



Criticism of Theory of Prophet's (PBUH) Learning from Monk Buhairā'

Ezzatollah Molaeniya¹; Morteza Valizadeh²

¹Associate Professor, Department of Qur'an and Hadith Sciences, University of Qom, Iran

² PhD Candidate of Qur'an and Hadith Sciences, University of Qom, Iran

E-mail: e.molaenia@qom.ac.ir; m.valizadeh.k@gmail.com

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v11i4.5695>

Abstract

The journey of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) to Bilād al-Shām (Levant) and meeting with the monk Buhairā' is one of the famous stories in the history books in recent centuries. Some orientalists, citing this meeting, have tried to identify Buhairā' as the teacher of the Prophet (PBUH) and to adopt the teachings of Islam from Judaism and Christianity. This article, while presenting the opinions of orientalists about the learning of the Prophet (PBUH) from Buhairā', criticizes this point of view and examines the role of Sunni traditions in creating this view. Using analytical-critical method based on rational and historical reasons, it has tried to prove that the opinion of orientalists has no scientific basis and is false for many reasons, some of which are as follows: not accepting the story by researchers; distortion of the sanad of these narrations; the existence of many differences and contradictions of some parts of the story; the Prophet's (PBUH) illiterate ('ummī) personality and the short duration of the meeting; not using the story by enemies of the Prophet (PBUH), Jews, and Christians; the existence of many differences and contradictions in the Jewish and Christian beliefs with the teachings of the Prophet (PBUH); and the miracles and challenges of the Qur'an on the inability of others to imitate it. Moreover, even if the meeting of Prophet (PBUH) with Buhairā' happened, there was no reason for the Prophet (PBUH) to learn from him.

Keywords: *Revelation; Learning of the Prophet (PBUH); Buhairā'; Orientalists; Adaptation*

Introduction

Since the revelation of the Qur'an, a group of people who did not want to acknowledge its truth, used various ways to make doubt in its revelation. In fact, they looked for a source for the Qur'an; Among the sources cited by orientalists for the teachings of the Qur'an - not at the time of its revelation but in recent centuries - is Monk Buhairā'. Orientalists have presented the results of their research on Qur'anic knowledge in the form of articles, books and encyclopedias. A detailed understanding of these works and the views expressed within them seems to be an undeniable necessity.

The studies of orientalists about Islam have been very extensive and serious. Despite their scholarly researches in the field of hadith, they have sometimes raised doubts about it. In terms of the source of the Qur'an, they are divided into three groups: some consider the Qur'an to be a revelation from God, some consider it to be non-spiritual and the result of the genius of the Prophet (PBUH), and some consider the source of the Qur'an to be the previous books, especially the Torah and the Bible (Zamani, 2016, pp. 126-143).

Orientalists who consider the source of the Qur'an to be Jews and Christians, mainly mention two persons as the most influential people in the compilation of the contents of the Qur'an: the monk Buhairā' and Waraqat bin Noufil.

In general, the premise of many orientalists is that the Qur'an is not a revelation but is a human work that the Prophet (PBUH) has used the teachings of previous books and historical reports before him in creating it. Maxim Rodenson, a French orientalist of Russian descent, says: "The issue of the lack of originality of Islam and its dependence on other religions is a common issue among all orientalists." (Al-Sharqāwī, nd, pp. 84-85)

Some orientalists, citing some reports about the meeting of the Prophet (PBUH) with people like Buhairā', have tried to depend Islam on Judaism and Christianity and introduce its teachings as unoriginal. Considering the increase of studies by orientalists in the field of Islam and Qur'an, the necessity of checking the accuracy of their doctrines and replying scientifically to them is felt a lot. Also, since some orientalists are trying to cast doubt on the beliefs of Islam, it is necessary to examine and answer their theories and doubts.

Among the authors who narrated and criticized the story of Buhairā', we can mention the following: Zurqānī in *Manāhil al-'Irfān* (1416 AH, pp. 452-456), Sayed Ja'far Mortadā 'Āmilī in *Al-Sahih Min Sīra Al-Mustafā* (1428 AH, vol. 2, pp. 176-181); and Zargari-Nejad in *The History of Early Islam*. (1999, pp. 184-192)

Also, the following two articles have been written in this regard:

- a. "Examination of the article "Buhairā'" in *The Encyclopedia of Islam*"; Fariha Mamorzadeh and Mohammad Ibrahim Roshanzamir.
- b. "A critical review of the Prophet of Islam's (PBUH) trip to the Levant and his meeting with Buhairā', a Christian monk"; Mahdi Khaza'ei.

In most cases, the writings have only addressed this matter by mentioning a few reasons; However, the present article has tried to reject the Prophet's (PBUH) learning from the monk Buhairā' with extensive intellectual and historical reasons.

In this article, examining historical documents, texts and reports, an attempt has been made to answer the questions, "Did Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) learn anything from Buhairā'?" and "why did orientalists claim such a theory?"

1.The Possibility of the Prophet's (PBUH) Learning from Buhairā' from the Perspective of Orientalists

The only names whom the opponents of Islam have tried to mention as teachers of the Prophet are the monk Buhairā' and Waraqat bin Noufil (Zamani, 2015, p. 147).

