

Article

Between Skepticism and Context: Four Methodological Paradigms in Orientalist Qur'anic Scholarship

Mohamad Abdullah Alsaied¹, Abderrazak Ourkia², Asma Omar Ali³, Fatima Mohammed Alameri⁴, Fatima Alketbi⁵

Mohamed bin Zayed University for Humanities, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

¹mohamad.alsaied@mbzuh.ac.ae, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4739-8891>

²abderrazak.ourkia@mbzuh.ac.ae, <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-8599-673X>

³202200018@mbzuh.ac.ae, <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5816-6518>

⁴202300274@mbzuh.ac.ae, <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-6823-0340>

⁵Fatima.alketbi23@outlook.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-4993-0009>

Correspondence: **Fatima Alketbi**, Fatima.alketbi23@outlook.com

Abstract

This study examines the methodologies of Western Orientalism in Qur'anic studies through a critical comparative analysis of four prominent models: John Wansbrough, Andrew Rippin, Arthur Jeffery, and Angelika Neuwirth. These figures represent a spectrum of methodological trends – from Jeffery's lexical-philological approach and Wansbrough's radical historical criticism to Rippin's hermeneutical skepticism and Neuwirth's literary-contextual approach rooted in Late Antiquity. The study adopts a descriptive, analytical, and comparative method by consulting the original works of these scholars and recent studies on the field's methodological transformations. The study addresses three questions: What methodological foundations govern each scholar's reading of the Qur'an? What are the points of agreement and difference among them regarding the text's authority, history, relationship to Islamic exegesis, and prior religious contexts? To what extent can these approaches be assessed as useful scholarly contributions versus hypotheses that exceed the bounds of methodological inference? The study argues that Western Orientalism in Qur'anic studies is not a unified tradition but an internally diverse field, and that judging it monolithically leads to reductive oversimplification. Jeffery's philological contributions, while limited in scope, provide useful textual data. Wansbrough's and Rippin's revisionist hypotheses, though methodologically provocative, often rely on argument from silence and impose biblical source-critical models onto the Qur'an without sufficient regard for its particularity. Neuwirth's approach, by contrast, offers a more text-sensitive paradigm that engages seriously with the Qur'an's oral and liturgical dimensions while situating it within the religious landscape of Late Antiquity. The study concludes by proposing a balanced critical framework for engaging with Orientalist Qur'anic studies, based on distinguishing between the methodological tool and the interpretive result, and between what is suitable for scholarly benefit and what ought to be subjected to review and critique. Such a framework may open the way for a more precise academic dialogue between Arabic Qur'anic studies and modern Western treatments.

Keywords: Orientalism, Qur'anic studies, John Wansbrough, Andrew Rippin, Arthur Jeffery, Angelika Neuwirth, Historical criticism, Textual criticism, Late Antiquity, Methodology

Introduction

Qur'anic studies in the Western context have undergone profound methodological transformations over the past two centuries. They moved from a phase dominated by linguistic and philological attention and lexical comparisons to a more complex phase in which the tools of historical criticism, literary study, discourse analysis, and the approaches of the history of religions became intertwined, and then to more recent trends that seek to move beyond classical Orientalist models toward a "post-Orientalist" horizon. This transformation has made the field of Western Qur'anic studies a highly branched domain that cannot be reduced to a single image or a unified epistemological stance.

Within this context, certain names emerged that had a profound effect on shaping the major questions of this field. John Wansbrough represented a sharp turning point in reading the Qur'an through the employment of biblical criticism and methodological skepticism regarding foundational narratives, whereas Andrew Rippin worked on issues of the Qur'an, tafsir, and the history of its scholarly reading, offering a treatment more closely tied to the history of interpretation and questions of method within the field of religious studies. Arthur Jeffery, for his part, was a prominent example of the philological tendency that sought to explain some Qur'anic vocabulary in light of linguistic borrowing and prior or neighboring cultural influences. Angelika Neuwirth, meanwhile, advanced a relatively different approach, seeing the Qur'an as an active text within the horizon of Late Antiquity and emphasizing the importance of analyzing its literary structure and discourse within its broader historical and cultural context.

The importance of this topic arises from the fact that many Arabic writings deal with "Qur'anic Orientalism" as though it were a homogeneous, solid block, whereas close examination reveals major differences among its leading figures in their premises, tools, and conclusions. Likewise, many defensive studies remain at the level of general rebuttal, without any real deconstruction of the methodological structure of each model individually, and without highlighting what may be scientifically beneficial and what should be critiqued or surpassed. Hence, the need for a critical comparative study that addresses selected models representing different trends within the field itself, so that the evaluation may be grounded in scientific analysis of the original texts and methodological positions, rather than in general impressions or preconceived judgments.

Accordingly, this study does not aim merely to present the positions of Wansbrough, Rippin, Jeffery, and Neuwirth. Rather, it seeks to analyze the epistemic backgrounds that governed their readings, clarify their points of convergence and divergence, and then present a critical assessment that balances the value of the research tools they offered against their procedural and epistemological limits. In this way, the study seeks to contribute to building a more coherent Arab approach to the study of Western Orientalism in the field of Qur'anic studies—an approach that benefits from the achievements of contemporary scholarship without falling into either uncritical acceptance or emotional rejection.

Research Gap

Despite the extensive body of scholarship addressing Western Orientalism in Qur'anic studies, most of these studies have moved either toward a general presentation of Orientalists' views of the Noble Qur'an or toward an overall critique of their conclusions, without constructing a precise methodological comparison among influential Western models according to the differences in their epistemic and procedural tools. Arabic studies, moreover, have not—within the limits of what could be consulted—devoted a critical comparative treatment that brings together Jeffery, Wansbrough, Rippin, and Neuwirth as representatives of four distinct methodological trends within the field itself: the philological, the historical-critical, the interpretive, and the literary-contextual. In addition to this, there is an absence of the voices of contemporary Arab scholars specializing in the critique of Orientalist Qur'anic methodologies, whose contributions have not been methodically employed in this comparison, including the efforts of those who have offered original, systematic critical perspectives in confronting this field of knowledge. Hence, this study

comes to fill this gap by analyzing these models through a critical comparative lens that focuses on the structure of method and its effect on results, not merely on the final outputs, while also bringing the Arab critical voice into this epistemic dialogue.

