

CHAPTER IV
MŪSA’S AND HIDHIR’S EPISTEMOLOGY AND CORRELATION
BETWEEN BOTH OF THEM

In this chapter the author presents an analysis to the contents of the story of Mūsa and Hidhir contained in the surah al-kahfi verses 60-82. The focus of the analysis is at the dialogue between Mūsa and Hidhir which is expected to answer the research wuestions presented in the first chapter.

A. Epistemology of Mūsa

As the author has explained the theoretical framework, which is meant by epistemology here is a discussion in the philosophy of knowing how to obtain true knowledge. So that, the epistemology of Mūsa here is how Mūsa obtains true knowledge. And from this, it can be seen how this kind of knowledge is possessed by Mūsa and also the background or reasons why Mūsa "failed" to run the terms proposed by Hidhir to him.

In this story, Mūsa’s epistemology can be analyzed from three questions asked by Mūsa to Hidhir, regarding to the behavior of Hidhir, whose questions are considered by Hidhir as Mūsa violation to the terms of the submission. The three questions can be described as follows:

1. Ship Leakage

فَانْطَلَقَا حَتَّىٰ إِذَا رَكِبَا فِي السَّفِينَةِ خَرَقَهَا قَالَ أَخَرَقْتَهَا لِتُغْرِقَ أَهْلَهَا لَقَدْ جِئْتَ شَيْئًا إِمْرًا

(71) قَالَ أَلَمْ أَقُلْ إِنَّكَ لَنْ تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا (72) قَالَ لَا تُؤَاخِذْنِي بِمَا نَسِيتُ وَلَا

تُرْهِقْنِي مِنْ أَمْرِي عُسْرًا (73) (الكهف : 71-73)

Meaning: So they both proceeded: until, when they were in the boat , he scuttled it. Said Moses: “Have you scuttled it in order to drown those in it? Truly a strange thing have you done!”. He answered: “Did I not tell you that you that you can have no patience with me?. Moses said: “Rebuke me not for

forgetting, nor grieve me by rising difficulties in my case¹⁴⁷.”
(QS. Al-Kahfi :71-73)

When Hidhir suddenly leaks the boat on which he was traveling with Mūsa, Mūsa immediately asks questions revealing his astonishment and disapproval of what is done by Hidhir. Mūsa’s question is the assessment of Hidhir’s actions. Of course, this assessment was based on knowledge possessed by Mūsa before. From these questions, it appears that Mūsa uses logic standpoint of syllogism thinking method. *"Why did you punch the boat that consequently you drown its passengers?" Indeed, you have done something big mistake.*" Mūsa revealed that the punch or the leak was the cause of the sinking of the boat and its passenger. The boats passenger sinking is a big mistake. So Mūsa concludes that leaking boat is a big mistake. Mūsa’s mindset can be briefly described as follows:

Leaking boat	= Sinking the passenger (Major Premise)
Sinking the passenger	= Big mistake (Minor Premise)
Leaking boat	= Big mistake (Conclusion)

Conclusion obtained by Mūsa is a true result of syllogism thinking system. The truth of this system is generated from the object captured by the senses which is then processed using the deduction of such information with the previous information. Therefore, this kind of thinking system cannot reach things that cannot be reached by means of the senses. In addition, this system also requires other prior information/knowledge to produce conclusions and therefore something which is brand new and has no prior knowledge about it (or a related) cannot be reached with this system. In fact, the knowledge offered by Hidhir to Mūsa is the knowledge that had never been known by Mūsa.

¹⁴⁷ ‘Abdullah Yusuf ‘Ali, *The Hoy Qur’an; text and Translation*, Islamic Book Trust, Kuala Lumpur, 2005, p. 353

Hidhir had told Mūsa that he cannot reach (be patient) to what will be taught by Hidhir. Here is Hidhir expression to the matter:

قَالَ إِنَّكَ لَنْ تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا (67) وَكَيْفَ تَصْبِرُ عَلَىٰ مَا لَمْ تُحِطْ بِهِ
خُبْرًا (68) (الكهف : 67-68)

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?”*¹⁴⁸
(QS. Al-Kahfi :67-68)

Because Mūsa’s question arises, Hidhir reaffirms that Mūsa was not able to be patient to follow. Although then Mūsa reasoned that what he did as he forgot his promise and asked Hidhir to understand. Hidhir also accepted the reason and still invited Mūsa to participate in the journey.

