

CANONISATION IN ISLAM AND IN CHRISTIANITY

Introduction

Judaism, Christianity, Islam – all these religions have in common that they are called “book religions”. The Scripture is said to be inspired or to contain the word of God or even to be the word of God. Therefore, it is important to fix a canon for which this criterion is valid. Judaism was the initiator for such a process if we only consider the European religions which still exist now. Christianity, having its roots in the Jewish religion, became the next book-religion in the first century C.E.; Islam finally arose about 600 years later. Thus, I want to give a chronological view on the process of canonization in Christianity and Islam. The inner reasons for forming a canon will be analysed and also the role of pressure from the outside. How important was the practical use? Why was it important to have a canon in a written form? Were there different canons? Are there criteria for holiness or inspiration? It seems to be necessary to define what a canon is and what is its function. At the end there will be a comparison between the two processes of canonisation.

What is a written canon?

A canon is a fixed collection of selected writings which are normative for the faith and the life of the community to which it belongs. It is a result of a process in history which is not easy to reconstruct. When certain books were given the account of being parts of a canon, the next step was to fix their wording in order to allow an exegesis for experts¹. Thus, one can say that with the building of a canon the time of prophecy has ended and the time of exegesis has started².

The word canon as a term for describing a collection of holy writings came up in the second half of the fourth century in the Christian discourse.

¹ Cf. Pezzoli-Olgiati 2001, 767.

² Cf. Theissen 1999, 251.

Before this time it was used for ideal, and therefore normative, classic literature which defined the limits for writings and also for social living³. The classical/canonical works are the norm for all the literature after this time too. A canon must have the most possible *akribeia* so that no uncertainty remains⁴. "Let no men add to these, neither let him take ought from these"⁵: with these words Athanasius (298-373) illustrates that if a canon is fixed at one time, there should be no flexibility left for adding and removing books to and from it. One also finds this claim in the Old Testament (Dtn 13:1, Qoh 3:14, Jer 26:2 and Prov 30:6).

Two requirements have to be fulfilled so that a canonization of a text corpus is possible. On the one hand, the "texts in question must already have a special status"⁶. Texts which are out of interest and usage have no chance to get a special status by adding them to a canon. On the other hand, it "requires an external impetus to set it off"⁷. When there are no attacks from the outside which generate inner discussions, there is no need to canonize texts and attribute them a status of protection so that their existence is secured.

Inspiration and historicity

A central problem is that of inspiration. Johann David Michaelis (1717-1791) assumed that only an apostle could be an adequate inspired person. But with this criterion there would arise a problem about how to treat the Gospels of Mark and Luke (or the pseudepigraphies) because they were neither Apostles nor eyewitnesses: apostolicity, inspiration and affiliation to the canon belong together for Michaelis⁸.

Johann Salomo Semler (1725-1791) distinguished "word of God" from "Holy Scripture". He postulated that there are passages in the Scripture which are not inspired and therefore have no use for the "moralische Aufbesserung" (here one can find the use of the antique understanding of canon as norm for a moral life). Considering the canon (the Holy Scripture) as a historical

³ Cf. Schindler 2001, 767f. and Assmann 1992, 110.

⁴ Cf. Assmann 1992, 109.

⁵ Athanasius. Letter 39.6.

⁶ Radscheit 2006, 93.

⁷ Radscheit 2006, 93.

⁸ Cf. Schnelle 2007, 18.

developed entity, it can be studied under a historical perspective. If one supposes a verbal inspiration, this sort of examination is not possible⁹.

Christianity

Criteria for a canon

Christianity is based on the person, words and deeds of Jesus of Nazareth. Therefore, he has the crucial role in the writings of the New Testament. However, there is also the Hebrew Testament which remained in the canon in spite of efforts to remove it in order to cut off the connection with Judaism. Furthermore, one should not forget that the Old Testament as Holy Scripture was taken for granted by every New Testament author and certainly by Jesus himself, although the Jewish canon had not been fixed in the first century C.E. Therefore, the problem of a New Testament canon was not discussed in early times, although central sayings of Jesus, the passion and the collected letters of Paul became central writings through their frequent usage by the Christian communities ("Selbstkanonisierung")¹⁰. Paul never thought that his letters would one day become a part of a Christian canon called "novum testamentum" or "instrumentum novum" (Tertullian) later¹¹. When Paul wrote: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel"¹², he refers to the oral tradition, not to a written manuscript.

