

	<p>Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems Issue 2, Vol. 9, 2026</p> <p>RESEARCH ARTICLE </p> <h2>Textual Formation, Historical Transmission, and Documentation Processes in Late Antique Sacred Literature: A Critical Analysis of Contemporary Methodological Approaches</h2>
<b>Djamel Hadjira</b>	<p>Dr. University of Batna 1 - El Hadj Lakhdar Algeria Email: dhdjira96@gmail.com</p>
<b>Issue web link</b>	<a href="https://imcra-az.org/archive/392-science-education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-2-vol-9-2026.html">https://imcra-az.org/archive/392-science-education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-2-vol-9-2026.html</a>
<b>Keywords</b>	Textual transmission; documentation history; oral-written dynamics; historical criticism; manuscript studies; Late Antiquity; sacred literature; epistemology of texts
<p><b>Abstract</b>  This study examines contemporary scholarly approaches to the documentation and transmission of foundational sacred texts within Late Antiquity, focusing on methodological claims regarding the temporal relationship between initial proclamation and textual fixation. Recent modernist and historical-critical readings have advanced hypotheses suggesting extended intervals between the emergence of revelatory discourse and its formal written consolidation, thereby proposing susceptibility to textual alteration, loss, or historical reconstruction. Such approaches frequently apply comparative frameworks derived from Biblical textual history to Islamic scripture without sufficient methodological differentiation. The research critically evaluates these claims through a systematic analysis of early documentary practices, oral-written transmission dynamics, and source-critical evidence preserved in early historical records. Particular attention is given to the methodological assumptions underlying assertions of delayed documentation and the epistemological consequences of equating distinct textual traditions formed under fundamentally different socio-historical and institutional conditions. By reassessing primary historical data, manuscript evidence, and early community transmission mechanisms, the study demonstrates that claims of significant documentation gaps often rely on selective readings, methodological generalizations, or anachronistic analogies. The analysis further highlights how contemporary discourse frequently conflates oral authority with textual instability, overlooking well-established mechanisms of controlled transmission, verification, and communal authentication. The findings indicate that equating Islamic scripture with Biblical textual development models constitutes a methodological overextension rather than a conclusion grounded in empirical textual evidence. This study contributes to broader debates in textual criticism, historiography, and the philosophy of religious knowledge by advocating for differentiated analytical frameworks that respect the specificity of each textual tradition.</p>	
<p><b>Citation</b>  Djamel H. (2026). Textual Formation, Historical Transmission, and Documentation Processes in Late Antique Sacred Literature: A Critical Analysis of Contemporary Methodological Approaches. <i>Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems</i>, 9(2), 1-9. <a href="https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/9.2.5">https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/9.2.5</a></p>	
<p><b>Licensed</b>  © 2026 The Author(s). Published by Science, Education and Innovations in the context of modern problems (SEI) by IMCRA - International Meetings and Journals Research Association (Azerbaijan). This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<a href="http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/">http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/</a>).</p>	

### Introduction:

The Orientalist and modernist project, in its contemporary reading, revolves around several Islamic issues and questions, among them the question of the documentation of the Qur'anic text. This reading considers that the religious givens surrounded by a fence of sacredness and dogmatism are nothing but relative historical matters that need scientific revisions in light of contemporary modernist methodologies. Among those traditional matters stands the problematic of revelation and documentation in the Qur'anic text. The contemporary discourse insists on the existence of a temporal gap between revelation and documentation, which opens a door for doubting the authenticity and originality of the Qur'anic text and associates it with the Holy Scriptures in their historical journey, and with what the sacred text was exposed to from temporal gaps and external influences that contributed to shaping it with cognitive and linguistic errors and contradictions. So, do these problematic propositions really have scientific credibility? This research treats these two problematics with a critical approach within two axes as follows:

The first axis: The problematic of the temporal gap between revelation and documentation. The second axis: The equation of the Qur'anic text with the Holy Bible.

### **The First Axis: The Problematic of the Temporal Gap between Revelation and Documentation**

Among the dangerous results reached by the contemporary modernist reading in its study of the question of the collection of the Noble Qur'an is the claim of the existence of a temporal gap between revelation and documentation. They reached this conclusion while studying the Holy Scriptures, and this is what led them to a general conclusion which is to associate the Noble Qur'an with the Holy Scriptures. This general conclusion generated many partial results, the most important of which is the presence of a temporal gap between revelation and documentation.

