

# *CHAPTER 3*

## **CRITICAL APPROACH OF ORIENTALISTS TO *SĪRAH* OF PROPHET MUḤAMMAD (PEACE BE UPON HIM)**

Islam is the final form of monotheistic faiths which emerged from the Middle East particularly after the Judaism and the Christianity. The *Qur'ān* prove that Islam is the universal and primordial faith of all the Prophets from Adam (AS) to Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) and of all those who believe in Allah, Sovereign Lord, creator and merciful Lord of all things.<sup>1</sup> Islam came with its own independent ideology suited for the worldly success as well as hereafter which was not compromising with the self made beliefs and practices of Jews and Christians and contradictory to previous revealed faiths by which both Judaism and Christianity felt threat and they realize that this religion had come to stay.<sup>2</sup> So, their critical attitude and propaganda against Islam and Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) is as old as Islam itself and colored all discourse in Islam since then.<sup>3</sup> And, their hostility towards Islam is totally based on their biased religious aspect of the conflict, and they thought their faith is final instead of Islam. It has been a clash of ideology between Islam and other faiths.<sup>4</sup>

The deformation of the Islam by the West not cramped to one particular country, it has founded throughout Europe and America. In short, whenever Orientalists turned their attention towards Islam, they seem to be excited by a sense of hateful pleasure whenever an occasion real and imaginary arises for unfavorable criticism. These Orientalists are not from any special race but only promoters of their civilization and their social surroundings. As whole, the Westerns prejudiced against Islam as a religion and culture.<sup>5</sup> They forget that the so-called Dark Ages in Europe corresponded with the ascendancy of Muslim civilization. Their exaggerations of the crusades in the West have remained till today as one of the obstacle to a better understanding of Muslim world.<sup>6</sup>

It is really regrettable to see the modern Orientalists, with loud profession of objectivity and scholarly impartiality, devoting their energies to this sort of destructive task, taxing their talent to bring out simple mistakes and failings, real or imaginary, in the character of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) and presenting their findings in a dramatic manner in order to remove the faith and love of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) from the hearts and minds of Muslims from

its firmly unshakable position as the essence of historic authenticity and moral soundness. The knowledge and intelligence of a great majority of these scholars are passed to offer a minute examination of different incidents of the life of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) with the object of stretching insignificant events for casting a shade on the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). The device normally followed by such Orientalists is to determine their objectives first and then to try through all possible means, which are no better than an artificial alternate for critical and nuanced analysis, to prove their propositions. They collect information from all sorts of works on different topics, related or unrelated with the subjects of their study, as, for example, religious tracts, biographies, historical accounts, literary works, poetry, fiction, anecdotes etc., and then spin their material artfully to present their imagination. Very often they enumerate the merits of the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) but at the same time accuse some failings or ulterior motives to him which subtly create misgivings about his character in the minds of the readers. In giving the account of the Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) call, they usually delineate the historical, social and economic conditions of the then Arabian in such a way that one begins to wonder whether the call of Islam was not the product of its circumstances. They try to give an impression that the times in which the message of Islam was preached was ripe for revolution it brought and the only contribution of the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was to make a correct assessment of the prevailing situation like a political leader or statesman and then to pull the strings of the drama already set for the occasion. Such subversive or 'behind the lines' assaults are camouflaged by coloring the events in a careful and cautious manner, in a way in that an unbiased scholar trying to make an objective analysis of events and circumstances. The writings of such Orientalists are much more harmful than those who attack on Islam and the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) from the front. This biased nature of Orientalists not only checked by Muslim scholars but some rational and broadminded Orientalists also observed of this type of temperament such as a modern biographer of the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him), by John Bagot Glubb, has correctly mentions that Muḥammad was a founder of Islam which, for one thousand three hundred years, has been considered as the enemy of Christianity. The enmity, incidentally, has been largely due to political oppositions, not to religious prejudices have distorted nearly all the biographies of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). Western authors, even if not they very religious

have nevertheless unconsciously inherited the violent prejudices against Muslims which have become embedded in the European culture.<sup>7</sup>

John of Damascus comes in the rank of initiators to campaign of denigration against Islam and its Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). Moreover, he saw Islam as a Christian heresy. His work proved the Christian reaction towards Islam documented from an early date.<sup>8</sup> William Tripoli in his account of Islam has been written Muslims beliefs are wrapped up in many lies and decorated with fictions, He further claimed faith and doctrine of Islam, like that of the Jews is soon to come an end, leaving only the faith of Christ stable and enduring as long as the world shall last. Roger Bacon has given a long series of arguments against Islam that based on philosophy and advocated Muslim conversion to Christianity.<sup>9</sup> Bacon commented there is a saying for the religion of Mohammad that his religion would last only as long as the dynasty of Abbasids.<sup>10</sup>

The criticism against Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) has continued since he proclaimed himself as the last Prophet and messenger of God after receiving revelation ascended through the channel of Gabriel (AS) from Allah. He experienced a huge resistance from his fellow Arabs, but he never stopped conveying Allah's message of monotheism. Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) succeeded in his mission, and, Islam spread not only in Arabia but also beyond its territories. The people of the previous faiths (Judaism and Christianity) which mainly existed in Europe taught that the message of Islam as threat to their religion and Muḥammad as heretic to Christianity.<sup>11</sup>

Although, Muslims believe that Christianity is a previous revealed religion and Jesus was one of the line of true prophets, he also received message like Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) had. However, Christians had misunderstood their faith; they turned Jesus as God, and believed he had been crucified. They had "corrupted" their scriptures, either by tampering with the text or by misunderstanding its meaning. Their scriptures did not support their claims that Jesus was God, *Qur'ān* made it clear that he had not been crucified but had somehow been taken up into heaven. Again, Christians did not accept the authenticity of the revelation given to Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him), but a proper interpretation of the Bible would show that it had foretold the coming of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon

him).<sup>12</sup> These people not only denied but to challenge Muḥammad's role as a Prophet of Allah who had divine revelation from God. Moreover, they began the chain of polemical writings against Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). Their hostility increased even beyond the confines of Arabia.<sup>13</sup> They said, after the death of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) his followers considered him as a saint and attributed all kinds of wonderful work to him.<sup>14</sup>

To study the life of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) Orientalists adopted specific approaches. Sometimes they apply reason to criticize the miracles of the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) and some time they reduce his personal qualities. The first person who started campaign against Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was Yaḥya Damashqi or John of Damascus, about whom I already discussed in previous chapters. Yaḥya discussed Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as heretic or a fake Prophet, who had no divine message pretend as Prophet and preached among people with the help of Christian sources. He criticized the marriages and battles of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). His writings clearly show a biased perception, which use as soul work by Orientalists throughout the entire medieval period and even in modern time.<sup>15</sup>

The highly negative image of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as a heretic, false Prophet, betrayer cardinal, or founder of a religion that promotes violence found its way into many other works of European literature over the centuries, such as the Chansons de Geste, William Langland's "*Piers Plowman*", and John Lydgate's "*The Fall of the Princes*". Even Dante, who knew much about Islamic esoteric teachings, was forced to place the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) along with Ḥaḍrat 'Alī in the inferno in the twentieth canto of the *Inferno* of his "*Divine Comedy*". From the thirteenth century onward, romantic representations of Prophet Muḥammad's life also appeared, as in "*Alexandre du Pont's Roman de Mahomet*" and the *Mi'rāj* was translated by a certain Abraham, the court physician of Alfonso X of Castile and Leon and his son, as "*Escala de Mahomet*" (The Ladder of Muḥammad) and was definitely known by Dante in some version.<sup>16</sup>

