context
- cross-referencing verses
- established linguistic patterns
- historical accounts
- and the Prophet's explanations

None of these sources treat Shuʿayb as an obscure or irrelevant figure. He is one of the prophets with an extended narrative across multiple sūrahs.

The claim that:

- the Qur'an "gives no geographic details",
- that "the scholars made things up",

- or that the entire tradition “misled Muslims” by describing Shuʿayb as a prophet sent to Madyan,

…is simply incorrect.

He removes geographical, genealogical, and contextual information not because the Qur’an lacks it, but because removing it allows him to reshape the entire story into a symbolic reflection of Muhammad’s ﷺ life.

This is not exegesis.
It is reengineering a narrative so that it fits a predetermined system.

---

2. His insistence that Shuʿayb was a Rasūl with a scripture is based on selective reading

The Qur’an does call Shuʿayb a **rasūl**, and classical scholars acknowledged this.
This is not a discovery.

But the claim that because he was a rasūl, he must have had his own scripture — and that classical scholars “hid” this fact — is unfounded.

The Qur’an does not mention a scripture for Shuʿayb.
The absence of a mention does not mean the tradition erased it.
It simply means the Qur’an did not specify it.

Using this absence to accuse the entire tradition of “invention” and “corruption” is a common pattern throughout his methodology:

- find a silence,

- turn the silence into a gap,
- fill the gap with a narrative that reinforces his theory.

This is not how Qur'anic interpretation works.

---

3. His reinterpretation of 11:87 ("does your salāh command you…") is linguistically untenable

For over a millennium, scholars — linguistic, grammatical, exegetical — have understood *ṣalāh* to mean:

- prayer,
- devotion,
- ritual connection to Allah,
- or acts of worship.

His attempt to reinterpret *ṣalāh* as a **method of interpretation** or **composition method** contradicts:

- the root meaning,
- Qur'anic usage across numerous verses,
- the semantic field of ṣ-l-w,

- the parallel structures in other narratives,
- and the theological function of ṣalāh throughout the Qur’an.

There is no linguistic evidence for this new meaning.

It is imposed for one reason:
so that the conflict in Shuʿayb’s story becomes a conflict over **methodology**, mirroring the conflict he claims Muhammad ﷺ had with Quraysh.

Once again, the narrative is being reshaped to serve the system.

---

4. The “markers” argument is not a recognized interpretive tool

He claims that the Qur’an uses certain “markers” to link stories together, and that these markers prove Shuʿayb is a mirror of Muhammad ﷺ.

But:

- These “markers” are not part of any known science of tafsīr.
- They are not used by any classical scholar.
- They do not appear in any discipline of balāghah, uṣūl al-tafsīr, maʿānī, bayān, badīʿ, or linguistic analysis.
- They do not form a coherent or consistent methodology.

They are simply words he selects and treats as unique indicators.

This is not discovery.
It is pattern projection.

The Qur’an does use thematic cross-referencing, but it does so through:

- narrative parallels,
- moral themes,
- typology,
- and rhetorical devices.

Turning those themes into a rigid, cryptic system of “markers” that reveal hidden identities is not grounded in the tradition or in the text.

---

5. His claim that Shuʿayb’s name is a symbolic label is unsubstantiated

He argues that “Shuʿayb” is not a literal name but a divine label encoding roles or functions.

But in the Qur’an:

- Prophets are consistently named as historical figures.
- The Qur’an distinguishes between real names and symbolic labels.
- When the Qur’an uses symbolic descriptors (e.g., al-Ṣiddīq, al-Masīḥ), it makes them clear.

There is no evidence that “Shuʿayb” is such a descriptor.
The claim is purely speculative and serves to merge Shuʿayb’s narrative with Muhammad’s ﷺ narrative.

It is another example of molding the Qur’an around a prior framework.

---

6. His use of verses about “enemies of every prophet” as predictions of future lexical corruption is a major interpretive leap

Verses like 6:112 describe a universal historical pattern:

- prophets face opposition,
- opponents use rhetorical tactics,
- false arguments are spread.

Classical tafsīr interprets this clearly and consistently.

Reinterpreting these verses as:

> “The Prophet ﷺ predicted that future Muslims would corrupt the divine lexicon”

is not grounded in the text.
It uses broad verses and applies them to a specific phenomenon he has created.

This does not illuminate the Qur’an.
It reframes the Qur’an to validate his system.