The Governing Methodological Frameworks of Western Orientalist Studies in the Field of the Qur'an

The methodologies of Western Orientalism in Qur'anic studies cannot be understood merely by looking at their conclusions, because the result in this field is directly tied to the tool that produced it. The Orientalist who approaches the Qur'an as historical linguistic material will raise questions fundamentally different from those of one who deals with it as a text formed in a long religious polemical context, or one who reads it through the history of its interpretation, or one who places it within the cultural sphere of Late Antiquity. Therefore, the most appropriate entrance to these models is a methodological one before it is a judgmental one, for through it the epistemic backgrounds that produced the various conceptions of the Qur'an, its history, its structure, and its function become clear. This view is supported by recent literature in the field, which affirms that "Qur'anic studies" is not a single method but a pluralistic space of tools, questions, and assumptions.

From this perspective, this section proceeds from the hypothesis that the four selected models do not merely represent prominent names, but rather four modes of methodological operation within the field of Western Qur'anic studies: the philological mode in Arthur Jeffery, the historical-critical mode in John Wansbrough, the mode linked to the history of interpretation in Andrew Rippin, and the literary-contextual mode in Angelika Neuwirth. Thus, the comparison among them becomes a comparison between ways of constructing knowledge, not between scattered positions lacking any common framework.

The Methodological Shift in Western Qur'anic Studies from Philology to Historical Criticism and Then to Contextual Literary Reading

This subsection addresses the emergence of Western studies of the Qur'an and their shift from a concern with wording, vocabulary, and linguistic comparisons to historical questions related to origin, codification, and context, while highlighting the impact of biblical criticism and comparative studies of religion on this transformation. Jeffery may be taken here as a clear example of the philological tendency, and Wansbrough as an example of radical historical criticism.

Broad sectors of early Western studies of the Qur'an began with a clear interest in language, vocabulary, linguistic borrowing, and lexical relations between Arabic and other Semitic or neighboring languages. This tendency appears clearly in the works of Arthur Jeffery, particularly in his book *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, where his effort focused on tracing words he believed to have non-Arabic origins or to have entered Arabic through earlier cultural and linguistic contacts.¹

This indicates that the central question in this phase was not: How was the text historically formed? Rather, it was: What is its linguistic and cultural background?

Yet the field did not remain confined to this philological tendency. It later developed toward more radical questions related to the history of the text, its formation, and the

¹ Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, pp: vii-viii; 1-2.

degree of trust that can be placed in early Islamic narratives concerning its collection and interpretation.

John Wansbrough is among the most important figures who pushed this transformation to its furthest point in his book *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*, in which he proposed a reading that deals with the Qur'anic text within the horizon of an extended interpretive and sectarian debate, rather than treating it as a text that historically completed its formation in the manner described by traditional Islamic narratives. His work has been regarded as a major turning point in Western Qur'anic studies because it shifted the center of gravity from the linguistic question to the historical-critical one.²

Then another more complex path emerged, one that neither confines itself to strict historicism nor remains at the level of philology, but instead focuses on how the understanding of the Qur'an was formed through the heritage of interpretation. Andrew Rippin clearly represents this path. His works show that the study of the Qur'an in the Western field is inseparable from the study of its interpretive history, and that interpreting the text in the Islamic tradition is not merely a secondary body of material, but part of the history of the formation of its meaning and its scholarly and religious reception. The presentation of his book *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition* indicates that it addresses the principles and problems related to the study of the Qur'an within the framework of religious studies, as well as the history and diversity of interpretation.³

In recent decades, another trend has emerged, especially associated with the name of Angelika Neuwirth. It is based on situating the Qur'an within the horizon of Late Antiquity, with special attention to the literary and rhetorical structure of the text. The presentation of her book *The Qur'an and Late Antiquity: A Shared Heritage* shows that her approach offers a new entrance to understanding the foundational text of Islam, and that it objects to limiting oneself to traditional interpretation isolated from the broader cultural sphere. Her recent studies also reveal her insistence on reading the Qur'an as interacting with intellectual, theological, and literary discussions that were present in that era, not as a text merely dependent upon them or copied from them.⁴

Thus, it may be said that methodological development in Western Qur'anic studies passed, in broad terms, through three major movements: a linguistic-philological movement⁵, then a historical-critical movement⁶, and then a literary-contextual movement more conscious of textual structure and the civilizational space of Late Antiquity. This does not mean that these movements succeeded one another in a rigid sequence or that each later one abolished the former.⁷

Rather, more accurately, they are overlapping methodological layers, some of which continued within the field, while others were reformulated through new means.

² John Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*, pp: xii,xiv, xv, xvi, xvii ,xviii.

³ Andrew Rippin, *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*,p:xvii

⁴ Angelika Neuwirth, *The Qur'an and Late Antiquity*,pp:ix,x,xi.

⁵ Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, pp: vii-viii; 1-2.

⁶ John Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*, pp: xii,xiv, xv, xvi, xvii ,xviii.

⁷ Angelika Neuwirth, *The Qur'an and Late Antiquity*,pp:ix,x,xi.

