

CHAPTER I

PREFACE

A. Background of Rasearch

Al-Quran discourses find their momentum, even it indicates that al-Quran discourses become a trend and locomotive in Islamic science development. For common muslims, al-Quran is holly word of Allah that included to religious devotion when they read it. For the consequence, they place al-Quran just in theological area, by describing the Quran as something sacred, absolute, transcendent without correlation with the reality of history¹.

Whereas, predicate which carried by al-Quran is “*al-huda*”, a guidance for who have godfearing, a guidance for them whom want get knowledge truth which can carry them to the absolute truth. Therefore, it become a must for every muslim to keep on gaining the knowledge of al-Quran in order to strength it predicate as “*al-huda*”.

In doing its function as guidance to the truth, al-Quran use kinds of methods, sometime by clear and detail explanation, using parables, with order sentences or report sentences and also using story of preceding peoples to take its lessons for latest generation. In this research, the writer would like to try to understand how al-Quran explain about knowledge and its truth trough the story of preceding peoples which can be toke many lessons of it story as one of knowledge development medium, particularly in Islamic studies.

Moreover, al-Quran itself clearly explain that the stories told in al-Quran is not just a story to tell before sleep, but they are historical facts

¹ In this positon, acoording to Muhammad Arkoun, al-Quran become something unthinkable, See Justisia Jurnal, “*Kritik Qur’an ; Strukturalisme, Analisa Historis dan Kritik Idiologis*”, 23th edition, XI, 2003, P. 2

which can be knowledge for *Ulil Albab* and guidance also mercy for them who believe in.

لَقَدْ كَانَ فِي قَصَصِهِمْ عِبْرَةً لِأُولِي الْأَلْبَابِ مَا كَانَ حَدِيثًا يُفْتَرَى وَلَكِنْ تَصْدِيقَ الَّذِي

بَيَّنَّ يَدَيْهِ وَتَفْصِيلَ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَهُدًى وَرَحْمَةً لِّقَوْمٍ يُؤْمِنُونَ (يوسف : 111)

Meaning: "*There is, in their stories, instruction for men endowed with understanding. It is not a tale invented, but a confirmation of what went before it- a detailed exposition of all things, and a Guide and a Mercy to any such believe*" (QS. Yusuf : 111)

Talking about the knowledge, Al- Qur'an also mentioned lot of it. One of them is the process of truth finding in Mūsa and Hidhir story on QS. al-Kahfi verse 60-82. Even it does not mention the name of Mūsa's interlocutor; but he called as "pious servant of God." Majority of Muslim scholar argue, man who called by the pious servant of God is Hidhir.

Background of this story is the arrogance of Mūsa who consider as a man who has deepest knowledge. So, Allah admonished him and commanded him to look for the pious servant of God. As told by Imam Bukhari through Muhammad's companion, Ibn 'Abbas r.a that another prophet's companion, Ubay bin Ka'ab r.a said he listened Rasulullah utter: "Actually Mūsa was preach in front of Bani Israil then he asked by someone, "who is the really intellectual?" Mūsa said, "Me". So, Allah flayed him because he did not bring the knowledge back to Allah. Then, Allah revealed to him: "I have a mankind were in the middle of sea. He more knows than you." Mūsa asked: "God, how can I meet with him?" Allah saying "Take one fish and then put it on something that made from palm leaf, afterwards on-site where you lost that fish. So, there he (the

² 'Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali, *The Hoy Qur'an; text and Translation*, Islamic Book Trust, Kuala Lumpur, 2005, p. 284

fish) was³.” There upon, the truth finding was begun as told in QS. al-Kahfi verse 60-82.

This story tells us how Mūsa has strong desire to find and meet Hidhir to learn his knowledge he has. We can see from surah al-kahfi verse 60:

وَإِذْ قَالَ مُوسَى لِفَتَاهُ لَا أَبْرَحُ حَتَّىٰ أَبْلُغَ بَحْرَيْنِ أَوْ أَمْضِي حُقُبًا ۝

(الكهف : 60)

Meaning : “Behold, Moses said to his attendant, “I will not give up until I reach the junction of the two seas or (until) I spent years and years in travel⁴”. (QS. al-Kahfi : 60)

The word (حقباً) *huquban* means a year. In other hand it means seven years or forever. Whatever the meaning, the important thing is he show his willpower to meet with the pious servant of God⁵(Hidhir).

