Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

RJAH

https://doi.org/10.58256/vvp42e80

Open Access

Check for updates

RESEARCH ARTICLE **Section:** *Literature, Linguistics & Criticism*

What counts as a meaning? Amr in the Qur'an and the interpretation of al-Wujūh wa-l-Naẓāʾir

Mohammed Al-Ruwaili1*

[1]Department of Humanities,College of Science and Theoretical Studies, Prince Musaid bin Abdulrahman University, Saudi Arabia

*Correspondence: m.alrwaili@seu.edu.sa

ABSTRACT

Exegetical classifications of Qur'anic vocabulary often place lexical senses alongside particular events, moral evaluations, and theological explanations. This article examines the consequences of that practice through the root ʾ-m-r, with particular attention to Ibn al-Jawzī's treatment of *amr* in *Nuzhat al-aʿyun al-nawāẓir*. A complete occurrence concordance, checked against the Qur'anic Arabic Corpus, records 248 tokens in 226 verses across 61 surahs. Philological comparison relates their grammatical forms and recurrent constructions to explanations in selected lexical, exegetical, and theological works. The analysis distinguishes directive and matter-related uses without forcing every derivative into an exhaustive binary classification. Several reported "faces" identify what a divine determination brings about, rather than an additional lexical sense, while disputed passages reveal the contribution of theological reasoning to semantic decisions. Recurrent wording provides valuable constraints but does not remove the need to identify agency: in two of the twelve occurrences of *bi-amrihi*, the possessive refers to Solomon, although divine action enables his authority. The article argues that *al-wujūh wa-l-naẓāʾir* is best approached as an explanatory practice whose entries operate at different levels. A layered account preserves its contextual knowledge while distinguishing lexical possibility, referential identification, and theological interpretation. This contributes to religious studies by clarifying how statements about scriptural language become arguments about divine action, obligation, and human authority.

KEYWORDS: Qur'anic exegesis, *amr*, *al-wujūh wa-l-naẓāʾir*, Arabic lexicography, divine command, contextual interpretation

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 8, Issue 1, 2027

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted **29 September 2026**

Accepted: **14 October 2026**

Published: **11 November 2026**

HOW TO CITE

Al-Ruwaili, M. (2026). What counts as a meaning? Amr in the Qur'an and the interpretation of al-Wujūh wa-l-Naẓāʾir. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.58256/vvp42e80

Published in Nairobi, Kenya by Royallite Global, an imprint of Royallite Publishers Limited

© 2026 The Author(s). This is an open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction

When Noah tells his son that there is no protection that day from *amr Allāh*, the surrounding account makes the danger unmistakable: a wave separates them, and the son joins those who drown (Q 11:43). It is consequently understandable that an exegete should explain *amr* here through drowning. A difficulty arises, however, when this explanation becomes one item in a list of the word's meanings. Does *amr* mean "drowning", or does the narrative identify drowning as the form taken by the divine determination from which the son cannot escape? The distinction is consequential because the same expression occurs where the event in view is understood as death, resurrection, victory, or another intervention. A list can preserve these explanations accurately while leaving uncertain whether it records different senses, different referents, or different ways of interpreting divine action.

The tradition of *al-wujūh wa-l-naẓā'ir* makes that difficulty especially visible. Its classifications connect an expression with explanations and corresponding passages, providing readers with an organised account of variation within scripture. Ibn al-Jawzī's *Nuzhat al-aʿyun al-nawāẓir* presents eighteen faces of *amr* and then records a nineteenth attributed to others. The list includes requesting an action, an affair or condition, punishment, consultation, death, and specific historical events (Ibn al-Jawzī 1984, 172–76). These entries plainly do different kinds of explanatory work. "Requesting an action" describes a general linguistic function, whereas identifying a conquest specifies an event. Recognising that difference need not diminish the compilation; it makes its interpretive purposes a question for investigation rather than assuming that every face is a dictionary sense.

The religious importance of the distinction extends beyond the organisation of vocabulary. Qur'anic uses of ʾ-m-r concern instructions that people may obey or reject, decisions entrusted to human agents, affairs about which communities deliberate, and determinations attributed to God. An interpretation of one occurrence as an obligation cannot simply be transferred to another in which an event is accomplished. Conversely, rendering every occurrence as an undifferentiated "affair" can obscure the directive force through which responsibility and disobedience are expressed. The theological distinction between what God requires and what God brings about therefore intersects with linguistic interpretation without being identical to a grammatical distinction between verbs and nouns. The noun *amr* itself participates in both kinds of discourse.

Attention to context has a substantial scholarly history and is not the discovery claimed here. Abdel Haleem (2018) explicitly identifies contextual relations as central to Qur'anic word meaning, sentence interpretation, and the organisation of information. El-Awa (2006) places relations within Qur'anic discourse at the centre of textual interpretation. Their approaches support examination beyond an isolated lexical equivalent, but the question pursued here concerns the status of the explanation produced: when context allows an interpreter to identify an event, what warrants treating that identification as an additional sense of the expression? The answer requires attention to the interpretive genre as well as to the passage, since a contextual handbook need not classify in the same way as a historical dictionary.

Existing work on *amr* also precludes a claim that its semantic range remains unexamined. Ishtīwī (2022) studies its Qur'anic meanings alongside its linguistic and legal treatment, explicitly recognising the relevance of surrounding verses. Sinai's dictionary entry offers a particularly close point of comparison, distinguishing command, decision or intervention, and matter-related uses while discussing their contextual range (2023, 78–84). The present article does not replace those analyses with a newly discovered twofold definition. It asks how Ibn al-Jawzī's particular classifications relate to a complete occurrence record and what kind of claim each classification makes. This narrower enquiry allows general semantic description and the history of explanatory practice to illuminate one another.

A root concordance is useful for that purpose because it puts familiar examples beside less convenient ones. An arrival formula may introduce rescue as well as the destruction of an opposing community; a possessive that appears in a cosmic setting may refer grammatically to Solomon rather than directly to God. Such cases are easily lost when only the most recognisable proof texts are collected. Yet a concordance does not adjudicate their meanings by enumeration. It can establish where expressions occur, reveal repetition, and prevent omission; interpretation still depends on syntax, the surrounding account, and the grounds offered by exegetes. The relationship between comprehensive retrieval and selective explanation is therefore part of the method, not a problem that disappears once a total has been obtained.

The study examines the root in the received text within the scope of the reading of Ḥafṣ ʿan ʿĀṣim. The occurrence register contains 248 tokens distributed across 226 verses and 61 surahs. Ibn al-Jawzī supplies the focal classificatory material, while Ibn Fāris and al-Rāghib supply lexical distinctions, and selected passages from al-Baghawī, al-Qurṭubī, al-Saʿdī, and al-Tafsīr al-muyassar provide exegetical comparison. Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Qayyim enter the discussion where creative and religious command require theological distinction. These sources do not constitute a representative history of every Islamic interpretive school; their differences are retained rather than amalgamated into a single classical position.

