


## Comparative Study of Hamka and Quraish Shihab's Interpretation: Application of Gadamer's Hermeneutics in Qs. Al-Maidah [5]: 51

I'Syatul Lutfi<sup>1</sup>, Raisa Zuhra Salsabila Awaluddin<sup>2\*</sup>, Safri Nurjannah<sup>3</sup>,  
Moh. Isbat Alfani Ghoffari<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,3</sup> Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

<sup>2,4</sup> Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatra Utara, Medan, Indonesia

 [isyatullutfi97@gmail.com](mailto:isyatullutfi97@gmail.com)\*

 10.33086/jic.v4i2.3584

Keywords	Abstract
Hamka, Quraish Shihab, Gadamer	Hamka and Quraish Shihab have a different understanding of the interpretation of QS. al-Maidah [51]. Hamka interprets this verse as an absolute prohibition of making non-Muslims as leaders. While Quraish Shihab interprets this verse not as an absolute prohibition, so that Quraish Shihab argues may make non-Muslims as leaders with certain conditions. This article will analyze the factors causing the differences in their interpretations with Gadamer's hermeneutic approach. Gadamer's hermeneutics is chosen because for Gadamer the result of understanding or interpretation is strongly influenced by the author's pre-understanding and context. In analyzing an interpretation, Gadamer considers four things, namely Consciousness Influenced by History, Pre-understanding, Hermeneutic Circle and assimilation and Application. After analyzing the interpretations of Hamka and Quraish Shihab using Gadamer's Hermeneutics theory, it can be concluded that the differences in their interpretations are influenced by the context of their lives and different educational backgrounds. Hamka lived when political relations in Indonesia between Muslims and non-Muslims were tense. Meanwhile, Quraish Shihab lived when politics in Indonesia was no longer heated and the lives of Muslims and non-Muslims in Indonesia were harmonious. Analysis of interpretation by considering the author's horizon encourages the creation of objectivity in assessing a work of interpretation.

Keywords	Abstract
Hamka, Quraish Shihab, Gadamer	Hamka dan Quraish Shihab memiliki pemahaman yang berbeda mengenai penafsiran QS. al-Maidah [51]. Hamka menafsirkan ayat ini sebagai larangan mutlak menjadikan non-Muslim sebagai pemimpin. Sedangkan Quraish Shihab menafsirkan ayat ini bukan sebagai larangan mutlak, sehingga Quraish Shihab berpendapat boleh menjadikan non-Muslim sebagai pemimpin dengan syarat tertentu. Artikel ini akan menganalisis faktor-faktor penyebab perbedaan penafsiran mereka dengan pendekatan hermeneutika Gadamer. Hermeneutika Gadamer dipilih karena bagi Gadamer hasil pemahaman atau interpretasi sangat di pengaruhi oleh prapemahaman dan konteks pengarang. Dalam menganalisis sebuah interpretasi, Gadamer mempertimbangkan empat hal, yaitu Consciousness Influenced by History, Pre-understanding, Hermeneutic Circle and assimilation and Application. Setelah menganalisis penafsiran Hamka dan Quraish Shihab menggunakan teori Hermeneutika Gadamer dapati disimpulkan bahwa perbedaan penafsiran mereka dipengaruhi oleh konteks kehidupn dan backroug pendidikan yang berbeda. Hamka hidup saat hubungan politik di Indonesia antar Muslim dan non-Muslim tengah tegang. Sedangkan Quraish Shihab hidup di saat politik di Indonesia tidak lagi memanas dan kehidupan muslim dan non-muslim di Indonesia sudah harmonis. Analisis penafsiran dengan mempertimbangkan horizon pengarang mendorong terciptanya objektif dalam menilai sebuah karya tafsir.

*Received: November 11, 2022. Revised: January 29, 2023. Accepted: February 3, 2023*

## 1. Introduction

Hamka and Quraish Shihab are Indonesian exegetes who live in the 21st century. Their commentary books, namely *Tafsir al-Azhar* and *Tafsir al-Misbah*. They are categorized as contemporary interpretations because their interpretations do not only explain the textual meaning of a verse but give a re-meaning of a verse related to the situation where the Qur'an is interpreted (Hidayati, 2018, p. 407). Hamka, for example, interprets the stone brought by the bird of Ababil to destroy Abraham's army in QS. al-Fiil/105: 4, as a smallpox epidemic that hit the people of Mecca, Hamka contextualizes the verse with the case of the Bird Flu that hit Indonesia (Hamka, 2007).

