

PROCEEDING INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ISLAMIC EDUCATION (ICIED)
 "INNOVATIONS, APPROACHES, CHALLENGES, AND THE FUTURE"
 FAKULTAS ILMU TARBIYAH DAN KEGURUAN
 UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI (UIN) MAULANA MALIK IBRAHIM MALANG
 23-24 OF NOVEMBER, 2017
 p. ISSN 2477-3638 e. ISSN 2613-9804
 VOLUME: 2 YEAR 2017

**"STUDYING THE "OTHER": CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS OF MUSLIM SCHOLARSHIP
 IN SOUTHEAST ASIA"**

Ahmad F. Yousif

Sultan Sharif Ali Islamic University
 Spg. 347, Jalan Pasar Baharu, Gadong, BE1310, Negara Brunei Darussalam
 Phone number: Cell: (673) 835-9099; Fax: (673) 246-2233
 ahmad.yousif@unissa.edu.bn

Abstract. In institutions of higher learning in the Muslim world, in contrast to similar institutions in Western countries, scant attention is paid to the field of religious studies (comparative religion). This, however, was not always the case. Between the ninth and twelfth centuries, Islamic civilization witnessed the rise—and also eclipse—of the discipline of *‘Ilm al-Milal wal n-Nihal* (literally, “knowledge of religious groups and sects”). As in the early Islamic era, today Muslims scholars and students face several challenges in their study of world religions. Some of these challenges are common to Muslim and Western intellectuals on the subject, while others are peculiar to Muslim scholarship. They range from the challenge of defining and delimiting the field to those associated with methodology. This presentation examines some of these challenges, drawing upon classical Islamic heritage, experience of Western comparativists, and works of modern Muslim scholars in the field. It will deal with the question: *Why do Muslim scholars need to make a serious study of major world religions?* Interestingly, some Muslims are opposed to such an intellectual exercise, arguing that it will do more harm than good. It is, therefore, necessary to ask again: *What led Muslim scholars, especially in the past, to study world religions.*

Keywords: Study; Muslim Scholars; World Religions

A. INTRODUCTION

Between the third/ninth and sixth/twelfth centuries, Islamic civilization witnessed the rise—and also eclipse—of the discipline of *‘Ilm al-Milal wal n-Nihal* (literally, “knowledge of religious groups and sects”). According to Ismail Raji al-Faruqi, interest in learning about other faiths and in interreligious debate and discussion during this period was so high that these areas became subjects of “salon conversation” and a “public past-time” (Ismail Raji, 1991).

Among the works written during the heyday of comparative religious studies in Islamic history are: *Ar-Radd ‘ala n-Nasara* (“Refutation of the Christians”) by ‘Umar b. Bahr al-Jahiz (d. 255/869), *Al-Farq bayna l-Firq* (“Differences among Muslim Groups”) by ‘Abd al-Qahir b. Tahir al-Baghdadi (d. 429/1038), *Al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa al-Nihal* (“Decisive Treatise on Religious Sects and Divisions”) by ‘Ali b. Ahmad b. Hazm (d. 456/1064), *Al-Radd al-Jamil li Uluhiyyat Isa bi-Sarih al-Injil* (“Proper Refutation of the Divinity of Jesus with Clear Evidence from the Bible”) by Abu Hamid al-Ghazali (d. 505/1112), and *al-Milal wa al-Nihal* (“Religious Sects and Divisions”) by Abu l-Fath ash-Shahrastani (d. 548/1154). Mention may also be made of such writers as Muhammad b. Jarir at-Tabari (d. 313/926), who wrote about the religion of the Persians; Abu l-Hasan al-Mas‘udi (d. 346/958), who wrote two books on Judaism, Christianity,

and the religions of India; al-Qadi 'Abd al-Jabbar (d. 415/1025), who devoted part of *Al-Mughni* to Muslim sects and to religions other than Islam; and Abu Rayhan al-Biruni (d. 440/1053), who wrote about religion in India and Persia.

After a lapse of about six to seven centuries, there is, today, renewed interest among Muslims in studying other religions and faiths. Notable works in this connection are: Faruqi's *Christian Ethics, Trialogue of the Abrahamic Faiths, and Islam and Other Faiths*; Ahmad Shalabi's four-volume *Muqaranat al-Adyan* ("Comparative Study of Religions"); Taha al-Hashimi's *Tara'ik al-Adyan wa Falsafatuha* ("Religions: Their History and Philosophies"); Muhammad Abu Zahrah's *Muhadarat fi n-Nasraniyyah* ("Lectures on Christianity"); Muhammad 'Abdallah Daraz's *Ad-Din* ("Religion"); and Sulayman Muzhir's *Qissat ad-Diyanat* ("Story of the Religions").