Four questions guide the enquiry. First, how are occurrences of ʾ-m-r distributed across forms, passages, and recurrent constructions? Second, what kinds of explanation appear in Ibn al-Jawzī's classification, and how do the selected lexical and exegetical works support or complicate them? Third, which explanations identify a lexical sense, a contextually specified use or referent, or a theological interpretation, and where does the evidence resist a firm distinction? Finally, what does that reassessment contribute to understanding divine command, human authority, and the relationship between philology and interpretation? The distributional account addresses the first question; the mapping and close readings address the second and third; the discussion develops their religious implications.

The argument is that *amr* can be described economically without erasing the knowledge carried by its exegetical classifications. Two dominant semantic bases, directive action and matter-related reference, provide an initial organisation, but they are neither two exhaustive theological categories nor a complete account of every derivative. Divine determination introduces questions that cross those bases, while *imran* in Q 18:71 and the disputed *amarn*ā in Q 17:16 preserve important limits. A stronger account consequently keeps several levels visible: the form occurring in the text, its possible meaning in that construction, the referent identified in the passage, and the interpretation through which an exegete explains its significance. The value of regrouping the faces lies in clarifying those relationships, not in reducing their number for its own sake.

2. Lexical explanation and the purposes of exegesis

2.1. The face of a word and the work of an explanation

For this enquiry, *wujūh* denotes different meanings assigned to an expression in different passages, and *naẓā'ir* denotes occurrences brought together under a corresponding meaning. That working definition identifies the genre's comparative organisation, but it should not settle in advance what "meaning" includes. Ibn al-Jawzī's list moves between broad descriptions and particular realisations, sometimes within the same grammatical construction. The range suggests that the compilation is concerned with making the intended passage intelligible, even where doing so requires a historical or theological explanation. Its knowledge can therefore exceed a lexical definition without becoming irrelevant to language.

Rippin's work places lexicographical writing within the broader study of Qur'anic interpretation rather than treating lexical and exegetical texts as interchangeable resources (2001). This orientation matters when assessing a compiler who records different explanations inherited from commentators. A modern semantic analysis may reasonably distinguish a sense from an instance, but a historical evaluation must also ask what the compiler was trying to preserve. It would be circular to define a *wajh* as a modern lexical sense, discover that several entries identify events, and then conclude that the work has failed on its own terms. The present analysis instead compares the explanatory levels represented by the entries.

The distinction is especially important for classifications connected with occasions of revelation. Rippin's enquiry into the function of asbāb al-nuzūl directs attention to the work such reports perform within exegesis (1988). Here, a reported event is treated first as an exegetical identification whose evidential status must remain visible. The statement that *amr* in a passage concerns a particular conquest establishes what a commentator says the expression refers to; it does not independently authenticate the event, date the verse, or prove that the noun has acquired "conquest" as a separate lexical meaning. Historical argument would require additional evidence beyond the classification itself.

A criticism of inconsistent enumeration requires similar care. Different compilers can divide their material differently because they preserve different explanatory resolutions, not necessarily because one has counted incorrectly. Al-Qurṭubī's reported identification of an occurrence with Jesus' creation illustrates the issue: naming Jesus identifies the person whose creation is under discussion, whereas explaining *amr* through

determination describes a relation within the clause (1964, 2:88). Both may help a reader, but they answer different questions. Their difference is more instructive than a competition between lists of fourteen and nineteen items.

2.2. Context, semantic description, and the closest preceding studies

Ishtīwī's study is an important Arabic predecessor because it concerns the expression *amr* rather than only the imperative mood. Its stated scope combines Qur'anic uses with linguistic and legal accounts of command, and its abstract expressly identifies contextual relations between verses as relevant to meaning (2022). The present study therefore cannot claim that contextual interpretation was absent from that work. Its distinct emphasis is the comparison of the nineteen recorded classifications with an occurrence-level inventory, asking whether a given face is a lexical description, an interpretation of a construction, or an identification of a particular referent. A claim of exhaustive novelty across the wider Arabic literature is neither necessary nor supported.

Studies of imperative constructions answer a related but separate question. The grammatical imperative and jussive forms with lām al-*amr* can express commands through roots other than ʾ-m-r, while the present root includes nouns that issue no instruction. The boundary is methodological: a census of the root cannot estimate the frequency of commands throughout the Qur'an, and a study of imperative mood cannot substitute for the inventory of *amr*. The conceptual connection between these projects should not obscure their different units of analysis.

Sinai's entry already makes the range of *amr* explicit and warns against narrowing divine action to punitive intervention; its discussion also recognises the human referent of the possessive in the Solomon passages (2023, 78–84). These are relevant antecedents, not discoveries to be assigned to the present article. The contribution developed here is the detailed reassessment of Ibn al-Jawzī's explanatory categories against the documented occurrence set. A linguistic description of the expression and a study of how exegetes classify it are closely related projects, but their evidence and conclusions need not coincide.

Abdel Haleem's treatment of context and El-Awa's account of textual relations offer a further methodological connection: a phrase receives constraints from the discourse around it, and those constraints may be missed by a gloss considered alone (Abdel Haleem 2018; El-Awa 2006). The present analysis adds no universal rule that neighbouring verses always select a single meaning. Instead, it asks what a particular contextual observation establishes. Identifying the destroyed vegetation in Q 10:24 is relatively direct; deciding whether *amr* in Q 7:54 includes religious prescription as well as governance involves an additional interpretive step.

2.3. Theological interpretation without semantic predetermination

The distinction between creative and religious command is especially useful when a theological argument depends on separating effective divine determination from an instruction that a creature may disobey. The distinction appears in Ibn Taymiyya's al-Tuḥfa al-ʿIrāqiyya and Ibn al-Qayyim's Iʿlām al-muwaqqiʿīn (Ibn Taymiyya 1399 AH, 46–47; Ibn al-Qayyim 1423 AH, 2:285). Their formulations belong to particular arguments about divine action and obligation. They should not become a prior annotation rule under which every verbal form is legislative and every divine possessive is creative. Those equations would confuse grammatical description with theological explanation.

Hoover's study locates Ibn Taymiyya's treatment of creation and command within an account of his theodicy and the relationship between divine action and human responsibility (2007). Cook's history, by contrast, concerns the specifically ethical injunction of commanding right and forbidding wrong across Islamic traditions (2000). Their different objects help delimit the present enquiry. The moral obligation expressed through a recognised formula does not exhaust the uses of the root, while a theological account of why divine determination and prescription differ does not remove the need to identify which relation a verse expresses. The Arabic evidence must still carry the local argument.

