

**THE ROLE OF FOREIGN ELEMENTS IN THE  
FORMATION OF MUHAMMADAN ISLAM;  
A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE CONTRAST OPINIONS  
OF ORIENTALISTS.**

*Yasmin Nazir\**

*Prof. Dr. Abdul Rauf Zafar\**

The orientalists like Goldziher, Guillaume Alfred, M. M. Bravmann, Margoliouth, Foster, William Muir, and Richard Bell etc. express that much of Islamic literature has been taken from pre-Islamic Arab traditions, customs and religions. We, on the contrary, have analyzed through various channels that almost all such objections of orientalists are baseless, illogical and irrational that contradict the biographical history of the Arabs. Not only history proves them wrong, but some reasonable orientalists have also refuted them in clear words. Hence the lack of solid historical proofs in the argumentation of the orientalists and the impartial counter arguments of some other orientalists have weakened the case of those orientalists who endeavored to prove the role of some foreign elements in the formation of Islam. The contradictions among orientalists on this issue have even unveiled the superficiality in the investigations of orientalism regarding Islamic Studies as a whole. The discussion naturally leads us to the conclusion that the basic fountain of Islamic teachings and beliefs is divine revelation and it is a self-sufficient theological system.

**Keywords:** Foreign elements, Formation of Islam, previous divine scriptures, Arab history, Impartial opinions of Orientalists, self-sufficient code of life.

One of the most prominent and usual objections of orientalists against Islam is that most of the foundations of Islam like its theological beliefs, worships, social, political, economic, strategic and family laws, social traditions and customs, mentioned in Qur'ān and Hadīth, have been borrowed and echoed from ancient religions as Judaism, Christianity and the 'Arab, Persian, Egyptian and Roman laws and traditions. To prove such of their assumptions, some of the orientalists have spared even complete books for this sole purpose as M. M. Bravmann, 'The Spiritual Background of Early Islam', Torrey, 'The Jewish Foundation of Islam' and Richard Bell, 'The Origin of Islam in Its Christian Environment', while many of others presented several research papers on this core issue.. In expressing these objections they have followed the Arab pagans of the time of the holy Prophet whose

---

\* Ph.D Scholar, Dept. of Islamic Studies, University of Sargodha, Sargodha.

\* Chairman, Dept. of Islamic Studies, University of Sargodha, Sargodha..

attitude towards the Holy Qur'ān is explained by the Almighty in this verse of the Holy Qur'ān:

"وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَسْتَمِعُ إِلَيْكَ وَجَعَلْنَا عَلَى قُلُوبِهِمْ أَكِنَّةً أَنْ يَفْقَهُوهُ وَفِي آذَانِهِمْ وَقْرًا وَإِنْ يَرَوْا كَلَّ آيَةٍ لَا يُؤْمِنُوا بِهَا حَتَّى إِذَا جَاءَهُكَ يُجَادِلُونَكَ يَقُولُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا إِنْ هَذَا إِلَّا أَسَاطِيرُ الْأَوَّلِينَ<sup>1</sup>

“And among them are some who listen to your discourse on practical divinity and to the Qur'ān when you recite it, not to profit by it but to pick holes in it and be able to tell their evil minds. The fact is that We have closed their hearts' ears and deafened their ears to reason. They just would not apprehend with their senses any revelation or any sign no matter how convincing to the mind they be. And when they come to you O Muhammad they do not humble themselves but in arrogance they are more ready to argue than to obey. Vested with infidelity, they interpret their thoughts in words: «This is nothing», they say, «but fables of old.»”