As in the early Islamic period, today Muslims scholars and students face several challenges in their study of world religions. Some of these challenges are common to Muslim and Western scholarship on the subject, while others are peculiar to Muslim intellectuals. They range from the challenge of defining and delimiting the field to those associated with methodology. This work examines some of these challenges, drawing upon classical Islamic heritage, experience of Western comparativists, and works of modern Muslim scholars in the field. It will deal with the question: *Why do Muslim scholars need to make a serious study of other major world religions?* To be sure, some Muslims are opposed to such an academic exercise, arguing that it will do more harm than good. It is, therefore, necessary to ask what led Muslim scholars, especially in the past, to study other religions.

Muslim's Motivating Factors

Historically, several factors have motivated Muslims to undertake study of other religions:

1. *Qur'anic Injunctions.* For a Muslim, the main impetus for studying other peoples and their faiths comes from the Qur'an itself. Numerous Qur'anic verses urge human beings to reflect and ponder on the world around them. In so doing, Muslims cannot help but notice the diversity of belief professed by people. The Qur'an not only affirms such differences, but also contains a wealth of information about other religions—both revealed and man-made—including Judaism, Christianity, paganism, and idolatry. Though not a textbook on other religions, the Qur'an encourages Muslims to investigate and study religious differences. For example, 49:13 says: "O Mankind! We created you from a single (pair) of a male and female, and made you into nations and tribes, that ye may know each other (not that ye may despise each other)." Exposure to different beliefs often contributes to greater mutual understanding and to collaboration among people of different faiths, reducing hatred and suspicion born of ignorance and prejudice. According to the Qur'an 4:48, God has created differences among human beings as a means of testing the latter: "To each among you have we prescribed a Law and an open way. If Allah had so willed he would have made you a single people, but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: so strive as in a race in all virtues."
2. *Dialogue and Discussion.* The Qur'an stresses the importance of a healthy exchange of ideas among different religious communities: "Invite (all) to the Way of thy Lord with wisdom and beautiful preaching and argue with them in ways that are best and most gracious, for thy Lord knoweth best, who have strayed from His Path and who received guidance" (16:125). The Prophet Muhammad, whom Muslims regard as the living embodiment of the Qur'an, was on several occasions known to have engaged in religious discussion with both Jews and Christians.
3. *Addition to Knowledge.* In the very early Islamic period, Muslims were sometimes surrounded by and had as their neighbors Jews, Christians, Magians, idol-worshippers, as well as star-, sun-, and moon-worshippers. Inspired by the above-quoted and other Qur'anic verses, classical Muslim scholars studied the beliefs of the various groups they encountered. Initially, they focused primarily on differences between Muslims and the

“People of the Book”—that is, the Jews and Christians. With the expansion of the Islamic State, however, they enlarged the scope of their inquiry to include the new religions with which they came in contact, particularly Hinduism. Today, large numbers of Muslims live in multi-religious societies. Muslims who live as a minority religious community in a land or region—as in North America—interact with non-Muslims on a daily basis. On the other hand, sizeable non-Muslim minorities exist in many Muslim majority countries. Furthermore, modern systems of communication and transportation have increased interaction among diverse religious groups. Such interaction inevitably raises the question: Why do people hold the beliefs they do or practice their religion the way they do? While some people may choose to ignore the fact of diversity of belief and to associate with like-minded people only, such an attitude of aloofness is becoming more and more difficult to maintain in a world that is increasingly cosmopolitan.

4. *Truth and Falsehood.* Many classical Muslim scholars were motivated to study religious differences out of a desire to compare “false” religions with Islam—which they regarded as the religion of truth. Frequently, such studies were undertaken with the intention of refuting, either directly or indirectly un-Islamic beliefs or philosophies—especially those that were perceived to have had a deleterious effect on Muslims’ faith. Such refutation was supposed to make Islam intellectually stronger and more attractive to others (Mohammad Rafiudin, 1994:11-12). According to Faruqi, study of other religions should aim at stressing on the commonalities rather than the differences among the religions. He thinks that it is up to the researcher to determine the extent to which the various religious traditions agree with “*Din-al-Fitrah*, the original and first religion” (Ismail Raji, 1967:15-16). Keith Roberts opines that a scientific study of other religions can be beneficial in that it will force one to be rigorous in the search for truth and in that it demands logical coherence in the articulation of faith (Keith A. Robert, 1995:35).
5. *Colonial Powers and Missionary Activities.* Muslim interest in studying other religions peaked in the sixth/twelfth century, declining thereafter. It resurfaced with the arrival of the colonial powers in the Muslim world. Muslims, on the one hand, wished to acquire a sounder understanding of the religion of those who had defeated them—i.e. Christianity—and, on the other, hoped to counteract the work of the Christian missionaries who accompanied the colonial powers. Thus, we notice the appearance of such works as the *Mahomedan Commentary on the Holy Bible*, written by Sayyid Ahmad Khan (d. 1898) (C.W. Troll, 1978); among the later works were those written by Abu Zahrah, Faruqi, and Shalabi. Interestingly, many Orientalist works written during this period were prompted by the desire to gain a better understanding of the mores and practices of the colonized people—with the eventual aim of strengthening administrative and political control over those people.
6. *Affirmation of One’s Religious Identity.* Study of other religions and philosophies may serve to increase one’s own religious identity and commitment. Those who interact with people of different faiths often feel the need and pressure to find out more about their own faith. It is not uncommon for Muslim students in recent times to express the view that it was only after they had traveled overseas to study in non-Muslim countries that they truly came to understand Islam.

