

# Examination of Orientalist Views on the Law-Giving Prophets

Hassan Rezaee Haftador<sup>1</sup>, Morteza Walizadeh<sup>2</sup> & Seyf Ali Zahedifar<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hadith and Qur'anic Sciences Department, University of Tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup> M.A in Hadith and Qur'anic Sciences of University of Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Hadith and Qur'anic Sciences Department, Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Iran

Correspondence: Hassan Rezaee Haftador, Hadith and Qur'anic Sciences Department, University of Tehran, Iran.  
E-mail: hrezaii@ut.ac.ir

Received: February 13, 2016 Accepted: March 11, 2016 Online Published: May 20, 2016

doi:10.5539/ass.v12n6p140

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v12n6p140>

## Abstract

The law-giving prophets or the prophets of strong resolve are prophets that possessed independent divine books and religions. Noah, Abraham, and Moses are numbered among the prophets of strong resolve. Orientalists have studied issues related to these prophets. The present study evaluates the views of orientalists concerning prophets of strong resolve. This library study takes an analytic, critical, and descriptive approach to the topic. Though examination of the views of orientalists concerning prophets of strong resolve is the focus of this study, views of Muslim scholars are also considered to complement the study. As indicated by examination of their opinions on the matter, orientalists have performed extensive research in Islamic sources on prophets of strong resolve. However, they have utilised weak Islamic narratives and have thus erred in regard to these prophets.

**Keywords:** Orientalists, law-giving (*ulu al-'azm*) prophets, prophets of strong resolve, Prophet Noah, Prophet Abraham, Prophet Moses

## 1. Introduction

The law-giving prophets or the prophets of strong resolve refer to prophets who possessed independent divine books and religions, persisted in the face of problems in propagation of divine precepts, and invited people from all over the world to their respective religions (Kulaynī, 1987, vol. 1, pp. 175, 224; Majlisī, 1984, vol. 11, p. 35; Nūrī, 1988, vol. 10, p. 289). When a prophet is called law-giving, it shows that he had a separate system of religions teachings or sharia. In other words, such a prophet had a distinct religion, which had to be propagated by contemporary and future prophets until a prophet with a new religion appeared.

For many years, orientalists have been studying topics related to prophets of strong resolve, publishing the results of their research in the form of scientific articles, books, and encyclopaedias (Rezaee Haftador, 2015, p. 33). The present study takes a descriptive and analytic approach to answer the following questions.

1. What views do orientalists have on issues related to Noah, Abraham, and Moses who are considered among the prophets of strong resolve?
2. To what extent are these views congruous with Islamic teachings?

## 2. Prophet Noah

Brinner has conducted research concerning Prophet Noah. His ideas are discussed below.

### 2.1 Repetition of Prophet Noah's Name in the Quran

Brinner writes, "Noah is attested in twenty-six sūras in the Qur'ān" (Brinner, 2003, vol. 3, p. 540). However, examination of the Quran reveals that Prophet Noah's name has been mentioned in 28 chapters. ('Abd al-Bāqī, 2004, p. 834)

### 2.2 Review of Chapter Noah

In this regard, Brinner writes:

The contents of Q 71, which bears his name, consist primarily of Noah's recounting to God how he continually urged his people to repent...their sins...while both warning them of the consequences of God's punishment and conveying to them God's promise of reward if they repented... The people did not accept

his warnings and instead urged him to worship their pagan gods... This account ends with their being drowned in the deluge, being cast into the fire...and Noah's asking God not to leave any unbelievers in the land. (Brinner, 2003, vol. 3, p. 540).

Brinner explains that Noah's people did not accept his warnings and instead asked him to worship their own gods. Examination of Chapter Noah indicates that Brinner construed this from verse 23 of the chapter. In fact, this construal is erroneous. According to this verse, the leaders of Noah's people invited the people – not Prophet Noah – to idolatry. Brinner, however, incorrectly states that Noah's people asked Noah himself to worship their gods. (Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 25, pp. 82-83).

### 2.3 *Illegitimacy of Prophet Noah's Son*

Concerning this, Brinner writes, "...when Noah asked God to have mercy on Canaan, God refused, saying that, as the offspring of his wife's deception, he was not his kindred. (Brinner, 2003, vol. 3, p. 541)

Brinner interpreted this illegitimacy from Q 11:46. A translation of this verse is as follows.