Orientalists start their criticism with the theory that the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was a "false Prophet" and the rest of the allegation are built on this assumption. Among the false accusations against the Prophet Muḥammad (peace

be upon him); most of them were mere wild speculations and totally wrong assumptions, unsupported by facts or misinterpretations of facts.<sup>17</sup> These assumptions are mainly about his divine inspiration from Allah, personality and character. To discard Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) Orientalists raised questions regarding *wahy* and miracles happened with him. And to denigrate his personality and character orientalist misrepresent the Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) birth, family, name, status, migration to Madinah, marriages and dealings with the people of other religions and so on.<sup>18</sup>

### **3.1 Orientalists' Denial of Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) Prophethood**

The Orientalists argue that the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) is far from being divinely inspired and had no any divine revelation or *wahy* or miracle, he took his inspiration to found a new religion from his frequent contact with the Jews and the Christians of his day, *Qur'ān* is his own composition and product of his own mind and thought not a divine and spiritual one, which was predominantly dependent upon Jewish and Christian sources in the formulation of his doctrines. *Qur'ān* has distorted shape the stories that he had heard from the Jew and Christian priests.<sup>19</sup> Such a view expressed by Richard Bell in "*The Qur'ān: Translated with a Critical Rearrangement of the Surahs*", Arberry in his introduction to his translation of the *Qur'ān*, Kenneth Cragg in "*The Call of the Minaret and Nauseum*".<sup>20</sup> Charles Cutler Torrey (1863-1956 C.E.), an American historian in his book "*The Jewish Foundation of Islam*" asserted that the Prophet was a disciple of synagogue, while W. Ahrens (1872-1927 C.E.) maintained that the Christian influences were decisive for him. These Orientalists try to establish that Islamic civilization is copied from Greek and Roman civilization.<sup>21</sup>

Orientalists claim that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was an ambitious person who since an early age had made preparations for the role he subsequently played by pertaining as a Prophet. As an instance of this alleged ambition it has been suggested that since early youth he had cultivated his linguistic and poetical skill which he subsequently made use of in composing the *Qur'ān*.<sup>22</sup> Some Orientalists say, even Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) himself was not confirmed that revelation ascended upon him. William Muir (1819-1905 C.E.),

famous Orientalist who worked on *sīrah* and wrote “*The Life of Muḥammad*” which contains thirty-seven chapters, in which he said that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was ambitious and depressed by the debasement of his people he sought relief in meditation and reflection at mount Hira. Gradually his impulsive and susceptible mind wrought up to the highest pitch of excitement and certain ideas came in his mind such as God, Sole Creator, Ruler, punishment of idolatry, reward, resurrection, judgment, good and evil and life hereafter took clearer before Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). He gave way to this realization by enforcing these ideas on the people with incoherent oaths and addressed to mankind. Muir said he assumed very earlier to establish an office of Divine teacher and Waraqah bin Nofal, Ḥaḍrat ‘Alī, Ḥaḍrat Khadijah and Ḥaḍrat Abu Bakr were involved with him in his planning. Muir claims that I have found various intimations in the holy *Qur’ān* that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) assumed an office or institution of Prophet. Further, they said that the traditional view of his being an illiterate person is not quite correct and that at least he knew regarding reading and writing to some extent.<sup>23</sup>

At one instance Montgomery Watt says that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) himself did not insist his own Prophecy. In his early life in Madinah he did not demand from the Jews that they should recognize him as Prophet. For this statement he says that at the early age of Madinah Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) contemplated an arrangement which would give a message of unity but would not demand to the Jews that they give up their faith or accept Islam and Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as a Prophet, it would transform idea that every Prophet has come for a particular community and he was sent for Arabs.<sup>24</sup> For this wild allegation Watt has no proof. If Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) contemplated any arrangement of this type it must have found mention in the *Qur’ān* or *Sunna* of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). There is no single verse in the holy *Qur’ān* which said that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was a Prophet for a particular community rather *Qur’ān* says to believe in all previous Prophets which proves the universality of Islam, that it is for all human beings. *Qur’ān* mentions all from the beginning (Adam AS) of this world till the end. If Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) claimed that he was only a Prophet for the Arabs why Jews show their hostility towards him and why they felt threatened by him for their religion. The freedom which Islam gives to the people of other faith and do not

force them to convert in Islam is a sign of its universality not for its particularity only far Arabs. Because by giving this freedom of it opens way to come in its sphere and know about it optimistically and logically. So the idea that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was sent for Arabs only is abhorrent and disgusting which does not find in Quran, Hadith and writings of any scholar.<sup>25</sup>

At a place William Montgomery Watt also claimed that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was tried to mould Islam on the older religion of Judaism.<sup>26</sup> And as usual he has no proof for this illogical speculation. He derives his charge from the Muslim Institution of a fast on the Day of Atonement, the fast of *'Ashūra*, which the Jews observed. But Watt himself acknowledges or admits that perhaps some of the Muslim of Madinah had already been in the habit of observing it. So Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) did not abolish the tradition was prevalent among the people of Madinah and continued it. Apart from this all other facts disapproved to this allegation of Watt.<sup>27</sup> Even Watt himself recognized that the Islamic institution of pilgrimage to Ka'ba had been prevalent from the very beginning of Islam. He also mentions that "the verse of the holy *Qur'ān* enjoying pilgrimage (2/196/1922) is dated by Richard Bell before Badr and this adoption of an Arabian custom would suitably occur about the time of Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) break with the Jews. Nevertheless something of this kind had long been implicit in Islam.<sup>28</sup> The pilgrimage of Ka'ba is an original institution of Islam and has nothing to do with Judaism. If the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) wanted to praise the Jews and mould his religion on Judaism, he should have not allowed the Muslims of Madinah from making pilgrimages to Ka'ba.<sup>29</sup>

### **1. *The Story of Epilepsy***

The *Shaqq-i-Ṣadr*, an incidence of splitting of the chest is an important event in the early life of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). As reported of many traditionists, Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was little and with his foster mother Halima, two angels appeared split the chest of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him), cleaned it and put it as it was. The Orientalists do not believe in it and unanimously denies this happening. They would show various discrepancies and contradictions in the various versions of the story on the one hand and declare it as against the laws of nature on the other hand. These Orientalists are so much opposed



to its authenticity that sometime they reach to the wildest phase and explain the incidence of *Shaqq-i-şadr* (splitting of the chest) as one of those occasions of the epilepsy of the early phase of the life of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him).