Recent discussion of philology and exegetical elaboration makes a similar question available from another direction. Palanci's study of dhālika al-kitāb in Q 2:2 examines the relation between philological analysis and explanatory multiplicity in commentary (2024). Its expression and conclusions are not transferred to *amr*; it serves as a methodological interlocutor for asking what supports an interpretation beyond its availability in the

exegetical record. The resulting framework is deliberately modest: lexical possibility, contextual specification, and theological explanation are distinguishable claims, but an adequate interpretation may need all three. The task is to show their relationship rather than to grant one automatic priority over the others.

3. Corpus, sources, and analytical procedure

3.1. The occurrence record and its scope

The primary linguistic corpus consists of the occurrences assigned to the root ʾ-m-r in the Qur'anic text. A complete token register was prepared during development of the English article from the root page of the Qur'anic Arabic Corpus, whose displayed locations and Arabic contexts were consulted on 16 October 2026 (Qur'anic Arabic Corpus n.d.). Every record has a surah, verse, and token position, an Arabic surface form, a derived-form category, and a short working contextual description. Sorting these records in Qur'anic order produces the concordance supplied as Supplement S1; its accompanying machine-readable file permits the principal totals to be recalculated.

The resulting 248-token inventory reproduces the total reported in the Arabic study. Counting distinct verse coordinates gives 226 verses, and counting distinct surah coordinates gives 61 surahs. These agreements concern the identifiable occurrence set, not an independent validation of every semantic decision. The register is complete as a root-based list, while its English contextual descriptions remain working interpretations. Sustained exegetical analysis is concentrated on the classifications and passages discussed below. No claim is made that every one of the 248 tokens has undergone separate adjudication against the complete tafsīr literature.

Surface-form totals require a different qualification. The Arabic manuscript reports 78 vocalised forms without supplying a full form inventory or a sufficiently explicit normalisation procedure. The plain-Arabic working transcription contains 76 distinct vocalised surface strings, retaining attached prefixes and suffixes but not every Uthmanic sign. That discrepancy is reported rather than silently reconciled: differences in transcription or orthographic treatment may account for it. Neither number is used as evidence for the semantic argument. The reported division into 153 Meccan and 95 Medinan occurrences is likewise retained in the audit as a source-study result, rather than presented as newly reproduced without an occurrence-level classification key.

3.2. Grammatical and interpretive units

A token is one occurrence at an identified word position; a lemma is the lexical item under which inflected forms are grouped; and a root is the broader derivational affiliation. These units must remain separate. The Corpus distinguishes 77 form I verbs, two form VIII verbs, 166 occurrences of the noun *amr*, and three further nominal derivatives. In the broader Arabic division between ism and fiʿl, the adjective *imran* and the participial forms belong with the nominals, producing 169 nominal and 79 verbal occurrences. This regrouping does not claim that the finer categories are interchangeable.

The interpretive unit is the token within the clause and passage necessary to establish its role. Repeated occurrences in one verse are recorded separately but read together where the argument requires it, as in Q 3:154 and Q 27:33. Recurrent constructions are identified through explicit families of wording, not through an assumption that every occurrence of *amr Allāh* has the same function. For example, the arrival family includes both *amr* as the subject of coming and God as the agent who brings an *amr*; its sixteen members therefore form an interpretively justified comparison, not sixteen instances of one identical string.

3.3. Exegetical evidence and the order of interpretation

Ibn al-Jawzī's chapter on *amr* is the focal interpretive text. The nineteenth item is kept distinct from his preceding eighteen because he records it as an addition attributed to others. Ibn Fāris and al-Rāghib provide the lexical background; the selected tafsīr and theological passages preserve the comparisons developed in the Arabic manuscript. Publication details and printed-page locators follow the editions identified there. Additional electronic checking covered al-Rāghib's entry and selected al-Baghawī and al-Saʿdī commentaries, particularly the contested command in Q 17:16 and the Solomon and creation passages. This checking does not amount to a fresh collation of every cited print edition.

Each close reading begins with the Arabic form, identifies its grammatical relations, and then considers the explanation supplied by the exegetical classification. It asks whether the gloss describes a use found beyond

that passage, whether neighbouring wording identifies an event or moral quality, and whether the conclusion depends on a particular account of divine action. Competing readings are retained when supported. The English translations of Qur'anic anchors and brief lexical statements below are analytical translations prepared for this article, not quotations from a published English Qur'an; they assist comparison but do not independently prove the interpretation they express.

The analysis is philological and qualitative, supported by descriptive counts. There was no second independent coding exercise, no participant study, and no measurement of readers' understanding. English-language sources were used at the level actually accessible: detailed claims about *amr* rely on the consulted lexical discussion and Arabic evidence, while works available only through abstracts or descriptive records provide orientation rather than unexamined passage-level authority. Supplement S1 distinguishes the original working record, the checks supporting the present concordance, and matters requiring further verification. This separation allows the argument to be assessed without equating a reproducible total with an incontestable reading.

4. Distribution and recurrent wording

The concordance confirms a broad distribution of ʾ-m-r rather than a concentration in a small set of doctrinal proof texts. Āl ʿImrān and Hūd each contain sixteen tokens, while al-Ṭalāq contains nine in twelve verses. Table 1 reproduces the principal surah counts and expresses density as tokens per verse. Its denominators are verse counts, not word totals, and the ratios do not indicate the proportion of verses containing the root. A verse can contain more than one token; the three occurrences in Q 3:154 demonstrate why that distinction matters.

Table 1. Principal surah counts in the occurrence register.

Surah	Tokens	Verses	Tokens per verse
Āl ʿImrān (3)	16	200	0.080
Hūd (11)	16	123	0.130
Al-Baqara (2)	13	286	0.045
Al-Aʿrāf (7)	12	206	0.058
Al-Kahf (18)	11	110	0.100
Al-Nisāʾ (4)	10	176	0.057
Yūsuf (12)	10	111	0.090
Al-Tawba (9)	9	129	0.070
Al-Ṭalāq (65)	9	12	0.750

Token counts reproduced from S1. Density is an occurrence-to-verse ratio, not a percentage of affected verses.

The grammatical distribution in Table 2 establishes the predominance of nominal forms, but it does not establish the predominance of the meaning "affair". Both instruction and determination can be expressed nominally. Conversely, the occurrence of a verbal form does not make its speaker divine or its command legitimate. The distinction between God's command to justice and Satan's command to wrongdoing depends on the subject and complement, not on replacing one verb with another. The distribution provides the material from which these contrasts can be read; it does not supply their evaluation.

Table 2. Grammatical distribution under the broad noun–verb division.

Form	Tokens	Percentage of 248
Form I: perfect active	17	6.9
Form I: perfect passive	17	6.9
Form I: imperfect active	33	13.3
Form I: imperfect passive	6	2.4
Form I: imperative	4	1.6
Form VIII: one imperfect, one imperative	2	0.8
All verbal forms	79	31.9
Singular noun *amr*	153	61.7
Plural noun *umūr*	13	5.2

Form	Tokens	Percentage of 248
Other nominal derivatives: ammāra, imr, āmirūn	3	1.2
All nominal forms	169	68.1

Nominal includes the adjectival and participial categories. Percentages are rounded; subtotal rows are not additional tokens.