Said He, 'O Noah! Indeed He is not of your ahl (people/family). Indeed he is [personification of] unrighteous conduct. So do not ask Me [something] of which you have no knowledge. I advise you lest you should be among the ignorant.' (Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 9, p. 115-116)

If the prophet's son were truly illegitimate, the Quran should have said something on the lines of "He is the result of the wicked act of adultery" (Abū al-Futūḥ Rāzī, 1988, vol. 10, p. 277).

Islamic narratives stress that the notion of Canaan being illegitimate is erroneous. (Ṣadūq, 1999, vol. 2, p. 23; Majlisī, 1983, vol. 43, p. 23; vol. 49, p. 21; vol. 93, p. 222; Ṭabrisī, 1998, vol. 5, p. 254; Ibn Kathīr, 1999, vol. 4, p. 282; Qurtubī, 1985, vol. 10, p. 46)

God protects the prophets and their families from infamy, humiliation, and denunciation due to sexual decadence. Divine Wisdom necessitates that God prepare the groundwork for people's inclination towards His apostles and prohibit loathsome factors that would cause people to turn away from them. What could be more scandalous than a prophet's child being a result of adultery? (Ibn Kathīr, 1999, vol. 4, p. 282)

Even those who opposed Prophet Noah did not accuse his wife of adultery. This shows that Prophet Noah's wife did not commit adultery since if she had, Noah's enemies would have taken advantage of it to humiliate him.

The correct interpretation of the verse "...Indeed He is not of your ahl (people/family)..." (Q 11:46; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 9, p. 115-116) is that God seeks to inform Prophet Noah that even though Canaan was his son, he had deviated from Noah's path and teachings through his own actions. Therefore, this verse can be translated as follows. "Oh Noah! Your son is an unworthy individual whose familial relationship with you has become insubstantial since he cut off religious ties with you". (Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 9, p. 115; Ṭabrisī, 1993, vol. 5, p. 253; Ma'rifat, 2011, p. 215).

### 2.4 *The Giant Og's Escape from Punishment*

Brinner writes, "Another unwanted figure who was saved from destruction was the giant Og ('Ūj), son of 'Anaq (Heb. for "giant"), who was too tall for the water to reach his head". (Brinner, 2003, vol. 3, p. 543)

The story of Og's salvation is a fabrication since he did not even exist at the time of Prophet Noah. It was fabricated by freethinkers from among the People of the Book. In this way, they sought to ridicule divine prophets and their followers. Taking advantage of the simpleminded masses, fabulists have spread such fables as the salvation of the giant Og (Ibn Qutayba, 1995, pp. 259-260; Ālūsī, 1995, vol. 6, p. 86; Abū Shuhba, 1993, pp. 186-187; Muṭahharī, 2007, pp. 138-140; Diyārī, 2000, p. 239). Even assuming that the giant Og existed during the time of Prophet Noah, the story of his avoidance of death is still a fabrication. As the story goes, Og was an unbeliever and did not board the Ark. Prophet Noah cursed the disbelievers among his people and asked God not to leave any of them upon the earth (Q 71:26; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 25, p. 87), and God accepted Noah's request (Q 26:119-120; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 15, p. 287-288). It is thus clear that the disbelievers among Noah's people were all annihilated. Since the giant Og was among the disbelievers, he also died as a result of divine retribution. (Ibn Kathīr, 1999, vol. 3, p. 69)

## 3. Prophet Abraham

Firestone has researched issues related to Prophet Abraham, some of which are discussed below.

### 3.1 *Abraham as the Patriarch of the People of Israel*

Firestone writes, "Some two hundred and forty-five verses in twenty-five sūras of the Qur'ān make reference to Abraham (Ibrāhīm), the progenitor of the nation of Israel". (Firestone, 2001, vol. 1, p. 5)

Prophet Abraham was the forefather of both the people of Israel and the Muslims. God has stated:

And wage jihad for the sake of Allah, a jihad which is worthy of Him. He has chosen you and has not placed for you any obstacle in the religion, the faith of your father, Abraham. He named you ‘muslims’ before, and in this, so that the Apostle may be a witness to you, and that you may be witnesses to mankind... (Q 22:78; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 14, pp. 181-182).

According to Muslim tradition, Ishmael was the eldest child of Prophet Abraham and the forefather of the Arabs. The other son of Prophet Abraham was Isaac, father of Jacob who was also given the name Israel.

