IBN ABBAS : Jurnal Ilmu Alquran dan Tafsir
https://jurnal.uinsu.ac.id/index.php/ibnabbas
E- ISSN : 2620-7885

The Dynamics of *Ma'na* and *Maghza* Q.S. Al-Ma'idah: 51: A Critical Reading of Sahiron Syamsuddin's Interpretation in the Hermeneutic Framework of Hans-Georg Gadamer

Ridho Yoni Aprilianto
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Al-Qur'an Kepulauan Riau
ridhoyoni@stiq-kepri.ac.id

Abstrak

Abstrak Q.S. al-Mā'idah: 51 menjadi ayat yang paling diperdebatkan dalam wacana kepemimpinan non-Muslim di Indonesia, terutama sejak 2016. Sahiron Syamsuddin menafsirkannya melalui pendekatan *ma'nā-cum-maghzā*, yakni merekonstruksi makna historis (*ma'nā*) lalu mengembangkan signifikansinya (*maghzā*) bagi masa kini. Artikel ini membaca penafsiran tersebut secara kritis dengan hermeneutika Hans-Georg Gadamer, khususnya konsep prasangka (*Vorurteil*), aplikasi (*Anwendung*), sejarah pengaruh (*Wirkungsgeschichte*), dan peleburan cakrawala (*Horizontverschmelzung*). Penelitian ini berjenis kualitatif-kepustakaan dengan pendekatan filosofis-hermeneutik; sumber primernya adalah artikel Syamsuddin (2018) tentang Q.S. 5:51 dan *Truth and Method* karya Gadamer. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa kedua kerangka bertemu pada pengakuan atas historisitas teks dan peran subjektivitas penafsir, tetapi berbeda dalam tiga hal. Pertama, *ma'nā* diperlakukan sebagai pijakan yang relatif objektif, padahal motif anti-politisasi sudah memandu pemilihan data, makna kata *awliyā'*, dan jangkauan partikel *al-* sejak tahap rekonstruksi. Kedua, *maghzā* ditempatkan sebagai tahap lanjutan, bukan sebagai aplikasi yang menyatu dengan pemahaman, sehingga perumusan *maqṣad* belum disertai prosedur pengujian. Ketiga, tradisi tafsir dan sejarah pemakaian politik ayat hadir sebagai bahan pendukung, bukan lawan dialog. Artikel ini merekomendasikan penguatan *ma'nā-cum-maghzā* melalui pengakuan dan pengujian prasangka sejak awal, pemroseduran transisi dari *ma'nā* ke *maqṣad*, serta kriteria validitas yang kompatibel dengan hermeneutika Gadamer.
Kata Kunci: *Ma'nā-cum-Maghzā*; Sahiron Syamsuddin; Hermeneutic Gadamer; Q.S. al-Mā'idah: 51

Abstract

Q.S. al-Mā'idah: 51 has become one of the most contested verses in Indonesian debates about non-Muslim leadership, particularly since 2016. Sahiron Syamsuddin interprets it through the *ma'nā-cum-maghzā* approach, which reconstructs the historical meaning (*ma'nā*) of a text and then develops its significance (*maghzā*) for the present. This article critically reads that interpretation through Hans-Georg Gadamer's hermeneutics, focusing on prejudice (*Vorurteil*), application (*Anwendung*), effective history (*Wirkungsgeschichte*), and the fusion of horizons (*Horizontverschmelzung*). The study is qualitative library research with a philosophical-hermeneutic approach, drawing on Syamsuddin's (2018) article on Q. 5:51 and Gadamer's *Truth and Method* as primary sources. The findings show that the two frameworks converge in recognizing the historicity of text and interpreter and the role of the interpreter's subjectivity, but diverge in three respects. First, *ma'nā* is treated as a relatively objective foundation, even though an anti-politicization motive already guides the selection of data, the meaning of *awliyā'*, and the scope of the particle *al-* at the reconstruction stage. Second, *maghzā* is positioned as a subsequent stage rather than an application integrated with understanding, so the formulation of *maqṣad* lacks a testable procedure. Third, the exegetical tradition and the political history of the verse's use serve as supporting material rather than as dialogue partners. The article recommends strengthening *ma'nā-cum-maghzā* by acknowledging and testing prejudice from the outset, making the transition from *ma'nā* to *maqṣad* procedural, and developing validity criteria compatible with Gadamerian hermeneutics.
Keywords: *Ma'nā-cum-Maghzā*; Sahiron Syamsuddin; Gadamerian Hermeneutics; Q.S. al-Mā'idah: 51

INTRODUCTION

The introduction of Q.S. al-Mā'idah: 51 is among the most frequently referenced verses in debates on the relationship between Muslims and non-Muslims, especially in political leadership discourse.[1] Sahiron Syamsuddin notes that this verse has become very popular, not only among Indonesian Muslims but also non-Muslims, since September 2016 due to the case of the former Governor of Jakarta, Basuki Tjahaja Purnama.[2] According to him, this verse has been misunderstood and used by certain Muslim groups for political purposes. The main problem is the meaning of the word *awliyā'*, whether it means "leader" or "loyal friend, ally, and helper", and on the scope of its prohibition, whether universal or limited to a particular historical context.[3] This polemic shows that the interpretation of the verse is rarely neutral from the socio-political experience of the interpreter.

In response, Syamsuddin offered an approach to *ma'nā-cum-maghzā*, that is, an attempt to capture historical significance (*And*) that the audience first understands, then develops its significance (*Maghzā*) for contemporary situations.[4] In Q.S. 5:51, he traces the macro context of the Charter of Medina and the deterioration of relations with some Jewish communities after the Battle of Badr, as well as the micro context of various histories *Asbāb al-Nuzūl* which is set in a war situation.[5] Linguistically, it means *awliyā'* as "close friends, allies, and helpers", and particles *al-* on *Al-Yahūd* and *Al-Naṣārā* As *Li 'Ahd al-Dhihn*, i.e. a particular group in Medina, not all Jews and Christians. He concluded that this verse had nothing to do with the election of heads of state or region, and that its universal message included friendship with trustworthy parties, loyalty to mutual commitment, and fairness to all.[6]

This offer raises unanswered theoretical questions. Syamsuddin called the theory *Anwendung* Gadamer as the basis for reinterpretation and accepts the role of the subjectivity of the interpreter as long as it is a continuation of the historical meaning of the text.[7] Yet Gadamer is present in the article in only one section, while the structure of his argument rests on the reconstruction of historical significance that precedes a decline in significance. This two-stage structure differs from Gadamer's hermeneutics which

---

[1] Annas Rolli Muchlisin, "Tafsir in Its Context, or How Socio-Political Milieu Informed What to Include and Exclude in Qur'an Commentaries: At-Tabari's, Ibn Abi Hatim's, and al-Maturidi's Interpretations of Surah Al-Ma'idah (5): 51 as a Case Study," *SUHUF* 17, no. 2 (December 2024): 215–30, https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v17i2.1114. Zohratul Mahmudah and Muhammad Tarmizi Tahir, "NON-MUSLIM LEADERS IN THE DISCOURSE OF TAFSIR: Comparative Study of Al-Misbah and Ibn Kathir's Tafsir," *Alif Lam: Journal of Islamic Studies and Humanities* 2, no. 1 (July 2021): 22–45, https://doi.org/10.51700/aliflam.v2i1.290.

[2] Sahiron Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an: Interpretation Of Q. 5:51," November 2017, 131, https://doi.org/10.2991/icqhs-17.2018.21.

[3] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 133. Saipul Hamdi, "Pilkada Rasa Pilpres : Al-Maidah 51 Dan Politisasi Simbol Agama Dalam Kontestasi Politik Di Pilkada DKI Jakarta," *Indonesian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 2, no. 1 (March 2021): 9–22.

[4] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 132.

[5] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 133–34.

[6] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 135–36.