7. His repeated claim that the Arabs did not understand the Qur’an contradicts both text and history

The Qur’an repeatedly appeals to the Arabs’ understanding:

- “a clear Arabic Qur’an”
- “so you may understand”
- “We made it easy in your tongue”
- “its verses are explained in detail”
- “in clear language”

The Sahābah did not treat the Qur’an as incomprehensible.
The early Arabs did not treat the Qur’an as foreign.
The Qur’an itself does not describe its language as inaccessible to its first audience.

The only reason he insists on this point is because his methodology collapses if the Arabs understood the Qur’an.

So the conclusion is declared first, and the verses are interpreted afterward to fit it.

8. His “Quraysh inherited a corrupted Judaic-Christian interpretive system” claim is really an attack on the early Muslims

At first glance, it sounds like he is only talking about the pagan Quraysh of Makkah.
He describes them as:

- shaped by “Biblical thinking,”
- following Judaic–Christian interpretive habits,
- trapped inside a corrupted “compositional framework,”
- and therefore fundamentally unable to understand the Qur’an.

If you only hear that once, you assume he is just criticising the mushriks, but getting this wrong as he normally does.

Of course, the Quraysh did not study corrupted Judaic-Cristian works.

But once you listen across his videos, it becomes clear he is doing something else.

The **exact same charges** are later applied to:

- the first three generations,
- the Sahābah as a whole,
- the mufassirīn,
- the ḥadīth scholars,

- and the entire classical tradition.

He says the salaf:

- borrowed concepts from Jews and Christians,
- allowed Biblical frameworks to shape their understanding,
- misread key Qur'anic terms because of that influence,
- and then passed those mistakes into tafsīr and fiqh.

In other words, when he says "Quraysh did not understand the Qur'an," he is **not** isolating a small group of idolaters in Makkah. He is describing **everyone who first received the Qur'an and everyone who transmitted it after them.**

His narrative only works if:

- no companion truly understood the Qur'an,
- no tābiʿī truly understood the Qur'an,
- and no classical mufassir truly understood the Qur'an.

If any one of them did, his entire methodology collapses.

Historically, there is no evidence that pagan Quraysh were operating within some inherited Judaic-Christian "hermeneutic system."

The Qur'ān's own critique of them is very clear and very simple:

- idolatry,

- moral corruption,
- tribal pride,
- blind attachment to forefathers,
- denial of resurrection,
- economic injustice.

Not “sophisticated Biblical compositional habits.”

So this move serves one purpose only:
to portray the first audience of the Qur’ān — and by extension the Sahābah and early Muslims — as people whose **entire interpretive apparatus was rotten from the start**, so that his private methodology can be marketed as the first genuine alternative in fourteen centuries.

Once you see that, it’s obvious that this isn’t a historical claim.
It’s a framing device:
Quraysh = the early ummah = 1,400 years of scholars = all wrong —
and he is the corrective.

---

9. His final claims rest entirely on the presumption that a “lost methodology” is being restored now

He ends by saying:

- The Qur’an contains a self-contained methodology.
- This methodology was lost for 14 centuries.
- Allah is now unveiling it.
- Those who accept it follow the “divine lexicon.”
- Those who do not are repeating the mistake of Quraysh.

These are not scholarly conclusions.
They are assertions.

No evidence is provided that:

- the methodology ever existed in the form he describes,
- that it was lost,
- that classical scholars misled the ummah,
- that Allah is unveiling it now,
- or that this unveiling corresponds to his videos.

This structure is how closed systems justify themselves:

1. Declare the past invalid.
2. Announce a rediscovered method.
3. Present yourself as the conduit.

4. Frame disagreement as a spiritual failure.

None of this belongs to Qur'anic exegesis.

Overall Conclusion

Part 3 brings together all the earlier errors into a single narrative:

- Shuʿayb = literary mirror of Muhammad ﷺ
- conflict = lexicon corruption
- Millat Ibrāhīm = linguistic method
- Quraysh = incapable of understanding the Qur'an
- tradition = corrupted
- divine lexicon = hidden for centuries
- methodology = rediscovered now
- markers = secret interpretive keys
- meanings = derived only from stories
- language = inaccessible without this method

Every major conclusion is built on:

- false premises,

- unsupported redefinitions,
- selective readings,
- elimination of historical context,
- and a closed-loop methodology that validates itself.

There is no linguistic, historical, or scholarly foundation for the system he constructs.

It is not tafsīr.
It is not linguistics.
It is not uṣūl.
It is not Arabic analysis.

It is an invented interpretive framework that reframes the Qur’an to fit itself.