Slightly different from Hamka, Quraish Shihab is not eager to contextualize the meaning of the verse in an Indonesian context. The contextualization built by Quraish Shihab is based on the opinion of contemporary scholars such as Muhammad Abduh and Ash-Sya'rawi. Just like Hamka, Quraish Shihab also explained the textual meaning of the verse and then developed its meaning with the context in which the verse was interpreted. For example, in interpreting QS. al-Fiil[105]:5, Quraish Shihab quoted Muhammad Abduh's opinion that the Ababil bird is not interpreted as a literal meaning: a bird, but a type of animal that can fly and carry germs, so that when humans touch the animal or touch what the animal touches, will result in injury leading to death (M. Q. Shihab, 2002a).

Although both figures were born in Indonesia and categorized as contemporary tafsir, the two works have very significant differences in some interpretations. In interpreting QS. al-Maidah [5]: 51, Hamka interprets it textually instead of contextually, which characterizes contemporary interpretation, so he argues that Muslims cannot be non-Muslims as leaders. Meanwhile, according to Quraish Shihab, the prohibition is not absolute by considering several aspects. Differences in interpretation in a work of interpretation are not infrequently used as an object of comparison against other works of interpretation, giving rise to a haphazard assessment of a work of interpretation such as: not contemporary because it does not contextualize verses according to the times because lately there is an adage that is silent that the characteristics of contemporary interpretation are to contextualize verses according to the times, whereas differences in interpretation are inevitable and cannot be avoided (Alwi HS, 2017).

Instead of determining which work of tafsir is the most correct and which is a contemporary tafsir, it would be much more academic to look for the reasons behind the differences in the interpretations of Hamka and Quraish Shihab. One of the theoretical tools used to analyze the text is Gadamer's hermeneutics. In his theory, Gadamer assumes that understanding is not a reconstruction of meaning but a mediation, so understanding cannot be used to determine truth. Truth is the starting point of entering a transmission event where the past and present are always connected (Kushidayati, 2014). He emphasized that the method is not a way to truth but an ontological process in human beings (A.P. Kau, 2014). Suppose Gadamer's hermeneutics is applied to read the differences between Hamka's and Quraish Shihab's interpretations. In that case, such judgments are not contemporary because they need to contextualize, and verses will not surface because each author or author has their horizon (Hasanah, 2017).

Although the two figures were born in Indonesia and categorized as contemporary interpretations, the two works still have very significant differences. For example, the difference in interpreting QS. al-Maidah [5]: 51. Hamka interprets the verse as an absolute prohibition on taking non-Muslim leaders, while according to Quraish Shihab, the prohibition is not absolute. The difference in understanding the text, in this case, is QS. al-Maidah [5]: 51 if this is seen from Gadamer's hermeneutics, then it is strongly influenced by the tradition, culture, and life experience of a commentator in the sense of the texts outlined in the process of interpreting the text. A particular context must influence interpretation (Rahmatullah, 2017). Related to this study, researchers will analyze the life experiences of Hamka and Quraish Shihab and how the impact of their life

experiences on the interpretation of QS. al-Maidah [5]: 51? The study of the interpretation of Hamka and Quraish Shihab on QS. al-Maidah [5]: 51 has been discussed by some previous researchers. For example, Jaka Ghianovan's research entitled *Choosing non-Muslim leaders in the Qur'an: a study of Al-Azhar's interpretation and Tafsir al-Mishbah*, Jaka, in his article only describes the differences and similarities between the two figures. Furthermore, Abd. Kholid et al., *Re-reading the interpretation of the Indonesian Qur'an about Auliya': the case of Hamka and M. Quraish Shihab*, Jaka's article is similar, Kholid also only conducts a descriptive analysis of the two mufasir and concludes the permissibility and impermissibility between the two. So far, the interpretation of Hamka and Quraish Shihab regarding QS. al-Maidah [5]: 51 has only been discussed, and no one has analyzed the reasons behind the differences. Therefore, this article seeks to analyze these reasons as well as will show that the truth of an interpretation is very subjective.