The Philological Approach of Arthur Jeffery and the Historical-Critical Approach of John Wansbrough

Arthur Jeffery represents an influential phase in the formation of linguistic Qur'anic Orientalism, because his attention was directed primarily toward Qur'anic vocabulary in terms of its linguistic origins, pathways of transmission, and possible relations to neighboring languages and cultures. The very title of his most famous work, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, is sufficient to indicate that the priority of research for him was lexical-philological above all else. Jeffery, therefore, does not begin by deconstructing the historical structure of the early Islamic narrative so much as by analyzing words, derivations, and assumptions, along with what follows from that regarding the conception of the Qur'an as a text that can be studied through the linguistic and cultural networks surrounding it.⁸

The importance of this method lies in the fact that it expanded the scope of research into the linguistic backgrounds of the Qur'an and drew attention to the necessity of distinguishing between pure Arabic and Arabic as it interacted within the wider Semitic environment.⁹

However, this path was also subjected to broad criticism, because some of its conclusions were based on expansive assumptions about linguistic borrowing, and because the mere existence of lexical or semantic resemblance is not always sufficient to prove a decisive derivational or historical relationship¹⁰. Nevertheless, Jeffery remains important in any comparative study because he clearly represents the philological question that constituted one of the earliest Western entrances to the study of the Qur'an.

John Wansbrough, by contrast, represents a sharp transition from philology to radical historical criticism. What matters for him is not only whether Qur'anic vocabulary is of Arabic or non-Arabic origin, but how the text itself was formed, in what interpretive and polemical context it took shape, and to what extent later Islamic narratives can be trusted in reconstructing this history. The material of his book, *Quranic Studies*¹¹, as well as Andrew Rippin's reading of his methodology, shows that Wansbrough employed tools close to biblical criticism and worked on the Qur'an as a text that entered into an extended process of formation and interpretation, rather than as a document whose meaning or history was simply closed.¹²

From a comparative perspective, the difference between Jeffery and Wansbrough is substantial, not merely formal. Jeffery often asks: Where did the word come from? What is its linguistic history?¹³

Wansbrough, on the other hand, asks: How was the text formed? What was the nature of the polemical environment that produced its current form? What is the value of later Islamic reports in explaining their emergence?¹⁴

This means that the comparison between them is not a comparison between two degrees of the same method, but between two different structures in conceiving the text as an object of

⁸ Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, pp: 1-2.

⁹ Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, pp:5-8

¹⁰ Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, pp:10-11

¹¹ John Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*, pp: xii- xiv-xvi.

¹² Andrew Rippin, *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, p: II/151.

¹³ Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, pp:1-2

¹⁴ John Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*, pp: xvi.

study: the first sees the text as historical linguistic material, while the second sees it as a textual-historical construction that requires questioning at the level of its very formation.

Moreover, Wansbrough's influence in the field did not stop at his direct theses; it extended to raising the question of method itself: Should the earliest Islamic texts be studied with tools derived from biblical studies and historical criticism? And does this methodological expansion open a new horizon for research, or does it burden the Qur'anic text with hypotheses external to the specific conditions of its own formation? These are the questions that made Wansbrough a central name in any methodological map of Western Qur'anic studies, whether one agrees with his conclusions or not.¹⁵

The Interpretive Approach of Andrew Rippin and the Literary-Historical Approach of Angelika Neuwirth

Andrew Rippin represents a distinctive trend within Western Qur'anic studies. He did not primarily devote himself to tracing the linguistic origins of Qur'anic vocabulary in the manner of Arthur Jeffery,¹⁶ nor did he make radical skepticism about the history of the text's formation the axis of his scholarly project in the manner of John Wansbrough.¹⁷ Rather, he focused to a great extent on the history of Qur'anic interpretation and on the principles and problems governing the study of the Qur'an within the field of religious studies. This feature appears clearly in the academic presentation of his book *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*,¹⁸ which states that Rippin deals therein with the principles and problems of Qur'anic study, as well as the history of Islamic exegesis of the text in its diversity.¹⁹ This reveals that, for him, the text is not considered independently of its interpretive history; rather, that history forms part of the structure of knowledge about it.

Hence, Rippin's methodological specificity lies in the fact that interpretation, for him, is not merely material that comes after the text; it is a scholarly gateway to understanding the history of the text's reception and the evolution of its methods of reading. This point is important because it shifts the center of inquiry from the question, When was the text formed? to another question no less important: How was the text understood? And how did its layers of meaning take shape across the centuries?²⁰

Rippin's involvement in the project *Approaches to the History of the Interpretation of the Qur'an* clearly confirms this orientation,²¹ for his name became associated in the Western field with the attempt to establish the study of the history of tafsir as an organized field with its own tools and questions, not merely as a historical appendix to Qur'anic studies.²²

In this sense, Rippin occupies a middle position between radical approaches that cast doubt on the foundational structure of the Islamic narrative and descriptive approaches that merely present interpretive material.²³ On the one hand, he works within the modern critical horizon in the study of religious texts, while on the other, he grants the Islamic

¹⁵ John Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*, pp: ix-x-xi.

¹⁶ Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, pp: vii-viii; 1-2.

¹⁷ John Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*, pp: xii,xiv, xv, xvi, xvii ,xviii.

¹⁸ Andrew Rippin, *the Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, p: xvii-xviii.

¹⁹ Andrew Rippin, *the Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, 41.

²⁰ Andrew Rippin, *the Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, 44-45.

²¹ Rippin, A. (Ed.). (1988). *Approaches to the History of the Interpretation of the Qur'an*. Oxford University Press. P: 1.

²² Andrew Rippin, *the Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, 44-45.

