

TRACING 'PROJECTION' IN ORIENTALISTS' SCHOLARSHIP OF QUR'ĀNIC TEXT

*Dr. Muhammad Feroz-ud-Din Shah Khagga**

Criticism in Religious scholarship is hardly a justified task, particularly when the matter is about textual divinity. Hence, this critical perpetuity has always been an arena of cross objecting among the religions. Attributing pitfalls to others and considering himself as immaculate is known as *Projection*. Projection, a psychological phenomenon of defense mechanism, is attempted at in this work, which has frequently been traced in scholarly orientalist discourses on the Qur'ān. After giving a thoroughgoing exploratory touch to this concept effort has been made to highlight its reflections in orientalist works on the Qur'ān. Contrarily has been thrown light upon which fruits it bears by bringing Muslims' conception of their sacred book in the Qur'ān.

Key Words: Projection, Qur'ānic Text, Orientalism, Defense Mechanism, Textual Criticism.

Introduction

In any sphere of intellectual activity, criticism follows a certain methodology and it is a tool which signifies the merits and demerits of a work for constructive purposes, especially, in research. The criticism intended otherwise, might have been guided by some other non-academic motives, may not be useful and. And, its reliability and validity lie on the methodology employed in it for analysis of its subject matter. Therefore, it is pertinent to analyze the Orientalist critical study of the Qur'ān that, of what kind its methodology is and whether it gives rise to constructive discourse. Many Muslim scholars around the world undertook this task while discussing various dimensions of scholastic Orientalist discourses on Islam. Hereby is taken into consideration the Orientalists' critical study of the Qur'ān. Purpose here would not be to answer the objections on the holy text of the Muslims but to reflect upon and discuss the nature of Orientalist study of the Qur'ān.

'Projection', a well-established fact now and deliberated upon by many scholars, has perpetually been detected in critical writings on the Qur'ān and Islam by the Orientalists; and this element in their writings is perhaps quite unconsciously present. This term was first coined by a great psychologist 'Sigmund Freud', founder of "Psychodynamic School of Thought" in Psychology. He studied 'unconscious forces' acting as determinants of personality besides

* Assistant Prof. of Islamic & Oriental Studies, University of Sargodha.

being guiding force behind behavior of an individual. They keep disturbing normal behavior and cause, thus, anxiety. According to him an individual represses these unconscious memories back into the 'unconscious' – a part of memory out of awareness of an individual. Unluckily, as described by Freud, anxiety associated with them can't be completely buried which can produce abnormal behavior. To avoid such psychological disturbances, Freud writes, individual employ various defense mechanisms – a range of unconscious strategies used by an individual to reduce anxiety by concealing from himself and others. 'Projection' is one of those mechanisms in which "people attribute unwanted impulses and feelings to someone else". In more elaborate way Philip Lawrence Harriman defines that "Freud's term (1894) for the process of attributing to others the desires and complexes which belong to oneself. Ideas of reference and delusions of persecution are examples. In academic psychology, the term refers to the localization of sensations at the place of stimulation."¹ He further explains the term that it is the unconscious mechanism where one's own faults are seen in other persons' rather than in one's own personality; in other systems of psychology, the act of objectifying what is actually a subjective or internal experience.²

An Indian famous psychologist Mohan Kumar exposes the term in more comprehending way, such as:

In psychoanalytic theory, a mechanism of defense, in which various forbidden thoughts and impulses are attributed to another person rather than the self, thus warding off same anxiety.³

Although in its simplest form, it refers to seeing one's own traits in other people. A more rigorous understanding involves perceiving others as having traits that one inaccurately believes oneself not to have. As a broad form of influence of self-concept on person's perception, 'projection' may be regarded as more a cognitive bias than a defense mechanism. Nonetheless, projection can be seen as defensive if perception of a threatening trait in others helps the individual in some way to avoid recognizing its presence in him or herself, and indeed this is how Freud (e.g., 1915/1961a) conceptualized 'projection'. Thus, there are multiple ways of understanding projection, and they vary mainly along the dimension of how effectively the undesirable trait or motive is

repudiated.⁴ The same way Simon Sheppard expands the scope of the term by classifying it into two major categories.