Origen was the first to make a distinction between accepted (*homologoumena*), controversial (*amphiballómena*) and mendacious writings¹³. About 100 years later, Eusebius also divided the books in three categories: "first place", "disputed" and "not genuine according to the tradition of the Church"¹⁴. What were the criteria for adding a book to the canon?

If one takes a look at the 39th letter of Athanasius, a main source for the process of canonization, the already mentioned criterion "godly inspired Scripture"¹⁵ can be recognized. Athanasius gives a simple definition for what

⁹ Cf. Schnelle 2007, 19.

¹⁰ Cf. Schindler 2001, 768.

¹¹ Cf. Gamble 1992, 853: „none of them was composed as scripture“.

¹² Romans 1:16.

¹³ Cf. Schindler 2001, 768.

¹⁴ Cf. Origen, Ecclesiastical History, III, 25.

¹⁵ Athanasius. Letter 39, 3.

can be called inspired: the authors had to be eyewitnesses from the beginning and ministers of the word¹⁶. As one could see above, this definition contains some problems.

That is why Harry Y. Gamble supposes four criteria which a canonical book has to fulfil: it has to be apostolic ("from the beginning"), catholic (relevant), orthodox ("genuine according to the tradition") and in traditional/customary use. According to him, inspiration was not a criterion because inspiration "characterizes the church as whole"¹⁷.

Nevertheless, in the fourth century, diverse synods formed the canon through listing of the books which a Christian canon should contain¹⁸.

Inner-Christian reasons for a canon

The canon is "normative for the faith and the life of the Christian community"¹⁹. However, that had not been the case from the beginning. Since the Christians lived in expectation of an imminent return of the Messiah, it did not seem necessary to write down the words and deeds of Jesus. Rather, preaching, oral traditions and charismatic experiences form the core of Earliest Christianity. With the absence of Jesus' return it became necessary to write down words to keep alive the memory and authority of Jesus²⁰. Thus, "the gospels were valued first as historical records, not as scripture"²¹.

The canon had to ensure the praxis of the communities' worship, teaching and living; the fundamental axioms are the belief in one God and in a redeemer²². To guarantee its accuracy, an adequate text testimony which goes back to the very beginning of the life of the Lord Jesus had to be the basis. Although Jesus' person, deeds and words are the centre of the New Testament, it is open to different exegetical approaches. The content is not coherent; quite opposing stories of Jesus can be found as well as different opinions about christological, eschatological etc. issues. Thus, a vivid life of

¹⁶ Cf. Athanasius. Letter 39, 3.

¹⁷ Cf. Gamble 1992, 858.

¹⁸ Cf. Schindler 2001, 769 and Gamble 1992, 853.

¹⁹ Gamble 1992, 852.

²⁰ Cf. Gamble 1992, 853f.

²¹ Gamble 1992, 854.

²² Cf. Theissen 1999, 271.

the community is facilitated. Not the one theological norm can be found in the New Testament, it is open to exegesis. The plurality of Early Christianity can be found in its books included²³. "The canon includes writings of almost all representative currents"²⁴ for which a consensus could be found.

The judgements of respected Christian theologians and the collections of famous communities had influenced the choice of books which formed the canon²⁵. According to Gamble, another factor was the codex form in which the New Testament was collected. It only allowed a limited number of writings to be fixed in one codex in contrast to the Jewish tradition where every single book is written on one roll²⁶.

The new writings in addition to the Old Testament (which was still in use as Holy Scripture) were spread within the communities and frequently used in the 2nd and 3rd century with the consequence that a core of writings emerged which later became the so-called New Testament.

Every religious group has its ceremonies and rituals. In oral cultures, permanent performances are necessary to conserve ritual coherence. Since the canonical texts are important for the correct performances, there is a high responsibility for the copier of the texts because some texts contain the oral traditions in a written form. Thus, Jan Assmann defines canon as "die Fortsetzung ritueller Kohärenz im Medium schriftlicher Überlieferung"²⁷.

