

In Defense of Islam:

Confronting the Christians with their own Scriptures

Ali Ataie

In Defense of Islam:

Confronting the Christians with their own Scriptures

Copyright 2004

By

Ali Ataie

For Roya

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	i
<u>Part I – Refuting Christianity</u>	
Chapter 1 <i>Refuting the divinity of Christ</i>	1
Chapter 2 <i>Refuting the Trinity</i>	40
Chapter 3 <i>Refuting Pauline Doctrine</i>	69
Chapter 4 <i>Refuting the Crucifixion and Resurrection</i>	110
<u>Part II – Defending Islam</u>	
Chapter 5 <i>Muhammad in the Old Testament</i>	153
Chapter 6 <i>Muhammad in the New Testament</i>	193
Chapter 7 <i>Muhammad, a Mercy unto all mankind</i>	227
Chapter 8 <i>There is no god except Allah</i>	274
<i>Appendix A – Jesus in Islam: Selected Qur’an Verses</i>	310
<i>Appendix B – On Interfaith Dialogue and Debate</i>	320
<i>Appendix C – Answering Tough Questions and Turning the Tables</i>	325
Glossary	334
Bibliography	346

Introduction

As-salamu 'alaikum wa rahmatullahi wa barakatuhu. May the peace and blessings of God Almighty be upon you all. As Muslims, we know that Islam is Truth and nothing but the Truth. Those of us who have immigrated to this country from foreign lands, like yours truly, try to live our lives in accordance to this ultimate Truth. Many times, however, due to unnecessary circumstances that we create for ourselves, the *deen* that *Allah* perfected and promised would be victorious is compromised and in many unfortunate cases, apologized for. Why are we apologizing for the blessings of Islam you may ask? Well, it's quite simple. The average American Muslim comes home from a hard day's work of sitting inside of a cubicle behind a computer screen and begins to go through his robotic motions of ablutions and prayer. After a three-minute whirlwind of bowing and prostration, he turns on the good old "tube" and hears about a deranged Muslim man who tried to light his shoes on fire on a commercial airliner. Naturally, he changes the channel. This time he is told of a lunatic in America's heartland who goes around sniping people at random. Oh by the way, he is Muslim. Again, he changes the channel. Ah, the war in Iraq! He increases the volume to hear the latest about the American campaign known as "Iraqi Freedom." The newscaster begins, "Today in Iraq, an American soldier killed three fellow American soldiers when he tossed a couple of hand-grenades into various tents while the men were asleep." "Interesting", you might say. Why would an American soldier do such a dastardly deed? Why? Because he was Muslim! Our Muslim friend turns off his television set and goes into the bathroom to shave, twice. Any sign of facial hair could be disastrous. The next day at work he is asked by a co-worker, "Hey Rasheed, are you Muslamic?" Immediately Rasheed is filled with terror and before he can respond, he feels his

heart beating like a drum in his chest. “Ye-es, but I’m a *good* Muslim.” If you, dear reader, would also consider yourself a “good Muslim” then this book is for you.

As Muslims, it is absolutely imperative that we free ourselves from this mentality of timidity and inferiority. Did not Allah the Exalted say through His Chosen One¹: “You are the best of peoples evolved from mankind” (Qur’an 3:110)? In America today, we have become so obsessed with how to defend our religion while back on our heels that we have forgotten that the best defense is a good offense. We must learn to weather the storm of overhand rights and left jabs while we lean seemingly defeated on the ropes. Suddenly, like our brother Muhammad Ali, we explode out of our pretended injuries and unleash such a flurry of punishment that George Foreman will forever think twice before he steps into the ring again with “the greatest.”

But why do we never seem to get off the ropes? Sadly, the reason is because we have lost hope. Characters like Pat Robertson, Billy Graham and sonny Franklin, Jerry Falwell, and Jimmy Swaggart have taken the wind right out of our sails. These fundamentalist Christians and many others like them are the main reasons for Muslim inferiority complexes in America. We are called terrorists, uneducated, barbarous, woman-beaters, and Satanic by these so-called followers of the son of Mary (upon whom be peace). Books such as *Reasoning from the Scriptures with Muslims* by Ron Rhodes, *Answering Islam* by Norman Geisler and Abdul Saleeb, *Why I am not a Muslim* by Ibn Warraq, and *Islamic Invasion* by the eccentric Robert Morey, have poisoned the hearts and minds of our less informed brethren as well as the ignorant average American with lies and slanders about Allah and His mighty Messenger Muhammad (upon whom be peace). O dear Muslims,

¹ *Al-Mustafa*: A title of the Prophet Muhammad.

have you forgotten that you are in the community of believers under the Holy Apostle of Allah that Allah has taken as His Beloved? The saying goes, “If you can’t beat them, join them,” *but verily I say unto thee*², “If you can’t join them, beat them!”

“It is He who has sent His Messenger with guidance and the religion of Truth; that he may proclaim it over all religion, even though the Pagans may detest it.” -Holy Qur’an 61:9.

This book is for those brothers and sisters of mine who want to challenge their Christian friends to look into their own sources and derive answers for themselves without the aid of their pastor, preacher, Pope, or Paul. If a Christian should happen to ask you a question such as, “What do you say about the fact that Islam has been spread by the sword?” - Naturally, you should provide him with a satisfactory answer. You do not, however, stop there. After removing the cobwebs of ignorance from your Christian friend’s mind, follow up with a question like, “and what do *you* say about Jesus commenting in Matthew 10:34: ‘Think not that I have come to bring peace on earth, I have not come to bring peace, but a sword?’” Usually employing such a tactic causes the “Holy Ghost” to forsake your Christian friend and flee much like the disciples did to Jesus according to the canonical gospels. **Lesson 1:** Most Christians who enjoy proselytizing their “good news” to the Muslims are actually extremely cowardly. Like a school-yard bully they derive pleasure by preying on those smaller in stature. On one occasion, a Christian approached me on campus and wanted so much that I should be anointed by the Holy Spirit and have my many sins forgiven. After a short exchange he realized that my short-cropped beard

² A refrain commonly used by Jesus according to the Christian Gospels.

and red *kufi* were no push over. In frustration he blurted out, “Allah is bad news, He only loves those who obey Him, while Jesus (the Christian god) loves everyone, *even the worst of sinners.*” I retorted by quoting his own scripture and the expression on his face still, to this day, causes me to chuckle: “You *hate all* workers of iniquity. The Lord abhors the bloodthirsty and deceitful man” (Psalms 5:5,6). He gathered his things and quickly took leave of me.

What about Islam’s view of women? Let’s state the facts: 1) The head of the woman is the man. 2) Women are the glory of man. 3) Women were created for man. 4) Women are to be submissive unto men. 5) A woman speaking in a house of God is shameful. 6) Wives must submit to their husbands as to the Lord. 7) Women are the weaker sex. 8) The natural use of women is to satisfy men. 9) If a woman does not pray with her head covered then it must be shaved. Interestingly, all but one of the above facts come straight from *Paul*, a Pharisee turned Christian zealot. Number 6 comes from Peter, the disciple whom Jesus calls “Satan” (Romans 1:27; I Corinthians 11:3-9, 13, 14:34-35; Ephesians 5:20-24; I Peter 3:7).

By Allah, the Lord of the heavens and the earth, the only way to truly understand the Christian Bible is to study it from a Muslim perspective. Only then can we separate myth from Truth. The Christian, however, is allowed no room for demonstrating such objectivity and must submit to believe in every letter of this so-called “Book of God” with all of its documented stories of rape, incest, “whoredom”, murder, and cruelty; not to mention hundreds of blatant contradictions. You may have heard the Christian boast that there are now over 20,000 original Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, but what he doesn’t tell you is that no two manuscripts are identical! “But the variations in the manuscripts do not deal with essentials of belief,” he cries. Really? I personally own Bible versions such as

the Revised Standard Version of 1952 & 1971, the Revised English Bible, and New King James Version³ that have the following revisions: 1) the word begotten in 3:16 changed to “unique” or “one and only” which contradicts the Nicene and Athanasian creeds that Jesus is “begotten, not made.” 2) Mark 1:1 – Jesus the “son of God” changed to “son of Abraham.” 3) Mark 16:9-20 & Luke 24:51 where Jesus ascends into the heavens is MIA (missing in action) in the RSV 1952. 4) 1 John 5:7 - the only verse in the entire Bible that explicitly describes the doctrine of the Trinity is now expunged from most modern translations! Are concepts such as Trinity, divine-sonship, and the ascension of the “Lord” not essentials of Christian belief? God made it a point to mention His “Son” riding a donkey into Jerusalem in all four gospels, but decides to leave out the greatest feat of Christendom, the home-coming of Jesus into the heavens?

As the Christians step up their missionary efforts in America, what are we doing to counter them? It is incumbent upon all of us to do our part in our own capacities. For many Christians, religion is big business. The fundamentalists have very effectively used our own technology against us. Our televisions are riddled with programs featuring Christian preachers praying into the camera and wearing Armani suits and gold Rolex wristwatches while asking their viewers to send them money. Did not Jesus say that it was easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God (Mark 10:25)? Did he not exhort his followers to pray secretly in their “closets” with the doors shut (Matthew 6:6)? Did he not insist upon giving alms in such a way that our “left hands know not what our right hands doeth” (Matthew 6:3)? Are not his followers supposed to “sell all that they

³ All references made in this book from the Bible are taken from the KJV & NKJV unless otherwise specified.

own” in order to follow him (Matthew 19:21)? **Lesson 2:** Know your place. If you don’t even know the basics of Islam, then what right have you to go to the Christian and tell him he’s wrong? You will only make yourself look foolish.

Allah the Exalted has said: “Who is better in speech than one who calls to Allah, works righteousness, and says, ‘I am of those who bow down in Islam’” (Qur’an 41:33). So call your Christian friend, co-worker, or relative to the Truth of Islam but make no apologies for your faith, and know that honor comes only from Allah *subhana hu wa ta ‘ala*. Also, be extremely respectful of their beliefs and have patience with what they may say. A comment that may seem offensive to you may be a result of a Christian simply not knowing any better.

This book is written under the assumption that you, the reader, are knowledgeable of the fundamentals and practices of Islam and that you implement these practices on a daily basis. This book is divided into two parts with four chapters in each part. In Part I, we will examine the so-called “deity” of Christ, the dogma of the Trinity, and prove that Jesus was in fact a faithful servant of Allah and that he was never crucified. In Part II, we will look closely at the nature of the One True God, Allah, and His Beloved Messenger Muhammad, a mercy unto all mankind from a Biblical and Qur’anic perspective. Futile Christian lies such as the Prophet being an epileptic or possessed by a demon will be refuted and revealed to be ridiculous. You will read how no man in history, whether prophet, god-incarnate, or world leader, has ever achieved as much as this frugal son of the desert.

I am a firm believer in the notion that you cannot truly know your own argument unless you fully understand your opponents’. So the next time a Christian comes to you with talks of love and brotherhood, deal gently with him, but turn the tables and give him a

hearing of Truth. You will more than likely see his phoniness melt away and true feelings of hate and racism surface. **Lesson 3:** Don't waste your time on extremely emotional Christians who have nightly conversations with God and enjoy speaking in tongues. As soon as you start to make sense to these people they accuse you of being Satan incarnate! "But if they turn back, say: Bear ye witness that we are at least Muslims bowing to Allah's Will" (Qur'an 3:64). We must not label all Christians either, as that would be a gross injustice. I personally have dozens of Christian friends who would put almost any Muslim to shame when it comes to morality and piety. They are respectful of our beliefs and kind to their fellow man. Whenever in doubt, refer to Allah's Word: "Strongest among men in enmity to the believers wilt thou find the Jews and Pagans; and nearest among them in love to the believers wilt thou find those who say, 'We are Christians': because amongst these are men devoted to learning and men who have renounced the world, and they are not arrogant" (Qur'an 5:82). For those Christians, however, who simply want to insult Islam and spread mischief, give them a steady diet of their own scripture and watch how they tuck their Bibles safely under their arms and walk away with ignominy, all the while wondering how they let themselves become victims of the Muslim "rope-a-dope."

***Qaala Rabbish-shrahli saadri
Wa yas-sirli amri
Wahlul 'oqdatam-mil-lisaani
Yaf qaahu qowli***

*He said: My Lord expand for me my
courage
And ease my task for me
Remove the impediment from my
speech
So they may understand what I say.*
-Al Qur'an 20:25-25.

Part I – Refuting Christianity

Chapter 1 *Refuting the divinity of Christ*

“In blasphemy indeed are those who say that ‘God is Christ, the son of Mary.’” – Holy Qur’an 5:17.

Is Jesus Christ really God Almighty? In his book *The Case for Christ*, Lee Strobel comments: “The Old Testament paints a portrait of God by using such titles and descriptions as Alpha and Omega, Lord, Savior, King, Judge, Light, Rock, Redeemer, Shepherd, Creator, giver of life, forgiver of sin, and speaker with divine authority. It’s fascinating to note that in the New Testament each and every one is applied to Jesus.” Let’s take a look at the Bible and use our God-given faculties of logic and reason to arrive at a definitive answer.

The Books of the Bible

The Christian Bible is divided into two parts: 1) The Old Testament and 2) The New Testament. The Old Testament, or Hebrew Bible, is the sacred scripture of the Jews. It consists of three parts known as the Torah (Law), *Nebim* (Prophets), and *Kettubim* (Writings). The Jews simply took the first letter of each of these names and collectively dubbed their scripture by the acronym *Tanakh* (TaNaKh). The first five books of the *Tanakh* are called the Torah and are generally ascribed to Moses. The next thirty-four books in the Protestant Bible are split between the Prophets and Writings. The Roman Catholic Version of the Bible (RCV or *Douai*) contains seven extra books that the Protestants reject and call *Apocrypha*, meaning doubtful or spurious.

The New Testament is believed by Christians to be evidence of God's new covenant with mankind. Although Christians continue to believe in the Old Testament as God's Word, they also believe that it has been superseded and abrogated by the writings of Paul and the Apostles. The New Testament contains twenty-seven books which include four biographical accounts of the life of Jesus called Gospels, fourteen (although this number is disputed) letters of Paul written to various Christian churches and communities in Europe, and several other epistles, letters, and an apocalypse authored by various apostles including Peter, James, Jude, and John.

The first three Gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) are called the *synoptic* Gospels, meaning "one-eyed." This is because they basically follow the same sequence of events in the life of Jesus. The Gospel of John, or Fourth Gospel, is drastically different than the synoptics in almost every sense. Rather than Jesus making speeches about the coming Kingdom of God or constructing parables to demonstrate the likeness of that Kingdom, the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel elects to provide his listeners with very long theological discourses about his very nature.

Unlike what we claim for the Qur'an, Christians believe that the Bible is inspired, not revealed by God. The difference between inspired and revealed can be demonstrated in the Islamic tradition when we look at the Qur'an and *hadith*. The former is the literal speech of God (revealed) whereas the latter are the words of God filtered through the mind and articulated by the Prophet Muhammad (inspired). In the case of the Bible, you will notice that the prejudices and the social/religious agendas of the authors come through very vividly in their writings. For instance, one can easily notice the war-like tone of Isaiah's words, the systematic, all-encompassing style of Luke, the high christological elements of John, and the passionate and in many places,

sarcastic tone of Paul. It is very evident that the hands of man, through the minds of man wrote the Bible.

Some Bibles feature what is known as “red-letting.” This is where all of the so-called words of Christ are written in red ink while the rest remains in black. Jesus is the centerpiece of the religion of Christianity yet you will notice that out of the nearly two-thousand pages of the Bible written over the centuries by various authors, scarcely eighty pages contain red ink!

The Old Testament (TANAKH): N = *Nebim* (Prophets)
K = *Kettubim* (Writings)

The Torah:

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Genesis | 20. Proverbs - K |
| 2. Exodus | 21. Ecclesiastes – K |
| 3. Leviticus | 22. Song of Songs – K |
| 4. Numbers | 23. Isaiah – N |
| 5. Deuteronomy | 24. Jeremiah – N |
| | 25. Lamentations – K |
| 6. Joshua - N | 26. Ezekiel – N |
| 7. Judges - N | 27. Daniel - K |
| 8. Ruth - K | 28. Hosea - N |
| 9. I Samuel - N | 29. Joel - N |
| 10. II Samuel - N | 30. Amos - N |
| 11. I Kings - N | 31. Obadiah - N |
| 12. II Kings - N | 32. Jonah - N |
| 13. I Chronicles - K | 33. Nahum - N |
| 14. II Chronicles - K | 34. Micah - N |
| 15. Ezra - K | 35. Habakkuk - N |
| 16. Nehemiah - K | 36. Zephaniah - N |
| 17. Esther - K | 37. Haggai - N |
| 18. Job - K | 38. Zechariah - N |
| 19. Psalms - K | 39. Malachi - N |

The Apocrypha (RCV of Bible)

1. Tobit
2. Judith

3. I Maccabees
4. II Maccabees
5. Wisdom of Solomon
6. Sirach
7. Baruch

The New Testament:

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------|
| 1. Matthew | 15. I Timothy |
| 2. Mark | 16. II Timothy |
| 3. Luke | 17. Titus |
| 4. John | 18. Philemon |
| 5. Acts | 19. Hebrews |
| 6. Romans | 20. James |
| 7. I Corinthians | 21. I Peter |
| 8. II Corinthians | 22. II Peter |
| 9. Galatians | 23. I John |
| 10. Ephesians | 24. II John |
| 11. Philippians | 25. III John |
| 12. Colossians | 26. Jude |
| 13. I Thessalonians | 27. Revelation |
| 14. II Thessalonians | |

The “I am” statements of the Gospel of John

It should be noted that none, not a single one of these so-called “divine claims” of Jesus appear in any way, shape, or form, in the synoptic gospels. This is certainly problematic since Christians almost invariably point to these passages as undeniable proofs of the divinity of Christ. It should also be noted that the *Jesus Seminar*¹ decided unanimously that *none* of the “I am” statements are historically accurate. The facts are clear: 1) The Gospel of John was the last of the canonical gospels to be written, somewhere around 90-100 CE. 2)

¹ A group of about one-hundred leading North American scholars that study and critically examine the historicity of the canonical Gospels. They have determined that only about 30% of what the Jesus of the Bible said is historically accurate.

The form, content, style, and chronology of this Gospel is very much in contrast to the synoptic tradition. 3) This book, as well as the synoptics, were anonymous books until about the year 200 CE when they were pseudonymously attributed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. 4) None of the four canonical gospels were written down during the lifetime of Christ (upon whom be peace), nor were they written in his mother tongue. There were countless communities of first century Christians who never even heard of the Gospel of John or the mighty “claims” of Jesus within its pages. The oldest Greek New Testament text, the *Codex Sinaiticus*, was not codified until the year 375 CE and included an Epistle of St. Barnabas that has since been expunged by the Church as a fabrication. After the infamous Council of Nicea in 325 CE, any Christian community that did not believe in the Trinity was deemed heretical and considered “lawful blood” for the Church hoards. Books were burned and entire populations were exterminated by Constantine and his cronies.

Most Christians claim that John the son of Zebedee, a disciple of Jesus, wrote the Gospel that bears his name. To understand the sheer folly of such a claim, I will draw a similarity that you can easily follow. To say that John the son of Zebedee authored the Fourth Gospel is equivalent to saying that *Zayd Ibn Thabit* (may Allah be pleased with him), the chief scribe of the Prophet Muhammad, decided to wait seventy years until after the death of his Master to write anything down on paper or papyrus about the Prophet and when he finally did, he wrote it using Chinese characters, not Arabic letters! Point out to your Christian friend that Matthew was also a disciple of Jesus. He has no choice but to agree. Then ask him why Matthew, an ear and eyewitness to the ministry of Jesus did not record a single one of the “I am” statements that Christians often quote to prove Christ’s divine nature? In fact, Matthew

decides to plagiarize 90% of Mark's Gospel, a man who never even saw the historical Jesus!

The following "I am" statements are found only in the Gospel of John:

- "I am that bread of life." – John 6:48.
- "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am." – John 8:58.
- "As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world." – John 9:5.
- "Then said Jesus unto them again, Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep." – John 10:7.
- "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." – John 10:11.
- "Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." - John 11:25.
- "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." – John 14:6.
- "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman." – John 15:1.

How can Matthew miss *all* of these essential "divine" claims? 100% failure? Was Matthew truly inept or maybe he never heard of any of these statements? What about Luke and Mark? Do they put these words into the mouth of the Master? Nope, not once. St. Luke actually tells us why he wrote his Gospel:

“Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word; It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, That thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed.” - Luke 1:1-4.

In this introduction to his Gospel, Luke very candidly admits that his Gospel of Jesus is purely from hearsay traditions and that it “seemed good” for him to write since he is a physician and can give a more orderly account than a bunch of fishermen and tax collectors. He never claims that he is under the trance of the Holy Spirit and in fact, this Gospel is actually a letter to a person named “Theophilus.” Basically what Luke is saying is the following: “There have been many that have written about the life of Jesus that were there to witness his ministry. I think that it would be a good *idea* for me to write about him also since I know what I’m talking about. My book will help you understand what we have been trying to convince you of, Mr. Theophilus.”

John 1:1 – The Word was God

Never settle for anything less than Jesus. In other words, don’t let the Christian quote you John 1:1: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God,” and be content that he has gained mastery over you. John 1:1 are not the words of Jesus, but of John, *at best*. We as Muslims must demand as proof unequivocal statements of Jesus where he states “I am God” or “worship me.” In reality, there are no such statements. John is not nearly good enough for us.

We want to hear it from the Master himself. But what about John 1:1? Will I simply dismiss it as an obvious Christian forgery? I wouldn't call it forgery as much as deception. In Exodus 7:1, we are told that the Lord God of Israel sent the Holy Prophet Moses (upon whom be peace) as "*elohim*," meaning "God" (royal plural) unto Pharaoh and Aaron as his Prophet. In Psalm 82:6, God tells His chosen Israelites: "I said: Ye are *elohim*, all sons of the Most High." In I Corinthians 4:4 Satan is called "*theos*," or God of this world. In all three of the above mentioned passages the Christians have rendered the Hebrew and Greek as "god(s)" with a small "g," yet insist on translating "*el*, *Immanuel*, and *theos*" mentioned in Isaiah 9:6, Matthew 1:23, and John 1:1 as "God" with a big "g" because they are, as they claim, referring to Jesus! Don't let them pull the wool over your eyes in this matter. Inform your Christian friend that there are no capital letters in the original Hebrew and Greek and ask him why Christian authors have arbitrarily decided to capitalize certain "key" words while leaving others alone. See Chapter 2 for the correct meaning of the phrase "Word of God."

A Christian may rebut, "There are no capital letters in Greek but there surely is the definite article." This does not help his case however. In the first occurrence of the predicate noun "God," it is preceded by the definite article "*ton*." Therefore, the translation, "and the Word was with (the) God" is correct. The second occurrence of the predicate noun "God," is *not* preceded by a definite article *ton* yet the Christians continue to render it as "and the Word was God" when in reality it should read, "and the word was *a* god." According to Greek rules on grammar, however, a predicate noun that is preceded by a verb may be translated as definite according to context. For example in John 4:19 we are told: "The woman saith unto him, Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet." This verse can also be translated as "I perceive that thou art *the*

Prophet,” because the predicate noun “prophet” is preceded by the verb “*ei*,” or “art.” In John 1:21, the Jews ask John the Baptist, “art thou the Prophet?” This is in reference to the Prophet of Deuteronomy 18:18, not just any prophet. The Jews are asking him a very specific question. The woman in John 4:19 simply remarks that Jesus is *a* prophet. Again, the context is what determines the usage. Jesus never claims that he is God in the Bible and always considers himself subordinate to Him, so while the translation offered by Christians of John 1:1 is grammatically correct, it is *contextually* incorrect.

John 8:58 – Before Abraham was, I AM

The Christians claim that Jesus uses the Divine Name “*Yahweh*” that God gave to Moses in Exodus 3:14 as referring to himself in this oft-repeated verse. Let’s examine this claim more closely. The New Jerusalem Bible has translated this phrase “I am that I am” from “*Ehe’ye asher ehe’ye*” (Hebrew) as “I am He who is: *Ego emi, Ho on*” (Greek). The commentary of this verse states that this rendering of the original Hebrew of Exodus 3:14 is exactly how the seventy translators of the Greek Septuagint (LXX)² understood the meaning to be, and these were highly educated Greek-speaking Hebrew scholars. Essentially God is telling Moses that “He who is” or He that can never die has sent him unto Pharaoh.

The Divine attribute is the phrase “*Ho on*” (He who is), yet Jesus in John 8:58 simply says, “Before Abraham was, *ego emi*.” He does not claim the divine attribute used in the Septuagint which educated Jews at the time of Jesus would have been aware of. Again, we have Christian word games being played here. The

² A Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible completed by seventy Greek-speaking Hebrew scholars in Alexandria, Egypt (250 BCE).

words in English are the same, namely “I am.” The Greek of John, however, is different than the Greek of Exodus 3:14. Let’s look at the entire passage:

“Then said the Jews unto him, Now we know that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead, and the prophets; and thou sayest, If a man keep my saying, he shall never taste of death. Art thou greater than our father Abraham, which is dead? and the prophets are dead: whom makest thou thyself? Jesus answered, If I honour myself, my honour is nothing: it is my Father that honoureth me; of whom ye say, that he is your God: Yet ye have not known him; but I know him: and if I should say, I know him not, I shall be a liar like unto you: but I know him, and keep his saying. Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw [it], and was glad. Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am. Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by.” – John 8:52-59.

So what does Jesus mean by “Before Abraham was, I am,” and why do the Jews pick up stones? Jesus is simply claiming his legitimacy in a very clever way. The Jews were so proud that they were the progeny of Abraham, so he (Jesus) hits them where it hurts most. He basically says, “Before Abraham was born into this earthly existence, I was in the knowledge and Will of God. When we all existed before the creation of the physical universe in spiritual form, Abraham longed to see my day, the day of the Messiah.” Jesus is saying that since God knew him and made him Christ before the creation of Abraham, he (Jesus) is just as legitimate as Abraham. God tells the Prophet Jeremiah: “Before I formed thee in the belly *I knew thee*; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, [and] I

ordained thee a prophet unto the nations” (Jeremiah 1:5). This is precisely what Jesus meant when he said: “And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was” (John 17:5). Is it unusual for a Prophet to speak like this? Did any other prophets prove their “bona-fides” by suggesting their pre-existence in the Will and infinite knowledge of God? The best of creation, the Prophet Muhammad (upon whom be peace and blessings) once said, “*I am* the seal the of the Prophets when Adam was in clay.” Surely this makes Muhammad more worthy of being a god-incarnate since Adam predates Abraham chronologically. Alas, the fundamentalist Christian’s programmed mind can only see in black and white.

Even the Baptist cousin of Jesus warns the Jews: “And think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to [our] father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham” (Matthew 3:9). - See Chapter 6 for a meaning of this verse. Your Christian friend may explode, “Then why do the Pharisees pick up stones?” The answer is because Jesus is claiming to be genuinely sent from God and His anointed. We are told in the Book of Deuteronomy 18:20 that false prophets must be killed. Turn the tables on your Christian buddy and ask him, “If the Jews truly believed that Jesus claimed to be God, then why don’t they use these ‘claims’ as evidence against him in the religious High Court of the Sanhedrin?” We are told in Mark 14:55: “And the chief priests and the whole council gathered together to find evidence that would warrant a death sentence, *but failed to find any*” (Revised English Bible). They couldn’t even get two witnesses to agree with each other! Having no reason to kill Jesus, the Jews pulled a “180” and changed their charge from blasphemy, a religious crime, to sedition or treason, a political crime. Why? Because they knew that Pilate, the Roman Procurator, would have little mercy on enemies of the state. After Pilate tells the hoards of Jews

shouting for Jesus' execution that he finds no fault in Jesus, the Jews very cleverly answer, "If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Caesar" (John 19:12). Therefore, Pilate had little choice but to hand him over to be crucified.

The Christian will at this point be obstinate. He will cry, "No! They killed him because he claimed to be God, not just a prophet!" Answer this by simply asking him if any of the previous Hebrew prophets ever claimed to be God. He will say no. Then inquire as to why *they* were killed by the Jews? Jesus lashes out against his people: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, [thou] that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under [her] wings, and ye would not" (Matthew 23:37). Is it surprising that the Jews are constantly picking up stones against Jesus when many of the previous prophets were stoned, and they *never* claimed to be God?

Josh McDowell says in his book *More than a Carpenter* whose cover boasts over 10,000,000 copies printed worldwide (emphasis mine): "An analysis of Christ's testimony shows that he claimed to be 1) the Son of the Blessed One (God); 2) The One who would sit at the right hand of power, and 3) the Son of Man who would come on the clouds of heaven. Each of the affirmations is distinctively *messianic*." I agree. They were claims to be the *Christ*, not God.

Jesus...a false prophet by Jewish and Christian standards

Speaking of false prophets, let's examine the Old and New Testament criteria concerning them. According to Mark 13:22, *false* prophets can perform "great signs and wonders to deceive even the very elect." Peter however, uses this same false criteria in the book of Acts to prove that Jesus is the Christ: "Ye men of

Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know:” (Acts 2:22). Why would the chief disciple of Jesus and first Holy Pontiff try to prove the Messiah-ship of Jesus by using standards that Jesus himself rejected? In fact Jesus says of miracles: “An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after signs” (Mark 12:39). Further he asks: “Will none of you believe without seeing signs and portents” (John 4:48)? According to Jesus, belief in magic tricks constitutes a low level of faith. In John 3:2, Nicodemus comments, “no one can do these signs that you do unless God is with him.” Jesus apparently disagrees with these words.

In Deuteronomy 18:20 we are told: “But the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die.” According to Christians, prayers must be done in the name of Jesus, the name of a man, a false god! Christians also claim that this is how Jesus taught his people to pray, *in his name*. Little wonder Jesus exclaims: “Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied *in thy name*? And *in thy name* have cast out devils? And *in thy name* done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity” (Matthew 7:22-23).

Deuteronomy 18:22 states: “When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that [is] the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, [but] the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.” In other words, if a so-called prophet makes a prediction, then that prediction must come true in the future or at least when the prophet says it will happen. Also see Jeremiah 28:9. According to the New Testament, however, Jesus says concerning the Second Coming:

“Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled” (Matthew 24:34); “Verily I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power” (Mark 9:1). It is very apparent from the letters of Paul and the early Pauline church that they expected the appearance of Jesus to be imminent. However much like the “Great Disappointment,”³ this event never happened.

Finally, in Deuteronomy 21:23 we are told: “His body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day; (for he that is hanged [is] accursed of God;) that thy land be not defiled, which the Lord thy God giveth thee [for] an inheritance.” Thus false prophets will be hanged on trees.

Let’s take another look at the above criteria and compare them to the Biblical Jesus:

- 1) He will show you signs and wonders.
- 2) He will speak in the name of false gods.
- 3) His prophecies will not come to pass.
- 4) He will be hanged on a tree because he is accursed.

Woefully, the Christian Jesus is four for four. It is only with the Qur’an that Jesus (upon whom be peace) is exalted and cleared of all falsehood:

“Behold! the angels said: ‘O Mary! Allah giveth thee glad tidings of a Word from Him: his name will be Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, held in honour in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest to Allah; He shall speak to the people in

³ October 22, 1844: The date calculated by Baptist preacher William Miller to be the day of Christ’s return. When it didn’t happen, many of his followers, called Millerites, became Seventh-Day Adventists.

childhood and in maturity, and he shall be (of the company) of the righteous.’ She said: ‘O my Lord! How shall I have a son when no man hath touched me?’ He said: ‘Even so: Allah createth what He willeth: When He hath decreed a plan, He but saith to it, ‘Be,’ and it is! And Allah will teach him the Book and Wisdom, the Law and the Gospel, and (appoint him) a messenger to the Children of Israel, (with this message): ‘I have come to you, with a Sign from your Lord, in that I make for you out of clay, as it were, the figure of a bird, and breathe into it, and it becomes a bird by Allah’s leave: And I heal those born blind, and the lepers, and I quicken the dead, by Allah’s leave; and I declare to you what ye eat, and what ye store in your houses. Surely therein is a Sign for you if ye did believe.’” – Holy Qur’an 3:42-49.

John 14:6 – I am the way, the truth, and the life...

Certainly extremist Christians have abused this verse all throughout their 2000 years of blood-stained history by using it to justify the killing of millions of innocents. You should know that Bible-believing Christians are extremely *exclusivist*, meaning that they will never accept you until you not only believe as they do, but *exactly* as they do. Muslims often wonder why there are so many different denominations of Christianity. The reason is because fundamentalist Christians not only hate the “heathen,” as they call them, but also hate each other. You will hear evangelist born-again call the Pope the anti-Christ. You will hear Catholics call Protestants astray. You will hear Baptists call Jehovah Witnesses non-Christian. And you will hear almost all of them call Mormons “cultists.” Allah has given us the cause of this mutual Christian rancor: “From those, too, who call themselves Christians, We did take a covenant, *but they forgot a good part of the message that was sent them*: so we estranged them, with enmity and hatred between the one and the other, to the day of judgment. And soon will Allah show them what it

is they have done” (Qur’an 5:14).

This verse (John 14:6) reads in its entirety: “I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me.” Interestingly, we as Muslims should not take any exception to this verse. Belief in Jesus as a true Prophet, Messenger, and Messiah is an article of Islamic faith. Denial of this constitutes *kufir*, or unbelief. We can surely imagine Moses mimicking these very words as he descended Sinai only to find his “rebellious” and “stiff-necked” community worshipping a golden calf. *Moses* was the way, the truth, and the life, while the calf was a false way, a false truth, and a false life.

Let’s examine the verse in its historical context. The Children of Israel at the time of Jesus were expecting the coming of three distinct luminaries, the second of which was *Ha Mashiakh*, or the “Anointed One” (See Chapter 6 for a complete explanation of Jewish prophetic expectations). When Jesus arrives on the scene he finds the Jews clinging onto a myriad of customs and traditions that had nothing to do with the true teachings of the Torah as revealed through Moses (upon whom be peace). When the Gospel revelations attempted to abrogate many of these invented traditions, the Jews became filled with hatred for the nature of Jesus’ teachings. The son of Mary lashes out: “Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell” (Matthew 23:33)?; “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithes of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier [matters] of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.[Ye] blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel” (Matthew 23:23-24).

On another occasion he tells the self-righteous Jews: “I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me” (John 14:6). He is essentially saying: “Your little scruples and customs will not save you from damnation. The Anointed of God is

here before you and yet you reject him! How do you expect to attain salvation?” Let me draw an analogy that you can easily grasp: When the Prophet Muhammad began admonishing the *Quraysh* of Mecca, he found success with great difficulty because the hearts and minds of the people were very much fixated on their idols of wood and stone. The Quraysh certainly believed in Allah, the most High God as they called Him, but felt that He was too holy to be approached without the means of intermediaries. Obviously believing in the messengership of Muhammad is the defining characteristic of a Muslim, and the very fact that the Quraysh felt that they didn’t need his guidance demonstrated their contentment with the religion of their Pagan fathers. Therefore, despite their belief in Allah, can any of the Quraysh expect to enter Heaven now that God’s Holy Prophet is among them in their very midst, and they reject him? Never!

The Christian may inform you that Jesus claimed to be “the truth,” or *al-Haqq* in Arabic, which is one of the Divine attributes of God mentioned in the Qur’an. “He is using a divine attribute to refer to himself, an attribute found in your scripture,” he will say. Inform him that the words *Ra’uf* and *Rahim*, meaning Kind and Merciful respectively, are also attributed to God in the Qur’an. However, Allah reveals in Surah Tawbah, verse 128: “Now hath come unto you a Messenger from amongst yourselves: it grieves him that ye should perish: ardently anxious is he over you: to the Believers is he *most kind and merciful*” (Qur’an 9:128). The words that Allah has used in this verse to describe the character of His Beloved are *Ra’uf* and *Rahim*, two of the divine attributes! Does this make Muhammad God? Certainly not. He simply embodies many of the sacred attributes at a much smaller, human level. By the same token, we can say that Muhammad is Great, Noble, Generous, and Truth. He is not, however, “the Creator,” or “the Giver of Life and Death.” These

attributes are solely for God and nowhere does Jesus ever claim to be these things.

You may also want to mention to the Christian the story of the Sufi mystic known as *al-Hallaj*, who in a state of spiritual realization of his Lord exclaimed, “*Ana al Haqq*,” or “I am the Truth!” This is a level of *Taqwa* (divine awareness) that the Christian is vastly ignorant of.

John 10:30 – The Father and I are One

Christians regard this verse as the golden egg of divine claims. They almost always, however, take it completely out of context. What does Jesus mean when he says that he and the Father are One? One in divinity? Let’s examine the entire passage and arrive at the truth.

“Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him, How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not: the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me. But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, **neither shall any [man] pluck them out of my hand.** My Father, which gave [them] me, is greater than all; and **no [man] is able to pluck [them] out of my Father's hand.** I and [my] Father are one. Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him. Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world,

Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" - John 10:24-36.

Notice Jesus, referring to his sheep, says that no man can pluck them out of his hand. Then he says that His Father is greater than all, and no man is able to pluck them out of His Hand. He and the Father are one, yes, one in *purpose*! Their unity exists in the fact that they are protecting their sheep, not in their godhead, as Christians claim. Jesus even prefaces his so-called "claim" by saying that the Father "is greater than all" so that there is no confusion in what he is saying yet Christians remain confused. Christians needing to justify themselves, ridiculously claim that Jesus in verse 29 is speaking of the *person* of the Father and not of His nature or essential being. However in the very next verse, they now claim that Jesus *is* speaking of the nature and essence of the Father and equating himself to Him. This is a classic case of Christians reading into the scripture something that is not there.

Ron Rhodes, author of *Reasoning from the Scriptures with Muslims*, quotes the Athanasian Creed: (emphasis mine, bashfully): "(Christ) is equal to the Father as touching his Godhood, and inferior to the Father as *touching his manhood*" (pages 154-155). With statements like this, who needs the funny pages? - See Chapter 2 for a complete refutation of the Trinity.

We are then told that the Jews pick up stones and tell Jesus, "for a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God." Rhodes comments, "Notice that Jesus did not respond by saying, 'Oh, no, you've got it all wrong. I was not claiming to be God. I'm just claiming unity of purpose with Him.' Jesus did not offer a single correction because the Jews understood Him exactly as He had intended to be understood." Maybe Mr. Rhodes forgot to read the remainder of the passage

because Jesus does, most definitely, correct the Jews' misunderstanding of his claim.

In verse 34, Jesus quotes Psalm 82:6: "Is it not written in your law: 'I said, you are gods?'" He continues: "If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken." So what exactly *is* Jesus claiming? He is claiming that he is *receiving the word of God*, and that since those who were bestowed this honor in the Law are called "gods," like Moses in Exodus 7:1, there is nothing blasphemous about him saying that he is the "Son of God." He is simply confirming previous scripture.

McDowell says: "Greek scholar A.T. Robertson writes that the 'one' is neuter, not masculine, in the Greek, and does not indicate one in person or purpose but rather one in 'essence or nature'" (page 16). However Jesus says about his disciples: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, [art] in me, and I in thee, *that they also may be one in us*: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (John 17:21). I don't think any Christian will submit to believe that there is actually a fifteen-unit godhead consisting of the Father, Son, Holy Ghost, and twelve disciples which includes the "Satanic" Peter, the doubting Thomas, and the traitor Judas Iscariot. The Greek for "one" in both verses (John 10:30, 17:21) is "*hen*." Again, oneness of purpose is meant here.

Correct your Christian friend's misunderstanding of this passage, just as Jesus corrected the Pharisees.

Refuting Divine Sonship

Rhodes states: "...the phrase 'Son of God' means of the order of God, and represents a claim to undiminished deity. There is no sexual connotation in the phrase...clear evidence for Christ's eternal Sonship is found in the fact that Christ is represented as already being the Son of God before His birth in Bethlehem"

(pages 141-142). I would agree with Rhodes partially. In the Bible, Adam, Jacob, David, any pious Jew for that matter can qualify as being a “son of God.” This title is purely metaphorical and has nothing to do with God having a physical relationship whatsoever. This concept is also carried into the New Testament. Jesus says: “*Our* Father who art in Heaven...” (Matthew 6:9); “I ascend unto my Father and *your* Father...” (John 20:17); “Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the *children* of God” (Matthew 5:9); “Call no man your father upon the earth: for one is *your* Father, which is in heaven” (Matthew 23:9).

Christians often quote John 19:7 and claim that the Jews understood Jesus’ claim as being the Son of God as a divine claim: “The Jews answered him (Pilate), We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.” The question is: Why would the Jews understand Jesus’ claims to be referring to his deity by simply saying that he is the Son of God when they know that Adam, David, and Jacob, to say the least, are called Sons of God in their scriptures? If Jesus only meant that he was the Son of God in a metaphorical sense then why would this anger the Jews? Either he meant it in a *literal* sense or perhaps in some other way. The answer is fourteen verses later. The Romans wrote “King of the Jews” above the head of Jesus while he allegedly hanged on the cross. The Jews, feeling a bit insulted, asked Pilate: “Write not, The King of the Jews; but that he said, *I am King of the Jews*” (John 19:21). Therefore, Son of God and King of the Jews are synonymous titles! Really what the Jews were saying in verse 7 was: “We have a law, and he should be killed because he has claimed to be *the Messiah*, a King.” – Not God, and certainly not the physical Son of God. Therefore, there is a clear distinction between *a* son of God, who can be anyone, and *the* son of God who is the Messiah. Thus Jesus was killed for *treason*, not blasphemy.

Christians, however, believe that the divine Sonship of Jesus is something quite different. Let's examine Rhodes' claim that Jesus was made Son before his birth in Bethlehem. St. Luke tells us:

“And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.” – Luke 1:31-35.

We are told in verse 32 that Jesus *shall* be called, not *is* called, the Son of the Highest. When Mary asks the angel Gabriel how she shall have a son, Gabriel replies, “the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.” Ask your Christian friend what exactly the phrases “come upon” and “overshadow” mean. If I said that Jack came upon and overshadowed Jill, what would I be implying? The passage continues: “*therefore* also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.” Usage of the word “therefore” clearly denotes a cause and effect relationship in which Jesus is only made Son by virtue of God coming upon and overshadowing Mary. In the Revised English Bible, this verse reads: “and for this *reason*, the child born shall be called the Son of God.” What reason is that?...the fact that God came upon and overshadowed Mary?

In the Revised Standard Versions (RSV) of the Bible (1952 & 1971) as well as nearly all modern translations with the exception of the New King James

Version (NKJV), the word “begotten” in John 3:16 has been changed to “unique” or “one and only.” Christian writers like Rhodes and Geisler claim that the Greek word *monogenes* in John 3:16 literally means “unique” or “only.” Simply stating the literal meaning of a word, however, does not grasp its true significance when it is used in a particular or specific context. If I were to say during the course of a Little League Baseball game, “Good try Jimmy, you’ll catch it next time *son*,” people in the audience may get the wrong idea. Let’s say that after the game, a curious woman approaches me and asks, “Is Jimmy really your son? I was wondering because Jimmy is white and you’re, well, kinda brownish.” If I said, “Yes, he is my son, my begotten son which proceeded from my loins,” I would also be saying that Jimmy looks like his mother. If I say, however, “Heavens no, I simply meant son as a term of endearment,” then the meaning of the word changes dramatically. The Gospel of Luke explains the concept of Jesus as the begotten son using very explicit sexual language. It explains him as being *literally* begotten.

Why did the NKJV of the Bible decide to stay with the spicy “begotten?” The preface provides us with an explanation (emphasis mine):

Dynamic equivalence, a recent procedure in Bible translation, commonly results in paraphrasing where a more literal rendering is needed to reflect a specific and vital sense. For example, references to Christ in some versions of John 3:16, as “only Son” or “one and only Son,” are doubtless dynamic equivalents of sorts. *However, they are not actual equivalents of the precisely literal “only begotten Son,”* especially in consideration of the historic Nicene statement concerning the person of Christ, “begotten, not made,” which is a crucial Christian doctrine.

In other words, Jesus is *literally* begotten of the Father, just as Isaac is literally begotten of Abraham, and Jacob of Isaac. Translations for *monogenes* which read “unique, only,” and “one and only” are not rendering the true meaning of the word when used in the context of the Christian Jesus. Ask your Christian friend what the Nicene statement “begotten not made” means. Christians say, “Adam was made, but Jesus is begotten” yet continue to insist that it is a spiritual relationship! Let the Christian take a lesson from the Word of God:

“They say: ‘(Allah) Most Gracious has begotten a son!’ Indeed ye have put forth a thing most monstrous! At it the skies are ready to burst, the earth to split asunder, and the mountains to fall down in utter ruin, that they should invoke a son for (Allah) Most Gracious. For it is not consonant with the majesty of (Allah) Most Gracious that He should beget a son. Not one of the beings in the heavens and the earth but must come to (Allah) Most Gracious as a servant. He does take an account of them (all), and hath numbered them (all) exactly. And everyone of them will come to Him singly on the Day of Judgment. On those who believe and work deeds of righteousness, will (Allah) Most Gracious bestow love.”
– Qur’an 19:88-96.

Origins of the Christian man-god

As Muslims, we very often wonder just how did the message of a simple Palestinian carpenter turn into the convoluted hocus-pocus hodge-podge that Christians believe in today. Originally, the Christians considered themselves as a sect of Judaism, but today I think we can safely say that Judaism and Christianity have very little or nothing in common. The Jews slander Mary and call Jesus a false prophet and deceiver while at the other end, the Christians call him God incarnate. Is there no middle ground here? There is, and it’s called Islam.

Christians believe that the Jesus event was the only time in all of history that God brought Himself down to our earthly level and incarnated into a human being. This is not a novel Christian idea, however. The most popular concept of God at the time of Christ in the Greco-Roman world was that of a life-giving mother goddess and sin-bearing savior (*soter*) man-god. Another ancient religion, Hinduism, also believes in the idea of the Supreme Being incarnating at various times into people in the form of Buddha, Rama, Krishna, and many other divine *avatars*. Why did the Almighty decide to do this? Because He wanted to experience this life as a man so that He can have sympathy for His creatures as they endure various trials and tribulations. Allah has told us in the Qur'an: "...the Christians call Christ the son of Allah. That is a saying from their mouth; (in this) they but *imitate what the unbelievers of old* used to say. Allah's curse be on them: how they are deluded away from the Truth" (Qur'an 9:30)! Ahmad Deedat (may Allah be pleased with him) said in his book *What is His Name?:* "Call upon Him by any name, for His are the Most Beautiful names, as long as those names are not contaminated and as long as they do not conjure up in our minds the images of men or monkeys howsoever glorified they might have been."

It remains an abiding fact that many of the present-day Christian beliefs have origins in Greco-Roman mystery religious traditions. The idea that Zeus, the supreme god, chooses mortal women to bear his sons Hercules, Persius, Asclepius, and Dionysis bears a striking resemblance to orthodox Christian doctrine, namely God the Father sending His Son Jesus out into the world via Mary. The character of *Dionysis* is of special interest to us. According to myth, Dionysis survived an attempt by Hera to kill him as an infant, invented wine, and was the only man-god of the Greek pantheon to suffer rejection and martyrdom at the hands of men. After a brief stay in *Hades*, Dionysis is

resurrected in all of his glory and ascends to heaven to accompany his father Zeus. It is not surprising that early Christian artists used the figure of Dionysis to depict Christ. In another tradition Dionysis was brutally killed by the powerful Titans, but Zeus, being the crafty god that he is, was able to reconstruct his body by using a piece of flesh torn from his son's heart. In this sense, Dionysis was re-born, or "born-again."

The most popular and politically effective religion at the time of Jesus was the cult of *Mithraism*. *Mithras*, the Persian sun-god, existed as man up until an appointed time when he committed an act of self-immolation for the sins of the world. Mithraism, also called the bull cult, enjoined on its initiates called *christos*, blood rites, communal meals, and sacrificial atonement. In their underground rituals, a bull would be brought forth which represented God, in fact *was* God. The Mithraic priest would proceed to slaughter the bull-god and sprinkle the blood onto the various *christos* signifying the remission of sin. Similarly, Christians love to wail, "My sins have been washed away by the blood of the Lamb!"

Mithras was born on the winter solstice, December 25th, and is dubbed "*solen victus*," the conquering sun-god. The Greeks and ancient Egyptians knew him as *Helios* and *Ra* respectively.

Stephen L. Harris, author of *The New Testament*, has this to say about the "I am" statements found in the 4th Gospel: "In Hellenistic culture, the closest parallel to these Johannine statements occurs in the hymns honoring Isis, an Egyptian mother-goddess who, in John's time, was recognized as a universal deity throughout the Greco-Roman world." One text from the first or second century has Isis saying (Compare to John 14:6: "I am the way, the truth, and the life..."):

I am Isis, the mistress of every land...I am the deity that had no beginning...I am the truth, I am the creator and the destroyer.

From Jesus to God

An earnest study of the canonical Gospels reveals an interesting evolution of Jesus' status during the first 200 years of Christian history.

In Mark (68-70 CE), Jesus is viewed as the hidden Messiah, suffering Prophet, and future eschatological judge who “did not come to be served, but to serve and give his life as a ransom for many” (Mark 10:45). Matthew (80 CE) pictures Jesus as the Great Teacher and obvious Jewish Messiah who has come to “fulfill the Law and the prophets” (Matthew 5:17). Luke (85-90 CE) sees Jesus as a universal Messiah who was sent to die for the sins of mankind. Luke is the first evangelist to dub Jesus “*Soter*,” meaning Savior (Luke 2:11). Finally, in John (90-100 CE), Jesus is the Divine Word (*Logos*) that initiates creation who exhorts his followers, “...if any man serve me, him will [my] Father honour” (John 12:26). What happened to “I did *not* come to served?” Ask your Christian friend why Mark and John are saying opposite things.

Strobel quotes Dr. Bruce Metzger who comments about the *pseudepigraphia*, the proliferation of gospels, epistles, and apocalypses in the first few centuries after Jesus: “They are fanciful and heretical...neither genuine nor valuable as a whole.” These documents include the Gospels of Nicodemus (an eyewitness to the crucifixion), Barnabas (the mentor of Paul, the founder of Christianity), Bartholomew (an eyewitness disciple of Jesus), and Andrew (an eyewitness disciple of Jesus).

Do people worship Jesus and call him Lord?

Although Jesus never once says the words “worship me,” Christians love pointing to verses in the Gospels (Matthew 8:2, 9:18, 15:25, 28:9, 28:17; John 9:38, 20:28) where it apparently describes Jesus accepting the worship of human beings. Let’s look at one example and examine it closely. First of all, the word rendered “worship” in all of the above mentioned passages is the koine Greek “*proskuneo*.” According to the Lexicon Strongs’ Concordance, this word is most likely derived from a root meaning which denotes “a dog licking his master’s hand.” The following, more applicable, definition reads as follows:

Proskuneo: In the New Testament by kneeling or prostration to do homage (to one) or make obeisance, whether in order to express respect or to make supplication.

a) used of homage shown to men and beings of superior rank: 1) to the Jewish high priests 2) to God 3) to Christ 4) to heavenly beings 5) to demons.

It can be observed from the definition above that the word *proskuneo* is the same word used to describe reverence of God *as well as* man. Even the Jewish priests and satanic demons are “worshipped” according to this definition! Also notice how God is mentioned distinct from Christ. So how do we ascertain the matter in which people “worshipped” Jesus? We have to look at the historical context for that.

Before the Muslims under Muhammad came along, the Children of Israel were the standard bearers of light and guidance in the world. They possessed a very clear and uncompromising theology which stated that God was a Supreme Power who can never be represented by any form, shape, or graven image. They were told in very unequivocal words: “*God is not a man*

that he should repent, *nor* the son of man that he should lie..." (Numbers 23:19. Also see I Samuel 15:29); "Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness [of any thing] that [is] in heaven above, or that [is] in the earth beneath, or that [is] in the water under the earth: *Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them:* for I the Lord thy God [am] a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth [generation] of them that hate me; And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments" (Exodus 20:3-6). Therefore, for a Jew to worship another Jew as God would be tantamount to insulting everything that Judaism has stood upon for thousands of years! The problem here is that we have an Eastern-Semitic revelation, the Gospel, being interpreted by Westerners and Gentiles. In the above cited New Testament verses most of those doing the worshipping were in fact Jews, some of whom worshipped Jesus in the presence of "multitudes." If Jesus accepted worship *as God*, then he would not have found so much favor among the peasant Jewish populace who loved and revered the theology of their forefathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Let's now look at one example from the scriptures. In Matthew 15:25, we are told that a Samaritan woman "came and worshipped him, saying, 'Lord, help me!'" Before we continue, let's shed some light on the usage of this word "Lord." Rhodes defines this word (emphasis mine): "...*the New Testament equivalent of 'Yahweh' is Kurios.* Like Yahweh, Kurios means 'Lord' and usually carries the idea of a sovereign being who exercises absolute authority." Whether or not the word Yahweh is derived from the mystical *tetragrammaton*, YHWH, or from the phrase "I am" in Exodus 3:14, Jesus certainly does not say "Before Abraham was, *ego emi Kurios.*" He simply says "*ego emi.*" This is important because most Christians will tell

you that *Yahweh* is obtained from the name that God gave to Moses. Also, in Mark 12:36 Jesus quotes Psalm 110:1: “For David himself said by the Holy Ghost, *The LORD said to my Lord*, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool.” The Greek word in both instances is “Kurios” in Mark, but the Hebrew translations of “LORD” and “Lord” are “*Yahweh*” (YHWH, Jehovah, GOD) and “*Adon*,” meaning master or lord, respectively. The words are different in Hebrew! Therefore, Kurios and Yahweh cannot *always* be equivalents and contextual matter must be taken into consideration. In the Revised English Bible, Mark 12:36 appears as: “This is the *Lord’s* oracle to my *lord*...” The commentary points out:

A Royal Psalm, probably used at the coronation ceremonies for kings 1) The Lord: Yahweh. My lord: the king who is taking office.

Jesus uses this verse to reveal his identity as the Messiah, a king, not as God. Here’s the Strongs’ Concordance definition of Kurios:

Kurios: 1) he to whom a person or things belongs, about which has power of deciding, master, lord.

- a) the possessor and disposer of a thing. 1) the owner, one who has control of the person, the master. 2) in the state: the sovereign, prince, chief, and Roman emperor.
- b) Is a title of honor expressive of respect and reverence with which servants greet their master.
- c) The title is given to: God, the Messiah.

Just like with the word *proskuneo*, the word *kurios* can be applied to *both* God and man. Notice Rhodes defines kurios as “Lord” with a big “l” while it is written as “lord” in the Concordance with a small “l.”

So again, how do we know in what way Jesus is kurios? We must look at the context. This word is taken right out of the vernacular of seventeenth-century England, where the KJV was first composed in 1611. Even in England today any Tom, Dick, or Harry is called “lord.” There is a House of Commons and a House of Lords!

Let’s revisit Matthew 15:25 as it is translated in a more modern and accurate version: “But the woman came and fell at his feet, and cried, ‘Help me, Sir!’” – Revised English Bible. In the Revised Standard Version, the woman “knelt before him,” meaning she begged him. Notice the word worship has evolved into “knelt” and “fell at his feet,” and “Lord” into “Sir.” It seems as if these contemporary Bible revisers are finally recognizing the true significance of these words in their proper contexts.

If we were told that a Roman centurion called the Emperor kurios and offered him proskuneo, then we could say due to the context, that the centurion intends to address him as God Almighty and also worship him as such. Again, the problem here is that we have an Eastern-Semitic revelation, the Gospel, being interpreted by Westerners and Gentiles.

Here’s an interesting tidbit: In Jesus’ parable of the Kingdom of God he relates in Matthew 18:23-34, he refers to the King in the story as kurios and the Christians scholars have it translated as “lord” in verses 23-25 and 27-34 in the King James Version. This is obviously a correct rendering since Jesus in no way intends to say that the King is God. In verse 26, however, we read: “The servant therefore fell down, and *worshipped* him (the King), saying, *Lord*, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all.” Ask your Christian friend why the translators of the Bible have suddenly made this poor servant an idolater!

In Matthew 25, Jesus gives us a parable of the bridegroom and his ten virgin brides. In verses 10-11, he states: “And while they went to buy, the bridegroom

came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut. Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, *Lord, Lord*, open to us.” Does this mean wives can refer to their husbands as GOD? Don’t tell that to my wife.

Isaiah 7:14 – Immanuel

Christians believe that this verse predicts the coming of Christ as God since the name *Immanuel* literally means “God with us.” Here is the verse in it’s entirety: “Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel” (Isaiah 7:14). First of all, the word for virgin in the Hebrew original is “*almah*,” meaning young woman, not “*bethula*,” meaning virgin. This discrepancy is really of little significance however, since “young woman” and “virgin” are used interchangeably by Semitic speaking cultures. What concerns us is the translation of Immanuel as God with us. Certainly, this is meant to be symbolic. It’s funny how the Christian suddenly assumes a literal stance when it comes to this verse, but sill insists that “begotten” in John 3:16 is purely metaphorical! Should we then believe in the Prophet Ishmael, meaning “God heard” as being the “Ears of God” or in Joshua as the literal “Jehovah savior?” Is Sayyidina ‘*Ali* (may Allah be pleased with him) *really* the “Most High?” Most importantly, is the kid who played “Webster,” Immanuel Lewis, “God with us” too? - Probably not.

Miracles of Jesus done by others

Despite miracles being an attribute of false prophets and christs (Mark 13:22) as previously discussed, Christians continue to qualify them as evidence of Jesus’ divinity. They are especially vocal with the Muslims because their ignorance has led them to believe that the Prophet Muhammad lacked this God given ability. This claim will be dealt with extensively in

Chapter 7, God willing. At the present moment, let's take a look at three of Jesus' greatest miracles and see how the Hebrew prophets Elijah and his successor Elisha stack up to them:

1) Jesus healed the lepers.

Luke tells us: "And as he entered into a certain village, there met him ten men that were lepers, which stood afar off: And they lifted up [their] voices, and said, Jesus, Master, have mercy on us. And when he saw [them], he said unto them, Go shew yourselves unto the priests. And it came to pass, that, as they went, *they were cleansed*" (Luke 17:12-14). Compare with Elisha: "And it came to pass, when the king of Israel had read the letter, that he rent his clothes, and said, [Am] I God, to kill and to make alive, that this man doth send unto me to recover a man of his leprosy? wherefore consider, I pray you, and see how he seeketh a quarrel against me...And Elisha sent a messenger unto him, saying, Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean... Then went he down, and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God: and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and *he was clean.*" (II Kings 5:7-14).

2) Jesus healed the blind.

Mark tells us: "And he, casting away his garment, rose, and came to Jesus. And Jesus answered and said unto him, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? The blind man said unto him, Lord, that I might receive my sight. And Jesus said unto him, Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole. And immediately he *received his sight*, and followed Jesus in the way" (Mark 10:50-52). In John 9:6, we are told that Jesus healed a blind man by rubbing his spit mixed with mud on his

face. Why don't the Christian "miracle-workers" of today do this? Compare with Elisha: "And Elisha prayed, and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord *opened the eyes* of the young man; and he saw: and, behold, the mountain [was] full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha. And when they came down to him, Elisha prayed unto the Lord, and said, smite this people, I pray thee, with blindness. And he smote them with blindness according to the word of Elisha" (II Kings 6:17-18).

3) Jesus raised the dead.

John tells us: "Then they took away the stone [from the place] where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up [his] eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by I said [it], that they may believe that thou hast sent me. And when he thus had spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. *And he that was dead came forth*, bound hand and foot with graveclothes: and his face was bound about with a napkin. Jesus saith unto them, Loose him, and let him go" (John 11:41-44). Compare to Elijah: "And he said unto her, Give me thy son. And he took him out of her bosom, and carried him up into a loft, where he abode, and laid him upon his own bed. And he cried unto the Lord, and said, O Lord my God, hast thou also brought evil upon the widow with whom I sojourn, by slaying her son? And he stretched himself upon the child three times, and cried unto the Lord, and said, O Lord my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul come into him again. And the Lord heard the voice of Elijah; and the soul of the child came into him again, *and he revived*. And Elijah took the child, and brought him down out of the chamber into the house, and delivered him unto his mother: and Elijah said, See, thy son liveth" (I Kings 17:19-23).

Mark 10:18 – No one is good but one...

This passage in Mark is, in my estimation, the most blatant denial of Jesus' so-called deity in all of the canonical Gospels. Here it is in context: "And when he was gone forth into the way, there came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God" (Mark 10:17-18). Christian apologists have gone through great lengths trying to construct an exegesis to this passage that agrees with their man-god concept but have failed miserably.

Norman Geisler and his apostate co-author Abdul Saleeb (slave of the cross) expound in their book *Answering Islam*: "A careful look at this context reveals that Jesus never denied his deity here. He simply rebuked this wealthy young man for making this careless appellation without thinking through its implication" (page 259). Such meaningless jibberish gives testimony to the fact that the Christians take what is very clear, like the verse under consideration, and mystify it. At the same time, they take what is meant to be mystical, "Before Abraham was, I am," and say it's very clear! Not only does Jesus deny being God here, he denies even being good! Let's see if Rhodes can give us a better solution. He says: "Jesus was asking the man to examine the implications of what he was saying. In effect Jesus said, 'Do you realize what you are saying when you call me good? Are you saying that I am God'" (pages 155-156)? In Rhodes' view, the quality of "good" can only belong to God. He further says (emphasis mine): "Is it not clear from the context that what Jesus was really saying is, 'You have given me a title *that belongs only to God*. Do you understand and mean it?'" In response to this bold assertion, I will direct you to the Book of Acts. Listen to how Luke describes St. Barnabas: "Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the church

which was in Jerusalem: and they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch. Who, when he came, and had seen the grace of God, was glad, and exhorted them all, that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord. For he was a *good man*, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith: and much people was added unto the Lord” (Acts 11:22-24). The word in this verse for good is identical to the word used in Mark 10:18, a title that should *only* belong to God! Do Christians believe that Barnabas is God? Not only do they not believe he is God, they call his Epistle and Gospel heretical as well. In numerous other places Jesus also uses this word *agathos* to describe men, the ground, and trees (Matthew 7:17, 12:35, 25:21-23; Luke 8:8, Luke 12:19, Luke 23:50).

So why does Jesus rebuke the young man? The reason is because he wants to make very clear what his teaching is all about. Obviously men can be good as was Jesus himself, but in order to drive the point home that God is exceptional and unique, Jesus reminds the man that he shouldn't speak presumptuously about men; God knows their level of goodness. In this sense, Jesus is making a very unambiguous distinction between God and man, *between God and himself*. In humility he denies even being good let alone God. The Prophet Muhammad taught us not to over praise people because God is fully aware of their reality.

Other Jesus responses...

John Chapter 5 describes an event in which Jesus heals a paralyzed man on the Sabbath. We are told in verse 18 that the Jews sought all the more to kill him because of this; he had made himself equal to God. In verse 19 we are told: “Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, *The Son can do nothing of himself*, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.” In the REB it states: “to this charge, Jesus

replied, I tell you the truth, the Son can do nothing by himself...,” and that is exactly what it was, *a charge*. Literally eleven verses later he says: “I can of mine own self *do nothing*: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me. If I bear witness of myself, my witness is *not true*” (John 5:30-31). These statements can never be attributed to an all-knowing, all-powerful God.