2. Teen Murder

فَانْطَلَقَا حَتَّىٰ إِذَا لَقِيَا غُلَامًا فَقَتَلَهُ قَالَ أَقْتَلْتَنِي بَعِيرٍ نَّفْسًا زَكِيَّةً بِغَيْرِ نَفْسٍ لَقَدْ جِئْتَ شَيْئًا نُكْرًا
(74) قَالَ أَلَمْ أَقُلْ لَكَ إِنَّكَ لَنْ تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا (75) قَالَ إِنْ سَأَلْتكَ عَنْ شَيْءٍ
بَعْدَهَا فَلَا تُصَاحِبْنِي فَدَ بَلَعْتَ مِنْ لُدِّي عُذْرًا (76) (الكهف : 74-76)

Meaning: *Then they proceeded: until, when they met a young man, he slew him. Moses said: “Have you slain an innocent person who had slain none? Truly a foul (unheard of) thing have you done!” He answered: “Did I not tell you that you that you can have no patience with me? Moses said: “If ever I ask you about anything after this, keep me no in your company: then would you have received (full) excuse from my side.”*¹⁴⁹” (QS. Al-Kahfi: 74-76)

¹⁴⁸ ‘Abdullah Yusuf ‘Ali, *The Hoy Qur’an...*, p. 352

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid*

At this incident, Mūsa was really surprised by what is done by Hidhir. Suddenly, when they both met a teenager, Hidhir killed the teenager who obviously did not take any action in front of them. Immediately, Mūsa returned to express his disagreement with Hidhir's behavior, he even expressed with *nukrâ* words that has worse meaning than words *imrâ* as in the event of previous ship leakage.

This is understandable, since the first incident which occurred as a result of Hidhir's speculative bad deeds, but this time the bad effect actually had occurred in the form of the death of an innocent teenager in Hidhir hand in front of Mūsa's eyes. To Mūsa, this is obviously a violation to the Shari'a of Allah. If in the previous case he claimed to forget his promise not to ask Hidhir, then in this case Mūsa really with full consciousness, as a prophet who brought the Shari'a of Allah, rejected action committed by Hidhir.

From the composition of Mūsa's question this time, it is clear that the protest against Hidhir was based on Shari'a reasoning. Mūsa judged that murder which is done by Hidhir as unjust act after confirming that the adolescent did not commit murder. It means that the murder carried out by Hidhir is murder for no apparent reason which is forbidden by law. It will be certainly different if the murder committed by Hidhir is a murder which is based on punishment for someone who has killed another person.

Of course, Mūsa considers the truth at this time as an absolute truth because it is based on knowledge of Allah swt in the form of revelation. In fact, it is quite contrary, what is regarded as an absolute truth by Mūsa is considered by Hidhir as second failure of Mūsa in running conditions proposed by Hidhir. This means, Mūsa's knowledge which was based on God's revelation cannot be used in the process of acquiring Hidhir's

knowledge. Once again, it asserted that Hidhirs knowledge is knowledge which is completely unreached by Mūsa.

Hearing Hidhir's rejection on his protest, Mūsa could only surrender and admit that what he saw in the incidence of innocent teenage murder is beyond the limits of science. Therefore, then Mūsa himself let Hidhir to leave him if he asked anything else to Hidhir. Although it was proven that Mūsa was not able to run the proposed terms of Hidhir, but he was given the opportunity by Hidhir to follow his journey.

3. Building Collapsed House

فَانطَلَقَا حَتَّى إِذَا أَتَبَا أَهْلَ قَرْيَةٍ اسْتَطَعَمَا أَهْلَهَا فَأَبَوْا أَنْ يُضَيِّقُوهَا فَوَجَدَا فِيهَا جِدَارًا يُرِيدُ أَنْ يَنْقُضَ فَأَقَامَهُ قَالَ لَوْ شِئْتَ لَاتَّخَذْتَ عَلَيْهِ أَجْرًا (77) قَالَ هَذَا فِرَاقُ بَيْنِي وَبَيْنِكَ سَأُنَبِّئُكَ بِتَأْوِيلِ مَا لَمْ تَسْتَطِعْ عَلَيْهِ صَبْرًا (78) (الكهف : 77-78)

Meaning: Then they proceeded: until when they came to the inhabitants of a town, they ask them for food, but they refused them hospitality. They found there a wall on the point of falling down, but he set it up straight. (Moses) said: "If you had wished, surely you could have exacted some recompense for it!" 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 patience.¹⁵⁰" (QS. Al-Kahfi: 77-78)

In this third incident Mūsa is actually indirectly asked Hidhir relating to what is done by Hidhir. Mūsa only advised on Hidhir to ask for reward for what he did to build the house which is almost collapsed. However, it should be noted that his suggestion contains question whether the advice is accepted or not. That is why Hidhir regarded this suggestion is a breaching commit to the terms of the submission.