Regarding this study, the researchers will answer two critical research questions: How is the life experience of Hamka and Quraish Shihab? What is their life experience's impact on the interpretation of the QS. al-Maidah[5]:51? These two questions are important to discuss so that readers can be more objective in viewing the differences in the interpretation of the two figures. Regarding Hamka and Quraish Shihab's interpretation of QS. al-Maidah [5]: 51 has been discussed by previous researchers. For example, Jaka Ghianovan's research entitled *Memilih pemimpin non-muslim dalam al-Qur'an: studi tafsir al-Azhar dan Tafsir al-Mishbah* examines the differences between the two figures. Abd. Kholid, *Rereading the Indonesian interpretation of the Qur'an on Awliya': the cases of Hamka and M. Quraish Shihab*, who reread the interpretation of Hamka and Quraish Shihab with Gracia's hermeneutic. They conclude that it is permissible to appoint non-Muslim leaders without suspicion of him. From several studies mentioned above, it can be highlighted that the study on the reasons for the different interpretations of Hamka and Quraish Shihab on QS. Al-Maidah [5]:51 still needs to be discussed. Therefore, this article attempt to be a complement to previous research as well as enrich the study of the interpretation of the al-Quran.

## 2. Methods

This study uses qualitative methods and data collection using library research. The author, in this case, uses Gadamer's hermeneutic approach. In the initial discussion, the author will explain the two commentators' biographies and describe the QS's interpretation. al-Maidah[5]:51. After getting the new data, the writer conducted an analysis using Gadamer's hermeneutic approach. In this theory, four things must be done to understand Allah's message. The author only mentions two theories in this interpretation: the theory of consciousness, influenced by history, and the theory of pre-understanding. The primary source in this study come from articles and books that discuss Gadamer's Hermeneutics, Quraish Shihab and Hamka, Like *Tafsir Al-Azhar* by Haji Abdul Malik (Hamka, 2007) then *Tafsir Al-Mishbah* by Quraish Shihab (Q. Shihab, 2010), and *Menakar Hermeneutika Fusion of Horizons H.G. Gadamer Dalam Pengembangan Tafsir Maqasid Alquran* by Rahmatullah. (Rahmatullah, 2017) the secondary source comes from articles and books like *Kepemimpinan Non-Muslim: Penafsiran Surat Al-Maidah Ayat 51 dalam Tafsir Al-Azhar dan Tafsir Al-Mishbah* by Muhammad Wahyudi (Wahyudi, 2019) then *Biografi dan Pemikiran Hamka tentang Nasionalisme Tahun 1950-1975* by Asep Muhammad Abduh (Abduh, 2019) and *M. Quraish Shihab dan Rasionalisasi Tafsir* by Afrizal Nur (Nur, 2012a).

In the first stage of analyzing the interpretation of Hamka and Quraish Shihab in QS. Al-Maidah [5]: 51, then make a comparison in the interpretation. Finally, it is applied to Gadamer's Hermeneutics approach and the two figures until a conclusion is reached using the theory of Consciousness Influenced by History and Pre-Understanding. The material object in this article is the interpretation of Hamka and Quraish Shihab related to QS. Al-Maidah [5]: 51, while the formal object

is books and articles related to the history of the two figures. The primary reference used to understand Gadamer's hermeneutic theory is the book *Al-Quran Hermeneutics and its Development* by Sahiron and journals related to it.

### **3. Results and Discussion**

#### **Hamka Biography**

Haji Abdul Malik bin Abdul Karim Amrullah is one of the literary figures known as Buya Hamka. Born on February 16 1908 M or 14 Muharram 1326 H in Sungai Batang Village on the shores of Lake Maninjau, West Sumatra. He was given the title Buya, a nickname for the Minangkabau people, which in Arabic means father or can be interpreted as a person who is respected in his time. He was respected in his time, inseparable from his father's role, a prominent cleric in Minangkabau, who became the founder of the Minangkabau "kaum muda" and the pioneer of the Tajdid Islamic movement in Minangkabau known as "Haji Rosul." His father's full name is Dr. H. Abdul Karim Amrullah, and he belongs to the lineage of Abdul Arif, who holds the title Tuanku Pauh Pariaman Nan Tuo. Meanwhile, Shafiyah bint Bagindo nan Batuah is the mother of Hamka, who died in 1934 (Abduh, 2019).

Hamka had a nickname when he was a child, Abdul Malik. His first education started at his house by reciting the Qur'an to his parents. Then in 1914, M and their family moved from Maninjau to Padang Panjang, where the place they were going to occupy was the basis for the Minangkabau youth movement. In 1916, Abul Malik was seven years old. He had activities in the afternoon, where he attended diniyah at the Pasar Usang Padang Panjang school while he recited from his parents in the evening (Sri Andayani, 2019, p. 14).