On his first meeting, the dialogue between them started. Mūsa asked to Hidhir may he followed Hidhir and learn from him.

قَالَ لَهُ مُوسَى هَلْ أَتَّبِعُكَ عَلَىٰ أَنْ تُعَلِّمَنِي مِمَّا عَلَّمْتَٰ رُشْدًا ۝ (الكهف : 66)

Meaning: *Moses said to him: “May I follow you on the footing that you teach me something of the (Higher) truth which you have been taught?⁶”* (QS. Al-Kahfi: 66)

Hidhir said to Mūsa that he had no patient if he followed him. As Allah’s saying in the Qur’an:

قَالَ إِنَّكَ لَنْ تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا ۝ وَكَيْفَ تَصْبِرُ عَلَىٰ مَا لَمْ تُحِطْ بِهِ خُبْرًا ۝

(الكهف : 67-68)

³ M. Quraish Shihab, *TAFSIR AL-MISBAH: pesan, kesan, dan keserasian al-Qur’an*, vol 7, Lentera Hati, Jakarta, second printing, 2009, p. 334

⁴ ‘Abdullah Yusuf ‘Ali, *The Holy Quran...*, p. 351

⁵ M. Quraish Shihab, *TAFSIR AL-MISBAH...* p. 336

⁶ ‘Abdullah Yusuf ‘Ali, *The Holy Quran...*, p. 352

Meaning : *(The other) said: “Verily you will not be able to have patience with me! And how can you have patience about things about which your understanding is not complete?”*⁷ (QS.Al-Kahfi:67-68)

Mūsa tried to make sure Hidhir that he can be patient from God’s permit. Finally, Hidhir allowed him to follow the trip but Hidhir make some rules for Mūsa that he never asked anything to him before Hidhir himself tell to Mūsa.

قَالَ فَإِنْ اتَّبَعْتَنِي فَلَا تَسْأَلْنِي عَنْ شَيْءٍ حَتَّى أُحْدِثَ لَكَ مِنْهُ ذِكْرًا

Meaning : *The other said: “If then you would follow me , ask me no questions about anything until I myself speak to you concerning it”*⁸. (QS. Al-Kahfi: 70)

By this rule, the question of Hidhir before becomes interesting for the writer. If we combine the question with the rule, the question become “How can you be patient (for not to ask to me) of anything that you never know?” It means Mūsa cannot get the new knowledge of Hidhir if he question what’ll happened to Hidhir. In other word, Hidhir gave the sign to Mūsa that he cannot get the knowledge if he opposes the new knowledge with the knowledge he knew⁹.

What Hidhir thought was come true. On the trip, Mūsa found some affairs out of his rationality as the prophet and he cannot hold up his patience for asking to Hidhir.

In this story were mentioned three incidents that makes Mūsa could not fill the rules by Hidhir. *First*, when Mūsa saw Hidhir, without clear

⁷ *Ibid*

⁸ *Ibid*

⁹ It is certainly has contradiction with Hegel's opinion states that everything exists in the universe come from contradiction of two things results and raises new things. Thus, according to Hegel, to gain a new knowledge, must through the contradictions of two other prior knowledge. Hegel called his theory that the term Dialectic. See Bertrand Russell, *Sejarah Filsafat Barat dan Kaitanya dengan Kondisi Sosio-Politik dari Zaman Kuno Hingga Sekarang*, Trans. Sigit Jatmiko etc., Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta, ed. III, 2007, p. 953-954

reason, he leaked the boat which Mūsa and Hidhir ride in. Mūsa asked: :
 “Have you scuttled it in order to drown those in it? Truly a strange thing
 have you done!” (QS. al-Kahfi: 71)

Second, when they met with a teenager and suddenly Hidhir killed
 him. Mūsa was surprised with it, then he ask to Hidhir, “Have you slain an
 innocent person who had slain none? Truly a foul (unheard of) thing have
 you done!” (QS. al-Kahfi:74)

Third, when they arrived in a town and asked some food to the people
 there, but the people won’t make them as a guest. Thus, contrary, Hidhir
 rebuilt the decrepit house in their town. Mūsa said to him, “If you had
 wished, surely you could have exacted some recompense for it!” (QS. al-
 Kahfi:77). Although Mūsa did not directly ask to Hidhir, Mūsa thought he
 was only giving a suggestion, but in that suggestion containing a question
 accept or not. Factually, Hidhir argued that suggestion is a question and
 judge him as breach of the rule.