### 3.2 Prophets Bearing Scriptures

Firestone writes, “...in the Qur’ān Abraham and Moses are the sole prophets explicitly identified as bearers of scriptures” (Firestone, 2001, vol. 1, p. 5). In addition to Prophet Abraham and Prophet Moses, other prophets have also been clearly identified as owners of divine books such as prophets David, Jesus, and Muhammad. (4:163; 17:55; 5:46; 57:27; 15:87; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 4, pp. 212, 395; vol. 11, p. 129; vol. 12, p. 161; vol. 23, p. 380)

According to Islamic tradition, 104 scriptures were sent by God, 10 of which were given to Prophet Adam, 50 to Prophet Seth (or Shayth), 30 to Prophet Idris, the Torah to Prophet Moses, the Bible to Prophet Jesus, and the Psalms (or Zabur) to Prophet David. (Ṭabrisī, 1993, vol. 10, p. 722)

### 3.3 Who Was Abraham’s Attempted Sacrifice?

Firestone writes:

A quantitative study of the early exegetical literature suggests that most qur’ānic exegetes until about the middle of the second/ninth century, regarded Isaac as the intended victim, but later the choice of Ishmael gained favor and this has prevailed until the present day. (Firestone, 2001, vol. 1, p. 10)

For the following reasons, it seems that Ishmael was Abraham’s attempted sacrifice.

First, in the Quran, Ishmael, not Isaac, has been named ‘the Patient’ (Q 37:102; 21:85; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 13, p. 482; vol. 19, p. 111). It refers to Ishmael’s patience regarding the sacrifice. (Majlisī, 1983, vol. 12, p. 132; Rāzī, 1999, vol. 26, p. 347)

Second, since the sacrifice occurred in Mecca, where noble Ishmael helped his father rebuild the Kaaba, Ishmael was the sacrifice. Asma’i has narrated:

I asked Aba Amr ibn Ala, ‘Who was the intended sacrifice?’ He replied, ‘Where has your mind gone? When did Isaac come to Mecca? Ishmael lived in Mecca and rebuilt the Kaaba with his father. The place of the sacrifice was also in Mecca.’ (Ṭabrisī, 1993, vol. 8, p. 708; Majlisī, 1983, vol. 12, p. 132; Rāzī, 1999, vol. 26, p. 347)

Third, it is not clear on what grounds Firestone bases this claim since most Companions and Followers believed that Ishmael was the intended sacrifice. (Ālūsī, 1995, vol. 12, p. 128; Rāzī, 1999, vol. 26, p. 347; Majlisī, 1983, vol. 12, p. 132)

Fourth, Shia traditions consider Ishmael to have been the intended sacrifice. (Ṣadūq, 1999, vol. 1, p. 210; vol. 2, p. 269; Ṭabāṭabā’ī, 1996, vol. 7, p. 232)

Even though the Jews knew that Ishmael was the intended sacrifice, they made the claim that it was Isaac due to envy. (Ṭabrisī, 1993, vol. 8, p. 807; Majlisī, 1983, vol. 12, p. 134)

### 3.4 Idolatry of Prophet Abraham’s Father as well as the Relatives of Prophet Muhammad

Concerning this, Firestone writes:

Despite his father’s hostility towards him..., Abraham prays that he be forgiven for his sin of worshipping idols... This aspect of the legend may have held particular poignancy for Muḥammad, who, according to tradition, wished to do the same for his idolatrous ancestors. (Firestone, 2001, vol. 1, p. 7)

This makes it clear that Firestone considered the father of Prophet Abraham and ancestors of Prophet Muhammad to have been idolaters. The view of the Shia scholars differs in both cases as they consider these personages to have been monotheists (Mufīd, 1993, p. 139; Ṭūsī, 1992, vol. 4, p. 175; Ṭabrisī, 1993, vol. 4, p. 497; Majlisī, 1983, vol. 12, p. 49; ‘Āmilī, 1995, vol. 2, p. 74-75). The following rationales have been presented to show that Abraham’s father and Muhammad’s ancestors were not idolaters.