Among those who most insisted on the existence of a temporal gap between revelation and documentation is Mohammed Arkoun. His statement is an application on the Holy Qur'an of what he found in the Holy Scriptures. He said: "Testimony - the testimony of the Companions to the time of revelation - was first practiced, as Ibn Taymiyyah had noticed well, at the level of oral transmission of the revealed speech and at the level of narratives related to the foundation of the community; then it was practiced at a second time, somewhat later or much later than the major founding event, the event of revelation, from seventy to a hundred years concerning the Gospels, and thirty years according to the known tradition concerning the Qur'an; I say it was practiced at the level of written transmission." (Arkoun, n.d., p. 173)

What Arkoun says about the existence of a temporal gap in the Qur'an between oral and written transmission is refutable by authentic textual evidences confirming that the whole Qur'an was written during the lifetime of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him. He died while it was preserved both in lines and in hearts. The reader of Arkoun's words about the time gap between oral and written transmission finds a contradiction in his statement: sometimes he says that the period between revelation and documentation is thirty years, and sometimes he considers the interval to be a few years – from three to nine years. (Arkoun, n.d., p. 190; Arkoun, n.d., p. 173) Some may think that Arkoun miscalculated the time between revelation and documentation or that he intended this in order to cast doubt on the authenticity of the transmitted reports and consequently to question the entire written Islamic heritage. However, the view closer to correctness regarding the multiplicity of the temporal dates between revelation and documentation in Arkoun's writings, based on his previous words, is that it returns to his absolute equation between the Qur'an and the Gospels. He views the Qur'an in the same way he views the Gospels. The four Gospels differed concerning their dates of documentation. Thus, when he set more than one date for the documentation of the Qur'an, he wanted to say that the Qur'an differed in its documentation date just as the Gospels differed in theirs. For example, the Gospel of Matthew (Al-Mufti, n.d., p. 83) has nine different reported dates of documentation: 37 CE, 38 CE, 41 CE, 43 CE, 48 CE, 61 CE, 62 CE, 63 CE, or 64 CE. (Abu Zahra, n.d., p. 117)

To refute the result of the historical method represented in the claim of a temporal gap between revelation and documentation, we say that the Companions did not content themselves with memorizing the Qur'an by heart, despite the strength of their memory and their frequent recitation and review of the Qur'an. They added to that its fixation in writing with whatever simple tools were available to them. Whenever something from the Qur'an was revealed, it was at the same time memorized and written down in the session of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him. Everyone who wrote some part of the Qur'an took what he wrote and kept it in his house. The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, had many Companions who wrote the revelation; sometimes they all attended and wrote what was revealed, and at other times the majority were absent and only a few wrote, or the opposite. What is established in authentic Hadiths is that most of the writers of revelation did not collect all its writings in their scrolls during the Prophet's lifetime, peace be upon him. Only those whom Allah destined to write everything revealed to the Messenger of Allah did so, and their number did not exceed four. A few

were enabled by Allah to collect the whole Qur'an, while others were not, for objective reasons: the difficulty of accompanying the Prophet, peace be upon him, day and night, in residence and on travel, during that long period in which the revelation was descending; their preoccupation with the affairs of their livelihood, since each one had to turn toward his means of subsistence; and their numerous travels and movements. Many times, the Prophet, peace be upon him, sent his scribes of revelation on a military expedition or a certain mission, in which they spent days or months away from him. When they returned to Medina, they found that much good had been revealed during their absence.

Ibn Kathir narrated that the number of those killed in the Battle of Yamama among the Qur'a' in 11 AH was about 500 men, and those killed before that in the incident of Bi'r Ma'una during the time of the Prophet, peace be upon him, was about 70 men (Ibn Kathir, n.d., vol. 4, p. 51; Ibn Kathir, 1990, vol. 1, p. 26). These and others were specialists in the Noble Qur'an in memorization, understanding, and teaching. It is not possible that the process of recitation and the Qur'an was not written and documented in scrolls during the Prophet's time, peace be upon him. Among the strongest evidences indicating that is the Hadith of collecting the Qur'an during the caliphate of Abu Bakr al-Siddiq, may Allah be pleased with him, which Zayd bin Thabit undertook, and he did not find the end of Surah al-Tawbah except with Abu Khuzaymah al-Ansari. The loss of the two verses was interpreted as the loss of the written copy (Ibn Hajar, n.d., vol. 9, p. 15). There are only two cases in which what was revealed from the Qur'an was written by only one scribe: Ibn Abi Khuzaymah who wrote the end of Surah al-Tawbah, and Khuzaymah al-Ansari who wrote the twenty-third verse of Surah al-Ahzab and no one else wrote it. As for the other verses, two or more wrote them during the time of the Prophet, peace and blessings be upon him.

The documentation of the Qur'an in lines is what the modernist discourse relies upon to penetrate the Qur'anic text and place the mind before a set of suspicions and fallacies, the most prominent of which is their insistence in their books on the existence of a temporal gap between revelation and collection. The Orientalist Arthur Jeffery, editor of the book *al-Masahif* by Imam Ibn Abi Dawud, reaches several conclusions in his introduction to the book, among them his claim that the Prophet, peace be upon him, passed away without the Qur'an being collected in any scrolls. As for the opinion that says the whole Qur'an was collected during the Prophet's lifetime, peace be upon him, in scrolls and papers, arranged as it is now in its surahs and verses, it is an opinion that Orientalists do not accept. They make the basis of their research in Qur'anic sciences the book *History of the Qur'an* by Nöldeke. Arthur Jeffery tries to establish evidence for his claim, which consists in the fear of Abu Bakr al-Siddiq and Umar ibn al-Khattab after the Day of Yamama that the Qur'an might be lost with the killing of the reciters. Had the Qur'an been collected and written, there would have been no reason for their fear (Ibn Abi Dawud, n.d., p. 105).