What to do by Mūsa is an effort to make dialectic with Hidhir. On the
 first incident, from Mūsa question, it seems he was opposing what Hidhir
 done with his logic. The logic that used by Mūsa is causality logic. On his
 view, Hidhir leaked the boat, it can cause the passengers sink and danger
 all of passengers.

On the second incident, Mūsa try to oppose the incident of child
 murder done by Hidhir with the logic of religion law (*syariah*). So, Mūsa
 think that what he did is infamy (شيئاً نكراً)¹⁰. And for the last incident,
 Mūsa try to oppose the incident with the norm of social life (*Habbitus*). In
 norm view, if somebody given requital by somebody else of an effort in

¹⁰ Unlike the case of the first to use the word امرأ which means a big mistake, in this
 second case the word Mūsa uses نكراً that has bigger meaning. This is because in the first
 case concerns the recent loss of life in the sinking of the ship, but in the second case of
 murder had actually occurred. See M. Quraish Shihab, p.350

helping him, it often happens. That's why, Mūsa gave suggestion to Hidhir for require a pay of his kindness rebuilt the house.

All of dialectic efforts of Mūsa was not accepted by Hidhir. Hidhir assume that Mūsa works as an infraction of the rules. Then, Hidhir said:

هَذَا فِرَاقٌ بَيْنِي وَبَيْنِكَ سَأُنَبِّئُكَ بِتَأْوِيلِ مَا لَمْ تَسْتَطِعْ عَلَيْهِ صَبْرًا ۝

Meaning: *He answered: "This is the parting between me and you: now will I tell you the interpretation of (those thing) over which you were unable to hold patience¹¹"* (QS. Al-Kahfi:78)

Hidhir rejection to Mūsa question about what did by him make this story become interesting to be studied. Mūsa efforts to ask Hidhir about what he did, is an effort to get knowledge why Hidhir did it. Unfortunately, Mūsa forgot the main requirement to get knowledge from Hidhir that is "patient", moreover he use his logic and sense perception he had and they are the tools which he had and used to get knowledge¹². As the result, he got nothing except rejections of him.

After Hidhir convey his farewell address to Mūsa, then he explain the sacred behind his acts which make Mūsa can't fulfill the main requirement to get knowledge of Hidhir, that is patient:

أَمَّا السَّفِينَةُ فَكَانَتْ لِمَسَاكِينَ يَعْمَلُونَ فِي الْبَحْرِ فَأَرَدْتُ أَنْ أَعِيبَهَا وَكَانَ وَرَاءَهُمْ مَلِكٌ يَأْخُذُ
كُلَّ سَفِينَةٍ غَصْبًا ۝ وَأَمَّا الْعُلَامُ فَكَانَ أَبَوَاهُ مُؤْمِنَيْنِ فَخَشِينَا أَنْ يُرْهِقَهُمَا طُغْيَانًا وَكُفْرًا ۝

¹¹ 'Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali, The Holy Quran..., p. 353

¹² According to Suhrawardi, there are two kinds of knowledge, they are: *husuli* knowledge and *huduri* knowledge. To get or maximize *husuli* knowledge, someone can use two medium, *first*: by using sense perception he have to describe the object of sense. *Second*, by using reason observation with syllogism as an effort to make all of reason object become reasonable. In different, *huduri* knowledge can be gotten by spiritual observation like *mujahadah*, *riyadhah*, and *ibadah*. see Amroeni Drajat, *SUHRWARDI: Kritik Falsafah Peripatetik*, LKiS, Yogyakarta, 2005, P. 135

Based on Suhrawardi opinion, it can be undertood that what did by Mūsa is an effort to get *husuli* knowlwdge, but the requirement of Mūsa, "patient", is a way to get *huduri* knowledge.