Gamble concludes: "the canon is very much a product of the church, but much of the contents of the canon rose to authority by virtue of their self-evident value"²⁸.

Disputes with "heretics"

There is also a tendency in research to see the main factors for the forming of a canon through the pressure from heterodox doctrines. A consensus among the different currents of the so-called orthodox Christianity is the premise. If the group became too small, a worldwide mission would not be possible, but if the consensus was too wide, there would not remain a clear

²³ Theissen 1999, 261.

²⁴ Theissen 1999, 250.

²⁵ Cf. Gamble 1992, 857.

²⁶ Cf. Gamble 1992, 857.

²⁷ Assmann 1992, 105.

²⁸ Gamble 1992, 858.

profile. That is why Gerd Theissen stresses the importance of separation of "orthodox" Christianity (including Pauline, Jewish, Synoptic and Johannine Christianity) from other groups²⁹: "the canon is the great answer to the identity crisis of the church at the end of [Early] Christianity"³⁰.

Pressure first came from the outside when Marcion (85-160) "purified" the holy writings from Jewish passages which he saw as corruptions of the true doctrine according to the scheme *lex* and *evangelium*.³¹ He wanted to give a clear *evangelium* which does not allow a wide spectrum of interpretation. That is the reason why he was seen as a big danger: systems with a clear message are always attractive. However, "the four-Gospel canon is the 'revolutionary innovation' in the second century, and not Marcion's one-Gospel canon"³².

The main hostile movement were the Gnostics so Theissen postulates: "There are no Gnostic writings [in the New Testament]"³³. There can only be an internal consensus of a sign system for different Christian groups when there is a clear outside world (Judaism, Paganism, Gnosticism, prophetic renewal movements)³⁴.

Islam

A canon in Islam?

In Muslim culture, the loanword *Qānūn*, which comes from Greek, is not used in the context of Holy Scripture but in the judiciary and the political system³⁵. If inspiration is the criterion for canonicity, the *Qur'ān* can be regarded as the canonical text of Islam. In the traditional view it is seen as book of divine revelation; it is even said to be the pure word of God. With regard to this, one can treat the *Qur'ān* in the same manner as the Jewish and Christian canon is understood in the tradition. A difference between the *Qur'ān* and the Holy Scriptures of Judaism and Christianity is its unity: it is

²⁹ Theissen 1999, 251.

³⁰ Theissen 1999, 259.

³¹ Cf. Marksches 2010, 88 and Schindler 2001, 768.

³² Theissen 1999, 267.

³³ Theissen 1999, 250.

³⁴ For a discussion of this topic cf. Theissen 1999, 274-282.

³⁵ Graham 2001, 772.

not a collection of different books written by different authors who were at different places at different times and wrote in different forms. So the meaning “list” of the term canon can not be used here.

The ḥadīths could also be seen as a second part of the Muslim “canon” because they were and are used to define the customs and practice of the Muslim society, they contain the norm in addition to the Qur’ān.

A short history of the canonisation of the Qur’ān

It is difficult to fix a starting point for the development of the Qur’ān. The earliest complete Qur’ān is dated in the 9th century³⁶. One can not know if the followers of Muḥammad wrote the first *sūras* or even Muḥammad himself.

According to Angelika Neuwirth the Qur’ān reflects the “wording of communications that were actually pronounced by Muḥammad”³⁷. In the beginning there was the oral tradition. But after the death of Muḥammad it became urgent to get a fixed text of the revelation – the *muṣḥaf*, the physical bound volume, arose in the 650s C.E.³⁸. With the *muṣḥaf* there now existed a *textus receptus* which is said to be the “definite corpus of the Prophet’s recitations”³⁹. The *rasm* of the Qur’ān is claimed to go back to the ‘Uthmānic redaction. For the *rasm* of every text passage the third caliph ‘Uthmān (574–656) needed two witnesses as validation to get an identical and thus authoritative text. When the *rasm* had been fixed, the vocalization strokes and points for consonants followed. At the end of the development additional signs were added. In the 8th century a fixed form existed through an orthographic reform. “[T]he redaction of the text is viewed as identical with canonisation”⁴⁰. The governors of the empire were very eager to spread the standardised Qur’ān in their territory about the year 700 C.E. For this

³⁶ Cf. Radscheit 2006, 96.