When Hamka was 10, he was transferred to a madrasah in Java, where his father taught religion. The system of teaching methods used initially used the old method. Over time, Hamka's father turned it into a new teaching method and named it Thawalib School. During his four years as a student at Thawalib School, Hamka had a critical character. He felt that learning activities at the place could have been more enjoyable. He felt bored and wanted to continue once he graduated from this madrasah. He felt that the seriousness of studying at Thawalib School did not grow from the inside, but it was forced from the outside. Even though the latest system had been used, in terms of the curriculum and learning methods, they still used the old methods, including old books, and memorizing was one of the characteristics of this school. For that reason, Hamka moved to the Zainaro library, which Zainuddin Labei el-Yunusi and Bagindo Sinaro founded. The forerunner of Hamka's intelligence started from this library. He could imagine, read and write without any external pressure. In addition, he was also sent to study at the Sayikh Ibrahim Musa Parabek school in Parabek high school. So in 1924, Hamka left his hometown to study in Yogyakarta. It can be concluded that Hamka's formal education took about seven years (Alfiyah, 2017, pp. 25–35).

His activities as a teacher began when Hamka was 29 years old (1957-1958 M). He taught at the Islamic University of Jakarta and Muhammadiyah University in Padang Panjang. He was once trusted to be the rector of the Jakarta Islamic University and served as a professor at Mustopo University, Jakarta. He passed away on July 24, 1981, in Jakarta and is remembered as a writer and a religionist because of his Qur'anic interpretation (Hidayati, 2018, pp. 25–42).

#### **Biography of Quraish Shihab**

Muhammad Qurais Shihab was born on February 16, 1944 in Si Dendeng Rampang Regency, South Sulawesi. He is in a family of educated Arab descent and is a devout Muslim. When he was young, he was able to follow his father while teaching at various educational institutions. In addition, from 6-7 years old, he was required to listen to his father teach the Qur'an. It can be seen that his

father had taught him how to study al-Qur'an and how to teach it to others. Besides the role of the mother figure, the father figure, namely Abdurrahman Shihab, also shaped his personality and scientific spirit. Quraish Shihab's father, Abdurrahman Shihab (1905-1986), was a Tafsir IAN Alaudin Ujung Pandang professor. He was appointed as the rector of the campus. On the other hand, he was also the founder of the Indonesian Muslim University (UMI). Quraish Shihab was a rector at IAIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta (1995-1998). It can be concluded that perhaps the saying "the fruit does not fall far from the tree" is true (Iqbal, 2010, p. 250).

Ujung Pandang is the hometown of M. Quraish Shihab and his first place of study. After that, he continued his secondary education at the Dar al-hadith al-Fiqhiyah Islamic boarding school in Malang. In 1958 he studied at Al-Azhar, Egypt, the Faculty of Ushuluddin, majoring in Hadith interpretation. In 4 years, Quraish Shihab completed his Bachelor's (S1) in the interpretation of hadith and received an Lc degree in 1967. Additionally, he continued his education with the same faculty. Therefore, he completed a thesis with the title *al-I'jaz al -Tayri' li al-Qur'an al-Karim* and an MA degree in the concentration of Qur'anic Tafsir science (Nur, 2012 b).

M. Quraish Shihab resumed his education in 1980 at the same university with the same faculty. Again in a short time, within two years, he completed a dissertation with the title *Nazma al-Durar li al-Baq'a'i Tahqiq wa Dirasah* and got a doctorate in the study of the science of the Qur'an. In addition, he received an award (Mumtaz Ma'a Martbat al-syaraf al-Ula) with a degree of Summa Cumlaude, as well as being the first person in Southeast Asia to receive the title.

In 1984 M. Quraish Shihab returned to Indonesia, assigned to the Faculty of Ushuluddin and Postgraduate IAIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta. He served as Chancellor at the campus, as Chairman of the Central Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI) in 1984, and as a member of the Lajnah Pentashih al-Qur'an of the Ministry of Religion since 1989. Additionally, he was appointed Minister of Religion in 1998, and most recently, he was the Indonesian Ambassador to Egypt on 17 February 1999 (Wartini, 2014, p. 111).