[7] Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (Sheed & Ward, 1975), 310. Natasha Astrid Constantin and Fitzerald Kennedy Sitorus, "HERMENEUTIKA, MAKNA DAN KOMUNIKASI DALAM PERSPEKTIF HANS-GEORG GADAMER," *Komunikologi: Jurnal Pengembangan Ilmu Komunikasi dan Sosial* 8, no. 1 (June 2024): 72–81, https://doi.org/10.30829/komunikologi.v8i1.18771.

views understanding, interpretation, and application as a single entity.[8] The problem of this study is the epistemological tension between the claim that historical meaning can be formulated in advance in a relatively objective manner and the Gadamerian claim that every understanding is always guided by the prejudices and traditions of its interpreter. This tension has not been tested in Syamsuddin's interpretation of Q.S. 5:51.

Theoretically, *ma'nā-cum-maghzā* Syamsuddin positions himself in the map of contemporary interpretation which he divides into conservative quasi-objectivists, subjectivists, and progressive quasi-objectivists, with his approach close to the latter group.[9] He aligns it with *Double Movement* Fazlur Rahman and Abdullah Saeed's contextualist approach, but consider both to apply only to the verses of the law, while the approach is aimed at the entire Qur'an.[10] The basis of his assumption is that every text, including the Qur'an, has a historical significance tied to the context of revelation, so the analysis of the 7th century Arabic and *Asbāb al-Nuzūl* becomes a mandatory step. For the stage of development of meaning, he refers to *Meaning function* and *Implicative function* in the theory of textuality Jorge Gracia.

Gadamer's hermeneutics offers a more radical framework. Gadamer rehabilitates prejudice as a condition of understanding, not a barrier to it and asserts that the meaning of a text is not limited to the author's intent.[11] Understanding is seen as the melting of horizons (*Horizontverschmelzung*) between the text's horizon and the interpreter's horizon, while the interpreter is always in the history of influence (*Wirkungsgeschichte*) that forms his pre-understanding.[12] Application is not an additional stage after understanding, but a part that helps determine understanding from the beginning. These concepts are used to test Syamsuddin's interpretation work.

Based on these issues and frameworks, this study reads Syamsuddin's interpretation of Q.S. 5:51 as a hermeneutical event that can be analyzed through Gadamer's four concepts. The reconstruction *of ma'nā* is examined through the role of prejudice, and the development of *maghzā* through the concept of application. The position of Syamsuddin's interpretation in the Indonesian tradition of interpretation and political discourse is examined through the history of influence and the melting of horizons.[13] Finally, the tension between the objectivist tendencies of his approach and the

[8] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 321; Za'farullah Jamaly et al., "Menganalisis Pemikiran Filsafat Gadamer (Pemikiran Hermeneutika)," *Leksikon: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Budaya* 2, no. 1 (April 2024): 01–06, https://doi.org/10.59632/leksikon.v2i1.190.

[9] Sahiron Syamsuddin, "Pendekatan Maʿnā-Cum-Maghzā: Paradigma, Prinsip, Dan Metode Penafsiran," *Nun: Jurnal Studi Alquran Dan Tafsir Di Nusantara* 8, no. 2 (December 2022): 217–40, https://doi.org/10.32495/nun.v8i2.428. Akhmad Aidil Fitra and Yousuf Aboujanah, "Gadamerian Hermeneutical Analysis of Hasbi Ash-Shiddieqy's Interpretation of QS. Luqman (31):6 in the Context of Contemporary Entertainment Discourse," *Al-Karim: International Journal of Quranic and Islamic Studies* 3, no. 1 (March 2025): 59–78, https://doi.org/10.33367/al-karim.v3i1.6839.

[10] Akhmad Aidil Fitra et al., "Integration of Ulumul Qur'an And Western Hermeneutics: Sahiron Syamsuddin's Intellectual Project in The Context of Islamic Studies in Indonesia," *Takamul El-Ulum: Jurnal Studi Islam* 1, no. 2 (June 2026): 207–30, https://doi.org/10.24952/tkml.v1i2.19672.

[11] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 278–96.

[12] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 300–305.

[13] Raifatul Rifka and Amanda Syahryani, "Kepemimpinan Non-Muslim Dalam Al-Qur'an: Kajian Hermeneutik Terhadap QS. Al-Mā'idah 51, Ali Imran 28, Dan An-Nisā' 144," *Muhkamat : Jurnal Ilmu Al-Quran Dan Tafsir* 3, no. 1 (June 2025): 89–102.

ontology of Gadamer's understanding is critically evaluated. This problem-solving plan is analytical and evaluative. This study does not intend to reject *ma'nā-cum-maghzā*, but to test the consistency of its hermeneutical foundations and formulate possible reinforcements.

Based on the above description, this study aims to: (1) describe and reconstruct the steps of Sahiron Syamsuddin's interpretation of Q.S. al-Mā'idah: 51 through the *ma'nā-cum-maghzā approach*; (2) analyze the interpretation with the concepts of prejudice, history of influence, horizon fusion, and application in Gadamer's hermeneutics; and (3) assess the meeting points, tensions, strengths, and limitations of both as a contribution to the development of contemporary interpretation methodologies in Indonesia.

METHODS

This research is a literature-based qualitative research (*Library Research*),[14] with a philosophical-hermeneutic approach. The object of his study is Sahiron Syamsuddin's interpretation of Q.S. al-Mā'idah: 51 which is formulated through the approach *ma'nā-cum-maghzā*, while the formal object is Hans-Georg Gadamer's hermeneutics as an analytical lens. The primary data sources consist of Syamsuddin's (2018) article on the interpretation of Q.S. 5:51 and Gadamer's work, *Truth and Method* (2004), as a source of theory. Secondary data sources include the literature referred to by Syamsuddin, namely Rahman (1979), Saeed (2006, 2014), and Gracia (1996); classical interpretations of the verse such as the works of al-Ṭabarī, al-Wāḥidī, and Muqātil ibn Sulaymān to examine historical and linguistic claims; as well as studies of Gadamer and its application in the study of the Qur'an. Data were collected through documentation and textual analysis, with repeated readings of primary sources to identify the interpreter's steps, assumptions, and methodological choices.[15]

Data analysis is carried out in three stages. First, descriptive reconstruction, which is mapping the flow of Syamsuddin's interpretation which includes historical context, linguistic analysis, and *maqṣad al-āyah*. Second, hermeneutic mapping, which is placing each step on relevant Gadamer concepts, namely prejudice (*Vorurteil*), history of influence (*Wirkungsgeschichte*), horizon fusion (*Horizontverschmelzung*), and application (*Anwendung*).[16] Third, critical evaluation, which is to assess the consistency, strength, limitations, and points of convergence and tension between the two frameworks. This research is limited to Syamsuddin's interpretation of Q.S. 5:51 and does not cover all of his commentary works. Gadamer is used as an analytical tool to test the hermeneutical foundation, not to judge the theological truth of the results of

[14] Akhmad Aidil Fitra and Novizal Wendry, "Penafsiran, Ideologi, dan Afiliasi Politik: Kritik Buya Hamka (1908-1981 M) terhadap Nasakom Era Demokrasi Terpimpin (1959-1966 M)," *Istinarah: Riset Keagamaan, Sosial dan Budaya* 6, no. 2 (December 2024): 234–49, https://doi.org/10.31958/istinarah.v6i2.13607.

[15] Nazifatul Ummy Al Amin and Ilham Akbar Habibie, "Analisis Pengaruh Konteks Sosial-Historis Terhadap Penafsiran Ibn Kaśīr Atas QS. Al-Mā'idah [5]: 51," *Contemporary Quran* 2, no. 1 (February 2022): 17–32, https://doi.org/10.14421/cq.v2i1.5671.