As the Holy Qur'ān is the first, basic and the direct source of Divine revelation and the others like Hadīth, Analogy (Qiyās) and Consensus (Ijma‘) etc. are its various branches that revolve around it but never go contrary to its divine spirit. The Holy Qur'ān verifies the original dogmas of pre-Islamic divine scriptures that had been altered with the passage of time. In this way, the Holy Qur'ān contains and confirms those ideas of the scriptures originally revealed by Allah Almighty. It notes:

"وَلَمَّا جَاءَهُمْ كِتَابٌ مِنْ عِنْدِ اللَّهِ مُصَدِّقٌ لِمَا مَعَهُمْ وَكَانُوا مِنْ قَبْلُ يَسْتَفْتِحُونَ عَلَى الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا فَلَمَّا جَاءَهُمْ مَا عَرَفُوا كَفَرُوا بِهِ فَلَعْنَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَى الْكَافِرِينَ<sup>2</sup>

“And when there came to them (the Jews) a book (this Qur'ān) from Allah, confirming what is with them (the Taurat and Injīl), although aforetime they had invoked Allah (for coming of Muhammad PBUH) in order to gain victory over those who disbelieved in it. So let the curse of Allah be on the disbelievers.”

Now we shall turn to the alleged sources of Islamic literature pointed out by the orientalist. The final outcome of their claim is: “*The Mohammaden common law is by no means divine or superhuman.*”<sup>3</sup>

Most of the opinions of orientalist regarding the provision of the role of foreign elements in the making of Islam are based on mere speculations and logically the results of their speculative

assumptions differed from one another on a large scale as will be clear in the coming discourse.

Here we endeavor to quote and precisely answer all of their objections one by one.

### **Pre-Islamic Arab Customs and the Islamic Literature.**

Margoliouth, in his article on the words 'Muslim' and 'Ḥanīf' pays full attention to prove that the term muslim meant the adherents of the prophet Musaylima, who preached in the ḥijāz in Muḥammad's time and whom the Muslims, of course, regarded as a false prophet. Musaylimah was the first in Arabia who originated the concepts 'Muslim' and 'Ḥanīf' and Muhammad stole these concepts from him.<sup>4</sup>

Charles Lyall denies Margoliouth's opinion in the light of historicity and logic. He opines that Margoliouth's opinion would indicate to the supposition that (Musaylimah's teaching should, for a considerable time before the appearance of Muhammad, have attained such a celebrity and extension in the Arabian Peninsula that, although the tribe to which he belonged had its settlements in al-Yamamah, ...the ideas embodied in it had made their way across to the Western Ḥijāz and Tihamah, and these left in current use these words of religious import, without any trace surviving in the memory of men of their real origin.<sup>5</sup>

He then questions the rationale for Musaylimah waiting some nine or ten years after the Hijrah (9 or 10 AH) before posing a challenge to Muhammad if the 'original ideas' were his and 'stolen'. Historically, Lyall points out, only two poets of the Banū Hudhayl were known to have used the concept Ḥanīf in their poetical literature during Muhammad's time. He names these as Sakhr as-Ghayy and Abu Dhu'ayb. Sakhr, he says, was most probably a pagan, while Abū Dhu'ayb was a Muslim born in 622 CE.<sup>6</sup>

He cites Welhausen, pointing out the deputation of Hunafa' which paid a courtesy call on Muhammad were Christian and had the institution of priesthood. Lyall then deduces that, 'with Christianity in possession, before the appearance of Musaylimah as a Prophet, it is difficult to believe the propagator of the religious movement represented by the 'Ḥanīfs'<sup>7</sup> He subjects to critical linguistic analysis the words

‘Hanīf’ and ‘Muslim’ and rejects Margoliouth’s reasoning as a very singular example of extravagant Conjecture<sup>8</sup>

M. M. Bravmann, an orientalist of a good repute, denies all the suggestions of all, Margoliouth, Lyall, and Torrey and advances a secular origin for the word Islam. He argues in these lines:

*“All these interpretations of the concept ‘Islām do not seem satisfactory to me. I maintain that the original sense of the term as a designation for the religion of Muḥammad is “defiance of death, self-sacrifice (for the sake of God and his prophet)”, ... According to this interpretation, ‘Islam (like Jihād) was originally a secular concept, denoting a sublime virtue in the eyes of the primitive Arab: defiance of death, heroism, in the fight for honour or for what seemed to him the most noble aspirations.”*<sup>9</sup>