Recurrent constructions offer more focused evidence. Table 3 records the families highlighted in the Arabic study and the distinctions required to use them. Some families overlap: *bi-amrihi* in Q 2:109 and Q 9:24 also belongs to the arrival comparison. Their counts must therefore not be added as though they constituted mutually exclusive subdivisions of the corpus. The thirteen plurals *um*ūr form a separate morphological observation, including return, consequence, resolve, and the opponents' turning of affairs against the addressee in Q 9:48.

Table 3. Recurrent constructions and the limits of their interpretation.

Construction family	Tokens	Interpretive distinction
Arrival or bringing of *amr*	16	Outcome varies; Table 6.
bi-amrihi	12	Antecedent varies; Table 5.
quḍiya l-amr and conditional counterparts	7	Settlement does not imply identical fates.
Return or outcome of *um*ūr	9	Seven returns and two outcomes.
yudabbiru l-amr	4	Governance; revelation remains an exegetical question.
*ʿazm al-um*ūr	3	Affairs characterised through resolve.
*ul*ū *al-amr*	2	Authority and the identification of its holders.

Families overlap. Complete locations and extraction rules appear in S1.

The absence of *awāmir* from this occurrence set supports a statement about the Qur'anic distribution of a later familiar plural; it does not establish a theological reason for that absence. Nor does the concentration of *bi-amrihi* in cosmic-motion contexts determine its possessor in every verse. Such limits are not incidental reservations. They show how the same corpus can support a reliable count and leave the interpretation of an individual construction dependent on grammar. The following readings accordingly begin where the numbers cease to decide the question.

5. Reconsidering the faces of *amr*

5.1. A classification containing several kinds of explanation

Table 4 preserves all nineteen reported classifications, including the qualification attached to the last. Its analytical column does not assign each face to a new exclusive lexical box. Instead, it identifies the explanatory question raised by the example. "Requesting an action" can describe a directive use; "drowning" identifies what happens within the Flood account; and "revelation" can involve a theological account of what descends. The distinction is tested in the passages rather than inferred simply from the length or specificity of the gloss (Ibn al-Jawzī 1984, 172–76).

Table 4. The nineteen reported classifications and their explanatory levels.

Recorded face	Qur'an verse	Question raised by the classification
1. Religion	9:48	Domain specified by the passage.
2. Speech	18:21	Disputed matter or the speech about it?
3. Punishment	11:44	Consequence of accomplished determination.
4. Defeat/killing of Meccan opponents	8:44	Historical identification.
5. Conquest of Mecca	9:24	Historical identification.
6. Qurayẓa's fate and al-Naḍīr's removal	2:109	Historical identification.
7. Resurrection	16:1	Eschatological referent.
8. Decree	7:54	Divine determination or governance.
9. Revelation	32:5	Interpretation of descent and governance.
10. Victory	3:154	Outcome, authority, or participation in decision?

Recorded face	Qur'an verse	Question raised by the classification
11. Sin	5:95	Evaluation supplied through action and consequence.
12. Affair and condition	11:97	Conduct including directive action.
13. Death	57:14	Exegetically identified event.
14. Consultation	7:110	Contextual use of directive language.
15. Precaution	9:50	Assessment of an earlier decision.
16. Drowning	11:43	Narrative realisation of determination.
17. Fertility/abundance	5:52	One contested identification.
18. Requesting an action	16:90	Directive use.
19. Increase, attributed to others	17:16	Disputed reading or interpretation.

Faces and exemplars follow the documented chapter of Ibn al-Jawzī (1984, 172–76). The final column is the present reassessment, not his wording.

Ibn Fāris begins from five lexical bases, including affair, command as the opposite of prohibition, growth or abundance, a distinguishing mark, and wonder (1979, 1:137). Ibn al-Jawzī's introductory contrast between the plurals *awāmir* and *umūr* nevertheless provides a useful starting point for the two most prominent uses of *amr*. These are levels of organisation within lexical scholarship, not incompatible totals requiring one authority to defeat another. A root entry can preserve rare derivatives while a discussion of its common noun distinguishes its principal patterns. The present analysis retains that asymmetry rather than forcing the root and noun into identical definitions.

5.2. Directing, deciding, and seeking counsel

The queen's consultation makes two related uses visible within one exchange: وَٱلْأَمْرُ إِلَيْكِ فَٱنظُرِي مَاذَا تَأْمُرِينَ, wa-l-amru ilayki fa-nẓurī mādhā taʾmurīn, "The decision rests with you; consider, then, what you will command" (Q 27:33). The opening noun identifies the matter or decision entrusted to her; the concluding verb concerns what she will direct others to do. Their relation is understandable without treating them as identical. Authority over a matter provides the setting in which an instruction can be issued. The preceding consultation prevents the second clause from floating free as an abstract example of an imperative.

The passage also limits a definition of command that assumes a permanently fixed hierarchy between every speaker and addressee. Pharaoh's question fa-mādhā taʾmurūn in Q 7:110 and Q 26:35 is interpreted through counsel: the ruler asks those around him what course they advise. Al-Baghawī's explanation directs attention to the practical recommendation sought, while al-Rāghib relates mutual consultation to accepting one another's direction (al-Baghawī 1997, 3:263; al-Rāghib 1412 AH, 89). It is possible to connect counsel with directive language, but the connection should be demonstrated through the interaction rather than asserted from a definition requiring superiority in every use.

Form VIII gives the comparison a sharper ethical contrast. In Q 28:20, يَأْتَمِرُونَ بِكَ لِيَقْتُلُوكَ, yaʾtamirūna bika li-yaqtulūka, identifies consultation directed towards killing Moses. In Q 65:6, وَأْتَمِرُوا بَيْنَكُم بِمَعْرُوفٍ, waʾtamirū baynakum bi-maʿrūf, calls for consultation conducted according to what is right in the regulation of care after separation. The verbal family alone contains no guarantee of moral legitimacy. Purpose and manner determine the contrast: consultation is directed against someone's life in one setting and qualified by fairness in another. A classification that groups both under counsel need not lose that distinction, provided that the ethical qualification remains attached to the passage.

The same point applies to the form I verb. Q 9:67 and Q 9:71 reverse the objects of enjoining and forbidding, distinguishing hypocrites from believing men and women through what they commend. Q 12:32 presents a coercive human demand concerning Joseph, whereas Q 16:90 attributes the command to justice and beneficence to God. These are not reasons to abandon a directive semantic base. They show why its moral and theological interpretation cannot be read from its morphology. Cook's account of commanding right concerns one particularly consequential ethical formulation; the concordance makes clear why that obligation cannot serve as a definition of the whole root (Cook 2000).