Defining the Field

A variety of terms have been used, particularly in the Western scholarly tradition, to designate the field under discussion. They have ranged from “comparative religion” to “religious studies” to “history of religion” (Ismail Raji, 1998:161). But first we will take a brief look at the relevant Qur’anic terminology.

The Qur’an uses three main terms for “religion”: *din*, *millah*, and *ummah*. Although *din* has a number of meanings including “obligation, direction, submission, retribution,” (L. Gardet, 1960) it is frequently used to denote religion in the generic sense of the word (Ghulam Haider

Aasi, 1993). In some cases, it refers to the primordial, monotheistic religion that, being one and the same, has subsisted throughout history. In others, it alludes to one of the false or corrupted forms (for example, polytheism) of a once true religion—a falsehood or corruption that may be regarded as *din* by those who accept it as a true and uncorrupted religion. This latter meaning is evidenced in 109:1–3, 6: “Say: O you who deny the truth! I do not worship that which you worship, and neither do you worship that which I worship . . . Unto you, your moral law (*Dinukum*) and unto me mine.” Commenting on these verses, the classical scholar Qurtubi says that the religion of the infidels has been referred to as a religion (*Din*) because “they believed and adhered to it” (Muhammad Sayed Ahmad, 1994:34)

Millah denotes a religious tradition, a worldview, or a faith (Ghulam Haider Aasi, 1993:226-267). The term implies a system of doctrines, creeds, and rituals that is followed by a group of people regardless of whether, from a social and political standpoint, that group does or does not make up an independent polity.

Ummah refers to a religio-moral and sociopolitical community. Aasi maintains that, although *ummah* sometimes gives “the meaning of a nation, a people, a culture or a civilization, basic to all these groups of people is the idea of one binding religio-moral system of law and values” (Ghulam Haider Aasi, 1993:221)

Islamic tradition does not assign an official name to the study of religious communities and sects. Faruqi says that the discipline was called *‘Ilm al-Milal wal n-Nihal* (Ismail Raji). But there is no scholarly consensus on the term. According to Shalabi, the discipline of comparative religion, which he calls *muqarant al-adyan*, can be traced back to al-Hasan b. Musa an-Nawbakhti’s (d. 202/816) *Ara’ wa-d-Diyanat* (“Opinions and Religions”). On this view, the discipline originated about the same time as a number of other Islamic sciences, including those of *Fiqh*, *Tafsir*, and *Hadith* (Ahmad Shalabi, 1996:31). Shalabi goes on to list a number of reasons for the decline of the discipline in later times. First, since, in Islamic societies, non-Muslims came to occupy high positions in the administrative and political fields, and since many members of the Muslim ruling elite were married to non-Muslim women, comparative works that showed Islam to be superior to other faiths—and the other faiths to be deficient in comparison with Islam—were ill-suited to the political climate of the times. Second, the Crusades, which aimed at wiping out Islam and Muslims by means of the sword, left little hope for religious dialogue and discussion. Third, most of the *fuqaha’* (“jurists”) developed a fanatical loyalty to their own *madhhabs* (“schools”) and had little interest in studying other *madhhabs*, much less other religions. Finally, some scholars refused to acknowledge the existence of other religions and felt that no comparison could be made between them and Islam (Ahmad Shalabi, 1996:32).

In the modern period, the most commonly used Arabic term to describe the discipline of the study of other religions is *Muqaranat al-Adyan*, which is a direct translation of the Western term “comparative religion.” The word *Muqaranah* (“comparison”) may mean *Muwazanah*, *Tashbih*, *Qiyas* (Maghdi Wahba, 1974), or *Muqayasah* (Ahmad F. Yousif, 1998). Generally, however, the word “comparative” in this context refers to comparison of two or more kinds of phenomenon (Munir Ba’ibakki, 1985). It is also used to describe the method whereby likenesses or dissimilarities between two or more items are determined through a simultaneous examination of those items.

Western Scholarship on Comparative Religion

The classic Western definition of “comparative religion” is that offered by Louis H. Jordon in 1905. According to Jordon, comparative religion is,

The science which compares the origin, structure and characteristics of the various religions of the world, with the view of determining their genuine agreements and differences, the measure of relation in which they stand one to another and their relative superiority and inferiority when regarded as types (Eric J. Sharpe, 1975).