### **Hamka's Interpretation of QS. al-Maidah {5}: 51**

In his interpretation, Hamka explained that for people who believe it is their duty not to hand over leadership matters to people outside their group, namely Jews and Christians. According to him, the attitude of making them leaders is not a solution to the problems that occur in the body of the Muslims. On the contrary, taking the Jews and Christians as leaders will make it difficult for the Muslims (Mubarok, 2019, p. 85). For Hamka, although Jews and Christians hate each other because of their different beliefs, they herd to become one unit in this matter when facing Islam. (Hamka, 2007, p. 1761) This statement was explained when Hamka interpreted QS. al-Miadah [5]: 51. The complete interpretation of QS.al-Maidah [5]:51 is as follows: *Yā ayyuhallāzīna āmanu lā tattakhizul-yahūda wan-naṣārā auliyā`, ba'duhum auliyā`u ba'd, wa may yatawallahum mingkum fa innahu min-hum, innallāha lā yahdil-qaumaz-zālimīn*. It means, "O you who believe! Do not take Jews and Christians as leaders; some of them are leaders of some. And whoever makes them a leader among you, then indeed he is one of them. Verily, Allah will not guide the unjust people."

According to Hamka, the verse above clearly indicates for whom, namely those who believe. It means that whoever claims to be a believer does not take the leader from the Jews and Christians. In understanding Judaism and Christianity, Hamka relates them to some history, such as what happened in Bandung during the election of members of the Constitutional Body. Representatives from Islamic parties want to form a constitution consisting of seven sentences 'With the obligation to carry out Islamic law for its adherents.' However, this was met with opposition from several groups. Even the Catholic, Protestant, National Party, Social Party, and Communist Party mutually supported and

united to bring down Islam, even though they have different ideologies and interests (Farid, 2017, p. 43). Hamka also related it to the history of the state of Israel, which was finally able to stand with the help of Christians in an Islamic state. At that time, Jews and Christians supported each other against Islam, even though their ideologies differed. Jews believed that Jesus was the child of adultery, while Christians believed Jesus was the son of God (Hamka, 2007, pp. 1762–1763).

Then Hamka explained the meaning of the verse "*And whoever makes them a leader*" those people choose a leader because they like the leader. Even though they like individuals of different religions, it is not official that he leaves his religion. Then Hamka quoted Hudzaifah bin al-Yaman's words: Be careful one of you will become a Jew and a Christian, while he does not know. Therefore, if someone made them a leader, he has been included in the group of people whom he appointed as the leader (Hamka, 2007, pp. 1762–1763).

The last word is, "Indeed Allah will not guide the sinners." According to Hamka, this word is understood that people who choose Jews and Christians as leaders are sinners. The word sinners (*zalim*) means "dark," so they are classified as people who choose the dark path, so there is no light from Allah. Hamka argues that QS Al-Maidah verse 51 prohibits believers from making people who are hostile to us, Jews and Christians, become leaders. Hamka strengthens his understanding with one of the principles of Usul Fiqh: 'What is seen is the general meaning of the words, not the specific cause.' So that this prohibition applies forever in order to maintain the teachings of Islam (Wahyudi, 2019, p. 177).

### **Quraish Shihab's Interpretation of the QS. al-Maidah {5}:51**

In the interpretation of Al-Misbah, Quraish Shihab interprets the meaning of words in a verse in detail so that a broad understanding of the words in the verse to be interpreted can be obtained (Wahyudi, 2019, p. 117).

In interpreting these verses, Quraish Shihab begins his first sentence with, "If the situation of Jews and Christians or anyone, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, has the nature as described in verse, which is to turn Muslims away from what Allah has prescribed, then do not take it. They as *auliya* (close friends)". Whoever makes those hostile to Islam as *auliya*, he is indeed part of it. After explaining the context of this verse, only then did Quraish Shihab interpret the texts in verse. The word *tattakhizu* (you take) is taken from the word *akhaza* which means to take, but in its use, the word can contain many meanings according to the word or letter mentioned after it. For example, the word called after "book" means "to take". If it is a "gift" or "offering", then it means "accept". If "safety", it means "destroyed". The word *ittakhaza* is understood as relying on something to deal with something else. If so, does the verse prohibit a Muslim from relying on a non-Muslim? Not absolutely, because it is prohibited here to make them *auliya*" in a specific context (M. Q. Shihab, 2002a).

In the Indonesian translation of the Koran, the word *auliya* is translated as the leader. This translation needs to be corrected. The word *auliya*" is the plural form of the word *wali*. This word has the basic meaning of close. Then develop new meanings, such as supporters, defenders, protectors, and more essential. These are bound by a common thread of closeness, like a father is a guardian of his daughter. People who are obedient and diligent in worship are called *wali* because of their closeness to Allah. Likewise, a leader should be close to those he leads. All the meanings stated above can be covered by the word *auliya*" (M. Q. Shihab, 2002b).