[16] Noril and Huril Aini, "KAJIAN HADIS TENTANG KEMANUSIAAN DALAM PERSPEKTIF HERMENEUTIKA HANS-GEORG GADAMER," *Al-Furqan : Jurnal Agama, Sosial, Dan Budaya* 5, no. 3 (June 2026): 2272–81.

interpretation.[17]

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Prejudice and Reconstruction *of Ma'nā*: Anti-Politicization Motives as Interpreters' Pre-Understanding

The first step of the approach *ma'nā-cum-maghzā* is to reconstruct historical significance (*And*), which is defined by Sahiron Syamsuddin as the meaning that the first audience of the text understands.[18] The basic assumption is that each text, including the Qur'an, has a specific historical significance in its context, while the universality of the new meaning is achieved through further interpretation, so that the analysis of the 7th century Arabic and the tracing of the micro-macro context are made mandatory. In Q.S. 5:51, this reconstruction runs in three layers, the macro context in the form of the Charter of Medina and the deterioration of relations with some Jewish communities after the Battle of Badr, the micro context in the form of some histories *Asbāb al-Nuzūl*, and the analysis of the upper language *awliyā'* and particles *al-*.[19] The sequence of work assumes that historical and linguistic data are collected first, then *And* formulated, and this is what makes his approach he calls quasi-objectivist.

Gadamer's hermeneutics rejects the idea of sequence. Understanding never begins from zero, because the interpreter always brings a revised projection of initial meaning when the text points in a different direction, and the movement between anticipation and correction is the hermeneutical circle.[20] The prejudice of the individual, according to Gadamer, is more a historical reality of his existence than his judgment.[21] He does not state that all prejudices are valid, but rather distinguishes the productive prejudices that open understanding from the prejudices that close them, and the task of the hermeneutist is . Therefore, the reconstruction of the meaning of the first audience as a stage independent of the interpreter's horizon appears to be an illusion, and the meaning of the text is not locked to the intention of the author or the original audience.[22]

---

[17] Fajar Illahi, Muhammad Farhan Firas, and Saifullah, "Integrasi Hermeneutika Hans-Georg Gademer dalam pembelajaran Al-Qur'an dan Hadist: Studi Metodologi di Pesantren Sumatera Thawalib Parabek Bukittinggi," *Al-Afkar: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Pendidikan Islam* 2, no. 2 (July 2026): 363–75, https://doi.org/10.0111/afkar.v2i2.165.

[18] Akhmad Aidil Fitra et al., "From Historical Meaning To Dynamic Ecological Significance: A Ma'na-Cum-Maghza Reading Of Q. 30:41 And Q. 7:56 In The Context Of Indonesia's Climate Crisis," *Ibn Abbas* 9, no. 1 (June 2026): 119–50, https://doi.org/10.51900/ias.v9i1.29487.

[19] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 133–35.

[20] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 268–70.

[21] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 278.

[22] Mohammad Alfin Niam, "Membaca Ulang Gender Dalam Tafsir: Perspektif Hermeneutika Filosofis Dan Kritis," *Nida' Al-Qur'an : Jurnal Kajian Quran Dan Wanita* 23, no. 1 (March 2025): 112–36, https://doi.org/10.33511/nidaquran.v23n1.112-136. Akhmad Aidil Fitra and Oktasandi Oktasandi, "Pembacaan Hermeneutis : Penafsiran Buya Hamka Tentang Lahw al Ḥadīṡ (Studi Pemikiran Hans George Gadamer)," *Syariati: Jurnal Studi Al-Qur`an Dan Hukum* 10, no. 2 (November 2024): 147–62, https://doi.org/10.32699/syariati.v10i2.7707.

In this frame, Syamsuddin's stated motives for writing are very important. He writes that he was interested in this topic because the verse has been misunderstood and used by certain Muslim groups for political purposes.[23] This statement is of double value. It demonstrates the honesty of the hermeneutist, because the interpreter recognizes the practical concern that determines the questions posed to the text, and Gadamer sees the question as the basic structure of the hermeneutical experience.[24] The formulation of Syamsuddin's question, whether *awliyā'* means a loyal friend or leader, whether the verse is universal, and what morals it contains,[25] It is clearly born from the situation of post-2016 Indonesia, not from the problems of the 7th century audience. On the other hand, although he stated that he did not discuss the Ahok case, the final conclusion that this paragraph is not related to the election of heads of state or regions directly answers the problems triggered by the case.[26]

The neat meeting between the results of reconstruction and contemporary needs can be examined in three key decisions. First, the determination of meaning *awliyā'*. Syamsuddin admitted that *Lisān al-'Arab* note two possible root meanings, *São Paulo* (power and regulation) and *São Paulo* (help).[27] To choose, he adheres to the understanding of the historical audience and proposes a hadith about hostility to *Guardian*, which according to him could not have meant a leader because the supreme leader at that time was the Prophet himself, and then corroborated it with the commentaries of Muqātil, al-Ṭabarī, and the translation of the Quraish Shihab.[28] This argument revolves around an unmatized circle, evidence is taken from other texts and then used to decide the meaning of the word in the verse being tested, the hadith is mentioned without reference to the source and the assessment of the narration path, and the selection itself is guided by the pre-understanding that the meaning sought is not "leader".

Second, the meaning of particles *al-* As *Li 'Ahd al-Dhihn*, which he states with the phrase "I prefer to say". This choice is grammatically valid because both possibilities (*Li 'Ahd al-Dhihn* and *Li Istighrāq al-jins*) is known in Arabic grammar, but its support relies on a macro context that speaks almost entirely of the Jews of Medina, while the verse mentions Jews and Christians at the same time and the micro context only mentions Christians at a glance in the post-Uhud history.[29] Circle works Again, context is used to determine the range of the particle, while the desired range determines which part of the context is raised as the setting. Third, the unification of various histories *Asbāb al-Nuzūl* through the common thread of the war situation. The common thread is productive, but it is a synthesis of the interpreter, the quality of the history is not

[23] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 131.

[24] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 355–60.

[25] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 133.

[26] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 136. Niam, "Membaca Ulang Gender Dalam Tafsir."

[27] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 134–35.

[28] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 135. Muhammad Wahyudi, "Kepemimpinan Non-Muslim: Penafsiran Surat Al-Maidah Ayat 51 Dalam Tafsir Al-Azhar Dan Tafsir Al-Mishbah," *Progresiva : Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Pendidikan Islam* 7, no. 2 (2018): 166–83, https://doi.org/10.22219/progresiva.v7i2.13980.

[29] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 133–35.

assessed, the history of Ubadah and Abdullah ibn Ubayy can also be read as a matter of group loyalty and not just a military tactic, and the macro narrative relies on al-islam.org online website, not a primary source of sirah.[30]

This analysis does not accuse Syamsuddin of manipulating data. In Gadamer's framework, the influence of anti-politicizing motives on reconstruction is precisely a normal condition of understanding, and that motive serves as a productive prejudice because it opens up relevant questions and forces a return to contextual data that is often ignored by literal readings.[31] The problem lies in the claim of methodological order. Syamsuddin mentions the role of interpreting subjectivity at the development stage *Maghzā* and accept it as long as it is a continuation of historical meaning. Thus, subjectivity is limited to the second stage while the first stage is treated relatively free from it. In fact, the three decisions above show that the first stage is already full of interpreter choices. This position is closer to Hirsch's tradition of differentiation of meaning and significance than to Gadamer, although Gadamer is explicitly referred to.[32]

An interim finding of this theme is that *the ma'nā* in Shammsuddin's interpretation of Q.S. 5:51 is more accurately read as the result of an interpreter's reading guided by anti-politicization motives, rather than a meaning, found first in a neutral manner. This reading does not weaken his interpretive contribution, but it undermines the claim of a firm separation between finding *ma'nā* and developing *maghzā*. The *ma'nā-cum-maghzā approach* would be more consistent with the hermeneutics to which it refers if it recognized prejudice as a constitutive element from the reconstruction stage and provided a mechanism for its testing, for example by presenting an alternative reading of the same data and weighing the strengths of each.