¹⁵⁰ *ibid*, p. 353

Furthermore, from the suggestion that Mūsa disclosed, it can be seen that Mūsa was giving judgment on the action taken by Hidhir from habitus point of view. In Mūsa's knowledge, asking reward for the efforts already made to others is normal and acceptable customs. Moreover Hidhir did it in a place where the citizen has declined to help them both while they were asking for help to the citizen. Again, what was done by Mūsa with the basic knowledge that he had become a cause of his failure in running conditions proposed by Hidhir. This incident was the cause of separation between Hidhir and Mūsa, because Mūsa had promised to let Hidhir leave him if he asked question again to Hidhir.

Of the three questions in the events mentioned above, the author can know that the questions are appearing based on what is perceived by the Mūsa's senses and how Mūsa rationalizes it. Such knowledge, in Suhrawardi's language is called *'ilm husûlî*, namely knowledge acquisition which is achieved through human's initiative (*karsa*), either through language (definition), though (logic), or sensory perception. Meanwhile, according to Mehdi H. Yazdi, such knowledge is knowledge with correspondence.

When it's seen through Abid Al-Jabiri's point of view, Mūsa's knowledge can be simplified as follows: for the first and third incident, Mūsa's knowledge can be categorized as Burhani epistemology that uses language, though and perception of senses to achieve it. While for the second occurrence, such knowledge is included in Bayani epistemology whose acquisition is based on texts/revelation of God. Although when viewed from the acquisition of revelation is part of 'Irfani epistemology given directly by God. In this case the researcher sees Mūsa places revelation as a tool to justify the phenomenon he sees. From that, the researcher is more inclined to categorize it as Bayani epistemology.

B. Hidhir's Epistemology

After discussing the analysis of how Mūsa's epistemology is, the researcher's further intention in this study is to discuss Hidhir's epistemology which, in the background of this story, received recognition from Allah that he has a deeper knowledge than Mūsa. Because of the depth of his knowledge, Mūsa was commanded by God to learn from him. If Mūsa's epistemology can be analyzed from the questions he proposes, then Hidhir's epistemology can be analyzed from how God describes Hidhir's knowledge in the early story when Mūsa met Hidhir and Hidhir responded to Mūsa's question and explained *ta'wīl* of any events that happened to them both during the journey, as follows:

1. Description of Hidhir's knowledge

فَوَجَدَا عَبْدًا مِنْ عِبَادِنَا آتَيْنَاهُ رَحْمَةً مِنْ عِنْدِنَا وَعَلَّمْنَاهُ مِنْ لَدُنَّا عِلْمًا (65) قَالَ لَهُ مُوسَى

هَلْ آتَيْتَكَ عَلَى أَنْ تُعَلِّمَنِي مِمَّا عَلَّمْتَ رُشْدًا (66) قَالَ إِنَّكَ لَنْ تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا

(67) وَكَيْفَ تَصْبِرُ عَلَى مَا لَمْ تُحِطْ بِهِ خُبْرًا (68) قَالَ سَتَجِدُنِي إِنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ صَابِرًا وَلَا

أَعْصِي لَكَ أَمْرًا (69) قَالَ فَإِنِ اتَّبَعْتَنِي فَلَا تَسْأَلْنِي عَنْ شَيْءٍ حَتَّى أُحْدِثَ لَكَ مِنْهُ ذِكْرًا

(70) (الكهف : 65-70)

Meaning : *So they found one of our servants, on whom We had bestowed mercy from Ourselves and whom We had taught knowledge from Our own presence. 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?" (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?". Moses said: "You will find me, if Allah so wills, (truly) patient: nor shall I disobey you in aught." The other said: "If then you would follow me, ask me*

*no questions about anything until I myself speak to you concerning it.*¹⁵¹” (QS. Al-Kahf: 65-70)

In the verse, it is mentioned that both (Mūsa and his student) met the servant of God (Hidhir) and God has taught him knowledge from his side. From this description, it can be seen that who did teaching knowledge to the servant of God is God himself. It means that Hidhir’s knowledge is without intermediaries such as teacher because this knowledge presented directly at Hidhir from the main source of knowledge namely Allah swt.