Quraish Shihab quoted the opinion of Thabathaba'i. He explained that in obedience, *auliya* is a closeness to something that makes the boundary between the approachable disappear. If the context is help and piety, then *auliya* means helper. If in the context of association, then *auliya* means soul attraction that makes a person unable to help but be attracted to him, fulfill his will and follow his orders. If in the context of association, then *auliya* means his will and following his orders. If in the context of family, *auliya* is an heir who cannot prevent inheritance. Thabathaba'i says that in this

verse, Allah does not explain the prohibition in what context so that it can be understood in the sense of everything. However, this verse's continuation states, "We are afraid of disaster".

After explaining at length the meaning of auliya, Quraish Shihab explained the position of non-Muslims by quoting Muhammad Sayyid Thantawi's opinion that non-Muslims can be divided into three groups. First, those who live in peace and do not carry out activities for the benefit of opponents of Islam, and there are no signs that lead to prejudice against them. Second, groups that fight or harm Muslims in various ways should not be approached or have a relationship with them. Third, groups that are not openly hostile to Muslims, but they do not sympathize with the Muslims and sympathize with the enemies of Islam. Against them, Allah commands the believers to be careful without being hostile to them (Q. Shihab, 2010).

From the interpretation of Quraish Shihab, it can be concluded that he did not forbid choosing non-Muslim leaders absolutely because the context of the verse above talks about the fear of Muslims not getting protection from Jews and Christians at that time. Thus they want to make Jews and Christians protectors, friends, and supporters or establish a more harmonious relationship so that they can provide protection if something goes wrong (Q. Shihab, 2010).

### **Gadamer and his Hermeneutic Theory**

Hans-Georg Gadamer was born in Margburg February 11, 1900. He is a Protestant but grew up and grew up in a religion of reason (vernunftreligion) (Hasanah, 2017, p. 4). He is a philosopher, as evidenced by the education he pursued until he obtained a doctorate in philosophy. His career peaked through the publication of *Wahrheit und Methode* (Truth and Method, 1960). Gadamer's hermeneutics is inseparable from Heidegger's hermeneutic thinking. This work is an invaluable support for Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit* (Being & Time, 1949). Gadamer's framework of thought as a starting point for understanding hermeneutics is related to specific points closely related to Heidegger's philosophy. The points are truth as unhidden, language and understanding, and the relationship between truth and method (Kaprisma, 2011, p. 248).

Gadamer's Hermeneutic theories are summarized into several related theories:

a. Theory "Consciousness Influenced by History" (*wirkungsgeschichtliches Bewusstsein*; historically effected consciousness).

According to this theory, every interpreter must be in certain situations that can affect his understanding of the text being interpreted. This situation is called "effective history," which consists of traditions, culture, and life experiences. Therefore, when interpreting a text, an interpreter must or should be aware that he is in a particular position that can significantly color his understanding of a text is interpreted. Gadamer states, "One must learn to understand and recognize that the influence of good history plays a significant role in every understanding, whether he is aware of it or not. The message of this theory is that an interpreter must be able to overcome his subjectivity when he interprets a text (S, 2017, pp. 80–81).

b. "Pre-understanding" theory (*Vorverständnis*; pre-understanding).

The influence of the first theory forms in an interpreter called Gadamer with the term "pre-understanding" of the interpreted text. Pre-understanding, which is the initial position of the interpreter, is specific and must be present when he reads the text. According to this theory, the need for pre-understanding is intended. So that an interpreter can dialogue with the contents of the text being interpreted, with pre-understanding, one will succeed in understanding the text well. According to Gadamer, pre-understanding must be open to criticism, rehabilitation, and correction by the interpreter when he realizes or knows that his pre-understanding is not following what is meant by the text being interpreted. This is intended to make sure the text message is understood (Syamsudin, 2017, pp. 80-81).

c. Theory of “Horizontverschmelzung/Assimilation” (Horizontverschmelzung; fusion of horizon) and “Hermeneutic Circle” Theory (hermeneutischer Zirkel; hermeneutical circle).

In the process of interpretation, one must be aware that there are two horizons, namely the horizon (knowledge) or horizon in the text and the horizon (understanding) or the horizon of the reader. These two horizons are always present in the process of understanding and interpretation. According to Gadamer, these two horizons must be communicated so that "tensions between the two can be resolved." Regarding the text horizon, Gadamer asserts, "I have to let the past text apply (give information about something is because the past text has something to say. So, understanding a text means letting the text in question speak. The interaction between these two horizons is called the "hermeneutic circle." Then, according to Gadamer, the reader's horizon only acts as a person's starting point in understanding the text. This starting point must be able to help understand what the text means and should not be allowed to force the reader to have the text speak according to its starting point. It shows there is a meeting between the reader's subjectivity and the text's objectivity, where the text's objective meaning is prioritized (Syamsudin, 2017, pp. 81-83).

d. Theory “Application/Anwendung” (Anwendung; application).