To my Muslim Brethren...

The beauty of Islam resides within our shining example of living it daily. As Muslims, we have been given the enormous responsibility of spreading the message of Allah (*subhana hu wa ta'ala*) to the Christian community. A very important rule of thumb: Always be humble in your conversations with Christians, especially regarding the divinity of Jesus. This is something Christians have been trained to believe and not to question since they were young children. Always listen to their side of things and do not interrupt anyone as that is the example of the Best of Creation (*salallahu alaihi wa sallam*). If a Christian insults you personally, continue to make your *dawah* efforts towards him or her and bear their words with beautiful patience and constancy. If they should unleash their slanders and insults towards Islam or the Prophet of Islam, gently take leave of them and let Allah sort them out later.

Be simple in your approach and always exhort Christians you speak with to use their minds and follow their *fitrah* (natural monotheistic inclinations). Remember, only Allah can open hearts unto the fold of Islam, so do your duty and put all of your trust in Him, the Exalted in Might, the Wise!

Questions to ask your Christian friends.

1. Why didn't Matthew, who was a disciple of Jesus and an ear and eyewitness to his ministry, ever record even a single one of the "I am" statements found in John? What do you think this says about their authenticity?
2. If John the son of Zebedee authored the Fourth Gospel, why did he wait nearly seventy years before writing it down in a language different than that in which he heard it from Jesus?
3. Why don't any of the Gospel authors identify themselves as Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John? Why don't they claim to be writing while inspired by the Holy Spirit?
4. Can you explain why Christian translators capitalize the word "God" in John 1:1 ("and the Word was God"), & Matthew 1:23 when there are no capital letters in Hebrew and Greek? Why don't they capitalize the word *elohim* as "God" when applied to Moses in Exodus 7:1?
5. Did you know that Jesus doesn't use the divine attribute *Ho on* (Yahweh) that God gave to Moses in Exodus 3:14, but rather says, "*ego emi*?" Can you explain why?
6. Did you know that according to the criteria given in the Old & New Testaments (Mark 13:22; Deuteronomy 18:20, 22, 21:23) the Christian Jesus fits the description of a false prophet?
7. How can you justify saying that John 10:30 refers to the oneness of God's nature and essential being

when the *context* is very clearly speaking of unity in purpose?

8. Did you know that the Jews misunderstood Jesus when he said: “The Father and I are one” (John 10:30) so Jesus corrects them by saying that they too are called gods and sons of God in the Hebrew Bible?
9. What do the words “came upon” and “overshadow” mean as used in Luke 1:35? Explain to me the phrase “begotten not made.”
10. Did you know that the Bible (Luke 1:35) as well as orthodox Christianity (Nicene Creed) teach that Jesus was literally begotten physically by God the Father?
11. How do you explain Christianity’s striking similarities to ancient Greco-Roman mystery religious cults? Have you ever heard of *Dionysis* or *Mithras*?
12. Did you know that Christians in no way agreed upon the nature of Jesus and his teachings during the first 300 plus years of Christian history?
13. Did you know that the words for “worship” and “Lord” in Greek, *proskuneo* and *kurios* respectively, could be applied to extraordinary men, prophets, demons, kings, and heavenly beings?
14. Did you know that the Hebrew Bible describes Elijah and Elisha performing many of the same miracles that Jesus did in the Gospels, including raising the dead?

Chapter 2 *Refuting the Trinity*

“Say not ‘Trinity:’ desist: It will be better for you. For God is One God.” – Holy Qur’an 4:171.

Let’s do something very simple. I will quote to you verbatim from the *Athanasian Creed* concerning the Trinity and every time you see “God” or “Person” make a mental check mark and then total them. It reads: “The Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost is God...the Father is a Person, the Son is a Person, the Holy Ghost is a Person.” How many check marks did you get? Anyone who can count at a first-grade level should have gotten six. Three for “God” and three for “Person.” The Creed continues: “and yet they are not three Gods but one God...and yet they are not three Persons but one Person.” The Creed further states: “We worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity.” Does anyone speak English here? Have words lost their meanings? In this chapter we will examine this doctrine of the “triune” god and expose it as an obvious fabrication perpetrated by the Hellenistic Pauline gentile Church.

What the Trinity is

As Muslims it is tremendously important for us to have accurate knowledge as to what exactly the Trinitarian belief entails. Christians very often charge us with propagating false information regarding this dogma. You may hear an apologist say, “Muslims believe that we worship *three* gods and that we have left the monotheistic tradition.” Remind your Christian acquaintance, “It’s not that we believe you worship three gods, we understand your *claim* to monotheism, we are simply not buying it.”

The Trinity teaches that there is only one essential being or nature, but that this nature is manifested into three separate and distinct personalities, namely the Father, the Word (Son), and the Holy Ghost (Spirit). Although the Father is *greater* than the Son and the Holy Ghost is His office or person, their essential natures are co-equal, co-eternal, co-substantial, and completely inseparable. Therefore, where the Father is in essence so are the Son and Holy Ghost. You can think of this in terms of a triangle: At the three points are the three persons, labeled “Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” These are the three “Who’s.” Now imagine an arrow starting from the inside of each corner and pointing inward toward the middle. The middle can be labeled “God.” This is the one “What.” Therefore, the Father is not the Son nor is he the Holy Ghost, but they are all God.

The triune god cannot be divided in his spirit. Christians who know something about their beliefs will agree with you on this, lest you charge them with tritheism. This leads us to an interesting question: If Jesus (the Son) is inseparable from the Father in his nature/spirit/essence, then when Jesus died on the cross as Christians claim, the Father as well as the Holy Ghost must have also died along with him. The Christian will rebut, “No, Jesus died as God in his *person*, not in his essence.” Jack T. Chick writes frequently in his Christian propagandist literature the refrain, “The Creator allowed Himself to be murdered by men.” If Jesus does not die as *both* God and man, then there is no atonement for sin.

Geisler and Saleeb state: “Only if one and the same person, who is God and man, dies on the cross for our sin can we be saved. For unless Jesus is both God and man he cannot reconcile God and man” (page 268). Despite having a divine nature as God, Jesus also has a human nature as man. Geisler explains this dualism: “Did Christ die? In his human nature, he did die. But in

his divine nature he did not die. The person who died was the Godman, but his Godness did not die.” Confused yet? It is little wonder why nearly all Christian apologists who have tried to explain the Trinity find themselves reduced to drawing triangles and scribbling grade-school level equations. So to recap: Christ died as God in his person, he died as man in his nature, but not as God in his nature. In other words, he was two-thirds dead, but the one-third that really counted, the divine nature, survived and resurrected him on the third day. Therefore, Jesus has the unique honor of being of two natures, God and man in one person.

The person of Jesus however, is not divine but human, flesh and blood in all respects. Viewed logically, it is the nature of God, His Spirit, within that person that makes him (Jesus) divine. It is the infinite within the finite that makes the latter God-incarnate. Let’s not forget that “God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth” (John 4:24), not in form, shape, size, flesh, or blood. Christians, however, do not believe that God died in his nature on the cross, only the person of God that was Jesus. Certainly God was not killed because He resurrected Jesus (the man) while he lay dead in his tomb and according to Christianity, Jesus resurrected himself. Thus to say that Jesus died as the “Godman” but his “Godness” did not die is to abandon logical consistency as to the manner of his death. What made Jesus human?...his nature as man. What made him God?...his nature as deity. Therefore, in order for him to reconcile God and man he must die in both natures. If one of them survives then this cannot be accomplished. Dying as God in person would be impossible since it was only his divine nature that made him God, and it survived according to Christianity. Would it then be possible for the person of Jesus to die but have his nature as man survive? Certainly not. He must die equally for redemption. This is perhaps what Jesus meant when he cried on the cross: “My God, my

God, why hast thou forsaken me” (Mark 15:34)? Basically saying, “Why have you abandoned me to die as a man?” So unless Jesus died in his divine nature (Godness) there is no atonement of sin. If a Christian should admit that Jesus did in fact die in his divine nature as well as his human nature, then respond by saying that the Father and Holy Spirit must have died as well because all three persons of the Trinity are inseparable in their nature as God according to the Trinitarian Creeds. Ask him, “Who ruled and maintained the heavens and the earth when ‘God’ lay dead in His tomb for three days?”

A basic example: If the nature of a dog incarnated into a cat, who would you say the animal *really* (essentially) is? Answer: A *dog*...even though he is in the *person* of a cat. Therefore, our nature dictates who we really are. If the person of the cat was killed by a passing truck but somehow his dog nature survived, can you say that the cat died as dog? No, he only died as a feline. How could the cat die as dog without his canine nature dying that *made* him dog in the first place? He can't!

A Christian might explain to you that truth is not always simple. In fact, it can be extremely complex. You do not have to disagree with him here. Explain to him that the essence of God's absolute unity is something that Muslims believe *is* extremely complex and mysterious, however the *concept* of God in Islam is not a difficult thing to grasp. It can be summed up in literally four verses: “Say: He is Allah, the One and Only; Allah, the Eternal, Absolute; He begetteth not, nor is He begotten; And there is none like unto Him” (Qur'an 112:1-4). The Christian concept of God as $1+1+1 = 3$ cannot be grasped, even by the likes of Einstein. Can God be the creator of such a concept? No, because “God is not the author of confusion” (I Corinthians 14:33). But what about $1 \times 1 \times 1$? Doesn't that equal one? Yes, but so does one to the fourth, fifth, or fiftieth power, so why

stop at three persons of God when you can have a million! $1/1/1 = 1$ also. Can God be divided?

What the Trinity is not

Christians charge the Prophet Muhammad as one who denounced an incorrect concept of the Christian Trinity because Allah has said: “And behold! Allah will say: ‘O Jesus the son of Mary! Didst thou say unto men, worship me and my mother as gods in derogation of Allah?’ He will say: ‘Glory to Thee! never could I say what I had no right (to say). Had I said such a thing, thou wouldst indeed have known it. Thou knowest what is in my heart, Thou I know not what is in Thine. For Thou knowest in full all that is hidden’” (Qur’an 5:116). Christian authors claim that the Prophet believed the Trinity to consist of somewhat of a “holy family,” Father, Son, and Mother. Looking at the verse a little closer, however, reveals that this assertion is completely incorrect and unfounded. The words “in derogation of Allah” translated from the Arabic “*min du-nillah*,” does not correspond to a sense that complements, but rather antagonizes. In essence God is asking Jesus if he ever told his followers that he or his mother were gods *other than* Allah. Certainly no Christian will ever concede that there are three gods, but only one God in three persons. This verse has nothing to do with the Trinity; it is dealing with the deification of Jesus and Mary.

Was Mary ever deified though? There were actually sects of Christianity at the time of Muhammad called the Miriamites and Choloridians who worshipped Mary as a mother-goddess much like the cult of Isis did in Greco-Roman times. Also, mention the word “Catholic” and you will see your born-again accuser blush. The Catholic will answer that he only uses Mary as an intermediary, not as an object of worship. Explain to him the Muslim concept of *shirk*, or false deification. According to Islam, worship is a direct contact between the worshipper and God. Invoking God through a

creature, no matter how saintly he or she might have been, would make us no better than the Israelites and their golden calf or the Quraysh with their stone statues. Paul tells us: “Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an *image made like to corruptible man*, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and *worshipped and served the creature* more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen” (Romans 1:22-25). Although Paul is actually offering a cause of the rampant homosexuality in Roman culture, he unwittingly lets the cat out of the bag. Worshipping man and serving him, which is exactly what Christians intend with Jesus, is *foolish* behavior. If you say, “Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou amongst women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb Jesus. Hail Mary, *mother of God...*,” you are a fool! – Not my word, but Paul’s.

Keep these words of Paul in mind: “changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an *image made like to corruptible man*.” Now listen to what he says about Jesus in Colossians 1:15: “He (Christ, a man) is the *image* of the invisible God.” Can you say hypocrisy?

Jesus is the “Word of God”

Many Muslim authors have drawn erroneous analogies between the Qur’an and the Christian Jesus. They have said that since both are uncreated, imperishable, and an expression of the divine, they can be thought of as identical. Make sure that when you say Jesus is the “Word of God,” you explain him not as *Kallamullah*, the Word (Literal Speech) of God which is the Qur’an, but rather *Kallimatullah*, a word *from* God. The creation of Jesus was purely an act of divine Will that resulted from God’s command for a thing to come

into existence. “When He hath decreed a plan, He but saith to it, ‘Be,’ and it is” (Qur’an 3:47).

A Christian may say, “You believe that the Qur’an is uncreated and eternal, well, we feel the same about Jesus. You say that there are two eternal and uncreated things, the Qur’an and God, and we say there are three uncreated and eternal persons, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Yet you call me an idolater and accuse me of worshipping three gods. Do you worship two gods then?” Obviously, we do not worship the Qur’an and we never will. But why not? Is it not the speech of God? Sure it is. Speech, however, is not a “separate and distinct personality” of God but rather an attribute or reflection of Him that *cannot* be separated. God’s attribute of Mercy (*Rahma*) is certainly never detached from Him and is also uncreated. His eternal Word is precisely identical. The Christian believes that God is in three persons and that Jesus, the revelation of God, is a person or entity in his own right. The Qur’an, however, is a revelation of God’s *only* person. There is no plurality in God’s holy person whatsoever. Besides, is Jesus really uncreated? Paul calls him “the firstborn of all *creation*” in Colossians 1:15.

There are a total of ninety-nine attributes that Allah, most Exalted, has revealed to us in the Qur’an. The Qur’an itself embodies many of these attributes and is frequently referred to as “Light,” “Truth,” and “Mercy.” These ninety-nine attributes are reflections of the *one* essence of God that help us to understand His Will and to develop and maintain a relationship with Him by familiarizing ourselves with him *personally*. For example, you may think that you are merciful or loving, yet Allah is infinitely more merciful and loving as He is called *al-Rahman* and *al-Wadud*, the most Merciful and most Loving, respectively.

Is the Trinity Biblical?

Fact: The word “Trinity” appears absolutely nowhere in the Bible in any way, shape, or form. What do I mean by “way, shape, or form?” Remember, the word Trinity is a description of a concept, that of the triune god. If the Bible should say that there are *three* and that these *three are one*, then this would suffice as evidence that the Trinity is Biblical. The exact word “Trinity” does not need to be spelled out. If a Christian who thinks himself clever should say, “The word ‘*Tawhid*’ is nowhere in the Qur’an,” correct him joyfully. The term “Tawhid,” meaning “oneness,” is Semitic (Arabic), and like all Semitic words it is derived from a tri-literal root word. In this case it is *wahid* (*whd*). The word *wahid* denoting an absolute unity is used many times in the Qur’an as one of the Holy attributes of the Almighty. Here’s an example:

“O People of the Book! Commit no excesses in your religion: Nor say of Allah aught but the truth. Christ Jesus the son of Mary was (no more than) a messenger of Allah, and His Word, which He bestowed on Mary, and a spirit proceeding from Him: so believe in Allah and His messengers. Say not ‘Trinity’: desist: it will be better for you: for Allah is *one* God: Glory be to Him: (far exalted is He) above having a son. To Him belong all things in the heavens and on earth. And enough is Allah as a Disposer of affairs” (Qur’an 4:171).

Not only is the concept of Tawhid mentioned and glorified in this verse, the belief in Trinity is explicitly *rejected* as well.

What about 1 John 5:7? It reads: “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.” This appears only in the KJV & NKJV of the Bible and has been unceremoniously expunged from all other modern translations. Here’s how it looks in the Revised English

Bible: “7-8) In fact there are three witnesses, the Spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three are in agreement.” Notice the verse number “7-8?” This is actually verse 8 in the KJV! The commentary reads (emphasis mine):

7-8: An ancient trinitarian formula (which identifies “Father, Word, and Spirit” as “heavenly witnesses”) was a *gloss* inserted into this passage in some Latin versions.

Harris states that there have been numerous New Testament modifications done over the years. On page 20 he lists a few, the last one is of special interest to us (emphasis mine):

No two ancient Greek manuscripts of the New Testament are precisely alike. Although most differences in the texts were probably caused by unintentional errors in copying, some textual variations seem to result from deliberate changes, *many of which may have been motivated by theological considerations*. A few of the oldest manuscripts, including the Codex Sinaiticus, do not contain the phrase “son of God” in Mark 1:1, leading some scholars to think that the phrase was inserted at the beginning of the Gospel to refute a belief that Jesus became God’s adopted son at his baptism...Similar concerns about an orthodox understanding of Jesus’ origins apparently influenced manuscript changes in Luke’s story of the youthful Jesus’ being left behind in the Temple. Mary’s reprimand to the child, “your father and I have been anxiously searching for you,” was, in some manuscripts, changed to “we have been searching for you” (Luke 2:48; emphasis Harris’), ostensibly to avoid any implication that Joseph was Jesus’ real father. A theological belief in Jesus’

omniscience may have prompted deletion of references to “the Son” from some copies of Matthew’s statement that “about that day and hour [of the End] no one knows,...not even the Son; no one but the Father alone” (24:36) *...Perhaps the most striking New Testament interpolation appears in very late manuscripts of 1 John 5:7-8, where a scribe inserted the Bible’s only explicit reference to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, asserting that God exists in three persons and that “these three are one.” This trinitarian statement occurs in no manuscript prior to the fourteenth century.*

An interpolation? How can such a verse find its way into the Word of the Almighty? Does He not care to preserve His Word? Let Allah, the Knower of all things open and secret describe such scriptural guile: “There is among them a section who distort the Book with their tongues: As they read you would think it is a part of the Book, *but it is no part of the Book*; and they say, ‘That is from God,’ but it is not from God: It is they who tell a lie against God, and (well) *they know it*” (Qur’an 3:78)! Amen.

Jesus as sacrifice

As we have observed, Jesus can only reconcile humanity if his nature as God died *exactly* as his nature as man died. Christians will also try to convince you that Jesus sacrificed his life for our transgressions, but did he really? What does it mean to sacrifice your life? This reminds me of a story I heard about one of the Nazi death camps that housed many of the European Jews during the 1st World War. A piece of bread or fish or something had been stolen or misplaced from one of the storehouses that the Germans used to feed the Jewish laborers. All of the men in that section of the camp were ordered to stand in a straight line before a firing squad. The Nazi officer told the men that unless someone

confessed of the crime, all of them would be shot dead. No one said a word. The officer began counting backwards from five and before he reached one, an old man stepped in front of the others to single himself out. The officer walked casually over to him and without a second of hesitation, shot the man in the face. The others were ordered to carry on with their work. Was he guilty or innocent? We will never know. The point is he sacrificed his life for the sake of others. This means that he lost his life and it was never returned.

Another, less dramatic example: A rich man sees an old beggar on the street and feels compassion for him to the point that he decides to give the beggar all of the money in his wallet. It was a total of \$500.00. He gave the beggar the money with the understanding that it was not a loan, the beggar did not have to pay him back.

Let's relate the above two examples to the Christian Jesus. In the first case, the old man gave up his life and did not expect to survive or to have it returned to him. This is what it means to sacrifice, or to "give up" something. Jesus on the other hand, was given his life back by himself(?), after three days in the tomb. What did he really sacrifice then? Three days? If the old man in our example suddenly stands up from where he was shot and discovers that the bullet only grazed his head and knocked him unconscious for three days, did he really give up his life for the other prisoners? He might have had that intention but that was not the reality. If the Christian Jesus was truly a "sacrificial lamb sent to the slaughter" then he should have stayed dead.

In the case of the rich man and the beggar, the rich man freely gave out of the mercy in his heart. Obviously, the rich man has thousands of dollars in the bank, but that particular \$500.00 he will never see again. John 3:16 states: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son..." yet the only begotten son was returned to God three days later and in an exalted and glorified form! Paul tells us: "And being found in

fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath *highly exalted him*, and given him a name which is above every name” (Philippians 2:8-9). Luke also says: “The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God *exalted* with his right hand [to be] a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins” (Acts 5:30-31). This would be equivalent to the beggar giving the rich man back his \$500.00 three days later, *with interest*.

Mark 12:29 – The Lord is One

The Trinity is central to Christian belief yet it is never clearly found or defined within the pages of the Bible. Why would God decide to veil this sacred knowledge of Himself for thousands of years from the ancient Hebrew prophets and *still* not make it crystal clear in His New Testament that such a concept exists? When it comes to theology, the Christian scriptures must be unequivocal. Certainly the Qur’an and Hebrew Bible stand in stark contrast to the twenty-seven books of the New Testament in this respect. By saying, “It is written...,” Jesus uses textual support from scripture in Matthew 4:4, 7 to chase away Satan while he (Jesus) was fasting in the desert for forty days. So what *is* written about the concept of God? Indeed God revealed to Moses the holy *Shema* in the Old Testament: “Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God [is] one Lord” (Deuteronomy 6:4). The verse transliterated from Hebrew reads: *Shma yisra’ale adonai eloheynu, adonai echad*.

We are told in the Gospel of Mark of an exchange between a scribe and Jesus: “And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, which is the first commandment of all? And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments [is], Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord” (Mark

12:28-29). Now if Jesus were sent here to preach that he, the Father, and the Holy Ghost are of one co-equal nature, then this would have been the perfect time for him to expound, even implicitly, upon this newly-revealed doctrine. Yet Jesus does nothing of the sort. He actually quotes Deuteronomy 6:4 verbatim to drive the point home that the theology he is preaching is exactly the same as the theology that Moses preached. Any reasonable Christian will agree that Moses did not worship God in three persons.

Obviously Jesus did not utter these words in Greek as the New Testament records them. He actually said, “*Shma yisra’ale adonai eloheynu, adonai echad.*” The word used by both Moses and Jesus for “one” is the Hebrew “*echad*” which is exactly the same word Allah reveals in the Qur’an in Chapter 112:1: “Say: He is God, the One and Only (*ahad*)!” What exactly does “*ahad (echad)*” mean? It means that there is nothing comparable unto God whatsoever. Whatever our petty little minds can possibly conjure up as being the Almighty can never be Him who is beyond our scope of human comprehension. The Prophet Isaiah said it perfectly: “To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him” (Isaiah 40:18)? The Christian, however, is in an extremely pitiful state of affairs when he affirms that God is *echad* but still maintains that Jesus is Him in the flesh. Such an utterance stands in direct contradiction to Jesus himself. Explain to him that we can certainly imagine what a physical Jesus looked like in person. After he has the image locked in his mind exclaim, “that is not God!”

A Christian may bring up the fact that God uses the word *echad* in Genesis 2:24 to describe the “coming together” of Adam and Eve in the garden. “Therefore,” he will shout, “there is allowance for dualism and even pluralism in the Hebrew word.” Remind him that he must look at the *context* to determine the proper meaning. In reference to Adam and Eve, they’re coming

together as one (*echad*) flesh is used as a *symbol* of their union, sexually. It should also be noted that the Hebrew word for one numerically is also *echad*. When used in reference to God, however, the word takes on a meaning that denotes uniqueness and incomparability, as this is exactly what the Arabic translates to. This is also what the Jews at the time of Jesus would have understood the meaning to be. If Jesus wanted to teach plurality within the godhead he would have said, “Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is three in one.” By him not doing so lends credence to the fact that Jesus allowed the Jews to understand him in exactly the same way in which they understood Moses. *If Jesus was truly sent to reveal God in three persons, for him to quote the sacred Shema within the presence of the scribes and Pharisees is not only inappropriate, but also viciously deceptive.*

The scribe responds to Jesus’ answer: “Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and *there is none other but he* (and beside Him there is no other, Revised English Bible)” (Mark 12:32). There is nothing else equal to the One and Only God! This comment is added by the scribe to stress the significance of *echad*.

Man or God???

Due to the dual nature of Jesus in Christianity, Christians justify Gospel verses where Jesus expresses a very human element by saying, “he is speaking and acting as a man.” The Muslim will have to agree. Yet when we try to reason with them concerning verses in which they allege that Jesus is claiming divinity, they reply, “he is speaking as God!” This identity crisis provides the Christians with a full proof way of dodging questions concerning Jesus’ humanity. The Christians have no qualms about labeling their “God” a schizophrenic. For instance, Strobel tells us: “When Jesus does something that’s a reflection of him being God, that’s ascribed to Christ’s deity. When there’s

something reflecting his limitations or finiteness or his humanness – for example, his tears; does God cry? – that’s ascribed to his humanity.” Here are some verses that demonstrate both natures of Jesus.

Jesus as man

a) Jesus cried like a man. (This is the shortest verse in all of the Christian Bible).

“Jesus wept.” – John 11:35.

b) Jesus hungered like a man.

“Now in the morning as he returned into the city, he hungered.” – Matthew 21:18.

c) Jesus did not know the seasons, like a man.

“And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find any thing thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves; for the time of figs was not [yet].” – Mark 11:13. Also see Matthew 21:19 & Luke 13:6.

d) Jesus did not know the Day of Judgment, like a man.

“But of that day and [that] hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.” - Mark 13:32. Also see Matthew 24:36.

e) Jesus can do nothing by himself and seeks his Father’s Will, like a man.

“I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me.” - John 5:30.

“For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.” - John 6:38.

f) Jesus is subordinate to his Father, like a man.
“Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come [again] unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I.” - John 14:28.

g) Jesus prayed to his Father like a man.

“And he went a little further, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou [wilt].” - Matthew 26:39. Also see Mark 14:35 & Luke 22:41.

h) Jesus was born like a man.

“Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife: And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name Jesus.” – Matthew 1:24-25.

Jesus as God

a) Jesus can amend the Sabbath as God.

“For the Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day.” – Matthew 12:8. Also see Mark 2:28 & Luke 6:5.

b) Jesus can forgive sins as God.

“And when he saw their faith, he said unto him, Man, thy sins are forgiven thee.” - Luke 5:20.

“And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven.” - Luke 7:48.

c) Jesus knew people’s thoughts as God.

“And Jesus knowing their thoughts said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?” – Matthew 9:4.

“But he, knowing their thoughts, said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation;

and a house [divided] against a house falleth.” - Luke 11:17.

d) Jesus claimed to be “Yahweh.” (See Chapter 1 for a rebuttal).

“Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.” – John 8:58.

e) Jesus claimed equality with God (See Chapter 1 for a rebuttal).

“I and [my] Father are one.” – John 10:30

f) Jesus is the only way (See Chapter 1 for a rebuttal).

“Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.” – John 14:6.

g) Jesus is worshipped as God (See Chapter 1 for rebuttal).

“And when they saw him, they worshipped him: but some doubted.” – Matthew 28:17.

h) Jesus is all-powerful as God.

“And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” – Matthew 28:18.

So what is the Christian answer? McDowell makes it “easy” for us: “Jesus was the God-man. He was just as much man as if he had never been God and just as much God as if he had never been man.” Are you scratching your head yet? Okay, try this: Jesus was either a Liar, a Lunatic, or Lord! This Christian gimmick known as the “trilemma” is designed to trick Muslims into submitting that there are only three possible conclusions about the historical Jesus. He either 1) lied about who he was and deserved to die a criminal’s death or 2) was insane or possessed by a demon or 3) was the

Lord God. Don't fall victim to their sorcery, the answer is none of the above!

Strobel tells us: "The New Testament specifically confirms that Jesus ultimately possessed every qualification of deity, including omniscience, omnipresence, omnipotence, eternity, and immutability." (page 262). If Biblical passages point to Jesus' deity as Christians claim, then what in the world are we to make of this man Melchisedek who was "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually" (Hebrew 7:3)? Why is he not worshipped by Christians as God?

Christian Trinity Proof

As explained in Chapter 1, the Christian concept of Christ as Son of God is grossly anthropomorphic and Pagan. Christian apologists, in an attempt to convert unsuspecting Muslims who take issue with such a concept, are asking us to think of Jesus as the *ibn* of Allah, not the *walad* of Allah, like "*ibnus-sabeel*" or "son of the road." Ask such people if God "coming upon and overshadowing" Mary is meant to be figurative. Remind them that the Nicene Creed describing Jesus as being "begotten not made" is meant to be literal, not figurative.

Geilser and Saleeb say, "Some have pointed to the fact that Muhammad was simultaneously a prophet, a husband, and a teacher. Why then should a Muslim reject the idea of a plurality of functions (persons) of God." Surely this comparison is false and inapplicable. The Prophet was still only *one* person (human) and one essence (man). The attributes or *roles* of Muhammad were as prophet, husband, and teacher, but these were not his "separate and distinct personalities." Also, Muslims do *not* reject the plurality of the functions of God. The Qur'an has called Him the One who creates,

destroys, gives sustenance, bestows honor, etc. Functions and persons, however, are not synonymous terms as Geisler and Saleeb would like you to believe. *The God of the Qur'an is one person who has many functions.*

Christians maintain that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are equal in their nature but are identified by their specific roles. For example, the Father planned salvation, the Son accomplished it by the cross, and the Holy Ghost applies it to the lives of the believers. If all three are essentially equal, would it be okay to say “In the name of the Holy Ghost, the Son, and the Father?” Such a formula will cause the Christian to cringe, but why? Why should it matter? Although Christians will never admit it, they believe in a hierarchy of gods. Ask them, “When you think of the Father in heaven, what image comes into your mind?” Again, they will never admit it, but the image is very clear. Basically, they imagine a person very much like jolly old Saint Nick, sitting on a throne with the heavens as His canopy and the earth as His footstool. When you say “Son” the image of a young man in his mid-thirties with white skin and a straight nose are conjured. When you say Holy Spirit, they imagine a white dove much like the one that descended onto Jesus during his baptism. It is in the nature of primal man to make images of that which he reveres or worships. Islam has come to rescue the Christians from such a pitiful quagmire of religious deviation and bring them into the light of true guidance under the banner of God’s final and solidifying Messenger.

Elohim...means Trinity?

An error Christians make very frequently is their interpretation of the Hebrew word *Elohim*. They claim that since this word is plural, literally meaning “Gods” or “gods,” the plurality of the godhead is evidenced in the Hebrew scriptures. First of all, remind them that

according to the orthodox definition of the Trinity, God is only one. For a Christian to say that Elohim should be taken as “gods” in the literal sense ambushes their futile claim of being monotheistic and in the tradition and spirit of Abraham. Certainly Christians don’t believe in three gods in three persons, but in only one God in three persons.

Why is this word plural? Elohim is plural because in the Semitic languages, there is a phenomenon known as the “royal plural.” The book of Genesis tells us: “And God said, Let *us* make man in *our* image” (Genesis 1:26), a verse that Christians construe to mean that God, being in the form of a man (Jesus), decided to create Adam by modeling him after Himself. Christians often charge the Muslims with interpreting the New Testament in crooked ways in order to corroborate with Islamic belief. As it turns out, however, the accuser has become the accused. The Christians have made grievous errors in interpreting the Hebrew Bible by reading into the scripture of the Jews concepts completely alien to Judaism such as original sin, divine Sonship, the plurality of God, the divinity of the Messiah, etc. Even the Qur’an, a scripture in which a very strict monotheism is stressed, frequently reveals verses like: “*We* created the heavens and the earth...”; “Why do ye reject *Our* Signs...”; “If you are ever in doubt as to what *We* reveal unto *Our* servant...,” etc. The mutual recriminations of the People of the Book are recorded in Allah’s Word: “The Jews say: ‘The Christians have naught to stand upon;’ and the Christians say: ‘The Jews have naught to stand upon.’ Yet they (profess to) study the (same) Book. Like unto their word is what those say who know not; but Allah will judge between them in their quarrel on the Day of Judgment” (Qur’an 2:113).

Matthew 28:19 – The Great Commission

We are told in Matthew 28:19: “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the

Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Christians often cite this as an example of Jesus supporting the Trinity since he uses the Trinitarian formula “Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” Simply mentioning these three entities, however, in no way constitutes evidence for the *doctrine* of the Trinity within this verse. Let’s not forget that central to the Trinitarian belief is the notion that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are all equal and of the same essence. If a father tells his son while the latter ships off to war, “Defend freedom in the name of your country, your father, and your God,” does this mean that they are all co-equal, co-eternal, and co-substantial? Certainly not! Ask your Christian friend, “How is it that Jesus has gone from saying ‘God is *echad*’ (Mark 12:29) and ‘enter ye not into any gentile lands’(Matthew 10:5) to ‘Go into *all* nations and baptize’ in the name of a triune god?”

Jesus can forgive sins?

Can Jesus really forgive sins? He certainly can, but this does not have to be a point of contention between you and the Christian. Let’s not forget that Jesus said: “I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things” (John 8:28). Jesus can only forgive sins because that is what God *allowed* him to do, very much like how God allowed him to raise the dead. This does not indicate deity however. The prophets are mediators between God and man. They speak with the authority of God, but are not God by any means.

The Prophet of Islam was once approached by a man who had committed a grievous sin but rather than censuring the man and asking him to confess what he had done, the Prophet asked him an unusual question. He said, “Is your mother still living?” The man sorrowfully replied that she had died many years prior. “Do you have an aunt, your mother’s sister who still lives?” he asked again. The man answered, “Yes, I do.”

The Prophet concluded, “Go care for your aunt, make her life easy, and your sin is forgiven.” Muhammad spoke with the authority of God yet possessed no authority to forgive sins by himself.

Also, Jesus did not just arbitrarily forgive anyone’s sins without a reason of some sort. In Luke 7:48, he forgave a woman’s sins *because* of the great love she had for him by anointing his feet. In Luke 5:20, he forgave a paralyzed man *because* he “showed great faith.” He was simply communicating to them what the Father had informed him of. Give praise to God, not to the man. Matthew said it best: “But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house. And he arose, and departed to his house. But when the multitudes saw [it], they marvelled, *and glorified God, which had given such power unto men*” (Matthew 9:6-8).

John even goes so far as to say that the disciples of Jesus can forgive the sins of men. Are they then God as well? “And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; [and] whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained” (John 20:22-23).

Jesus knew the thoughts of people

Matthew writes: “And Jesus *knowing their thoughts* said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts” (Matthew 9:4)? Again, this does not make Jesus God, only sent from God. The Qur’an relates a similar type of incident with respect to the Prophet Muhammad: “When the Prophet disclosed a matter in confidence to one of his consorts, and she then divulged it (to another), and *Allah made it known to him*, he confirmed part thereof and repudiated a part. Then when he told her thereof, she said, ‘Who told thee this?’ He said, ‘He told me Who knows and is well-acquainted (with all things)’” (Qur’an

66:3). There are also numerous other examples from the sound *ahadith* of the Prophet in which God informs him of the hidden motives of certain people. On one such occasion, he was able to avert an assassination attempt while visiting the house of a Jewish family of Bani Nadir.

Origins of the triune god

How did all of this Trinity nonsense begin? The New Catholic Encyclopedia tells us, “The doctrine of the Trinity is not taught in the Old Testament.” This should not be surprising to you since Jewish theology is nearly identical to that of Islam and the Muslims. According to the Illustrated Bible Dictionary, however, “The word Trinity is not found in the theology of the church till the fourth century.” It is a *fact* that none of the disciples ever heard of this word “Trinity” in their lifetimes. Generations of Christians would come and go over a span of three-and-a-half centuries that never knew of the triune Christian god. Here are how some of the pre-Nicene Christian scholars and theologians felt about the nature of Jesus:

a) *Justin Martyr* (165 CE) – Believed Jesus to be a created angel, NOT EQUAL TO GOD.

b) *Irenaeus* (200 CE) – Believed Jesus to be inferior to “the one true and only God,” and NOT EQUAL TO GOD.

c) *Clement of Alexandria* (215 CE) – Believed the Son to be next to the “only omnipotent Father,” and therefore NOT EQUAL TO GOD.

d) *Tertullian* (230 CE) – Believed Jesus to be inferior because he was begotten and sent by God, NOT EQUAL TO GOD.

e) *Origen* (250 CE) – Believed Jesus and the Father to have two separate essences and substances that were NOT EQUAL.

Unlike Judaism and Islam whose articles of faith were laid down by the founders of their respective religions, Christianity's articles and doctrine were always decided upon in councils and church synods centuries after its founder. The Roman Empire under Constantine was riddled with major political and religious strife. Constantine, a worshipper of the *Solen Victus*, the conquering sun-god, saw in a vision one day the figure of a cross illuminated by the light of the sun. He immediately interpreted this as a sign from *Mithras* that he would be victorious on the battlefield. After dealing a crushing blow to the enemy, he apparently converted to the religion of the persecuted Christians although he would not be baptized until years later as he lay dying in his bed.

In 325 CE it was this very Constantine who presided over the infamous Council of Nicea in which Jesus was declared as co-equal, co-eternal, and co-substantial with the Father and which also laid the groundwork for the doctrine of the Trinity. Most of the 300 bishops present signed the new dogma into effect although many did so hesitantly. The Son of God had now officially become *God the Son*. This was followed by a mass genocidal campaign of all Christians who did not believe as they were told. Constantine's leading opponent, Arius, was humbled before the council and promptly anathematized.

One Nazarene sect in particular, the *Eubonites*, asserted that Jesus was only a servant and chosen Messenger of God who was sent by Him to guide the formal and legalistic Children of Israel into harmony by teaching them the true spirit of the law. The Eubonites did not believe that Christ was divine in any way, and only considered Matthew's Gospel as authentic while

declaring Paul a heretic and an apostate. Due to their strong convictions that Jesus was the true Christ, they elected not to participate in the doomed *bar Kokhba* rebellion of 132 CE, which promoted Simon “the son of the star” as being the Jewish Messiah. Not long after the failed insurrection, Simon was assassinated by the Romans and declared “*bar Koziba*,” “the son of the lie.”

You may come across some Christian authors who will claim that the Prophet Muhammad actually came into contact with some surviving remnants of an Eubonite community and was instructed by them to reject Christ’s divinity. Such foolish assertions are backed by not even a shred of historical evidence and causes one to wonder just how this could have even been possible since the entire Eubonite population was systematically exterminated by the Trinitarians shortly after the Synod at Nicea almost 250 years prior to the birth of Muhammad.

In 381 CE Emperor Theodosius convened the Council of Constantinople to determine the role and nature of the Holy Ghost. After much deliberation, the Council decided that the Holy Ghost was also in fact God, the third of three persons in the Holy Trinity.

The Athanasian Creed, named after a clergyman of the mid-third century, spelled out exactly the dictates of the various Councils: “The Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Spirit is God, yet not three Gods but one God.” Athanasius was present at Nicea and supported the decree of Constantine and his frightened bishops. Born and raised in Alexandria, Egypt, he became very much influenced by the Pagan Egyptian concept of god as a triad.

The Church credits another theologian from the same period, Augustine, as being one of the chief developers of modern Christianity for his work entitled, *On the Trinity*.

Rather than rooting out idolatry and Paganism whenever it went, Christianity actually adopted the

Paganism and idolatry of various cultures and “Christianized” them as their own. Contrast this to how Islam spread over the globe as a light of shining Truth that was never influenced by any sort of false teaching.

The Christian may take issue with you and claim that Islam’s God, Allah, was actually a Pagan deity of pre-Islamic Arabia. Remind him that Allah, the Semitic name of God used by Moses (*Elohah*) and Jesus (*Allaha*), was the same deity that the Prophet Ishmael worshipped while he lived in the Arabian peninsula (See Chapter 5 for amazing prophecies regarding the coming of the *Kedarite* Prophet). This is also the name of God used by contemporary Christian Arabs and Arabic speaking Jews. In its origins the name “Allah” was true but was later corrupted by descendants of Ishmael who had fallen away from the tradition of their forefather Abraham. By contrast, the origins of the triune god were Pagan and later incorporated into Christian theology as the “one true God.” Let your Christian friend see the difference.

Pagan triad deities worshipped in ancient Babylon, Assyria, and Egypt:

- a) The triad of *Anu*, the god of the sky, *Enlil*, the god of the earth, and *Ea*, the god of the ocean.
 - b) The triad of *Ishtar*, *Sin*, and *Shamash* in Babylon.
 - c) The Hindu triad of *Brahma*, the creator, *Shiva*, the destroyer, and *Vishnu*, the maintainer.
 - d) The Egyptian triad of *Amon-Ra*, *Ramses II*, and *Mut*.
 - e) The Egyptian triad of *Horus*, *Isis*, and *Osiris*.
-

To my Muslim Brethren...

Praise be to the One who has guided us and made us Muslims bowing to His Will. It is truly the greatest tragedy of human history that over a billion Christians stand alienated from the truth of Islam over a theology that is not even found in their own scripture. Help your Christian friends to understand that their theology is outside the tradition of all the mighty prophets and apostles of God that were sent with the same basic message: *There is only one God, and Abraham, Moses, Noah, David, Jesus, or Muhammad is the Messenger of God.* Help your Christian friends understand that God does not change His spiritual laws because He Himself cannot change. For God to become man or become revealed as three persons is incongruent with the majesty of Him who has created the heavens and the earth.

At the basic level, explain to the Christian why belief in the Trinity has no basis as being from the God of Abraham. Be careful that you do not offend him while attempting to do this. As with the divinity of Christ, belief in the Trinity has always been a personal conviction of faith that the Christian has been enamored with since he was a young boy or girl in the church. As usual, begin on a basic level and use reasonable arguments. I cannot stress enough the importance of freeing Christians from this absolutely false theology, a theology that only beckons to the fire. Emulate our beloved Prophet (*salallahu alaihi wa sallam*) by dealing gently and speaking with humility.

Questions to ask your Christian friends.

1. How can Jesus die as both God and man when his divine spirit survived the cross? If you believe that

he was one person with two natures (man and God), then don't BOTH natures have to die in the same way? After all, our nature is really who we are. How can he die as God without his divine nature dying that *made* him God? Can't you see that he only died as a man?

2. Why is God never explicit about the doctrine of the Trinity in the Old and New Testaments? Why would He wait until the fourth century to completely reveal Himself in three persons?
3. Why do you believe that God sacrificed His Son when Jesus was given his life back after three days? You only sacrifice something when it doesn't return to you.
4. Did you know that according to Paul, "changing the glory of incorruptible God into an image *like that or corruptible man*" (Romans 1:22-25) is the cause of homosexuality?
5. Did you know that the only verse in the entire Bible that explicitly mentions Trinitarian doctrine (1 John 5:7) was expunged from all modern Bible translations and deemed a fabrication to the text?
6. Why would Jesus quote the sacred Shema of the Jews found in Deuteronomy 6:4 if he were sent by God to preach the concept of three in one? Did you know that the word *echad* that Jesus uses in Mark 12:29 cannot denote any type of plurality when used in reference of God, and this is exactly how the Jews understood it?
7. Did you know that just because Jesus amended the Sabbath, knew people's thoughts, and had the ability to forgive sins makes him no different than

Muhammad who changed the direction of prayer, abrogated the Sabbath, knew people's intentions and hidden motives, and forgave sins as well (by the leave of God)? Don't you think that prophets could have done these things?

8. Why do Christians claim that *Elohim* justifies the Trinity when this word literally means "Gods?" Certainly you don't believe in a plurality of gods, but rather persons of God.
9. Are you aware of the Pagan origins of the triune or triad god? Did you know that the Trinity wasn't even firmly established as doctrine in the churches until late in the fourth century CE?
10. Did you know that the name Allah was the same name that Moses and Jesus used to address the Almighty?

Chapter 3 *Refuting Pauline Doctrine*

“...but who doth more wrong than one who invents a lie against Allah, to lead astray men without knowledge? For Allah guideth not people who do wrong.” – Holy Qur’an 6:144.

In this Chapter we will primarily look at five Christian concepts and ascertain whether or not Paul, the self-appointed apostle of Jesus Christ, agreed with his “Lord” regarding these concepts. They are 1) original sin 2) the nature of sin 3) the value of good works 4) atonement through sacrifice and 5) the role of the Mosaic Law. Let’s begin with an introduction to the life of Paul.

Paul, Apostle to the Nations

The apostle Paul is the single most influential person in all of Christian history. Many scholars have even gone so far as to say that *he* is the true founder of the religion that bears the title of Jesus. His revolutionary view of Jesus’ crucifixion and its redemptive value as well as his doctrine of original and inherent sin, salvation, and justification through faith alone superseded all Mosaic obedience and established a new covenant between mankind and the divine. Paul asserts, “For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second” (Hebrews 8:7). Go into a church at random and you may or may not hear the words of Christ as recorded in the Gospels, but rest assured, you could bank on hearing Pauline teaching 100% of the time.

Paul is believed by Christians to be the author of fourteen of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament and the only historical author of the New

Testament who is also a major character *within* the New Testament. Paul bridged the gap between Jew and Gentile by abrogating the sacred Torah of Moses and demanding from Christians absolute faith in the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ. However unlike Jesus, Paul almost never mentions the impending Kingdom of God and seems to know next to nothing about the historical Jesus' ministry experiences in Galilee and Jerusalem. Rather than assimilating himself into the first century Jesus tradition, Paul instead invents a religion *about* Jesus and declares himself the "Apostle of the Lord". Many scholars will surely agree that if it weren't for Paul, Christianity would still have been a sect of Judaism today.

Exact information regarding specifics in Paul's life is not known. Unfortunately, the only sources that we can examine are his letters and the book of Acts written by Luke, a student of Paul. We are told, however, that Paul was born "Saul" after the first king of the tribe of Benjamin in Tarsus (Philippians 3:5). As a young man Saul studied under the great Pharisaic rabbi Gamaliel who instructed Saul in scripture and wisdom. According to Paul's letters and Luke, Saul hated the early Jesus movement and many times participated in the persecution of the early Christians.⁴ The book of Acts describes Paul's role in the stoning of Stephen, the first Christian martyr: "And cast him out of the city, and stoned him: and the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul" (Acts 7:58). The *Encyclopedia Britannica* describes Paul before his conversion as an "intolerant, bitter, persecuting, religious bigot – proud and temperamental."

Around the year 35 CE, Paul had an experience that altered history forever. During his trial in the court

⁴ The word Christian was not used until Acts 11:26 in Antioch. Believers in Jesus as Messiah were said to follow "the new way."

of King Agrippa, he retells of this *apocalypsis*, or revelation:

“I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Which thing I also did in Jerusalem: and many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the chief priests; and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against [them]. And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled [them] to blaspheme; and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted [them] even unto strange cities. Whereupon as I went to Damascus with authority and commission from the chief priests, At midday, O king, I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about me and them which journeyed with me. And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying in the Hebrew tongue, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? [it is] hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And I said, Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; Delivering thee from the people, and [from] the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, To open their eyes, [and] to turn [them] from darkness to light, and [from] the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me. Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision.” – Acts 26:9-19.

After this life-changing experience Paul does not go into Jerusalem to consult with the chosen disciples of Jesus, but rather goes to Arabia for about three years to basically formulate his revolutionary doctrine pertaining to the death and resurrection of Jesus. Scholars agree

that Paul most likely did not author the book of II Timothy. The pseudonymous author, however, is schooled enough in Pauline doctrine to declare: “Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead *according to my gospel*” (II Timothy 2:8).

Paul does eventually travel to the Holy Land but only meets with Cephas (Peter) and James, the Lord’s brother. Paul makes it very evident that the Jerusalem leadership not in any way influences his teaching and feels strong enough about his convictions to take an oath: “What I write is plain truth; before God I am not lying” (Galatians 1:16-20). After his meeting with Peter, Paul goes north into Syria and does not return to Jerusalem until fourteen years later accompanied by Titus and Barnabas for the church conference described in Acts 15.

Luke gives us a description of Paul’s early career in Acts that is significantly different with respect to the extent of Paul’s relationship to the Jerusalem apostles. According to Luke, shortly after his conversion Paul travels to Jerusalem to try to “join the body of disciples” but is rejected as a deceiver. It was only after the careful convincing of Barnabas that the disciples accepted Paul as a member of the church (Acts 9:27). Surely Paul could have fabricated his so-called vision of Jesus and it was very apparent that the disciples had serious reservations about his sincerity. Interestingly, scholars debate whether or not Paul would have ever been known to the world at large if it wasn’t for the vouching of Barnabas. However Paul unabashedly mentions nothing of Barnabas’ pledge for him but rather credits the “three pillars” for accepting as legitimate not only himself, but Barnabas as well! He tells us in Galatians 2:9: “And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, *perceived the grace that was given unto me*, they gave to me and Barnabas the

right hands of fellowship; that we [should go] unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.”

Barnabas and Paul eventually quarreled over what seemed to be very flimsy grounds and scholars often wonder what Luke has decided *not* to tell us regarding this irreparable split between these two good friends who had enjoyed success and endured failure together for many years. We are told: “And some days after Paul said unto Barnabas, Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see how they do. And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark. But Paul thought not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. And the contention was so sharp between them, that *they departed asunder one from the other*: and so Barnabas took Mark, and sailed unto Cyprus” (Acts 15:36-39). In the “spurious” Gospel of St. Barnabas, the former missionary companion of Paul accuses him of being deceived and spreading false doctrine.

Luke also tells us that Paul agrees with James’ notion that Gentile Christians should follow at least four Torah prohibitions: “that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication.” Apparently James was concerned about what the “thousands” of zealous Jewish Christians might perceive of Paul if he spoke out against the observance of the Law. James orders Paul to “Go with them to the Temple and join them in the purification ceremony, and pay for them to have their heads shaved. Then everyone will know that the *rumors* are all false and that you yourself *observe the Jewish laws*” (New Living Translation, Acts 21:24). Although Paul submits to James’ requirements in the book of Acts, he vehemently opposes all Torah restrictions in Galatians, calling the Law “bondage” and a “curse.” Thus Paul’s hypocrisy is manifested in his apparent

allegiance to the Mosaic laws by action and subsequent renunciation of them by words. We are also told in Acts 9:17 that Paul did not receive the Holy Spirit until after he was baptized by Ananias and hands were laid on him. Paul, however, is obstinate that he owes his apostolic commission to no one, and never refers to his baptism in any of his letters. Paul also rescinds his verbal agreement with James concerning meat sacrificed to idols and regards eating such meat as undefiling (I Corinthians 10:27 & Romans 14:13-15:6).

Traveling from Antioch to Greece, Paul establishes the first Christian congregations of Europe in Philippi, Thessalonica, and Corinth. Paul writes a letter to the Thessalonians around 50 CE and then travels to Ephesus and writes I Corinthians in 54-55 CE. Paul then returns to Greece and writes II Corinthians and most likely Galatians which is soon followed by Romans. Despite the Christian belief that Paul wrote over half of the New Testament, many scholars hold the opinion that he only penned seven genuine books (I Thessalonians, I & II Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, Philemon, and Philipians). The remaining seven books (II Thessalonians, Colossians, Ephesians, I & II Timothy, Titus, and Hebrews) are viewed as either doubtful or pseudonymous.

Eventually Paul gets himself arrested in Caesarea and before the high Roman official Antonius Felix, he insists that he adheres to “all that is written in the law and the prophets” (Acts 24:14). Paul is absolved and released and deemed an innocent man who was simply teaching “nothing beyond what was foretold by the prophets and by Moses” (Acts 26:22). This cowardly and deceptive gesture buys Paul some time and he decides to go to Rome. Scholars are not in agreement as to the exact circumstances of Paul’s death. Some place its occurrence around 64 or 65 CE, sometime after his arrival in Rome. Even Luke who presumably wrote

Luke-Acts around 90 CE, is conspicuously silent regarding the death of his one-time teacher.

Pauline influence on the four evangelist accounts is quite obvious. All of Paul's letters were written and widely circulated before a single Gospel was even put down on parchment. It is unfortunate that no Gospel of Jesus composed prior to or concurrent with Paul's writings has survived long enough to be handed down to us for research. Whether this was deliberately done or not will never be known. Again, all of our information about Paul comes from only two sources, Paul himself, and Luke, Paul's student. What we *do* know is that there were undeniably different interpretations, oral traditions, and Gospels of Jesus proclaimed in Paul's time that did not agree with his teaching. Paul, realizing the danger in this, exhorts his church in Galatia to reject anyone who may preach to them "another gospel" unlike that which he has told them (Galatians 1:8).

Central to Paul's letters is the belief in Jesus' triumphant return to earth in the foreseeable future. Harris says:

Paul's advice on marriage, divorce, slavery, celibacy, and human behavior in general is largely shaped by his expectation of an imminent Final Judgment. In his oldest surviving letter, he states that he expects to witness the *Paraousia*: "We who are left alive until the Lord comes...[will be] caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air" (1 Thess. 4:15-17). In 1 Corinthians, his expectation to live until the End is equally certain; hence, he advises his correspondents that "the time we live in will not last long. While it lasts, married men should be as if they had no wives;...buyers must not count on keeping what they buy, nor those who use the world's wealth...For the whole frame of this world is passing away" (1 Cor. 7:29-31). Eagerly awaiting

the *eschaton*, he also tells the Corinthians, “Listen! I will unfold a mystery: we shall not all die, but we shall all be changed in a flash, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet-call. For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will rise immortal, and we shall be changed” (I Cor. 15:51-52).

This belief was carried into the synoptic tradition but by the time John’s Gospel was written, it seemed as if Christians had somewhat given up on the idea on Jesus’ swift return since the author of the Fourth Gospel almost never mentions it. John downplays the idea of the *Paraousia* and seemingly replaces its imminence with the coming of the *Paraklaytos*, or Comforter, who will in the meantime guide believers “into all truth.” McDowell quotes Kenneth Scott Latourette saying (emphasis mine): “What integrated Paul’s life, however, and lifted this almost *neurotic* temperament out of obscurity into enduring influence was a profound and revolutionary religious experience” (page 83). With no sign of Jesus on the horizon, Paul may have literally gone insane in his later years and died alone and in shame (or his insanity [neurosis] may have simply returned to him). Shades of this developing madness can be detected in Paul’s notorious pronouncements concerning women (Romans 1:27; I Corinthians 11:3-9, 13; I Corinthians 14:34-35; Ephesians 5:20-24) and in his unorthodox admission to calling his message “foolishness:”

- “I know very well *how foolish the message of the cross sounds* to those who are on the road to destruction. But we who are being saved recognize this message as the very power of God.” - I Corinthians 1:18 (NLT).
- “Since God in his wisdom saw to it that the world would never find him through human wisdom, he

has used *our foolish preaching* to save all who believe.” - I Corinthians 1:21 (NLT).

- “*This foolish plan of God* is far wiser than the wisest of human plans, and God's weakness is far stronger than the greatest of human strength.” - I Corinthians 1:25 (NLT).
- “Stop fooling yourselves. If you think you are wise by this world's standards, *you will have to become a fool* so you can become wise by God's standards.” – I Corinthians 3:18 (NLT).

Despite these statements being horrendously blasphemous, they also contradict Jesus who said: “Whosoever shall say, *Thou fool*, shall be in danger of hell fire” (Matthew 5:22). According to Jesus, calling someone a fool may make you worthy of Hell yet *becoming* a fool is a prerequisite of faith according to Paul! Also see Romans 1:22 where Paul calls the Romans “fools.”

Paul also seems to ignore Jesus’ vital foremost instruction to his disciples forbidding them to enter into any Gentile land (Matthew 10:5). A Christian may bring up the verse at the end of Matthew where Jesus commissions his chosen eleven to “go into all nations” (Matthew 28:19). Remind him that this permission was only given to Jesus’ immediate disciples who had learned the Gospel under their Master’s tutelage for over three years. Paul was nowhere in the picture and was never authorized by the Jesus of the Gospels to admonish the Gentiles. If your Christian friend should cling to the so-called vision of Paul, tell him that such a vision would render arbitrary *everything* that Jesus struggled to teach his disciples.

With this in mind, let’s now examine the doctrine of Paul and determine whether or not he confirmed the teaching of Jesus (upon whom be peace).

Original Sin

Christianity propagates the belief that the sin of Adam is passed through heredity to all of us, his descendants, and that this sin separates us from the pure and holy deity. The problem with such a belief is that it totally undermines our personal responsibility before God. The Qur'an is quite emphatic regarding this idea: "Every soul draws the mead of its acts on none but itself: no bearer of burdens can bear the burdens of another" (6:164). Allah further tells us in the Qur'an that each of us will appear singularly before him on the Day of Judgment to give an account of how we spent the time that was allotted to us. Make the Christian understand that this doctrine is very obviously the creation of man. Adam's immediate shift of blame upon his wife (found only in the Bible) reveals that man is a coward by nature, and what better feeling is there knowing that 1) your sinfulness is not your own fault but rather Adam's who passed it unto you and 2) your sins are forgiven by the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross who "became the embodiment of our sins" (I Peter 2:24). We can imagine a teenaged drunk driver being pulled over by the police only to have the latter exclaim, "Oh it's okay, teenage rebellion is only natural." Even if the teenager does go to jail, he knows that mommy and daddy will pay the fine and bail him out. What a warm and squishy feeling! Such delusional beliefs not only insult the perfect justice of God, but also give people false senses of security while living in this world. As Ahmad Deedat remarked, "Adam did not ask my permission before he ate of the tree!" Christians believe that putting their trust in the merits of other human beings will land them in Paradise one day to "walk with the Lord."

The Holy Prophet Muhammad said, "People are born into a state of submission before God (Islam) and it is only their parents and society that make them Jewish, Christian, or Zoroastrian." Contrast this with the Roman

Catholics who believe that if a baby were to die before undergoing baptism, it would enter straight into Hell. A “born-again” once tried to convince me that children throw tantrums due to their natural evilness, the taint of original sin. I quoted to him from Jesus and the conversation abruptly ended: “Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put [his] hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, ‘Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: *for of such is the kingdom of heaven*’” (Mark 9:13-14). Children throw tantrums because they are immature and undisciplined, not inherently sinful.

Is there any Biblical basis for belief in original sin? Does the Bible expressly say that man is born in a state of inherited depravity? Although the religion of Judaism does not subscribe to such a belief, the Christian uses the story of Adam and Eve found in the modern day Torah as evidence of its legitimacy. The Old Testament teaching, however, is very clear in this regard: “The soul that sinneth, it shall die. *The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die*” (Ezekiel 18:20-21; Also see Deuteronomy 24:16 & Jeremiah 31:30). This is precisely what Islam teaches as well. Let your Christian friend realize that the duty of man to be personally responsible for his own actions was distorted by the Christians and then corrected and reinstated in Islam.

Christians have looked long and hard at the Gospels for sayings of Jesus which expound on the dogma of original sin and have failed miserably. The truth is clear: *Original sin is advocated neither explicitly nor implicitly by the Jesus of the Gospels.* Here’s the best that the Christians could muster: “O generation of

vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh” (Matthew 12:34); “Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: All these evil things come from within, and defile the man” (Mark 7:22,23); “Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth” (Luke 15:10); “And saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel” (Mark1:15). In the first case, Matthew 12, Jesus is referring to *his generation*, and is directly speaking about the iniquitous scribes and Pharisees. In Mark 7 Jesus is simply making a factual statement. Where does he say that Adam is the cause of all these vices? In Luke 15 Jesus again is making a factual statement with no reference to man’s innate evil whatsoever. Finally in Mark 1 he is simply exhorting the rebellious Children of Israel to repent of their past sins and transgressions just as *any other* prophet would.

The real creator of original sin is in fact Paul. He clearly states: “Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death *passed upon all men*, for that all have sinned: (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law). Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come” (Romans 5:12-14); “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive” (I Corinthians 15:22). But Ezekiel says that we can be saved from spiritual death and separation from God by “doing that which is lawful and right”?

In sharp contrast to what Christianity preaches, Islam believes that Adam and Eve repented unto God for their human weaknesses and forgetfulness and were both forgiven. In Genesis 3:17, however, it is very clear who was at fault for the fall of mankind: “And unto Adam he

(God) said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of *thy wife*, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed [is] the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat [of] it all the days of thy life.” It is little wonder why the Christian churches debated up until the Middle Ages as to whether or not a woman possessed a soul!

Are we as Muslims denying that man has a sin problem? Certainly not. The Qur’an is very clear: “The (human) soul is certainly prone to evil” (Qur’an 12:53); “Verily, man is given up to injustice and ingratitude” (Qur’an 14:34); “Man becomes an open disputer” (Qur’an 16:4); “Man doth transgress all bounds” (Qur’an 96:6). The solution to this problem, however, lies not in blaming the Prophet Adam for disobeying God. Christians need to learn to point their fingers inward rather than out. Tell them to take heed of their “God”: “And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye” (Matthew 7:3)? Christians claim to be liberated from the bondage of sin yet history has testified to the fact that no other religion on the face of the earth has as much blood and torture on their hands as Christianity has. Obviously their solution for sin is not working.

The nature of sin

As Muslims we believe that all people sin. We also believe that the sin problem can be rectified by our own personal struggle and trust in God. This is accomplished by purifying our hearts and minds of exactly those vices that Jesus described in Mark 7:22. Allah the Almighty has revealed through His Prophet Muhammad (upon whom be peace) that all must come into the presence of God with *qalbis-saleem*, or a “sound heart.” Allah further reveals: “O ye who believe! Fear Allah, and (always) say a word directed to the Right: That He may make your conduct whole and sound and forgive you your sins: He that obeys Allah and His

Messenger, has already attained the highest achievement” (Qur’an 33:70-71). In Islam we are taught that righteousness and perfection are not synonymous terms; a person can be righteous and sinful simultaneously. The crucial point is that we *realize* our sins and toil to correct ourselves in a process called the “struggle against the self.” Frequent repentance and absolute conviction in God as being our sovereign Lord who accepts the supplications of His servants accompany such struggle. This assures us that we do not grow heedless of our actions and intentions. A Christian will exclaim, “But God does not allow sin in His presence!” You can surely agree with him here. God tells us in the Qur’an, however, that He will purify the righteous of all their ills and admit them to gardens beneath which rivers flow. However the presence of God or “seeking His Face,” *that* is the supreme felicity. What need does God have to torture and murder his “Son” for iniquitous people that He hates? The Christian will rebut, “God loves all, even the worst of sinners. He hates no one!” Really? That’s not what the Bible says. Quote the following verses and watch his facial expression turn from ecstatic to constipated in a matter of seconds. - “The foolish shall not stand in thy sight: *thou hatest* all workers of iniquity. Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing: the Lord will abhor the bloody and deceitful man” (Psalm 5:5-6); “Thou lovest righteousness, and *hatest wickedness*: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows” (Psalm 45:7).

Let’s examine how the Biblical Jesus felt about the nature of sin and its role in human lives. We are told: “And when the scribes and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, how is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? When Jesus heard [it], he saith unto them, they that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: *I came not to call the righteous*, but sinners

to repentance” (Mark 2:16-17). In this verse Jesus equates the healthy with those who are righteous and the sick with those who are sinners. He admits very evidently that he was *not* sent for the righteous, but *only* to the sinners. In other words, there of some that don’t even need his teaching! This concurs with his statement that he was only sent for the *lost* sheep of the House of Israel (Matthew 15:24). According to Christianity, however, all of us need the blood of Jesus to wash away our sins. Maybe someone should inform Jesus of this idea because he seems to know nothing of it. In fact, Jesus’ view of sin is exactly identical to that of Islam and the Muslims. Allah has revealed to us: “(Satan) said: ‘Then, by Thy power, I will put them all in the wrong, - *except Thy Servants amongst them, sincere and purified by Thy Grace*’” (Qur’an 38:82-83).

As is his style, Paul contradicts his so-called Master in his letter to the Romans: “There isn’t a *single one righteous*, no not one...For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God” (Romans 3:10, 23). It is purely out of his attempts to universalize the teaching of Jesus that causes Paul to make such jarringly contradictory statements about the originally Jewish message of Christ. The tragedy lies in the fact that *this* is the teaching that all of Christendom has adopted as truth.