Freudian Projection:

Simon gives a set of definitions of 'projection' from conventional psychological point of view. According to him, the distinctive apparatus of projecting own unconscious or unwanted attributes against rival is known as Freudian Projection. Multifaceted definitions given by him, some important are (1) A defense mechanism in which the individual attributes to other people impulses and traits that he himself has but cannot accept. It is especially likely to occur when the person lacks insight into his own impulses and traits. (2) The externalization of internal unconscious wishes desires or emotions on to other people. So, for example, someone who feels subconsciously that they have a powerful latent homosexual drive may not acknowledge this consciously, but it may show in their readiness to suspect others of being homosexual. (3) Attributing one's own undesirable traits to other people or agencies, e.g., an aggressive man accuses other people of being hostile. (4) The individual perceives in others the motive he denies having himself. Thus the cheat is sure that everyone else is dishonest. Similarly, an adulterer accuses his wife of infidelity. (5) People attribute their own undesirable traits onto others. An individual who unconsciously recognizes his or her aggressive tendencies may then see other people acting in an excessively aggressive way. (6) Projection is the opposite defense mechanism to identification. We project our own unpleasant feelings onto someone else and blame them for having thoughts that we really have.⁵

General Projection:

Here 'projection' assumes another aspect that, others act or perceive similarly – according to this definition it is not necessary for a projected trait to be undesirable or unconscious. 'Projection' is probably inherent in social animals and the single most important psychological mechanism. The following are some examples: (a) Person X presumes that Z sees the color green as he does, until the reality was told to X that Z is color-blind; (b) An incompetent person frights that other people are struggling to deceive him, he demonstrates his fear and makes other people alert; (c) According to Freudian theory, a person who has

malicious characteristics, but reluctant to identify himself as a hero, convinces himself that his enemy senses his intentions and will precede the similar style.⁶

Consequently, some deducible points from the preceding discussion on 'projection' can be drawn as; the motive of '*Projection*' is based on the imperfection of consciousness and the sense of inferiority. The objective of '*Projection*' is to defend/hide the flaws and deficiencies which a person has. This activity happens unconsciously. It is not necessary to have always the sense of imperfection or inferiority rather there must be some other circumstances besides that create this situation and a person may start 'projecting' either unintentionally or intentionally. It has been observed the defense mechanism of '*Projection*' has mostly been exercised in its negative appearance.⁷

So it's a kind of self-defense mechanism meaning an unconscious act of refusal of a person's own flaws, shortcomings, deficiencies, thoughts, desires, conflicts, urges, malicious tendencies and fear of defeat and emotions, which are then ascribed to the outside world, such as to the weather, the government, a tool, or to other people just to put aside himself from these faults or to reduce his regret, embarrassment and deficiency or to conceal the sense of sin. In this way, a man gets relaxed while knowing inside that he has flaws. '*Projection*' is considered one of the most profound and subtle of human psychological processes, and extremely difficult, thus, to work with, because by its nature it is hidden as an individual infected with it keeps himself uninformed about himself in order to elude psychological disturbances in daily functioning.

In socio-psychological point of view, 'projection' survives its status as a self-defense mechanism, but in sphere of academic activity, intellectual capacity of scholars may try to find out shortcomings in others merely to demonstrate the point that the accuracy just lies with them, and behave as if they were being truthful.⁸ Likewise, this phenomenon has been frequently and abundantly traced in Orientalist writings on the fundamental sources of Islam which, in turn, results in dissemination of misleading information about Islam to western readers and new researchers. While taking the support of disingenuous arguments, deficient-knowledge calculations and wrong assessments, they come up with absolute misconceptions about Islam and propagate,