The opinions of a number of orientalists about the influence of the Prophet (PBUH) from Buhairā' are as follows:

Montgomery Watt from Scotland believes in the adaptation of the Prophet (PBUH) from oral sources, saying: "The way of expressing the contents of the Holy Book in the Qur'an shows that Muhammad, himself, has not read this book and he has not used other books as well; So the information whom he gave from Jews and Christians were undoubtedly through listening and in different ways; For example, he had met Jews and Christians and discussed religious issues with them. (Watt, 1963, p. 51)

Claude Gilliot in *The Encyclopedia of the Qur'an* in the last paragraph of the entry "Informants", after referring to the story of Buhairā', says about the relation of the Prophet (PBUH) with people such as Warqa Bin Noufil and 'Addās and learning from them: "The study of the reports about the informants leads to the conclusion that we cannot exclude the possibility that whole sections of the Meccan Qur'an could contain elements originally established by, or within, a group of "God's seekers," in the milieu of the "deprived" or "have-nots" who possessed either biblical, post-biblical or other information. People like Waraqa b. Noufil and Khadija may also have participated in that common enterprise under the direction of Muhammad or another individual." (Gilliot, 2001, v. 2, p. 517)

Bodli said: "It is true that Muhammad's beliefs go back to the teachings that he had heard in his travels and had learned from Bahirā', Waraqa and Qis bin Sā'ida." (Bodli, nd, p. 85)

Ignác Goldziher says: "Mohammed has exploited everything in his low encounters in his merchant trips without considering its aspects and without how to organize it." (Goldziher, nd, p. 25)

Montgomery Watt says: "Abu Talib's caravan landed and took shelter near the Nestorian monastery. They welcomed Abu Talib and his nephew. One of the monks known as Sergiyous, whom some called Bahūrī, as he spoke to Muhammad and was surprised of his intelligence, power and perceptiveness in that age, when he saw his curiosity and scrutinizing in the questions about religions and beliefs, he was very happy to meet him. Both of them started talking to each other frequently. The monk's efforts were constantly busy in this direction to prove the falsity of the pagan religion (which was the religion of Muhammad 's time in Mecca). Most historians believe that the knowledge of the principles, spirit and habits of the religion of Jesus, which Muhammad expressed later, came from his meeting with this priest." (Nazari, 1992, p. 136)

William Federer said: "Since Muhammad could not read, he learned what about the Messiah, Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Manichaeism, and ignorant Arab religions such as the Sabians, mostly from stories and oral traditions during a business trip with his merchant uncle." (Federer, 2008, p. 21)

Karen Armstrong, a contemporary American orientalist and an expert on religion in the Western world, has accepted the story of Buhīrī and narrated it. (Armstrong, 2004, pp. 101-99)

According to the investigations carried out in regarding the opinions of the orientalists about the influence of the Prophet (PBUH) and the Qur'an from the People of the Book, it is clear that some of the orientalists, such as Abraham Geiger, Montgomery Watt, Bernard Lewis, and Wiley M. Federer, with the principle of the Prophet's (PBUH) being an illiterate and his inability to use the sources of the People of the Book, claim the adaption of the Prophet and the Qur'an from oral sources such as Buhairā' and Waraga bin Noufil. (Shaygan, 2019, p. 73)

These were examples of orientalists' opinions about the Prophet's (PBUH) adaptation from oral sources, such as Buhairā'. Of course, one should not expect an orientalist who does not believe in God and revelation to admit that the Prophet (PBUH) received the Qur'an through an angel from God. Some of these orientalists themselves admitted that they are atheists and do not believe in God (Shariati, 2003, pp. 280-281); Therefore, it is completely natural for them to look for an earthly source for the religion of Islam and consider this source as the ground for the emergence of Islam.

Although orientalist try to instill the fact that their research is unbiased, these assumptions and sometimes prejudices can be seen in the works of most orientalist. Mrs. Annemarie Schimmel in her book *Mystical Dimensions of Islam* wrote: " In the West, whoever studies and researches in the field of Islam, gets used to the traditional depiction of Muhammad (PBUH) - as hatred and enmity has spread in the Christian world for centuries." (Sami M., 1386, p. 477)

2. Introducing Buhairā'

The story of Monk Buhairā' is one of the famous stories that have been quoted by most historians. This story is found in most Sunni historical sources. Historians such as Ibn Hisham (212 or 218) in *Al-Sirah al-Nabawīyah*, Ibn Sa'd (230) in *Tabaqāt al-Kubrā*, Ya'qubī (284) in his *Ta'rīkh*, Tabarī (310) in *Ta'rīkh al-Tabarī*, Mas'oudī (346) in *Muroj Al-Dhahab*, Ibn Kathīr (774) in *Al-Bidāya wal-Nihāya*, etc. have narrated this story.

Some Shiite historians (quoting Sunni sources) have brought the story of the Prophet's (PBUH) trip to Syria accompanied by his uncle Abu Talib and his encounter with "Buhairā'". Scholars such as: Sheikh Sadouq (381) in *Ikmāl al-Din*, Ibn Shahrāshoub (588) in *Manāqib* etc.

In historical sources, in addition to the fact that there is no complete information about Buhairā', there is also a difference about his name: his name is Buhairī or Buhairā' (Ibn Hishām, 1996, vol. 1, p. 180; Ibn Ishāq, 1982, p. 157; Dhahabī, 2003, vol. 2, p. 58), Sarges (Masoudi, 1425 AH, vol. 1, p. 60), Georges (Ibn Hishām, 1996, vol. 1, p. 180), Buhairī or Buhairā' (most of the later sources such as: Ibrahim as 416, vol. 1, p. 65) have recorded.

He was a Christian monk and priest and the most learned person in the Christian community (Beihaqī, vol. 1, p. 197). Christians believed that the books and sciences that were in front of their past scientists were transferred from hand to hand and breast to breast to Buhairā'. (Ibn Hishām, 1996, vol. 1, p. 180)

It is also stated in the book of Ibn Hishām: "Buhairā' was a monk from Christians, and for some time he had visited a monastery in that place (Basri) and sat in it, and did not come out of that monastery and did not speak to anyone. Buhairā' was in asceticism and piety. He had reached the level of perfection and he also had a good hand in knowledge, as at that time there was no one with his asceticism and knowledge, and he had found out the condition of the Prophet, PBUH, from the Bible, and he had known his nature and attributes, and he had been sitting in that monastery for several years. He was waiting to see our Prophet (PBUH), because he knew from the Bible that the Prophet of the end of time will pass through that place and will descend under a certain tree in a certain place.... (Ibn Ishāq, 1982, pp. 158-159)

Some Islamic historians and scholars have accepted this story and narrated it in their books. This story is mostly reported in Sunni books and is also found in some Shiite sources.