By raising allegations of epilepsy and physical fits Orientalists supported the theory of “false Prophet” and directed to create doubt over the *wahy* (revelation) upon Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). With the reference to the incident of *Shaqq-i-şadr* these Orientalists have made the wildest insinuation that the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was, since his boyhood, a life-long patient of epilepsy or ‘falling disease’. Although some Orientalists have not accepted the theory of epilepsy, but has almost admitted the line of Muir’s arguments as far as its implications namely the ingenuineness of the prophecy was concerned and have explained the revelations in terms of what is called “consciousness” of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him), that is, what the thought or “sincerely” believed to be “inspiration” but which was nonetheless not from God.<sup>30</sup> Muir said it was emanating from Prophet Muḥammad’s (peace be upon him) mind and thought, a result of his contemplation, and is a psychological phenomenon not Divine. The *wahy* was a reverie, an instance of physical stress that he experience while receiving *wahy*. To prove his allegation true he extended his assumption that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was a sufferer of epilepsy or fainting fits. There is no support of facts for this wild allegation of William Muir. William Muir’s portray of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) is negative. The immediate acceptance of Islam by three persons Ḥaḍrat Khadijah (wife of Prophet Muḥammad PBUH), his cousin Ḥaḍrat ‘Alī and first Caliph of Islam Ḥaḍrat Abu Bakr after first revelation was not possible if Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) had slightly doubt or hesitancy about his divine mission. Because it is recorded that when Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) received his first revelation, just after it he shared his whole experience with his wife Ḥaḍrat Khadijah, who at once testified him after that to reassure herself took Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) to Warqa bin Nawfal, a Christian priest, who assured both of them that it was the same angel who brought divine message to Ḥaḍrat Mūsa (AS). After this long episode this is ridiculous to say that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was not assured for his Prophethood.<sup>31</sup>

Earlier, most of the Western people who refuted the divine message upon Prophet of Islam were belonged to clergy and missionary groups who refuted it for the

sake of their religion. But with the passage of time Western writers increased their strategies to reject the divinity of Islamic revelation. They tried to logically and scientifically deny the authenticity or divinity of revelation upon Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him).

Maxim Rodinson also agrees with the view of William Muir that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was a patient of epilepsy, hysteria and schizophrenia. He writes in his book *“Muḥammad”* “We find these ecstasies and sensory phenomena in a very similar form among persons suffering from recognized mental conditions such as hysteria, schizophrenia and uncontrolled verbalization.”<sup>32</sup>

Another Western writer who also discusses on this allegation is Sprenger mentions that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was experienced trembling while receiving revelation was a symptom of epilepsy. Others say it was religious madness. It was the time when the mind of Muḥammad hung in anticipation and doubted the reality of a heavenly mission. Orientalists further say his epilepsy was either from the physical adjunct which marked the Prophet at the time when he received a divine revelation or from an incident in the boyhood of the Prophet when he lived with his foster mother (Halima). The incident when Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) and his brother went to wondering with their lamb, and two men in white raiment appeared and seized the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him), thrown him down and opened his belly and thrown out something black. After this event when his brother ran towards him his face was livid.<sup>33</sup> So, the allegation thus developed by Muir and Margoliouth has been reiterated by many subsequent writers. Mentioned may be made particularly of Richard Bell, while giving his support to the allegation, lists all the leading Orientalists who have made it and also relates it mainly to the process of revelation.<sup>34</sup>

The Western writers who say that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was confused about receiving revelation have been divided into two groups, first who says that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was confused about his Prophecy up to his last breath. But other said he was confused until he was at Makkah, after migration from Makkah to Madinah in 622 C.E. he was pretending to be a prophet to get success and spread Islam.<sup>35</sup> William Muir said, Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was not convinced in the initial stages that he had been commissioned by

God to spread the message of Islam. It was only after a long period of doubts and hesitancy that he became certain that he was divinely commissioned. William Muir writes: “Thus was Muḥammad led by such processes as we can only conjecture, but seemingly after a protracted period of doubts and hesitancy to give forth this message as proceeding direct from the Almighty?”<sup>36</sup>

But point is this from where he has got this knowledge? although he was not a literate person, to resolve this question Orientalists say Prophet Muḥammad had good relations with Jews and Christians previously, from Jews’ scripture and from the Bible he gained this knowledge to employ it in the construction of the system of Islam and whatever good in Mohammedanism has borrowed from Christianity.<sup>37</sup> They claim that the message brought by Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was not original or from God rather Muḥammad himself composed this religion by receiving different ideas from previous revealed religions and even Mandaenism. He copied many things from Judaism, including many beliefs and stories in the *Qur’ān* are similar with different Judaic texts.<sup>38</sup> Stephens (1839-1902 C.E.) writes that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) aquatinted this knowledge from Gospel by the means of a great annual fair at “Okaz” a place near to Makkah, where Jews, Christian and Pagans all were assembled for trade purpose, at this occasion they also used to engage in poetical and martial contests. Here, Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) heard Cross, Bishop of Najran, which was based on Gospel. From here he first conceived the idea of new religion, Islam.<sup>39</sup> On the other hand they says the Holy Prophet was “too ignorant” of the teachings of the Bible and intrinsic Worth of Christianity, and show controversy among their statements.<sup>40</sup> Alois Sprenger (1813-1993 C.E.) says Muḥammad did not deliver a new scripture, but only reproduced previous divine message in an Arabic form. He tried to re-establish the revelation of Jews and Christian. And for the rehearsal of this existing scripture for a time period he confined himself; till after several years, breaking through his scruples, he commenced the delivery of direct and independent revelation. Sprenger also claims that *Qur’ān* is not sufficient to satisfy its followers for their daily life therefore Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) ordered to record his sayings, habits and doings.<sup>41</sup>

## 2. *Story of Bahira*

The incident of Bahirah has a great importance in the polemical works on Islam prepared by Western writers. When Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was just nine years old, he travelled to Syria with his uncle (Abu Ṭalib) for trade purpose. So, while his journey, at the place of Busra he met Bahirah (a Nestorian Christian Monk), who at once recognized him as would be Prophet and insisted on Abu Ṭalib that he should take him back to Makkah, and exposed dangers. Bahirah also advised to Abu Ṭalib to protect Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) from the hostility and resentment of Jews. Orientalists say that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) developed his knowledge of religion particularly knowledge of Christianity from Bahirah, they further claim that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) developed the idea of new religion after this meeting with Bahirah.<sup>42</sup>

By the reference of Bahira's meeting Western writers show Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) privilege by Christians.<sup>43</sup> William Muir claims that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) first adopted the Jewish and Christian system as the basis of his own religion and when he firmly established his religion and served his purpose he cast aside the Jewish and Christian system.<sup>44</sup>

This charge against Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) is unauthenticated and unreliable. The story of Bahira has not sound proofs in history. Many Muslim historians showed doubts about this story and rejected its authenticity with the help of facts. And if it has happened too, so, the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was only twelve years old when he met Bahira for a very short period of time. This very brief meeting is not sufficient to discuss religious doctrines. It is not proper to assume that the young boy, Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) can discuss religious doctrines and scriptural Prophecy about the coming of the messenger etc, at this tender age. On the other hand if Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) had followed what all was taught by Bahira, how could he has rejected doctrines like those of Trinity, Crucifixion, Atonement and Incarnation which form the core of Christianity? The *Qur'ānic* teachings about Christianity are contrary to what Christian monks would have taught.<sup>45</sup>

Orientalists' charge that traditions of Islam is predominantly dependent upon previous revealed books is totally wrong, Islam has similarities with previous revealed

faiths because it is a continuation of previous divine messages which are also a part of Islam. Islam admits all Prophets and previous revealed scriptures. So the Judaic and Christian teachings did not the basis of Islam but part of Islam.<sup>46</sup>