#### **Islam has Stolen Many of its Major Ideas from Judaism.**

William Muir claims:

*“It must have been about this time that Mahomet obtained a closer acquaintance with Jewish history and tradition, either from those whom he met at the season of pilgrimage, or some Hebrew captive detained at Mecca. The chapters of the Coran belonging to this period begin to teem with lengthy narratives of the creation, fall, flood etc. as also of the patriarchs, kings and prophets, all betraying an intimate acquaintance with Jewish lore.”*<sup>10</sup>

Alfred Guillaume also maintains that the Prophetic aḥādīth contain many ideas borrowed from Judaism. He states:

*“The presence of folk-lore and fable whose heathen origin was well-known to the learned could not but excite contempt, and the hadith which were directly borrowed from Haggada (part of Jewish literature containing historical events) and Christian legend were especially vulnerable to attack.”*<sup>11</sup>

Both Muir and Alfred try their best to prove that the ideas which the Holy Prophet (PBUH) used to preach were originally taken from Judaism as well as from Christianity in his childhood and youth. But real history disproves it, as no contemporary book mentions any tutor or any religious literature having any concern with the teachings of the Holy Prophet (PBUH). On the contrary, it proves their claims to be baseless and based on their personal speculation and mere imagination.

It is a common fact that the Jews were bitter enemies and opponents of Jesus Christ and his cause but the Holy Prophet was one of his great admirers.

Dr. Henry Stubbe truly reveals the logical picture of the Prophet's relation with Christ and the Jews. He points out:

*“On the other hand, had a Jew been his instructor, he would not have been, as he undoubtedly was, so great an admirer of Isa, of which he makes so great and so frequent declarations, saying that Isa was his predecessor, and taught the same doctrine.”<sup>12</sup>*

Having proven these allegations wrong, let us move on to another part of this common objection of the orientalist.

### **Christian Beliefs Merged in Islamic Literature.**

In these lines, we shall examine the claims of orientalist and try to reach a precise conclusion. A legendary scholar, Richard Bell, gives the story of the early history of the development of Islamic literature and the circumstances in which Christian literature entered into the Islamic Literature, especially in the genre of hadith literature. He writes:

*“The great influx of Christian converts to Islam, which took place in the end of the first and the beginning of the second century of the Hijra, naturally brought Christian popular ideas with it. These converts did not entirely change their spirit by changing the name of their religion. It has been even asserted that it was they who brought into Islam the spirit of partisanship and bigotry to which they themselves had been so long accustomed. Of that it would be unfair to lay the whole or even the main blame upon them. Islam in the beginning was tolerant in a sense. So long as the Christians submitted and paid the tribute they were not very much molested, and even enjoyed a considerable amount of liberty. But that was because the Umayyad Caliphs and Governors were not so much religious leaders as worldly rulers. As the religious system took deeper hold, Islam would probably of itself have developed a stricter spirit. But these Christian converts must have brought with them much that belonged to their former faith. The collections of Moslem Traditions contain many stories and sayings which are evidently of Biblical and Christian origin. It was natural that the early Moslems should show keen interest in the Bible, and their discussions with Christians would help to make them familiar with the contents of Scripture. Still, I think it was by way of popular*

*importation that much of the Christian material in the traditions came*”<sup>13</sup>

He gives many examples of traditions which, according to him, have been taken into circulation from the Christian ritual literature. He points out:

*“Thus we find quite a number of sayings both from the old Testament and from the new, reported as having been spoken by Muhammad. On the authority of Abu Huraira, upon whom a large proportion of these pious and edifying sayings are fathered, the Prophet is reported to have commended, “The man who gives alms, but hides it so that his left hand does not know what his right hand does.” On the same authority, the Prophet is reported to have said: One of you does not really believe until I am dearer to him than father or son”, a reminiscence probably of the Gospel saying: “He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me.” I need not continue citations of these. It was natural that these things should find their way into collections of sayings of the Prophet*”<sup>14</sup>

According to his stance, the miraculous stories of Old and New Testaments influenced the Muhammadan literature more than any other variety of literature. He writes:

*“The miracle stories of the Old and New Testament were perhaps even more fruitful in influence upon popular Islam.*”<sup>15</sup>

Goldziher also speaks in the same tune: He writes:

*“The fact that Islam regarded Christianity as a religion from which something could be learnt, and did not disdain to borrow from it, is acknowledged by the Muslim theologians themselves, and the early elements of Hadith literature offer us a great wealth of examples which show readily the founders of Islam borrowed from Christianity.*”<sup>16</sup>

Here, Goldziher refers to the acknowledgment of Muslims of the emergence of foreign (Christian) elements in Islamic literature but neither he mentions the Prophet’s advice about the Biblical literature nor he notes the attitude of Muslims, as a principle, towards the Israelite traditions circulating in the Muslim literature. Coming pages of this paper will illuminate the status of this genre of literature in Islamic literary circles.

Goldziher spares about nineteen pages of his book to prove with examples that a large part of hadith has been taken from the New Testament.

Will Durant argues the similar ideas in these words:

*“Many of the traditions put a new color upon the Moslem creed. Mohammad had not claimed the power of miracles, but hundreds of pretty traditions told of his wonder-working: how he fed a multitude from food hardly adequate for one man; exorcised demons; drew rain from heaven by one prayer, and stopped it by another; who he touched the udders of dry goats and they gave milk; who the sick were healed by contact with his clothes or his shorn hair. Christian influences seem to have molded many of the traditions; love towards one’s enemies was inculcated, though Muhammad had sterner views; the lord’s prayer was adopted from the gospels; the parables of the sower, the wedding guests, and the laborers in the vineyard were put into Mohammad’s mouth; all in all, he was transformed into an excellent Christian, despite his nine wives.”<sup>17</sup>*

William Muir points out that Muhammad (PBUH) was taught some Christian beliefs by Baḥīra (a Christian monk) on his visit to Syria with his uncle when he was twelve or fourteen. He raises the objection in these words:

*“He would have left Mahomet, now twelve years of age, behind; but when the caravan was on the point of starting, the lad clung to his protector, and Abu Talib, moved by his entreaty, took him with him. The journey stretched to Bosra, perhaps still further north. It lasted several months, and Mahomet had thus the opportunity of seeing the Christian people of Syria, with their churches and their worship. However sunk in superstition, these must have stood out in strong contrast with the rude and barbarous rites of the Meccan valley, and furnished food for his inquiring and reflective mind.”<sup>18</sup>*

Muir gives this journey and such a limited stay for taking a meal, a color of an informative and educational visit to an ‘area (or culture) study centre.’ A similar tone seems in the remarks of Bodley. He speaks so productively:

*“Near the Bosra market was a monastery of Nestorian Monks – Christians. They knew AbūTāleb and offered him and his nephew the hospitality. One of the monks, whose name was Baḥīra, took a special interest in Muhammad. His inquiring mind, his eagerness*

*for knowledge, his lucid thoughts impressed him. He talked to the Arab, say as if he was a contemporary. He told him about the creed of the followers of Christ. He denounced idolatry. Muhammad listened. All that this man was giving him was so strange, so different from what he had been brought up to believe.*<sup>19</sup>

Both the statements can be concluded in the following points:

- Muhammad (PBUH) travelled to Syria at the age of twelve in eagerness to learn as much as possible about the culture, social traditions and religious dogmas of Christianity.
- He achieved his tasks and made this visit very informative and a strong initiative for his future life to become a great religious lawgiver.

In accordance with logic and living history, both the claims can be refuted by the following.

- Was He (PBUH) able to speak and understand the foreign language of Syria and religious terms of Christianity? If not, in which language did Bahīra briefed him?
- Can a boy of just twelve or fourteen preserve a so vast and deep religious system listened to in a period less than or equal to an hour?
- Did Muhammad (PBUH) express any of the ideas and beliefs after his journey until the Prophethood?