With the problem of a different period between the emergence of the text and the period when an interpreter lived, the social, political, economic, and other conditions were far different. According to Gadamer, when a person reads the scriptures, apart from the process of understanding and interpreting, one more thing is required, which is called the term "application" (Anwendung) of messages or teachings at the time when the biblical text was interpreted. Gadamer states that the message that must be applied during the interpretation period is not the literal meaning of the text, but the meaningful sense "meaning that means" or a message that is more meaningful than just the literal meaning (Syamsudin, 2017, p. 83).

### **Gadamer's Hermeneutic Analysis of QS. al-Maidah{5}:51.**

In Gadamer's theory of hermeneutics, four things must be done to understand a text. However, in this case, the author only uses two theories in analyzing the interpretation of Hamka and Quraish Shihab, namely the theory of awareness Influenced by History and the theoretical understanding, so that the interpretation of Hamka and Quraish Shihab in surah al-Ma'idah[5]: 51 does not experience alienation.

Awareness of being influenced by history or adequate histories in certain situations, such as a commentator's traditions, culture, and life experiences. According to Gadamer, it dramatically affects the results of understanding the text. In other words, the interpretation of a commentator is not only determined by knowledge but also by life experience. If readers look at the life experiences of Hamka and Quraish Shihab, both were born in Indonesia but are in very different situations. Hamka, when he wrote the commentary on a-Azhar, was under political pressure and spent a long time in prison. He is also a very active political activist and earned the nickname Pangeran Wiroguno from the Indonesian government for his struggle. Additionally, he is also a member of the Masyumi party, which rejected the idea of President Soekarno in implementing the Guided Democracy system. Hamka's life experience in politics brought him to the bitter experience of Indonesian history when it was led by the Dutch and the Islamic Communist Party, which firmly rejected Islamic values in Indonesia. Seeing Hamka's life experience, colored by political tension, greatly influenced the results of Hamka's interpretation of the QS. al-Maidah [5]: 51, so it is pretty reasonable if Hamka firmly rejects non-Muslim leadership so that the next generation does not feel the bitter history he feels.

Quraish Shihab's life experience is very different from Hamka's. Quraish Shihab spent much of his youth at al-Azhar for ten years studying. His career journey after returning from Egypt was centered on Islamic educational institutions rather than directly related to certain party groups such as Hamka. In addition, the context of writing the interpretation of al-Misbah is very different from the



interpretation of al-Azhar. The interpretation of al-Misbah was written in 1997 when politics in Indonesia were no longer heated, and life between Muslims and non-Muslims was harmonious. Life experiences like this affect the results of Quraish Shihab's interpretation of the QS. al-Maidah [5]:51. In interpreting the verse, Quraish Shihab was not under political pressure, so his interpretation was different from Hamka's.

Meanwhile, pre-comprehension hermeneutics is the initial position of the commentator when he wants to read the text, in the sense that an interpreter already has knowledge or knowledge about the text to be interpreted. Between Hamka and Quraish Shihab, they have their knowledge which significantly influences the result of interpretation. Hamka's pre-understanding in interpreting QS. al-Maidah [5]: 51 is very thick with historical texts and is relatively minimal in dissecting the meaning of the verse text. While the interpretation of Quraish Shihab is very focused on studying the meaning of the text and the opinions of contemporary figures. The pre-understanding of the two characters is closely related to their life experiences.

#### 4. Conclusions

After researching various literature and Gadamer's hermeneutical approach, it can be concluded that Hamka and Quraish Shihab have very different life experiences. Hamka lives under political pressure and is a very active political member. He also feels how to live under communist leadership, while Quraish Shihab lives at a time when politics in Indonesia are no longer hot, and the lives of Muslims and non-Muslims in Indonesia are already harmonious. Their life experiences greatly influence the interpretation results. Hamka firmly rejects non-Muslim leadership, while according to Quraish Shihab, leadership is not seen from the religion adopted but the harmony created through every decision taken.

#### 5. Acknowledgments

Appreciation to Mr. Saifuddin Zuhri, who has opened the broadest possible discussion space during the learning process. Additionally, thank's to friends who have provided input for the development of this article.