³⁷ Neuwirth 2006, 141.

³⁸ Lynch 2010, 248.

³⁹ Neuwirth 2003, 2.

⁴⁰ Neuwirth 2003, 2.

undertaking they had the help of the *qurrā'* (paid experts for Qur'ān recitation)⁴¹.

The canonisation seemed to happen in a hurry because the *sūras* are not arranged in a theological order. Rather, this arrangement can be seen as "a conservative and theological disinterested arrangement"⁴². As a consequence it is very difficult to reconstruct the communicative situation lying behind the arbitrarily arranged *sūras*⁴³. Although there were attempts to destroy divergent text traditions (*riwayat*), they still exist. However, it is nearly impossible to get knowledge about pre-canonical texts. A method to find traces of the pre-canonical time is to analyse the Qur'ānic passages for "Self-Referentiality"⁴⁴. Thus, Gerhard Endress has to admit: "If a relative or absolute chronology can be constructed at all this is only at the basis of allusions in the text"⁴⁵.

The Al-Azhar university published the most influential *rasm* for today in 1923/24. This is the standard text for today's Islam⁴⁶.

Besides this standard explanation, there are also differing theories of the origin of the Qur'ān:

Allama Tamanna Imadi assumes that Muḥammad himself wrote the oldest texts of the Qur'ān. The parts, which treat the revelation, were later additions.

According to Günter Lüling, a collection of non-trinitarian Christian hymns were the basic content of the Qur'ān. The idea of monotheism was spread in the Greek, Hebrew and Syriac language and there are traces of Syriac loanwords in the Qur'ān. Therefore, Lüling assumes that the core of the Qur'ān was not written in Arabic but later normalized "to fit the rules of

⁴¹ Cf. Radscheit 2006, 98.

⁴² Neuwirth 2003, 11.

⁴³ Cf. Neuwirth 2003, 11.

⁴⁴ Cf. the title of the book "Self-Referentiality in the Qur'ān".

⁴⁵ Endress 2002, 23.

⁴⁶ Halm 2007, 15.

'arabiyya"⁴⁷. Karl Vollers and Christoph Luxemburg assume that vernacular traditions had been transmitted before Arab grammarians transformed it into classical Arabic – a view also opposed to the traditional Islamic tradition⁴⁸.

The sceptic John Wansbrough sees the origin of the Qur'ān in the agitation of a Judeo-Christian sect which spread in the space of the later Muslim empire. The Qur'ān as an original collection from the beginning was a myth, a projection back into history⁴⁹. Only some texts could have had an origin in "Qur'ānic times". But there was evidence in the Dome of the Rock, where one could discover older inscriptions.

These inscription and coins of the caliph 'Abd al-Malik are the starting point for the outsider theory of Karl-Heinz Ohlig, who tries to identify the depicted word "Muḥammadun" as a title for Jesus Christ. The Qur'ān emerged in an anti-trinitarian Arabic Christian sect. The title "Muḥammadun" was reinterpreted as a person on its own, Muḥammad, 150 or 200 years later.

All in all, there is not much evidence for the research about the canonization process of the Qur'ān. "Many questions remain unanswered"⁵⁰. That is why the traditional explanation is still the most plausible.

The function of the Qur'ān

The *umma* (the religious community of all Muslims) came up in a time of change and crisis. Angelika Neuwirth writes: the *muṣṣḥaf* is "a codex endowed with the symbolic power of creating social coherence and the identity of its community"⁵¹. The place of the different nomadic tribes was the frontier between two powerful empires which started to lose power when the Muslim movement started. There were also tendencies towards an urban society. If there was only one God, what the Qur'ān postulates, there should be only one community. With the end of polytheism, the end of solidarity only with one's

⁴⁷ Neuwirth 2003, 7.

⁴⁸ Cf. Neuwirth 2003, 7f.

⁴⁹ Endress 2002, 23.

⁵⁰ Endress 2002, 24.