فَأَرْذَنَّا أَنْ يُبَدِّلَهُمَا رَبُّهُمَا خَيْرًا مِنْهُ زَكَاةً وَأَقْرَبَ رُحْمًا ۖ وَأَمَّا الْجِدَارُ فَكَانَ لِغُلَامَيْنِ يَتِيمَيْنِ فِي
 الْمَدِينَةِ وَكَانَ تَحْتَهُ كَنْزٌ لَهُمَا وَكَانَ أَبُوهُمَا صَالِحًا فَأَرَادَ رَبُّكَ أَنْ يَبْلُغَا أَشُدَّهُمَا وَيَسْتَخْرِجَا
 كَنْزَهُمَا رَحْمَةً مِنْ رَبِّكَ وَمَا فَعَلْتُهُ عَنْ أَمْرِي ذَلِكَ تَأْوِيلُ مَا لَمْ تَسْطِعْ عَلَيْهِ صَبْرًا ۖ (الكهف

(82-79 :

Meaning: “As for the boat, it belonged to certain men in dire want: they plied on the water. I but whised to render it unserviceable, for there was after them a certain king who seized for every boat by force. As for the youth, his parents were people of Faith, and we feared that he would grieve them by obstinate rebellion and ingratitude (to Allah and man). “So we desired that their Lord would give them in exchange (a son) better in purity (of conduct) and closer in affection. As for the wall, it belonged to two youths orphans in the Town; there was beneath it, a buried treasure, to which they were entitled: their father had been a righteous man: so your Lord desired that they should attain their age of full strength and get out their treasure – a mercy (and favour) from your Lord. I did it not of my own accord. Such is the interpretation of (those things) over which you were unable to hold patience.¹³” (QS. Al-Kahfi : 79-82)

There are interesting thing in the Hidhir explanation. In his explanation in every incident, Hidhir use different pronoun (*dhamir*) leaned on a same verb (*fi'il*), that is word (أَرَادَ) *arada*; which it meaning is willing.

Meanwhile, it is very clear that every act was done by Hidhir in front of Mūsa.

In the first incident, the used pronoun is singular pronoun (تُ) *tu* which refer to the actor is the speaker. For the second incident, Hidhir used prular pronoun (نَا) *na* which refer to the actor is the speaker and the other.

¹³ ‘Abdullah Yusuf ‘Ali, The Holy Quran..., p.353-354

In different, Hidhir used word (رَبِّكَ) *rabbuka* as the actor (*fa'il*) which refer to the actor is *rabbuka* (the God of Mūsa) He is Allah s.w.t.

According to M. Quraish Shihab, in the incident of ship holing, Hidhir mentioned himself who have willing because ship holing is clearly bad deed, therefore it is not in order if depending bad deed to Allah. Whereas, in child murder there are two willing; willing of child murder with a good intention which depended to himself and the willing of exchanging murdered child with the better one which is depended to Allah s.w.t. so he used pronoun *na*. In the last explanation he only depend the willing to Allah because rebuilding the house is clearly a good deed¹⁴.

Based on Quraish Shihab opinion above, it can be understood that different pronoun using in Hidhir explanation is an etic attitude of him to Allah s.w.t. also as his effort to clean bad impression which depended to Allah s.w.t.

In this case, the writer agree with Quraish Shihab opinion. This opinion become more strength if it's correlated with Hidhir statement in the last story. He state that every done act of him, are not caused by his will, but they're caused only by Allah will.

.....وَمَا فَعَلْتُهُ عَنْ أَمْرِي.....

“.....and what I did is not of my will....” (QS. Al-kahfi: 82)

If what done by Hidhir is not by his will, but Allah will, therefore what seen by Mūsa, in the essence, is not Hidhir's act but Allah's act. It give a new understanding that in this story Mūsa was not learned by Hidhir but he was learned by someone who has will of every Hidhir act that made Mūsa couldn't hold his patient, He is Allah s.w.t.