In the third quarter of the nineteenth century, the German-British philologist F. Max Müller (1823–1900) extended the comparative approach, which he had used in his philological studies, to the study of religion (Seymour Cain, 1995). Central to this conception of comparative religion was application of the comparative—or scientific—methods to the data supplied by the world's religions, past and present, in order to discover the laws that are operative in the realm of religion. In Germany, however, the newly developed school had a narrower scope, limiting its research to the background of the Old and New Testaments (Eric J. Sharpe, 1975:578-579). The term “comparative religion” remained in use until the end of World War II, even though, by the end of World War I, the discipline had already started to split up into a number of interrelated disciplines, such as history of religion, psychology of religion, sociology of religion, and philosophy of religion (Eric J. Sharpe, 1975). Although initially the main discipline involved collecting, in a dispassionate manner, a massive amount of information about other people's religions, there has been, since World War II, a large-scale direct interaction among persons of diverse faith, both on professional and personal levels (W. C. Smith, 1959:32). This has, in turn, led to a shifting of the focus of study. One result of the shift has been that Western scholars have almost entirely ceased to concern themselves with the “relative superiority or inferiority” of religions. A second outcome is that Western scholarship has almost abandoned the term “comparative religion” (Eric J. Sharpe, 1975), replacing it with a wide variety of terms, which reflect both diversity of thought and methodological uncertainty. One of the more popular of these terms is “religious studies,” which came into existence in the 1960s when there was a period of growth of higher education in the West (Darlene M. Juschka, 1999:86). According to Sharpe, “religious studies attempts to study religion not on the basis of one tradition (or a part of a tradition) only, but “in the round” (Eric J. Sharpe, 1983:10). In his view, religious studies can, at best, reveal the principles on which all religious belief and behavior, viewed from the believer's angle, rests—principles which, once grasped, can be applied in other, separate areas (Eric J. Sharpe, 1983:13).

It seems, however, that the discipline of religious studies began to lose its focus in the 1980s. Its curriculum has increasingly become “a crazy quilt of courses encompassing many disciplines, areas, regions, languages and methods of inquiry” (Thomas L. Benson, :91) at the end of the millennium, Juschka argues that “the discipline of religious studies is seen to be void, empty, [or] whimsical at best. Since it lacks an identity it also lacks cultural capital, and lacking cultural capital its survival in the changing world of the university is uncertain” (Darlene M. Juschka, 1999).

In light of this overview of the historical origins and development of the terms “comparative religion” and “religious studies,” as well as of the status of these disciplines in the West the next question to ask is: Where do Muslim scholars in the field stand in relation to such developments? The chasm between modern Western and Muslim scholarship in the field is very wide. While in the Western academic tradition the discipline appears to be on the wane owing to a lack of direction and focus, in academic institutions in the contemporary Muslim world the field is still in the early stages of revival.

Western historical experience has demonstrated that each new scholarly attempt to define the field is based upon a new understanding not only of the goal of the research to be undertaken, but also of the methodology to be employed in the research. While the term “comparative religion” may have gone out of vogue in Western academic circles, comparison is still a valid method in Islamic intellectual circles. This method is frequently used in the Qur'an, and was also used by early Muslim scholars, particularly the *fuqaha'*, who were known for their use of *qiyas* (“analogical reasoning”). At the same time, some of the assumptions underlying the new term “religious studies” seem to be questionable from an Islamic point of view. The Western religious studies programs are predicated on the assumption that, epistemic certainty being unattainable, no religion has an exclusive claim to truth. On this view, we are left with three possibilities: (1) all religions are equally true; (2) all religions contain bits of truth; (3) none of the religions contain any truth at all. But while the above-stated assumption is in

keeping with modern trends in Western philosophical thought, in which “no form of knowledge can be absolute” and all truth is relative, it would not appeal to a Muslim, since the denial of absolute values in favor of relative ones serves to negate God and the hereafter (Syed Muhammad Naquib, 1995:87).

Having said that, we must add that some of the issues that Western scholars in the field have grappled with must be addressed by Muslims as well. For example: Should study of world religions focus on the external—namely, doctrinal, legal, and social—aspects and manifestations of religion or on the internal—namely, experiential—aspects of religions, or on both? To what extent is it possible for an individual who is committed to a given religious belief to make an objective study of another religion? Should the study of other religions include an evaluative aspect or should it defer evaluation in light of the difficulty in reaching epistemic certainty? Some of these questions will be dealt with in the following sections.

Challenges of Methodology

The classical Greeks, who were critical of popular native religion, were curious about other religious traditions—and, therefore, open to studying them. In their quest for information and truth, they recorded and described what they saw, read, and experienced; they also compared and contrasted the material thus collected with their own tradition and culture (Eric J. Sharpe, 1983). But, according to Sharpe, the Judeo-Christian tradition, in contrast to the Greek, has been exclusivist and intolerant in the matter of religion. In his view, the New Testament exhibits a total lack of objective interest in other religious traditions and virtually rules out even the possibility of an objective study of other religions (Eric J. Sharpe, 1983).