What Arthur Jeffery went to is an overt bias against the Noble Qur'an, which anyone with the slightest religious knowledge can discover. He adopts the method of total denial of facts and texts, a trait that appears clearly in historical studies, especially those related to the Noble Qur'an. Authentic texts that clearly indicate that the entire Qur'an was collected during the Prophet's lifetime, peace be upon him, are numerous and scattered in books of Hadith, biography, and history. His evidence for his claim is fallacious, because Abu Bakr al-Siddiq, according to the authentic Hadith in his collection of the Qur'an, relied on two witnesses: the memorized and the written. One is not accepted without the presence of the other. As for the fear, it resulted from two important matters: first, preservation in hearts is the original, while documenting the Qur'an in a single *Mushaf* was, may Allah be pleased with him, aimed at facilitating its recitation and memorization in order, to compensate with the written Qur'an for what was lost from the preserving hearts that were killed in the Battle of Yamama.

The second is the fear of the loss of the scrolls existing with the reciters. The written Qur'an during his time, peace be upon him, obviously exists with those who recite and memorize it. If the reciters die, memorization diminishes, and the written copies they have in their homes become exposed to the danger of disappearance and destruction. Thus, Abu Bakr hastened to collect it.

Arkoun, in many of his lectures and seminars in which he participates, attributes to Imam al-Zarkashi the statement that only some surahs of the Qur'an were documented during the Prophet's lifetime, peace be upon him (Al-Ubaqi, n.d., p. 147). The statement is not originally from al-Zarkashi; rather, he transmits it in his book *al-Burhan* and attributes it to al-Hakim, who comments on the Hadith of Zayd bin Thabit saying: "We used to compile the Qur'an from fragments at the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him" (Al-Tirmidhi, 2000, vol. 5, p. 734). Al-Hakim said: "It contains the clear indication that the collection of the Qur'an was not done at one time. Some of it was collected in the presence of the Prophet, peace be upon him; then it was collected in the presence of al-Siddiq; and the third collection, which is the arrangement of the surahs, was during the caliphate of Uthman" (Al-Zarkashi, n.d., vol. 1, pp. 237-238). Al-Hakim's statement as it appears in *al-Burhan*, if it ends at the word Uthman, does not explicitly mean the collection in writing, but rather the collection of arrangement and division of surahs and verses. During the Prophet's time, peace be upon him, the whole was written, with some attempts to

collect it, as in the case of Ibn Mas'ud's *Mushaf* and that of Ubayy ibn Ka'b. In Abu Bakr's time, it was collected officially, and in Uthman's time, it was collected arranged by surahs as we have it now.

The focus of Arkoun and others on such narrations reveals the negative traits in their methodology for studying the Noble Qur'an. They often rely on negation and selectivity: they deny all authentic or good narrations related to a subject, such as the collection of the Qur'an, and select a weak or fabricated narration, or even an authentic one but ambiguous, twisting its neck as they wish and building upon it erroneous conclusions. If we consider reliance on al-Hakim's words in al-Mustadrak as explicitly indicating the denial of documentation during the prophethood era, then insisting on a gap between revelation and documentation is not a scientific method. No one is justified in taking a statement to build results upon it without a proper study in its general context. What Arkoun relies on and promotes does not stand a moment before scientific rigor, which he often raises as a slogan in his studies and writings. We say:

**A-** Al-Hakim's statement is refuted by the Hadiths mentioned earlier, which clearly indicate by authentic narration and explicit evidence that the Noble Qur'an was entirely written during the Prophet's time, peace be upon him. Accepting the statement of anyone, whoever it may be, if it contradicts authentic narrations and reports, is not acceptable scientifically.

**B-** One who contemplates al-Hakim's words finds that he does not mean by "collection of the Qur'an" the writing itself, but rather gathering the largest number of verses and surahs together in one compilation, as we pointed out earlier. This meaning is correct, for the Qur'an was not collected in one *Mushaf* during the Prophet's lifetime, peace be upon him, for many reasons, among them:

**A-** That the Qur'an was not revealed at once but piecemeal, and it cannot be collected before its revelation is completed.

**B-** The arrangement of verses and surahs was not according to the order of revelation. Had it been so, collecting it in a *Mushaf* would have been easy: what is revealed from the Qur'an would be written after what was revealed before it. But the revelation of verses and surahs is a matter determined by Allah Almighty. Some verses descend at the end of the revelation period but their place is at the beginning of surahs. Had the Qur'an been written in one *Mushaf*, every time a new verse descends, another *Mushaf* would have to be prepared to rearrange the verses, and that involves great hardship.