Value of good works

Most Christians that you will encounter will have an absolutely false conception of how Muslims attain salvation. For example, Rhodes says:

The Qur’an teaches that if a person has any hope of salvation, it will be based on pleasing Allah by good works. We read in Sura 23: 102-3: “In the day of judgment, they whose balances shall be heavy with good works, shall be happy; but they, whose balances shall be light, are those who shall lose their souls, and shall remain in hell forever.”

Salvation is based upon one's own merit, for one's good deeds must outweigh one's bad deeds.

First of all it should be noted that the words "good works" do not appear in the original Arabic, only "balance of good." I can see why Rhodes has chosen such a translation. Secondly, the "good" that God is referring to here is not solely our physical acts such as prayer, alms giving, or fasting, but also the *intention* behind those physical acts. The Qur'an teaches us: "Allah will not call you to account for thoughtlessness in your oaths, *but for the intention in your hearts*; and He is Oft-Forgiving, Most Forbearing" (Qur'an 2:225); "But there is no blame on you if ye make a mistake therein: (what counts is) the *intention of your hearts*: and Allah is Oft-Returning, Most Merciful" (Qur'an 33:5). "Every man shall have as he *intends*," said the Prophet of God. The Prophet also said, "On the Day of Judgment, people will see mountains of good accredited to them and will wonder where it came from. It will be said that it came from their intentions." Allah takes account of every single little thing, with perfect justice (72:28). Allah says: "If God were to punish men for their wrong-doing, He would not leave, on the (earth), a single living creature: but He gives them respite for a stated term" (Qur'an 16:61). With this verse in mind, if mankind were to be judged by their good works alone, then how will anyone get to heaven? They can't! Therefore, the "balance of good" that the Qur'an is referring to includes works, intentions, hidden motives, and above all Beneficent Mercy. Allah reveals: "That Allah may reward them according to the best of their deeds, and *add even more for them out of His Grace*: for Allah doth provide for those whom He will, without measure" (Qur'an 24:38); "And if any one earns any good, *We shall give him an increase of good* in respect thereof: for Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Ready to appreciate service" (Qur'an 42:23); "If any does good, the reward

to him *is better than his deed*; but if any does evil, the doers of evil are only punished (to the extent) of their deeds” (Qur’an 28:84).

In Islam we believe that salvation is given only by the Mercy of God Almighty which He bestows upon us for bearing witness that He alone is God and that Muhammad is His Messenger. Our good works increase our worthiness to receive additional divine Mercy and elevate our spiritual stature in the next life. There are many *ahadith* that the Prophet related to demonstrate this. Here are a few famous examples:

- 1) The Prophet told us of a man who had done many good works in the world. At his judgment God told him that he could enter into Paradise “*bi rahmati* (by My Mercy).” The man immediately responded “*bi ‘amali* (by my works)!” God then took him to account. He placed all of the man’s good deeds on one side of a scale and then only the man’s blessing of eyesight on the other. The scale tipped in favor of God’s blessing. God asked the man, “Do you want to continue this reckoning?” The man cried, “by your Mercy,” and entered Heaven.

- 2) Some of the companions of the Prophet came to him and told him of a woman who was exceedingly righteous in her works but extremely harsh and abusive to her neighbor. The Prophet said, “She is in the fire.” Then they told him of a woman who did only the bare minimum of physical works but was kind and considerate to her neighbor. The Prophet said, “She is in Paradise.”

- 3) The Prophet also related to his companions the story of a prostitute who gave water from her shoe to a dying dog near a well. The Prophet said that because of this one sincere act of goodness, she was forgiven.
- 4) In *Sahih Muslim*, it is narrated that the Prophet said, “No one is entered into Paradise due to his or her works.” A man asked, “Oh Messenger of God, not even you?” The Prophet said, “Not even me unless my Lord wraps me in Mercy.”

Just by looking at some of the verses that I have quoted in the preceding paragraphs, it becomes very clear that the God of Islam is a God of Mercy: He is “Oft-Forgiving, Most Forbearing, Oft Returning, Most Merciful, and most ready to appreciate service.”

Rhodes cites the example of the cross mate of Jesus whom the latter promised would receive him in Paradise (Luke 23:43). The thief “had no chance of going out and doing any good works” yet Jesus promises him salvation. This story is supposed to convince disheartened Muslims that there is still hope for them. We have a tradition that is somewhat similar to this. When the Prophet’s uncle Abu Talib lay on his death bed, the Prophet pleaded with him to utter the *Shahadah*, or declaration of faith, *so that he would be saved*. If salvation in Islam was based on good deeds as the Christian claims, then why is the Prophet even bothering to convince his elderly uncle who had been an idolater his whole life that Islam was Truth?

It is interesting to note that John of Patmos, the author of the apocalyptic Book of Revelation, advocated the belief of judgment through works. He writes: “And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is [the book] of life: and the dead were judged out

of those things which were written in the books, *according to their works*. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man *according to their works*” (Revelation 20:12-13). There is nothing in the Qur’an or the whole of the volumes of hadith that even come remotely close to the likes of these verses. Yet the Christian accuses us of what *his* scripture says.

What exactly do good works amount to for the Christian? As one Christian put it, “good works are the by-product of our faith.” Furthermore, good works have absolutely “no bearing on salvation” as Christians are saved through grace by faith alone (*sola fide*). Paul says: “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: [it is] the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast” (Ephesians 2:8-9; Also see Romans 4 & Galatians 3:6-14 by none other than Paul). Christians enjoy quoting Isaiah 64:6 to Muslims which states that our righteousness are as filthy rags in the sight of God. Obviously Jews and Christians are very much at odds in their respective understandings of the significance of works and this is yet another instance where the Christians graft their own theology onto the Hebrew scriptures.

Christian apologists accuse Islam as being a religion where God can arbitrarily forgive sins or punish sinners according to His whim or fancy. Don’t let the Christian dictate your religion for you. You will quickly learn from your interaction with them that the vast majority of what they say is supported by neither scripture nor logic but only emotional catharsis. The Qur’an teaches us that Allah will forgive any sin if sincere repentance is made. *We* have to take the initial step forward, however. As the Prophet said in a *Hadith Qudsi*, “Your Lord says, ‘If you walk toward Me, I will come running towards you.’” If the individual does *not* make repentance, however, then Allah may chose to

punish or forgive the sin *based on His perfect knowledge of the person*, and not simply arbitrarily as the Christian would have you believe. The only sin the Qur'an states that Allah will not forgive if repentance is not made is idolatry or associating partnership to God (*shirk*) because a person who expires in such a dreadful state dies in open rebellion against God and His Messenger.

According to Christianity, as long as faith in Christ as God and Savior is observed, whatsoever we do in this life is completely and most definitely arbitrary and devoid of meaning. This may be the very reason why Christians throughout history have perpetrated some of the most horrific acts of inhuman cruelty and barbarism. As long as they "keep on believin'", they are saved through grace. Accordingly, if Adolph Hitler believed in Jesus as Lord and Savior which he very well could have, when he gave orders to his Nazi minions to begin the incineration of six million Jews called "Christ-killers," he did so with full assurance of salvation from Hell and righteous fellowship in the next life! Make sure that you warn your Christian friend not to be deceived by the life of this world. We only get one shot, so make it count. Allah tells us of the Christian mentality: "After them (the Jews) succeeded an evil generation: They inherited the Book, but they chose for themselves the vanities of this world, saying for excuse: '*Everything will be forgiven us.*' Even so, if similar vanities came their way, they would again seize them" (Qur'an 7:169).

But what says Jesus? Surely the son of Mary had an opinion as to the significance of good works. Matthew records him saying: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your *good works*, and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Matthew 5:16). Are these the same good works that Christians call filthy rags? John records Jesus commenting: "Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him, How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed

not: the *works* that I do in my Father's name, *they bear witness of me*" (John 10:24-25). Again, according to Christians good works are essentially meaningless and unnecessary. Yet Jesus tells the Pharisees of his day that it is his *works* in his Father's name that prove his identity as the Messiah. Nothing can be more meaningful and necessary!

The Qur'an repeats many times the refrain, "those who believe and perform righteous action." Compare this to James: "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? Was not Abraham our father *justified by works*, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, *and by works was faith made perfect*? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God. Ye see then how that *by works a man is justified, and not by faith only*. Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent [them] out another way? For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also" (James 2:20-26).

Compare the above verses from James to Paul: "Therefore we conclude that a man is *justified by faith* without the deeds of the law" (Romans 3:28); "For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath [whereof] to glory; but not before God" (Romans 4:2); "Was it because of his good deeds that God accepted him? If so, he would have had something to boast about. But from God's point of view Abraham had no basis at all for pride" (New Living Translation, 1996). Here's what we can gather from all of this: James believed that man was both justified by faith and works while Paul believed in faith alone. Notice how each author uses the same story of Abraham to prove opposite points. Who should we believe, the "Lord's" brother and disciple of Jesus or a former Christian killer?

Atonement through sacrifice?

Strobel says: “As Jews in the Old Testament sought to atone for their sins through a system of animal sacrifices, here was Jesus, the ultimate sacrificial lamb of God, who paid for sin once and for all. Here was the personification of God’s plan for redemption.” The most useful passage in the entire New Testament for you as a Muslim refuting Christianity will undoubtedly be Mark 12:28-34. In Chapter 2 we looked at the first two verses as a clear proof against Trinitarianism. The remainder of the passage provides us with vital information in our attempt to rebut Paul’s doctrine of sacrificial death and atonement. I encourage you to memorize these verses and put them to good use.

“And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments [is], Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this [is] the first commandment. And the second [is] like, [namely] this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but he: And to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love [his] neighbour as himself, *is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices*. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. And no man after that durst ask him [any question].” – Mark 12:28-34.

Notice how the scribe mentions that God's absolute unity, the love of God, and the love of neighbors is more than *all* whole offerings and sacrifices. Ask your Christian friend if he understands what the word "all" entails. If Jesus were to die for the sins of mankind, why did he not correct the man's bold assertion, or at least show disapproval? Instead Jesus is marveled by how "thoughtful" (Revised English Bible) the man had answered and actually tells the scribe that he is not far from the kingdom of God! Jesus doesn't even say anything comparable to this to his chosen twelve disciples who, according to Christians, propagated the doctrine of atonement through the sacrifice of Jesus until their death. To them he lashes out, "Are ye even yet without understanding" (Matthew 15:16)?

"But there must be payment! Someone has to die!" you will hear Christians shout. Remind them what Jesus said to the Pharisees: "But go ye and learn what [that] meaneth, I will have *mercy, and not sacrifice*" (Matthew 9:13). It doesn't get any clearer than that! Jesus was actually quoting the book of Hosea in the Old Testament: "For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God *more than burnt offerings*" (Hosea 6:6). Amazingly, Paul calls Jesus both an "offering" and a "sacrifice" in Ephesians 5:2. Also see Hebrews 9:26. Reiterate to the Christian that the unity of God, the love of God, and the love of neighbors amount to far more than *all* offerings and sacrifices. In Matthew 12:7 Jesus obliterates the doctrine of original sin as well: "If ye had known what [this] meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, *ye would not have condemned the guiltless.*" Once again Paul has demonstrated his uncanny ability to contradict his "Lord" in a matter of religious significance. Even more astonishing is the fact that Christians all follow Paul's doctrine rather than Jesus' despite the latter proclaiming: "The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord"

(Matthew 10:24). Ask your Christian buddy why he has devoted himself to Paul over his professed Master, Jesus.

Christian apologists have drawn Muslim attention to the story of Abraham and his son as foreshadowing what they believe happened to Jesus on the cross. Rhodes says, “Use Abraham’s story as a way of illustrating the need for a sacrifice to take another’s place and allow that person to be spared...Recall that in the Qur’an’s depiction of this event, we are told that Abraham’s son was ‘ransomed’ from death by an animal ‘sacrifice’ (sura 37:102-7).” Although the son ransomed was actually Ishmael and not Isaac, we will examine this parallel in a way that better fits the events that actually occurred to Jesus (See Chapter 5 for the truth about Ishmael’s legitimacy). In Genesis as well as the Qur’an we are told that the son of Abraham was *saved* from the knife of his father and another was put in his stead to bear the brunt of the sacrifice. This is *precisely* what happened to Jesus! Respond to the Christian by saying, “Yes, just as Abraham’s son was saved by God and ransomed from death by an animal sacrifice, so was ‘God’s son’ saved by God and ransomed from death by someone else.” This is also exactly what the Qur’an teaches (Qur’an 4:157; See Chapter 4 for the truth about the crucifixion). Make sure that when you use Christian lingo such as “God’s son,” you clarify to the Christian exactly what this title entails (See Chapter 2).

McDowell says:

An incident that took place several years ago in California illuminates what Jesus did on the cross in order to solve the problem God had in dealing with the sin of humanity. A young woman was picked up for speeding. She was ticketed and taken before the judge. The judge read off the citation and said, “Guilty or not guilty?” The woman replied, “Guilty.” The judge brought down the gavel and fined her \$100 or ten days. Then an amazing thing took

place. The judge stood up, took off his robe, walked down around in front, took out his billfold, and paid the fine. What's the explanation of this? The judge was her father. He loved his daughter, yet he was a just judge. His daughter had broken the law and he couldn't simply say to her, "because I love you so much, I forgive you. You may leave." If he had done that, he wouldn't have upheld the law. But he loved his daughter so much that he was willing to take off his judicial robe and come down in front and represent her as her father and pay the fine (pages 114-115).

This story, however, misses on a few vital points. Allow me to give a better representation of Christian belief. Let's say that a burglar broke into an old woman's house one night and was caught by police after fleeing the scene. The police ask the old woman if she would like to press charges because she was the one victimized. She says, "Yes." In court, it comes out that the man was simply trying to get some food or money to help his family currently living in a homeless shelter. The woman is overcome with mercy and decides not to press charges after all. The man who pleaded guilty is released due to a clean record and given a stern warning. He learned his lesson. Suddenly, the judge pulls his very own begotten son out of the crowd kicking and screaming and slices his throat ear to ear to atone for the burglar's sin. Is this justice? Was this murder necessary? In McDowell's example it would have been more fitting if the judge simply put his robe over his daughter and sent her to jail.

Another example: If you kill my dog then apologize and I forgive you, the matter is closed. Let's say that you feel great remorse and offer to kill your own dog so that there could be justice. I would answer you: "Because I have forgiven you, killing your dog would be an *injustice*. You sinned against *me*, and I have accepted

your apology. I don't need the blood of your dog to convince me of that." Similarly, when man sins against God then makes sincere repentance unto Him, He and only He can decide to forgive or to exact retribution. However, a Just and Holy God never ignores the sincere repentance of His servants.

Torah Obedience

According to Pauline doctrine, Jesus' death on the cross signifies the end of Torah "bondage," as he puts it (Galatians 5:1). Believers were now "living in the grace" and had only to trust in the redemptive work of Christ at Calvary and nothing more. Paul says very clearly: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law" (Galatians 3:13). Paul also obliterates all of the Mosaic dietary restrictions as well as the practice of circumcision despite the latter being called "an everlasting covenant" by God in the Torah (Genesis 17:13).

Be prepared to be scoffed at by Christians you encounter with regards to this. They cannot help but feel rage in their hearts when you order a cheese pizza or ask if the spaghetti sauce in your pasta is made with wine. Keep it clear in your mind that the Christian does not want to invite you to a new religion or way of life but rather to a "relationship" with God where you can basically do and eat anything you want without any fear of consequence. "The Law is nailed to the cross!" he shouts ecstatically. Ask him if his "God" ever sanctioned him to do such a thing. Jesus Christ, a practicing Jew, held the Law of Moses as sacred and binding during all of his life. Let's look at one example: The Christians of today have no qualms about eating the flesh of pigs. Please note that quoting to them from the book of Leviticus regarding this is futile since the Christians believe that the Law has already been abrogated by the death of Jesus ("And the swine, though he divide the hoof, and be clovenfooted, yet he cheweth not the cud;

he [is] *unclean to you*” [Leviticus 11:7]). Such a tactic will only egg him on more. Rather make it your practice to look at the Gospels to drive your arguments home. In all three synoptics we are told of a man who had his demons exorcised by Jesus by the latter sending the unclean spirits into a herd of swine, 2,000 in all that Jesus drowned in the sea (Mark 5:12; Matthew 8:30; Luke 8:33). Ask your Christian friend why he enjoys eating the meat of an animal that his “God” dubbed “swine” in the Torah as well as the Gospel. Enlighten him: “What’s good enough for your God must be good enough for you too!”

While Paul destroys the Law, Jesus demands its strict observance. Again, I encourage you greatly to memorize the passage below verbatim and practice it on your Christian acquaintances:

“Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach [them], the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed [the righteousness] of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.” – Matthew 5:17-20.

Jesus is basically saying: “I am not here to abrogate the Torah, but to confirm it. In truth I tell you, as long as heaven and earth endure nothing will be gone from the Law until all that must happen has happened. Whoever decides not to follow even the smallest of the commandments will be in the lowest rank in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever keeps all of them and

teaches them to others will enjoy the highest rank in the kingdom of heaven. If your obedience to the Law is not greater than the Scribes and Pharisees, then you can not expect to enter Paradise.” There is no heaven for you if you are not better than the Jew! Are not the heavens and the earth still intact? Therefore, the Law is still in effect and must be followed.

According to Judaism, the Torah was the blueprint that God used to construct His universe, His sacred Word that guided and shaped the lives of millions of penitent Jews including Moses, David, Mary and Jesus. St. John records Christ saying: “I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in his love” (John 15:10). Christians believe, however, that this great Law of God was suddenly superseded and deemed unnecessary on account of a dream of Peter, a man who denied knowing Jesus three times, and a vision of Paul, a man who tortured and killed many of the true followers of Jesus. Both of these gentlemen are shady characters, at best, yet their word is weightier in Christian eyes than the words of Christ and all of his prophetic predecessors! Concerning the Torah, the Qur’an tells us of its relation to the Gospel of Jesus: “And remember, Jesus, the son of Mary, said: ‘O Children of Israel! I am the messenger of Allah (sent) to you, *confirming* the Law (which came) before me...’” (Qur’an 61:6).

The Christian will tell you, “The Law and commandments act only as a means to make one conscious of sin, but we cannot be saved by it. Only by belief in the death and resurrection of Jesus can one attain salvation.” The so-called crucifixion and resurrection will be dealt with in Chapter 4, but for the present time, let’s examine what exactly we must do to be saved from God’s wrath in the next life. The Hebrew Bible gives us clear guidance. Here are just a few examples: “Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, *and keep his commandments*: for this is the whole duty of man” (Ecclesiastes 12:13-14); “And

shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and *keep my commandments*” (Exodus 20:6); “Therefore shall ye *keep my commandments*, and do them: I am the Lord” (Leviticus 22:31); “If ye walk in my statutes, and *keep my commandments*, and do them” (Leviticus 26:3); “But if ye will not hearken unto me, and will not *do all these commandments*; And if ye shall despise my statutes, or if your soul abhor my judgments, so that ye will not do all my commandments, [but] that ye break my covenant: I also will do this unto you; I will even appoint over you terror, consumption, and the burning ague, that shall consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart: and ye shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it” (Leviticus 26:14-16); “And if ye have erred, and not *observed all these commandments*, which the Lord hath spoken unto Moses...” (Numbers 15:22); “Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may *keep the commandments* of the Lord your God which I command you” (Deuteronomy 4:2); “O that there were such a heart in them, that they would fear me, and *keep all my commandments always*, that it might be well with them, and with their children for ever” (Deuteronomy 5:29)!; “Ye shall diligently *keep the commandments* of the Lord your God, and his testimonies, and his statutes, which he hath commanded thee” (Deuteronomy 6:17); “Praise ye the Lord. Blessed is the man that feareth the Lord, that delighteth greatly in *his commandments*” (Psalms 112:1); “*Lord, I have hoped for thy salvation, and done thy commandments*” (Psalms 119:166). Also see I Kings 18:18; I Chronicles 28:7; II Chronicles 7:19, 31:21; Nehemiah 1:5-9; Psalms 78:7, 89:31, 119:35, 119:115, 119:151. Even as late as the book of Malachi we are told: “Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, [with] the statutes and judgments” (Malachi 4:4). Now compare this to Paul: “Having *abolished* in his flesh the enmity, even the law of

commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace” (Ephesians 2:15); “No man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, the just shall live by faith” (Galatians 3:11). Also see Galatians 2:16, 3:24, 5:4; Romans 2:13, 20, 28.

But what says Jesus? In the Gospels we are told of a man who asks him a very direct question, essentially saying, “How do I become saved?” Ask any Christian today the same question and they will pump you full of exclusivist Pauline dogma. Let’s look at Jesus’ response as recorded by Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

- Matthew 19:17 – “And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, *keep the commandments.*”
- Mark 10:19 – “Thou knowest *the commandments*, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not, Honour thy father and mother.”
- Luke 18:20 – “Thou knowest *the commandments*, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother.”

Ask your Christian friend how “keep the commandments” sounds at all like “I will die for your sins.” Just as we encountered with Mark 12:29, if Jesus was truly sent by God to preach salvation through his flesh and blood, then for him to advise his Jewish contemporaries to follow the Law and commandments to “enter into life” constitutes deception of the highest order. If your Christian friend knows his Bible he might rebut, “But Jesus says, ‘Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life’ in John 6:54.” You

may treat such a comment the same way as we did the “I am” statements also found only in John. Ask him how three evangelists seemed to miss *all* of the following highly theological declarations:

- “Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” – John 1:13.
- “Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” – John 6:53.
- “For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.” – John 6:55.
- “He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.” – John 6:56.

It doesn't take a Doctorate of Divinity to see the difference between the three synoptics and the distinctive Fourth Gospel. It is of little wonder why second and third century Roman communities charged Christians for engaging in acts of cannibalism in their secret underground ceremonies! Today the Catholics enjoin upon their congregations this practice in their services and celebrate it as a “Holy Communion” between God and His children. They actually believe that God in the person of the Holy Ghost comes down during the mass and transforms the bread and wine into the literal flesh and blood of Christ in a process called *Transubstantiation*. Members of the mass then partake of the *Eucharist* and go home feeling like they have just achieved eternal life. Please help your Christian friend see the error of his ways by pointing out to him the very Pagan (Mithraic) elements of such practices. But if he still wants only John, then we can still give it to him.

Despite the alleged statements of Jesus concerning his flesh and redeeming blood given above, John also records him providing us with a very different definition of eternal life; a definition that is identical to the first pillar of Islam. He says: “And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent” (John 17:3). Allah records Jesus in the Qur’an saying: “Verily God is my Lord and your Lord: Him therefore serve ye: this is a Way that is straight” (Qur’an 19:36). The appearance of such strikingly opposed statements from the synoptics as well as from the Fourth Gospel itself, bears witness to the fact that the absurdities mentioned in the sixth chapter of the Gospel of John were never actually uttered by Christ himself and are rather on the same footing as the first twelve verses of John 8, namely, they are a fabrication to the text.

As we have examined and proven above, all of the doctrine Christians believe today to be “Gospel Truth” were created by the infamous Paul and not by the so-called founder of Christianity, Jesus. Given the disparaging differences between the views of Paul and Jesus, we cannot help but to be very skeptical regarding Paul’s claim that he received his authority not from man, “but only by the revelation of Jesus Christ” (Galatians 1:12). By his own admission Paul does not go immediately to converse with the remaining disciples after experiencing his vision of the resurrected Jesus, but rather opts for Arabia and stays there for three years doing God only knows what. It was perhaps in Arabia where Paul dreamed up many of his dogmatic and innovative interpretations of the death of the Jewish Messiah on a cross. Ironically, it was from this very land that the authentic teachings of the Gospel were vindicated some 575 years later by the thundering revelations of the Qur’an.

It seems almost ridiculous that Jesus never prophesied the coming of the “Apostle to all nations”

given Paul’s unparalleled influence and revolutionary views about his Lord and Savior. You may get some Christians who will try to convince you that Paul is actually the Comforter that Jesus spoke of that will come after him to guide humanity “into all truth” in John 14 & 16. The identity of the Comforter, or *Paraclytos*, will be fully revealed in Chapter 6, but for now let’s quickly invalidate Paul as a possible candidate. Jesus further says regarding the Comforter: “for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak.” In other words, the Comforter says nothing on his own authority. Paul tells us regarding men with unbelieving wives that the former should retain their spouses if “she be pleased to dwell with him.” He prefaces this injunction with, “But to the rest *speak I*, not the Lord” (I Corinthians 7:12). God tells us in the Qur’an: “And if the messenger (Muhammad) were to invent any sayings in Our name, We should certainly seize him by his right hand, and We should certainly then cut off the artery of his heart: nor could any of you withhold him from Our wrath” (Holy Qur’an 69:44-47).

Knowing that his gospel may not easily find its way into the hearts of those who hear it, Paul warns his Christian community in Galatia about those who preach to them a gospel different than what he has taught them (Galatians 1:8). Let’s now compare the gospel of Paul with that of Jesus:

Is there original sin?

JESUS/Judaism

ISLAM

PAUL

No - Mark 9:13-14; Ezekiel 18:20-21.

No – Qur’an 6:164.

Yes - Romans 5:12-14; Corinthians 15:22.

Are we *all* unrighteous people?

JESUS/Judaism

ISLAM

PAUL

No – Mark 2:16-17; No – Qur’an 33:70-

Yes – Romans 3:10, 23.

Matt. 15:24 71; 38:82-83.

Do our good works have *any* bearing before God?

JESUS/Judaism

ISLAM

PAUL

Yes – Matt. 5:16;
John 10:24-25.

Yes – Qur’an 24:38;
42:23.

No – Ephesians 2:8-9;
Galatians 3:6-14.

Is it necessary to follow the physical laws and commandments of God?

JESUS/Judaism

ISLAM

PAUL

Yes – Matt. 19:17;
Mark 10:19; Luke
18:20; Psalms 112:1;
Exodus 20:6.

Yes – Qur’an 6:151-
153.

No – Galatians 2:16, 3:11,
3:24; Romans 2:13.

Is atonement through sacrifice necessary?

JESUS/Judaism

ISLAM

PAUL

No – Mark 12:28-29; No – Qur’an 3:77.
Matt. 9:13;
Hosea 6:6.

Yes – Ephesians 5:2;
Galatians 3:13;
Hebrews 9:26.

Christ was a Muslim

So far in this book we have learned that Jesus Christ (upon whom be peace) is certainly not God, nor the begotten son of God, nor the second person in the godhead of the Trinity. We have also been able to separate the teachings of Christ from those of Paul and shown that the former coincides with what Islam and the Muslims believe. Therefore, if Jesus’ teaching is essentially Islamic, then he is essentially a Muslim! The word “Muslim” is derived from the Semitic root “*salam*” or “*shalom*” (*slm*) and means peaceful submitter. Islam, or “peaceful submission” was the universal religion of all the mighty prophets and apostles of God that were sent out into the world. Make sure that you stress to your Christian friends the fact that Muhammad (upon whom be peace) was not the founder

of Islam. We are not *Muhammadan*. The Prophet himself was a Muslim, albeit Muslim *par excellence*.

The Islam of the Prophet Muhammad was identical to the Islam of his forefather Abraham, and *both* the Bible and Qur'an make it imperative that we stay within the Abrahamic tradition. Jesus said: "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham" (John 8:39). Allah in the Qur'an speaks through His beloved Prophet: "They say: 'Become Jews or Christians if ye would be guided To salvation.' Say thou: 'Nay! I would rather the Religion of Abraham the True, and he joined not gods with Allah'" (Qur'an 2:135); "Abraham was not a Jew nor yet a Christian; but he was true in Faith, and bowed his will to Allah's (which is Islam), and he joined not gods with Allah" (Qur'an 3:67). It is truly unfortunate how Christians have left the sacred "bosom of Abraham" (Luke 16:23) and chosen for themselves the worship of a foreign triune deity that was known to no prophet or saint prior to and including Jesus. Inform your Christian friend that by forsaking the religion of Abraham, "he has made himself a fool" (Qur'an 2:130). But isn't that what Paul wants?

It is certainly a fact of history that the Prophet Moses (upon whom be peace) never heard of the word "Judaism" during his entire earthly existence. According to scholars, this word was coined sometime in the late seventh century BCE after the Assyrians attacked and wiped out ten of the twelve tribes of Israel, some 600 years or so after the death of Moses. There were *Jews* during his time, but no "Judaism." The word "Jew," however, denoted a person's tribal rather than religious identity. Interestingly, Moses does not even qualify for this. We are told: "These are the *families of the Levites*: the family of the Libnites, the family of the Hebronites, the family of the Mahlites, the family of the Mushites, the family of the Korathites. And Kohath begat Amram. And the name of Amram's wife [was Jochebed, the

daughter of Levi, whom [her mother] bare to Levi in Egypt: and she bare unto Amram *Aaron and Moses*, and Miriam their sister” (Numbers 26:58-59).

While Moses was a Levite tribally, what was he religiously? A Muslim! He was a man who peacefully and utterly submitted his entire being to the Will of the Almighty. He “ate and slept” religion. Contrast this to modern day Christians who believe that going to church once a week on Sunday and listening attentively to a man strum a tune on his banjo represents personal sacrifice and total submission to God’s Will.

Was Jesus a Jew? Most Christians will have you believe that he was a descendant of David, from the tribe of Judah. The contradictions of the two genealogies of Jesus given by Matthew and Luke will be more closely examined in Chapter 6, God willing. Although the word Judaism was used during the time of Jesus, it remains a fact that this name was never intended to be the title of the *religion* of the Children of Israel. You can read every single verse of the thirty-nine books of the Hebrew Bible as well as the seven books of the Apocrypha and you will never come across the word “Judaism.” Did God forget to name His chosen people?

Was Christ a Christian? Absolutely not! Luke tells us that this word Christian was first used as *derogatory* for those who followed the path of Jesus, the Jewish Messiah: “And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch” (Acts 11:26). What were the disciples called by God? Allah tells us: “When Jesus found unbelief on their part he said: ‘Who will be My helpers to (the work of) Allah?’ Said the disciples: ‘We are Allah's helpers: We believe in Allah, and do thou bear witness that we are *Muslims*’” (Qur’an 3:52).

During the Sermon on the Mount as recorded by St. Matthew 5, Jesus teaches his followers the “Lord’s Prayer” and then recites nine declarations known as the Beatitudes. In verse 9 he says: “Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of

God.” The Greek for peacemakers, *eirenopoios* is derived from the word peace, or *eireny*. The Aramaic *Pshitta* Version of the New Testament based on the original Greek manuscripts renders this verse in the original language of Jesus as: *Goovay hoon la'ovdai shlomo, davanaa-hi d'Aloho nethqroom*. Notice the words *Aloh* and *l'ovdai shlomo* for “God” and “makers of peace” respectively. Those who make *shlomo* are also those who make *salam*, the Muslims! The words *Eirenopoios*, *L'ovdai shlomo*, and *Muslimoon* all have identical meanings, that is, peaceful submitters unto *Aloh's* (God's) Holy Will. The *Aramaic Bible Society* translated Luke 6:40 into Hebrew as: *Ein talmeed na'leh al rabbo, shekken kal adam, she'mushlam yihyeh ka rabbo*. The English reads: “The disciple is not above his master: but every one that is perfect (*Mushlam*, Muslim!) shall be as his master.”

The Gospels reveal to us the following statements of Christ:

- “For whosoever shall *do the will of God*, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother.” - Mark 3:35.
- “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth *the will of my Father* which is in heaven.” - Matthew 7:21.
- “For whosoever shall do the *will of my Father* which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.” - Matthew 12:50.
- “Saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless *not my will, but thine*, be done.” - Luke 22:42.

We are told that after the resurrection of Jesus, he appears before his remaining eleven bewildered

disciples in the upper room. The Gospel of Luke records his greeting as “Peace be unto you,” or the Hebrew *Ashalom malay chem* (Also see John 20:19, 20:21, 20:26). Let the Christian hear these words come from your mouth with meticulous *tajweed* (pronunciation) and then say them in their Arabic equivalents: *Asalamu ‘alaykum*. He cannot help but to notice the similarities. Who other than Muslims continue to speak in such ways?

Matthew tells us that Jesus asked God to save him from the ignominy of crucifixion by praying in a very specific manner: “And he went a little further, *and fell on his face, and prayed*, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt” (Matthew 26:39). Matthew also tells us that when the disciples heard the voice of God on the Mount during the Transfiguration, they “fell on their faces, and were sore afraid” (Matthew 17:6). Also read how the Hebrew prophets prayed in exactly this manner in Joshua 5:14; I Kings 18:42; Numbers 20:6; Genesis 17:3. Who other than Muslims continue to pray in such ways?

The Torah tells us that Moses and Aaron had to wash their outer limbs in order to be able to pray: “And Moses and Aaron and his sons washed their hands and their feet thereat: When they went into the tent of the congregation, and when they came near unto the altar, they washed; as the Lord commanded Moses” (Exodus 40:31-32). John also tells us of a pool located just outside the Temple precincts that Jews at the time of Jesus used to make their ablutions. Jesus refers to this pool after healing a man’s blindness: “And said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, he went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing” (John 9-7). Who other than Muslims continue to perform ablutions in such ways?

“Both the Jews and the Christians say: ‘We are sons of God, and his beloved.’ Say: ‘Why then doth He punish you for your sins? Nay, ye are but men,- of the men he hath created: He forgiveth whom He pleaseth, and He punisheth whom He pleaseth: and to God belongeth the dominion of the heavens and the earth, and all that is between: and unto Him is the final goal of all.’” – Holy Qur’an 5:18

To my Muslim Brethren...

Glory be to the One who has sent His Chosen Messenger into the world to glorify and exalt His Holy Name, Allah! In your quests to “de-evangelize” the Christians, know that God is with those who restrain themselves. You are not sanctioned by God to slander, belittle, or mock the chosen deities or saints of others. You can, however, investigate and critically examine their purported claims only to arrive at the inescapable truth that Islam is Reality. It’s okay to become angry, but it is not in the example of Allah’s Beloved to act with anger. Keep your tongues moist with the remembrance of Allah for “truly in the remembrance of Allah do hearts find satisfaction” (Qur’an 13:28).

Stress to your Christian acquaintances the unparallel universality of the Islamic tradition. Remind them that once a year, the faithful representing every country on the planet converge upon God’s Holy House in Mecca. There truly is absolutely nothing in the world that can even hold a candle to such a magnificent gathering of the hearts. We are *not* a religion consisting solely of Arabs and Africans, although *al-hamdulillah*, many from these ethnicities are Muslim. We are a world faith, a faith that transcends any man, leader, or nation. We are the shining embodiment of God’s guidance as

perfected by His Holy Prophet. We are Muslim, the standard by which all human beings can be measured.

Questions to ask your Christian Friends.

1. Why do Christian preachers and pastors so often quote Paul in their sermons and not Jesus nearly as much? (If they should deny this, ask to go with them to a church sermon or gathering).
2. Why does Paul at first concede to impose Torah restrictions on Gentile Christians as described in the book of Acts (21:24), but later calls the law a “curse” and “bondage” in his letters to the Galatians and Romans?
3. Did you know that during the time of Paul and the apostles, there were many oral traditions and Gospel principles that were different from those of Paul? Why is there not a Gospel of Jesus existent that predates Paul?
4. Did you know that according to Paul, you must become a “fool” before you can understand Christian dogma such as the true significance of the crucifixion and resurrection (I Corinthians 1, 3)?
5. How do you explain the fact that the Old Testament and Biblical Jesus do not support the doctrine of original sin yet you believe it to be Gospel Truth? See Ezekiel 18:20-21; Deuteronomy 24:16; Jeremiah 31:30; Mark 9:13-14.
6. Why does Paul say that no one is righteous (Romans 3:10) while Jesus very clearly states

that there are many righteous who do not need his teaching (Mark 2:16-17)? How do you think this affects the sin problem?

7. Did you know that Muslims *do not* believe that we can earn heaven by our good works alone? Did you know that the book of Revelation advocates judgment through works (Revelation 20:12-13)? Did you know that according to Jesus it was his *good works* that testified to his anointing as God's Messiah (John 10:24-25)?
8. Are you aware of the fact that God's unity, His unconditional love, and love for neighbors mean more in the eyes of God than *all* types of sacrifices (Mark 12:28-34)? Did you know that God demands Mercy and not sacrifice? See Hosea 6:6; Matthew 9:13, 12:7.
9. Did you know that Jesus instructed his people to follow the laws and commandments in order to be *saved* (Matthew 19:7; Mark 10:19; Luke 18:20)? Can I show you many passages in the Hebrew Bible where it states the same? See Ecclesiastes 12:13-14; Exodus 20:6; Psalms 112:1; Psalms 119:116.
10. How do you explain the teachings of Paul contradicting nearly everything that Jesus preached?
11. Are you aware that according to your Bible, Jesus spoke like a Muslim (John 20:19, 21, 26), prayed like a Muslim (Matthew 26:39), and even blessed the Muslims (Matthew 5:9)?

Chapter 4 *Refuting the Crucifixion and Resurrection*

“...but they killed him not, nor crucified him, but so it was made to appear to them, and those who differ therein are full of doubts, with no (certain) knowledge, but only conjecture to follow, for of a surety they killed him not.” – Holy Qur’an 4:157.

The single most important belief in all of Christendom is that Jesus Christ, the long-awaited Jewish Messiah, died on a cross between two thieves and rose from the dead three days later. In essence, the entire religion of Christianity lingers on the veracity of these very events occurring exactly how they are described in the Gospels and interpreted by Paul. In short, if no crucifixion, no resurrection, no Christianity! Strobel tells us on page 206: “The Resurrection is the supreme vindication of Jesus’ divine identity and his inspired teaching. It’s the proof of his triumph over sin and death. It’s the foreshadowing of the resurrection of his followers. It’s the basis of Christian hope. It’s the miracles of all miracles.” Paul perhaps said it best: “And if Christ be not raised, your faith is *vain*; ye are yet in your sins” (I Corinthians 15:17).

Allah must save his prophets?

Rhodes says, “Muslims believe Allah would never have allowed one of his own prophets to be dishonored and suffer a humiliating death on a cross. The crucifixion, we are told, is simply incompatible with Allah’s absolute sovereignty.” In the Qur’an, we *are* in fact told that many prophets and messengers were saved from the imminent wrath of God descending on their

unbelieving communities. Allah mentions Moses' flight out of Egypt, Noah's construction of the ark, Lot's departure from the cities of the plain, and the prophets Shu'ayb, Salih, and Hud finding sanctuary after Allah's command. Nowhere are we told, however, that a prophet being stoned, crucified, or disemboweled is "incompatible with Allah's absolute sovereignty." On the contrary, Allah has revealed through His Prophet concerning the rebellious Children of Israel: "We gave Moses the Book and followed him up with a succession of messengers; We gave Jesus the son of Mary clear (signs) and strengthened him with the holy spirit. Is it that whenever there comes to you a messenger with what ye yourselves desire not, ye are puffed up with pride?-Some ye called impostors, *and others ye slay*" (Qur'an 2:87; Also see 3:21, 183; 5:70). Interestingly, Jesus is specifically mentioned in this verse as someone whom the Jews called an imposter and had the intention of slaying, but were not successful. Allah even mentions that the Prophet Muhammad himself could very well be killed: "Muhammad is no more than a messenger: many were the messenger that passed away before him. If he died or were *slain*, will ye then turn back on your heels" (Qur'an 3:144)? This is in exact agreement with Jesus' condemnation in Matthew 23:37: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, [thou] that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee."

The Christian may ask you, "If Jesus *could* have been slain or crucified, then why does the Qur'an say that he wasn't (4:157)?" Because it is simply a *fact* that Jesus was not crucified! There would be no incongruity within the message of the Qur'an or Islam if Jesus is killed on a cross or not; we don't even believe that he atoned for our sins so what difference does it make to us? Why does Allah find it so important to mention in His eternal Word that Christ wasn't crucified when there is no religious significance attached to the manner of his

death for Muslims? It's important because it never happened, that's why.

Geisler and Saleeb put a twist on the issue. They say, "Even if Muslims assume that God will deliver his prophets from their enemies, it is wrong to conclude that he did not deliver Christ from his enemies. Indeed, this is precisely what the resurrection is." We will examine this so-called "resurrection" a little later in this chapter. For now, you should be aware that Islam's aim is to make one conscious of the next world. If all of the inhabitants of this planet were singing your praises and decided to elect you the dictator of Earth, it would not benefit you one iota if Allah were displeased with you. Muslims would most certainly honor any prophet who is killed without warrant as a noble martyr. Jesus, however, was never killed.

Two Theories

The Qur'an is quite emphatic in its categorical rejection of Christ's death by crucifixion and simply states that "God raised him up unto Himself" (4:158) and saved Jesus from his enemies. Allah has further said: "O Jesus! I will take thee and raise thee to Myself and clear thee (of the falsehoods) of those who blaspheme; I will make those who follow thee superior to those who reject faith, to the Day of Resurrection: Then shall ye all return unto me, and I will judge between you of the matters wherein ye dispute" (Qur'an 3:55). This is the extent of our sure knowledge regarding the end of Jesus' earthly ministry. Any speculation other than what Allah has told us would render us no better than the astray Christians whom Allah charges as possessing "no certain knowledge but follow only conjecture" (Qur'an 4:157). But simply for the sake of argument, and also to appease our Christian questioners, let's examine two of the most widely held Muslim theories as to what indeed happened to the son of Mary over 2,000 years ago – 1) The Swoon Theory and 2) The Substitution Theory. Remind your

Christian friend that these are only *possibilities*, and that the exact sequence of events brought about by Allah to save Jesus are not known by anyone save Allah Himself.⁵ The Swoon Theory, although much less popular among Muslim scholars, will be the focus of our first analysis. The erudite Ahmad Deedat (may Allah have Mercy upon him) has shown great effort in utilizing the evangelical witnesses to support this theory in his book *Crucifixion or Crucifiction*. The theory states that although Jesus might very well have been “crucificted,” that is, placed on the cross, he was not “crucified,” or *killed* on the cross. As Deedat points out, there is simply no verb in the English or Greek languages to describe a person who has been nailed to a cross yet survived. If you say that he or she was “crucified,” then you should expect the person to be dead. Every Good Friday in the Philippines extremist Catholics reenact the scourging and killing of Jesus by nailing themselves to crosses yet none of them die from their experiences. Were they then really *crucified*? Therefore, we can rightly say according to this theory, that Jesus was *crucificted*, and survived his ordeal at Calvary. Interestingly, Jesus provides himself the greatest evidence in support of this theory as we will see below.

The Sign of Jonas

The Gospels tell us of many miracles that Jesus performed while preaching to his people in Galilee and Jerusalem. Many of these signs and wonders I have previously mentioned in Chapter 1. But what was the greatest miracle of Jesus? Christians would contend that it was his apparent rising from the dead. Jesus *does* in fact reveal what his lasting miracle will be in Matthew

⁵ Orthodox Islam does not subscribe to the factional Ahmadiyya belief that Jesus *did* in fact swoon and then move to India where he died as an old man.

12:39, 16:4, and Luke 11:29. We are told that a group of sadistic Pharisees approach Jesus with a special request. Although they had certainly heard or perhaps even seen with their own eyes Jesus do the seemingly impossible, such as raise the dead, feed multitudes, or heal the blind and lepers, they ask him to perform a miracle on demand. They say, "Master, we would see a sign from thee." In other words, "Show us a trick so we can be amused!" But unlike your average street magician, Jesus is not prepared to pander at the bidding of these unbelieving "vipers" and rebukes them severely: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign." It takes a very low level of faith to be swayed in our religious convictions by simply watching a man pull a rabbit out of his hat. Allah has similarly told us regarding Muhammad in the Word of God: "The Unbelievers say: 'Why is not a sign sent down to him from his Lord'" (Qur'an 13:27)?

The nature of Jesus' teaching, his extreme piety, and his guiding moral example should have been "sign" enough for the Pharisees, but their hearts were diseased and physical miracles of the immediate nature was not a cure that Jesus saw fit for them. Jesus continues: "and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: *For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*" (Matthew 12:39-40). This was Jesus' greatest and lasting miracle – The Sign of Jonas.

So what exactly *did* happen to Jonas? Let's examine this tiny book of only four chapters found in the Hebrew Bible. A much less detailed story of Jonas, or Jonah, is also found within the pages of the Qur'an, and he remains the only prophet with the distinct honor of having both a book of the Bible and chapter of the Qur'an named after him (Chapter 10, *Sura Yunus*).

We are told that God instructed Jonah to go to Nineveh and admonish the populace of the city about

their wickedness. For reasons not given in the Biblical reading, he decides rather to go down into Joppa and hitches a boat ride across the sea headed for Tarshish. Suddenly a great storm arises and the men present on the boat feel that someone in their very midst brought with him an evil omen. They decide to cast lots and sure enough, the blame fell squarely upon Jonah. Jonah explains to the heathen men that he was a Hebrew who had “fled from the presence of His Lord” and that the only solution to this problem would be to cast him into the sea. The men refuse and row desperately toward land but fail. After repeated attempts to spare Jonah’s life, they supplicate unto God: “We beseech thee, O Lord, we beseech thee, let us not perish for this man’s life, and lay not upon us innocent blood: for thou, O Lord, hast done as it pleased thee” (Jonah 1:14). Compare the men’s gesture of absolving themselves of all guilt with Pilate washing his hands and remarking: “I am innocent of the blood of this just person (Jesus): see ye [to it]” (Matthew 27:24).

In order to calm the torrential storm, the men cast Jonah into the sea and offer sacrifices and vows. Therefore, one man must die to save the others. In John, the High Priest Caiaphas, fearing another doomed Jewish insurrection led by Jesus, comments: “One man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not” (John 11:50).

Now we are told that a great fish or whale swallows Jonah whole and he stays inside of its massive belly for three days and three nights praying to the Almighty. Finally, after uttering the clinching words, “Salvation is of the Lord!” (Jonah 2:9), God orders the fish to vomit him onto dry land. Jonah goes straightway into Nineveh and after giving his people a renewed sense of faith, they immediately become believers.

After reading the entire book of Jonah you may think to yourself, “what was the miracle or sign that Jesus referred to and what does it have to do with

Jesus?” After all, Jesus does say: “For as Jonas was a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation” (Luke 11:30). What was Jonah a sign *of*? Imagine that you were on that boat and witnessed the events that took place on that stormy night. You saw how Jonah was tossed overboard and left to tread water in the vast sea and as you and the other men begin to row away, you are shocked to see a huge fish swallow Jonah and disappear under water. What would you conclude about the physical condition of Jonah? You would be very safe in assuming that he has died. To your utter amazement, however, you spot Jonah walking the streets of Nineveh three days later. What has happened? Is he a ghost? Has he been resurrected? What?

Remember that Jonah was *alive* in the belly of the fish for three days and three nights. He never actually died, but to those on the boat, it certainly seemed as if he had. When referring to the apparent crucifixion of Jesus, Allah says, “so it was made to appear unto them,” the “them” referring to the enemies of Jesus who planned to bring about his death. Therefore, the great sign of Jonah unto the Ninevites was the amazing method in which he had escaped the clutches of death when it seemed impossible for him to do so. According to Jesus (Luke 11:30 above), this Sign was applicable to his generation as well. He also said: “For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly; *so shall the Son of man be* three days and three nights in the heart of the earth” (Matthew 12:40). How was Jonah in the belly of the whale? Alive. Yet if you ask any Christian in the world how Jesus was in the heart of the earth, they will invariably shout, “Dead!”

Christians will try to convince you that Jesus was simply referring to the time factor, not the physical condition of Jonah. They will say, “Jesus meant that he will be ‘entombed’ for three days and nights like Jonah was.” Simply going into a tomb for three days, however, is not a miracle. Even you or I can go into a tomb or a

cave for three days and nights and emerge unscathed. The real miracle of Jonah was that he was supposed to die but did not. Jonah proved to his people the power of his God by escaping death. This evidence was enough to convince the Ninevites of the truthfulness of his prophetic mission and they repented unto God and entered into faith. Jesus likewise demonstrated the power of “his Father” by conquering death and thus providing further evidence that he *was* the true Messiah of the Jewish people. He had never died, and is still *alive*.

The Gospel accounts of the resurrection do not even agree with Jesus’ statement regarding the time duration in the “heart of the earth.” If he was crucified on Good Friday, placed into the tomb at the start of the Sabbath, and “resurrected” on Sunday morning, then that equates to only *two* nights and *one* day, not three days and three nights. The Christian may say that Jesus only said “three days and three nights” as a manner of speaking, and did not mean it to be taken literally. Tell him, “If Jesus did not want us to interpret this literally, then how can you claim that the ‘time factor’ was what Jesus intended to emphasize as being his lasting and greatest miracle?”

Luke’s post-“resurrection” events

Luke 24 tells us that Jesus appears to his disciples after the “resurrection” in the Upper Room. He narrates: “And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you” (verse 36). Notice the reaction of the disciples in the next verse: “But they were terrified and affrighted, and *supposed* that they had seen a spirit” (verse 37). Why did the disciples suppose that Jesus was a spirit when he looked no different than before? We have to go back to the story of Jonah. If one of those men in the boat saw what had happened to Jonah in the sea and then saw him again three days later on land, he would also conclude that it was the ghost or spirit of Jonah. This is

exactly what the disciples believed about Jesus. Therefore, he sets their hearts at ease: “Why are ye troubled? Why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; *for a spirit hath not flesh and bones*, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet” (verses 38-40). Jesus is essentially saying, “Why are you scared? Can’t you see that it’s me, Jesus! Look at my hands and feet, I’m the same person. Do spirits have flesh and bones like this?” The disciples, however, were still very doubtful so Jesus asks them, “Have ye here any meat?” And they gave him a piece of a “broiled fish, and of an honeycomb. And he took [it], and did eat before them” (verses 41-43). What does eating prove? It proves that he is the *same physical Jesus*.

Christians will not argue concerning these points. They will say, “Yes, we agree. He was the same physical Jesus. That’s because he was physically resurrected!” But do resurrected bodies require nourishment of a physical nature? Let’s consult the Biblical Jesus. After the Jews come to him with yet another riddle, this time about a woman who married seven brothers consecutively, Jesus comments about them in the next world:

- “For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, *but are as the angels of God in heaven.*” - Matthew 22:30.
- “For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; *but are as the angels which are in heaven.*” - Mark 12:25.
- “And Jesus answering said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that

world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage.” - Luke 20:34-35.

From the above mentioned verses found in the synoptics, it becomes very clear that resurrected bodies become spiritualized or immortal. They no longer need to eat, drink, sleep, have sex, etc., for they are “equal unto the angels.” If Jesus was resurrected, then he must also be in a spiritualized form. Yet he denies this outright: “A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” He is not spiritualized and thus *not resurrected*. Yet Christian apologists such as Geisler and Saleeb continue to refer to Jesus as being in a “transformed body,” meaning the same body but now immortal, unworldly, *spiritual*! They are making the same mistake that the disciples made. He is *not* transformed. He is the same Jesus in all respects. McDowell similarly says that the body of Jesus had passed “right through his grave clothes and into a new existence.”

A Christian once informed me that in the three passages above, Jesus was only referring to the final resurrection of the dead at judgment, and not necessarily his own resurrection. Although there is nothing in the very general context to suggest this assertion, I conceded that he had made a fair observation. “Besides,” he said, “it doesn’t *clearly* state that resurrected bodies become spiritualized anyway.” Then he accused me of reading into the scripture. Maybe hearing it from Paul, his real Master, will convince him:

“But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou fool, (Paul loves calling people fools despite Jesus’ stern warning against this. See Chapter 3.) that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die: And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other [grain]: But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to

every seed his own body. All flesh [is] not the same flesh: but [there is] one [kind of] flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, [and] another of birds. [There are] also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the glory of the celestial [is] one, and the [glory] of the terrestrial [is] another. [There is] one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for [one] star differeth from [another] star in glory. So also [is] the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: ***It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.*** There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.” – I Corinthians 15:35-44.

Resurrected bodies

“What about Lazarus!?” my Christian friend exploded. “Was he not physically resurrected by Jesus and *not* made spiritual?” The answer is yes. But where is Lazarus now? He’s dead. He died twice. Let’s turn it over to Paul: “And as it is appointed unto men *once* to die, but after this the judgment” (Hebrews 9:27). The Christian at this point must either agree that there is clear contradiction in his Bible, or admit that Lazarus’ resurrection was the exact same type as that of the Christian Jesus, namely, physical yet transformed (spiritual). So what is the solution? It’s a lose/lose situation!

The Qur’an also mentions Jesus’ God-given power to raise the dead: “And I heal those born blind, and the lepers, and I quicken the dead, by God’s leave” (Qur’an 3:49). Allah also tells us of the Prophet ‘Aziz: “Or take the similitude of one who passed by a hamlet, all in ruins to its roofs. He said: ‘Oh! how shall Allah bring it (ever) to life, after this its death?’ but Allah caused him to die for a hundred years, then raised him up again” (Qur’an 2:259). As Muslims we believe that both of these aforementioned resurrections were purely

physical. Therefore, we can conclude that in *general*, resurrected bodies become spiritualized. But God can do what He wills, and if He wants to raise someone from the dead in exactly the same form physically, then He certainly can. “Exactly!” the Christian will say, “that’s what happened with Jesus.”

Only Three Possibilities

There are only three possible explanations for Jesus’ physical appearances after the “resurrection.” The first possibility, known as the *Doomsday resurrection*, maintains that Jesus was raised in a physically “transformed” body identical in nature to that in which we are all raised on the day of general resurrection at the end of time. This would make Jesus immortal and spiritually oriented. This was also precisely the type of body that the disciples thought Jesus was raised into in Luke 24. Again, Jesus corrects them by stating that he was *not* a spirit, but the same Jesus. He then eats to further prove that he is not spiritually but rather *physically* oriented. Christians run into trouble here when they claim that Jesus was physically resurrected yet immortal, but *not* spiritual. This argument is completely devoid of logic because immortality is an attribute of spiritualized bodies, not physical ones. If a Christian wants to say that Jesus was resurrected immortal, then he *must* also say that he was a spirit, yet Jesus denies this. Unlike Luke, John mentions that the “doors were locked” when Jesus appeared to his disciples, seemingly materializing out of thin air! (John 20:19). Only a spiritually resurrected body can do this. So was he a spirit or not? Who is lying, John or Jesus?

A second possibility, known as the *Earthly resurrection*, asserts that Jesus was raised into the same exact physical body that he had been in before his death. This would make Jesus mortal and physically oriented. This type of resurrection is identical in nature to those of Lazarus mentioned in the Gospel of John, and ‘Aziz

mentioned in Sura 2 of the Holy Qur'an. This would also mean that Jesus was subject to hunger, thirst, pain, fatigue, and death. Ask your Christian friend that if Jesus were to be spotted by a group of Pharisees after his resurrection, would it be possible for them to mob Jesus and kill him again. The Christian will say no. But why? He will answer, "Because he was immortal, and also because my Bible says that we can only die once." Ask him, "Do you mean he was spiritualized?" If he answers no, then remind him once again that *all* immortal beings are spiritualized. That is why "God is Spirit" (John 4:24). If he answers yes, then you've got him trapped because Jesus says: "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have" (Luke 24:39).

The third possibility, known as the *Jonas resurrection*, states that Jesus never died in the first place, but had escaped death as Deedat says, "by the skin of his teeth." This is the only way to reconcile Christianity's 2,000-year parade of confusion and misguidance with regards to the dogma of the resurrection.

Evidence supporting a Jonas resurrection:

A) The rolled away stone

Mark tells us: "And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulcher? And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away: for it was very great" (Mark 16:3-4). If Jesus was resurrected immortal as Christians claim, and if he could simply "beam" in and out of rooms as John says (John 20:19), then why does the stone need to be rolled away at all? Wouldn't it be a greater, more convincing miracle if the stone had *not* moved yet Jesus was gone? Sure it would be. This is exactly the reason why Matthew records that the women actually saw an angel roll the stone away to reveal a

missing Jesus (Matthew 28:2)! This statement of Matthew is obviously a fabrication, perhaps invented to erase from your mind the fact that one man, Joseph, was able to roll the stone over the door of the sepulcher on Friday night (Matthew 27:60). Luke and John saw it as Mark did, the stone was already rolled away from the sepulcher (Luke 24:2; John 20:2). The fact that Jesus needed the stone removed to exit the tomb indicates that he was the same physical Jesus who never died.

B) He's "ALIVE!"

Mark says: "And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not" (Mark 16:11). The disciples heard from the women that Jesus was *risen* and *alive*. According to the Strongs' Concordance, the Greek for risen, *egeiro*, also has primary definitions, "to arouse from sleep, to awake." But if I say that a person is *resurrected*, then that can only mean that he or she was *dead* and then raised back to life. In Matthew 27:63, the Pharisees tell Pilate: "Sir, we remember that deceiver said, while he was yet alive..." Somebody should have told them that he is *still* "alive." Even if Jesus did appear unto "five hundred of his brethren" as Paul says (I Corinthians 15:6), this does not prove that he was dead then resurrected but only that he was alive.

- "And when they found not his body, they came, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that he was *alive*" (Luke 24:23).
- "To whom also he showed himself *alive* after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God" (Acts 1:3).

- “And as they were afraid, and bowed down [their] faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the *living* among the dead” (Luke 24:5)?

The fact that Jesus is always referred to as being *alive* and *risen* rather than *resurrected* indicates that he was the same physical Jesus who never died.

C) Jesus in disguise

When Mary Magdalene went to the sepulcher in John 20:15 she did not recognize Jesus. She actually thought that he was a gardener. Ask your Christian friend if resurrected bodies take on the appearances of gardeners. If he says no, then ask him why Mary thought Jesus was a gardener when he didn't look like a gardener? The answer is because he was *disguised as a gardener!* But why? For fear of the Jews. If Jesus were resurrected “in power and glory” as the Christians claim, then he would have nothing to fear. The passage reads: “Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the *gardener*, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away.”

Luke tells us that Jesus actually went on a stroll to Emmaus with two of his disciples that had known him personally for at least three years yet failed to recognize him: “ And it came to pass, that, while they communed [together] and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them. But their eyes were holden that they should not know him” (Luke 24:15-16). Apparently, Jesus was still in his gardener costume. The fact that Jesus found it necessary to guise himself from unruly people who might bring him further harm indicates that he was the same physical Jesus who never died, and was in fear of being killed.

D) Women rescuers

On Sunday morning, Mary Magdelene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome go to the garden tomb for a very special reason. According to the Gospels, all three of these women along with Joseph of Arimathaea were present at the events that unfolded the previous Friday at Calvary. If the Swoon Theory were correct, then these women would certainly have seen at least a glimmer of life in the body of Jesus as he was removed from the cross. Mark tells us that when news of Jesus' apparent death had reached Pilate, he "marveled" over this because he knew from experience that it took at least a couple of days to expire while crucified (Mark 15:44). Jesus had been on the cross for just a few hours. Interestingly, Mark further tells us that it was this same Joseph who "craved for the body of Jesus" and actually went to Pilate to ask him to turn it over to him. A Christian may point out the fact that Pilate confirmed Jesus' death via a Roman centurion before he gave his body to Joseph. He will also inform you that the Romans were extremely gifted in this practice of killing and soldiers knew that they would be killed themselves if they failed to completely carry out their duties. You can agree with him here but remind him that God does whatever He wills. Truly if God wanted to save His Messiah from death, making a Roman guard believe that Jesus was already dead would certainly be no problem. In fact, God in the Qur'an says this very thing: "But they (Jesus' enemies) killed him not, nor crucified (caused him to *die* on a cross) him, but so it was made to *appear* to them" (Qur'an 4:157).

Mark then tells us that it was exactly these three women (the two Marys and Salome) who came to the tomb on Sunday morning to "anoint" the body of Jesus (Mark 16:1). Why would these women want to anoint a dead rotting corpse after three days? Was this a common practice amongst the Jews? Isn't it obvious that these

women came to tend to the wounded, ailing, and weary Jesus who had survived his ordeal and thus fulfilled the sign of Jonah? John, recognizing the folly of the synoptic evangelists, tells us in Chapter 19 verse 39 that Nicodemus and Joseph anointed the body of Jesus *the night of the crucifixion* with myrrh and aloes, 100 pounds in all. The author of the Fourth Gospel wants to make it crystal clear, without a shadow of doubt that Jesus did in fact die on the cross. John further proves this point by concocting an incident in which Jesus is impaled with a spear to ensure non-survival, a touch that the synoptics are ignorant of. In all four Gospels we are told that at least one woman of those present at the crucifixion visited the tomb on Easter Sunday morning. Mark and Luke say that it was to “anoint” Jesus (Mark 16:1; Luke 24:1), which cannot be true since John says that this was already done, while Matthew and John provide no reasons for their unorthodox visits (Matthew 28:1; John 20:1).

John also mentions the episode in which Mary weeps while facing the empty sepulcher only to hear Jesus’ voice behind her say, “Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou?” Since Mary is not able to recognize the “gardening” Jesus, she comments, “Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away.” Was this the intention of Mary, to “take away” Jesus? Where would she take him, to another tomb? If John is correct about the time of anointing, then Mary would have had to carry a corpse which would easily weigh in excess of 250 pounds (Jesus plus 100 pounds of myrrh and aloes), all by herself! Unlike the disciples who were terrified upon seeing Jesus in the Upper Room, Mary becomes filled with joy because she *knows* that this was no ghost or spirit, but only Jesus wounded but *alive*.

E) Body intact

Another fact supporting the Swoon Theory is the admission of John that the Roman soldiers did not break the legs of Jesus as he hanged on the cross. It reads: "Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other which was crucified with him. But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs" (John 19:32-33). From this we can deduce: 1) the crossmates of Jesus were still *alive* at this time and 2) Jesus' unbroken legs would only be useful to him if he were still alive. Again, just because it states that the soldier "saw that he (Jesus) was dead already" does not provide us with a definitive answer. Ask your Christian friend: "Have you considered the possibility that God *wanted* the soldier to believe that Jesus had died in order to save him?"

Let's pretend for arguments' sake that Jesus was decapitated while he was on the cross, a fate that some of his disciples would later endure. Would you expect a resurrected Jesus to be walking around headless? Of course not, he would be "transformed" and healed, made spiritual, and raised incorruptible (to use Paul's word). Yet Christians do not believe that Jesus' resurrected body became spiritualized. Therefore, just as Jesus showed Thomas his various wounds to prove his *physical* "resurrection," had his legs been broken, he would have also shown Thomas his bones protruding from his shins. If the Romans had amputated his legs, then Jesus would have required major assistance simply to meet with his disciples. The disciples of John the Baptist buried their teacher's headless body yet Herod believed that Jesus was John resurrected and made spiritual. This provides further proof that resurrected bodies become spiritualized and immortal, and if Jesus was not spiritualized as Christians claim, then he was not resurrected either.

The Christian wants the best of both worlds. He will say that Jesus was physically raised yet immortal, he was incorruptible yet not spiritual. You should not be

surprised by these illogical beliefs. After all, according to Christianity, three equals one, man is God, bread is flesh, wine is blood, death is salvation, and begotten means unique!