First, reason dictates that a prophet must be clear of anything that causes people to hate or draw away from him (Ḥillī, 1996, p. 350). If the ancestors of the Prophet Muhammad had been polytheists, people would have drawn

away from him. Prophet Muhammad's ancestors must have been free of polytheism. If they had been polytheists or disbelievers, the Prophet's people would not have accepted his words and invitation, with the excuse, "Your own forefathers were idolaters, but you forbid us to worship idols?" This would certainly have been an obstruction for the Prophet's invitation. (Abū al-Futūḥ Rāzī, 1988, vol. 7, p. 340)

Second, it is evidence that to some extent the ethics and behaviour of human beings are inherited from one's forebears, and thus, a father that is a polytheist cannot have an infallible child free of vice. (Irbilī, 1962, vol. 2, p. 65)

Third, after completing construction of the Kaaba, Prophet Abraham and his son Ishmael prayed for God to make their descendents Muslims (Q 2:128; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 1, p. 455), and spare them from worship of idols (Q 14:35; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 10, p. 361). God accepted this request by Prophet Abraham (Ṭabarī, 1991, vol. 13, p. 151). Hence, as a result of the prayer of Prophet Abraham, the ancestors of Prophet Muhammad were monotheists.

Fourth, historical documents provide proof that the ancestors of Prophet Muhammad were monotheists. For example, Abd al-Mutallib, the Prophet's grandfather, was known as the Second Abraham for his strong adherence to the religion of Abraham. (Ya'qūbī, 1969, vol. 2, p. 11)

#### 4. Prophet Moses

Schock has researched issues related to Prophet Moses. Some of her views are discussed below.

##### 4.1 Derivation of the Quran from the Testaments

Concerning such influences, Schock writes:

The references to Moses are spread throughout the Qur'ān, with mentions already in the Meccan sūras. Most narratives...about Moses, however, date from the Medinan period of revelation..., when Muḥammad came in close contact with Jews... The topics in the Qur'ānic account of Moses go back to biblical and post-biblical narratives. The details in the Qur'ān and in early Islamic exegesis testify to the great influence of Jewish Haggada on Muḥammad and early Islam. (Schock, 2003, vol. 3, p. 419)

Reflection on the preceding quote indicates that Schock sought to suggest the notion that the Quran was derived from the Testaments. Such a notion is unreasonable for the following reasons.

First, there is no historical evidence suggesting the existence of means or circumstances required for derivation and transfer of teachings from the Testaments to the Quran. The Testaments had not yet been translated into Arabic during the lifetime of the Prophet of Islam. Rather, the translation of the Testaments was carried out years after the passing of the Prophet (Mughniyya, 1986, p. 82). Such Orientalists as Böwering and Robinson have acknowledged this fact. (Böwering, 2001, vol. 1, p. 316; Robinson, 2003, vol. 3, p. 8)

Moreover, Prophet Muhammad was not familiar with the Hebrew language. In fact, he did not even know how to read. Additionally, there is no historical report about visits between the Prophet and Christian priests or Jewish rabbis for transfer of teachings from the Testaments (Mughniyya, 1986, p. 82). According to both the Quran and history, it is undeniable that prior to his Islamic invitation, the Prophet did not know how to read or write, go to school, learn from any teacher, read a book, or write anything (Ja'fariyān, 1995, vol. 1, p. 191). As written in the Quran about the Prophet, "You did not use to recite any scripture before it, nor did you write it with your right hand, for then the impugnors would have been sceptical" (Q 29:48; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 10, p. 303). It is obvious that Prophet Muhammad could not have created such a book including divine teachings and eternal decrees without a connection with God, but instead under the influence of popular culture and limited visits with various individuals. For a person to be able to gather information from previous books, they must first have the scientific experience and knowledge of their time whereas this was not so for Prophet Muhammad.

Second, Prophet Muhammad introduced the Quran as divine revelation. In order to accept derivation of the Quran from the Testaments, Prophet Muhammad must be considered a liar. However, he was so trustworthy that the Quraysh polytheists had named him Muhammad the Honest. They trusted him so greatly that when he gathered the dignitaries of the Quraysh for his initial invitation to Islam and asked, "Have you ever heard a lie from me?" They answered, "No. We have so much faith in your truthfulness that if you claimed it was night during the daytime, we would accept it!"

Third, the People of the Book were enemies of Prophet Muhammad and continuously plotted against him. They did all they could to weaken Islam. Therefore, if Prophet Muhammad had received the Quran from the People of the Book, they would certainly have publicised this fact. They would have said, "He has learned the Quran from us" or "He has derived it from our books". Though the People of the Book have said many things to attempt to

discredit Islam, they have never said this. If they had, this too would have been quoted just like other claims they have made.