3. The Reasons for Rejecting the Prophet's (PBUH) Learning from Buhairā'

Despite the acceptance of this theory by some scholars, it has problems in its sanad and content, as follows:

3-1. Weakness of the Origin of Narration

The origin of this narration and meeting has been doubted by Muslim and non-Muslim researchers and observers. Some historians, due to the various and different narrations about the journey of the Prophet (PBUH) to Syria before the Mission (Ba'tha), have considered its narrations to be confusing and have questioned the origin of the journey (Āmilī, 1428 AH, vol. 2, p. 176) and some of

Islamic scholars have doubted the authenticity of the meeting of the Prophet (PBUH) with the Christian Nestorian Buhairā' in the history of Islam: Darrāz believes that despite his efforts to find a solid historical document for this meeting, his efforts were fruitless (Darrāz, 2012, p. 134) as one of the orientalist named Howart has also announced that his efforts in this direction have not reached anywhere. (ibid)

The French Louis Massignon is another orientalist who stated that this story is baseless. In Salman Pak's book, he doubts the existence of such a person and considers him a legendary figure, saying: "Buhairā', Sergius, Tamim Dari and others who gathered narrations about the Prophet are suspicious and untraceable ghosts." (Massignon, nd, p. 81) Even the reporters of the story themselves never considered the completeness of the story to be definitive and completely certain, and by mentioning the words "In Sahha" (Dhahabī, 1413 AH, vol. 1, p. 55) and "Fīmā Yaz'umoun" (Ibn Hisham, 1996, vol. 1, p. 180; Tabarī, 2008, vol. 2, p. 277; Ibn Kathīr, 1408 AH, vol. 2, p. 345) have doubted the whole story in its parts.

3-2. Sanad Weakness

The sanad of these traditions is weak; Ibn Ishāq did not provide a sanad for his report and Tabarī has two narrations for this story; He took the first narration from Ibn Ishāq, and the second narration is interrupted by Abu Musa 'Ash'arī, who was born ten years before the Prophet 's Mission. Thirty years after this incident, and in fact fifty years after this incident, he converted to Islam and did not say from whom he heard this. Bayhaqī has also quoted it from Ta'rīkh Tabarī.

In the Shiite sources, only Sheikh Sadiq has given this narration in detail in kamāl al-Din wa Tamām al-Ni'ma, and his narrators are all Sunnis. He has two ways for this report: the first way is cut and weak in terms of the sanad, and the second narration is also marfou'a, none of which is reliable. Also, the first contains strange things that are more similar to legends up to a true story. (see Sadouq, 2016, vol. 1, pp. 182-186) Ibn Shahr Āshoub also took the narration from Sheikh Sadouq in Manāqib. The beginning of it was narrated by the commentators and its continuation by Tabarī, and he put the responsibility of guaranteeing the authenticity of this story aside (Ibn Shahr Āshoub, 2000, vol. 1, pp. 38-40).

Therefore, the narrators of this story are either untrustworthy Sunnis or unknown Shiites; The origin of this story is distorted in terms of the sanad; Both the sanads mentioned in the Shia books and the sanads mentioned in the Sunni books. These hadiths should be considered among the hadiths transmitted by the Companions, because the narrators of this story (Ibn Ishāq or Abu Musa Ash'arī or Dawud bin Hussain) were not born at that time and they did not narrate their own chain of transmission.

Tirmidhī believes that the hadith of Buhairā' is strange (cited by: Ibn Kathīr, 1408 AH, vol. 2, p. 347) and Ibn Kathīr has doubted this hadith and said that there are strange things in this story, considering it to be one of the Morsalāt of the Companions (ibid., p. 348). Dhahabī said: "This hadith is strongly Monkar" (Dhahabī, 1413 AH, vol. 1, p. 57) and he also said: "I think this hadith is fake and some of its content is false." (Ibn Kathīr, 1408 AH, vol. 2, footnote, p. 347). Hashim Ma'rouf Hassanī also believes that the narrators of these news are accused of lying and those who are not restrained in presenting historical events. (Ma'rouf Hassanī, 1985, p. 54)

3-3. Content Weakness

Another thing that weakens this story is the dispute about Buhairā's character. As mentioned in the introduction, there is a difference even in his name; Was his real name Jurjis or Sarges or Georges, or was he one of the Jewish scholars and Jewish rabbies (Ibn Kathīr, 1408 AH, vol. 2, p. 349), as some have said, or was he one of the Christian priests and of the tribe of Abdul Qais (Mas'oudī, 1425 AH, vol. 1, p. 60) as some others have said? These differences cause weakness and loss of trust in the traditions that have been reached in this field.

The existence of many discrepancies and contradictions in Buhairā's story makes this report untrustworthy. Here are a number of clear contradictions and cases that reason refuses to accept:

- A) In the narration of Ibn Hisham, it is stated that when Buhairā invited the Quraysh caravan to welcome them, all the people left and only the Messenger of God (PBUH) was placed next to the furniture because he was the youngest of all. (Ibn Ishaq, 1982, p. 180) How is it possible to hire a child to guard the furniture of a caravan? How could Abu Talib, who was the guardian of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), be willing to leave his brother's relic for guarding and go to the table himself?

Another contradiction that can be seen in these traditions is that according to these traditions, when the caravans came to Buhairā's house, he looked at everyone, but did not find Prophet Muhammad (PBUH). He asked the caravans, are there any of you left? They answered: Our youngest person stayed with the furniture. Also, it has been reported that Abu Talib sent him to Makkah with Abu Bakr and Bilal. According to historians, Abu Bakr and Bilal were younger than him. In this case, the smallest person will be Abu Bakr and Bilal, not the Prophet (PBUH); This contradiction shows that these narrations are fake.