#### 6. References

- A.P. Kau, S. (2014). Hermeneutika Gadamer Dan Relevansinya Dengan Tafsir. *Farabi*, 11(1), 109–123.
- Abduh, A. M. (2019). *Biografi dan pemikiran Hamka tentang nasionalisme tahun 1950-1975*.
- Alfiyah, A. (2017). Metode Penafsiran Buya Hamka Dalam Tafsir Al-Azhar. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Ushuluddin*, 15(1), 25. <https://doi.org/10.18592/jiiu.v15i1.1063>.
- Alwi HS, M. (2017). Dewasa dalam Bingkai Otoritas Teks ; Sebuah Wacana dalam Mengatasi Perbedaan Penafsiran al-Qur ' an Pendahuluan Akhir-akhir ini umat Islam di Indonesia sedang digemparkan oleh persoalan. *Journal Of Islamic Studies and Humanities*, 2(1), 20–21. <https://doi.org/10.18326/millati.v2i1.1-19>.
- Farid, A. M. (2017). Pengangkatan Non-Muslim Sebagai Pemimpin: Studi Pemahaman Kiai Kaliwungu Kabupaten Kendal Terhadap QS Al-Maidah Ayat 51. *Skripsi*. <http://eprints.walisongo.ac.id/7899/>.
- Hamka. (2007). *Tafsir Al-Azhar*. Kerhaya Print.
- Hasanah, H. (2017). HERMENEUTIK ONTOLOGIS-DIALEKTIS HANS-GEORG GADAMER (Produksi Makna Wayang sebagai Metode Dakwah Sunan Kalijogo). *At-Taqaddum*, 9(1).

- Hidayati, H. (2018). Metodologi Tafsir Kontekstual Al-Azhar Karya Buya Hamka. *El- 'Umdah*, 1(1), 25–42. <https://doi.org/10.20414/el-umdah.v1i1.407>.
- Iqbal, M. (2010). Metode Penafsiran al-Qur'an M. Quraish Shihab. *Tsaqafah*, 6(2), 248. <https://doi.org/10.21111/tsaqafah.v6i2.120>.
- Kushidayati, L. (2014). Hermeneutika gadamer dalam kajian hukum. *Yudisia*, 5(1), 64–82.
- Mubarok, Z. F. (2019). PENAFSIRAN AL-QUR ' AN SURAT AL-MAIDAH AYAT 51 ( Studi Komparasi Penafsiran Buya Hamka dan Sayyid Quthb ) INTERPRETATION OF AL-QUR ' AN SURAT AL-MAIDAH VERSES 51 ( Comparative Study of the Interpretation of Buya Hamka and Sayyid Quthb ). *Al-Karima*, 3(2), 79–90.
- Nur, A. (2012a). M. Quraish Shihab Dan Rasionalisasi Tafsir. *Jurnal Ushuluddin*, 1(1).
- Nur, A. (2012b). M . Quraish Shihab. *Ushuluddin*, XVIII(1), 21–33.
- Rahmatullah, R. (2017). Menakar Hermeneutika Fusion of Horizons H.G. Gadamer dalam Pengembangan Tafsir Maqasid Alquran. *Nun : Jurnal Studi Alquran Dan Tafsir Di Nusantara*, 3(2), 149. <https://doi.org/10.32495/nun.v3i2.47>.
- S, S. (2017). *Hermeneutika dan Pengembangan Ulumul Qur'an*. Nawesea Press.
- Shihab, M. Q. (2002a). *Tafsir al-Misbah Pesan, Kesan dan Keserasian Alquran*. Lentera Hati.
- Shihab, M. Q. (2002b). *Tafsir al-Mishbah*. Lentera Hati.
- Shihab, Q. (2010). *Tafsir Al-Mishbah* (3rd ed.). Lentera Hati.
- Sri Andayani, D. (2019). Biografi Buya Hamka dalam Novel “Tadarus Cinta Buya Pujangga” Karya Akhmal Nasery Basral [Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan]. In <https://medium.com/>. <https://medium.com/@arifwicaksanaa/pengertian-use-case-a7e576e1b6bf>.
- Wahyudi, M. (2019). Kepemimpinan Non-Muslim: Penafsiran Surat Al-Maidah Ayat 51 dalam Tafsir Al-Azhar dan Tafsir Al-Mishbah. *Progresiva : Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Pendidikan Islam*, 7(2), 166. <https://doi.org/10.22219/progresiva.v7i2.13980>.
- Wartini, A. (2014). Corak Penafsiran M. Quraish Shihab dalam Tafsir Al-Misbah. *Hunafa: Jurnal Studia Islamika*, Vol. 11, N(1), 109–126.