In fact, no orientalist can give a satisfactory answer to any of the above mentioned questions to prove the statements of Muir and Bodley. Owing to the fallacy and irrationality of the claims of these orientalists, Thomas Carlyle denies the artificial historical assumption of Muir and Bodley in these words:

*“I know not what to make of that Sergious, the Nestorian monk, whom AbūTāleb and he (Muhammad PBUH) are said to have lodged with; or how much any monk could have taught one still so young. Probably enough it is greatly exaggerated, this of the Nestorian monk. Mahomet was only fourteen; had no language but his own; much in Syria must have been a strange unintelligible whirlpool to him.”*<sup>20</sup>

Margoliouth too, rejects any idea of Islam being close to Christianity. When Foster, in an article, suggests that Islam might be called a 'Christian heresy',<sup>21</sup>

Margoliouth spurns the idea, arguing that at best it could be closer to Judaism at least in its earlier stages.<sup>22</sup>

However, Foster had to submit to Margoliouth's acclaimed, immense knowledge<sup>23</sup>

R.V.C. Bodley, on another place, also refuses to accept the statements of Muir, Alfred and even his own by saying:

*"In spite of the many ancient traditions and doctrines which he now expounded, the common complaint that Muhammad plagiarized the Bible is untrue. He had never seen it with the possible exception of fragments of Waraqa's incomplete version. There was no Bible for him to see. It is, moreover, most unlikely that he saw these. The earliest official Arabic translations of the Old and New Testaments were made centuries after Muhammad's death."*<sup>24</sup>

All of the objections and claims of the orientalist mentioned above can be refuted by the following explanations also.

**Basically all the Divine Religions have the Same Teachings.**

History of the world religions proves that all the religions, which have been revealed by the Almighty, possess the same basic themes and teachings, Oneness of God, Prophet hood, faith of good and bad fate, theory of life, death and the day of Judgment. It is because that the basic source and origin of all of them are the same. And it is quite natural to ask that how the same authority can issue different types of teachings that differ and contrast to each other? As Richard Bell, a well known orientalist and a big propagator of the influence of foreign, especially, the Biblical Christian literature in the manufacturing of Islam, admits this universal and historical reality in this way:

*"Could there be more than one revelation? God might make known his decrees to different peoples in different forms, but the actual content of the revelation must always be the same."*<sup>25</sup>

It is why that Islam has never claimed of having the teachings absolutely different from those of the previous religions but on the other hand Islam announces that its teachings are a continuation of the teachings of the previous religions that got started from the

ever first religion revealed to the ever first man and Prophet in this world.

But Islam goes further on this topic and reveals the fact that the religion of each previous Prophet was named 'Islam' as of Muhammad the last Prophet.

So, from the teachings of Islam mentioned earlier, it is clear that the mission of God to send Prophets to the humanity has always been to remind people to continue the existing Divine teachings. Therefore, if God is one, then his message must invariably one even though the mode or tone of it might differ from one epoch to another.

Therefore, it is sinful and not justified in Islam to prefer some Prophets on the others. And, one's faith is questionable if he regards some messengers and decreases the dignity of other Prophets.

It therefore stands to reason that God speaks to Prophet 'x' and reveals the same issue to Prophet 'y', albeit with some variations. If such variations are so serious that they amount to a completely different message, it could be argued that a thorough check has to be made of the form in which the old version has existed over the years.

Therefore, it would not be so odd if the teachings of Islam resemble the teachings of the previous religions because the main and basic points of the teachings of Islam and the previous religions are same and identical. Islam claims that the Holy Quran confirms and certifies the unaltered parts of the teachings of the previous religions and also preserves the original subjects and concept of those religious scriptures in which changes had occurred in the previous times. Islam has addressed the followers of Christianity and Judaism in the same background. The holy Quran reads:

"قُلْ يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ تَعَالَوْا إِلَى كَلِمَةٍ سَوَاءٍ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ أَلَّا نَعْبُدَ إِلَّا اللَّهَ وَلَا نُشْرِكَ بِهِ شَيْئًا وَلَا يَتَّخِذَ بَعْضُنَا بَعْضًا أَرْبَابًا مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ فَإِنْ تَوَلَّوْا فَقُولُوا اشْهَدُوا بِأَنَّا مُسْلِمُونَ"<sup>26</sup>