thus, disinformation time and again. Question arises: why are such deductions being made by Orientalists again and again? Before having a thoroughgoing look to solve this conundrum one has to keep in mind the following factors about a religion; like Incapability of growing or stagnancy in the teachings of religion, Intervention of corruption in sacred religious literature, Contradictions in beliefs, Irrational and biased behavior Irresponsible role of Church etc. But as far Islam is concerned, Orientalists have been very attentive to take the Islamic sacred text to higher criticism but with the mindset imbibed from their forefathers and got their thinking influenced of it; which afterwards was untowardly reflected in scholastic discourses on Islam's basic sources. Century after century, decade after decade, period after period, same criticism and objections leveled against the Qur'ān containing differences exiguous if any, witness it. Hereby this work attempts to bring to the fore certain manifestations of 'projections' in critical analysis of the Qur'ān by Orientalists.⁹ Inherent to this study will be revelation of the reality that unfortunately, the alleged deductions from and described fallacies in Qur'ānic studies remain an integral part of their own religious literature, but they on the contrary, always paste them upon Islam and its fundamental sources – 'projection'.

Reflections of 'Projection' in Orientalist' Study of the Qur'ānic Text:

In the Islamic scheme of studies, Qur'ān is considered to be the word of Allah but the western approach is opposite to that. The basic dissimilitude between the Muslim understanding of the revelation and composition of the Qur'ān and Western historical accounts of the origin and composition of the text is based on the refusal of its divine character by the later. And this view of Western interpreters is still in vogue since the 12th century, when the Qur'ān was first translated into Latin by Robert of Ketton under the aegis of Peter the Venerable (d. 1156 A.D.),¹⁰ so that Christians would be better able to refute Islam. Quite surprisingly there have been some notable exceptions that some western authors have even tended to consider the Qur'ān to be the work of Muhammad himself, rejecting thus the revealed nature/origin of it. Since the 19th century, when Orientalism movement in its modern form re-emerged in the West, there developed many West-coined

theories about the origin and structure of the Qur'ān. Drawing from a variety of intellectual developments—the rationalization of the enlightenment, the historicism of the 19th century, contemporary European philosophy, and the findings of Semitic philology—some scholars have considered the Qur'ān to have been based on what the Prophet Muhammad heard from Jews and Christians around him. Other scholars have allegedly pointed out the similarity of some Qur'ānic terms with words existing in Aramaic, Syriac, and other Semitic languages and identified older lingual models from which the text of the Qur'ān was drawn. In the late 20th century some revisionist Western scholars even sought to refute completely the historical context of the appearance of the Qur'ān and claimed that the Qur'ān was assembled in its present form much later than the 7th century.¹¹

So, thus, they challenge the definiteness, divinity and origin of the Holy Book of the Muslims to demonstrate it doubtful and spurious. But it is an established fact that origin and history of the Bible utterly corrupted and thus, distrustful, which has been accepted even by its followers, and many heated debates among them have taken place over these issues. Even it has been confessed by Judaic and Christian academic circles that Old Testament and New Testament have not been saved entirely and that's too not without corruption. Yet most of the Orientalists instead of admitting this reality, they relentlessly propagated the same allegation on sacred text of the Qur'ān. As it has been described in the prelude of this discourse under the caption of 'projection' (to portray one's own flaws onto others), perhaps one of the reason for disbelieving the divinity of the Qur'ān is because of the fact that they could not endure accepting textual corruption in the Bible. In these conditions, with no regard to being right or wrong, the scholars and political stake holders of Christianity embarked upon to comment upon the personality of Muhammad and the character of the Qur'ān to assert their interest in the subsistence or the continued existence of their religion parallel to Islam. And, scope of this kind of study is extended even further.