From *Ma'nā* to *Maghzā* and *Maqṣad*: *Anwendung* Gadamer as an Integral Moment

If previous discussions show that the reconstruction *And* guided by prejudice, the following discussion turns to the second step of Syamsuddin's approach, namely the development of significance (*Maghzā*) and the formulation of the moral message of the verse (*Maqṣad al-Āyah*). Syamsuddin stated that the understanding of historical meaning is only the starting point for a deeper interpretation that is relevant to the time of the interpreter.[33] For this stage it mentions two devices: *Meaning function* and *Implicative function* from Jorge Gracia,[34] as well as theory *Anwendung* Gadamer who according to him is relevant because it pays attention not only to the horizon of the text but also to the horizon of the interpreter. The question that this theme asks is whether *Maghzā* Synonymous with *Anwendung* Gadamer or just to borrow the term.

[30] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 134–36. Yusril Adistia, "TELAAH KITAB TAFSIR ATH-THABARI DALAM Q.S AL-MAIDAH AYAT 51," *Al-Munir: Jurnal Studi Ilmu Al-Qur'an Dan Tafsir* 1, no. 02 (2019): 55–78, https://doi.org/10.24239/al-munir.v1i02.36.

[31] Akhmad Aidil Fitra et al., *DARI KAIRO KE YOGYAKARTA Genealogi Pemikiran Tafsir Kontemporer: Abduh, Arkoun Hingga Sahiron Syamsuddin* (Hafizhah Press, 2026), 35.

[32] Eric Donald Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (Yale University Press, 1967), 245–64.

[33] Syamsuddin, "Pendekatan Maʿnā-Cum-Maghzā," 217–40.

[34] Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation*, 160–64.

The application of Q.S. 5:51 can be read as three sequential movements, which are the author's analytical reading and not Syamsuddin's term. The first movement is narrowing, reconstruction *And* resulting in a reading that the verse forbids Muslims to appoint certain Jews and Christians in Medina who betrayed the Charter of Medina as allies and helpers.[35] The second movement is the reversal, which is the inference that Muslims are allowed to establish friendships with Jews, Christians, or followers of other religions who are good and trustworthy. The third movement is the abstraction towards *Maqṣad*, when Syamsuddin formulated three universal messages, friendship with trusted parties, the obligation to maintain mutual commitments, and the demand for leaders to act fairly to all people regardless of religion and ethnicity, while emphasizing that the verse is not related to the election of heads of state or regions.[36]

The three movements are not epistetically equivalent. The first and second movements are still in the realm of language and context analysis, while the third movement contains a qualitative leap because it produces general values that are not mentioned explicitly in the verse. The value of trust and commitment can indeed be derived from the context of the betrayal of the reconstructed covenant, but the leader's demands for justice to all people do not result from reconstruction *And* anywhere. The phrase "Islam only teaches",[37] indicates that his reference is to the broader principles of Islam, not just this verse. Moreover, the two theoretical devices that Syamsuddin calls are not operated, he does not show which parts of his analysis are the functions of meaning and which are implicit functions, and do not explain how the horizon of the interpreter fits into the formulation of the three moral messages.[38] Mapping *And* on the function of meaning and *Maghzā* On the implicit function is an implicit reading, not an explicit statement.

To assess his suitability with Gadamer, it is necessary to understand the position *Anwendung* in *Truth and Method*. Gadamer states that understanding, interpretation, and application are not three separate steps but one whole process, and application is an element that is just as constitutive as other elements of understanding.[39] He illustrates this with legal and theological hermeneutics, the judge does not first understand the original meaning of the law and then apply it, but understands the law precisely in relation to the case at hand, and the sermon is not merely an application after the understanding of Scripture but a part of the understanding itself. The Gadamerian application is not free according to the will of the interpreter. He is bound to the question

---

[35] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 135. Akhmad Aidil Fitra et al., "Integration of Ulumul Qur'an And Western Hermeneutics: Sahiron Syamsuddin's Intellectual Project in The Context of Islamic Studies in Indonesia," *Takamul El-Ulum: Jurnal Studi Islam* 1, no. 2 (June 2026): 207–30, https://doi.org/10.24952/tkml.v1i2.19672.

[36] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 135–36. Fadhila Sidiq Permana, "TAFSIR AL-MAIDAH 51 PERSPEKTIF HERMENEUTIKA PEMBEBASAN: TELAAH DAN IMPLEMENTASI PEMIKIRAN FARID ESACK," *Muàṣarah: Jurnal Kajian Islam Kontemporer* 6, no. 1 (June 2024): 1–15, https://doi.org/10.18592/msr.v6i2.13596.

[37] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 136.

[38] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 133–36. M. Dani Habibi, "INTERPRETASI HERMENEUTIKA JORGE J.E. GRACIA DALAM AL-QUR'AN SURAH AL-MAIDAH: 51," *QOF* 3, no. 2 (December 2019): 195–204, https://doi.org/10.30762/qof.v3i2.1377.

[39] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 307–8.

(*Bag*) that the text talks about and is tested in dialogue with the current situation, not on fidelity to the author's intentions.[40]

From this comparison it appears that *Maghzā* Syamsuddin and *Anwendung* Gadamer partially overlaps. The two meet in recognition of the role of the interpreter's horizon and the rejection of the literal repetition of historical meaning, in line with the idea of the fusion of horizons. However, the two differ in the position of application in the process of understanding, for Syamsuddin *Maghzā* is the second stage that departs from *And* As a starting point,[41] while for Gadamer, applications work together with understanding from the beginning.[42] The benchmark of attachment is also different. Syamsuddin requires that *Maghzā* is a continuation of historical meaning, a historical-philological benchmark, while Gadamer demands conformity with the problem of the text in conversations across the ages, a dialogical benchmark. The character of the results is also different, the universal message formulated by Syamsuddin is closer to tradition *maqāṣid* and stable moral values, while for Gadamer the results of understanding are never final because they are historical and open.

The procedural shortcomings in this second stage can be explained by the attempt to maintain two separate stages. There is no criterion to explain why the three values were chosen, whereas from the context of treaty betrayal, other values can also be drawn, such as strategic vigilance in conflict situations or the limits of cooperation between communities in war. The values that are most in line with contemporary needs, namely preventing the politicization of the verse, are chosen without procedural accountability, so that the motives that work covertly in Theme 1 here work most openly. The claim that the verse has nothing to do with the election of leaders and the demands of a just leader also mixes historical-negative statements that can be tested with contextual data and normative-positive statements whose sources of authority need to be explained.[43] In Gadamer's framework, when application is understood as part of understanding, the criterion of value selection is sought in the interpreter's dialogical work with the problem of the text, which demands practical considerations (*phronēsis*),[44] a concept that Syamsuddin does not use even though it is the most relevant to explain how the values are chosen.

However, *ma'nā-cum-maghzā* can be met with Gadamer through two paths. First, reading *And* as an initial understanding tested, rather than a final original meaning, historical reconstruction remains valuable as a discipline that inhibits anachronism, because Gadamer does not reject historical research but rather claims that it liberates the interpreter from his situation.[45] Second, it recognizes that three *Maqṣad* is the result of responsible application, not the findings of the verse, and provides its testing tools, such

[40] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 291–300.

[41] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 133. Naufa Izzul Ummam and Abdul Haris, "Deciphering QS. al-Maidah: 51 in Qur'an, Liberation & Pluralism: Analyzing the Interpretation of the Word Auliya' through Farid Esack's Perspective," *Journal of Islamic Civilization* 5, no. 2 (2023): 138–56, https://doi.org/10.33086/jic.v5i2.5378.

[42] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 307–8.

[43] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 134–36.

[44] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 312–22.