⁵¹ Neuwirth 2006, 143.

own tribe ended in favour of a high religion, and a community exceeding geographical and ethnic differences with solidarity for the whole *umma*. On the other hand, if someone did not accept the monotheism, it was a case of treason with the death penalty as consequence. We still have this problem today in some Islamic countries.

The "Qur'ān is not meant as a book to study but as a text to recite"⁵². Music, rhythm and rhyme are important components of the assertions which are pronounced. Kristina Nelson stresses that the "significance of the revelation is carried as much by the sound as by its semantic information"⁵³. It is interesting to note that reading the Qur'ān is not one of the so-called "five pillars of Islam". The performance of the ritual duties play a more central role for the Muslim's identity than reference to the Qur'ān. Of course, the central role of the Qur'ān for preaching cannot be denied; its *sūras* play a crucial role in the daily *ṣalāt*. But it is striking that a clear rule for using the *sūras* in the prayer is not given. "Obviously, there exists no established liturgy for praying and preaching in Islam"⁵⁴. Only the *fātiḥa* ("The Opening"), the first *sūra*, has its fixed role at the beginning of prayer. Traditionally, the *sunna* gives some examples of in which situation Muḥammad chose which *sūra*. Thus, the Muslims have some orientation, but it is not a duty (*fard*) to follow him. There are two arguments which underline the liturgical origin of the *muṣḥaf*: First, the opening *sūra*, the *fātiḥa*, clearly points to the liturgical character. Secondly, the proper name of the codex itself, *al-qur'ān* ("the recitation"), shows this connection⁵⁵. Matthias Radscheit concludes: "all the collected revelation texts are given a stable connection to Islamic ritual"⁵⁶. Hence, one can conclude that there had been liturgical traditions before the formation of the *muṣḥaf*. When the *muṣḥaf* came into being, it had a strong unifying

⁵² Neuwirth 2003, 12.

⁵³ Neuwirth 2003, 12.

⁵⁴ Radscheit 2006, 94.

⁵⁵ Cf. Radscheit 2006, 95.

⁵⁶ Radscheit 2006, 95.

power among the different Muslim communities⁵⁷. Nevertheless, the sequence is "From Ritual to Textual Coherence"⁵⁸.

The texts of the Qur'ān are not understood as historical documents of past events like the narratives in the Bible where they are integrated in the history of salvation. Rather they stand for a process of communication in the present between "the human and the super-human"⁵⁹ always with a view to Judgement Day.

Hadīth

Fred Donner has demonstrated that the literature of *ḥadīth* and *sīra* was not produced in the same milieu as the Qur'ān⁶⁰. The genesis of *ḥadīths* is very complex and would exceed this assignment. Nevertheless, one can say that eye witnesses are central for the evaluation of every *ḥadīth*. The most important instrument for this method is the *isnād*, that is, the complete listing of the transmitters which should go back to one of Muḥammad's companions or to his wife 'A'ischa⁶¹. The most famous collection of *ḥadīths* is that of Al-Buḥārī.

Similarities and differences – a conclusion

The criterion "from the beginning" is a very central one to the Christian (Athanasius) and the Muslim exegetes for calling a writing inspired and therefore canonical. Both text corpora have their origin in an oral transmission which goes back to eye witnesses of the events around Jesus and Muḥammad.

The central message of the canon is also clear: monotheism. But the belief in a redeemer distinguishes the Christian from the Muslim religion.

Christianity and Islam are both "book religions" as it was mentioned in the beginning. Both are associated with their Holy Scripture which for each community is a unifying factor. For Muslims and Christians the belief in one

⁵⁷ Radscheit 2006, 96.

⁵⁸ Neuwirth 2006, 153.

⁵⁹ Neuwirth 2003, 16.

⁶⁰ Cf. Neuwirth 2003, 5.

⁶¹ Cf. Halm 2007, 39.

God is the crucial element. But the relation between this God and the Holy Scripture is quite different.

The relationship to the written form has been quite different in Christianity and Islam from the very beginning. The Christians lived in expectation of the present return of Jesus; for the Muslim community the Qur'ān was seen from beginning on as basis for the liturgical praxis. In the Bible only some passages were used for ritual performances, in the Qur'ān every *sūra* is a potential liturgic text. That is why it became closed and authoritative in quite a short time in comparison with the process of canonization in Christianity.