**C-** The period between the descent of the last thing revealed and his death, peace be upon him, was very short. His saying, Almighty: {And fear a Day when you will be returned to Allah} [al-Baqarah/281], was revealed nine nights before his death. Had the period between the cessation of revelation and his death been long, he would have collected it.

**D-** There was no compelling reason for collecting it in one *Mushaf* like the one that appeared during Abu Bakr's time. The Muslims during his time, peace be upon him, were in good condition, the reciters were numerous, and sedition was secure. In Abu Bakr al-Siddiq's time, many reciters were killed, and seditions began to appear, so he feared the loss of the Qur'an and collected it (Al-Sabuni, n.d., p. 59). As for the claim of no writing and collection of the Noble Qur'an during the prophethood era, some Arab thinkers took it from Western Orientalist thought, by which they were influenced, and in its light, they began to read and criticize Islamic thought.

The negative results stemming from the contemporary reading's methodology in studying the Noble Qur'an fundamentally return to the negative employment of the rules and methods of the approach in studying religious or literary heritage texts. Goldziher claims that in his study of Islam, he relies on precise critical scientific research, saying: "It is true that we must acknowledge that Islam in all these fields has confirmed its readiness and ability to absorb these views and embody them, just as it confirmed its ability to melt all those foreign elements in one crucible, so that they do not appear in their true reality except after deep analysis and precise critical investigation" (Goldziher, n.d., p. 11). But right after this speech, he reaches arbitrary conclusions with no connection to precise research. He considers the revelation that the Arab Prophet announces to be nothing but a mixture taken from previous religious ideas and opinions he knew and was influenced by when he connected with the Jewish and Christian elements present in the Arabian Peninsula and the Levant (Goldziher, n.d., p. 12).

But Goldziher's statement and that of his likes among Orientalists has become past with no value. Strangely, we do not find retraction from these claims that explicitly or implicitly suggest the distortion of the Qur'an and that it is a mixture of Jewish and Christian ideas. If there was some retraction and restriction, it, in our estimation, returns to the great scientific progress and what it revealed of facts explicitly mentioned in the Qur'an in what is called the scientific miracle in the Noble Qur'an. This type of knowledge has become one of the strongest means that proves the truthfulness of the Qur'an and that it is from Allah, untouched by human hands in distortion. The Qur'an, besides calling for persistence in engaging with science, also contains diverse reflections, especially on natural phenomena, and speaks of explanatory details that perfectly agree with modern scientific data. Nothing equivalent to that exists in the Torah and Gospel (Bucaille, 2004, p. 147).

### **The Second Axis: Equating the Qur'anic Text with the Holy Bible.**

Among the Islamic issues that contemporary readings concern themselves with is associating the Qur'anic text with the Holy Scriptures; that is, the results they reached in studying the Holy Scriptures — that they are distorted, of human language not miraculous, embodied in history, and of a historical nature revealing a specific time period — are the same results they reached in studying the Qur'an through the historical method. These are erroneous results for many considerations, among them the random applications and mistaken projections they made.

We now speak briefly about Western scholars' view of the Torah and Gospel, the historical method relied upon in textual criticism, and the results they reached. Modern Western methodical studies that subjected the current Torah to criticism, scrutiny, and comparison reached definitive and conclusive results: the books of the Torah and Gospels, or what is called the Old Testament and New Testament, are not revelation from Almighty Allah, nor composed by Moses and Jesus, peace be upon them. Rather, those who came long after them authored them, and the author of the Holy Books is unknown, his state unknown (Tawila, 2002, pp. 88-89). Western scholars diligently searched for the sources from which the unknown authors took the material of these books, and after study and scrutiny, they concluded that the Holy Books' material comes from ancient pagan religions' books. These ideas were taken and attributed in the Torah and Gospel to Moses and Jesus. Other sources used in writing the Torah are from the myths and legends of ancient nations. The same applies to the Gospels: what the ancient Egyptians wrote about their gods, what the Hindus and Buddhists wrote, and what the Greeks and Romans wrote about their gods — and what relates to them of trinity and crucifixion — is embodied in the Christian Gospels. This means that the material of the Gospels was taken from ancient pagan books (Al-Sharqawi, 1990, p. 235 and following).

Many Church scholars acknowledge the existence of pagan sources in the Holy Books, through the criticism of the Holy Bible. Among these is Baruch Spinoza (Roberti, n.d., pp. 216-217), who after long efforts reached definitive results conclusively stating that the books are not revelation from God, but rather composed by many unknown authors who drew their material from ancient pagan books. His study was based on a historical methodology consisting in criticizing the chain and text of the Holy Books. He affirmed the complete interruption of their chain, and that they cannot by any means be attributed to Moses or Jesus or even any of Christ's disciples, peace be upon him. As for their text, it is full of absurdity, strangeness, contradiction, and clumsiness; it is inconceivable that it could be the speech of a prophet, let alone the speech of God. Hence, he concluded with certainty that they are not revelation from God (Al-Sharqawi, 1990, p. 235 and following).