Additional Reflections

Everything above has dealt directly with the structure of his methodology — the claims, the redefinitions, and the rhetorical scaffolding used to hold it together. Before concluding, there are a few broader points worth adding. These are not separate critiques, but natural extensions of what the document has already shown. They clarify *why* his system seems persuasive to some people, why it collapses the moment you examine it properly, and why the common understanding of the Qur’an that the ummah has always shared is not the result of confusion, but the result of clarity.

SECTION A — The Unavoidable Implication of His System

The Qur’an Was Always Clear

There is an unavoidable implication buried underneath everything he teaches, and once you see it, the entire structure of his methodology collapses instantly.

He keeps repeating:

- that his interpretations come “directly from the Qur’an,”
- that the Qur’an contains “its own built-in methodology,”
- that this method is “obvious once you learn to read properly,”
- and that no one needs external tools, classical scholarship, or linguistic tradition to access these meanings.

But if these claims are true, then there is a simple and devastating consequence:

If the Qur’an itself is teaching these meanings,

and if the methodology is built into the Qur’an,
and if it is accessible to anyone who reads properly,
then millions of sincere Muslims over fourteen centuries should have seen it.

You cannot claim:

- the Qur’an is teaching X,
- the methodology is simple,
- the meanings are directly in the text,
- *and* no one understood any of it for 1,400 years.

The moment he says:

> “This is the organic methodology of the Qur’an,”

he is saying — whether he admits it or not — that:

there has not been a single sincere, intelligent Muslim with two functioning brain cells in 14 centuries who actually understood the Qur’an.

Because if even **one** existed, his system would not be “new.”

To maintain his theory, he must assume:

- every companion misunderstood the Qur’an,
- every tābiʿī misunderstood the Qur’an,
- every mufassir misunderstood the Qur’an,
- every Arabic linguist misunderstood the Qur’an,
- every scholar in every century misunderstood the Qur’an,
- and all of them blindly copied each other’s confusion.

This is not something you can say out loud, because the absurdity is too obvious.

So he says it sideways — by blaming “Quraysh,”
and then extending the same accusation onto the entire ummah.

But the reality is simple:

The Qur’an was always clear.

And because it was clear, people naturally understood it.

This is why:

- people in Makkah understood the message immediately,
- people in Madinah understood it immediately,
- new Muslims understood it immediately,
- entire civilizations understood it immediately,
- and for 14 centuries the basic understanding of the Qur’an has remained the same across continents and cultures.

Not because of a conspiracy.
Not because of inherited confusion.
Not because people were stupid.
But because the Qur’an says:

بِلِسَانٍ عَرَبِيٍّ مُّبِينٍ

“In a clear, articulate Arabic.”

If the meanings he is claiming were truly in the Qur’an, then millions of sincere Muslims would have seen them long before him.

The fact that no one in the entire history of the ummah ever reached anything resembling his conclusions is not a sign that the entire tradition failed.

It is a sign that **his readings are not in the Qur’an.**

This is where his entire system breaks.

SECTION B. What Tafsīr Actually Does (And Why His ‘Opinions’ Narrative Is False)

A large part of his appeal comes from one repeated claim:

> “The scholars only gave *opinions*.
> They didn’t have methodology.
> They didn’t understand the Qur’an’s internal system.”

This sounds persuasive to people who have never studied tafsīr, because they assume tafsīr means “scholars sharing what they think.”

It is completely false.

Classical tafsīr is not a collection of opinions.
It is a **discipline** — one of the most structured, rigorous, and method-driven sciences in the Islamic tradition.

For over a thousand years, tafsīr has operated on explicit, recognizable principles that every trained scholar knows and applies. Scholars differ in nuance, but the **methodology is shared**.

Here is what real tafsīr actually does:

---

1. Tafsīr identifies the semantic range of each word.

It examines:

- the root letters,
- morphological patterns,
- classical precedents of usage,
- contextual constraints,
- and syntactic implications.

This anchors every meaning inside the actual language the Qur’an was revealed in.

---

2. Tafsīr distinguishes between literal and figurative usage.

Arabic contains:

- **majāz** (metaphor),
- **istiʿārah** (extended metaphor),
- **kināyah** (allusion),
- **ḥaqīqah** (literal meaning).

Tafsīr identifies which category a phrase falls into, so the reader understands exactly what the verse intends.

This isn't "opinion."
It's classical Arabic rhetoric.

---

3. Tafsīr unpacks rhetorical structure (balāghah).

The Qur'an uses:

- ellipsis,
- emphasis,
- contrast,
- sequencing,
- compacted arguments,
- layered imagery.