Fourth, parallels to many of the stories regarding the prophets in the Quran cannot be found in the Testaments. Some of these include the stories of Hud, Salih, and Shu‘ayb. If Prophet Muhammad had learned the Quran from the People of the Book, he would not have added these to his book. (Māḍī, 2001, p. 148)

Fifth, the consistency of the entire Quranic text, which was revealed over the period of 23 years, is another strong testimony to its divinity. If it had been the product of human thought and derived from a variety of religions and cultures existing within the Arabian Peninsula, it would not be uniform and would hold many discrepancies. (Tha‘labī Nayshābūrī, 2002, vol. 3, p. 350; Bayḍāwī, 1998, vol. 2, p. 86)

Sixth, if the book had been created by Prophet Muhammad himself, then why did he not create revelation in his own favour? For example, before the direction of prayer (or kiblah) was changed from Jerusalem to the Kaaba, he was faced with bitter accusations from polytheists for sixteen months. If revelation was not controlled by God but by Prophet Muhammad himself, why did he not change the direction of prayer sooner?

Seventh, how could the Quran have been derived from the Testaments while many verses strongly censure the Jewish and Christian people? (Q 2:51; 3:70; 4:153; 5:14; 9:30; 57:27; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 1, p. 253; vol. 2, p. 611; vol. 4, pp. 193, 316-317; vol. 7, p. 360; vol. 23, p. 380).

Eighth, the differences between the Quran and the Testaments shows that the Quran has not been derived from them. These differences manifest in various areas of belief, ethics, commandments, and the stories themselves. Sometimes, these cases go beyond dissimilarity, even clashing with popular Jewish and Christian culture and denying various elements. (Khuṭī, 1974, p. 57-68)

#### 4.2 Moses' Sandals

Concerning Q 20:12, Schock writes, “Commentators explain that Moses’ sandals were made from the skin of the carcass of an ass, i.e. one that was not slaughtered; therefore, Moses was ordered to take them off”. (Schock, 2003, vol. 3, p. 421)

God has stated, “Indeed I am your Lord! So take off your sandals. You are indeed in the sacred valley of Tuwa”. (Q 20:12; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 13, p. 168)

Examinations of various exegeses (Ṭabarī, 1991, vol. 18, p. 278; Farrā’, 1996, vol. 2, p. 175; Balkhī, 2003, vol. 3, p. 22) demonstrates that the opinion Schock mentions concerning this verse is based on weak traditions (Ṭabāṭabā’ī, 1996, vol. 14, p. 159; Qumī Mashhadī, 1990, vol. 5, p. 241). Narratives stating that Moses’ sandals were made from the skin of the carcass of an ass originate from Ka‘b al-Ahbar (Ṭabarī, 1991, vol. 18, p. 278). Since he narrated a profusion of Israeli traditions, it is possible that the above narrative is also Israeli in origin. It is obvious that traditions of solely Jewish origin cannot be utilised in Islam. Thus, Schock has provided the weakest exegetic view regarding Q 20:12 and has disregarded other views that were more consistent with the context of the verse and the status of Prophet Moses. Some of these views are as follows.

First, leaving the feet bare is a sign of humbleness which Prophet Moses had to observe in the holy valley of Tuwa. (Zuḥaylī, 1997, vol. 16, p. 99; Sabzwārī, 1986, vol. 4, p. 422; Ṭayyib, 1999, vol. 9, p. 13; Mughniyya, 2004, vol. 5, p. 208)

Second, footwear is used for avoiding uncleanness and protecting the feet from harm whereas God had given Prophet Moses safety and security in the holy valley of Tuwa. (Ṭabrisī, 1993, vol. 7, p. 9)

Third, the order to remove his footwear was due to the holiness of the valley in which Moses had set foot, and the valley was holy since divine light had manifested within it. (Ṭabāṭabā’ī, 1996, vol. 14, p. 73; Ḥusaynī Shīrāzī, 2003, vol. 3, p. 270; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 13, p. 169; Faḍl Allāh, 1998, vol. 16, p. 123)

#### 4.3 The Pages of Prophet Moses

In this regard, Schock writes:

Q 87:18-9 mentions the “first” or “former pages” (*al-ṣuḥuf al-ūlā*) of Moses...Commentators also explain the “pages of Moses” (*ṣuḥuf Mūsā*) as part of those “former pages,” namely the pages of all other former prophets. None of these interpretations, however, necessitates a difference between “the pages of Moses” and the “book of Moses” (*kitāb Mūsā*) or the Torah. (Schock, 2003, vol. 3, p. 425)

God has stated, “This is indeed in the former scriptures, the scriptures of Abraham and Moses” (Q 87:18-19; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 26, pp. 404-405). Commentators believe that the pages or scriptures of Prophet Moses are different from the Torah and that they were given to him prior to the Torah. (Ṭabrisī, 1993, vol. 10, p.

297; Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996, vol. 20, p. 152; Zuḥaylī, 1997, vol. 30, p. 199; Ibn 'Āshūr, 2004, vol. 16, p. 228; Ālūsī, 1995, vol. 15, p. 323)

Prophet Muhammad has stated, "Prior to the revelation of the Torah, God revealed ten scriptures to Prophet Moses". (Majlisī, 1983, vol. 74, p. 71; Qumī, 1993, vol. 38, p. 356; Haythamī, 1991, vol. 1, p. 53)

The preceding narrative indicates that the scriptures of Prophet Moses differ from the Torah. On this basis, it is clear that the view of Schock regarding the scriptures of Prophet Moses being the same as the Torah is incorrect.

#### 4.4 Seeing God

With reference to Q 7:142, Schock writes, "His lord spoke to him (*kallamahu rabbuhu*), he said: 'My lord, show me [yourself] that I may gaze upon you.'" (Schock, 2003, vol. 3, p. 423-424)

Schock mentions that Prophet Moses makes a request to see God. The first question that comes to mind regarding this statement is: Though Moses was a great and law-giving prophet, who knew very well that God was neither material nor had spatial dimensions nor could He be seen, how did he ask God for something which was even unbecoming for those of weaker belief than himself?

Schock does not answer this question in her research. Even so, commentators have provided a variety of responses to this question (Ibn 'Aṭīyya Undulusī, 2002, vol. 2, p. 450; Baghawī, 2000, vol. 2, p. 228; Zuḥaylī, 1997, vol. 9, p. 84; Ibn 'Āshūr, 2004, vol. 8, p. 275; Bayḍāwī, 1998, vol. 2, p. 317; Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996, vol. 8, p. 24). The most obvious answer is that Prophet Moses asked this on behalf of his people since some ignorant individuals from among the Children of Israel insisted that they had to first see God before they would have faith. Therefore, God directed Moses to request this of Him in order that the people receive a satisfying response. A concrete piece of evidence that validates this interpretation is that, according to Q 7:155, afterwards Prophet Moses asked God, "Will You destroy us because of what the fools amongst us have done?" This makes it clear not only that Prophet Moses had no such request, but also that perhaps all of the seventy people that accompanied him to the rendezvous did not have such thoughts either. They were merely scholars and representatives of the Children of Israel who sought to present their observations to the ignorant masses who desired to see God. (Ṭūsī, 1992, vol. 4, p. 534; Ṭabrisī, 1993, vol. 4, p. 311; idem, 1998, vol. 1, p. 467; Makārim Shīrāzī, 2009, vol. 6, p. 356; Ṣādiqī Tihirānī, 1986, vol. 11, p. 282; Ḥusaynī Shīrāzī, 2003, vol. 2, p. 240; Sabzwārī, 1986, vol. 3, p. 209; Ja'farī, 1997, vol. 4, p. 207)

### 5. Conclusion

Examination of the views of orientalist concerning the law-giving prophets demonstrates that they have utilised the Quran extensively and have referenced the Quran in almost all cases. This indicates their considerable knowledge about the Quran. They have also suitably reported narratives about the law-giving prophets. Examination of the views of orientalist concerning law-giving prophets indicates that they have performed extensive research in Islamic sources. However, their undeniable mistakes demonstrate that they either did not have access to the complete range of reliable Islamic sources or were unaware of many such sources. Usage of weak Islamic narratives and fallacious interpretation of various Quranic verses have led to unconvincing opinions regarding law-giving prophets.