According to Imam Jalaluddin, the term *علماء* is *maf’ul Tsani* which shows the knowledge received by Hidhir from God is the knowledge that deals with the problems of supernatural.¹⁵² Likewise, Ahmad al-Shawy, when giving an explanation in *tafsir Jalalain* for the interpretation of the knowledge of the unseen (*ma'luman min al-mughaiyyibat*), said that *من لدنا علماء* according to *ahli dhahir* is a God-given knowledge not by learning and not through teacher’s intermediaries.¹⁵³

Meanwhile, according to Abu al-Fida al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir, the sentence *و علمناه من لدنا علماء* is Hidhir the prophet to whom God specifically gives knowledge and not given to Mūsa. Al-Hidhir is "green prophet", who drang the water of life that arose purity, who still exists to recruit Sufis to the highest spiritualism and he is still alive on this earth. He was given the title "eye of the heart", namely God-gift knowledge (*‘ilmu Laduni*) through His presence.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵¹ *Ibid*, p. 342

¹⁵² Imam Jalaluddin al-Mahally, *op. cit.*, p. 383

¹⁵³ Ahmad al-Shawy al-Maliki, *Hasyiyah al-'Alamah al-Shawy 'ala Tafsir al-Jalalain*, Jilid 3, (Beirut, Libanon : Darul Fikr, t.th), p. 20

¹⁵⁴ Amatullah Amstrong, *Sufi Terminologi (al-Qamus al-Sufi) The Mystical Language of Islam, Book Four*, Noorden, United State of America, 1995, p. 117.

The opinions of the commentators above confirm that the knowledge possessed by Hidhir is the knowledge that God gave to His chosen servant without intermediaries of teachers. Therefore, how to get the knowledge is not to look for it, but rather to wait for the mercy of God to give this knowledge directly to His servants. In addition, the knowledge possessed by Hidhir is the knowledge dealing with unseen things that certainly cannot be achieved by ordinary human senses.

After Mūsa met Hidhir, he then expressed his intention to learn from Hidhir about what was taught to him. Hidhir did not take for granted the petition of Mūsa, even he said that Mūsa will not be able to be patient with him. Hidhir reinforced his message by asking, *"And how are you able to wait for something, that you do not have enough knowledge about it?"*. Mūsa responded to this with full confidence that he can be patient together with Hidhir under the permission of Allah.

Seeing Mūsa's great effort to convince Hidhir to allow him to go with him (Hidhir), finally Hidhir allowed Mūsa to follow in the condition that he would not ask anything about what will happen on their journey until Hidhir himself would explain it to him. Mūsa agreed to the terms and the two began to travel as Mūsa expected.

With the provisos above, the Hidhir's previous question become very interesting. If the question is combined with the conditions proposed by Hidhir, then the question becomes "How can you be patient (to not ask me) on something you do not have knowledge yet about it?" This shows that Mūsa will not be able to acquire new knowledge from Hidhir if he questioned Hidhir's knowledge. In other words, Hidhir signaled that Mūsa would not get new knowledge if he opposes it with the knowledge that has been owned by Mūsa.

Epistemologically, there are some interesting things from it. It's explained that Mūsa had never known about the knowledge possessed by

Hidhir. On the other hand, the knowledge possessed by Mūsa is knowledge gained through correspondence as the researcher explained in the previous analysis. Later, it is explained that Mūsa will not get knowledge of Hidhir if he uses his own knowledge. Therefore, the researcher can briefly reveal that Mūsa will not get knowledge of Hidhir through correspondence method, therefore, the knowledge possessed by Hidhir is not the kind of correspondence knowledge.

2. Hidhir's Responses to Mūsa's Questions

As explained earlier, Mūsa failed to meet the conditions proposed by Hidhir. He asked three different questions and which are actually a form of justification of Mūsa against Hidhir's actions that cause him separated from Hidhir. Those questions also described how epistemology building owned by Mūsa is.