The classical Muslim approach to the subject—insofar as one can speak of one—is in stark contrast to the Judeo-Christian. It is true that Muslim scholars viewed other religions from the perspective of the foundational sources of Islam, the Qur’an and Sunnah. At the same time, however, they felt free to approach the subject from several different angles. In this connection, we will briefly compare the methodologies of three representatives of the classical period—Biruni, Ibn Hazm, and Shahrastani.

Biruni made an extensive and profound study of Hindu civilization, including Hindu religion, philosophy, manners, customs, and scientific achievements. In both *Kitab al-Athar* (Eng. trans. “*The Chronology of Ancient Nations*”) and *Kitab al-Hind* (translated as *Al-Biruni’s India*), Biruni discusses a total of twelve religions and religious communities and then compares their traits with corresponding features in Islamic and other known cultures (Jussi Aro, 1973:319). He makes three types of comparisons: interreligious, intrareligious, and intersectorian (Kamar Oniah Kamurazaman, 1996:107). This enables him to make use of his knowledge of the Greek and Indian philosophical systems to reach conclusions and make observations that would be understood and appreciated by his fellow Muslims. It is noteworthy that Biruni wrote about Hindu doctrine in a completely detached manner. He quoted Hindu sources verbatim at length when he thought they would contribute to elucidating a subject. Biruni himself confirms that his book “is not a polemical one,” and that it is “nothing but a simple historical record of facts”.¹ Biruni was highly successful in describing Hinduism in an objective manner, without identifying himself with the religion.²

Ibn Hazm was the first Muslim comparativist to use a critical analytical approach to study other religions, particularly the Jewish Torah and Christian Gospel (Mahmoud Ali Himaya, 1983:148-149). Although both Christians and Jews continuously rejected his analysis

¹ *Al-Biruni’s India: An Account of the Religion, Philosophy, Geography, Chronology, Astronomy, Custom, Laws and Astrology of India about AD 1030*. Edward C. Sachau, ed., and trans., with notes and indices. (London: Kegan Paul Trench, Trubner & Co., 1910), p. 7. See also, Ahmad F. Yousif, “A Socio-cultural, Religious Analysis of al-Biruni’s Contributions Towards the Study of Science, Mathematics and Philosophy,” in *Cultural and Language Aspects of Science, Mathematics and Technical Education*. M. A. (Ken) Clements and Leong Yong Pak, eds. (Brunei: University Brunei Darussalam, 1999), pp. 18–19.

² *Al-Biruni’s India: An Account of the Religion, Philosophy, Geography, Chronology, Astronomy, Custom, Laws and Astrology of India about AD 1030*, p. xxii.

for almost three-quarters of a millennium, Faruqi states that today some Christians have come to acknowledge the worth of Ibn Hazm's study (Ismail Raji, p. 19). As far as his methodology was concerned, Ibn Hazm would report all the beliefs of the group in question and then critically analyze them with a view to showing their merits and demerits. Using the *Zahirite* methodology, he rejected interpretations of the Old Testament offered by clergymen and Christian theologians, who, he thought, might have committed errors in interpreting that scripture. Ibn Hazm preferred to examine the original texts and arrive at new conclusions, taking an approach similar to that taken by the Protestant Reformers in understanding the Bible (Mahmoud Ali Himayala, p. 178). He would, however, reject the texts if he found contradictions in them.

Shahrastani's *Kitab al-Milal wa al-Nihal* is a virtual short encyclopedia on all the religions, sectarian groups, and supernatural and philosophical systems known at his time (d. 1154). According to Sharpe, Shahrastani has the honor of having written the first ever history of religion. In his view, Shahrastani's work "far outstrips anything which Christian writers were capable of producing at the same period" (Eric J. Sharpe, p. 11). In contrast to Ibn Hazm, who bases his analysis strictly on a study of original and primary sources, Shahrastani does make use of a number of secondary sources—for which he is severely criticized by A. J. Arberry, who remarks that Shahrastani's *Milal* "is little more than a farrago of quotations from older writers, loosely arranged and inconsequently strung together without the slightest acknowledgment" (A. K. Kazi & J. G. Flynn, 1984, p.4). A. K. Kazi and J. G. Flynn, who are less critical of Shahrastani argue that, although Shahrastani draws heavily on Ash'ari's *Maqalat al-Islamiyyin*, he does make use of other sources as well, and often differs considerably from Ash'ari—especially in terms of arrangement of material and classification of the subsects—and gives a fuller account of some of the sects than Asha'ri. Furthermore, Kazi and Flynn point out that Shahrastani's section on the *Isma'iliyyah* seems quite independently written (A. K. Kazi & J. G. Flynn, 1984, p.4). Nevertheless, they admit that Shahrastani rarely mentions his sources, with the exception of Abdallah b. Mahmud al-Ka'bi (d. 319/931) whose name occurs quite frequently.

