Reading / EN

Understanding begins before agreement.

How wording, interpretation, and personal application remain distinguishable.

Epoch AdL · Bib / 2026-10-22

Understanding begins before agreement.

A reading about taking a second look: what does the text say, what does the reader bring, and what conclusion does the source really support? Selected methodological ideas from I'TIBAR are developed through a fictional everyday example.

A familiar sentence is quickly understood

A fictional club handbook says: "Responsibility means being there for others." One person reads it as an obligation to take on every additional task. Another reads it as the group's duty to distribute work fairly. Both recognize in the short sentence something already important to them. Whether the text supports this particular interpretation has not yet been examined.

The example is invented and does not come from I'TIBAR. It makes accessible a question that the book asks about its own subject: what presuppositions does a reader bring? A personal expectation need not be wrong. But it should remain recognizable as an expectation so that it does not silently take the place

of the source.

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: I’TIBAR – Die Brücke, Endfassung 1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 3, p. 8; chapter 7, p. 11; chapters 11–12, pp. 14–15; chapter 22, p. 25. The origin is a methodological work on reading the Qur’an.

Context can limit the first reading

The next paragraph of the fictional handbook might explain that every task is taken on with consent and that a person should promise only a limited contribution. This gives the first sentence a different scope. Someone who passes it on alone need not quote the words incorrectly and may still omit a decisive condition. Careful reading therefore asks not only whether the words are correct, but what context matters to their use.

For this purpose, I’TIBAR develops seven levels of reading the Qur’an, from the word to the overall context. This particular arrangement is not declared here to be a universal method for all texts. What is applied is the more modest working question: which neighboring passage or section could actually change the understanding of this sentence?

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: I’TIBAR – Die Brücke, Endfassung 1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 3, p. 8; chapter 7, p. 11; chapters 11–12, pp. 14–15; chapter 22, p. 25. The origin is a methodological work on reading the Qur’an.

What does it say, and what do I infer from it?

In chapter 11, the source distinguishes six kinds of statement: Qur’anic wording, linguistic observation, transmitted tradition, an identified tafsir statement, one's own analytical inference, and a possibility not yet decided. These categories belong to its religious field of investigation. Their methodological purpose is to avoid raising the status of a statement through different justifications passing unnoticed into one another.

A smaller distinction is enough for the fictional club example. The handbook's first sentence is the wording. The observation that the following paragraph speaks of consent is a finding about the context. The recommendation that tasks should in future be distributed jointly is already a personal application. It can be well justified. But it should still not be presented as though this precise organizational form already appeared verbatim in the sentence.

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: I’TIBAR – Die Brücke, Endfassung 1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 3, p. 8; chapter 7, p. 11; chapters 11–12, pp. 14–15; chapter 22, p. 25. The origin is a methodological work on reading the Qur’an.

A rendering makes decisions

Anyone who renders a thought into another language or into their own model vocabulary makes a selection. An expression can be understood more broadly or narrowly; a relationship can emerge differently in the new sentence. I'TIBAR therefore distinguishes between the Arabic Qur'an text, the German rendering of its meaning, and the subsequent AdL explanation. A technical term from the model does not become a word of the source merely because it vividly describes a connection.

For ordinary reading, this implies an examinable approach to one's own wording: identify whether you are quoting, summarizing, or applying. If a translation is decisive for your argument, state which choice of meaning you are using and why. A particularly fitting formulation is initially a reason to look more closely. It is not yet a reason to remove other defensible readings from the presentation.

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: I'TIBAR – Die Brücke, Endfassung 1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 3, p. 8; chapter 7, p. 11; chapters 11–12, pp. 14–15; chapter 22, p. 25. The origin is a methodological work on reading the Qur'an.

Read a source twice

The following exercise is an editorial application. Choose a short passage and, before rereading it, write down what you expect to find there. Then read it with the necessary context. Afterwards, note three separate sentences: what is expressly said, what you observe about how the words are used, and what you infer from it for a particular situation.

Now look for a passage that limits or corrects your first expectation. If you find none, ask what further information could change your interpretation. The purpose is not to manufacture a contradiction every time. It is to give your own reading a transparent opportunity for examination. Sometimes the second reading confirms the first impression; sometimes it changes its scope.

One's own attitude remains part of the examination

Reading can lead to a reasoned conviction. The path there should leave visible which source, linguistic observation, and personal application support the result. This is especially important when a general statement is to become a judgment about a particular person. Understanding a rule does not mean already knowing all that person's circumstances.

The theological status of the Qur’an belongs to the source's own framework of faith and is not derived from a technical balance value. Nor does this reading edition claim a new binding interpretation. Its subject is the discipline of human reading: do not confuse the source with your own tool, take the context seriously, and allow a better justification even when it changes the familiar interpretation.

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: I’TIBAR – Die Brücke, Endfassung 1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 3, p. 8; chapter 7, p. 11; chapters 11–12, pp. 14–15; chapter 22, p. 25. The origin is a methodological work on reading the Qur’an.

Questions

What expectation do you already bring before reading a passage?

Where does the wording end and your own application begin?

What neighboring passage could change the scope of your conclusion?

About this edition

Adapted from “I’TIBAR – Die Brücke,” final version of 12 October 2026: chapter 3, p. 8, on the reader's attitude; chapter 7, p. 11, on the passage; chapters 11–12, pp. 14–15, on kinds of statement and translation;

chapter 22, p. 25, on the working procedure. The source explicitly addresses reading the Qur'an. The nonreligious example text developed here is a new editorial application, not evidence that all kinds of text have the same rules of interpretation.

Explains the separation of source, linguistic observation, and personal inference in ordinary language.

Adds a fictional example and a short exercise in examining one's own expectations.

Preserves the religious origin and its disciplinary prerequisites; claims no interpretation of a new Qur'anic passage or general theory of all texts.

An independent adaptation of selected passages with new examples and context. This is not a complete reprint of the source texts. Examples are fictional; ADL interpretations are editorial applications. External sources do not establish ADL's effectiveness.

Sources

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: I'TIBAR – Die Brücke, Endfassung 1.0
12 October 2026 · Chapter 3, p. 8; chapter 7, p. 11; chapters 11–12, pp. 14–15; chapter 22, p. 25. The origin is a methodological work on reading the

Qur’an.