Responding to the question, Hidhir said:

قَالَ أَمْ أَفْلَأِنِ إِنَّكَ لَنْ تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا (الكهف : 72) قَالَ أَمْ أَفْلَأِنِ لَكَ إِنَّكَ لَنْ

تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا (الكهف : 75)

Meaning: *He answered: "Did I not tell you that you that you can have no patience with me?"... He answered: "Did I not tell you that you that you can have no patience with me?"¹⁵⁵*. (QS al-Kahf: 72 & 75)

قَالَ هَذَا فِرَاقُ بَيْنِي وَبَيْنِكَ سَأُنَبِّئُكَ بِتَأْوِيلِ مَا لَمْ تَسْتَطِعْ عَلَيْهِ صَبْرًا (78)

(الكهف : 78)

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 patience."¹⁵⁶* (QS al-Kahfi: 78)

¹⁵⁵ 'Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali, *The Hoy Qur'an...* p. 352

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid*, p. 353

Three Hidhir's responses to Mūsa's questions are basically showed Hidhir rejection to all arguments of truth proclaimed by Mūsa. Arguments which are based on logic reason and sensory perception, as the researcher explained in the previous section, are not able to attain Hidhir's knowledge. Interestingly, although Hidhir considers the questions of Mūsa as a violation of the conditions he determined, Hidhir did not give justification that what was done by Mūsa is "wrong" or "right". Though, Mūsa obviously gave "wrong" justification to the deeds done by Hidhir. Generally, when there is a denial to a justification certainly there will be opposition to such justification.

In response, it should be kept in mind that the possible knowledge to produce a justification must have objects which are outside of subject knowledge. If the correspondence between the subject and the object produces a resemblance, then the output is "true". Conversely, if the correspondence produced by the subject and object forms contradiction, then the output is "wrong". True-false dualism will always include the pattern of knowledge using correspondence. In fact, the result of the previous analysis says that the knowledge possessed by Hidhir is knowledge about something *ghoib* that is not possible for correspondence. Therefore we can conclude that one of characteristics of Hidhir's knowledge is that his knowledge does not recognize dualism "right-wrong".

Seeing some above analysis, the researcher can summarize how the characteristics of Hidhir's knowledge from which we can conclude how his epistemology is. *First*, Hidhir's knowledge is given by Allah swt directly, without intermediaries of the ratio or sensory perceptions, therefore the only key to gain this knowledge is "patiently" waiting for the All-Knowing bestows knowledge, as Hidhir expressed requirement on Mūsa to be patient when he followed Hidhir in order to get a lesson

from him. *Second*, Hidhir's knowledge is about *Ghoibiyat*, which means that his knowledge is a kind of knowledge that does not have an object in the form of senses-data which is represented into the subject. Therefore Hidhir said, "*How can you be patient with something that you have no knowledge of it?*" *Third*, the existence of the second characteristics which says that Hidhir's knowledge does not recognize dualism of "right-wrong". It is due to the dualism possibly emerges with the correspondence process which requires the existence of sensory data representation in the subject. From the third characteristic, it is understandable why Hidhir rejected "truths" which were delivered by Mūsa, not because Hidhir considers Mūsa 'wrong', but because the knowledge of Hidhir does not know the "right" or "wrong".

After learning some of the characteristics of Hidhir's knowledge above, the researcher can conclude that so far, epistemology theory which can explain Hidhir's knowledge is epistemology of *'ilm al-huduri* whose term was first coined by Suhrawardi, a knowledge that emphasizes on self-cleaning as a mean to get an abundance of self-knowledge through direct teaching from Allah swt, which is called epistemology *'Irfani* in terms of Abid al-Jabri, even though the term is more general than *ilmu al-hudûri*.

C. Correlation between Mūsa's and Hidhir's Epistemology

After knowing each epistemology of Mūsa and Hidhir, further intention of this study is to determine how the correlation between epistemology owned by both. In the researcher's perspective, the correlation between the two epistemology can be analyzed through Mūsa's and Hidhir's explanation of the events that made Mūsa was not able to be patient to convey

his "truths". In his explanation, there is transformation of knowledge from Hidhir to Mūsa, as follows:

أَمَّا السَّفِينَةُ فَكَانَتْ لِمَسَاكِينَ يَعْمَلُونَ فِي الْبَحْرِ فَأَرَدْتُ أَنْ أَعِيبَهَا وَكَانَ وَرَاءَهُمْ مَلِكٌ يَأْخُذُ كُلَّ سَفِينَةٍ غَصْبًا (79) وَأَمَّا الْعُلَامُ فَكَانَ أَبَوَاهُ مُؤْمِنِينَ فَخَشِينَا أَنْ يُرْهَقَهُمَا طُغْيَانًا وَكُفْرًا (80) فَأَرَدْنَا أَنْ يُبْدِلَهُمَا رَبُّهُمَا خَيْرًا مِنْهُ زَكَاءً وَأَقْرَبَ رُحْمًا (81) 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 (82)