¹⁴ Quraish Shihab, P. 357

The story, of course, is not just a fairy tale read before sleep, as the Qur'an insists that the stories in it is a historical fact that has a lot of lessons to be learned in this life and the future. "*Indeed in their stories that there is a lesson for people who have sense (ulul albaab)...*". So, research of this story is very needed to earn new understandings from the story of Mūsa with Hidhir that's expected can give wider horizon of Islamic studies. Al-Ghozali said that the knowledge is can't be ended except by the death. As long as someone thinking and has willing to drill his thought, the knowledge will be earned by him until the end of his live.

So that, the writer doing this research as a media to drill his thought ability and to get new understanding about the story of Mūsa with Hidhir with an expectation, it can be useful for the writer himself and the reader.

B. Research Question

Based on the background the research question is divided into three, there are:

1. What is Mūsa's Epistemology?
2. What is Hidhir's Epistemology?
3. How is the correlation between Mūsa's and Hidhir's epistemology?

C. Aim and Significance of Research

Stand on the research question, the aim and the signification of this research are:

1. To know Mūsa's Epistemology.
2. To know Hidhir's Epistemology.
3. To know the correlation between Mūsa's and Hidhir's epistemology.

While, the significations of this research are as the following:

1. To strengthen the teleological for the mankind and in order to know more about the Qur'an deeply.
2. Give a new discourse in Islamic knowledge specially in philosophy.

D. Prior Research

From the literature survey by the writer of the story of Mūsa with Hidhir, the writer found several works that are relevant to this study. With shows such works, it's expected to see its difference with research that the writer did with the previous studies and to clarify the position of this research.

The book *al-risalah al-laduniyah* by Imam al-Ghazali translated into Indonesia by M. Yaniyullah. Al-Ghazali told that this story as the basis of learning ethic of student toward the teacher (*salik* and *mursyid*). He described the students attitude to the teacher like dry land be cascaded by heavy rain. The land will absorb the rain and it submissive to the rain. It means, when teacher was teaching, the student should be listening carefully and avoid his own argument. And if the student does not play the rule of his teacher, he did not accept the knowledge from his teacher. In the same way as Mūsa and Hidhir story.

In the book "*Ilmu Laduni dalam Perspektif teori belajar Modern*" by A. Busyairi Harith, mention this story as the embryo of laduni science term. In this work, he tried to dismantle the myth of science laduni to see it from perspective of modern learning theory. In the concluding chapter of this book, he concludes that laduni is a learning system that identic with intuitive learning, fast learning, precise, simple, a little difficulty, the result being a lot and be able to solve various problems.

While M. Quraish Shihab in "*Tafsir Al-Misbah: Pesan, Kesan dan Keserasian al-Qur'an*", Explains the story in the perspective of

interpretation. In his commentary, he did not name Hidhir, but he uses the term "pious servant of God". This story in the book peeled with a knife in order to show the semantic message and impression in the story with the linguistic analysis.

Broadly speaking, Quraish describe this story as a form of teaching of the pious servant to Mūsa, about the secret of deeds Hidhir which is unseen that is not revealed by God but on His servants whom He chooses. In addition, Quraish also cites the opinion of many scholars of tafsir in his attempt to interpret the words contained in the story.

Amru Kholid also discuss this story in his book entitled "*Kahawathir Quraniyah : Nazhrat Fi ahdaf Suwar al - Quran*" which was translated into Indonesian version became "*Pesona al-Quran dalam Merantai Surah dan ayat*", in one sub chapter he describes the story Mūsa and Khidr as how your lesson humans interact with destiny . He concludes that Allah s.w.t. can establish a business that wisdom and goodness we do not know .

Nining Sholatul Awaliyah, at 2006, also discuss this story in her thesis, *Nilai-Nilai Pendidikan Dalam Kisah Nabi Mūsa – Nabi KHidhir (Analisis Surat al-Kahfi Ayat 60 – 82)*. She use education perspective to approach this story. She conclude that from Mūsa and KHidhir story, we can learned about *hikmah* or lesson behind the destiny, knowledge of *nubuwwah*. Moreover, this story, show us a learning methodology like dialogue, study tour, lecture etc. that can be used in education world specially for Islamic education.