No less frequently have been questioned the collection and preservation of the Qur'ān. For this sake, they try to assert, without solid and reliable argument, that there is a perpetual historical development of text of the Qur'ān that, it came to its existing final

shape after a series of broken and variant oral transmissions. While on the contrary, their own scripture has suffered from many evolutionary and developmental stages and has also been made subject to human whims and passions. "To summarize, the chronology in which the 'Christian Scriptures' had evolved was in the following order: the first, the Q gospel emanating from the historical Jesus the Prophet; the second, Paul's letters replacing the historical Jesus with a mythical *Chrestos* in the context of a pagan Hellenistic milieu; and the third and the last, the narrative Gospels which merged the historical figure of Jesus the Prophet, with a mythical *Chrestos of Pauline* invention. All authors of the canonical gospels were exponents of Pauline theology."¹² As Origen, a Christian theologian-philosopher of the 3rd century has acknowledged that the scriptures were subjected to editing, deletions and additions, so as to suit the theological climate of those who set themselves up as 'correctors'¹³, it becomes clear that new Christian religion attributed to the Jesus came into being on the basis of Paul's writings and doctrines. And the same fault they try to find in Uthmān's collection and preservation of the Qur'ān, which is nothing but an entirely baseless accusation and possible 'projection' of faults just mentioned in their own holy scriptures. Likewise, Arthur Jeffery, Bergstrasser and Pretzl¹⁴ have attempted to find out different versions of the Qur'ān. To this end, they collected early Kufic Codices and early 'unpublished *Qira'āt* works' to trace variant versions of the Qur'ān without any solid ground.¹⁵ However, on the other hand, different versions of the Christian Bible are a well-known established fact among the Christian communities. And all these versions are not necessarily identical. Its history seems to be either adopted or fabricated from time to time, and from one Christian denomination to another. "For example the Roman Catholic Version, RCV for short, includes seven additions which Protestants don't acknowledge and deem as *Apocrypha*. Responding to the Protestants, these books are called 'deutero-canonical' by the Roman Catholics and the Orthodox churches, meaning they are a second canonical corpus."¹⁶ Similarly, the most significant aspect of Orientalist criticism on Qur'ān is applied to its chronological order and its history; which in fact is a glaring feature of the text of the Bible. As Rev. H. H. Rowley writes:

The Old Testament is puzzling to the reader in part because materials of various ages often lie side by side in the same book, and because there is no chronological order of the books as a whole. In the first part of the Bible there is a broadly chronological arrangement down to the book of Esther, though there are some differences of arrangement in the Hebrew Bible. But this chronological arrangement belongs to the times surveyed and not to the dates of composition of the books. To determine the age of each book is often very difficult, and arrangement amongst scholars is far from complete.¹⁷

Same view is expressed by Dr. H. G. Meecham about "*Apocrypha*" and its historical importance while indicating the fact that "there is much diversity of scholarly opinion on the original language, date, and origin of some of the Apocrypha makes classification difficult."¹⁸

Contrarily, Henry Preserved Smith, D.D. tries to show the dependency of Qur'ān on Bible, while resorting not to any logical and serious argument. He rather takes the plea of assumptions and accusations; he says:

The dependence of the Koran upon the Bible whether the dependence be mediate or immediate we do not now inquire is evident at a glance. There is not a page whose language does not remind us of the Old Testament or of the New. This is partly accounted for by the similarity of the Arabic language to the Hebrew, and also by the resemblance of the civilizations represented in the two books.¹⁹

He declares all the Qur'ānic narratives as Biblical anecdotes and points out some other sources additionally; according to him "for considerable portions of the Koran we cannot be in doubt. Nearly all its narratives are Biblical stories. But in no case are they exact translations of the Biblical text. Quotations even of a single verse are not easy to find. The most diligent search does not discover more than two or three. The reasons for this are obvious. For one thing, there existed no Arabic translation of the Scriptures in the time of Mohammed. The Jews or Christians from whom he got his information were obliged to give the stories in their own words. But besides this, the Prophet evidently worked over the material he

received, to fit it to his own purpose. He was not a historian, but a preacher. He used the history to convey a lesson. He may have had the idea that he could entertain his hearers and attract them by relating these histories. If so, he was disappointed. The Meccans openly preferred a reciter of fairy-stories who set up as his rival perhaps a lesson to those who think the pulpit succeeds if it entertains its hearers. How far Mohammed indulged the hope of making his message attractive by putting it in the form of stories, it is not easy to say".²⁰