Among the earliest critical studies of the Torah is that conducted by the Jewish rabbi of high scholarly status, Ibn Ezra al-Garnati (Al-Sharqawi, 1990, pp. 238-239), who died in Granada in 562 AH. Then critical studies followed one after another until a broad movement arose in the West to study and criticize the Holy Books in the seventeenth century. Among the most important Western scholars in this period, who were an extension of Ibn Ezra, is the philosopher Baruch Spinoza, who explained the critical thought of Rabbi Ibn Ezra. He cited his obscure and very ambiguous statements. Ibn Ezra resorted to a complex and ambiguous style out of fear of the rabbis' oppression or their pursuit of him. Then Spinoza explained these statements in detail and clearly, revealing from his explanation the error of attributing the five books to Moses. The results of Spinoza's study of the Holy Bible can be summarized as follows:

**A-** Moses, peace be upon him, did not write these books that the Jews attribute to him.

**B-** The author of the books is a person who lived a very long time after Moses.

**C-** Moses, peace be upon him, wrote a book different from these five well-known books (Al-Sharqawi, 1990, pp. 238-239).

What indicates that the current Torah was not written during Moses' time, peace be upon him, is a series of matters, the most important of which are:

**A-** The five books refer to events that certainly occurred only after Moses, peace be upon him, and make him a partner in their fabrication, which does not stand to reason — it is impossible for Moses to live an event after his death by a long time.

**B-** The true Torah of Moses that existed in his time was not of this size but much smaller than the five known books. The current books acknowledge that Moses' Torah was small in size.

**C-** The style of composition of the current books conclusively proves that Moses, peace be upon him, was not their author. What they contain of clumsiness, confusion, misuse of pronouns and attributions, commenting on the narrative text and explaining it, gives the reader a strong feeling that it is not the speech of a prophet among Allah's prophets, who is one of the resolute messengers.

**D-** The Torah books refer to names of places that were not known by those names until long after Moses' death, peace be upon him. This was not by way of miraculous prophecy by Moses but by way of narrative storytelling (Al-Sharqawi, 1990, p. 242 and following).

**E-** In Spinoza's precise research and study of the Torah, he concluded according to the references it contains that Moses himself wrote a book about the Lord called the Book of the Wars of the Lord, containing the story of the war with the Amalekites. He also indicated that Moses wrote another book called the Book of the Covenant, which Moses read before the Israelites when they made a covenant with the Lord. There is also mention of a book called "Torat Yahweh" or "Torat Elohim," then Moses explained the laws he legislated and took a covenant from the Children of Israel to remain submissive to the law.

Spinoza concludes in the end that the books Moses wrote were completely lost, and nothing of them exists among the current five books. At the same time, he sees that the current Book of Deuteronomy is the only book whose content can be attributed to Moses because it speaks of the law that Moses explained to the Children of Israel and includes a series of moral commandments and etiquettes that there is no doubt are remnants of revelation and prophetic traces (Al-Sharqawi, 1990, p. 242 and following).

What is said about the Old Testament represented in the Torah is also said about the New Testament represented in the Gospel. The original Gospel text became mixed with Christian history, and thus was distorted by many additions and appendages. With this mixing, the original text was lost. The Gospels existing now contain true narrations and others false. It is said that Christians in the second century CE changed their Gospels three or four times, such that it is said their contents also changed (Al-Hindi, 2005, vol. 1, pp. 192-193).

Ibn Hazm preceded Ibn Ezra, Spinoza, and other ancient and modern Western scholars who applied various methodologies, including the historical method by which they proved the distortion of the Holy Bible. Ibn Hazm, in his valuable book "al-Fisal fi al-Milal wa al-Ahwa' wa al-Nihal," addressed the Holy Bible with study and applied the historical methodology to it, proving its falsehood and distortion before Western scholars. His methodology was based on studying the chain and text, which are two fundamental axes in historical studies of any text, whether human or divine. As for the chain of the Holy Bible, he studied it extensively in the Torah and Gospel. We suffice with a quick reference to his view of the chain of the Christians' Gospel. After speaking about the Gospels not being revelation from Allah but documentation of a historical phase done by four of Christ's disciples in few sheets after his ascension by a time period, Ibn Hazm then spoke of the few followers of Christ, whose number did not exceed one hundred and twenty individuals, and what they faced of persecution for long years made them hide their belief and not show it to people (Arkoun, n.d., p. 199). Christianity remained in this state until King Constantine was Christianized (Al-Mufti, 2004, p. 72), so the Christians appeared and revealed their religion (Ibn Hazm, n.d., vol. 1, p. 13 and following). From this historical review of Christianity's course, Ibn Hazm concludes the impossibility of continuous transmission among Christians, due to the persecution practiced on Christ's call with the sword, the resort of his followers to hiding their belief, and their inability to protect Christ's religion and prevent its alteration. In addition, impostors who pretended to be Christians were able to insert whatever deviations they wished into Jesus' religion. Ibn Hazm also discusses with Christians the miracles they attribute to the four Gospels book, considering them fabricated lies existing in what Jews claim for their rabbis and some Muslim sects claim for righteous people. They are lies because their chain is not valid; the one who transmitted those miracles does not establish proof by his word, nor is there audible or rational evidence to confirm him, for he transmits what he does not know (Ibn Hazm, n.d., vol. 1, pp. 17-18).