²³ Andrew Rippin, *the Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, x-xi.

interpretive tradition an epistemic weight that cannot be ignored in the study of the Qur'an.²⁴ For this reason, Rippin may be regarded as an appropriate representative of what can be called the interpretive-historical method in Qur'anic Orientalism: that is, the method that sees the history of Qur'anic interpretation not as a marginal matter attached to the text, but as one of the keys to understanding the formation of meaning in both Islamic and scholarly consciousness.²⁵

Angelika Neuwirth, by contrast, represents a different path in structure and horizon. Her project is not centered primarily on the history of exegesis,²⁶ nor on radical criticism of codification narratives,²⁷ but on reading the Qur'an as a literary and historical text that arose within the space of Late Antiquity. This appears clearly in her book *The Qur'an and Late Antiquity: A Shared Heritage*²⁸, which Oxford University Press presents as a comprehensive treatment for understanding the Qur'an in its historical context,²⁹ while its introduction explains that it aims to trace the historical emergence of the Qur'anic text against the backdrop of the period and to connect its study with the broader intellectual and cultural context.³⁰

What is important in Neuwirth's project is that she does not read the Qur'an as a mute historical document, but as a discourse endowed with an active rhetorical and literary structure. The chapters of her book affirm that the Qur'an is a document from the age of rhetoric, and that it employs rhetorical devices to advance its thesis in dialogue with earlier or contemporary texts and beliefs. This means that her method combines historical sensitivity with literary awareness: it neither dissolves the text entirely into its cultural environment nor isolates it from that environment in interpretive seclusion.³¹ Hence, the importance of her approach in the contemporary Western field, for it broadened the scope of research from the question of sources and origins to the question of rhetorical structure, the function of the surah, and the relationship of the Qur'anic text to the religious and cultural world of Late Antiquity.

The methodological difference between Rippin and Neuwirth is subtle but fundamental. Rippin focuses on the history of reception and interpretation – that is, on how the meaning of the Qur'an was built within the Islamic scholarly tradition and through the tools of modern religious studies³² whereas Neuwirth turns to the text itself as a literary-historical event, asking about its structure, rhythm, units, and place in the late antique cultural scene³³. Thus, the comparison between them is not a comparison between two scholars working in the same field in the same way, but between two distinct paths: one that interprets the center of inquiry, and another that makes the text in its literary-historical context the center.

From the standpoint of scholarly value, Rippin made an important contribution by organizing the view of the Islamic interpretive tradition as research material possessing a

²⁴ Andrew Rippin, *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, xvi.

²⁵ Andrew Rippin, *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, 44-45.

²⁶ Andrew Rippin, *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, p: xvii-xviii

²⁷ John Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*, pp: xii,xiv, xv, xvi, xvii ,xviii.

²⁸ Angelika Neuwirth, *The Qur'an and Late Antiquity*, pp: ix, x, xi.

²⁹ Angelika Neuwirth, *The Qur'an and Late Antiquity*, p: IV.

³⁰ Angelika Neuwirth, *The Qur'an and Late Antiquity*, p: 1.

³¹ Angelika Neuwirth, *The Qur'an and Late Antiquity*, p: 2-3-4.

³² Andrew Rippin, *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, p: xvii-xviii; 44-45.

³³ Angelika Neuwirth, *The Qur'an and Late Antiquity*, p: 2-3-4.

historical structure, and he played a major role in establishing the importance of studying early exegesis and its diversity.³⁴

By contrast, Neuwirth made a major contribution by restoring attention to the literary unity of the surahs and to the rhetorical and contextual analysis of Qur'anic discourse, linking all of this to the debates of Late Antiquity.³⁵

Therefore, bringing them together in a comparative study is highly useful because it reveals that development within Western Qur'anic studies was not a single line, but adjacent paths: some approach the text through its interpretive history, and some approach it through its literary structure and historical location.

If we view the four models together within a single map, it may be said that Jeffery represents the philological turn³⁶, Wansbrough the historical-critical turn,³⁷ Rippin the interpretive-historical turn,³⁸ and Neuwirth the literary-contextual turn.³⁹

This map is what gives the comparative study its legitimacy, because the comparison here is not based on merely gathering scattered names, but on a divergence in tools, a difference in methodological center of gravity, and diversity in the conception of the Qur'an as an object of research.

A Critical Comparative Study of the Four Approaches to the Issues of Text, Interpretation, and Context

If the first section has shown that Jeffery, Wansbrough, Rippin, and Neuwirth do not belong to one single system, then the next critical step requires testing this differentiation in specific issues that touch the very core of Qur'anic studies: the conception of the Qur'anic text as an object of research, the position toward the Islamic interpretive heritage, and the limits of benefiting from historical, linguistic, and literary methods in interpreting the Qur'anic phenomenon. Contemporary academic literature confirms that the Western field itself is no longer read as a solid unity, but rather as a space of competing and overlapping approaches, and that an important part of the development of contemporary Qur'anic studies has come from reconsidering the validity of methodological tools rather than merely repeating inherited conclusions.

A Comparison among the Four Approaches in Their Conception of the Qur'anic Text and the Sources of Knowledge about It

A comparative examination shows that the first point of real difference among the four models is how each conceives of the Qur'an itself as an object of study. Arthur Jeffery deals with it primarily as a linguistic text whose vocabulary can be traced in light of language contact and lexical borrowing, something clearly announced by the title of his most famous work, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*. The center of his project is therefore not so much the history of textual formation as it is the analysis of the word and its linguistic and cultural field.⁴⁰

³⁴ Andrew Rippin, *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, p: xv-xvii-xviii.

³⁵ Angelika Neuwirth, *the Qur'an and Late Antiquity*, pp: ix, x, xi; 2-3-4.

³⁶ Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, pp: vii-viii; 1-2.

³⁷ John Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*, pp: xii,xiv, xv, xvi, xvii, xviii.

³⁸ Andrew Rippin, *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, p: xvii-xviii; 44-45.

³⁹ Angelika Neuwirth, *the Qur'an and Late Antiquity*, pp: ix, x, xi; 2-3-4.

⁴⁰ Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, pp: vii-viii; 1-2-5-8.