5.3. The circumstances that turn an affair into a sin

Q 5:95 regulates the consequences of killing game while in a consecrated state and includes the phrase لِيَذُوقَ وَبَالَ أَمْرِهِ, li-yadhūqa wabāla amrihi, "so that he may taste the grievous consequence of his action". Ibn al-Jawzī's classification under sin identifies the character of the action for which the consequence is imposed (1984, 174–75). The negative evaluation is supported by the prohibition, the compensation, and wabāl. It need not be assigned to *amr* independently of those relations. Replacing the possessive phrase with the bare gloss "sin" may convey the intended offence, but it compresses the distinction between an action and the judgement made about it.

The related formulas in Q 64:5 and Q 65:9 reinforce that reading without making every occurrence synonymous. In Q 65:9, the community tastes the grievous consequence of its *amr* and the outcome of its *amr* is loss. The repetition sustains reference to conduct and its result, while different surrounding expressions specify the adverse evaluation. The verse offers a particularly useful test because both tokens are available within one sentence. A lexical account that makes *amr* itself mean "punishment" would obscure the relationship between what the community has done and what follows from it.

Other faces operate through different contextual relations. In Q 21:93 and Q 23:53, the division of a community's *amr* follows discourse about religious unity, which supports explanation through religion. In Q 18:21 and Q 20:62, contention about an *amr* involves speech, but speech is the medium of dispute and need not exhaust the matter disputed. In Q 9:50, "we took our *amr* beforehand" receives the gloss of precaution in a setting where speakers claim that their earlier decision protected them from another's misfortune (al-Baghawī 1997, 4:57; 5:353). These explanations remain useful when recognised as contextually focused readings of an affair, course of action, or concern.

A general meaning should not, however, become a device for avoiding every specialised use. Repetition within a distinctive construction can support a conventional interpretation more specific than "something concerning someone". The article's preference for a layered description therefore leaves room for established contextual uses between a wholly general lexical base and a unique event. What it resists is the immediate inference that every successful gloss supplies an additional autonomous meaning. The burden is to explain which information belongs to the expression and which is supplied by its relationships in the verse.

5.4. Divine determination and the event that fulfils it

The Flood account supplies the clearest case of a particular event being read through *amr*. Noah's warning is لَا عَاصِمَ الْيَوْمَ مِنْ أَمْرِ اللَّهِ, lā ʿāṣima l-yawma min amri llāh, "There is no protection today from God's determination" (Q 11:43). The subsequent drowning identifies the danger, while the next verse reports that the water subsides and the *amr* is accomplished. Al-Tafsīr al-muyassar explicitly connects divine decree with drowning and destruction in its explanation of Q 11:43 (2009, 226). That connection can be expressed without making drowning a general property of the noun.

The comparison becomes stronger when the associated arrival formulas are read together. In Q 11:58, 11:66, and 11:94, the coming of the divine *amr* is followed by the rescue of the messenger and those who believe. Destruction forms part of these narrative sequences, but rescue is not an accidental omission that a punitive gloss can ignore. In Q 10:24, the ruined vegetation in the comparison determines what the intervention accomplishes, while Q 57:14 is interpreted through death within an address concerning the end of false expectations (al-Baghawī 1997, 8:36). Table 6 below retains the sixteen-member family without assigning identical consequences to every member.

Q 9:106 supplies an important boundary: others are deferred for *amr Allāh*, with punishment and acceptance of repentance presented as alternatives. The expression can therefore concern an awaited decision whose outcome is not yet fixed in the clause as punishment. This agrees with the broader semantic range already recognised by Sinai (2023, 78–84), but its particular role here is to test the regrouping of Ibn al-Jawzī's punitive faces. A general category of divine determination can accommodate differing outcomes; a definition restricted to punishment cannot account for the explicit alternative without further qualification.

The formula *quḍiya l-amr* also requires attention to what is decided. Its seven recorded occurrences include Q 12:41, where the interpretation of the prisoners' dreams differentiates their fates. Finality of determination does not make their outcomes identical. Similarly, the judgement scenes of Q 14:22 and Q 19:39

cannot be exhausted by selecting only the adverse fate of some participants. The shared construction concerns accomplishment or settlement, while the narrative determines whose case is settled and what follows. This preserves the force of finality without confusing it with a single event or consequence.

5.5. Whose command? The grammar of *bi-amrihi*

The twelve occurrences of *bi-amrihi* are predominantly associated with the ordering or movement of created things, but that setting must not be mistaken for a uniform grammatical reference to God. In Q 21:81, Solomon is introduced before the wind that moves *bi-amrihi*, and in Q 38:36 the wind is subjected to him and moves according to his direction. Al-Baghawī's explanation of Q 21:81 explicitly follows Solomon's wishes in describing the wind's motion (1997, ad Q 21:81). Divine agency enables the arrangement, but the immediate possessor of the command is Solomon.

This distinction separates the command's immediate possessor from the agency enabling it. The phrase تَجْرِي بِأَمْرِهِ, tajrī *bi-amrihi*, "moving at his command", can participate in a narrative of divinely granted power while referring to a human agent's instruction. The English possessive "his" is useful precisely because it requires an antecedent to be identified. Capitalising it as "His" before making that decision would import a resolution into the transcription. Table 5 separates grammatical reference from the larger account of divine enabling.

Table 5. The twelve occurrences of *bi-amrihi*: context and antecedent.

Context	Locations	Tokens	Possessor
Celestial bodies	7:54; 16:12	2	God
Ships	14:32; 22:65; 30:46; 45:12	4	God
Wind directed by Solomon	21:81; 38:36	2	Solomon
Heaven and earth standing	30:25	1	God
Awaited divine intervention	2:109; 9:24	2	God
Angels acting as commanded	21:27	1	God

The two Solomon occurrences distinguish grammatical possession from divine enabling.

Of the nine occurrences associated with cosmic ordering or motion, seven refer directly to God and two to Solomon. The remaining three concern God's bringing an *amr* in Q 2:109 and Q 9:24, and the angels' acting by his command in Q 21:27. This grouping supports a contextual tendency, not a one-to-one equivalence between a prepositional phrase and a theological category. The angelic passage itself concerns acting in accordance with command; the two Solomon passages concern delegated authority over motion. Their differences show why a theological interpretation must follow, rather than replace, the identification of grammatical relations.

Table 6. The arrival/bringing family: sixteen contextual occurrences.

Narrative setting	Locations	Tokens
Messenger–community sequences, including rescue	11:40, 58, 66, 76, 82, 94, 101; 23:27	8
Vegetation destroyed in a comparison	10:24	1
Anticipated judgement or intervention	16:33; 40:78	2
Eschatological warning	16:1	1
Death in the selected exegetical account	57:14	1
Awaited intervention or victory	2:109; 9:24; 5:52	3

The family includes different syntactic constructions. Historical and eschatological identifications remain interpretations rather than autonomous lexical senses.