### **3.2 After Migration to Madinah Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) became a Politician**

Another accusation of Orientalists about Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) is, that he has changed his aims and objectives after migration from Makkah to Madinah. He politicized his thoughts, and his Prophetic role became subsidiary. Now he used his efforts to consolidate Islamic government and spread its territory rather than to get success on the hearts of people.<sup>47</sup> The polemicists say if Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) had died before migration, he would know as a real Prophet who preached his religion peacefully and suffered persecution and oppression without taking up the sword. In Madinah he fought battles against his enemies and became a warrior and give up his role as Prophet.<sup>48</sup>

William Muir, like many other Orientalists divides Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) life into two periods, Makkah and Madinah period. He asserts that that in Makkah period there was no personal motives can be traced in Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) and painting him as a man of good faith and a genuine reformer. However, that all changed after the *hijrah*, according to Muir. After migration to Madinah the temporal power, aggrandizement and self-gratification mingled rapidly with the grand object of the life of Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him), and they were sought and attained by the same manner. Again, in the same way, he accuses Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) message from heaven in order to justify a lust for women and reprisals against enemies, among other sins.<sup>49</sup>

Bernard Lewis a well known orientalist has presented his research on Islam and Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) thoroughly. He has described the status of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) at Makkah and Madinah in this attitude, when the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was still the leader of a minority group struggling against the dominant pagan oligarchy, the word often has the meaning favoured by modernist exegetics, of moral striving. In the later chapters promulgated in Madinah, where the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) headed

the state and commanded its army, it usually has a more explicitly practical connotation.”<sup>50</sup>

Moreover, Bernard Lewis comments in his book “*What Went Wrong?*” “Muḥammad was, so to speak, his own Constantine. In the religiously conceived polity that he founded and headed in Madinah, the Prophet and his successors confronted the realities of the state and, before very long, of a vast and expanding empire. At no time did they create an institution corresponding to, or even remotely resembling, the Church in Christendom. But the tension between religious concerns and politics needs was often felt, and the resulting polemics and conflicts are a recurring theme in Muslims history.”<sup>51</sup>

Another a German Orientalist Philip Schaff (1819-1893 C.E.) says that in the earlier part of his life Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was a sincere and enthusiastic reformer, but after migration or the establishment of his kingdom or state, Schaff describes him as “a slave of sensual passion.” William St. Clair Tisdall (1859-1928 C.E.), a British historian also accused Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) of inventing revelations to justify his own desires.<sup>52</sup> These Orientalists casted all kind of shameful acts towards the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him).

Stephens said that Muḥammad declined his morality and humanity with the advancement of his career, earlier his moral character was high but after getting success he gave up his moral values.<sup>53</sup> He also claimed that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) misused his power in Madinah and changed it in the cold blooded massacre of all the men belonging to hostile Jewish tribe Banu Qurayza and subjugation of all the women to slavery. Gibbon marked Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as a cruel man, and said Jews were dragged in chains in the market of Madinah, they ascended alive into the graves prepared for their execution burial, and the Muḥammad Beheld with an inflexible eye the slaughter of his helpless enemies.<sup>54</sup>

Orientalists ignore the facts are recorded while depicted Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as cruel man in Madinah that after migration he touched new spiritual heights while engaged in fighting and politics he started voluntary prayer, he got up at night and prayed such an extent that his feet became swollen on being asked why he did this, he replied, “should I not be a grateful servant”.

The height of religiousness and spirituality of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) that he attained at Madinah shown by his simplicity of life, although he had power and money, if he wanted could enjoy all the pleasures of life to the maximum extent. But he lived and died in extreme poverty, owning no possession no property.<sup>55</sup> Ḥaḍrat ‘Aisha reported that sometimes a month would come in which they did not kindle a fire, having only dates and water, unless a little meat was brought. She also said that Prophet Muḥammad’s family did not have a full meal of wheaten bread on two successive days but would have dates on one of them.<sup>56</sup> It was the life of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) at Madinah when he had all the resources of Arabia at his command as regards his wealth possession and property at Madinah. A tradition by Ḥaḍrat ‘Aisha says that the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) did not leave a dinar or a dirham or a sheep or a camel and did not make a will about anything. ‘Amr ibn al-Ḥārith, the brother of Juwairiyah, says that when the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) died, he did not leave a dinar or a dirham, a slave or a slave woman, or anything but his white she-mule, his weapons and some land which he left as *Sadaqa*.<sup>57</sup>

The greatness has shown by Prophet Muḥammad’s (peace be upon him) character has proven by the ‘Constitution of Madinah’ and his ‘Farewell Sermon’ which has conditions agreements are, only for the welfare of humanity and sake of monotheism, proves that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) did not left his role of Prophet till his last breath.<sup>58</sup>

### **3.3 Orientalists’ Claim Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was always offensive in the Battles**

A common allegation of Western writers is, that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was always offensive in the battles between Muslims and non Muslims. A large number of biographies of the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) have appeared in English as well as other languages by the Orientalists, the majority of the biographers limited the scope of their works to the exploits, attainments and set-backs of the prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) in the struggle against forces opposed to Islam and did not cover his contributions in the field of belief and thought, and the far reaching social, political, economic and cultural reforms that he effected. A perusal of such biographies, therefore, necessarily gives the impression that Prophet

Muḥammad (peace be upon him) did hardly anything more than fight wars and engages encounter with the enemies of Islam.<sup>59</sup> In this regard Montgomery Watt claims that the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) tried to provoke the people of Makkah soon after he took his residence in Madinah. He says, “In all this we may say a deliberate intention on Muḥammad’s part to provoke the people of Makkah”<sup>60</sup>

This is a false allegation. It is hardly conceivable that in the first two or three years of his Madinah life, when the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) lacked sufficient armed strength and when he was ringed round by his Jewish enemies, he should have invited the people of Makkah to attack him in Madinah. That would have been a suicidal policy. Watt contradicts himself in this when he says, “As these expeditions, even that to Badr, were razzias, where the aim was to capture booty without undue danger to oneself, the Anṣār did not presumably think they would provoke a great expedition against Madinah, such as that of the Makkans to Uhud.” Not only the Anṣār but also Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) and the Emigrants did not think that these expeditions would lead to an attack on Madinah. The aim of these expeditions was not to provoke the Makkans but to stop their trade to Syria. It was a kind of economic blockade. A further object was to impress with Muslim strength the nomadic tribes living round Madinah so that they might not make common cause with the Makkans.<sup>61</sup>

Sir William Muir says that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) waged wars of conquest, extirpation as well as proselytizing against the Quraysh, other Arab tribes the Jews and Christians.<sup>62</sup> Muir charged that first Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) enjoined creeds around him than gradually changed his attitude towards these creeds other than his followers and became persecutor, who had *Qur’ān* in one hand and sword in the other hand and announced convert, pay tribute or put to death. Orientalists also charged him for the assassination of many Jews secretly.<sup>63</sup> Gibb says in Madinah Muslim community has come into practical sphere from theory. It assumed a new shape on political lines. First Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) had tried to make alliance with Jews but when he did not get any positive response he reacted against Judaism. Gradually he began to nationalize Islam by eliminating Jews and Christians. After that he showed his interest in the city of Makkah to incorporate it into his religio-political mission. When he failed in his



peaceful persuasion he used means of violence and attacked on Makkan Caravan during the sacred month of Rajab in 624 C.E.<sup>64</sup>