- b) Another contradiction in this narration is that it is mentioned in the narrations of this story: there was a cloud over the Prophet's head that casts a shadow on him. It further says that when the Prophet sat down, the tree would shade him. Now, when there is a cloud that casts a shadow over the head of the Prophet (PBUH), how is it possible to imagine that a tree also casts a shadow on him? Because the shadow of the cloud destroys the shadow of the tree that is sitting under it. (Dhahabī, 1413 AH, vol. 1, p. 57)
- c) It has been said that the Prophet (PBUH) made a second trip to Levant when he was 25 years old. (Ibn Ishaq, 1982, p. 165) This trip was for trade with Khadijah's property at the suggestion of Abu Talib. If this trip took place, it is a reason why the first trip did not take place; Because Buhairā had warned Abu Talib to return the Prophet (PBUH) to Mecca so that he would be safe from the Jews. Did the Prophet (PBUH) forget this warning when he went to Levant again, or did the Jews abandon their enmity?
- d) Abu Talib, with the intensity of his love for the orphan brother and was not willing to separate this child from himself for an hour, and he did not even trust the other uncles of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) in this regard, here he was left with a child, smaller than him! It means that "Bilal" should send him to Mecca from that far distance and leave him to predestination and that desert without water and grass and full of danger. In this way, he should separate him from himself and go to search for business and continue his business trip with an easy mind! Especially after the order given by the said monk to Abu Talib to protect that child from the evil of Jews and others and return him to Mecca as soon as possible! (Rasuli Mahalati, 1954, pp. 147-148)
- e) Abu Bakr was more than two years younger than the Prophet (PBUH) and Bilal was between five and ten years younger than Abu Bakr (Āmilī, 1428 AH, vol. 2, p. 177). How could they travel to Levant at this age? And how could they protect the Prophet (PBUH)? It is narrated from Mughlatāy and Damiātī that Abu Bakr was not present at all in that trip (Ibid., p. 178), so, some have considered this section to be a later addition and proof of the fabrication of the entire narrative. (Ma'rouf Hassanī, 1364, pp. 54-55)

Can it be accepted that Bilal, who was an infant and unable to move, or that he was not yet born, accompanied Abu Bakr on this long journey, and then took the responsibility of bringing the Prophet (PBUH) back from Basri to Makkah, despite the fact that the Prophet (PBUH) was older than him? (Āmilī, 1428 AH, vol. 2, p. 177) So there is a possibility that this report was made and added later in order to prove the closeness of Abu Bakr to the Prophet (PBUH) and his superiority over other Companions. (Ibid., p. 179)

- f) If we assume that Abu Bakr - six years old or nine years old or ten years old - was present in this trip and went to Basri and Sham with the caravan, but that Abu Bakr had wealth, business, slaves and servants at that age, so that he could command or to issue a prohibition and send his slave or servant here and there, it is very unlikely and generally unacceptable. (Rasouli Mahalati, 2004, vol. 1, p. 147)

What was the relationship between Bilal and Abu Bakr so that Abu Bakr could order him to do this, while he was not Bilal's owner? Bilal's owner was 'Umayya bin Khalaf and Abu Bakr, as they say, bought him thirty years after this event. (Āmilī, 1428 AH, vol. 2, pp. 177-178)

- g) The age of the Prophet (PBUH) when he met Buhairā, is reported nine (Ya'qoubī, 1379, vol. 2, p. 14; Tabarī, 1387, vol. 2, p. 278; Mas'oudī, 1425 AH, vol. 2, p. 224), or twelve years (Ibn Ishaq, 1361, p. 158; Ibn Sa'd, 1968, vol. 1, p. 121; Mas'oudī, 1425 AH, vol. 1, p. 60). At this young age, even if a person is a genius, how much can he learn from the teachings of a religion so that he can organize a religion that can become a great world civilization within a few decades and overcome the great civilizations of Iran and Rome?
- h) According to historians, Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) was illiterate and did not know how to read and write, and he was no more than nine or twelve years old when he traveled. According to reports, the meeting of the Prophet (PBUH) with Buhairā was not more than a few hours. In these few hours, how much of the teachings of the People of the Book could he learn and turn those teachings into a voluminous book thirty years later and organize a comprehensive religion that covers all aspects of human life? The world's greatest scientists cannot learn these two great books in such a short time, let alone an uneducated child.

Can a meeting of half an hour or a maximum of one hour unexpectedly, without prior planning and in the childhood age of the uneducated Prophet 'Ummī (illiterate), after the passage of thirty years, be the source of extensive developments and the expression of all those miraculous verses that call all the eloquent and orators to fight and challenge it? (Baqarah/23-24)

4-4. Implication Weakness of the Story

Basically, there is no way to prove that the Nestorian monk said something from the Bible to the Prophet (PBUH) or taught him some of the teachings of the covenants. This is simply an unsubstantiated claim. If we accept the fact that the Prophet (PBUH) met with Buhairā, there is no reason to prove that he explained the Holy Book to the Prophet (PBUH) or explained the teachings of the People of the Book to him.

Contrary to the conclusion of orientalists, these quotes indicate that Buhairā recognized the authenticity of the prophecy and its signs with the reasons promised in their holy book in the Prophet (PBUH). So Buhairā didn't teach anything to the Prophet (PBUH), but he understood that he is the same prophet who will be sent by God.

The negotiations of the Christian monk with the Prophet of Islam (PBUH) show that the monk knew the prophet of the end of time and gave good news about his prophecy. (Zurqānī, 1416 AH, vol. 2, p. 454) In addition, the meeting with Nestor at the age of 25 proves the same thing; (Ibn Ishaq, 1361, p. 165) So these narrations show that Buhairā realized the truthfulness of the Prophet (PBUH), not that he taught the honorable man.