Unreliable sources

Christians believe that the most solid fact in human history was the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Apologists claim that no other ancient book surpasses the reliability of the Gospel accounts as recorded by the four evangelists in the Bible. You will hear them say, “The Bible is documented historical evidence that Jesus died on the cross and arose three days later and you (Muslims) reject this because some book revealed 600 years after the fact told you so!” Respond by agreeing that the Bible is exactly that, *a history book*. Point out to the Christian the following example: In 1990, we read in our American history textbooks that Thomas Jefferson died on July 4, 1826 leaving a wife and a few white children behind. In 2000, you might have read that Jefferson actually fathered five more children with one of his slaves Sally Hemings. Has history changed? History has not, only our *perception* of it has. In this case, science has proven that we can’t always rely on what’s written in the history books. As more and more evidence comes to light, we may be forced to rethink the validity of certain past events that we always thought were unshakably true. This is precisely what the Qur’an has done to the Bible. It confirmed some of it, corrected some of it, and rejected some of it. There *never was* a Trinity, a begotten Son of God, or a crucifixion of Jesus Christ.

It seems as if the four evangelists are in major disagreement as to who went to the sepulcher on that Sunday morning and what exactly they saw. Ask your Christian friend how he or she can in good conscience believe these heavily contradictory statements to be the true Word of God. If the Biblical accounts of the

resurrection were to be scrutinized with the same standards by which sayings (*ahadith*) of the Prophet Muhammad were authenticated, *all* of the accounts would be thrown out and deemed unreliable. Strobel quotes Charles Templeton who recently said: “The four descriptions of events...differ so markedly at so many points that, with all the good will in the world, they cannot be reconciled.”

Who went?

What did they see?

What did they do?

Matthew

The two Marys (28:1).

.An angel seated on the stone (28:2).

Both women ran with “fear and joy” to tell The disciples (28:8).

Mark

The two Marys & Salome (16:1).

A “young man” seated inside the tomb on the right side (16:5).

They fled from the sepulcher trembling, “neither said they any thing to any man” (16:9).

Luke

The two Marys, Joanna, & “other women” (24:10).

“Two men in shining garments” (24:4).

They told the disciples and Peter alone went to see for himself (24:9-12).

John

Mary Magdalene alone (20:1).

Just an empty tomb, no Angels or young men (20:1).

She only told Peter and “the disciple whom Jesus loved.” Both men went to see for themselves (20:2-3).

Jesus said he would “die”

Since this is such a tough issue to debate, the Christian will not back down easily. As stated earlier, the entire basis of Christianity is the belief that Jesus rose from the dead. Surely Christians will confront you with verses in which Jesus apparently prophesized this event:

- “And as they came down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the Son of man were risen from the dead.” - Mark 9:9.
- “And they shall scourge [him], and put him to death: and the third day he shall rise again.” – Luke 18:33.
- “For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and after that he is killed, he shall rise the third day.” - Mark 9:31.

“Do these verses seem clear enough to you!” the Christian will ask. Ask him if we can, for just one second, take these sayings to be figurative and he will immediately roll his eyes and blurt, “No! Isn’t it obvious what he is saying!? How blind are you Muslims!” Surely the disciples should have had no problems understanding Jesus, after all, we are told that Jesus “spoke not to them (the general populace) without a parable; but he *explained everything secretly to his own disciples*” (Mark 4:34). Of course this contradicts John who quotes Jesus before the Sanhedrin: “I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort; *and in secret have I said nothing.*” (John 118:20).

Let’s now examine the reaction of the disciples when they heard the above three statements of Jesus. These are the very next verses:

- “And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising from the dead *should mean*” (Mark 9:10, NKJV). “So they kept it to themselves, but they often asked each other *what he meant* by “rising from the dead” (Mark 9:10, NLT).
- “And they understood *none of these things*: and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken” (Luke 18:34, NKJV). “But they didn’t understand a thing he said. Its significance was *hidden from them*, and they failed to grasp what he was talking about” (Luke 18:34, NLT).
- “But they *understood not that saying*, and were afraid to ask him” (Mark 9-32, NKJV).

It appears as if the disciples had little idea as to what Jesus was talking about. But why? Perhaps they understood these statements to be totally literal and debated mutually about whether or not Pagans could even kill the Messiah. Unlike Paul, they conceived of the paradoxical implications of a dead Messiah. For the disciples, a dead Messiah was no Messiah at all.

The Gospels tell us that Jesus often used the word “dead” symbolically. The evangelists as well as Paul do as well. Here are a few examples:

- Mark tells us that a certain scribe wanted to follow Jesus but asked the latter if he could go bury his father first. Jesus responded: “Follow me; and let the *dead* bury their dead” (Mark 8:22). The first occurrence of the word “dead” is used figuratively by Jesus to represent the *spiritually* dead, those who have rejected his message. Also see Luke 9:60.

- Matthew tells us of a ruler to requested Jesus to raise his dead daughter. Jesus responded: “Give place: for the maid is not dead, *but sleepeth*. And they laughed him to scorn” (Matthew 9:24). Is it possible that the maid only appeared dead? Perhaps this is what Jesus intended when he said that he would be “dead.” Also see Mark 5:39 and Luke 8:52.
- Jesus responds to a question put forth by a Sadducee: “But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the *dead*, but of the living” (Matthew 22:31-32). Obviously, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were all physically dead yet still alive in their spirit of teaching. Also see Mark 12:27 and Luke 20:38.
- When the guards posted at the tomb saw an angel roll back the stone, they were filled with fear and “became as *dead men*” (Matthew 28:4).
- After Jesus exorcises a demon from a man, Mark comments: “and *he was as one dead*; insomuch that many said, He is *dead*” (Mark 9:26). Yet he was not dead because the next verse states: “But Jesus took him by the hand, and lifted him up; and he arose” (Mark 9:27).
- In his parable of the Prodigal Son, Jesus says: “For this my son was *dead*, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found. And they began to be merry” (Luke 15:24). The words “dead” and “lost” are used synonymously.

- Paul says, “I protest by your rejoicing which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, *I die daily*” (I Corinthians 15:31). He means that he suffers daily.

Jesus asks for his life

Christians believe that before the creation of the earth, the Father and Son made a contract together stipulating that the latter would enter into flesh and redeem mankind in the year 4000 (after Adam). They believe that the death and resurrection of Jesus was something ordained since time immemorial. Using this logic, the greatest Christian saint of all time should have been Judas Iscariot! Was he not the one who made it all possible? It seems extremely unjust to hold him in contempt for doing something that 1) was already preordained 4000 years prior by God and 2) necessary for the redemption of mankind. Yet after all of this, Jesus calls poor Judas “a traitor.” Maybe Jesus didn’t want to die after all? In fact, the synoptics actually record Jesus asking for his life. It appears as if Jesus knows nothing about the contract he supposedly made in heaven with his Father. Why is he so reluctant to die? Even an average zealot will go to his death readily if it meant martyrdom. As is his style, John omits Jesus’ prayer to provide his readers with a sense of security that Jesus did in fact go willingly.

- “And he went a little further, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou [wilt].” -Matthew 26:39.
- “And he said, Abba, Father, all things [are] possible unto thee; take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt.” – Mark 14:36.

- “Saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done.” – Luke 22:42.

According to Jesus’ own teaching, God must answer his request and deliver him. He said: “If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if [he ask] a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent?” (Luke 11:11; Also see Mark 7:10). “And I say unto you, ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you” (Luke 11:98; Also see Matthew 7:7). “But I know, that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give [it] thee” (John 11:22). Instead of throwing him a fish, God decides to have His Son spat upon, stripped, scourged, nailed to a cross, and finally sent to Hell for three days and Christians call this love? Even up until the very end Jesus is defiant. He wails on the cross: “*Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?* That is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me” (Matthew 27:46)? Are these the words of a willing sacrifice? Shouldn’t he be happy about completing his mission and saving the world? Instead he tells his disciples just before his arrest: “My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death” (Mark 14:34). Crying, complaining, sweating, and bargaining? Consider McDowell’s words: “When he went to the cross almost 2000 years ago, a holy, just, righteous God poured out his wrath upon his Son.” God kills an innocent man and Christians call it “holy, just, and righteous”!

Alleged Old Testament Prophecies of Jesus’ Death

After the apparent death of Jesus on the cross, the witnessing of Paul and the Hellenizers found staunch opposition from most Jews over one issue: How can the Romans kill the Messiah? Paul professes: “But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness” (I Corinthians 1:23).

Therefore, the heavily Paulized New Testament authors took it upon themselves to search long and hard for passages in the Hebrew Bible that they could incorporate into their evangelical accounts. Isaiah 53 and Psalm 22 tickled them the most, and these along with other so-called prophecies of the death of Christ are examined below.

Sold for thirty pieces of silver

Christians say that Zechariah 11:12-13 is fulfilled by Matthew 27:9. Here are the verses respectively: “And I said unto them, If ye think good, give [me] my price; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty [pieces] of silver” (Zechariah 11:12); “Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value” (Matthew 27:9). Did you notice it? Matthew erroneously cites the book of Jeremiah instead of Zechariah! Jeremiah only mentions “seventeen shekels of silver” (Jeremiah 32:9). Yet Christians believe this is God talking.

Isaiah 53 – “The Suffering Servant”

Isaiah tells us: “He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were [our] faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not...But he [was] wounded for our transgressions, [he was] bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace [was] upon him; and with his stripes we are healed...He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? For he was cut off out of the land

of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken” (Isaiah 53:3, 5, 7-8).

In the Traditional KJV of the Bible the caption to this chapter reads, “the sin-bearing Messiah” yet the word “Messiah” does not appear in the original text in any way, shape, or form. Harris says (emphasis mine):

To defend Jesus against charges that he “failed” to reestablish David’ kingdom, early Christians point to certain passages in the Hebrew Bible that seemed to them to illustrate the nature of Jesus’ unexpected messiahship. In Christian interpretations of the Messiah, he became the “prophet like Moses” described in Deuteronomy (18:15-20) and the mysterious “suffering servant” in Isaiah (52:13-53:12). *In the original texts, neither the Mosaic prophet nor the anonymous servant is associated with the Messiah*, and we do not know whether these two unidentified figures were given messianic emphasis before the Christian period (pages 75-76).

McDowell admits: “The suffering Messiah was completely foreign to the Jewish conception of messiahship” (page 73). We will take a closer look at the “prophet like Moses” in Chapter 5 and identify him, God willing.

Christians love informing people that Jesus “opened not his mouth” as it states in verse 7. However John tells us that when the high priest Annas and the entire council of officers were interrogating Jesus, he could keep his peace no longer and began to *defend himself*. In fact, his defense is so convincing that one of the officers which stood by “struck Jesus with the palm of his hand, saying, Answerest thou the high priest so” (John 18:22)? But Jesus was no easy pushover. He

retorts sharply: “If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me” (John 18:23)? Such behavior is hardly comparable to a “dumb sheep.”

Also, when Pilate asks Jesus flatly, “what hast thou done?” (John 18:35), Jesus becomes his own lawyer again and says: “My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence” (John 18:36). Basically saying: “You don’t have to worry about me. I will not try to overthrow Rome with zealotry. My teaching is only spiritual in nature.” After these words, Pilate goes to the angry mob outside and declares, “I find in him no fault at all” (John 18:38).

Consider the phrases, “he is brought as a lamb led to the slaughter” and “he was cut off out of the land of the living.” These words were fulfilled in the person of the Hebrew Prophet *Jeremiah*, not Jesus. In Jeremiah 11:19 we are told: “But I was like a *gentle lamb led to the slaughter*. I did not know it was against me they devised schemes, saying, ‘Let us destroy the tree with its fruit, *let us cut him off from the land of the living*, that his name be remembered no more” (RSV). Jeremiah was rejected and afflicted by his people after warning them of the terrible Babylonian punishment on the horizon. He was mocked, ridiculed, spat on, flogged, imprisoned, and eventually killed for his trouble. It was not *for* his people’s sins that Jeremiah was made to suffer, but rather *because* of their sins - they simply would not believe in him. Many scholars believe that either chapter 53 was written by the prophet Isaiah himself or by some other contemporary who prophesied the ministry of Jeremiah, or that it was actually written in retrospect after Jeremiah’s death by a Jewish scribe living in Babylon. Either way, it is definitely not a reference to Jesus Christ.

The Jews interpret Isaiah 53 to be a reference to Israel as a whole since many times in the book of Isaiah (chapter 42), Psalms, and elsewhere in the Old Testament God does in fact refer to Israel as “My servant.” The problem with this is the fact that Israel simply does not fit the description. Besides, how can this be a reference to Israel when Israel itself is doing the talking? Consider the phrases: “But he [was] wounded for *our* transgressions... and with his stripes *we* are healed.”

Forsaken by disciples

Zechariah 13:7 reads: “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man [that is] my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts: smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered: and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones.” Both Mark and Matthew tell us that at the most critical juncture in the life of Jesus, “all of his disciples forsook him and fled” (Mark 14:50; Matthew 26:56). When Muslims try to point out that *all* of Jesus’ disciples deserted him and did not witness what had happened at Calvary, Christians retort that “the disciple whom Jesus loved” was there and even stood at the foot of the cross (John 19:26). Just as John invented the impaling incident to prove Jesus’ death, he also places a disciple at the crucifixion thus contradicting the synoptics which mention that *all* of his disciples left him in the lurch. John also mentions that two “secret disciples,” Joseph of Arimathaea and Nicodemus removed Jesus’ body from the cross. It’s unfortunate that we don’t have first hand accounts from either of these two men as to what they noticed about Jesus’ “dead” body.

Peter did “follow at a distance,” but before Jesus’ trial even began, “he *went out*, and wept bitterly,” and is not mentioned again until Easter Sunday. Therefore, he was not present at the cross. Ask your Christian friend why the synoptics maintain that all of

Jesus disciples forsook him and fled when “the disciple whom Jesus loved” and two secret disciples stayed put? Either the synoptics are wrong or John is mistaken.

Psalm 22

David says: “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? [why art thou so] far from helping me, [and from] the words of my roaring?... For dogs have compassed me: the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet... They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture” (Psalm 22:1, 16, 18). This is obviously nothing more than the evangelists’ attempts to legitimize the death of the Messiah, but yet again, there is no mention whatsoever that this is referring to God’s Anointed. The evangelists have borrowed freely from the Old Testament in order to get their theological doctrine across, but when the Qur’an confirms a story or an event found within the Hebrew Bible, the Christians call Muhammad a forger!

Psalm 34

Christians believe that John 19:33-36 fulfills Psalms 34:20 where it states: “He keepeth all his bones: not one of them is broken.” This is taken viciously out of context. Let’s look at the three preceding verses: “The righteous cry, and the Lord heareth, and delivereth them out of *all* their troubles. The Lord [is] nigh unto them that are of a broken heart; and saveth such as be of a contrite spirit. Many [are] the afflictions of the righteous: but the Lord delivereth him out of them *all*” (Psalms 34:17-19). Notice the word “all” mentioned twice in this passage. God will deliver those who call upon Him from *all* of their troubles and afflictions. Does this verse really find its fulfillment in the Christian Jesus who was apparently beaten beyond recognition, pricked by thorns, scourged mercilessly, and had stakes driven

through his hands and feet? But God “delivered” him by not braking any of his bones? Ridiculous!

The Real Messianic Prophecies

Psalm 91 – “He shall deliver thee”

According to the New Testament, Psalm 91 is a confirmed messianic prophecy which states that God will deliver his Messiah from all harm. When Jesus was in the desert preparing for his ministry, Satan tells him: “If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: *for it is written*, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in [their] hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone” (Matthew 4:6; Also see Luke 4:11). Christians may take exception to the fact that Satan mentions this passage, but that point is irrelevant. The critical issue is that this prophecy was believed to be referring to the Messiah by all of the Jews in Jesus’ day and even until this day. Satan reminds him of the passage from the Hebrew Bible yet Jesus does not offer to correct Satan by saying something to the effect of, “That does not apply to me.” Jesus rather replies: “It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God” (Matthew 4:7). Therefore, while Satan is correct about relating this prophecy to Jesus, he has no right to demand anything from God for his own amusement. Notice how Jesus also uses the phrase “it is written” to rebut the tempting of the Evil One. In essence he is saying: “*I am* the ‘Son of God’ (Messiah), and am fully aware what God has said about me. But did *you* forget that it is forbidden to tempt Him?”

“He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty. I will say of the Lord, [He is] my refuge and my fortress: my God; in him will I trust. Surely he shall deliver thee from the snare of the fowler, [and] from the noisome pestilence.

He shall cover thee with his feathers, and under his wings shalt thou trust: his truth [shall be thy] shield and buckler. Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night; [nor] for the arrow [that] flieth by day; [Nor] for the pestilence [that] walketh in darkness; [nor] for the destruction [that] wasteth at noonday. A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; [but] it shall not come nigh thee. Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked. Because thou hast made the Lord, [which is] my refuge, [even] the most High, thy habitation; There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling. For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in [their] hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone. Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet. Because he hath set his love upon me, therefore will I deliver him: I will set him on high, because he hath known my name. *He shall call upon me, and I will answer him:* I [will be] with him in trouble; *I will deliver him,* and honour him. With long life will I satisfy him, and shew him my salvation.” - Psalm 91.

Compare “they shall bear thee up in their hands” to “God raised him up unto Himself” (Qur’an 4:158).

Psalm 20

King David writes: “We will rejoice in thy salvation, and in the name of our God we will set up [our] banners: the Lord fulfil all thy petitions. Now know I that the Lord saveth his Anointed; he will hear him from his holy heaven with the saving strength of his right hand. Some [trust] in chariots, and some in horses: but we will remember the name of the Lord our God” (Psalm 20:5-7). Verse 6 transliterated reads: *At-tah yadha-tiki hoshiya adonai meshicho, anehu mishemey qodsho bighb-huroth yesha yemeeno.* There is no

ambiguity here whatsoever. The words for “saveth,” and “anointed” are *hoshiya* and *Meshicho* respectively. The *Meshicho*, or rather Messiah, is the Christ. Can it be any more clear: God saves His Messiah!

The majority of Christians believe Jesus’ true name to be *Yeshua*, a name that has *exactly the same* etymological root meaning and significance as the word *hoshiya* in verse 6. The root word being *yasha*, “to save.” According to the Strongs’ Concordance, *Yeshua* means “*he is saved*,” not Savior.

Hoshiya: 1) to save, be saved, be delivered.

- a) to be liberated, be saved, be delivered
- b) to be saved (in battle), be victorious
- c) to save, deliver
- d) to save from moral troubles
- e) to give victory to

Christians are quick to quote Psalm 22 or 34 and claim that they are foretelling the death of the Messiah when there is no specific reference to him at all. Yet when he *is* mentioned specifically in Psalm 20 and other passages presented below as being saved by God, Christians suddenly become ignorant!

Psalm 18

Replace the word “Anointed” with Messiah or Christ: “He delivereth me from mine enemies: yea, thou *liftest me up* above those that rise up against me: thou hast delivered me from the violent man. Therefore will I give thanks unto thee, O Lord, among the heathen, and sing praises unto thy name. Great deliverance giveth he to his king; and showeth mercy to *his Anointed*, to David, and to his seed for evermore” (Psalm 18:48-50). Again we have a very specific messianic prophecy of the

saving of God's Anointed which matches exactly with what the Qur'an says happened to Jesus yet Christians remain deluded!

Psalm 28

“Blessed [be] the Lord, because he hath heard the voice of my supplications. The Lord [is] my strength and my shield; my heart trusted in him, and I am helped: therefore my heart greatly rejoiceth; and with my song will I praise him. The Lord [is] their strength, and *he [is] the saving strength of his Anointed (Messiah)*” (Psalms 28:6-8).

Psalm 105

“When they went from one nation to another, from [one] kingdom to another people; He suffered no man to do them wrong: yea, he reproveth kings for their sakes; [Saying], *Touch not mine Anointed (Christ)*, and do my prophets no harm” (Psalm 105:13-15).

The Anointed are Always Saved

According to the Old Testament, priests would consecrate as king a prophet or prince by anointing the latter's head with oil from the sacred tabernacle. The people who witnessed this event would then shout, “God save the king (messiah)!” Certainly Solomon was a king, a great and wise king, but he was not *the King*. That office belonged to only one person, the Christ of God who is Jesus (upon whom be peace). If God saved his lesser messiahs from harm, then how much more would He protect His true Messiah?

- “And Zadok the priest took a horn of oil out of the tabernacle, and anointed (*mashach*) Solomon. And they blew the trumpet; and all the people said, God save king Solomon.” - I Kings 1:39.

- “And he brought forth the king’s son, and put the crown upon him, and [gave him] the testimony; and they made him king, and anointed (*mashach*) him; and they clapped their hands, and said, God save the king.” - II Kings 11:12.
- “Then they brought out the king’s son, and put upon him the crown, and [gave him] the testimony, and made him king. And Jehoiada and his sons anointed (*mashach*) him, and said, God save the king.” - II Chronicles 23:11.

The Substitution Theory

The Substitution Theory states that someone else who resembled or was made to resemble Jesus was nailed to the cross and crucified while Jesus himself remained totally unharmed. This is the more widely accepted theory among Muslim scholars and as already noted, confirms Jewish expectations of the Messiah. Stress again to your Christian friend that this is only a possibility and that God alone knows how this was actually accomplished.

Unlike the Swoon Theory, the Substitution Theory is much more difficult to prove from a Biblical standpoint, but like the Swoon Theory’s Sign of Jonas, the Gospels unintentionally provide us with a 500-lb. sledgehammer to use against the Christian crucifixion advances. Although not specifically mentioned in the synoptic Gospels, Christians believe that Jesus, after his six or so trials, sleep deprivation, and numerous beatings, was so weak that he could not even carry the wooden cross bar to his own execution. The question of *exactly* why Jesus did not carry his own cross remains a mystery. We do know from the Gospels, however, that a man known as Simon of Cyrene played an extremely interesting role during those Friday proceedings almost 2,000 years ago...

- Matthew 27:32 – “And as they came out, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name: him they compelled to *bear his cross*.”
- Mark 15:21 – “And they compel one Simon a Cyrenian, who passed by, coming out of the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to *bear his cross*.”
- Luke 23:26 – “And as they led him away, they laid hold upon one Simon, a Cyrenian, coming out of the country, and on him *they laid the cross*, that *he might bear [it]* after Jesus.”

Who is this man Simon of Cyrene? The Gospels do not mention him prior to or after the crucifixion. Could it be that *Simon* was seized by the Romans during the riotous atmosphere and crucified instead of Jesus? His son, Alexander, is mentioned twice by Paul using extremely harsh language: “Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord reward him according to his works” (II Timothy 4:14); “Of whom is Hymenaeus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme” (I Timothy 1:20). If this is the same Alexander *bar Shimon*, then why does Paul despise him so much? Perhaps Alexander opposed Paul’s paradoxical doctrine of the murdered Messiah by claiming that his father was killed in Jesus’ place. Using Mark as their primary source, both Matthew and Luke prefer not to mention the sons of Simon for reasons that remain unknown. Amazingly, John makes absolutely no mention of Simon at all! He tells us: “And he (Jesus) *bearing his own cross* went forth into a place called [the place] of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha” (John 19:17). Who is lying, John or the synoptic evangelists?

Stress again to your Christian friend that the intention behind the writing of John's Gospel by the Johannine community was to tie up the many loose ends of the Jesus event. The ambiguous divinity of Christ, his mysterious death on the cross, and his unsettling "no show" second coming are problem areas that John attempts to address and resolve. As already stated, John invents an impaling of Jesus on the cross as well as contradicts the synoptics by claiming that Jesus was anointed by his secret disciples the *very* night of his "death" and that a disciple was present at the crucifixion. Now he goes a step further and says that Jesus bore his own cross to Golgotha to give us the assurance that he, and not Simon, was the one actually killed.

John's highly mystical *Christology* seems to be in response to some of the Gnostic elements found amongst the Christian communities of the first century. Harris says (emphasis Harris'): "One branch of Gnosticism, called Docetism (a name taken from the Greek verb 'to seem') argued that Christ, being good, could not also be human; he only *seemed* to have a physical body. The Docetists contended that as God's true son, Christ was wholly spiritual, ascending to heaven while leaving another's body on the cross" (page 194). Although we as Muslims cannot totally agree with this statement, we can certainly appreciate its testimony that there were in fact many divergent early Christian opinions with regards to the so-called crucifixion.

The Johannine community declares: "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh *is of God*. And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that [spirit] of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world" (I John 4:2-3). The Fourth Gospel and three epistles of John eventually defined what became the official church view of Jesus' dual nature. But is it this simple? If a

spirit confesses that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh he is of God? Mark tells us that *unclean demonic spirits* declared to Jesus: “I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God” (Mark 1:24); “Thou art the Son of God” (Mark 3:11); “What have I to do with thee, Jesus, [thou] Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not” (Mark 5:7). Are these spirits of God?

Abdullah Yusuf Ali states in his commentary to the Holy Qur’an (page 236, note 663):

The end of the life of Jesus on earth is as much involved in mystery as his birth, and indeed the greater part of his private life, except the three main years of his ministry. It is not profitable to discuss the many doubts and conjectures among the early Christian sects and among Muslim theologians. The Orthodox Christian Churches make it a cardinal point in their doctrine that his life was taken on the Cross, that he died and was buried, that on the third day he rose in the body with his wounds intact, and walked about and conversed, and ate with his disciples, and was afterward taken up bodily to heaven. This is necessary for the theological doctrine of blood sacrifice and vicarious atonement for sins, which is rejected by Islam. *But some of the early Christian sects did not believe that Christ was killed on the Cross.* The Basilidans believed that someone else was substituted for him. The Docetae held that Christ never had a real physical or natural body, but only an apparent or phantom body, and that his Crucifixion was merely apparent, not real. The Marcionite Gospel (about A.C. 138) denied that Jesus was born, and merely said that he appeared in human form. The Gospel of St. Barnabas supported the theory of substitution on the Cross. The Qur’anic teaching is that Christ was not crucified nor killed by the Jews,

notwithstanding certain apparent circumstances which produced that illusion in the minds of some of his enemies; that disputations, doubts, and conjectures on such matters are vain; and that he was taken up to Allah.

To my Muslim Brethren...

The Christians' fanatical infatuation with the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ will be very evident in your conversations with them. Films such as Mel Gibson's *The Passion of the Christ* have only added fuel to their evangelical fire. Meanwhile, Gibson pocketed hundreds of millions of dollars for his depiction of the last twelve hours of Jesus' life. Religion certainly pays in Christendom! Consider the prophetic words of Ahmad Deedat penned by the Sheikh at least fifteen years prior to the premiere of Gibson's film (emphasis mine):

...a thunderstorm; an eclipse of the sun; an earthquake; rocks being rent; the veil of the temple being torn from the top to bottom; graves being opened and sleeping corpses marching through the streets of Jerusalem...as narrated by the Christians' witnesses. What a scenario for a *billion dollar, record-breaking, film production!*...The Jews were in extreme haste to have Jesus done away with. Remember the midnight trial? Early in the morning, they dragged him to Pilate. From Pilate to Herod. From Herod back to Pilate. According to a boisterous American (another "born-again") there were *six* trials within twelve hours. At the busiest time in Jerusalem, around the Feast of the

Passover, it appears from the Gospel narratives that people of worth had nothing else to do but twiddle their thumbs in great expectation of interviewing Jesus. Exactly as things happen on the “set”, for the shooting of *films*. Hurry! Hurry! Hurry!

Remember again the words of Paul: “And if Christ be not raised, your faith is *vain*; ye are yet in your sins” (I Corinthians 15:17). The three or six hours that Jesus was supposedly hanged on a cross provide the basis for the entire religion of Christianity, so expect the Christian to take your criticisms personally. Also call to mind the stunning admission of Paul previously quoted in Chapter 3: “Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead *according to my gospel*” (II Timothy 2:8). This acknowledges the fact of history that there were many first and second century Christian communities that did not hold the belief that Christ died on the cross. Unfortunately, the Gospels that relate these events are heavily influenced by Pauline doctrine of sacrificial death and atonement. This also explains why Jesus apparently foretold that he would be killed on the cross. These words were simply put into his mouth by the evangelists.

You will notice that when you say “Sign of Jonas” or the name “Simon of Cyrene,” most Christians will stare blankly into your face. This is because they don’t know what in God’s Holy Name you are talking about and are too embarrassed to ask. Take it one step at a time and don’t let yourself be bombarded with questions. Christians will always try to dominate a conversation with idle words and emotion rather than with logic and scripture. Slowly chip the rust of the “crucifixion curse” off your Christian friend’s heart and mind by explaining his own scripture to him in a calm and dignified yet bold manner.

Also remember to stop where Allah and His Messenger have stopped. We know with *haqqul yaqeen*

(certainty of truth) that Jesus Christ was not killed nor crucified. The rest is only conjecture and theory, and Allah does not give us further specifics but simply tells us regarding the matter: “And (the unbelievers) plotted and planned, and Allah too planned, and the best of planners is Allah” (Qur’an 3:54).

Questions to ask your Christian friends.

1. Have you ever heard of the Sign of Jonas (Matthew 12:39, 16:4; Luke 11:29)? (Usually the answer will be no). What do you think the miracle of Jonas was?

2. Sequence of Questions regarding the Resurrection:
 - 2a. **Was Jesus resurrected?** Answer will be yes.
 - 2b. **Was he resurrected a) physically and made spiritual (immortal, angelic) or b) just physically like Lazarus?** If answer is “a,” go to question 2c; If answer is “b,” go to question 2d.
 - 2c. **Are you agreeing then with Jesus (Matthew 22:30; Mark 12:25; Luke 20:34-35) and Paul (I Corinthians 15:35-43) that resurrected bodies become spiritualized?** If answer is the usual “No, he was ‘transformed’ and made immortal,” go to question 2e; If answer is yes, go to question 2g.
 - 2d. **So Jesus would have been susceptible to hunger, thirst, fatigue, and death?** If answer is the usual “No, he was ‘transformed’ and made immortal,” go to question 2e; If answer is yes, go to question 2f.
 - 2e. **Did you know that being transformed and immortalized is the same as being spiritualized? (Immortality is an attribute of**

- spiritually resurrected bodies).** If answer is no, they are far astray. Start over and make them see the logic. If answer is yes, go to question 2g.
- 2f. **So if Jesus could have died twice, doesn't that contradict Hebrews 9:27?** If answer is no, they are far astray. Start over and make them see the logic. If answer is yes, then conclude: *"Therefore, Jesus was not resurrected!"*
- 2g. **Are you aware that Jesus denied that he was spiritualized (Luke 24:39)?** If answer is no, tell them to read their Bibles more closely. If answer is yes, conclude: *"Therefore, Jesus was not resurrected!"*
3. Why would an immortally resurrected Jesus 1) need to have the stone at the mouth of the sepulcher rolled away and have his linen sheets unwrapped. 2) Be disguised as a gardener. 3) Feel the need to eat with his disciples?
4. If the resurrection is a fact as you say, then why do all four Gospels differ as to who initially witnessed this event, what they saw, and what they did?
5. Are you aware that Jesus used the word "dead" literally as well as symbolically (Matthew 23:31-32; Mark 8:22; Luke 15:24)?
6. According to Jesus' own teaching, God will grant His faithful whatever they ask of him. Why is Jesus then forsaken by God and killed after asking God to save him (Matthew 26:39; Mark 14:36; Luke 22:42)? Do you not see the cruelty in this?
7. Why do you claim that mysterious and unspecific passages from the Hebrew Bible such

as Isaiah 53; Psalm 22, 34; Zechariah 11:13, 13:7, etc. refer to Jesus when there are very clear and specific prophecies of the “Messiah” in Psalm 18, 20, 28, 91, and 105? Is it because they state that the Messiah will be saved?

8. Why does John contradict the synoptics by maintaining that: 1) Jesus bore his own cross. 2) Jesus was impaled on the cross. 3) A disciple was present at the crucifixion. 4) Jesus was anointed on Good Friday?

Part II – Defending Islam

Chapter 5 *Muhammad in the Old Testament*

“Those to whom We have given the Book know him as they know their own sons. Those who have lost their own souls refuse therefore to believe.” - Qur’an 6:20.

In our attempts to expound upon prophecies of Muhammad (upon whom be peace) in the Biblical text, it should be noted that our faith as Muslims is completely independent of the Jewish and Christian scriptures. We do not believe that any part of the Bible is the True Word of God. Although there are many evident prophecies of the Prophet of Islam in the Bible even as it exists today, we cannot say for certain whether such predictions are in fact authentic. As Muslims we are taught that the Qur’an and Sunnah of Allah’s Messenger are wholly sufficient unto us for guidance. But just as the Christians enjoy extracting apparent prophecies of Jesus out of a text they consider to be abrogated in order to prove the legitimacy of their Lord, we too have a right to examine the Hebrew scriptures and investigate the Biblical legitimacy of our Prophet. This is important because we can actually invite our Christian friends to Islam by utilizing something that is in his or her own frame of reference. Allah tells us: “Those who follow the messenger, the unlettered Prophet, whom they find mentioned in their own (scriptures) - in the law and the Gospel;- for he commands them what is just and forbids them what is evil; he allows them as lawful what is good (and pure) and prohibits them from what is bad (and impure); he releases them from their heavy burdens and from the yokes that are upon them. So it is those who

believe in him, honour him, help him, and follow the light which is sent down with him - it is they who will prosper” (Qur’an 7:157). Your Christian friend will smirk at such a claim and demand to see the name “Muhammad” spelled out in his Bible. Remind him that Jesus said: “For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me” (John 5:46). Tell him that if he examined with a fine-toothed comb any one of the hundreds of messianic prophecies that he claims refer to Christ in the Old Testament, he will *never* come across the name “Jesus.” So why do Christians demand from us something they cannot produce for themselves? It will be shown, however, that we *can* in fact fulfill the demand of the Christian in this regard (*insha-allah*).

Ishmael or Isaac?

Who was the *real* covenant child of Abraham? Obviously, the Jews and Christians stand united in their support for Isaac, the second-born of Abraham and forefather of the Children of Israel. Most Muslims, however, believe him to be Ishmael, the first-born of Abraham and forefather of the Arabs. If modern-day Trinitarian Christians whose ancestors worshipped trees and rocks can get away with being counted among the spiritual progeny of Abraham simply because Jesus descended from Isaac, then we as Muslim monotheists can certainly present our case for Muhammad, *a direct descendant of the first-born son of Abraham* (upon whom be peace). Let’s attempt to ascertain the true identity of this covenant son by closely examining the book of Genesis in the Jewish Torah.

We are told in Genesis 22:2: “Take now your son, your only son Isaac, whom you love, and go to the land of Moriah, and offer him there as a burnt offering on one of the mountains of which I shall tell you.” At no time during the lifetime of Isaac (upon whom be peace) was he ever the “only son” of Abraham. Did “God” forget about Ishmael, Isaac’s brother who was fourteen

years his senior? Christians will retort that God only intended the son Abraham “loved,” the implication being that Abraham hated Ishmael. Although we can never believe such nonsense, what does the Law say about this? In Deuteronomy 21:15-17 we read: “If a man has two wives, one loved and the other unloved, and they have borne him children, both the loved and the unloved, and if the firstborn son is of her who is unloved, then it shall be, on the day of bequeaths his possessions to his sons, *that he must not bestow firstborn status on the son of the loved wife in preference to the son of the unloved, the true firstborn.* But he shall acknowledge the son of the unloved wife as the firstborn by giving him a double portion of all that he has, for he is the beginning of his strength; the right of the firstborn is his.” Therefore, it matters not whether Abraham loved Ishmael, he *is* the first-born. It was none other than the evil pen of a scribe who changed the name “Ishmael” to “Isaac” in Genesis 22:2. Truly Allah has told us: “Of the Jews there are those who displace words from their (right) places...” (Qur’an 4:46).

“But Ishmael was the illegitimate son of a bondswoman!” the Christian will shout. Tell him to consider the following passage: “Then Sarai, Abram’s wife, took Hagar her maid, the Egyptian, and gave her to her husband Abram to be his *wife*, after Abram had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan. So Hagar bore Abram a *son*; and Abram named his *son*, whom Hagar bore, Ishmael. Abram was eighty-six years old when Hagar bore Ishmael to Abram” (Genesis 16:3, 15-16). According to the Bible, Ishmael is Abraham’s *son* through his *wife* Hagar. Now listen to what Abraham has to say about the mother of Isaac, Sarah: “Because I thought, surely the fear of God is not in this place; and they kill me on account of my wife. But indeed she is truly my sister. She is the *daughter of my father*, but not the daughter of my mother; and she became my wife” (Genesis 20:11-12). Once again we have a breach of the

book of Deuteronomy: “Cursed is the one who lies with his sister, the *daughter of his father* or the daughter of his mother. And all the people shall say, Amen!” (Deuteronomy 27:22). If Abraham lived during the time of Moses, the latter would have had him stoned to death. So how can the son of Abraham’s sister be legitimate? He can’t!

God’s Covenant

Genesis 15 reveals to us two vital stipulations in the covenant between God and the chosen child of Abraham. It reads: “Then He (God) brought him (Abraham) outside and said, ‘Look now toward heaven, and count the stars if you are able to number them.’ And he said to him, (1) ‘So shall your descendants be.’ On the same day, the Lord made a covenant with Abram saying, (2) ‘To your descendants I have given this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the River Euphrates’” (Genesis 15:5, 18.). The vast majority of land between the two great rivers constitutes the Arabian desert and peninsula. This region was never conquered by the Children of Israel, but immediately upon the emergence of Muhammad and the Muslims. It was only with the appearance of the Messenger of the Covenant Muhammad (Malachi 3) that all idolatry was rooted out of these lands promised to the covenant progeny of Abraham. Jewish history demonstrates the obvious ineptness of the Children of Jacob to abolish the heathen worship of statues in Palestine and even in their very Temple! Karen Armstrong, author of the popular book *A History of God* remarks (emphasis mine): “We have seen that it took the ancient Israelites some 700 years to break with their old religious allegiances and accept monotheism, but Muhammad managed to help the Arabs achieve this difficult transition *in a mere 23 years*” (page 146).

At this point it is worth giving an overall breakdown of the family of Abraham the Patriarch, the

true in faith (*Hanifah*). Abraham's first son and covenant child was Ishmael, whom he bore through Hagar. Next, Sarah conceived a son called Isaac. Abraham took a third wife, Keturah, and had six sons with her. Ishmael's first born, *Nebajoth*, had a brother named *Kedar* (Genesis 25:13) and his progeny are called the Kedarites or Ishmaelites. Ishmael's two daughters Basemath and Mahalath wed Esau, who is Edom. The Lexicon Strongs' Concordance gives Esau the title, "the progenitor of the Arab peoples" and this to a son of Isaac! These become known as the Edomites. From Jacob, Isaac's other son, twelve luminaries appear with names such as Ruben, Levi, Judah, Joseph, and Benjamin. The descendants of Jacob, and not Jacob or Isaac, are dubbed the Children of Israel (*Bani Isra'il*). Abraham's first born of Keturah, Midian, is described by the Strongs' Concordance as, "progenitor of Midians or Arabians." Therefore these Arabs are called the Midianites. A descendant of Midian named Jethro (*Shu'ayb* in the Qur'an) gave his daughter Zipporah permission to marry a Levite and fugitive of Egypt named Moses. Therefore, it can be observed that the vast majority of the progeny of Abraham were and are in fact Arabs "as numerous as the stars" who intermarried and accepted the sons and daughters of Jacob as righteous servants of the Almighty.

The *Sign* of God's covenant was circumcision. In Genesis 17:9, 11 God tells Abraham: "As for you, you shall keep My covenant, you and your descendants after you throughout their generations...and you shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskins, and it shall be a sign of the covenant between Me and you." In verse 26 we are told: "That very same day Abraham was circumcised, *and his son Ishmael.*" So far we have been told that: 1) Ishmael is Abraham's first-born son. 2) Hagar is Abraham's lawfully wedded wife. 3) The covenant seed will be as numerous as the stars. 4) The covenant seed will be given the land between the Nile and Euphrates Rivers. 5) Ishmael was Abraham's only

son and seed for fourteen years. 6) Circumcision is the symbol of God's covenant. 7) Ishmael was circumcised with his father on the same day to fulfill the covenant with the flesh of their foreskins. *None* of the above have anything to do with Isaac!

Christians will no doubt point to verse 19 where God tells Abraham, "No, Sarah your wife shall bear you son, and you shall call his name Isaac; I will establish My covenant for an everlasting covenant, and with *his* descendants after him." Why has God changed his mind? He continues: "And as for Ishmael, I have heard you. Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly. He shall beget twelve princes, and I will make him a great nation" (verse 20). In other words: "Don't worry about Ishmael, I'll throw him a bone a two!" The most obvious piece of Jewish scribal deception, however, occurs in Genesis 21:

"Now Abraham was one hundred years old when his son Isaac was born to him...So the child grew up and was weaned. And Abraham made a great feast on the same day Isaac was weaned. And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, whom she had borne to Abraham, scoffing (playing with Isaac, REB version). Therefore she said to Abraham, 'Cast out this bondswoman with her son; for the son of this bondswoman shall not be heir with my son, namely with Isaac'...So Abraham rose early in the morning, and took bread and a skin of water; and putting it on her shoulder, he gave it and the boy to Hagar, and sent her away (*he set the child on her shoulder*, REB version). Then she departed and wandered in the wilderness of Beersheba. And the water in the skin was used up, and she placed the boy under one of the shrubs. Then she went and sat down across from him at a distance of about a bowshot; for she said to herself, 'Let me not see the death of the boy.' So she sat opposite him, and lifted her voice and wept. And God heard the

voice of the lad (God *heard the child crying*, REB version). Then the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven, and said to her, ‘What ails you, Hagar? Fear not, for God has heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise, lift up the lad and hold him *with your hand* (in your hand), for I will make him a great nation.’ Then God opened her eyes, and she saw a well of water. And she went and filled the skin with water, and gave the lad a drink.” – Genesis 21:5-19.

It is very clear from the text that we are given the profile of an *infant* here and not that of a seventeen-year old man. In Jewish custom, a child (Isaac) is weaned after three years. This would have made Ishmael seventeen. Can you imagine a grown man *sitting* on Hagar’s shoulder, *crying* beneath a shrub for water, and then being *lifted up* and *fed* by his mother? It is very interesting to note that although Ishmael is referenced in no less than eleven places in this passage, he is never addressed by name. According to Genesis 16:10-11, God called him “Ishmael” because He heard Hagar crying after she ran away from Sarah. In actuality, the child was not named until after Genesis 21:5-19 was written and “God heard” (verse 17) the infant child Ishmael crying while he and his mother settled in *Baca*, “the weeping valley,” and not Beersheba as the Bible states. It seems as if the chronologies of these events have been deliberately manipulated in order to give the reader the impression that Ishmael was banished due to a conflict between him and Isaac. In actuality, the nameless infant would not know his younger sibling until many years later. We are also told in Genesis 25:9 that in the spirit of brotherhood, *both* sons of Abraham buried their father. From this we can also conclude that the story given in Genesis 16:10 in which God tells Hagar that she must “submit herself under Sarah’s hand,” and Ishmael is called a “wild ass of a man,” are undoubtedly forgeries

penned by the Jewish rabbis and scribes in order to discredit the God-given rights of Ishmael, the ancestor of Muhammad.

Where is Baca?

David wrote: “Blessed are they that dwell in thy house: they will be still praising thee. Selah. Blessed is the man whose strength is in thee; in whose heart are the ways [of them]. [Who] passing through the valley of *Baca* make it a well; the rain also filleth the pools” (Psalms 84:4-6). Amazingly, this word appears in the Qur’an: “The first House (of worship) appointed for men was that at *Bakka*: full of blessing and of guidance for all kinds of beings” (Qur’an 3:96). *Bakka* is the ancient name of Mecca, named after the episode of Hagar and her son. Christians and Jews continue to maintain that *Baca* is actually a river in Palestine yet they have no idea where it is located. This shouldn’t surprise you. Christians don’t even know for certain where the birth, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus took place!

This first House ever dedicated to the worship of the One True God was constructed by Abraham and Ishmael in *Bakka* (Mecca) as the Qur’an tells us. After they raised the foundations of the House, the Qur’an records their sublime supplication unto their Lord:

“Our Lord! Accept (this service) from us: For Thou art the All-Hearing, the All-knowing. Our Lord! make of us Muslims, bowing to Thy (Will), and of our progeny a people Muslim, bowing to Thy (will); and show us our place for the celebration of (due) rites; and turn unto us (in Mercy); for Thou art the Oft-Returning, Most Merciful. Our Lord! send amongst them a Messenger of their own, who shall rehearse Thy Signs to them and instruct them in scripture and wisdom, and sanctify them: For Thou art the Exalted in Might, the Wise.” - Qur’an 2:127-129.

The Holy Messenger “of their own” would come from that very city thousands of years later and would be called Muhammad, literally the *Praised One* (upon whom be peace).

Esau or Jacob?...more deception

The Bible tells us that Rebekah, the wife of Isaac, became pregnant with twins. In Genesis 25:23 God tells her: “Two nations are in your womb. Two peoples shall be separated from your body; one people shall be stronger than the other, and the older shall serve the younger.” The two nations were the descendants of Esau, an Arab line, and the descendants of Jacob, the Israeli line. Esau (hairy) was born first and Jacob “grabbing at his heel” shortly followed. Notice the words of God above to Rebekah, “the older shall serve the younger.” These words are obviously a fabrication given the following reasons:

- Genesis 25:31-34 relates a story in which Jacob tricks Esau out of his birthright over a cup of “pottage and lentils.” If God had already ordained that Esau serve his younger brother Jacob, then why does Esau need to be tricked at all?
- In Genesis 27:22-29 Jacob fools his elderly father Isaac by pretending to be Esau by wearing goat skins on his hands (in an attempt to make himself appear hairier) to obtain his father’s lasting blessing. - “Let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee: be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother’s sons bow down to thee: cursed [be] every one that curseth thee, and blessed [be] he that blesseth thee.” If Isaac meant to give these words to Esau, then what does this say about “God’s” words to Rebekah?
- If God wanted Esau to serve Jacob then why does the latter address the former as “lord” (*adon*) yet

addresses himself as his “servant” (*ebed*) in Genesis 32:3-6, 33:1-10? Also, why does Jacob, Leah and her children, the handmaidens and their children, Joseph, and Rachel prostrate themselves seven times to Esau if he was inferior to his brother? Jacob comments: “If I have now found favor in your sight, then receive my present from my hand, inasmuch as I have seen your face as though I had seen the face of God, and you were pleased with me...Please let my lord go on ahead before his servant. I will lead on slowly at a pace which the livestock that go before me, and the children, are able to endure, until I come to my lord in Seir” (Genesis 33:10, 14).

Professor Abdul Ahad Dawood (formerly Reverend David Benjamin Keldani) writes in his book *Muhammad in the Bible*:

When we behold the number of the family of Jacob when he went to Egypt, which hardly exceeded seventy heads, and when he was met by Esau with an escort of four hundred armed horsemen, and the mighty Arab tribes submitted to the twelve Emirs belonging to the family of Ishmael, and then when the Last Messenger of Allah proclaims the religion of Islam, all the Arab tribes unitedly acclaim him and accept his religion, and subdue all the lands promised to the children of Abraham, we must indeed be blind not to see that the Covenant was made with Ishmael and the promise accomplished in the person of Muhammad (upon whom be peace).

Deuteronomy 18:18 – The Prophet like Moses

God revealed to Moses: “I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him” (Deuteronomy

18:18). Christian apologists have several issues when we try to indicate that this verse can only refer to Muhammad. Rhodes point out: “First the term ‘brothers’ in this passage refers to Israelites, not to Arabs, who historically have been enemies of Israel. Elsewhere in Deuteronomy the term ‘brothers’ refers to fellow Israelites, not to foreign enemies. For example, God instructed the Israelites to choose a king ‘from among your brothers,’ not from among foreign enemies (Deuteronomy 17:15)...The reality is that there has never been an instance in the history of Israel in which a non-Jewish king was chosen to rule over a nation.” Geisler and Saleeb echo the same message: “It is clear that the term brethren means fellow Israelites. For the Jewish Levites were told in the same passage that ‘they shall have no inheritance among their brethren’ (v. 2)...why would God raise up for Israel a prophet from their enemies?”

Here is the prophecy transliterated from the Hebrew: *Navi akeem lahem mikerev acheyhem komocha. Venatati devarai befiv, vediber alayhem et kol asher atsavenu.* The word for brethren is *acheyhem* from the Semitic root *ach*. The Christian rebuttal can easily be defeated by familiarizing yourself with the lineage of Abraham (upon whom be peace). Abraham’s grandson through Isaac was Esau, also known as Edom. Esau was the “progenitor of the Arab peoples,” an Arab! Is Rhodes correct when he says that elsewhere in the book of Deuteronomy the term “brothers” or “brethren” refers only to fellow Israelites? Let’s read Deuteronomy 23:7: “Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; *for he [is] thy brother (ach)*: thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian; because thou wast a stranger in his land.” Amazing, the Edomites (Arab progeny of Esau) are “brethren” (*acheyhem*) of the Israelites. Deuteronomy 2:4 says: “And command thou the people, saying, Ye [are] to pass through the coast of *your brethren* the children of Esau, which dwell in Seir; and they shall be afraid of you: take ye good heed unto

yourselves therefore.” If the descendants of the brother of Jacob the son of Isaac are considered brethren to the Israelites, then how much more the descendants of the brother of Isaac the son of Abraham! Bottom line: The term “brethren” can be and *is* applied to *both* Jews (Israelites) and Arabs.

What about King Herod the Great? You might be surprised to know that this King of Judea who reigned during the time the Baptist and Christ were born (Luke 1:5) was an *Idumean*, also known as an Edomite, an Arab! – Yet a Jew by religion. Although he was cruel and genocidal toward his *brethren*, he is most remembered for his splendid restoration of the Temple of Solomon. Is it really true that an *Arab* rebuilt the Jewish Temple? It certainly is. The son of Herod the Great surnamed Antipas married the daughter of Aretas, the King of Arabia. Let’s not also forget Moses, the great Lawgiver of Israel who married the daughter of Jethro, a Midianite Arab. Ask your Christian friend why he considers the Arabs and Israelis to be enemies when the Holy Prophet Moses, presumably the man who wrote Deuteronomy 18:18, himself bore children that were half Arab.

The prophecy also says that this great Prophet will be like Moses (upon whom be peace). Christians again claim that Jesus fits the description here. Rhodes quotes scholar Gerard Nehls who states that Moses and Jesus: a) had death plots initiated against them as infants b) were both authenticated by signs and wonders c) liberated their people from bondage either physically (Moses) or spiritually (Jesus) d) spoke to God and e) mediated the Old and New Covenants. The funny thing is, all of the above criteria with the exception of “a” fit the Prophet of Islam as well. Despite what Christian fundamentalists have claimed, Muhammad did perform many miracles, over 3,000 are mentioned in the books of traditions (See Chapter 7 for the truth about this). He spiritually, as well as physically liberated his people and

released them from “their heavy burdens and from the yokes” that are upon them (Qur’an 7:157). He also spoke with God while he was His guest on the night of *Miraj* in the seventh heaven. Allah tells us: “For truly did he see, of the Signs of his Lord, the Greatest” (Qur’an 53:18). Finally, the Prophet Muhammad *restored* to the earth the true and original covenant that God made with Abraham and his first-born Ishmael. He is called “a covenant for the people” (Isaiah 42:6) and the “Messenger of the Covenant” (Malachi 3:1; Qur’an 3:81).

Ironically, no two prophets of God were ever as *dissimilar* as Jesus and Moses. Ask your Christian friend: “Do you not believe that Jesus is God? What about Moses? Do you not believe that Jesus committed suicide for the redemption of mankind? What about Moses? Do you not believe that Jesus descended into Hell? What about Moses? Do you not believe that Jesus wielded no sword? What about Moses? Do you not believe that Jesus is one of three in a Trinity, a triune god? What about Moses?” Even if all the dogma about the Christian Jesus was to be thrown out the window, he is still nothing like Moses yet Muhammad is. Dr. H.M. Baagil observes the following in his book *Muslim/Christian Dialogue*:

	<u>Moses</u>	<u>Muhammad</u>	<u>Jesus</u>
Birth	Normal	Normal	Miracle
Wives and children?	Yes	Yes	No
Death	Normal	Normal	Mysterious
Roles	Prophet and Statesman	Prophet and Statesman	Prophet
Forced Emigration (in adulthood)	To Median	To Medina	None
Battles?	Yes	Yes	No

Results	Moral/Military Victory	Moral/Military Victory	Moral Victory
Revelation written... departure	In his lifetime	In his lifetime	After
Nature of Teaching only	Spiritual/Legal	Spiritual/Legal	Spiritual
Accepted by people?	Yes eventually	Yes eventually	No

Allah says: “We have sent to you, (O men!) a messenger, to be a witness concerning you, *even as We sent a messenger to Pharaoh*” (Qur’an 73:15); “Say: ‘See ye? If (this teaching) be from Allah, and ye reject it, and a witness from among the Children of Israel *testifies to its similarity* (with earlier scripture), and has believed while ye are arrogant, (how unjust ye are!) truly, Allah guides not a people unjust” (Qur’an 46:10). We will continue to analyze this prophecy in Chapter 6 when we look at Muhammad in the New Testament, *insha-allah*.

Isaiah 29 – The unlettered Prophet

“Those who follow the messenger, the unlettered Prophet (*nabiyyul ummi*), whom they find mentioned in their own (scriptures),- in the law and the Gospel...” (Qur’an 7:157). Just how did the Prophet become a Prophet? Was he riding his horse or camel somewhere in the desert and experience a vision of God or an angel like Paul? *Unlike* Paul, he does not go into hiding for three years but rather tries to find the true significance of this apparent divine commissioning (What Muhammad did after his initial revelation will be examined in Chapter 7). Abdullah Yusuf Ali narrates this event in his introduction to *The Meaning of the Holy Qur’an* (published in 1937):

But Muhammad came in the fullest blaze of history; with no learning he put to shame the wisdom of the

learned; with pasture folk he lived and worked, and won their love; in hills and valleys, caves and deserts, he wandered, but never lost his way to truth and righteousness; from his pure and spotless heart the angels washed off the dust that flew around him; through the ways of crooked city folk, he walked upright and straight, and won from them the ungrudging name of the Man of Faith (*al Amin*) who never broke his word...The Chosen One was in the Cave of *Hira*, for two years and more he had prayed there and adored His Creator and wondered at the mystery of man with his corruptible flesh, just growing out of a clot, and the soul in him reaching out to knowledge sublime, new and ever new, taught by the bounty of Allah, and leading to that which himself knoweth not. And now, behold! A dazzling vision of beauty and light overpowered his senses, and he heard the word "*Iqra!*" "*Iqra!*" which being interpreted may mean "Read!" or "Proclaim!" or "Recite!" The unlettered Prophet was puzzled; he could not read (Muhammad answered, "*Maa ana bi qaari*", meaning "I am not lettered"). The angel seemed to press him to his breast in a close embrace, and the cry rang clear "*Iqra!*" And so it happened three times; until the first overpowering sensation yielded to a collected grasp of the words which made clear his mission; its Author, Allah, the Creator, its subject, Man, Allah's wondrous handiwork, capable by Grace of rising to heights sublime; and the instrument of that mission, the sanctified Pen, and the sanctified Book, the Gift of Allah, which men might read, write, or study, or treasure in their souls.

It was on that great night of power (*laylatil qadr*) when the Prophet received the first five verses of the Holy Qur'an, or recitation: "Read! in the name of thy Lord and Cherisher, Who created- Created man, out of a

(mere) clot of congealed blood: Read! And thy Lord is Most Bountiful,- He Who taught (the use of) the pen,- Taught man that which he knew not” (Qur’an 96:1-5). The events of this initial revelation are recorded in the book of Isaiah. (Note: The Hebrew word for read, *qara*, in this text has not only the same meaning as the Arabic *iqra* but is the *exact word itself*):

“And the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I am not learned...Therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, [even] a marvellous work and a wonder: for the wisdom of their wise [men] shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent [men] shall be hid...And in that day shall the deaf hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind shall see out of obscurity, and out of darkness.” – Isaiah 29:12, 14, 18.

Isaiah 42 – The Chosen One

“1) Behold! My servant (*ebd*) whom I uphold, My Elect One in whom My soul delights! I have put My Spirit upon Him; He will bring forth justice to the Gentiles. 2) He will not cry out, *nor raise his voice*, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. 3) A bruised reed He will not break, and smoking flax He will not quench; He will bring forth justice unto truth. 4) He will not fail nor be discouraged, till he has established justice on earth; and the islands shall wait for his Law. 5) Thus says God the Lord, who created the heavens and stretched them out, who spread forth the earth and that which comes from it, who gives breath to the people on it, and spirit to those who walk on it; 6) I, the Lord, have called you in righteousness, and will hold your hand; *I will keep you and give you as a covenant to the people*, as a light to the Gentiles. 7) To open blind eyes, to bring out prisoners from the prison, those who sit in darkness from the

prison house. 8) I am the Lord, that is my Name, and my glory I will not give to another, nor my praise to graven images. 9) Behold, the former things have come to pass, and new things I declare; before they spring forth I tell you of them. 10) *Sing unto the Lord a new song*, and his praise from the ends of the earth, you that go down to the sea, and all that is in it, the islands and the inhabitants of them. 11) Let the wilderness and its cities lift up their voice, *the villages that Kedar inhabits*. Let the inhabitants *of Sela (the rock) sing*, let them shout from the top of the mountains. 12) Let them give glory to the Lord, and declare his praise in the islands. 13) The Lord shall go forth like a mighty man, he shall stir up jealousy like a man of war. He shall shout, yes, roar. He shall prevail against his enemies.” – Isaiah 42:1-13.

The Chosen One of God will inherit the Holy Spirit (not the third person of the Trinity) and bring forth judgment unto the Gentiles. In the marketplace, nay, even on the battlefield will he not cause his voice to be heard for he “did not call upon a deaf Lord.” How can such a description befit Jesus who apparently made a scourge of small cords and drove out the sheep and the oxen from the Temple and poured out the changers’ money while overturning their tables (John 2:15) and shouting: “It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves” (Matthew 21:13)! “Hypocrites! Brood! Vipers!” – Does this sound like someone who does not “cry out” nor “raise his voice” (verse 2)? Consider this: “And when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he (Jesus) so *cried out*, and gave up the ghost...” (Mark 15:39).

Notice how God calls his Chosen One His *ebd* (*abd*), or “servant” (verse 1) and not “Son” as you would expect with a messianic prophecy. When the companions of the Prophet Muhammad asked him how they should address him, he replied, “*Abduhu wa*

rasuluhu,” meaning, “(I am foremost) His servant and then His Messenger.” Also note that one of the exalted titles of the Prophet given to him by Allah is *al-Mustafa*, which literally means “The Chosen or Elect One.”

Muhammad was “never discouraged” (verse 4) even when his wife, sons, uncles, daughters, and beloved companions passed away within his very sight, yet God guaranteed his safety from his enemies: “And Allah will guard you against men” (Qur’an 5:67). Although the Meccan period of his life was littered with persecutions, tortures, martyrdoms, and sanctions, God rewarded His Beloved with a sovereign post in Medina where he executed “justice unto truth” (verse 3). Again, that true covenant that God had made with Abraham and Ishmael was finally vindicated in the form of this champion Prophet, Muhammad *al-Mustafa* (verse 6). The “new song” (verse 10) of the Qur’an filled the hearts of the believers with such a firm faith in the absolute Oneness of the Almighty that they carried this message into the majestic isles (verse 4) and into the four corners of the globe. This “mighty man of war” (verse 13) stirred up such a reaction of absolute jealousy in his enemies that they sought to kill him simply because of his Arab ancestry! Yet when they traveled within a month’s journey of his holy person, God would strike their hearts with such terror the likes of which no man has ever known. The Torah tells us: “I will move them to jealousy with [those which are] not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation” (Deuteronomy 32:21).

There are three conditions of the above prophecy that *only* Muhammad fulfilled: 1) The message would be accepted in Gentile lands. Today, all of the Muslims of the world are *goyim*, while only a few of the sincere Jews of the Prophet’s time accepted his call of Prophethood, one of which was *Abdullah Ibn Salam* (may God be pleased with him). Although the Greco-Roman Gentiles embraced the Pauline doctrines of

Christianity, the true message of Christ was never intended to travel to them. – “Enter ye not into any Gentile land...I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel” (Matthew 10:5, 15:24). 2) The message would arrive at the “islands.” The island country of Indonesia has more Muslims than all of the entire Arab world put together! Modern day Christianity can also claim things similar to this yet on a smaller scale. 3) The inhabitants of *Kedar* (Arabs) would fully accept the message (verse 11). This is where the message of Paul and the Jesusites falls woefully short of the mark. It is Matthew’s wishful thinking that causes him to allude to the Hebrew Bible in no less than sixty places in his evangelical account in order to prove prophetic fulfillment in the person of Jesus. His application of Isaiah 42 to Jesus in Matthew 12:17-21 is completely unfounded and erroneous. The Chosen One must be accepted by the Gentiles, the islanders, *and* the Arabs. Alas, John admits about poor Jesus: “He came unto his own, and his *own* received him not” (John 1:11).

The name Kedar should sound familiar to you. Genesis 25:12-15 tells us: “Now these [are] the generations of Ishmael, Abraham’s son, whom Hagar the Egyptian, Sarah’s handmaid, bare unto Abraham: And these [are] the names of the sons of Ishmael, by their names, according to their generations: the firstborn of Ishmael, Nebajoth; and *Kedar*, and Adbeel, and Mibsam, And Mishma, and Dumah, and Massa, Hadar, and Tema, Jetur, Naphish, and Kedemah.” Kedar is the second son of Ishmael, an ancestor of the Prophet Muhammad. The Jews, in their infatuation with second-born sons, refer to the Arabic language even unto this day as *Leshon Qaidir*, literally “the tongue of Kedar.” Also keep in mind the names *Nebajoth* and *Tema* as they will come into play a little later. But how can we be certain that Kedarite and Arab are synonymous? The Bible itself provides us with the assurance: “Arabia, and all the

princes of Kedar, they occupied with thee in lambs, and rams, and goats: in these [were they] thy merchants” (Ezekiel 27:21).

Also, consider the similarities between a “light for the Gentiles” (“a lamp for nations” – Revised English Bible, verse 6) and Qur’an 33:45-46: “O Prophet! Truly We have sent thee as a witness, a bearer of glad tidings, and as a warner - and as one who invites to Allah’s Grace by His leave, and as a *lamp spreading light*.”

Regarding verse 11, the commentary of the Revised English Bible says:

Kedar and Sela (Sela, an alternate translation of “the inhabitants of the rock”), remote inhabited places in the desert of *Arabia*, the former to the north and the latter to the south, will praise the Lord along with the remote places to the west, the coasts and islands.

Isaiah 60 – “A little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation...”