Bernard Lewis comments about Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) life at Madinah. He has written many books like "*The Arabs in History*",<sup>65</sup> "*What Went Wrong?*"<sup>66</sup> and "*The Crises of Islam*".<sup>67</sup> In these books he tried to create a negative image about the life of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). He raises questions in view of *Jihād* and comments, "the immigrants, economically uprooted and not wishing to be wholly dependent on the Medinites, turned to the soul remaining profession, that of arms. Much righteous indignation has been expressed by European writers at the spectacle of God leading the faithful in predatory raids on merchant caravans; but in the conditions of the time and to the moral ideas of Arabs raiding were a natural and legitimate occupation, and no discredit attacks to the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) for having adopted it. The expeditions against Makkan commerce served a double purpose; on the one hand they helped to maintain a blockage on the city which alone could ultimately reduce it to submission to the new faith. On the second hand, they increased the power, wealth and prestige of the *Ummah* in Madinah."<sup>68</sup>

Some Orientalists such as Maxim Rodinson says the aims behind these battles were looting the booty, capturing the fertile land, snatching the women and to assassinate the enemies.<sup>69</sup>

However, the attacks on the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) have been going on for centuries as well. But recently due to 9/11, it has seems a rising wave of attack on the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). Some of the books by Robert Spencer, Richard Dawkins<sup>70</sup> and Sam Harris<sup>71</sup> portray, directly or indirectly, Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as a violent person. Robert Spencer in his book, "*Truth about Muḥammad*" blames the teachings of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) for the violent acts of terrorism in the contemporary times. He argues that the war and conflict and bloodshed will long as the Muslims keep on using the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as an inspiration. The accusations that Richard Dawkins, Sam Harris and Robert Spencer, and other writers, have made against the prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) are not new. They

repeat the same criticism offered by the opponents of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) throughout the millennium.<sup>72</sup>

Robert Spencer proclaimed that the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) has given permission to Muslims to cut the neck of the unbelievers and that is maintaining by the Muslims even in contemporary world.<sup>73</sup>

### **3.4 Marriages of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him)**

The last and common allegation raised by almost all Orientalists is regarded the marriages of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him), it was a strongly debated topic in the history of Orientalism. The Orientalists accused Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) for innovation of polygamous practice in history of humanity as well as man of over sexuality.<sup>74</sup> They attributed Islam as a religion of sensuality and try to justify this claim with the argument that the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) permitted polygamy and himself had many wives. They attributed these marriages as a lust of sex and exploitation of women and they ignored that till the age of fifty two, the Prophet was content with one wife (Ḥaḍrat Khadijah) only who was fifteen years older than him, and unjustly call it his sensuality. So, it is proved by history that after the death of Ḥaḍrat Khadijah when Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) came to Madinah he contracted a number of marriages, but all his wives were widow or divorced women except Ḥaḍrat ‘Aisha. He married them for the purpose to provide them home, protection and position that they could not otherwise enjoy. Umme Salma, who had a number of children when her husband died in battle of Uhad, what can be purpose to marry with her? It was only sympathy that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) married to her. And to recognize the sacrifices that her husband made for Islam.<sup>75</sup>

Orientalists also charged that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) limited the number of wives to his followers at a maximum four than why he contracted marriages more than four? As to the law, the limitation of the number of wives was fixed at the end of the eighth year of the *hijrah* and Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) had married all his wives before that period. He was told by Allah to keep those whom he had married but was forbidden to marry any more.<sup>76</sup>

Some Orientalists say that the marriages of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was not a result of sensuality but Muḥammad was anxious to bind his chief

followers more and more closely to himself.<sup>77</sup> They viewed that Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) marriages was his preparation to found a congenial soil in Arabia for effecting his religious revolution, as the Arabs were thirsting for a socio-religious change.<sup>78</sup> They say, Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) left nine wives and a Christian concubine and each of his marriages there was a political reason, the forming of closer links with the father or relative of the women.

Most of the Orientalists are accused Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) marriage with Ḥaḍrat 'Aisha at early age, through this allegation they attacking the pure character of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him), they said he was a pedophile and involved in child abuse. Some of them portrayed the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as a sexually suppressed man.<sup>79</sup> Although some Orientalists say because responsibility of message of Islam was so hard so Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) could not think of desire at that time and this marriage was confirm the relation with his best friend Ḥaḍrat Abu Bakr, through kinship. There are many contradictions on the age of Ḥaḍrat 'Aisha at the time when she left her parents home and was entering in the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him)'s home. Most of the historians and traditions recorded her age nine or ten years. Even Ṣaḥīḥ al Bukhari recorded her age nine years at the time of her permission from her parent's home. However, in contrast the modern day scholars have attempted to establish her age as being fourteen or even sixteen years.<sup>80</sup> Abu Muḥammad 'Abdul Malik b. Hishām (218 AH) mentioned in "*As- Siratun- Nabawiyyah*" that after the demise of Ḥaḍrat Khadijah when Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was tied in a bond of matrimony with Ḥaḍrat 'Aisha, this was happened in tenth *Nabawi*, the month of *Shawwal*, at that time Ḥaḍrat 'Aisha was seven years old, but her growth and development had matured remarkably well, otherwise Khaulah bint Ḥakim could not suggest this marriage.<sup>81</sup> And until she had not fully matured she was reside at her parental home, although *Nikah* had taken place. After five years of her *Nikah*, when Ḥaḍrat Abu Bakr approached to Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) to take Ḥaḍrat 'Aisha with him, the second year of Hijrah in the month of *Shawwal*, at the age of twelve she left her parent's home and entered the household of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him).<sup>82</sup> Ibn S'ad (230 AH) agreed with Abu Muḥammad Abdul Malik b. Hisham through his writings of "*Ṭabaqāt*" in which he mentions that Ḥaḍrat 'Aisha was born in the beginning of fourth *Nabawi*.<sup>83</sup> These Orientalists forget

that at the time of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) in the Arabian culture young girls were married at an early age and age difference between husband and wife was not matter. The young girls were matured earlier due to climate and geographical conditions and they were seen as goods that needed to grow in their husband's house.<sup>84</sup>

Much of the contemporary Orientalists criticized Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) marriage to Zaynab bint Jahsh, divorced wife of his adopted son Zaid ibn Haritha, by pagan custom this was not allowed; but the relationship was fictitious, and Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was apparently attacking the pagan system of relationship. In this sphere, then, Muḥammad was not satisfying his lusts but acting as a reformer, and had given an example.<sup>85</sup> But some Western critics further elaborated and misinterpreted it they added the event to their offensive tool to disrupt the Prophetic mission by saying 'Muḥammad married his son's spouse'. They said, once when Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) visited at the home of Zaynab, saw her in half-necked condition that her fine black hair was covering half of her body, and that every curve of her body was full of desire and passion. Other Orientalists relates that when Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) opened the door of the house of Zayd the breeze played with the curtains of the room of Zaynab, thus permitted Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) to catch a glimpse of her stretched out on her mattress in a nightgown. They then show the beauty of Zaynab attracted and stormed the heart of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) who was extremely passionate in love and desire for women. But these writers forget that Zaynab was a cousin of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him), and he has seen her many time before. So the story seems to have been unnecessarily romanticized. This and many like pictures have been painted arduously by Orientalists and missionaries working against Islam and Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). William Muir, Dermenghem, Washington Irving, Lammens and others supported this wild allegation.<sup>86</sup> Montgomery watt to prove this story as authentic one attached one new fake tale with it, he said Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was how much overcome by her beauty he was swept off his feet. And other wives are said to have feared her beauty.<sup>87</sup>

### 3.5 Other allegations on the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him)

The Orientalists have made various assumptions and raised questions regarding the very initial phase of Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) life. These assumptions mainly deal with his family status, his name, important events of his life.