With John Wansbrough, by contrast, the center of gravity shifts from the word to the text as a historical and interpretive product. Later studies have described Quranic Studies as an attempt to apply the tools of biblical criticism to the Qur'an and its early commentaries. In other words, his object of inquiry is not merely the vocabulary of the text, but the formation of the text, the context of its emergence, and the extent to which traditional foundational narratives can be trusted in explaining that formation. Hence, Wansbrough came to be regarded as one of the central figures in the revisionist or radical turn in Western Qur'anic studies.⁴¹

Andrew Rippin differs from this path in that he deals with the Qur'an through its interpretive history – that is, through the trajectories of its understanding and interpretation within the Islamic tradition and within the field of modern religious studies. The publisher's description of his book *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition* presents this project as an inquiry into the principles and problems of Qur'anic study, together with detailed investigations into the history and diversity of Islamic exegesis, which indicates that, in Rippin's view, the Qur'anic text is not separable from the history of its reception. In this perspective, the source authority of knowledge about the text is not reduced to the isolated text itself, but includes the interpretive layers formed around it.⁴²

Angelika Neuwirth, meanwhile, represents yet another conception. She views the Qur'an as a literary-historical text that emerged within the space of Late Antiquity and insists on reading its historical emergence against the cultural and intellectual background of the era. The introduction to her book clarifies that her project aims to trace the historical emergence of the Qur'anic text against the background of the period. This means that, for her, the text is neither merely linguistic material nor simply a document to be historically deconstructed, but an active discourse endowed with literary structure and civilizational placement.⁴³

It thus becomes evident that the comparison is not based on formal differences, but on a difference in the center of the methodological question. Jeffery asks about the linguistic origin of certain words; Wansbrough asks about the formation of the text within its historical and polemical context; Rippin asks about the formation of meaning through the history of interpretation; and Neuwirth asks about the rhetorical structure of the text within the horizon of Late Antiquity.

This difference in the initial question necessarily affects the conclusions, because each method chooses a dominant entrance that determines what counts as valid evidence and what counts as marginal.

From a critical standpoint, these approaches should not be weighed with a single standard. Jeffery's philological method is useful in tracing linguistic interactions, but it is not sufficient on its own to explain the Qur'anic phenomenon in its entirety. Wansbrough's historical-critical method broadens the horizon of inquiry, but it may at times push the circle of doubt so far that the methodological hypothesis becomes more present than the historical material available. Rippin's method adds an important dimension, namely the history of reception, but it does not make the literary structure of the text a primary focus. Neuwirth, by contrast, offers a strong recovery of rhetorical structure and cultural context, but remains tied to the framework of Late Antiquity as the broader interpretive horizon.

⁴¹ John Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*, pp: xii, xiv, xv, xvi, xvii, xviii.

⁴² Andrew Rippin, *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, p: xvii-xviii; 44-45.

⁴³ Angelika Neuwirth, *the Qur'an and Late Antiquity*, pp: ix, x, xi; 2-3-4.

The Position toward the Islamic Heritage and the Limits of Using Western Methodologies in the Study of the Qur'an

The position toward the Islamic heritage constitutes a decisive axis in comparing the four models. Wansbrough, according to later studies describing his influence, was part of a radical critical turn that sought to reconsider the early Islamic narratives about beginnings by benefiting from the tools of biblical criticism. This means that the Islamic heritage, for him, is not received as a direct transmitter of the history of the text, but as later material requiring intense scrutiny.⁴⁴

By contrast, Rippin does not work to exclude the interpretive heritage, but to place it at the heart of the study as a scholarly subject. His attention to the history of interpretive traditions in his project indicates that the Islamic heritage, for him, is not merely a secondary source or an epistemic obstacle; rather, it is a fundamental field for understanding how Qur'anic meaning was constructed within Islamic consciousness. This is an important methodological difference, because it makes the researcher's relationship to the heritage one of historical and interpretive analysis, not one of total rejection.⁴⁵

As for Jeffery, his relation to the heritage is not the center of his project, because his main concern is lexical and philological. Therefore, the Islamic heritage appears in his work mostly insofar as it helps explain words, transmit variant readings, derivations, and linguistic explanations, rather than as the governing framework for understanding the Qur'an.⁴⁶ From this perspective, the place of the heritage in his project is less central than it is for Rippin and less problematic than it is for Wansbrough.

Neuwirth, meanwhile, does not begin from a rejection of the Islamic heritage, but she does reposition the Qur'an in a broader context than that of internal Islamic reception alone. She seeks to read the text in light of the intellectual and cultural field of Late Antiquity.⁴⁷ Oxford's presentation of her book indicates that she sees this path as a way of understanding the historical emergence of the text within its background, thereby enabling one to move beyond the traditional polarization between the Islamic inside and the Orientalist outside. Thus, the heritage is not canceled in her work, but neither is it the only or final frame.⁴⁸

From this difference arises a second issue, namely the limits of using modern Western methodologies, especially those derived from biblical studies, historical criticism, or comparative literature. Recent reviews have shown that Wansbrough's influence was tied to the attempt to apply biblical criticism to the Qur'an and its early commentaries, which provoked a long debate over the validity of transferring analytical models developed in the context of biblical texts to the Qur'anic text.⁴⁹ This point is useful for evaluation, since the problem does not lie in benefiting from the modern tool in principle, but in the extent to which the specificity of the Qur'anic material is respected in its application.

Herein lies the value of Rippin and Neuwirth in the comparison, because they represent two different forms of a less severe use of modern methodologies. Rippin employs the tools of

⁴⁴ Emmanouela Stefanidis, *Narratives of Qur'anic Evolution in Western Academia*, p:71.

⁴⁵ Andrew Rippin, *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, p: xvii-xviii; 44-45.

⁴⁶ Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, pp: vii-viii; 1-2-5-8.