Tafsīr exposes these layers and shows why the verse is phrased exactly as it is.

This is why genuine tafsīr increases awe, clarity, and reverence — it reveals the perfection of Qur'anic expression.

---

4. Tafsīr extracts the argument and the suppressed premises.

The Qur’an often compresses a full argument into a brief phrase.

A mufassir will:

- identify the implied premises,
- expand the reasoning,
- and show how the logical flow unfolds.

This is disciplined analysis rooted in the text itself, not “interpretive guessing.”

---

5. Tafsīr reconciles verses on the same subject.

A verse is never interpreted in isolation.
A mufassir:

- gathers all relevant passages,
- compares wording,
- harmonizes themes,
- and produces a coherent picture.

This cross-referencing is one of the most sophisticated parts of the discipline.

---

6. Tafsīr preserves the linguistic usage of the early Arabs.

To understand Qur'anic Arabic properly, scholars relied on:

- pre-Islamic poetry,
- early oral usage,
- transmitted dialectal patterns,
- and the speech of the first generations.

Not because the Qur'an is unclear — but because its language is deep, precise, and anchored in a living linguistic tradition.

---

7. Tafsīr clarifies background context when relevant.

Most verses require no historical background at all.
But when a verse **does** refer to a known event, tafsīr preserves that context so the verse's precision and implications are understood fully.

This context never replaces meaning — it sharpens it.

---

8. Tafsīr evaluates multiple legitimate meanings and selects the strongest one.

Arabic often allows several grammatically possible readings.

A mufassir:

- lists the viable options,
- evaluates each according to Qur’anic usage,
- checks rhetorical fit and semantic precision,
- and then identifies the preferred reading.

This is method, not opinion.

The bottom line:

Tafsīr is not a replacement for the Qur’an’s clarity.
It is a **preservation** of its depth.

It protects:

- linguistic accuracy,
- thematic coherence,
- rhetorical power,
- and the integrity of meaning.

Classical tafsīr is the reason the Qur’an has been understood consistently across centuries and civilizations.

To dismiss tafsīr is not to remove “opinions.”
It is to remove **methodology, discipline, language, evidence, and structure** — the very tools that guard the Qur’an’s meanings.

A Final Note on Why Tafsīr Matters Even for Arabic Speakers

Even someone who knows Arabic well — someone who can read fluently and understands grammar, morphology, and vocabulary — will still miss things in the Qur'an that only become visible through tafsīr.

Not because the Qur'an is unclear, but because:

- its wording is purposeful,
- its sequencing is deliberate,
- its rhetorical structures carry layered meaning,
- its arguments are compact,
- its premises can be suppressed,
- and its precision flows from a level of balāghah that requires trained attention.

Tafsīr does not *add* meaning.
It **reveals** what is already there.

A scholar of tafsīr draws your attention to elements you would not have noticed on your own — even though they are right in front of you. And once those elements are made visible, your appreciation of the verse deepens in a way that is impossible without that guidance.

This is one of the greatest values of tafsīr:
it teaches you how to see what the Qur'an is actually doing.

And that deeper appreciation is what protects the integrity of Qur’anic meaning — something no invented methodology can ever replace.

SECTION C — The False Dichotomy Between “Opinion” and “Method”

One of the easiest ways to mislead people who haven’t studied the tradition is to repeat the accusation:

> “The scholars gave opinions. They didn’t have a methodology.”

This creates a false dichotomy between:

- his alleged “method,” and
- what he portrays as “random opinions” from the entire ummah.

In reality, the exact opposite is true.

Classical tafsīr is not a collection of guesses.
It is one of the most structured, rigorously governed disciplines the world has ever seen.

Its foundations are:

- linguistic evidence,
- rhetorical analysis,
- transmitted usage,
- semantic reasoning,
- coherence across the Qur’anic corpus,
- and the shared uṣūl that all scholars recognise and apply.

This is method — real method — the kind that remains stable across centuries, schools, geographies, and cultures.

By contrast, what he presents **is** pure opinion:

- a series of private assumptions,
- supported by invented categories,
- insulated from correction,
- and anchored in no linguistic or scholarly foundation.

When he accuses the scholars of "opinions," he is projecting what *he* is doing.

The difference is not between "their opinions" and "his method."
The difference is between **a 1,400-year intellectual discipline** and **one man improvising in front of a camera**.

This distinction matters because once you understand it, his entire narrative about "rediscovering a lost method" falls apart completely.