The role of politics is also quite different for the emergence of the canon. Christianity appeared in a mostly peaceful time. Thus, a close contact between the different communities was possible, supported by the excellent Roman infrastructure. Nevertheless, the canonization was an inner-Christian process independent from political decisions. When Christianity became the state religion in the 4th century, the process of canonization was nearly completed. The Qur'ān in contrast was claimed by the rulers from the beginning. It is no wonder that the first three caliphs had a big importance for the formation of the Muslim canon: Abū Bakr collected the revealed words, 'Umar wrote them down and under 'Uthmān the redaction took place.⁶² The subsequent governors tried to exceed each other in spreading the canonised text.

The relationship to history is also different. In biblical view God reveals himself in his historical intervention for His people's sake. But in the Qur'ān not a history of salvation is important but God's presence in the present⁶³. The Scripture is not understood as historical record but as current communication.

The short transmission history is another reason why there are not many different versions of the Qur'ānic texts, but there still exist some. But one

⁶² Cf. Wimmer/Leimgruber 2007, 42.

⁶³ Cf. Neuwirth 2011, 504.

cannot find a serious effort on the Muslim side for editing a historical-critical version of the Qur'ān as in the case for the Bible.

The reason lies in the importance of an exact spelling of the Qur'ān from the beginning. For Christianity the content had a more central meaning from the beginning. The "Qur'ān is not meant as a book to study but as a text to recite"⁶⁴. Nevertheless, after some time, in Christianity also the exact words became more and more important in order to practice an exact exegesis and worship. But the Scripture as a whole does not have such a high status as the Qur'ān in Islam where every word is said to be word of God. Although there have existed and still exist some Christians who are adherents of the verbal inspiration of the Bible, these are a clear minority.

Therefore, the form of exegesis is quite different today. But with regard to early Christianity, one can find similarities. If one takes a look at Augustine's method of exegesis, one can detect that he treated every passage equally for interpreting a text or solving a problem. It was also not important whether that passage belonged to the Old or to the New Testament. The Muslim exegesis also uses this method for the Qur'ān interpretation⁶⁵. But the difference can be found in the assumption that the Qur'ān is self-explanatory. The early Christian theologians were more influenced by philosophy (middle-Platonism), and used the method of allegory to find a final meaning for a passage of text. The Muslim canon is not dependent on such speculations according to the Muslim tradition. Angelika Neuwirth even formulates: "It is not an exaggeration, then, to classify the Qur'ān – in addition to its being prophecy – as 'exegesis'"⁶⁶ of "well-known biblical and post-biblical traditions"⁶⁷. Thus, it would be more adequate to compare it with the writings of the Talmudim or the Church Fathers. According to Neuwirth the literary genre of the Qur'ān is a "transcript of an orally performed, open ended drama"⁶⁸.

⁶⁴ Neuwirth 2003, 12.

⁶⁵ Cf. Wimmer/Leimgruber 2007, 42.

⁶⁶ Neuwirth 2011, 496.

⁶⁷ Neuwirth 2011, 496.

⁶⁸ Neuwirth 2011, 497.

There are still problems with examining the Qur'ān with a historical method when it is still regarded as totally inspired. In the traditional Islamic view the Qur'ān "appears as a meta-historical text constructed and preserved by tradition"⁶⁹ This awareness of Scripture was also common in pre-modern Judaism and Christianity⁷⁰. But with this presupposition a critic of the text would be identical with critic of God himself which in the end would be blasphemous; a historical-critical analysis is thus not possible although especially an examination of the Qur'ān by scholars of a Muslim background would be very fruitful.