“1) Arise, shine; for your light has come! And the glory of the Lord has risen upon you. 2) For behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and deep darkness the people; and the Lord will arise over you, and His glory will be seen upon you. 3) The Gentiles shall come to your light, and kings to the brightness of your rising. 4) Lift up your eyes, all around and see: They all gather together, they come to you; your sons shall come from afar, and your daughters shall be nursed at your side. 5) Then you shall see and become radiant, and your heart shall swell with joy; Because the abundance of the sea shall be turned to you, The wealth of the Gentiles shall come to you, 6) The multitude of camels shall cover your land, the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah; all those from Sheba shall come; They shall bring gold and

incense, and they shall proclaim the praises of the Lord. 7) All the flocks of *Kedar* shall be gathered together to you. The rams of *Nebaioth* shall minister to you; They shall ascend with acceptance on My altar, *and I will glorify the house of my Glory...*10) The sons of foreigners shall build up your walls, and their kings shall minister to you; for in My wrath I struck you, but in my favor I have had mercy on you. 11) Therefore your gates shall be open continually; They shall not be shut day or night, That men may bring to you the wealth of the Gentiles, and their kings in procession. 12) For the nation or kingdom which will not serve you shall perish, and those nations shall be utterly ruined. 13) The glory of Lebanon shall come to you, the cypress, the pine, and the box tree together, to beautify the place of My sanctuary; and I will make the place of My feet glorious. 14) Also the sons of those who afflicted you shall come bowing to you, and all those who despised you shall fall prostrate at the soles of your feet. And they shall call you the city of the Lord, Zion of the Holy One of Israel. 15) Whereas you have been forsaken and hated, so that no one went through you, I will make you an eternal excellence, a joy of many nations...18) Violence shall no longer be heard in your land, neither wasting nor destruction within your borders; but you shall call your walls Salvation, and your gates Praise...22) A little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation. I, the Lord, will hasten it in its time.” – Isaiah 60.

It was during a period known as “the Dark Ages” (verse 2) when this great Apostle of Allah was raised to guide humanity and to give the earth glory and praise. The Prophet invited all, even the Kings of Abyssinia and Yemen, as well as the rulers of Byzantium and Persia to follow in his guidance (verse 3). If they accepted it, they did well for themselves. If they did not, they were “utterly ruined” (verse 12). When he entered Mecca with his head bowed in servitude

during the Great Conquest, the “sons of those who afflicted” him and tortured him, and fought him for over twenty years came and “fell prostrate at his feet” and begged for clemency (verse 14). The Beloved of Allah and *Adon* of the Prophets answered magnanimously, “This day there is no blemish on you.” Allah made his Prophet “an eternal excellence” to all nations (verse 15) and from that time onward, violence was no longer heard in that sacred place of the station of Abraham (verse 18).

This prophecy can never apply to Jesus since hardly a *single* flock or ram of *Kedar* and *Nebaioth* (also spelled *Nebajoth*, the first-born of Ishmael) was ever gathered unto him. Also notice the mention of the people of *Midian*, *Ephah*, and *Sheba*. *Midian*, as we know, was the “son of Abraham by Keturah and progenitor of the tribe of Midianites or Arabians” (Lexicon Strongs’ Concordance). *Ephah* and *Sheba* are Midian’s son and nephew respectively. As you can see, all references are to Arabs, not Israelites.

Jesus was not victorious over his enemies. Can you picture the Prophet of Islam upon his mount with ten thousand *Sahaba*, veritable saints behind him, singing the praises of God and making their way into that Holy City! The Prophet dismounts and destroys forever those graven idols and cleanses the blessed precincts while his enemies look on with terror and bear witness to his greatness. Now compare this to the “unbelieving and perverse” generation of the Jews at the time of Jesus who were always misunderstanding and misinterpreting his mystical sayings to the point where even his own chosen twelve were rebuked several times by the Master himself for being “faithless” and “cowardly.” In the end, they “forsook him and fled,” one of them a demon-traitor, and then the disastrous trial and humiliating end at Golgotha. After that point, *only* violence could be heard in the city of Jerusalem. With all due respect to the Holy Prophet Jesus, the magnificent twenty-three years of Muhammad’s prophetic career in which thousands

upon thousands of hearts and minds embraced his teaching makes Jesus' mere three-year disaster, preaching to a blind, deaf, and dumb (Matthew 13:13; Luke 8:10) population look *utterly ridiculous!* Jesus' work on earth does not even amount to the shadow of what Muhammad accomplished.

Isaiah 21 – The Thirsty One

In the year 622 CE, in the thirteenth year of his ministry, the Prophet and his fellow believers were forced to leave their beloved city of Mecca due to the humiliating torture and oppression they were experiencing at the hands of the Pagan *Quraysh*. The Muslims found refuge in the oasis of Medina some 250 miles to the north. Upon arrival, the Muslims were surprised to discover many Jewish tribes living in and around the city boundaries. What were they all doing there? Why did they not travel north into their “homeland” rather than live in the deserts of Pagan Arabia? Perhaps they were waiting for something or someone.

In Ramadhan of the following year, the Prophet received word from his Lord that the Muslim community was now given permission to actively resist the tyranny of their invading neighbors from the south. The Prophet dispatched an army of 313 men, himself included, to the wells of Badr to await the advancing Quraysh. Although the tiny Muslim band was outnumbered three-to-one, they dealt a crushing defeat to the Meccans who lost seventy of their tribal chiefs (“the glory of *Kedar*”) on that very day. The Jews of Medina *knew* that the Prophet would return victorious. Isaiah tells us:

“13) The burden upon Arabia (“To the Arabs an oracle,” REB version): In the forest in Arabia you will lodge. O ye traveling companions of *Dedanim*. 14) O inhabitants of the land of *Tema*, bring water to him who is thirsty; with their bread they met him who fled. 15) For they fled

from the swords, from the drawn sword, from the bent bow, and from the distress of war. 16) For thus the Lord has said to me: ‘Within a year, according to the year of a hired man, all the glory of *Kedar* will fall; 17) and the remainder of the number of archers, the mighty men of the people of *Kedar*, will be diminished; for the Lord God of Israel has spoken it.” – Isaiah 21:13-17.

According to the Strongs’ Concordance, the *Dedanim* are those who are either descended of *Dedan*, the son of *Jokshan* and grandson of Abraham, or inhabitants of the land of *Dedan* which is defined as “a place in southern Arabia.” *Tema* is the “ninth son of Ishmael; the land settled by *Tema* the son of Ishmael” mentioned in Genesis 25:15. But how do we know that the emigrants were Arabs and not Jews? The word for “traveling companions” in verse 13, *oreycha*, appears in just one other verse in the entire Old Testament. – “And they sat down to eat bread: and they lifted up their eyes and looked, and, behold, a *company of Ishmaelites (oreycha)* came from Gilead with their camels bearing spicery and balm and myrrh, going to carry [it] down to Egypt” (Genesis 37:25). It now becomes more than obvious that the travelers were in fact Arabs. *Dedan* and *Tema* may be considered as Mecca and Medina respectively.

Song of Songs 5 – “Such is my Beloved...”

As I mentioned earlier in the present chapter, we can answer the Christian’s request for the name “Muhammad” spelled out in his Bible. Believe me when I tell you that the satisfaction you will receive from quoting this verse (Songs 5:16) to Christians in its original Hebrew will make your entire study of comparative religion worthwhile. Not only is the name of God’s Beloved given, but a perfect physical description as well! Here is the passage in its entirety:

“1:5) I am dark, but lovely, O daughters of Jerusalem, like the tents of *Kedar*, like the curtains of Solomon ...5:10) My *beloved* is white and ruddy (red), chief among ten thousand. 11) His head is like the finest gold; his locks are wavy, and black as a raven. 12) His eyes are like doves by the rivers of waters, washed with milk, and fitly set. 13) His cheeks are like a bed of spices, banks of scented herbs. His lips are lilies, dripping liquid myrrh. 14) His hands are rods of gold set with beryl. His body is carved ivory inlaid with sapphires. 15) His legs are pillars of marble set on bases of fine gold. His countenance is like Lebanon, excellent as the cedars. 16) His mouth is most sweet, yes, *he is altogether lovely*. This is my beloved, and this is my friend, O daughters of Jerusalem.” – Song of Songs 1:5, 5:10-16.

Verse 16 transliterated reads: *Hiko mamtaqim vi kollo Muhammadim, zay dudee viza hera'ee, benot Yerushallam*. When the royal plural “*im*” is removed from the word “*Muhammadim*,” you are left with “*Muhammad*.”- And Muhammad is the Messenger of God! This word is derived from an archaic Semitic triliteral root known as *hemed* (hmd). The word *Hamad* (verb) means: to praise, glorify, exalt, covet, love. The Arabic is spelled: *Meem, Ha, Meem, Dal*; The Hebrew spelling is identical: *Mem, Cha, Mem, Dalet*. All Christian translations of the Bible render this word literally rather than recognizing it as the actual name of God’s Beloved (*Habibullah*). “Ah! who is more unjust than those who conceal the testimony they have from God? But God is not unmindful of what ye do” (Qur’an 2:140). The verse should read: “His mouth is most sweet, yes, he is Muhammad. This is my beloved, and he is my friend, O daughters of Jerusalem.”

In his book *Portrait of Human Perfection*, Shaykh Ahmad Muhammad Al-Hawfi provides us with a description of the Prophet based on the sound *ahadith*

(traditions) that exactly matches with the description given in this passage. See for yourself.

- “I am dark, but lovely...like the tents of *Kedar*... My beloved is white and ruddy (red)...” (Songs 1:5, 5:10). In a *hadith* of Anas (may Allah be pleased with him), he described the Prophet as having the most beautiful complexion which was neither pure white nor dark. Imam Ahmad said, “It was a brown bordering on white.” ‘Ali described him with the words, “He was *white mixed with red*.”
- “His head is like the finest gold; his locks are wavy, and black as a raven” (Songs 5:11). At-Tirmidhi transmitted that ‘Ali said, “The Messenger of Allah had a large head and beard.” Anas said, “He had (black) wavy hair which was neither straight nor curly.”
- “His eyes are like doves by the rivers of waters, washed with milk, and fitly set” (Songs 5:12). In one hadith, it states that “he had redness in the black of his eyes.” In another variant, “He had black eyes even without wearing *kohl* (antimony).” Al-Bayhqi related from ‘Ali, “The Messenger of Allah had large eyes and long lashes, and his eyes were mixed with red.”
- “His cheeks are like a bed of spices, banks of scented herbs. His lips are lilies, dripping liquid myrrh. His hands are rods of gold set with beryl. His body is carved ivory inlaid with sapphires” (Songs 5:13-14). In a hadith found in al-Bukhari, the transmitter said, “I took his hand and placed it on my face. It was cooler than snow and had a more pleasant fragrance than musk.” Anas said, “My hand did not touch any brocade or silk or anything softer than the hand of the Messenger of Allah.” Abu Ya’la

and al-Bazzar related with a sound *isnaad* (chain of narration) from Anas: “When the Messenger of Allah passed through the streets of Medina, the fragrance of musk could be smelt coming from him and it could be said, ‘The Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, has passed this way.’”

- “His legs are pillars of marble set on bases of fine gold. His countenance is like Lebanon, excellent as the cedars” (Songs 5:15). In a hadith of A’isha in Abu Khaythama we find, “None of the people with him were called tall without the Messenger of Allah seeming taller than them. If there were two tall men at his side, he seemed taller than them. But when he left them, they were called tall and the Messenger of Allah was called medium.”

Now that you have shown your Christian friend the name of the Prophet Muhammad in the Bible, demand to see the name “Jesus!”

The Messenger of the Covenant

A derivative of the verb (*hamad*) appears in Haggai 2:7 as *Himdah* (superlative, identical to the Arabic *Ahmad*. The significance of the name *Ahmad* will be examined when we look at Muhammad in the New Testament). The passage reads:

“6) For thus says the Lord of hosts: Once more I will shake heaven and earth, the sea and dry land. 7) and I will shake the nations, and the *desire of all nations* shall come here, and I will fill this temple with glory, says the Lord of Hosts. 8) The silver is Mine, and the gold is Mine, says the Lord of Hosts. 9) The glory of this latter temple shall be greater than the former, says the Lord of Hosts. And in this place *I will give peace*, says the Lord of Hosts.” – Haggai 2:6-9.

The phrase “desire of all nations” in Verse 7 transliterated reads: *Ve yavu Himdoth kol haggoyim*. The “Desire (*Himdah*) of all nations” (NKJV), also known as the “joy of many nations” (Isaiah 60:15), will come to the sacred Temple and God will fill it with *shalom*, or peace. This apocalyptic prophecy should be read alongside Malachi’s Messenger of the Covenant:

“Behold, I send my messenger, and he will prepare the way before me. And the Lord, whom you seek, will suddenly come to His temple, even the *messenger of the covenant*, in whom you delight. Behold, he is coming says the Lord of Hosts. 2) But who can endure the day of his coming? And who can stand when he appears? For He is like a refiner’s fire and like launderers’ soap. 3) He will sit as a refiner and a purifier of silver; He will purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer to the Lord an offering in righteousness. 4) Then the offering of Judah and Jerusalem will be pleasant to the Lord, as in the days of old, and in former years. 5) And I will come near you for judgment; I will be a swift witness against sorcerers, against adulterers, against perjurers, against those who exploit wage earners and widows and orphans. And against those who turn away an alien- because they do not fear Me, says the Lord of Hosts.” - Malachi 3:1-5.

Christians believe that this is actually a prophecy of John the Baptist who “prepared the way for the Lord” (Matthew 11:10). This claim will be examined in Chapter 6, God willing. For now, it would suffice to say that if we were to adopt this Christian interpretation, John must have totally *failed* in his preparation duties. From the context of the verse it is clear that the messenger (*malak*) and the lord (*adon*) are the same person. This powerful figure will prepare the path for the final and complete revelation of God upon the earth.

Compare the phrase “in whom you take delight” to “in whom My soul delights” from Isaiah 42:1. We can imagine the scene at the Temple Mount when all of the Prophets and Messengers, all 124,000 of them, await the sudden coming of the Messenger of the Covenant (Qur’an 3:81), when behold! - With a thunderous roar he appears to them, coming in the clouds and seated on his conveyance to the right of the Holy Spirit, Gabriel. The awe and reverence of his majesty permeates through the crowd of Holy Ones who now see their lord, *adon*, Sultan, and *Imam*. They clear a path as he makes his way to the pulpit of David where he leads them all in prayer and supplication and thereafter ascends into the heavens above. This event known as *al Isra wal Miraj* occurred while the Prophet was living in Mecca. *Al Isra* being the Prophet’s night journey to Jerusalem in one night and *al Miraj* being his ascension into the heavens at the Dome of the Rock. Allah describes this event in His Word: “Glory to (Allah) Who did take His servant for a Journey by night from the Sacred Mosque to the farthest Mosque, whose precincts We did bless - in order that We might show him some of Our Signs: for He is the One Who heareth and seeth (all things)” (Qur’an 17:1).

The Coming of Shiloh

Genesis 49:1, 10 tells us: “And Jacob called his sons and said, ‘Gather together, that I may tell you what shall befall you *in the last days*...The scepter shall not

depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, *until Shiloh comes*; And to Him shall be the obedience of the people (nations).” This is the only occurrence of the word *Shiloh* in the entire Hebrew Bible. What does it mean? Many Muslim scholars including Professor Abdul-Ahad Dawood have attempted to explain that this word *Shiloh*, should really be pronounced *Shiluakh*, meaning “Messenger.” The Strongs’ Concordance defines this word as such: “1) he whose it is, that which belongs to him, tranquillity a) meaning uncertain.” Since the diacritical vowel notations were not inserted into the Hebrew text until many centuries later, it may very well be possible that the original pronunciation of the word was in fact *Shiluakh* rather than *Shiloh*, or *Sheeloh*.

Note the phrase “in the last days.” This apocalyptic touch is in reference to the last messenger who will arrive in the last days and require the obedience of all nations. Jacob is essentially saying: “The Kingdom of Judah (the Jews) will reign supreme and the lawgiver (Moses) shall be its King until the coming of the Messenger of God (who is not of Judah). Then will all surrender and declare *him* King.” This cannot be in reference to Jesus because according to Christians, Jesus was a descendant of Judah. The scepter, however, will *leave* Judah (the Jews) and be given to the *Shiloh*, who will convert the nations.

The Prince of Peace (Sar Shalom)

When the Prophet Muhammad (upon whom be peace) was twelve or thirteen years old, he accompanied his uncle Abu Talib on a business trip to Bostra in Syria. As the caravan of Meccans arrived, a certain monk, Bahira by name examined the men carefully. He had been informed from his scriptures that the dawning of the Kingdom by the Chosen One of God was imminent. When the men arrived and were seated, Bahira looked very closely at all of them but failed to see any signs of light in their faces. After inquiring as to whether all of

the men were present, Bahira was informed by Abu Talib that a boy was left outside to tend the flock. Bahira asked to see him and as the boy entered, the monk became filled with an overwhelming feeling of awe and reverence. He addressed the young Prophet, "I will ask you in the name of *al-Lat* and *al-Uzza*..." - But he was suddenly interrupted by the boy who complained, "no two names are more detestable to me than those two!" After a short conversation with the young Muhammad, Bahira asked Abu Talib what his relation was to the boy. "He's my son," Abu Talib replied fearing the situation. "He cannot be your son for this boy is an orphan," Bahira commented. Bahira then asked to see between the shoulder blades of the Prophet and as he suspected, the birthmark, the symbol of prophethood and dominion was upon his left shoulder blade. With the words *hammisrah al shikhmo* ringing in his ears he said to Abu Talib, "Take this boy back to Mecca, for great things are in store for this son of thine brother."

Isaiah tells us: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government will be upon his shoulder (he shall bear the symbol of dominion upon his shoulder (*shikhmo*), NLT): and His name will be called Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace" (Isaiah 9:6). Your Christian friend will undoubtedly scream "Jesus!" at this point. Remember the words "Might God" and "Everlasting Father" are meant to be symbolic. A "mighty God" is simply an exalted messenger of God (See Chapter 1; Psalms 82:6; Exodus 7:1. Also see John 10:35 where Jesus says that those who "receive the word of God are called gods").

But everybody knows that Jesus is the Prince of Peace! Christians certainly love calling Jesus by this illustrious designation. Jesus himself, however, negates this title. He says: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: *I came not to send peace*, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in

law against her mother in law. And a man's foes [shall be] they of his own household" (Matthew 10:34-36; See Chapter 7). If Jesus came back to earth today and claimed that he was not God nor begotten of God the Christians would continue to worship him anyway.

A Branch from the roots of Jesse

Who is Jesse? Both the Old and New Testaments identify Jesse as the father of King David (Ruth 4:22; Matthew 1:6). The prophecy reads: "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked" (Isaiah 11:1-4).

It becomes very clear that this person is going to be a prophet, judge, and statesman. Despite this fact, Christians claim that this is in fact a prophecy of Jesus Christ since Jesus is a descendant of David. But why does God use the name Jesse, a relatively unknown figure in the Old Testament, and not David, the glorious King? Would it not be more fitting for God to say, "There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of *David*" if this were really a messianic prophecy? Paul is the first person to relate these words to Jesus. He tells us: "And again, Esaias saith, There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust" (Romans 15:12). Paul, however, knows nothing about the virgin birth, since he never mentions it, and believes that Jesus was *literally* descended from the loins of David. He says: "Concerning his Son Jesus

Christ our Lord, *which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh*” (Romans 1:3). Amazingly, Jesus was not a descendant of David at all! He was the son of Mary, a Levite, the cousin of Elizabeth whom Luke calls “the daughter of Aaron” (Luke 1:5). This corroborates with what the Torah says about Aaron’s lineage as being a progeny of “anointed (*mashach*) priests” (Exodus 28:41). The two genealogies of Jesus given in the New Testament will be closely examined in Chapter 6. In order to find prophetic fulfillment of Isaiah 11 in the person of Jesus, the evangelists invented a person called Joseph the carpenter (of the House of Judah) to pass on his kingly line to Mary, his betrothed wife. Jesus, however, was *not* the son of Joseph, but only of Mary. Therefore, he can never be a descendant of Judah (David).

You may find some Christians who read the word “Nazarene” rather than “Branch” to further implicate Jesus since the original Hebrew word for the latter is *netzer*. This is certainly how Matthew interpreted Isaiah’s passage and other alleged passages he has chosen not to reference since he claims that this was what “the *prophets* had spoken of.” (Matthew 2:23). Compare this to John’s Gospel who records Philip asking Nathaniel, “Can *anything* good come from Nazareth” (John 1:46)? Matthew’s ineptness at accurately quoting and interpreting the Old Testament (he quotes from the Hebrew Bible at least sixty times in his Gospel) is reason enough for me to reject his notion that “Nazarene” and “Branch” are synonymous. The fact is clear that the word Nazarene does not appear once in the entire sacred writ of the Jews.

Let’s go back to our original question: Why did God mention Jesse and not David? Could this be *another* Jesse, not the father of David? The *Encyclopedia Biblica* Vol. 3 tells us (emphasis mine):

Jesse, for *Ishmael*... The changes which proper names undergo in the mouths of small children account for a large number of these particular abbreviations - who could guess, to take modern examples, that Bob and Dick arose out of Robert and Richard? ... such forms were particularly common in later times ... and many more in the Talmud, which also exhibits various other kinds of abbreviation.¹

Just as Ahmad is a shorter form of Muahmmad, Jesse (*Yeshayee*) is an abbreviation of Ishmael (*Yishma'ale*). Interestingly, the same word used for Branch in Isaiah 11:1, *netzer*, is used to describe the mighty one who will gather unto himself the flocks of Kedar and rams of Nebajoth in Isaiah 60:21. This person in none other than Muhammad.

The Holy One “full of praise” from Mount Paran

“1) God came from Teman, the Holy One from Mount Paran. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. 4) His brightness was like the light; He had rays flashing from his right hand, and there His power was hidden. 5) Before Him went pestilence, and fever followed at His feet. 6) He stood and measured the earth; he looked and startled the nations. And the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills bowed. His ways are everlasting. 7) I saw the tents of the land Cushan in affliction; the curtains of the land of *Midian* trembled.” – Habakkuk 3:3-7.

¹ Encyclopedia Biblica, Rev. T. K. Cheyne D.Litt D.D., J. Sutherland Black M.A. LL.D., Vol. 3, under “Names,” p. 3292, item 52.

Rhodes says: “Paran is nowhere near Mecca where Muhammad ministered...Paran refers to the wilderness region in the central part of the Sinai peninsula” (page 63). The problem here is that the Christian is not willing to look at Islam and the Muslims as a solution to the many gaping holes of his religion. Just as with *Baca*, Christians claim to know exactly where all of their holy sites are located but still cannot *prove* the historicity of anything. Biblical maps can only guess at possible locations of cities and regions that have been extinct for many years.

We do know that Muhammad was a direct descendant of Ishmael. Even the most obstinate Christian fundamentalist will admit to this. Ask him, “Where did Ishmael settle and live?” The Bible gives us a clear answer: “So God was with the lad; and he grew up and dwelt in the wilderness, and became an archer. He dwelt in the *wilderness of Paran*; and his mother took for a wife for him from the land of Egypt” (Genesis 21:20-21). If Muhammad was a descendant of Ishmael and born in Mecca, then isn’t Paran Mecca? Let’s entertain the Christian for a minute and concede that Paran is in the “central part of the Sinai peninsula.” Where is the Sinai peninsula? Paul tells us while slandering Hagar and Ishmael: “For this Agar is mount Sinai *in Arabia*, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children” (Galatians 4:25). Therefore, the wilderness of Paran is in Sinai which is *in Arabia* which is where the “Holy One” full of *praise*, or should I say, The Praised One (Muhammad) full of holiness emerged from. Therefore, this prophecy should not be taken to be referring to Mecca, but rather *Arabia*. Note: The Old Testament terms “God” and “Holy One” can be used for both God and man.

Who is *Teman*? He is the son of *Eliphaz*, the grandson of *Esau*, an Arab. Compare verse 1 where it states that “God came” from the lineage of Esau to Jeremiah 49:10 which says that the seed of Esau is

“plundered” and “cursed,” as well as his “brethren and his neighbors.” Is it not impiety to utter such calumnies about a son of Isaac, who is the son of the *Khalil* (Companion) of Allah? Also, is it not hatred that leads the pen of this scribe to even curse his neighbors!? In fact, the book of Jeremiah even admits to Jewish forgeries within the Hebrew Bible: “How do ye say, We are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us? Lo, certainly in vain made he [it]; *the pen of the scribes is in vain*” (Jeremiah 8:8); “How can you say, ‘We are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us?’ But, behold, the *false pen of the scribes has made it into a lie*” (Revised Standard Version). Today as always, the Jews continue to abhor Ishmael and his Egyptian mother Hagar as well as the multitudes of Arab peoples which sprang from the loins of Abraham through his sons Ishmael, Isaac, Midian, Jokshan, etc. Verse 7 makes mention of Midian once again and also of *Cushan*. According to the Strongs’ Concordance, *Cushan* is “a place in Arabia or Mesopotamia.” Rhodes comments that “Muhammad is nowhere in sight in this verse.” On the contrary, I think it is more than obvious that the Prophet of Islam is very much in plain view.

The Lord from Mount Paran

The Torah tells us: “Now this is the blessing with which Moses the man of God blessed the children of Israel before his death. And he said, ‘The Lord came from Sinai, and dawned (rose) on them from Seir; he shone forth from *Mount Paran*, and he came with ten thousand of saints; from His right hand came a fiery law for them’” (Deuteronomy 33:1-2). Many Muslim scholars believe the three visitations of God described here refer to Moses from Sinai, Jesus from Seir, and Muhammad from Paran. To make things clear, I want to reiterate that the *wilderness* of Paran and Paran are essentially the same country. The former referring specifically to the central Sinai peninsula in Arabia and

the latter referring to Arabia in general. It's like saying New York City and New York. The city is a specific place within the state. It seems very unlikely that Seir is in reference to Jesus since this was actually the mountainous land inhabited by the Edomites, the descendants of Esau (Genesis 32:3, 33:16, 36:9). It's rather unclear how or why the Lord "dawned from Seir," but the important thing is that all three locations 1) Sinai 2) Seir and 3) Paran were inhabited by Arabs.

How did God "shine forth" from Mount Paran (Arabia)? – By sending his universal Prophet and glorious Messenger Muhammad into *Jabal Nur*, or the mountain of Light, to receive His eternal Word. Mount Paran cannot be another name for Mount Sinai since this verse accurately distinguishes as different places Sinai, Seir, and Mount Paran.

Compare the phrase "ten thousand saints" in verse 2 with Song of Songs 5:10 in which God describes His Beloved as being "chief among ten thousand." In 5:16 the prophecy culminates with the identification of the Beloved as Muhammad.

"Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but (he is) the Messenger of Allah, and the Seal of the Prophets: and Allah has full knowledge of all things." – Qur'an 33:40.

To my Muslim Brethren...

Our Holy Prophet Muhammad was, without a doubt, the greatest human being to ever walk the planet. We need to share this fact with our Christian friends and neighbors. In Chapter 7 we will compare the pre-eminence of Muhammad (upon whom be peace) with

other towering figures in history and bear witness as to how all others fall *drastically* short of his noble and universal standards. Truly he is the Praised One!

When it comes to Muhammad in the Old Testament, the blatant hypocrisy of the Christian fundamentalists becomes manifest. They will not hesitate for a second to quote some half-witted obscure passage and claim that it refers to Jesus, but when we as Muslims extract crystal clear prophecies of Muhammad, even where he is mentioned by name, they sneer and turn away their faces!

I highly recommend that you memorize as many of the aforementioned passages from the Old Testament as you can, as this will greatly enhance the level of success in your *dawah* efforts. Also know where they are located! One of the worst things that you can say is, “Did you know that the Bible says that a Prophet will come from Mecca and travel to Medina?”-“Where?” “Uh, I don’t know.” The Christian, noticing your interest in his scripture, will most certainly take advantage of such a situation by feeding you a bunch of nonsense about how God killed His Son for your sake. So don’t show any weaknesses and don’t bring up a subject unless you are fully prepared to defend it from all angles.

Questions to ask your Christian Friends.

1. Did you now that the Prophet Muhammad was a direct descendant of Abraham through his first-born son Ishmael?
2. Why do you claim that Isaac was the covenant child when: 1) Ishmael is Abraham’s first-born son. 2) Hagar is Abraham’s lawfully wedded wife. 3) The covenant seed will be as numerous as the stars. 4) The covenant seed will be given the land between the Nile and Euphrates Rivers. 5) Ishmael was

Abraham's only son and seed for fourteen years. 6) Circumcision is the symbol of God's covenant. 7) Ishmael was circumcised with his father on the same day to fulfill the covenant with the flesh of their foreskins?

3. Why do you think the Jewish scribes have claimed that Ishmael and Hagar were banished from their family during the weaning party of Isaac? This would have made Ishmael seventeen years old yet he is presented as an infant in Genesis 21. Can I tell you the real reason why Hagar and her son were commanded to go to the wilderness?
4. If Esau was supposed to serve Jacob as his master (Genesis 25:23), then why does the latter trick the former out of his birthright (Genesis 25:31-34)? Why does Jacob pretend to be Esau when speaking to his elderly father (Genesis 27:22-29)? Why does Jacob call Esau his "lord" and himself "servant" (Genesis 32:3-6, 33:1-10)?
5. Did you know that the term "brethren" used in Deuteronomy 18:18 is also used in reference to Arabs in Deuteronomy 2:4, 23:7? Are you aware that the King of Judaea during the time Christ was born, Herod the Great, was an Arab? If The Torah calls Esau the brother of Jacob a "brother," why do you consider Ishmael the brother of Isaac (the father of both Esau and Jacob) to be a "foreigner"?
6. Why do you claim Isaiah 42 refers to Jesus when he clearly does not fit the profile? The Chosen One must be accepted by Gentiles, in the islands, and by the *Kedarites* (Arabs).
7. Can I explain to you the person who is prophesied in Isaiah 21:13-17, 29:12, 60:1-22? As you will see,

these prophecies fit the Prophet of Islam like a glove.

8. Did you know that Song of Songs 5:10-16 refers to Muhammad? What do you think the Hebrew for “altogether lovely” is? Can you show me the name “Jesus” as being the Jewish Messiah in any of the hundreds of Old Testament messianic prophecies?
9. Why do you believe that Jesus was the “Prince of Peace” prophesied in Isaiah 9:6 when he outright denies this appellation (Matthew 10:34). Let me tell you the story of Muhammad and Bahira.
10. Did you know that Habakkuk 3:3-7 & Deuteronomy 33:1-2 refer to Muhammad? (Explain how the wilderness of Paran located in the Sinai peninsula and the place where Ishmael settled, is considered to be northern Arabia (Galatians 4:25). Both prophecies do not say that the Holy One will come from the wilderness of Paran, but rather *Mount Paran*, a mountain found in Arabia).

Chapter 6 *Muhammad in the New Testament*

“... and to give you glad tidings of a messenger to come after me whose name shall be Ahmad.” - Qur’an 61:6.

Extracting prophecies of Muhammad (upon whom be peace) from the New Testament presents us with a dimension that was not applicable to the Hebrew Bible. Whereas in the Old Testament the Christian and Muslim are on equal footing in scrutinizing the text of a third party (Judaism), the Muslim is now at a disadvantage since he must now provide textual support for Muhammad within the Christian scripture itself. The Christian will always be given the benefit of the doubt. But I think that you will agree with me when I say that there is *no doubt* that our beloved Prophet was not only prophesied in the Christian Gospel but was also praised and glorified by Jesus as well as John the Baptist.

The “Mighty One” from among the rejected stones

The Baptist explodes at the Pharisees and Sadducees: “‘Brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Therefore bear fruits worthy of repentance, and do not think to say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our father’. For I say unto you that God is able to raise up *children of Abraham* from these stones. And even now the ax is laid to the root of the trees. Therefore every tree which does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire’” (Matthew 3:7-10). The Jews’ raw arrogance of their “chosen” ancestry of Abraham disgusted the Baptist in such a way that he even likens “children of Abraham” to mere stones. In fact, a wonderful prophecy is being revealed here. During that time, the Jews’ wilderness dwelling

cousins, the Arabs, were caught in an unprecedented quagmire of idolatry, tribal warfare, and barbarism. However these numerous worthless stones were none other than the children of Abraham. How subtle yet how powerfully the Baptist speaks! He essentially says: “Your reign as being chosen is ending very soon. Your salvation will not be based on your so-called covenant relationship as being the ‘true’ progeny of Abraham. Stop being so deluded! God will raise up children of Abraham from those whom you have rejected and despised. It’s time for God to ‘take out the trash!’”

Jesus tells these same priests and Pharisees: “Did ye never read in the scriptures, The *stone which the builders rejected*, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes? Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder” (Matthew 21:42-44; Also see Mark 12:10; Luke 20:17). Who was this rejected stone that became the “main cornerstone” (REB) if not Ishmael? The issue of the Jews losing the “kingdom of God” will be dealt with a little later. Christians claim that John is talking about Jesus and that Jesus is talking about himself. Let’s examine the validity of such a claim and expose it as completely fallacious.

John continues:

- Matthew 3:11-12: “I baptize you with water unto repentance, but He who is coming after me is mightier than I, whose sandals I am not worthy to carry. He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire. His winnowing fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly clean out His threshing floor, and gather His wheat into the barn; but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.”

- Mark 1:7-8: “There comes One after me who is mightier than I, whose sandal strap I am not worthy to stoop down and loose. I indeed baptized you with water, but He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit.”
- Luke 3:16-18: “I indeed baptize you with water; but One mightier than I is coming, whose sandal strap I am not worthy to loose. He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire. His winnowing fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly clean out His threshing floor, and gather the wheat into His barn; but the chaff He will burn with unquenchable fire. And with many other exhortations he preached to the people.”

According to Mark and Luke, not the skies opening and a dove descending upon the shoulder of Jesus, nor even hearing the voice of God comment, ‘This is my Son, in whom I am well pleased’ (Matthew 3:16-17; Luke 3:22) is enough to convince the Baptist that Jesus is the “one mightier” than he. John continues to baptize penitent Jews, deliver fiery sermons about the “coming Kingdom of God,” and accept new initiates into his inner circle of believers with what seems to be little concern for Jesus. Is Jesus really the one to come *after* John? These two cousins were contemporaries of one another, born six months apart, and had very similar prophetic messages. Their message was twofold: 1) Warn the Children of Israel regarding the approaching Kingdom of God. 2) Give them glad tidings of *Ahmad*, the one who is to come after them both. Matthew gives an account of Jesus’ baptism in which John says, “It is I who needs to be baptized by you,” to which Jesus responds, “It behooves us to fulfill all the justice” (Matthew 3:14-15); a statement which makes absolutely no sense and is utterly unintelligible. Is it *just* for a servant to baptize his Master? The Fourth evangelist goes even a step further into the bizarre as he mentions nothing about Jesus being baptized by John but instead

has the latter exclaim: “Behold, the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world” (John 1:29)! Such a statement defeats the entire purpose of the Baptist’s message of bearing your own fruit and repenting unto God. This statement found only in John is quite ridiculous and pagan.

It remains an abiding fact that Jesus never baptized anyone with the Holy Spirit and with fire during his ministry. Jesus’ baptisms were exactly the same type as John’s, with water as a symbol of repentance. While John 3:23 states that Jesus was baptizing and winning more converts than John, the evangelist or some clever scribe, quickly rebuts this admission with the parenthetical John 4:2 which states that it was not actually Jesus doing the baptizing but his disciples! What are we to make of this jarring contradiction? It seems as though the Fourth evangelist has made it his mission to fully demonstrate the superiority of Jesus over his Baptist cousin by omitting Jesus’ baptism, which implied John’s eminence over Jesus, as well as explaining with pains the fact that Jesus never baptized with water but with Spirit and fire. But how? When? Who? The answers are not given.

Also notice that according to the Gospel of John, Jesus does not come “after” his Baptist cousin at all. He begins his ministry before John is cast into prison (John 3:24) which flies in the face of the synoptics, yet the Baptist, upon noticing Jesus nonetheless declares: “This is he of whom I said, *After me* cometh a man which is preferred before me” (John 1:30). There is no such statement of recognition found in the synoptics whatsoever. The author wants to make plain to you what to believe.

When the Holy Spirit Gabriel initially came to Muhammad, tradition relates that the young Prophet’s body and mind were in such agitation that he thought he would soon expire (Evil, slanderous Christian propagandists falsely claim that Muhammad was

suicidal. Such nonsense will be refuted in Chapter 7). This purging of the heart, mind, and soul of the Prophet of all pre-Islamic residue that could have even remotely affected his mission was in fact an act of Benevolent preparation for the baptism of Allah upon his entire being. It reminds one of the forty days Jesus spent in the desert before the Gospel was revealed to him. The Qur'an declares: *Sibghatal-lah. Wa man ahsanu minal-lahi sibghah. Wa nahnu lahu 'aabidoon*; "The Baptism of Allah! And who is better than Allah to baptize; and it is Him we worship" (Qur'an 2:138). While in Mecca, *all* converts to the new faith would bear witness to this incredible experience whereupon the revelation of God through the Holy Spirit washed clean, or baptized the believer and admitted him or her into the Kingdom of God on earth. We can imagine seeing the fierce 'Umar marching to the House of Arqam with the intention of killing the Prophet in mind, when suddenly, upon hearing the revelation of God through the Holy Spirit, he experiences a baptism of the soul and utters his declaration of faith.

When the Prophet ascended into a position of authority in Medina and executed his commandments with an unprecedented sense of mercy, magnanimity, and justice, any and all who opposed him, fought him, or conspired against him, were given ample warning and respite to amend their ways. While some of the evil confederates did amend and submit to the Prophet, still others wavered. And when it came to the point where the community at large was under danger or attack, the "axe was laid at the root" and whoever failed to produce good fruit was "cut down and thrown into the fire." Compare these statements to what Malachi's Messenger of the Covenant will do: "He will sit as a refiner and a purifier of silver; He will purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer to the Lord an offering in righteousness" (Malachi 3:3). The sinister Jewish tribes of *Nadir*, *Qaynuqah*, and *Qurayzah* who

had plotted against the Prophet after submitting to his leadership and signing a treaty of mutual peace were “purged” and “purified” for their repeated acts of treachery and treason. The righteous Jews who did recognize the Prophet as the powerful *Kedarite* foretold in their scripture were able to once again enjoy the privilege of being in God’s Holy Kingdom: “*Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former years*” (Malachi 3:4). Alas, Jesus admitted to Pilate: “If my kingdom were of this world, my disciples would have fought you” (John 18:36).

Who is the “Coming One?”

“And when John had heard in prison about the works of Christ, he sent two of *his disciples* and said to Him, ‘*Are You the Coming One, or do we look for another?*’ Jesus answered and said to them, ‘Go and tell John the things which you hear and see: The blind see and the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear; the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. And blessed is he who is not offended because of me. As they departed, Jesus began to say to the multitudes concerning John... For this is he of whom it is written: Behold I send My Messenger before your face, who will prepare Your way before You. Assuredly, I say to you, among those born of women there has not risen one greater than John the Baptist; but he who is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he... And if you are willing to receive it, he is Elijah who is to come.’ - Matthew 11:2-7, 10-14.

The fact that John, now in prison, continues to remain ignorant of Jesus’ true identity is extremely inconsistent with the rest of the witnesses. Previously in Matthew, as already stated, it becomes clear as day that John definitely declared himself inferior to his cousin of

Nazareth by exclaiming, “it is I who needs to be baptized by you.” Perhaps John recognized Jesus as Messiah but not “the Coming One?” Even more contradictory is the notion employed by Luke that states that John actually worshipped Jesus while the both of them were in their mothers’ wombs?! Yet after worshipping Jesus, seeing the Holy Spirit descend upon him, hearing the voice of God addressing crowds regarding him, offering himself to be baptized by him, and calling him the ‘Lamb of God,’ John resorts to sending two of his disciples to ask Jesus, “Are you the one we are waiting for, or are we to expect another?”

Notice how Jesus does not directly answer John’s question. The two Johannine disciples leave Jesus and return to John to tell him of the miracles they saw Jesus perform. If the voice of God did not convince John about Jesus, what makes Jesus think that a leper “being cleansed” will do the trick? If even for a second, any of John’s disciples perceived Jesus to be the powerful prophet whose sandal strap John was not worthy to loose, they would have gracefully taken leave of the Baptist and clung themselves to the son of Mary. Such was never the case. In fact, the followers of John remained true to him even long after he was martyred by Herod Antipas, and it was only when the Sabians (followers of John the Baptist, Qur’an 2:62) were introduced to Muhammad (The Coming One) that they converted to Islam nearly in total. Today only very sparse communities of Sabians have survived in areas of Iran and Iraq while thousands upon thousands of them found prophetic fulfillment in the person and mission of Muhammad carrying “his fan in his hand” and “cleaning his threshing floor.”

The author of the Fourth Gospel, realizing the Baptist and the Johannine disciples’ failure to recognize Jesus as “the Coming One,” decides to yet again invent a narration totally alien to the synoptic tradition in order to implicate Jesus as the fulfillment of the Baptist’s

prophecy. He actually states that Andrew and another unidentified man were initially disciples of John the Baptist and when they heard their Master declare about Jesus, “Behold! The Lamb of God,” they begin to follow him (Jesus). When Jesus realizes that two men are trailing behind him, he asks, “What seek ye? Where dwellest thou?” Andrew then finds his brother Simon (Peter) and tells him that they have found the Christ (John 1:35-41). However the synoptics place the location of the apostleship of the two brothers by the shores of the Sea of Galilee. It was *Jesus* who approached *them* while they were casting their nets into the sea and there is no mention of John the Baptist at all. Rather than deciding to follow Jesus because of the advice of the Baptist or due to the influence of Andrew upon his brother Simon, the synoptics record that *Jesus told them*, “Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men” (Matthew 4:20; Mark 1:18; Luke 5:10). Finally, the Fourth evangelist merges “the Coming One” and Christ into one person thus unequivocally pointing to Jesus as the “mighty one” prophesied by the Baptist.

- Matthew 4:18-20: “And Jesus, walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers. And he saith unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. And they straightway left [their] nets, and followed him.”
- Mark 1:16-18: “Now as he walked by the sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and Andrew his brother casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers. And Jesus said unto them, Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men. And straightway they forsook their nets, and followed him.”

- Luke 5:10, 6:13-14: “And so [was] also James, and John, the sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men...And when it was day, he called [unto him] his disciples: and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles; Simon, (whom he also named Peter,) and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew.”
- John 1:35-38, 40-41: “Again the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples; And looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God! And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus. Then Jesus turned, and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye? They said unto him, Rabbi, (which is to say, being interpreted, Master,) where dwellest thou?... One of the two which heard John [speak], and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ.”

Is John Elijah?

It seems that “Jesus” makes two significant errors in the above-mentioned passage (Matthew 11:10-14). First, he misquotes Malachi 3:1 by changing “before My face” to “your face,” and “the way before Me” to “your way before you.” Secondly, he calls John Elijah, a “title” John rejects (John 1:21). Your Christian friend will say, “No, he denied being Elijah because he wasn’t *actually* him. He was rather ‘in the spirit and power of Elijah (Luke 1:17).’” Ask him, “Did the Jews believe that Elijah would actually return physically?” He will have to say yes since Elijah did not suffer death but was carried into the clouds on a chariot of fire (II Kings 2:11). If Elijah doesn’t die, then Paul’s words cannot be

true: “And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment” (Hebrews 9:27). Then say, “If John isn’t Elijah physically, then Jesus cannot be the Messiah!” for we are indeed told: “Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord” (Malachi 4:5). But perhaps the Jews had misunderstood their scripture. Maybe John truly was in the spirit and power of Elijah. Either way, his answer to the Levites’ question, “Are you Elijah?” should have been a resounding “Yes!” – “Yes, I am him physically” or “Yes, I am him in spirit.” Instead he confesses, “I am not.” We know as Muslims that Jesus truly was the Christ but let the Christian work out this contradiction on his own time.

The Last and “Least?”

In Matthew 11:11, we are told that the “least in the kingdom of heaven” is greater than John the Baptist. The average Christian pig-eater (I do not mean this to be derogatory) uses this verse to prove that since he has knowledge of the Trinity, partakes of the redeeming flesh and blood of Jesus, and believes whole-heartedly in the death and rising of his Lord, this makes him greater than John the Baptist, the Apostle of God! He claims that John, Moses, Abraham, Isaac, and David are all out of the kingdom of Heaven, but he is not. Such inordinate and obstinate rebellion rattles the Muslims down to their bones. The parallel verse in Luke (7:28) taken from the *Q* source document gives us two important details that Matthew has chosen to ignore. Instead of saying “kingdom of heaven,” Luke uses, “kingdom of *God*.” The choice of words is significant. This is not an abstract kingdom residing somewhere in the heavens above. This is a kingdom of God right here on earth, a physical dominion. Remember, the Jews were told by Jesus: “The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof” (Matthew 21:43). The question remains, what exactly did the Jews

lose? The Prophethood. The son of Mary was the final Messenger and Prophet sent to the Children of Israel. “The Kingdom of God (Heaven, Prophethood)” will be given to a “foolish nation” that will provoke the Jews with “jealousy” (Deuteronomy 32:21). The second detail absent in Matthew is Luke’s use of the word “prophet” when describing John the Baptist. The word in the *Pshitta* version of the New Testament, *zi’ra*, is rendered from the Greek *micros*, meaning small, junior, young. Who is the youngest of the prophets, if not the Last Prophet? It follows then that the verse can be understood as: “But he who is the least (last) among the prophets (kingdom of God) is greater than he.”

- Matthew 11:11: “Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.”
- Luke 7:28: “For I say unto you, Among those that are born of women there is not a greater *prophet* than John the Baptist: but he that is *least* in the kingdom of *God* is greater than he.”

You may get a Christian or two who will claim that Paul is being spoken of here as being the last and least of the saints. Explain to him the drastic differences between the teachings of Paul and Jesus as described in Chapter 3. Why would Jesus say that Paul was greater than John the Baptist when he (Paul) contradicts his “Master” in so many areas? The Christian may reply that Paul actually related the verse found in Deuteronomy 32:21 to the Gentile Christian community in Romans 10:19. The Greco-Romans, however, were anything but “foolish.” McDowell points out: “...being born in Tarsus gave him (Paul) the opportunity to be exposed to the most advanced learning of his day. Tarsus was a

university city known for its Stoic philosophers and culture. Strabo, the Greek geographer, praised Tarsus for being so interested in education and philosophy. Paul like his father, possessed Roman citizenship, a high privilege. He seemed to be well versed in Hellenistic culture and thought. He had great command of the Greek language and displayed dialectic skill. He quoted from less familiar poets and philosophers” (page 79).

The Arabs on the other hand were truly an unlearned and foolish people. In his book *Muhammad, the Natural Successor to Christ*, Ahmad Deedat quotes Thomas Carlyle who said in a speech on May 8th 1840 (emphasis mine):

A poor shepherd people, roaming unnoticed in its deserts since the creation of the world. A hero-prophet was sent down to them with a word they could believe: See, the unnoticed becomes world-notable, *the small has grown world-great*; within one century afterwards, Arabia is at Granada on this hand, at Delhi on that; - Glancing in valour and splendour and the light of genius. Arabia shines through long ages over a great section of the world. Belief is great, life-giving. *The history of a nation becomes fruitful, soul elevating, great*, so soon as it believes. These Arabs, the man Mahomet (Muhammad), and that one century, - is it not as if a spark had fallen, one spark, on a world of what seemed black and unnoticeable sand; but lo, the sand proves explosive powder, blazes heaven high from Delhi to Granada! I said, the *great* man was always as lightning out of heaven; the rest of men waited for him like fuel, and then they too would flame.

Who is “The Prophet?”

As promised, the “Prophet like Moses” will be further identified as Muhammad (upon whom be peace).

Keep in mind that during the time of Christ, the Jews were still waiting for the fulfillment of three distinct prophecies. The Gospel of John tells us: “Now this is the testimony of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, ‘Who are you?’ He confessed, and did not deny, but confessed, ‘I am not the Christ.’ And they asked him, ‘What then? Are you Elijah?’ He said, ‘I am not.’ ‘*Are you the Prophet?*’ And he answered, ‘No.’” (John 1:19-21). Hence the three promised luminaries are 1) Elijah 2) Christ (the Messiah) and 3) the Prophet. Certainly John was *a* prophet, just not *the* Prophet. If John the Baptist is Elijah or in the spirit of Elijah and Jesus is the Christ, then who is the Prophet? The Christian will say “Jesus! (?)” He simply meshes together the Prophet and Messiah and claims that they are one and the same person. But there are *three* figures mentioned, not two! I quoted Harris in Chapter 4 who said: “In the original texts, neither the Mosaic prophet nor the anonymous servant (Isaiah 53) is associated with the Messiah, and we do not know whether these two unidentified figures were given messianic emphasis before the Christian period.” The “Prophet like Moses” is *not* the Messiah.

The Christian notion that the Prophet and Messiah are the same person is completely exploded when we continue to examine the Fourth Gospel. In John 7:40 we are told that the people of Palestine, in wonderment of Jesus (upon whom be peace), cannot agree upon his spiritual identity: “Many of the people therefore, when they heard this saying, said, Of a truth this is the Prophet. *Others said*, This is the Christ. But some said, shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the scripture said, that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was? *So there was a division among the people because of him*” (John 7:40-43). From this it is clear that there was a difference of opinion regarding the mission of the son of

Mary and that the Jews of the first century did not believe Deuteronomy 18:18 to be a messianic prophecy. The Prophet and the Messiah are two distinct persons, not one and the same. Yet the Christian calls John Elias (Elijah) and Jesus the Christ as well as the Prophet? Why? Because the Prophet never came? Tell your Christian buddy, “My friend, he did come. His name was Muhammad, a Mercy unto all mankind, and you are missing the bus!” The people further reason that if Jesus is the Christ, he had to have come from Bethlehem. We read in Micah 5:2: “But thou, Bethlehem, small as you are among the towns of Judah; from you shall arise a king (Christ) who shall shepherd my people, Israel (Micah 5:2).” Obviously these common folk were not aware of the fact that Jesus was actually born in that city.

We are told: “Nicodemus saith unto them, (he that came to Jesus by night, being one of them,) Doth our law judge [any] man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth? They answered and said unto him, Art thou also of Galilee? Study the scriptures, *the Prophet does not come from Galilee*. And every man went unto his own house” (John 7:50-53). The Pharisees, the educated doctors and lawyers of the Torah, stress to the people that the Prophet definitely does not come from Galilee. Therefore, Jesus is not the Prophet. It’s quite interesting that the Pharisees do not seem to dispute the possibility that Jesus is the Christ. This may be due to the fact that these older, more educated men might have had some sort of background knowledge of Jesus and his mother Mary and their story many years prior in Bethlehem. The Prophet, however, was to come from the Israelite brethren, the Ishmaelites, from the lineage of *Kedar*, not David. The argument of the Pharisees is so convincing that we are told: “And every man went unto his own house.” Yet they are continually held in suspense regarding the question of Jesus as the Christ. In John 10:24, just three chapters later, they ask him outright: “If you are the Christ, tell us plainly.” It seems

that the Jews have collectively abandoned the idea that Jesus is the Prophet of Deuteronomy 18:18 because the Prophet is never mentioned again in the Fourth Gospel.

John further says: “Then those men, when they had seen the sign that Jesus did, said, ‘This is truly the Prophet who is to come into the world.’ Therefore when Jesus perceived that they were about to come and take Him by force to make Him king, he departed again to the mountain by Himself alone” (John 6:14-15). Let’s not forget that the crowds who saw Jesus perform his miracles were for the most part the peasants of the Jewish society. Although the works of the Messenger of God Jesus easily softened their hearts, they were by no means scholars of scripture. It becomes clear from the text that it was *because* they perceived him to be the Prophet that they schemed to force his earthly kingdom, the purist Islamic Kingdom of God spoken of by the Baptist and Jesus himself. Jesus knowing their error, since he was not the Prophet, departed to the mountain alone.

Apparently “Peter” (Acts 7:37) should have given his proofs as to why he thought Jesus was the one foretold in Deuteronomy 18:18, yet he is as silent as a mouse. In fact, the real apostle Peter (*Shimon bar Yonah*) would not make such an ignorant and erroneous statement, but Luke, being a disciple of the notorious Paul would, and has.

Who is “the prince of this world?”

“Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, [saying], I have both glorified [it], and will glorify [it] again. The people therefore, that stood by, and heard [it], said that it thundered: others said, An angel spake to him. Jesus answered and said, This voice came not because of me, but for your sakes. Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out.” - John 12:28-31.

The “prince of this world” is mentioned only three times in the entire Bible. It is interesting to note that two out of the three times he is mentioned alongside the *Paraklaytos*, the Comforter, whom Christians believe to be the Holy Ghost. The reason for this is because the Paraklaytos and the prince of this world are the very same person. He is not the Holy Ghost and certainly he is not Satan! Studied from an Islamic point of view, the misty haze of the Christian scriptures is lifted and clear guidance is shown.

The above passage from the scripture demonstrates a definite relationship between the “judgment of this world” and the prince of this world. Christian commentators contend that since Jesus mentions that he (the prince) will “be cast out,” this implies that he is a demon spirit such as Beelzebub, the chief of devils. In Matthew 12:24, Mark 3:22, and Luke 11:15 Beelzebub is called the “prince of the devils” and never “the prince of the world.” In fact Jesus himself is called the “prince of the kings of the earth” in Revelation 1:5. The translation of the Greek *ekballo* here rendered “cast out” can be defined as “send out” according to the Lexicon Strongs’ Concordance. This is also a primary definition of the word *ekballo*. Therefore, this is actually a prophecy of one who will be “sent forth” to judge the world. In Isaiah 42 we are told “he shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law.” This Chosen One of Isaiah will be glorified by the Gentiles (non-Jews), the inhabitants of the islands, and in *Kedar* (Arabia). Only one person has achieved this in the history of the world, and that man is the Prophet Muhammad.

We can now observe that the prince of the world is certainly not a title given to an evil person. As mentioned above, Jesus himself is called the “prince of the kings of the world” in the Book of Revelation. The Greek words used for prince and world are *archon* and

ghay respectively, the latter literally meaning “earth, this temporal world.” However in John 12:31 Jesus calls the prince “*archon tootou kosmos*” (the prince of this world). The word *kosmos* actually means “worlds, or universe.” Certainly this title is more highly exalted than the one given to Jesus by John of Patmos in Revelation! This prince of the Fourth gospel will judge or in the Biblical language, enforce Divine Will, and be called a prince to all the worlds. This word *kosmos* is also used as the object of God’s *love* in the oft-repeated John 3:16: “For God so loved the world (*kosmos*) that he gave....” Allah has told us: “We have sent thee (Muhammad) as a Mercy unto all the worlds” (Qur’an 21:107).

Who is the Comforter?

“He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father’s which sent me. These things have I spoken unto you, being [yet] present with you. But the Comforter, [which is] the *Holy Ghost*, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid. Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come [again] unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I. And now I have told you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye might believe. Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me. But that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence.” - John 14:24-31.

John 14 records the second occurrence of the prince of the world. Jesus mentions here that the Comforter will teach us all things and bring to our remembrance the true teachings of Christ. Notice the words “which is” in brackets. Why the brackets? Because these words do not appear in the original *koine* Greek of John. This is a gloss in the text that the translators have added to make it easy for you to believe what they are telling you to believe. The Comforter is called the Holy Ghost here. In the *Codex Sinaiticus* (375 CE), the oldest living codex of the Bible on earth, the Greek reads “*Paraklaytos pneuma*” or “the Comforter, the Spirit.” There is no occurrence of the fabricated “Holy” anywhere. Again, Christian scholars have tried to pull one over on you by adding their own personal flavor to a text that is supposed to be from the infallible God. Indeed we are told in the Qur’an: “And remember Jesus the son of Mary said ‘O Children of Israel, I am the Messenger of God sent unto you, confirming the Law which came before me, and giving you glad tidings of a Messenger to come after me *whose name shall be Ahmad*” (Qur’an 61:6). Why Ahmad and not Muhammad? According to the sound *hadith*, the final messenger of God’s name on earth is Muhammad and in the heavens he is known as “Ahmad.” A *spiritual* name indicative of his *moqam* (station), *Moqama Mahmood*. Jesus, being a purely spiritual prophet, naturally uses the heavenly name for this great Messenger who will teach us all things. What is the *Moqama Mahmood*? In the RCV (Roman Catholic Version) of the Bible, the Paraklaytos is called “Intercessor.” Here is our answer. The heavenly station of Muhammad is *mutashafi*, the one who intercedes. The verse continues: “Hereafter I will not talk much with you; for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me.” What does “hath nothing in me” mean? In other translations, this is rendered “he has no power over me.” This simply means

that the prince will be similar to Jesus, of like nature. Yusuf Ali says in note 5438:

“*Ahmed*”, or “*Muhummed*”, the Praised one, is almost a translation of the Greek word *Periclytos*. In the present Gospel of John 14:16, 15:26, and 16:7, the word “Comforter” in the English version for the Greek word “*Paracletos*”, which means “Advocate,” “one called to the help of another, a kind friend,” rather than “Comforter.” Our doctors contend that *Paracletos* is a corrupt reading for *Periclytos* and that in the original saying of Jesus there was a prophecy of our holy Prophet *Ahmed* by name. Even if we read *Paraclete*, it would apply to the Holy Prophet, who is “a Mercy for all creatures” (H.Q. 21:107) and “most kind and merciful to the Believers” (H.Q. 9:128). See also note 416 to H.Q. 3:81.

Jesus says: “If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you *another* Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; [Even] the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you” (John 14:15-17). Notice the word “another.” So who is the first Comforter? I John 2:1: “My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.” Don’t be fooled by the word “advocate.” The Greek is actually *Paraklaytos*. Hence, Jesus is the *first* Comforter. The next Comforter will abide with us forever, which means that his teaching will be for all and it will never die. Why do we as Muslims grow our beards, eat with our right hands, and sleep on our right sides? The answer is because we want to emulate the perfect and timeless example of our Holy Prophet! And as long as we

continue to implement his shining life example (*Sunnah*), he will remain eternally alive in the hearts and minds of over a billion of our faithful worldwide. Every time Christians are faced with an issue in which there is no explicit answer found within their scripture, they ask themselves, “What would Jesus do (WWJD)?” You can find this tetragrammaton written on many bumper stickers, t-shirts, and belt buckles. It’s time for us to respond to this question by saying, “I have no idea what Jesus *would do* but I can tell you what Muhammad *did*.”

Jesus says:

“But [this cometh to pass], that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, they hated me without a cause. But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, [even] the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he *shall testify of me*: And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning.” – John 15:25-27.

There is no doubt that Jesus was hated by his own people: “He came unto his own, and his own received him not” (John 1:11). The Children of Israel insulted, slandered, and even attempted to kill their Messiah. Although Jesus was truly a Messenger of God, the overwhelming majority of Jews rejected him, calling him a false prophet and deceiver. Christ is redeemed by the Comforter who testifies to the truth of the Jewish Messiah and requires the Children of Israel to accept him once and for all. Allah reveals the following through His Holy Prophet regarding Jesus:

- Jesus was given “clear signs” and “strength from the Holy Spirit.” – Qur’an 2:87, 253.
- The revelation of Jesus (Gospel) was truly from God. – Qur’an 2:136.
- The Gospel of Jesus was a true guide for mankind. – Qur’an 3:3.

- The mother of Jesus was “chosen above the women of all nations.” – Qur’an 3:42.
- Jesus is “a word from God” and “held in honor in this world and among those nearest to God in the next.” – Qur’an 3:45.
- Jesus was in the company of the most righteous. – Qur’an 3:46.
- The mother of Jesus was a virgin. – Qur’an 3:47.
- Jesus was taught “the Book and wisdom, the Law and the Gospel.” – Qur’an 3:48.
- Jesus could perform miracles such as healing the blind and lepers and even raise the dead. – Qur’an 3:49.
- The disciples of Jesus were righteous submitters unto God’s Will. – Qur’an 3:52.
- The Gospel of Jesus is described further as “guidance”, “light,” and “an admonition for those who fear God.” – Qur’an 5:46.
- Jesus and his cousin John the Baptist are “in the ranks of the righteous.” – Qur’an 6:85.
- Jesus defended his mother’s honor and chastity against her enemies. – Qur’an 19:30.
- Jesus is “blessed wheresoever he is.” – Qur’an 19:31.
- Jesus was “granted favor” by God and “made an example to the Children of Israel.” – Qur’an 43:59.
- Jesus will be a “sign of the coming hour of judgment.” – Qur’an 43:61.
- The true followers of Jesus exhibit “compassion and mercy in their hearts as ordained by God.” – Qur’an 57:27.

Holy Spirit cannot be the Comforter

“Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto

you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: Of sin, because they believe not on me; Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, [that] shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew [it] unto you.” – John 16:7-14.

The Spirit of Truth (*al-Ameen*), the Comforter (*al-Mutashafi*), and the prince of this world (*rahmatallil ‘alamin*) all find prophetic fulfillment in the person of Muhammad. Here the prince is again identified with the Paraklaytos. Compare the words, “he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak” to “and I shall put my words into his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him” (Deuteronomy 18:18). In verse 13 Jesus uses an unprecedented *seven* masculine pronouns to drive to point home that the Comforter is going to be a man. Now the coming of the Paraklaytos is *conditional* in the above verse. Therefore, it can never be the Holy Ghost or Spirit which the Christian claims. Jesus must *go* in order for the Comforter to come. The Gospels, however, tell us that the Holy Ghost (Spirit) was already present in the world prior to and during the earthly ministry of Jesus.

- “For he (John the Baptist) shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and *he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost*, even from his mother’s womb.” - Luke 1:15.

- “And it came to pass, that, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth *was filled with the Holy Ghost.*” – Luke 1:41.
- “And his father *Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost...*” - Luke 1:67.
- “And the *Holy Ghost descended* in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.” - Luke 3:22. Also see Matt 3:16; Mark 1:10; John 1:32.
- “And Jesus *being full of the Holy Ghost* returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness.” – Luke 4:1.

All of these occurred before Jesus’ statement, “for if I do not go, he will not come unto you.” The prince of this world is “judged?” What does this mean? Again, there are some word-games being played here. The Greek *kreeno* here rendered “judged” also has primary and secondary definitions of “to select, pick out, choose, prefer, esteem, approve” according to the LSC. Back to Isaiah 42: “Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine *Chosen One*, [in whom] my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth *judgment* to the Gentiles.” This verse should read: “Of judgment, because the prince of this world is chosen.”

For your information: There was actually a mid-second century sect of Christians (150 CE) called Montanists whose founder, *Montanus*, claimed to be the Paraklaytos foretold in the Gospel of John! – Don’t forget that John’s Gospel was written around 100 CE. This is a pretty good indication of how early Christians viewed the nature of the Comforter.

What about the “Pentecostal experience?”

You may hear from many Christians that Jesus (in John 14, 16) was actually referring to the Day of Pentecost described in Acts 2. In verse 16, however, Peter makes a comment that it was actually the *Prophet Joel* who prophesied this event and not Jesus. Interestingly, this crucial tidbit has been quietly expunged from many modern translations including the Revised English Bible. Furthermore, the Comforter was supposed to “guide us unto all truth” (John 16:13). Ask your Christian friend for just one piece of truth that he has gained from the Day of Pentecost. Just one. What exactly did we learn from the mysterious ranting of these men? Nothing! Their words are not even recorded. In fact, the bystanders who witnessed this event thought that they were listening to the alcohol induced ramblings of drunken fools (Acts 2:13)! How did the Day of Pentecost “reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment?” This Christian claim grossly undermines the nature of the mission of the true Comforter.