### References

- 'Abd al-Bāqī, M. F. (2004). *Muḥjam al-mufahras li-alfāz al-Qur'ān*. Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifa.
- Abū al-Futūḥ Rāzī, Ḥ. ibn 'A. (1988). *Rawḍ al-jinān wa rūḥ al-jinān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān*. Ed. Muḥammad Ja'far Yāḥaqqī and Muḥammad Mahdī Nāṣiḥ, Mashhad: Bunyād Pizhūhish-hāyi Islāmī-i Astān-i Quds-i Raḍawī.
- Abū Shuhba, M. (1993). *Al-Isrā'īliyyāt wa al-mawḍū'āt fī kutub al-tafsīr*. Beirut: Dār al-Jīl.
- Ālūsī, M. (1995). *Rūḥ al-ma'ānī fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-ʿaẓīm*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya.
- 'Āmilī, J. M. (1995). *Al-Ṣaḥīḥ min sīrat al-nabiyy al-a'ẓam*. Beirut: Dār al-Hādī.
- Baghawī, Ḥ. ibn M. (2000). *Ma'ālim al-tanzīl fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān*. Beirut: Dār al-Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī.
- Balkhī, M. ibn S. (2003). *Tafsīr Muqātil ibn Sulaymān*, Beirut: Dār al-Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī.
- Bayḍāwī, 'A. A. ibn 'U. (1998). *Anwār al-tanzīl wa asrār al-ta'wīl*. Beirut: Dār al-Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī.
- Böwering, G. (2001). *Chronology and the Quran. Encyclopaedia of the Qurān*, Leiden: Brill.
- Brinner, W. (2003). Noah. *Encyclopaedia of the Qurān*, Leiden, Brill.
- Diyārī, M. T. (2000). *Pizhūhishī dar bāb-i isrā'īliyyāt dar tafāsīr-i Qur'ān*. Tehran: Daftar-i Pizhūhish wa Nashr-i Suhrawardī.