“Say to them: “O you Ahl al-Kitāb, let us come to terms to agree among ourselves that we venerate and worship no one but Allah and that we shall not incorporate with Him other deities. Nor shall any of us take another for a godhead or a tutelary guardian besides Allah. If they turn a deaf ear and insist upon hugging their irreverent conviction to their

hearts, then say to them: Do then bear witness that we conform our will to Allah's blessed will, and this reflects conformity to Islam."

Quran says about its act of certifying and confirming the unaltered concepts of the previous scriptures. It says:

"نَزَّلَ عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ وَأَنزَلَ التَّوْرَةَ وَالْإِنجِيلَ" <sup>27</sup>

"He has revealed to you, O Muhammad, the Quran, in truth and in agreement with reality, corroborating and authoritatively validating the authentic books previously revealed, and in temporal order He revealed AL-Tawrah and AL-Injil"

Qur'ān explains further:

"وَمُصَدِّقًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْ مِنَ التَّوْرَةِ وَالْإِنجِيلِ لَكُمْ بَعْضَ الَّذِي حُرِّمَ عَلَيْكُمْ وَجِئْتُكُمْ بِآيَةٍ مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ فَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا" <sup>28</sup>

"And to bring matters to completion-, It shall be my duty to Allah to corroborate your faith in AL-Tawrah which is set before me and to make lawful to you some of what was forbidden before. Now, I have come to you with convincing divine evidence which exacts your reverence for Allah and obedience to me."

The Almighty addressed the Christians and Jews to make them believe in the Holy Quran that certified what they had with them. The Almighty said:

"يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ آمِنُوا بِمَا نَزَّلْنَا مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا مَعَكُمْ" <sup>29</sup> ...

"O you to whom the Book had been given (Ahl al-Kitab) Give credence to the Book (the Quran) We have revealed to Our Messenger Muhammad, corroborating and authoritatively validating the authentic Book (AL-Tawrah) you hold in possession,"

The Almighty speaks more about this role of the Holy Quran. He says:

"وَأَنزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ مِنَ الْكِتَابِ وَمُهَيْمِنًا عَلَيْهِ" <sup>30</sup> ...

"And We have sent down to you O Muhammad the Quran confirming the Scriptures revealed before it (AL-Tawrah and AL-Injil) and serving as the Book of reference for matters disputed among Ahl AL-Kitab, for it is the umpire of all preceding Scriptures,..."

Moreover, it is the universally known fact that all the teachings and beliefs included in the Bible cannot be said and confirmed of having been preserved from the original and first hand evidence. It is not the mere statement of the writer, but it is a historical fact stretched throughout the literary history of the Biblical literature. Not only the impartial historians and Muslims but also the orientalist from Christians and Jews admit that the Biblical literature, the old as well as the new testament could not be preserved in the original shape as they were revealed by the Almighty. They rightly say that there is a huge gap of time between the time of Christ and the writers of these five scriptures (new testament). It is a reality on the record of world history that after the death of Christ, the followers of Christianity distributed into several sects who carried on quarrelling with one another for a long time. Each of these sects had its own scriptures according to their faith and theory different from those scriptures which were possessed by the other sects. In the end, Saint Paul and his followers reached the dominating position. Their faith and views got popularity among the people and the other sects had left no more energy to face the popularity of the sect of Saint Paul and its faith. Finally it happened that the scriptures which were, according to Saint Paul's faith, accepted and approved and all of the remaining were rejected and were ordered to be finished.