Unlike Ibn Hazm, Shahrastani does not critically analyze the ideas of the groups he discusses. Generally he reports the views of the sects without elaboration and without comment, though he offers an occasional brief criticism (A. K. Kazi & J. G. Flynn, 1984, p.7). "I have," he says at the beginning of his book, "stated their beliefs as found in their books without favoring them and without attacking or criticizing them" (Muhammad b Abd Karim, p. 14). This approach, however, has not found favor with some Muslim scholars. Mahmoud Ali Himaya, for instance, criticizes Shahrastani for not correcting the mistaken ideas he described. Himaya thinks that the major problem with such an approach is that false ideas may stick in the readers' minds, without these readers knowing whether such ideas are false or wrong. He further says that it is easy to learn about the ideas of another group and report them, but that it is more difficult to respond to the wrong ideas (Mahmoud Ali Himaya, p. 147-148).

This brief review of the differing methodologies of three Muslim scholars has shown that there is no such thing as a single "classical Muslim method" for studying other religions. Both Biruni and Shahrastani preferred to take a descriptive approach, but Biruni obtained his information from first-hand field research, while Shahrastani relied more heavily on secondary sources. Ibn Hazm, on the other hand, preferred the critical analytical approach and relied exclusively on original religious texts, ignoring second-hand commentaries on those texts.

In the modern era, Western scholars have used an increasingly wide variety of methods to study the field. The so-called Orientalist methodology reigned supreme in nineteenth-century Western Europe. The Orientalists treated the religions of the world as "dead-cold data and static external observables in human behaviour or as enemy territory, which must be reconnoitered in order to be conquered with the least possible effort (Ismail Raji, p. 9)." In their view, the ideal scholar was a detached academic who surveyed material impersonally, almost majestically, and subsequently reported on it objectively. This detachment meant that the scholar studied the religion without participating in it (W. C. Smith, pp. 44-45). In addition,

many Orientalists were evolutionists in the sense that they tended to classify religions historically, geographically, and culturally, systematizing them into various “isms,” each a rough equivalent of a biological species (Eric J. Sharpe, pp. 13:84).

One of the shortcomings of the Orientalist methodology is that it failed to recognize that “religion is not a ‘scientific’ fact that can be coldly examined in the manner of a geological or biological sample” (Ismail Raji, p. 3). To be sure, several dimensions of religion are amenable to scientific study, but these may not be religion as such, the heart of a religion consisting of the meaning a religion holds for those who believe in it (W. C. Smith, p. 35).

A second shortcoming is that the great majority of the Orientalist writings were prejudiced by Western—if not strictly Christian—categories of thought and analysis (Ismail Raji, p. 35). Sharpe says that comparisons frequently involved “undue and conventional selectivity, which chose not what is most important in an exotic tradition, but what is accessible and superficially attractive.” In addition, many Western students tended to treat the “other” tradition as a mirror for their own concerns (Ismail Raji, p. 88).

As already mentioned, “comparative religion,” since World War I was broken down into a number of subdisciplines, each with its own methodology or approach. The anthropological approach examines the role of religion in early or traditional societies—particularly the ways in which religious rites and ceremonies bind a community together—the role of a chief or *shaman* in the life of the people, and the function of myth in revealing a tribe’s self-understanding and identity (Richard J. Buchel, 1988, p. 9). Anthropologists are also interested in finding out how society’s religious beliefs and institutions sanction or elicit acceptance of a certain behavior and how these factors assist in making that society integrated and cohesive (James C. Livingston, 1989, p. 29). A favorite method of the anthropologists is that of participant observation, which requires an open, serious, and respectful attitude toward alien ways of life and thought (Seymour Cain, p. 72).

Many of those who used the anthropological approach to study other religions were criticized for being arm-chair scholars, in the sense that their methods were skewed by unreliable data obtained at second hand, by unsifted sources, and by inauthentic comparisons and haphazard synthesis in which bizarre phenomena were focused on, or certain types of examples selected to prove preconceived theories. The latter-day anthropological method—that of undertaking intensive fieldwork—has also been criticized as impressionistic, haphazard, or simply meaningless busywork, while even the technique of “participant observation” has been dismissed as the romantic illusion that one can get an inside view of a foreign culture in a few months or years (Seymour Cain, p. 73).

The sociological approach to other religions focuses on group or social behavior and on the way religion interacts with other dimensions of social experience (James C. Livingston, p. 31). The psychological approach, on the other hand, tends to emphasize the study of such experiences as conversion, prayer, and mystic ecstasy, using such methods as questionnaires, personal interviews, autobiographies, and other empirical data that could be analyzed, classified, and statistically measured ((Seymour Cain, p. 77). The historical approach is concerned with establishing the role that religious experience and ideas play in the lives of individuals and communities, and also with determining how religion influences the development of larger societies, nations, and whole cultures. In reconstructing a religion’s past or by attempting to distinguish historical fact from myth, legend, saga, and religious tradition, the historian draws on a vast range of non-textual sources, including archaeology, numismatics, and geography (James C. Livingston, p. 28).