The Apocalyptic Son of Man

“But he held his peace, and answered nothing. Again the high priest asked him, and said unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.” – Mark 14:61-62.

There is much confusion regarding the identity of this so-called “Son of man” (*Barnasha*) and his coming in the clouds. Daniel tells us in 7:13: “I saw in the night visions, and, behold, [one] like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.” This great apocalyptic son of man is he who obliterates forever the four beasts mentioned by Daniel. They are

symbolical for the Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans. A quick glimpse at Daniel 7:13 leaves little doubt that the person Daniel envisioned was none other than Muhammad *al-Mustafa*, coming in the clouds to the Temple of Solomon and then ascending unto the “Ancient of Days” where he was brought near and “shown of the Signs of his Lord, the greatest” (Qur’an 53:18; Malachi 3:1; Haggai 2:7). Notice that in Mark 14:61-62, Jesus identifies himself with the Christ yet speaks in the third person when mentioning the Son of Man. This is a common practice in the sermons of the son of Mary. He says elsewhere: “Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh” (Matthew 24:44). Jesus also makes a vital connection between the impending Kingdom of heaven (God) and the coming of the Son of man in his parable of the bridegroom and his ten virgin brides. He says: “Then the kingdom of heaven shall be likened to ten virgins who took their lamps and went to meet the bridegroom... Watch therefore, for you know neither the day nor the hour in which the Son of Man is coming” (Matthew 25:1-13; Also see Matthew 11:11; Luke 7:28). In the above verses of Mark 14:61-62, Jesus makes both an admission and a prophecy. He claims to be the Jewish Messiah and then warns the sinning Children of Israel that they will behold the coming of the Son of Man, the Messenger of the covenant who will “purify the sons of Levi” (Malachi 3:3). These words were extreme enough to cause the High Priest to rent his own garments in disgust.

In the Old Testament, there are two distinct Sons of man. The first, *ben-Adam* (Hebrew), simply means a prophet of God. The prophet Ezekiel is called by this title at least fifty times in his book of the Old Testament. Then there is the *Barnasha* (Aramaic), or the Apocalyptic Son of Man mentioned in the book of Daniel. This Son of man is exceedingly powerful in the earth and ushers in a heavenly kingdom that never

perishes. Daniel remarks in chapter 7 verse 14: “And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion [is] an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom [that] which shall not be destroyed.” Strobel comments regarding the *Barnasha*: “This is someone who approaches God himself in his heavenly throne room and is given universal authority and dominion.”

The oldest manuscripts of the Old Testament on earth were discovered in the caves of Qumran along the Dead Sea in 1947. Before this discovery there had not been a surviving Old Testament manuscript that predated the ninth century of the common era. It is extremely interesting to note that the community which authored these ancient writings also believed in the idea of the “dual-Messiah.” The *Essenes*, as they were called, wrote of a Priestly Messiah, whom we can call Jesus (*ben-Adam*), and also of a Kingly Messiah, who is Muhammad (*Barnasha*). Many contemporary Jewish scholars have found evidence of the dual-Messiah in the Hebrew Bible as well. It is also interesting to note that according to historical scholars, John the Baptist and probably Jesus himself spent at least some of their earthly existences learning from the Essene masters, although there is no mention of this in the Bible. The Gospel of Barnabas reports an incident where Jesus denies being the Messiah and points out to the Pharisees that an Ishmaelite named Ahmad will carry that title. Looking at this statement from the surface the Muslim cannot help but reject it since we are told in the Qur’an that Jesus is the Christ (*al-Masih*). But which Christ? Could it be possible that Jesus was speaking of another Messiah, the Kingly Messiah? Did he not mention the Comforter in this way...“I will pray to the Father and He will send you *another* Comforter, to abide with you forever” (John 14:15-17)? Even in the canonical Matthew 22:45 Jesus informs the Pharisees that “the

Messiah” will not come from the lineage of David: “If David then call him Master (*adon*), how is he his son?”

Christ makes mention of the “Son of man” in over eighty places in the New Testament Gospels. At times, referring to himself, and at other times not. The Christian evangelists and revisers have certainly done a number on these texts throughout the years and it is only through the understanding of the dual-son of man that truth can be extracted from forgery. Just as the revisers have meshed “the Prophet” of Deuteronomy 18:18 and Messiah together as one person, they have also managed to combine both Sons of man into one man, Jesus...and they call him God too! Remember: “God is not a man, that he should lie; *neither the son of man*, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do [it]? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good” (Numbers 23:19)? Here are some examples where Jesus refers to the Apocalyptic *Barnasha* of Daniel 7 (Muhammad):

- “For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together. Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.” - Matthew 24:27-30.
- “But of that day and hour knoweth no [man], no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only. But as the days of Noe [were], so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying

and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, And knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.” - Matthew 24:36-39.

- “Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.” - Matthew 16:28.
- “For the Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day.” - Matthew 12:8.

Notice that in these next two verses, Jesus most definitely distinguishes himself from the Son of Man as a completely separate person. He uses “me” and “my” for himself, but “he” and “him” for the *Barnasha*.

- “For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and [in his] Father’s, and of the holy angels.” - Luke 9:26.
- “Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God.” - Luke 12:8.

Here now are some examples of Jesus referring to himself as the Son of man, *ben-Adam*, as found in Ezekiel:

- “When Jesus came into the coasts of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?” - Matthew 16:13.
- “The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber, a

friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children.” – Matthew 11:19.

The next two verses cannot possibly be in reference to the Mighty *Barnasha* who will bring forth “dominion, glory, and an everlasting kingdom.” How does Jesus’ death conquer the four beasts mentioned in Daniel? The Babylonians (Iraqis) continued in their Pagan pre-Islamic ways and the Persians elected to stay Zoroastrian rather than convert to the religion of “Jesus.” The Greeks actually absorbed the Christians into their culture and way of life. In fact, the so-called “original” Gospels were written in Greek. Finally, the Romans continued to persecute and oppress the Christian believers until once again the Christians became absorbed, but this time into the Roman Empire. It was only when the mighty Muhammad came on the scene that all four beasts submitted to him or suffered annihilation: “For the nation or kingdom which will not serve you shall perish, and those nations shall be utterly ruined” (Isaiah 60:12).

- “And while they abode in Galilee, Jesus said unto them, The Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of men: And they shall kill him, and the third day he shall be raised again. And they were exceeding sorry.” - Matthew 17:22-23.
- “Ye know that after two days is [the feast of] the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified.” - Matthew 26:2.

See verse below: How can such Paganism be believed to be the words of Jesus?

- “Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man,

and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” - John 6:53 (See Chapter 3).

Fallacy of Genealogical Evidence

Matthew and Luke have gone through great lengths in order to prove that Jesus was in fact “the lion of the tribe of Judah,” the Messiah. First of all, Jesus did not have a father and therefore, had no genealogy to begin with. Secondly, Jesus is actually a Levite, not a Judite (Jew). Luke describes Elizabeth as “a daughter of Aaron” (1:5) as well as Mary’s cousin (1:36). This makes Mary a Levite as well. The third chapter of the Qur’an called *Ali Imran* (The family of Imran), correctly calls Mary “a sister of Aaron” (Levite). Christian apologists claim that Muhammad erroneously confused Aaron’s actual sister Miriam with Jesus’ mother Mary (Maryam). They simply do not understand how Semitic languages are spoken. Ask your Christian friend, “If this claim of yours is true, then I guess Luke also made a blunder by calling Elizabeth ‘a daughter of Aaron!’ She lived many hundreds of years after him.”

In Matthew 1:1-16, the evangelist lists for us forty fathers and grandfathers for Christ tracing them back to Abraham. Luke, however, lists fifty-five ancestors of Jesus ending with Abraham (Luke 3:23-3:34). The first fourteen on both lists are identical (from Abraham to David). Matthew, however, lists Solomon as next down the chain while Luke opts for Nathan. After this point, *no two names are the same* until we get all the way down to Joseph the carpenter. Christians try to hide this embarrassment by claiming that one of the genealogies traces Joseph while the other actually traces Mary’s lineage. This is wholly false for two reasons: 1) Again, Mary was a Levite, a descendant of Aaron not David. 2) The two evangelists tell us respectively: “And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ” (Matthew 1:16); “And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age,

being (as was supposed) the son of *Joseph*, which was [the son] of Heli” (Luke 3:23). It’s more than obvious that they are both genealogies of Joseph.

To my Muslim Brethren...

Before you attempt to expound Muhammad from the text of the New Testament, make sure that you explain your view of these books of the Bible. According to modern scholarship, the Gospels that bear the names Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were actually anonymous books until the year 180-200 CE. Obviously, we do not believe that these accounts are the literal and revealed words of God. Once during a debate with a Coptic Christian I was asked, “Why don’t Muslims believe in the *Injil* (Gospel) as Christians believe?” Had I said, “We do,” then the Christians would have expected me to swallow every chapter, verse, and word from Matthew to Revelation. If I had said, “We don’t,” then he would have replied, “Then what right have you to tell me that Muhammad is prophesied in the New Testament!” Explain to him that he needs to stop thinking in terms of black and white and realize that there are endless shades of gray. Yes, the four canonical Gospels are not the words of God, but some of the *words of Jesus* may have been (at least in part) accurately recorded. This was the goal of the *Jesus Seminar*, a group of North-American Christian scholars who examined the sayings of Jesus using various types of literary and textual criticisms. They concluded that only about 30% of what the Gospels record were likely uttered by the historical Jesus of Nazareth. - And the remaining 70%? Pure fiction!

I responded to the question by saying, “You Coptics believe in the *Injile Mattue, Injile Marcus, Injile Lukas, and Injile Yuhanna* (the Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John). We believe in the *Injile ‘Eesa* (the Gospel according to Jesus). Produce for me the ‘Gospel according to Jesus Christ’ and I will gladly believe in it as the Word of God.” Allah tells us: “And they say: ‘None shall enter Paradise unless he be a Jew or a Christian.’ Those are their (vain) desires. Say: ‘*Produce your proof* if ye are truthful” (Qur’an 2:111). Ironically, we as Muslims have the ability to show *them from their own scriptures* that Islam is Truth.

Use these simple arguments to remove the blindfold from your Christian friend’s eyes so that he or she may enjoy fellowship in God’s True Kingdom. Every soul is priceless! Allah tells us: “...if any one saved a life, it would be as if he saved the life of the whole people” (Qur’an 5:32). Amen.

Questions to ask your Christian Friends.

1. What do you think John the Baptist means when he says that God will raise up children of Abraham from stones (Matthew 3:7-10)? Isn’t it odd that Jesus tells the Jews that the “rejected stone” will become the main corner-stone (Matthew 21:42-44)?
2. If John the Baptist truly recognized Jesus as the “mighty one” to come after him, then why does he not become his disciple? Why does John not instruct his disciples to follow Jesus in the synoptic tradition? According to Matthew, John sends two of his own disciples to Jesus to ask him *who he is!* Yet in the Fourth Gospel he immediately recognizes Jesus as “the Lamb of God.” Do you not see the problem here?

3. Why do you think the Gospel of John claims that Andrew was originally a disciple of John the Baptist (John 1:35-38, 40-41) who came to Jesus, while the synoptics mention nothing of the affiliation of Andrew and the Baptist and state the *Jesus came to Andrew* while the latter was fishing? See Matthew 4:18-20; Mark 1:16-18; Luke 5:10, 6:13-14.
4. Why would the imprisoned John the Baptist still be “up in the air” as to the identity of Jesus after 1) witnessing the dove descending upon Jesus 2) hearing the voice of God refer to Jesus 3) proclaiming Jesus the “Lamb of God” 4) worshipping Jesus in the womb of his mother and 5) recognizing his inferiority at Jesus’ baptism? Why didn’t Jesus unequivocally answer John’s question that he was in fact “the Coming One?”
5. Why does the Baptist deny that he was Elijah (John 1:21)? Does this not contradict Luke 1:17 that states that John was “in the spirit and power of Elijah?”
6. Why does Paul claim that the Gentile Christian community was the “foolish” nation foretold in Deuteronomy 32:21 when the Greco-Romans were actually the most learned of people on the face of the earth? See Romans 10:19.
7. Have you considered the possibility that “the Prophet” foretold in the Gospel of John is Muhammad? Isn’t it obvious that there were three lines of prophecy (Elijah, Christ, and the Prophet)? Why do you combine Christ with the Prophet?
8. Why do you believe that the “prince of the world” mentioned in the Fourth Gospel is Satan when Jesus himself is called the “prince of the kings of the earth” in Revelation 1:5? Did you know that the

word in Greek used for “world” is *kosmos* (universe) which is the same word used in John 3:16 as the object of God’s *love*? Why would God love something that Satan is prince of? Is it just a coincidence that the “prince of the world” is mentioned alongside the Comforter?

9. Why do you believe that the Comforter was the Holy Ghost when we are told that the coming of the Comforter was contingent upon the departure of Jesus from the world? Do you not believe that the Holy Ghost existed in the world prior to and concurrently with Jesus and his followers?
10. If Jesus is the apocalyptic Son of man, then why did he not destroy the four beasts mentioned in the book of Daniel? After reading Luke 9:26, 12:8, isn’t it obvious that Jesus and the *Barnasha* are two separate and distinct people?
11. Why do Matthew and Luke seem to disagree so dramatically with regards to the genealogy of Jesus? Why does a fatherless man have a genealogy anyway?

Chapter 7 *Muhammad, a Mercy unto all mankind*

“If thou callest them to guidance, they hear not. Thou wilt see them looking at thee, but they see not.” – Qur’an 17:198.

After a recent talk I gave at a university, a Christian fellow from the audience asked me the following question during the Q & A session: “You said that Jesus wasn’t really crucified and that he wasn’t God but only a Prophet yet there are over a billion Christians who believe otherwise. Why would God send Jesus to deceive so many people from the Truth?” Do not attempt to answer such a question but turn the tables on your Christian friend. I answered, “I have a similar question for you. You don’t believe that Muhammad is a Prophet. If he isn’t sent by God then why does God allow him to ‘deceive’ billions of people away from the truth of Jesus!” He sat still for a moment then admitted, “Good question.” Then another member from the audience had the answer revealed to him by the “Holy” Spirit. “Satan,” he blurted. “Yes,” I said. “You have answered your own question. Why do so many Christians believe that Jesus died for their sins and that he is God and one of three in a Trinity? Because *Satan* has convinced them so.”

As more and more Americans come into the fold of Islam, Christian apologists and Islam bashers such as Geisler, Saleeb, Rhodes, Daniel Pipes, Robert Morey, Ibn Warraq, Jerry Falwell, Franklin Graham, and Steve Emerson believe it to be their duties to “educate” the masses regarding the person of the Prophet of Islam. They enjoy wrenching various *ahadith* and Qur’anic

verses completely out of context and expect their readers and listeners to buy into their slanderous lies and deceitful conclusions. For example, Rhodes exclaims: “Muhammad was a demon-possessed man who was a false prophet and a bad moral example to humanity” (pages 66-67). Strobel suggests: “No one knows anything about it (Muhammad’s conversion). Muhammad claims he went into a cave and had a religious experience in which Allah revealed the Koran to him. There’s no eyewitness to verify this. Muhammad offered no publicly miraculous signs to certify anything...And someone easily could have had ulterior motives in following Muhammad, because in the early years Islam was spread largely by warfare. Followers of Muhammad gained political influence and power over the villages that were conquered and ‘converted’ to Islam by the sword.” In this Chapter, I will be answering many of these charges. More specifically, the assertions of Geisler and Rhodes since they have included in their books sections in which the Prophet’s life is evaluated. Armstrong admits: “We know more about Muhammad than about the founder of any other major religion.” Let’s arrive at the Truth objectively, *insha-allah*. As the great Thomas Carlyle once said, “The lies, which well-meaning zeal has heaped round this man (Muhammad), are disgraceful to ourselves only.”

al-Ameen

His kinsmen gave the title of *al-Ameen* (the Trustworthy) to the Prophet before he was even commissioned by God. Why? Because he was unanimously recognized as the best man among them. They knew him as someone who did not engage in their frivolous activities but rather as a family man who cared dearly for the poor and down-trodden. Muhammad was never an idolater and there is absolutely no evidence in any sources Muslim, historical, or otherwise, that states that he worshipped idols at any time during his life. He

was a pure spirit and possessed an untainted heart. Muhammad lived a quiet, peaceful life with his wife Khadijah and their four daughters Ruqayyah, Umm Kulthum, Zaynab, and Fatimah.

Around the year 605 CE, a flood swept through the streets of Mecca and the sacred shrine of Abraham, the *Kaaba*, was damaged. The black stone that Gabriel had brought down from heaven and gave to Abraham was dislodged from its place causing the heads of the four clans of the Quraysh tribe to argue over which clan would have the honor of replacing it. The pre-Islamic Arabs were a people given to warfare, and it wasn't long before swords were drawn over the matter. An old man, however, had an interesting solution. He said, "Let the first to enter the gate be your judge." All of the men looked towards the gate with anticipation and were suddenly overjoyed to find Muhammad making his way into the courtyard. "It's *Al-Ameen!*" the men shouted ecstatically. The then thirty-five-year-old Muhammad spread his cloak on the floor and placed the sacred stone in the center. He then instructed a representative from each clan to take hold of a corner of the cloak. They raised the stone while he himself eased it back into position. The clans accepted this action and a blood feud was averted.

Call to Prophethood

Muhammad had made it a habit of his to retire to a cave called *Hira* atop a steep mountain on the outskirts of Mecca. On one such occasion, during the month of Ramadhan in the year 610 CE in his fortieth year, Muhammad was visited by a personage in the cave and five verses of exquisite rhymed prose were revealed to him. According to the sound *hadith*, the personage was the angel Gabriel who embraced Muhammad tightly while giving him the command to recite (Isaiah 29:12; See Chapter 5). Christians like Rhodes and Geisler claim that the Prophet was "seized by the throat and shaken

violently” or “choked into submission.” These claims are the result of Christians putting their own twisted spin on an event that they cannot explain. The embrace of Gabriel acted as a way of purging the Prophet’s mind and body of all earthly aspirations and to prepare him for the honor and burden of receiving the messages of God. This can be likened to Jesus’ forty day fast in the wilderness before receiving the Gospel. Christians continue to contend that Gabriel was in fact *Satan* who in disguise, visited Muhammad. This claim will, God willing, be laid to rest.

We *do know* however that Satan came to Jesus while the latter was in the wilderness. Matthew tells us: “And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward an hungred... Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve” (Matthew 4:2, 8-10). Apparently, Matthew believed that the world was flat since Jesus needed to be taken to an “exceedingly high mountain” in order to be able to see the kingdoms of the world.

Parenthetically, I want to mention that the first five verses (Qur’an 96:1-5) revealed to the Prophet on that “night of power” (Qur’an 97:1) marked the beginning of the Qur’anic revelation that would last for the next twenty-three years. Verses would be revealed piecemeal in a tongue other than Hebrew just as Isaiah 28:10-11 says: “For precept [must be] upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, [and] there a little: For with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people.”

Charging a Prophet with demon-possession is common amongst the rejecters of Truth. Christian apologists would have us believe that Jesus was without

a doubt recognized as “God’s Son” wherever he went. This is simply not true. John tells us that “many” of the Jews who were ear and eyewitnesses to Jesus’ ministry concluded, “He *hath a devil, and is mad*; why hear ye him” (John 10:20)? Even Jesus’ own friends and family thought he was insane (Mark 3:21). In fact, the first people who actually recognized Jesus as the “Son of God” and “worshipped” him were Satan and satanic demons!

Now I want you to look at the honesty of this man Muhammad. He storms out of the cave and goes to his wife for solace. “Cover me, cover me!” he tells her. “I am afraid something has befallen me.” Muhammad’s initial diagnosis as to what had happened to him was that he was possessed by a *jinn*, or demonic spirit. He did not descend the mountain with his nose in the air huffing and puffing that he was chosen of God. He is being quite sincere in his reactions. His wife Khadijah assures him that God would not disgrace him in such a way. But she was no expert. She tells her husband that he must visit her cousin *Waraqah*, a Christian scribe who is learned in the Torah and Gospel, and it is *Waraqah* who assures the Prophet that he has been chosen of God. Therefore, *it was a Christian who first confirmed the messengership of Muhammad!* Geisler has chosen to mention Waraqah very quickly in passing while Rhodes leaves him out altogether and claims that it was *Khadijah* “who assures him that the source of his revelation was divine” (page 39). Rhodes also makes a ridiculous claim without any historical evidence that Khadijah was an Eubonite Christian. He points out that since the Eubonites rejected the virgin birth of Jesus, Muhammad must have been influenced by this teaching. It doesn’t, however, take a Th. D from Dallas Theological Seminary to notice that the Qur’an *does* in fact confirm the virgin birth of Jesus. - “And (remember) her who guarded her chastity: We breathed into her of Our spirit, and We made her and her son a sign for all peoples” (Qur’an 21:91).

Geisler and Saleeb ask: “Have Muslims not taken seriously the possibility that Muhammad’s first impression was not the right one, namely, that he was being deceived by a demon” (page 156)? Ask your Christian friend, “Have you not taken seriously the possibility that Jesus’ family, friends, and fellow Jews first impression was not the right one, namely, that he was deceived by a demon and insane?” Who was there to console him that he was genuinely sent from God? Geisler and Saleeb also contend that the Prophet was “suicidal” after his experience. This comes from a very weak hadith that is much disputed among Muslim scholars.

We know from historical and religious sources that Muhammad did claim without a doubt that he was the Messenger of God and that the Qur’an was the Word of God, not his own, revealed through him. Either Muhammad falsified this claim or believed it to be true - And not only did he himself have to believe it to be true, but he had to convince tens of thousands of people during a span of twenty-three years of the same truth. In this case, we can surely say that he was either a liar, Prophet, or a lunatic! Christian apologists and authors try to use the same test for the historical Jesus but unfortunately, they base their research on the four canonical Gospels which claim different things about Jesus and were written many decades after his departure from the world in a non-Semitic language (see Chapter 1).

Hidden Motives?

Initially the Prophet was instructed by God to admonish his family. But the day came when he had to go public with his message. He climbed a tiny hill overlooking the city and called out to his kinsmen and neighbors, “People of Quraysh! If I told you that an army was advancing towards you on the other side of this hill, would you believe me?” The people

immediately exclaimed, “Yes, of course!” The Prophet continued, “Then know this: I am the Messenger of God.” After a brief silence, he was jeered and dismissed as a liar. Liar? This man who had never been known to utter a single untruth during his entire noble existence, now suddenly, a liar? Allah says: “Say: ‘If Allah had so willed, I should not have rehearsed it to you, nor would He have made it known to you. *A whole lifetime before this have I tarried amongst you:* will ye not then understand” (Qur’an 10:16)? In other words: “You have known me forever. Do I invent lies? Do I willfully deceive people? Aren’t I *al-Ameen*? Why do you now doubt me?”

The Quraysh had a quick solution. Abu Sufyan, Abu Lahab, Abu Jahl, and others went to Abu Talib and asked him to offer his nephew a bribe. He offered the Prophet riches, fame, kingdom, women, lordship of the Kaaba, and whatever else he may have wanted. All he had to do in return was to stop calling people to Islam. The Prophet magnanimously responded, “If they were to put the sun in my right hand and the moon in my left, I would not renounce this mission until God makes it victorious or I die therein.”

Before his mission, Muhammad had very few financial worries. His wealthy wife Khadijah made available to him all that he needed. Ironically, it was after his call to prophethood that he began to live in poverty. Dr. Jamal Badawi in his book *Muhammad’s Prophethood* relates the following sound *ahadith*:

- 1) A’isha narrated that a month or two might have elapsed before fire was lit in the Prophet’s house (to cook a meal), while the household subsisted on milk and dates (Remember that this deprivation was self-imposed).

- 2) When asked about Muhammad's bedding, Hafsa answered, "It comprised of a piece of canvas which I spread double-folded under him. Once I did it four-fold in an effort to make it comfortable. The next morning he asked me, 'What did you spread under me last night?' I replied, 'The same canvas, but I had four-folded it instead of the customary double-fold.' He said, 'Keep it as it was before. The additional softness stands in the way of *Tahajjud* (night prayer).'"
- 3) When 'Umar noticed the Prophet's room comprised of only three pieces of tanned skin and a handful of barley lying in the corner he began to cry. The Prophet asked, "Why are you weeping?" He replied, "Why should I not weep? The kings of Persia and Rome sleep on beds of gold and you are the Messenger of God. I can see the marks of the mat you sleep on imprinted on your back!" The Prophet answered, "O 'Umar! Are you still in doubt about the matter? Ease and comfort in the hereafter are much better than ease and comfort in this world."
- 4) Even at the time of his death, despite all of his victories, the Prophet was in debt with his shield in the hands of a Jewish citizen of Medina as collateral for that debt. Therefore, there were absolutely no materialistic motives behind Muhammad's claim of prophethood.

The Arabs loved the man but hated the message whereas the racist Jews of Medina hated the man but loved the message! Alas Allah has revealed: "It is never

the wish of those without Faith among the People of the Book, nor of the Pagans, that anything good should come down to you from your Lord. *But Allah will choose for His special Mercy whom He will* - for Allah is Lord of grace abounding” (Qur’an 2:105).

Fabrication for Worldly Power and Glory?

Perhaps Muhammad decided to claim that he was God’s Prophet so that he could attain status and world greatness? Let’s examine this possibility. The orientalist have suggested that Muhammad noticed how the Jews revered Moses and how Christians loved Jesus hence he wanted very much for his fellow Arabs to love and respect him similarly. Surely if Muhammad was guilty of this you would expect to find the Qur’an riddled with personal events from his biography, stories of his beloved companions, and numerous accounts of his triumphant victories. This, however, is not the case. In fact, the Prophet seems to mention his own name in his own book only five times while Jesus and Moses are mentioned twenty-five and forty times respectively! Why would Muhammad make more mention of the names of his “rivals” if he wanted to supersede them?

Let’s not forget that in the first instance Muhammad was sent to the Pagan Arabs of Mecca. If he wanted them to love and revere him as a Messenger of God then he would have tailored his message to tally with their existing beliefs. Instead, Muhammad tells them that the intermediaries that they worshipped were false, and that Jesus was the true Messiah while his mother was a woman of truth and a virgin. Why is Muhammad talking about Jesus and Mary? Why didn’t he accept their worship of intermediaries and claim that *he* was the Messiah and that *his* mother was the immaculate one? Why is Muhammad going out of his way to glorify Jesus in the presence of Pagan Arabs who could not care less about Jesus? He mentions the birth of Jesus twice, once in Sura 3 and again in Sura 19 (Sura

Mary: The only chapter in the Qur'an that is named after a woman), but never mentions his own birth? In fact, the names of his mother, father, beloved daughters, and closest companions Abu Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthman, and 'Ali do not even appear once!

According to the sound traditions, Muhammad used to mend his own garments, repair his sandals, milk his goat, de-lice the clothes of his friends, and perform everyday household duties. His life was an amazing model of simplicity and humbleness before God and man. He sat on the floor, went to the market to shop, talked and listened attentively to anyone who stopped him, and accepted invitations to dine with the poor and ate graciously whatever was served to him. He used to say, "I hate to have any privilege over you" and "I am only the son of a woman who used to eat dried meat." Are these the words and deeds of a man trying to gain power and glory in the world?

Allah says: "Who can be more wicked than one who inventeth a lie against Allah, or saith, 'I have received inspiration,' when he hath received none, or (again) who saith, 'I can reveal the like of what Allah hath revealed?' If thou couldst but see how the wicked (do fare) in the flood of confusion at death! - the angels stretch forth their hands, (saying), 'Yield up your souls: this day shall ye receive your reward,- a penalty of shame, for that ye used to tell lies against Allah, and scornfully to reject of His signs'" (Qur'an 6:93). It would be the greatest contradiction to claim that Muhammad invented the Qur'an whose very verses harshly condemn such an invention as the most wicked of deeds!

Self-deception?

Some Christian orientalist and missionaries assert that Muhammad unconsciously fabricated his claim to prophethood while he himself whole-heartedly believed that he was God's Chosen Prophet. In other

words, he was deluding himself. The error with this theory lies in the fact that Muhammad was *always* known by his people as the most clear-thinking and lucid man among them. Compare this to the pre-Christian Paul who was known as an “intolerant, bitter, persecuting, religious bigot – proud and temperamental” (*Encyclopedia Britannica*). Muslims, Jews, and Pagans alike would always go to Muhammad to judge their quarrels both before and after this divine call. Christians claim that under the influence of repeated “visions,” Muhammad *gradually* convinced himself that he was the Messenger of God. Badawi says: “What is overlooked in this type of theory is that Muhammad’s claim of prophethood was continuously and consistently made throughout the full twenty-three years of his mission, and that it was not something that was gradually developed or felt. It was rather a claim that came up unexpectedly at the age of forty.” Also, this theory completely fails to explain from where Muhammad received his words - words that the greatest of Arab poets could not imitate.

Epilepsy?

Christians also contend, although to a lesser extent, that Muhammad might have actually suffered from epileptic seizures in which he would mouth-off his so-called divine incantations. Rhodes says: “William Miller reports that when Muhammad received revelation his whole body would become agitated, perspiration would pour down his face, and he would fall to the ground and foam at the mouth.” Such a statement can only be confirmed in part by the authentic *hadith*. It’s true that the Prophet was physically bothered by the mighty *tanzil* (revelation) of the Almighty God coming through his flesh and blood body, and there were many instances where he would sweat and experience headaches. Did he fall to the ground and foam at the mouth? Certainly not! Don’t “fall” for this Christian

trickery. During epileptic seizures, the brain is disturbed. A person may mumble a few things but forget what he or she said five minutes later. Besides, epilepsy was a condition *known* by the contemporaries of Muhammad as the “falling down disease.” No one, not even *Abu Jahl* (one of Muhammad’s bitterest enemies) ever claimed that Muhammad suffered from such things. Badawi says: “It does not stand to reason to say that the book that caused a far-reaching spiritual, moral, social, economical, and political revolution that changed the course of history, was a product of convulsive epileptic seizures!”

Tutored by others?

Perhaps Muhammad knew of Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and Noah due to his frequent visits to a secret teacher’s house somewhere in Mecca or on the outskirts of the city. If so, what happened to this teacher? Why could not Muhammad’s enemies produce any candidates? This charge also overlooks the fact that there was no Arabic version of the Bible until the eighth century CE. Christians continue to insist that even so, Muhammad could have learned these things from Jewish and Christian Arabs like Waraqah who simply translated the Greek and Latin into Muhammad’s mother tongue. Ask your Christian doubter: “How can an illiterate man learn something of the former prophets from a teacher *translating* their stories to him and then be able to rehash what he had heard in a way that was *completely inimitable* by the greatest poets of his day?” Allah asks: “How shall the message be (effectual) for them, seeing that Our Messenger explaining things clearly has already come to them,- Yet they turn away from him and say: ‘Tutored by others, a man possessed’” (Qur’an 44:13-14). The Prophet *did* have a teacher, Gabriel. - “Say, the Holy Spirit has brought the revelation from thy Lord in Truth, in order to strengthen those who believe, and as a guide and glad tidings to Muslims. We know indeed that

they say, 'It is a man that teaches him.' The tongue of him they wickedly point to is *notably foreign, while this is Arabic, pure and clear*" (Qur'an 16: 102-103).

Another common charge is that Muhammad learned the stories of the Bible from his interactions with Christians and Jews during his business trips to the religiously diverse Syria. This would have been impossible since Muhammad only made two trips to Syria during his whole life. Once as a thirteen-year-old boy, and once again at age twenty-five. Armstrong states: "Having practically no contact with either Jews or Christians and their scriptures, Muhammad had cut straight into the essence of historical monotheism."

Forger?

Christians will also try to convince you that the Prophet simply plagiarized many of the stories of the Bible and added some other invented falsehoods and called it the Qur'an, the final revelation of God. This is similar to what Luke and Matthew did with Mark's Gospel. As Muslims we know that Allah revealed the Qur'an to Muhammad (upon whom be peace) to be the perfect and complete Word of God. We also believe that in their original forms, the Torah and the Gospel were also divinely revealed but that the fancy of man had altered many things. Therefore, these scriptures are not universal in their teaching because God Almighty conferred the responsibility of their preservation to human beings, and the latter failed. The final Word, however, will most definitely confirm the previous divine dispensations, abrogate what is now irrelevant, and also correct the errors found within them. Thus it is only natural that there will be many similarities between the Qur'an and the Bible. The difference, however, is that neither man nor demon will be able to so much as even touch this final and perfect Word because *God Himself* has guaranteed its preservation: "We have, without doubt, sent down the Message; and We will

assuredly guard it from corruption” (Qur’an 15:9). Allah tells us plainly: “When We substitute one revelation for another,- and Allah knows best what He reveals in stages,- they say, ‘Thou art but a forger’: but most of them understand not” (Qur’an 16:101).

Allah challenges those who question the source of the Qur’an by first asking the Prophet’s detractors to produce the like of the entire Qur’an, then just ten chapters, then only *one* chapter! All challengers have failed miserably.

- “Or do they say, ‘He fabricated the (Message)?’ Nay, they have no faith! Let them then *produce a recital* like unto it,- If (it be) they speak the truth!” - Qur’an 52:33-34.
- “Or they may say, ‘He forged it,’ Say, ‘Bring ye then *ten suras* forged, like unto it, and call (to your aid) whomsoever ye can, other than Allah!- If ye speak the truth.” - Qur’an 11:13.
- “Or do they say, ‘He forged it?’ say: ‘Bring then *a sura* like unto it, and call (to your aid) anyone you can besides Allah, if it be ye speak the truth.” - Qur’an 10:38.

If Muhammad can “forge” 114 suras (chapters) why can’t anyone else forge just one? Allah has further said: “Who doth more wrong than such as forge a lie against Allah, or deny His Signs? But never will prosper those who sin” (Qur’an 10:17). Why would the Prophet forge lies against Allah and then condemn what he himself had done? Christians will reply that Muhammad was, to use Armstrong’s words, “a man of exceptional genius” (page 134). She continues: “When he died in 632, he had managed to bring nearly all the tribes of Arabia into a new united community, or *ummah*.” Many apologists have used the example of Mozart. “He wasn’t

taught how to play the piano, yet he was a master, a prodigy!” they will say. Muhammad, however, was *not* a poet before he became a Prophet nor could he even read or write! His poetical recitations started abruptly at the age of forty and continued until his death twenty-three years later. - “We have not instructed the (Prophet) in Poetry, *nor is it meet for him*: this is no less than a Message and a Qur’an making things clear” (Qur’an 36:69).

“What about Shakespeare?” your Christian friend will then ask. Although Shakespeare was a great poet, can we truthfully say that no other works by any other poet in history can be compared to his? Was he, bar-none, the greatest poet of all time? This is highly disputable. But if you ask anyone who can understand classical Arabic about the beauty of the Qur’an, they will respond that there is absolutely nothing even remotely close to this literary masterpiece. You may marvel at the words of Wordsworth or Coleridge more than Shakespeare, but you will never make the mistake of comparing the Qur’an’s eloquence to anything. Your Christian friend may finally concede that the Qur’an is supernatural, but that it wasn’t God revealing the pronouncements to Muhammad but rather Satan!

Possessed by a demon?

Amazingly, all of the claims that the enemies of the Prophet made against him and continue to make are answered within the Qur’an itself. Regarding demon possession, Allah tells us: “Verily this is the word of a most honourable Messenger, endued with Power, with rank before the Lord of the Throne; with authority there, (and) faithful to his trust. And (O people!) your companion is not one possessed; And without doubt he saw him in the clear horizon. Neither doth he withhold grudgingly a knowledge of the Unseen. *Nor is it the word of an evil spirit accursed. When whither go ye?* Verily this is no less than a Message to (all) the Worlds”

(Qur'an 81:19-27). Allah asks those who make such a claim, "When whither go ye?" or "Where then are you going?" There is no warrant for saying such nonsense.

Every single aspect of Muhammad's life bore witness to one undeniable truth, that he was truly the Chosen One of God. When asked by his disciples as to how to distinguish true prophets from false ones, Jesus responded: "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither [can] a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. *Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them*" (Matthew 7:16-20). Let's examine the "fruits" of Muhammad: 1) Muslims are the most charitable people in the world. 2) Muslims as a believing community do not imbibe alcohol – "the mother of all evil," alcoholism has reached epidemic proportions in the Christian west. 3) Muslims are the most hygienic people in the world. While the Christians were rubbing orange peels on their bodies to repel their horrendous stench, the Muslims were showering regularly, trimming their body hairs, clipping their nails, and brushing their teeth in accordance with the Prophet's habits! 4) Muslims have the lowest divorce rate in the world. In the "Christian" country of the United States, many sources reveal that nearly 60-70% of marriages end up in divorce. 5) Muslims are the most hospitable people in the world. 6) Muslims have the lowest murder and suicide rates in the world. 7) Muslims have the lowest crime rates in the world. 8) Finally, Muslims are the most dedicated people to their faith in the world. Of course we have our black sheep, just as the Jews and Christians do as well. No one is denying this. In general, however, it is clear that the Muslim *Ummah* (community) is truly "the best of peoples evolved for mankind" (Qur'an 3:110).

A Christian co-worker once told me, “Islam just seems like a religion invented by man whereas Christianity is most definitely the handiwork of God.” I responded, “If I, as a man, wanted to invent a religion for myself why would I make it obligatory to wake up at five o’clock in the morning to pray? Why would I burden myself with constant ablutions and daily prayers? Why would I make it compulsory to give away some of my wealth to the poor? Wouldn’t it be much easier to say that someone else died for my sins and that I am free to do what I want, when I want? Sure I would, and this idea reeks of man!”

Prophets are sinless

We obviously believe that all of the Prophets of God were free of major sin (*ma’sum*). Christian authors, however, have pointed out the following: Adam’s sin of eating of the forbidden fruit (Qur’an 7:11-27), Moses’ murder of the Egyptian (Qur’an 28:16), David’s adultery with Bathsheeba (Qur’an 38:18-25), Solomon’s repentance (Qur’an 38:31-36), and Muhammad’s need for forgiveness (Qur’an 47:19). Let’s educate our poor Christian brethren.

Regarding Adam, Allah says, “By deceit he (Satan) brought about their fall” after he had sworn to them that he was “a sincere advisor.” Adam and Eve’s transgression is viewed by Islam as an example of human imperfection, an innate forgetfulness that is within all men and women. They did *not* willfully disobey God but were rather deceived by Satan out of ignorance. Besides, the major reason why Prophets are sinless is because they must act as role models for people who are under their commands. Adam at this point is not yet a leader of men.

Moses did not intentionally kill the Egyptian. The Qur’an tells us that he struck the Egyptian with his fist and “made an end of him.” A Christian may ask, “Then why does Moses ask for forgiveness?” – “O my

Lord! I have indeed wronged my soul! Do Thou then forgive me! So (Allah) forgave him: for He is the Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful” (Qur’an 28:16). He asked forgiveness for his *display* of anger and hot-headed impatience which *led* to him striking the Egyptian. Impatience, however, is not a *sin*. It is a human characteristic. Again, he did not *want* to kill the Egyptian and “every man shall have as he intends.”

Finally, there is no mention whatsoever in Surah *Sad* (Qur’an 38:18-36) of David committing adultery or Solomon asking for forgiveness. Why do Christian fundamentalists make themselves look like fools by making stuff up and expecting that no one will notice?

Muhammad as a moral example

Allah tells us in the Qur’an: “Ye have indeed in the Messenger of Allah (Muhammad) a beautiful pattern of conduct for any one whose hope is in Allah and the Final Day, and who engages much in the Praise of Allah” (Qur’an 33:21); “And thou (standest) on an exalted standard of character” (Qur’an 68:4); “And raised high the esteem in which thou art held” (Qur’an 94:4). Yet Christians like to indicate the fact that Muhammad needed to ask for forgiveness because he was sinful. Allah reveals: “Know, therefore, that there is no god but Allah, and ask forgiveness for thy fault, and for the men and women who believe” (Qur’an 47:19; Also see 40:55; 48:2). The “faults” of the Prophet, however, are not the same as an average person. The extent of his transgression was leaving an act of great virtue for an act of lesser virtue. But he was still virtuous. Jesus asks the Jews: “Which one of you can convict me of sin” (John 8:46)? – And they could not. I would submit to you that no one ever convicted the Prophet Muhammad of sin either. Even those who hated him and wanted him dead could not help but to admit that he was flawless in his lifestyle. Allah asks all of us to ponder and reflect objectively upon His Prophet. The

inevitable conclusion must be that he was truly sent from God. Allah tells us: “Say: ‘I do admonish you on one point: that ye do stand up before Allah,- It may be in pairs, or it may be singly,- and reflect (within yourselves): your Companion is not possessed: he is no less than a warner to you, in face of a terrible Penalty’” (Qur’an 34:46).

He frowned

Christians such as Geisler and Saleeb invariably cite the opening verses of *Suratul Abasa*, Chapter 80 of the Qur’an to demonstrate a so-called “sin” of Muhammad. This describes the Prophet (upon whom be peace) frowning into the face of ‘*Abd Allah Ibn Maktum*, a blind man, out of frustration. The Prophet did *not* sin. He simply succumbed to human imperfection. Besides, at the exact time of the frowning the Prophet was actually engaged in *dawah* (propagation) to leaders of the Quraysh. But how does this compare to Jesus telling his mother: “Woman, what have I to do with thee?” (John 1:4)? – And this to *Maryam* no less, a woman chosen by God above all nations. Apparently, Jesus addresses his mother in exactly the same manner as he addresses prostitutes, namely, “woman.” How does this compare to Muhammad’s well-known saying, “Paradise lies at the feet of your mother?” So did Jesus sin? Certainly no Christian would admit he did. Did the son of Mary forget to follow his own advice? - “Whoever curses his father or mother shall be put to death” (Matthew 15:4; Also see Exodus 21:17. Is Jesus really advocating the killing of children?) What about Jesus turning his face away and ignoring a Canaanite woman who begged and pleaded with him to heal her demon-possessed daughter? It was only after the disciples “urged” him and after him calling her a “dog” that he finally pities her enough to heal her daughter. We are also told that when Jesus came upon a fig tree that he discovered was out of season, he “cursed it from its very

roots” (Matthew 21:19; Mark 11:13). Why was he so impetuous? – Because he was “hungry.” Frowning into the face of a man who could not even see him frowning was the worst “fault” that the Prophet Muhammad ever committed.

Although the Prophet was sinless he said, “Ask forgiveness from your Lord at least seventy times a day as I do.” Christians don’t understand that he did this out of modesty and by way of instructing his companions. Luke tells us that Jesus and his disciples prayed by saying: “*And forgive us our sins*; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil” (Luke 11:4). Sounds like Jesus asking for forgiveness to me!

Eleven wives, oppressive to women

Christian authors claim that the Prophet was not consistent with his own laws when it came to the number of women that a man can be married to simultaneously. The Prophet at one point did have no less than eleven women living under his care while Allah has revealed: “Marry women of your choice, Two or three or four; but if ye fear that ye shall not be able to deal justly (with them), then only one” (Qur’an 4:3). This verse, however, was revealed to the Prophet *after* he had already taken his last wife and therefore, did not apply to him. But why did he marry so many? Christian abusers claim that the Prophet was addicted to sensuality. Let’s examine this claim. When the Prophet was in the prime of his youth, twenty-five years old, he married Khadijah, a woman fifteen years his senior. Can you imagine yourself at twenty-five marrying a forty-year-old woman? This was also during a time when a man could have an endless number of wives and concubines. Yet the Prophet *never* married any other woman until Khadijah’s death at age sixty-five some twenty-five years later. The Prophet then married a series of women in order to unite different communities and create

familial ties between tribes that were constantly at each other's throats. Now they all had a common relative, and he was the best of relatives! Out of the eleven women the Prophet married after Khadijah, *ten* of them had already been married and were either divorced or widowed.

Christians also claim that polygamy is morally wrong and that God would never allow it. Did not Abraham have three wives? Ask your Christian friend, "Are you saying that Abraham was morally wrong?" Most likely he will answer "yes" because Christians feel as though they have a license to slander the great Prophets and saints of God. Say, "Okay then, how about Jesus?" Listen to his parable of the bridegroom:

"Then the kingdom of heaven shall be likened to ten virgins who took their lamps and went to meet the bridegroom...And while they went to buy (oil), the bridegroom came, and those who were ready went in with him to the wedding; and the door was shut. Afterward the other virgins came also, saying, 'Lord, Lord, open to us!' But he answered, 'Assuredly I say to you, I do not know you.' Watch therefore, for you know neither the day nor the hour in which the Son of Man is coming." - Matthew 25:1, 10-13.

In this very interesting parable, Jesus associates the "Kingdom of Heaven" with the coming of the *Barnasha*, the Son of Man (See Chapter 6). This word Lord or *Kurios* in Greek, is the same exact word that Christians claim denotes divinity when applied to Jesus. Well, according to Jesus himself, a wife may call her *husband* Lord and a man may marry up to ten women at once! "But it's only a parable!" your Christian friend will explode. Ask him, "Then why is Jesus giving us an immoral parable?" Polygamy was a practice that God allowed to exist for thousands of years. In fact, the Jews at the time of Jesus practiced polygamy and Jesus never

said one word against it. We should remember that the *rule* in Islam is monogamy while the *exception* to the rule is polygamy. For instance, if a man goes off to war and dies in battle, what are to become of his wife and children? In today's world there are other options, but in the olden days, the woman would either return to her parents or wed a man (married or not) who could afford to take care of her as his wife. You will very seldom find a Muslim man today who has more than one wife. In the Christian West a man can sleep with multiple women, father their children, but neither the women nor the kids have any rights over the father. Marrying these women, however, gives the *women* rights to maintenance and support for her children.

Monasticism or celibacy, however, was never sanctioned by God and is viewed by Muslims as extreme. This was an invention of the early church fathers who believed that women were evil and that hygiene was sinful. This unnatural practice has led many so-called "holy" Christians to engage in perverse acts of sexual gratification such as homosexuality and pedophilia.

Christian liars may also claim that the Prophet lusted after the wife of his adopted son Zayd, and that he (the Prophet) forced him to leave his wife (Zaynab) so that he could have her to himself. The verse reads: "Behold! Thou didst say to one who had received the grace of Allah and thy favour: 'Retain thou (in wedlock) thy wife, and fear Allah.' But thou didst hide in thy heart that which Allah was about to make manifest: thou didst fear the people, but it is more fitting that thou shouldst fear Allah. Then when Zayd had dissolved (his marriage) with her, with the necessary (formality), We joined her in marriage to thee: in order that (in future) there may be no difficulty to the believers in (the matter of) marriage with the wives of their adopted sons, when the latter have dissolved with the necessary (formality) (their marriage) with them. And Allah's command must be

fulfilled” (Qur’an 33:37). From the context it becomes clear that the Prophet did *not* want Zayd to divorce his wife despite their marital problems because he felt that people without knowledge would have spoken lies and slander about them (like Christians today). When the divorce was made official and public, it was only *then* that Allah joined the Prophet with Zaynab to demonstrate that there was nothing wrong with marrying the wives of adopted sons much to the chagrin of the Quraysh who held this to be taboo yet frequently married their own step-mothers! (In fact, Zayd was only ten years younger than the Prophet).

Many scholars have called Muhammad the greatest feminist of all time. Whereas in Islam (over fourteen centuries ago) women were given the right to vote, own property, be educated, choose or refuse a husband, initiate a divorce, own businesses, keep all of her wealth, and be protected by men, the Bible says the following regarding women...

- a) Genesis 3:12-17: The fall of man is because of the woman. The man shall “rule” over her; do not heed the voice of your wife. God accepts Adam’s shifting of blame upon Eve.

It is because of these verses that many of the early church fathers called women “evil Eves” and “soul-less.” Adam, however, is blamed not only for eating of the tree of life, but also because he listened to his wife.

- b) Exodus 21:7: Instructions on how to “sell” your daughter into slavery!
- c) Leviticus 12:1-5: Female children make women twice as impure as male children.

According to *Shariah* (Islamic Law), a woman is impure for forty days regardless of the sex of the child.

- d) Proverbs 23:27-28: The harlot increases the man in unfaith! – “She also lies in wait as for a victim, and *increases the unfaithful among men.*”

There is no mention of how a man prone to infidelity affects the society. After all, who are the ones that are committing adultery with these harlots? From this verse it can be concluded that women are the cause of faithlessness (*kufir*) among men in the Biblical tradition. In the Islamic tradition, the evil and impurity that arises from illegal sexual relations between the sexes shares its responsibility equally between the man and woman because they heeded the Evil One known as Satan.

- e) Zephaniah 3:1-2: Five feminine pronouns to describe rebellion against God; *she* needs to obey *his* voice.
- f) Matthew 5:32: A man can only divorce his wife if she commits adultery.

Again we have a double standard and this time it is Jesus doing the talking. The question remains, what if the *man* commits adultery? In reality, this is much more likely. Can the wife initiate a divorce? Jesus is silent.

- g) Romans 1:27: According to Paul, the “natural use of the woman” is to satisfy the lust of men.

Contrast this with the Islamic tradition that states women are made only to worship Allah just as men are. Although not quite *Mithraism*, the early Christian view of women as sub-species is clearly advocated.

- h) I Corinthians 11:3-9, 13: The head of the woman “is the man”; the woman was “created for man.” Why must a woman cover her head (wear *hijab*)? – According to the Bible it’s because she is the “glory of man.”

It seems unbelievable that the Christian scriptures teach that women were created for men, and that women need to cover their heads while praying. In Islam, women cover their heads with *hijab* because of the *man’s weakness*, not because they are the “glory” of man. Do any Christians other than Roman Catholic nuns follow this clear injunction from Paul? Nope. Go into any country where Christians are found and bear witness as to how their women dress and act in church – uncovered, singing, dancing, clapping their hands, and shouting for salvation. A far cry from Paul saying, “Let your women keep silent in church” – See I Corinthians 14:34 below. Yet when a Muslim woman expresses her piety before God by adhering to the Islamic dress code, she is suddenly an extremist and backward! Is Hell not a fitting abode for the hypocrites?

- i) I Corinthians 14:34-35: Women are to be “submissive” as the Law says; it is “shameful” for a woman to speak in church.

It is interesting how Paul agrees with the Law (Torah) regarding the attitude of women, but also calls the Law a “curse” and “bondage” in his letter to the Galatians. Contrast this to our tradition of *Sayyidina ‘Umar Ibn al Khattab* (may Allah be pleased with him). Once during his caliphate on the day of *Jumu’ah*, he advised the men in the Friday congregation to give as little dowry as possible and to make it easy on themselves. While concluding his words, he was suddenly interrupted by a woman standing up in the mosque who asked ‘Umar if he was suggesting that

women should not receive what God had entitled them to receive. ‘Umar immediately rescinded his comment and was humbled before the entire mass of people. To Paul, this would have been “shameful.” An example from the *Sirah* of our beloved Prophet is the time when a woman came to the Messenger of God to complain about her husband who had divorced her by saying “*zihar*,” a Pagan tradition in which a man tells his wife that she is “as the back of his mother.” God Almighty starts the 29th section (*juz*) of His Word with the story of this woman and calls the 58th chapter (*surah*) “The Woman that Pleads” (*Mujaadilah*). Can you think of a more honorable mention!

- j) Ephesians 5:20-24: Wives have no power whatsoever; they must submit to their husbands, “as to the Lord.”

There is no ambiguity in Paul’s usage of the word “Lord.” He means Lord as in Lord God.

- k) I Peter 3:7: “Peter” tells us to honor our wives not because they are worthy of honor, but because they are the “weaker vessel.”
- l) Deuteronomy 21:10-13: God sanctions taking wives from prisoners of war. - “When you go out to war against your enemies, and the Lord your God delivers them into your hand, and you take them captive and you see *among the captives a beautiful woman*, and desire her and would take her for your wife...”
- m) Deuteronomy 22:13-21: To all fathers: Please keep those bloody sheets! “If a man takes a woman, and goes in to her, and detests her, and charges her with shameful conduct, and brings a bad name on her, and says, ‘I took this woman. And when I came to

her, I found that she was not a virgin.’ Then the father and mother of the young woman shall take and bring out the *tokens of the young woman’s virginity* to the elders of the city at the gate. And the young woman’s father shall say to the elders, ‘I gave my daughter to this man as wife, and he detests her’...But if the thing is true, and tokens of virginity are not found for the young woman, then they shall bring out the young woman to the door of her father’s house, and the men of the *city shall stone her to death with stones*, because she has done a disgraceful thing in Israel, to play the harlot in her father’s house.”

- n) Deuteronomy 22:28-29: If a man rapes a woman, he must give her father “fifty shekels of silver” and marry her. “He shall not be permitted to divorce her all his days.”

Would any woman in her right mind agree to be married to her rapist? Too bad ladies, you have no choice. Oh yeah, you can’t get a divorce either.

- o) Deuteronomy 25:11-12: No low blows ladies! “If two men fight together, and the wife of one draws near to rescue her husband from the hand of the one attacking him, and pulls out her hand and seizes him by the genitals, *then you shall cut off her hand; your eye shall not pity her.*”

Armstrong tells us: “Women had been among Muhammad’s earliest converts, and their emancipation was a project that was dear to his heart. The Koran strictly forbade the killing of female children and rebuked the Arabs for their dismay when a girl was born. It also gave women legal rights of inheritance and divorce: most Western women had nothing comparable until the nineteenth century. Muhammad encouraged

women to play an active role in the affairs of the *ummah*, and they expressed their views forthrightly, confident that they would be heard...The result was a revelation that addressed women as well as men and emphasized the absolute moral and spiritual equality of the sexes. Thereafter the Koran quite frequently addressed women explicitly, something that rarely happens in either the Jewish or Christian scriptures.”

Islam spread by the sword?

This is the oldest trick in the Christian book. Did the Prophet truly use his sword for the furtherance of Islam? Remember that for thirteen long years the Prophet endured torture and abuse inflicted upon him by the Pagan Quraysh in Mecca. During this time he *never* defended himself. The Quraysh even put sanctions on the Muslims and forced them to live in desert camps for three years, a time period equal to the entire ministry of Jesus Christ! The Prophet’s beloved wife Khadijah, uncle Abu Talib, and numerous companions died during this difficult time. It was only when the Prophet became the “King” of Medina that he exercised his responsibility of defending the believing community. He *never* forced anyone to convert and strictly observed the Qur’anic proclamation: “Let there be no compulsion in religion: Truth stands out clear from error” (Qur’an 2:256). De Lacy O’Leary in *Islam at the Crossroads* (1923) states: “History makes it clear however, that the legend of fanatical Muslims sweeping through the world and forcing Islam at the point of the sword upon conquered races is one of the most fantastically absurd myths that historians ever repeated” (page 8). Armstrong says: “In the West, Muhammad has often been presented as a warlord, who imposed Islam on a reluctant world by force of arms. The reality was quite different. Muhammad was fighting for his life, was evolving a theology of the just war in the Koran with which most Christians would agree, and never forced anybody to

convert to his religion.” Even Geisler asserts: “Islamic conquests were successful because in some of the conquered lands the people were fed up with the maltreatment of their own Roman rulers and willingly accepted Islam due to its emphasis on equality and brotherhood.”

Christians will claim that the Prophet sanctioned Muslims to unjustly raid caravans simply to better themselves financially. First of all, this refers to a very specific case. The caravan belonged to Abu Sufyan, a man who was at the center of Quraysh oppression of Muslims in Mecca. Secondly, many of the goods and wares on the caravan returning from Syria were bought and traded for by using the stolen possessions of Muslims which were abandoned in Mecca before the migration. Rhodes claims that the Prophet received the following verse that allowed the Muslims to begin the raid: “O Prophet! Strive hard against the unbelievers and the hypocrites, and be firm against them. Their abode is Hell - an evil refuge indeed” (Qur’an 9:73; this is verse 73 and not 74 as Rhodes erroneously cites). But why strive hard? You will have to go back a few verses. Allah reveals: “Will ye not fight people who *violated their oaths*, plotted to *expel the Messenger*, and took the aggressive by being the *first (to assault) you*? Do ye fear them? Nay, it is Allah whom ye should more justly fear, if ye believe! Fight them, and Allah will punish them by your hands, cover them with shame, help you (to victory) over them and heal the breasts of the Believers” (Qur’an 9:13-14). Allah then asks us: “And why should ye not fight in the cause of Allah and of those who, being weak, are ill-treated (and oppressed)? Men, women, and children, whose cry is: ‘Our Lord! Rescue us from this town, whose people are oppressors; and raise for us from thee one who will protect; and raise for us from thee one who will help’” (Qur’an 4:75).

Christians love calling Jesus the “Prince of Peace” because he told us “to love our enemies.” Paul

seems to disagree with Jesus by proclaiming: “If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema (cursed)” (I Corinthians 16:22). Even Jesus himself said: “Do not think that I came to bring peace on earth, I did not come to bring peace *but a sword*. For I have come to set a man against his father, a daughter against her mother, and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and a man enemies will be those of his own household” (Matt 10:34). “But it’s a ‘spiritual sword!’” the Christian cries. Then ask him, “Was it with a spiritual sword that Peter struck off the servant of the high priest’s ear?” – Matthew 26:51. He will retort. “Yes, but Jesus says in the very next verse to put his sword away because ‘all who live by the sword shall die by the sword.’” The question is, why did Peter have a sword in the first place? Because Jesus told him to sell his garment to buy one! – Luke 22:36. Essentially, Jesus is censuring Peter for doing something that he (Jesus) instructed him to do...defend his Master. You can literally look into the thousands upon thousands of *ahadith* narrated by the companions and wives of our Holy Prophet (upon whom be peace) and you will never come across anything as remotely blatant as “I came to bring a sword.” Give yourself the pleasure of quoting this verse verbatim to the Christian and watch how he pretends to not hear you! It’s quite fascinating. If Islam is known by being spread by the sword, then why does it continue to grow at a phenomenal rate? Where’s your sword? I must have left mine next to my oozy in my tank parked outside. The country of Indonesia has over 200 million Muslims, *more than all of the Arab world put together*, yet never did a Muslim army ever step foot in that land (See Isaiah 42:4: “and the islands shall wait for his law”)! Such a statement by the “Prince of Peace” negates everything the Christian wants the Muslim to believe. The liberation of Jesus was one of the spirit, but the physical as well as the spiritual, the Kingdom of

God, was established some 600 years later with the emergence of the Chosen One of God.

The question of Islam advocating violence is raised by the Bible-onians in hopes of turning the hearts of our less informed brethren into Jello, thus converting and inviting them to the worship of men and monkeys. They employ low-ball tactics of taking numerous *ahadith* out of context and using them for their own evil ends. There is one occasion in particular where I must, for the sake of God and His Messenger, rebut their lies and slanders and set the record straight for you my Muslim brethren. It is the killing of the *Bani Qurayzah*, a Jewish tribe living in Medina. The Christians and some Jewish scholars (funny how mostly Christians and not Jews cite this as an example of Islam advocating holocaust) describe how the Prophet became ever so grieved about the Jews not accepting his Prophethood that he decided to exterminate them and divide up their possessions as booty to be used at his own discretion. When we read further into these things, however, it becomes clear that the Prophet had absolutely no personal motive for carrying out the sentencing of the men of *Qurayzah*, some 700 of them.

Immediately after the Hijrah, the Prophet and the Jewish tribes of *Bani Nadir*, *Qaynuqah*, and *Qurayzah* signed a mutual treaty of peace which stated that both Muslims and Jews were required to protect one another from outside attacks and that there must not be any treachery from either side. The Prophet had been invited to Yathrib, later called Medina, by the warring *Aws* and *Khazraj* tribes to act as peacemaker between the two and to give the Jews glad tidings of his appointment as the Prophet whom they had been eagerly anticipating from their Torah. Although the vast majority of Jews did *not* believe him to be a Prophet, they *all* agreed to join in the pact of peace out of political reasons.

During the Battle of the Ditch, the Muslims found themselves under siege from three directions. From the south, Abu Sufyan and his armies of Quraysh led by *Khalid Ibn Walid* on camel and horseback. From the east came the armies of *Najd* known as the *Muharib* and *Ghatafan*. To the west lie the Red Sea. Finally, and most importantly, to the north resided the now exiled Bani Nadir and Qaynuqah as well as the Bani Qurayzah. 10,000 men in all stormed the oasis of Medina. The Qurayzah convinced themselves that the Muslim army and the city would be sacked so they broke their covenant with the Prophet and aided their tribesmen from the east. When ‘Umar came to the Prophet with news of the treason, “Bani Qurayzah has broken their covenant and have declared war on us,” the Prophet became visibly distressed. Many Muslims went to the tribe and pleaded with them to uphold their pledge, but the Jews responded, “We know of no Messenger of God.” After internal wrangling had nearly gotten the better of them, the chief of Qurayzah sent a messenger to Abu Sufyan to ask him to send a few chiefs of Quraysh to him as collateral for their participation in the confederacy. Abu Sufyan had many misgivings about this offer and decided not to comply, thinking that his own chiefs would likely be killed by the treacherous Jews. The Qurayzah were left in an awkward position. After many days of little confrontation, the Meccans depleted their supplies and God sent against them a furious wind and storm in the night. Eventually the conditions were too much for them to bear and they departed in humiliation. The city was saved, but the Qurayzah had still to be dealt with.

There was no doubt that the Bani Nadir, who had been exiled by the Prophet some time earlier, had added to the strength and influence of the Quraysh and the tribes of Najd. If the Nadir were the ones who had been executed, then it would have been very likely that the Meccans would not have advanced in the way that

they did, and certainly the Qurayzah would never have broken their pledge. The exiling of the two previous Jewish tribes should have been warning enough! The very home and hearth of the Muslims was at stake in this situation and something needed to be done that would send a lasting message to those who would betray the Messenger of God. A man of Aws was given the duty of judging the Nadir since he was of their kinsmen, and now *S'ad* of Khazraj was appointed by the Prophet to give his judgment regarding the Qurayzah. *S'ad* wounded from battle and on his deathbed, decided that the men should be slain while the women and children were to be taken into captivity. Soon after this pronouncement, the punishments were carried out and the chief of Qurayzah commented before his execution, "You (Muslims) were just with us." *S'ad* died shortly after and the men who carried his body were surprised about how light it was while the Prophet commented, "the angels are carrying him."

Now if we look into the Jewish scripture with regards to an event like this you will be very surprised at what we find. In Deuteronomy 20:10-13, "God" tells the Jews that when they invade a city, the inhabitants of that city must willingly become their slaves. If they refuse, kill the men and take the women and children into captivity. However in verse 16, it states that if a city that God has given as an inheritance is averse to the Israelites, then "thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth." *S'ad's* judgment was the more merciful and more importantly, it complied with their *own* scripture.

In Numbers 21:35, we are told that when the King of Bashan opposed Moses, Moses "smote him, and his sons, and all his people, until there was none left him alive, and they possessed his land." On another campaign described in Numbers 31:15-18, Moses asks if there are any women still alive. Then he orders that all men and boys be executed and only the women "who have not known a man" to let survive and "keep for

yourselves.” Now the question remains, how are they supposed to know which women were virgins, and which were not? The answer is, by raping them! It then states that 32,000 women who had been discovered as “not knowing men” were taken by the army of “God” and placed into the custody of the men of Israel. Even Joshua, Moses’ successor gets in on some of the action. At the battle of Jericho, “they utterly destroyed all that was in the city, both man and women, old and young, and ox, and sheep, and ass, all by the edge of the sword” (Joshua 6:21). Other dishonorable mentions: “And we utterly destroyed them, as we did to Shihon, king of Heshbon, utterly destroying the men, women, and children of every city” (Deutero 3:6); “And when the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee, thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them, thou shalt make *no covenant* with them, *nor show mercy* unto them” (Deuteronomy 7:2).