[45] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 303–5.

as comparison with alternative readings, consistency checks with other verses on interfaith relations, and assessment of the practical consequences of the formulation. Thus the findings of this theme are that *Maghzā* in Syamsuddin's interpretation of Q.S. 5:51 is not identical to *Anwendung*, rather an advanced stage that borrows the idea of the involvement of the interpreter's horizon while maintaining a two-stage architecture. Its strength lies in the clarity of the sequence of work, while its weakness lies in the absence of a procedure that explains how universal value is derived from a limited historical meaning.

The History of the Influence and Melting of Horizons: The Position of Tafsir Syamsuddin in Indonesian Political Tradition and Discourse

In the first and second discussions, the internal work of the *ma'nā-cum-maghzā*, namely the role of prejudice in the reconstruction of meaning and the status of application in the development of significance. In this third discussion, it moves outward, where Sahiron Syamsuddin's interpretation of Q.S. 5:51 stands against the tradition of interpretation that preceded it and against the political discourse that underlies it. Two concepts of Gadamer are used for this reading. First, the history of influence (*Wirkungsgeschichte*), that is, the idea that the interpreter is always in the historical sequence that has shaped the way the text is present to him, so that the awareness of it (*wirkungsgeschichtliches Bewusstsein*) is an element of true understanding. Second, the melting of the horizon (*Horizontverschmelzung*), which is the process when the present horizon and the past horizon do not stand as two closed entities, but are intertwined in understanding.[46]

Tradition was presented by Syamsuddin, especially as a reinforcement of arguments. In the discussion of the meaning *awliyā'*, he refers to the tafsir of Muqātil ibn Sulaymān which interprets him as "helper", the tafsir of al-Ṭabarī which interprets him as "helper and ally or close friend", and the translation of Quraish Shihab which is in line with both. In the microcontext, he relies on al-Wāḥidī for a variety of narrations *Asbāb al-Nuzūl*.[47] This pattern is consistent, tradition invoked when supporting the reading of "alliance," and is not presented as a challenging counterpart. Other classical interpretations that give different weight to the dimensions of power or loyalty are not discussed, and there is no explanation as to why the three references are considered to represent the understanding of historical audiences. It should be noted that this statement rests on what is and is not in the article under review. Whether other interpretations do exert different pressures needs to be examined directly at the source, and this study has not done so.

In Gadamer's framework, the treatment of such traditions suggests that tradition is positioned as a source of data, not as a voice that helps determine the question. Gadamer asserts that we are not dealing with the past from the outside, because tradition

[46] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 300–306.

[47] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 134–35. Akhmad Aidil Fitra et al., "FROM HISTORICAL MEANING TO DYNAMIC ECOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE: A MA'NA-CUM-MAGHZA READING OF Q. 30:41 AND Q. 7:56 IN THE CONTEXT OF INDONESIA'S CLIMATE CRISIS," *Ibn Abbas* 9, no. 1 (June 2026): 119–50, https://doi.org/10.51900/ias.v9i1.29487.

is where we stand when we understand, and hermeneutical consciousness lies in acknowledging that we are shaped by the influences we want to understand.[48] Syamsuddin's attitude towards tradition is closer to that of selection: he takes what underpins reconstruction *And*. This does not mean that he ignores tradition, for the claim that historical audiences understand *awliyā'* As a friend and ally, he did support the authority of the tradition of interpretation. However, compared to Gadamer's demand that tradition be invited to dialogue so that the interpreter's own views can be corrected by him,[49] This relationship is one-way. There does not appear to be a point when tradition raises objections, for example, a reading that still sees the verse as a general norm about the boundaries of loyalty between communities, and Syamsuddin has to answer it.

The historical concept of influence also directs attention to influences that Syamsuddin did not mention but work on its formulations. He places his approach in the modern contextualist tradition, citing *Double Movement* Fazlur Rahman and Abdullah Saeed's contextualist approach as approaches with similar substances.[50] Rahman himself views the understanding of socio-historical context as a way to find *Ratio Legis* which is then applied to the present situation, while Saeed emphasizes that context helps decide whether the message of a verse is specific or universal.[51] Thus, the logic of "from a particular context to a general principle" at work in Q.S. 5:51 was already shaped by the tradition of 20th-century commentary renewal, which in turn was a response to modernity. The traditions that shaped Syamsuddin were not only al-Ṭabarī and al-Wāḥidī, but also the Western contextualist and hermeneutic movements he studied. This awareness of the history of dual influences, the classical tradition as material and the contextualist tradition as a way of reading, is not matatized in his article.

Turning to Indonesian political discourse, Syamsuddin noted that Q.S. 5:51 has become very famous since September 2016 due to the case of the former Governor of Jakarta. At this point, the history of the influence of the verse meets the history of the influence of the interpreter. The verse does not come to Indonesian readers as a neutral text, but as a text that has been full of public use, and in Syamsuddin's reading, as a text that has been used by certain groups for political purposes. According to Gadamer, the interpreter cannot jump over the layer of meaning, because the text is always present with the history of its acceptance.[52] Syamsuddin's position is thus not a position that returns to the "pure" text, but an intervention in the ongoing history of influence, namely an attempt to shift the dominant meaning from "the prohibition of choosing non-Muslim leaders" to "the prohibition of allying with the treacherous party". In this sense, his

[48] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 300–302.

[49] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 355–62. Akhmad Aidil Fitra et al., "REINTERPRETING QUR'AN 4:32 THROUGH MA'NA-CUM-MAGHZA: A Hermeneutical Framework for Gender Justice," *TAJDID: Jurnal Ilmu Ushuluddin* 24, no. 2 (December 2025): 433–65, https://doi.org/10.30631/tjd.v24i2.5228.

[50] Syamsuddin, "Pendekatan Maʿnā-Cum-Maghzā," 217–40. Zain Faqih Mubarok, "Penafsiran Al-Qur'an Surat Al-Maidah Ayat 51: Studi Komparasi Penafsiran Buya Hamka Dan Sayyid Quthb," *Al Karima : Jurnal Studi Ilmu Al Quran Dan Tafsir* 3, no. 2 (July 2019): 39–53, https://doi.org/10.58438/alkarima.v3i2.69.

[51] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 133.

[52] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 300–301.

interpretation is performative, he has helped shape the history of the verse's influence in Indonesia, something that Gadamer affirms when he says that understanding is an event that is included in the occurrence of the meaning itself.

On the other hand, Syamsuddin explicitly stated that he did not want to discuss the case. This statement shows an interesting hermeneutical tension. Rhetorically, he keeps his distance so that the article appears to be a scientific study, not a defense of a particular party in political matters. But functionally, the final conclusion that the verse is not related to the election of heads of state or regions,[53] directly answers the problem triggered by the case. From Gadamer's point of view, this kind of distancing effort cannot be fully maintained, because the interpreter cannot get out of his hermeneutical situation.[54] However, this is not a flaw that needs to be condemned. What is more important is whether the interpreter realizes that distance is rhetorical, and whether that awareness helps him test his own tendencies. In this article, the awareness is present as a statement of motives but does not continue to be a methodological test.

The question of the fusion of horizons can be answered through the way Syamsuddin separates *ma'nā* and *maghzā*. The textual horizon, namely 7th-century Medina with the Charter of Medina, conflicts with Jewish tribes, and war situations, is reconstructed in the first stage.[55] The interpreter's horizon, namely the need of contemporary Indonesian society for peaceful interreligious relations and fair leadership, enters the second stage through the formulation of *maqṣad*. Both horizons are presented, and the meeting of the two clearly occurs in the final formulation. But the meeting took place after each horizon was constructed separately. Gadamer rejected such an idea: the present horizon was not formed without the past, and the horizon of the past was never obtained by breaking away from the present, so the two were in a melting motion from the beginning.[56] So what happened to Syamsuddin is more appropriately called a late and unrecognized melting. The horizon melts from the choice of questions and the selection of data, as shown in Theme 1, but the architecture of the method recognizes it only in the second stage.