#### 1. *Birth*

Orientalists claim that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was not belong to an important and humble family of Makkah. In this regard Margoliouth says, Quraysh were wondered people according to the *Qur'ān* than why a Prophet should be sent to them who was not of noble birth. Another place he mentioned that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) himself rejected the title, 'Master and son of our Master' offered him by some devotee. Margoliouth again stressed, that the meaning of 'Abd al Muṭṭalib is "slave of al- Muṭṭalib" as many historian says. So, the previously 'Abd al Muṭṭalib was a slave and afterward he enrolled himself into the Hashim clan.<sup>88</sup> Watt also adopted Margoliouth's conclusion about the Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) family status without, however, recapitulating the former's arguments that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) did not belong to an aristocratic group of family.<sup>89</sup>

#### 2. *Name*

Many times the opponents of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) have gone the extreme behavior in dealing with the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). Even they did not spare even his person and for a long time Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) had been attributed to the most unbecoming and slanderous names and they create confusion about his name such as "Maphomet" "Bephomet" and "Bafum". All of which are laden with negative meanings. And Muslims were said to be pagans, with Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) being one of the idols that they worship.<sup>90</sup>

The first modern scholar to agitate doubts about it seems to be Aloys Sprenger (1813-1893 C.E.), who claimed that the name of Muḥammad had not been given to him at the time of his birth, his original name was '*Quthām*', but after the migration to Madinah it was subsequently changed to 'Muḥammad'.<sup>91</sup> But Almost simultaneously

with Sprenger, Muir advanced his remarks about the Prophet Muḥammad's (peace be upon him) name. he did not of course refer to the name 'Quthām', but otherwise attempted to create confusion about the name, particularly the name 'Aḥmad'. He suggested that this latter form was adopted by the Muslims and became common in their confrontation with the Christians and Jews because it fell in line with the supposed prophecy about their Prophet in the Bible.<sup>92</sup>

### **3. *Depiction as Imposter and Magician***

Christian scholars of medieval Europe painted Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as an imposter, a lecher, and a man of blood.<sup>93</sup> They thought that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as idol breaker and an enemy of idols, invited people to worship his own golden statue.<sup>94</sup> To denigrate the image of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). Western writers charged him as mentally ill, liar and a fake person who was anti Christ. They depicted him as magician, who used the black magic to compose *Qur'ān*, destroyed churches by magic and cunning and had gotten his success by authorizing promiscuity.<sup>95</sup> Some Orientalists characterized Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as 'first born of Satan', who seduced the Orient with his pestilent doctrines.<sup>96</sup> George Sale expresses his softness towards Islam and Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) by saying that although Muḥammad was a culprit and a fraud man but none can deny his personal qualities that he possessed. He said Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) cleverly forwarded his mission and he was a rigid religious man.<sup>97</sup> Edward Gibbon (1737-1794) characterized Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as curiously designed and artful impostor, who pretended to be the recipient of divine revelation merely in order to facilitate his scheme of personal ambition.<sup>98</sup> Stephens writes about Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) that he was a magician, and confused that he was inspired by God or an evil spirit, he depicted him as a master mind and ambitious to become a Prophet, who planned to use weakness the people of Roman and Persian Empires to establish his new religion.<sup>99</sup> This picture of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) has further elaborated by Maxime Rodinson:

We know very little for certain about this man whose ideas and actions have shaken the world, but, as with Jesus, we may get through the unreliable tales and one-sided traditions, a glimpse of something that is

the echo of a remarkable personality which astonished the ordinary men who gathered around it. It is this echo, as I believe I have glimpsed it, that I have tried to capture in this book. The picture is not a simple one. It is neither the satanic monster of some nor the best of all created things of others, neither the cold-blooded imposter, nor the political theorist, nor the mystic wholly in love with God. If we have understood him rightly, Muḥammad was a complex man, full of contradictions.” He was fond of his pleasures, yet indulged in bouts of asceticism. He was often compassionate, yet sometimes cruel. He was a believer consumed with the love and fear of God, and a politician ready for any expedient. Without any gift of eloquence in ordinary life, he was able for a short period to produce, from his unconscious, phrases of disturbing poetic quality. He was cool and nervous, brave and timid, a mixture of cunning and frankness, forgiving and at the same time capable of terrible vindictiveness, proud and humble, chaste and sensual, intelligent and, in certain things, oddly stupid. But, there was a power in him which, with the help of circumstances, was to make him one of the rare men who have turned the world upside down.<sup>100</sup>

Maxime Rodinson’s criticism on Islam and its Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) is mainly about the compilation of *Qur’ān* and *ḥadīth*, revelation, polygamy and *Jihād*. He objects on the *sīrah* of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him), he said it has been written one hundred and twenty years after the death of the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). One can answer it, is it possible that one and a sole companion of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) can remain in touch with him all the time and do write the every nick and corner of his life span’s details, so it was only possible after the death of the Prophet (peace be upon him) as many people observed different aspects of his life.<sup>101</sup>

#### **4. Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) worshipped by Muslims**

Some Orientalists blame that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was worshipped by his followers. Margoliouth says, about him, “Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) inherited the devotion and adulation which had hitherto been

bestowed on the idol and, though he never permitted the worship to be used of the ceremonies of which he was the object, here long he became hedged with a state which differed little from that which surrounded a god.”<sup>102</sup>

The allegation is totally wrong and unfounded. The fact was that the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) forbade the Muslims to do anything which smacked of worship. ‘Umar reports that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as saying, “Do not eulogies me as the Christians eulogies the son of Mary. I am just His servant, so say, God’s servant and messenger.”<sup>103</sup>

Could humility go further? If the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) wanted, he could assume many titles but till the last day of his life, he preferred to be called by the simple name, “Muḥammad, the messenger of God.” If the Prophet had been worshipped by the Muslims, he would not have permitted his Companions to gain easy excess to him. But he was easily accessible at all times. He did not even like the Muslims to be called his followers. Therefore, he preferred to call them by the titles of ‘Companions’. He was so easy of access to the humblest of men and treated them on a footing of such perfect equality that according to Anas, one of the maid servants to the people of Madinah would hold God’s messenger by the hand and take him whenever she wished.<sup>104</sup> So, the allegation is stupidity that the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was worshipped.