A Frances orientalist Maurice Bucaille opens the veil of this historical reality in these words:

*“As for as the decades following Jesus's mission are concerned, it must be understood that events did not at all happen in the way they have been said to have taken place and that Peter's arrival in Rome in no way laid the foundations of the Church. On the contrary, from the times Jesus left earth to the second half of the second century, there was a struggle between two factions. One was what one might call Pauline Christianity and the other Judeo Christianity. It was only very slowly that the first supplanted the second, and Pauline Christianity triumphed over Judeo-Christianity.”<sup>31</sup>*

He writes more about the quarrel between two fighting sects of Christianity in this way.

*“For those Judeo-Christianity who remained “Loyal Jews” Paul was a traitor: Judeo-Christian documents call him an*

*“enemy” accuse him of “tactical double dealing.....until 70 A.D, Judeo-Christianity represents the majority of the Church, and Paul remains an isolated case. The head of the community at that time was James, a relation of Jesus. With him were Peter (at the beginning) and John. James may be considered to represent the Judeo-Christian camp, which deliberately clung to Judaism as opposed to Pauline Christianity. Jesus’s family has a very important place in the Judeo-Christian Church of Jerusalem.”<sup>32</sup>*

The passages mentioned above clarify that there has been no consensus among the Christian people upon the originality and authenticity of the present set of scriptures or those which were finished. But rather the originality and authenticity of the finished scriptures were far better and credible than those of the present one’s because the formers were written by the companions and followers of Christ while on the other hand the present set of scriptures is written by the companions and followers of Saint Paul who remained an open enemy of Christ in his life and occupied his leading seat and made the people realize that he was the spiritual descendent of Christ.

#### **Holy Prophet’s Attitude towards the Previous Scriptures and the Israelite Traditions.**

The Holy Prophet was fully aware of the reality that the previous scriptures available in His time were not left unaltered and on the other hand there was also the possibility that some of their original contents may had been preserved in their original shape. Therefore, it was doubtful to credit or discredit any content of their teachings. So the Holy Prophet guided the Muslims properly and advised them;

(a). To avoid from crediting or discrediting them.

The holy Prophet advised his ummah how to deal with the contents of the previous scriptures.

“لَا تُصَدِّقُوا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ وَلَا تُكَذِّبُوهُمْ وَقُولُوا: آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَمَا أُنزِلَ”<sup>33</sup>

“Neither confirm nor deny the reports of Christians and Jews and say ‘ we believed Allah and what revealed (to us)”

(b) Neither to read or write nor to transmit them to others.

Once ‘Umar b khaṭṭāb came to know that a man dictated the text of Daniel to the people. Upon which Umar called him, punished him for doing this, ordered him to erase what he had written and told the people that the Holy Prophet prohibited him of copying or dictating the previous scriptures. He himself relates this event thus:

"انطلقت أنا فانتسخت كتابا من اهل الكتاب ثم جئت به في أديم فقال لي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: ما هذا في يدك يا عمر؟ قال: قلت: يا رسول الله، كتاب انتسخته لترداد به علما الى علمنا فغضب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم حتى احمرت و جنتاه ثم نودي بالصلاة جامعة فقالت الانصار: أغضب نبيكم صلى الله عليه وسلم السلاح السلاح فجاءوا حتى أحرقوا بمنبر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال: يا أيها الناس! ان أوتيت جوامع الكلم وخواتيمه واختصر لي أختصارا لقد أتيتكم بما بيضاء نقية فلا تنهوا ولا يقربكم المتهوا كون قال عمر: فقامت فقالت: رضيت بالله ربا وبالإسلام ديننا وبك رسولا ثم نزل رسول الله<sup>34</sup>

(c) To Follow Qur’ān and Ḥadīth Instead of these Scriptures.

Because Islam is a complete code of life and is sufficient for the guidance to the right path of the Almighty. Therefore the holy Prophet said:

" تَرَكْتُ فِيكُمْ أَمْرَيْنِ، لَنْ تَضِلُّوا مَا تَمَسَّكْتُمْ بِهِمَا: كِتَابَ اللَّهِ وَسُنَّةَ نَبِيِّهِ<sup>35</sup>

“I have left with you two things; you shall never go astray as long as you follow them: the holy Book of Allah and the sunnah of his Prophet.”