He is not reviving anything.
He is replacing something — scholarship — with nothing.

Prophetic Warnings About Interpreting the Qur'an Without Knowledge

This is why the Prophet ﷺ warned:

1. "Whoever speaks about the Qur'an without knowledge, let him take his seat in the Fire."
مَنْ قَالَ فِي الْقُرْآنِ بِغَيْرِ عِلْمٍ فَلْيَتَبَوَّأْ مَقْعَدَهُ مِنَ النَّارِ
— Sunan al-Tirmidhī (no. 2950), graded ḥasan.

And in another wording:

2. “Whoever interprets the Qur’an by mere opinion has erred — even if he is correct.”
قَالَ ﷺ:مَنْ فَسَّرَ الْقُرْآنَ بِرَأْيِهِ فَأَصَابَ فَقَدْ أَخْطَأَ
— Reported by al-Tirmidhī (no. 2952), al-Dārimī, and others.

The scholars explained:

- “bi ghayri ʿilm” = without grounding in Arabic, the uṣūl of tafsīr, transmitted knowledge, and the discipline that governs meaning.

- “bi-ra’y” = interpreting based on personal theories, inner hunches, or frameworks imposed onto the text.

Even **being accidentally right** does not excuse the crime, because the error is methodological, not factual.

SECTION D — The Extraordinary Spiritual Emptiness of His System

After watching more than eight hours of his material, and after working through transcripts line by line — for me personally — one thing became impossible to ignore:

There is nothing spiritually nourishing in it at all.

Not a single segment — not a paragraph, not a moment, not a sentence — contained anything that would:

- deepen īmān,
- strengthen conviction,
- clarify a truth of Islam,
- inspire taqwā,
- motivate worship,
- elevate the heart,
- soften the soul,
- or teach any moral or spiritual lesson rooted in revelation.

Nothing.

And that is not an exaggeration.

Across all the material I reviewed, every minute was spent:

- attacking Muslims
- attacking the Sunnah
- attacking the Ṣaḥābah
- attacking the Mufassirīn
- attacking consensus
- attacking the Arabic language
- redefining words
- inventing terminology
- promoting himself as the sole decoder
- pushing conspiracies
- dismantling certainty
- undermining revelation's clarity
- destabilizing the religion

There is **no worship**,
no **hope**,
no **fear of Allah**,
no **love of Allah**,
no **love of His Messenger** ﷺ,
no **reliance**,
no **remembrance**,
no **submission**.

What remains is ego, demolition, and an obsessive need to replace Islam with his own structure.

And after all those hours of listening and reading, not once did I encounter even a single:

- duʿā’
- reminder of the Hereafter
- ayah explained in a way that softens the heart
- ethical teaching
- moral call
- moment of humility
- moment of spiritual clarity
- anything that produces khushūʿ
- anything that produces sakīnah

Spiritual truth does not sound like this.
Islamic guidance does not feel like this.
The Qur’an does not operate like this.

Everything I examined was pure intellectual demolition with zero spiritual construction.

And that alone tells you what kind of source we are dealing with.

If you want a simple, timeless test:

If someone speaks for hours and hours about the Qur’an…

…and your heart never once feels:

- closer to Allah,
- more in awe,
- more obedient,
- more humbled,
- more grateful,
- more fearful,
- or more hopeful,

then that speech is not coming from a heart connected to Allah.

And Allah knows best.

Final Reflection

If you take one thing from this entire document, let it be this:

The Qur’an was always clear.

And the ummah understood it because Allah intended it to be understood.*

No hidden lexicons.
No imported “locutions.”
No lost methodologies.
No secret keys revealed in the 21st century.

Just revelation — preserved, protected, and explained by those who carried it with sincerity.

One thing that has become especially clear during this project is how quickly a flawed interpretive method creates its own psychological world.

You can see it directly in the comments under the video where this document was released — the defensive slogans, the inability to address

specifics, the appeals to “special insight,” and the belief that centuries of scholarship were misguided until one YouTube channel appeared.

These are not small red flags. They are the classic telltales of a high-control interpretive environment.

If reading this document helped you understand the issue more deeply, I would genuinely appreciate it if you visited the **YouTube video where it was released** and left a brief comment about your experience. Even a short note can help others recognise what’s happening and approach the Qur’an with clarity rather than confusion.

Your feedback also helps me understand what was most valuable to you and what kind of topics you’d like explored next.

May Allah grant clarity, preserve sincerity, and keep our hearts attached to His Book.

Warmest salams,
Yusuf Mullan