Apart from all above accusations, critics of Islam also misinterpreted and misquoted many other aspects and events related to the life of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). Margoliouth in his book “*Muḥammad and the rise of Islam*” wrote that Quraysh were glad to get rid from Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) and his Companions by their migration to Madinah, and Quraysh leaders were congratulating themselves on being rid of Muslims without bloodshed.<sup>105</sup> This is far from truth, the reaction of the people of Makkah was different they were astonished to know that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) has left the Makkah because they had planned to murder Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him), they pursued him and reached the “cave of *Thawr*” where Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) hiding with Ḥaḍrat Abu Bakr,<sup>106</sup> when they failed to search him they announced amount of reward hundred camels for whom, who brought prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him), when Suraqā b. Ja’sham heard about this reward he pursued



Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) and Ḥaḍrat Abu Bakr and reached very near to both of them but had failed to brought them. Even after reaching at Madinah Quraysh pursued to Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him), and had written a letter to ‘Abdullah b. ‘Ubayy in which they said “do not give refuge to our man in Madinah expel him or kill him. We swear of God otherwise we would attack you and after exterminated you we shall lay hands on your females. The whole event shows that the Quraysh were far from being glad to get rid of the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him).<sup>107</sup>

Montgomery Watt claimed that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) has not an important place in the “Constitution of Madinah”<sup>108</sup> and said that the present document might belong to the period after the elimination of Banu Quryzah.<sup>109</sup>

After the elimination of Banu Qurayza Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was an undisputed ruler over Madinah. His enemies from Makkah and their supporters among the Arabs had been defeated in the battle of ditch. Banu Qainuqa, Banu Naḍir had fled from Madinah and Banu Qurayza had been completely exterminated. No one, then, might dispute authority with the Prophet at Madinah. A document written at this time could hardly have given an insignificant place to the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). The document clearly mentioned that all the disputes in Madinah will be referred to the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him). Now we can conclude that what significance prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) has in the “Constitution of Madinah”. On the other hand Watt says Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) provoked Quraysh from the very beginning of his emigration to Madinah, which shows that Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) was firmly established at Madinah, otherwise how could, he have dared to provoke the potent Quraysh, when his position at Madinah was so insignificant? Truth is that the “Constitution of Madinah” gave an important and central place to the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) as the head of Emigrants and Helpers and recognized him as a Prophet.<sup>110</sup>

Aḥmed Gunny stated that: “For more than ten centuries Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) continued to suffer at the hands of Western intellectuals all the disrespect that they were capable of inflicting on him, and very few writers were willing to remove the stigma that was attached to his name.”<sup>111</sup>

## References

---

- 1 M. Ayoub, Mahmoud, *Islam Faith and History*, England, 2006, pp. 9-10
- 2 El Affendi, Abdelwahab (ed.), *About Muhammad: The Other Western Perspective on the Prophet of Islam*, UK, 2010, p. xv
- 3 *Ibid*, p. xv
- 4 Zafar Ali Qureshi, Reason for Orientalists Hostility towards prophet Muhammad  
<http://hamditabligh.saylitech.com/pdf/ReasonForOrientalistsHostilityTowardsProphetMuhammad.pdf> 20/March/2016
- 5 Asad, Muhammad, *Islam at the Crossroads*, Delhi, 1934, pp. 64-65
- 6 M. Kitagawa, Joseph, *Religions of the East*, USA, 1976, p. 222
- 7 Nadwi, Abul Hasan 'Alī, *Islamic Studies, Orientalists and Muslim Scholars*, Lucknow, 1983, pp. 9-10
- 8 Daniel, Norman, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*, England, 1960, p. 13, see also Southern R. W., *Western Views of Islam in The Middle Ages*, London, 1962, p.38
- 9 *Ibid*, Southern R. W., p. 60
- 10 *Ibid*, p. 62
- 11 T. A. Yusuf (ed.), *Islamic Studies and Orientalism*, Nigeria, 2012, p. 34, see also Syed Amer Safir (ed.), *The Review of Religions*, Vol-107, November 2012, Issue-11, p. 98
- 12 Hourani, Albert, *Islam in European Thought (Lectures)*, England (Cambridge University), 1989, p. 226
- 13 A. L. Tibawi, English Speaking Orientalists (First Part), Elmer H. Douglas (ed.), *The Muslim World: A Quarterly Journal of Islamic Studies and of Christian Interpretation Among Muslims*, Vol-53, July 1963, Issue--3, USA, p. 185
- 14 G. E. Morrison, *The Christian Approach to the Muslims*, Edinburgh, London, 1959, p. 15
- 15 T. A. Yusuf, *op. cit.*, p. 14
- 16 Sayyed Hussein Nasr, *Muhammad: Prophet of Islam*

---

<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/396226/Muhammad/251806/The-image-of-Muhammad-in-the-West> 26/June/2015

- 17 Şiddiqi, Mazheruddin, The Holy Prophet and the Orientalists, Muḥammad Khalid Masūd (ed.), *Islamic Studies: Quarterly Journal of the Islamic Research Institute*, Islamabad (Pakistan), Vol-xix, Autumn: 1980, No: 3, p.143
- 18 Mohar ‘Alī, Muḥammad, *Sīrat-al-Nabi and the Orientalists*, Vol-1(A), Madinah, 1997, p. 131
- 19 *Ibid*, p. 401
- 20 Jamal al Din Zarabozo, The Miraculous Quran  
<http://www.islamreligion.com/article/529/miraculousquran-part-2/>  
12/March/2007
- 21 ‘Alī, ‘Abdul, *Insight into Islamic Humanism: A Comprehensive Approach*, New Delhi, 2007, p. 3
- 22 Mohar ‘Alī, Muḥammad, *op. cit.*, p. 233
- 23 Muir, William, *The Life of Mahomet*, 3rd edition, Edinburgh, 1923, pp. 35-41
- 24 Watt, W. Montgomery, *Muhammad at Medina*, Oxford, 1956, pp. 200-201
- 25 Şiddiqi, Mazheruddin, *op. cit.*, p. 156
- 26 Watt, W. Montgomery, *Muhammad: Prophet and Statesman*, Britain (Oxford University Press), 1961, p. 198
- 27 *Ibid*, p. 199
- 28 Watt, W. Montgomery, *Muhammad at Medina*, *op. cit.*, p. 307
- 29 Şiddiqi, Mazheruddin, *op. cit.*, p. 157
- 30 Mohar ‘Alī, Muḥammad, *op. cit.*, p. 158
- 31 Şiddiqi, Mazheruddin, *op. cit.*, p. 146
- 32 Rodinson, Maxime, *Mohammad*, Anne Carter (tr.), London, 1968, p. 79
- 33 Ibn Ishāq, *Sīrat Rasul Allah*, Al Guillaume (tr.), London, 1955, pp. 71-72
- 34 Bell, Richard, *Introduction to the Koran*, Edinburgh, 1953, p. 30
- 35 ‘Alīm, Dr. ‘Abdul, *Sīrat-e-Nabwi aur Mustashreqīn*, Lucknow, 2000, p. 42
- 36 Muir, William, *The Life of Mahomet*, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-47
- 37 Al Anşari Al Qaderi, Dr. Muḥammad Faḍl ur Raḥmān, *Islam and Christianity in the Modern World*, 2nd edition, Karachi (Pakistan), 1976, pp. 6-8