⁴⁷ Angelika Neuwirth, *the Qur'an and Late Antiquity*, pp: ix, x, xi; 2-3-4.

⁴⁸ Angelika Neuwirth, *the Qur'an and Late Antiquity*, p: 1.

⁴⁹ Emmanouela Stefanidis, *Narratives of Qur'anic Evolution in Western Academia*, p: 71-72.

religious studies and the history of interpretation without making that synonymous with the principled overthrow of the heritage,⁵⁰ while Neuwirth employs historical and literary sensitivity within a project focused on the text as a discourse possessing unity and structure, not merely as fragments of source material.⁵¹ Thus, comparison among the four allows for the display of multiple layers of using Western method: from linguistic tracing, to radical historical doubt, to interpretive history, to literary-contextual reading.

From a critical standpoint, the most important scholarly contribution of this comparison lies in deconstructing the common binary between acceptance and rejection. The four approaches are not to be treated in the same way. Some provide useful tools within a limited area; some expand the horizon of questioning but remain strongly contested in terms of evidence; and some allow a rereading of literary structure and historical context without requiring acceptance of all their conclusions. This deconstruction is what gives the study its genuinely comparative character and takes it beyond rhetorical generalization about Orientalism as though it were a single unit.

A Critical Evaluation of the Four Approaches and a Proposal for a Balanced Interpretive Framework

Scholarly evaluation requires distinguishing between the methodological tool and the interpretive result. As for the tool, Jeffery rendered a clear service to the field of Qur'anic studies by drawing attention to the importance of comparative lexical research. Yet exaggerating the explanation of words through foreign origin may shift from being an interpretive tool to becoming a prior assumption if it is not restrained by rigorous controls in historical linguistics and semantic history. The central place of his book in lexical debate since 1938 is testimony to the influence and continuing relevance of this path, as well as to the criticism directed at it.⁵²

As for Wansbrough, his strength lies in the fact that he activated the major methodological questions surrounding the text, history, and interpretation—a point acknowledged even by modern studies discussing his legacy. Yet that very strength is also the source of the problem, because extending methodological doubt may move research from testing the material to reconstructing the historical scene according to highly abstract assumptions. Recent reviews have described the impact of his book as a radical attempt to apply biblical criticism to the Qur'an, making his project foundational for a deep and controversial transformation at once.⁵³

Rippin is distinguished by offering a more balanced entrance because he restores the importance of the history of understanding as a basic epistemic element. This is a significant merit,⁵⁴ since the Qur'an is not merely a fixed text closed upon itself; rather, its interpretive history is part of its scholarly and religious presence. Yet this entrance, despite its importance, still needs to be complemented by a broader analysis of the internal structure of the text itself, because focusing exclusively on the history of exegesis may at times obscure some of the literary and rhetorical characteristics of the text that cannot be reduced to the history of its reception.

⁵⁰ Andrew Rippin, *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, p: xvii-xviii; 44-45.

⁵¹ Angelika Neuwirth and Dirk Hartwig: *The Qur'anic Intervention into the Late Antique Discourse about the Origin of Evil*, p: 1-2.

⁵² Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, pp: vii-viii; 1-2-5-8.

⁵³ Emmanouela Stefanidis, *Narratives of Qur'anic Evolution in Western Academia*, p: 71-72.

⁵⁴ Andrew Rippin, *The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition*, p: xvii-xviii; 44-45.

Neuwirth, among these four, appears to be the closest to combining historical sensitivity with literary awareness. Her project, as described by Oxford, is based on tracing the historical emergence of the Qur'an and linking it to its rhetorical structure and to the world of Late Antiquity.⁵⁵ The strength of this path lies in the fact that it does not reduce the Qur'an to raw source material, but reads it as a discourse with rhetorical unity and communicative function. Yet this same framework may at times encourage making Late Antiquity into an overly comprehensive interpretive frame if it is not used with methodological caution.

These critical conclusions gain further firmness when read in light of the essential observations made by several contemporary Arab scholars specializing in the critique of Qur'anic Orientalist methodologies. In this regard, Dr. Ridwan al-Sayyid sees that the radical problem in many Orientalist studies of the Qur'an does not relate to their research tools in principle, but to the mental presuppositions governing the deployment of those tools. Methodologies of biblical criticism or linguistics are often borrowed without regard for the structural differences between the Qur'anic text and other religious texts in terms of the nature of revelation, the mechanisms of preservation and transmission, and the conditions of collective reception. Al-Sayyid also warns that ignoring these differences often leads to projecting conclusions borrowed from foreign theological or critical fields onto the Qur'anic experience, thereby making the methodological hypothesis precede historical verification rather than emerge from it. This observation reinforces what the present study has reached regarding the need to distinguish carefully between the methodological tool and the interpretive result when evaluating any Orientalist trend.

Accordingly, it is possible to propose a balanced interpretive framework for the study of Western Orientalism on the Qur'an, based on four methodological foundations. The first is to benefit from linguistic and philological tools without turning them into the sole explanatory framework for the Qur'anic phenomenon. The second is to welcome the raising of historical questions while maintaining a fundamental distinction between what is established by objective evidence and what remains at the level of a hypothesis open to refutation and review. The third is to include the Islamic interpretive heritage in the analysis as a historical record, not as material to be accepted wholesale or rejected wholesale. The fourth is to attend to the literary and rhetorical structure of the text within its historical context, without dissolving its particularity into general civilizational frameworks. This conclusion is not a verbatim transfer from any single source, but a comparative inference built upon the nature of the four projects as described by their primary works and by recent academic reviews.