5.6. Historical identification and the reach of a general expression

The repeated formula ḥattā ya'tiya llāhu *bi-amrihi* links Q 2:109 and Q 9:24, yet Ibn al-Jawzī's classifications connect them with different historical outcomes. The first is associated with the fate of Banū Qurayẓa and Banū al-Naḍīr, the second with the conquest of Mecca; Q 8:44 is associated with the defeat of Meccan opponents (1984, 174). These identifications record an interpretive use of historical knowledge. They do not require the same construction to acquire a different lexical definition each time its narrated application changes.

The point is not that history is extraneous to exegesis. A commentator may need an account of events to explain why a warning, permission, or anticipated decision matters within an understood setting. The distinction concerns the status of the resulting explanation. "The conquest of Mecca" names the event assigned to a passage; it does not describe a semantic feature found whenever *amr* occurs. Preserving the identification alongside a broader meaning retains more information than either collapsing the event into the definition or deleting the event because it is not a definition.

The reported face of fertility or abundance in Q 5:52 further illustrates the problem of exclusive identification. The passage anticipates victory or an *amr* from God, while al-Baghawī records other interpretations, including completion of the Prophet's cause, punishment, or the removal of a particular group (1997, 3:68). Such disagreement should remain visible. The absence of one proposed referent from that commentary does not establish that it was unknown elsewhere, and the existence of several proposals does not mean that all are simultaneously the verse's reference. Their comparison supports a broader lexical description while preserving the need to justify a more specific historical reading.

5.7. When theological distinctions enter the interpretation

Q 7:54 places created things under divine direction before declaring رُمْأَلْاوَ قُلْخَلْا هُلَ الَأ, alā lahu l-khalqu wa-l-*amr*, "Surely creation and command belong to him". The exegetical record offers three pertinent explanations: Ibn al-Jawzī's decree, al-Rāghib's origination, and al-Saʿdī's religious prescription in contrast with creation (Ibn al-Jawzī 1984, 174; al-Rāghib 1412 AH, 88; al-Saʿdī 2000, 291). The difference is substantive. One reading relates *amr* to effective governance, while another uses the coordination to distinguish the created order from revealed instruction. Listing them as equivalent synonyms would obscure their theological work.

The earlier *bi-amrihi* provides strong contextual support for divine governance, but it does not mechanically decide the scope of the later coordinated noun. Nor does the definite article independently prove that every possible kind of command is included. A comprehensive reading can bring governance and prescription together as an interpretation of the passage's assertion of divine sovereignty, but that synthesis remains an argumentative judgement. It should not be presented as the grammatical inevitability of al- or as a consensus achieved merely by placing the exegetes' glosses beside one another.

A comparable openness appears in Q 32:5 and Q 65:12. Al-Baghawī records determination and revelation in explaining the descent and management of *amr*, while al-Saʿdī draws the religious and predestining dimensions together (al-Baghawī 1997, 6:300; 8:158; al-Saʿdī 2000, 654, 872). These formulations show the value of separating the expression from the doctrinal account offered for it. A description of descent does not by itself name the content of every command, and a theological synthesis requires more than a root gloss. The relation among creation, revelation, and ordering is what the interpretations seek to explain.

The spirit passage preserves the same need for restraint: يبِّرَ رِمْأَ نْمِ حُورُّلا لِقُ, qul al-rūḥu min amri rabbī, "Say: the spirit is of my Lord's *amr*" (Q 17:85). Retaining *amr* in this analytical translation makes the disputed relation visible rather than resolving it through an English equivalent. An affair whose knowledge belongs to God and creative origination are contrasting explanations available in al-Tafsīr al-muyassar and al-Rāghib (2009, 290; 1412 AH, 88). The possibility of relating these accounts does not make their explanatory emphases identical. One concerns the limits of human knowledge; another concerns the spirit's dependence on divine action.

5.8. The difficult cases that an economical account must preserve

Q 17:16 resists any easy assignment: اهَيفِيرَتْمُ انَرْمَأ اوقُسَفَفَ اهَيفِ, *amarn*ā mutrafīhā fa-fasaqū fīhā, "We commanded its affluent people, and they transgressed within it". This deliberately restrained analytical translation leaves unstated what the clause itself leaves unstated: the content of the command. Al-Baghawī records interpretations of obedience commanded and disobedience committed, of people being made rulers, and of their number increasing, while distinguishing forms with lengthening or gemination in the reading tradition (1997, 5:83). Alternative readings and alternative interpretations of the unlengthened, ungeminated form are related evidence but not the same phenomenon.

Al-Saʿdī interprets the command here as predestining, amran qadariyyan (2000, 455). The obedience interpretation instead supplies an understood righteous requirement that the affluent people violate. Q 7:28, which

denies that God commands indecency, gives a reason for refusing to infer moral authorisation of transgression from the sequence. That intertextual constraint does not make the unexpressed object visibly present in Q 17:16, nor does it remove the need to explain the relation between willing destruction and subsequent wrongdoing. The interpretive choice consequently draws on theology and wider Qur'anic claims as well as the local verbal form.

The present article retains the Ḥafṣ form in its counted corpus and records other readings within the discussion of interpretation. It does not count a reported variant as an additional Qur'anic occurrence. Nor does it adopt "increase" as a secure nineteenth sense simply because Ibn al-Jawzī mentions it. His attribution of the addition and his recording of another explanation are evidence that the item was already contested within the tradition (1984, 176). The difficulty is part of the object being studied, not an inconvenience to be hidden after the categories have been assigned.

The adjective اِمْرٌ, *imran*, in Q 18:71 provides a different limit. Moses' assessment لَقَدْ جِئْتَ شَيْئًا اِمْرًا, laqad jiʾta shayʾan *imran*, can be rendered analytically as "You have done a grievous thing". The lexical and exegetical evidence relates the expression to something grave, extraordinary, or objectionable (al-Baghawī 1997, 5:190; al-Rāghib 1412 AH, 90). Its affiliation with ʾ-m-r does not make it an occurrence of the same noun *amr*. A complete root survey must retain it, while an economical account of the common noun should not claim that this exceptional derivative has been explained by the contrast between command and affair.

Finally, *ul*ū *al-amr* in Q 4:59 and Q 4:83 raises the relation between a lexical expression and the identification of authorised persons. The selected sources offer rulers, those administering communal matters, and people of religious knowledge among the interpretations (al-Rāghib 1412 AH, 90; al-Saʿdī 2000, 183). The phrase connects authority to directing or attending to affairs, but grammar alone does not determine the social institution that fulfils that description. The distinction between description and identification thus recurs at a political and religious level: a verse's wording can support an account of authority without settling every later disagreement about who possesses it.