The phenomenological method attempts to supply the deficiencies of the Orientalist approach and of the reductionism of several of the above-noted approaches. It is designed “to portray each religion in its own terms as a unique expression, as a reality that is not to be reduced. In order to achieve this goal, the phenomenologist must remain detached and impartial. But insightful description and interpretation also requires a genuine feel for, and empathy with, religious experience (James C. Livingston, p. 39). The phenomenologist must

exercise *epoche*, or the suspension of judgment, a state that allows him or her to see through the eyes of those who believe—or of those who are committed (Eric J. Shape, p. 32).

B. Conclusion

This paper has critically examined a number of challenges facing Muslim students and scholars of world religions. It commenced with a discussion of why Muslim scholars in both the past and the present have undertaken investigations of people of different faiths.

Upon examining the issue of “defining the field”, it was shown that the Qur’an employs three different terms to describe religious communities – *din*, *millah* and *ummah*. Accordingly, any study of religious groups or communities should incorporate at least one of the above terms. It was further shown that traditionally, there was never any agreed upon term for the discipline of studying other religions. In the contemporary Muslim scholarship, some such as Faruqi refer to the discipline as *‘ilm al-milal wa al-nihal* (Knowledge of religious groups and sects), thereby incorporating the plural of the word *millah*. The vast majority of present-day Muslim scholars however, employ the term *muqaranat al-adyan*, which is essentially a direct translation of the Western term “comparative religion.” It was argued that although the term “comparative religion” is no longer in vogue in Western academic circles, it can still be considered valid in the Muslim world, since the comparative technique is frequently used in the Qur’an, as well as by the classical Muslim scholars in various fields of study (especially jurisprudence). At the same time, it was also shown that the term “religious studies” which has found favour in Western academic circles since the 1960’s, is not acceptable to Muslims, due to the questionable epistemological foundations upon which it is established.

The next issue this chapter addressed was the challenge of methodology. It was argued that there was no one classical Muslim method of studying other religions. While some scholars preferred a descriptive approach, others preferred to undertake a critical analysis of the religion in question. Moreover, while some scholars preferred to undertake the investigation directly in the field, others preferred to rely on secondary sources. The common thread between these divergent approaches however, is that their perception of reality was derived from the Qur’an and/or the prophetic traditions.

As far as a contemporary methodology for Muslim scholars in the field is concerned, it was argued that there is no one precise “Islamic methodology” per se. Instead, it is incumbent upon Muslim intellectuals to study and investigate different religious beliefs held by people, in a manner which is objective and fair to the people under investigation. In fact, academically, it is unacceptable for Muslim scholars to maliciously attack or downgrade other religions.

Finally, the third issue addressed by this paper was the extent to which a Muslim’s religious commitment affects his or her objectivity when studying other religions. It was argued that every scholar is committed – either consciously or unconsciously – to certain convictions or pre-suppositions about what constitutes reality, rationality or evidence. The key to overcoming any inherent bias is to state one’s fundamental presuppositions from the beginning, rather than keeping them under the claim of being “objective.”

While the issues discussed are hardly an exhaustive list of challenges facing Muslim scholars and students of world religions, they do represent some of the greater difficulties in academia. While some insight has been offered into a scientific methodology of comparative religion, much more work has to be done to further develop and refine such a methodology.

REFERENCES

A. Non-Muslim References

Benson, Thomas L. “Religious Studies as an Academic Discipline,” in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. Mircea Eliade, (ed.). New York: MacMillan Library Reference, 1995, 13:91.