4-5. Lack of Historical Evidence for the Claims of Orientalists

The uncle of the Prophet (PBUH) and dozens of other people were with the Prophet (PBUH) on the trip to Levant, and they have not mentioned anything about this visit. This shows that such a meeting

did not take place. If the Prophet's uncle and his other companions were aware of what the Prophet (PBUH) had learned from Buhairā and, as a result, made and treated those materials as revelations, why did they believe in him and expose themselves to many dangers? A faith that is so true that they will face all the tortures and give their lives and money in this way. Also, if this group did not believe, why did they not say anything about the teachings of the Prophet (PBUH) from Buhairā in order to disgrace the Prophet?

If Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) learned something from the monk, it would definitely become famous among the Quraish and everyone would recite those things. If the Prophet (PBUH) had learned something from Buhairā, he would not have been able to claim in front of the people that I am illiterate ('ummī) and did not study, while the Holy Prophet (PBUH) started his mission with the same title and no one said that he learned from a monk at the age of twelve. (Sobahani, 1984, vol. 1, p. 175)

Sobhi Saleh said: "The enemies of the Holy Prophet among the People of the Book and polytheists, who used every tactic to attack the Prophet and the Qur'an, have not mentioned anything about this meeting. If something had been said, the Qur'an would have reacted, as it did in the case of the polytheists' accusation against the Prophet that he probably learned some verses of the Qur'an from the "Roman Gibr", the slave of "Āmir bin Hadramī" or "Yasār" who made swords in Mecca, saying: "We certainly know that they say, 'It is only a human that instructs him.' The language of him to whom they refer is non-Arabic, while this is a clear Arabic language." (Nahl/103) (Ma'mourzadeh, 2018, pp. 135-136)

The fact that the story of the meeting of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) with a Christian or Jewish monk was not used by any of his opponents in Mecca and Medina - the Meccans who were always looking for a teacher for the Prophet (PBUH) - is a clear proof that the story is fake. None of the Muslims of the Meccan period, who faced the flood of slanders of the Meccans against Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), did not refer to Buhairā's prophecies. Also, when the Meccans expelled him from the city, the Prophet (PBUH) did not protest those events; So, it is clear that even the polytheists and opponents of the Prophet (PBUH) did not have such a belief in the era of descent, but this is the brainchild of the orientalist of our era.

People of the Book were also enmity with the Prophet (PBUH) and prepared many conspiracies against him and did not fail to do anything to weaken Islam. Therefore, if Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) had taken the Qur'an from the People of the Book, they would have spread the news about it, saying that He learned this Qur'an from us or took it from our books and is reciting it for you, while many words have been narrated from them. But this matter was not raised by them. If they had said anything, it would have reached us like their other matters; Therefore, the Quraish and the Jews, who used any means to oppose the mission of the Prophet (PBUH), did not have any reference to this narration, while if the Prophet (PBUH) had learned something from someone, it would have been the best tactic for those who opposed this religion.

3-6. Historical Evidence Contrary to the Claims of Orientalists

The prerequisite for believing in the adaptation of the Qur'an from the Testaments is that Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) has been introduced as a liar in history; Now, we have many reports that the honesty and truthfulness of that Prophet was so great that the polytheists of Quraysh nicknamed him "Muhammad Amin" (Tabarī, 1378, vol. 2, p. 290; Ibn Sa'd, 1968, vol. 1, p. 156) to such an extent that when he began his Da'wah (call) announced to the Quraysh elders and asked: "Have you ever heard a lie from me?" They replied: "No, we believe in your honesty and truthfulness so much that if you claim it is night during the day, we will confirm you."

There are traditions that the Jews used to ask the Prophet (PBUH) about their teachings and sciences to test him; Like a question about the soul, about the number of the reservoirs of hell and....

(Tabrisī, 1993, vol. 6, p. 674; Ibn Kathīr, 1419 AH, vol. 5, p. 104). It is clear that these questions were not popular topics that everyone was aware of; Because if all the people were aware of it, it would have been possible that those materials would have reached the Prophet (PBUH), while it was a science that was only available to a few scholars, not all people. When they heard the correct answer from the Prophet (PBUH), they became silent. These questions and answers show that the Prophet (PBUH) was aware of all the contents and teachings of the People of the Book through revelation.

3-7. The Difference and Conflict between the Teachings of the Prophet (PBUH) and the Testaments

What the Prophet (PBUH) presented in the Qur'anic verses is very different from the words of the Torah and the Bible, and no trace of the superstitions introduced in those two holy books can be seen in the Qur'anic verses. Can this high-ranking be considered derived from that lowly one? Therefore, the lofty teachings presented by the Qur'an are never compatible with the flimsy legends and manuscripts of the Testaments, and there is no room left for this false idea from which it is derived.

The Prophet (PBUH) has criticized and challenged many of the beliefs of Jews and Christians and strongly opposed some of these beliefs; So, how is it possible that the source of the Qur'an is the opinions of the People of the Book? Accordingly, it is baseless to prove any learning or adaptation or influence of the Prophet (PBUH) from Buhairā or others.

The difference between the Qur'an and the Testaments is the reason that the Qur'an is not derived from them. Many of the stories of the prophets mentioned in the Qur'an are not found in the books of the Testaments; including the stories of Hood, Saleh, and Shoaib. If the Prophet (PBUH) had learned the Qur'an from the People of the Book, he would not have included these additions in his book. (Mizzī, 1416 AH, p. 148)

The differences between the Qur'an and the Testaments have shown themselves in various areas of beliefs, ethics, rulings and stories, and sometimes these cases exceed the difference and lead to confrontation with the common Jewish and Christian culture and negation of some of their elements. (Khoufī, 1429 AH, pp. 51-57)

The similarity of the Qur'an and the Testaments and some books of other religions is not a proof that the Qur'an was adapted from those books, but it indicates that the Qur'an and other heavenly books were taken from the same source, which is Revelation. If the foundation of Islam is Monotheism, it is not influenced by Jewish culture, and if prayer and fasting are in Islam, it is not a reflection of Christian culture, but God, who made these matters obligatory for the previous religions, also made them obligatory for the last Prophet (PBUH). If the similarity of the principles and regulations of divine religions is to be the proof of influence, it should be said that Christianity is also a copy of Judaism and Judaism is derived from the religion of Abraham and it is also derived from the religion of Noah.