An example of Ibn Hazm's study of the Holy Bible's text is his addressing Christ's saying, peace be upon him: "Whoever says something about the Son of Man, it will be forgiven him, but whoever blasphemes the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven him." This word invalidates the Christians' claim that Jesus is the Holy Spirit himself, because the text of Christ's words here shows they are two distinct things. If Christ is the Son of Man, then he is not the Holy Spirit at all by the text of his speech. If Jesus is the Holy Spirit, then he is not the Son of Man either. Or if the Son of Man is the Holy Spirit, then Christ lied, because he distinguished between them, making blasphemy against one forgivable and against the other unforgivable (Ibn Hazm, n.d., vol. 2, p. 153). In this example appears Ibn Hazm's methodology in studying the text of the Holy Bible: he uncovers the contradictions within it and shows how one part contradicts another. The existing difference is one of contradiction and opposition, impossible to reconcile in any way. Had the Holy Bible been revelation from Allah or the speech of an infallible prophet, it would not contradict to this astonishing degree. During our following of the examples Ibn Hazm cited in al-Fisal, it became clear to us his focus on flaws and contradictions as a way to prove the distortion of the Holy Bible.

What was reached in results concerning the Holy Books made some Arab thinkers among secularists and modernists attempt to apply the historical method to the Qur'an as it was applied to the Torah and Gospel, to reach the same results that historical

studies of the Holy Books reached. They fall into blatant contradiction when they cling to the historical method as a strict procedural mechanism to reach truth, praising this method and others as fruits of human progress and civilization, while on the other hand speaking of the relativity of historical knowledge. Linking past and present inevitably ends in relativity, for every piece of information is colored by the motives and purposes of the present. The historian is not free but a slave submissive to his present (Al-Urawi, n.d., p. 39). They also view history as a cognitive experience, and cognitive experience means subjectivity. Since historians pointed to the connection between history, politics, thought, and action, history is studied to justify reform, which is proof of the relativity of historical knowledge. The actor in the field of history mentions past events to use them to achieve his purposes. Great historians were men of history in a double sense: men of politics and men of study, rememberers and influencers of history. No professional historian did not try to play a political role (Al-Urawi, n.d., p. 45).

Advocates of the contemporary historical method see external influences in the Qur'anic stories coming from reliable and authentic sources like the Torah and Gospel. They do not suffice with claiming influences of the Holy Books on the Qur'an but consider the entire human heritage before Islam in the Arabian Peninsula and around it as having influenced the new religion, where Islam was able to crystallize all that and formulate it in a religious way. An example is the Hajj, which was an ancient Arab custom that was seized upon and presented as rituals of the final religion (Arkoun, n.d., pp. 141–142). To achieve equation between the Torah and Qur'an and that both are full of errors and contradictions, there is no way except raising the largest number of suspicions and attempting to deny the greatest amount of facts proving the Qur'an's truth and divine origin. Among the explicit texts in equating the Qur'an and Torah is Arkoun's statement: "The Qur'an, exactly like the Torah, presents numerous somewhat precise or imprecise preliminary pieces of information attributed to all these mentioned sciences, but this never means that every modern scientific discovery was previously stated in the Qur'an, as contemporary Islamic apologetic and laudatory literature tries to suggest. This is an error that must be condemned immediately" (Arkoun, n.d., p. 199). His words are clear in equating the Qur'an and Torah. This equation springs from his ideological background, by which he often accuses Muslims of being ideological rather than scientific, thus erecting a fence around many Islamic facts and preventing himself and others from thinking about them and rereading them critically. Religious ideology is what consecrated the stagnation of Muslims and their lack of intellectual and methodological liberation. But what Arkoun accused classical Islamic thought of, he fell into clearly, and it did not stop at him: most modernists — if not all — fell into a Westernizing ideology from which they could not detach. They think and theorize from an intellectual background drawing its strength and activity from the Western Orientalist school in its various branches and orientations. When Arkoun decides the equation between the Torah and Gospel so hastily, we wonder: Did he conduct a precise scientific study like that of Spinoza and Ibn Ezra? Or is it a result without research, a comparison without cause? His effort thus focuses on equating the Qur'an and Holy Books. The results reached by studies in criticizing the Holy Books should, in his view, be the same for the Qur'an. If distortion of the Holy Books is proven, with a temporal gap between revelation and documentation, containing many errors and contradictions, composed in human language, and embodying historical judgment and legislation, then the Qur'an itself fits the results and descriptions of the previous books because it is part of them — that is, one of the three monotheistic religions.