- Bowker, John. *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Bush, Richard C. *The Religious World Communities of Faith*. (2nd ed.). New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1988.
- Cain, Seymour, "History of the Study of Religion," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. Mircea Eliade, (ed-in chief), 16 vols. New York: MacMillan Library Reference, 1987, 13:69.
- Eliade, Mircea, (ed-in-chief). *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. 16 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- Fisher, Mary Pat. *Living Religion*. London: Pearson, 2008.
- Gordon J. Melton and Marin Baumann. (eds.) *Religions of the World, Second Edition: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia of Beliefs and Practices*. 6 vols. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio.e-Book
http://ebooks.abcclio.com/reader.aspx?isbn=9781598842043&id=REW2C_54
- Jeffery, A., "Al-Biruni's Contribution to Comparative Religion," in *Al-Biruni Commemorative Volume*. Hakim Mohammed Said, (ed.). Karachi: Hamdard National Foundation, 1973, 125-159.
- Juschka, Darlene M., "The Construction of Pedagogical Spaces: Religious Studies in the University," *Studies in Religion*. 28, 1 (1999): 85-97.
- Lewis, Bernard, Ch. Pellat, and J. Schacht, (eds.). *The Encyclopedia of Islam*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960.
- Livingston, James C. *Anatomy of the Sacred: An Introduction to Religion*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1989.
- Noss, David S. *A History of the World's Religions*. (12th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, 2008.
- Picart, Bernard. *Encyclopedia of Religious Rites and Ceremonies of All Nations V1*. Delhi: Caxton Publication, 1826, 1992.
- Roberts, Keith A. *Religion in Sociological Perspectiv*. New York: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1995.
- Sharma, Arvind, (ed.). *World's Religions after September 11*. 4 vols. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2008.
- Sharpe, Eric J. *Comparative Religion: A History*. London: Gerald Duckworth and Company, 1975.
- Sharpe, Eric J., "Comparative Religion," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. Mircea Eliade (ed.), 16 vols. New York: MacMillan Library Reference, 1995, 578-579.
- Sharpe, Eric J. *Understanding Religion*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983.
- Smart, Ninian. *Dimensions of the Sacred: An Anatomy of the World's Beliefs*. (1st ed.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999.
- Smith, Huston. *The World's Religions: Our Great Wisdom Traditions*. San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991.
- Smith, W. C., "Comparative Religion: Whither and Why?," in *The History of Religions: Essays in Methodology*. Mircea Eliade and Joseph M. Kitagawa (eds.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Troll, C. W. *Sayyid Ahmad Khan: A Re-Interpretation of Muslim Theology*. Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1978-79.
- Woodhead, Linda, Hiroko Kawanami and Christopher Partridge. *Religions in the Modern World: Traditions and Transformation*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

B) Muslim References

- Aro, Jussi, "Encounter of Cultures in the Work of al-Biruni," in *Al-Biruni Commemorative Volume*. Hakim Mohammed Said, (ed.). Karachi: Hamdard National Foundation, 1973.
- Al-Attas, Syed Muhammad Naquib. *Prolegomena to the Metaphysics of Islam*. Kuala Lumpur: International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization, 1995.

- Al-Biruni's India: An Account of the Religion, Philosophy, Geography, Chronology, Astronomy, Custom, Laws and Astrology of India about AD 1030.* Edward C. Sachau, (ed.), trans., with notes and indices. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1910.
- Al-Faruqi, Ismail Raji. *Christian Ethics*. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967.
- Al-Faruqi, Ismail Raji, (ed.). *Triialogue of the Abrahamic Faiths*. Herndon: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 1991.
- Al-Faruqi, Ismail Raji. *Islam and Other Faiths*. Ataullah Siddiqui (ed.). Leicester, England: The Islamic Foundation, 1998.
- Himaya, Mahmoud Ali. *Ibn Hazm wa-Manhajuhu fi Dirasat al-Adyan*. (Ibn Hazm'a Methodology for Studying Religions. (in Arabic). Cairo: Dar al-Ma'arif, 1983.
- Kamaruzaman, Kamar Oniah. *Early Muslim Scholarship in Religionswissenschaft: A Case Study of the Works and Contributions of Abu Rayhan Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Biruni*. Kuala Lumpur: International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization, 2003.
- Kazi, A. K. and J. G. Flynn, Introduction to Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Karim Shahrastani, *Muslim Sects and Divisions* London: Kegan Paul International, 1984.
- Al-Masir, Muhammad Sayed Ahmad. *Al-Madkhal li-Dirasat al-Adyan* (Introduction to the Study of Religions) (in Arabic). Cairo: Dar at-Tiba'ah al-Muhammadiyah, 1994.
- Muhammad b. Abd al-Karim al-Shahrastani. *Al-Milal wal-Nihal* (Muslim Sects and Divisions). (in Arabic). Abdul Aziz Muhammad al-Wakil. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, n.d.
- Muqim, Mohammad (ed). *Research Methodology in Islamic Perspective*. New Delhi: Institute of Objective Studies, 1994.
- Said, Hakim Mohammed, (ed.). *Essays on Islam*, Felicitation Volume in Honour of Professor W. Montgomery Watt. Karachi: Hamdard Foundation Pakistan, 1993).
- Shalabi, Ahmad. *Muqarant al-Adyan* (Comparative Religions). (in Arabic). 4 vols. Cairo: Maktabat al-Nahdah al-Misriyyah, 1996.
- Yousif, Ahmad F., "Al-Nizam al-Ma'rifi 'inda l-Biruni fi Dirasat al-Adyan" (Al-Biruni's Epistemology for Studying Religions). (in Arabic). Paper presented at the International Seminar on Islamic Epistemology, Amman, Jordan, 1998, 27pp.
- Yousif, Ahmad F., *Studying in World Religions: An Introduction to Monotheistic Traditions*. (2nd ed.). Brunei Darussalam: UNISSA Press, 2017.
- Yousif, Ahmad F., "Studying the "Others": Challenges and Prospects of Muslim Scholarship on World Religions," *Studies in Contemporary Islam*. 2, 1 (2000): 38-59.