It was only after two warnings and a major act of treason that prompted the Prophet to carry out the sentences. He gave them ample opportunity for coming back under his protection but the stubborn Qurayzah refused. There was no alternative left for him and the men were killed for their crimes. Let us now understand the true account of this event and clear the Prophet (upon whom be peace) of any personal motivation. He is truly, “a Mercy unto all the worlds.” Here are some more examples of violence and intolerance in the Bible...

- a) II Chronicles 15:13: Whoever does not worship the “God of Israel” will be murdered, man or woman, young or old.

Although Islam is erroneously characterized by the mainstream media as being an intolerant religion, the Hebrew Bible is second to none in its command to

violence. It seems that there is no room for any other “people of the book” in Judaism.

- b) Psalm 137:9: The smashing of children against stones makes God happy.

Isn't this what the Nazis did to Jewish children during the Holocaust?

- c) Matthew 18:8-9: Jesus tells us to cut off the hands and pluck out the eyes of sinners – “It is better for you to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes, to be cast into hell fire.”

“...We change people by changing their spirit, not by cutting off hands.” – Jimmy Swaggart in a debate against Ahmad Deedat (Allah’s Mercy be upon him) in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1986. Somebody should tell that to Jesus!

- d) Luke 19:27: “I am King, or die” - signed, Jesus. “But bring here those enemies of mine, who did not want me to reign over them, and slay them before me.”

Jesus says this just before he goes into Jerusalem to declare himself the “King of the Jews.” Just three chapters later he instructs his disciples to sell their garments to buy swords. See next verse.

- e) Luke 22:35-36: “And he said to them, ‘When I sent you without money bag, knapsack, and sandals, did you lack anything?’ So they said, ‘Nothing.’ Then he said to them, ‘But now, he who has a money bag, let him take it, and likewise a knapsack; and he who has *no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one.*’”

Miracles of Muhammad

The topic of divine miracles is extremely important. Did Muhammad ever perform any miraculous feats like those of Jesus? Sure he did! We as Muslims, however, do not make them an issue. But why? Because the miracles of the Prophet Muhammad as well as those of Moses and Jesus are events in storybooks. *We* never saw Moses split the Red Sea or Jesus raise Lazarus. Of course, we have faith that these events occurred, but what good is that to us now? In the books of tradition, the sound *ahadith*, there are no less than 3,000 miracles ascribed to Muhammad (upon whom be peace). These include healing the blind with his saliva, feeding his companions water which ran from his finger tips, turning water into milk, feeding ninety men with a few loaves of barley, being shielded from the hot sun by a mysterious shade, walking undetected through the midst of ten assassins, knowing people's intentions and hidden motives, and so on. But his greatest and lasting miracle was the Qur'an. This is a miracle that all of us can experience even today. - A living, breathing miracle of Muhammad. Allah tells us: "This Qur'an is not such as can be produced by other than Allah; on the contrary it is a confirmation of (revelations) that went before it, and a fuller explanation of the Book - wherein there is no doubt - from the Lord of the worlds" (Qur'an 10:37).

Remember Jesus answered the Pharisees when asked to perform a miracle: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas" (Matthew 12:39). The son of Mary also said: "Will none of you believe without seeing signs and portents" (John 4:48)? Why is Jesus so reluctant to perform any miracles? If Jesus did not perform any miracles on demand when asked by the Pharisees, why do Christians expect Muhammad to perform them when demanded by the Quraysh? Truly Jesus said of John the Baptist: "Among those that are born of women there is not a greater

prophet than John the Baptist” (Luke 7:28), yet John performed no miracles. He also says: “For there shall arise false christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if [it were] possible, they shall deceive the very elect” (Matthew 24:12; Also see Mark 13:22). If false prophets and christs can perform “great signs and wonders,” then it must be admitted that miracles are of little or no use to us when determining the legitimacy of a would-be Prophet of God. We must look at character, and Muhammad was unsurpassed in this department.

Christians like Geisler and Saleeb state that the Qur’an does not record *any* of Muhammad’s miracles. On the contrary Allah informs us of the following: 1) The splitting of the moon (also found in *Sahih Bukhari*, volume 5) recorded in Qur’an 54:1-2. Geisler contends that the Qur’an does not call this a miracle but rather a “sign” (*ayah*). This point overlooks the fact that Jesus refers to miracles as “signs” as well; they are synonymous words. Also, Geisler uses 3:184 to prove that Muhammad did not perform feats of nature like this. The verse reads: “Then if they reject thee, so were rejected messengers before thee, who came with Clear Signs (*ayah*), Books of prophecies, and the Book of Enlightenment.” Suddenly Geisler equates signs with miracles! This is further evidenced when Geisler says: “He (Muhammad) refers to God confirming Moses’ prophetic credentials by *miracles* several times. He wrote: ‘Then We sent Moses and his brother Aaron, with Our Signs (*ayah*) and authority manifest’” (Qur’an 23:45; page 167). Again, signs and miracles are one and the same. In 98:1-2 the Prophet is called *Bayyinah*, meaning “clear and convincing evidence or proof.” 2) The miracle of *Isra* and *Miraj* recorded in Qur’an 17:1; 53:1-18. The orthodox Muslim position is that this was a *literal* or physical trip to Jerusalem and then into the seven levels of Heaven. Upon the Prophet’s return, many of the Quraysh mocked and insulted him by calling him

a liar and soothsayer. But when the Prophet described to the letter a caravan he had seen while traveling overhead with Gabriel, the Meccans changed their charge from liar to sorcerer. 3) The miraculous victory at Badr recorded in Qur'an 3:123; 8:17, 65-66. Allah tells us that the angels fought alongside the Muslim army and helped them to a splendid victory despite being outnumbered three-to-one. Geisler says: "One tradition tells how Muhammad threw a handful of dirt into the Meccan army to blind them and drive them into retreat." This is not a "tradition." This event is specifically and clearly mentioned in the Qur'an: "It is not ye who slew them; it was Allah: when thou threwest a handful of dust, it was not thy act, but Allah's: in order that He might test the believers by a gracious trial from Himself: for Allah is He Who heareth and knoweth (all things)" (Qur'an 8:17). Geisler also asks, "If Badr's victory is a sign of divine confirmation, then why was not the subsequent clear defeat at Uhud a sign of divine disapproval?" It was. Allah tells us regarding Uhud: "Allah did indeed fulfill His promise to you when ye with His permission were about to annihilate your enemy -until ye flinched and fell to disputing about the order, and *disobeyed* it after He brought you in sight (of the booty) which ye covet. Among you are some that hanker after this world and some that desire the Hereafter. Then did He divert you from your foes *in order to test you* but He forgave you: For Allah is full of grace to those who believe. Behold! Ye were climbing up the high ground, without even casting a side glance at any one, and the Messenger in your rear was calling you back. There did Allah give you one distress after another by way of requital, to teach you not to grieve for (the booty) that had escaped you and for (the ill) that had befallen you. For Allah is well aware of all that ye do" (Qur'an 3:152-153). 4) Muhammad knew what people harbored in their thoughts (Qur'an 66:3; See Chapter 2).

Let's just say, for argument's sake, that Geisler and Saleeb are correct in their assertion that the Qur'an does not contain any miracles of Muhammad. Why would this even matter? Christians don't believe in the Qur'an anyway. If "Muhammad" claimed that he raised the dead and walked on water in the Qur'an would this make any difference to Christians? How many times have we looked up at the sky during the trying moments of our lives and asked God, "Just give me a *sign*"? – And nothing happened. We must submit our wills unto God's perfect Will and put our trust in Him. *He* knows what is best for us. The demand for miracles is the characteristic of an "evil and adulterous" people. The truly great miracle is that which is miraculous by human standards. True, Jesus could raise the dead back to life, a person here and there. But Muhammad *resurrected nations*! He single-handedly revived an earth that had been dead with the light of his Truth and guidance.

Geisler further claims that the *ahadith* of the Prophet must not be authentic since they record so many hundreds of miracles performed by Muhammad. He outrageously claims, "They do not come from contemporary eyewitnesses of the events." First off, all of the sound *ahadith* have gone through rigorous examinations of authenticity where every word has been exactly corroborated and chains of narration (*isnaad*) established all the way back to the Prophet himself. According to Emerick, out of the over 600,000 *ahadith* compiled by *Imam Bukhari*, only 2,602 were deemed sound in transmission! How does this compare to the 20,000 *varied* copies (McDowell, page 48) of the New Testament written hundreds of years after Jesus in a foreign language? If the entire Bible were to be scrutinized with the same processes of *hadith* authentication, *all* 67 books would be thrown out as unreliable. This is another example of a Christian accusing us of that which he himself is guilty.

Regarding the Qur'an, Geisler says: "There are many other great pieces of religious literature that teach things contrary to the Qur'an, including the Jewish prophecy of Isaiah, the Christian Sermon on the Mount, and the Hindu Gita. Yet all these teach things contrary to the Qur'an." Yes, and these are all easily imitated. In fact, Chapter 37 of Isaiah is verbatim the same as II Kings 19. I will admit that all of these are beautiful works of literature, but they cannot possibly be mentioned in the same breath as the inimitable and sublime Qur'an (We will look at the Qur'an more closely in Chapter 8). Besides, the Qur'an has stood the test of time while the others have not. Ask your Christian friend, "Why do you consider the Bible to be the unchangeable Word of God when it has gone through numerous revisions and has been exposed to many additions and deletions? Shouldn't this be a *sign* for you that it is not God's Word?"

Muhammad was the Greatest

What are objective non-Muslims saying about Muhammad? The following list of quotes and comments have been taken from Ahmad Deedat's book entitled *Muhammad the Greatest* (emphasis mine). May Allah the Exalted reward the Sheikh for his service in the cause of Islam. Amen!

- "My choice of Muhammad to lead the list of the world's most influential persons may surprise some readers and may be questioned by others, but he was *the only man in history* who was supremely successful on both the religious and secular level." - Michael H. Hart. *The 100: A Ranking of the Most Influential Persons in History*, New York: Hart Publishing Company, Inc., 1978, p.33.
- "If you measure leadership by impact, then you would have to name Jesus, Buddha, Mohammed,

Confucius, the great prophets of the world...” – William McNeill, a United States historian of the University of Chicago.

- “Among leaders who have made the greatest impact through ages, I would consider Mohammed, Jesus Christ, maybe Lenin, possibly Moa. As for a leader whose qualities we could most use now, I would choose John F. Kennedy.” – James Gavin, described as a United States army man, a retired lieutenant general.

Deedat says: “Jules Masserman, United States psychoanalyst and professor of the Chicago University, gives us, unlike the other contributors, the basis for making his selection. He gives us his reason for choosing his greatest leader of all times. Masserman does not want us to depend on our fancies or prejudices: he wants to establish objective standards for judging, before we confer greatness upon anybody. He says that ‘Leaders must fulfill three functions...1) The leader must provide for well-being of the lead. 2) The leader or would be leader must provide a social organization in which people feel relatively secure. 3) The leader must provide his people with one set of beliefs...Perhaps the *greatest leader of all times* was Muhammed, who combined all three functions. To a lesser degree, Moses did the same.’”

- “In the person of the Prophet of Islam the world has seen this rarest phenomenon on earth, walking in flesh and blood.” - Professor K.S. Ramakrishna Rao, a Hindu philosopher in his book *Muhummed - The Prophet of Islam*.
- “Muhammad was the soul of kindness, and his influence was felt and never forgotten by those around him.” - A Hindu scholar, Diwan Chand

Sharma in his *The Prophets of the East*, - Calcutta 1935, p. 122.

- “Four years after the death of Justinian, A.D. 569, was born at Makkah, in Arabia the man who, of all men exercised the *greatest influence upon the human race*...Mohammed.” - John William Draper, M.D., LL.D., in his *A History of the Intellectual Development of Europe*. London 1875.
- “I doubt whether any man whose external conditions changed so much ever changed himself less to meet them.” - R. V. C. Bodley in *The Messenger*, - London 1946, p.9.
- “I have studied him – the wonderful man – and in my opinion far from being an anti-Christ, he must be called the *Saviour of humanity*.” - George Bernard Shaw, in *The Genuine Islam*, - Vol. 1, No. 81936.
- “By a fortune *absolutely unique in history*, Mohammed is a threefold founder of a nation, of an empire, and of a religion.” - R. Bosworth-Smith in *Mohammed and Mohammedanism*, 1946.
- “Mohammed was the *most successful* of all religious personalities.” - *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th Edition.
- “A man of truth and fidelity; true in what he did, in what he spake and thought. They noted that he always meant something. A man rather taciturn in speech; silent when there was nothing to be said; but pertinent wise, sincere, when he did speak; always throwing light on the matter. This is the only sort of speech worth speaking!” – Thomas Carlyle in *Heros and Hero-Worship*, p. 69.

- “The creed of Mohamed (Muhammad) is free from the suspicions of ambiguity and the Koran is a glorious testimony to the unity of God.” - Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.
- “The more I study the more I discover that the strength of Islam does not lie in the sword.” - Mahatma Gandhi, the father of modern India, in *Young India*.
- “They (Muhammad’s critics) see fire instead of light, ugliness instead of good. They distort and present every good quality as a great vice. It reflects their own depravity...the critics are blind. They cannot see that the only ‘sword’ Muhammad wielded was the sword of mercy, compassion, friendship, and forgiveness. – The sword that conquers enemies and purifies their hearts. His sword was sharper than the sword of steel.” - Pandit Gyanandra Dev Sharma Shastri, at a meeting in Gorakhpur India, 1928.
- “He preferred migration to fighting his own people, but when oppression went beyond the pale of tolerance he took up his sword in self-defense. Those who believe religion can be spread by force are fools who neither know the ways of religion nor the ways of the world. They are proud of this belief because they are a long, long way away from the truth.” - A Sikh journalist in *Nawan Hindustan*, Delhi, 17 November 1947.
- “He was Caesar and Pope in one, but he was Pope without the Pope’s pretensions. And Caesar without the legions of Caesar: Without a standing army, without a bodyguard, without a palace, without a fixed revenue; If ever any man had the right to say

that he ruled by the right divine, it was Mohammad (Muhammad), for he had all the powers without its instruments and without its supports.” - R. Bosworth Smith in *Mohammad and Mohammadanism*, 1946.

- “If greatness or purpose, smallness of means and astounding results are the three criteria of human genius, who could dare to compare any great man in modern history with Muhummed? (Muhammad)...Philosopher, orator, apostle, legislator, warrior, conqueror of ideas, restorer of rational beliefs, of a cult without images: the founder of twenty terrestrial empires and of one spiritual empire, that is Muhummed. *As regards all standards by which human greatness may be measured*, we may well ask, is there any man greater than he?” - Lamartine, *Historie de la Turquie*, Paris 1854 .

“Allah and His angels send blessings on the Prophet: O ye that believe! Send ye blessings on him, and salute him with all respect” (Qur’an 33:56).

Allahumma salli ‘ala Sayyidina Muhammad, was ‘ala alihi was sahibihi ajama’een. Ameen, ya rabbil ‘alamin!

To my Muslim Brethren...

Be proud, he is our Prophet! Allah took Abraham as His *Khalil* (friend) and He spoke to Moses. He gave David the Psalms and strengthened Jesus with the Holy Spirit. He provided Noah the ark and gave Adam the garden. To Muhammad, Allah gave His love! Our Prophet is the Best of Creation and the Beloved of God (*Habibullah*). Be grateful to Allah for we have been

chosen many times over. First, He chose us to be human beings, articulating and clear-thinking. Then, He chose us again to be Muslims bowing unto His Will. And not only did Allah choose us to be Muslims, but Muslims under the nation of the greatest of the Prophets! Allah tells us: “If ye count the favours of Allah, never will ye be able to number them. Verily, man is given up to injustice and ingratitude” (Qur’an 14:34).

I must say that it was truly one of the most painful experiences of my life to read what Christian apologists were saying about our beloved Prophet (upon whom be peace). Yet I find solace in Allah’s words: “Those who abuse the Messenger will have a grievous penalty” (Qur’an 9:61). This man should be dearer to us than our own parents, our own selves! Remember the great *‘Umar*. He went from wanting to kill the Prophet to wanting to be killed *for* the Prophet. Anything is possible. You may think that your Islam-bashing cousin or roommate who drinks alcohol and fornicates regularly will never be given the blessing of Islam. You may think that they are doomed for Hell. Well, think again. The instant that we become heedless of the commands of Allah and think ourselves better than anyone else, Allah will take what we took for granted and bestow it upon an unlikely person. The Almighty has revealed: “If ye turn back (from the Path), He will substitute in your stead another people; then they would not be like you” (Qur’an 47:38). May Allah make us of those who remain grateful to Him and faithfully defend His Holy Messenger Muhammad. Amen!

Questions to ask your Christian Friends.

1. Did you know that Muhammad was known as *al-Ameen* (the Trustworthy) before he claimed prophethood? Did you know that he was renown for never telling a lie and for his impeccable moral character?

2. You claim that Satan came to Muhammad in the cave posing as Gabriel. You have said that this was a perfect way for Satan to mislead billions of people. Do you not see how this would also be a very effective way for God to *guide* billions of people? Explain the parallels and differences between Muhammad's mission and that of Paul.
3. Did you know that a Christian scribe named *Waraqah* was the first to confirm the messengership of Muhammad?
4. If Muhammad claimed prophethood for worldly wealth, why then did he live in self-imposed poverty? If he claimed prophethood for world fame, why does he mention his so-called "adversaries" Jesus and Moses so many times in his own book, the Qur'an? Why does he not mention details from his own life such as his numerous victories or names of his own companions or family members?
5. Why do you claim that the Prophet was an epileptic when no one during his life ever claimed such a thing and there is no proof historical or otherwise that supports this? If the Prophet forged the Qur'an, why does he not contradict himself while the Bible is riddled with contradictions (See Chapter 8)? Why can't anyone else forge anything like the Qur'an?
6. Did you know that Muslims believe that Muhammad was *ma'sum*, free of major sin? There is no record of the Prophet committing any sin!
7. If Muhammad married eleven women because he was addicted to sensuality, why then does he wait until he is well into his fifties to do this? Why did he not take several more wives while married to

Khadijah and still in his youth? Why does he choose almost all widows and divorcees to wed?

8. If Islam was spread by the sword, why does it continue to grow at phenomenal rates in America and abroad? Are we forcing people at the end of swords to convert? What does this say about what the orientalist have said in the past?
9. Did you know that the *ahadith* as well as the Qur'an record many of Muhammad's miracles? Explain some of them.
10. Let me show you some passages in the Bible regarding women and violence.
11. Don't you think that it's time to stop deluding yourself and accept once and for all the true messengership of Muhammad? Ask this question only to those Christians whom you know well.

Chapter 8 *There is no god except Allah*

“Who originates creation, then repeats it, and who gives you sustenance from heaven and earth? Can there be another god besides Allah? Say, ‘Bring forth your argument, if ye are telling the truth!’” – Qur’an 27:64.

Different people worship different things. In Islam, we are taught that the object of our worship takes priority in our lives. For instance, if brother Hamid spends much of his time in the garage washing and polishing his brand new Hummer yet answers the call to prayer, then we can safely say that he knows what should come first in his life. However, if he ignores the call and continues to work on his car, then it is as if he is saying that his material possessions are above his God. Hence, his material possessions *are* his god. This is called *shirk*, or association. Keeping this definition in mind, it follows that someone who even considers himself an atheist will ultimately worship something or someone. Human beings worship their wealth, their families, or even *themselves*.

The most common form of *shirk* found in the United States is the false worship of our own desires (*howwa*). Even the Christians will agree with us here. We are literally inundated by media tailored specifically to fulfill our passions and desires through our televisions, computers, radios, etc. We demand instant gratification through the means of fattening fast food, mind-numbing films, t.v. shows that never end, violent video games, weekend-long sporting events, addictive on-line shopping, and enough internet pornography to last ten lifetimes. The other few hours of our day we spend sleeping or working. Has life lost all its meaning?

It is time, dear brothers and sisters, to come back to Allah and recognize that our time in this *dunya* is severely limited. We cannot waste another second of our precious lives appeasing ourselves by heeding the chief deceiver, Satan, who does nothing but make us forget our Lord by employing the above-mentioned vices. True happiness and tranquility comes from only one source as Allah, the Most High has told us: “Those who believe, and whose hearts find satisfaction in the remembrance of Allah: *for without doubt in the remembrance of Allah do hearts find satisfaction*” (Qur’an 13:28).

Who is Allah?

Allah is the ancient Semitic name of God as used by all of the Judeo-Christian-Islamic prophets. We do not believe that Allah is a “Muslim” or Arab God distinct from the deity of the Jews and Christians. It was the same Allah who revealed the Torah to Moses, Psalms to David, Gospel to Jesus, and finally the Qur’an to Muhammad. Christians claim that Allah was worshipped in pre-Islamic Arabia as the chief God even before Muhammad came on the scene. This is true. Let’s not forget that the Arabs living in the Arabia peninsula (*Paran*) before and during the advent of Muhammad were direct descendants of Ishmael and that their forefathers Kedar, Nebajoth, Tema, among others taught them the name of the one and only deity. Yet as more and more time elapsed, the Arabs began dabbling into idolatry and eventually set up a pantheon of deities as Allah’s “daughters” and intermediaries. This is similar to the Old Testament stories of I & II Chronicles, Kings, and Jeremiah where we are told of the Children of Israel’s frequent backslidings into idolatry. Rhodes claims: “As Muhammad grew from boyhood to manhood, he increasingly became convinced that Allah was the only true God, and all other were mere idols” (page 96). This is a common claim among Christians

although entirely erroneous. Dr. Morey's claim that Allah was the "moon god" is utterly ridiculous.

In the Old Testament, God is called *Adonai Elohim*, which is translated "Lord God." The word *Adonai* is actually a concocted word originating from the Greek god *Adonis* that the Jews incorporated into their scriptures in order to save themselves from the trouble of articulating the mystic tetragrammaton YHWH. The phrase Lord God or *Adonai Elohim* appears in over 6,000 places in the Old Testament. The word *Elohim*, literally, "Gods" (royal plural), is read *Eloh* or *Elah* when separated from the *im*. This is *exactly* the same word as the Arabic Allah. As shown in Chapter 3, even Jesus Christ himself referred to God as "*Aloh*," a name found in Matthew 5:9 in the *Pshitta* version of the New Testament. Furthermore, the non-Biblical words Yahweh (a word not found in the Old Testament) and Jehovah (a word not found in the New Testament) are nothing more than inventions like just about everything else in Christendom. Allah has already warned us about ascribing false names to Him in the Qur'an. Addressing the Pagan pre-Islamic Quraysh He says: "These are nothing but names which ye have devised - ye and your fathers - for which Allah has sent down no authority (whatever). They follow nothing but conjecture and what their own souls desire! - Even though there has already come to them guidance from their Lord" (Qur'an 53:23). How true is this about Christians as well.

Allah tells us: "Allah is He, there is no other god - Who knows (all things) both secret and open; He, Most Gracious, Most Merciful. Allah is He, there is no other god - the Sovereign, the Holy One, the Source of Peace (and Perfection), the Guardian of Faith, the Preserver of Safety, the Exalted in Might, the Irresistible, the Supreme: Glory to Allah! (High is He) above the partners they attribute to Him. He is Allah, the Creator, the Evolver, the Bestower of Forms (or Colours). To Him belong the Most Beautiful Names: whatever is in

the heavens and on earth, doth declare His Praises and Glory: and He is the Exalted in Might, the Wise” (Qur’an 59:22-24). Memorize these verses in its original Arabic and experience for yourself the unparalleled majesty of Allah’s sacred writ. Allah also says: “The most beautiful names belong to Allah: so call on him by them; but shun such men as use profanity in his names: for what they do, they will soon be requited” (Qur’an 7:180). We can call upon God by any of His beautiful names as long as that name is not contaminated by anything that we can visualize physically. For instance, if I said that the name of God was Jesus Christ, a mental image immediately pops up into our heads. If I said his name was Buddha, or Muhammad, other images are conjured. Therefore, these are *not* God. Not only has man invented images for his gods, but he also modeled them after himself. Greek gods look like Greeks, Hindu gods look like Hindus, and Roman gods look like Romans. This *ethnocentric deification* is also very much found within the Christian tradition. When was the last time you saw a Christian depiction of a Jewish Jesus with a hooked-nose, thick hair, and brown skin?

Biblical descriptions of God

The Bible describes God in the following imperfect ways: Moses sees God’s “back parts” (Exodus 33:23). God wrestles with Jacob (Genesis 32:28). God awoke from his sleep like a drunk man (Psalm 78:65). God “repented” for various things (Genesis 6:6; I Samuel 15:35). God smells a “sweet savour” (Genesis 8:21). God crouched like a lion (Numbers 24:9). God “rested and refreshed” on the seventh day (Exodus 31:17). Adam and Eve hear God “walking” in the garden (Genesis 3:8). God is jealous (Exodus 34:14). God has “nostrils” and a “mouth” (II Samuel 22:9). God “deceives” people (Jeremiah 20:7). God could not drive out the inhabitants of a valley because they had “chariots of iron” (Judges 1:19). The Christians go even a step

further into the wrong by claiming that Jesus Christ was God in the flesh. In this case, “God” is subject to all the physical limitations of man. In his book, *What is His Name*, Deedat tells us about *Atnatu*, the name of God used by the Australian aborigines. He says:

The aborigine of South Australia calls his God *Atnatu* because some philosopher, poet or prophet had programmed him, that the Father in Heaven is absolutely free from all needs; He is independent; He needs no food nor drink. This quality, in his primitive, uninhibited language, he conversely named *Atnatu*, which literally meant “the One without an anus - the One without any flaw” - i.e. the One from Whom no impurity flows or emanates. When I started sharing this novel idea with Hindu, Muslim and Christian friends, without exception, their immediate reaction was one of mirth, they giggled and laughed. Most of them not realising that the joke was on them. The boot was on the other foot. Though the word “anus” is a very small word, only four letters in English, most people have not heard it. One is forced to use the colloquial substitute which I hesitate to reproduce here, nor will I use the same in public meetings because of people’s hypersensitivity - because in the words of Abdullah Yusuf Ali, people “had perverted their language once beautiful, into jargons of empty elegance and unmeaning futility.”

Christians may object to you and say that the Qur’an is guilty of similar depictions of God. Allah tells us: The “Hand” of God is over their hands (Qur’an 48:10). The heavens will be rolled up in His right Hand (Qur’an 39:67). These verses, however, are obviously meant to be symbolical whereas the Bible descriptions of God reveal a gross anthropomorphism. The “right hand” is a symbol of God’s absolute power over His creation.

Remember Psalm 20:6? David was told: “Now know I that the Lord saveth his anointed; he will hear him from his holy heaven with the saving *strength of his right hand*.” The Arabic and Hebrew words for “right hand” are identical (*yameen*).

Deedat then concludes, “This primitive man is higher in his concept of God Almighty than the millions of civilized men and women, of both East and West who strut the world today!” Again, God is He from whom “no impurity flows or emanates.” Allah tells us in the Qur’an quite unequivocally: “Say: ‘Shall I take for my protector any other than Allah, the Maker of the heavens and the earth? *And He it is that feedeth but is not fed*’” (Quran 6:14); “Christ the son of Mary was no more than a messenger; many were the messengers that passed away before him. His mother was a woman of truth. *They had both to eat their daily food*. See how Allah doth make His signs clear to them; yet see in what ways they are deluded away from the truth” (Qur’an 5:75)! In other words, neither Jesus nor Mary is God.

God must enjoin morality

If the Bible is the Word of a Holy and moral God, then *it* must be Holy and moral as well. As Geisler and Saleeb have said, “Salt water does not flow from a fresh stream.” While the Qur’an tells us that God never commands what is shameful or immoral (Qur’an 7:28), the Bible relates the following:

- a) Genesis 19:30-38: The Prophet Lot fornicates with his two daughters after the latter get him drunk.

The firstborn bore a son, Moab, forefather of the Moabites while the younger bore a son called Ben-Ammi, forefather of the Ammonites. In verse 31, we are told: “Now the firstborn said to the younger, ‘Our father is old and *there is no man on the earth to come in to us* as is the custom of all the earth.’” Apparently, the whole

world had been destroyed by God and not just the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. Obviously, Islam rejects this story as a corruption of the Torah. Such inordinate slandering of prophets has caused the wrath of Allah to descend upon the Children of Israel from time to time and instead of looking inward at their own faults, they point their fingers outward and expect sympathy from the world. One tidbit: The most respected of the pre-Islamic pagan deities was *Hubal*, a god of the ancient Moabites.

- b) Genesis 24:2,9: “So Abraham said to the oldest servant of his house, who ruled over all that he had, ‘Please, *put your hand under my thigh*’...So the servant put his hand under the thigh of Abraham his master, and swore to him concerning this matter.”

Hand under his thigh? What’s under there? Is he swearing by the “seed” of Abraham?

- c) Genesis 38:8-10: “Onanism” invented. - “And Judah said to Onan, ‘Go in to your brother’s wife and marry her, and raise up an heir to your brother.’ But Onan knew that the heir would not be his; and it came to pass, when he went in to his brother’s wife, *that he emitted on the ground*, lest he should give an heir to his brother. And the thing which he did displeased the Lord; therefore He killed him also.”

This event describes the “spiciest piece of pornography” in all of the Christian Bible according to Ahmad Deedat. Onan, the son of Judah, decided to let his seed fall to the ground in a practice known as “onanism,” or *coitus interruptus*. Why is this lewdness in the “Book of God?”

- d) Genesis 38:15-30: Judah commits adultery with Tamar, his daughter-in-law by the roadside thinking

her to be a harlot and she conceives by him. Judah becomes so enraged that he demands that she be burned. Meanwhile, she has twins named Perez and Zerah.

“God” decided to honor such a man by calling His chosen people, the Jews, after his name, Judah! Even more astonishing is the fact that He allowed these children of adultery and incest to find their way into the genealogy of Jesus, His “only begotten Son!” – A man who in reality had *no genealogy*. Matthew 1:1-3 tells us: “The book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham: Abraham begot Isaac, Isaac begot Jacob, and Jacob begot Judah and his brothers. *Judah begot Perez and Zerah by Tamar...*”

- e) I Samuel 18:25-27: David gives King Saul “two hundred foreskins” of the Philistines as dowry to marry his daughter.
- f) Ezekiel 23:12-20: The whoredoms of Aholah and her sister Aholibah. – “She lusted for the neighboring Assyrians, captains and rulers, clothed more gorgeously, horsemen riding on horses, all of them desirable young men...As soon as her eyes saw them, she lusted for them and sent messengers to them in Chaldea...Yet she multiplied her harlotry in calling to remembrance the days of her youth, when she had played the harlot in the land of Egypt. *For she lusted for her paramours, whose flesh is like the flesh of donkeys, and whose issue is like the issue of horses.*”

I’m guessing that they left this story, especially verse 20, out of the Children’s Bible. If this verse were to be translated into modern everyday English, it would receive a triple-X rating from the censors. Yet it is the Word of God?

g) Mark 14:50-52: Has anybody seen a naked boy running around? Who is this young man and why is he following Jesus? - “Then they all forsook him and fled (This was during the garden scene). Now a certain young man followed him, having a linen cloth thrown around his naked body. And the young men laid hold of him, and he left the linen cloth *and fled from them naked.*” I don’t remember seeing this in *The Passion of the Christ*.

Other dishonorable mentions of incest, pornography, and rape: Genesis 9:21; Leviticus 18:8-18, 20:11-14, 17-21; I Samuel 19:24; II Samuel 6:20, 13:14, 16:22; Isaiah 20:3-4.

God’s Love and Holiness

Allah says in the Qur’an: “Allah loveth not those that do wrong” (Qur’an 3:140). Christians exploit this idea by claiming that Allah only loves those who follow his laws and commandments. First of all, *never* does Allah say that He hates or abhors anyone like the Bible does: “*Thou hatest* all workers of iniquity...the Lord will *abhor* the bloody and deceitful man (Psalm 5:5-6);” “Thou lovest righteousness, and *hatest wickedness...*” (Psalm 45:7). He simply states that He “doesn’t love them.” There is a difference. Secondly, God’s Love is open to all, but we must reciprocate that love. Would it be the attribute of a Just and Holy God to love those who do wrong by openly declaring war on Him by creating tumult and oppression in the land? But this doesn’t mean that Allah doesn’t want them to be guided. Nor does it mean that Allah will not show Mercy and favor to them while living in the earth. It would certainly *appear* as if those who live in places like Iraq, Afghanistan, and Palestine are hated by God while the Americans and British are loved. But this is an extremely simplistic view of things. Trial and tribulation come to all of us,

some more than others according to Allah's Will – “If a wound hath touched you, be sure a similar wound hath touched the others. Such days of varying fortunes We give to men and men by turns: that Allah may know those that believe” (Qur'an 3:140). He reveals through our Beloved Prophet: “Say: ‘If ye do love Allah, Follow me: Allah will love you and forgive you your sins: For Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful’” (Qur'an 3:31). Unlike us human beings who hold grudges against each other for years, Allah immediately sends His divine Love to anyone who returns to Him. Christians claim that God only hates the sin and not the sinner (this contradicts Psalm 5:5-6). The blood-curdling violence found within the pages of the Bible as examined in Chapter 7 is enough evidence for me to reject this delusion. Ask your Christian friend, “If God loves all regardless of behavior, then why do you believe that God will put people He loves into Hell one day?” That's like an abusive husband telling his wife, “I do this because I love you” just before clenching his fist!

Christians will also claim that only God's Wrath and not His Love is mentioned in the Qur'an. Here's something interesting: The word “sword” does not appear even once in the entire Qur'an while it appears 424 times in the Bible! – over 100 more than the occurrence of the word “love!” Allah tells us...

- “But ask forgiveness of your Lord, and turn unto Him in repentance: For my Lord is indeed full of mercy and loving-kindness.” – Qur'an 11:90.
- “And He is the Oft-Forgiving, All-Loving.” – Qur'an 85:14.
- “...for Allah loveth those who do good.” – Qur'an 2:195; 3:134, 148; 5:93.

- “For Allah loves those who turn to Him constantly and He loves those who keep themselves pure and clean.” – Qur’an 2:222; 9:108.
- “Those that keep their plighted faith and act aright, verily Allah loves those who act aright.” – Qur’an 3:76.
- “Allah loves those who are firm and steadfast.” – Qur’an 3:146.
- “Then, when thou hast taken a decision put thy trust in Allah. For Allah loves those who put their trust in Him.” – Qur’an 3:159.
- “...for Allah loveth those who are kind.” – Qur’an 5:13.
- “For Allah loveth those who judge in equity.” – Qur’an 5:42; 49:9; 60:8.
- “O ye who believe! If any from among you turn back from his Faith, soon will Allah produce a people whom He will love as they will love Him.” – Qur’an 5:54.
- “...for Allah loveth the righteous.” – Qur’an 9:4, 7.
- “Truly Allah loves those who fight in His Cause in battle array, as if they were a solid cemented structure.” – Qur’an 61:4.

Does Allah lead men into evil? Christian apologists claim that they have found some twenty verses in the Qur’an where this is stated. For example, we are told: “Verily We have set veils over their hearts lest they should understand this, and over their ears,

deafness, if thou callest them to guidance, even then will they never accept guidance” (Qur’an 18:57). Christians then conclude that since Allah is the One responsible for bringing about evil, He must *be* evil. Ask your Christian friend if he believes that there is evil in the world or not. He will have to admit there is. Then ask him, “If God has *nothing* to do with evil as you say, then why do evil people commit evil acts?” Did Satan create evil? If so, then Satan possesses the creative attribute of God. Let’s educate our Christian brethren.

Allah created evil by way of trial and measured it out into the world. It is solely our free will, however, that chooses to engage in it or not. Why does Allah “set veils over the hearts” of people? Let’s read the preceding sentence in 18:57 cited above: “And who doth more wrong than one who is reminded of the Signs of his Lord, *but turns away from them, forgetting the (deeds) which his hands have sent forth?*” He does this because human beings have willfully disobeyed his call to righteousness. He tells us: “Whatever good, (O man!) happens to thee, is from Allah; but whatever evil happens to thee, *is from thy own soul*. And We have sent thee as a messenger to instruct mankind. And enough is Allah for a witness” (Qur’an 4:79). Notice the phrase “lest they should understand this” in 18:57. Christians charge Allah with being unjust because He refuses to let certain people grasp His message. Listen to what Jesus told his disciples as recorded in Mark 4:11-12: “And he said unto them, Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all [these] things are done in parables: That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; *lest at any time they should be converted*, and [their] sins should be forgiven them.” Why wouldn’t Jesus want certain people to be converted and saved? – Why? Because they are in open rebellion against God so He sealed their hearing, their sight, and their hearts. In other words, it has been made very clear

that they are never going to believe. Remember that Allah is *Ad-Darr* (The *Creator* of harm) but also *Al-Barr* (The *Doer* of good).

Rhodes cites a verse which reads: “God hath power over all things” (Qur’an 3:165) as proof that Allah engages in evil. But doesn’t God have power over all things in Christianity? If not, then He is no God at all! This refrain appears just 139 verses prior to 3:165 as: “Verily, over all things Thou hast power” (Qur’an 3:26). But let’s look at the preceding sentence: “In Thy hand (O Allah) is *all good*” – and no evil. Allah has given *insan* (the human being) the inexorable responsibility of enjoining peace, harmony, and tolerance in the world. If we fail or fall short, however, we have only ourselves to blame.

In II Samuel 24:1 we read: “And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and *he moved David* against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah.” However in I Chronicles 21:1 we are told: “And *Satan* stood up against Israel, and *provoked David* to number Israel.” Are God and Satan synonymous in Christianity? In order to reconcile this troubling contradiction, Christian apologists have said that since everything in existence is done according to God’s Will, it doesn’t make a difference whether we say that God or Satan did something! This solution overlooks the fact that Satan is evil, but God is not. By this logic, we can say that God is responsible for the attacks on the World Trade Center and not the terrorists. We can also say that it was God’s fault that Hitler incinerated those 6,000,000 Jews during the Holocaust. The Qur’an teaches us that the Prophet Job cried out to his Lord: “The *Evil One* has afflicted me with distress and suffering” (Qur’an 38:41). Sure Allah knew what was going on, but He cannot be blamed for afflicting evil against Job. The Biblical telling of the story is somewhat similar except for the fact that God and Satan make a friendly *bet* as to whether Job will ever curse his maker (Job 2:5). The

Qur'an, however, tells us that Satan is our avowed enemy and that we must treat him as such (35:5-6). The Christian claim that God has nothing to do with evil is further proven to be false by the Bible itself: "I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and *create evil*: I the Lord do all these things" (Isaiah 45:7).

Rhodes claims: "It is not surprising to learn that there is no suggestion in the Qur'an that Allah is holy" (page 102). However six pages earlier, on page 96, he cites chapter 59 verse 23 which reads: "Allah is He, there is no other god - the Sovereign, *the Holy One (al-Quddus)*, the Source of Peace..." Strange!

The Concept of God

Remember that in *principle* we all worship the same God. There is only one God. Unfortunately the Christian's *concept* of God as a triune deity severely hinders him from an active pursuit of ultimate truth. Furthermore, the warm and squishy feeling that all his past and future sins are forgiven him renders the life of the present completely arbitrary and devoid of meaning. This leads many Christians to irresponsible actions. In your conversations with them, you will not fail to hear about how God Himself comes to them in the night and speaks unto them saying, "My Son..." and so on. When Jesus was being baptized in the Jordan River God addressed him in the third person saying, "This is My Son," yet any Tom, Dick, and Harry within the fold of Christendom has nightly intimate conversations with the Almighty – In the first person! Now they may very well be talking to someone, but that someone is not God. Allah tells us: "Both the Jews and the Christians say: 'We are sons of Allah, and his beloved.' Say: 'Why then doth He punish you for your sins? Nay, ye are but men - of the men he hath created'" (Qur'an 5:118).

In contrast to the Christian conception of God as One who grows tired and requires rest, Allah reveals: "Allah! There is no god but He - the Living, the Self-

subsisting, Eternal. No slumber can seize Him nor sleep” (Qur’an 2:255). In contrast to the Christian conception of God as One who walks, resides in clouds or in the Temple of Solomon, the Qur’an tells us that He is outside of time and space, yet present everywhere (omnipresent): “To Allah belong the east and the West: Whithersoever ye turn, there is the presence of Allah. For Allah is all-Pervading, all-Knowing” (Qur’an 2:115). In contrast to the Christian conception of God as One who repents due to the discovery of future events, the Qur’an states: “He knoweth what (appeareth to His creatures as) before or after or behind them. Nor shall they compass anything of His knowledge except as He willeth” (Qur’an 2:255); “With Him are the keys of the unseen, the treasures that none knoweth but He. He knoweth whatever there is on the earth and in the sea. Not a leaf doth fall but with His knowledge: there is not a grain in the darkness or depths of the earth, nor anything fresh or dry green or withered, but is inscribed in a record clear to those who can read” (Qur’an 6:59). Even the book of Numbers tells us: “God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, *that he should repent*” (Numbers 23:19). In contrast to the Christian conception of God as a “Jealous God of Israel,” the Qur’an tells us in the very first chapter: “Praise be to Allah, the Cherisher and Sustainer of the *worlds*” (Qur’an 1:2). In contrast to the Christian conception of God as One who deceives (Jeremiah 20:7), the Qur’an teaches us that deception comes only from the chief deceiver (*al Gharoor*), Satan: “O mankind! Certainly the promise of Allah is true. Let not then this present life deceive you, nor let the Chief Deceiver deceive you about Allah” (Qur’an 35:5). Finally, in contrast to the Christian conception of God as One who “cannot do” certain things, the Qur’an states: “For thy Lord - He is the Strong One, and able to enforce His Will” (Qur’an 11:66). Allah is wholly omnipotent. Rhodes compromises this divine attribute when he says:

“Though God revealed Himself in mighty acts in human history, the *only way* for Him to be *able* to fully do and say all that He wanted was to actually leave His eternal residence and enter the arena of humanity” (page 112). Obviously, he is speaking of Jesus. But didn’t Jesus say, “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now” (John 16:12)? Apparently, despite God leaving His eternal residence in heaven, the mission remains unaccomplished.

Break things down for the Christian so that he can see for himself the sheer folly of his conception of God. A Christian once asked me, “Do you actually believe that God waited 600 years after Jesus to send an Arab Prophet with His final and complete revelation?” I responded, “Of course! Now I have a question for you: Do you actually believe that God decided to contradict everything He taught the Jews in the Old Testament by becoming a Jewish man?” He stuttered, “Ye-es.” I continued, “Do you also believe that God told God to tell His mother that she was going to give birth...to God?”

God’s Mercy – A defining attribute

Christians criticize our theology and say that in Islam, God is viewed as someone who is utterly transcendent and totally inaccessible while the God of the Bible is intimate and personal. They claim that there can be no personal fellowship with the God of the Qur’an in any way. They further claim that the primary attributes of Allah are transcendence and sovereignty while the Christian God is Holy and Loving. It is true that Allah is completely transcendent, the Qur’an says: “Glory to Allah, the Lord of the Throne: High is He above what they attribute to Him” (Qur’an 21:22). But is He inaccessible? Certainly not. The Prophet told us to “worship God as though you see Him, and if you cannot see Him then know that He sees you.” We can gain access unto the Creator of the universe by simply calling

upon Him with sincerity. We need no priestly, prophetic, or saintly intermediary to help us attain this. We as Muslims come into direct contact with Allah in our daily prayers. In this sense, not only is Allah wholly transcendent but also wholly *immanent*, present and active in His creation. Allah tells us in the Qur'an: "It was We Who created man, and We know what dark suggestions his soul makes to him: for *We are nearer to him than his jugular vein*" (Qur'an 50:16); "When My servants ask thee concerning Me, *I am indeed close to them*: I listen to the prayer of every suppliant when he calleth on Me: Let them also, with a will, Listen to My call, and believe in Me: That they may walk in the right way" (Qur'an 2:186); "Know that Allah cometh in between a man and his heart" (Qur'an 8:24).

Out of the 114 chapters in the Holy Qur'an, 113 of them begin with the words: "In the name of Allah, Most Gracious, Most Merciful." These are the dominating attributes of the God of Islam, Mercy and Grace. An elementary reading of the Qur'an will tell you at least this much (See Chapter 3 for the key to salvation). – "Your Lord hath inscribed for Himself the rule of Mercy" (Qur'an 6:54).

The 99 Exalted Names of Allah:

1. *Ar-Rahman*: The All-Compassionate
3. *Al-Malik*: The Absolute Ruler
5. *As-Salam*: The Source of Peace
7. *Al-Muhamyin*: The Guardian
9. *Al-Jabbar*: The Compelling
11. *Al-Khaliq*: The Creator
13. *Al-Musawwir*: The Shaper of Beauty
15. *Al-Qahhar*: The Subduing
17. *Ar-Razzaq*: The Sustainer
19. *Al-'Alim*: The All-Knowing
21. *Al-Basit*: The Reliever
23. *Ar-Rafi'*: The Exalter
25. *Al-Mudhill*: The Humiliating
27. *Al-Basir*: The Seer of All
29. *Al-'Adl*: The Just
31. *Al-Khabir*: The All-Aware
33. *Al-'Azim*: The Magnificent
35. *Ash-Shakur*: The Rewarder
37. *Al-Kabir*: The Greatest
39. *Al-Muqit*: The Nourishing
41. *Al-Jalil*: The Mighty
43. *Ar-Raqib*: The Watchful
45. *Al-Wasi'*: The All-Comprehending
47. *Al-Wadud*: The Loving
49. *Al-Ba'ith*: The One who Resurrects
51. *Al-Haqq*: The Truth
53. *Al-Qawi*: The Possessor of All Strength
55. *Al-Wali*: The Governor
57. *Al-Muhsi*: The Appraiser
59. *Al-Mu'id*: The Restorer
61. *Al-Mumit*: The Taker of Life
63. *Al-Qayyum*: The Self-Existing
65. *Al-Majid*: The Glorious
67. *Al-Ahad*: The One
69. *Al-Qadir*: The All Powerful
71. *Al-Muqaddim*: The Expediter
73. *Al-Awwal*: The First
75. *Az-Zahir*: The Manifest
77. *Al-Wali*: The Protecting Friend
79. *Al-Barr*: The Doer of Good
81. *Al-Muntaqim*: The Avenger
83. *Ar-Ra'uf*: The Clement
85. *Dhul-Jalali Wal-Ikram*: The Majesty
87. *Al-Jami*: The Gatherer
89. *Al-Mughni*: The Enriching
91. *Ad-Darr*: The Creator of The Harmful
93. *An-Nur*: The Light
95. *Al-Badi*: The Originator
97. *Al-Warith*: The Inheritor of All
99. *As-Sabur*: The Patient
2. *Ar-Rahim*: The All-Merciful
4. *Al-Quddus*: The Pure & Holy
6. *Al-Mu'min*: The Faithful
8. *Al-'Aziz*: The Victorious
10. *Al-Mutakabbir*: The Greatest
12. *Al-Bari'*: The Maker of Order
14. *Al-Ghaffar*: The Forgiving
16. *Al-Wahhab*: The Giver of All
18. *Al-Fattah*: The Opener
20. *Al-Qabid*: The Constrictor
22. *Al-Khafid*: The Abaser
24. *Al-Mu'izz*: The Bestower
26. *As-Sami*: The Hearer of All
28. *Al-Hakam*: The Judge
30. *Al-Latif*: The Subtle
32. *Al-Halim*: The Forbearing
34. *Al-Ghafur*: The Forgiver
36. *Al-'Ali*: The Highest
38. *Al-Hafiz*: The Preserver
40. *Al-Hasib*: The Accounter
42. *Al-Karim*: The Generous
44. *Al-Mujib*: The Responder
46. *Al-Hakim*: The Perfectly Wise
48. *Al-Majid*: The Majestic
50. *Ash-Shahid*: The Witness
52. *Al-Wakil*: The Trustee
54. *Al-Matin*: The Forceful
56. *Al-Hamid*: The Praised
58. *Al-Mubdi*: The Originator
60. *Al-Muhyi*: The Giver of Life
62. *Al-Hayy*: The Ever Living
64. *Al-Wajid*: The Finder
66. *Al-Wahid*: The Only One
68. *As-Samad*: The Satisfier
70. *Al-Muqtadir*: The Power
72. *Al-Mu'akkhkir*: The Delayer
74. *Al-Akhir*: The Last
76. *Al-Batin*: The Hidden
78. *Al-Muta'ali*: The Supreme
80. *At-Tawwib*: The Guide to Repentance
82. *Al-Afu*: The Forgiver
84. *Malik al-Mulk*: The Owner
86. *Al-Muqsit*: The Equitable
88. *Al-Ghani*: The Rich
90. *Al-Mani'*: The Preventer
92. *An-Nafi*: The Creator of Good
94. *Al-Hadi*: The Guide
96. *Al-Baqi*: The Everlasting
98. *Ar-Rashid*: The Righteous Teacher

through a mosque where they see Muslim men in prostration. Here is a reproduction of the dialogue:

Son: What are they doing daddy?

Father: They're praying to their moon god, son.

Muslim man (while prostrating): Moon god?...You wait!

Father: Me?

Muslim: Yes I heard what you said you infidel. The Holy Qur'an says that I could kill you for saying that.

This tract was actually handed to me on the street one night while I was walking in downtown San Luis Obispo, California. A few weeks later, a Muslim brother and I saw a stack of them on the Christian student propagation table in the university quad. We asked kindly that it be removed since it was not only wrong and misleading but also full of hatred. The young man at the table, noticing our earnestness, responded, "We will pray about that tonight." I answered, "If I see this tract here next week I will take that as a challenge to debate me in the university auditorium." A week later, the tract was gone.

Defending the Qur'an

The below four verses from the Holy Qur'an are very often abused by Christian apologists in their efforts to discredit Islam. It is very important that we understand that, unlike the Bible, every single verse in the Qur'an has a context that cannot be detached from it. We must look at what went before and after and why. On the surface, it appears as if the Qur'an is saying that 1) Men can beat their wives. 2) Men are superior to women. 3) Muslims must kill all infidels. 4) Muslims cannot make friends with unbelievers. Let's examine the true significance of these statements.

- a) Qur'an 4:34: "...As to those women on whose part ye fear disloyalty and ill-conduct, admonish them first, next, refuse to share their beds, and last beat them (lightly); but if they return to obedience, seek not against them means (of annoyance): For Allah is Most High, great above you all."

Notice first that there is a step by step process here. Does this mean that we can put on our boxing gloves and tee-off on our wives like "Moody" does in the pitiful movie *Not Without my Daughter*? Obviously, many Muslim men have completely failed in their implementation of this verse. In order to obtain the correct meaning, we must seek out the "walking Qur'an," our shining guide and example Muhammad *al-Mustafa*. Did the Prophet ever beat his wives? Never! In fact, he said that the worst among his nation are those who physically abuse their women. He also said, "The best of you are those who are kind to their wives, as I am kind to mine." He (upon whom be peace) actually demonstrated for his beloved companions what Allah meant when He said, "beat them." The Prophet took a *miswak*, or toothbrush, and began lightly tapping the back on his own hand. The companions were confused since this was hardly a form of punishment. By doing this, he intended to stress that this was to be a non-verbal method for a husband to get his wife's attention. No mark was allowed on her body and she should feel no pain. This is how God's Messenger, the best example of conduct (Qur'an 33:21; 68:4) interpreted the verse. And Allah tells us: "Those who listen to the Word, and *follow the best meaning in it*: those are the ones whom Allah has guided, and those are the ones endued with understanding" (Qur'an 39:18).

- b) Qur'an 2:228: "...And women shall have rights similar to the rights against them, according to what

is equitable; but men have a degree (of advantage) over them. And Allah is Exalted in Power, Wise.”

Why do men have an “advantage” or “degree” (*darajat*) over women? Because we are better? *Ibn Abbas* (may Allah be pleased with him) said that this verse means that men are *required* to fulfill all of their rights towards women while women are pardoned if they cannot fulfill all of theirs toward men. This is because women must often deal with additional and unforeseen circumstances arising from children, monthly courses, etc. In this sense, women are actually at an advantage over men! Other commentators believe that the advantage spoken of by Allah has to do with man’s *physical* strength over women, in general. Allah tells us: “Men are the protectors and maintainers of women, *because Allah has given the one more strength*” (Qur’an 4:34).

To make it crystal clear that women are equal to men, Allah mentions them distinctively: “For Muslim *men and women*, for believing *men and women*, for devout *men and women*, for true *men and women*, for *men and women* who are patient and constant, for *men and women* who humble themselves, for *men and women* who give in charity, for *men and women* who fast and deny themselves, for *men and women* who guard their chastity, and for *men and women* who engage much in Allah’s praise, - for them has Allah prepared forgiveness and great reward” (Qur’an 33:35).

c) Qur’an 4:91: “...seize them and slay them (the unbelievers) wherever ye get them: In their case We have provided you with a clear argument against them.”

Here we must remember the context of the verse. It was revealed during a wartime situation in Medina in which the Muslims were being besieged and

attacked. Actually, the first part of the verse reads: “If they withdraw not from you nor give you guarantees of peace besides restraining their hands...” Thus there is a condition that must be present in order for the Muslims to engage in fighting for purposes of *self-defense*. Allah also says: “But if the enemy incline towards peace, do thou also incline towards peace, and trust in Allah: for He is One that heareth and knoweth all things” (Qur’an 8:61).

- d) Qur’an 3:28: “Let not the believers take for friends or helpers unbelievers rather than believers: if any do that, in nothing will there be help from Allah.”

Many Christians (and Muslims!) use this verse to prove why Muslims are forbidden to be friends with the “heathen.” The Arabic word for “friends or helpers” here is simply *owliya*, plural of *wali*. This is a word that essentially means “protector.” For example, Allah is *al-Wali*, the Protector of the faithful. When a woman is getting married, she is represented by her *wali*, protector. Allah is simply telling us that *we* need to look out for one another! We shouldn’t have to depend on anyone else to defend or protect us. This is true with all other religions and cultures, all over the world. We often wonder why “Allah” allows our women and children to be raped and killed in Kosovo, Chechnya, Kashmir, Palestine, Iraq, etc. The real question is, how can *we* allow this to happen? Allah tells us plainly: “Allah does not change a people’s lot unless they change what is in their hearts” (Qur’an 13:11).

It should also be noted that Muslim men are allowed to marry Jewish and Christian women. If Muslims are forbidden to be friends with the “unbelievers,” as Christians claim, then it would certainly seem contradictory for a Muslim man to love and marry a non-Muslim woman and trust his wife to raise his children.

Answering the Critics

We believe that the Qur'an is errorless and eternal, possesses a unique and inimitable literary style, perfectly preserved, contains fulfilled prophecies, totally unified and consistent within itself, scientifically accurate, the final revelation to humankind, and a direct result of billions of changed lives. Geisler and Saleeb quote Muslim author Ajijola: "The Qur'an effected a transformation of humanity from the lowest depth of degradation to the highest pinnacle of civilization within an incredibly short time where centuries of reformation work had proved fruitless" (page 186). To our critics, I will simply quote Allah's Word: "A Revelation from the Lord of the Worlds. Is it such a Message that ye would hold in light esteem? And have ye made it your livelihood that ye should declare it false" (Qur'an 56:80-82)?

Unique Style

Regarding the unique style of the Qur'an, Gesiler quotes an Iranian Shia scholar Ali Dashti who points out that the Qur'an possesses numerous grammatical irregularities as well as cites Anis A. Shorosh as someone who has listed other literary flaws. First of all, the Shia position is very much a minority opinion in the fold of the global Islamic community. Books such as *Answering Islam* and *Reasoning from the scriptures with Muslims* try to present and critically examine the Islamic tradition as it is believed and practiced by the *orthodox* schools of thought. Therefore, Dashti's conclusions are of no value in this context. Would it be accurate for me to say that Christians believe in a supplement text called the *Book of Mormon* as authoritative alongside the Bible? According to Geisler (page 194), the Shia also believe that the Caliph Uthman intentionally eliminated many verses from the Qur'an that spoke of 'Ali. Sunni (orthodox) Islam abhors

such a claim. Secondly, what Geisler does not mention is the fact that Shorrosh is actually a Christian Arab! In a debate against Jamal Badawi, Shorrosh, after mouthing-off some apparent grammatical errors in the Qur'an, quickly blurted, "I never said that I was a scholar of the Arabic language!" when his aberrations were proven false by the Muslims in the audience. For instance, he had tried to convince the Muslims that the words *Kun faya kun* in 3:47 and 19:35 correctly translated "Be and it is," should have been *Kun fa-kan*. This latter rendering, however, is the *past tense* "Be and it was." This is not what the original Arabic says!

Regarding uniqueness, Armstrong says: "Even those Qurayshis who refused to accept Islam were disturbed by the Koran and found that it lay outside all their familiar categories: it was nothing like the inspiration of the *kahin* or the poet; nor was it like the incantations of a magician. Some stories show how powerful Qurayshis who remained steadfastly with the opposition being visibly shaken when they listened to a sura (chapter). It is as though Muhammad had created an entirely new literary form that some people were not ready for but which thrilled others."

Illiteracy?

Christians have also at times questioned the illiteracy of the Prophet. Geisler says, "It is questionable whether Muhammad was actually illiterate. As one authority notes, the Arabic words *al ummi*, translated 'the unlettered' prophet in the Qur'an (7:157), may be [rendered] gentile rather than illiterate...Indeed, this is how the term is rendered in 62:2." In the three most widely circulated and read translations of the Qur'an, 'Ali, Pickthal, and Shakir, the word *ummi* is *never* rendered "gentile," although Muhammad *was* a gentile. The reason why Geisler has chosen not to divulge his "authority" is because this is how *Rashad Khalifa* has translated this verse. Khalifa (now deceased) was a man

who claimed to be the Messenger of the Covenant foretold in the book of Malachi and in the Qur'an 3:81 – He was not a Muslim! If Muhammad was indeed able to read and write, it is truly inconceivable that he managed to conceal this ability from his immediate family, countless enemies, and thousands of beloved companions throughout his entire life. Also, unlike Jesus, we have a detailed biography of the Prophet that is consistent with the claim that he had absolutely no schooling.

Perfectly Preserved

The preservation of the Qur'an is also an issue that requires clarification. It is in the Sunni tradition that the entire Qur'an was written down during the lifetime of the Prophet. Verses were penned on paper, stones, palm leaves, ribs, shoulder blades, and sheets of leather. There was actually a group of scribes called *As-habbus-suffah* whose sole purpose was to record the divine revelations as Muhammad uttered them. We also believe that the Prophet recited the entire Qur'an once a year to Gabriel and twice in his final year to ensure accuracy. Even with this said, there were hundreds of disciples that had the entire revelation committed to memory (*hufaz*) as there are thousands today ranging from age five to eighty-five. After the Prophet's demise, Abu Bakr and 'Umar noticed that many of the hufaz were being killed in the various ensuing battles and conflicts. They called for Zayd Ibn Thabit, the chief scribe of the Prophet, and told him to gather the various parts of the Qur'an that were written. They then instructed Zayd to find two witnesses *for each verse* who were present at the very time that it was revealed to the Prophet. Make it clear to your Christian friend that this wasn't even necessary. The Qur'an was already preserved in the hearts and minds of countless men and women, in writing, and attested to by the Prophet himself.

The Qur'an was then codified as a single book and distributed among different Arab communities. The problem, however, was that it was written in shorthand. By the time Uthman became Caliph, he had learned that many believing non-Arab (*ajami*) communities that had obtained these copies were reciting the Qur'an incorrectly due to the lack of diacritical vowel notations. For instance, the word "bed" would appear in the text as "bd." Those who were not familiar with Arabic would either say "bad," "bud," "bod," or "bid." Therefore, Uthman called for Zayd to recollect all of the shorthand Qur'ans distributed by Abu Bakr and 'Umar and ordered them all burned. The subsequent Qur'an canonized by Uthman became the official text of the Muslim world. In short, the Qur'an revealed to the Prophet is exactly the same as the Qur'an today. Christians claim that Uthman made *textual* changes that were not in the original. Geisler says, "Some of the variations involve a whole clause and others omit complete sentences." If this were true then why didn't anyone among the thousands of *sahaba*, *hufaz*, *qari*'s, and *ulema*² at the time point out that Uthman had done this? The evidence does not support such a claim.

Fulfilled Prophecies

The Qur'an also contains prophecies that could not have been known by Muhammad. In 30:1-4 we read: "A. L. M. The Roman Empire has been defeated - In a land close by; but they, even after this defeat of theirs, will soon be victorious -Within a few years. With Allah is the decision, in the past and in the future: on that Day shall the believers rejoice." The Pagan Persian hordes defeated the Christian Byzantine Empire causing great joy among the Quraysh of Mecca. This battle took place in the year 615 CE. According to 'Ali, the Arabic words

² Companions, guardians (of the Qur'an), recitors, and scholars respectively.

rendered “a few years” means a time period between three to nine years. In 622 CE, the Romans under Heraclius mounted a counter-offensive which culminated in a shattering victory over the Persians at Issus in 624 CE, the very same day as the Battle of Badr - nine years later. This is a very clear and concise prophecy that found its fulfillment during the life of the Muslims who first witnessed its revelation. Compare this to the convoluted so-called prophecies of the Bible that Christians point out predict the rise and fall of Soviet Russia, the creation of the state of Israel, and formation of the European Union.

Allah also tells His Prophet: “Verily He Who ordained the Qur’an for thee, will bring thee back to the Place of Return (Mecca)” (Qur’an 28:85). This prophecy was revealed in 623 CE at a place called Juhfa during the Hijrah and fulfilled in the year 8 AH (631 CE) during the Conquest of Mecca.

Other prophecies include the victory at Badr (8:7), the life-long rejection of Truth by Abu Lahab and his wife (sura 111), the Farewell Pilgrimage (48:27), the growth and ultimate triumph of Islam (61:9; 9:33; 48:28), and the Christian’s mutual hatred of each other until the Day of Judgment (5:14).

Unity of the Qur’an

Geisler says, “Both the Jewish Bible and New Testament, known through existing manuscripts, are at least as equally self-consistent as the Qur’an.” This is where we must draw the line. Whereas in the Qur’an there are no contradictions, the Bible is riddled with them. Allah tells us: “Allah has revealed from time to time the most beautiful Message in the form of a Book, *consistent with itself*, yet repeating its teaching in various aspects” (Qur’an 39:23). Now examine the following Biblical contradictions: II Samuel 24:1 & I Chronicles 21:1; II Samuel 24:13 & I Chronicles 21:11; II Chronicles 36:9 & II Kings 24:8; II Samuel 10:18 & I

Chronicles 19:18; II Chronicles 9:25 & I Kings 4:26. In his book *Is the Bible God's Word?*, Ahmad Deedat reproduces a page from Collins' Revised Standard Version of 1971 (pages 12-17). It says the following (emphasis mine):

GENESIS

AUTHOR: One of the "five books of Moses."