To clarify further the method of projecting the results of the Holy Bible onto the Noble Qur'an, we add another example: the example of difference in the documentation dates in the Holy Bible and attempting to suggest that the Qur'an also differed in that. The second example is the model of errors existing in the Holy Bible and the Noble Qur'an together, as they claim.

The Holy Bible is full of errors and contradictions because it is not revelation from Allah but human composition, hence the abundance of errors therein. Among the errors this book contains is that the Arameans were defeated by the Israelites and forty thousand infantry were killed from them, while in another place the Holy Bible says forty thousand cavalry perished. This error, by which reconciliation between the two texts is impossible, indicates confusion in the authors' thought and failure to distinguish between cavalry and infantry. It is an error that places God in the position of accusation for being the source of inspiration and revelation that did not know the difference between cavalry and infantry (Deedat, 1986, p. 56).

This type of errors in the Holy Bible, which Jewish and Christian scholars could not deny before the strength of arguments and the acknowledgment by many of their scholars of the distortion that afflicted their books — after somewhat conceding the existence of errors, contradictions, and distortions in their books — they went on to market them and project them onto the Noble Qur'an. The Orientalist Nöldeke, in his historical study of the Qur'an as if speaking about the Holy Bible, claims that the Qur'an is full of linguistic errors and errors in content. He cites aberrant and weak narrations attributed to Aisha and Uthman, and provides flimsy explanations for the errors he imagines. Among these explanations is that the Mushaf writers were not proficient in writing, and that writing with ink played a role in perpetuating errors. For example, the word "wa wassa" was written erroneously when the ink fell between the second waw and the sad, so it was read "wa qada." In His saying,

Almighty: {Indeed, these two are magicians} [Ta Ha/63], Nöldeke says this is a linguistic error and the correct is “inna hadhayn” (Nöldeke, n.d., p. 443 and following). The example he presented and judged erroneous, he did not study scientifically nor trace it in light of the Arabic tongue. The reading “inna hadhayn” is the reading of the majority and most reciters, contrary to “inna hadhayn.” Most reciters read with doubled nun, and few read with sukun of nun as lightened from doubled. Scholars mentioned six opinions on the raising of the noun after “inna” contrary to the famous rule, the most important being that the doubled “inna” comes in the Arabic tongue meaning “yes,” so it is here a particle of response. Another is that raising the noun after “inna” is the language of Kinanah, one of the eloquent Arabic dialects. The variety in Qur’anic expression is among the evidences of miracle and aspects of eloquence (Ibn Ashur, 1984, vol. 16, p. 250 and following). As for claiming error in the Mushaf’s writing, this is negligence not to be considered. What was narrated of solecism in the Qur’an on the tongue of Uthman and Aisha has weak chain. The Muslims wrote the Mushafs only from their memorization; memorization is the basis. Had the error existed in the Mushafs, why do Muslims not read riba, salah, and zakah with waw, since it is fixed with waw in the Mushafs? (Ibn Ashur, 1984, vol. 16, p. 254) Thus, what Nöldeke went to is haste in issuing judgments without objective scientific study, and it is also an attempt to project the errors and contradictions in the Holy Bible onto the Noble Qur’an.

### Conclusion:

The attempt of contemporary readings to historicize the Qur’anic text and subject it to the scalpel of criticism and doubt in light of Western methodologies, and cloning the experience of Ibn Ezra and Spinoza in criticizing the Holy Bible on the Qur’anic text, is a failed attempt. The Qur’anic text proved its credibility and the truth of its fully divine source through the amazing preservation process it enjoyed since the first verse descended. The Qur’an was preserved in hearts and lines, collected in one Mushaf with strict historical methodology. The Qur’an does not contradict historical and scientific facts as is the case of the Holy Bible, for there are no historical errors or scientific fallacies in it, and this confirms also that it is preserved divine revelation.

### Ethical Considerations

This research adheres to internationally recognized ethical standards for humanities scholarship. All sources are cited accurately and transparently, and interpretations are presented without misrepresentation or selective distortion of historical data. The study does not involve human participants, personal data, or confidential materials, and therefore did not require institutional ethical approval.

### Acknowledgements

The author expresses sincere appreciation to colleagues and peer scholars in the fields of textual criticism, manuscript studies, and intellectual history whose academic discussions and published works contributed to refining the analytical framework of this study.

### Funding

This research received no external funding from public, commercial, or non-profit organizations.

### Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest related to the publication of this study.