Western Orientalism in Qur'anic studies should not be treated as a single homogeneous trend, for the four selected models reveal a clear methodological differentiation. Arthur Jeffery makes language and lexical borrowing the center of research, while John Wansbrough shifts the focus to the history of the text and its formation within the horizon of historical criticism. Andrew Rippin, meanwhile, rearranges the field by focusing on the history of interpretation and the methods of receiving the text, whereas Angelika Neuwirth offers a literary-historical reading that integrates the rhetorical structure of the Qur'an with its context in Late Antiquity. Thus, the comparison is grounded in real methodological differences, not merely nominal or chronological differences among scholars.

⁵⁵ Angelika Neuwirth, *the Qur'an and Late Antiquity*, pp: ix, x, xi; 1-2-3-4.

It also becomes clear that this methodological differentiation is the basis upon which the second section should be built, because rigorous scholarly criticism does not begin by discussing conclusions directly, but rather by analyzing the tools that produced them, weighing their validity, and testing their limits. Therefore, the next step in the study should proceed toward an applied critical comparison among these approaches in specific issues, such as: the conception of the source authority of the text, the position toward the Islamic heritage, the limits of using biblical methodologies, and the place of literary and linguistic analysis in interpreting the Qur'anic phenomenon.

Conclusion

This comparative study makes clear that the differences among Jeffery, Wansbrough, Rippin, and Neuwirth are structural methodological differences, not merely differences in conclusions. Each of them defines the object of Qur'anic research differently, grants different weight to the sources of knowledge about it, and employs different tools in analysis. Therefore, the true value of the comparison lies in showing that Western Orientalism in Qur'anic studies is not one single school, but a map of differentiated paths: a linguistic path, a historical-critical path, an interpretive-historical path, and a literary-contextual path. This is the basis upon which a sound critical judgment may be built, away from overgeneralization or misleading fragmentation.

+Is There a Real Difference Among the Four Approaches?

Yes, there is a clear difference. Indeed, these four represent different stages or schools in Western Qur'anic studies.

They may be methodologically arranged as follows:

Scholar	Method	Nature of the Approach
Arthur Jeffery	Linguistic-philological method	Study of vocabulary and linguistic origins
John Wansbrough	Radical historical-critical method	Doubting the history and formation of the text
Andrew Rippin	Historical-analytical method of interpretation	Studying the Qur'an through the interpretive heritage
Angelika Neuwirth	Literary-historical method	Reading the Qur'an in the context of late antique culture

Thus, we are indeed dealing with four genuinely different approaches.

The Nature of Each Approach in Brief

Arthur Jeffery:

Method: Linguistic-philological.

Idea: Analyzing Qur'anic vocabulary and searching for its linguistic origins.

Example: His famous book, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*.

He holds that some Qur'anic vocabulary has Syriac, Ethiopic, or Hebrew origins.

Thus, his focus is not on history, but on language.

John Wansbrough:

Method: Radical historical criticism.

Idea: The Qur'an was formed gradually within a context of religious debates.

Most important book: Quranic Studies.

He holds that the Qur'anic text developed through stages and that the Islamic narratives concerning its codification are late.

Therefore, he represents the revisionist school.

Andrew Rippin:

Method: Interpretive history.

Idea: Understanding the Qur'an through the history of its interpretation.

Important book: The Qur'an and Its Interpretative Tradition.

He focuses on works of tafsir and on the history of understanding the Qur'an; thus, he is less radical than Wansbrough.

Angelika Neuwirth:

Method: Literary-historical (Late Antiquity approach).

Idea: The Qur'an is a literary text that emerged in the cultural context of Late Antiquity.

Her book: The Qur'an and Late Antiquity.

She is concerned with the literary structure of the surahs, Qur'anic discourse, and cultural context; therefore, her approach is closer to literature and cultural history.

Why Is This Comparison Good?

Because it represents the development of Western Qur'anic studies:

Linguistic method

↓

Historical-critical method

↓

History-of-interpretation method

↓

Literary-cultural method

That is, the study will present the transformation of the scholarly field itself.

How Can the Comparison Be Made Stronger?

The comparison should be made according to specific axes, such as:

The Concept of the Source of the Qur'an

Is it a historical text? A religious text? Or a literary text?

Their Position toward the Islamic Heritage

Scholar	His Position
Jeffery	Uses it partially
Wansbrough	Casts doubt upon it
Rippin	Studies it historically
Neuwirth	Places it in a cultural context

The Scholarly Method

Scholar	Method
Jeffery	Linguistic

Wansbrough	Historical-critical
Rippin	History of interpretation
Neuwirth	Literary-cultural

The Nature of the Qur'anic Text According to Them

Scholar	Conception of the Text
Jeffery	A historical-linguistic text
Wansbrough	A historically developed text
Rippin	A text understood through interpretation.
Neuwirth	A literary text in a civilizational context

Comparative Table of the Four Orientalist Approaches in the Study of the Noble Qur'an

Scholar	Dominant Method	Central Question in His Study	Method He Followed	Representative Example	Scholarly Value	Critical Revision
Arthur Jeffery	Linguistic-philological method	What are the linguistic and cultural origins of some Qur'anic vocabulary?	He relied on tracing Qur'anic words, comparing them with Hebrew, Syriac, Ethiopic, and others, and linking some vocabulary to the phenomenon of linguistic borrowing within the broader Semitic environment. This is clearly seen in his book <i>The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an</i> , which made the word, not the history of the formation of the text, the center of inquiry.	<i>The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an</i> is the clearest model of his method, as it revolves around the "foreign vocabulary" in the Qur'an and its possible linguistic history.	He contributed to broadening comparative lexical research and drew attention to the importance of linguistic and cultural interaction in the pre-Islamic environment.	He is criticized for the fact that some of his conclusions expanded the assumption of "foreign origin" on the basis of linguistic similarities that are not sufficient on their own for historical certainty. Therefore, his method is more useful for the partial analysis of vocabulary than for explaining the Qur'anic phenomenon as a whole. This is a comparative conclusion supported by the nature of his lexical project itself.
John Wansbrough	Radical historical-critical method	How was the Qur'anic text formed? And what is the value of later Islamic narratives in explaining their emergence?	He applied tools close to biblical criticism to the Qur'an and early interpretive material, and dealt with the text in light of its formation within an extended interpretive and historical debate, rather than as a	<i>Qur'anic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation</i> is the central example, as it revolves around the "sources" and "methods" of interpreting the text and its formation.	He reopened the major questions related to the history of the text, codification, and early exegesis, and pushed the Western field toward revisiting its methods and assumptions.	He is criticized because his methodological skepticism may expand to the point that the historical hypothesis becomes