He goes on quoting accounts of various events of previous Prophets in order to signify their resemblance to the motives of and ways of establishing the religion applied by Muhammad (PBUH) – a notion which is highly probable, unsupported and misconstrued and seems to be aimed at casting doubt at the genuineness of the Prophethood of the Prophet (PBUH). Surprisingly, if any such similarity is found why has it not been interpreted in the way that it symbolizes the same divinely origin of Prophethood of every Prophet of Allah? Besides, similitude in teachings of the preceding Prophets and the Prophet (PBUH) points to the continuity of the same chain which culminated in Islam. If it's true, as it is, this fact then could merely be explained through 'projection'. For the most part the narratives were made strictly subordinate to his main purpose, and we can understand the narratives only as we keep the purpose in mind. *To warn his hearers of the wrath to come*- this is his main aim, and this explains his choice of material, as well as the form in which the material is presented. As has already been remarked, this purpose is seen in his use of material from other than Biblical sources. The two histories which he takes from Arab antiquity are cast by him in Biblical form. As he tells them, both relate that a prophet was sent to his tribe. The tribe rejects the prophet and is punished. These brief sentences give the key to a large part of what we find in the Koran. His own experience is the light in which the author sees all history. The only proof necessary to adduce for this proposition is the choice of material. The Old Testament stories used by Mohammed are those of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Lot, Joseph, and Moses. These are all from the Pentateuch, and some of them are repeated a number of times. The destruction of Sodom is given eight times, as is the account of the flood. The creation and fall of Adam are recounted five times,

while there are no less than thirteen somewhat extended references to Abraham. It must be evident from this that the Pentateuch furnishes the largest part of the material borrowed for narrative purposes. From the rest of the Old Testament he takes Saul, David, and Solomon, and he has allusions to Elijah, Job, Jonah, and *Gog* and *Magog*. But none of these receives anything like the space given to the characters taken from the Pentateuch."²¹

The Qur'ān as an Immaculate Scripture for Muslims

Conversely, Muslims believe that the Qur'ānic Text is a verbal communication of the Almighty Allah which without any corruption exists in this universe. The textual infallibility of the Qur'ān derives its being from the transcript, *al lauh al mahfūz-testimony of its divine origin*. Allah says:

“Nay, this is a glorious Qur'ān, (inscribed) In a Tablet Preserved!”²²

This term is one of those gripping metaphors in which the Qur'ān abounds; it means ‘the Preserved (or Guarded) Tablet’. The Arabic admits of both constructions, both preserved (from, and for, all time) and guarded (against textual corruption). What is referred to here is the same as what Horace meant when he spoke of having erected a monument more enduring than bronze or marble.²³

To the end of asserting its divinity, a great scholar, Syed Athar Hussain describes that the Qur'ān itself testifies that its author is God Himself. It is never the Prophet who speaks in the Qur'ān. Rather the scripture addresses him directly or refers to him as a third person. Its literary style and diction are altogether different from the sayings of the Prophet which have meticulously and painstakingly been preserved. If ever the Prophet slightly faltered or hesitated the revelation pulled him up, for instance when the Prophet was annoyed at the interruption of a blind man while he was in conversation with a *Quraish* noble²⁴ or when he forbade himself a thing which God had made lawful. On numerous occasions when he was confronted with some baffling problems, he had to wait for the revelations to appear.²⁵

As far as the matter of protection of Qur'ānic text against humanly corruption is concerned, Allah the Almighty says about the force protecting it:

“We have made it a Qur'ān in Arabic, that ye may be able to understand (and learn wisdom). And

verily, it is in the mother of the Book, In Our presence, high (in dignity), and full of wisdom."²⁶