There is one thing that should be noted as an advantage. The separation *of ma'nā* and *maghzā* maintains a distance between the text and the interpreter so that the text is not absorbed by current interests, and Gadamer himself admits that awareness of the difference in horizons is still necessary in the process of fusion.[57] In the context of Indonesian politics that is full of the use of verse for electoral purposes, this distance has practical value: it requires the reader to ask what the verse says in its context before asking what it can say in the present. Thus, Syamsuddin's position can be understood as a selective use of Gadamer's ideas for pedagogical and public purposes, not just a theoretical fallacy. The challenge is to recognize that the distance is a hermeneutical

[53] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 136.

[54] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 301.

[55] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 133–34. Sokon Saragih, "KEPEMIMPINAN NON MUSLIM MENURUT HUKUM ISLAM (Kajian Tafsir Ayatul Ahkam Surah Al-Maidah Ayat 51)," *Tazkiya: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam* 9, no. 2 (December 2020): 110–27, https://doi.org/10.30821/taz.v9i2.833.

[56] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 305–6.

[57] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 305.

distance that the interpreter consciously produces, as a working tool, and not an ontological distance between the "original meaning" and the "present meaning".

The findings of this theme can be formulated as follows. Syamsuddin's interpretation of Q.S. 5:51 is an intervention in the history of the influence of the verse in Indonesia and at the same time a product of the history of the influences that shaped it, namely the tradition of classical interpretation as a material and the modern contextualist tradition as a way of reading. Its relationship with tradition tends to be selective and one-way, while the melting of the horizon takes place but is not recognized in the initial stage and is only made explicit in the second stage. Implicitly, strengthening *the ma'nā-cum-maghzā approach* requires two steps: presenting tradition as opposed to a dialogue that can correct, and making awareness of the history of influence, including the history of the political use of verse, part of the reconstruction from the first stage, so that the distance between the text and the interpreter is accounted for as a methodological choice and not claimed as a natural state.

Critical Reading: Quasi-Objectivism and the Ontology of Comprehension: Common Points, Tensions, and Methodological Implications

The previous three themes examine *the ma'nā-cum-maghzā approach* from three sides the role of prejudice in the reconstruction of *ma'nā*, the status of application in the development *of maghzā*, and the position of interpretation in the history of influence and political discourse. Theme 4 synthesizes the findings at a more fundamental level, namely the meeting of two different epistemological frameworks. Syamsuddin places his approach in the category of progressive quasi-objectivists, which he distinguishes from conservative and subjectivist quasi-objectivists.[58] Gadamer, on the other hand, rejects the hermeneutic question understood as a question of method and views it as an ontological problem, that is, the way of being human who understands.[59] The following critical reading weighs the common points, tensions, and methodological implications of both.

The first common point lies in the awareness of the historicity of the text and the interpreter. Syamsuddin departs from the assumption that the Qur'an is revealed in a culturally bound situation so that its initial meaning is specific to the context, and the universal meaning is only achieved through further interpretation.[60] Gadamer also emphasizes that understanding is always historical and conditional to the interpreter. The second common point is the recognition of the role of subjectivity. Syamsuddin states that the subjectivity of the interpreter plays an important role in reinterpretation and this is in line with the rehabilitation of prejudice by Gadamer.[61] The third common point is the rejection of an ahistorical literal reading. Syamsuddin considers that

[58] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 131–32. Akrimi- Matswah, "Tafsir Kontekstual Terhadap Ayat Tentang Larangan Menjadikan Non-Muslim Sebagai Pemimpin: Studi Terhadap Surat Al-Maidah Ayat 51," *SUHUF* 9, no. 1 (2016): 15–34, https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v9i1.122.

[59] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, xxviii–xxxi.

[60] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 132.

[61] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 278.

textualist and semi-textualist approaches ignore the context of revelation, while Gadamer rejects the idea that texts can be understood independently of the situation of the reader. These three similarities explain why Gadamer can be used productively as an analytical lens, and why Syamsuddin's reference to him is not just a decoration.

The first tension concerns the status *of ma'nā*. Syamsuddin states that the goal of the first stage is to capture the original meaning understood by the first audience and that this is the "historical function of interpretation" in Gracia's formulation.[62] This formulation is parallel to Hirsch's distinction between verbal meanings that are stable according to the author's intention and significance that changes according to the relationship of that meaning to other situations.[63] Gadamer rejects such a distinction because the meaning of the text is not locked to the author's intention and is always determined by the situation of understanding. It should be noted that Syamsuddin does not refer to Hirsch, so this closeness is an analytical reading of the author, not a claim about direct influence. What can be said is that the structure of his argument moves in the same logic: historical meaning is formulated first as a foothold, then significance is developed from it. Theme 1 has shown that it is already guided by prejudice on three key decisions, so the "quasi" claim becomes important. It acknowledges the limitations of objectivity, but does not provide the methodological consequences of that recognition.

The second tension is the separation of *ma'nā* and *maghzā* versus the unity of understanding, interpretation, and application. Syamsuddin uses the term *Anwendung* but places it in the second stage,[64] while for Gadamer application is a constitutive element of understanding from the beginning.[65] Theme 2 has shown that the consequence is the absence of a procedure explaining how the three *maqṣad* are derived from a limited historical meaning. There is a noteworthy irony here: the separation of the two stages intended to maintain discipline actually makes the second stage less disciplined, since the considerations that determine the selection of values are not given a place in the method. Gadamer offers the concept of practical considerations (*phronēsis*) to fill this gap, but the concept does not fit into Syamsuddin's framework.

The third tension concerns the criterion of validity, and here both frameworks face criticism. Syamsuddin is explicitly concerned about the subjectivist school that interprets the Qur'an by ignoring its historical significance and focusing only on its significance for current needs.[66] This concern is justified, and the distinction between *ma'nā* and *maghzā* is his attempt to build a fence. But Gadamer does not teach relativism either. Prejudice must be tested, and the interpreter is bound by the issue the text discusses.[67] The problem is that Gadamer's testing criteria are dialogical and do not

[62] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 132.
[63] Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation*, 255.
[64] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 133. Zohratul Mahmudah and Muhammad Tarmizi Tahir, "NON-MUSLIM LEADERS IN THE DISCOURSE OF TAFSIR: Comparative Study of Al-Misbah and Ibn Kathir's Tafsir," *Alif Lam: Journal of Islamic Studies and Humanities* 2, no. 1 (July 2021): 22–45, https://doi.org/10.51700/aliflam.v2i1.290.
[65] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 307–8.
[66] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 131–32.
[67] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 299–300.

formulate procedures that can be examined by the other party. Hirsch's classical criticism that without a stable criterion of verbal meaning there is no basis for distinguishing between valid and invalid interpretations represents the same concern as Syamsuddin,[68] while Habermas raises the opposite objection, that tradition itself needs to be critically tested and cannot be the final judge.[69] Thus Syamsuddin's approach offers procedural clarity at the price of a fragile epistemological foundation, whereas Gadamer offers a solid foundation at the price of a less operoperable procedure.

The assessment of strengths and limitations needs to be fair. The strength of *ma'nā-cum-maghzā* lies in several things. It provides a clear and teachable sequence of work. It requires the interpreter to trace the linguistic and historical context before concluding, thus becoming a fence for out-of-context reading. It is also intended to apply to the entire Qur'an, not just the legal verses (Syamsuddin, 2018: 132). In Q.S. 5:51, the real contribution is to propose an alternative reading based on linguistic data and context on verses that are often read out of context. Its limitations are the epistemological foundations that have not been secuted, the selective use of Gadamer in a single paragraph,[70] the absence of a testing mechanism for prejudice, and the treatment of tradition as supporting material. It should be emphasized that this assessment rests on one article by Syamsuddin. Other works that may have answered some of these objections have not been examined in this study, and that is a limitation that must be acknowledged.