### References:

1. Abu Zahra, M. (n.d.). *Lectures on Christianity*. Al-Shihab Company.
2. Al-Hindi, R. A. K. (2005). *Izhar al-haqq* (A. A. R. A. ibn S., Ed.; 1st ed.). Dar Ibn al-Haytham.
3. Al-Mufti, M. K. D. (2004). *Izhar al-haqq in religions, sects, and prominent contemporary movements* (2nd ed.). Dar al-Isra’ for Publishing and Distribution.
4. Al-Sabuni, M. A. (2004). *Al-tibyan fi ‘ulum al-Qur’ān* (1424 AH ed.). Al-Maktabah al-‘Asriyyah.
5. Al-Sharqawi, M. A. (1990). *Faith: Its reality and effect on the soul and society, its roots and branches, requirements and nullifiers* (2nd ed., 1410 AH). Dar al-Jil.
6. Al-Tirmidhi. (2000). *Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi* (M. N. al-Albani, Commentator; 1st ed., 1420 AH). Maktabat al-Ma’arif.
7. Al-Ubaqi, H. (2009). *The noble Qur’ān and the modernist reading* (1st ed.). Dar Safahat lil-Nashr.
8. Al-Urawi, A. (2005). *The concept of history* (4th ed.). Al-Markaz al-Thaqafi al-‘Arabi.

9. Arkoun, M. (1989). *Islamic thought: Criticism and ijtihad* (H. Saleh, Trans.). Al-Mu'assasah al-Wataniyyah lil-Kitab.
10. Arkoun, M. (1999). *The historicity of Arab-Islamic thought* (S. Hashim, Trans.; 2nd ed.). Al-Markaz al-Inma' al-Qawni.
11. Bucaille, M. (2004). *The Torah, the Gospel, the Qur'an and science* (4th ed.). Maktabat Madbuli.
12. Deedat, A. (1986). *Is the Bible the Word of God?* (N. A. al-Nu'man, Trans.; 5th ed.). Dar al-Zaytunah lil-I'lam wa-al-Nashr.
13. Goldziher, I. (n.d.). *Dogma and law in Islam* (M. Y. Musa, A. H. A. al-Qadir, & A. A. al-Haqq, Trans.; 2nd ed.). Dar al-Kutub al-Hadithah.
14. Ibn Abi Dawud. (n.d.). *Kitab al-masahif*. Dar al-Basha'ir al-Islamiyyah.
15. Ibn Ashur, M. T. (1984). *Tafsir al-tahrir wa-al-tanwir*. Al-Dar al-Tunisiyyah lil-Nashr.
16. Ibn Hazm. (n.d.). *Al-fisal fi al-milal wa-al-ahwa' wa-al-nihal* (Vols. 1-2; M. I. Nasr & A. R. Umayrah, Eds.). Dar al-Jil.
17. Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani. (n.d.). *Fath al-bari* (M. al-Din al-Khatib, Ed.). Dar al-Ma'rifah.
18. Ibn Kathir. (1988). *Al-bidayah wa-al-nihayah* (A. Shiri, Ed.; 1st ed., 1408 AH). Dar Ihya' al-Turath al-'Arabi.
19. Ibn Kathir. (1990). *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'azim* (S. B. M. Salama, Ed.; 2nd ed., 1420 AH). Dar Taybah.
20. Ibn Kathir. (1416 AH). *Fada'il al-Qur'an* (A. I. al-Huwayni al-Athari, Ed.; 1st ed.). Maktabat Ibn Taymiyyah.
21. Nöldeke, T. (2000). *History of the Qur'an* (F. Schwally, Rev.; G. Tamar, Trans.; 4th ed.). Dar Jurj Almz.
22. Roberti, A. S. (n.d.). *Principles of philosophy* (A. Amin, Trans.). Dar al-Kitab al-'Arabi.
23. Tawila, A. A. (2002). *The holy books in the balance of authentication* (2nd ed., 1422 AH). Dar al-Salam.
24. Al-Zarkashi, B. al-D. (1984). *Al-burhan fi 'ulum al-Qur'an* (M. A. al-Fadl Ibrahim, Ed.; 3rd ed., 1404 AH). Maktabat Dar al-Turath.
25. Berg, H. (2000). *The development of exegesis in early Islam*. Routledge.
26. Cook, M. (2000). *The Koran: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
27. Donner, F. M. (2010). *Muhammad and the believers: At the origins of Islam*. Harvard University Press.
28. Déroche, F. (2009). *La transmission écrite du Coran dans les débuts de l'islam*. Brill.
29. Déroche, F. (2014). *The Qur'an: A new introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.
30. Graham, W. A. (1987). *Beyond the written word: Oral aspects of scripture in the history of religion*. Cambridge University Press.
31. Neuwirth, A. (2010). *Scripture, poetry, and the making of a community*. Oxford University Press.
32. Neuwirth, A., Sinai, N., & Marx, M. (Eds.). (2011). *The Qur'an in context: Historical and literary investigations into the Qur'anic milieu*. Brill.
33. Sadeghi, B., & Goudarzi, M. (2012). San'a' 1 and the origins of the Qur'an. *Der Islam*, 87(1-2), 1-129. <https://doi.org/10.1515/islam-2011-0025>
34. Wansbrough, J. (1977). *Qur'anic studies: Sources and methods of scriptural interpretation*. Oxford University Press.