- Faḍl Allāh, M. Ḥ. (1998). *Min waḥy al-Qurʾān*. Beirut: Dār al-Milāk.
- Farrāʾ, Y. ibn Z. (1996). *Ma ānī al-Qurʾān*. Cairo: Dār al-Miṣriyya.
- Firestone, R. (2001). Abraham. *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*. Leiden, Brill.
- Haythamī, ʿA. ibn A. B. (1991). *Mawārid al-ẓimān ilā zawāʾid ibn Ḥibbān*. Damascus: Dār al-Thaqāfa.
- Hillī, Ḥ. ibn Y. (1996). *Kashf al-murād fī sharḥ tajrīd al-iʿtiqād*. (Ed. Ḥasan Ḥasan Zādah Āmulī). Qum: Muʾassisah al-Nashr al-Islāmī.
- Ḥusayni Shīrāzī, M. (2003). *Taqrib al-Qurʾān ilā al-adhhān*. Beirut: Dār al-ʿUlūm.
- Ibn ʿAshūr, M. ibn Ṭ. (2004). *Al-taḥrīr wa al-tanwīr*. Beirut: Dār Iḥyā al-Turāth al-ʿArabī.
- Ibn ʿAṭiyya Andalūsī, ʿAbd al-Ḥaq ibn Ghālib (2002). *Al-muḥarar al-wajīz fī tafsīr al-kitāb al-ʿazīz*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya.
- Ibn Kathīr, Ismāʿīl ibn ʿU. (1999). *Tafsīr al-Qurʾān al-ʿaẓīm*. Ed. Muḥammad Ḥusayn Shams al-Dīn, Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya.
- Ibn Quṭayba, ʿAbd Allāh ibn M. (1995). *Ta wīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth*. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr.
- Irbilī, ʿAlī ibn ʿI. (1962). *Kashf al-ghumma*. Tabriz: Maktaba Banī Hāshimī.
- Jaʿfarī, Y. (1997). *Tafsīr kawthar*. Qum: Nashr-i Hijrat.
- Jaʿfariyān, R. (1995). *Tārīkh-i siyāsī-yi Islām*. Tehran: Wizārat-i Farhang wa Irshād-i Islāmī.
- Khūʾī, Abū al-Q. (1974). *Al-Bayān fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān*. Qum: Al-Maṭbaʿa al-ʿIlmiyya.
- Kulaynī, Muḥammad ibn Y. (1987). *Al-Kāfī*. Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islamiyya.
- Māḍī, M. (2001). *Al-Waḥy al-Qurʾānī fī al-manẓar al-istishraqī wa naqduh*. Medina: Dār al-Daʿwa.
- Majlisī, M. B. (1983). *Biḥār al-anwār al-jāmiʿa li-durar akhbār al-aʿimmat al-aṭḥār*. Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī.
- Makārim Shīrāzī, N. (2009). *Tafsīr-i Nimūnah*. Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islamiyya.
- Maʿrifat, M. H. (2011). *Tanzīh al-anbiyāʾ*. Ed. Khusraw Taqadusī Niyā. Qum: Nashr-i Aʿimma (ʿa).
- Mufīd, M. (1993). *Taṣḥīḥ al-iʿtiqād*. Qum: Kungira-yi Jahānī-yi Shaykh Mufīd.
- Mughniyya, M. J. (1986). *Shubahāt al-mulḥidīn wa al-jawāb ʿanhā*. Beirut: Dār wa Maktabat al-Hilāl.
- Mughniyya, M. J. (2004). *Tafsīr al-kāshif*. Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islamiyya.
- Muḥahharī, M. (2007). *Sayrī dar sīra-yi nabawī*. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Sadrā.
- Nūrī, M. Ḥ. (1988). *Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil*. Qum: Muʾassisa Āl al-Bayt li-Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth.
- Qaraʾi, A. Q. (trans.) (2004). *The Qurʾān with phrase by phrase English translation* (2005), London: ICAS Press.
- Qumī Mashhadī, M. (1990). *Tafsīr kanz al-daqaʾiq wa baḥr al-gharāʾib*. Tehran: Sazmān-i Chāp wa Intishārāt-i Wizārat-i Irshād-i Islāmī.
- Qumī, J. ibn A. (1993). *Jāmiʿ al-aḥādīth*. Mashhad: Majmaʿ al-Buḥūth al-Islamiyya.
- Qurtubī, M. ibn A. (1985). *Al-Jāmiʿ li-aḥkām al-Qurʾān*. Tehran: Naṣir Khusraw.
- Rāzī, F. al-D. (1999). *Maḥāṭib al-ghayb*. Beirut: Dār al-Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī.
- Rezaee Haftador, H. and etc. (2015). Examination of the Ascension of the Prophet of Islam in the View of Orientalists. *Review of European Studies*, 3.
- Robinson, N. (2003). Jesus. *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*. Leiden: Brill.
- Sabzwārī, M. ibn Ḥ. A. (1986). *Al-Jadīd fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān al-Majīd*. Beirut: Dār al-Taʿārif.
- Ṣādiqī Tihrānī, M. (1986). *Al-Furqān fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān bi-al-Qurʾān*. Qum: Intishārāt-i Farhang-i Islāmī.
- Ṣadūq, M. ibn ʿA. (1999). *Uyūn akhbār al-Riḍā*. Tehran: Manshūrāt-i Jahān.
- Schock, C. (2003). Moses. *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*. Leiden: Brill.
- Ṭabarī, M. ibn J. (1991). *Jāmiʿ al-bayān ʿan ta wīl āy al-Qurʾān*. Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifā.
- Ṭabāṭabāʾī, M. Ḥ. (1996). *Al-Mizān fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān*. Qum: Daftar-i Intishārāt-i Islāmī-yi Jāmiʿa-yi Mudarrisīn-i Ḥawza-yi ʿIlmiyya-yi Qum.

- Ṭabrisī, F. ibn Ḥ. (1993). *Majma‘ al-bayān li-‘ulūm al-Qur‘ān*. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Nāṣir Khusraw.
- Ṭabrisī, F. ibn Ḥ. (1998). *Jawāmi‘ al-jāmi‘*. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Dānishgāh-i Tihārān.
- Ṭayyib, ‘Abd al-Ḥ. (1999). *Aṭyab al-bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur‘ān*. Tehran: Intishārāt al-Islām.
- Tha‘labī Nīshābūrī, Abū Ishāq Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm. (2002). *Al-Kashf wa al-bayān ‘an tafsīr al-Qur‘ān*. Beirut: Dār al-Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī.
- Ṭūsī, M. ibn Ḥ. (1992). *Al-Tibyān fī tafsīr al-Qur‘ān*. Beirut: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī.
- Ya‘qūbī, A. (1969). *Tārīkh Ya‘qūbī*. Trans. Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Āyatī. Tehran: Bungāh-i Tarjuma wa Nashr-i Kitāb.
- Zuḥaylī, W. ibn M. (1997). *Al-Tafsīr al-munīr fī al-‘aqīda wa al-sharī‘a wa al-manhaj*. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-Mu‘āṣir.

### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the authors, with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).