Some orientalist consider the similarity of historical events in the Testaments and the Qur'an as the reason for the adaptation of Islam from previous books. This promise is invalid; Because the history is the same and a similar citation of an event is not a proof of adaptation. Historical events happen once, and if several people want to quote from the same source correctly, they will all quote in the same way. This is not a reason for quoting from each other, but it shows that they used a single divine source.

3-8. Orientalists' Opposition to Adaptation

Some orientalist themselves have denied the adaptation of the Qur'an from the Testaments; Gerhard Bowering, the author of the article "Influence and order of revelation of the Qur'an" in the Leiden Encyclopedia of the Qur'an, admits at the beginning of the article: "There is no collection of works related to the Torah and the Bible, legitimate or forged, which is the direct basis and main source of the Qur'an. However, the Qur'an, as the last holy book in historical order among the world's great religions, has a

clear temporal relationship with the biblical tradition of Judaism and Christianity, but there is no evidence that this tradition existed as a complete collection or as separate books in Arabic before the time of Muhammad. (Bowering, 2003, p. 316) Also, some bigoted and anti-Islam priests such as "Lamans" have admitted that the Qur'an cannot be adapted from the Testaments at all. (Mughniyeh, 1986, pp. 81-82)

Some orientalists have become Muslims by studying the Qur'an and observing the agreement of its teachings with reason, science and nature. This shows the authenticity of the Qur'an and its revelation and the fact that the Prophet (PBUH) did not learn from others. (see Zamani, 2014, pp. 177-147)

The most important reason for not adapting the Qur'an from the Testaments is that it is a miracle. The Holy Qur'an itself, in several verses, shows such a unique effect beyond the power of human beings and makes a request to prove it: For example, "Say, 'Should all humans and jinn rally to bring the like of this Quran, they will not bring its like, even if they assisted one another.'" (Isrā'/88 and cf.: Yunus/38; Hood/13; Baqarah/23)

4. The Role of Sunni Traditions in Casting This Doubt

Examining the works of orientalists leads us to the conclusion that when they refer to Islamic sources, they often refer to non-authentic sources, but mostly they use Sunni books.

Considering the abundance of Sunni sources compared to the sources of other Islamic sects and religions, orientalists often study Islam from the perspective of Sunni sources and make judgments about it. This is due to the fact that, firstly, there are many weak and unacceptable contents in these books - even from the opinion of Sunni great scholars. Secondly, there are many contents in these books which are acceptable according to Sunni scholars, but in other Islamic religions, including Shi'a, there are traditions and views contrary to it.

In the West, in all universities, the Sunni interpretation is considered the same as Islam. (Neuwirth, 2007, p. 27) Therefore, orientalists often study Islam from the perspective of Sunnis and consider their interpretation to be Islam. They use Sunni sources without make a special classification in terms of the quality of their credibility. Often, they do not refer to authentic and reliable sources, and in narrating stories, they mostly use non-authentic sources such as the Book of Stories of the Prophets, which is full of Israelis, while they have used very few authentic narrative and commentary books. These narrations in Sunni sources have been used by some Orientalists as a basis for learning the Prophet (PBUH) and adapting the teachings of Islam from the People of the Book.

Indeed, doubts of Orientalists regarding the adaptation of the Prophet (PBUH) from the People of the Book and the Testaments are mostly influenced by Sunni sources and the influence of Israeli traditions in this school. In some of the hadiths mentioned in Six Sahīhs of Ahl al-Sunnah, there are some contents that the people of the book mentioned something useful for the Prophet (PBUH) in their dealings with him, as such he was not aware of that matter!

In fact, in such narrations, there are two major accusations against the Messenger of God (PBUH): 1) adapting Shariah topics and rulings from Jews; 2. The clarification of the independence of the Prophet (PBUH) regarding the establishment of Shariah rulings, that is the author whose opinion changes with the opinions of those around him regarding the enactment of jurisprudence rulings. (Nayshābourī, nd, vol. 2, H 1130, 1131 and 1134; Shayegan, 2020, p. 82)

At first glance, it seems that many of the doubts of Orientalists about Islam, the Qur'an and the Prophet (PBUH) are caused by the pessimistic and spiteful view of Orientalists towards Islam, while with a deeper look, we find out that most of these doubts - if not all of them - are rooted in some sources. It has Sunnis (especially interpretive sources) and what is interesting is that some Sunni writers on the one hand consider themselves to be the only proponents of the fight against Orientalism, and on the other hand,

they introduce Shi'a to be in collaboration with the enemies of Islam in fighting against the Sunnah and the way of the Prophet (PBUH). This is despite the fact that Shiite scholars and commentators, with the guidance of Ahl al-Bayt (AS), did not accept these undocumented and incompatible materials with the spirit of religion and the Qur'an, and from the very beginning, they blocked the way for doubters. (Ma'mourzadeh, 2018, p. 129)

Therefore, the role of Sunni traditions in creating this doubt is strong. When these unjust relations are attributed to the Prophet (PBUH) in the collections of Sunni narrations, naturally, one should not expect anything from Orientalists other than what they have attributed to the Prophet (PBUH).