Methodological implications can be formulated in three strengthening proposals. First, acknowledging prejudice as a constitutive element since the reconstruction *of ma'nā*, for example by stating at the beginning the questions and concerns that guide the reading, as some have done in the opening paragraph,[71] and then following it up with testing. Second, it proceeds the transition from *ma'nā* to *maqṣad*, by explicitly indicating which parts are the functions of meaning and which are implicit functions,[72] why certain values are chosen from several possibilities, and how normative claims such as the leader's demands for justice are linked to the source of his authority. Third, it develops validity criteria that are compatible with the Gadamer framework, namely testing through alternative readings of the same data, consistency with other Qur'anic verses and principles, and consideration of the practical impact of the formulation. With these three steps, *ma'nā* can be maintained as a historical discipline without being claimed as a neutral foundation, and *maghzā* can be maintained as a responsible application without being claimed as a final universal message.

[68] Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation*, 245–64.

[69] Josef Bleicher, *Contemporary Hermeneutics: Hermeneutics as Method, Philosophy and Critique* (Routledge, 2017), 268–85.

[70] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 133.

[71] Syamsuddin, "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an," 131.

[72] Jorge J. E. Gracia, *A Theory of Textuality: The Logic and Epistemology* (State University of New York Press, 1995), 160–64.

As a synthesis, this study finds that Syamsuddin's interpretation of Q.S. 5:51 and Gadamer's hermeneutics meet in the recognition of historicity and the role of subjectivity, but are separated on the status of historical meaning, the relationship of understanding and application, and how to maintain validity. Syamsuddin's quasi-objectivism is more appropriately read as a methodological strategy that is aware of the risks of subjectivism, not as a theoretical fallacy, but the foundation will be more consistent with the hermeneutics to which he refers if the role of prejudice is recognized from the beginning. The theoretical contribution of this study is to show that the problem *of ma'nā-cum-maghzā* does not lie in the choice between objectivism and subjectivism, but in the need for a testing procedure that recognizes the unity of understanding and application while maintaining historical discipline.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion presents a summary of the description of the results and discussion, referring to the purpose of the research. Based on these two things, new points of thought were developed which are the essence of the research findings. This study shows that Sahiron Syamsuddin interprets Q.S. al-Mā'idah: 51 through two stages: reconstructing historical meaning (*ma'nā*) through the analysis of macro and micro contexts and language, then formulating a moral message (*maqṣad*) as a significance (*maghzā*) for the present. The result is a reading that *awliyā'* means close friend, ally, and helper, that the *particle al-* refers to a specific group of Jews and Christians in Medina who betrayed, and that this verse has nothing to do with the election of heads of state or region. In the framework of Gadamer's hermeneutics, this interpretation meets Gadamer in the recognition of the historicity of the text and the interpreter and the role of subjectivity, but differs in three respects. First, *ma'nā* is treated as a relatively objective footing, even though anti-politicization motives have guided the selection of data, the meaning of words, and the range of particles since the first stage. Second, *maghzā* is placed as an advanced stage, not as *an Anwendung* that is integrated with understanding, so that the selection of the three universal values is not accompanied by a testable procedure. Third, the tradition of interpretation and the history of the use of verse politics is present as a supporting material, not an opponent of dialogue, so that the melting of horizons takes place but is only recognized in the second stage.

Thus, the problem *of ma'nā-cum-maghzā* lies not in the choice between objectivism and subjectivism, but in the need for a testing procedure that recognizes the role of prejudice from the reconstruction of meaning and unity of understanding with application, without abandoning the historical discipline that is its strength. This study recommends three reinforcements: stating and testing the interpreter's prejudices from the beginning, procedural the transition from *ma'nā* to *maqṣad* along with the reasons for the selection of values and sources of authority, and formulating validity criteria through alternative readings, consistency with other Qur'anic principles, and consideration of practical impact. This research has limitations because it relies on one primary article, so other works of Syamsuddin that may have answered some of the above objections, as well as direct comparisons with classical and Indonesian interpretations, have not been examined. Further research can apply the same framework to other verses or compare it with the hermeneutics of Ricoeur or Abou El Fadl.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adistia, Yusril. "TELAAH KITAB TAFSIR ATH-THABARI DALAM Q.S AL-MAIDAH AYAT 51." *Al-Munir: Jurnal Studi Ilmu Al-Qur'an Dan Tafsir* 1, no. 02 (2019): 55–78. https://doi.org/10.24239/al-munir.v1i02.36.

Akhmad Aidil Fitra, Suprize, Agus Widianto, and Farid Fauzi. *DARI KAIRO KE YOGYAKARTA Genealogi Pemikiran Tafsir Kontemporer: Abduh, Arkoun Hingga Sahiron Syamsuddin*. Hafizhah Press, 2026.

Amin, Nazifatul Ummy Al, and Ilham Akbar Habibie. "Analisis Pengaruh Konteks Sosial-Historis Terhadap Penafsiran Ibn Kaṡīr Atas QS. Al-Mā'idah [5]: 51." *Contemporary Quran* 2, no. 1 (February 2022): 17–32. https://doi.org/10.14421/cq.v2i1.5671.

Bleicher, Josef. *Contemporary Hermeneutics: Hermeneutics as Method, Philosophy and Critique*. Routledge, 2017.

Constantin, Natasha Astrid, and Fitzerald Kennedy Sitorus. "HERMENEUTIKA, MAKNA DAN KOMUNIKASI DALAM PERSPEKTIF HANS-GEORG GADAMER." *Komunikologi: Jurnal Pengembangan Ilmu Komunikasi dan Sosial* 8, no. 1 (June 2024): 72–81. https://doi.org/10.30829/komunikologi.v8i1.18771.

Fitra, Akhmad Aidil, and Yousuf Aboujanah. "Gadamerian Hermeneutical Analysis of Hasbi Ash-Shiddieqy's Interpretation of QS. Luqman (31):6 in the Context of Contemporary Entertainment Discourse." *Al-Karim: International Journal of Quranic and Islamic Studies* 3, no. 1 (March 2025): 59–78. https://doi.org/10.33367/al-karim.v3i1.6839.

Fitra, Akhmad Aidil, Farida Nur 'Afifah, Busra Febriyarni, and Idi Warsah. "Integration of Ulumul Qur'an And Western Hermeneutics: Sahiron Syamsuddin's Intellectual Project in The Context of Islamic Studies in Indonesia." *Takamul El-Ulum: Jurnal Studi Islam* 1, no. 2 (June 2026): 207–30. https://doi.org/10.24952/tkml.v1i2.19672.

———. "Integration of Ulumul Qur'an And Western Hermeneutics: Sahiron Syamsuddin's Intellectual Project in The Context of Islamic Studies in Indonesia." *Takamul El-Ulum: Jurnal Studi Islam* 1, no. 2 (June 2026): 207–30. https://doi.org/10.24952/tkml.v1i2.19672.

Fitra, Akhmad Aidil, Siti Nuri Nurhaidah, Muhammad Haris Hakam, Mudrikatul Arafah, and Navi' Vadila. "REINTERPRETING QUR'AN 4:32 THROUGH MA'NA-CUM-MAGHZA: A Hermeneutical Framework for Gender Justice." *TAJDID: Jurnal Ilmu Ushuluddin* 24, no. 2 (December 2025): 433–65. https://doi.org/10.30631/tjd.v24i2.5228.

Fitra, Akhmad Aidil, and Oktasandi Oktasandi. “Pembacaan Hermeneutis : Penafsiran Buya Hamka Tentang Lahw al Ḥadīṡ (Studi Pemikiran Hans George Gadamer).” *Syariati: Jurnal Studi Al-Qur`an Dan Hukum* 10, no. 2 (November 2024): 147–62. https://doi.org/10.32699/syariati.v10i2.7707.