All of the explanations and facts mentioned earlier show clearly that after all when all the Israelite traditions, coming from the Biblical literature of having some close acquaintance with it, have been categorized separately and regarded as useless by the Prophet himself and his followers, then there is no reason to maintain, as Goldziher, Guillaume Alfred, M. M. Bravmann, Margoliouth, Foster, William Muir, and Richard Bell etc. express that the whole of Islamic literature has been taken from pre-Islamic Arab traditions, customs and religions.

We have analysed that almost all such objections of orientalist are baseless, illogical and irrational and contradict the biographical history of the Arabs. Not only history proves them wrong, but some reasonable orientalist have also refuted them in clear words. So the lack of solid historical proofs in the

argumentation of the orientalists and the impartial counter arguments of some other orientalists have weakened the case of those orientalists who endeavoured to prove the role of some foreign elements in the formation of Islam. The contradictions among orientalists on this issue have even unveiled the superficiality in the investigations of orientalism regarding Islamic Studies as a whole. The discussion naturally leads us to the conclusion that the basic fountain of Islamic teachings and faith is divine revelation and it is a self-empowered theological system.

### REFERENCES & NOTES

1. Qur'ān, 6:25.
2. Qur'ān, 2:89.
3. Guillaume, Alfred, *The Traditions of Islam* (Lahore: Universal Books, Zulqarnain Chambers, Ganpat road, 1977), 96.
4. Margoliouth, D.S., 'On the Origin and Import of the Names, Muslim and Hanif', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. 35, (July 1903), 492.
5. Lyall, Charles J. , "The Words, "Hanif" and "Muslim," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. 35, (1903,): 771-2.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid., 777.
8. Ibid., 784.
9. Bravmann, M. M., *The Spiritual Background of Early Islam* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), 8-9.
10. Muir, William, *Mahomet and Islam* (London: Darf Publishers Limited, 1986), 46.
11. Guillaume, *The Traditions of Islam*, 81.
12. Henry Stubbe, *An Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism*, ed. Mahmood Khan Shairani (Lahore: Orientalia Publishers, 1975), 150 – 151.
13. Bell, Richard, *The Origin of Islam in its Charistian Environment* (London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd. , 1968), 190-91.
14. Ibid., 193.
15. Ibid., 197.
16. Goldziher, Ignaz, *Muslim Studies*, Trans. C. R. Barber and S. M. Stern (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1967), 2/346.
17. Will Durant, *The Age of Faith* (New Yark: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1997), 211-12.
18. Muir, *Mahomet and Islam*, 15.
19. Bodley, R. V. C., *The Messenger* (London: Robert Hale Limited, 1946), 33.

20. Carlyle, Thomas, On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History, (New York: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1948), 287.
21. Frank Hugh Foster, "Is Islam a Christian heresy?" The Muslim World, vol. 23 no.1, (January 1933), 126-33.
22. Margoliouth, Is Islam a Christian Heresy?, The Muslim World, vol. 23, no.1 (January 1933), 126-33.
23. Foster, "Reply to Professor Margoliouth's Article." The Muslim World, vol. 23, no. 2 (April 1933), 198.
24. Bodley, The Messenger, 86.
25. Bell, Richard, The Origin of Islam in its Christian Environment, 101.
26. Qur'ān, 3:64.
27. Qur'ān, 3:3.
28. Qur'ān, 3:50.
29. Qur'ān, 4:47.
30. Qur'ān, 5:48.
31. Bucaille, Maurice, The Bible, the Quran and Science (Lahore: 1979), 50.
32. Ibid., 14.
33. Bukhārī, Muhammad b. Isma'īl, Ma Yajūzu min Tafsīr al-Taurat wa Ghairiha, 2.
34. Haishamī, 'Alī b. Abī Bakar, al-Maqṣadal-'Ulāfī Zawā'id Abī Y' al-'Āl-Mūṣlī, 4 vols. , (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiya.), 1/60.
35. Malik b. Anas, Muwattā, al-nahi an al-qawl bi al-qadr, 3