Ja'far Morteza Āmilī says: "The secret of fabricating this hadith [Buhairā] was to prove Abu Bakr's faith in the prophethood of the Prophet (PBUH) before the Mission (Batha), so that they show his priority over everyone such as Ali (AS) and Khadijah and even the Prophet (PBUH) himself. (Āmilī, 1428 AH, vol. 2, p. 179) Diyarbakri gave a narration from Ibn Abbas about the case of Buhairā, saying finally: 'Before Muhammad (PBUH) became a prophet, certainty and confirmation [of his prophethood] appeared in the heart of Abu Bakr.'" (Diyarbakri, nd, vol. 1, p. 261; Ibn Athūr, nd, vol. 1, p. 167)

Conclusion

Since the revelation of the Qur'an, some people who did not believe in its revelation have tried to deny it in various ways. Sometimes they said: "This is magic, and we indeed disbelieve in it" (Zukhruf/30). Sometimes they used to say: "[They are] muddled dreams!" 'Indeed, he has fabricated it!' ('Anbīyā/5); They called it poetry (ibid), priesthood (Hāqah/42), false words (Rum/58), human teaching (Nahl/103), first myths (Furqān/5), etc. They naturally sought to find a source for the Qur'an and whatever came to their mind, they declared it as the source of the Qur'an in order to escape from the truth.

The most important evidence and the most fundamental proof of orientalist to prove the influence of the Prophet (PBUH) from Christians and Jews is the story of his meeting with the Monk Buhairā and Waraqa bin Noufil. In recent centuries, orientalist have used this story as a reason to introduce Buhairā as the teacher of the Prophet (PBUH) and to say that the Prophet (PBUH) learned his teachings from him during his journey to Levant.

This accusation has not been accepted from the first centuries of Islam until the new centuries, which indicates the weakness of this accusation. This meeting is one of the famous stories in history books, which, despite the fact that it is a single story, has unfortunately become famous due to repetition and has prepared the ground for the aforementioned suspicions. There are many reasons for rejecting Prophet's (PBUH) learning from Buhairā, which can be mentioned as follows: the non-acceptance of this story by Muslim and non-Muslim researchers and reviewers; The distortion of the sanad of this narration; Many differences in the details of the story; The unreasonableness and contradiction of some details of the story; The Prophet's (PBUH) illiterate character and the short duration of the meeting; Not using this story by the enemies of the Prophet (PBUH) and the Jews and Christians; The absence of any proof and evidence for the teachings of the Prophet (PBUH); The existence of many differences and contradictions in the beliefs of Jews and Christians with the teachings of the Prophet (PBUH); The miracle and challenge of the Qur'an on the inability of others to imitate it, etc.

The roots of these traditions can be found in the political trends of early Islam. Some people aimed to raise the status of Abu Bakr and prove his faith - even before the Prophet's (PBUH) Mission - saying that Abu Bakr's faith was ahead of everyone, Ali (PBUH) and Khadija, and even the Prophet (PBUH) himself, so that they fabricated narratives. Also, Āl-e Zubair, after the political defeat, tried to promote their beliefs through using 'Ayesha, who was their aunt.

Reporting these traditions underestimates the status of the Holy Prophet (PBUH). The people who have narrated this story in their books and have made justifications to defend these narrations, did not realize that with these justifications, the position of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) will be diminished.

Finally, if we accept the meeting the Prophet (PBUH) with Buhairā with tolerance, there is no reason to prove that he explained the Holy Book to the Prophet (PBUH) or explained the teachings of the People of the Book to him. In this story Buhairā testifies the prophethood and greatness of His Holiness Muhammad (PBUH).

References

The Holy Qur'an [English Translation by AliQoli Qarai].

Ebrahim Hassan, Hassan, (1416 AH / 1996 AD), *Ta'rīkh al-Islām al-Sīyāsī wal-Dīnī wal-Thaqāfī wal-Ijtīmā'ī*, Beirut: Dar al-Jail, and al-Maktabat al-Nahdat al-Misrīya.

Ibn Athūr, 'Izz al-Din Ali bin Muhammad al-Jazarī, (nd), *'Usd al-Ghāba fī Ma'rifat al-Sahāba*, Lithography, np.

Ibn Ishāq, Ishāq bin Muhammad (1982), *Sīrat Rasoulullah*, [introduction and correction by Asghar Mahdavi,] Tehran: Khwarazmi Publications.

Ibn Sa'd, Mohammad bin Saad (1968), *Al-Tabaqāt al-Kubā*, Beirut: Dar Sādir.

Ibn Shahr Āshoub, Muhammad bin Ali (1379 AH), *Manāqib Āl Abi Talib (AS)*, [edition: Muhammad Hossein Ashtiani and Hashim Rasouli,] Qom: Allamah.

Ibn Kathīr, Ismail bin Omar (1408 AH / 1988 AD), *Al-Bidāya wal-Nihāya* [Research: Ali Shiri,] Beirut: Dar 'Ihyā' al-Turōth al-Arabī.

..... (1419 AH), *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azeem*, Beirut: Dar al-Kutub Al-'Ilmīya.

Ibn Hisham, Abdul Malik (1375 AH/ 1955), *Al-Sīra Al-Nabawīyyah*, [edited by: Mustafa Al-Saqqa, Ibrahim El-Abiarī, Abdul Hafīz al-Shalabī,] Egypt: Mostafa Al-Babi Al-Halabī Publishing House.

Armstrong, Karen (2004), *The Life of Mohammad*, [translated by Kianoush Heshmati,] Tehran: Hekmat Publications.

Boodle Arfang (nd), *Al-Rasul Hayat Muhammad*, [Translated by Mohammad Mohammad Faraj and Abdul Hamid Jouda Al-Sahar,] Egypt: Library of Egypt.

Beyhaqī, Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Hossein (nd), *Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa*, [translated by Mahmoud Mahdavi Damghani,] np: Center for Scientific and Cultural Publications.

Khaza'i, Mehdi (2014), "A critical review of the Prophet of Islam's journey to Levant and his meeting with Buhairā', a Christian monk", *Journal of History*, no. 33, pp. 55-78.

Khoufī, Abulqasem Mousavi (1429 AH), *Al-Bayan fī Tafsir al-Qur'an*, [researcher: S. Ja'far Hosseini,] Tehran: Dar al-Saqalain.