- 
- 38 T. A. Yusuf, *op. cit.*, p. 18
- 39 Stephens, William Richard Wood, *Christianity and Islam: The Bible and the Koran*, London, 1877, pp. 17-18
- 40 T. A. Yusuf, *op. cit.*, p. 18
- 41 Muir, William, *The Mohammedan Controversy*, Edinburgh, 1897, pp. 105-06
- 42 Şiddiqi, Mazheruddin, *op. cit.*, p. 145
- 43 ‘Alīm, Dr. ‘Abdul, *op. cit.*, p. 43
- 44 Muir, William, *The Life of Mahomet*, *op. cit.*, p. 514
- 45 *Ibid*, pp. 46-47
- 46 Şiddiqi, Mazheruddin, *op. cit.*, p. 158
- 47 ‘Alīm, Dr. ‘Abdul, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-47
- 48 Şiddiqi, Mazheruddin, *op. cit.*, p. 151
- 49 Muir, William, *The Life of Mahomet*, *op. cit.*, pp. 165-78
- 50 Lewis, Bernard, *The Crises of Islam: Holy War and Un Holy Terror*, London, 2003, pp. 25-26
- 51 Lewis, Bernard, *What Went Wrong?*, Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. 98-99
- 52 St. Clair, Tisdall William, *The Religion of Crescent: or Islam: Its Strength, Its Weakness, Its Origin, Its Influence (Lectures)*, London (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), 1895, p. 177
- 53 Stephens, William Richard Wood, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-42
- 54 *Ibid*, p. 36
- 55 Şiddiqi, Mazheruddin, *op. cit.*, p. 152
- 56 James Robson (tr.), *Mishkāt al Masabih*, Vol-3, Lahore, 1964, p. 890
- 57 *Ibid*, Vol-4, p. 1310
- 58 Şiddiqi, Mazheruddin, *op. cit.*, p. 153
- 59 Husain, Aṭhar, *Prophet Muhammad and His Mission*, Bombay, (India), 1967, p. ix
- 60 Watt, W. Montgomery, *Muhammad at Medina*, *op. cit.*, p. 4
- 61 *Ibid*, p. 231
- 62 Muir, William, *The Life of Mahomet*, *op. cit.*, p. 211

- 
- 63 Smith, Bosworth, *Mohammed Mohammedanism*, 2nd edition, p. 137
- 64 M. Kitagawa, Joseph, *op. cit.*, pp. 234-35
- 65 Lewis, Bernard, *The Arabs in History*, London, 1964
- 66 Lewis, Bernard, *What Went Wrong?*, *op. cit.*
- 67 Lewis, Bernard, *The Crises of Islam: Holy War and Un Holy Terror*, *op. cit.*
- 68 Lewis, Bernard, *The Arabs in History*, *op. cit.*, p. 44
- 69 Rodinson, Maxime, *op. cit.*, pp. 151-55
- 70 Dawkins, Richard, *God Delusion*, Boston (Houghton Mifflin Company), 2006, p. 37
- 71 Harris, Sam, *End of Faith*, New York (W. W. Norton & Company), 2004, pp. 30-34
- 72 Spencer, Robert, *Truth About Muhammad*, Washington D.C. (Regnery Publication), 2006, p. 177
- 73 *Ibid*, pp. 108-09
- 74 M. Kitagawa, Joseph, *op. cit.*, p. 56
- 75 ‘Alī, ‘Abdul, *op. cit.*, p. 9
- 76 Sarwar, Ḥafīẓ Ghulam, *Origin and Development of Islam*, New Delhi, 1988, p. 495
- 77 Margoliouth, David Samuel, *Muhammad and the Rise of Islam*, 3rd edition, London, 1905, p. 176
- 78 Şiddiqi, Mazheruddin, *op. cit.*, p. 163
- 79 Sabeel Ahmad, Prophet Muhammad and Aisha Siddiqa  
[http://www.themodernreligion.com/prophet/prophet\\_aisha.htm](http://www.themodernreligion.com/prophet/prophet_aisha.htm)
- 80 Aḥmad, Ḥazrat Mirza Bashir, The Life and Character of the Seal of Prophets, Syed Amer Safir (ed.), *The Review of Religions*, Vol-107, Issue: 11, November 2012 p. 122
- 81 Ibn Hishām, Abu Muḥammad Abdul Malik, *As Sīratun Nabawiyyah*, Lebanon (Beirut), 1st edition, 2001, p. 891
- 82 Aḥmad, Ḥazrat Mirza Bashir, *op. cit.*, p. 121
- 83 Ibn Sa‘d, Muḥammad, *At Ṭabaqāt al Kubra*, Vol-8, 1st edition, Lebanon (Beirut), 1996, p. 283

- 
- 84 Resit Haylamaz, At what age did Aisha marry the Prophet? Fountain Magazine, Issue-69, May-June 2009  
<http://www.fountainmagazine.com/issue/detail/At-What-Age-Did-Aisha-Marry-the-Prophet>
- 85 B. Norton, Peter & Others, *The New Encyclopaedia of Britannica*, 15th edition, Vol-12, 1994, p. 609
- 86 Ḥusayn Haykal, Muḥammad, *The Life of Muhammad*, Isma‘īl Ragi A. al Faruqi (tr.), North America, 1976, p. 287
- 87 Watt, W. Montgomery, *Muhammad at Medina*, *op. cit.*, p. 331
- 88 Mohar ‘Alī, Muḥammad, *op. cit.*, pp. 131-32
- 89 Watt, W. Montgomery, *Mohammad at Mecca*, London (Oxford press), 1988, p. 49
- 90 Hilal Gorgun, The Orientalist view of Prophet Muḥammad  
<http://www.lastprophet.info/the-orientalist-view-of-prophet-Muhammad>  
17/June/2013, see also ‘Alī, ‘Abdul, *op. cit.*, p. 4
- 91 Hafiz, Ahmed Yar, *Sirat-e-Tayyaba*, Lahore (Islamic Publications), 1989, p.18
- 92 Mohar ‘Alī, Muḥammad, *op. cit.*, pp. 142-43
- 93 *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, *op. cit.*, p. 609
- 94 Majeed ‘Abdul, *The Last Prophet and His Teachings*, Delhi, 1988, p. 18
- 95 Southern, R. W. *Western Views of Islam in The Middle Ages*, London, 1962, p. 31
- 96 Daniel, Normanl, *op. cit.*, p. 210
- 97 Hussain, Aṭhar, Qur’ān aur Mustashreqīn, Sayyed Sabahuddin ‘Abdul Raḥmān, *Islam aur Mustashreqīn*, Vol-2, Issue: 157, Azamgarh (Darul Musannefīn), 1986, No: 157, p. 107
- 98 Stephens, William Richard Wood, *op. cit.*, p. 3
- 99 *Ibid*, p. 14
- 100 Rodinson, Maxime, *op. cit.*, p. 313
- 101 Ḥafiz, Aḥmed Yar, *op. cit.*, p. 39
- 102 Margoliouth, David Samuel, *op. cit.*, p. 216
- 103 *Mishkāt al Masabih*, Vol-3, p. 1021

- 
- 104 *Ibid*, p. 1246
- 105 Margoliouth, David Samuel, *op. cit.*, pp. 211-12
- 106 Prof. K. ‘Alī, *A Study of Islamic History*, Delhi, 1950, p. 38
- 107 Nu‘mani, Shibli, *Sīrat-a- Nabi*, Vol-1, Azamgarh (Darul Muṣannefīn), 2003, p. 196
- 108 Watt, W. Montgomery, *Muhammad at Medina*, *op. cit.*, p. 227
- 109 *Ibid*, p. 322
- 110 Şiddiqi, Mazheruddin, *op. cit.*, p. 154
- 111 Gunny, Aḥmed., *The Prophet Muhammad in French and English Literature, 1650 to the Present*, UK (The Islamic Foundation), 2010, p. 207