Thus the Qur'ān affirms that it is but the transcript of a celestial archetype, which is why the Prophet is abjured to add or subtract nothing but to adhere strictly to the text that is given to him. To be totally effective it is necessary for the text to be unassailable from the standpoint of literary or textual criticism. Consequently, the Qur'ān is described as 'an unassailable scripture' which 'Falsehood cannot come at from before or from behind, a disclosure from the wise, 'the Laudable'. When the Prophet is invited by his critics to produce another reading (*Qur'ān*) or alter the existing one, he replies that 'It is not for me to alter it on my own accord. I follow only that which is revealed to me. I fear I disobey my Lord the punishment of an 'Awful Day'. To Yaqub Zaki, as a literal transcript it cannot be altered in any way, even by translation. The instant the Qur'ān is 'translated' into another language it ceases to be the Qur'ān and the resultant book is not the Qur'ān but an interpretation- one amongst many possible out of its meanings. This is why there can be no such thing in Islam as is this Authorized Version (of the Qur'ān in Arabic), and a translation has neither theological nor liturgical status.²⁷ He comments further upon the relationship of the Qur'ānic Revelation with the Prophethood and of the Prophethood with scripture. According to him Prophethood and scripture are the twin vehicles of revelation from the Almighty: one is the impermanent life, the other permanent record. Both testify to the truth of the same origin which is why the Muslim creed is known as the *Shahāda* or testimony, and the centrality of the Prophethood is evident from the fact that it forms the content of the second clause of the *Shahāda*.²⁸

Conclusion

In nutshell, scrutiny of the scholastic study of the Qur'ān by Orientalists gives crystal clear indication of 'projection' which might have been exercised consciously or unconsciously in analytical discourse of the holy scripture of the Muslims. Whatever be the reason for the presence of this psychological mechanism just highlighted, it pinpoints the dire need of rethinking of Orientalist research approaches towards the Qur'ān in particular and Islam in general, as otherwise, research eclipsed by such things may prove

counterproductive; it carries great potential to undermine efforts to promote interfaith dialogue and harmony. And this in turn demands the renunciation of intellectual activity reflecting 'projection'. Accordingly, tolerance be shown to all other religions which is core to achieve interfaith harmony and establishment of cosmopolitan societies around the world in this globalized arena. Hostile attitude towards this divinely ordained Book be cast aside and Qur'ānic research should be conducted by taking into account the reliable and authentic sources. As this piece of writing attempts to unfold the fact that the Orientalist thinking is darkened by 'projection', it gives space to some questions. Firstly: is its practice in higher criticism fair and justified? Secondly, if this higher criticism of the Qur'ān is positive or for the constructive purposes, as is claimed by intellectuals under discussion, why are, then, scholarly treatises propounded in response to such Orientalists' conclusions on the Qur'ān not taken into consideration by them as are made persistent repetitions, with exiguous alterations, of the same deductions by each generation of Orientalists?

NOTES & REFERENCES

-
- ¹ Philip Lawrence Harriman, *The New Dictionary of Psychology* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1947), 269-70.
- ² Philip Lawrence Harriman, *Hand Book of Psychological Terms* (New Jersey: Littlefield Adams & Co, 1963), 141.
- ³ Mohan Kumar, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychology*, ed. by Darshan Singh (India: A.I.T.B.S. Publishers, 2007), 387.
- ⁴ Baumeister, Roy F.; Dale, Karen; Sommer, Kristin L., 'Freudian Defense Mechanisms and Empirical Findings in Modern Social Psychology: Reaction Formation, Projection, Displacement, Undoing, Isolation, Sublimation, and denial', *Journal of Personality*, 6 (December 1998), 1081-1124.
- ⁵ Simon Sheppard, 'Basic Psychological Mechanisms: Neurosis and Projection', in *The Science of Sex*, (Carshalton: *The Heretical Press* 2010)
- ⁶ Ibid
- ⁷ On the contrary, the positive sense is rather appreciated as Allah (SWT) pledges "*Nafs al-Lawāmah*", See Al-Qiyamah: 2. the pledge of Allah

(ST) for something, place or person etc. increases more sanctity and reverence. For more detailed study see under the mentioned verse Al-Qurṭubī, "*al-Jāmi li-Aḥkām al-Qur'ān*".