(الكهف : 79-82)

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.¹⁵⁷” (QS al-Kahfi : 79-82)

After Mūsa was not able to hold his temper to ask Hidhir, finally Hidhir said farewell to him and explained the purpose of all the events experienced by them both. In Hidhir’s explanation of these events, there are interesting things that can be used as the key in this discussion. First,

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid*, p. 353-354

there are differences in the use of pronouns that were referred to the verb 'Arada in the explanation of each incident as if it shows different actors on the actions that are clearly, in this story, performed by Hidhir. In the first incident, Hidhir used pronoun *tu* indicating that the perpetrator of leaking boat was indeed Hidhir and indeed at his will. While at the time Hidhir explained teenage murder, he used the pronoun *na*, which means there is other actor who is willing together with Hidhir in the incident, namely Allah. For the third event, Hidhir no longer used pronouns in his explanation, but Hidhir directly mentioned who wished in the event of the construction of collapse house with word *rabbuka*.

Second, after he explained the purpose of all these events by stating that the owner of will varies, at the end of his explanation he said: "*wa ma fa'altuhu 'an Amri*. The statement seemed as if it has contradiction with the explanation. In the explanation, Hidhir involved himself and God as the owner of will of the events there, this statement actually states that Hidhir did not have the will to act.

According to M. Quraish Shihab, in the incident of ship holing, Hidhir mentioned himself who has willing because ship holing is clearly bad deed, therefore it is not in good if depending bad deed to Allah. Whereas, in child murder there are two willing; willing of child murder with a bad intention which is 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 depended the willing to Allah because rebuilding the house is clearly a good deed¹⁵⁸.

Above explanation of Quraish Shihab confirms that Hidhir actually did not have the will in the actions he did. Whereas, depending the will into his self is merely an ethical attitude towards Allah because it really does not

¹⁵⁸ Quraish Shihab, P. 357

deserve anything bad to rely on Allah. Therefore, in his explanation, Mūsa involved himself in wills of all the incidents and rely all the good will on Allah s.w.t.

Based on this analysis, it means Hidhir really knows the will of Allah in every action he did. How he can know the will of God which is unseen is what is called *'ilmu Hudhûri*; Hidhir's epistemology. It is knowledge which cannot be achieved by efforts to gain but to wait the mercy of Allah swt giving that knowledge to those whom He wishes, a knowledge that has no external object and does not allow dualism of right or wrong, as like it is impossible to say right or wrong on the will of Allah the Almighty.

Therefore, Hidhir's knowledge of God's will does not have an external object and is a gift directly from God, that knowledge cannot be owned by people who are not endowed with knowledge as like Mūsa. On the other hand, Hidhir had difficulties conveying his knowledge of the will of God to Mūsa, even impossible to say because his knowledge does not have an external object that can be digested by the epistemology of Mūsa. As for all the explanations of Hidhir to Mūsa about God's will are just an attempt to express his knowledge to Mūsa by the method of correspondence that can be received by Mūsa.

It is therefore understandable, even though Hidhir has explained the purpose of all his actions that constitute the will of God, Mūsa was only pensive looking Hidhir's departure leaving scientific mystery. It happened because what was known by Mūsa is simply the expression of Hidhir on Mūsa's knowledge, not knowledge which is actually possessed by Hidhir. Easy analogy of this explanation is like a man who sees another man who is feeling and tasting spicy chili. What is known by the first man actually is just an expression of the man tasting spicy flavor of chili, spicy flavor that is not known to him.

The analysis shows that the relationship between epistemology of Mūsa (knowledge with correspondence/*'ilm husulî*) with Hidhir's epistemology (knowledge of the presence/*'ilm hudhurî*). And the relationship meant here is a cause-effect relationship in terms of illumination and emanation, namely a relation that describes the reliance or dependence of a being whose existence comes from the higher being. Relationships like these in Islamic philosophy are called illuminative relation. Thus, Hidhir's knowledge of the will of Allah becomes the cause of his knowledge about the will of God which was delivered to Mūsa.