Darāz, Muhammad Abdullah (1391 AH), *Al-Qur'an al-Karim*, Kuwait: Dar al-Qur'an al-Karim and Dar al-Qalam.

- Dayarbakrī, Hossein bin Mohammad (nd), *Tar'rīkh al-Khamīs fī Ahwāl Anfus al-Nafīs*, Beirut: Sha'ban Institute of Publishing and Distribution.
- Dhababī, Shams al-Din Muhammad bin Ahmad (1413 AH/1993), *Ta'rikh al-Islam wa Wafayāt al-Mashōhūr al-'A'lām*, [research: Omar Abdul Salam Tidmiri,] Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi.
- (1382 AH/1963), *Mīzān al-'Itidāl fī Naqd al-Rijāl*, [research: Ali Mohammad Al-Bajawi,] Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rafa.
- Rasouli Mahalati, S. Hashem (2004), *Lessons from the Analytical History of Islam*, Tehran: Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance.
- Zurqānī, Muhammad Abdulazim (1416 AH/1996 AD), *Manāhil al-'Irfān*, [Research: Ahmad Shams al-Din,] Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-'Ilmīya.
- Zargarinejad, Gholam Hossein, (1999), *History of Early Islam*, Tehran: Samt.
- Zamani, Mohammad Hassan; Gholami, Abdullah; Kazemi, Syed Nasim Abbas (2014), "Converted (Guided) Orientalists", *Orientalists' Qur'an Research*, Year 9, Number 16, pp. 147-177.
- (2016), *Orientalists and the Qur'an*, Qom: Boostan-e Kitab Publishing.
- Sobhani, Ja'far (1984), *Forough Abadyat*, Qom: Danesh Islami Publications.
- Shayegan, Seyed Ali; Saeedi, Hassan (2020), "Examination and criticism of the influence of the Prophet's Prophet (PBUH) and the Qur'an from the people of the book with emphasis on the opinions of the Orientalists", *Ayen-e Ma'refat Journal*, Shaheed Behesht University.
- Al-Sharqāwī, Muhammad Abdallah (nd), *Al-Istishrāq fil-Fikr al-Islāmī al-Mu'asir*, Cairo: Dar Al-Fikr al-Arabi.
- Shariati, Sarah (2003), "A mention of Maxim Rodenson", *Anthropology Letter*, 1(3&4).
- Sadouq, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Ali (1395 AH), *Kamal al-Din and Tamām al-Na'mah*, [editor: Ali Akbar Ghafari,] Tehran: Islamiyah Publishing House.
- Samimi, Minoos (2007), *Muhammad in Europe*, [translated by Abbas Mehrpouya,] Information Publications.
- Tabrisī, Fadl bin Hassan (1993), *Majma' al-Bayan fī Tafsīr al-Qur'an*, Tehran: Nasser Khosrow.
- Tabarī, Muhammad Ibn Jarīr (1387 AH/1967), *Ta'rikh al-Umam wal-Mulouk*, [research: Muhammad Abu al-Fadl Ibrahim,] Egypt: Dar al-Ma'rafa.
- Āmilī, Ja'far Mortaza (1428 AH/2007), *Al-Sahih min Sīrat al-Nabī al-'A'zam*, Dar al-Hadith.
- Goldziher, Ignác (nd), *Al-'Aqīda wal-Sharī'a fī al-Islam*, [translated and edited by: Muhammad Yusuf Musa, Ali Hassan Abdul Qadir and Abdul Aziz Abdul Haq,] Egypt: Dar al-Kutub al-Haditha.
- Massignon, Louis (nd), *Salman Pak*, [translated by Ebrahim Khalili,] Alborz Publications.
- Mādī, Mahmoud (1416 AH/1996), *Al-Wahy al-Qur'anī fī al-Mandour al-Istishrāqī wa Naqdh*, Dar al-Da'wa.
- Ma'mourzadeh, Fariha; Roshanzamir, Mohammad Ibrahim (2018), "Examination of the entry Buhairā in the Great Encyclopedia of Islam", *Orientalists' Qur'an Research*, 30(25), pp. 125-146.

- Mas'oudī, Ali bin Hussein (1425 AH/2005), *Morouj Al-Dhahab wa Ma'adin al-Jawahir*, Beirut: Al-Maktabah al-Asrīya.
- Marouf Hassanī, Hashem (1985), *Sīra al-Mustafā*, Qom: Al-Sharif al-Razi Publications.
- Mughniyah, Mohammad Jawad (1986), *Shubahōt al-Mulhidīn wa al-Jawāb 'anhā*, Beirut: Dar wa Maktaba al-Hilāl wa Dar al-Jawad.
- Nazari, Morteza (1992), *A Review of the Propaganda of Christianity against Islam*, Islamic Propagating Organization.
- Neuwirth, Angelika (2007), "Qur'an Scholarship in the West", *Haft Aseman*, 9(34), pp. 15-34 .
- Naishōbourī, Muslim bin Al-Hajjāj (nd), *Sahih Muslim*, [Research and Commentary: Mousa Shahin Lāshin and Ahmed Omar Hashem,] Beirut: 'Izz al-Din Institute.
- Watt, William Montgomery (1965), *Muhammad the Prophet and Politician*, [translated by Ismail Valyizadeh,] Islamiya Bookstore.
- Ya'qoubī Ahmed bin Abi Yaq'oub (1960), *Ta'rīkh Ya'qoubī*, Beirut: Dar Sadir.
- Bowering, Gerhard (2003), *Chronology and the Qur'an*, *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'an*, Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Federer, William J. (2008), *What every American needs to know about the Qur'an: a history of Islam in the United States*, Amerisearch Inc, Library of Congress.
- Gilliot, Claude (2001), "Informants", *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'an*, General Editor: Jane Dammen McAuliffe, Georgetown University, Washington DC.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), 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/4.0/>).