			closed text whose meaning was complete from the beginning. His book, <i>Quranic Studies</i> , is the foundational text of this path.			stronger than the evidentiary material available. Therefore, his basic value lies more in raising methodological questions than in accepting all of his conclusions.
Andrew Rippin	Interpretive-historical method	How was the meaning of the Qur'an formed through the history of its interpretation? And what are the methodological problems in studying it within the field of religious studies?	He focused on the history of Islamic exegesis and on the principles and problems of studying the Qur'an, and saw that understanding the text cannot be separated from the history of its reception and interpretation. The publisher's presentation of <i>The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition</i> explicitly states that it addresses "principles and problems" and "the history of Islamic exegesis in its diversity."	The Qur'an and its Interpretative Tradition, as well as his work on the history of early Qur'anic exegesis, are the clearest examples of his method.	He restored the status of the interpretive heritage as a fundamental scholarly source and shifted the approach from the question of "the text alone" to the question of "the history of understanding."	He is criticized insofar as focusing on the history of reception may not by itself be sufficient to highlight the internal literary structure of the text, yet he remains among the most balanced approaches in benefiting from the heritage without rejecting it wholesale. This is an analytical conclusion based on the nature of his project as presented in his primary works.
Angelika Neuwirth	Literary-historical method in the context of Late Antiquity	How is the Qur'an to be understood as a literary-historical text that emerged within the space of Late Antiquity?	She combined literary and rhetorical analysis of the text with situating it in the intellectual and cultural context of Late Antiquity. The introduction to <i>The Qur'an and Late Antiquity</i> explains that her project is based on tracing the historical emergence of the Qur'anic text against the backdrop	<i>The Qur'an and Late Antiquity: A Shared Heritage</i> is the clearest example, because it presents the Qur'an as a text with an active rhetorical structure within a broader civilizational context.	She contributed to restoring attention to the literary unity of the surahs and to the rhetorical and discursive dimension, linking all of that to historical context without reducing the text to a mere compilation of sources.	This trend is criticized insofar as the framework of "Late Antiquity" may at times turn into an overly broad interpretive umbrella if not controlled by a rigorous method, yet it remains

			of the period.			among the most mature approaches in combining history and literature.
--	--	--	----------------	--	--	---

Brief Interpretive Summary of the Table

This table shows that the four scholars do not represent a single degree of Qur'anic Orientalism; rather, they represent four distinct methodological entrances: Jeffery reads the Qur'an through the gateway of the word, Wansbrough through the gateway of the history of formation, Rippin through the gateway of the history of interpretation, and Neuwirth through the gateway of literary structure and civilizational context.

For this reason, the research value of comparing them is high, because it does not rest on collecting scattered names, but on showing the shift in the very center of the scholarly question—from language, to history, to interpretation, to literature and context.

Works Cited

- Fudge, Bruce. "Scepticism as Method in the Study of Quranic Origins." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 88, no. 3, 2025, pp. 477–492.
- Grasso, Valentina A. "The Qur'ān through the Lens of Late Antiquity, Late Antiquity through the Lens of the Qur'ān: Approaches, Perspectives and Possibilities." *Harvard Theological Review*, vol. 115, no. 3, 2022, pp. 466–476.
- Jeffery, Arthur. *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ān*. Woods Press, 2008. [Originally published 1938.]
- Neuwirth, Angelika. *The Qur'an and Late Antiquity: A Shared Heritage*. Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Neuwirth, Angelika, and Dirk Hartwig. "Beyond Reception History: The Qur'anic Intervention into the Late Antique Discourse about the Origin of Evil." *Religions*, vol. 12, no. 8, 2021, art. 606.
- Rippin, Andrew. "Contemporary Scholarly Understandings of Qur'anic Coherence." *Al-Bayan: Journal of Qur'an and Hadith Studies*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2013, pp. 1–14.
- Rippin, Andrew. *The Qur'an and Its Interpretative Tradition*. Routledge, 2001.
- Río Sánchez, Francisco F. del. "The Deadlocked Debate about the Role of the Jewish Christians at the Birth of Islam." *Religions*, vol. 12, no. 10, 2021, art. 789.
- al-Sayyid, Ridwan. *al-Mustashriqun al-Alman: al-Nushu' wa al-Ta'thir wa al-Irtiqā'* [The German Orientalists: Emergence, Influence, and Destinies]. 2nd ed., Dar al-Madar al-Islami, 2016.
- al-Sayyid, Ridwan. "Contemporary Radical Transformations in Western Qur'anic Studies." Lecture, Al-Ittihad News Center, 20 Feb. 2022. *Al-Ittihad*, www.aletihad.ae/news/4263880/. Accessed 8 Apr. 2026.
- Stefanidis, Emmanuelle. "In Search of Chronology: Narratives of Qur'anic Evolution in Western Academia." *ReOrient*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2024, pp. 70–95.
- Thaver, Tehseen. "Toward a Post-Orientalist Conception of Qur'anic Studies." *ReOrient*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2024, pp. 4–9.
- Wansbrough, John. *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*. Prometheus Books, 2004. [Originally published by Oxford University Press, 1977.]

Publisher's Note/Disclaimer: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of NJH. NJH disclaims responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.