Fitra, Akhmad Aidil, Suprizen Suprizen, Muhammad Hafidz Kusnadin, Riri Maiyati, and Idi Warsah. “FROM HISTORICAL MEANING TO DYNAMIC ECOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE: A MA’NA-CUM-MAGHZA READING OF Q. 30:41 AND Q. 7:56 IN THE CONTEXT OF INDONESIA’S CLIMATE CRISIS.” *Ibn Abbas* 9, no. 1 (June 2026): 119–50. https://doi.org/10.51900/ias.v9i1.29487.

———. “FROM HISTORICAL MEANING TO DYNAMIC ECOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE: A MA’NA-CUM-MAGHZA READING OF Q. 30:41 AND Q. 7:56 IN THE CONTEXT OF INDONESIA’S CLIMATE CRISIS.” *Ibn Abbas* 9, no. 1 (June 2026): 119–50. https://doi.org/10.51900/ias.v9i1.29487.

Fitra, Akhmad Aidil, and Novizal Wendry. “Penafsiran, Ideologi, dan Afiliasi Politik: Kritik Buya Hamka (1908-1981 M) terhadap Nasakom Era Demokrasi Terpimpin (1959-1966 M).” *Istinarah: Riset Keagamaan, Sosial dan Budaya* 6, no. 2 (December 2024): 234–49. https://doi.org/10.31958/istinarah.v6i2.13607.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. Sheed & Ward, 1975.

Gracia, Jorge J. E. *A Theory of Textuality: The Logic and Epistemology*. State University of New York Press, 1995.

Habibi, M. Dani. “INTERPRETASI HERMENEUTIKA JORGE J.E. GRACIA DALAM AL-QUR’AN SURAH AL-MAIDAH: 51.” *QOF* 3, no. 2 (December 2019): 195–204. https://doi.org/10.30762/qof.v3i2.1377.

Hamdi, Saipul. “Pilkada Rasa Pilpres : Al-Maidah 51 Dan Politisasi Simbol Agama Dalam Kontestasi Politik Di Pilkada DKI Jakarta.” *Indonesian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 2, no. 1 (March 2021): 9–22.

Hirsch, Eric Donald. *Validity in Interpretation*. Yale University Press, 1967.

Illahi, Fajar, Muhammad Farhan Firas, and Saifullah. “Integrasi Hermeneutika Hans-Georg Gademer dalam pembelajaran Al-Qur’an dan Hadist: Studi Metodologi di Pesantren Sumatera Thawalib Parabek Bukittinggi.” *Al-Afkar: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Pendidikan Islam* 2, no. 2 (July 2026): 363–75. https://doi.org/10.0111/afkar.v2i2.165.

Jamaly, Za’farullah, Nazwa Hidayatunnisa, Velisa Azzahra, Ramadhani Firmansyah Wahid, and Nashikin Nashikin. “Menganalisis Pemikiran Filsafat Gadamer (Pemikiran Hermeneutika).” *Leksikon: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Budaya* 2, no. 1 (April 2024): 01–06. https://doi.org/10.59632/leksikon.v2i1.190.

Mahmudah, Zohratul, and Muhammad Tarmizi Tahir. “NON-MUSLIM LEADERS IN THE DISCOURSE OF TAFSIR: Comparative Study of Al-Misbah and Ibn Kathir’s Tafsir.” *Alif Lam: Journal of Islamic Studies and Humanities* 2, no. 1 (July 2021): 22–45. https://doi.org/10.51700/aliflam.v2i1.290.

———. “NON-MUSLIM LEADERS IN THE DISCOURSE OF TAFSIR: Comparative Study of Al-Misbah and Ibn Kathir’s Tafsir.” *Alif Lam: Journal of Islamic Studies and Humanities* 2, no. 1 (July 2021): 22–45. https://doi.org/10.51700/aliflam.v2i1.290.

Matswah, Akrimi-. “Tafsir Kontekstual Terhadap Ayat Tentang Larangan Menjadikan Non-Muslim Sebagai Pemimpin: Studi Terhadap Surat Al-Maidah Ayat 51.” *SUHUF* 9, no. 1 (2016): 15–34. https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v9i1.122.

Mubarok, Zain Faqih. “Penafsiran Al-Qur’an Surat Al-Maidah Ayat 51: Studi Komparasi Penafsiran Buya Hamka Dan Sayyid Quthb.” *Al Karima : Jurnal Studi Ilmu Al Quran Dan Tafsir* 3, no. 2 (July 2019): 39–53. https://doi.org/10.58438/alkarima.v3i2.69.

Muchlisin, Annas Rolli. “Tafsir in Its Context, or How Socio-Political Milieu Informed What to Include and Exclude in Qur’an Commentaries: At-Tabari’s, Ibn Abi Hatim’s, and al-Maturidi’s Interpretations of Surah Al-Ma’idah (5): 51 as a Case Study.” *SUHUF* 17, no. 2 (December 2024): 215–30. https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v17i2.1114.

Niam, Mohammad Alfin. “Membaca Ulang Gender Dalam Tafsir: Perspektif Hermeneutika Filosofis Dan Kritis.” *Nida’ Al-Qur’an : Jurnal Kajian Quran Dan Wanita* 23, no. 1 (March 2025): 112–36. https://doi.org/10.33511/nidaquran.v23n1.112-136.

Noril, and Huril Aini. “KAJIAN HADIS TENTANG KEMANUSIAAN DALAM PERSPEKTIF HERMENEUTIKA HANS-GEORG GADAMER.” *Al-Furqan : Jurnal Agama, Sosial, Dan Budaya* 5, no. 3 (June 2026): 2272–81.

Permana, Fadhila Sidiq. “TAFSIR AL-MAIDAH 51 PERSPEKTIF HERMENEUTIKA PEMBEBASAN: TELAAH DAN IMPLEMENTASI PEMIKIRAN FARID ESACK.” *Muảṣarah: Jurnal Kajian Islam Kontemporer* 6, no. 1 (June 2024): 1–15. https://doi.org/10.18592/msr.v6i2.13596.

Rifka, Raifatul, and Amanda Syahryani. “Kepemimpinan Non-Muslim Dalam Al-Qur’an: Kajian Hermeneutik Terhadap QS. Al-Mā’idah 51, Ali Imran 28, Dan An-Nisā’ 144.” *Muhkamat : Jurnal Ilmu Al-Quran Dan Tafsir* 3, no. 1 (June 2025): 89–102.

Saragih, Sokon. “KEPEMIMPINAN NON MUSLIM MENURUT HUKUM ISLAM (Kajian Tafsir Ayatul Ahkam Surah Al-Maidah Ayat 51).” *Tazkiya: Jurnal*

Pendidikan Islam 9, no. 2 (December 2020): 110–27. https://doi.org/10.30821/taz.v9i2.833.

Syamsuddin, Sahiron. "Ma'na-Cum- Maghza Aproach To The Qur'an: Interpretation Of Q. 5:51." November 2017, 131–36. https://doi.org/10.2991/icqhs-17.2018.21.

———. "Pendekatan Maʿnā-Cum-Maghzā: Paradigma, Prinsip, Dan Metode Penafsiran." *Nun: Jurnal Studi Alquran Dan Tafsir Di Nusantara* 8, no. 2 (December 2022): 217–40. https://doi.org/10.32495/nun.v8i2.428.

Ummam, Naufa Izzul, and Abdul Haris. "Deciphering QS. al-Maidah: 51 in Qur'an, Liberation & Pluralism: Analyzing the Interpretation of the Word Auliya' through Farid Esack's Perspective." *Journal of Islamic Civilization* 5, no. 2 (2023): 138–56. https://doi.org/10.33086/jic.v5i2.5378.

Wahyudi, Muhammad. "Kepemimpinan Non-Muslim: Penafsiran Surat Al-Maidah Ayat 51 Dalam Tafsir Al-Azhar Dan Tafsir Al-Mishbah." *Progresiva : Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Pendidikan Islam* 7, no. 2 (2018): 166–83. https://doi.org/10.22219/progresiva.v7i2.13980.