By analyzing previous studies that the writer mentioned above, the writer can conclude that previous studies are still struggling on transcendental issues and tends to touch the mystical and has less humanistic aspects. This causes the story to stop the related discourses of Sufi wisdom, *mursyid* and *salik* relationship, the *hakekat*, and destiny. As the results, lessons of this story hard to develop even tend to stagnant.

Therefore, the writer attempt to try to fill these shortcomings instead of giving a new color using philosophical perspectives that did not found yet on previous studies or research above. With the hope to open a new discourse, in Islamic Philosophy specially, or at least to stimulate further research related to this story.

E. Research Methodology

In order to get the right conclusion, then in the process of this writing using the following methods in its discussion:

1 . Method of Research

The research method used is a type of qualitative research that is technically do more stressing on text study, participant observation, and grounded research¹⁵.

In this research the writer would like to use philosophical approach which, according to Jhon Hick, has four key words as the characteristic of this approach, they are; Logic, Metaphysics, Epistemology and Ethic. Therefore, the writer used these four key words as a perspective on this research¹⁶.

2 . Methods of Data Collection

This research included to the study of literature (Library Research) research that the data collection methods based on literature books of scientific papers related to the issues to be discussed¹⁷ . In this case the

¹⁵ A. Hasan Asy'ari Ualam'I et.al, *Pedoman Penulisan Skripsi*, Fakultas Ushuludin IAIN Walisongo, Semarang, second printing, 2013, p. 25

¹⁶ <http://erlanmuliadi.blogspot.com/2011/04/pendekatan-filosofis-dalam-studi-islam.html> (retrieved at march 10th 2015)

¹⁷ Sutrisno Hadi, *Metode Research*, Yayasan Penerbit Fakultas Psikologi UGM, Yogyakarta, 1996, h. 7

writer distinguish source of the data into two, namely primary and secondary source.

For primary data source in this research are books that discuss the story of Mūsa with Hidhir, either in the form of commentaries or other types of books that still have a connection with the story. As for secondary sources, the writer use books on Islamic philosophy in the term of epistemology.

3. Techniques of Data Analysis

To interpret the story, the writer used *tahlili* method that effort to explain al-Quran by analyzing it sides and interpret it meaning. In this method, an interpreter have to interpret *ayah* by *ayah* or *surah* by *surah* followed with al-Quran arrangement.¹⁸

Moreover, the story of Mūsa with Hidhir in this research is a story that is contained in a text of QS. Al - Kahfi : 60-82 . Thus story could not be separated from the symbols of the text itself. Therefore, to reveal the meaning in this story, required analysis technique that can be used to unpack the meaning of the symbols. In this case, the writer uses discourse analysis techniques developed by Teun van Dijk¹⁹ .

In this technique, Van Dijk see a discourse consists of various structures / levels , which its part support each other . The structure consists of; *First* , Macro Structure which is a global meaning of a text that can be observed by looking topic of a text ; *Second* , The superstructure is a text frame , how to structure and discourse elements are arranged in the text as a whole ; *Third* , microstructure is the observed meaning by analyzing the words, sentences, propositions, and so on.²⁰

¹⁸ Muh. Nur Ikhwan, *Menjelajah Dunia al-Quran*, Toha Putra, Semarang, p. 247

¹⁹ Burhan Bungin, *Analisis Data Penelitian Kualitatif: Pemahaman Filosofis dan Metodologis ke Arah Penguasaan Model Aplikasi*, Rajawali Pers, Jakarta, 2008, P. 174-175

²⁰ *Ibid*

F. The Systematic of Writing

While The Systematic of Writing of this research is as follow:

CHAPTER I : this chapter explore about background of research, research questions, aim and signification of research, prior research, research methodology and the systematic of writing.

CHAPTER II : this chapter explore about definition of epistemology, sources of Islamic knowledge, Islamic knowledge mode, correlation among *bayâni*, *burhâni* and *'irfâni*.

CHAPTER III : this chapter explore about text and translation, background of story, macrostructure, superstructure and microstructure.

CHAPTER IV : this chapter explore about Mûsa's epistemology, Hidhir's epistemology and the correlation of both epistemology

CHAPTER V : this chapter explore about conclusion and suggestions.