6. Discussion: from lexical possibility to religious explanation

6.1. What the concordance establishes

The first research question receives a determinate but limited answer. The documented root inventory contains 248 tokens in 226 verses across 61 surahs, with 169 broadly nominal and 79 verbal occurrences. Its recurrence patterns can be checked against identified locations, including the thirteen plurals, twelve occurrences of *bi-amrihi*, and sixteen-member arrival family. This provides a stronger basis for the argument than a sequence of memorable examples because counterinstances remain recoverable. It also allows apparently simple claims to be reconsidered without disturbing findings that withstand checking: the count of *bi-amrihi* remains twelve even though its possessive does not refer to God in every case.

Comprehensiveness here concerns retrieval, not uniform interpretive certainty. A complete list can contain unresolved readings; indeed, an inventory that removes Q 17:16 or *imran* to achieve a tidy semantic account would be less faithful to its declared corpus. Conversely, a concordance of every root token is not a census of all Qur'anic injunctions. Imperative constructions formed from other roots fall outside it, while many included nouns issue no injunction. The value of the design lies in matching the completeness claim to a specified linguistic unit and leaving other kinds of completeness unclaimed.

The surface-form and chronological qualifications reinforce that principle. A reproducible count of the working forms is preferable to quietly repeating an unreproduced figure, but a difference between 76 surface strings and the source's 78 does not license an immediate verdict of error without its counting rules. Likewise, the Meccan–Medinan division belongs to a particular system of classification whose application must be documented. Neither uncertainty weakens the occurrence-level comparisons, provided that the article does not use the uncertain totals to support claims about semantic development. Corpus precision is achieved by specifying what was counted, not by presenting every number with equal confidence.

6.2. What the faces preserve

The answer to the second question is that Ibn al-Jawzī's classifications preserve several kinds of explanation within one organised account. Some concern a broadly repeatable use, such as requesting action; others identify

a consequence, event, or object within a passage; still others depend on the interpretation of divine action. Treating this variety as mere confusion would miss an important historical possibility: the compiler may be preserving what different passages were understood to mean rather than attempting to construct mutually exclusive dictionary entries. The present distinctions should illuminate that practice before judging its coherence. There is nevertheless a real analytical gain in marking its levels. A reader who sees drowning, death, and resurrection as three independent lexical senses may overestimate the semantic distance between the passages. A reader who sees only one broad word for "affair" may underestimate the particular force given to it by finality, divine attribution, and narrative consequence. The layered account avoids both losses. It can say that an expression concerns a determination, that a passage identifies the determination through an event, and that an exegete explains the event within a theological account. None of those statements needs to displace the others. This also changes the significance of disagreement among compilers. A longer list may record more specific referential identifications rather than more lexical senses, while a shorter list may organise a comparable range at a more general level. The difference between fourteen and nineteen cannot therefore establish superior comprehensiveness or defective method on its own. Comparison must examine what each entry does and how its examples support it. This is where the proposed mapping contributes something beyond reducing the total: it makes different explanatory resolutions comparable while preserving their particulars.

6.3. Where the distinction between meaning and reference remains difficult

The third research question cannot be answered with a binary verdict for every token. Clear cases exist: a named historical event is more specific than the lexical meaning that permits reference to it, and the grievous consequence in Q 5:95 contributes an evaluation not supplied by *amr* alone. Other cases lie between a general sense and a single referent. Recurrent patterns of divine intervention may sustain a recognisable contextual use even when their particular outcomes differ. The existence of that intermediate level is why a useful semantic account needs more than either an unrestricted general gloss or a proliferating list of events.

A further complication is that theological interpretation can become embedded in the proposed lexical equivalent. "Creative command" already describes the relation between a divine utterance or determination and its effective realisation; "legislative command" already distinguishes obligation from guaranteed occurrence. These terms can clarify the readings, but they should not be treated as observations equivalent to identifying a noun or a pronoun. Q 7:54 and Q 17:16 show why: the same textual features receive different explanations when exegetes draw the boundary between creation, instruction, and divine determination differently. The disagreement is part of the semantic evidence precisely because it exposes the reasoning required.

The classification in Table 7 consequently describes levels rather than competing numerical totals. Two dominant semantic bases provide an economical account of common uses; three principal interpretive settings distinguish directing, human affairs, and divine determination; exceptional derivatives and contested readings remain separately visible. The divine setting is not proposed as an autonomous third root meaning simply because the referent is God. Nor does the table claim that every divine occurrence can be reduced without remainder to an ordinary human affair. The point is to keep the description revisable by the actual passage.

Table 7. A layered account rather than competing totals of meanings.

Level	Proposed organisation	Boundary
Dominant semantic bases	Directive use; matter/affair	Neither is a theological category.
Principal interpretive settings	Directing; human affairs; divine determination	Settings can overlap semantic bases.
Contextual specification	Conduct, counsel, events, referents	A successful gloss need not be a separate sense.
Theological explanation	Prescription, creation, delegated authority	Requires a passage-specific argument.
Exceptional or disputed derivatives	*imran* (18:71); *amarn*ā (17:16)	No forced resolution into an exhaustive binary.

Contextual groupings are distinguished from independent root meanings.

6.4. Divine action, delegated authority, and moral responsibility

The fourth question concerns what these distinctions make available to religious studies. The Solomon passages

demonstrate that the relation between divine and human agency cannot be recovered by selecting one actor and suppressing the other. God subjects the wind, while Solomon directs its motion within the narrative. Calling the possessive divine would erase the delegated authority that the passage expressly represents; describing the command as merely human would ignore the enabling action that makes that authority possible. Grammatical precision therefore supports, rather than diminishes, a theological account attentive to the relations among agents.

The directive examples provide a parallel lesson about moral evaluation. Satan, a coercive human speaker, a prophet, and a believing community can all be represented through the same verbal family. What is commended or condemned depends on the speaker's claim, the demanded action, and the narrative or normative setting. The distinction between commanding right and commanding wrong is not a distinction between two unrelated verbs. It is an ethical differentiation within a shared linguistic capacity to direct. A study of divine legislation may build upon that capacity, but it cannot claim the entire root as its exclusive terminology.

Divine determination also exceeds a vocabulary of punishment. The arrival sequences can place rescue and destruction within one event, and Q 9:106 explicitly leaves punishment and repentance as alternatives under an awaited divine decision. These comparisons matter for interpreting what the religious account makes salient: effective sovereignty is not identical to a single adverse consequence. They also prevent a broader enquiry into divine justice from being narrowed by a selection of predominantly punitive examples. Contextual specificity and theological breadth need not compete when the steps between them are shown.

6.5. Consequences for reading, translation, and future enquiry

For English presentation, the analysis recommends deliberate variation rather than an obligatory equivalent. "Command", "decision", "matter", "affair", and "determination" foreground different relations, and a translator may need a note where a theological alternative cannot be preserved economically. Yet translation remains an application of the present argument, not a separately tested corpus of English versions. The analytical translations supplied here make particular relationships visible for discussion; they do not demonstrate how published translators have handled every occurrence or how readers respond to a retained ambiguity.