- ⁸ See Wade, Tavis, *Psychology* (Dallas: Prentice Hall, TX, U.S.A., 1999). The study of Chapter 8: *Behavior in Social and Cultural Context* would also assist the readers and highlight useful points in understanding the case in better position. This chapter specially discusses group conflict and prejudice, group identity: us vs. them, stereotypes, prejudice and efforts to reduce prejudice.
- ⁹ There is a very long list of projections, but we are just taking some of them for the better comprehension. However, the scholars who wish to have a detailed description of this subject may retrieve towards the work of Dr. Shouqī Abū Khalīl, *Al-Isqāt fī Manāhij al-Mustashriqīn wal-Mubashirīn* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-Mu'āṣir, 1416 A.H.)
- ¹⁰ An Outstanding French Abbot of Cluny whose spiritual, intellectual, and financial reforms restored Cluny to its high place among the religious establishments of Europe. Peter joined Bernard of Clairvaux in supporting Pope Innocent II, thereby weakening the position of the antipope, Anacletus II. After Peter Abelard's teachings had been condemned at the Council of Sens (1140), Peter received him at Cluny and reconciled him with Bernard and with the Pope. He also tried to convert the Crusades into nonviolent missionary ventures; ordered the first Latin translation of the Qur'ān so that it might be refuted; and was papal ambassador to Aquitaine, Italy, and England. He wrote hymns and poems in addition to theological tracts and left about 200 letters of considerable historiographical interest. Although Peter has not been canonized, his cult received papal approval in 1862. See *Encyclopaedia of Britannica*, under Peter the Venerable.
- ¹¹ See more details in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, under "Qur'ān".
- ¹² Zein, Faruk, *Christianity, Islam and Orientalism* (London: Saqi Books, 2003), 40.
- ¹³ Freke, Timothy and Gandy, *The Jesus Mysteries* (New York: Harmony Books, 1999), 145.
- ¹⁴ Arthur Jeffery, *Materials for the History of the Text of the Qur'ān* (Leiden, Brill: 1937), pvii.
- ¹⁵ Ibid.,
- ¹⁶ Mack, Burton L., *Who Wrote the New Testament?* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1995), 4.

¹⁷ Rev. H. H. Rowley, *The Literary Growth of the Old Testament*, in “*The Bible Today: Historical, Social, and Literary Aspects of the Old and New Testaments*”, by Christian Scholars, (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1955), 28.

¹⁸ Dr. H. G. Meecham, *The Apocrypha: Its Value and Historical Importance*, in “*The Bible Today: Historical, Social, and Literary Aspects of the Old and New Testaments*”, by Christian Scholars (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1955), 52.

¹⁹ Henry Preserved Smith, D.D., *The Bible And Islam OR The Influence Of The Old And New Testaments On The Religion Of Mohammad* (New York: Charles Scribers Sons, 1897), 60.

²⁰ Ibid, p.61

²¹ Ibid, p.62

²² 85:21-22

²³ Yaqub Zaki, *The Qur’ān and Revelation*, in “Islam in a World of Diverse Faiths” (ed.) Dan Cohn-Sherbok, p. 46.

²⁴ 80:1-2

²⁵ Athar Husain Sayed, *The Qur’ān and the Orientalists* (India: Dār al-Muṣanifīn, Shiblī Academy, Azam Garh, 2005), 11.

²⁶ 43:3-4

²⁷ Yaqub Zaki, *The Qur’ān and Revelation*, 46-48

²⁸ Ibid.,