ԹԻՂԵՄԱՆ ԱԼԵՔՍԱՆՆԵՐ (ՄԼՀ, ԳԵՐՄԱՆԻԱ)

ՍՐԲԱՑՈՒՄԸ ԻՍԼԱՄՈՒՄ ԵՎ ՔՐԻՍՏՈՆԵՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՈՒՄ

Հուդաիզմ, քրիստոնեություն, իսլամ. բոլոր այս կրոնները ունեն այն ընդհանրությունը, որոնք կոչվում են «գրքի կրոններ»: Ասվում է, որ Աստվածաշունչը ոգեշնչված է Աստծո խոսքով կամ պարունակում է այն, կամ նույնիսկ հենց Աստծո խոսքն է: Կարևոր է հասկանալ այն սուրբ օրենքը, որի համար այդ չափանիշը գործում է: Այդ օրենքի կենտրոնական ուղերձը նույնպես պարզ է՝ միաստվածությունը. Բայց Փրկչի հանդեպ հավատը տարբերակում է քրիստոնյային մահմեդականից: Քրիստոնյաների ու մահմեդականների համար հավատը մեկ Աստծուն առանցքային է: Բայց այդ Աստծո և Սուրբ Գրքի միջև հարաբերությունները բոլորովին տարբեր են:

Քրիստոնեությունում և Իսլամում սուրբ օրենքների ժամանակագրական գործընթացները քննարկված են հոդվածում, ինչպես նաև վերլուծվում են այդ օրենքների ստեղծման ներքին պատճառները, ինչպես նաև դրսի ճնշման դերը, թե որքան կարևոր էր դրանց գործնական կիրառումը, ինչու էր կարևոր օրենքը գրավոր ձևով

⁶⁹ Neuwirth 2003, 1.

⁷⁰ Neuwirth 2011, 498.

ունենալը, արդյոք տարբեր սուրբ օրենքներ կային, կան արդյոք չափանիշներ սրբության կամ ոգեշնչման համար:

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

Athanasius. From the *39th Festal Letter* (Course material, edition not mentioned).

Eusebius. *Hist. Ecl.* 3.24-25 (Course material, edition not mentioned).

Secondary Literature

1. Assmann Jan. Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. München: C. H. Beck, 1992.
2. Barton John. The Spirit and the Letter. Studies in the Biblical Canon. London: SPCK, 1997.
3. Coogan Michael D. The New Oxford Annotated Bible. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
4. Endress Gerhard. Islam. An Historical Introduction. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002.
5. H.Y. Gamble, "Canon, New Testament", in D.N. Freedman (ed.). The Anchor Bible Dictionary 1, New York: Doubleday 1992, 852-861.
6. Graham William A., Art. Kanon VI. Islam in Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001⁴, Vol. 4, 772.
7. Halm Heinz, Der Islam. Geschichte und Gegenwart. München: C. H. Beck, 2007.
8. Lynch Joseph H., Early Christianity. A Brief History. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
9. Marksches Christoph, Die Gnosis. München: C. H. Beck, 2010.
10. Neuwirth Angelika, "Qur'ān and History – a Disputed Relationship. Some Reflections on Qur'ānic History and History in the Qur'ān" in Journal of Qur'ānic Studies 5:1 (2003): 1-18.
11. Neuwirth Angelika, "Structure and the Emergence of Community" in Rippin, Andrew (ed.). The Blackwell Companion to the Qur'ān. Hoboken (New Jersey): John Wiley & Sons, 2008, 140-158.

12. Neuwirth Angelika, "The Qur'ān as a late antique text" in Orfali, Bilal (ed.). *In the Shadow of Arabic: The Centrality of Language to Arabic Culture*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2011, 495-509.
13. Pezzoli-Olgiati Daria, "Art. Kanon I. Religionsgeschichtlich" in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001⁴, Vol. 4, 767.
14. Radscheit Matthias, "The Qur'ān – codification and canonization" in Wild, Stefan (ed.). *Self-Referentiality in the Qur'ān*, 2006, 93-101.
15. Schindler Alfred, Art. Kanon II. Kirchengeschichtlich" in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001⁴, Vol. 4, 767-770.
16. Theissen Gerd, "Plurality and Unity in Primitive Christianity and the Origin of the Canon" in: *The Religion of the Earliest Churches. Creating a Symbolic World*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999, 249-285.
17. Wimmer Stefan Jakob and Stephan Leimgruber, *Von Adam bis Muhammad. Bibel und Koran im Vergleich*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2007.