EXODUS

AUTHOR: *Generally* credited to Moses.

LEVITICUS

AUTHOR: *Generally* credited to Moses.

NUMBERS

AUTHOR: *Generally* credited to Moses.

DEUTERONOMY

AUTHOR: *Generally* credited to Moses.

JOSHUA

AUTHOR: *Major part* credited to Joshua.

JUDGES

AUTHOR: *Possibly* Samuel.

RUTH

AUTHOR: *Not definitely known*, perhaps Samuel.

FIRST SAMUEL

AUTHOR: *Unknown*.

SECOND SAMUEL

AUTHOR: *Unknown*

FIRST KINGS

AUTHOR: *Unknown*.

SECOND KINGS

AUTHOR: *Unknown*.

FIRST CHRONICLES

AUTHOR: *Unknown*, probably collected and edited by Ezra.

SECOND CHRONICLES

AUTHOR: *Likely* collected and edited by Ezra.

EZRA

AUTHOR: *Probably* written or edited by Ezra.

ESTHER

AUTHOR: *Unknown*.

JOB

AUTHOR: *Unknown*.

PSALMS

AUTHOR: *Principally* David, though there are other writers.

ECCLESIASTES

AUTHOR: *Doubtful*, but commonly assigned to Solomon.

ISAIAH

AUTHOR: *Mainly credited* to Isaiah. Parts may have been written by others

JONAH

AUTHOR: *Unknown*.

HABAKKUK

AUTHOR: *Nothing known* of the place or time of his birth.

Samuel possibly wrote Judges and perhaps wrote Ruth but not the two books that bear his own name? Ask your Christian friend, “If the authors of most of these books are ‘unknown,’ how can you possibly attribute them to God?”

Scientific proofs

Where ever Islam went, the sciences flourished. This is historical fact. Whereas in Christianity, science and religion are opposites and antagonists, Islam teaches us that scientific discovery can only strengthen our faith. Armstrong comments: “Muslims are not to abdicate their reason but to look at the world attentively and with curiosity. It was this attitude that later enabled Muslims to build a fine tradition of natural science, which has never been seen as such a danger to religion as in Christianity.” (page 143). History also teaches us that Islam was a direct cause of the European Age of Enlightenment and Renaissance. Although volumes can be written on this subject alone, I will just briefly mention what Allah has taught us in His Holy Word: Human embryonic development (23:12-14); mountains as pegs (78:6-7); the universe being like “smoke” (gas and dust) in the beginning (41:11); the Big Bang theory confirmed (21:30); the function of the prefrontal area of the brain (96:15-16); the partition between fresh and salt water (55:19-20; 25:53); the formation of waves (24:40); the formation of clouds (24:43); the circular orbiting of the moon and planets (36:38-40; 21:33); the origin of life from water (24:45). In the book *A Brief Illustrated Guide to Understanding Islam*, I.A. Ibrahim quotes the following scientists regarding Muhammad and the Qur’an...

- “You have someone illiterate making profound pronouncements and statements that are amazingly accurate about scientific nature. And I personally can’t see how this could be mere chance...I have no difficulty in my mind that this is a divine inspiration or revelation which led to these statements.” – Dr. T.V.N. Persaud, Professor of Anatomy, Pediatrics and Child Health, Obstetrics, Gynecology, and

Reproductive Sciences at the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada.

- “As a scientist, I can only deal with things which I can specifically see. I can understand embryology and developmental biology. I can understand the words that are translated to me from the Qur’an. As I gave the example before, if I were to transpose myself into that era, knowing what I knew today and describing things, I could not describe the things which were described. I see no evidence for the fact to refute the concept that this individual, Muhammad, had to be developing this information from some place.” – Dr E. Marshall Johnson, Professor Emeritus of Anatomy and Developmental Biology at Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- “I find it very interesting that this sort of information is in the ancient scriptures of the Holy Qur’an, and I have no way of knowing where they would come from, but I think it is extremely interesting that they are there and that this work is going on to discover it, the meaning of some of the passages.” – Dr. William W. Hay, Professor of Geological Sciences at the University of Colorado, Boulder.

In his famous book *The Bible, the Qur’an and Science*, Dr. Maurice Bucaille states: “The above observation (his own thesis) makes the hypothesis advanced by those who see Muhammad as the author of the Qur’an untenable. How could a man, from being illiterate, become the most important author, in terms of literary merits, in the whole of Arabic literature? How could he then pronounce truths of a scientific nature that no other human being could possibly have developed at that time, and all this without once making the slightest error in his pronouncement on the subject?” (page 125)?

Geisler and Saleeb end their various arguments by stating: 1) “Even if the Qur’an were the most eloquent book in Arabic, this would hardly prove it has divine authority. For the same could be argued for the most eloquent book in Hebrew or Greek or any other language.” 2) “Even if it were granted that Muhammad was illiterate, it does not follow logically that the Qur’an was dictated to him by God.” 3) “Even if the present Qur’an were a perfect word-for-word copy of the original as given by Muhammad, it would not prove the original was inspired by God.” 4) “Self-consistency is the same kind of argument others (like some Christians) use for their Holy Books that oppose the Qur’an on many things. Both cannot be true. Hence, unity in itself does not prove divine authenticity.” 5) “Even if perfect harmony could be demonstrated between the Qur’an and scientific fact, this would not prove the divine inspiration of the Qur’an. It would simply prove that the Qur’an made to scientific error.”

We would have to agree with the authors on these individual points. However, when *all five* assertions are correct simultaneously, we can *only* conclude without a shadow of doubt whatsoever that there is absolutely nothing on earth comparable to the Holy Qur’an and that such a Book could have only come from the One and Only True God.

Think about it! An illiterate man composes a literary masterpiece which is unsurpassed rhetorically and poetically, free from any contradictions and discrepancies, confirming modern 21st century science, containing fulfilled prophecies, and preserved without the change of a dot for over fourteen centuries. It’s time to recognize the Truth of Islam! Allah tells us: “Here are Signs *self-evident* in the hearts of those endowed with knowledge: and none but the unjust reject Our Signs” (Qur’an 29:49); “Say thou: ‘This is my way: I do invite unto Allah - on evidence *clear as the seeing with one’s eyes*’” (Qur’an 12:108).

I would like to end this chapter about Allah by quoting two of the most beautiful passages in all of the Holy Qur'an. – The verse of Light and the Verse of the Throne. How can the crude English language possibly do any justice to such words that cause the hearts of even the most obstinate and rigid of men to explode with love and awe?

“Allah is the Light of the heavens and the earth. The Parable of His Light is as if there were a Niche and within it a Lamp: the Lamp enclosed in Glass: the glass as it were a brilliant star: Lit from a blessed Tree, an Olive, neither of the east nor of the west, whose oil is well-nigh luminous, though fire scarce touched it: Light upon Light! Allah doth guide whom He will to His Light: Allah doth set forth Parables for men: and Allah doth know all things.” – Qur'an 24:35.

“Allah! There is no god but He,-the Living, the Self-subsisting, Eternal. No slumber can seize Him nor sleep. His are all things in the heavens and on earth. Who is there can intercede in His presence except as He permitteth? He knoweth what (appeareth to His creatures as) before or after or behind them. Nor shall they compass anything of His knowledge except as He willeth. His Throne doth extend over the heavens and the earth, and He feeleth no fatigue in guarding and preserving them for He is the Most High, the Supreme (in glory).” – Qur'an 2:255.

To my Muslim Brethren...

Allah the Majestic and Exalted has given you the privilege of being in His beloved community of believers enjoining the good and forbidding the wrong.

As my final words to you, my dear brothers and sisters, I would like to exhort you to stay upon the path of knowledge. The song says, “All the world needs is just a little love.” Love, however, rooted in ignorance is more detrimental to societies than hatred rooted in intelligence. An insightful man who displays hatred may easily see Truth when it is presented correctly, whereas a passionate, self-righteous ignoramus will always be exactly that, ignorant. Knowledge is the only path to true love.

May Allah accept all of our services in the path of Islam and increase our rewards hundreds of times over. May Allah forgive us our transgressions and make us of those who turn to Him with sincere repentance. May Allah shield from us the evil of Satan and the vices of arrogance, greed, jealousy, hatred, and ignorance. May Allah increase our understanding of His *deen*. May Allah wrap us with the mantle of Muhammad’s *sunnah*, upon whom be peace. May Allah unite the Muslim hearts around the world under the banner of peace. May Allah shower His peace and blessings upon the Messenger, and upon his family, companions, wives, and progeny. *Amen!*

Questions to ask your Christian Friends.

1. Did you know Muslims admit that Allah was worshipped by pre-Islamic Arabs as the “most High God?” In fact, Allah was worshipped by Jesus, Moses, and Abraham as well!
2. Can you show me one place in the Old Testament where it states that the name of God is “Yahweh?” Can you show me one place in the New Testament where it states that the name of God is “Jehovah?”
3. If the Bible is the Word of a moral and Holy God, then why are the pages of it drenched in rape,

pornography, incest, and murder almost from beginning to end?

4. If God has *nothing to do with evil*, then why is it present in the world? Can't you see that God created evil in order to test us as to whether we will engage in it or not? God, however, never engages in it according to Islam. Doesn't the fact that God and Satan working together against Job prove that the Biblical God *does* engage in evil?
5. Are you aware that God tells us in the Qur'an that He is "close to our hearts" (50:16; 2:186; 8:24). Can I tell you more about God's love?
6. Why does the Bible contradict itself in so many places? Can I show you a few? Now, let me tell you what the Qur'an says about contradictions.
7. Did you know that the Qur'an is completely unique in its style, perfectly preserved, totally unified, scientifically accurate, and contains fulfilled prophecies? Is your Bible like this? Let's talk about it.

Appendix A – Jesus in Islam: Selected Qur’an Verses

Jesus given Clear Signs and strength from the holy spirit (Gabriel)

“We gave Moses the Book and followed him up with a succession of messengers; We gave Jesus the son of Mary Clear Signs and strengthened him with the holy spirit. Is it that whenever there comes to you a messenger with what ye yourselves desire not, ye are puffed up with pride?- Some ye called impostors, and others ye slay” (2:87)!

“Those messengers We endowed with gifts, some above others: To one of them Allah spoke; others He raised to degrees (of honour); to Jesus the son of Mary We gave Clear Signs, and strengthened him with the holy spirit. If Allah had so willed, succeeding generations would not have fought among each other, after clear (Signs) had come to them, but they (chose) to wrangle, some believing and others rejecting. If Allah had so willed, they would not have fought each other; but Allah fulfilleth His plan” (2:253).

“When Jesus came with Clear Signs, he said: ‘Now have I come to you with Wisdom, and in order to make clear to you some of the (points) on which ye dispute: therefore fear Allah and obey me’” (43:63).

We believe in the True Gospel

“Say ye: ‘We believe in Allah, and the revelation given to us, and to Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, and the Tribes, and that given to Moses and Jesus, and that given to (all) prophets from their Lord: We make no difference

between one and another of them: And we bow to Allah (in Islam)''' (2:136).

“It is He Who sent down to thee (step by step), in truth, the Book, confirming what went before it; and He sent down the Law (of Moses) and the Gospel (of Jesus) before this, as a guide to mankind, and He sent down the criterion of judgment between right and wrong” (3:3).

“Say: ‘We believe in Allah, and in what has been revealed to us and what was revealed to Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, and the Tribes, and in (the Books) given to Moses, Jesus, and the prophets, from their Lord: We make no distinction between one and another among them, and to Allah do we bow our will (in Islam)''' (3:84).

Jesus and his disciples were Muslim

“When Jesus found Unbelief on their part He said: ‘Who will be My helpers to (the work of) Allah?’ Said the disciples: ‘We are Allah's helpers: We believe in Allah, and do thou bear witness that we are Muslims. Our Lord! we believe in what Thou hast revealed, and we follow the Messenger; then write us down among those who bear witness''' (3:52-53).

“And behold! I inspired the disciples to have faith in Me and Mine Messenger: they said, ‘We have faith, and do thou bear witness that we bow to Allah as Muslims.’ Behold! the disciples, said: ‘O Jesus the son of Mary! can thy Lord send down to us a table set (with viands) from heaven?’ Said Jesus: ‘Fear Allah, if ye have faith.’ They said: ‘We only wish to eat thereof and satisfy our hearts, and to know that thou hast indeed told us the truth; and that we ourselves may be witnesses to the miracle.’ Said Jesus the son of Mary: ‘O Allah our Lord! Send us from heaven a table set (with viands), that there

may be for us - for the first and the last of us - a solemn festival and a sign from thee; and provide for our sustenance, for thou art the best Sustainer (of our needs).’ Allah said: ‘I will send it down unto you: But if any of you after that resisteth faith, I will punish him with a penalty such as I have not inflicted on any one among all the peoples’” (5:111-115).

“O ye who believe! Be ye helpers of Allah: As said Jesus the son of Mary to the Disciples, ‘Who will be my helpers to (the work of) Allah?’ Said the disciples, ‘We are Allah's helpers!’ Then a portion of the Children of Israel believed, and a portion disbelieved: But We gave power to those who believed, against their enemies, and they became the ones that prevailed” (61:14).

“The same religion has He established for you as that which He enjoined on Noah - the which We have sent by inspiration to thee - and that which We enjoined on Abraham, Moses, and Jesus: Namely, that ye should remain steadfast in religion, and make no divisions therein: to those who worship other things than Allah, hard is the (way) to which thou callest them. Allah chooses to Himself those whom He pleases, and guides to Himself those who turn (to Him)” (42:13).

Jesus is not God

“In blasphemy indeed are those that say that Allah is Christ the son of Mary. Say: ‘Who then hath the least power against Allah, if His will were to destroy Christ the son of Mary, his mother, and all every - one that is on the earth? For to Allah belongeth the dominion of the heavens and the earth, and all that is between. He createth what He pleaseth. For Allah hath power over all things’” (5:17).

“Christ disdaineth nor to serve and worship Allah, nor do the angels, those nearest (to Allah): those who disdain His worship and are arrogant,-He will gather them all together unto Himself to (answer)” (4:172).

“And behold! Allah will say: ‘O Jesus the son of Mary! Didst thou say unto men, worship me and my mother as gods in derogation of Allah?’ He will say: ‘Glory to Thee! never could I say what I had no right (to say). Had I said such a thing, thou wouldst indeed have known it. Thou knowest what is in my heart, Thou I know not what is in Thine. For Thou knowest in full all that is hidden. Never said I to them aught except what Thou didst command me to say, to wit, worship Allah, my Lord and your Lord; and I was a witness over them whilst I dwelt amongst them; when Thou didst take me up Thou wast the Watcher over them, and Thou art a witness to all things. If Thou dost punish them, they are Thy servant: If Thou dost forgive them, Thou art the Exalted in power, the Wise” (5:116-118).

“When (Jesus) the son of Mary is held up as an example, behold, thy people raise a clamour thereat (in ridicule)! And they say, ‘Are our gods best, or he?’ This they set forth to thee, only by way of disputation: yea, they are a contentious people. He was no more than a servant: We granted Our favour to him, and We made him an example to the Children of Israel And if it were Our Will, We could make angels from amongst you, succeeding each other on the earth” (43:57-60).

“The similitude of Jesus before Allah is as that of Adam; He created him from dust, then said to him: ‘Be’. And he was” (3:59).

Jesus is not Son of God

“The Jews call ‘Uzair a son of Allah, and the Christians call Christ the son of Allah. That is a saying from their mouth; (in this) they but imitate what the unbelievers of old used to say. Allah’s curse be on them: how they are deluded away from the Truth! They take their priests and their anchorites to be their lords in derogation of Allah, and (they take as their Lord) Christ the son of Mary; yet they were commanded to worship but One Allah: there is no god but He. Praise and glory to Him: (Far is He) from having the partners they associate (with Him)” (9:30-31).

“It is not befitting to (the majesty of) Allah that He should beget a son. Glory be to Him! When He determines a matter, He only says to it, ‘Be’, and it is. ‘Verily Allah is my Lord and your Lord: Him therefore serve ye: this is a Way that is straight.’ But the sects differ among themselves: and woe to the unbelievers because of the (coming) Judgment of a Momentous Day” (19:35-37)!

There is no Trinity

“O People of the Book! Commit no excesses in your religion: Nor say of Allah aught but the truth. Christ Jesus the son of Mary was (no more than) a messenger of Allah, and His Word, which He bestowed on Mary, and a spirit proceeding from Him: so believe in Allah and His messengers. Say not ‘Trinity’ : desist: it will be better for you: for Allah is one Allah: Glory be to Him: (far exalted is He) above having a son. To Him belong all things in the heavens and on earth. And enough is Allah as a Disposer of affairs” (4:171).

Miracles performed by Jesus

“Then will Allah say: ‘O Jesus the son of Mary! Recount My favour to thee and to thy mother. Behold! I

strengthened thee with the holy spirit, so that thou didst speak to the people in childhood and in maturity. Behold! I taught thee the Book and Wisdom, the Law and the Gospel and behold! thou makest out of clay, as it were, the figure of a bird, by My leave, and thou breathest into it and it becometh a bird by My leave, and thou healest those born blind, and the lepers, by My leave. And behold! thou bringest forth the dead by My leave. And behold! I did restrain the Children of Israel from (violence to) thee when thou didst show them the clear Signs, and the unbelievers among them said: ‘This is nothing but evident magic’” (5:110).

“And (appoint him) a messenger to the Children of Israel, (with this message): ‘I have come to you, with a Sign from your Lord, in that I make for you out of clay, as it were, the figure of a bird, and breathe into it, and it becomes a bird by Allah's leave: And I heal those born blind, and the lepers, and I quicken the dead, by Allah's leave; and I declare to you what ye eat, and what ye store in your houses. Surely therein is a Sign for you if ye did believe’” (3:49).

“At length she brought the (babe) to her people, carrying him (in her arms). They said: ‘O Mary! truly an amazing thing hast thou brought! O sister of Aaron! Thy father was not a man of evil, nor thy mother a woman unchaste!’ But she pointed to the babe. They said: ‘How can we talk to one who is a child in the cradle?’ He said: ‘I am indeed a servant of Allah: He hath given me revelation and made me a prophet; And He hath made me blessed wheresoever I be, and hath enjoined on me Prayer and Charity as long as I live; (He) hath made me kind to my mother, and not overbearing or miserable; So peace is on me the day I was born, the day that I die, and the day that I shall be raised up to life (again)!’ Such was Jesus the son of Mary: it is a statement of truth, about which they vainly dispute” (19:27-34).

Jesus was neither killed nor crucified by his enemies

“And (the unbelievers) plotted and planned, and Allah too planned, and the best of planners is Allah. Behold! Allah said: ‘O Jesus! I will take thee and raise thee to Myself and clear thee (of the falsehoods) of those who blaspheme; I will make those who follow thee superior to those who reject faith, to the Day of Resurrection: Then shall ye all return unto me, and I will judge between you of the matters wherein ye dispute’” (3:54-55).

“That they said (in boast), ‘We killed Christ Jesus the son of Mary, the Messenger of Allah’;- but they killed him not, nor crucified him, but so it was made to appear to them, and those who differ therein are full of doubts, with no (certain) knowledge, but only conjecture to follow, for of a surety they killed him not:- Nay, Allah raised him up unto Himself; and Allah is Exalted in Power, Wise” (4:157-158).

Jesus predicted the coming of Muhammad

“And remember, Jesus, the son of Mary, said: ‘O Children of Israel! I am the messenger of Allah (sent) to you, confirming the Law (which came) before me, and giving Glad Tidings of a Messenger to come after me, whose name shall be Ahmad.’ But when he came to them with Clear Signs, they said, ‘this is evident sorcery’” (61:6)!

Jesus is a Sign of the Hour and a witness on the Day of Judgment

“And (Jesus) shall be a Sign for the coming of the Hour of Judgment: therefore have no doubt about the (Hour), but follow ye Me: this is a Straight Way” (43-61).

“And there is none of the People of the Book but must believe in him before his death; and on the Day of Judgment he will be a witness against them” (4:159).

Annunciation and birth of Jesus

“Behold! the angels said: ‘O Mary! Allah hath chosen thee and purified thee- chosen thee above the women of all nations. O Mary! worship Thy Lord devoutly: Prostrate thyself, and bow down (in prayer) with those who bow down.’ This is part of the tidings of the things unseen, which We reveal unto thee (O Messenger!) by inspiration: Thou wast not with them when they cast lots with arrows, as to which of them should be charged with the care of Mary: Nor wast thou with them when they disputed (the point). Behold! the angels said: ‘O Mary! Allah giveth thee glad tidings of a Word from Him: his name will be Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, held in honour in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest to Allah; He shall speak to the people in childhood and in maturity. And he shall be (of the company) of the righteous.’ She said: ‘O my Lord! How shall I have a son when no man hath touched me?’ He said: ‘Even so: Allah createth what He willeth: When He hath decreed a plan, He but saith to it, ‘Be,’ and it is! And Allah will teach him the Book and Wisdom, the Law and the Gospel’” (3:42-48).

“Relate in the Book (the story of) Mary, when she withdrew from her family to a place in the East. She placed a screen (to screen herself) from them; then We sent her our angel, and he appeared before her as a man in all respects. She said: ‘I seek refuge from thee to (Allah) Most Gracious: (come not near) if thou dost fear Allah.’ He said: ‘Nay, I am only a messenger from thy Lord, (to announce) to thee the gift of a holy son.’ She said: ‘How shall I have a son, seeing that no man has

touched me, and I am not unchaste?’ He said: ‘So (it will be): Thy Lord saith, that is easy for Me: and (We wish) to appoint him as a Sign unto men and a Mercy from Us: It is a matter (so) decreed.’ So she conceived him, and she retired with him to a remote place. And the pains of childbirth drove her to the trunk of a palm-tree: She cried (in her anguish): ‘Ah! would that I had died before this! would that I had been a thing forgotten and out of sight!’ But (a voice) cried to her from beneath the (palm-tree): ‘Grieve not! for thy Lord hath provided a rivulet beneath thee; And shake towards thyself the trunk of the palm-tree: It will let fall fresh ripe dates upon thee. So eat and drink and cool (thine) eye. And if thou dost see any man, say, ‘I have vowed a fast to (Allah) Most Gracious, and this day will I enter into not talk with any human being’” (19:16-26).

Jesus confirmed the Torah

“I have come to you to attest the Law which was before me. And to make lawful to you part of what was (Before) forbidden to you; I have come to you with a Sign from your Lord. So fear Allah, and obey me. It is Allah Who is my Lord and your Lord; then worship Him. This is a Way that is straight” (3:50-51).

“And in their footsteps We sent Jesus the son of Mary, confirming the Law that had come before him: We sent him the Gospel: therein was guidance and light, and confirmation of the Law that had come before him: a guidance and an admonition to those who fear Allah” (5:46).

True followers of Jesus have compassion and Mercy

“Then, in their wake, We followed them up with (others of) Our messengers: We sent after them Jesus the son of Mary, and bestowed on him the Gospel; and We

ordained in the hearts of those who followed him Compassion and Mercy. But the Monasticism which they invented for themselves, We did not prescribe for them: (We commanded) only the seeking for the Good Pleasure of Allah; but that they did not foster as they should have done. Yet We bestowed, on those among them who believed, their (due) reward, but many of them are rebellious transgressors” (57:27).

Jesus cursed the Children of Israel

“Curses were pronounced on those among the Children of Israel who rejected Faith, by the tongue of David and of Jesus the son of Mary: because they disobeyed and persisted in excesses” (5:78).

Appendix B – On Interfaith Dialogue and Debate

“And dispute ye not with the People of the Book, except with means better (than mere disputation), unless it be with those of them who inflict wrong (and injury): but say, ‘We believe in the revelation which has come down to us and in that which came down to you; Our Allah and your Allah is one; and it is to Him we bow (in Islam).’” – Qur’an 29:46.

As Muslims living in America, the most important duty to our fellow countrymen is to call them to the *deen* of Allah *subhana hu wa ta ‘ala*. This does not mean that you must possess a degree or need to be affiliated with some sort of bureau or interfaith organization. *All* of us need to get involved according to our capacity. As one of our sheiks said, “This land (America) is thirsty for *sajda*.” The purpose of this book is not to give you a license to belittle or defame the Christian religion or its adherents. My intention is rather to provide you with a last line of defense should your Christian friend turn sour and decide that he wants to slander Islam and its Messenger. Under no circumstances, however, are we permitted to slander or disrespect anyone. Remember what Spiderman’s uncle said to him just before he died: “With great power comes great responsibility.” Therefore, choose your words carefully and use your wisdom. In whatever way you decide to engage yourself in conversation with Christians, do so in a manner befitting a Muslim, the best of all human beings. Ironically, you may notice that those who are strongest in opposition to you and your *dawah* efforts will actually be fellow Muslims! I have personally experienced Muslims making comments to me such as, “Brother, who cares what the Bible says, concentrate on the Qur’an” or “Don’t waste your time

trying to ‘convert’ people, just practice your faith and let God take care of them.” Or my personal favorite, “Brother, don’t you know that the Prophet (upon whom be peace) forbade ‘Umar from reading the Torah!” Yes, he did. The reason, however, is because it wasn’t ‘Umar’s place to read the Torah. All of us have different roles. I implore you to deal gently with each other and to respect those roles. Allah reveals to His Prophet: “Muhammad is the messenger of Allah; and those who are with him are strong against Unbelievers, but *compassionate amongst each other*” (Qur’an 48:29). These days it seems as if Muslims are strong against each other but compassionate amongst the Unbelievers!

As co-founder of Muslim Interfaith Council (MIC), I have had the good fortune of speaking at various interfaith venues. Events are of two types: Interfaith dialogue and interfaith debate. The purpose of interfaith dialogue is simply to *inform*. Our focus here should be on discovering similarities between our respective religious traditions, which in turn, inculcates understanding and tolerance. The goal of dialogue is to make your non-Muslim friends understand Islam and the Muslims and not necessarily agree with us. Use the Qur’an to demonstrate various points such as: The exalted status of Jesus and Mary, the rights of women in Islam, the life of the Prophet Muhammad, and/or the great Abrahamic tradition.

It is extremely important that we maintain ourselves in a dignified and disciplined manner. You will notice that many non-Muslims who attend interfaith dialogue events wear their prejudices on their sleeves. Do not let this discourage you. A simple smile or handshake can go a long way. If a member of the audience tries to pick an argument with you, do not accept the challenge. Answer the question to the best of your knowledge and politely ask that he or she refrain from further comments on the issue. Also, it is not a good idea to discuss politics. You will discover that once

this door is open, it becomes extremely difficult to close. You may find yourself spending the entire night defending political regimes and ideologies that have little or no relation to Islam. Once during the course of a dialogue, a Pastor hidden in the audience asked our panel to explain why a deranged Muslim man in Pakistan set fire to a church. I responded, "I really don't know. That certainly isn't the behavior of a good Muslim. – But why should we have to sit up here and answer for what some insane man in Pakistan did? I don't know what was going through his head!" This response caused the audience to chuckle and the questioner abandoned his probing. About a half-hour later, however, the Pastor began to interrupt us with one word questions like "Jihad?" or "bin Ladin?" I asked him, "What about Jihad and bin Ladin?" Make sure that a specific question is asked before you attempt to answer it. In dialogue, it is perfectly acceptable to respond by saying, "I don't know." Lastly, unless you're really gifted, try not to use Biblical quotes to back your points. Christians in the audience may take this as an affront against them. Rather spend that time talking about the beauty of the Qur'an or the greatness of our beloved Prophet *salallahu 'alaihi wa sallam*, two subjects that can never be exhausted. I once began quoting from John's Gospel during a dialogue at a Catholic Church to support the Muslim belief in the nature and function of Jesus, upon whom be peace. I noticed that although 99% of the audience found what I said pleasant and enlightening, there was one woman who took strong exception. She stood up and began rattling off various "I am" statements and demanded that I accept them as well. I had no choice but to further explain the Muslim position regarding the authenticity of the present-day Bible. As I continued to speak, other audience members began verbally objecting to my statements to the point where I had to quickly change subjects just to maintain

order. Therefore, save your comparative analysis for after the dialogue for those who *want* to hear it.

Debates are a whole separate issue. The purpose of debate is to *convince*. The goal of a debate is to make your non-Muslim friends *agree* with Islam and the Muslims. Obviously, this is much more difficult and requires a great deal of knowledge and effective articulation. While debating with Christians, it is *vital* that you make use of the Biblical text to defend your arguments. Unlike an interfaith dialogue, where both sides are presented independent of each other, debates require us to implement concepts and ideas that are present in our opponent's frame of reference. For example, in a dialogue I would simply inform the audience that in Islam we send blessings of peace upon one another. If I were debating, I would say, "Muslims send blessings of peace upon one another just as Jesus did according to your Gospels (Luke 24:36)." Since our focus in a debate is to win the argument, "I don't know" is never an acceptable answer.

You will notice that when cornered, Christians often resort to slander and ridicule. Make sure that if you plan on debating a Christian in a public forum, you let him know during a preliminary meeting that you have zero tolerance for such tactics. Remind him that he must stay on the topic as you will do the same. Have a strong moderator who will not be afraid of enforcing the rules. There was a certain priest with whom I met at a hotel the night before I was to debate him. We talked for hours about the format including the order of speakers, time limits, etc. The next night I noticed that he had brought two of his older colleagues to join him on the panel to debate me. After an hour or so, when they realized that they were losing badly, they began making disruptive noises like children and then slandered the Prophet. This behavior continued until the debate concluded. Even though the Muslim Student Association organized this event, not one of their intimidated members spoke up

and against the “triune” usurpers. On another occasion a few years earlier, a Christian from the audience decided that he would declare himself the official timekeeper and scriptural aide to my opponent. He would give him cues and whisper verses to him under his breath while the moderator, a Muslim, simply sat idly. Fortunately, one of my Muslim brothers from the audience publicly confronted him about this and shortly thereafter, he was gone. Thus a controlled environment is essential for a quality debate.

The good news about a debate is that you will always have an advantage over your Christian opponent. The reason is simple. Most Christians, even those who do public speaking events, know next to nothing about the Islamic tradition; and what they do know is often a bunch of stereotypical myths that can be easily combated. Muslim speakers, on the other hand, actually study Christian scripture and religious sources beforehand in order to critically evaluate the material in an educated and convincing manner. For instance, a Muslim might say the following during the course of a debate: “According to renowned New Testament scholar and author Bruce Metzger, I John 5:7 which explicitly outlines the Trinity, was fabricated into the Bible sometime during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. He comments in Strobel’s book: ‘I acknowledge that (the verse in question) is not part of what the author of I John was inspired to write.’” A Christian, on the other hand, will say something like: “Muslims believe that they must kill infidels in order to attain salvation” or “In Islam, dogs are considered dirty” or “Muhammad was suicidal and suffered from epilepsy.” I hope you can see the differences between the logical, lucid Muslim argument and the ignorant Christian ramblings. Truly “with Allah is the argument that reaches home” (Qur’an 6:149).

Appendix C – Answering Tough Questions and Turning the Tables

1. How can Islam be true when it has produced a person such as Osama bin Ladin?

Answer:

- The (alleged) actions of individuals cannot be blamed on their religious faith, even if what they (allegedly) did was in their minds, justified by religious motives. Can we then blame Christianity for the Ku Klux Klan or for turning Germany into a nation who took it upon itself to rid the world of “Christ-killers?” Can we blame Christianity for causing blood to flow through the streets of Jerusalem as one historian put it, “knee high to the horse (during the Crusades)?” Would it be fair for me to blame Christianity for the actions of Vlad the Impaler who used to dip his bread into the blood of Ottoman Muslims and then eat it on the battlefield? Can I blame Christianity for giving rise to such things as Nazism, Atheism, Socialism, Satanism, etc.? What about Jim Jones and David Kouresh?
- I really don’t know enough about Osama bin Ladin to give you an educated answer. All I do know about him is what the media is telling me, and *anyone* will tell you that the American media is masterful at spinning things.
- Bin Ladin is not the measuring stick of Islam, nor is any person or group of persons in the world today. Rather, judge Islam by the actions of the Prophet of Islam and you will clearly see what is right and wrong.

2. Why are Muslims killing Christians all around the world?

Answer:

- Is your question really accurate? – “All around the world?” If that is true then we should expect that the largest refugee population in the world to be Christians. Instead, they are Muslims!
- Again, Islam does not condone vigilantism, so if some crazy man in Pakistan or Lebanon decides to run a missionary over with his car, then he should be dealt with as a murderer. What happens to Muslims is quite different, however. Non-Muslim persecution of Muslims is something that is very often state endorsed! Look at Palestine, Kosovo, Kashmir, Chechnya, and Bosnia. Even in so-called “Muslim” countries like Turkey and Egypt women cannot wear headscarves in college and young men cannot grow their beards respectively.
- You have to understand that all countries have a right to govern themselves. In many Muslim countries, like Afghanistan, evangelizing Muslims is against the law yet Christians continue to do it. Therefore, they must be punished, not murdered. How would the American government and the Christian right feel if I decided to break the laws of this country by *preaching* (not teaching) Islam to elementary, intermediate, and high-school students?

3. Why are women so mistreated in Muslim countries? In Saudi, a woman cannot drive a car. In Afghanistan, women are forced to wear *burqas* that cover their entire bodies.

Answer:

- First of all, we must make a distinction between what culture says and what Islam is saying. Although wearing a *burqa* and banning women from driving are religiously motivated laws, both of these

are actually cultural practices originating from their respective countries. The *burqa* actually predates Islam.

- If women are mistreated in Muslim countries as you say they are, then why do they continue to adhere to Islamic dress-code after they immigrate to America? Why do American-born Muslim converts decide to wear *hijab* and *jilbaab*?
- To us, making a thirteen-year-old girl believe that she will not be popular with other girls or desired by boys if she doesn't show enough skin is true oppression. The *hijab* is viewed by Muslim women as a symbol of liberation from the yoke of man and dedication to the cause of God. For our women, wearing a *hijab* sends a message: "Don't deal with me physically. Deal with me spiritually and mentally." How powerful a message!
- Why do you suppose that nuns cover their heads? Have you ever once seen a statue or portrait of the Blessed Virgin without a *hijab*? This is a practice of religiously-oriented women.

4. Why do you not accept the New Testament as the Word of God?

Answer:

- Let's start with Paul. According to Christians, fourteen out of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament were authored by Paul who was not an eye or ear-witness to the ministry of Jesus. Paul's letters outline Christian dogmatic beliefs such as the divinity of Christ, vicarious atonement, original sin, value of good works, divine Sonship, and the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus. Before any canonical Gospel was even written, Paul had completed all of his letters and they were well distributed.

Therefore, the Gospels are very much steeped in Pauline influence and thought. Luke, for example, authored a Gospel and the book of Acts comprising nearly one-fourth of the entire New Testament, and he was a devout student of Paul. The only information we know about Paul comes from himself and his prize pupil. Mark was not a witness to Jesus yet Matthew decided to copy 90% of his Gospel verbatim. John's Gospel is totally different than the synoptics in form, chronology, style, and content yet it was accepted into the canon by the churches because of its high Christology.

- Why didn't the churches accept the Gospels of Thomas, Peter, Barnabas, Bartholomew, Andrew, or Mary as authentic? The answer is because these books, although ascribed to towering figures, were not in line with the theological agenda of the Hellenized Pauline churches. (Christians accept Mark's Gospel because Peter "the rock," the chief disciple of Jesus tutored him, yet reject the Gospel of *Peter* himself? Christians accept the Gospel of Luke and his book of Acts as authentic because Luke studied under Paul yet reject the Epistle and Gospel of Barnabas, the *teacher* of Paul? Christians accept the Gospel of Matthew because he was a disciple yet reject the Gospel of Thomas... a *disciple*?)
- None of the narratives about Jesus were written down during his lifetime and none of them were written in his mother tongue. In fact, according to modern scholarship, none of the four narratives were even named until the latter part of the second century. Therefore, these works are pseudonymous.
- Even if modern archaeology confirmed places and events in the New Testament; even if the Gospels were accurately transmitted down to us from the original Greek manuscripts; even if the 20,000 manuscripts matched exactly to one another; even if non-Biblical historians such as Tacitus or Josephus

mentioned the death of Jesus in Roman and Jewish records; even if the four Gospels were viewed as authentic by the earliest churches – This does not make them true and certainly does not make them the Word of God!

5. How do you know the Qur'an is the Word of God?

Answer:

- The Qur'an has not changed for over fourteen centuries because God said that He would preserve His Word. The Qur'an has a unique literary style that no one has ever matched, and no one will match because God had guaranteed us this as well. The Qur'an has no contradictions or discrepancies and is totally consistent of itself. The Qur'an has fulfilled prophecies within its pages and confirms modern science. The Qur'an contains stories of the past that Muhammad, an illiterate, could not have possibly known. The Qur'an contains many miracles of Muhammad. Muhammad is the fulfillment of many Biblical prophecies found in the Old and New Testaments (Cite examples and remind them that although the present-day Bible is not the Word of God, elements of Truth still exist within its text).

6. Why did Muhammad marry a six-year-old girl?

Answer:

- This is a very misunderstood topic. It was not uncommon back then for girls to get married at such a young age. Just because something is seen as improper in today's society, does not mean that it was improper then. In fact, in this case, she (*Aysha*, may Allah be pleased with her) was already engaged

- to marry someone else before the Prophet but that person was a non-Muslim. The Prophet did not consummate the marriage until she was older.
- Did you know that up until the late nineteenth-century, the legal age for a girl to get married in *this country* was six years old?
 - Islam is a religion of human nature. Therefore, when boys and girls reach the age of puberty, Muslims consider that as a *natural sign* that they are ready for marriage. Man-made laws should not dictate when we are supposed to be responsible!
 - This marriage was never attacked as immoral or indecent by even the worst of the Prophet's enemies.

7. Why aren't any non-Muslims allowed in Mecca?

Answer:

- Muslims do not view the pilgrimage to Mecca as a vacation in which to relax and go sightseeing. It is an arduous religious undertaking requiring dedication and patience. We view the city of Mecca as the holiest of all in the world. Therefore, for fear of it turning into a tourist attraction, non-Muslims are not permitted to travel there. Certainly if a Christian or Jew really wanted to see the *Kaaba*, he could simply pretend to be a Muslim.
- With regards to the spiritual reason, anyone who has not fully submitted his or her will to Gods' is simply not in any position to visit His sacred House. Muslims view this allowance by God as a privilege for only those who have faith.

8. Do Muslims believe that Jesus will one day return and convert to Islam? Is it the goal of Islam to dominate the world?

Answer:

- Let's look at your first question. First of all, it is true that Muslims believe in the second-coming of Christ, but he will not have to convert to Islam since he is already a Muslim (cite examples from scripture, see Chapter 3). He will, however, follow the perfected and complete form of Islam as practiced by the Prophet Muhammad, upon whom be peace. Jesus will not return as Prophet but rather as *Imam* (leader) and warrior. He will "kill the pig and break the cross" and he will not accept any sort of *jizyah* tax from non-Muslims (you may or may not want to mention this statement). We also believe that Jesus will live another forty years, during which time he will raise a family, and kill the Anti-Christ. Then he will die a natural death.
- The goal of Islam is to guide humanity. According to the Qur'an, most people in the world are devoid of knowledge and guidance. Sadly, they are also completely heedless that Islam is out there for them. We are not, however, permitted to force anyone to except Islam because we believe that "There is no compulsion in religion for truth stands clear from falsehood" (Qur'an 2:256).
- The irony about your second question is that many Muslims in the Muslim world view America in exactly the same way. They see this country as an imperialistic war machine bent on subjugating the masses into its one way of life. Yet if you ask the average American about this they will only say that America wants to "educate" and "civilize" the world with Western democratic ideals.

9. Why don't Muslims believe in democracy? Don't you know that dictatorships don't work?

Answer:

- Muslims *do* believe in democracy. That is the Islamic ideal! Let me make this clear immediately: There is no country in the world today that practices Islam in its purist tradition. Muslims do not believe in dictatorships or monarchies, yet Saudi Arabia, the country that has within its borders the two holiest cities, is a monarchy! Muslim leaders must be elected by the people, for the people. Look at the first four Caliphs after the Prophet's death and you will see this democratic process in action.
- Many things have contributed to the fall of Islamic democracy. First and foremost, it is our fault for not exhibiting ties of love and brotherhood among ourselves. Secondly, the colonization of the Muslim world by Western countries played a role in the process of Muslim self-hatred. This led to Muslims changing their focuses from wanting to please God to wanting to be just like the so-called "modern" world with all of its decadence.

10. Why weren't Muslims more vocal in their condemnation of the 9-11 attacks on the World Trade Center?

Answer:

- Again, the media chooses very carefully what it decides to filter down to us. I know for a fact that there were literally hundreds of Muslim organizations and thousands of Islamic leaders who condemned such cowardly acts of terrorism but the American West never knew of it and never reported it.
- Also, please don't forget that there were no winners during 9-11. All of us lost. You have to ask yourself: How did Islam benefit from 9-11? It did nothing but put us in a heightened state of fear from people who we would normally consider our friends. Our

children were teased at school, our wives and daughters were harassed in the supermarket, and we were called terrible names by our co-workers and neighbors.

Glossary

‘Abd Allah Ibn Maktum: An old blind man whom the Prophet frowned at in frustration while making *dawah* to the leaders of *Quraysh*. See Chapter 80 of the Holy Qur’an entitled *Abasa*, “He frowned.”

Abu Jahl: (*Abul Hakam*). A chief of the Makhzumites and one of the Prophet’s bitterest enemies. He was killed at Badr in 624 CE.

Acheyhem: Hebrew for “brethren” in Deuteronomy 18:18; used in reference to both Israelites and Arabs. See Deuteronomy 2:4, 23:7 where the *Edomites* are referred to as “brethren.”

Al-Ameen: “The Trustworthy.” A pre-Islamic title of the Prophet Muhammad given to him by his clansmen. This can also be translated “The Truthful” and “Spirit of Truth.”

Al-Mustafa: “The Chosen or Elect One;” a title of the Prophet Muhammad. See Isaiah chapter 42. Comes from the same root word as “Cephas,” the title of Peter given to him by Jesus meaning “chosen stone.”

Andrew: A disciple of Jesus Christ and brother of Simon Peter. He was a Galilean fisherman who may have been a follower of John the Baptist.

Anthropomorphism: To ascribe human shape and form to a deity, a theme prevalent in the Hebrew Bible.

Apocalypsis: A revelation of the spiritual world that is normally veiled from average human beings. Both Paul and Muhammad experienced these in their lifetimes. The final book of the New Testament called Revelation is based on a dream that a man named John had while imprisoned on the island of Patmos. This book is called the *Apocalypse* in the RCV of the Bible.

Apocrypha: A body of Jewish religious writings dating from about 200 BCE to 100 CE that were included in Greek editions of the Hebrew Bible but not in the official Hebrew Bible canon. These books are believed to be authentic by the Roman Catholics and are therefore retained in the RCV of the Bible.

Apologetics: A form of literature in which the author defends and attempts to prove his particular views.

Archon tootou kosmos: (Greek). “The prince of this world.” A title used for a person mentioned only in the Gospel of John alongside the Comforter by Jesus. In actuality, he *is* the Comforter. Christians believe this person to be Satan.

As-habbus-suffah: (Arabic). The designated scribes of the Prophet Muhammad.

Athanasian Creed: Orthodox creed of Christianity which states that “The Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost is God...the Father is a Person, the Son is a Person, the Holy Ghost is a Person... and yet they are not three Gods but one God...and yet they are not three Persons but one Person.” The Creed further states: “We worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity.”

Avatar: The Hindi word for a man-god or divine incarnation. These include Rama, Krishna, Buddha, and the Christian Jesus.

Baca: (Hebrew). “The weeping valley.” The ancient name for Mecca used by David in Psalm 84:6. Also see Qur’an 3:96. Named after the infant Ishmael’s crying while his mother Hagar ran frantically between two hills called *Safa* and *Marwah* in an effort to find water for her son.

Bahira: A Nestorian monk living in Syria who affirmed the Prophethood of Muhammad when the latter was a twelve-year-old boy. He asked *Abu Talib* (the Prophet’s paternal uncle and guardian) if he could see the area between the shoulder blades of the young Prophet.

Bar Kokhba: Judas “son of the star” who led a Jewish insurrection against Rome and claimed to be the Messiah. He was defeated in humiliation around 132-135 CE.

Barnasha: (Aramaic). The apocalyptic Son of Man mentioned in the book of Daniel 7:13 who is given power and dominion over his enemies and defeats the four beasts. He is also frequently mentioned by Jesus throughout the Gospels.

Ben-Adam: (Hebrew). The prophetic Son of Man applied to Ezekiel and Jesus Christ.

Christology: Theological interpretation about the nature and function of Jesus. This includes doctrines about his virgin birth, pre-human existence, and the meaning of his so-called crucifixion. The four evangelists all have differing christologies.

Christos: (Greek). The title given to a new initiate of the Greco-Roman mystery cult of *Mithraism*. The word “Christ,” translated from Messiah, is derived from this word.

Codex Sinaiticus: The oldest surviving Greek codex of the Bible (including New Testament) on earth (375 CE). Found in a monastery at the base of Mount Sinai.

Comforter: See *Paraklaytos*.

Constantine: The first Roman Emperor to embrace Christianity. Presided over the infamous Council of Nicea in 325 CE. Prior to his conversion, he was a staunch worshipper of the *Solen Victus*.

Council of Constantinople: Church synod in which the Holy Ghost was voted and declared co-equal, co-substantial, and co-eternal with God the Father and God the Son (381 CE).

Council of Nicea: Church synod in which Jesus Christ was voted and declared co-equal, co-substantial, and co-eternal with God the Father (325 CE).

Crucifict: To survive a crucifixion.

Cushan: A place in Arabia or Mesopotamia. See Habakkuk 3:7.

Dead Sea Scrolls: Scrolls found by a bedouin in a cave in Qumran along the shores of the Dead Sea in 1947 CE. These included the entire Old Testament with Apocrypha, as well as the Essene codes of morality and conduct.

Dedan: (Hebrew). A son of *Jokshan* and grandson of Abraham through Keturah; a place in southern Arabia. See Isaiah 21:13.

Dionysus: The son of Zues and the mortal Semele. The Greek god of wine and emotional liberation. He was the only Olympian to suffer rejection, death, descent into Hades, resurrection, and ascension to heaven. A chief deity and sin-bearing savior man-god of many mystery cults at the time of Christ.

Docetism: The Gnostic belief that Jesus only apparently seemed to be human when in actuality, he was pure spirit and escaped the death on the cross; from the Greek word meaning “to seem.”

Doomsday Resurrection: The rising of the dead at the end of time, just before the Day of Judgment. Resurrected bodies are raised physically and made immortal (spiritual/transformed).

Earthly Resurrection: The rising of the dead during the present world. The resurrection of Lazarus and ‘Aziz. Bodies are only raised physically and are thereafter subject to hunger, thirst, sleep, and death. Therefore, such a person may actually die twice.

Ebed (Abd): “Servant” or “slave” in Hebrew/Arabic. See Isaiah 42:1; Qur’an 17:1; 18:1. The primary title of the Prophet Muhammad, upon whom be peace.

Echad (Ahad): The Semitic word for “One” as used in Deuteronomy 6:4; Qur’an 112:1.

Edom: (Hebrew). Literally “red.” Name given to Esau, the first-born son of Isaac and brother of Jacob; progenitor of an Arab line of descendency.

Edomite (Idumean): A descendant of Esau, the son of Isaac.

Elohim: The Hebrew word for God; literally “Gods” (royal plural). This word is identical to the Arabic “Allah” and Aramaic “Allaha” or “Aloh.”

Epistle of Barnabas: A moralistic commentary on the Hebrew Bible supposedly written by Paul’s mentor and traveling companion. This book was included in the *Codex Sinaiticus* but has since been expunged by the church and deemed heretical.

Esau: See *Edom*.

Eschatology: Beliefs about the supernaturally directed destiny of humanity and the universe; from the Greek word meaning “study of the last things.”

Ethnocentric deification: To give physical characteristics to deities that exactly match the ethnic characteristics of the people who worship them.

Eubonites: A sect of first-century Nazarene Christians who denied the divinity of Christ, reviled Paul as an apostate and heretic, and believed only in Matthew’s Gospel. They also refused to participate in the failed *bar-Kokhba* rebellion in 132 CE.

Evangelist: An author of a canonical Gospel (Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John).

Exegesis: Close analysis and interpretation of a text to discover the author’s exact intent and meaning.

Gamaliel: A famous rabbi and Pharisaic teacher of Saul of Tarsus; a leader of the *Sanhedrin* and grandson of Hilel.

Gospel of Barnabas: A noncanonical Gospel of Jesus Christ presumably written by Barnabas, Paul's mentor. This Gospel contains clear prophecies of Muhammad by name but is rejected by Christians as heretical and spurious. The earliest mention of this Gospel is made by Pope Gelasius in a fifth-century letter as "*Evangelium Barnabe*." The oldest manuscript, however, is dated no earlier than the fifteenth-century and written in Italian.

Habibullah: (Arabic). "The Beloved of God;" a title of the Prophet Muhammad. See Song of Songs 5:10-16.

Hered the Great: The *Idumean* Roman-appointed ruler when Jesus was born. He reconstructed the Temple of Solomon but was also notoriously cruel toward his Jewish brethren.

Himdah: "Desired" in Hebrew; used in Haggai 2:7. The equivalent of the Arabic *Ahmad*. A derivative of the archaic Semitic root known as *hemed* (hmd).

Holy Communion: The Catholic ritual of eating bread and drinking wine (or water) representing the body and blood of Jesus Christ. Families whose children fulfill their "first Holy Communion" celebrate this event.

Hoshiya: "Saves;" used in reference to the Messiah in Psalm 20:6; derived from the Hebrew root word *yasha* meaning "to save."

Immanence: God's presence in the daily lives of his creatures.

Isnaad: (Arabic). The chain or transmission of *hadith* narration that is traced back to the Prophet Muhammad.

Jesus Seminar: A group of about one-hundred leading North American scholars that study and critically examine the historicity of the canonical Gospels. They have determined that only about 30% of what the Jesus of the Bible said is historically accurate.

Jonas Resurrection: The type of “resurrection” experienced by Jesus if the Swoon Theory were correct.

Judah: The son of Jacob; the Jewish people are named after him. In Genesis 38, he commits adultery with his daughter-in-law Tamar by the roadside which produces twins named Perez and Zerah, ancestors of Jesus according to Matthew and Luke.

Judas Iscariot: The disciple of Jesus who supposedly betrayed him for thirty shekels of silver.

Kedar: (Hebrew). The second son of Ishmael and forefather of the *Kedarites* or Ishmaelites; ancestor of the Prophet Muhammad. See Isaiah 42, 60; Song of Songs 1:5.

Kurios: Greek for “Lord.” A title of reverence given to both God and man in the Old and New Testaments.

Leshon Qaidir: (Hebrew). Literally “the tongue of Kedar;” the Arabic language.

Ma’sum: (Arabic). To be free of major sin. A characteristic of all the Prophets of God according to the Islamic tradition.

Messiah: The Anointed One (King) of Israel; from the Hebrew (*Mashiakh*). This is the primary title of Jesus, the son of Mary.

Midian: Son of Abraham by Keturah and progenitor of the tribe of Midianites or Arabians. Jethro or *Shu’ayb* is a descendant of Midian who becomes the father-in-law of Moses, upon whom be peace.

Mithraism: An ancient Greco-Roman mystery religion prevalent at the time of Jesus. Also known as the “bull-cult.” Initiates (*christos*) were all men, engaged in communal meals, animal sacrifices, and ritualistic baptisms. A slaughtered bull’s blood, representing God, would be sprinkled upon the initiates as a symbol of remission of sin.

Mithras: The Persian sun-god worshipped by much of the ancient Greco-Roman world. According to legend, he

committed an act of self-immolation for the sins of mankind. Also known as *Ra* (in ancient Egypt), *Helios* (Greek), and *solen victus* (Latin) meaning “the conquering sun-god.”

Monogenes: The Greek word used for “begotten” in John 3:16. Modern translations render this word as “unique” or “one and only.” According to the Nicene Creed, however, Jesus is supposed to be physically begotten of the Father, “begotten not made.”

Montanus: Founder of *Montanism*, a mid-second-century Christian sect. He claimed to be the *Paraklaytos* foretold by Jesus in John chapters 14 & 16.

Muhammadim: (Hebrew). “Altogether lovely or desirable” (royal plural). The word used in Song of Songs 5:16 to refer to the Beloved of God. This is the very same word as “Muhammad” as used by the Arabs.

Mutashaf'i: (Arabic). The spiritual station of the Prophet Muhammad as the Intercessor between God and his nation of believers on the Day of Judgment. This is the *moqama mahmood* described in the Qur'an 17:79.

Nabiyyul ummi: (Arabic). The “unlettered Prophet” mentioned in the Qur'an 7:157 and described in Isaiah 29:12. This is a prophecy of Muhammad's initial revelation from God.

Nebajoth: The first-born son of Ishmael. See Isaiah 60:7.

Paraklaytos: The Comforter, Counsellor, Advocate, Helper, or Intercessor prophesized by Jesus in John chapters 14 & 16 who will guide humanity into all truth. The coming of this person is conditional upon the departure of Jesus. The description of the Paraklaytos matches that of the Prophet like unto Moses of Deuteronomy 18:18.

Paran: (Hebrew). Another name for Arabia in general. See Deuteronomy 33:2; Habakkuk 3:3.

Parousia: The second-coming of Jesus Christ as supreme Judge and Redeemer. This event was expected to happen during the time of Paul and the Pauline church but never did.

Paul (Saul of Tarsus): The most influential person and missionary of the first-century church and author of at least seven of the New Testament books. A Pharisee turned Christian zealot and self-proclaimed apostle of Jesus Christ. The actual founder of Christianity.

Pentateuch: Greek for “five scrolls.” The first five books of the Hebrew Bible, also known as the *Torah*. Christians and Jews believe that these books were authored by Moses some 3,500 years ago.

Peter: The most prominent of Jesus’ twelve disciples, also known as Simon or Cephas. The brother of Andrew and native of Galilee; a fisherman by trade.

Pharisee: A religious sect of Judaism during the first two centuries CE who rigorously observed the Law of Moses. Jesus frequently butts heads with them in the Gospels about their hypocrisy and unbelief.

Proskuneo: Greek for “worship” or “revere;” can be applied to both God and man.

Pseudepigrapha: A collection of religious books outside the Hebrew canon composed in Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek from about 200 BCE to 200 CE.

Q: An abbreviation for *Quelle*, the German term for “source.” A hypothetical document that many scholars believe contained a collection of Jesus’ sayings (50-70 CE). The theory of its existence was formed to explain material common to both Matthew and Luke but absent from Mark’s Gospel. Consists mainly of parables and lacks a passion narrative.

Quraysh: The largest and most influential tribe in Mecca during Muhammad’s time. The Prophet belonged to this tribe.

Rahma: Arabic term for the Mercy of God.

Rashad Khalifa: False Prophet and cultist who declared himself the Messenger of the Covenant foretold in Malachi 3:1; Qur'an 3:81. Killed in 1990.

Sadducees: An ultraorthodox Jewish sect and priesthood who controlled the Temple and cooperated with Roman rule in Palestine. They denied the resurrection of the dead as well as judgment in the afterlife.

Sanhedrin: The supreme religious court of the Jews during the time of Jesus. According to the Gospels, this is where Jesus' trial was held.

Sar Shalom: (Hebrew). The "prince of peace" mentioned in Isaiah 9:6 who will "bear the symbol of dominion upon his shoulder."

Septuagint (LXX): A Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible completed by seventy Greek-speaking Hebrew scholars in Alexandria, Egypt (250 BCE).

Shahada: (Arabic). The first pillar of Islam. To "bear witness" that there is no god but Allah and that Muhammad is His slave and Messenger. This is the true key to salvation.

Shema: (Hebrew). The greatest commandment of ancient Israel found in Deuteronomy 6:4: "Hear (Shema) O Israel, the Lord our God, The Lord is One."

Shiloh: (Hebrew). The person prophesized by Jacob in Genesis 49:10 who will have "the obedience of all nations."

Shirk: (Arabic). Association or false worship. Muslims believe that this is the only sin that God does not forgive if sincere repentance is not made.

Sign of Jonah: The miracle of the Prophet Jonah alluded to by Jesus in Matthew and Luke. This great Sign was the manner in which God brought about the survival of Jonah from the clutches of death. Jesus applies this Sign to himself.

Simon of Cyrene: A mysterious figure mentioned in the synoptic Gospels who bore the cross for Jesus to Golgotha. Many first-century Christian sects believed that *he* was actually crucified in Jesus' place.

Sola fide: "Faith alone;" one of the principal doctrines of Paul.

Solen victus: See *Mithras*.

Soter: Greek word meaning "savior." This title is first given to Jesus in the Gospel of Luke. The most popular concept of God in the Greco-Roman world at the time of the composition of Luke's Gospel was that of a life-giving mother goddess (*Isis*) and sin-bearing savior (soter) deity (*Dionysus*).

Soteriology: The study of salvation; from the Greek word *soter*.

Substitution Theory: The theory that someone else was killed on the cross while Jesus escaped unharmed.

Sunnah: Life example of the Prophet Muhammad, upon whom be peace.

Swoon Theory: The theory that Jesus was placed on the cross but survived his ordeal by the Grace of God. The greatest support for this theory is found in the Q source document passages about the Sign of Jonah borrowed by Matthew and Luke.

Synoptics: "One eyed." The first three Gospels, so named because they share a large quantity of material in common.

Tahajjud: (Arabic). A late night optional prayer consistently offered by the Prophet Muhammad.

Tanzil: (Arabic). The revelation of God's Words; the literal Speech of the Almighty.

Taqwa: (Arabic). An important concept in Islam; to be conscious of God in all aspects of life.

Tawhid: (Arabic). The central concept in Islam meaning oneness of God, nature, and humanity.

Tema: (Hebrew). The ninth son of Ishmael; the land settled by the ninth son of Ishmael.

Teman: (Hebrew). Son of Eliphaz, grandson of Esau, and one of the dukes of Edom.

Torah: See *Pentateuch*.

Transubstantiation: The act of the Holy Ghost coming down during mass and transforming the bread and wine into the literal flesh and blood of Jesus Christ.

Trinity: The post-New Testament doctrine that God exists as one nature or essence but also as three separate and distinct persons or entities, namely the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Uthman: The third Caliph of Islam who oversaw the task of unifying the Qur'an in the Muslim world.

Waraqah: Christian scribe and cousin of Khadijah (Muhammad's wife) who testified to Muhammad's Messengership as evidenced within the Christian Bible.

Wilderness of Paran: The central Sinai peninsula (northern Arabia) where Ishmael settled.

Yahweh: A translation of the sacred name of Israel's God, represented almost 7,000 times in the canonical Hebrew Bible by the four consonants of the *tetragrammaton* (YHWH).

Yeshua: The original Hebrew name of Jesus according to modern-day Christians. This word actually means "saved," not Savior.

Zayd Ibn Thabit: The official scribe of the Prophet Muhammad. He compiled the Qur'an and made it into one codex under Abu Bakr and 'Umar's instruction.

Selected References

- Abdalati, Hammudah. *Islam in Focus*. Plainfield, IN: American Trust Publications, 1996.
- Alan, K. *Contradictions and Fallacies in the Bible*. Dr. D. Suliman, 1988.
- Al-Disuqi, Rasha. *The Resurgent Voice of Muslim Women*. Lombard, IL: Foundation for Islamic Knowledge, 1999.
- Al Hawfi, Ahmad Muhammad. *Portrait of Human Perfection*. London, England: Dar Al Taqwa Ltd., 1996.
- Al-Kalby, Kais. *Prophet Muhammad: The Last Messenger in the Bible*. Bakersfield, CA: American Muslim Cultural Association, 1997.
- Armstrong, Karen. *A History of God*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1993.
- Aziz-us-Samad, Ulfat. *Islam and Christianity*. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: International Islamic Publishing House, 1988.
- Baagil, H.H. *Muslim/Christian Dialogue*. Jeddah, Saudi Arabia: Islamic Education Foundation, Revised Edition.
- Badawi, Jamal A. *Muhammad's Prophethood: An Analytical View*. Plainfield IN: The Muslim Students' Association of the United States and Canada, 1973.
- Bucaille, Maurice. *The Bible, the Qur'an and Science*. Delhi: Taj Company, 1988.
- Chick, Jack T. *Allah had no Son*. Chick Publications, 1994.

- Dawud, Abdul-Ahad. *Muhammad in the Bible*. Malaysia
Edition: Pustaka Antara, 1969.
- Deedat, Ahmad. *Crucifixion or Crucifiction?* Durban, South
Africa: Islamic Propagation Centre International.
- Deedat, Ahmad. *Is the Bible God's Word?* Durban, South
Africa: Islamic Propagation Centre International.
- Deedat, Ahmad. *Muhammad, the Greatest*. Durban, South
Africa: Islamic Propagation Centre International.
- Deedat, Ahmad. *Muhammad, the Natural Successor to Christ*.
Durban, South Africa: Islamic Propagation Centre
International.
- Deedat, Ahmad. *What is His Name?* Durban, South Africa:
Islamic Propagation Centre International.
- Denny, Frederick Mathewson. *An Introduction to Islam*. New
York: Macmillan, 1994.
- Dimashkiah, Abdul Rahman. *Let the Bible Speak*. Riyadh,
Saudi Arabia: International Islamic Publishing
House, 1995.
- Emerick, Yahiya. *The Complete Idiot's Guide to
Understanding Islam*. Indianapolis, IN: Alpha
Books, 2002.
- Geisler, Norman L. and Abdul Saleeb. *Answering Islam: The
Crescent in the Light of the Cross*.
Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1993.
- Harris, Stephen L. *The New Testament*. Mountain View, CA:
Mayfield Publishing Company,
1999.
- Ibrahim, I.A. *A Brief Illustrated Guide to Understanding
Islam*. Houston, TX: Darussalam Publishing, 1997.

- Kee, Howard Clark. *Jesus in History: An Approach to the Study of the Gospels*, Third Edition. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1996.
- Keturegga, Badru D. and David W. Shenk. *A Muslim and a Christian in Dialogue*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1997.
- Lings, Martin. *Muhammad: His Life based on the Earliest Sources*. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions International, 1983.
- Mawdudi, Abdul-A'la. *Towards Understanding Islam*. The Message Publications, 1986.
- McDowell, Joshua. *More than a Carpenter*. Wheaton, IL: Living Books, 1977.
- Morey, Robert. *The Islamic Invasion*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers, 1992.
- Rahman, Fazlur. *Islam*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Rhodes, Ron. *Reasoning from the Scriptures with the Muslims*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers, 2002.
- Sakr, Ahmad H. *Muslims and Non-Muslims: Face to Face*. Lombard, IL: Foundation for Islamic Knowledge, 1991.
- Schimmel, Annemarie. *Islam: An Introduction*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- Strobel, Lee. *The Case for Christ*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1998.
- Usmani, Mohammad Taqi. *What is Christianity?* Karachi, Pakistan: Siddiqi Trust, 1987.
- Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania. *Should*

You Believe in the Trinity?: Is Jesus Christ the Almighty God? Brooklyn, NY: Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc., 1989.

Zebiri, Kate. *Muslims and Christians: Face to Face*. Oxford, England: Oneworld Publications, 1997.