The study's limitations also identify a productive next stage. The occurrence set is inspectable, but its working descriptions require independent specialist scrutiny before serving as a fully adjudicated semantic resource. A wider comparison of *wujūh* compilations could test how classificatory purposes change across authors, while a broader theological corpus could examine alternatives not adequately represented by the present sources. Full print collation would strengthen the inherited page references, and a documented orthographic procedure could resolve the surface-form discrepancy. These are specific extensions of the evidence, not reasons to postpone the distinctions already supported by the passages.

The discussion thus returns to the question posed by the Flood example. Identifying drowning is necessary to explain that narrative, but naming its event does not exhaust the linguistic contribution of *amr*. An adequate account preserves the event, the expression through which it is presented, and the interpretation connecting them. The same discipline applies when a commentator names revelation, a ruler, or a historical conquest. What counts as a meaning depends partly on the explanatory task, and scholarship becomes more precise when it makes that task explicit rather than allowing a single list to conceal several kinds of claim.

7. Conclusion

The Qur'anic distribution of ʾ-m-r supports an economical account of its dominant directive and matter-related uses, but it does not justify turning that account into an exhaustive two-part theology. The 248-token concordance establishes where the forms occur and permits repeated constructions to be compared, while the selected exegetical readings show how those constructions acquire particular reference and religious significance. Nineteen recorded faces consequently need not represent nineteen independent lexical senses; neither should their regrouping erase the contextual knowledge they preserve.

The principal finding is a distinction among explanatory levels. A lexical description indicates what an expression can contribute, a contextual identification specifies the person or event in view, and a theological interpretation explains the relationship between that occurrence and divine action or obligation. These levels often cooperate. They can also diverge, as the disputed *amarnā* in Q 17:16 and the competing readings of

creation and command demonstrate. Retaining their differences produces a more informative interpretation than either multiplying senses without qualification or imposing one gloss throughout.

The corrected treatment of Solomon's command makes the practical value of that distinction clear. A religious setting does not remove the need to resolve a pronoun, just as a complete count does not remove the need to interpret a clause. Approached in this way, *al-wujūh wa-l-naẓā'ir* becomes a record of explanatory judgements whose linguistic, contextual, and theological commitments can be examined together. The article's contribution is to make those commitments visible while respecting both the specificity of Qur'anic language and the intellectual purposes of its interpreters.

References

Abdel Haleem, M. A. S. 2018. "The Role of Context in Interpreting and Translating the Qur'an." *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 20 (1): 47–66. https://doi.org/10.3366/jqs.2018.0320.

Al-Baghawī, al-Ḥusayn ibn Masʿūd. 1997. *Maʿālim al-tanzīl fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān*. Edited by Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh al-Namir, ʿUthmān Jumʿa Ḍamīriyya, and Sulaymān Muslim al-Ḥarash. 4th ed. Riyadh: Dār Ṭayba. Selected electronic witnesses: King Saud University Qur'an project, https://quran.ksu.edu.sa/tafseer/baghawy/.

Cook, Michael. 2000. *Commanding Right and Forbidding Wrong in Islamic Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

El-Awa, Salwa M. 2006. *Textual Relations in the Qur'an: Relevance, Coherence and Structure*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203014486.

Hoover, Jon. 2007. *Ibn Taymiyya's Theodicy of Perpetual Optimism*. Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004158474.i-270.

Ibn al-Jawzī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAlī. 1984. *Nuzhat al-aʿyun al-nawāẓir fī ʿilm al-wujūh wa-l-naẓā'ir*. Edited by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Karīm Kāẓim al-Rāḍī. Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla.

Ibn al-Qayyim, Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr. 1423 AH. *Iʿlām al-muwaqqiʿīn ʿan rabb al-ʿālamīn*. Edited by Mashhūr ibn Ḥasan Āl Salmān. Dammam: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī.

Ibn Fāris, Aḥmad. 1979. *Muʿjam maqāyīs al-lugha*. Edited by ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr.

Ibn Taymiyya, Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥalīm. 1399 AH. *Al-Tuḥfa al-ʿIrāqiyya fī al-aʿmāl al-qalbiyya*. 2nd ed. Cairo: Al-Maṭbaʿa al-Salafiyya wa-Maktabatuhā.

Ishtīwī, Aḥmad Muḥammad. 2022. "Lafẓ al-*amr*: Taṣrīf maʿānīhi fī al-Qurʾān al-karīm wa-dalālatuhu al-lughawiyya wa-l-uṣūliyya." *Majallat al-Buḥūth al-Akādīmiyya* 21: 110–27. https://doi.org/10.65540/jar.v21i.402.

Palanci, Merve. 2024. "Surplus of Meaning or Suspending Philology? Some Reflections on the Philological Ramification of the Classical Qurʾān Commentary." *Ilahiyat Studies* 15 (1): 3–29. https://doi.org/10.12730/is.1416368.

Qur'anic Arabic Corpus. n.d. "Quran Dictionary: ʾ-m-r." Accessed October 16, 2026. https://corpus.quran.com/qurandictionary.jsp?q=Amr.

Al-Qurṭubī, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad. 1964. *Al-Jāmiʿ li-aḥkām al-Qurʾān*. Edited by Aḥmad al-Bardūnī and Ibrāhīm Aṭfayyish. 2nd ed. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya.

Al-Rāghib al-Iṣfahānī, al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad. 1412 AH. *Al-Mufradāt fī gharīb al-Qurʾān*. Edited by Ṣafwān ʿAdnān al-Dāwūdī. Damascus: Dār al-Qalam.

Rippin, Andrew. 1988. "The Function of Asbāb al-Nuzūl in Qur'ānic Exegesis." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 51 (1): 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X00020188.

Rippin, Andrew. 2001. *The Qur'an and Its Interpretative Tradition*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Al-Saʿdī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Nāṣir. 2000. *Taysīr al-karīm al-raḥmān fī tafsīr kalām al-mannān*. Edited by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muʿallā al-Luwayḥiq. Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla. Selected electronic witnesses: King Saud University Qur'an project, https://quran.ksu.edu.sa/tafseer/saadi/.

Sinai, Nicolai. 2023. *Key Terms of the Qur'an: A Critical Dictionary*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691241326.

Al-Tafsīr al-muyassar. 2009. Prepared by a group of scholars. 2nd ed. Medina: King Fahd Glorious Qur'an Printing Complex.

The Qur'an. n.d. Muṣḥaf al-Madīna al-Nabawiyya, reading of Ḥafṣ ʿan ʿĀṣim. Medina: King Fahd Glorious Qur'an Printing Complex. Cited by surah and verse; the working root inventory is identified separately above.